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PREFACE

My explorations of the valleys of Arabia Deserta in 1908 and 1912 brought me to the right bank of the middle Euphrates, which I followed in the course of my expedition of 1912. Urged on by what the ancient and Arabic authorities had written of mysterious rivers Saocoras and at-Tartâr, I penetrated also the interior of southern Mesopotamia in 1912 and 1915. In the latter year, on my return from an extended journey in central Arabia (which will be narrated in Northern Neýd, a forthcoming volume of the present series) I not only made an investigation of the canal systems adjoining the former estuary of the Euphrates but on my way back to Syria traced the left bank of the Euphrates northward from al-Waßâš to ad-Dejr, following a route prompted by the study of historical records which demonstrate that in early times the left bank was even more important than the right as a commercial and military highway. These explorations both along the banks of the great river and in its vicinity form the subject of the present work.

A discussion of the method by which I constructed my map of Northern Arabia, which illustrates a part of the text of this volume, will be found in the preface of my Arabia Deserta (New York, 1927), pp. xiii—xvi. The data for my map of Southern Mesopotamia, which accompanies this volume, were assembled in much the same manner. The map of Northern Arabia was printed by the Cartographical (former Military Geographical) Institute, Vienna, that of Southern Mesopotamia by the Military Geographical Institute (Vojenský zeměpisný ústav), Prague.

The primary motive of my explorations was historical, not cartographical; I therefore tried to collect as many topographical names as possible as a basis for historical researches, and in so doing I paid especial attention to the spelling. In transliterating Arabic letters I have used the same signs as in my two works The Northern Hejâz (New York, 1926) and

---

1 See my Arabia Deserta (constituting No. 2 of the present series), New York, 1927, pp. 44—75, 212—275, 357—373.
Arabia Deserta, attempting to express each sound by a single letter or a single symbol. The meaning of the different symbols will be found by experts below the title of the accompanying map of Southern Mesopotamia. For the general reader I would point out that ġ is to be read like g in gem, š like sh, ẓ like z in azure, č like ch in chief, j like y in yoke, and that ' is a strong guttural sound. The remaining symbols need not trouble him.

Throughout this work most of the Biblical and Assyrian names have been transliterated consistently with the scheme of transliteration employed for Arabic names. The Biblical forms, therefore, are often somewhat different from those found in the King James version, but the latter may readily be ascertained by reference to the Bible itself. Greek names are in general spelled in their Latin form rather than directly transliterated from the Greek.¹

References to the Bible are to Rudolf Kittel's second edition of the Hebrew text, Leipzig, 1913. The reader will observe that occasionally these references are at variance with the text of the King James version. These variations are due to the fact that my interpretations of the meaning of the original Hebrew sometimes diverge from that of the translators of the King James version.

Bibliographical references in the footnotes are given in abbreviated form. The full references, with the dates of Arabic and ancient authors, will be found in the Bibliography, pp. 371—383.

The meaning of the majority of Arabic terms used in the text will be evident from the context. Two terms, however, are frequently employed without explanation:

šē'īb (plural, še'ībān): relatively small watercourse or valley occupied by an intermittent stream;

wūdāt (plural, wūdijān): relatively large watercourse or valley occupied by an intermittent stream.

Arabic botanical terms appearing in the text are listed in the index with brief characterizations and Latin equivalents as far as these have been determined.

A sketch map showing the author's route and indicating the pages in this volume on which the different portions of his itinerary are discussed accompanies the volume.

¹ Exceptions to these general rules governing transliteration are made for those proper names that have acquired conventional English forms, the latter being used to avoid the appearance of pedantry.
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PART I

1912
CHAPTER I

DEJR AZ-ZÔR TO AL-FHEJMI

In March and early April, 1912, in company with Prince Sixtus of Bourbon, whom we called our Emir, I made a journey through Palmyrena.1 Rudolf Thomasberger, an official of the Military Geographical Institute in Vienna, accompanied our party as the scientific assistant whose duty it was to take care of our scientific instruments and to sketch our itinerary. The nine she-camels which carried us and all our baggage were in charge of Nāṣer eben ‘Obejdi al-Mařlûk and Muhammaduben Sa‘adaddin al-Ḥamûte, who also cooked and washed for us.

From Palmyrena we crossed over the ridge of al-Bišri, arriving on April 8, 1912, at the town of Dejr az-Zôr.2

DEJR AZ-ZÔR TO AS-SAḤEL

Dejr az-Zôr (Fig. 1), otherwise known as Dejr aš-Ša‘ar or briefly as ad-Dejr, lies on the right bank of the Euphrates opposite a green islet, across which a permanent bridge leads to the left bank. Six white minarets rise above a group of white domes and flat brown roofs. To the east of the houses is a green mass of gardens and sown fields, while on the west are desolate bare spaces. To the north can be seen a large barrack, beyond it the Circassian settlement, and still farther north the gardens of aš-Sâlīiji, the property of Sâleḥ Pasha. The houses in the northeastern part of the town are higher than the rest. The principal quarters of the town, called maḥall, are: aš-Šejiḥ Jâṣîn, Abu ‘Abed, ar-Rušdijje, Ġâme‘ aš-Kebrîr, al-Wâṣṭ, and ‘Abdal‘azîz. The government building (as-serûja) is situated on the Euphrates between Maḥall ‘Abdal‘azîz and Maḥall aš-Šejiḥ Jâṣîn. Ġâme‘ aš-Kebrîr, or al-Ḥamîdi, was built in 1900; Ġâme‘ al-‘Omari is old and occupies the center of the town. Besides numerous public schools there

---

1 This part of the journey is dealt with in Palmyrena, a forthcoming volume of the present series.
2 A key to the place names mentioned in this volume and which appear on the maps of Northern Arabia and Southern Mesopotamia published in this series is included in the Index. See also the index map.
was one rušdijje (polytechnic school) and one ʿadadijje (high school). Among the chief families I may mention the Bejt Ftejeh, the Bejt ʿAbdalʿaziz, and the Bejt Ḥaṭṭār.

The inhabitants make their living chiefly by trade. They buy wool, make carpets and blankets for the semi-fellāhīn and even for the Bedouins, and also buy goat’s and sheep’s butter, which they export principally to Damascus. From the latter town and from Aleppo they import European wares, especially cotton and linen fabrics, and from Bagdad tumbāk (tobacco for the water pipe) and fine cloaks for the natives. In Bireğik they buy small rafts and load them with wheat and barley. Sailing by day and resting by night, they are said to reach al-Fellūğe in from eight to ten days. There they load the grain into wagons or on donkeys, sell the rafts at about two hundred piasters ($9.00) each, and return home. Sometimes they buy cheap butter and other articles in Ḫarīr, load them in sailing boats, and then travel from settlement to settlement offering their goods for sale. It takes about two months for such a boat to make the voyage upstream from al-Fellūğe to Dejr az-Zūr.

Besides four thousand Moslems there have long been Christians also living in Dejr az-Zūr, mainly Armenians and Syrians. These immigrants have increased to such an extent that in 1912 there were about eight hundred Syrian and six hundred Armenian Catholics; also two hundred Jews. The Armenians and Syrians had two chapels.

Subordinate to the command in Dejr az-Zūr there were gendarmerie barracks west of the Euphrates on the highway from Damascus to Bagdad, at al-Bēزا, Tudmor, Arak, as-Suḫne, ad-Dīdī, al-Ḵebāžebe, and al-Khejbe; also on the highway from Aleppo to Bagdad, at al-Kassāra (or al-Kasra), al-Madān, at-Tibnī, as-Ṣmēṭijje, Bu Ḥesan (or as-Ṣōr), al-Mījāḏīn, as-Ṣālḥijje, Abu Kemāl (or Abu Čemāl), and al-Kājem. A gendarme received 160 to 180 piasters ($7.20 to $8.10) a month as salary and 120 to 150 piasters ($5.70 to $6.75) for horse keep. The garrison of Dejr az-Zūr consisted of four hundred barrāle (men mounted on mules), and the patrol duty fell to 120 gendarmes. The fact that the mail was no longer sent from Damascus to Bagdad by the Darb as-Sāʿī, but from Aleppo along the right bank of the Euphrates to Hit and Bagdad, was of great advantage to the inhabitants of ad-Dejr, as the distance from Aleppo to Bagdad was covered in
eight days. For every hour of delay the fine was one Turkish pound ($4.50). The contract for carrying the mail was in the hands of al-Hāqīqi Ṣejjo of Dejr az-Zūr, who received 105 Turkish pounds ($475.50) a month for his services. He kept horses at all the stations. The messenger would transfer the letter bags to fresh horses and immediately leave again, riding at a trot all the time. Money or parcels he did not accept.

The carriages or coaches from Bagdad used to stop for the night at the following stations: al-Fellūğ, ar-Rumādí, Hit, al-Barādí, al-Haḍīta, Ṭāna, an-Nehjīya, al-Kājem, aş-Sāḥbijje, al-Miṣjādīn, Dejr az-Zūr, at-Tībni, as-Sāḥja, al-Ḥammām, al-Meskene, Nahr Dahab, and Aleppo.

We cannot state positively the ancient name of Dejr az-Zūr. We called on the mutasāṣrīf (governor of the sanjak) immediately after our arrival, but as he was asleep we handed our letters of recommendation to the commander of the gen-

3 Following Jāḳūt, Ma’ṣane (Wustenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 682, and Abu-l-Fadā’il, Marāṣid (Juynholl), Vol. 1, p. 436, we might identify it with Dejr Rumāmā, as this was a large town with market places for the Bedouins between ar-Raḳṣa and al-Ḥabbūr, where the caravans from Irak to Syria used to stop for rest. —

Ar-Raḳṣa and al-Ḥabbūr (Kerkī)a lie, it is true, on the left bank of the Euphrates, while ad-Dejr is on the right, but Jāḳūt rarely locates any place very precisely, and between the two towns mentioned on the left bank there is no trace of a great town called ad-Dejr. The caravans rested at Dejr Rumāmā because there the easiest road via Tadmur to Damascus branches off from the road along the right bank of the Euphrates to Syria.

Oppenheim, Vom Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golfe (1890), Vol. 1, p. 330, writes that the first mention of ad-Dejr is found in Abu-l-Feda’a’s chronicle for the year 1321 A.D. and tells of the demolition of the dam at Dār Bāṣir. — This passage, mentioned but not quoted by Oppenheim, occurs in the Cairo edition, 1905, Vol. 4, p. 106.

Ibn Kaṭīr, Rūđija (Codex vindobonensis, No. 818 [N. P. 187]), Vol. 7, fol. 20 r., relates that in 1331 the Euphrates was in great flood, the inundation lasting twelve days, and that much property was destroyed in the neighborhood of ar-Raḳṣa. The raging stream demolished the pontoon bridge at Dejr Bāṣir, in consequence of which the price of grain there went up very high. The inhabitants repaired the bridge, but the water tore it down a second time. —

The context indicates that the bridge in question was near ar-Raḳṣa (the present al-Miṣjādīn), forty-five kilometers southeast of ad-Dejr. Grain was brought there probably from Mesoopotamia down al-Ḥabbūr, as well as from the fertile region around the ancient Daurūn canal. According to this interpretation, Dejr Bāṣir should be located near al-Miṣjādīn and not at Dejr az-Zūr, where it is placed by Oppenheim and Moritz (Palmgren [1897], p. 35). Ibn Kaṭīr refers only to a destroyed pontoon bridge. It is also possible that the name of the modern settlement of al-Beṣrja is derived from Bāṣir.

Khaṭṭī Bāḥrī, Mīlān namuṣ (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 444, mentions the towns of Raḳṣa and Dejr as being in the political district of ar-Raḳṣa. He asserts that the fort of ad-Dejr is supposed to stand on a height in the administrative district of ar-Raḳṣa.

Evliya Čelebi, Taṣrīḥ (Von Hammer’s transl.), Vol. 1, p. 36, refers to the sanjak of Dejr Raḳṣa.

In 1867 Şāʾid ēben ‘Abdal’ažiz and his Wahḥābites plundered ‘Āna and Dejr az-Zūr (Rousseau, Pašallık de Bagdad [1886], pp. 179 f.).

In 1898 Rousseau (ibid., p. 79) described Dejr as a miserable village of a few huts of Arabs nominally subject to the pasha of Bagdad.

In 1857 this settlement was occupied by ‘Omar Pasha of Aleppo. His successor, Ḥall Bāy, established some sort of order there as well as in the whole neighborhood, with the result that after only five years a mutasāṣrīfījje (Arabic for Turkish sanjak) was organized. The first mutasāṣrīf was Hāsīn Pasha. His successor, Arslān Pasha, warred constantly with the Gebūr, ‘Aṣźāža, Sammar, and ‘Anāk tribes, thus extending his power: but after a year and a half he was recalled and superseded by the peaceable ‘Omar Pasha, who built in his political district schools, military barracks, hospitals, and a bridge across to the left bank of the Euphrates; the eastern part of this bridge was carried away by floods soon after (1856). In 1909, under Ḥāfız Pasha, telegraphic connection was established and the road from Aleppo to Bagdad made safe.
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darmes and at 2.20 P. M. left again, since there was absolutely no pasture for our camels around the town. The sparse grass had been eaten off by mules, and only the fields were green. On the right bank south of the town extended the gardens of al-Ğofra; on the left, those of al-Hsăniğje and al-Ħatăla. On our right we had the group of hillocks at-Tarde. At 3.45 we passed three small ruins, al-Ħajaran. At 4.35 we lay down to rest near the as-Saheıl ruins by the Euphrates, pitying the peasants from al-Mrâjjiğje because of the labor necessary for the irrigation of their lands. All night long they drew the water from the river with the help of their cows, lead it by tiny ditches through the fields, and then dig it into the grain with broad shovels. It is cruel work, of a sort to which our peasants of central Europe would hardly accustom themselves.

AS-SAHEİL TO AŞ-ȘEJİḤ ‘ALI

On April 9, 1912, at 5.45 A.M. we entered the cultivated alluvial tracts of Mezrâk al-Heşel and al-Mrêjjiğje. The river was flowing quietly under a cover of light mists; the rocky slopes enclosing it merged with the violet horizon; only in the east a red glow steadily brightened, until the sun, glistering like gold and appearing to have just risen from the river, at last came into view and looked around wonderfully on the quiet, sleeping country. Both to the right and left of the sun rose tiny wisps of thin smoke, which vanished in the rose-tinged blue of the sky. Nothing stirred. Only a wooden hoist, beneath a cluster of poplars on our left, creaked as water was drawn for the irrigation of a tract of land near by.

At 6.33 we had on our left the three ruin mounds of as-Sera'. At 7.05 we came in sight of two fair-sized groves of poplar, the western one called Bu Ḥasan and the eastern one on the left bank known as at-Ṭabijje. To the southeast appeared the gray dome of the little sanctuary of Abu Nhūd.¹

¹ Abu Nhūd I take to be the shrine of Fam Sa’lld. Ibn Serapion, ‘Adā’iḥ (British Museum MS), fol. 33 r.: (Le Strange), p. 14, says that the Sa’lld canal branches off from the Euphrates at the little shrine of Fam Sa’lld, runs past many villages on the right bank, irrigates the farms of the town of ar-Rḥba, sends out a few branches to the farms of the little town of ad-Dâlijja, and empties into the Euphrates above this place, which is called Dâlijjat Mâlik ibn Towṣ.

Jâydi, Maťom (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 246, likewise refers to the Sa’lld canal below the town of ar-Rākkā. It was so called after the son of the Caliph ‘Abdalmalek, who, owing to his piety, was also called Sa’lld al-Hejir. The district intersected by the Sa’lld canal was overgrown with bushes, a favorite hiding place of lions. Sa’lld received it in fief from his brother, the Caliph al-Walîd. He ordered a canal to be dug and the land around it to be settled.

Abu-l-Feda', Tawâfis (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 281, writes that the inhabitants of the chateau and settlement of ar-Rachba drink from the aqueduct issuing from the Sa’lld canal.
At 7.18 there appeared on our left the knoll with the aš-Šnāfījje ruins and at eight the at-Ṭāleʾ ruins. The little shrine of Abu Nhūd is situated south of the hamlet of al-Ḵat’a on a rather low heap of ruins. East of it rose several ruin mounds, half covered with sand and called Tuʾús al-Ḥubez. Beyond them spreads an undulating plain with the al-Ḥrejm ruins and the hamlet of aš-Ṣūr, the property of the Bu Šīl family of the ‘Akejdāt. Al-Ḥrejm forms an oblong, flat hill, where the peasants excavate various antiquities during the winter months. On the right, about three kilometers to the south, projects a steep, rocky bluff, shutting in the valley which the Euphrates during countless ages has dug for itself through the plateaus of the Arabian desert.

To the northwest, in front of the bluff, rose the hillock Nišān at-Tejs; southwest of us extended the bare plain of al-Mdawwara and to the east rose the hill Tell al-Žībel. Towards eight o'clock a cold northwest wind began to blow. At 8.40 we rode past some ruin mounds; at 9.20 we passed the ruin mound Tell umm Đakar, and at 9.33 we were among the ruins west
of the hamlet of at-Towb. East-southeast, on a low, oblong ridge running out to the Euphrates, the settlement al-Bsejra appeared; to the south rose the castle of ar-Rhaba. On our right the plain was covered with 'erz plants. At 10.20 on our left lay the aş-Şlē' ruins, beyond them the fields of Sa'luwa, and to the southeast the hamlets of az-Zebāri and al-Mimleha. At 10.35 we crossed the plains of al-Ḥrejse and Borros, which in time of flood are regularly inundated.

From 10.55 to 12.56 we rested on the fields of Lâjeq and sketched a map of the neighborhood. At 1.50 P. M. we had on our right the remains of a tower built of brick and on our left the fields of Be'lūm and as-Sajjahāt. At 2.05 we passed ruins. The Euphrates eats away its right bank, thus constantly forming new islets (ḥawīje, pl. ḥawājej) which are overgrown with poplars. On the left two minarets and two palms came into view, marking the site of the little town of al-Mijāḏin, hidden in the midst of cultivated fields. The town is inhabited by about four hundred Moslem, fifteen Syrian Christian, and three Jewish families. The Christians immigrated from Mardin not long ago. Altogether there are 2500 people in about 380 houses there. The town is also the residence of a kājmakām (or kājemmakām, governor of a ḫada'). Order and safety are secured by ten mule riders (baru'de), twelve gendarmes, and ten policemen. There is also one school for boys.⁸

South of al-Mijāḏin lie the hamlets of al-Fādse, al-Mehkān,⁶ Tell al-Krejje, and al-Ḳzejm. Near al-Mehkān and al-Krejje antiquities were being excavated.

On our right, on a hill artificially separated from the steep bluffs, the ruined castle of ar-Rhaba (Fig. 2) glowered down on the flood plain. It is built on a spur separated from the plain to the west by a wide, deep moat, thus forming an isolated hill. The hill was surrounded by a solid stone wall in which a serpentine road to the castle was constructed. The material of which the wall was made has since been broken up and hauled away to al-Mijāḏin, and the road has disappeared; it is therefore not easy to climb up to the castle.

⁸ See below, Appendix XV.
⁶ In the ruins between al-Mehkān and al-Krejje I locate the ancient town of Sirkī. When the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta II (880—884 B.C.) camped in the fields of Ašarbānī, he was presented by Muṣada of the land of Lāḳ with two hundred wethers, thirty head of cattle, with grain, straw, bread, and drink. When he approached Sirkī, the king of that town sent him three minae of gold, seven minae of pure silver, forty copper vessels, one talent of myrrh, several hundred sheep, 140 head of cattle, twenty asses, and twenty birds, as well as corn, straw, and fodder (Annales [Scheil, Annales (1909), pl. 4], reverse, II. 2 f., 8-10; Scheil, op. cit., p. 30).
Still in a good state of preservation are extensive subterraneean vaults erected of bricks, and a high wall enclosing a rectangular court. In the center of this court stands a large building with thick walls, with a second court inside. Nearly all the walls are partly demolished and some have been entirely carried away. North and east of the castle hill can be seen insignificant remains of old brick buildings and large heaps of broken earthenware. Freshly dug holes here and there show that the ruins are being excavated either for building material or treasure.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Abu-l-Feda\'s \textit{Ta\'uris} (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 281, asserts that Rabbat Mâlik ibn Tawâk had been demolished and that nothing remained of it but a settlement in which the projecting towers of mosques and other buildings were the sole remnants of the former town. South of it, about one parasang from the Euphrates, Sirkâh ibn Ahmad ibn Sirkâh, the lord of Ḥoms, built ar-Raḥbat al-Geđide. This was said to be a small settlement with a fort on a mound of earth; its inhabitants drank water from a ditch issuing from the Sa\'id canal. About 1330 it was a halting place of caravans from Irak and Syria and a Moslem frontier post. Abu-l-Feda\' in this connection cites the book \textit{al-Aẓār} as saying that from ar-Raḥba to Ḫarkisija\' is three parasangs.

Della Valle, \textit{Viaggi} (Venice, 1664), Vol. 1, p. 571, records that towards evening he saw at quite a distance from the Euphrates the fort of Raḥba, where, as he was informed, many old monuments still existed. Elsewhere (\textit{ibid.}, p. 574) he writes that he encamped by a settlement which was not walled in and was called Mesghel `Ali, as many settlements in Arabia Deserta were then called.
East of the castle of ar-Rhaba, right above the bluffs, stand three little sanctuaries. The domes of two of these are intact, but the third is partly demolished. The name of the northern one is aš-Šibli; that of the next to the south, aš-

Šrejž; and that of the southernmost, aš-Šejh ‘Ali, or ‘Ali al-Hsejn. Below this at 5.12 we encamped by the fields of ‘Alijat al-Muğallaṭ at the foot of steep bluffs. Climbing with some difficulty up the bluffs we examined the sanctuaries. ‘Ali al-Hsejn lies in the south part of a large ruined settlement (Fig. 3) hidden in a small hollow which falls off to the southeast towards an abundant, but bitter, spring in the valley of al-Ḥor. The huts are built of good stone, bricks, and mud, but nobody lives in them. The mosque, not a large building, is formed at the bottom like a square, which changes into an octagon above, and is topped by a dome. Northeast of the mosque stands an octagonal minaret. Aš-Šrejž is a poor sanctuary, consisting of an extensive mosque and a ruined minaret, and is built above a spring of fresh water. The two settlements of ‘Ali and aš-Šrejž are of modern origin. At the foot of the

AŠ-ŠEJH ‘ALI TO AŠ-ŠÂLHIJJE

On April 10, 1912, at 5.55 A.M. we were again on the road. A cold wind was blowing from the northwest. To our right we had the broad valley of al-Ḥôr, through which the run-off is brought a great distance from the Arabian desert; on the left close by the river appeared old ruins on a black hill, on which cluster the brownish huts of the large settlement of al-‘Aṣâra, or Tell ‘Aṣâra, inhabited by almost two hundred families. The hill is artificial and about twenty meters high; its eastern part had been washed away by the river. There was a government office in this settlement originally, but in 1862 it was moved to Dejr az-Zôr because military barracks were built on the road from Damascus by way of Tudmor to Dejr az-Zôr and from there to aš-Śwar.

Tracts of land irrigated merely by rain water are called sejl, while lands which can be watered from the Euphrates either artificially or in a natural way are known as sera’.

To the south of al-‘Aṣâra are grouped the hamlets of as-Swêdân, al-Kasra, al- Роrejbe, as-Sôrâni, Sûr al-Ḥarb (also called Sûr al-Ḥarm), as-Śbejhdën, al-Ma‘ejzûle, al-Mûsejfe, al-Kišme, ‘Ajin abu Śwêmer, and ad-Dwêr.

At 9.37 we were riding along the very foot of the rocky bluffs of al-Ḳamar, which are about thirty-five meters high and shut in the valley of the Euphrates on the southwest. At 10.20 we went through the cultivated fields of Sarât Abu Śwêmer and at 10.47 ascended the height of Ḳamraṭi, since at that point the Euphrates comes right up to the bluff of al-Andara which overlooks the flood plain on the south. From 11.27 to 12.40 P. M. we rested. At 12.52 we crossed the gully of Ab-al-Ẓâsem, a deep cleft in the rocky ground. On its right by the Euphrates lies the hamlet of ad-Dwêr.
From here to the south as far as al-Kâjem the chief of the al-Bu Čemâl clan is Mhammad ad-Dandal, whose usual residence is the settlement of Abu Čemâl.

At 1.54 the huge fortifications of aš-Šâlhijje came into view. Large, yellow buildings enveloped in layers of quivering air appeared and vanished with the slightest motion of the observer’s head. It seemed as if the brown, scorched, gravel plateau across which we were riding now brought the walls closer to us, now made them recede—thus the mirage (sarâb) deceived us. At 2.30 we were at the demolished tombs of Umm Ešba’, built in the Palmyrene style like square towers; we rode through them until 2.52, when we made our camels kneel down within the northwestern corner of the extensive aš-Šâlhijje ruins (Figs. 4, 5).

In the southeastern part of these ruins, which are the ramparts of the ancient town of Dura, the Arabic writers locate the settlement of ad-Dalîja.⁸

North of the aš-Šâlhijje ruins, right above the Euphrates, stands the little sanctuary of aš-Sejh Bedr, and farther north appears the black spur of al-Mešneka; still farther north are the rocks of aš-Štèbe and al-Arba’tin, beyond which gapes the rift of Abu-l-Barâ’dî.

At 5.10 we rode down the highway to the Euphrates and encamped at 5.22 on the swampy grounds of al-Čizle—which are overgrown with tarfa—not far from the camp of the al-Bu Čemâl, of whom our gendarme bought barley for his

---

⁸ In 905—904 A. D. Abu Śams, the lord of the Carmathians, fled with his little son and an uncle from the environs of Ḥammâ around the desert to al-Kûfâ, guided by a native. When he came near the settlement of Dalîja in the district of Tarîk al-Furât, he sent his companion to buy provisions for his party and fodder for the animals. The companion entered the settlement called Dalîjeat ibn Tewâ, but betrayed himself by his manner of speaking and was led before the commander of the local garrison. He told the latter the lord of the Carmathians was awaiting his return. The officer went with his soldiers to the place indicated, a hillock not far off, found the Carmathian party there, arrested them and brought them to ar-Rakja, then the residence of the Caliph al-Muktaﬁ (aš-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîh [De Goeje], Sec. 3, pp. 2237 f.).

In January, 906, a troop of Carmathians came to ad-Dalîja by the Euphrates road and, after being joined by some Bedouins, went on a marauding trip in the direction of Damascus (‘Arîb, Sîfa [De Goeje], p. 9).

In 908—909 an army marched from Karṣhîja by way of ar-Ṭabrî to ad-Dalîja (aš-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Sec. 3, p. 2284).

In 928 the Carmathian lord, Abu Ṭâher, came to the settlement of ad-Dalîja in the district of Tarîk al-Furât and killed many of its inhabitants, but obtained no booty as there was nothing of value there. Then he marched on ar-Rakja, which he entered on March 3, 928, and here also killed many of the inhabitants (Ibn Mikhawajî, Ta’rîh [Amerovos], Vol. 1, p. 182; Ibn al-Mutarrîf, Rûmî [Tornberg], Vol. 8, p. 132).

Jükîst, Muṣṭafî (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 538, says that ad-Dalîja is the little town on the right bank of the Euphrates between Ḍāna and ar-Rakja, where the leader of the Carmathians was captured.

Abu-l-Fadâ’il, Muṣṭafî (Juynholl), Vol. 1, p. 386, in copying this statement remarks that in his time ad-Dalîja was no longer known.

Between ad-Dalîja and al-Bahana, on the left bank of the Euphrates below Rakbat Mâlek ibn Tewâ, the monastery of Ḥanṣala was situated (Jükîst, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 655; Abu-l-Fadâ’il, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 428).
horse. Below the crag on which the castle of the fortified town of aš-Ṣālhijje stands an ancient canal is still visible, but the Euphrates has broken into it in some places. Near both the right and left banks are large and small islands, proof that during the last few centuries the Euphrates has changed its channel. In the flood plain east of the river bed the ancient channel of the Euphrates still remains. The canal stretched along the right bank to the southeast, irrigating the fields of numerous settlements, the ruins of which lie between aš-Ṣālhijje and al-Blīze.

AŠ-ṢĀLḤIJJE TO AL-KĀJEM

On April 11, 1912, we broke through the brush to the highway. At 6.35 A.M. in the rocky bluffs on the right appeared the wide rift of the še‘īb of Swēhel. In the Euphrates valley east of Swēhel rise the last remnants of once thick strata not yet worn away by erosion. At 6.40 we had on our left the gendarmerie station of Nuḵṭat aš-Ṣālhijje with a khan owned by a citizen of Dejr az-Zōr. By the Euphrates were seen some common water hoists called čerd. The simplest of these consist of two posts supporting the axis of a pulley, on which works a rope with a large leather bucket on one end; a cow hitched to the other end of the rope pulls up the full bucket.

We now went through the plain of al-Lājeh, in which the še‘īb of Werd terminates. This plain is cultivated in some places, in others overgrown with big bushes of ṭarfa.10 At 7.10 we passed the hamlet of ar-Rōt and at eight o’clock al-Kaṭ‘a, beyond which stood a few huts known as al-Ḥrejṭa and ad-Demim; on the west was the ruin mound of an-Nṣūriijje, beyond which ran the bluffs of Rḵēbt al-Jehūdi. At 8.45 we saw on our left the al-Mṣallaḥa ruins and southwest of them the broad ruin mound of al-Ǧaḥaš, with the village of ar-Rumādi (or Rumādi az-Zōr). From 9.45 on we rode through the fields of Sarāt Abu Ḳbē and past the Še‘bān, Ummu Zhād, and al-Ḥarīrī ruins, situated west of the hamlets of al-Ḥasrāt, as-Sejjāl, and al-Ḥlābījje. At eleven o’clock we were at the large hill formed by the Madḵūk and smaller Rasīl ruins.

---

10 Arabic terms (except botanical terms) not defined in the text are explained in the Preface.

11 Latin equivalents and brief characterizations of many Arabic botanical terms appearing in the text are given in the Index.
Needing pasture for our camels, at 11.25 we turned to the right and rested from twelve to one o’clock near the Abu Sēbāt ruins. The heat was oppressive. The wind blowing from the southeast carried with it clouds of fine sand and irritated the nerves. On the left bank there came into view the huge rocky spur of al-‘Erṣi, which sinks steeply into the Euphrates. On the right beyond Sarāt abu .getPlayer(204,421,294,481) Kerāmi was seen al-Ḥbrane, a demolished gendarmerie station, and the remains of old buildings. We were now going through the fields of al-ʿAṣājer, as-Sukkerijje, and al-Bīze.

At 2.15 P. M. we saw the new settlement of Abu Čemāl with its rather small mosque and slender minaret and a few larger buildings in the southwestern part. At Abu Čemāl the western upland merges into the cultivated flood plain. We stayed there from 2.32 to 2.58, negotiating with the kājmakām for an escort of gendarmes. At 3.12 we crossed the ṣevāb of ar-Raṭṭa at the shrine of Mizār (or Kaṣr) ʿAli, west of the
hamlet of Umm 'Ajjāš, and made camp at four o'clock by the fields of as-Swē'ijje, north of the elevation of aš-Šifr.

On April 12, 1912, at 5.38 A. M. we set out through the fields of as-Swē'ijje. At 6.10 we crossed the še'rb of al-Ḥmēza

and immediately afterwards that of al-Fhede. South of this, far from the Euphrates, the horizon is shut in by the upland of Žhūr al-Mānī. At 7.10 we had on our left to the north the old burial place Kubūr 'Ali. For a long time we had in view the high table rock of al-'Erṣ, with a great number of large and small remnants of ruined, tower-shaped tombs. We rode through the fields of Sarāt abu-l-Čaras, south of the hamlets of al-Ḥṣēbe and al-Heli and the 'Anka¹¹ and al-Wahlāt ruins.

¹¹ The 'Anka ruins I connect with Kājem 'Anka.
Abu-l-Foda', Tājribah (Reinaud and De Blain), p. 51, quoting Sulejmān ibn Muhanna, writes that on both sides of the Euphrates a wide plain stretches as far as Kājem 'Anka, from where the valley narrows down to 'Ana, al-Ḥadīta, Hit, and al-Anbār. Beyond the town of Hit the Euphrates flows through the irrigated plain of Irak. — Kājem is Dejr al-Kājem, the present station of al-Kājem. The Euphrates flood plain ends eight kilometers west of 'Anka and more than twenty kilometers west of al-Kājem.
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Having crossed at 7.56 the še'ib of al-Mān‘i (or al-Māne‘i), we found ourselves in the ruins of Tell al-Ĝäbrījje—or āš-Šējḥ Ġāber, as the little sanctuary built in the midst of the ruins by the Euphrates (Figs. 6, 7, 8) is called. There we stayed from 8.10 to 8.52.12

At 9.15 we crossed the še'ib of Sa‘ede and at 9.50 the še'ib of as-Sidbe, beyond which the juggled buffals again approach the Euphrates. On the road some fellāhin were riding on donkeys. The last of them, an elderly one-eyed man, cursed us incessantly: "Oh, may you die even today; Oh, that it were your last day in this world!" he repeated at least a hundred times. Our servant Muhammad wanted to beat him, but bidding him keep his temper I turned off from the highroad to the še'ib of al-Iḥwēl by the station of al-Kājem, where we remained from 10.00 to 12.20 P.M.

AL-KĀJEM TO Ā’ĀNA

The gendarmerie station of al-Kājem stands on a rise on the right bank of the še'ib of al-Ihwēl or al-Kājem. West of it, down by the highway a khan has been built; to the

12 The position of the ruins of al-Ĝäbrījje compels us to identify them with the ancient town of Hindānu. Amma Abana, king of the town of Hindānu, delivered to the Assyrian king Tukulti Enurta II (889–884 B.C.) ten minae of gold, ten minae of silver, two talents of lead, one talent of myrrh, sixty pieces of copper, ten minae of the zadda plant, eight minae of the ḥumzāda stone, thirty camels, fifty head of cattle, thirty asses, fourteen large birds, two hundred sheep, bread, drink, straw, and fodder (Annals, pl. 3, obverse, ll. 76–79; Schell, op. cit., p. 18).

The myrrh and the camels show that Hindānu had dealings with merchants importing various South Arabian produce from the Persian Gulf.

When Assurnasirpal, shortly after his ascension to the throne (884 B.C.), was quelling the rebellion in the town of Sūrī in the land of Bit Ḥadīpē, Ḥajānī, the lord of Hindānu (sic) sent him silver, gold, lead, bronze, precious stones, purple, and riding camels as tribute. As a proof that he acknowledged Assurnasirpal's supremacy, he had his statue with an inscription erected in his palace and a stele with a similar inscription placed by the town gate (Annals, pl. 4, obverse, l. 36; Schell, op. cit., p. 129; Budge and King, Annals [1902], pp. 287 f.).

In 878 the inhabitants of Hindānu paid Assurnasirpal III silver, gold, lead, vessels, cattle, and flocks (Annals, pl. 5, obverse, l. 13; Budge and King, op. cit., p. 359).

Samsi-Adad VII (824–811 B.C.) mentions that the lord of Hindānu joined Assūrānāpal, the rebellious son of Shalmanesar III (858–824 B.C.), but that the rebellion was suppressed and the land of Ashur from the town of Arīd as far as the land of Sūrī again obeyed Samsi-Adad (Obellak Inscription, Schrader, Keilschriften der Bibliothek, vol. 1, pp. 176 f.).

About 652 B.C. Sin-Sarrūdqar, from whom some of the records are dated, was prefect in Hindānu (Peiser, Studien No. 4 [1901], p. 37; Rawlinson, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 46, No. 1, 45 f.; Corpus inscr. syriac. 1889–1911, Part 2, pl. 2, no. 22).

In 616 Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, looted Hindānu (British Museum Tablet No. 21,901, obverse II, 1–11 [publ. and transl. in Gadd, Full of Nineveh (1922), pp. 31 f.]).

Isidore of Charax, Mssiones partisciae (Muller), p. 247, knew of the town of Giddan, according to whose description must have been identical with Hindānu.

Stephen of Byantium, Ethnica (Meineke), p. 296, calls the town of Eddana on the Euphrates a Phoenician settlement named after the dax Eddana. — The assertion that Eddana, which is identical with Hindānu, was a Phoenician settlement, proves its commercial importance. Jāktāt, Mu-ra (Wistenfeld), vol. 3, p. 688, says that the town of 'Askān on the Euphrates belonged to Queen Zabbīb and the town of 'Aiddān on the opposite bank of the
east stands a heap of ruins, above which project the remains of a tower. At 1.10 P. M. we had on our left the plain of al-Fejjāzijje, on our right the rocky slope of at-Trejōzijje. At 1.44 we crossed the šeʾib of Selmān, on the right bank of which rise several flat-topped, oblong hillocks, the Zhūr al-Knētre. At two o’clock we were in the šeʾib of Abu Rbēʾ, where a large commercial caravan, bringing dates and butter from ‘Ānā to Aleppo, was just camping. Abu Rbēʾ originates at the slope Tarāk abū Saʿad and makes its way between the hills of ar-Rḥejmijjāt and at-Trejōzijje. At 2.12 we left the flood plain of al-Frēzijje and started eastward over the upland of Mefāzāt aš-Šnāne, as we did not desire to ride around four peninsulas made by the course of the river. On the right bank of the Euphrates hereabout are situated the hamlets of al-Frēzijje, al-Knētre, al-Obḍjū, al-Mutrejzijje, Miṣṭal, al-Berd, al-Iḥṣāʾ, aš-Šqārā, aš-Šqājijje, ar-Rāfda, ar-Ġerwa, aš-Sahaf, al-Wuẓahijje, al-Haffa, al-ʾAmmārī, az-Zafarānē, az-Zelle, aš-Šerwānnijje, and an-Nehijje. Near aš-Šqāra are the large ruins of al-Iḥṣāʾ, where the peasants find various antiquities. At al-Ġerwa ends the šeʾib of Ab-al-Ġerwa, on the left side of which, about six kilometers from the river, more ruins are to be seen. To the south rise the two hillocks of al-Ekrūn, which terminate to the southeast in a long elevation. At 3.10 we had on our left the hill of Rīg al-Faras; at 3.40 we re-entered the plain of the Euphrates near al-Berd, crossed the Ab-al-Ġerwa valley, and at 5.14 bivouacked on the left of the highroad among some tarfa bushes. From the Dlejmī camp at the ruins aš-Šqāra, where Farḥān abīn Ħerzī was the chief, we heard all

Euphrates to her sister. — ’Aḍdān suggests the pronunciation Edanā, Geddan, and Ĥidān, while in Aṣzān the Arabic Ḥimzān persisted.

Al-ʾAṣzānli, ’Aḏāʾib (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, pp. 283 f., writes that Aṣzān belonged to Queen Zabba’, who had two towns built on the banks of the Euphrates opposite each other and had them connected by a tunnel under the river.

13 Al-Kājm was a Persian frontier town, Abu-l-Faraḡ, Arḫās (Būlāq, 1285 A. H.), Vol. 5, pp. 123 f., (a.Hokri, Muʾṣamm (Wüstenfeld), pp. 359 f.), writes that the monastery of al-Kājm al-Aḵšā’, visited by him, is situated on the west bank of the Euphrates on the road leading to ar-Raḵša. It is said to have been originally a high watchtower, such as the Persians and Greeks used to erect on the frontiers. Close to it a monastery was built, but in the middle of the tenth century this was already without roof or gate. It was still inhabited in the reign of Harun ar-Rašīd (789–809 A.D.), who stopped there three days on his journey to ar-Raḵša, attracted by the vicinity, which is overgrown with pied anemones and other flowers; the hospitality of the monks pleased him to such a degree that he freed them from the payment of the ṣarāb, or ground tax, ordering them to pay only ten dinārs annually from their whole property.

Jākkūt, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 684, and Abu-l-ʾAṭāʾi, Mardāqād (Juyhīnī), Vol. 1, p. 437, quote Abu-l-Faraḡ’s words on the subject, but add that they too had seen this monastery. It was said to be called al-Kājm (rising tower) because of its high spire, from which both the Persian and Roman frontier lines could be observed. This spire was supposed to resemble the ʿAṣṣārāt al-Baṣrad or the aš-Šebe ʾ Ḥaffān in the environs of al-Raḵša.
Fig. 6—From al-Ǧābrijje looking southeast.
Fig. 7—Milking goats at al-Ǧābrijje.
night the monotonous sounds of a big drum. They were preparing for a circumcision there and both men and women danced from evening until morning.

On April 13, 1912, at 5.46 A. M., we again traversed the plateau intersected by the še'ibân of aš-Šafra. The Ertâге ruin appeared on a high crag to the left. At 6.44, in the fields of al-Haffe, we saw the first water hoists of the kind known as nā'ūra (Fig. 9), a largewooden wheel with longish earthen jugs tied to its rim. The wheel rests very deep in the river on an axis supported by two pillars of stone. It is connected with the bank by a row of set pillars carrying arches, on which a trough is placed. The stream sets the wheel in motion, the water fills the jugs and is poured by them into the trough, from which it flows into the fields. The hoarse squeaking of these wheels is heard day and night.

At 6.55 the farm Kaşr al-Mşawwaḥ came into view to the north in the fields of az-Zaťarâne. At 7.28 we rode down to the Euphrates by the fields of az-Zelle. From eight to 8.50 we rested at az-Zawije, then passed through the flood plain of Rbēža, which is enclosed on the south by the hil-
locks of Edene, where many camels were seen grazing. These were herds of the ʿEbede tribe, who were camping in the šeʿibān of al-Ḥejmijjāt. At 10.30 we reached the gendarmerie station of an-Nehijje, lying south of the road near a pile of old building material. To the east of it, in the fields of Bureknijje and al-Aftarijje, was a large camp of the Dlejm. At 11.10 we rode up the rugged upland of Maḵṭṭ al-Čḥāb. On the left on the river lay the ad-Dinijje ruins and, a little farther on, the hamlets of al-Mhedijje and al-Ebrahimijje, the al-Ḥalāwī and at-Tizalijje ruins, and the fields of al-Hedrijje. In ad-Dinijje various glasses, pitchers, and big earthen vessels were being excavated. To the south appeared the low mesas Kūr al-Ǧaṭātīḥ, north of them the hillocks of al-Rzuwjijjāt, east of these the mesa of Čeṭf al-Morr, and still farther east the flat ridge of at-Ṭmejdijjāt. From 11.35 to 1.10 P. M. we rested. At 3.10 we were by the river again, near the fields of al-Ebraḥijjie. On the right the gaps formed by the šeʿibān of al-Ḥazka showed black. At 4.30 we encamped by the fields of al-ʿUничje north of the hillocks of al-Ḥmejdijjāt.

On April 14, 1912, we passed between the hillocks of al-Hālālijjāt south of the hamlets of al-Ḥṣenijje, aš-Šerwānijje, aš-Šewwidje, aš-Sraḥlijje, and al-Manṣerijje. From 6.30 to 7.00 A.M. our camels grazed in the šeʿib of al-Ḥasa, where the spring of ar-Raḥiṣi bubbles out. In front of us we saw a group of half-demolished buildings of the sanctuary of al-Mašḥad (or al-Mašḥad al-Čeḇir) and north of it a mill, with the gardens of the settlement of Rāwa to the east, overtopped by a rocky spur with a barrack and the shrine Mizār aš-Šeṯā Ṭeḡeb even Äḥmed ar-Refāʿī. At 8.23 we were at al-Mašḥad al-Čeḇir. This is a ruined hamlet close to a sanctuary with one large and two small domes.14

Near al-Mašḥad al-Čeḇir we saw the first humpbacked cows. On our left was the islet of al-Karabāl with five houses and fine palm trees. At 9.06 we had the shrine of ʿAli on our left, beyond it the tomb of aš-Šeṯā Muḥammad and the islet of Libbād. At 9.15 we crossed the šeʿib of al-Čeḥef and from 9.24 to 9.38 halted below steep rocky bluffs, from which there was a splendid view of the northeast. The left bank of the Euphrates is crowned by green gardens; above them rise terrace-like the huts of the settlement of Rāwa (Fig. 10) and still

14 Al-Mašḥad al-Čeḇir was formerly a Christian monastery, for seven years the abode of Muʿaṣir, at one time commander under the Sasanian King Sapor II (309–379 A.D.) (Hoffmann, Auszlige [1886], pp. 39ff.)
higher, on a table-shaped rock, stand the great military barracks of al-Klé’a. To the left above al-Klé’a the pilgrim sanctuary Mizár aš-Šejh Reğeb tops the horizon. The waters of the Euphrates dash against numerous palm-covered islets here, and on the right bank rise yellowish rocky bluffs, which partially conceal the palms and huts of ‘Ána. Al-Klé’a was built in 1872 by Midhat Pasha, but is now deserted, as it is said to be haunted.

At 9.50 we reached the gardens of the settlement of ‘Ána. Of the vegetables cultivated here, onions and garlic were the most plentiful. As to trees, besides the palms there were pomegranates, figs, mulberries, and, but rarely, olives. We rode at first among the gardens and along the rocky slope, in which are many natural and artificial caverns. Later we followed a narrow lane among the gardens and huts, which look as if they were pasted to the rocks, for the settlement is nothing but a single street almost five kilometers long between a steep cliff on the south and the Euphrates on the north. From 10.53 to 11.41 we waited for the representative of the absent kájmakám. The government building stands by

---

15 See below, Appendix XVI.
the šeʿīb of al-Ḵanṭara. When we went on we saw at twelve o'clock on the right the tomb Ḫubbet al-Barmakijje; then we crossed the šeʿīb of aš-Šeǰh Ḥazar, and at 12.07 P. M. came to the ruined bridge (Fig. 11) connecting the settlement with

![Fig. 10 — Rawa from the southwest.](image)

the islet Ḥawīqet al-Ḵal'a — otherwise known as Ḥana al-Ḵaṭīže, the old Ḥana, — where the remains of a stout fort are still visible. It was 12.32 when we left Maḥall al-Ḫadāhde, as the eastern quarter of Ḥana is called.

The oldest quarter of Ḥana is the western, Bejt al-Kohli; then follow al-Ḫomrān, as-Sāḡe, as-Serāje, Ġmejla, al-Ḵeḡe, aš-Šerī'a — also called ad-Dalābhe — as-Sādde, and al-Ḫadāhde. Ḥana is inhabited by about seven hundred Moslem and five hundred Jewish families. The Jews live in the quarters of al-Ḵeḡe and aš-Šerī'a. They have a synagogue (kenise). Their head is Ḥōğa Rubēn eben Menāhem. Many houses in aš-Šeri'a are built in the antique style (Fig. 12), forming either a square or an oblong, narrower towards the top and covered by a flat roof enclosed by a low, machicolated wall. Many of them are three stories high but without windows on the ground floor. The islands near Ḥana are called Libbād, al-Ḫagra, al-Mesḡed, al-฿išen, al-Ḫrāb, and aš-Šeǰh Nuṣṣāb.

**‘Āna to al-Fhejmi**

Once past the settlement we rode through small fields sown with barley, and encamped at 1.30 P. M. opposite the šeʿīb of Abu Ğerābê'a (Fig. 13). On the left bank rose before us the al-Maftūl minaret of the ruined monastery of al-Melwijje near the deserted hamlet of Ḥābūlijje.
On April 15, 1912, we started at 5.50 A.M. along the strip of flood plain between the rocky bluffs on the south and the river. The flood plain here is narrow and stony. At six o'clock we had on our left a demolished farm beside a shrine called al-Kaṣr or al-Mašhad aš-Šaṭir; on the right the gap formed by the še'ib of al-Kaṣr, the branches of which, at-Tawil and Abu Tin, rise between ثقة abu Sa'ad and ハウス al-Wa'arijje. At 6.25 we crossed the še'ib of al-Muḥaddar and, just opposite the inhabited islet of Telbes, began to climb to the upland of ar-Raḥāne (also known as ar-Riḥāne), which is bordered on the south by low hillocks among which winds the Wādi Ḥeẓlān. At 8.30, through the še'ib of al-Awṣijje, we could see the palm trees of the settlement of Ḥbēn on the left bank. From 9.30 to 10.38 our camels grazed. Shortly before eleven o'clock we met the kājmakām and a major with twenty soldiers mounted on mules (barrāle) escorting two chiefs of the Dlejm tribe who, as we were told, had refused to pay for a second time dues which the tax collector at the settlement of al-Ḥadiṭa had embezzled. At 11.35 we reached the Euphrates. On the north lay the fields of aš-Ṣwemijje, Bēgān, and al-Ūṣijje; to the south of these
stretched a strip of ṭarfa and ʿawseĝe bushes along the river to a width of about thirty meters. The bushes were all red and white with countless blossoms, and the slope was covered with a green carpet of various annuals and perennials. Our camels were tired and hungry and we longed for a good bath; therefore, at 11.48 we encamped on the left of the high-road, close by the Euphrates itself.

Both the sixteenth and seventeenth of April were spent in examining and perfecting our topographical and cartographical notes, gathering plants, and arranging the photographic plates. I should have liked to make up a list of all the Dlejm clans, but could not find even two informants who agreed regarding them. They would reduce the clans familiar to them to bands or even single families; or sometimes they would represent single families as great clans, whereas clans of which they knew but little they would consider as insignificant families.
CHAPTER II

AL-FHEJMI TO AR-RUMADI

AL-FHEJMI TO WADI HAWRAN

On April 18, 1912, we started at 5.49 A. M. At 6.20 we crossed the wide še‘ib of al-Fhejmi (also called āl-Ḥaẓar) and ascended to the upland of Mefāz al-ʿAwsāq. On the left stood the gendarmerie station of al-Fhejmi with two high piles of stone in front of it, which point out the way. The narrow strip of fields along the river is called Ḡeren. Farther east the river washes against the southern rocky bluffs, forming many islets. After eight o’clock we had on our left the peninsula of al-Marzūkijj, on the north and east bank of which lie the hamlets of Žerna, aš-Šhame, Ternāne (with ruins), Šerjiṭe, Tartāse, Sūse, and Šēal. The Euphrates winds lazily between low, cultivated banks and numerous islands. To the south rise the low, dark hillocks of al-ʿĀmri and Abu Šābūr. At 9.16 we crossed the še‘ib of as-Sikke, at 10.02 that of al-Bāreḍ, and at the hamlet of Bâhijje again came close to the Euphrates. On the south appeared the hillocks where rises the še‘ib of Abu Šābūr, which we crossed at 11.26. On the left were the hamlets of al-Buṣtijje, Ṭemānje, Beni Ḥāreṭa, and al-Ǧizel. From 11.38 to 12.46 our camels grazed in the al-Ḥaẓar valley.

At 1.10 P. M. we rode by the hamlet of al-Bṭeṇe and the shrine of aš-Šeɟh Ḥadid (Fig. 14). The latter is built on a square base upon which rest five circular steps; on the fifth step stands a cone. At 1.26 we saw on our right the tomb of as-Sajjed Mḥammad (Fig. 15), an octagon supporting eight circular steps and a cone. The fields on the left were called Ḥamse, ʿAlāte, Ḥabib, and al-Mehāza (the ford). At 1.40 we reached the settlement of al-Ḥadiṭa.

Al-Ḥadiṭa lies on an island. The houses of its northern half stand close together; in the southern half grow fine palm trees. A bridge leads to the right bank, and close to it stand the gendarmerie station and a khan. On the surrounding hillocks are seen many white graves.16

---

16 Al-Eldorji, Futāk (De Geijz), p. 179, writes that in the reign of the Caliph ʿOmar (641–642 A.D.) Mādāg ibn ʿAmr as-Sulami marched out from al-Kūfa towards Ḥit and other...
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South of al-Ḥadīṭa cluster the hamlets of Muhasse, al-Kajed, Ḥandūl, Mēlān, Sarw, al-Meğewed, an-Naqmī, al-Ḥagar, Beni Zāhēr, Karhēfe, and aš-Šrûmë; by the last-named ends the Wāḍī Ḥezlān and above it rises the shrine of al-Imām ʿAli. All these hamlets are also called Beni Zāhēr. At 2.47, when opposite the island of al-Wrbān, we ascended to the upland Mefazī ad-Dirab. At three o’clock we crossed the deep Wāḍī Ḥezlān, down which the islet of at-Temīmijje in the Euphrates was visible. Our way took us through the bare, scorched plain of al-Kaʿidēn, where only in the lowest places some dry annuals (ḥemīrī) could be seen. At four o’clock we crossed the ṣeib of Zrādhān, at 5.20 that of al-Jehūdhī; at 5.55 we turned to the left and then descended the west side of a short gully which drops down to the river opposite the island of Ālūs, where we camped for the night. There are about twenty high and solidly built houses on the island with huge palm trees rising above them. Beneath the rocky cliffs overlooking the right bank stands a demolished fortress. Lighting was flashing that night over Mesopotamia.

April 19, 1912. As early as 6.17 A.M. our camels carried us through an undulating plain, intersected by the ṣeib of al-Ḥafāǧijjāt, the slopes of which are full of caves. At 7.08 our gendarme showed us near the ṣeib of Banāt al-Ḥasan some skeletons of horses and camels, remnants of a fight between gendarmes and the warriors of the az-Zefīr tribe. The Zefīr, whose camping grounds lie near the Persian Gulf, attacked a caravan of Ānā merchants who were bringing tumbāk (tobacco for water pipes) and fine cloaks from Bagdad. Two gendarmes lying in that direction, conquered them, and founded al-Ḥadīṭa on the Euphrates. His son is supposed to have been born at Hit.

In the first half of January, 1060, the Caliph al-Kājem came from his exile in Ānā to the settlement of Ḥadīṭat Ānā, whence he returned to Bagdad ( Ibn al-Kalānī, Daš [Amedroz], p. 89; Abu-l-Fedā, Maḥasīr [Adler], Vol. 3, p. 172).

In 1122—1126 the lord of the settlement of al-Ḥadīṭa was the Emir Salejmān ibn Muḥāres of the ʿOqajjī tribe; he granted asylum to the deposed vizier Gōlāhādīn ibn Ṣaddākī, who before long rebelled against the caliph (Ibn al-Aṣrīr, Kāmil [Tornberg], Vol. 10, p. 425).

In November, 1144, Emir ʿImādūddīn Aṭābēz, learning that the inhabitants of Ḥadīṭat Ānā were rebelling against him, sent troops against them, who took the settlement, killed many persons, and looted everything there ( Ibn al-Kalānī, op. cit., p. 280).

In 1190 Ḥadīṭat Ānā was captured by an-Nāṣirīdīnālāh, but only after an obstinate resistance and when the inhabitants were guaranteed grants of land in other territories (Ibn al-Aṣrīr, op. cit., Vol. 12, p. 38).

According to Jākūt Muṣṭawīn (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 223, Ḥadīṭat al-Furqā: also called Ḥadīṭat an-Nūrā) lay several parasangs from al-Anbār on an island in the Euphrates and formed a notable stronghold. He cites as-Semʿānī (died 1166—1176) as stating that the settlement of al-Ḥadīṭa was the residence of the az-Nuṣerījīs sectarians.

Abu-l-Fedā, Taḥṣīl (Roinaud and De Slane), p. 287, locates the settlement of al-Ḥadīṭa between al-Anbār and Ānā.

Jākūt, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 65, 352, refers to the settlement of Ālūs, or Alūs, near Ānā and al-Ḥadīṭa on the Euphrates.

Abu-l-Ḥaddīḥ, Marāḏīd (Juybīlī), Vol. 1, p. 88, adds that Alūs lies below the settlement of Ānā not far from al-Ḥadīṭa. — From al-Ḥadīṭa to Alūs is eleven kilometers.
were killed, three wounded, and the caravan robbed of everything. The merchants escaped, but all the camels with their loads were driven away by the Zefir. The fallen animals were skinned by the peasants and semi-fellâhîn, who also cut out the best parts of the flesh, leaving the rest to the beasts of prey. At 8.15 we crossed Wâdi Ḥawrân.  

WĂDI ḤAWRĂN TO HÎT

At 9.28 the palm trees of the settlement of Ġubba came into view to the southeast; to the east the gardens and huts of the hamlets hugged the rocky slope on the right bank by the island of Alús. The hamlets are: al-Flêfli, as-Sborût, al-Ḳasab, al-Ǧêdîd, Ğîne, al-Wardijje, ar-Ribî, ‘Anâje, as-Śwēneh, Ebli, Abu-l’-Ala, al-Brâzijje, al-Ǧôdejijje, as-Semānijje, and al-Merwânijje, the last-named lying close to Ġubba. At 9.39 we saw the island with the settlement Ġubba directly to the east of it, and were once more approaching the Euphrates.

South of Ġubba are the hamlets of al-Ẓâmîjje, Ummu Dwîl (also called Ğanafte), al-Mîshed, al-Mhêrijje, Bejt Ḥalaf, and Halbasijje.

From 10.25 to 12.30 P.M. we rested. At 1.09 we crossed the ṣeṭib of al-Ḳasr, near which a gendarmerie station and the khan of al-Barâdāi stand on the banks of the Euphrates. At 1.20 we had on our left a large garden, the property of Fahad eben Haddâl, the head chief of the Ḥamâst tribe. The ṣeṭib al-‘Ašâl terminates at this garden. We then pursued our way past the hillocks of al-Bejâder on our right, while to the left of us were the fields and hamlets of: Şâkijje, al-Ǧêdîde, al-Wusēṭa, Lammâ, al-Mızâwil, ad-Der’a, al-Beşîri, az-Zwejje, az-Zrejž, ad-Dwilje, and the al-Ǧâbrijje ruins situated by a defile (muṣîţ). Beyond the defile lay the hamlets of: al-Ǧânijje, az-Zarrâ’a, al-’ellejje, al-Lissijje, al-Ḥusküke, al-Kotbijje, al-Kraje, az-Zeḫîje, an-Narâše, al-Ḥâzijje, an-Nuwe’em, al-Fâleţ, al-Werṣânijje, al-Ǧerejijje, al-Ḥazârem, Beni Ḥazraqt, al-Myferdât, ad-Dibbijje, Sa’dân, aš-Šejaţ Zâher, as-Sakkârijje, al-Bostâmijje, al- prostituje, as-Selijje, al-Ħoldijje, as-Sredijje, as-

18 Ptolemy, Geography, V, 20: S. refers to a district of Auranitis by the Euphrates in Babylonia. — If the name Auran is not transcribed wrongly from Aram, Auranitis should be looked for in the neighborhood of Wâdi Ḥawrân, although this region was not in Babylonia but in Arabia Deserta. But Ptolemy often places localities in the adjoining countries and may have done so with Auranitis. The northwestern part of Babylonia was called Aramâria.


From 2:18 to 2:56 we rested not far from the inhabited island of an-Nâûsa.20

The heat was oppressive, especially as the peninsula of al-Ma‘ajzîlî separated us from the cool river while we were riding over the bare, scorching plain of as-Sêbât. At five o’clock we bivouacked in a hollow west of the highroad.

On April 20, 1912, we rode through a rough rocky country with low cones rising here and there. At 6:05 A.M. we crossed the first and at 6:28 the second šerib of al-Fâlež, where ših and ‘asansal grew in abundance. To the east of us appeared the white shrine of al-Imâm Ab-az-Zin by the hamlet of aš-Šejh Zâher, and to the southeast rose clouds of black smoke from the town of Hit. At 6:57 we entered the salty ground of as-Sahalijje and al-Ḥesenije. At 7:12 we rode past the islet of al-Eflêwî (or al-Flêwî), which has been converted into a garden. From 7:32 to 7:52 we filled our water bags at the gardens of aš-Šejh Mhammad as-Slejje. At 8:01 we left the Euphrates and rode between some low bare hillocks and at 8:28 we passed through the broad šerib of al-Merğ, which extends between white crags. From 8:34 to 9:22 we rested.

The town of Hit,21 from which columns of smoke rose continually higher and blacker, at last came into view. It was hidden behind the rich green of the gardens of Knân, al-BSâjer, and Kandi, and only a few dark houses and a slender but ominously leaning minaret were to be seen on its east side. To the south stretched the broad, low ridge of Kôs as-Sinn, south of which projected the high minaret of al-Mu‘êmire. At 10:53 we reached a light railway, used for hauling building stone from the old quarries at al-Mu‘êmire to the Euphrates. The stone was being shipped in boats to al-Hindijje to be used in the construction of a dam over the Euphrates. West of this railway, on the edge of the gardens, stood the half ruined little shrine Maşam ‘Ali and not far off a spring bubbled up. From 11:10 to 12:15 P.M. we halted at the gardens of ad-Dawwâra on the south

20 An-Nâûsa is an old station on the road from Bagdad to ar-Raikal. Al-Idrîsî, Nuzhâ (Jaubertz’s trans.), Vol. 2, p. 144, says that Nausije is a little town with many inhabitants on an island in the Euphrates; in the gardens surrounding it grow fine fruit and various vegetables.

21 See below, Appendix XVII.
side of the town. Nâser went to buy salt, some vegetables, and also barley for the gendarme's horse.

The dark brown buildings of the town of Hit cover from top to bottom a yellowish cone about thirty meters high. The largest and tallest houses are on the east side, where also stands the old mosque with the leaning minaret. A broad street divides the town on the cone from the khans and warehouses at its southwestern foot. Between the suburb and the gardens of ad-Dawwâra are ovens for melting and refining bitumen. Hit has about five thousand inhabitants, two-thirds of whom come from the Dlejm tribe and only about a fifth from the 'Aıkîl. The houses are usually two stories high, the streets narrow, crooked, and dirty, as they are washed only during the copious winter rains. Above the houses rises the tall minaret. Among the inhabitants are numerous Jewish families who have lived there from time immemorial. The name of the most prominent family is al-Jâsîn, with Muhammad eben Dîjâb as its head. The principal occupations of the inhabitants are gathering bitumen and naphtha, quarrying stone, gardening, and building boats (sulhâtîr). The material used in making these boats is wood and palm pulp, with pitch for coating both the outsides and insides. A boat sells for six or seven Turkish pounds ($27 or $31.50). All the salt and naphtha springs are state property and are rented at one hundred ($90) and even as much as two hundred meğidijjât ($180). The bitumen (žîr) is used in building as well as in coating the flat house roofs and the
boats, which are exported chiefly to Kerbela. The very narrow gardens are located only on the river bank. A little farther off, the soil is saturated with salt to such an extent that nothing grows in it. The garden of al-Ḥammādī, which adjoins

the long gardens of Bannân, has been recently laid out east of ad-Dawwâra.

The ground in the vicinity of Hit consists of yellow limestone, covered with a thick layer of roughly crystallized gypsum, from which issue many springs with salt or somewhat bitter water, the latter smelling of sulphur. From these springs various gases escape, which form large bubbles. The bitumen flowing on the surface resembles dirty scum. The salt surrounded by rosy-tinged slime settles on the edges of the springs. The bitumen is scooped up with palm leaves, stored in large pieces, then diluted with lime and exported by boat. Jugs are also woven at Hit from straw or palm leaves and are smeared both inside and outside with pitch; they are then hung on the high wheels used in raising the water from the Euphrates for the irrigation of the gardens. These wheels are as much as ten to fifteen meters in diameter. Southwest of Hit is a broad, flat area where innumerable springs of salt water bubble out; the water runs into square reservoirs, where salt is obtained from it by evaporation. The most important pitch or bitumen springs are the ‘Ājn Lṭajjīf, ad-Dahabi, ad-Durūbi, Lâjez, al-Ma‘mûre, al-Merğ, and al-Ġarb.
Many reproaches are brought against the inhabitants of Hit and its environs by their neighbors and guests. As long as the caravan trade between Syria and Irak flourished, herds of pack camels used to graze in the vicinity of Salamja, a town in northwestern Palmyra, whence they returned, when rested, with new wares to Irak. Near Hit a part of the goods was reloaded into boats and the camels sent to pasture. But in the immediate neighborhood of this settlement no pasture could be found for them and hospitality was refused even to their owners, whence arose these sayings:

“When Allāh granted rain to Salamja he withheld it from Hit, for the men there are lewd as devils. May Allāh consume the fruits of their lands with bitumen, salt, šnān (a plant the ashes of which are used in making soap), and sulphur.”

“Don’t ask for night lodgings at Hit, for the dogs of al-Mu’emmīre are better than the first men of Hit.”

Al-Mu’emmīre is a settlement west of Hit. All that remains of it is a mosque; its inhabitants have moved to the settlement of al-Kubejṣa.

A member of the Dlejm tribe married a girl from Hit and took her to his tent where she had to help him milk the sheep and cows. But the life in the sunny pasture was not to the liking of the fair maid. She yearned for her native place and said to her husband:

“Even if you like the sunny country, I do not; give me the sound of the flush wheels and the palms of Hit.”

From Hit the ancient transport road to Damascus led in a westerly direction. Its actual starting point was the settlement of al-Kubejṣa about fifteen kilometers to the west.

In al-Kubejṣa live about nine hundred families. The most powerful of these is the Bejt ṭāzi, with Farāq ab-al-Ḥāfez at its head. There are many springs there, the ‘Ajin al-‘Erzī having the best water of them all. The whole vicinity has been converted into extensive gardens with many palms but no olive trees. The majority of its inhabitants make their living by trading with the nomads, whence the name Kubejṣi (plural, Kbejsāt) meaning peddler. The Bedouins ridicule them for their cowardice. As the story goes, once upon a time the Beni Kubejṣ, while journeying through the desert, saw from afar a black object not unlike a rider. Their elder then spoke thus: “Look out! If that is a real rider (in čân az-zōl zōl), lie down
on your bellies and pretend to be habari (bustards). But if that dark object is only a bush, then, fully armed, advance like men!"  

The settlement of al-Kubejisa lies north of Wadi aš-Sa’îr, which starts as the še‘ib of al-Bezem in the plain Fejżat ‘Âmez at Radir al-‘Awaq and Riym aš-Sâbûn and winds between the al-Mezâhir mesas. On the right this wâdi is joined by the še‘ibân of Ab-al-'Ofejn, aš-Swa’, and Abu Žalta. On the transport road in the main part of the aš-Sa’îr valley stands the ruin Kṣejr Ḥabbâz; the springs of Za‘zû’a and al-‘Ezi also bubble forth near this valley; in the še‘ib of Ab-al-'Ofejn is the spring of al-'Awâsel and in that of Abu Žalta the springs of aš-Šejh and al-'Asfûrijje.

22 Jâγût. Maf‘ûla (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 235, refers to a spring of Kubejisa on the border of the aš-Sâmâwa desert four miles from Hit. There are several settlements around, the inhabitants of which are often destitute on account of their proximity to the desert.

In the spring of 1320 the head chief Muhanna and his clan, the Isaac, were driven out from the neighborhood of Salemja. They encamped in the region around ‘Ana and al-‘Adîta on the Euphrates. The Syrian troops pursued them as far as ar-Raib and even to ‘Ana, whence they fled to the desert beyond al-Kubejîaj (Abû-l-Fedah), Maḥtasar (Adler), pp. 340 f.). — Al-Kubejîaj stands for the groups of huts in the oasis of al-Kubejisa, sixty-five kilometers from al-‘Adîta.
About thirty kilometers south of al-Kubejsa flows forth the bitumen spring of Ab-al-Zir, around which the cultivated lands of the al-Bu Cleb clan are situated. Still farther south, by the wells of at-Tmejjl, this clan also sows crops. There are no houses there, but only a few miserable huts.

**Fig. 15—Tomb of as-Sajjad Mhammad.**

**HIT TO AR-RUMADI**

At 12.50 P.M. we reached the southern edge of the salt marsh as-Sabja, where we rested until 2.28. Our Emir (Prince Sixtus of Bourbon) was made sick by the heat and the smell of the pitch. We then proceeded until 3.10 across an undulating, white, rocky plain. The bluffs which overlook the right bank of the Euphrates disappear by the ruins of Kalka north-

The name of the spring of al-Ezi suggests that of al-Aqa', which Jakut, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 683, says is a place on the Euphrates between Hit and ar-Rabba. It is so called after the mare whose speed saved the avenger of Prince Gudejma al-Abra, who was murdered by Queen az-Zabba'. The battle of al-Aqa' and Hafak was famous among the Arabs. — The location of the existing spring of al-Ezi near Hit and al-Balak, where the notorious Queen az-Zabba' used to reside, corresponds with that of al-Aqa. The name in the text of Jakut should probably have been written al-Ada', instead of al-Aqa'), the error being due to an exchange of letters not difficult in Arabic. The name al-Aqa' likewise suggests that of the hamlet al-Awshije.
west of Hit and do not come into view again until the south-west end of the Bannân fields is reached, where they are cut into an upland called al-Mrêr and al-Ħaḳba. By 3.20 we were in the pass of Mazîż between the bluffs and the river. On the northwestern slope of al-Mrêr flows the spring of ar-Rajjân. After four o'clock we rode through the salt basins of aš-Ša‘îr, al-Ħoqa, and al-Mhamadi, which are partly cultivated. At 4.45 we began to ascend the rocky spur of al-Ŏkoba, on the southern slope of which we camped at 5.10. We hastened at once to the river to wash off the salt dust which completely covered us. The heat was scorching and the east wind enervating.

Branching off immediately below the spur of al-Ŏkoba, the old clogged-up canal Žeri Sa‘de runs southeast through the fertile plain of Abu Tibân. At the beginning of this canal both its banks are lined solidly with stone; the reason why the left bank was provided with a wall of considerable breadth was probably to make it serve as a dike to prevent the flood waters of the Euphrates from eroding away the plain of Abu Tibân.

On April 21, 1912, we were in our saddles as early as 5.27 A.M. The wind had fallen altogether. The whole east was wrapped in golden haze. The separate palms appeared as gigantic trees with tops projecting above the horizon and nearly touching the sky. We rode along the east side of the canal Žeri Sa‘de through the fields constituting part of the plain of Abu Tibân. The bluffs shutting in the valley of the Euphrates on the west become lower south of al-Ŏkoba and draw away from the river. On the right in the fertile plain stood the Tlêl al-Ŏdde ruin mound; at 6.55 it was due west of us. East of it the Sa‘de canal rejoins the Euphrates, which beats against the rocky spur of al-Aswad and then makes a considerable bend towards the south. At 7.47 we were at the farm and khan of Abu Rajjât, where there are several small ponds filled with water from the Euphrates. North of the river appeared the palms of al-Ŷoţnijje. From 8.35 to 9.40 our camels grazed at ad-Dwâr.

On a pool hard by kuţa sand grouse were quenching their thirst. Flying in a long row they dropped down to the surface of the water and drank one after another from the same place without stopping in their flight; then they turned, came back, and drank again. Not before they had had
their fill did they fly away. There were thousands of them, forming a great ellipse.

At ten o'clock, beyond the little shrine of al-Imām al-Uwēs, we came to the range of hillocks as-Serḡ, which runs from the southern bluffs northwards very close to the Eu-

phrates. The shrine of al-Uwēs consists of a whitewashed dome resting on a square base and a courtyard. From 10.30 to 11.45 we stopped in the plain of al-Mijāḏīn, which is in-
tersected by shallow brooks. We also scared a lizard (arwal) which fled before us with such lightning speed that even Mḥammad could not overtake it—good runner as he was. In
the fields of al-Ḥarfaše the peasants were beginning their harvest. The wheat was fully ripe but the grain small; moreover the peasants could not keep off the kaṭa birds which flew in swarms from field to field destroying the ears of grain. The luxuriant palm groves of the town of ar-Rumādī beckoned to us from afar. At 2.35 P.M. we crossed the canal of al-Warrār, at 2.40 that of as-Ṣerī', and at three o'clock the canal of al-ʿAzizījjeh and entered the palm gardens and the town of ar-Rumādī. At 3.30 we encamped on the marshy meadow northeast of the town.

Ar-Rumādī is a wealthy settlement with about fifteen hundred inhabitants, who own all the fields from Bannān as far as al-Fellūţe. The Bejt Aram is the richest family, al-
Ḥagī Ḥ. Ali being their representative. For about forty years, or since the time of Midḥāt Pasha, who greatly improved or, one may say, even founded ar-Rumādī, about 150 Jews have lived in the town together with the Moslems and have had their own synagogue. Ḥ. Ali eben Slīmān al-Bekr, the head chief of the Dlejm, built many houses in the southern part of the town. Although the town, with the surrounding district, was administered by a kājmakām, or subordinate Turkish official, it was called by the peasants wilāje. Similarly they called Hit as well as Kerbelā wilāje, although no wāli, or governor of a vilayet, resided in those towns.

We negotiated with the kājmakām for an escort for our further trip, completed our supplies, and bought barley for the gendarmes' horses. Besides this I also arranged my carto-

graphical records and sketched a map of the region we were to pass through.

To the east of ar-Rumādī lie the gardens and fields of al-Ḵoṭnijje, al-Ǧwejbe, as-Ṣūfījjje, al-Mšēhed, and as-Saḥalāt.
South of them rises a hillock with the old sanctuary al-Mâehed,23 divided by the hollow of al-Munsarbe from the hillocks al-Muza- hrât, which, on the south, shut in the Euphrates flood plain, with the hamlets of Sôra, al-Kêsebe and Stêh. Southeast of the last, on the rocky bluffs of ar-Ra‘jân, stand the ar-Râhâja ruins.24

East of the ar-Râhâja ruins the plain of Šatt al-‘Atîz widens out and is irrigated by the ditches of al-Fellâhât, Naşâf, az-Zwejr, and az-Za‘erîjî. Above the al-Fellâhât fields, in the midst of which stand the al-Bârûd ruins, rise the bluffs of Ğurf al-‘Hamar and al-Ḥeţîtan with the little sanctuary aş-Šeţ Mas‘ûd. Farther east, the rocks of al-Mu‘ajjed, bordered by the şeţib of al-‘Haţar to the south, approach the Euphrates. From ar-Rumâdi we rode via ‘Ajn at-Tâmar to an-Neţef.25

23 The shrine al-Mâehed is a remnant of the settlement of Sandawa‘a. In 684–685 A. D., Sa‘îd ibn Hujaﬁla ibn al-Jamâh marched from Karêţiţa‘ by way of Hit and joined al-Mu‘ayyina ibn Muharrim al-‘Abadi at Sandawa‘a, where they stayed one day and one night (at-Tabari, Ta‘rîkh [De Goeje], Ser. 2, p. 668).

Ibn Munkîd, Šîbîd (Derenbourg), Vol. 2, pp. 125 f., relates that in 1169–1170 the Caliph al-Muktaﬁ B‘ammarallah visited the mosque built in honor of the Prince of the Faithful in the environs of al-Anbâr on the right bank of the Euphrates; it was at Sandawa‘a.

Abu-J-Fadil‘î, Mardjat (Juynboll), Vol. 2, p. 168, writes that Sandawa‘a was the name of a ruined settlement on the right bank of the Euphrates above al-Anbâr. In Sandawa‘a was the mosque of ‘Ali.

The traveler Pedro Teixeira noticed, when two leagues out of Ummu-r-Râs a mosque called by the Arabs Mekat Sandâdîsh at a distance of about three leagues on his left (Teixeira, Travels [Selinçâr’s transl.], p. 75). — Ummu-r-Râs is situated about twelve kilometers east-northeast of al-Mâehed.

24 According to the itinerary of Tukulti Enurta II we might regard these ruins as the remains of the ancient frontier town of Rapilî (Annals [Schell, op. cit., p. 16]).

Hammarûbi in the eleventh year of his reign took over the government of the towns of Rapilî and Salîbi (King, Chronicles [1907], Vol. 2, p. 96).

Adadnîri I (about 1235 B. C.) in his Annals (Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions, Vol. 4, pl. 44), oververse, l. 7 (Budge and King, Annals [1902], p. 5), names Rapilî, a frontier place of the Assyrian empire.

Tiglath Pîleser I (1120–1100 B. C.) conquered Dûr-Kurigalzu, Sippar ša Šamaš, Babylon. Upi, great cities with their forts, and plundered Akkaûla as far as Lûbulî: also Dîšî as far as Rapilî, all of which he conquered (Chronicle of History [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 5, pl. 4, No. 3], col. 2, II, 18–24: Abel in: Schrader, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 198).

Streck, Keilinschrifchtsliche Beiträge (1906), 36 f., states that the first mention of Rapilî on the borders of Dîšî occurs during the reign of Marišûnaîêhe (about 1190 B. C.). Asurannîpal boasts (Limestone Tablet [British Museum, No. 92,988], II, 7–8; Inscription of Mûkhîr [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 5, pl. 69], oververse l. 9; Standard Inscription [Layard, Inscriptions (1853), plates 117, l. 8; Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. I, pl. 17–26], col. 2, I, 128; Budge and King, op. cit., pp. 163, 169, 216, 254) that he became the lord of the whole land of Lûkê and of the land of Dîšî with the city of Rapilî.

Sargön (Cylinder Inscription [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 36] l. 12 f.; Schrader, ed., Keilinschrifchtsliche Bibliothek, Vol. 2, p. 49) mentions that he conquered Dûr-Kurigalzu, Rapilî, and the whole desert as far as the Brook of Egypt.

25 This portion of our journey, as it took us into the desert away from the Euphrates, is described in the author’s Arabia Deserta, New York, 1927, pp. 339–356.
CHAPTER III
AN-NEGEF TO BAGDAD BY WAY OF KERBELA

AN-NEGEF TO ḤĀN AL-MAṢALLA

On April 27, 1912, early in the morning, we visited the town of an-Negef. From its northern gate a broad market street (ṣūḵ) runs south. The part of the town west of the ṣūḵ is called Smert and the part east of it, Škert. Going by the ṣūḵ one reaches the splendid mosque of Imam al-Muʿminin ʿAli, where ʿAli, son-in-law of the Prophet and the greatest saint of the Shiites, lies buried. As-Sajjad Ğwād, kilidār of al-Ḥaḍra, the chief administrator of the mosque of ʿAli (which is called al-Ḥaḍra), is the most powerful man in the town and its neighborhood. The Turkish Government built two military barracks in an-Negef, one in Smert, or the main town, and another in its southwestern suburb, Ḥawwāš, where about 250 soldiers, infantry and mule cavalry besides the gendarmes, are quartered. Above the northwestern gate the town offices (al-baladijje) were installed. The citizens of an-Negef annex tracts of land wherever possible, but their largest source of profit is from the pilgrims.

The flat, barren elevation on which the town is situated is called negef, a name which has been transferred to the town itself, called by the Bedouins either an-Negef, al-Maṣhad, al-Meṣhed, or Maṣhad ʿAli.28

At 5.40 P. M. we departed by the road alongside the horse tramway leading to al-Kūfā. This tramway was built at the expense of the city council in 1909. On both sides of it are some poor burial grounds, al-Ḥennâne on the south, al-Kumeji farther north. From 6.03 to 7.12 our camels grazed. After this

28 Al-Jaʿṣībī, Buldān (De Goeje), p. 369, writes that al-Ḥira is three miles from al-Kūfā. Al-Ḥira is built on the elevation an-Negef, which once formed the coast of the sea, which reached in ancient times as far as here. From al-Ḥira to the manor of al-Ḥawarnaḵ is three miles in an easterly direction. As-Sadir was built in the desert near al-Ḥira. — The center of al-Ḥira is located southeast of the ruin mound of al-Knèdèr, whence it is the same distance to the ruins of al-Kūfā and al-Ḥawarnaḵ.

Al-Idrīsī, Nuzha, III, 6, says that six miles from al-Kūfā a huge dome was built, resting on pillars and with a gate on each side. All the walls were covered with splendid carpets and the floor with costly rugs. It is said that ʿAli ibn Abi Ṭâlib and his descendants are buried there.

Ibn Ǧubejī, Ṣibla (De Goeje), p. 216, records that an-Negef by its position in the barren vicinity of al-Kūfā forms a sort of border between this town and the rocky desert. It is in rough, open country with an unobstructed and delightful view far around. About
we crossed the tracks and proceeded eastward between ruin mounds. At eight o’clock we had on our left Kṣejr al-Kena’ by a subterranean aqueduct. At 8.10 we rode over an old canal and at 8.58 encamped by the Euphrates (Fig. 16) under palm trees on the fields of the Eben Barrāk clan. The chief of the clan, Dreyjem eben Barrāk, was just then in prison, where he had been put at the request of the citizens of an-Negef who, whether rightly or wrongly, deeply hated him. During his absence his brother, as his representative, welcomed us in a friendly way and offered his protection to us as his guests. And of that protection we certainly were in need, as the Eben Barrāk clan belongs to the Ḥaza’el tribe, with whose troop we had had a skirmish shortly before on the al-Lisān height.27

We explained to him what had happened and he replied that all was buried and forgotten, because the fault lay with the Ḥaza’el, who were the attackers, while we were doing no more than defending ourselves; he added that it was also Allāh’s will that our rifles carried farther than theirs.

On April 28, 1912, we perfected our notes and sketches and made a list of the tribes in the region between ar-Rubhe and al-Msajjeb.

April 29, 1912. We left our camp at 5.20 A.M., going in a north-northwesterly direction. At 6.05 we passed the ruins of Tell as-Sajjār, where people from al-Kūfa search for antiquities. All the vaults and walls were built of bricks. At 6.25 we had on our left the fairly well-preserved monastery of Muslim, enclosed by high walls reminding one of the walls of the manor of al-Aḥejzer; on our right lay the as-Shale ruins and to the east beyond them the sunken walls of the gardens of al-Kūfa. South of us a mound of ruins about one kilometer long by four hundred meters wide could be seen.

one parang west of al-Kūfa is a famous sanctuary known by the name of ‘Ali ibn Abi Ṭāleb. It stands on the spot where the she-camel carrying ‘Ali’s dead body knelt down. He is supposed to be buried there, but this is not certain.

Ibn Baṣṣaṭa (Taḥfa) (Defrémery and Sanguineti), Vol. 1, pp. 414 f.) slept in the town of Maṣḥad ‘Ali ibn Abi Ṭāleb on the plain, an-Negef. He says that it is a fine town on hard, level ground and, owing to the number of its inhabitants and its architecture, is counted among the chief towns of ʿIrāq. It also has large, clean market places, which are entered by the al-Ḥadr gate: this gate leads likewise to the tomb where ‘Ali is supposed to lie buried.

In 1263 the Mongol governor of Ḥadhd had a canal dug from the Euphrates to an-Negef, but it was soon clogged by sand. In 1508 this canal by order of Shah Ismā’l II was cleaned and vaulted: the vaulted roof was then provided with holes through which the water could be drawn up. Its original name was Nahr al-Sāḥ; at the present time it is called al-Kena’ (Laḥat al-Qara, Vol. 2, 1536–1531 A. H. (1912 A. D.), p. 458).

In 1792 a new canal was built, but this was also soon clogged up by the sand. Later the canal ʿerī al-Saḥ was dug and in the reign of Sultan Abdul-Hamid II the canal of al-Ḥadratīje was constructed, but the sand filled both of these in a few years. In 1912 the laying of iron pipes was begun, to lead water to an-Negef directly from the Euphrates (ibid., pp. 458 f., 491).

27 See Musil, Arabia Deserta, pp. 368–389.
Farther north no remains of any considerable size were visible. This was all that remained of the once great town of al-Kūfa. 28

A rocky, sand-strewn slope rises gradually west of the old canal of Sa'de, where we halted from 7.20 to 7.30. We photographed the old brick bridge spanning the canal (Fig. 17). At 7.48 at the farm Kaşr Abu Fšêže we crossed another half-caved-in canal. From the Euphrates a subterranean aqueduct branches off, which now brings water to an-Neğef. On the west extends the bare, desolate plain of al-Mamrüţa, with here and there isolated hillocks projecting above it. To the east our guide pointed out the hamlet Kaşr Bêk Ahâmi, north of it the hamlet of Ummu Śwâri, still farther to the northeast the palm gardens of Anab, and to the north-northeast the minaret of the settlement of Ğifil rising above the palm trees. 29

HAN AL-MŞALLA TO KERBELA

At nine o'clock we had the Hân al-Mşalla on our right. This is a large, rectangular building enclosed by high walls of brick. Each of the walls is buttressed in the center by a semicircular tower. The gate opens on the east. Along the walls in the court arcades have been built. To the east stand three smaller khans, a few coffee houses and other buildings, and a tomb. From 9.26 to 10.05 our camels grazed; from 10.30 to eleven o'clock we filled our bags with water from a pond connected with the flooded Euphrates. At 10.35 we saw on the right bank the hamlet of Umm al-'Ağa, which is surrounded by the waters of the lake Hôr Beni Hasan, and on the east beyond it the large settlement of Ğifil. The Euphrates was here about one kilometer wide and studded with numerous islets.

28 Barhebruc, Chron. syriacum (Beijan), p. 106, says that al-Kūfa is identical with al-'Ašûla.
29 Eiljah of Nisibis, Opus chronologicum (Brooks), p. 173, records that in 751–752 A.D. several towers were built along the transport road from al-Kûfa to Mecca to serve as signposts for the pilgrims.

Ibn al-Fâthî, Buldân (De Goeje), p. 165, writes that there were in al-Kûfa eighty thousand inhabitants, among them forty thousand fighting men. He mentions (ibid., p. 174) the Mesgêd Žafat, also called Mesgêd as-Sahla.

Ibn Ḥudejî, Ribla (De Goeje), p. 213, relates that the destruction of the town of al-Kûfa was caused by the Ḥijâże tribe, which camped in the country around and oppressed the inhabitants incestously.

30 Jâhîz, Ma'qûm (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, p. 335, reports that the village of Ṣûa lies in the Babylonian territory below Hillat Beni马šan. There al-Kâsem ibn Mûsa al-Kâsem ibn Ğâfar as-Sâdîq is buried, and near his tomb at Barmalâha is the tomb of the Prophet Esekid, called Du al-Kifîl.

ハウス Hâfîn mumûd (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 464, mentions that Du al-Kifîl is a settlement three hours from al-Kûfa, famous for the grave of the prophet al-Kifîl.
Many herds of buffaloes were moving about in the water. The inhabitants cross from islet to islet on inflated skin bags. At 12.20 P.M. we had on the west the deserted Hân Ćedân, on the east the hamlet of al-Meqarr, and beyond it al-Melewije.

![Boat on the Euphrates near al-Kûfa.](image)

From 12.43 to 1.47 we rested opposite the hamlets of Flêfel and Umm ar-Rağî.

Above the palms on the north the ruin mound of al-Biris came into view. Seen from the south it reminded us of the Rotunda in Vienna. On a huge ruin, which resembles a dome tilted to the east, stands a narrow, longish remnant of ancient walls.³⁰

Westwards on our left extended the undulating plain of Mazarûr al-Mhejmîd with the remains of the ancient fortress of Işân al-Mhejmîd; on the right were seen a few ruined brick ovens (kûra), in which bricks for the Hân Sakkîr had been burned. At 3.20 we sighted, opposite the hamlet of al-Ağda, the inlet of the Žerî Sa'de canal. Not far off to the north of it stands the Hân Sakkîr, a large building with semi-

---
³⁰ Al-Belâdorî, Futûh (De Goeje), p. 255, calls al-Biris Burs or Ağmet Burs, recording that Rustam marched out against the Moslems and encamped at Burs, then between al-Hira and as-Sahlân, while the Moslems camped between al-'Odeîb and al-Kûdestîjî.

The Moslem leader sent out a troop mounted on horses, which rode as far as Burs, killing whoever crossed its path. The Persians fled to al-Mudâjen (ibid., p. 259).

By a written message 'Ali assessed the people of Ağmet Burs for a payment of four thousand dirhem. Ağmet Burs is situated below Şarch Nimrud near Babil (ibid., p. 274).

Kodâma, Harâj (De Goeje), p. 238, refers to an upper and a lower al-Burs.
circular towers. Three small khans, several coffee houses and huts, as well as some dilapidated houses, enclose it on its eastern side. On the northeast the palms of the hamlets of al-Mnēfer, Umm Helāl, al-Humējānijje, and A'ejje showed black. Al-Birīs stood out between the palms of the last two hamlets, resembling, when seen from this side, a symmetrical pyramid with an annex. Beyond and east of it were grouped high piles of old building material and on the north the horizon was shut in by the palms of the hamlets of Ṣantūnija, al-Ḥarka, and Ražbān, the high buildings of the last-named glistening in the rays of the sinking sun. We bivouacked at 4.55 west of al-Birīs, close to a branch of the Euphrates.

On April 30, 1912, we started at 5.15 A.M. The sun was just coming up behind al-Birīs, its rays striking the ruins and sending out countless long shafts. In the bare plain of Ammu Šwejē to the west was seen the ʿAṭsān mound of ruins from which a road leads west via Nišān as-Sāhār and the Ḥirbet al-Mūzde to the manor Kašr al-ʿHejζer. North of Nišān as-Sāhār is the plain of az-Zājdī, east of which lie the farms Kašr Nūr and ar-Rḥēṯ and farther north the farm of at-Ṭemānijje. Northeast of the last is the hamlet of Abu Rwejje. At seven o’clock we had to the east the huts of ar-Rezībe and az-Zibdijje, behind them the hamlet of Twērīq — or, as it is officially called, al-Hindijje — and northwest of them that of Abu ʿAbed ʿAwnejjāt. Riding through the al-Mēgāhīl plain we met many Shiīte pilgrims mounted on donkeys journeying to an-Neğef. They hire the animals from men of Bagdad, who take the pilgrims to Kerbela and return home from there with new passengers, while the Kerbela people take the pilgrims on to an-Neğef and back again. For the loan of the donkey the pilgrim has to pay from fifteen to twenty piasters (73 to 90 cents) the trip.

At eight o’clock the crags of Šdēra Šubhān appeared to the west. At 8.10 we reached the Ḥān eben Nējele. By the side of the large khān stand three smaller ones.²¹

Beyond the Ḥān eben Nējele begins the lake Hōr Brāz, east of which lie the settlements of at-Ta‘būri, Hnēdijje, az-Zibilijje, and as-Slejμānijje. To the west extend the desolate undulating plains of al-Mīhā and at-Ṭaḥfāt.

²¹ The present Ḥān eben Nējele, is perhaps the Moslem military station of an-Nuḥeiļa.

²² Jākūt, Muḥam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 771, says that an-Nuḥeiļa lies near al-Kūfa on the Syrian borders.
To the north-northwest appeared the black outlines of the Kerbela gardens, and the golden dome of the mosque of Sahn  Ḥusejn shone out brightly. From ten to eleven o'clock we rested. At 11.45 we sighted on the west the cleft hillock of

Abu Rāsēn and in front of us numerous limekilns (kwar). At 12.35 P. M. we entered the Kerbela gardens at Kaşr al- Hendi. After a short ride over the salt plain of al-Ḥaĉime, at 1.05 we reached the town itself. As the dam of the al- Ḥsēnijje canal had broken in one place and many streets were inundated, we had some difficulty in leading our camels through the town to the northern gardens where, at 2.24, we encamped by the Umm Tell ruin.

Kerbela has about thirty thousand inhabitants, half of them Persians. The most prominent tribes among the population are the Beni Sa'ad, Salâlme, al-Wuzūm, at-Tahâmze, and an-Nâṣerijje. The Dede family is the richest. It was they who constructed the canal Nahr al-Ḥsēnijje, for which the Sultan Selim rewarded them with a grant of extensive tracts of land. The most respected family is the Āl Bwe', for they buried
Husejn. The main sanctuary, which stands in the western part of the town, is as-Sah\n or al-Imam Sajjedna Husejn, with a golden dome. The mosque in the eastern part is called Sajjedna 'Abb\nas. The government building was begun in 1871 at the southern edge of the town by the governor Midhat Pasha, but it is not yet finished. The same governor also enlarged the market place, which begins at the government building. The name Kerbela is used to designate merely the eastern part of the gardens. The town proper is called al-Ma'\shad or Ma\shad al-Husejn. North of the Kerbela gardens lie the suburbs, gardens, and fields of al-Bk\ere; to the northwest, those of Kurra; and to the south, those of al-Rageerijje; west of the latter lie Razze, then Raitawaijje, Nahr al-Horr, Nahr al-Ejs\avi, and last of all al-Hajdarijje on the west. From here to the southeast lie al-Baz\zul, al-Bdaw\nijje, as-Serifijje, al-Hendi, Bl\bel, and Kerbela.\n
In 184 A.D. D. Suleim\nn ibn \Surad, the leader of the penitents, marched with his followers from an-Nuqja and spent the night at Dejr al-A\war. Next day they encamped at al-A\ka, or A\s\a M\liek, on the banks of the Euphrates. Leaving before daybreak, they reached Husejn's grave in the morning, stayed there a day and a night, and then marched on al-Hassak, al-An\ba\r, as-Sa\dul, and al-Ka\jara (as-Tabar\, Ta\r\h [De Goeje], Ser. 2, p. 545). Al-Is\azraji, Masdl\k (De Goeje), p. 56, writes that Kerbela lies west of the Euphrates opposite Ka\r ibn Hubejr\a.

Ibn Haw\k\al, Masd\l\l (De Goeje), p. 166, says the same thing, adding that the grave of Husejn, son of 'Ali, was there, with a large tomb above it, and that the grave was visited by great numbers of pilgrims several times a year.

Al-I\risi, Nus\a, IV, 6, repeats the statement of Ibn Haw\k\al.

Al-Mu\k\adasi, A\\s\an (De Goeje), p. 130, records that Husejn's grave is on the very spot where he was killed in the settlement of Kerbel, beyond Ka\r ibn Hubejr\a.

In 1016-1017 Husejn's tomb at Kerbel caught fire from two candles and burned to the ground. Hasan ibn al-Fa\l also had a wall built around the tomb, died about 1025-1024 A.D. (Ibn Ta\ri Birdi, Na\g\u\u (Popper), Vol. 2, pp. 113, 141). According to Ibn al-\A\l, K\\mu\l (Tornborg), Vol. 9, p. 154, Hasan ibn al-Fa\l also had the fortification wall of Ma\shad 'Ali built.

\A\'kil\, Ma\'\k (\W\\\\\ttenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 870, mentions that in the administrative district of Ninawa also lies the settlement of Kerbel, the place where al-Husejn was killed.

\A\b\b ibn Mu\\\k\u\u\l (al-A\s of 'Aja al-Tamr, head chief of many clans, violated al-Ma\shad (Husejn's tomb) at al-H\a\r (Kerbel). In 988 an army was sent to 'Aja al-Tamr, but \b\b escaped into the desert (Ibn Miskaw\u, Ta\\g\r (Amedroz), Vol. 2, pp. 358, 416). Ibn Ba\j\a\u (Tab\ja [Defr\emery and Sanguinetti, Vol. 2, pp. 991] journeyed from al-Hil\a to Kerbel; he says that Kerbel is a rather small town lying in a palm grove which gets its water from the Euphrates. The sacred tomb is in the center of the town by the side of a large schoolhouse and the famous monastery where pilgrims are given food. The gate to the tomb is guarded and nobody can enter unless the guards permit. The pilgrims kiss the silver sarcophagus, above which hang lamps made of gold and silver. On all the doors are silk curtains. The inhabitants are divided into the Aw\\d\d R\h\c and Aw\\d\d F\\k\s, between whom there is constant friction, although all are Shi\e\s. These internal dissensions are blamed for the decay of the town.

Al-Ma\f\l, Masd\l (Codex windobonensis 988 [A. F. 68]), fol. 62 r., records that to the settlement of Kerbel, where the grave of Husejn, belong many fields.

In March, 1355, the Sultan Selim visited both Kerbela and an-Nef\f and had the canal of al-Husejnijje dug (Chiba, La province de Bagdad [1908], p. 34; Hammer-Purgstall, Osmanisches Reich [1827-1883], Vol. 3, p. 154).

\\s\u, \\u\p\n\u (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 464, writes that the town with the grave of Imam al-Husejn lies in the district of Kerbel, one day's march north of al-Hil\a. It is famous for its dates.

In the neighborhood of Kerbela I locate Dejr al-Cem\g\m and Dejr Kurra, which figured in the campaign of 635 A.D. between the Mostems and Persians. The name Kurra has been preserved in the northwestern part of the gardens.

After the defeat at al-Kadosijje, 635 A.D., a part of the Persian army fled to Dejr Kurra and, when hard pressed there, went farther to al-Mad\\s\f (as-Tabar\, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2907 fl.).
KERBELA TO THE ḤĀN AL-MAḤĀWĪL; RUINS OF BĀBIL

We were visited by a few peasants working in the gardens near by and they sketched for me in the sand a map of the surrounding country. Thus I was able to complete my topographical notes on the region between the settlements of Kerbela, Şetāţa, and ar-Rumādi. One of the peasants was camping west of al-Imám Ḥorr, a little shrine built on the southwestern edge of the gardens, by the well of al-Ḥinēfes. South of here is the hamlet of Şerīţat as-Slejb, south of this Rezāzā, and on the west ar-Raṣūlīje and Zulṭene. The canal Nahr al-Kāzī, after supplying all these hamlets with water, ends in the swamp Hîr abu Dībes south of the hill Tell Gesāne. In the evening we ascertained the latitude; we were much disturbed that night, being tormented by mosquitoes.

May 1, 1912. We departed at 5.16 A.M. To the west the trees of the hamlet of al-Kurṭa showed green, and southeast of the hamlet shone the sanctuary of al-Imâm Ḥorr with its bluish dome. At 5.22 we crossed the canal Nahr al-Kāzī and at 5.45 the canal of al-Horr. Our hungry camels grazed from

Evidently we must seek Dejr Kurra north or northwest of al-Kādezije, on the west side of the Euphrates. The Persians could not flee to the south or southeast, the regions there being under the sway of the Bekr ibn Wâlî tribe, allies of the Moslems. The territory of this tribe stretched as far as al-Kādezije. From here northward are the camping grounds of the Taylsh, who remained faithful to the Persians and therefore offered a place of refuge for the fugitives.

In 781 A.D. al-Haṣṣag ibn Jûsif, the governor of Irak, on his march from al-Basra reached the region between al-‘Odejba and al-Kādezije. His enemy ibn al-Aṣṣat sent against him a strong troop of cavalry, which pursued him from al-Kādezije as far as Dejr Kurra and then encamped. Ibn al-Aṣṣat himself had joined the troop at Dejr al-Ǧumäğem. Al-Haṣṣag even before reaching Dejr Kurra received reinforcements from the Syrian Caliph Abdalmatek. He had planned to escape by way of Hit to Mesopotamia and thus to be nearer to Syria, but first he encamped at Dejr Kurra, near al-Fâlalîg and ‘Ajn al-Tamr. Both armies entrenched themselves and a battle took place (ṣā-Ṭabari, op. cit., Ser. 2, pp. 1072 f.). Ibn al-Aṣṣat was defeated and in his flight reached the hamlet of Benî Gūde in al-Ǧulluǧ, where he crossed the Euphrates in a boat (ibid., p. 1085).—

This report also shows that Dejr Kurra was situated north or northwest of al-Kādezije. Al-Haṣṣag wanted to escape to Hit; therefore, starting from al-Kādezije, he went west around al-Kūfâ and joined the auxiliary detachment hastening to his aid from Syria. Hit he did not reach, as ibn al-Aṣṣat with the other troops joined his enemies and blocked his further progress. Dejr Kurra lay in the administrative district of al-Falalîg, not far from ‘Ajn al-Tamr. Al-Haṣṣag apparently did not advance in the direction of ‘Ajn al-Tamr (for had he done so we should have been informed that he fortified himself in this stronghold), but stopped about half way between the settlements of al-Falalîg situated right on the Euphrates and ‘Ajn al-Tamr — thus at the very spot where the gardens of Kerbela now lie. That al-Haṣṣag’s communications with Mesopotamia were interrupted is also evident from his lack of provisions, because nobody brought him anything, while his enemy ibn al-Aṣṣat was in uninterrupted communication with Irak. Dejr al-Ǧumäğem must have lain south of Dejr Kurra and at least half a day’s march from the Euphrates, for ibn al-Aṣṣat reached the river in his flight only after a long forced march and then crossed it in a boat.

Jâkūt, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 693, located Dejr al-Ǧumäğem on the borders of the desert in the vicinity of al-Kūfâ, about seven parasangs from the latter on the road to al-Baṣra. Abu-l-Fâlîlî, Marjūj (Juynīb), Vol. 1, p. 427, merely repeats Jâkūt’s account. —

From what source Jâkūt learned the distance between al-Kūfâ and Dejr al-Ǧumäğem we do not know, but that Dejr al-Ǧumäğem could have been on the road from al-Kūfâ to al-Baṣra is out of the question. Seven parasangs south or southeast of al-Kūfâ take us to the territory of the Bekr ibn Wâlî tribe far from Hit, to which al-Haṣṣag was hurrying, and, likewise, far from al-Falalîg and ‘Ajn al-Tamr, between which places — at Dejr Kurra near Dejr al-Ǧumäğem — he fortified himself.
5.55 to 6.17. At 6.20 we rode over the Nahr al- Câmâlîjîje. To the north, on the southwestern spur of a broad elevation, stood the shrine of al-Imâm ʿOnk. At 7.10 we had to the northwest some ruins and to the right the gardens of Kurra with the gardens of al-Řâzerîjîje to the southwest of them. At 7.45 we rode through sandy, uncultivated ground past the shrine of al-Imâm ʿAwn with a green dome and a green inlaid gate. To the northwest of us was seen the upland of Umm al-Hawa and to the northeast that of Markâda. At eight o’clock we were in the old canal of ʿAlkûmi, which once brought water from the Euphrates through the hills of ad-Daʿâleţ to Kerbelâ and was connected with the canal running west of Hûr Ῥâjîd. At 8.18 we saw to the east some rather small ruins and the hamlet of al-Uwend; to the north the upland of Markâda. The swamps of al-Eneb and al-Bhêra west of it are shut in by Târ Sawîd and the hills of al-Mräraţer. We now proceeded between the knolls of ad-Daʿâleţ and the salt plains of Câzje and as-Swâreţ, which are intersected by numerous half-caved-in canals. At 9.58 we saw more ruins on our right and from 10.05 to 10.52 we rested. At 11.20 we were in the plain of al-Bowbehâni, an area protected against inundation by earth ramparts and in which extensive gardens have been planted where cucumbers especially were grown on a large scale.

At 12.40 P.M. we crossed the boat bridge over the Euphrates and entered the town of al-Msajjeb (Fig. 18), which is wreathed, as it were, by palm trees. After turning south-southeast, we waited from 1.20 to 2.50 for the gendarme. To the north were seen the domes of the sanctuary of Aвлâd Muslim.33

Security on the roads in the neighborhood of al-Msajjeb is guaranteed by Chief Eben Fejhâl of the Maʿâmre clan.

The fields here are irrigated by the long canal of an-Nâsrijîje and the shorter one of al-Kaţî. At 3.17 we had on our right the large Tell Masʿûd and al-Eğêmi ruins; then other ruins including that of the shrine of as-Sajjed Ibrâhîm and the Işān Najnwa. To the east lay the ruin knoll Işān al-Mansûrîjîje.34

33 In this settlement the Shi‘ite pilgrims revere a grave where al-Musajjeb ibn Naṣîba is supposed to have been buried. He was a member of the Fesâra tribe, lived at al-Kûfâ, was an ardent follower of ʿAli, and desired to avenge the death of Bûsîjn (al-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 2, pp. 497, 551).

34 These extensive ruins are in part the remains of the Moslem town of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra. About 750 A.D. Jaʿāl ibn ʿOmar Ibn Hubejra built a farm near Gîşr Sûra, which came to be called Kaşr Ibn Hubejra (al-Rûbîḥî, Futûh [De Goërde], p. 297). Al-Muḥaddad, Aḥsan (De Goërde), p. 121, asserts that Kaşr Hubejra is a large town irrigated from the Euphrates, with well-frequented markets. A şâmeʿ (cathedral mosque) is built in the market place: among the inhabitants there are many weavers and Jews.
Both to the right and left we could see the high embankments of ancient canals. At 3.55 the ruins Isân al- línea appeared on the left; to the east of these the Isân al-Úfí, and to the southwest of the latter the Isân as-Sajjed 'Abbâs.

Difficult in crossing an irrigation ditch caused a delay from 4.30 to 4.52. At 5.20 on the left we saw the Isân al-Badd and east of it the Isân umm al-Ward. At 6.15 we passed over a wide old canal and at 6.43 camped behind the Hân al-Mahâwil. In the large hân was a gendarmerie station and behind it clustered about thirty huts. The settlement Kaşr al-Mahâwil lies farther east. I was seized by a violent attack of fever which shook me all night and did not leave me until morning.

May 2, 1912. At 5.16 A.M. we took the road going south. At 5.33 we had on our right the ruins Isân abu Rûte, to the

Abu-l-Feda', Yâkwûm (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 305, says that Kaşr Ibn Hubejra is situated near the Euphrates proper, from which many small canals lead to it. On the opposite side, to the west in the desert, lies Kerbela. Ibn Hubejra, the political administrator of Irak in the reign of the Caliph Merwân II, built the town near the boat bridge of Sûrâ and the old city of Babylon.

The book al-'Azârî, as quoted by Abu-l-Feda', gives the distance from the town of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra to the Euphrates proper as two parsangs.

The Isân Najnwa is the Ninawa' mentioned by al-Tabari, Ta'rib (De Goeje), Ser.3, p. 2190. Jâkût, Ma'wâm (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 870, writes that Kerbela is a town in the administrative district of Ninawa', which lies in the fertile country around al-Kûfa.
southeast the Išân al-Ḥāṭûnijje, to the south the al-Ḳrejîn and al-Bezel ruins, and to the southwest the palm grove of al-Baṭṭa. At 6.50 we crossed the canal of Bedʿat as-Sejjâhijje and then that of al-Fendijje; the latter brings water to the shrine of Umm Ḥamdân. The region is owned by the families of al-Jisar, al-Ḡâwne, and al-Ḡedi. At 7.37 we rode over the bridge spanning the canal Nahr Nil and came to the high, crumbling ruin mound of Bābil. At 8.25 we halted near the shrine of ʿAli eben al-Ḥasan and walked to the ruins, just then being excavated under the direction of Professor Robert Koldewey. This gentleman welcomed us in a friendly way, spoke about the results of the excavations, and showed us different parts of the old town. Then, after regaling us with refreshments, he bade us good-by, and we returned to our camels. At 2.15 P.M. we left ʿAli eben al-Ḥasan, reaching the Ḥān al-Mahāwil at 4.55.

THE ḤĀN AL-MAḤĀWĪL TO BAGDAD

On May 3, 1912, we started at 5.17 A.M. in a northerly direction. At 6.12 we had on our right the shrine of al-Imām Ḥāzer and on our left the az-Zbāʿ ruins. At 7.12 we crossed the Nahr an-Nāṣrijje and at 7.21 were at the deserted khan of the same name, northeast of which stands the Išān abu Šaʿir. From 8.05 to 8.52 our camels grazed. The soil here is much mixed with sand and small gravel and overgrown chiefly with ʿaṭreš, but those places which are sufficiently irrigated either from the river or springs are covered with luxuriant grasses. On the other hand, spots depending on the rain alone soon dry up and from May onwards resemble a bare, scorched desert. At 8.55 we crossed the Nahr al-Msajjeb. At 9.20 on the left we saw the shrine Mizār Kāzem al-ʿUfi; at 9.35 we passed two buttes formed by the at-Ṭwejbe ruins and sighted to the northwest the Išān as-Ṣlejbi.

We met several hundred soldiers marching against the Ba ʿEjjī fellāhīn, owners of the lands southeast of Ḥān al-Mahāwil, who only a few days before had attacked the kā’ma-kām of al-Ḥilla and killed the officer in command of the gendarmes and several of his men. At eleven o'clock we reached the khan and gendarmerie station at al-Ḥaṣwa. West of the highroad from al-Msajjeb lies the farm of al-Hrāwī. At 11.17 we crossed the Nahr as-Sikandarijje (or al-İskandrijje), west of
which on the highroad stands the khan of the same name. At 11.44 the road leading by this khan to al-Msajjeb and Kerbela turns to the left. We continued our way across a desolate country and through the Ammu Sfū' ruins, and at 1.34 P. M. reached the ruined Ḥān al-Bīz, with old ruin mounds adjoining. From 1.48 to 2.35 we rested at the Nahr al-Latifijje. On the right was the Šejšebār ruin. At 3.58 we reached the nahr, khan, and gendarmerie station of al-Maḩmūdijje. This is a village with twenty inns, coffee houses, shops, and a few dwelling houses. To the west appeared the huge Isān abu Ḥabbā and northeast of it the al-Mekā’id ruin. At 4.40 the Isān ad-Dār was to the left. We then crossed the old Nahr al-Malek. At 5.20 we saw the deserted Ḥān az-Zâd on the left. In the vicinity camp the Ba `Āmer, a branch of the Ma’dān tribe.

This is a wild, inhospitable region. Both to right and left are ruin mounds and between them scorched, bare ground. Only here and there in some low-lying spots `aḍrēš was thinly growing, and even these spots were covered by a dark gray layer of dust. Ahead of us the wind raised dust and sand which, forming high columns and moving from place to place, frequently covered us from head to foot. With the dry air, the hot sun, and the parching southeast wind it was no wonder that we were eager to make headway. From 5.50 to 6.27 our camels grazed southeast of al-Abjaz, after which we remained in the saddle until 8.55, when we bivouacked in the ditch to the left of the highroad. We could not light a fire as there was no fuel and we were afraid of thieves, whom our fire might have attracted. That the Tigris was not far away we were soon aware from the multitudes of mosquitoes which found us in less time than it takes to tell.

On May 4, 1912, we started at 5.11 A. M. On the right sailing boats on the Tigris came into view, floating lazily on the river, which is here bordered with palms. The sun sent out its first rays as if to spy out the country and seemed to rise from the water, so low was it on the horizon. The road was full of people. Peasant folk of both sexes were bringing vegetables, poultry, and grain to market; Shiīte pilgrims were marching to the Holy Cities or returning from them; several funeral parties with the bodies of dead Shiites were making for Kerbela or an-Neğef to bury them there; Bagdad townsmen with their servants were journeying to their country estates; dealers in live stock drove before them buffaloes and sheep
for the butchers of Bagdad — the rush and bustle on all sides were unmistakable signs that we were near a big town. But Bagdad itself was still covered with a heavy blanket of mist, asleep on both sides of a beautiful river. To the north above the town and through the vapory clouds shone the gilded domes of the Shiite sanctuary of al-Kāzimēn.

At 6.15 we ascended the long embankment of al-Ḥerr (which had been built for a railway but was being used as a highroad), crossed the iron bridge, and turned north through a barren plain overgrown with nothing but ‘aḥreṣ, in order to reach the highroad to Mosul. Not far from the tomb of as-Sitt Zobejde soldiers were having rifle practice. The officer in command permitted us to pass between the firing party and the target, but gave the gendarme a sharp scolding for leading us that way. The poor gendarme! He was an old man from al-Mahāwil whom we kept in our service that he might buy clothes for his ragged grandchildren. His son had been killed a few days before by the Ba ʿEjğ.

At eight o’clock we reached the Mosul highroad and encamped under the palms in the garden of ʿAli Ḥāḡğ Ta’ma. We enjoyed our stay there very much. The ground was dry, the palms gave us their shade, and the mulberries their fresh fruit. Although there was but little water in the Tigris hard by, the banks were covered with lush grass, a pleasing sight to our camels who had had very little to eat for several days past; therefore nothing was lacking now for our complete recreation. And recreation was something we very much needed.
CHAPTER IV

BAGDAD TO TEKRIT

BAGDAD TO WELL OF AL-ḪŠĒŅI

On May 8, 1912, we proceeded toward the west, at first through the gardens and then over the fields of at-Taff. The soil grew wetter as we approached the lake Hör Diheh, which dries up in the autumn but in the spring fills again. On its western as well as on its southern shore the Baṭṭa clan of the Zōba’ tribe was camping with their chief, Ḥāmūd. At 6.20 A.M. we turned northwest and at 7.40 crossed the canal Nahr Baččāč, which conducts the water from the Hör Diheh southeast to the Tigris. In front of us in the morning light shone the summit of the ancient tower of ‘Aḵarkūf, to the south the ruin mound of al-Bzār, and to the west the hillocks of as-Sarrāḥa and the Hör abū Ġedājed.

From 9.20 to 9.55 we halted at ‘Aḵarkūf. This is the remains of a huge tower, with heaps of old brickwork lying about. The tower was built of large sun-dried and burnt bricks, between which were laid palm leaves cemented with pitch.35

Northwest of ‘Aḵarkūf stands the ruin mound of Bajjūz, a little below it the al-Asmar and al-Faras ruins, and west of them the shrine of Sahlījīn adorned with a small dome. At 11.25 we saw the latter due south of us.36

We rode northwest along the dry edge of the Hör ad-Dam, which was planted with turnips (ṣalāram). From twelve o’clock to 1.10 P.M. we rested. At 1.35 we were at the wells Bijār Karma. Passing them we crossed the Nahr al-Ḵarma,


36 Sahlījīn was a station on the highroad from Bagdad to al-Ḫanbār. At-Ṭahārī, Taʿrīf (De Goeje), Ser. 3, p. 1009, relates that in 865 A.D. the most of the town of al-Ḫanbār was filled with water from the Euphrates and overflowed so that it inundated the whole country around, even as far as as-Sahlīn. Most likely it flowed through the channel of al-Karma and flooded the vicinity of as-Sahlīn, just as it did in 1015. Jāḵūṭ, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 13, writes that this place name is written Sahlīn and pronounced Sahlīn, but that both are wrong, as the correct way of writing and pronouncing it is Sahlān, Abu-l-Faṣḥūl, Mardūṣ (Juyboll), Vol. 2, p. 4, adds that this settlement lies on the Nahr ‘Isa.
which branches off the Euphrates west of as-Saklāwījje. This
channel is scarcely two meters deep and had in it at that time
no more than twenty centimeters of water. West of it and to
the south of where we were stood the Bíjāz and al-Āshābī
ruins and to the north of us the al-‘Akla and al-Mkajjer ruins.

At 1.55 we had on our left the shrine of Sajjedna Ibrā-
him eben Ḥalil ‘ammu ʿAli. At 4.10 we rode east of a ruin
mound on the top of which are two white shrines, Banāt al-
Ḥasan; and we encamped at 4.31 at the foot of the plateau
of Ḥamra Beni Saʿed east of the white hill of al-Maḡaṣṣa.
A little distance from us there was a camp of the Dlejm,
whose feelings were very bitter against the Government and,
oddly enough, against us, too, because we were accompanied
by the gendarmes. They reproached us with having imprisoned
their head chief, Neğres eben Курсūd. According to them he
had committed no offense whatever but was deceived by the
tax collector, who wanted him to pay a tax a second time,
although he had already paid it without getting a receipt.
The gendarmes did not sleep all night for fear of the Dlejm,
and, as a matter of fact, after midnight someone fired a shot
at them. We all sprang to arms, though to no purpose, for
nobody appeared. Yet in spite of the absolute quiet we could
not sleep any more.

May 9, 1912. At 5.16 A.M. we rode northwestwards along
the eastern edge of the Hūr abu Rwejs, where glistened the	
tabular hill of al-Maḡaṣṣa, while beyond it farther to the west
appeared the white shrine Makān al-Mahdi. At 6.20 we passed
through the Hūr abu-l-Wejžile, to the north of which rises
the Tell Ṭarīb.

Our guide, a native of Tekrīt, said that the Dlejm had
told him that the Šammar had revolted against the Govern-
ment and were now raiding both the highroad from Bagdad
to al-Fellūqe and the one from Bagdad to Tekrīt and Mosul.
The reason was that twenty days earlier their head chief,
Meğwel eben Fārḥān, had been deposed by the Government
and superseded by his brother, Ḥmejdī. Meğwel, enraged, had
leagued himself with Feiṣal, another brother, and had gone
on the warpath. The preceding winter Feiṣal had been in Neğd,
in central Arabia, the original home of the Mesopotamian
Šammar, for the purpose of appeasing the Ṭūmān, who, after
a disagreement with his father, Fārḥān, had migrated to Neğd
in a body. Feiṣal’s mission had met with success, even to the
extent of bringing the recalcitrants back to Mesopotamia. Once there, it had not been difficult to gain them over for the revolt, as they hated Hmejdi fiercely because he had been the favorite son of Farhân.

This story frightened our gendarmes almost out of their wits, and they both began to lament the cruel fate Allâh had reserved for them. For were we not traveling in a country which the Šammar would have to pass if they wished to attack travelers on the Bagdad-Fellûge road? And we should soon have to take the Tekrit road where the Šammar might also be plundering. And surely they would not spare the gendarmes, the representatives of the Government. We did our best to console them, but in vain. They kept up their wailing.

We rode over an undulating plain which rises gradually towards the west. Here and there were scattered low, domed hillocks. Only the low-lying spots were overgrown with perennials and annuals. In one of these flat areas at the southern foot of the upland of Redâjef north of the well of Abu Čalb, our camels grazed from 8.40 to 9.20. To the west our guide pointed out the wells of al-Kejfijjât and to the north the well of ar-Rašrâši.

The gendarmes could not be pacified. All the time they spoke of their children, parents, and brothers, insisting that we should all perish in the desert, that nobody would ever know our murderers, and that we should therefore remain unavenged. The air was now full of dust, the sun shining but feebly, and the heat oppressive. From 11.02 to 11.55 we rested in the district of at-Trêter. There was not a hill, knoll, or tree to be seen in any direction. Only the undulating plain with its broad rises and shallow depressions extended before and behind us. It was very difficult to keep a straight course and the guide himself begged us to take our direction by the compass.

THE WELL OF AL-ḤŠĒNI TO KAHAF KALB

West of the well of al-Ḥšēni our camels grazed from 3.42 P. M. to 4.20. To the south were seen the low hills of ʻAkkâz, to the east of which is the well of as-Sab'a with the water of ʻAlît al-Banât to the south, and to the north at the foot of the upland of Redâjef the well of al-Ehsefât. Suddenly the gendarmes refused to go any farther, even threatening to
return to the Tigris if we persisted on our course. As the guide joined them, nothing was left for us but to negotiate. All that day we had not seen a single tent nor a human being. We could have done without the gendarmes, but not without the guide. Finally we agreed to go to the Tigris but in a northerly, not easterly, direction; and therefore we turned north-northeastward toward a huge mound of earth which appeared on the horizon. To the west we had the wells of Ḥenfsān, al-Ṯiwi, and Ḥlejż ad-Dib; to the east that of as-Sab’a. At 6.50 we encamped in a valley covered with grasses and perennials.

On May 10, 1912, by 5.02 A.M. we were in our saddles and at six o’clock, when north of the well of al-Ṯardāḵijje, we reached a rampart mound (ṭālū) between four and six meters high, thirty meters wide at the bottom, and fifteen meters on the top. In some places circular bulges projected, resembling remnants of towers. On the west side there extended a shallow depression from which the earth for making the mound may have been taken and which would also explain why the mound was considerably higher on the west than on the east side. We continued along the mound, for the most part on its eastern side. In the neighborhood grew rint and arfa. To the west appeared the broad upland of aš-Šnānāt, in which are the wells of Lubbaḏ and al-Baraḏīrīt. East-northeast of al-Ṯardāḵijje is the water of Abu ‘Azām. From 8.25 to 8.53
our camels grazed between the wells of Abu Zhêr and Abu Šerrâta (Fig. 19). To the east the horizon was shut in by the low, broad hills of al-Mṭabbâk, near which the wells of al-Enêk and aš-Šṭêt are located. To the west the tomb of Abu Ḫērâ came into view.

At eleven o’clock a high minaret appeared above the horizon, and west of it a dome in the town of Sâmarra shone like gold. Other domes and then some buildings began to appear through the haze, which made their glitter, position, and shape seem constantly to change. The burning sunbeams scorched us unmercifully, the air quivered, and presently the haze formed dense sheets, which hung above the wide horizon, altering the aspect of the whole country every little while. To the east on the Tigris were seen the Eṣṭablât ruins and the ruins and hamlets of al-Ḵabbâh, al-Mû’ēber, Ammu Ša’ēfe, Tell al-Mṣâjēh, al-Ḵâzâzer, al-Bhērijje, al-Ḫbâb, Tell Dâhab, and at-Twête.

At 12.45 P.M. we turned a little to the right from the rampart mound, crossed at one o’clock an ancient canal, and rode through a desolate, white plain overgrown with ‘erz and šefalleh plants and sidr trees. From 1.30 to 2.35 we rested between the hamlets of Šeri’at al-Ḵâzâl and al-Mâ’ūgîl by the highroad leading from Bagdad to Tekrit. To the west of us was the end of the rampart mound, to the east were tents belonging to the working gangs building the railroad track. We now proceeded along the highroad northwards. To the left rose gradually a rocky slope, which soon changed into a line of precipitous bluffs overlooking the Tigris valley and shutting off the western view. In the southern part of these bluffs, which is called Kahaf Kalb, are the wells of Abu Ḫšêr and Abu Senîne. At 3.55 the ruin mound of Kahaf Kalb was seen on our left, north of it the aš-Slebjîje ruin, still farther north on the high bluffs the castlê Kaṣr al-Ḫalîfa or al-Âšêk, and to the northeast the few huts of Čerje ‘Abed.

In the undulating plain known as Čummâm, west of al-Âšêk, are the natural well of al-Âgwâdi and the ruin mound of al-Ḫwêslât.

KAHAF KALB TO TEKRÎT

At 4.20 we had on our left the bluffs of Kahaf Kalb with the cave of the same name. The land we were passing
through was cultivated. Between the road and the foot of the bluffs stretches the old canal of al-Ishāḥī. On our right we saw the modern town of Sāmarra and the ruins of the older city, long since abandoned. How gigantic must once have been the capital Bagdad, built and embellished by so many caliphs, when even Sāmarra, only a temporary residence of theirs, boasted of such an extent! Sāmarra is full of memorials of times long past, while in the capital, Bagdad, not one of the splendid ancient buildings is preserved. There all has been torn down and destroyed, and the remnants of stately palaces have been used for repairing the houses and huts of today.

At 5.05 we made camp on a small headland right on the river below the castle of al-ʿĀṣek.37

From the rocky right bank (Fig. 20) there issues on the very brink of the Tigris a vigorous spring of pure fresh water, much cooler and better than that of the river. Not far from it some raftsmen, returning from Bagdad, were lying down for a short rest. Their donkeys were laden with large panniers filled with bags sewn of tanned goatskins. The raftsmen travel with these bags as far as Kurdistan, where they buy lumber, grain, wool, or butter; then they make small rafts of the lumber, and, tying skin bags filled with air underneath and loading the rafts, they sail down the Tigris to Bagdad. There they sell everything with the exception of the skin bags. These they put again on their donkeys, which they either bring with them or buy on the road, and go back to trade with the Kurds once more.

On May 11, 1912, at 4.58 A.M., we traveled along the eastern bank of the al-Ishāḥī canal.38

37 Ibn Ǧubayr, Riḥla (De Goeje), p. 233, relates that he encamped near the settlement of al-Ḥarba, which lies in a beautiful and very fertile region. From there he wandered all night and rested in the morning on the banks of the Tigris not far from a castle called al-Maṣḥūk. This is said to have been the pleasure site of Zobeidja, daughter of the uncle of Harun ar-Raschid and his wife. The distance from this point to Tekrit is one day’s march.

38 Ibn Ṣarrapion, ‘Aḥdāt (Brit. Mus. MS), fol. 56 r.; (Le Strange), pp. 18 f., writes that the Nahr al-Ishāḥī branches off the Tigris a little distance from Tekrit, flows past various farms and lonely places, touches the settlement of Ṭeṭrān and the manor of al-Ǧasāṣ, built by the Caliph al-Maṭṣṣaṭ, irrigates the farms opposite Sāmarra, which are called by number from first to seventh, and empties into the Tigris opposite the settlement of al-Maṭṣra. The manor of al-Ǧasāṣ stood on the right bank above the manor of al-Ḥarūnī, opposite which, on the left bank, rose the manor of al-Maṣḥūk. It is identical with the Kār al-ʿĀṣek of today. Al-Maṭṣra was a pleasure resort for the inhabitants of Bagdad and Sāmarra, and lay about two parasangs below the latter (Jāḥṣat, Muʿjam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 4, p. 568). The settlement of Ṭeṭrān is located north of the manor of al-Ḥarūnī, perhaps in the al-Ḥwēṣ-lāt ruin.
To our right, on the left bank of the Tigris, rose the walls of as-Šnās and the minarets of Abu Žalāf and Imām Dōr. At 6.15 we sighted on a bluff to our left the ruin mound of al-Ḥwēṣlāt; on the right were the cultivated fields of al-

Bu ʿAbbās. The flood plain widens out here as the az-Zbāʿī bluffs withdraw towards the west. After seven o’clock we rode through fields where barley was being harvested. At 7.15 the hamlet of ʿAbbās was on our right; behind it, on the left bank, rose the rectangular minaret of Abu Žalāf. From 8.32 to 8.55 our camels grazed near a path which comes down from that part of the upland of az-Zbāʿī where the al-Mēsīfe ruins, the spring al-Hwēra, and the well of al-Hajza are situated. At 9.20 we saw on the right of the road the ruin mound of Rasm al-Mhēḡīr, where the flood plain is only about one kilometer wide. At 10.50 we were at the tomb ʿΑbrūs below the bluffs of Ḥaṃ al-Ẓadme. The fields northeast of the tomb,

Along the right bank of the Nahr al-Iṣḥāki the road Ṭariḍ al-Iṣḥāki led from Bāmmara to al-Anbār (al-Ṭabar), Taʿrī [De Goede], Ser. 3, p. 1000). — Since at no place did the main channel of the Nahr al-Iṣḥāki approach nearer than eighty kilometers to al-Anbār, we must assume that the road followed along the right bank of a branch of this canal. In order to avoid the irrigation ditches, this road must have kept upon the upland of Ṭadīj. The branch canal must have left al-Iṣḥāki west of the present ʿEṣṭablā and run south, while the Nahr al-Iṣḥāki proper rejoined the Tigris southeast of ʿEṣṭablā. The branch I regard as the now filled-in canal of al-Ḥarṣṭīj. 
called Ḥāwi al-‘Ōgā, are owned by the Bēḡāt clan of Sāmarra. From 12.00 to 12.30 P.M., near the al-Mžēbre fields, we filled our bags with water from the flooding river, which had already reached the rocky bluffs on the west, cutting off the direct route to Tekrit. Hence we took the highroad leading through the ṣe‘īb of al-Fahal (which rises at the water of aš-Šāmcī) and ascended to the upland of al-Maṭla‘ on the west. In the river numerous islets covered with poplars showed black, but all the way from al-‘Āšek neither tree nor bush grew on either bank. At 1.15 we crossed the deep ṣe‘īb of ar-Rūmijje, at 1.25 the ṣe‘īb of Śišīn, and at 2.02 that of Śa‘eba. Down in the river to the east we could see the somewhat large island of Čiwān, the property of al-Bu ‘Ağī; far away on the northeastern horizon appeared the ridge of al-Ḥamrīn, to the west of us the sanctuary of al-Arba‘in with the tomb of Mḥammad al-Bedr to the north of it, and ahead of us the ruin mounds Tlūl al-Ġaffa, which we soon left on our right.

The houses of modern Tekrit⁵⁷ cover a rocky spur of the upland in the northeastern quarter of a tract of ruins. To the east the spur falls steeply to the river; to the south it sinks into a deep hollow; to the north it gradually merges into a cove in the river bank; while to the west a steep saddle connects it with the higher levels of the upland. The southern part of the inhabited settlement is called al-Ḳal‘a; the northern, al-Ḥāra. In the saddle is a cemetery, where we made a halt at 2.27. The hollow to the south, which is called al-Mesil, divides the ruins into two parts. The ruin mounds of the southern part, al-Ġaffa, are of more than the usual height. Another large ruin mound, as-Ｓeken, lies northwest of the present settlement. Tekrit is inhabited by about one thousand families, of which many are Jewish; but there is not a single Christian family. The inhabitants’ principal means of living is through trading with the Kurds and with the towns of Sāmarra and Bagdad.

⁵⁷ See below, Appendix XXI.
CHAPTER V

TEKRİT TO RĀWA BY WAY OF AT-TARTĀR

TEKRİT TO THE ŠEṬĪB OF ŚĪṢĪN; THE COUNTRY NORTH OF TEKRİT

Having found a reliable guide in the person of one Ahmed al-Ḥaṭṭāb and after taking in a supply of barley for the gendarmes' horses, we left the untidy settlement of Tekrit at 5.25 and set out westward over the bare plain. We rode past the tomb of Mḥammad al-Bedr and the large ruined sanctuary — once a monastery — of al-Arba'īn, until the wide but shallow valley of Śīṣīn was reached, where we bivouacked at 6.20. Our hungry camels found fairly good pasture there, while we enjoyed the pure atmosphere and perfect quiet of the place.

Our guide drew for us in the sand a map of the country.

North of Tekrit stand the hills Tiūl Gaḥa'. In the flood plain north of these hills end the šeṭīb of al-Ḥamar, close to which lie the at-Twejbet ruins and the cave Morārat as-Sa'īlūwa; farther on are the šeṭīb of al-Čerīm with a well of the same name, then come the šeṭīb of Abu Rejāš, al-Gēsāt with the wells of Abu Kāṭob and ar-Ribēga, and finally aš-Srejmiyye with the spring of aš-Sbejha. On the river bank by the last-named šeṭīb is the gendarmerie station Nuṭṭat aš-Srejmiyye and by al-Gēsāt the Ḩān al-Harmīne. Close to the šeṭīb of al-Čerīm is the shrine Kūbbit abu Ḥalbalān. North of aš-Srejmiyye, the ridges of al-Makḥūl and al-Mēčēḥ start running north-northeast from the Tigris and are divided from each other by the hollow, Gūfrat al-Ḥār, through which winds the šeṭīb of Gēhennam, which enters the Tigris near the ruined fort Kašr al-Banāt.

The erosion of the Tigris through the southern half of the ridge of al-Mēčēḥ has created the defile of al-Ḥanūka. Close to this defile the Ḥān an-Namél is built by the river; above it, to the north, lie the Kal'at

40 The ridge of al-Makḥūl is a part of the mountain chain which was once called Bārāmmā. The present name may have been given to it after the settlement and creek of al-Kuβītj.

Abū-l-Farāq, Ṣūطب (Bölk, 1285 A. H.), Vol. 11, p. 58, and Ibn al-Ḡṭūr, Kāmil (Tornberg), Vol. 4, p. 260, refer to a šeṭīb of al-Kuβītj twenty parasangs south of Mosul. There, in the time of the Caliph 'Abdalmalek (685—705), the allied Tālāb and al-Jūmūn tribes met the Kējs tribe in battle. — Twenty parasangs from Mosul would lead us to the ridge of al-Makḥūl.

The father of the learned bishop Moses Barcsba, who died in 906, was a native of the settlement of al-Kuβītj on the Tigris (Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1719—1728], Vol. 2, fol. 218).

Al-Iṣtabri, Māsālīk (De Goecje), p. 75, records a place called as-Sīn on the Tigris, about one day's march from the ridge of Bārāmmā, through which the river Tigris cuts its channel. The ridge stretches west far into Mesopotamia.

Abū-l-Fāḳhīl, Maḏā'ī (Juybhill), Vol. 2, p. 480, says that the settlement of al-Kuβītj lies below Mosul on the west bank of the Tigris opposite al-Ḥadītīn. The mosque there is called Mešēḥ al-Kuβītj. Al-Kuβītj is said once to have been a great town.

Thévenot, Voyages (Paris, 1689), Vol. 2, p. 157, journeys from Mosul to Bagdad alongside a ridge where, as the story goes, a Frank built a castle called Mekhoul-Calat (Kal'at
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Šerkāt ruins, or the ancient Ashur. Along the western foot of the ridge of al-Makhūl winds the valley of at-Tartār, which rises northwest of the end of the ridge near the hills Tell 'Abda, al-Mrejkiš, and an-Neŋme.

The natives locate the head of at-Tartār in the ṣeʾib of at-Trejṭir, which is joined on the right by the 'Abdān, Horr Morr, al-Hnéfes, and Fwēʾa ṣeʾibān and on the left by the ṣeʾib of al-Ḥamār. In the last-named ṣeʾib are the waters of Sahil Ḥamed, al-Elēbāt, and ad-Dibāšījī; in that of at-Trejṭir, the water of al-Ġemal. At the junction of al-Ḥamār with at-Trejṭir are the remains of the bridge al-Kaṭṭara, southwest of which lie the ruins of al-Ḥaẓr. East of these ruins, near the river bed of at-Tartār, is the al-Asrāb ruin. Out from the ridge of al-Makhūl run the ṣeʾibān of al-Ṣaʾfa, al-ʾAnejbe, Chaft al-Ḥeji, as-Swejse, al-ʾAʿāreb (with the spring ʾAjn Muṭlak), Umm al-Ruruba, al-Manḡūr, and az-Zubejdi. In the last-named are the natural wells of az-Zubejdi, Belālīz, Abu Šāṭen, and Ḥedren.

West of the well of Ḥedren rises the Tell Baŋr ruin mound, and south of it stands the shrine of al-Šeįj Ḥadīd. On the ridge of al-Makhūl, above the Tigris, are the al-Msahbaḵ and al-Qabbar ruins with, to the south, the well of al-Maras and the ṣeʾib and shrine of al-Masalla. South of az-Zubejdi at-Tartār is joined on the left by the ṣeʾibān of at-Tmrāt, Ab-al-Kūr, as-Samūme, Umm Rurube (with the well al-Ḥeji), al-ʾEffētēb, and Abu Ġed′a; this last ṣeʾib is traversed by the road to ʾAnā. The ṣeʾibān which join at-Tartār on the right are shallow and short. South of al-Ḥaẓr are the ṣeʾibān of Ṣadde, ad-Dbarījī, and at-Ṭejjījī, the latter coming from the wells of al-Šūḥ, al-Khejjāt, and al-ʾAzāmiljāt. In the ṣeʾib of al-Gurān is a well of the same name, west of which lies the Bir Nufel′a and to the south the watering place of as-Šarrijāt. East of this are the wells of al-Rorejōr, with the well of al-Šteįjāt to the south of them. Below the ṣeʾib of az-Zubejdi at-Tartār is joined by the ṣeʾib of al-Ḥejejbe, at the head of which lie the Bir abu ḍkēr and the Benijjet al-Fāqg ruín. Southwest of the latter are the wells of al-Baḥbaḥ, as-Semadān, Abu Zbr, Ammu ʾThbk, al-Lōlaḥjīj, and al-Heli. Southeast of Abu Zbr are the wells of al-Merwān, at-Ṭmejjjījāt, al-Muṣṭafjāt, and al-Mar. West of at-Tmrāt are the wells of al-Arṣa, al-Māneʾe, and Benijjet al-Maʾla. Immediately below the junction of the ṣeʾib of Umm Rurube with at-Tartār is that of the ṣeʾib of at-Ṭejjījīj, and close to the mouth of the ṣeʾib of al-ʾEffētēb near Kubr as-Šlubi is that of a ṣeʾib descending from the springs of al-Greįbjāt.

Makhūl. — Kaʾaš al-Makhūl is also known as Kaşr al-Banāt. Right below it the Tigris receives the ṣeʾib of Gebennam, which may be identical with the ṣeʾib of al-Kubjī. This agrees with the twenty parangs distance from Mosul. Al-Makhūl, also, is identical with the older al-ʾAkr.

Ibn Battūta (Ṭaḥfa [Defrémery and Sanguinetti], Vol. 2, p. 133), after two marches from Tekrit, reached the settlement of al-ʾAkr on the bank of the Tigris. He writes that above the town rises a conical hill with the remains of a castle at the foot of which stands the Ḥan al-Ḥaẓr, solidly built and strengthened with towers. From here to Mosul there was one settlement after another on the road. According to Abu-S-Fajjāl, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 267, this settlement was called Akr ḫbn Zuʾā′a.

41 Al-ʾAṣyāl, Dihān (Salhani), p. 92, mentions Tell ʾAbda near al-Ḥaššāš on the at-Tartār river.

42 Jākēt, Muṣaw (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 1, p. 711, says that al-Belālīz is a place between Tekrit and Mosul and that it is also called al-Belālīz, by interchange g with ṣ. — The ṣ here represents a patał pronunciation of k, which in the Rwala dialect differs from the sound of ṣ.
THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

THE ŠEĪB OF ŚIŚĪN TO AL-ΓAMMA

On May 12, 1912, we began our march at 5.12 A.M. in a westerly direction through an undulating country with a few broad valleys. To the southwest appeared a rather low cone where the well of al-Rurbān is situated; to the northwest some little heaps of stone marked the position of the small spring of al-Bēgāt. At 6.05 we had to the south the ruin and well of al-Ǧabrān, and at 7.10 we rode through the šeīb of al-Bsejṭīn, at the head of which is the water of al-Bsejṭīn and farther down the springs of ad-Drejge, al-Ruzlānī, al-Ḥrejs, al-Abtaḥ, aš-Šujūḥ, and al-Ḥammās. By 8.07 we were at the wells of al-Ḥumrānī, situated in a broad vale sloping to the south and bordered with the low hillocks Kārt al-Ḥasa. The water of al-Ḥumrānī is brackish and the vicinity desolate with dark-gray crumbling soil. About five kilometers to the west could be seen the ruins of the khan of al-Elwān on the road to ‘Āna which leads west past the wells of Abu Ğed’a, aš-Ṣlubī, Benijjet Ḥamad, al-Ma‘ālef, Amμu Ṛkēba, Abu Darāq, al-Ehjbē, al-Mĉábbas, an-Nヘjele, Sahl at-Ṭawīl, Sahl Abu Ḥrejebe, at-‘Ṭakāke, and as-Sfa’.

The šeīb of al-Ḥumrānī converges with the šeīb of al-Bsejṭīn; to the west of the latter are the wells of Abu Ėhās, al-Maṅkūb, aš-Šakra, and as-Sādde. From 8.25 to 8.56 we took our rest. Then turning southwest we reached at 10.10 the well of al-Ḥejjāzijjē and at eleven o’clock saw before us, twenty-five kilometers away, the right bank of the at-Ṭarṭār valley, bordered with a row of sidr trees. At 12.20 P.M. we crossed the šeīb of al-Mrēr, which has many wells with brackish water, and from 12.30 to 1.31 we rested.

Al-Mrēr runs southwest between the hills of Maṅkab Farḫān and Maṅkab al-Ḥama on the west and of al-‘Awseğijjē on the east. The wells of Abu Zumājel and al-‘Awseğijjē are both in this valley. South of the latter rises the Tell al-Mālhā, close to which lies the well of al-Mālḥa, while to the west flows the spring ‘Ajn al-Arnab. From this spring and from the wells of al-Mumbaṭah, al-Krejde, and Umm al-Ḥajāja several short little gullies descend to at-Ṭarṭār. At 2.35 we had on our right the spring of an-Nヘjele, which lies at the southern foot of the hillock of Abu Ėda’.

43 Jāḵtōt, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 333, states that Kaşr Ėmurān is the name of a settlement one day’s journey from Tekrīt near al-Ma‘ālīk west of Sāmarrā. — Evidently the farm of Ėmurān lay on the road from Tekrīt: we may therefore identify it with our Ėmurān.
At 2.45 we reached the western edge of the plateau that stretches between the Tigris and the broad valley of at-Tartār, which we saw before us, bordered on the west by a gray slope and filled with dark-green groves and little, reddish, glistening ponds. The valley disappeared far to the south behind the high red cone of al-Iḫṣejbi, where shone the surface of a salina not unlike a frozen pond. Our guide recognized this as Umm Rahal. People from all the settlements far around, as well as from Tekrīt, get their salt from this lake, claiming it to be of much better taste than that from the salt pan Melḥ al-Askar north of ‘Āna, or from other salt pans west of at-Tartār. The descent was quite difficult, especially at first because the yellowish ground was worn away to some depth and all the gradients were steep. At 3.25 we rode past the spring ‘Ajin al-Hasa, just then full of locusts. After winding our way between innumerable mounds of earth, we finally descended to the small basin of at-Trejtīr (not to be confused with the šeʾib of the same name at the head of at-Tartār), which is covered with a thick growth of grass and in which we encamped at five o’clock in the afternoon. The setting sun was already disappearing beyond the plateau to the west. To the north the mesas of Ḥumr at-Ṭubejṣijje and Ammu Rkēba were still visible.

On May 13, 1912, at 5.06 A.M. we were again on the road. The šeʾib of at-Trejtīr widens into a plain bordered on the east by a high escarpment with layers of rock salt. On the north appeared the white tomb ḫabr aṣ-Ṣlubi. At 5.40 we were on the bank of the channel of at-Tartār. The valley of at-Tartār is from six to ten kilometers wide and is very swampy and shallow, so that the river spreads far abroad when in flood. At such times it is very difficult to cross, as the animals cannot avoid the swamps. Only on the left bank of the šeʾib of at-Trejtīr rocky ground reaches almost to the channel and thus makes crossing possible. On the right bank is the well of al-Γamma, which, like all the other wells along our route is scarcely a meter deep. Here we stopped from 6.00 to 6.18. As we could not be sure that all the other wells would not, like this one, be polluted with locusts, we threw the dead ones out and poured the yellow, brackish, and evil-smelling water into our water bags.¹⁴

¹⁴ The river at-Tartār was known to the ancient authors. Tukulti Enurta II. (Annali, Scholl, Annalen (1909), pl. 2), obverse, il. 45 f.; Scholl, op. cit., p. 14) caught nine wild bulls by the Tartār.
THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

AL-ĞAMMA TO AL-MUSTAFEZ

The well of al-Ğamma is on the ancient road from Bagdad and Mesćin northward by way of al-Ḥazr. Leaving al-Kāziměn, this road passes Tell Ṣarib, the wells of as-Sab'a, al-Wēl, Umm al-Ḥajjāja, ‘Ain al-Parās, al-Gamma, Benijjet Ḥamad, al-Ǧrejrīfāt, Benijjet al-Malḥa, al-Merwān, Benijjet al-Fāg, Benijjet at-Ṭejlijje, al-Ḥazr, Šrē'a, Sifra Tarṭār, and Tell ‘Abda. Along the whole road at intervals of about thirty kilometers halting places or roadside inns (called benijje) were built.

At 6.30 we came in sight of the eastern bank of the valley of at-Ṭarṭār (Fig. 22), formed by a precipitous bluff about twenty meters high. Then we passed through the undulating plain of at-Ṭablāt, which rises towards the west and is strewn

Scheil, op. cit., p. 35, is of the opinion that Tukultu Ninip (Tukultu Enunta) II ordered rain water to be drawn from artificial cisterns, which he called ḡubba, along the Tarṭār. The word ḡubba is identical with the modern ḡub, signifying an artificial well with spring water; and of the latter there is a multitude along at-Ṭarṭār.

Ptolemy, Geography, V. 18 : 3, refers to a river Saocoras between the Euphrates and the Tigris. This branches off the river Chaboras (al-Ḫabīr) and flows by itself into the Euphrates. —

The river Saocoras, not mentioned by any other classical writer, is identical with the Araxes canal, the Dasrum of today, which branches off from al-Ḫabīr at the settlement of as-Suкеjir, the ancient Saocoras. Of the river at-Ṭarṭār Ptolemy makes no mention whatever, although a very important commercial center, the fortified town of Hatra, was situated on it. Ptolemy must have known of Hatra, which he introduces by the corrupted name Hematra (rather than Bethatra).

The Arabic authors adopted Ptolemy's explanation of the origin of the Saocoras — as issuing from the Chaboras — and explained the origin of at-Ṭarṭār in the same manner. In the reign of the Caliph 'Abdalmalik (685–705 A.D.) the rival Tarlab and Ḥeṣ tribes often met in battle on the banks of al-Ṭarṭār. Abū-Ṭarān, Ḳadmi (Būlāq, 1285 A.H.), Vol. II, p. 62, relates that the Ḧeṣ and Tarlab came to the river al-Ṭarṭār between Rās al-Uṯejl and al-Kubaṣ. A fresh troop of the Tarlab crossed the Tigris at the village of Abī between Tekrit and Mosul and also arrived at at-Ṭarṭār.

Al-Ḳamīl, Dīrās (Saibani), p. 22, mentions wild asses on at-Ṭarṭār.

Ibn al-Ḳuršī, Ṣamīl (Tornberg), Vol. IV, pp. 235 ff., writes that the river at-Ṭarṭār rises east of the town of Sinjar near the settlement of Sarrak and empties into the Tigris between al-Kušī and Rās al-Ṭarṭār, both of which belong to the administrative district of al-Farāq. — The settlement of Rās al-Ṭarṭār is identical with Rās al-Uṯejl. At-Ṭarṭār never emptied into the Tigris.

Ibn Ḥorđabīš, Muṣṭalik (De Goeje), p. 175, relates that at-Ṭarṭār branches off from the river al-Ḫamās, flows around al-Ḫabīr, and empties into the Tigris. — Al-Ḫamās is a branch of al-Ḫabīr. Ibn Ḥorđabīš does not state at what point at-Ṭarṭār enters the Tigris. Ibn Ḥorđabīš, Baṭṭān (De Goeje), p. 125, also describes the Naḥr at-Ṭarṭār which, he says, originates at Sinjar, divides the town of al-Ḫabīr in two, and irrigates many smaller settlements and gardens. It is navigable and flows into the Euphrates. — There were, however, not many settlements along at-Ṭarṭār except, probably, a small garden here and there. Neither could boats sail on it, as it has practically no water for many months and its gradient is fairly steep. It never emptied into the Euphrates.

Ibn Ṣarajī, Ḳalāb (Le Strange), p. 18, says that the river at-Ṭarṭār starts from the river al-Ḫamās (which flows by the town of Nišibin), breaks through a mountain range into the desert, passes the town of al-Ḫabīr, enters the desert of Sinjar, and joins the Tigris from the west two parasangs north of Tekrit. — “It is strange indeed that Ibn Ṣarajī, who knew even the outlying districts around Bagdad so well, did not know that the river at-Ṭarṭār flowed neither into the Tigris nor into the Euphrates.

Abū-I-Fidā'ī, Tārīkh (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 32, writes that the Euphrates receives the water of the river al-Ḫamās, which rises in the Nišibin district. Afterwards the river at-Ṭarṭār branches off from al-Ḫamās, flows by the town of al-Ḫabīr through the desert of Sinjar, and empties into the Tigris not far from Tekrit; but the river al-Ḫamās after at-Ṭarṭār has branched off from it makes a turn towards al-Ḫabīr and joins the latter before it reaches Karšīja. A little later Abū-I-Fidā'ī (ibid., p. 55) remarks that the river at-Ṭarṭār empties into the Tigris below Tekrit; or according to others, above the latter town, at a distance of two parasangs.
with countless small natural knolls and domes, all of which are hollow (Fig. 21) — the result of the solution and weathering of gypsum deposits. Many of these are dilapidated or have fallen to pieces altogether; but others are intact. It is possible to crawl into some. A layer of cemented earth and gravel about fifty centimeters thick forms a kind of a vault over a space covered with remnants of crystallized gypsum. During the rains the natives use these knolls for shelter; there is room for as many as twenty persons in some of them. Between such bubble-like knolls, on ground composed of rock salt and crystallized gypsum, gape many hollows of varying sizes, which the camels carefully avoid.

At 8.30 we reached the wells of Abu Kbara and at 9.23 the wells of Abu Semâč (Fig. 23), where we remained until 11.05. At that time the Dlejm were camping there. They were led by the son of the imprisoned chief Neğres eben Kâ‘ud, with whom we began negotiations in order to assure ourselves of his protection. The clans under him sometimes encamp on the edge of the cultivated region between Hit and Sâmarra,
where they own some land. He had taken refuge in the inner desert, that he might be in a position to attack the government officials and their protégés on every possible occasion. I promised him that we would exert ourselves on behalf of his imprisoned father, if he would give us a guarantee that his followers would not molest us. He agreed in turn to send with us one of his servants as a sign that we were under his protection; but in return we had to give him our word to send the servant back as soon as the banks of the Euphrates were sighted. As he had an excellent knowledge of the country between the salina of Umm Rahal and the Euphrates, he marked for me in the sand the location of the different places, thus enabling me to sketch a map which I could use when making further inquiries. Eben Kāūd had camped during the last six months at nearly all the wells between al-Ḥābūr and Tekrit and hence knew the names of the wells situated by the principal roads. This gave me a clear idea of their exact location and of the distances between each.

The shallow ṣe'īb of Abu Semāc ends in at-Tartār opposite the ṣe'īb which descends from ‘Ajn al-Faras. South of Abu Semāc at-Tartār is joined by aš-Šejejiyye (where there is the water of ad-Değūkî) and farther south by Ammu-t-Thūl, Abu Şnēne, and al-A'wağ. These all rise on a broad upland across which leads the road from Abu Semāc to Hit and where are the wells of Abu Trejejiyye, al-Rzejel, at-Twil, al-Ejdi, and al-Kmejżem. Southwest of Abu Semāc is the watering place of ar-Riğma, south of which lie the wells of Ummu Tbûk, al-Mwēżîbe, and al-Mrejżel. Southwest of the last-named is Abu Şfēha. West of ar-Riğma there is good water in the well of al-'Aḵābî, to the west of which the undulating plain, intersected by numerous ṣe'ībān of all sizes, slopes down to the Euphrates.

The water in the well of Abu Semāc comes out of the ground with considerable force and forms bubbles. It is even said that sometimes it brings small fish to the surface, whence its name Abu Semāc (Father of Fishes). Its taste is slightly brackish, like all the waters in al-Burrejže— as the district between al-Ḥābūr and the Tigris and from the Singár ridge to the Euphrates is called. Burreţ means either rock salt or mica, which flash like lightning when exposed to the rays of the sun.

At 12.23 P.M. the cone of Markāb al-Ahejmer came into view to the west. From 12.35 we rested below the Bir al-Ahejmer until 1.30, when we set off again in a west-northwesterly direction. At 2.40 the well of ar-Rbēza was on our right; at
3.20 we could see a few hillocks to the southwest, among which were the waters of al-Kzejm. To the north lay the wells of Abu Kelâjad and spring of al-Melwâh. The latter comes out with such force that its roar can be heard for a considerable distance. Close by stand the ruins of a small building. North of al-Melwâh rose the low scarp of Ammu Rkêba, while to the northwest the setting sun shed its last rays on the similar scarp of al-Lôlahijje. Al-Lôlahijje stretches from the northwest, where it is called Kûrajên Fâtme, to the southeast under the names Ammu-t-Tûs and Ḩumr aṭ-Ṭubejšijje. North of it a small group of low mesas, Ķûr umm ad-Dîlî, face the south in a similar but shorter escarpment. Between the latter and al-Lôlahijje, beginning from the south, are these wells: al-Lôlahijje, al-Helhi, Ammu Ṭbûk, Abu Zbêr, as-Semadân, and Umm ad-Dîlî.

Turning now more northwest, at 5.10 we reached the well of al-Mustafez, on the west side of which we made camp.

**AL-MUSTAFEZ TO BİR ABU DARAĞ**

The country was of a uniform nature — a smooth, polished, rocky ground with pits and hollow knolls. In the low places grew half-dry annuals and very poor perennials, principally rîmt, rûte, zrejçe, šîb, and kejsûm.

Our guide Aḥmed al-Ḥatṭâb of the Bêğât clan of the ʿAkej-dât was for eleven years the chief of a robber band. His brother was killed by a gendarme sergeant in the course of a dispute. In revenge Aḥmed killed the sergeant and two gendarmes and then fled with twenty riders and their families to the inner desert. Their usual camping ground was between aṭ-Tarţâr and the Tigris, whence they made marauding trips to the highroads. At night he used to visit Tekrît, the home of his beloved, whose parents from fear of the Government would not let her marry him. Finally the girl's father began to negotiate with the officer in command of the gendarmes, offering to make amends for the blood which had been shed. The commander asked for ten mares and a mule, but all Aḥmed was willing to give was one mare. The commander just then received information that Aḥmed was camping in the neighborhood of Tekrît and was intending to visit his sweetheart; he summoned his gendarmes and went to arrest him, but Aḥmed proved himself to be the more astute of the two.
Learning through his countrymen on what night the gendarmes would leave their three tents pitched by the river near Tekrit, he attacked them with his riders, killed two of the gendarmes who remained there as a guard, took the tents and six mules, sent these spoils by two of his men to the desert, and then ambushed the gendarme commander with the rest of his force. The commander fell, several gendarmes were wounded, and the rest escaped. In the following years he robbed more than twenty wagons on the highroad, captured about thirty-six government mules, and filled the gendarmes with such respect for his person that they made no more attempts to arrest him. In 1909 when the Sultan Abdul-Hamid was dethroned, Ahmed, together with other rebels, was pardoned, married the woman of his love, and moved to Tekrit. In 1911 he was elected a member of the assizes and was able to rent the collection of taxes.

On May 14, 1912, leaving at 5.07 A.M., we journeyed northwestwards and at 5.51 reached the watershed between at-Tartár and the Euphrates. To the south — that is, toward the Euphrates — extends a rocky, undulating region with broad, upland areas and shallow valleys. The plateaus are almost bare; in the alluvial soil of the lowlands, however, perennials of several kinds do well. There were no annuals. The southeastern part of this country is called Sakrân; the center, 'Allawi; and
the northwestern part, al-Watāha. Between the two latter divisions are the tabular hills Kārt al-Rubejn. Southwest of the Euphrates the country is shut in by a rather low but conspicuous line of bluffs. To the west of al-Watāha rise iso-
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**Fig. 23—Our caravan at Abu Semâč.**

lated table-shaped hills divided by deep hollows called *šhūl*. A *sahl* (plural, *šhūl*) is, properly, a narrow channel dammed in by rocks, where rain water accumulates under the gravel. On the road from Tekrīt to Ḍānā are the *šhūl* of at-Ṭawīl, Abu Hrejbe, at-Taḵāḵe, and as-Šfa'; northwest of the latter, the Sahī at-Tīn; below that of at-Taḵāḵe, the Sahī al-Ḥadetīn; and above the Sahī abu Hrejbe, the *šhūl* of az-Zkēt and ar-Rumagānī. At this last spot there is also an ordinary well.

An icy north wind was now blowing, against which we vainly tried to protect ourselves. It went through our thin clothing right to the skin. Unable to remain in our saddles any longer, where the wind kept lifting our cloaks and kerciefs, we walked most of the time. At 7.55 we sighted to the northeast the hills of Ammu Rkēba and could even see Humr at-Ṭubejšijje. To the north lay the butte Markab al-Fāg, in the neighborhood of which are the wells Māḥat al-Fāg and Ṭbēzat al-Fāg.

The aspect of the country did not change. Nothing was seen in either direction but the hollow knolls (*tablāt*), with pits of various sizes between them and only here and there
a dingle overgrown with perennials. As there had been no rain in the last winter, scarcely any annuals were to be seen. From 8.20 to 9.18 our camels grazed. At 10.55 we were at the well Bir abu Darağ on the road from Tekrit to ‘Ána. Northeast of this well the scarp of Ammu Rkēba sinks so low that one can see beyond it to al-Lōlahijje and Ammu-Tūs. Northwest of us appeared the hill Klejb al-Mrejzel, behind it the spur Rūs as-Shūl, and still farther away the gray escarpment Kār at-‘Tanmāše.

BIR ABU DARAĞ TO THE MOSUL HIGHWAY

The wind did not cease, but veered suddenly and blew in our faces direct from the west. The sky was hidden by dense clouds, the sun gave no warmth at all, and our fingers became stiff with cold. From 12.10 to 1.11 P.M. we rested. Our Dlejmi guide did not wish to go any farther, and Ahmed al-Ḥaṭṭāb likewise showed much desire to return. Ahmed was undoubtedly afraid of meeting some fellāhin from Rawa or merchants from ‘Ána whom he had robbed several times and who might now take his mare as a sort of compensation. The Dlejmi had wounded a Rawa man and so far had failed to pay the indemnity agreed on. Therefore he was much concerned for his she-camel. Both he and Ahmed felt cold. Ahmed rode in his shirt only and the Dlejmi, wrapped in a torn cloak, longed for the shelter of a tent and the warmth of a fire. The gendarmes, too, shook with cold, but they wanted to go forward, not back, knowing that in ‘Ána they would be relieved by the gendarmes stationed there; therefore they urged us on, even threatening to shoot the Dlejmi and Ahmed, should they leave us before we reached the road from ‘Ána to Mosul.

It was not a merry journey. The guides were dissatisfied, everybody was stiff with cold, and the region unchangeingly monotonous. To the north were low escarpments, to the south an almost level plain, in front of us the hills of al-Mrejzel, and all around hollow domes or “bubbles” (tablāt) with circular holes, between which our camels stepped with evident fear. Some of the “bubbles” are as much as three meters high and from ten to fifteen meters in diameter. Many of them have caved in but others are still intact. They usually begin to crumble at their lowest part, which is most affected by wind-blown sand. The crust of each “bubble,” which gradually
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becomes thinner and thinner, is at last broken by wind or rain and the hole thus made widens out until the whole has fallen in. The pieces of such a “bubble” are sharp and glisten as if mixed with mirror glass.

From 2.50 to 3.12 our camels grazed. Green perennials became more scarce the farther we went. We were now approaching a region where there had been no good rain for several years past. At 5.52 the cold west wind brought a fine rain and therefore we camped between the heights of al-Ḥmâm to the south and Kârît at-Ṭammâšâ to the north. Ahmed pointed out to us the wells of at-Trejnîr east of our camp, of aṣ-Škêk to the north, and of al-Ḥmâm to the south of aṣ-Škêk. In Kârît at-Ṭammâšâ good water can be had at the well of Nûkîd. In spite of the rain, we gathered a large heap of dry perennials, lighted a huge fire, warmed ourselves as best we could, drank hot tea, and soon forgot the cold, which had been tormenting us all day. Only the wind would not abate and was continually overthrowing our tents throughout the night, so that we could sleep but little.

On May 15, 1912, by 5.40 A. M. we were on the road. It was not raining, but a cold wind was still blowing and the sky was envelopes with gray clouds. Above the plain hovered a thick fog. Monotony again, nowhere any change in the scenery. The same smooth level ground, the same “bubbles,” hollows, low hillocks, and table-shaped heights, but nothing worthy of attention.

At 6.40 we reached the highway, Darb as-Sulṭâni, leading from ‘Ānâ via an-Neğme to Mosul.

COUNTRY TO THE NORTH OF ‘ĀNÂ

The Darb as-Sulṭâni is wide and trodden hard, a sign that it is still much used for travel. From the Euphrates it rises in quite a steep ascent over the slopes of ‘Elw Cîbrit, Mèsbâh al-Krejjem, Kârît al-Ḥarrâr, and as-Sanâqre, and thence traverses the plain of al-Burrejî into a north-northeasterly direction. In this plain it passes the wells of Umm al-Ma’aṭîn, as-Sâbîr, Fâṭme, at-Twejsân, al-Sadân, at-Trejfâwî, Klejî al-Mellâh, Umm Rejîr, Umm ad-Dîjâbê; west of al-Ḥazr it passes the wells of Šrê’a, Fwê’a, al-Gemal, ad-Dibşij, Sahîl ‘Aṭṭâf, and al-Meṭjâha. Beyond the well of as-Sâbîr the road mounts the scarp Kârît at-Ṭammâše; beyond Fâṭme it enters the valley of Hîr Mw’ejd; beyond at-Twejsân it traverses the lowland Nûkrat al-Uwên, and beyond as-Sadân it goes around the salina or salt pan Meḥî at-Trejfâwî. The Kârît at-Ṭammâše ends west of the highroad near the well of aṣ-Šallâh; south of this begins another scarp,
the Kârt Abu-Šûn, and then Haṣm Eben Bwêne, which extends as far west as the salt pan Meḥl al-’Edejî. The escarp of Kerajem Fâjme is connected on the west with the Kârt al-Hîr, the Ka’ud aš-Šâred, al-’Aṣdîn, and with the Kârt az-Zejej near the salt pan Meḥl al-’Edejî. Near the Kârt az-Zejej are the wells of Abu ’Arâqî, La’aime, al-Grejîrât, ad-Duḥûl, al-Raråj, aš-Safawijîjât, and Meḥl al-Maṯîn. The Nuṣrat al-’Uwèn is shut in on the northwest by the scarps of al-Kaṭṭâr and Kârt al-Meẓâdeh, between which lies the salt pan Meḥl al-Kaṭṭâr with the well of al-Ṣâkim to the southwest. North of the salt pan of al-Kaṭṭâr and west of the salt pan of at-Trejeta are the wells of at-Tmâḥijîjât, Ḍalîl aš-Ṣellân, Abu Sâme, and aš-Šejejîr; north of these lie the wells of al-’Unejîf, al-Ṣawîmel, and farther on at-Tmâḥijîjât in the lowland Nuṣrat Umm ad-Dijâbî. The saline Meḥl al-Aṣkâr occupies the western half of this low plain, which lies about twenty kilometers north of the escarp Kârt al-Meẓôadeh and is shut in on the west by the spur Haṣm al-Baṣâla and the Kârt ar-Rōse, while the Haṣm al-Melek enters it from the north. The salt pan of al-Aṣkâr is widest on its south side; to the north it divides into two branches—the eastern being known as Meḥl Ḍesân and the western as aš-Ṣnâlâl—and encloses the Haṣm al-Melek as if it were a peninsula. In the aš-Ṣnâlâl branch terminate the șe’îbân which wind from the wells of Trej al-Karrâh, al-Wutejî, and al-Mellâh. Between the two branches of the salt pan are the waters of al-Bwejî and the Saḥl Abu Kejšûma. On the southern edge of al-Aṣkâr are several wells, all containing rather brackish water. The best water is in the wells of Mâḥat al-Matwije, al-Fawwârât, Abu Cerî, and, on the west, Abu Zîdâh and Abu Ḥwejîme. South of Abu Zîdâh stand, on the Haṣm al-Baṣâla, the cones of al-Menâjef and Kzejî Na’am.

From Āna to Mosul there is also a road by way of Singâr. On the slopes of the Euphrates valley it is called Darbal al-Mellân, in the plateau Darb Singâr. In a northwesterly direction it ascends the Maksar al-Gemal, Kârt aš-Šîfî, Abu Rârâb, and al-Maḥrûk, reaching the plateau at the last-named, where it turns almost due north. Alongside this road lie the wells of Saḥl al-Emir, aš-Zerqab, al-Hebî迦, al- Ḥeṣâl, Njgelat abu Rârâb, al-Mâleh, Šrê’at al-Râbîjî, Šrê’at ’Abdelâh, La’aime, ad-Duḥûl, Abu Râsên, Aqlat al-Heṣîn, aš-Šûbejî, al-Meņjar, and Trej al-Mellân. Nearly due west of Trej al-Mellân rises the high hillock Tiejî al-Sâkîn, south of which are the wells of al-’Erđijîjê, al-Rzejîl, al-Mâleh, ar-Raḏîle, and Abu Ḥejîjâ. West of these wells the higher plateau sends out to the south the low ridge of al-Çâb, above which rise several knolls. Southwest of al-Çâb in the salt pan of ar-Roṣa terminates the șe’îb of al-’Aṣîzî and which comes from the Tiejî al-Sâkîn to the northeast. At the head of this valley is the spring of al-’Iṣâle. Al-’Aṣîzî is joined on the left by the șe’îbân of al-Ḥwejiśîje and at-Taǧařîjî, which lie west of ’Rîjûm ’Ajîr and in which there are springs of the same names. On its right al-’Aṣîzî is joined by the șe’îbân of al-Dejî, al-Muḍajma’, al-Mafalâka, ’Okêtî al-Ḥalîbî, aš-Sîhel, Umm Rurejîb, and Umm Rûruhî, all of which contain watering places. East of the well of Umm Rurejîb, at the foot of al-Çâb, lies the watering place Kubâb aš-Śulîbi. From the Mellân road at the well of Šrê’at ’Abdelâh a road turns west towards al-Ḥâbûr, which it reaches below the village of ad-Dejî. Along this road lie the wells of aš-Safawijîjîjê, Trejîwî al-Mellân, Ḥeṣîn.
al-Rlejsiije, and al-Ḥubejra. Northeast of as-Ṣafawijjāt there is good water in the well of al-Rarāj, lying nearly halfway between as-Ṣafawijjāt and ad-Duḥūl. North of al-Rarāj is the Bir Ṭarṭān, above which rises a hill with two tops, the Abu Rāḥūn. Between as-Ṣafawijjāt and Ṭrejwān al-Mellāḥ the road leads close by the salina of al-‘Edejd and passes north of the salt pan of ar-Rowgā.

KĀRT AS-SANĀḠRE TO RĀWA

Both the Dlejmi and Ahmed now wanted to return, but as we needed them to tell us the names of the different places on our descent to the Euphrates, we did not let them go and continued our journey on the highroad in a south-southwesterly direction.

The plateau falls away here toward the river, but in a series of distinct step-like gradients, of which the Kārt as-Sanāḡre forms the northermost. This scarp on the southeast connects with the Kārt abu-l-Kerwa and Kārt al-Rabejın and on the west with the Kārt al-Mahrūk, with Kūr Ṭwejsān al-Mellāḥ, and with Kūr aṭ-Ṭajjārāt near the salt pan of al-‘Edejd. On the southern slope of Kārt as-Sanāḡre is the water of az-Za‘ejzi; below al-Mahrūk are the waters Umm ‘Aṣa, al-Ḳeṣ‘a, and Iwēḥa.

From 7.50 to 8.25 we rested on the Kārt as-Sanāḡre. The Dlejmi begged to be allowed to go, before any fellāhin from Rāwa saw him. We assured him of our protection, but he feared that his enemies might lie in ambush somewhere and take his she-camel from him after his discharge. So he was paid off and he left at once. Ahmed, who wanted to go with him, remained only when told he would not get a bāra (about one mill) until the gardens of the Rāwa settlement came in sight and that in any case on his mare he could escape his enemies more easily than the Dlejmi on his she-camel.

At 9.28 we were on the upper edge of the Kārt al-Ḥarrār, whence we beheld for the first time the rugged vicinity of the Euphrates. To the southwest and southeast clustered innumerable mesas, hills, hillocks, and knolls separated by deep gullies and ravines. Here and there narrow white strips of level ground appeared, but it would have been very difficult to get from one to another. To the east yawned the ravine of the ‘Aḥa valley in which the water of az-Za‘ejzi is situated. To the right of this valley rises the Kārt abu Baṭṭiḥa with the rain well Moḵr abu Baṭṭiḥa, and to the left Umm Rejra and the Kārt al-Enāb. Almost due south projected the Tell al-Paras and to the southwest the yellow chain of the Kārt aṣ-Ṣifī hills and the longish hillock Maksar al-Ċemal.
Many spots showed traces of the efforts of men to break through the rocks and make the descent easier. Crossing such places from the high terrace Mesbâh al-Krejjem, at 11.20 we reached the stony plain of at-Tîn and at twelve o'clock were on the branch road to Tekrît. Thence we had to lead our camels by the reins in order to pass around the isolated cones and stunted buttes in the deep ravines, a feat often difficult even for pedestrians.

The valley of the Euphrates was enveloped in dense gray vapors. The wind abated; the sun, which gave out heat like a furnace, could not be seen through the air, laden as it was with fine dust and sand. We longed for fresh water and for the cool of shady gardens, knowing that both were within our reach, but the pace of the led camels could not be quickened—and all around us were white and yellowish weathered rocks, without a vestige of green and without offering cover as a protection from attack.

At 12.40 P.M. we sighted on our right on the slope of az-Zerḳab two sidr trees and down below us the ruined barracks of al-Kal'â above the settlement of Râwa. Here Ahmed al-Ḥaṭṭâb stopped and after receiving his wages rode as fast as
he could toward the road to Tekrīt. At one o’clock we turned west, descended from the steep bluff on which the shrine of aš-Šejaḥ Reğeb stands, and saw below us the gardens of al-Ḥrejbe. But as the camels could not descend as we did a detour was necessary. Finally, at 1.40 we halted in al-Ḥrejbe by three mulberry and two sidr trees (Fig. 24). There were no other trees, because the Dlejm had demolished the garden wall and cut down the trees and bushes. The main gardens extend to the east of al-Ḥrejbe and are called al-Muʾejmîre, ad-Darağiijje, al-Mesčenijje, az-Zreįjįjje, al-Helâlîjjje, ʿObejdallâh, az-Zaʾfarâne, and al-Halîč; finally comes the settlement of Râwa.

After resting a while and drinking some hot tea, we dismissed the gendarmeres, who had themselves ferried over to ʿĀna without delay. In the afternoon we received a visit from Şerîf eben ʿAli, my companion on my trip to the Heğâz in 1910. He brought some men with him who were familiar with the whole of al-Burrejże. They helped me sketch a map of the various roads, work which kept me busy until late at night.

The settlement of Râwa is made up of the following districts: as-Sâde or al-Ahrâb  as-Swâhiğ
as-Sarâhne  al-Bu ʿObejd.
The chief elder, Muḥsen eben Muḥammed, comes from as-Sâde. His brother Ibrahîm had been three times to Constantinople for an audience with the Sultan.

Palm gardens are very expensive to plant. A square drâʾ (58 square decimeters) of such ground costs at least half a meğiįjje (45 cents) and a grown palm costs two to three Turkish pounds ($ 9 to $ 13.50).

The patron of the settlement is Sheikh Reğeb eben Aḥmed ar-Refâʿî. Once when Râwa was besieged by the ʿAkejil and soldiers, Reğeb defended it for twenty-eight days, helping the besieged inhabitants by various means. On the twenty-ninth day he finally emerged from his grave in the shape of a gazelle buck and ran against the besiegers. Seeing this portent, the besieged followed him, threw themselves on the ʿAkejil and the soldiers, killed them, and thus preserved their independence. When soldiers were sent to the large barracks built there in 1872 by Midhat Pasha, Reğeb tormented the poor fellows for three nights so cruelly that they fled terror-stricken, and the barracks remained empty.
From Râwa many goods are transported on camels and donkeys to Mosul. Coffee, petroleum, clothes, and other European products are shipped by boats from Bireğik to Râwa, where they are reloaded on camels and carried farther on to Mosul, whence in turn tobacco for water pipes (tumbak) and raisins are brought for transshipment to Aleppo or Damascus. A camel with a moderate load needs eight nights to cover the distance between Râwa and Bagdad, or nine marches of thirty kilometers; the charge is one Turkish pound ($4.50) for each camel. From Bagdad the camels bring tallow, dates, grape honey (dibes), and tummen (a kind of rice). These caravans are exposed to frequent attacks by the Dlejm. The inhabitants of Râwa—or, as they are called, Râwijjin—are much braver than the ‘Anijjin, or inhabitants of ‘Âna. They often raid the gardens of the latter, pluck their dates, and compel them to pay the ħâwa (tribute for peace and protection).

May 16, 1912. I was at work as early as five in the morning gathering data for my map. As to many of the districts I inquired of each of five or six informants separately, so that none of them would know what the others had drawn or said. In this manner I made at least partly sure that their statements were correct. In the evening Serif brought me two Dlejm from the environs of Hit who completed the map I had sketched from information furnished by Chief Eben Ngires. I found that they did not contradict each other to any appreciable extent.
CHAPTER VI
RĀWA TO AR-RAḴKA BY WAY OF AŠ-ŠWĀR

RĀWA TO THE PLAIN OF AL-EKREKE;
THE 'AḴEJDĀT TRIBE

May 17, 1912. At 5.15 A.M. we set out westward along the left bank of the Euphrates. At 5.30 we had on our left the fields of al-Emerijje. These are bounded on the north by the Barādin hills, above which rise the cones of Da'ēble, Selmân, and Ҫwērēn. At 5.50 we saw on the left the huts of Abu Kawwa and in the Euphrates remains of broken-down flush wheels (Fig. 25); on the right the šeib of al-Ḥṣewān, to the right of which the spur Ḥašmet an-Nihel, on which lies the ruin Kīsat al-Krāṭijje, reaches the river. Leaving the bank, we turned towards the plateau. At 6.40 we approached the fields of al-Űrijje and at 7.08 crossed the šeib of Ğabāla, on the slope of which are the caves Ğaḥf as-Swēlām. At 7.30 we had the fields of an-Nāṭrijje on our left and at eight o'clock took the road leading to the salina of al-Edej. On this road we met a migrating party of the aḡ-Ġeràjfe clansmen, who cultivate the fields of an-Nāṭrijje and al-Ŭrijje. The Ġeràjfe are members of the 'Aḵejdāt tribe.

The 'Aḵejdāt tribe own the banks of the Euphrates from at-Tibni to al-Ŭejmi and those of the river al-Ŭābūr as far as Tell aḡ-Šejh Ḥamed. They are divided as follows:
al-Bu Ğāmel
al-Bu Ğemāl
al-Bkejjer; this division camps on al-Ŭābūr from al-Bsejra to Tell aḡ-Šēh Ḥamed.
The clans of al-Bu Ğāmel:
aḡ-Zwāhre (chief: Tabbān eben Ḥefle)
ad-Daʾēbel (" Dawš eben 'Addād)
aḡ-Šhabāt (" Ḥsēn eben Ḥezēl)
at-Tallā (" 'Abdallāh eben 'Ali)
az-Zbejjeb (" Munādī al-Ŭallī)
al-Kurān (" 'Abed eben 'Abejji)
al-Bu Ṭhama (" Ėğbārat eben Ḥalīl)
aḡ-Šaʾětēt (" Hamed abu Sab‘)
al-Meṣāhde (" Hāqquben Ḥalaf)
aḡ-Ǧhejjī (" Ḥalaf eben 'Agīl)
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az-Zebârî (chief: Aḥmed eben 'Ali)
al-Bu Ṣrâja (" Ḥammûd eben Ṣlāṣ)
ad-Dijāb (" 'Abdallâh eben Ḥâggâ)
al-Bu 'Izzeddîn (" Sârî eben 'Abdaččerîm)

The clans of al-Bu Čemâl:
al-'Azâr (chief: 'Ali eben Mḥemmmed eben Neğres)
ad-Demîm (" 'Ali eben Ḥsên)
al-Ḥassûn (" Mḥammad eben Dandal)
ağ-Čerrâh (" Ṣajjâh eben 'Abdallâh)
al-Bu Hardân (" Sîlêmân eben Sejîhân)
al-Mrûh (" Hazzâ' eben Mhalla)
ağ-Gerâjfe
al-Meğâwde (" Ḥammed aș-Šammar)

The clans of al-Bkejjer:
al-Hnèdî (chief: Ḥâggâg eben Ḥarbi)
al-Mišrêf (" Ğeđân eben Ḥsên)
al-Ḥalaf (" Ĉebên eben Ėarrâllâh)
al-Kbësa (" Srûr eben 'Affî)
aș-Sa'bân (" Farḥân eben Kassâr)
al-Farağ (" Farḥân eben Meîhem)
al-Bu Lîl (" Mûsâ eben Şâleḩ)
al-Bu Ḥîhêl (" Ėhzâm eben 'Ali)
al-Bu Me'eṭ (" Damûk eben 'Ali)

North of the cones of Twârên rises the mesa of al-Čâne and northwest of it the mesa of Abu Maḥâmâr. By the last-named there is a very shallow well of the same name, visited now and again by wild asses. These rare animals graze on the plain of al-Burrejže and have their hiding places in the ravines near Abu Maḥâmâr, where hunters often lie in wait for them. Our guide, Čamil, alleged that he had once seen there a herd of about sixty asses, both large and small. Near the well of Abu Ṭôul he shot one; the wounded animal tried to escape but was easily overtaken by a man on horseback. The flesh of the ass is eaten, while from the hide various articles are manufactured. At 8.22 we crossed the še‘îb of ad-Dahârîg, which rises near Abu Maḥâmâr and joins the Euphrates at the hamlet of Srejser. Our ascent led between crags with jagged walls and across narrow, deep gullies. The terraces by which the plateau falls away towards the Euphrates were still in sight. The beds of rock salt, called ğîbâbe by our guide, became thicker the higher we ascended. From 9.25 to 9.57 our camels grazed by the še‘îb of 'Ūd as-Sadde. To the west appeared the low butte of al-Meşâd with the remains of a fortress on it.
At 10.40 east of the ‘Ajn as-Saкра we crossed the deep še'ib of al-Ḥambeli, which looks as if it had been worn out of white crags; it is joined by the small še'ib of Abu Dikr, which we were just passing through. Al-Ḥambeli starts in the ravine of Sahl Hwēḥa and reaches the Euphrates at the hamlet of as-Semṣijje. In its channel are numerous hollows as much as thirty meters deep, in which, however, the water cannot accumulate, as it soon evaporates or filters through the gypsum soil. At 11.45 we reached the dam of al-Harbaka, which consists of a stone wall eighty centimeters thick built across the narrowest part of the še'ib; northwest of the wall the še'ib opens out as a basin of considerable size, easily convertible into a pond. In the course of time this basin has been filled with alluvial soil, the dam has fallen down, and the water is now wearing out a deep new channel for itself. Much *nejtul* — or *jetnān*, as our guide called it — grows all over the basin. The Dlejm boil this plant and rub the thick unguent thus obtained into the fleece of their mangy sheep.

The ravines above Rāwa are the hiding place of many beasts of prey: the wolf, the *nimr* (leopard; plural, *annār*), and the *porejri*. Above al-’Emerijje three *annār* were shot in the summer of 1911. The *porejri* is an animal about the
length of a dog, but not so tall. It has a broad, white back, black sides, and a short, goat-like snout. Our guide related that he was once attacked by a *rorejri* near at-Ṭakâke and managed to beat off the wild beast only with the greatest effort.

At 12.30 P. M. we saw to the northwest the well of al-Medkâr, with the escarpment of Kûr at-Ṭajjârât behind it and to the west the mesa of al-Meštâh. From 12.35 to 1.40 our camels grazed. At 1.47 on the left by the road appeared the grave Kabr Šâber and beyond it to the west the mesa Kârt al-Meşâjed, with the waters Sahl al-Flâhijje to the north and Abu Barâbîc to the south. At 2.10 on our right we saw the head of the *še♭b* of Abu Dikr. At 2.23 we ascended to the broad plateau of Feżżat al-ʿAlâwi, on which are wide, shallow depressions or *sowh* (plural, *sijâh*), overgrown with *šerr*. Its northern boundaries are the flat-topped heights Kûr Ťwejsân al-Mellâh and Kûr at-Ṭajjârât. At 3.25 the summit of the Kârt as-Siĉče came into view to the southwest, and at 4.38 we began to descend to the wide plain of al-Ekreke. Much *šerr, ġezar, šnân, and ʿafw* grow there; the wood of the latter burns for a long time.

On the horizon to the south-southwest and west were seen the violet, level escarpments of the Kârt as-Siĉče and Kârt umm Ṣâdir, and in front of them three rows of flat-topped hillocks; to the northwest rose the curved escarpment of at-Ṭajjârât, which shuts in the low plain of al-Ekreke. The soil in al-Ekreke is loose and salt to the taste. At five o’clock we bivouacked by the well of al-ʿUwêge (Fig. 26). There was perhaps not a vestige of an annual in the whole neighborhood and only a few sprouts on the perennials here and there, and yet the locusts had found their way even into this well, although luckily in not too great quantities. If some thousands of these insects fall into a deep well, they rot and poison the water. Woe to the pilgrims who supply themselves with only enough water to last them from one station to another and then find the next well filled with locusts!

Our guide, Čamîl, once led a large caravan carrying wool and butter from Sinğâr to ʿAnâ at a time when all the wells on the road were full of locusts (*mağrud*). Finally the water gave out, and, tormented by thirst, the travelers halted at the well of Abu Râsên, from which they wished to draw water, in spite of its being mixed with decaying locusts. Stopping
their noses with onions, they descended one after another into the well (about three meters deep), scooped up the foul juice with the copper kettle used for cooking their meals, and sent it up by two ropes to their companions, who poured out the evil smelling stuff and let the kettle down again. To the man working in the well an extra rope was attached, so that he could be pulled up into the fresh air when he gave a signal. But two failed to do this, collapsed, and died before they could be pulled to safety. At last, by exerting themselves to the utmost, the others succeeded in cleansing the well and were rewarded by a drink of good water, when after some waiting the well filled up again.

A few years ago the Government built gendarmerie stations by the well of al-Uwêğe and in the neighborhood of the salina of al-Edjejd to prevent the salt being carried away too freely. Then the people from both banks of the Euphrates began to go for their salt to Umm Raḥal at the end of the valley of at-Tartār. When the Government noticed that nobody any longer bought salt at al-Edjejd, the guards were recalled. As soon as
this was done, the fellâhin returned there and the Râwa merchants even hired 250 donkeys and thirty camels to carry off an extra large supply of salt, because the price had risen considerably. On receiving a report of this expedition, the Govern-

ment sent 250 men mounted on mules, who overtook the caravan, killed two men, five camels, and twelve donkeys, and captured 106 donkeys and seventeen camels. The owners threw down the salt from the surviving animals and fled with them to the še‘îbân. After this incident the Government collected from each kunfâr (about 200 kilograms) one meşûdiyye (90 cents); yet about two months later the salt guards were surrounded by the Fedân, who killed seven of them, the rest escaping. Since that time the salt pans had been left unguarded. Usually one and a half kunfâr of salt costs at Râwa six meşûdiyyât ($5.40). The Government continually searched for salt in all the settlements and on finding any confiscated it and collected a fine. After this the price generally went up.

In the evening we ascertained the latitude.

PLAIN OF AL-EKREKE TO AL-ḤÄBUR

May 18, 1912. Starting at 4.53 A. M., we proceeded very slowly due west through the plain of al-Ekreke. At 6.45 we
left the road Darb al-Melah, which turns nearly due north to the table-shaped hillocks Kur al-Kantara. These hillocks are scattered among the salt surfaces, and as they are not surrounded by swamps the gathering of salt near them is not difficult. North of Al-Kantara are the wells of Al-Mrejritat and Al-Malha, and still farther on, the salt spring of Trejfawi al-Mellah, after which the northern part of the salina of al-Edejd is sometimes called. In winter, especially after heavy rains when all the valleys send their water down to the salt flats, the salt dissolves, disappearing entirely. In summer the water evaporates and the salt forms a crust as much as fifty centimeters thick, with which the ground is covered. The salt of al-Edejd is very white, fine, and of a pleasant taste. Salt from Al-Askar, as-Sneile, or al-Kattar tastes bitter and is so hard that it must be pounded and ground to pulverize it.

On the southeast the salina of al-Edejd is bounded by the tabular hills Kar aš-Schejk, to the south by Zahr Dedebe, and to the southwest by Kar umm Radir and al-Msejre. To the northwest the salt pan is shut in by the slope of al-Hedage, which is connected on the west with the huge elevation Hazm al-Ōga. At eight o'clock we rode between the flat-topped heights of at-Twérán, where, according to the local belief, in some deep cavern spooks like to play their pranks. From 8.00 to 8.28 our
camels grazed. The pasture was but poor: only šīh, 'alanda, šnān, ropol, and ġezar, and not much of these. Far to the south appeared the ridge Żahr Dèdeb with the dark mesa Kārt aš-Şhejğ to the north-northeast of it.

At nine o’clock the salt surface of Melh al- Educação, stretching from south to north, came into view on our right. Reaching it at 9.14, we began to cross it in a northwesterly direction (Figs. 27, 29). The salt crust broke and cracked under our weight. Wherever it was thick enough the crossing was easy for both us and the animals, but where the salt crumbled it was not possible for the camels to follow each other; they sank into the mud and slipped continually. The level of the salt surface is not the same everywhere; often large areas are entirely smooth and level, whereas other tracts consist of countless sharp ribs about ten centimeters high.

At 10.25 we reached terra firma again, passed over the spurs of Kārt umm Rādir and the hillocks of al-Msejżre, and rested from 11.23 to 12.30 P. M. To the north appeared the low scarp of the Kūr at-Ţwāl and beyond it the long, moderately steep slope Ḥazm al-Ḥedāğe. At 1.48 we came to the well Bīr as-Saba’, where we drew its bitter-tasting water until 2.25. From 3.07 to 3.30 we rode through the salt morass Sbaḥt as-Saba’, which is bounded on the northeast by the table-shaped hills Kūr at-Ţwāl, on the north by the spurs of al-‘Ogha, on the west by the Tār ad-Demim, and on the south by the spurs of ‘Ač’ač. North of it is the Rādir al-Ka’ed and northwest the wells al-Mwēleḥ, al-Barrūṭ, and ad-Demim.

From 3.40 to 4.20 our camels grazed north of the Bīr Šeṭāṭ. To the north the mesa Kārt al-Ḥasān (Fig. 28) loomed above the horizon. At 5.24 we sighted to the west-southwest beyond the Euphrates the as-Ṣālhijje ruins and to the northeast the low hillocks Bṭānt ad-Demim. At 5.55 we made camp.

May 19, 1912. By 4.58 A. M. we were in our saddles. The night was warm — not a breeze stirring. We were now passing through country where there had been no good rain for four years. No annuals, green or dry, were to be seen anywhere. The perennials were quite dried up; they had even been torn up by the wind and heaped in piles as high as fifteen centimeters behind every large stone. To the south-southeast the white hillocks of Bēżat ‘Ajn ‘Ali, with the spring of the same name, came into view. At seven o’clock we turned northwest not far from the stone heap Rīglm al-Ḥwejți. The northern
horizon was shut in by the Ĥāzm al-‘Oğā behind it.

From 8.18 to 8.45 the camels grazed on the dry, dark brown nejtūl southwest of the well of ad-Dmejjem, where numerous trails from all sides converge. To the south and west the undulating plain Erdeft az-Zör fell away to the escarpments Kârt abu Zelle and Kârt al-Ranamijje. Toward the north spread the plains of Sejlīt al-Warde, al-Feqārā, and Fejzat al-Ĥīzer, in which lie the wells of al-Ĥaddāg and al-Flēta. From 10.00 to 10.20 we halted at a group of bushes called Ṣağarat al-‘Alejji (from a species of belladonna), the twigs of which (still fairly green) our hungry camels seemed to find very appetizing. From 12.10 P. M. to 12.52 we had our rest. We were passed by a caravan of the ‘Akejdāt tribe on its way for salt. From the almost red-hot ground rose fine salt dust, painfully irritating to the mucous membrane. There was nothing in the scenery to attract us. The “bubbles” (fībūl) we had left behind, and, except for the glitter of rock salt in some spots, there was nothing to remind us of them. Neither annuals nor perennials appeared anywhere. The nejtūl was already black,
the šīh and šān blown away by the winds. The left bank of the Euphrates was disappearing, but the bluffs on the right bank were in plain sight. There, at 2.30, the ruined stronghold of ar-Rhaba came into view impressively above the western horizon. From 3.35 to 4.12 and then again from 4.45 to 5.38 our camels grazed. We encamped at 7.05 in a flat, bare plain where we could find nothing with which to make a fire.

On May 20, 1912, we started at 4.58 A.M. in a north-westerly direction and sighted at 5.20 through a rift the river al-Ḫābūr near the hamlet of as-Sičer. At the Tell Ḥeğna ruins and as-Šejh Sālem we turned north.

THE AL-ḪĀBŪR VALLEY; THE ĞÜR TRIBE

The al-Ḫābūr valley has been eroded below the surface of a plateau in the same manner as the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris. On the western side the plateau falls off steeply, on the eastern only gradually, to the flood plain through which the deep channel meanders. Scattered along the banks are ruin mounds of all sizes. Close to the river grow solitary poplars with green strips of fertile land and small yellow huts between them and the valley walls. On the left bank of al-Ḫābūr, north of its outlet into the Euphrates, lie the ruins and hamlets of az-Zīrr, Ta’ō, al-Wēne, al-MAšēh, and as-Sičer. Near the last-named place the Dawrīn canal branches off. On the right bank of al-Ḫābūr are the hamlets and ruins al-Bsejra, as-Sālha, Tell al-Ǧeben, Beršem, Tell al-Bnejjāt, and at-Ṭalē’e, opposite Tell Ḥeğna. At 6.15 we descended to the left bank at the hamlet of Tajjebt al-Fāl. The left slope of the valley is not very steep, and the gullies eroded out of it are short and shallow. From 7.05 to 7.45 our camels grazed south of the hamlet of Telfis, which is situated on a small spit of land running out from the right bank almost due north from the al-Hnejdi ruins. North of us overlooking the right bank we saw the ruin mound Tell Fdēn (or al-Fdejn), stretching from south to north.
At 8.30 we had on our left the hamlet of al-Mžejbre next to the Tell Fdên; at nine o’clock on the left bank the hamlet of al-Ḥariğa; and at 9.45 the farm of an-Nimlijje. The river here approaches the eastern bluffs of the valley. From 10.15 we rode among jagged crags, which we did not leave until 11.25. Beyond an-Nimlijje the fertile flood plain on the right bank steadily widens, finally reaching the rocky spur on which stand the as-Ṣwar ruins above the river. On the left bank, beginning at the white crags of an-Nimle, another stretch of fertile flood plain extends to the north to where the ruin mound of aš-Ṣeįh Ḥamed overlooks it.

Above this point on al-Ḥābūr, as well as on the right bank of the Tigris between al-Makḥūl and Tekrit, are the camping grounds of the Gbūr tribe. The western division of this tribe is called al-Ḥagğāq, the eastern al-Ḥejācēn (or al-Ḥejācēl). The clans of the Gbūr are as follows:

al-Ḥejācēl (chief: Maslād ebn Mḥammad Ėmin)
as-Ṣwēḥ ("Ḥaṣr al-Emarr)
aş-Ǧāmūn ("Abdarrahmān ebn Daɾer)
al-Bu Ḥaṭṭāb ("Obejjed ebn Hallūś)
al-’Eġēl ("Waƙā’ ebn Zārẓūr)
al-Bu Ngād ("Abdal’aziz al-Mhejri)
an-Nāṣer ("Ḥmād ebn ‘Abdrabbo"
al-Backkāra ("Beṣīr ebn Ģāber")
al-’Obejdaɾ ("ǩiğ ebn ‘Alā’i")
al-’Ābed ("Beṣīr")
Harrāṣad ("Maḥmūd ebn Kāhīt")
al-Bu Ḥasan ("Dabbūs ebn Zwēḥ")
al-Bu Ḥamdān ("Wāwī ebn Šawwās")
al-Bu Rḥama ("’Abdallāḥ as-Semin")
al-’Abdaǧčerim ("Mḥemēd ebn Kāhīt")
al-Maṣḥūr (" العلي ar-Ramaqān")
al-Ḥanqar ("Ṣaṭṭām al-Mḥammad").

We followed the cultivated flood plain on the east bank almost due north until 12.10 P.M. when, at a bay of the river, we turned west and at 1.20 camped by the ford opposite the

Fudejn on al-Ḥābūr and killed all the members of the Taṭḥab tribe there. The poet Nufcj mentions this settlement together with as-Ṣuwwar (Ibn al-Aṯfr, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 256).

Ibn Hordēbdh, Mḥālīq (De Goër), p. 74, names these towns in the administrative district of al-Ḥābūr: as-Ṣuwwar, al-Fudejn, Mḳesln, aš-Ṣaḥmiṇjį, and as-Suḳeįr.


Al-Fudejn was undoubtedly a halting place on the road from Karqṭlaťa to Mosul, as there was an important connecting road along al-Ḥābūr between Mesopotamia and Syria at that time. This fact is attested by many records that have been preserved to us. These records, however, have been so much altered by the copyists that to locate the separate stations is no longer possible.

Ibn Hordēbdh, op. cit., p. 96, describes the road from Mosul west through the desert as far as the station of Suḳeįr al-’Abbās, which lay on al-Ḥābūr. The distance thence to al-Fudejn was 8 parasang, thence to Mḳesln 6 parasang, and thence to Karqṭlaťa at the junction of al-Ḥābūr with the Euphrates 7 parasang. — The name al-Fudejn has persisted
gendarmerie station and khan of aṣ-Ṣwar (Fig. 30) on the highroad from Dejr az-Zór to Mosul.

There is a small islet north of the ford and to the southeast a grove of poplars. Above the islet a large flush wheel

![Fig. 30—Khan of aṣ-Ṣwar from the east.](image)

(nāʿūra) draws water from the river to irrigate the fields along the banks, which were dotted with the tents of the 'Akejdát and Ćbûr tribes. Presently from these tents several men came to visit us, among whom I tried to find a guide. Leading them one by one a little way off, I sat down with each and asked him to draw for me on the ground al-Ḥâbûr and Euphrates; also to lay pebbles on the places he named. Some had no idea of direction and could tell neither north nor south; on such I did not waste much time. Again, the applicant who marked correctly the places I knew had to show me the lines

in that of the present al-Fdejn, about 27 kilometers from the old Ḳarḥisija'. But according to Ibn Ḥordâdbeh the distance from Ḳarḥisija' to al-Fdejn is 13 parasangs, or 65 kilometers. It may therefore be assumed that not only was the order of the stations changed, but the distances between them as well.

From Ḳarḥisija' it is 17 kilometers (four parasangs) to as-Siecer, the old as-Suṣajr (otherwise Suṣajr al-ʿAbhâs).

From as-Siecer to al-Fdejn is 10 kilometers.

Ḳodâma. ʿḪarrâj (De Goëje), p. 216, gives these names in the same erroneous order and gives the same distances as Ibn Ḥordâdbeh.

Al-Muṣtaḍṣīj, ʿAḥâma (De Goëje), p. 156, records one march from Ḳarḥisija' to Fdejn (without the article), and from this place to as-Suṣajr (without al-ʿAbhâs) also one march.

Al-Īdrisî, ʿUṣ̂za (Jaubert's transl.), Vol. 2, pp. 154 f., gives the distance from Ḳarḥisija' to Mâkefîn as 21 miles, thence to Fdejn as 18 miles, thence to Suṣajr al-ʿAbhâs as 15 miles. The order, as well as the distances, corresponds with the data of both Ibn Ḥordâdbeh and Ḳodâma: 54 miles, 18 parasangs, or 90 kilometers.
of the roads either from aş-Şwar to Dejr az-Zór, or from aş-Şwar direct to ar-Raḳḳa, or from aş-Şwar to the salina Melh al-Aşḳar or al-Ededj, etc. Having gone over one district in which I was interested with the first man, I returned to it with the second, third, and fourth, until I had established a firm basis for inquiries about other roads and the region around them. In this manner I completed my map and prepared the itinerary of the route it was my intention to follow.

The whole of May 21, 1912, was spent in sketching maps not only of the territory we had passed through so far but also of the country which we were about to visit between al-Hābour and ar-Raḳḳa. The flood plain on the left bank of al-Hābour merges into the plateau of Ḥaṣm al-Mu'eğel, where to the north-northeast of aş-Şwar stands a stunted butte. The productive part of the flood plain is over two kilometers wide and can be irrigated or completely inundated. In some places it is cultivated throughout, but in others the fields stretch only along the very banks of the river, where al-Hābour has here eroded a deep channel for itself; here and there groups of poplars variegate the scenery. On the west bank as one goes upstream the flood plain nearly disappears, not to widen again until beyond the Tell al-Ḥṣeṣj̪n ruins. After passing the Tell Marḳada it is wider than the plain on the left bank.

Near the Tell Marḳada ends the ʿeṭiḥ of al-Hemma, which, descending from the west, shuts in on the south the volcanic district of al-Maʿeze with its three extinct volcanoes. Southwest of these and of al-Hemma are the wells of al-Maʿāmre, al-Ḥwejjej, al-Mrabbɪ, and al-ʿUmejjej. West of the extinct volcanoes and northwest of these wells are the watering places of Fejja, Sehlan, Ab-an-Nuḳ, ʿat-Ṭarān, Rorajjān, Rmejčān, Milḥān, and al-Baḳḳa. Among these heads the ʿeṭiḥ of Ḥahd, which meanders by the volcanic district Ḥemmat al-Maʿeze on the north and ends opposite the settlement of ad-Dejāmīje, north of the Tell Fadrami. From here a road leads east to Mosul by way of the wells of Abu Ḥamz̪a and al-Beṭa. On the right bank of al-Hābour south of the Tell Fadrami are the Tell Śmeješānī and the hamlet of ad-Deṣeṣ; on the left bank south of the Tell Marḳada are the hamlet of Sāṭtaḥ and the Tell aş-Śeji Ḥāmed.

In the evening we determined the latitude. On May 22, 1912, we loaded our baggage into a large boat and crossed to the right bank. Our camels forded the river about half a kilometer farther south. For being ferried over we had to pay five meqīṭājījāt (§ 4.50). The aş-Şwar ruins lie

---

47 Ḥṣeṣj̪n, Muṭḥaṭ (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 281, writes that al-Ḥṣeṣj̪n is a small town on the river al-Hābour. Annual pilgrimages were formerly made to the grave of Sheikh Abu Bekr, who was buried near the town.
on the right bank on and at the southern foot of a rocky spur. Though otherwise not remarkable they are quite extensive and apparently have been dug over several times; the better kind of building material has been carried away. Far more attractive are the ruin mounds Tell aš-Šeįḥ Hamed on the left bank, Tell al-Ḫeįn on the right bank north of aš-Ṣwar, and Tell Fdėn to the south.

AL-HĀBUR RIVER TO THE BĪR AZ-ZHAMAK

At 7.45 we left aš-Ṣwar and started northwest towards the bare, undulating plateau of az-Zahara, which is merely the continuation of the plateaus which overlook the left banks of al-Hābur and the Euphrates. The highroad to Dejr az-Zör runs west-southwest across the plain, Feįżat aš-Ṣnāne, and the southern spurs of the Ḥammt abu Šāleḥ. In the southern part of the Feįžat aš-Ṣnāne is the well of al-Kassār, in the northern are those of al-Bu Ṭaḥama and Kales.

At 8.45 we sighted to the north-northwest one of the al-Ma’eze, groups of black volcanic hillocks which terminate to the west in the sharp “nose” Ḥāsm al-Ma’eze. At 9.48 there came into view the reddish, rather low height of Žetab az-Zerw, which stretches from southwest to northeast; and to

---

48 Aš-Ṣwar is the Sūri of the Assyrian records, the center of the land of Lākē. When Tukultî Ninīŋ (Tukultî Enurta II) came to Šupri (perhaps now the aš-Ṣafa’ ruins), Ḥamatai, the prefect of Lākē, sent him the tribute due: two hundred sheep, fifty head of cattle, bread, drink, grain and straw. When the Great King approached his residence, the town of Sūri in Ḥāddippē on al-Hābur, the prefect delivered over to him twenty minae of gold, twenty minae of silver, thirty-two talents of lead, one hundred and thirty talents of copper, one talent of dark blue cotton, five minae of the sådūl plant, one talent of iron, fine oil, twelve hundred sheep, one hundred head of cattle, large birds, and two of his own wives with a rich dowry (Annales [Schell, Annales (1999), pl. 4, reverse, II. 4f., 15–20]; Schell, op. cit., pp. 20, 22).

Asurnazîrpal III (884–869 B. C.), shortly after ascending the throne, appeared suddenly before the town of Sūri in the region of Bit-Ḫāddippē, to punish its inhabitants for murdering the prefect Hamatai, who had been set over them by the Assyrian king to govern as his representative, and for replacing Hamatai with one Ajišaba from the land of Bit-Adini. The prominent officials and elders surrendered unconditionally. The Great King ordered the palace and temples to be looted, which brought him as spoil gods, women, maidens, silver, gold, bronze, iron, lead, divers bronze utensils, alabaster, precious stone from the mountains, chariots, harnesses, teams, horses, fabrics of many colors, cedar wood, inlaid panels, purple, wool, fragrant spices, cattle, goats, etc. Outside the town gate a scaffold was erected, where the skins stripped from several prominent rebels were exhibited. Others were hanged on the scaffold and some impaled around it (Annales [Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions, Vol. I, pl. 17–26], col. 1, ll. 79–82; Budge and King, Annales [1992], pp. 281–284).

Asurnazîrpal III in 878 received from the inhabitants of the town of Bit-Ḫāddippē (our aš-Ṣwar) silver, gold, lead, bronze utensils, variegated fabrics, castle and flocks (Annales [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. I, pl. 17–26], col. 3, ll. 6–7; Budge and King, op. cit., p. 348).

Al-Abţal, Diĉa (Saḥāni), pp. 106 f., mentions al-Ḫaḏmūm with aš-Ṣwar and also al-Hābur with aš-Suwar.

Jâkût, Muʿjam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 8, p. 49, writes that the settlement of Suwar lies on the bank of the river al-Hābur four parasangs from al-Faḏejn. A battle with the Kharijets was fought there.

Ibn al-Feqîr, Ba’dûn (De Goeje), p. 133, enumerates among the subdivisions of the administrative district of al-Hābur the following: aš-Suwar, al-Braddjīr, Maḵûn, al-Samsûnlîajî, and aš-Sukrejī. Al-Braddjīr must be a wrong transcription of al-Faḏejn, while aš-Sukrej is the modern aš-Sifār.
the west appeared one small and two large black volcanoes known as al-Ḥžāf (or al-Ḥžēfāt). From 9.50 to 10.25 the camels pastured on rūṭe, sərə, and keʃũm. At eleven o’clock we saw west of us the wells of Swēlēm, al-Ḥaba, and ʿAbdaččerim. From 12.10 P. M. to 1.08 we rested at the well of al-Mrejžeb, which was partly filled with the remnants of dry plants.

Our guide pointed out to us to the west the wells of ar-Rwešēd and Ḥamar at-Ṭawīl, south of the latter that of Ka-maraddīn, north of it al-ʾErbīdī, and east of al-ʾErbīdī that of al-Ḥajjūz. Towards the north, at the western foot of a fairly long elevation, little heaps of stone marked the well of ʿUmejjer; northwest of it below a black spur lay the Bir al-Mrāba; beyond that, al-Gwej∫ef; and west-northwest of the last, the Bir al-Maʾāmre.

The air, now extremely hot, was clearly seen to be divided into four or five layers of unequal depth and transparency, vibrating incessantly and obstructing our view. It was the sarāb (mirage). At 2.15 on our left we caught a glimpse of the well of al-Ḥajjūz. To the northwest the horizon was shut in by the elevation of Ūetab aẓ-Ẓerw, which in some places is penetrated by gaps. The two higher volcanoes of al-Ḥžēfāt (or al-Ḥžāf) appeared to the south of us and, as veiled by the mirage, seemed not unlike two black monsters. From time to time the black Rīğm at-Ṭarān emerged from the mirage; a well of the same name is situated directly below it, and to the south of it are the wells of Fejjāz and Ab-an-Nūk. After three o’clock pieces of basalt and lava could be seen here and there. Reaching the spur of al-Ḥemma at 3.48, we gained its ridge at 4.05 and remained there until 4.45. It is composed of basalt and lava, hemma, or hamme as it was called by our guide. The volcanic area stretches from the Tell Markāda on al-Ḥabbūr as far as the well of Milēḥān. To the north our guide showed us piles of stones which mark the wells of Sēh-lān, Ab-an-Nūk, Roṣajān, and Rmejlān, and to the south that of al-Ḥadāb. At 5.10 the range of ʿAbdalʿāzīz appeared to the north. We encamped at 6.20 at the head of the šeʾib of Čahīd and determined the latitude.

On May 23, 1912, at 5.02 A.M. we set out toward the northwest in a cold west wind. At 6.30 we observed in a large basin north of us the ruin mound of al-Malḥa and far beyond it the jagged range of ʿAbdalʿāzīz. East of us the isolated hill of Zanatri was in sight. From 8.00 to 9.48 we stopped at
al-Mālḥa (Fig. 31), a well about twenty-five meters deep with water nearly fresh to the taste. Northeast of the ruins of al-Mālḥa is the well of Mlēḥān. On the west-northwest the ‘Abdal-‘azīz range merges with the lower ridge of al-Bēza, the highest summits of which are in its center.

We wished to examine the al-Mālḥa ruins because of their similarity to a fortified camp built of basalt blocks, but our guide warned us against the robbers who roam about the foot of the ‘Abdal-‘azīz range and were most likely observing our movements all the time that we were watering our mares and camels and filling our water bags. The guide seated himself on a knoll near by and kept a sharp lookout over the neighborhood. Our gendarmes were likewise unwilling to expose themselves to danger and pleaded with us to turn back and thus keep clear of the Kurds. To humor them we headed west over an undulating plain which rose toward the southwest. At 10.27 we came to a caved-in well. At 11.25 we crossed the road leading north-northwest from Dejr az-Zōr. Starting from Dejr az-Zōr this road crosses the šeṭāb of al-Bakar, ascends the Ḥammt abu Sāleḥ east of the volcanoes of al-Iḥżēfāt, and runs by the wells of al-‘Erbiṭī and Abu Ḫbara. We arrived at the last-named at 11.35. From 12.10 P. M. to 1.20 we rested.

At two o’clock we were at the Bir ‘Abbās. South of us at the well of Abu Rānī we saw a pile of stones and south of that again the cone of az-Zarrāb situated on the Žetab az-Żerw. To the north a pile of stones marking the Bir Fnejğir showed black, while to the west the horizon was shut in by the hillocks of al-Mān’ijje. At 2.40 we noticed south of us six men mounted on camels and four on foot, heading north; on catching sight of us they fled to the east. Evidently the three men on horseback in our company made them suspect us of
being robbers returning with loot from a marauding expedition. To all appearance they were robbers themselves who might have attacked us, but lacking horses would not risk it, as in an attack a horse is quicker and more nimble than a camel. From 2.55 to 3.42 our camels grazed, while the elevation on which we were standing enabled us to observe the movements of the enemy. The ridge of al-Bêža stretches from east to west. For about half its length to the east it remains at the same height, only sinking off farther to the west. West of us we saw the well of az-Zhamak and south of it the black hill Klejb al-Ḥanme. East of this are the wells of al-Ǧerdije and Ṭmâd. We bivouacked at 5.20 but were on our guard all night lest the strangers attack us.

THE BĪR AZ-ZHAMAK TO AR-RAḴKA

On May 24, 1912, we were on our way by 4.55 A. M. A light but chilly wind blew from the west-southwest. At 5.55 we had on our right near the road the Bīr az-Zhamak, a well twenty meters deep, where we watered our horses until 6.10. Northeast were seen the dark hillocks of al-Mān’ījje and to the south beyond the Euphrates the ridge of al-Bīšrī. Especially striking was the deep rift between the main part of the ridge and its eastern spur, al-Faṣṣājāt. From 8.00 to 8.21 our camels grazed southwest of the well of at-Ṭrejfvāwī and north of the wells of Durra wa Ṣabbāra in the ṣe‘ib of al-Msawwāk. We were now traversing the watershed between the Euphrates and the ṣe‘ibān running towards the ridge of al-Bêža. To the south the slope was very steep, to the north, however, it was gradual. On the western horizon at 8.40 appeared the two volcanoes of al-Menāḥer at the end of the monotonous plain through which we were passing. To the south we looked down on the vast rolling region stretching from the foot of al-Bīšrī and sloping towards the Euphrates where it ends in the lofty bluffs which border the right bank of the river. On the left bank west of the wells of Durra wa Ṣabbâra the bluffs disappear. At 9.50 we saw to the south the huge Tell al-Ḥmēza on the Euphrates. Then we proceeded across a southward-winding ṣe‘ib. At 10.40 we were in the broad ṣe‘ib of ʿAḵłat Meşhem. This is overgrown with ṭarfa and ends between the Tell Maṭabb and al-ʿAnz on the Euphrates. The gap of al-Ḥânūka, through which the Euphrates passes,
now became plainly visible. The ridge of al-Bişri, or al-Ḥamme as its eastern basaltic continuation is called, stretches as far as the volcanoes of al-Ḥţáfāt and once undoubtedly formed a natural dam of the Euphrates. But the soft layers of rock salt and gypsum could not resist the rapid current, which eroded out a deep and narrow channel called al-Ḥānūka, thus dividing the larger part of the ridge, al-Ḥamme, on the east from the remainder on the west. On the right bank of the ʿAklat Meşhem from north to south run the hillocks of Dâble, west of which rise broad uplands separated by shallow vales sloping towards the Euphrates. At 11.30 we crossed the šeʾib of al-Ḥass and rested from 12.20 P. M. to 1.20. The camels were in pasture from 2.50 to 3.10 in the valley al-Ḥfejjān (Fig. 32) south of Ǧibb aš-Šaʿīr. At four o’clock we set foot on a stratum of pure lava and at 5.55 reached the eastern al-Menḥer volcano and rode around its northern base to the šeʾib of aš-Šaʿaraʾ. This volcano is an elongated cone with axis running from southeast to northwest and, as it seems, has four craters, the one at the southwest being the largest. From it a deep lava flow extends to the northwest. In the upper part of the šeʾib of aš-Šaʿaraʾ is the well of Abu Čedājeʾ; in the lower the well of Abu Marmar, and west of the latter the wells of al-Řejlān, al-Ḥafijjje, and Demîm. Below a knoll north
of the western al-Menḥer volcano lies the well of Luḵta, southwest of the volcano that of Abu Tûte, and northwest of the latter the wells of al-Habā and al-Ḥwār.

At 6.50 we encamped on the lava about midway between the two volcanoes, where not a twig or anything resembling fuel could be found far and wide. The night was mild and the wind blew from the west.

On May 25, 1912, we took to the road at 4.35 A.M. The wind was now blowing from the north. At 5.32 we rode around the southern base of the second volcano, which stands on a layer of basalt and lava about twenty-five meters in height and is steeper on the north. At 6.20 we had the wells of Abu Tûte on our right and at 7.25 reached the bank of the Euphrates west of the al-Ǧehhāl ruins, where our camels grazed their fill on ‘awṣef bushes until eight o’clock.

Southwest of al-Ǧehhāl the channel of the Euphrates cannot as yet be called established. Numerous branches of the great river meander between islets, which appear and vanish again, as there is no rocky foundation to support them. Many of the islets show a luxuriant growth of grass, and herds of buffaloes and cows pasture there. We tried to go through the as-Smērī fields direct to the settlement of ar-Rakṣa, but the meadows in which the river al-Baliḥ disappears were so marshy that at 8.40 we were obliged to turn aside to the north in order to ride around them on dry, stony ground. Not without some difficulty at the Zejdān ruins we at length succeeded in crossing the swampy al-Baliḥ and turned west again.

From 11.20 to 12.40 P.M. we rested southeast of ar-Rakṣa in the gardens by the al-Ḥamra ruin and west of the ruins of ar-Rakṣa as-Samra.

The present settlement of ar-Rakṣa is inhabited by about three hundred families. ‘Abdallahī al-‘Aẓēlī is the most influential man there. The water of the neighborhood is of a brackish taste.

At 1.05 we reached the Euphrates ferry. Only with the greatest efforts could we drive our poor camels into the high boat. The ferrymen were a cruel lot. Beating, pushing, kick-
ing, and shaking the scared animals, they made us afraid for
the safety of their limbs. Nāṣer, Muḥammad, and Tūmān went
with the camels, the rest of us stood guard over the baggage.
The camels were landed far to the southeast, Muḥammad and
Tūmān remaining there while Nāṣer returned with the boat.
After loading the remaining three camels and the baggage,
we ourselves went aboard. The boat was carried by the stream
easily. Halfway across the river the ferrymen stuck their long
heavy poles into the bottom, trying to work the boat a little
to the right into the eddy which washes a spur of the flood
plain of al-Kassāra, on the right bank. The effort succeeded:
we were carried by the eddy right to the bank, where at six
o'clock we encamped for the night.
CHAPTER VII

AR-RAKKÅ TO ABU HRÉRA

May 26, 1912. At 4.57 A.M. we rode across al-Kassâra, a part of the flood plain of the Euphrates subject to frequent inundations. At this time it was overgrown with licorice, the dark green leaves of which our camels did not find much to their taste. At 7.15 we entered the flood plain Háwi abu Kîbê where at 7.32 we saw the ruin mound of as-Sîhel. Along the left bank of the river near here are the hamlets and fields of al-Hassânijjê, ad-Derîjijê, and al-Çazra, the Heracli, Sarât ‘Abed‘ali, al-Kdérât ruins, and the somewhat large village of Şelehebijjê. We now were riding to the fields of Biilî along a narrow footpath on the edge of the river, a passage in some places quite difficult. At 8.40 we crossed the narrow šeîb of Abu Habâta and rested from 9.00 to 9.28. At ten o'clock we began to ascend through the cultivated tract of Umm Telûs toward the Sûrija ruins, which at 10.37 were above us on the left, and came to the hollow between Sûrija and al-Ḥammâm, which affords an easy descent to the river. At 10.58 we had to ascend again and at 11.20 we halted in front of the gendarmerie station of al-Ḥammâm, where there were two khans, a postal and telegraph station, and a few huts. From 11.50 to 12.50 P.M. we rested. The two cones of Ṭadejjên⁵¹ were clearly visible to the west.

At 1.05 we passed our camping ground of the first and third of the preceding April.⁵²

At that time the slopes had been covered with fresh green and the bushes were sprouting, but now everything was scorched and bare, the grass dry or scattered by the wind, and the bushes eaten up. Only near the water surface a few spots remained green. At 2.32 the al-Hnejda ruins were on our left and opposite, on the left bank, the bush-covered peninsula of al-Kdérân. Northwest of it are the fields of an-Neşâbe, to the west those of al-Msêtiha, al-Ḳbejbe, ar-Ruţuba, and the Ḍalʿat

⁵¹ Al-Mutanabbi, Diwâna (Dieterici), p. 434, refers to the place at-Ṭadjân, where he was caught in a heavy rain, as lying on the road from Aleppo along the right bank of the Euphrates to ar-Bâka.

⁵² See the author's forthcoming work, Palaegena.
The middle Euphrates

Gabar ruin. At 3.27 we had reached the flood plain of Suf-safah, the southern part of which is overgrown with tafsa and hammezi (or humbezi) and the northern with licorice (sus). In summer the semi-fella'hin cut and dry the licorice leaves for hay, of which their cows are very fond. In winter and spring they dig out the roots, pile them into large, tent-like heaps, and sell them when thoroughly dry to a firm in Aleppo, which has agents at ar-Rakka and Biregik. These men buy only through the chief, who delivers the dry roots to them and receives the money. For each Turkish kunbur (56 kilograms) of roots the workmen get ten piasters (45 cents). At 3.50 we saw a cemetery on our left on the left bank of the seib of al-Kbur. From some of the graves there projected poles with pieces of kerchiefs and even whole chemises on them. At four o'clock we were in the defile of as-Sa'ba. The footpath here is about two meters wide. The bluffs south of it are nearly thirty meters high, while on the right the ground falls off ten meters perpendicularly to the river. In some places sharp corners projecting from the bluffs compelled us to ride in single file. Suddenly our white she-camel caught one such edge with the left half of her load and tumbled headfirst down into the river. She probably would have drowned but for the load tied to her back with ropes drawn under the belly, which kept her afloat. The poor beast, lying legs upward, struggled with all her might to keep her head above the water. Stopping the other camels, we laboriously climbed down to her, pulled and tied the kicking animal to the bank, took off her load carefully, carried it piecemeal up to the road, helped the camel turn over, and then hauled her about one hundred meters east to a small gully, from where she could be led back to the road again. Luckily she was not at all wounded nor did she show signs of internal injuries. The delay caused by this accident lasted only thirty-seven minutes, from 4.38 to 5.15. Putting the thoroughly soaked load on her back again, we emerged through a small gap upon the southern plateau, traversing it until 5.40, when we descended through the seib of as-Sa'ba back to the Euphrates and at 6.12 encamped on the cultivated fields of al-Hora. There we had to dry our wet clothes. Our sugar was soaked through, our cigarettes were black, and our flour turned to dough.

On May 27, 1912, we broke camp at six o'clock in the morning. To the east on a stunted butte appeared the fort
Kal'at Ga'bar. From its center rises a slender minaret, to the north of which a second one could be seen.23

The fertile plain of al-Tabkā, which we now traversing, perceptibly widens, owing to a bend which the Euphrates makes towards the north. At 7.22 we saw on the left the ruins of a small town. The strip of land close to the river, called Ḥāwi Ḥājed (or Ḥājjid) is covered with the licorice plants; heaps of roots which had been dug up were seen everywhere. At 7.38, on our left in the rocky bluffs about ten meters below the top, we noticed some artificial caves, which a man could not enter except by letting himself down with a rope, unless there is a passage hewn down to them through the rock. At eight o'clock we reached the end of the bluffs, which here change into a stony slope, strewn with heaps of old brickwork. On this slope are some demolished shrines and old tombstones, with the round tower of Banāt abu Ḥrēra to the north of them. North of the tower the slope becomes lower and turns from

23 Kal'at Ḥa'bar marks the site of the old town of Dawar.  
Fronto, Epistula ad Verum, II, 1, writes that Verus conquered the towns of Dausara and Niephorion.  
Stephen of Byantium, Ethnica (Meineke), p. 222, says that the town of Dausara is situated near Edessa.  
Procopius, De aedificiis, II. 6 : 14, records that the Emperor Justinian I had the fort of Dausaron restored.  
According to Ibn Ḥoradēbe, Masōlik (De Goede), pp. 74 and 98, Dausar lies on the road from ar-Raqṣa to Mensīg, as well as on the road from ar-Raqṣa via Bābīs to Aleppo.  
Ibn al-Kalnīnī, Dād (Amedron), p. 160, says that at the end of 1068 A.D., the Emir Ga'bar, lord of Kal'at Dawar, died: the place was called Kal'at Ga'bar after him.

Rumālsīdīn, Ta'vīrī (Barber de Mynard), pp. 605, 610, 615 f., 644 f., writes that in 1115 the name of the lord of the fort Kal'at Ga'bar was Mālek ibn Sālem and that this fort was also called Kal'at Dawar.

Ibn al-Kalnīnī, op. cit., p. 207, records that in the spring of 1122 there was a cloud-hurst at Kal'at Ga'bar, eight hundred houses in its suburbs being demolished on that occasion. He also states (ibid., pp. 284 f.) that on August 15, 1146, Īmād-al-Din Abūz Zaykī was killed below the fort Kal'at Dawar, then already called Ga'bar. The murderer, Īmād-al-Din's own servant, was originally a Crusader.

William of Tyre, Historia. XVI. 7, mentions a fortified town on the Euphrates named Calogherbar (Kal'at Ga'bar).  
Ibn Munkīdī, Pitībīr (Dernbourg), pp. 95 f., relates that his father sent a young captive daughter of some Crusader to his friend, the lord of Kal'at Ga'bar, who begot a son by her.  
This son, whom he called Bādrān, he appointed as his successor. After the death of his father, Bādrān, directed by the advice of his mother, administered both Kal'at Ga'bar and the vicinity for some distance around. But, wishing to make her escape, his mother gained over trust-worthy friends, who first let her down from the walls by a rope and then accompanied her to the town of Sarūq, which was held by the Crusaders at that time. There she married a Crusader, a trade a shoemaker, while her son Bādrān was the lord of Kal'at Ga'bar.

Hammon-Purgstall, Osmanisches Reich (1827–1855), Vol. I, p. 42, writes that in 1226 Soliman Shah returned with his tribe from northern Syria to Armenia by the road from Aleppo through Ga'bar. While crossing the Euphrates he sank with his horse, was drowned, and was buried in the fort of Ga'bar.

Abu-l-Farāh, Taʾṣīrīn (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 277, says that the fort Kal'at Ga'bar was originally called Dawarijī, for it was built by Dawar, the servant of an-Nu'mān ibn al-Mundīr. Later one Shākeḍūn Ḥaḍar al-Kabīrī came to be its lord, whence its name Kal'at Ḥa'bar. Then Malekān, the Seljūq, got possession of it. In Abu-l-Farāh's time the fort was in ruins. There were no houses there. It had been built in the Mesopotamian desert on a high cliff on the Euphrates between the towns of ar-Raqṣa and Bābīs.  

Ḥāfīz ad-Dāhēri, Zubda (Ravaisee), p. 50, describes Ga'bar as a fine town with a strong fort and many settlements in the neighborhood. It belonged to the political district of Aleppo.
an east and west to a north-northeast and south-southwest direction, forming the boundary of the basin of al-Minṣef, in the northwestern part of which the shrine of aš-Šejḥ abu Ḥrēra showed white, while on a rocky spur of the northeastern edge of Ṭaraḵ al-ʿAṭfa, which separates the šeʿb of al-Minṣef from the broad šeʿb of Selmâs, almost directly above the river, the black walls of a khan and the gendarmerie station at Abu Ḥrēra came into view. There are two khans and a few huts in this place, near which we stopped at 9.06 in the fields of al-Ḵrên.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{34} On Abu Ḥrēra, see also below, Appendix IX. For an account of the completion of this journey from Abu Ḥrēra to Damascus, see the author’s forthcoming volume, \textit{Palmirena} (to be No. 4 of the present series).
PART II

1915
CHAPTER VIII

IN THE ENVIRONS OF AL-ḤĪRA

Between December, 1914, and April, 1915, I journeyed through Arabia Deserta and northern Neğd. The supervision of my scientific instruments, the plane-table survey, and the determination of latitudes were entrusted to Karl Waldmann, an official of the Military Geographical Institute in Vienna. Our eleven she-camels, which we used partly for riding and partly for carrying our baggage, were under the charge of Nāṣer eben ʿObejāl al-Maqlūk. Our steady companion and protector while in Neğd was Nāzel eben Tnejjān, a cousin of the head chief of the Sinğāra tribe, who guided us to an-Neğef (or Meşhed ʿAli), which we reached on April 5, 1915.

MISSION TO DŘEJJEM EBEN BARRĀK

On April 6, 1915, I camped at the northeastern corner of the fortified town of an-Neğef. A little after ten o’clock in the morning I was visited by the kājmakām of an-Neğef, whose servant also brought for me a mare, all ready to mount. The kājmakām begged me to bring about a reconciliation between him and Chief Dřejjem eben Barrāk, as the chief’s people were now firing at every gendarme who ventured to show himself outside the city limits. As I had been acquainted with Dřejjem’s family since 1912, I promised to go and see him. My sole escort was to be Nāzel eben Tnejjān, my faithful companion from Neğd, and a gendarme, the latter to prevent our being arrested by any Turkish troops which might be prowling around there. At eleven o’clock we started. The gendarme kept all the time between me and Nāzel, evidently for fear of a bullet. First I looked for Dřejjem by the Euphrates, where his family had encamped at the end of April, 1912, but he was not there. Next we rode to his storehouse, knocked on the door there as hard as we could, and shouted; but nobody answered. Both men and women went into hiding the moment

55 The part of this journey from Damascus to al-Ḡowf has been narrated in the author’s Arabia Deserta (No. 2 of the present series), New York, 1927, pp. 377—474; that from al-Ḡowf through northern Neğd to an-Neğef will be narrated in his forthcoming work, Northern Neğd (to be No. 3 of the present series).
they sighted us from afar; for seeing a gendarme between two Bedouins, they thought it likely that we were sent by the Government to do them harm.

At last I dismounted, walked alone to the gardens on the Euphrates, and inquired about Dřejjem. Nobody here fled before me. Learning that Dřejjem was camping in the ruins southwest of al-Kufa and south of the horse tramway, I returned to my companions, mounted my horse again, and before long Dřejjem’s tent was found. The owner welcomed us from afar, led me inside, and bade the women prepare dinner for me and Nāzel. The gendarme was told to return to an-Neğef by the Royal Road. Only when I entreated Dřejjem to allow the gendarme to remain with us, as he was our guide for whom we were responsible, did the chief nod to him to sit down in a corner of the tent. Then he poured out a torrent of complaints against the Government:

“They almost flay us alive,” he said, “and ruin us in fact. Under the name of a war tax they take our grain, flocks, horses, press us into military service, and exact ever-increasing payments without giving us anything in return. The fields between al-Kufa and Ca’ara have been cultivated by us from time immemorial. They have always belonged to us, were the property of our forefathers and our inheritance. And now the government wants to take this property away from us. Ten years ago some citizens of an-Neğef, especially Ābdulhsén Śiśerli, as-Sajjed Mehdi, and Hsĕn Heğjerādi, bribed the government officials in order to get the title to our land and have it recorded in their names. Of this we were left in ignorance for full nine years. But now, when there are more gendarmes at an-Neğef and the vicinity is a kind of thoroughfare for the military, those men ask us to recognize them as the real owners and ourselves as their tenants. And in all this they are so far assisted by the Government that gendarmes have already been sent against us. Now, Mūsa, I ask thee, is this the kind of Government to fight for?”

I tried to cheer him up by promising that I would intercede for him with the authorities both at an-Neğef and Bagdad, so that justice should be done to his people. Then I came to terms with him about putting myself under his protection and arranged that either he himself or his brother would accompany me to al-Kājem, a settlement lying about one day’s journey south of an-Neğef.
After my return to town I laid Dřejjem’s complaint before the kājmakām. He said unreservedly that Dřejjem was in the right, but that the people of an-Negef had powerful friends both in Kerbela and Bagdad and that, anyway, the Government itself favored the townspeople to the detriment of the peasants. Especially now, in war time when the English were trying to ingratiate themselves with the Shiite town populations, the Government was doing its best to retain the good will of the inhabitants of the sacred towns of Meşhed ‘Ali (an-Negef) and Kerbela. In conclusion he advised me to consult either the mutasarrif at Kerbela or the wāli at Bagdad in regard to the matter, as he himself could do nothing at all.

I also had to ask the kājmakām for permission to leave the most important part of my property in his house, because, after all, I could not very well leave everything in Dřejjem’s care. At that time the environs of an-Negef were full of wandering military deserters who might easily have attacked Dřejjem’s tiny camp some night and robbed me of my property. The kājmakām assented readily to this and, moreover, hired two men to carry my baggage to his house. In the evening we determined the latitude.

On April 7, 1915, Chief Dřejjem with his brother and two servants came to take us through a Shiite graveyard (Fig. 33) to his camp, which he had moved closer to the Euphrates. The whole camp consisted of only five tents, for the other members of his clan lived in huts erected about the gardens.
THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

East of our camp, which lay northeast of al-Knêdre and southeast of al-Kûfâ, an old canal which formerly brought water from the Euphrates to al-Hawarnâk was still visible. A few small heaps of ruins stand on its left bank.\(^{36}\)

Every day after sunset we were visited by ten armed men, who guarded the tents against the deserters. In his hate for the Government Dreqjem frequently prayed that it might perish. Being a Shiite he disliked the English intensely, but could not help complaining that he wished the Shiite Persians were as orderly as they.

In the evening a dealer in donkeys and horses brought us five donkeys and a horse for our journey to al-Kâjem and, if possible, to Abu Râr as well. Camels could not be used for this trip, for our route led through irrigated fields and deep ditches, full of water and with slippery banks, well-nigh impassable for camels. Besides, the fellâhîn would have taken us for Bedouins and attacked us. Therefore we decided to ride in the same fashion as the fellâhîn themselves.

\(^{36}\) I regard these ruins as the old settlement of Hârawâ, which, according to Jakob, Muñîm (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 246, and Abu-l-Fâlîl, Muradî (Jayyebî), Vol. 1, p. 297, lies two miles from al-Kûfâ, where, in the time of 'Ali ibn Abî Tâlib, the Kharijites had their camping ground, whence their name al-Hârawîjîn.

Al-Mas'ûdî, Tanbih (De Goeje), pp. 381 f., makes it evident that Hârûra was situated between two canals opposite al-Hawarnâk.

\(^{37}\) (see p. 263) Al-Ḫîra consisted of various quarters called kâir, which were separated by gardens and covered a large space. The center of the town was at the site of the ruin mound of al-Knêdre, or, rather, somewhat to the south of it, as this place lies five kilometers from both al-Kûfâ and al-Hawarnâk and ten kilometers from an-Nâjîf, distances which correspond exactly with those given in the Arabic records. Glanucius, Fragmenta (Müller), p. 409, and Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnica (Meineke), p. 276, report that Erthas was a Parthian town on the Euphrates.

At-Tahârî, Taŕîgh (De Goeje), Ser. 1, pp. 748 ff., writes that al-Ḫîra was built for the Arab traders. There, as well as in al-Anbûr and the river-bank settlements near by, lived the Tandâh in huts made of branches of trees and in woven tents, not in houses built of earth.

Hamrat al-Ifahâhî, Taŕîgh (Gottwald), p. 115, says that no king died at al-Ḫîra with the exception of Kâbis ibn al-Mundir. All the others perished either in raids, when hunting, or while visiting the settled regions, and this was because the air in the town is very healthful. A common saying of the Arabs was that one night of sleep in al-Ḫîra was of more benefit to him who had it than any medicine he could take.

The decision of the Nestorian synod of 410 A.D. was signed among others by Hôsî, bishop of Hîra (Chabot, Synodicon [1902], p. 36). In 424 a certain Simûn was bishop of Hîra, which belonged to the Ṭaijajîn nomads (ibid., p. 43). In 466 another Simûn was bishop of Hîra (ibid., p. 53).

In 407 a certain Elisha was bishop of Hîra (ibid., p. 82).

In 585 the name of the bishop was Joseph (ibid., p. 164) and that of his successor, Simûn (Assemannus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1710-1728], Vol. 5, Part 1, p. 110; Hoffmann, Ausgärte [1880], pp. 97, 103).

Some time after 594—595, the batholikos Hôsîjabî came in his flight to the settlement of Bêt Kûb and died there. His body was carried by No'mân's daughter, Hindu, accompanied by the priests and faithful, to the town of al-Ḫîra, where it was buried (Chronica minora [Gudil], p. 17; Chronique de Saint [Scher], p. 313).

At-Tahârî, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2056, records, quoting Soâf, that Hûfûl remained a whole year at al-Ḫîra, making many raids from there before he set out for Syria.

In 790 one Hûfûl is mentioned as the bishop of al-Ḫîra (Chabot, op. cit., p. 603). Ibn al-folios, Buldûn (De Goeje), p. 181, adds the settlement of al-Ḫîra al-Bîdât to the town of al-Kûfâ, stating also that it was formerly used by the kings as their residence, on account of its fine situation and wholesome air.

Ibn Rûstâ, A’lûs (De Goeje), p. 309, puts the distance from al-Kûfâ to al-Ḫîra at three
At night our watchmen danced their war dances, stamping their feet, applauding, singing and telling stories till dawn. The uproar was intended to warn off robbers, but it also deprived us of sleep.

VISIT TO AL-ḤAWRAN K AND ABU SHĒR

April 8, 1915. Seated on donkeys, we set out at 8.05 A.M. for al-Ḥawrān, first following a west-southwesterly course. At 8.13 we crossed an old, half-filled canal stretching to the southeast. At 8.32 we came to large ruins extending towards the east.

At 8.50 we passed a continuous line of large piles of old building material. The highest of these is at the western end of the line and is called Ummu Fśezē. They form the outskirts of the old town of al-Ḥira proper. The old settlement of an-Negef, from which arose the present town, lay close to al-Ḥira, forming a suburb on the road to Dūma.57

(Footnote 67 continued)

miles. According to him al-Ḥira was built on the plateau an-Negef, supposedly the coast of a salt sea which formerly reached to al-Ḥira. Three miles east of al-Ḥira lay the manor of al-Ḥawrān, while another manor, as-Sadir, was built still closer to it in the desert.

Al-Ṭaibāri, Masdīk (Du Goeje), p. 26, says that al-Ḥira was built before the Prophet Mohammed’s time; and was renowned for its salubrious location and fine buildings. But it was deserted by its inhabitants when al-Kūfa was built, one parasang away. Near al-Kūfa ‘Ali was buried, but the authorities could not agree as to the exact location of his grave, for some looked for it near the gate of the great mosque, others again at a distance of two parasangs by a stone arch and the remains of an old cemetery. — Two parasangs from an-Negef (or Meḥsh ‘Ali) takes us to the vicinity of al-Knōdro, the site of al-Ḥira.

To this Ibn Hawkal, Masdīk (Du Goeje), p. 163, adds that ‘Abdallāh ibn Ḥamdān (killed in 929) had a stout fort built by the tomb of ‘Ali and above it a large dome resting on four walls with a gate through each, and richly decorated both within and without. The most prominent of Ḥusein and ‘Ali’s descendants were buried in this building, while the graves of the other members of his family were ranged around the sanctuary.

As-Sāhilī, Diyarāt (Codex berolinensis), fol. 163 r. l., states that the Diyar Ṭakī al-Askāf were built on an elevation near the town of al-Kūfa, on the outskirts of the former town of al-Ḥira. They consisted of small shrines with domes and walled courts, which were called Diyar Ṭakī al-Askāf, or Monasteries of the Bishops. Beyond them flowed a canal named al-Rafir, on the right bank of which the ‘Aqṣa Abī-l-Ḥasib was built, and on the left that of as-Sadir with the Monasteries of the Bishops between them. The ‘Aqṣa Abī-l-Ḥasib was a place for entertainment and gadding above the flood plain. Fifty steps led up to its roof, which offered a splendid view over the plateau an-Negef and the town of al-Ḥira. By ascending fifty steps more to a still higher roof the view obtained was enchanting. As-Sadir was a huge manor or walled court built by the Lakhm kings in olden times, of which nothing remained except a few monasteries and a Christian church, as well as a building called al-Musaṣṣāt. This was a court with long, half-ruined arcades. On the Pilgrim Road east of al-Ḥira lay al-Kaṣr, farther Ḥabūl Abīlul, Kaṣr ‘Al-adāsān (al-ʿAdāsātinn), al-Akṣa al-ʿAbši, Kaṣr Beni Buqija, and Dār ‘Awa, still on the height an-Negef. All these walled ṭaṣṣār are the remains of the former town of al-Ḥira (ibid., fol. 165 v.). Of the old buildings of al-Ḥira only the Koḥbi al-Ṣabil on the Pilgrim Road was left. On the other side of it stood several shrines called al-Ṣāḥira, all of which belonged to the Christiana. On one of their holidays they held a procession from al-Ṣāḥira to Koḥbi al-Ṣabil, carrying crosses and censers and accompanied by their priests as well as by a throng of curious spectators and amused Moslems.

The monastery of Ibn Māzūk stood in the center of the town of al-Ḥira. It was large and the abode of many monks. As an excursion place it was very popular (ibid., fol. 161 r.).

The monastery of Hind — called thus after Hind, the daughter of an-Neŷman, Ibn al-Mundir, who had built it in al-Ḥira and afterwards lived there until she became blind — was one of the largest monasteries in al-Ḥira, had the most occupants, and stood between al-Ḥumāq and Šagrāt. (Bīr (ibid., fol. 166 v.).

The canal of al-Rafir, mentioned by al-Ṣāḥūši, still exists. It branches off the Eu-
THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

The plain of al-Ğar'a, which we were now traversing and the south end of which we reached at 9.05, is capable of cultivation if sufficiently irrigated.\footnote{\text{58}}

Below this plain at the foot of a rocky slope which falls off to the flood plain to the south, stretches a canal from east to west. We rode on the edge of the bluffs in a southeasterly direction. At 9.32 a short but deep gully was on our right and on a crag above its left bank a pile of old brickwork. The gully descends from the ruin mound of al-Knêdrel. At ten o'clock there appeared on the right at the foot of the bluffs a rather small ruin called Hejţ as-Salâm. At 10.15 we saw on the right at the very edge of the bluffs a small ruin and at 10.20 another ruin on the right bank of the gully. At 10.25 we rode down to a wide canal which originates to the northeast. On the right, east of the canal, the remnants of some buildings stretched as far as the al-Ḥawarkan\footnote{\text{59}} ruin, where we halted at 10.35.

\footnote{The canal and the 

phrases in the Ġa'ara gardens, runs along the foot of the rocky bluffs of An-Neqef northwestwards, and ends in a depression, which is also filled by the Wādī al-Ḩerr, though of course only after abundant rains. The Kaşr Abi-l-Ḩajj is located in the ruins above the canal on the edge of the bluffs about ten kilometers southeast of An-Neqef. South of there, on the left side of the canal in a garden, is a small ruin, most likely a remnant of the as-Sādir manor. The old Pilgrim Road led from al-Kūfā direct to al-Ḥawarkan and therefore to the east of al-Ḥira, as al-Sākūli remarks. The monastery of Hind, or, as written by Ibn al-Ąțr (Kāmil [Tornborg], Vol. 1, pp. 315 and 375), Dejr Beni Hind, was situated north of al-Ḥira, for the location of the Dejr Beni Marina' is given as between Dejr Beni Hind and al-Kūfā.

On November 19, 1015, John, bishop of al-Ḥira, was elected katholikos (Deliontique, Digestiones [1891], p. 383).

Abū-l-Fādil, Taḵwīs (Reinand and De Slane), p. 299, writes that the town of al-Ḥira was built before the time of the Prophet Mohammed at a distance of nearly one parasang from al-Kūfā in the midst of numerous canals; according to others it was said to be at 3 miles distant. In the town resided the descendants of an-No'mān ibn al-Mundir, from among whom al-Mundir ibn Imru'l-Ḳais became a Christian. He built two large churches in al-Ḥira. This town lies by a place called an-Neqef. The ancients were of the opinion that there was a time when the Persian Gulf reached thus far.}

\footnote{Jakūt, Muḡam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 62, gives the name al-Ŷar'a to the sandy plain near al-Kūfā, which extends (as stated by Abu Ṣuktur in his Kūfī fi ḫutḥ al-kūfī) between an-Neqef and al-Ḥira and where Hādī encamped on his expedition to Irak. In the same plain the inhabitants of al-Kūfā quarreled with the governor sent to them against their will by the Caliph Othman (al-Ṭabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2834 and 3409).

— Neither in Jakūt nor in al-Ṭabari is al-Ŷar'a considered to be a proper name but merely a designation of a stony plain bare of vegetation. A search for plain of that kind extends on the upland between the sites of al-Ḥira and an-Neqef.}

\footnote{As late as 697–698 A. D. Christians were still living at al-Ḥawarkan (al-Ṭabari, Taḵr (De Geocie), Ser. 2, p. 760). In 690–691 the Caliph 'Abdalmalek paid a visit to al-Kūfā and gave a feast to the inhabitants at al-Ḥawarkan (ibid., Ser. 2, pp. 819f.; Ibn Ḥaldūn, Ittar [Būkār, 1284 A. H.], Vol. 3, pp. 24f.). Al-Ḫelāḏeri, Putḥ (De Geocie), pp. 287f., relates that once al-Ḫawarkan belonged to the Persians. During the reign of the Caliph Abu-Ḫarab, Ḫarīdā (Būkār, 1255 A. H.), Vol. 12, p. 113).

Al-Jaḏūbi, Balāṭ (De Geocie), p. 299, writes that al-Ḫawarkan lies not far from al-Ḥira, no more than three miles, while as-Sādir is in the desert still closer to al-Ḥira. Al-Maṣ'udī, Taḵr (De Geocie), pp. 381f., records that early in December, 927, the Camaṭian leader, Abu-Ṭâhir, encamped at al-Ḥawarkan, while the commander of the Romans with his army was stationed not far from him in a place called the Bejn an-Nahrān. A battle ensued at the settlement of Ḥārūn', the victory being won by the Camaṭians, who then began a march by way of al-Kūfā to al-Anbār.—The Bejn an-Nahrān (the Country between Two Rivers) is undoubtedly the narrow flood plain between the old canal of al-Ḫawarkan and the Frat (Euphrates) of today, which runs east of al-Kūfā and Abu Šṭer. The old Ḥārūn'
This ruin (Fig. 34) is sixty paces long from northwest to southeast and is rounded on the southwest. All the better building material either has already been or is now being carried and hauled away. The scenery hereabouts is beautiful. To the west, at the right of the town of an-Neĝef, the yellow heights of the bare desert appear, to the north and east numerous small and large groups of huts shaded by tall palms and spreading willows. Here and there the gleaming surface of the Euphrates may be seen, sails flash into view, to vanish the next moment between the trees. To the south spreads a fertile plain resembling a vast garden bordered on the east by the Euphrates, on the north by the rose-tinted rocky bluffs of an-Neĝef, and on the west and southwest by white crags and sand dunes, which break the rays of the sun with an effect painful to the eyes if focused on them for any time. The air at al-Ĥawarnak has always been highly salubri-

may be the ruins at the warehouse of Eben Barra, about five kilometers south of the modern al-Kūfa and ten kilometers north of al-Ĥawarnak. (See above, p. 102, note 56.)

Al-Ĥajabī, Maṣâliḥ (Do Goeje), p. 82, and Ibn Ḥawṣa, Maṣâliḥ (Do Goeje), p. 153, say that al-Kādezījī, al-Ĥira, and al-Ĥawarnak lie on the border of the desert, which stretches to the west, while to the east extend palm groves and fertile fields irrigated by canals.

Jākiṭ, Muḥammad (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, pp. 491 f., describes al-Ĥawarnak as a manor, the building of which for an-No'mān ibn Ḫamzah took the Byzantine architect Sinimmār sixty years. An-No'mān once went up to his roof, looked at the lake before him and then at the desert behind, and saw the real kinds of animals, both those that live in the water and those that live on dry land, and also date palms. Another time he was sitting in al-Ĥawarnak enjoying the view: westward he saw the plateau an-Neĝef and the expanse of gardens and palm groves with the canals flowing through them; eastward, the river Euphrates which enclosed his manor like a moat: and he marveled at all the beauty displayed.

Jākiṭ, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 218, and Abu-l-Ｆaḥlī, Mardṭejī (Juyndoll), Vol. 2, p. 89, record that al-Ĥawarnak lies on the road leading from al-Kādezījī by way of al-Saljahān to al-Kūfa. As-Saljahān I locate at the eastern border of the grove of Desen near the gardens of Gāhra. Along a low ridge stretching from this point to the southeast the Pilgrims Road formerly led from al-Kādezījī, avoiding the morasses. At the settlement of al-Saljahān a bridge of boats was built across the canal of al-Ḥudūj.

Jākiṭ, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 375, states that al-Ĥawarnak lies about one mile east of al-Ḥudūj and is situated in the midst of the desert land between al-Ĥira and Syria. This statement is not correct, as it brings the manor of as-Sadīr into connection with the plain of al-Sudejī. The manor of as-Sadīr stood in the flood plain south of Ǧaṣr Abī-l-Ḥaṣib, whereas the manor of as-Sudejī stood south of the town of Kasîr on the road from al-Kūfa to al-Baġra (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 61). Ibn al-Ṭaʿṣīb, Bujjān (Do Goeje), p. 187, calls as-Sadīr the whole area between the Nahar al-Ĥira, an-Neĝef, and Kasîr.

Jākiṭ, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 642, 682; Vol. 4, p. 197, and Abu-l-Ｆaḥlī, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 418, say that the manor belonging to Abū-l-Ḥaṣib, a courtier of the Caliph al-Mutadīr, was erected in the environs of al-Kūfa on the edge of the plateau an-Neĝef, not far from as-Sadīr by the Dījkāt al-Asḵef (Monasteries of the Bishops). These consisted of sanctuaries and walled groups of houses (kāṣer). The canal of al-Ḥudūj flowed below them, with Ǧaṣr Abī-l-Ḥaṣib on its right and as-Sadīr on its left bank. Between Abu-l-Ḥaṣib's manor, al-Ĥawarnak, and as-Sadīr the monastery of Mārat Muhājam was built by the al-Mundīr family, probably either on the edge of the plateau or at its foot. The present Ḥoj as-Salām ruins may be what remains of Mārat Muhājam.

Ibn Ǧaṣṣūja, Taḥfīz (Dhīrjemry and Sānumīnī), Vol. 2, pp. 62. Journeyed from Mōṣheb ‘Alī to al-_dst by way of al-Ĥawarnak under the protection of the chief of the Ḥafṣā tribe, who owned the whole environs. In al-Ĥawarnak Ibn Ǧaṣṣūja saw various remains of sanctuaries in a large plain by a canal which issued from the Euphrates. From there he went to Ḥajj Muhammad al-Wāṭeq.

Abū-l-Ｆaḥlī, Taḥfīz (Reinhard and Do Slane), p. 391 f., writes that according to some al-Ĥawarnak is a canal in the district of al-Kūfa, according to others it is a manor.

Abū-l-Ｆaḥlī, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 375, denying that al-Ĥawarnak is a canal, maintains that it was a manor still existing in the environs of al-Ĥira. In close proximity to the manor of al-Ĥawarnak an old canal flowing from the northwest is yet visible, which might, therefore, also have once been called al-Ĥawarnak.
ous because the winds have free access from all directions.

Leaving al-Hawarnaḳ at 11.32, we set out over the slope of Dīb aš-Šejāha to the southeast. At twelve o'clock we saw earthen huts and an earthen mosque of the settlement of Abu Sḥēr, the residence of the kājmāḵām. The gardens there are called Ga'ara, as is also the dam in them southeast of the settlement of al-Mazrēz. At 12.09 P.M. we had an old ruin on our right. At 12.32 we stopped before the one-story, mud-brick government building of the settlement. A gate on the west side leads into a courtyard surrounded by arcades resting on pillars, and on the north side is the jail. We left Abu Sḥēr at 1.00 P.M. by the old Pilgrim Road along the right bank of the Euphrates and headed for our home camp near al-Kūfa. At 1.50 we sighted on our right the hamlet of Abu Ġazra. At 3.18 we reached our tents and at once began to prepare for our trip to al-Kājem.

A visit to Abu Ṭabr was not to be thought of for the moment, as war had broken out just then between the inhabitants of the settlement of as-Samawa and the Government, as well as between the Hazā'el and Zejād tribes. The Eben Barrāḳ, aš-Sibl, and al-Razālāt clans, who cultivated the
land north of as-Samâwa, are akin to the Ḥazâ‘el and there was much reason to doubt whether we should find any one nort hof as-Samâwa to protect us from the Zejâd and the clans allied with them.

The following are the clans of the Beni Selâme division of the Ḥazâ‘el tribe, or, as they are sometimes called, the Ma‘dān:
- Āl Mas‘ūd, whose camping grounds are near Kerbela (chief:
  Sa‘ūd eben Htejmi)
- al-Mo‘rara, camping grounds east of al-Barrīt
- al-Razâlāt
- aš-Šibl
- Beni Hasan
- Fatlā.

The last four clans listed camp southeast of Wādī al-Ḥerr and the village of al-Kājem.

South of the Beni Selâme camp al-‘Ağib, az-Zejâd, and al-Bdûr. The principal chief of al-Bdûr is Širšâb eben Zwejîd.

The Zejâd are descended from the Kwâ‘ab and these again from the Kḥatān. Their head chief is ‘Azârâa eben Šindîl and their camping grounds stretch as far as ‘Ajin Sajîd. In years where there is plenty (rabî‘) they wander with their flocks to the desert, where they pasture under the protection of the chiefs of the Zejîr, Mṭjrî, Šammar, or ‘Aneze tribes. The protecting chief gets a sheep with its young from each tent as his reward. In May they return with their flocks, butter, and wool to the Euphrates.

FROM OUR CAMP NEAR AL-KÛFA TO AL-KÂDESIJJE

On April 9, 1915, at 7.05 A.M., we set out on our journey to al-Kājem, accompanied by Dřejjem’s brother and a servant. My servant Na‘ser remained with the tents to guard the camels and part of our belongings. At 7.15 we crossed an old, wide canal. At 7.40 we had the Abu Fšēže ruin on our left. At 8.20 we rode over the Darb al-Kaṭ‘a, at 8.35 over the road Darb abu Şhēr, and at 8.45 reached the outskirts of an-Neğef, which remained on our right. Above its brown walls and roofs the golden dome of the tomb of ‘Ali shone far and wide.

By the al-Baḥra road we descended at nine o’clock from the bluffs of an-Neğef to a canal which brings water from the Euphrates in a northwesterly direction right to the town. At 9.12 we halted to water our animals and to fill two of our smaller bags.
At ten o'clock we rode away southwest through the fertile, cultivated fields of al-Bahra, which in the early eighteen-nineties were a lake, inundated every time the Euphrates was in flood. At the time of our visit the dam of as-Sâdde had finally been built, the water had dried up, and the lake was changed into fertile plain, flooded but rarely by the run-off from the al-Ḥerr valley and then for a few days only. Its lowest point is southwest of an-Neğef, west of the last palm grove. The whole plain was converted into fields and palm groves; here and there were also seen rectangular ʿkJur, or courtyards, the dwelling places of farmers. On the outside each ʿkJur is enclosed by high mud-brick walls closely resembling fortification walls, with a single gate into the yard, where huts and stables with flat roofs are built alongside the walls. Whenever a marauding troop comes near such a farm, the people inside bar the gate, climb to the roofs, and observe through the loopholes the movements of the unhidden guests.

The al-Bahra road leads over many irrigation ditches, which at this time of ripening grain were full of water. There were no bridges and our donkeys could not jump over, as they were all laden with various articles. Therefore at the Kaṣr ad-Daʿam we turned a little to the south to get out of the fields. After resting at the hamlet of ač-Člâbât from 10.55 to 11.30, we rode almost due south. At twelve o'clock we went through some ruins covered with a thick layer of sand.

At 12.55 P.M. we saw to the southwest al-Kaṣâjem (plural of ʿkJame, sand drift), a line of high, flat-topped dunes, stretching from south-southeast to north-northwest. Behind it to the west of us rose the Kaṣr at-Ṭrejēwi and the Kaṣr Ḥesw ʿObejd, north of these the Kaṣr al-Mzerāwī, and east of the last the Kaṣr aš-Ṣkek and the Kaṣr al-Maẓlūm. At 12.45 we crossed the al-Medieḳ canal which issues from the pond Hôr al-Mišḥâb. The name hôr is applied in the Euphrates basin to low-lying tracts which the river fills with water from time to time. At one o'clock we set foot on the dune belt Kaṣîmt umm Ṣuzlân, which branches off from the sand drifts Kaṣîmt umm Naṣje towards the east. At 1.05, leaving the fruitful alluvium and proceeding over rocky ground in which the šeʿub of al-Amēleh terminates, we entered the new Pilgrim Road which runs from al-Kūfa to Mecca by way of al-Ḵâdesijje. After 1.42 we crossed a swampy projection of the alluvial ground which penetrates among the rocky hil-
locks to the west. At 2.20 we came to the water hole Radīr al-Makṣūra in a branch of the channel of the šeʾib of al-Ḥeseb. The surrounding fields were all cultivated. To the southeast were seen fifteen tall palm trees, with some remnants of long walls close to them. Northeast of the palms rose a few piles of old brickwork and the remains of some walls. This is all there is to be seen on the surface of the pilgrim station of al-Ḳādesijje (Fig. 35), at which we arrived at 3.28 P. M. 60

60 The poet al-Mutanammi (Dhīrāṣa [Vollers], pp. 290 f.) asserts that the kings of al-Ḥira owned as-Šadīr, Bàzār, Mubākij, al-Ḥawwarak, the manor of Sīnāʿ, al-Ṭamīr by the wells of al-Aysha, and the whole of at-Taʾlabijje. Al-Hamdānl, Siḥa (Müller), p. 230, gives al-Ḳādesijje instead of at-Taʾlabijje. The reading al-Ḳādesijje is correct. At-Taʾlabijje was a simple station with wells and without any gardens; it is therefore hard to understand why the poet should have added that the “whole” of it belonged to the king, or that the latter should have had personal property so far out on the borders of territories belonging to tribes never thoroughly subject to him. As al-Ḳādesijje, on the other hand, was surrounded by extensive palm groves, in reference to this settlement it was obviously necessary to state that the king of al-Ḥira was lord of the whole settlement and the groves around it.

In 762–763 A.D. al-Ḳādesijje was occupied by Ibn Maʿṣul to prevent the inhabitants of al-Ḳūf from joining the rebels in al-Ṭābāra. (The people of al-Ḳūf used to go by way of al-Ḳādesijje, al-ʿOdejib, Wādi as-Sibāʿ, and through the desert to al-Ṭābāra.) Soon afterwards Ibn Maʿṣul received word from some inhabitant of the place of Shāfī, situated two miles north of the station of Wāḥal, that twelve men of al-Ḳūf were camping at Wādir as-Sibāʿ. Ibn Maʿṣul went in pursuit of them, overtook them at Ḥaffān, four parasangs from al-Ḳādesijje, and slew them there (at-Taḥari, Taʾvīḥ [De Goeje], Xr. 5, p. 295).

Ibn Hawkal, Manālik (De Goeje), pp. 162 f., writes that the little town of al-Ḳādesijje lies on the border of the desert. There is an abundance of palms and water there; in the fields forbearing plants are raised extensively and the inhabitants supply alfalfa to the pilgrims, who stay there to feed their animals.

Al-Muqaddusi, Abū al-Ḥasan (De Goeje), p. 117, also reports that al-Ḳādesijje lies on the border of the desert. During the pilgrimage period it is thickly populated, and all kinds of goods are brought there. It has two gates and is protected by a fort built of mud bricks. A canal brings water from the Euphrates into a large pond at the Baghdad gate. But at the desert gate water also flows from other fresh sources. The whole town is in fact a market place; there is a qāmī (cathedral mosque) there, too.
AL-KÁDESIJJE TO AR-RUHBE.

To the southeast appeared the fortress of ar-Ruhbe, also called Kaşr as-Sejied. We reached it at four o’clock through fertile, cultivated fields, and encamped on the north side of it. The fortress of ar-Ruhbeb was inhabited only by peasants. Outside the northern gate a few huts and a small farm were standing. The owner of the latter ran to us begging us to lodge with him, as there were many deserters from the army prowling around, who might attack and rob us at night. Accordingly, my companions moved our things into the ar-Ruhbe farm, while Halaf and I went to the shrine of Eben Hasan on an elevation near by, from where we sketched a map of the neighborhood. North-northwest, about three kilometers from

\textit{Al-Sābūtī, Dījārdāt (Codex berolinensis), fol. 102 v., remarks that the monastery of \textit{Seržis was at Tarnābād between al-Ḳūfā and al-Kādesiye, on the road, one mile from the latter. It was encircled by vineyards, trees, and selling booths. At the end of the tenth century of the Christian era nothing was left of it but a few half-ruined tombs and piles of stones by the road. Its popular name was Maṣara abī Nawās.} 


Ibn Gubejr, \textit{Rihla (De Goeje)}, p. 210, says that al-Kādesiye is a large settlement with palm groves and watering places filled with water from the Euphrates.

Al-Madāʾin mentions that al-Kādesiye was originally called Kudēs, and Ibn Hākām derives its name from the farm of Kudēs near al-Ḳudēb. From al-Kādesiye to al-Ḳūfā is fifteen parasangs; to al-Ḳudēb four miles (Jākūt, \textit{op. cit.}, Vol. 4, pp. 7, 9; Aḥu-l-Fadālī, \textit{Marājī} (Juynholl), Vol. 2, p. 276).

Jākūt and Aḥu-l-Fadālī both erroneously give the distance between al-Kādesiye and al-Ḳūfā in parasangs instead of miles. Kudēs may be the modern ar-Ruhbe.

Aḥu-l-Fadālī, \textit{Tawāfes (Reinaud and De Siano)}, p. 236, refers to al-Kādesiye as a little town with palm groves and plenty of water, situated like al-Ḥira and al-Ḥawarnač between the desert and the cultivated region.

Al-Maṣrī, \textit{Muṣālī} (Codex viudobonensis), fol. 58 v. f., records that the settlement of al-Kādesiye lies on the border of the desert west of the Bagdad territory, that its water is not very good, and that much fodder is raised there.

Ṣaḥīḥ Ḥalīfa, \textit{Gīhān masām} (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 465, describes the little town of al-Kādesiye as well-known for its palm groves and abundant water. It is situated on the western border of the cultivated parts of Irak.

\textit{Aṣ-Ṭabarī, Ta'riḥ (De Goeje)}, Ser. 2, p. 967, relates that in 696—697 A.D. Saḥbī with his army came to ar-Ruhbe.

In the second half of the eighth century the hereditary Prince Isa ibn Mūsā lived on his estate in ar-Ruhbe, visiting al-Ḳūfā only during the holidays of ramūḍan and du al-ḥijjā (al-Ṭabarī, \textit{op. cit.}, Ser. 3, p. 467).

Ibn Gubejr, \textit{Rihla (De Goeje)}, p. 212, who was there early in May, 1184, relates that ar-Ruhbe lies near al-Ḳudēb, that there are several inhabited houses there, and that the inhabitants get water from a spring bubbling out above the settlement.

Jākūt, \textit{Maṣām (Wüstenfeld)}, Vol. 2, p. 762, records that the settlement of ar-Ruhbe lies east of the Pilgrim Road opposite al-Kādesiye, one day’s march from al-Ḳūfā. It was already deserted in his time, having suffered much from the raids of the nomads, as there was no other settlement beyond it. Jākūt quotes Saḥānī as saying that whoever wishes to go to the cultivated territory (al-ṣarr) has to set out from the station of Mūrtaṭ to the springs on the borders of Ḥeṣāḥ — the first of which, Aṣ-Ṭabarī, is three miles from al-Kādesiye — and thence to the ‘Aṣīn Ḥafījje. Aḥu-l-Fadālī, \textit{Marājī} (Juynholl), Vol. 1, p. 964, adds that in his time the settlement of ar-Ruhbe was in ruins.

\textit{Aṣ-Ṭabarī, Ta’riḥ (De Goeje)}, Ser. 2, p. 967, relates that in 696—697 A.D. Saḥbī with his army came to ar-Ruhbe.

In the second half of the eighth century the hereditary Prince Isa ibn Mūsā lived in his estate in ar-Ruhbe, visiting al-Ḳūfā only during the holidays of ramūḍan and du al-ḥijjā (al-Ṭabarī, \textit{op. cit.}, Ser. 3, p. 467).

Ibn Gubejr, \textit{Rihla (De Goeje)}, p. 212, who was there early in May, 1184, relates that ar-Ruhbe lies near al-Ḳudēb, that there are several inhabited houses there, and that the inhabitants get water from a spring bubbling out above the settlement.

Jākūt, \textit{Maṣām (Wüstenfeld)}, Vol. 2, p. 762, records that the settlement of ar-Ruhbe lies east of the Pilgrim Road opposite al-Kādesiye, one day’s march from al-Ḳūfā. It was already deserted in his time, having suffered much from the raids of the nomads, as there was no other settlement beyond it. Jākūt quotes Saḥānī as saying that whoever wishes to go to the cultivated territory (al-ṣarr) has to set out from the station of Mūrtaṭ to the springs on the borders of Ḥeṣāḥ — the first of which, Aṣ-Ṭabarī, is three miles from al-Kādesiye — and thence to the ‘Aṣīn Ḥafījje. Aḥu-l-Fadālī, \textit{Marājī} (Juynholl), Vol. 1, p. 964, adds that in his time the settlement of ar-Ruhbe was in ruins.
the shrine, the farm Kaşr Neğgârijie stands in a bay of the flood plain. West of it gushes forth a vigorous spring of the same name. Of still greater force is the spring of as-Seijjad, about four kilometers southwest of ar-Ruhbe, from which a considerable stream flows through a deep ditch to ar-Ruhbe where it irrigates the fields of the settlement (Fig. 36)."}

AR-RUHBE TO AL-ḲÂJEM

The basin, at the southern edge of which ar-Ruhbe is situated, might be cultivated for at least three kilometers to the west, and it is now cultivated around Neğgârijie. The fortress I did not enter. In the evening we determined the latitude, but afterwards it was impossible to sleep, as our

---

(Footnote 62 continued) assemled to the bluffs between al-Hawaznak and al-Hira. To the right of al-Kâdeslije a well-irrigated flood plain extended as far as al-Waleqa. The Moslem advance guard later encamped at al-Kâdeslije, between al-'Atîk and al-Ḥandaq, opposite a stone bridge, about one mile below which the settlement of Kudeja was situated at that time. Sa'd left all his women under the protection of his cavalry at al-'Odejeb and marched with the rest of the troops on al-Kâdeslije (at-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2228 ff.).

After the victorious battle at al-Kâdeslije Sa'd had the Moslems who had fallen carried to al-'Odejeb, where they were buried all along the slopes of the Muṣerrik valley between al-'Odejeb and 'Ain al-Ṣams (at-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2304).

'Odjeb al-Ḥaḍānî is the present 'Ain as-Seijjad, and 'Odjeb al-Kawâdès the 'Ain Neğgârijie. Al-Ḥandaq might have been a Persian rampart the remnants of which are visible west of the gardens of al-Kâdeslije. Al-'Atîk is perhaps the ancient half-filled-in canal, which at the southeastern end of the gardens joined the rampart. The western road led along the scorched upland, the eastern followed the narrow but long elevation stretching from al-Kâdeslije to the northeast. The remains of the al-Ḥusāb canal may still be seen at the northwestern foot of this elevation. Near as-Ṣejjne the ancient canal turns slightly west towards the gardens of al-Kâdeslije. Al-Waleqa is to be sought at the modern 'Ain Zâbêb, because in time of flood the flood plain is inundated to this point. For about two kilometers northeast of ar-Ruhbe the remnants of both the ancient canal and rampart are still visible: I think therefore that ar-Ruhbe is, properly, the ancient Kudeja. The graves of the fallen Moslems are to be sought on the elevation of Eben Ḥasan. Finally, the valley of al-Mulêrik is the low ground between the 'Ain as-Seijjad and the 'Ain Neğgârijie.

In 689—691 a warrior of the Taʿlî tribe rode by the Beni Tuʿal road to join Ḥusayn, the son of 'Alî. Learning when near 'Odejeb al-Ḥaḍānî that Ḥusayn was unable to reach al-Kûfah, he went back again (at-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 2, p. 356).

Ibn Ṭustî, Aṭībî (De Gejce), p. 175, states that the Persians kept a garrison at al-'Odejeb for the protection of the desert road.

Ibn Kâtemra, Marwân (Wüstenfeld), p. 225, cites verses of the poet al-Ḳutfânî, who mentions the summer camping grounds between al-'Odejeb and Râchéb.

Ibn Ǧubayr, Râsâ (De Gejce), p. 212, writes that al-'Odejeb is a valley with rich pastures and springs: a building stood close to these.

Jâkıût, Muṣam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, p. 626, mentions that the valley of al-'Odejeb belongs to the Beni Tamîm. It is a halting place on the Pilgrim Road from al-Kûfah to the borders of the cultivated country. He cites as-Sakûnî as stating that the distance from al-Kâdeslije to al-'Odejeb is six miles.

To this Ayûb-Ṭâḥâ, Marwâdî (Juybollî), Vol. 2, p. 213, adds that al-'Odejeb is a watering place four miles to the right of al-Kâdeslije on the road from the pilgrim station Manâkât al-Ḳûfûn and that it belongs to the Beni Tamîm.

In times gone by a farm called Kûdeja was situated in al-'Odejeb, from which the settlement of al-Kâdeslije, distant four miles from the valley, received its name (Jâḳût, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 7 and 8).

Jâḳût asserts that near the station of al-'Odejeb the valley of al-Ḥusayn is cut by the Pilgrim Road from al-Kûfah to al-Ṭârîb, but that al-Hâzmi denies this (ibid., Vol. 1, p. 498).

Ibn Ǧaḥdâm, Ṭubâ'at (Defrémery and Saqaqûnêti), Vol. 1, p. 413, who visited al-'Odejeb at the end of 1238, describes it as a fertile valley, with a building and good pasture in the neighborhood.
guards amused themselves all night with dancing, singing, and shooting.

April 10, 1915. At 5.35 A. M. we rode to the southeast through a fertile, level plain, cultivated in some places. We left the Pilgrim Road at ar-Ruhbe and at 5.50 crossed the šeʾib of al-Wdéčân, on the right bank of which lies the farm Kašr ‘Akklâr. At 6.10 we were in the šeʾib of Wuʾer east of the water of the same name. At 6.25 the farm of Abu Rwejjes came into view to the southeast in the center of the glittering surface of the large lake Bahrat ummu-s-Sbâ’. This is not a permanent lake, for whenever the Euphrates sinks its water evaporates, leaving only small ponds and swamps here and there. All over the lake could be seen settlements of the peasants, who raise in the swampy ground a plant called šilm, the seed of which (tummen) resembles rice. At 6.38 we had on our left the farm Kašr Saʿad. At 6.48 we ascended from the swamps to the rocky upland bordering the lowland on the west and south. At seven o’clock, near the Kašr Abu Leben, we passed the dry bed of the šeʾib of Abu Ṭahlī, which comes from the direction of the reservoir of as-Sitt Zobejde on the Pilgrim Road. The travelers we met, even the peasants work-
ing in the fields, were all armed and always kept in groups, the better to defend themselves against the deserters.

At 8.08 we crossed the še'ib of Umm Dowde, where a few palms grow. Its head is close to the station of Ummu Krûn on the Pilgrim Road; in its upper part, where Barçet Ḥamed is situated, it bears the name of Ummu-s-Sbâ'. From 8.14 to 8.46 we rested.

Our guide, a fellâh from Umm Bezzûne whom we had hired at ar-Ruḥhe, uttered bitter complaints against the Government. There was, he said, no end to the taxes. No sooner had the peasant, who generally could not read or write, paid one tax, than up came the collector again, accompanied by gendarmes or soldiers, and asked for further payments. Whoever was unable or refused to pay was beaten until his relatives paid for him to the last farthing. If the collector did not find the man at home, his wife or daughter was beaten. For this reason the fellâhin fled from their settlements to the desert, where they joined the tribes engaged in raising goats and sheep and whence, in order to provide themselves with corn and clothing, they raided localities which remained faithful to the Government. They bought their arms from the deserters and gendarmes, the latter afterwards pretending to have been attacked and robbed. The negroes of Eben Raṣīd, too, were willing to sell their own arms or those of anybody else. With reference to this, Nâzel told us that Raṣed and the other slaves who had come with us to an-Neĝef sold in five days thirty-eight Mauser rifles which had been sent to Eben Raṣīd by the Turkish Government.

At 9.40 we had on our left the hamlet of Umm ʿAṣāfir. The hamlets in this vicinity were completely surrounded with water, and hence the only communication was by means of boats, the sails of which were to be seen over the whole tract to the east and southeast. At ten o'clock we had traversed the še'ib of al-ʿAṣi, which rises at al-Mrîte. We also met a funeral procession with six dead bodies carried in open boxes. The beard of the haṭîb (conductor of prayers) who accompanied the dead was dyed yellow with henna, but his moustache was left gray. At 10.25 we came to the at-Ṭarṭûr

---

53 Jâkûl, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 29, writes that as-Sibâ' is a locality and that the valley of as-Sibâ' lies beyond Birket umm Gaťar on the Pilgrim Road three miles from as-Zoh-
cijdjîo. There were said to have been there a fort, a rain pond, and a well over forty fathoms deep and with good water.

ruins, where we remained until 10.37. The ancient settlement was situated on an isolated cone at the west end of the once fertile lowland now covered with water. The foundations there are of stone, but the walls are of large bricks such as are seen in buildings remaining from the Babylonian era. The fellâhûn excavate at-Tartûr unceasingly, selling both the stone and bricks in aş-Sennâfijje.

At 10.45 we ascended to the rocky upland plain, from which we saw before us the fortress of al-Ḳâjem\(^64\) and east-northeast of it the palms and huts of the little town of aş-Sennâfijje. At 11.06 we dismounted in the settlement of al-Ḳâjem, which consists of barely twenty-five poor huts north of the fortress. The latter stands on the right bank of a con-

\(^64\) See below, Appendix XIX.
siderable stream which runs from a spring in the rocks about
two hundred meters to the west (Figs. 37, 38, and 39). The
fortress is not inhabited; its walls are cracked and in some
places in ruins. Between it and the spring is a fine pond full

Fig. 38—Al-Kājem, the fortress.

of fish. Northeast of the fortress rises a hillock, with the
remains of ancient walls, called aṣ-Ṣāḏīb; to the east are the
Dūrak ruins, and west of them stands the sepulchral mound
of ʿAbdallāh ebin al-Ḥasan.

RETURN TO AL-ḤĪRA

The large settlement of aṣ-Ṣennāfijjje is surrounded by
a palm grove. West of it glistened the surface of the Hūr
Ṣlejb and to the south the Hūr Rubejā where the ṣerīb of al-
Mhâri terminates. The head of the latter lies to the south, near the Ṣâdir abu Murîs east of as-Smê’a. Southeast of the Ḥôr Rubejš are the hamlets of ‘Ajn Žâheč, al-Ḥafs in fields of the same name, ad-Dehemijje, al-Ṣâdirî, ‘Ajn al-Bhêre, and Čaw ‘Amûde. In the swamps of al-Ṣâdirî end the šebbân of Umm al-‘Awâzîl and Šennân, which come from the well of Firzû, and northwest of these swamps end the šebbân of al-Wêne and at-Ṭemîd. All these šebbân intersect the undulating plain of Umm Ḥejîlân, which merges gradually into the alluvial levels of the Euphrates. From an-Neĝef southeastward along the whole edge of the stony upland plain of which Umm Ḥejîlân is a part were to be seen the low sand dunes known by the name al-Kasîjem.  

My companion, Eben Barrâk, could not go any farther with us as his tribe was at war with the Zejâd, who at the time were camping south of al-Ḳâjem. The Maşîhdi, the dealer from whom we hired our donkeys, was afraid of being robbed of them by the Zejâd and entreated me therefore to procure elsewhere the animals I needed, if I should decide to continue to the southeast. This was the last straw. Seeing that I could not work effectively in a country where there was war not only against the established Government, but also, what was still worse, civil war between the tribes, at 1.43 I turned back northwestward. From 3.10 to 3.40 we rested. To the east, north of aš-Šennâflîje, appeared the village of aš-Šâṭî. At 3.54 we had to the north-northeast the settlement of Ummu Ḫbara and west of it the high ruin and the new hamlet of Telek.  

Our guide related that the fortress of ar-Ruhbe was built by one al-Åhejzîr, who also owned the castle of that same name situated southwest of Kerbela. The fellâhîn from the vicinity of ar-Ruhbe, therefore, consider al-Åhejzîr to be a man; the article al with them has the meaning of the Bedouin ál or eben, so that al-Åhejzîr signifies “descendant of Åhejzîr.”
IN THE ENVIRONS OF AL-ḤĪRA

An old man from the hamlet of al-Ḳājem said that the fortress of al-Ḳājem was formerly in the possession of the Ḥafāĝe clan, who guarded the commercial roads to al-Ｂaṣra and neglected agriculture, because al-Ḳājem lies on the edge of sterile rocky hillocks.

Not caring to return by the road on which we had come, we turned into the level flood plain. At 5.10 we saw to the north-northeast the conical ruins Nişān at-Ṭowk, southeast of them the settlement of Umm Bezzûne, and farther in the same direction the palms of the settlements of Umm al-Baṭṭ and aṣ-Ṣāṭī. East-northeast from Umm Bezzûne stands the Uhejmer ruin and on the river beyond it the settlements of ad-Daʿrijiye, al-Ḥanaf, al-Ḥammâm, Umm ʿAwde, and al-Ḥarmijije. At al-Ḥammâm, too, some ruins are yet standing. At 5.20 we had on our left a hill on which stood the al-Fardijije ruins and at 5.48 the Kaṣr Masʿūd, near which we camped. The swampy, salt-covered ground was so moist that we sank in to our ankles. Our companions amused themselves with some fellâhen, who were working in a neighboring field sown with šilm (a kind of rice); while the guards sang, we were left to the tender mercy of millions of mosquitoes swarming around us.

April 11, 1915. It was with pleasure that I looked forward to our departure, as I had not been able to close my eyes all night. I was not used to the mosquitoes as yet and did not know how to protect myself against them. At 5.25 A. M. we rode away and at 5.38 crossed the channel of the šeṭib of al-Wdēchân, which once served as an irrigation canal. At six o’clock we reached a sandy ridge stretching from southwest to northeast along which a former Pilgrim Road led from al-Kâdesijje to al-Ḥawarnâk. At 6.16 we crossed a canal running northwest, on the north side of which extend the ruins of the ancient aṣ-Ṣbejne, now merely a few large heaps. Northeast of them winds a canal filled with water, beyond which rise brick walls of a medieval fortress of considerable dimensions. To examine this structure was impossible, much as we should have liked to do so, as there was no means of crossing the canal encircling the mound on top of which stood the fortress.

At 6.57 we were at the ar-Ｒumādī ruin, west of Umm ʿAwde and southwest of the palm grove of Desem. At 7.25 we rode across the old canal stretching from the aṣ-Ṣinnîn ruins⁶⁹ southwest to al-Kâdesijje.

⁶⁹ Hamzat al-Ifahâni, Taʾrih (Gottwaldt), pp. 104 f., records that Imruʾl-Qays ibn an-Noʾmân had the fort of aṣ-Ṣinnîn built by the Byzantine architect Sinimmâr.
From 8.53 to 9.15 we stopped for rest by the reddish rise of ar-Râkûb, southeast of Kašîm úmm Ruzlân; at 9.53 we reached the Pilgrim Road and followed our way through the fields of al-Mašâb. At 10.30 we crossed a canal which brings water from the Euphrates. At 10.46 we saw to the west the Kaşr al-Mazlûm and southwest from it aš-Šižîz (or aš-Škêz), and entered at 12.06 P.M. the gardens of an-Neğef, where date palms and pomegranate and mulberry trees are cultivated in preference to all other trees. At 12.29 we were at an-Neğef.

After calling on both the kâjmakâm and the mayor of the settlement, I copied, in the presence of Nâzel and two other natives who knew the region, all the geographical names between al-ʾElaʾ and an-Neğef from my notebooks and then prepared to make another journey northward. I was now so exhausted physically and mentally that I yearned for a longer, undisturbed rest at Bagdad. Nâzel, it is true, promised over and over again to accompany me as far as al-Bîšri, but I knew he would find it difficult to keep his word and that the moment he got homesick he would surely leave me and return with his kinsmen into the desert. Just then he asked my permission to spend the night with his fellow countrymen. To this I would not, of course, agree, as I wished to show him at once that I was loath to lose him; but my refusal evidently increased his bad humor, for he did not come to our tent either that evening or night.

In 635 A.D. a troop of Moslems was sent by Saʾd on a dark night to attack al-Ḥira. Setting out from the station of al-ʾOdejî they crossed the boat bridge at aš-Sağlûn in order to reach their destination. Suddenly hearing the uproar of a large wedding party, they stopped and concealed themselves until the crowd passed them in the direction of aš-Šinnîn. The lord of this settlement had married the daughter of the Persian administrator of al-Ḥira (aš-Ṭabari, Taʾrîḫ [De Goeje], Sor. 1, pp. 2232 f.).—

The Moslems arrived at the southern edge of the present Kašra gardens by way of the ridge on the left side of the canal. There they crossed the canal by a bridge and sighted the wedding party. Hiding as best they could, they waited for the crowd to go by the bridge; but when it turned on the right of the canal towards aš-Šinnîn, they threw themselves upon the unsuspecting people and captured the bride.

Jâšît, Meʾkham (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, p. 430, writes that aš-Šinnîn was formerly a settlement in the neighborhood of al-Ḫûfa, where al-Mundîr occasionally resided. There were a canal and fields there.
CHAPTER IX

AL-ḤĪRA TO BAGDAD BY WAY OF AL-FELLÛĢE

AL-ḤĪRA TO AL-MSAJJEB

On April 12, 1915, we loaded our tents and baggage (Fig. 40), took leave of Dṛejjem eben Barrāḵ, and returned to an-Neţef for our things left in the kâjmakâm’s care. Having loaded these also, at 9.10 A.M. we started, accompanied by two gendarmes, by the highroad to Kerbela. From 10.50 to 11.19 we rested on the northern border of the plateau of al-Mamrūţa. At 12.25 P.M. we reached the Hān al-Msalla, east of which lies the Ḳal‘at Derwiš. From 1.10 to 1.50 our camels grazed in the Buṭnān al-Ḥumr not far from the Hān Ėddān and Tlejī ad-Ḍib. At 5.08 we made camp by a demolished building near the Hān Sabbār.

April 13, 1915. We set out at 4.45 A.M., but at 5.50 I discovered the loss of my notebook; I quickly turned around and trotted back to the Hān Sabbār. There the book was returned to me by the local gendarme, who had received it from a small boy who had found it in our camping ground. He had ransacked the place that morning in the hope of finding something we had forgotten there which might come in handy for him. Having noted down before dawn the time of our departure, I had put the book in my pocket, but as I had not pressed it down far enough it had fallen out when I mounted my camel. Both the gendarme and the boy were duly rewarded, for the notebook contained topographical notes dating from March 16, and its loss would have been irreparable.

At 8.55 we set out again for the north and at twelve o’clock reached the Hān eben Nḥejle. At one o’clock we saw to the north the az-Zibilijje ruins and at 2.10 P.M., to the east, the village of as-Slejmānijje. At 2.50 we were at the bridge in the gardens of Kerbela.

Telling my companions to go with the camels northwards through the town, I went with the gendarme to the gov-

46 Fuller details relating to the road between an-Neţef and al-Msajjeb will be found above, pp. 38—45.
ernment building to call on the mutaşarref. As this dignitary was engaged in an important conference, our conversation was necessarily short. The streets in Kerbela were empty. The life we had seen there in 1912 was a thing of the past. Soldiers alone were plentiful everywhere. I found my companions at the northern end of the gardens, near the old brickkilns. In the evening the mutaşarref and the gendarme commander paid us a visit, but did not stay long, as the mosquitoes proved too much for them. They warned us to look out for robbers, who of late had made the brickkilns their favorite abode. The brickkilns seemed to be deserted, and in general there was little or no work going on anywhere.

On April 14, 1915, at five o’clock in the morning, we took the highroad to al-Msajjeb. The fields both to the right and left for the most part were lying fallow, since the peasants were abstaining from cultivation and sowing, as they either had been forced to serve in the army or the Government had requisitioned their teams and seed corn. From 6.00 to 6.16 our camels grazed. The highroad was muddy to such an extent that all vehicles had to make a wide detour. At 7.20 we crossed the old ‘Alkumi canal, which extends from the north-northeast, and at 8.10 another similar canal by the al-Hûte ruins. From 9.38 to 10.12 we rested again. At eleven o’clock the chief of the gendarme post at al-Msajjeb bade us welcome, giving us at the same time two new gendarmes for our escort to Bagdad.

AL-MSAJJEB TO AL-FELLÜGE

Turning from our road west to the fields of al-Bowbehâni, we stayed there until 12.48 P.M., when we found a guide familiar with the right bank of the Euphrates from al-Msajjeb north. He was a member of the Mas‘îd clan, which, together with the az-Zekârîţ clan, camps between Kerbela and al-Msajjeb. Both clans hail from the Šammar and breed sheep as well as camels.

At al-Bowbehâni stand the Uhejmer ruins, west of these those of aš-Šrâţî, to the north those of Abu Šatje, and still farther north on the Euphrates the large al-Ols ruin with the ruins and farms of aš-Šnejdiţ and ad-Dawwâs to the northwest of it. Near the last-named the ancient al-‘Ezida canal branches off from the Euphrates in a southwesterly direction.
On the left bank southeast of ad-Dawwâs lie the fields of Ṣazâr and Abu Lôme. It was our intention to proceed directly northwest, but at one o'clock at the Uhejmer ruins we had to retrace our steps, as our camels could not be made to pass over the irrigation ditches. Making use of the half-filled-in canal of al-Ḥsênîjjet al-'Atîže, at 1.25 we reached the high-road, which we followed southwest and at 1.50 turned through the fields of al-Bowbehâni north-northwest again. At 2.50 we saw to the southwest the Nîşân Ğâzje ruin and north of it the slope of the upland of Markâda. At three o'clock we rode through the al-Ǧbûr ruin and at 3.16 through another ruin, called Ehwêš. There are broken-down walls of a rectangular fort there with a tower at each corner, and south of them
piles of ancient brickwork. But all had apparently been excavated several times, and the better bricks had been carried away. Close by here runs the huge ancient canal of al-‘Eziṣa, which leaves the Euphrates to the northeast at the palm grove of ad-Dawwās. At 4.20 we prepared our night quarters on the fields of the hamlet of ar-Rurē‘ijje, the home of our guide ‘Awwād. The neighboring fields are owned by the Mas‘ūd clan under the chief of the Eben Htejmi family. They assert that they have immigrated there from the vicinity of Ḥājel and that the Šammar are their blood relatives.

On April 15, 1915, we were in our saddles by 5.08 A.M. By 5.20 we had ridden through the old ‘Alḵumi canal, which is said to issue from the Euphrates opposite the little shrine Sajjeda al-Ḥażr Eljās. The latter came into view at 5.25 to the northeast. To the southwest the al-Ḥārēa ruins appeared again and beyond them the ruin Isān ad-Dahab. After traversing the fertile alluvial plain of Ġīrḫ as-Ṣaḥr, which is nearly ten kilometers wide, we came at 5.50 to the old shrine of Abu Ḳūbbe. At 6.24 we saw, about four kilometers to the northeast, the al-Maḏbaḥa ruins, with, to the east of them, the knoll of al-Ġuṣṣ in Irak. Remains of old farms were seen everywhere. At 6.50 we noticed to the west-northwest the upland where the well of al-Ḵlejb is located, with that of Fakhād to the west of it and north of this again that of Umm Ṿwēr. At 7.50 we saw to the east-northeast the modern tomb Ḳabr ar-Rṣēf in an ancient ruin east of the ‘Alḵumi canal and the al-Bāḡ ruins in the fields north of the tomb of al-Ehḡēr. We then rode along the rocky upland of az-Zahrā. At 8.20 we had on our right the palm grove of al-Laṭīfijje and east of it, on the left bank of the Euphrates, the undulating upland of al-Meḏaṣṣa. The fields north of al-Laṭīfijje belong to the Ġennābijjin, a clan of the Zobejd under Chief Bu Ṣḥarījje. From 9.55 to 10.54 the camels grazed near Abu-l-Fejjāz on the Euphrates.

From 11.10 on we rode along the rocky upland of al-Fażlījje, which almost reaches the Euphrates, and at 11.22 crossed an ancient canal of gigantic dimensions which leaves the Euphrates near by; our guide called this Žeri Sa‘de. At 11.40 ruins were visible on our right; at 12.40 P.M. other ruins on our left; and at 12.45 on the right large ruins on the very bank of the Euphrates, out of which flows an old canal. To the east-northeast, on the left bank at the inlet of the al-Mahmūdijje canal, stood the small sanctuary of Ibrāhim
al-Ḥailil. At one o’clock we rode through the extensive Bitra ruins which lie close to the Euphrates. The former settlement here was divided into three parts by two canals. In the rolling plain to the west beyond the steep slope Tār al-Ḥejbān are the wells of al-Ǧrajbē, southwest of them those of aš-Šīḥijjāt, and northwest of the latter those of as-Sihel with the well of az-Ze’eb to the north. East of the az-Ze’eb well is the well of al-Birṣē, and northwest of al-Birṣē the wells of al-Ḥeṭerbi, aš-Šerwijjje, aš-Šlubijjje, Umm Šīṭen. Southwest of the last-named is the well of al-Misma.

At 1.08 to the north-northeast on the left bank of the river appeared the shrine of Ḥamze eben Kādem. Beyond Abu-l-Fejjāz the land was not cultivated, because the gravel (ḥaṣw) contained in it completely obstructs plowing. Nor is the soil alluvial, like that southeast of Abu-l-Fejjāz, but rocky ground throughout, mixed to a large extent with rock salt and gypsum. At 1.20 we again passed through ruins, where we halted for a short rest from 1.23 to 1.52. To the north-northeast in al-Ǧezīrē—as the region on the left bank of the Euphrates in these parts is called by the natives—rose the high, isolated ruin knoll of ‘Aḵar al-Eḏda’. We were now passing along the western border of the narrow cultivated strip of al-Bzēbez. At 2.15 we crossed an ancient canal and had on our right a steep line of bluffs which descends nearly to the Euphrates and is intersected by numerous short gullies. At 2.30 we reached a deep basin running from north to south and bordered by precipitous bluffs; of these only the rocky northern ones are cleft in such a way that water can enter when the Euphrates is in flood. Then a pond forms in the basin, and, as the water dissolves the layers of soft gypsum and rock salt there, it becomes saturated with salt, which remains on the bottom of the pond after the water has evaporated away. Hence its name al-Amēlha (brackish pond). From 2.40 to 3.30 we rode past al-Amēlha, at the northeastern edge of which lie the Abu Ḵṣajbe ruins.

All along the Euphrates appear groups of huts in which the fellāhīn dwell in the rainy season, while during the dry season they live in their tents. Although owners of large flocks of sheep and goats and living under tents for many months, they differ in many respects from the nomads, who pay more attention to the raising of goats and sheep than to agriculture. I often heard them say:
“With us it is so and so, but with the goat and sheep breeders it is again so and so (‘endana ḥē ḡa ‘enda-ḥl al- ḥ̣anām ḥē ḡ).

All the way from an-Neĝef I listened to grumbling against the Almān (Germans). It was quite usual for the officials, high and low alike, to put the blame for the war in general and for the Turkish participation in it in particular on the Almān. The gendarme Muḥammad, who accompanied us from al-Msajjeb, complained bitterly that the Almān were of no help to the Government and moreover that they unblushingly consumed all the best foodstuffs themselves. Pitying Sultan Abdul-Hamid, he cursed the liberty brought by the Party of Unity and Progress which had caused Turkey nothing but war and distress.

After passing the ṭaṭṭās ruins in the district of al-ʿĀm- rijje, we bivouacked at 5.30 by a small camp of the Ġen- nābijjīn clan, below a high dam which protects the fertile plain of al-Ḥābūrī from inundation, as the channel of the Euphrates is here nearly four meters higher than the flood plain. Before the evening set in we were enveloped in clouds of bloodthirsty mosquitoes, which tortured both man and beast all night. The ground was so damp that in the morning even our blankets were wet.

On April 16, 1915, I rose more tired than when I had lain down. At 5.06 we left the valley for the rocky western bluffs. When past the al-Ḥābūrī ruins we crossed the short šeʾb of Abu-š-Šowk and started northwest again. To the north-northeast in al-ʿĢezīre we saw the ruin mound ʿAḵar an-Naʾēli; west-northwest, on the Euphrates, the Tell as-Sūltān; southeast of it the Tell al-Ḵeṣān and Tell al-Knejšė; and west of the Tell as-Sūltān, in the fields of al-Ḥsej, the al-ʿAḡāribijje ruins.

At 7.30 there came into view the Niśān Uhejmer to the north-northeast on the left bank, and before us on the right bank the white rocky escarpment Čāl at-Turba with the hills of Sened Ḍubbān to the north above it. From 7.53 to 8.28 our camels pastured.

When west of the Tell al-Uhejmer we left the road on the base of the rocky upland which shuts in the alluvial plain, and at nine o’clock headed through the flood plain east-northeast towards the mosque of al-Fellūğe. Our road led through the fields of al-Ḥsej and was in some places very difficult, as
our camels sank deep in the mud. At 9.28 the ruin mound of al-Úrāb appeared on the left bank. At ten o'clock we reached the pontoon bridge al-Kantara, where we relieved the camels of their loads. These we had carried over to al-Fellūge and afterwards we led our camels across—something of a feat, as they constantly shied and all that connected the high bridge with the considerably lower left bank of the stream was a plank hardly more than thirty centimeters wide.

AL-FELLŪGE TO BAGDAD

At one o'clock in the afternoon we left the wretched settlement of al-Fellūge and stopped at 1.32 at a ruin by the road, where we ate our dinner and rested until 2.40.

At 2.55 we entered the rocky ground of Abu Tīlūl, in which there is much of the gypsum so characteristic of al-Gezire, a region of which the natives consider the district we were now traversing to be a part. Its broad, undulating elevations are covered with pebbles and sand. Northwest of al-Fellūge the low-lying fields are irrigated from the al-Azra-kijje canal. From the left bank of the Euphrates south of al-Fellūge branch off the Abu Rēb, Daffār, Ar-Rawwānije, al-Mahmūdije, al-Latifijje, and as-Sikandarijje canals and many shorter ones, all of which still contain water. At four o'clock we rode over a bare rock and at 4.20 turned to the

67 After his defeat suffered at the end of 701 A. D. near Deir al-Glimām, Ibn al-Abī'ašf fled towards the settlement of Benī Ḥanīf ibn Hubayra in al-Fellūje, where he crossed the Euphrates (at-Tabari, Ta'wil (De Goeje), Ser. 2, p. 1065).—Deir al-Glimām is located in the vicinity of Kerbel, and the village of Benī Ḥanīf east of the present al-Masā'ibīj.

Al-Fellūje was an administrative district, in which the settlement of as-Zubālā was situated (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 225); 'Arifk, Sūr (De Goeje), p. 10). In 740-750 Ibn Hubayra, sent by the Caliph Merwān II, encamped by a branch of the Euphrates in the district of al-Fellūjūj al-Ula, twenty-three parasangs from al-Kūfā. Then, since the Khalijites had crossed the Euphrates at al-Anbār and were marching with all speed along its right bank to al-Kūfā, Ibn Hubayra advanced in the same direction between the Euphrates and the Sūrā canal (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 13)—Twenty-three parasangs from al-Kūfā takes us northwest as far as the present settlement of al-Fellūje.

Ibn al-Šārī, Rūmūk (Tornberg), Vol. 9, p. 413, states that in 1064 the Bagdad troops besieged al-Anbār, which had shortly before been taken by the lord of Mosul, and that they burned Dimmimma and al-Fellūje.
right towards the inundated lowland Hôr abu Rêb, beyond which to the east was seen the new Hân as-Senijîje and west of it the hamlet of aš-Šâ’ebe, the residence of a mudîr. We encamped near the water, as the best pasture for our camels was to be found there. Once more we were tormented by the mosquitoes.

On April 17, 1915, we were in our saddles as early as 4.38 A.M. Returning to the highroad which runs from al-Fellûğe to Bagdad, we next went across the fields of al-‘Abbâdi. East of our camp our guide ‘Abed ebîl (sic) ‘Abbâs from the Be (sic) Sôde clan, pointed out to me Tell at-‘Twêbe and north of it the Tell al-Ḥamal ruins; about four kilometers northeast of these stands the abandoned gendarmerie post Nûkṭat al-‘Aṣîd. At 5.40 the as-Snedijîje ruins, the old as-Sindijîje,48 appeared to the south-southeast.

From 6.20 to 6.39 our camels grazed. At 6.48 we came to the gendarmerie station Nûkṭat abu Mnîsrî at the Hân al-‘Abbâs (also called Hân Zârî). At 7.08 the ad-Darrâ‘î ruins appeared north-northeast of us; at 7.13 we rode across the old and great canal of al-Elêmî and at 7.18 across the new canal of Abu Rêb, through which the water flows to at-Tarâğef; east-northeast of us the Tell Hwêrîg Pasha came into view.

The only points of the compass whose names were known to our guide were west and east, which corresponded with the course of the Euphrates. Consequently he constantly took north for west and south for east. He said, for instance: “A little to the east from the west,” when he meant northeast. Frequently he was heard to say: “It lies neither south nor north (lâ hu ẓiblî wa lâ hu ẓêmîl),” meaning southwest. He pronounced ebên like ebêl, tell ar-raml like tarr ramîl; jaskotîn (they will become silent) spoken by him sounded like jisiktûn.

At 7.55 we crossed the old canal of al-Ejsâwî; to the north were visible the at-Tarâğef ruins and to the northeast the Nišân al-Asmar. At 8.46 the latter again appeared to the north of us and then the village of aš-Šênêfî, the ruins of Abu Salâbîh, and, to the southeast, the hamlet of al-Ţerje. At 9.15 the Nišân abu Ṭaţûr lay on our right. To the north appeared the cone of ‘Akarkûf and east of it the banks of the al-Ambârî canal. From 9.25 to 10.00 o’clock the camels pastured.

48 Ibn al-‘Âṣîr, Ta’rîfî (De Slane), p. 13, writes that in 1085 Ṣarafaddîwî established a dominion which stretched from as-Sindijîje on the ’Isa canal to Menîbî and included the towns of Hît, al-Ambârî, and Meûfî, as well as the districts of Râfînî and al-Ġesîrî.

Jâfît, Muṣ’inî (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, p. 188, says that the settlement of as-Sindijîje lay on the ’Isa canal between Bagdad and al-Ambârî.
At 10.30 we saw at about five kilometers to the south-southwest the settlement of al-Żerje, to the east-southeast the deserted gendarmerie station of ad-Dâûdî, and to the northeast the embankments of the al-Ambârî canal and the Tell al-Adram. At 10.40 Tell Bzîr appeared to the northeast.

Our guide explained to us in what manner the Government recruited volunteers. The wâlî summoned all the chiefs to Bagdad and, when they were there, he asked them to accept military service voluntarily. Every recruit was to get ten to twelve gold Turkish pounds ($ 45 to $ 54). Each chief then named offhand the number of volunteers in his clan and received at once the amount due to him. Thus, for instance, Žâri, the chief of the Žôba’î, announced 170 men and was paid, accordingly, two thousand gold pounds. But no one in his whole clan would hear of going to war. Finally he made ten poor fellows who were indebted to him join the colors as a means of paying him, but only after threatening to take all they had if they persisted in their refusal. And in this way he sent to war ten men instead of 170, keeping, of course, the two thousand pounds all for himself. The Government was also served in this way by other inhabitants of Irak and al-Ǧezîre.

The Žôba’î are descendants of the Ťajj tribe. Their main camping ground lies between al-Mahmûdijj, Abu Ḥunţa (Ḫabba), and the highroad from al-Fellûğe to Bagdad.

Their families are as follows:

- aš-Šîṭî
- as-Sêhêût
- as-Sâ’dân
- aš-Sâ’âr
- al-Fejjiāz
- ʿAzze
- al-Hejtâwîjîn
- al-Hîcîjel
- al-Krâşijîn
- al-Mekâdîme
- Čêdâde
- Beni Zejî of Khaṭîân.

The chief’s name is Žâri eben Fedâra eben Žâher al-Mâmûd.

At 11.20 we crossed an old canal at the sepulchral mound Ḫabr Ḥmûd. Ḫmûd eben Tâmer was the head chief of the Muntefîzî tribe at the beginning of the nineteenth century. At 12.30 P. M. we reached the embankment al-Ḥerr, extending across the fields of ad-Dûrâ’s north of the al-Kheîbî and ar-

---

99 This is the ancient Bû (or Beît) Dûrâjî.

Jâkût, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 469 f., and Abu-Ḥalîl Yaqînî, Marâṣîd (Juyhînl), Vol. 1, p. 116, write that Bûdûrâjî was a part of the district of al-Ostân and later of that of Nahr Iṣālîn ‘Ali. A few of the suburbs of Bagdad were built on the border of Bûdûrâjî. According to some authorities cited by Jâkût all that lies east of aš-Ṣâra’ is Bûdûrâjî; all to the west, Ḫârûbul. However, instead of east and west of aš-Ṣâra’ we should understand north and south, because Ḫârûbul is situated north of Bagdad.
Raml ruins, where we remained until 12.54. At 1.25 we saw on our right the light railway to al-Meždem, which was being used for the transportation of guns from boats on the Euphrates to those on the Tigris. At 1.30 we had the highroad from al-Msajjeb to al-Kâzîmîn on our right.

At 1.48 we reached the branch road to al-Jîllâ and al-Msajjeb. After paying the toll, we crossed the new al-Jîrr bridge and came at 2.25 to railroad yards full of passenger and freight cars. At 2.43 we turned through the northwestern suburb and at three o’clock reached the garden where we had camped in 1912 in the al-Metwâlîjje suburb on the horse tramway from Bagdad to al-Kâzîmîn. Its owner, Ahmed Ta‘ama, welcomed us as old friends — and within an hour our tents were pitched under tall palms by a field planted with pepper. Unfortunately the water of the Tigris flowing close by was very high just then, making the garden so wet that it was impossible to sit down on the bare ground. Also, everything in our tents became moist, and swarms of mosquitoes, which in 1912 we had not noticed at all, came to torment us here as well as later at Bagdad, where we hoped to recuperate. It began to rain in the evening and continued raining all night.

**BAGDAD IN WAR TIME**

On April 18, 1915, in the forenoon I went to the gendarme post on the right bank of the Tigris to report my arrival and also to ask for a guard in order to save myself, my companions, and our camels from molestation. Next I crossed the pontoon bridge to the left bank into Bagdad proper, there to visit the Austro-Hungarian consul, De Tahy, who lived south of the town on the very bank of the Tigris.

On the way I had a good opportunity of observing the damage caused by war and flood. The streets of the inner town, through which it was hard to move in 1912, gaped empty. The shops were mostly closed, the coffeehouses only half filled, and the country women who sold food in normal times were absent. Groups of soldiers appeared occasionally here and there. On the northeast the town was bordered by a lake which one could not see across. In the palm groves whole rows of huts were either demolished or half carried away by the floods. Both men and women were fishing for various wooden articles floating in the lake and with long hooks pulling out blankets
and pillows from the huts into their boats. In the Christian cemetery east of the highroad leading to Persia coffins and half mouldering skeletons were floating. On account of the cholera which was ravaging the town (three hundred people were dying of it every day) the Christian dead were now being buried on the new embankment of the highroad, so that people walking and riding had not only to pass by but even to make their way among and over the graves. These were shallow and, as the dead bodies were only thinly covered with earth, pestilent odors soon spread in all directions. There was no longer any life in the town, formerly one of the busiest in the Orient.

Consul De Tahy, a noble and whole-hearted Magyar, greeted me in a friendly manner, yet with a certain reserve, thawing only when he learned in the course of conversation that I was a Czech. Then he offered me his hospitality with such heartiness that I gladly accepted. Before noon we drove to call on the governor. Here I asked for permission to visit the vicinity of as-Sumejče immediately and then to return along the left bank of the Euphrates to Syria. The governor replied that what I wanted lay in the competency of the military commander of the district, whom I therefore must see. But the son of Mars would not even listen to me. Throwing my references aside with the remark that in such matters he would take no advice from Constantinople, he ordered me at the same time to go back to Syria by the ordinary road on the right bank of the Euphrates. When I declared that I ought to have the right of traveling in a hinterland not as yet included in the war zone and that all I asked for was a gendarme to protect me against the everlasting inquiries after my passport and my affidavit stating that no military deserter was with me, he curtly denied that I had any such right and dismissed me, remarking that I could complain in Constantinople if I was so inclined, but that I should have to wait for the answer in Syria, not at Bagdad. His sole apology to the consul for not accommodating the latter’s protégé was to shield himself under the military law, which he said forbade him to do as I asked.

I left in a very embittered mood, for although the commander maintained all the outward forms of courtesy while refusing my request, I could not help feeling his fierce hatred of me. I came to Bagdad for the sole purpose of examining
the lower valley of the river at-Tartār and the left bank of the Euphrates; could I have foreseen such a venomous refusal, I should certainly have kept clear of Bagdad and made al-Fellūge my starting point. The consul, too, was surprised at the commander's decision and expressed the opinion that perhaps Eben Rašid's minister Saʿūd, who was a great protégé of Enver Pasha and against whom I had worked in central Arabia, had laid charges against me in Constantinople, and that in consequence Enver Pasha had sent a telegraphic order to Bagdad to order me back to Syria. This surmise was reasonable and highly probable, because it had been my intention while in central Arabia to cause the downfall of the minister Saʿūd and naturally with it that of the weak prince Eben Rašid, who had received from Enver Pasha a gift of several thousand Mauser rifles with the necessary ammunition and a great sum of gold. Saʿūd might have forwarded the accusation by a fast rider to the al-Muʿazzam station on the Heġāz Railway and Enver Pasha, who knew I did not approve of his policy in inner Arabia, might have taken steps against me on discovering from the accusation that my activities against his protégés had been effective.

It now occurred to me to ask the consul, who claimed to be on the best of terms with the commander, if possible to ascertain the reasons of his behavior, and this he did two hours after. I waited for him in front of the government building, whence he emerged after scarcely half an hour and invited me to come in, saying that everything had been explained and that he thought the explanation would be to my satisfaction. In fact, the commander came out as far as the anteroom to greet me and did so very politely, excusing himself for the way he had treated me before. Taking me for an Austrian German, whom he hated just as fiercely as the other, or Prussian, Germans—as he called them—, he wanted to show me his power and thus to revenge himself—if indirectly—for all he had had to suffer from the multitude of Germans around him, against whom he was helpless. He uttered bitter complaints against the ways of the Prussian officers who, even when not soldiers by profession, claimed to know everything better than the best officer in the Turkish army. As an example he cited a major, representing the Prussian staff in Bagdad, who had dared to put to shame before the public not only the Turkish but also the Austrian officers. For instance, this major not
long before had arranged a kind of festivity to which he invited the more prominent citizens of Bagdad and the officers. The music was supplied by a large phonograph. Suddenly a spring operating a wheel in the machine got loose, causing the phonograph to play with increased speed. At that moment the major rose to his feet exclaiming: “That’s the speed of the Austro-Hungarian army when running before the Russians.” Consul De Tahy leaped at him shouting angrily: “Take that back or I’ll slap your face!”

Now, if the Prussian military representative at Bagdad behaved like that to his European ally, it can be imagined how he acted towards the Asiatic, who had become his ally by compulsion. Consequently the Bagdad commander was never more pleased than when he could score on his Prussian colleague. Furthermore, he related, evidently with great glee, how he had annoyed the members of the German expedition to Afghanistan, taking from them more than half their gold and arms; how he purposely delayed in Bagdad the Prussian and Austrian ministers who were going to Teheran, and so on. Consul De Tahy, in whose quarters the Austro-Hungarian minister to Persia during his involuntary stay at Bagdad was a frequent guest, also told me how he pitied the latter, because on every occasion he was thrust into the background and slighted by his Prussian colleague. The commander greatly deplored the war, fearing that in any case it meant the end of Turkey. He was afraid that if the victory went to the Entente, Turkey would be dismembered; but that if the Germans won, Turkey would be subjected by them. And when he learned that I hailed from one of the subjected peoples of Austria, he became still more friendly, declaring finally that I could travel whenever and wherever it suited me. After taking leave of the completely mollified commander, I returned to our tents, placed all our things in the care of Halaf and Nāṣer, and then went to the consul’s house in order to have my indisposition cured.

From the eighteenth to the twenty-seventh of April I had to remain in bed almost uninterruptedlly and was visited daily by a German physician, who had moved to Bagdad from Bombay after the declaration of war. The doctor was a man well advanced in his profession and a man of intelligence. During his long stay in foreign countries he had learned to know the English and to esteem them more than his Prussian com-
patriots, whom he praised for some of their qualities; but he could not help adding that it was just these qualities which made the Prussian so unpopular abroad. Consul De Tahy likewise hated the Germans and the Prussians in particular. Of all the Austro-Hungarian representatives whom I met in foreign countries none denounced the alliance with Germany more strongly than he. At the same time he pitied his mother country, Hungary, which he felt sure was threatened with the same fate as Turkey. For, as he said, there was no doubt that the victorious Entente would liberate the subjected nationalities of Austria-Hungary; whereas, if fortune favored the Germans, Hungary would be swamped by them.

Occasionally the proprietor of the house where the consul lived also came to sit with me a while. He was a man of about sixty, the owner of a few small factories and of the largest importing and exporting concern at Bagdad. Being an Arab, he showed much interest in the ancient history of his people and also wished to learn the character of the region from which, as he thought, his forefathers had come to Bagdad. For this reason he was glad to meet a man who knew both Arabian history and the inner desert and he demonstrated his good will towards me in every way possible. He brought to my bed all his sons, grandsons, and even great-grandsons, and he begged me to be sure to visit him as soon as I was on my feet again, in order that he might entertain me and introduce me to his wives. He too was bitter against the Government, which, in his opinion, could hardly maintain itself in Irak any longer. He preferred the Germans to the Turks, because they would promote agriculture and with it industries and commerce, but best of all he liked the English because of their firm hold on the Indian trade.

"The Irak of today is, believe me, Mûsa, already a part of India. Freight rates from Bombay or Calcutta to Bagdad have been and are going to be cheaper than those from Constantinople; thus, since India now belongs to the English it were better for us if they held Irak as well. Then there would be neither duties nor frontier inspections, and we could trade without any hindrance whatever."

Similar views were expressed by nearly all the merchants of Bagdad whom I met either at the consulate or outside. They all thought a political change highly desirable for the welfare
of their whole country and were not at all backward in expressing this opinion.

On April 28, 1915, I went to see my companions, who had visited me repeatedly during my sickness, keeping me informed of all that had happened in my absence. During this time they had all been inoculated against cholera and smallpox. My appearance in the tent was a cause of great rejoicing. I was served at once with fresh mulberries and a cup of the best tea. Yet all were united in the wish to leave and begged me hard to take them away as soon as possible. In the desert, they said, where there was neither meat, fruit, nor vegetables, everything was better than here in the shade of the Bagdad palms. As I was practically of the same opinion, I told them to examine and repair the pack saddles, to buy what was necessary, and make ready to depart on the first of May. I spent the evening with the family of the consul's landlord.

On April 29 and 30 I visited some of my friends, procured several letters of recommendation, determined the latitude, sketched a map of the territory which I intended to visit, inspected the saddles, water bags, arms, and provisions, and in general saw that nothing was lacking. But parting with the consul was indeed hard for me. He had received me hospitably when I was physically exhausted, cared for me tenderly day and night in the first critical stages of my sickness, fed me, assisted in the preparations for my next trip — and throughout behaved like a brother to me. May Allāh increase his prosperity!
CHAPTER X

BAGDAD TO AT-TARTĀR BY WAY OF MESČĪN

BAGDAD TO THE ḪĀN AL-MEŠĀHDE

May 1, 1915. We left the garden of al-Metwālījīje at 4.57 A.M. and proceeded along the horse tramway to al-Kāzīmēn. At 5.05 we had on our left the gendarmerie station Nuḥṭat al-Metwālījīje and at 5.15 reached the gardens of al-Kāzīmēn.\(^9\)

At 5.48 we passed the al-Kāzīmēn gendarmerie post and at 6.08 the railway station. At 6.40 we were in the fields of al-Ḥebne. West of the railway an old canal is still visible. At 7.20 in the fields of as-Sarrāḥa we passed three heaps of earthenware fragments, perhaps the remains of potters' kilns. From 8.25 to 9.00 o'clock our camels grazed east of the Tell Abu ʿAẓām. Then we turned west through the fields of al-Ḥamamijjāt towards a few huts by the Tigris called al-Bēzā. At ten o'clock we reached the Tigris and followed northward a high levee on its right bank which protects the fertile fields from being flooded. In the fields onions were thriving especially well. The palm groves hereabouts were all on the left

\(^9\) I hold that al-Kāzīmēn is identical with al-Ḥanāfēs of the Arabic authorities.

\[\text{Source}^8\text{ records, quoting Muḥāfēz (al-Tabāri, Tīrīḥ [De Geërc], Ser. 1, p. 2204), that al-Ḥanāfēs could be reached from al-Anbār in one night. Setting out from Ulejja, the Moslem leader al-Muṭṭanna came first to al-Ḥanāfēs: after that he marched on al-Anbār, where he asked for a guide, and then retraced his steps to al-Ḥanāfēs. Then about half way he inquired how far it might yet be to this town, and was told that it was four or five parasangs. He then despatched a scouting party in advance of the main troop, crossed the ford after it, and in the morning attacked the market-place of al-Ḥanāfēs. Next he encamped at the crest of as-Sajjāšt and at last reached al-Anbār. To al-Ḥanāfēs there went market (ibid., pp. 2202 ff.) people from the whole neighborhood as well as Arabs from the Rabē'a and Ḥūlā'a tribes.}

\[\text{Jākkāt, Muṣṣam (De Geër), Vol. 2, p. 473, and Abu-l-Fadālīllū, Maṣrādī (Juybhel), Vol. 1, p. 365, say that al-Ḥanāfēs is the name of an Arab country in Iraq near al-Anbār in the district of al-Barnāshīn. Abu-l-Fadālīllū adds only that al-Ḥanāfēs lay east of the Euphrates. —}

\[\text{Sejf's record makes it possible for us to define at least in some measure the location of the market of al-Ḥanāfēs. From al-Anbār (now pronounced am-Anbār) a road leads thither. Half the distance from al-Anbār to al-Ḥanāfēs amounts to four or five parasangs. The road follows the as-Sajjāšt canal, and before al-Ḥanāfēs is reached another canal must be crossed. The fact that markets were held there makes it likely that al-Ḥanāfēs was a stopping place of commercial caravans and that it was situated in the vicinity of the later town of Baghdad. According to the statements of Sejf and Jākkāt we may locate al-Ḥanāfēs in the district of al-Barnāshīn and identify it with the western part of the present settlement of al-Kāzīmēn, which is fifty-five kilometers (about ten parasangs) from al-Anbār. The canal which had to be crossed was that of al-Dūjgī, As-Sajjāšt is the modern Sahlīzīn, twenty kilometers west of the al-Kāzīmēn gardens on the direct road to al-Anbār.}

\[\text{Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Tafsīr (Dufrènery and Sanguiinetti), Vol. 2, p. 108, states that Mūsā al-Kārim, whose father was Gāfīr as-Ṣadeq, was buried on the right bank of the Tigris. Next to him lies the ninth ūmām, Muhammad al-Gawādī. A chamber was built above both graves, lined with wooden planks which were ornamented with silver.}
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bank; on the right bank a single mulberry tree was to be seen. At 11.08 we sighted on our right the hamlet of al-Mezorfa\footnote{The present al-Mezorfa is the old settlement of al-Mazrafa, which marked the northern boundary of the district of Kutrabbel. I locate the settlement of Kutrabbel in the ruins on the as-Sarraba fields, about twelve kilometers from the Bagdad bridge. It was called originally Béth Nikator by the Syrians and as early as the first half of the third century was the residence of a Christian bishop (Chronicle of Arbeo [Sachau’s transl.], p. 51). The settlement of Kutrabbel suffered much from Turkish mercenaries in the reign of the Caliph Ahmad al-Musta’in (682–686 A.D.) and finally succumbed (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 3, pp. 1556 f.). Abu-l-Fadhl al-Falde, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 229 f., writes that Kutrabbel or Kutrabbel was a settlement between Bagdad and al-Mazrafa west of the Tigris. From it the district of Kutrabbel, stretching above as-Sarraba and irrigated from the Duqaj canal, received its name. Al-Mazrafa he states (ibid., Vol. 5, p. 90) to be a large settlement on the road north of Bagdad not far from the Tigris. Hadji Talha, Chidin nuna (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 490, copying old records, says that the settlement of Kutrabbel between Bagdad and ‘Okbara’ is known for its Christian inhabitants and many churches.} and after a while on our left the ruin mound Tell Köş.

In the fields of as-Stéh, situated on higher ground, the fellûhîn were just cutting the wheat, which was almost entirely blackened by incessant rains. At 11.48 we sighted to the north-northwest the Tell Kerr\footnote{The Tell Kerr and the ruins in the vicinity are probably the remains of the old settlement of al-Baradân. Al-Sabûlî, Diyârît (Codex berolinensis), fol. 24r., says that there was a monastery at al-Baradân on the bank of the Tigris. All the way from Bagdad to al-Baradân extended gardens, with many pleasure grounds among them, such as Telî Sikr, al-Muhammadîyâ, al-Tulûnî as-Safir, al-Tulûnî al-Kebir, and al-Baradân. Jakhan, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 353, reports that the distance from Bagdad to al-Baradân was seven parasangs. Not far off lay Sarfûn. — In Jakhan’s time the locations of Sarfûn and al-Baradân were no longer known. The distance of seven parasangs must be wrong. Ibn Shamsîn, ‘Abûdîb (Le Strange), p. 9, records that the Tigris flows by the towns of Tekrit and Sâmarrâ, then by the settlements of al-Kâdesîyâ, al-Azma, al-Alâ, al-Hazira, as-Sawâmî, ‘Okbara, Awânâ, Buṣra, Basîrâ, al-Baradân, al-Mazrafa, Kutrabbel, and al-Samsâmî, and divides the town of Bagdad. Abu-l-Fedâa, Tâhisefî (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 54, states that the Tigris flows by the town of Tekrit, in long. 68° 25’ lat. 34’; after which it turns east to Sâmarrâ, in long. 69° lat. 24’; then south to ‘Okbara’ in long. 68° lat. 33’; next east to al-Baradân, in long. 69° 50’ lat. 32° 30’; and finally southeast to Bagdad.} and to the west-northwest the Tell az-Zwârîr.

Leaving the bank we set out northward along the old channel of the Tigris, called as-Šeîţa, and from 12.25 P. M. to 1.10 had our dinner on the western border of the fields of as-Šeîţa Ḥabîb. At 1.45 we had on our right the grave of as-Šeîţa Ḥabîb; at two o’clock our way led through the Tell al-Mufâhade ruins; and at 2.40 we dismounted in front of the gendarmerie station by the Ḥân al-Meşâhîde. The khân was deserted and in ruins. I planned to leave our supplies and tents in a room on the first floor of the gendarmerie station with Nâser to guard them and our five she-camels in a camp of the Meşâhîde near by, and then to set out for the river at-Ṭartar. When we had completed the examination of the regions along the lower course of that river, we were to return to the Ḥân al-Meşâhîde for our property and then all of us were to proceed to Syria along the left bank of the Euphrates. On our trip to at-Ṭartar...
we were to be accompanied by two gendarmes. As both were mounted, it would be necessary to buy barley for their horses; but there was none in the whole neighborhood. The reason, we heard, was that no barley was raised there now, because wherever a field was sown with it the Government confiscated the crop. Everybody there told us to go to as-Sumejče for it, as the soil in that neighborhood is drier and hence better suited to barley, which can always be bought there.

The vicinity of the Ḥān al-Meşāḥde was formerly irrigated from the Duğejl canal and belonged to the administrative district of Duğejl.73

THE ḤĀN AL-MEŞĀḤDE TO AS-SUMEJČE

On May 2, 1915, at 5.08 A.M. we left the Ḥān al-Meşāḥde on the road74 leading from Bagdad to Tekrit by way of as-Sumejče.

The region of Masʿūd, through which we were now passing, was largely cultivated. At 5.30 we had to the west-northwest

73 According to tradition preserved to us by Abu Zejd, Muṣābah was killed in 690–691 A.D. near the Duğejl canal close to the monastery of al-Ǧatūrīk (al-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīḫ [De Goeje], Ser. 2, p. 811).

Ibn Ḥordābēh, Masālik (De Goeje), p. 7, states that the Euphrates and Duğejl irrigate the districts of Firāz Sābūr, Maskan, Kaṭrabbul, and Bāḏūrāja. — That Ibn Ḥordābēh evidently confuses the canal of al-Duğejl, which issues from the Euphrates, with the Duğejl canal, which branches off the Tigris, is shown by the fact that the district of Maskan could not be irrigated from the Euphrates, whereas the other districts could not be irrigated from the Tigris.

In 896 ʿAbī ʿAbdūl Ṣāiʿ ibn ʿAbd al-Ṣāliḥ, the chamberlain of the Caliph Muʿtazz, put the detached Caliph Ahmad al-Mustanʿin into a boat and sailed with him on the Tigris from Sāmrār to the outlet of the Duğejl canal, where he tied a stone to his foot and threw him into the water (al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 3, pp. 1670 f.).

Ibn Ḥawkal, Masālik (De Goeje), p. 158, records that the Duğejl canal branches off from the Tigris near the town of Tekrit, irrigates some farms and estates of this town, and then flows into the fields belonging to the town of Sāmrār, making them suitable for cultivation; as far as Bagdad. Ibn Ḥawkal confuses the Ishā ᵐ canal with the Duğejl canal.

Jāḥiṣ, Muṣʿam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 555, says that Duğejl is a canal between Bagdad and Tekrit, below Sāmrār, opposite al-Kāṣeṣijī. It irrigates wide districts and numerous settlements, such as Awāna, Ḍokhara, al-Hazara, Sarfūn, etc., and empties into the Tigris. The settlement of Maskan, where Muṣābah was defeated and slain, is situated on this canal.

Abū-Ḥamāla, Muṣʿam (Juyndi), Vol. 1, p. 382 f., adds to this that the Duğejl canal flows into the Tigris at the settlement of at-Ṭabarījī. Above the site of Muṣābah’s grave a shrine was built to which pilgrimages are made. In the district of Duğejl, near the town of Awāna, was the Nāḥ canal (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 239). Not far from Ḍokhara ran the Žawar canal (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 217) past the settlement of Žawar. The Baṣtar canal flowed between the settlement of Ḥarbān and the town of Awāna (ibid., Vol. 3, p. 245).

Naṣṣ al-Halfa, Olḥa ᵐvaṣṣ (Constantinople, 1149 A.H.), p. 480, says that the settlement of Duğejl lay by the Harq canal (Duğejl) one or two hours from its inlet. Formerly it was a famous center of an administrative district, full of settlements inhabited by peasants. This district became desolate when the Duğejl canal was choked up. The political administrator of Bagdad, Muṣṭafā Pasha, in 1651 had the old canal cleaned to some extent and several villages resettled, but the water flowed in the canal in insufficient quantities. Consequently the inhabitants soon left again, and the cultivation of the land there ceased, since a thorough repairing of the canal would have cost too much.

74 From the Bagdad of earlier times two roads led north, one on the right and one on the left bank of the Tigris. We are interested only in the one on the right bank.

Kudama, Ḥarq (De Goeje), p. 214, records the following distances: from Bagdad to the station of al-Baradān, 4 parasangs; thence to Ḍokhara, 5 parasangs; thence to Bāḏūrāja, 3 parasangs; thence to al-Kāṣeṣijī, 7 parasangs. — Al-Baradān may be identical with the
the railroad station Maḳaṣṣ Maṣād and to the east the fields of al-Mellūḥ with the Tell Subbūḥ ruins; at 6.15 about three kilometers to the east lay the Tāse ruins, northeast of them the Tell al-Mdawwed, and east-northeast of the latter the Sāddet al-Mellūḥ dam. Next we traversed the Maṣābīr al-Murr plain. At 6.40, after crossing an old canal, we saw to the north of it many mounds formed by the an-Nādrijjāt ruins. At 6.48 we reached several caved-in wells and the brick-lined artificial pond of al-Bir. At 7.10 we crossed the canal of an-Nāṣrījeh, which comes from as-Sumejje. About four kilometers from us on the right the large pond of Ḥor at-Ṭārmijje was seen, with the gendarmerie station Nuḳṭat at-Ṭārmijje north of it. From 7.48 to 8.16 our camels pastured near the Kābr al-ʿAbed. At 8.25 we crossed the spur of the railway which branches off towards Abu Farraḡ and the Tigris and then rode along the southwestern side of the ridge of Ṣeff ʿAli. To the east appeared the Ṣakhir Bārūḏ, Razāl ruins and the gardens of al-Ḥzāra; to the northwest the Mekādime family of the Zobaʾ clan had their herd of camels grazing. At 9.12 we passed by

Tell Kār ruīns, 29 kilometers north of old Baghdad. The ʿOkbarra’ ruins lie 26 kilometers north of the Tell Kār on the left bank of the old Tigris channel. The station of Bāḥamās is to be sought somewhere near al-Seḥī Maṣūf. The settlement of al-Kādēsijje, inhabited to this day, is situated on the left bank of the present channel of the Tigris.

Al-Iṣḥārī, Māṣūlīk (De Goeje), p. 79, states that the distance from Bagdad to Sāmarrā’ is three days’ march in all, and from Sāmarrā’ to Ṭekrit one day’s march. — From Bagdad to Sāmarrā’ is 105 kilometers, from Sāmarrā’ to Tekrit 48 kilometers; the marches were, therefore, not of equal length.

Ibn Ḥawṣal, Māṣūlīk (De Goeje), p. 105, reckons three marches from Bagdad to Sāmarrā’ and two marches from Sāmarrā’ to Tekrit.

Al-Mukaddasī, Abuṣaf (De Goeje), pp. 134 f., counts from Bagdad to al-Baradān two barā Ṭ (mail stations); thence to ʿOkbarra’, one march; thence to Bāḥamās (noe), half a march; thence to al-Kādēsijje, one march. — From Bagdad to al-Baradān is actually about 20 kilometers, this being the distance between two main stations. Thence to ʿOkbarra’ is 26 kilometers, or one march; thence to Bāḥamās is about 14 kilometers, or half a march: and thence to al-Kādēsijje, about 37 kilometers, or one march.

Al-Iṣḥārī, Nuzhah, IV, 6, agrees with al-Mukaddasī. Furthermore, he preserves a fragment relating to a route from Bagdad to the valley of at-Ṭārīr, which route he says originates at the town of al-ʿAqib and thence runs nine days through the desert to ar-Raḳṣa. In the translation of al-Iṣḥārī by Jaubert, Vol. 2, pp. 146 f., we read that this road turned off from the Tigris at Tekrit. — If it were possible to reach ar-Raḳṣa by this route in nine marches, then the marches must be about 50 kilometers each. From Tekrit the road led directly west, passing the wells of Ab-al-Kūr, Benjejet al-Malāḥa, as-Senādān, at-Tawṣijjān, as-Sāǧīma, Umḥ Ṣedām, al-Ḥeṣaṣje, and al-Ḥuṣaṣirj. It crossed the river al-Ḥābūr at Tell al-Seḥ Hamed (Māṣūf) and at the settlement of al-Baṣāṣa reached the Euphrates, the left bank of which it continued to follow.

Ibn Baṭṭūta, Taḥfah (De Frémery and Sanguinetti), Vol. 2, pp. 132 f., traveled from Bagdad to a settlement by the Duṣēj canal, which flows out of the Tigris and irrigates many villages. After two days he came to the large and wealthy town of Ḥarba’ and from there, after another march, to the mansion of al-Maṣūf on the bank of the Tigris, at a short distance from which he encamped. His next halt for the night was in the town of Tekrit. After two marches more he reached the village of al-ʿAqīr on the Tigris. In the upper part of this place rose a hillock with a ruined ancient fort. Directly below stood the Ḥām al-Ḥādīd, fortified by towers. To the right that the road continued between villages and many inhabited farms as far as Mosul. The next station beyond Mosul was called al-Ḥaṣṣār, situated on the river; in its neighborhood were numerous bitumen springs. — The first night Ibn Baṭṭūta probably spent at the settlement of al-Baradān, which was 29 kilometers north of Bagdad and received its water by a branch of the Duṣēj canal. From there it was 52 kilometers to Harba’. The mansion of al-Maṣūf may be identified with the present al-ʿAšīb, 37 kilometers from Harba’ and 40 kilometers from Tekrit. The station of al-ʿAqīr, above which village after village with cultivated fields extend all the way to Mosul, is to be sought near Kaṣr al-Banāṭ.
the shrine of āš-Šeįh Ibrâhîm, built at the end of an extensive ruin. At 9.25 we had on our right a large old canal, behind it the shrine of Čeff ʿAli, and north of that again the Uwâne ruins; in front of us were some palm gardens and on the west the knoll of ʿAṭṭāf. At 10.05 we saw to the east the Bir as-Sfejrât and north of it, on the left bank of the old Tigris channel, the ruins and railroad station of ʿOkbara.74

A wind began to blow from the east-northeast. At 10.20 we had on our right the Tell Manşûr ruin. At eleven o’clock we halted in the ruins south of the settlement of as-Sumejê (Fig. 41), east of which there towers the débris of the ruined settlement of Mesîn.75 To the southeast lay the ruin mounds of Uwâne and Şrifin, northeast was ‘Okbara’ with gardens between us and it, and to the north clustered the huts of the settlement of as-Sumejê.

74 ʿOkbara’ and Uwâne were settlements known to the early Arabic writers.

King Şanor I (241—272 A.D.), a contemporary of the Emperor Valerian, built on the banks of the Tigris the town of Marw Ḥâbûr, which was later called ʿOkbara’ (‘Chronicle of Saint [Scher], p. 221).

At-Ţabarî, Taʾriḥ (De Goeje), Ser. 1, p. 839, note e, writes that the original name of this place was Buzûrj Sânûr (see Ibn Hovdâdheb, Maqālîk [De Goeje], p. 28).

In 433—434 Hâcîl ibn al-Walîd sent a troop of Moslems from ʿAjn at-Tamr against the camp of the Taṣlûb near some watering place and from there to the district of which the town of Tekrît was the center. Muhammad ibn Merwân relates that when this troop arrived at the town of ʿOkbara’ its inhabitants begged for peace. Then the Moslems went to al-Baradân, where peace was arranged, and after that to al-Myârârûm. Here they crossed a pontoon bridge at the Kaşr Sânûr, later called Kaşr ʿIsâ ibn ʿAli, where the Persian commander offered resistance. After defeating him, they returned without mishap to ʿAjn at-Tamr (al-Belâdori, Fûţûh [De Goeje], pp. 248f.).

According to this account the raiding party returned from ʿOkbara’ along the right bank of the Tigris by way of al-Baradân, or the present Tell Kêrî, to the Kaşr Sânûr, or the later ʿIsâ. As the latter stood on the very outskirts of Bagdad by a canal of the same name, we must look for al-Muḥârûm in the vicinity of the gardens of al-Metwallîjû. As the raiders passed over by a pontoon bridge at the Kaşr ʿIsâ, it is obvious that the al-Tâjên canal, later known as the ʿIsâ, must at that time have emptied into the Tigris near the point where Bagdad was subsequently to arise.

Ibn Hovdâdheb, Maqālîk (De Goeje), p. 59, counts nine sikâk (relays) from Śímarra’ to ʿOkbara’, from this place to Bagdad six sikâk. Elsewhere (ibid., p. 93) he says that from
BAGDAD TO AT-TARTÂR

The lands around the old Duğel canal belong to the Beni Tamîm tribe, which numbers about two hundred tents and is made up of the following clans:

- al-Bu Ḥašme
- al-Bu Ḥasan
- al-’Atâbbe
- aš-Šrejfâf
- al-Ṭâmer.

The settlement of as-Sumejâe is inhabited by both Sunnites and Shiites in about equal numbers, while the settlement of al-Balad is inhabited by Shiites alone. We found it very difficult to buy the barley we needed, and even then it was withered from drought and not much better than chaff. It was also very dear, because of the presence of the Kurdish volunteers (muğâhêđîn) who were returning home after the defeat of the Turks at al-Baṣra and all of whom were mounted and needed fodder for their horses.

AS-SUMEJÉE TO PLAIN OF AŠ-ŠNÂNÂT

Having found a guide, we left at two in the afternoon and, riding in a zigzag course in order to avoid meeting the volunteers, at three o’clock we reached the northern end of the gardens, northeast of which rises the Tell al-‘Abbâra, with the Tell aš-Sêfîjîe to the east of it, and to the east-southeast the Tell al-Ağejme. To the southwest we saw the Tell ad-Dwêr, beyond it the Tell Semâr, and far to the west the heights of Redajef. At 3.15 we rode through the al-Wakof ruin. At 3.50 we saw to the north the Tell ad-Dâbişjin and

Bagdad to al-Baradân is four parasangs; from there to 'Olkara' five parasangs. — These statements are not correct.

Al-Muḥammad Al-Period. Aṣ-Ṣaṣa (Be Gecje), p. 122. writes that 'Olkara' is a large, populous town, in the neighborhood of which vegetables and vines are cultivated with good results.

Abû-Ṭâ’lî, Mandjûf (Juynboll), Vol. 2, p. 370, records, quoting Jâkût, that 'Olkara' is a small town in the administrative district of Duğel ten parasangs from Bagdad; but he adds that the town of 'Olkara' lay on the east bank of the Tigris and says that when the Tigris dug a new channel for itself east from that place, the old channel was called aš-Sûtejâ. Awânâ' lies on the right bank of the old channel opposite 'Olkara', the inhabitants of which moved over to Awânâ' and other settlements. The region between aš-Sûtejâ and the new channel of the Tigris is known as al-Mustanâesch, because al-Imâm al-Mustanâesch had an irrigation canal dug there, branching off the Duğel canal.

Ibn al-Αfrî, Kândî (Tornberg), Vol. 4, p. 225. records that on his march from al-Kâfîa Muṣ‘âb encamped at Bâhâmarra' not far from Awânâ', which belonged to the political district of Maskan. The Caliph 'Abdallak marched against him by way of Kâljîsîa' and took up a position in Mâskan, three or perhaps only two parasangs from Muṣ‘âb's camp. In order to avoid the place where Ibn Hûbojra had fortified himself, Kâlṭabâ Ibn Şâbîb marched in July A. D. by way of Buṣûrj Sâbbîr (i. e. 'Olkara') and forced the Tigris over to Awânâ' (at-Ṭâbarî, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 2). In 865 the Turks had a skirmish at Awânâ' with the garrison of Kûråbulî (ibid., Ser. 3, pp. 1357 f.).


Al-Guwejî is a settlement between Bagdad and Awânâ', near al-Baradân (ibid., Vol. 2, p. 163).
at 4.02 close on our left the shrine of aš-Šejḥ Manšūr and north of it the al-Wzūn ruins. At 4.30 we reached the camp of the Ṣannām clan of the Ḥazrağ tribe, a tribe which engages in agriculture only. At 5.50 we camped in the Ḥazrağ camp near the sepulchral mound of aš-Šejḥ Ṣarīb, which is shaded by a palm tree. Here we found a new guide, who professed to know every inch of the region of at-Tartār. Although I did not put much trust in what he said, I at last hired him, as the Ḥazrağ said he was a Ṣammari. His name was Ḥamūdī eben Žāher eben Rbejeʾa. At night there was much lightning in several directions and a few heavy drops of rain fell. Mosquitoes of the ḫarāṣ and zrejž varieties also helped to make the night unpleasant.

On May 3, 1915, we left at 5.20 A.M. There was no wind. To the northwest were seen the Umm Ḥejme ruins, west-southwest those of Umm Žejbaʾa, and to the northeast the railway station of at-Ṭwēbeʾe. At 5.35 the Umm Žbejʾa (or Žejbaʾa) ruin was reached, past which flows the irrigation ditch Ḍamm Šerʾa which issues from the ad-Ḍuḡejl canal. The fields north of Umm Žbejʾa are called Abu Šenna and belong to the Ṣḥf family of the Muɣammaʾa clan, which owns the district as far as the ad-Ḍuḡejl canal.

The Muɣammaʾa clan consists of the following families:

- ar-Ṭāʾāt
- at-Ṭaʾème
- al-ʿAwāsāt
- al-ʿAdīje.

The land around the Eṣṭablāt ruins is the property of the Sawāmre, inhabitants of Sāmarrāʾ. At 5.45 we came to Ša-ḡarāt al-ʿAsal, a group of about twenty big trees supposed to have been planted by order of the Caliph Majmūn. Their blossoms are fairly large and lemon yellow in color. In the growth and shape of their leaves they resemble medlar trees. As our guide and the gendarmes both declared these trees to be sacred, for which reason cutting a stick or breaking off a branch from them is forbidden, I could not obtain even a twig with a few blossoms for my botanical collection. At 6.25 we crossed the old canal of Abu Daraḡ, which begins at the settlement of Ġisr Ḥarbaʿ to the north and ends at

17 Ibn al-Atir, Tāʾāʾī (De Slane), p. 202, states that in 1158 the troops of Prince Muḥammad, the son of the Sultan Mahmūd, joined the troops of the Atabeg Ṭuḥbaddūn, lord of Mosul, in the district of Ḥarbaʿ and then marched on Baḡdad.
Ibn Battūṭa (Fahāʾis [Delerméry and Sanguineti], Vol. 5, p. 123) on his journey from Baḡdad to Mosul came to a station on the Duḡejl canal which branches off from the Tigris and irrigates many settlements. After two days more he reached the large settlement of Ḥarbaʿ.
the swamps of al-Hūr north of ‘Aḵarkūf; to the north-northwest the sepulchral mound of Abu-l-Maḥāsen showed white.

At 6.40 the Tell al-Eḵēr’ā came into view to the south-southwest, with the ruins of Abu ʿAwseḡe close by and to the west-southwest the Tell Bejāz. The hour from 7.10 to 8.10 we spent drawing water from the shallow wells by the Saʿlwa ruins. At 8.50 we had on the southeast the Tell Bejāz ruins; they form a rectangular, table-shaped hillock about ten meters high and are situated on the western border of the alluvial plain. To the west rise the undulating uplands of Redājef intersected by broad, shallow valleys. At nine o’clock we crossed the old rampart of al-Farḥatijje, which stretches from north to south as far as the Hūr abu-l-ʿWejžile, close by the Tell Bejāz, and is over twenty meters wide and five meters high. To the south our guide pointed out to me the little well ʿAḵlat ad-Drejgeh and to the north the Fāḡ abu ʿAṣāfīr well. By 9.10 our camels were beginning to graze on the plants typical of the desert, which we were just entering. At 9.25 we had on the north the hillocks of al-Mṭabbāḵ, through which runs the defile Ṭenijjēt aš-Šṭēṭ; in the ṣeʿib adjoining this defile is a ṭadīr of the same name. Ahead of us lay the ʿAḵlat Naffāḥ and to the southwest the well of Abu ʿAẓām with that of al-Rardakijje to the west of it.

The region which we were now traversing resembles a great park. The undulating uplands are overgrown with various annuals and perennials, in the lowlands sidr groves alternate with luxuriant meadows, where thousands of  qaṭa’ (sand grouse) were nesting. Beneath almost every third bush these birds had dug in the ground a shallow pit which contained three little eggs not much larger than a hazelnut and of a greenish tint with brown spots. Nowhere was a bird sitting on the eggs; when we occasionally startled one it was always a female who happened to be laying just at that moment. We also sighted a few lizards (arwal) in the thick grass.

At 10.40 we had the ʿAḵlat Naffāḥ about one kilometer south of us and south-southwest of it the ʿAḵlat abu ʿAẓām. From 10.48 to 12.00 o’clock was our dinner time. At 1.40 P.M. we reached the ʿAḵlat abu Kowze, south of which lies in the midst of extensive and fertile fields. From there he arrived on the same day at a village built on the river Tigris near the castle of al-Maṭḥūḵ and after a prolonged march reached the town of Tekrit.

Abu-l-Feḵiš, Marqeh (Juynholi), Vol. 1, p. 285, asserts that Ḥarba is a small settlement in the upper part of the district of Dujehl between Bagdad and Tekrit. Coarse cotton fabrics made there are sold in the country far around.
the well of Abu Zhêr and north of it that of al-'Enêk. At 2.18 we crossed a high rampart (cáli or cálu), the same one which we had followed on May 10, 1912.78 At three o'clock a stiff wind began to blow from the west. At 3.04 our guide pointed out to me the 'Aklat abu Şerrâta about three kilometers south of us. At 3.20 we had on the right the Żélîb al-Abjâz, where four army deserters were trying to hide at that moment behind some sidr trees. When our gendarmes expressed a desire to arrest them, I put in my veto, reminding them that their duty was to protect me and not to hunt deserters; thus the poor fellows were saved for the moment. To the north we saw a hillock with the sepulchral mound of Abu Iğêra. West of the mound the district is called aš-Ŝnânât on account of the abundance of ŕnân growing there. At 4.44 we bivouacked near a Dlejmi camp, where we obtained a new guide. About four kilometers south of the camp was the water of al-Barâţ and six kilometers to the northeast the 'Aklat ummu Ŝnée.

PLAIN OF AŠ-ŜNÂNât TO UMM RAḤAL

On May 4, 1915, we set out at 4.40 A. M. in a westerly direction over the undulating pebbly plain of aš-Ŝnânât. At six o'clock we had on our right the well of al-Ḫadidi. Our way led over the upland of Maršab aṭ-Tjûr, which falls away to the south towards a valley containing the wells of al-Wêlêl, al-Ĉrajbe, and Lubbâd. Here and there rock salt and layers of gypsum were sighted. From 7.25 to 8.00 our camels grazed. At 8.40 to the north rose the flat-topped hillocks Kâ vista al-Ĉuzlânî, between which winds the še'îb of aš-Ŝadra. At 9.40 our guide showed us to the south-southeast the high, red tabular hill of al-Medarra, northeast of which lies the 'Aklat al-Kuṭbe. After 10.20 we saw to the southwest, west, and northwest the steep escarpment of ar-Rhejmi, which exposes reddish and yellowish strata. To avoid this, we turned northwest through the small še'îb of al-Ĉdjejde. From 11.25 to 1.00 we rested in the deep še'îb of al-Hbi, which is full of rich grasses. At 1.25 P. M. we came to rain pools in the še'îb of aš-Ŝadra where, farther north, are also the wells of al-Hammâš, aš-Ŝujûh, and al-Abtaḥ. At two o'clock we were in the še'îb of Abu Nîhala. At 2.20 we sighted to the north-northwest in

78 See above, p. 51.
the high Abu Nḥala bluffs the gully in which is the water of as-Sādde. At 2.54 we passed in the še'ib of Abu Nḥala the water of the same name and beheld to the west-northwest the hillocks of al-Ḥṣejbi, north of which rise the Wudijān of al-Ḥaṣabijjāt. At 3.10 we saw the western part of the valley of at-Tartār. It is a smooth, gray tract which slopes gently westward and is dissected by wide gullies and overlooked by flat-topped eminences.

Nearly due west there rose above the plateau surface some table-shaped hills, the Kārt al-Mu'assam, which lie on the watershed between the Euphrates and at-Tartār. Southeast of these the watershed follows the mesas of al-'Wēṣģi, an-Nwēkṭāt, al-Umehmāt, Kwērat 'Amar, and ar-Rhejmiyjāt. The most prominent of these is the Kwērat 'Amar, on top of which some remnants of a fortress are said to be standing. Northwest of the Kārt al-Mu'assam lies the well of al-Rzejjel, al-Mwēzībe, and al-Mrejzel; at the first terminates the še'ib of Abu Ta'je, which rises at the well of Abu Zwejje to the north; at the second, the še'ib of al-Mwēzībe, which extends from the well of Ummu Tḥūk. Southwest of al-Mrejzel is the well of Abu Șfēhā and south-southwest of it that of Abu Rummāne. East of Ummu Tḥūk at the well of Abu Trejčijje begins the še'ib of Abu Trejčijje, a branch of the še'ib of Abu Semāč which ends in at-Tartār. The upland of aṣ-Ștejiyjje, upon the eastern end of which lies the well 'Aklat ad-Dekūji, separates Abu Trejčijje from the še'ib of Ammu-t-Tḥūl. Farther south stretches the še'ib of Abu Šene, close to which lies the water Ḥlewijjet Marzūk. Still farther south is the še'ib of al-A'wağ, the largest branch of which descends from the Kārt al-Mu'assam, while two shorter ones come from al-'Wēṣģi and an-Nwēkṭāt. In the largest branch is the 'Aklat al-Merkede. On the watershed beyond the mesas of an-Nwēkṭāt lie the wells of as-Sultānijjāt, at-Twil, and Abu Șfej. To the left of at-Tartār and due east of Abu Trejčijje rises the spring 'Ain al-Arnāb, southward of which in order are the 'Ain al-Faras and the wells of al-Mumboṭah, al-Krejde, and Umm al-Ḥajāja, all connected with at-Tartār by short gullies.

At 4.15 we entered the še'ib of al-Ḥamār, at 5.35 crossed the road Darb umm al-Ḥajāja, and at six o'clock bivouacked by at-Tartār in the plain Fežat Farḥān where al-Bu Hazim of the Djejm tribe were then camping. We determined the latitude and looked around for a new guide.

The Djejm tribe camps along both banks of the Euphrates from al-Ḥeje wearing to al-Ambar. Of its clans I recorded the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Clan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu Maḥāl</td>
<td>al-Bu Saḵr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu 'Asāf</td>
<td>al-Maḥāmede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu Člēb</td>
<td>al-Maṣāḥa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu Ḥalīfa</td>
<td>al-Bu 'Obejdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu Dįjāb, families</td>
<td>al-Ḥardān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Malāhme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Ċmejla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bu Fakhād</td>
<td>al-Bu 'Isa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
al-Bu ِRannâm  al-Halâbse
al-‘Aleij ِZāsem  al-Bu ِHajjât
al-Bu ِNimr  Ġerajfe
al-Bu ِHazîm  al-Gfajfe
al-Bu ِ‘Alwân  al-Bu ِMarî.

On the right bank ‘Ali as-Sîmân al-Bekr of the al-Bu ِAsâf is the head chief. He owns much land in the vicinity of ar-Rumâdi.

On the left bank Ngîres eben Kâ‘ûd used to be the ruling chief, but after his imprisonment Ḥârdân al-‘Ojîte (or al-‘Ejîte) of al-Bu ِDîjîb was proclaimed head chief.

THE DEPRESSION OF UMM RAḤAL

May 5, 1915. At 4.45 A. M. we set out with both our new and old guides in a south-southeasterly direction. At 5.10 we halted in order to make a sketch map of the environs of the lower course of the river at-Ṭartâr, which traverses the broad lowland Fejzat Farhân. Towards this lowland on both the east and west sides numerous flat-topped mountains and hills—the eroded remnants of the plateau surface—present gentle slopes. At 5.20 we ascended an elevation to the east, whence we could overlook the whole elliptical depression into which at-Ṭartâr empties its waters. This depression emerged slowly from a veil of dense vapors and appeared amidst the green of luxuriant vegetation, enclosed by a precipitous, rose-tinged escarpment; gradually it changed into a vast elliptical plain, rising from the center toward the north and south and shut in by a second, but white, escarpment still higher than the first. A salina, called al-Meleh, or Umm Raḥal, lies on the floor of this depression at an altitude of 50 meters below sea level. Both escarpments and plain are intersected by numerous gullies which carry the run-off from the south and north into the depression. At seven o’clock we halted in order to sketch a map.

On examining our new guide with regard to the names of the various hills and valleys, I soon learned that his knowledge of them was insufficient. Therefore, discharging him at once, I sent one of the gendarmes with the old guide to the še’îb of al-Ǧdejde, where the al-Bu ʿObejd clan of the Dlejm tribe happened to be encamped, to fetch a guide. This clan dwells by the salt lake all the year round in order to extract salt from it. The old guide, a member of al-Bu ِDîjîb, who own the stony slopes of Redâjef bordering the alluvial plain between as-Saklāwijdje and ِSâmarra’, had told us about the different places east and northeast of the lake. He and the
gendarme did not return until ten o'clock, but they brought a
guide with them, who never contradicted himself and evidently
was entirely familiar with the whole surrounding country.

North of the Kwârât 'Amar and east of the Kûr al-Umehmât could
be seen the Salâbâ plain, which falls off in a terrace to the east and
from which the še'îbân of Ummu Diî, Abu Sbâ', and Abu Biîse, each
containing a well ('akla) of the same name, wind towards the lake of
al-Meleh. South of the Kwârât 'Amar lies the well of al-Fwâra, from
which the še'îb of al-Ḥnejzîr descends to the lake. East of ar-Râjeimijjât
are the wells of al-Ḥaffî, al-Mnezzel, and Abu 'Erzâje, and here also are
the heads of the še'îbân of al-Rurâba, al-Mezâbed, and Daşşet Nâffe.
Farther southeast the escarpment Târ al-Mezâbed was visible, below
which yawn the še'îbân of al-Hamar, an-Na'erî, Daşşet ar-Rdîni, and
Abu Ḥoss, the last ending at the south edge of the lake.

Having finished the outline of the sketch map, we de-
parted at 11.35, making our way along the banks of the lake.
At 12.25 P. M. we had on our right the water Bahât Şerab.
To our left, north of the lake, we observed a stratum of
reddish earth about twenty meters thick and interbedded with
thin horizontal streaks of salt, resting on a rocky foundation.
At 1.30 we crossed the še'îb of al-Ḫlîwât and at 2.15 rested
in the še'îb al-Ubejter by two low wells ('aklatên) among
luxuriant bushes of raza (Fig. 42), the leaves of which seemed
to be very much to the taste of our camels. Ascending the
nearest elevation, we sketched another map of the neighbor-
hood and in the evening determined the latitude. At night a
sand storm burst upon us from the west, and towards midnight
it rained for about half an hour.

On May 6, 1915, we were on the march at 5.09 A. M.,
proceeding through a level plain covered with a rosy sand
wet by the rain, from which grew huge raza bushes. The gray
coating of salt and sand on the needles of these bushes had
been washed off by the rain and they almost blinded us with
their fresh green. Above the plain rose isolated, reddish, dome-
shaped hillocks, not unlike the mausoleums in ancient cem-
eteries. The lake shone the purest blue, while the steep southern
escarpments were enveloped in a rosy veil. The air, purified
by the rain, permitted a very clear view.

At the north end the lake is shut in on the west by three
steep escarpments rising one beyond and above another. About
one-third of the distance along the lake the middle escarpment,
Salâba, ends, but about ten kilometers farther south it reap-
ppears to form the Târ al-Mezâbed. The third or highest es-
carpment also disappears to the south, whereas the lowest one rises in such a way that a high wall is formed at the southern end of the lake. On the east side there are three escarpments or terraces above the northern end of the lake, but south of the mesa of al-Medarra only two remain. The northwestern part of the plateau the edge of which forms the highest escarpment east of the lake is dissected into flat-topped hills. All the slopes overlooking the depression are composed of gypsum and rock salt and supply salt to the lake, where it is said that a layer of pure salt more than two meters thick has been deposited.

At 6.30 we saw on the left among some *rażo* bushes the wells ʿAkl al-Ḥelwāt. At 7.10 we crossed the first *ṣeʿāb* of al-Ǧerdānijjāt. At its east-southeast end two rocky spurs with low but almost perpendicular sides project into the lake from the south. The great number of footpaths leading to these indicate that they offer the most convenient spots for collecting salt. From 7.23 to 7.43 our camels grazed. In the fertile soil of the *ṣeʿāb* I found a stock of barley with twenty ears, each of seventy-five to eighty-four grains. At 9.16 we sighted to the south on a slope above the lake a rocky ridge consisting of vertical ribs. A wind now rose from the west-northwest. At 9.50 we crossed the *ṣeʿāb* of al-Mḥabbeš. The lake glittered like glass. At 10.20 we saw to the south-southwest the *ṣeʿāb* of an-Naʿerī running back up into the upland. At 11.15 we had the south edge of the salt deposits due west of us (Fig. 43), while to the east was the hill of ad-Dwër. At 11.40 we passed on our left the end of the *ṣeʿāb* of an-Nwēkīd, which unites with that of al-Ḵaṭṭāra. From 11.46 to 1.10 P. M. we rested. At 1.40 there was visible to the west-southwest of us the steep escarpment Tār al-Mezābed in which heads the *ṣeʿāb* of an-Naʿerī. On our right was the *ṣeʿāb* of Bohoz or, as our old guide called it, Abu Ḥoss.
At 2.20 we rode past the wells Bijár abu Ḥoss, which contain good fresh water. At 2.30 we reached the as-Siĉče road (siĉče means an easy and much used road) leading from the Euphrates to the small spurs which project into the lake and have been mentioned above as the easiest place for the collection of salt. The escarpments shutting in the lake of al-Melēḥ on the west, as seen from the place where we entered the as-Siĉče road, resemble a high ridge. At 3.10 we ascended to the surface of the plateau of ar-Raffī, out of which the depression containing the lake of al-Melēḥ has been eroded. The plateau is grayish white, overgrown in the lower parts with samʿ and covered with countless pebbles.

Leaving the salt road as-Siĉče we turned east, casting a last look on the lake, which glittered as if full of crystals. From 3.18 to 3.48 our camels grazed. At 4.25 we had south-southeast of us the Želīb Ṭarrāḥ in the center of a large meadow, and west of it the hills of at-Twēm. At 5.28 we headed toward the al-Bu Sakr camp of the Dlejm, which we had seen to the northeast. At 6.08 three whitewashed sepulchral mounds shone to the east-southeast, north of which lies the Bir at-Ṭrejfa'awi. At 6.35 we made camp but shortly after were surrounded by the Dlejm, who wanted to examine our saddles and even our baggage. For the gendarmes they had nothing but derisive laughter; they annoyed us in every possible manner and could not be dissuaded from doing so. Only when I declared that I would tell in every settlement on the left bank of the Euphrates how the Bu Sakr treat their tired guests did they leave, the old men first and the young people after them.
CHAPTER XI

AT-TARTĀR TO AL-ḤĀBŪR ALONG THE EUPHRATES

UMM RAḤAL TO THE ḤĀN AL-MEŠĀHDE

On May 7, 1915, at 4.56 A. M. we set out in an easterly direction. At 5.05 we had the well of at-Ṭrejfāwi on our right. At six o'clock the wells of al-Ḡziwi, Ḥlejž ad-Dīb, and al-Ḡardaḵijjje were north of us, and at 6.53 we crossed an ancient rampart close to the Bīr Ḥenfsān. At 7.13 we passed across some footpaths leading north to the shallow well Ḥlejž ad-Dīb. To the south the heights of ‘Akkāz were pointed out to us by our guide; north of them are the wells of al-Eḥṣēfāt and to the south the wells of ‘Alīt al-Banāt and Šāb. From 7.40 to 8.07 our camels grazed. At 8.20 the well of al-Ḥṣēnī lay to the south of us. At 9.47 we recrossed the large, ancient rampart (Ḡalw or Ḡali) which we had crossed farther north four days before⁷⁶ and which was here about three meters high and twenty-four meters wide. To the northeast this rampart turns towards the Bejāz ruins and then runs north to the Tigris. Formerly it divided the cultivated territory from the desert. Apparently it was once strengthened by semicircular bastions, as there were bulging projections on both sides. The guide showed us to the northeast, west of the Ḡalw, the wells of Bakr, as-Sab’a, and north of the latter the Bīr al-Ḡardaḵijjje. At 10.20 the Bīr al-Ḵṣejbe was south of us, northwest of it the well of al-Hnēfre, and northeast of the latter the Bīr ar-Raṣrāši. At 11.20 we rode over a branch of the ancient rampart stretching from north-northwest to south-southeast. Much Ḡarfeḡ grew in this particular locality. From 11.38 to 1.55 P. M. we rested by the well of as-Ṣbaḥi. At 2.15 we had to the southeast the ‘Ajn al-Bakara, to the north the water of an-Nḥeje, and before us that of al-Fażijjje. At 2.20 we crossed the Darb al-Ṛṣaž, which leads from Bagdad through the valley of at-Tartār to the former town of al-Ḥaẓr. At 3.40 the well of al-Mὲrān was to the north-northeast of us, with that of al-Werrān to the north of it and farther northeast the well of Šennā’a; at 3.50 the Bīr al-Fażijjje was on our left.

⁷⁶ See above, p. 142.
From 3.55 to 4:15 our camels pastured on the western border of a large vale called ‘Ebb abu Towb where palm trees might well be planted. Turning to the southeast at five o’clock, twenty minutes later we saw to the south-southwest at the end of the vale the large al-Ḥamra ruins. At 5.25 we crossed a wide, ancient canal running from north to south. At six o’clock we sighted at a distance of about two and a half kilometers to the east the extensive ad-Dejr ruins, which form a huge rectangle and to the north of which rises a small hillock. North-northwest of ad-Dejr appeared the al-Mṣarrahāt ruins and to the east those of al-Ḥaṭawijjāt. At 6.22 we bivouacked for the night alongside a camp of the Beni Zejd and al-Ǧmejla, both of whom are descended from the Ḥaṭān but have joined the al-Bu Sākr clan of the Djejm.

May 8, 1915. We set off at 4.47 A. M. to the southeast. On the left we could see the white grave of Šlāš eben Ġarba’, once chief of the Šammar who camp in Mesopotamia. At 5.10 we sighted to the south the glitter of the decorated shrine Banāt al-Ḥasan, to the southeast the Sab’at Eṣen (or Seven Ruin Mounds), and beyond the latter the rectangular az-Zab’a ruins. At 6.45 the Sab’at Eṣen were to the southwest and the large ruin mound of Mas‘ūd almost to the north of us. We crossed an old canal at 7.35 and again at 7.45, and at 7.58 the road Darb al-Kelek, which runs from al-Kāzimēn to as-Sumejē. During the rainy period this road is not used, but, rather, the highroad leading past the Ḥān al-Meṣāhde. From 8.18 to 8.46 our camels grazed, and at 9.44 we reached the Ḥān al-Meṣāhde, outside of which we encamped. Here we found Nāṣer and the tents, supplies, and camels which we had left on May 2. During the day we completed our cartographical notes and in the evening we determined the latitude.

THE ḤĀN AL-MEṢĀHDE TO AL-WAṢṢĀŠ

On May 9, 1915, we set off at 4.45 A. M., passing in a southwesterly direction through the al-Ḥrejbe ruin. On our left we had the Hūr Bākū’a. At 5.20 we rode through the al-Ehmedi ruins; at 5.45 we crossed an old canal and at 5.51 the road Darb al-Kelek. At 6.30 the large az-Zab’a ruins were south-southeast of us. At 6.45 we turned in a south-southwesterly direction. At 6.55 the at-Tākijje ruin, resembling a high cap, was seen to the southeast and below it the az-Zwārīr
ruin. At 7.10 we reached the as-Stēh ruins, and from 7.18 to 7.41 our camels pastured. Then we turned southwest in order to obtain a guide in a camp of the Beni Tamīm which lay in that direction. In front of each of the Beni Tamīm tents lay a heap of white gypsum. On our left we had the Ṙādir al-Ḥṣān with the Hōr abu-l-Wejżīle beyond it. At 8.30 the Tell al-Ḵarʿa appeared to the north. At 8.45 the ruin mounds of as-Sumr were north, the dome of the shrine of Banāt al-Ḥasan southwest, and the Tell ʿRaʾrīb northwest of us. We were now traversing a fertile alluvial plain, to all appearances well suited for the cultivation of cotton. At 9.25 we passed through the camp of the Lhēb clan of the Zobejd tribe. Here we had to turn west-northwest in order to circumvent the Hōr al-Ḥamra, from which a stiff west wind was driving the water as much as five hundred meters eastward over the level plain. At 10.15 the islet of al-Maḡaṣṣa was sighted to the south-southwest. This islet consists of a rather low, white hillock, which slopes most steeply towards the west and northwest; here the Beni Tamīm dig gypsum, which they sell at al-Kāzīmīn and Bagdad. To the southwest the Tell abu Rwejs appeared above the horizon.

The Zobejd tribe belongs to the Beni Tamīm; of its clans I noted down the following:

al-Baṭṭa, between Ḥān abu Ṭanṭūr and Bagdad north of the highroad;
Ḳararāl, by the left bank of the al-Lāṭifijje canal;
al-Ǧannābījjīn, on both banks of the Euphrates between Abu-l-Fejjāz and ar-RwēḤijje;
al-Bu Sīṭīe, camp with the Zōba;
al-Bu ʿAṣk, between al-Mṭabbāḵ and ʿAḵarḵūf;
al-Lhēb, by the Nīṣān al-Kassāwi.

From 11.20 to 12.50 P. M. we rested at a high rampart which stretches from the south-southeast to the north-northwest, east of the old frontier fort of Abu Rwejs. At its base this rampart is about forty-five meters wide. At 1.10 we rode through the shallow ṣevaib of at-Trēṭer, coming from an upland of the same name. To the southwest we beheld the Bīr abu Ṭoḳ, which lies almost due west of the large al-Mekjējjed ruins. To the east appeared a wide canal running from the south. At 1.25 the isolated hill of Abu Čalb came into view to the north-northwest; beneath it is the well of the same name and beyond to the northwest the well of al-Kejfijjāṭ.
The first halt we made after 2.15 was at the Tell al-Mœjjied, formerly a town enclosed by an elliptical wall. At 2.38 we turned southward along the rampart to the Lhëb camp, where we wished to buy barley for our gendarmes’ mares. From 3.08 to 3.34 our camels grazed by the well of Gaffâl; in the meantime, standing on another rampart which was here more than seventy-five meters broad and extended to the south-southeast, we sketched a map of the neighborhood. To the east was visible at one side of the shrine of Banât al-Hasan the smaller white shrine of Makân al-Mahdi; to the east-northeast the sepulchral mound of Kabr ‘Abdallâh; to the south the sepulchral mounds of al-Aḥajjên and an-Nimráwi and beyond them the ruin mounds of at-Tejbe, al-‘Akla, Bijâž, al-Mkajjer, and al-Ašhâbî. At the last-named ruin there flows out of the canal of al-Karma a branch called ad-Dwâje towards the Banât al-Hasan. Between the main canal and its branch lie the al-Mkajjer and al-‘Akla ruins. At 5.15 we encamped at the wells of al-Kassâwî.

On May 10, 1915, at 4.43 A.M. we continued on our journey through an undulating plain which slopes gradually to the southwest. At five o’clock we saw to the southwest the Tell umm al-‘Ašûš and beyond it the Tell Ğesem; to the southeast, to the left of the Išân al-Mhejdi ruins and northeast of the Išân ar-Rhejle, lay the sepulchral mound of Sajjedna Ibrâhîm and to the east the sepulchral mound of Kabr Mhanne. To the north, northwest, and northeast the horizon was shut in by rocky uplands, where the layers of rock salt were seen glistening. In the valleys sidr was growing plentifully. At 5.30 on our right were the Tell umm al-‘Ašûš ruins and at 5.48, on the left, the Tell Ğesem. Then we turned west and rode across an ancient canal, which once brought water from “al-Hûr” — as our guide, Ğasem eben ‘Ali of the Lhëb, chose to pronounce it, instead of “al-Hûr,” as it is pronounced by the tribes on the right bank of the Euphrates. At 6.08 on the right were the Bijâr umm al-‘Ažâriţ and on the left the district of al-Hšéwât, owned by the Ğmejla clan. At 6.45 the Tell al-Ašhâbî appeared to the south, south of al-Karma, the canal which branches off from the Euphrates at the settlement of as-Sa-kâwîije and connects with the Tigris. A canal through which water runs continually is a “live” canal and is called kurne, while a dry or “dead” canal is spoken of as rasm and, if surrounded by large heaps of earth, as ḥejţ (pl. ḥjûţ). West-northwest
was seen another huge ancient rampart (čālw). After seven o'clock we were riding through the valley of al-Ĥūr. From 7.18 to 7.46 our camels grazed by the extensive Abu Şhêr ruins. At 8.25 we were among the al-Ĥannâzi ruins. To the south the south bank of the al-Karma canal showed blue. At 9.20 we saw to the south on the right bank of al-Karma the two ruin mounds of ad-Dijâbîjîât, to the southwest the large ruins of al-Ambâr, and near them the old canal of Abu Sdêre with the hill of al-Kûh.

From 10.15 to 11.30 we dined by the shallow wells of al-Klajjebât, the property of the Maḥânde clan of the Dlejm. We sketched a map of the surrounding country from the top of a height, below which there are some deep little wells. The al-Ambâr ruins and the palms of the settlement of as-Sâkîâwije, the latter lying on the left banks both of the Euphrates and of al-Karma, could be plainly seen from the height. There are about 250 houses in the settlement. The slopes to the north of us called aš-Ŝnâne and ‘Akkâz become steeper and the še’îbàn deeper the farther north one goes. At 12.35 P. M., after passing through the plain of al-Ĥariţi, we reached the aš-Şfêra ruins, which owe their name to šfêra, an annual plant growing throughout the undulating and pebbly country in the vicinity. Between the mound of al-Kûh and the ruins of al-Ambâr we sighted the minaret of the settlement of al-Fellûģe. In the extensive al-Ambâr ruins the sanctuaries of Abu Fejjâţ, aš-Şeţî ‘Abdallâh, and the Mesţged ‘Ali are still well preserved.\(^{39}\)

At 1.35 we observed on our right the end of a čâli or čâlw and beyond it the hillocks of al-]\(\text{Ror}\); on the left we could see gardens and houses along the Euphrates. We also met two deserters, who took to their heels on catching sight of our gendarmes.

On the right bank of the Euphrates not far from the flood plain, rises a steep line of bluffs, the eastern part of which is called Sened Ḏubbân and the western al-Mû‘ajjed, aš-Şeţî Mas’ûd, and Abu Fahad, the last stretching as far as ar-Rumâdis. Two rifts appear in the bluffs. Above the eastern one stands a rather low cone and above the western a cone which slopes most steeply to the north. From 2.08 to 2.45 we sketched a map of the vicinity. At 3.20 on the left appeared an embankment of rock about four meters high, through which

\(^{39}\) See below, Appendix XVIII.
water from the Euphrates flows by three holes into the branch called al-Waṣṣāš (Fig. 44). On the rocky space above the cataract thus formed two fishermen were spearing fish with a four-pronged fork (fâle) (Fig. 45). The flooded plain west of the falls is called al-Mrâjir.

AL-WAṢṢÂŞ TO AS-ŠBÈB

The al-Waṣṣâš branch connects the Euphrates with the al-Karma canal, which itself branches off from the Euphrates at as-Saklâwijje. Between this settlement and al-Waṣṣâš are the hamlets and fields of Šellâl, al-Hwêwa, the al-Ḥôz ruins, the hamlets of as-Serijje, al-Keń‘ânijje, al-Keń‘ânijje, az-Zwîjje, and Rârrâz, and the Abu-l-Fréwâ ruins.

At 4.08 we had on our right the Ṭâdir al-Wâhâle and at 4.30 on our right the al-Ḥarîzijje ruins and on the left those of Abu-l-Fréwâ. These are all situated on a spit of land accessible from the southeast from the flood plain, which is frequently inundated. At five o’clock we noticed to the west the group of Išân Mâhûz ruins; the fields of al-‘Obejديدie lie west of these, and those of Rârrâz to the southeast. On our right opened the wide valley of ‘Ebdân with small ruins at its northeast-northwest end.

The Euphrates along this part of its course flows through an alluvial plain and divides into several branches,81 of which al-Waṣṣâš, which leaves the main stream at al-‘Obejديدie is one.

81 Kâddâm, Ṭâdir (De Goeje), p. 332, says that the Euphrates touches the settlements of Bâlîs, ar-Râqîb, Ṭâdir, and ar-Râchba, encircles the islands of Ānâ, and reaches the settlements of Hit and al-Abîbâr, where it splits into two branches. The first branch, the ‘Alâqim, flows slightly west of south to the town of al-Kûfâ, whereas the second, the Sûrâ, keeps a straight course and flows past the towns of Sûrâ and an-Nîl through various cultivated districts. Below al-Abîbâr the ad-Dâğič canal separates from this branch, and from the ad-Dâğič, in turn, the ‘Iša canal issues.

Ibn Shârub, ‘Alâqim (Le Strange), p. 10, writes that the Euphrates flows by Bâlîs, ar-Râqîb, al-Mâhûz, the outlet of the Sa‘îd canal, Ṭâdir, ar-Râchba, and ad-Dâlijja, forces its way through the rocks of the ridge of al-Keń‘ānijje, flows around the island town of Ānâ, and reaches also al-Ahim, Nâ‘îâs, Hit, al-Abîbâr, to which a pontoon bridge leads, and finally of al-Kûfâ.

Al-Muḥammadî, Aḥsan (De Goeje), p. 128, refers to Ṭâhir ibn Ɋowk, Ṭâdir, ‘Ānâ, ad-Dâlijja, and al-Ḥarîzijje as the most important towns on the Euphrates.

Al-Iṣrîl, Nasbar, IV, 5 (Jaubert’s transl., Vol. 2, pp. 107 ff.), says that the towns of ar-Râfîa and ar-Râqîb are to the left of the Euphrates, al-Muḥammadî as to the right. The Euphrates flows past al-Occûb and Ṭâdir, where it reaches the river al-Ḥûbâr; then by Ṭâhir ibn Mâlik, ad-Dâlijja, ‘Ānâ, Hit, and al-Abîbâr. Here the ‘Iša canal branches off and runs towards Bağdâd. Beyond this point (the head of the ‘Iša canal) the Euphrates flows from ar-Râqîb through the desert, four branches issuing from it on the way: the first in the direction of Sarşar, the second to al-Keşr, the third to Sûrâ, and the fourth to al-Kûfâ. —

The inscription of ar-Râchba here after al-Abîbâ is wrong. The second branch should have been given as the Nahr al-Mâlik, since the canal which passes al-Keşr (Keşr ibn Hu-behî) was identical with the Sûrâ canal.

Ad-Dimîshki, Nasbar (Mehren), p. 93, states that the Euphrates touches the settlements of Bâlîs, ar-Râqîb, ar-Râchba, al-‘IŠa, al-Ḥarîzijje, encircles the islands of Ānâ, and reaches the settlements of Hit and al-Abîbâr, where it divides into two branches. The branch called
At 5.35 two low natural cones, at-Twêm, came into view to the north-northwest. At 5.55 we crossed the wide valley 'Ebb Háter, which comes from the well of Tarrâh. At 6.10 we saw before us a rampart (čālī) ending at the fort of Ummu-r-

Rūs, which lies on a rise in the fertile Euphrates flood plain. The fort consists of a few low heaps of old brickwork together with the main part of the stronghold itself, which is rectan-

al-'Alğam flows in the more southerly direction to the districts of Sūra', Kaşr Ibn Hubejrə, and al-Ḥilla, and to the swamps of al-Baţiha. The name of the second branch is 'Isa,—

The article before 'Ana is very strange. It is possible, however, that this 'Ana arose from another name, as it appears again in the form of 'Anāt (though, of course, in a wrong place). The description of the Euphrates canals is altogether incorrect. The canal of al-'Alğami (not al-'Alğam) was at one time connected with the branch running past al-Kūfa (al-Ḥira). The canal by Kaşr Ibn Hubejrə, Sūra', and al-Ḥilla, on the other hand, received its water from the main channel of the Euphrates, which flowed from al-Anbār in a southeasterly direction. Abu-l-Foda', Tağrīm (Reinaud and De Slaëe), p. 51, records that the Euphrates flows eastwards past Bālis, Kašfat Ga'bar, ar-Rağba, ar-Raḥba, 'Ana, Hit, and al-Kūfa.
gular in shape with walls strengthened by semicircular towers. On its west side the gate was still visible. From afar the fort resembled a Roman camp. It was impossible to come close to it, as water surrounded it on all sides. We bivouacked for the

![Fisherman with fâle at al-Wassâš.](image)

night at 6.47 in the fields of al-'Obejdijje near a camp of the Dlejm, who were busy cutting corn. The air was full of big mosquitoes (bakk), the pest of the Babylonian alluvial soil on which we were camping. Intersected as it is by innumerable old and new canals, ponds and swamps of varying dimensions are formed on this ground and make ideal places for mosquitoes to breed in.

On May 11, 1915, at five o'clock we proceeded along the al-Kejфijje road with a fisherman named Ğamil for a guide.
At 5.40 A. M. having left the flood plain, we crossed the 'Ebb abu 'Arejğ. 'Ebb means an inlet or bay and also a valley without a channel. From the 'Ebb abu 'Arejğ, which comes from the well of 'Awağ, a footpath leads through a tract of land known as al-'Asîl to the water of at-Twêm, situated at the head of the še'îb of Bohoz, which runs down to the lake in the depression of Umm Rahal. At 5.50 to the southwest the white shrine of al-Mâhed showed above a steep bluff on the right bank of the river, and west of it the palms of al-Ĝweib were visible. At 6.08 we crossed the 'Ebb Helli, in which lies the well of Abu Kbère. To the west were seen the ruins and farm of Şebât Mhammad al-'Ejte, west of it large ruins with a sepulchral mound, Kafr Farağ, northwest of this a few small houses, and above them the extensive rectangular Isân abu Ḥalib ruins. At 6.40 ar-Rumâdi was sighted to the southwest between two groves of Babylonian poplars (ruřâb); to the west-southwest we saw the white dome of the burial mound of aš-Şejî Ḥaddî, with the burial mound of aš-Şejî Muḥammad to its right. Rocky spurs of the northern bluffs here reach almost to the Euphrates. At 6.42 we were on the alluvial plain, here about five kilometers wide. West of ar-Rumâdi the flood plain is bordered by a gentle slope rising gradually towards the northwest. At 7.08 we reached the northern edge of the plain of al-Elêmijje, which begins at Kafr Farağ and extends as far as aš-Şejî Ḥaddî. At 7.18 the large rectangular Isân abu Ğrîjî ruins appeared to the west. From 7.32 to 8.01 our camels grazed south-southwest of Abu Kbère. At 8.20 we had on our left the Isân abu Ğrîjî and also the inlet of the ditch of Şadr 'Azzâr which irrigates the flood plain. At 8.30 we crossed a secondary channel of the še'îb of al-Ḥadd. Our guide Ġamil related that he once shot a wild ass, called razâlî, near the well of al-Ḥlêwât at the head of al-Ḥadd, but that the animal, being only wounded, kept on running. A stranger, who chanced to be passing by mounted on a mare, overtook and killed it. Ġamil took the hide; the flesh they divided equally.

It could be observed that the line of precipitous rock bluffs on the right-hand side of the Euphrates, bordering the flood plain, grows gradually lower from northwest to southeast. The flood plain here forms a tract about ten kilometers wide, the center of which lies almost due south from aš-Şejî Ḥaddî.
Farther south the bluffs again slowly rise until they form the high escarpment which stands east of ar-Rumādī.

From 8.56 to 9.14 our camels were in pasture, while we negotiated with a new guide. At 9.42 we crossed the main channel of al-Ḥadd at the right of the Abu Sfējne ruins. The ʿšeʿib of al-Ḥadd comes from the northwest, beginning in the tabular hills of ar-Rhejmijjāt northeast of Hīt. In the channel are the small wells of al-Ḥlēwāt, al-Kalb, and Abu Dkēr. From 10.35 we rode along the foot of the bluffs of Ḥazm aṣ-Ṣārī, which border the fields of Abu Sfējne and al-ʿUmēleḥ forming the southern edge of the undulating plateau of Below, which extends as far as al-Ḥadd. At 10.50, about two hundred meters to our left we had the Kawwašte ruins. At eleven o’clock we were almost on the banks of the Euphrates. To the right rose the red terrace of Ḥazm aṣ-Ṣārī. In the Euphrates the islet of Abu Rīše was visible. At twelve o’clock we had on the left the fields of Mōḥ Farhān and on the right the fields of Ḵbūr Žāṣem. From 12.14 P. M. to 1.32 we rested. At two o’clock we were in the ʿšeʿib of Nabar below some small ruins on its right bank. At 2.32 we crossed the ʿšeʿib of aẓ-Zbāʿī. To our left was a field about thirty meters wide and farther northwest a salt marsh (sabhā). At this point on the left bank of the Euphrates close to the water there was a low dike. A few groups of poplars and one palm grew near by, and many huts were scattered among the trees. In the rocky bluff overlooking the flood plain on the north we noticed much rock salt and gypsum.

At three o’clock we reached a strong naphtha spring called an-Naffāta. The naphtha bubbles out in a fountain about two meters deep and four meters wide. The naphtha obtained here is stored in a poor hut standing by the spring. West of this the northern upland sends forth a black, rocky projection which compels the great river to make a bend of about five kilometers to the south, thus forming a peninsula. At 3.40 we saw on the left a deep ancient ditch bordering on the north the aṣ-Ṣnejdīz ruins, the southern half of which have been carried away by the Euphrates. In front of these ruins is an islet overgrown with poplars. At four o’clock we crossed the ʿšeʿib of at-Ṭmād. On the black, rocky peninsula before us appeared the Tell al-Aswad, a mighty, ruined fortress. At 4.40 we stood beneath its walls. The fortress is enclosed on the
east and north by deep moats which resemble ancient irrigation canals. Of buildings there is not much left, as the greater part has been washed away by the Euphrates and whatever remained has been dug over and then covered with a thick layer of sand. At 4.45 we descended to the Euphrates into the level plain of az-Zwejje, which is bordered on the north by steep, rocky bluffs, topped by the shrine Banât al-Muḥallabât. Close by stands a half-demolished stronghold. In the fields of aš-Sbēb, then sown with wheat and barley, we encamped at 6.08.

**Aš-Sbēb to al-Mhabūbijje**

On May 12, 1915, we left, accompanied by a guide named Māne' eben  Şaḥaw. First we traversed the plain of aš-Sbēb, which is bordered on the west by a rocky spur that projects from the bluffs toward the river and is known as ‘Onḳ al-Hawa'. In this spur is the cave Čhaft al-Bhēs. Between the crags of Čhaft al-Bhēs on the left and those of al-Okoba on the right, the valley of the Euphrates is very narrow, and the roads on both banks of necessity lead through defiles. At 5.53 we saw to the south-southwest on the right bank the Išān al-Haľba ruins. After 5.40 we rode along the northern edge of the fields of al-Čbēl. The dark, conical hill of Ḥit, covered with gaily colored little houses, now came into view before us and could be seen more clearly as we advanced. At intervals, however, it was enveloped by clouds of black smoke, arising from the bitumen furnaces on its southeastern base. At 6.50 we had on the right the small še'iḥ of Ḥeshēs, at the lower end of which lie the Čellā' Zeben ruins and at the head of which is the well of al-Ma’aṭše. To the northwest the steep slope of Tābaḥje came into view. From 7.08 to 7.34 we breakfasted in the še'iḥ of aš-Śwēb by the side of the al-Marbat ruin.

The cultivated fields on both sides of the Euphrates are irrigated for the most part. The water is raised by large flush wheels fastened to stone pillars, which very often reach far into the river. These stone structures have names of their own, and the fields around are called after them. Here and there stand mud huts, either solitary or in groups, which have no names at all but are designated by the water hoists next to them, even if these are already broken and out of
use. Since 1912 the number of the huts has noticeably increased, and in several places whole hamlets have been built; the latter, as a rule, are each the property of one family, from which they also receive their names.

Fig. 46—Defile along the Euphrates, al-Mažîž.

At 7.53 we came near the Euphrates proper. To our left, on the right bank of the river, we saw the hamlet of Bannân. The rocky cliffs which border the valley of the Euphrates on the north gradually approach the water at this point, finally leaving along the river a rocky strip called al-Mažîž (Fig. 46) no more than three meters wide. On this we rode from 8.00 to 8.04. Before us were the black palm groves of al-Mağnûne, Derestânîjje, al-Bakk, and at-Țurba, and on the right bank the farm of al-Ḥammâdi. The word for farm here is not ḫaṣr
but šeriče, the term also applied to a group of huts. At 8.22 we crossed the first of the še'ibān of al-Ma'edijāt. At 8.43 we reached the high hills of Tābahje, where bitumen (ziir) and sulphur (kibrīt) bubble out. At 8.48 on our left was the hamlet of al-Mağnūnīe and on the right bank the dome of as-Sajjed Ahmad. At 8.58 we passed through the še'ib of al-'Idi, on the left bank of which is the vigorous spring 'Ajin al-Żir. This valley heads south of the table-shaped hills Kūr al-Umehmāt and Kwērāt 'Amar, which rise above the plateau about midway between the Euphrates and at-Ṭartār. South of the Kwērāt 'Amar is the well of al-Fwārā, west of which lies the well of al-Ḥajj and south of the latter the wells of al-Kmejžem and ar-Rhejmijjāt, all of which are in the al-İdi valley. About the middle of its course on the right, east of the Ḫāṭr al-Ḥelme, this še'ib is joined by the še'ib of Abal-Ḫrūs; in its lower part lie the al-Esē'el ruins.

The hamlet of al-Bakk is enclosed by palm trees.82

At 9.05 we had the town of Hit on our left. The houses there are grouped together on the terraces of a huge conical hill. About the middle of the town rises the minaret of an ancient mosque. There is an old Jewish colony in Hit. On the left bank of the Euphrates opposite the town stands the shrine of 'Ali al-Hiti, with the palm garden of at-Ṭurba adjoining. At 9.40 we saw on our right the as-Ṣadke ru, in front of which an old canal issues from the Euphrates and brings water to irrigate the fields along the left bank. On this bank also lies the hamlet of an-Natēf and beyond it that of al-Ḥesnijje, where we rested from 10.00 to 11.54. Both the wheat

82 Al-Ja'ḥi, Ta'riḥ (Houtsmen), Vol. 1, p. 237, knew of the administrative district of Baṛka on the bank of the Euphrates near al-Anbār. Its ruler was a woman, as-Zabbā'.

At-Ṭahārī, Ta'riḥ (De Goeye), Ser. 1, pp. 715ff., records that the kings of al-Hira resided at times in the settlement of al-Baṛka, King Gudeimat al-Abrār marched from there by way of al-Furqā on the Euphrates to Zelebiyeh, the residence of the beautiful and crafty Queen as-Zabbā'.

Ibn as-Sikkiṭi relates (Abu-l-Faraq, Adasi (Bolik), Vol. 8, p. 70) that the poet Imruklās sought shelter with one of his relatives on the Euphrates. That relative was 'Amr Ibn al-Mundīr, who in the name of his father administered the several territories along the Euphrates and lived in the settlement of Baṛka, situated between al-Anbār and Hit, 'Amr, whose mother belonged to the poet's family, received him, but when al-Mundīr heard of this the poet had to flee (Imruklās, Diez (De Sleave), p. 12).

Al-Mas'udi, Ta'riḥ (De Goeje), p. 288, describes the siege of Hit by the Carmathians in December. 927. Some advanced from al-Anbār along the left bank of the Euphrates and, finding a number of boats in the inlet into the Baṛka canal, the Pam Bāṛka below Hit, they crossed the river. This proves that Baṛka lay on the left bank near and to the southeast of Hit, for the inhabitants would surely not have hidden their boats very far from their homes.

Al-Bekrī, Ma'ṣūm (Wüstenfeld), p. 176, referring to Ibn al-Kalbi, writes that Baṛka is a town on the Euphrates on the borders of Irak. According to (Muḥammad Ibn Ahmad) al-Muṣafī, Baṛka was a settlement between al-Anbār and Hit. Jāḥiṣ, Ma'ṣūm (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 1, p. 702, and Abu-l-Faraq, Madīn (Juyhobī), Vol. 1, p. 186, describe Baṛka as an old settlement or fortress, two parasangs from Hit, Jāḥiṣ's statements as to distances are seldom correct.
also lies the hamlet of an-Nāṭef and beyond it that of al-Ḥesnijje, where we rested from 10.00 to 11.54. Both the wheat and barley were already harvested. In the gardens apples and apricots were nearly ripe. At 12.04 P.M. we rode past the hamlet of al-Knoijje, northwest of which the strong bitumen spring of ‘Aṭāṭ gushes out. At 12.10 we had on the right two other bitumen springs, said to furnish six donkey loads of ẓīr (bitumen) daily. At 12.20 the hamlet of al-Ḥebbijje was on our left.

At 12.28 when near the settlement of al-‘Amire we left the level flood plain and took the road called Mefāẓt al-Banāšire leading beyond the rocky bluffs. Along the Euphrates in this vicinity lie the hamlets of al-Manāzel, ‘Abde, Salāmiijje, ‘Awīre (with a ruin), Ḥellādijje, as-Sabbi, an-Nwēṭr, ad-Diṭāṭt, and al-Ḳoṣerijje, and the al-Meḥlebije ruin. At one o’clock we saw on our right the mesa Kârt al-‘Eleme; at 1.30 we crossed the ṣeṭib of al-Ḳoṣerijje, and at 1.54 we descended to the level plain of al-Manāšire (or al-Banāšire), where our camels grazed from 2.05 to 2.30. From the hamlet of Dwēlit ad-Debes to al-Manāšire the Euphrates washes the bluffs of the left bank, leaving alluvial deposite on the right. At 2.40 we had the group of huts of al-Manāšire on our left, and on the right bank lay the hamlet of Sa’dān with the sepulchral mound of aṣ-Ṣeḥḥ Zāher above it. At three o’clock the hamlet of al-Hiṭān was on our left and on the right bank al-Muferdāt, a hamlet of a more considerable size, owned by the Ḥazraḡ tribe. At 3.20 we saw to the west twelve large and fifteen small palm trees, with a flush wheel and the large farm of al-Weṛṣānijje close by; farther on we could see the hamlets of al-Eḥzāriijje and as-Sēnijje.

Then we had to cross the bare aṣ-Ṣubejše plain, covered with fine gravel, from which we ascended the rocky slope of aṣ-Ṣīḥa, only to descend to the Euphrates again at 3.50. At 4.10 al-Mabrijje was on our left. We next proceeded along the fertile, cultivated flood plain, where the valley of al-‘Ajin terminates; this we crossed at 4.20. Much ṭarfa grows there. At 4.40 we had on our left the hamlet of al-Ḳoṭbijje and on our right the jagged yellow hillocks of al-Ǧared, their color contrasting noticeably with the whitish bluffs which shut in the Euphrates flood plain. Although from afar they resemble large ruins, no remains of old buildings are to be found there. At 4.50 we had on our right some small ruins and before us
a picturesque tract in which there are formations not unlike those of the great Nefūd of Arabia. The west wind has excavated out of the dark gray sand of the Euphrates at least one hundred hollows or ka‘ar, which are open to the east; these ka‘ar are, however, very small. Their western sides are steep and higher than the others. At 5.30 we rode through the fields of al-Leḥūdijjē, which are slowly changing into a salt marsh because of the proximity of the še‘īb of al-Mustāḥ, which we crossed at 5.53. The run-off brings much salt, which it absorbs from the gypsum rocks forming the bed of this ravine. In the še‘īb of al-Mustāḥ, south of the Kārt al-Mu‘assam, are the wells of Abu Rārarab and Abu Swejże; east of this še‘īb lies the well of az-Za‘tri. Beyond al-Mustāḥ we came to the farm of al-Mḥabūbijjē and at 6.12 made camp in the fields of as-Srāḡijjē, only to be tortured by the mosquitoes all night long.

AL-MḤABŪBIJJE TO ŠE‘ĪB OF AD-DMĀME

On May 13, 1915, we set out at 4.43 A.M. through the fields of Ma‘alijjē towards the dissected plateau of al-Ąg‘āl, which here forms a promontory encircled on three sides by the Euphrates. This plateau consists of innumerable rocky, flat-topped hillocks, with deep, narrow gullies winding between them. After missing our way, at 8.20 we reached the Euphrates again near al-Mar‘abdijjē and left our camels in pasture there until nine o’clock. Our new guide then led us past the hamlet of at-Tahmānijjē up the crags. Along the bank of the Ąg‘āl promontory fronting the river are the hamlets of at-Ţlēhijjē, al-Warrādijjē, ad-Dānakijjē, al-Wāšlijjē, Jerde, Smāle, Rarrāf, ad-Dwēlje, al-Mesğed, al-Mheddānijjē, az-Zwär, al-Misrijjē, al-Mbāraka, al-Madda, Markān, and Ġubba. To the south we observed an island with some old houses on it. This island is called Ḥnēfes or Ḥawīḥt an-Nāúsā. Across the river on the right bank we saw at 9.50 the hamlets of al-˚Gnānijjē and ad-Dwēlje, with the al-˚Gbrjijjē ruin rising near the latter.

These hamlets for the most part are owned by the wealthier citizens of Kerbela, Bagdad, and even of Aleppo, who have either bought the land outright from the Dlejm or have simply taken possession of it, driven the Dlejm out, set up flush wheels (nāwā‘îr), built huts, and rent the land to peasants from other villages. The tenant pays all the taxes and gives one-
third of the crop to the owner, keeping the rest himself. He remains on the land if he desires; if not, he goes to seek work elsewhere. Owing to this loose system a good deal of the land lies uncultivated for years, the irrigation works deteriorate, and the huts go to pieces. If these lands were owned by the men who worked them or if the owners would themselves pay the taxes besides allowing the tenants to keep a certain portion of the produce, in a short time there would be no uncultivated land all along the Euphrates. But the owners insist on receiving the stipulated part of the crop without heeding whether the yield is satisfactory or how high a tax is imposed. The tax collector, too, squeezes the peasant in the most heartless manner, often leaving him even less than a bare sixth of the crop, on which the poor fellow has had to work with all his family, his cattle, and implements for a whole year.

At 10.35 we again came to the river at the hamlet of at-Tahmânijje. Ahead of us lay an islet with the old settlement of Ğubba. From 10.44 to 11.45 we dined by the fields of Sifê. At twelve o’clock we crossed the šeṭ́b of al-Čbârîjje opposite the settlement of al-Merwânîjje on the right bank. At the head of this valley is the well of Abu Ğemâ’a, southeast of which lies the well of ‘Anêze and to the north that of Abu Rummâne. At 12.36 P.M. on the left were the huts of al-Brûte and on the right the shrine of aš-Šejḥ Zâher. Leaving the Euphrates through the šeṭ́b of Abu-l-Κanâṭer, we rode until 1.25 along a rocky spur which slopes down to the water and then through the salt marsh of al-‘Amre, where our camels grazed from 1.38 to 2.06. At 2.38 we rode past the at-Ťossîjje ruins. At 3.15 we had on our right the Sifê ruins, and at 3.20 we encamped among reapers. As we had before us a long journey through a rocky desert where neither our camels nor our mares would find anything to sustain them, we remained in the fields.

On May 14, 1915, we started at 4.43 A.M. and entered the Mefâzt abu Sakrán. These are bare, rocky uplands intersected by deep ravines which extend down to the Euphrates. At 5.08 we crossed the šeṭ́b of an-Nîhel, in which lies the water of Umm al-Ḥâmâm; at 5.15 on our left were the fields of az-Zejre and on the right bank the hamlet of ‘Anâje, with a heap of old ruins standing close by. At 5.50 we reached the Euphrates again, this time at the fields of al-Ḥâldîjje so called after the shrine of aš-Šejḥ Ḥâled, which at 6.05
was on our right. On the bluffs above the shrine stand the remains of a stronghold, and to the east gapes the šeʿīb of Sakrān, which descends from the wells of Ummu ʿṬbūk and Abu ʿṢokāje. At 6.15 we sighted the inhabited island of al-Ḥāzāne. When near al-Aswadijje we again had to ascend a bluff, beneath which the river is bordered by a narrow strip of gardens and small tracts of field called al-Aswadijje, al-Mašṭūr, al-Ḥammādi, al-Halḥalijje, al-Kwēze, al-ʿGbēl, Zabde, as-Sadke, as-Slejige, Ber-bibi, Barkēta, Bahrān, al-Ḥaddādiije, az-Zambākijje, Beni ʿSaleh, aṣ-Ṣubejje, Harejmes, Beċārijje, Beni Zečče, Dowār, and, finally, Berwāne. At 7.35 we entered the šeʿīb of al-Ḥisēn through the fields owned by the inhabitants of Berwāne.

Our guide, a peasant from Berwāne, uttered bitter complaints against the Government, which he said demanded every tenth sheep for meat and from each animal three okkāt (3.84 kilograms) of wool and three okkāt of butter, as well as seven piasters (31 cents) and one third of all the corn harvested. This exorbitant tax the Turkish Government collected twice in 1914.

At 8.40 we had a beautiful view over the river, decorated, as it were, with green islands in its midst and bordered by palm groves, above which rose white bluffs. We had to travel on the uplands in order to get around the settlement of Berwāne, which though very narrow is five kilometers long, a detour which took us from 8.57 to 10.00. The settlement consists of the huts and fields of aṣ-Ṣkēlijje, Eben Sellām, Sāṭīn, Abu-l-Krādis, al-Maʿbara, ad-Dwēļje, and al-ʿElje. At 10.12 we emerged from the šeʿīb of ad-Dmāme, where lies the water of al-Krene.

THE ŠEʿĪB OF AD-DMĀME TO RĀWA

At 10.50 we had on the right the shrine of aṣ-Ṣeǰh Mḥammād al-Hawrāni, east of which rises the rocky spur Rās Laʾal. By the Euphrates stood the hamlet of al-Muʾejmīre. On the right bank the shrine of as-Sajjed Nūraddin showed white, with the huts of Ḥamse clustering beneath. West of the island of al-Ḥadīta on the right bank of the Euphrates stood the dome of al-Imām ʿAli (or Mešhed ʿAlī). From 11.15 to 11.38 the camels were in pasture. At 11.45 we saw to the west of us on the right bank the hamlet of al-Bṭēne with the shrine of aṣ-Ṣeǰh Ḥadid. At 12.35 P. M. we rode through the fields
of Abu Tafsara. At 12.47 we crossed the še‘ib of Abu Tafsara, which is joined near the water Abu Dkhër by a branch, az-Zwejči. At one o’clock we had the hamlet of Abu Tafsara on our left. By 1.10 we had passed the small gully of Zečeb, by 1.30 the še‘ib of Lāte, and from 2.20 to 2.58 we rested at al-Rorejr near the še‘ib of al-Čebir. On the river bank lie the hamlets of Ḥavrāte and Zibde. At 3.38 we saw on our right the small gully of ad-Dwejlīb and on our left the cultivated islet of Sūse, west of which lies the islet of al-Ḫṣejjēn with a pretty garden.

Near as-Slejmiţje there is a ford (mahāza) used by the Bedouins when going out on their raids. In the course of these raids they steal all the forage they can lay their hands on and allow their horses and camels to eat off the grain which is still green. At 4.05 we had on our left the hamlet of al-Afaq with the islet of an-Nāşriţje beyond it and on our right the še‘ib of al-Māmsijje. At 4.20 we went through a defile between the Euphrates and a line of rocky bluffs and at five o’clock reached the large še‘ib of al-Gamme, in front of the mouth of which extends a salt marsh. On the right bank of the river at this point stand the huts of Tartāse. In the west high above us on the bluffs appeared the little shrine Mzār Ḥabīb an-Naḡgār; the guide explained to us at some length that this Ḥabīb was a carpenter who helped to build Noah’s ark. At 5.38 we had on our left the huts of ad-Dejr; these were built in an old ruin opposite the islet Ḥawīgt ad-Dejr and the flush wheels of Šerjāte on the right bank. In the level plain which we were now traversing the wind blows up the dark sand into thousands of low drifts (tu‘ūs) which form an obstacle to travel. At 6.32 we crossed the broad še‘ib of al-Četībe, which begins in the plateau of ‘Allāwi, and at 6.50 the še‘ib of al-Ḫabīb, which comes from the level plain of al-Watāhā. At seven o’clock we were beneath the shrine of Ḥabīb an-Naḡgār and at 7.20 bivouacked in the fields of ar-Rizkē, where barley was being cut.

On May 15, 1915, we left ar-Rizkē at 4.38 A. M. with Ḥamad eben ‘Abdallāh for our guide. At 4.54 we had on our left the islet of as-Sawwārī and ahead of us the Tell al-Mḥaddāde, which conceals the še‘ib of as-Shalijje. On the right bank we saw Šerna and to the west beyond it the defile Muẓīž.

---

33 Asinius Quadratus, Fragmenta (Müller), p. 669, states that Sýrbane is an island in the Euphrates. — Possibly this island is identical with Sawwārī, or as-Sawwārī, b having been misrendered for w and the order of r and 3 changed.
al-Marzûkijje. The island of al-'Askar to the south of as-Sawwârî is fairly large, cultivated, and inhabited.

At 5.20 we had on our left the hamlet of Abu Ğûâme, which lies opposite the islet of al-Wudâje, and the al-'Elje farm farther along on the left bank. At 5.43 we traversed the deep šeʿīb of as-Shalijje, which is bordered by white limestone rocks; opposite its mouth lies the islet of al-Mohra, covered by a thick growth of poplar trees and ātarfa. At 5.53 on our right were the ruins of an ancient settlement and at 6.05 on our left the al-Ğera ruin with the little shrine of aš-Šejh Mḥammed to the west of it and farther on the large settlement of az-Zâwje. From 7.13 to 7.44 our camels grazed.

At eight o'clock we reached the hamlet of Abu Ğow'a, which lies on the river bank in the end of a defile. Then we proceeded through a limestone plain, which extends far to the north. At 8.15 we saw the al-Maʿâḍib ruins to the south-southwest, at 8.20 we crossed the šeʿīb of al-Belĉârije, and at 8.42 the šeʿīb of al-Emrijje, which heads at Ājn al-Ğubejn. The rocky plain of Šeben, through which we were passing, is bordered by the upland of Ėnâb (beyond which extends the upland of al-Watâha) and is intersected by a number of deep gullies. At 8.55 we saw close to us the hamlet of al-Merdâdijje and on the right bank the narrow strip made by the gardens of aš-Šwêmijje stretching to a point opposite the settlement of Ḥbên, the palm trees of which greeted us from afar (Fig. 47).

At 9.10 we rode past the palm trees of the hamlet of al-Bêza, which together with the neighboring aš-Šaʿbijje properly forms part of the long but narrow settlement of Ḥbên. Our way led along the rocky bluffs above this settlement and after 9.30 approached the Euphrates again. Before us in the midst of the river lay the island of Telbes (Fig. 48) on which stand a number of old buildings, the walls of which are washed by the Euphrates. Fine palm trees grow on the eastern part of the island, opposite which on the left bank stand the Sûr ruins,
consisting of a round hill and a high mound of ruins extending from southwest to northeast.84 The small še‘īb of Abu Sāli, which heads at the wells of Bēza Men‘a, runs along the south side of the ruins. We crossed this še‘īb at 10.20.

84 In the time of King Hammurabi one Sin-kīlim was the regent of Sūrī, his residence being at Sūrī in that province (Sayce, Early Babylonian Documents [1889], pp. 24 ff.; Peiser, Orientalische Alterthumskunde, No. 4 [1911, pp. 59 ff.]). — This may have been the fort of Sūr opposite the island of Telbes.

In 878 B.C. Kudur, the prefect in Sūrū, a stronghold of the land Sūri, rebelled against King Assurnasirpal III (Annals [Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions, Vol. 1, pll. 25 ff.], col. 3, ll. 17–25; Budge and King, Annals [1902], pp. 351–363), who was approaching from the northwest. Kudur was aided by a Babylonian auxiliary army sent him by King Nabū-apli-iddin under the command of the latter’s brother, Šiblānu. Assurnasirpal took the fort by assault, but Kudur escaped on the Euphrates with seventy men. Fifty of the cavalry, the brother of the Babylonian king, as well as three thousand of the Babylonian troops, however, were captured; the fort was pillaged for two days and then demolished; the women from the prefect’s harem, his team (of war horses), chariot, horses, various implements of war, silver, gold, lead, copper vessels, precious stones from the mountain, and all his supplies became the spoil of the Assyrians. Assurnasirpal had a statue of himself erected in the demolished town with an inscription announcing his victory.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Res Gestae Romanae, XXIV. 2: 1, writes that Thilutha is a stronghold built in the middle of the river on a high hill fortified alike by nature and by the hand of man. In 363 A.D. the Emperor Julian, fearing a heavy loss, hesitated to attack it. The soldiers then called on the inhabitants to surrender; this they promised to do, but only after the Romans had gained the victory over their Persian overlord.

Athinaios Quadratus, Fragments (Müller), p. 660, mentions a settlement of Thelamusa on the Euphrates in Arabia. Since the letter b is often mispronounced as m, and the name of the island of Telbes was undoubtedly written in various ways by the classical authors, Thelamusa may be identical both with Thilutha and Telbes.

Al-Baladī, Futūḥ (De Goeje), pp. 178 ff., writes, quoting an informant from Kaḥkiṣa, that ‘Omejr ibn Sa‘d, while conquering Rā‘ al-Ajn, set out (in 642 A.D.) along al-Ḫābūr to Kaḥkiṣa and from there to the fortresses along the Euphrates, which he took one after another as not one offered resistance. In this manner the Moslems became the lords of Telbes, ‘Anā‘, an-Nā‘ūs, Aḥāsa, and Hit; in the last-named ‘Omejr left half of the church to the inhabitants. Later he marched on ar-Ra‘īya.
level plain of ad-Difle, where oleanders grow in profusion, beyond which we came to the Razzâz fields, the gully Sahl al-Ḥadeţīn in which lies the water of Umm Naḥl, the gardens of Zaḥnûne, ʿAbdelleh, the ʾseʾibān of ʿĀna, the gardens of al-Mezandaḵa, az-Zwejʿa, and aš-Šaʾeba, the rocky spur of al-Kinda, and the settlement of Râwa. Unable to pass with our camels between the huts and the flooded Euphrates, we rode around Râwa on the rocky bluffs above it. These, however, are furrowed by the Wudijān at-Tor, which are so deep and precipitous that we had to make a detour far to the north before we could reach the road leading to Mosul. At 5.25 we encamped by the Euphrates, close to a high garden wall about one kilometer west of Râwa, where we were well protected from a sand storm which burst later in the evening. Both the garden and the surrounding fields were irrigated by a flush wheel (nāʾūra) (Fig. 49).

RĀWA TO AS-SÛSE

On May 16, 1915, I wrote to the kājmakām at ʿĀna to send me two new gendarmes. Our gendarmes had themselves ferried over with their horses to ʿĀna, and their successors came to us in the same way. This was a venture both risky and dangerous, as there was no sufficiently large boat to be had either at Râwa or at ʿĀna. The water in the Euphrates had risen very high by this time and a stiff wind blew all day from the northeast. We busied ourselves in arranging and completing our cartographical notes and making inquiries as to the settlements on the Euphrates between Râwa and al-Hābûr. In the evening the latitude was determined. A tremendous storm surprised us at midnight, with much lightning and peals of thunder but little rain.

On May 17, 1915, the storm died down sometime after 2 A.M., but the sky remained clouded, and a strong, cold, west wind arose to add to our discomfort. We set out at 4.45 A.M. At 5.08 we were on the fields of al-ʿAmârijje south of some large ruins with a small cemetery close by. At 5.30 the little shrine al-Mašhad on the right bank of the river south of the fields of Abu Kawwa was sighted. Then we ascended the rocky bluffs and at 6.20 rode down again to al-Ūrijje on the river bank. To the south appeared the trees of the hamlets of al-Kûzijje and Eḵratiţje. From 6.52 to 7.30 our camels pastured
on the right side of the še'îb of al-Ğbâle. At 7.30 the farms of an-Nâtrijje were reached. Across the river, on the right bank, the bluffs recede towards the south, but owing to the many low spurs which they send out to the Euphrates, the flood plain is capable of cultivation in a few places only. At eight o'clock we traversed the fields of as-Semsijje past the islet Ḥawīqet Srejser, which is overgrown with young poplars. The rocky spurs on the right bank reach right down to the water, creating there a defile (muẓīž). West of this stands a large mulberry tree in the fields of as-Swêwîde. Once more we had lightning and thunder.

At 8.20, when near the še'îb of Srejser, we left the fertile plain with the hamlets of al-Bûnijje, al-Ğbêl, and al-Hasanijje, and proceeded along a rocky flat-topped upland, where at 9.06 we saw the hillocks of Mezrâb al-'Anz. From 9.45 onwards the road both on the right and left was marked with small heaps of stones, called here Rğûm al-Feţîr. Far to the east above the tabular hillocks we could see the rather long, low escarpment formed by the edge of the upland Kârt al-Ţubejn. At 10.35 we crossed the še'îb of Abu Redijje, which has here
eroded its way through white rocks. From 10.51 to 12.14 P. M. we rested. At 12.23 we had the small še'ib of al-Hdejbe behind us and at 12.36 the farm of al-'Ağamijje on our left, and on the right bank the small ruin mound of al-Ḫalawi; at 1.10 we passed the settlement of Ebrahimijje on the left bank and, shortly after, the settlement of al-Mhedijje, and observed west of the latter on the right bank the ad-Dinijje ruin, which measures about five hundred meters in diameter. Opposite ad-Dinijje on the left bank lie the hamlets of al-Ǧzânijje with beyond it that of al-Ǧessijje, where saltpeter, used by the fellâhin in the manufacture of gunpowder, is dug. At 1.18 a stiff wind began to blow from the northwest. At 1.38 we crossed the še'ib of al-Ǧessijje; at 2.05 we passed the al-‘Amrijje hamlet with a smaller ruin and a cemetery lying close by; and at 2.54 the broad še'ib of al-Ḫaddâr. Jagged crags on the right bank here reach almost to the water. At 3.38 we had the hamlets of as-SA'adijje and as-SA'eti on our left; to the north-northeast we saw three table-shaped hills, the Kârt at-Tlejtawât, among which lies the well of Abu Barâbič; to the west-southwest was the hamlet of az-Za'farâne, to the west the islet of 'Alejjı, and on the right bank the hamlet of al-'Ammâri.

From 3.57 to 4.30 our camels grazed in the še'ib of al Mesâjijde close by the fields of ad-Dejr,\(^{42}\) which were then lying fallow. As our guide Ḥmûd told us, he had rented them the year before but gave up in despair when the tax collector took almost his whole crop, leaving him barely enough to live on for two months.

Near ad-Dejr is the islet of al-Čediš, overgrown with poplars. We ascended to the upland again, where we saw on our left on a crag overlooking the Euphrates the medieval fortress of Ertâğe, which forms an oblong enclosed by a mighty rampart with eight semicircular towers. A fellâh from Râwa once dug up there a brick covered with inscriptions (lîrne maqtûbe) and promptly sold it for forty meqûdijjât (§ 36.00). According to a local legend there is a golden horse hidden somewhere at Ertâğe. At 6.04 we made camp in a small vale opposite the huts of ar-Râfda, which could be plainly seen on the right bank. There was more lightning and thunder

\(^{42}\) Ad-Dejr probably is the ancient Dejr Lubba. Jâhût, Ma'ṣâm (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, pp. 690 f., and Abu-l-Fadâ'il, Mardûq (Juynboll), Vol. 1, p. 438, write that Dejr Lubba (or Lubna) is said to be an old monastery on the left bank of the Euphrates in the territory of the Beni Tarâbîb, where the latter encountered the Beni Şcbân. — At the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century of our era the Beni Tarâbîb used to camp southeast of al-Ḫâbdâr between the Euphrates and the Tigris, or in the region where our ad-Dejr is situated.
throughout the night. The surrounding crags were struck several times by thunderbolts and one bolt fell into the Euphrates.

On May 18, 1915, we started at 4.53 A.M. across the rocky upland of al-Wrejêe. At 5.38 on the left ahead of us the white dome of as-Sultân ʻAbdallâh swung into view. West of it lie the fields of al-Bûbijje, al-Ča’brijje, al-Béza, and al-Emlêli. Then we passed through the rocky plain of as-Suḵât, where heavy rain had fallen (waka’ al-maṣār) the night before. At 6.15 we rode past the little shrine of as-Sultân ʻAbdallâh, built on a sharp spur of rocky bluffs right above the Euphrates. West of it, in the bluffs close by the river, is the large cave of Ğuhrân. At 6.32 we saw to the south-southeast, opening in the rocky bluffs on the right bank of the Euphrates, the deep še’îb of Ab-al-Čerwa, where a ruin of the same name lies near some old trees about six kilometers from the river. The fields east of al-Čerwa are called aš-Škaḳiijje; west of its mouth the islet of al-Ḥšêm was in process of forming. We found on the road a spotted adder which had set its fangs into a small lizard (šlēmānijje), and as it would not run away we killed it. At 6.55 we sighted on the right bank the large aš-Šgêra ruin, where various ancient remains have been excavated by the fellâkîn from the neighborhood, and on the left bank the fields of al-Bêza. At seven o’clock the live green of a poplar grove at al-Berd appeared to the south-southwest. At 7.20 the already ripe grain on the beautiful field of ar-Rûmijje was surging in waves not unlike those of the sea; on the right bank at this point lie the farms of al-Mutreẓijje and Miš’al. Once past ar-Rûmijje the Euphrates approaches very near to the cliffs, thus creating a defile (muẓiẓ) remarkable for its row of poplars. At 7.35 we crossed the še’îb of al-‘Erz, which starts at the well of Abu-I-Ḳâje on the Sŏhbān plateau. At nine o’clock we ascended from the fields of Šamma to the upland of Beniže. A strong wind, almost a gale, was blowing from the west. At 9.14 we crossed the small še’îb of ad-Drême and on the right bank sighted the large village of al-‘Obejdi. On the left bank hereabouts are situated the hamlets of ad-Drême, al-ʼEṣṣ, ad-Derče, and al-Ḥamiza, all of which are known collectively as Rabâṭ. The road which we were now following is called Dačṭ ad-Derhem.

Our guide complained bitterly about the distress then prevailing at Râwa. As his two sons had had to join the army,
their wives and nine children were now dependent upon him for support, although his whole property consisted merely of a dilapidated hut and a garden patch only eight meters long by four meters wide, at the side of which we had camped. Both he and the whole family had to weave wool and were greatly pleased when they could earn one piaster ($4\frac{1}{2}$ cents) a day each. And yet the Government since November, 1914, had made him pay first six, then three, and finally another five mejidijât ($5.40, $2.70, $4.50). In order to pay the second and third levy, he had had to sell two copper kettles and a part of the wearing apparel of his daughters-in-law.

At ten o'clock the remnant of the tower of al-Ḳājem came into view to the south-southwest. We were now traveling over the rocky plain of al-Ḳāṣṣāṣ, where there are numerous subterranean caverns and cavities into which the rain water from the neighborhood accumulates. From 11.08 to 12.45 P. M. we dined in the small še'īb of ‘Ajn al-Waḥme. After dinner, crossing the še'īb of Ummu-s-Sba‘, parts of which were covered with a salt crust, we ascended to a plateau bounded on the northeast by the terrace of al-Ẓena‘. At 2.05 we had the farm of al-Barūt on the west-southwest and southeast of it the hamlets of al-Marzûḥa and al-Medneb. From 2.16 to 2.30 our camels grazed in the level plain of al-‘Oklī and at 3.25 we reached the še'īb of al-Haḡḡ, which begins at al-Rijārī and terminates in the alluvium of aṣ-Ṣiqle. At 3.43 we saw on the rocky spur of al-‘Erṣi to our left numerous remains of sepulchral mounds and towers called Abu Čelāl, where earthen vessels containing human bones, copper jugs, various ornaments, and money have been found. Digging in a ruined building known as Ḳaṣr abu Zubbēn, a Rāwa fellāḥ once found more than fifty earthen pots containing remains of skeletons. Al-‘Erṣi was the necropolis of a large town, the ruins of which, now called aṣ-Ṣeḥḥ Ġāber, are situated on the right bank. On the northwestern edge of the burial grounds are the remains of an ancient fortress with three tolerably well preserved towers in which even the stairways inside are still intact.

At 4.20 we made camp in the alluvial plain of as-Sûse, which is known as Mōzān in its northern part. Ahead of us rose the small ‘Antūd or at-Tawi ruin. The level plains of aṣ-Ṣiqle, Mōzān, and al-Mesîle are quite swampy and overgrown with poplars and tarfa, the latter almost like brushwood.
On May 19, 1915, we set out at 4.41 A. M. through the fertile parts of the Euphrates flood plain of al-Werdiijje, known as Şanşile and aš-Šaťfe, the last-named stretching as far south as the rocky spur of al-Erşî. To the east the plain merges gradually into an easy slope, the several portions of which are called from south to north al-Rijâri, al-Bejâder, and 'Ač'ač. In the southern part of this slope there are several wells. Thus the še‘îb of al-Mesîle comes from the Bir aš-Şlubi; west of this lies the Bir abu Śdēha; north of the še‘îb of al-Mesârin, which has no water, is the well of al-Krejžî’a; at Ab-až-Zell are hollows (temajel) in the earth, which receive the ground water; finally in the še‘îb of al-Ilélé, which ends opposite al-Bahasna, is the Želîb ‘Allôni.

At 5.40 there appeared to the west-southwest on the right bank the isolated Tell Madkûk cone with ruins on it; east of this tell we saw the extensive al-Ĥarîri ruin and still farther south that of Abu Sêbât. After 6.10 we observed on our right the ancient Dawrîn canal and thenceforth had to cross all its numerous branches which run off to the west. Dawrîn is said to end beneath the crag of al-Erşî by the Abu Raţîk ruins in the plain Ḥâwi al-Barûţ. At 6.47 we had on our left a branch of the Euphrates called Sarât al-Kişme. Sarât signifies a branch leading off from a river into its flood plain. Such a plain is commonly called hâvi or, when covered with brush or trees, zôr. From 7.10 to 7.40 the camels were in pasture (Fig. 50). At 8.05 at the ruin mound of Zenkîh we crossed a sand-filled branch of the Euphrates about fifty paces in width. To the south-southwest on the right bank of the river the Ummu Znâd ruins could be seen; west-northwest of these stretched the dark sand dunes Tuţuş Še‘bân and south of them to the
west of the Tell Madḵūk the sand hill Te’es Rasūl. Nearly
due west of us rose the dark hillock of al-Ḡaḥaš, in which
various ancient remains have been excavated.

At 8.52 we rode past the Tell al-Bahasna ruin, which forms
a hill about twenty meters high and two hundred meters long
from northeast to southwest by one hundred meters wide,
adjoined on the east by many small heaps of old brickwork.
A canal, now half clogged up, formerly brought water from
the Euphrates. The western part of the ruin has been washed
away. 86

On the opposite bank rises the long ruin mound of al-
Ḡaḥaš, around which are grouped the huts of the settlement
of ar-Rumādī. At nine o’clock to the west-southwest the hamlet
of ad-Demim appeared on the right bank and on the left that
of al-Mufaššaḵ. To the northeast no ruins of large dimen-
sions were seen in the fertile flood plain. At 9.39 we had
on our left al-Heğin and north of it the al-Ma’ĕṣṛe ruin, with
a cemetery. At 9.53 to the west-southwest on the right bank
appeared the hamlet of al-Ḥrejta and before us the dark
mound of the al-Roreji ruins, beyond which lay the farm
of as-Ṣaфа’ and farther north a roseate dome in the aḵ-Ĉa-
‘ābi ruins. At 10.35 the trees of the hamlets of Kattūha could
be seen to the southwest, with the farm of al-Bahra’ to the
north of them, and to the west of us in the midst of the
fields the as-Ṣaфа’ ruins. 87 Al-Bahra’ lies opposite the gen-
darmerie station of as-Ṣāḥbijje.

From 11.30 to 12.46 P.M. we worked in the aḵ-Ĉa‘ābi
ruins. An extensive town enclosed by a wall on the north
west, and south (Fig. 51) once lay to the east of a mighty
fort. 88

---

86 In the ruin of al-Bahasna I locate the Assyrian Naḵarabani. In 878 B.C. its in-
habitants brought to King Asurnasirpal (Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 23],
col. 5, l. 10; Budge and King, op. cit., [1902], p. 340) silver, gold, lead, utensils, cattle,
and sheep.

87 Jākūt, Māqārom (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, pp. 655 ff., writes that Dejr Hanṣaḵa lies near the
east bank of the Euphrates below Raḥbat Mālek ibn Tawṣ between ad-Đellin and al-Bahasa.
‘Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad al-Emin ibn ar-Rašid, who once made a short stay there, sung of
its beautiful situation.

88 According to the records of the journey of Tukulti Enurta II, as-Ṣaфа’ is the an-
cient Šuḫri (see below, p. 204).

In 878 B.C. Asur-nasir-pal (Annals [Rawlinson, loc. cit.], col. 3, l. 9–10; Budge
and King, op. cit., p. 249) received in Šuḫri, as his dues, silver, gold, lead, utensils, cattle,
and sheep.

89 Aḵ-Ĉa‘ābi, according to Isidore of Charax, Mānṣumūs pantiκić (Müller), p. 248,
Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 14. and Ammanius Marcellinus, Rōmu̇s gentūmar, XXIV, 1: 5,
is identical with a suburb of Eupanopus — or, as it was also called, the town of Nicanor (Nika-
noros Polis) or Dura — and was founded by the Macedonians.

Polybius, History, V, 48, relates that Molon conquered (221 B.C.) Parapamisia, from
Seleucia on the Tigris to Eupanopus, and Mesopotamia as far as Dura. —
West of aĉ-Ča'âbi, on a rocky spur of the western Euphrates valley wall, stand the as-Sâlhijje ruins. At one o'clock we reached a deserted channel of the Euphrates, the Sarât al-Mwêh; the present channel which passes as-Sâlhijje was, in all probability, originally a canal. At 1.50 we had on the west the hamlet of al- Raqâniţ and numerous islets in the river. From 2.33 to 3.05 our camels grazed. At 3.38 we left the fields and at 3.52 struck a hard road, strewn with fine sand. The wind here blows the sand over the level flood plain and forms small, dark gray hillocks in which tarfa thrives well. Here and there long drifts accumulate, which greatly damage the fields. At 4.20 we came to an ancient channel of the Euphrates called Abu Ḥamâm. At 4.30 our guide showed us, at a distance of about eight kilometers to the east near Dawrin,
the ruins of a small building, the monastery Dejr aṣ-Ṣwēwīne, as he said. At 4.53 we had on our right the Tell al-Ma‘ādi ruins.

AL-MERWĀNIJJE TO AL-BSEJRA ON AL-ḤĀBĪR

Turning north, at 6.05 we reached the al-Merwānijje ruins (Fig. 52), now entirely fallen to pieces. The central part forms an oblong, 60 meters long from east to west by 30 meters wide. At every eighteen meters the ruin is rounded, suggesting that the fortification wall was strengthened by bastions or side towers. An oblong enclosure — a fortified camp, perhaps — surrounding the central part is adjoined on the east by a tall, roundish heap of stonework. The Dawrīn canal flows about one and a half kilometers to the northeast, but a side branch of it brought water as far as al-Merwānijje.89

Leaving at 6.20 in a north-northwesterly direction, we encamped at 6.40 at al-Ǧirdī, where we determined the latitude.

On May 20, 1915, we left our camp at 4.45 A. M. At five o'clock we had the small ruins and shrine of aṣ-Ṣeijī Ḥālēd about one kilometer to the south. At 5.45 we rode past the al-Meztela ruins, which form four extensive heaps. On the right bank of the Euphrates we saw a hill about twenty meters high and consisting of ruins, the eastern side of which was washed by the Euphrates. On the summit was the settlement of al-‘Aṣāra, where the Government had a representative before Dejr az-Zōr was restored. In and around al-‘Aṣāra and among all the ruins as far as Dejr az-Zōr, the fellāhīn spend much time excavating for antiquities, Tell Krāh on the left bank opposite al-Mijādīn being especially productive in that respect.

We were now traversing the fertile flood plain of Swēdān, which is bordered on the east by the fields of al-Ḥāmed. Our guide again gave vent to his spleen, uttering accusations against the chief, Tabbān eben Ḥefle, from the ‘Akejdāt tribe, who had taken camels and sheep from the fellāhīn in the whole region from al-Erṣī to al-Ḥābūr and then to aṣ-Ṣwar, the Government rewarding him with a decoration for this show of zeal. His father, Ḥefle eben ‘Abdallāh, is said to be known for his cruelty, for he had killed three of his nephews and a guest whom he had robbed.

89 See below, Appendix XIV.
At 6.50 the little shrine of aš-Šeįh Āmše appeared to the north on the eastern spur of Tell Ğemma. From 7.00 to 7.35 the camels grazed opposite the hamlet of al-Ġzejrî on the right bank. On the left bank the fertile flood plain narrowed down considerably, being bounded on the east by the Sarât al-Ġemma branch of the Euphrates, along which we were now riding. On the right bank rose a ruin mound about fifteen meters high, on which stood the large settlement of al-Kreįje or at-Tell. After eight o'clock the ḫâvi (flood plain) grew wider again. At 8.20 we reached another branch which leaves the Euphrates north of al-Kreįje.

From 8.31 to 9.04 we examined the large al-Msâjeįh ruin (Fig. 53). This is enclosed by high but irregular walls. The eastern side is 480, the northern 532 meters long. The southern side bulges out and has a gate at about the center; the western changes its direction several times. The walls, more than five meters in thickness, are built of brick. The whole is covered with a deep layer of crumbled bricks, so that it was impossible to form any definite conclusions about its construction. To the west on the right bank lay the extensive al-Meḥkân ruins and to our left towards the northwest stood the hamlet and ruins of Tell Dambûk; beyond these are the ruins and settlement of at-Ṭajjâne and to the north-northwest the Krâh ruins. Not until 9.22 did we see to the west-northwest beyond the hamlet of at-Ṭajjâne the castle of ar-Rhaba, stand-
ing out clearly on the horizon above the western bluffs. The castle itself shone dark red, while the hill on which it stands was a rose color in the middle and violet at the base. By its position the castle dominates the whole surrounding country and forms as it were a threat to the traveler, no matter from what direction he may be coming.

At 10.05 we had to the south-southwest the fields of Dibân, to the north-northwest the Krâh ruins, and about three kilometers to the north, the Dawrîn canal. At 10.35 to the west of us on our side of the river lay the small hamlet of al-ᴿʳᵉjî and on the opposite side the town of al-Mijâdîn. At 10.55 we crossed a broad ditch issuing from the Dawrîn canal; at 11.45 we saw on the left the Tâmmî ruins with the shrine of aš-Šᵉjî Mḥammâd and to the west the hamlet of al-ᴴwaḩâjî. From 11.55 to

1.20 P. M. we rested before crossing the cultivated plain of aš-Šᵉjî. At 2.15 we went through the Ḵrajît az-Zhejje ruin, which stretches from east to west; in its eastern part stands a large heap of brickwork not unlike the remains of a fortress. To the northwest a precipitous ridge extending from north to south, upon which stood the remains of the old fort of ᴷᵃʳḳîsîjî and the huts of the new settlement of al-Bsejra, made a powerful impression upon us. The ruin mound of az-Zîrî to the west projected above the fields of al-Mîḥî; to the north was the river bank of al-ᴴâbûr, and to the northeast the remnants of the ancient buildings of the Ta'ô. At 2.50 we crossed an ancient irrigation ditch running out of al-ᴴâbûr. On the west, on the left bank of the Euphrates, the Ḵerjet az-Zîrî ruins were visible. At 3.05 we rode through some old ruins, where, however, all the building material had been carried away and nothing was left but small pieces of bricks and shards.
At 3.40 we crossed al-Ḫābūr by a new bridge which rests on eight stone pillars and is provided with a wooden railing. The inhabitants of the surrounding villages paid for its construction. The bridge toll amounts to two piasters (9 cents) for one camel with a load; for one camel without a load, one piaster; for one mule with a load, four metallicks (6 cents); for one mule without a load, two metallicks. Then we passed through a broad, open space dividing some ruins on a hillock from more ruins in a flat called al-Mitraş lying to the east; and at 3.50 we halted at the northeastern base of the hillock, where we had to wait until 4.45, when two new gendarmes replaced those who had accompanied us from Rāwa. After their arrival we headed through the fields of al-Brāḥa and al-Flēwa to the northwest.

AL-BSEJRA

The settlement of al-Bsejra⁹⁰ is built in the southwestern quarter of the extensive ruins which cover the ridge overlooking the outlet of al-Ḫābūr into the Euphrates. Its 130 houses are grouped in two quarters: al-Ǧōba, administered by Šibī al-Hsēn as elder, and al-ʿAlje, administered by Ḥalaf an-Nājef. Of the ancient buildings not a single one remains intact; there are only a few columns and hewn blocks to be seen. Evidently the better kind of building material has been carried away either to ar-Rahba or ar-Rakka. Most of the antiquities are obtained by the fellāhin in the quarter called al-Mitraş.

At 5.30 we saw to the east-northeast, at the southern foot of the height of ar-Raḵkāʾa, the ruin mound Tell al-Ǧeben and at 5.40 we encamped near the shrine of aš-Šejḥ al-ʿAbbōni, where we determined the latitude.

⁹⁰ See below, Appendix XIII.
CHAPTER XII

AL-ḤĀBĪR TO BĀLIS BY WAY OF DEJR AZ-ZĪR

AL-BSEJRA TO DEJR AZ-ZĪR

On May 21, 1915, we set out at 5.02 A.M. through the level plain of al-Flēwa, which extends between the Euphrates and al-Ḥābūr. Near the former we saw at 5.15 the ad-Dwālib ruin and to the northwest the volcanoes of al-Ḥṣēfāt.

At 5.20 we were in the margin of the flood plain of as-Sabja and at 6.12 passed through the fields of al-Ġēdīd past the little shrine of aš-Sejḥ Mhammad al-Uejs (Fig. 54), which stands at the edge of a terrace that falls off about five meters to the alluvial flood plain (ḥāwi). It seems that the Euphrates here originally flowed close to the eastern slope of its valley, as it does even now between the shrine of Mḥammad al-Uejs and al-Bsejra. The terrace, which the road crosses, is a bare level without annuals or even perennials, except for an occasional patch of the sparse, dry annuals known as hemri. At 6.47 our guide pointed out to us to the west-southwest on the right bank of the river the saddle-shaped hillock of al-Hrejm, in which the fellāhin dig for ancient remains. At 7.33 the two hills of aš-Ṣruffijjāt came into view on the northwest. From 7.40 to 8.09 our camels grazed on the banks of a creek branching out of the Euphrates, the Sarāt al-BuʿAmr, near the al-Mżēbre ruins on the outskirts of the hamlet of at-Tābijje. At 8.20 the settlement of Umm Ḥasan was sighted to the west on the right bank. At 8.45 we rode past the sepulchral mound of aš-Sejḥ Miṣref, erected in the center of a cemetery where branches and stems of the ṣarfā had been planted at the head of some of the graves (Fig. 55). At 8.50 we passed in an old dry channel of the Euphrates the blind branch Sarāt al-Ḥṣām. At 9.15 we saw to our right on the right bank of the old channel the large al-Mālha ruins. At 9.40 we entered the deep dry channel of as-Sabʿa and, passing through this, arrived at the as-Sinn ruins, where we halted from 10.50 to 12.06 P. M.

The ruin mound Tell as-Sinn (Fig. 56) is encircled on the east, south and west by ramparts and on the north by irrigation
ditches, the latter of which also served as a means of defense. In the northwest corner of the ruins stand a small shrine with two slender marble columns, slabs of marble, and a few fragments of column heads inside. There are more than fifty pits in the ruins, dug by people looking for antiquities. The road from Tell as-Sinn to ad-Dejr leads between the irrigated fields of Marrād, al-Haṭla, and al-Ḥṣēnijje.

At 1.18 we reached the bridge connecting the town of ad-Dejr, which is situated on the west side of the river, with an islet and with the left bank. From this bank eleven finished pillars supporting the bridge run into the river; but the rest of the bridge rests on boats. As soon as we had crossed, I went to the government building to see the mutaṣarref (administrator of the district). He was asleep. Then I went to the gendarme station. Everybody was sleeping there. Having awakened the officer in command, I showed him my letters of recommendation and asked for two gendarmes to accompany me farther. He made the excuse that without the mutaṣarref’s consent he could not help me. To this I replied that I would wait for his gendarmes until three o’clock outside the town and that if they did not come, I should continue my journey. This worked: a little after two o’clock a rider came galloping after us, asking me to present myself at once to the mutaṣarref. My answer was that, as I had been there already, it was now his turn to visit me, since he had been asleep when I called. Not long afterwards the mutaṣarref’s secretary came with the request that I should at least send him my papers for inspection. I referred him to the gendarme commander, who had copied the most important passages in them. At 2.50, just when we were finishing our tea, we saw two gendarmes galloping towards us. They halted and reported themselves as the escort for which I had asked. Nāser gave them each a cup of tea.

DEJR AZ-ZĪR TO AṬ-ṬREJFĀWI

At 3.12 we left the place where we had rested. It was about two kilometers from the government building and one and a half from the town. At 3.30 the highroad on which we were riding crossed the small še‘ib of al-Ǧūra to the left of the hamlet of aṣ-Ṣāḥijje. After four o’clock no more fields were to be seen on the right bank, as the rocky bluffs reach
right down to the water in these parts. On the left bank lay the huts of al-Ġnēne and al-Ma’ejšijje among extensive cultivated fields. After 4.40 we rode between lava rocks and at 5.06 crossed at the hamlet of al-Brēlijje the small but deep še’īb of Abu Ṣnēṭīl (Father of a Small Conical Cap), named thus after a high pile of stones resembling a cap, above its left bank. This še’īb was joined on its left by a small tributary, the še’īb of al-Erḥām. At 5.45 we had on our left a road branching off to the cultivated valleys of al-Ｍaḥass and al-Ḳṣejebe; at 5.55 we passed on our right the extinct volcanoes of al-Ḥṣefāt; at 6.05 we crossed the še’īb of Abu Ǧum’, on the right-hand side of which gushes the vigorous spring of ‘Ajjaṣ; at 6.10 we sighted on the left the az-Zabi ruins standing on a crag, and then turned east into the cultivated level plain of al-Ḥrēṭa, where we observed a camp of the ‘Aḳejdaṭ. Our gendarmes had no barley for their horses. As the path which we took here turned to the east and became wetter at every step, and as the camp of the fellāḥin was some distance away, I sent the younger gendarme thither for barley, while we set off northward through the alluvial plain. Before long we found ourselves on a spit of land surrounded by swamps. Unable to advance and not willing to go back, we made our camp at 7.15. There was nothing for the camels to graze on; and as we could not find any fuel with which to cook our supper, we lay down without it. Like our animals, we suffered much from the mosquitoes, which swarmed down upon us in thousands.

On May 22, 1915, at 4.45 A. M. we were glad to leave the spot, where we had been unable to close an eye all night. Returning southwest, at 5.21 we struck the highroad which we had quitted the evening before. On the left bank of the river at this point is a group of hamlets, al-Mḥēmide, Abu Ṣefir, al-Ḥwājeg, az-Zraqjer, and Sa’wa with some mounds of ruins standing at the last-named. At 5.45 we reached the alluvial plain of aš-Ṣmēṭijje, which is covered with a growth
of ṭarfa brush. In the Euphrates we saw the islets Ḥawājeğ ad-Damm. At 6.50 we passed the bluff of Ṭābūs, on which lies a small heap of old brickwork. From 6.10 to 6.38 our camels pastured in the level plain of aš-Ṣmēṭijje, which extends for fifteen kilometers in length and in some places is as much as ten kilometers wide. If the ṭarfa were cleared away and the plain partly irrigated, both rice and cotton could be raised there with success. At 7.40 we saw on the east-northeast the house of the mudir of aš-Ṣmēṭijje and on the left bank, beyond the Ḥamar fields, that of the mudir of al-Kasra.

At 8.07 we crossed the še'ib of al-Ma'mūri, above the left bank of which there are said to be the remains of an ancient fortress. The bluffs of as-Sēkarān, along which the highroad leads, are about twenty-five meters high and are eroded out of clay in which are many small holes, the abode of countless pigeons and small ravens. At 8.20 we left the flood plain (ḥāwi) and from 8.32 to 8.50 halted on the southeastern borders of the jagged region of al-Faṣṣājāt.

![Tarfa pole on a grave.](image)

**Fig. 55—Tarfa pole on a grave.**

**AT-ṬREJFĀWI TO AL-MADĀN**

At 9.03 we saw on the riqāt the fields of al-Miṣrāb and al-Miṣrāka and on a rocky spur to the north the deserted hamlet of at-Ṭrejfāwi or at-Ṭrej. Formerly a road led through this hamlet, but as this road sank in at several places, the present road was built leading around it, and the hamlet was abandoned. At 9.25 we sighted to the north-northwest the Ḥalebijje ruins and to the north-northeast the outlet of the ancient irrigation canal of al-Masrān, through which water was once led along the foot of the Ḥarmūšijje escarpment, which shut in the alluvial plain of al-Kebar on the east. At
9.40 we crossed the deep, wide še'b of at-Trejf and at 10.18 passed the hamlet of at-Trejfwári. At 10.22 we saw ahead of us the huge table-mountain of al-Ḥamme, which is cleft by the river and at the southeastern foot of which lies Ḥalebijje.\footnote{See below, Appendix XII.}

On the left bank south of the defile are the Zelebijje ruins, just below which the ancient canal of al-Masrán issued from the Euphrates and from which a patch of flood plain extends as far south as the outlet of this canal.

From 10.45 to 12.20 P.M. we let our camels graze at the end of the ravine Sīhel az-Zrejjer in the large meadow of al-Ubētje before the gendarme station of at-Tibni. At 12.40 we crossed the deep valley of the Sīhel al-Ekrēr; on its left bank a khan was just being built. The Sīhel al-Ekrēr starts at the cone of al-ʿObēd, to the southwest of which lies the well of Čerlajûk and to the east of which runs the še'b of al-ʿElēži coming from the Żetab al Bišri range. The latter še'b joins al-Ekrēr by the well of al-ʿElēži. Northeast of this junction the še'b of al-Ḥaramijje (or Sīhel al-Čebîr) comes from the pyramidal
hill of Ţerb and borders the ridge of as-Sirre on the south. In this še'ib lies the well of al-Ḥaramijie.

The station of at-Tibni lies on a bluff beyond the khan and about fifteen meters above the highway. At 1.18 we had on our left close to the highway the small aš-Sejḥāt ruins, east of which rises the sepulchral mound of Mizār aš-Sejḥāt Mubârek; from some reeds stuck in the ground above this mound a few headcloths fluttered merrily in the breeze. At 1.40 the Ḥalebijje ruins were sighted almost due north. The level plain between them and the highway is called ad-Deĉē and the slope northeast of the latter al-Wusā'. From Ḥalebijje to al-Kšubi the footpath Dreįb al-Wāwi leads along the river past the ‘Ajn al-Mužīž. North of Ḥalebijje on the left bank stands the little shrine of Abu-l-'Āṭīz, close to which rises the volcano of al-Klejb on the left side of the še'ib of al-Murr. Further west, also on the left bank and in the small še'ib of al-ハウスhe, are situated the hamlets of al-ハウスka and  erotische Sāți.

* * *

72 Al-ハウスka is same word as Asyrian ハウス and the Byzantine Annukas.

Asurnazirpal III (Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 34], col. 3, l. 30: Budge and King, op. cit., p. 354) penetrated in 877 B.C. to a defile [ハウス] on the left bank of the Euphrates.

Procopius, De aedificiis, I, 6: 12, relates that beyond Cirecius is situated an old fort called Annukas, the fortifications of which were in an advanced state of dilapidation. On learning this, the Emperor Justinian I had it restored so thoroughly that it equalled any town. The Pseudo-Wâkodi, Faiţik (Ewald), pp. 4 f., relates that Eḏār (one of the commanders of the first Moslems conquering Mesopotamia) while preparing for the expedition against Râs al-‘Ajn, sent two troops against two forts, one of which lay on the right, the other on the left bank of the Euphrates. Leaving Eḏār's camp at Bulûl before evening, those troops arrived near al-ハウスka before daybreak at two o'clock. — The text gives the names of the forts as "Râs" and "Faiţik". Correctly, the first should read Zâbba', as it designates the residence of Queen Zabb'a, or the modern Halebijje. For the second I read Zalabka or Zelbijje. At Bulûl, opposite the town of ar-Râkka (Callinicus), was the best ford across the Euphrates, and therefore Eḏâr must have encamped there, intending to set out afterwards along al-Bâlîb to the bridge at Râs al-‘Ajn. As the distance from Bulûl to al-ハウスka is eighty kilometers, the troops had to march at a rate of nearly eight kilometers an hour.

 Ibn Hawtal, Masāliq (De Goeje), p. 138, says that al-ハウスka forms a halting place on the road about halfway between Karšīljā and ar-Râkka, and the starting point of a road which reaches the settlement of ar-Râbîn on al-ハウスb after four days’ march.

From Karšīljā to al-ハウスka is almost one hundred kilometers, but from there to ar-Râkka is only sixty kilometers. The road from al-ハウスka to ar-Râbîn, a total distance of about one hundred kilometers, led past the watering place of Abu Kbara and the al-Malik ruins. Between al-ハウスka and ar-Râbîn, a chaos of stones have become really twenty-five kilometers long, or about the distance a heavily laden camel can cover in a day.

Al-Bekri, Muḥammad (Wüstenfeld), p. 320, writes that al-ハウスka is a town built by Queen az-Zabb'a on the bank of the Euphrates in Mesopotamia. When the water in the river became low the queen caused a dam to be built across and a strongly roofed passage constructed underneath it. After this the dam was removed so that the water flowed over the hidden passage. This enabled the queen when in danger to take refuge with her sister az-Zobeij̄a. —

Al-Bekri in this instance confuses al-ハウスka with the fort of Halebjie, Queen az-Zabb'a resided on the right bank of the Euphrates, while al-ハウスka is on the left. According to the Pseudo-Wâkodi the residence of az-Zabb'a should be sought on the right bank opposite a similar fort on the left. This second fort must be identical with the town of her sister az-Zobeij̄a. The hidden passage under the river must have led, therefore, from Halebjje, the seat of Queen az-Zabb'a, to the residence of her sister, az-Zobeij̄a, on the opposite shore.

Sibāt ibn al-Ǧawrî records (Ibn al-Ǧalīlī, Daḫṭ [Ameròes], p. 116) that in 1063 the sons of Mahmūd ibn ar-Rawâlijje were given al-ハウスka, Karšīljā, and Duwejīn, all of which then belonged to the administrative district of ar-Râbîn.

Al-Ḫadīrī, Naṣīrī (Jaubert’s transl.), Vol. 2, p. 143, calls Hanûka a very small place with a well frequented market place and active commerce.

Jābrit, Muḥammad (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 394; Vol. 4, pp. 560 f., and Abu-l-Ǧâdālī, Marāqīd (Juyûnî), Vol. 3, p. 113, say that al-ハウスka is situated on the Euphrates, not far from
Opposite al-Ḳsubi the flood plain to the left of the Euphrates begins to widen; the hamlets of Metlûleh and al-Ḳezra are situated on this part of the plain.

The fields on both sides of the Euphrates from at-Ṭilbi to al-Kassāra (or al-Ḳasra) are owned by the Afâšle subdivision of the Ša'bân tribe, with the following clans:

- al-Mûsa Zâher (chief: Hwejdi eben Šlâš)
- al-Ḥawwas (chief: Mḥammad abu Ḥadîd)
- Šibel
- al-Baḵ̲ḵ̲âra (chief: Mḥammad Agha).
- az-Zijārât
- as-Šâbiha

At 2.10 we crossed the small ʃe′ib of as-Ṣûrijie. From 2.35 to 3.04 our camels grazed. The rugged district of al-FAṣṣājāt to the south of us forms a continuation of the mountain range of al-Bišri. The latter is divided by the Šihele al-Čebîr ravine from the ridge of as-Sîrre, a broad tract furrowed by deep gullies, which stretches northeastward. It ends on the northeast in the table-mountain of al-Ḥamme, which is covered with a stratum of lava a meter and a half thick. At 3.30 we reached the highest point of the gap dividing as-Sîrre from al-Ḥamme. To the southwest we saw the range Žetab al-Bišri, with five low cones projecting above it. At 4.20 we passed the end of the lava stratum. The undulating slopes west of the ridge of as-Sîrre are called al-Ḥâmana* and on the northwest al-Ḥaṣṣâṣ. At 5.15 we saw the saddle-shaped hillock of Ṭerb, with, to the north of it, the lower, similarly shaped Ṭrējb, below which is the well of al-Ḥnâfes. The undulating slopes here are without well defined watercourses, as the run-off flows into numerous subterranean caverns, dolines (daḥl; plural, ḍhûl). From 6.14 to 6.39 our camels pastured on the slope of al-Mînne. Beyond the Euphrates on the west-northwestern horizon the two volcanoes of al-Menâḥer and north of them the long ridge of al-Bêza came into view. To our left on the southern slope of the elevation of al-Ḥaṣṣâṣ was the ‘Aylat ar-Raʾijje and to our right far below us lay the hamlet of al-Ḳsubi. At this point converge all the numerous gullies which separate the various spurs forming

---

* Al-Maḏîl, the supposed location of Queen az-Zabbaʾ’s town, is sought by Jâlîk’s informants between the districts of al-Ḥânta or Karkîša; on the Euphrates; Abu-ul-Fadâʾil, on the other hand, refers to al-Maḏîl as a place between the town of Queen az-Zabbaʾ and the districts of al-Ḥunûkha and Karkîša. -- Al-Maḏîl is the name of the narrow gorge which the Euphrates has dug for itself at al-Ḥamme through the lava-covered spurs of the ridge of al-Bišri. Al-Ḥânta or Karkîša lies on the left bank about midway up this gorge, while the residence of az-Zabbaʾ, the Ḥalbiije of today, is situated on the right bank at the east end of the gorge.
the eastern edge of the plateau we were traversing. West of al-Ḳṣubi flows the spring of Metlûleh, and north of it extend the fields of al-Farwa. At eight o’clock we made camp beside the gendarme station of al-Ma’dân, where we determined the latitude.

AL-MA’DÂN TO THE SŪRIJA RUINS

On May 23, 1915, we were on the road again at 4.45 A.M. As guide we had a deserter, a native of al-Farwa, which belongs to the Baḵḵāra clan of the Afāzle. The gendarme accompanying us was to escort him to the next gendarme station. We were now going past the fields of as-Swêde and al-Ḥamīṣij opposite the al-Baḵ’a and Daḵūr ruins on the left bank. At 5.10 we saw on the left bank the end of the še’ib of al-Ḥass and then rode through the fields of al-Mšērfe and Zūr Šammar. From 6.54 to 7.15 our camels grazed in the fields of al-Morla. The upland to the south here descends by steep bluffs to the flood plain (ḥāwi), which is overgrown here and there with ṭarfa and in some places is cultivated. No bluffs were to be seen on the left bank, where the hāwi of al-Ḥass gradually merges into the rolling upland plain. On the left bank appeared the little shrine of Abu Sa’ād and west of it by the še’ib of al-Ḥfejjān the hamlet of al-Brjež; farther west are the ruin mounds of ad-Dūḥijje and al-Ḥadāwi, the hamlets of aš-Ṣara’ (or aš-Ṣārawle) and al-Ġdejde, the as-Sultān ruins, and the fields of al-Fādse and as-Ṣmēri. At 8.30 we crossed the še’ib of al-Ḥarrār, which cleaves the bluffs here to a great depth and also divides the fields of al-Grājbe from the level plain of aš-Ṣeride to the west. At 10.38 from aš-Ṣeride we ascended the rocky spur of al-Mrūṭ, which falls off into the swamps of as-Sab’a. At 10.53 we were on the hāwi of as-Sabḥa. The highway in these parts leads along the foot of a line of rocky bluffs. East of it stretches a strip of fields some hundred meters wide, and beyond them as far as the Euphrates extend swampy lands covered with ṭarfa. The small ponds were swarming with wild ducks, but there was no way of approaching them. At 11.32 we passed the mill of the as-Sabḥa fellāḥin, who cultivate the flood plain between at-Tibni and al-Kassāra. From 11.45 to 1.45 P.M. we rested at ar-Rḥabi.

At two o’clock we saw on a bluff to our left the remains of the medieval fortress of an-Nhejla and at 2.30 on the left
the piles of brick of the Sennān ruins. We left the ḥāwi at the foot of the bluffs of al-Merwaze, but at 2.47 descended to the ḥāwi of ad-Dlaha. South of al-Merwaze is the basin of al-Bēt. From 3.14 to 3.44 our camels grazed.

We next rode through the defile Mažiż al-’Akerše (Fig. 57), which has been cut through the rocks. At 4.15 we saw on the bluffs at our left the medieval fortress of Ṣaffin and at 4.30 on the right some ruins, with the sepulchral mound of aš-Šeįḥ Ḥadīd. At five o’clock the bluff Čurf al-Ḥamar was reached; at 5.20 we crossed the šeįb of al-Bīr, which leads from the well of al-’Ama’, and at six o’clock encamped at the western border of the Čurf al-Ḥamar not far from the camp of the Welde, the owners of the flood plain west of al-Kassāra. In the camp were about twenty deserters, waiting to be transported to Aleppo. They all had shackles on their hands. The gendarmeres complained that soldiers of this sort will not stay in Aleppo longer than two weeks. After that time they will desert again. The fellahīn again cursed the Government, which they said first takes everything from them and then compels them to catch and feed deserters.

Beginning at al-’Aššāš, north of al-Meskene, both sides of the Euphrates as far as at-Tibni are strewn with camps of the Ša'bān tribe, which is subdivided into al-Welde and al-Afāzle.

The Welde own the land from al-’Aššāš to al-Kassāra, number about three thousand tents, and consist of the following clans:

- al-Welde (chief: Aḥmad al-Farağ ad-Dendel)
- al-Wardāt
- al-Bu Šallāh
- al-Bu Musarra
- al-Ḥafāğe
- Meżādme
- al-Bu Ḥasan
- al-Hwewāt
- al-Ğreįjāt
- aš-Šafārāt
- al-Marāḑāt
- al-Bu Ĝāber
- al-’Aţīl
- al-’Ali
- al-Bu Ḥmēd
- al-Ga’abāt
- al-Bu Žāher
- al-’Amer

- Ḥaṭṭāb eben ’Abdallāh
- Halaf al-Ḥağgi
- ʼAbdalžāder
- ’Amūd aš-Šabr
- Ḥamūd eben ’Abdal’āl
- Aḥmad al-Buṣrān
- Klāḥ
- Maŏrūk as-Šatam
- Ḥamri eben Mellā’īsa
- ’Ali an-Nāṣer
- Ibrāhīm aš-Šlāṣ
- Mḥammad eben ’Abdallāh
- Šlīmān eben Mellālī
- Aḥmad al-’Īsa.

The high chief on the right bank of the Euphrates is Aḥmad al-Farağ ad-Dendel, on the left bank Aḥmad al-Buṣrān.
On May 24, 1915, we set out at 4.33 A.M. From 4.40 on a cold wind was blowing from the west. Ahead of us the rocky spur of az-Zejże was seen, on the left the two volcanoes of al-Menâher, the ruin mound of Zejdân, the towers of the old walls of the town of ar-Raḵka, as well as the chatelet of Herakla. The highway we rode on is built alongside an old canal and branch of the Euphrates, the Sarât az-Zejże, a remnant of an ancient channel.33 At 5.26 we were at the little shrine Mizâr aš-Šejž As'ad. This consists of a small rectangular building with a pyramidal tower, a large hut, and a well near a long pile of ancient brickwork about ten meters high, together with a few smaller heaps of building materials. The bluffs to the south are called al-Kâter. At 6.21 we had on our right about two hundred meters from the highway two groups of ruins known as al-Maṛâmer; the one to the south, which extends from west to east, is apparently of later origin, whereas the

---

33 On the part of the Euphrates valley between here and Abu Hrëra, see also pp. 93—96 above.
northern one is of larger dimensions and much older. Close to the ruins runs an ancient canal.

From 6.51 to 7.24 we waited for our gendarme, who should have been exchanged at the station Nukṣat al-Kassāra, or al-Kasra. On the left bank, west of the river al-Balīḥ, begins a range of hillocks which presents a steep face towards the Euphrates and is deeply gullied. At 8.30 we had on our right the island Ḥawīget Ḥamdān. The Euphrates has here formed a new channel for itself; the abandoned channel was on our right at 8.51, with a heap of ruins above it and to the west a sand knoll. At nine o'clock we crossed the small šeʾīb of as-Siḥel, the first deep one after leaving al-Harrār. At 9.14 we rode through the šeʾīb of al-Fansa, at 9.18 crossed a smaller gully, at 9.25 sighted on the right some large ruins, at 9.50 again more ruins, and at 10.11, when past the šeʾīb of Abu Kbē, reached the edge of plateau which spreads south of the Euphrates flood plain and is here covered with small knolls and intersected by narrow gullies. To the north the old channel of the river was now plainly visible.

After 10.50 we were able to overlook the whole region both to the west and northwest. The valley which the Euphrates has dug for itself in the plateau seemed deeper than it really is, and the numerous islets formed dark green spots on the yellowish surface of the great stream, just then violently agitated by a west wind which had free access to the water, as the river flows here from west to east. From 11.00 to 12.08 P. M. we rested in the small šeʾīb of Abu Habāṭa. At 12.30 the two cones of Ṭadejjēn came into view, and at 12.55 we had on the right the ruins of the town of Sūrija, encircled by about two hundred tents of a Feḏān clan.

**Sūrija Ruins to Bālis**

The ruins of Sūrija are about six hundred meters long from east to west, but they are of no great width. The western half is the oldest as well as the strongest part. At 1.10 we saw on our right by the highway the foundation walls of a building facing east and some fragments of sarcophagi lying close to it. South of the ruins the plateau was cleared of stones and changed into fields and gardens; a few tracts were under cultivation. West of Sūrija the upland, on which there lie heaps of ruins some three hundred meters long, slopes

---

"See below. Appendix X."
gradually down to the very channel of the Euphrates, in such a way that the river always has been easy of access at this point. On the opposite side solid ground likewise reaches to the water, with no swamp between it and the channel; hence it has been possible to build a pontoon bridge here.

At 1.50 we had on the right the station of al-Ḥammám. Here our gendarme disappeared and his place was taken by a soldier of the line, an infantryman armed with his rifle, who announced that he would accompany us. He was a native of the town of Kilis, north of Aleppo, and planned to get a furlough in this way without having to ask for leave. At 2.06 we had on our right a small ruin, with finely hewn stone blocks lying about. From 2.12 to 2.32 we watered our camels. At 3.54 we passed on our left the two conical hills of Ṭa-djejjen. The al-Hnejda ruin lying west of these is of larger extent than that of Sûrija. West of al-Hnejda we descended through the small ṣe'ib of al-Ḥulmi into the wide valley of aš-Šêle, which affords easy access to the channel of the Euphrates. No swamps are visible anywhere on the right side; on the left the channel touches the peninsula of al-Ḳdêrân. At five o'clock we passed through the small gully of al-Ḳbûr. The west wind now raised a sandstorm which caused the usually smooth surface of the Euphrates to roll in mighty waves. We made camp at 6.08 south of the highway in a protected gully which joins the ṣe'ib of aš-Ṣajba coming from the low hillocks of Ṭarak Ambâġ.

On May 25, 1915, at 4.03 A. M. we took the highway in a westerly direction. The sandstorm had abated a little by now, but the cold wind was still blowing hard. At 5.26 we crossed the wide ṣe'ib of aš-Ṣajba.\(^5\)

At 6.15 we saw on the north-northwest, in the sand fog below us, the fort Kal'at Ġa'bar and at 6.20 ahead of us the deep basin of an-Nfele, which is open to the north and has a row of white hillocks projecting from it. The basin is bounded on the east by the slope of the upland of al-Hôra and on the southwest by the spurs of the Ṭarak al-'Aţfa, along which stretches the ṣe'ib of al-Minsef. The descent was quite difficult, the new highway having been dismantled and having sunken in at some places. Unable to get our benumbed fingers warm, we built a fire at 6.27, around which we sat until 7.55.

\(^5\) Al-Aḥṣal, Dîved (Salhun), p. 100, mentions a Du Shi'b. — The vicinity of the present ṣe'ib of aš-Ṣajba was owned formerly by the Taḥih tribe, of which al-Aḥṣal was a member.
At 8.10 we observed among old ruins on our right three Moslem mausoleums (two were well preserved but one had collapsed) called Banât abu Hrêra, and west of them a slender minaret. North of Banât abu Hrêra, on an isolated hill on the left bank of the Euphrates, stands the fort Ka’at Ğa’bar and west of it on another hill the little shrine of as-Sultân. On the right bank the tents of the Fedâăn showed black. After 8.30 we followed an ancient canal and at 8.54 were riding between cultivated fields. At 9.25 we had on our right the three small houses of the gendarme station of Abu Hrêra. At 10.20 we reached the end of the cultivated area. On our left large herds of camels were grazing, made up not only of the slender, well-shaped animals of inner Arabia, but also of some belonging to the strong, bony breed of the regions farther north, a breed suitable for carrying heavy burdens. At 11.05 we passed through an old canal and from 11.05 to 1.07 P. M. rested on the edge of cultivated land. At two o’clock we rode by a few ruin mounds and past a large canal where our camels pastured from 2.10 to 2.28.

At 2.40 we sighted on our right east of the canal the ruins of the large settlement of al-Ḥwêra with a small cemetery. At 2.51 we reached the southeastern edge of the ad-Dibsi ruins, which consist of two parts, one lying on a flat-topped hillock overlooking the bluffs by the river and the other constituting the lower town at the foot of the hillock. At three o’clock we were at the southwest end of the town site and at 3.05 in the še‘îb of al-Kshejr, which is eroded deeply in white limestone. On its right bank stood two huts. We now proceeded through an undulating rocky plain across numerous small gullies and at 4.05 reached some small ruins standing close to cultivated ground. From 2.40 to 4.45 our camels grazed. At 5.06 we saw on the left about four hundred meters from the highway the remnants of the small square building of al-Fhehe; we then descended into the deep še‘îb of Umm Ḥarûm, which is shut in by limestone walls and from which we emerged at 5.38 on the level plain of ar-Radhe.

On reaching the river bank, from it we saw the Bâlis ruins with a tall minaret. South of the minaret rises a high tower and to the west two more remnants of pyramidal towers. From 5.44 to 6.00 o’clock we watered our camels in the Euphrates. This great river, as it seems, never flowed immediately past Bâlis, for nowhere could I find a trace of an old
channel. An irrigation canal ran about three hundred meters east of the ruins, south of which it followed the foot of a rocky bluff, on top of which rise the ad-Dibsi ruins; it then turned off into the flood plain, where at two o'clock we passed it. At some time in the Middle Ages the Euphrates broke into the middle of this canal, washing away the fertile flat beneath the bluffs of ad-Dibsi, and at that time both the upper and lower part of the canal dried up. The fields north of the canal could have been irrigated directly, but on the south the water had to be obtained by pumping. By the remains of a pump once used for this purpose we bivouacked at 6.37, having first determined the latitude.

On Bālis, see below, Appendix VIII. The narrative of the completion of this journey from Bālis to Damascus will be found in the author's forthcoming volume, Palagren, which will constitute No. 4 of the present series.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX I

THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES IN THE ASSYRIAN PERIOD

THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES VALLEY

The desert river Euphrates has cut its valley about forty meters deep into the surrounding plateau. Although in places the valley is scarcely two hundred meters wide, in others it broadens to a width of as much as ten kilometers. At the level of the river on both banks there are flood plains of varying extent, which could be converted into luxurious gardens and fertile fields by irrigation. Against cold winds these flood plains are protected by the high bluffs and valley walls, but they have a great enemy in the river itself, which, constantly changing its course, washes away their fertile soil, forms and reforms islands and swamps, and makes new channels for itself. The land which receives regular rains and is therefore productive and suitable for permanent settlement on a large scale ends on the Euphrates at about latitude 36° north, near the point where the stream makes a great bend from a southward to an east-southeastward course, or about at the present ruins of Bâlis. The country north from here on either side of the river has been settled from early antiquity both to the west and to the east. Farther south, on the other hand, first on the right and later on the left bank extends a vast, treeless country with, now as ever before, only a few isolated settlements.

Close to the very channel of the river on both banks the flood plains form strips of land sufficiently wide and long for permanent settlement. Starting from the bend, the first important center in these flood plains is at the ruin of Bâlis; then follow Abu Hrêra on the right and ar-Râkkâ on the left bank. From the station of al-Mâ’dân as far as Zelibijje on the left and at-Trejî on the right bank, the rocky spurs of the al-Biârî range reach down to the very river bed and the fertile tracts disappear except in a few reaches. Southeast of Zelibijje the valley widens to from two to four kilometers, a width which it maintains as far as the mouth of the river al-Hâbûr, a distance of seventy-eight kilometers. Southeast of this river the valley for about ninety kilometers is from six to ten kilometers wide. From the modern settlement of Abu Ėmâl (or Abu Kemâl) as far as the rocks of al-‘Oûkâ on the right bank and those of al-Aswâd on the left, southeast of the town of Hit, the flood plains are but narrow and comparatively short, while southeast of the rocks the alluvial lands of Babylonia run up like a wedge.

The flood plains on the middle Euphrates are irrigated by canals. Arabic authors (al-Belâdorî, Futâh [De Goeje], pp. 156f.) mention the quay of the town of Bâlis as facing a canal. During the Moslem rule this canal was restored, for it is certain that a canal had existed there before. Irrigation canals are also mentioned in the vicinity of ar-Râkkâ (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle [Chabot], Vol. 4, p. 457). Isidore of Charax (Mansiones parthicae [Müller], p. 247) knew of an irrigation ditch dug
by Semiramis near Zelebijje. About thirteen kilometers northwest of the modern settlement of al-Bsejra (the ancient Circesium), the Sa‘id canal branched off from the right bank of the Euphrates.

From the river al-Ḫabūr water was also led off through a canal to irrigate the fertile flood plain, here ninety kilometers long and in some places nearly six kilometers wide, on the left bank of the Euphrates. This canal, called Ḥabur-ibalbugas, was constructed in the beginning of the second millennium before Christ by the Babylonian king Hammurabi (Thureau-Dangin, Un contrat de Ḥana [1909], pp. 149 ff.). Tukulti Enurta (Tukulti Ninip) II also mentions the Pal-gu ša (Nār) Ḫabūr (Annals [Scheil, Annales (1909), pl. 4], reverse, l. 14; Scheil, op. cit., p. 22).

The Euphrates flood plains southeast of the rocks of al-‘Oţoba and al-Aswad on the border of Babylonia proper were likewise irrigated by canals, one of which, running along the right bank, is mentioned by the prefect Šamaš-rēš-ūṣar at the end of the eighth century before Christ (Relief Inscription, pl. 3, col. 2, l. 27—41; Weissbach, Babylonische Miscellen [1903], p. 10).

**Early Records**

Both banks of the middle Euphrates were undoubtedly settled in remote antiquity. At the beginning of the second millennium before Christ the state of Ḥana (‘Āna) was established there, with the city of Tirka for its capital. The site of this city is that of either the modern settlement of al-‘Asāra twenty-one kilometers southeast of the mouth of al-Ḫabūr or of the settlement of al-Krejje about five kilometers northwest of al-‘Asāra. In both places tablets with cuneiform characters have been found. The oldest of these tablets, dating from the end of the twentieth century, records that Isar-lim, the king of Ḥana, presented someone with a house situated near his palace in the city of Tirka; and on another tablet are inscribed the terms of a contract of sale from the time of King Kaštiliašu, relating to some real estate in that city.

Hammurabi states that he opened the canal of Ḥabur-ibalbugas. King Ammi-bail bestowed upon a servant of his a tract of land in Tirka. King Šamsi-Adad had a temple built there in honor of the god Dagan (Thureau-Dangin, loc. cit.; idem, Lettres and contrats [1910], Nos. 237 and 238).

The rulers of the Ḥana kingdom also made incursions into Semitic Babylonia, whence they brought away as spoils images of the gods Marduk and Šarpanit. In the middle of the seventeenth century the Ḥana kingdom became a part of Babylonia, and King Agumakurime returned the stolen gods to their original temple (British Museum Tablet No. 96,152 [King, Chroniques (1907), p. 125], l. 10; King, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 119; Vol. 2, p. 22).

In the following centuries the Arameans, both settlers and nomads (ahlamé), increased greatly in numbers on the middle Euphrates but soon settled down and mingled with the natives. In the reign of Arik-dên-ilu (1555—1320 B.C.) these ahlame gave much trouble to the Assyrians, who strove with the Babylonians for supremacy on the middle Euphrates (Adad-nirari I’s Limestone Tablet [Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions (1861—1884), Vol. 4, pl. 44], obverse, l. 29; Budge and King, Annals [1902], p. 6; Messerschmidt, Keilschrifttexte [1911], pl. 3). They revolted against Shal-
maneser I (1280—1260) (*ibid.*, pl. 15), and Tiglath Pileser I (1120—1100) met them in battle. The latter on the expedition against the Arameans reached the town of Dūr Kālimu, which may be identified with the Tell Fardam ruins on al-Ḥābūr (The Broken Obelisk [Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pl. 4, no. 1], col. 3, l. 22; Budge and King, *op. cit.*, p. 136). Before long Tiglath Pileser I arrived at the Euphrates itself (Cylinder Inscription from Kal‘at Šerkāt [Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pl. 13], col. 5, ll. 44—66; *Annals* [Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pl. 5, no. 2], obverse, l. 11f.; The Broken Obelisk [Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pl. 4, no. 1], col. 2, ll. 19—24; Budge and King, *op. cit.*, pp. 72—74, 118, 131). Aided by his lord, the god Ašur, he took chariots and warriors, and passing through the desert came right into the midst of the ahlamē (nomads) and Arameans (settlers). He made a raid in one day from Sūhi to the town of Carchemish in the land of Ḥatti, slew many of their troops, and carried away their gods and much property as spoil. The rest of their army fled across the Euphrates. In pursuit Tiglath Pileser crossed the river on skin bags and took, burned, and destroyed six of their towns at the foot of the Bišri range. —

This record is not very clear. It does not state which route Tiglath Pileser I took. Possibly he passed along al-Ḥābūr down to its junction with the Euphrates and then had to cross the Euphrates twice, first on his way to Carchemish, which was situated on the right bank, and later in pursuit of the army. The record no longer calls the flood plain of the middle Euphrates Ḥāna, but Sūhi. From the borders of Sūhi Tiglath Pileser came in one day to Carchemish, which lay at the present settlement of Gerābis, about eighty kilometers north of the Euphrates bend above the settlement of Bālis and above the dividing line between the settled region and the desert. If Sūhi extended as far as this line, then the Assyrian king might easily have reached Carchemish in one day with his chariots. He probably was making a swift raid, satisfying himself with such booty as happened to be in his way and returning without delaying to besiege any of the walled towns. Carchemish was the capital of a state, the natural frontier of which in all probability was formed by the desert to the south. We may therefore assume that Sūhi extended to a point right above the modern settlement of Bālis at the Euphrates bend. Tiglath Pileser I remained for some time near the Bišri range — the modern mountain of al-Bišri, which reaches the Euphrates — and gained possession of six towns at its foot. The location and the names of these towns are not known. The inscription on the Broken Obelisk (*Rawlinson, op. cit.*, Vol. 3, pl. 4, no. 1), col. 2, ll. 19—24 (Budge and King, *op. cit.*, p. 131), states that Tiglath Pileser I marched from al-Ḥābūr through the land of Ḥarki to the town of Carchemish in the land of Ḥatti. According to this it seems that the proper name of that part of Sūhi stretching northwest of the mouth of al-Ḥābūr was Ḥarki. Whether Tiglath Pileser I also went southeast of al-Ḥābūr we do not know; there is no record of such an expedition.

**The Route Of Tukulti Enurta II**

For the study of the historical topography of the middle Euphrates the record of the march of the Assyrian king Tukulti Ninip (or Tukulti Ninip II) (889—884 B.C.) is of great importance. This march was not a
military campaign. There was no revolt on the middle Euphrates, but the Assyrian king went there to receive in person gifts and tribute and to strengthen his influence. He marched from Ashur (the modern Kal‘at Sherkât) in a southerly direction to the town of Sippar (the modern Abu Ḥabbā); from there northwest on the left bank of the Euphrates almost to the mouth of al-Ḫabûr and then along the left bank of the latter river northwards. He touched several towns, known and unknown, and had a record kept of the various camping places and settlements; thus we may fix with considerable accuracy the length of his daily marches and the location of the places on his route. The marches were usually twenty-three kilometers long and only in exceptional cases shorter or longer.

Details of Tukulti Enurta’s Route

Tukulti Enurta II, according to the Annals (Scheil, Annales [1909], pl. 2–4), obverse, II. 41–82, reverse, II. 1–24 (Scheil, op. cit., pp. 14–22), marched out of Ashur on the twenty-sixth day of Nīṣān and encamped in the steppe (east of al-Tartâr). Crossing the river Tartar he encamped again and drew water all night like a gardener. Next day he did not drink this bitter water at all. He passed through the desert and slept by the Tartar. Four days he marched along this river and slew nine wild bulls. At the mouth of the Tartar he encamped and, having obtained supplies of water, set out through the trackless plain of Ḫamate to the Margani fields, where he found irrigation ditches and plenty of food. There he camped one day and one night, for his army was drawing water. Arriving at the river Tigris and the settlements of the land of Utu’ate, he took the burial grounds on the Tigris, killed many inhabitants, carried off various goods, and then encamped in Ašuṣi. Departing from here, he did not march along the road but forced his way through the brush and reached Dūr Kurigalzu, where he encamped. Continuing his journey, he crossed the canal of Patti Bēl, where he spent the night, and then came to Sippuru ša Šamaš. From here he went to the Euphrates and camped in Salate, opposite Dūr Balāti on the other side of the Euphrates; also in Raḥimme opposite Rašiku on the other side; in the fields of Kaṣīte by the Euphrates; in Daṣaṣeṭi; by the bitumen spring opposite the town of Išd, which was on the other side of the Euphrates. At Išd there were the usṣētu stones, and great gods spoke there also. Leaving Išd he camped opposite Ḫarbi; then in the meadows by the Euphrates, where the army drew water all night and all day. From there he turned into a desolate range of low hills, where there was neither food nor water. There he slept and then marched to the meadows of Ḫudubili by the Euphrates, where he again encamped. The next camp was pitched between Zadiḫani and Sabirte, a settlement which lies in the middle of the Euphrates. From here he went to Sūri near Taḫiš, which was also in the middle of the Euphrates. From Sūri he marched on Anat in the land of Sūhi, where its prefect, Ilu-ibni, delivered to him various payments and dues. Continuing his march he camped in Maškīte, opposite Ḫarada, in Kaṭīte, and opposite Ḫindāni (or Ḫindānu). Amme-alaba, the head of the last-named town, brought him various dues. Leaving the Euphrates, he caused a road to be made through hilly country to the settlement of Nāgiate, where he encamped, as well as in Akarbane, where Mudada from the land of Laḫē handed over to him
the tribute due. Marching farther, he halted in the settlement of Šupri to receive the dues from Hamatai of the land of Laḳē and encamped at Arbate, where Ḥarānī of the land of Laḳē paid him tribute. Beyond Arbate he camped in Kaṣi and then opposite the town of Sirḳī, where Mudda, the lord of Sirḳī, paid his dues and, for the second time, Ḥarānī from the land of Laḳē. Leaving Sirḳī, he passed through the Euphrates meadows and encamped by the Pāl-gū ṣa (Nār) Ḥābūr (or canal leading from al-Ḥābūr); before the settlement of Rummunīdu; and by the settlement of Sūrī, situated on the river al-Ḥābūr and belonging to Ḥadippē, where Ḥamatai from the land of Laḳē rendered him, for the second time, the requisite dues. On his farther march he camped in Usalā, where he received dues; and in Dūr Katlimmu, lying in Laḳē, etc.

Reconstruction of Tukulti Enurta’s Route

The following is the probable reconstruction of Tukulti Enurta’s route:

The first camp was pitched at the foot of the range of al-Makḥūl, perhaps near the spring of al-Manḡūr.

The second camp was perhaps at the wells of al-Ḥājib. The king with his retinue crossed the shrinking channel of the river at-Tartār, which runs through a country where there is much crystallized gypsum and rock salt. As a result of this the water in the numerous shallow wells there is somewhat brackish and tart to the taste. It seems that for the first three days the king drank only the fresh water which he brought with him from the Tigris.

The third camp may have been at al-‘Arṣa.

The fourth camp may have been at Umm Ṭurūbe.

The fifth camp may have been at an-Ḥeṭaīl.

The sixth camp may have been at al-Farās.

The seventh camp may have been near the outlet of the river at-Tartār into the salt lake of Umm Ṭalḥa. In this region there are many shallow wells holding water all the year through. Somewhere near the present well of al-Ḥeṭaīl the king probably left at-Tartār and proceeded east through the land of Ḥamate; this name is preserved in Marḵab al-Ḥama.

The eighth camp I locate at the well of al-Ḥammās.

In the Margani fields the king found irrigation canals. In view of the topography, these canals should not be looked for farther north than the alluvial land west of the modern village of Esṭablāt, about forty-five kilometers east of at-Tartār. There the ninth camp may well have been pitched. Margani means a sweet-smelling flower. The territory west of Esṭablāt is now called aṣ-Ṣnānāt, likewise after a sweet-smelling plant, the šnān.

The tenth camp was in Aṣūṣi. The king approached the Tigris and plundered the settlements of the Utu’ate, which lay alongside the river. Aṣūṣi I locate near the present ‘Azīz Balad.

From Aṣūṣi, marching southward, he reached in three days the border fortress of Dūr Kurigalzu, the ‘Akarkûf of today. To do so in all probability he left the Tigris and proceeded along the foot of the upland of Rēlājef, on the western edge of the alluvial region. Along the river he would have had to make his way through fields and across numerous irrigation
canals and ditches, while at the foot of Redâjef his road would have been free and only in some places would he have been compelled by the acacia bushes to turn aside.

The thirteenth camp was at Dûr Kurigalzu.

The fourteenth camp was by the canal of Patti Bêl, which he crossed while traveling in a southerly direction probably near the site of the modern settlement of al-Zerje. The fact that the Great King crossed this canal is a proof that it issued from the Euphrates and not from the Tigris, since the route from 'Aḵarkûf to Abu Ḥabba, the site of the next camp, lies entirely on ground higher than the channel of the Tigris.

The fifteenth camp was at Sippuru ša Šamaš; this town may be identified with the Abu Ḥabba ruins. From 'Aḵarkûf to Abu Ḥabba the distance is barely thirty-three kilometers, but the road led through cultivated lands over numerous ditches and canals which would make it impossible to cover the distance in a single day.

From Sippuru (Sippar) the king took a northwesterly course. Id (Hit) was reached in six days' march. We know that he proceeded along the Euphrates, the banks of which he did not leave. From Abu Ḥabba to Hit is 140 kilometers, to cover which distance in six days would require an average of 23 kilometers for each day's march. Some of the marches must have been a little shorter, others, again, longer, as it was necessary to procure supplies and the king desired to treat with the local chiefs on his route. Unfortunately, none of the ancient names have been preserved (with, perhaps, the sole exception of Kabûte, which I locate in Kawwašte); they would have been very useful in enabling us to determine more precisely the length of the daily marches. I regret this chiefly in connection with the town of Rapiku, a border fortress, the name of which we meet in the records so frequently. Wherever it is not stated that the camp was in the fields, remains of ancient settlements or ruins, even if small, are to be looked for. It is regrettable that not a single canal between Sippar and the northwestern extremity of the Babylonian alluvium was put on record, although Tukulti Enurta II had to cross various canals which, like the Patti Bêl, distributed water from the Euphrates.

From Sippuru ša Šamaš, or Abu Ḥabba, the king marched (ana ŠAG) to the Euphrates, probably not along its left bank, but along the left bank of a wide canal or branch of the main river, to his sixteenth camp, which was pitched at Salate, perhaps near the group of ruins now known as al-Maţdam.

The seventeenth camp was opposite the fortress of Dûr Balâṭi on the right bank of the Euphrates. Perhaps the ruins of Uhejmer 22 kilometers from al-Maţdam mark the spot.

The eighteenth camp was at Raḫimme opposite the fort of Rapiku. If we count the daily marches as 23 kilometers each, then Raḫimme should be sought in the Mâhuš ruin and Rapiku in the ar-Raḥâja ruins situated near a little shrine on a rocky hillock on the right bank of the Euphrates. I should prefer to identify Rapiku with the flourishing modern settlement of ar-Rumâdi, 17 kilometers west of ar-Raḥâja, but the king would have had to make at least 33 kilometers daily to come from Abu Ḥabba to the point opposite ar-Rumâdi in three marches, while from there to Id (Hit) the daily marches would have averaged only 16 kilometers. On the other hand, if the nineteenth instead of the eighteenth camp had been pitched
opposite Rapiku, the statements about the location or ar-Rumâdi would agree well enough.

The nineteenth camp was on the fields of Kabsite, which may be the fertile fields east of the Kawwaštê ruins.

The twentieth camp at Dajašeti was, perhaps, where the al-Aswad ruin now lies, 22 kilometers from Kawwaštê and between the Euphrates and an ancient canal.

The twenty-first camp was in the town of Id, or the modern Hit, 20 kilometers from al-Aswad.

The twenty-second camp was opposite Ḥarbie, on the ruins of which the present hamlet of al-Ḳoṭbijje probably stands. About ten kilometers northwest of there the fertile plain ends and steep bluffs approach the very river bed of the Euphrates, blocking the road in some places. As the river makes many bends in this region, the road leaves the Euphrates and leads across a rocky plain due northwest, not returning to the river until as-Slejmijje is reached, 54 kilometers from al-Ḳoṭbijje. The king proceeded along this road also and pitched the twenty-third camp in a desert where there was no water, probably in the šeʾib of an-Nihel.

The twenty-fourth camp, on the meadows at Ḥudubili, may have been near where the modern as-Slejmijje lies. I found no ruins there, but opposite as-Slejmijje the Euphrates forms numerous islands; therefore Ḥudubili may have disappeared in its channel.

The twenty-fifth camp was between Zadidâni and the island of Sabirite. This islet I regard as the present islet of as-Sawwâri, while Zadidâni may be identical with the al-Mhaddâde ruins.

The twenty-sixth camp was near Sûrî opposite the island of Talbiṣ or Talmiṣ. The present Sûr ruins by the island of Telbes, 22 kilometers from as-Sawwâri or the ancient Sabirite, lie on the site of this camp.

The twenty-seventh camp was opposite the island of Anat in the land of Sûjî. Anat is the modern Āna, the fort and principal mosque of which are built on an island 16 kilometers from Sûr.

The twenty-eighth camp was at Maşkîte, probably the modern hamlet of Srejser.

The twenty-ninth camp was opposite the settlement of Ḥarada on the right bank. This is probably marked by the ad-Dinijje ruins.

The thirtyieth camp was at Kalîte, perhaps near the modern al-Ḳâbirîje at the foot of the hillocks of al-Rijâri, in the name of which an echo of the pronunciation of the old name Kalîte may be traced.

The thirty-first camp was opposite the town of Hindâni on the right bank. This town is undoubtedly marked by the extensive aš-Sejî Gâber ruins of today. From Anat to Hindânu the king cannot have marched at a rate of more than twenty-three kilometers daily.

Opposite aš-Sejî Gâber the bluffs reach the very river bank making marching alongside of it difficult and in time of flood quite impossible. For this reason the people prefer to travel at a distance from the river over a rough, rocky plain. This was done by the king also. He left the river bank and ordered a road to be built to the thirty-second camp at Nagiate, which may be represented by the ruin mound of at-Ṭâwî. This lies at the southeast end of a strip of flood plain, here ninety kilometers long and in places as much as six kilometers wide, strewn with both small and large remains of old settlements.
The thirty-third camp of Aḵarbani or Naḵšarabani I locate in the ruins of al-Bahasna, about twenty-three kilometers from aṯ-Ṭāwi.

The next day the king halted in the town of Şupri and had the thirty-fourth camp pitched at Arbate. Şupri is perhaps identical with the aṯ-Safa’ ruin, and Arbate with aṯ-Ḵaḏibi. That day’s march I estimate at sixteen kilometers, as the king delayed in Şupri.

The thirty-fifth camp was in the Kaši fields. The road led through cultivated and irrigated tracts, so that hardly more than twenty kilometers were made that day, and the king’s camp was probably in front of the site of the present al-Mežtele ruin.

The thirty-sixth camp was opposite the town of Sirḵi, which lay on the right bank. If we insist on a regular day’s march of twenty to twenty-three kilometers, we shall reach a point opposite the modern town of aṯ-Mīţāḏin, which we might regard as the old Sirḵi. But the name Sirḵi reminds us of Tīrḵa, the name of the capital of the state of Ḥana, which may be identified either with the modern al-‘Aṣāra or with al-Ḵrejje (see above, p. 198). The true location of Tīrḵa could probably be ascertained by excavations, which might also make clear whether this town was or was not the same as Sirḵi.

At Sirḵi the king left the Euphrates and proceeded in a northerly direction along the western bank of the river al-Ḥābūr to the thirty-seventh camp, by the settlement of Rummnûdû, not far from the place where a canal issues from al-Ḥābūr. From this river a single great canal, the Dawrīn, branches off below the small hamlet of as-Sičer, about twenty-one kilometers north of al-Mīţāḏin and the village of Tāmme, which lies opposite al-Mīţāḏin on the right bank. If Sirḵi be identified with al-Ḵrejje, the shortest distance thence to the inlet of the Dawrīn would have been twenty-five kilometers. We might, therefore, locate the thirty-seventh camp at Rummnûdû to the north of Pal-gu ša (Nār) Ḥābūr, or near the present Ḥeḡna ruins. According to the Assyrian record this camp was still in the “Euphrates meadows,” an appellation which probably meant the fertile plain extending from the Euphrates as far as beyond as-Sičer. Scheil, op. cit., pp. 487 ff., locates Rummnûdû close by the Euphrates and thinks that the king had to reach this point before he could proceed northward. But this would have been impossible, partly because of the mention of the Pal-gu ša (Nār) Ḥābūr, or starting point of the Dawrīn canal, and partly because of the distance thence to the thirty-eighth camp, which was at Sūrī. This place, the modern aṯ-Šwar, was about forty kilometers from the Euphrates. If we take into consideration the fact that the king’s army had to cross the canal coming out of al-Ḥābūr and march through a cultivated country, we find that the distance from the Euphrates to Sūrī could not possibly have been traversed in a single day’s march. On the other hand, admitting the identity of Rummnûdû with Ḥeḡna, we get the usual average, twenty-three kilometers.

Scheil (op. cit., p. 49) writes that aṯ-Šwar lies ten hours, or forty kilometers, from the Euphrates and also takes this to be just one day’s march, as is stated in the text. But here he contradicts not only his own location of the different places but the text itself; for marching at forty kilometers a day the king would have reached Rummnûdû from Anat not in ten but in five marches.
From Sūri (aš-Šwar) the king marched along al-Ḥābūr northward, returning home by the usual route.

The record of this expedition of Tukulti Enurta II makes possible not only a fairly accurate localization of the various settlements, but also reveals the political organization on the middle Euphrates. In the time of Tiglath Pileser I Sūhi extended as far as the borders of Bit-Adini, or above the modern settlement of Bālis, where the desert ends and the cultivated country begins. Under Tukulti Enurta II the proper name of that part of Sūhi north of the rocky spur of al-‘Erṣi was Ḭaḳe (Annals [Scheil, op. cit., pl. 4], reverse, ll. 3, 5; ibid., p. 20). Likewise, the towns of Sūri (aš-Šwar) (ibid., ll. 15, 20; p. 22) and Dūr Kaṭlime (the modern Tell Fadrumi on al-Ḥābūr) (ibid., ll. 22; p. 22) belonged to the Laḳe region. Tiglath Pileser I (The Broken Obelisk [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 3, pl. 4, no. 1], col. 3, l. 22; Budge and King, Annals [1902], p. 136) placed Dūr Kaṭlime in Aramē, not then knowing Ḭaḳe.

Both countries, Sūhi as well as Ḭaḳe, were divided into larger and smaller city states with lords of their own. The center of these states were the towns of Anat, with a lord named Ilu-ibni (Annals [Scheil, op. cit., pl. 3], obverse, ll. 69, 70; ibid., p. 18), Ḥindānu, with a lord named Amme-alabu (ibid., ll. 76, 79; p. 18), and Sirḳi, with a lord named Muddad (ibid., pl. 4, reverse, ll. 8, 10; p. 20). Ḥarānu of Ḭaḳe, who rendered his payments in Sirḳi, was king of some realm not yet entered by Tukulti Enurta II, which therefore must have been situated northwest of the mouth of al-Ḥābūr (ibid., l. 11; p. 20). The lord of Sūri was Ḥamatai (ibid., l. 5; p. 20; ll. 15, 19; p. 22), and the territory of which this town was the capital was called after its inhabitants Ḥaćippē or Bit-Ḥaćippē (var., Ḥalıpē) (ibid., ll. 15, 20; p. 22).

The Assyrian king always appointed some of the lords of the city states to be his representatives. In the time of Tukulti Enurta II Ilu-ibni, lord of Anat in Sūhi, and Ḥamatai, lord of Sūri in Ḭaḳe, were such representatives for their respective countries. Such a representative or prefect of the Assyrian king in Sūhi or Ḭaḳe had a very difficult position, because his subjects, especially when incited by their neighbors, often had political interests entirely different from those of his Assyrian overlord.

**ASURNAZIRPAL'S CAMPAIGNS AND ROUTES**

Asurnazirpal III (884—859 B.C.) relates (Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 18f.], col. 1, ll. 74—101; Budge and King, op. cit., pp. 279—289) that soon after he ascended his throne he learned that the prefect Ḥamatai had been murdered by the inhabitants of the town of Sūru in the Bit-Ḥaćippē country and replaced by one Aḫiababa from the land of Bit-Adini. Therefore the king marched from Commagene, where he then was, with his war chariots and troops against Sūru (or Sūri).

The realm of Bit-Adini adjoined Ḭaḳe on the northwest. Its king was endeavoring to extend his power and gain allies against the great lord of Assyria and had therefore leagued himself with the dissatisfied party in Sūri, who had killed their lord, the Assyrian prefect Ḥamatai, and had given allegiance to the new lord (Aḫiababa by name) sent to them by the king of Bit-Adini. The Great King of Assyria meted out
a bloody punishment to the rebels and appointed as the new prefect of Laḵē one Azi-ilu, who, it seems, was king of the city state of Kipina situated on the Euphrates west of the mouth of al-Ḥābūr. The cruel punishment meted out to the town of Sūru and its rebels acted as a warning to the rest of the lords in the land of Laḵē, who at once began to overwhelm Asurnazirpal III with gifts. Ḥajāni, lord of the town of Ḥindāni (Annals [Rawlinson, loc. cit.], col. 1, ll. 96—99; Budge and King, op. cit., p. 287) also sent messengers with gifts to the Great King at Sūru. But the peace was not of long duration, for soon after the return of Asurnazirpal III to Nineveh, the prefect Ilu-ilbī of Sūhi came to him as a refugee seeking asylum. He had apparently remained faithful to his Assyrian sovereign and was therefore expelled by his countrymen, who preferred an alliance with the king of Babylon.

Details of Asurnazirpal's First Expedition

This supposition is confirmed by the report of Asurnazirpal's new expedition to Laḵē and Sūhi, recorded in Annals (Rawlinson, op. cit., pll. 23 ff.), col. 3, ll. 5—26; Budge and King, op. cit., pp. 348—353.

The Great King marched from the town of Ḫatmi to the town of Dūr Ḫatmi, from there to the town of the land of Bit-Ḥadippē, and thence to the towns of Sīrki, Ṣupri, and Naḵarabani, and encamped before the town of Ḥindāni (or Ḥindānu), situated on the right bank of the Euphrates. Having received many gifts, he proceeded farther, camped in the mountain range above the Euphrates, and halted in the land of Bit-Ḥarbāja, opposite the town of Ḥarīdu (or Ḥarīdo) on the right bank of the Euphrates. Then he hastened to the town of Anāt on an island in the middle of the Euphrates and at last arrived before the fort of Sūru (or Sūri), where Kudurū, the prefect of the land of Sūhi, with the troops sent to his help by the Babylonian king Nabu-apal-iddin, offered resistance. Taking the fort by storm, Asurnazirpal captured Šabdānu (the brother of the Babylonian king), Bēl-apal-iddin (the commander of the auxiliary troops), three thousand men of the Babylonian army, and fifty mounted men. The prefect with seventy companions saved himself in the Euphrates. Sūri was then demolished and a monument extolling Asurnazirpal's victory placed in the ruins.

Reconstruction of Asurnazirpal's First Expedition

Dūr Ḫatmi may be identified with the Tell Fadrami, and the town of the land of Bit-Ḥadippē with Sūru, the modern aṣ-Ṣwar. From Dūr Ḫatmi to Sūru the distance was about 48 kilometers. If Sīrki was situated on the site of al-Mijādīn, its distance from Sūru would have been 45 kilometers; if on the site of al-ʿAṣāra, the distance would have been 52 kilometers, a distance which Asurnazirpal's army could scarcely have covered in a single day. Ṣupri may have been where aṣ-Ṣafāa' now stands. The site of Naḵarabani (or, as it is written in the records of the expedition of Tukulti Enurta II, Aḵarabani) is probably marked by the present al-Bahassna ruins. From al-Mijādīn to aṣ-Ṣafāa' is 42 and from al-ʿAṣāra to aṣ-Ṣafāa' 37 kilometers, but from aṣ-Ṣafāa' to al-Bahassna is only about 12 kilometers; and from here to the aṣ-Ṣējī Gāber ruins,
the ancient Hindânu, is 42 kilometers. Farther southwest the Great King camped first in the mountains and then in the land of Bit-Garbâja, opposite the town of Ḥaridu. Taking the report of Tukulti Enurta II's march as a guide, we have located this town at the site of the present ad-Dinijî ruins, 46 kilometers from aš-Sebh Gâber. As two marches were required to reach a point opposite it, we see that even Asurnazirpal III's march could have averaged only about twenty-three kilometers a day. This gives us a clue to the site of his camp between Hindânu (aš-Sebh Gâber) and Ḥaridu (ad-Dinijî). About 16 kilometers southeast of Hindânu the Euphrates makes three great bends. At this place the line of rocky bluffs almost reaches the water's edge and the road leads over the plateau, departing as much as ten kilometers from the river bank. This was the road the king had to take, and his camp most likely was about twenty-three kilometers southeast of Hindânu, near the present shrine of as-Sulțân 'Abdallâh. The region of the town of Ḥaridu was called Bit-Garbâja, just as the territory of the town of Sûru was named Bit-Hadippê.

The island town of Anat, the modern 'Âna, lay 40 kilometers from Ḥaridu. The record does not mention where the Great King camped before he arrived at Anat. Thence to the fort of Sûru (the modern Sûr) by a direct route is no more than sixteen kilometers. Sûru was a fortress of the land of Sûhi, where Kuduru, the prefect appointed by the Babylonians, took refuge together with his Babylonian auxiliaries. The fortress was unable to resist and was destroyed, the Babylonian auxiliary troops with their officers were made prisoners of war, and only the prefect Kuduru saved himself with about seventy men by flight to some of the islands in the Euphrates.

Although the Great King goes on to assert that he again strengthened his authority in the land of Sûhi, extending his influence as far as the Babylonian borders, and that he made the inhabitants of the mountainous districts on both sides of the Euphrates fear him, he nevertheless did not on this occasion advance farther southeast and did not march past the fort of Dûr Kurigalzi to Assyria, but returned by nearly the same route by which he had come: that is, along the left bank of the Euphrates and up al-Ḥâbûr, whence he crossed to his residence at Kalâṯ.

*Details of Asurnazirpal's Second Expedition*

He had not yet reached home when he received a report that the inhabitants of the countries of Laḫe and Sûhi had again revolted and crossed the Euphrates. So he set out against them, perhaps in 877 B. C. (Annals [Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pl. 24], col. 3, ll. 27—50; Budge and King, *op. cit.*, pp. 353—361). First he proceeded to the town of Sûrî in Bit-Ḥalupê, where he had boats made of wood and inflated hides. Even before they were ready he marched to the narrows (ḫiški) of the Euphrates, took some towns belonging to the lords Henti-ilu and Azî-ilu of the land of Laḫe, captured their inhabitants, killing some, and carried away much booty. The towns were burned and demolished. Returning, he crossed al-Ḥâbûr at its mouth, marched through the land of Sûhi as far as the town of Sîbate, burning and destroying the towns of the lands of Laḫe and Sûhi. He also killed 470 warriors and had twenty impaled.

On boats of wood and inflated hides at the town of Ḥaridu he passed
over to the right bank of the Euphrates, where he encountered the allied troops of Laḵē, Sūḥi, and the town of Ḥindānu—about six thousand men in all, both in chariots and on foot. The Great King defeated them and destroyed their chariots; sixty-five hundred (ṣie) of their warriors were slain, and the rest perished of thirst in the desert of the Euphrates. From the town of Ḥaridu in the land of Sūḥi as far as the town of Kipina he took the towns on the right bank belonging to the realm of Ḥindānu and to the other inhabitants of Laḵē; these towns he plundered, demolished, and burned.

Azi-iliu of the land of Laḵē fortified himself in the town of Kipina, but, unable to defend himself any longer, he fled; one thousand of his warriors were killed, many of his chariots destroyed, and his gods captured. Azi-iliu took refuge in the desolate range of Bisuru on the Euphrates. The Great King fought him for two days, killed many of his men, and then, pursuing him, reached the towns of Dummete and Asmu, which belonged to the people of Adini. These he took also, pillaged, demolished, and burned. Azi-iliu lost not only his horned cattle but his sheep as well; the Great King took them for his booty.

At that time Ilā of the land of Laḵē, with his chariots and five hundred warriors, also fell into captivity.

The Great King reached the narrows (ḥinkī) of the Euphrates, where he brought his expedition to an end. Azi-iliu fled before him. Ḥimti-iliu of the land of Laḵē was besieged in his town and begged for mercy. The Great King took all that was in his palace—silver, gold, lead, copper, copper utensils, colored textiles—and increased his tax. On the Euphrates he founded two towns. The town on the left bank was named Kār-Asur-anširpal and that on the right bank, Nibarti-Asur.

Reconstruction of Asurnazirpal’s Second Expedition

The boats made in Sūri (aṣ-Ṣwar) were probably rafts fastened to inflated goatskins. The skins might have been obtained from both the settlers and nomads and the wood taken from poplars and tamarisks, trees which still grow abundantly on al-Ḥābūr as well as on the Euphrates. From these woods boats were also built for the Roman emperor Septimius Severus in 198 A. D. (Cassius Dio, Historiae, LXXV, 2f.).

Asurnazirpal did not wait in Sūri until the boats were ready, but continued his conquest of the towns on the left bank of the Euphrates belonging to the lords Ḥentī-iliu and Azi-iliu. Azi-iliu was perhaps the prefect whom the king had appointed shortly after ascending his throne. The Great King came as far as the narrows of the Euphrates; that is, to the modern Zelebiţje, where the Euphrates channel leaves the narrows seventy-five kilometers northwest of the mouth of al-Ḥābūr. At that point was probably the strongest town of the lord Ḥentī-iliu, the siege of which the Great King did not attempt at this time.

After his return from this raid to the junction of al-Ḥābūr with the Euphrates Asurnazirpal marched along the left bank of the latter in a southeasterly direction, demolishing one town after another, and finally reached the town of Šibate. This undoubtedly lay southeast of Ḥaridu, or even southeast of the fort of Sūru, as otherwise it would not have been true that the king subjugated the whole land of Sūhi. The brief
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report is not of much assistance in defining the precise location of Šibate, but I believe it to have been identical with the island town of Sabirite mentioned in the records of the expedition of King Tukulti Enurat II. Instead of the correct Ku-ra-ši-ti, Ku-ši-ti is sometimes written (Rassam Cylinder [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 5, Part 1, p. 1-10], col. 8, l. 121; British Museum Tablet K 2502 [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 6, p. 35-36], col. 6, l. 41; Streck, Assurbanipal [1916], Vol. 2, pp. 73, 206). On this analogy we may therefore assume that Šibate represents the correct Sabirite, which we have identified with the present island of as-Sawwārī, twenty kilometers southeast of the islet of Telbes. Of course, Sabirite is written with an s, Šibate with an š. The Assyrians, however, did not differentiate the sound š very distinctly from s in foreign names; for example, the Assyrian s as in Sūri, may signify both the Arabic š as in Śwār, or the Arabic s as in Sūr.

Farther southeast than Šibate Assurbanīpal could not go, as he would have encountered the Babylonian army while the rebel warriors were assembling at Haridu in his rear. Turning on the rebels he crossed the Euphrates at Haridu (ad-Dinijje) and defeated the combined troops of Sūhi, Laḥē, and the town of Hindānu. Their number is not given correctly. According to the Assyrian report the greater part of them fell in the battle, the rest perishing from thirst in the desert, as the Assyrians did not let them approach the Euphrates. The Great King then proceeded along the right bank to the northwest.

From Haridu, which was still in Sūhi, the king first pillaged the towns dependent on Hindānu and then the settlements of the inhabitants of Laḥē; finally he reached the town of Kipina, where Azi-ilu, the disloyal prefect from Laḥē, had taken refuge. Azi-ilu must have been a feudal ruler who resided not in the demolished fort of Sūri (as-Swar) in Bit-Ḥadippē but in his own realm, which I look for along both banks of the Euphrates northwest of the mouth of al-Ḥābūr. The towns on the left bank of the Euphrates were pillaged on the march from Sūri (as-Swar) to the Euphrates narrow, while the towns on the right bank suffered the same fate after the defeat at Haridu. The Assyrian record fails to state whether the Great King also took and demolished the town of Kipina, a circumstance which leads us to the conclusion that Azi-ilu was defeated near, but not actually in, this town and with what remained of his army retreated into the range of Bisuru on the Euphrates. That this is the range of al-Bišri mentioned by Tiglath Pileser I (Cylinder Inscription [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 18], col. 5, l. 59; Budge and King, Annals, p. 74), is attested by the whole course of the events. Azi-ilu defended himself in the mountains for two days, but, after losing great numbers of his faithful followers, he was compelled to flee again. It would appear from this that the town of Kipina is to be sought close by the al-Bišrī range, perhaps near the present Dejr az-Zūr.

Reaching the northern foot of the al-Bišrī range, the Great King pursued the prefect Azi-ilu as far as the settlements of Dummete and Asmu, which were in the land of Bit-Adini and hence beyond the modern settlement of Bālis. (Forrer, Provinzeinteilung [1921], p. 26, notes 3, 4, locates Dummete southwest of Dejr az-Zūr and Asmu opposite the mouth of al-Balī, but this does not agree with the Assyrian report.) The Great King plundered both of these settlements on the southern border of Bit-
Adini. After that he crossed over to the left bank of the Euphrates and returned southeast, pillaging on the way the settlements of IIâ, king of Laḳê, to whom probably belonged both banks of the Euphrates west of the junction of the river al-Balîh. On the borders of this realm on the left bank in the environs of the present Zebelîji ruins was the kingdom of the lord Hîmtî-îlu, whose eastern settlements the Great King pillaged on his raid from Sûru and whose western settlements he pillaged on his return from Bit-Adini. As Hîmtî-îlu was unable to resist, he had to yield and pay a large tax.

Asurnâzîr-pal does not call the inhabitants of the environs of al-Bîšrî aḥlamû as they are designated by Tiglath Pileser I, although he uses this expression often when mentioning the Aramean peasants (Monolith Inscription [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 3, pl. 6], reverse, l. 4; Budge and King, op. cit., p. 240). He often boasts that he subjegated all Laḳê and Sûhî, together with the town of Rapîkî (Limestone Tablet [British Museum No. 92, 986], obverse, l. 7–8; Standard Inscription [Layard, Inscriptions, pl. 1], l. 8; Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 17ff.], col. 2, l. 128; Budge and King, op. cit., pp. 163, 216, 344). Since Rapîkî and Dûr Kurigalzî were frontier strongholds of Assyria, Rapîkî must have been on the southeastern boundary of the land of Sûhî, which must then have extended beyond the modern settlement of ar-Rumâdî and probably as far as the ar-Raḥîja ruins on the south and to the rocks of al-‘Erşî on the north.

Shalmaneser III (859–824 B.C.) received as the payment due to him from Marduk-aplu-uṣur of the land of Sûhî silver, gold, ivory, and colored fabrics (Obelisk Relief [Layard, op. cit., pl. 98], No. 4; Winckler in: Schrader, Keilinschriften- Bibliothek [1889–1900], Vol. 1, p. 151). In 838 he probably made an expedition to the land of Sûhî (Forrer, Chronologie [1915], p. 11).

**The Province of Raṣappa**

In the time of Šamšî-Adad VII (824–811 B.C.) the land of Sûhî belonged to the Assyrian empire (Obelisk Inscription [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 29], col. 1, l. 13; Abel in: Schrader, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 179), for together with Laḳê, it was converted into an Assyrian province, and the Assyrian governor (šakûn) resided at Raṣappa. A stele of the governor Urigallu-e-reš, dated 806, tells how this province was divided and how far it extended (Relief Stele of Adadnîrî IV [Unger, Reliefstele Adadnî- rîs III., pl. 2], l. 23–25.; Unger, op. cit., pp. 10, 12). It consisted of the following administrative districts: the towns of Nimit-Iṣtar, Apku, andMari; the territories of Raṣapi and Kaṭûn; the town of Dûr Karpâtî, opposite the town of Kâr-Ašûr-năṣîr-pal; the town of Sirkiu; the territories of Laḳê and Hîndânu; the town of Anat; the territory of Sûhî; and the town of Aṣûr-îṣbat.—

The districts referred to here show that the regions of the lower al-Ḥâbûr and middle Euphrates were a part of the province of Raṣappa. Kaṭûn lay on al-Ḥâbûr near the modern Tell Gelîlî, almost 105 kilometers from the junction of the rivers. Kâr-Ašûr-năṣîr-pal, built by Asurnâzîr-pal on his expedition in 877 (see above, p. 208), was situated on the left bank of the Euphrates. Opposite it, and therefore on the right bank, was Dûr Karpâtî. As Kâr-Ašûr-năṣîr-pal lay in the range of al-Bîšrî
west of the mouth of al-Ḫābūr, we may identify it with the present Zelebijje, and Dūr Karpāti with Ḥalebijje. The position of both is very important, because they dominate not only the land but also the water routes. Dūr Karpāti was possibly the native designation of the town which Assurnazirpal named Nibarti-Asur, although this is not certain, for we should expect that the Assyrian governor would have inscribed on his stele the official designation and not the native name. Sīrku, as we have seen, may be identified with either al-Mijāḏin or the modern al-Krejje or al-‘Asāra. The land of Laḵē was the vicinity of Sūru (the present aš-Swar), formerly the principal fort in Laḵē. The realm of Hindānu was the country around aš-Šeįḫ Šabēr of today. The town of Anatāu was to become the medieval Ḍiā and the modern ‘Ana. The land of Sūḥi was the vicinity of Sūri (the modern Sūr), the principal fort of the ancient Sūhi. The name of Aššūr-isbat was not native; this town was situated still farther southeast in the fertile flood plain northwest of Rapiḫ (ar-Rahāja), which marked the boundary of the land of Sūhi.

Nimit-Īstar, Apku, and Mari are to be looked for at the site of the modern Bālis and between that site and the range of al-Bīšā; as the ancient Laḵē extended on the west as far as Bālis, it would have been strange indeed if in the whole section from al-Bīšā to Bālis there should not be a single organized administrative district. Between al-Bīšā and Bālis are three stretches of flood plain of some extent, one near Bālis, the second near Abu Hrēra, and the third near ar-Raḵka. Bālis itself I regard as marking the position of Nimit-Īstar, Abu Hrēra as marking that of Apku, and ar-Raḵka that of Mari. Nimit-Īstar was undoubtedly differently named by the natives, but Apku and Mari were native designations. A modern rendering of the name Apku I have not yet found; but that of Mari has persisted in the name of the Mari canal, from which the lands of the town of Callinicus (the modern ar-Raḵka) were irrigated; Mari, or Marē, may therefore have been the original name of the town near which Seleucus Nicator built the Hellenic settlement of Nicephorium, later called Callinicus (see Appendix XI).

The territory of Rašāpi extended around the capital of the province of Raşappa, which, as we have just seen, stretched from Nimit-Īstar (Bālis) on the northwest to Aššūr-isbat in the neighborhood of the modern ar-Rumādi on the southeast, and to the north to include the land of Kaṭni in the environs of the modern Tell Ğellāl.

Emil Forrer (Provinzeinteilung [1921], p. 15) would place the Assyrian Raşappa on the ridge of Sinğār and identify it with the Belbed Sinğār, the Roman Singara. But it seems to me that this conflicts with the existing records as well as with the position of the Belbed Sinğār itself. All the administrative districts under discussion may be found on the lower Ḫābūr and middle Euphrates, and the town of Raşappa survived as ar-Reşāfa, owing, no doubt, to the commercial importance of its position. The Belbed Sinğār lies only one hundred kilometers west of the great capital, Nineveh, the routes leading to it were dominated by the Assyrians from time immemorial, and it is therefore hard to understand how an Assyrian šaku residing at Singara could have governed and administered territories more than three hundred and fifty kilometers distant from his residence and separated from it by a desert.
LATE ASSYRIAN AND CHALDEAN RECORDS

From the end of the eighth century a few records have been preserved; these are dated by the term of office of a prefect of Sūhi and Mari, whose name was Šamaš-rēš-uṣur (Relief Inscription No. 2 [Weissbach, Babylonische Miscellen (1903), pl. 2—5], col. 2, ll. 27—41; col. 3—5; Weissbach, op. cit., pp. 9—11; Peiser, Orientalische Altertumskunde [1901], pp. 144 f.). From them we learn that, as the ancient canal in Sūhi was clogged up, Šamaš-rēš-uṣur ordered a new one to be dug, twenty-two ells wide and one thousand rods long. It was navigable and emptied itself again into the Euphrates at a point called Ė-SAL-A. The banks of the canal at the prefect's order were planted with trees to furnish timber for the ferryboats. These trees grew so dense that they obstructed the approach to his palace. The people had to dig a canal from the town of Ḥarzē as far as the town of Lābi'. Šamaš-rēš-uṣur had a palace in the town of Ribaniš. The gardens of this palace could be irrigated from the new canal, and the prefect had palms planted there like those in the extensive gardens of the palaces at Ra-ilu, Karnabu, Iāduru, and Ukalai. He also founded a new town, which he named Gabbari-KAK, where he had a temple built to the god Adad and his son Šala. At one time when Šamaš-rēš-uṣur was residing in the town of Baḳa four hundred warriors of the Tu'mānu tribe attacked Ribaniš. No sooner had he received a report of this than he crossed the Euphrates, overtook the tribe in the fields of Aradatu, slew three hundred and fifty of them, and made the rest prisoners.

Neither the position of the canal in Sūhi nor that of the several towns whose names have been preserved in these records can be fixed with any degree of accuracy. If the upper half of the ancient Sūhi was called Lāḳē as late as the end of the eighth century, we should locate the Sūhi canal only to the southeast of the rocks of al-'Oḳoba and al-Aswad, where the Euphrates flood plain merges into the Babylonian alluvium. The land of Lāḳē (or Mari) probably extended southeast as far as the rocks of al-'Eršī and the small modern town of Abu Ėmāl. Below this point in the region that once was the land of Sūhi there is no stretch of flood plain long enough to render profitable the digging of an expensive canal for irrigation. Not until we are southeast of al-'Oḳoba does the flood plain begin to widen. But we are also directed to the southern half of the land of Sūhi by the date palms which Šamaš-rēš-uṣur had planted in many places. The northernmost point at which the date palm may be profitably grown in the Euphrates valley is Āna. Hot southeast winds have free access up the valley as far as this settlement and the islet of al-Karāble; but farther north the valley turns abruptly west as one goes upstream and thus cuts off the warmer air from the southeast. The name of Baḳa, the town where Šamaš-rēš-uṣur was residing at the time of the incursion of the Tu'mānu warriors into Ribaniš, suggests the town of Baḳka which the Arabic authors locate southeast of Hī and which I identify with the small settlement of al-Baḳḳ, southeast of the latter town. As al-Baḳḳ lies on the left bank and the prefect was compelled to cross the Euphrates when he wanted to pursue the invaders, we may infer that the town of Ribaniš was situated on the right bank and that the new canal originated at the rock of al-'Oḳoba and extended to the site of the present ar-Rumādi. As I locate the town of Rapliḳi, which lay
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on the border of the land of Sûhi, either in the modern settlement of ar-Rumâdi or in the ar-Râhâja ruins eighteen kilometers southeast from ar-Rumâdi, the town of Ribaniš ought to be sought between the latter and al-‘Oğoba.

During the final struggles between the Assyrians and Babylonians the middle Euphrates was visited by the armies of both. In the year 616 B.C. Nabopolassar, king of Babylonia, occupied Sûhi and Hindânu without meeting any resistance; but three months later he was obliged to defend these districts against an Assyrian army based on the city of Kailation. He vanquished the Assyrians, captured the city, sent a detachment of his army against the cities of Mani (or Mari), Saḫiru, and Balîbu, and returned with great booty. On his return march he took many inhabitants of the city of Hindânu and its gods to Babylon. In the meantime the Assyrians concluded an alliance with Egypt, and the united armies again made camp at Kailation. Nabopolassar hastened against them, but no fight ensued, and the inhabitants of Sûhi endeavored to regain independence. Their efforts were stopped in 613 when Nabopolassar made an assault upon Rahilu, a city which lay in the midst of the Euphrates. On the same day the city was captured. He encamped opposite the city of Anatu, brought up from the west siege engines near to the city wall, and made an assault upon the city, but did not capture it...since the Assyrian king came down and forced him to retire (British Museum, Tablet No. 21,901, ll. 1—11, 31—37; publ. and transl. in Gadd, Fall of Nineveh [1923], pp. 31—34).

Nebuchadnezzar (604—561) mentions, among the gifts offered to the god Marduk, wine from the mountain range of Ḥi-il-bu-nim and Su-uḫa-âm (Grotefend Inscription [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pll. 65 f.], col. 1, ll. 23—24; Inscription A from Wâdi Brisa [Weissbach, Die Inschriften Nebukadnezzars II (1906), pl. 12], col. 4, ll. 50—52; Langdon, Building Inscriptions [1905], pp. 82, 158; Weissbach, op. cit., p. 17; Winckler in: Schrader, Keilinschrichtliche Bibliothek [1889—1900], Vol. 3, p. 33).—Ḥi-il-bu-nim is identical with the volcanic territory around Ḥelbân, northeast of Ḥama’. Su-uḫa-âm is the land of Sûhi on the middle Euphrates, where the wine made in the environs of Ḥana has been celebrated in song and verse by the Arabic authors.

APPENDIX II

XENOPHON ON THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

Of the classical authors, Xenophon, Isidore of Charax, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Zosimus give the most detailed reports about the left bank of the middle Euphrates.

XENOPHON’S ACCOUNT OF THE ROUTE OF THE TEN THOUSAND

Xenophon, Anabasis, I, 4: 6—10, describes the march of the Greek mercenaries led by Cyrus, son of Darius II, against his brother, Arta-xerxes II, through northern Syria and along the left bank of the middle
Euphrates in the spring of 401 B.C. From Myriandrus, a town inhabited by the Phoenicians, after four marches (i.e., 20 parasangs) Cyrus reached the river Chalus, one plethrum wide and full of large tame fish. From here he hastened in five marches (30 parasangs) to the sources of the river Dardas, also one plethrum wide. There, in a fine large garden, where the fruits of all the seasons flourished, stood the manor of Belesis, the satrap of Syria. Cyrus had the garden destroyed and the manor burned.

From the Dardas in three marches (15 parasangs) he reached (ibid., I, 4:11) the river Euphrates, which was four stades wide and by which lay the large, flourishing town of Thapsacus. Then Cyrus crossed the river and the whole army followed his example. The water reached no man's breast. The inhabitants of Thapsacus asserted that nobody ever crossed the river afoot, but always in boats; these had been recently burned by the order of Abyrocomas, Artaxerxes' general, to prevent Cyrus from passing over.

After nine marches (50 parasangs) the army came to the river Araxes, where they found numerous settlements and abundant supplies of wine and corn (ibid., I, 4:19).

Cyrus proceeded farther through Arabia on the left side of the Euphrates and made 35 parasangs in five marches through a desolate country. The district he passed through was as level as the sea and thickly overgrown with wormwood. There were no trees to be seen far and wide, but, instead, many animals, chiefly wild asses and ostriches, and also bustards and gazelles. The bustards were easily caught when anyone went quickly after them, as they could not fly far and soon tired. Their flesh tasted very good. Passing this country Cyrus reached the river Mascas, one plethrum in width, which flows all around the ruined town of Corsote (ibid., I, 5:1–4).

The next thirteen marches (90 parasangs) were made through desolate countries on the left of the Euphrates to Pylae, where many of the draft animals died of hunger, the whole land far around being bare, without grass or bushes. Often the marches were difficult, particularly when the army wanted to reach water or pasture. Once the chariots sank in a swampy hollow and could not proceed any farther... Across the Euphrates (ibid., I, 5:5–10) in the direction of the desert lay the flourishing town of Charmande... Marching still farther, they found the tracks of about two thousand horses, whose riders had ridden ahead, devastating and burning everything in their way (ibid., I, 6:1).

From Pylae Cyrus hastened in three marches (12 parasangs) through Babylonia and on the third day at midnight inspected both the Hellenes and his Barbarians in a plain (ibid., I, 7:1). Then he advanced one day (3 parasangs) in battle array, thinking that the Great King would engage him in battle on the same day, as he found in the middle of the march a ditch three fathoms deep and five fathoms wide dug by the Great King as a defence against the invader and stretching across the plain for twelve parasangs as far as the Median Wall. (A gloss here adds that in the same district he found four other ditches running from the Tigris. These were one plethrum wide and deep enough for ships laden with corn. They emptied into the Euphrates at a distance of one parasang from each other and could be crossed on bridges.) On the bank of the Euphrates between the river and the ditch which the Great King had dug was a
narrow passage about twenty feet wide. Cyrus passed through this narrow opening, thus putting the ditch behind him. Meeting with no resistance, he and the others thought that as yet it was not the Great King’s intention to fight; therefore on the next day (the fifth from Pylae) they went ahead less cautiously (ibid., I, 7: 14–19).

On the third day (of their marching in battle array; the sixth from Pylae) Cyrus drove in a chariot; with him were only a few soldiers prepared to fight, while the greater part of the army marched without any set formation... (ibid., I, 7: 20). The sun was already high in the heavens, and the place where they meant to encamp was not far off, when the Persian Patetygias suddenly announced that the Great King was approaching in battle array with a big army... Cyrus jumped from the chariot and ordered all to arm themselves and take their places. This was done with great speed. Clearchus posted his right wing with the Euphrates in his rear... (ibid., I, 8: 1–4). It was already noon and still the enemy did not appear. But after noon a cloud of white dust was sighted... (ibid., I, 8: 8), and a battle ensued, in which Cyrus fell (ibid., I, 8: 27). Clearchus with his Hellenes would not withdraw the right wing from the river, but Ariaeus with the Barbarian troops on the left wing was unable to resist the Persians and fled through the camp to the place from which they had marched out in the morning, which was said to be four parasangs distant (ibid., I, 10: 1). Pursuing Ariaeus, the Great King plundered the camp (loc. cit.) and then turned against the Hellenes of Clearchus... but his Barbarians began to flee... and the Hellenes pursued them as far as some settlement. There they halted, for beyond rose a hillock on the top of which the royal riders rallied again... (ibid., I, 10: 4–12). When the Hellenes advanced, the riders left the hillock..., below which Clearchus halted with his men shortly before sunset. After that he returned to the plundered camp, where he remained all night and the following day (ibid., I, 10: 17–19; II, 1: 2).

Towards the evening the Hellenes, led by Clearchus, began to retire and reached at midnight their former camping ground, where they met Ariaeus (ibid., II, 2: 8). At daybreak they set out again in such a way that the sun was on their right, being of the opinion that by sunset they would reach the villages of Babylonia. In the afternoon a few thought they saw the enemy’s cavalry in the distance..., but this did not make Clearchus deviate from his route...; he followed a straight course ahead, until he reached the first villages just at sunset with the advance guard (ibid., II, 2: 13–16). Early the next morning the Hellenes were ordered by Clearchus to proceed on their march in battle array... (ibid., II, 2: 18–21). The following day after sunrise the royal heralds made their appearance, offering an armistice. Clearchus declared after a while that he would agree to a truce, but demanded to be led to a place where supplies could be had (ibid., II, 3: 1–5). When this was done, Clearchus marched out to conclude the armistice. The army advanced in battle array, while he protected the rear guard. Across the numerous ditches and canals filled with water, which it was impossible to cross without bridges, the Hellenes placed palm trees which were already lying there or had first to be cut down... In this manner they came to the villages, where their leaders gave them food (ibid., II, 3: 10–14).

After a halt of three days they were visited by Tissaphernes (ibid.,
II, 3:17), who had been sent to them with other Persians by the Great King and who, after negotiating with Clearchus, returned the same day to the king. The next day he did not show himself... but on the third day he came (ibid., II, 3:25) to conclude a treaty with the Hellenes and then again returned to the Great King. Following this the Hellenes waited for Tissaphernes more than twenty days (ibid., II, 4:1), after which they resumed their march under his guidance (ibid., II, 4:8—9). After three days they reached the so-called Median Wall and then crossed the area enclosed by it. This wall, built of bricks joined by bitumen, measured twenty feet in width and one hundred in height, was about twenty parasangs long, and was not far distant from Babylon (ibid., II, 4:12).

From here they made two marches (8 parasangs), crossing two canals, one by a permanent bridge, the other by a bridge formed of seven boats. These canals ran out of the Tigris..., which they also finally reached at a point about fifteen stades from the large inhabited town of Sittace, where they encamped (ibid., II, 4:13—14).

Clearchus asked a messenger who came to him about the extent of the territory between the Tigris and the (second) canal and was answered that it was a big country with many settlements and numerous towns of considerable size. The Barbarians feared lest the Hellenes should destroy the Tigris bridge and remain in this country, which formed an island shut in by the Tigris and the canal; here they would be sure of plenty of food as well as of workers to cultivate the soil (ibid., II, 4:21—22).

With the daybreak the Hellenes began very cautiously to cross the bridge over the Tigris, which was supported on 37 boats, and came after four marches (20 parasangs) to the river Physcus, one plethron wide and provided with a bridge, where the large town of Opis was situated (ibid., II, 4:24—25). From here they marched through Media, finally reaching in six marches (30 parasangs) through wild regions the settlements belonging to Parysatis, mother of both Cyrus and the Great King... (ibid., II, 4:27), where they found grain, fruit, and other supplies. From there, with the Tigris on their left, in four marches (20 parasangs) through a rugged district they reached the river Zapatas, four plethra wide (ibid., II, 4:28; II, 5:1).

Reconstruction of the Route of the Ten Thousand

The part of the route described by Xenophon which is of interest to us is that which leads from the harbor of Myriandrus on the Mediterranean to the town of Thapsacus on the Euphrates and along the left bank of this river as far as the place where Cyrus the Younger lost both the battle and his life. Not far from this point the route leaves the Euphrates, crosses the Tigris at Sittace, and on the left bank of the latter stream at the town of Opis reaches its tributary, the Physcus.

To state more exactly what route the army followed is not easy if we have to depend on Xenophon's notes alone. The direction is given by him only once and he mentions only a few places, the positions of which he indicates very superficially. The distances he defines by daily marches and parasangs. If these had been determined with precision and the records preserved to us, it would be safe to follow them, but it seems that the marches were not measured by the Greek foot-soldiers, but merely estimated
roughly; furthermore, it is also probable that the original figures have suffered many changes in transcription. Xenophon quotes five day's marches at four parasangs each; seven at five; nine at five and one-half; five at six; and eighteen at seven. Of the last eighteen, thirteen were through a rough and nearly impassable region where neither man nor beast could possibly have proceeded for thirteen days at a rate of seven parasangs a day.

As Xenophon (ibid., II, 2: 6; V, 5: 4) counts thirty stades to a parasang, the distance between Thapsacus and the settlement near which Cyrus was killed would be 5940 stades. Plutarch, Artaxerxes, 8, calls this place Cunaxa and states that it lies 500 stades from Babylon. This would make Thapsacus 6440 stades from Babylon. Eratosthenes, however, placed it at only 4800 stades from Babylon.

Of much greater service to us than the parasangs in determining the positions on the march of the Ten Thousand are the daily marches. From Pylae, which may be located with accuracy from physiographic features, to the river Araxes — which could only be al-Habur — the distance is 355 kilometers. Xenophon fixes this distance at 128 parasangs and says that the army made it in eighteen marches. One march would therefore amount to about twenty kilometers, or seven parasangs; and one parasang would measure only three kilometers. This, however, according to other authorities, is incorrect. On the other hand, the same agreement in the relation of the daily marches with the actual distances and the same discrepancy in regard to the length of the parasang is also found in other passages in Xenophon.

Position of Thapsacus

The starting point of Xenophon's route was the harbor of Myriandrus, the ruins of which lie 13 kilometers southwest of Alexandretta; its first goal was the Euphrates at the town of Thapsacus. The shortest line between Myriandrus and the Euphrates is 210 kilometers long, to the bend where the river leaves its south-southwesterly course and turns southeast. It would be futile to look for Thapsacus south or north of this bend, as Xenophon would then have had to march for some distance along the right bank of the river. His whole narrative makes it appear that he did not reach the Euphrates before reaching Thapsacus. He did not swerve northeast, inland, because then he would have had to return along the left bank, and it would have been equally impossible for him to have turned southeast, as the salina of Gabbūl with the surrounding marshes, as well as the barren, waterless country between the marshes and the river compels all caravans coming from the west or northwest to go directly to the Euphrates at the bend.

Moreover, we are almost compelled to look for the ford of Thapsacus in the immediate neighborhood of the Euphrates bend, when we compare two statements of Strabo. In the Geography, XI, 12: 3; XI, 14: 2, Strabo writes: "When the Euphrates leaves the mountains and enters Syria, it turns southeast as far as Babylon . . . ." The second passage (ibid., XVI, 1: 13) runs thus: "Then the Euphrates breaks through the Taurus, runs as far as Thapsacus . . . ., and then it rolls on, dividing lower Syria from Mesopotamia, as far as Babylon."
To the same bend we are brought by Arrian (Anabasis, III, 7), who writes: "Alexander crossed with his army to the other side and from there, with the Euphrates and the Armenian mountains on his left, he marched still farther inland and through Mesopotamia to the Tigris." The words "with the Euphrates on his left" become true if Alexander crossed the Euphrates at the bend and then turned northeast, for thus he would have seen the Euphrates on his left for three days, while the reach of the river on his right would have been lost to his view on the first day. If he had crossed the river farther to the north or south of the bend, he would have seen it on either the one or the other side for about the same time.

The location of Thapsacus at this bend is further emphasized by Strabo, where he writes (op. cit., XVI, 1: 21 f.) that the distance between the Euphrates and Tigris is the greatest at the foot of the mountain range and that this may be the very distance of 2400 stades fixed by Eratosthenes as the distance from Thapsacus, where there was once a bridge across the Euphrates, to the ford on the Tigris which Alexander crossed. A single glance at the map shows us that the greatest width of Mesopotamia is between the great bend of the Euphrates and the Tigris below Gezret ibn 'Omar along the base of the Taurus mountains. The stade of Eratosthenes, as we may infer from Pliny, Naturalis historia, XII, 14: 53, was 157.5 meters or at most 159.75 meters long; hence the 2400 stades would equal about 378 or 383 kilometers, a distance which agrees essentially with the distance from the bend (Thapsacus) to the Tigris ford (about 400 kilometers).

According to Strabo (op. cit., II, 1: 21, 26 f., 36), Eratosthenes determined the distance between Thapsacus and Babylon along the Euphrates as 4800 stades, the equivalent of 756 or 766.8 kilometers. If we measure the road used to this day along the left bank of the Euphrates we arrive, at 765 kilometers upstream from Babylon, at the Samûma ruin in the very bend under consideration. This road was so much frequented in the time of both Alexander and the first Seleucids that it might well have been measured accurately. Thus the figure of 4800 stades may have become traditional. This, therefore, justifies us in referring to this coincidence and in locating the Thapsacus ford at the Samûma ruin.

Strabo (op. cit., II, 1: 26) cites Eratosthenes to the effect that the measured distance north from Thapsacus to the Armenian Gates was said to be 1100 stades. In a straight line 1100 stades, or approximately 173 kilometers, north from Samûma as the crow flies brings us near the ancient ford of Zeugma near Samosata in Commagene, actually 166 kilometers north of Samûma. It seems, therefore, that this Zeugma must have formed the farthest point of a direct survey from Thapsacus northward, for elsewhere Strabo gives the distance thither along the Euphrates as "not less than two thousand stades" (ibid., XVI, 1: 22). This latter, however, is a merely superficial statement and, as is evident from the context, is quite misleading; the actual distance from Samûma to Samsat along the river being, not 315 kilometers or 2000 stades, but 240 kilometers or 1500 stades. Therefore the word ὰβξ (not) should be struck out of the text, which should read "less than two thousand stades."

The argument for the position of Thapsacus at the Euphrates bend, whence the distance to the Mediterranean is shorter than from other points, is also supported by Aristobulus' story (Arrian, Anabasis, VII, 19;
Strabo, *op. cit.*, XVI, 1:11) that Alexander had boats made in Phoenicia and on the island of Cyprus and transported in sections to Thapsacus, seven stages (*statthmosei*) distant, where they were joined together and floated downstream to Babylon. If these boats were made at Myriandrus, which belonged to the Phoenicians, or in Cyprus, and from there delivered at the site of Alexandretta, they could have been carried on wagons or pack animals to Thapsacus in seven days. The whole distance, if we follow the present road, amounts to 210 kilometers, which if made in seven days would necessitate a speed of thirty kilometers daily for a pack caravan. But this distance could be shortened if the boats were unloaded on the river Orontes at the site of the later Antioch. Thirty kilometers a day is the maximum speed of a heavily laden caravan on a journey of considerable duration.

The position of Thapsacus at the bend is likewise indirectly confirmed by Ptolemy, when we compare his statements with those of the Arabic authors and modern natives. According to Ptolemy (*Geography*, V, 15:7), Thapsacus lay on the borders of Syria and Arabia; according to the Arabic writers, the settlement of Bâlis, situated in the Euphrates bend six kilometers from Samûma, also marked the border between Arabia and Syria.

Ernst Herzfeld (Sarre and Herzfeld, *Archäologische Reise* [1911], Vol. 1, pp. 143 ff.) locates Thapsacus at the Tell Tadejjên, 66 kilometers east of Samûma and not far from ar-Râgka, on the site of the ancient Nicephorium. The length of the present road from Alexandretta by way of Aleppo to the Tell Tadejjên he determines as 327.5 kilometers and writes (*ibid.*, p. 145) that it now takes a carvan only seven days to make this journey. This, however, is incorrect, as no caravan with a heavy load could do the requisite forty-seven kilometers a day, especially in a mountainous and rolling country like that between Alexandretta and Aleppo or between Hân aš-Šaʿar and Tell Tadejjên.

Herzfeld (*ibid.*) furthermore argues on the following grounds that Thapsacus must have been near Nicephorium. He refers to Pliny (*op. cit.*, VI, 119) who says that not far from the Euphrates lies Nicephorium, which was built by Alexander's order on account of its advantageous site. He also cites Isidore of Charax, who relates that Alexander marched by way of Nicephorium (ar-Râgka). As Alexander crossed the Euphrates at Thapsacus, Herzfeld concludes that Thapsacus must have been near Nicephorium, since Alexander founded towns solely in positions he had himself visited. Before admitting this, however, it would be necessary to prove that Alexander really did found all the towns which made that claim for themselves, and that he also visited them in person. It is likewise certain that not only Alexander but other rulers as well were credited with the founding of Nicephorium. Therefore this argument for the position of Thapsacus loses all weight. Pliny (*op. cit.*, XXXIV, 150) himself remarks that Alexander crossed the river Euphrates by the bridge at Zeugma; this point, however, is far distant both from Nicephorium and from Tell Tadejjên, where Herzfeld locates his Thapsacus. Furthermore, according to Herzfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 153), who accepts the identity of Xenophon's and Ptolemy's Thapsacus, Ptolemy constantly used the scientific material accumulated during Alexander's marches, and for this reason his locating of Thapsacus in relation to Alexander's route and to Nicephorium should be decisive for the true position of Thapsacus. And yet Ptolemy places
the town not northeast but far to the southeast of Nicephorium, thus excluding the possibility of Alexander’s having marched from Thapsacus through the latter town.

Samûma is situated on the southeastern boundary of the settled country and forms an important junction of roads leading from the Euphrates to fertile Syria and Mesopotamia. The caravans arriving from Babylonia or Mesopotamia left the Euphrates at Thapsacus (Samûma) and proceeded through a cultivated and settled region either west to Chalcis or northwest to Beroea and north to Bambice (Hierapolis). As the flood plain at Samûma is fairly wide, the passage to the channel is here easy on both sides; and, since the river itself is also of considerable width, the crossing is not difficult; to this day the ford is used by commercial caravans as well as by migrating tribes. Opposite Samûma on the left bank of the Euphrates the road terminates which leads northeast to Harrân (Carrhae), past which Alexander the Great probably advanced.

The town of Thapsacus flourished as long as Babylonia, Mesopotamia, and Syria obeyed one sovereign and perished when these countries separated. This was the natural consequence of its position on the southeastern border of Syria proper. Palmyra, as soon as it gained a certain independence, strove for and gained control of the commercial routes from Babylonia and from southern and central Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean. Thus the importance of the ford at Thapsacus was irreparably diminished. In this policy Palmyra was aided not only by the small native rulers but by their overlords, the great Parthian kings, who, if for no other reason, from political motives alone liked to see the strengthening of the buffer state of Palmyra. When the Parthians made Nicephorium their commercial center, the commercial transport from Egypt and from southern and central Syria came to pass through Palmyra, and the Euphrates was crossed near Nicephorium. If, then, the ancient Thapsacus were identical with Tadejjen, being on this line of trade, it would have flourished in this period also and its inhabitants would have had no reason to leave it and build the town of Sura, seven kilometers farther east. The land around Tadejjen is just as productive as the neighborhood of Sûrîja, while the Tadejjen ford is much easier than the one at the latter town. But if Thapsacus was situated at the bend at Samûma, its decay under the changed political conditions is easy to understand. Nicephorium and Sura concentrated in themselves the whole commerce of the Parthian empire and Palmyrene states; the crumbling empire of the Seleucids to the northwest and northeast had Seleucia and Apamea for its mercantile centers; thus it came about that the ancient ford of Thapsacus on the frontier between these not overfriendly states was gradually avoided by the caravans. For this reason no classical author has given us the correct position of the town, the brickwork of which was probably used in building the town of Barbalissus, three kilometers to the southeast. (For a further discussion of Thapsacus, see below, Appendix VIII.)

**Myriandrus to Thapsacus**

To return to Xenophon, we note that it took the army twelve days to cover the distance from Myriandrus to Thapsacus (Samûma). After the first four days it reached the river Chalus. This must have been the
river 'Afrin; Chalus may also have been the name of a settlement on its banks. In all probability the army crossed this stream where the modern Marata Köi is situated. The distance from Myriandrus by way of the Bajlân Pass and the necessary detour through the marshy valley to Marata Köi is 65 kilometers, requiring a speed of sixteen kilometers a day for the Hellenic troops, a creditable performance considering the hundreds of meters they had to ascend and descend again.

From the Chalus they arrived in five days at the sources of the river Dardas. As Xenophon says that the width of this river was one plethrum, it is evident that he exaggerates and that the army could not have been at the source proper, but perhaps at the junction of two creeks which combine to form the river. In this case we could look for Xenophon's "sources of the Dardas" at the point where two creeks actually do combine to form the river Dahab. On the western creek there lies a village now called Abu 'Taltal, but in medieval times Tartar (Jâkût, Ma'gam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 3, p. 529); this name might be regarded as the Greek Dardas (or Dardar, according to some manuscripts). The distance from the Chalus (Marata Köi) to the Dardas (Dahab) would then be about ninety kilometers, involving a march of eighteen kilometers daily through a hilly region, almost impassable in some places.

From the Dardas the army reached the Euphrates at Thapsacus in three days. The beginning of the Nahr ad-Dahab being only 55 kilometers from Samûma, a day's march would here have amounted to nineteen kilometers; we may, however, assume that the last march was much shorter than the others, just as was the case before the Chalus and Dardas were reached. On the day of arrival the march is always counted as a whole one.

**Thapsacus to Pylae**

At Thapsacus the army forded the Euphrates, here four stades (about 640 meters) wide, and proceeded along its left bank as far as the river Araxes, which was reached in nine days. According to Xenophon, this river marked the boundary between Syria and Arabia and had numerous wealthy settlements along its banks. It is evident that Xenophon's Araxes is the river Chaboras, or al-Hâbûr, which forms the dividing line between the settled country and that of the nomads. The name "Araxes" itself was probably derived from the Arabic designation for the canal bringing water from al-Hâbûr to the ancient town of Corsote. This canal, already known to the Assyrian king Tukulti Enurta II, was called in the Middle Ages, as it is today, Dârîn and emptied into the Euphrates at the foot of the rocks of al-'Arşî or al-'Erşî. "Araxes" is the Greek transliteration of the Arabic 'Araṣî ('Arṣî or 'Erṣî in dialect), just as the Greek name of the river Axios is identical with the Arabic 'Āṣî. Hence Xenophon transferred the Arabic designation of the canal which issues from al-Hâbûr and which he followed for five days to the river al-Hâbûr itself, which the army crossed. Now, as the distance from Thapsacus (Samûma) along the Euphrates to the Araxes (al-Hâbûr) is 240 kilometers, the army must have marched twenty-six kilometers daily, an unusual feat indeed. No army could have continued marching twenty-six kilometers a day for any length of time.
Both banks of the lower Ḥābūr as well as the right bank of the Dawrīn canal are covered with ruins and are very fertile to this day. From al-Ḥābūr Cyrus marched on the left bank of the Euphrates for five days to the ruins of the town of Corsote, which were encircled by the river Mascas.— “Korsote” (Corsote) is the old Aramaic form of the Arabic “'Araṣī” (Araxes), a name which stuck to the town once inhabited by the Arameans. That in Xenophon's time the country people appear to have pronounced the Aramaic “Korsote” in the Arabic way, “'Araṣī,” is proved by the use of this designation in the form “Araxes” as applied to the canal.

As the context shows, the town of Corsote was situated at the southeastern extremity of a fertile plain; we must therefore look for it at the foot of the steep rocks of al-'Erṣī. On the left bank of the Euphrates between al-Ḥābūr and al-'Erṣī extends a flat flood plain from which project ruin mounds, the remains of numerous towns. Through the eastern half of this plain winds the Dawrīn (Araxes) canal, now completely dried up. The western half is furrowed by innumerable old and new irrigation ditches leading from the Euphrates and Dawrīn (Araxes), a great hindrance both to marching and transport. Owing to this the commercial route follows the left bank of the canal, to which Cyrus' army also kept. This strip of the plain could fairly be described as desolate, especially if the Persian cavalry had clogged up the Araxes canal at its very beginning in such a way that no water could flow into it.

The “river,” or rather the irrigation canal, of Mascas did not branch off from the Araxes, which to all appearances was dry, but from the Euphrates and encircled the ruined town of Corsote. The description of this town answers to that of the ʿat-Ṭāwī ruins at the foot of the rocks of al-'Erṣī, all around which runs an old ditch filled with water only in time of flood. Here the road leaves the flood plain and leads through the rugged hills along the river bank. From the point where Cyrus reached the Araxes (al-Ḥābūr) to Corsote (ʿat-Ṭāwī) the distance is 90 kilometers, which would have meant eighteen kilometers for a day's march, if we do not take into consideration the possibilities that the last day's march may have been shorter than the others, that the army must already have been tired, and that the crossing of al-Ḥābūr also must have taken some time.

From Corsote the army marched in thirteen days to Pylae ("The Gates"). This leads us to where the Tertiary formation ends and the alluvial plain of Babylonia begins at a point marked on the right bank of the Euphrates by the rocky spur of al-'Ojkoba and on the left bank by the rocks of al-Aswad. We may therefore look for the Pylae of Xenophon at the pass at the eastern foot of the latter crag.

Xenophon's picture of this part of the Euphrates valley is true to nature. The banks thereabout are formed by porous rocky bluffs containing much crystallized gypsum and dissected by innumerable short, deep gullies. In some places for a distance of many kilometers the Euphrates washes the foot of steep rocks on the left bank, leaving no room for the road, which has to follow a course far from the river over rocky ground and through gullies. Where some of the gullies run down to the Euphrates marshy and often impassable bays are formed. In a territory of this character the daily marches could not have been of equal length because the army must have taken care to reach, if not every day, then
at least every other day, a fairly large bay where it could obtain water and pasture.

It is evident from the context that the town of Charmande must have been located near Pylae. This is confirmed by Sophaneses, who took part in Cyrus' expedition and described it (Stephen of Byzantium, Etnica [Meineke], p. 689). To me the name seems to be composed of *karm* and *Ande*. *Karm* is the Aramaic *karma* and Arabic *karm*, meaning vineyard; *Ande* the original name of the town. Ptolemy (Geography, V, 18: 7) records in almost the same territory a town of Addaea, the doubled *d* of which may replace the original *nd*. Southwest of the crag of al-Aswad on the right bank of the Euphrates lies the huge 'Adde ruin, which in its name as well as in its position corresponds with Xenophon's Charmande. Opposite this ruin on the left bank the remains of a strongly fortified building are visible; on the rocky slopes there are terrace sand piles of stones from the ancient vineyards. It is highly probable that both the building and the vineyards belonged to the town of Ande and that on the map of Mesopotamia which Ptolemy copied the settlement of Addaea was marked on the left bank of the Euphrates. Even today every large settlement on the right bank has some kind of suburb opposite on the left bank, and the natives do not differentiate between the right and left banks when speaking of such settlements.

From Corsote (at-Ṭawi) to Pylae (al-Aswad) is 265 kilometers, which involved a march of a little over twenty kilometers a day for Cyrus' army, though, for reasons already given, these marches were not always of equal length.

**Pylae to Cunaxa**

From Pylae the army went along the left bank of the Euphrates as far as the battle ground which, according to Plutarch, extended around the settlement of Cunaxa, at a distance of five hundred stades from Babylon. Five hundred stades, or eighty kilometers, from Babylon along the left bank of the Euphrates brings us to the al-Knejse ruin, about four kilometers from the river. Kunaja, or Knejse in the dialect, is the diminutive of Kunaga, and this again is the Arabic form of the Greek "Kunaxa," *s* being the Greek *α*. Following Xenophon also we reach the immediate environs of al-Knejse. From al-Aswad (Pylae) to al-Knejse is 90 kilometers, a stretch which the army required six days to cover, at a rate of fifteen kilometers a day. We must not lose sight of the fact that the march led in its second half through an irrigated alluvial plain over numerous old and new ditches, and also that four large canals had to be crossed. The marches were longer on the first three than on the following days, especially the fourth, when the army was in full battle array and had to go through a passage barely twenty feet wide between the Euphrates and the ditch dug by the Persians to hinder the enemy's progress.

Beyond al-Aswad (Pylae) the alluvial plain was, and still is, intersected by numerous ditches, but during the first three day's marches it was not necessary to cross them. The road followed the foot of the Tertiary bluffs. Admitting that on the first three marches from Pylae (al-Aswad) the army made eighteen kilometers a day — more than that they surely could not have covered, as they had to be prepared for a
sudden attack, the tracks of the enemy's cavalry being visible—they must have had to rest at the end of the third march near al-Waššāš in the depression of al-Ḥūr. This depression, which is six kilometers wide, slopes to the east, and through it flows al-Waššāš, also known as al-Ḵarma. Al-Waššāš is not properly a canal but a natural branch of the Euphrates, from which it receives its water by two channels. South of the depression of al-Ḥūr above the left bank of the Euphrates rises another Tertiary upland, rather difficult to irrigate or cultivate. On the fourth day the army probably had to cross what is now the northern channel of al-Waššāš by a bridge and then to pass through the narrow opening between the Euphrates and the newly dug ditch. Being in battle array they could not have covered a great distance; as Xenophon himself estimates the fourth day's march from Pylae at no more than three parasangs, we are therefore justified in believing that it did not exceed ten kilometers.

The ditch three fathoms (5 m.) deep and five fathoms (8 m.) wide reached by the army at about the middle of the fourth march may have been what is now the southern channel of al-Waššāš, which, according to Xenophon, shortly before Cyrus' arrival had either been freshly excavated or perhaps dredged, undoubtedly not merely as a defense against the invaders but also for irrigation purposes. It had not, however, as yet been connected with the Euphrates and consequently contained no water. Cyrus' army could then pass over the strip of earth remaining between the ditch and the Euphrates. Xenophon estimates the length of the ditch at twelve parasangs, or about three marches.

According to our estimate of the probable rate of march, the army must have encamped after the fourth day from Pylae (al-Aswad) at about the inlet of the present al-Azarqijje canal, and after the fifth march just east of the inlet of the Daffār (al-'Ejsāwi) canal. We may assume, therefore, that the Greeks covered about 16 kilometers on the fifth march (the length of which Xenophon does not specify) and 14 on the sixth (the length of which Xenophon, op. cit., I, 10: 1, asserts, was said to have been 4 parasangs). This sixth march brought them nearly to the place where they had meant to encamp (ibid., I, 8: 1), but the battle ensued in the afternoon. The battle line must have been drawn up to the east of this intended camping ground, for the Persian army in its pursuit of Ariaeus swept through the Greek camp there, plundering the baggage which had been left there when the troops went into battle (ibid., I, 10: 1, 5). This position would also seem to be the camp by way of which Clearchus retired after the battle (ibid., I, 10: 17).

Our estimate of the total length of the six marches from Pylae (al-Aswad) to Cunaxa as given by Xenophon brings us to the al-Knejše ruin. Since Clearchus after the battle pursued the Persians as far as a "certain village" (Cunaxa) lying beside a hill (ibid., I, 10: 11—12), we may assume that the Greek battle position with its right wing on the Euphrates must have been about five kilometers southwest of Cunaxa.

Cunaxa to the Zapatas

From Cunaxa (al-Knejše) the Greeks returned to the camping place at the inlet of the Daffār (al-'Ejsāwi) canal and from there started back—either to the north or northeast, because at sunrise they had the sun on
the right—in search of some as yet un plundered Babylonian settlements which could only be north of the Euphrates. These they reached towards evening.

In agreement with our placing of the Greek camping ground close to the Daffâr canal is not only Xenophon’s narrative of the march but the topography of the country as well. About four kilometers north of the Daffâr begins the barren Tertiary upland. As all the villages on the Euphrates had been completely plundered by the Great King’s cavalry, the Greeks could have found no provisions in the fertile strip about four kilometers wide along the river here, nor any villages on the adjacent upland. The villages were situated about seventeen kilometers farther off, in the depression of al-Hûr by the present ruin mound of al-Ašhâbi. In this depression, now cultivated and productive, as well as between the site of al-Ašhâbi and the Umm Ḫetîme ruin at the Median Wall, were rich Babylonian villages, where the Greeks laid in a stock of provisions.

As far as this point we have been able to follow the march described by Xenophon with accuracy, as we have had the guidance not only of Xenophon but also of the Euphrates. North of the camping ground at the Daffâr, however, Xenophon left the river without mentioning either the direction or the distance covered by the army before it reached the Median Wall on the fourth march from the Babylonian villages.

In the two marches from the Median Wall to the vicinity of Sittace the Greeks did not make much headway, as they had to cross two canals; the second march, judging from the context, was very short. The marching was then, and still is, very difficult, as the ground in that region is intersected by countless old and new ditches.

It is remarkable that Xenophon, whose description of the country generally agrees with the facts, could make all the Babylonian canals rise in the Tigris, when all the canals he had to cross probably took their water from the Euphrates and led into the Tigris, as did the canal of Patti Bêl (see above, p. 202).

He writes (Anabasis, II, 4: 13) that beyond the Median Wall the Greeks crossed two canals issuing from the Tigris. The lay of the land, however, renders it almost impossible for two such canals to issue from the Tigris in this region at the present time, and the same was undoubtedly true in Xenophon’s time. It is just barely possible that the upper or second canal might have issued from the Tigris at least ninety kilometers north of the point where the Greeks presumably crossed it in the vicinity of the mouth of the river Phycus; but in this case its left bank would have had to have been reinforced by a large dike to prevent its waters rejoicing the Tigris somewhere near the site of the modern Bagdad. We may therefore assume that both of the canals which Xenophon crossed beyond the Median Wall actually issued from the Euphrates and that the first one was probably identical with the Naarmalcha (Royal River, or the present Nahr al-Malek) and the second with the Nahr Šârshar of the early Arabian writers.

It is no less remarkable that he should write that the ditch dug by Artaxerxes’ order runs through a plain for a distance of twelve parasangs to the Median Wall and yet should not mention it again. Had it reached the Median Wall he would have had to pass it twice, first on his march from Cunaxa northward and then on that from the Median Wall south-
eastward toward Sittace. The length of the Median Wall he states as twenty parasangs, a little too much. According to Eratosthenes (Strabo, Geography, II, 1: 26), Queen Semiramis had a wall built at the point where the Euphrates and Tigris are only two hundred stades distant from each other. This can be no other than the Median Wall spoken of by Xenophon. By the wall of Semiramis, where the two rivers are closest together, Eratosthenes locates the town of Opis (ibid.). Xenophon erroneously, as we shall explain below, places Opis at the junction of the river Phycus with the Tigris.

In order to determine this part of Xenophon's route we must ascertain as precisely as possible the points passed by him on the left bank of the Tigris. Here the two rivers named by him, the Zapatas (four plethra [over 120 m] wide) and the Phycus, or the frontier river (one pletrum [31 m] wide) dividing Babylonia from Media, are the factors. The Zapatas we might identify with the Great Zab: its very name as well as the given width indicate this. The Phycus could not have been a canal running out from the Tigris, for no such canals have ever diverged for a sufficient distance from the middle Tigris to have formed a boundary. The Phycus must therefore have been a river of some length, probably al-Adhem of today. In Xenophon's time the Djâla to the south had already been diverted into innumerable irrigation canals and could not possibly have been one pletrum wide.

The journey from the Phycus to the Zapatas is divided by Xenophon into two parts: from the Phycus to the settlements of Parysatis, six marches; and from there as far as the Zapatas, four marches. The distance between the rivers al-Adhem and Zab along the Tigris is 260 kilometers. Six marches from the Phycus (al-Adhem) led through a wilderness, and not until the sixth march did the army reach the fertile region of the settlements of Parysatis, which had grain, fruit, and other provisions in abundance. Nearly 160 kilometers north of al-Adhem extends the fertile basin of the Little Zab, which could have been reached in six day's marches of twenty-seven kilometers each. For this reason we may locate the settlements of Parysatis there. Thence to the mouth of the Great Zab is ninety-six kilometers, a distance that could have been covered in four days at a rate of nearly twenty-four kilometers a day, the last march probably being shorter than the others.

We see that the Hellenic army went from the Phycus to the settlements of Parysatis at a speed which had previously been kept up on the march from Thapsacus to the Araxes. If we admit that the Greeks had proceeded at the same rate after crossing the Tigris near Sittace, reckoning backward four marches of twenty-five kilometers from al-Adhem (Phycus) along the Tigris brings us to the confines of the later town of Seleucia as a probable site of Sittace. Twenty-five kilometers a day would have been a notable speed, considering that it was necessary to pass over all the canals of the Djâla river. Accordingly, the Greeks must have crossed the Tigris near the present Tell 'Omar ruins somewhat to the north of the site of Seleucia. The Median Wall must therefore be looked for at more than two day's marches northwest from there, and the Babylonian villages at more than three short day's marches north-northwest from the Median Wall.
APPENDIX III

ISIDORE OF CHARAX ON THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

ISIDORE'S SCHOENUS

Isidore of Charax describes in his *Mansiones particae* (Müller), pp. 247–249, the Parthian highway from Nicephorium along the banks of the Euphrates to Seleucia and records the halting places which were best known in the first century of our era. His statements are very valuable, as he gives the distances between the several stations in *schoeni* and also the totals of these *schoeni* from the station of Phaliga, situated on the river Aburas (al-Ḥābūr), to Seleucia. His work would provide us with an excellent basis for defining the location of the different halting places if his original figures had been correctly preserved. But even a passing glance over his *Mansiones* shows that the present numbers cannot be correct. In the total the distance from Phaliga to Seleucia is given as 100 *schoeni*; but, if the distances between the stations are added up, the result is 118 *schoeni*. Since it is more likely that the total, one single figure, has been preserved intact than that the several distances consisting of many figures have remained unaltered by copyists, we may assume that the number 100 is correct. We desire, however, to prove this.

In the present discussion of Isidore's data and in those that will follow of certain Arabic itineraries, it is of great importance for us in each case to adopt a working figure for the lengths of the various units of measurement. By a "working figure" we mean one which represents the ratio between the actual distance between two known points as expressed in kilometers and the same distance as given by our authorities in stades, *schoeni*, parasangs, Arabic miles, etc. Such a working figure, it is true, may not represent the length of the stade, *schoenus*, parasang, or mile as conceived by the Greek or Arabic writers. On the other hand, for any study of the relative accuracy of the various distances given by them and as an aid in determining doubtful positions in relation to known positions the working figure is obviously of greater value than the theoretical figure.

Let us determine a working figure for the length of Isidore's *schoenus*. For this purpose we have chosen the following distances as given by him between certain points the positions of which are known:

From Phaliga to Dura: 10 *schoeni*; in reality 47 kilometers; therefore 1 *schoenus* = 4.7 km.

From Dura to Giddan: 10 *schoeni*; in reality 47 kilometers; therefore 1 *schoenus* = 4.7 km.

From Giddan to Anatha: 17 *schoeni*; in reality 80 kilometers; therefore 1 *schoenus* = 4.7 km.

From Anatha to Thilabus: 2 *schoeni*; in reality 14 kilometers.

In the last case one *schoenus* would equal 7 kilometers; but if the figure 2 has been erroneously transcribed for 3, we get one *schoenus* = 4.7 km.
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From Thilabus to Izan: 12 schoeni; in reality 58 kilometers; therefore one schoenus = 4.8 km.

From Izan to Is: 22 schoeni; in reality 57 kilometers; in this instance one schoenus would be only 2.6 kilometers. If the figure 22, however, has been erroneously transcribed for 12, we have an average of 4.75 kilometers for one schoenus.

We may therefore accept as our working figure for the length of one schoenus as used by Isidore approximately 4.7 kilometers and thus locate the next two stations, the positions of which are not as certain as those of the previous ones.

From Is to Besechana is given as 12 schoeni (~ 56.5 km.). Fifty-five kilometers from Is, which corresponded to the modern town of Hit, lies the prosperous settlement of ar-Rumâdî, which I believe marks the site of the station of Besechana.

A road led from Besechana also along the right bank of the Euphrates as far as the station of Neapolis, whence it turned across the river and across the Royal Canal to Seleucia. From here (Neapolis) to Seleucia was 9 schoeni, or about 42 kilometers, the actual distance from the site of Seleucia to the Euphrates in a westerly and southwesterly direction.

If we add up the figures in schoeni so far given and corrected as I have suggested (that is 10, 10, 17, 3, 12, 12, 12, 9), we get 85, or 15 less than the total of 100 given by Isidore. If, however, as we shall explain below, the distance between Besechana and Neapolis should be 15 and not 22 schoeni as stated in the text, the total would become 100. At 15 schoeni, or about 70 kilometers, from ar-Rumâdî (Besechana) along the right bank of the Euphrates, we reach the Bitra ruins, directly west of Seleucia, which may, therefore, be identical with the ancient station of Neapolis.

RECONSTRUCTION OF ISIDORE'S ITINERARY

Nicephorium to Phaliga

Having thus determined a working figure for the length of the schoenus as used by Isidore and the total of the distances between Phaliga and Seleucia, we may turn our attention to the identification of the different stations.

Adding up the various distances between Nicephorium and Phaliga, we get a total of 30 schoeni, or 141 kilometers; but in reality the distance is 165 kilometers, or 35 schoeni. Isidore's statements here, however, have not been accurately preserved. In order to find the source of the mistake, we may first divide up the whole distance into two parts, from Nicephorium to the "Ditch of Semiramis" and from there to Phaliga. The "Ditch of Semiramis" we can locate only at the present Zelebijje ruin, where the Euphrates leaves the narrows and below which a fertile alluvial plain spreads along its left bank. There only would it have been possible to confine the current and divert the waters into a "ditch" or canal. Near Zelebijje we actually find the remains of an old irrigation canal now called al-Mayrân. According to Isidore, it is 16 schoeni from Nicephorium to the "Ditch of Semiramis;" but the actual distance from the site of Nicephorium to the canal with which we identify the "ditch" is 90 kilometers, equaling 19 schoeni.
From Zelebijje to the site of Phaliga on al-Ḥābūr is 75 kilometers, or 16 schoeni, whereas from the “Ditch of Semiramis” to Phaliga Isidore gives as only 14 schoeni.

To consider now the data provided by Isidore in reverse order from the “Ditch of Semiramis” back to Nicephorium: at 33 kilometers northwest of Zelebijje we reach the group of Tell Maṭabb ruins, which we regard as the royal station Tellada Mirrada, 7 schoeni distant from the “Ditch of Semiramis.” Seven schoeni equal 33 kilometers. From the Tell Maṭabb to the west there are no large ruins except al-Hadawi at 19 kilometers, a place we might identify with the settlement of Chumbane, four schoeni from Tellada Mirrada.

Isidore states that from Chumbane to the nearest station, the deserted settlement of Galabatha, it was only one schoenus. At this distance from al-Hadawi are situated the Tell as-Sultān ruins.

From Galabatha to Nicephorium it was 4 schoeni according to Isidore; but in reality it is 33 kilometers, or 7 schoeni, from the Tell as-Sultān to the site of Nicephorium.

If we add up these several actual distances between the “Ditch of Semiramis” and Nicephorium, the total will be 19 schoeni, not 16 as according to Isidore, the error probably lying in an erroneous transcription of the distance from Nicephorium to Galabatha, where by the figure 7 may have been changed to 4.

From Zelebijje along the Euphrates to al-Ḥābūr we know of only two ruins of any significance. The first, Sa’wa, stands on an escarpment above the flood plain, while the second, as-Sinn, with a shrine renowned throughout the neighborhood, forms a small knoll in the alluvium. Isidore likewise knew of only two stations in this stretch: Allan and Beonan, in the latter of which he mentions a temple of Artemis. From Zelebijje to Sa’wa is 25 kilometers, or 5 schoeni; from Sa’wa to as-Sinn 28 kilometers, or 6 schoeni; from as-Sinn to al-Ḥābūr 25 kilometers, or 5 schoeni. Isidore gives the distance from the “Ditch of Semiramis” to Allan as 6 schoeni, from Allan to Beonan as 4 schoeni, and from Beonan to Phaliga also as 4 schoeni, making a total of 14, or 2 short of our total of 16 from Zelebijje to al-Ḥābūr. Erroneous transcriptions of Isidore’s text, however, are so easily conceivable that we may safely identify the little town of Allan with the Sa’wa ruins, and Beonan with its temple of Artemis as corresponding to the large ruin mound of as-Sinn and its shrine.

Phaliga to Is

The settlement of Phaliga, the name of which Isidore (op. cit., p. 248) translates as “half-way,” was identical with a section of the later Circesium. Close to it, according to Isidore, was situated the little town of Nabugath on the river Aburas, a tributary of the Euphrates. Troops sent to the Roman territory beyond the Euphrates used to pass through this town.

From Phaliga to the settlement of Asicha Isidore gives as 4 schoeni, or 18 kilometers. This distance from al-Ḥābūr leads us to the present al-Mājeh ruins. The root of the word “Msājeh” contains the same consonants as Isidore’s “Asicha”.
The next station, Dura—which Isidore describes as the ancient town of Nicanor, built by the Macedonians and called Europus by the Greeks—lay at a distance of 6 schoeni, or about 28 kilometers. Twenty-nine kilometers from al-Msâje are the extensive ruins of the fortified town of aţ-Ca'âbi, which we may identify with a suburb of the Macedonian colony of Dura or Europus, the modern aţ-Şâlıhije.

According to Isidore, from Dura to the fortress of Merran was 5 schoeni, or 23.5 kilometers. At 23.5 kilometers from aţ-Ca'âbi we arrive at some swamps, now deeply cut into by the Euphrates, which may also have carried away the remains of the fortress of Merran. Along both banks of the Euphrates settlements often disappear, as the channel constantly changes. If Merran has not been lost altogether, it might possibly be located at the al-Kišme ruins not far from the še'ib of al-Mesârin. The original word from which Mesrân (the singular of Mesârin) was derived was perhaps changed into the form Merran. But if al-Kišme be identified with Mesrân, it actually lies 29 kilometers, or 6 schoeni, from the site of Dura and not 5 schoeni as Isidore would have it, the distance thence to Isidore's next station, the town of Giddan, should be 4 schoeni and not 5 as Isidore states it.

Giddan is identical with the large aţ-Šeţh Gâber ruins, which extend on both banks of the Euphrates 23.5 kilometers from the swamps and 17.5 kilometers from al-Kišme, figures which agree with our definition of 5 or 4 schoeni from the two possible sites of Merran.

The distance between Giddan and Belesi Biblada is stated by Isidore as 7 schoeni, or 33 kilometers. Exactly at that distance on the rocky left bank of the Euphrates rise the ruins with the small fortress of Ertâge, important for their position, as the Euphrates forms a deep cove right below them, where river boats find a safe harbor.

From Ertâge to the islet of Srejsjer is 31 kilometers; according to Isidore the distance from Belesi Biblada to the unnamed islet where the Parthian king Phraates had his treasures was 6 schoeni. We may therefore identify Srejsjer with Phraates' islet. On this little island, according to Isidore (op. cit., p. 249), Phraates killed his wives when the banished Tiridates returned. This was Phraates IV, against whom Tiridates II revolted in 32 B. C. After his banishment to Syria Tiridates had returned to the Euphrates and suddenly attacked Phraates.

From Srejsjer to 'Aná is 18 kilometers; according to Isidore, from Phraates' island to the island of Anatha was 4 schoeni, which exactly agrees.

As the next station beyond the island of Anatha Isidore names the island of Thilabus, distant only 2 schoeni, or 9.5 kilometers. Thilabus may be identified with the island of Telbes; but this lies 15 kilometers, or 3 schoeni, from 'Aná.

From the island of Thilabus to the island town of Izan was 12 schoeni; from Telbes to the island of al-Eţzâne is 58 kilometers, or 12 schoeni, in a direct line.

From Izan to the town of Is, with the naphtha springs, was, according to Isidore, 22 schoeni, or 103 kilometers; but in reality from al-Eţzâne to Hit is barely 60 kilometers, or 12 schoeni. As we have already suggested, the 22 is probably due to a misreading of 12.
Is to Seleucia

Beyond Is (Hit) a highroad also led along the right bank of the Euphrates. At what point this road passed from the left bank to the right—whether at Is or seven Roman miles above this town, where Julian’s army crossed (Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 2: 3), we do not know. The right-bank road was preferred in order to avoid the innumerable canals and ditches, both large and small, which a few kilometers below Is branched off from the left side of the Euphrates to irrigate the fertile alluvium. Although Isidore does not say clearly that the road described by him followed the right bank, his statement makes it evident that travelers using the road from Neapolis had to cross both the Euphrates and the Royal Canal before Seleucia was reached.

The distance from Is to Besechana, where the temple of Atargatis was located, is given by Isidore as 12 schoeni, or 55 kilometers, which would bring us to the environs of ar-Rumādi. In the Orient local tradition dies hard, and it is possible, even almost certain, that the ancient temple of Atargatis survived under a different name in the Christian as well as the Moslem eras. The Moslem authors knew of a settlement of Ṣandawda near ar-Rumādi and mention a shrine there in which the memory of ‘Ali was honored, east of which the first big canal runs out of the Euphrates. Isidore’s Besechana might also be identified with the Massiex of Pliny (Naturalis historia, V, 90), as Massiex or Masken is the Arabic form of the Aramaic Besechana.

From Besechana to Neapolis according to Isidore was 22 schoeni, and from Neapolis to Seleucia 9 schoeni. The sum of the distances between the stations from Phaliga (on al-Hābūr) to Besechana, after the probable errors in transcription have been eliminated, amounts to 76 schoeni. If we add to this the 9 schoeni from Neapolis to Seleucia, as we have already seen (p. 228), 15 schoeni would be lacking of Isidore’s total of 100 schoeni from Phaliga to Seleucia. These 15 schoeni should then represent the distance from Besechana to Neapolis. The present version of Isidore, however, gives this as 22 schoeni. The latter distance from ar-Rumādi, the site of Besechana, would lead us to the little modern town of al-Msajjeb, situated almost due south-southeast of the site of Seleucia; but there is no reason why travelers should have gone so far out of their way. We should expect that the highroad turned east at a point where it attained the latitude of Seleucia, somewhere between the Bitra ruins and the inlet of the present al-Maḥmūdijjė canal. Just beyond the town of Bitra (according to Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 19) in 363 A.D. the Romans under the Emperor Julian, in all probability marching along the highroad, left the Euphrates and turned aside to Ctesiphon, which lay on the left bank of the Tigris opposite Seleucia. Fifteen schoeni, or about 70 kilometers, from ar-Rumādi brings us to the Bitra ruins, which are identical with the town of Bitra of Zosimus. We may therefore assume that Bitra was the native name of the Greek town of Neapolis.

From Neapolis to Seleucia according to Isidore was 9 schoeni, or about 42 kilometers, which corresponds to the actual distance from the Bitra ruins to the ruins of Seleucia.

The highroad must have led across a bridge from the right bank
of the Euphrates to the left and then continued on the right bank of the Royal Canal, or Naarmalcha, which it crossed shortly before reaching Seleucia.

At Neapolis we may locate a bridge destroyed by the Persians in 580 A.D. when the Roman army, commanded by Maurice and accompanied by the phylarch and patrician al-Mundir ibn al-Haref with the Arab auxiliaries was approaching. John of Ephesus (Ecclesiastical History, III, 40; VI, 16f.) writes explicitly that this bridge of boats had been built across the Euphrates in Beth Aramaie near the Persian capital. Beth Aramaie was the Syriac name for the northwestern part of Babylonia proper. Its capital was Ctesiphon, situated due east of Neapolis (or Bitra). The Romans under Maurice also had boats in which they carried their provisions and military equipment. No report makes it clear whether they had marched along the left or right bank of the Euphrates or along both banks. If they had marched on the left bank, they must have crossed in their own boats to the right bank above the present Hit, for southeast of Hit the alluvium begins, intersected on the left of the Euphrates by innumerable canals and irrigation ditches. There is no doubt that the Persians, aware of the advance of the Roman army, were carefully guarding the borders of the Babylonian alluvium. That they would have destroyed the bridge at Neapolis was evident; therefore it is hard to understand why some Greek records blame al-Mundir for the check which the Romans encountered here. Perhaps they would imply that he should have remained on the left bank of the Euphrates, outflanked the Persians, attacked them in the rear, and pressed them back from the destroyed bridge. If he had done this, the Romans could have bridged the river anew with their boats and, protected by al-Mundir’s Arabs, have passed over to the left bank. But it seems that al-Mundir could not make up his mind to attempt such a stroke, and consequently Maurice was unable to build a bridge for himself and his army.

APPENDIX IV

THE MARCH OF THE EMPEROR JULIAN IN 363 A. D.

The march of the Emperor Julian along the middle Euphrates was described by the eyewitnesses Magnus of Carrhae, Eutychianus of Cappadocia, and Ammianus Marcellinus. The report of the last-named alone has been preserved intact. Of the others, we know of only a few fragments, published by C. Müller in the fourth volume of his Fragmenta historiorum graecorum (Paris, 1851), pp. 4—6. Much, however, was taken from Magnus of Carrhae by Zosimus, a contemporary of the Emperor Zeno, and included in Zosimus’ Roman history, which we still have.

JULIAN’S MARCH ACCORDING TO AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

According to Ammianus Marcellinus, on March 26, 363 A. D., Julian arrived with his army on the river Belias at the strongly fortified com-
mercial center, Callinicus. With the dawn of the next day he set off along the left bank of the Euphrates. At some halting place homage was paid to him by Saracen chiefs, who presented him with a golden crown and offered him auxiliary troops, both of which he gladly accepted. While he was still treating with the chiefs, a fleet consisting of one thousand freight boats, fifty troop transport boats, and an equal number of pontoons arrived. (Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIII, 3: 7–9.)

Accompanied by the Saracen auxiliaries, he now accelerated his march and on the first of April entered Ceresium (Ciccesium), a strongly built fortress, the walls of which were encircled by the rivers Abora (al-Ḥābūr) and Euphrates, making the space inside look like an island. This fortress was originally but small and had afforded little protection until Diocletian, at the time when he was regulating the limes interior on the barbarian frontier, had it enclosed by walls and high towers to keep the Persians from making raids into Syria and causing much damage in the provinces, as they had done in the time of the Emperor Gallienus. (Ibid., XXIII, 5: 1–3.)

Julian waited at Ceresium until the army and all who accompanied him had safely passed the pontoon bridge across the Abora. Then, crossing the river himself, he had the bridge removed in order to discourage deserters. From the Abora they reached a place called Zaitha, this name meaning “Olive Tree,” where stood a monument to the Emperor Gordian, visible from afar. After paying honors to his predecessor, Julian hastened toward the desert town of Dura. On the way his soldiers captured a large lion. (Ibid., XXIII, 5: 4–8.)

Marching along the river Euphrates, they reached Dura in two days. There they sighted several herds of deer, the greater part of which swam the river and escaped into the desert. After four more easy marches the emperor in the evening sent boats with a thousand armed men commanded by Lucillian to take the fort of Anatha, situated like many others on an island in the Euphrates. The armed boats made a night attack, but without success. At dawn the inhabitants begged for mercy, driving before them a garlanded bull, which with these people signified a desire for peace. The fort was then given over to the flames, its commander Pusaeus appointed a tribune, and the inhabitants with all their property sent to the Syrian town of Chaleis. (Ibid., XXIV, 1: 5–9.)

The next day there broke out a storm of such violence that many tents were torn down; the raging river overthrew the dam protecting the boats, and some of those which were laden with grain sank. (Ibid., XXIV, 1: 11.)

When the army had been supplied with food, the emperor had the standing grain as well as all the huts set on fire, thus causing damage to the enemy, who were watching his actions from the opposite bank. When a drunken soldier crossed to the other side of the river, he was captured and killed before the eyes of his comrades. (Ibid., XXIV, 1: 14–16.)

Following the river, they reached the fort of Thilutha, which projected from the middle of the stream like a gigantic hill and was fortified by nature as well as by man. Fearing the taunts of the enemy in case of defeat, they did not try to take the fort but merely asked the inhabitants
to surrender; the latter answered that they would join the Romans only if the Romans were victorious and got possession of the kingdom, and they then inactively watched the Roman boats floating by. A like refusal was given to the Romans by another island fort, Achaiachala, to pass which was very difficult. The next day the Romans set fire to a fort which had been deserted by its garrison owing to its weak fortifications. *(Ibid., XXIV, 2: 1–2.)*

Having marched two hundred stades during the following two days, they reached a place called Baraxmalcha, where they crossed the river and attacked the town of Diaicira, seven miles away, a place which had been deserted by its inhabitants but contained large stores of grain and pure salt. There they saw a temple built in a fort on a high hill. Having burned the town and killed a few women there, they marched by a naphtha spring and occupied the town of Ozogardana, the terrified inhabitants of which had also fled. There the judgment seat *(tribunal)* of the Emperor Trajan was shown. After resting there for two days, they proceeded to the village of Macepracta, where they found remains of half-demolished ramparts, which stretched to a great distance. These were said to have protected Assyria against foreign invaders in ancient times. *(Ibid., XXIV, 2: 3–6.)*

At this point the Euphrates divides, one branch of the river flowing to inner Babylonia, thus benefiting not a little the surrounding fields and towns; the other branch, called Naarmalcha, which signifies “Kings' River,” flowing towards Ctesifon *(sic.)*. At the inlet of the latter rises a tall tower resembling the Pharos (lighthouse at Alexandria). All the foot soldiers passed over the bridges which the Romans had carefully built and soon reached the large and populous town of Pirisaboras, fortified like an island town. Riding around the town, the emperor examined its position closely with the object of filling the inhabitants with fear of a coming siege; he also attempted both by promises and threats to make them yield. All this being without avail, he encircled the town with a threefold ring of armed men, had missiles thrown into it day and night, and then, at night time, brought up the war engines and ordered the moats to be filled. When the corner tower was demolished by the Romans, the defenders left the double walls of the town and occupied a castle built on a high isolated hill within the fortifications. This castle rose in its center to a great height and on the northern side fell off steeply to the Euphrates; it was built of burned bricks mortared with pitch. Finally the defenders yielded. There were only 2500 in all; the rest in small boats had fled in time to the other side of the river. The Romans found in the castle great quantities of arms and provisions and took from them what they needed, burning the rest and the town as well. *(Ibid., XXIV, 2: 7–22.)*

After marching about fourteen miles from there, they reached fields which were naturally swampy and had been entirely flooded by the Persians, and there they rested the next day. Meanwhile the emperor had many bridges made from hides and pontoons as well as from palm branches, on which he brought the army over with great difficulty. *(Ibid., XXIV, 3: 10–11.)*

Having passed several islands and repulsed a treacherous attack of the enemy's bowmen, they came to a region where the Euphrates almost
disappeared by supplying water to several ditches and canals. (Ibid., XXIV, 3: 14.)

Here the soldiers burned a settlement enclosed with rather low walls; the inhabitants were Jews, but they had fled. Proceeding farther, the emperor ordered a camp to be built near the large, strongly walled town of Maiozamalcha and, posting guards all around against a sudden attack of the Persian cavalry, he besieged and took the town. (Ibid., XXIV, 4: 1—26.)

Having taken Maiozamalcha, Julian started with his army to cross on pontoon bridges constructed by his soldiers over numerous ditches to a double line of fortifications, where the son of the Persian king attempted to oppose him with an army from Ctesifon. Terrified, however, by the sight of the Romans, the Persians fled without a fight. (Ibid., XXIV, 4: 31.)

Marching on, they came to a royal castle built in the Roman style and then reached an extensive, circular royal game preserve full of wild animals, beyond which the Roman army encamped inside fortifications not far from Coche, also called Seleucia. From here Julian went to see the town (of Seleucia), which had been demolished by the Emperor Verus; close by, a copious spring gushes out, the waters of which soon enter the Tigris. Setting out again after two days, the Romans had to repel continuous sallies of the town garrison as well as attacks on their rear from the Persian army on the left bank of the river. Exasperated by all this, Julian decided to possess himself of a high and powerful fort situated near Ctesifon. (Ibid., XXIV, 5: 1—6.)

During the siege of this fort the army suffered not only from the sorties of the garrison but also from the sudden attacks from the left side of the river. Nevertheless, the fort was taken and burned and the camp secured by deep trenches and a stout rampart against the unceasing attacks from Ctesifon. (Ibid., XXIV, 5: 9—12.)

The army reached the channel of the river Naarmalcha, which at the time was dry. This “river” was properly a canal which had been deepened by the orders of the Emperor Trajan and later by Severus to make it navigable for boats from the Euphrates to the Tigris. The Persians had had it filled with stones in places for fear of a hostile attack. By Julian’s order the canal was cleared and the boats entered the Tigris, which was only thirty stades distant. The army then crossed the canal on pontoon bridges and approached Coche. (Ibid., XXIV, 6: 1—2.)

The ferrying of the army across to the left bank of the Tigris was to be carried out on the stouter boats. When this had been partly completed and a portion of the army landed, the other boats came to their aid, beating back the enemy and thus making the passage secure. (Ibid., XXIV, 6: 4—7.)

The army now advanced on the left bank of the Tigris almost as far as Ctesifon, fighting all the way. (Ibid., XXIV, 6: 12.)

Julian’s March According to Zosimus

Zosimus, describing the campaign of Julian, relates that the emperor marched from Carrhae to Callinicus and from there to Circeium; that he crossed the Asbora (al-Hābūr) and then sailed by boat down the Euphrates. (Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 13.)
Once past the Persian frontier he posted cavalry on the left wing and infantry on the right on the very bank of the river. Behind this advance guard the provisions were transported, the bulk of the army following at a distance of seventy (var., eighty) stades (John Malalas, Chronographia, XIII, 18). After sixty stades the settlement of Zautha was reached and then the demolished town of Dura, with Gordian's mausoleum. From Dura after four stations (stathmoi) the army came to the settlement of Phathusa, opposite a fort on a densely populated island; this was besieged by an advance detachment which had remained all night unobserved. (Ibid., III, 14.)

After this they reached another island fort, but so formidable that they passed it by, as they did several more. After advancing some stations farther, they entirely destroyed the town of Dacira on the right bank. On the other side of the Euphrates from Dacira a strong naphtha spring flowed out. From here the army came to Sitha, Megia, and finally to Zaragardia, where a high stone seat, ascribed by the natives to Trajan, could be seen. The town was plundered and burned. Julian sent his lieutenant, Hormisdas, ahead with a troop to find the enemy, who had secreted themselves behind a canal branching off the Euphrates. If the enemy could have forded there easily, they would have attacked Hormisdas. As it was, Hormisdas, making a detour, put them to flight. (Ibid., III, 15.)

Julian next reached a canal running out of the Euphrates through the plain toward Assyria and the Tigris. The canal was deep, clogged with mud, and formed many swamps, and consequently was not easy to cross, especially as its right bank was occupied by the enemy. Therefore the emperor sent out 1500 men who crossed the canal at a distance and attacked the enemy in the rear. At the same time help was brought to this detachment by the commander, Victor, who, leaving the main army at night unperceived, crossed the canal, joined the 1500, and drove off the enemy (ibid., III, 16). This maneuver made it possible for the cavalry to be ferried over in Roman vessels and the infantry in captured boats (ibid., III, 17). They marched to Bersabora (Pirisaboras), a town enclosed by two circular walls and with a round castle in its center. The castle could be reached from the town only by a steep road, difficult of ascent. From the west and south the town was entered by a gate with a zigzag passage, while on the north it was encircled by a wide branch of the river, which supplied the inhabitants with water. It was protected on the east by a deep moat fortified by palisades and strong towers at the bottom built of bricks and bitumen and at the top of mud bricks and gypsum (ibid., III, 17—18). The capture of this town, after Ctesiphon the largest in Assyria, was accomplished by Julian in two days; then he hastened along the Euphrates to the town of Phissenia, around which ran a deep ditch, filled by the Persians with water from the near-by canal called Royal River (Basileos Potamos). His army passed through this town and then reached a district inundated by the Persians from the Royal River as well as with water direct from the Euphrates. Crossing this with great difficulty, they occupied the town of Bithra, where they found a royal palace and extensive buildings (ibid., III, 19). Pressing on, they arrived at a large palm grove and a stout fort near the town of Besuchis. The fort, built on a hillock, had a double wall with sixteen large towers and a moat full of water all around. It too was besieged and taken (ibid., III, 20). The
time spent by the emperor in conquering the castle was also employed by the army in building a highroad to Ctesiphon, ninety stades distant (ibid., III, 21).

Continuing his march, Julian came to a walled game preserve, where the Persian kings kept various animals; also to a building in the Roman style, and finally to the town of Meinas Sabatha (var., Minas), about thirty stades from a town formerly called Zochase but in Julian's time known as Seleucia. The town of Meinas Sabatha was taken by assault. (Ibid., III, 23.)

In the meanwhile the Roman army was being molested by the Persians from the other side of the river (Tigris). The Romans, however, finally reached a canal dug according to the natives by the orders of Trajan, through which the canal called Naarmalcha (Royal River) emptied into the Tigris. Julian had this canal cleaned and thus prepared a passage to the Tigris for his boats, where they could be used for building bridges for the army to cross. (Ibid., III, 24.) The royal game preserve extended as far as this canal, by which the army crossed the Tigris. (Ibid., III, 25.)

RECONSTRUCTION OF JULIAN’S ROUTE

The two records of Ammianus Marcellinus and Zosimus are complementary and add greatly to our knowledge of the local topography of Mesopotamia in antiquity.

The Roman army marched with the Emperor Julian from Callinicus along the left bank of the Euphrates to the frontier stronghold of Circesium. How many marches were needed to arrive there it is impossible to state, as we do not know how long it took the emperor to negotiate with the kings (chiefs) of the Saracens, or how long he waited for the boats which had to accompany him. It is strange that not a single settlement between Callinicus and Circesium is mentioned. Near Circesium, where now stands the modern village of al-Bsejra, a bridge of boats was thrown across the river Abora (al-Hābūr) for the army to enter the Persian Empire. Beyond this point, as before reaching it, the left wing of the advance guard was formed by cavalry and the right by a detachment of the infantry, behind which came the baggage train, and last of all the main army.

It seems, according to Zosimus, as if the bulk of the army followed at seventy (or eighty) stades in the rear of the two advance wings. The cavalry was assigned to the left wing because the surprise attacks of the enemy’s cavalry were generally expected from that side. Fifty transport boats and as many pontoons always accompanied the army. The emperor proceeded either by boat or, in some places, on horseback. When the main body had covered a distance of sixty stades from the Abora (al-Hābūr), it reached the settlement of Zaitha (Olive Tree), where a mausoleum had been erected in honor of the Emperor Gordian.

Eutropius, Breviarium, IX, 2, writes that this mausoleum was at a distance of twenty miles from Circesium. — The settlement of Zaitha may be identified with the modern al-Merwānijje, 29 kilometers or about twenty Roman miles southeast of al-Bsejra (Circesium); therefore Zosimus’ sixty stades (8.6 miles) cannot be accepted as representing the actual distance between Circesium and Zaitha. It seems as if Zosimus must have
made an error in copying and as if seventy (or eighty) stades which he mentions as the distance separating the advance guard from the main body of the army actually should have been added to the sixty, for (60+80 =) 140 Philetacric stades equal 20.4 kilometers, or approximately twenty Roman miles. That Gordian’s mausoleum was erected at Zaiatha and not at Dura, as Zosimus states, is confirmed by several writers. From Zaiatha the army proceeded to the ruined town of Dura, reaching it in two marches from Circesium.

The ruins of Dura on the left bank of the Euphrates are now called a-Ca’abi and are 50 kilometers from al-Bsejra (Circesium), i.e. two day’s marches of 25 kilometers each.

From Dura to the place from which the emperor sent the boats with a thousand armed men against the island fort of Anatha the army marched in four days. If they could not march more than twenty-five kilometers a day in a plain like the one between Circesium and Dura, we cannot expect greater speed in the rough hillocks east of Dura. Four marches from a-Ca’abi (Dura) bring us at a distance of ninety kilometers to the Ertağe ruin, below which the Euphrates boats find a safe harbor in modern times. If the Roman war vessels started from this harbor after three o’clock in the afternoon — or, as Ammianus Marcellinus (Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 1: 6) writes, towards the evening — and were propelled by oars and carried by the current, they could have arrived at the fort of Anatha (the present ‘Ana) before five in the morning — that is, at dawn. It would not have been difficult for them to have sailed downstream the necessary 55 kilometers (allowing for the curves in the river between Ertağe and ‘Ana) in fourteen hours.

Where Zosimus writes that the Romans came in four marches from Dura to the settlement of Phathusas, which lies opposite an island fort (Anatha), he only proves that here also he copied incorrectly. The distance from a-Ca’abi (Dura) to the point opposite ‘Ana is 130 kilometers, quite two-thirds of which led through a rocky and rough territory where no army could have marched continuously at the rate of 32.5 kilometers that would be necessary if this distance were covered in four marches. To fix the position of Phathusas is not an easy task. If we give credence to Zosimus’ statement that the Roman army reached it in four marches, we must look for it at Ertağe; but if we consider the phrase in his text which places Phathusas opposite the islet of ‘Ana, then it would have to be identified with the present settlement of Rawa. The narrow passage between the Euphrates and the crag on top of which Rawa proper is built is now called al-Fath, a name suggesting Phathusas, though it is also possible that this name may be a corruption of Bethauna (‘Ana).

Apparently the inhabitants of the island fort of Anatha were in collusion with the Romans and surrendered without much resistance. Only thus can we explain why its commander received a reward and why the inhabitants were removed to the town of Chalcis (Kinnerin), southwest of the present Aleppo.

Near Anatha some Roman grain boats were wrecked, because the raging river overthrew the dam behind which they had sought protection. The dam might have been a stone wall connected with an arcade to the outer end of which was attached a flush wheel. Such walls or dams have long been very common in the vicinity of ‘Ana, and the grain boats might
easily have been wrecked by striking one of them. Both the islands and
the banks around Anatha were well cultivated, and thus the army was
able to lay in a supply of grain and wine. The enemy watched them from
the right bank and killed a soldier whom they captured.

Southeast of Anatha the emperor sighted another island stronghold
called Thilutha, which was so strongly fortified that he dared not besiege
it. This Thilutha could only have been the rocky island of Telbes, which
had been fortified in the earliest times and is situated 14 kilometers south-
east of Aná. The ṭ in Thilutha (for Thiluutha) probably corresponds
with ṭ; hence: Thilutha—Telbes.

From Thilutha the Roman army reached the fort of Achaiacha, which
was encircled by the river and thus very difficult to approach. We
may assume that this town lay on the right bank, separated from the
mainland by a narrow canal or branch of the Euphrates, for Ammianus
Marcellinus (op. cit., XXIV, 2: 2) does not say that it was built in the
middle of the river, as is usual when islands are spoken of. His description
agrees with the position of the present settlement of al-Ḥadīta, which is
likewise separated from the mainland by a narrow artificial ditch filled
by the Euphrates. The name al-Ḥadīta (The New) is of later origin.
Possibly in Achaiacha (or Achaiacha) originated the local name La‘al,
now applied to a crag on the opposite side. Our location for Achaiacha
agrees with the following statements of Ammianus Marcellinus.

From Achaiacha (al-Ḥadīta) the army on the next day reached
a small, deserted fort, which they burned. We should look for this on the
left bank; and, in fact, at 20 kilometers east-southeast of al-Ḥadīta we
find the Sīfel ruin, which is perhaps identical with the fort in question.
From here the army marched two hundred stades in two days and came to
the ford of Baraxmalcha, seven miles from the town of Diacira. “Diakira,”
or “Dakira” (from du kiri, meaning “giving bitumen”), was an ancient
appellation of the town of Hit. Seven Roman miles, or about ten kilo-

meters, upstream from Hit, there lie on the left bank the al-‘Awira ruins,
whence a good ford leads by the island of al-Fīṣe to the right bank.
This might justify us in identifying ‘Awira with Baraxmalcha. The
distance from Sīfel to ‘Awira is 43 kilometers, almost equal to two
hundred Philetareic stades.

“Barax” may be a corruption of the Arabic root farad or faraz (to ford),
“Baraxmalcha” hence meaning “the Royal Ford.” In dialect ṭ resembles ṣ
in pronunciation and was often transliterated by the Greeks with an x.

The “Bitumen-Giving” (Diacira) town (Hit) was situated on two hills,
of which the higher slopes steeply down to the river. On the left bank,
opposite the present town, numerous naphtha springs gush out. Right
by the roadside northeast of the settlement flows the spring of ‘At‘at,
and to the southeast that of an-Naffa. The naphtha spring referred
to by Ammianus Marcellinus probably was the latter.

Having destroyed Diacira, the army continued its march along the
left bank. According to Zosimus, the army passed through the settlements
of Sitha, Megia, and Zaragardia, but it is not certain whether Sitha and
Megia should be located before or beyond the naphtha spring. Ammianus
Marcellinus seems to place Ozogardana, which is identical with the Zara-
gardia mentioned by Zosimus, immediately beyond the spring. Possibly
we may locate the settlement of Sitha in the al-Aswad ruins on the edge
of the plain of az-Zwejje, Megia in the small ruins west of the an-Naffâṭa spring, and Zaragardia in Sâri al-Ḥadd. Southeast from the last-named ruin extends a wide plain with a few short irrigation ditches, behind one of which the Persian and Arabian troops might have concealed themselves, as Zosimus indicates.

The settlement of Macepracta is easier to find, because, according to Ammianus Marcellinus (op. cit., XXIV, 2: 6), it lay near the remains of a rampart which in ancient times protected the Assyrian empire against hostile attacks, and also because not far from there the first broad canal ran out from the Euphrates. The rampart beginning at the Ummu-r-Rûs ruins and stretching from the left bank of the Euphrates northward as far as the Tigris we may regard as the remains of the rampart in question. Furthermore, the first big canal or branch of the Euphrates as one goes downstream—al-Ḵarma, a canal which has been artificially deepened only in its first part and which winds for more than four-fifths of its length through the depression of al-Ḥûr—also begins near Ummu-r-Rûs. We may hence identify this ruined settlement with Macepracta. The canal of al-Ḵarma, however, was not formerly called Naarmalcha, as Ammianus Marcellinus states, because, as we know from other sources, the Naarmalcha branched off from the Euphrates much farther to the southeast. The banks of al-Ḵarma while yet near the Euphrates are very steep and the canal itself filled deeply with mud, which renders it very difficult to cross; but farther east, where the banks become low, the passage is easy. Here, perhaps near the present al-Ḵhābû ruins, the troops sent over by Julian to the south bank could ford unperceived and attack the Persians from the cover of low hillocks. After this the Romans crossed the canal and laid siege to the fort of Pisarobara, the al-Ḵmâr of today, which they captured in two days.

From Pisarobara Julian marched (ibid., XXIV, 3: 10) fourteen miles and reached a place where it was necessary to traverse both natural and artificially flooded swamps; among these, according to Zosimus, was situated the town of Phissena, enclosed by a deep moat filled with water from the "Royal River" near by, which had been made to overflow the swamps. The context makes it evident that both authors are describing the same swamps.

Fourteen miles from al-Ḵmâr (Pisarobara) brings us to the inlet of the present Dafâr canal. The low plain to the southeast is even now occasionally flooded by the Euphrates, forming a lake or slough over fifteen kilometers long and one kilometer wide.

The town of Phissena, the moat of which Zosimus says was not filled directly from the Euphrates but from the "Royal River" (Basileos Potamos, or Naarmalcha), was probably identical with the small 'Aḵar an-Nâ'ēli ruin, lying about two kilometers from the Euphrates on the left bank of an ancient canal.

We may infer from Ammianus Marcellinus (op. cit., XXIV, 3: 14) that the army kept on marching on the left bank of the Euphrates, passed numerous islands, and finally came to a region where the great river almost disappeared by filling a multitude of irrigation ditches and canals. Yet he says nothing of the length of this march, nor when the army left the Euphrates again. Here Zosimus (op. cit., III, 19) comes, in a way, to our aid, by recording a town occupied by the Romans. This was "Bithra,"

...
the name of which is preserved to this day in a group of ruins (Bitra) stretching over a distance of six kilometers from 22 to 28 kilometers southeast of 'Aṣār an-Nāʾilī (Phissenia) on both the right and left banks of the Euphrates. The majority of the ancient Euphrates towns were situated on both banks, and the environs were called after them; we may therefore locate the town of Bithra mentioned by Zosimus in the Bitra ruins by the shrine of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥallī. On the north side of these ruins the great ancient canal Naarmalcha (Royal River; the Regium Flumen of Pliny, *Nat. hist.*, VI, 120; the Nahr al-Malek of the Arabs) branched off from the left bank of the Euphrates; and the 'Alkāmi canal, the successor of the Marsares of antiquity, similarly diverged from the right bank near the ruins. Other smaller canals and ditches in this vicinity also diverted water from the main stream in such a way that it grew continually narrower and in places almost disappeared.

Zosimus' Bithra, with a royal palace and extensive buildings, does not seem to have been the same as the town deserted by its Jewish inhabitants on account of its vulnerable condition of which Ammianus Marcellinus writes (*op. cit.*, XXIV, 4 : 1). About the position of the latter we are still in doubt, whether it lay on the Euphrates or farther inland.

Immediately beyond Bithra the Roman army left the Euphrates. The vessels probably sailed on the Naarmalcha, the army proceeding along its right bank. From Bithra to the Tigris at Ctesiphon the distance was forty-three kilometers. The army marched in an easterly direction as far as the fort of Maiozamalcha. According to Zosimus (*op. cit.*, III, 20), who does not mention its name, this fort lay by the town of Besuχ, ninety stades from Ctesiphon. Maiozamalcha in Aramaic means "King's, or Royal, Fort." We may assume that it was called thus because it was situated on the Naarmalcha. Ninety stades, or about eighteen kilometers, west of Ctesiphon we find a ruin mound at the present Ijān az-Zād, situated on the left bank of the ancient Naarmalcha.

Leaving Maiozamalcha the Romans went in the direction of Ctesiphon past a stately building in the Roman style and through a game preserve, which was enclosed by a high wall and which belonged to the Persian kings and extended as far as the Naarmalcha canal. This game preserve is undoubtedly identical with the park mentioned by Xenophon (*Anabasis*, II, 4 : 14) on a great canal near the town of Sittae.

Once past the game preserve the Romans encamped near a town with a high, strong fort, the name of which is not given by Ammianus Marcellinus. According to Zosimus (*op. cit.*, III, 23) it was called Meinas Sabatha (sab., Minas) and was distant about thirty stades, or six kilometers, from Zochase, a part of the ruined city of Seleucia. Ammianus Marcellinus (*op. cit.*, XXIV, 5 : 3), on the other hand, places the fort near Coche, also a part of Seleucia. After an obstinate resistance the fort of Sabatha was taken and given over to the flames. It is probable that the Roman boats sailed on the Naarmalcha to beyond Sabatha, the present al-Munejir ruin. At this point the ancient Naarmalcha turns southwards almost at right angles, flows around the ruins of Seleucia, and disappears in innumerable branches there. Ammianus Marcellinus does not assert that Trajan and Severus had the whole Naarmalcha from the Euphrates to the Tigris dug or that the Persians had the whole of it obstructed with boulders. He probably refers only to a connecting branch about six
kilometers long leading from Sabatha east straight into the Tigris. This was the branch that gave the Roman flotilla free access not only to the Tigris but to Seleucia and Ctesiphon as well. Trajan and Severus had had it deepened, but the Persians had blocked it by a large dam. By destroying this dam Julian would enable his boats to reach the Tigris without hindrance; thus the crossing of his army to the left bank of the Tigris and its farther march to Ctesiphon near by would be facilitated. By blocking the branch connecting the canal and the river the Persians had probably wished not only to prevent the enemy’s boats from entering the Tigris but also to preserve the water of the Naarmalcha for the vicinity to the west of Seleucia.

At Julian’s command the rock obstruction was removed and water from the Naarmalcha poured in, enabling the Roman boats to reach the Tigris. The army posted on the right bank of the Naarmalcha then crossed it on bridges and also proceeded to the Tigris, keeping north of the neighboring town of Coche. This town, which the Romans did not enter, was on the left bank of the Naarmalcha opposite Ctesiphon and about thirty stades, or six kilometers, from Sabatha.

Pliny (Naturalis historia, VI, 132) knew of the town of Sabata (var. Sabdata) but fails to give its exact position.

Abu-l-Fadâ’il (Marâšid [Juynboll], Vol. 2, p. 1) writes that the settlement of Săbăţ Kisra lies near al-Madâ’in by the bridge over the Nahr al-Malek. From this bridge the settlement got the name al-Kanţara (a crossing, connection, link = săbăţ). The position of Săbăţ Kisra agrees fully with the position of our town of Sabatha. Sabatha too lay not far from al-Madâ’in (i.e. ancient Seleucia and Ctesiphon) on the Nahr al-Malek (the ancient Naarmalcha), and, as it appears from the statements of Zosimus and Ammianus Marcellinus, on the right bank of this canal thirty stades, or six kilometers, from Coche, which formed a part of al-Madâ’in. According to Hoffmann, Auszüge (1880), p. 110, the martyr Gisargis was sent to Māhôze and imprisoned in a castle called Akra’dh Khôkhe. — Máhôze’ means in Aramaic the same as the Arabic Madâ’in, and Khôkhe’ is the classical Coche. Sabatha I locate in the present al-Munejîr ruins, about five kilometers northwest of the Tell ‘Omar (the ancient Coche) and five and a half kilometers from the Tigris.

APPENDIX V

HIGHROADS ON THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES ACCORDING TO THE ARABIC AUTHORITIES

ROADS FROM BAGDAD TO AL-KÛFÁ

The road from Baghdad to al-Kûfa was of great importance in the Arabian period. Forming a part of the great Pilgrim Road to al-Medina and Mecca, it has often been described; and yet the statements of the different authors agree neither with each other nor with the facts.
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Ibn Ḥordāḇeh, *Masālīk* (De Goeje), p. 125, reckons the distance from Baghdad to al-Kūfa as 31 parasangs; as the real distance is 146 kilometers, we might adopt 4.7 kilometers as our working figure (see above, p. 227) for the length of Ibn Ḥordāḇeh's parasang; in other instances, however, a comparison of the known distances with those given by Ibn Ḥordāḇeh would give us at least 5 kilometers per parasang (see below, p. 248). On the latter basis we should expect no more than 28 or 29 parasangs between the two cities. In the discussion which follows we have adopted 5 kilometers as our working length for the parasang, except where otherwise explained.

The distance from Baghdad to Kašr Ibn Hubejra is given by Ibn Ḥordāḇeh as twelve parasangs. The latter town I locate in the ruins by the little shrine of as-Sajjed Ibrāhīm 62 kilometers, or approximately twelve parasangs, south of Baghdad.

Al-Jaḵūbī, *Buldān* (De Goeje), pp. 308 ff., has 30 parasangs as the distance from Baghdad to al-Kūfa; hence one parasang according to him would be about 4.9 kilometers; to Kašr Ibn Hubejra he says is 12 parasangs.

According to Ibn Roste, *Alḵā* (De Goeje), p. 174, the distance from Baghdad to Kašr Ibn Hubejra is 12 parasangs and from there to al-Kūfa 20 parasangs; yet in reality from Kašr Ibn Hubejra to al-Kūfa would be no more than 16 parasangs.

Elsewhere in Roste (op. cit., p. 182) gives the distances in miles (3 per parasang): from Baghdad to Kašr Ibn Hubejra, 36 miles, or 12 parasangs; from there to al-Kūfa, 57 miles, or 19 parasangs, which is also too much.

Kodāma, *Herāy* (De Goeje), p. 185, states that the distance from Baghdad to Kašr Ibn Hubejra is 12 parasangs, but from there to al-Kūfa is only 17; altogether, 29 parasangs; this agrees better with the reality.

Al-Hamdānī, *Ṣīfa* (Müller), p. 183, records from Baghdad to Kašr Ibn Hubejra 36 miles, or 12 parasangs, and from there to al-Kūfa only 46 miles, or 15 parasangs plus 1 mile; altogether, 27 parasangs and 1 mile. Al-Hamdānī's statements would seem to be more correct than those of the other records.

Ibn Ḥordāḇeh, *loc. cit.*, writes that from Baghdad to Ġisr Kūṭa' (the Boat Bridge of Kūṭa') is 7 parasangs; thence to Kašr Ibn Hubejra, 5 parasangs; thence to Sūk Asad, 7 parasangs; thence to Sāḥi, 7 parasangs; and thence to al-Kūfa, 5 parasangs; altogether, 31 parasangs. — Ġisr Kūṭa' I locate in the Ammu Sfū ruins, 37 kilometers from Baghdad, a distance which corresponds with 7 parasangs if we measure from the outer gate of ancient Baghdad. The huge embankments of the Kūṭa' canal can be traced from Ammu Sfū for a long distance. From there to the shrine of as-Sajjed Ibrāhīm, or Kašr Ibn Hubejra, is 25 kilometers, or 5 parasangs. From this place to al-Kūfa is 80 kilometers, or only 16 parasangs, not 19, Ibn Ḥordāḇeh's total. Ibn Ḥordāḇeh's statements, however, make it hard for us to decide which of the distances combining to make total are correct and which are incorrect; nor can we be certain where the halting places of Sūk Asad and Sāḥi were situated. Other Arabic authors locate Sāḥi on the left bank of the Euphrates by the ford and boat bridge of the modern settlement of Cifil, 25 kilometers north of al-Kūfa.

Al-Jaḵūbī, *loc. cit.*, estimates the number of parasangs from Baghdad
to al-Kūfa as thirty and divides this stretch into three marches. The first march was as far as the town of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra, 12 parasangs from Bagdad and only about two miles from the Euphrates proper. Here a boat bridge, called Gisr Sūra, led across the river. Thence the second march led to a town called Sūk Asad west of the Euphrates in the administrative district of al-Fallūğ. The third march was from Sūk Asad to al-Kūfa. — The branch flowing by Bābīl and al-Hilla al-Ja'kūbi takes for the Euphrates proper. He does not give the lengths of the second and third marches.

These are the detailed figures given by Ibn Roste, op. cit., p. 174: from Bagdad to the Boat Bridge of Kūta, 7 parasangs; thence to Kaşr Ibn Hubejra, 5 parasangs; thence to Sūk Asad, 6 parasangs; thence to Sāhi, 7 parasangs; thence to al-Kūfa, 7 parasangs. — Ibn Roste's distances between the stations south of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra differ from those of Ibn Ḥordāšeb.

Further details regarding this road are recorded by Ibn Roste in the second passage to which we have referred (ibid., p. 182): from Bagdad to the Gisr Nahr Şarşar, 10 miles; thence to Nahr al-Malek, 7 miles; thence to Nahr Kūta, 4 miles; thence to Bazikija, 6 miles; thence to Kaşr Ibn Hubejra, 9 miles; thence to Gisr Sūrān, 2 miles; thence to Damād (or Damār), 9 miles; thence to Sūk Asad, 7 miles; thence to al-Ja'kūbijje, 4 miles; thence to al-Kānāter, 7 miles; thence to Sāhi, 10 miles; thence to al-Kūfa, 18 miles. — The distance from Bagdad to the Gisr Nahr Şarşar, or Boat Bridge across the Şarşar canal (Tell al-Abjaţ), is 10 miles, or approximately 17 kilometers. The next two figures, those for the distances from the Şarşar bridge to the Nahr al-Malek (7 miles) and thence to the Nahr Kūta (4 miles), have been transposed. From the Gisr Şarşar (al-Abjaţ) to the Nahr al-Malek by the ruins of ad-Der is about 8 kilometers, which would correspond roughly with 5 miles. Thence to the Nahr Kūta by the Ammu Sfū ruins is 13 kilometers, or approximately 7 miles. Six miles, or 10 kilometers, from Ammu Sfū would bring us to the present farm of al-Hrāwi, which we identify with Bazikija; from there 9 miles, or approximately 15 kilometers, leads us to the extensive ruins by the little shrine of as-Sajjied Ibrāhīm, where the former Kaşr Ibn Hubejra was situated. The Boat Bridge of Sūrān, 2 miles distant, is to be looked for on the left side near the inlet of the present canal of al-Maḩāwil. The Euphrates takes a big bend there, though apparently this bend is of no great age. To locate any more stations from Ibn Roste's records alone is impossible.

Kodāma (loc. cit.) gives the following details: from Bagdad to the Gisr Kūta on the Nahr al-Malek, 17 parasangs; thence to Kaşr Ibn Hubejra, 5 parasangs; thence to Sūk Asad, 7 parasangs; thence to Sāhi, 8 parasangs; thence to al-Kūfa, 5 parasangs. — It is not true that the Gisr Kūta, or Bridge of Kūta, led across the Nahr al-Malek. The words 'ālā nahrī-mlakī came into the text perhaps from a marginal note referring to some other stations. Seven parasangs, or almost 35 kilometers, from Kaşr Ibn Hubejra (the modern as-Sajjied Ibrāhīm) would bring us east of the modern settlement of Raṣābān, where the station Sūk Asad may have been situated. The distance of 5 parasangs, or 25 kilometers, thence to Sāhi makes it probable that Sāhi is to be sought near the settlement of Čifīl, 25 kilometers, or 5 parasangs, from al-Kūfa.
Al-Hamdānī, *loc. cit.*, gives the latitude of Bagdad as 33° 9' and the distance thence to Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra, which is at latitude 32° 30', as 36 miles; he further gives the distance from Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra to al-Ḳanāṭer (at latitude 32° 10') as 24 miles and the distance thence to al-Ḳūfa as 22 miles.—Translating these distances into parasangs we get: from Bagdad to Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra, 12 parasangs; thence to al-Ḳanāṭer, 8 parasangs; and thence to al-Ḳūfa, 7 parasangs plus 1 mile. That al-Ḳanāṭer is to be located in the al-Biris ruins is confirmed by other records. Al-Hamdānī's distances, supported by the given latitudes, correspond to a total of 27 parasangs plus 1 mile, or 82 miles. As the actual distance is 146 kilometers, assuming that al-Hamdānī made no error in his total, we might adopt 1.79 kilometers as a working length for al-Hamdānī's mile and 5.37 kilometers for his parasang.

Ibn Ḥawqal, *Masālik* (De Goeje), p. 166, relates that between the towns of Bagdad and al-Ḳūfa extend wide cultivated tracts irrigated by numerous canals from the Euphrates. Nearest the Tigris the canal Nahr Ṣarṣar, which cuts the highroad to al-Ḳūfa, is navigable for large boats and is crossed by a bridge of boats at the town of Ṣarṣar, only 3 parasangs from Bagdad. From there it is 2 parasangs to the canal Nahr al-Malek, through which passes twice as much water as through the Ṣarṣar canal and which also has a boat bridge. The road continues to the largest place between Bagdad and al-Ḳūfa, the town of Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra, situated close to the main channel of the Euphrates. Numerous canals issuing from this channel surround the town on both sides. Thence the road leads to the flourishing town of Ṣūra and to the canal of the same name, the largest of the canals flowing out of the Euphrates.—

The town of Ṣarṣar, lying about three parasangs from Bagdad, is probably identical with the al-Abjaẓ ruins. The point where the Nahr al-Malek was crossed on the boat bridge is not more than two parasangs from Ṣarṣar is to be looked for at the Niṣān ad-Dīr.

Al-Muḳaddasi, *Akṣan* (De Goeje), p. 134, gives these details: from Bagdad to the Nahr al-Malek, one march; thence to al-Ḳaṣr, one march; thence to Ḥammām Ibn 'Omar, one march; thence to al-Ḳūfa, one march.—The first day's march from Bagdad to the Nahr al-Malek was of about twenty-five kilometers. The subsequent marches, as we shall see below, were each of about forty kilometers. This record is very important, as it enables us to determine the position of Ḥammām Ibn 'Omar and at the same time the direction in which flowed the Nars canal, which branched off at the modern town of al-Ḥilla. The station Ḥammām Ibn 'Omar lay on the highroad between al-Ḳaṣr (surely Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra) and al-Ḳūfa, a road which certainly made no great bends. We shall probably not be far enough in locating Ḥammām Ibn 'Omar about midway between Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra and al-Ḳūfa and to the south or southwest of al-Ḥilla. In support of the position to the southwest rather than to the south of al-Ḥilla we may mention the distances of one march from Ḥammām Ibn 'Omar both to Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra and to al-Ḳūfa. The boat bridge across the Nahr al-Malek was one march from al-Ḳaṣr, from which it actually lay about forty kilometers to the north. From al-Ḳaṣr to al-Ḳūfa was two marches; as this distance was actually 82 kilometers, one march in this case also would have been about forty kilometers. Measuring, therefore, forty kilometers from al-Ḳaṣr, we are brought to
the al-Biris ruins southwest of al-Ḥilla. This determines the position of Ḥammām Ibn Omar well enough and shows the course of the Nars canal, which, according to Ibn Serapion, 'Aǧā'īb, (British Museum MS), fol. 34r.f., (Le Strange), pp. 16f., issued from the Lower Sūrā — or, according to others, from the Euphrates — at the ancient al-Ǧāmī‘ajn, the modern al-Ḥilla, and passed Ḥammām Ibn Omar. The station of Ḥammām Ibn Omar is undoubtedly identical with the station of al-Ǧānāṭer (The Bridges) of Ibn Rosāt and al-Ḥamdānī. Bridges built of brick probably spanned the Nars canal and some of its branches below Ḥammām Ibn Omar.

Al-Idrīsī, Nuzha, IV, 6, repeats with but few changes Ibn Ḥawqāl’s statements. From Kaşr Ibn Hubajra to Bagdad he makes three light marches, that is marches of about twenty-one kilometers each, or as much as a heavily laden camel can cover in a day.

Ibn Gūbejr (Rihla [De Goeje], pp. 212f.) left al-Kūfā with a pilgrim caravan early in the morning and came shortly before noon to a canal issuing from the Euphrates, which flowed about half a parasang east of al-Kūfā. Continuing their journey, they spent the night near the town of al-Ḥilla, which they entered in the morning. Al-Ḥilla was situated on the west bank of the Euphrates; they crossed by a bridge of boats and then encamped about one parasang from the town. Resuming their journey about nine o’clock, they marched across a boat bridge over the canal of an-Nil, which branched off the Euphrates, and at almost every mile came to brick bridges spanning various irrigation canals. Before sunset they encamped in the settlement of al-Ǧāntara, or, as it was also called, Ḥṣn Bāšir. Then they reached the settlement of al-Ǧīrāš and in the evening the settlement of Zurejrān, the eastern part of which was irrigated by the Tigris and the western by the Euphrates. Opposite, on the east, rose the Iwān Kiswa. —

Ibn Gūbejr did not inquire into details about the names of the different settlements and canals, and he is therefore difficult to follow. From early morning until almost noon on the first day the pilgrim caravan surely must have made twenty-five kilometers, thus arriving at the settlement of Cifil. The canal issuing from the Euphrates, along which, as it seems, the caravan proceeded to al-Ḥilla, is probably identical with the Nars canal. Ibn Gūbejr calls by the name Euphrates not only the branch flowing near al-Kūfā but also the one near al-Ḥilla. From al-Ḥilla the road most likely followed a straight course to Iwān Kiswa, the old Ctesiphon. As Bābil (Babylon) is not mentioned by Ibn Gūbejr at all, he evidently kept to the east of it.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Tuhfa (Defrémery and Sanguinetti), Vol. 2, pp. 96—100, went from al-Kūfā through Bir Mellāha, a pretty town almost hidden among palm groves, to al-Ḥilla. Here the inhabitants were divided into two hostile groups, the Kurds and the inhabitants of al-Ǧāmī‘ajn. A boat bridge led across the Euphrates. From al-Ḥilla Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited Kerbela and not until afterwards did he go to Bagdad. — The little town of Bir Mellāha was situated on the highroad from al-Kūfā to al-Ḥilla, but it is hard to define its position correctly. Al-Ǧāmī‘ajn, the original name of the modern al-Ḥilla, must have been a name used as late as the middle of the fourteenth century. It is a pity that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa did not describe in greater detail his journey from al-Kūfā to al-Ḥilla, or from this place to Kerbela.
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Hasṣi Ḥalfa, Ḥīhān numa (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 470, says that the road from Bagdad to an-Negef leads past the Tell Ṣarrār, the Tell Parāšer, the Saṭṭ an-Nil, and al-Kufa. By the end of the seventeenth century a pilgrim road led through this region almost in the same direction as today. The Tell Parāšer (or, better, al-Parāš) is to be looked for north of the Saṭṭ an-Nil, which branched off the Euphrates, or Lower Sūra', at Babylon.

Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung (Copenhagen, 1774-1837), Vol. 2, p. 291, relates that on January 5, 1766, he rode out from Helle to Bagdad in an almost due northerly direction. In four hours he reached Mḥavie; thence it took him four hours to Scanderie; thence three hours to Bir u nus; thence three hours to Chān assad; and thence four hours to Bagdad. In each of these settlements was a big caravansery. East of Mḥavie lay a settlement of the same name and between Bir u nus and Chān assad the village of Mahmūdī, founded only a few years earlier by Adīl Chatūn, the wife of Soleiman Pasha. The rest of the region was absolutely desolate.

Mḥavie is erroneously transcribed from Mahāwīl. Scanderie is the modern Ḥan al-Iṣkanāriye, and Chān assad the modern Ḥan az-Zād. The distances are at best approximately correct. Ḥan al-Mahāwīl lies almost midway between al-Hilla and Ḥan al-Iṣkanāriye, twenty-seven kilometers from each. From Ḥan az-Zād to Bagdad is twenty-three kilometers. Bir u nus can be identified only with the deserted Ḥan al-Bīz, midway between Ḥan al-Iṣkanāriye and Ḥan az-Zād, its distance from each being twelve kilometers, although Niebuhr makes it three hours, thus reckoning now seven and now four kilometers to an hour. Mahmūdī (al-Mahmūdīje) is situated on the canal of the same name between Ḥan az-Zād and Ḥan al-Bīz.

Roads from Bagdad to Syria

At-Ṭabarī, Taʿrīḫ (De Goeje), Ser. 1, p. 2075, calls the road leading along the right and left banks of the Euphrates from al-Kūf to Syria Taṣrīḵ al-Fīrāḏ (Road of the Fords), perhaps because it connected the various fords and crossings over the Euphrates. Its other names were Taṣrīḵ aṣ-Ṣām and Taṣrīḵ al-Fūrāt (ibid., Ser. 3, pp. 2237 ff., 2278).

After the battle at Siffin, 657 A.D., 'Ali's army (ibid., Ser. 1, p. 3345) marched, not along the left bank as it had come, but through the desert and along the right bank of the Euphrates to Hit and from there via Sandawda' and an-Nuḥejla to al-Kūf. This road probably led from Siffin (Abu Hrēra) via ar-Reṣāfa, Ab-al-Zīr, and al-Kawāṭel to al-Furqā (aṣ-Ṣāḥījje) and from here along the Euphrates via Hit and Sandawda' (the modern al-Muḥēd or ar-Rumādī) direct through the desert to an-Nuḥejla (the modern Ḥan eben Nṣejle), after which the tents and houses of al-Kūfā soon appeared.

In the days of the Abbassides the highroad leading from Bagdad by way of Hit to ar-Raḳqa and farther on to Syria was accurately surveyed and provided with halting places. The oldest of the extant Arabic geographers, al-Ḥawārizmi, Sūrat al-ard (Codex strassburgensis), fol. 42 v., records these settlements on the Euphrates: Ḧarkṣīja', Ṭanāt in the middle of the river, Ḥaddīṭat Ṭanāt, an-Nā'ūsa, Ālīṣa, Hit, and al-Anbār.
Ibn Ḥordābeh on the Road from Baghdad to ar-Raḵḵa

Ibn Ḥordābeh, Masālik (De Goeje), pp. 72f., enumerates not only the individual stations but the distances as well. From Baghdad to as-Sajlahūn, 4 parasangs; thence to al-Anbār, 8 parasangs; thence to ar-Rabb, 7 parasangs; thence to Hit, 12 parasangs; thence to an-Nāʿūsa, 7 parasangs; thence to Alūsa, 7 parasangs; thence to al-Fuḥejma, 6 parasangs; thence to an-Nehijjē, 12 parasangs through the desert; thence to ad-Dāzēkī, 6 parasangs; thence to al-Furda, 6 parasangs; thence to Wādī-s-Sibāʾ, 6 parasangs; thence to Ḥailī Benī Ğumej; 5 parasangs; thence to al-Fās opposite Karkālīsja, 7 parasangs; thence to Nahr Saʿīd, 8 parasangs; thence to al-Gardān, 14 parasangs; thence to al-Mubāreke, 11 parasangs; and thence to ar-Raḵḵa, called by the Greeks Kālānḫūs, 8 parasangs.

What may we adopt as a working figure (see above, p. 243) for the length of Ibn Ḥordābeh's parasang? From Baghdad to al-Anbār he reckons it twelve parasangs; in reality it is 62 kilometers; therefore one parasang in this case would equal a little over five kilometers. This ratio would seem to be fairly well applicable to all Ibn Ḥordābeh's figures, as we may see from the following detailed examination of the data furnished by him; here the parasang, except where otherwise stated, is reckoned as 5 kilometers.

From Baghdad to as-Sajlahūn (the modern Sāḥījīn) he reckons it 4 parasangs; I measure it 26 kilometers, or at least 5 parasangs.

From as-Sajlahūn to al-Anbār he reckons it 5 parasangs; it is actually 36 kilometers, or about 7 parasangs.

From al-Anbār to ar-Rabb (the modern aš-Šejja Ḥadid opposite ar-Rumaḍi) he reckons it 7 parasangs; I count it 36 kilometers, which agrees.

From ar-Rabb to Hit he reckons it 12 parasangs; it is actually 50 kilometers, or at most 10 parasangs. Ibn Ḥordābeh does not state whether the road from ar-Rabb led along the right or left bank of the Euphrates.

From Hit to an-Nāʿūsa he reckons it 7 parasangs. The station or halting place of an-Nāʿūsa lies on an island in a bend of the Euphrates, its distance from Hit along the right bank being 55 kilometers, or 7 parasangs. Along the left bank it would be at least 45 kilometers, which would not agree with Ibn Ḥordābeh's distance. In my opinion the road as one goes toward Syria crossed to the right bank somewhere above Hit, perhaps at the ancient ford by the present islet of al-Flāwi; below Hit it kept to the left bank in order to avoid the difficult ascent of al-Ūjaba.

From an-Nāʿūsa to Alūsa (the modern Alūs) Ibn Ḥordābeh reckons it 7 parasangs; it is actually only 28 kilometers along the Euphrates and 25 kilometers in a straight line, or 6 parasangs at most.

From Alūsa to al-Fuḥejma he reckons it 6 parasangs; it is actually 35 kilometers, or 7 parasangs. Probably this distance has been transposed with the preceding one. Along the left bank from Alūs to the modern al-Fuḥejmi it would be at least 54 kilometers, or 11 parasangs — another proof that the highroad here followed the right bank.

In Codex B at Oxford (see Ibn Ḥordābeh, op. cit., p. 72, note k) a note has been added between "Alūsa" and "al-Fuḥejma" reading "to ad-Dāri, six parasangs." This remark has absolutely nothing to do with
the immediate context and probably arose from a wrong transcription of “ad-Dâzeği,” or of whatever name was applied to the station beyond an-Nehijije. This is the first intimation we get in this connection that the text of Ibn Ḫordâdbeh has not survived in its original form.

From al-Fuḥejma through the desert to an-Nehijije Ibn Ḫordâdbeh gives as 12 parasangs; 60 kilometers (12 parasangs) is the actual distance to an-Nehijije along the Euphrates by way of ʿAna, whereas by a direct road through the desert the distance is only 50 kilometers, or 10 parasangs. It seems, however, that travelers used to go along the Euphrates and not through the desert and that between al-Fuḥejma and an-Nehijije one station was omitted. Proof of this omission seems to be furnished by the insertion of the reference to the 6 parasangs “to ad-Dârı” in Codex B, which probably represents the distance which should have been given as that from al-Fuḥejma to the present settlement of ʿAna.

From an-Nehijije to “ad-Dâzeği” Ibn Ḫordâdbeh gives as 6 parasangs. The correct name of this station we do not know. Codex B (ibid., p. 73, note c) gives “ad-Dârı”; Kodâma, Ḫorâg (De Goeje), p. 216, gives “ad-Dawâkî” or “ad-Dawâmi”; al-Idrîsî, op. cit., IV, 6, gives “ad-Darâfî,” or as translated by Jaubert (Vol. 2, p. 145) “Dawraḵ.” The stations enumerated so far should make it evident that travelers in Ibn Ḫordâdbeh’s time stopped for the most part exactly where they stop today. We may therefore locate the station of ad-Dâzeği, or whatever it may have been called, at the present halting place of al-Kâjem; this, however, is 35 kilometers, or 7 (not 6) parasangs, from an-Nehijije.

From ad-Dâzeği to al-Furda Ibn Ḫordâdbeh gives as 6 parasangs. The name of the station of al-Furda is mentioned frequently by the older authors, yet neither Jâkît nor Abu-l-Fadâ’il give it. The name itself signifies “The Ford” — but there are many fords on the Euphrates, and we therefore require a closer definition. Some older authors record a Furdat an-Nu’m, identifying it with the later town of ar-Rahba. This might explain why the later writers did not know of the name al-Furda as applying to a different place. In any case Ibn Ḫordâdbeh’s al-Furda cannot have been the same as Furdat an-Nu’m and ar-Rahba. We should probably look for his al-Furda in the little town of ad-Dâlija, which is marked by the present aş-Ṣâḥijije ruins. As is frequently done by the Arabic geographers, Ibn Ḫordâdbeh has probably here confused the order of the names of the halting places. It would seem that al-Furda should have been placed at 5 parasangs beyond Ḥalîğ Beni Ġumêj rather than at 6 parasangs beyond ad-Dâzeği. The order of stations and distances would then run thus: ad-Dâzeği to Wâdi-s-Sîbâ’, 6 parasangs; thence to Ḥalîğ Beni Ġumêj’, 6 parasangs; thence to al-Furda, 5 parasangs.

With this change in mind, we may resume our detailed examination of Ibn Ḫordâdbeh’s data.

From ad-Dâzeği (al-Kâjem) to Wâdi-s-Sîbâ’ he would reckon it 6 parasangs; although the distance from al-Kâjem to Abu Ğemâl near the še’ib of ar-Raīḵa is only 25 kilometers, or 5 parasangs, we should probably associate Wâdi-s-Sîbâ’ with Abu Ğemâl rather than with the present še’ib of Ammu-s-Sha’ on the left bank of the Euphrates east of Abu Ğemâl, inasmuch as Ibn Ḫordâdbeh makes no mention of the highroad crossing to the left bank.

From Wâdi-s-Sîbâ’ to Ḥalîğ Beni Ġumêj’ he would probably reckon
it 6 parasangs, not 5 as it is actually given in the printed text because of the misplacing of al-Furda (though in Codex B it is given as 6). At 20 kilometers, or only 4 parasangs, northwest of Abu Čemâl are the ruin mounds of Şe'bân, which we may associate with Ḥaliğ Beni Ğumej' and near which an old channel (ḫaliğ) of the Euphrates may be recognized. Kodâma recorded this stretch not as 6 but as 5 parasangs; it is evident, however, that the figures have not been correctly preserved in either case. It is questionable whether beyond an-Nehijje Ibn Ḥordâðbêh meant to record 6 parasangs three times in succession, or, according to Codex B, as many as four times.

From Ḥaliğ Beni Ğumej' to al-Furda, if our correction of the position of the latter is justified, Ibn Ḥordâðbêh would give as 5 parasangs; from Şe'bân to as-Šâliĥije is 25 kilometers, or 5 parasangs also. Therefore we may locate the station of al-Furda below the present ruins of as-Šâliĥije, where in fact a station exists even now.

From al-Furda to al-Fâs opposite Karkisija' he reckons it 7 parasangs; and from there to the canal of Sa'id, 8 parasangs. The position of this canal is known to us. According to Ibn Serapion, 'Ağā'ib, (British Museum MS), fol. 33r., (Le Strange), p. 14, it emptied into the Euphrates a little above the settlement of ad-Dâlija and had its inlet below a shrine named after it (Sa'id), not far above the town of ar-Raḥba. This little shrine still stands on the right bank about thirteen kilometers northwest of the site of Circeium and is now called Abu Ṯâd. The little town of ad-Dâlija I locate at the as-Šâliĥije ruins, hence at a point where the station of al-Furda must have been situated. In Ibn Ḥordâðbêh's time the highroad probably led from this station along the Sa'id canal. As the station named after al-Fâs lay above Karkisija', we are probably justified in placing it at the inlet of the canal, where a station is definitely located by Kodâma, op. cit., p. 217. From as-Šâliĥije to the shrine of Abu Ṯâd the distance in a straight line is 60 kilometers, or 12 parasangs, not 15 as Ibn Ḥordâðbêh would have it. The station of Nahr Sa'id, then, we may identify with the little shrine of Abu Ṯâd.

At 8 parasangs, or 40 kilometers, southeast of Abu Ṯâd we reach the settlement of al-'Aṣâra, in or near which we may seek the station of al-Fâs'. In Kodâma, op. cit., p. 217, al-'ĀSR is written, a word which contains the same consonants as the modern name al-'Aṣâra, where there is a station even today. But al-'Aṣâra lies 24 kilometers southeast of the former Karkisija'; therefore the specific designation ḥeǰāl karkisija' (opposite Karkisija') proves that the original text cannot here have been preserved.

Ibn Ḥordâðbêh reckons it from Ḥaliğ Beni Ğumej' to al-Fâs as 7 parasangs; it is actually 23 kilometers, or 5 parasangs, from as-Šâliĥije to al-'Aṣâra.

From Nahr Sa'id to ar-Raḳka he reckons it 33 parasangs; in reality it is 150 kilometers, which agrees roughly.

It is difficult to determine the stations between Nahr Sa'id and ar-Raḳka, as we do not know whether the highroad led along the right or the left bank of the Euphrates. On the left bank at the settlement of al-Ḥânûka the še'tib of al-Ḥeḳe reaches the river; in this še'tib is the spring of al-Gerdijje, the name of which suggests that of the station of al-Ḡardân. But it is almost sixteen parasangs from Abu Ṯâd to this valley,
not fourteen, as it should be to accord with Ibn Ḥordādbeh. On the right bank, behind the modern station of at-Tibni, are ruins with the shrine of ʿaš-Šeṭḥ Mubārek, the name of which is like that of the second station on the road from the Nahr Saʿīd to ar-Raḵḵa. The route described by Ibn Ḥordādbeh must have crossed the Euphrates at some point in order to reach ar-Raḵḵa on the left bank, but we do not know whether it did so at the station of Nahr Saʿīd or at ar-Raḵḵa itself. We do know, however, that in the Middle Ages the caravans traveling from Mesopotamia down al-Ḥabbūr and thence to Damascus were ferried over at the station of Nahr Saʿīd. If we were to admit, then, that the highroad led along the right bank, we might locate al-Mubārek at the present station of at-Tibni or at ʿaš-Šeṭḥ Mubārek. This, however, would only be on the assumption that Ibn Ḥordādbeh had transposed the order of the stations of al-Gardān and al-Mubārek, an assumption which would seem to be confirmed when we reckon al-Mubārek at a distance of 14 parasangs (the figure actually given for al-Gardān) from the Nahr Saʿīd. Taking into account all the windings of the road, ʿaš-Šeṭḥ Mubārek is actually 66 kilometers from Abū Nhād (Nahr Saʿīd), a distance which corresponds approximately to 14 parasangs.

On the same assumption, it would be eleven parasangs from al-Mubārek to al-Gardān, a station which we could then regard as the al-Ǧrajbē ruin, actually 53 kilometers (approximately eleven parasangs) from at-Tibni and 40 kilometers, or 8 parasangs, from ar-Raḵḵa; the latter figure would agree with the 7 parasangs which Ibn Ḥordādbeh gives as the distance from al-Mubārek to ar-Raḵḵa.

**Kodāma on the Road from Bagdad to ar-Raḵḵa**

Kodāma, Harāǧ (De Goeje), pp. 216 f., also describes the road from Bagdad to ar-Raḵḵa. The total distance along the Euphrates he gives as 126 parasangs. His separate distances between stations added up, however, amount to 132 parasangs; whereas in reality the distance is 620 kilometers, or 124 parasangs of 5 kilometers each.

Kodāma records the same stations as Ibn Ḥordādbeh but with some additions. For instance, he says that from al-Anbār two roads lead to ar-Rabb, a straight one through an irrigated plain and a second one through the desert. — This second road probably branched off almost due northwest at al-Anbār and followed the foot of the Tertiary upland as far as the as-Sahalāt ruins, whence, taking a southwesterly course, it reached ʿaš-Šeṭḥ Ḥadīd. Evidently ar-Rabb lay on the left bank of the Euphrates, for along the right bank there led in Kodāma’s time — and still leads — only one road.

From al-Fuḥejma to an-Nebijje Kodāma also knew of two roads; one, 12 parasangs long, led through the desert; the other one, which followed the Euphrates and was used as a post road, was only 6 parasangs long. — The shortest route between al-Fuḥejmi and an-Nebijje runs through the desert 50 kilometers, or 10 parasangs; whereas following the great river the distance is at least 60 kilometers, or 12 parasangs. The 6 parasangs of Kodāma must have referred to the distance to the settlement of ‘Āna, the name of which he does not mention.

At the station of al-Furda Kodāma asserts that the highroad divided,
one branch leading through the desert and the other along the Euphrates. From al-Furda to Wādi-s-Sibā' he gives as only 5 parasangs. The next station he calls Ḥalīṭ Ibn Gumej, not Ḥalīṭ Beni Gumej as Ibn Ḥordābeth names it.

From there to al-Fāš (or as the Constantinople manuscript reads, al-ʿĀSR [ibid., p. 217, note l]), he states it is only 6 parasangs. From al-Fāš to Karkisija', or to the outlet (jamā) of the canal of Sa'īd, he reckons it 8 parasangs. Karkisija', however, lies on the left bank, Fam Nahr Sa'īd on the right, and they are at least 13 kilometers apart, proving that the two places cannot have formed one station.

Kodama, op. cit., pp. 217 f., records the road from the station of al-Furda through the desert by way of ar-Ruṣafā (ar-Ruṣafā) to ar-Raḵka as follows: from al-Furda to al-Kamrați, 3 parasangs; thence to al-ʿAwāmel, 9 parasangs plus 1 mile; thence to al-ʿAṣaba (var., al-Ḵaṣaba), 8 parasangs; thence to al-ʿArīr, 9 parasangs; thence to ar-Ruṣafā, 8 parasangs; thence to ar-Raḵka, 8 parasangs. From Bagdad to ar-Raḵka by the desert route he gives as 127 parasangs and 1 mile. —

The details regarding this road prove that al-Furda is to be located at the modern as-Ṣāḥījije. According to Kodama, the distance from al-Furda by way of ar-Ruṣafā to ar-Raḵka is 45 parasangs; from as-Ṣāḥījije by way of ar-Ruṣafā to ar-Raḵka is 221 kilometers, a figure which fully agrees with the figure in parasangs (225 km.). Almost on the direct road from as-Ṣāḥījije to ar-Ruṣafā lie al-Kamrați, Čawātel, and Ab-al-ʿIr, which we may identify with certain of Kodama's stations. East of this road the watering place of al-Ḵeṣelbe (diminutive of al-Ḵaṣaba) is situated, the name of which strongly suggests Kodama's al-ʿAṣaba or al-Ḵaṣaba, although there is no reason why the road should have swerved to this place when water was to be had even on the straight course.

From al-Furda (as-Ṣāḥījije) to al-Kamrați, Kodama gives as 3 parasangs. Al-Kamrați is a valley with water about 16 kilometers northwest of as-Ṣāḥījije; this distance corresponds essentially with 3 parasangs.

From al-Kamrați to al-ʿAwāmel he reckons 9 parasangs plus 1 mile. I know of no station northwest of as-Ṣāḥījije named al-ʿAwāmel, nor is such a name mentioned in the Arabic geographical literature. A station of al-Kawātel, however, is frequently spoken of in that region. Hall al-Dāheri, Zubda (Ravaisse), p. 119, calls this station al-Kawātel, which makes it evident that the correct form of al-ʿAwāmel may have been al-Kawātel. The watering place now known as Čawātel or ʿAṣula lies 37 kilometers northwest of al-Kamrați. We might therefore identify it with the station of al-ʿAwāmel (or, more correctly, al-Kawātel), but in this case the distance would not be 9 parasangs plus 1 mile, but only 7 parasangs plus 1 mile. The correct Arabic subʿa (seven) might easily have been changed to tisʿa (nine) especially if it had been written without the diacritical marks.

From Čawātel (al-ʿAwāmel) to al-ʿAṣaba (var., al-Ḵaṣaba) Kodama reckons it 8 parasangs. Forty-eight kilometers in the same northwesterly direction brings us to the present station and well of al-Ḵebāzeh, which is probably identical with al-ʿAṣaba. Ten parasangs would have been correct, not 8.

From al-ʿAṣaba to al-ʿArīr, Kodama reckons it 9 parasangs. The name of this station has probably not been correctly preserved. De Goeje ex-
presses his doubt by adding the word "sic" to his note (ibid., p. 217, note s). The Arabic al-RJR might easily have originated from al-KJR or al-Zir, as Ab-al-Zir is the name of a watering place situated 40 kilometers, or 8 parasangs, northwest on the road from al-Kebâže to ar-Reşâfa.

From Ab-al-Zir (al-‘Arir) to ar-Reşâfa Kodâma reckons it 8 parasangs; in reality it is 55 kilometers, this being equal to 11 parasangs.

From ar-Reşâfa to ar-Rağka he reckons it 8 parasangs; it is actually 39 kilometers.

According to Kodâma, the total distance from Bagdad to ar-Rağka by this road is 127 parasangs plus 1 mile. If, however, we add up the distances between the different stations, leaving al-Furda where located by Kodâma, we get 120 parasangs plus 1 mile. On the other hand, if we identify al-Furda with the modern aṣ-Ṣâlhiţje, the result will be 130 parasangs plus 1 mile. Here we may have additional testimony that al-Furda should be looked for at the present aṣ-Ṣâlhiţje, for the total 127 agrees better with 130 as the aggregate of the different stations than with 120. The real distance is 636 kilometers, the equivalent of 127 parasangs.

Al-İṣṭaţhri and al-Muşaddasi on Roads from Bagdad to ar-Rağka

Al-İstaţhri, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 72, states that the distance between Bâlis and ar-Rağka is two day's march, between ar-Rağka and al-Anbâr is twenty days' march, and from there to Tekrit is two day's march. From Bâlis to ar-Rağka along the left bank of the Euphrates is about 90 kilometers, or two marches of 45 kilometers a day. From ar-Rağka to al-Anbâr is 560 kilometers, which would involve marching at a rate of only 28 kilometers a day, a slow rate when compared with that hinted at in the subsequent statement, to the effect that from al-Anbâr to Tekrit is no more than two day's march. As Tekrit lies almost 135 kilometers north of al-Anbâr, to reach it in two days would necessitate a march of 68 kilometers each day.

Ibn Ḥawkâl, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 139, records the same distances as al-İstaţhri.

Al-Muşaddasi, Ahsan (De Goeje), pp. 134 f., reckons it two barid (mail stages) from Bagdad to as-Sâljâhîn; thence to al-Anbâr, one march; thence to ar-Raib, one march; thence to Hit, two marches; thence to an-Nâţsa, one march; thence to ʻAna, one march; thence to ʻAlûsa, one march; thence to al-Fuhejma, one march; thence to al-Ḥadiţa, one march; and thence to an-Nehije, one march. The remainder of the marches on this route are omitted. Not until page 149 does he remark that from ar-Raib to Karṣâisâ it is one march and from ar-Raib to ad-Dâlîla, or from ar-Raib to Bîra, likewise one march.

From Bagdad to Sâlhiţjîn is only 26 kilometers; thus each of the two mail stages between them must have been only approximately thirteen kilometers long. The day's march from Sâlhiţjîn to al-Anbâr was of 36 kilometers and thence to ar-Raib (aṣ-Ṣâlj Ḥadid) the same distance.

Between ar-Raib and Hit, according to al-Muşaddasi, was a single march, hence one of only 25 kilometers. Between Hit and an-Nâţsa he gave as two marches, hence of 32 kilometers each.

In al-Muşaddasi the correct order of the different stations is broken beyond an-Nâţsa. The stations of ʻAna and al-Fuhejma are not in their
right places; the names should run in this order: an-Nāʿūsa, Ālusā, al-
Ḥadīta, al-Fuḥejma, 'Ana, an-Nehijje. Here, too, the different marches
are of unequal length. From an-Nāʿūsa to Ālusā is 28 kilometers; thence
to al-Ḥadīta, 12 kilometers; thence to al-Fuḥejmi, 28 kilometers; thence to
'Ana, 30 kilometers; thence to an-Nehijje, 32 kilometers all these stations
being one march apart according to al-Muḥaddasi. It seems as if the
station of al-Ḥadīta had been slipped into the text from a marginal
note by the transcriber, as al-Ḥadīta is recorded in no other itinerary
and should have been placed where 'Ana actually stands.

According to al-Muḥaddasi, from ar-Raḥba to Karḵisija' is one
march and from ar-Raḥba to ad-Dālijja, or to Bira', the same. From
al-Mijādīn, the ancient ar-Raḥba, to Karḵisija' it is only 10 kilometers
and not one march in a northwesterly direction; but it is 33 kilometers
southeast from al-Mijādīn to as-Ṣābīhije, which according to other reports
must be regarded ad-Dālijja (see above, p. 250). De Goeje identifies the
next name beyond Karḵisija', written in the Berlin and Constantinople
codices (ibid., p. 149, note n) without the diacritical marks, with the ancient
Biṛta and the present ad-Dejr. But Birtha, since it belonged in the
province of Osroène, could not have been situated on the right bank (see
below, pp. 331—334), and it is absolutely impossible to prove that ad-Dejr
of today was called Bira' in the Middle Ages. It would seem more likely
that the modern ad-Dejr is identical with the medieval Dejr ar-Rummān
(Jāḵūt, Muḥjam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 2, p. 662) and Bira' with the Zele-
bijje ruins on the left bank (and therefore in the ancient Osroène) two
marches from ar-Raḥba — not one, as al-Muḥaddasi indicates.

Al-Idrisi on the Road from Bagdad to ar-Raḵka

Al-Idrisi, Nuzha, IV, 6, states the distances between the different
stations from Bagdad to ar-Raḵka partly in miles and partly in marches:
from Bagdad to as-Sajlaḥūn, 12 miles; thence to al-Ānbār, 24 miles;
thence to ar-Raḥb, 21 miles; thence to Hit, 36 miles; thence to al-Nāʿūsa,
21 miles; thence to Ālusā, 21 miles; thence to 'Anāt, 21 miles; thence to
ad-Dālijja, 21 miles; thence to Raḥbat Mālek ibn Ṭowḵ, also on the Euphrates
but on its left bank, 50 miles; and from there to al-Ḥabdār, two marches;
to Karḵisija', two marches. Karḵisija' lies east of the Euphrates, into
which, below the town, flows the river al-Hermā, now called al-Ḥabdār.
From Karḵisija' to al-Ḥabdār is two day's marches; and from there to
ar-Raḵka two marches.

Al-Idrisi also writes that the journey from Bagdad to ar-Raḵka may
likewise be made in about ten marches by leaving the Euphrates at an-
Nāʿūsa and turning to the right, eastward into the desert: from an-Nāʿūsa
to Ālusā, 21 miles; thence to ad-Ḍarāf (ad-Dāzek), 18 miles; thence
to al-Furda, 18 miles; thence to al-Ugejma (al-Fuḥejma) 18 miles; thence
to Wādī-s-Sibā', 15 miles; thence to a station (al-Pāš) opposite (hejāl;
not ḫibā<num> [hills], as printed) Karḵisija', 21 miles; thence to the Nahr Sā'id,
24 miles; thence to al-Ḡardān, 42 miles; thence to al-Muḍārek, 33 miles;
thence to ar-Raḵka, 24 miles. Altogether it is 372 miles from Bagdad to
ar-Raḵka.

In Jaubert's translation of al-Idrisi we find (Vol. 2, pp. 144 f.) the
same account, to which, however, it is added that ar-Raḥb is a flouris-
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ing town surrounded by farms and large gardens and that Alūsa lies a short distance from the river (in reality Alūsa is an island, and hence the station was built on the mainland to the west of it). Ad-Dālīja is described in this translation as a little town on the west bank of the river. From Bagdad to ar-Raḵka by way of al-Ḥānūka is reckoned at fifteen days. On page 145 "al-‘Ugejma" is written instead of al-Fuţejma; "Dawraki" instead of ad-Dâzekh; and from Bagdad by way of al-Gardān to ar-Raḵka the distance is reckoned at 372 miles. —

To examine in detail the data furnished by al-Idrīsī: in regard to the first route we find that he gives the distance from Bagdad to al-Anbār as 36 miles; in reality it is 62 kilometers. On the assumption that the distance in miles was accurately stated, we may take approximately 1.7 kilometers as our working figure for the length of al-Idrīsī's mile.

From Bagdad to as-Sajlahūn he reckons it twelve miles; in reality it is 26 kilometers, or approximately 15 miles.

From as-Sajlahūn to al-Anbār he reckons it 21 miles; in reality it is 36 kilometers, or about 21 miles.

From al-Anbār to ar-Rabba (aš-Ṣejb Ḥadīd) he reckons it 21 miles; in reality it is 36 kilometers, which agrees with al-Idrīsī's figure.

From ar-Rabba to Hit he reckons it 36 miles; in reality it is 52 kilometers, or only 30 miles.

From Hit to an-Nāţūsa he reckons it 21 miles; by the shortest route it is actually 35 kilometers. Along the left bank the distance would be at least 45 kilometers.

From an-Nāţūsa to Alūsa he reckons it 21 miles; in reality it is 28 kilometers, or only about 17 miles.

From Alūsa to 'Ānāt he reckons it 21 miles; in reality it is 62 kilometers, or 36 miles.

From 'Ānāt to ad-Dālīja he reckons it 21 miles; and from ad-Dālīja to Raḥbat Mālek ibn Tōwk, 30 miles: a total of 51 miles from 'Ānāt to ar-Raḥba. In reality this distance is 173 kilometers, which would be not 51 but 100 miles.

Some stations have undoubtedly been omitted between 'Ānāt and ad-Dālīja. Ad-Dālīja could not have been below the present aš-Sālījiye, for, according to Ibn Serapion, 'Ağā'īb, (British Museum MS), fol. 33r., (Le Strange), p. 14, although the main Su'a'd canal had rejoined the Euphrates somewhere above ad-Dālīja, numerous branches of it reached the fields surrounding that place. No water, however, could well have flowed from the canal into fields south of aš-Sālījiye, as these fields lie higher than the flood plain between the Euphrates and the aš-Sālījiye bluffs.

Al-Idrīsī's statement that Raḥbat Mālek ibn Tōwk, or ar-Raḥba, lies east of the left bank of the Euphrates is correct in the sense only that nearly every town had a suburb on the opposite bank.

From ar-Raḥba to al-Ḥābūr al-Idrīsī gives as two marches. Al-Ḥābūr refers either to the river or to the town of Karkišia', which was often called al-Ḥābūr, especially by the Syriac authors. The station of al-Ḥābūr in any case was identical with the station of Karkišia', which, however, was only ten kilometers from al-Mijādīn (ar-Raḥba). We may infer, therefore, that the two day's distance to al-Ḥābūr meant from the station of Wāḍi-s-Sibā' (Abū Ĉemāl) rather than from ar-Raḥba.
From Karkisija' to al-Jānuqa al-Idrīsi reckons it as two days; it is actually 90 kilometers, which would mean two marches of about 45 kilometers each.

From al-Jānuqa to ar-Raḳḳa he reckons it two marches; it is actually 80 kilometers, involving two marches of 40 kilometers each.

Between Bagdad and ar-Raḳḳa al-Idrīsi reckons it at least ten marches; as this distance is 620 kilometers, a rate of 62 kilometers per march would be necessary. This distance can at this speed be covered by wheeled transport or by riders on horses or camels, but only when the animals are changed on the way.

Let us now turn to the second route described by al-Idrīsi. This branched off from the Euphrates at an-Nā'ūsa and went eastward into the desert. This road actually led through the desert, yet from time to time it returned to the Euphrates.

From an-Nā'ūsa to Karkisija' he counts it 111 miles, or about 189 kilometers if we continue to reckon 1.7 kilometers to a mile. The real distance is 283 kilometers.

From an-Nā'ūsa to Ālūsa he counts it 21 miles; in reality it is 28 kilometers, or about 17 miles.

From Ālūsa to al-Fuḥejma (not al-'Ugejma, as printed) he counts 18 miles; in reality it is 35 kilometers, or about 21 miles.

From al-Fuḥejma to ad-Darāfi he reckons it 18 miles, or 30.6 kilometers. This ad-Darāfi must be the station Ibn Ḫordāḏbeh calls ad-Dāzego, which we locate at al-Kājem. From al-Fuḥejma to ad-Dāzego is actually 92 kilometers; therefore many stations must have been left out by al-Idrīsi. From ad-Darāfi to al-Furdy he reckons it 18 miles and thence to Wādī-s-Sibā', 15 miles.

The stations Ḥaliṯ Beni Ġumaj and al-Fāš opposite Karkisija' are omitted. Instead of the latter, al-Idrīsi, like Ibn Ḫordāḏbeh, inserts the phrase "from Karkisija'". That, however, the station of al-Fāš was known to al-Idrīsi is confirmed by the distance to the next station, Nahr Sa'id, which he gives as 24 miles, a distance which agrees roughly with the actual distance of 37 kilometers from al-Fāš (al-ʿAsāra).

From the Nahr Sa'id to ar-Raḳḳa al-Idrīsi gives as 99 miles. The actual distance is 150 kilometers only. From the Nahr Sa'id to al-Gardān he gives as 42 miles; thence to al-Mubārek as 33 miles; and thence to ar-Raḳḳa as 24 miles. These figures correspond to the figures given by Ibn Ḫordāḏbeh for the distances between these places.

The total distance from Bagdad to ar-Raḳḳa by this road is given by al-Idrīsi as 372 miles, but the sum of the distances between stations given by him amount to only 348 miles; the real distance is 620 kilometers, which would be about 364 miles if al-Idrīsi used a mile of 1.7 kilometers.

Other Data on Roads along the Euphrates

At the beginning of 1348 the indefatigable traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Ṭuḥja [Delfrémy and Sanguinetti], Vol. 4, pp. 314 f.) left Bagdad and came by way of al-ʿAnbār, Hit, and al-Ḥadīṯa to ʿAna. Passing through a country carefully cultivated, he was almost continuously among inhabited houses, a fact which led him to compare this road with the very
fertile main valley in China. From 'Āna he traveled to the town of ar-Rahba, which then marked the boundary between Irak and the first town in Syria. From ar-Rahba he proceeded via as-Suhne and Tadmur to Damascus. — The road which he took from ar-Rahba to as-Suhne undoubtedly led via Ĉawātel and al-Ĉebâţeb, as is also recorded by aq-Dâheri, Zabda (Ravaisse), pp. 119 ff.

Haaği Hälfal, Gîhan numa' (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 483, also knew of the road along the Euphrates and gave the distance from al-Hilla to Hit as two marches; thence to 'Āna, three marches; thence to ar-Rahba, three marches; thence to ad-Dejr, one march; thence to Bâlis, five marches. — Haaği Hälfal's statements do not agree with the facts. The direct distance between al-Hilla and Hit is approximately 210 kilometers; to cover this in two days would be absolutely impossible. From Hit to 'Āna is 130 kilometers, and from 'Āna to ar-Rahba almost 170 kilometers; yet three marches are given for each. From ar-Rahba to ad-Dejr is 45 kilometers, which might be one march. From ad-Dejr to Bâlis is close to 210 kilometers, necessitating five marches of 46 kilometers each.

Ibn Ḥordâbêh, Masûlîk (De Goeye), p. 74, names on the road from Raḳḳa to Haleb (Aleppo) the stations of Dawsar and Bâlis and on the right bank of the Euphrates Ḫusâf and an-Nâ’ûra. — It is interesting to notice that Ibn Ḥordâbêh writes simply Raḳḳa, without the article. The road led at first along the left bank to the station of Dawsar, about fifty kilometers away. Dawsar was the ancient name of a fort which later came to be and still is called Kal'at Gâ'bar. From here the road led forty kilometers farther along the left bank to the town of Bâlis, situated on the right bank, where the Euphrates had to be crossed by a boat bridge. From Bâlis it was 48 kilometers to Ḫusâf, or the modern Tell Ḫsâf. Thence to Aleppo, about fifteen kilometers to the southeast of which lay the station of an-Nâ’ûra, it was fifty kilometers.

Al-Idrîsî, Nuṣha, IV, 5, refers to the same stations as Ibn Ḥordâbêh, but he begins with Haleb (Aleppo).

Aţ-Ṭabari, Ta'rîh (De Goeye), Ser. 3, p. 2200, relates that at the close of the year 900 A. D. the caliph al-Mu'tadid returned from an expedition against the Byzantines by way of Aleppo, an-Nâ’ûra, and Ḫusâf to Sîffîn, whence he proceeded along the left bank — passing 'Ali ibn Abî Tâleb's estate on the opposite side — by way of Bâlis, Dawsar, and Baţn Dâmân to the town of ar-Raḳḳa. — This road also led via Ḫusâf and Bâlis. Where it crossed to the left bank, aţ-Ṭabari does not make clear, though it was perhaps at Bâlis. The text is not very accurate here, as Sîffîn, the modern Abu Ḥrâra, is actually situated between Bâlis and Dawsar (Kal'at Gâ'bar).

Jâkût, Mu'ǧam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 538, writes that the settlement of Dâmân lies five parasangs from ar-Râfiḳa opposite the inlet of the canal of an-Nîjja, and that certain apples bear its name, ad-dâmâni. The name of this canal in the manuscript is al-NHJ (ibid., Vol. 5, p. 184).
APPENDIX VI

THE CANALS OF THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Of the ancient and medieval canals in Irak many records have been preserved, but to define their exact courses is usually impossible. The alluvial plain is deeply furrowed by existing irrigation ditches and completely intersected by embankments of varying sizes, and so far-reaching in every direction are the huge, rampart-like dikes which enclosed the medieval canals, that, though here and there the remains of the Persian or even more ancient times may survive, their routes can be determined only by excavation. The canals of Irak become choked comparatively quickly with alluvium and, if not regularly cleaned out, after a few years their restoration costs more than the digging of new ones. This being the case, the channels of the old canals are filled up from their embankments or the old embankments are simply left standing and new canals dug alongside them. Only where the old embankments have to be crossed are they leveled with the surroundings. If all the canals dug in the past had remained undisturbed, there probably would be no arable ground left in Babylonia; and, indeed we cannot but suppose that in ancient times, also, abandoned canals were filled up and converted into fertile fields. The remains of such canals as are left in the country are very insignificant, and the casual observer finds it difficult to distinguish them from the medieval canals.

The question whether in ancient times the Euphrates flowed in its present channel through upper Babylonia or whether it has since changed its course is important. The almost universal opinion is that at one time it flowed by the town of Sippar (now Abu Ḥabbā), about ten kilometers from its present channel. But even were this so, it could not have deviated from its present course until about five kilometers south of the settlement of al-Fellūge, for not before that point does the Tertiary upland give place to the Babylonian alluvium, and there is no evidence that the Euphrates ever carved a channel through the Tertiary east of al-Fellūge. At about ten kilometers southwest of the site of Sippar the isolated plateau of al-Meqaṣṣā, forming an outlier of the upland, stretches for a distance of twenty kilometers from northwest to southeast; this was never broken through by the Euphrates, which now washes its western slope. But if the river ever did flow by Sippar, it either turned southwest again immediately beyond the town, rounding the northern end of the plateau of al-Meqaṣṣā, or else it flowed due south past the southeastern edge of the plateau to the town of Bābīl. It has always flowed past the latter place.

I found no visible traces of either of these two possible courses and am of the opinion that the Euphrates channel from the earliest times has probably been where it is today, but that a huge canal branched off towards Sippar, through which, perhaps, more water once flowed than through the river bed proper and which, at least for a time, may have borne the name Euphrates.
THE CANALS OF THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

As early as at the beginning of the second millennium before Christ King Hammurabi relates that he had a canal dug out from the Euphrates unto Sippar (Bilingual Inscription [King, Hammurabi (1898-1900), Vol. 1, Nos. 57 ff.], col. 1, ll. 10—24; King, op. cit. Vol. 3, pp. 177 ff.). According to this, the main channel of the Euphrates must then have been at a considerable distance from Sippar.

Nabopolassar (British Museum, AH 82, 7–14, col. 1, ll. 10—15; col. 2, ll. 4–12; Langdon, Building Inscriptions [1905], p. 54) likewise had Sippar connected with the Euphrates, which had receded somewhat from the town. The king ordered a new channel to be dug and enclosed by a wall of burnt bricks. — This statement also makes it evident that the main bed of the Euphrates was some distance from Sippar. The channel ordered by Nabopolassar is perhaps identical with the later Royal Canal, or Naarmalcha.

Nebuchadnezzar’s Dam and Reservoir

Nabopolassar’s successor, Nebuchadnezzar, desired to strengthen the fortifications of Babylon against the Median attacks (Inscription B from Wádi Brisa [Weissbach, Die Inschriften Nebukadnessars II (1906), pl. 33], col. 6, ll. 67–76; Weissbach, op. cit., p. 27; Langdon, op. cit., p. 166). He therefore had a huge dam of earth built, five Babylonian miles long, stretching from Opis as far as the vicinity of Sippar, between the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates; he also had the city (Bábil, or Babylon) surrounded by “a mass of water like a deep sea” for twenty miles. To protect the earth-built dam against the waves, he had it lined with bricks set in bitumen. —

According to this record the dam was built between the towns of Opis and Sippar. The position of the latter we know, but not that of the former. When we read that the dam connected the Tigris with the Euphrates and was meant to protect Babylon against the Medes, we come to the conclusion that it must have led directly east (or slightly to the north or south of east) from Sippar and hence that Opis should be sought in that direction, on the right bank of the Tigris, as Sippar was situated not far from the left bank of the Euphrates. This position is also indicated by the length of the dam. This is stated as being five miles, or about sixty kilometers. Thirty kilometers is the shortest distance from Sippar to the Tigris in an easterly direction. The figure given by Nebuchadnezzar, however, corresponds with this — as we shall explain below — for we interpret it to represent the length not merely of a single embankment but the total length of a double line of embankments enclosing a reservoir.

The water contained in such a reservoir could have been taken only from the Euphrates, either from its main channel or from the great canal leading to Sippar. The inscription, however, says that Nebuchadnezzar had the city (Bábil) surrounded by “a mass of water like a deep sea” for 20 miles. This is not very clear. Twenty miles certainly cannot be taken as representing the length of the artificial lake or of its embankments. A lake of any such length could only have been shaped like an open letter U with two arms running from Babylon up the Tigris and Euphrates valleys. To create such a lake enormous embankments would have had to be built along both Tigris and Euphrates to prevent the water from escaping eastward and southwestward respectively.
For the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar’s statements the records of Herodotus, Abydenus, and Diodorus are of much assistance; they were taken either from the Babylonian authors or from eyewitnesses.

Herodotus, *History*, I, 184, relates that Semiramis had remarkably large dams built across the plain to prevent its being flooded by the river. — The dams, however, surely were not built across the plain, but only along one or both banks of the river in the same manner that the inhabitants of those parts build them even today when they wish to protect their fields which lie lower than the Euphrates channel from inundation. It should be added that this channel is constantly being raised by the alluvium washed down by the stream.

In the *History*, I, 185, Herodotus mentions Queen Nitocris, who caused the Euphrates to wind by building new canals. At her command a basin was dug to hold a lake far above Babylon and a little away from the stream. The lake was deeper than the river and was 420 stades in circumference. With the excavated earth, dams were built along the river banks, the height and strength of which compelled admiration. —

Nitocris was the wife of Nebuchadnezzar; to her Herodotus ascribes the deeds performed by her husband. He does not give the position of the reservoir, but, as he attributes it to Nebuchadnezzar’s wife, we may assume it to be identical with the “mass of water” of Nebuchadnezzar’s inscription. According to Herodotus, this reservoir had a circumference of 420 stades, or about 66 kilometers, which agrees well enough with the statement of Nebuchadnezzar that the length of the dam — i. e. circumference of the reservoir — was five miles. To judge from this, the lake must have been about thirty kilometers long and over two kilometers wide. The long dam on the south side as well as the dam along the right bank of the Tigris must have been especially strong.

If we connect Herodotus’ report with the record of Nebuchadnezzar, we may obtain a picture of the lake close by the towns of Sippar and Opis. This lake was probably enclosed on the south between the Euphrates and Tigris by a mighty dam, which was strengthened on the north by a lining of bricks set in bitumen. As the southern dam, according to our interpretation of both Nebuchadnezzar and Herodotus, was only thirty kilometers long, it is evident that it must have led from the Euphrates near Sippar eastwards to a point on the Tigris that was thirty kilometers away. Therefore we must locate Opis at such a point on the right bank of the Tigris south of the dam.

Abydenus’ report has been preserved in two works of Eusebius, the *Chronicon* (Schoene), Vol. 1, cols. 38f., and the *Præparatio evangelica*, IX, 41 : 7. According to Abydenus, Nebuchadnezzar, after ascending the throne had Babylon enclosed by a fortification wall and a threefold rampart. He ordered the canals of Armakalen and Akrakanon to be dug leading out of the Euphrates, and above the town of the Sipparians he had a lake excavated twenty fathoms deep and forty parasangs in circumference. The plain could be irrigated by opening sluices. —

Abydenus’ location of Nebuchadnezzar’s great reservoir shows its identity with part of the defensive works referred to in Nebuchadnezzar’s inscription in Wadi Brisa’. The impossible circumference of forty parasangs nearly equals the twenty miles of Nebuchadnezzar, and the depth of twenty fathoms is undoubtedly exaggerated. It is not without interest
that Abydenus, who probably took his reports from the Babylonian writer
Berosus (Schnabel, Berossos [1923], p. 271), connects the "Royal Canal,
Naarmalcha — the name of which, either by him or by his transcribers,
was corrupted into "Armakalen" — with this huge reservoir. Therefore,
according to Abydenus the water flowing into the reservoir did not come
directly from the Euphrates but from the Royal Canal, which turned off
from the Euphrates west or northwest of Sippar to irrigate the land around
this town. I find no reference in classical writers to the second canal,
Akrakanon, mentioned by Abydenus, but its name suggests the town of
Agranis, where according to Pliny, Naturalis historia, VI, 120, the Naar-
malcha branched off. Probably Abydenus found such a statement in Berosus
and from the town of Agranis made a canal Akrakanon.

According to Abydenus the great lake was built for the irrigation
of the neighboring plain, which must have adjoined it only on the south
side, as the water could have been let out through sluices or locks into
the canals and ditches in that direction and no other. The reservoir
must have been filled in the month of May, when the level of the Eu-
phrates is at its highest, and must have been let out over the plain from
September to December. The dams on its southern and eastern sides
particularly must have been very solidly built and the southern dam must
have led from Sippar directly east. Only by strengthening the eastern
half of the main dam and the whole dam along the right bank of the
Tigris, could the danger of breaking have been avoided.

Diodorus was apparently influenced by Agatharchides, who in the
main followed Ctesias and Clytarchus, two authors who had visited
Babylonia and therefore were familiar with the local records. According
to Diodorus, Bibliotheca historica, II, 9, Semiramis had a quadrangular
lake dug, selecting for this purpose the lowest spot in all Babylonia. The
lake was enclosed by walls built of bricks laid in bitumen. Each wall was
300 stades long and 35 feet high.

Diodorus undoubtedly speaks of the same reservoir as that dis-
cussed by Abydenus and Herodotus, yet he ascribes it neither to Nebu-
chadnezzar nor to his wife Nitocris, but to the older Assyrian Queen
Semiramis, and he records nothing which might lead us to an expla-
nation. The location of the lake he also fails to state. That the place
where the lake was dug should have been the lowest in all Babylonia
does not agree with the facts and is also contradicted by the statement
that the lake was enclosed by four walls built of brick and bitumen,
for a lake dug into the lowest spot would require no enclosing walls. Each
of the walls was said to have been 300 stades long and 35 feet high.
Three hundred Eratosthenic stades equal 47 kilometers. This length if
multiplied by four, suggests the twenty miles of Nebuchadnezzar and forty
parasangs of Abydenus. The passage, in any case, cannot be explained,
for, while the average distance between the Euphrates and Tigris above
Sippar is about forty kilometers, south from Sippar three hundred stades
(47 km.) would not even reach Babylon, whence it is much more than
47 kilometers to the Tigris.

The Greek mercenaries who in 401 accompanied the younger Cyrus
on his expedition against the great Persian king Artaxerxes passed
through the extensive territory around Sippar after their defeat at Cu-
naxa. Xenophon, a participant in this expedition, has well described for us
the fate of the Greeks. We should, therefore, expect in his work details that might help to solve many riddles. But Xenophon in only one passage of his *Anabasis* mentions any ancient remains that could possibly be identified with Nebuchadnezzar's dam. In the *Anabasis*, II, 4:12f., he relates that the Hellenes reached the Median Wall (see above, pp. 216, 225f.). This was said to have been built, not far from Babylon, of bricks laid in bitumen to a thickness of 20 feet, a height of 100 feet, and a length, according to hearsay, of 20 parasangs. Having crossed it, they came after two marches (equaling 8 parasangs) to the boat bridge across the Tigris, fifteen stades from the town of Sittace.

Both the height and width as stated can represent nothing but averages and the length is recorded from hearsay only. A diligent study of Xenophon's work, however, would seem to show that what the Greek army crossed was Nebuchadnezzar's dam and that, therefore, Xenophon's Median Wall may, or even must, be identical with the remains mentioned by Herodotus, Abydenus, and Diodorus. The Greeks reached the wall from the northwest; they found no lake on that side of it, but only a low plain intersected by numerous canals and ditches which were very difficult to cross. We learn from Xenophon neither the manner in which the Greek army crossed the wall, nor for what purpose it was built. That it extended not far from Babylon is not to be taken literally, as Xenophon did not know where Babylon was situated and his only reason for believing the army to be approaching the great city was simply the fact that they were marching in a southeasterly direction.

Beyond the Median Wall the Greeks (*ibid.*, II, 4:14) went through an extensive park. Possibly the wall shut in the park at least in part. The fact that the wall was probably built on Nebuchadnezzar's dam may well have been the reason why it looked so high and thick to Xenophon. The length, 20 parasangs, he learned from hearsay — as he himself states. This figure may have represented the circumference of Nebuchadnezzar's reservoir. The northern dam Xenophon does not mention at all, having probably mistaken it for the numerous similar embankments enclosing the ancient canals; nor does he pay any attention to the reservoir, as there was no longer any water in it.

Besides Xenophon, the region of Nebuchadnezzar's dam was also visited by Ammianus Marcellinus, who in 363 A.D. accompanied the Emperor Julian on his expedition against the Persians. In *Rerum gestarum*, XXIV, 3:10, Ammianus describes a swamp reached by the Roman army after a march of fourteen miles from Pirisabara (see above, p. 234). Zosimus, who drew mainly from Magnus of Carrhae, another participant in the expedition, states in *Historia nova*, III, 19, that this swamp was inundated from the Euphrates and the Naarmalcha (see above, p. 236).

Pirisabara is identical with the modern al-Ambâr. Fourteen Roman miles from here along the Euphrates would bring us about to the inlet of the present Daffâr canal, from where in an east-southeasterly direction extends a low-lying plain which is inundated every time the Euphrates is in flood. Zosimus connects his swamp with the Naarmalcha just as Abydenus so connects the reservoir of Nebuchadnezzar.

Ammianus Marcellinus also writes (*ibid.*, XXIV, 5:1f.) that the Romans reached groves and fertile fields, where they found a royal residence built in the Roman style, also a large game preserve enclosed
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by high walls and full of various beasts of prey (see above, p. 235). From there it was not far to Coche, which was then called Seleucia.

Evidently Xenophon's great park (Anabasis, II, 4: 14) was identical with the game preserve of Ammianus Marcellinus. It may therefore be assumed that the wall enclosing the preserve likewise formed a part of Xenophon's Median Wall. Indeed, Xenophon, whose statements regarding the width of the various rivers are always exaggerated, might be expected to describe this wall as larger and higher than it really was.

THE LOCATION OF OPIS AND ITS RELATION TO NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S RESERVOIR

To learn the course of Nebuchadnezzar's dam it is very important to know exactly where Opis was situated. From the various reports on the former we have shown that the latter should be looked for on the right bank of the Tigris.

Opis, identical with the Old Babylonian Akšak (Thureau-Dangin, Chronologie [1918], p. 61), was also called U-pi-e, the name from which the classical "Opis" was derived. The center of a kingdom with a dynasty of its own, it maintained its independence for a long time.

The authors of the Assyrian era do not mention the town at all, while the kings of New Babylonian epoch introduce it anew, not by the then common name of U-pi-e but by the old name Akšak. Older classical writers knew of no more important town on the middle Tigris than Opis.

Herodotus, History, I, 189, relates how Cyrus I on his expedition against Babylon reached the river Gyndes, which connects with another river called Tigris flowing past the town of Opis and into the Erythrean Sea.

Of course, Herodotus does not state whether this Opis was situated above the mouth of the Gyndes or below it, but the context would lead us to assume that the Gyndes joined the Tigris above the town of Opis, hence north of it. If the Gyndes were identical with the present river Dičala, then Opis should be looked for south of its mouth. Such a position would place Opis almost due east of the present Abu Ḥabba (the ancient Sippur), or in the very region to which all the records of Nebuchadnezzar's reservoir point.

A location for Opis is indicated in the Anabasis (II, 4: 25) (see above, pp. 216, 225f.). Xenophon writes that from the boat bridge across the Tigris at Sittace the Hellenes made four marches (20 parasangs) and reached the river Physis, which was one plethrum wide and provided with a bridge; on this river the great town of Opis was situated.

As the location of Sittace is unknown to us, we cannot state accurately at what point the bridge was built which was crossed by the Hellenes from the right bank of the Tigris to the left; thus we lack a starting point for the four marches thence to Opis.

According to the Anabasis, II, 4: 27, the Hellenes proceeded from the river Physis in six marches (30 parasangs) to the settlements of Parysatis and (ibid., II, 5: 1) along the Tigris in four marches (20 parasangs) to the river Zapatas, four plethra wide.

If the river Zapatas is, as is highly probable, identical with the present Great Zab, Opis should be sought ten marches (50 parasangs)
southwards along the Tigris from its mouth. In this way we would reach
the present river al-Adhem, commonly identified with the Phycus, and
Opis would lie somewhere near its junction with the Tigris, though whether
on the right or left side of the latter, Xenophon does not say. Yet this
location of Opis, more than ninety kilometers almost directly north of
Abu Ḥabba, the ancient Sippar, conflicts with everything we have so far
brought forward to explain the records of Nebuchadnezzar's reservoir
and the Median Wall. These explanations would have to be replaced by
others, if Xenophon alone were to be trusted.

Our study of Xenophon's work, however, proves that, at least while
describing the middle Euphrates, he is not altogether reliable. For in-
stance, as we have already explained, he confuses the river Chaboras
with the Araxes canal (see above, pp. 221 f.); he fails to mention more
than one crossing of the ditch of Artaxerxes, though the army must have
crossed it twice after Cunaxa if this ditch reached the Median Wall (see
above, pp. 215 f.); and he asserts that beyond the Median Wall the Hellenes
traversed two canals flowing out of the Tigris, although these canals
must have issued from the Euphrates (see above, pp. 225 f.).

Another error of the same sort was, perhaps, made by Xenophon
in the passage (ibid., I, 4: 10) where he locates the residence of the
satrap Belesis by the river Dardas, instead of by a canal issuing from
the Euphrates not far from the town of Thapsacus, where the town of
Barbalissus (Son of Balissus or Belesis) was known to the classical as
well as to the Syriac and Arabic authors.

In view of this tendency to incorrect observation, it is highly prob-
able that Xenophon mistook the position of Sittace for that of Opis and,
therefore, that Opis should, even according to Xenophon, be looked for
south of the Median Wall, fifteen stades south of the boat bridge by
which the Hellenes crossed to the left bank of the Tigris. Xenophon does
not say that he had seen Opis; he merely states that the Hellenes there
met the Persian troops marching from Susa and Eebatana to the aid of
the Great King. This meeting may easily have taken place at the river
Phycus, as in all probability these troops were marching by the road
leading along this river from Persia. As the whole attention of the Hel-
enes was centered on this auxiliary army, Xenophon was likely to have
mistaked the name Sittace for Opis. It is true that Herodotus mentions
Opis (see above, p. 263), but that Xenophon had ever read Herodotus be-
fore the expedition is very doubtful, for his statements regarding Bab-
ylonia would have been much more complete if he had studied the work
of his compatriot or had taken it along with him.

If Opis really lay at the outlet of the river Phycus (the present
al-Adhem), as Xenophon says, then it would be hard to understand why
King Nebuchadnezzar should have had a rampart or dam ninety kilo-
meters long built for the protection of Babylon from Sippar northward to
Opis. This rampart or dam would have had to lead almost parallel with
the right bank of the Tigris. West of it would have extended a vast,
long plain, which might have been inundated as it still is at every large
flood of the Euphrates. But this half-natural, half-artificial lake sixty
kilometers north of Babylon could in no way have served as a defense
of the city, and Cyrus I could have avoided it altogether.
According to the passage in Herodotus (History, I, 189) to which we
have referred, Cyrus came on his march to Babylon in 539 B.C. to the river
Gyndes, which, as we have said before, is to be identified with the river
Dijâla of today; then, according to Nabonidus (the Nabonidus Chronicle
[Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts (1924), pl.13], reverse, col.3, ll.12—16;
Smith, op. cit., p. 113), he defeated the Babylonian army at Opis. Now,
if Opis lay at the mouth of the river Phycus, or al-Adhem, Cyrus would
have had to return from the Dijâla northward, although this was the very
direction he came from; while if, on the other hand, Opis was situated
below the mouth of the river Gyndes at the point indicated by the proba-
bly course of Nebuchadnezzar's dam, he would have merely continued
his march, forced his way across the Tigris, broken through the defen-
sive line of the Babylonians at Opis, occupied Sippar, and marched without
fighting into Babylon.

Arrian, Anabasis, VII, 7, relates that in 324 B.C. Alexander the Great
destroyed all the weirs on the Tigris, thus making the shipping free on
this river from the Persian Gulf as far as Opis, which was situated on
its bank. He remained there (ibid., VII, 8) all summer, sent the Mace-
donian veterans home from there, and set out (ibid., VII, 13) on an ex-
pedition from Opis to Ecbatana (Hamadan).

It appears from Arrian's report that on account of its position Opis
must have been a very important town and the junction of roads leading
from Babylon to Persia and northern Mesopotamia. It would have been
strange if, in a place of such significance and one that was almost
sacred in consequence of Alexander's stay, his successors should not have
established an important colony there. Nowhere is there any mention of
a Greek colony at the outlet of the river Phycus, the most celebrated
Greek colony of this region having been Seleucia below the outlet of the
river Dijâla and almost due east of Abu Ḥabba, or at a point where we
should, in accordance with the reports of Nebuchadnezzar's reservoir and
its dam, look for Opis. Therefore it is highly probable that the Greek col-
ony of Seleucia was built in the closest proximity to the ancient town
of Opis, thus becoming its successor. This supposition would seem to be
confirmed by Strabo (Geography, XVI, 1: 9) where he states that the
Tigris is navigable as far as Opis, a settlement and market for the sur-
rounding country, as well as to the present Seleucia. Hence with Seleucia
Strabo connects the older Opis, which, so to speak, formed a suburb of
the newer town. Every large town of the modern Orient has a suburb
of this kind, which serves as a market for the natives from the whole
neighborhood, who, purchasing rather than selling their products, avoid
the large shops of the main streets.

According to Eratosthenes (Strabo, op. cit., II, 1: 26) the closest
approach of the Euphrates to the Tigris, two hundred stades, was at the
wall of Semiramis and the town of Opis; elsewhere (ibid., XI, 14: 8) he
states that the Tigris flows by Opis and the so-called wall of Semiramis.

Both of these reports, as well as the records of Nebuchadnezzar
and Abydenus, connect Opis with the embankments of the great reservoir
which, of course, was by Eratosthenes as by Diodorus ascribed to Semir-
amis. Consequently, Eratosthenes would place Opis east of the modern
Abu Ḥabba (Sippar). This situation is also confirmed by Eratosthenes'
statement that the wall of Semiramis was built at Opis at the point where it is the shortest distance between the two great rivers, that is to say between the ancient Sippar and the Greek colony of Seleucia. Between the two last-named places there are no more than two hundred Eratosthenic stades, or about 31 kilometers, between the rivers. That the main stream of the Euphrates flowed about ten kilometers west of Sippar in the time of Nebuchadnezzar as well as in that of Eratosthenes, we must conclude from geological evidence. It seems that this shortest distance between Seleucia and the Euphrates proper is recorded by Strabo in two passages: in one (op. cit., XVI, 1: 5) he estimates it not very carefully at three hundred stades; in the other (ibid., XVI, 1: 21) we read of it as being “more than two hundred stades.” (In both of these passages it is obvious from the context that for “Babylon” should be read “the Euphrates.”) If Opis had actually been situated at the mouth of the river Phisicus, then the Euphrates could not possibly have ever been nearest to the Tigris at Opis, as the shortest distance between the rivers at the mouth of the Phisicus is about eighty kilometers as against thirty kilometers in the latitude of Seleucia.

It appears from the foregoing that, except for the statements of Xenophon, there is no argument in ancient literature which would prevent our locating Opis in the immediate neighborhood of Seleucia on the right bank of the Tigris. The dam of Nebuchadnezzar’s reservoir would then be identical with the Median Wall of Xenophon and would extend north of Sippar eastward to the Tigris, reaching it north of Opis.

The possibility of confusion of Opis with Sittace is confirmed by Strabo (op. cit., XI, 13: 6) where he says that the territory of Apolloniatis was originally called Sitacene. This territory lay on the left bank of the Tigris where it was joined (ibid., XV, 3: 12) by the Susis. Its name being derived from that of Sittace, we should look for the latter place also on the left bank of the Tigris, not on the right bank where Xenophon would locate it.

According to Ptolemy (Geography, VI, 1: 6) also, Sittace was situated on the left bank of the Tigris in Assyria and not in Babylonia, to which it would have belonged if it had been situated on the right bank below the Median Wall.

**CANALS OF THE MIDDLE EUFPHRATES**

Besides the reservoir of Nebuchadnezzar, many canals in our part of Babylonia are mentioned by the Babylonian, Assyrian, and classical records, but seldom with sufficient accuracy to make their location possible.

Tukulti Enurta (Ninip) II (Annals [Scheil, Annales (1909), pl. 2], obverse, l. 52f.; Scheil, op. cit., p. 16) crossed the canal of Patti Bêl on his fourteenth march, while proceeding from Dûr Kurigalzî (‘Aḵarkûf) to Sippur (Abu Ḫabba). — As he was marching in a straight course and took his rest at the canal, this must be sought somewhere near the present settlement of al-Żerje, on a branch of the al-‘Ejsâwî canal. The Patti Bêl therefore must have issued from the Euphrates below the modern settlement of al-Feilêge at about the point where in later times the Şarşar canal had its inlet. Tukulti Enurta certainly crossed many canals on his
route from Sippar northwest along the left bank of the Euphrates, yet he does not mention a single one, merely giving the names of the settlements near which he camped.

The Northernmost Large Canal System

Classical Authorities on the Northernmost System

A gloss in Xenophon states (Anabasis, I, 7: 15), after mentioning the ditch encountered on the approach to the battlefield of Cunaxa after leaving Pylae, that the Hellenes came to four other ditches which flowed out from the Tigris, each one plethrum (31 meters) wide and deep enough to be navigable. They all emptied into the Euphrates at distances of one parasang from each other. —

Xenophon does not say whether on their march to the battlefield the Greeks had crossed any of these canals, yet they must have crossed all of them, because in a later passage (II, 3: 10—13) he describes the difficulties the Greeks met on their way back to the Median Wall when crossing the different irrigation canals and ditches.

In the Anabasis, I, 7: 14—16, Xenophon, in describing the ditch "dug by the Great King as a defense against the invader" and encountered by the Greeks on the approach to Cunaxa (see above, pp. 214 f.), accurately gives the location of the first Babylonian canal as one comes from the northwest. The Hellenes arrived from Pylae in four marches (15 parasangs) at a ditch 5 fathoms wide, 3 fathoms deep, and 12 parasangs long, which extended as far as the Median Wall. —

Xenophon believed that this "ditch" was dug by the order of the Great King to prevent Cyrus from entering Babylonia, but in this he was mistaken. If it had been a defensive ditch it would surely have been filled with water. As it was, there still remained between it and the Euphrates a neck of land twenty feet wide, which, in the first place, prevented the water from entering the canal and, in the second, allowed the Hellenes to pass through freely. The "ditch" must have been a canal just in the process of cleaning; the inlet of which had probably been blocked with earth to make the labor inside easier. Its location can be determined fairly well from Xenophon's words. His Pylae may be identified with the last spur of the Tertiary upland which comes down as far as the Euphrates itself and bounds the Babylonian alluvium proper on the northwest, i. e. the present spur of al-Aswad upon which lies the ruin of the same name. To the east-southeast of al-Aswad alluvium intervenes on the left bank of the Euphrates between the river and the upland, and here Babylonia proper begins. Four marches (about 60 kilometers) from al-Aswad brings us to the al-Karma or al-Saqlawijje canal, which leaves the Euphrates at al-Ambār. Xenophon's informant spoke the truth when he gave the length of the "ditch" as twelve parasangs (about 60 kilometers), as this is the distance from the Euphrates to the Tigris, into which latter this half-natural, half-artificial canal empties. Not the main canal but one of its branches could extend as far as the Median Wall. As Xenophon does not say whether the main canal was crossed by the Hellenes during their march away from the battlefield northeast, we may draw the conclusion
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either that he forgot to mention it or that they did not get so far north; in any case the main ditch did not extend to the Median Wall.

Most likely it was this canal that Pliny (\textit{Naturalis historia}, V, 90) had in mind when he wrote that the Euphrates branches at the settlement of Masicen, 594 miles from Zeugma. He adds that the left-hand stream, taking its course to Mesopotamia and flowing through Seleucia, empties into the Tigris, while the right-hand one flows through its channel to Babylon.

Pliny either copied his figures incorrectly or they were put down wrongly by subsequent clerks, for 594 miles from Zeugma would not have brought us even to Anatha, the modern 'Ana; and the Euphrates does not divide until well below that place, at the point where the stream enters the Babylonian alluvium. Between the latter and the Tertiary upland of Mesopotamia is a depression now called al-Ḥūr, into which the waters from the Euphrates flowed in Pliny's time, and still flow, through what is now called the al-Karma or as-Saklàwiyye canal — the first canal leading off from the river —, whence they could be conducted by artificial and natural channels as far as ancient Seleucia. The site of Pliny's Masicen, therefore, is to be looked for at the inlet of al-Karma; the settlement may have been identical with the Bessechana of Isidore of Charax (see above, p. 231) or with the modern ar-Rumādī.

Ammianus Marcellinus, \textit{Res gestarum}, XXIV, 2: 7, as we have seen above (pp. 255, 240) writes that the Euphrates divides at Macepracta. One branch flows in a broad stream into inner Babylonia to the great profit of the fields and adjoining settlements; the branch called Naarmalcha, signifying Kings' or Royal River, flows toward Ctesiphon. At the beginning of this branch a tower resembling the Pharos is said to stand. After passing it, the Romans reached the fort of Pirisabara.

Zosimus, \textit{Historia nova}, III, 16, in this connection speaks only of a canal, without giving its name; he says it extends toward Assyria and the Tigris (see above, p. 236).

The record of Ammianus Marcellinus reminds us strongly of that of Pliny, but with the former the name of the settlement is Macepracta, not Masicen. The Naarmalcha, which actually lay some distance to the south, probably got into Ammianus Marcellinus' record at this place by inattention, possibly from Pliny or his source. Magnus of Carrhae, who was often used by Zosimus, did not know the name of this canal, although he names more places than Ammianus Marcellinus.

Like Ammianus Marcellinus (\textit{op. cit.}, XXIV, 3: 10), Zosimus (\textit{op. cit.}, III, 19) also writes of the natural and artificial swamps which the Romans reached after marching fourteen miles beyond the fort of Pirisabara and among which lay the town of Phissenia.

According to Zosimus, the moat of this town was filled from the Naarmalcha, from which the swamps also were inundated. The canal referred to in this case, however, cannot have been the one which Ammianus erroneously calls the Naarmalcha, as the latter (now al-Karma) had its inlet many miles northwest of Phissenia ('Akar an-Na'ölü); furthermore, between the swamps of Phissenia and the fort of Pirisabara (al-Ambār) an isolated tract of Tertiary upland extends for almost twenty kilometers from northwest to southeast. The settlement of Macepracta may be identified with the Ummu-r-Rūs ruins, in the neighborhood of
which is the inlet of the channel of al-Waššāš, which joins the channel of as-Saqlāwījje to form the al-Karma canal.

Arabic Authorities on the Northernmost System

The first large canal in Babylonia which branches of from the left bank of the Euphrates the Arabic writers call ad-Du'kejl, ar-Ruufejl, or ad-Du'gejl, often confusing it with the Nahr 'īsā canal, which was not excavated until under the Moslem rule.

Kodāma, Ḥurāq (De Goeje), p. 234, writes that at a point below al-Anbār a canal known as ad-Du'kejl issues from the Euphrates. From it separates the 'īsā canal, which flows towards Baghdad, where it empties into the Tigris. — This does not agree with the facts: the Nahr 'īsā could not have branched off the Nahr ad-Du'kejl, as they both issued from the Euphrates.

A correct differentiation between the ad-Du'kejl canal and the Nahr 'īsā is made by Ibn Serapion ('Āġā'īb, [British Museum MS], fol. 33 v., [Le Strange], p. 14) when he says that a canal, commonly called Du'gejl, issues from the Euphrates at one parasang, or slightly more, from the settlement of ar-Rabb, whence it runs east. It splits into many branches, irrigating the farms of the districts of Miskan and Qur trabbul as far as its outlet into the Tigris, between the settlement of 'Okbara' and the town of Baghdad.

To the Arabic authors the village of ar-Rabb was well known. I identify it with the ruin mound at the little shrine of aš-Šeįh Ḥadīd. The Du'gejl canal in this case must have issued from the Euphrates at about the same point as the modern 'Azzār canal, whence it must have extended along the northeastern edge of the alluvial plain — nearly five kilometers wide here — to al-Anbār; north of this point it must have entered the depression of al-Ḥūr and thence wound its way between the al-Ašhāũ ruin on the right and that of al-Mkajjer on the left, until finally, near the Sarrāũa of today, it flowed into the Tigris. It was therefore the predecessor of the present al-Karma canal.

Jākūt, Muğ'am (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 839, mentions the Nahr Ruufejl, which enters the Tigris at the bridge of the same name at Baghdad. It branches off from the Nahr 'īsā and is spanned by the bridge of aš-Šowk.

Abu-l-Faḍā'īl, Marāsid (Juynboll), Vol. 3, pp. 247-250, corrects and completes Jākūt. He reminds us that ar-Ruufejl is, properly, the name of an upper (northern) branch of the great canal known as Nahr 'īsā. Ar-Ruufejl is supposed to have flowed into the aš-Šara' canal. But 'īsā ibn 'Ali, in order to have a continual supply of running water, had a ditch dug out from ar-Ruufejl past his manor and leading into the Tigris; for this reason the whole canal came to be called the Nahr 'īsā. —

It is evident from Abu-l-Faḍā'īl's record that the Nahr 'īsā proper (near Baghdad) was connected on the north with the Nahr ar-Ruufejl and that the name “Nahr 'īsā” also came to be applied to the latter. The Nahr ar-Ruufejl proper was conceived of as the northern member of a canal system having two inlets from the Euphrates, the branch from the north bearing the name “ar-Ruufejl” and that from the south the name “'īsā.” The designation “ar-Ruufejl” undoubtedly originated from a wrong transcription of “ad-Du'gejl.” In this word the letter ğ frequently had a palatal sound and
might easily have been replaced by ǧ; "Rufjel" would in turn be an easy misrendering of "Duğejli."

Ibn Serapion, loc. cit., distinguishes between the Nahr 'Isa and the Nahr Duğejli. He claims that the Nahr 'Isa issues from the Euphrates at the village of Dimimma, where it is spanned by a strong bridge called Kanṭara Dimimma, and that it irrigates the district of Frûz Sâbûr. On its banks various villages and farms are situated. At al-Muḥawwal it splits into several branches, which then flow through Bagdad.

At-Ṭabarî, Taʿrîkh (De Goeje), Ser. 3, pp. 121 f., is of great help in defining the location of the village of Dimimma. Қaḥṭaba ibn Šâbîb arrived in 749 A.D. at 'Okbara', crossed the Tigris, and reached Awâna. But prior to this he sent his faithful Ḥâzem from Ḥânekîn with orders to cross the Tigris, to hasten from there to the Duğejli, and to wait at Kūṭaba'. To that place he then sent him a written command to set out for al-Ânbâr, to requisition all the boats he should find there, and to sail with them down stream (jâhdîra) to Dimimma, where he was to wait for him. All this was done, and at Dimimma Қaḥṭaba ferried himself in the boats over the Euphrates.

This makes it clear to us that the village of Dimimma was situated below al-Ânbâr and that, for this reason, the Nahr 'Isa cannot have been identical with the Nahr Duğejli, which issued from the Euphrates above al-Ânbâr.

Al-Iṣṭāḥri, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 84, also was familiar with the inlet into the Nahr 'Isa at the stone bridge of Dimimma. On this canal ships sailed from the Euphrates through Bagdad to the Tigris.

Ibn Ḥawkal, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 165, writing of the western part of Bagdad, also mentions a canal, Nahr 'Isa, branching off from the Euphrates not far from al-Ânbâr, beneath the stone bridge of Dimimma.

Abu-I-Feda', Taḵwîn (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 62, fixes the inlet of the Nahr 'Isa at long. 68° E., lat. 32° N., opposite al-Kūfâ at a settlement called Dahama; he adds, however, that according to others it issues near al-Ânbâr beneath the stout bridge of Dahama. He cites Sulêjmân ibn Muhanna as asserting that the Nahr 'Isa originated below al-Ânbâr and not far from that place; that is, by the farm of al-Fallûḡa. The name 'Isa is supposed to have been given to the canal after 'Isa ibn 'Ali ibn 'Abdallâh ibn 'Abbâs, the uncle of the caliph al-Manṣûr.

Abu-I-Feda' thus gives three accounts of the location of the inlet of the 'Isa canal. Both the first and second call the settlement Dahama. According to the first the settlement was situated near al-Kūfâ, but this does not agree with the facts, as no other Arabic author says that the Nahr 'Isa issues near al-Kūfâ. The second account is more probable, for it should be understood that "Dahama" is a wrong transcription of the word "Dimimma." We know that Dimimma lay below al-Ânbâr and learn from Abu-I-Feda' that it was at no great distance from this place. But the most reliable account is the third, in which Dimimma is for the first time replaced by the name of al-Fallûḡa, where nowadays the Bagdad road crosses the Euphrates on a bridge of boats.

Abu-I-Fadâ’il, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 422, reminds us that the manor of 'Isa was thus called after 'Isa ibn 'Ali, uncle of the caliph al-Manṣûr. It was built at the outlet of the canal of ar-Rufejl into the Tigris. He asserts
that in his own time (first half of the fourteenth century) there was no mention of the manor.

Abu-l-Fadā'il, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 267, corrects Jākūt's statement that 'Aḵarḵūf is a village in the environs of Duḵejīl, saying that it is, rather, a village near the Nahr Ḩīsa, four parasangs from Bagdad.—

Both Jākūt and Abu-l-Fadā'il are right, however. 'Aḵarḵūf lies on the northern side of the old canal of ad-Duḵejīl, or as it was called in dialect, ad-Duḵejīl, with which, in the eastern part, the Nahr Ḩīsa was connected and to which the latter name, as we have seen, was sometimes applied.

According to Abu-l-Fadā'il, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 151, the canal of aṣ-Ṣara' branched off from the Nahr Ḩīsa at the settlement of al-Muḥāwwal, one parasang from Bagdad, irrigated the farms of Bāḏūraja', and divided into numerous branches flowing through Bagdad.

Haḍḍī Ḥalfā, Gīhān numa' (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 461, says that the little town of al-Muḥāwwal lies two parasangs west of Bagdad by the Nahr Ḩīsa. In other times a delightful chatelet of the caliph al-Mu'ta-shambilāh stood there, but of this chatelet almost nothing remained at the time of Haḍḍī Ḥalfā's visit (first half of the seventeenth century).—

According to these accounts, the inlet of the Nahr Ḩīsa is to be sought not far from the modern settlement of al-Fellūḡe. About two kilometers southeast of this place lies a big ruin mound by the Euphrates, known by the name of al-Ḥrāb, and south of it are the remains of an old canal which is called al-Ejāwī to this day. We are therefore justified in identifying the ruins of al-Ḥrāb with Dimimma and this canal with the old Nahr Ḩīsa. Al-Ejāwī encircles the Tertiary upland, turns to the east-northeast, and some of its branches join those of the canal of al-Karma, the old ad-Duḵejīl, about 25 kilometers west of Bagdad.

The Ṣarṣar Canal

Ibn Serapion ('Agā'ib, [British Museum MS], fol. 33 v., [Le Strange], p. 15), records that the Nahr Ṣarṣar issued from the Euphrates three parasangs below the village of Dimimma. It was a great canal, spanned by a boat bridge and surrounded by many farms and villages; its course led through the district of Bāḏūraja', to flow finally into the Tigris between Bagdad and al-Madā'in four parasangs north of the latter place.—

Three parasangs (15 kilometers) from al-Ḥrāb, the old Dimimma, brings us along the left bank of the Euphrates to the Tell as-Sultān, where the ar-Raḡwānijījī canal now issues. There also the embankments of the old Ṣarṣar canal are still to be seen.

Ibn Ḥawkal, op. cit., p. 166, knew of continuous groups of cultivated tracts between Bagdad and al-Kūfa, intersected by canals and ditches filled from the Euphrates. The ditches nearest the south side of Bagdad were filled with water from the Ṣarṣar canal, by which, three parasangs from Bagdad, the town of Ṣarṣar was situated. At two parasangs from here the Nahr al-Malek canal was reached; in this there was more than twice as much water as in the Nahr Ṣarṣar. It was spanned by a bridge of boats.

Abu-l-Feda', op. cit., p. 52, locates the inlet of the Ṣarṣar canal below that of the Ḩīsa canal; the former ran into the fertile tracts of Irak between Bagdad and al-Kūfa and as far as the town of Ṣarṣar.
THE MIDDLE EUPHRATES

Abū-l-Faḍāʾil, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 153, refers to two places called Șarṣar in the neighborhood of Bagdad. Upper Șarṣar belonged to the villages of the canal Nahr al-Malek and lay to the south of its course. Lower Șarṣar was a little town on the Pilgrim Road north of the canal. The canal Nahr al-Malek had formerly been spanned by a bridge of boats, but, owing to the frequency of serious accidents there, Ibn Muḥāsen had it replaced by a five-arched brick bridge which cost a large sum of money. The small town at this bridge was called Șarṣar ad-Dejr, as a monastery (dejr) once stood there, the remains of which were visible at the time of Abū-l-Faḍāʾil (first half of the fourteenth century).

Abū-l-Faḍāʾil does not say whether in his time the Șarṣar canal still existed and whence the water which flowed under the bridge at Șarṣar ad-Dejr (the modern ad-Dër ruins) came. It may be taken for granted that the vicinities not only of the settlement of Upper Șarṣar but also of Lower Șarṣar were irrigated by the Nahr al-Malek, or Royal Canal, and that the Nahr Șarṣar was already clogged up in the time of Abū-l-Faḍāʾil, at least at its inlet.

Haḡī Hafta, *op. cit.*, p. 461, repeats Abū-l-Faḍāʾil’s statement, with the exception that he locates Upper Șarṣar at Bagdad by the ʿIsa canal, while Lower Șarṣar he places on the Pilgrim Road to Mecca three parasangs from Bagdad and two parasangs from the Nahr al-Malek.

It seems that Haḡī Ḥalfa’s statement is more correct than that of Abū-l-Faḍāʾil, whom we should expect to have known the environs of Bagdad well enough not to have called the Șarṣar settlement to the north of the canal Nahr al-Malek “Lower,” when both the Tigris and the Euphrates flow in a southeasterly direction. Haḡī Ḥalfa does not mention the Șarṣar canal.

The Royal Canal

The next important canal south of the Șarṣar is that which was known in antiquity and the Middle Ages as the “Royal River” or “Royal Canal” (Naaromalcha, Nahr al-Malek). Though we have frequently had occasion to refer to this in other connections, we propose here to give a brief résumé of the references to it in geographical and historical literature.

We may assume that the Armakalen canal of Abydenus (*Eusebius, Chronicon* [Schoene], Vol. 1, col. 38; *idem, Preparatio evangelica*, IX, 41:7) was the Royal Canal, the word “Armakalen” probably representing a faulty transcription of “Naarmalcha” (see above, pp. 240f., 260f.). It also seems probable that the two canals which Xenophon (*Anabasis* II, 4:13) describes as flowing out of the Tigris actually flowed from the Euphrates and may be identified with the Royal Canal and the Nahr Șarṣar (see above, p. 264).

According to Polybius, *History*, V, 51:6, Antiocbus III was warned (in the spring of 220 B.C.) by Zeuxis not to go from Liba along the right bank of the Tigris, because after six marches he would come to the “Royal Ditch” and would have to return if it were held by Molon and if he were unable to force a crossing.

The “Royal Ditch” (Basilike Diorix) must be identical with the Nahr al-Malek and, possibly, also with Nebuchadnezzar’s dam and Xenophon’s
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Median Wall. The narrative makes this Royal Ditch run between the Euphrates and Tigris; it must have reached the right bank of the latter north of Babylon and north of Seleucia at the point where we placed the southern dam of Nebuchadnezzar's great reservoir.

Strabo, Geography, XVI, 1:27, knew of a river between the Euphrates and Tigris which was called "Royal": i.e. Naarmalcha.

From Isidore of Charax, Mansiones parthicae (Müller), pp.247-249, we know that the great transport road from Syria to Seleucia followed the right bank of the Royal Canal eastward from Neapolis (now the Bitra ruins), crossing to the left bank just before Seleucia was reached (see above, pp. 231 f.).

Pliny, op. cit., VI, 129, records that the prefect Gobares had a part of the Euphrates' water led off in order to protect Babylon from the danger of its powerful current. This branch divided from the Euphrates at the town of Agranis and was called by all Assyrians Narmalcha, which signifies Royal River.

The name of Pliny's Agranis may be related with that of the Akakanon canal which Abydenus (Eusebius, loc. cit.) associated with the Armakalen canal (see above, p. 261).

According to Ptolemy, Geography, V, 18:8, the Royal River (Basileios Potamos) formed the boundary line between Mesopotamia and Babylonia. It branched off from the Euphrates at the same latitude as Seleucia, or directly west of that place.

This should lead us to seek the origin of the Royal River, or the Naarmalcha, where the canal of al-Mahmudiye now issues from the Euphrates; hence, at the ruin mound near the shrine of aš-Sejih Ibrāhīm.

This statement of Ptolemy places the inlet of the Royal Canal directly west of Seleucia at the position where Abydenus and Isidore of Charax would seem to place it, if our interpretation of their texts is correct (see above, pp. 231 f., 260 f.). Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 2:7, on the other hand, in describing the campaign of Julian, confuses the Royal Canal with the first large canal issuing from the east bank of the Euphrates, the canal which now enters the al-Karma system (see above, pp. 267-271). Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 19, on the other hand, in discussing the same events correctly places the Royal Canal farther to the south, near the town of Phissenia ('Ağar an-Na'îl). The subsequent testimony of both Ammianus Marcellinus (op. cit., XXIV, 6:1) and Zosimus (op. cit., III, 24) leads us to believe that Julian, having cleared away obstructions with which the Persians had blocked a branch connecting the Royal Canal with the Tigris, made use of the Royal Canal and the branch to float his boats through from the Euphrates to the Tigris (see above, pp. 241 f.).

We may conclude from the data at hand regarding the Emperor Julian's march that at the end of the fourth century the Royal Canal branched off from the Euphrates almost directly west of Sippar (Abu Ḥabba of today), in the neighborhood of Bithra, the name of which is preserved to this day in the ruins lying on both the right and left banks of the Euphrates west of Abu Ḥabba, and that this canal did not flow into the Tigris north of Coche, one of the suburbs of Seleucia, but extended past it either to the south or southeast.

The records which have been left by the Arabic writers on the Royal
Canal are scarce. They mention it while describing the Pilgrim Road from Bagdad to al-Kūfa, but with one exception they fail to locate its inlet.

Ibn Šerapion, Aǧāʾīb, (British Museum MS), fol. 34 r., (Le Strange), p. 15, alone says the Nahr al-Malek branched off from the Euphrates five parasangs below the inlet of the Šarṣar canal. There were many prosperous farms and settlements on both of its banks, and a bridge of boats led across it. Its outlet into the Tigris was three parasangs below al-Madāʿīn.—

Five parasangs from the inlet of the Nahr Šarṣar, which we have placed at the Tell as-Sūltān, brings us to the inlet of the present Nahr al-Махмудийе, almost due west from Abū Ḥabbā; or, in other words, to the point where, following Zosimus, we looked for the issue of the Royal Canal. The Pilgrim Road from Bagdad via Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra to al-Kūfa crossed it by a bridge of boats near the present ad-Dejr ruins, only about 25 kilometres from Bagdad. Al-Madāʿīn is the Arabic name of the Aramaic Māḥōze, as the remains of ancient Seleucia were called.

Al-Iṣṭaʿīrī, Massālīk (De Goeje), p. 85, says that one branch of the Nahr al-Malek extends to Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra and that the second enters the Tigris at the farm of al-Kīl beyond the large settlement of Kūṭa. Ibn Hawkal, Masālīk (De Goeje), p. 166, asserts that through the Nahr al-Malek flows twice as much water as through the Šarṣar.

Jāḵūt, Muʿjam (Wüstefeld), Vol. 4, p. 546, and Abū-l-Fadāʾīl, Marāṯūd (Juyboll), Vol. 3, p. 252, under the name Nahr al-Malek knew of a large canal flowing through a wide cultivated area of the Bagdad district below the Nahr Ḥṣa. Issuing from the Euphrates, it was supposed to have branched out among 360 settlements, finally joining the Tigris.

Nowadays the Nahr al-Malek is no more, but its huge embankments are visible for many a mile.

The Kūṭaʾ and Šaraʾ Canals

According to Ibn Serapion, loc. cit., about three parasangs below the Nahr al-Malek there issued from the Euphrates the Nahr Kūṭaʾ. On both sides of it lay a great number of farms and settlements, and a bridge of boats led across it. It flowed by the town of Kūṭaʾ Rabbaʾ, to join the Tigris ten parasangs below al-Madāʿīn—

I locate the inlet of the Nahr Kūṭaʾ at the southern base of the isolated al-Meǧaṣṣa plateau (see above, p. 122), close to the point where the modern Nahr as-Sikandārījā leaves the Euphrates. The boat bridge formed a link in the Pilgrim Road from Bagdad to al-Kūfa. In the description of this highway, the Nahr Kūṭaʾ and the town of Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra are often mentioned.

Al-Jāʾkūbī, Buldān (De Goeje), pp. 308 f., calls the town of Kaṣr Ibn Hubejra a fine and populous one. As it was a seat of government, its population consisted of members of various tribes. It was situated by the aš-Šaraʾ canal, about two miles (equivalent to less than four kilometres) from the main channel of the Euphrates, which was here spanned by a boat bridge called Gisr Sūraʾ.

According to Ibn Serapion, op. cit., (British Museum MS), fols. 34 r. f., (Le Strange), pp. 16 f., about six parasangs to the southeast of the inlet into the Nahr Kūṭaʾ the Euphrates divided into two branches. One, keeping
the name Euphrates, flowed towards the boat bridge at al-Kūfa and farther on to the swamps of al-Baťajeh; the second, wider and having more water than the main river, was called the Upper Sūra’, irrigated many farms, and sent various smaller ditches throughout the districts of Sūra’, Barbisama’, and Bārūsma’. The Upper Sūra’ canal came within nearly one mile of the town of Ḫaśır Ibn Hubejra, near which the boat bridge of Sūra’ led across it. One parasang west of this town the canal of Abu Ṭahla’ branched off from the Upper Sūra’, flowed through the town itself, and at a distance of one parasang below the town rejoined the Upper Sūra’, which then extended six parasangs farther beyond al-Ḵaṣr. From this canal there branched off the Lower Sūra’ canal, spanned right at its inlet by a large bridge, Kantarat al-Ḵamīrajn. The numerous branches of this canal irrigated the districts of Bābil, Ḥuṭarnija, al-Ǧāmi’ajn, as well as of both Upper and Lower Fallūğa. The main channel of the Lower Sūra’ flowed around the town of Bābil and the two al-Ǧāmi’ajn, i. e. Old and New al-Ǧāme’. From it at Old al-Ǧāme’ (al-Ǧāme’ al-Ḵadīm) issued the canal of an-Nars, which then touched al-Ḥarejij̣eh and Ḩammām Ibn ‘Omar. The distance from Ḩammām Ibn ‘Omar to the inlet of the canal of an-Nars was six parasangs and from there to the bridge Kantarat al-Ḵamīrajn another six parasangs. The an-Nars canal emptied into the canal of al-Bedā’, which flowed through the fields of al-Kūfa east of the Euphrates. Beginning at the bridge Kantarat al-Ḵamīrajn the Upper Sūra’ canal was called the Great Šara’. At the settlement of an-Nawā’ir the Šara’ Ġamūs canal branched off it. The latter irrigated numerous farms and joined the Great Canal three parasangs below the town of an-Nil. The Great Šara’ canal, spanned by the bridge of al-Māsi, also ran past this town. Beyond the bridge it was called an-Nil. —

These canals flowed through regions on the edge and beyond the limits of my explorations. The following interpretation is therefore to be regarded as conjectural only. Definite identification of the various canals and localities mentioned must await further research.

Six parasangs (30 kilometers) from the inlet of the Nahr Kūṭa’ (as-Sikandarijeh) brings us almost exactly to the point where the Saṭṭ al-Hilla and the Šaṭṭ al-Hindijeh separate. The Saṭṭ al-Hilla was probably the original Euphrates flowing around the city of Babylon. While Ibn Serapion gives the name Euphrates to the modern al-Hindijeh, Ibn Ḥawḵal, *op. cit.*, p. 168, writes that al-Hilla lies west of the Euphrates, thus not considering the al-Hindijeh branch flowing by al-Kūfa to be the Euphrates proper. The Nahr Sūra’, which according to Ibn Serapion was larger than the main Euphrates, flowed by Bābil and al-Ǧāmi’ajn, as the modern town of al-Hilla was originally called. At Old al-Ǧāme’ the canal of an-Nars branched off from the Sūra’ canal. As the inlet of the an-Nars canal is known to have been where the modern town of al-Hilla now is, it forms for us a sure starting point for our further identification of the canals described by Ibn Serapion. The distance from Old al-Ǧāme’ upstream to the bridge Kantarat al-Ḵamīrajn is given as six parasangs. This points (if we take into consideration the windings of the river) to the vicinity of the present settlement of al-Baťa’, about six kilometers southwest of Ḩān al-Maḥāwil. As far as this bridge the canal issuing from the Euphrates was called the Upper Sūra’ and from here southeast the Lower Sūra’. The Upper Sūra’ lay about one and a half kilometers south of the town
of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra. The boat bridge crossing this canal near this town
was called Gisr Sūra. The town of Kaşr Ibn Hubejra received its water
from the ditch of Abu Raḥa, which issued from the Upper Sūra' one
parasang west of the town and emptied again into it one parasang south-
east of the town. The origin of the Upper Sūra' cannot be placed much
farther north than the point where the Euphrates now separates into
the Saṭṭ al-Ḥilla and Saṭṭ al-Hindijje. With this location the statements
of Ibn Serapion regarding the branches of all the different canals from
al-Duqeṭl southwest fully agree.

The direction of the Pilgrim Road from Bagdad to al-Kūfa points
to the modern as-Sidd, northwest of the settlement of al-Beṭṭa, as the
point where the road crossed the 'Upper Sūra'. This road crossed the boat
bridge Gisr Sūra', whence it led to the boat bridge Gisr al-Kūfa; it must
therefore have followed the east, not the west, side of the main al-Hindijje
branch of the Euphrates and have run almost due north and south.

We interpret the account of Ibn Serapion to show that the town of
Kaşr Ibn Hubejra lay at the present shrine of as-Sajjed Ibrāhīm in
the neighborhood of the Najvwa ruins. It is probable that the Abu Raḥa'
canal issued from the Upper Sūra' near where the latter separated from
the Euphrates and that it rejoined the Upper Sūra' above the bridge
Kaṭarāq al-Kāmiḥaj. This bridge was not built across the Upper, but
across the Lower Sūra'; thus making possible a passage from the east to
the north. To the north of it the continuation of the Upper Sūra' canal diverged
in the west under the name Great Ṣara', as, indeed, the entire Upper
Sūra' all the way from its inlet from the Euphrates was called by al-
Ja'kūbī, Buldān (De Goeje), pp. 308 f. Six parasangs east of Kaşr Ibn
Hubejra, near the settlement of an-Nawā'ir (beyond the modern village
of Kaşr al-Maḥāwīl), the Ṣara' Gāmūs canal issued from the Great Ṣara';
the latter canal then turned south to the town of an-Nil, where it was
spanned by the strong bridge of al-Māsī. From this town it received the
name an-Nil, and three parasangs farther east this Great Ṣara' (or an-Nil)
canal was joined by the Ṣara' Gāmūs. The town of an-Nil I locate at
the al-ʿAṣība ruins on the old canal Saṭṭ an-Nil about twenty kilometers
east of Kwērēs (Bābil).

The Upper Sūra' canal with its branches, the Great Ṣara' and Ṣara'
Gāmūs, irrigated the land surrounding Kaşr Ibn Hubejra and the districts
of Sūra', Barbīsama', and Bārūsma'. The water from the Lower Sūra'
flowed over the districts of Bābil, Ḥuṭanajja, al-Gāmīṣajan, and Upper
and Lower Fālīgīa, the last two districts are to be sought southeast of al-
Gāmīṣajan, where there issued from the Lower Sūra' the an-Nars canal. An-
Nars flowed southwest six parasangs to the station Ḥammām Ibn
ʿOmar, which lay, according to al-Muḳaddasī, Ahīsan (De Goeje), p. 133,
on the highway from Kaşr Ibn Hubejra to al-Kūfa, somewhere southeast
of the al-Biris ruins. According to Ibn Serapion the an-Nars canal emptied
into the al-Beda' canal, which irrigated the land around al-Kūfa. It is
thus probable that the al-Beda' canal issued from the al-Hindijje branch
of the Euphrates which flowed past al-Kūfa between al-Kūfa and al-
Biris. Such a position leads us to the settlement of Cīfīl of today, from
where numerous irrigation ditches run out from the Euphrates to the
southeast. If, as Ibn Serapion states, the al-Beda' canal branched off the
Euphrates proper (i.e. the al-Hindijje branch) at a point which I judge
could have been only near the site of the present settlement of Çifil, Çifil itself (where the tomb of the Prophet Ezekiel is venerated; see above, p. 37) or one of its suburbs might well have been called “Inlet of the Beda” (Fam al-Beda’) or Pum Beditha, a name which frequently occurs in the Talmudic literature.

Jâkût, Mu'jam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 798, records a statement of al-Ḫaṭīb that Niffar is a settlement by the Nahr an-Nars in the territory of al-Fars (Persia). —

Neither Jâkût nor Abu-l-Fadâ'il knew the location of Niffar, but both knew that the an-Nars canal does not flow through Persia, an error which they correct. The an-Nars canal was probably mentioned in locating Niffar either because the word rimes with the name of al-Fars or else because “an-Nars” was erroneously transcribed from “an-Nil.” Niffar was situated by a branch of an-Nil.

Al-Ḫaṭīrī, Masālik (De Goeje), p. 85, also knew the branch flowing near al-Kūfā as the Euphrates proper. From this, he said, the huge Sūra' canal, flowing around the town of the same name, branches off, while the Euphrates irrigates the land around al-Kūfā and floods the al-Baṭâjeḥ swamps.

Ibn Ḥawqal, Masālik (De Goeje), p. 166, calls the Nahr Sūra' the largest canal; he also, however, refers to it as if it were the Euphrates proper where he asserts (ibid., p. 168, note a) that the town of al-Ḫilla lies west of the Euphrates.

Canals on the Right Bank of the Euphrates

Al-Maḥdūd, Maarsares, and al-ʿAlkāmi Canals

On the right bank of the Euphrates the authorities refer to many canals in Babylonia.

Farthest to the north extended a canal called al-Maḥdūd. Jâkût, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 424, writes that this is a canal in Irak on the right bank near al-庵bār and that it was deepened by order of the mother of caliphs, al-Ḫaḍurān by name. At first it was known as al-Marbān, but, as during its excavation it was divided into sections which were assigned to different groups of workmen, someone began to call it al-Maḥdūd (The Limited), and so it has been called ever since. —

Al-Ḫaḍurān lived in the second half of the eighth century after Christ. The al-Maḥdūd canal issued from the Euphrates below the rocky spur of al-ʿOkoba, which juts into the great river sixteen kilometers southeast of Hit.

Ptolemy, Geography, V, 20: 2, besides the Royal River and the river flowing by Babylon, also knew of a “river” in Babylonia called Maarsares (var., Marsares, Baarsares, Naarsares, Naarsag [ibid., V, 19; ed. Müller, p. 1018, note]). It branched off from the Euphrates at lat. 35° 40' N., thus at 40' north of Babylon. The towns situated along it (ibid., V, 20: 6) were: Volgæsia at lat. 34° 30' N., long. 78° 20' E., and Barsipa at lat. 34° 20' N., long. 78° 45' E. According to these figures, however, Volgæsia should be located northwest of Barsipa and far to the south of the inlet of the Maarsares canal. The Peutinger Table (Vienna, 1888), Segm. 10, would make
the distance from Babylon to Volcoesia (Volgaesia) eighteen miles, which would take us to the environs of the al-Ḥūṭe ruins south of al-Msağeb.

As we know from the Palmyrene inscriptions (De Vogüé, Syrie [1868], Palmyra Inscriptions No. 4; Corpus inscriptionum graecarum [1828–1877], No. 4489) that the merchants of Palmyra used to import their wares from “Ologesia,” we are inclined to look for this place west of Seleucia-Ctesiphon and west of the Euphrates, therefore in the neighborhood of Neapolis. By coming here the Palmyrene pack camels would have avoided the dangerous heat and mosquitos of Babylonia proper. To Volgaesia/neapolis the wares could have been brought either on the highroad or on the Royal River. The native name of the place was perhaps Bitra, the Greeks probably called Ἰτα-Neapolis, and the Parthians gave it the name Volgaesia; but the two foreign appellations have disappeared and only the native name Bitra survives.

The Maarsares canal branched off from the right bank of the Euphrates; but from the same bank also, according to Ptolemy, the Royal Canal branched off, although we know from other writers that the latter issued from the left bank. For this reason Ptolemy’s statement is not to be trusted. His text would seem to imply that both canals, the Royal and Maarsares, branched off in the same latitude and both flowed south, which cannot be true. The only possible help Ptolemy gives us toward identifying the course of the Maarsares is his locating Volgaesia and Barsipa on its banks; this is because the situation of Barsipa happens to be known to us. It is the al-Biris of today, 21 kilometers southwest from Bābil. It is known from the Babylonian records that the town of Barsipa was situated on a canal which flowed out of the Euphrates right at the city of Babylon. Possibly — indeed, almost probably — a branch, partly natural, partly artificial, diverged from the right bank of the Euphrates well above Babylon, and its waters irrigated the settlements around the site of the modern al-Hindijeh. This branch may have flowed to the west of Barsipa, where it was probably joined by a canal which ran through this town, coming from the direction of Babylon. Remains of a huge ancient canal are to be seen eleven kilometers west of al-Msağeb. This canal issued from the Euphrates at the fields of Bitra, was dug in a natural depression in the Tertiary upland, and ran south-southeast of the ancient town of Barsipa or the present al-Biris. Its upper half is now clogged up, but the southern half still exists, as it receives water from the Euphrates through the al-Hindijeh branch, which turns west at the modern as-Sidd and flows by al-Kūfa.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIII, 6: 25, records in Babylonia the river Marses (Marsares), the Royal River, and the Euphrates, which is the largest. He (ibid., XXIV, 3: 14) as well as Zosimus (Historia nova, III, 19) writes that at Bitra the Euphrates almost disappears, having filled many canals on its way. —

Ammianus Marcellinus, though he went with the Roman army far into Babylonia, makes no mention whatever of the Maarsares in the description of this journey; we may conclude from this that, as the Romans did not cross the canal at all, it either must have issued at a point farther down than the point reached by the army on the left bank of the Euphrates, or must have branched off from the right bank. The last supposition may be correct, because, according to Ptolemy, the Royal
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Canal had its inlet below the Maarsares, which could not be true if the latter branched off from the Euphrates on the left. As Ammianus Marcellinus is silent on this point, we may only assume that the Maarsares branched off the right bank.

No Arabic author mentions the Maarsares canal, but where according to Ptolemy we should look for its course they refer to a canal named 'Alkami.

Kodama, Ḥorāq (De Goeje), pp. 233 ff., says that beyond al-Anbār two canals branch off from the Euphrates. One, which turns somewhat to the west and is called al-'Alkami, flows to al-Kūfa. The second maintains a straight course and is called Sūra. From the latter, below al-Anbār, branches off the Nahr ad-Duqejī, from which again issues the Nahr ʿĪsa, which at Bagdad empties into the Tigris. —

The Nahr al-'Alkami left the Euphrates 14 kilometers south of the fields of Bitra, flowed south-southwest across the dry channel of the ancient Maarsares canal, and near az-Zibblije, 13 kilometers southeast of Kerbel, joined the branch of the Euphrates which today irrigates the gardens of al-Kūfa.

In 1085 the al-'Alkumi canal, winding near al-Mashadān, was cleaned and repaired (Al-Bondārī, Taʾwārīḥ [Houtsma], p. 77). —

Al-Mashadān (The Two Maṣḥads) are the towns of Kerbel and an-Negef, or, as they are sometimes called, Maṣḥad al-Ḥusejn and Maṣḥad 'Ali. Both received their water from al-'Alkumi, which in its lower half was identical with the earlier Maarsares.

The Pallacotas, or al-Fallūqa, Canal

The Babylonian records refer to a Naarpallukat canal, the Pallacotas of the classical writers and al-Fallūga of the Arabic authorities.

Arrian, Anabasis, VII, 21, gives the best description of this canal. Alexander sailed from Babylon down the Euphrates as far as the “river” Pallacotas (var., Pallacopas). This canal branched off the Euphrates about eight hundred stades below Babylon and in time of flood led off the surplus water into the ponds and lakes which extend from the great river as far as the borders of Arabia and form a long belt of swamps, the water from which flows by many insignificant channels into the sea. The canal near its inlet was so large and deep that even in the dry season water from the Euphrates flowed into it and little remained for the irrigation of Assyria. The inlet of the river Pallacotas was very difficult to close, as it was filled with mud and the whole vicinity was composed almost exclusively of clay. Notwithstanding this, Alexander resolved to stop the inlet. Finding stony soil about thirty stades lower down, he gave orders to have it dug through and thus to have a new inlet created for the river Pallacotas. He was of the opinion that in case of need it would be easier to stop an inlet in a stony soil than in clay. After that he sailed into the Pallacotas and along it as far as the lakes, even to the land of the Arabs, where he found a beautiful country and built a fine city, garrisoning it with Hellenic soldiers.

Appian, Bella civilia, II, 153, also relates that from Babylon Alexander sailed on the Euphrates down to the river Pallacotas, by which the water from the great river flowed to lakes and swamps, so that the Assyrian
 territory could not be irrigated from the Euphrates, nor could boats be sailed on it. The object of Alexander’s trip was to dam this canal.

Pliny, *Naturalis historia*, VI, 118, writes that the town of Bura lies on the river Pallacotas.—

It appears from both Arrian and Appian that the Pallacotas canal branched off from the right bank of the Euphrates below Babylon. Arrian estimates the distance at approximately eight hundred stades. If these were Eratothenic stades, the distance would be 125 kilometers. Admitting that the Euphrates proper below Babylon flowed in about the same direction that it does today, at a distance of 125 kilometers we should reach a point near ad-Diwâniţje. The ancient Euphrates would then have been identical with the present Šaţţ al-Ĥâr, and the Pallacotas canal with the Šaţţ al-Fraţ. This identification cannot be far wrong, as it is not to be assumed that the Euphrates came any nearer the Tigris than the Šaţţ al-Ĥâr of today.

Kiepert, *Formae orbis antiqui* (1905), Map 5, locates the inlet of the Pallacotas canal to the northwest of the inlet of the Naarimalcha; this contradicts the classical statements quoted above.

A certain Jew of Bêt Arâmâje ‘from the village of Pallûgta’, which is the place where the waters of the Euphrates separate for the irrigation of the surrounding lands, preached in 640 A.D. that the Messiah had come. He collected about four hundred men — weavers, carpetmakers, and bleachers of linen — who burned three churches and killed the superintendent of the district. Then the troops sent against them from ‘Aḵôla’ killed them all with their wives and children and crucified their leader in his own village (Nödeke, *Syrische Chronik* [1893], p. 36; Guidi, *Un nuovo testo* [1891], pp. 28f.).—

Nödeke identifies (note 4) this village with Kal’at Fellûţe (al-Fellûţe), but this can scarcely be correct, as this Fellûţe was never mentioned before the thirteenth century. It seems, rather, that the village of Pallûghta lay east or southeast of ‘Aḵôla’ (al-Kûfa), where the Arabic authors knew of a settlement of the same name.

**The Rivers of the Garden of Eden**

A glance at the canals branching off the Euphrates in Upper Babylonia enables us to throw some light on the story of the Garden of Eden.

Genesis, 2: 8—14, relates that the Lord God planted a garden in Eden near Kedem and settled there the man whom he had created. A river emerging from Eden irrigates the garden, after which it divides into four branches. The first branch, called Pišôn, flows around the whole country of Hawila, where there is pure gold, fragrant resin (*belodaţ*), and precious stones (*sôkam*). The second branch, Giḥôn, flows around the land of Kush. The third river is the Hīdkekel; this extends towards Assyria. The fourth river is the Euphrates.—

The region of Eden which the author had in mind was known to him and therefore he tried to describe its position in such a way that his readers might learn to know it as well. Of the names given by him, “Euphrates” refers to the river now known by that name, and “Assyria” to the well known state; both these names lead us east of the Arabian de-
sert. With this also agrees the name “Kedem,” which in the language of the Bible signifies the northern third of Arabia (see my Arabia Deserta, pp. 494—497). We may infer that it was the river Euphrates which irrigated Eden and divided beyond it into four branches.

The words used in Genesis, 2: 10f., describing the manner in which Eden was watered by the great river and how the latter divided into four branches remind us forcibly of similar expressions used by various classical and Arabic authors (see above, pp. 267—274, 277—279). According to these the main river Euphrates divides into several branches about forty kilometers southeast of the site of the present town of Hit. It is here that we should locate the Biblical Eden.

The Arabic authors borrowed from the classics, and these again from the Babylonians; and what they each borrowed they supplemented from their own experience. The Biblical author likewise drew from the Babylonian records. He knew the region where he locates Eden and that it consisted of alluvium brought down by the Euphrates. He also knew that the original estuary of the Euphrates lay at the upper end of what is now the alluvial plain and that the great river first of all filled in the embayment that begins at al-‘Oqbā in the Tertiary uplands 17 kilometers southeast of the present Hit. Here is the oldest part of the Babylonian alluvium, and here also man could have settled in the earliest times. If we accept the author’s conception we may seek Eden between the Babylonian Pylae (al-Aswad; see above, pp. 222f.) and the first large canal on the left bank as one goes downstream. This branches off almost due east from the modern settlement of ar-Rumālī. Here lies the embayment just mentioned, which averages fifteen kilometers in width from north to south, 35 kilometers in length from east to west, and is eminently suited for a garden, as it is enclosed on all sides by Tertiary uplands and opens only on the southeast into a depression about two kilometers wide and through which warm breezes enter.

According to the Biblical text it would seem that the river irrigating this garden divided into four branches only when past it (i.e. to the east of it). This agrees with the facts.

The first branch, or canal, was the Pišôn, which flowed around the whole land of Ḥawila. The Biblical Ḥawila was identical with the classical Arabia Felix and bordered on southwestern Babylonia, as is shown by the following records.

I Samuel, 15:7, relates that Saul defeated the Amalekites and plundered their camps from Ḥawila to Sūr, “which is over against Egypt.” — Both Sūr and Ḥawila were territorial names. Sūr was the Egyptian borderland, the eastern environs of the site of the modern Suez Canal. No Biblical text, however, would justify us in placing Ḥawila on the Sinai Peninsula. To the east of the latter rises the mountain range of Seʿīr, which belonged to Edom, to which there is no mention of Saul’s having come. It is therefore necessary for us to look for Ḥawila to the south of Edom and southeast of Elath (now the modern settlement of al-ʿAqaba), which the classical writers knew as marking the northwestern corner of Arabia Felix (see my The Northern Hejāz, p. 261, and Arabia Deserta, pp. 498–500).

The text of Genesis, 25: 18, also shows familiarity with Ḥawila in stating that the Ishmaelite tribes camped from Ḥawila to Sūr near Egypt and to the road leading to Assyria. — From the Biblical and Assyrian
records relating to the different Ishmaelite tribes we learn that the Ishmaelites camping grounds extended from the eastern borderland of Egypt (Ṣūr) to the middle Euphrates in northeastern Palmyra. The principal road from Syria to Assyria crossed northeastern Palmyra. Yet the Ishmaelites, according to the Bible, were also lords of the oasis of Adumu (Dūmat al-Ġandal). These facts, therefore, force us to look for Ḥawila to the south and east of Adumu in the country which the classical writers called Arabia Felix (see my Arabia Deserta, pp. 492 ff.).

Arabia Felix reached as far as the southern vicininity of Babylon. According to Aristobulus (Strabo, Geography, XVI, 1: 11) and Arrian (Anabasis, VII, 21), Alexander, having passed eight hundred stades (about 125 kilometers) from Babylon down the Euphrates, sailed into the “river” Palacotas and along it as far as the land of the Arabs, where he found a beautiful country which he wished to conquer.

Herodian, Ab excessu Divi Marci, III, 9, writes that in the years 195 and 199 Emperor Septimius Severus invaded Arabia Felix, whence different fragrant spices and other perfumes were exported. — Septimius Severus, having plundered Babylon, raided the right bank of the Euphrates, along which led a great transport road used by the merchants conveying precious incense and different spices from the town of Gerrha (al-Ġerā) by way of Palmyra to the west, to Syria and Italy. He may have plundered some commercial stations, for his historians (not only Herodian, but Zosimus, Historia nova, I, 8, as well) record that he took the whole of Arabia and came to Arabia Felix, although as a matter of fact he arrived at a point not far from the modern settlement of al-Ḫūfa. Thus we see that these classical records also justify us in placing the land of Ḥawila, where there was fragrant resin, near Babylonia and the Euphrates, and in identifying it with Arabia Felix, also famous for its spices.

We may assume, then, that the Pišôn branched off from the right bank of the Euphrates and flowed south or south-southeast. This was the course of the classical Maarsares and Arabic al-ʿAlḵami canals, which we know formed the western boundary of the fertile plain of Babylonia. Twenty kilometers northwest of the inlet of the Maarsares canal Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 19, mentions, as lying close to the Euphrates, the town of Phissenia (the ʿAḵar an-Naʿēli ruins), suggesting both by its name and position the Biblical Pišôn. Phissenia lay on the left bank of the Euphrates, whereas the Pišôn branched off from the right bank; but in Babylonia we find in other places also settlements or canals named after localities situated on the opposite banks. I judge, therefore, that the Pišôn branched off from the right bank of the Euphrates near the present ʿAḵar an-Naʿēli ruins, flowed southeast, then turned south, later on southeast again, and irrigated the lands where now stand the present settlements and ruins of al-Ḵūfa, aš-Šemmāfijje, and al-Mḵajjer. It formed the northeast boundary of the land of Ḥawila, or Arabia Felix.

The second branch, or canal, the Gihôn, flowed around the land of Kush. The position of this land may be ascertained from Genesis, 10: 8—10, where we read that Kush was lord of Babel, Erêḫ, Akkad, and Kalne in the land of Sinear. As Akkad was the northern part of Babylonia, we shall make no mistake if we look for the Gihôn in a large canal which flowed through northern Babylonia. Such a large canal was the
classical Naarmalcha, or Arabic Nahr al-Malek, which branched off from the Euphrates almost opposite the Maarsares and then flowed east-south-east, irrigating the plain to the north and east of Babylon (Bab). It may formerly have turned southeast just beyond Babylon and irrigated the vicinity of the town of Kalne (the modern Niffer), as well as of Erech (the modern Warka), and then rejoined the Euphrates.

The third branch, or canal, was the Hitdekel, which flowed towards Assyria. According to our interpretation the Hitdekel can be represented by nothing but the present al-Karma canal, which in Biblical times, as at present, followed the northern boundary of the Babylonian alluvium proper. North of it extends the Tertiary upland, which nearly always was considered as belonging to Assyria. Opposite the inlet of this canal on the right bank of the Euphrates was situated Rapiku, often mentioned as an Assyrian frontier town. The Arabic authors called this canal ad-Duqejl or ad-Duqeji (dimin. of Dekel or Dgejl), both of which names remind us of the Biblical Hiddekel, especially since “Hiddekel” (Hid-Dekel, The Swift Dekel) in classical Arabic was rendered “Digele.” Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 16, also says of the ad-Duqeji canal that it flows towards Assyria.

The fourth branch was the Euphrates itself. It was the original river which, considerably depleted, passed the capital of Babylonia.

APPENDIX VII

Hâleb ibn Al-Walîd’s Campaigns Along the Euphrates

Hâleb’s Advance on Al-Hira

Many, but often conflicting, records have been preserved of the initial efforts of the Moslems to conquer Persia. Especially many are the topographical difficulties connected with the interpretation of the reports of the deeds of the Moslems led by Hâleb ibn al-Walîd and of those dealing with the deeds of the nomads of the Bekr ibn Wâ’il tribe under the command of the head chief al-Mu’tanna ibn Hâretha.

Hâleb’s Approach to Al-Hira

In the present appendix we are concerned with Hâleb’s and al-Mu’tanna’s campaigns in Irak and along the Euphrates from the end of the spring of 633 to the spring of 634 A.D. Hâleb’s famous subsequent raid against the oasis of Dûmat al-Ǧandal and his march through the desert to Syria have been discussed in some detail in the author’s Arabia Deserta, pp.539-552, 553-573. Hâleb, in the second half of 632 and first of 633 A.D., in quelling the rebellion in al-Jemâma, almost reached the boundaries of the Bekr ibn Wâ’il tribe, which had been resisting the Persians for some time and making marauding incursions into the Persian territory. Al-Mu’tanna was quick to understand the advantage of an alliance with the Moslems for a joint advance against the Persians; during Hâleb’s cam-
paigned in al-Jemâma he therefore made a compact with the caliph Abu Bekr and joined Ḥāled, who at the command of the caliph began a march on Irak.

About the object of Ḥāled's march there is not only a difference of opinion between the al-Medîna and al-Kûfa traditions, but even among the representatives of each school there is no unity of opinion. According to some it would seem as if Ḥāled was to conquer the right bank of the Euphrates from the Persian Gulf northwestern, thus securing the farther advance of the Moslems, while all that others mention are his operations in the neighborhood of al-Hira, as if he made a raid against this town only. I shall paraphrase and explain here such passages from the records as deal with Ḥāled's advance on the al-Hira country and from there to the northwest, devoting my attention first to the writers of the al-Medîna school (al-Belâdorî, al-Wâkî, al-Madâ'î, Ibn Nubeîsâ, Ibn Ishâq, Abu Jûsuf, and Hišâm ibn al-Kalbi) and then to the account of Sejî ibn 'Omar, the principal representative of the al-Kûfa school.

**Versions of the al-Medîna School**

Al-Belâdorî on Ḥaffân and the Alliance with the Bekr Tribe

Al-Belâdorî, *Futûh* (De Goeje), p. 241, quotes the compilation of Hišâm ibn al-Kalbi and Abu Miğnaf, according to which al-Muṭṭanna ibn Ḥâreṭa, the chief of the Bekr ibn Wâ'il tribe, which was then pillaging the Persian borderland, made a compact with the caliph Abu Bekr in al-Medîna, encamped after his return at Ḥaffân, and called on his tribe to accept Islam, which they accordingly did.—

Ḥaffân was situated four parasangs (20 kilometers) southeast of al-Kâdesijje on the border of the desert and was a favorite camping ground of smaller Bedouin clans. It is identical with the present Kaşr al-Kâjem.

Caetani, *Annali* (1905), Vol.2, p.917, writes that al-Muṭṭanna assembled his whole tribe at Ḥaffân and that they all became Moslems. This does not agree with the text and is very improbable, as the whole tribe would not have found pasture for their herds around Ḥaffân, which bordered to the north on tilled land but to the south on sand desert.

Caetani (*op. cit.*, Vol.2, p. 921, notes 6c, d) also thinks that Ḥaffân lay beyond the borders of Arabia Deserta in the alluvial region (*sawâd*); that it did not belong to the Bekr ibn Wâ'il and could not therefore have been their camping ground, as al-Belâdorî wrote, but that it was the first station conquered in the enemy's territory where the Moslems made their first camp beyond the borders of Arabia. In this connection Caetani refers to a verse extolling a victory obtained in the neighborhood of an-Namârêq. The verse is said to have been by al-Muṭṭanna and is cited by Jâkût, *Mu'jam* (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 812, lines 21—22. This passage Caetani interprets as showing that the Moslems on their march to Persia, after leaving the desert, advanced from Ḥaffân and therefore from the immediate neighborhood of al-Hira. Yet of all the numerous historical sources on the subject, not a single one states that the Moslems left the desert at Ḥaffân for their march on al-Hira. Al-Belâdorî says only that al-Muṭṭanna camped there. The spring of Ḥaffân flows near on the borders of the desert but actually in the desert itself and not in the alluvial region. Both the Bed-
ouins and the settlers claim to be the owners of springs or oases of this sort. In reality these oases are controlled only by those who happen to be the stronger. During the reign of the caliph Abu Bekr the Persian government was so feeble that it could not even defend its frontier and had been obliged to give up many stations; consequently the inhabitants of the border districts were driven to protect themselves against the Bedouins as best they could. Al-Belâdori relates that al-Mu'tanna plundered the Persian border districts even before he allied himself with the Moslems; he therefore could easily have taken possession of the Ḥaffân spring. If al-Mu'tanna was really the author of the verse recorded by Jâkût (op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 812 f.), the verse must have been made before his alliance with the Moslems, as it does not mention them at all. When Jâkût explains the verse, saying that an-Namâreç is a place near al-Kûfa in Iraq where the Moslem army encamped during its first incursion, he does not refer to Ḥaffân, is not supported by any original tradition, and shows only his fragmentary knowledge of the topography of the vicinity of al-Kûfa.

From Ḥaffân a road led at the time of Ḥâled and still leads along the edge of the desert southeast to al-Bâṣra, and from it another road branched off southwest to an-Nibâḡ. Al-Muṭanna and Ḥâled met in an-Nibâḡ. Ḥâled had been ordered to invade Iraq and with the Bekr ibn Wâ'il Bedouins to fight the Persians. All the sources agree in stating that he had received orders to march to Iraq, but not one of them says that his objective was to be al-Ḥîra. We must take into consideration the fact that al-Ḥîra lay on the border between the mutually hostile Bekr and Tarleb tribes and that the Bekr could much more easily plunder the Persian settlements adjoining their territory. This territory extended from al-Kâdesije as far as the Persian Gulf. Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 920, note 3, locates the northern boundary of the Bekr tribe as running past Ḥit and refers to al-Ḥamdâni, Siḫa (Müller), Vol. 1, p. 169, line 25, as authority for this. Al-Ḥamdâni is an admirable expert in regard to southern Arabia but when it comes to northern Arabia he is not to be depended upon. Furthermore, his informants deal with the affairs of their own time, or the tenth century, and not with those of the first half of the seventh. All the contemporary sources prove that in Ḥâled's time the territory of the Bekr tribe did not extend north of al-Ḥîra. In their own territory, which they know well enough, the Bedouins need no foreign guides, and yet the allied warriors of the Bekr tribe and the Moslems sought for aliens as guides on all their expeditions north of al-Ḥîra. North of al-Ḥîra, as, for instance, at 'Ājn at-Tamr, were garrisons of the Tarleb, which surely could not have been maintained in territory belonging to the Bekr. But elsewhere, too, we frequently find statements that on the south the Tarleb territory extended as far as al-Ḥîra; thus al-Bekri, Muʿtam (Wüstenfeld), p. 97, records that the table mountain of Ilâha, rising west of al-Ḥîra, once belonged to the Tarleb.

The Bekr tribe had no intention of attacking al-Ḥîra itself but was satisfied with plundering individual Persian settlements not far from its own territory. Some clans attacked al-Ubulla, the important starting point of the commercial caravans, which lay about twenty kilometers east of the modern town of al-Bâṣra. It is therefore highly probable that Ḥâled selected the shortest and easiest route from an-Nibâḡ north-northeast to al-Ubulla in Iraq, took part in the fighting there, and then proceeded north-
west, pillaging the Persian settlements now on the right, now on the left bank of the Euphrates. As the region southeast of Ḥaffān is not intimately known to me, I shall not consider his campaign there in detail. Suffice it to remark that in the year 633 the western border of Irak was almost entirely free from the Persian garrisons and thus Ḥāled’s plundering activities were made easy. Not before the end of 634 did the Persians offer any resistance; then in 635 they themselves attacked, and the Moslems were subsequently obliged to regain settlements which had already been plundered by Ḥāled.

Al-Wāḥedi’s, al-Madāʾini’s, and Ibn Nubejša’s Accounts

Al-Wāḥedi (al-Belādorī, Futūḥ [De Goeje], p. 242) records that Ḥāled, having quelled the rebels in al-Jemāma, returned to al-Medīna and from there went by way of Fejd and at-Ta’lābījje to al-Ḥira. — The return to al-Medīna is very unlikely. Why should Ḥāled have made a detour of more than eight hundred kilometers? If, however, Ḥāled really did return to al-Medīna, then he could not have gone thence to al-Ḥira except by the great transport route by way of Fejd and at-Ta’lābījje, this latter station being nearly three hundred kilometers north of an-Nībāḡ. But, in any case, al-Wāḥedi does not seem to have been correctly informed on this subject. Of the advance in conjunction with the chief al-Muṭanna he makes no mention at all.

Caetani (op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 921, note 9 b) thinks that Ḥāled went from an-Nībāḡ to al-Ḥira by way of Fejd and at-Ta’lābījje, “as has already been asserted by our best historical authority, al-Wāḥedi” (al-Belādorī, loc. cit.). Al-Wāḥedi, however, makes no mention whatever of an-Nībāḡ. And even if al-Wāḥedi really were our best historical authority and if his informants had been persons well acquainted with the positions of an-Nībāḡ and the station of Fejd, he would not have written that Ḥāled marched from an-Nībāḡ by way of Fejd. As an-Nībāḡ lies nearly two hundred kilometers southeast of Fejd, it was nearer from Fejd to al-Ubulla by way of an-Nībāḡ than from an-Nībāḡ by way of Fejd to al-Ḥira (see also ‘Arib, Šila [De Goeje], p. 17).

Caetani (op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 922, note 12) writes that the Arabs marched direct on al-Ḥira, which they attacked from the desert without having encountered any foe on the way. He asserts that Ibn Ishāk agrees with al-Wāḥedi in this regard. On page 921, note 6 d, Caetani adds that the feeble resistance of al-Ḥira, almost without a show of defense, proves that its inhabitants were surprised and that the Arabs therefore must have attacked and robbed the town on the very day of their arrival. According to Caetani these are psychological and military arguments against the possibility of Ḥāled’s having approached al-Ḥira in the course of a marauding expedition from al- Başra (al-Ubulla) northwest. I maintain, however, that not a single source states that Abu Bekr commanded Ḥāled to march direct on al-Ḥira. The words of Ibn Ishāk are likewise at variance with this conclusion of Caetani, in spite of the latter’s view to the contrary, for according to Ibn Ishāk Ḥāled gained possession of several settlements in the country around al-Ḥira before he came to the town itself. Ibn Ishāk writes that Ḥāled passed al-Ḥira on the south, west, and north,
and only from the north returned southward again to attack the town. A surprise attack was therefore out of the question.

Al-Madâ‘ini (at-Tabari, Ta`rîh [De Goeje], Ser. 1, p. 2016) relates that Abu Bekr sent Háiled to the land of the town of al-Kûfa, the residence of al-Mu’tamanna. Háiled proceeded by way of al-Bašra, where Kuṭba ibn Katûde as-Sadûsi was then living. — By the land of the town of al-Kûfa is not meant the definite vicinity of this town, which was founded after 637 A.D., but the whole region centering around the site of al-Kûfa in the first century of the Mohammedan era — i.e. the whole of Irak. This also indicates al-Madâ‘ini’s conviction that Háiled must have marched from al-Jemâma direct to Irak by the transport road leading to al-Ubulla.

Caetani (op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 923 f., note 2) denies that al-Madâ‘ini meant that Háiled went to al-Bašra, holding that this would have been in direct contradiction to the beginning of the sentence, where Háiled is said to have proceeded by “the road usually called the road to al-Bašra.” As this road divided at a certain point, one branch leading to al-Bašra, the other to al-Kûfa (al-Ḥira) Caetani assumes that Háiled took the latter. But this explanation is too artificial and contradicts the text. Furthermore al-Madâ‘ini does not say that Háiled followed “the road usually called the road to al-Bašra,” but that he proceeded by way of al-Bašra. The phrase “he went by the road to al-Kûfa” cannot be substituted for “he went by way of al-Bašra,” as Caetani, Annali (1905), Vol. 2, p. 925, note 3, seems to think permissible. The first does not state whether al-Kûfa was reached, while in the second it is evident that al-Bašra was passed before Háiled arrived at his destination.


Jazîd ibn Nubejša (al-Belâdorî, op. cit., pp. 243 f.) relates that on his march with Háiled to Irak he reached the fort of al-‘Odejb and from there al-Ḥira, where the inhabitants barricaded themselves in the Kašr al-Abjad, Kašr ibn Buqejla, and Kašr al-‘Adasîjîn. When the Moslems drove their horses into the standing grain, the inhabitants made peace.

— Jazîd ibn Nubejša fails to state from where and by what route he came with Háiled to Irak. He begins his narrative only at the station of al-‘Odejb, situated 32 kilometers nearly due south from al-Ḥira and at the junction of two roads. One comes from the south by way of Fejd, the other from the southeast from al-Bašra by way of Haffân. This position of al-‘Odejb at the meeting point of two roads makes it impossible for us to determine from what direction Háiled arrived there. As Jazîd ibn Nubejša mentions neither a detour nor the capture of the fortress of al-‘Odejb, we may assume that the latter had been deserted by the Persians.

Al-Ḥira

Al-Ḥira was reached by the Moslems from the south. This town, built on the very edge of the desert, was formed of a few groups of fortified buildings with gardens and fields between them. Such a group of buildings, called kašr (pl., kašûr), “castle,” is rectangular. Its center
is formed by a courtyard entirely enclosed by the separate buildings. The outer walls, which are higher than the inner ones, are strongly built and are provided with loopholes in their upper parts and with towers at the corners, giving the whole the aspect of a fort. Through the outer wall a single fortified gate leads into the yard, and from this doors open into the separate buildings, which have no other exits. These ḫṣūr are either narrow or wide, according to the number of the members of the respective clans who live together in them.

At the approach of an enemy the inhabitants of a ḫṣūr drive their best animals, especially the mares, into the yard, close and bar the gate, ascend to the flat roofs, and through the loopholes beat off the attack. If the enemy also are settlers, they bring their mattocks and ladders with them, break through the garden walls, and, seeking cover behind the palms, approach the ḫṣūr. When they reach the walls they first raise their ladders, trying to climb upon the roof. If repulsed, they collect at different points close to the wall in order to make a breach through it. But if the attack is made by the Bedouins, whose object is not the subjection of the settlers, but loot, they possess themselves first of all of the flocks which have not been driven into the yard and then of the grain heaped upon the threshing floors; they pick the ripe fruit, pasture their animals on the standing grain, and then disappear as quickly as they came. If the nomads want to compel the settlers to pay them regular tribute, they encamp before the ḫṣūr, drive the animals they have brought with them into the fields and gardens, light a fire under one of the large fruit trees, prevent the settlers from getting to the wells, threaten to burn and break all their trees and bushes, and in this manner force them to surrender. All this was done, according to Jazīd ibn Nubejšā, at the different ḫṣūr in al-Ḫira. The inhabitants are said to have saved themselves from the Moslem army in their "strong buildings," which proves that the town was not enclosed by a common wall. The Moslems encamped before the various ḫṣūr, drove the animals into the gardens and fields, and compelled the settlers to negotiate and finally to surrender.

Ibn Ishāḵ’s Account

Ibn Ishāḵ heard from Šāleḫ ibn Kejšān (at-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2016f.) that Ḥāled received from Abu Bekr a written order to proceed to Irāk. Ḥāled marched from al-Jemāma and encamped in the cultivated territory as-Sawād by the hamlets of Bānīkījaʿ, Bārūšmaʿ, and Ul-lejs, the owner of which made peace with him. — According to this report Ḥāled did not return to al-メディна before proceeding to Irāk. Nor is any mention made of the route he took; but evidently he did not head directly for al-Ḫira, for, whether he marched straight northward on what later became the Pilgrim Road or first went towards al-Ḵaṣrā in a northeasterly direction, in either case he stopped before reaching al-Ḫira at the settlements of Bānīkījaʿ, Bārūšmaʿ, and Ul-lejs. This last settlement was an important Persian stronghold at the junction of the transport routes southeast of al-Ḫira; the chief there and of the lands around was the wealthy landowner, Ibn Šalūbaʿ. Other sources name a certain Ḡābān as the lord of Ul-lejs, assigning to Ibn Šalūbaʿ only the hamlets of Bānīkījaʿ and Bārūšmaʿ; and in the peace treaty Ibn Ishāḵ himself refers to Ibn Šalūbaʿ as the
owner of the two last named, thus contradicting himself. He locates Bânîkîja' as lying on both banks of the Euphrates in the environs of the station of Ullejs. Half of Bânîkîja' and the whole settled part of Bârûsma' with its best fields lay on the left bank of the western branch of the Euphrates. Owing to this position they were not threatened directly by the Moslems, and it is therefore remarkable that Ibn Šalûba' immediately began to negotiate for peace, without paying any attention to the Persian government nor concerning himself about assistance from al-Ḥira, although this town had not yet been taken by the Moslems.

From Bânîkîja', Ibn Ishâk continues, Ḥâled marched on al-Ḥira, the inhabitants of which surrendered to him without any effort at resistance. — Hence, according to Ibn Ishâk, Ḥâled possessed himself of the most important part of the Persian border without a fight, without bloodshed, and with his Moslems alone, as the great chief al-Muţâmîna and his tribe are not mentioned. Why al-Ḥira, the center of the whole border district, surrendered without a fight, when even the simple military post of 'Ain at-Tamr, situated far in the desert, made such a brave resistance, Ibn Ishâk fails to explain. It would be useless to claim that the settlers of al-Ḥira were taken by surprise, as they could observe the Moslem army for a long time before it came near from the south, and, besides, they must have received information of the threatened invasion from Ibn Šalûba' s settlements, already at least partly plundered by the Moslems.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 931, note 8, says that in the environs of al-Ḥira and between the fortresses or præsidia of the old Roman limes (or fortified frontier) there rose numerous rich Christian monasteries. — It happens, however, that the limes was four hundred kilometers from al-Ḥira.

Abu Jūsuf’s Account

Abu Jūsuf, Harâq (Cairo, 1392 A.H.), pp. 82f., referring to Ibn Ishâk, writes that Ḥâled returned from al-Jemâma to al-Medîna and from there marched with two thousand soldiers to Irak by way of Fejd; there he was joined by five hundred Bedouins of the Ṭajj tribe. The inhabitants of the station of Šerâf fled before them to the castle of al-Murîta, which, as well as the castle of al-‘Odejî, was taken by the Moslems after a fierce attack and then plundered, demolished, and set on fire. The inhabitants of the settlement of al-Kâdesijje surrendered without a fight. From there Ḥâled marched on the largest and strongest Persian border stronghold, an-Neţef, which he also took by assault and then destroyed. His advance guard had in the meantime taken the little Persian fort of Ullejs. This feat so frightened the inhabitants of the settlement of Ullejs that they asked for peace. From Ullejs Ḥâled set out for al-Ḥira, the inhabitants of which took refuge in their kuṣūr and would not be enticed by the Moslems to a fight in the open country, which offered no protection. At last they surrendered. From al-Ḥira Ḥâled turned along the river to the village of Bânîkîja', took the Persian fortress there, made peace with Hâni ibn Ġâber at-Ṭâ'i, the representative of the Bânîkîja' people, marched still farther, fought all night with the inhabitants of Bânîkîja', and got possession of and demolished their castle. From here he sent Ġârir against the village of Bârûsma', lying east of the Euphrates; but the elder of this community,
Salūba, met Garīr while yet on the right bank of the Euphrates and made peace with him. Ḥālēd now returned to an-Neğef and, accompanied by guides from al-Ḥira, began his march to ʿAjn at-Tamr.—

This description of Ḥālēd’s campaign contains many contradictions and impossibilities, so that we cannot trust Abu Jūṣuf in spite of his reference to Ibn Ishāk. The latter does not mention Ḥālēd’s return from al-Jemāma to al-Medīna. According to Abu Jūṣuf, Ḥālēd went from al-Jemāma to al-Medīna and from there took the road—the later Pilgrim Road—to al-Kūfa. Abu Jūṣuf is the only Arabic writer whom I find mentioning an-Neğef as the largest and strongest border fort. Notwithstanding the fact that Ḥālēd took it by assault, the inhabitants of al-Ḥira, although living close to an-Neğef, were not intimidated. From the near vicinity of al-Ḥira Ḥālēd went southeast to Ulejās and only from there northwest to al-Ḥira. After possessing himself of this town, he again returned southeast to the village of Bānīkīja, the fort of which—likewise recorded by Abu Jūṣuf only—he twice conquered and twice burned and demolished. The crossing of the Euphrates caused Garīr no difficulties. From Bānīkīja Ḥālēd returned, not to al-Ḥira but to the burned and demolished an-Neğef—although he could have found no stores or accommodation there—and from that place began his march on ʿAjn at-Tamr.

According to Abu Jūṣuf the whole Persian territory far into the desert (to al-Muṣṭa) was occupied by soldiers; this is in direct opposition to what is known of the administrative conditions of that time in Persia. The regular Persian garrisons of the border fortresses of al-Muṣṭa and al-Odejb could not hold out against an attack of Ḥālēd’s 2500 riders on horseback and camels! And yet the Persians were well provided with food and water, both of which the attacking Moslems lacked. The cruel fate of these garrisons should have induced the Persian troops to defend the strongest border fort of an-Neğef with desperate resistance; but the Moslems, who certainly did not bring along either ladders or heavy pickaxes and consequently could not have pulled down the stone-built Persian fortifications, conquered this mighty stronghold as if it were a castle of sand, although they were not used to besieging forts, as is clearly shown during the siege of al-Ḥira. The inhabitants of the latter shut themselves in their ǧāṣar, and the Moslems, whom up to that time not even the strongest fort could resist, did not dare to attack these mere fortified buildings. Altogether, the absence of comment about the assistance given to the Moslems by the Bekr tribe led by the chief, al-Muṭanna, is characteristic of the al-Medīna school. Abu Jūṣuf knew of no one in Irak but the Moslems with Ḥālēd. Of the Bekr Bedouins and their wise chief, al-Muṭanna, he makes no mention whatever; and yet it was impossible for the Moslems to get into Irak without their help or to return from there laden with booty.

I do not agree with Caetani (op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 932), who indorses these curious statements of Abu Jūṣuf on the ground that they come from a good and ancient source. The number alone of Ḥālēd’s warriors given by Abu Jūṣuf may be correct. But even this statement becomes improbable owing to the remark that the two thousand warriors were accompanied by as many non-combatants. On a marauding raid, which Caetani considers Ḥālēd’s expedition to have been, such a great camp-following is out of the question, as it would have deprived the real combatants of freedom of movement, thus robbing them of food and water as well. Its presence
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could be comprehended only if it was intended to help at sieges or for colonization. All the other statements of Abu Jūsuf belong to the later, romantically embellished, meager, and not very clear traditions of Hāled’s expedition, which were current in al-Medīna and had for their object the glorifying of Hāled and his company rather than the true description of an historic event.

Hiṣām Ibn al-Kalbi’s Account

Hiṣām ibn al-Kalbi records a tradition originated with a Bedouin of the Bekr ibn Wā’il tribe (aṭ-Ṭabarī, Ta’rīḥ [De Goeje], Ser. 1, pp. 2018 ff.). According to this account al-Muṭṭanna asked Abu Bekr personally to appoint him head chief, in return for which he promised to make war on the Persian settlers along the borders of his tribe. His wish having been granted, al-Muṭṭanna assembled his tribesmen and invaded the district of Kaskar, as well as the districts on the lower Euphrates. When Hāled on his march to Irak reached the station of an-Nībāḡ, by letter he summoned al-Muṭṭanna, then camping at Ḥaffān, to join him; which the chief did. On reaching Irak, Hāled pillaged the different settlements as far as Ullejs, the lord of which, Gābān, offered resistance but was defeated by al-Muṭṭanna near an irrigation canal called ever since “the Bloody.” Hāled then made peace with the inhabitants of Ullejs and approached al-Ḥira. At the “Union of the Canals” the Persian cavalry, with Azādbēh at their head, were waiting; they were routed by al-Muṭṭanna. On seeing this, the inhabitants of al-Ḥira went out of the town to meet Hāled, who made peace with them and immediately afterwards with Busbuhra ibn Šalūba’, the lord of Bānikija’.

Perhaps the Bedouin did not relate all this exactly as here stated, although in general he was right. It is highly probable that the circumstance Muṭṭanna, on learning of the humiliation of his western neighbors by the Moslems, went to al-Medīna, where he asked Abu Bekr’s assent to his enterprise. By this step he would have strengthened his own position, as he could not have been attacked so easily by the other chiefs; furthermore, he would have secured his tribe against the raids of the Moslems, or the western tribes related to them, while he was busy pillaging the Persian settlements. In order to win the Bedouin chief completely to his side and in order to conquer the Persian borderland, Abu Bekr subsequently sent to Irak Hāled, who knew how to handle the Bedouins. On reaching an-Nībāḡ, Hāled asked al-Muṭṭanna, then camping at Ḥaffān, to join him with his warriors; this seems to prove his intention of taking a road distant from Ḥaffān, otherwise he himself would have met al-Muṭṭanna at Ḥaffān. Not even according to this tradition was Hāled bent on going direct to al-Ḥira, for, instead, he attacked the Persian settlement of Ullejs on the “Bloody Canal,” or Nahr ad-Dam, southeast of al-Ḥira. The fact that both at this canal and at the “Union of the Canals” the Persians were defeated by al-Muṭṭanna may be the reason why neither al-Wāḳedī nor Ibn Ishāk, who knew nothing of the chief al-Muṭṭanna, mention these victories. According to Hiṣām ibn al-Kalbi Hāled made peace with the lord of the settlement of Bānikija only when al-Ḥira surrendered; and yet he must have passed and therefore threatened this settlement on his march to Ullejs as well as when making the detour to al-Ḥira.
With regard to the battle at the "Union of the Canals," the following old rimed saying (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2026) has been preserved: "In the middle of asfār all the heroes were slain at the 'Union of the Canals.'" This saying is very important as it has preserved the original and hence the correct date. The first Moslem troops did not observe exact dates and cared for them just as little as do the Bedouins of today. But even if the original date had been observed correctly, tradition could hardly have preserved it if it had not been supported by a saying, a song, or some well known contemporary incident. For the precise determination of the chronology of these events the dates of the different peace treaties would be serviceable if we had them; we should, however, have to be sure that these documents, as copied by the later chroniclers, were genuine and agreed with the original treaties. Yet we do not possess these dates and neither did the collectors of the various traditions. Thus no wonder there is conflict regarding the chronology of the events under discussion. That the saying just mentioned puts the battle at the "Union of the Canals" in the autumn and, what is more, in the month of October, is shown by the fact that with some of the modern Bedouins safar al-asfār signifies the middle of safar (the yearly season of safar includes the months of September, October, and November), hence, October (Musil, Arabia Petraea, Vol. 3, p. 7). This has already been suggested by Wellhausen in his Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, Vol. 6, p. 40, note 1.

Caetani (op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 960, note 2) doubts the probability of this opinion of Wellhausen because, among other reasons, in the era of the Islamic conquest the names of the Arabian months had already lost their old meaning of the yearly seasons and signified movable lunar months.—Caetani disregards the fact that we have to deal with a saying of the people and that with many Arabian tribes the names of the months have not even now lost their original meaning of the yearly seasons. Nearly all the present inhabitants of the ancient Moab and Edom designate the autumn as ʻṣafarījah ʻlādē. Of the movable lunar months they are almost totally ignorant.

Summary

In order to gain a correct view of these events from all this conflicting evidence supplied by the writers of the al-Medina school, we must decide first whether or not al-Muṣṭaffa and the Bekr tribe took part in Ḥāled’s campaign against the Persians. The arguments we have already introduced, which will receive further support compel us to claim that Ḥāled could not have risked a raid and still less a campaign against the Persians without the acquiescence and help of the Bekr. If we admit that the Bedouins of this tribe gave him their support, then in all likelihood they first attacked the settlement from which started the commercial caravans that passed through the Bekr territory to the south, southwest, west, or northwest. This starting point, called al-ʻUbulla, adjoining the southeastern part of the Bekr lands. Ḥāled undoubtedly knew all about the commercial caravans leaving al-ʻUbulla, because they carried various products to both Mecca and al-Medina. He must have learned still more of them in al-Jemāma, and at an-Nibāğ he finally found himself on the road they usually frequented. As he had not received exact
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instructions from Abu Bekr as to which road he was to take, he was at liberty to proceed from an-Nibāğ by the caravan route to al-Ubulla and from there to assist the Bekr in their raids on the Persian settlements. Advancing together with al-Mutānna, he would have been able not only to secure to himself the larger part of the booty but to ensure its unhindered delivery at al-Medina. Probably the chief representatives of the al-Medina school make no mention of the head chief, al-Mutānna, as it did not suit their purpose that a Bedouin chief, who was related neither to the Mecca nor to the al-Medina settlers and knew little if anything of Islam, should be given credit for its propagation in Irak and for the conquest of Persia. Other members of the same school name al-Mutānna but endeavor to belittle as much as possible his share in Ijāled's successes.

A Version of the al-Kūfa School

Sejf ibn 'Omar's Account

The chief representative of the al-Kūfa school of tradition, Sejf ibn 'Omar, explains (at-Ṭabari, op. cit., Ser. I, pp. 2921 f.) that, according to his several informants, Abu Bekr ordered Hāled ibn al-Walid to invade Irak from the south and 'Ejād ibn Ramm to enter it from the north, both to unite at al-Hira. — According to this the campaign ended but did not begin at al-Hira.

Sejf (ibid., pp. 2032–2035) asserts that Hāled marched northwest from the environs of the later town of al-Baṣra. After an encounter with the Persians at al-Waleğa he surprised the Persian commander, Gābān, near the station of Ullejs on the Euphrates, defeated him, and ordered all the prisoners to be killed. A canal branched off there, which the Moslems blocked in order a little later to let its water out over the bodies of the slaughtered prisoners cast into the channel. Their blood colored the water in the canal to such an extent that it was ever afterwards called Nahr ad-Dam, the "Bloody Canal." — The station of Ullejs, spelled in the manuscript (ibid., p. 2031, note h) with a double I, was situated on a bend of the Euphrates but still on the right bank. The ease with which the Moslems stopped the canal there indicates that there could not have been much water in it just then and, consequently, that the event must have happened in the autumn. Al-Waleğa I locate in the neighborhood of 'Ajn Zāheč, about fifty kilometers southeast of al-Hira, and Ullejs at the present settlement of aš-Sāṭi northwest of 'Ajn Zāheč.

After taking Ullejs Hāled marched (ibid., p. 2036) on the town of Amrīšija', which he plundered and demolished. Like al-Hira, this was a fortified town and Ullejs served as its stronghold. The canal called Bā-daḵla ended at Amrīšija'. —

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 929 f., note 3b, thinks that Ullejs and Amrīšija' are two different names for the same place and that the name Amrīšija is corrupted from Alğişijja, the old designation of Vologesias, which the Arabs later made into Ullejs. He locates Amrīšija at the settlement of Umnischigedia (Kiepert, Carte des provinces asiatiques [1884]) on the western bank of the al-Hindijje canal opposite Birs Nimrud.

I cannot see in Amrīšija' a corruption from Alğişijja and Vologesias. The Arabic ţ is too pronounced a sound to be interchanged with ḥ; it is
also difficult to understand why the Arabians should have expressed the
consonant s of the name Vologesias with ș in Amrišija' and s in Ullejs.
Seif differentiates distinctly between Ullejs and Amrišija', so that without
complete proof we should not identify them. A comparison of Amrišija'
with Ummischigedia is philologically impossible and topographically al-
together to be excluded. Besides, on Kiepert's map it is not written Um-
missigedia but Umm Ischjeddje (Umm Isiţjeddije), a name which shows
no similarity to Amrišija'. The old Ullejs lay about thirty-five kilometers
southeast of al-Ḥira and formed (according to Seif) the stronghold of
the settlement of Amrišija'. This is one more reason why we should not identify
it with the settlement of Umm Isjiedijje, which is recorded far to the north
of al-Ḥira. Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 936, note 2, is, of course, firmly con-
vinced that Ḥāled attacked al-Ḥira from the north, but this view conflicts
not only with all the Arabic sources but also with the very psychological
and military reasons with which he seeks to substantiate his theory.

The Arabic geographers either do not mention Amrišija' at all or
give a literal copy of Seif's version, which was taken from al-Muṣira
(aṭ-Ṭabarî, loc. cit.). This makes it evident that this town perished in the
first century of Islam and that its name thereafter disappeared.

Having received the information that Amrišija' had fallen, the Per-
sian commander in al-Ḥira prepared to resist the advance of Ḥāled, (ibid.,
p. 2037), who had his whole baggage loaded on boats, in which his foot
soldiers also embarked. The boats sailed on the west branch of the
Euphrates, while Ḥāled with his cavalry accompanied them along the
river bank. To prevent his advance the Persian commander sent his
son with a detachment against Ḥāled and himself encamped behind al-
Ḥira. The son had some canals opened, thus filling them with water and
causimg the level in the Euphrates branch to fall so low that Ḥāled's
boats grounded and could not move. When told by the native boatmen
of the reason for this check, Ḥāled hurried with his cavalry against the
Persians, encountered their first troop at the outlet of the al-ʿAtīk canal,
pursued it, and annihilated it near al-Moqr. He surprised the son of the Per-
sian commander at the inlet of the Bādaḵla branch of the Euphrates and
killed him. Then he blocked the canals again, the branch of the Euphrates
became navigable, and the boats could come nearer.—

This record shows clearly that Ḥāled marched from Ullejs upstream;
therefore Ullejs cannot have lain to the north but must have been to the
southeast of al-Ḥira. Ḥāled could hardly have accompanied his fast sail-
ning boats downstream, as it would have been necessary to ride on camel-
back around many swamps, canals, and ditches. He would have had to
return again to let the water into the Euphrates branch, which move
would have brought both him and his boats into the midst of the Persian
army. The advice of the native sailors to block the canals and thus to
make sailing on the Euphrates possible testifies that there was not much
water in the river at the time. As the river begins to rise after the first
copious rains, which set in regularly at the end of November, and continues
to rise until the middle or the end of May, we see from this circumstance
also that Ḥāled must have taken Ullejs in the șafar al-aṣfâr period,
or some time in October.

A similar incident, almost in the same locality, is recorded by aṭ-
Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 2, p. 725, who quotes Abu Mīḥna. During the warfare
between Ibn az-Zubejr and Caliph 'Abdalmalek (685-705), the brother of the former, Muṣ'ab, proceeded from al-Ｂaṣra by land and water against al-
Muḥṭār, 'Abdalmalīk's lieutenant in al-Kūfā. Al-Muḥṭār marched out of al-Kūfā against Muṣ'ab, encamped at as-Sajlahūn, and had the Euphrates
dammed below the "Union of the Canals," a point where the canals to al-
Hira, as-Sajlahūn, al-Kādesijjē, and Bursuf either joined or left the main
stream. As this made the water from the Euphrates flow into these canals,
Muṣ'ab's boats stuck in the mud and his warriors had to march on foot,
but his cavalry soon reached and broke open the dam, and the water
flowed into the Euphrates anew, floating the boats and carrying the
troops towards al-Kūfā. Al-Muḥṭār then encamped near Harūra.—

As-Sajlahūn lay fifteen kilometers southeast of al-Hira below the
modern settlement of Abu Șhēr. The "Muṭtame' al-Anhār," or "Union of
the Canals,"—more properly the starting point of these canals from the
Euphrates — must be sought southeast of al-Hira at Abu Șhēr in the
gardens of Ǧa'ara, whence issued the al-'Atīk canal, flowing to al-
Kādesijjē, as well as the Bādaḵla canal running south-southeast. The
canals of al-Hira and Bursuf ended there. From this "Union of the Canals"
Hāled advanced against al-Hira (ibid., Ser. 1, pp. 2038 f.), encamped between
al-Ḥawarnaḵ and an-Neğef, and waited in al-Ḥawarnaḵ for the arrival
of the rest of his troops. In the meantime the Persian commander at
al-Hira had fled across the Euphrates. His army now being complete,
Hāled moved from al-Ḥawarnaḵ and took up a position between al-Raridjān
and the Kašr al-Abjad, which the Persian troops had left shortly before.
The inhabitants of al-Hira barricaded themselves in their different kusār;
this caused Hāled, unable to take them by assault, to devastate the neighbor-
hood and thus to compel the besieged to surrender.—

Al-Ḥawarnaḵ, where Hāled awaited the boats with his troops, lay
about six kilometers northwest of the "Union of the Canals" and nearly
as many south of al-Hira. An-Neğef, on the edge of the plateau on which
al-Hira was situated, likewise lay to the west of al-Hira.

Summary

Summarizing our conclusions in regard to the events leading up to
the seizure of al-Hira, we see that the principal representatives of both
schools, that of al-Medīna and that of al-Kūfā, admit the cooperation of
Hāled ibn al-Walīd with al-Muṭṭama ibn Ḫāreṣṭa and that Hāled tried by
every means to get possession of all the settlements on the right bank of
the Euphrates from the Persian Gulf as far as al-Hira. On the left
bank his troops set foot only in a few places and then only when they
were endangered from that side or expected to find much booty there.
This program was also adhered to by Hāled after al-Hira had been taken.

HĀLED AT AL-ÂNBĀR

Al-Madā'ini relates (at-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2076 f.) that Hāled
went from al-Hira to al-Ânbār and gave the inhabitants of the latter
place permission to depart; but, having changed his mind, he left al-Ânbār,
attacked some market center not far from Bagdad, sent the chief al-Muṭṭama
against another settlement, and turned towards 'Âjn at-Tamr. After taking
this place and sending the captives — the first he had seized from Persian territory — to al-Medina, he marched on Dumat al-‘Udah, where he killed Okazdat, captured the daughter of al-‘Udah, and then returned to al-Hira. —

Hâled allowed the Persian garrison at al-Anbâr to leave and concluded a peace treaty with the inhabitants. The raid on the market center near the site of the later town of Bagdad is an illustration of Hâled’s remarkable courage, as he had to cross many irrigation canals and came quite near Ctesiphon, the Persian capital.

Caetani, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 940, note 3, in general invests the narrative of al-Madâ’ini with great significance, as giving us a criterion for estimating the value of Sejî’s tradition; he declines to accept reports of battles other than those recorded by al-Madâ’ini. Yet I doubt whether it would be safe to depend on al-Madâ’ini’s silence regarding the various incidents mentioned by Sejî. On the other hand, Caetani does not recognize the incidents recorded in this connection by al-Madâ’ini, rejecting all the successes on the left bank of the Euphrates and, hence, the taking of al-Anbâr, of the market near Bagdad, as well as the raid on Dumat al-Gandal. Caetani writes (*ibid.*, pp. 942f., note 1) that the school of al-Medina, of which al-Madâ’ini was a representative, had no knowledge of the capture of al-Anbâr, although al-Madâ’ini relates it on the authority of ‘Omar ibn Subba.

Caetani (*op. cit.*, p. 939, note 1) would identify al-Anbâr with the as-Šfar ra ruins, but the extensive al-Anbâr ruins have kept their name to this day and are situated ten kilometers southwest of as-Šfar. In any case al-Madâ’ini’s report is so questionable and incoherent that we cannot give full credit to his statement that the captives from ‘Ain at–Tâmar were the first who were sent from Persia to al-Medina.

Al-Belâdori, *Fatâh* (De Goeje), pp. 245f., writes that after capturing al-Hira Hâled went to Bâni Kiya and from there to al-Falâlîj against a Persian troop which fled before him. Returning to al-Hira he prepared and soon afterwards carried out an expedition against al-Anbâr. From al-Anbâr he sent the chief al-Muţanna against some market place near Bagdad, from which the chief returned with much booty. Al-Anbâr was surrounded, its gardens burned, and the inhabitants compelled to surrender. Some traditionalists quoted by al-Belâdori state that Hâled followed al-Muţanna to Bagdad, participated in the onslaught on the market place, and returned from there to al-Anbâr; but al-Belâdori doubts this. —

Caetani, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, pp. 942f., note 1, points out that in this report al-Falâlîj is used as the name of a definite locality, whereas in fact it is but the common designation of settlements in the alluvial region of as-Sawâd; he also reminds us that the name is mentioned only in the first reports on the expedition to Irak and never again. He is certainly not right on the latter point. Al-Falâlîj is mentioned not only in the reports about the first expedition but in those of the years 13 (634/5 A.D.) and 72 A.H. (691/2 A.D.) as well (*at-Tabari, *op. cit.*, Ser. 1, p. 2203; Ser. 2, p. 1072) and also frequently in Arabic geographical literature. Several settlements called al-Falâlîj lay southeast of al-Hira by the large al-Fallûja canal, the ancient Pallacot; others again to the southeast of al-Anbâr, where al-Fallûgat al-‘Ujja and al-Fallûgat as-Sufja were situated.
Caetani, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 943, note 2d, denies the capture of al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) because it is not mentioned in the best sources, Ibn Ish\=ak, Abu J\=asuf, and al-W\=ak\=edi. Abu J\=asuf, however, whose report contradicts other reports of the same events (see above pp. 289-291), surely cannot be counted among the best sources. Ibn Ish\=ak and al-W\=ak\=edi are very brief, even superficial. Against the capture of al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) by \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) we might cite the local tradition which prevailed at al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\), according to which the peace treaty between al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) and the Moslems was completed during the reign of the caliph \(\text{Omar}\), \(\text{Gar\=ir}\) ibn \(\text{\'Abdall\=ah}\) acting as intermediary. If, however, this does not properly refer to this peace treaty, perhaps after the defeat of the Moslems at al-\(\text{G\=isr}\), then due weight should be laid upon the report of the conquering of al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) given by al-Bel\=adori, *op. cit.*, p. 246. Caetani is of the opinion that the Moslems could not have passed from the right to the left bank, where al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) was located, without the assistance of the inhabitants of that town; and yet he writes elsewhere (*ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 1236), in commenting on events after \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\)'s departure, that the Moslems forded the Euphrates to make incursions into the whole district between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Thus, after \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\)'s departure they could easily cross the Euphrates, but not before, although there was more water in the river after he left, in the spring and summer, than in the preceding autumn and winter.

The crossing of the Euphrates would not have caused the Moslems much difficulty if they besieged al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\), as we think, at the beginning of November. At that time of year the great river is easy to ford either above or below al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\). Furthermore, the Moslems could have found plenty of boats of all sizes on the right bank and would thus have been enabled to cross the river not only with all their supplies but with their horses and camels as well, just as the Carmathians did later and the modern marauding troops, which keep clear of the boat bridges at al-Fell\=uje and al-Msajeb, do now. As a second argument against the siege of al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) Caetani makes the assertion that \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) invaded Irak with the sole object of robbery and therefore that it would have been foolish of him to waste his time and strength before the bastions of some fort. But Caetani does not prove that \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) went to Irak simply on a marauding trip and not on a military campaign. If it had been nothing but a raid, \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) would not have stopped to besiege either al-\(\text{H\=ira}\) or \(\text{\'Ajin at-Tamr}\), which he took and garrisoned. In al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) there were great stores of corn needed both by \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) and al-Mu\=\=anna for their companions and horses, the supplies on the right bank being scarce. In any case, according to al-Bel\=adori, \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) besieged al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) just as he did al-\(\text{H\=ira}\). He surrounded the town and devastated the gardens, thus forcing the inhabitants to surrender. Situated as they were on the border of the desert, the inhabitants of al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) were accustomed to such sieges. In order to save their gardens, they agreed to pay tribute to the Bedouins, this obligation, of course, being valid only as long as the Persian government was too weak to protect them.

**\(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) at \(\text{\'Ajin at-Tamr and \=Sandawda}^\prime**

Al-Bel\=adori (*op. cit.*, pp. 246f.) relates, without giving his source, that \(\text{H\=ale\=d}\) went from al-\(\text{Anb\=ar}\) direct to the strong Persian fort of \(\text{\'Ajin at-Tamr}\). Its garrison offered resistance but was driven back into the fort
and was so sorely besieged by Ḥāleed and his Moslems that it soon had to ask for quarter. This was not granted. The fort was taken, the warriors all slain, and the rest of the inhabitants made prisoners. Several young men imprisoned in one of the churches were caught. According to other informants cited by al-Belâdorî, Ḥāleed made a peace pact with the inhabitants of the fort of ‘Ajn at-Tamr and the young men were not captured in a church at ‘Ajn at-Tamr but in some other settlement.

Caetani, _op. cit._, Vol. 2, p. 944, writes that after taking al-ʿAmbār Ḥāleed advanced still farther north to ‘Ajn at-Tamr. In the text of al-Belâdorî no mention is made of a northward march, and, besides, this direction is altogether out of the question, as ‘Ajn at-Tamr lay almost due south of al-ʿAmbār.

On the whole, al-Belâdorî’s account agrees with that of Sejf. Al-Belâdorî likewise records _ibid._, p. 248) that Ḥelâl ibn ‘Aḵḵa commanded the Arab auxiliary troops fighting with Ḥāleed. With regard to the oasis of ‘Ajn at-Tamr, a distinction must be made between the fort garrisoned with troops and the settlement proper. The garrison was killed, but with the native population peace was made. This also explains the apparent discrepancy between the different accounts. At al-Ḥira, too, the inhabitants surrendered after the Persian garrison had fled. But, as in front of al-Ḥira, so also at ‘Ajn at-Tamr blood was spilt. Tradition gives the names of the _amādīr_ (early believers and helpers of the Prophet) who fell before ‘Ajn at-Tamr (al-Belâdorî, _loc. cit._). For this reason Caetani _op. cit._, Vol. 2, p. 940, note 3b; p. 945, note 2, and elsewhere) contradicts the sources when he states that the first campaign against Persia was almost bloodless.

Al-Belâdorî, _op. cit._, pp. 249f., relates that, according to some accounts, Ḥāleed started from ‘Ajn at-Tamr for Syria but, according to others, he first marched on Dūma and, after taking this oasis, returned to al-Ḥira and then only did he begin his expedition against Syria. Al-Belâdorî’s own opinion was that Ḥāleed marched on Syria from ‘Ajn at-Tamr—not from al-Ḥira. The date of his expedition according to some was the first and according to others the second month of Rabi’.

To this Caetani, _op. cit._, Vol. 2, p. 947, note 1, adds that al-Belâdorî absolutely disbeliefed the tradition of Ḥāleed’s expedition to Dūmat al-Ǧandal. But this remark is not justified. Al-Belâdorî does not venture any opinion on the expedition against Dūmat al-Ǧandal, although, following trustworthy witnesses, he mentions it twice without comment. He merely fixes the starting point of Ḥāleed’s expedition to Syria.

Caetani, _op. cit._, Vol. 2, pp. 1193f., note 1a, argues that al-Belâdorî does not commit himself explicitly as to the place from which Ḥāleed started. He would correct both al-Belâdorî and al-Ḥadīnî by insisting that the report gives the precise date of Ḥāleed’s departure from al-Jemâma (not from Irak) as 12 A. H. (March 15, 638, till March 6, 639 A. D.). And yet the whole content of the report makes it evident that it deals with the expedition from Irak to Syria and not with that from al-Jemâma to Irak. Furthermore, if, adhering to al-Belâdorî’s statements, we acknowledge that he is defining Ḥāleed’s departure for Syria, we again find that in the original account the fixed yearly periods of _rabi’_ must have been meant, not the movable months of Rabi’. The Bedouins know of a first, a second, and even a third month of _rabi’_, yearly period of spring affluence lasting from about Febru-
ary 20 to May 20; thus their first and second months of *rabī‘* correspond to the latter part of our February, our March, and the first half of our April.

Abu Jūṣuf, Ḥarāq (Cairo, 1302 A.H.), pp. 85–87, referring to Ibn Ishāk and others, writes that after taking al-Ḥira Ḥāled proceeded along the river to the settlement of Bāniṣija‘ and on his return encamped at an-Negef. With guides from al-Ḥira he then marched to the oasis of ‘Ajn at-Tamr, where he captured the fort after a siege of some duration and killed the whole Persian garrison. The Arab commander (*diḥkān*) was likewise killed. With the native population Ḥāled made peace on the same terms as at al-Ḥira. Then he sent a troop under Sa‘d ibn ‘Amr ibn Ḥarām against the Christians of the Kinda and Ijād tribes, who were living in the settlement of Šandawda‘, and compelled them to surrender. Ḥāled wanted to remain permanently in al-Ḥira, but a letter from Abu Bekr caused him to go to the aid of Abu ‘Ob[ejda in Syria. Accompanied by guides from al-Ḥira and ‘Ajn at-Tamr, he marched out from al-Ḥira, passed through the arid desert, and reached the territory of the Tarleb tribe, many of whom he killed and many of whom he took prisoners. With several Tarleb for guides he left their territory, arrived at an-Nuḳejb and al-Kawātel, and forced the neighboring settlements to surrender on the same terms as those which he accorded the inhabitants of ‘Anāt. As he was marching past this settlement (‘Anāt) the local patrician came to him begging for peace. Ḥāled assured him that neither the monasteries nor the churches would be demolished there, that they would be free to use wooden bells by day and night except at the time of Moslem prayers, and that during their holidays they might hold processions, carrying crosses. But they had to promise that they would extend to all Moslems three day’s hospitality and a safe conduct. All this was taken down in writing. Hiring a guide in ‘Anāt, Ḥāled then came by way of an-Nuḳejb and al-Kawātel—with the inhabitants of which he likewise concluded peace—to the district of Karkifija‘, where he pillaged the whole vicinity, laid siege to the town, and finally made peace with the people on terms such as those that he had offered to ‘Anāt.

Caetani, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 1199, note 2a, is of the opinion that this narrative of Abu Jūṣuf is especially valuable because it does not mention the capture of al-Anbār, which may therefore be considered a fable of later generations. It seems to me that Caetani attaches too much importance to this silence, for Abu Jūṣuf refers neither to Kurākir nor Suva‘, although Ḥāled visited both. And, for all that, Abu Jūṣuf would seem to confirm the account of the capture of al-Anbār by mentioning Šandawda‘. Šandawda‘, now al-Mšeheid near ar-Rumādi, according to Ibn Munqid, *I‘tibār* (Derenbourg), pp. 127f., was considered a suburb of al-Anbār.

Abu Jūṣuf’s narrative contains much that is lacking in Ibn Ishāk, to which he refers, but it agrees on the whole with the account left us by Sejf, for Abu Jūṣuf, like Sejf, knew of the expedition to the north-west of ‘Ajn at-Tamr. At first he speaks of this expedition in connection with Ḥāled’s march to Syria, but after describing the capture of Karkifija‘ he interrupts his narrative without saying whether Ḥāled returned from there to al-Ḥira or set out directly for Syria. He also represents ‘Ajn at-Tamr as being captured before the departure for Syria. It is interesting to note that Ḥāled sought guides in al-Ḥira to bring him to
'Ajn at-Tamr, a thing he would hardly have done if the territory between al-Ḥira and 'Ajn at-Tamr had belonged to his allies and companions of the Bekr ibn Wā'il tribe. At 'Ajn at-Tamr Abu Jūsuf makes a distinction between the natives, who offered no resistance to Ḥāled, and the Persian garrison with the Arab auxiliaries, who had to be conquered. The Arabic dihākān executed by Ḥāled's order was undoubtedly the leader of these auxiliaries, recognized by the Persian government.

After his account of the taking of 'Ajn at-Tamr, Abu Jūsuf records a tradition which probably originated in Iraq and persisted in the settlement of Ṣandawda'. According to Abu l-Faḍā'il Mūṣāid [Juynboll], Vol. 2, p. 168), who died in 1338 A.D., this place lay above al-Anbār on the right bank of the Euphrates, but in his time it had already been demolished and only the shrine at which 'Ali ibn Abī Ṭāleb was worshiped was preserved there. In the time of Ibn al-Kalbi (died 819 A.D.) Ṣandawda' was the property of the Ibn Ḥarâm al-Anṣārī family, which lived there. It was probably this family which created the legend recorded by Abu Jūsuf of its ancestor Sa'd ibn 'Amr ibn Ḥarām, who was sent by Ḥāled to Ṣandawda'. Ibn al-Kalbi brought this tradition from Iraq to al-Medina, where it found credence, as it concerned an ansārī (early believer and helper of Mohammad). It is strange that Sejūf knew nothing of this expedition to Ṣandawda' and that Sa'd ibn 'Amr is mentioned in no other place except the work of Abu Jūsuf. Indeed it is most unlikely that Sa'd could have maintained himself in the settlement of Ṣandawda' after Abu Bekr's death, when almost all the Moslems were driven out of Iraq. After all, Abu Jūsuf's words, "Sa'd ibn 'Amr remained in Ṣandawda' during the reigns of Abu Bekr, 'Omar, and 'Uthmān until his death and his descendants live there to this day," prove that even the school of al-Medina considered Ḥāled's expedition not a simple raid but a regular military campaign, the object of which was to conquer a country and to hold it when conquered.

According to Abu Jūsuf it was probably Ḥāled's intention to make al-Ḥira his residence and to remain permanently in Iraq. This idea would surely not have occurred to him if a mere raid had been in his mind. This supposed intention or plan of Ḥāled's leads us to the belief that at that time he was already in possession of a larger territory than the mere vicinity of al-Ḥira. He could have resided in al-Ḥira and from there have harassed the Persians only if sure of the obedience or sympathy of all the Bedouins southwest and northwest of the town. Otherwise his communications with al-Medina might easily have been interrupted. The necessity of securing this tract of country makes Ḥāled's previous warlike enterprises between the Persian Gulf and al-Ḥira seem very probable. It likewise explains why he had no other course than to win over to his side the Taṭlīb tribe, which wandered from al-Ḥira northwest to al-Reṣāfa.

**ḤĀLED'S EXPEDITION AGAINST THE TARLĪB TRIBE**

In dealing with Ḥāled's expedition against the Tarlīb tribe, as in our treatment of his advance on al-Ḥira, let us first discuss the reports that have come down to us in the writings of representatives of the al-Medina school of tradition, and then let us consider the more detailed account given by Sejūf ibn 'Omar of the al-Kūfa school.
Versions of the al-Medina School

Abu Jūsuf’s Account

According to Abu Jūsuf (see above, p. 299) Abu Bekr caused Ḥāled to go to the aid of Abu ‘Obejda in Syria. This order forces us to believe that Abu ‘Obejda’s detachment must have been in Syria for some time. Abu Jūsuf does not describe Ḥāled’s march to Syria, but merely the incursion into the Tarlab territory. Ḥāled marched from al-Hira to ‘Ajin at-Tamar and thence, guided by the inhabitants of these towns, to the northwest. Abu Jūsuf does not define the route taken by Ḥāled but speaks only of the desert he had to cross to reach the Tarlab camps. We may judge from this that from ‘Ajin al-Tamr he proceeded northward by way of ‘Aklat Hawrān into the territory of the Tarlab tribe. Of the subsequent events, Abu Jūsuf seems to combine two accounts. According to the first, Ḥāled appears to have proceeded to the north of al-Bišrī, whence, after scattering the Tarlab, he returned over the pass an-Nuqējib and by way of al-Kawātel to ‘Ānāt; according to the other account, however, he marched by way of ‘Ānāt, an-Nuqējib, and al-Kawātel to Ḥarkīsijja’ and compelled this town to surrender. The first account implies that Ḥāled passed through an-Nuqējib and al-Kawātel on his return from north to south; the second that he passed them on his way from south to north.

The location of ‘Ānāt is known. It is the modern ‘Āna, on the right bank of the Euphrates. Formerly it was called ‘Ānāt (plural of ‘Āna) because properly it consisted of four settlements, two of them lying on the left, one on the right bank, and one on the islands. Later the western settlement on the left bank began to be called Rāva; as the eastern one and the one on the island were abandoned, only ‘Āna on the right bank remained. Al-Kawātel (or al-Kawātel) is an important station, known to the Arabic authors, on the road from al-Kebāžeb to ar-Raḥiba. It is situated west of the modern town of al-Mijāḍin and bears the name Čawātel (or Čakula).

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 1203, note 1b, would like to identify al-Kawātel with the present Karāblé on the right bank of the Euphrates above the settlement of ‘Āna. But this is impossible, as it contradicts the assertion of the Arabic geographers. Al-Karāblé, as a matter of fact, is not on the right bank, but is an island settled with immigrants from Kerbel, who are called Karāblé.

An-Nuqējib (little pass) is the name of the pass over the Żetab al-Bišrī range on the route from the station of al-Kṣejbe to ad-Duraklijje. Karḵisijja’, the ancient Circesium, lies on the left bank of the Euphrates at the mouth of al-Hābūr. In Ḥāled’s time Karḵisijja’ was a frontier stronghold of the Byzantine Empire against the Persians and had a large Byzantine garrison. If this town had been captured by Ḥāled, tradition would certainly have perpetuated the event, for it would have been his first encounter with the Rūm (Byzantines) and Sejf could not have failed to mention it. We may, then, exclude from Abu Jūsuf’s narrative as unsubstantiated the second account to which we have referred and in which the reference to the capture of Karḵisijja’ occurs. As the first account implies that Ḥāled returned from al-Bišrī at least as far as ‘Ānāt, we may safely assume that
he continued his southward return march to al-Ḥira and that the expedition against the Taʾleb was quite independent of his subsequent march to Syria.

In sum, our interpretation of this campaign is as follows. On his outward expedition, taking the route via ʿAqlat Ḥawrān through the desert, Ḥālēd reached the camp of the Taʾleb near ar-Resāfa; here he turned to the south and on his way back proceeded along the Euphrates. After crossing the al-Bāṣir ridge through the an-Nuṣāja pass, he encamped at al-Kawāṭel, whence his troops pillaged the settlements lying on the right bank of the Euphrates opposite Kurḵisijā. As many of these villages belonged to the citizens of this town, the tradition later arose that he compelled the town also to surrender. Thence, following the Euphrates, he reached the large settlement of ʿĀnāt, the inhabitants of which likewise agreed to pay an annual tribute, and from there he returned to al-Ḥira.

Al-Jaʿkūbiʾs and ad-Dinawariʾs Accounts

According to al-Jaʿkūbi, Taʾrīḥ (Houtsma), Vol. 2, pp. 150 f., Ḥālēd by Abu Bekrʾs order left Chief al-Mutanna in Irak and with a picked corps set out for Syria. During his march he encountered ʿAjn at-Tamr the Persian garrison commanded by ʿAḥka ibn Abi Helāl an-Nimār, compelled it to surrender, and had ʿAḥka executed. Then he attacked a troop of the Taʾleb led by al-Hodejil ibn ʿOmār. He dispersed this also and killed the commander. Many of the captured Taʾleb were sent to al-Madīnah. Twenty young men were found by his people in a Jewish synagogue. After that he went to al-Anbār and procured a reliable guide there for his trip through the desert; reaching Tadmur he laid siege to it and on arriving at the Ḥawrān defeated its inhabitants decisively. Ḥālēd was said to have remained in the desert and the waterless region for eight days before he joined the Moslem troops in Syria.

Al-Jaʿkūbiʾs report, like that of Abu Jūṣuf, presupposes that Ḥālēd was sent to help the Moslem troops to gain a victory in Syria. Al-Jaʿkūbi does not say from what place Ḥālēd set out for Syria, but the context points only to al-Ḥira. From there he marched to ʿAjn at-Tamr.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 949, note 1, states that ʿAjn at-Tamr lay northwest of al-Anbār; this, however, is incorrect, as this important settlement was and still is situated almost ninety kilometers south of al-Anbār. Caetani (loc. cit.) would also erroneously substitute for al-Anbār the watering place of Kurḵir. Ignoring the fact that other authorities state that the skirmish where Chief al-Hodejil ibn ʿOmār fell took place at al-Muṣajjaḥ, Caetani assumes that if al-Anbār were correct Ḥālēd would have had to return on his tracks from ʿAjn at-Tamr to al-Anbār. As such a return seems impossible, Caetani would avoid the difficulty by substituting for al-Anbār Kurḵir, which not a single Arabic geographer or historian places in the region of the Euphrates.

Caetani also thinks that Ḥālēd could hardly have found a guide in the frontier town of al-Anbār, but al-Jaʿkūbi does not say distinctly that the guide was actually a native of this place. Al-Anbār was the starting point of the transport routes leading across the desert, and consequently a large number of guides familiar with the desert roads could surely always have been found there. In commercial centers of this kind it is
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natural to find better guides than in the desert itself. If, however, Haked had advanced northwest along the Euphrates, as Caetani, who looks for Kurakir in that region, imagines, he would not have needed a guide at all.

According to al-Ja'kubi, Haked in going from al-Hira to Syria arrived at 'Ain at-Tamr and made a raid on the Tarleb under the chief al-Hodejib ibn 'Omrân. As we know from other sources, al-Hodejib camped at al-Musajjah. Haked would in this case have had to cover 270 kilometers from al-Hira to al-Musajjah ('Ain al-Arnab) in a northwesterly direction and then to have turned back southeast 115 kilometers to al-Anbar. There, having obtained an experienced guide, he would have had to proceed through the wild country to the northwest as far as Tadmur and from there he would have reached the Hawran. For topographical reasons, such a march is most improbable. It is not easy to understand why Haked, going to the aid of the Moslem troops in Syria, should not have gone with his picked warriors by the shortest and easiest route by way of Kurakir, or why he should have entered a strange, still unconquered territory. Exasperated as the Tarleb must have been at the slaughter of their kinsmen in 'Ain at-Tamr and al-Musajjah, they would undoubtedly have attacked Haked or at least have blocked his progress during a march from al-Anbar to Tadmur through almost five hundred kilometers of their territory. When Haked returned to al-Anbar after al-Hodejib had been killed, there to prepare for a march through the desert on Tadmur, the Tarleb, informed of this plan, would have had sufficient time to assemble and make themselves troublesome to him. All they would have had to do was to poison two watering places in the desert with naphtha, locusts, or dead animals, and Haked could scarcely have saved his corps from dying of thirst. And if he had proceeded along the Euphrates, he would have had to overcome not only the resistance of the numerous large settlements but also the onslaught of the revengeful Tarleb both in front and behind. I doubt if he could have overcome all these difficulties with his picked, yet small, troop on a march of over eight hundred kilometers.

Under the Turkish rule — which certainly was not any stronger than the Persian or Byzantine of those times — no chief to whom belonged the oases of Damat al-'Gandal and of the depression of Sirhan would have advanced along the Euphrates to Syria with a troop no stronger than that of Haked, but would have taken the far easier and secure road by way of Kurakir (Kerazer). It is only proper to add that while marching to Syria Haked could not have been sufficiently equipped to besiege a frontier fort of such strength as 'Ain at-Tamr. The like may also be said in regard to al-Anbar. We may therefore assume that al-Ja'kubi associates events with Haked's march to Syria which of necessity preceded that march. Furthermore, in regard to the march through the desert al-Ja'kubi gives no details. According to one account cited by al-Ja'kubi (loc. cit.), Haked remained in the desert and in a waterless region for eight days. From where to where these eight marches should be counted does not appear. In my opinion the eight marches should be connected with the five nights (i.e. six marches) between Kurakir and Suwa', about which the Moslem tradition has so much to say, and with the two marches from Suwa' to the Merg Rakef near Damascus in Syria (see my Arabia Deserta, pp. 553—573). Judged from this, al-Ja'kubi's
narrative consists of many incoherent fragments which can be explained only with the help of better sources.

Ad-Dinawari, Aḥbār (Guirgass), pp. 117 ff., records that Hālel received from Abu Bekr orders to hasten with his Moslem troops to the assistance of Abu ‘Obejda in Syria; in obedience to these orders he marched via al-Anbār to ‘Ain at-Tamr, laid siege to the town, and killed the Persian garrison there. After that he attacked some Ta’leb and Numayr and finally reached Syria. —

According to this narrative Hālel on his march to Syria first made a detour north to al-Anbār, 170 kilometers from al-Ḥira, then returned ninety kilometers south to ‘Ain at-Tamr, and from there proceeded northeast to al-Muṣajjah, for the attack on the Ta’leb is undoubtedly connected with al-Muṣajjah. Such a march is so improbable that we learn nothing of value regarding Hālel’s actual route to Syria from ad-Dinawari. If we compare al-Ja‘kūbi’s and ad-Dinawari’s statements, we see that they deal merely with some of the incidents of Hālel’s warfare in Irak and along the Euphrates before his invasion of Syria.

Al-Belādori’s Account

Al-Belādori, Futūḥ (De Goeye), pp. 110 ff., relates that, according to certain unnamed sources, Hālel received Abu Bekr’s written orders to march to Syria while he was at al-Ḥira; but that, according to others, he received them while at ‘Ain at-Tamr after the capture of this oasis. He left al-Ḥira in the second month of Rabi‘, A. H. 13, according to some, with eight hundred, and according to others with six hundred — or even as few as five hundred — men, and started for ‘Ain at-Tamr, which he forced to surrender. From there he marched to Ṣandawda, where he was informed that the Ta’leb were gathering under Rabi‘a ibn Buṣajr at al-Muṣajjah and al-Huṣajd (or al-Huṣajd). He attacked these leaders and scattered their forces. After that he made an onslaught on the camp by the watering place of Kurākir owned by the Kalb tribe, and passed through a wild country as far as the waters of Suwa‘, an habitual camping ground of the Kalb and Bahra; there Hurkūs ibn an-No‘mān was killed. Before he entered the desolate waterless region, he issued an order to water the riding camels well, to cut off their lips and to tie up their jaws so as to prevent their chewing their cuds, as otherwise they would have needed much water. Then he had as much water loaded as could possibly be carried, and set out. During the march he had one riding camel after another killed, and he himself and all his warriors drank water from their stomachs. Rāfe‘ ibn ‘Umejr of the Taj tribe served as his guide. Reaching Suwa‘ he found a camp there with a merry company in Hurkūs’ tent, drinking and singing. Other collectors of traditions relate, says al-Belādori, that some poet was declaiming a poem at the very moment when Hālel attacked the Ta’leb camp, which was under the chief Rabi‘a ibn Buṣajr. —

It is interesting to note that some of al-Belādori’s informants placed the capture of ‘Ain at-Tamr before the start of Hālel’s expedition to Syria, but that, according to others, on receiving Abu Bekr’s order he went from al-Ḥira to ‘Ain at-Tamr, which he took; then he marched on Ṣandawda’, defeated the Ta’leb at al-Muṣajjah and al-Huṣajd, and passing through the desert reached Kurākir. It is hard to understand why Hālel
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should have turned from al-Muṣājjāh to al-Ḥuṣeṣj, which probably lay to the southeast. Even a march from al-Muṣājjāh direct to Kurākīr would have involved a great detour, during which for a distance of several hundred kilometers Håled would not have found a spring. If we credit this account, we should also have to admit that he marched almost six hundred kilometers before he began his expedition to Syria in earnest. But this is so improbable that we prefer to agree with the second group of al-Belâdori’s informants and with other authorities; that is, with those who believed that both the capture of ‘Ajn at-Tamr and the raid on al-Muṣājjāh took place before the start of the expedition to Syria. Nobody except al-Belâdori mentions a fight with the Kalb at Kurākīr.

The treatment of the camels mentioned by al-Belâdori has been discussed in the author’s Arabia Deserta, pp. 570f.

Al-Belâdori writes that some authorities locate the story of the singer, or poet, in the camp of Ḥurḵūṣ and others in the camp of Rabī‘a ibn Buĝejr. Ḥurḵūṣ was camping at Suwa‘, but Rabī‘a ibn Buĝejr’s camping place was not specified by al-Belâdori. The story assumes that the singer, or poet, was informed of the advance of the Moslems. This could hardly have been the case at Suwa‘ where the Moslems could not have been expected, but it might very well have been the case at al-Muṣājjāh, al-Ḥuṣeṣj, or al-Biśr, where the Tarṭeb were arming against them. Furthermore, it seems improbable that the Christian Arabs near Suwa‘ would have feasted with drinking and singing in Holy Week (see Arabia Deserta, pp. 561—563), this being the time when the Moslems arrived, according to al-Madâ‘ini (at-Ṯabarî, Ta‘riḥ [De Goeje], Ser. 1, pp. 2108f.).

Al-Wâḳedi’s Account

Al-Wâḳedi (al-Belâdori, op. cit., p. 111) relates that Håled marched from Suwa‘ via al-Kawâṭel to Karkisija‘, but that there he was met by the lord of Karkisija‘ with an army so powerful that he had to flee to the desert, through which he then proceeded. —

This account by the best representative of the school of al-Medina is a proof of how little was known in al-Medina of the various incidents of Håled’s campaigns and of the inability of the al-Medina historians to arrange these events in their correct order in time and place.

Caetani, Annali (1905), Vol. 2, p. 1228, who would include the battles at al-Muṣājjāh and al-Ḥuṣeṣj in the Syrian expedition, believes that Håled after leaving Suwa‘ made a detour as far as Karkisija‘, claiming that the two best sources, al-Wâḳedi and al-Belâdori, support this view. But Caetani in propounding this theory did not take into consideration the locations of either Suwa‘ or Karkisija‘. Suwa‘ is known to have been situated on the borders of Syria. Therefore, according to Caetani’s theory, Håled, although he had been asked to bring help quickly to Syria, did not hasten from Suwa‘ directly west to Damascus but turned east, marched three hundred kilometers across an inhospitable desert as far as al-Kawâṭel near the Euphrates, then turned northeast to Karkisija‘, and thence escaped to the desert, through which he again proceeded back to Syria. I think we are justified in assuming that al-Wâḳedi’s narrative of a march from Suwa‘ to al-Kawâṭel and Karkisija‘ has nothing to do with the expedition to Syria and is misplaced. Al-Wâḳedi’s mention of al-Kawâṭel
and _HARDIŠIJA", none the less, is very important, as it proves that the
al-Medina authorities brought these places into connection with Haled's
campaign in Irak and therefore that his raid on the Tašleb has a
historical foundation. The peace treaty with Ṣaḏaša' mentioned by Abu
Jūṣuf, Ḥardīq (Cairo, 1502 A. H.), p. 87 (see above, p. 259), is inconceiv-
able, because al-Waḵedī asserts that Ḥaled saved himself from total
defeat only by a flight to the desert. Where he went after this reverse and
what direction he took, al-Waḵedī fails to say. In all probability his
return along the Euphrates to al-Ḥira is indicated by this omission.

A Version of the al-Kūfa School: Sejf ibn Ṭzar's Account

Al-Ḥira to 'Ajn at-Tamr

A more detailed report of what happened after the fall of al-Ḥira
is given us by the al-Kūfa school, the chief representative of which was
Sejf ibn Ṭzar (al-Ṭabarī, Tašrīh [De Goeje], Ser. 1, p. 2049). According
to Sejf, only after the fall of al-Ḥira did the various landholders begin
to subject themselves to Ḥaled. Among the first was Ṣaḏaša' ibn Naṣṭūna
of Kuṣs an-Nāṭef (or Kuṣjāta), a settlement on the left bank of the Eu-
phrates. Ḥaled guaranteed him his property in the settlements of Bānīkīja
and Basma' (Bārūšma') on the right bank. Following Ṣaḏaša' example,
other landholders east and northeast of al-Ḥira hastened to secure their
property from seizure. — According to the tradition preserved to us by Sejf,
the agreement between Ḥaled and Ṣaḏaša' was made in the month of Ṣafar;
this surely does not mean the movable month of Ṣafar, but the fixed yearly
season of Ṣafar, the autumn.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 966, note 1, thinks that the location of
Kuṣjāta (or Kuṣiyāthā, as transliterated by Caetani) is not known and
that this place is not mentioned anywhere else. He therefore ranges it with
the numerous other unfamiliar names preserved by Sejf alone. And yet
Caetani himself knows and defines the location of this place when he
writes elsewhere (ibid., pp. 929 f., note 3) that not far from Bārūšma'
lay "Bāqisyathā" where in A. H. 13 Abu 'Obejd defeated the Persians.
Kuṣjāta' is identical with the "Qusiyāthā" of Caetani (al-Ṭabarī, op. cit.,
Ser. 1, p. 2032) and with the Bākusjāta (Ba [Bêt] Kuṣjāta') of al-Ṭabarī
(op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2172), a place also known to the Arabic geographers
by the name Kuṣs an-Nāṭef, Jaḵūt, Muṣjam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, pp. 97 f.,
writes that Kuṣs an-Nāṭef lay not far from al-Kūfa on the left bank of the
Euphrates opposite al-Mawwaḥa and that between these settlements
Abu 'Obejd fought with the Persians in A. H. 13.

After capturing al-Ḥira, Sejf continues, Ḥaled carried on the fighting
for over a year (al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2056) in a region the
subjugation of which should have been the duty of dād ibn Raḵm. But
dād was hard pressed at Dūma, and the Persian troops were garrisoning
dād's, al-Anbār, and al-Firād. —

According to the context this Dūma must have been Dūmat al-Ǧandal,
just as dād's must have been the well-known 'Ajn at-Tamr. 'Ajn at-Tamr
and al-Firād lie west, al-Anbār east of the Euphrates, and all three were
most important transport centers. Whoever controlled them as well as the
large oasis of Dūmat al-Ǧandal was the real lord of northern Arabia. Now,
if it was Abu Bekr’s intention to conquer the whole of Arabia, as Seif following several authorities claims in four different places, his despatching of ‘Ejād ibn Ramm to northeastern Arabia was an act of great sagacity. ‘Ejād’s duty was to make things easier for Ḥāled and thus indirectly to save the Moslems who were advancing in Syria from being surrounded. As ‘Ejād was not able to perform this task, which first meant the occupation of the oasis of Dūma, there was nothing for Ḥāled to do but to go to his assistance (ibid., pp. 2057 f.). At that time the whole country west of the Euphrates from al-Falālīg and al-Hira to the Persian Gulf was already under Ḥāled’s control. His Bedouin allies, commanded by the chief al-Muṭanna, watched the movements of the Persians east of the Euphrates, while Ḥāled set out northwest from al-Hira towards Kerbela.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 1193 f., note 1a, claims that, according to the version of the al-Medina school, Ḥāled’s military achievements in Irak were so insignificant that their alleged duration of one year is hardly possible and that the best narrators assert that all his enterprises north of al-Hira happened during his expedition to Syria. — Caetani writes all this because he understands in all the dates the movable months of the later ages, not the fixed yearly seasons of the original narrative. He attempts to get rid of the accumulated difficulties without considering that it would not have been in keeping with Ḥāled’s character to make various ventures requiring many men and much time after receiving orders from his well-wisher, Abu Bekr, to hasten to the assistance of the Moslems in Syria.

From Kerbela Seif tells us that Ḥāled set out against al-Anbār (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2059 f.). In this walled and moated town a Persian garrison commanded by Širzād offered a heroic resistance. For a long time Ḥāled had no success. Finally he ordered some old, emaciated camels to be driven to the narrowest part of the moat, killed, and thrown down. The moat thus being filled, the Moslems crossed it quickly and attacked the Persians, who, unable to defend themselves against superior numbers, soon begged for mercy. With the native inhabitants of al-Anbār and the vicinity a peace treaty was then concluded.

Al-Anbār, situated as it is on the northwestern projection of the alluvial plain of Irak, in ancient times controlled an important crossing over the Euphrates. Once in possession of this frontier town, Ḥāled would not have had any reason to fear a Persian surprise attack on al-Hira from the northwest. The inhabitants of al-Anbār were Arabs who knew how to get along with the Bedouins and therefore left the defense of the town to the Persian garrison in the fort and themselves made a compact with the superior Moslem force.

After capturing al-Anbār, Seif continues (ibid., Ser. 1, pp. 2062 ff.), Ḥāled set out for ‘Ajin at-Tamr, where the Persian garrison was commanded by Mihrān and the Arab auxiliaries of the Namir, Tarleb, and Ijād tribes, with their allies, by ‘Aḵka ibn Abi ‘Aḵka. Hearing that Ḥāled was approaching, ‘Aḵka with the Arab auxiliaries occupied the Karʃ road about one day’s march (rawaha or radwa) or a little more from ‘Ajin at-Tamr and there waited for the enemy; but he was surprised, attacked, and captured with many of his companions. The rest dispersed without a fight. On receiving the report of this defeat, Mihrān took refuge with his warriors in the fort of ‘Ajin at-Tamr, as did also the fugitive Arabs, thinking that Ḥāled
would not undertake a siege, but, after the manner of the Bedouins, would march away quickly with the loot. Yet when he surrounded them completely they had to surrender unconditionally. All were made prisoners and, with their commander and the Arab auxiliaries under 'Akkā, murdered on the bridge leading to the fort. The victors led away the women and children as their spoils. Studying the gospel in a locked church the Moslems found forty youths, who had been kept there as hostages. These also were made prisoners and distributed among the bravest Moslems.

Some parts of this account are very instructive. We see that the great oasis in which 'Ajn at-Tamr is situated was no longer the property of the Bekr ibn Wā'il tribe, but that it was claimed by other tribes, especially by the Tarīb. The youths held there as hostages were undoubtedly the sons of various chiefs brought to the monastery school in the fort by their relatives partly from good will and partly under compulsion, just as at a later date various chiefs gave their own sons or those of their relatives to the Turkish authorities, who then sent them to Constantinople in order to assure their fidelity and to instil into them respect for the power of the Government. The words used by Sejf describing the distance between the place occupied by 'Akkā and 'Ajn at-Tamr sound very much like expressions now employed by the Bedouins. Rawha means a day's march, or the distance it is possible to cover before the night rest, jurāwād. Radwa also signifies a whole day plus a considerable period before the next sunrise.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 978, neither translates nor explains the sentence in which these words occur, nor does he locate the Tārik (road) al-Karḥ, where 'Akkā lay in wait for Ḥāled. In my opinion the latter was the direct road leading from al-Anbār to 'Ajn at-Tamr and running between the swamps of al-Ḥabbānja and al-Bhēra (whence its name, al-Karḥ); the place where 'Akkā lay in wait was probably about fifty-five kilometers north of 'Ajn at-Tamr, where the morasses both on the north and south would not have allowed Ḥāled to swerve from the road.

'Ajn at-Ṭamr to al-Muṣajjaḥ

With al-Anbār and 'Ajn at-Tamr in his possession Ḥāled and his party went to the oasis of Dūmat al-Ǧandal in response to 'Ejād's urgent request for help. During his absence in the distant oasis (at-Ṭabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2067; see also my Arabia Deserta, pp. 550—552) the Persians made an attempt to regain al-Anbār. The tribes of northeastern Arabia, incited to vengeance for the murder of 'Akkā and his men at 'Ajn at-Tamr, offered the Persians their aid. In order to assure themselves of this support, the Persian leaders from Bagdad went to their camps at al-Ḥuṣejd and al-Ḥanāfes. When this was reported by a courier of the Moslem commander in al-Anbār to al-Ḳa'kā, Ḥāled's lieutenant in al-Ḥira, he at once sent a troop to the vicinity of al-Ḥuṣejd and al-Ḥanāfes to watch every move of the enemy. Subsequently Ḥāled returned from Dūmat to al-Ḥira and sent al-Ḳa'kā and Abu Lajla ibn Fadaki against the Persians. (Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 980, writes that he gave them orders to regain 'Ajn at-Tamr; yet there is not a word about its having been lost in the whole text.)
Al-Ka'kā' and Abu Lejla proceeded from al-Hīra by way of Ḥāned at-Tamr. No sooner had they left than a messenger came to Ḥāned in haste with the report that the tribes of northeastern Arabia were assembling in the camps of al-Muṣajjaḥ, at-Ṭeni, and al-Bīr preparatory to attacking him from these camps in company with the Persians. Therefore Ḥāned had to take action himself. Collecting his forces he hurried after al-Ka'kā' and Abu Lejla, overtook them at 'Ajn at-Tamr, and from there sent the first to al-Huṣejd and the second to al-Ḥanāfes. Al-Ka'kā' defeated the enemy at al-Huṣejd so thoroughly that only a few escaped to al-Ḥanāfes, whence they fled, together with the warriors of that place, to al-Muṣajjaḥ, thus getting out of Abu Lejla's reach.

The capture of al-Anbār was intolerable both to the Persians and the tribes of northeastern Arabia, because it gave the Moslems control over the route between Irāk and the middle Euphrates. Besides that, the northeastern tribes wished to revenge their kinsmen slain at Ḥāned at-Tamr. Very likely they conferred with the Persians about common action against the Moslems. Seff calls these tribes Mesopotamian, a term which as used by the Arabic geographers does not mean solely the tribes of Mesopotamia proper but also those camping in the eastern half of northern Arabia adjoining Mesopotamia. All three mustering places of these tribes, al-Muṣajjaḥ, at-Ṭeni, and al-Bīr, lay to the west of the Euphrates and in the territory of the Tarleb. The Persians made a detour to al-Huṣejd and al-Ḥanāfes, where the tribes were to join them. At first they had intended merely to recapture al-Anbār, which would not have caused them much difficulty, as the Muslem garrison could not depend on the native inhabitants. But the alliance with the tribes furnished them with an opportunity of inflicting on the Moslems a still greater blow. This we see from the selection of the assembly places, to the west and not to the east of the Euphrates, as well as from the circumstance that Ḥāned on leaving al-Hīra with all his forces did not march direct to al-Anbār but to Ḥāned at-Tamr, making this oasis the base for his actions. Al-Huṣejd I locate nearer 'Ajn at-Tamr than al-Ḥanāfes, for al-Ka'kā' reached it before Abu Lejla reached al-Ḥanāfes, although both left 'Ajn at-Tamr at the same time and the Arabs from the camp at al-Huṣejd sought refuge at the latter place. If the defeat had taken place on the left bank of the Euphrates, the tribes would not have fled to the right bank to al-Ḥanāfes and from there to al-Muṣajjaḥ.

Jāḵūt, Muḡam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 280, like his informant, Naṣr, places al-Huṣejd on the right bank, saying that it is a valley between al-Kūfa and Syria and that there in A. H. 13 Ka'kā' utterly defeated the Persians and the Tarleb and Rabī'a tribes.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 981, note 2a, writes that Jāḵūt, “2, 10 and ff.” (correctly, Vol. 2, p. 280, lines 10 ff.), asserts that the battle was fought in A. H. 13, thus after Ḥāned's departure to Syria and with the assistance of Chief al-Muṭanna ibn Ḥāreța only. Jāḵūt-mentions only al-Ka'kā' ibn 'Amr and not al-Muṭanna. The year 12 written in Arabic might easily have been misrendered 13 by Jāḵūt.

Seff goes on to write that, on learning of the enemy's defeat at al-Huṣejd and of the flight of the al-Ḥanāfes detachment to al-Muṣajjaḥ, Ḥāned ordered the commanders al-Ka'kā' and Abu Lejla (at-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2069ff.) to join him at a certain hour of a certain night near
al-Muṣajjaḥ between Ḥawrân and al-Ḳalt. Leaving Ḍin at-Ṭamr with the rest of his troops mounted on horses and camels, he, too, hurried by way of al-Ḡanāb, Barādān, and al-Ḥenī to al-Muṣajjaḥ, was joined at the appointed hour by the other detachment, surrounded the camp of their sleeping enemies on three sides, attacked, and so completely defeated them that only the chief al-Ḥudejī with a small troop escaped.

This report shows that Sejf's informants were well acquainted with all the circumstances as well as with the topography of that region. As long as the enemy occupied al-Ḥuṣejd and al-Ḥanāfīs, Ḥālēd could not leave Ḍin at-Ṭamr, as in that case his communications with al-Ḥira might easily have been interrupted. For he was no longer waging war in the territory of the Bekr ibn Wā'il tribe, who were allied with him against the Persians, but in the territory of supporters of the Persians, the Tarīb and Rabī'a, who were just then assembling at several points in order, with the help of the Persians, to drive him out of their domains. Yet to assemble in this manner the Bedouins as a rule need much time. The several clans often camp many days' march from each other, especially in the rainy season, and their warriors, even when the report reaches them, cannot always leave their herds immediately and hasten to the common camping ground. The safety of their families and their flocks must first be provided for. They have to find camping places near copious wells and in the midst of good pasturage and such as are also easily defended. Before they can find all this and bring their families and cattle there, several weeks sometimes elapse. Only after all these arrangements are completed can the warriors proceed to the appointed assembling ground, where they deliberate on all the information their spies bring about the new movements of the enemy.

In al-Muṣajjaḥ it must have been necessary to consider many matters, because the fugitives from al-Ḥuṣejd and al-Ḥanāfīs could not have promoted harmony. But Ḥālēd, true to his aggressive tactics, surprised the Arabs before they could come to a decision. Having rid himself of the enemy on his flank at al-Ḥuṣejd and al-Ḥanāfīs, he could advance boldly against the northeastern tribes and quench their ardor for combat. He knew well that if he could surprise and crush them in their camps all northern Arabia would submit to the Moslems. And his undertaking was bound to succeed if he started out the moment the message was received about the defeat at al-Ḥuṣejd and the flight from al-Ḥanāfīs. If the messenger reached Ḥālēd in the morning at Ḍin at-Ṭamr, the detachment directed against al-Ḥanāfīs could receive the new marching order that night and proceed on al-Muṣajjaḥ, while Ḥālēd, his corps being all in readiness, could set out from Ḍin at-Ṭamr the next forenoon. His objective, al-Muṣajjaḥ, lay between Ḥawrân and al-Ḳalt. Both these places still exist.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 982f., note 1, claims that this Ḥawrân must be another mistake of Sejf or of his transcribers, or else that Sejf refers to fictitious names; he believes that this also applies to al-Ḳalt. In note 2d, he states that “al-Bekrī and al-Hamdānī, two of our oldest and best geographical sources on Arabia, know absolutely nothing of these places which, according to Sejf, are situated in as-Samāwā.” Therefore they are classed by Caetani with the numerous geographical places mentioned by Sejf alone, a fact which, to Caetani, makes their existence more than
doubtful. Yet Sejf’s Ḥawrān was known to the geographer Ptolemy as Auranitis (Geography, V, 20:3; see above, p. 25); it is a long valley terminating at the Euphrates about 160 kilometers northwest of ‘Ajn at-Tamr. Al-Kalt, Baradān, and al-Ḥeni also lie in the region where Sejf locates them. It is therefore not permissible to doubt their existence and accuse Sejf of fabrication. That al-Hamdāni, to whom Caetani refers, knew very little about north Arabian topography is universally known and the limited acquaintance of al-Bekri with the same region is shown in a great number of instances. For al-Kalt I look to the well of Abu Ḥalta about seventy-five kilometers south-southeast of the ‘Aḵlat Ḥawrān. The camping ground of al-Muṣajjaḥ, which is to be sought somewhere between them, must undoubtedly have also had a good watering place. Its name I have not found, but its location as required by the context is almost certain, as the names of the places passed by Ḥađed confirm us in the position to which we assign it. From ‘Ajn at-Tamr Ḥađed rode by way of al-Ġnāb, Baradān, and al-Ḥeni to al-Muṣajjaḥ. Al-Ġnāb I locate at the vigorous spring of al-‘Aṣibījje, 27 kilometers north-northwest of ‘Ajn at-Tamr. Baradān is identical with the large watering place of Bradān, 10 kilometers farther northwest, while al-Ḥeni (al-Ġnēj) is 60 kilometers from al-Baradān, also to the northwest. These locations show clearly the direction of Ḥađed’s march. Sejf’s al-Ġnāb cannot be taken for the one placed by Jāḵūt, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 119f., in the Kalb territory, as is done by Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 983, note 3a, for all the places named together with this al-Ġnāb in the verses quoted by Jāḵūt are situated in the western half of northern Arabia. Here, east of the Moab territory and east of al-Mūṣatta, a spring camping ground of al-Ġnāb is known, which for a time was the property of the Kalb tribe, whose home never was in the vicinity of ‘Ajn at-Tamr.

According to the narrative of a poet and eyewitness quoted by ās-Tabarī (op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2114), after his arrival at Suwā’ Ḥađed attacked the watering place of al-Muṣajjaḥ, which belonged to the Bahra’ clan in al-Ḵāṣwānī, surprising the al-Muṣajjaḥ camp early in the morning, when the Arabs were still drinking and singing. —

Although quoting an eyewitness, this record contains much which it is impossible to place after Ḥađed’s arrival at Suwā’. That Ḥađed attacked the camp of the Bahra’ after arriving at Suwā’ is attested by nearly all narrators of these events. According to some a singer lost his life in the mêlē; according to others a singer named Ḥurḵūs fell either at al-Biṣr or al-Muṣajjaḥ. Al-Muṣajjaḥ according to this report is a watering place lying in al-Ḵāṣwānī. Sejf’s informants, however, as we have seen, locate al-Muṣajjaḥ not near Suwā’ but between the āṣīb of Abu Ḥalta (al-Kalt) and the Ḥawrān valley. The region bordering the Ḥawrān valley on the south is called al-Kāṣī. This seems to correspond to al-Ḵāṣwānī, thus furnishing a new argument for the correctness of Sejf’s topographical statements. Thus al-Muṣajjaḥ might be the watering place ‘Ajn al-Arnab of today. This location, furthermore, is supported by the circumstance that this vicinity used to be the camping ground of the Namir tribe, to which some records (Abū-l-Faraq, Arānī [Cairo, 1285 A.H.], Vol. 20, pp. 127f. and 134) ascribe the ownership of the territory northwest of ‘Ajn at-Tamr.
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To al-Biṣr, and Return to al-Hira

Sejf tells us (at-Ṭabarî, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2072 f.) that from al-Muṣājaḥ Ĥâleld marched farther northwest to surprise the Tarîb also at their other assembling grounds. Al-Ka'kâ' and Abu Lejla marched quickly ahead of him with orders to conceal themselves at a given time near the enemy and then to attack him simultaneously from three sides. Their first objectives were at-Teni and al-Biṣr. Ĥâleld proceeded from al-Muṣājaḥ by way of Hawrān, "ar-Rank," and al-Ḥama', and finally reached the territory of al-Biṣr, where the two assembling grounds of at-Teni and az-Zumejl were situated. When joined on this side of at-Teni by al-Ka'kâ' and Abu Lejla, he attacked the unsuspecting enemy at night and killed all the warriors, so that no one could carry the news of the defeat to az-Zumejl. This enabled him to surprise and defeat the Tarîb assembled in the last-named camp. Afterwards he departed from al-Biṣr with the intention of falling upon the camp at ar-Ruḍāb, but his advance was observed and the Tarîb waiting there saved themselves by a timely flight. This last exploit of Ĥâleld's filled all the Beduins in northeastern Arabia with such terror that they dispersed, partly to Syria and partly to the east of the Euphrates.

According to this part of the narrative, Ĥâleld marched from al-Muṣājaḥ to al-Biṣr. Al-Biṣr (or, as it is called today, al-Biṣri) is the easternmost extremity, about one hundred kilometers long, of the mountain chain stretching under various names from the Anti-Lebanon northeast and ending at the Euphrates.

Caetani, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 1229, locates al-Biṣr to the left of the Euphrates north of Palmyra, although all writers since the second millennium before Christ have known of al-Biṣr as lying to the right of the river. Palmyra was far to the southwest of al-Biṣr.

Even today the Zana Biṣr tribes of the 'Aneze group, who wander between an-Negef and Aleppo, regard the al-Biṣri ridge as a center for their camps, as they always find water there and can easily defend themselves even against a superior enemy. From this region Ĥâleld was threatened with danger, which he desired to ward off quickly. The Tarîb collected at at-Teni and az-Zumejl. At-Teni lies at the southern slope of the al-Biṣri ridge. It is a rather low, isolated hill, visible from afar and now called Gubeljat at-Tani or al-Gubejla (The Little Hill) for short. From its summit there is a splendid view far to the east, south, and west, and southeast of it are several watering places. The neighboring country makes a fine camping ground. The same may be said of the rise of az-Zmejî (az-Zumejl of Sejf) in the flat country north of al-Biṣri.

To reach these two camping grounds Ĥâleld now hastened with all possible speed. His ordering the chiefs al-Ka'kâ' and Abu Lejla to march ahead of him was very sensible, as in that way the lack of pasturage was not so severely felt and the crowding at the watering places was more easily avoided. Ĥâleld himself took the road leading from al-Muṣājaḥ northwest. The camping ground of Hawrān mentioned by Sejf is probably identical with the watering place 'Āklat Hawrān in Wādī Hawrān. The next camping ground, "ar-Rank," I identify with ar-Ratka. In Arabic the latter word could easily be misspelled as "ar-Rank." Though the name ar-Rank is unknown north of 'Āklat Hawrān, ar-Ratka is a famous
watering place about 140 kilometers northwest of 'Aqlat Ḥawrān. The station following, Ḥama', I do not know.

In spite of the wide view from the summits of the at-Tīn hill, the coming of Ḥālīd’s force was not observed by the Taḥlib sentries posted there. Probably he passed through the lowlands between the various heights of the neighborhood and approached the camp at night. The same thing happened near az-Zmejli, where the Bedouins believed they were camping in full security, knowing that their countrymen were guarding the roads leading through the ridge from south to north. According to Saif the camping ground of ar-Rudāb was beyond the limits of al-Bišrī; judging from the context it should be looked for north of az-Zmejli.

Jākūt, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 789, gives the name ar-Rudāb to a place where Caliph Ḥišām later built his residence, ar-Resāfa. But as ar-Resāfa was built long before either Ḥišām’s or Ḥālīd’s time, the only inference from Jākūt’s statement would be that his informants placed ar-Rudāb in the near vicinity of ar-Resāfa. Were this the case, we could readily understand how the Taḥlib, camping at ar-Rudāb, were able to escape. Learning in time of the raid at az-Zmejli, they fled with their wives, children, and flocks to the neighboring town of ar-Resāfa, the mighty white walls of which warned Ḥālīd from afar. This place he could easily leave alone, as the task he had set for himself had been accomplished to his full satisfaction. The eastern half of northern Arabia trembled before the Moslems.

After the defeat of the Taḥlib, as sudden as complete, Saif (aṭ-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2074 f.) goes on to relate that Ḥālīd turned to al-Firād, a frontier town between Syria, Irak, and Mesopotamia. — The whole context justifies the belief that from ar-Rudāb Ḥālīd did not go farther north or northwest, but that he returned southeast. The Taḥlib mustering places were cleared, yet not far off were Byzantine strongholds, and it surely was not Ḥālīd’s intention to fight the Byzantines too. Therefore he turned back. On his march to al-Bišrī he followed the transport road through the desert far from the Euphrates; returning, he probably came near the great river to supply himself from the settlements in that region. The report we have cited names the settlement of al-Firād. This word is the plural of al-Furqā, the name of a station, known to all the Arabic geographers, on the right bank of the Euphrates, whence a road branched off to al-Bišrī. It is identical with the present aṣ-Ṣāḥīlīje ruins.

In the meantime, opposite al-Firād on the left bank of the Euphrates, the Byzantine and Persian border garrisons, as well as Bedouins of the various tribes, were assembling. Below al-Firād they crossed over to the right bank and attacked Ḥālīd, but (ibid.) suffered a total defeat. A hundred thousand men are supposed to have fallen. Ḥālīd remained at al-Firād ten days longer and from this place sent his warriors back to al-Ḥira. — Numbers are almost always exaggerated, but the fight itself may have been authentic. Among Ḥālīd’s prisoners were both Bedouins and Persians, Byzantine and Persian subjects. The Taḥlib, who had fled from al-Bišrī to the left bank, had undoubtedly informed the Byzantine and Persian guards there of what had happened, and the latter, reinforced by the Bedouins camping on the left bank, made an effort to bar the road by which the Moslems were returning and to free the captives.
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Crossing the Euphrates southeast of al-Fīrād they attacked the Moslems, only to be repulsed.

According to at-Ṭabarī (op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 2075 f.), who fails to give his source, Ḥāled, during his return from al-Fīrād secretly left his corps, made a rapid trip to Mecca passing through al-ʿAnbari, Miṯḵab, and Dāṯ ʿErḵ, and arrived back at al-Ḥīrā almost simultaneously with his troops. —

The distance from Mecca to al-Fīrād in a straight line is more than 800 kilometers and to al-Ḥīrā from Mecca over 700, so that Ḥāled would have required for the ride alone at least twenty-five days, even if he had several good camels; for he could not have strained his physical powers indefinitely. On the other hand, if his warriors had kept close to the Euphrates, resting with their animals by the way and had been obliged to get their sustenance in the settlements they passed by, they could not have covered the distance from al-Fīrād to al-Ḥīrā in thirty days. Therefore it is not altogether impossible that Ḥāled may have returned from Mecca to al-Ḥīrā at the same time as his warriors. Yet I cannot understand why Ḥāled should have left his army and traveled incognito to Mecca. The places he had to pass on this trip, al-ʿAnbari, Miṯḵab, and Dāṯ ʿErḵ, can, of course, be identified in northern Arabia, but why Ḥāled when he came so close to al-Medina should not have visited his well-wisher, Abu Bekr, to pride himself a little upon his successes is indeed hard to explain.

APPENDIX VIII

BARBALISSUS, BĀLIS, THE THAPSACUS OF XENOPHON, AND OBBAANES

BARBALISSUS AND BĀLIS

Bālis is the ancient Barbalissus, Bêt Balaš, or, simply, Balaš.

According to Ptolemy, Geography, V, 15:17, the town of Barbalissus was situated in Chalybonitis on the Euphrates. On the Peutinger Table (Vienna, 1888), Segm. 10, Barbalisso figures as a station on the Roman Road leading along the right bank of the Euphrates.

After 293 A.D. Barbalissus belonged to the province of Augusta Euphratensis; it was garrisoned by the Equites Dalmatiae Illyriciani (Notitia dignitatum, Oriens 33, No. 25).

At the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century of our era the dux Antiochus gave orders that Bacchus, the second officer in command of the foreign Palatine Guard, should be tortured to death; he refused to permit his body to be buried. This happened in the fort of Barbarissus, lying in the eparchy of Augusta Euphratensis on the frontier near the Saracens. But in the evening some hermit brothers, who were dwelling in caves near by, came and buried the body in one of their caves. Shortly after this they took Bacchus from the cave and reinterred him beside St. Sergius at ar-Reṣāfa (Bolland, Acta Sanctorum, Oct., Vol. 3, [1770], pp. 885 f.; Passio antiquior [Analecta Bollandiana, Vol. 14], pp. 384 f.).
The Arabic list of signatures of the Church Council at Nicaea in the year 325 includes that of the Bishop Antûniyûs al-Barbalis. — Gelzer, Patrum nicaenorum nomina (1898), p. 171, would interpret al-Barbalis as Hierapolis, but the same list (ibid., pp. 147, 165) also includes the signature of a Bishop Philoxenus of Menbiğ, which is identical with Hierapolis. There is no mention of Bishop Antonius of Barbalissus in the other texts.

During the dissensions between Alexander, the metropolitan of Hierapolis, and John, the patriarch of Antioch after the Council of Ephesus in 431, Bishop Acclinus Barbalissi was expelled from the fort by the Patriarch John (Mansi, Concilia [1759—1798], Vol. 5, col. 966) and in his place one Marinianus was unlawfully installed and consecrated as bishop (ibid., cols. 908, 913). Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnica (Meineke), p. 158, writes that Barbalissus is a fortified settlement.

Theodosius, De situ Terrae Sanctae (Geyer), p. 150, states that from Quido to Barbarisso, where St. Sergius and Bacco were killed, the distance is sixty miles. From Barbarisso as far as Eneaopl ... in Calonico is eighty miles. From Calonico to Constantinia, sixty miles. — Eneaopl is probably corrupted from Leontopoli, as Callinicus was sometimes called. The distance is not eighty but approximately only seventy miles (98 kilometers).

In the spring of 540 Chosroes I marched via Zenobia (Halebijee) and Sura (Sürria) on the town of Hierapolis (Menbiğ), which ransomed itself. Then he advanced against Beroa and Antioch; these he took and demolished. Leaving Antioch, he attacked the harbor of Seleucia, Apamea, and Chalcis, this town being 84 stades from Beroa. In order to bring his loot safely to Persia, Chosroes did not return by the road by which he had come, along the right bank of the Euphrates, but at the settlement of Obbanes, forty stades from the fort of Barbalissus, he had a boat bridge thrown across the river; there he passed over to the left bank and reached Edessa by way of the little town of Batna (Procopius, De bello persico, II, 5—12). — If Chosroes could set out from Obbanes to Mesopotamia with so many thousand prisoners and so much plunder, there must have been a good road from that place. The ford of Obbanes is to be sought on the fields of al-Ishâkijje by the Samûma ruins.

Michael the Syrian, Chronicle (Chabot), Vol. 4, p. 348, relates that in the ninth year of the Emperor Justinian the commander Adharmûn, under the orders of Chosroes, marched out and pillaged Bêt Balas, Kasrîn (Kâşerîn), Bêt Dama, the environs of the town of Gabbul, and Kênêšîn, and came back with many prisoners (Bedjian, Acta martyrum et sanctorum, Vol. 3, p. 399).

In the fifteenth year of the Emperor Justinian the Persians pillaged Callinicus and Bêt Balaš and took away the relics of the martyr Bacchus as well as the gold ornaments from the sarcophagus of St. Sergius (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 296).

Justinian paid much attention to all the towns and fortified settlements on the borders of the province of Euphratensis, such as Barbalissus, Neocaesarea, Gabulon (Gabula), etc. (Procopius, De aedificiis, II, 9:10).

Antonine of Piacenza, Itinerarium (Geyer), p. 191, says that he journeyed from Carran (Carrnae), the birthplace of Abraham, to the town of Barbarisso, where rested St. Bacchus, the brother of St. Sergius. — This record, intended as a guide for pilgrims, likewise proves that a
transport road led from Carrhae (Harrân) to Barbalissus and that the ford across the Euphrates was in the neighborhood of the Bâlis of today.

In the plain between Bâlis and ar-Raûka lay the famous monastery of Mar Ḥananja (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 379). — Mar Ḥananja may be identical with the Medint al-Fâr ruin.

When the Moslems arrived in Syria, the settlements of Bâlis and Ḥüzerin belonged to two noble Byzantines. Many inhabitants emigrated to Byzantine territory east of the Euphrates, and the rest made terms with the leader of the Moslems, Abu 'Obejâda, agreeing to pay the 'ṣīja head tax levied upon Christians and Jews. Abu 'Obejâda made Bâlis his residence and settled the neighborhood partly with his soldiers, partly with Arabs from Syria, who had accepted Islam, and finally with nomads of the Ḟejas tribe. The land around Bâlis is very fertile but was not sufficiently irrigated. Therefore the inhabitants of the settlements of Bâlis, Buwejjis, Ḥüzerin, 'Âbedin, and Ṣiffìn, as well as of those situated above Bâlis, begged Maslama, the son of the Caliph 'Abdalmalek, who happened to camp there during his march against the Byzantines, to have an irrigation canal dug for them from the Euphrates. This Maslama did, and after that time Bâlis with all the surrounding villages remained the property of him and his descendants, until they were driven out by the Abbasides (al-Belâdorî, Futûh [De Goeje], pp. 150 ff.; Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle [Chatot], pp. 26 f.). —

Al-Belâdorî mentions settlements above Bâlis without naming them; those named as lying below Bâlis have to be looked for between this settlement and Ṣiffìn. Buwejjis may be recognized in the ruin mound at the eastern end of the șe'ib of Umm Ḥarûm; Ḥüzerin in the al-Ḥwâra ruins east of the казан of ad-Dibsi, and 'Âbedin in the ruin mound on the right side of an old irrigation canal still farther east. Ṣiffìn then, according to this account, must have been identical with the present Abu Ḥrâra, as the canal irrigating Bâlis and the other villages could have extended only so far. This canal undoubtedly branched off from the Euphrates below the settlement of aṭ-Ṭammûze at the point where the river swerves from a southerly to an easterly direction. The remains of such an old canal, without question the Nahr Maslama, are visible from the al-Mellâh fields as far as Abu Ḥrâra. Between the end of the șe'ib of Umm Ḥarûm and the ad-Dibsi ruin as well as near Abu Ḥrâra the Euphrates has changed its course and broken into this canal. It is not certain if Maslama had a new canal dug; more probably he had an ancient one cleaned. This may also be indicated by the fact that later Arabic authors make no mention whatever of Maslama's canal. It therefore must again have become filled in.

Ḵâzerin is brought into connection with Ṣiffìn also by Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 348, and by Theophanes, Chronographia (De Boer), pp. 346 f., who say that in 667 Mauwiyah encamped beyond Barbalissus near Kaisarion (Caesariyum) and the Arabs under 'Ali at Saphhin. — Kaisarion is identical with our Ḥâzerin, Saphhin with Ṣiffìn. The poet 'Amr mentions (Mu'allakah [Völdeke], p. 24) Ḥâzerin, where he drank good wine.

Jâkût, Mu'jam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 16, writes that Ḥâzerin was a settlement not far from Bâlis on the Euphrates.

Maslama's descendants lived at Bâlis in the fort he built there. In 750 Bâlis was raided by 150 cavalymen of the Abbasid army, who with
their commander maltreated Maslama's descendants and their wives. Their adherents finally came to the rescue and killed all the tormentors (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 52).

In 820 the Patriarch Dionysius of Tell Ma'zir conferred with several bishops in the fort of Bêt Balaš (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 504).

In 821 Naṣr ibn Ṣabat, the leader of the opponents of the increasing Persian influence, bought the fort of Bêt Balaš, garrisoned it with his partisans, and then advanced to the Hani canal which flows around Callinicus (ibid., p. 505).

'Abdallah, son of Tāber, defeated Naṣr's followers and in 825 took the fort of Bêt Balaš, inhabited by many Christians, who suffered much during the siege (ibid., p. 510).

In 859 an earthquake caused much damage at Bālis, ar-Raḵḵa, and some other towns (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 1440).

Al-Iṣṭahri, Masūlīk (De Goeje), p. 62, describes Bālis as a little town on the right bank of the Euphrates on the borders of Syria and Irak. The Syrians used to go there through a country which was both inhabited and cultivated, and at Bālis crossed the Euphrates. — This shows that from the Bālis ford an important transport road led into the inner regions of Mesopotamia.

Ibn Hawkal, Masūlīk (De Goeje), p. 119, mentions that the walled town of Bālis suffered much after the death of Sejfaddowle (944—967 A.D.), the powerful lord of the Aleppo district. The consequence was that the commercial caravans ceased to come there and only wheat and barley were exported. Between the town and the Euphrates were large gardens.

In March, 1060, Bālis was governed by 'Atījje, brother of the administrator of the Aleppo district (Ibn Taťrī Birdi, Nūfūm [Popper], Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 227).

Sibīt ibn al-Gawzi, Mirāt (De Meynard), p. 554, mentions (referring to the year 1115) that the road leading from Aleppo to ar-Raḵḵa crossed the Euphrates at Bālis, whereas the road from ar-Raḵḵa to Damascus crossed it at ar-Raṃr (this word being wrongly transcribed in the French translation as "az-Zorw").

In 1117 the Crusaders allied with the Aleppans besieged the fort of Bālis; but in vain, as they had to retire before reinforcements approaching from Mardin (Kemāladdīn, Ta'riḥ [De Meynard], p. 613).

In 1182—1183, in the war for Nūraddīn's inheritance, the fort of Bālis was demolished, and in 1200—1201, during the quarrel between the heirs of Saladin, the settlement of Bālis was plundered (Kemāladdīn, Ta'riḥ [Bischot's transl.], Rev. d'or. lat., Vol. 4, pp. 162, 223).

Jāḳūt, op. cit., Vol. 1, pp. 477f., states that the settlement of Bālis lay originally on the Euphrates proper on the right bank, but that the river gradually shifted southeast so that already by his time (the beginning of the thirteenth century) it was four miles distant.

Abu-l-Fadā'īl (Marāsīd [Juynboll], Vol. 1, p. 122) corrects Jāḳūt and states that it was not very far from Bālis to the Euphrates and that Bālis was situated below Siffin. —

Jāḳūt's statement does not agree with al-Belādorī's account nor with the facts. Not far to the east of the settlement of Bālis an old canal is visible, but nowhere is there a trace of an old Euphrates river bed. From
the ruins of Bālis to the Euphrates is quite two kilometers, and Bālis lies not below but above Şiffin.

In 1240 the KhorasmiANS crossed the Euphrates by the boat bridge at ar-Raḥṣa, plundered Bālis, and killed all its inhabitants who had not fled either to Aleppo or Menbig. A second time they crossed the Euphrates by the same bridge in the beginning of 1241 and reached al-Fāja', Dejr Ḥāfer, Gabbūl, and as far as Tell 'Aran. On their return they pillaged Salamiyya and ar-Resāfa, where they were defeated by the Arabs under 'Ali ibn Ḥadīta, and their loot was taken away from them. Fleeing towards the Euphrates, they encamped on February 19 opposite ar-Raḥṣa and west and north of Bālis. The Aleppo troops hastened by way of Şiffin to prevent their crossing the river but came one hour too late. The KhorasmiANS entrenched themselves at Bustān al-Bālis behind a rampart and a ditch and repulsed all the attacks of the Aleppoans until sunset. One hour after sunset the Aleppo troops marched back to Şiffin, leaving behind only a few companies; these the KhorasmiANS killed and then crossed to ar-Raḥṣa (Kemāladdān, op. cit., Vol. 6, p. 3; al-Maḵrīzī, Sulāk [Blochet's transl.], pp. 468f.). Dejr Ḥāfer, Gabbūl, and Tell 'Aran are settlements west-northwest of Bālis.

In 1257 the maḥfiṭan (Metropolitan) Ṣalība of Tekrīt journeyed by way of Balaṣ to Aleppo (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccles. [Abbeloo and Lamy], Vol. 1, col. 723).

In 1260 the Mongols got possession of the fort of Balaṣ, killed all its inhabitants, and left their own garrison there (ibid., Chron. syriacum [Bedjan], p. 582).

Al-Kazwini, 'Aḏā'ib (Wüstefeld), Vol. 2, p. 203, copies Jaḵūt and states that the small settlement of Bālis lies on the west bank of the Euphrates, which is steadily moving farther east, so that it is now four miles distant from Bālis.

Ad-Dimishi, Nuhba (Mehren), p. 205, describes Bālis as already deserted and says that it is an old town by the Euphrates not far from Şiffin and ar-Ruṣaifa, the latter built by Ḥiṣām ibn 'Abdalmalik among the ruins of ancient Greek structures.

Haḡī Ḥalfa, Gihan nawa' (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 593, who uses old sources, states that the counties of Bālis and ar-Resāfa belong to the district of Kinnosrin, the capital of which is Aleppo, and that, like Bālis, Kal'at Ḍā'bar also is inhabited by Turkomans.

Evlija' Celebi, Ta'rih (Von Hammer's transl.), Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 94, says that Bālis is a sanjak of the Aleppo district and that it pays annually 20,000 pieces of money.

The Thapsacus of Xenophon

North of Bālis I locate the ancient ford of Tifsah (Thapsacus).

In 1 Kings, 5: 4, we read that Solomon ruled all the country on the other side of the river (Euphrates) from Tifsah as far as Gaza.

A passage in 2 Chronicles, 8: 4, states that Solomon also fortified Tadmur in the desert. Even the town of Reşef, now ar-Resāfa, is mentioned in connection with Solomon, which makes it evident that, according to the Jewish tradition, he controlled important transport roads. Of Tadmur we have, so far, no older records; but that this oasis was of great
importance as early as the reign of the Achaemenids cannot be denied. In the Orient the records of the building activity of early rulers are of much importance as historical sources.

Xenophon (Anabasis, I, 4: 11) crossed the Euphrates by the ford of Thapsacus in the spring of 401 B.C. with the army of Cyrus the Younger (see above, p. 214).

Arrian, Anabasis, III, 7, says the same thing of Alexander the Great, who at the end of June, 331 B.C., found at Thapsacus two boat bridges.

Strabo, Geography, XVI, 1: 11, records that according to Aristobulus Alexander had boats built in Phoenicia and on the island of Cyprus, loaded them in sections, and brought them in a seven days’ march to Thapsacus, where the sections were put together and the boats sailed down to Babylon (Arrian, op. cit., VII, 19; Plutarch, Alexander [Sintenis], p. 354).

According to the same Aristobulus (Strabo, op. cit., XVI, 3: 3) the people of Gerrha carried their wares on light vessels to Babylon and from there on the Euphrates as far as Thapsacus, whence they were distributed throughout the country.

Cassius Dio, Historiae, XL, 17, writes that Crassus (in 53 B.C.) crossed the Euphrates at Zeugma, this place being thus called since the expedition of Alexander, who forded the river there.

Pliny, Naturalis historia, XXXIV, 150, mentions an iron chain by the Euphrates in a town called Zeugma used by Alexander the Great in fastening the bridge there. —

Neither the Zeugma of Cassius Dio nor that of Pliny is identical with the former Thapsacus, but with the later ford of Zeugma, where the Euphrates was crossed in the Seleucid period. The region around this Zeugma was full of hillocks (see Cassius Dio, op. cit., XLIX, 19).

Pliny, op. cit., V, 87, names in Syria the towns of Europus and the former Thapsacus, in his time called Amphipolis; also the Scenitan Arabs. The Euphrates reaches Sura where it turns to the east and leaves the Palmyrene deserts of Syria, which extend as far as Petra and the territories of Arabia Felix. —

These statements of Pliny, like so many others, are evidence of the carelessness with which he arranged his quotations. According to Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnica (Meineke), pp. 90, 711, Amphipolis lay by the town of Oropus, the original name of which was Telmessus (Carchemish), while Amphipolis was called Turmeda by the Syrians. Oropus they called Aghri-pus, later changed into the Arabic Gerâbis.

Stephen of Byzantium, op. cit., p. 307, records Thapsacus as a Syrian town by the Euphrates, for which statement Theopompus was his source.

On Thapsacus see also above, pp. 217—221.

OBBANES AND SAMÛMA

Not far from Thapsacus Stephen of Byzantium places the town of Aenus (ibid., p. 52). — With “Ainos” (Aenus) I compare the name of the settlement of Obbanes, where, in 540, the Persians crossed the Euphrates (Procopius, De bello persico, II, 12: 4). ‘Obbâ in Syriac signifies a bay, a bend of a river or arm of the sea, or a depression in a plain, just as does the Arabic ’obb. Therefore we may divide the name Obbanes into ‘Obb and Anes. This latter word closely resembles “Ainos” and might
easily arise from it either through a mistake in hearing it pronounced or through misspelling. The settlement was called “Ainos”; the neighboring bay (‘obb) where the ford or crossing was situated was probably called after the settlement ‘Obb Ainos, and in that manner the settlement itself may later have been so designated.

The ford of Obbanes lay forty stades, or about six kilometers, above Barbalissus (Bâlis). If our opinion in regard to the identity of Obbanes and Aenus is correct, we must look for Thapsacus in the neighborhood of Aenus, hence near Barbalissus. In this we are helped by Xenophon, Anabasis, I, 4: 10f., who immediately after mentioning the manor of Belasis, the Syrian satrap, speaks of Thapsacus. The manor certainly did not stand isolated and it, together with the settlement—not the satrap who lived there—was probably called Belesis. This name is identical with Basios, Balaš, and Bâlis, for the syllable bar in Barbalissus only stands for son (eben). Of course, Xenophon locates the manor of Belesis on the river Dardas, not on the Euphrates, but that is merely one of his numerous mistakes (see above, p. 264). It was the easier to make as not even our Belesis (Bâlis) was situated directly on the Euphrates, but on a canal issuing from it.

To attain a particular end, the same means and often also the same roads as in olden times are still used in the Orient. In 1906 the Turkish Government wished to strengthen its political influence in Babylonia and on the northwest shore of the Persian Gulf. The military equipment consisting of guns, ammunition, tents, and the most necessary provisions were shipped toward the end of the year by steamer to Beirut and from there by train to Aleppo. Here the whole armament weighing 4100 quintals was loaded on freight cars and transported to al-Meskene on the Euphrates, four kilometers from the Bâlis ruins. The reason for selecting this place was its proximity both to Aleppo and the Mediterranean. In al-Meskene (near Samûma) everything was put into seventy-six heavy, flat-bottomed boats, called šahhâra, and floated in three divisions to al-Fellûqa, reaching this place in eight days (Riepl, Nachrichtenwesen [1913], pp. 177f.).

The men who executed the orders of Alexander the Great doubtless knew northern Syria just as well as the Turkish general Pertew Pasha. They likewise had the loaded boats transported to the Euphrates by the shortest route, and, since Aristobulus records (Strabo, loc. cit.) that after being unloaded the boats were launched into the Euphrates at Thapsacus, we are justified in looking for Alexander’s Thapsacus at Samûma near Bâlis.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXI, 7: 7, says that in 361 the Emperor Constantius had a boat bridge built across the Euphrates at Capersanam, visited Edessa, and returned to Hierapolis.

Theodoretus, Religionis historiarum, 19 (Migne, col. 1427), writes that the monk Salamanes hailed from the village of Capersana on the right bank of the Euphrates.

The name of the Samûma ruins suggests that of a settlement of Kafr (village) Sanam, if we may read Sanam for Samam (Samûma).
APPENDIX IX

SEPE, ŞIFFİN, AND ABU HRÉRA

Abu Hzera is the ancient Sepe and the Şiffin of the Arabic authorities. No old building material is to be seen anywhere around. In all probability it was carried away to the fort Ka‘lat Ga‘bar, near by.

The anonymous Ravenna geographer, Cosmographia, II. 5 (Pinder and Parthey, p. 54), calls it Sepe, also Sephe. — Sephe suggests as-Safja, as the sources of the še‘ib of Selmas terminating at Abu Hzera are called. Socrates, Historia ecclesiastica, III, 25, mentions Sippa.

Hāmzat al-İsfahānī, Ta‘rīh (Gottwald), p. 119, says that Ga‘bara ibn an-No‘mān, the victor of ’Ajin Ubār, used to reside at Şiffin.

In 634—635 A.D. al-Muţanna sent two of his lieutenants from al-Anbār to attack the Ta‘reb tribe at Şiffin and followed later himself. When he approached Şiffin, whoever could do so escaped thence to Mesoopotamia. The supplies of the army commanded by al-Muţanna being exhausted, the soldiers killed their riding camels and lived on the flesh. A little later, meeting with some pack caravans owned by the inhabitants of Dabba‘ and Hawrān, they slew the escort and captured the animals (at-Tabari, Ta‘rīh [De Goeje], Ser. 1, pp. 2206 f.; Ibn al-Aṭār, Kāmil [Tornberg], Vol. 2, p. 343). —

Şiffin lies on the right bank of the Euphrates; al-Muţanna therefore must have marched along this bank. On the right bank of the Euphrates 135 kilometers east-southeast of Şiffin the fortified settlement of Zabba‘ was situated. The correct reading therefore should be Zabba‘, not “Dabba‘” as is printed in the editions of both at-Tabari’s and Ibn al-Aṭār’s works. On the right bank of the Euphrates, 340 kilometers from Zabba‘ and not far from the settlement of Gubba the broad Wādī Hawrān ends. Probably there were settlers or nomads camping there at that time, and al-Muţanna seized their goods also.

Towards the end of the spring of 657 there was an encounter at Şiffin between the Caliph ‘Ali and his antagonist, the caliph Moawiyah. The latter, encamping with his Syrian army in the plain on the right bank of the Euphrates, barred all the easy roads to the river. Unable to force its way to the water, ‘Ali’s army suffered much from thirst (at-Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 3268).

Theophanes, Chronographia (De Boor), pp. 346 f., writes that in 657 Moawiyah fought with ‘Ali by the Euphrates. Moawiyah camped beyond the town of Barbalissus near Caesarius, the Arabs at Saphin.

Ad-Dinawari, Aḥbār (Guirgass), pp. 178 f., says that ‘Ali, after staying three days near al-Balilj, gave orders to build a bridge of boats, on which he crossed the Euphrates. Two commanders sent out by him in advance met a troop of the enemy in Sūr ar-Rūm. During the night Moawiyah encamped with his cavalry at Şiffin, a demolished settlement originally built by the Greeks within a bow’s shot of the Euphrates. Between it and the river extends a thicket two parasangs long, through which the
ground water spreads. Only one road, but this one paved with stone, leads to the Euphrates. Most of the thicket is nothing but mud or morass. As the steep bluffs form another impediment to travel, the road is the only means by which the river can be reached with ease. — From the end of the še'eb of aš-Ša'ba to Banāt abu Ḥrēra the flood plain is bordered on the south by rocky bluffs which do not allow of descent to the river except through a few gaps. The flood plain itself is swampy and covered with torfa and other bushes, which make approach to the river difficult.

Al-Iṣṭaḥri, Masālik (De Gejse), pp. 75f., writes that west of the Euphrates, between ar-Raḳḳa and Bālīs, lies the district of Şiffin, where a tomb was built for 'Ammār ibn Jāser.

Al-Bekri, Muʿjam (Wüstenfeld), p. 610, says that Şiffin is a place in Īrāk where a battle took place between 'Ali and Moawiyah. There also Sejfaddowlew 'Ali al-Hamdānī defeated the Egyptian governor, thus gaining possession of Syria. — Al-Bekri locates the district of Şiffin in Īrāk, to which it never properly belonged. Sejfaddowllew possessed himself of Syria in 944, selecting Aleppo for his residence.

In 1108—1109 'Ali ibn Sālem, lord of the town of ar-Raḳḳa, was attacked and driven away by the Numej tribesmen, who then took possession of the town themselves. On learning this, al-Malek Raḍwān marched out from Aleppo against them. Near Şiffin he met ninety Crusaders, bearing the ransom sent by the lord of Edessa to the lord of ar-Raḳḳa. Al-Malek Raḍwān compelled them to give up the ransom to him and made many of them captives. Then, reconciling himself with the Beni Numej in ar-Raḳḳa, he returned to Aleppo. (Ibn al-Ṭibrīzī, Kāmil [Tornerg], Vol. 10, p. 324.)

At the beginning of 1121 Joscelin, the lord of Tell Bāšer, undertook an expedition with his Crusaders against the Arabs and Turkomans in Şiffin, despoiled them, and drove their flocks from the Euphrates (Ibn al-Kalānīsī, Dajl [Amedroz], p. 203).

In 1139 Ḫādi Bahaʾaddīn ibn aš-Šahrazūrī was buried in the mosque of Şiffin (ibid., p. 266).

On September 14, 1146, the Sultan Imādaddin Zenki, while besieging the castle of Gaʾbar, which belonged to the family of Prince Sālem ibn Malek al-Oğezji, was killed by his own soldiers and buried at Şiffin (Ibn al-Ṭibrīzī, Taʾriḥ [De Slane], pp. 132—135; according to his Kāmil [Cairo, 1884], Vol. 11, p. 50, Zenki was buried in ar-Raḳḳa).

In the beginning of May, 1195, a meeting took place at Şiffin between al-Malek al-Afḍal and his uncle al-Malek al-Ādel. The latter gave his nephew the fort of Gaʾbar for his residence. (Al-Maḳrizi, Mawḍīʾ [Blochet’s transl.], pp. 229f.)

Jāḳūt, Muʿjam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, pp. 402f., writes that Şiffin is a place near ar-Raḳḳa on the right bank of the Euphrates, between ar-Raḳḳa and Bālīs. Also, that Moawiyah and 'Ali fought there and in one hundred and ten days had ninety skirmishes.

Al-Kazwīnī, Aǧūb (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 142, states that Şiffin is an old settlement built by the Greeks not far from ar-Raḳḳa on the right bank of the Euphrates. Between it and the Euphrates extends a swampy growth of bushes about two parasangs long, through which the Euphrates can be reached only by a single path paved with stone. — From Kaʿlat Gaʾbar to ar-Raḳḳa is seven parasangs. The swampy flood
plain spoken of still exists, stretching opposite Kal’at Ga’bar as far as Banāt Abu Hrēra.

Abu-l-Feda’, Takwim (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 269, remarks that the distance from the settlement of Bālis to Kal’at Dawśar, also called Kal’at Ga’bar, east of the Euphrates, is five parasangs. West of the Euphrates, opposite Kal’at Ga’bar, extends the district of Şiffin, where ‘Alī and Moawiyyah once fought.

Abu-l-Fadā’il, Mawṣūl (Juynboli), Vol. 2, p. 162, corrects Jākūt by observing that Şiffin is a region above the settlement of Bālis and about half a march distant from it on the right bank of the Euphrates, while ar-Ra’ka lies east of the great river below Bālis. In another place (ibid., Vol. 2, p. 442) Abu-l-Fadā’il defines the location of the fort of Ga’bar by stating that the distance thence to the Euphrates is nearly one mile, whereas Şiffin is over ten miles up-stream from this fort. — These statements of Abu-l-Fadā’il have not been correctly preserved. From Kal’at Ga’bar to Bālis is forty kilometers. If Şiffin were situated above this settlement, it could not be ten miles from Kal’at Ga’bar. From Bālis to Abu Hrēra is twenty-seven kilometers, or about half a march, not upstream but downstream. From Abu Hrēra to Kal’at Ga’bar is fourteen kilometers, or ten miles, as the crow flies. Thus Abu-l-Fadā’il also leads us to Abu Hrēra.

**APPENDIX X**

**SURA OR SŪRIJA**

During the decline of the Seleucid power the course of the great transport routes changed; Palmyra began to grow in importance, and her caravans crossed the Euphrates at Sūrija, owing to which fact many records of this town have been preserved.

Pliny, *Naturalis historia*, V, 87, writes that at Sura the Euphrates turns east, leaving the Palmarene desert. — The river Euphrates does not turn east exactly at the walled town of Sura, but seventy-five kilometers to the west.


In 165 A.D. Avidius Cassius probably defeated the Parthians at Sura and took the towns of Nicephorium and Dausara (Suidas, *Lexicon, sub voce* ‘Zeugma’ [Bekker], p. 459; Lucian, *De historia consoribenda*, 29; Fronto, *Epistulae ad Verum*, II, 1).

The *Peutinger Table* (Vienna, 1888), Segm. 11, records Sure as the terminus of the Roman highway from Damascus by way of Palmyra and Oruba (at-Taḥṣib) to the Euphrates. At Sure the Roman empire ended and the barbarian borderland began.

After 293 A.D. Sura belonged to the province of Augusta Euphratensis and was, according to the *Notitia dignitatum*, Oriens 33, no. 28, the residence of the *praefectus legionis sextae decimae Flaviae firmae*.

At the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century of our era the commander of the foreign Palatine Guard, Sergius, was taken from
the fort of Barbarissus (the present Bâlis) to the fort of Syrum (i. e., Sura) and thence driven to the fort of Tetrapyrgium (the Ḫējr as-Šēle of today), at a distance of nine Roman miles (Bolland, Acta Sanctorum, Oct., Vol. 3, p. 385).

The resolutions of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 were signed by the metropolitan Stephen of Hierapolis (Menbîg) in the name of his suffragan, a certain “Uranios poleos Suron” (Uranius of the town of Sura) (Harduin, Conciliorum collectio [Paris, 1715], Vol. 2, col. 485).

In June, 504, the Byzantine Constantine, who had joined the Persians, returned through the desert to Syria. For a fortnight he traveled with his two wives by day and night without meeting anyone. Not until reaching Šīla (var. Šina) did he find some Roman Arabs, who accompanied him to the fort of Šūra, whence he was brought to the town of Edessa (Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle [Martin], LXXV).—Šīla may be the estate of as-Šēle, twelve kilometers south-southwest of Šūra’, as the Syrians called Sura.

In 512, Marion, bishop of the town of Šūra’ d’ Rūmaje’, participated in the consecration of Bishop Severus as patriarch (Notices relatives à Sévère [Kugener], pp. 319, 321; Chronica minora [Guidi], p. 221; Vitae virorum apud monophysitas celeberrimorum [Brooks], p. 41).

Marion was a bishop as late as 521, when he was exiled (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle [Chabot], Vol. 4, p. 267).

We read in John Malalas’ Chronographia (Migne), XVIII, 175, that the Emperor Justinian sent to the Orient several dignitaries, who were to direct the defense of some towns against the Persian King Kawâd I (496—531). Among others the towns of Beroia (Beroea, or Aleppo), Suron (Sura, or Sûrîja), and Constantia (Constantine) prepared themselves for defense.

In 531 Belisarius with his army pursued the Persians returning with their loot from Syria. He went as far as the town of Suron (Sura), where he met them in battle (Procopius, De bello persico, I, 18: 14).

In the spring of 540 Chosroes the son of Kawâd (ibid., II, 5; Guidi, Un nuovo testo [1891], p. 13; Edessenische Chronik [Hallier], pp. 156f.; Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1719–1728], Vol. 1, p. 416; James of Edessa, Canon [Brooks], p. 300; Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 287) marched along the right bank of the Euphrates and reached a point opposite the Roman fort of Circesium, which, however, he did not attack; nor did he cross the Euphrates. Then, marching again as far as a vigorous man can go in three days, he arrived before the town of Zenobia on the right bank. Seeing that the country was not inhabited, was sterile and of no importance whatever, he tried to persuade the townspeople to surrender. Failing in this, he continued on his way. After considering about the same distance as from Circesium to Zenobia, he came to the town of Suron (Sura) on the Euphrates and ordered it to be taken by assault. The first attack the commander Arsaces repulsed, but when he was killed the Persians succeeded in entering the town, which they looted, making all the inhabitants captives.

Procopius, De aedificiis, II, 9: 1f., says that the fortifications of Suron Polisma (the little town of Sura) were so weak that they could resist Chosroes barely half an hour. The Emperor Justinian, therefore, had the town restored, enclosed with a strong wall, and provided with various other defensive works.
In 543 one Sergius was bishop of Šūra’ (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccles. [Abbelloes and Lamy], Vol. 1, col. 215).

Antoine of Piacenza, Itinerarium (Geyer), p. 191, records how he (Antonine) came from Barbarisso (Barbalissus, the modern Bālis) to the town of Suras (Sura), through which flows the river Euphrates, there crossed by a bridge. In this town Saint Sergius and Saint Bacchus were tortured to death. Saint Sergius rests twelve miles farther in the desert of the Saracens at the town of Tetrapyrgio. — Bacchus was tortured in Barbarisso (Bālis), Sergius in ar-Reṣāfa, where he was also buried. In Tetrapyrgio, now called Kṣejr as-Sèle, the latter spent the night only.

The little town of Sura is mentioned at the end of the sixth century in Nicephorus’ Vita sencti Symeonis junioris (Migne), col. 3184.

In the spring of 657 two partisans of the Caliph `Ali set out from al-Kūfa and proceeded along the right bank of the Euphrates until they reached `Ānāt (‘Āna). Being informed there that `Ali was marching along the left bank of the Euphrates with Moawiyah and his army advancing against him from Damascus, they planned to cross at `Ānāt to the left bank, but the inhabitants of this town prevented this by removing all the available boats. They therefore retraced their steps and, crossing the Euphrates at Hit, overtook `Ali at some settlement below the fort of Karkisija’, from which they advanced against the inhabitants of the settlement of `Ānāt, intending to punish them. Yet, as the latter had fortified themselves and many had dispersed, nothing was accomplished. When `Ali crossed the river at ar-Rakka, he sent the two partisans in advance of himself. In the settlement of Sūr ar-Rūm they met a troop of the caliph Moawiyah’s Syrian army (at-Ṭabari, Ta’riḥ [De Goeje], Ser. 1, pp. 3260f.).

Sūr ar-Rūm is the true Arabic translation of the Syrian name Šūra’ d’Rūmaje’.

Jākūt, Muṣṭam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 3, p. 184, knew of no settlement of Šūra’ and only mentions that, according to Abu-l-Ḥasan al-Adībī, Šūra’ is a place in Mesopotamia and is pronounced Sawra’.

Al-Battānī, Zīj (Nallino), Part 3, p. 240, writes Šūra’, fixing its geographical position as lat. 36° and long. 80° 30’.

Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, cols. 545f., as late as 1471 mentions the monastery of Mar Abi at Šūra’.

APPENDIX XI

NICEPHORIUM, CALLINICUS, AND AR-RAKKA

Strabo, Geography, XVI, 1 : 27, knew of a river called Basileos between the Euphrates and Tigris and in the territory of Anthemusia he knew of a river Aborras.

In Basileos the name Balichus is hidden. Strabo’s informant, who knew Aramaic, read its name as Malichus (king) and translated it as Basileos. The town of Anthemusia lay (Isidore of Charax, Mansiones
parthicae [Müller], pp. 244 f.) on the road from Zeugma-Apamea to Edessa, eight schoeni east of Apamea, hence far from the basin of the river Aborras, or al-Ḫābūr. The river Balichus has preserved its name to this day, being now called al-Balīḥ.

The flood plain on the left bank of the Euphrates could be irrigated from the al-Balīḥ river as well as by canals leading from the Euphrates itself. That this plain was once twice as large as it is today, since the Euphrates has changed its course, is proved by the wide swampy ground on the river’s right bank in this vicinity. Of the canals on the left bank the most important were those of Hāni and Mari. In the latter name there was preserved into the Middle Ages the name of the town to which the surrounding country once belonged. This town of Mari may be located between the left bank of the Mari canal and al-Balīḥ. Since an important trade route led along the latter from upper Mesopotamia to the Euphrates and at Mari crossed another route following the left bank of the Euphrates, the inhabitants of Mari, supported by the fertile territory under their control, might easily have dominated the trade caravans as well as other less prosperous settlements along the Euphrates. It is no wonder, therefore, that as early as the close of the third millenium B.C. the town of Mari controlled the upper half of the middle Euphrates just as Ḥāna (perhaps ‘Āna) dominated the lower half (Herzfeld, Ḥāna et Mari [1914], p. 196). On the site of the ancient Mari or beside it at the outlet of al-Balīḥ into the Euphrates the famous town of Nicephorium was situated (Isidore of Charax, op. cit., p. 247).

Appian, Historia syriaea, 57, relates that Seleucus Nicator (301—281 B.C.) founded many towns in Syria, to which he gave Greek or Macedonian names, among others Nicephorium in Mesopotamia. — That at this important place a settlement had existed before is certain. It was called Mari (Unger, Reliefsstele Adadmiraris [1916], pl. 2, l. 23, p. 10); this name persisted in that of the Mari canal (Michael the Syrian, Chronicon [Chabot], Vol. 4, p. 457; al-Belāḏori, Futāḥ [De Goeje], p. 180). That the Greeks preferred to alter the native appellations was already known to Posidonius (Strabo, op. cit., XVI, 4:27), but Ammianus Marcellinus (op. cit., XIV, 8:6) found in his sources a note that Seleucus Nicator and his successors, although arbitrarily changing the names of many localities, had not eradicad the original names, the use of which was continued.

Isidore of Charax, loc. cit., ascribes the foundation of Nicephorium to Alexander the Great, as does Pliny, who writes (Naturalis historia, VI, 119) that near the Euphrates lies Nicephorium built by Alexander after he had recognized the importance of the site. — We possess no absolute proof that Alexander ever came as far as the mouth of the river Balichus and cannot, therefore, judge whether it was he who had the town of Nicephorium built. A like tradition arose in regard to other towns along the Euphrates, which all claimed to have been founded by Alexander, although we know without doubt that such was not the case.

At the outlet of the Balichus into the Euphrates, thus near the point where Nicephorium stood, Callinicus (Kallinikos) rose (Ammianus Marcellinus, op. cit., XXIII, 3:7).

Chronicon paschale (Migne), col. 429, and Michael the Syrian, Chronicle (Chabot), Vol. 4, p. 78, ascribe the founding of this town to Seleucus II Callinicus (247—226 B.C.) in either 244 or 242 B.C.
Libanius, Epistolae, I, 20 (ad Aristaeenetum), says that the town of Callinicus on the Euphrates was named after the rhetorician Callinicus, who resided there. — This rhetorician, a native of Petra, lived in the reign of Gallienus, about 269 A.D. It is very doubtful whether the Christians, of whom there was a great number in the town as early as the third century and who were in complete control of it in the fourth, would have accepted and kept for the town the new name given it after a pagan rhetorician. It seems that at the outlet of the river Balichus into the Euphrates there existed from time immemorial two settlements. One, rebuilt by Seleucus Nicator, received the name Nicephorium; the second, restored by Seleucus II (Callinicus) received the name Callinicus. For many centuries Nicephorium was more important than Callinicus, but later the relation was reversed in favor of the second town, which began to prosper exceedingly. Finally, in the third century of our era, Nicephorium perished as a town, remaining merely as a suburb of Callinicus. This statement is confirmed by the Arabic writers, especially the poets of the era before the Abbasides, who mention two towns of the name ar-Raḳḳatān, calling one the “black,” or “burnt,” the other the “white” ar-Raḳḳa. The white town of ar-Raḳḳa they call also by the old name Callinicus, from which I conclude that the “black” or “burnt” town was the ancient Nicephorium.

Droysen, Geschichte (1878), Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 310, locates Callinicus in the Heraḳla ruin, but Heraḳla was a manor built by the Calif Harun ar-Rashid for a highborn Byzantine beauty, whom he made captive (Jāḳūt, Muǧam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 4, p. 962; aṭ-Ṭabari, Ta'rīḥ [De Goeje], Ser. 3, p. 710).

Crassus in 54 B.C. easily possessed himself of towns with inhabitants largely Greek, as was the case with Nicephorium (Cassius Dio, Historiae, XL, 13).

Florus, Epitoma, III, 11, relates that when Crassus camped at Nicephorium he was visited there by the envoys of Orodos.

According to Strabo, op. cit., XVI, 1:23, in the fairly productive country between Zeugma in Commagene and the ancient Zeugma near Thapsacus there lived a people called by the Macedonians Mygdones. In their territory were the towns of Nisibis, Tigranocerta, Carrhae, Nicephorium, etc.

Pliny, op. cit., V, 86, likewise knew of a town of Nicephorium in the Mesopotamian prefecture.

According to Ptolemy, Geography, V, 17:5, Nicephorium lay on the Euphrates in Mesopotamia.

Eutropius, Breviarium, IX, 24, and Theophanes, Chronographia (Migne), col. 69, both record that Galerius Maximianus in 297 was totally defeated between the towns of Callinicus and Carrhae.

Libanius, op. cit., I, 20, records that the garrison of Callinicus could not support itself and had to be supplied by the prefect of the province of the Euphrates.

In 363 Ammianus Marcellinus visited Callinicus and writes in regard to it (op. cit., XXIII, 3:7) that it is a huge fort and important as a commercial center.

Uranius, Fragmenta (Müller), p. 529, mentions the old name Nicephorium with the further remark that the town is also called Constantina and lies near Edessa.
In 393 the Jewish synagogue in Castrum Callinicum was set on fire by the Christians. The Emperor Theodosius ordered the bishop of that town to have the synagogue rebuilt. In response to this Bishop Ambrose of Milan wrote to the emperor complaining that the Jews had burned many basilicas without paying for their rebuilding (Ambrose, Epistola ad Theodosium [Migne], cols. 1105 ff.).

The Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.) was attended and the letter of the bishops of the province of Osroène to the Emperor Leo was signed by Damianus, bishop of Callinicus (Mansi, Concilia [1759—1798], Vol. 6, col. 571; Vol. 7, col. 553).

In 465—466 the Emperor Leo rebuilt in the province of Osroène the town of Callinicus, called it Leontopolis, and installed a bishop there (Barhebraeus, Chron. syriacum [Bedjan], p. 77; Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1719—1728], Vol. 1, pp. 258, 406; Edessenische Chronik [Hallier], p. 152).

Toward the end of 503 the Persian king Kawadh I (496—531) was returning along the Euphrates from the territory of the town of Sarūg. Reaching Callinicus he ordered one of his commanders to attack the town. The officer did as he was bidden, but was surprised by the Roman general Timostrates and made prisoner. Kawadh then threatened to besiege and completely destroy Callinicus if Timostrates did not surrender the captive. This Timostrates did. (Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle [Martin], LXV; Assemanus, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 276.)

At the beginning of the sixth century mention is made of the monasteries of Mar Zakaj and Kadar or 'Amūd near Callinicus (Vitae virorum apud monophysitas celeberrimorum [Brooks], p. 38; Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 414 ff.).

In 529 an order was issued by Justinian that henceforth all trading between the Byzantines and Persians was to be done only in the frontier towns of Nisibin, Callinicus, and Artaxata, to prevent the Byzantine merchants from spying in the Persian empire and the Persian merchants from doing the same in the Roman empire (Codex Justinianus, IV, 63 : 4; Krueger), p. 188). — It is interesting to note that Justinian does not recognize the name Leontopolis given to Callinicus by his predecessor.

Theodosius, De situ Terrae Sanctae (Geyer), p. 150, counts it sixty miles from Calonico (Callinicus) to Constantina and from there to Edessa as eighty miles. In the latter town lived King Abgar, who wrote to Jesus Christ.

Hierocles (about 535) mentions among the towns of the Osroène eparchy Leontopolis or Kallinike (Synodenum [Burekhardt], p. 39).

Procopius, De bello persico, II, 21, relates that in 542 Chosroes got possession of Callinicus with great ease. As the ramparts were quite dilapidated in some places, Justinian had ordered them to be rebuilt (idem, De aedificiis, II, 7). This was to be done by tearing them down section by section and rebuilding them at once. Chosroes, unable to get possession of Sergiopolis, had a boat bridge thrown over the Euphrates, approached Callinicus, and entered the town at a place where the wall had just been torn down. The soldiers and wealthier residents sought refuge elsewhere, but the town itself was crowded with peasants from the surrounding country. These were captured and the town demolished; but, soon after;
it was again fortified by Justinian (James of Edessa, Chronological Canon [Brooks], p. 300; Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 287).

The learned Bishop Cyriac of Amid (578–623) hailed from the monastery Mar Zakkaj at Callinicus (ibid., p. 399).

In the synod held in the monastery of Mar Ḥananja, situated in the desert between Barbalissus and Callinicus, the young priest Peter, son of Paul of Callinicus, was elected patriarch of Antioch (ibid., pp. 370, 379; Barhebraeus, Chron. ecle. [Abbeloos and Lamy], Vol. 1, col. 250; John of Ephesus, Ecclesiastical History, IV, 22).

After ascending the throne, the Emperor Justin II sent the patrician John from Callinicus with presents to Chosroes. On his return a synod was held in the monastery of Mar Zakkaį. At this period mention is made of Mar Cyrus in Callinicus. (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 331, 334.)

At the beginning of the seventh century (602 A. D.) Georgius Cyrius (Descriptio [Gelzer], p. 45) uses in the list of the towns of the eparchy of Osrœne the older name Callinicus but adds that it is also called Leontopolis.

Denha (History of Marúthā [Nau], p. 70) mentions shortly before 629 the monastery of Mar Zakkaį at Callinicus.

In 639 the Moslems got possession of Callinicus or, as it was also called by the Syriac authors, ar-Raḵḵa. A detachment sent by their leader, ʿEjād, against ar-Raḵḵa attacked the farms and settlements of the Arabs and the peasants in the vicinity and drove them for refuge into the town. When ʿEjād approached with the main army, he encamped before the ar-Ruḥa gate. After five or six days the patrician governing the town asked for peace. ʿEjād guaranteed the inhabitants their lives, property, and good order in the town, and became its lord. (Elījah of Nisibis, Opus chronologicum [Brooks], p. 133; al-Belâdorī, Futāh [De Goeje], pp. 172 ff., 175.)

On his expedition against Moawiyah in 656–657 ʿAli marched from an-Nuḥeja to al-Madāʾīn and from there farther to ar-Raḵḵa. There he ordered the inhabitants to build him a bridge of boats, so that he could pass over the Euphrates to Syria. The inhabitants complying, he crossed with his infantry and the whole train. (At-Ṭabarī, Taʿrīḥ [De Goeje], Ser. I, p. 3259; Ibn Miskawajh, Taḡārīb [Caetani], p. 571.) — An-Nuṭeja is identical with the modern Ḥān eben Ṣhejle, sixty kilometers north-north-west of al-Kūfa. al-Madāʾīn is the Arabic designation for Ctesiphon and the neighboring towns, former suburbs of Seleucia.

Ar-Ruḵajjāt, Diwān (Rhodokanakis), p. 222, mentions that about the year 690 the two settlements of ar-Raḵḵa and al-Ḵalas were deserted, as if they had no inhabitants. Even the monastery near al-Ballīh was empty and its high walls stood up like a memorial of an extinct people. In another place (p. 285) he says that, during his journey from the southwest or south, the ridge of al-Bišr gradually appeared to him and finally ar-Raḵḵa as-Sawdaʿ.

That many settlements around ar-Raḵḵa were deserted and that owing to this many people had to leave the two towns of ar-Raḵḵa, we learn also from other Arabic sources, but that there should not have been any inhabitants at all is surely poetical exaggeration. Al-Ḵalas is probably the poetically distorted name of Callinicus. The monastery standing near
al-Balîh is undoubtedly identical with the monastery of Estûna or al-
'Amûd (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 414), but even this was
not deserted at that time. Rhodokanakis (loc. cit., note 3) puts Dejr al-
Qâsîlî (katholikos) on the Tigris, which is absolutely impossible; al-Bîsîr
is the present ridge of al-Bišri; ar-Raḳḳa as-Sawda’, or Black Raḳḳa,
was one of the two former towns, perhaps Nicephorium. The second town
was called ar-Raḳḳa al-Bêda’, White Raḳḳa, and is mentioned by the poet
al-Aḥṭal, Diwân (Salhâmi), p. 304, who describes the glistening of its spires.

The caliph Hišâm, to whom the vicinity of ar-Raḳḳa fell as a fief,
had the Hanî and Mari canals dredged in the beginning of the eighth
century, several settlements founded along their banks, and a bridge built
across the Euphrates (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 457; Pseudo-
Dionysius of Tell Maḥre’, Chronicle [Chabot], pp. 26, 31; Barhebraeus,
Chron. syriacum [Bedjan], p. 156).

In the time of Merwân II (744–750) mention is made of John, bishop
of Callinicus, who in 760 was elected patriarch (Michael the Syrian, op. cit.,
p. 468; Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Maḥre’, op. cit., p. 70; Barhebraeus,
Chron. eccles. [Abbeleos and Lamy], Vol. 1, cols. 321, 323; Elijah of Nisi-
bis, op. cit., p. 176).

In 772 the caliph al-Mansûr built the town of ar-Râfiqâ near
Callinicus. Harun ar-Râshid had it encircled with another wall (Michael
the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 476, 483; Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Maḥre’,

In 793 Cyriac, a monk from the monastery of Bezûnâ, or Estûna,
(‘Amûd) at Callinicus, was elected patriarch (Barhebraeus, Chron. eccel.
[Abbeleos and Lamy], Vol. 1, col. 329).

Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, col. 205, mentions in 872 a church of
St. Thomas belonging to the Tekrît townspeople at ar-Raḳḳa. In 873 the
patriarch John was buried in the monastery of Mar Zakkâj, where he
had formerly been a monk (ibid., Vol. 1, cols. 385, 387).

Ibn al-Fâkîh, Buldân (De Goeje), p. 132, writes that ar-Raḳḳa lies
in the center of the territory belonging to the Muḍar tribe. Ar-Raḳḳa
is said to have been completely rebuilt by the caliph al-Mansûr (754–775)
and then garrisoned as well as settled by people from Khorasan.

Ibn Serapion, 'Aḡā'îb (Le Strange), p. 12, says that the river al-Balîh
flows by ar-Raḳḳa and empties into the Euphrates below that part of
the town called ar-Raḳḳa as-Sawda’.

Al-Iṣṭaṭhûri, Masâlik (De Goeje), pp. 75 f., records that ar-Raḳḳa is
the largest of the towns in the territory of the Muḍar tribe. Ar-Raḳḳa
and ar-Râfiqâ are two towns connected with each other. Each has a mesjâd
gâme’ (cathedral mosque). They are situated on the left bank of the Eu-
phrates and contain many trees and much water. There is a spot shown in
ar-Raḳḳa where ‘Ali laid down some baggage when marching on Sîfîn.

Besides ar-Raḳḳa, the center of the Muḍar tribal lands, al-Muṣkaddâsi,
Aḥsan (De Goeje), pp. 137, 141, also mentions the burnt towns ar-Raḳḳa
(ar-Râfiqâ), Ḥanûkât al-Ḥarîsh, and Tell Meḥrâ’. Ar-Raḳḳa is a huge fort
with two gates and numerous ancient memorials. There are fine market
places there; among its products are soap and olive oil; it is also known
for its salubrious atmosphere, gardens, and settlements. Among the build-
ings he names a gâme’ and even bathhouses. But soon the town was
surrounded by the nomads, and the roads leading to it became difficult
to pass. Ar-Rakṣa al-Muḥṭarihқa, or “Burnt Rakṣa,” situated not far off, was deserted by its inhabitants and demolished. Ar-Rāfī qa is a suburb of ar-Rakṣa. Near by there is a shrine fastened to a column.

Aṣ-Ṣābušt, Dījārāt (Codex berolinensis), fol. 95v., writes that the monastery of Zakkaj is situated in ar-Rakṣa on the Euphrates close to the river al-Balḥi, which flows around it on two sides. Being one of the most pleasant monasteries, it was a favorite stopping place of royalty, who found there all they longed for: fine lodgings, a beautiful location, pure air, and, close by, gazelles, hares, and other game, as well as various birds, even ḥabāri (a kind of bustard); and in the Euphrates fish could be caught with nets.

In February, 1135, the Atabeg Zenki went from ar-Rakṣa by way of al-‘Obejdiyye to Ḥama’ (Kemâladdin, Taʿrīḫ [De Meynard], p. 669).

Jaḵūt, Muʿūṣan (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 994, knew of the canals of al-Hani and al-Mari at ar-Rakṣa and ar-Rāfī qa. They were dredged by the order of Hišām ibn ‘Abdalmalek, who also founded several settlements on their banks. Later they became the property of the rulers of the Abbasside family and were restored by Umm Gaʿfar. The poet Ġarīr likewise mentions the al-Hani canal dug by Hišām.

About 1177 John Denha was bishop in Callinicus (Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 1, col. 565).

Ad-Dimihši, Nuḥba (Mehren), p. 191, states that ar-Rakṣa is the principal center of the Muḍar territory. Ar-Rakṣa al-Biḏa is supposed to be a Roman town of great antiquity. The caliph al-Manṣūr in 772 built a new town beside it and called it ar-Rāfī qa. The first town (i. e. ar-Rakṣa al-Biḏa) is said to have been demolished, but its name persisted and is still used in connection with the town of ar-Rāfī qa. The al-Hani and al-Mari canals flow by the town and on their banks are settlements. This vicinity is considered as among the most beautiful parts of the world. The town of Ḥarrān became the capital of the Muḍar territory.

Abu-l-Fed’a, Taḵwim (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 277, relates that in his time (in the beginning of the fourteenth century) ar-Rakṣa was demolished and entirely deserted.

Evījaʿ Cēlēbi, Taʿrīḥ (Von Hammer’s transl.), Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 95, mentions the sanjaks of Ġemāsa, Ḥārpud, Dejr Raḥba, Beni Raḥ’a, Sarūq, Ḥarrān, Raḵqa, and Ruha (or ‘Orfa) where the pasha resides.

**APPENDIX XII**

**BIRTHA, ZENOBIA, AND ḤALEBIJJE**

In Ḥalebijje I locate the town of Dūr Karpati, or Nibarti Aṣur, built in 877 B.C. by the orders of Asurnazirpal III (Annals [Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions (1861—1884), Vol. 1, pl. 24], col. 3, ll. 49 f.; Budge and King, Annals [1902], pp. 360 f.; see above, p. 208).

Ḥalebijje was subsequently called Zenobia and still later az-Zabba’a.

Procopius, De aedificiis, II, 8: 4-8, writes that between the border province of Commagene, as the province of Euphratesia was formerly
called, and the Persian empire extends a vast, desolate region containing nothing worth fighting for. The Persians and Romans both built on the borders of this desert fortresses of mud bricks, which were never attacked because they protected nothing that could incite the lust for spoil. In this desert the Emperor Diocletian had three fortresses built of mud bricks; of these three forts the Emperor Justinian restored the demolished fort of Mambri (var., Mabri) which lies scarcely five Roman miles from Zeno-
bia. — Mambri, or Mabri, is to be sought in the as-Šejh Mubařek ruin at the present station of at-Tibi, seven kilometers from Halebijje.

Procopius (De bello persico, II, 5: 4–5; idem, De aedificiis, II, 8: 8–25) records that the town of Zenobia is three full days’ march from Circesium. It was founded by and named after Zenobia, the wife of Ode-
nath, the king of the Saracens of that region, who were allied with the Romans. When in course of time the fortification fell into ruin, the inhab-
habitants left the town, thus enabling the Persians to enter the Roman territory at their will and long before the Romans could learn of it. This town Justinian then had rebuilt and peopled, and a strong garrison with a com-
mander was placed there. Not merely the old town but the surrounding hillocks as well were fortified to prevent the inhabitants from being shot at from the higher summits. The Euphrates flows between high crags close by the town. When in flood the river reaches as far as the town walls and undermines them. For that reason Justinian had this part of the rampart built of large stone blocks and he strengthened it in addition with a protective dam of huge basalt boulders, so that the water could not reach the blocks. On the north the town was extended, the high hill to the west fortified, and a church, baths, and arcades built. — The distance from Karkişija to Halebijje is one hundred kilometers; Procopius therefore reckons thirty-three kilometers to one march.

According to the Liber chalipharium (Land), p. 16, in 609–610 A.D. the Persians occupied the towns of Edessa, Harrân, Callinicus, and Circe-
sium, as well as all the other towns east of the Euphrates, which thus formed a boundary line. On August 6, 610, Šahrvaraz crossed the river and took the town of Zenobia on the western bank of the Euphrates.

Ibn Kotebja, Ma’ārif (Wüstenfeld), p. 317, relates that it was (the legendary) Ġadima’s intention to marry az-Zabba’, a daughter of the king of Mesopotamia, who had become queen after her husband had died. When she gave him her consent, Ġadima went to her but was murdered by her. To revenge him az-Zabba’ was killed by his friends and her town occupied and plundered.

Al-Ja’kūbi, Tabih (Houtsmal), Vol. 1, p. 238, relates that Ġadima’s avengers made use of a stratagem in order to get into the town of Queen az-Zabba’. They loaded two thousand cases with four thousand warriors, carried them into her town, opened the cases in the inns there, attacked the queen at night, and killed her.

Jākūţ, Mu’tam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 912, and Abu-i-Fadā’il, Marâṣid (Juynboll), Vol. 1, p. 504, write that az-Zabba’ is a town on the bank of the Euphrates, so called after az-Zabba’, Ġadima’s sweetheart. Towards the end of the twelfth century the old town of az-Zabba’ was demolished, but a large number of beautiful memorials remained to excite admiration. —

Southeast of Halebijje at the point where the canal of al-Maṣrān issues from the Euphrates extend the Zelebijje ruins. Their location is
of great significance. Lying on the western border of a long flood plain which supplied all its needs, Zelebijje dominated both the land and water routes of the region. For this reason the natives as early as the beginning of the first millennium before Christ had their own fort there, which King Asurnazirpal during his expedition in 877 B.C. (Annals [Rawlinson, op. cit., Vol. 1, pl. 24], col. 3, ll. 27—50; Budge and King, op. cit., pp. 353—361) gave orders to strengthen, calling it Kûr-Asûrnâsirpal. We may assume that the natives called their administrative center, Birtu (Fort) and that the official name Kûr-Asûrnâsirpal had disappeared, but that the native name Birtu as applied to the principal fort of the district had persisted (Forrer, Provinzeinteilung, p. 105).

We learn from Isidore of Charax, Mansiones parthicae (Müller), p. 247, that on the site of the present Zelebijje there was once a royal station with a temple of Artemis and that King Darius had a royal palace and Semiramis an irrigation canal built there. To make the water flow from the river into the canal, the Euphrates was narrowed by a dam constructed of stone. In the autumn, when there was little water in the river, many boats were wrecked on this dam. — King Darius probably had his royal palace built in the center of the administrative district, and this center was Birta, the Assyrian Birtu.

In the reign of the Seleucids the Macedonians founded a number of settlements on the left bank of the middle Euphrates. Later authors call the town of Birta also by the name Macedonopolis, which leads us to think that Macedonians also settled at Birta; of such a settlement the temple of Artemis may be a memorial. With the natives the new official name evidently never became popular and disappeared with the extinction of the Seleucid reign; nor did it reappear until the Christian era, when the Church brought a revival in the use of the Greek language on the middle Euphrates. That explains why Isidore of Charax does not mention the name of the royal station where the temple of Artemis was located.

Ptolemy, Geography, V, 19: 3, records a settlement of Birta but places it on the right bank of the Euphrates in Arabia Deserta southeast of the influx of the river Aborras (al-Ihâbûr), thus in the ancient political district of Hîndânû. As the word Birta is a common designation for a fort, and several places in the territory tributary to the middle Euphrates and Tigris bore this name, Ptolemy may have meant some other fort.

The resolutions of the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. were signed by a certain Marcas of Macedonopolis as one of the bishops of the province of Mesopotamia. In the Syriac text his name reads Mara of Birta. (Gelzer, Patrum nicaenorum nonna [1898], pp. 22, 64, 102.) — At no point did the province of Mesopotamia reach the right bank of the Euphrates; we must, therefore, seek the bishopric of Birta, or Macedonopolis, on the left bank.


After this council, John, the local archimandrite, was expelled from Kefra Birta (ibid., p. 266).
The archimandrite Constantine of the Kefra Birtha monastery is mentioned in Documenta... monophysitarum (Chabot), pp. 103, 173, 181, 184. Bishop Sergius, from the fort Birtha situated on the left bank of the Euphrates, towards the end of the year 565 received a subvention from the emperor Anastasius (491—518) which enabled him to repair the fortification walls of his residence (Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle [Martin], xciii).

Hierocles, Synecdemus (Burckhardt), p. 39, and Georgius Cyprius, Descriptio (Gelzer), p. 45, name Birtha as one of the towns of the eparchy of Rosroines (Osroëne).

APPENDIX XIII

PHALIGA, CIRCESIUM, AND ḤARKISIJA'

The modern settlement of al-Basra is the ancient Circesium.

Michael the Syrian, Chronicle (Chabot), Vol. 4, p. 78, relates that the Syrian king Seleucus, called Callinicus, built two towns on the river Ḥabūr (or al-Ḥābūr). One he named Callinicus (Kallinicos) after himself, the second Carcis. (Barhebraeus, Chronicum syriacum [Bedjan], 38, writes Karkisin instead of Carcis.) —

Not one of the classical authors known to us mentions a town of Carcis built by Seleucus Callinicus (Seleucus II, 247—226 B.C.). But the Seleucids were great builders and it is therefore possible that they founded the Hellenic settlement of Carcis at the junction of al-Ḥābūr with the Euphrates, an important commercial point where there had probably been a native settlement before. The Hellenic name Carcis was later revived by Diocletian as Circesium.

Isidore of Charax, Mansiones parthicae (Müller), p. 248, refers to the settlement of Phaliga at the influx of the Chaboras into the Euphrates, and states that the name Phaliga means "halfway"; he also mentions a fortified little town of Nabagath adjoining Phaliga.

Arrian, Fragmenta, X (Müller, p. 588), where he describes the sailing of Trajan's fleet on the Euphrates, mentions a place called Phaliga (see Roos, Studia arriaea [1912], pp. 50 f.).

Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnika (Meineke), p. 656, says correctly in explanation that Phalga is a place situated halfway between Seleucia Pieria and Seleucia in Mesopotamia. — The distance from Phalga to Seleucia Pieria along the Euphrates is 840 kilometers and thence to Seleucia in Mesopotamia 850 kilometers. The name Phalga was probably given to the settlement by the commercial caravans, while its original name no doubt sounded entirely different. In my opinion Phalga is identical with the Hellenic settlement of Carcis, built for the merchants close to the native settlement of Nabagath. Even the present ruins appear to be divided into two unequal halves. In the southern half, or the present al-Basra, I locate the fortified settlement of Nabagath; in the northern, or the present al-Mitrās, the commercial center of Carcis or Phalga.
It must be of this commercial center of Phaliga that Pliny was thinking when he said (Nat. hist., V, 89) that very close to the Roman town of Sura lies the Parthian town of Philiscum, about ten days' sail from Seleucia and nearly as far from Babylon.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIII, 5: 2, relates that the Emperor Diocletian had the small, miserable Circesium (Cercesium) enclosed by high walls with towers in order to prevent the Persians from pillaging Syria as easily as they had done until a few years previously. — It follows from this that Diocletian did not build a new settlement, but only fortified the ancient Circesium (or Carces [Phaliga]), making of it a powerful frontier stronghold. The settlement of Nabagath was joined to the Hellenic settlement of Carces and the Hellenic designation revived.

In 363 A. D. the Emperor Julian, while marching against the Persians, reached Circesium, a Roman camp on the Assyrian border, enclosed by the rivers Abora (al-Habur) and Euphrates (Ammianus Marcellinus, op. cit., XXIII, 5: 2; Magnus Carthusius, Fragmenta [Müller], pp. 4 ff.; Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 13).

The resolutions of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 were signed among others by Abraham, bishop of Circesium (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle [Chabot], Vol. 4, p. 199; Harduin, Conciliorum collectio [Paris, 1715], Vol. 2, col. 473; Mansi, Concilia [1759—1798], Vol. 7, col. 432).

In 592 Persian Arabs suddenly appeared near the fort of Circesium on al-Habur, but the dux Timostrates from the town of Callinicus overtook and annihilated them (Joshua the Stylite, Chronicle [Martin], p. 58).

In the beginning of the sixth century one Nuna from Circesium is mentioned as bishop (Vitae virorum apud monophysitas celeberrimorum [Brooks], p. 61).

In 586 the declaration of the Eastern bishops against the Aephelians was signed by David, bishop of Circesium (Harduin, op. cit., Vol. 2, col. 1222).

During the reign of Justinian, al-Munadir, the king of the Persian Arabs, plundered the border districts along al-Habur and al-Balih and also got possession of the town of Homş (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 270 f.).

The Roman frontier fort of Circesium lay on the right bank of the river Aborras (al-Habur) where it flows into the Euphrates, and formed with its bastioned walls a triangle between these two rivers (Procopius, De bello persico, II, 5: 2—4).

Diocletian did not wall in the whole fort but had merely a rampart built outside the town from the Aborras to the Euphrates, strengthening it, in addition, with a tower overlooking each river. The sides adjoining the rivers were left without ramparts, the rivers forming, in his opinion, a sufficient protection in themselves. When the southern tower by the Aborras was undermined to such an extent as to be on the point of collapsing, at Justinian's order it was rebuilt of basalt. The two sides along the rivers were also provided with ramparts and the settlement raised to the rank of a town. It received a garrison commanded by a dux; furthermore, baths were built there. (Procopius, De aedificiis, II, 6: 2—12; Evagrius, Historia ecclesiastica, V, 9.)

In 580 a Roman army under the commander Maurice marched past the Roman town of Circesium. Its intention was to cross the remainder
of Arabia and then to surprise Babylonia. But the phylarch Alamundar (al-Mundir) is supposed to have informed the Persians, who destroyed the bridge across the Euphrates in the province of Bêt Aramâje', and simultaneously a Persian army led by Adormaan (var., Adharmahan) appeared before the town of Callinicus. To counteract this, Maurice had the supply boats on the Euphrates burned and, hastening with some chosen troops to the aid of the endangered town, compelled the Persians to retreat. (John of Ephesus, Ecclesiastical History, III, 40; VI, 15f.; Theophylactus Simocatta, Historiae, III, 17: 5—11; Evagrius, op. cit., V, 20.)

In 590 Chosroes II was fleeing before his stronger antagonist Warahân along the Euphrates between such forts tributary to the Persians as Pêrôz Sâbûr (al-Ambân), Hit, and 'Ana, in the direction of Circesium. When about ten miles from this front he sent messengers to its prefect Probus. After the third night watch they arrived before the gates and were at once admitted by the prefect; the next morning Chosroes himself entered the town with his women and suckling children. (Nöldke, Syrische Chronik [1893], pp. 5f.; Guidi, Un nuovo testo [1898], p. 7; Theophylactus Simocatta, Historiae, IV, 10: 4—11.)

Georgius Cyprius, Descriptio (Gelzer), p. 46, among the towns of the eparchy of Orôene mentions Kirkesia (Circesium) lying on the borders of the Byzantine and Persian empires.

In 637 the Moslems from the town of Hit arrived before Karkisija' (Circesium) and took this town by force (ašt-Tabari, Ta'rifkh [De Goeje], Ser. 1, p. 2479).

Al-Belâdori, Futâh (De Goeje), p. 176, records that the Moslems in 639—640 concluded peace with the inhabitants of Karkisija' on the same terms as with the town of ar-Râkka.

In 684 mention is made of John, bishop of Circesium or Ḥabûra (al-Ḥâbûr) (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle [Chabot], Vol. 4, pp. 438, 440). — The Syriac and Arabic authors therefore called the town not only Karkisija' but gave it a name derived from that of the river al-Ḥâbûr.

About 700 in the time of the Caliph 'Abdalmalek, Chief 'Umejr ibn al-Ḥubâb encamped with his warriors of the Kajis tribe by the river al-Balîh between Harrân and ar-Râkka, whence he made raids on the Kalb and al-Jemâniye tribes. Thence he transferred his camp to al-Ḥâbûr. The Ta'lef tribe camped at that time between the rivers al-Ḥâbûr, Euphrates, and Tigris. 'Umejr attacked the Ta'lef settlement at Mâkesîn by the river al-Ḥâbûr one day's march from Karkisija'. The warriors of the Ta'lef tribe in retaliation plundered the settlements of the Kajis tribe in the neighborhood of Karkisija'. (Abu-l-Faraq, Arâbîn [Bûlak, 1285 A.H.], Vol. 20, p. 127; Ibn al-Âṭîr, Kâmîl [Tornberg], Vol. 4, p. 254f.)


Ibn Serapion, 'Agâûb, (British Museum MS.), fols. 32 r. f., (Le Strange), p. 12, says that the rivers al-Ḥâbûr and al-Hermas merge in the desert into one single stream which flows past the various estates built north of Karkisija', where this stream empties into the Euphrates.

Ibn Hawkal, Masâlik (De Goeje), pp. 139f., 155, records that the nomads possessed themselves of numerous towns and settlements on the river al-Ḥâbûr. Whenever the Euphrates country has a powerful lord
the settlements there live in peace; but, once the power is taken away from such a lord, they soon perish under the predatory attacks of the nomads. The town of Karkisija' lying on al-Ḥābūr is blessed with numerous trees and gardens, where various kinds of vegetables are raised. The distance from there to the town of al-Ḥanūka is two days.

Al-İṣṭaḥrî, Masālik (De Goeje), p. 74, says that there are gardens and fields on al-Ḥābūr for a distance of twenty parasangs above its mouth at Karkisija'.

Al-İdrisi, Nuzha (Jaubert's transl.), Vol. 2, p. 145, records that al-Ḥābūr is a town on the Euphrates, not large but very pleasant. It is surrounded by trees and gardens with much fruit and vegetables.

In 1220, al-Malek al-Aṣraf had the son of ʾImādaddīn, the lord of the town of Karkisija', arrested and then took possession of the town of ʿĀna and other places belonging to him (Kemāladdīn, Taʾrib [Blochet's transl.], Rev. d'or. lat., Vol. 5, p. 63).

In 1260, a pontoon bridge was built at Karkisija' for the Mongols (Barhebraeus, Chron. syriacum [Bedjan], p. 554).

Abu-l-Fed'a, Tawkīm (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 281, writes that Karkisija' is a town which once belonged to Queen az-Zabba' and that there are various inhabited houses there.

Ad-Dimishki, Nuḥba (Mehren), p. 191, states that the river al-Ḥābūr rises at Rās al-ʿAin. Its length is seven parasangs and it is adjoined by the districts of ʾas-Ṣuwwar, Mākesin, Samsānijje, ʿArābān, Ṭābān, al-Maṭdal, and ʾSaʾa', as well as by the capital Karkisija'; the latter, however, had already been demolished before ad-Dimishki's time (the beginning of the fourteenth century).

Ḥaggi Ḥalfa, Gihān numa' (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 444, states that the town of Karkisija' lay in the territory of the Muḍar tribe on the right bank of al-Ḥābūr at its outlet into the Euphrates. Ġarır ibn ʾAbdallāh al-Beğeli died there.

A P P E N D I X XIV

ZAITHA, DURA, AND SAOCORAS

Al-Merwānijje was the station of Zaitha, the burial place of the Emperor Gordian.

Eutropius, Breviarium, IX, 2, relates that Gordian was murdered not far from the Roman borders at the instigation of Philip, who became emperor after him. At the twentieth milestone from Circesium the soldiers erected a mausoleum in his honor, but his body they brought to Rome.

Julius Capitolinus, Gordiani tres, 34, adds to this that the soldiers built the mausoleum to Gordian at Circesium (var., Circesium) on the Persian border and carved on it Greek, Latin, Persian, Jewish, and Egyptian inscriptions. This mausoleum is said to have been destroyed later by Licinius.

In the first half of the fourth century of our era the hermit Benjamin lived in the deserted town of Dūra', after which the whole surrounding
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desert is named. The Angel of God (the Lord’s messenger) ordered him to go from there to the ridge of Singār, situated to the east. (Hoffmann, *Auszügen* [1880], pp. 28 f.) — The town of Dūrā’ is aṣ-Ṣāḥihije and aṣ-Ṣāḥibī of today.

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae Romanae*, XXIII, 5: 4—8; XXIV, 1: 5, records that in the year 363 A.D. from Aborā (al-Ḥābir) the Roman army reached a place called Zaitha — this name meaning “Olive Tree” — where stood a monument to the Emperor Gordian, visible from afar. After paying honor to his predecessor, Julian hastened toward the deserted town of Dura. On the way his soldiers captured a large lion. Dura lies two marches from Circesium (Circensium) on the river bank. In the vicinity several herds of deer were grazing.

Zosimus, *Historia nova*, III, 14, writes that Julian’s army after a march of sixty stades (from Circesium) reached the station of Zatha and from there came to the former town of Dura, where a mausoleum was erected to Gordian.

Neither the distance from the settlement of Zaitha to Circesium nor the record of the location of Gordian’s sepulchral mound, which was not at Dura but at Zaitha, has been correctly preserved by Zosimus. Zosimus is the first who brings the colony of Zaitha into connection with the town of Dura and who ascribes to the latter events which really happened in the former. The settlement of Zaitha lay in the district of Dura, so called after the old town of Dura, or Nicanoropolis, built by the Macedonians, to which the Greeks gave the name of Europus (Isidore of Charax, op. cit., p. 247).

At-Ṭabarī, *Ta’riḵ* (De Goeje), Ser. 2, p. 1735, relates that Hišām received in fief a desolated district called Dawrīn. — This Dawrīn district is identical with the desert or district of Dūra’.

Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Mahre’, *Chronicle* (Chabot), p. 26, states that in 717—718 A.D. Hišām had irrigation canals dug, various towns, forts, and many settlements restored, and also gardens planted, all in the district of Zejtūn. — The “district of Zejtūn,” called after the Zaitha colony, is merely another name of the desert of Dawrīn or Dūrā’.

Al-Belāḏori, *Futūh* (De Goeje), p. 180, records that Hišām son of ʿAbdalmalek originally resided at az-Zejṭûn, had the canals of al-Hani and al-Mari dug, planted the estates of al-Hani and al-Mari, and restored a part of the town of ar-Raḵkā. — According to this account, Hišām resided at az-Zejṭûn (Olive Tree), the old Roman colony of Zaitha, in his fief of Dawrīn or Zejtūn. When he became caliph and built himself a splendid residence in ar-Reṣāfa, he ordered the al-Hani and al-Mari canals to be dug near ar-Raḵkā, which was not far from his residence; these canals irrigated the environs of ar-Raḵkā on the right bank of al-Balih.

Hišām received the news that he had become caliph in 724—725 in a modest house at az-Zejṭûn (At-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 2, pp. 1467 f.) — that is, in the settlement of Zaitha.

In 744—745 (ibid., Ser. 2, pp. 1895, 1907, 1908 f., 1913) the Caliph Merwān sent his lieutenant, Ibn Hubajra, with twenty thousand auxiliary troops to march towards Irak, but with orders to encamp at Dawrīn and there to wait for him. After this, Merwān marched from ar-Reṣāfa by way of ar-Raḵkā in the direction of Karkiṣija; repeating his order to Ibn
HAEBJRA to remain in his camp near DAWRIN. Another account makes Ibn HAEBJRA encamp by the canal of SA'ID ibn 'Abdalmalek.—Both these reports, although seemingly at variance, are in reality in agreement and confirm us in the following explanation of the circumstances. MERWÂN must have marched from AR-REȘÂFA by way of AR-RAQQA towards KARKISIJA, following his lieutenant, Ibn HAEBJRA. Accordingly the camp of the latter should be located southwest of KARKISIJA, where the district of DAWRIN extends between the left bank of the lower al-HÂBUR and the EUPHRATES. The Nahr SA'ID— that is, the canal named after SA'ID, the son of 'Abdalmalek—branched off from the Euphrates about thirteen kilometers northwest of KARKISIJA to irrigate the flood plain along the right bank of the river as far down as the southern end of the district of DAWRIN. The army led by Ibn HAEBJRA camped without doubt on both banks southwest of KARKISIJA, therefore partly in DAWRIN and partly in the district of Nahr SA'ID.

Ibn ḇOREDâbheh, MUSÂLÎK (De Goeje), p. 74, names az-ZEJÎĪNE among the more important administrative districts of that period. — This az-ZEJÎÎNE evidently indicated the vicinity of the ancient settlement of ZAITHA and consequently the whole district of DAWRIN. Moreover, as HIŞÂM, a member of MERWÂN's family, after receiving in fief the district of az-ZEJÎÎNE (or DAWRIN), restored the neglected canals and thus caused the agricultural areas as well as the towns and settlements there to flourish anew, it is not surprising that the memory of the BANI MERWÂN, their former lords, was kept green among the people and that the residence of these lords, the settlement of ZAITHA, was called al-MERWÂNIJJE in their honor.

The Caliph MERWÂN II (744—750 A.D.) issued an order to demolish HIŞÂM's estates on the Euphrates and at other points; but HIŞÂM's protégés, withdrawing into his fort on the Euphrates opposite AR-RAHBA, defied MERWÂN from there in an insulting manner. Hastily collecting some troops, MERWÂN marched on their stronghold, captured it, and had four hundred of them executed (Agapius, 'UNWÂN [Vasiliev], Patrol. or., Vol. 8, pp. 517 f.). — We shall not be far wrong in locating HIŞÂM's fort in the Roman camp of ZAITHA, the az-ZEJÎÎNE of HIŞÂM, al-MERWÂNIJJE of today. AR-RAHBA, the present al-MIJÂDIN, lies about twenty kilometers to the northwest on the right bank of the Euphrates.

According to al-'IMÂD (ABU ŚÂMA, RAWDATEJN [Cairo, 1277—1278 A. H.], Vol. 2, p. 32), Saladin in the latter part of 1182 took RAS 'Ajn, DAWRIN, MÂKESIN, aš-SAMSÂNIJJE, al-FUDEJN, al-MÂQDAL, and al-HUŞEJN—all situated on the river al-HÂBUR, which he crossed beyond the KÂFÂRAT at-ΤUNEJÎR on the road to NAŚIÎBÎN. — The place names are not given in their geographical order. Ad-DAWRIN probably stands for the whole district, yet it is not unlikely that al-'IMÂD thus called the settlement of AS-SUKÎR, at which the DAWRIN canal branches off from the river al-HÂBUR.

The DAWRIN canal issues from al-HÂBUR below the settlement of AS-SÎCÎR, the ancient as-SUKÎR. According to IBN SERAPION, 'AGHÂIB, (British Museum MS), fol. 32 r. f., (Le Strange), p. 12, the river al-HÂBUR joins the river al-HERMÂS in the desert, forming one single stream which flows along the farms north of KARKISIJA and at this town empties into the Euphrates. From al-HERMÂS the river al-ΤÂRTÂR again branches off at a point near SUKEJR al-'ABBÂS, runs through the desert, and flows into
the Tigris below Tekrit. — Ibn Serapion gives us a solution of the riddle of the river Saocoras; this river, according to Ptolemy, *Geography*, V, 18: 3, rises east of the Chaboras (al-Hābūr) and empties southeast of it into the Euphrates. The upper course of Ptolemy’s Saocoras is identical with al-Hermās of the Arabic writers, which, coming from the northeast, joins al-Hābūr proper. The latter rises to the northwest. At the settlement of as-Sukejr fifteen kilometers north of Қarkisija’ the Dawrīn canal issues from the united al-Hābūr and al-Hermās, and flows 112 kilometers southeast to where it empties into the Euphrates. Ptolemy evidently believed that this canal was the lower course of the Saocoras, deriving the name from the settlement of Sukejr, where the canal leaves al-Hābūr. He recorded correctly the upper and lower courses of his Saocoras, but failed to state that in its central part it formed with al-Hābūr one single stream. The Arabic geographers, to whom Ptolemy was a source of much information, understood well enough that his Saocoras at its origin was identical with al-Hermās, but, knowing also that it did not flow into the Euphrates independently, they connected its middle and lower course with mysterious river at-Tartār.

APPENDIX XV

THE THAPSSACUS OF PTOLEMY AND AR-RAHBA OF THE ARABS

Al-Miṣāḏīn I regard as the ford of Thapsacus placed by Ptolemy, *Geography*, V, 19: 3, on the right bank of the Euphrates below the mouth of the river Chaboras (al-Hābūr) (see my *Arabia Deserta*, pp. 502 f.). This is confirmed by the Moslem tradition that in the time before Islam this town was called Furdat Nu’m. At-Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh* (De Goeje), Ser. 1, p. 917, says that Furdat Nu’m is Rahbat Mālek ibn Towk.


The name Thapsacus (Ford) has the same meaning as the Arabic al-Furda. Al-Furda was the first Roman settlement (going up the Euphrates) while al-Kājem was the first Persian frontier fort (going down the Euphrates) (at-Ṭabarī, *op. cit.*, Ser. 1, p. 769; Abū-l-Faraqī, *Arānī* [Būlāk, 1285 A.H.], Vol. 5, pp. 123 f.; al-Bekri, *Muğān* [Wüstenfeld], p. 359; Abū-l-Fadāʾīl, *Marāǧīd* [Juyyboll], Vol. 1, p. 437). — The Persian fort of al-Kājem is identical with the present station of al-Kājem, 106 kilometers east-southeast of al-Miṣāḏīn, the Roman Thapsacus and early Moslem ar-Rahba.

Al-Belādori, *Futūḥ* (De Goeje), p. 180, relates that there were no remains of old buildings on the spot where, in the reign of the Caliph
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al-Maʿmūn (813–833 A.D.), Mālek ibn Ḥwak ibnʾ Attāb at-Ṭarlebi built and restored the town of ar-Raḥba.

Ibn al-ʻAtīr, Kāmil (Tornberg), Vol. 7, p. 188, also says that Mālek ibn Ḥwak at-Ṭarlebi built the town of ar-Raḥba. The latter died in 873–874 A.D.

His son ʻAḥmad succeeded him as the lord of the town, but in 883 was driven out by Ibn ʻAbī as-Sāḵ, to whose share fell al-ʻAnbār, Ṭārik al-Furāt, and Raḥba Ṭowḵ (at-Ṭabarai, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 2039).

On March 3, 928 A.D., the town of ar-Raḥba was attacked by the Carmathians, who, besides looting it, carried away with them from the town and the vicinity about five thousand captives (Ibn Miskawajh, Taǧāriḥ [Amedroz], Vol. 1, pp. 182 ff.; Ṭārikī, Sīla [De Goeje], p. 134; al-Masʿūdī, Taubbīḥ [De Goeje], pp. 384 ff.; Ibn al-ʻAtīr, op. cit., Vol. 8, p. 132).

The following years were filled with continual fights for the government of the town, which suffered greatly in consequence. In 938–939 soldiers, sent by Baḡḵam of Bagdad, reached ar-Raḥba in five days, arrested the unreliable governor, and brought him on a camel to Bagdad (Ibn al-ʻAtīr, op. cit., Vol. 8, pp. 266 ff.).

In 941–942 Baḡḵam’s courtier, ʻAdel, obtained possession of ar Raḥba and of the whole district of Ṭārik al-Furāt, as well as of a part of al-Ḥabbūr (ibid., p. 295).

In 947–948 Ḡamān, a member of the Ṭarleb tribe and an untrustworthy lieutenant of Nāṣeraddowle, became the lord of ar-Raḥba. Ḡamān rebelled against his chief and laid siege to the town of ar-Raḵša, but was repulsed. The inhabitants of ar-Raḥba then fell upon his followers and killed many of them in revenge for their cruel administration. For this Ḡamān made the inhabitants suffer greatly when he returned; but he was soon afterwards expelled by one of Nāṣeraddowle’s courtiers and on his flight was drowned in the Euphrates. (Ibid., pp. 357 ff.)

The sons of Nāṣeraddowle begrudged each other the inheritance from their father and from quarrelling came to blows about it. Ar-Raḥba fell to the share of Nāṣeraddowle’s son, Hamdān, but in the spring of 969 the latter was driven out and fled to Irak. Being reconciled with his brothers, he returned to ar-Raḥba in the spring of 970, but not long afterwards was compelled to yield his position to his brother Abu-l-Barakāt and seek refuge in the desert near Tadmur. Yet no sooner had Abu-l-Barakāt marched off to ar-Raḵša, than Hamdān with his men approached the town at night; some of the troops climbed over the walls and opened the gate to Hamdān, who entered the town again without the governor, who had been appointed by Abu-l-Barakāt, learning of it. Hamdān then gave orders to alarm the town by blowing horns and beating drums, which brought the defenders to the walls, as they believed the enemy were firing outside. There some were killed, some made prisoners, and Hamdān again became the lord of ar-Raḥba. Leaving his lieutenant there, he now crossed the Euphrates and marched against the town of ʻArabān. But the lieutenant, stealing all his master’s property, fled with it to Hamdān’s brother, Abu Ṭarleb. This caused Hamdān to return quickly to ar-Raḥba, but he was soon besieged by Abu Ṭarleb’s army and had to flee. Abu Ṭarleb thus became lord of ar-Raḥba and had its walls rebuilt. (Ibid., pp. 437 ff.)

Ibn Ḥawḵal, Masāliḵ, (De Goeje), p. 155, says that Raḥbat Mālek
ibn Töwḳ exceeds al-Ḥānūḳa in size. It is a fine town, enclosed by stout walls, but suffers greatly from interminable factional fights. There are water and many trees there on the east side of the Euphrates; date palms and various other fruits also thrive.—

Ibn Ḥawḳal’s account is not sufficiently clear. It would seem that ar-Ｒḥba lay on the east side of the Euphrates, whereas in reality it was built on the right bank. On the left bank there were probably a suburb and irrigated tracts owned by the townspeople. Date palms will grow there, but their fruit will not ripen. The present inhabitants say that dates ripen in the environs of Abu Čemāl only rarely in especially hot summers and when winter sets in much later than usual. The limit of the date belt is marked by the islet of al-Karabīle near Ānā, to which the hot southeast winds penetrate up the Euphrates valley.

Al-Ｉṭḥaḥī, Maṣālik (De Goeje), p. 77, writes that Raḥbat Mālek ibn Töwḳ is larger than Karḵisija’ and that it contains many trees and much water and is on the west bank of the Euphrates.

In 978—979 Abu Taṛleb lost ar-Ｒḥba, which, together with ar-Ｒḳḳa, came under the control of ‘Aṣḥaddowlie (Ibn al-Ａṭīr, op. cit., Vol. 8, pp. 511f.).

Al-Muḵaddasi, Aḥsan (De Goeje), p. 142, mentions that ar-Ｒḥba is the center of the administrative district of al-Furāt. It was a large town built in a semicircle on the edge of the desert and protected by a mighty fort. Other towns by the desert were also inhabited.

In 991—992 the inhabitants of ar-Ｒḥba requested Baha’addowlie to send them a governor, which he did (Ibn al-Ａṭīr, op. cit., Vol. 9, p. 64).

Soon after, ar-Ｒḥba came into the possession of Abu ‘Ali ibn Ta[māl al-Ḥafāḡi, who, in 1008—1009, was killed by Ḳa ibn Ḫalat of the ’Oḳejli tribe; but in turn the slayer was defeated and killed by the army sent against him by the Egyptian sultan, al-Ḥākem B’ilamrallāh. This army was driven out by Beldān ibn al-Muḳalled, also an ’Oḳejli, but Lulu’, the lieutenant of the Egyptian sultan in Damascus, then took both ar-Ｒḳḳa and ar-Ｒḥba and brought them once more under Egyptian rule. However, one Ibn Muḥḳān (or Muḳlekān), a citizen of ar-Ｒḥba, obtained possession of the town and, seeking support, finally allied himself with Ṣāleḥ ibn Mirdās al-Kilābī, who owned the town of al-Ḥilla. Ibn Muḥḳān also took the settlement of Ānā, but was killed by his ally, who then became the lord of ar-Ｒḥba. (Ibid., p. 148; Ibn Ḥaldūn, Ibar [Būlāk, 1284 A.H.], Vol. 4, p. 271).

Abu ‘Alwaṇ Ta[māl, the son of Ṣāleḥ, succeeded his father in the control of ar-Ｒḥba and in the autumn of 1042 also took possession of the fort of the town of Aleppo (Ibn al-Ａṭīr, op. cit., Vol. 9, p. 163).

At this time ar-Ｒḥba had many Christian inhabitants, who also had their bishop (Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis, Vol. 3, p. 263).

The Syriac authors called this town Reḥobūt (Barhebraeus, Chron. syriacum [Bedjan], pp. 291, 305).

In the spring of 1060 the town was taken by ’Aṭījian, another of Ṣāleḥ’s sons (Ibn al-Ａṭīr, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 8).

In 1086—1087 the sultan Mālekṣāḥ gave in fief to Muhammad, son of Šarafaddowlie, ar-Ｒḥba with all the environs, as well as Ėḥrān. Sarḡ, ar-Ｒḳḳa, and al-Ḥābūr (ibid., p. 106; Ibn Ḥaldūn, op. cit., Vol. 5, p. 9).
THAPSACUS AND AR-RAḤBA

In 1096 the town of ar-Raḥba was conquered and plundered by one Kerbōka, who came out against it from al-Ḥilla (Ibn al-Ąţīr, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 177).

After Kerbōka's death in 1102, ar-Raḥba was held by Kājīmāz, a former general of Sultan Ālp Arslān. The sultan of Damascus besieged him without success. Kājīmāz died at the close of the spring of 1103 and was succeeded by a Turkish commander named Ḥasan. Therefore the sultan of Damascus sent a new expedition against ar-Raḥba, which was surrendered to him by the inhabitants. Ḥasan defended himself in the fort for a time, but at last accepted a pardon and as reward received in fief several estates in Syria. The sultan of Damascus restored order in the town, treated the inhabitants charitably, and left a garrison there, at the same time appointing as governor Muḥammad ibn as-Saabāk of the Beni Ṣeṭbān tribe, whose little son he took with him to Damascus as hostage. (Ibn al-Ąţīr, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 249.)

In the beginning of 1107 Gāwali set out from Mosul by way of Sināğar to ar-Raḥba, which he besieged from February 26 to May 19. The inhabitants offered a brave resistance, but when the distress in the town became unbearable, the defenders of one of the towers promised the enemy commander to let him in if he would spare life and property. The commander then sent his men on the flooded river in boats up to the walls, whence at midnight they were hoisted by ropes into a tower. Once in the town the soldiers blew their horns and beat their drums and so frightened the rest of the defenders that next morning Gāwali was able to enter the town. He permitted his army to plunder until noon of that day. Muḥammad aš-Ṣeṭbānī became reconciled with him and accepted service under him. (Ibn al-Kahānīsī, Dājīl [Amedroz], pp. 156 ff.; Ibn al-Ąţīr, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 297.)

Soon after this, ar-Raḥba came into the power of the al-Barṣāqi family (ibid., pp. 360 ff.). In 1127 ʿEzzedīn Maṣʿūd ibn al-Barṣāqi, who attempted to conquer Syria, died there. He began his campaign at ar-Raḥba, to which he laid siege. The inhabitants defended themselves vigorously. ʿEzzedīn fell sick but felt much relieved when he learned that the garrison of the main fort had surrendered. When he died an hour later the inhabitants regretted having let his troops enter the fort. After his death his followers dispersed, pursued and killed each other, none taking the least care of the dead body of their leader, which was not buried until some time after. The succession falling to ʿEzzedīn's young brother, his affairs were administered by the mameluke, Gāwali, to whom Sultan ʿImādaddīn Zenki gave ar-Raḥba in fief. (Ibid., pp. 453 ff.)

In 1149–1150 Koṭbdīn, the son of Zenki, was the lord of ar-Raḥba (ibid., Vol. 11, p. 93). At that time the town, lying on the banks of the river and to the east of the Euphrates, was flourishing. According to al-Idrīsī, Nuzha (Jaubert's transl.), Vol. 2, p. 145, it was enclosed by walls of mud bricks and adorned with various buildings and market places.

Ibn al-Kahānīsī, op. cit., p. 344, records that on August 12, 1157, both Salamja and ar-Raḥba were demolished by an earthquake.

At the end of 1161 the Ḥafāḡe tribesmen were pillaging the country around al-Ḥilla and al-Kūfah, and when the military were sent against
them they retreated as far as Raḥbat aš-Šām, where they were pursued by the soldiers. Numbers of other nomads having joined the Ḥafage tribe, they attacked the soldiers' camp and captured their supplies and mules; whereupon the soldiers took to flight and many of them perished. One of their commanders took refuge behind the walls of ar-Raḥba, whence he was brought to Bagdad. (Ibid., pp. 182 f.) — It is interesting to note that this account mentions first Raḥbat aš-Šām and then ar-Raḥba. It would seem from the context that the two names do not indicate the same town.

Saladin gave ar-Raḥba and Homs in fief to his cousin Nāṣeraddin Muḥammad ibn Širkūh, a drunkard who died in his cups. Ar-Raḥba remained in the hands of his family until 1264, when the sultan Bībars of Egypt appointed his own governor there. (Ibn al-Aṭīr, op. cit., Vol. 11, p. 341; Vol. 12, p. 189; Abu-l-Feda', Muḥtaṣar [Adler], Vol. 4, p. 142; Vol. 5, p. 16.)

Jākūṭ, who visited the town at this time, writes (Muḥjam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 2, p. 764) that the distance from Raḥbat Mālek ibn Towk to Damascus is eight days, to Aleppo five days, and to Bagdad one hundred parasangs, while to ar-Raḵḵa it is little over twenty parasangs. Raḥba is situated between ar-Raḵḵa and Bagdad on the bank of the Euphrates below Karkīšja', and according to some is said to have been built in the reign of the Caliph al-Ma'mūn; according to others during Harun ar-Rashid's reign. Its geographical latitude is 33°; its longitude, 60° 15'.'


Ad-Dimishki, Nejba (Mehren), p. 292, mentions, among the eastern Syrian towns, ar-Raḥbat al-Furāṭija', which is situated on the enemy's boundaries and dominates large territories.

In 1313 Ḥarbanda with his Mongols besieged ar-Raḥba and made raids into Syria. The lords of the different Syrian towns assembled with their armies in the environs of Ḥama', and their spies penetrated as far as 'Ord and as-Suǧne. When hunger and pestilence broke out in Ḥarbanda's camp, he withdrew, leaving his siege engines behind. The defenders brought them to the fort of ar-Raḥba. (Abu-l-Feda', op. cit., Vol. 5, pp. 268 f.)

In 1315—1316 Ibn al-Arkāši, the governor of ar-Raḥba at the time when it was besieged by Harbanda, died at Damascus (Ibid., Vol. 5, p. 300). Ḥall al-Dāheri, Zabda (Ravaisse), p. 50, as late as the second half of the fifteenth century of the Christian era writes that ar-Raḥba was a town of fine buildings and that many settlements belonged to it. It formed a part of the political district of Aleppo.

Ḥaǧǧi Ḥalfa, Gihān numa (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 444, merely repeats the older accounts of ar-Raḥba. He says that it was built by Mālek ibn Towk at-Tarhebi on a hill by the Euphrates between 'A Paran and ar-Raḵḵa. After some time it was demolished, but in 1321 Širkūh ibn Muḥammad, the lord of Homs, had it rebuilt and in his time it was an important center for the caravans between Syria and Iraq. — Ḥaǧǧi Ḥalfa was undoubtedly thinking of the fort of ar-Raḥba lying near the town al-Mijāḏín, because in his time all caravans going from Bagdad to Syria turned away from the Euphrates at this fort, as we are told by the
European authors. Thus Tavernier, Les six voyages (Paris, 1676), Vol. 1, p. 285, writes that Mached-raba is a fortress not far from the Euphrates on a hill at the foot of which a copious spring fills a pond. A high wall with several rectangular towers enclosed white huts, where the inhabitants kept their cattle.—This Mached-raba is the French transcription of the word Mašhad ar-Raḥba and refers to the fortified settlement of al-Mešhed or Mešhed ‘Ali, nine kilometers southwest of the fort of ar-Rḥaba, near al-Mijādīn.

APPENDIX XVI

ANATHA OR ‘ĀNA

The center of the ‘Āna settlement originally lay on the islands, which have always been very fertile and in former times were surely not eroded away to the extent they are today. Their inhabitants were not only safe from the nomads, but were even able to subjugate the surrounding settlements. For this reason the Assyrians usually had the political district of Sūhi administered by the lords of ‘Āna.

Tukulti Enurta II (880—884 B.C.) received as the tribute due him from Ilu Ibnī, the prefect of Sūhi, who lived in the town of Anat lying in the middle of the Euphrates: three talents of silver, twenty minae of gold, a chair inlaid with ivory, three pidnu of ivory, eighteen pieces of lead, forty tree trunks of meškannī wood, a couch of meškannī wood, six tables of meškannī wood, a bronze pitcher, various dresses and embroideries, variegated fabrics, cattle, sheep, bread, and drink (Annals [Scheil, Annales (1909), pl.3], obverse, ll. 69—73; Scheil op. cit., p. 18).

Arrian, describing in his tenth book the sailing of Trajan's fleet to Coche, calls this settlement Anatha and also Tyrus (Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnica [Meineke], p. 643; Roos, Studia arrianea [1912], pp. 50f.).

After having become Christian, Mu‘ajn, commander under the Sasanian king Sapor II (309—379 A.D.), built ninety-six monasteries, churches, and other sanctuaries and consecrated priests and other clergy at Sīgār (Sinçār). Afterwards he went to ‘Anath, where, on the banks of the Euphrates two miles from ‘Anath, he built for himself a hermitage, in which he lived seven years. He healed the sick with such success that his fame spread all over Persia. (Hoffmann, Auszüge [1880], p. 30; Wright, Catalogue [1870—1872], p. 1135, col. 1.)

Fort Anatha was situated on an island. In 363 A.D. the Roman fleet surrounded it before daybreak. When observed at sunrise, the Romans put their siege engines in readiness and summoned the inhabitants to surrender. After consulting together the latter did so, driving before them a garlanded bull as a sign that they desired peace. The fort was then set on fire and the inhabitants moved with their property to the Syrian town of Chalcis. Next day several ships were sunk by the wind and swollen waters and broken to pieces on the walls built in the river.
for irrigation purposes (Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 1: 6—9).

Mebârak, a contemporary of Mar Bar-'Idta' in the middle of the sixth century of our era, was a native of 'Âna, a town by the river Euphrates (Budge, Histories [1902], Vol. 1, p. 127).

In the beginning of 591 Varamus sent a troop of soldiers to the fort of 'Âna, lying on the Euphrates near Circesium, to prevent Chosroes from returning to Persia. But the soldiers killed their commander and declared for Chosroes. (Theophylactus Simocatta, Historiae, V, 1: 2; V, 2: 3.)

In the beginning of the seventh century the bishop of the Ta'labije nomads resided at 'Âna (Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1719—1728], Vol. 3, Part 2, p. 607).

Imruâl ja'âs (Dîwân [De Slane], p. 36), al-Ahâl (Dîwân [Salhani], p. 117), and 'Alkama (Dîwân [Socîn], p. 7) mention the wine of 'Âna.

Ibn Ârâdâbî, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 74, names among the towns of the administrative district of al-Furât: Karkisija, ar-Râbah, ad-Dâlija, 'Anât, Hit, al-Hadiya, and ar-Râb. — Ibn Ârâdâbî names the separate towns in the order of their location from northwest to southeast.

Kodâmâ, Harrag (De Goeje), p. 233, writes that the Euphrates flows alongside of ar-Râbah, all around 'Âna, and past the settlements of Hit and ad-Anbâr.

Al-Hamâînî, Shîja (Müller), p. 129, also refers to 'Anât among the towns famous for their wine.

Al-Istâ/hrî, Masâlik (De Goeje), p. 78, describes 'Âna as a little town in the middle of the Euphrates.

Al-Mu'akkâsî, Ahsan (De Goeje), p. 138, says that the largest town on the Euphrates is Ra'bat ibn Tâwîk. Besides this, there are Karkisiya, 'Âna, ad-Dâlija, and al-Hadiya. Âs-Sâbûstî, Djihârât (Codex berolinensis), fols. 100 v. f., refers to the monastery Ma' Sergis in the inhabited town of 'Âna on the Euphrates, a fine large structure with many monks and a favorite resort of the population. It was surrounded by vineyards, gardens, trees, wine presses, and pleasure grounds. Close to the settlement of 'Âna the wet nurse of the Caliph Harun ar-Rashid is buried. She accompanied him once on a journey from Bagdad to ar-Ra'ka, fell sick and died at 'Âna. Harun ar-Rashid then bought a tract of land near the se'eb of al-Kânâ'er on the banks of the Euphrates and, burying her there, built a tomb over her grave, called to this day Kubbat al-Barmakijije (Jâkût, Mu'jam [Wüstenfeld], Vol.2, pp.693 f.; Abu-l-Parag, Arânu [Buûk], 1255 A. H.), Vol. 17, p. 129).

In 1005—1009 the inhabitants of the little town of 'Âna accepted Ibn Mu'hkan as their lord. He sent them a number of his followers and trusted his property to their charge, but exacted hostages. Soon afterwards, however, they rebelled against him, exchanged his captive children for their hostages, and kept his property. Ibn Mu'hkan found an ally in the person of Sâleb ibn Mirdâs, emir of the Kilâb tribe. With his help he regained 'Âna, but was soon afterwards assassinated by Sâleb, who became the sole lord of 'Âna and ar-Râbah. (Ibn al-Afîr, Kanîf [Tornberg], Vol. 9, p. 148.)

In 1023—1024 Hassân, emir of the Ta'ij tribe, Sâleb ibn Mirdâs, emir of the Kilâb tribe, and Sinân ibn AlejÎân formed a league against the Egyptian governor of Syria and agreed among themselves that Sâleb
was to get the territory between Aleppo and ‘Ana, Hassân the region from ar-Ramle as far as Egypt, while Damascus was to go to Sinân. Sâleh actually succeeded in conquering the whole territory from Baalbek to ‘Ana and resided in Aleppo for six years. (Ibid., Vol. 9, p. 162.)

Al-Bekri, Mu‘gam (Wüstenfeld), p. 641, says that ‘Ana, like Hit, belonged to the administrative district of al-Anbâr and was renowned for its wine. The settlements of ‘Ana and Hit had been almost completely in ruins at the time when Anushirwan had a ditch dug from Hit as far as al-Kâzima near al-BAṣra (where it ended in the sea) and had watch-towers built as a protection against the inroads of the Arab nomads into the cultivated territory.

I have examined the country southeast of Hit for a distance of nearly 250 kilometers without finding a trace of a fortification ditch, although I made a diligent search for one. The story probably originated in the natural formation of the ground. Fifty-five kilometers southeast of Hit begin the plateaus of Târ al-Hejbla, Târ as-Sejhed, and others, which fall gently towards the east, but on the west overlook the depressions of al-Bhêra and Cufr al-Mâleh with a somewhat precipitous escarpment. This escarpment, intersected in places by gaps of various widths, can be followed far to the southeast. A few kilometers below the settlement of Hit the remnants of a huge irrigation canal are still visible. This canal extended to the very beginning of the natural escarpment of Târ al-Hejbla. All Persian frontier stations were built to the east of the scarp, which formed for them something of a natural line of fortification, as it could be ascended by the Arab camels with riders or freight only at the more passable places.

The inhabitants of ‘Ana joined the religious sect of al-Bâṭeníje. For a long time no notice was taken of this sect, but at last, during the reign of the Caliph al-Muḳtadî, they were denounced to him and their elders had to undergo an examination by the vizier, Abu Suḥ̄gā’ (1083–1091), at Bagdad; but as they denied everything, nothing was done to them. (Ibn al-Atîr, op. cit., Vol. 10, p. 221.)

In October, 1103, the Turkomans took the towns of ‘Ana and al-Hadija, which until then had belonged to the Beni Ja‘îš clan. When Sejfaddowlé Şâdaqâ ibn Mazjad came to the clan’s assistance, the Turkomans fled. But no sooner had he returned to the town of al-Hilla than the Turkomans possessed themselves of the towns again, plundered them, captured all the women, and then advanced against Hit along the right bank. Not far from Hit they turned back, not desiring to meet the army sent against them by Sejfaddowlé. (Ibid., Vol. 10, p. 252.)

In 1143–1144 the Atabeg Zenki occupied ‘Ana (ibid., Vol. 11, p. 64).

Al-Idrîsî, Nuzha (Jaubert’s transl.), Vol. 2, pp. 144f., writes that ‘Anât is a little town on an island in the Euphrates. There are market places and factories there.

Jâkût, op. cit., Vol. 3, pp. 594f., states that the famous settlement of ‘Ana lies between the towns of ar-Râkka and Hit in the administrative district of Mesopotamia. It is built on an elevation above the Euphrates near Ḥadītata an-Nûra and includes a stout fort. When King Anushirwan heard that the nomads were making raids on the inhabited borders, he restored the walls of the town of Alûs, built by the order of Sapor, and put in a garrison to guard the desert line. He also had a ditch dug from
the settlement of Hit, which was to run through the border of the desert as far as al-Kažima by al-Baṣra and to terminate in the sea. Along the ditch watchtowers were put up and barracks for the garrisons, whose duty it was to prevent the nomads from entering the settled territory. These fortifications were the cause of the destruction of Hit and ‘Anāt. —

The Anushirwan mentioned by al-Bekr and Jaḵut was Chosroes I (531—578). Alūs is the station of Alūs lying almost sixty kilometers northwest of Hit. King Sapor was Sapor II (309—379). According to this record Hit and ‘Anāt fell because they were situated northwest of the frontier forts and the garrison of the fort Alūs could not defend them.

In 1238 ‘Anā as well as ar-Raḥba and al-Ḥabūr were subjected to the lord of Ḥomṣ (al-Maḵrizi, Sulūk [Blochet’s transl.], p. 427).

At the end of January, 1239, Naḵmaddīn Ajjūb yielded the towns of Sīṅgār, ar-Raḵkā, and ‘Anā to Emīr Jūnūs al-Malek al-Gawwād, who sold ‘Anā to the caliph al-Muṣṭaṣer. With the proceeds of the sale Emīr Jūnūs crossed the desert to Gażā and joined the Crusaders in the fort of Akka.

(Abu-l-Feda’, Muḫtaṣar [Adler], Vol. 4, pp. 343, 400f.)

In the spring of 1241 ‘Anā was the caliph’s property. The Khorasians fleeing from the pursuit of al-Malek al-Maṣṣūr, who had just conquered Tell Ḥabūr and Karkisīya’, sought refuge there. (Kemāladdīn, Ta’riḥ [Blochet’s transl.], Rev. d’or. lat. I, Vol. 6, pp. 12f.)

Towards the end of 1249 the Sultan al-Malek al-Mu’azzam Tūrānšāh set out from ‘Anā with about fifty companions on a journey through the desert of as-Samāwā and reached without accident the settlement of al-Ḵusṣur east of Damascus (al-Maḵrizi, op. cit., p. 528).

In 1253—1254 al-Malek an-Nāṣer Dāḥūd, the ex-lord of al-Kerak, who had been imprisoned at Ḥomṣ, was set at liberty at the caliph’s intercession. Al-Malek an-Nāṣer then went across the desert to Bagdad for the jewels he had deposited there, but was not allowed to enter the town. For that reason he remained in the neighborhood of ‘Anā and al-Ḥadiṭa. He was in such distress that the then lord of the towns of Tell Bāšer, Tadmur, and ar-Raḥba sent him flour and barley. Afterwards permission was given him to settle in the town of al-Anbār, distant three days from Bagdad. (Abu-l-Feda’, op. cit., Vol. 4, pp. 530f.)

Al-Kāzvīnī, ‘Aḏābī (Wüstefeld), Vol. 2, p. 280, writes that the settlement of ‘Anā, situated between Hit and ar-Raḵkā, is encircled by the Euphrates on all sides. There are many trees there and fruit; also vineyards which yield a famous wine. It has a strong fort. Whenever the Bagdad people are in distress they say that the caliph is in the settlement of ‘Anā. This saying dates from 1059, when the caliph of that period, al-Kājam Bi’amrallāh, was imprisoned in ‘Anā, whence he did not return until the spring of 1060.

At the end of August, 1316, Muḥanna ibn ʿIṣa, who had paid a visit to the Mongol ruler, Ḥarbānā, near a place spelled “KNNRīlān,” camped in the vicinity of ‘Anā (Abu-l-Feda’, op. cit., Vol. 5, p. 308).

Abu-l-Feda’, Taḵwīm (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 287, records that ‘Anā is a rather small settlement on an island in the middle of the Euphrates.

Ḥāǧǧī Halfa, Fadilat at-tawārīḫ (Codices vindobonenses, No. 1064 [H. O.64], fol. 162r.; No. 1055, fol. 140 r.), writes that in 1616 the lord of ‘Anā and Ḥadiṭa was Aḥmad abu Riṣ.
In 1629 Philip the Carmelite (Orientalische Räisbeschreibung [Frankfurt, 1671], p. 78) came after two marches from Theibas (aṭ-Ṭajjibe) to the settlement of Reiba (ar-Raḥba), lying on a hillock not far from the Euphrates. Marching farther he found only small islets near the town of Anna. This town was said to have been the largest in that part of the desert and to have been quite famous until it was demolished by the Persians a few years before. It stretched on both sides of the Euphrates for about a mile at the foot of a mountain, from which it was separated by an enclosure. On the islet in the river a castle was built, which could be brought under fire from all the surrounding hills. The town was then half in ruins and populated only by Arabs and Jews.

Tavernier, Les six voyages (Paris, 1676), Vol. 1, pp. 285—287, relates that while going from Bagdad through the desert to the little town of Anna he saw at a distance of five hundred paces a lion in the act of mating with a lioness. The town of Anna he described as not very large and said that it belonged to an Arabian emir. The land was well cultivated for half a mile around. There were gardens and pleasure places there. Its situation reminded one of Paris, because it was built on both sides of the river opposite an islet where stood a fine mosque.

Della Valle, Viaggi (Venice, 1664), Vol. 1, p. 515, states that the town of Anna lay on both banks of the Euphrates, which was crossed in boats, of which the inhabitants had a great number. On either bank the town consisted of a single street over five miles long. The huts for the most part were built of mud, but were compact and pretty. Each had a garden with various trees, such as palms, oranges, lemons, figs, olives, pomegranates, and the like. In the river were many islets also overgrown with fruit trees. On the central island stood a fort. The town was not enclosed by a wall, but the steep bluffs shut in the gardens from the rear, leaving at both ends only a narrow passage along the river. The bluffs were so precipitous that it was impossible even to enter the town from them. The lord of the town and of the whole desert was Emir Feiad, who had a fine house there. His old surname was Abu Rizc ("The One With the Feather"). Although some of the inhabitants professed to be Moslems, they must have had a different faith, as they belonged to some secret sect. —

Emir Fejjāz abu Rīs was a member of the al-Mwāli tribe which dominated the right bank of the Euphrates from Palmyrena to al-Kūfa.

In the middle of the seventeenth century Ḥāna and Bēreği formed a part of the administrative district of ar-Raḳḳa, but Bālis belonged to that of Aleppo (Rycaut, Ottoman Empire [1670], p. 178).

Ḫāği Halfa, Ǧihān nama' (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 465, writes that the island town of Ḥāna lay above the settlements of Hit and al-Hadiṭa on the border of the Bagdad territory. It was said to be the only settlement in this territory where olives thrive. It also enjoyed great renown as the birthplace of many scientists, saints, musicians, and experts in physics. Formerly many adherents of the Nusejrije sect lived in the district, but in the seventeenth century there were only a few left.

Evlija Celebi, Ta'rih (Von Hammer's transl.), Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 101, says that Ḥāna belonged to the province ar-Raḳḳa.

In 1807 Saʿūd ebn `Abdalʿaziz with his Wahhābites plundered Ḥāna and Dejr az-Zūr (Rousseau, Pachalik de Bagdad [1809], pp. 180ff.).
APPENDIX XVII

ID OR HÎT

Tukulti Enurta II camped in 885 B.C. opposite the settlement of Id near bitumen springs (iddû) where there is the ušmeta stone and the great gods speak (Annals [Scheil, Annales (1909), p. 22 f.], I, 59, Scheil, op. cit., p. 16). The bitumen springs are mainly on the right bank while the naphtha bubbles out especially on the left. West and southwest of Hit are ancient stone quarries whence building material for the dams on the Euphrates was brought. Probably the yellowish limestone for the Babylonian buildings was also taken from there and we might identify it with the ušmeta stone. Yet ušmeta perhaps means hardened bitumen, which issues with a peculiar sound from many springs thereabouts. The name Id or It has some connection with idîû, as the Babylonian bitumen was called (ibid., p. 38).

Herodotus, History, I, 179, refers to the town of Is at a distance of eight days from Babylon. Past this town flows a little river, also called Is, which joins the Euphrates. Its waters carry bitumen such as was used in building the fortifications of Babylon.

Isidore of Charax, Mansiones parthicae (Müller), p. 249, mentions the station of Ispolis—which spelling is correct and not, as printed, Aepolis.

Ptolemy, Geography, V, 19: 4, records on the right bank of the Euphrates the town of Idikara. This name we may split up into id and kara. Id is the Babylonian, kâr the Aramaic-Arabic word for bitumen.

In the Talmudic literature the town of Ihi (for Idi) or Ihidacira is mentioned (Berliner, Beiträge [1882—1883], p. 62).

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 2: 3, and Zosimus, Historia nova, III, 15, relate that in 363 A.D. the Roman army entered the town of Diafrica, above which rose a church built in a fort on a high hill. The town was deserted; only a few women were left and these were killed. The Romans found plenty of corn and white salt there. Zosimus calls the town Dakira and adds that it was so completely demolished that from the left bank it seemed as if there had never been a town.—Dakira is the Syriac da kira’, Arabic da kîr, “the place where bitumen comes out of the ground.”

About 525 the Persian king, Kawâdh I (488—531 A.D.), the son of Peroz, met at Kantarat al-Fajjâm King al-Hâreṯ ibn ‘Amr of the Kinda family (at-Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh [De Goeje], Ser. 1, p. 88).—Al-Fajjâm is supposed to have been a settlement not far from the town of Hit (Jâkût, Mu’jam [Wüstenfeld], Vol. 3, p. 933).

Ibn Kotejba relates that not long after this meeting al-Hâreṯ was driven out by King al-Mundir and his son Mâlek was murdered in Hit. Al-Hâreṯ sought refuge at Mushûfân, where the Kalb tribe killed him (Abû-l-Farâq, Arâni [Bûlûk, 1285 A.H.], Vol. 8, p. 65).

In 637 the inhabitants of Hit as a defence against the Moslems entrenched themselves with a deep ditch. The Moslems then invested the town on all sides, preventing both exit and entrance. Pillaging on the
way, half of them marched along the Euphrates as far as Ḫarkisija', which place they took by force. When the inhabitants of Hit saw that the Moslems were preparing to encircle the town with another ditch and a rampart, they surrendered. After this the Moslems drew off northwestward. (At-Ṭabarri, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 2479.)

In 659 the Caliph Moawiya sent troops against Hit, where his rival 'Ali had a majority. On reaching Hit the troops found no adherent of 'Ali there and started for al-Anbār. (Ibid., Ser. 1, p. 3445.)

In 685 the penitents left a place called Kabr al-Husejn and proceeded by way of al-Ḥaṣṣaṣa, al-Anbār, aṣ-Ṣadūd, and al-Kajjāra to Hit, and from there to Ḫarkisija' (ibid., Ser. 1, pp. 548—551).

Kabr al-Husejn is the present Kerbela. Al-Ḥaṣṣaṣa is to be sought north of Kerbela in the vicinity of al-Msajeb of today, through which there formerly led a road to al-Anbār (Ibn al-Atir, Kāmil [Tornberg], Vol. 4, p. 328) and aṣ-Ṣadūd northwest of al-Anbār. Al-Kajjāra is undoubtedly identical with the spring of an-Naffāta, thirty-two kilometers southeast of Hit. The penitents went from al-Anbār to Ḫarkisija' along the left bank of the Euphrates.

Ibn al-Faḥīh, Buldān (De Goeje), p. 187, refers to the springs of al-ʾErk at a distance of a few parasangs from Hit.

Jākāt, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 652, repeats this. — The springs of Abu ʾErzāje are thirty-five kilometers east-northeast of Hit.

Ibn Roste, Ḩlāk (De Goeje), p. 107, writes that under the Persian rule the settlements of Hit and Ḫanāt formed the border of the cultivated region belonging to the settlers in Irak and were a part of the administrative district of al-Anbār. When Anushirwan (Chosroes I) learned that some Arab tribe was making raids on the borders of the desert and the cultivated territory, he gave orders to restore the walls of the town of Ālus that had been built by Sābūr du al-ʾAṭkāf (Sapor II) and then to have a garrison put in to keep watch over the desert near by. He likewise ordered a fortification ditch to be dug from Hit through the frontier tract of at-Taff, which divided the desert from the inhabited territory.

In 906, from their camp near ad-Dimāne and al-Ḥāla, the Carmathians made a raid on Hit, attacked the suburbs at sunrise, plundered the boats anchored by the town, and after three days returned to the desert with three thousand camels carrying the loot, mainly wheat. The town of Hit proper, being fortified, they could not take (at-Ṭabarri, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 2258). — I locate their camp in the neighborhood of al-Kaʿara on the road Darb aṣ-Ṣāfi from Damascus to Hit (see my Arabia Deserta, p. 63, note 15).

ʿAli ibn ʿĪsa records (Kremer, Einnahembudget [1887], p. 27) the manner in which tolls were collected at Hit in 918—919. Hit formed an administrative district from which, according to the same author (ibid., p. 31), the farms as-Sikr were excluded. Thus writes Kremer referring in note 10 to al-Muṣaddasi, Aḥsan (De Goeje), pp. 53, 114, where, likewise, a settlement of as-Sikr is mentioned. But this settlement lay in the administrative district of ʾAwṣaṣ and could not therefore adjoin the district of Hit. The manuscripts have “al-SKN,” either with or without a dot above the N, or “al-SKR.” The R is undoubtedly a corruption from N and we should read “Maskin.” M in conjunction with an L could easily escape the copyist’s attention. The settlement al-Masken, lying 133 kilometers east-northeast of Hit, formed the center of another district.
In 928 Abu Ṭāher, the Carmathian lord of al-Baḥrejn, arrived before Hit, the inhabitants of which were reinforced by the caliph’s garrison. A part of Abu Ṭāher’s followers, after pillaging the environs of al-Andār, passed over from the left to the right bank in boats, which they had seized at a place called Fam Baḵka below Hit. They joined Abu Ṭāher and made their first attack on Sunday, February 3. The defenders burned many of the Carmathians’ siege engines. Forced to return to his camp without success, Abu Ṭāher drew off early on Monday morning and marched to the district of Raḥbat Mālek ibn Ṣawr, where he took by assault that town as well as Karḵisija’. Seven months later he again tried to take Hit, but its inhabitants in the meantime had repaired and strengthened their fortifications and they repulsed his attack. He then went to al-Kūfā. (Ibn Miskawajh, Taḡāriḥ [Amedroz], Vol. 1, pp. 180–183; al-Masʿūdi, Taʾrīḫ [De Goeje], p. 383; Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, Kāmiūl [Tornberg], Vol. 8, pp. 126f.)

The name Fam Baḵka (Inlet of Baḵka) shows that at the settlement of Baḵka a canal branched off from the Euphrates. This settlement lay below Hit on the left bank, hence to the southeast. It could not be far distant, since the defenders of Hit concealed their boats there. I locate it about two kilometers southeast of Hit in the al-Baḵka gardens, where a remnant of a canal is still visible.

Al-ʿIṣṭaḥrī, Masʿālik (De Goeje), p. 77, and Ibn Ḥawqal, Masʿālik (De Goeje), p. 155, write that Hit is a town of medium size on the west bank of the Euphrates and is well populated and provided with a fort. There is a tomb there in which Abdallāh ibn al-Mubārek was buried.

Al-Muḵaddasi, Aḥsan (De Goeje), p. 123, says that the large walled town of Hit lies on the Euphrates not far from the desert.

The deposed vizier Abu-l-Ḵāsem, who was imprisoned in Hit for two years and five months, died in 1038–1039 (Ibn al-ʿAṯīr, op. cit., Vol. 9, p. 317).

Al-Bekrī, Muḥam (Wüstenfeld), p. 834, records that Hit marks the western boundary of Ḥirak and is situated on the bank of the Euphrates. Its inhabitants were not held in high esteem, as diverse derogatory adages witness; for instance: “O Lord of the town of Hit, save us from the abyss (hell)” or: “In the town of Hit there is the shark (ḥūṭ),” for some believed that it was there where the shark assailed the prophet Jonah.


In 1065–1066 Ṣarafaddowle Muslim ibn Kurejis ibn Bedrān, the lord of Mosul, received al-Andār and Hit in fief. (Ibid., Vol. 10, p. 35.)

In 1087–1088 the inhabitants of Hit subjected themselves voluntarily to the governor of Ḥirak, who at that time was Kemāl al-Malek Abu-l-Fatḥ ad-Dahastānī. (Ibid., Vol. 10, p. 107.)

In 1092 Tutuš ibn Alp Arslān, the lord of Damascus, journeyed to his brother, Sultan Malekzāḥ, at Baghdad. On reaching Hit he learned of his brother’s death and took possession of this town as well as of arrāba. (Ibid., Vol. 10, p. 149.)

Tutuš did not remain long the lord of Hit, for the sultan Barkijāroḡ gave it in fief to Baha’addowle Ṭarwān ibn Wuhejba of the Beni ʿOḡjī
tribe, who was closely related to Sejfaddowlie Šadača. The latter would have liked to take Hit. His first attempt failed, for his son Duhejs, who was sent there, returned without having accomplished anything. Later Šadača possessed himself of the town of Wāsaæ and then marched on Hit again, to find Tarwān’s nephew opposing him there. But some members of the Rab’a tribe opened the gates, Šadača entered the town, occupied it, and in 1102—1103 appointed one of his relatives as governor. (Ibid., Vol. 10, p. 247; Ibn Ḥaldūn, ‘Ibar [Būlāk, 1234 A. H.], Vol. 4, p. 281.)


Al-Idrisi, Nuzha (Jaubert’s transl.), Vol. 2, p. 144, says that the walled town of Hit has the most inhabitants of all the settlements on the Euphrates and that it lies west of the Euphrates opposite Tekrit, which marks the northern boundary of Irak on the right bank of the Tigris.

Jākût, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 997, writes that the settlement of Hit lies on the Euphrates above al-Anbār. There are many date palms and various other things there.

According to al-Kazwini, ‘Ajā’ib (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 186, Hit is a pleasant town on the Euphrates with many trees and palms and abounding in wealth. It is blessed with a healthy climate, good soil, fresh water, and splendid land all around.

Abu-l-Feda’, Ta‘kwin (Reinaud and De Slane), pp. 275, 299, records (quoting Ibn Hawkal) that at Hit were the remains of the residence once occupied by the Caliph Abu-l’-Abbās al-Kājem. Hit is supposed to lie east of the Euphrates, with many palm trees and fields. There is a ford across the Euphrates. Springs of bitumen and naphtha also flow forth there. The distance to al-Kādesije is eight parasangs and to al-Anbār twenty-one parasangs. — Here the distance from Hit to al-Kādesije is confused with the distance to al-Anbār. From Hit to the latter is eighty-five kilometers or about fourteen parasangs, while to al-Kādesije it is 245 kilometers, or about forty parasangs. Abu-l-Feda’ attributes to Hit what Ibn Hawkal wrote of al-Anbār. The latter lies east of the Euphrates and Abu-l’-Abbās built his residence there.

Hağği Ḥalfa, Gīhān numa’ (Constantinople, 1145 A. H.), p. 465, writes that the settlement of Hit belongs to the settlement of ‘Āna. It is distant eight parasangs from al-Anbār and is famous not only for its sanctuary, where ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Mubārek is buried, but also for its bitumen and naphtha springs.

APPENDIX XVIII

PIRISABORAS OR AL-ANBĀR

Al-Tabari, Ta’riḥ (De Goeje), Ser. 1, p. 748, derives the name al-Anbār from the storehouses erected in that town, which was also called al-Ahrā (The Granaries) on account of the provisions supplied from there to servants of the Persian kings.
The town of al-Anbār was built (ibid., Ser. 1, p. 889) by the order of Sapor I (241–272 A.D.), who gave it the name of Buzarg Sābur or Pērız Sābur.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XXIV, 2: 9–22, writes that the extensive and populous town of Pirisaboras lay as if on an island and was enclosed by a mighty double line of fortification walls. One night in the year 365 A.D. the Romans under Emperor Julian succeeded in breaking down a strong corner tower. This made the inhabitants leave the town and flee for safety to a castle built on a steep isolated hill washed by the Euphrates. The walls of this castle were made of bricks and bitumen. The besieged defended themselves heroically, but surrendered when promised that they would be allowed to depart freely. About 2500 left the castle, the rest saving themselves in small boats which took them to the other bank of the river. The magazines in the castle were full of food and arms. The Romans took what they wanted, burning the rest and the town also.

At the end of the fourth century of our era the hermit Mar Jūnān took up his abode in the then desolate environs of al-Anbār. After his death he was buried in the suburb of al-Anbār and above his grave a church and a few cells were built to mark the spot. However, one day the Redeemer revealed himself to the priest Mar 'Abdā, ordering him to say prayers at Mar Jūnān's grave and then to remove his body to the church at al-Anbār. This was accordingly done and Mar Jūnān was buried on the right of the altar not far from the font. (Chronicle of Saint [Seher], Patrologia orientalis, Vol. 5, p. 248.)

Jākšt, Mu'gām (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 2, p. 701, says that the monastery of Mar Jūnān was also called 'Omr Mar Jūnān. It was large, strongly fortified, and adjoined the main mosque.

Abu-l-Faḍā'il, Marāsid, (Juynboll), Vol. 1, p. 441, adds that this monastery was called Dejr al-Rūrāb and lay below al-Anbār. The Christians used to celebrate church festivals there and went there annually as if it were a pleasure resort.

Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis (Rome, 1719–1728), Vol. 3, pp. 198, 511, quoting 'Amr, writes that about 540 A.D. 'Abdalmasīh from al-Ḥira had a monastery of St. Jonas built near al-Anbār; this monastery, as well as that of St. Cyriac, was demolished in 852 during the reign of the Caliph al-Mutawakkel.

Al-Hārēt ibn 'Amr resided at al-Anbār. When he was attacked by al-Mundir, he fled before the latter to at-Tawiijje, where he was surprised by a mounted troop of the Tarleb, Bahra', and Ijād. He therefore sought safety in the territory of the Kalb tribe. (Imrulkajs, Diwān [De Slane], p. 4.)

Chosroes the Elder set out in 531 from Babylonia (Ctesiphon) to the desert near the settlement of Abaron (al-Anbār) five marches from the Roman frontier fort of Kyrkensian (Circesium), where he divided his army, sending one part commanded by Adormaanes along the Euphrates to the Roman territory and himself leading the other part to the river: Aboras (al-Hārēr), there to surprise the Romans who were besieging Daras. Adormaanes crossed the Euphrates, outflanked Circesium, and pillaged Syria. (Theophylactus Simocatta, Historiae, III, 10: 6–8.)

According to John of Epiphania, Fragmenta (Müller), p. 275, Adaormanæs crossed the Euphrates near Circesium.
Chosroes II fled at the end of 590 by way of the fortified settlements of Abbareon (al-Anbâr) and Anathon (‘Ana) to the fort of Kyrkension (Circesus). Halting by the tenth milestone from that place, he sent a supplication to the commander. (Theophylactus Simocatta, op. cit., IV, 10: 4f.)

Chosroes fled via Pêrôz Šâbûr and ‘Anât to Kirkesion, whence he asked the protection of the Emperor Maurice (Chronica minora [Guidi], p. 15; Nödeke, Syrische Chronik [1893], p. 6).

In 752 the Caliph Abu-l-‘Abbâs moved from al-Kûfâ to al-Anbâr, where he had a residence built for himself (Elijah of Nisibis, Opus chronologicum [Brooks], Part I, p. 173).

In 754 Abu-l-‘Abbâs died in his manor at al-Anbâr and was buried there (al-Ja’kûbi, Ta’rîh [Houtsma], Vol. 2, p. 434).

In 797 Harun ar-Rashid paid a visit to al-Anbâr and took up quarters in the town of Abu-l-‘Abbâs, about half a parasang from al-Anbâr. In this town there remained many of the inhabitants brought from Khorasan. (Ad-Dinawari, Abbâr [Guirgass], p. 386.)

Returning from a pilgrimage in 803, Harun ar-Rashid stayed for some time at al-Hîra, whence he took the “Road of the Desert” (Ţârik al-Barrijje) to a place in the administrative district of al-Anbâr called al-Hîruf. He quartered himself in the al-Omr monastery there, where he had his vizier Ga’far ibn Ja’hja murdered. (Al-Ja’kûbi, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 510.)

Aţ-‘Tabari, op. cit., Ser. 3, p. 678, records that Harun ar-Rashid traveled from al-Hîra by boat to al-Omr in the environs of al-Anbâr. — Al-Omr is the monastery of Mar Jûnân.

Al-Iṣṭaḥrî, Masâlîk (De Goeye), p. 77, calls al-Anbâr a rather small town east of the Euphrates. He says that there were some remains of buildings there which the Caliph Abu-l-‘Abbâs had restored when he settled in that place. The inhabitants were engaged in agriculture and the raising of palms and other trees. — These trees (ṣâgar) were poplars and willows, the wood of which they used in building boats, houses, and various implements. Both poplars and willows thrive especially well north-west of al-Anbâr.

Al-Muṣkaddasi, Abšan (De Goeye), p. 123, calls al-Anbâr a large town, where the Caliph al-Mansûr originally resided.

Al-Idrîsi, Taḵwîm (Jaubert’s transl.), Vol. 2, p. 144, writes that al-Anbâr is a small town thickly inhabited and with a market place, various workshops, and large vegetable gardens. There the Ḳâ canal, dug by the Moslems when they wanted to reach Bagdad by boat from the Euphrates, branched off that river.

On January 13, 1258, the Mongol leaders Bâjgu-nôjân and Sôngâk crossed the Tigris and marching by the ad-Dugebn road reached the Ḳâ canal, where they encamped. From here Sôngâk advanced as far as the neighborhood of al-Harbijje. The caliph’s commanders, whose camp was between Ba’kûba’ and Bâkisra’, now also crossed the Tigris and attacked Sôngâk nine parasangs from Bagdad in the vicinity of al-Anbâr, not far from Mansûr’s palace above Mezraka. Sôngâk then returned to al-Biĝerijje on the Dugebn. On January 17 the Mongol army suddenly threw itself on the Caliph’s regiments, which were defeated and crushed so thoroughly that only a few soldiers escaped to the towns of al-Hîlla and al-Kûfâ. (Rašid-daddîn, Gâme’ [Quatremère], pp. 278, 280.)
In 1262 the Tartar commander Kerbōka plundered al-Anbār and slew many of its inhabitants (al-Maqrizi, Sulūk [Quatremère’s transl.], Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 171).

Pērēz Sābūr, otherwise al-Anbār, was the seat of a bishop. Chabot, Synodicon (1902), p. 53, records that in 486 Bishop Mōše’ of Pērēz Sābūr participated in the Nestorian Synod. In 497 either Mōše’ or Šama’ was the bishop (ibid., pp. 62, 67).

In 544 one Šimʿūn was bishop at Pērēz Sābūr, a town of the Taṣja’i (ibid., pp. 70, 73; Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis [Rome, 1719—1728], Vol. 2, p. 413). — Taṣja’i is the name by which the Syriac authors called the early Arabs.

In 576 Bishop Marai is mentioned (Chabot, op. cit., p. 110).

In 605 Bishop Šimʿūn (ibid., p. 214).

In 719 Bishop Johannan (ibid., p. 603).

The Jacobites also had a bishop at al-Anbār. Michael the Syriac, Chronicle (Chabot), Vol. 4, p. 413, mentions in 629 the Jacobite Bishop Aḥa at Pērēz Sābūr and in the territory where Arabs (Taṣja’i) of the an-Namrijin tribe were camping.

According to the metropolitan Elias of Damascus, who, in the last decade of the ninth century, was transferred from Jerusalem to Damascus, the Nestorian katholikos was obeyed by the bishops of Kaškar, at-Ṭejarāhān, Dejr Herkal, al-Ḥira, al-Anbār, as-Sinn, and Okbura’ (Assemanus, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 458).


In 1028 a certain al-Mundir was bishop (ibid., p. 264).

Al-Anbār lies on the border line dividing Mesopotamia (al-Gezire) and Babylonia (al-Irāk, or Irak).

Ibn Hawkal, Masūlik (De Goeje), pp. 138, 155, 158, writes that the border line of Mesopotamia runs from al-Anbār to the town of Tekrit; farther north the borders are formed by the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. But even on the left of the Tigris and west of the Euphrates there are towns and villages considered a part of Mesopotamia, although lying beyond its borders. Mesopotamia proper consists of desolate regions and extensive salt marshes. From these salt is gathered by the inhabitants as well as from the plants al-ašān and al-keli (šānūn and kēlūn), the ashes of which are used in the manufacture of soap. The inhabitants of Mesopotamia belong to the Rabi’a and Mudar tribes. They breed horses, sheep, goats, and a few camels. They live for the most part in villages. In the middle of the tenth century there came to Mesopotamia various clans of the Kejs tribe, such as the Beni Kušēr, Oḵējil, Numejr, and Kīlāb, who drove the original population from their settlements and districts, such as Ḥarrān, Gisr Manbij, al-Ḥābūr, al-Ḥānūkā, ‘Arābān, Karkisija’, and ar-Raḥba.

Al-Iṣṭaḥri, Masūlik (De Goeje), pp. 71 f., 77, 87, bounds Mesopotamia on the west by the river Euphrates, which flows past Bālis, ar-Raḵkā, Karkisija’, ar-Raḥba, and al-Anbār. From here the boundary line runs to the town of Tekrit on the Tigris, whence it follows this river toward the north. West of Tekrit, as well as between it and al-Anbār, inhabited villages are sparse except for a distance of a few miles opposite Sāmarra'.
The rest of the district is nothing but a desert, where the Rabī‘a and Muṣṣar tribes camp.

Al-Kazwīnī, ‘Ağā‘ib (Wüstefeld), Vol. 2, p. 280, records that from north to south the borders of Irak extend from Mosul to ‘Abbadān and from east to west from al-Kādesijjė to Ḥelwān. — Thus, according to al-Kazwīnī, the eastern boundary of Mesopotamia is formed by a line running from Mosul to al-Kādesijjė.

Abu-l-Feda‘, Taḵwīm (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 273, understood by Mesopotamia the territory between the Tigris and Euphrates, together with the extensive regions to the west of the Euphrates, such as ar-Raḥba, etc., which properly belong to Syria. However, he adds that the more generally recognized boundary is formed by the channel of the Euphrates where it passes the towns of Bālīs, ar-Rakḵa, ʿIṣrāj, ar-Raḥba, Ḥit, and al-Anbār. From al-Anbār the boundary line runs to Tekrit on the Tigris and up this river past the towns of as-Sinn and al-Ḥadiṭa as far as Mosul.

Caetani, Annali (Milan, 1907), Vol. 2, p. 919, note 1, makes the northern boundary of Irak a straight line from Ḥit on the Euphrates to Tekrit on the Tigris. Though this agrees with the statements of some Arabic geographers, it is contrary to the statements of the classical authors and, moreover, has no relation to the physiographic configuration of the ground.

APPENDIX XIX

HAFFĀN OR AL-KĀJEM

The present al-Kājem on the settlers’ road from al-Kūfa to al-Baṣra is on the site of the ancient Ḥaffān.

According to Jāḵūt, Muṣṣam (Wüstefeld), Vol. 2, p. 456, Ḥaffān was a place near al-Kūfa, frequented by pilgrims and lying in a country still infested with lions. According to other authorities it lay above the settlement of al-Kādesijjė. Abu ‘Obejd as-Sakāni wrote that the spring of Ḥaffān flowed two or three miles beyond an-Nusūḥ near a hamlet owned by the son of ʿĪsā ibn Mūṣa al-Hāṣemi. Like an-Nusūḥ, Ḥaffān also lay on the border known as Ṭaff al-Ḥeḡāz, across which the road from Ḥaffān led to the town of Wāseṭ. As-Sukkari said that both Ḥaffān and Ḥafijjē were areas covered with brushwood, not far from the mosque of Sa‘d ibn Abī Waḵkās in the territory of al-Kūfa.

Like Jāḵūt, Abu-l-Faḍā‘l, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 359, describes the location of Ḥaffān but superficially, which makes it evident that this place by the time of these authorities had either already acquired a different name or was not known to them personally. As-Sukkari also shows but a superficial acquaintance with the region when he connects Ḥaffān with Ḥafijjē, locating them near the mosque of Sa‘d ibn Abī Waḵkās, which was actually situated on the Pilgrim Road south of al-Muṣṭa in a scorched desert where no brush is to be found. Ḥafijjē was evidently mistaken by
Jākūt for Ḥaffān, because it was Ḥafījje and not Ḥaffān that had to be traversed by the pilgrims whenever the road north of al-Ḳādesijje was inundated.

Of much importance to us are the statements of as-Sakūnī, especially where he defines the location of the settlement of an-Nusūḥ as being almost ten miles east of al-Ḳādesijje on a road to Ḥaffān (Jākūt, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 782). (The hamlet of an-Nusūḥ I identify with the Umm 'Asāfir ruins, fifteen kilometers southeast of al-Ḳādesijje.) From al-Ḳādesijje to Ḥaffān, therefore, according to as-Sakūnī was twelve or thirteen miles. East in this instance, however, means southeast. Both the location and distance in this case agree with the statement of Jahja ibn Majmūn, a native of al-Ḳādesijje (at-Ṭabarī, Taʾrīḥ [De Goeje], Ser. 3, p. 295). According to him Ibn Maʾkul, in 762 A. D., occupied al-Ḳādesijje in order to block the passage of the inhabitants of al-Ḳūfa who were seeking to go to the rebel Ibrāhīm at al-巴士ra. They were in the habit of going by way of al-Ḳādesijje and al-ʿOdejb to Wādi as-Sibāʾ and then, turning to the left, of reaching al-巴士ra through the desert. In this manner twelve men of al-Ḳūfa had come as far as the Wādi as-Sibāʾ, where a man from the settlement of Šerāf, two miles from Wāqiṣa, saw them and at once informed Ibn Maʾkul. The latter went in pursuit and came up with them at Ḥaffān, four parasangs from al-Ḳādesijje.

But there are also other records which oblige us to seek Ḥaffān southeast of al-Ḳādesijje and on the border of the desert.

Al-Masʿūdī, Tubīš (De Goeje), p. 380, states the distance from al-Ḳādesijje to Ḥaffān as six miles, but in so doing confuses this distance with that from al-Ḳādesijje to al-ʿOdejb. That Ḥaffān lies southeast of al-Ḳādesijje on the road to al-巴士ra is also shown by the fact that the Carmathian leader Abu Ṭāher marched from Ḥaffān in a northwesterly direction to al-Ḳādesijje, where he faced about in order to block the way of the pilgrims fleeing north. He then overtook the latter at al-ʿOdejb, at a distance of six miles (op. cit., pp. 380 f.).

Caetani, Annali (1907), Vol. 2, p. 921, note 6b, writes that al-Masʿūdī (loc. cit.) states that the road from Arabia to al-Ḵūfa led by way of Ḥaffān, in the neighborhood of which the princes of the Laḥm dynasty had the famous manors called al-Ḥawarnāk. (In this connection Caetani also refers to al-Ṭabarī, op. cit., Ser. 1, p. 551.) — The texts of neither al-Masʿūdī nor al-Ṭabarī support Caetani's conclusion in this regard.

In 906—907 Ḥaffān (Arib, Siṣa [De Goeje], p. 17) was traversed by a detachment of the caliph's army on its march to punish the lord of the Carmathians, Zikrwaḥ, who was trying to escape with the captured and robbed pilgrims from the station of Fejād by way of an-Nibāğ and Ḥufajjer abī Mūsā al-ʾArḫari to al-巴士ra.

Ibn al-ʾAtīr, Kāmil (Tornberg), Vol. 9, pp. 411 f., relates that in 1026 the Benī Ḥaḏgra pillaged al-Ǧāmīʿajn and the vicinity. The governor of this territory, Ibn Mazjed, overtook them at the desert fort of Ḥaffān. Dispersing them and taking a great deal of property from them, he laid siege to the fort, which he captured and demolished. He wanted to destroy the tower (kājem), built of bricks and lime, but relented when its owner, Rabiʿa ibn Mutāʾ, presented him with large gifts. This tower (al-kājem) is said to have been a landmark for ships in the time when the sea reached as far as an-Neqef.
All these statements show that the old Ḥaffān is to be sought at the present hamlet of al-Ḵājem.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Tuhfa (Defrémery and Sanguinetti), Vol. 2, p. 2, visited the place on his journey from an-Negef by way of al-Ḥawarnaḵ to al- Başra and calls it Kājem al-Wāṭeq. — It seems that the Caliph al-Wāṭeq (842–847 A.D.) had a mosque built there, of which there was standing in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa’s time only a minaret in the center of the demolished settlement. After this prominent spire both the settlement and the vigorous spring gushing out there were called al-Kājem, the old name Ḥaffān having disappeared altogether. This is confirmed by Abu-l-Faḍāʾil, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 382, who says that al-Kājem, a structure in Ḥaffān, gave its name to this settlement situated in the desert of al-Kūfa. It is also possible that the Caliph al-Wāṭeq built the mosque on the site of an old monastery and al-Kājem was a mere remnant of a Christian church or Persian watchtower.

Abu-l-Faḍāʾil, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 428, writes that Dejr Ḥenna is an old monastery in al-Hira opposite a very high minaret resembling a watchtower and that this tower is called al-Kājem. He adds that in his opinion the tower of al-Kājem is identical with the one called Kājem Ḥaffān.

Jāḵūt, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 684, quoting Abu-l-Faraḵ al-Iṣfahānī, says that the tower al-Kājem al-Aḵṣa’ resembles the tower of Esba’ Ḥaffān in the vicinity of al-Kūfa. Furthermore (ibid., Vol. 1, p. 291), Jāḵūt knew that Esba’ Ḥaffān was a large building near al-Kūfa, erected by the Persians to serve as a watchtower. This is repeated by Abu-l-Faḍāʾil, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 71.

Al-Bekri, Muʿjam (Wüstenfeld), p. 323, describes Ḥaffān as an area on the road leading to al-Jemāma, which was swampy, overgrown with brush, and full of lions. According to a poem of ‘Amr ibn Kulṭūm the Taʿlīb Arabs were said often to have camped between Ḥaffān and al-Odejb.

The poet al-Aḥṭal (Diwān [Salhani], p. 294), himself a Taʿlebi, used to camp at Ḥaffān. —

Al-Kājem lies on the southwest border of vast swamps where wild beasts of various kinds could easily have hidden. Furthermore, for a distance of fifty kilometers west of the Euphrates there is plenty of water, although of a brackish taste. In the numerous flats and vales of this lowland the farfa forms bushy clumps, above which rise wild palm trees with leaves luxuriant and almost black or else dry and dark gray. From their color these are called as-sumr (the black) by the natives. The undergrowth and the shallow pools could have afforded the wild animals shelter as well as water.

Jāḵūt, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 359, quotes from his informant al-Urani that from al-Baṣra to the ‘Ajn Ğamal is 30 miles, thence to the ‘Ajn Ṣajd 30 miles, thence to al-Aḥdār 30 miles, thence to Ukur 30 miles, thence to Salmān 20 miles, thence to La’la’ 20 miles, thence to Bāreḵ 20 miles, thence to Meşgēd Sa’d 40 miles, thence to al-Muřīṭa 30 miles, thence to al-Odejb 24 miles, thence to al-Kādesije 6 miles, and thence to al-Kūfa 45 miles. — From Salmān to al-Kūfa then, according to al-Urani, is 185 miles, or 314 kilometers; in reality it is about 160 kilometers. The different distances cited, therefore, are not worthy of consideration.
From al-Kâdesijje to al-Kûfa, according to al-Urani, is 45 miles, or 76 kilometers. In reality, it is only 30 kilometers, or 17 miles.

From al-Kâdesijje to al-'Odejb is 8 kilometers; according to al-Urani it is 6 miles, which might agree well enough if we were to count one and a half kilometers as equal to one mile.

From al-'Odejb ('Ajn as-Sejjed) to al-Muřîta is 36 kilometers; according to al-Urani it is 24 miles; this would agree, too, counting one and a half kilometer to a mile.

From al-Muřîta to Mesghed Sa'd is 40 miles according to al-Urani, although the distance from there to al-Msejğed, as the latter place is now called, would actually be only 23 miles.

The location of the station of Bârek is not known. Jâkût, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 463, makes Bârek a dividing point between al-Kâdesijje and al-Baṣra. However, I think that ħudd (well) is the proper spelling, not ḥadd (border, dividing point), for al-Kâdesijje has never been the center of a political administration and consequently Bârek could not divide two administrative districts. But on the other hand there was a road from al-Baṣra to al-Kâdesijje by way of the station of Bârek, and, since each desert station had a watering place, we may safely assume that this was represented at Bârek by a well (ḥudd).

From al-Msejğed to Salmân is sixty kilometers.

Ibn Baṭṭûta, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 1 f., journeyed from Meshed 'Ali by al-Ḥawarnaḵ to the station of Kâjem al-Wâṭek, a demolished settlement with a shrine, of which only the tower was left. From there he proceeded along the bank of the Euphrates through swampy, brush-covered land called al-'Idâr, in which the semi-fellâhin of the Maḏâdi clan were hiding; and then farther on to al-Baṣra. — The swampy stretch of al-'Idâr is at present known as al-Ḥâdarî; instead of Ḫâdar, Ḫâṣar should have been printed. The name of the Maḏâdi clan is identical with the name of the Maḏân clan, settled both on the right and left banks of the Euphrates.

APPENDIX XX

AHAWA, MASCHANA, AND MESCÎN

The position of Mesçîn is of great importance and explains why a settlement like as-Sumêjê subsequently arose and flourished here in the neighborhood of the ruins. At this point in ancient times as today two roads, one leading westward and one northward, branched off from the transport road following the right bank of the Tigris. The site of Mesçîn was and now is at an important crossing, and I see in it the Hebraic Ahawa and the classical Sceane, or Maschana.

Esdras (8:15, 21, 31) writes that he assembled the Jews, who were to return with him from Babylonia to Palestine, by a river flowing in the direction of Ahawa; there they stayed three days, fasting. — Apparently this river or canal flowing in the direction of Ahawa is to be sought on the borders of Babylonia proper, because the region which
the Jews had to cross beyond that point was said to have been very
dangerous. The word *ahawa* signifies a settlement consisting of tents,
the same as *skenes* or *maschna*. The Israelites could have returned to
their motherland either along the Euphrates or through central Mesopo-
tamia. The first route was shorter but far more difficult and dangerous
than the second. There was no corn ripe as yet in early April on the
Euphrates, and the Jews would therefore have found neither food for
themselves nor pasture for their animals. Moreover, the chiefs of the dif-
ferent settlements along the Euphrates, always more or less independent,
would undoubtedly have troubled them with their demands. The chiefs
from the surrounding country would not have hesitated to fall upon a
body of strangers not protected by Persian soldiery and who, as they
knew or at least imagined, had plenty of money and supplies.

Ezra himself (8: 31) points out the danger threatening him and his
people on their way home. Disliking, however, to ask the Persians for
military protection, he put his trust in God alone and then, most likely,
chose the longer but easier and safer route through central Mesopo-
tamia. This route led first along the right bank of the Tigris northward
nearly as far as the Mosul of today; then it turned west along the foot
of the northern mountain range and went through the region between the
desert and the settled country as far as the Euphrates, which it reached
at the ford of Thapsacus in the neighborhood of the present Bâlis ruins.
If Ezra chose this route, then his starting point must have been our
Mesâna, the classical Scenae and Hebraic Ahawa. The river flowing to-
wards Ahawa was the Dûqej canal of the Arabs.

Strabo, *Geography*, XVI, 1: 8, 26f., leads us to the same point.
According to him the neighbors of Babylonia, on the side of Adiabene
and Gordyaea, are the Scenitan Arabs (Skenites), whose camps are south
of the mountain range in that part of Mesopotamia which lacks water and
is therefore sterile. Between the Euphrates and the Tigris flows the so-
called Royal River and then the Aborras, which intersects the territory
of Anthemusia and that of the Scenitae, now (in Strabo's time) called
Maljil. Through their part of the desert a commercial road from Syria
leads to Seleucia and Babylon. The merchants cross the Euphrates at
Anthemusia, a place in Mesopotamia. Beyond the river, at a distance of
four *schoeni*, lie Bambye, also called Edessa and Hierapolis, where the
Syrian goddess Atargatis is worshiped. From the ford a road leads through
the desert as far as Scenae, a town of considerable size on the Babyloni-
nian border and built near an irrigation canal. The journey from the
Euphrates ford to Scenae takes twenty-five days. The merchants travel
on camels and have their roadside inns supplied with water usually kept
in cisterns but also brought from elsewhere. The Scenitae are friendly,
demanding only small payments; just on this account the merchants
avoid the river banks, preferring to go through the desert and thus to
leave the river almost three marches on their right. For the chiefs along
both sides of the river, in a region not very fertile though cultivated,
are independent of each other, and each demands a payment — seldom
a moderate one — when his domain is crossed. It is very difficult among
so many and such greedy people to introduce a common standard of
duties favorable to the merchants. The distance from Seleucia to Scenae
is eighteen *schoeni*. —
Strabo's statements are not sufficiently clear. According to him the Scenitan Arabs camped south of the mountain range in the southern part of Mesopotamia between the Euphrates and the Tigris, Babylonia adjoining them on the southeast. His Royal River was the Arabian Ballāh, or classical Balichus (see above, pp. 325 f.). His informant pronounced it Malichus and translated it by the word Royal. The Aborras was al-Ḫābūr. Anthemusia was not situated above the Euphrates ford but far to the east of it. Bambysce is not identical with Edessa. If the caravans marched from the ford to Scenae in a straight course, they would have been at a distance of three marches from the Euphrates at three places only. For a much longer time they would have traveled much nearer, sometimes no more than thirty kilometers from the river. In such places they might of course have been molested by the chiefs of the settlements along the stream and deprived of the advantages of the march through the desert. No account of a great transport route through the desert three marches northeast of the middle Euphrates has been preserved, but we know the route of the old transport road northeast of the Euphrates along the southern foot of the mountain range and along the dividing line between the desert and settled territory. In its eastern section this road turned towards the river at-Ṭartār, reaching the latter about where the al-Ḫāzr ruins are situated. From here one branch led east to the ancient town of Ashur, the present Kaʿat šerkāt and another through the valley of at-Ṭartār in a south-southeasterly direction. The latter, leaving the valley below the al-Žedma ruins and avoiding all rough ʿṣibān, turned east-southeast, leading finally to what are now the Mesčin ruins. In my opinion the commercial road mentioned by Strabo may be identified with this one, as only in this manner can the origin and the flourishing state of the town of Hatra (al-Ḫāzr) be explained. The different stations from al-Ḫāzr south-southeast are still visible, the surviving ruins being called beniye (building). From Seleucia to Mesčin is eighty-five kilometers, hence fourteen, not eighteen schoeni.

Asinius Quadratus mentions (Stephen of Byzantium, Ethnica [Meineke], p. 487), in connection with the war between the Emperor Septimius Severus and the Parthians, the town of Maschana, situated opposite the region of the Scenitan Arabs. — This agrees with the location of our Mesčin, since the Emperor Septimius Severus, having twice besieged the town of Hatra, could proceed from Mesčin along at-Ṭartār to al-Ḫazr.

Bēṭ Maškene’ as early as 224 A.D. was the residence of a Christian bishop (Chronicle of Arbela [Sachau’s transl.], p. 62).

Sometime after 422 the Persian king, Varhan, robbed the church of Kārvān in “MŠK” of its wonderful jewels, which the Roman king had sent by the Bishop Acacias to honor Varhan’s father, King Yezdegard (Hoffmann, Auszige [1880], pp. 40 f.; Braun, Persische Märtyrer [1915], p.165). —

The context shows that “MŠK” is identical with the older Bēṭ Maškene’ and the Arabic Maskin or Mesčin. The church of Kārvān was perhaps built by the merchants who imported and exported goods there by land and water.

Al-Ąhtal, Diwān (Salhani), p. 79, refers to Maskin.

Jākt, Muğam (Wüstenfeld), Vol. 4, p. 529, states that Maskin is a place near Awāna by the ad-Duğel canal near the monastery of al-Ġātuṭi. 
ABDU-l-FADā’IL, Marāṣid (Juynboll), Vol. 3, p. 98, adds that Maskin is the name of the tract where Awāna’ is situated and that it belongs to the administrative district of Duğejī. A settlement arose near the grave of Muṣāb, and the monastery of al-Gāṭuṭīk is not far away.

The ruin mounds of Uwāne and Şrīfīn or Esrīfīn are visible to the east of Mesēn.

Jāḵūt, op. cit., Vol. 3, p. 384, asserts that Şarīfūn is a large settlement overgrown with trees and near ‘Okbara’ and Awāna’ on the bank of the Duğejī canal. When a call goes out there for prayers, it can be heard in Awāna’ as well as in ‘Okbara’. In the space between these and Maskin, ‘Abdalmalek had an encounter with his opponent Muṣāb. — This is corrected by Abdu-l-Fadā’IL, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 154 ff., who says that Şarīfūn lies above the settlement of Awāna’ near the old channel of the Tigris called aš-Šuṭeja, and extends as far as the farms of Awāna’. ‘Okbara’ is opposite Awāna’ on the other bank of aš-Šuṭeja. The Duğejī canal lies at a considerable distance from it.

APPENDIX XXI

BIRTU AND TEKRĪT

The name Tekrit appears in the Babylonian chronicle preserved in the British Museum Tablet, No. 21,901, lines 16—22 (Gadd, Fall of Nineveh [1923], p. 38). In the year 615 B.C. Nabopolassar, king of Babylonia, attacked the city of Ashur (Kal’aṭ Şerqāṭ) but was compelled to flee down the right bank of the Tigris as far as the city of Takritaj. He made his army go up into the citadel (birtu) of Takritaj, where he was besieged. For ten days the king of Assyria made assaults on them, but did not capture the city and returned to his country. — As the citadel (birtu) was the strongest and most important part of the city of Tekrit, which was situated on two hills (therefore the dual form Takritaj is used), the city itself was called Birtu by the Assyrians (Limestone Tablet [Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions (1861—1884), Vol. 2, pl. 6]; Rost, Keilschrifttexte [1883], Vol. 1, p. 56; Schrader, Keilinschriftenliehe Bibliothek [1839—1900], Vol. 2, pp. 5, 11, 29). Ptolemy, Geography, V, 18: 9, who also knew of the town of Birtha at about the point where the Tekrit of today is situated, follows the Assyrian usage.

Ammianus Marcellinus, Rerum gestarum, XX, 7: 17, relates of Sapor II (309—379 A.D.) that, having already possessed himself of several smaller forts, he laid siege to the ancient fort of Virta, which according to common belief was built by Alexander of Macedon on the remotest frontier of Mesopotamia. It was walled in by mighty ramparts provided with towers and was very difficult of approach. Unable to capture the town by force or friendly offers and, having suffered heavier losses than he himself inflicted, Sapor finally withdrew from Virta without success.

Al-Ja’kūbī, Tarih (Houtsma), Vol. 1, p. 258, writes that the Ijād tribe emigrated from al-Jemāma to al-Ḥira, where it owned the mansors
of al-Ḥawarnaḵ, as-Sadir, and Bārek. Later they were established by Kisra' in the old town of Tekrit on the banks of the Euphrates. — The inhabitants of Tekrit (Takärte) were soon arabicized. This is easy to understand, as their town became the marketing center for the nomads between the middle Euphrates and Tigris after the decay of al-Ḥaẓr.

The inhabitants of Tekrit joined the Jacobites. Barhebraeus, Chron. eccles. (Abelens and Lamy), Vol. 2, cols. 67, 85, relates that Barṣawma, after his expulsion from Nisibis (449 A.D.), tried to convert them to Nestorianism, but without success.

Tekrit became the seat of the maphrian, or representative of the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, who administered the whole Jacobite East. Bishop Aḥūdemneh (559—575) built not far from Tekrit, at a transport road where there was no water, the monastery of Gaṭani (ibid., cols. 99, 101; Aḥūdemneh, History [Nau], p. 32). Assemanus, Bibliotheca orientalis (Rome, 1719—1728), Vol. 2, p. 414, speaks of two monasteries built by Bishop Aḥūdemneh at Gawika and 'Ajn Kena'.

The first maphrian in Tekrit was Marūta' (629 A.D.). At first only ten, but, soon after, twelve, bishoprics were subordinated to him (Michael the Syrian, Chronicle [Chabot], Vol. 4, p. 413; Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, col. 123; Elijah of Nisibis, Opus chronologicum [Brooks], Part 1, p. 127; Denha, History of Marūta' [Nau], p. 79).

The Moslems gained possession of Tekrit in 637. Al-Belāḏorī, op. cit., p. 333, narrates that both life and property were guaranteed to the inhabitants of the fort of Tekrit. They are said to have received a written agreement to that effect, but it was burnt during a hostile attack some time later. (At-Ṭabari, op. cit., Ser. 1, pp. 2474—2477.)

According to Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, cols. 123, 125, 131, the maphrian Marūta' (629—649) surrendered the fort of Tekrit to the Moslems. This maphrian built in the fort of Tekrit a cathedral church, where he was buried.

Barjesu (669—683) built in Tekrit the church of the holy martyrs Sergius and Bacchus; later it became the second cathedral church. Besides that he founded near Tekrit the monastery of Bēt 'Urba' (Assemanus, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 422, 429; Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, cols. 133, 143, 145). — Bēt 'Urba' may be identical with the present al-Arba'īn.

The maphrian Denha (after 684), desiring to be independent, consecrated bishops without the consent of the patriarch. On account of this he was deposed, incarcerated in a monastery, and not until the decease of the Patriarch Julian was he installed again. (Michael the Syrian, op. cit., Vol. 4, p. 448.) He built a new church of St. Aḥūdemneh, which was made the third cathedral church (Assemanus, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 490; Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, col. 147).

In 767 the Nestorians built for themselves a small church outside the ramparts but close to Tekrit and remained in it until the end of the thirteenth century (ibid., p. 157; Assemanus, op. cit., p. 432). In 817 the Jacobite patriarch, Cyriacus, died in Mosul. His body was brought in a boat to Tekrit and there buried in the great church of the fort. (Syriac Chronicle [Brooks], pp. 578 f.)

Ibn Roste, A'lāk (De Goeje), p. 106, says that Tekrit belongs to the administrative district of Mosul.
In 939 the Caliph ar-Rādī and the Turkish commander Başkam of Bagdad marched against Nāṣeraddowle, who was approaching Mosul. The caliph remained at Tekrit, while his army encountered Nāṣeraddowle near the settlement of Kūṭīji. (Elijah of Nisibis, *op. cit.*, Part I, p. 210.)

Mivām, *Tabīb* (De Goeje), p. 155, relates that both in Bagdad and Tekrit he often met the priest Abu Zakariyya’ Denja. In the church of al-Ḥādra’ in Tekrit he often discoursed with him on the Holy Trinity and other Christian teachings. — Abu Zakariyya’ was, under the name of Denja, *maphrian* from 912 to 932.

Mivām, *Mūrāj* (De Meynard and De Courteille), Vol. 2, p. 329, writes that most of the Jacobites live in Irak in the vicinity of Tekrit and that this town is also the residence of their bishop.

According to al-Iṣṭaḥri, *Masālik* (De Goeje), p. 77, Tekrit is a town on the west side of the Tigris. Christians comprise the great majority of the inhabitants.

Ibn Hawkal, *Masālik* (De Goeje), pp. 156, 168, states that Tekrit, the inhabitants of which are largely Christians, stands on a huge steep hill on the right bank of the Tigris. On the summit of this hill is a place called The Fort. It is a stronghold enclosed by stout walls built long ago. In the town there are a number of old churches and monasteries, erected soon after the death of Jesus and his disciples. They had not changed greatly, as they were solidly constructed of hard material. The largest church is that of al-Ḥādra’, built of gypsum, bricks, and stone. In 932 Ibn Ḥawkal saw below Tekrit the remains of a former bridge built of bricks.

Muḥammad, *Ahṣau* (De Goeje), pp. 115, 123, names among the towns belonging to the administrative district of Sāmarra’ the following: ‘Okbara’, Ajwāna’, Dimimma, al-Anbār, Hit, and Tekrit; from the last named, the story goes, much sesame and woolen cloth was exported. The Christians had a church there, to which they made pilgrimages.

As-Sabūṣi, *Diqārī* (Codex berolinensis), fol. 73v., describes the monastery of St. John close by Tekrit. It was a large inhabited edifice, and contained many rooms and monks. Pilgrims came to it from all parts. Among its possessions were fields, gardens, and vineyards. It is supposed to have been the property of the Nestorians, and the Melchite monk ‘Abdūn had a cell by its gate. ‘Abdūn lived there, and the monastery was named after him. Rooms for the guests were built extending sideways from the monastery. — As-Sabūṣi is not justified in calling ‘Abdūn a Melchite or in ascribing the monastery to the Nestorians.

Another monastery, al-‘Aǧğāq, according to as-Sabūṣi, *op. cit.*, fols. 133 r. f., lay between Tekrit and Hit. It was inhabited by many monks. Not far off bubbled out a spring filling a pond where threw black fish which were praised for their savory taste. The monastery was surrounded by field and vegetable gardens irrigated by the spring. — Perhaps the ruins near Kwārāt ‘Amur and the natural well of al-Fwāra, 35 kilometers northeast of Hit on the road to Tekrit, are the remains of this monastery.

THE MIDDLE EUFRATES

In 1017 the maphrían Ignatius, stealing the church utensils and ornaments, fled with them to Bagdad, where he became a Muslim (Elijah of Nisibis, op. cit., Part 1, pp. 226 f.; Barhebraeus, op. cit., Vol. 2, cols. 287, 289).

In 1089, in the time of the maphrían John (1075—1106), the governor of Tekrit had the church of St. Sergius and Bacchus on the upper hill demolished. The church of St. Aḥûdîmmeh was looted, the Christians dispersed, and the maphrían fled to Mosul. (Barhebraeus, op. cit., cols. 305, 309; Assemanus, op. cit., p. 448.)

The maphrían Dionysius (1112—1142) returned to Tekrit, collected the believers, and repaired the churches. He was buried in the church of St. George under the altar of Barṣawma, which he had built. (Barhebraeus, op. cit., cols. 317, 331; Assemanus, op. cit., p. 449.)

After 1153 the maphrían no longer resided in Tekrit. The number of Christians decreased, and the Moslems increased. (Barhebraeus, op. cit., col. 337.)

Al-Idrîsî, Nuzha (Jaubert's transl.), Vol. 2, pp. 147 f., records that Tekrit is in the administrative district of the political department of Mosul. It lies west of the Tigris opposite the town of al-Ḥâdr. A great part of the inhabitants of Tekrit are Christians. The houses are built of gypsum and bricks.

At the beginning of June, 1182, Tekrit was visited by the traveler Ibn Gubejr. He says (Rihlu [De Goeje], p. 232) that Tekrit is a large town with extensive suburbs, wide streets, much frequented markets, and many sanctuaries. Very numerous are the inhabitants, who excel in honesty, cheating nobody when selling by weight. The Tigris flows deep beneath Tekrit and above it rises a stout fort, the most important part of the town, which is protected by mighty bastions, already crumbling in many places. Tekrit is one of the towns formerly famous.

In 1218 the maphrían Ignatius visited Tekrit, the seat of his predecessors, in order to see the town which had been the capital of the Orient. Its inhabitants came out to meet him with great rejoicing, carrying gospels and crosses on their spears, and singing Syriac and Arabic hymns. This welcome incensed the Moslems to such a degree that they cast the maphrían into jail and fined the people of Tekrit twenty thousand gold pieces. The maphrían fled from Tekrit to al-Ḥâbûr (Karkešîja) and was later elected Jacobite patriarch. (Barhebraeus, op. cit., col. 389; Assemanus, op. cit., pp. 450 f.)

The maphrían Barhebraeus (op. cit., cols. 447) relates that he himself visited Tekrit in 1277. About 1365 the maphrían Athanase, traveling to Bagdad, approached Tekrit. The Christians came out to meet him, rejoicing greatly, and carried him into the town on the old maphrían seat. (Ibid. col. 527.)

Ibn Baṭṭûṭa, Tuḥfa (Defrémery and Sanguinetti), Vol. 2, p. 133, writes that the great town of Tekrit has large suburbs, fine markets, and many mosques. Its inhabitants are known for their good qualities. The huge fort stands on the bank of the Tigris. There are many ancient buildings in the town, which is enclosed by a wall.

Ad-Dimiški, Nuhba (Mehren), p. 190, remarks that Tekrit lies on a high hill west of the Euphrates. The river at-Tartûr, which originates in the river al-Hermâs and empties into the Tigris, flows by the town. — Tekrit is not situated west of the Euphrates, but on the right bank of
the Tigris. The river at-Tartār flows fifty kilometers west of Tekrit and never emptied into the Tigris.

Abu-l-Feda', *Taḥwīl* (Reinaud and De Slane), p. 289, states that Tekrit is one of the last towns in Mesopotamia in the direction of Irak. It lies west of the Tigris in the Mosul desert. The distance from there to Mosul is six days' march.

Abu-l-Faḍāʾil, *Marāṣid* (Juynboll), Vol. 1, p. 209, records that the correct name of the town is Tekrit. It is a famous settlement between Mosul and Bagdad, thirty parasangs from the latter and on the west bank of the Tigris, which washes one side of its stout fort.

Thevenot, *Voyages* (Amsterdam, 1727), Vol. 2, pp. 202 f., came to Tekrit, the sixth caravan station from Mosul. Twice he tried unsuccessfully to enter the town, but could not climb the steep rocks to the walls. Therefore he examined only the houses on the water front. They were stately enough, all being built of stone. He learned merely that once it was a great town, of which now nothing remained but ruins and an insignificant hamlet. The town stood on a high cliff, undoubtedly for protection against the spring floods of the Tigris.

Tavernier, *Les six voyages* (Paris, 1679), Vol. 1, p. 206, describes the town of Tegrit in Mesopotamia. There was a demolished fort there with only a few chambers intact. The river Tigris forms the moat of this town both on the north and east. On the west and south the steep declivity under the fort was lined with hewn stones. The Arabs related that in olden times it was the greatest fort in Mesopotamia, although two hills near by rise higher than it. The Christians lived about a quarter of a mile from the town, where the ruins of a church and a tower could still be seen, their extent showing that it must have been a building of great size.

Haghi Ḥalfa, *Gihān numa* (Constantinople, 1145 A.H.), p. 434, writes that the administrative district, or liwa (subdivision of a vilayet), of Tekrit forms the remotest boundary of Mesopotamia. The town of Tekrit, six days' march from Mosul, is situated on the right bank of the Tigris. The fort of this town, built by Sābur ibn Ardešir Bābek, was in ruins. Close by a naphtha spring bubbles out.
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'A. Abbreviation for 'Ain. See proper name
Aasehok, 53
Ab —. See main part of topographical proper name
Abat, 69
Abaron (al-Anbár), 354
Abábadán, 357
'Al-'Abábadí (f 11), 126
'Al-'Abbára, Tell (c 11), 130
Abbara (al-Anbár), 555
Abbas, hamlet of, 64
Abbasí, Bir (a 2–3), 88
Abás, Al-Bu (d 10), 54
'Al-'Abábs, Hân, 126. See also Zaír, Hân
Abbas, Sián as-Süajid, 44
Abábs, Sa'jed, 41
Abüssidas, 247, 316, 327
'Al-'Abbáni (b 2–4), 179
'Abba', Mar. priest of al-Anbár, 354
Abu, Tell (a 7), 57, 60
'Abdášir (b 3), 87
'Al-'Abdášir, clan of the Zúbar, 83
'Abdálas'íraz, range, 87, 88
'Abdálas'íz, Ma'alla, 1
'Abdálas'íz, al-Májirí, 83
'Abdálláh al-'Abáší, 91
'Abdálláh, Ka'b, 151
'Abdálláh, Aš-Šéjá, 152
'Abdálláh, son of 'Allí, 317
'Abdálláh ibn Ali, 73
'Abdálláh ibn 'Abáší, 74
'Abdálláh ibn al-Hassán, 115
'Abdálláh ibn Háfíz, 9
'Abdálláh ibn Hamdán, 103
'Abdálláh ibn al-Músabák, 352, 353
'Abdálláh ibn Muhammed al-Emin ibn ar-Ráisí, 174
'Abdálláh as-Semín, 88
'Abdálmilek ibn Morékán (685–705), 4, 42
Abéna, 26, 60, 82, 194, 295, 316, 326, 343
'Abdalnesib, Christian of Dejr as-Zor, 9
'Abdalnesib, of al-Hira (c. 540), 354
'Abdán (a 7–8), 87
'Abdárshán, Ch. Dejer, 83
'Abde, 161
'Abdich, 188
'Abdul-Hamíd II, (1856–1909), 36, 64, 124
'Abdülşâh Şüercili, 100
'Abdün, Meichtie monk, 365
'Al-'Abed, 83
'Abed, Abu, 1
'Al-'Abed, Khráb, 137
'Abed 'Awniyjálí, Abu (NA a 20), 39
'Abed abel 'Abbás, 126
'Abed chen 'Abezjí, 73
'Abédin, settlement of, 316
Abel, L., 14, 54, 219
Abhár, king of Edessa (1350), 328
Abi, Mar. monastery of, 325
Abí-Hasbá, Kašr, 103–105
'Al-'Abjáaz, Tell (f 11), 46, 244, 245
Al-'Abjáza, Żöll (e 10), 142
Ahora, 233, 257, 358, 358
Aboras, 354
Aborras, 325, 326, 333, 335, 361, 362
Abraham, bishop of Circusium, 335
Abraham, patriarch, 315
Abroenóas, general under Artaxerxes II, 214
Al-'Abásh (c 10), 58, 142
Abu. See main part of topographical proper name.
Abu-l-'Abbás as-Saffáh, 'Abdálláh ibn Muhammed (750–754), 104, 353, 355
Abu-l-'Abbás al-Kájém, See Abu-l-'Abbás as-Saffáh, 'Abdálláh ibn Muhammed
Abu 'Ali ibn Támár al-Hasfá (d. 1006–1009), 342
Abu 'Aliwán Tamál ibn Muhammed al-Kilábi, 342
Abu-l-Bazdaét, son of the Hamdanide lord of Mosul, Násraddawle, 341
Abú Ćemál, (NA d 13), 2, 9, 10, 12, 197, 212, 249, 250, 355, 343

387
Abu Fojájh, sanctuary in al-Amârâb, 152
Abu-l-Fojâjâ (NA f29), 122, 123, 150
Abu-l-Hassan al-Adîbi, 325
Abu-l-Hâshîb, Marzûq ibn Wârâqjâ, 105
Abu Hujafa, Isâbâh ibn Baqir, 104
Abu-l-Kâsim, vizier (d. 1038—1039), 582
Abu Kemâl (or Abu Cemâl), 2, 197
Abu Lejla ibn Badaklî, 308, 309, 312
Abu-l-Majâsîn, sepulchral mound (c10—11), 141
Abu Miûfâf, Lawâf ibn Jahîsâ, 284, 294
Abu 'Obejî ibn Mas'âd, 306
Abu 'Obejîh as-Sakânî, 119, 111, 357, 358
Abu 'Obejda ibn al-Gârâbî, 299, 301, 316
Abu Rûc (Abu Rûh, the ruling house of the Mu'awiya tribe), 549
Abu Şâmâ, the historian, 339, 371
Abu Şâmâ (al-Husayn ibn Zikrâwâjî Sâhîb as-Sâmâ), 10
Abu Şîrîr (f10), 104, 106, 152, 295
Abu Şîrîr, Darb, 197
Abu Şûqâkî, vizier (1083—1091), 347
Abu Tâhâr, Sulejmân ibn al-Husayn al-Karmâtî, 10, 104, 352, 358
Abu Târîb, 'Oddâtuddowle, Hamdanide lord of Mosul (968—979), 341, 342
Abu Zakariyâh (or al-Fadlîh) (son of Dumbân, mahfân, 912—932), 365
Abu Zejd. See 'Omân ibn Sâheb abu Zejd ar-Rawî
Aburas, 227, 229
Abydenus, 289—292, 265, 272, 273
'A'ârâsî (c67), 80, 173
'Acaduân, bishop (5th c.), 362
'Acephalians, heretics, 235
'Achâmenidîs, 319
'AcchâÂchânîs, 234, 239
'AcchâÂchânîs, 238
'Aeclinus Barbalissi, bishop, 316
'Afân (dence thorny bush with green leaves), 45, 46
Al-'Abî, 31
Adamah, Persian commander under Chosroes I, 334. See also Adharhmân, Adamah
Adad, god, 212
Adâdînri (1310—1280 B.C.), 34
Adâdînri IV (811—782 B.C.), 216
Al-'Adâsîn, Kaşr, 193
Adda, 225
'Addâm, 15
'Addûb, 225
Addor, 171
'Adel, Bağkam's cousin, 341
Adhimnâh, Persian commander (c. 580), 336
Adharhmân, Persian commander under Chosroes I, 131
Al-Ahchâm, 284, 286, 285
Alâbenc, 361
Al-'Adîjî, 140
Adilke Chaftân, 347
Adormân, Persian commander (c. 580), 336
Adormammân, Persian commander under Chosroes I, 334
Alaâddowle. Abu Şuqay'a, Buyide sultan of Baghdad (977—982), 342
Adum, 282
Aelopolis, 359
A'ejîle, 39
Aennus, 319, 320
Al-Adîgî, 186—188
Afghanistan, 131
Al-Afjâph (d7), 165
'Afrîn, 221
Al-Afrîjî (NA d45), 18
'Âfş (large bush with flexible branches and small leaves), 76
Al-Âfi, Umm (NA h20), 37
Al-AÎâl (c68), 182
Al-'Ajamîjih (d66), 170
Âqâpius of Hierapolis, 339, 371
Al-Akhrisbîjî (NA h18—20), 124
Agatharchides, 261
Al-Akhdâ (NA h20), 38
Al-'Aqâû, monastery, 365
Aghripes (or Oropas), 319
A'ârî, Al-Bu, 55
Al-'Aşîb, 107
'A'ârî, the poet, 83
Al-Azâma, 335
'Â'ûmi, Burs, 38
Aquars, 351, 373
Al-Azâwâd (d10), 52
Aba, Jacobite bishop of Pêros Sábbûr, 356
Al-Âhïfî, 359
Al-Âhâmî (c11), 151
Ahawa, 360
Al-'âbîjîm, Bir (d8), 62
Al-'Abejîm, Tell, 138
Al-'Abejîm, 116
Al-'Abejîm, Kaşr (NA h18—19), 36, 39, 116
Ahbab, 86, 295
Ahdad, As-Sa'jadî, 160
Ahdad abu Rûh, 338
Ahdad al-Bursân, 188
Ahdad al-Farakh (or 'Abd al-Dawla), 188
Ahdad ibn Mâleb ibn Tawîh al-Tarîbî, 341
Ahdad al-'Ibîs, 188
Ahdad al-Mustûn (882—886), 135, 136
Ahdad ibn 'Umm, 74
Ahdad-al-Hasîbûn, guidû, 56, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 70
Ahdad 'Umm, 128
Al-Ahrâ' (or al-Abâr), 353
Al-Ahrâb, 71
Al-'Abâs, 160
Al-Ahsht, 57, 60, 86, 191, 339, 346, 359, 362, 371
Ahûdeemmih, bishop of Tekrît (565—575, 364, 371
Ahûdeemmih, Church of St., 364, 366
Ahûs (or Aenas), 319, 320
'Ajîd (or 'Âjîd), Hâwi (NA a9), 95
'Ajîjâr, Rîzûm (as—6), 68
'Ajîlâ (NA b12), 182
'Ajîjâ, Umm, 13
'Ajîjî, Hâwi, 95. See also 'Âjîjî, Hâwi
'Ajun, See proper name
Al-'Ain (c8), 161
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'Ali oßen-Hasan, shrine of (g.12), 45
'Ali oßen-Hefel oßen-Norès, 9
'Ali oßen-Boûn, 74
'Ali oßen-Mehmed oßen-Norès, 74
'Ali oßen-Slimân oßen-Belek, 33
'Ali Hâlâ Tâ'ma, 47
'Ali oßen-Hîthî, 160
'Ali oßen-Hasîn, 8, 9. See also 'Ali, Abâ-Scîch
'Ali ibn Abî Tâleb, mosque of, 34; shrine of, 18
'Ali ibn Hâditâ, 318
'Ali ibn 'Ins, 351
'Ali ibn Sâmîl, 322
'Ali en-Nâgerî, 188
'Ali en-Ramsân, 83
'Ali en-Slémân en-Belek, 144
'Alliţ en-Mulghalîj, 8
'Allît en-Ranât (e.10), 50, 148
Al-'Ajej, 179
Al-'Akhâmî, 164
Al-'Akkam ibn Abûa Abûd al-Fâbî, 346, 371
Al-'Akmî, 245
Al-'Akmî, 156, 164, 241, 277, 278, 282
Al-'Akmî (NA 220), 45, 120, 122
Al-'Akmî, 279
Allàn, 229
Al-'âfâî (d.71), 64, 165
Al-'âfâmî, Zîîîb (e.1—5), 173
Alûmû, 124
Alp Arsîlân ibn Dâ'ud (1061—1072), 345
Alûs, 24, 347, 348
Alûs, 351
Alûs (NA d.16—17), 24, 25, 248, 254, 255
Allûn, 24, 154, 167, 245, 248, 258—258, 348
Alwân, Al-Bu, 144
Al-'Aznà (NA 108), 188
Alûzîkîtîtes, 281
Alûzîtîs (NA b.12 16), 25
Al-'Amârîjî, 168
Ambâz, Târîch (NA a.8), 191
Al-Ambarî (f.10), 154, 154, 152, 240, 262, 267, 268, 270, 298, 336, 355, 356
Al-Ambarî (f.11), 126, 127
Ambrose, bishop of Milan (d.397), 328, 371
Al-Amâdî (NA 120), 108
Al-Amâdîs (NA 119—20), 123
Al-'Amîr, 188
'Amr, Ra, 46
American Geographical Society of New York, Library of, xx
'Amîd, Fezût (NA e.14—15), 30
Al-'Amîr (e.8), 161
'Amîr ibn Jâser, 322
Al-'Amîrî, 15, 170
Amme-alâsh, king of Hindûsh, 14, 206, 205
Ammanus Marcellinus, 167, 174, 213, 231—232
Ammi-ball, Babylonian king of the first dynasty, 198
Ammu. See main part of topographical proper name
Amphipolis (or Tarmeda), 319
'Amîr ibn Kûtûm, 316, 318
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'Amr ibn Matta' (14th c.), 354
'Amr ibn al-Mundhir, 169
Al-'Amr (es), 163
Al-'Amri (NA i06), 23
Al-'Amrija' (NA i10—20), 124
Amrija', 285, 394
'Amrî, Al-Şeţî (es), 177
'Amrûb, monastery of, 328, 330
'Amûd as-Sabir, 188
Al-'Ana, 151
'Anâl al-'Attîh, 20
'Anâb (NA i20), 37
'Anîk (NA di7), 25, 163
Anzâr batîfname, 314, 372
Anastasius (491—518), 334
Anastat, 206, 208—209, 210, 211, 345
'Anât, 355
'Anâs, 24, 135, 161, 247, 247, 254, 255, 259, 391, 392, 325, 346—348, 351
'Anath, 345
Anathâ, 227, 229, 234, 238, 239, 288, 345
Anathôn (Âná), 355
Anatul, 217
Al-'Anbarî, 314
Al-Andana, 9
Ande, 223
Al-Andeche (es), 57
Anes, 319
'Anâz, 3, 107, 312
'Anâz, (es), 163
Angel of God, 338
'Anîjîfên, 72
'Anjâ (NA di4), 13
Anna (or Âná), 349
Al-'Anadzî (Fl0), 152
Annûkîs, 184
Antherumia, 325, 361, 392
Antilebanon, 312
Antioch, 219, 315; Jacobite patriarch of, 384
Antiochus III the Great (223—187 B.C.), 175, 314
Antiochus, dux of Euphratesia, 314
Antonine of Piacenza, 315, 325, 372
Antoninus, bishop of Barbalissus, 315
'Amâd, 172
'Antônîus al-Barbalis, bishop, 315
Anushirvan. See Chosroes I. Anushirwan
Al-'Anz (es), 60
Apadana, 82
Aphamea, 235
Aphphadana, 82
Apu, 210, 211
Apolloniatis, territory of, 266
Apolladana, 82
Arabian, 279, 280, 326, 372
Arab, 132; country in Iraq, 194; nomads, 347; tribe, 351; traders, 102
Arabâ, 341
Arabân, 385, 337, 356
Arabia, xii, 49, 130, 162, 167, 175, 192, 214, 219.
227, 277—278, 282, 285, 350—311, 313, 314, 356, 358
Arabia Deserta, xii, 7, 25, 59, 284, 357
Arabia Felix, 291, 285, 319
Arabian desert, 5, 9
Arabian history, 132
Arabian troops, 249
Arabic authors, xii, xiv, 60, 102, 134, 138, 197, 213, 316, 336, 346, 357
Arabic botanical terms, xiv
Arabic names, xiv
Arabic translation, xii, xiv, 3, 31, 34, 102, 111, 134, 276, 286, 397, 309, 316, 318, 321, 322, 324, 339, 349, 356, 361, 367; land of the, 282
Aradatu, 212
Arâji, Al- (be), 68
Arak (NA es), 2
Armen, 25
Arumâ, 295
Armenian peasants, 210
Armenians, 198, 199, 222
Armenitis, 25
'Arân, Tell (NA es), 318
'Arâšî, 221, 222
Araxes, 69, 214, 217, 221, 222, 226, 394
Al-'Arîsûn, 10, (es), 55, 56, 364
Arbate, 201, 204
'Arîji, 'Bbîb abî (es), 156
'Arîf (Musliy arzachi. Vel.: bushy subshrub
with white branches, small leaves, and heads of
scented yellow flowers), 148
Ariaceus, Persian commander under Cyrus the
Younger, 215, 224
Arîf, 10, 125, 286, 341, 358, 372
Arild, 14
Arik-dên-îlu, 198
Al-'Aris, 252, 323
Arslanbuls of Cassamria (c. 369—285 B.C.), 218, 282, 319, 320
Armakalen, 260, 261, 272, 273
Armecia, 55
Armenian Gates, 218; mountains, 218, 222
Armenians, 2
Al-Armab, 'Aja' (es), 58, 147; (NA es), 203, 311
Arrian, 91, 216, 265, 279, 280, 282, 319, 334, 345, 372
Al-'Arûs (es), 57, 91
Arsaces, commander of Sura, 234
Al-'Arîsî, 221
Arslân Pasha, 3
Ar'ta (Caliph Honorius Constant., L.: nearly leafless
shrub with scaled branches, clusters of small
flowers, and nut-shaped hairy fruit), 51
Artaxaeta, 328
Artaxerxes II Maecnus (404—358 B.C.), 213, 295, 261, 264
Artemis. temple of, 229, 333
Al-'Arûs, Kabîr (es), 54
Al-'Aṣî, 31
Al-'Aṣâba, 352
A'sâd, Mirzâ al-Şeţî (NA es), 19, 189
'Asîf, Al-Bû, 143, 144
'Asîfîr, Fâh abî (es), 11—11, 141
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Aσίφηρ, Ομμ (NA 120), 113, 358
A’-Ašāker (NA d15–14), 12
A’-Aštār (NA c17), 25
A’-Assāl (NA c17), 25
A’-Assāl (NA c15), 9, 136, 198, 204, 206, 211, 250
A’sāra, Tell, 9. See also A’-Aštār
Aṣbora, 235
A’-Ašeq (d10), 52–55, 137
A’-Assārīje (NA c17), 39
A’-Aštāh (f10), 49, 131, 225, 249, 269
Ashur, land of, 14; ruins of, 57, 200, 362, 363
A’-Aštī (NA c20), 115, 221
A’-Aštī (NA c18), 311
Asica, 329
A’-Aṣīd, Nuqţαt (f10–11), 126
A’-Aṣīd (c9–10), 116
Aṣīnūs Qanduras, 165, 167, 362, 372
A’-Aṣkrār (NA d16), 165
A’-Aṣbūr, Melib (d6–7), 59, 68, 79, 85
A’-Aṣmar (f11), 48, 126
Aṣmū, 208, 209
Aṣmūn, 356. See also Šmū
A’-Aṣrāb (a8), 57
A’-Aṣrāb, 188
Aṣsemanus, J., 36, 102, 324, 328, 342, 346, 353, 354, 358, 364, 366, 372
Asse, wild, 74, 156
Assuršammalpal, 472
Aṣūr-ibštā, 210, 211
Assur, 205, 207, 210, 234, 236, 266, 270–283, 285
Assyrians, borders, 335; empire, 34, 210, 240; names, xiv; period, 197; records, 86
Assyrians, 167, 198, 299, 211, 212, 273, 345, 363
A’-Aš, 58
Ašur, the god, 199
Ašûr-šammalpal, son of Shalmaneser III, 14
Ašûršammalpal III (884–859 B.C.), 14, 34, 86, 167, 174, 185, 293–298, 210, 211, 331, 353
A’-Aššā, Tell umm, 151
Aṣpi, 200, 201
A’-Aswāl (c8–9), 32, 157, 197, 198, 203, 212, 222–224, 240, 291
A’-Aswāl (c7–8), 164
Ašuršippa, Syrian goddess, 361; temple of, 231
Aštā (c9), 161, 239
A’-Aštībbo, 139
A’-Aṣūs, Ta’ar (NA c9), 96, 191
Athamanc, Assurban of Mosul, 366
Aṭṭījb ibn Ṣāleḫ ibn Mirūda al-Kilābi, 317, 342
A’-Aṭīḇ, 113, 111, 262, 285
Aṭīb, Abu-l (a22), 83
Atriplex leucocneda, Boiss. See Koyol
Aṭībān (NA h20), 39
Aṭṭāf (c11), 138
Aṭṭāfeh, Sabl (a88), 67
Augusta Enfractensis, 314, 325
Auran, 25
Aurantium, 25, 311
Austria, 131
Austria-Hungary, 132
Austrian, German, 139
Austro-Hungarian army, 131

Austro-Hungarian minister to Teheran, 131
Austro-Hungarian officer, 130
Austro-Hungarian representatives, 132
Avildus Cassius (d. 175), 323
A’-Awāq (c10), 156
A’-Awaq (d–c9), 62, 131
A’-Awāq, Ra’dīr (NA f15), 30
A’-Awāeq, 252
Awāna, 135, 136, 138, 139, 270, 352, 362, 363
A’-Awaqāl, Umma (NA c31), 116
A’-Awaq, Umma (c29), 117
A’-Awaqāt, 140
A’-Awīr (a8), 161, 239
Awāl Muslim, sanctuary of (a11), 43
Awāl Raḥīl, 41
A’-Amn, Al-Imām (NA g19–20), 43
A’-Awāṣeq (Lyceum arabicum, Schw.; diese thorn-ny shrub with sweet reddish berries), 22, 91
A’-Awāṣeq, Abu, 141
A’-Awaṣeqīje (d6–9), 58
A’-Awaṣeqīje (NA d15–16), 21, 31
A’-Awād, 122
Axos, 225
A’-Aṣ, Ummm (c8–7), 69
Aṣīgābeh (al-Āṣīgābeh, Abu-ṣ-Ṣājīdbā), 291
Aṣḥām, Abu (c10), 51, 141; (f11), 134
A’-Aṣḥāmījī (d8), 57
A’-Aṣhār, 74
A’-Aṣṣāra ebn Ǧindil, 107
A’-Aṣṣārāb (d9), 57
A’-Aṣṣārāb, Bilād umm (c10), 151
A’-Aṣṣārābī, 189
A’-Aṣṣārābād, 206–209
A’-Aṣṭā (a5), 68
A’-Aṣṭā (a5), 68
A’-Aṣṭāl, Bahādal (d11), 201
A’-Aṣṭāl, Bahādal (NA f18), 33
A’-Aṣṭāl, (f10), 125, 224
Aṣān, 15
A’-Aṣsār, Ṣāfār (f9), 126, 269
A’-Aṣsār, (f9), 127
Bā Dūrā’, 127
Baalbek, 347
Bairstow, 277
Bab, 282
Babil (c11), 38, 42, 45, 244, 246, 256, 259, 275, 276, 278, 288
Babylonians, 198, 297, 213, 265, 281
Bačěš, Nahr (f11), 48
Bächus, St. (end of the third c.), 314, 315, 325; church of St. Sergius and in Tekrit, 384, 386
Bacco, St., 315
Badaksha, 295–296
Al-BAŠĪf, Ĥān (c11), 44
Bâdirajna', 127, 136, 271, 352
Al-Bâq (NA f20), 122
Bîqamâtà', 137
Bagdad (Báypâd, f11—12), 2, 3, 15, 24, 36, 35, 36, 38, 45, 47—50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 69, 72, 100, 101, 118—120, 125—146, 148, 150, 153, 162, 225, 242—248, 254—256, 269—272, 274, 276, 286, 296, 308, 341, 344, 346—349, 352, 355, 364, 366, 367; bridge, 135; gate, 198; territory, 110; townsmen, 46; troops, 125
Bâgûra', 355
Bağûm, emir al-\-sha'ara\‘a' (d. 941), 341, 365
Baha'uddin ibn abu-Sahhrâzûrî, 322
Baha’uddâwâlî ibn 'Abdallâhî, Abu Naṣr, emir al-\-sha'ara\‘a' (d. 1012), 342
Baha‘uddowîc Tarwân ibn Wuheîb al-‘Oqlî, 352, 353
Bâhûçâns, 139
Bâhûçânsâ, 136, 137, 139
Al-Bahânas (e4), 10, 173, 174, 294, 296
Baḥât Sherb, 145
Al-Baḥbît (b2), 57
Baḥîjî (NA d16), 23
Al-Bâhira (e4), 174
Al-Bâhira, fields, 108: road, 107, 108
Bahen, tribu, 304, 311, 354
Baḥrân, 164
Baḥrât ummuss-Sâhî, See Sâhî, Ummu-S-Abâbîrân, 362
Bâdût-nûjulan, Muqoll leader, 355
Bâdût (f11), 48
Al-Bâdût (a3), 87
Bâlîan Pasis, 221
Bâjtûr, Nahr, 158: district of, 352
Bâla, 212
Al-Bâla (a3), 187
Al-Bâkâr (e9), 34
Al-Bâkara, 'Ajn (e10—11), 148
Al-Bâkî (e9), 31, 169, 169, 212, 352
Al-Bâkîa, 169; (a3), 83
Bâkîn, canal, 169: district, 169; settlement, 212, 352
Al-Bâkîquir, clan of the Alâûsî, 186, 187: clan of the Əbûr, 85
Bâkîr (e10), 148
Bâkîr, Tell, 57
Bâkîla (e11), 149
Bâkîla's, 355
Bâkîusajtâ, 306
Al-Balad (e11), 139
Balâs, 314, 318, 320
Balilchus, 325—327, 362
Al-Balîlî (a4), 91, 185, 199, 269, 210, 218, 321, 329, 331, 335, 336, 346, 362
Bâlî, 318
Balûs (NA a9), 95, 153, 154, 189, 190, 192, 193, 197, 199, 206, 209, 211, 218, 255, 314, 316—318, 322—325, 348, 356, 357, 361
Balûsos, 320
Bambyce (Hierapolis), 229, 361, 362
Al-Banûsâîrê, 161, See also Al-Manîsîr
Al-Banût, 89; 56, 57, 137
Banût abu Hrêna (NA a9), 36, 192, 222, 232
Banût al-Hassan (NA e16:24): (e11), 49, 149—151
Banût al-Muhallâbât (e9), 158
Bânûkînîa', 289—291, 296, 298, 306
Banûn (Na e17—18), 28, 32, 33, 139
Bâqusîyâthî, 306
Barâbîd, Abu (e3—6), 76, 170
Baradân, 310, 311
Al-Baradân, 134, 135, 137—139
Barakkî, Abu-l-10
Barâdîn, 73
Barakkâm'â, 56
Al-Barakkî (e10), 51, 142
Baraxmâlech, 324, 329
Al-Barbalis, 315
Barbalisso, 314, 325
Barbalissos, 220, 264, 314—316, 320, 321, 325, 329
Barbian borderland, 327: troops, 215
Barbarians, 214, 216
Barbarisso, 315
Barbarissos, 314, 324
Barbisamâna, 275, 276
Barésit 1'mûkîl, 133
Barêc as-Sitt Zobchîlî. See Zobchîlî, Barêc as-Sitt
Al-Barâdîlî (NA e16—17), 3, 25
Al-Barêc (NA d16), 23
Barêc, 109, 359, 360, 364
Barbarraeius, Gregorius, naphtrian of Mosul, 37, 318, 325, 328—331, 334, 337, 342, 345, 364, 372
Bar-U'dîta, Mar, 346
Barjasu, naphtrian of Towri (666—683), 364
Barjefa, 164
Barjikârî, ibn Malchâshî, sultan of Irak (1062—1104), 132
Barmaîlâ, 37
Barâkî, Eben, 36, 105, 106, 116
Al-Barû, K. (NA 117), 107
Al-Barût (b3), 90
Al-Baruski, family, 343
Barçawma, Jacobite archimandrite, 366
Barçawma, Nestorian bishop of Nisibis, 364
Barispa, 277, 278
Barüd (e11), 137
Al-Barüd (NA f19), 34
Barusma', 275, 376, 288, 289, 306
Al-Barûd (e4—5), 172, 173
Barûs, Tell, 348
Basílicos Potames, 275
Basílicos, river, 325
Basílicos Potames, 256, 249
Basílicos Dioksa, 272
Basîr, See also Dejr Basîr
Basma', 306
Al-Bâstîjêb, 275
Al-Bâstîjêb, Kôr (NA d15), 18
Al-Bâstîwîjî (e11), 149
Al-Bâtêmêjîc, 347
Al-Batbûs, 154
Batjê, Abu, 129
Batj Dâmnân, 257
Batna, 315
Al-Batûn, Umun (NA 129), 117
Al-Battà (e11), 45, 275, 276
Al-Bâtûn, clan of the Zobchîlî, 48, 150
Al-Bâtûnî, 325, 372
Batîlîba, Kâr abu, 69
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Al-Buṣ, Hān (111), 46, 247
Al-Bība (NA d13), 11, 12
Al-Bīsj, 73, 74
Al-Bītbī, 41
Al-Bītbīt, 26
Bīsehī, 41
Biechová, Anna, xv
Al-Bnowjāt, Tell (b4), 82
Boat sailing up stream, 2
Boats, building, 27
Biblos, 146, 156, See also Hoss, Abu
Bollandus, J., 314, 324, 372
Bombay, 131, 132
Al-Bondāri, 279, 372
Borros, 8
Al-Bostāmatcha, 25
Al-Bowshāni (NA g20), 43, 129, 121
Braddā (NA f18), 311
Al-Brāhi (33), 179
Braun, Oskar, 362, 373
Brāz, Hör (NA g20), 39
Al-Bīblītīj (NA d12), 182
British India mail, 2, 3
Brook of Egypt, 34
Al-Bruṣī (eb), 163
Al-Buṣīj, 28
Al-Busajra (d63), 3, 6, 73, 82, 176, 178—180, 198, 257, 258, 354
Al-Buṣīj (d19), 58
Būṭān and-Demtn, 89
Al-Bītān (NA d16), 23, 164
Bu. See main part of proper name
Al-Bīhūjī, 171
Budge, E. A. W., 346, 373
Budge, E. A. W. and L. King, 14, 34, 86, 167, 174, 185, 198, 199, 205—207, 209, 210, 331, 351, 353, 376
Al-Bufālī, 38
[333, 378]
Al-Buḥt, 111
Bull (NA a9), 93, 185
Al-Būnījīc, 169
Bura, 289
Burckhardt, 18
Al-Burraq (d6—9), 62, 67, 71, 74
Burs, 38
Al-Burs, 38
Burst, 290
Russbuhra ibn Ṣalūba, 298—291
Buṣra’, 135
Bustān al-Balā, 318
Al-Baṣṣīṭī (NA d14—17), 23, 25
Baṣṭān al-Ḥum (NA b19—20), 119
Burquq, 316
Buṣūrg Ṣāhrūr, 138, 139, 354
Bwe’, Al, 40
Al-Bwajī (eb), 68
Bwēnec, Ḥazm ibn (eb), 68
Byzantine empire, 301, 336
Byzantine, 257, 313, 316, 328
Al-But (f11), 48
Al-Bbēb (NA g29), 123
A-Sạlībī (eb), 174, 175, 294, 239, 238, 338
Al-Cūb (a—b), 68
Casaurian (or Kāserīn), 315, 321
Casazini, L., 284—287, 288, 290, 292—294, 296—299, 302, 303, 305—312, 357, 538, 373
Cāf as-Swēlom, 78
Cābū, Abu (c10—11), 50, 150
Cauicatta, 132
Calendula egyptina, Desf. See Šērā
Calendula microstachya, Boiss. See Šērā
Calligonum comosum, L. See Armū
Callinicum, castrum, 328
Calouzehār, 95
Calonico, 315, 328
Camel, Al-Bu’, 78
Capersana, 320
Capersanam, 320
Capparissa spinosa, L. See Šēfalleh
Carachem, 199, 319
Careis, Hellenic settlement, 334, 335
Carmathians, 16, 104, 160, 297, 341, 351, 352, 358
Carra (or Harrān), 315
Carraque, 220, 235, 315, 316, 327
Cartographic (formerly, Military Geographical) Institute, Vienna, 183
Cassius Dio, 388, 397, 373, 374
Catholics, Armenian, 2; Syrian, 2
Caves, artificial, 95
Cawāṣ (NA e12), 552, 257, 291
Cebon ibn Ġarrāh, 74
Al-Čebīr, 165
Al-Čehrī, 184, 186
Čedā, 127
Al-Čehī, 170
Čeff ‘All (c11), 137, 138
Al-Čeṭef (NA d15), 18
Čenāl, Al-Bu, 9, 10, 75, 74
Cerclusium, 235, 335, 338
Cerd, Abu (b4), 68
Al-Čerīm (c19), 56
Al-Čerīm, Bīr (e10), 56
Čerlājūk (NA e11), 184
Čeff al-Morr, 18
Al-Čelīc (d7), 165
Chahoros, 60, 221, 284, 354, 340
Chabot, J. B., 162, 356, 373
Chaṭṭ al-Bīṣa (eb), 158
Chaṭṭ al-Ḥajī (eb), 57
Chaledon, fourth oecumenical council in 451, 324, 328, 333, 335
Chaleis, 220, 233, 238, 315, 345
Chaldean records, 212
Chalas, 24, 220, 231
Chalybonitis, 314
Chān assad, 247
Charles University, Prague. Library of, xv
Chararea, 214, 225
Chiba, Hābīb K., 41, 373
China, 257
Choories I, Anushirwan (531—578), 315, 324, 328, 332, 347, 348, 351, 354
Choories II, Porzvs (668—682), 356, 346, 355
Christian bishop at Rāt Nikator (Kutrubbul), 135
Christian cemetery in Baghdad, 129
Christian, former = inhabitants of Kutrubbul, 135; former = monasteries, at all-Maṣḥad al-
Čebīr, 18; at ar-Rabba, 342
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christians, 2, 6, 9, 103, 104, 299, 316, 347, 327, 328, 364, 365–367; dead in Baghdad, 129; Syrian, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicles minora</em>, 324, 355, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicle of Arbelo</em>, 135, 362, 372, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicle of Eddesa</em>, 324, 328, 373, 374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicle of Sartet</em>, 138, 354, 373, 381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles, Books of, 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicon paschale</em>, 326, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambano, 229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cifri (NA e20), 37, 243, 244, 246, 276, 277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circium, 357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circium, preparation for, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čiswán (ci80), 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Chisbú (NA 120), 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearchus, 215, 218, 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cîeb, Al-Ru, 31, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clystarchus, historian (contemporary of Alexander the Great), 261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Cümalîjî, Nahr (NA e19), 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach stations, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Chébôb, 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochê, 229, 241, 242, 263, 278, 345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Codex Justinianus</em>, 328, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Codex Scevitelli</em>, CAM, Soc 'Asassal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University, New York Library of, 1xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commagene, 285, 318, 331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial caravan, 15, 24, 25, 72, 76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinina, town in Osroêne, 315, 324, 325, 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine, a Byzantine, 324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine, archimandrite, 334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine, town in Osroêne, 324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantineople, 71, 129, 130, 308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius, Roman emperor (324–361), 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corpus inscriptionum graecarum</em>, 278, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum</em>, 14, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosotto, 214, 221–223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cows, hump-backed, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crassus (115–54 B.C.), 319, 327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crusader, murderer of 'Imâddîddîn Atâbez Zenkî, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crussader, 317, 322, 348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctesias of Cnidos (c. 367 B.C.), 361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctesiphon, 232, 236, 247, 241, 242, 278, 296, 329, 354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracena, 217, 223–225, 261, 264, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus, 215, 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril, Jacobite patriarch, 339, 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril, monastery of St., 354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyriacus of Amid, bishop, 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus, Mar, monastery of, 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus I (658–538 B.C.), 263–265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus the Younger, 213–217, 222–224, 261, 267, 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâebâlî (NA e20), 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâam, Kaşr (NA 120), 108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabbâ, 321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabba ibn Muhammad al-Asadâ, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabbûd ibn Yâhûb, 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâble, 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dačêt ad-Derhem (45), 171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daecra, 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daţâbe, 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâebâlî (NA e20), 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daffâr (f10), 125, 224, 225, 240, 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dağan, god, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dahab, Ibn (NA e19–20), 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahab, Nahr (NA e6), 3, 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahab, Tell (f11), 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dahabi, 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahana, 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâhabîrî (e6), 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâherî, Hallî, 95, 252, 257, 344, 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dajâshî, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâkîr, Tell unnam. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâkîr, 259, 356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daţâkûr (a2), 187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dalâtâbî, 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâlîja, 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dalâlija, 4, 10, 153, 171, 249, 250, 252–255, 346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâlijet ibn Tôwîk, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâlijet Mâleâ ibn Tôwîk, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâmûn, Mîr (f11), 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâ-Dâm, Nahr, 291, 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmûd, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmûn, 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damâr, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmbûk, Tell (b-85–4), 177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dânamus, bishop of Callinicus, 328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâmûk ibn 'Ali, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dânašîlîje, 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel, bishop of Birtha, 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâr 'Awn, 193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Darâfî, 249, 254, 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darûg, Abu (e11), 140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darûg, 'Abî abû (e8), 58, 63, 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Darâlîjîje, 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Darâlîkîje (NA b11), 301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daras, 354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darb, see proper name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darî, 221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darîs, 214, 221, 264, 320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dârvî, 248, 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâruje (NA 120–21), 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Hyystapes (522–886), 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâzârî (f11), 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dašket, Nâjîje (e9), 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dašket ar-Rûbîn (e9–10), 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dât 'Erîk, 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dâtûdî (f11), 127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâsura, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâsurasor, 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David, bishop of Circium, 335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dawâqî, 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad-Dawâmi, 249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawraštî, 249, 255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawân (e4), 3, 50, 82, 178, 179, 294, 221, 222, 333–340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawrîn, district of, 338–349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dâwîs eber-Addâlî, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawar, servant of an-No'mân ibn al-Mundir, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dawlar, Ka‘af, 323
Dawariji, 95
Ad-Dawwara, 26–28
Ad-Dawwās (g11; NA g20), 120–122
Ad-Dineqā, 248, 249, 254–256
Ad-Dhibbājjan, Tell, 129
Ad-Dibārījī (h8), 57
Ad-Dībor (NA c12), 185
Dede, family of Kerbela, 40
De Goeje, M. J., 254, 373
Ad-Dheemijīje (NA i23), 116
Dejer, 3
Ad-Dejr (br), III, 1–3, 181, 254, 257: (d5—6), 170: (d7), 165: (e11), 129. See also Dejr als-Zor
Ad-Dejr, Hawīt, 165
Dejr el-A‘war, 41
Dejr Basīr, 3
Dejr Beni Hind, 104. See also Hind, monastery of
Dejr al-Ghātālī, 330
Dejr al-Genzākūm, 41, 42, 125
Dejr Hāfīr, 318
Dejr Kaftam, 174
Dejr Henna, 259
Dejr Herkūl, 356
Dejr al-Kūjām, 15
Dejr Kūrma, 41, 42
Dejr Lusha, 170
Dejr Lushama, 170
Dejr Nu‘mār, 340
Dejr Rabāb, 3, 331
Dejr as-Rumānān, 5, 254
Dejr al-Rurāb, 254
Dejr as-Sā‘ār, 1
Dejr as-Sawāwine, 175
Dejr as-Zur (br), I–5, 5,9,11, 84–86, 88,176, 180, 181, 209, 310. See also Ad-Dejr (br)
Dequl, 283
Ad-Deqūgū (dt), 62, 143
Didadorte, L., 104, 374
Demin (ta), 91
Ad-Demim, clan of al-Bu Čenāk, 74; huts of, 11, 174: (e5), 80
Ad-Demin, Tār (dt–e5), 80, 81
Denba, maphriān of Tekrit (d. 660), 329, 364, 374, 379
Dēnba, maphriān of Tekrit (after 684), 361
Denba, Abu Zakariji‘a, maphriān of Tekrit (912–932), 365
Ad-De‘ér, 3
Ad-De‘ér, Ba‘an (f11), 46, 244, 254, 272
Dër Basīr, 3
Ad-Der‘ā (NA c17), 25
Ad-Der‘ē (dt), 171
Dervštānīje, 159
Ad-Dor‘ījīje, 95
Dorqīj, Kām‘ūt, 119
Desem (NA c20), 163, 117
Ad-Dōhše (ta), 68, 85
De Tahy, Austro-Hungarian consul, 128, 129, 131, 132
De Vogguè, Melchior, 278, 374
Dīaur, 254, 259, 350
Dinkūr, 259
Dīb aš-Sejāh, 106
Dībān (b3–4), 178
Ad-Dibāhījījī, 25
Dībīs, Hūr abu (NA g19), 42
Ad-Dībiṣ (NA a8), 192, 193, 316
Ad-Dibāhījī (e8), 57, 67
Ad-Dīlī (NA b10), 2
Ad-Dīfe, 168
Dīgel, 233
Dīgīl, 233
Dīhne, Hūr (f11), 48
Ad-Dījhān, 74
Dījhān, Ab-Bu, 145, 144
Ad-Dījābī, Umm (a7), 67
Ad-Dījābījāt (f16), 152
Dījāh, 226, 265
Dījār Beni Marīm, 104
Dījārūt al-A‘ṣāfīf, 103, 106. See also Monasteries of the Bishops
Dīkār, Abu (b6), 75, 76
Dim‘ārīne, 351
Dimimēma, 125, 270, 271, 365
Ad-Dīmīṣkī, 13, 318, 331, 357, 344, 386, 374
Ad-Dīnawārī, 302, 304, 321, 355, 374
Ad-Dīnawī (NA d3a), 18, 170, 205, 267, 269
Dioecletian (284–305), 233, 332, 355
Diodorus Siculus, 269–282, 265, 374
Dionysius, maphriān of Tekrit (1112–1142), 366
Dionysios, patriarch of Tell Mahre‘, 347
Dionysius of Tell Mahre‘, See: Pseudo-Dionysius
Ditch of Semiramis, 228, 229
Ad-Dīwānījīje, 280
Dīkār, Abu (d8), 165: (c9), 157
Dīkār, Bīr abu (b6), 57
Ad-Dīla, 188
Ad-Dīlātāt, 161
Ad-Dīlqānījīje (ad), 85
Ad-Dīqām (d8–g9; NA 15–16), 18, 21, 22, 27, 29, 33, 49, 61, 71, 72, 75, 143, 144, 147, 149, 152
Ad-Dīqām (ad), 155, 162
Dikmī, 66, 69: camp, 142
Ad-Dīlī, 26
Ad-Dīni, Kār ummn (b7–9), 62
Ad-Dīni, Umm, 63
Dīl, Umm (c9), 145
Ad-Dīmām (d7–8), 162, 164
Ad-Dūrmje (b4–5), 81
Documentum ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas, 334, 374
Domes, hollow gypsum, 61, 65, 66, 81
Dōr, Imlān, 54
Ad-Dōrā (f11), 127
Dūrak (NA c20), 115
Dowār, 164
Dowāt, Umm (NA c20), 115
Drujā ab-Wakīl, 165
Ad-Drujājī (d10), 58
Ad-Drujāje, ‘Aklāt (c9–11), 141
Drujem cebn Barrāţ, 36, 99–102, 119: brother of, 107
Ad-Drejjarī (e5), 171
Droyesen, J. G., 327, 374
Du al-Kifīl, 37
Du al-Kifīl, 37
Du Šībah, 191
Dubjeje ibn Seifuddowle sæhašen ibn Mandarin, 353
Ad-Dūrujī (e11), 140, 260, 271, 283, 362: read, 355
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Edessa, 363, 361
Al-Kufel, 169
Al-'Ezîle (a5—6), 68
Edru(180,176),(274,190)(274,176),(328,190)(328,176),(371,190)(371,176),(414,190)(414,176),(457,190)(457,176),(500,190)

Al-Eṣfahān (d10), 52, 54, 140, 365
Estûma, monastery of, 330

Euphrates, province, 315, 327, 331
Euphrates, xili, 1—7, 9—15, 17, 19, 22—26, 28,
30—32, 34, 36—39, 41—44, 48, 49, 60, 62, 64,
65, 67—70, 71—75, 77—79, 80, 82—84, 86, 88—91,
93—95, 99—102, 104—110, 112, 116, 118, 120,
122—126, 128—130, 134—137, 142, 147, 150—154,
156—171, 173—180, 184—192, 197—304, 306—314,
316—324, 324—327, 329—332, 324—363, 364—383,
386, 389—391, 393—397, 399—407, 399, 311—337,
339—346, 348—357, 359—362, 364, 366
Europus (as-Ġa-Ṭâb), 174, 175, 230, 319, 338
Eusebius of Caesarea, 290, 272, 273, 374
Eutropius, 297, 327, 337, 374
Eutychius of Cappadocia (mid-th c.), 292, 379

Eucrat, 335, 336, 374
Eulûja Celebi, 3, 318, 331, 349, 387, 374
Excavation of antiquities at: Abu Gelâl, 172
at-Asârâ, 176; ad-Dînîjîe, 18; Ertâlîe, 176
al-Ḥijdâm, 5; al-Ḥârîr, 5; Kaşr abu Zubbân,
172; al-Kûrîf, 6; al-Mîtrâs, 175; ar-Râbba,
7; az-Sinîm, 181; Tell as-Saṣûrâ, 36
Exekiel, Prophet, 37, 277
Al-Ḳâ, 'Ain (NA c7), 29—31
Al-Khâba, 123, 122
‘Erneşûn Maç'dûb ibn al-Barsuṣâ (d 1127), 317

Fadramî, Tell (a4), 8, 129, 205, 206
Al-Fârîq (NA b13), 6; (a1), 187
Al-Fârîq, Beni (b8—9), 57, 60
Fâq abu ‘Aṣâfîr, See ‘Aṣâfîr, Fâq abu
Fahad, Abu, 132
Fahad, Al-Bu, 143
Fahad eben Haddâl, 25
Fahad, Al-Quadî, 55
Fahîdî (NA t19), 122
Al-Fâjîa', 318
Al-Fâjûm, 350
Al-Fâlîqî, 42, 296, 297
Fâlîqî as-Sawâdî, 125
Al-Fâlîqî (NA c7), 25, 26
Al-Fâlîqî, canal, 275, 296
Fâlîqî, Upper and Lower, 273, 276
Al-Fâlîqî as-Krubâ', 125
Al-Fâlîqî as-Sûfîa', 125, 236
Al-Fâlîqî as-Ṣuṣra', 125
Al-Fâlîqî as-Suṣra', 125, 236
Fam Bakkâ, 160, 352
Fam Sa‘îd, 4
Al-Famns, 190
Farnâk, Ṣabî, 156
Farâq ab-al-Fâñs, 29
Al-Farâm, clan of al-Bikijer, 74; district of, 69
Al-Farâm (f10—11), 48
Al-Farâm, ‘Ayn (d9), 60, 62, 143, 201
Al-Farâm, Râmîz, 15
Al-Farâm, Tell (d7), 69
Farâsîr, Tell, 247

Al-Farânîje (NA 120), 117
Farâhân, chief of the Monopatanian Sammar,
49, 50
Farâbân, Feṣâjî (d9), 143, 144
Farâhân eben Kassâr, 74
Farâhân eben Melhem, 74
Farâhân eben Serâïî, 15
Al-Farâsîjîje (c41), 54, 141
Farrañ, Abu (c11), 137
Al-Fars, 277
Al-Farsa (NA a11), 187
Al-Fâsîjî (NA b11), 89, 183, 186
Al-Fatâ, 242
Fatâ, 167
Fâtîma (c7), 67
Al-Fawwârîj, 66
Al-Fâzîjî, Bir (c10—11), 148
Al-Fâşîjîje (NA 206), 122
Al-Fedîqî, 82, 84, See abu Fadîn, Tell
Fedîn, Tell (b4), 82, 83, 86
Fedîn (NA c9—e11—12), 78, 190, 192
Fëbîn abu Rûs, 349
Feṣâjî (NA 15), 286, 297, 298, 358
Feṣâjî, Eben, 43
Feṣâjî (a18), 86, 87
Al-Feṣâjîsî, family of the Zâbîrî, 127
Feṣâjîsî, abu Rûs, 349
Al-Feṣâjîsîje, 14
Feṣâjî eben Farâbân, 49
Feṣâjî, See proper name
Al-Fêhâm (b4), 81
Al-Fêhâmî, 34
Fêhâmî, suffer from the Bedouins, 165
Al-Fêhâmîje (f10), 2, 3, 33, 42, 49, 50, 119, 129,
124—127, 152, 268, 271, 274, 290, 297, 329
Fêhâmîje, Kaṣî, 209
Al-Fêhâmîje (a14), 45
Fêzârî, 43
Al-Fêhâde (NA d3—13—14), 15
Al-Fêhêjî, 192
Al-Fêjîmî (NA 165), 1, 29, 23, 70, 143, 248, 254
Al-Fêjîmîjî, 18
Al-Fêjîl, 306, 313, 311
Al-Fêjîl, 246, 247
Fêzûm Sâhîr, 136, 270
Fêzûm (NA 230—231), 116
Al-Fîhâmîje, Sâhib (e8), 76
Fêñèl (NA h20), 38
Al-Fêñîlî, 55
Al-Fêñîsî (b4), 81
Al-Fêñwîsî (b3), 179, 180
Al-Fêñwî (NA c7), 36, 248
Florîs, L. Ammânas, 327, 374
Fejian, Bir (a2—3), 88
Foreigners, hatred of, illustrated, 14
Forron, E., 209—211, 333, 374
Frât, 104
Frejîj ab’al-Abâlsâzî, 188
Frêswa, Abu-ḥ (f10—15), 158
Al-Frêjîjîme (NA d4), 15
Fronto, 95, 323, 374
Fêkê, Kaşr abu (NA h20), 37, 107
Fêkê, Ummu, 183
Fudêmîn, 84
Al-Fudêmîn, 82—84, 86, 339
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 şessâne, Tell (NA g19), 42
 Al-şessîje (c–d6), 170
 Gezâr (Praenos arabica, Veh.; high perennial
 with vertical root, white hairy branches and
 leaves, and yellowish umbels), 76, 90
 Al-şeṣîre, 129–127, 356
 Guzebî ibn ʿOmar, 218
 Guzebî ibn ʿOmar, 26
 Al-guzâra (a2), 186
 Al-ğeṣîfe, 144
 Al-ğhamma (NA a11), 186
 Gîbî, Abu (d9–10), 58
 Az-ğeṣîfe, 33
 Gîbî ibn ʿAṣ–ṣâr (a2), 90
 Gîddan, 15, 227, 230
 Gîhîn, 280, 282
 Ginîfe, 25
 Al-ğîrîl, 176
 Gîrf as-Sahîr (NA f–c20), 122
 Gîrgî, Christian of Dejr az-Zebr, 9
 Gisr, See proper name
 Al-ğisr, 257
 Gîwâr, martyr, 242
 Al-ğîzîl, 23
 Al-ğîzer, Feżîat (a–b4), 81
 Al-ğîzîl (NA c13), 10
 Glauoc, 192, 375
 Ghêjîla (NA d10), 20
 Al-ğîmêla, clan of the Djejm, 143, 149, 151
 Al-ğâmênejje, 25, 162
 Al-ğnejîf (d7), 68
 Al-ğnêne, 182
 Al-ğâbîa, 179
 Gophera, prefect of Babylonia, 273
 Al-gôbîjîfe (NA c17), 25
 Al-ğofra (NA b12), 4
 Gourdian III (238–244), 233, 237, 337, 338
 mausoleum of, 236, 238
 Gordyjean, 361
 Gow'e, Abu (d7), 166
 Al-ğofîr (NA a11), 99
 Al-ğeţajîfe (e10), 142; (NA a11), 187, 251; (NA f9), 129
 ʿUârî, Išan abu (e9–10), 156
 Geva, heads of branches and stems of tarfa
 at, 190; head cloths above, 185
 Greek, foot soldiers, 216; mercenaries, 213
 Greeks, 15, 224–225, 230, 239, 262, 267, 278,
 321, 322, 326, 328
 Al-ğerîjîfîat (b6), 68; (e8–9) 57, 60
 Al-ğerîjîfe, 26
 Al-ğerîjîat, 188
 Gûjîne, Abu (d7), 166
 Gobîna (e7–8), 25, 162, 166, 324
 Al-ğobîjîla, 312
 Gobîjîjîat al-Tni (NA b11), 312, 313
 Gobîjîjîm, al-Abrâs. See Ǧadîmat al-Abrâs
 Al-ğusîl ibn Rabî, 296
 Gufîr al-Mâleb, See Al-ğâlîbî (NA b19–20)
 Gufîrat al-Ḥar (b3), 56
 Gûbrâ, 171
 Al-ğubrîn (b8), 57
 Gûdî, L., 324, 326, 375
 Gûnî, Abu (NA b11–12), 182
 Al-ğûrû, 181
 Gufîr al-Ḥusam, 34, 188
 Al-ğuṣî (c11), 122
 Al-ğuwîjî, 139
 Ǧâwî, As-Sajjîd, khalîdar of al-Ḥaḍra, 25
 Al-ğwejbe, 33, 156
 Al-ğwejbejîfî (a–e), 85, 87
 Al-ğwejmejîl (b7), 68
 Gynsz, river, 263, 265
 Al-ğânîjîfe (d6), 170
 Al-ğşeṣî (NA c15), 6, 177
 Al-ḥebra (a1), 91; (b3), 87
 Hâbirî, Abu (NA a9), 95, 190
 Hâbîâ, Išan abu (f11), 46, 127, 200, 202, 204,
 209, 243, 283–236, 272, 274
 Al-ḥabâbnîjja (NA f18–19), 308
 Al-ḥabîb (d7), 165
 Hâbîb, fields of, 23
 Hâbîb, Al-ṣâqî (c11), 135
 Hâbîb an-Nâṣîṣ, Miṣrîr (d7), 165
 Ǧâbîra (Cireceium), 336; (river al-Ḥâbûrî), 354.
 Hâbîlîjje (d7), 21, 167
 Hâbûrî, 243
 Al-ḥâbîrî (a41), 3, 60, 62, 68, 73, 78, 82–86, 137.
 143, 153, 167, 168, 170, 176, 178–180, 185,
 197–201, 204–211, 217, 221, 222, 237, 229, 231,
 235, 236, 237, 251, 254, 255, 326, 333–341, 344,
 362; (districts), 336; (Kârîbejîa), 3, 356, 357,
 364, 366.
 Hâbûrî, Tell, 248
 Al-ḥâbûrî (NA f19), 124
 Ḥabûr, al-ḥâbûrî, 130
 Al-ḥaʃîne, 49
 Al-ḥadab (a3), 87
 Al-ḥadābe, Mašâfî, 20
 Al-ḥadâwi (a1), 187, 229
 Al-ḥâdî (a9), 156, 157
 Al-ḥadâdîjje (d7), 164
 Al-ḥadâdash (b4), 81
 Al-ḥadâdar (e–d6), 170
 Al-ḥadîʃın, Sabî (e–c7), 65, 168
 Al-ḥaddîd, Ḥān, 57, 127
 Ḥâdîd, al-ṣâqîj, 23, 30, 164; (b9), 57; (f9), 157,
 248, 251, 255, 269; (NA a10), 188
 Al-ḥaddîl (d10), 142
 Ḥaddîye, 86, 201, 305
 Ḥaddît, 348
 Al-ḥaddît, 56; (d7), 3, 13, 21, 23, 24, 30, 163,
 164, 239, 253, 254, 266, 345–349, 357
 Ḥâdîṣ̄at ‘Ans, 24
 Ḥâdîṣ̄at ‘Anât, 247
 Ḥâdîṣ̄at an-Nûr, 347
 Al-Ḥaḍîr, 60, 187, 366
 Al-ḥaḍîra, church in Tekrî, 365
 Al-ḥaḍîra, mosque of ‘Ali ibn Abî Ṭâleb in
 an-Nokef, 35, 36
 Ḥâfîṣe Paños, 3
 Ḥaffân, 109, 284–287, 291, 357–359
 Al-Ḥaffe, 15, 17
 Al-Ḥafî (d9), 145
 Ḥafîje, 307, 358
 Al-Ḥafîji (a1), 91
 Ḥafîje, *Ajîn, 110
 Al-Ḥafs (NA d21), 116
INDEX

Al-Ḥaḍrā, Saḥī (e6), 68
Al-Ḥaḍrā (NA d16), 29, 24
Hugen, O.E., 376
Al-Ḥārūr (d5), 172
Ḥāzīr b. Ḥaḍiṣ 73
Al-Ḥaḍājī, eastern division of the Gū ürünü, 83
Ḥaḍājī b. Ḥarīb, 74
Al-Ḥaḍājī b. Ḫusef, 42
Al-Ḥaḍājī Ṭall Ṣaḥī, 3
Al-Ḥaḍājī (NA c17), 36
Al-Ḥālir, 41
Al-Ḥaḍājī, Darū ṣuṣm, 143
Al-Ḥaḍājī, Umm (d9), 58, 60, 143
Ḥuṣain, lord of Ḫadānī, 14, 206
Al-Ḥaḍārījī, Ṣaḥī, 41
Ḫašī (NA q14), 122
Ḫašfā, 31
Ḫaṭīb, Al-[(d10), 54
Al-Ḫaṣāurr (d. 780), mother of Ṭabūn Al-Ḫaṣār and Ḥarūn al-Ḫaṣāri, 277
Al-Ḫašāṣa (NA c17), 32, 185
Al-Ḫeḳem Binmawallāh Manṣūr (1020–1055), 352
Al-Ḫān, 351
Al-Ḫalābā, 144
Al-Ḫalaf, 74
Ḫalaf (Karl Waldmann), 110, 131
Ḫalaf b. Ḫaṣār, 73
Ḫalaf al-Ḫaḍājī, 188
Ḫalaf an-Nafīf, 179
Al-Ḫalāwī (NA d15), 18, 170
Ḫubasījī, 25
Al-Ḫulīlijo, 163. See also Ḫaleel, Al-Ṣaḥāḥ
Ḫaleel, 152. See also Allepo
Ḫalebijje (NA a11), 181–186, 211, 315, 332
Ḫaleel, Al-Ṣaḥāḥ, 176; (d8), 185
Ḫaleel b. al-Walīd, 102, 104, 188, 328, 314
Al-Ḫalābiṭ, 164
Ḫalīb, Ṣāḥib b. (e9–10), 156
Al-Ḫaṣaf, 71
Ḫalif, Al-[(a14), 143
Al-Ḫalifā, 282
Ḫalif Ṣuṣm, 248–250, 252, 256
Ḫalif b. Ḫalif, 252
Ḫalif Boy, governor of Aleppo, 3
Ḫalif al-Dāher, See Al-Dāher
Ḫallir, L., 324, 288
Ḫalosylon articulatum, Cav. See Ḫirat
Ḫalup, 305
Ḫanā (NA b5), 10, 213, 312, 313, 344
Ḫamad, 41, 69
Ḫamad b. Ǧamīl (e11), 134
Ḫamān (a–b3), 183
Al-Ḫamān (a8), 57; (c10), 56; (c9), 145
Ḫamāst b. Ṣuṣm (a5), 87
Ḫamata, prefect of Lākē, 86, 201, 295
Ḫamātur, 200, 201
Al-Ḫamīl, 75
Ḫamān, son of the Ḫamānīc Nāṣer-dowlah, 241
Ḫamān, Al-[(d7), 83
Ḫamān, Ḫawīf (NA a9–10), 190
Ḫamān, Umm (d12), 45
Al-Ḫamānī, 109, 245, 245, 246, 286, 310, 311, 346, 375
Al-Ḫāmed, 176
Ḫamed, Ṣabī (a9), 57
Ḫamed, Tell al-Ṣaḥāḥ (a4), 73, 85, 86, 137
Ḫamet abu Ṣabī, 76
Al-Ḫamed, Tell (t10–11), 126
Al-Ḫamīdī, 1
Al-Ḫamīsījje (NA a11), 187
Al-Ḫamīṣa, 171
Al-Ḫamīṣdāl, 28, 159, 164
Al-Ḫamīṣmām (NA a9), 3, 93, 191; (NA n20–21), 117
Ḫamīṣmām b. Ḫamīṣmām, 245, 275, 276
Al-Ḫamīṣmām (d10), 58, 142, 201
Al-Ḫamīṣmām (NA a11), 90, 184, 186
ḫamēt ad-Ṣammar, 74
Ḫamēt (or Ḫamēt), 94
Ḫammurābī, Joseph von, 41, 96, 375
Ḫamēt abu Sāleḥ (a–b3), 86, 88
Ḫammād, 74
Ḫammūrābī (2129–2084), 34, 167, 188, 259, 375
Al-Ḫamūrā (a1), 91; (c11), 149
Al-Ḫamūrā, Ḥor, 150
Ḫamūrā Ibn Saʿed, 49
Ḫamīr b. Mīlāl-aṣṣa, 188
Al-Ḫarīmī, 56
Ḫasim, 25, 164
Ḫaḍūr b. Ḫaḍūr (b–d), 188
Ḫaḍūr b. Zāḥer b. Ḫaḍūr, 149
Ḫaṣaṣa, Abu (a–b3), 85
Ḫamat al-Ḫaṣārī, 162, 117, 321, 375
Ḫamẹt b. Kādem, 129
Ḫan. See proper name
Ḫan, state of, 198, 199, 204; town of, 326
Al-Ḫαna (NA b10), 117
Al-Ḵanāf, 124, 308–310
Ḫanāja, Mar, monastery of, 316, 329
Al-Ḫanāk, 103, 110, 111
Ḫandūlī, 24
Al-Ḫandūr, 82
Ḫanū, canal, 317, 326, 330
Al-Ḫanū, canal, 383, 338
Ḫanū ibn Ḫāberṣ Ṭaṭā, 290
Ḫaṭṭa, 185
Ḫaṭṭa (a2), 89, 99, 137, 138, 155, 186, 250, 256–257, 337, 342, 358; (b9), 56
Ḫaṭṭa oph al-Ḫarīs, 330
Ḫanūs, 19
Al-Ḫaṭṭa, 55, 171
Ḫaraṣ, 200, 203
Ḫarīṣat, 147
Ḫaraṣ (NA a1), 184, 185
Ḫaraṣ (or Ḫaraṣ), 136, 137, 140, 141. See also Al-Ḫaraṣa
Ḫaraṣa, 52
Ḫaraṣa, Ġīz (e11), 149
Al-Ḫaraṣa, 75
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Harbouda, Mohsol leader, 344, 348
Harboe, 280, 283
Al-Harbijie, 355
Al-Hardan, clan of the Dicjm, 143
Hardan, Al-Bu, clan of the 'Akejlat, 74
Hardan al-'Ojjie (or al-'Ejej), 144
Harduin, Jean, 324, 335, 375
Harzmsce, 164
Al-Haref ibn 'Amr al-Kindi, king of al-
Ahmar, 350, 354
Al-Harshijie, 275
Haridji, 206
Haridui, 206–209
Al-Harjia (ib), 83
Al-Harjii (NA e13), 11, 175
Al-Harffi (10), 158
Al-Harlijiie, 153
Harqi Duqcel, 136, See also Duqcel
Al-Harqii (NA e20), 39
Harqi, 149
Al-Harmilije (NA i20–21), 117
Harmujilije (a2–3), 183
Al-Harnine, Hain (e10), 56
Harkouk, 351
Harran, 229, 316, 321, 333, 336, 342, 356
Al-Harrar (NA m18), 187, 190
Al-Harrar, Kart (e5–7), 67, 69
Harran, 89
Harun, Umm (NA as), 192, 316
Harun ar-Rashid (Harrun ar-Rashid, 786–809)
15, 139, 327, 344, 346, 355
Al-Harrini, 55
Harura", 192, 194, 295
Harru, 212
Al-Hassa, 18
Al-Hass, 'Ain, 39
Al-Hassa, Kart (e–b), 58
Hashiti Mehemmed Pasha, governor of
Bagdad, 125
Husam, Turkish commander and lord of al-
Rahba, 543
Husam, Beni, 107
Husam, Bu (or as-Sur), 2; clan of the Gbdr,
81; clan of the Beni Tamim, 199; groove of
poplar, 4
Husam, Al-Bu, 188
Al-Haykin, Kart (e5), 80, 81
Husam, Umm, 180
Husam ibn al-Fadil, 41
Al-Hassanjie, 169
Husam. See proper name
Husme, Al-Bu, 139
Hahnet al-Bassala (b6), 68
Hahnet an-Nihel, 73
Al-Haym, 'Ibn (e11), 64
Al-Harrat (NA e15–14), 11
Harrat Bikr, 103
Al-Hass, 90, 187
Al-Hassakeh, 57
Hassan, emir of the Taij, 346, 347
Al-Hassanjije, 93
Al-Hassos (NA a11), 186
Al-Hassos, 41, 561
Al-Hassouan, 74
Al-Hasswa, Hain (e11–12), 45
Hater, 'Ubb (e10), 154
Al-Hattib Abu Bekr al-Barsibi, 277
Al-Hattia (ib), 4, 181
Hatra, 69, 362
Hattib, Al-Bu, 83
Hattib ibn 'Abdallah, 188
Hatti, 199
Al-Hattujije, Isan (g11–123), 45
Al-Hawa, Umm, 43
Al-Hawakejje, 178
Hawakejje al-Bamam, 183
Al-Hawaraini, 247, 375
Al-Hawarsak (NA 220, 35, 102–106, 169–111,
177, 295, 356–360, 364
Hawl. See proper name
Hawli, or Hawli, or Hawli. See: proper name
Hawlia, 289–292
Hawran, 'Ahtag (NA e16), 301, 302, 311–313
Hawran, Gebel (NA g–h–8), 302, 303
Hawran, Wadi (NA e14), 25, 25, 310, 311, 321
Hawrate (e7), 165
Hawwasi, southwestern suburb of an-Nasib, 35
Al-Hawwas, 186
Haxel, 36, 106, 107
Al-Hayvar (NA b12), 41 (f19), 34
Al-Hiwar (NA e16), 23
Haxar, Al-Seej, 20
Al-Hawared (NA e17), 25
Haksen ibn Husein, 279
Al-Haxemi, Muhammed ibn Mous Abu Bekr, 111
Hazer, Al-Imam (e11–12), 45
Hazim, Al-Bu, 135, 141
Al-Hasra, 135, 136, 139
Al-Haya, 18
Hazr. See proper name
Al-Hazr (a8), 57, 60, 67, 148, 382, 391
Al-Hazar Elyas (f–zt11), 122
Haxar al-Emmar, 83
Al-Hayra, 20
Al-Hayra, 139, 140, 167
Huzan, chosen Mullah, 74
Al-Hibb, 21, 165
Al-Heib (d–b), 109, 142
Al-Hedjhe (ib), 57, 201
Al-Hedjhe (e–d), 170
Al-Hebbijje (e8), 161
Al-Hebbani, Sayid (e6), 68
Al-Hebene (111), 134
Al-Hebbani, Hazim (b–e5), 78, 80
Hebron (ib), 57
Al-Hebbani, 15
Hefel of the Nossor family, 9
Hefeh chosen 'Abdallah, 176
Al-Hejaa, 71, 119
Hejaz Railway, 130
Al-Hejaa (e4), 174
Hejna, Tell (b4), 82, 294
Al-Hejned, 83, See also al-Hejadoun
Al-Hejadoun, 83
Hejja, Abu al-'Abd, 68
Al-Hejban, Taar (NA f19–20), 121, 347
Al-Hejaddije (e–d), 58
Al-Hej (e9), 57
Hejlan, Umm, (NA a20–21), 116
Hojme, Umm (e11), 140
Hejze Salam, 104, 105
Ibn Abī ʿAṣ–Ṣāḥī, lord of ar-Raḥba. 341
Ibn al-Arāṣā (d. 1315–1316). 344
Ibn al-Aʿrāf, ʿAbdārrahmān ibn Muḥammad. 42, 125
Ibn al-Aṭīḥā, 10, 34, 41, 56, 60, 62, 83, 104, 125,
126, 134, 140, 321, 322, 336, 341—344, 346, 347,
351, 352, 358, 375
Ibn Βατυτα, 36, 41, 57, 105, 111, 134, 137, 140,
236, 359, 360, 366, 376
Ibn al-Ṭāḥib, 37, 69, 86, 102, 165, 330, 351, 375
Ibn al-Ṭūbaj, 36, 37, 53, 110, 111, 246, 366, 376,
Ibn Ḥabīb, 104, 344, 353, 376
Ibn Hawkāl, 41, 103, 105, 109, 136, 137, 185,
245, 246, 253, 270, 271, 274, 275, 317, 338, 341,
352, 354, 356, 365, 376
Ibn Ḥifūm, 110
Ibn Ḥorābizd, 66, 83, 84, 95, 136, 138, 245,
244, 248—254, 256, 257, 339, 340, 376
Ibn Ḥubayr, ʿAzīz ibn ʿOmar, lieutenant under
Muʿawwān. 42, 125, 135, 139, 356, 375
Ibn Ḥishāb, 284, 286, 288, 289, 291, 297, 299
Ibn al-Kaṭlānī, 24, 95, 182, 322, 341, 376
Ibn al-Kalbī, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Jabāb
Abū-l-Mundir (d. 785), 169, 360
Ibn Kaṭīr, 5, 376
Ibn Ḫāṭib, 332, 353, 376
Ibn Maʿṣūl, 109, 138
Ibn Māṣūd, Dubeiq ibn ʿAll. 358
Ibn Mūṣṭafā (Muḥammad), lord of ar-Raḥba. 347
Ibn Miskawawīj, 10, 41, 329, 340, 341, 352, 376
Ibn Muḥāsas, 272
Ibn Muḥāsīn (Mughāsīn), lord of ar-Raḥba and
ʿĀmm. 342, 346
Ibn Munīqīd, 34, 95, 299, 376
Ibn Rosta, 103, 111, 248, 244, 246, 296, 341, 364, 376
Ibn Scrapium, 4, 53, 60, 135, 153, 246, 250, 255,
289—291, 276—278, 339, 382, 394, 397, 376
Ibn as-Sīkīkī, Abū Jāʿūb Jaʿūb ibn Ishāk
(d. 857), 169
Ibn Taṭrī Bīrī, 376
Ibn al-Wardī, 95, 377
Ibn as-Zubayr, ʿAbdālāh, brother of ʿAbdālāh,
Makki. 295
Ibrāhīm, As-Sajjād (g11), 43, 245, 244, 276
Ibrāhīm, Saqīsān (f11), 151
Ibrāhīm, ʿAlī-Ṣalāḥ (g11), 128, 273
Ibrāhīm, Ibn Ḥallī, ʿAbdālāh, 295
Ibrāhīm, Ibn-Muḥaṣṣīb, 295
Ibrāhīm al-Ḥallī (f11), 125, 126, 241
Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbdālāh ibn Ḥasan ibn ʿAli
(d. 760), 366
Ibrāhīm ibn Salāma, 295
Ibrāhīm al-Ṣūkā, 188
Irb, 296, 292, 293, 358
Al-ʿIṣār, 369
Id, 360
Id, 360
Al-ʿId, (es–9), 169
Idkaran, 350
Al-Idrīsī. 26, 35, 41, 84, 137, 153, 185, 246, 249,
57—59, 237, 244, 257, 258, 355, 356, 358
Ignatius, 369
Ignatius, 369
Ignatius, 369
Idāb, 350
Ijab, tribe. 299, 367, 354, 365
Kahaf Kalb (d10), 50, 52
Kaṭḥaṣba ibn Sabīh, 125, 270
Al-Ḵaṭṭāb (NA c16), 24; (c16), 98
Kalīt, 200, 265
Kāʿṣur, 316
Kāṭe, Abu-l- (c5), 171
Al-Ḵāḵed, 24
Al-Ḵāḏem (NA d14), 2, 3, 10, 11, 12–15, 172, 249, 256, 340; (NA d20), 101, 102, 186, 107, 111, 114–115, 257, 359
Al-Ḵāḏem al-Ḵāṣbī, 15, 359
Ḵāḏem ‘Anḵa, 13
Al-Ḵāḏem Bīamurralah, Abu Ḥafar ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Kādīr (1051–1075), 24, 348
Kāḏem Ḥaffān, 359
Ḵāḏem al-Walṭābī, 165, 359, 360
Ḵāḏimāvāz, governor of ar-Raḥba (d. 1103), 343
Al-Ḵāḏikāra, 41, 137, 334
Al-Ḵanā’īb, Amīr, lieutenant under Ḥulayl ibn al-Walīd, 308, 369, 312
Ḵa‘a or Ka‘af, See proper name
Al-Ḵa‘a (c7), 70; at Teksīr, 55
Al-Ḵa‘a, Ḥawwīt, 29
Kalāb, 207
Ḵāḏīnḵūa, 248
Al-Ḵalās, 329
Ḵa‘at Sūrāḵ, 169, 36–37, 199, 299, 362, 363
Kalb, trib., 394, 395, 311, 236, 356, 359, 354
Al-Kalb (c9), 137
Kaleb, Bīr (b3–4), 86
Kalika, 31
Kalīnīk, 328
Kalīnīk, 326, 334
Kalne, 282, 283
Al-Kalīt, 316, 311
Al-Ḵanāz, 9
Ḵanaraddīn (a3), 87
Al-Ḵanāmījī, 28
Ḵamrat (NA c12–13), 9
Al-Ḵamratī, 352
Al-Ḵamūṯār, 244–246, 234
Ḵanāṯer, Abu-l-, 163
Kandi, 26
Al-Ḵanṭarā (NA d13), 20; (a8), 57; bridge at al-Felūgīr, 125; on Nahr al-Malek, 242, 246
Al-Ḵanṭarā, Kūr (5–6), 79
Ḵanṭarā Dimmīm, 270
Ḵanṭarāt al-Faṭjūm, 359
Ḵanṭarāt al-Ḵāḏimāvāz, 275, 276
Ḵanṭarāt al-Tuhmānī, 359
Al-Ḵa‘rābī, 171, 150
Al-Ḵa‘rābī (d-c6), 18, 212, 301, 342
Ḵaṟaṟūlī, clan of the Zobjād, 150
Ḵār-Abūnḵāz, 208, 210, 233
Ḵrāt or Kārt, See proper name
Ḵācheḵe, 24
Ḵārḵūn, 334
Karma, Bīr (a11), 48
Al-Karma, Nahr (c10), 48, 151–153, 224, 240, 267, 268, 271, 275, 283
Karnabū, 212
Kāwsān, church in Maskan, 362
Al-Kaṣāb, 35
Al-Kaṣāba, 252
Al-Kaṣāḵīm (1–229–21), 168, 116
Al-Kāṣem ibn Ṣūṣa al-Kāṣem ibn Ḥaḏfar as-Sādīk, 37
Ḵāṣarīn, 315, 316
Ḵāṣī, 201, 204
Al-Ḵāṣī (NA c15–16), 311
Ḵaẓīm umm Nashe, 169
Ḵaẓīmat umm Kusīn, 108, 188
Ḵaṇīr, 205, 291
Ḵaṣīrah, 356
Ḵaṣīrah, See proper name
Al-Ḵaṣīrah, 101; (Ḵaṣīrah ibn Ḥaḏfar), 163; (al-Ḵaṣīrah as-Saqrī), 21
Al-Ḵaṣīrah, S. (d15–16), 21; (c16), 25
Ḵaṣīrah al-Abjadi, 297, 236
Ḵaṣīrah al-Daṣṣājīnī, 287
Ḵaṣīrah Bīk Ḥaḏfar, 199
Ḵaṣīrah ibn Bīk Ḥaḏfar, 297
Ḵaṣīrah ibn Ḥaḏfar, 41, 45, 44, 153, 154, 243–246, 257–258, 254
Ḵaṣīrah Muṣṭafā, 110
Al-Kasara, 2, 9, 183, 186, 190; See also Al-Kaṣāsera
Ḵāṣarīn (Ḵaṣīrah), 315
Al-Kaṣāsera, Bīr (b3–4), 86
Al-Kaṣāsera (NA a10), 2, 9, 93, 186–188, 190
Al-Kaṣāwsī, Nilsān (c10), 150, 151
Ḵaṭṭīlimānī (e. 1709–1807 B.C.), 198
Al-Kaṣāwīnī, 111
Ḱanta’ birds, destroy the ears of grain, 33; drink at the same spot, 32, 33; nest together, 141
Al-Kaṭa‘a (b12), 51; (e13), 11
Al-Kaṭīr, 189
Ḵaṭīrī, territory, 206, 210, 219
Ḵarṭublāb, 127, 135, 136
Al-Kaṭṭ, 83
Al-Kaṭṭār, Muḥb (c7), 68, 79
Al-Kaṭṭārā (c10), 146
Kuṭṭāna (c6), 174
Ḵūḏā, Ezek. 62
Ḵa‘da‘ al-Sādīk (c7), 68
Kawāḏīl (c68–c71), 324, 328, 350
Al-Kawāḏīl, 252
Al-Kawāṭel, 309, 301, 302
Al-Kawāṭel, 247, 252, 301, 306
Kawwāk, Abu Dī (c9), 73, 75, 138
Kawwāwist, 157, 202, 293
Ḵāzim al-Ūfī, Mizār (e11–12), 45
Al-Ḵāzī, Nahr (NA a19), 42
Al-Ḵāzīm (naq al-Başra), 347, 348
Al-Ḵāzīmān (f11–12), 47, 69, 128, 134, 149, 150
Al-Kawzani, 15, 48, 335, 322, 348, 353, 356, 378
Kbura, Abu (a3), 88, 185; (d9), 61
Kbura, Ummu, 118
Kbīr, ‘Hwī al-Um al-Na (NA a9), 93, 199
Al-Kbījeb, 98; (f11), 127
Khujaḵt, 29
Kbīr, Abu (c9), 154
Al-Kbīša, 74
Al-Kbīr, 94, 191
Ḳbūr Zāsīm. See Zāsīm, Kbūr
Al-Kfīrān, 93, 191
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Al-Kufa, Čiar, 276
Al-Khī (Fig), 152
Kūh al-Bakāl, 103
Kūfje, 365
Al-Kūfje, 56, 57, 69
Kūbbān, plural of Zīlāb. See proper name: Al-Kumīj, 85
Kūnaīja, 223
Kūnasa, 223
Kūnasa, 223. See also Canaxa
Kūr, plural of Kūrat. Kūrt. See proper name: Kurākīr, 299, 302—305
Al-Kūrān, 73
Kūras-i-tī, 269
Kurdish volunteers, 139
Kurdistan, 53
Kurds, 53, 55, 88, 246
Kurellīb ibn Bodrān, lord of Mosul (d. 1061), 352
Kurrgāza I (Kassite king), 48
Al-Kūmī, 168
Kurra, 41, 43
Al-Kurta (NA ch10), 42
Al-Kūrūn, 151
Al-Kūshje, 348
Kušje, Beni, 356
Kush, 280, 282
Kuškūl, 209
Kūšmān, 125
Kussātā, 306
Kuss an-Nāfe, 306
Kūta, settlement, 274
Kūta, Čierr, 243, 244
Kūta, Nahr, 244, 274, 275
Kūta Rabba, 274
Kūtāba, 270
Al-Kuṭāmī, 110, 111, 378
Kutba ibn Kādāb as-Sudān, 287
Al-Kuṭba, "Aqlat (e10), 142
Kutrubbul, 135, 139, 289, See also Kaṭrubbul
Al-Kūzājī, 168
Al-Kūzājī, 168
Kwērat "Amar (e9), 143, 145, 169, 365
Kwērat al-Ruṣālānī, 142
Kwērz, 276
Al-Kwēre (e7), 164
Kyrkenes, 354, 355
Al-Kżejm, 63
Kzőj Nāʿam (e6), 68
La-al, Rās (e7—e8), 164, 243
Laʿrmo (e6), 68
Laʿmā, 105, 358
Al-Lājeb, 11
Lājeb, 29
Lājez (NA e12), 6
Lābē, 34, 86, 209, 201, 208—208, 210—212
Laʿla (e3), 350
Lamūmā (NA e16—e17), 25
Lāzedon, Stephen, 213, 259, 378
Lāţe (e7—e8), 165
Al-Latifījje, Nahr (f11), 46, 122, 125, 150
Lava, 87, 90, 91, 156
Lāyard, A. E., 34, 219, 378
Leben, Kaṣr Abu (NA 120), 112
Al-Ležižijje (e8), 182
Léo I, the Great (457—474), 328
Leonopolis (or Callinicus), 315
Leonopolis, 328, 329
Al-Lēbē, clan of the Zobojd, 150, 151
Liba, 272
Libanius the Sophist, 327, 378
Libbād, 18, 29
Liber chalipharum, 332, 378
Licinius (313—324), 337
Lil, Al-Bu, 5, 74
Al-Lissājī, 25
Lizards (aṭaq), 33, 141
Locusts pollute water, 59, 76, 77
Lōke, Abu (c11), 121
Al-Lōhābijje (e6), 57, 63
Lotus angustissimus, L. See Zreijje
Lotus Ghebāla, L. See Zreijje
LuṭAjje, "An, 28
Libbād (e10), 61, 142
Luṭ, 34
Lucian, 323, 379
Lucilius, commander under Julian the Apostate, 235
Luṭa (a1), 91
Luṭu‘ī, Egyptian commander in Syria, 342
Lyrat al-ʿarab, 39, 379
Lyon, D. G., 379, 381
M. Abbreviation for Molvj, Mūr. See proper name
Ma‘ Serqīs, 346
Ma‘ādī, clan, 300
Al-Ma‘ādī, Tell (e4), 176
Al-Ma‘ādij (e7), 186
Al-Ma‘āzīlje (NA e17), 26
Al-Ma‘āfe (e6), 58
Ma‘ālījje (e8), 162
Ma‘āmār, 41
Al-Ma‘amme (a6), 85, 87
Ma‘arṣavīs, 277—279, 282, 283
Maaschoub, 58
Al-Ma‘āṣīn, Umn (e7), 67
Al-Ma‘āṣīs (e9), 158
Al-Ma‘ābaru, 164
Mabrī, 282
Al-Mabrijje (e8), 161
Mabrīk as-Saṭām, 188
Macedonian colony, 175, 230
Macedonians, 174, 239, 327, 332, 338
Macedonopolis, 333
Macedonustria, 294, 248, 268
Machṣed-raḥn, 345
Al-Madžīn (or al-Madājoun), 38, 41, 242, 271, 274, 329
Al-Madīnā, 110, 284, 286, 287, 295, 296, 298, 305
Ma‘dān (NA 118—g—h10), 46, 107, 380
Al-Ma‘dān (NA a11), 2, 183, 187, 197
Al-Ma‘dabāna (NA e29), 122
Al-Ma‘da, 162
Al-Ma‘da, 186
Madīyūk (NA e13), 11, 173, 174
Al-Ma‘cīblijje (e6—e9), 160
Al-Ma‘cījje (e6), 182
Al-Ma‘cīzīlje (NA e15), 4
Al-Ma‘cīrje (e1), 174
Al-Ma‘esse (αι.—Α.), 86
Al-Ma‘esse, Ḥāṣm, 86
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Macev Hāhār, 138
Al-Marābba (d1), 172
Al-Marznůkīj (NA d16), 23, 165–166
Al-Masāba, 143
Maṣara abī Nawās, 110
Masca, 214, 222
Maschana, 360, 362.
Masāḥ, 82
Al-Masāḥ (d4), 82
Al-Masāh (NA d15), 18, 188; (Kerkela), 41; (ar-Noçoft), 35. See also Al-Masāh
Masāḥ (Ali ibn Abī Tāhob, 35, 36, 41 279.
See also Mešhed 'Ali
Al-Masāh al-Čebīr, 18. See also Al-Masāh
(NA d15)
Masāḥ (Ali ibn Huseyn, 41, 270
Masāḥ abī-Rahba, 345
Al-Masāḥ as-Sayrī (NA d16), 21
Al-Masāḥabūn, 279
Al-Masāḥ (NA e17), 26
Al-Masāḥūr, 83
Al-Masāḥūr, 25, 276, 276
Masācb, 268
Masācbīb, 116
Masāh, 136, 139, 269. See also Maskān
Masāin, 351, 362, 363
Masākūla, 398, 400
Al-Masākpē, 25
Masāh abī-Ben Mhammad Kūnīn, 83
Masāma, Nahr, 316
Masā'īm ibn 'Abdālmalekh (d, 732–733), 316, 317
Al-Masār (a2), 183, 184, 228, 332
Masāc, 231
Al-Masā'ūr, 164
Masā'ūd (e11), 187
Masā'ūd, ruqūn, 136; ruqūn mawād, 149
Masā'ūd, 'Āb, 107, 129, 122
Masā'ūd, Kaṣr, 117
Masā'ūd, Tell (e11), 43
Al-Masā'ūdī, 102, 104, 169, 341, 352, 358, 365, 379
Al-Masā'ūdī, 54, 55, 137, 141
Maṭābb, Tell (a2), 89, 229
Al-Maṭāba, 53
Al-Maṭāla’ (e10), 55
Maurice (682–620), 232, 305, 336, 355
Al-Masā'ūdī (f10–11), 202
Masā'ī, 188
Al-Masā'ūd, 32, 159
Maṣūf al-’Alurū, 188, 189
Al-Maṣūf, Kaṣr (NA d10), 108, 118
Al-Maṣura, 135
Al-Marābba, 196
Maṣrūr al-Maṣūf (NA b19–20), 38
Masūq, Ibn, monastery of, 105
Al-Maṣūrak, 162
Al-Maṣūrah (e7–8), 58
Al-Maṣūrah (a9–b9), 16
Al-Maṣūrah (d10), 54
Al-Maṣūrah (NA b2), 5
Al-Maṣūrah, Tell (e11–12), 137
Mehārak, 348
Mecca, 37, 108, 242, 272, 392, 283, 314
Al-Medarr (c10), 142, 146
Medea, 259
Media, 216, 226
Median Wall, 214, 216, 225, 226, 262–264, 266–268, 273
Medīnītan (NA a7–8), 316
Mediterranean Sea, 216, 218, 220, 320
Al-Meṣḥūr (d), 78
Al-Mešēk, 108
Al-Mešēk (d), 172
Mešēk, Abū Bu, 74
Mešēk abī Sakrān, 163
Mešēk al-Awāfī, 23
Mešēk al-Baṣābīr, See Al-Maṣūrī
Mešēk al-Dībēs, 24
Mešēk abī-Snāne, 15
Al-Mešēk (NA b29), 38
Al-Mešēk (NA b29), 38
Al-Mešēk (NA b11), 122, 258, 274
Al-Mešēk, 74
Al-Mešēk, 24
Mēgas, 236, 239, 249
Meqāwī bēn Farbān, 49
Al-Meşārā, 23
Mešēk, As-Saijī, 190
Al-Mešēk (NA b13), 6
Al-Mešēkī (e8), 181
Mešēkī, Toll, 330
Melōsh, Nahr, 316
Melōsh, Galīn, 56
Mēlān, 24
Al-Mešēk, 141, 145, 147. See also Rašā, Umm
Al-Mešēk, Darb (b4), 79
Al-Mešēk, Hazm (a8), 68
Al-Mešēk, Tell (e11), 38
Melā, See proper name
Al-Mešēkī (c11), 137
Al-Mešēkī, Darb, 68
Al-Mešēkī (c11), 137
Al-Mešēkī, 83
Al-Mešēkī, 21
Al-Mešēkī, 189
Al-Mešēkī, Tell (a1), 89, 186, 189
Al-Mešēkī (b1), 88
Mēḥānī, 95, 126, 315, 318, 324
Al-Mešēkī, 68
Al-Mešēkī (one of the al-Mešēkī volcanoes, a1), 93, 97
Al-Mešēkī, 166
Al-Merk (NA e17), 26, 28
Merīf Rāhēt, 393
Al-Merūda, ‘Akhat (d9), 145
Merran, 320
Al-Merwān (b8–9), 57, 60
Merrawān II al-Hīmār (744–750), 44, 125, 330, 338, 339
Merrawān, Bēni, 329
Al-Merwānī (NA c16–17), 17, 25, 163, 173, 176, 177, 237, 337, 339
Al-Merrawān, 188
Al-Meṣād (e8), 74
Al-Mešāzī, 72, 135
Al-Mešāzī, ‘Āb (e11), 134–136, 148, 149
Al-Mešāzī, 170

Al-Maḥāsīl, (NA no. 11), 21
Maḥaffīz (‘Obeijaddān ibn Maḥaffīz ibn Ṭalaḥa ar-Rāwī), 134
Muḥammad, gendarmerie, 124
Muḥammad, Abī-Saḥḥ, 18, 156
Muḥammad ibn Dījāb of the al-Jäsin family, 127
Muḥammad ibn Sa‘daddīn al-Ḥamīsī, 1, 14, 92
Muḥammad al-‘Awāwīd, 134
Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Muqaṣṣ, 169
Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, sultan of Rassil (1156–1160), 146
Muḥammad ibn Merwān, 138
Muḥammad ibn as-Sabīḥ al-Ṣubīhānī, 343
Muḥammad ibn Sarraḥfaddīwī, lord of ar-Rāwa, 342
Al-Muhammadījī, 135, 153
Muḥanna ibn Ismā‘il, 30, 348
Al-Muḥarrameh, 138
Mūsā, 24
Al-Muḥājir, 270, 271
Muḥṣen ibn Muḥammad, 71
Al-Muḥātir ibn Abū ‘Obaid ar-Taḥṭīfī, 235
Al-Muḥṣadās, 41, 42, 84, 109, 137, 139, 153, 245, 252, 254, 278, 300, 340, 346, 351, 352, 365, 379
Al-Muḥtādī Bī‘amāraḥīla (1075–1094), 347
Al-Muhtarīf, (A) (902–908), 10
Al-Muḥtafī Bī‘amāraḥīla (1136–1160), 34
Müller, C., 165, 167, 211, 236
Al-Muḥṭaḥ (69), 58, 143
Munkī al-Hālī, 75
Al-Muṣṭir, bishop of al-Anlār, 356
Al-Muṣṭir ibn al-Ḥarqī, the Ghassanian (570–581), 312, 336
Al-Muṣṭir ibn Ma‘ṣṣama, the Lakhamite (505–554), 104, 165, 118, 160, 305, 358, 354
Al-Muṣṭirīf, 241, 242
Al-Muṣṣarīb (NA F18), 34
Munṭafīf, 127
Al-Muṣīrī ibn ‘Oṣṭībī ibn Naḥḥās al-‘Arāqī ar-Rāwī, 294
Mūsā, Rāḍīr abu (NA k20), 116
Al-Muṣīrī, 110, 289, 290, 357, 359, 360
Al-Muurr (32), 185
Muṣṭādī Fadhan, administrator of Rassil, 13
Muṣīr, 132
Muṣā, Imām (al-Kāḥīmīn), 125
Muṣā ibn Șāleḥ, 74
Muṣā al-Kāḥīmī, 154
Al-Muṣārāfī, 186
Maṣṭāb ibn as-Zubayr, 136, 139, 235, 363
Al-Muṣāsja, 302–305, 308–312
Al-Muṣāsjīb ibn Naṣṣār al-Fūḥrī, 43
Al-Muṣāṣṭāb, 185
Musarrā, Al-Bu‘, 188
Musajfe (NA e13), 9
Mukkārī, 111
Mushā’in, 359
Masullā ibn ar-Rabī‘, Vel. See 'Aṣāfī
Muslim ibn ‘Aṭīl ibn Abī Ẓāreb, monastery of, 96
Muṣafāzī (69), 60, 61
Al-Muṣṭāfī (69), 57
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Näseraddin Muhammed ibn Shirkūh, lord of Ḫum and ar-Baḥbah, 344
Näseraddowlı Hasan ibn Abadallah, Hamala-
side lord of Mosul (d. 969), 341, 365
An-Näsirīya, 40
An-Näsiridinallāh (1180–1225), 24
Naṣībīn, 335, 352. See also Naṣībīn
Naqr ibn Ḵabar-Abraḥam Abū-l-Fātá al-Iskan-
dari, 91, 309
Naqr ibn ʿAbdallah, 317
An-Nāṣirīya (NA d16), 165
An-Nāṣirīya, Naqr (g11), 43, 45
Naṣīf (NA f19), 34
An-Nāṭef (e8), 160, 161
National Library, Vienna, xv
An-Nāṭif, 73, 163
An-Nāʿara, 237
Nāʿīna, 26, 153
An-Nāṣūs (NA c17), 26, 162, 167, 247, 248, 255, 256
Naṣūhī, 26
An-Nawāʿir, 275, 276
Nāẓel eben Tnejījān, 99, 113, 118
An-Nāṣirīya (g11), 157
Naqalis, 228, 231, 232, 272, 273, 278
Nebuchadnezzar (964–961), 213, 250, 258; his
dam, 272, 273
An-Nefūd (NA c10–14–p15), 162
Naʿūd, 49, 99
An-Nejīf (NA b129), 34–37, 39, 41, 46, 49, 99–
105, 107, 108, 113, 115, 118, 119, 121, 246, 279,
280, 286, 299, 312, 358, 359
An-Nejīfe, 114
Najīrīya (NA b129), 111
An-Nejīmī (e8), 57, 67
An-Nejīmī, Naqr, 9, 72
An-Nejīmī, Ibn Kūḥ, 49, 61, 144
An-Nejījīya (NA d15), 3, 15, 18, 24–25, 255, 256
Najīfī (perennial with high stem and green,
scents-giving leaves), 75, 81
Necoesaerea, 315
An-Nejīse, 98
Nestorian Synod at Ctesiphon in 410, 102; in
486, 356
Nestorians (Christians of the Persian empire)
364, 365
An-Nīfī (e10), 191
Nūr, Abū, 83
Nīḥāla, Abū (bluffs, d9), 143; (dāʿib), 142, 143
An-Nīčīya (NA a10), 187
An-Nīčījī (e7), 58; (d9), 58, 201 (e10), 138
Nījīje, Hān eben (NA g19–20), 39, 119, 247,
329
Nījījī, Abū Raḥīm (e8), 68
Nīḥūd, Abū (NA b12), 4, 5, 250, 251
An-Nīkāh, 286–287, 291–293, 358
Nīharī-Asur, 268, 211, 331
Nīčanor, town of, 174, 230
Nīčanoropolis, 338. See also Nīčanoros Podis
Nīčanoros, first ecumenical council at, 315, 333
Nīchophorion, 91, 211, 219, 220, 227–229, 325–
327
Nīchophoros Uranus, 326, 380
Nīkouris, 247, 380
Nīkfar, 277, 293
An-Nīfī (d8), 163, 293
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An-Niṣa, 357
Nikanoros Polis, 174
An-Nil, town, 153, 275, 276
An-Nil, Nahr (ζ 111), 45, 275, 276
Nimr-Itār, 210, 211
An-Nîmâ, 83
An-Nîmlîye (b4), 83
Nîmûr, tribe, 82
Nîmûr, Al-Bā, 144
An-Nîrmâwî (ζ111), 151
An-Nîrmîjîn Araba, 358
Nînawâ, 41, 44
Nîneveh, 296, 211
Nišān, šes proper name
Nišībān, 60, See also Nasībān
Nişibis, 327, 328
Nītoeris, wife of Nebuchadnezzar II, 260, 261
Noah, 165
Nôdîke, T., 286, 336, 355, 386
An-No'mân ibn Imru'âl, 105
An-No'mân ibn al-Mundir, 95, 192–104
Nostitā Antiochica ac Serosrothum patriarcal
scholastum, 380
Notitia dignitatum, 82, 314, 323, 380
Notitia ducum episcopatus, 380
An-Nûsîrîje (NA c13), 11
Nucef ibn Sa’fârâr, 83
Nucefîn, Blc (B8), 57
An-Nûṣîjâl, 39, 41, 247, 329
An-Nûkî, Ab- (α3), 85, 87
An-Nûşîjâb, 289, 301, 302
Nûkîl (ζ7), 67
Nûkîl umm ad-Dîjhâb (α7), 68
Nûkîl al-Uwîwân (β7–8), 67, 68
Na’m, 340
Numajj, tribe, 394, 322, 356
Nama of Cirocium, bishop, 355
Nûr, Kaşr (NA h20), 39
Nûrâdîn, as-Sażîjîd, shrine of, 164
Nûrâdîn Zenki Atâbâc (d. 1174), 317
An-Nûsîjîjîs, 24, 349
Nûsâdî, al-Sûjîb, 20
An-Nûsûtî, 357, 358
An-Nwêf’em, 25
An-Nwêf’Ir, 163
An-Nwêf’d (ζ9), 146
An-Nwêf’êt (ζ9), 143
‘Obb, 319
‘Obb Almas, 320
Obabas, 314, 315, 319, 329
Al-Obeï, NA (a11), 184
‘Obeïd, Al-Bu, clan of the Dirjem, 145, 144: pecvins of Rawa, 71
‘Obeïdadîâb, gardens at Rawa, 71
Al-Obeïdâbât, 83
Al-Obeïdî (NA d4), 15, 171
Al-Obeïdjîjî, 153, 155, 331
‘Obeïjî al-Halâh, 83
Al-Obroidjî, 25
‘Obeïjî ab-Heçnâtî, 110, 111
Obeïjî al-Kawâdûs, 110, 111
Odenath, king of Palmyra (d. 267), 332
Al-Ofejîn, Ab- (NA f6), 30
Al-Oqla, Hâari (d10), 35
Al-Oqla, Hasm (β4–5), 70–81
Oka’dêr ibn ‘Abdalâmaâk, 286
‘Oka’ba ibn Abî Helâm an-Nîmârî, 302
‘Oka’bar (ζ11), 135–139, 269, 278, 352, 354, 363
‘Okejî, tribe, 24, 342, 352, 358
‘Okejî al-Halâb (a5), 68
‘Okejî al-Zollâh (b7), 68
Al-Okejî (b5), 172
Al-Okejîb (NA c171), 72, 158, 197, 198, 212, 213, 222, 281
Ologyesias, 278
Al-Ole (NA g20), 129
‘Omar, Tell (H1–12), 226, 242
‘Omar ibn al-Hajjâb (634–644), 23, 297, 300
‘Omar ibn Sa’âb âbu Je’d ad-Râwî, 136, 296
‘Omar Pasha, governor of Aleppo; 3; muta’sarref of Dejr az-Zar, 3
Al-Omr, monasteries at al-Anbâr, 355
‘Omr Mûnâm, 564
‘Onk, Al-Imâm (NA g19), 43
‘Onk al-Hawâ (ζ9), 198
Opis, 246, 259, 260, 265–266
Oppenheim, Y., 3, 380
‘Oryj, 344
Orient, 129, 213, 269, 320, 324, 366
Orodes I, son of Phraates III, 327
Orozîrres, 219
Orops, 319
Oruba, 323
Osrâcîne, eparchies, 328, 329, 333, 336; provinces, 91, 254, 328
Al-Orfân, 127
Othman (‘Othmân ibn ‘Affân, 641–656), 104, 390
Ozogadzâr, 214, 239
Palestine, 390
Pal-cuṣa (Nâr) Hâdur, 108, 201, 201
Pallacostas, 286
Pallacostas, 279
Pallacostas, 279, 280, 282, 296
Pallàgöta, 280
Palmyra (NA c9), 229, 276, 282, 312, 323
Palmyren e, 1, 299, 328, 349
Palmyrene desert, 315, 325; states, 259
Parapamisada, 174, 175
Parthia, 349
Parthian empire, 220; highway, 227; kings, 220; towns, 102
Parthians, 278, 362
Party of Unity and Progress, 124
Parysatis (wife of Darius II), settlements of, 216, 226, 263
Passto antiqui, 349, 380
Patetyzias, the Persian, 315
Pattî Bâlî, canal, 209, 202, 225, 266
Pelasg, E., 14, 167, 212, 380
Perez (159–160), 309
Pérez Sâhû, 354–356
Persia, 129, 131, 264, 265, 277, 283, 298, 315, 345
Persian administration of al-Ḫura, 118: Arabs, 336; army, 41, 224, 256, 336; capital, 232; ca-
vulcy, 222, 255; commandery, 139; empire, 257, 336; frontier, 236, 337; frontier stations, 15, 347; kings, 235, 237, 241, 359; rampant, 111; rule, 351; soldiers, 361; troops, 240
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Persian Gulf, 14, 24, 104, 265, 284, 286, 295, 300, 307, 329
Porteo Plasha, "Turkish general," 320
Peter, son of Paul of Callinicus, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (d. 591), 329
Petra, 319, 327
Petrauiger Tablo, 314, 323, 380, 382
Phalisa, 217-219, 211, 334, 335
Phares, 234, 268
Phathasas, 236, 238
Philothaeic stades, 258
Philip Arab, (244-249), 337
Philip the Cemelito, 349, 389
Philiscum, Parthian town, 335
Philoxenus, bishop of Meroe, 315
Phissenia, 226, 246, 311, 368, 275, 282
Phoenicia, 219, 319, 325
Phoenician settlement, 15
Phoenicians, 214, 219
Phraates IV (c. 57-4 B.C.), 229; island of, 229
Physaeus, 216, 226, 263-265
Pirzabores, 234, 236, 246, 262, 238, 355, 354
Pikū, 280-282
Pinya, 218, 239, 231, 241, 242, 261, 268, 273, 286, 319, 323, 326, 327, 335, 389
Platarch, 217, 233, 319, 389
Polibius, 174, 175, 272, 380
Pontoon bridge at al-Fellūje, 125; at al-Masjed, 43
Posidonius the Stato (c. 128-45 B.C.), 326
Potamia, 176
Pragmata arabica, Vol. See Gazar
Probuss, prefect of Cireconium, 336
Pr-coepiscopi, 95, 175, 115, 319, 324, 328, 331, 332, 335, 390
Prosopis Stephaniana, W. See Friz
Prussian military representative at Baghdad, 131; officers, 139
Prussians, 132
Pseudo-Dionysius of Tell Mahor', 315, 326, 338, 337, 349
Pseudo-Wāclādi, 185, 386, 383
Ptolemy, 25, 60, 82, 219, 223, 286, 278, 277-279, 314, 319, 323, 337, 331, 330, 332, 335, 363, 381
Purn Bidtah, 277
Pusaeus, commander at 'Anā, 233
Pythe, 214, 215, 219, 221-222, 307, 281
Pyramidus Mssali, Vol. See Kejsām
Quaries near Hit, 26
Qirū, 315
Quṣayrā'n, 306
R-Abbreviation for Badir. See proper name
Rabat, 165
Rabāb, (65), 171
Ar-Rabāb, 248, 551, 253-256, 269, 346
Rabāb, district, 125
Rabāb, Boni, 364, 309, 331, 325, 366, 357
Rabāb ibn Buṣayr, 394, 395
Rahā'a ibn Muṭṭā'a, lord of Ḥaffān, 358
Al-Raḥāri (NA 221), 116, 380
Ar-Rađhe (as), 392
Ar-Rādī, Abu-l-'Abbās Muḥammad (934-946), 365
Badrī. See proper name
Al-Badrī, 165-166
Badrī, Kārūr umm (as), 76, 78, 80
Ar-Rāđeh (as), 68
Ar-Rādīa (NA 214), 15, 170
Rāfī' ibn 'Umar, 304
Ar-Raftī (as), 147
Ar-Rāfiqa, 153, 237, 330, 344
Ar-Raṣā, 326
Rafia, on the Euphrates, 2; on the Tigris, 39
Ar-Rājī, Umam (NA K20), 28
Rahā', Abū, canal, 276, 278
Ar-Rahāja (NA 18-19), 34, 202, 219, 211, 213
Rahāl, Umm (as), 59, 62, 77, 142, 144, 147, 148, 156, 309
Ar-Rāhānē (NA d16), 21
Ar-Rahba, 3, 4, 7, 10, 36, 31, 153, 184, 179, 185, 249, 256, 253-255, 257, 301, 322, 339-344, 346, 349, 394, 356, 357
Rahba Towek, 341
Ar-Rabāth al-Furātijī, 344
Ar-Rabāth al-Ḳudēde, 7
Rahāb ibn Towek, 153, 346
Rabābat Mā'ās, 153
Rahābat Mā'ās ibn Towek, 7, 10, 174, 254, 255, 349-344, 352
Rahbat as-Sā'am, 344
Rahī, 215
Rahimīnc, 326
Ar-Rahīji, 18
Ar-Raṣījī, 'Akhāt (NA a11), 186
Ra-a, 215
Ar-Raṣīān, 34
Ar-Raṣād, Hūr (NA h29), 45
Ar-Raṣājān (NA c17), 32
Rajājāt, Abu (NA f18), 32
Rakh, Abu (44-5), 175
Ar-Raḳa (a3), 3, 4, 10, 15, 36, 75, 85, 89-91, 95, 137, 153, 154, 167, 179, 185, 189, 189, 197, 211, 219, 247, 248, 250-257, 316-318, 322, 323, 325, 327, 329-331, 332, 335, 339, 341, 342, 344, 346-349, 356, 357
Ar-Raḳkā al-Bālā', 339, 331
Ar-Raḳkā al-Muḥātiqā, 331
Ar-Raḳkā as-Samā' (a1), 91
Ar-Raḳkā aṣ-Ṣawāda', 328, 329
Ar-Raḳkā (a3-9), 179
Ar-Raḳḳātān, 327
Ar-Raḳūb, 118
Bahrawijī, 41
Ar-Ramī (711), 127-128
Ar-Ramī, 347
Rampart mound from Euphrates to Tigris, 51, 146, 150, 152, 154
Al-Razīrī, 169
Ar-Ramū, 317
Ar-Raṣāmijī, Kārūr (b4), 81
Ar-Raṣā, 312
Rasām, clan of the Ḥaṭrā, 140
Rasām, Al-Rū, clan of the Dīqam, 144
Rapiš (or Rapilū), 34, 292, 293, 218-212, 283
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Bār, Abū, 102, 106
Bārab, Abū (e8), 68, (d8), 162
Al-Kārājī (b6), 68, 69
Al-Karānīn (e4), 175
Al-Karakešīn (e10), 51, 141, 148
Barbī, Ab-Šeṣ (c11), 140
Barbī, Tell (e11), 49, 60, 150
Al-Barjānīn, 205
Barraf, 162
Barzā (99–10), 153
Rās, See proper name
Rās al-Aṣ, 60
Rās 'Aṣīn, 339
Rās al-'Aṣīn, 167, 185, 336, 337
Rās al-Uṭulj, 60
Raṣāppa, 216, 211
Raṣāppa, 216, 211
Ar-Rasālī (NA g19), 42
Rāsib, 111
Rāsīn, Abū (b6), 68, 69, 76; (NA g19), 49
Rashīd, Eben, 113, 130
Rashīdīn, 355, 381
Rasām al-Muțāfī (d10), 54
Al-Rașābī (e10), 50, 148
Rasūl (NA c12), 11, 174
Ar-Rağūn (NA d19), 12, 249, 312
Rāsīṭ (NA f19), 124
Ravena geographer, 321, 381
Rāwa (d6), 18, 20, 56, 66, 69–75, 73, 75, 78, 164, 167–171, 179, 238, 391
Rāwījlān, 72
Rawlinson, C. H., 14, 34, 86, 167, 185, 199, 205–207, 209, 213, 365, 381
Rās (tree-like bush with long flexible branches and lean, needle-shaped leaves), 145, 146
Al-Rāṣa, Darb, 148
Rāsālī (c11), 137
Al-Raṣālāt, 106, 107
Raṣār (g11), 121
Al-Raṣṣāq (c11), 52
Barbān (NA h29), 39
Al-Raṣṣāqījīn, 41, 43
Al-Raṣīb, 140
Ar-Raṣṣāwījīn (f10–11), 125, 271
Razās (d7), 188
Razājīn, 41
Rbe', Abū (NA d14), 15
Rbāsa (NA d15), 17
Ar-Rība (e9–10), 56, (d8), 62
Rībān al-Fā' (e8), 65
Rūānī, Abū (a2), 88
Al-Rōbre (NA c13–14), 12
Rīfījī (e10–11), 50, 54, 139, 141, 144, 201
Rūfījī, Abū (d8), 169
Rodrem, Umm (b6), 137
Rōgbē (Aboud ar-Rōgbī, Mīzār al-Šeṣī (d6–7), 18, 19, 71
Regium Flumen, 241
Rhōbūl, 342
Reba, 349
Rējā (e9–10), 56
Al-Rējān (a1), 91
Rējemen, Umm (e7), 69
Rejren, Umm (b7), 67
Ar-Rēkāf (NA a9), 211, 247, 252, 253, 300, 302, 313, 314, 318, 325, 388, 389
Reṣef, 318
Resān (NA g19), 42
Ar-Reṣīb (NA h29), 39
Ar-Rēfāt, 140
Rīgān al-Fā'īr (e5), 169
Ar-Rīhān (NA b12), 6–8, 82, 177, 344
Ar-Rīhānī (NA a10), 187
Rūšām, Abū (b4), 73, 83, 86
Ar-Rūṣaļī, 185, 151
Ar-Rūṣajī (e9–10), 142
Ar-Rūṣajījīn (NA d14), 15; (e9), 143, 145, 157, 169
Ar-Rūṣajī (NA h20), 39
Rhodosanthis, N., 339
Rībanāt, 212, 218
Ar-Rībī (a7), 25
Rīgān, 360
Riepl, Wolfgang, 320, 381
Rīghin, See proper name
Al-Rīghīnah (d8), 62
Ar-Rīhānī, 21, See also Ar-Rīhānī
Ar-Rūṣajī (d6), 172, 173, 269
Rīve (Hydrargyrum articulatum, Cav.; large bush with needle-shaped leaves and spikes of small white flowers), 51, 63
Rūš, Abū (e9), 125
Ar-Rūṣajī (d7), 165
Rubājah, Annum (c81), 58, 59, 63, 65, 66
Rūjābah al-Jahāhilī (NA c13), 11
Al-Rūjājahījī, Ḥabān (b5–6), 68–69, 137
Rūjījīn (a5), 85, 87
Rock salt, 59, 74, 81, 151
Rome, 337
Rees, A. G., 324, 345, 381
Rūjījīn (a5), 85, 87
Ar-Rūjījīn, 9
Al-Rūjījīn, (d7), 165
Al-Rūjījījī (b6–9), 57
Royal (Arabies lycocodium, Boiss.; subshrub with resplendent leaves and small yellowish flowers), 80
Ar-Rūlīk, 185 (a6), 68
Roscoines, epanchry, 234
Rost, Paul, 363, 381
Ar-Rūt (NA c13), 11
Rousseau, J. B. L. J., 3, 349, 381
Ar-Rūta (b6), 68, 69
Royal Road, 190
Rūshā, Abū (b10), 125, 128
Rūshā, Hūr Abū, 126
Al-Rūṣajī (b4), 178
Ar-Rūṣajī, Kārīb (NA a20), 122
Ar-Rūṣajī, 'Aṣīn (d7), 166
Ar-Rūṣajī, Kārīb (d7), 65, 69, 169
Rubījīn, Hūr (NA d20–21), 116
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Salt springs, 28
Şalûba ibn Naṣūna, 305
Sa'luwa (NA b12), 6
Sa`lwa (c10—11), 141
Şam" (Stipa tortilis, Desf.: grass with a one-flowered spikelet and long awns), 147
Şams, bishop of Pèros Şakhir, 356
Şamam, 329
Şûmarra" (c10—11), 52—55, 58, 61, 135—138, 140, 144, 356, 365
Şams-ı-şâ-şur, prefect of Şhiî, 198, 212
As-Samâva, 196, 197, 310, 348
Şamma (d5), 171
Şammar (a5—9), 3, 49, 50, 107, 120, 122, 149
Şammari, 146
Şamosata, 218
Ab-Şams, "Ayn, 111
Şamsânîje, 357
Ab-Şamsânîje, 83, 86, 135, 329
Şamsât, 218
Şamî-Adad VII (824—811 B.C.), 14, 198, 210
Samuel, Books of, 281
Şumûna (NA a8), 218—221, 215, 319, 329
As-Samûme (c9), 57
As-Sanâqre, "Sart (c7), 67, 69
Şanam, 329
Sand storm, 168
Şanawda", 54, 231, 247, 267, 299, 390, 391
Şanawda"a, 84
Şanûlê (d5), 173
Şanûmîja (NA b29), 39
Saccom, xii, 60, 337, 349
Sapor I (241—272), 158, 334, 367
Sapor II (309—379), 18, 345, 347, 348, 351, 363
Sapphûn, 316, 321
Sara", canal, 269, 271
Ab-Şara" (a1), 39, 187
As-Sara", 127, 155, 274
Şara", Great, 275, 278
Şara" Gâmdûs, 275, 276
Saracenc auxiliaries, 230: chiefs, 233
Saracens, 287, 314, 325, 352
Şarafaddowlû: ibn "Ağudaddowlû, the Buyûd (d. 997), 129
Şarafaddowlû: Muslim ibn Kurejî ibn Bedûn, lord of Mosul (d. 1085), 352
As-Sarûba, 71
Sarât: "Abîd All, 93
Şarât abû Qâras, 13
Şarât abû Kheîl, 12
Şarât abû Khrâmî, 12
Şarât abû Şêmor, 9
Şarât al-Bu "Amr, 189
Ab-Şarwâle, 187
Sarçon II (722—705 B.C.), 34, 381
Şarî Nîmûrû, 38
As-Sârî, "Jasûm (e9), 157
Şârî ebeb "Aďâbîcérû, 74
Şarî al-Ḫadî, 240
Şarihûn, 135, 156, 363
Şarşanî, 196
As-Sarûba (f11), 48, 134, 155, 260
Şarûq, 69
Şarre, Fr., 381
Şarşî, town, 155, 245, 271
Şarşî, Gîrî Nahr, 244

Şa'în Içûsûn. 40. See also As-Şa'în
Sahveraz, Persian commander, 322
As-Sâlî, Darb (NA c7, e—f14), 2, 351
Şa'îd, Abu (a1), 187
Şa'îd, Nahr. 4, 7, 153, 198, 248, 250—252, 254—256, 339
Şa'îd al-Hejîr, 4. See also Şa'îd ibn 'Abdalmalek
Şa'îd ibn 'Abdalmalek, 4, 339
Şa'îd ibn Şâleb, 136
Ab-Şa'îr (NA c6—17), 30, 32
Şa'îr, İbn abu (c12), 45
A-Sa'îs (NA a9), 191
Şâjd, "Ayn, 107, 359
Şâlijîh, ebeb 'Abdallah, 74
As-Sa'îlîhâ (NA b12), 6
As-Sajjâr, Tell, 36
Şa'jâni, 48
As-Sa'jâni, 38, 105, 118, 134, 248, 250—255, 295
Şâlîh (b4), 85
As-Sakkârije, 25
As-Sakkârije (b10), 49, 144, 151—153, 267—269
Aş-Sakma (b7), 65, 137
Şâky (a11), 137
Şakry, Al-Bu, 143, 147, 149, 150
Aş-Sakma (d9), 68
As-Sakma, "Ayn (b5), 75
Şakrûn (b8), 64, 164
As-Sa'înî. See Abu 'Obejî: us-Sa'înî
Aş-Sakma, 185
Şala, son of zod Adad, 212
Şalûba (c9), 145
Şalûbî, Abu (f11), 138
Şa'dûn al-Maleke an-Nâjer Şalîbaddîn Jâouf, d. 1193), 317, 339, 344
Şalûme, 49
Salûnamûs, 320
Salûnîja, 318
Salûnîje, 161
Salûnuma (NA c6), 29, 30, 345
Şalute, 200, 202
Şâleb ibn Kefûnân, 288
Şâleb ibn Mirdâs al-Kilâhi, lord of al-Hilla, 342, 346, 347
Şâleb Pasha, 1
Şalum, Ab-Sa'lîh (b4), 82
Şâleb ibn Mâleke an-'Ojejî, 322
Aş-Sâla (b8—4), 82
Aş-Sâlihîje (b12), 1, 181: (c13), 2, 2, 9—13, 80, 174, 175, 230, 247, 248, 250, 252—255, 313, 338
Şâlihîje (f11), 48, 134, 248, 255
Şâli, Abu (c67), 167
Şalûba, mahîrîb of Tekrit, 318
Şalûbi, 34
Şalûbin (or Şalûbin), 48
As-Sa'îlîhîje, 48
Salûnas: Me leth al-Askar, 68; Me leth al-'Ecedîj, 68, 77—80; Me leth al-Kaçîrô, 68; Umm Râbal, 59, 144—146
Şalûb, Al-Bu, 188
Aş-Sûleîje (c6—7), 67
Salûn, 339, 360
Şâlûnum (turnip), 48
Şalûdûla laçefôla, Boiss. See Rîte
Şalûrî, mine, 170
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Sericopolis, 328
Serdés, monastery of, 110
Seriu, bishop of Bitha, 334
Sergius, bishop of Šīra', 325
Sergius, St., 344, 315, 325, 325; and Bacesus, church of, in Tekrit, 364, 366
As-Serî', 33
As-Serî'n, 30
Serît al-Baṣîl (d10—11), 52
Serît as-Shab (NA g19), 42
As-Serîdide (NA a10), 187
Serîf eben 'Ali, 71, 72
As-Serîfîjî, 41
As-Serîfîjî (fig), 133
Serîjîte (NA d16), 24, 165
Ser (Nocca spinosissima, L.; shrub with long spines), 76, 87
Serîdîn, Abu (e8), 52, 142
As-Serîwâniyâ, 15, 18
As-Serîwîjî (NA f9), 123
Šîtè (Bir (ε)), 80
Šîtâ (NA g18—19), 42, 110
Sevourus, emperor. See Septimius Severus
Severus, Jacobite patriarch, 324
As-Šîfâ', Sabî (ε7), 58
Šîhâ, Abu (ε8), 62, 143
Šîj, Abu (ε8), 143
Šîjî, Abu (e9), 137
As-Sîkî-jî, Bir, 138
Šîrâ (Calendula acayptiaea, Desf.; Calen-
dula anisantha, Boiss.; a species of mallow), 152
As-Šîrâ (f10), 152, 296
Šîrî, Ammu (f11), 46, 243, 244
As-Šîrâ, 15, 171
Šîhâ (e10), 148
As-Shabâ', 76
Šâbîlîjî, 25
As-Shâlî, 36
As-Shâlîjî (ε7), 166
Shalmaneser I (1257—1257 B.C.), 198
Shalmaneser III (889—824 B.C.), 14, 210
As-Shâmı, 23
Šâm, Abu (b7), 68
As-Sharijîjî (b8), 57
Šârijî, Bu, 122
As-Šîjîl (b4), 178
Šîlîtê graucyarei, 101; pilgrims, 33, 45, 46, 113; sanctuary, 47
Šîlît, 65, 41, 46, 109, 139
As-Sîlî, 113
As-Sîlî, Wädi, 169, 113, 248, 254, 256, 358
Šîlît, 297—299
Šîhâ, 186
As-Shîbî, 105, 107
As-Shîbi, 8
Šîbîr al-Šâbî, 179
Šîbîr ibn Abî-Ṣawâl, 185, 317, 381
As-Sîcîs, 147
As-Sîcîs, Kärt (ε5—6), 76
As-Sîcîr (b4), 82, 84, 86, 294, 339
As-Sîdîd, 278
As-Sîdîd, (NA d14), 14
Šîdr (species of acacia with long lean branches), 52, 58, 70, 71, 141, 142, 151
Šîflîn, 247, 257, 316—318, 321—323, 339
Sîfe (d-e), 165, 229
As-Sîfîr, (NA d13), 13
Sîfâr Šaṭīr (a7), 66
Šîgār, 345
As-Šîık (d4), 142
Šîk (kind of wormwood), 28, 65, 80, 82
As-Sîhâ (e8), 161
As-Sîhâl (a5), 68, (NA f19), 123
As-Sîhîl (NA a9), 95, 196
As-Šîhîjî (NA f19), 123
As-Sîkandarîjî, Nâhr (e11), 45, 125, 274, 275
As-Sîkî (NA d16), 25
As-Sîkîr, 351
Sîkî, Tell, 135
Šîkâ, 324
Šîlî (kind of rice), 112, 117
Šîmîrân, bishop of Šîrî, 102
Šîmîn, bishop of Pôrç śâbûr (in 544), 356; (in 605), 356
Šîn, 324
Sînî, Peninsula, 281
Sînîn ibn 'Abîqîn (s4), 346, 347
Sînîlîd, 109
As-Sînîlî, 126
Sînîr, desert, 69; ridge, 62, 211, 338; town, 68, 76, 345, 345, 348
Sînîr, Dark (b4), 68
Sînîrâ, 211
Sînîrâ, 99
Sin-šîšâm, nephew of Sîhî, 167
Sînmîrû, Byzantine architect, 105, 107
As-Sînî, 56, 356, 357
As-Sînî, Tell (b8), 180, 181, 184, 229
As-Sînîn (NA d12), 117, 118
Sin-Šar-asur, prefect of Hindâm, 14
Sîppa, 321
Sîppa, 200, 202, 258—261, 264—267, 273
Sîppa (or Sîppara) ša Samaš, 34, 200, 202
Sîpparîans, 290
Šîrîhâ, Wâdi (NA 55—60—7—8—9), 306
Šîrî (or Sîrîk), 6, 251, 294—296, 210, 211
Šîrîk âbn Ahmad ibn Şîrîkân, 7
Şîrîkân ibn Muhammad, lord of Šāmî, 344
As-Sîrye, (NA a11), 18, 186
Şîrîf, lord of Şîhî, 207
Şîlîn (e10), 55, 56, 58
Sîtacene, 266
Šîtûn, Umûm (NA f18—19), 125
Sîthâ, 256, 256, 310
As-Sîtî, 127
Sîtacene, 216, 225, 226, 241, 262—264, 266
Sîtacene, 216, 225, 226, 241, 262—264, 266
Sixtus of Bourbon, Prince, 1, 31
As-Šîțî, 118; See also As-Šîțâ
As-Šîțâ (NA d14), 15, 171
As-Šîțî, (e7), 67
As-Šîțîjî, 164
Skînîzî, 363; See also Seknitac
Sîrît, 35
As-Šîkâ (NA d19), 105, 118
Skin bags inflated used in crossing from islet to islet, 28
As-Šîkrîjî, 186
Šîkî eben Ǧarba', 149
As-Šîrî', 6
INDEX

Şükî, Hür (NA d20), 115
Aş-Sheikh, Idrîn (a21), 45
Aş-Sheikh, (d18), 22
Aş-Sheikh, 164
Aş-Sheji, Aş-Sheji (NA e17), 26
Aş-Shejâni (NA g20), 99, 119
Aş-Sheji (d7), 165, 293
Silmân ben Şejîân, 74
Şilmân ben Molîâni, 188
Aş-Şahî, Hrî (c6), 173
Aş-Şahî, Kâbr (c9), 57–59
Aş-Şahî, Kühân (a5), 68
Aş-Şahîji (NA f19), 123
Aş-Sa'mânîji (NA c17), 25
Şâmîc, 162
Aş-Sâmâ (NA k19, 20), 116
Şmîjanalysis, Tell (a4), 38
Aş-Smîrî (a1), 187
Smer, 25
Aş-Snâliji (NA b22), 2, 182, 183
Smith, S., xv, 265, 382
Aş-Snîşâyî, 5
Şînâ (Seutdizjûa Rosmarinus, Ehrh.), scented subshrub with white branched, greenish leaves, and winnifruit fruit, 29, 76, 99, 92, 142, 265, 256
Aş-Snîmât (d-c19), 51, 139, 142, 201
Aş-Snâm (f10), 152
Aş-Snâm, Fîrû, (NA b3–4), 86
Aş-Snâm, 54
Aş-Snîji (f11), 126
Aş-Snîfî (a11), 128
Aş-Snîfelî (d-c9), 157; (NA g20), 120
Şnîm, Abu (db), 62, 148
Şnîn, 'Aqlît ummu, 142
Aş-Snîn, Mollî (c6), 85, 79
Socrates the Scholastic, 321, 382
Sulî, Al-Sûo (or Ho), 126, 159
Aş-Şîfîji, Tell (c11), 139
Sûhânî (c6), 171
Şûjî, Abu (d8), 164
Suleiman Pasha, 347
Sulîman, king, 218
Sûnî, Mongol leader, 355
Sophocles of Sympheus, historian in the time of Cyrus the Younger, 223
Aş-Şûrî, (NA b18–19), 31
Aş-Sûrînî (NA c13), 9
Soyk, Abu-124
Aş-Sûriji, 162
Aş-Sûrîji (NA c-d15), 18
Aş-Şûrî, 120
Şû'n (a2), 60, 67
Şû'n 'Abdellâh (c6), 68
Şû'n 'Abdellâh (c8), 68
Aş-Sücki, 25
Aş-Sücîfî, 128
Aş-Sücîj (b7), 68
Aş-Sücîji (c6), 56
Aş-Sücîji (c10), 56
Sreper, hamlet, 253; 'Abîlîb, 169
Sreper, Hawîjet (c6), 74, 169, 230
Aş-Sreper (NA e12), 8, 9
Şûfîn, 128, 363
Aş-Sûfijîjât (b3), 180
Aş-Sûnî (NA d16–17), 24
Şûr; ben Âthîf, 74
Aş-Sûrê, 10
Şûr, 34
Aş-Sûr (a11), 135
Aş-Sûrîji (a9), 62, 143
Aş-Sûrî (a11), 135
Aş-Sûrîfî (b9–9), 57
Stephen, metropolitan of Hierapolis, 324
Stephen of Byzantium, 15, 95, 102, 223, 315, 318, 334, 395, 397, 382
Aş-Sûrî (d10–11), 52, 141
Sippe tortitès, Desf. See Şâm
Şiraho, 175, 217, 218, 226, 265, 266, 272, 282, 319, 320, 323, 327, 361, 362, 382
Street, M., 14, 299, 382
Sûbîbîh, Tell (e11), 137
Aş-Sùboji, 66, 68
Aş-Sùboji, 161
Aş-Sùboji, 164
Aş-Sûbejir, 164
Suez Canal, 281
Aş-Sûfî, Kûrî (c6), 68, 69
Aş-Sûfî, (NA f18), 35
Şûfakî (NA e9), 34
Aş-Sûhî (b8), 57
Şûhi, 14, 34, 167, 190, 200, 263, 285–293, 345
Aş-Sûnc (NA c8), 2, 257, 344
Sûsâns, 223, 382
Aş-Sûsîj (d10), 58, 142
Sûk Assad, 243, 244
a-Sûjâ (d5), 171
Aş-Sûjî, 69, 82–84, 86, 228, 340
Sûkelî-El-Abbâs, 82–84, 229
Aş-Sukkari abu Saûd, al-Hasan Ibn al-Husejin, 337
Aş-Sukkariji, (NA d14), 12
Suleiman I, the Magnificent (1520–1566), 41
Sülçiman Ibn Mahanna, 13, 270
Suleiman Ibn Mahâre, 24
Suleiman Ibn Murâd, 41
Aş-Sülîn, 192; (a1), 187
Aş-Sülîn, Tell (f70), 124, 227, 271, 274
Aş-Sûlîn 'Abdalâh (d8), 171, 207
Aş-Sûlînî, Darb (b7), 67
Aş-Sûlînîjât (c9), 143
Aş-Sumeçi (e11), 139, 138, 139, 143, 160
Aş-Sûmî (e11), 159
 Şûn, Kûrî abû- (66–71), 68
Sunnîtes, 129
Şûrî, 68, 174, 201, 264, 266
Sûr (d7), 166, 167, 205, 269, 287, 211
Şûr, 281, 282
Sûr al-Harb, 9. See also Sûr al-Harâm
Sûr al-Harâm (NA e13), 9
Sûr ar-Rûm, 321, 325
Sûrû, 225, 319, 322–325, 395
Sûrû, 325
Sûrû, 324, 325
Sûrû, canal, 125, 153, 274, 275, 277, 279; district, 153, 275, 277; town in Iraq, 153, 276, 277
Sûrû, Gis., 43, 44, 244, 274–276
Sûrû, Lower, 246, 247, 275, 276
Sûrû', Upper, 275, 276
Sûrû', 'Rûmâjî, 324, 325
Şûrûn, Gis., 244
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Assur, 86
Susa (Sura), 325
Suse, 323
Suri in Lakê (as-Swar), 14, 86, 201, 204, 205, 207–209; in Sûhi (Sûr), 167, 190, 203, 204, 206, 209, 211. See also Sûru
Sûrûja (NA a3), 93, 167, 190, 230, 315, 323, 324
Suron, 324
Sûru (Sûr), 167; (as-Swar), 205–208, 210, 211
Sûs (Sûr), 94
Susa, 264
Sûsâ, 37
Sûse (NA d16), 23, 165
As-Sûse (d6), 168, 172, 173
Susa, 296
As-Sûţeţâja, 139, 363
Sû-û-ţa-am, 213
Susa", 399, 395–396, 311
As-Swar, 86
As-Sûwevar, 88, 86, 337
As-Sûwa', Rûqet (NA f16), 30
As-Swâhlî, 71
As-Sûwar (b4), 9, 73, 84–86, 176, 204, 206, 288, 299, 211
As-Swârûq (NA g20), 43
Swârî, Ummûn, 37
As-Swêb (e8), 158
Swêdan (e7), 176
As-Swêdan, 9
As-Swêde, 187
As-Swêd, 82
As-Swêl, S. (NA e12), 11
As-Swêlîje (NA d14), 33
Swêjû, Ammu (NA h19–20), 39
As-Swêjûje (b9), 87
Swêjûje, Abu (e8), 162
Swêlem (b8), 87
Swêmer, 'Ain abû (NA e12–13), 9
As-Swêmîje (NA d16), 22, 186
As-Swêmûhe (NA e17), 25
As-Swêvede (NA d15), 18, 169
Sybano, 165
Syriac authors, 386, 342, 356
Syriac Chronicles, 364, 382
Syrian borders, 39
Syrians, 2, 135, 317, 319
Syrians, fort, 324
Tâbâhîje, (e8), 158, 160
Tâbân, 327
Tabbân eben 'Jeffe, 73, 176
At-Tâbîje (bâ), 4, 189
At-Tâba (NA a9), 95
At-Tâbîhât (a7–b9), 60
Tabula peutingeriana. See Eutininger Table
At-Tâmûrî (NA g20), 39
Tâha (NA b11), 183
Tadcir, Telif (NA a9), 93, 190, 191, 219, 229
At-Tadîm, 93
Tadmur, 257, 302, 303, 318, 341, 348
At-Tâmû, 140
At-Taft, 48, 351
Tarîf al-Hejâzî, 357
At-Taftarat (g19), 39
Tâsarî, Abu (d7–8), 165
At-Taşûrîje (a3), 68
At-Tâmûme, 40
At-Taşûrije, 136
At-Taşûrije (e8), 162, 163
Taţî, tribe, 111, 127, 280, 304
Taţûje, 162, 356
At-Taţûje (b4), 177
At-Taţûjirâtâr, Kûr (e5–8), 69, 76
Taţî, Abu (e8), 145
Tajûh, al-Fâl (b4), 82
At-Taţûjîje (NA b9), 323, 349
At-Taţûjî (e7), 58, 65, 76
At-Taţûjî (habitants of Tekrît), 364
At-Taţûjî (e11), 149
Taţûlî, 365
Taţûlije, nomads, 346
At-Taţûlije (NA p18), 109, 286
Taţûbî, 206, 209
At-Taţû 'e', 5
At-Taţû 'e' (b4), 82
Taţû, Abu (NA i9–20), 112
At-Taţûla', 73
Talnîs, 263
Talmudic literature, 350
Tâltu, Abu, 225
Tamarîz Hammoena, Boiss. See Tarîa
Tamarîz niloticus, Ehrh. See Tarîa
Tamarîz verrucosa, Vel. See Tarîa
At-Ṭâmer, 138
Tâmûm, Benî, 111, 138, 150
At-Ṭâmmûse, Kûr (e7), 66, 67
Tâmûme (b4), 178
At-Ṭâmmûse (NA a8), 216
Taţûnîr, Abu (f11), 126, 150
Tâbûb, 102
Ta'tû (b3–4), 82, 178
Târîk. See proper name
At-Târîkî (f11), 126
Tarîk. See proper name
At-Târîn (a3), 85
At-Târîn, Rûmûn, 87
At-Ṭârîn (NA d12), 4
Tarîa (Tamarîz Hammoena, Boiss.: Tamarîz niloticus, Ehrh. var. Tamarîz verrucosa, Vel.), 19, 11, 16, 22, 89, 94, 161, 166, 172, 175, 180, 183, 187
Tarîk al-Bârîrîje, 355
Tarîk al-Fîlîd, 247
Tarîk al-Fûrât, 247: district, 10, 341
Tarîk al-İbîlî, 54
Tarîk al-Karîb, 308
Tarîk nâ-Sâmû, 247
At-Ṭârmûjî, Hûr, 137
THE MIDDLE EURPHATES

Trebjījū, Abu (d. 62), 143
At-Trejf (a.11), 182, 184
At-Trejfāwī (a.28, 39; a.10, 147, 148; (NA 120), 108; (or at-Trejī), 181, 184
At-Trejaftawī, Melt (57), 67, 68
Trebjījū al-Mellāh (65—6), 68, 69, 79
At-Trejīj (a.8), 57; (a.9), 59
At-Trejīt (e.10), 50, 150
Tribute for peace and protection, 72
Tuṣul, Beni, 111
Tulmur (NA e.8), 2, 3, 9
Tulnūt Emrūt (or Nizīp II) (889—884 B. C.), 6, 14, 34, 39, 86, 174, 198—202, 205—207, 209, 211, 266, 345, 350
At-Tūlūn al-Khīrīr, 135
At-Tūlūn as-Sarīrīr, 135
Tūmān (Rudolf Thomasberger), 92
Tūmān, tribe of the Simmār, 49
Tuṣmān, 212
Turman, (d.10), 52
At-Turba, 159, 160
At-Turba, Gāl (NA f.19), 124
Turk, 124, 131, 152
Turkish army, 130; government, 35, 113, 320; mercenaries, 131; soldiers tormented by Arab saint, 71; troops, 99
Turkmans, 318, 322, 347
Turks, 132, 139
Turquos, 219
Tās, Ammatt-st, (e.6), 63, 66
Ṭūṣa, Abu (a.1), 432
Tutūb, Abu (a.1), 432
Tutūb, provincial of Tēcē. See proper name
At-Tuwālib, Kūr (e.8), 80
At-Tuwālib, Tell Fīl (f.10), 126
At-Tuwēhē (e.10), 110
At-Tuwēhī (a.1—12), 45
At-Tuwējeb (e.10), 56
At-Tuwējān (b.7), 67, 137
Tuwējān al-Mellāh, Kūr (e.6), 69, 76
At-Tuwējī (e.9—10), 147, 154, 156
At-Tuwērān (e.3), 80
Tuwērān (e.6), 73, 74
Tuwērī (NA g.20), 39
At-Tuwēta (d—e.11), 32
At-Tuwīd (e.8), 62, 143
Tyr κ (a.1), 345
At-Ubejjet (e.9—10), 145, 146
At-Ubejje (NA a.11), 181
At-Ubejje, 253—257, 295
Üd as-Saddī, (e.6), 74
At-Uqīs, Al-Ṣūf Māhmat (b.3), 180, 182
At-Uqī, Ḩāsh, 44
Al-Uqī, 39
Al-ʿUqījām, 254—258
Uṣeṣma, (g.12), 111
Al-Uṣeṣma, Niṣān (NA f.10), 120, 121, 124, 202
Uṣikai, 212
Ukur, 359
Ulluj, 134, 288—291, 293, 294
Al-Umnalmāk, Kūr (e.9), 145, 145, 160
Al-ʿUmūjīr (a.9—4), 35, 87
ʿUmūjīr ibn al-Hublāb, chief of the Ḫeṣ tribe, 82, 336
ʿUmūjīr ibn Saʿd, 167
Al-Unefūleb (a.10, 157
Umman, See main part of proper name
Ummischiṣaḏa, 295, 294
Ummu, See main part of proper name
Unger, E., 210, 226, 356
Al-ʿUnījī (NA f.18), 18
Union of the Canals, 291, 292, 295
Uṣi, 34
Uṣi, 263
Al-ʿUṣrāni, 359, 369
Uranius polos Solon, 324
Uranius, 327, 388
Uranius, bishop of Sura, 324
Urigallia-cob, 210
Al-ʿUrījī (a.16), 74, 168
Uṣāl, 291
Al-ʿUṣājī (NA d.16), 22
Uṭāṭa, 209, 209
Uwānī (e.11), 135, 363
Al-ʿUwējī (a.6), 76, 77
Al-Uwēnī (NA g.20), 45
Al-Uwēs, Al-Inām (NA f.18), 43
Valerin (253—260), 138
Vallée, P. Josla, 349, 383
Varamas (Varahana VI, 590—591), 245
Varān (Varahana V, 419—440), 362
Volosovski, J. M., 383
Verus (c. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, 161—189), 95, 235
Victor, commander under Julian the Apostate, 236
Virta, 363
Vítæ virorum apud monophysitārum celeberrimorum, 324, 328, 335, 383
Volosovski, J. M., 383
Varamas (Varahana VI, 590—591), 245
Volosovski, J. M., 383
Vologēsia, 277, 278
Vologēsia, 278
Vologēsia, 293, 294
W., Abbreviation for Wādi. See proper name
Al-Wuṣarijī, Ḥāṣan (NA d.15), 21
Wāḥi, See proper name
Wāḥi Bīsa, 236, 269
Wāḥi, Bādir (e.7—10), 153
Wahhābīte, 3, 349
Al-Walī, 13
Al-Walī, A. H. (d.5), 172
Wālī, beib Sallār, 83
Al-Wâkki, 284, 286, 291, 297, 305, 396
Wākī, 109, 159
Al-Wakīf, 139
Waldbaur, Karl (or Julaif), 99
Al-Walī, 111, 235
Al-Walī, 111, 235
Al-Walī, Ḥāṣan amm (g.11—12), 44
Al-Wardāt, 188
Al-Wardījī, 25
Warja, 283
Al-Warrādījī, 182
Al-Warrāf (NA f.18), 33
Wāṣēn, administrative district, 351; town, 357
INDEX

Al-Wašáltija, 162
Al-Waššá (f10), xilí, 149, 153, 154, 224, 269
Al-Wast, 1
Al-Wawál (d7), 65, 165, 166
Al-Witrú (842–847), 359
Water hoists on the Euphrates, 4; ērd, 11; flue wheels, ed'āw, 17, 161, 162, 165, 168, 169
Wāwī, abu Wāwī, 83
Al-Wādžān, 112, 117
Wiejdebech, F. H., 196, 212, 213, 259, 383
'Wajžle, Hūr al-aššūr (e11), 49, 141, 150
Al-Widde, 188

Wellhausen, G., 292, 383
Al-Wênç (b4), 82; (NA 24), 116
Werd (NA c15), 11
Al-Wertiš (e4), 173
Al-Werrān (e10–11), 148
Al-Weršānī, 25, 161
Al-Wérgī (e8), 146
William of Tyre, 95, 383
Winckler, Hugo, 48, 216, 213

World War, aggravates the sufferings of the natives, 171, 172; deserters, 161, 187, 188; Kurdish volunteers, 138: natives against the Turkish Government, 99–101; officials against the Germans, 124, 130, 131; recruiting of volunteers, 127; streets of Bagdad empty, 125; transportation of guns, 128

A-l-Whrūn, 24
Al-Wrofje (e5), 171
Wright, J. K., xv
Wright, W., 346, 383
Al-Wušāl (e10), 69, 142
Al-Wušalāj, 166
Wušālāj (e9), 143
Wušālāj (e9), 143
Wušālāj (e7), 168
Wūrč, 112
Al-Wušalāj, 165
Al-Wūṣet, see 'Adr al-Wuṣet
Al-Wuṣerā, 25
Al-Welābī, 15
Al-Wuzum, 49
Al-Wrūn (c11), 140


Youzouzard I (390–419), 362

Zab, Great, 226, 263
Zah, Littie, 229
Zah-Ba (c11), 149
Zahba', settlement of, 185, 331
Zah-Ba', Queen, 15, 31, 169, 185, 186, 322, 337
Zahke (d7), 164
Az-Za'b (h1), 182
Az-Za'balka, 125
Zacharius, bishop of al-Anbār and Hit, 353
Az-Za'd, Hān (f11), 46, 243, 247
Zādān, 91
Zadilān, 260, 265
Az-Žaddū, Hām (c–d10), 54
Az-Za'c'īnā (e7), 60
Az-Za'wīja, 34
Az-Za'wījan (NA d15), 15, 17, 71, 170
Az-Zahura, 86
Zāhūch, 'An (NA 121), 111, 116, 293
Zāhur, Al-Ba, 188
Zāhur, Al-Saḏib (NA c17), 25, 26, 161; (e7–8), 163
Zahmūne, 168
Zahār, Dāb (c3), 79, 80
Az-Zahra, 122
Zālī, 233, 237, 238, 357–359
Az-Zādāfī (NA b19–20), 39
Zakka', Mar. monastery of, 328–331
Zaladī, 185
Zalī, Abu, 54
Zaīt, Abu (NA f16), 30, 311
Az-Zambākīja, 164
Zānā, Bārā', 312
Zanātā, 87
Zanatās, 216, 224, 226, 293
Zaraqardia, 236, 239, 240
Zāri Hān (f11), 126
Zāri, ‘Ali, 48
Az-Zarrā'a, 25
Az-Zarrāb (a10), 88
Al-Zāzam, Ab- (NA c12–13), 9
Zāzem, Khār (e9), 157
Al-Zassāt, 140
Az-Za’trī (e8), 162
Zaitha, 338
Zāwar, canal, 136; settlement, 136
Az-Zawīja, 37
Az-Zaykā (d7), 166
Za’a’a (NA c6–7), 30
Az-Zībī (e11), 45
Az-Zībī (d10), 54; (e9), 157
Zoja', Umm, 149; See also Zeja'a, Umm
Az-Zbajjak, 73
Zbēr, Abu (b8), 57, 63
Ab-Zhdāmilī, 25
Az-Zebārī, 67
Al-Zedma (d9), 362
Az-Ze’b (NA f19), 133
Az-Ze’be (NA 118–19; m19–20; n20), 24, 25, 107
Az-Zebeh (NA e17), 25
Az-Zejdā, 106, 107, 116
Zeja'a, Umm (e11), 140
Zēdā, Beni, of the Ḫṣāṭān, 127, 149
Zejdān (e1), 91, 189
Az-Zejāj, Kār (b–e6), 68
Az-Zeire, 163
Zēḥūn, district, 338, 339
Az-Zejudīn, 368, 369
Az-Zejāj, Samīt, 189
Az-Zejārā, 120
Zeje (d7), 165
Zelebijja (e2), 160, 184, 185, 197, 198, 208, 210, 211, 228, 229, 254, 332, 333
Zeibib, See proper name
Al-Zeibib, 172
Zeit, Ataibeg. See 'Imād ad-Dīn Ataibeg Zenkī
Zenjkī (e4), 173
Zeno (474–911), 232
Zenoa, Queen of Palmyra, (until 272), 332; settlement, 315, 324, 352
Zenodotium, 31
Zeri. See proper name
Al-Zerje (f11), 126, 127, 202, 266
Az-Zerjâb (c6—7), 88, 79
Žerma (NA d16), 23, 165
Zîtab al-Ḫârî (NA b11), 184, 186, 301
Zîtâb az-Zezr (d2—3), 86, 88
Zeugma 323: near Samosata in Commagene, 218, 327; near Thapsacus, 327
Zeugma-Âpameia, 218, 268, 319, 326
Zeuxis, lieutenant under Antiochus III, 272
Az-Zhâmakî, Brîr (d2—3), 86, 89
Zhêr, Abu, (e10), 51, 52, 142
Zhûr al-Kâêtî, 15
Zhûr al-Mânî (NA d13), 13
Zibde, (d5), 265
Az-Zibdîlijî (NA g20), 39
Al-Zîbîlî, Teîî, 5
Az-Zibdîlijî (NA g30), 39, 119, 279
Zîdah, Abu, (a6), 68
Az-Zîjlârât, 186
Zîkrwâjâh ibn Mehrwâjî al-Karmâtî, 358
Az-Zîn, Al-Îmâm ab-, 26
Al-Zîrî, Abî (NA f17), 31, 247, 253
Al-Zîrî, 'Alî, 160
Az-Zîrîr, Kërîît (b8), 82, 178
Az-Zîkîâ (c7), 65
Zînâd, Ummu (NA e13), 11, 173
Zîbâbî, tribe, 48, 127, 157, 159
Az-Zobejkâba, 185
Zobejî, tribe, 122, 150
Zobejî, Barêcêt az-Sitt (NA 119—39), 112, 113
Zobejîdet umm Ġûfar, Harûn az-Rashîd's wife, 53, 331
Az-Zobejîlijî, 113
Zochace, 257
Zîr al-Kâîmî. See Al-Kâîmî
Zîr al-Sammar, 187
Az-Zowrî, 317
Zrâdân (NA d16), 34
Az-Zrâjîîer (b4), 182
Az-Zrêjîîer, Sîbel (NA a11), 184
Az-Zrêjîî, 35
Az-Zrêjîîlijî, 71
Zubbên, Kaîrî, 172
Az-Zûbîdî (b6), 57
Zûbîre (NA g19), 42
Zûmêkîlî, Abu (d9), 58
Az-Zûmêkîlî, 312
Zûrejkîrân, 246
Az-Zûwâhîr, 73
Az-Zwâjîîr (c11), 133, 149
Az-Zwêjîâ, 168
Az-Zwêjîîîer (d8), 165
Zwêjîî, Abu (d8), 143
Az-Zwêjîîs (NA e17), 35, 158, 244
Az-Zwîrî (NA f19), 34
Az-Zwîrîr, 162

ERRATA
p. 94, note 23, line 5: for 1169—70 read 1159—60.
p. 106, Fig. 34: southeast is at the top.
p. 110, line 1: for southeast read southwest.
p. 123, line 34: for northeastern read northwestern.
p. 124, line 39: for west-northwest read east-northeast.
p. 124, line 54: for left read richt.
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