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ABSTRACT

This thesis is divided into three parts. Part One summarises the description of individual localities in the Northern Hijaz as presented in the writings of the Arab geographers in the period 800-1150. Since it is not practicable to include all the information they proffer on all localities of this region, a representative selection of places is given, arranged alphabetically, each entry containing a synopsis of the data supplied by the Arab geographers of this period. This part of the thesis is essentially informative except when, in order to eliminate contradictions, it has been necessary to examine the evidence thoroughly and refer to authors of later periods. Under Qurā 'Arabiyyah and Nakhirah where there is great confusion, a few paragraphs are added to elaborate the conclusions to be drawn from the investigation. The second part is devoted wholly to the pilgrim routes in the Northern Hijaz as described by the Arab geographers. The tables of the routes frequented by the Iraqis are based on the original mileages as recorded by the geographers. In this part, fewer authors outside the period have to be consulted; when they are, it is usually in connection with the pilgrimage rites and administration. The third and last part consists of a general survey of the information supplied by the Arab geographers of the period on the Northern Hijaz, and deals with sources, quotations, mis-
quotations and borrowings as well as attempts at the authentication of works of disputed authorship. It also discusses the characteristics of these geographers, "geographical poetry, the rise and decline of towns and villages, and the dependencies of Medina and Mecca.

Discussion of the two cities of Mecca and Medina has been excluded from this thesis.
The period 800-1150 was chosen because it is prolific in original Arabic works on geography. Al-‘Asma‘I flourished at the court of al-Rashīd at the turn of the 8th and 9th centuries when he composed his influential "literary" geographical work Jazīrat al-'Arab. A few years later saw the emergence of 'Arrām, the pioneer of "regional" geography, and his revolutionary work on Tihāmah and the Hijaz. In the mid 9th century Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh wrote the first "general" geography. The closing limit was adopted because it was in the mid 12th century that al-‘Idrīsī wrote his Nuzhah, and Nasr compiled his Jibīl.

The chronological list of Arab geographers provided by V. Minorsky is nearly accurate as it is almost comprehensive. It is certainly reliable as far as the general geographers are concerned, but required to be supplemented by the addition of mainly regional geographers, and by minor corrections of the dates in the light of information which was not at the disposal of this very eminent scholar. I have not included biographical data on the Arab geographers since De Goeje, Krachkovski, Minorsky, Dr Šāliḥ al-‘Alī, Shaikh Ḥamad al-Jāṣir and Dr Husain Nāṣār have already proffered all that is required in this respect. An exception is made in the case of authors whose works have not yet been utilized such as Wākī, on whom a brief biographical reference is given in
this thesis. It has been found necessary to stress that Ishaq b. al-Musain, the author of Akām al-Murjān, could not have lived, as generally assumed, before the 12th century.

Five terms are applied in this thesis to denote certain schools of geographers: literary geographers who, though aiming at the definition of localities in Arabia, were mainly concerned with literature, such as al-Asma’ī, Lughdah and al-Hajarī; regional geographers, who limited themselves to particular parts of Arabia such as ‘Arrām and al-Hafṣī; official geographers who, being senior members of the administration for whose benefit they wrote, had access to official archives; Fatimid geographers, namely Ibn Hauqal, al-Muqaddasī and al-Muhallabī, who advocated the Fatimid cause; and general geographers who describe all Islamic territories or even the whole known world. This school includes the official and Fatimid geographers as well as al-Jāhid, Ibn al-Faqīh, al-Bakrī and al-Idrīsī. Al-Ḥamdānī's intention was to compile a general geography, but his means apparently fell short of the ambition to produce a work as exhaustive as his description of the Yemen, Najd and Tihāmah. With the exception of al-Mas‘ūdī and al-Hajarī, the term "geographer" is applied only to authors of works primarily concerned with geography.

The method of transliteration is conventional except for a few names which have well-established English forms such as Islam, Arab, Mecca, Medina, Taif and Ibn Rosteh. The letters gh, kh, dh, th and sh are not underlined. Capital B,
denotes Banū, whereas small b. denotes Ibn between two names.
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BIBLIOGRAPHY
THE HIJAZ AS DEFINED BY THE ARAB GEOGRAPHERS

The Arab geographers differ in their definitions of the Hijaz. Some of them limit themselves to the linguistic explanation of the word hijāz (the barrier); others demarcate the Hijaz from east to west; a third group tries to delineate the Hijaz from south to north; undertakings in which they by no means agree.

It is impossible to accept Qudāmah's concept that it was the Prophet who ḥajaza (set up a barrier) between the Yemen and the province of Mecca by assuming Ṭalḥat al-Malik as the borderline dividing the two provinces, a statement implying that the Prophet was the first to call that locality the Hijaz. It is most likely that the Prophet named it as the point where the two administrations separate, since the name Hijaz stems no doubt from a much earlier date than Islam. Qutrub proffers two explanations of the linguistic derivation of the word hijāz (the place surrounded by mountains, or the cord). According to Yaqūt, al-Khalīl maintains that the Hijaz was given this name because it "separates al-Ghaur, Syria and the Steppe." This quotation is given by al-Bakrī in a more explicit form. Here al-Khalīl

1. Qudāmah, Kharāj, p. 189.
says that it is called Hijaz because it separates al-Ghaur from Syria, and Tihāmah from Najd, a statement of which, by the way, only the second part is correct. To al-Hasan (al-Basrī) the word *hijāz* "denotes the land of rivers and plants and signifies Paradise". Ibn Duraid claims that it is called Hijaz because it separates Najd from al-Sarāh. This is incorrect since al-Sarāh is identical with the Hijaz north of the Yemen. Al-Asma'ī is said to have maintained that *hijāz* means "the land encircling the mountains". This cannot be accepted, as *hijāz* denotes the mountain and not the land surrounding it.

Ibn 'Abbās is the first to define the Hijaz, according to a report transmitted by Ibn al-Kalbī to the effect that the Hijaz is the mountain range called al-Sarāh which stretches from the borders of the Yemen to the Syrian steppe. The low land to its west is called Tihāmah, and the relatively high land to its east bears the name of Najd. Had this report ended here, it would be intelligible, but a reporter intervened to complicate a hitherto clear issue. He added that Najd was the desert stretching from al-Sarāh to the borders of Iraq and al-Samāwah, and that the Hijaz was equivalent to the mountain range stretching east of al-Sarāh as far as

2. Ibid., p. 11.
Fa'id and the two mountains of Tayy. He went on to say that these mountains were called Najd, Jals or Hijaz, though the latter was the common name. This erroneous explanation caused many Arab geographers to confuse the Hijaz with Najd. Without this uncalled-for addition, it would have been perfectly clear that Arabia was divided into four sections, the Yemen, the Hijaz or Mt. al-Sarah, Tihamah or al-Ghaur to the west of Mt. al-Sarah, and Najd to the east of that mountain.

Al-Hamdani, who records this report, discards another attempt at the explanation of the Hijaz attributed to al-Harbī, apparently because he realises that it conflicts with the previous demarcation of the Hijaz and Najd. He is right, as in this report Bishah, Tabalah, Tarj, al-Maraghan and Ranyah were all described as dependencies of Najd, whereas all the land east of Mt. al-Sarah from Tathlith and the land of Madhij until Fa'id and the two mountains of Tayy, were described as Hijazi lands. As this definition of the Hijaz includes these Najdi dependencies, al-Hamdani, a native of Arabia, could not accept this mis-statement. It is also unlikely that either Ibn 'Abbās or Ibn al-Musayyib was responsible for these mistakes. Both al-Harbī and Wakī attribute this report to Ibn Fadalah, whereas Ibn al-Anbārī traces it back to Ibn Habīb. It is, however, from Ibn 'Abbās that

3. Wakī, Manazil, fols. 72-73.
the delineation of the Arab land and its sub-regions seems to have originated, though his report is laden with many additions and misleading explanations. Only one author, namely Ibn Nasîh, seems to have rejected the erroneous assumption that the Hijaz stretches as far to the east as Faid which he locates thirteen days' journey from the Hijaz. His criticism, however, was ignored by other authors.

Ibn 'Abbâs' definition of the Hijaz is far more authentic and reliable than any attempted by his successors. 'Arrâm describes the Hijaz as stretching from al-Naqîrah to Medina which, according to him, is half Hijazi and half Tihāmî. This definition, though borrowed by Nasr, is unacceptable even when taken as drawing a cross line through the Hijaz from east to west, since not all the lands west of Medina are situated in Tihāmah as he suggests. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Asadî describes the land between the vicinity of Ta'if and Syria as comprising the Hijaz. This remark, too, is attributable to al-Asma'î who, on another occasion, defines the Hijaz as "the land surrounded by the five lava fields of Shaurān, Laylā, Wâqîm, al-Nâr and B. Sulaim. In both definitions, the Hijaz appears too small a region to be accepted. As to the other definition attributed to al-Asma'î by al-Bakrî who states that

1. Ibn al-Anbârî, Sharh al-Qasâ'id, p. 534.
2. 'Arrâm, Jibāl, p. 424.
3. Al-Bakrî, Mu'jam, p. 10.
Tihāmah forms the frontier of Najd at Dhāt 'Irq, and that of the Hijaz at the pass of al-'Arj, it cannot be accepted since not only Dhāt 'Irq forms part of the Hijaz, but the slopes of Mt. al-Sarāh west of it are also Hijazi localities. It appears from al-Samhūdī that al-Bakrī's source for the borders of the Hijaz was al-Asma'ī. In this definition, the Hijaz is bordered by Batn Nakhl, the upper Rummah and the western parts of the Laylā lava fields in the east; by Shaghb and Badā in the north; by Badr, al-Suqūyā, Ruhāt and 'Ukāz in the west, adjacent to Tihāmah; and by Sāyah and Waddān in the south. This definition invites a number of criticisms. Apart from the fact that the Hijaz is much wider than the area thus delineated, al-Asma'ī's demarcation of the borderline in the west and south is marred by logical and geographical errors. Ruhāt and 'Ukāz are regarded as western borders with Tihāmah, and Waddān is regarded as the southern border. Now, 'Ukāz is situated well outside the region described here as the Hijaz, lying as it does, not in Tihāmah, but near Taif. Ruhāt should form part of the southern borders, since it is distant from Badr as well as al-Suqūyā. Waddān cannot be regarded as a border town of the Hijaz, since it is a port separated by Tihāmah from the Hijaz. The nearest al-Asma'ī approaches to accuracy in his definitions of the Hijaz is when he terms it "the land stretching from

3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 10-11.
the borders of ʿanāʾ at al-ʿAblāʾ and Tabālah to the Syrian borders. Though it is difficult to discover a connection between ʿanāʾ on the one hand, and al-ʿAblāʾ and Tabālah on the other, it can be said at least that al-ʿAsmaʾī looks for the Hijaz in the right place. Al-ʿAsmaʾī is followed here by Nasr.

Ibn al-Kalbī himself is quoted by Yāqūt as having located the Hijaz between the two mountains of Tayy, and the Iraqi route to Mecca. This does not include a definition, since the distance between these two localities and the route is a mere thirty-six miles, which hardly constitutes a region. The fact is that Yāqūt misquotes Ibn al-Kalbī who, according to al-Bakrī and in reliance on al-ʿAhwal, says that the Hijaz is situated between the two mountains of Tayy and the Iraqi route, (the eastern borders of Tihamah) شعب shaʿaf (upper) Tihamah, and the Yemen. This coincides with the explanation found in the report of Ibn ʿAbbās and is, at best, partly correct. Ibn al-Kalbī also proffers another definition of the Hijaz which, according to him, stretches between al-Yamāmah and al-ʿArūd on the one hand, and Najd and the Yemen on the other. It is obvious from this definition

4. Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, p. 11.
5. Ibid., p. 10.
that Ibn al-Kalbī regards both Taif and Medina as situated in Najd. It is difficult to understand why this definition is recorded, since it is contrary to fact, and conflicts with other reports transmitted by Ibn al-Kalbī himself. Al-Harbī includes even Palestine in the Hijaz, but regards as the southern borders of the Hijaz the Basra pilgrim route (Rukbah) in the east and the pass of al-'Arj in the west. He does so in defiance of the report he himself transmits from al-Zubair where Mt. al-Sarāh is equated with the Hijaz (except in the Yemenite part of al-Sarāh).

Mālik seems to follow Ibn 'Abbās when he divides Arabia into three (provincial) towns: Medina (the Hijaz), Mecca (Tihāmah) and al-Yamāmah (Najd) together with the Yemen. Ibn 'Ayyāsh locates the Hijaz between al-Shuqrah (east of Medina) and the pass of al-'Arj. This can be accepted only if taken as drawing a cross line through the Hijaz from east to west. Abū 'Ubaidah locates the Hijaz between al-Juḥfah in the west and the two mountains of Tayy in the east "because the Hijaz separates al-Ghaur from Najd". With this definition of the Hijaz, there would hardly be any Ghaur or Najd left, because al-Juḥfah is only several miles from the sea, and the Tayy mountains are in the heart of Najd. Thus only the second part of this definition can be correct.

1. Ibid., p. 12.
2. Ibid., p. 5.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
There is also the information found in al-Hamdānī's Sifah and attributed to three poets from Najd, Tihāmah and the Hijaz who try to define their respective localities. According to their definitions, the Hijaz begins in Mecca and stretches northwards along the coastal line until Yanbū', the turns westwards at Dhul-Marwah near Wādī al-Qurā as far as Medina. Consequently, many Hijazi localities south of Medina along Mt. al-Sarāh as far as Kutnah are described either as Tihāmī or as Najdī localities. This cannot be accepted, since it conflicts with the clear definition of the southern borders of the Hijaz by al-Hamdānī himself. To describe Taif and Mt. al-Sarāh as Tihāmī territories is even contradictory to the very meaning of the name "Tihāmah" or "al-Ghaur", namely the low lands between the Red Sea and Mt. al-Sarāh. It is likely that the poems in question have been misquoted, possibly in order to disgrace their authors or even al-Hamdānī himself, a malicious act similar to that directed against another poet quoted by al-Hamdānī. It is more likely than not that these poems were the work of one author. It has not been possible to ascribe this erroneous location to administrative or political factors for lack of information about the time at which they were composed.

2. Ibid., p. 51.
Al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal locate the Hijaz between al-Sirraín south of Jiddah, al-Yamāmah, the two mountains of Tayy, al-Ḥijr and Madyan. Al-Muqaddasī's location of the Hijaz is rather vague, since he situates it between the borders of the Yemen and Qurh (Wādī al-Qurā), but describes Madyan as Hijazi. Al-Idrīsī regards Ḥdāt 'Irq as part of Tihāmah, an opinion untraceable in other sources. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī defines al-Suwaidā' (north of Medina) as the frontier of the Hijaz. It is likely that this strange remark has its origin in a misreading of al-Hamdānī's statement: wa Uwāl al-Hijāziyyah aimanu min al-Suwaidā' (the Hijazi Uwāl is situated to the right of al-Suwaidā') where Uwāl may have been altered into awal (first). Al-Zamakhsharī does not define the Hijaz, though he implies that its northern border stops short of al-Ḥijr which he locates between Syria and the Hijaz. It is not clear on which border of the Hijaz Sayy'ah is

3. Al-Muqaddasī, Ahsan al-Taqāsīm, p. 94.
4. Ibid., p. 178.
5. Al-Idrīsī, Nuzhat al-Mushtāq, fol. 41.
6. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 22.
7. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 130.
9. Ibid., p. 83.
situated, unless its name is a corrupted form of Sāyāh which is regarded by al-Asma'ī as part of the western borders of the Hijaz. Al-Zamakhsharī, however, relies on 'Ullayy in describing Hāly as the Hijazi border with the Yemen. As to the Hijazi borders with Najd, al-Zamakhsharī seems to rely on the traditional opinion that "he who sees Mt. Hadan is already in Najd", which is unobjectionable. He, however, locates al-'A'rād between the Hijaz the Yemen and Mt. al-Sarāh, an incorrect statement as the Hijaz is identical with Mt. al-Sarāh north of the Yemen.

'Umarah b. 'Aqīl, followed by al-Sukkari, maintains that Najd begins (and the Hijaz ends) where the waters of Mt. al-Sarāh turn east, and that Tihāmah ends (and the Hijaz begins) at the edge of the slopes of Mt. al-Sarāh in the west. The latter is essentially true, since Tihāmah is the coastal plain between the Red Sea and Mt. al-Sarāh. The former is, however, incorrect because both the western and eastern slopes of Mt. al-Sarāh (the Hijaz) should be regarded as parts of the Hijaz. Otherwise, many Hijazi localities would be included in Najd.

'Arrām, when mapping Tihāmah and the Hijaz, locates the latter in the mountainous area between Medina and Turabah.

1. Ibid., p. 8.
2. Ibid., p. 48.
3. Ibid., p. 116.
from north to south, and from al-Naqrāh to Medina from east to west. The first part of this statement is less erroneous than the second which has already been discussed. Lughdah records the opinion that the territory stretching from Medina to the hills of al-'Arj is Najdī, and the territory south of al-'Arj until Mecca Tihāmī. It is likely that Najd here is a misplacement of the Hijaz. Lughdah also states that the frontiers of Najd begin where those of Tihāmah end which is inaccurate. He is more correct when he places Najd immediately east of Wajrah, and Tihāmah immediately west of Dhāt 'Irq. Ibn Qutaibah's location of the Hijaz and Syria at "Taimā" and Mt. al-Sarāh of Najd" is not likely to be his actual utterance. Nasr identifies the Hijaz with al-Jauz which, being a Hudhaiči chain of hills west of Mt. al-Sarāh, is too small a locality to be equated with the Hijaz. Al-Hamānī equates Ptolemy's Soēne which he calls the island of سوينى Suwainī, vocalized as Suwainā, with the Hijaz which is difficult to understand. Qudāmah correctly equates it with the region of Aswan. Al-Hamānī may have been misled by the ancient description of both sides of the Red Sea as inhabited by the Arabs. As Aswan

1. 'Arrām, Jibāl, p. 424.
5. Al-Hamānī, Sifah, p. 15; Ptolemaeus, Almajest, p. 41.
6. Qudāmah, Al-Khāraj (MS.) fol. 54.
is situated on the same latitude on which parts of the Northern Hijaz are located, al-Hamdānī may have used the name Soene for the Hijaz.

In conclusion, it will be expedient to discard most of the demarcations of the Hijaz proffered by the Arab authors in order to clear up the confusion which reigns in this field. As to the eastern and western borders of the Hijaz, the meaning of the word hijāz itself proves that they end at the edge of the slopes of Mt. al-Sarāh. As to the southern borders, it is advisable to consult and accept al-Hamdānī's definition since he is, in this respect, a most reliable authority on demarcating the political frontiers of the Yemen with the Hijaz in the 10th century. According to him, the borderline between the Yemen and the Hijaz stretches from al-Hujairah in the east to Tathlīth, the valley of Jurash, Kutnah and then Umm Jahdam in Tihāmah in the west. These are the Yemenite borders with the Hijaz (and Tihāmah) which are quite unequivocally drawn. On another occasion, al-Hamdānī describes Kutnah as the first of the Hijazi localities in the vicinity of the Yemen. This is a later development on the demarcation attempted by Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh and Qudāmah, who both maintain that Talhat al-Malik (fifty-three miles south of Kutnah) is the southernmost border of lands under Meccan administration, which is an ancient demarcation. Al-Idrīsī follows them in this

2. Ibid., p. 186.
3. Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, Masālik, pp. 135, 137.
respect. This delineation by al-Famānī may clarify the confusing statement made by al-ʾAsmaʾī when locating the Hijaz between the borders of Ṣanʿāʾ at al-ʾAbāʾ and Tabālah. Ṣanʿāʾ here may mean the Yemen because Ṣanʿāʾ is too far from al-ʾAbāʾ and Tabālah to be situated on one line with them.

There is little doubt that, about the 7th century, the northern borders of the Hijaz used to end immediately north of Medina, near Dhū Khushub and al-ʾĪs. For some Medinese, the area beginning in Wādī al-Qurā and to the north of it was called al-Shām (Syria). Some authors do not even regard it as an Arab land and attribute to this the fact that 'Umar had desisted from deporting the local Jews. This assumption may also be a legacy of the ancient "Provincia Arabia", or Qurāʾ 'Arabiyyah, which most likely used to include these localities. The Prophet assigns a mīgāt for the pilgrims on the way from Syria, which means the part of Arabia north of Medina. Ibn al-Kalbī calls this part "Bilād al-ʾArab" and locates it north of Tihāmah, of which Yanbu and Mt. Radwā are regarded as the northernmost frontiers. It is to this ancient concept that Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ may have referred when they describe al-Yamāmah, Taif, Mecca and Medina as Hijazi, Yemenite, Tihāmī and "the home-town of the Prophet" respectively. Nevertheless, the region north of Medina was des-

2. Infra, p. 255.
3. Wākīʾ, Manāzil, fol. 73.
cribed as part of the Hijaz by later authors when Suragh was cited as the northern border of the Hijaz. Al-Hamdānī refers to Taimāʾ as the capital of the ancient kingdom of the Hijaz.

It is the administrative factors that account, no doubt, for the confusing demarcation of the Hijazi frontiers by later authors. The fact that the governor of the Hijaz was responsible for the Iraqi pilgrim route south of Meidī influenced Ibn al-Kalbī to describe the localities south of the two mountains of Tayy as Hijazi. This statement was accepted by many later geographers such as al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn Ḥauqāl, al-Bakrī, and Naṣr. It was perhaps the reason why Tīhāmah was later incorporated partly in the Yemen and partly in the Hijaz, from which it was administered. Later, when both Mecca and Medina had their own governors with the southern and northern parts of the Hijaz and Tīhāmah controlled by the governors of Mecca and Medina respectively, some authors included the northern part of the Tīhāmah with the Hijaz, and the southern part of Mt. al-Sarāḥ (the Hijaz) with Tīhāmah. Since Tīhāmah is also surnamed al-Ghaur, some authors were led to believe that it formed an entity separate from both the Hijaz and Tīhāmah, and located it between Yanbu' and al-Juḥfah; this may have been dictated by administrative factors. It may also account for the fact that some authors

1. Al-Hamdānī, Iklīl, 1, pp. 73-74.

allot parts of the Hijaz to corresponding provincial capitals as "the Hijaz of Medina", "the Hijaz of Wādī al-Qurā'" and "the Hijaz of Taimā"; obviously because these parts happened to be administratively linked with these centres. For this reason, the Hijazi localities from al-Haurā', northwards were regarded, in the 11th century, as part of Egypt. Ibn Ḥazm, however, regards髂lah as part of the Hijaz.

Remarks by some authors on "the first Hijaz" seem to suggest that there was a "second" or even a "third" Hijaz. This misconception seems to have originated in a misunderstanding of the phrase "ود الحجاز الأول wa haddu al-Hijāz al-awwal" (the first border of the Hijaz) which occurs in Ibn Fadālah's definition of the Hijaz. Yāqūt quotes Mālik to the effect that Suragh is a village in the valley of Tabūk and that it is "the farthest in the first Hijaz". al-Bāji, the commentator on al-Muwatta', attributes the first part of this statement to Ibn Ḥabīb, and records the opinion that Suragh is the Syrian locality nearest to the Hijaz. Had Mālik mentioned the first Hijaz, al-Bāji would have mentioned it too. Yāqūt's reference may have originated in a misinterpretation, possibly by 'Iyāḍ, of Ibn Fadālah's report. The author of Akām al-Murjān greatly aggravates this error.

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 914; Al-Hamdānī, Iklīl, vol. 1, p. 73.
2. See Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 538; Ibn Hauqal, op.cit., p.53.
when he locates the first Hijaz between al-Qairawān and Ailah, localities which are described by al-Bakrī as comprising asfal al-ard = lower territories (of Egypt). Since al-Idrīsī describes Ailah as being part of asfal ard al-Hijāz, the author of Ḥikām al-Murjān may have regarded even al-Qairawān as part of asfal = lower or awwal = first Hijaz. It may also be a misreading of 'amal = administrative area as .awwal = first, which is not unusual. al-Hijāz al-aswad = the black Hijaz = the Sarāh of Shanū'ah, compared by al-Bakrī with the Hijāz of Medina, seems to stem from al-Hamdānī's mention of the black mountain of Shanū'ah. 'Umarah b. 'Aqīl describes parts of al-Bakrī's Hijaz of Medina as being a black hijāz = black mountain which al-Samhūdī changes to hijārah sūd = black stones.

Unlike the eastern and western geographical borders of the Hijaz which end, as has already been seen, at the edge of the slopes of Mt. al-Sarāh, the southern and northern geographical borders are not easy to ascertain on the basis of the works of the Arab geographers.

Throughout this work, the term "Northern Hijaz" applies to the whole region north of Mecca as far as Suragh and Ailah,

1. Ḥikām al-Murjān, p. 407; and al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 89.
3. Al-Hamdānī, Sīfāh, p. 70.
4. Lughdah, op.cit., p. 15.
including the region between the Red Sea and Dhēt 'Irq (al-Darībah), Khāibar, Waṣī al-Qurā, Taínā' and Tabūk. The occasional liberal interpretation of the eastern borders of the Hijaz by some authors had to be disregarded, since it includes most of Najd such as the two mountains of Tayy, and al-Yamāmah. The rather narrow interpretation by some other authors which would entail the exclusion of the eastern half of Mt. al-Sarāh from the Hijaz was also disregarded. But Tihāmah had to be included in the Hijaz because the part west of Mt. al-Sarāh was often called the Hijazi Tihāmah as against the Yemenite Tihāmah.
PART ONE

A REPRESENTATIVE SELECTION OF LOCALITIES

AS DESCRIBED BY THE ARAB GEOGRAPHERS
Placing al-Abwā' on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca, Ibn Khurrahadbeh states that it is rich in wells. He gives the distance between al-Abwā' and al-Suqyā as twenty-nine miles, and the distance between al-Juḥfah and al-Abwā' as twenty-seven miles. Thus he places al-Abwā' south of al-Suqyā and north of al-Juḥfah. Qudāmah follows him; so does Ibn Rosteh who adds that al-Abwā' is a huge-sized village not far from the sea which can be reached from there by a journey lasting one day and one night. Al-Ya'qūbī accepts their statements but only in so far as the location is concerned. He adds that it belongs to the Aslam. Al-Mas'ūdī calculates the distance between Waddān and al-Abwā' as eight miles. Ibn Rosteh calculates the distance between al-Suqyā and al-Abwā' as nineteen miles, but follows Ibn Khurrahadbeh with respect to the distance between al-Abwā' and al-Juḥfah.

Al-Muqaddasī mentions al-Abwā' in connection with the route between Medina and Mecca. He states that it is equi-

---

1. Ibn Khurrahadbeh, op. cit., p. 130.
5. Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbīh, p. 235.
distant from both al-Juhfah to the south and al-Suqāy to the north, from which it is separated by a day's journey. Al-Istakhri calculates the distance between al-Abwā' and Waddān to the east as six miles, adding that al-Abwā' is on the pilgrim route and that "it" - which may refer to either al-Abwā' or Waddān - was the residence of the Ja'farī chief during his stay there. Ibn Hauqal is more explicit about this, stating that al-Abwā' is the residence of the chief in question. He gives the same location as al-Istakhri whose statement is attributed by Yağūṭ to Abū Zaid.

'Arrām remarks that the water of the valley of Ārah flows first into al-Abwā', then into Waddān and then into al-Turaifah, a small village on the sea coast. This seems very accurate as al-Abwā' is higher than Waddān to the west which lies between al-Abwā' and the sea, contrary to al-Istakhri's statement. 'Arrām also says that al-Hashā, the mountain of al-Abwā', is to the right of Ārah on the right hand side of the route from Medina to Mecca. This mountain is situated by the valley of Bu'q which is flanked by the valley of Shass to the left and al-Hashā to the right. Al-Abwā' is half a mile from there. The whole statement is

5. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 405.
6. Ibid., p. 411.
repeated by al-Bakrī without reference to his source.

Al-Zubairī says that Arthad is the valley whose water flows into al-Abwa'. This statement is attributed, in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, to Ibn Ḥabīb who adds that the distance from al-Abwa' to Medina is four miles, which cannot be accepted unless "miles" reads "days". Al-Bakrī also quotes Ibn Ḥabīb to the effect that al-Shabā, near al-Abwa', is Juhaina territory, which was true before his time. In a third passage al-Bakrī borrows 'Arrām's statement about the link between Waddān, al-Turaifah and al-Abwa', without reference to a source. (The Egyptian edition of al-Bakrī's Mu'jam prefers al-Turaiqah which contradicts al-Bakrī's spelling of it in another entry when he states clearly that it is al-Turaifah.) Al-Bakrī describes al-Turaifah exactly as 'Arrām does though he quotes al-Sakūnī once only.

As to the derivation of the name al-Abwa', there are different theories. Kuthayyir is quoted as a source for two of them, both related by al-Bakrī. Kuthayyir in one place

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 449.
4. Ibid., p. 777.
5. Ibid., p. 1052.
6. Ibid., p. 891.
7. Ibid., p. 1052.
ascribes the name to the prevalence of epidemics there \( \text{ضیوفه} \), which al-Bakrī immediately refutes as irrelevant. In another place, kuthayyir attributes it to the alleged circumstance that the rain water lingered \( \text{بیکثلی} \) there, which is improbable. Yaqūt reports Kuthayyir as providing a third derivation, namely, that people tend to settle there \( \text{جبلا} \). But Yaqūt also refers to the attempts to link it with constant rain which he traces back to the philologist Marthad. Al-Bakrī mentions al-Abwā', when mapping the conventional route between Medina and Mecca, and follows al-Hamdānī with respect to the distances to and from al-Abwā', without referring to a source. He stresses, however, that travellers occasionally choose to avoid al-Abwā' and take the route leading through Waddān, preferring the diversion through al-Abwā' for a stretch of approximately eight miles. His source seems to be Wakī' or al-Isadī. According to al-Bakrī, al-Abwā' is a town with a minbar, subject to the administration of al-Fur'. As to the place called Mut'īn

1. Ibid., p. 102.
2. Ibid., p. 1257.
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 954.
6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1021.
by al-Bakrī and Muẓ'in by Yaqūt, both authors quote the same poem by Kuthayyir in support of their respective variants of the name. They both locate it between al-Suqyā and al-Abwā', a location which Yaqūt attributes to Ibn al-Sikkiṭ.

Al-Hamdānī places al-Abwā' south of al-Suqyā and north of al-Juhfah at the latitude 22°30'. He assesses the distance from al-Suqyā to al-Abwā' at nineteen miles and that from al-Abwā' to al-Juhfah at twenty-three miles. He quotes a Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlanī, to the effect that al-Abwā' is situated between Mt. Quds and the valley of Waddān. Al-Hajarī states that al-Hashā is a locality between Marr, Shaukān and Khals Ārah. Nasr places it between Mecca and Medina. He does the same with regard to al-Abwā', and describes Arthad as the valley of al-Abwā'. 'Iyād describes al-Abwā' as a dependency of Medina subject to the administration of al-Fur'. Al-Idrīsī places al-Abwā (al-Abwā'), which

---

1. Ibid., p. 1240.
3. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 185.
4. Ibid., p. 218.
5. Al-Hajarī, Nawādir, part 2, fol. 150.
7. Ibid., fol. 4.
8. Ibid., fol. 11.
9. 'Iyād, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 49.
he describes as a halt with wells, in the fifth part of the second climate, adding that it is at a distance of twenty-seven miles from both al-Juhfah and al-Suqyā.

Al-Maqdisī states that al-Abwā' is a halt between Mecca and Medina and calculates the distance from al-Abwā' to Waddān as six miles. Wakī, followed by Al-Bakrī, describes the valley of al-Abwā' as the richest in the tamarisk trees among all the valleys. According to Yaqtūt, al-Sukkarī describes al-Abwā' as a barren mountain, devoid of any sort of vegetation except for khazam and bashām, adding that it belongs to the tribes of Khuzā'ah and Damrah. This description is identical with that of 'Arrām with respect to al-Hashā. However, in another entry, Yaqtūt records part of this statement to describe al-Hashā itself. As to al-Shubā, Yaqtūt states that it is a valley in al-Uthail (in al-Saqrah), and a dependency of Medina with a spring called Khāif al-Shabā which belongs to the B. Ja'far. Al-Bakrī, in his Masūlik, mentions two mosques of the Prophet near al-Abwā'; one is

3. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 182.
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 102; and Wakī, Manāzil, fol. 50.
5. Yaqtūt, Mu'jam, vol. 1, p. 100. Al-Sukkarī here may be a misreading of al-Sakuni.
five miles distant and the other is eight miles distant. His source is obscure, but al-Isadī mentions these two mosques south of al-Abwā' as well as a third in al-Abwā' itself and a fourth at two miles to its north. Al-Isadī maintains that the valley between Mt. Quds and Mt. Baqil (Thāfil) is the valley of al-Abwā'. He adds that there are wells and cisterns, one of which lies near the (government) palace, in al-Abwā'. Wukī' mentions a quadrilateral cistern near the small (government) palace. According to him, the distances from al-Abwā' are twenty-three miles to al-Juhfah; sixteen miles to al-Suqyā; two miles to the hills of Yumm; eight miles to either Waddān or the pass of Hirshā; seven miles to the half-way sign on the route from Medina to Mecca; and, finally, eleven miles to the spring of Ja'far b. Sulaimān at (the valley of) Rābīgh.

Al-Abwā' is well-known in that area as it is the place where the Prophet's mother was buried, though Shaikh Rushdī Mulhis identifies al-Abwā' with al-Khuraibah. This had been generally the case until recently when the ancient name al-Abwā' was revived.

---

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 75.
Al-A Ghra‘

Ibn Khurramadbeh mentions al-Aghra‘ on the pilgrim route from Ailah to Medina. He locates it south of Madyan and north of an unnamed way-station north of al-Kilābah. Ibn Rosteh follows him to the letter, but al-Muqaddasi, while assuming the same geographical location, misreads the name al-Aghra‘ as al-A‘rā‘, and al-Kilābah as al-Kilāyah.

Ibn Rosteh indicates that al-Aghra‘ lies on the inland route; al-Muqaddasi says that it lies on the old and abandoned one, while Ibn Khurramadbeh mentions only one route, the conventional inland one.

Al-Ya‘qūbī also lists it as a halt on the inland route, but differs from the other two in naming the anonymous stop to the south which he calls Qālis. He passes over al-Kilābah in silence. Thus it is difficult to be sure whether he means by Qālis the unnamed halt, or a replacement of al-Kilābah. Yākī‘ locates al-Aghra‘,

1. Ibn Kurramadbeh, op. cit., p. 149.
which he calls al-Agharr, south of Qālis and north of al-Kilābah,\(^1\) which cannot be accepted as al-Aghrāʾ should be located south of Mādīyan and north of Qālis. The latter separates al-Aghrāʾ in the north from al-Kilābah in the south. Musil correctly favours the form of al-Agharr.\(^2\)

Neither al-Bakrī nor Yāqūt have any mention of it, which may imply that it lost its importance to another place and fell into oblivion to reappear later under another name. Nevertheless, al-Idrīsī does mention it on the inland route between Ailāh and Medina. He locates it south of Mādīyan and north of an unnamed halt north of Ankilāyah (al-Kilābah). However, al-Aghrāʾ re-appears in al-Idrīsī's work, as al-Aʿdāʾ.\(^3\)

---

3. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
AILAH

Ailah was the most important way station on the pilgrimage route between Egypt and the Holy Cities of Arabia. The Palestinian pilgrim caravans used to pass through Ailah at times. Ibn Khurradadhbeh locates it north of Ḥaql and south of an anonymous halt south of al-Ḥafr. He counts it among the Egyptian provinces and describes it as the extreme eastern limit of Egypt.

Al-Ya'qūbī situates Ailah on the Palestinian pilgrim route to Mecca and mentions that the Syrian caravans may also choose this way if they wish to join the Palestinians, the Maghribīs and the Egyptians. The last halt mentioned by al-Ya'qūbī on the Egyptian pilgrim route west of Ailah is al-Qulzun, at a distance of six days. Sharaf al-Ba'il is the first stop to the south. According to al-Ya'qūbī, Ailah is a flourishing town on the "salt sea" and a meeting place of pilgrims from Syria, Egypt and the Maghrib. It is rich in trade but its population is heterogeneous. Some of its inhabitants have claimed to be clients of 'Uthmān, and there is a robe in existence which is said to have been bestowed by

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op.cit., p. 149.
2. Ibid., p. 81.
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the Prophet upon Ru'bah b. Yuhannah when they met at Tabūk.  

All Ibn Rosteh has to say about Ailah is that it lies on the coast of the sea of Fāris. He locates it north of Sharaf al-Nanāl (Ba'Il) and south of an unnamed halt south of al-Ḥafr. The latter has become al-Ḥisn in Qudāmah's Kharāj, just as Sharaf al-Nanāl has become Sharaf al-Ba'Il. Otherwise, Qudāmah's location is in concordance with that of his predecessors. He also says that the town called Ailah is situated on the shore of a gulf of the sea of Fāris. Qudāmah regards Ailah as one of the provinces of lower Egypt. In one passage, Ibn al-Faqīh states that Ailah forms the extreme eastern limit of Egypt. In another passage, however, he says that it is the south western limit of Syria. According to him, Ailah is the eastern end of the Wilderness. Al-Ḥamdānī quotes Ptolemy to the effect that the gulf of Ailah is on the western border of Arabia. He also mentions the coast of Ailah which is not to be confused with a Hijazi

1. Ibid., p. 341.  
4. Ibid., p. 230.  
5. Ibid., p. 247.  
7. Ibid., p. 92.  
8. Ibid., p. 69.  
mountain of the same name, among the coastal strips of Arabia. As regards the tribes inhabiting that area, al-
Handānī says that the territories of the Bāliyy extend between Tabūk, Mt. Sharāh, Maʿān and Ailah. Wākī', who
locates Ailah south of جل (manzil = an anonymous halt?), states that the Medina-bound Egyptian route bifur-
cates there, with the inland route leading to Sharaf al-Ḥāl, and the coastal route leading to ʿAinūnah.

Al-Masʿūdī records what was already common knowledge that Ailah is situated on the coast of the sea of Fāris, but
he calls it the Ethiopian Sea. He also records the episode of Ruʾbah b. Yuḥannānah, whom he calls Yuḥannānah b. Ruʾbah,
upon whom the Prophet bestowed a robe of honour. Al-
Muhallabī records the way stations between al-Fustāṭ and
Ailah. He states that the halt to its north, at a day's
distance from it, is called the pass of Ailah  ﷲ. Describing Ailah, al-Muhallabī remarks that it is a flourishing
town on the "salt sea", a meeting place of the pilgrims
from Syria and al-Fustāṭ. Some of its inhabitants claim to
have been clients of ʿUthmān, and it is said that it possesses

1. Ibid., p. 182.
3. Ibid., p. 130.
6. Ibid., p. 272.
the robe of honour which the Prophet bestowed upon Yuhannah b. Ru'bah when they met at Tabūk. He estimates that the land tax levied in Ailah amounts to approximately 3000 dinars. Al-Muhallabi locates Ailah in the third climate at thirty degrees of latitude. Yaqūt states that Haqil is sixteen miles south of Ailah. This statement is reminiscent of the system followed by al-Muhallabi which suggests that he might have been Yaqūt's source.

Al-Istakhri states that the Arabian part of the sea of Fāris ends at Ailah, a statement borrowed by Ibn Hauqal. The latter's remark that the Qulzun coast ends at Ailah in the east where the Arab territories begin, is clearly borrowed from Al-Istakhri. So is the information that the sea of Fāris extends from 'Abbādān to Ailah, bordering about three quarters of Arabia, the rest of which is bordered by Syria from Ailah to Bālis; and that the wilderness adjacent to Ailah does not form part of Arabia. Al-Istakhri's description of Ailah as a prosperous small town with a few farms whose

2. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 299.
5. Ibid., p. 18.
Jews still treasure a deed from the Prophet, and where the Jews who defied (God) in not observing the sabbath are said to have been transformed into monkeys and pigs, is also found in Ibn Hauqal's work. Ibn Hauqal proffers no new information when he states that the distance between al-Jār and Aileh equals twenty days' journey, because al-Istakhri has already said so. Nor is there anything new about Ibn Hauqal's assessment of the distance between Egypt and Medina as twenty days' journey and the statement that the Egyptian and Syrian pilgrims meet at Ailah at the southern end of the Syrian steppe, as this assumption is recorded by al-Istakhri, who adds that there is no need to map the Egyptian pilgrim route, as the Egyptians mix with the Syrians at Ailah whence the two routes become one and the Syrian steppe begins. Neither of these accounts is repeated by Ibn Hauqal. It should be noticed, however, that neither author makes any attempt to enumerate the stations on the Syrian route. Ibn Hauqal borrows al-Istakhri's report about Tarān which he

1. Ibid., p. 31.
3. Ibid., p. 40.
4. Al-Istakhri, op.cit., p. 27.
6. Al-Istakhri, op.cit., p. 28.
7. Ibid., p. 28.
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describes as the most dangerous place between the Qulzum and Ailah. Even al-Iṣṭakhri's description of the different sorts of fish found near Ailah is, as only to be expected, taken over by Ibn Hauqal.

The author of Hudūd al-ʿĀlam describes Ailah as a Syrian borough on the coast of the Qulzum sea where the steppes of Egypt and Syria divide. Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih claims that Ailah has a minbar. Al-Muqaddasī substitutes Wailah for Ailah and says,

"Wailah stands on an arm of the China Sea. It is a considerable and flourishing city, possessing many palm trees, and fish in plenty. It is the port of Palestine and the emporium of al-Hijaz. The common people call it Ailah, but the true Ailah lies near by it and is now in ruins. This is the place of which God—may He be exalted—has said: 'Enquire of them concerning the village that was situate on the sea'."

According to al-Muqaddasī:

"Syria, al-Hijaz and Egypt dispute between them as to which province belongs Wailah—even as is the case with regard to ʿAbbadan—but it is more properly included in Syria, since its weights and measures and the customs of its people are those of that province. Further, as before stated, it is the port of Palestine, from which the merchants sail to sea."

1. Al-Iṣṭakhri, op.cit., p. 29.
2. Ibid., p. 16.
He also regards it as part of the Arabian steppe.

Al-Muqaddasi, who divides Syria into four zones, counts Ailah, together with Tabūk and several others, among the towns of a belt he calls the valley of al-Ghaur. Ma‘ān is enumerated among the towns of another belt. He states that there are several routes between Ailah and Medina and adds that Ailah is situated on the pilgrim route from the Islamic west. (The editor reads كلًا for للن and is followed by the translator, p. 168. It is obviously attributable to a scribe’s error.) Al-Muqaddasi locates Ailah north of Sharaf al-Ba‘il, which he calls, in another place, Sharaf Dhū al-Na‘īl. He is alone in omitting the unnamed halt north Ailah, as he locates the latter immediately to the south of al-Hafr.

Al-Maqdisī lists Ailah among the principal towns of the Hijaz. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr quotes al-Waqidi when saying that al-Zuhri was buried in Shaghb and Badē in the Balliyya (Ailah) region. Al-Biruni situates it on the Qulzum Sea or on a gulf of that sea, calling it the Ailah of Transformation الصخ (it is printed الصخ). According to al-Biruni, its longitude is 56° and its latitude is 23°50. He lists it among
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the towns of the third climate in Arabia. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī describes Ailah as a large village with markets and mosques, and many Jews among its population. He situates it on the conventional inland route between Egypt and Medina north of Ḥaql and south of Batn Najd (sic). Even Ailah is corrupted in the MS. to 'Ammulah'. He also reports the story of the Ailah delegation to the Prophet, but differs from the others in stating that it was the Ailah chief who presented the Prophet with the robe and with a white mule in Tabūk.

He quotes Saʿīd b. Ghālib al-Jaihanī when saying that the frontiers of Arabia extend from the Ailah coast eastward to Kufa. He also states that the Red Sea is called the Sea of Ailah between al-Haurā', and the Qurzum and lists Ailah among the towns situated on that Sea.

In his Muʿjam, al-Bakrī, relying on the authority of Ibn Ḥabīb, identifies Uthāl with the valley of Ailah. He quotes Abū 'Ubaidah to the effect that Ailah is half way between Egypt and Mecca; and al-Ahwal on the derivation of its name. He also believes that there is another name for Ailah, Dar al-Qunfudh, and quotes a poem by 'Abd Allāh b.
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'Anbasah in support of this assumption. It seems, however, that the word in question is only a poetic metaphor with a satirical undertone which, moreover, refers to another Ailah situated inland near Medina. In another passage, al-Bakrī counts Ailah among the lower provinces of Egypt. Yāqūt attributes to Ibn al-Kalbī a statement on the origin of the name of Ailah which is ascribed by al-Bakrī to al-Ahwal. He also quotes Abū 'Ubaidah to the effect that Ailah is a Syrian town, and relates Ibn al-Sikikt's statement that the Hīsmā mountains and land, which are inhabited by the Judhūfī, lie between Ailah and the land of the 'Urdrah. To Abū Zaid, Yāqūt attributes the two above-quoted statements found in the works of al-Istakhrī and Ibn Hauql, one concerning Ailah and its population and the other concerning Tārān.

Al-Sam'īnī says that Ailah is a town on the Qulzum coast adjacent to the territories of Egypt. He adds that al-Zuhri died in a place in the region of Ailah called Badā.

1. Ibid., p. 594.
2. Ibid., p. 1143.
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 216.
5. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 1, p. 422.
7. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 422.
8. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 811.
and Shaghb "two valleys on one day's journey from Ailah".

Al-Balādhurī says that the Prophet accepted a 300 dinārs tribute annually from Ailah when Yuhanna b. Ru'bah met him at Tabūk. 'Iyāḍ describes Ailah as a known "Syrian" town half way between al-Fustāt (Cairo) and Mecca, attributing the statement to Abū 'Ubaidah. Nasr also states that Ailah is a Syrian town, but draws attention to the claim that it is the end of the Hijazi frontiers and the beginning of the Syrian. The author of Akām al-Murjān places Ailah in the first Hijaz al-hijāz al-ail, and adds that the Jews of Ailah treasure a deed from the Prophet penned by 'Alī.

Al-Idrīsī locates Ailah on the pilgrim route between Egypt and Medina, north of Ḥaqāl and south of an anonymous halt which, in its turn, lies to the south of al-Ḥafir. Describing Ailah, al-Idrīsī says that it is a small town and a centre of Arab (Bedouin) trade. He adds that a part of the sea of China passes near Madyan and Ailah to the Qulzum. He enumerates Ailah among the famous localities in the fifth part of the third climate.

The Arab geographers' accounts of the routes between Ailah and Medina and Mecca are discussed elsewhere.

1. Al-Sam'ānī, Ḥansāb, p. 55.
3. 'Iyāḍ, Mashārīq, vol. 1, p. 50.
5. Akām al-Murjān, p. 35. For the "first Hijaz" see supra, p.25.
6. Al-Jārīsī, op.cit., fol. 89.
7. Ibid., fol. 5.
8. Ibid., fol. 89.
Ibn Khurrađadhbeh does not mention al-‘Arj among the recorded halts on the conventional route between Mecca and Medina, but refers to it when mapping the route to Medina followed by the Prophet when he emigrated from Mecca. He locates al-‘Arj between al-Qāḥah and the hill of al-‘A’yar.\(^1\) Al-Ya’qūbī mentions it on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca, placing it between al-Ruwaidithah and Suqyā B. Ghifār towards Mecca, and adds that it belongs to the Aslam.\(^2\) All Ibn Rosteh has to say about al-‘Arj is that it lies between al-Ruwaidithah and al-Suqyā in the direction of Mecca.\(^3\)

Ibn al-Faqīh says that Mt. al-‘Arj which lies between Mecca and Medina, stretches to Syria and is adjacent to Mt. Lebanon at Ḥims, and continues under the name al-Lukām as far as Antioch and Muṣayyisah, is one of the marvels of Medina.\(^4\) This statement has subsequently been borrowed by al-Idrīsī without referring to either Ibn al-Faqīh or al-‘Aṣma’ī who seems to be the former’s
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1. Ibn Khurrađadhbeh, op. cit., p. 130
2. Al-Ya’qūbī, Buldan, p. 313
source. Ibn al-Faqīh also quotes al-Asma'i as saying that the border of Tihāmah (edited Yamāmah) converges with that of the Hijaz at the hills of al-'Arj. Al-Bakrī does not mention the source of this statement when recording it.

Al-Hamdānī enumerates al-'Arj (edited al-Mazj) together with al-Majnabiyyāt which should read al-Khubaitāt owing to the proximity of al-Khabt, among Juhainī territories. He places al-'Arj at twenty-four miles from both al-Ruwaithah and al-Suqyā, giving its degree of latitude as 23°. He states, on the authority of Ibn al-Musayyib, that al-Abyad, the mountain of al-'Arj, emerges from the mountain range al-Sarah. Al-Bakrī, when borrowing this statement does not mention his source, while Yāqūt, in one passage, traces it back to Ibn al-Kalbī who attributes it to Ibn al-Musayyib, and, in another

L. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 88.
2. Ibn al-Faqīh, op. cit., p. 27.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 322.
5. Ibid., p. 184.
6. Ibid., p. 49.
passage, merely to al-Ḥamdānī himself.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 3, p. 66.}

'Arrām states that Ṣariqān, which is the first mountain after Medina, on the left hand side in the direction of Mecca, ends at the "evening meal" halt between al-Ruwaithah and al-'Arj, while Mt. Quds starts at the "evening meal" halt between al-'Arj and al-Suqyā with the Rakūbah pass separating the two mountains. 'Arrām says that al-'Arj lies in the lower Nahb, and that the valley of al-'Arj which has certain kinds of trees and grass, is called Masīḥah.\footnote{'Arrām, op. cit., pp. 401-4.} Al-Bakrī borrows the whole statement without acknowledging his source but with a number of erroneous alterations such as placing al-'Arj in the upper Nahb, instead of the lower Nahb, and locating some villages near Wariqān with al-'Arj to their left, and with al-Sayālah, al-Rauḥā and al-Ruwaithah to the right of Wariqān.\footnote{Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 1377, 1050-52.} 'Arrām states clearly that Mt. Wariqān lies on the left side of the route in the direction of Mecca, with the three above-mentioned villages to the right of Mt. Quds on the right of that route with al-'Arj on the route.\footnote{'Arrām, op. cit., p. 401.} Ḥamad al-Jāšir is no doubt correct when reading غبار in
'Arrām's MS as despite the editor's insistence on the contrary.\(^1\) Thus it is clear that all four villages are situated on the right hand side of Wariqān with one of them on its far right on the other side of the route. Al-Bakrī seems to have been misled by his own error when he described Wariqān as the first mountain encountered by travellers from Mecca to Medina\(^2\) which is contrary to fact and to 'Arrām's statement.

Though al-Bakrī, in one entry, follows 'Arrām in calling the valley of al-'Arj Masīḥah\(^3\) (edited Masyaḥah), he, in another, chooses the name al-Munbajis.\(^4\) He also says that Mt. Quds is the mountain of al-'Arj,\(^5\) though, in another passage, he follows al-Hamdānī - as has been seen - in conferring this distinction upon al-Abyad\(^6\). It is, however, not contradictory, as Quds is a name for two mountains in that locality; one is called al-Abyad - the white - and the other al-Aswad - the grey. As regards al-'Arj itself, al-Bakrī enumerates it among the twelve
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L. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 403f.
3. Ibid., p. 1052.
4. Ibid., p. 930.
5. Ibid., p. 91.
6. Ibid., p. 8.
villages with minbars which are under the control of al-Fur'.

He describes al-'Arj as a principal village with a mosque of the Prophet, counts the lower parts of al-'Arj among the Juhainī lands, in one passage, and, in another, among that of the Aslam. As to the distances to and from al-'Arj, al-Bakrī says that it is two miles from al-Uthayyah, seventeen from al-Suqya, three from the pass of al-'Arj, fourteen from al-Ruwaithah, three from the mosque of the Prophet at al-'Arj and, according to al-Sakūnī, five miles from the hill that contains two or three graves.

On the derivation of the name al-'Arj, al-Bakrī mentions two theories attributing both to the poet Kuthayyir who ascribes the name to its winding paths مسرج, in one place, and to the curves eroded in its soil by the rain.

1. Ibid., p. 1021.
2. Ibid., p. 930.
3. Ibid., p. 38.
4. Ibid., p. 930.
5. Ibid., p. 954.
6. Ibid., p. 930.
8. Ibid., p. 930.
9. Ibid., p. 930.
1. Yaqūt, while ascribing to Kuthayyir that it is called so because it is situated on a diversion from the route, attributes to Ibn al-Kalbī a fourth deriving from the campaigns of the Tubba' who noticed lame animals there. Yaqūt fares no better than al-Bakrī on the subject of al-'Arj. He describes it as a principal village of one of the valleys of Taif, a statement taken over by Abū al-Fidā'. Though he places it in the land of the Hudhail, Yaqūt describes it as the border of Tihāmah, seventy-eight miles from Medina. 2 These statements cannot all be made about one locality as the land of the Hudhail is too far from Medina to be calculated as such. There are two places called 'Arj, one of which is near Taif and the other is Mt. 'Arj and its village between Mecca and Medina. After relating al-Āṣmaʾī's warning to the necessity to distinguish between al-'Arj, the valley of Taif, and al-'Arj, the pass between Mecca and Medina, Yaqūt follows this definition, describing what he thinks a third 'Arj which, lying on the pilgrim route, is no other than al-'Arj in question 3 and to which he obviously refers when quoting al-Āṣmaʾī's statement about

1. Ibid., p. 1257.
Rakūbah being a hill near al-'Arj,\(^1\) and which al-Asma'ī regards as lying on the border between Tihāmah and the Hijaz.\(^2\)

According to al-Muqaddasī, al-'Arj is equidistant from both Suqyā B. Ghīfār and al-Rauhā' on the conventional route at one day's journey.\(^3\) Al-Muqaddasī remarks that there is in the proximity of al-'Arj, "a hill through which it is said Gabriel hewed for the Prophet, peace and blessing be upon him, at the time of his emigration a pathway to al-Madīna".\(^4\) Al-Asadī is quoted as saying that there is a mosque of the Prophet, three miles east of al-'Arj, called the mosque of al-Munbajis, which is the name of the valley of al-'Arj, and two cisterns built on a spring called al-Munbajis eight miles from al-'Arj. He also says that al-Suqyā is situated seventeen miles from al-'Arj in the direction of Mecca, that al-Ruwaithah is fourteen miles from al-'Arj which is three miles from the pass of al-'Arj and two miles from al-Uthāyah.\(^5\) Wāḥī states that al-'Arj, which belongs to the Muzainah,

---

1. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 811.
2. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 902.
possesses many wells and is situated near three graves. The distances from al-’Arj are fourteen miles to al-Ruwaithah; eleven miles to al-Ṭalūb; seventeen miles to al-Suqyā; and three miles to the local mosque of the Prophet.\(^1\) Al-Azharī states that al-’Arj is a halt between Mecca and Medina.\(^2\) This statement is borrowed by al-Zamakhshari.\(^3\) The scribe of al-Bakrī’s Masālik changes al-’Arj to al-Qadaḥ, in one place,\(^4\) and to al-’Arfaj,\(^5\) in another. According to al-Bakrī, there is a mosque of the Prophet at a distance of three miles from al-’Arj. Al-Uthāyah has become, in his Masālik, al-Inābah.\(^6\)

\(^1\) Wakī’, Manāzil, fols. 48-49.
\(^2\) Al-Azharī, Tahdhib, vol. 1, p. 356.
\(^3\) Al-Zamakhshari, Jībāl, p. 108.
\(^4\) Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 22.
\(^5\) Ibid., fol. 23.
\(^6\) Ibid., fol. 75.
AL-'AUNĪD (AL-'UNĀNĪD)

Al-Ya'qūbī seems to be the first Arab geographer in whose surviving work the name 'Aunīd occurs. He mentions it while mapping the coastal route from Ḫilāh to Mecca, and locates it south of 'Ainūnah. According to him, it is separated from Ḫubā in the south by five halts. This indicates that unless al-Ya'qūbī's account is marred by scribal mistakes, it is not based on first-hand experience, but on extremely inaccurate sources. The distance between al-Nakūk and Ḫubā is too short to require four days' journey as he assumes it to be. Nor does the distance from 'Ainūnah to Ḫubā require seven days, as it can be covered in no more than two days. The distance from al-Ḥaurā to al-Ju'fah on the other hand must have necessitated the interposition of not only one halt, as he supposes, but at least eight. As to the distance between al-Ḥaurā and al-Jār, and between al-Jār and al-Ju'fah, they cannot be covered without intervening halts.

Wakī locates al-'Aunīd north of al-Wajh and south of al-Murrah or al-Maddah which he places south of Ḫubā. Thus what is located by al-Ya'qūbī six days' journey north of Ḫubā, is situated by Wakī two days' journey south of it. Though neither author is accurate, the margin of error in

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
2. Wakī, Manāzil, fol. 114.
Wakī' is narrower. Qudāmah locates al-'Aunīd south of Ḍubā and north of al-Wajh which is almost correct, though al-'Aunīd is nearer Ḍubā than al-Wajh. l Al-Muqaddasī mentions not only one locality named 'Aunīd but two, the second being a watering place in the open country of Tainā', two days' journey from Ḍirman. As to the 'Aunīd in question, al-Muqaddasī differs from his predecessors in locating it on both the inland and the coastal route from ʿIlah to Medina and Mecca. On the inland route, he situates it, on one occasion, at one day's journey from Badā Yaʿqūb, but makes no mention of it in a later reference to that route. On the coastal route, he follows Qudāmah in locating it south of Ḍubā and north of al-Wajh which he misreads as al-Rubbah. He repeats this location on another occasion. Al-'Aunīd does not lie on the inland route.

Both Wakī' and Qudānah remain silent on the subject of al-'Aunīd, while al-Yaʿqūbī refers to it as a populated area with palm groves and gold mines. Al-Muqaddasī describes al-'Aunīd as a Hijazī town and a dependency of Medina in one passage, and of Qurh in another. He states that it is the port of Qurh (= Wādī al-Qurā) with an adequate anchorage, and refers to the abundance of honey there. 4

1. Qudānah, op.cit., p. 191.
3. Ibid., pp. 107, 110, 112.
4. Ibid., pp. 69, 84.
Al-Bakrī does not mention al-'Aunīd in his *Mūţjan* and, but for the sake of *zabarjad* (chrysalite), might have totally disregarded it in his *Masālik*, where he mentions it in discussing the special products of Arabia. He states there that chrysalite is found on Zabarjada, which he describes as an island lying between al-'Aunīd and al-'Haurā'. An island bearing this name is still known in the Red Sea, but lies at too great a distance from both al-'Haurā' and al-'Aunīd for al-Bakrī's location to be accurate. Apparently, al-Bakrī does not agree with al-Muqaddasi in regarding al-'Aunīd as the port of Ṣa'd al-Qayrī, since he assigns this function to al-'Haurā'. This variation may be due to a deterioration in security at Wādī al-Qurā between the time of al-Muqaddasi and the time of al-Bakrī's source, or to a different interpretation of Wādī al-Qurā.

Al-Idrīsī describes al-'Aunīd as a port with fresh water. Opposite to it lies the isle of al-Nu'mān ten miles from the coast. Al-Idrīsī, however, follows al-Ya'qūbī in placing al-'Aunīd north of Ḍubā, which cannot be accurate.

In al-Idrīsī's work, the locality in question can be read either "al-'Aunīd" or "al-'Uwainīd". None of the above-quoted geographers mentions its name in vocalized form. Apart from then, no geographer of this period even mentions it in a surviving work. Yaḥūt, however, vocalizes it unequivocally.

1. *Al-Bakrī, Masālik*, fol. 66.
as al-'Aunīd. This is not likely to be its correct form, as the modern name of the locality is al-'Uwainidiyyah. There are several localities in Arabic called al-'Uwainīd, three of which are situated in the Northern Hijaz. Musil rightly corrects this form to al-'Uwainīd. Al-Ya'qūbī's form may have been an Arabic transliteration of the Onne of Ptolemy and Marcianus of Heracleia who described it as an emporium of Arabia Felix. Though Ritter, Burton and Sprenger identify Onne with 'Ainūnah, Musil identifies it with al-Khuraijah, the port of 'Ainūnah, and Glaser and Rüppel move it even farther north, it is more likely that Onne is al-Ya'qūbī's 'Aunīd. In fact, the description of Onne is more applicable to al-'Aunīd than to 'Ainūnah since the former is a port and lies nearer Wādī al-Qurā than 'Ainūnah. It is true that the latitude of Onne does not coincide with that of al-'Aunīd, but Ptolemy's locations are, understandably, not always accurate. What should be identified with 'Ainūnah is Ptolemy's settlement of Aine which Musil, in spite of the

3. Ibid., p. 312.
longitude, correctly locates opposite Tārān. This location of mine is more convincing than Forster's who equates it with the 'Uyainah of Wādī Hanīfah, Sprenger's who identifies it with Jubbah, or even Hogarth's who assumes it to be Faid or Hā'il.

4. Hogarth, Penetration of Arabia, p. 156.
As will be seen in Shaghb, Badā is often mentioned with Shaghb though they are separated by one day's journey. Badā, for most Arab geographers, is a halt on the inland route between Ailah and Medina. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah locate it south of Shaghb and north of al-Sarḥatain, al-Ya'qūbī differs from them only by having al-Suqyā instead of al-Sarḥatain.

Al-Hamdānī says that the Bâliyy posses land in Shaghb and Badā between Ta'mī and Medina.

Al-Muqaddasī, often calling it Badā Ya'qūb, describes it as one of the smaller urban dependencies of Mecca. In another passage, he enumerates it among the towns of the Wādī al-Qurā region, which he calles Qurba. In a third citation, he relates that it lies on the route from Ailah to Medina and describes it as inhabited and

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 149.
5. al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 170.
7. Ibid., p. 53.
prosperous.\textsuperscript{1} According to him, it is three day's journey from al-Suqā in the southern direction, and at one day's journey from 'Aunīd to the north.\textsuperscript{2} On two occasions, he calls it Bādā and locates it south of Shaghb,\textsuperscript{3} not of al-'Aunīd. The last mentioned location is no doubt more accurate.

Al-İstakhri\textsuperscript{5} seems to assume that Bādā is north of Shaghb;\textsuperscript{4} so does Ibn Ḥauqal.\textsuperscript{5} Both place it on the inland route from Egypt and Palestine to Medina.

In al-Bakrī's Nasālik, the scribe calls it Nadā Ya'qūb,\textsuperscript{6} which, in al-Jazīrī's quotation from al-Bakrī, has become Mādā Ya'qūb.\textsuperscript{7} Al-Sa'mānī calls it Yadā Shaghb and describes it as a valley in the Ailah region.\textsuperscript{8} In his Mu'jan, al-Bakrī relies on al-Asadī when stating that Shaghb and Bādā are the northern limits
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\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 107.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., pp. 110,112.
\textsuperscript{4} Iṣṭakhri, op. cit., p. 28.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 40.
\textsuperscript{6} Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
\textsuperscript{7} Al-Jazīrī, Durar, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{8} Al-Sa'mānī, Ansāb, p. 335.
of the Hijaz.\textsuperscript{1} He does not quote al-Handānī when saying that the Bailiy possess land in Shaghd and Badā between Taimā' and Medina.\textsuperscript{2}

Ibn Khallikān adopts the spelling Badā, which is right, but errs in stating that it is a mere valley, though he adds that some call it a village. He says also that it is situated at the northern corner of the Hijaz, a statement which can be traced to al-Asadī.\textsuperscript{3} Besides, Badā is mentioned in the chronicles as one of the villages of Egypt at the turn of the third century (A.H.) at the time of the revolt of Abū al-Nadā, a client of the Bailiy.\textsuperscript{4} Wākī' errs when he locates Badā north of Shaghd and south of al-Kilābah, since Badā is the halt south of Shaghd and north of al-Sarḥatain.\textsuperscript{5} It is still known in this region, though al-Qalqashandī states that both Badā and Shaghd are unknown to him.\textsuperscript{6} Its name, however, appears on the official map as al-Baīdā'.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Al-Bakrī, \textit{Mu'jam}, p. 11.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 90.
\item Al-Kindī, \textit{Akhbār al-Wulāh}, p. 412.
\item Wākī', \textit{Manāzil}, fol. 114.
\item Al-Qalqashandī, \textit{Subh}, vol. 3, p. 393.
\end{enumerate}
The halting place, al-Baida', is mentioned by five Arab geographers as situated on the inland route between Ailah and Medina. Ibn Khurrahadbeh locates it between al-Sarhatain in the north, and Wadi al-Qura in the south.\footnote{Ibn Khurrahadbeh, op. cit., p. 149} Ibn Rosteh\footnote{Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 183.} follows him in this respect, and so does Qudamah.\footnote{Qudamah, op. cit., p. 190.} Al-Muqaddasi agrees with them in one place,\footnote{Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 110.} but has, in another, "Qurh" instead of Wadi al-Qura.\footnote{Ibid., p. 112.} However this is of little importance as al-Muqaddasi does not distinguish between Qurh and Wadi al-Qura. Al-Idrisi refers to al-Baida' when recording the way-stations of the inland route between Ailah and Medina. He locates it south of Sha'ib (Shaghb) and north of Wadi al-Qura.

Neither al-Ya'qubi nor al-Bakri, in his Masalik, has any mention of al-Baida' when marking out the halts on that route. Nor does Waki' in his Manazil. Though it is tempting to identify the Baida' in

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] Ibn Khurrahadbeh, op. cit., p. 149
\item[2.] Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 183.
\item[3.] Qudamah, op. cit., p. 190.
\item[4.] Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 110.
\item[5.] Ibid., p. 112.
\end{itemize}
question with a place called Ri'r al-Baiḍāʾ between Shaghb and Wādī al-Qurā, the latter is, in fact, a mis-
reading of Badāʾ.
al-Ya'qūbī is the first Arab geographer to mention Zubabah as a halting place on the coastal route to Mecca from Ailah. He locates it between al-Muqithah in the north and al-Wajh in the south.¹ Qudāmah follows him in mentioning it on the coastal route, but comes nearer to accuracy when he places it between al-Nabk to the north and al-'Aunīd to the south.² Neither scholar provides any information whatever about this place. The first to do so is al-Muqaddasī who says that Dabbah is a town of Qurīh,³ situated between al-Nabk and 'Aunīd. He refers to it in two passages in his book in connection with the pilgrim route between Ailah and Mecca.⁴

Neither of the two names occurs in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, even when he quotes al-Khali'il on the fact that al-Zaby valley lies in Tihāmah.⁵ However, in his Masālik, he is the only one to situate Dubā on the conventional inland route from Ailah to Medina. There al-Bakrī locates
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1. Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
4. Ibid., pp. 110, 112.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 902.
it north of Nadā (Badā) Ya'qūb and south of al-Nabk, and relates that Dubā is a harbour with several wells and plenty of daum trees, and that there are a number of lofty mountains with caves, rock-hewn houses and graves.\footnote{Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.}

Wakī' locates Dubā, which he reads as Taibah in his Manāzil, south of al-Nabk and north of a place called al-Marrah or al-Murrah which he places north of al-'Aunīd.\footnote{Wakī', Manāzil, fol. 114.}

It is obvious that he has no personal experience of that area. Nor does he seem to have had access to the official archives.

Al-Idrīsī says that the port of Dubā lies between al-'Aunīd to the north and al-'Uṭūf to the south. His source is somewhat obscure for, though al-Ya'qūbī locates 'Aunīd to the north of Zubah, al-Idrīsī is unique in mentioning a place called al-'Uṭūf as lying to the south of Dubā.\footnote{Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 90, see infra, p. 287.}

Al-Idrīsī, however, has no mention of Dubā in his list of the halting places on the coastal route between Ailah and Mecca.\footnote{Ibid., fol. 89.} Indeed, he has two versions of the coastal route with a very loose connection, as will be
discussed elsewhere.\footnote{Infra, p. 433.}

Yaqūt, apparently following the hint by al-Khalīl, says that Ḍabbah is a village in Tihāmah opposite to, and seventy miles distant from, Badda Yaʿqūb.\footnote{Yaqūt, Muʾjam, vol. 3, p. 464} Unayyah b. al-Salt locates Ḍubā, corrupted to Ṭanah, in the eastern part of Egypt between al-Ḥaurāʾ and al-Nabk.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 4, p. 548.} So does al-Maqrīzī, though he gives the locality in question the name of Ṭanasah.\footnote{Al-Maqrīzī, Khiṭat, vol. 1, p. 16.}

Al-Ḥimyarī states that Ḍubā is a dependency of Medina and, apart from that, a safe harbour with a good supply of water and plenty of daww trees. He also says that there are a number of lofty mountains between Ḍubā and Madīnah, relying no doubt for this statement on the authority of al-Bakrī's Masāliṣ and on al-Idrīsī.\footnote{Al-Ḥimyarī, al-Raṣūl, fol. 281.} For the statement, however, that there is an ancient footprint of usual proportions which has never been eroded by age or water,\footnote{Ibid, fol. 230, see al-Qalqashandi, Subḥ, vol. 3, p. 393.} no source has been traced.

Ḍubā is still a well-known town on the Red Sea.
No information about al-Fur' is found in the work of Ibn Khurredadhbeh\(^1\), Ibn Rosteh\(^2\) or Qudāmah\(^3\) except that it is one of the dependencies of Medina. A lost account by Ibn Faqīh describes it as the most important dependency of Medina, even implying that it had dependencies of its own, as well as a resident governor and a mosque attributed to the Prophet.\(^4\) There is no mention of al-Fur', however, in any of the available copies of his book. Al-Hamdānī does not elaborate beyond recording a poem defining the Hijazi localities, in which al-Fur' occurs.\(^5\)

Al-Mas'ūdī assumes the distance between Medina and al-Fur' to be eight postal stages.\(^6\) The author of Ḥudūd al-Ālam states that it is a small borough.\(^7\)

---

1. Ibn Khurredadhbeh, *op. cit.*, p. 129
7. Ḥudūd al-Ālam, p. 148.
Al-Muqaddasi refers to it in one passage as a town of Mecca and, in another, as a dependency of Mecca. He adds that it is a small fortress with a minbar. Al-Iṣṭakhrī says that the Jaʿafir have extensive properties in al-Furʿ. Ibn Ḥauqal says the same except that he substitutes "the chief of the Jaʿafir" for "the Jaʿafir". Both al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥauqal locate al-Furʿ south of Medina at four days' distance and mention that it has a minbar. 'Arrān describes al-Furʿ as a picturesque village with a spring descending from Mt. Ṭarah. According to him, it is inhabited by Quraish, Ānṣār and the Muzainah.

Al-Bakrī quotes 'Arrān when stating that al-Furʿ is a dependency of Medina. This definition is not to be found in the available copy of 'Arrān's work. Al-Bakrī also appears to regard al-Furʿ as the north-eastern border

---

1. Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 53.
2. Ibid., p. 69.
3. Ibid., p. 79.
8. 'Arrān, op. cit., p. 404.
of Tihāmah. In another entry, he indicates, on the
authority of al-Zubair, that there are four routes leading
from Medina to al-Fur'. al-Bakrī provides abundant
information about al-Fur' describing it as a large Hijazi
dependency of Medina with many villages, twelve of which
have minbars. He lists these twelve villages which he
describes as dependencies of al-Fur', from which taxes
are collected by the central administration of the district.
They are in their original order of occurrence in al-Bakrī's
text: al-Maḍīq of al-Fur', al-Suwāriqiyyah, Sāyah, Ruhāṭ,
'Amq al-Zar', al-Juḥfah, al-'Irj, al-Suqyā, Al-Abwā',
'Usfān and Istārah (Sitārah). He mentions also Umm
al-'Iyāl and the routes from Medina to al-Fur'.

Al-Bakrī quotes Hishām al-Zubairī to the effect
that al-Fur' was the first village to export dates to
Mecca at the time of Ishmael. To judge by the accounts
he gives of al-Fur''s early land owners, al-Bakrī seems
to rely heavily on reports by al-Zubair. He also states
that al-Fur' is one of the most important dependencies

1. Ibid., p. 13.
2. Ibid., p. 1323.
3. Ibid., p. 1020.
4. Ibid., p. 196.
5. Ibid., p. 1323.
of Medina. Ibn Ishâq states that Baḥrân (Buḥrân), the
gold mine, lies in the Fur' region. Al-Maqdisî enumerates
al-Fur' among the Hijazi smaller towns. Al-Mas'ûdî
describes Buḥrân as a valley, in one book, but as a gold
mine in another.

According to al-Samhûdî, al-Suhailî states that
there are two accepted forms of spelling of the name
al-Fur' in existence, al-Fur' and al-Fara'. Al-Suhailî,
however, says that the form of the name is al-Furu'.
The spelling adopted here is the prevalent one and is also less
apt to be confused with that of other places called al-
Fara'. Wâkî' refers to al-Fur' as lying on an alternative
route from Medina to the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim. He also
regards it as a dependency of Medina. Al-Hajari records
a debate in which al-Fur' figures as the habitat of al-Zunûj.

1. Ibid., p. 1020.
3. Al-Maqdisî, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 70
5. Al-Mas'ûdî, Tanbîh, p. 249.
6. Al-Samhûdî, Khulāsah, p. 291, see al-Suhailî, Sîrah,
   vol. 2, p. 120.
7. Wâkî', Manâzil, fol. 17.
8. Ibid., fol. 40.
Ibn Khurradadhbeh mentions this name when listing the way-stations on the pilgrim route from Ailah to Medina. He locates it to the immediate south of Ailah and to the immediate north of Madyan.¹

No geographer, for about two centuries, followed in his footsteps. Not even Ibn Rosteh, who is often a consistent borrower of Ibn Khurradadhbeh's work, mentions this name.

It seems unlikely that the route as set out by Ibn Khurradadhbeh is fully detailed, as Ḫaql is too close to Ailah and too far from Madyan to be regarded as equi-distant from both.

Al-Bakrī mentions Ḫaql in al-Mu'jan but only in the introductory part in which he records the territories of each particular tribe. He says there that Juhainah had come north and driven Judhām and Bāliyy from their habitations in the region of Ḫaql on the coast of Taimā'.² He seems here to be quoting Ibn al-Kalbī to whom Yāqūt attributes a statement of this kind.³ Al-Hamdānī also

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 149.
2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jan, p. 38.
says that Ḥaql is the port of Taimā'.

Al-Bakrī also mentions Ḥaql in al-Masālik as a way-station on the conventional route between Medina and Ailah. He locates it south of Ailah and north of Wādī al-Ghurāb.

Al-Sam'ānī says of Ḥaql that it is a valley near Ailah on the sea. Yāqūt gives the distance between Ḥaql and Ailah as sixteen miles. However, he confuses the Ḥaql in question with another place of the same name. He quotes a poem by Kuthayyir in which the poet reminisces about his love dwelling in a place called Ḥaql. Yāqūt believes it is a question of Ḥaql near Ailah, and adds that 'Azzah, Kuthayyir's love, used to have two gardens there. As, however, the poet speaks not of gardens, but of grazing camps, it is unlikely that Kuthayyir's Ḥaql is identical with Ḥaql near Ailah. There are many places in Arabia called Ḥaql and it is more probable that 'Azzah's dwelling was in the Ḥaql south of Yanbu'. The Ḥaql in question, however, is still known and is situated to the immediate south of Ailah. Al-Idrīsī no doubt means this

1. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 171.
2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
3. Al-Sam'ānī, op. cit., p. 172.
Haql when speaking about it as being on the pilgrim route between Egypt and the Holy Cities in Arabia. In one passage he calls it Haql;\(^1\) in another its name becomes al-Haql.\(^2\) On both occasions, al-Idrisi locates it to the immediate south of Ailah and to the immediate north of Madyan.

The other geographers, who disregard Haql when mapping the route, mention Sharaf al-Ba'il, apparently as a replacement. The two localities are, however, not identical.

---

AL-HAURĀ'

Mapping the Egyptian coastal pilgrim route, both Waki'ī and al-Ya'qubī locate al-Haurā' south of Munkhūs. Unlike al-Ya'qubī who places it north of al-Jār, Waki'ī mentions four halts which separate the two localities, the one south of al-Haurā' being al-Qusaibah which cannot be accepted, since the latter is situated further north. Al-Ya'qubī, on the other hand, is mistaken in naming no halts between al-Haurā' and al-Jār which were separated by at least three halts. This may be the result of a scribal omission which must be of early date, because al-Idrisī follows him in this respect. Al-Muqaddasi states that al-Haurā' is a town of Mecca, a dependency of Medina and a town of the valley of Khaibar. The anchorage itself is full of rocks at its entrance where ships are taken unawares. The town has a fortress and a flourishing suburb with a market on the side which faces the sea. According to him, al-Haurā', together with al-Marwah and Khaibar, are the only towns in the valley of Khaibar. An interesting reference is made to a fire which once "fell between al-Marwah and al-Haurā' which blazed like burning coals."

Al-Muqaddasi's description of al-Haurā' as the port of Khaibar is more correct than al-Bakrī's assumption in his

1. Waki'ī, Manāzil, fol. 114.
Masālik, that al-Haurā' is the port of Wādī al-Qurān, the port of which is, according to al-Muqaddasī, al-'Aunīd. This variation may be due to a deterioration in security at Wādī al-Qurān between the time of al-Muqaddasī and the time of al-Bakrī's source, or to a different interpretation of Wādī al-qurān. Al-Bakrī also refers to the existence of chrysolite on an island between al-'Aunīd and al-Haurā' called Zabarjadal (chrysolite). This island is, in fact, situated far from these two localities. In his Mu'jam, al-Bakrī shows little consistency with these statements made in al-Masālik. In al-

Mu'jam, al-Bakrī relies on Ibn al-Sikkīt in locating al-Haurā' opposite to Yanbu', whose port he claims it is, which cannot be accepted. Al-Bakrī places al-Tajbar (al-Nukhbār) between Munkhūs and lower al-Haurā', whereas al-Wāqīdī locates al-Nukhbār in the region of al-Haurā' behind Dhul-Marwah on the coast. Al-Bakrī names no source when locating the mine of al-Hurādah between al-Haurā'; Shaghb and Badā; and Yanbu' in the region of al-Haurā'. Yaqūt attributes this statement to Ibn al-Sikkīt who makes it clear that it is al-Hurādah which lies near al-Haurā'. In fact, al-Hurādah is nearer Yanbu' than al-Haurā'.

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fols. 22.
2. Ibid., fol. 66.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 474, 1310.
4. Ibid., p. 656.
Ibn al-Kalbī reports the story of 'Abd al-Dār b. Hudaib of Juhanah who asked his tribe to erect a temple in a place within their territories called al-Haurā', so that it could rival Mecca in attracting the Arabs, and became indignant when his suggestion was turned down. This Haurā' is the one in question which is still inhabited by Juhanah. This story may be taken as evidence of the importance of al-Haurā' in pre-Islamic history. Al-Handānī also describes al-Haurā' as part of Juhanah land. Al-Idrīsī, on the other hand, states that it is a flourishing village populated by the descendants of the Prophet, which is partly correct. According to him, it has a quarry for hewing stones for storage jars which are taken to all places near and far. Al-Idrīsī fails to distinguish between al-Haurā' and al-Rauhā', and thus makes some errors which are pointed out below.

Though al-Haurā' is part of the Hijaz, the description of it as a dependency of Medina during the period under consideration cannot be credited. In fact, al-Haurā' had been the southern frontier of the Egyptian-controlled territories in the Hijaz for the whole period. This is clear from Ibn Hauqal's statement that the governor of Aswan in 232 A.H. (846) administered al-Haurā' and 'Unūnah. Both al-Qudā'ī

3. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 88, see below, p. 392.
and Unayyah b. Abū al-Salt regard al-Haurāʾ as the frontier between Egypt and the Meccan administration. It remained so for many centuries. Though it is unknown now, al-Haurāʾ was famous until the early years of this century. It lies to the very north of Umm Lujj, the Red Sea town. In the Cambridge MS. of his journey, Kābrīt locates it west of Ṣammānah which is situated north east of Umm Lujj.


2. Kābrīt, Rihlah, fol. 8.
Ibn Khurradadhbeh counts al-Hijr, which he locates south of al-Junainah and north of Wādī al-Qurān, among the way-stations of the Syrian pilgrim route to Mecca.\(^1\) He is followed in this respect by Ibn Rosteh\(^2\) and Qudānāh.\(^3\) Al-Īstakhri regards al-Hijr as the northern limit of the Hijaz and the land to its north as part of the Syrian steppe.\(^4\) Ibn Hauqal borrows the entire passage without referring to a source.\(^5\) In describing al-Hijr itself, al-Īstakhri states that it is a small, sparsely populated and strongly fortified village.\(^6\) He assesses the distance between it and Wādī al-Qurān at one day's journey through the mountains. He mentions particularly the dwelling of Thawūd, the story of which is related in the Qur'ān, and claims to have seen those dwellings which he found similar to the ordinary houses of his time except for the fact that they were hewn out of mountain

---

rock. Of the mountain range called Hathālib on which they were situated, he says that it seemed to be a single mountain but proved to be separate mountains. They were surrounded by lofty sand hills which could not be surmounted easily. The well of Thamūd was among them. Ibn Ḥauqal uses the same words to describe al-Ḥijr except that he does not claim first hand knowledge of the Thamūdite dwellings on which he quotes al-İṣṭakhrī by his name, al-Fārisī. Al-İṣṭakhrī's statement on the location of Tabūk between al-Ḥijr and the southern boundaries of Syria is repeated by Ibn Ḥauqal and, about three centuries later, by Yāqūt, who attributes it to Abū Zaid. There must have been another revised copy of Ibn Ḥauqal's work in existence which is not available yet, because Abū al-Fidā' quotes him to the effect that he himself had seen the Thamūdite dwellings. As to the statement of al-İṣṭakhrī that the distance between Wādī al-Ġurā and al-Ḥijr equals one day's journey, Ibn Ḥauqal repeats

1. Ibid., p. 24.
2. Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 32.
4. Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 32.
6. Abū al-Fidā', Taqwīm, p. 89.
it literally and incurs the severe criticism of Abū al-Fida‘ who claims to be sure that it equals five days' journey, which is not the case. Al-Bakrī estimates the distance between al-Ḥijr and Qurṭ as eighteen miles. He is of the opinion that Qurṭ is another name of Ṭādī al-Qurṭ.

According to al-Bakrī, al-Ḥijr was the habitat of Thamūd between Syria and the Hijaz. It seems that individual dwellings of Thamūd were famous even in his time for he states that they were rock-hewn and that the graves could also be seen. They were normal in size which suggests, according to him, that the Thamūdites were of normal stature, unlike Ḫd, the ancient, who were giants. This information is borrowed from al-Mas‘ūdī, though al-Bakrī does not mention his name. Al-Bakrī believes that what accounts for their strange manner of building is the unusual longevity of the Thamūdites who would have outlasted any dwelling erected by ordinary means. Al-Maqdisī, however, indicates that both tribes were contemporary. Al-Bakrī situates al-Ḥijr between the Hijaz and Syria near the Red Sea and on the

1. Mas‘ūdī, Kurūj, vol. 3, p. 84.
2. Al-Bakrī, Maṣālik, fol. 12.
Syrian pilgrim route in the Tabūk region.

In al-Mu'jam, al-Bakrī states that the route between Medina and Taimā' leads through al-Hijr\(^1\) which implies that al-Hijr was on the Syrian pilgrim route even for those who chose the north-eastern route. Naṣr locates al-Hijr between Syria and Wādī al-Qurā.\(^2\) Of al-Hijr, al-Muqaddasī says:

"a small town and fortified. It has many wells and cornfields. The Mosque of Ṣa‘īb is situated in close vicinity on a height; it has the form of an open gallery, cut in a rock. In this place are to be found the marvels of Thamūd and their habitations".\(^3\)

Wakī' locates al-Hijr south of al-Jumainah and north of Wādī al-Qurā on the Syrian pilgrim route.\(^4\) Lughdah describes al-Hijr as a market-town whose inhabitants live just outside the dwellings of Thamūd.\(^5\)

Al-Idrīsī says that al-Hijr is one day's journey from Wādī al-Qurā. It is, according to him, a small fortress in the mountains which contains the Thamūdite rock-hewn dwellings and/called by the natives Abālib

---

1. al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 330.
3. Al Muqaddasī, op. cit., p. 84, the English translation, p. 134.
(Athālib). They seem to be a single mountain, but prove to be separate mountains. They are surrounded by lofty sand hills which could not be surmounted easily. The well of Thamūd is there. It is clear that he is copying Ibn Hauqal's statement. He adds, however, that the distance between al-Ḥijr and Taimā' is four days. This is contradictory to the assessments of both al-Hamdānī and al-Bakrī who state that it is three days only. Al-Idrīsī might have been misled by al-Muqaddasī's estimate of the distance between Taimā' and Wādī al-Qurā, not al-Ḥijr, as four days. Mapping the Syrian pilgrim route, al-Idrīsī locates al-Majz (al-Ḥijr) between al-Ḥanīfīyyah (al Junainah) in the north, and a small village on a small river (Wādī al-Qurā) to the south, adding that it is a strongly fortified fortress amidst mountains in the territory of Thamūd. He enumerates al-Ḥijr among the famous localities in the fifth part of the third climate.

1. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
5. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 96, and see infra, p. 433.
6. Ibid., fol. 89.
Al-Hijr is a well-known site in that region where massive efforts are being made to increase our knowledge of its past.
\textit{\textit{Al-\textit{I}s}}

\textit{Al-Istakhri}, who describes \textit{al-\textit{I}s} as a small fortress is correct in locating it between Yanbu' and al-Marwah. Ibn Hauqal omits this statement in the printed text of his Masālik, but calls it, in the unpublished MS. III Ahmet 3012, \textit{al-Faid} and describes it as "from Yanbu' and al-Marwah". "From" here is no doubt a corruption of "between ~ between ~ which is the only acceptable form. \textit{Al-Mas'ūdī} places it in the land of Juhainah and, in another passage, in the route to al-Marwah, one day's journey from the latter and four days from Medina. He locates it southwest of al-Marwah. His source seems to be Ibn Sa'd. \textit{Al-Hamdānī}'s location of \textit{al-\textit{I}s} is somewhat obscure in the printed version where he says that \textit{al-\textit{I}s} lies between "them" by which he refers to \textit{Wādī al-Qurā} and al-Ḥijr, which is unlikely to be \textit{al-Hamdānī}'s actual statement. However, he correctly adds that \textit{al-\textit{I}s} grows a famous kind of date which is called after it. He places \textit{al-\textit{I}s} in the Juhainī land

1. \textit{Al-Istakhri}, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 25.
though he states, in another passage, that both Juhainah and Muzainah live there. He also records a poem by the Hijazi poet al-ʻAjlānī who is precise in locating it between Būwāṣṭ in the south and al-Rass in the north. Since the poet locates al-Rass south of al-Marwah, it appears that his location of al-ʻĪs is in line with the above-quoted authors apart from al-Handānī.

Al-Wāqidī speaks of the environment of al-ʻĪs, where some of the early Meccan Muslims took refuge when persecuted by the native polytheists and were turned away by the Prophet in accordance with a pledge he had given to the latter. But the refugees molested the Syrian-bound Meccan caravans until the polytheists themselves begged the Prophet to admit the refugees to Medina. Al-Wāqidī implies that they lived near the sea whose fish they ate. This statement indicates that al-ʻĪs is not only the village, but a large area stretching to the sea. Al-Hājarī situates al-ʻĪs at or near the route between Medina and al-Marwah. Both al-Zubairī and Ibn Hazm state that the descendants of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. ʻAuf possessed property at al-ʻĪs. They do not, however, attempt to locate

1. Ibid., p. 130.
2. Ibid., p. 218.
4. Al-Hājarī, Nawādir, part 1, fol. 213.
it apart from describing it as a dependency of Medina. Al-Zamakhsharī does not elaborate beyond saying that it is a "place". Yāqūt voices the assumption, which he attributes to al-Hazimī, that Jumdān is a mountain between Yanbu' and al-'Īs, the latter being one night's journey from Medina. This statement can be traced back to Nasr who adds that al-'Īs is a dependency of Medina. Waki describes al-'Īs as a dependency of Medina, inhabited by Juhainah and the Hasanīs.

So far, the location of al-'Īs is, on the whole, correct. As to the 'Īs mentioned by 'Arrām, it is situated off the Iraqi pilgrimage route to Mecca near Sufainah. Since 'Arrām makes no mention of the 'Īs in question which was more famous than the one he does mention, al-Bakrī fails to distinguish between the two places and consequently applies 'Arrām's statement to both. Clearly, 'Arrām's 'Īs is situated at the foot of Mt. Burthum near al-Suwāriqiyyah, in Sulaimī land, whereas our 'Īs is near al-Marwah in Juhainī land. Yāqūt's

1. Al-Zamakhsharī, Jībāl, p. 117.
3. Nasr, op.cit., fol. 44.
4. Ibid., fol. 116.
5. Waki, Manāzil, fol. 40.
6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 814, 985.
7. 'Arrām, op.cit., p. 436.
information is even more confusing as he mentions that Dhanabān is a watering place in al-'Īs. He records 'Arrān's statement, applying it to the Juhainī 'Īs about which he quotes Ibn Ishāq to the effect that it lies in the Marwah region.

Al-'Īs is a valley containing several villages to the east of Umm Lu'jī on the Red Sea.

Ibn Khurradadhbeh records the fact that Jiddah and al-Jār are frequented by non-Muslim traders from east and west.1 Listing the halts of the pilgrim coastal route from Egypt, al-Ya'qūbī locates al-Jār south of al-Ḥaʻūrā' and north of al-Juhfah.2 Qudāmah, on the other hand, mentions three way-stations between al-Jarrāh (al-Ḥaʻūrā') and al-Jār, namely al-Ḫiṣā', Yanbu' and Masʻūlān. He implies that the pilgrim route leads from al-Jār to Medina which can be reached in two days.3 Ibn Rosteh merely enumerates al-Jār among the towns of the second climate, without giving further information.4 Ibn al-Faḍīh relates that the adjoining section of the Red Sea is called "Sea of al-Jār".5

Al-Muqaddasī lists al-Jār among the towns of Mecca,6 and describes it, together with Jiddah, as "the

2. al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
5. Ibn al-Faḍīh, op.cit., p. 78.
two granaries of Egypt".\(^1\) is to the distances to and from al-Jār, al-Muqaddasi states that it is equidistant at one day's journey from both Badr and al-'Ushairah,\(^2\) at two days' distance from both al-Juḥfah and Yanbu' and at four days' journey from Jiddah.\(^3\) Describing al-Jār, al-Muqaddasi says,

"al-Jār is on the sea coast, it is fortified and walled on three sides, the quarter facing the sea being open. It contains lofty mansions and a thriving market. Al-Jār is the granary of al-Medīnah and its townships. Water is carried to the town from Badr and food grains from Egypt. Its mosque has no courtyard".\(^4\)

Al-İstakhri mentions al-Jār when speaking about the Sea of Fāris which stretches to al-Jār, Ḥadyan and al-Ṣulzum.\(^5\) Ibn Hauqlal follows him in this\(^6\) and in other details\(^7\) such as that al-Jār is the port of Medīnah, that it is situated at three days' journey from it, and that it is smaller than Jiddah and is "on the sea".\(^8\) When borrowing

---

1. Ibid., p. 97.
2. Ibid., p. 110.
3. Ibid., p. 107.
4. Ibid., p. 83, the English translation, p. 132.
5. Al-İstakhri, op. cit., p. 20.
7. Ibid., p. 31.
al-ʾIṣṭakhri's assessment of the distance from al-ʾJār to al-Juḥfah and ʾIlah, Ibn Ḥauqal is definite that they equal three days' and twenty days' journey respectively, unlike al-ʾIṣṭakhri who only says that this is more or less the case. Ibn Ḥauqal, however, is alone in stating that the Ḥudūd al-ʾĀlam islands which stretch as far as ʾIdhāb opposite al-ʾJār on the other side of the Red Sea, have ships ready for pilgrims desirous to cross to either al-ʾJār or Jiddah. He also states that there are uninhabited places facing Madyan, al-ʾJār and Jiddah. The author of Ḥudūd al-ʾĀlam describes al-ʾJār as "a borough on the sea coast which is the emporium of Medina".

Relying on Ibn al-Šabbaḥ, Wakīʿ locates al-ʾJār on the coast and lists it among the dependencies of Medina. On another occasion, however, Wakīʿ locates al-ʾJār, the sea port at a few miles from the pass of Hirshā. This is likely to be a scribal mistake,

1. Ibid., p. 27.
3. Ibid., p. 42.
4. Ibid., p. 48.
7. Ibid., fol. 51.
since Kirshā is too far from al-Ｊār to be located at a few miles from it. It appears that the phrase: "al-Ｊār the sea port" is a misreading of "the coast of the sea of al-Ｊār". 'Arrām states that al-Ｊār is a port frequented by ships from Ethiopia, Egypt, Bahrain and China. He describes it as a large, densely populated town with a minbar, and adds that one half of it is on an island while the other half is on the coast. Opposite al-Ｊār there is an island, Ğurāf by name and a square mile in area, to which there is no access except by boat. This island is frequented only by Ethiopian ships. Its inhabitants, like those of al-Ｊār, are traders. They get their water from (a place) two parasangs away, while the people of al-Ｊār get theirs from a spring in the valley of Yalyal which flows from "the depths of the sands". That spring is renowned for its most abundant and very fresh water which flows through the sands and which withstands any attempt at control on the part of the peasants except in a few sandy zigzags (where) it irrigates groves of palm trees and (some fields of) vegetables and melons. ¹ Both al-Bakrī ² and Yaqūṭ ³

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 399.
borrow 'Arrān's description of al-Jār with very minor alterations. Their quotation of 'Arrān provides his editor with the statement about Qurāf which is missing from the MS.

Al-Idrīṣī states that al-Jār is the port of Medina from which it lies at a distance of three days. According to him, al-Jār used to be a prosperous densely populated "village" about the size of Jiddah, and its trade was dwindling in his time, though ships were still sailing in and out of it. He describes the journey between al-Jār and Jiddah as taking ten days along the sea coast where most of the way-stations are surrounded by lofty mounds, and the old road signs have been obliterated. The only signs remaining there are the mountains and the sea. Al-Idrīṣī's route from Medina to al-Jār comprises the following stations:

from Medina to H.s.b ِ (Khushub); then to 'Ar. b عرب ('Udhaibah) which he says lies at the foot of a mountain, and has a fresh water well within easy reach; and finally al-Jār. On another occasion, he maps the rout from al-Ḥaurā as follows:

from al-Ḥaurā to Ṭādī al-Ṣafrā, which is an adequate port;

from ʿIbād al-Ṣafraʿ to al-Quraifah which is a prosperous port getting its water from afar;

From Quraifah to al-Jār, and then to al-Juḥfah.¹

al-Idrīsī, in a third passage, locates al-Jār south of al-Haurāʾ and north of al-Yazīd (Qudaid).² He places al-Jār in the fifth part of the second climate and describes it as one of its famous ports.³

al-Hamdānī speaks of al-Jār as the port of Mecca,⁴ adding that the valley of al-'Ushairah is not to be confused with the sands of al-'Ushairah in the region of al-Sirrān.⁵ According to the Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlānī, whom al-Hamdānī quotes, al-Jār is situated between Waddān and Badr.⁶ It should be borne in mind, however, that location by poetry cannot always be precise. Ibn Sa'd claims that al-Jār has another name, Būlā.⁷

Al-Maqdisī lists al-Jār among the Arab territories of

1. Ibid., fol. 89, and see supra, p. 287.
2. Ibid., fol. 88.
3. Ibid., fol. 34.
5. Ibid., p. 182.
6. Ibid., p. 218.
the second climate. Al-Bīrūnī describes al-Jār as the
port of Medina "on the sea", giving its degrees of
longitude and latitude as 66,20 and 23,50 respectively.2

In his *Mu'jam*, al-Bakrī mentions a multitude
of places adjacent to al-Jār such as Kulfā on which he
quotcs Ibn Ḥabīb's location between Waddān and al-Jār;3
al-Bazwā, which is inhabited by B. Ḍamrah;4 al-Surair
which he describes as one of the valleys of Khaibar at
seven miles from al-Jār;5 al-Jamīsh, a desert between
Mecca and al-Jār;6 Shanūkah between al-'Udhaib ('Udhaibah)
and al-Jār, sixteen miles from al-Jār and thirty-two
miles from Yanbu';7 al 'Udhaib ('Udhaibah), a locality
on the route (from Egypt) to Mecca between Yanbu' and
al-Jār;8 Dhāt al-Sulain, a well in the possession of the
B. Ḍamrah; Ḥasnā, a mountain between Waddān and al-Jār;9

5. Ibid.; p. 737.
6. Ibid., p. 395.
7. Ibid., p. 884.
8. Ibid., p. 928.
and the Faifā' of Khuraim on the route from Medina to al-Jār.\(^1\) As regards the above-mentioned statement attributed by al-Bakrī to Ibn Ḥabīb in relation of Kulfā', Yāqūt ascribes it to Ibn al-Silkit,\(^2\) to whom Yāqūt also ascribes al-Bakrī's location of al-'Udhaibah. Moreover, he quotes Ibn Ḥabīb when saying that Ḥasnā' is a desert between al-Jār and Waddān where al-Jaihal (hayyahal) grass grows.\(^3\) Al-Bakrī attributes to al-Ḥarbī the statement that al-Jār is the port of Medina,\(^4\) a statement attributed by Yāqūt to Ibn al-Kalbī.\(^5\) As to al-Surair, it is clear that the waters of a Khaibar valley cannot abut upon al-Jār, and thus Naṣr's distinction between two Surairs, one in Khaibar and the other in the proximity of al-Jār\(^6\) is more correct. Al-Bakrī refers to 'Arrān when saying that al-Jār is a dependency of Medina without dependencies of its own,\(^7\) but this statement is not traceable in the available work of 'Arrān.

---
1. Ibid., p. 1038.
2. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 300.
7. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 10.
Al-Bakrī assesses the distances between al-Jār and Badr at sixteen miles and adds that the latter gets its food supply from al-Jār.¹ 'Iyāḍ follows al-Bakrī as regards this distance,² and describes al-Jār as the port of Medina, a large village "on the sea", densely populated and abounding in mansions.³ Al-Zamakhsharī describes al-Jār as a coastal village where ships from 'Aidhāb, Qulzum and the Sea of al-Na'ām can be seen.⁴ Naṣr says that al-Jār is the sea port of Medina, but reduces the distance between al-Jār and Medina to a mere journey of one day and one night.⁵ The truth of this contention is disproved by the following story: 'Umar is said to have intimated to a client that he liked fresh fish, whereupon the client hurried to al-Jār from which he came, after three days, bringing the fish with him. But 'Umar refused to consume the fish himself, as he believed that the mount had been subjected to cruelty by being ridden at excessive speed.⁶ Another version of

---

1. Ibid., p. 231.
2. 'Iyāḍ, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 100.
3. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 145.
the story cites the round journey of the client as taking four days, which ʿUmar regarded as unusually short for such a distance.¹

Al-Bakrī proffers an explanation of the origin of the name al-Jār which strikes one not merely as archaic, but even as so contrary to all logic that it could be safely disregarded. The author of al-Tījān relates a story in which the name al-Jār is derived from Jāruh in this poem:²

أعيذك بالرسن إن تجمعى هو
علي وسجران وحبيك (سبيك) جاره

Now al-Bakrī attributes this story to Ibn al-Kalbī, but replaces the support word Jāruh by Qātiluh and thus regards the whole poem as a support, which, in spite of the editor's efforts, carries no conviction whatsoever.³ This, however, does not mean that the author of al-Tījān has offered an acceptable theory.

Al-Jār is identical with what is called now al-Rāʾis, a small village on the Red Sea south of Yanbu'.

---

¹ Al-Ḥimyarī, al-Raud, . . . fol. 85.
² al-Tījān, p. 194.
³ Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, p. 356.
Jiddah is the most important coastal town of the Hijaz. It derives its importance from being the port of Mecca. Al-Shu’ainibah used to perform this function before Islam and until the time of Uthmān who, in 26 A.H. (646) chose Jiddah to replace it. However, at the time of political crises, which were by no means infrequent, Jiddah was often passed over in favour of weaker neighbouring ports such as al-Shu’aibah, al-Qunfudhah or even Rābigh, and was either besieged by the rulers of Mecca or had to appease their insatiable avarice which was often attracted by its wealth. Jiddah suffered from successive rulers of Mecca and native chiefs more than from the foreign enemies who also attacked it. Nevertheless, Jiddah, which had been at the time of Uthmān mere huts, was transformed gradually into a bulwark of Mecca and the garrison for troops, of which it was said, in later years, that a prayer in Jiddah was more rewarding than many million prayers elsewhere. This was a result of the growth of the seafaring trade and the increasing number of pilgrims as well as the dangers of foreign attack.

Mapping the coastal route from Oman to Mecca, Ibn Khurramadbeh situates Jiddah between Mecca and an unnamed halt north of al-Shu’aiabah. He also records the fact that Jiddah, like al-Jār, was frequented by non-Muslim traders.

who imported goods from east and west. Ibn Rosteh lists Jiddah among the towns of the second climate, adding that a part of the Red Sea is referred to as the Sea of Jiddah. He states that sea-borne pilgrims from Egypt cross the Red Sea from al-‘Allaqī to Jiddah in twenty-four hours. It is interesting to notice here that al-Muqaddasī assesses it at 300 parasangs which can be covered in twenty-five to sixty days' journey according to the direction of the wind. Ibn Rosteh calculates the distance from Jiddah to Mecca as two days. Al-Ya’qūbī lists Jiddah among the dependencies of Mecca, and points out that the food supplies from Egypt to Mecca are transported by way of Jiddah. He implies, in another passage, that Jiddah is on the Yemenite coast. All that Ibn al-Faqīh has to say about Jiddah is that the stretch of the Red Sea facing Mecca is called the Sea of Jiddah. Al-Hamdānī refers to Jiddah as the port of Mecca, and places:

1. Ibid., p. 153.
2. Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 87.
3. Ibid., p. 99.
4. Ibid., p. 183.
6. Al-Ya’qūbī, Buldān, p. 316.
7. Ibid., p. 317.
8. Ibid., p. 319.
10. Al-Hamdānī, Sīfah, p. 47.
in the second climate. He follows the traditionalists in stating that it was in Jiddah that Hawwa (Hawwa' = Eve) began her search for Adam. Ibn 'Abbās is quoted to the effect that Eve was buried there. Al-Bakrī, in al-Masālik, states, on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās, that Jiddah was the place to which Eve went from Paradise and that she was buried at Mecca. Al-Idrīsī, however, says that Eve went from Paradise to Jiddah where she died and was buried. Al-Handānī also quotes al-'Ajlānī, the Hijazi poet, in support of locating Jiddah between al-Qirsh and Judaidāt.

Al-Istakhri states that Jiddah which lies at two days distance from Mecca whose port it is is larger than al-Jāz. According to him, Jiddah is a large flourishing town dominated by the Persians. It is second only to Mecca with regard to trade and the capital invested in it. Ibn Hauqal proffers the same in the early copy of his Masālik, but implies, in the later copy, that Jiddah suffered economically under the harsh governorship of Ibn Ja'far, the Hashemite.

1. Ibid., p. 6.
2. Ibid., p. 222.
4. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fols. 4, 6.
5. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 36.
8. P. 27.
ruler of Mecca, which led to the break up of its trading community. Al-Istakhri assesses the distance from Jiddah to Aden at about one month's journey and from Jiddah to al-Juhfah at about five days' journey. Ibn Hauqal records the same, except for the omission of "about" with respect to the distance from Aden to Jiddah. Yaqūt, however, attributes this statement to Abū Zaid of Balkh. Ibn Hauqal's location of Jiddah on the Sea of Faris is identical with that of al-Istakhri, but differs from him in stating, in his later copy, that there are uninhabited places between Ailah, Madyan, al-Jār and Jiddah. In the later copy, Ibn Hauqal adds that there are boats on the islands of B. Ḥādān ready to transport the pilgrims to Jiddah at a moment's notice. He states that the "islands" of Sawākin face Jiddah, whereas the isle of Sinjelah lies at one day's journey from Jiddah. The author of Ḥudūd al-Ālam says: "Judda is a town belonging to Mekka and situated on the sea coast, prosperous and

1. Ibn Hauqal, op.cit., p. 32.
2. Al-Istakhri, op.cit., p. 27.
flourishing." He describes Jiddah as situated on the western borders of the Arabian desert. Al-Mas'udī assumes the distance from Jiddah to Bāb al-Abwāb as 600 parasangs, and the distance from Jiddah to Mecca as thirty-two miles. Al-Muqaddasi states that Jiddah is a Hijazi town, and that pilgrims coming from 'Aidhāb, which lies opposite to Jiddah on the other side of the Red Sea, begin performing their pilgrimage rites at Jiddah. About Jiddah itself, al-Muqaddasi says,

"Jiddah is a town on the Sea shore, whence it derives its name. It is fortified, flourishing and populous and its inhabitants are chiefly merchants and people of wealth. Jiddah is the granary of Makkah and the emporium of al-Yaman and Egypt. It has a noble mosque. The water supply, however, is not sufficient although there are many reservoirs in the town. Water is brought from a distance. The Persians are the ruling class and live in splendid palaces. The streets are straight and the situation of the town excellent, but the heat is very great."

He states that millet is imported to Jiddah from al-Sharjah, Hirdah and 'Atanah; and that Jiddah and al-Jār are the two granaries of Egypt. Al-Muqaddasi also proffers some infor-

1. Ḥudūd al-'Ālan, p. 148.
2. Ibid., p. 91.
5. Ibid., p. 78.
7. Ibid., p. 86.
8. Ibid., p. 97.
nations about the customs and taxes of Jiddah saying,

"At Jiddah ½ dinār is exacted on every load of wheat and a kail (gallon) from each half of a camel-load; on a bundle of Shatawī linen, 3 dinars and on a bundle of Dabiqi, 2 dinars and on every bale of wool, 2 dinars. The land taxes are as follows:— on the caravans of Jiddah half a dinar at both al-Qarīn and Batn Marr." 1

As regards the population of Jiddah, al-Muqaddasī states that the Persians are in the majority there, but that their language is Arabic. He calculates the distance from Jiddah to Mecca as two days' journey, to Batn Marr as one day's journey, to either al-Jār or al-Sirrain as four days' journey and that to al-Qulzum as 300 parasangs. He is in no doubt about the last mentioned figure because he states that this journey lasts from 25 to 60 days according to the direction of the wind. Al-Bīrūnī states that Jiddah is the port of Mecca and assesses its latitude at 21°.20' and its longitude at 66°.30'. 5 Al-Maqdisī enumerates Jiddah among the large urban communities of the Hijaz, and situates it in the second climate. The author of Āḵān al-Murjān states that Jiddah is the port at which the seaborne pilgrims dock on their way from Suez to Mecca.

1. Ibid., pp. 104-105, English translation, p. 159.
2. Ibid., p. 96, English translation, pp. 159-160.
3. Ibid., p. 106.
4. Ibid., p. 107.
7. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 50.
8. Āḵān al-Murjān, 33.
In his Mu'jam, al-Bakri concerns himself with the origin of the name "Juddah" which he attributes to its coastal position termed "al-Juddah" in Arabic. This name seems to have been regarded as ancient at least as a certain Juddah b. Jurm who was born at Jiddah and named after it as is recorded by al-Bakri on the authority of Ibn 'Abbās.  

Al-Bakri quotes Ibn Fadālah to the effect that Jiddah is famous, and that it is the port of Mecca. He records this statement in another passage without quoting a source. Al-Bakri also mentions Jiddah's situation on the extreme (western) border of Arabia, and the Sea of Jiddah which he designates as the western border of the Yemen. He points out that Jiddah is in the Ghaur of Tihāmah. Yāqūt quotes al-Zanakhsharī when calculating the distance between Jiddah and Mecca as three days' journey; a statement not to be found in al-Zamakhsharī's Jibāl from which Yāqūt usually derives his quotation, and where Jiddah is referred to as a mere "place". Nor is Yāqūt's quotation traceable in the two

2. Ibid., p. 17.
3. Ibid., p. 7.
4. Ibid., p. 6.
5. Ibid., p. 16.
6. Ibid., p. 12.
other works of al-Zanakhshari which are likely to contain geographical information of this sort, al-Fā‘iq and Asâs al-Balâghah. As to the assessment of this distance at one day's and one night's journey which Yâqūt attributes to al-Hâzimî, it is to be found in Nasr's work. Yâqūt also quotes Ibn al-Kalbî when stating that the region of Jiddah was allotted from the first to the Qudā'ah. Ibn al-Kalbî claims that 'Amr b. Iuhayy introduced to the Arabs the worship of five idols which he discovered at Jiddah. He also states that an idol called Sa'd erected on the coast of Jiddah, remained in the care of the Kinânah. Al-Zuhrî, on the other hand, is thought to have said that Jiddah was the camping place of the tribes Hâ', al-Ash'ar and 'Akk who used to settle between "Jiddah and the sea". Mâlik is quoted as saying that the distance between Jiddah and Mecca is forty-eight miles. Ibn 'Asâkir records a 9th century debate in which a poet from Medina pleaded with Dâwûd b. 'Îsâ, the Abbasid governor of the Hijaz, to pay a visit to Medina as he tarried too long in Mecca. A Meccan poet rebuked the Medinese and expatiated on the merits of Mecca with some harsh criticism of

4. Ibid., p. 36.
Medina. At this point, a third poet, al-İjlî by name, a native of Jiddah and one of the military volunteers, appeared on the scene to advocate the merits of Jiddah as the port of Mecca, the sacred bulwark of defence, a place which would witness great future events and the place whose martyrs were favoured above all martyrs. Al-Jahiz, in his Rasāʿīl indicates that Jiddah plays the role of a health resort to which (wealthy) Meccans repair in winter.

Al-İdrîsî lists Jiddah among the famous ports of the fifth part of the second climate. He gives a very interesting account of the conditions prevailing at Jiddah in his time. According to him, no pilgrim was allowed to cross from 'Aidbâb to Jiddah without satisfying the authorities there that he was economically able to meet the demands of the pilgrimage. Once the boat had safely crossed, it docked at a distance from Jiddah whose governor then sent out customs officials to assess dues payable on taxable wares on board ships, and accompany the passengers to the shore where the duties were collected. If a passenger could not acquit himself of the landing tax of eight dinârs, and the captain was unwilling to pay, the passenger was detained until the pilgrimage period was over. Sometimes, such passengers were saved by the beneficence of a third person. This payment was exacted on behalf of the Hashemite ruler of Mecca to cover the expen-

3. Al-İdrîsî, op.cit., fcol. 34.
diture on his troops and household, as his revenue was not large enough to meet all his needs.  

Al-Idrīsī’s description of Jiddah is not as genuine as his information about the customs proceedings there. In describing Jiddah, he seems to rely on Ibn Ḥauqal and al-Muqaddasī. Nevertheless, his description is not devoid of interesting points. He states that Jiddah is a flourishing town with a brisk trade, a wealthy population with immense capital investment, large profits and adequate living conditions. It has a yearly trade season which precedes the pilgrim period when imported wares, selected goods and magnificent treasures are exchanged with satisfactory profit. Its people are second only to the Meccans in wealth and property. Its governor, appointed by the ruler of Mecca, receives its taxes, alms tax and customs duties and supervises its security arrangements. (The merchants of) Jiddah have numerous boats sailing in many directions, and also a number of fishing boats. As to the distances, al-Idrīsī locates Jiddah north of al-Sufayyah (al-Shu‘aibah) at three days’ journey which he equates with forty miles. According to him, Jiddah, together with Mecca, lies in the north of Tihāmah.

Al-Idrīsī’s harsh words about the severe treatment of pilgrims at Jiddah sound rather apologetical when compared

1. Ibid., fol. 35.
2. Ibid., fol. 36.
3. Ibid., fol. 38.
with the statement of Ibn Jubair. Though writing forty years after al-Idrīsī, Ibn Jubair refers to a period wider in span than that covered by al-Idrīsī’s authorities. It appears that the ruler of Mecca had a representative at ‘Aidhāb, the Egyptian port, to supervise the collection of dues levied on all pilgrims in transit. Those who did not pay were humiliated, and those who could not pay exposed to various atrocities, surpassed only by the severe torture perpetrated at Jiddah. According to Ibn Jubair, this had been common practice in the whole Fatimid period, which is hard to credit, since the ruler of Mecca did not acquire absolute power until the 11th century, when both Baghdad and Cairo were too helpless to intervene. Moreover, Nāsir-i Khusraw, though by no means intent on white-washing the ruler of Mecca, does not mention cruelty at Jiddah. In fact, he was himself exempted from paying the dues without experiencing hardship. He mentioned the cruelties imposed by the tribes on the route between Mecca and Medina. Besides, it can hardly be credited that ‘Aidhāb had always been the centre of such blatant oppression. It is more likely that it became one after the closure of the pilgrim coastal route through Ailah by the crusaders, which is implied by Ibn Jubair himself when suggesting some substitutes for ‘Aidhāb until Ailah

1. Ibn Jubair, Rihlah, pp. 56, 71, 73, 77, 78.
3. Ibid., p. 68.
is regained. In fact, it was not only the ruler of Mecca, notorious no doubt though he was, who exploited the pilgrims at 'Aidhāb; according to Ibn Jubair himself, shipowners also used to cram their ships so full of people that they recovered their cost with profit already on the maiden voyage of their craft. Authors earlier than Ibn Jubair view this procedure with resignation. Al-Idrīsī implies that the Hashemite ruler of Mecca needed the revenue from these dues to maintain his household. 'Umārah acted as a go-between to secure the payment of some dues held back by the Fatimid government as a result of some Egyptian pilgrims having been slain by the retinue of the ruler of Mecca. The Muslim rulers themselves vied with each other in appeasing the ruler of Mecca by paying an annual tribute so that he should forego levying dues and tolls from the pilgrims. However, this only encouraged him to exact more money from pilgrims whenever the official payment failed to arrive or fell short of satisfying his greed. It was not until Saladin put a temporary end to this practice that voices were raised against an abuse too inveterate to be successfully eradicated. According to Ibn Jubair, the ruler of Mecca claimed it as his right to exact these dues unless paid by other governments. The pilgrims were looked upon as legitimate booty, "even more so than non-Muslims." Moreover, wealthy Muslims had to bribe the ruler before carrying out any improvement or maintenance

1. 'Umārah, al-Nukat, pp. 42, 123.
projects at places of religious interest in Mecca, or attempting to facilitate the pilgrimage journey. Dues on pilgrims had been levied before Ja'far b. al-Hasan whom 'Abd Allāh Ghāzī accuses of originating the practice in 358 A.H. (969); an Abbasid chief minister had even been praised, thirty years before, for trying to bring the dues system to an end. The avarice of the ruler was by no means limited to pilgrims, since the trading community of Jiddah was subjected to periodical atrocities which, as Ibn Hauqal observes, usually resulted in a temporary break-up of these communities.

AL-JUHFAH

Al-Juhfah, a halt on the northern pilgrim route to Mecca, is important in that it is not only the rendezvous of pilgrims, but also the point at which certain pilgrims have to start observing the rules of the hajj. Hence it is mentioned by all Arab geographers of the period under consideration, often with additional information. According to Ibn Khurradadbeh, who locates it south of al-Abwā' and north of Qudaid, it is a place in Tihāmah with wells; and lies at a distance of eight miles from the sea. The distance between al-Juhfah and al-Abwā' is twenty-seven miles which is the same as that between al-Juhfah and Qudaid. He singles out the Syrian pilgrims as having to start their pilgrimage rites there.

Al-Ya'qūbī locates al-Juhfah, which, according to him, forms a dependency of Mecca, south of al-Abwā' and north of Qudaid without giving the mileage. He mentions al-Juhfah both in connection with the conventional route between Mecca and Medina, and the coastal route between Ailah and Mecca. He locates Ghadār Khumm at two miles' distance from the road to al-Juhfah. Of the population of al-Juhfah, al-Ya'qūbī says that it comes from the Sulaim. Ibn Rosteh's calculation

1. Ibn Khurradadbeh, op.cit., p. 131.
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of the mileage of the distance to and from al-Juhfah is in accordance with that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh, except for the distance between al-Juhfah and Qudaid which is assessed at twenty-nine miles. Ibn Rosteh also states that al-Juhfah is the point at which the Syrian pilgrims should start performing their pilgrimage rites. He describes al-Juhfah as a huge-sized village whose supply of water comes from wells.

Qudāmah differs from his predecessors not only in calculating the distance between al-Juhfah and Qudaid as twenty-six miles, but also in describing al-Juhfah as a sea port. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah mention only the conventional route between Medina and Mecca. Al-Mas'ūdī states that al-Juhfah lies at a distance of ten miles from Rābigh for those who travel from Medina. This somewhat complicated definition is borrowed from al-Wāqidi to the letter. Ibn Sa'd's description is less complicated as he says that al-‘āhyā', situated in the valley of Rābigh, is at a distance of ten miles from al-Juhfah on the left hand side of the road "if you want Qudaid". Al-Mas'ūdī also places Ghadīr Khumm near al-Juhfah.

Al-Istakhri describes al-Juhfah, situated at two miles' distance from the sea, as the only village between Mecca and

1. Ibn Rosteh, op.cit., p. 178.
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Medina with a permanently settled population. It shares this trait with Ta'd to which it is also comparable in size. Al-Juhfah, he adds, is notable for its prosperity. Ibn Hauqal borrows the whole of this statement, except in implying that there are other, though minor, settlements of this kind between Mecca and Medina as he says, "As to size and settled character of the population, al-Juhfah is second to none". Both Al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal assess the distance between Waddan and al-Juhfah at one day's journey, which Yaqut attributes to Abu Zaid. Al-Istakhri gives the distance from al-Juhfah to Jiddah in the south, and al-Jar in the north as five and three days' journey respectively, which corresponds to the data given by Ibn Hauqal, who obviously relies on him for this information. Al-Istakhri mentions the existence of a coastal route from Madyan to Mecca which leads through al-Juhfah where pilgrims from Iraq, Damascus, Palestine and Egypt meet. Ibn Hauqal says the same except that he speaks of pilgrim routes instead of pilgrims.

3. Al-Istakhri, op. cit., p. 25.
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Al-Handānī enumerates al-Juhfah among the places of Tihāmah and indicates, in another passage, that it is in the extreme northern limit of the administrative districts of Mecca. He records the well-known fact that al-Juhfah is the point at which the Syrian pilgrims should start performing their pilgrimage rites and includes the Egyptians with them in his statement. As to the distance between al-Juhfah and al-Abwā', to the north, and Quḍaiḍ to the south, al-Handānī assesses it at twenty-three and twenty-four miles respectively. He gives its latitude as 22° 10'. In another passage, he inserts a poem by al-ʻAjlānī, a Hijazi poet, in which al-Juhfah is counted as a place in the Hijaz between al-Sītārah and Quḍa. Al-ʻAzharī points out that al-Juhfah, the point at which the Syrian pilgrims start performing the rites of the Ḥāji, is a village near the sea. Al-Bīrūnī describes it as a flourishing Arabian locality in the second climate near the sea and gives its degree of longitude as 65 and that of its latitude as 22° 15'. Al-Maqdisī lists it among the principal rural towns of the Hijaz.
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Al-Muqaddasi says that al-Juhfah is:

"a flourishing town inhabited by the Banū Ja'far; it is commanded by a strong fortress which has two gates. It possesses a few wells and at a distance of two miles from it is a spring of water; it has also a large reservoir, but water sometimes becomes very scarce in it. Al-Juhfah is a hot-bed of fever. It is related to a tradition that the Prophet of God, peace and blessing be upon him, said, 'O God, endear al-Madīnah to us as thou hast endearing Makkah, and even more, and transplant its fever to al-Juhfah'."

He also mentions the fact that al-Juhfah is the point at which the Syrian pilgrims start observing the requirements of pilgrimage, and the existence of a mountain called al-Dhabīb or al-Dhunaib by name, situated on the opposite side of al-Juhfah, at which the (sea-borne) pilgrims begin their pilgrimage rites. Al-Muqaddasi enumerates Al-Juhfah among the dependencies of Mecca and states that dragon's blood is found there. According to al-Muqaddasi, al-Juhfah is equidistant from al-Khaim (in the direction of Mecca) and Badr (in the direction of Medina) at one day's journey, but that it is at two days' journey from al-Jār. Al-Muqaddasi expresses one adverse judgment on al-Juhfah describing it, together with al-Marwhā, as the "native country of libertines". He finds a point of similarity between al-Juhfah and Dandānāqān in
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that they have the baths and guest houses in their outskirts.

Al-Bakrī describes al-Juhfah, in his Mu'jam, as a principal village with a minbar, giving details of several routes leading through the place. According to him, there are two mosques of the Prophet there and a third in Ghadīr Khumm, which is at three miles' distance from al-Juhfah on the left of the road. There is also a spring which flows into a cistern richly surrounded by trees. It was from that thicket that the Prophet announced to his people: "Friends of mine are friends of 'Alī. O God, befriend his friends and destroy his enemies." Al-Bakrī adds that the Prophet pointed out al-Juhfah as the place at which all pilgrims from Syria should start the rites prescribed for the pilgrimage. He claims that it forms one of the twelve villages which have minbars and are subordinated to the administrative control of al-Fur'.

As to the distances between al-Juhfah and the neighbouring halts, al-Bakrī says that it is two days' distant from Badr; twenty-three miles from al-Abwa'; two miles from Dhūtul-Asāfīr and twelve miles from Kulayyah. It seems rather strange that he places Rabigh, which lies at a distance of a mere ten miles north of al-Juhfah, between the
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latter and Medina which lies at several days' journey from al-Juhfah. In another entry, he states that al-Marād is a locality between Rabigh and al-Juhfah. Of these two statements, the latter is very exact and the former rather vague.

Al-Idrīsī places al-Juhfah at a distance of twenty-six miles from Qudaid in the south, and twenty-seven miles from al-Abwā (al-Abwā’) in the north. He describes it as a flourishing halt, unfortified but densely populated. He also mentions that it is the point at which the Syrian pilgrims should start practicing their rites of pilgrimage. He lists al-Juhfah among the sea ports in the fifth part of the second climate and adds that it is one of the fortresses with a governor of its own. He omits it from the Egyptian coastal route in one version but mentions it in another. 'Iyād assesses the distance between al-Abwā’ and al-Juhfah at twenty-three miles. He also differs from the rest in placing al-Juhfah north of al-Abwā’ which can be attributed only to inadvertence. 'Iyād situates Khumm at three miles
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from al-Juhfah adding that there is a thicket with a famous pool named after it. Describing al-Juhfah, 'Iyād says that it is one of the places where the first rites of al-Hajj are performed; that it is a principal village in Minā (sic) on the route between Mecca and Medina from which it is at eight days' distance, and that it is six miles from the sea. 'Iyād is clearly mistaken in locating al-Juhfah at Minā, since Minā does not lie on the route from Medina to Mecca. What he has in mind is Manāh, the idol erected at al-Mushallal near Qudaid at a day's journey from al-Juhfah.

Al-Khawārizmī is quoted to the effect that the distance between al-Juhfah and al-Suqyā is twenty-nine miles. Al-Asadī assesses the distance between al-Juhfah and Kulayyāh to the south, at twelve miles, and that from al-Juhfah to Khumm at four miles. Al-Sukkarī calculates the distance between al-Juhfah and Mecca as three days' journey, and states that it is the point where the southern and eastern borders of al-Ghaur converge with al-Thaghr. The commentator on the ḍīwān of al-Khansa' says that (the village of) Shuwān lies in the upper section of the valley of al-Juhfah which he describes as a Tihānī village. Al-Kutbī claims that
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"al-Juhfah was built" by 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz. Al-Zubairī implies that al-Juhfah used to be cultivated, in the seventh century by Ibn 'Āmir, a wealthy Meccan who also owned a village called "Bustan Ibn 'Āmir" which lay on the Iraqi pilgrim route to Mecca. This piece of information may provide a solution to the old argument about the identity of the owner of that village. Some authors identify him with Ibn Ma'mar, who according to al-Baṭalūsī was interested in wells and farming. Others believe that it was Ibn 'Āmir, who is known to have owned a farm in al-Juhfah. Al-Zubairī is well-informed about Mecca and about the rural settlements in the Hijaz. His explanation is more likely to be correct than that of others.

The etymological derivation of the name al-Juhfah varies from one author to another. Ibn al-Kalbī seems to be the source of the most frequently quoted explanation. According to him, 'Abīl, his sons and his followers, all from Ṣād, were driven out from Yathrib by the 'Amāliq. While in Mahya'ah, the former were carried away by the flood, an episode which accounts for the name of the place الجافة
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which is derived from \[\text{اجتمهم السبيل} \]. Al-Mas'ūdī relates this story without mentioning Mahya'ah. The Prophet is said to have used both names. Once seeing his Meccan companions suffering from the fever of Medina, the Prophet prayed to God to transfer that fever to Mahya'ah, al-Juḥfah in another hadith. On another occasion he referred to al-Juḥfah in connection with the pilgrimage rites. Thus the philologists were obliged to look for a link between those two names. Ibn Qutaibah digs less deep than Ibn al-Kalbī, merely pointing to the flood of the year 80 A.H., (699) as the origin of the name. Though he is followed in this respect by 'Iyād, it is clear that this assumption is groundless as the name al-Juḥfah is found in use at least seventy years before this catastrophe. Apparently to shirk responsibility when recording Ibn al-Kalbī's view, Ibn Duraid voices some suspicions of the correctness of that view. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī records both stories without citing any source. Al-Maqdisī attributes the name to a flood whose date he does not

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 369.
5. Ibn Qutaibah, Ma'ārif, p. 181.
8. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 10.
mention. Mahī'ah is said to be another name of al-Juhfah. A fourth name for this locality which occurs in a reliable early source is al-Juhūf, used by the poet Kuthayyir in one of his poems. Kuthayyir believes that it was called al-Juhfah because torrential rain cut through its soil. According to Wākī', al-Juhfah has many wells, a cistern and a spring. Its citadel has two gates, and its market and houses are situated within the castle. The distances from al-Juhfah are twenty-four miles to Qudaid; twenty-three miles to al-Abwā'; six miles to the sea; four miles to Khumm; three miles to the local mosque of the Prophet at Khumm; one mile to the spring of 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās; and finally twelve miles to (al-Mushallal). The scribe seems to have omitted the distance from Kulayyih to al-Mushallal. This can be deduced from the total distance between al-Juhfah and Qudaid which does not tally with the sum total of the particular distances quoted in the work. Wākī' also states that al-Juhfah is the mīgāt of the Syrian pilgrims, and that it is a dependency of Medina.

Summing up, it can be safely said that al-Juhfah was the accepted name even before Islam, because the name Mahya'ah
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or Mahī'ah is not to be found in the poems of pre-Islamic or even early Islamic poets, who are held to have been men of wide knowledge. What we find is only al-Juhfah or al-Juhūf. Al-Jāhiz and Ibn Duraid, however, imply that Mahya'ah and al-Juhfah are two separate localities when they speak about the notorious fever of both. Al-Zamakhsharī comments on Mahya'ah in two entries: under al-Juhfah he says that it is called Mahya'ah; but records under Mahya'ah that it is said to be identified with al-Juhfah. This indicates that he is in doubt. Yāqūt records that Mahya'ah is said to be identified with al-Juhfah or a place near it. There is a village called Mahāyi', about which we read in the works of 'Arrām and al-Muqaddasī. This village is situated on the Sāyah valley north east of al-Juhfah.

'Arrām says that three valleys all situated between Mt. Shamansīr and Mt. Dhurah separate the pass of Hirshā in the north, from al-Juhfah in the south. There is Ghazāl, rich in wells and inhabited exclusively by the Khuzā'ah who live there in tents. Secondly, there is Daurān which has two well-known wells, Rahbah and Sakūbah and belongs to
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the Khuzā'ah. The third is Kulayyah which equally belongs to then. As regards the pool of Khumm, 'Arrām situates it 1 mile to the east of al-Juhfah.

'Arrām seems to err when he places the valley Kulayyah between Hirshā and al-Juhfah, as al-Juhfah is situated between Hirshā in the north and Kulayyah in the south. Al-Ajlānī, the poet, locates al-Juhfah north of Sitārah which lies north of Kulayyah. Al-Asadī correctly places Kulayyah at twelve miles south of al-Juhfah.

Ibn Habīb mentions a place called Maghbat al-Juhfah where al-Harīth, the Ghassānī king, defeated the Kinānah. In al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, it has become Ma'yat near al-Juhfah. Al-Bakrī quotes Ibn al-Kalbī when he locates al-Juhfah at the extreme limit of al-Jals. When al-Bakrī places al-Juhfah in al-Ghaur, his source seems also to be Ibn al-Kalbī. Nasr places Daurān between al-Juhfah and Quda'id in contradiction to 'Arrām.

Al-Juhfah is still known in that area though its importance has dwindled owing to causes to be discussed elsewhere.

---
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KHAIBAR

Ibn Khurradadhbeh mentions Khaibar as a dependency of Medina. Ibn al-Faqīh also names it as one of the northern administrative districts of Medina. This is the only significant statement he relates about it. Like al-Jāḥiz, he quotes a proverbial saying in connection with its endemic fever. Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah follow Ibn Khurradadhbeh in describing it as a dependency of Medina. Al-Masʿūdī registers the distance from Khaibar to Medina as eight postal stages. Al-Hamdānī concerns himself with the origins of the tribes settled at Khaibar. In one passage, he enumerates it among the Juhainī lands, while he states in another that it is inhabited by the Sulaim alone, except for some nomadic Ḥāṣār who often live with them, but also reside, on some occasions, with the Ṭayy. In a third passage he says that it is inhabited by Jews, Mawālī and a variety of Arabs. In another book he states that the 'Ahnazah live in Khaibar.

8. Ibid., pp. 130, 131.
Al-Hamdānī registers two routes leading from Medina to Khaibar; one is straight and direct, whereas the other turns to the right after Hisn B. 'Uthmān. Being a Yemenite himself, al-Hamdānī says that the Yemenite dates, al-Mudabbas, are not surpassed in excellence even by the Burdī (Barnī) dates of Khaibar. He also says that its fever is notorious.

Al-Muqaddasī represents Khaibar as a main town of Mecca, a dependency of Medina and one of the only three towns in the Khaibar region, the other two being al-Marwah and al-Haurā'. He says about the latter that it is the port of Khaibar. Describing Khaibar itself, al-Muqaddasī says "Khaibar is a strong town as large as al-Marwah. It possesses a good Mosque. Here is the gate which the Prince of the Faithful lifted by main force." Al-Istakhrī says that Khaibar is a fortress abounding in palm groves and farms. Ibn Hauqal has the same to say about it except that he refers to it by a masculine pronoun in place of the feminine form used by al-Istakhrī.

Al-Dakrī mentions Khaibar in his Masālik only when discussing the specialities of different parts of Arabia. On
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this occasion, he says that the whetstone (hijārat al-masann حجارة المسن) of which the floors of the baths of Mecca are made, is plentiful in the Khaibar region near Medina. This statement, later, misled al-Idrīsī who assumed that Mt. Radwān near Khaibar because Ibn Hauqal mentions that whetstone is found on that mountain. In his Mu'jam, al-Bakrī gives a very detailed description of Khaibar. First, he quotes 'Arrām when saying that Khaibar is a dependency of Medina. Then he quotes al-Asadī, in counting Khaibar among the twelve settlements which form part of the Hijaz. In another place, he says that Khaibar is one of the Arabian قرى عربية villages because it lies in the Arab land. He regards it as originally inhabited by the Juhainah; and assumes the distance between Khaibar and Medina as eight postal stages, equating it with three days' journey. He places Numār, which al-Waqidī and Yāqūt call Thibār, at a distance of six miles from Khaibar.

Al-Bakrī lists the villages of Khaibar which he calls fortresses as follows:
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Al-Dūmah, to the extreme south-west of Khaibar in the direction of Medina;

Al-Mirṭah, the market of Khaibar, which had been made the seat of the Khaibar province by 'Uthmān. It belongs to the descendants of 'Umar;

Wajdah with trees and palm groves which belong to the Prophet;

Sulālin belonging mainly to the Prophet;

Al-Watīh, a compound of Jewish fortresses, farms and properties in the mountain of Al-Aḥyāl, from whose products the Prophet's wives and some of his relatives received their shares;

Khals, adjacent to al-Watīh, belongs entirely to the Prophet and is also called al-Katībah;

Al-Ṣahbā', of which he clearly says that it is at a distance of one postal stage from Khaibar;

Al-Qanūs, the strongest of them all, which was conquered by 'Alī b. Abī Taʾlib. It has a mosque of the Prophet extravagantly built by 'Īsā b. Mūsā (a governor of the Hijāz in the early Abbasid period);

Natāh, a valley containing Marhāb's fortress and his palace, which was then allotted to al-Zubair and whose main spring is called al-Luhaiḥah;

Dār B. Qirmah, which was the first fortress conquered. Marhāb's brother, al-Yāsir has his palace there;

and, finally, al-Shaqq, a valley containing the spring called Hammah, whose water was miraculously divided at the
Prophet's wish, a division which no effort, however hard, could change. Though Waki' seems to be the original source, al-Bakrī quotes al-Sakūnī or the whole list.

In another passage, he quotes 'Īsā b. Dinār when saying that al-Kharrār is a spring in Khaibar. Ibn Ishaq states that al-Zubair's share in Khaibar is called al-Khū' in Natāh, not Marhab's palace as in the above quoted passage.

In contrast to al-Bakrī, Yaqūt says that Khaibar has seven villages, which he also calls fortresses. Those are: Na'im, al-Shaqq, al-Natāh, al-Sulālim, al-Watīh, al-Katībah and al-Qamūs. The latter is called al-Ghamūd in another place. In other passages of his Mu'jam, Yaqūt names additional villages, some of which such as al-Khass, are mentioned by al-Bakrī who calls it Khals, and Wakhdah, which al-Bakrī calls Wajdah. Other villages such as al-Zihār and al-'Uzum, which, he says, is a dependency of Khaibar abounding in springs and fine groves of palm trees, are not to be found in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam.
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Yaqtūt says that al-'Ird is the name of the Khaibar valley which is dominated by the 'Anazah. He quotes Abū Zaid when recording the statement found in the works of al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal in praising the quality of the Baradī (Barmā) dates of Khaibar. Yaqtūt also quotes al-Sakūnī when assessing the distance between Khaibar and al-Jabalain at five nights' journey.

Al-Idrīsī enumerates Khaibar among the dependencies of Medina. His description of it is full of confusions as he thinks that it is a small town resembling a fortress, with farms and groves of palm trees. He says that, in the early days of Islam, it used to be inhabited by B. Quraizah, and according to another MS. and a quotation found in Abū al-Fidā', B. al-Nadīr. He adds that Khaibar was the home of al-Sama'u'al b. 'Adiyā', who was famous for keeping his promises. Al-Idrīsī locates Medina and Taimā' at an equal distance, i.e. four days' journey from Khaibar. He states, besides, that Mt. Radwān is near Khaibar, apparently because this was the only way to reconcile the contradictory statements of al-
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Bakrī, and Ibn Hauqal concerning the place of the main supply of whetstone.

Al-Idrisī may, in his turn, have misled a later geographer, Ibn Sa'īd, who says that Yanbu' is between Khaibar and Medina, because Mt. Radwā, which al-Idrisī locates near Khaibar, is seen from Yanbu'.

In the history of music, Khaibar is regarded by Ibn al-Kalbī as one of the six principal towns of Arabia where Arabian music developed. Those towns are also the main markets of Arabia. Ibn Ḥabīb also regards Khaibar as one of the annual fairs of Arabia. Al-Marzūqī indicates that the market used to be held at al-Natāh.

Al-Wāqīdī relates the importance of Khaibar among the Arabs even before Islam. When the Prophet decided to set out on his campaign against Khaibar, there was a widespread belief that Khaibar would be the real test as it was regarded as the richest part of the Hijaz in food and property. That belief was shared by Muslims and polytheists alike. It had enough permanent supply of water to enable its defenders to resist.
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for a long time. In al-Waqidi's *Maghazi*, the Khass of Yaqūt and Khals of al-Bakrī is called *Hiyād*. There are a number of villages there which are not reported by either al-Bakrī or Yaqūt, such as al-Nizar, al-Sa'ab and Ubayy.

Like al-Waqidi, Ibn Ishaq records the view of the polytheists that Khaibar was strong and important. Waki' describes Khaibar as a dependency of Medina. Nasr states the same, and adds that it comprises plenty of farms and many fortresses. He locates it at several days' journey from Medina, and refers to its endemic fever. In Nasr's text, al-Bakrī's Wajdah, a village of Khaibar, has become Wakhdah. Al-Idrisī enumerates Khaibar, which is a well-known region in the Northern Hijaz, among the famous localities of the fifth part of the third climate.

---
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KHULAILIS

Khulailis is described by al-Muqaddasī as a small town in the Hijaz, adjoining `Amaj, with a canal, a reservoir, palm trees, vegetable gardens and corn-fields, and situated together with `Amaj, one day's journey from both `Usfān to the south and al-Khaim to the north. This is one theory concerning its location. `Arrām proffers another, mentioning a spring named after a certain `Amrī called Khulailis. He locates it opposite to `Ukāz in the region of Rukbah. These two conflicting reports cannot be reconciled. Nor is it possible to identify either of them with what Shaikh Mulhis alleges to be a village called Khulailis found, at present, in Marr al-Zahrān.

It is clear that each of the three localities is meant to be separate; for `Arrām's Khulailis lies in Rukbah which forms part of the western borders of Najd. Nor can the existence of the Khulailis of al-Muqaddasī be denied. That of Shaikh Mulhis, however, does not exist. His statement is the result of inadvertence, as there is no such place in Marr al-Zahrān. He might have been thinking of the Khals spring.
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there, but this is no excuse for overlooking Khulais itself. On the other hand, it is unlikely that 'Arrān would have located Khulais in the Rukbah while ignoring the Khulais of Tihāmah because it is certain that the latter was known in his time long before al-Muqaddasī located it. Waki'ī, of the third century A.H., followed by al-Asadī, speaks of it, and so does Ibn al-Athīr when recording events of that century. Besides, there is no mention of the Rukbah's Khulais in the works of the geographers apart from al-Bakrī, in his Mu'jam. Al-Bakrī's MS. of 'Arrān's work was no doubt disordered in some places as will be seen elsewhere.

Al-Asadī states that Khulais lies just above eight miles south of Qudaid and two miles north of Amaj. According to him, there is a pass called the pass of Khulais three miles from the village of Khulais (the spring of Ibn Bazī)! and lies on the road to the latter. It is separated from Khulais by a lava field called Zahirat al-Barakah which grows trees. A mosque of the Prophet is found at Khulais. Al-Asadī describes Khulais as a rich spring abounding in groves of palms with canals and a reservoir. Al-Bakrī, in his Mu'jam, borrows this statement of al-Asadī, but alters the distance from Qudaid to Khulais to seven miles. He adds that it used to be a thriving village rich in water, palms, fruit trees
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and canals before it was devastated by Ismā'īl b. Yūsuf. However, he records an emendation to the effect that it was reclaimed after the year 180 a.H. (796) which is an obvious miscalculation, as Ismā'īl's rising in the Hijaz took place in 251 a.H. (865). Al-Bakrī's account of Khulais in his Masālik, is almost identical with that of al-ʿAsadī, except that he substitutes Ḥain abu Rabī for Ḥain Ibn Bazī, and uses tharraraa غَزِيرَة instead of ghazīrah غَزِيرَة meaning "rich" in both cases. He records the distance from Qudaid to Khulais as eight miles instead of "just above eight miles" which al-ʿAsadī has. As to the Khulais of Rukbah, al-Bakrī records the whole of Ṣarrām's statement without mentioning a source or adding information. 

Al-ʿAsadī's source seems to be Wakī' who identifies Khulais with the spring of Ibn Bazī', and locates it eight miles south of Qudaid, three miles south of the pass of Khulais, two miles south of the Prophet's mosque at that pass, two miles north of Amaj and fifteen miles north of Uṣfān. As for the lava field there, he calls it Zāhirah, the omission of al-Barakah is clearly due to a scribal mistake. The scribe is also to blame for the misreading of the reference to plants growing on that lava field. Wakī' also mentions that the rich spring of Khulais had palm groves, fruit trees and many cisterns, and that Ismā'īl b. Yūsuf had caused this spring to dry out.
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Abū al-Fidāʾ's account coincides with that of Wakī' and al-Asadī in locating Khulais north of 'Usfān. So does the account of al-Jazīrī who has a first-hand knowledge of the whole coastal area between Mecca and Medina. Yaqtūt states that Khulais is a fortress between Mecca and Medina. Khulais is not to be confused with Khals Ārah which 'Arrān describes as a valley with villages, cultivated land and groves of palm trees. According to him, Khals Ārah is adjacent to Mt. Dharah, his implication being that Khals Ārah lies to the north of Mt. Dharah. Al-Bakrī, however, defines Khals Ārah as a village. His source is no other than 'Arrān's work though through its transmitter, al-Sakūnī. Al-Waqīdī states that Khals is a valley in the Ruwaithah region. Al-Hajari's location is in line with that of al-Waqīdī, since he situates it near Mt. al-Hashā. Nasr gives substance to the claim that Khalas (Khals) is the valley of Mt. Baʿal, a Ghifārī territory near 'Usfān.

The Khulais in question is a thriving settlement between Qudaid and 'Usfān.

1. Abū al-Fidāʾ, Taqwīm, p. 32.
4. 'Arrān, op.cit., pp. 405-407.
5. Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, p. 1052.
7. Al-Hajari, Mawādir, part 2, fol. 149.
Dhū-Khushub is a halt on the pilgrim inland route between Medina and al-Marwah. It is not described in any geographical source as a dependency of Medina or even as a village. According to Ibn Khurrađadhbeh, it is situated between al-Suwa\dhā' to the north and Medina.\(^1\) He states this when listing the way-stations on the inland route between Egypt and Medina, and also repeats it when referring to the Syrian route.\(^2\) Ibn Rostch follows him to the letter.\(^3\) Since al-Ya'qūbī does not mention al-Suwa\dhā', he locates Dhū Khushub as the first stop to the south of al-Marwah.\(^4\) Gudāmrah follows Ibn Khurrađadhbeh with respect to locating this place, which he, however, calls Khushub omitting the article Dhū.\(^5\)

Al-Bakrī refers to it as Naqā Dhū Khushub when listing the halts between Medina and Allah in al-Masālik.\(^6\)

---

1. Ibn Khurrađadhbeh, _op. cit._, p. 150.
2. Ibn Khurrađadhbeh, _op. cit._, p. 150.
5. Gudāmrah, _op. cit._, p. 191.
Al-Jazīrī, who quotes him, calls it Banā Khushub.¹ In al-Mu'jam, al-Bakrī does not distinguish between two places called Dhū Khushub which are both near Medina; one is situated to the east of Medina near al-Kulāb in the territory of B. 'Uqail,² while the other is the place in question. However, he relies for his description of the latter on poems referring to the former which results in confusion.³ He even says that Dhū Khushub is adjacent to al-Kulāb at one day's journey on the Syrian pilgrim route,⁴ though it is clear that al-Kulāb does not lie on that route. He states that there is a mosque at Dhū Khushub where the Prophet held prayers when setting out on the campaign against Tabūk.⁵

'Ukāf is the only Arab geographer to mention a halt between al-Sūwaída and Dhū Khushub, namely al-'Irāk.⁶ Lughdhab describes Dhū Khushub as a valley with many springs, and situates it near Medina. Commenting on this location, Ḥamad al-Jāsir identifies Dhū Khushub

1. Al-Jazīrī, op. cit., p. 441.
3. Ibid., p. 633
4. Ibid., p. 500.
5. Ibid., p. 1223.
6. 'Ukāf, Manāzil, fol. 114.
with the region of al-Ghābah.\(^1\)

Al-Hamdānī implies that the Dhū Khushub in question is different from the valley of Dhū Khushub in Najd,\(^2\) whereas the former is in the territory of the Juhainah.\(^3\) He speaks of the settlements of the people of Lot which are to the left of Mt. al-Sharāh and proceeds to say that Dhū Khushub and al-Ghamr are among them.\(^4\) As he does not elaborate on this statement and Dhū Khushub is at quite a distance from there, it seems to be a question of a scribe's error. It is very likely, however, that he intended to include Dhū Khushub, not among the settlements of the people of Lot, but among the settlements of the Juhainah, which is partly accepted. Al-Idrīsī counts Dhū Khushub among the halts on the pilgrim inland route from Hilah to Medina.\(^5\) He locates it south of al-Suwaīdā' and north of Medina. Naṣr describes Dhū Khushub (he calls it Khushub) as a valley near Medina comprising some houses, and assesses the distance between Khushub and Medina at one day's

---

3. Ibid., p. 131.
4. Ibid., p. 147.
5. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
journey.¹ According to al-Iṣfahānī, there was a spring at Dhū Khushub which once belonged to Marwān and was later given as an ʿīqāb² by al Saffāh to al-Ḥasan, a descendent of ʿAlī.³ Al Zamakhsharī describes Dhū Khushub merely as a mountain.⁴ Al-Wāqidī states that the distance between Buwāṭ, in the region of Dhū Khushub and Medina is three postal stages.⁵ Al-Masʿūdī describes this mountain as Juhainī territory in the region of Dhū Khushub, but gives the distance as eight postal stages.⁶

---

1. Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 65.
3. Al-Zamakhsharī, Jibāl, p. 68.
This is a way-station on the conventional inland route from Ailah to Medina. Ibn Khurramadbeh mentions it on the only route he lists for that part of Arabia. He locates al-Kilibah between Shagib to the south and an anonymous halt immediately to the north of al-Aghra'. Ib Rosteh repeats this account literally when listing al-Kilibah on the inland route for the Egyptian pilgrim caravans via Medina; so does Qudāmah who calls it al-Kulabah.

Al-Ya'qūbī does not mention al-Kilibah, nor does he refer to the unnamed stop between it and al-Aghra'. Instead, he cites Qālis immediately after al-Aghra'. It is therefore, impossible to ascertain whether he has either of them in mind when he speaks of Qālis.

Al-Muqaddasī, however, mentions both al-Aghra’ and the unnamed stop on one occasion, but omits the unnamed stop on another without a replacement, as al-Ya'qūbī does.

Al-Muqaddasī not only changes al-Ighrā’ into

al-'rā', but also changes al-Kilābah into al-Kilāyah throughout his book.¹

Al-Idrīsī calls it Ankilāyah and locates it north of Sha'b (Shaghb) and south of an anonymous halt to the immediate north of al-ṣarrā' (al-'rā').² Wākī' locates al-Kilābah south of al-Agharr north of which he locates Qālis, and north of Badā south of which he erroneously locates Shaghb.³

---

2. Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
KULAYYAH

'Arrām mentions Kulayyah as a village with wells on the route between Medina and Mecca, adding that the name Kulayyah, given to the third and last valley between Hirsha in the north and al-Juhfah in the south, derives from these wells. He states that the valley of Kulayyah begins in the east at Mts. Shamansīr and Dharah. In the upper reaches of the Kulayyah valley there are three small isolated mountains called Shanā'ik. The valley belongs to the Khuzā'ah.\(^1\) Al-Bakrī, without giving a source, records the same statement but substitutes Sanābik for Shanā'ik,\(^2\) a distortion which cannot be attributed to a scribe's error as al-Bakrī vocalizes it out very clearly in another passage.\(^3\) According to Naṣr, who does not refer to a source, these mountains are called al-Shanā'ik.\(^4\)

As to the location of Kulayyah, it is clear that 'Arrām speaks about the valley, not the village, of Kulayyah when he places it between Hirsha and al-Juhfah. There is a place called Khabt, not valley of, Kulayyah

---

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 412.
2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1352.
3. Ibid., p. 578.
4. Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 89.
to the north east of Rābigh\(^1\) which cannot be the locality meant by 'Arrām, as the village and the valley of Kulayyah are no doubt south of al-Juḥfah. In his Mu'jam, al-Bakrī follows 'Arrām, in one passage,\(^2\) with respect to the situation of the Kulayyah valley north of Rābigh. In another passage, al-Bakrī describes Kulayyah as equidistant at twelve miles from al-Juḥfah to the north and Qudaid to the south.\(^3\) Al-Bakrī, however, implies, in a third passage, that Kulayyah is in Najd and quotes, in support of this statement, Kuthayyir who refers to Kulayyah together with al-Nibā'.\(^4\) On the strength of the fact that al-Qattāl (who mentioned Kulayyah) was a native of Najd,\(^5\) he gives his statement preference over the more authentic information contained in the poems of two Hijazis, Kuthayyir and al-'Arjī, whose location of al-Nibā' near Kulayyah is clear and whose poems he quotes without utilizing them to suggest, at least, that the Hijazi Kulayyah is more famous as it lies on the pilgrim route.

Al-Bakrī states that the distance between

---

2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1134.
3. Ibid., p. 956.
4. Ibid., p. 1292.
5. Ibid., p. 469.
Kulayyah and al-Mushallal, which lies to its south, is nine miles only. According to al-Isaḍī Kulayyah is the name of a salt-watered well in al-Qā', twelve miles from al-Juḥfaḥ, which is two cubits in diameter. He also mentions some shops in that area. All al-Zamakhshārī has to say about Kulayyah is that it is a watering place. Al-Hamdānī quotes al-'Ajlānī, a Hijazī poet, to the effect that Kulayyāt (Kulayyah) is to the north of Qudaq and the south of al-Sitārah, which is situated south of al-Juḥfaḥ. Unlike 'Arrām, al-Bakrī states, in another entry in his Mu'jām, that Kulayyah belongs, not to the Khuzā'ah, but to the Ǧamrah. It is, however, not a great mistake, as it is a question of two related tribes between whom there is no clear dividing line. Al-Iṣfahānī mentions Kulayyah as a village between Medina and Mecca where the poets Naṣīḥ and Kuthayyīr used to reside.

Unlike al-Bakrī, Yaqūt does not locate al-Nībā' as far as Najḍ but misplaces it, nevertheless, when he

1. Ibid., p. 956.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jām, p. 956.
says that it lies between Yanbu' and Medina, quoting, in support of his location, a poem by Ibn Marzah which mentions al-Mushallal, a very famous place near Qudaid.¹ Nasr thinks that Kulayyah is a valley in the Hijaz between Mecca and Medina and adds that it is also a locality in Najd on the pilgrim route from Basra to Mecca.²

Due to a scribal mistake, not only the name of Kulayyah is found misread as al-Mukallabah in Ṣakī'ʼs Manāzil, but also its description and the distance from there to al-Mushallal are omitted.³

Kulayyah, a rural community, is still known in that area south al-Juhfah.

---

1. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 737.
3. Ṣakī', Manāzil, fol. 51.
AL-MA'DAN (OF B. SULAIM)

The Ma'dan (mine) of B. Sulaim is one of the most famous gold mines in Arabia in general and in the Hijaz in particular. It is certain that it had been exploited by the ancient Arabs until some centuries after Islam; it afterwards remained derelict for a long time. It was by no means exhausted, and was reactivated during the second world war to alleviate the dire need for gold. Thus it must be assumed that this mine was neglected either for security reasons or through sheer ignorance on the part of the local people who succeeded the Sulaimīs, its previous owners. The Sulaim migrated from Arabia in numbers in consequence of the expansion of Islam.

When mapping the Iraqi pilgrim route, Ibn Khurrawadadhbeh locates the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim twenty-four miles west of al-Rabadhah from which it is separated by the "evening meal" halt Sharaurā, at twelve miles' distance, and twenty six miles east of al-Salīlah from which it is separated by al-Kunābain, an "evening meal" halt at thirteen miles distance. Though he mentions the cisterns of the Ma'dan, Ibn Khurrawadadhbeh is by no means appreciative of its water which is, according to him, the last thing to be looked for there. He quotes a poem advising
the traveller not to linger in the place as even wild animals and birds are complaining there.\(^1\) Al-Ya'qūbī places the Ma'dan west of al-'Umaq and east of Ufai'iyyah without recording the mileage.\(^2\) Ibn Rosteh follows al-Ya'qūbī with respect to the location, but adds that it is situated nineteen miles from al-'Umaq and thirty-two miles from Ufai'iyyah. As regards the Ma'dan itself, Ibn Rosteh describes it as a densely populated halt with wells and cisterns. He proceeds to say that it comprises ancient villages whose inhabitants are B. Sulaim.\(^3\) Qudāmah locates the Ma'dan nineteen miles west of al-Rabadhah and twenty-six miles east of al-'Umaq, and adds that it has wells and cisterns.\(^4\)

\(\text{Wakī}\) places the Ma'dan between al-'Umaq and al-Ufai'iyyah. The distances from the Ma'dan are twenty-two miles to al-'Umaq; 102 to Medina; twenty-six and a half miles to al-Ufai'iyyah; ten miles to al-'Safāhah; fourteen miles to the 46th postal stage; and two and a half miles to al-Rayyān, the old palace of al-Rashīd. Describing the Ma'dan, \(\text{Wakī}\) says that it has a palace

---

1. Ibn Khirradadhbeh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 131.
and a mosque, a round cistern erected by Zubaidah, and many wells, old and new. Ṣakī' quotes 'Ali b. Muhammad to the effect that gold used to be dug there, and even the soil of the Ma'dan was mixed with gold, but that its exploitation was abandoned due to the enormous cost involved. However, Ibn Abū Sa'd claims that as soon as the gold was produced, it was confiscated, so that its owners were deprived of it by the sheer force of B. Ṣuraish, B. Ja'dah and B. Qasr.¹

Al-Mas'ūdī identifies the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim with the Ma'dan of Buhrān in al-Fur² which cannot be acceptable as they are separated by a considerable distance. Probably he is misled by al-Taqīdī's location of Buhrān in the region of the B. Sulaim Ma'dan.³ Al-Mas'ūdī places the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim at eight postal stages from Medina. His source seems to be Ibn Sa'd.⁴ Al-Asadī assesses it at a hundred miles which is more acceptable.⁵ Al-Hamdānī calls the region "Harrah (lava fields) of B. Sulaim" and places it at twenty-two miles

¹ Ṣakī', Manāzil, fols. 14-16.
² Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, p. 244.
³ Al-Taqīdī, op. cit., p. 17.
⁵ Al-Samhūdī, Wafā', p. 1124.
west of al-'Unaq and twenty-six miles east of al-Ufai'iyah, giving its latitude as 23°.30'. Al-Muqaddasi follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh literally in so far as the location of the Ma'dan and the mileage between it and both al-Rabadhah and al-Salīlah are concerned. The versions of the seven geographers who record the way-stations between al-Naqirah and Mecca on the route leading through the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim, with Medina on the right hand side, by no means coincide in their details. It may be useful to compare their data on the location of the places in the original order, but omitting al-Kunābain and Sharurā which, being mere "evening meal" halts with no effect on the actual location, are mentioned by Ibn Khurradadhbeh alone. Al-Hamdānī's account records the route from Mecca eastward, but rearranged to blend in with the others:

1. Al-Hamdānī, Sīfah, p. 185.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Khurradadhbeh</th>
<th>Waqī'</th>
<th>al-Ya'qūbī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughithat al-Mawān</td>
<td>Mughithat al-Mawān</td>
<td>Mughithat al-Mawān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rabadhah</td>
<td>al-Rabadhah</td>
<td>al-Radadhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23 ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Maʿdan</td>
<td>al-Salīlah</td>
<td>al-ʿUmaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Salīlah</td>
<td>al-ʿUmaq</td>
<td>al-Maʿdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ʿUmaq</td>
<td>al-Maʿdan</td>
<td>Ufaiʿiyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>26 ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufaiʿiyah</td>
<td>Ufaiʿiyah</td>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>26 ½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
<td>Dhūt ʿIrq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhūt ʿIrq</td>
<td>Dhūt ʿIrq</td>
<td>Bustān Ibn ʿĀmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustān B. ʿĀmir</td>
<td>(a lacuna. On the Basra-Mecca route:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dhūt ʿIrq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Bustān</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rosteh</td>
<td>Qudāmah</td>
<td>al-Hamdānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mughīthath al-Mawan</td>
<td>Mughīthath al-Mawan</td>
<td>al-Māwān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rabadhah</td>
<td>al-Rabadhah</td>
<td>al-Rabadhah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Salīlah</td>
<td>al-Ma'dan</td>
<td>al-Salīlah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Umaq</td>
<td>al-'Umaq</td>
<td>al-'Umaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ma'dan</td>
<td>Ufai'iyyah</td>
<td>al-Harrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ufai'iyyah</td>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
<td>al-Ufai'iyyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
<td>al-Mislah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
<td>Dhāt 'Irq</td>
<td>al-Ghamrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhāt 'Irq</td>
<td>Bustān Ibn 'Amir</td>
<td>Dhāt 'Irq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustān B. 'Amir</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>al-Bustān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table shows, the Ma'dan is unanimously located west of al-Rabadhah though it is not uniformly considered the immediate halt in the western direction. Three geographers situate it immediately west of al-Rabadhah. They are Ibn Khurradadhbeh, al-Muqaddasi and Qudamah. Yaki', al-Hamdani and Ibn Rosteh insert al-Salihah immediately west of al-Rabadhah followed by al-'Umaq then the Ma'dan. Al-Ya'qubi and Qudamah omit al-Salihah altogether, but differ with regard to al-'Umaq which al-Ya'qubi locates between al-Rabadhah and the Ma'dan, and Qudamah, as has been mentioned, immediately west of the Ma'dan. Ibn Khurradadhbeh and al-Muqaddasi both locate al-Salihah immediately west of the Ma'dan followed by al-'Umaq. However, only those who locate both al-Salihah and al-'Umaq east of the Ma'dan are correct.

As to al-Hamdani, he states, in one passage, that the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim is a Najdi locality,¹ but includes it, in another, in the territories of Balliy, thus implying that it is part of the Hijaz.² 'Arram³ regards that region as Hijazi which is true. So does

---

2. Ibid., p. 170.
3. 'Arram, op. cit., p. 430.
al-Bakrī. Al-Hamdānī, however, quotes a poem recording the Najdi localities in which the two Ma'dans, that of B. Sulaim and that of Būhrān, figure. Terminologically, he records another name for the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim, Farān, which he ascribes to Farān b. Bāliyy, the ancestor of a branch of Bāliyy. Al-Bakrī goes a step further stating that Farrān (Farān) b. Bāliyy comes from a Sulaimī branch but claims to belong to Bāliyy. It should however, be noted that there is another form of the name in existence, namely Qarān, a valley in that area. Yaqūt seems to prefer the form Farān, though he does not identify it with the Ma'dan. He also mentions Qurān but locates it at Marr al-Zahrān near Mecca. Neither form is used by 'Arrām who mentions the valley of Qaurān in that area. As to Qarān, it is the correct name of a valley there, but it cannot be equated with the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim because Qarān is nearer to Būhrān than to the Ma'dan in

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 12.
3. Ibid., p. 170.
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 28.
6. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 51.
7. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 432.
question. Naṣr mentions Farān as a Sulaimī locality called the Ma'dan of Farān, but also records the opinion that it is identical with the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim. As to Qurrān, he locates it near al-Yamāmah which suggests that he neither regards it as identical with Farān nor as applicable to the Ma'dan. Al-Hamdānī, who lists the places called Qurrān, situating them all far away from the Ma'dan region, seems to exclude, by implication, the use of the name Qurrān for any Sulaimī locality. 2

'Aarrām mentions a mountain called Dhul-Iauqīshah which he calls "the mountain of the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim". 3 Al-Bakrī changes it to Dhul-Marqī'ah and calls it the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim. 4 Al-Hajarī describes the Ma'dan of Sulaim as a famous white mountain to the right hand (eastern) side of the Iraqi pilgrims returning from Mecca. It lies between al-Asyaq and al-Rayyān, on one morning's journey from al-Suwā'īqiyyah. 5 All al-Iṣṭakhrī 6 and

3. 'Aarrām, op. cit., p. 430.
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 432.
6. Al-Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 28.
Ibn Ḥauqal\(^1\) have to say about the Ḫa'qan is to mention it in connection with a shorter route from Iraq to Mecca. Ibn Ḥabīb calls the locality in question "the Gold Mine".\(^2\) Naṣr is quoted by al-Samhūdī when locating al-Rabadḥah between al-Salīlah and al-'Aqīq and explaining the latter by the 'Aqīq at Dhat 'Iqr.\(^3\) Al-'Aqīq should read al-'Umaq as Naṣr has it\(^4\) and as correctly quoted by Yaqūt.\(^5\)

---

MADYAN

The attention that Madyan has always attracted from the Arab geographers is due to the fact that it is mentioned in the Qur'ān in connection with the story of the prophet Shu'aib. Besides, it is mentioned in the Prophet's campaigns on the occasion when a party of Muslim troops was sent there and took some prisoners from Magnā. This incident is often cited in juristic works not only because of its importance but also because the Prophet directed his troops not to separate the captive families when bartering them. Moreover, Madyan is an important halt on the routes that lead to the holy places of Islam in Arabia. Most of the geographers who refer to Madyan concern themselves with all or most of these facts.

Ibn Khurrradadhbeh mentions it as a dependency of Medina, and a stop after Ḥaql and before al-Aghrāʾ on the route to Mecca. Ibn Rosteh follows him with regard to its relationship with Medina, but has Sharaf

2. Ibn Khurrradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 129.
3. Ibid., p. 149.
al-Naml instead of Haql when defining the location of Madyan.¹

Al-Ya'qūbī mentions Madyan as a halt on the route from Palestine to Mecca,² and an alternative route for the Syrian caravans if they wish to mix with the Egyptians and the Maghribīs whose caravans come through Madyan.³ He adds that there are two routes leading from there: a coastal one to Mecca; its first stop is at Ainunah,⁴ and an inland one leading to Medina; its first stop is at Aghrah.⁵ He names neither Haql nor Sharaf al-Naml as a halting place before Madyan, but has Sharaf al-Ba'il instead.⁶ He says that Madyan is a flourishing ancient town with numerous wells and permanently flowing springs whose water has a good taste. There are farms, gardens and groves of palm trees in Madyan. Its inhabitants are of heterogeneous origins.⁷ Like Ibn Khurradadhbeh,

1. Ibid., p. 183.
3. Ibid., p. 341.
4. Ibid., p. 341.
5. Ibid., p. 341.
6. Ibid., p. 341.
7. Ibid., p. 341.
Qudāmah states that Madyan is a dependency of Medina;\(^1\) he also accepts al-Ya'qūbī's spelling of Sharaf al-Ba'\(l\).\(^2\) He differs from all his predecessors in omitting the name of Madyan from his list of way-stations on the coastal route. Al-Hamdānī does not give any information about Madyan except that it lies on the border of the Judhāmī territories.\(^3\)

Al-Iṣṭakhrī, Ibn Ḥauqal and al-Muqaddasī take us a step further because they stress the importance of Madyan as a geographical factor. Al-Iṣṭakhrī says that the northern borders of the Hijaz end near Madyan. He considers the territories north of Madyan as a part of the Syrian desert.\(^4\) Ibn Ḥauqal says exactly the same.\(^5\) About Madyan itself, al-Iṣṭakhrī says that it is situated on the Red Sea opposite Tabūk which is smaller and is at six days' distance from it. There is the well from which Moses watered the flocks of Shu'āib. He claims to have seen that well which was covered and upon which a house had been built. Its inhabitants took their water from

\(^1\) L. Qudāmah, op. cit., p. 248.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 190.
\(^3\) Ḥamdānī, Sīfah, p. 129.
\(^4\) Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 21.
\(^5\) Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 21.
a spring. He says that Madyan derives its name from the tribe of Shu'aib which bore it. 1 Ibn Ḥauqal's statement is identical with al-Iṣṭakhrī's except that he does not claim that he has seen the well. 2 Al-Iṣṭakhrī regards Madyan as a stopping place on the route of the Egyptians and Palestinians to Mecca and Medina. He states that there are two routes from Madyan to Mecca; a coastal route and an inland one which leads through Shaghb, Badā and Medina. 3 Ibn Ḥauqal, not unexpectedly, says the same. 4

According to al-Muqaddasī, Madyan "in reality is within the borders of the Hijāz; for the Arab peninsula includes all that is bordered by the sea and Madyan lies in this tract. Here may be seen the stone which Moses removed when he gave water to the flocks of Shu'aib. Water here is abundant. In this town the weights and measures and customs are those of Syria." 5 He believes that the province of Ailha includes Madyan and that it is Syrian rather than Hijazi or Egyptian in appearance, because the weights, measures and customs of its people

1. Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 24.
3. Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 28.
are those of Syria. Nevertheless, he states that the centre of the third climate is "near Madyan, the city of Shu'aib on the side of Syria". Al-Muqaddasi cites Madyan on the conventional route to Medina, but states immediately afterwards that the route in use in his time did not lead through Madyan. He locates Madyan before A'ra' (Aghrā') and after Sharaf Al-Ba'il in another passage. The author of Hudūd al-Ālam describes Madyan as a flourishing town on the sea coast. He also mentions the well from which Moses drew water for Shu'aib's sheep.

Al-Bakrī, in his Masālik, provides no geographical information about Madyan, but enlarges on the story of Shu'aib and the ancient kings of that area. He also says that Madyan is the name of the tribe dwelling in al-Aikah and that Shu'aib is of that tribe. He speaks of the lofty mountains between Ḍubā and Madyan where there is a cave to which Shu'aib used to bring his sheep. There are other caves which have served as

1. Ibid., p. 179.
2. Ibid., p. 60.
3. Ibid., p. 110.
4. Ibid., pp. 110, 112.
6. Al-Bakrī: Masālik, fol. 15.
dwellings, and graves which contain decaying bones as large as those of camels. Those dwelling places extend to about 20 cubits. They emit a disgusting smell which nobody can bear without protection. He also says that the Jews of Madyan possess a document from the Prophet written on a goat skin blackened in the course of centuries, though the writing is clear and said to be in the hand writing of either 'Alī or Mu'āwiyyah.¹ He lists it among the way-stations, and locates it between 'Ainūnah and Ashrāf al-Ba'l.²

In his Mu'jam, al-Bakrī adds that Madyan is a well-known balad in Syria, opposite to Gaza and is the dwelling place of the Judhām. He relies on Muḥammad b. Sahl al-Abwal in describing Madyan as a dependency of Medina.³ He also attributes to Ibn 'Abbās two conflicting reports in trying to locate al-Aikah. According to one report, it comprises the territories between Madyan and Shaghb and Badā; the other places it between Madyan and the coast and states that the tree prevalent there is the daum palm.⁴

1. Ibid., fol. 77.
2. Ibid., fol. 77.
4. Ibid., p. 216.
Al-Qūḍā'ī is quoted as saying that Madyan is a dependency of Egypt.¹ It is clear that Madyan had been regarded as a dependency of Egypt well before al-Qūḍā'ī, as it is related that a qādī of Egypt sought refuge in Faid in 196 A.H. (812) taking his property from Madyan.² Had Madyan not been within the confines of Egypt, he would have felt safe there. This question will be discussed in another place.³

Al-Idrīsī locates Madyan in the fifth part of the third Climate.⁴ He follows Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh in describing Madyan as a dependency of Medina⁵ and borrows Ibn Ḥauqal's words in referring to Madyan and its well and even in comparing it with Tabūk and in saying that it is on the sea coast. He adds a new item of information, relating that its inhabitants live in precarious conditions, drawing their livelihood from a stagnant trade. He places it on both the inland and the coastal routes from Alīlah to the Holy Cities.⁶

4. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
5. Ibid., fol. 36.
6. Ibid., fol. 89.
Yāqūt attributes to ʿAbū Zaid a description of Madyan which coincides with that of al-ʾIṣṭakrī and Ibn Ḥauqal. Yāqūt also quotes al-Ḥāzimī to the effect that Madyan lies between ʾWādī al-Qurā and Syria. Madyan was occasionally the residence of an Umayyad prince, ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Sulaimān b. ʿAbd al-Malik who received his guests there; among them was Ibn Harmah, the poet, who has recorded this fact.¹ On the whole, it was not unusual in the Umayyad era to find influential people living in or near Madyan.

When mapping the Egyptian inland pilgrim route, Wākī' situates Madyan south of Sharaf al-ʾBaʿl and north of Qālis.² The author of ʾAḵām ʾal-Murjān describes Madyan as a city, and places it between the borders of Egypt and those of Syria. According to him, its latitude is 29°, and its longitude is 61°. For the information on religious matters, he seems to rely on al-Bakrī.³ Al-Maqdisī refers to the flourishing trade of Madyan, previously a tribal metropolis. His reference to the way in which its merchants' deal with counterfeit coins is

3. ʾAḵām ʾal-Murjān, p. 34.
somehow obscure. The old town of Madyan is near the site of al-Bid'.
Ibn Khurradadhbeh describes Malal as the first way-station on the Mecca-bound route from Medina, at a distance of twelve miles from the latter. The first stop, nineteen miles after it, is al-Sayālah. Ibn Khurradadhbeh states that Malal possesses wells.\textsuperscript{1} Al-Ya'qūbī says that its inhabitants are the Ja'āfir. He counts two stops, Dhul-Ḥulaifah and al-Ḥufairah between Medina and Malal, and names al-Sayālah as the immediate halt after Malal.\textsuperscript{2} Qudāmah follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh with respect to the distance between Malal and al-Sayālah and on the existence of wells there, but agrees with Ibn Rostch in regarding al-Shajarah as the stop immediately after Medina. As to the distance between Malal and al-Shajarah, he also assesses it at twelve miles. The information about Malal's numerous wells of fresh water recurs in al-Idrīsī who assumes the distance between al-Sayālah and Malal to be seventeen miles and that between Malal and al-Shajarah twelve miles. He states that the latter is the point at which the pilgrims emerging from Medina have to start performing their

\textsuperscript{1} Ibn Khurradadhbeh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 130.

\textsuperscript{2} Al-Ya'qūbī, \textit{Buldān}, p. 313.
pilgrimage rites.¹

Al-Bakrī implies that the distance between Malal and al-Sayālalah is seven miles² and that between Malal and Medina twenty-two miles.³ He also mentions a place called al-Hufair (the Egyptian edition prefers the form al-Hufain,⁴ in one place, and al-Jafīr in another,⁵ but the correct form is al-Hufair or al-Ḥufairah which is followed by the European edition). Al Bakrī himself varies the spelling of other names. A well with ten cisterns at three miles from Malal and which he correctly attributes, in one entry, to Abū Hishām,⁶ is called in another entry the spring of Banū Hāshim,⁷ a mountain situated on this region is called Ṣafar in one passage,⁸ and Ḍafir in another.⁹ Yāqūt in his Muʿjam calls it both

---

2. Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, p. 1258, see Wākī', Manāzil, fol. 46.
3. Ibid., p. 465.
4. Ibid., p. 954.
5. Ibid., p. 465.
7. Ibid., p. 113.
9. Ibid., p. 878.
Saghar\(^1\) and Safar.\(^2\) It is the latter which is to be regarded as the correct form. Al-Bakrī is doubtful whether to use Yain or Bain for a place which he describes as a village of Medina, and the residence of a notable Quraishi. Relying on a MS. of al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, Prof. al-Saqqā has وَعَظُ الَّذِي يَقَالُ لِمَ غَرْيَرٍ (= this Quraishi) but the European edition seems less erroneous in reading وهي التي يقال لها غريـر (= the village).\(^3\) It is clear from the author's own immediately following comment that what he has in mind is a place, as he says: they may be two places. غُرِيَّـر here is no doubt a corruption of i.e. "the valley of Yain". Both al-Bakrī\(^4\) and Yāqūt\(^5\) quote Abū Ziyād when speaking of Turbān near Malal, but Yāqūt uses "Barthān"\(^6\) in another entry. Yāqūt subjects Yain to the same treatment. In a passage which should read "the valley of Yain", Yāqūt says مر بين ملأ و... "Marr which is between Malal and ...."\(^7\) In

2. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 400.
4. Ibid., p. 308.
6. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 547.
another entry it is called Marayain.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 3, p. 372.} Another passage shows the correct spelling: Yain or Marr Yain.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 4, p. 1046.}

Speaking of a hill near Malal, al-Bakrī calls it 'Adhbah ə画面, in one entry,\footnote{Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 926.} and 'Udnah in another.\footnote{Ibid., p. 1358.} 'Abbūd which al-Bakrī correctly locates between al-Furaish and Malal is called by Yaqūt 'Abbūd\footnote{Yaqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 3, p. 306.} and 'Attūd.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 3, p. 612.} Ghamīs al-Ḥamām which occurs in its correct spelling in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam\footnote{Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 957.} has become in Yaqūt: 'Amīs al-Ḥamām,\footnote{Yaqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 3, p. 731.} Ghamīs al-Ḥamā'īm, Ṣukhairāt al-Ḥamām,\footnote{Ibid., vol. 3, p. 875.} and Thumāmah.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 2, p. 329.} However, he by no means excludes the proper spelling.\footnote{Ibid., vol. 3, p. 816.}

Naṣr, who is usually very meticulous, is responsible for one of Yaqūt's mistakes about Yain.\footnote{Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 57b.}
As for Turbān, al-Ḥufair, Ghamīs al-Ḥamām and Yain, in its entry, Nasr is correct. He describes Yain as a dependency of Medina at a distance of one postal stage from it.

As to Malal itself, Ibn al-Sikkīt states that it is a halt between Medina and Mecca, at a distance of twenty-eight miles from Medina. Ibn al-Kalbī tries to trace the derivation of the name Malal to the account in which the Tubba' gave the place that name because he was tired and bored. Al-Bakrī, on the other hand, attributes to Kuthayyir the statement that people in general were tired when they reached that place, hence the name "Malal". Describing Malal, al-Bakrī states that it lies on the left hand side of the travellers from Medina to Mecca on a diversion which is shorter than the conventional route. He relates that it has several public wells, which he attributes to the caliphs 'Uthmān, Marwān, al-Mahdi, al-Makhlū' (= al-ʿAmin) and al-Wāthiq.

1. Ibid., fol. 37.
2. Ibid., fol. 57a.
3. Ibid., fol. 57b.
4. Ibid., fol. 30.
5. Yaqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 637.
6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1258, see Waki', Manāzil, fol. 46.
Only one well is named after a tree; which is al-Sidrah.\(^1\) 

Al-Zamakhshari\(i\) relates that Ibn Udhainah, the poet, used to live in Turbān, which he locates on the pilgrim route between Malal and al-Sayālah.\(^2\) 'Iyāḍ situates Malal at a distance of eighteen miles from Medina, but quotes Ibn Waḍḍāh's assessment of that distance at twenty-two miles.\(^3\) Al-Samhūdī attributes to Kuthayyir another etymological explanation of the name Malal deriving it from the boredom \(مَلَأٌ\) felt by its inhabitants.\(^4\) The same derivation is attributed to Kuthayyir by Wakī', who also describes Malal as a place with numerous wells and cisterns. The distances from Malal are six miles to al-Ḥufair, seven miles to al-Sayālah and sixteen miles to Medina. It is obvious that al-Asadī, on whom al-Bakrī relies, has borrowed Makī',\(^5\)’s description of Malal.

---

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1258.
3. 'Iyāḍ, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 344.
5. Wakī', Manāzil, fol. 46.
AL-MARR

Only three Arab geographers of the early period mention al-Marr as a stop between al-Marwah and Medina. Ibn Khurrawadbeh locates it between al-Marwah, to the north and 'al-Suwaidā' to the south. So does Ibn Rosteh and Wākī. Al-Bakrī makes no mention of it in his Masālik. In al-Mu'jam, he speaks of it only when locating Balaqīth which, as he says, lies between al-Marr and al-Shabakah near Birmah above Khaibar on the Egyptian inland route to Medina. He also says that al-Shabakah is among the dependencies of Medina. He does not quote a source, but a statement implying this piece of information is attributed in Yāqūt's Mu'jam, to Ibn Ḥabīb. Yāqūt also states that al-Ḥazimī calls it al-Murr and locates it in the centre of 'Iṣam valley. According to some reports, Yāqūt says, it is the centre of that valley.

1. Ibn Khurrawadbeh, op. cit., p. 150.
6. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 495.
Al-Idrīsī enumerates al-Marr among the way-stations on the inland route between Ailah and Medina. He also locates it to the south of Dhul-Marwah and to the north of al-Suwayda'. He calls it Marr.¹

¹ Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
In his version of the conventional route from Medina to Mecca, Ibn Khurradadhbeh locates Marr al-Zahrān, which he calls Baṭn Marr, and describes as having a spring and a cistern, at thirty-three miles from 'Usfān and sixteen miles from Mecca.\(^1\) Al-Ya'qūbī's information is identical with Ibn Khurradadhbeh's except for the distances which are omitted, and the addition that it is inhabited by B. Kinānah. According to him, Marr al-Zahrān is a dependency of Mecca and some of its springs and properties are in the hands of Meccans. Al-Ya'qūbī calls it Marr al-Zahrān in the two passages, and Baṭn Marr in another.\(^2\) Ibn Rosteh's location coincides with Ibn Kurradadhbeh's, but the distance from 'Usfān to Marr al-Zahrān, which he calls Baṭn Marr, is calculated as thirty-four miles, and that between Marr al-Zahrān and Mecca as fifteen miles, i.e. three miles from Marr al-Zahrān to the burial place of Maimūnah - the Prophet's wife who was buried at Sarif -, six more miles to the Mosque of 'Aishah and then a further six miles to Mecca. As to the village itself, Ibn Rosteh describes it as very large and prosperous,

\(^1\) Ibn Khurradadhbeh, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

densely inhabited, abounding in farms and palm groves and with a cistern which draws its water supply from a neighbouring mountain.\footnote{1} Qudāmah concurs with Ibn Khurradadhbeh with respect to location, and with Ibn Rosteh on the distance from Maimūnah's burial place to Mecca, but assesses the distance from Marr al-Zahrān— he calls it Baṭn Marr—to Maimūnah's burial place at four miles, and to 'Usfān at sixteen miles. According to Qudāmah, Marr al-Zahrān is a village of considerable size, densely populated with farms, palm trees and a cistern of running water.\footnote{2}

\[\text{Al-Mas'udī records the story of the Khuzā'ah who, on leaving the Yemen, stayed at Marr when their cousins went farther north.}\] \footnote{3} Al-Muqaddasi describes Marr as a point near Mecca where custom were collected from caravans.\footnote{4} According to him Marr is nearly equidistant from Mecca, Jiiddah and 'Usfān as it is separated from each by one day's journey.\footnote{5} It is to be noted that all the above-mentioned geographers call it Baṭn Marr except,

\footnote{1} Ibn Rosteh, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 178.
\footnote{2} Qudāmah, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 187.
\footnote{3} Al-Mas'udī, \textit{Tanbīh}, p. 249.
\footnote{4} Al-Muqaddasi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 105.
\footnote{5} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 105.
for one occasion, on which al-Ya'qūbī calls it Marr al-Zahrān. 'Arrām, venturing on an explanation, differentiates between Marr the village itself and al-Zahrān the valley.¹ So does Naṣr who probably relies on him.² According to 'Arrām, there are some "named" villages between 'Usfān and Marr one of which is called Masāḥah and another called Mudrakah (Madrakah), both large and rich in water and palm groves. As to Marr itself, he describes it as a valley possessing many springs and groves of palm and sycamore trees جميزة. 'Arrām points out that it is inhabited by the tribes of Ḥudail and Ghādirah. Naṣr's information about these tribes coincides with that of 'Arrām. Al-Hamdānī states that the surroundings of Mecca, among which is Marr al-Zahrān, are inhabited by Khusā'ah and Quraish.³ In one passage he locates Marr in the lower region of Mecca;⁴ in another, he places it at thirteen miles from Mecca and twenty-threc from 'Usfān, adding that its latitude is, 21°.9.⁵ Idrīṣī's location and his assessment of the distances are

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 415.
3. Al-Hamdānī, Ṣifah, p. 120.
4. Ibid., p. 179.
5. Ibid., p. 185.
identical with that of Ibn Khurrazadhabeh. al-Idrīṣī also calls it Baṭn Marr. As to Baṭn Marr itself, al-Idrīṣī says that it is the first way-station after Mecca in the direction of Medina. He mentions a spring surrounded by palm groves and some properties. He also mentions some minor palm groves to which some Arabs repair.\(^1\) In another MS, the description runs as follows: "It is a way-station with a spring in a sandy valley surrounded by a few palms to which some Arabs repair".\(^2\)

Wakī' fails to describe Baṭn Marr and limits himself here to its distances. They are twenty-three miles to 'Usfān, four to the well of al-Biḥār, thirteen to Mecca, seven to Sarif, ten to al-Tanīm, twelve to the mosque of 'Ishah and fourteen to Fakhkh which lies at two miles from the great mosque of Micca. Wakī' seems to assume that Mecca stretches three miles from the mosque in the direction of Medina, since he assesses the overall distance from Baṭn Marr to Mecca as thirteen miles which is three miles less than the sum of his details.\(^3\) Mecca is unlikely to have stretched so far in the 9th century.

---

1. Al-Idrīṣī, op. cit., fol. 34.
2. MS2221, fol. 63.
3. Wakī', Manāzīl, fol. 53.
Al-Bakrī calculates the distance between 'Usfān and Marr as twenty-three miles, and that from Marr to Mecca as thirteen miles. ¹ In another passage, his calculation of the last-mentioned distance is sixteen miles. ² He says that Rābigh is a place in Marr where he also situates Majannah, at a distance of a few miles from Mecca. ³ Rābigh, however, is too far from Majannah to be located in the same valley. Rābigh is situated near al-Marāq, not Marr. ⁴ Al-Bakrī describes Baṭn Marr as the valley upon which the waters of the two Nakhlah abut. ⁵ He also borrows 'Arrām's statement about Marr al-Zahrān, but attribute it to al-Ṣakūnī, a transmitter of 'Arrām. ⁶ Al-Bakrī quotes Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib to the effect that Marr al-Zahrān was once the dwelling place of the 'Akk. He claims that Kuthayyir ascribes the name Marr to the bitter taste murr ٍٍٍٍ of its

---

¹. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 957.
2. Ibid., p. 1212.
3. Ibid., p. 628.
4. Ibid., p. 1187.
5. Ibid., p. 1006.
6. Ibid., p. 1304.
7. Ibid., p. 787.
water;\(^1\) and Ābū Ghassān to two letters inscribed in the rock on a small hill there which resemble the letters in the word mār.\(^2\) The first theory which also recorded by Wāqī', is untrue and the last is archaic.

Ya'qūt\(^3\) attributes to Ābū Zaid the statement found in al-Īṣṭakhrī's Māṣālik\(^4\) to the effect that the valley of Sitārah lies between 'Uṣfān and Marr. The printed work of Ibn Hauql does not contain this statement, but a MS. of his work does.\(^5\) Ibn ʻAbbās is quoted as saying that Marr is situated in the vicinity of Mecca.\(^6\) Al-ʻAsmaʻī mentions that the fair of Majannah used to take place during the ten days before pilgrimage day and maintains that Majannah lies in Marr, on one occasion,\(^7\) and describes it as a mountain in the exclusive territories of B. Di'l in Tihāmah. Al-ʻAqīḍī\(^8\) and al-ʻAsadī\(^9\)

1. Ibid., p. 1257, see Wāqī', Manāzil, fol. 53.
2. Ibid., p. 1212.
6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 943.
8. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 494.
locate Marr at five miles' distance and at seventeen respectively from Mecca. Al-Asadī adds that, in Marr, there is a mosque at the place where the Prophet once prayed; and a cistern, thirty cubits in length, mostly filled with rain water but sometimes by a spring called al-'Aqīq. Al-Asadī points out that this cistern is flanked by two wells. 'Iyāḏ believes that both Marr and Marr al-Ẓahrān are acceptable names for this locality, and places al-Ẓahrān itself at twelve miles' distance from Mecca. However, he records Ibn Ḫaydāh's assessment of this distance as twenty-one miles and the claim by others that it is sixteen miles only.\footnote{Iyāḏ, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 286.} It is possible that only the last-mentioned assessment refers to the distance from Marr to Mecca, while the former refers to that from Marr to 'Uṣfān. 'Iyāḏ also quotes Ibn Ḫaydāh when saying that this locality is called Marāzahrān by some.

Al-Sam'ānī states that there is a village called al-Ẓihran الزهران near Mecca which is not identical with either Marr al-Ẓahrān or Baṭn Marr,\footnote{Al-Sam'ānī, Insāb, p. 377.} a statement rejected by Yāqūt.\footnote{Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 3, p. 582.} Al-Sam'ānī ḪZihran could be identified
with al-Zāhir الزاهر, which al-Zamakhsharī describes as the watering place nearest to Mecca on the route to Yanbu' (and Medina).\(^1\) It is now known to be one of the fashionable quarters of the city. Al-Zamakhsharī also states that Baţn Marr is the point at which the waters of the two valleys of Nakhlah converge.\(^2\) He borrows al-Iṣma'i's description of Majannah.\(^3\) Of Marr al-Zahrān, al-Zamakhsharī says that it lies in Tihāmah near 'Arafāt (‘Arafah).\(^4\)

Marr al-Zahrān is now called Wādī Fātimah.

---

2. Ibid., p. 13.
3. Ibid., p. 33.
DHUL-MARWAH

This is an important locality in the Northern Hijaz not only because of its paramountcy among the way-stations of the ancient trade route through Arabia to Syria, but also because it kept its importance in the early period of Islam and was used as a main halt on the pilgrim routes from Egypt and Syria. It is mentioned in the campaigns of the Prophet as dominated by a friendly tribe, Juhainah, who gave shelter to the Muslim scouts, and who were given in recompense a large area as an ḍālī from the Prophet. It is recorded, however, that the Prophet prayed to Allah that He should restrain the Juhainîs from vexing the pilgrims and vice versa.

The Arab geographers of the early period gave attention to Dhul-Marwah. Ibn Khurradadhbeh describes it as a dependency of Medina, and locates it between al-Ruḥaibah (al-Ruḥbah) to the north and al-Marr to the south when listing the stops of both the Egyptian and

2. Ḥamīdullāh, op. cit., p. 140.
the Syrian caravans.\(^1\) Al-Ya'qūbī locates it on the inland route between Madyan and Medina, south of al-Suqāya and north of Dhū Khushub.\(^2\) Ibn Rosteh says that it is a dependency of Medina,\(^3\) and places it between al-Ruḥbah and al-Marr on both the Syrian and the Egyptian routes to Medina.\(^4\) Qudāmah also says that it is one of the dependencies of Medina.\(^5\) He locates it between al-Ruḥaibah (al-Ruḥbah) and al-Suwaida\(ā\) when listing the way-stations on the inland route between Egypt and Mecca.\(^6\) Al-Mas'ūdī says that the route from al-Marwah runs between al-'Īs and the sea at a distance of one night's journey from al-'Īs.\(^7\) He seems to have in mind the ancient trade route between Mecca and Syria. In another passage he indicates that the distance between al-Marwah and Medina is three postal stages\(^8\) which is unthinkable though

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 150.
\(^2\) Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldānī, p. 341.
\(^3\) Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 177.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 183.
\(^5\) Qudāmah, op. cit., p. 248.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 190.
\(^7\) Mas'ūdī, Tanbīh, p. 253.
\(^8\) Ibid., p. 266.
al-Maqrīzī concurs. It may also be a scribe's error, as al-Bakrī assesses the distance at eight postal stages.

Al Hamdānī says of al-Marwah that it is in the land of Juhainah. He also says that two routes lead from Medina to Wādī al-Qurā, one of which passes al-Marwah. He assumes the distance between it and Medina as two days' journey with al-Suwa'idā' as the only halt. He states that the palm groves of al-Marwah are in Uwāl. The inhabitants of al-Marwah are the B. Ja'far, Mawalī and a variety of people. He also says that Balakith lies between al-Marwah and Shabakat al-Daum, a dependency of Medina. Throughout his book he calls the place al-Marwah except in one passage where he uses the form Dhul-Marwah. Al-Iṣṭakhrī mentions al-Marwah in connection with al-'Ushairah and an Egyptian inland route to Medina. Ibn Ḥauqal does not refer to it except when following
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al-Iṣṭakhrī about the inland route.\(^1\) Neither author does more than register its name giving al-Marwah only, and omitting Dhul.

Al-Muqaddasi\(^2\) says that Khaibar, al-Marwah and al-Haurā' are the only towns in the Khaibar region.\(^2\) He describes al-Marwah as a principal town of Mecca,\(^3\) and a dependency of Medina.\(^4\) He uses the term al-Marwah without Dhū throughout his book, and locates al-Marwah to the south of al-Suqyā at a distance of one day's journey, and to the north of al-Ḥa'dan in one direction and al-Suwaidā' in another as equidistant from both at two days' journey.\(^5\) In describing al-Marwah, al-Muqaddasi\(^6\) says that it is

"a strongly fortified town abounding in palm trees and excellent dates. A wide canal supplies it with drinking water. It is surrounded by a ditch and guarded by iron gates. It abounds in bdellium (= chamaeops humilis) and an excellent variety of dates known as Burdi (Barnī). The town is hot in summer. It is dominated by B. Ja'far".

He mentions the Burdi (Barnī) dates and the bdellium of al-Marwah again when speaking of the specialities of the

---
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different parts of Arabia. He says that between al-Marwah and Yanbu' there are gold mines and "between al-Marwah and al-Ḥaurā', there was once a fire which blazed like burning coal." He is, however, by no means pleased with everything in the town which he describes as "the native country of libertines."

Al-Bakrī, in his Masālik, mentions al-Marwah as a place on the route between Medina and Hilah. He locates it north of al-Suwaydā' and south of Suqyā Yazīd. In his Mu'jam, however, he locates it between Wādī al-Qurā and Dhū Khuchub. He says that it belongs to Medina and that it consists of several large villages. As to its inhabitants, al-Bakrī says that the tribes of Juhainah, Ishja' and Muzainah lived there together. In another passage, he describes it as Juhainī territory.
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quotes al-Ḥarbī when counting al-Marwah among the Mashārīf, i.e. the Arabian settlements adjoining the fertile lands. ¹ In the Masālik he calls it al-Marwah but Dhul-Marwah in al-Mu'jam. Wākī' relies on Ibn al-Ṣabbāh when listing al-Marwah among the dependencies of Medina. According to him, it belongs to the Juhainah. ² Wākī' locates al-Marwah south of 'Anāb and north of al-Marr. ³ According to Lughdah, Dhul-Marwah, which he locates between Dhū Khushub and Wādi al-Qurā in one passage, and between Birmah and 'Ain Ma'n in another, is a village of huge proportions on the route from Syria and Egypt to Medina and Mecca. Its inhabitants are of heterogeneous origin. ⁴

All al-Idrīṣī has to say about al-Marwah is that it is a dependency of Medina to which he refers as Dhul Marwah, ⁵ and he mentions it on the inland route, locating it between al-Ruhaibah and al-Marr, ⁶ calling it here Abū al-Marwah.

Al-Marwah enjoyed its importance until the
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¹ Ibid., p. 793.
² Wākī', Manāzil, fol. 40.
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Egyptian pilgrim route was finally diverted to the coast mainly because of the dangers besetting the pilgrims from the tribes of that region. Al-Marwah is now unknown, but Shaikh Hamad al-Jāsir thinks that it is identical with the ruins called Umm Zarb.¹ All the information derived from the early authors supports his conclusion.

MUNKHŪS

Al-Ya'qūbī is the first Arab geographer to record this name. He states that Munkhūs lies on the coastal route from Aidah to Mecca, and locates it south of al-Wajh and north of al-Haurā'. Besides, he is the only geographer to hint at the conditions of life in this place, as he mentions the divers there who search the sea for pearls. Qudāmah concurs with al-Ya'qūbī with respect to the location, although he changes al-Haurā' to al-Jarrah. Al-Muqaddasī mentions it twice as situated on what was then the only used route. In his version, al-Haurā' and al-Wajh are changed to al-Jarrah and al-Rahbah respectively. Wākī' locates it south of al-Wajh and north of al-Haurā'.

Al-Bakrī does not mention Munkhūs in his Masālik. Even in al-Mu'jam he refers to it only to locate al-Tajbār which is situated between "lower" al-Haurā' and Munkhūs on the trade route from Mecca to Syria. Al-Bakrī's Tajbār is correctly called al-Nukhbar in al-Wāqidi's Maghāzī.

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 657, 1168.
Munkhūs is not known in the region nowadays. However, it is tempting to identify it with Mons Hippos of Ptolemy not only because the sound of the name Munkhūs, which is not Arabic, is reminiscent of Mons Hippos, but also because there is a bay called after Habbān south of al-Wajh. Sprenger, Musil, Burton and Hogarth locate Mons Hippos north of Ḍubā, but Forster identifies it with Mt. Hassānī on one occasion, and with Mt. Hanak south of Habbān, on another. It is the latter location that seems to be correct.

Ibn Khurrahadbeh does not mention the coastal route between Ailah and Medina, so that al-Nabk does not occur in his work. Al-Ya'qūbī refers to it, assuming that it lies between al-Ṣilā in the north, and al-Quṣaibah in the south.\(^1\) His account cannot be accepted because al-Quṣaibah is actually situated to the north of al-Nabk.

Qudāmah places al-Nabk south of al-Ṣilā, and north of Ḍubā.\(^2\) Al-Muqaddasī states that there are two places in that region called al-Nabk, one being the place in question and the other between Ta'mā' and Amman.\(^3\) His account makes it very clear that al-Nabk is different from al-Ṣilā as he assesses the distance between the two localities at one day's journey.\(^4\) He also locates al-Nabk which, according to him, is one of the towns of Qurḥ, between al-Ṣilā and Ḍubā, which he calls Ḍabbah.\(^5\) Wākī' also locates it between al-Ṣilā and Ḍubā.\(^6\)
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Umayyah b. al-Ṣalt is quoted as saying that al-Nabk lies between Ḍubā, which he calls Ṭanah, and the land of Madyan, and forms part of the eastern region of Egypt.¹ Al-Bakrī makes no mention of al-Nabk in his Mu'jam, but places it in al-Masālik on the route between Hīlah and Medina. He differs from other Arab geographers not only in listing it among the way-stations of the inland route, but also in identifying it with the stopping place called al-Ṣilā.²

Later, as stated by al-Jazīrī,³ the name al-Nabk was changed to al-Muwailih which appears on the maps of the Northern Hijaz. Unfortunately, Musil had not seen al-Jazīrī's book. Otherwise, his location of al-Nabk would have been less erroneous.

---
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NAKHLAH (THE BUSTĀN OF IBN 'ĀMIR)

Al-Ya'qūbī lists Nakhlah among the dependencies of Mecca. Defining Naklah, al-Mas'ūdī says that it is identical with the Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir on the Iraqi pilgrim route, and al-Waqīdī believes that Naklah is the valley of Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān. Al-Hamdānī states that Naklah used to be inhabited by the Hudhail who were subsequently driven out by B. Sa'id with the help of 'Ujj b. Shākh, the governor of Mecca in the early 10th century A.D. He records a poem by a Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlanī, which lists Naklah, together with al-Zaimah, among the Hijazi localities. Al-Hamdānī also enumerates Naklah among the places where heathen idols were worshipped. He attributes to Sa'id b. al-Musayyib the information that Naklah is adjacent to al-Sarah, the mountain range, in the place where Mts. Khais and Yasūm mountains rise. He is followed by al-Bakrī with respect to this quotation.

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 316.
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Nakhlah is the name of two adjacent localities near Mecca, one called Nakhlah al-Yamāniyyah (the Southern), and the other Nakhlah al-Shāmiyyah (the Northern). Abu Ziyād al-Kilābī states that Nakhlah is a Hijazi valley at two nights’ distance from Mecca, and equates the Nakhlah where pilgrims from the Yemen, Najd, Oman, Bahrain, Hajar and Yabrīn meet, with al-Yamāniyyah. They meet at al-Wabā’sah (Buhaitā’) which is the topmost peak of this valley. The other Nakhlah is called al-Shāmiyyah and is identical, in his opinion, with Dhāt 'Irq on the pilgrim route from Basra and Kufa. The upper reaches of its valley belong to B. Sa’d b. Bakr to whom the Prophet was entrusted in his childhood. It abounds in groves of palm trees. Its lower reaches are called the Čustān of Ibn Āmir. Al-Sukkārī describes the two Nakhlahs as flanking Ibn Āmir’s Čustān. According to Yāqūt, al-Sakūnī describes Nakhlah as a halt, equidistant from Wajrah and Ibn Āmir’s Čustān at one day’s journey from either, which cannot be accepted. When, in another passage, Yāqūt records this quotation, he makes no mention of Nakhlah which indicates that it is identical with the Čustān. Al-Bakrī states that the expression "Baṭn Nakhlah" refers to the Nakhlah in question.

1. Yāqūt, Mu’jam, vol. 4, p. 768.
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and quotes Ibn Wallād who differentiates between the two Nakhlahs, al-Shāmiyyah, upon which the waters of al-Ghumair abut; and al-Yamāniyyah, into which the waters of Qarn al-Manāzil flow. When the waters of the two Nakhlahs mix at al-Masadd, they form the valley of Batn Marr. Al-Bakrī speaks of a battle between the Hudhail and B. Laith which took place at Naklah. Al-Hamdānī lists Batn Naklah among the watering places on the pilgrim route. Al-Zamakhsharī describes the two Nakhlahs as two Hudhailī valleys on the route to Mecca at two nights' distance from it. He seems to rely on the above-mentioned statement of Abū Ziyād when he mentions Qarn al-Manāzil and al-'Umair (al-Ghumair). In another passage, he states that the two Nakhlahs - which are valleys - converge at Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān. In a third passage, al-Zamakhsharī says that the point they meet at is Batn Marr. Al-Mas'ūdī says that the idol al-'Uzza was erected at Naklah al-Yamāniyyah, but al-Tibrizī speaks in this connection of a Naklah near Medina. Al-Hamdānī calls this idol al-Lāt.
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The correct account is that of al-Mas'ūdī. Waki' locates Nakhlah before Dhāt 'Iqr on the pilgrim route from Basra, which is incorrect, and contradicts another reference he makes when enumerating the halts on this route. In another passage, he equates it with the Bustān. This Bustān is ascribed by Waki' to B. 'Āmir, but one of his poets ascribes it to 'Umar (Ibn Ma'mar). The description of the Bustān is missing from the account of Waki', but the distance from there to Mecca is mentioned on another occasion.

In the period under consideration, Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān was even more famous than its valley, Nakhlah, mainly because it was the halting place of the Iraqi pilgrims, but also due to its connection with Ibn 'Āmir, who was born in the Prophet's time and rose to meteoric fame under 'Uthmān who appointed him governor of Basra and the East. He spent his immense wealth on irrigation and founded several settlements around his springs. Among his most famous settlements were al-Nibāj, in al-Qašīm; the Bustān of Nakhlah; the Bustān near 'Arafah; and the Bustān of al-Juhfah. It appears from his choice of places that his concern was mainly with providing fresh water for the
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pilgrims, but it cannot be excluded that he had the secondary idea of putting the land to agricultural use as there were descendants of his at Basra and at al-Nībā'ī; some hundred years later, and part at least of his property at al-Juhfah was sold by his sons to Caliph al-Walīd I. He was so popular among the people of the Hijaz and even among the caliphs that one of them, Mu‘awiyyah, a caliph known for his impassivity, asked Ibn 'Āmir, in the latter's old age, to marry the caliph's beautiful and influential young daughter. A poet related to her expresses his despair as his wait for Ibn 'Āmir's death after which the young princess would be free to marry him seemed to be long. Apparently Ibn 'Āmir was sure of his own longevity and thus the princess did not have to wait for his death; he sent her back to her father on the ground that she was too rich to need his money and he was too old to give her enjoyable company.

This story is more accurate than another story given by al-Bakrī about Ibn 'Āmir being lured to divorce a wife of his after Mu‘awiyyah hinted that he might marry the caliph's daughter. Al-Asma‘ī and Ibn al-A‘rābī are quoted by al-Balādhurī when saying that al-Bustān belonged, not to Ibn 'Āmir, but to
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Ibn Ma'mar and that only the ignorant allowed themselves to ascribe it to Ibn 'Āmir. Thus the argument about the identity of the owner of the Bustān at Nakhlah was sparked off. So effective was this criticism that even Ibn Qutaibah listed among his cardinal rules that the authors should not attribute it to Ibn 'Āmir, but to Ibn Ma'mar. Contrary to his wont, al-Batalyūsī, the commentator of Ibn Qutaibah's Adab al-Kuttāb, does not argue on this point. Indeed he goes so far as to mention that there are two places called Bustān, one in Nakhlah and the other near al-Juhfah. Of the two, only the latter can be attributed to Ibn 'Āmir, while the former must be ascribed to Ibn Ma'mar. He does not deny, however, that Ibn 'Āmir won legitimate fame by his successful irrigation projects. Al-Bakrī, Nasr and Yāqūt all stress this claim, though ironically none of them dare call it Bustān Ibn Ma'mar except on the authority of al-Asma'i and Ibn al-A'rabī. Even so, they attribute it to Ibn Ma'mar only once or twice. Instead, they seem to defy these two scholars on almost every occasion. Yāqūt seems suspicious of the accuracy of Ibn al-A'rabī's and al-Asma'i's statement, since he refers the reader under Ibn
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'Āmir's Bustān to the entry on Ibn Ma'mar's Bustān. In the latter's entry he states that it is wrong to call it "Ibn 'Āmir's", a mistake he himself already has committed if his judgement were true. Al-Zamakhshari ascribes it in one passage, to Ibn 'Āmir and to Ibn Ma'mar in another, without accounting for the contradiction. Indeed, he uses both names in a single passage. Apart from the hesitation of these authors, little attention has been paid to al-Asma'ī or Ibn al-'Arābī in this regard. All Arab geographers attribute it to Ibn 'Āmir or Banū 'Āmir. Besides, al-Zubairī states very clearly that al-Juhfah "belonged" to Ibn 'Āmir who also "owned" Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān of Nakhlah at one day's journey from Mecca. Most acceptable and likely are the accounts of the geographers, some of whom are officials, and that of al-Zubairī who is well informed about people and places in the Hijaz.

As to the Bustān itself, Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh locates it at a distance of twenty-two miles from Dhāt 'Iraq with the Ghāmr of Dhū Kindah half way between both. He assesses the distance between the Bustān and Mecca at twenty-four miles, adding that water is abundant at the Bustān. Al-Ya'qūbī gives the same location, but places Dhāt 'Iraq between Chamrah and the Bustān.
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Ibn Rosteh follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh with respect to the location and mileage, but adds that the Bustān is densely populated and that it gets its water through a canal. All three attribute it to Banū 'Āmir. Qudāmah attributes it to Ibn 'Āmir, and implies that it is the meeting point of Yemenite pilgrims coming from al-Futuq; and Iraqi and Najdī pilgrims coming from Dhāt 'Irq. Al-Muqaddasī situates it half-way between Mecca and Dhāt 'Irq at one day's journey from either. Al-Hamdānī states that the distance between the Bustān and Mecca is twenty-nine miles, and between the Bustān and Dhāt 'Irq twenty-four miles. He gives its degree of latitude as 21° 15'. According to him, its name is al-Bustān. He mentions another bustān = fruit gardens, which he attributes to Ibn 'Ubayd Allāh al-Hāshimi and situates it at al-Zaimah. In the reign of al-Muqtadir in the early 10th century this bustān was a very thriving estate, producing a revenue of 5000 "mithqāl dinārs." It had a fortified palace garrisoned by B. Sa'd. Its palms numbered thousands and its rich spring gushed from the valley of Nakhlah, flowed across the farm and formed a large pool. It was planted with banana and henna trees, and several sorts of vegetables. Al-Hamdānī mentions a milestone which had been erected at Sabūhah near al-Zaimah. He gives the latitude of al-Zaimah as 21° 6', which indicates
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that he does not identify al-Zaimah and the bustān of al-
Hashimi with the Bustān of Ibn 'Amir. Another indication
of this is his use of al-Zaimah for the Yemenite pilgrims
and the Bustān for Iraqi pilgrims.

Both al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal speak of the hā'it =
bustān of Ibn 'Amir which they situate at 'Arafah. Ibn Hauqal
says: "The hā'it of Banū 'Amir has palm trees and there are
palms also west of 'Arafah". Al-Istakhri says: "The hā'it
of Banū 'Amir are palms at 'Arafah". What they have in mind
is clearly the Ibn 'Amir's Bustān near 'Arafah. Abū al-Fidā'
describes this hā'it as one of the borders of 'Arafah and
locates it near the great local mosque. He also ascribes it
to Ibn 'Amir. His source seems to be al-Shāfi'i. This hā'it
had fallen into oblivion by the time of Ibn Zuhairah of the
16th century, but the matter-of-fact style of al-Azraqī
(9th century) admits no doubt of its existence as he locates
it near al-Dahādīh where Ibn 'Amir carved a public road through
a hill. According to an account recorded by al-Fāsī, it was
more than two hā'its. In later years this hā'it was also known
as the Bustān of Ibn 'Amir. Ibn al-Athīr describes how the
pilgrims fled to Ibn 'Amir's Bustān when fighting broke out
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between the troops and the governor of Mecca at Minā in 295 A.H. (908 A.D.). It is difficult to imagine pilgrims having to seek refuge in so remote a place as Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān of Nakhlah. A more probable alternative is that of 'Arafah where they could have waited until the fight had died down and then gone back to complete their pilgrimage rites.

'Arrām's statement about Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān needs detailed consideration. It runs as follows:

Then (after what appears to be Marr al-Zahrān) you descend to B.h.r.n. (or Kh.r.i.n.), then you proceed to descend to Mecca from a hill called al-Jafjaf. And in Najd on the border of Mecca there lies a valley (this is the reading suggested by Shaikh H. al-Jāsir. According to Yāqūt, however, 'Arrām says: 'And you descend to the borders of Mecca through a valley') called the valley of Turabah whose waters abut upon the Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir. The lower region of Turabah belongs to B. Hilāl. Around it stand Mts. al-Saratā, Yasūm and Qirqīd, and also the Birām mine and the two mountains of Shuwān. . . .The route from Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān passes through Qafal, a hill from which you ascend to the Qarn of al-Manāzil near Taif. (al-Bakrī records it as: مَجَال الطَّائِفَةَ and then the mountains of Taif.) And among the mountains of Mecca there are Ābū Qubais, al-Safā, the Red Mountain, al-Hailā', al-Marwah and Thabīr which faces Mt. Hirā'. None has water. Then the mountains of 'Arafāt ('Arafah) join that of Taif which have plenty of water running through canals, one of which is al-Mushāsh which gushes from 'Arafāt and flows into Mecca. And from Qu'aiqi'ān to Mecca (an addition borrowed by the editor from Yāqūt) the distance is twelve miles on the Hauf (Jauf in Yāqūt) route from the Yemen. Qu'aiqi'ān is a village with water, palms, corn-fields and fruit. It is al-Yamāniyyah."

confusion. It is exceedingly difficult to pinpoint all the errors, some at least of which go back to a pre-eleventh century MS. With the passage of time, the MSS have become laden with what their copyists and readers think to be corrections. There is good reason to assume that some mis-statements are due to a misplacement of some folios. How else could it have happened that 'Arrām, speaking of Marr al-Zahrān in Tihāmah, suddenly shifts to Turabah in the Hijaz, or even in Najd according to some authors, and also suddenly goes back to Tihāmah? Al-Bakrī quotes a passage from 'Arrām's work in which Qarn al-Manāzil is followed by the mountains of Taif which are followed by the mountains of 'Arafah; an indication that the description of the mountains of Mecca has been misplaced in the available MS. of 'Arrām's text. Al-Bakrī himself seems to be sceptical about the beginning of the statement. Therefore he simply says: "Then after Marr al-Zahrān you descend in the direction of Mecca where you encounter a hill called the valley of Turabah whose water flows into Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān. The lower region of Turabah belongs to B. Hilāl." This correction is no less archaic than the mistake it tries to rectify. Moreover, the correction made by 'Arrām's editor on the authority of Shaikh H. al-Jāsir cannot be accepted, because the waters of the Turabah valley flow eastward and not westward. Besides, there is the huge mountain range of al-Sarāh which divides Turabah from Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān. Nor
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can Yāqūt's version be accepted. Moreover, the traveller from Marr al-Zahrān does not descend into Mecca. Indeed he ascends almost constantly as Marr al-Zahrān is in the lower region of Mecca.

'Ārrām, being a native of the area, could hardly have been responsible for the error contained in the statement by locating Qu'āiqi'ān at a distance of twelve miles from Mecca in the very middle of which it actually stands. Nor can the description of Quāiqi'ān as a village with water, palms, cornfields and "Yemenite fruit", be taken at its face value. The editor attributes to Yāqūt the claim that "Yamāniyyah" is a description of the fruit, but in fact it simply refers to Nakhlah al-Yamāniyyah the description of which has no doubt been lost. Al-Bakrī locates Hunain at a distance of twelve miles from Mecca in his Masālik, but at twelve to fifteen miles from Mecca in al-Mu'jam where he adds that it has water. He refers to it as the valley of Taif, which he inadvertently confuses with Wajj, the famous valley of Taif. Could Qu'āiqi'ān be a misplacement of Hunain?

Similarly, the valley whose water flows into Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān is not Turabah, but is actually called Sabūhah which was known to many authors of that time, including al-Hamdānī, al-Zamakhsharī, Nasr and Yāqūt. Even al-Bakrī mentions it,
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2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 471, 1370.
5. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 3, p. 35.
though he substitutes al-Yaman for al-Yamāniyyah. The mountains which 'Arrām has allegedly grouped around Turabah are in fact not to be found there. They are found around Nakhlah as stated by al-Handānī, al-Bakrī and Yāqūt. The passage about Turabah may well have been shifted from its original place among the Hijazi localities because another place name has been corrupted to Turabah.

Yāqūt attributes to 'Arrām information not found in the latter's text about Turabah's being at two days' distance from Mecca. This cannot be accepted because 'Arrām is unlikely to have recorded so short a distance. The suggestion that 'Arrām's Turahab is a Turabah of Tihāmāh different from its famous Hijazi namesake is equally unacceptable, because 'Arrām mentions its inhabitants, B. Hilāl, who cannot have lived except in the Hijaz. The inhabitants of the area around the Bustān long before 'Arrām's time, the early 9th century, down to the present day, have always belonged to the Hudhlail tribe, except for a short time after 'Arrām when the B. Sa'id and B. Laith dominated it. Unless a new source or MS. appears, there can be no absolute and final say as to how 'Arrām dictated the above-mentioned statement. What alone is certain is that this statement, in its present shape, could not have emanated from 'Arrām himself. There are some possibilities suggested by parts of this statement which should be taken
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separately because it would be futile in the extreme to attempt rearranging it as a whole. Some sentences admit of more than one attempt at correction, all of which are mutually exclusive. It is not the fault of the editor that so confused a text has been handed down. Be this as it may, it is an advantage to have 'Ārrām's work, whatever its state.

The first problem presented by the statement is how to read B.h.r.n. or Kh.r.i.n. If we accept that this sentence still occupies its original place in the text, then the best choice is خرتين Khairatain, namely those two mountains which according to Nasr, lie between Marr al-Zahrān and Mecca, the part facing Marr being hill حَل = free for all to hunt, and the part facing al-Mudairah is haram حرم a sanctuary. If one accepts this, Jafjaf جفيف may be also accepted with a slight alteration in spelling, as Nasr, in reliance on al-Sukkārī says that the mountains of Mecca are called جَبَابَج Jabājib. As, however, 'Ārrām is unlikely to have suggested that travellers descend from Marr al-Zahrān to Mecca, the possibility cannot be excluded that this sentence has been shifted from its original place i.e. east of Mecca on the route to Taif or Najd. If this is assumed, حرسن could be read داربہ Darībah, الظریبه al-Dara'ib, or زریب Dari'ibah, three names for one locality on the Najdī route to Mecca. The form given by the Egyptian edition for حرسن is not very helpful, but the editor observes that al-Maimanī, in

2. Ibid., fol. 40.
his Indian edition, has read it al-tarīq which is not very remote from al-tarīb. Yaqtūt states that al-Darā'iib is a locality separated from Marr al-Zahrān by a pass, a statement implying that 'Arrām's text may read so; al-Bakrī says: "al-Zuraiibah (al-Darāb) is a place in al-shām" which suggests that his source might have been speaking of al-Shāmiyyah (northern Nakhlah), especially as he states that a wealthy Meccan, Sa'id b. al-'Asī died there, and also quotes Ibn Ishāq to the effect that al-Zuraiibah lies in the Taif region where Sa'id had an estate. Yaqtūt follows Ibn Ishāq in this matter. In a third passage, Yaqtūt maintains that the waters of the Darāb valley abut upon Dhāt 'Irq. If such a reading is accepted, then Jafjaf should read Ghabghab, described by Ibn al-Kalbī as the sacrificial place of the idol al-'Uzza at Nakhlah. It could also read Jabjab which, according to Ibn al-'Irābī, is a mountain near 'Ukāz, not very far from Nakhlah. Bahrain, a spring in Marr al-Zahrān, cannot be accepted without assuming that this sentence is cut off from the rest of the statement, and that a preposition, في or ب, is missing. Moreover, there is no proof that it was known at the time of 'Arrām by this name as Wakī' calls it al-Bihar.

6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 364.
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As to the passage which reads, in Shaikh H. al-Jāsir's revision "and in Najd in the borders of Mecca lies a valley" or according to Yaqūt's reading "and you descend to the borders of Mecca through a valley" which is acceptable to the editor "called the valley of Turabah", it is difficult to accept either of the two readings in clear conscience. It is tempting to read ونجد ككب as ونجد درني حمك = and in the Najd of Kabkab" or = in the Najd of Mecca, because al-Bakrī, relying on the authority of both al-Akhfash and al-Tūsī, locate this Najd near 'Arafah. The Jāhilī poet Imru' al-Qais places the Najd of Kabkab near 'Arafah; al-Hamdānī mentions Najd of al-Hill which is identical with that of Kabkab. Al-Jafjaf جفجف could also read Kabkab ككب, but it must be supposed that Turabah is a corruption of a place name which fits this location. The valley of Turabah تربة could easily be a corruption of the valley of 'Uranah عرنة which lies near both 'Arafah and Kabkab. This assumption, however, would only be correct if Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān, upon which the waters of that valley abut, is not that of Nakhlalah, but the other Bustān in 'Arafah which is known to absorb some waters of the 'Uranah valley. This solution requires also that this sentence should be regarded as separate from its following sentence not only because B. Hilāl did not live in that region, but also because Mts. Yasūm, Qīrqīqīd and Shuwaḥ as well as the Biram mine are situated nearer to Ibn
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'Āmir's Bustān of Nakhlah than to 'Arafah.

Thus it is advisable to look for an alternative reading. One of the possibilities is Zaimah which seems to be a more likely name for that valley than Turabah as it lies near Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān at Nakhlah, the more so as the waters of the valley of al-Zaimah flow into the village of al-Zaimah near which the Bustān is situated. Jafjaf would then read Ghabghab as it lies nearest to al-Zaimah of all the above-mentioned places. However, it is highly likely, that the mention of Jafjaf is misplaced and should form part of another passage. If the reading of al-Zaimah is accepted, it will fit in conveniently with Mts. Yasūm, Qirqid and Shuwān. What militates against it is that B. Hilāl lived far from Nakhlah. So does the fact that the Birām mine lies at some distance from Nakhlah as it is actually situated south of Taif. Besides, the route from Marr al-Zahrān to Mecca does not lead through al-Zaimah.

Were it not for the statement that the valley of Turabah whose waters flow into Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān is inhabited by the B. Hilāl who lived in the eastern Turabah, it would be possible to accept the whole passage in its original wording. There is a mention in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam of the Qarn of Turabah, whose inhabitants are the A'jāz of the Hawāzin, which implies that this Qarn is not very distant from the Sulaimān territories. It is a vague notion, but then there is not much certainty about any of the above suggestions. If the Qarn of Turabah

---
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were identical with the Qarn of al-Manāzil, whose waters abut upon Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān of Nakhlah, the statement in question would be at least partly correct. Al-Hamdānī also maintains that the territories of the Hawāzin lie between Tabālah and Nakhlah, but he does not state exactly which Nakhlah he has in mind. This statement forms part of al-Hamdānī's comment on a verse referring to Nakhlah with a distinctly Najdī landscape as he describes the hamd plant which does not grow in the region of Bustān Ibn 'Āmir. He also mentions salt marshes which are of rare occurrence in the Tihāmī Nakhlah. The poet himself seems to locate it near Dhū Ṭuwa which, according to al-Asma’ī lies on the Taif route and which al-Bakrī, apparently misled by this statement, places between Mecca and Taif. There is also the Biram mine which actually lies south of Taif, and the famous valley of Sabūhah which 'Ārrām could not possibly pass over in silence if he were dealing with the region of Nakhlah.

'Ārrām's mention of Mt. Shuwa‘n, or rather of the two Mts. Shuwa‘n in the proximity of Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān seems to have encouraged some authors to jump to the conclusion that the waters of the valley of Shuwa‘n flow into the region of al-Juhfah which contains another of Ibn 'Āmir's Bustāns. Moreover, the existence of the valley of Uthāl near Ibn
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'Amir's Bustān of al-Juhfah, has led to the mistaken assumption that Uthāl lies between Ibn 'Amir's Bustān of Nakhlah and al-Ghumair. Actually Shuwān is nearer to Ibn 'Amir's Bustān of Nakhlah than to Ibn 'Amir's Bustān of al-Juhfah contrary to the Uthāl valley. As to the hill of Qafal, it is called Jabal by al-Hamdatī, Qafīl by al-Bakrī and al-Zamakhsharī, and Hamal by Nasr. A Qafīlah mentioned by al-Azraqī lies too far from Qarn al-Manāzil to be identifiable with Qafal.

Yāqūt mentions a certain Nakhlah of Mahμūd at one day's distance from Mecca and al-Zamakhsharī regards Nakhlah as an entity separate from al-Nakhlatain (the two Nakhlahs), for he assigns to each its own entry. Obviously the two entries should be treated as one. As to the Mahμūd's Nakhlah, it is unknown.

CONCLUSION

The names Nakhlah, Bātn Nakhlah, Nakhlatān and Wādī Nakhlah all denote one locality, namely the valley at which the Bustān of Ibn 'Amir is situated. Prior to Islam and for
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at least half a century after the Hijrah, this valley was called by one or another of these four names. Later, however, it became known as "the Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir", and became the last major halt before Mecca on the pilgrim routes from Kufa, Basra, Najd and the Yemen. The controversy on whether it was Ibn 'Āmir or Ibn Ma'war to whom this Bustān belonged has been also discussed. It appears that its real owner was Ibn 'Āmir but some scholars tend to exclude him as he also had other bustāns, one near 'Arafah and the other near al-Juhfah. This, however, should not argue against his having owned also this Bustān, especially as al-Zubairī, a well-informed Hijazī scholar, states that it was Ibn 'Āmir to whom the Bustān of Makhlah as well as that of al-Juhfah belonged. Besides, geographers and route-mappers ascribe it to either Ibn 'Āmir or his descendants.

'Ārrām's reference to the Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir is extremely confused and consequently unreliable in its present state. Several suggestions have been made in order to get a clear picture of what 'Ārrām actually said. All these suggestions concern alterations in the statement allegedly ascribed to 'Ārrām. There is little doubt that scribal mistakes have rendered this part of 'Ārrām's work wholly chaotic in the available MS. as well as in the quotations attributed to him or his transmitters by both al-Bakrī and Yaqūt. This confusion is not limited to this part of 'Ārrām's work, since there are numerous mis-statements on many other localities
in the entire region covered by his work.

It has also been seen that 'Arrān's location of both Mts. Shuwaḥ near Bustān Ibn 'Āmir at Nakhlah might have encouraged some scholars to locate Shuwaḥ near al-Juḥfah where the other Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir is situated. This is a perfect parallel to the manner in which Uthāl, a valley near al-Juḥfah, was located near Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān at Nakhlah.

The Nakhlah of "Mahmūd", which Yāqūt situates at one day's distance from Mecca, is unknown under that name. This location, however, suggests that it is the Nakhlah in question, and that the name "Mahmūd" is an erroneous addition due to lack of revision. Most likely Yāqūt copied a description of Nakhlah from the work of Mahmūd (al-Zamakhsharī), which consequently became Nakhlah of "Mahmūd" when Yāqūt entered it in his Mu'jam.
No Arab geographer of the period under consideration other than Waki' and al-Ya'qūbī mentions Qālis. They do so when recording the halting places on the pilgrim inland route between Hilah and Medina. In his Buldān, al-Ya'qūbī locates Qālis south of al-‘Aghrā‘ and north of Shaghb. He omits al-Kilābah, which is cited in several geographical works as being to the immediate north of Shaghb. He also omits the anonymous halt to the immediate south of al-‘Aghrā‘. Whether Qālis is to be equated with al-Kilābah itself, or with the unnamed halting place between al-‘Aghrā‘ and al-Kilābah, cannot be decided off-hand. Though Waki' locates Qālis south of Madyan and north of al-‘Agharr, south of which he locates al-Kilābah, his account is unreliable, since his list of the halts on this route is clearly mistaken with respect to Bada‘, Shaghb and Sharaf-al-Ba‘l.  

Yāqūt says that Qālis lies on the territory of the 'Udhrah tribe and was given by the Prophet to B. al-‘Abbāb of that tribe. Ibn Sa'd, who calls it Fālis,
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names, as the Ḣaḍratī holder, not B. al-Ḥabb as Yaḥūt does, but a certain al-Ḩabb, and his tribe as Sulaim, not 'Udhrāh.¹

Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh mentions Qudaid when mapping the route of the Prophet when he migrated from Mecca to Medina. On that route, he locates it north of 'Usfān and southwest of al-Kharrār. When drawing up the pilgrim route between Medina and Mecca, Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh places Qudaid between 'Usfān to the south and al-Juḥfah to the north which is also true. He describes it as a place with water and calculates the distance from Qudaid to al-Juḥfah as twenty-seven miles and from Qudaid to 'Usfān as twenty-four miles.

Al-Ya'qūbī mentions Qudaid twice, first on the Egyptian coastal route to Mecca, and second on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca. On both occasions, al-Ya'qūbī locates Qudaid south of al-Juḥfah and north of 'Usfān, but states on the second that Qudaid belongs to Khuzā'ah. Ibn Rosteh gives the same location but adds that the distance between al-Juḥfah and Qudaid is twenty miles and that between the latter and 'Usfān
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2. Ibid., p. 131.
4. Ibid., p. 313.
twenty-four miles. He also describes Qudaiḍ as a principal, densely populated and fertile village with several water wells. Ibn Rosteh implies that Qudaiḍ is not a sea port as he places it to the left of the sea.1

Qudāmah indicates that the water in Qudaiḍ is obtained by storing rain water in cisterns. He gives the distance between al-Juḥfah and Qudaiḍ as twenty-six miles and that between Qudaiḍ and 'Usfān as twenty-four miles.2 Al-Mas'ūdī mentions a place called Kudaiḍ which is not identical with Qudaiḍ, as he locates the former between Qudaiḍ and 'Usfān.3 Al-Hamdānī describes Qudaiḍ as Khuza'ī land under Meccan administration.4 He calculates its degree of latitude as 22°, and its distance from al-Juḥfah as twenty-four miles. The distance between Qudaiḍ and 'Usfān is given as twenty-three miles.5 Al-Hamdānī quotes a Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlānī, to the effect that Ḥmāj is situated between Qudaiḍ and 'Usfān.6
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Zubairî places al-Mushallal near Qudaid and adds that it is a hill. Ibn al-Sikkît calculates the distance between Qudaid and Mecca as two days' journey. 'Iyāḍ agrees with al-Zubairî as regards al-Mushallal and adds that it is a mountain from which travellers descend to Qudaid. He locates al-Mushallal between Qudaid and the sea.

Wakî' describes Qudaid as a dependency of Medina with a minbar and numerous wells, four of which are protected (from the sands) by a wooden fence. The distances from Qudaid are twenty-four miles to al-Juḥfah, twenty-three to 'Usfān, eight to Khulaisı, one and a half to the spring of al-Futūq, over two miles to the valley of Bidāl, one mile to the pass of Khulaisı, six to a mosque of the Prophet, six to Amaj, ten to al-Raūḍah, twelve to the Kāmilîyyah of Ibn Muḥriz and sixteen to al-Kadîd.

Al-Bakrî describes Qudaid as a rural community with a minbar, forming part of al-Fur' administration.

---
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In another passage, he describes it as a principal village abounding in water and groves of palm trees.\(^1\) He says that the distance from Qudaid to al-Mushallal is three miles, and to Khulais seven miles more.\(^2\) Al-Bakrī quotes "ancient" authors when saying that it was thither that the prophet Solomon was carried by the wind to meet the Queen of Shiba. He also mentions the battle between the people of Medina and the Khārijītes which took place there in 130 A.H. (748). Al-Bakrī attributes the name Qudaid to the fact that the torrential rain carves ḏā its way there;\(^3\) an explanation Wakī' and al-Bakrī, in another passage, attribute to Kuthayyir.\(^4\) Ibn al-Kalbī's derivation comes from the history of the campaign which the Tubba' mounted against Medina. According to Ibn al-Kalbī, when the Tubba' camped there, his tents were torn قدت quddat by gales.\(^5\) Hence the origin of the name. As to the location of Qudaid, the information al-Bakrī provides is irritating. In two passages it seems accurate, but in a third he places Qudaid between al-Safā and al-Marwah
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in Mecca in the vicinity of al-Mushallal which he says is there "above Qudaïd", an inconsistency obviously due to lack of revision. He adds an account of pre-Islamic rites at al-Mushallal\(^1\) without reference to his source, which is no other than Ibn al-Kalbï.\(^2\) Al-Bakrï also places al-Mushallal near Medina together with 'Azwar, but quotes Ibn al-Sikkït as his authority.\(^3\) He also places the valley of Daurän, in one passage, between Hirshä and al-Juḥfah\(^4\) and, in another, between al-Juḥfah and Qudaïd on the authority of Ibn Ḥabib.\(^5\)

Al-Idrïsï locates Qudaïd on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca. He describes it as a small fortress inhabited by a variety of Arabs who show signs of misery and rely for their livelihood on a few palm trees. He calculates the distances as twenty-four miles from 'Usfän to Qudaïd, twenty-six miles from the latter to al-Juḥfah and five miles from Qudaïd to the sea.\(^6\) He also includes Qudaïd, with the same location,
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in the coastal route from Egypt to Mecca. In another location of Yazīd (Qudaid), he places it between al-Jār and 'Usfān. Al-Idrīsī describes Qudaid as one of the inland sections of the fifth part of the second climate.

Al-Zamakhsharī states that Qudaid is a village with wells. He identifies it with a place called Khaimatā Umm Ma'bad. In another passage he quotes 'Ulayy to the effect that Uthāl is a valley emerging from the valley of Sitārah and flowing into the direction of Khaimatā Umm Ma'bad. He adds that Uthāl is only another name for Qudaid. In a third entry, al-Zamakhsharī describes Qudaid merely as a "place", and, in a fourth, he locates Kudaid between Qudaid and 'Usfān in the direction of Mecca. Naṣr locates Kudaid on the conventional route from Mecca to Medīna between Amaj and the pass of Ghazāl. Uthāl has become Uthānid in Naṣr's work, but its location
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varies, as Nasr once places it as a valley between Quda'ayd and 'Usfān;¹ and, on another occasion, as a mountain between al-Mushallal, near Medina, and the sea.² Nasr seems to be keen on placing al-Mushallal near Medina, as he assesses its distance from there at only seven miles, which is not true.³

Quda'ayd between al-Juḥfah and 'Usfān is still known in that area.

---
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Four Arab geographers who list the dependencies of Medina mention one called Qurā 'Arabiyyah تری عربیة. Two of them, Ibn Khurrradadhbeh and Ibn Rosteh, have no hesitation in naming it among the dependencies of Medina, using the conjunction و. The absence of this conjunction in Qudāmah's version is by no means indicative of any doubt on his part, as he definitely considers it a dependency of Medina. Though al-Idrīsī's version concurs with the above-mentioned statements, it cannot be considered corroborative as it is no doubt borrowed from these sources, even though the form of the name is corrupted to Qurā 'Uraibah or 'Arībah عربیة. None of the four geographers, however, ventures to give information about this locality.

Four more forms of this name occur in other sources: Qurā Gharbiyyah تری غربیة in Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's Istī'āb; Qurā 'Uyainah تری عینة in al-Baghawi's commentary on the Qur'ān; Qurā 'Uraibah تری عربیة, clearly accepted by
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Yaqūt, al-Hāfiẓ al-'Iraqī, al-Samhūdī, al-'Abbāsī and al-Kattānī; and Quran 'Arabiyyah favoured in the 8th century A.D. by Abū 'Ubaid Allāh, the chief secretary of al-Mahdī, and in the early 9th by al-Qāsim b. Sallām. Three of the six forms, Gharbiyyah, 'Uraibah and 'Uyainah, which are no more than scribes' errors, require no further discussion. As to the three remaining forms, one, Qurā 'Urainah, though accepted by many later reliable authors, is also a mere corruption. It is not conceivable that al-Shāfi‘ī should have called it Qurā 'Urainah which appears in print on the pages of both al-Umm and Ahkām al-Qur'ān, not only because he was an outstanding scholar of contemporary Arabic and Islamic studies, but also because al-Muzanī, who has abridged al-Shāfi‘ī's works, explicitly invokes the latter's authority when calling it Qurā 'Arabiyyah. So does Ibn Abū Ḥātim in his biography of al-Shāfi‘ī. Also the explanation given by al-Shāfi‘ī's closest disciple, al-Rabī‘.
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explicitly excludes any possibility of the form being 'Urainah. The same is true of Ibn Hazm who, though the printed version of his Jawā‘i‘il Sīrah has "Qurā‘ 'Urainah", calls it Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah in his Jamharah. Yāqūt, however, seems to have encountered this corrupted form in most of his sources because he is reluctant to accept responsibility when quoting the form correctly given and clearly vocalized by al-'Abdārī. Qurā‘ 'Urainah appears to have wrongly become the accepted form in the 14th century by the time of al-Ḥāfiz al-'Īraqī who has recorded it in a poem in which he defines its vowels:

\[\text{كذاك عمرا اخذوا وادي القرى}
\text{عرينة كذاك أيضا اعطىني}
\text{سحنا اخاهما منه الخطا}
\text{وقحك اخاهما على قرى}

Al-Samhūdī's definition, though not quoted in verse-form, is no less emphatic than that of al-Ḥāfiz for, as he rhymes it, it corresponds in its vocalized form with Juhainah. Al-'Abbāsī and al-Kattānī both draw on the information found in the above quoted authors. This form cannot be accepted. First, because it is in contradiction with all early sources where the argument is limited to the two forms, Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah and Quran 'Arabiyyah. Secondly, because the 'Urainah tribe have no qurā‘ (villages) of their own, at least not in the
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region concerned. Though a group of 'Urainīs were allowed, by the Prophet, to encamp on the pastures adjacent to Medina, they were soon put to a terrible death for endangering the security and peace of the community. As to the form Qurān 'Urainah found in the tafsīrs of al-Jassās, al-Qurtubī and Abū Hayyān, it can be safely assumed that the authors are clear of blame, and that the corruption is not of their making.

The two remaining forms Qurān 'Arabiyyah and Quran 'Arabiyyah formed the subject of protracted argument at the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century. When Abū 'Ubaid Allāh once used the form Quran 'Arabiyyah with nunation, Shabīb promptly criticized this usage and stressed that the only correct form was Qurān 'Arabiyyah with annexation اضلاع idāfah. It was a matter of logic as well as grammar as Abū 'Ubaid Allāh's usage would permit us to identify Qurān 'Arabiyyah with any village in any part of Arabia, whereas Shabīb simply wanted to indicate a specific locality which the chief secretary also had in mind. The verdict of a philologist, Qutaibah, favoured Shabīb's opinion, as he decided that Quran 'Arabiyyah was only applicable to villages in Arabia as a whole, and not to specific villages in the Hijaz. A few years later, al-Qāsim b. Sallām maintained that
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"Quran 'Arabiyyah" was the correct form, though Qurā 'Arabiyyah had, in his opinion, become the vogue among the "modern" authors of that time. However, and in spite of Ibn Sallān's insistence, this form cannot be accepted for the following reasons:

1. A pure Arab of the post-Islamic era would not say Quran 'Arabiyyah if what he had in mind was a specific locality;

2. Shabīb and Qutaibah maintain that it is called Qurā 'Arabiyyah;

3. Both Yahyā b. Ādam and Ibn 'Abbās state that Qurā 'Arabiyyah refers to specific villages, which leads to the exclusion of the form Quran 'Arabiyyah;

4. Al-Bakrī insists that it is Qurā 'Arabiyyah without nunation; so does al-'Abdarī according to Yāqūt;

5. Had Quran 'Arabiyyah been the accepted form or even one of the accepted forms, it would have been given the definite article al, which is also condemned as wrong by al-Bakrī.

The interpretation of the term Qurā 'Arabiyyah as given by al-Shāfi‘ī, Abū Yūsuf, and al-Bakrī, unintentionally allows

---
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the reading of Ibn Sallān which contradicts their own assertion that "Qurā 'Arabiyyah" denotes a specific place in the Hijaz. For it emerges unmistakably from their statements that they incline to the latter opinion; Ābū Yusuf contrasts this term with Qura A'jamiyyah (the non-Arabian villages); al-Shāfi‘ī opposes it to Hajar and Bahrain which he seems to regard as non-Arabian land; al-Bakrī applies it to every village in Arabia, though he insists on annexation and rejects both nunation and the definite article "al" as erroneous.

Summing up, it can safely be assumed that Qurā 'Arabiyyah is the only acceptable form. This implies annexing Qurā to 'Arabiyyah with the result that both nunation and the definite article "al" are excluded, since 'Arabiyyah is not used here to denote Arabia as a whole, but a specific locality in the Hijaz.

Having reviewed the different versions of the name in the sources, it has been thought advisable to use, in the following pages, the correct form Qurā 'Arabiyyah.

Authorities are in conflict on whether Qurā 'Arabiyyah is a dependency of Medina or a congeries of dependencies of Medina. Al-Qāsim b. Sallān records a ḥadīth in which al-Zuhrī observes that Qurā 'Arabiyyah comprises "Fadak and so on". Al-Balādhurī remarks that Tabūk, Khaibar and Fadak are Qurā

'Arabiyyah which means, in his opinion, Arabian villages. Ibn Hazm states that Qurā' 'Arabiyyah "comprises Fadak plus others". Ibn al-Anbārī relates that Taimā' is one of the principal villages of Qurā' 'Arabiyyah. Al-Samhūdī, al-Khattābī, al-'Abbāsī and al-Balādhurī record al-Zuhrī's hadith as transmitted by Ibn Sallām. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr describes Tabūk, Khaibar and Fadak as being 'some of qurā' 'Arabiyyah (Arabian villages) to which 'Amr b. Sa‘īd was sent by the Prophet. Al-Ya‘qūbī mentions Qurā' 'Arabiyyah among other localities in the Northern Hijaz, each of which has its own governor at the time of the Prophet. Khalīfah b. Khayyāt states that Khaibar, Wādī al-Qurā', Taimā' and Tabūk form the Qurā' 'Arabiyyah of which 'Amr was the governor at the time of the Prophet's death. Al-'Abbāsī equates Qurā' 'Arabiyyah with the villages of Medina. He seems to rely on Ya‘qūt who states that 'Urainah ('Arabiyyah) are villages in the Medina region. Al-Bakrī enlarges the scope by stating that every village in Arabia such as Khaibar, Fadak, al-Suwārīqiyyah and
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the like is called Qurā 'Arabiyyah. Dr A. al-Sharīf quotes a statement referring to Khaibar as "the best of Qurā 'Arabiyyah". His source, which he does not mention, seems to be of early Islamic concept.

The above statements refer to different places as forming part of Qurā 'Arabiyyah. In contrast to that, other sources tend to regard Qurā 'Arabiyyah as a specific stretch of land with a number of villages. In al-Tabarī's tafsīr, Ibn 'Abbās and al-Dahhak are quoted to the effect that Qurā 'Arabiyyah stretches from Medina to Syria. Qatādah is of the opinion that the qurā of 'Arabiyyah were so close to each other that the travellers would leave a village in the afternoon and spend the night in another and so on for several days. Saʿīd b. Jubair says that Qurā 'Arabiyyah is identical with qurā Zāhirah "the known villages" mentioned in the Qurān. He situates them between Medina and Syria. Abū Hurairah tells of the Jews who, on their flight from Nebuchadnezzar's persecution to Medina, attempted to identify the city they knew by description with al-Qurā al-'Arabiyyah al-ṭarī al-ḥarīmīyyah (the Arabian villages) which stretch all the length of the way from Palestine to Medina. As has already
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been seen, al-Shāfi‘ī, Ḥūṣain al-Ḥusaynī, al-Bakrī and al-Bakrī tend to equate Qurā‘ Arabiyyah with the whole of Arabia. Al-Bakrī attributes this statement to al- İslāmi on the authority of Ibn al-Sikkit. However, it can hardly be credited that either al- İslāmi or Ibn al-Sikkit should have defied Shabīb or Qutaibah who were so emphatic on Qurā‘ Arabiyyah denoting specific villages in the Hijaz. Besides, this statement is defective in that it identifies Iraq with the region between al-Raml (the Nafud) and Iraq, which suggests a lacuna in al-Bakrī’s source, or in his own text. Al-Bukhārī reports, on the authority of Dājājah, that 'Uthmān had promised that no religion but Islam should be tolerated in Qurā‘ Arabiyyah. In the light of this report, Qurā‘ Arabiyyah is not applicable to any locality in Arabia south of Ṭāhā al-Qurā‘ since the Jews had been expelled by the Prophet from the neighbourhood of Medina and deported by 'Umar from Khaibar, Fadak and Najrān. All Arabs in these regions had become Muslims, so that there were no other religions left in what was regarded as Arabia in 'Umar’s time. The Jews of Ṭāhā al-Qurā‘ and to the north of it had remained undisturbed on the ground that it was not regarded as Arabian territory.

No Arab chronicler denies that the Prophet’s campaign against Ṭāhā al-Qurā‘ took place immediately after that of Khaibar. Since Ibn Habīb mentions that the Prophet marched

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu‘jam, p. 15.
from Khaibar to Qurā 'Arabiyyah, Shaikh Mahmud Shākir feels justified in applying the name Qurā 'Arabiyyah to Wādī al-Qurā. There is, however, another passage where Ibn Hābīb, naming the regional administrators appointed by the Prophet, lists one for Wādī al-Qurā, another for Ta'īnā, and a third for Qurā 'Arabiyyah, which precludes a confusion between Qurā 'Arabiyyah and Wādī al-Qurā at that time. It is also clear from the list of the dependencies of Medina as recorded by Ibn Khurرادadhbeh, Qudāmah and Ibn Rosteh all of whom had access to the official archives, that Qurā 'Arabiyyah was a single dependency of Medina, separately administered, like all its other dependencies, by an amīr subordinate to the governor of Medina.

Another point tends to limit Qurā 'Arabiyyah to Medina. This is observable in the statements attributed to Ibn Zabālah and recorded by both al-Samhūdī and al-'Abbasī, as will be described later. They allege that there is an inscription on two stones at Medina, one of which says that a messenger of Solomon or Jesus was sent to Qurā 'Arabiyyah or Yathrib (Medina) or to "this village".

Both acceptable and reliable is the approach of the early Islamic era, which sees in Qurā 'Arabiyyah a separate unit with an identity of its own. The most acceptable version of course is that of tax officials such as Ibn Khurرادadhbeh
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and Ibn Rosteh, for whom Qurā 'Arabiyyah is one of the dependencies of Medina. This is the version accepted by Shabīb and Qutaibah who are convinced that Qurā 'Arabiyyah consists of certain villages in the Hijaz. Ibn 'Abbās known, among other things, for his geographical and Biblical reports, is quoted by al-Ṭabarī to the effect that Qurā 'Arabiyyah figures, together with Fadak and part of Khaibar, among the estates allotted to the Prophet. In al-Qurtubī's version, Ibn 'Abbās names these estates as Quraizah and Banū al-Nadīr at Medina, Fadak which lies at a distance of three days from Medina, Qurā 'Arabiyyah and Yanbu'. Abū Hayyān quotes Ibn 'Atiyyah (the later) when stating that Qurā 'Arabiyyah lies near Wādī al-Qurā. Yahyā b. Ādam states that Qurā 'Arabiyyah is a specific locality. Al-Maqdisī asserts that Qurā 'Arabiyyah, Fadak, al-Nadīr and most of Khaibar were estates of the Prophet.

Moreover, the authors whose statements have been quoted in support of alternative attitudes are quite decisive when implying that Qurā 'Arabiyyah is a separate dependency of Medina. Al-Zuhri's hadīth is reported as having the conjunction , between the name Qurā 'Arabiyyah and the names

which follow it in the list of the Prophet's estates. This is recorded by al-Tabarî, Ibn Abû Ḥatim, al-Bakrî, and al-Samhûdî. Al-Jassâs quotes al-Zuhîrî when mentioning Fadak and Qurā 'Arabiyyah among these estates. It is very likely that al-Zuhîrî used the conjunction , which had been omitted by some transmitters. Besides, most of al-Zuhîrî's account is attributed to 'Umar, a fact which strongly supports the opinion that Qurā 'Arabiyyah was one of the estates and not a term describing all of them, because there would have been no need for 'Umar to explain to his listeners what Qurā 'Arabiyyah meant. The lack of logic in both al-Balādhrū's and Ibn Abî al-Barr's opinion is obvious. There is no need to describe any of the villages administered by the Prophet as an Arabian village, since the Prophet's control was limited to what they considered Arabia. Indeed, al-Balâdhrū's description of Tabûk as "Arabian" is contested by early writers such as Mâlik and al-Wâqîdî. On the other hand, Ibn 'Abî al-Barr states in another passage of his Istî'âb, that 'Amr b. Sa'id was the governor of Taimâ', Khaibar and Qurā 'Arabiyyah, which does not tally with his
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assumption that Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah comprises Tabūk, Khaibar, Fadak and others.

It is almost certain that Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah was regarded as a separate unit already by the time of the Prophet who sent Mu‘ādh to collect its land-tax. Had it been a question of all the Arabian villages or even that of the Northern Hijaz, the task would have presented insuperable difficulties to one man, even as youthful and devoted as Mu‘ādh. It is well known that it was the practice of the Prophet to send one or two men to one tribe, while large regions were divided between two or even three tax collectors. What frustrates every attempt at identifying Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah at that time with some of the famous settlements of the Northern Hijaz, where it must be located, is that all these famous places are excluded by virtue of their being mentioned in many reports beside Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah. This is the reason why Fadak, Yanbu‘ and al-Sa‘frah cannot be identified with Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah. Nor can Khaibar, since al-Hasan, Qatādah and al-Suddī mention Khaibar and Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah in connection with a conspiracy to corrupt early Islam. Nor can Taimī or Wādī al-Qurā be the Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah of the post Islamic era, because each of the three places had its own governor at the time of the Prophet. As to Tabūk, it was not even considered Arab land.

All the above can be taken to prove that Qurā‘ 'Arabiyyah had come to denote a single locality by the time of the Prophet.

Nevertheless, there are some reports to indicate that this was not the case before Islam. To begin with, there is the report about the flight of the Jews from Palestine to Medina in which Qurā’ ‘Arabiyyah is used to denote all the settlements on their route two of which, Taima‘ and Wādī al-Qurā‘, are mentioned by Ibn al-Kalbī and Sharqī who substitute the Hijaz for Qurā’ ‘Arabiyyah. Ibn ‘Asākir attributes this report to Abū Hurairah, while al-Suyūṭī, who also attributes it to Abū Hurairah, maintains that it is recorded by Abū Nu‘ain. However, it does not figure in the latter’s Dalā'il, the place most likely to contain a report of this kind. The second report is that of Ibn ‘Abbās, al-Dāhkhā, Qatādah and Sa‘īd b. Jubair, all of whom state that Qurā’ ‘Arabiyyah stretches from Medina to Syria. Their knowledge of the pre-Islamic history of Arabia and their geographical and biblical reports were held to be authoritative. A third report, recorded by al-‘Abbāsī, equates Qurā’ ‘Arabiyyah, by implication, with Medina or its region. This report is extremely confused. Its transmitter, ‘Umar (‘Amr) b. Sulaim al-Zurqī, is alleged to have found an inscription on two large stones close to the grave of "Jeremiah اَرِمْيا, the messenger of Jesus" near Medina. Neither Jews nor Christians, nor members of other faiths that have sacred books at Medina, could decipher this inscription. However, two men from Māh (there are several places called
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Māh all of which are situated either in Iraq or to the east of it) succeeded in reading the writing on one of the two stones as follows: "I am al-Aswād b. Suwādah, the messenger of Jesus to Qūrā 'Arabiyyah". In another version of the report, Qūrā 'Arabiyyah has been replaced by "this village" and by Yathrib (Medina) in a third; al-Aswād by 'Abd Allāh, and Jesus by Solomon. There is no mention of the inscription on the other stone, but al-Samhūdī, on whom al-'Abbāsī might have relied, says that it proved too heavy to be removed. The story must be very old, as 'Umair ('Umar in al-Samhūdī and 'Amr in actual fact) lived in the 7th century. Al-Samhūdī has the correct form: "Iranī grave قبرارسمى " instead of "the grave of Jeremiah", though it has been corrupted in its turn to "human grave قبرآدمى " in another passage. The story is unreliable as a whole, since no Muslim of the 7th century could have tolerated the idea that there were sacred books of any faith apart from Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The two men of Māh are said to have claimed that their people used to live, in ancient times, in Qūrā 'Arabiyyah or Medina, a claim to which authors pay no attention. This report is, however, not devoid of geographical significance as it indicates where the early learned men of Arabia locate Qūrā 'Arabiyyah. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī refers to this story, but without
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mentioning Qurā 'Arabiyyah, and so does al-Tabarī in his Tarīkh. Ibn Ishāq, on the other hand, is more explicit and states that a certain Ibn al-Thalna was the messenger of Jesus to al-Arabiyyah which he identifies with the Hijaz. These reports, which illustrate the Arab’s idea of the Qurā 'Arabiyyah of pre-Islamic history, may have contributed to the confusion which reigns among later authors, when they try to locate the post-Islamic Qurā 'Arabiyyah which was no more than a dependency of Medina. The post-Islamic Qurā 'Arabiyyah became identified with a relatively small region, small enough to be regarded as a dependency of Medina like Fadak, Khaibar, Dhul-Marwah, Wādī al-Qurā and Taimā.

As regards the history of Qurā 'Arabiyyah at the time of the Prophet, it has already been said that it was among the estates allotted to the Prophet by virtue of their surrender without a war. Later lists of state-controlled properties contain no mention of Qurā 'Arabiyyah though the Prophet’s estates had become state-controlled. This may be accounted for by the fact that the Prophet had bestowed many of his estates upon his Companions. He had, however, exploited them for some time, as Mu‘ādh was sent to collect the revenue which was estimated at 7/12 of the produce. This means that the
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cultivation of Qurā' 'Arabiyyah was relatively less expensive than that of Khaibar or Fadak whose peasants were allowed to live there and till the land in return for half of the harvest. Wādī al-Qurā paid one third, but it does not mean that it was more expensive to run than Khaibar, as it was divided in equal parts between its Jews, the 'Udhrāh and the Prophet. This was because the 'Udhrāh, who had owned a third of Wādī al-Qurā before Islam in return for protecting its Jews, were left in possession of that third, but the Jews had to share their two thirds with the Prophet. Qurā' 'Arabiyyah is mentioned as the place to which the companions of the Prophet were about to look for supplies and means of livelihood after the Prophet's death. Yāqūt ascribes to Abū Hudhaifah the account that (not Ibn 1) Mu'ādh speaks of the feelings of the companions whose leaders had decided to live in peace on the proceeds of Qurā' 'Arabiyyah to avoid making war on the apostates and to spend their days in the worship of God. This report is attributed by al-Balādhurī to Ibn Mas'ūd who ends by saying that Abū Bakr insisted on waging war against the apostates. Ibn al-Athīr also attributes it to Ibn Mas'ūd. Al-Balādhurī's and Ibn al-Athīr's version is the most acceptable, because Mu'ādh survived this war by a mere six or seven years, when the events in question were still so fresh in the memory that there was no need to dwell on them. Thus Ibn

Mas'ūd is more likely to be the real source of that report. Abū Hudhaifah says that 'Amr b. al-'Ās passed Qurā' 'Arabiyyah which lay on his way from Medina to Palestine, while al-Balādhurī states that 'Amr's route led through Ailah. Al-Waqidī relates that the Prophet once sent 'Amr to Dhāt al-Salāsil, which lies between Wādī al-Qurā and Tabūk. In this story 'Amr was allowed to invoke the help of "al-'Arab which is the land of Bāliyy, 'Udhrah and Balqain". It is very probable that al-Waqidī means Qurā' 'Arabiyyah. Abū Bakr may have been referring to it when he said to 'Amr: "You are my governor of the Bāliyy, 'Udhrah, the rest of Qudā'ah and the variety of Arabs there". 

Some years later, Ibn 'Abbās, Sa'īd, al-Hasan, Qatādah and al-Suddī mention Qurā' 'Arabiyyah when trying to explain events relating to Islamic history or mentioned in the Qur'ān. It has been seen that the officials of Baghdad, especially the tax administrators, paid attention to Qurā' 'Arabiyyah. So did theologians such as al-Shāfi‘ī, Abū Yusuf, Yahyā b. ‘Adām and Ibn Sallām when trying to define Islamic tax legislation. Traditionalists such as Ibn Hanbal, al-Bukhārī, al-Nasā’ī, Abū Dawūd, Ibn Abī Hātin, al-Khattābī, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr and Ibn al-Qayyim naturally concern themselves with Qurā' 'Arabiyyah.
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Qur'ānic commentators such as al-Ṭabarī, one at least of the two Ibn 'Atiyyahs, al-Jassās, al-Qurtūbī, al-Baghwābī, 1 Ibn Ḥayyān and Ibn Kathīr record all the information available in their time which can be ultimately traced back to 'Umar, Muʿādh, Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn Masʿūd. So do chroniclers such as Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Ṭabarī, al-Yaʿqūbī, al-Balādhuri, al-Maqdisī, Ibn Hazm and Ibn al-Athīr. It is not certain whether al-Asmaʿī or Ibn al-Sikkit mentions Qurā 'Arabiyyah, because it is confused with al-Suwāriqīyyah which could not have been allotted to the Prophet as it was owned by the Sulain tribe. Arab estates were not confiscated by the Prophet and the zakāh = (alms tax) of 10%, 5% or 2.5% was the only tax applicable to them. Ṣhabīb, Qutaibah and al-Zubaidī have tried to define the form of the name Qurā 'Arabiyyah. Al-Bakrī, Yāqūt, al-Samhūdī, and al-'Abbāsī list it in their geographical dictionaries. 'Arrām, when enumerating the dependencies of Medina, does not mention 2 Qurā 'Arabiyyah. Nor does Ibn al-Kalbī when he lists the principal villages of Arabia among which he records Wādī al-Qurā and the Daumah of al-Handal. Al-Asadī omits both Qurā 'Arabiyyah and Wādī al-Qurā when he records the dependencies of Medina, and Wakī' omits the former.

Some of the terms "'Arabī" or "'Arabiyyah" refer to certain objects of daily life which have no clear connection
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with the Arabs or Arabia as a whole, such as "Arabī-barley" which is said to be of the best quality and is larger than the corresponding Iraqi product, or the 'Arabī (printed فَرَّص) wine which is made of dates. The Prophet is said to have recommended 'Arabī sheep for curative purposes. He has also praised the 'Arabiyyah bow. Five hundred 'Arabiyyah bows, which were among the equipment found at Khaibar after its conquest by the Prophet, formed the top of the list of important objects. "To lop off palm trees" تحريب derives one of its forms from 'Arab عرب which also denotes a curative treatment of service animals and also means "to have plenty of fresh water". Abū al-'Ajfā', reporting a speech by 'Umar, attributes his own failure to understand an uncommon phrase to the fact that he was an 'Arabī by birth, unable to comprehend Beduin phraseology. In the last mentioned report, 'Arabī may be opposed to 'Arabī عربي, Beduin, but there is little doubt that "'Arabī" or 'Arabiyyah" in the other reports indicate the locality called 'Arabiyyah. It is clear that some of these words were

4. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 88.
of pre-Islamic usage. There is a poem attributed by al-Jāhiz to Aus b. Hajār which represents the 'Arabī merchant as the symbol of avarice. Unfortunately, there is no indication of how or why this pre-Islamic poet had reached this conclusion, as the poem cannot be found in his diwan, and al-Jāhiz records but one verse of it. This single verse, however, implies that 'Arabiyyah is an urban settlement where frugality is considered a virtue, contrary to the wont of the nomadic tribes praised by Aus.

Trying to explain the term "Qurā Arābiyyah" al-Shāfi‘ī says that "the Jews used to live in the Arab villages around which the Arabs lived. These villages were Fadak and Khaibar which were Jewish villages in the Arab land". This is a very confused definition, as the villages supposed to be Arab turn out to be Jewish villages. Al-Azhari, in his book on al-Shāfi‘ī's uncommon words, quotes the latter to the effect that some pre-Islamic Arab tribes migrated to the Jewish and Christian settlements in Arabia, and were converted to these religions. This is indeed in line with al-Shāfi‘ī's information, but leads nowhere. In his Tahdhib, al-Azhari speaks of the Arab villages which he defines as habitations of the Arabs as opposed to the A‘rābs who have no villages and who become Arabs only by migrating to the settlements. These
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reports illustrate the 'Arabs' vague concept of pre-Islamic Qurā 'Arabiyyah: Al-Azharī reiterates the last-mentioned report when warning his readers not to refer to the Muhājirūn and the Ansār as A'rāb, since they are, in fact, 'Arabs who live in the "Arab" towns and villages.

Before the advent of Islam, the meaning of the word "al-'Arab" had come to denote the people of the settlements as opposed to "al-A'rāb" = the nomads. By the time of the Prophet, the distinction between al-'Arab and al-A'rāb had become very clear and any member of one section crossing the line to the other was added to the section of his choice. They were not identical at that time, but Islam helped to remove this distinction. Apparently as a move to discredit the settlers who had not embraced Islam, the term was changed to Muhājirūn and Ansār as opposed to A'rāb. Thus any non-Muslim Arab was called A'rābī. It was an offence to call any member of the Muhājirūn and Ansār an A'rābī. Any town or village in Arabia embracing Islam was immediately added to the distinguished class of Muhājirūn without its inhabitants being asked to move to Medina, but with the responsibility of defending the new state at any time. As to the Muslim nomads, they remained A'rāb with no military obligations. This meant that the settlers = the Muhājirūn or the Arabs were paid soldiers, whereas the A'rāb were paid only for the battles they fought. Later, when the needs of the new state claimed every available male in Arabia, they all became 'Arabs as they fought side by
side. Only the nomads who stayed in Arabia were called 1 Ārāb. Because of its early enmity to the Prophet, who was so incensed that he abandoned it in favour of Medina, Mecca was described as Ārābiyyah by a scholar of the 8th century with the ulterior motive of deterring other scholars from setting up residence there. 2

Though the conception of the post-Islamic Arabs of Qurā 'Arabiyyah was very vague indeed, reliable sources are, for the most part, definite in locating it in the Northern Hijaz. Some of them such as 'Umar, 'Uthmān, Mālik and al-Waqīdī exclude, from their map of the Arabian peninsula, Wādī al-Qurā and the rest of Northern Hijaz. What they probably have in mind are the political implications of the old "Provincia Arabia". Ibn 'Abbās, Abū Hurairah, Sa'īd and others state ahat Qurā 'Arabiyyah stretches from Medina to Syria. Other reports, on the other hand, define the actual status of Qurā 'Arabiyyah as it was known to later generations. In another context, al-Waqīdī interprets the word "al-'Arab" as the land of Balīyy, 'Uḥra and Balqain which, though not a small area is by no means as large as 'Arabiyyah of pre-Islam. Al-Zuhrī's version of Qurā 'Arabiyyah is likely to refer to an even smaller area, for he is quoted by the most reliable sources as including it among the estates allotted to the Prophet, an opinion which coincides with that of Ibn 'Abbās and with Mu'ādh's report. Several of the Arab chroniclers who list

the regional governors of the Prophet name one for Qurā 'Arabiyyah which was known to the tax administrators of Baghdad.

It is difficult to give a definite location of the Qurā 'Arabiyyah of which these officials speak as a dependency of Medina. There is, however, the possibility that it lay between Khaibar and Wādī al-Qurā, as Ibn Ḥabīb maintains that the Prophet marched to Qurā 'Arabiyyah from Khaibar. Other authors state that it was Wādī al-Qurā and not Qurā 'Arabiyyah. It is unlikely that Ibn Ḥabīb equates the two places since, in another passage, he mentions separate governors for each. Thus he must have another locality in that area in mind when he speaks of Qurā 'Arabiyyah other than Wādī al-Qurā. Al-Waqqādī points out that the Prophet passed through Birmah on his way from Khaibar to Wādī al-Qurā. This remark may help to identify what was described as Qurā 'Arabiyyah at that time. Birmah is adjacent to Balākith and al-Shabakah which are described as lying near Khaibar to its north-west. All three used to be considered dependencies of Medina. Indeed, two of them are even said to be great dependencies of Medina. Could the absence of Birmah, Balākith and al-Shabakah form the lists provided by Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah for the dependencies of Medina imply that they formed part of Qurā 'Arabiyyah? The fact that Fadak and Qurā 'Arabiyyah surrendered to the Prophet while he was at Khaibar also
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speaks in favour of this assumption. A companion was sent
to sign an agreement with the people of Padak which is about
three days from Khaibar, but no such delegate is mentioned in
connection with Qurā 'Arabiyyah. This suggests that it lay
too close to Khaibar to require a special envoy. Mahmūd
Shākir justifiably accepts al-Samhūdī's tendency to identify
Qurā 'Arabiyyah with Dhul-Marwah, Balākith and Birnah and the
other villages there. In support of his claim, al-Samhūdī
stresses that his Medinese contemporaries did not identify
Wādī al-Qurā with what must be considered its actual site,
but with the region of Dhul-Marwah, Balākith and Birnah. This
idea seems to be acceptable on condition that one excludes
Dhul-Marwah which has always been regarded as a dependency of
Medina. Dhū Khushub may also have formed part of Qurā
'Arabiyyah as it does not figure in the lists of the depen-
dencies of Medina.

As to Birnah, Balākith and Shabakat al-Daum (al-Shabakah),
there is no doubt that they are situated to the north-west of
Khaibar. According to al-Hamdānī, Birnah borders on Syria.
This definition is not relevant unless he has another Birnah
or another Syria in mind, especially as he situates al-Shabakah
near a Birnah which lies "above" Hunain on the Egyptian' route. He might have been using the term Syria from the view
point of the Medinese who used to describe the territories

1. Al-Wāqīdī, Maghāzī, p. 706. 1
3. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 182.
north of Medina as Syrian or Shāmī. Al-Bakrī records the same location, but substitutes Khaibar for Hunain apparently because he knows of no Ḥunain in the region of Birmah. As Khaibar does not lie on the Egyptian route, it may be safe to assume that al-Bakrī is mistaken. Hunain should also be excluded; it is Ḥasīn (now known as Ḥusayyīn) which lies near Ḥisār, a mountain described as belonging to Birmah. The latter, which was an important market in the 7th century, is described by Ibn Ḥabīb as a great dependency of Medina with spring and palm gardens owned by Quraishī lords. He situates it between Khaibar and Wādī al-Qurā. ²

As to Balākith, both al-Handānī and al-Bakrī state that there are two places of that name north of Medina. When trying to locate them, the two authors agree on locating one between Dhul-Mawrūh (or al-Marr according to al-Bakrī) and Shabakat al-Dauw, but differ on the other which al-Handānī locates between Ghām and al-ʾAnāb; and al-Bakrī between Gaza and Madyan. It is, however, possible that Balākith lies nowhere except near Birmah as Ghām and al-ʾAnāb lie there. Al-Bakrī was misled by the mention of its being near "Syria" which occurs in an account of a Medinese poet's journey to "Syria". It is, on the whole, not unusual for the Medinese to describe the region north of their city as "Syria" which

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 271.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 275.
may be an echo of the old idea of "Provincia Arabia". Ibn Ḥabīb describes Balākith as a great dependency of Medina between Khaibar and Wādī al-Qura. Ibn al-Sikkīt places it between Dhul-Marwah and Dhu Khushub in the valley of Idam.

Shabakat al-Daun is described by both al-Hamdānī and al-Bakrī as a dependency of Medina in the vicinity of Birmah, while Nasr places Dhul-Daun in the territory of the 'Udhrah. Yaqūt states that Wādī al-Daun stretches from al-Ghamrah, north of Khaibar, to al-Qasībah, south of it. Al-Asma'ī says that al-shabakah indicates an abundance of wells.

'Amr b. Sa'īd, who was the governor of Qurā 'Arabiyyah for the Prophet, is said, by his nephew, to have been the Prophet's governor for the sawād – the rural area – of Khaibar. Birmah is described by al-Bakrī as situated at the sawād of Khaibar. There is no doubt that the term "sawād" was known even before Islam, though al-Bakrī applies it, when used by Aus b. Hajar, the Jāhilī poet, to the Sawād of Iraq.

3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 271.
5. Yaqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 875.
6. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 779.
8. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 245.
These settlements seen to have formed part of not only "Provincia 'Arabia" but also the old Arabian kingdoms of the Northern Hijaz. Philby has discovered some Thamudic inscriptions there. The Qurā 'Arabiyyah of the post-Islamic era was but a very small portion of the huge 'Arabiyyah, so small that it would be difficult even to conjecture its location but for the fact that Birmah was located near Ḥasīn and Ḥisār, two mountains near Khaibar, and that 'Amr was governor of the sawād of Khaibar. The Muslim Arabs retained no precise knowledge of this province, and even their reports about the post-Islamic Qurā 'Arabiyyah are conflicting.

CONCLUSION

Qurā 'Arabiyyah, its status, its local history, location and the controversy concerning its nomenclature have already been discussed in the preceding pages. As has been seen, the only correct form of its name is Qurā 'Arabiyyah. Any attempt at locating Qurā 'Arabiyyah should consider the gradual change which occurred in the course of its political history. There is no doubt that it formed, at first, part of the Nabatean kingdom. After the disintegration of the latter, Qurā 'Arabiyyah was almost certainly incorporated in the Roman Provincia Arabia for at least a short period. That Brunnwö1

1. Philby, The Land of Midian, p. 56.
Euting and Domaszewski; Hitti, Musil; and Jawād 'Ali do not include this region in the Provincia Arabia does not automatically necessitate its exclusion, since neither the information on this province nor on Qurā 'Arabiyyah suffices to determine its southern boundaries. It is most likely that the name "Qurā 'Arabiyyah" is a later development of an older form, namely "Kūrah 'Arabiyyah", a literal translation of "Provincia Arabia". There would be no point in the region north of Medina being called "'Arabiyyah" (Arabian land) by the Arabs themselves, since it would lead to the exclusion of the rest of Arabia from this term, which would hardly be logical, unless 'Arabiyyah were, in their opinion, different from Arabia. Besides, the Arabs themselves do not seem to call their peninsula Arabia until many centuries later when they speak of Bilād al-'Arab. Prior to that it was sufficient to name its regions or to apply to some parts of it, the name of their inhabitants. Equally, foreigners would not have called this region "'Arabiyyah" had it not been for the need to distinguish between it and the rest of Arabia which they already knew at that time. The name "'Arabiyyah" is only ascribable to foreign usage, i.e. by non-Arabs, who alone would feel the need to describe this part of the province

as "inhabited by Arabs". The Arabs themselves accepted this name and applied it to this region. The very fact that only the towns and villages of this region were given the attribute "'Arabiyyah" indicates that they were subject to a rule different from that governing the Hijaz and Tihānah which were both adjacent to "'Arabiyyah".

That this region was regarded as different from the rest of Arabia is confirmed by the apparent contradiction that it was termed, by some Arab scholars, as "the land of the Arab", and excluded by others from Arabian territory. The last-mentioned opinion is probably that of those who identify Arabia with that Arabian territory which had never been controlled by foreign powers, whereas the other opinion is that of scholars with some knowledge, albeit vague and indirect of foreign sources on the part of the region and its Arabian nature. ʿAl-ʿWaqidī's assumption that the region around Wādī al-Qurā was called "the land of the Arab" is plainly, though not explicitly, influenced by the viewpoint of the past history of this region and the ancient historians of Syria and Palestine who had every reason to regard it as "the Arab land". The same could be deduced from Ibn Ishāq's references to the inhabitants of this region as "the Arabs". This was, perhaps, the motive of Ibn al-Kalbī when he limited the Arab land to the region north of Medina. This conception was still vivid in the memory of the 11th century when Nasir-i Khusraw equates al-'Arab with the northern part of Arabia. Indeed,

1 Nasir-i Khusraw, Sefer-Namėh, p. 78.
Ibn al-Kalbī described "the land of the Arabs" as the territory comprising the lands north of Medina, and stretching as far north as Sinai and north-west Mesopotamia, which seems to be a demarcation of Provincia Arabia, and partly corresponds with the delineation of Qurā 'Arabiyyah in certain references to its pre-Islamic history by some religious scholars. With the passage of time, Qurā 'Arabiyyah seems to have shrunk to much smaller proportions, a fact to be accounted for by the disintegration of Provincia Arabia itself. The Qurā 'Arabiyyah described as a dependency of Medina is likely to have been the fertile valley between Khaibar and Dhul-Marwah. It is in this region where Birmah was situated. Ibn Ḥabīb states that the Prophet marched from Khaibar to Qurā 'Arabiyyah, whereas al-Wāqidī refers to the place to which the Prophet went from Khaibar as Birmah. The lava fields of al-Kūrah lie close to this region. It is also an established fact that 'Amr b. Sa'īd was appointed by the Prophet governor of Qurā 'Arabiyyah. 'Amr's nephew states that the region governed by his uncle was the sawād (the rural land) of Khaibar. Since the rest of the ancient Qurā 'Arabiyyah was allotted to various governors, it is likely that this part adjoining Khaibar was the only one still described by the name Qurā 'Arabiyyah. Caliph 'Abd al-Malik granted Kuthayvir, the poet, a property called al-'Arab al-ʿarb Nasr reads it al-'Arib near Medina. 'Abd al-Malik used

1. Wakī', Manāzil, fol. 74.
to have his landed properties at Dhū Khushub which was situated in the region near Birnah.

It is from Qurā'an 'Arabiyyah that the name "'Arab" as opposed to "A'rāb" is to be derived, since the word "'Arab" denotes the settlers, as opposed to "A'rāb" the Beduin. This distinction is definitely pre-Islamic and can be assumed to have originated in this region which is known to have possessed commercial, agricultural and cultural centres. The region to its south was known as "al-'Arābiyyah" the land of the Beduin or the Hijaz as indicated by Ibn Ishāq, who was probably relying on early Christian sources. The people of Qurā'an 'Arabiyyah were called 'Arab as against A'rāb, the people of al-'Arābiyyah. This distinction seems to be the result of Qurā'an 'Arabiyyah being included in the Roman Provincia Arabia, as the Roman officials could not but have called the inhabitants of this region "'Arab". This became later a distinguishing term in opposition to the "A'rāb" or the inhabitants of the rest of Arabia whom nothing connected with the Romans. Arab traders from other parts of Arabia would find it advantageous to accept, and later claim, the description "'Arab" when visiting the Roman trading centres. As their settlements and way of life approximated more closely to those of the people of Qurā'an 'Arabiyyah than those of the Beduin, it is possible that the inhabitants of the settlements of Arabia gradually acquired the name "'Arab" by which they were all called at the advent of Islam.

The original meaning of the word "al-'Arab" the inhabitants of Qurā'an 'Arabiyyah or the Arabian part of Provincia
Arabia was, however, not totally forgotten by the time of the Prophet and the early days of his first successor, Ābu Bakr. This can be inferred from the fact that even the nomadic inhabitants of the region around Wādī al-Qurān were still referred to as 'Arab on several occasions at that time. This represents a deviation from the general practice of that era, and cannot be accounted for except by the fact that all the people there had always been called "'Arab", regardless of their mode of life. This, however, did not include the whole of Qurān 'Arabiyyah, since the tribes around Medina were described as "Ārāb" in the Qurān. This application is pejorative, aiming to discredit non-Muslim Arabs. For political reasons, the term "Ārāb" was applied to all non-Muslim Arabs, and the term "'Arab" was restricted to the Muhājirūn and Ansār, the Muslims of Medina in the early years of the Prophet until the surrender of Mecca and the rest of Arabia, when Medina could no longer accommodate all Muslims. The term "'Arab" was once again used to distinguish the inhabitants of the Arabian settlements on whom the defence of the new states was incumbent, and the term "Ārāb" once more came to denote the Beduīn who were not paid soldiers except when their help was needed. It was immediately after the time of the Prophet that the earlier practice of calling most of the "'Arab" "Ārāb" was reversed into promoting most of the "Ārāb" to "'Arab" when they joined the Muslim armies outside Arabia.

The term "A'rab" came to denote only the few Beduin elements who did not leave Arabia or certain settlers whose mode of life was semi-nomadic.

Yaqūt states that B. Usaidah regard their Najdī village, Wāsit, as 'Arabiyyah, a statement which is difficult to understand. Qurā 'Arabiyyah is not to be confused with Qaryat al-A'rab in north-east Arabia.


QURH

Al-Muqaddasi describes Qurh as a region with Wadi al-Qura as its capital.\(^1\) He cites five towns which, he says, belong to Qurh.\(^2\) He also regards Qurh as one of the principal towns of the Hijaz.\(^3\) Its population, according to him, are Sunnis,\(^4\) its "dried peaches" represent a renowned speciality of Arabia,\(^5\) but its water is totally unwholesome.\(^6\) Al-Muqaddasi's description of Qurh appears under the entry on Wadi al-Qura.

Al-Bakrî, in his Masālik, concurs with al-Muqaddasi in equating Qurh with Wadi al-Qura.\(^7\) In al-Mu'jam, he, however, contradicts this assumption declaring on two occasions that Qurh is the capital of Wadi al-Qura.\(^8\) Al-Muqaddasi assesses the distance between Qurh.

---

1. Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 53.
2. Ibid., p. 84.
3. Ibid., p. 69.
4. Ibid., 96.
5. Ibid., p. 98.
and al-Ḥijr at one day's journey,\(^1\) while al-Bakrī says that it is eighteen miles,\(^2\) which is a little less than a day's journey. According to al-Muqaddasī, the port of Qurḥ is al-'Aunīd;\(^3\) according to al-Bakrī, it is al-Ḥaurā'.\(^4\) In another entry in his Mu'jam, al-Bakrī mentions Qurḥ as a mere place without locating it.\(^5\) Al-Maqdisī is also of the opinion that Qurḥ is another name for Wādī al-Qurā.\(^6\) Al-Suddī, however, is quoted as saying that Qurḥ is the capital of Wādī al-Qurā\(^7\) which is actually the case as Wādī al-Qurā is a region whereas Qurḥ is one of its several towns and villages. Naṣr follows al-Suddī as regards Qurḥ.\(^8\)

It might have been a corrupted form of Wajj \(^\text{ заболевания}^9\) which led to the theory that Qurḥ \(^\text{ заболевание}^9\) was another name of Wādī al-Qurā, as Wajj was said to be the ancient

---

2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 12.
3. Al-Muqaddasī, op. cit., p. 84.
4. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 22.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1061.
7. Yaḥyū, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 54.
name of Wādī al-Qurā. It is, however, not unusual that a town gives its name to a region, as Jādī al-Qurā is known to-day by the name al-'Ula, which is the capital of that region.

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 22.
Al-Ya'qūbī is the only official geographer to mention al-Qusāibah when mapping the coastal route between Ailah and Mecca.¹ According to him, it is located between al-Nabk and al-Buḥrah. Were his description of the whole route consistent with the actual situation, it would be difficult to identify the place he had in mind. Things being what they are, it is likely that he refers to what is now called Ra's al-Qusāibah, near 'Arinūnah. Wākī', on the other hand, locates al-Qusāibah south of al-Ḥaurā' and north of al-Buḥrah.² His account of the Egyptian pilgrim routes is on the whole unreliable and thus cannot be taken for granted. Al-Qusāibah, though ignored by the early Arab geographers apart from al-Ya'qūbī and Wākī', was a way-station on the pilgrim route from Egypt. It was called 'Uyun al-Qasab.³

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
2. Wākī', Manāzīl, fol. 114.
Rābigh is mentioned by al-Mas'ūdī in connection with the history of the Prophet's campaigns. He places it at a distance of ten miles from al-Juḥfah on the route of travellers from Medina to Qudaid. 1 It is clear that his source is al-Wāqidī because both their statements are identical. 2 Ibn Sa'd is less complicated and more exact when he states that Rābigh is at a distance of ten miles to the left of the route from Medina to Qudaid. 3 It should, however, be borne in mind that all of them speak of the valley of Rābigh, not the village of Rābigh which is actually on the right side of this route. Al-Wāqidī assesses the distance between Rābigh and Medina at several days' journey. 4 In al-Zubairī's Nasab, Rābigh is called Rāfi'. 5 Al-Baladhurī describes Rābigh as a valley ten miles from al-Juḥfah; 6 and Ibn al-Sikkīt situates it

1. Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, p. 234.
5. Al-Zubairī, op. cit., p. 94.
between Waddān and al-Jihfah.\textsuperscript{1} So does Lughdah.\textsuperscript{2}

Al-Bakrī places Rābīgh between Medina and al-Juhfah in the valley of Marr which belongs to Khuzā'ah.\textsuperscript{3} This valley of Marr should be read al-Marād, as Marr is a name of two localities neither of which lies in that region, whereas al-Bakrī himself quotes Ibn Ḥabīb when he locates al-Ghamīm near al-Marād which is situated between Rābīgh and al-Juhfah.\textsuperscript{4} In a third passage, al-Bakrī describes Rābīgh as a place behind (west of) the pass of Hirshā, some miles off the Medina-Mecca route. He adds that it has a spring, wells and palm groves.\textsuperscript{5} He also mentions another place called Rābīgh which he locates in the proximity of Medina.\textsuperscript{6}

Nāṣr describes Rābīgh as a valley on the pilgrim route immediately before al-Juhfah and 'Azwar.\textsuperscript{7} Yāqūt attributes this statement to Ibn al-Sikkīt.\textsuperscript{8} But Nāṣr also locates Rābīgh at al-Marrūd in the territories of
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Ḍamrah. Al-Ḥāzimī describes Rābigh as a valley in al-Juḥfah. Al-Zamakhsharī places Rābigh between al-Juḥfah and al-Abwā' at ten miles' distance from the former. Ibn al-Ṣābūnī says that Rābigh is a halt on the Syrian pilgrim route, but Abū al-Fidā'ī indicates that Rābigh has already replaced al-Juḥfah as a stopping place, and the place where the Egyptian pilgrims begin to perform their pilgrimage rites. Abū al-Fidā'ī's account is more accurate as the Syrian pilgrim caravans used to call at Medina, which pilgrims should start observing their Ḥajj rites at al-Shajarah.

Yāqūt attributes to Ibn al-Sikkīt the location of al-Barūd near Rābigh. However, both Yāqūt, in another entry, and Nasr mention al-Marrūd which is identical with this locality, as Yāqūt stresses in both places that it is in the territories of Ḍamrah near

3. Al-Zamakhsharī, Jibal, p. 50.
7. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 505.
Rābigh. Moreover, al-Bakrī gives it the name al-Barūd, but places it in the territories of Đamrah in one passage,¹ and in that of Aslam near al-Fur', in another.²

Rābigh is a flourishing town in that region, but should not be confused with Mt. Rābighah which is situated on what used to the Iraqi pilgrim route near al-Suwārīqiyyah.

¹. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 246.
². Ibid., p. 1020.
Neither Ibn Khurradadhbeh nor Qudāmah mention al-Rauḥā' on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca. Ibn Rosteh places it at thirty-one miles from al-Shajarah and thirty-four miles from al-Ruwaithah. He adds that al-Rauḥā' is but another name for al-Sayālah, a statement which cannot be accepted.\(^1\) Al-Ya'qūbī places it on the pilgrim route between al-Sayālah and al-Ruwaithah in the direction of Mecca, adding that it is the land of Muzainah.\(^2\) Al-Muqaddasī fares no better than Ibn Rosteh when the former describes al-Rauḥā' as equidistant from al-'Arj and al-Ruwaithah in the direction of Medina at one day's journey from either. Actually it is al-Ruwaithah that lies between al-Rauḥā' and al-'Arj.\(^3\) He assesses the distance between Badr and al-Rauḥā' at a journey of two days.\(^4\)

'Arrām states that al-Rauḥā' is one of several villages at the foot of Mt. Ṭariqān on the right side of the mountain in the direction of Mecca. He implies that

---

al-Rauḥā' lies in the same direction between Sayālah and al-Ruwaithah. Al-Hamdānī points out al-Rauḥā' as Juhainī land, and adds that the water of the valley of Shanūkatān (the two Shanūkahs) flows into al-Rauḥā'. He places al-Rauḥā' at twenty-four miles from al-Sayālah and thirteen miles from al-Ruwaithah, giving its degree of latitude as 23° 20'. Al-Bakrī enumerates al-Rauḥā' among the lands usurped by the Juhainah tribe in their drive to the north. In another passage, he describes it as a principal village situated forty-one miles from Medina and inhabited by Muzainah. He states that there is a mosque of the Prophet erected in the place where the Prophet once held prayers, and quotes al-Bukhārī on the location of that mosque. He also quotes Mālik as saying that where the houses of a village stand close together, as they do in al-Rauḥā', the Friday prayer should be held. He relates the story of Muḍār's burial, who is said to have been laid to rest in al-Rauḥā'. Al-Bakrī attributes two different statements on the derivation of the name

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 402.
3. Ibid., p. 181.
4. Ibid., p. 184.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 38.
al-Rauha' to the poet Kuthayyir; one of them he attributes to the prevalence of a breeze رفع there; the other to the fact that the wind blows through it جر. Yaqut relies on Ibn al-Kalbi when relating that the Tubba' gave it its name because he had found comfort رماح there.

Al-Bakri states that the valley of al-Rauha' lies south of Mt. al-Ashar, and that Sajsaj is a well in the region of al-Rauha'. In another passage, he, however, describes it as the "well of al-Rauha'". Al-Bakri corrupts 'Arram's above-quoted statement on al-Rauha' without naming his source. Whereas 'Arram says that al-Rauha' lies between Saylah and al-Ruwaithah at the foot of Mt. Wariqan on its right side in the direction of Mecca, al-Bakri claims that al-Rauha' is situated between Saylah and al-Ruwaithah on the right side of Mt. Wariqan in the direction of Medina,

1. Ibid., p. 681-2, and see Wakil, Manazil, fol. 48.
2. Ibid., p. 1257.
5. Ibid., p. 724.
6. Ibid., p. 958.
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which cannot be true. This error is attributable to his misplacement of Ḫariqān which 'Arrām describes as the first mountain encountered by travellers leaving Medina for Mecca. Al-Bakrī, inadvertently, substitutes Mecca for Medina and vice versa.\(^1\) He calculates the distances from al-Rauḥā’ to al-Sayālah as eleven miles, that from al-Rauḥā’ to al-Ruwaithah as twenty-four miles and that from al-Rauḥā’ to the village of Ṭuḥ as twelve miles.\(^2\) According to al-Bakrī there is more than one route that leads from al-Rauḥā’ to Mecca.\(^3\) Yağūt quotes Muslim and Ibn Abū Shaibah when saying that the distance from al-Rauḥā’ is thirty-six and thirty miles respectively without signifying the other end of that journey. Yağūt seems to imply that this other end is al-Fur',\(^4\) but al-Samhūdī is clear in pointing it out as Medina\(^5\) which is true. Both authors seem to rely on 'Iyāḍ who describes al-Rauḥā’ as a dependency of Medina controlled from al-Fur'. As to the distances, 'Iyāḍ situates al-Rauḥā’ at forty miles from Medina, but quotes Muslim and Ibn Abū Shaibah

\(^1\) Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1377.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 959.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 959.


\(^5\) Al-Samhūdī, Ṭafā', p. 1222.
who assess it at thirty-six and thirty miles respectively.¹ Yaqtūt also relies on al-Wāqīdī in his calculation of the distance between 'Irq al-Zabyah and al-Rauḥā', which, as he assumes, is three miles,² but it is two miles only in al-Wāqīdī's Maghāzī.³ Al-Asadī, however, states that the distance from al-Rauḥā' to Medina is thirty-five or thirty-six miles, and, in another place, forty-two. As al-Asadī is usually accurate, the discrepancy could be the result of a variation made in the actual points of departure and arrival as al-Samhūdī suggests.⁴ Another fact recorded by al-Isadī is that there are two pillars at the entrance to, and two at the exit from, al-Rauḥā'. He adds that al-Rauḥā' possesses relics of the Prophet, two palaces and several wells, one of which is attributed to Marwān, and has a cistern built by al-Rashīd, while another provided with a waterscoop is ascribed to 'Uthmān. Its water also flows into a cistern. 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz had a well dug there whose water gushed from one of the two cisterns, in the middle of the market. As to the well of al-Wāthiq,
al-Asadî says that it is the worst of them all, since its depth is sixty cubits. He situates 'Irq al-Zabyah at two miles from al-Rauhâ'.\(^1\) Apart from the reference to al-Tâthîq's well, al-Asadî's information is derived from Wâkid\(^2\). Al-Idrîsî seems to confuse al-Rauhâ' with al-Haurâ', which results in locating al-Ṣafrah on the coast.\(^3\)

Al-Zamakhshari states that al-Rauhâ' is situated at four postal stages minus three miles from Medina.\(^4\) In his Masâlik, al-Bakrî mentions a mosque of the Prophet called al-Makhdûb at a distance of three miles from al-Rauhâ'.\(^5\) The name of the mosque is al-Munsaraf as al-Asadî mentions it, with the same location.

According to a letter addressed to Ibn Bulaihid, al-Rauhâ' is still known and lies at a distance of 75 K.M. from Medina in the direction of Mecca.\(^6\) In fact, it is called Bi'r Râhah.

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 1008-10.
\(^2\) Wâkid, Manâzil, fol. 48.
\(^3\) See supra, p. 94.
\(^4\) Al-Zamakhshari, Jibâl, p. 79.
\(^5\) Al-Bakrî, Masâlik, fol. 75.
AL-RUHBAN

Ibn Khurrawadhebheh refers to al-Ruḥbah as a dependency of Medina. However, in listing the names of the stops, he calls it al-Ruḥaibah and locates it between al-Marwah in the south, and Wādī al-Qurā in the north, and mentions it twice, once when speaking of the Egyptian route, and the second time when drawing up the Syrian route. Ibn Rostheh follows him to the letter except in calling it al-Ruḥbah throughout his book. Both authors vocalize it "al-Raḥbah". Qudāmah follows Ibn Khurrawadhebheh even with respect to the use of the name al-Ruḥaibah, but does not mention it with regard to the Syrian route. Indeed, he omits all stops between Wādī al-Qurā and Medina, apparently because he has already mentioned these in connection with the Egyptian route. He uses the name al-Ruḥbah when enumerating the dependencies of Medina.

1. Ibn Khurrawadhebheh, op. cit., p. 129.
2. Ibid., p. 150.
3. Ibid., p. 150.
5. Qudāmah, op. cit., p. 190.
6. Ibid., p. 248.
Al-Ya'qūbī does not mention al-Ruhbah either in connection with the Egyptian or the Syrian inland route. Al-Bakrī does not refer to al-Ruhbah in his Masālik, but does so in al-Mu'jam. He also discusses its spelling on which he is definite. He is less so on its population: he says, in one passage, that its inhabitants were from Balīyy,¹ and, in another place, that it lies in the land of 'Udhrah.² The editor, however, vocalizes it al-Rahbah in many places.³

Al-Idrīsī uses the name al-Ruhbah when describing the place as a dependency of Medina,⁴ but substitutes al-Ruḥaibah for it when listing the halting places on the conventional overland route between Ailah and Medina. He locates it south of Ṭādī al-Qurā and north of Dhul-Marwah.⁵ He, however, calls it al-Ruhbah when mapping the Syrian route.⁶

Al-Muqaddasī locates al-Ruhbah, apparently on the coastal route, north of Munkhūs and south of al-

¹ Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 28.
² Ibid., p. 643.
³ Ibid., pp. 28, 793, 1281.
⁴ Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 36.
⁵ Ibid., fol. 88.
⁶ Ibid., fol. 89.
'Aunīd. This is likely to be a result of misreading al-Wajh as al-Ruḥbah. Its form is al-Ruḥbah, according to Naṣr, who describes it as a region between Syria and Medina near Wādī al-Qura. Al-Maqrīzī lists al-Ruḥbah among the small Hijazi rural towns.

Al-Ruḥbah has gone out of existence, but it is easy to locate it as it is identical with, or lies near, Suqyā al-Jazl which means that both of them were situated near the valley of al-Jazl. It should be remembered that there are many places in Arabia called al-Ruḥbah and al-Raḥbah, no less than three among them in the Hijaz alone.

2. Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 73.
3. Al-Maqrīzī, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 70.
AL-RUWAITHAH

Ibn Khurradadhbeh places al-Ruwaithah thirty-six miles north of al-Suqyā and thirty-four miles south of al-Sayālah on the conventional route between Mecca and Medina. As to the place itself, he does not elaborate beyond saying that it has cisterns.¹ Al-Ya'qūbī locates it south of al-Rauḥā' and north of al-'Arj, adding that its population comprises descendants of 'Uthmān and other Arabs.² Ibn Rosteh follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh with respect to the location of al-Ruwaithah, and in the calculation of the above-mentioned distances, stating that it is a watering place on the pilgrim route, with a well called al-Aḥsā', and with a seasonal population during the pilgrimage months.³ Qudāmah seems to have borrowed Ibn Rosteh's statement about both location and distances, but what the latter calls al-Aḥsā' has become in Qudāmah's Kharāj, mere aḥsā' "wells within easy reach".⁴

Al-Muqaddasī places al-Ruwaithah north of al-Rauḥā' and regards it as the last halt for travellers

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 130.
2. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 313.
from Mecca to Medina.\textsuperscript{1} He does not seem to be accurate either about the location or the distances as al-Ruwaithah lies, in fact, south of al-Rauḥā', and is sixty miles distant from Medina according to al-Asadī,\textsuperscript{2} and fifty-nine miles according to Ibn Khurradadhbeh; such a distance could not be covered in a mere day's journey, and cannot be compared with the distance between al-Ruwaithah and al-Rauḥā', which is, according to al-Hamdānī, thirteen miles only.\textsuperscript{3} Al-Hamdānī describes Thāfil as a village of al-Ruwaithah.\textsuperscript{4} He places the latter at twenty-four miles from al-'Arj in the south and thirteen miles from al-Rauḥā' in the north, giving its latitude as $23^\circ.10'$.\textsuperscript{5} He describes it as Juhainī land,\textsuperscript{6} in one passage, and mentions, in another, a locality with that name as a territory of B. Murrah.\textsuperscript{7}

'Arrām states that Mt. Wariqān stretches from Sayālah to the "evening meal" halt between al-Ruwaithah

---

and al-\textsuperscript{1}Arrām.\textsuperscript{1} Al-Bakrī borrows this statement without mentioning his source.\textsuperscript{2} In another passage, al-Bakrī relates that al-Ruwaithah was among the territories conquered by Juhainah.\textsuperscript{3} He quotes Ibn Ḥabīb when he states that the waters of Buzrah valley flows into the fresh-water wells of al-Ruwaithah.\textsuperscript{4} Relying on the authority of Ibn al-Sikkīt, Yaqūt calls it Burzah,\textsuperscript{5} but draws on Naṣr in another entry where he calls it Buzrah which is the correct form. Naṣr, however, calls it both.\textsuperscript{6} Al-Bakrī calculates the distance from Medina to al-Ruwaithah as seventeen parasangs\textsuperscript{7} in one passage, and, in another, twenty-one parasangs,\textsuperscript{8} from al-Ruwaithat to al-Sugyā as ten parasangs,\textsuperscript{9} and from al-Ruwaithah to al-Ṣafrah twelve miles.\textsuperscript{10} The pass of

\begin{footnotes}
1. \textit{Arrām, op. cit.}, p. 402.
\end{footnotes}
al-'Arj is eleven miles distant from al-Ruwaithah, in one passage,\(^1\) and, in another, fourteen miles.\(^2\) is to the distance between al-Rauḥā' and al-Ruwaithah, al-Bakrī mentions that it is twenty-four miles. He says that two different routes lead from al-Rauḥā' to Badr, one of which passes al-Ruwaithah. Twelve miles south of al-Ruwaithah lies al-Uthāyah\(^3\) where the southern borders of the Hijaz end. He describes al-Uthāyah as a well close to a mosque of the Prophet.\(^4\)

Al-Bakrī seems to have relied mainly on al-Asadī whose information is derived from Waki'. According to the latter, al-Ruwaithah belongs to Muzainah, and possesses many wells. He refers to the Prophet's mosque at the 51st postal stage near al-Ruwaithah. He also mentions the Prophet's mosque, and a very old tree with numerous inscriptions on its trunk\(^5\) in close proximity of this mosque.

Al-Idrīsī follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh with regard to the distances and location of al-Ruwaithah which he

---

describes as a place in ruins, but still possessing its cisterns.¹ Naṣr claims that the Jiyy valley near al-Ruwaithah was the place where ancient people were carried away by a flood while they were asleep.² Yāqūt records a statement by al-Azhārī which describes al-Ruwaithah as a watering halt between Mecca and Medina. Ibn al-Sikkīt is also quoted as saying that al-Ruwaithah is the "evening meal" stop between al-'Irj and al-Rauhā'. In the same entry Yāqūt quotes Ibn al-Kalbī to the effect that the Tubba' was late arriving at al-Ruwaithah and gave it a name commemorating the delay raith.³

Al-Bukhārī locates the Prophet's mosque of al-Ruwaithah at two miles north of the postal sign of al-Ruwaithah near which stands a very old tree with numerous writings on its trunk.⁴ Al-Asadī gives two estimates of the distance between al-Ruwaithah and al-Rauhā': thirteen miles and sixteen miles and a half. He calls the two mountains flanking al-Ruwaithah "al-Ḥamrā'; which faces its houses", and al-Ḥasnā' "which

---

4. Al-Bukhārī, Sahīh, vol. 1, p. 134, and see infra, p. 514
lies to the east on the left side of it".¹ Al-Ruwaithah is identical with Bi'r 'Abbās.

¹ Al-Samhūdī, Wafā', p. 1012.


\textbf{AL-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a}}

Waki', regards al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a} as a dependency of Medina. He locates it at twelve miles from al-Ruwaithah and states that it belongs to the descendants of 'Uthmān and Ja'far.\textsuperscript{1} Mapping what seems to\textsuperscript{h} the conventional route from Mecca to Medina, al-Muqaddasi situates al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a} between Badr, in the direction of Mecca, and al-Rauḥa\textsuperscript{a} in the direction of Medina. It is separated from either by one day's journey. Al-Muqaddasi mentions its abundant palm groves and springs, and equates it with a place called al-MAṣlah.\textsuperscript{2} Of all Arab geographers of that era, 'Arrām gives the most detailed description of al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a} to which he refers as a village abounding with corn-fields and groves of palm trees, and water derived from springs. He locates it between Medina and Yanbu\textsuperscript{,}, and states that its waters flow into the latter. RAṢWA, which he locates close to 'Azwar, lies west of al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a}. 'Arrām also speaks of small hills and mountains surrounding al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a}, and adds that al-SAṣRA\textsuperscript{a} belongs to the tribes Juhainah, al-Înṣār, B.

\textsuperscript{1} WAKI', \textit{Manāzil}, fols. 40, 48.
\textsuperscript{2} Al-Muqaddasi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 107.
Fihr and Mahd. ¹ As regards the location, the text cannot be identical with 'Arrām's original account for two obvious reasons. First, the statement that Raḍwā lies to the west of al-Ṣafrā' is contrary to fact, as Raḍwā lies at a considerable distance from al-Ṣafrā' to the north of it. Secondly, the assumption that Yalyal is the valley of Yanbu' and that its waters flow into the latter is erroneous. Yalyal is not the valley of Yanbu', but of al-Ṣafrā' and its waters flow into Ghaiqah. As it is unthinkable that 'Arrām could have placed Raḍwā west of al-Ṣafrā' or confused Yalyal with the valley of Yanbu', it is obvious that alterations have been made to 'Arrām's text. Equally puzzling is the location of 'Azwar at the distance of a race course from Raḍwā, since all other authors locate it near al-Juḥfah, and some even speak of it in connection with the route which the Prophet took when travelling from Medina to Mecca. ² This is the region in which it is placed by al-Zamakhšarī who relies on the authority of the well-informed 'Ulayy, ³ as well as al-

---

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 398.
2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 368, 656.
3. Al-Zamakhšarī, Jibāl, p. 164.
Hamdānī and Ibn al-Sikkīt. Hijazi poets such al-Muzarrīd, Ibn Harmah, Kuthayyir and al-Ahwās also situate it near al-Juḥfah. 'Arram speaks of a spring in Yalyal called al-Buhair, a spring of extremely fresh water which gushes from a mound and runs on through the sands. So profuse is this spring that it defies all attempts at control on the part of the peasants, except where it meanders through the sands. It waters palm trees, melons and vegetables.

Al-Bakrī follows 'Arram's description of al-Ṣafrā', but mentions that al-Buhairah (al-Buhair) is a spring of al-Ṣafrā', and attributes the statement that al-Ṣafrā' is the valley of Yalyal to al-Qālī. Al-Bakrī relies on al-Sakūnī, a transmitter of 'Arram, in listing al-Safra' among the settlements of Damrah. In another passage, he states that it belongs to B. Ghifār (a branch

1. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, pp. 177, 181.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1233.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1280.
6. Ibid., p. 836.
7. Ibid., p. 659.
of Ḍamrah). ⁴ As to the location of al-Ṣafra', al-Bakrī states that it lies on the way from Medina to Mecca, but not on the conventional route. He assesses the distance from al-Ṣafra' to al-Ruwaidah at twelve miles, to Badr at twenty miles, to al-Khiyān at thirteen miles and to the village of Nūḥ at seventeen miles. ² He implies that al-Ṣafra', albeit having dependencies of its own, is a dependency of al-Fur'. ³ According to him, one of the valleys whose waters abut upon al-Ṣafra' is Ṣāsā (Ḍās); ⁴ so is Raḥqān. ⁵ Among the places which al-Bakrī locates at or near al-Ṣafra' are 'Irq al-Zabyah; ⁶ Ṣuṣ', a grey mountain; ⁷ Musliḥ and Mukhrī which are the mountains of al-Ṣafra'; ⁸ Faifa Khuraim; ⁹ al-Madīq of al-Ṣafra'; ¹⁰ and Thirā which he locates at two days' distance from

---

1. Ibid., p. 1227.
2. Ibid., p. 954.
3. Ibid., p. 1020.
5. Ibid., p. 439.
6. Ibid., p. 903.
7. Ibid., p. 1309.
8. Ibid., p. 1227.
9. Ibid., p. 1038.
10. Ibid., p. 958.
Medina.⁰

Al-Hamdānī lists al-Ṣafrā‘ among the Juhainī settlements,² and records a poem by al-‘Ajlānī, the Hijazi poet who situates it between Badr and al-Rauhā‘.³ Naṣr maintains that al-Ṣafrā‘ lies in the valley of Yalyal.⁴ Al-Ṭāqīdī places it in the neighbourhood of Sayar⁵ which Ibn Sa‘d locates at three days’ distance from Medina.⁶ Al-Zamakhsharī mentions al-Dabbah as lying between al-Ṣafrā‘ and al-Rauhā‘,⁷ and describes the former as a place, in one passage,⁸ and as a village in the valley of Yalyal, in another.⁹ Al-Idrīsī describes al-Ṣafrā‘ as an adequate port lying between two other ports, al-Ḥaurā‘ in the direction of Egypt and al-Quraifah in the direction of al-Jār.¹⁰ Both the location and the

---

¹ Ibid., p. 340.
² Al-Hamdānī, Sīfāh, p. 171.
³ Ibid., p. 218.
⁴ Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 34.
⁵ Al-Ṭāqīdī, op. cit., p. 100.
⁷ Al-Zamakhsharī, Jībāl, p. 61.
⁸ Ibid., p. 99.
⁹ Ibid., p. 165.
¹⁰ Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 88.
description are erroneous, as al-Šafrā' is situated in an inland valley east of al-Jār. ʿAl-Idrīsī seems to confuse al-Rauhā', a way-station east of al-Šafrā', with al-Ḥaurā', the famous port north of Yanbu'. Such confusion, if it happens, requires him to assume that al-Šafrā' lies on the coast between al-Ḥaurā' and al-Jār. ʿAl-Quraifah الفريغة العذيبة which lies west of al-Šafrā' and east of al-Jār. Thus the route from al-Rauhā', in the interior, to the port of al-Jār, has been confused with the route from the port of al-Ḥaurā' to the port of al-Jār.

Yāqūt records 'Arrām's statement about al-Šafrā' with minor alterations in phrasing. Instead of "Radwā' lies west of al-Šafrā'", Yāqūt has "The valley of al-Šafrā' lies east of Radwā'," which is of course the same mistake. He quotes Ibn al-Sikkīt when stating that al-Kharmā', which is a spring in the valley of al-Šafrā', belongs to a certain member of Ghifār, while al-Uthayyil (al-Uthail), which abounds in palm trees and lies between Badr and al-Šafrā', belongs to B. Ja'far. He attributes the information that the valley of al-Samak,

---

3. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 121.
which pilgrims sometimes pass, is a Hijazi locality in the region of al-Šafrā', to al-Ḥazimī, and the assumption that Farāqīd is a valley whose waters flow into the valley of al-Šafrā' to Ibn al-Sikkīt whom he also quotes when describing Fi'rā as a mountain whose waters abut upon the valley of al-Šafrā'. However, Yāqūt relies on al-Bakrī in vocalizing the name Fi'rā. It is true that al-Bakrī vocalizes it so, but he also gives another form Fu'rā which he attributes to Ibn Ḥabīb. Yāqūt also relies on Ibn Ḥabīb when locating Ṭāsiṭ between al-'Udhaibah and al-Šafrā', and on Ibn al-Furāt when describing al-Māziyyah near al-Šafrā' as a wide area with wild plants and grass. There is a spring called Kutānah located by Yāqūt at al-Šafrā' and described by him as the property of the descendants of Abū Maryam who inherited it from B. Ja'far. Yāqūt relies for both pieces of information on the authority of Ibn al-Sikkīt, while al-Bakrī

1. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 140.
2. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 865.
5. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 890.
6. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 728.
7. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 235.
attributes it to Ibn Ḥabīb and locates Kutānah in Najd which is unacceptable.¹ Al-Bakrī seems to confuse Kutānah with Kutnah which he describes, in another passage, as a Najdī dependency of Mecca.² Lughdah situates al-Ṣafrāʾ at two days' distance from Medina and describes it as a valley with palm groves. Its inhabitants are B. Yahīd, clients of the 'Uthmānis.³

Al-Ṣafrāʾ still has many villages and springs and is still famous in that area.

¹ Ibid., p. 1114, and see Lughdah, op. cit., p. 417.
² Al-Bakrī, Muʾjam, p. 309.
³ Lughdah, op. cit., p. 410.
The name al-Sarḥah has, in Arabic, a poetic, almost nostalgic sound, because it reminded the early Arabs of a very dear commodity, water. Where there was a sarḥah, there was also water; when the well was exhausted, the early Arab wandered on. In view of this desert character of the early Arabs, neither trees of which the Sarḥah is only one kind, nor water, nor wells can be traced with any certainty. That may account for our inability to identify this place which is mentioned by no less than four Arab geographers of the early period. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh, Qudāmah and al-Muqaddasī speak of it as a way-station on the inland route between Ailah and Medina. All of them locate it between Badā in the north, and al-Baida in the south. In spite of his different version of that route, al-Muqaddasī is quite consistent as regards its location. Al-Ya'qūbī omits both al-Sarḥatain and al-Baida' from his account of the inland route between Ailah and Medina. Al-Bakrī

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 149.
seems to follow him in this respect, as he passes over both these places in silence when mapping that route in his *Masālik*. Though he mentions al-Baiḍāʾ in his version of that route, al-Idrīsī fails to mention al-Sarḥatain.¹ Wākī' locates al-Sarḥatain north of al-Suqyā and south of Shaghib which should be Badā, as Badā separates al-Sarḥatain from Shaghib.²

Ibn Khurramadbeh lists al-Sayālah among the dependencies of Medina.\(^1\) As to the conventional route between Medina and Mecca, he places al-Sayālah, which possesses wells, at nineteen miles from Malal in the direction of Medina and thirty-four miles from al-Ruwaithah in the direction of Mecca.\(^2\) Al-Ya'qūbī adopts the same location, but without mention of distances. As to the inhabitants of al-Sayālah, al-Ya'qūbī relates that they are Ḥasanīs who have displaced the Quraisḥī and other elements.\(^3\) Ibn Rosteh describes al-Sayālah as fairly densely populated, with a small market and some wells. He points out that Shahines and Sakers are sold there. Ibn Rosteh places al-Sayālah at thirty-one miles from al-Shajarah towards Medina, and thirty-four miles from al-Ruwaithah in the direction of Mecca, adding that al-Sayālah is identical with al-Rauḥā',\(^4\) an opinion which is not acceptable. Al-Hamdānī is sure that al-Sayālah lies at twenty-four miles from al-Rauḥā' to the

---

1. Ibn Khurramadbeh, op. cit., p. 129.
2. Ibid., p. 130.
3. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 313.
south and at twenty-three miles from Medina. He gives its degree of latitude as 23° 40', and adds that there is a direct route from sayâlah to Uwâl north of Medina which some Egyptian and Syrian pilgrims choose to follow. He mentions a poem by the Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlanî, in which al-Sayâlah is located between al-Fur' and al-Khulai'ât (Khubaitât?).

Qudâmah follows Ibn Khurradadbeh on the location of al-Sayâlah and on the distances to and from this place. He also concurs in describing it as a dependency of Medina, and on the existence of wells there. Besides, Qudâmah follows Ibn Rosteh on the fact of Shahines and Sakers being sold there. According to Wâki', al-Sayâlah belongs to the descendants of al-Husain (al-Hasan) b. 'Alî. It possesses many famous wells. At a mile's distance from al-Sayâlah on the right side of the route lies the Suwaiqah of the descendants of 'Abd Allâh b. al-Hasan. The distances from

2. Ibid., p. 130.
3. Ibid., p. 219.
5. Ibid., p. 248.
al-Sayālah are seven miles to Malal; eleven miles to al-Rauḥa', and twenty-four miles to al-Ruwaithah.¹

Al-Bakrī assesses the distance from al-Sayālah to Malal at seventeen miles. He describes al-Sayālah as a principal village, dominated by the Ḥasanīs (they had been driven out well over a century before in the ninth century by the Ḥarb tribe), at twenty-nine miles from Medina and twelve miles from al-Rauḥa'. He adds that there are wells in al-Sayālah, the biggest of which is that of Calph al-Rashīd with a diameter of nine cubits.² Without referring to a source, al-Bakrī borrows 'Arrām's statement about Mt. Wariqān which stretches from al-Sayālah to the "evening meal" halt between al-'Arj and al-Ruwaithah.³ Al-Bakrī errs with regard to the location of Wariqān, which he describes as the first mountain to encounter travellers emerging from Mecca, a location contradictory to fact and to 'Arrām, and which leads to more errors discussed under the entry on al-'Arj. In another entry al-Bakrī calculates the distance between al-Sayālah and al-Rauḥa' as eleven miles.⁴ 'Arrām,

1. Waki', Manāzil, fol. 46.
2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 769-70.
3. Ibid., p. 1377.
4. Ibid., p. 958.
however, locates al-Sayālah west of Mt. Wariqān which he describes as the first mountain from Medina to Mecca, unlike al-Bakrī.¹

Al-Idrīsī lists al-Sayālah among the famous localities in the fifth part of the third (sic) climate.² He also counts al-Sayālah as a dependency of Medina. Al-Idrīsī says that al-Sayālah is a poor way-station, but that its water is fresh and good to drink. He follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh in respect of both the location and the distance from al-Ruwaithah. As regards the distance between al-Sayālah and Malal, he states that it is seventeen miles.³ Al-Maqdisī regards al-Sayālah as one of the smaller towns in the Hijaz.⁴ Al-Hajari records that there are four hills each called Ṣamrā', on the right hand side of travellers from Medina to Mecca.⁵ Al Zamakhsharī attributes to 'Ulayy a statement to the effect that al-Sayālah valley is the southern limit of the Qabaliyyah region on the pilgrim route.⁶ Ibn al-

¹ 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 402.
² Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
³ Ibid., fol. 37.
⁴ Al-Maqdisī, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 70.
⁵ al-Hajari, Nawādir, part 1, fol. 132.
Kalbī is of the opinion that the name al-Sayālah derives from the campaign of the Tubba' who, being short of water on his arrival there, was exceedingly pleased to find the valley flooded with rain.\(^1\) Al-Samhūdī attributes this to Ibn al-Sikkīt,\(^2\) which is unlikely.

Ibn 'Isākir mentions that Ibn Harmah, the 8th century poet, lived there.\(^3\) Al-Isfahānī relates that Ibn Harmah, having run out of wine during a party, sent a message in verse to a Ṭālibī notable, also resident in al-Sayālah, asking him for a supply (of wine), but begging him not to divulge the news to the people of al-Sayālah. The Ṭālibī was so outraged by this insulting hint that he summoned the governor of al-Sayālah, who broke up the party at his demand.\(^4\)

Like Wākī', al-Isadī locates al-Sayālah at eleven miles from al-Rauḥā', seven miles from Malal, one mile from Suwaiqah, two miles from the Prophet's mosque of al-Sharaf and nine miles from that of ('Irq) al-Zabyah. He adds that it is owned by the descendants of al-Ḥusain

---

b. 'Alī (it should read al-Ḥasan) and some Quraishīs.¹

In al-Bakrī's Masālik ('Irq) al-Zabyah has become 'Irq al-Ṭib.²

---

2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 75.
Shaghb is the twin village of Badā. The Arab geographers of the era in question hardly ever mention one without the other. Ibn Khurradadhbeh locates Shaghb north of Badā and south of al-Kilābah;\(^1\) so do Ibn Rosteh\(^2\) and Qudāmah.\(^3\) All of them, except Wākī, have an anonymous halt between Shaghb and al-Kilābah. Al-Ya'qūbī has Qālīs instead of both of the unnamed halt and al-Kilābah.\(^4\) Neither Ibn Khurradadhbeh nor Ibn Rosteh refer to its position on the inland route, but this fact is clearly stated by the others as every one of them has more than one route.

Al-Iṣṭakhrī says that it is on the Egyptian and Palestinian inland route from Ailah to Medina, adding that it was an iqṭā' granted by the Umayyads to al-Zuhrī, the muḥaddith, who died and was buried there.\(^5\) Ibn Ḥauqāl says the same except that he omits "muḥaddith" and, when speaking about the Umayyads, employs كأنوا .

---

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op. cit., p. 149.
2. Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 188.
5. Iṣṭakhrī, op. cit., p. 28.
which is not good Arabic, instead of كان 1

Al-Muqaddasī refers to Shaghb only when discussing the inland route from Ailah to Medina. He does so twice and on both occasions locates it between al-Kilāyah (al-Kilābah) and Badā. 2 However, he omits it altogether in another passage and is content with the mention of al-'Aunīd. 3

Al-Bakrī's Masālik contains no mention of Shaghb, though he alludes to Badā when speaking of the conventional route. 4 However, he quotes al-Īsādī in al-Mu'jam when saying that Shaghb and Badā are the northern limits of the Hijaz. 5 In another passage he locates both Shaghb and Badā between Taimā' and Medina, saying that they are situated within the territory of Bāliyy. 6 This can be traced to al-Hamdānī, who says that Bāliyy possess land in Shaghb and Badā between Taimā' and Medina. 7 According to al-Bakrī, Shaghb was

1. Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 40.
3. Ibid., p. 107.
4. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 11.
6. Ibid., p. 90.
the residence and the burial place of al-Zuhri. He
describes it as a watering place between the Egyptian
and the Syrian routes.¹ The last-mentioned statement is
borrowed by Naṣr.² Wakī' is mistaken in locating Shaghb
south of Badā', as the latter is actually situated south
of Shaghb. In consequence of this mistake, he locates
Shaghb north of al-Sarḥatain from which it is, in fact,
separated by Badā'.³

Al-Idrīsī calls it Sha'b and lists it among
the way-stations on the inland route between Ailah and
Medina. He locates it south of Ḥnikilāyah (al-Kilābah)
and north of al-Baṣīr.⁴

Yāqūt quotes Ibn al-Sikkīt when describing
Shaghb as a town larger than Badā', and adds that Badā'
has a minbar, while Shaghb has both a minbar and a
market. Yāqūt mentions two places, one called Shaghb
and the other Shaghbā, which are no doubt the same.⁵
The corruption of Shaghb to Shaghbā seems to derive
from a poem by Kuthayyir, in which Shaghb is nunated

¹ Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 802.
² Naṣr, op. cit., fol. 92.
³ Wakī', Manāzil, fol. 114.
⁴ Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
⁵ Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 3, p. 302.
to become Shaghban. It is not unusual for nunation with fathah to become alif maqṣūrah. Thus Shaghban becomes Shaghbā in some works, which confuses Yaqūt.

According to al-Sam'ānī, the full name of the place is Yadā Shaghb. He describes it as a valley in the Ailah region. In connection with al-Zuhri, he states that he died there and asked to be buried on the roadside to remind the Muslims to pray for him.¹

Ibn Khallikān states that al-Zuhri's grave is not found in Shaghb, but in a village called Ādāmā or Adāmā behind Shaghb and Bada, two valleys or villages between the Hijaz and Syria where the Hijazi territory ends and that of Palestine begins.² He does not quote any source for such information, but al-Bakri relates that al-Isadī states that the Hijazi territory ends, and that of Palestine begins, there.³ As to Adāmā being the burial place of al-Zuhri, Yaqūt attributes it to Abū al-Qāsim al-Sa'dī, adding that Nasr describes Adāmā as a dependency of Medina where al-Zuhri, in his old age, planted groves of palm trees.⁴ In another passage Yaqūt

---

¹. Al-Sam'ānī, op. cit., p. 335.
³. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 11.
says that Shaghib, a village behind Wādī al-Ḡurā, once belonged to al-Zuhrī who was buried there.¹

Moreover, Ibn Khallikān relies on the author of al-Tamḥīd when saying that al-Zuhrī is buried in al-Maʾf, a village in that region which was the residence of al-Zuhrī.² Ibn Qutaibah mentions an anonymous village on the northern border of the Hijaz to the south of Palestine where al-Zuhrī lived and was buried.³

Shaghib, by this name, is still known in the northern Hijaz though al-Qalqashandī expresses his inability to locate either Shuʾaib (Shaghib) or Bādā.⁴

---

1. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 302.
3. Ibn Qutaibah, Maʿārif, p. 239.
SHARAF AL-Ba'IL

This name does not occur in Ibn Khurraidadhbeh's Masālik. Nevertheless it is mentioned by Ibn Rosteh, though in a different form, Sharaf al-Naml, which is probably attributable to a scribe's error.¹ Al-Ya'qūbī, who is the first Arab geographer to mention it, calls it Sharaf al-Ba'īl.² So does Qudāmah.³ All three authors assume that this place is situated on the pilgrim route from Ailāh to the Holy Cities of Arabia. They are unanimous in locating it south of Ailāh and north of Madyan.

In al-Muqaddasi's work it occurs three times, but the spelling varies between Sharaf al-Ba'īl⁴ and Sharaf Dhul Naml.⁵ According to him, it is the starting point of both the inland and the coastal routes to Medina and Mecca. Those who want to follow the inland route go from Sharaf al-Ba'īl to Madyan, while those who want to use the coastal route turn to al-Salā (al-Sīlā). He

¹ Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 183.
² Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
³ Qudāmah, op. cit., pp. 190, 191.
⁴ Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 112.
⁵ Ibid., p. 110.
states that the latter route was the one in use at that time. ¹

Al-Bakrī does not refer to it in his Mu'jam, but mentions it in al-Masālik as a halt on the route from Medina to Ailah, calling it Ashrāf al-Ba'il. He locates it between Madyan in the south and Wādī al-Ghurāb in the north. ²

Yāqūt states, in one passage, that Sharaf al-Ba'il is a mountain on the pilgrim route between Syria and Medina. ³ In another passage, he records the opinion that it is a region in Syria. ⁴ He mentions no source, though it is likely to have been Naṣr. ⁵

Wakī' is in no doubt that Sharaf al-Ba'il does not lie on the Egyptian coastal route, since he describes it as the first halt on the inland route after Ailah. He locates it south of Ailah and north of Madyan. ⁶ The geographers who do not mention Sharaf al-Ba'il refer to Haql as the first stop after Ailah. The two localities

---

1. Ibid., p. 110.
2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
are not identical.

Up to the last century, this place was known under the name al-Sharfā'. It is still known as such to the old people of the area surrounding Mt. Buwārah.
Al-Ya'qūbī gives the name al-Ṣilā to a stopping place on the coastal route between Ḥilāl and Medina. He is the first geographer to record it in an available work. In his book, however, it is misspelt - probably due to a scribe's error - al-Ṣalāh. The place so described is located between al-'Aunīd to the north, and al-Nabk to the south. As has been seen in al-'Aunīd, al-Ya'qūbī's location cannot be accepted, as al-'Aunīd actually lies at several days' distance south of al-Ṣilā.

Qudāmah concurs with al-Ya'qūbī in locating al-Ṣilā north of al-Nabk, but differs from him in placing Sharaf al-Ba'il immediately to the north instead of al-'Aunīd, which he removes further south. In Qudāmah's work the name al-Ṣilā takes the form of al-Ṣalāh. Al-Muqaddasī mentions al-Ṣilā twice, mentioning, in one place, that it lies on what was the then used route, but stating, in another, that it is at one day's journey north of Sharaf al-Ba'il and south of al-Nabk. He uses

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 341.
4. Ibid., p. 112.
the name al-Ṣalā.

Al-Bakrī does not mention al-Ṣilā in his Mu'jam. He does so, however, in al-Masālik where he calls it al-Ṣalāh, locating it on the inland route from Ṣilāh to Medina.¹ Al-Jazīrī has obviously used a correct MS. of this book as he mentions only al-Ṣilā.² Al-Bakrī states very clearly that the location of al-Ṣilā is the same as that of al-Ḍabk. Yāqūt's location of 'Ainūnah might lead to the same conclusion as he insists on three occasions that 'Ainūnah lies between Madyan and al-Ṣalā.³ This tendency is supported by the location, in the Map of Saudi Arabia, of al-Muwailih, alias al-Ḍabk, exactly opposite to the Ṣilā islands, which suggests that the old Ṣilā of the al-Ya'qūbī had been forgotten and its name conferred upon a place in the proximity. Wākī', however, locates al-Ṣilā - which he calls al-Muṣallā - south of 'Ainūnah and north of al-Ḍabk.⁴

¹. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
². Al-Jazīrī, op. cit., p. 441.
Al-Mas'ūdī mentions al-Ṣufainah when listing the settlements of the descendants of ʿAbd-al-Rahmān, son of the first caliph ʿAbū Bakr, who inhabit that part of Arabia which lies on the Iraqi route to Mecca, and are mostly of Beduoin extraction. In another book, he calls it al-Ṣūfainiyyāt and locates it in the Hijaz. On this occasion, however, he does not stress the prevalence of the Beduoin element among the Bakris. The commentator on the dīwān of the poetess al-Khansa' quotes ʿArrān in support of the statement that Ṣūfainah is a Sulaimī village between ٌ (at ٌ) al-Suwāriqiyah, and adds that it is the property of B. al-Sharīd (of the Sulaim), a statement not to be found in ʿArrām's work. In another passage of this commentary, al-Ṣūfainah is described as a Sulaimī village amid lava fields, abounding in groves of palm trees.

Al-Hamdānī includes Ṣūfainah, together with

1. Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbīh, p. 287.
3. Al-Khansa', Dīwān, p. 103.
4. Ibid., p. 104.
al-Suwā'iqiyah, among the Juhainī settlements.\textsuperscript{1} It is recorded that the Prophet bestowed Ṣufainah as an iqa'\textsuperscript{2} upon B. Shamkh of Juhainah on condition that they refrained from claiming what they could not cultivate.\textsuperscript{2} At the time of the Prophet, Juhainah used to live in their own land north west of Medina, whereas Ṣufainah lies to its south east. Besides, B. Shamkh were regarded as belonging to Fazārah and lived far away from Ṣufainah.\textsuperscript{3} As to al-Hamdānī's statement that Ṣufainah is a Juhainī village, it is only acceptable in so far as it refers to the pre-Islamic past of this tribe. Al-Maqdisī describes Ṣufainah as a place between Dhāt 'Irq and al-Bustān,\textsuperscript{4} which cannot be accurate as Dhāt 'Irq is actually situated between Ṣufainah and al-Bustān.

'Arrām describes Ṣufainah as a village abounding in farms and palm groves which are watered by wells, and adds that its mountain, al-Sitār, faces Mt. al-Ḥarrās. He states that Ṣufainah lies on the part of Zubaidah's pilgrim route from Iraq which the pilgrims choose if they

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{1}] Al-Hamdānī, Ṣifāh, p. 171.
\item[\textsuperscript{2}] Hamidullah, Ṣathā'iq, p. 141.
\item[\textsuperscript{3}] Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 869.
\item[\textsuperscript{4}] Al-Maqdisī, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 76.
\end{itemize}
run short of water.\(^1\) Yāqūt attributes this passage to al-Kindī, one of the transmitters of 'Arrām, who adds that the route leads through the Ṣufainah pass which is difficult to ascend.\(^2\) 'Arrām goes on to say that there are wells called al-Ḩaj air and one called al-Nijārah whose water is slightly salty: all these wells face Ṣufainah. The "lower" region of these wells contains Mts. 'Āmūd al-Bān and 'Āmūd al-Safḥ which "nobody can conquer unless he flies". 'Āmūd al-Safḥ is on the right hand side of the route, at one mile's distance from Ufai'iyah which he also calls Ufai'iyah. He describes the latter as a "towering elevation" and with a village called Dhul-Nakhil which is also a halting place on that route.\(^3\) The remark "and salt is found there = َومَلْح" should read "its water is salty = َومَلْح "as it does in Yāqūt.\(^4\) 'Arrām also states that Dhul-Nakhil draws its fresh water from al-Nijārah and al-Ḩaj air, Dhū Mahbalah and al-Subhīyyah.

Most of this statement recurs in al-Bakrī's

---

1. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 436.
3. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 437.
Mu'jam\(^1\) but with some alterations; in one passage, al-Harrās is called al-Harrāq\(^2\) (al-Harrās in the European edition); al-Nijārah and al-Nujair are called al-Thijārah and al-Thujair, a spelling ascribable to al-Bakrī himself;\(^3\) 'Amūd al-Bān is spelt 'Amūd Albān\(^4\) which is the correct form. Unlike 'Arrān who situates al-Nujair and al-Nijārah opposite Šufainah, al-Bakrī maintains that they face al-Harrās.\(^5\) In one passage, al-Bakrī records only one form of the name Ufā'iyyah,\(^6\) but two forms in another.\(^7\) He describes it as a "large elevation" and adds that it has a village, which he does not name, which draws its fresh water from al-Šubhiyyah. 'Arrān, on the other hand, states that its water comes from al-Nijārah and al-Nujair, and Dhū Maḥbalah as well as from al-Šubhiyyah. al-Bakrī also adapts 'Arrān's imaginative metaphor on the impossibility of ascending 'Amūd al-Bān, to the more pedestrian statement that "only birds" reach

---

1. al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 722.
2. Ibid., p. 814.
3. Ibid., p. 336.
4. Ibid., p. 971.
5. Ibid., p. 721.
6. Ibid., p. 722.
its summit.¹

Like al-Bakrî, Yâqût misquotes 'Arrân's statement about Šufainah and its neighbourhood. The two versions of one name, Ufai'iyah and Ufâ'iyah are misinterpreted as two different localities, between which lies al-Nujîl (Dhul-Nakhîl).² Besides, he not only locates Ufai'iyah on the slopes of Šufainah, but also locates 'Amūd al-Bân and 'Amūd al-Safîh there which is contrary to the statement of 'Arrân's transmitter, al-Kindî, whom Yâqût quotes.³ What Yâqût quotes correctly is 'Arrân's statement about the fresh water of al-Nujîl (Dhul-Nakhîl) which helps to correct 'Arrân's edited work.⁴ As to al-Bân, Yâqût records two forms of its name Albân⁵ and Aîyân,⁶ though he does not favour the latter. His source seems to be Naṣr⁷ who also describes Šufainah as a Hijazi village with groves of palm trees, farms and a

¹ Ibid., p. 721.
² Yâqût, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 762.
³ Ibid., vol. 3, p. 730.
⁴ Ibid., vol. 4, p. 762.
⁵ Ibid., vol. 3, p. 730.
⁶ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 348.
sizeable population.¹ For its description, he seems to rely on 'Arrām though the latter's available text contains no mention of its population, merely referring to the size of its farms and palm groves. Naṣr is not consistent as regards the location of Ṣufainah, stating on the one hand, that it is a Hijazi village, but speaking, on the other, of its mountain, al-Sitar, as situated on al-‘Aliyah, which is part of Najd.² He also mentions the two watering places near al-Ṣufainah, Bard and Shir’,³ as belonging to B. al-Hārith of Sulaim. 'Arrām's Dhul-Nakhł figures as al-Najl which is borrowed by Yāqūt.⁴ According to Wākī’, Ṣufainah used to be a halt on the Iraqi pilgrim route before this route was diverted by Īsā b. Musā (d. 167 A.H. - 782 -). Wākī’ assesses the distance from Ṣufainah to Ḥādhah at twenty miles, and that from Ṣufainah to al-Mislah at twenty-eight and a half miles.⁵

Ṣufainah is still known as a village at the same location.

---

1. Ibid., fol. 96.
2. Ibid., fol. 80.
3. Ibid., fol. 82.
5. Wākī’, Manāzil, fol. 16.
Al-Suqīyā (OF B. GHIFĀR)

Al-Suqīyā lies, according to Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca. He places it at thirty-six miles from al-Ruwaithah, in the direction of Medina, and twenty-nine miles from al-Abwā' in the direction of Mecca. He mentions that it has a "flowing river". Ibn Rosteh concurs with regard to location as well as the distance between al-Suqīyā and al-Ruwaithah, but states that al-'Arj lies between them at fourteen miles from al-Suqīyā. As to the distance from al-Suqīyā to al-Abwā', Ibn Rosteh calculates it as nineteen miles. He says of it that it is densely populated, with a large garden and palm groves. Al-Ya'qubī locates al-Suqīyā between al-'Arj and al-Abwā'. He is the first geographer to call it Suqīyā B. Ghifār, adding that it belongs to Kinānah. Qudāmah follows Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh to the letter adding that it has "a plantation". Al-Muqaddasī calls it Suqīyā B. Ghifār and locates it between al-Abwā' and al-'Arj at one day's

1. Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh, op. cit., p. 130.
3. Al-Ya'qubī, Buldān, p. 313.
journey. In another passage he describes it as a mere way-station in the Hijaz.

'Arrām states that Mt. Quds ends at the "evening meal" halt between al-'Arj and al-Suqyū, thus accepting that the distance between them equals one day's journey. In another place, he locates al-Suqyū west of the villages of Arah at three days' journey from al-Fur'. Al-Idrīsī places al-Suqyū twenty-seven miles north of al-Abwā and thirty-six miles south of al-Ruwaithah. He mentions its "flowing river", its garden and groves of palm trees. As to its inhabitants, al-Idrīsī says that they come from the Ṭayy, and a variety of other Arab tribes. No source has been traced for this last statement which, however, is highly unlikely. Al-Hamdānī locates al-Suqyū twenty-four miles south of al-'Arj and nineteen miles north of al-Abwā, adding that its latitude is 22°.45'. Wāki' states that al-Suqyū possesses a spring which flows into the inalienable properties of al-Ḥusain.

1. Al-Muqaddasī, op. cit., p. 29.
2. Ibid., p. 27.
3. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 403.
4. Ibid., p. 405.
(al-Hasan) b. Zaid. Having run dry for years, it began to flow again in the year 248 H. (862), but in 253 (866) it stopped again, and once more started to flow. Waki' states that it was not flowing when he saw it in the year 274 (887). However, he mentions that it flowed once more after that year. This statement is more detailed than that of al-Asadī. Waki' calculates the distances from al-Suqyā at seventeen miles to al-'Airj, seven miles to the spring of al-Qushairī, one mile to 'iskar which possesses the properties of al-Husain (al-Hasan) b. Zaid, three miles to the spring of Ti'han and sixteen miles to al-Abwā'.

Al-Bakrī states that the distance from al-Suqyā to al-'Airj is seventeen miles, to al-Ruwaithah ten parasangs and to al-Abwā' nineteen miles. He also remarks that there is, at seven miles from al-Suqyā, an ancient well called Bi'r al-Talūb, and less than a mile north of al-Suqyā the valley of al-'Abābīd, otherwise known as al-Qāhah. In another entry he divides al-Suqyā from al-Qāhah by a well called Ti'han. He assesses the distance between Ti'han and al-Suqyā at three

1. Waki', Manāzil, fol. 49.
3. Ibid., p. 686.
4. Ibid., pp. 954-55.
miles.\(^1\) He quotes al-Sakūnī when placing al-Suqyā at three days' journey from Ṭarah,\(^2\) but makes no reference to his source when placing the far limit of Mt. Quds between al-'Irj and al-Suqyā.\(^3\) As to the latter, al-Bakrī says that it is a village with a minbar administered from al-Fur,\(^4\) with an abundance of wells, springs and cisterns.\(^5\) He mentions the existence of some waqfs attributed to al-Ḥasan b. Zaid.\(^6\) Al-Bakrī regards al-Suqyā as the northern limit of Tihārah.\(^7\)

As to the origin of the name al-Suqyā, al-Bakrī quotes Kuthayyir who ascribes it to its abundant supply of fresh water.\(^8\) Yāqūt quotes an account by Ibn al-Kalbī who relates that the Tubba' gave it the name because it rained there at a time of dire need. Yāqūt also records a statement by al-Khwārizmī to the effect that the distance between al-Suqyā and al-Fur' is twenty-

---

1. Ibid., p. 743.
2. Ibid., p. 1051.
3. Ibid., p. 1050.
4. Ibid., p. 1021.
5. Ibid., p. 743.
6. Ibid., p. 743.
7. Ibid., p. 11.
8. Ibid., p. 743.
nine miles. He also quotes al-Hanadhānī on the location of al-Suqyā which the latter places in the lower valley of Tihāmah, adding that it is a very large village at a mere day's journey from the sea,¹ a statement untraceable in al-Hanadhānī's available work.

Al-Samḥūdī quotes al-Hanadhānī on the origin of the name al-Suqyā, but it is very unlikely that al-Hanadhānī should have concerned himself with a matter of this kind. Besides, it is clear that al-Samḥūdī relies very heavily on Yaṣūṭī's account of al-Suqyā. It seems that, in copying Yaṣūṭī, he attributes Ibn al-Kalbi's account to al-Hanadhānī, overlooking Ibn al-Kalbi's name and al-Hanadhānī's statement. He does not err, however, when copying al-Khwārīzmī's statement. Al-Samḥūdī records a statement by al-Asadī which implies that the distance between Medina and al-Suqyā is ninety-six miles. 'Iyāḍ places al-Suqyā seventeen miles north west of al-Fur'.² He also places Ti'ahīn (Ti'han) three miles from al-Suqyā.³

₂. Al-Samḥūdī, Tafa', p. 1234.
₃. 'Iyāḍ, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 108.
al-Asadī, about two centuries before, and Yāqūt, about two centuries after al-Bakrī. Ibn Hishān calls it 'Abābīd and 'Abābīb. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī mentions a mosque of the Prophet at a distance of one mile from al-Ṭalūb. Khalīfah locates al-Ṭalūb between al-'Arj and al-Suq̄ā, but al-Zubairī calls it al-Ṣalūb. Al-'Isadī mentions the Prophet's mosque at one mile's distance from al-Ṭalūb which he locates at eleven miles from al-'Arj and six miles from al Suq̄ā, adding that its water is unwholesome. Another mosque mentioned by al-Asadī is that of al-Suq̄ā, near which gushes a fresh water spring. He states that there are more than ten wells, some with cisterns, at al-Suq̄ā. He adds that a rich spring runs through a cistern in the pilgrim's camp and gushes into the waqf estate of al-Hasan b. Zaid which abounds in palms and other trees. He, however, points out that this spring had ceased to flow until 243 A.H. (856 A.D.) when it resumed flowing, but it was

1. Al-Samhūdī, Wafā', pp. 1014-16.
4. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 75.
blocked again after ten years. Al-Isaḍī describes the estate of al-Hasan as having eighty wells, fifty of which were dug during al-Mutwakkil's reign, each well having fresh water within easy reach. Each well watered a farm.¹

¹ Al-Sanḥūdī, Wafā', pp. 1014–16.
There are several places in Arabia which bear the name of Suqyā. The place with which we are concerned here lies on the inland route between Ailah and Medina, according to the Arab geographers. The first among them to record it is al-Ya‘qūbī. He locates it south of Bādā and north of al-Marwah, calling it al-Suqyā. Neither Ibn Khurramadhabeh, nor Ibn Rosteh nor Qudāmah mention it in their respective versions of the route.

Al-Muqaddasī refers to it several times, but with little consistency. He often calls it Suqyā Yazīd and points out that it is a Hijazi town, a dependency of Qurh, and, in another place a dependency of Medina. He asserts that al-Suqyā lies on the inland route between Ailah and Medina and on the route between Medina and Syria. He places it one day’s journey from al-Marwah and three days’ journey from Bādā. In another passage, he enumerates the stopping places on these journeys. For the Syrian route, he mentions Wādī al-Qurā as the first halt to the north of al-Suqyā and al-Hijr as the next. However, he substitutes Qurh for Wādī al-Qurā in a third passage. This is not unexpected of him. It

3. Ibid., p. 84.
4. Ibid., p. 53.
5. Ibid., pp. 107, 112.
is noteworthy that in drawing up the routes, he shortens the form of the name to al-Suqqā, omitting Yazīd. In describing al-Suqqā, al-Muqaddasi says that it is the best town in the region of Qurh, alias Wādī al-Qurā. Its farms and groves of palm trees stretch in a continuous line as far as Qurh. He adds that the mosques lie outside the town. In distinguishing Suqqā Yazīd from Suqqā B. Ghifār, both in the Hijaz, al-Muqaddasi states that the former is a town whereas the latter is a mere way-station in the Hijaz.

Al-Bakrī mentions it in both al-Masālik and al-Mu'jam. In the latter he says that Suqqā al-Jazl is a village in Wādī al-Qurā, and quotes Ibn Ḥabīb to prove that this was the accepted form of the name. He also states that it was inhabited by Baliyy who used to live in the vicinity of Medina before they migrated to that part of Arabia. Nevertheless, he quotes Ibn Ḥabīb's statement that it belonged to 'Udhrah.  Yāqūt also says that Suqqā al-Jazl is within the territory of 'Udhrah attributing this statement, in one passage, to Ibn Ḥabīb, and, in another, to Ibn al-Sikkit. In al-Masālik,

1. Ibid., p. 84.
2. Ibid., p. 27.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 784.
4. Ibid., p. 28.
5. Ibid., p. 784.
al-Bakrī follows al-Muqaddasī in calling it Suqyā Yazīd. 1

Long after the Egyptians had ceased to use the inland route from Ailah to Medina, al-Samhūdī described al-Suqyā as the point where the routes from Syria and Egypt converge. 2 In al-Wafā', al-Samhūdī attributed this statement to al-Asadī who situates Suqyā al-Jazl at a distance of seven days' journey from Medina and two days' journey from al-Marwah.

Al-Asadī's source seems to be Wakī' who locates al-Suqyā north of 'Anāb and south of both Wādī al-Qurā on the Syrian route and al-Sarhatain on the Egyptian inland route. 3 Lughdah describes al-Suqyā as prosperous and abounding in (fruit) trees. He also locates it north of 'Ain Ma'in and 'Amūdān, and south of Wādī al-Qurā. 4
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1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.
5. Lughdah, op.cit., p. 396.
Al-Suwayda' is noted for its proximity to Medina on the conventional route of the Egyptian and the Syrian pilgrim caravans. In most Arab geographical works that care to mention the stopping places, al-Suwayda' is named as a half-way halt between Medina and al-Marwah.

Ibn Khurrahadbeh locates it between al-Marr to the north and Dhū Khushub to the south. So do Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah, except that the latter omits Dhū before Khushub.

Al-Mugaddasi is satisfied to state that al-Suwayda', which he calls al-Suwaidiyyah, is at an equal distance, i.e. two days' journey, from both Medina and al-Marwah.

Al-Handānī is alone in saying that it is at one day's journey from Medina. He does not state it directly, but implies it by stressing that the distance between al-Marwah and Medina is two days' journey with

1. Ibn Khurrahadbeh, op. cit., p. 150.
one halt at al-Suwa'idā', which, he says, is a watering place. He adds that to the right of al-Suwa'idā' (apparently, he means to the west of it) there is Uwāl to which the Egyptian and Syrian caravans are diverted after al-Suwa'idā' if they choose the route through al-Sayālah (in order to avoid visiting Medina). He says that Uwāl is populated by the Ja'afir, Mawālī and a mixture (of Arabs).  

Ibn al-Kalbī quotes ʿAbū Miskīn as saying that al-Suwa'idā' is at two days' journey from Medina on the route to Syria.  

Al-Bakrī's only statement about al-Suwa'idā' in his Mu'jam is that it is "a place". Nevertheless, in his Masālik, he mentions al-Suwa'idā' as the second halt after Medina on the way to al-Marwah which he places north of al-Suwa'idā'. He regards it as the northern limit of the Hijaz.  

Al-Idrīsī counts al-Suwa'idā' among the halts on the inland route between Ailāh and Medina. He locates

1. Al-Handāni, Sifah, p. 130.  
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 767.  
4. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 77.  
5. Ibid., fol. 22.
it north of Dhū Khushub and south of Marr. ¹ Wakī' is alone in locating al-Suwa‘a’ north of al-ʿIrāk. However, he agrees with the other geographers with respect to al-Marr which he locates north of al-Suwa‘a’. ²

1. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 89.
TABÜK

Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh cites Tabūk as situated on the Syrian pilgrim route to Medina, south of Suragh and north of al-Muḥdathah.¹ So do Ibn Rosteh² and Qudāmah.³ In the surviving part of al-Ya'qūbī's Buldān, Tabūk is mentioned only as the place at which the Prophet received a delegation from Ailah led by Ruḥah b. Yuhannā upon whom he bestowed a robe of honour.⁴ Al-Masʿūdī gives the distance between Tabūk and Medina as ninety parasangs which he equates to twelve days' journey.⁵ Wakiʿ locates Tabūk south of Ṭsrāʿ (Suragh) and north of al-Muḥdathah on the Syrian pilgrim route.⁶

Al-Iṣṭakhrī indicates that Tabūk is part of the Syrian desert,⁷ a statement borrowed in its entirety
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1. Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, op. cit., p. 150.
5. Al-Masʿūdī, Tanbih, p. 270.
by Ibn Hauqal\textsuperscript{1} who also concurs\textsuperscript{2} with al-Iṣṭakhrī in stating that Taimāʾ is a more prosperous fortress than Tabūk which lies to its south.\textsuperscript{3} According to al-Iṣṭakhrī Tabūk is situated between al-Ḥijr and the borders of Syria, from which it is four days' distant. He also states that Tabūk is half way between Syria (Damascus) and Mecca. Of Tabūk itself, al-Iṣṭakhrī says that it is a fortress with a spring, groves of palm trees and a garden said to have belonged to the Prophet. The people of al- EVENTS, to whom prophet Shu'ā'ib was sent, are said to have lived there, though Shu'ā'ib himself came from Madyan of which al-Iṣṭakhrī says that it is larger than, and opposite to, Tabūk from which it is at six days' distance.\textsuperscript{4} Ibn Hauqal borrows the whole description, even the wrong location of Tabūk in relation to Taimāʾ, but with a few minor alterations such as في نحو مراحل instead of نحو مراحل instead of نصف طريق الشام instead of نصف طريق الشام instead of نحو مراحل instead of نحو مراحل.\textsuperscript{5} The author of Ḥudūd al-ʿIltān locates Tabūk in the desert and
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\item Ibn Hauqal, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 21.
\item Ibid., p. 34.
\item Al-Iṣṭakhrī, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 25.
\item Ibid., p. 24.
\item Ibn Hauqal, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 32.
\end{enumerate}
describes it as a very prosperous borough in Arabia.\textsuperscript{1} Al-Muqaddasi describes Tabūk as a small Syrian town with a mosque of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{2} Listing the towns of al-Ghaur, the third zone of Syria, al-Muqaddasi counts Tabūk among them together with Ṭabarīyyah and Nablus, whereas Ma‘ān, Adhri‘at and Amman are situated on the fourth zone.\textsuperscript{3} There seems, however, to be no logical explanation for this distinction. Al-Muqaddasi assumes the distance between Tabūk and al-Manhab, in Najd, to be seven days' journey.\textsuperscript{4} Al-Ḥamdānī mentions Tabūk, not for its own sake, but only to define the territories of Judhām and Lakhm.\textsuperscript{5}

Al-Bakrī points out that Tabūk is the extreme northern limit of the Hijaz.\textsuperscript{6} Nevertheless, he states in another passage, that it forms the extreme southern boundary of Syria.\textsuperscript{7} In a third passage, he implies that Tabūk is part of Syria when he says that al-Ḥijr lies
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\item Hudūd al-Ālam, p. 148.
\item Al-Muqaddasi, op. cit., p. 179.
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between Syria and the Hijaz.\(^1\) Al-Bakri attributes to Sa'id b. Ghālib al-Jaḥānī the location of Tabūk on the line which leads from the coast of Hilah eastward to al-Kufa, dividing the land of the Arabs from Syria.\(^2\) Al-Balādhrī regards Tabūk as Syrian territory.\(^3\) So does 'Iyāḍ, who describes it as a known locality in the extreme south of Syria.\(^4\) Al-Bīrūnī regards it as one of the towns of the second climate, and, including it in Arabia, places it opposite to Madyan. Its longitude, according to him, is 58°.50' and its latitude 27°.5\(^5\) Naṣr, who locates Tabūk between Wādī al-Qūrā and Syria, states that the well of Tabūk ceased to fill every now and then since Ibn 'Urayyid repaired it when asked by 'Unar.\(^6\)

Al-Idrīsī is the first Arab geographer to enumerate Tabūk among the dependencies of Medina.\(^7\)

Indeed, he states that it is at four days' journey from

---

1. Ibid., p. 426.
2. Al-Bakri, Masālik, fol. 22.
4. 'Iyāḍ, Mashāriq, vol. 1, p. 108.
7. Al-Idrīsī, op. cit., fol. 36.
the nearest Syrian territory to the north. The distance between Tabūk and Madīyah is, according to him, six days. Describing Tabūk, he says that it is surrounded by fortifications. (Here the scribe changes مطيف بها to لطيف بها which obviously has no bearing on the statement).

Its inhabitants draw their water from a purling spring round which there are palm trees in plenty. He regards its ancient population as identical with the people of al-ʿAikah to whom prophet Shuʿaib was sent. ʿAlī ʾIdrīsī says that Taināʾ, which he places at a distance of four days' journey from Tabūk, surpasses the latter in size. As to the tribes inhabiting that area, ʿAlī ʾIdrīsī claims that the territories between Līlah, Wādī al-Qurā and Tabūk arc inhabited by the tribes of Juhainah, Baliyy and Jūḍān who are rich in camels, milk and clarified butter. He describes them as nomads who are generous and hospitable.¹ ʿAlī ʾIdrīsī also regards Tabūk as a town on the Syrian pilgrim route to Medīna south of a place which he calls Dimnah, a prosperous village. To the south of Tabūk, ʿAlī ʾIdrīsī places al-Muhdathah.²

He lists Tabūk among the famous localities in the fifth

---

¹. *Ibid.*, fol. 89.
part of the third climate.\textsuperscript{1}

Yāqūt repeats the above-quoted statement found in the works of al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥauqal which he attributes to Abū Zaid.\textsuperscript{2} Yāqūt also quotes Mālik to the effect that Tabūk is the metropolis of the Tabūk valley, and that it is the extreme northern limit of the "first Hijaz الحجاز الأول".\textsuperscript{3} According to Yāqūt al-Sam'ānī says that Tabūk has another name, al-Maulah.\textsuperscript{4} This statement is not to be traced in al-Sam'ānī's Ansāb. What al-Sam'ānī says there is that Taimā' is among the territories of Tabūk.\textsuperscript{5} Al-Zamakhsharī, however, says that al-Maulah is the name of the spring of Tabūk.\textsuperscript{6} Yāqūt also states that he was told by Ibn Abū Jarādah that Mt. Sharaurā could be seen from Tabūk when looking east.\textsuperscript{7} In another passage, Yāqūt says that the people of Tabūk could see Mt. Sharaurā in the
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east and Mt. Ḥisnā in the west. Al-Maqdisī calculates the distance between Tabūk and Medina at 90 parasangs, but he, unlike al-Mas'ūdī, does not convert it into travelling days.

Tabūk is of major importance in the history of the Prophet's wars as it was the object of his last campaign. It is still known in the northern Hijaz. It used to grow the famous large red Tabūkī grapes.

1. Ibid., vol. 2, p. 167.
2. Al-Maqdisī, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 239.
Ibn Khurrawadadhbeh enumerates Taimā' among the dependencies of Medina, mentioning its fortress, al-âbraq of al-Sama'a'al, the Jew, to whom he refers as the king of Taimā', who was famous for keeping his promises. He locates Taimā' between Syria and the Hijaz. Ibn Rosteh follows him in this respect but omits the reference to the religion of al-Sama'a'al. Qudāmah does not elaborate beyond saying that Taimā' is a dependency of Medina. Ibn al-Faqīh adds to this that it lies to the north of Medina.

Al-Iṣṭakhrī regards it as part of the Syrian desert. So does Ibn Ḥauqal. The former says that it is three days' journey from Syria. He locates Taimā' north of Tabūk, and describes it as a fortress and more prosperous than Tabūk, with groves of palm trees. He describes it as the market of the open country of al-

1. Ibn Khurrawadadhbeh, op. cit., p. 128.
2. Ibn Rosteh, op. cit., p. 177.
Jazīrah. Ibn Ḥauqal follows him to the letter. Their location of Taimā' is inaccurate, as it is, in fact, situated south-east of Tabūk.

Al-Muhallabī says that Taimā' is the metropolis of Ṭayy, and relates the story of the foundation of its fortress al-Iblaq, and its ruler al-San‘al al-Muqaddasī praises its water and describes it as the only town in the Arab steppe. According to him, Taimā' is a large ancient town abounding in groves of palm trees whose dates are all of good quality, and amazingly luxuriant gardens. Its water supply is fresh and abundant. The spring there flows through iron bars to a pool from which it spreads to the farms. There are many other fresh-water wells, but most of them are abandoned. The mosque and the houses are near to the market. But his judgment on the character of its inhabitants is adverse. They are greedy and have neither reliable 'ulamā' nor an able governor. He testifies to having seen that their governor was a shoemaker and their imām a grocer. They are also excessively clannish and

1. Al-Iṣṭakhri, op. cit., p. 25.
2. Ibn Ḥauqal, op. cit., p. 34.
3. Abū al-Fidā', Taqwīn, p. 87.
resort to arms at the slightest provocation. al-Muqaddasi relates different views as to the nature of its connection with neighbouring districts. He disagrees with those who regard it as a part of Syria or al-Jazīrah or even with those who consider it any intermediate region. He rather inclines to the opinion that it is part of the Arab open country which he regards as a separate region. He offers a detailed list of the routes leading through Taima' from Syria to the Holy Cities of Arabia and to Najd and Iraq, saying that those routes had served as postal routes for the Unayyads of Damascus, and had been used by the armies that carried Islam to Syria.¹

Both al-Muqaddasi and al-Handānī² state that travellers in that region are exposed to highway robbery, unless they are accompanied by a native escort. Al-Muqaddasi adds that pilgrims were at times assaulted and robbed of their property and camels. Al-Handānī refers to Taima' as the home of al-Sanaū'ī and locates it at full three days' journey from al-Ḥijr. He mentions the existence of routes leading from Taima' to Najd and Iraq, but stresses the necessity of a native escort. As regards the population of Taima', al-Handānī says

1. Ibid., pp. 248, 251, 252.

that it consists of members of Tayy with an admixture of Mawalī.\(^1\) He also states that there is another place called Taimā' in eastern Arabia.\(^2\)

Al-Idrīsī believes that Taimā' is equidistant from al-Ḥijr, Khaibar, Tabūk and Daunah at four days' journey from each, a calculation lacking in accuracy. He also says that the distance between Taimā' and the southern border of Syria equals three days' journey. According to him, Taimā' is the market of the Arab steppe with groves of palm trees and plenty of water, but a declining trade. However, he describes Taimā' also as a flourishing ancient fortress more prosperous than Tabūk.\(^3\) It is clear that he relies for this information upon both Ibn Ḥauqal and al-Muqaddasī. Where he differs from them is that he locates the fortress al-Ablaq, the home of al-Sama'ū'āl, in Khaibar, not in Taimā', where it actually stands.

Al-Bakrī points out in both al-Masālik\(^4\) and al-Mu'jam\(^5\) that Taimā' has a port on the Red Sea near
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1. Ibid., p. 131.
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Ailah. Both al-Handānī\(^1\) and Ibn al-Kalbī\(^2\) call this port Ḥaql. So does al-Bakrī, in another passage of al-Mu'jam, when listing the gradual expansion of the Juhainah tribe.\(^3\) He locates Shaghb and Badā between Taimā' and Medina,\(^4\) which can be accepted only on the assumption that the Taimā' region does stretch as far to the west as the Red Sea. On this occasion, al-Bakrī states that Baliyy lived in that locality. Another mention of a tribe camping in Taimā' occurs in connection with Jarn who, as he says, used to reside in Taimā' and Wādī al-Qurā until they were driven out to the Yemen by B. Sa'd.\(^5\) Al-Bakrī states that there is a Hijaz for Taimā' and Wādī al-Qurā.\(^6\) Al-Handānī describes the coast of Taimā' as wilderness.\(^7\) Ibn al-Inbārī marks out Taimā' as one of the principal villages of 'Arabiyyah;\(^8\) Ibn Qutaibah describes it as a city between Syria and the
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Hijaz. His definition of the Hijaz is rather confusing.\(^1\)

The author of Ḥudūd al-‘īlān describes Tainā’ as a very prosperous borough and situates it in the desert.\(^2\) Al- Bīrūnī, locating Tainā’ in Arabia among the towns of the second climate, assesses its longitude at \(58^\circ.30'\) and its latitude at \(27^\circ.3\).\(^3\) Al-Maqdisī regards Tainā’ as a Hijazi town.\(^4\) Al-Handānī, in al-Iklīl, says that al-Arqan was king of the Tainā’ tribe in the time of Moses who sent an expedition against that king.\(^5\) Al-Bakrī relates that a branch of the ‘Imālīq called Dāsim used to control the Hijaz of Tainā’ and that al-Arqan was their king.\(^6\) According to ‘Iyāḍ, Tainā’ is one of the principal villages situated in the territory of the Tayy. Though he states that Tainā’ is a coastal town, ‘Iyāḍ nevertheless adds that it is the point from which a route leads to Syria.\(^7\) Al-Marzūqī claims
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that Taimā' is a town in the Medina region.\textsuperscript{1} Ibn al-Sikkīt, however, places Taimā' at Wādī al-Qurā' and mentions its abundant groves of palm trees.\textsuperscript{2} Naṣr agrees to this location and adds that Jews used to reside there.\textsuperscript{3} The name of its fortress al-Ablaq is, according to Naṣr, al-Ḥillīt.\textsuperscript{4} Al-İsfahānī says that Taimā' is the home town of a very wealthy and numerous family, B. Yasār, the clients of 'Uthmān.\textsuperscript{5}

Al-San'ānī lists Taimā' among the territories of Tabūk, and adds that it is situated between the latter and Khaibar.\textsuperscript{6} Al-Muqaddasī, however, calls that area the desert of Taimā'.\textsuperscript{7} Yaqūt quotes al-Sakūnī to the effect that the distance between Wādī al-Qurā and Taimā' is four days' journey, and between Taimā' and Daumah of al-Jandal three or four days' journey.\textsuperscript{8} Al-Hajari points out that al-'Urudāt is half way between Taimā' and Wādī
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\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., fol. 65.
\textsuperscript{5} Al-Aghānī, vol. 2, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{6} Al-San'ānī, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{7} Al-Muqaddasī, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 248.
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al-Qurā. Al-San'ānī places Taimā' half way between Syria and Medina.

Taimā' appears to have been an important station on routes running in several directions. The Syrian pilgrim route must have often led through Taimā' before the 12th century A.D., as Ibn Khallikān says that prince Shirkuh went to Mecca via Taimā' and Khaibar in the year 555 A.H. (1160). Al-San'ānī, writing before that year, indicates that Taimā' and Khaibar lie on the Syrian pilgrim route. As has been seen, al-Muqaddasi mentions several routes converging at Taimā' from all directions. Besides, a highwayman who raided a herd of camels in Egypt in the early 8th century, drove them to al-Yanāmah via Taimā'.

As is the case with Wādī al-Qurā, some Muslin traditionists believe that Taimā' is situated outside Hijazi territory, because 'Umar did not exile its

1. Al-Hajari, Nawādir, part 1, fol. 133.
2. Al-San'ānī, op. cit., p. 113.
4. Al-San'ānī, op. cit., p. 113.
Jews. Indeed, it is for that reason that some of them do not regard these two localities as part of Arabia at all. Ibn Sa'd, on the other hand, considers it so much part of Arabia that he reports a statement in which "O, women of Taimā'" means women of Arabia. In another passage he relates a statement to the effect that the land of Taimā' would be blessed by a prophet, meaning Prophet Muhammad, words which identify Taimā' with Arabia itself.

Al-Waqidī attributes to Ḥizām b. Muḥayyisah of the early seventh century A.D. a statement that betrays the prosperity of Taimā' at that time. Ḥizām says that the spring of Taimā' gushes from a mountain and that it has never encountered any obstacle on its way.

Taimā' has been recently fully integrated with the Arabian territories in its neighbourhood.

L. Al-Balādhurī, Futūḥ, p. 39.
4. Ibid., part 1, vol. 4, p. 58, see supra, pp. 11-27.
5. Al-Waqidī, Maghāzī, p. 713.
'USFĀN

In mapping the route which the Prophet followed when he emigrated from Mecca to Medina, Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh includes 'Usfān in the list of places on that route. In the register of halts on the conventional route between Medina and Mecca, Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh locates 'Usfān at twenty-four miles from Qudaid and thirty-three miles from Baṭn Marr in the direction of Mecca. He points out that there are wells in 'Usfān. Al-Ya'qūbī assumes the same location, except that he changes Baṭn Marr to Marr al-Zahrān in one passage, but follows Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh's form in another. According to al-Ya'qūbī, 'Usfān is a dependency of Mecca. Ibn Rosteh accepts Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh's location as well as his calculation of the distance from Qudaid to 'Usfān, but assesses that from 'Usfān to Marr at thirty-four miles. Describing 'Usfān, Ibn Rosteh states that it is a very large village, densely populated, fertile and supplied with water by wells and occasionally

1. Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, op. cit., p. 129.
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3. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 313.
4. Ibid., p. 341.
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by ponds found between Arāk and 'Amīn Ghailān.¹

Qudāmah follows Ibn Khurradāchbeh as regards the description, the location and the distances to and from 'Usfān, with the sole exception of that from 'Usfān to Baṭn Marr which he calculates as sixteen miles.²

Al-Mas'ūdī mentions al-Ḥad'ah at seven miles distance from 'Usfān,³ and Kudaič, situated between 'Usfān and Qudaīd.⁴ Al-Ḥamdānī describes 'Usfān as a dependency of Mecca, inhabited by Khuzā'ah and Quraish.⁵ As to the conventional route, al-Ḥamdānī locates 'Usfān at an equal distance of twenty-three miles from Qudaīd and from Marr al-Ẓahrān in the direction of Mecca, giving 'Usfān's degree of latitude as 21°.⁶ In another passage, he places al-Ḥamaḥm between 'Usfān and Marr.⁷ All that al-Muqaddasī has to say about 'Usfān is that it is equidistant from both Baṭn Marr, and Khulaiṣ and Anaj in the direction of Medina at one day's journey.
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from each.\(^1\)

'Arrān states that before 'Usfān to the left there stands Mt. al-Sharāh from where a pass leads to 'Usfān itself.\(^2\) 'Arrān relates that 'Usfān lies on the road and has a minbar, palm groves and numerous farms. Its inhabitants derive solely from Khuzā'ah. After 'Usfān the traveller reaches the sea and loses sight of the mountains and villages.\(^3\) Al-Iṣṭakhrī says that the valley of Sitārah is situated between Batin Marr and 'Usfān on the left hand side of those who travel from Medina to Mecca.\(^4\) Unlike his usual practice Ibn Ḥauqal does not borrow al-Iṣṭakhrī's statement this time, but Yaqūt attributes it to ibū Zaid.\(^5\) Al-Idrisī places 'Usfān at thirty-three miles from Batin Marr and twenty-four miles to Quda'id in the direction of Medina. Of 'Usfān, al-Idrisī says that it is ten miles distant from the sea and has wells of fresh water. According to him, it is populated by Juhainah, a statement that cannot be
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2. 'Arrān, *op. cit.*, p. 413.
traced to any of his predecessors, and which is untrue.

Al-Bakrī relies on the Hadīth when saying that 'Usfān lies on the route of the Prophet's migration, and that al-Had'ah is between Mecca and 'Usfān. He places Kūjaid (al-Bakrī vocalizes it Kādi which is also acceptable) between Āmāj and 'Usfān, adding that it possesses a running spring flanked by many palm trees belonging to the Meccan Ibn Mu'āriz. Al-Bakrī also locates al-Rajī', a Hudhailī watering place, between Mecca and 'Usfān. He borrows Arrān's entire statement about 'Usfān attributing it to al-Sakūnī, but changes Mt. al-Sharāh to al-Sharā'. In another passage, al-Bakrī describes 'Usfān as a principal village with a number of wells and cisterns. According to him, 'Usfān has a minbar and is administered from al-Fur' which is a dependency of Medina. He quotes al-Āṣmā'ī as saying

2. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1161.
3. Ibid., p. 1347.
4. Ibid., p. 1119.
5. Ibid., p. 641.
6. Ibid., p. 787.
7. Ibid., p. 943.
8. Ibid., p. 1021.
that Ghurān of which he claims first-hand knowledge is a valley in the region of 'Usfān, owned by Hudhail, whereas Ibn Isḥāq says that it is a Liḥyānī village stretching to Sāyah. Liḥyān and Hudhail are, however, related tribes.¹

Al-Bakrī states, in one passage, that the borders of Tiḥānah converge with that of the Hijaz at al-Fur',² which situates 'Usfān and Qudaid within Tiḥānah. Nevertheless, he places Mt. Jumān, which he locates between Qudaid and 'Usfān, in the Hijaz when trying to point out the error of a leading nuhaddith who corrupts it to Jundān.³ However, in the entry on Jundān, al-Bakrī himself records a poem in which Jundān is a corrupted form of Jumrān because the poet was a native of Najd expressing his longing for his native encampment which cannot but be Jumrān.⁴ In connection with 'Usfān, al-Bakrī quotes two ḥadīths, one mentioning 'Usfān among the places within the radius of the jurisdiction of Mecca, and the other relating that the Prophet quickened his pace when passing through a colony of lepers near

1. Ibid., p. 993.
2. Ibid., p. 13.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. Ibid., p. 391.
'Usfān. As to the distances of 'Usfān, al-Bakrī calculates them at six miles from Kuḍaiḍ, eight miles from Kurā' al-Ghanīm and twenty-three miles from Khulais. There is the public well and the mosque of al-'Ādani at a mile's distance before al-Ghanīm. Adjoining that well there is a place called Masdūs, at which he says there are other wells belonging to some descendants of Abū Lahab. According to him, 'Usfān is inhabited by the Khuzā'ah tribe.

Yāqūt relates that al-Rashīd had a palace built near 'Usfān. He relies on Abū al-Isḥ'ath, a transmitter of 'Arrān's work when borrowing the latter's description of al-Sharāh. He also quotes al-Sukkari when locating 'Usfān at two days' journey from Mecca and three days' journey from al-Juhfah. In his quest for the derivation of the name 'Usfān, Yāqūt refers to a source he does not define assuming that it was called so because of the difficulties the rainwater (misread as

1. Ibid., p. 943.
2. Ibid., p. 957.
3. Ibid., p. 943.
5. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 270.
night) encounters in emerging from this place.\(^1\) \(\text{Al-Bakrī}\) attributes this statement to Kuthayyir.\(^2\) \(\text{Al-Sanhūdī}\), quoting from \(\text{al-Isadī}\), speaks of wells, cisterns and a spring called \(\text{al-}'Aulā'}\) in connection with this locality.\(^3\) \(\text{Al-'Azharī}\) states that \('Usfān is a watering place on the route between Mecca and al-Juḥfah.\)\(^4\) \(\text{Al-Zamakhsharī}\) says that \(\text{al-Had'ah} is found at seven miles from \('Usfān in the direction of Mecca.\)\(^5\) He locates Kudaíd between Qudaid and \('Usfān. About the latter, \(\text{al-Zamakhsharī}\) states, in one passage, that it is a "place",\(^6\) but describes it, in another, as wells in the valley of Faidah when he enumerates the watering places between Mecca and Yanbu'.\(^7\) 'Iyād places Kaddid (Kudaíd) between Qudaid and \('Usfān at a distance of forty-two miles from Mecca.\)\(^8\) He also situates Kurā' \(\text{al-Gharīn at}
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eight miles from 'Usfān in the direction of Mecca.¹ Waki‘ states that 'Usfān used to be a dependency of Medina, but belonged to Mecca in his time.² It possesses many wells and a spring attributed to the descendants of Ja‘far b. Sulaimān. This spring has a cistern and is located at one mile south of 'Usfān. Other distances from 'Usfān are two and a half miles to the pond of al-
Aḥṣātān, seven to the mosque of al-‘Arabī (al-‘Adanī),
eight to Kurā‘ al-Ghanīm, ten to the well of the Beduin,
twelve to the valley of al-Kurā‘, nineteen to the Janābīdh
of Ibn Ṣaifī, seventeen to the well of al-Qurashī,
eighteen to the well of Ibn Ḍubai‘, and twenty-three
to Qudaid in the north and Baṣn Marr in the south.³

'Usfān is a well-known locality in the Northern
Hijaz.

1. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 305.
2. Wakī‘, Manāzil, fol. 40.
3. Ibid., fol. 52.
WADDĀN

All al-Mas'ūdī has to say about Waddān is that it is eight miles distant from al-Abwāʾ. 1 Al-Isnakhī assesses this at six miles and also points out that it lies at one day's journey from al-Juhfah. He claims that during his stay there, in the early tenth century, the Ja'fari chief used to reside "there" (it can be either al-Abwāʾ or Waddān). He describes the Ja'fāfir as a powerful tribe with extensive properties in al-Furʾ and al-Sā'irah, but laments the feud that existed between them and their cousins and neighbours, the Ḥasanīs, a feud that led to the domination of the newcomer tribe Ḥarb over the whole region. However, he is in no doubt that Waddān is east of al-Abwāʾ, which is contrary to fact. 2 Nevertheless, Ibn Ḥauqal borrows the whole statement except for not referring to his stay there and pointing out al-Abwāʾ as the actual residence of the Ja'fāri chief. 3 Yāqūt records al-Isnakhī's statement literally but attributes it to Abū Zaid. 4

Al-Hamdānī includes Waddān in his list of the Hijazi settlements, in one passage, 5 but describes it as Juhainī

1. Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, p. 235.
3. Ibn Ḥauqal, op.cit., p. 34.
territory, in another. The Hijazi poet, al-'Ajlānī, whose work he has recorded, locates Waddān between al-Abwā’ to the south east and al-Jār to the north. Al-Bakrī describes Waddān, together with Sāyah, as the south-western limit of the Hijaz, and follows al-Handānī in regarding it as Juhainī territory. In defining Waddān, al-Bakrī says that it is a principal village. In another passage, he quotes al-Sakūnī in stating that the waters of the valley of Ārah flow into al-Abwā’ then into Waddān and finally into al-Turaifah before flowing into the sea. There is no need to stress that this statement is 'Arrām’s, as al-Sakūnī is one of his reporters. But al-Bakrī does not refer to his source when he states that Waddān lies west of Hirshā at two miles' distance from it and below it. This statement is also 'Arrām’s and is to be found literally in his work. In another entry, al-Bakrī claims that Waddān is five miles distant from Hirshā and adds that some travellers incline to avoid al-Abwā’ on their way from al-Suqyā to al-Juhfah, preferring the route leading through Waddān which is eight

1. Ibid., p. 171.
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5. Ibid., p. 1374.
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7. Ibid., p. 1351.
8. 'Arrām, op.cit., p. 411.
miles distance from al-Abwa’. His source seems to be al-Asadī who adds that Waddān has rich springs and cisterns, and that there are post signs erected by al-Mutwakkil. Al-Asadī’s source is Wākī’ who adds on the authority of Ibn al-Sabbāh, who is both a native of that area and a reliable source, that Waddān used to be a dependency of Medina with a minbar, but lay in ruins in his time. However, as the above-mentioned statements of al-İstakhri and Ibn Hauql indicate, it flourished again soon after Wākī’.

Al-Maqdisī calculates the distance between Waddān and al-Abwa’ as six miles. Al-Zamakhshari describes Waddān as borderland of the Hijaz and, in another passage, adds that it has palm trees and flowing springs. Nasr locates Waddān between Hirsha and al-Abwa’. Ibn Hazm remarks that Waddān is the dwelling place of the descendants of Ibn Muṭī’, the leader of the late seventh century rising of Medina against the Umayyads.

Al-İdrisi borrows Ibn Hauql’s statement with some alterations, as Waddān is corrupted to Arādān. One error,

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu‘jam, p. 954.
6. Ibid., p. 166.
8. Ibn Hazm, Jamaharāh, p. 149.
however, he corrects. Both al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal assert that the land of B. Ja'far, Waddān, lies to the east of the Ḥasanī land in Yanbu'. Al-Idrīsī states that Waddān is south of the Ḥasanī land, which is accurate, but, in another MS., Waddān is located east of the Ḥasanī land.

The ancient Waddān lay near a village known as Mastūrah in that region.

2. MS. 2221, fol. 133.
Wādī al-Qurā is, in fact, a region of major importance. Ibn Khurradadhbah enumerates it among the dependencies of Medina, implying that it is the point at which the Egyptian and the Syrian pilgrim caravans bound to Medina converge. He locates Wādī al-Qurā north of al-Ruhaibah (al-Ruhbah) and south of al-Hijr, on the Syrian route and al-Ba'idah, on the Egyptian route. Qudāmah states the same in both passages in which he refers to Wādī al-Qurā and so does Ibn Rosteh who differs from them only in calling the halt south of Wādī al-Qurā al-Ruhaibah instead of al-Ruhaibah. Ibn al-Faqīh proffers the additional information that the Red Sea borders Wādī al-Qurā which he describes as a northern dependency of Medina. Lughdah locates Wādī al-Qurā north of al-Suqiyah and south of al-‘Awālī (= al-‘Ulā). He says that its palm groves belong to 'Udhrāh, Baliyy, Sa'd Allāh and Juhainah, but all the inhabitants take part in the exploitation of its gold, silver and copper mines. He mentions its market, al-Sa'id, and the two famous springs, Ghālib and Zayyān. Wākir quotes

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op.cit., p. 129.
2. Ibid., p. 150.
Ibn al-Ṣabbāh to the effect that Wādī al-Qurā is a dependency of Medina. Its inhabitants are of heterogeneous origin. He locates it south of al-Ḥijr and north of al-Suqyā on the Syrian pilgrim route.

Al-Masʿūdī claims that the distance between Medina and Wādī al-Qurā equals seven days' journey. This claim is contradicted by al-Hamdānī who states that it is five days' journey by the conventional route and takes only four days through Hīṣn B. ʿUthmān in Najd. Al-Hamdānī is, however, inconsistent with regard to the inhabitants of Wādī al-Qurā as he states, in one passage, that it lies within the territories of ʿUdhrah, but counts it, in another place, among the territories of Sulaim and inhabited by them alone or together with some nomadic Ansār, who may choose to leave Sulaim for a while for the grazing lands of Tayy. As to the distance between Wādī al-Qurā and Taimāʾ, al-Hamdānī assesses it at full three days' journey.

According to al-Istakhri, Wādī al-Qurā represents the northern limit of the Hijaz south of the Syrian desert.

1. Wakiʿ, Manāzil, fol. 39.
2. Ibid., fol. 114.
5. Ibid., p. 180.
6. Ibid., p. 131.
statement which is literally repeated by Ibn Hauql. In
describing Wādī al-Qurā, al-Istakhri states that, after Mecca
and Medina among the Hijazi towns, it is second only to al-
Yamānīyah in size and production. Ibn Hauql’s description
is a literal repetition of these words. Al-Istakhri states
that Wādī al-Qurā is one day’s journey from al-Hijr. This
statement is borrowed by Ibn Hauql whom Abū al-Fidā’
strongly and unjustifiably condemns on the ground that the
distance is five days’ journey. Abū al-Fidā’ is no doubt
mistaken, as the journey takes no more than one day.
Ibn Hauql says that the land of the Tayy is parallel to
Wādī al-Qurā, a statement which could be traced in al-
Istakhri’s Masālik.

Al-Muqaddasī says that Wādī al-Qurā is "the mart of both
Syria and Iraq". According to al-Muqaddasī "the province
of Qurh is also called Wādī al-Qurā". He then describes its
town as:

1. Ibn Hauql, op.cit., p. 21.
5. Ibn Hauql, op.cit., p. 32.
7. Ibn Hauql, op.cit., p. 34.
9. Al-Muqaddasī, op.cit., p. 97, the English translation,
p. 148.
"the largest in al-Hijaz at the present day (= 375 A.H. 985 A.D.) after Makkah, as well as the most flourishing and populous, and the most abounding with merchants, commerce and riches. It is commanded by an impregnable fortress, at the angle of which a castle rises. Villages encircle it on all sides and palm trees skirt it about; and, besides, it is possessed of very cheap dates and excellent bread and copious springs of water, pretty houses and busy markets. The town is surrounded by a ditch and has three gates covered with iron plates. The mosque is in the midst of the main streets of the town; there is a bone in the mihrab of this mosque said to be the bone which spoke to the Prophet saying, 'Do not eat me, I am poisoned'. In fine it is a Syrian, an Egyptian, and Iraqi and a Hijazite town all in one, but the water is unwholesome and its dates of middling quality."1

Al-Muqaddasi notices here, as he does in al-Juhfah, that the public bath is outside the town. He points out that the inhabitants of Qurān (alias Wādī al-Qurān) are mainly Jews. He lists al-Hijr, Badā Ya'qūb, Dabbah and Nabk as the towns of that region, adding Al-'Aunīd as its port.

According to al-Muqaddasi, the distance between Wādī al-Qurān and Medina equals six days' journey, but only four days' journey to Taima' on the Syrian route. He also assesses the distance between Wādī al-Qurān and al-Manhab near Paid at five days' journey. According to him, the route between

1. Ibid., p. 84, the English translation, pp. 133-134.
2. Ibid., p. 312.
3. Ibid., p. 84.
4. Ibid., p. 53.
5. Ibid., p. 84.
Wādī al-Qurā and Basra leads through the Arab steppe indicating, in another place, that it is that of al-Manhab. Al-Muqaddasī's Egyptian route does not pass through Wādī al-Qurā as he implies that it leads from al-Suqayr to Badā Ya'qūb, though he locates Wādī al-Qurā on the Egyptian route in another passage. Nevertheless, he makes it clear that that route, in his time, followed the coast.

Al-Bakrī in his Mu'jam refers to 'Arrām when stating that Wādī al-Qurā is one of the large dependencies of Medina and that it has, in turn, dependencies of its own, a statement untraceable in 'Arrām's work. He quotes Ibn al-Kalbī when relating the historical changes in the population of Wādī al-Qurā which consisted, at first, mainly of Jews who came after Thamūd and cultivated the land, discovered its springs and planted palm trees. Then came some branches of Qudā'ah one of which, 'Udhrāh, concluded an alliance with the Jews engaging to protect the latter in return for an annual levy with the ultimate result that all other branches were driven out. The 'Udhrāh proved very effective in combating not only the Arab tribes but even al-Nu'mān, the Ghassānī king, who tried to conquer Wādī al-Qurā and was driven back. With the emergence of Islam, the 'Udhrāh tribe and some of the Jewish families there flocked to the Prophet and were

1. Ibid., pp. 250-252.
2. Ibid., pp. 107, 110, 112.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 10.
treated with generosity. Al-Bakrī mentions that Qurḥ is the capital of Wādī al-Qurā. He cites no source, but Yāqūt quotes al-Suddī to the effect that Qurḥ is the capital and market of Wādī al-Qurā. Al-Bakrī relies on Ibn Ḥabīb for the information that Suqyā al-Jazl is a village in Wādī al-Qurā; Yāqūt quotes both Ibn Ḥabīb and Ibn al-Sikkiṭ to that effect. Al-Bakrī also counts al-Muraisī among the villages of Wādī al-Qurā.

In his Masālik, al-Bakrī states that the ancient name of Wādī al-Qurā is Wajj. He counts it, together with the land of al-Hijr, among the Arab lands south of Ailah adding that it was the land of Thamūd. Nevertheless, al-Bakrī, in another place, locates Wādī al-Qurā and al-Hijr between the Hijaz and Syria. He regards al-Haurā as the port of Wādī al-Qurā. He also identifies Qurḥ with Wādī al-Qurā.

The author of Hudūd al-ʿĀlam places Wādī al-Qurā in the desert and describes it as a very prosperous borough. Al-Idrīsī mentions Wādī al-Qurā among the dependencies of

1. Ibid., p. 44.
2. Ibid., p. 246.
3. Yāqūt, Muʿjam, vol. 4, p. 54.
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10. Ibid., fol. 22.
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Medina and also along the halts on the overland route between Ailah and Medina where he locates it south of al-
Baidā' and north of al-Ruḥaibah (al-Ruḥbah). As to the
Syrian route, al-Idrīsī mentions only al-Majz (al-Hijr) which
he says is an impregnable fortress among mountains in the
land of Thamūd. He locates it between al-Ḥanīfiyyah (al-
Junainah) in the north, and a small town on a small river in
the south. This small town seems to be Wādī al-Qurā as he
locates it north of al-Ruḥbah. He also lists Wādī al-Qurā
among the famous places in the fifth part of the third
climate. Ibn al-Kalbī regards Wādī al-Qurā as one of six
main "villages" of Arabia in which (Arabian) music developed
and which he also calls the market places of Arabia.

Yāqūt attributes to al-Sakūnī the statement that the
distance between Wādī al-Qurā and Taimā' is four days' 
journey. He also quotes Ibn al-Kalbī when relating that
Wādī al-Qurā was a very fertile valley covered with villages
from end to end, adding that it lay in ruins in his time
with its water resources wasted, and that there was nobody
to exploit them. Al-Sakūnī is quoted as saying that Mu'āwiyah

1. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 36.
2. Ibid., fol. 88.
3. Ibid., fol. 96.
4. Ibid., fol. 89.
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rediscovered eighty springs there. Al-Hajarī regards al-
'Urudah as half way between Ta'ma' and Wādī al-Qurā. Yaqūt
calls it al-Uradah and locates it between al-'Ula (in Wādī
al-Qurā) and Ta'ma'. According to Ibn al-Sikkīt Ta'ma' is
opposite Wādī al-Qurā. Nasr holds it to be at Wādī al-Qurā.
Al-Bīrūnī, locating it in the second climate, assesses the
longitude of Wādī al-Qurā as 50° and its latitude at 26°.
Al-Maqdisī regards Wādī al-Qurā as one of the Hijazi rural
towns. Al-Bakrī claims that there is a Hijaz for Wādī al-
Qurā and Ta'ma'.

Al-Sam'ānī claims that Wādī al-Qurā is an ancient town
in the Hijaz towards Syria. He quotes Ibn Hibbān as saying
that Wādī al-Qurā is Syrian territory. He also quotes Sa'id
b. 'Abd al-'Azīz when regarding Wādī al-Qurā as the extreme
northern limit of Arabia. Al-Maqdisī states that Qurh is
Wādī al-Qurā, but Nasr says that it is the market of Wādī
al-Qurā. Nasr also places al-Hijr between Wādī al-Qurā and

1. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 82.
2. Al-Hajarī, Nawādir, part 1, fol. 133.
5. Nasr, op. cit., fol. 35.
8. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 914.
1 Syria, adding that Wādī al-Qurā lies between Medina and Syria too.

Muslim traditionists remained, for a long time, uncertain as regards the nature of Wādī al-Qurā and its relationship with the Hijaz. Some of them were of the opinion that 'Umar did not regard Wādī al-Qurā Hijazi territory, because its Jews, unlike those of Khai'bar and Najrān, had not been deported. Malik even thought that neither Wādī al-Qurā nor Taimā were in Arabia as 'Umar had desisted from deporting the local Jews. It should, however, be borne in mind that he did so for political, not for religious reasons, as he left those Jews who were not strong enough in their own right quite undisturbed. Those who remained in Wādī al-Qurā were dependent on the Arab tribes who were too strongly committed to Islam, and too busy outside Arabia, to encourage their clients to cause any trouble there. Nevertheless, Wādī al-Qurā was regarded by many as situated outside the Arab territory.

Wādī al-Qurā is still known as a prosperous region in the Northern Hijaz, though it is called al-'Ula.

1. Ibid., fol. 51.
2. Ibid., fol. 123.
5. Supra, pp. 225-257.
AL-WAHĪDĀH

The only three Arab geographers of the period under consideration to mention al-Wahīdah are Ibn Khurradadbeh, 1 Ibn Rosteh, and al-Idrīsī, who state that it is a dependency of Medina. However, the poet Ibn Harmah, a native of that area, trying to trace his love, speaks of al-Wahīdah and al-Ghamr. Nasr describes it as a place in the Hijaz without reference to its status. Confusion is to be avoided with al-Wahīd which is referred to by al-Bakrī in his Mu‘jam.

Al-Marzūqī, apparently relying on al-Asma‘ī, says that a few years before Islam there was, at the fair of 'Ukāz, an exceptionally large gathering of Arabs who had come to barter their camels, cattle and money for goods from Egypt, Syria and Iraq. It happened on that occasion that Ma‘mar, of B. 'Udrah, took good care of 'Amr, of Sulaim, who told his two sons that he had never seen such kindness and asked their permission to recompense him. Having obtained it, he asked for paper and a notary to whom he dictated this very detailed document:

1. Ibn Khurradadbeh, op.cit., p. 129.
2. Ibn Rosteh, op.cit., p. 177.
3. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 36.
"This is what was presented by 'Amr b. al-Sharīf al-Sulami to Ma'mar b. al-Harith b. al-Khai barī b. Zubyan b. Hinn b. Hizām al-'Udhri, namely his property at al-Wahīrah, which is one of the makhālif (dependencies) of Yathrib, with its abandoned habitations, its living quarters, ruins, pens, grazings, terraced fields, ravines, hillock grazing lands, high-growing plants (gaswar), 'ajram and basham with both first and last products thereof, figs, shīh, and arak, ujjazah and uncultivated lands, hillocks, small lava-fields, its donkeys and all things animate and inanimate, all things wet by rain or growing on land, belong to Ma'mar to the exclusion of 'Amr, given from the bottom of his heart with no disability to his enjoyment and without hint as to the source of ownership, totally detached from any claim arising from ineradicable friendship which time will not efface, ever renewed, till the end of time and the extinguishing of the stars while day and night succeed one another and the mountains and great hills stand. This was inscribed 35 years after the year of the elephant."

Then he sent the deed, together with some Yemenite presents to Ma'mar. Al-Asma'ī says that the descendants of Ma'mar remained in possession of this property up to his own time.


shīh: a kind of wormwood (Musil, Northern Negd, p. 362).
basham and arak: a shrub of which tooth-sticks are made (A. A. Bevan, al-Nakā'id, vol. 3 pp. 276, 289 Glossary).
'ajram: a shrub with long, stiff branches and solid needle shaped leaves. (Musil, Arabia Deserta, p. 121).
ujjazah: obscure. It may be a misreading of uqhdhah: pond.
Al-Wajh, an important town on the Red Sea, has received very little attention from the Arab geographers. Al-Ya'qūbī locates it on the coastal pilgrim route from Ailah to Mecca without proffering any information about its nature. He merely describes it as the first way-station after Zubah (Dubā) to the north on the route from Madyan to Mecca. He places Munkhūs to the immediate south.

Qudāmah, apparently following al-Ya'qūbī, locates it on the same route, but instead of listing it just after Zubah, places 'Aunīd between it and Zubah (Dubā).

Al-Muqaddasī twice mentions that al-Ruhbah is the halt to the north of Munkhūs. It is more likely that al-Ruhbah here is a corruption of al-Wajh. Wākī also seems to misread al-Wajh as al-Rajjah. According to him, it is situated south of al-'Aunīd and north of Munkhūs.

'Arrām, who begins his work on Tihāmah with Mt. Radwā, locates both Radwā and Yanbu' in the extreme north of Tihāmah. According to him, Yanbu' is "situated to the right of Radwā for those descending from Medina to the sea at a distance of one night's journey from Radwā." The underlined words, when omitted, make the definition rather less hazy. 'Arrām describes Yanbu' as a large and gorgeous "village" with a minbar; it has rich springs of fresh water; its population consists of Ansār, Juhainah and Laith; its valley, Yalyal, empties into Ghaiqah. According to him, the waters of al-Safrā' abut upon Yanbu'. As regards Mt. Radwā, 'Arrām locates it one day's journey from Yanbu'; two days from the sea and seven days from Medina; to the right of the Medina route and to the left of the Burairā' route in the direction of Mecca. Opposite to Radwā from which it is separated by the Mu'riqah route, lies Mt. 'Azwar at a distance of about a race course. The waters of these two mountains abut upon Ghaiqah whose valley empties into the sea. He estimates the distance between Mts. Radwā and 'Azwar, and the two Mts. of Thāfil at two days journey, on one occasion, and seven days on another. These are the statements in which 'Arrām is alleged to have spoken of Mts. Radwā and 'Azwar, and the region of Yanbu'.

1. 'Arrām, op.cit., pp. 397-398.
So hopelessly erroneous are most of these statements that the situation need not be aggravated by allowing for a misunderstanding on Yalyal by al-Bakri and the editor of 'Arrām. According to 'Arrām,

"the valley of Yalyal empties into the sea 'there' through the left bank of Ghaiqah in the direction of Medina to the right of travellers from Medina to Mecca and to the left of travellers from Syria to Mecca."

وادي يليل يصب في البحر ثم من عودة غيظة اليسرى ما يلي المدينة عن يمين الصعد الى مكة من المدينة وعن يسار الصعد من الشام الى مكة.

1 According to al-Bakri and the editor, it reads:

"and the valley of Yalyal empties into the sea. 'And' to the left bank of Ghaiqah in the direction of Medina...lie the two Mts. of Thāfil."

This misreading is not the responsibility of 'Arrām's scribes, who are to blame for a sufficiency of other errors. The point here is the alteration of ﺷم thamma - there - to ﺷم thumma - and -. Consequently, al-Bakri voices his only criticism of 'Arrām in the person of his transmitter, al-Sakūnī, for misdirecting the waters of Yalyal to the sea, without letting them first abut upon Ghaiqah.

There are, however, the numerous and gross mistakes of 'Arrām's scribes which go back to before the eleventh century in which the MSS. were apparently laden with what their copyists and readers think to be corrections. There is good reason to assume that these mis-statements are due to a misplacement of some folios. How else could 'Arrām, a native

of the region and an acknowledged authority on its
geography, have misplaced many famous localities such as
al-Safra', Kulayyah, al-Juhfah, Khulais, the Bustān of Ibn
'Amir and Mts. Radwā and 'Azwar and the two Thāfils. As
regards localities placed by 'Arrām in the region of Yanbu',
it is necessary to point out his mistakes and rectify some
of them.

The most lasting of those mistakes is the assumption
that 'Azwar lies at about a race course from Radwā which is
no doubt a result of the misplacement of folios in an early
MS., as 'Azwar should be situated far to the south near al-
Abwā'. Indeed, it is 'Azwar but not Radwā, which lies to the
right of the Medina-Mecca route. Al-Burairā' is situated
between al-Abwā' and Waddān (near Masūrah) and cannot be
connected with Radwā. Moreover, Radwā cannot separate the
Burairā' route (the coastal route from al-Juhfah to Badr) from
the Medina-Mecca route as Radwā lies too far from the
Medina-Mecca route to be situated there. Though this erro-
neous location of 'Azwar has been unquestioningly accepted by
al-Bakrī, Nasr and Yāqūt, all three register other references,
mainly in verse, which indicate the right location. Al-
Hamdānī, whose list of the dependencies of Mecca does not con-
tain localities in the north beyond the region of al-Juhfah,

1. See al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, pp. 656, 1233, 1280; Nasr, op.cit.,
fol. 75-76, 114; Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 2, pp. 669, 727,
regards 'Azwar as one of those dependencies. Al-Zamakhshari, who is the most reliable source for the location of places between Yanbu' and Mecca, seems to have located 'Azwar accurately. It is almost certain that he locates it between Mt. al-Tawālī in the north and Dhirwah in the south. Both localities are situated in the region of al-Abwā' and al-Juḥfah. The Hijazi poets such as Kuthayyir, al-Ahwas, al-Muzarrid and Ibn Harmah also place it near al-Juḥfah. 'Azwar has never been mentioned in any early Arabic poem in one breath with Radwā to suggest their proximity. It is 'Abāthir which is connected with Radwā.

Another mistake is the statement that the Mu'rqah route separates Radwā from 'Azwar both of which are lofty mountains. 'Arrām describes the Mu'rqah route as a short cut to Medina, Medina and Syria. This route was used by the ancient Quraishī caravans between Mecca and Syria via Radwā, al-'Īs, Dhul-Marwah and Ailah. The Medina-Syria route used to pass through Dhū Khushub and Dhul-Marwah. The Mu'rqah route cannot represent a short-cut from Medina to Mecca or Syria via Radwā and al-'Īs. This statement is likely to be a mixture of two statements, one on the Mu'rqah route and the other on the pass of Hirshā. The Mu'rqah route separates Radwā not from 'Azwar, but from 'Irda which lies close to it. Since the Mu'rqah route does not represent a

1. Al-Hamdānī, Sīfah, p. 177.
short cut for the Medinese, the description should be taken to refer to the Hirshā route which is used by these caravans in time of security and which is a short cut.

A third erroneous statement is that the waters of Radwā and 'Azwar abut upon Ghaiqah. In fact, the waters of Radwā and 'Irđah abut upon the sea north of Yanbu', and thus north of Ghaiqah. The waters of 'Azwar abut upon the sea far from Ghaiqah to the south near Waddān.

A fourth mis-statement is that Radwā lies west of al-
Safrā' whose waters abut upon Yanbu'. Actually, Radwā lies north of al-Safrā' whose waters abut upon Ghaiqah. The alti-
tude between Yanbu' and al-Safrā' prevents the waters of al-
Safrā' from abutting upon Yanbu'. Equally wrong is the assumption that Yalyal is the valley of Yanbu', since it is, in fact, the valley of al-Safrā'.

A fifth error is the estimate of the distance from Radwā and 'Azwar to the two Mts. Thāfil at two days' journey, in one passage, and seven days in another. This is clear evi-
dence of the alteration to which 'Arrām's work has been sub-
jected. These estimates cannot be accepted except by applying the former to Radwā and the latter to 'Azwar. This also applies to the claim that the distance from Radwā to Medina is seven days.

There is also the assumption that the waters of the two Mts. Thāfil abut upon Ghaiqah, which is untrue as they are situated too far in the south to send their waters to Ghaiqah or indeed anywhere north of Waddān.
These mistakes and many others have penetrated into 'Arrām's work and been accepted by al-Bakrī, Nasr and Yāqūt. They are also preserved in the available MS. of this work. Except for the above-mentioned groundless criticism of al-Sakūnī by al-Bakrī, none of these authors or any other author whom we know of has rectified or even pointed out 'Arrām's mistakes. It is because 'Arrām is so important an author that it is necessary to list his errors.

1 Waki', Ibn al-Kalbī, followed by Nasr, regards Yanbu' as a dependency of Medina. It does not figure as such in the lists of the "official" geographers, which is not surprising as they seem to speak only of what was listed in their archives. Ibn al-Kalbī claims that Ruhāt lies in the region of Yanbu' which is inadvertent, since it is obvious from his statement that Ruhāt is inhabited by B. Hudhail whose lands have always been around Mecca. On another occasion, he places Ruhāt in the valley of Nakhlah which is inhabited by B. Hudhail and situated north of Mecca. Ibn Duraid seems to have been the source of al-Bakrī's erroneous location of Yanbu' between Mecca and Medina. Ibn al-Sikkīt describes Yanbu', whose mountain is Radwā', as the valley of 'Alī which is true, since 'Alī did a great deal to develop it, and some

2. Ibn al-Kalbī, Ḍasnām, pp. 9-10, 57.
of his descendants have lived there for the last thirteen centuries. Ibn al-Sikkīṭ, on the other hand, locates al-
Haurāʾ opposite to Yanbuʾ whose port he claims it to be
1 which is incorrect. Ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ of the 9th century esti-
mates the number of springs of Yanbuʾ at ninety-nine. This
2 rose by the 12th century to 170. Ibn Saʿd, followed by al-
Masʿūdī and al-Bakrī, places al-ʿUshairah in the valley of
3 Yanbuʾ. Al-Masʿūdī also seems to rely on Ibn Saʿd in esti-
mating the distance between Medina and al-ʿUshairah at nine
4 barīds. In his Mūrūj, al-Masʿūdī locates al-ʿUshairah in
5 the bed of the valley of Yanbuʾ which is correct.
6
Al-Hamdānī is the only Arab geographer of that period
to mention "Yanbuʾ al-Nukhail" in the lower reaches of Yanbuʾ.
7 Yanbuʾ al-Nukhail may be identical with al-Bakrīʾs Nujail
and Yāqūtʾs Nukhail which the latter describes as a spring
9 near Medina. Both al-Bakrī and Yāqūt rely on one verse by
Kuthayyir. It is, however, not identical with "Yanbuʾ al-
Nakhl" since this term means the whole valley of Yanbuʾ and

1. Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, pp. 474, 1310.
2. Ibid., p. 656.
5. Al-Masʿūdī, Tanbih, p. 236.
is of recent date. Unlike 'Arrām, al-Hamdānī regards Yanbu' as part of the Hijaz, though one of his poets seems to regard it as the northern frontier of the Hijaz.

Al-Muqaddasī regards Yanbu' as a town of Mecca and a dependency of Medina. He describes it as a large and splendid town, with an impregnable wall and a copious supply of water, more flourishing than Medina and with larger palm groves. Its citadel is well-built and its market brisk, the majority of its dealers coming from Medina. It has two gates with the mosque standing close to one of them. It is dominated by the descendants of al-Hasan b. 'Alī. Ra's al-'Ain is twelve miles from Yanbu'. Ra's al-'Ain lies at one day's journey from Yanbu'. The distance from both al-Jār and Badr to Yanbu' is two days' journey. Al-Muqaddasī does not regard Yanbu' as a halt on the Egyptian coastal route for which he has al-'Ushairah. Speaking of the specialities of Arabia, al-Muqaddasī mentions the henna and whetstone of Yanbu', and the gold mines between Yanbu' and al-Marwah. He is not appreciative of the water of Yanbu' which he describes as notoriously bad. Al-Muqaddasī refers to the quarrels between the Sunnīs and Shi'īs of Yanbu'.

In locating al-'Ushairah between Yanbu' and the sea, al-Muqaddasī is less inaccurate than al-Istakhri who locates it between Yanbu' and al-Marwah. In fact, al-'Ushairah lies

in the lower reaches of Yanbu', near the spring of al-Barakah. 

Al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauql describe Yanbu' as a citadel with palm groves, water and farms. They mention that the inalienable properties of 'Ali are controlled by his descendants. They situate Mt. Radwa near Yanbu' from which whetstone is carried "to all regions". This remark, coupled with that of al-Bakri about whetstone being carried from Khaibar, seems to have driven al-Idrisi to the erroneous location of Khaibar near Radwa. al-Idrisi also changes Ibn Hauql's statement on having seen Radwa from Yanbu' looking like a green meadow into "the fords has rendered its summit like a green meadow."

Apart from this, al-Idrisi uses Ibn Hauql's words in describing Yanbu' and Radwa. Qudamah mentions Yanbu' only in connection with the Egyptian coastal pilgrim route, and gives no information beyond locating it south al-Ahsa' and north Mas'ula.

The Yanbu' of which our geographers speak is what we now call "Yanbu' al-Nakhl" because "Yanbu'" at present applies to the sea port of the same name.

2. al-Istakhri, op.cit., p. 25.
5. Qudamah, op.cit., 191.
PART TWO

THE PILGRIM ROUTES
IN THE NORTHERN HIJAZ
I - AILAH-MEDINA INLAND ROUTE

Table I (pp. 390-1)

Ibn Khurrajadhibeh is the first author to record the way-stations between Ailah and Medina which, according to him, number fourteen. It is noteworthy that he offers no information about water or other requirements on that route. Nor does he give the mileage between the way-stations. Musil believes the absence of mileage to be due to the lack of postal services on this route, and this is quite likely as it was not until later that the Hijaz was officially subordinated to Egypt. It is almost certain that the route between Egypt and the Hijaz was assessed in miles in the early days of the Fatimids when Cairo replaced Baghdad as the administrator of the Hijaz.

Ibn Khurrajadhibeh names all the way-stations between Ailah and Medina with the exception of one which he situates between al-Aghra‘ and al-Kilābah. According to him, the route led through Wādī al-Qurā which suggests that the pilgrims of his time used to follow the ancient caravan routes. Otherwise, pilgrims would have avoided the longer journey through Wādī al-Qurā, as it was easier and shorter to follow the

1. Ibn Khurrajadhibeh, op. cit., pp. 149-150.
valley of al-Jazl. Indeed, Waki', followed by al-Asadi, states that the junction where the Egyptian route converged with the Syrian route was al-Suqyā. It is safe to assume that what Waki' has in mind is the actual route followed by the pilgrims of his time, whereas Ibn Khurradadhbeh may rely on some older sources concerned with trade or military interests. Though Ibn Habīb situates al-Suqyā on Wādī al-Qurā, the two can by no means be equated since al-Suqyā lies, as its full name Suqyā al-Jazl suggests, on Wādī al-Jazl. Wādī al-Qurā is an extensive region, but the name, when applied to a waystation, usually refers to Qurḥ, the capital of that region. Waki' enumerates fifteen halts on the inland route between Aīlah and Medina. He mentions Qālis as the halt between Madyan and al-Agharr; 'Anāb, between al-Suqyā and al-Marwah; and al-Ārāk as the halt between Dhū Khushub and Medina. Apart from enumerating the halts, Waki' proffers no information except that al-Suqyā is the meeting point of the Syrian and Egyptian routes. He mentions both the inland and the coastal Egyptian routes. Waki' is the only geographer to state that the Egyptian route bifurcates at Aīlah after which the first halt on the inland route is Sharaf al-Ba'il, and on the coastal route 'Ainūnah.

Ibn Rosteh follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh to the letter with regard to the inland route between Aīlah and Medina, with

the sole exception that he substitutes Sharaf al-Naml for Haql and correctly changes Ruhaibah to al-Ruḥbah. While the name Ruhaibah is probably attributable to a scribal error, it is interesting to note that in mentioning Haql as the first halt south of Ailah, Ibn Khurradadhbeh was alone among the Arab geographers for nearly two centuries when the name was revived by al-Bakrī and, a century later, by al-Idrīsī. As to Sharaf al-Naml, Ibn Rosteh probably borrows from al-Ya'qūbī who uses the name Sharaf al-Ba'il. Al-Ya'qūbī differs from Ibn Khurradadhbeh on the number of way stations on that route: the latter records fourteen, but the former mentions only eight. The six way-stations omitted by al-Ya'qūbī are: Haql, which he replaces with Sharaf al-Ba'il; the unnamed station between al- Ağhra' and al-Kilābah; al-Kilābah itself, the latter two halts being replaced by one called Qālis; al-Sarḥatain; al-Baidā'; Wādī al-Qurā; al-Ruhaibah, all the four being replaced by al-Suqyā alone; al-Marr; al-Suwaidā', with no replacement for the last two. Thus al-Ya'qūbī leaves out nine of the fourteen halts mentioned by Ibn Khurradadhbeh and introduces only three new names instead. Al-Ya'qūbī's Qālis is not mentioned by any other geographer mapping this route except Wākī', but al-Suqyā is mentioned by Wākī' and revived later by al-Muqaddasī and al-Bakrī, albeit it is mentioned only once by the former

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 76.
and only in one book of the latter.

Al-Ya'qūbī differs from Ibn Khurrradadhbeh also in other points, especially in proffering information about the major halts. He mentions that a Syrian route to Mecca leads through Palestine to Ailah, where it converges with the Egyptian route. He also records a coastal route between Ailah and Mecca, including information on some intervening halts. Unfortunately, no such information is provided on the inland route beyond Madyan. This is difficult to account for, unless one assumes that Egyptians preferred the coastal to the inland route to Medina. Al-Ya'qūbī had strong connections with the contemporary ruling dynasty of Egypt, the Tūlūnīds for whom he worked; and was too well versed in administrative matters to overlook the importance of watering places. This suggests that the inland route was almost disregarded, as it was natural for those concerned with pilgrimage to follow the coastal route even if they intended to visit Medina. Qudāmah seems to follow Ibn Khurrradadhbeh literally, except for the substitution of Sharaf al-Ba'īl for Haql, and the omission of al-Marr. Qudāmah also mentions a coastal route between Ailah and Medina which suggests that that route had been finally recognized by the administration of Baghdad.

Al-Muqaddasī gives more than one version of this route, but the accounts are all incomplete. His sources are diffic-

cult to trace. He seems to follow Ibn Rosteh in one version, but none of his predecessors can be made responsible for the others, though he mentions al-Suqyā which occurs in al-Ya'qūbī. It is surprising that al-Muqaddasī should have had first-hand knowledge of that route since his accounts of it are conflicting. He states once very clearly that this route was derelict in his time, and uses the name Sharaf al-Ba'il in one account and Sharaf Dhul-Ḥaml in another. Besides, he locates Wādī al-Qurā, named Qurūn in another passage, to the north of al-Suqyā on both the Egyptian and the Syrian routes. However, he states on another occasion that al-Suqyā is at the junction of the two routes which contradicts his own lists of the way stations. It also indicates some uncertainty on his part that he should try four times to record what he believed to be a definitive list of the way stations, but uses different names and totals of halts at each attempt. He states that there were "several" routes between Wailah (Ailah) and Mecca, whereas in fact there were two only. This discrepancy may be due to variations in the sources at his disposal. Moreover, he records in a matter-of-fact tone that the route of the "western" pilgrims to Mecca leads inland through Medina, but soon adds that they have "several" routes which he prefers to his own experience. Al-Muqaddasī also records the coastal route between Ailah and Medina, without proffering any information on the conditions prevailing there while enumerating the way-stations. However, he does describe the major towns when he refers to the region.
He is quite unaware of the mileage on the Egyptian route or, for that matter, the Syrian route, which indicates that they had not been measured at the time his work was compiled. Nevertheless, he states that the three postal routes between the Hijaz and Syria during the Umayyad period were known to have led through Taimā'. His location of al-ʿAunīd on the inland route cannot be accepted since he himself describes it as the port of Wādī al-Qurān. ¹ The information inherited from his predecessors appears in al-Muqaddasī's account, enriched with explanations of the names of some halts on the inland route. He connects Badā with Yaʿqūb and al-Suqyān with بِيْد Yazīd, a name which, though borrowed by al-Bakrī, is probably a corruption of الجِنْسِل al-Jazl, the valley in which al-Suqyān is situated and to which it is usually assigned. Al-Kilābah figures as al-Kilāyah, Dhul-Marwah as al-Marwah, and al-Aghrāʾ as al-Aʿrāʾ. ²

Al-Bakrī's account seems even more confused than al-Muqaddasī's. Not only are most of the names given in corrupted form, but al-Bakrī mentions eleven way-stations between Ailah and Medina, three of which are between Madyan and Ailah, instead of the one listed by the other geographers. The first seven halts of his route are definitely part of the coastal route and represent less than a third of that route. His predecessors name Madyan as the point at which the inland route parts from the coastal route, but al-Bakrī's

---

¹ Al-Muqaddasī, op.cit., p. 84.
² Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 76.
route keeps to the coast as far as Dubā. This new arrangement requires that four halts on Ibn Khurrazadhabeh's route between Madyan and Badā should be omitted and replaced by three coastal ones. Al-Bakrī follows al-Ya'qūbī in omitting the way-stations between Badā and al-Suqyā which, according to al-Muqaddasī should be three, but adds al-Suwaīdā' which is not mentioned by al-Ya'qūbī. Like al-Ya'qūbī and al-Muqaddasī, he fails to mention al-Marr and that the distance between al-Suwaīdā' and al-Marwah equals a journey of two days as stated by al-Muqaddasī. Apparently, al-Bakrī, in his *Māṣālik*, relies on al-Muqaddasī with regard to the names Suqyā Yazīd and Badā Ya'qūb because he refers to them, in his *Muʿjam*, as Suqyā al-Jazl and Badā.

Al-Bakrī seems to have consulted more than one source and relies on several accounts. This is borne out by the fact that he assesses the distance between Ailah and Madyan as four days journey, whereas he refers to the distance between Badā and al-Suqyā, which is longer, as one day's journey. An innovation is the location of three places on the route between Ailah and Madyan instead of one, which may point to a reduction of the distance covered in a single journey. There is no explanation for the statement that the inland route went as far as Dubā on the coast, unless one assumes that it is an attempt to reconcile the coastal route with the inland route, since there would be no point in

going to Dubā with the intention of turning east in order to reach the inland route. Al-Bakrī is the only Arab geographer to call the inland route from Egypt to Medina "al-Jāddah" = the conventional route, which suggests that he knew of the existence of the coastal route though he does not mention the latter. In fact, this conventional route was derelict in his time. In al-Bakrī's text, the distances between some of the way-stations seem to be shorter than his predecessors maintain, at least as far as Dubā, between which and Āilah he names six halts, whereas between Dubā and Medina he names only five way-stations, which is improbable as the section between Dubā to Medina represents more than two thirds of the whole.

Al-Bakrī describes both al-Suwa'idā' and Āilah as towns, which implies that he looks upon the other places as minor halts. The MSS of his Masālik are full of corruptions of the names of these stations. Āilah is referred to as ān̄a Anmulah; Badā as 霆 Nadā; al-Silā as atics al-Salah; and Suqyā as ७१ Suqyu. The identification of al-Silā with al-Nabk is, however, accurate. Dhū Khashub is called Naqā Dhū Khushub, a name which is not to be found in any other source. The same might be said of al-Bakrī's account as a whole. It cannot be traced to any available source before him which we know of. Nor can his knowledge of the region always be accepted, as his account is contradicted by information he himself gives in his Mu'jam. There he describes some of the way-stations as mere "places", states
that Badā lies between the Egyptian route and the Syrian route, and makes the same assertion of Shaghee. Like al-Muqaddasi, he proffers no information about the way-stations while mapping the route, but details of some of the way-stations are found in a separate place.

Al-Idrisi records two routes between Ailah and Medina, the coastal route and the inland route. His inland route is identical with that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh except for the omission of two way-stations: Badā and al-Sarhatain. He seems to consider it the main route, with the coastal route as the second choice, though he does not record any information on the inland route, but includes some data of this kind when discussing particular places regionally.

Most of the names of the way-stations are recorded in corrupted forms: Ḥaml for Haql; Ḥārqilāyāh for al-Kilābah; Sa'b for Shaghee; al-Wujaih for al-Ruhaibah; Abī al-Mawr for Dhul-Mawar; Maryam for al-Marr; Dhū Shu'ab for Dhū Khushub. The last four way-stations, however, are also mentioned on the Syrian route where their names are correct. Al-Idrisi does not record the mileage when he maps the Egyptian route, probably because there is no mention of it in the sources available to him.

1. Ibid., p. 230.
Neither al-Istakhrī nor Ibn Hauqal gives any list of the way-stations between Ailah and Medina, though each of them points out that there is such a list in existence. The information they provide coincides almost in its entirety. Egypt is separated by twenty days' journey from Medina; the Egyptian route and that of the Maghrībīs converge with the Palestinian route to Ailah; after Madyan the route bifurcates, so that the inland route leads on through Shaghb an- Badā', and al-Marwah to Medina, while the other follows the coastline to converge with the inland route at al-Juhfah. Ibn Hauqal describes the relationship between the Egyptian and the Maghrībī caravans on the pilgrim route. In his earlier version, he states that the two parties do not encamp together, so that one of them must leave before the other arrives. Later, however, he says that the Maghrībīs form part of the Egyptian caravan, though they sometimes prefer to occupy a separate camp.

According to Ya'qūt, the route from Egypt to Ailah is also recorded by al-Muhallabī. There is little doubt that this route did not stop at Ailah, but extended to Medina or Mecca. Though there is no mention of it in the available sources, the extant part of al-Muhallabī's account of it indicates a further development in the relationship between Cairo and Arabia. For the first time, the mileage system is adopted

at some stages of this route, as from Cairo to Qulzum. Yaqūt says that Ḥaqā is separated from Ailah by sixteen miles and that Dubā lies at seventy miles' distance from Badā. Though Yaqūt does not quote his source, it seems most likely that this piece of information stems from al-Muhallabī's ʿAzīzī. Al-Muhallabī seems to follow al-Yaʿqūbī in providing information about some halts while mapping the route.

This inland route from Medina to Ailah is identical with the old Muʾriqah route used by the Quraishī caravans between Mecca and Syria or Egypt. The Quraishī caravan did not pass through Medina, as generally accepted, but followed the Mecca-Medina route as far as Badr, 148 km from Medina, and hence proceeded through the valley of Yanbu' and the valley of al-'Īs northward to al-Marwah and Wādī al-Qurā. This is confirmed by the fact that the point assigned by the Prophet to the Syrians to start their pilgrimage rites was different from that of which the pilgrims emerging from Medina. This is also borne out by the fact that when the Prophet decided to surprise this caravan in the year 2 A.H. (March 624), he obtained the necessary information by sending some scouts to al-Marwah, after having tried to surprise this caravan at Buwāt between al-'Īs and al-Marwah six months before. It was often seen at Badr. When the Prophet

2. Ibid., vol. 3, p. 464.
turned away some of his Companions in accordance with a treaty between him and Quraish, these Companions camped at al-'Īs and molested the Quraishi caravan. Abū Yusuf's statement that they camped at Dhul-Hulaifah contradicts all reliable sources and, anyway, the caravan could not have passed there for reasons of security since Dhul-Hulaifah lies six miles from Medina.

It is true that most of the above information concerns the Syrian route, but it is the Ailah branch and this branch led to Egypt. Besides, al-Mughīrah b. Shu'bah refers to an Egypt-bound caravan following the same route. It is called al-Mu'riqah as against al-Tabūkiyyah which leads to Syria through Tabūk. It was by these two that the Muslim armies went to Syria. Throughout the 7th century, the route from Medina to Syria often led through al-Marwah and Ailah, which cannot but mean that the Egyptian caravan followed an inland route since there is no mention of a coastal route from Egypt until two centuries later. This is also the implied

4. Yaqūt (Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 573) states that it was called al-Mu'riqah after Iraq which cannot be accepted, since the route to Iraq was called al-'Unsulain (Ibid., vol. 3, p. 736). Al-Mu'riqah may be derived from al-'Iraq = sweat from which the camels suffer on this difficult route.
opinion of Ibn Khurrađadhbeh in the 9th century. It was Wâkî, al-Asadî and al-Yâqûbî who mentioned an alternative coastal route at the end of the 9th century. At the time of al-Muqaddasî, a century later, the inland route had been deserted by the pilgrims. Forty years later, in 415 A.H. (1025), the governor of Wâdî al-Qurâ, 'Abd Allâh b. Idrîs, a Tâlibî, invaded Ailah, and this led to his dismissal from the governorship of Wâdî al-Qurâ. There he defied the authority of Egypt and was supported by the local tribes. This incident is a clear indication of the conditions prevailing on the inland route at that time and an overwhelming reason for the pilgrims to prefer the coastal route. As regards the mention of this inland route by al-Bakrî (1094) and al-Idrîsî (1154), it is clear that they merely quote the information recorded by previous geographers. So does, presumably, al-Muqaddasî who mentions this inland route though it was he who stated that it was no longer in use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Khurradadhbeh</th>
<th>Wāki‘</th>
<th>al-Ya‘qūbī</th>
<th>Ibn Rosteh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haqīq</td>
<td>Saraf (Sharaf)</td>
<td>Sharaf al-Bā‘l</td>
<td>Sharaf al-Naml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Aghrā‘</td>
<td>Qālis</td>
<td>al-Aghrā‘</td>
<td>al-Aghrā‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a station&quot;</td>
<td>al-A‘arr (al-Aghrarr)</td>
<td>Qālis</td>
<td>&quot;a station&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kilābah</td>
<td>al-Kalābinah (al-Kilābah)</td>
<td>Shaghb</td>
<td>al-Kilābah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaghb</td>
<td>Badā</td>
<td>Badā</td>
<td>Shaghb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badā</td>
<td>al-Shaghb</td>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>Badā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sarhatain</td>
<td>(al-Sarhatain)</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>al-Sarhatain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Baidā‘</td>
<td>al-Suqyā (al-Suqyā)</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>Wādī al-Qurā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wādī al-Qurā</td>
<td>(and then with the Syrian pilgrims to:)</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>al-Ruhbah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruhaibah</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>al-Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>'Anāb</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>al-Suwa‘idā‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Marr</td>
<td>al-Marwah</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suwa‘idā‘</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>al-Mayy (al-Marr)</td>
<td>al-Suwa‘idā‘</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>al-‘Arāk (Uwāl)</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudāmah</td>
<td>al-Muqaddasī</td>
<td>al-Bakrī</td>
<td>al-Idrīsī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Wailah</td>
<td>Anmulah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaf al-</td>
<td>Sharaf Dhul</td>
<td>Haql</td>
<td>Hamal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’l</td>
<td>Naml</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>Wādī al-</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ghurāb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Aghrā’</td>
<td>al-A’rā’</td>
<td>Ashrāf al-</td>
<td>al-A’dā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ba’l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a station&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;a station&quot;</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>&quot;a station&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Kīlābah</td>
<td>al-Kīlāyah</td>
<td>’Ainūnah</td>
<td>Ankilāyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagbh</td>
<td>Shaghb</td>
<td>al-Nabk and</td>
<td>Sa’b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Silā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badā</td>
<td>Badā</td>
<td>Dubā</td>
<td>al-Baiḍā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sarhatain</td>
<td>al-Sarhatain</td>
<td>Bāda Ya’qub</td>
<td>Wādī al-Qurā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wādī al-Qurā</td>
<td>Wādī al-Qurā</td>
<td>Suqyā Yazīd</td>
<td>al-Ruhaibah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruhaibah</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Marwah</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Suwa’idā†</td>
<td>Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naqā Dhu-</td>
<td>al-Suwa’idā†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suwa’idā’</td>
<td>al-A’rā’</td>
<td>Khushub</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhu Khushub</td>
<td>al-Kīlāyah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dhu Khushub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Shaghb</td>
<td>Badā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Sarhatain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Baiḍā’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qurh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suqyā Yazīd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to al-Samhūdī, al-Asādī states that if the Egyptian pilgrims choose the inland route, they meet with the Syrians at al-Suqyā. Al-Asādī's source seems to be Wakī who enumerates the halts on the Egyptian coastal route. Al-Ya'qūbī states that this coastal route was actually in use towards the end of the 9th century. Indeed, it seems from his detailed description of the way-stations on this route that it was the major one, as he gives no details of the stops on the inland route. Al-Ya'qūbī's account of this route is confusing with regard to the way-stations. It cannot be explained by the not unusual omission of a line, since there are at least seven instances of it in a list containing thirteen names. 'Aunīd (al-‘Uwainīd), for example, should not be located between ‘Ainānah and al-Silā, as it actually lies farther south immediately after Dubā. Similarly, Dubā should be located immediately south of al-Nabk as the actual distance between the two does not allow for more halts. Al-Nabk is clearly identical with al-Silā, so that the two should be treated as one. Al-Haurā' is too far from al-Jār for the distance between them to be covered in one journey. Al-Qusaibah should be located north of

2. Wakī, Manāzil, fol. 114.
al-Nabk and al-Silā. Al-Mughīthah is probably identical with Qudāmah's al-Ahsā', as the two words have, in Arabic, the same meaning of "water within easy reach". As al-Ahsā' is located immediately north of Yanbu' or al-'Ushairah by both Qudāmah and al-Mugaddasī, it can be assumed to be identical with Nibt, which lies opposite to a locality called Sharm Hasī south west of Uma Lujj which, in its turn, is adjacent to the site of al-Haurā'. Al-Mughīthah is described by al-Ya'qūbī as "tilled after rain" which means that rain-water can be kept there for a fairly long time. A place of this kind would be ideal for al-aḥsā', hence the name: "wells within easy reach". Al-Buhrah is difficult to locate unless it is identified with Yanbu' or al-Buhairah which 'Arrām describes as a very rich spring between Yanbu' and al-Jār.

Al-Ya'qūbī's route leads to Mecca. He regards Madyan as the junction at which the coastal route converges with the inland route. The journeys required between the stations are extremely long in some places, such as that between Ailah and Sharaf al-Bayl, and extremely short in other places such as that between al-Silā and al-Nabk and al-Qusaiyah. Al-Ya'qūbī does not record the distances, either by reference to the mileage, or even by specifying the length of time spent between one halt and another. It is, however, generally accepted that unless the actual length is quoted, one journey is required to cover the distance between one station and the next. Though Wakiī's list of these halts is less confused than al-Ya'qūbī's, he offers no description of these
halts. There is neither evidence of personal experience of this route, nor of reliance on an official source. The names of the halts are given in a corrupted form, but the location of al-'Aunīd is correct. There is a blank space where the halt (called Mas'ūlān by Qudāmah) between al-Jār and Yanbu' should be, which indicates that this name was not generally known to scholars.

Qudāmah records the way-stations on the coastal route in their correct sequence. Nevertheless, he omits Madyan which Musil correctly observes. The distance from Sharaf al-Ba'il to al-Silā is too long to be bridged in one journey. Otherwise, Qudāmah seems to be consistent in spreading the halts over almost equal, though long, distances. Thus al-Wajh is divided by one halt from Dubā in the north and al-Jarrah (al-Haurā') in the south. Equally, Yanbu' is divided by one halt from al-Haurā' in the north and al-Jār in the south. It should be noted that al-Silā and al-Nabk are identical. Though Qudāmah calls it "the coastal route to Mecca" he, unlike al-Ya'qūbī, does not record the way-stations between al-Jār and Mecca. Indeed, he indicates that some pilgrims go from al-Jār to Medina from which it is separated by two days' distance. The number of stops and presumably also of the journeys recorded by both Wakī' and al-Ya'qūbī exceeds that recorded by Qudāmah, though the latter introduced a new

place name: Mas'ūlān.

Though al-Muqaddasī states that he has first-hand knowledge of the area and that he himself had crossed it several times, the halts he records are identical with those of Qudāmah, except that he substitutes al-'Ushairah for Yanbu' and omits Mas'ūlān. The first difference is explained by the fact that al-'Ushairah lies in the valley of Yanbu', but the omission of Mas'ūlān is noteworthy, as the distance between Yanbu' and al-Jār requires two days' journey as stated by al-Muqaddasī himself in another passage. Some forms of the names are misread: Sharaf al-Ba'il is alternately called Sharaf al-Ba'il and Sharaf Dhul-Naml; Dubā is called Dabbah; al-Wajh is called al-Ruḥbah; al-Ḥaurā' is called Buḥairah. He follows Qudāmah with respect to the omission of Madyan from this route, but does not add immediately, as Qudāmah does, that al-Jār is separated from Medina by two days' distance, though he does so on another occasion. He differs from Wakī', al-Ya'qūbī and Qudāmah in calling this route "the conventional" route on one occasion and the coastal route on another, while they describe it as the coastal route. Similarly, he calls it the Ailah-Medina route when the other three call it the Egyptian route. One of al-Muqaddasī's two versions of this route is incomplete as it stops at al-Ḥṣā'. On the whole, his two versions are

1. Al-Muqaddasī, op.cit., p. 84.
consistent as regards the names and the sequence of the stops.

\[1\]

Al-Idrīsī also has two versions of the route, but neither can be described as even approximately complete. To judge by the way he speaks of the distance between Ailah and Haql on the one hand, and between Madyan and al-Haurā’ or al-Haurā’ and al-Jār on the other, these places seem to be more or less equidistant, though the distance in one case is 40 km, and more than 350 km, and 200 km respectively in the other. Whereas al-Ya’qūbī records thirteen halts between Ailah and al-Jār, al-Idrīsī records but three. In his other version, al-Idrīsī omits Haql and Madyan for which he substitutes ‘Aunīd, Ḍubā and al-‘Utūf, a name which is untraceable in early sources and not identifiable with any of the old halts there. Between al-Haurā’ and al-Jār, al-Idrīsī records two places: Wādī al-Safra and al-Quraifah, both of which he describes as prosperous ports. It is clear that he has confused the port of al-Haurā’ with al-Rauhā’, which lies in the interior of the territory east of al-Jār, from which it is separated by al-Safra and al-Udhaibah which he confuses with al-Quraifah. Neither al-Safra nor al-Udhaibah is situated on the coast, but al-Idrīsī believes that they lie between the ports of al-Haurā’ and al-Jār and therefore regards them also as ports. Thus al-‘Utūf may be a misreading of al-Munsarat which lies near al-Rauhā’.

---

trace al-Idrīsī's source as regards this route, though for
the sector between Ailah and Madyan he seems to rely on
Ibn Khurrradadhbeh's inland route. It appears that al-Idrīsī
regards Madyan as the place at which the route bifurcates.
He also differs from Qudāmah and al-Muqaddasī in naming all
the halts to Mecca after al-Jār but unlike al-Ya'qūbī, omits
al-Juḥfah without a substitute.

It has been mentioned already that al-Bakrī implies the
existence of a coastal route between Ailah and Medina. There
is, however, no trace of such a route in his Masālik, and it
is not clear where he places the meeting point of these two
routes. He carries the inland route as far as Ḍubā, which
represents a new departure with regard to the conventional
route, since it suggests that the conventional route coin-
cided with the coastal route as far at least as Ḍubā. This
development cannot be taken for granted. Not only does the
political unrest in the interior at about al-Bakrī's time
militate against it; it is also made to appear improbable
by the fact that he mentions so few halts between Ḍubā and
Medina. What is probable is that al-Bakrī quotes a much
earlier source and a modern one in an attempt to reconcile
the coastal with the inland route. Once pilgrims arrive
at Ḍubā, the coastal route becomes easier and safer than the
inland route. Ibn Rosteh does not mention the coastal route
but states that sea-borne pilgrims travel from Qulzum to
Jiddah, and estimates the journey as lasting one day and
one night. Al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal mentions the coastal route as an alternative to the inland route. According to them, the route bifurcates at Madyan and meets again at al-Juhfah.

Though this route is called coastal, it is not always so. After Haql it crosses a mountainous area to Ainunah via Madyan. The same is true of the sector between al-Haurā' and al-Jar.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waki'</th>
<th>al-Ya'qūbī</th>
<th>Qudāmah</th>
<th>al-Muqaddasī</th>
<th>al-Idrīsī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
<td>Wailah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ainūnā ('Ainūnah)</td>
<td>sharaf al- Ba'1</td>
<td>Sharaf al- Ba'1</td>
<td>Sharaf</td>
<td>al-Haqāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muṣallā (al-Silā)</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>al-Silā</td>
<td>al-Silā</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Nīl (al-Nabk)</td>
<td>'Ainūnāh</td>
<td>al-Nabk</td>
<td>al-Nabk</td>
<td>al-Haurā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taibah (Dubā)</td>
<td>'Aunīd</td>
<td>Zubah</td>
<td>Dubbah</td>
<td>al-Jār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Maddah</td>
<td>al-Silā</td>
<td>'Aunīd</td>
<td>al-'Aunīd</td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aunīd ('Uwainīd)</td>
<td>al-Nabk</td>
<td>al-Wajh</td>
<td>al-Ruhbah</td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rajjah (al-Wajh)</td>
<td>al-Qusaibah</td>
<td>Munkhūs</td>
<td>Munkhūs</td>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkhūs</td>
<td>al-Buḥrah</td>
<td>al-Jarrah</td>
<td>al-Buḥairah</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Haurā'</td>
<td>al-Mughithah</td>
<td>al-Aḥsā'</td>
<td>al-Aḥsā'</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qusaibah</td>
<td>Zubah</td>
<td>Yanbu'</td>
<td>al-'Ushairah</td>
<td>Ailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Buḥrah</td>
<td>al-Wajh</td>
<td>Mas'ūlān</td>
<td>al-Jār</td>
<td>'Aunīd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalba' (Yanbu')</td>
<td>Munkhūs</td>
<td>al-Jār</td>
<td>Duba</td>
<td>al-'Uṭūf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mas'ūlān)</td>
<td>al-Haurā'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Ḥaurā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Jār</td>
<td>al-Juḥfah</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wādī al-Safrā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Quraifah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Jār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Al-Idrīsī (op.cit., fol. 89) seems to have misread al-Haurā' for al-Haunā' in his second version of the route (see p. 398).
III THE CONVENTIONAL ROUTE BETWEEN MEDINA AND MECCA

Table III (pp. 415-20)

This pilgrim route between Mecca and Medina is the most discussed route in the works of the Arab geographers of the period under consideration. Most of these geographers concern themselves with the details of this route, its halts and their conditions. It is also by far the best known route with respect to the location of its stopping places. Little change seems to have occurred in its course for thirteen centuries, apart from a diversion aimed at avoiding the inland sector as far as possible. Beside this conventional route, there are several other routes which connect the two Holy cities.

1

Ibn Khurradadhbeh mentions ten halts on this route, starting with al-Shajarah six miles from Medina. Unlike some other geographers, Ibn Khurradadhbeh implies that al-Shajarah is a halt, apparently because he considers it self-evident as its religious functions require pilgrims to linger there for a while. He gives the mileage between the way-stations. Qudāmah's version of this route is identical with that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh as regards the location of the halts. The same could be said about the mileage between the way-stations. Exceptions are the distance between al-Juhfah.

and Qudaid which Qudāmah assesses at twenty-six miles instead of twenty-seven in Ibn Khurradadhbeh's estimate, and that between Baṭn Marr and 'Usfān which, according to Qudāmah, amounts to sixteen miles, far less than the thirty-three quoted by Ibn Khurradadhbeh. A mile's difference is acceptable, but seventeen miles are not. It is wrong to suppose that the distance between 'Usfān and Baṭn Marr is thirty-three miles. Qudāmah's estimate is more nearly correct. The information given by Qudāmah about the way-stations is more detailed than that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh. Whereas the latter limits himself to the water available there, its quantity and its quality, Qudāmah goes a step farther and speaks of agriculture, trade and the importance of these stations.

In naming the halts on this route, Ibn Rosteh differs from Ibn Khurradadhbeh by omitting Malal between al-Shajarah and al-Sayālah while assessing the total of mileage between the two to be the same. The distance between al-Juḥfah and Qudaid is given as twenty-nine miles as against the twenty-seven miles given by Ibn Khurradadhbeh. As to the distance between 'Usfān and Baṭn Marr, Ibn Rosteh's thirty-four miles exceed the former's assessment by one mile. This mileage is probably meant to cover the whole sector between 'Usfān and Mecca, though both authors allot sixteen more miles for the intervening distance between Baṭn Marr and Mecca. Ibn Rosteh

seems to be Qudāmah's source for the information on the halts. Both authors state that al-Shajarch is not a halt but merely the point at which pilgrimage rites start. What Ibn Rosteh called al-ahsāʾ near al-Ruwaithah, Qudāmah calls ahsāʾ = "wells within easy reach". Ibn Rosteh tends to over-rate the importance of some halts there, since he describes al-ibwāʾ, al-Juḥfah and 'Usfān as huge-sized villages. He errrs in equating al-Sayālah with al-Rauḥāʾ, as they are separated by more than 20 km. As a whole, Ibn Rosteh gives more details about the conditions of the stops than either Ibn Khurrawadhibeh before him or Qudāmah who probably relies on his work.

Contrary to his usual practice, al-Yaʿqūbī tries once to give the mileage between two halts. He situates Dhul-Hulaifah (al-Shajarah), where pilgrims emerging from Medina perform their first pilgrimage rites, at four miles from Medina. This solitary estimate is, however, inaccurate, as the distance is at least five and a half miles. However, he regards it as a halt and names it as the first of the ten halts between Medina and Mecca. Al-Yaʿqūbī announces his intention of naming ten halts and in fact enumerates thirteen. Three of these halts are not proper way-stations, since two of them, al-Rauḥāʾ and al-'Arj, are known as "stopping places for evening meal", and the third, al-Hufair, is so described, though it is separated by eight miles from either al-Shajarah.

or Malal. Al-Ya'qūbī, however, does not refer to any distinction between the thirteen halts. The names Suqyā B. Ghifār and Marr al-Zahrān are used for the first time by al-Ya'qūbī instead of al-Suqyā and Baṭn Marr, used by Ibn Khurāradadbeh before him and both Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah after him. Apart from mentioning the religious functions of Dhul-Hulaifah, al-Ya'qūbī limits his information entirely to the origins of the inhabitants of these stations. Ghadīr Khumm is situated by him at two miles off the route, but he does not refer to its significance in connection with Shi'ite belief.

1 Al-Hamdānī records ten halts on the way from Medina to Mecca. The number of way-stations coincides with that recorded by Ibn Khurāradadbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah, but al-Hamdānī differs from them by omitting al-Shajarah and Malal, for which he substitutes al-Rauḥā' and al-'Arj. He also estimates the distance from Medina to al-Sayālah as twenty-three miles against the thirty-seven miles at which they assess it. The same could be said about the distance between al-Sayālah and al-Ruwaithah which he estimates as thirty-seven miles, while they record it as thirty-four miles, without mentioning al-Rauḥā' as a stop, though Ibn Rosteh erroneously equates it with al-Sayālah. Al-Hamdānī refers to it as a stop, separated from al-Sayālah by twenty-four miles, and from al-Ruwaithah by thirteen miles. The last-mentioned

distance does not require a full day's journey as the local road conditions are not bad. The distance between al-Ruwaithah and al-Suqyā is, according to al-Hamdānī, forty-eight miles with al-'Arj as an equidistant way-station between them. The other three geographers omit al-'Arj and more correctly regard the distance as only thirty-six miles. Ibn Rosteh locates al-'Arj between al-Suqyā and al-Ruwaithah at a distance of thirteen miles, but does not regard it as a halt. In fact, both al-'Arj and al-Rauhā' were mere "evening meal" halts.

In estimating the distance from al-Suqyā to al-Abwā' as nineteen miles, al-Hamdānī is more accurate than the other three geographers who assess it at twenty-nine miles. Al-Hamdānī also differs from them in recording the distance between al-Abwā' and al-Juhfah as twenty-three miles, while they quote it as twenty-seven miles. Here, al-Hamdānī obviously errs less. The distance between Qudaid and 'Usfān estimated by al-Hamdānī at twenty-three miles, is one mile shorter than that recorded by them. Besides, Ibn Khurradadhbeh and Ibn Rosteh tend, as has been seen above, to exaggerate the distance between 'Usfān and Mecca which Qudāmah assesses at thirty-two miles, against forty-nine and fifty miles in the respective estimates of Ibn Khurradadhbeh and Ibn Rosteh. Al-Hamdānī assesses it at thirty-six miles which is nearest to correct, as the distance is 70 km, when more or less the same route is followed. Al-Hamdānī regards this route as a
continuation of the Iraqi pilgrim route. He limits his concern to the distance, and to the latitude, for which he relies on "some Iraqi authors".

Al-Muqaddasi ventures to record the route from Mecca to Medina according to his own experience. While he apparently borrows Ibn Khurraḍadhibeh's mileage on the Iraqi route, he prefers to ignore it as regards this route which he measures by journeys. Nevertheless, he commits a gross error here. The distance between al-Suqyā and al-Ruwaithah cannot be three days, for it can be covered in one or two days at most. According to al-Muqaddasi, al-Rauha is situated between Mecca and al-Ruwaithah, whereas it actually lies between al-Ruwaithah and Medina. He also states that the distance between al-Ruwaithah and Medina requires one day's journey only which cannot be accepted. He mentions new way-stations instead of old names such as al-Khaim, and Khulais and Amaj between al-Juhfah and 'Usfān, which suggests that he has substituted these two way-stations for Qudaid. The distance between al-Juhfah and 'Usfān can be covered in no more than two days. Though al-Muqaddasi does not give information on the particular halts while mapping the route, he describes some of them on other occasions. He gives the way-stations starting from Mecca to Medina, in which he is followed by al-Idrīsī.

Al-Idrisi differs from all his predecessors by stating, in the Paris 2222 MS. that the number of halts between Mecca and Medina is twenty, and, in the Paris 2221 MS. 33a, that it is ten. Unlike al-Ya'qubi who announces ten halts but enumerates thirteen, al-Idrisi stops far too short of the promised twenty. The ten halts he names are entirely identical in number, name and sequence with those given by Ibn Khurraadhbeh, except that the former terminates his route at al-Shajarah. Further differences concerns the distances on that route. Al-Idrisi, understandably, ignores the distance from al-Shajarah to Medina altogether. The distance between Malal and al-Sayalah, which he assesses at seventeen miles and that between al-Suqya and al-Abwa', which he assesses at twenty-seven miles, are both two miles shorter than Ibn Khurraadhbeh's estimate. Al-Idrisi mentions an alternative route which, however, turns out to be the Prophet's Hijrah route. The information proffered by al-Idrisi is richer than that of his predecessors. It ranges from the availability of water to the origins of the people inhabiting the way-stations and the conditions of life there, and even the distances between some halts and the sea. Nevertheless, it should be noted that he departs from his previous statement that al-Juhfah is situated on the sea coast, and that it is a port. Regarding the population, he seems to rely on

1. Al-Idrisi, op.cit., fols. 36-7.
2. Ibid., fol. 34.
different sources, since he mentions both the ancient and the new inhabitants of these places. His assumption that the Ṭayy also lived at al-Suqyā cannot be accepted.

Apart from Wākī’s, al-Asadī’s account of the route between Mecca and Medina is the most detailed among the Arab geographers. His work is not yet available, with the exception of a number of quotations recorded by al-Samhūdī on the subject of the mosques of the Prophet between Mecca and Medina, and some halts on the pilgrim routes. Fortunately, it is possible to derive from these quotations a relatively clear picture of the route between Mecca and Medina, the main feature of which is obviously the description of the Prophet’s mosques on that route, which is not a mean feat. Less clear are the data on distance and directions from place to place. Al-Asadī seems also very concerned with the living conditions of the natives; the post officials and the road signs. He disregards neither historical information about the route nor its contemporary condition. His admiration of the projects carried out by or under al-Mutawakkil in contrast to those of al-Wāthiq which he treats with contempt, is not shared by Wākī’.

How much has been recorded of al-Asadī’s account of the distances between one place and another is not always clear, as al-Samhūdī does not mention all the distances. Once al-Samhūdī attributes to al-Asadī the assessment of the distance

between Medina and al-Ruwaithah at sixty miles but, as he does not quote him on the intervening distance between al-Shajarah and Malal, one is left with the assumption that it is at least nineteen and a half miles in order to obtain the total of sixty miles. Also the assessment of the distance between Medina and al-Suqyā at ninety-six miles is attributed to al-Asadī.

This would imply that the distance between the latter and al-Ruwaithah is thirty-six miles, though the actual total is given as thirty-one miles. It should be noted, however, that Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah calculate the distance between al-Ruwaithah and Medina as seventy-one miles, and that between al-Suqyā and Medina as 107 miles.

Almost all the information attributed to al-Asadī by al-Samhūdī is to be found in Wakī'ī's Manāzil which contains the most detailed and consistent data on the conventional route from Medina to Mecca. It deals with many aspects, such as the spring and wells on this route and the inhabitants of the halts. The mosques of the Prophet are also discussed in detail. His meticulous assessment of the distances has not been exceeded by any other geographer whose complete work we know of.

Wakī'ī's concern about the distances is not limited to those between two successive halts or the total of distances

1. Ibid., p. 1225.
2. Ibid., p. 1234.
3. See Wakī'ī, Manāzil, fols. 41-54.
between several halts, but includes the distances between intervening points, even if they are only one mile apart. It seems to have been his purpose to compose a very detailed map of that route. It was his misfortune that his work was no doubt frequently consulted and borrowed from by both al-Bakrī and Yaqūt, but with a clear determination to suppress his name, as neither of them mentions a source when utilizing Waki'ī's data on this route. Yaqūt assesses the distance between Medina and al-Shajarah, between al-Qāhah and al-Suqyā and between al-Suqyā and Ti'han exactly as laid down by Waki'ī, but without reference to any source, not even to al-Asadī or al-Sakūnī whose reliance on Waki'ī is clear.

Al-Bakrī in his Mu'jam supplies a detailed description of almost all halts on the route from Medina to Mecca, including the distances from one place to another, their history and the contemporary condition. Most of this account is clearly identifiable with that of Waki'ī and al-Asadī. There is the distance between al-Ruwaithah and al-Uthāyah, and that between the latter and al-'Arj which coincides with Waki'ī's and al-Asadī's data. The same can be said of the distances between al-Qāhah and al-Suqyā; between the latter and Ti'han; between al-Ruwaithah and 'Aqabat al-'Arj;

2. Ibid., vol. 4, p. 5.
3. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 856.
between the latter and al-'Arj itself; between Wādī al-Azraq and Anaj. Also al-Bakrī's estimate of other distances is identical with some of al-Asadī's and Wakī'ī's assessments, but as these places are famous, the coincidence is less indicative of al-Bakrī's consistent borrowing from them than in the case of minor data. They situate the half-way point between Mecca and Medina at one mile before Hirshā in the direction of Mecca, a statement borrowed by al-Bakrī; they equate Khulais with Ibn Bazī's spring and so does al-Bakrī. The latter estimates the distance between al-Juḥfah and Kulayyah at twelve miles, an exact copy of what al-Asadī states.

The same can be said of the information on the mosque of the Prophet five miles south of al-Abwā'. Al-Samhūdī states that the mosque of the Prophet at Ti'han is not mentioned by any author except al-Asadī, so that the mention of this mosque by al-Bakrī is convincing proof of al-Bakrī's reliance on al-Asadī or Wakī'ī who mentions it before al-Asadī. These quotations suffice to demonstrate how heavily al-Bakrī is indebted to Wakī'ī or al-Asadī, at least with regard to this route. There is, however, no explanation yet why both al-Bakrī and Yaqūt persistently ignore their source here; but the very fact that al-Bakrī and Yaqūt adopt the same attitude suggests that this work had been handed down anonymously for undisclosed reasons as regards al-Asadī, and because Wakī'ī did not finish his work.

1. Ibid., p. 956.
Al-Bakri’s account is not limited to that of Waki‘ or al-Asadi. The traces of their work are strongest in the sections of al-Mu‘jan which are devoted to the route from Medina to Mecca. Nevertheless, there are numerous occasions on which al-Bakri tries to record the distance between one place and another, or to map parts of the route, about which there is no doubt that he has consulted sources which are sometimes contradictory to both Waki‘ and al-Asadi. Thus, though al-Bakri gives the total mileage between Medina and al-Rauha‘ as forty miles when mapping the route, he estimates it, in another passage, at forty-one miles. Similarly, the distance from Medina to al-Ruwaithah which varies between sixty-four, sixty-three and fifty-one miles in three different passages. The thirty-one mile distance between al-Ruwaithah and al-Suqyā shrinks to thirty miles in another entry; so does that between al-Sayalah and al-Rauha‘, which is given as twelve miles in one passage and eleven in another. Arthad, the valley of al-Abwā‘, is situated four miles from Medina, which is erroneous as miles ايال here is clearly a misreading for ni‘hts ليال. Al-Bakri seems

1. Ibid., p. 681.
2. Ibid., p. 954.
3. Ibid., p. 930.
4. Ibid., p. 686.
5. Ibid., p. 686.
6. Ibid., p. 770.
7. Ibid., p. 136.
hesitant with respect to Ti’han which he correctly situates, in one passage, after al-Suqīyā in the direction of Mecca, probably relying on Waki’i or al-Asadī. But in another passage, obviously confronted by a report transmitted by al-Bukhārī which, despite all al-Samhūdī’s and Ibn Hajar’s efforts, defies reconciliation with actual fact, he locates Ti’han before al-Suqīyā. Though al-Bakrī rightly followed al-Asadī in stating that ‘Azwar is near al-Juhfah where there are two mosques of the Prophet, al-Bakrī commits the error of relying on Arrām when he situates ‘Azwar near Radwān, north east of Yanbu’. He draws on al-Asadī in locating al-Mushallal three miles north of Qudaid and nine miles south of Kulayyāh, but in another passage he locates both Qudaid and al-Mushallal in Mecca which is clearly inadvertent. The distance between Qudaid and al-Kadīd is given, in a separate entry, as sixteen miles, one mile in excess of the total mileage assumed between the two places when mapping the route. Al-Bakrī follows al-Asadī when correctly locating Kulayyāh at twelve miles south of al-Juhfah, but situates it, in accordance with Arrām, north of al-Juhfah in another context. The fact that a description of the conventional route immediately precedes the

1. Ibid., pp. 315, 1041. See al-Samhūdī, Wafā’, pp. 1162-1163.
3. Ibid., pp. 1054, 1217.
4. Ibid., p. 1054.
5. Ibid., p. 1352.
statement that the total mileage between Mecca and Medina is 200 miles excludes the applicability of this statement to any other route, while the actual total of the distances given in the same passage is 209 miles, which implies that the Manāẓil of Waki‘ is not the only source of this route. Only when mapping the route does al-Bakrī calculate the distance in miles. In other entries his estimate varies, as some distances are given in miles and others in days’ journeys. The latter method is exemplified by his estimate of the distance between Medina and Thīrā (two nights’ journey); that between Medina and al-Qāyah (three nights’ journey) and that between lirthad and Medina (four nights’ journey).

According to al-Bakrī, there are several routes from Medina to Mecca. He mentions the one from al-Rauḥā’ to Badr mapped by Waki‘, and another one from al-Ruwaiṭah to Badr. After Badr, the route leads for two days through land which is barren though it has wells of fresh water. The route converges with the conventional route at al-Juhfah. He states that some travellers do not go to al-Awā‘ as they prefer to travel from al-Suqyah to Waddān. On this occasion, al-Bakrī mentions the distance from Waddān to al-Juhfah, though he disregards Waddān altogether when mapping the route from Badr to al-Juhfah which actually leads through Waddān. All this information is recorded by Waki‘ who states in a

1. Ibiù., p. 248.
2. Ibiù., p. 1040.
third passage that Waddān lies in ruins. It is this route which became the سلطاني sultānī "official" route in the following centuries.

The account of the route between Medina and Mecca given by al-Bakrī in his Mu'jam is of the highest value, since it comprises the minute details derived from Waki' and al-Asadī together with numerous additions which are often correct and always important. He also mentions the Hijrah route which will be discussed later. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī does not proffer any original or new information about this route. He does not even refer to it, except briefly in connection with the mosques of the Prophet between Mecca and Medina. The forms in which the names occur are narrated by constant misreading.

2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fols. 74-5.
### TABLE III: Medina-Mecca Conventional route with the mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Khurrahadbeh</th>
<th>al-Ya'qubī</th>
<th>Ibn Rosteh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shajarah</td>
<td>Dhul-Hulaiyah</td>
<td>al-Shajarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>al-Hufairah</td>
<td>al-Sayala =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(al-Rauha')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sayala</td>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-Sayala</td>
<td>al-Suqya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suqya</td>
<td>al-Rauha'</td>
<td>al-Abwa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Abwa'</td>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-Juhfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Juhfa</td>
<td>al-'Arj</td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td>Suqya B. Ghifār</td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Usfān</td>
<td>al-Abwa'</td>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
<td>al-Juhfa</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>Ghadīr Khumā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marr al-Zahrān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudāmah</td>
<td>al-Handānī</td>
<td>al-Muġaddasī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Yathrib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shajarah</td>
<td>al-Sayālah</td>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>al-Rauhā'</td>
<td>al-Rauhā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sayālah</td>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-'Arj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-'Arj</td>
<td>Suqyā B. Ghifār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>al-Abwā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Abwā'</td>
<td>al-Abwā'</td>
<td>al-Juhfah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Juhfah</td>
<td>al-Juhfah</td>
<td>al-Khaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td>Khulais and Amaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Usfān</td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
<td>Marral-Zahrān</td>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Idrīsī</td>
<td>al-Asadī according to al-Samhūdī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Shajarah</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>the Mosque of al-Munbajis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>the spring of al-Munbajis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sayālah</td>
<td>(repeated by Yaqūt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-Mu’rras (Dhul-Hulaifah)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>al-Ḥufairah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Abwā’</td>
<td>al-Ṭalūb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Juhfah</td>
<td>Liḥyay Jamāl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td>al-Qāhah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Usfān</td>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>al-Munsaraf (repeated by Yaqūt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batn Marr</td>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td>the pass of al-’Arj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-Uthāyah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al-’Arj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Ti'han</td>
<td>'Usfān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhul-Hulaifah</td>
<td>al-Abwā'</td>
<td>al-Janābidh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hufcīr</td>
<td>al-Juhfah</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malal</td>
<td>Kulayyah</td>
<td>the Well of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Sayālah</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>al-'Adanī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rauhā'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruwaithah</td>
<td>al-Mushāllal</td>
<td>Kurā' al-Ghamīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Uthayyah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Arj</td>
<td>Qudaid</td>
<td>Bathn Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talūb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sarif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qāhah</td>
<td>Khulais</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medina
2  al-ʿArj
al-ʿAqīq 5½
Dhul-Hulaifah
(al-Shajarah)
6
al-Hufair
6
Malal
5
a mosque of the Prophet
2
al-Sayalah
9
'Irq al-Zabyah
2
al-Rauha
2
al-Munsaraf, a mosque of the Prophet
11
al-Ruwaidhah
4
al-Jiyy
7
the pass of al-ʿArj
where the Hijaz ends
1
a mosque of the Prophet at al-Uthaynah near the barid no. 51
2
al-ʿArj
3
a mosque of the Prophet
1
the half-way sign
2
the pass of Hirsha
with a mosque of the Prophet
4
23
Liyyah Jamal
17
Wadi al-ʿAbid
(al-Qahah)
1
al-Suqyah
3
Tiʿhan
4
the spring of al-Qushairī
7
the spring of Ibn Mutlī
1
a mosque of the Prophet
1
the spring of Thaqīb
1
al-ʿAbwāʾ
2
the hills of Yumm
3
a mosque of the Prophet
1
the well of Rābigh
1
'Arun ('Azwar)
with a mosque of the Prophet
11
al-Juhfah with a mosque of the Prophet at the entrance and another at the exit
3
a mosque of the Prophet
9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the spring of B. Ja'far b. Sulaiman</td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the pond of al-Ashtat</td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the mosque of al-`Adanî</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurā' al-Ghamīm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the well of the Beduin</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the valley of al-Kurā'</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Janābidh</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marr (Baṭn Marr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharaf (Sarif)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Tanîn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the mosque of `A'ishah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fakhkh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(one mile less than his sum of the distances between the nine halts)
IV THE HIJRAH ROUTE FROM MECCA TO MEDINA

1 Ibn Khurradadbeh accords to this route more attention than any other geographer of this period. He records it as an ordinary route, but assigns to it the historic honour of having been chosen by the Prophet when he migrated from Mecca in 622 A.D. He does not mention a source, nor does he treat his account as a hadīth. Nevertheless, it is almost certain that he relies, with minor alterations, mainly omissions, on Ibn Ishāq's account of this route. He omits about a line of Ibn Ishāq's account where it concerns the convergence of the Prophet's route with the conventional route at the lower region of 'Usfān until after Amaj, where the Prophet deviated from the route for a while before and after Qudaid. Ibn Khurradadbeh mentions neither Liqf nor the route of Liqf referred to by Ibn Ishāq. Nor does he mention al-Jadājīd. The name al-'Abābīd is replaced by al-'Ithylānah, and al-'Āir by al-A'yār. The place called Dhū Salam by Ibn Ishāq, is called by Ibn Khurradadbeh Dhū Samr; the two names are, however, consensmatic, both dealing with one tree. Ibn Ishāq's Batn Marjih Dhul-Ghawawain is modified to Marjih ... as the word Batn بَتَن is changed to the verb tabattān تَبَتَن "went through". Batn Ri'm is called Ri'm; Mujāh is called Mujāj.

Al-Idrīsī regards this route as an alternative to the conventional route from Mecca to Medina. He implies that it was used by his contemporaries as he states that it is longer than the conventional route and that it leads through mountainous passages. The last-mentioned observation is correct, but the Hijrah route is not longer than the conventional route. Both Ibn Ishaq and Ibn Khurraadadhbeh state very clearly that the guide of the Prophet avoided the route on several occasions, no doubt to evade the pursuit by the Quraish, but also to take a short-cut. Al-Idrīsī substitutes "travellers" for "the guide of the Prophet", and proceeds to quote the account of Ibn Khurraadadhbeh, again with some alterations which are mainly due to misreading. So full of misreadings is the account that it is impossible to form a clear idea of this route on the basis of Al-Idrīsī's version alone. Here is a list of place names given by Ibn Khurraadadhbeh and in the two MSS of Al-Idrīsī:

'Usfān, Qudaid, Al-Kharrār
Thaniyyat al-Mar'ah,

Madlajat Mujāh, Marijīh of Mujaj;
Marijīh Dhū al-Ghādawain,

Batn Dhāt Kishād, al-Ajrad
Dhū Samr, A'dā' Madlajat Ti'han,
al-'Ithbānah ('Ithyānah), al-Qāhah,
al-'Arj, al-A'yār, Rī'm and
B. 'Amr b. 'Auf at Quba

Batn Marr, on the coastal route.
Ghusfān, Qudaid, al-Jiwar, al-Thaniyyah al-Harrah Marlad, Batn Marbah
Batn Dhāt Kishād, al-Ajrad, Dhū Shamir, Batn Aghrā',

Madlajat Ya'fur, al-'Aithā',

Adhān al-Qāhah, al-'Arj, al-A'yār, Rubbamā,
B. 'Amr b. 'Auf and Medina

Batn Marr, on the coast.
It should be noted that al-Idrīsī’s Adhān al-Qāghah or Adhān al-'Azjāh is the result of misreading; Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh’s thumma ajāz al-Qāghah = then he passed al-Qāghah. The same can be said of Thaniyyat al-Ma'rā’ah which has been split, in one MS., into two halts: al-Thaniyyah and al-Harrah. Ri'm is called Ri'mā which is due to a grammatical misconception. It should read Ri'mā in Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh’s account, as it is there the object of the verb ṣabā; no alteration is necessary in al-Idrīsī’s version. Similarly, owing to the omission of the place name Qubā after "B. 'Amr b. 'Auf", B. 'Amr figures as a place, though the correct place name would be Qubā where B. 'Amr used to live at the time of the Hijrah. Deviations in this particular instance from Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, al-Idrīsī seems to rely on the account of 'Urwhāh b. al-Zubair, though the latter states definitely that B. 'Amr lived at Medina, whereas al-Idrīsī indicates with equal clarity that B. 'Amr is a separate halt before Medina. The one addition of al-Idrīsī, Batn Marr is not mentioned by the other three on this route. He is, however, mistaken in placing it on the coast in one MS.

Though Ibn Ishaq’s account is more detailed than 'Urwhāh’s, the latter is clearly more successful in his attempt to map this route, as he unequivocally states on several occasions that the Prophet avoided some routes which

he names, implying that they were known and used at that time. Ibn Ishāq's account merely suggests that the Prophet avoided "the route". 'Urwah traces the Madīlah route between those of al-Rauḥā' and 'Amq, and correctly substitutes al-Ghā'ir for Ibn Ishāq's 'Ā'īr, describing it as a watering place, not a pass as Ibn Ishāq does. 'Urwah locates his Ghā'ir east of the Rakūbah pass. Both authors call Ri'm Bāṭn Ri'm which is also correct. 'Urwah is alone in omitting Amaj, Liqīf, Mujah, Marjih, Dhū Kushd, al-Jadājīd, al-Ājrad, Dhū Salam, al-Qāḥah and Ti'han. Ibn Hishām correctly preferred Dhul-'Asawain and al-Qāḥah to Dhul-Ghadawain and al-Fājah respectively as accepted by Ibn Ishāq.

1 Al-Bakrī repeats part of Ibn Ishāq's account as given by Ibn Hishām. This part stops at Liqīf which Ibn Hishām corrects to Liqīf. Al-Bakrī, however, regards this correction as an indication that Liqīf and Liqīf are two places at a short distance from one another. Though this part of the Hijrah route appears shorter than the corresponding section in Ibn Ishāq's account, the place names coincide as far as Liqīf. This part is recorded by al-Bakrī as a ḥadīth; on another occasion, he refers to the whole route as "the Hijrah ḥadīth", which suggests that he does not suppose that it was used by his contemporaries. However, he seems to be oblivious of this ḥadīth when he situates the Rakūbah pass on the route from

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1161.
Medina to Tabūk. Similarly, he quotes Mālik to the effect that Ri‘m is at four postal stages from Medina. According to 'Abd al-Razzāq, Ri‘m is thirty miles from Medina. Ri‘m is much closer to Medina than their estimate. Al-Bakrī also states that Dhū Kishd is mentioned in the "Hijrah hadīth", but this name does not occur in the part he records. Incidentally, Dhū Kishd is the correct form of the name and not Kishr or Kushr as printed in Ibn Hishām's Sīrah because Kishr lies east of Medina. Al-Bakrī also rectifies the name of the place which occurs in Ibn Khurradadhbeh as Muja‘ī and in Ibn Hishām as Muhāj, spelling it Muja‘ī, which is the correct form.

Nasr rarely errs, but he is mistaken in defining Marji‘ as Mudajjaj. He also seems to overlook the story of the Hijrah, as he assumes wrongly that the Prophet shunned this place. Yaqūt borrows the entire statement, but attributes it to Abū Bakr al-Hamadhānī. On another occasion, Yaqūt confuses it with another Marji‘ near al-Khall in the Yemen. Al-Muqaddasī refers to this route once in connection with a difficult pass through which, according to legend, a pathway was hewn by Gabriel for the Prophet when he migrated from Mecca to Medina.

2. Ibid., p. 689. 10. Al-Muqaddasī, op.cit.,
4. Al-Bakrī, Mu‘jam, p. 1161.
5. Al-Bakrī, Mu‘jam, p. 1161.
7. Ibid., fol. 136.
OTHER ROUTES BETWEEN MEDINA AND MECCA

There are other minor routes between Medina and Mecca such as those leading through al-Fur', south of Medina. According to al-Zubair, there are four routes leading from Medina to al-Fur'. 'Abd Allah b. al-Zubair passed al-Fur' when he fled from Medina to Mecca in the 7th century. The route through al-Fur' is a short-cut, but it is difficult and unsafe for pilgrim caravans in times of unrest. Abū al-Fida' indicates that some of his contemporaries travelled through al-Fur' though it was infested by robbers.

To judge by the information found in Nasr, the conventional route had already been diverted from its ancient course through al-Suqyā to its present course through Badr by the 6th Hijri century (12th century). As the old route was shorter and richer in water, this diversion can only be accounted for by the requirements of safety.

Al-Maqdisī mentions three routes from Mecca to Medina, the conventional route, the coastal one and the one called al-Khālif. Unfortunately he chooses not to enumerate the halts on each route on the ground that they are too many. It is, however, clear from his statement that both the coastal

1. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1323.
3. Abū al-Fida', Taqwīm, p. 95.
and the conventional routes were in use at his time, the 10th century. It has already been seen that al-Bakrī mentions two routes leading from Medina to Badr from which a route leads to al-Juhfah. Al-Maqdisī's Khālif is no doubt the Hijrah route which is known as al-Ghā'ir. Ibn Zabālah implies that the Prophet followed the Fur' route, and had three mosques there. It is presumably the route he followed during the campaign of Buhrān. The Najdi route between Medina and Mecca converges with the Iraqi route at the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim. This route was in constant use in the early centuries of Islam, and al-Rashīd had dams built at al-Arhadīyyah, half-way between Medina and the Ma'dan.

According to al-Samhūdī, Hirshā, north of Rābih, is described by 'Arrām as the meeting point of travellers from Medina and Syria to Mecca. This piece of information is not to be found in 'Arrām's text. What appears in his text is the statement that the Mu'riqah route, between Radwā and 'Azwar, is a short-cut taken by the Arabs going to Syria, Mecca and Medina. Any route with such a function should be located between Mecca and Medina, but Radwā lies north west of Medina, so that any short-cut from Medina to Syria would have to avoid Radwā. It is also difficult to understand what 'Arrām meant by placing Radwā and 'Azwar west of the

2. Ibid., p. 1224.
3. Ibid., p. 1326.
4. 'Arrām, op. cit., p. 396.
Medina route and east of the Burairā' route in the direction of Mecca, since Radwā does not lie on the direct route linking the two cities. The same applies to his assertion that Yanbu' lies "right of Radwā for those who travel west" unless the word "Radwā" is omitted. The distance between the two Mts. Thāfils and both Radwā and 'Azwar is given by 'Arrām as "two nights' journey" in one passage, and "seven nights' journey" in another, which cannot be explained except by assuming a lacuna in the MS., especially if one notes that 'Azwar does not lie near Radwā. 'Arrām refers to two "evening meal" halts on the route between Medina and Mecca, and mentions the mileage for some of the distances, but only sporadically since it occurs once or twice, so that it cannot be taken as proof that he knew the length of the whole route in miles. Nor can al-Waqidī's reference to the mileage, though often accurate, be regarded as the result of an official survey, since he mentions places unlikely to be of interest to the official administration. It is true that Lughdah and al-Hajarī refer to the mileage on the conventional route in the Malal region, but by the time of al-Hajarī, the route had already been measured in miles.

1. Ibid., p. 397.
2. Ibid., p. 399.
3. Ibid., p. 401.
4. Ibid., pp. 401, 403.
5. Al-Hajarī, Nawādir, part 1, fol. 132, and part 2, fol. 142; and Lughdah, op.cit., pp. 371, 376.
Waki' mentions the diversion leading from al-Rauha' to al-Juhfah through Badr to which al-Bakrī refers without naming a source. Since Waki' relies on the authority of a native, it seems that this diversion was not in general use, though the distances are quoted in miles as far as Badr. Waddān, which lies on this diversion, is not mentioned here, but is described on another occasion as "lying in ruins". Waki' also mentions the Najdī route from Medina to Mecca, and quotes the distances in miles. As regards the route from Medina to Mecca through al-Suwāriqiyyah, Waki' quotes the distances in days' journeys as far as al-Ma'dan where it converges with the Najdī route. He mentions the palaces of al-Rashīd, and the springs and wells dug by many prominent Muslims on this route.

2. Ibid., fol. 40.
4. Ibid., fol. 17.
VI SURÂGH—MEDINA ROUTE

Table IV (p.439)

The ancient Tabûkiyyah route was known to pre-Islamic Arabs whose trade caravans passed it on their way to Syria. Caliph Abû Bakr is said to have instructed two of his armies to follow this route on their way to Syria, and sent a third via Ailah. According to al-Asadî, the northernmost frontier of the Hijaz is Surâgh. Ibn Khurradadhbeh mentions eleven way-stations between Surâgh and Medina. He neither records the mileage nor proffers any other information with regard to this route. Ibn Rosteh enumerates the same number of halts in precisely the same sequence. Qudâmah carries the route only up to Wâdî al-Qurâ, observing the number and sequences of Ibn Khurradadhbeh's account, but referring by implication to his own previous account of the route from Ailah to Medina through Wâdî al-Qurâ. Since Qudâmah omits al-Marr from the latter account, his way-stations between Surâgh and Medina number only ten. Al-Ya'qûbî indicates that Syrian pilgrims travel to Mecca and Medina through Ailah.

5. Qudâmah, op.cit., fol. 94.
where they join the Egyptians. Though he describes their passage to Hila as difficult and mountainous, he fails to mention the Tabūkiyyah route which was no doubt in use at his time.

1 Though al-Idrīsī follows Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh to the letter with respect to the journey from Tabūk to al-Hijr, he seems to utilize an additional source in Wādī al-Qurā and on the journey from Suragh to Tabūk which Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah locate immediately south of Suragh. Al-Idrīsī mentions two halts, al-Bathniyyah and Dimmah, between Suragh and Tabūk, and identifies al-Bathniyyah with Adhri'at, while Musil identifies Dimmah with Dhūтul-Ḥājj. It can, however, hardly be credited that such a short distance from Suragh to Dhūтul-Ḥājj requires more than one day's journey. Nor is it possible to cover the whole distance from Suragh to Tabūk in one day's journey as Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh, Qudāmah and Ibn Rosteh suggest. Even the distance from Dhūтul-Ḥājj to Tabūk, measuring, according to Musil, 80 km, is more than could possibly be bridged in one day's journey. The other place on which al-Idrīsī differs from Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh is Wādī al-Qurā. According to the latter, it is the halt south of al-Hijr and north of al-Ruhbah that is called Wādī al-Qurā. The same halt is named by both authors with respect

1. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 94.
2. Ibid., fol. 93.
to the Ailah-Medina route. Al-Idrīsī does not name it on the Syrian route, but prefers to describe it as a small town on a small river. There are no rivers there. In another MS., however, it is called "Wādī" which suggests that an attempt at correction has been made.

The misreadings in al-Idrīsī's account are legion. The following is a juxtaposition of al-Idrīsī's two MSS compared with the account of Ibn Khurradadhbeh:

Ibn Khurradadhbeh          Al-Idrīsī

| Saragh                  | Yanū',        | Paris 2221, fol.138 | Yabū',        |
| Tabūk                  | al-Buthainiyyah, |                | al-Buthainiyyah, |
| al-Muḥdathah            | Da'ah (Dimnah), |                | Dimnah,       |
| al-Aqrā',               | Tabūk,        |                | Tabūk,        |
| al-Junainah             | al-Muḥdathah, |                | Imā Far',     |
|                        |               |                | (al-Aqrā')    |
| al-Hijr                 | al-Aqrā',     |                | al-Hanīfiyyah, |
|                        | al-Hijr       |                | a small town on |
|                        | Wādī, a very small |                | a small river. |
|                        | town on a small |
|                        | river.        |                |               |

Al-Idrīsī also differs from Ibn Khurradadhbeh in proffering information about some of the way-stations. Since al-Idrīsī does not try to give similar information about the inland route from Ailah to Medina, it is to be assumed that he had access to some first-hand data supplied by a traveller on
this route.  

1. Al-Istakhri and Ibn Hauqal state that there are two routes from Syria to Medina, one from Palestine through Ailah, and the other, by implication, from Damascus through Tabuk. Both routes require twenty days' journey. Neither al-Istakhri nor Ibn Hauqal attempts to map either route.

2. Al-MuqaddasI is the first Arab geographer to record the fact that three Syrian pilgrim routes converge at Taima'. Though all three routes start from Amman, only one requiring eight days' journey to reach Taima' leads through Tabuk. The second route leads through Thajr and takes twelve days all in all. The third leads through al-Nabk (north of Taima') and requires thirteen and a half days. He mentions that these three routes are the choice of most Arabs (tribes), and adds that the Umayyads used these routes for their postal services. Nevertheless, he says that many Syrians travel along these routes from Amman to Mecca, and that he himself had followed them more than once. Al-MuqaddasI mentions on this occasion that these routes are safe and short. To judge by his other accounts, they were neither. The irony of this statement is illustrated by another, following close on its heels, that the natives there often take to highway robbery if pilgrims do not engage

a native escort or protect themselves by force of arms. He says that pilgrims had been attacked and robbed of their beasts of burden and of their property. On another occasion also, he describes these routes as unsafe. He has handed on descriptions of numerous way-stations on these routes, especially of minor watering places in the desert about which he complains vociferously. His account has probably been written in several successive stages as some of the distance measurements are contradictory. On one occasion, he refers to Taimā’ as situated at four days’ journey from Tabūk, but on another he speaks of seven days. It could be the influence of early sources.

Al-Ḥamdānī does not mention the Syrian pilgrim route, though he implies that the way from Medina to Syria passes through Taimā’.

1. Al-Ḥamdānī, Sifah, p. 131.

It is uncertain whether he has this route or the other through Ailah in mind when he states that Syrian and Egyptian pilgrims can avoid Medina by deviating from the main route, travelling from al-Suwaidā’ to al-Sayālah by way of Uwāl (Dhū Uwān). Like al-Muqaddasī, al-Ḥamdānī states that travellers there are advised to have an escort among the natives, his implication being that no traveller is safe there without a native escort. He also mentions two routes from Khaibar to Medina, one which is a short-cut and the other

2. Ibid., p. 130.

3. Ibid., p. 131.
through Hisn B. 'Uthmān (west of Khaibar), and adds that a route leads from al-Hijr to Taimā', without naming the stations on this route.

1 Al-Bakrī mentions fifteen mosques of the Prophet between Medina and Tabūk, erected on the places at which the Prophet is known to have prayed on his return journey from Tabūk to Medina. However, it is impossible to assume that there are known mosques at all places at which the Prophet has prayed since he has no doubt prayed at least at three different places every day. The distance between Tabūk and Medina is too great to be covered in five days by an army whose beasts of burden were emaciated and few in numbers. There may be mosques at the main halts at which the Prophet not only prayed, but also encamped to rest. Though al-Bakrī seems to rely on Ibn Hishām's account with regard to these mosques, he differs from him in omitting al-Akhdar and Dhul-Jīfah which he mentions in another context, locating al-Akhdar at four days' journey from Tabūk. It should be three days. Dhātul-Khaṭmī is located, in another entry, at five days' journey from Tabūk. This is no doubt due to inadvertence, as he mentions, apart from al-Akhdar, two halts between Dhātul-Khaṭmī and Tabūk which means that the distance could

1. al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1223.
3. Al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 124.
4. Ibid., p. 504.
be covered in four days only. This equals, according to 1 Musil, an average of 25 km, which can be assumed as fairly reasonable for the "army of hardships". It is almost certain that these mosques are enumerated in their geographical order though Musil suggests that al-SA‘ID الصعيد is identical with SA‘ID سعيد, located at 100 km. northwest of al-Hijr and not south of it as would appear from Ibn Hishām's account. In fact, al-SA‘ID, or SA‘ID Qurh, was the capital of WĀDI al-Qurā which lies south of al-Hijr. Musil also identifies the mosque of HAUDA‘ with the well of al-HAUSĀ‘ at some distance north east of Tabūk, and not to the immediate north of al-Hijr according to the location of Ibn Hishām. In fact, the Prophet did not travel beyond Tabūk.

In another entry, al-BAKRĪ, quoting al-SAKŪNĪ, indicates that the route from Medina to TAIMĀ‘ leads through al-Hijr. Beside this route, he mentions three others from Medina to TAIMĀ‘, one by way of SILĀH and al-JINĀB; another by way of FAID and Judad, and a third by way of FAID and JAISR al-JUFĀ‘. The route from Medina to TAIMĀ‘ via SILĀH and al-JINĀB leads no doubt through Khaibar. The first reference to this route is met with in al-BAKRĪ’s MU‘JAM. A century later, Khaibar is mentioned as a fortress on the Syrian pilgrim route. In the year 555 A.H. (1160), the governor of Syria took this

3. Al-Samʿānī, op.cit., p. 113.
route for the hajj. It should be noted, however, that the conventional route via Wādī al-Qurā was never deserted except in time of crisis. Al-Maqdīsī assesses the distance between Tabūk and Medina at ninety parasangs. His source seems to be al-Mas'ūdī. Their estimate of the distance seems to be accurate. Wāḳī enumerates thirteen halts between Suragh and Medina, and reiterates that the Egyptian and Syrian routes converge at al-Suqyah. He also mentions the route from Medina to Khaibar and the route to Fadak. The lack of other information on these routes, of which he has no first-hand knowledge, indicates that his sources here are of minor value. He also lists the mosques of the Prophet between Medina and Tabūk without proffering any information.

During the late 7th and the early 8th centuries, the pilgrim route from Damascus to Mecca was in a good state of repair and many caliphs tried to make the journey less arduous for the pilgrims. 'Uthmān, Marwān, al-Walīd I and 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz attempted to ensure adequate provision of water for pilgrims on this route.

2. Al-Maqdīsī, op.cit., vol. 4, p. 239.
3. Al-Mas'ūdī, Tanbih, p. 270.
5. Ibid., fols. 74-75.
6. Ibid., fol. 75.
7. Ibid., fol. 115.
**TABLE IV: Surāqeh-Medina route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Khurradadhabh</th>
<th>Wākī'</th>
<th>Ibn Rosteh</th>
<th>Qudāmah</th>
<th>al-Idrīsī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surāqeh</td>
<td>Asra'</td>
<td>Surāqeh</td>
<td>Surāqeh</td>
<td>Surāqeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabūk</td>
<td>Tabūk</td>
<td>Tabūk</td>
<td>Tabūk</td>
<td>al-Bathniyyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muhdathah</td>
<td>al-Muhdathah</td>
<td>al-Muhdathah</td>
<td>Muhdathah</td>
<td>Dimnah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Aqrā'</td>
<td>al-Aqrā'</td>
<td>al-Aqrā'</td>
<td>al-Aqrā'</td>
<td>Tubūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Junainah</td>
<td>al-Junainah</td>
<td>al-Junainah</td>
<td>al-Junainah</td>
<td>al-Muhdathah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hijr</td>
<td>al-Hijr</td>
<td>al-Hijr</td>
<td>al-Hijr</td>
<td>al-Aqrā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wādī</td>
<td>Wādī</td>
<td>Wādī</td>
<td>Wādī</td>
<td>al-Junainah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Qurān</td>
<td>al-Qurā</td>
<td>al-Qurā</td>
<td>al-Qurā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Ruhaibah</td>
<td>al-Suqyā</td>
<td>al-Ruhbah</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Hijr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>(then to Medina)</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wādī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Marr</td>
<td>Egyptian pilgrims</td>
<td>al-Marr</td>
<td></td>
<td>al-Ruhaibah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Suwaidā’</td>
<td>on the inland route)</td>
<td>al-Suwaidā’ Medina</td>
<td>Dhul-Marwah</td>
<td>al-Marr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>Dhū Khushub</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Ibn Khurradadhbeh states that there is a diversion on the Kufa-Mecca route at al-Naqirah in the direction of Medina. That he regards it as a diversion from the main route is implied by the fact that he does not mention the "evening meal" halts as he does on the main route to Mecca. Pilgrims who prefer to visit Medina as well as Mecca follow this route to Medina and then embark on the Medina-Mecca route. He records some information about water facilities on this route. Qudāmah follows him to the letter, but Ibn Rosteh's account is more detailed than theirs. It contains the reference to one "evening meal" halt and several mentions of distances between intervening places. Even the information he gives on the water facilities on this diversion is richer than that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh. He also mentions some historical data concerning these facilities. Though Ibn Rosteh agrees with Ibn Khurradadhbeh with respect to the actual number of way-stations to Medina, and the names of the halts on this route, he differs from the latter on the total distance between al-Naqirah and Medina. Indeed, the sum of the detailed distances between al-Taraf and Medina in

1. Ibn Khurradadhbeh, op.cit., p. 128.
Ibn Rosteh's account is, at twenty-five miles, two miles short of his own total of twenty-seven. Despite these shortcomings, Ibn Rosteh's assessment of the total distance is, at 126 or 128 miles, less mistaken than the 137 miles quoted by Ibn Khurradadhbeh. Al-Ya'qūbī does not mention the distances and even differs from Ibn Khurradadhbeh in locating Batn-Nakhl to the immediate north west of al-Naqirah instead of al-'Usailah. He has also Tarafah instead of al-Taraf. Ibn Khurradadhbeh is correct in both respects.

Al-Hamdānī regards this route as a continuation of the Iraqi main route to Mecca, his assumption being that pilgrims go via Medina and return via Dhāt 'Irq. He is partly correct, as Iraqi pilgrims usually do not pass through Medina twice. Al-Hamdānī's mileage for this sector of the route is, at ninety-eight miles, too short to be acceptable. Besides, his information, in this account, is limited to degrees of latitude. Al-Asadī's account of this route is not given in a complete form. Moreover, the accounts attributed to him are contradictory. There is Bi'r Rukānah, which he situates at ten miles from Medina and two miles from Bi'r B. al-Muttalib, mentioned in another passage as al-Rikābiyyah, and in a third as Bi'r Abū Rukanah. Another example is the alleged statement that the distance between al-Nukhail and Medina is

1. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 312.
4. Ibid., p. 1158.
forty-five miles whereas, in another passage, this distance is described as more than sixty miles. Bi'r Rukanah, called al-Rukaniyyah by Ibn Rosteh but printed al-Rikabiyyah, is said to be the farthest frontier of al-Taraf in the direction of Median according to al-Asadī, but this is misread in another passage as "the last of the upper-most of al-Taraf". Al-Shuqrarah is situated at twenty-four miles from al-Nukhail. Al-Samhūdī quotes al-Asadī to the effect that there are more than 300 wells at al-Nukhail all with good quality water. He also quotes al-Asadī as situating al-Nakhil at forty-five miles from al-Rabadhah.

Al-Muqaddasī mentions that Batn Nakhil is equidistant between Medina and al-Naqirah, at two days' journey from either. Al-Mas'ūdī situates al-Taraf at thirty-six miles from Medina, and Batn Nakhil at four postal stations from Medina. While the last quoted figure is more or less accurate, the former cannot be accepted, as al-Taraf lies

1. Ibid., p. 1149.
2. Ibid., p. 1319.
3. Ibid., p. 1138.
4. Ibid., p. 1158.
5. Ibid., p. 1138.
6. Ibid., p. 1149.
7. Ibid., p. 1149.
half-way between Batn Nakhl and Medina. Both figures are traceable to Ibn Sa'īd. 'Arrām mentions Batn Nakhl as lying on the route to Medina. The same account is repeated by al-Bakrī who also quotes al-Sakūnī who mentions Nakhl as situated on the route to al-Naqirah and Fadak from Medina. When al-Bakrī states that al-Shuqrāh is a village on the derelict route to Medina, he implies that there was more than one route from al-Naqirah to Medina. Al-Shuqrāh is mentioned by Ibn Khurradadhbeh as situated on the diversion from al-Naqirah to Medina. No information is traceable as to how or when this route was diverted from al-Shuqrāh.

Al-Idrīsī follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh as regards this sector with the exception of assessing the distance between al-Taraf and Medina at fifteen miles instead of the thirty-six miles quoted by the latter. Al-'Usailah is given in a corrupted form: al-'Umlah. Though the information about the halts seems to be expanded, it actually remains within the outlines laid down by Ibn Khurradadhbeh. Wakī' maps two diversions from al-Naqirah to Medina, an ancient route called al-Akhrijah, and a new one leading through al-'Usailah which

---

1. Ibn Sa'īd, Tabaqāt, part 1, vol. 2, pp. 62, 63.
2. 'Arrām, op.cit., p. 424.
3. al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1016.
4. Ibid., p. 749.
5. Al-Idrīsī, op.cit., fol. 42.
7. Ibid., fols. 83-84.
figures in the other geographers. He quotes the distance in miles on the former, but not on the latter on which he quotes a poet. His own description of al-'Usailah diversion seems to be missing from the MS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ibn Khurraadaadhbeh</th>
<th>Waki'</th>
<th>al-Ya'qūbī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Na'qirah 46</td>
<td>al-Na'qirah</td>
<td>al-Na'qirah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Usailah 36</td>
<td>al-Muhdath</td>
<td>Ba'tn Nakhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba'tn Nakhl 22</td>
<td>al-Usailah</td>
<td>al-Usailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Taraf 35</td>
<td>Ba'tn al-Nakhl</td>
<td>Tarafah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>al-Taraf</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waki' also maps this ancient diversion to Medina which he calls al-akhirjah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faid</th>
<th>Husayy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27½ miles</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-akhirjah 6</td>
<td>Arqam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lihyay Jamal 6½</td>
<td>al-Sa'id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azamam 2</td>
<td>al-Nukhail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Talūb 18½</td>
<td>al-Shuqrah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghamrat Marzūq 24</td>
<td>Bīr al-Sā'ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Unūbah 27</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Rosteh</td>
<td>Qudamah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
<td>al-Naqirah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-'Usailah</td>
<td>al-'Usailah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batn al-Nakhl</td>
<td>Batn al-Nakhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taraf</td>
<td>al-Taraf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Medina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII  AL-NAQIRAH-MECCA ROUTE

Almost all geographers, with the exception of Wakī' and al-Hamdānī, imply that the Iraqi pilgrim route leads to Mecca via al-Naqirah with a diversion at al-Naqirah for those who want to visit Medina. As seen before, al-Hamdānī implies that both routes constitute, in fact, one main route, since the majority of pilgrims go by way of Medina and return through Dhāt 'Irq, or vice versa. This is also the implication of a poem quoted by Wakī'. Al-Asadī, however, observes that some, including al-Rashīd, began by visiting Medina, but returned to Mecca by the Najdī route which leads through al-Arhadīyyah and the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim. The stations as far as Mecca are mentioned by all geographers except al-Muqaddasī who stops at al-Ghamrah. Qudāmah stops at Dhāt 'Irq, but completes the number of stations in another account, without giving the mileage on the last mentioned addition. All geographers apart from al-Ya'qūbī quote the mileage on this route from station to station. None of them, except al-Hamdānī, records the latitude of these stations.

1. Wakī', Manāzil, fol. 79-84.
4. Ibid., p. 192.
Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh and Ibn Rosteh alone mention the intervening "evening meal" halts between stations. They all try to proffer some sort of information about this route except al-Ya'qūbī whose interest in this aspect of pilgrim routes wanes at al-Naqirah. Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh, followed by Qudāmah and al-Muqaddasī, errs in placing the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim east of al-Salīlah and al-'Umaq immediately west of al-Rabadhah. It should be placed west of al-'Umaq and east of Ufai'yah.

Al-Muqaddasī's account is identical with that of Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh as regards the mileage, the names of the stations and their actual order. He, however, differs from the latter in the omission of the water facilities at some stations and in the mention of these facilities at others. On the whole his attitude is more critical than that of Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh. Al-Ya'qūbī agrees with Ibn Rosteh on the number of stations, except for al-Salīlah which he omits. Ibn Rosteh follows Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh on the number of stations and on the names of the "evening meal" halts, but he does not mention the one between Ibn 'Āmir's Bustān and Mecca. Owing to Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh's erroneous location of the Ma'dan of B. Sulaim, his "evening meal" halts differ from those of Ibn Rosteh whose information on this route is richer than Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh's, as the former is concerned, in

1. Ibn Khurraḍǎdḥbeh, op.cit., p. 131.
3. Al-Ya'qūbī, Buldān, p. 312.
addition to the water facilities, with the history of the places discussed and the origin of their inhabitants. Moreover, Ibn Rosteh mentions the total distance between Mecca and Baghdad on both courses, while Ibn Khurradadhbeh mentions only the total of the main branch of the route. It should be noted, however, that Ibn Rosteh refers to the discrepancy between the total distance and the sum of the detailed distances on the route from Basra to Mecca, his declared intention being to revise the assessment.

The information proffered by Qudamah about stations on this route is similar to that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh. His total of the distance up to Dhāt 'Irq is 205, thirty-six miles shorter than that of the latter. Al-Hamdānī's total for the whole sector is 247 miles, also thirty-five miles below Ibn Khurradadhbeh's total mileage. Al-Hamdānī is the only geographer to mention the stations eastward from Mecca. He is also the only one to refer to the latitude of these stations, though he acknowledges his debt to an Iraqi author in this respect. Al-Samhūdī has preserved parts of al-Asadī's account of this route, which represent a valuable geographical description of some halts. Indeed, he seems to discuss this route in all its details as he proceeds from the ancient site of Dhāt 'Irq for about eight miles to the contemporary Dhāt 'Irq. He mentions, and locates, the cistern of Autās together

1. Al-Hamdānī, Sifah, p. 185.
with a mosque of the Prophet. He also pays a good deal of attention to the wells and cisterns of Ufai'iyah and the origins of its inhabitants. He does the same with regard to al-Rabadhah which he locates at four days from Medina. Wakī‘'s account of this route is by far the most detailed and accurate of all complete descriptions of this route by any author of this period. It contains the mileage of the distances between the major halts as well as between the intervening places, references to some short-cuts and diversions, and to other routes converging with this route. A good deal of attention is paid to the history of these halts and the facilities they offered to pilgrims, such as, for instance, the "light-house" at Umm Khurman where the Kufa-Mecca and Basra-Mecca routes converge. As to al-Idrisī, he does not fulfil his promise to enumerate the stations on the route from Baghdad to Mecca.

2. Ibid., p. 1129.
3. Ibid., p. 1091.
5. Al-Idrisī, op.cit., fol. 42.
IX CONCLUSION

It can be said that most of the pilgrim routes leading through the Hijaz were in use in the pre-Islamic era and were the subject of continuous care in the early centuries of Islam. The route from Basra to Mecca was a purely Islamic innovation - Ibn 'Āmir did a great deal to facilitate its use by having wells dug at some of its halts in the 7th century. In the 8th century Muhammad b. Sulaimān, the Abbasid prince and governor of Basra, ordered the route over the vast marshes west of al-Dathīnah to be paved with stone since it was impassable after rain, a project which was carried out except for eight miles. As to the Kufa - Hijaz route, Caliph 'Uthmān initiated certain improvements; the Abbasid caliphs gave it priority; al-Saffāh erected mile-stones on it, lighthouses in the desert and rest-houses; al-Mansūr increased the number of rest-houses; and al-Mahdī paid special attention to the upkeep of the route as well as the buildings along it and had cisterns dug at the halts. None, however, did more for this route than Zubaidah from whom the two official routes Basra - Mecca and Kufa - Mecca derive their names: دارب زبيدَة darb Zubaidah (Zubaidah's route). She had many a cistern dug there, and made many difficult parts on it accessible. Al-Mutawakkil erected the mile-stones on the

Medina – Mecca route which had been provided with wells by most caliphs. Difficult parts of the pass of Ḥilah were partly levelled by the Tulūnīds. The improvement made by the Umayyads on the Tabūkiyyah route consisted mainly of digging wells. No mile-stones were erected on non-Iraqi routes in the Hijaz until late in the 10th century when mileages were first mentioned on the Egyptian route to the Hijaz which implies that calculation in miles there was introduced by the Fatimids. There were places on the Iraqi routes where fires were lit to guide pilgrims in the desert, especially where the routes converge. These fires might have also been lit in times of emergency. Where the route bifurcates, there were road-signs to indicate points of bifurcation. It emerges from the accounts of Wakī' and al-Asadī that the mile-stones between the postal stages which had their own numbers, bore the figures from one to twelve. Some postal stages are given certain names.

The most discussed pilgrim routes during the period under consideration are those used by the Iraqis, mainly those leading from Kufa to Mecca, Kufa to Medina and Medina to Mecca. Far less information is supplied on the other Iraqi routes: the Basra – Hijaz, Samarrā – Hijaz and Wāsīt – Hijaz, though they are mentioned and their distances are


quoted in miles by Waki’r and al-Sakūnī. Pioneers in this respect, who are no doubt independent from each other, though their sources are not necessarily different, are Ibn Khurradadhbeh and Waki’r. Both authors seem to have utilized the official archives or religious and literary works. Waki’r is better informed, and seems to possess more firsthand knowledge about these routes than any other geographer except perhaps al-Sakūnī whose concern is not limited to the pilgrim routes as he records many others, especially those frequented by the Zakāh collectors. Al-Asadī seems to have incorporated most of Waki’r’s information which he enriches with personal observations. Al-Hamdānī is unique in recording the degrees of latitude of all halts between Mecca and both Medina and Kufa in reliance on “some Iraqi authorities”, possibly al-Fāzārī or Ḥabash. Ibn Rosteh draws heavily on Ibn Khurradadhbeh from whom he differs on some of the distances and on the succession of the halts about which his information is more detailed than that of Ibn Khurradadhbeh. Ibn Rosteh is the first official geographer to calculate the distances on the complete Basra - Mecca route in mileage. Waki’r’s assessment is, however, more consistent and detailed than that of Ibn Rosteh. Qudāmah relies on Ibn Khurradadhbeh and Ibn Rosteh, adding some information about the local postmasters and their residences. Al-Ya‘qūbī maps the

1. Waki’r, Manāzil, fols. 11, 91-99.
coastal route from Egypt to Mecca proffering ample information with respect to its inhabitants and the commodities available there. He seems to rely on 'Arrām with regard to the tribes of the region between Medina and Mecca. 'Arrām's is probably the first attempt at mapping the Najdi route from Medina to Mecca, which for reasons discussed elsewhere, is not entirely successful. Al-Muhallabī utilizes both al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Rosteh, though he seems to resort to a new, possibly official, survey for the distances. According to him, the distance from al-Tha'labiyyah to Faid is eighty-seven miles, whereas Ibn Khurradadhbeh and Ibn Rosteh assess it at ninety-two miles, which is one mile less than the assessment of Qudāmah, nine miles more than that of al-Handānī and two miles more than that of al-Muqaddasī. The latter enumerates more routes in Northern Hijaz than any other geographer, but some of his information is contradictory. He is unsuccessful in mapping the route from Mecca to Medina, as he disregards the definitions of his predecessors, but gives room to information which, on some occasions, is contrary to fact. As to the other Iraqi routes, al-Muqaddasī follows Ibn Khurradadhbeh even where the latter errs with respect to the sequence of the halts from al-Naqirah to Mecca.

According to Ibn Khurradadhbeh, the total distance between Baghdad (he means Kufa) and Mecca is 275½ parasangs =

827 miles. Ibn Rosteh assesses the Kufa - Mecca route at 848 miles, and the Kufa - Medina - Mecca route at 960 miles. Summing up the distances between the individual halts, one arrives in each case at a different total, namely 841, 838 and 948 miles respectively. Neither of them seems to notice this discrepancy, which may be due to scribal mistakes. According to al-Maqqisi, the Kufa - Mecca route is 765 miles, which agrees neither with Ibn Khurradadbeh nor with Ibn Rosteh. The most consistent and unequivocally clear estimate is that of Waki'. He quotes the total mileage between Basra and Mecca (675 miles); between Baghdad and Mecca through Medina, (758 miles, minus six miles if one takes the short-cut from al-Ma'dan-of al-Naqirah - to al-'Usailah); and the postal stages between Baghdad and Mecca through Medina (sixty-two and two thirds = 752 miles). His assessment of the length of the route from Baghdad to Mecca through Dhat 'Irq seems to be 694 miles. He also quotes the total mileage between Medina and Mecca as 200 miles.

The information provided by al-Bakri in the Munjam contains the most detailed data on the Medina - Mecca con-

1. Ibn Khurradadbeh, op.cit., p. 132.
5. Ibid., fol. 54.
6. Ibid., fols. 4-19.
ventional route because it is mainly derived from Wakī' or al-Asadī whom he does not even mention. In his Masālik, however, al-Bakrī refrains from mapp[s of] this route which is by no means a great loss. To judge by his description of the Ailah – Medina route, al-Bakrī could not have achieved, in his Masālik, the same degree of success as in al-Mu'jam, because the sources on which he relied for the latter, at least as far as the Northern Hijaz is concerned, are clearly superior to those he used for al-Masālik. The only innovation there concerns the comparatively short distances covered by the daily journey from Ailah to Dubā.¹ The proximity of the halts to each other is probably due to the huge size of the pilgrim caravans and the leisurely habits of the users in al-Bakrī's time, as well as to considerations of safety which seem to have required that the whole party of pilgrims should travel together.

Safety conditions on the pilgrim routes of that time were often precarious. Before Islam, the tribes on these routes used to exact a toll from the caravans. The advent of Islam modified their greed for only a short while. Already as early as the 8th century, the Abbasid caliphs launched out on a policy of appeasement of the tribes on the Iraqi routes to Mecca. From the mid-9th century onwards, conditions on all pilgrim routes became intolerable. In opposition to the

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 76.
2. See al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 1134.
the introduction of Turkish elements in the military ranks in the state, a very dangerous nationalistic revolt headed by a self-styled "caliph" broke out in 843. Though this unsuccessful revolt caused a sudden change in the policy of the state in favour of the Arab soldiers, the Iraqi pilgrims found themselves entirely at the mercy of these tribes whose greed was increased by the weakness of the central administration. The general uncertainty obviously favoured the aggressiveness of the tribes which began to bargain for the safety of the pilgrims. Caliph al-Muqtadir is said to have bought safety for the pilgrims between Medina and Mecca from B. Harb, and it is most likely that other tribes on other parts of the route were similarly bribed. An honest chief minister in Baghdad was confident that 5000 Arab horsemen would suffice to keep order on the Iraqi pilgrim route. This indicates that most of the huge sums ostensibly spent on this purpose by the official contractors were misappropriated. However, no pilgrim route in the Northern Hijaz was ever safe after the mid-9th century, since they were passable only if the pilgrims were accompanied by a native escort or a sizeable military force. Pilgrim caravans began to steer clear of the troubled territories as far as possible. This

3. 'Arîb, Silâh, p. 130.
happened on the Ailah – Medina route which was replaced by the coastal route before the 10th century. It also occurred a century later, on the Medina – Mecca route, where pilgrims preferred the coastal line after al-Munsaraf to ensure a safe passage. Not all pilgrim routes in the Northern Hijaz followed the course of the pre-Islamic trade routes. The coastal route between Ailah and al-Jār, the old Medina – Mecca route and the Basra – Mecca route were mainly post-Islamic. The ancient route between Mecca and Syria was diverted from al-Ṭis to Medina, possibly for administrative rather than religious reasons.

The attention paid by the geographers to the migāts (the points at which pilgrims start their rites) is considerable. However, only one out of the three migāts in the Northern Hijaz, al-Shajarah, on the outskirts of Medina, has always had a definite location, and has been in use since the time of the Prophet, though its name has undergone two changes, first from al-Shajarah to Dhul-Hulaifah, and later to Abyar 'Alī. As regards al-Ju'ufah, its location is of recent date, since the part of the route on which it is situated was, for safety reasons, replaced by a coastal route. Thus it ceased to be a migāt as early as the late 11th century. Most geographers describe it as the migāt of the Syrian pilgrims. In fact, it has been solely used by pilgrims arriving from Ailah by the coastal route, mostly Egyptians and Magribīs with a small admixture of Syrians.
The main Syrian caravans came via Medina and had therefore to use al-Shajarah. As for Dhāt 'Irq, it was assigned to Iraqi pilgrims as it proved more convenient for them than Qarn al-Manāzil, the mīqāt allotted by the Prophet to pilgrims coming from Najd and the rest of the east. Since the Prophet did not mention the Iraqis when assigning Qarn al-Manāzil for this purpose, 'Umar allotted Dhāt 'Irq to them. However, the original Dhāt 'Irq was forsaken in less than a century by most pilgrims who preferred to start their ritual in the modern section of the town, situated nearly a mile ahead of the ancient Dhāt 'Irq. Sa'īd b. Jubair, al-Shāfi‘ī and al-Asadī express their preference for the old site, but this advice seems to have been unheeded. Indeed, by the 10th century, pilgrims began to start their ritual not only a mile but, according to al-Ya'qūbī, a full journey ahead of the right place, at al-Ghamrah. Ibn Rosteh states that only camel-drivers waited until Dhāt 'Irq. Qudāmah's statement that all pilgrims waited until Dhāt 'Irq is unlikely to have been correct at that time. Ibn Khurرادadbeh assigns al-Mislaḥ, two days before Dhāt 'Irq, for this purpose, probably because the sources he utilized were out of date. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that the pilgrims used to start their rites at al-Ghamrah as early as the late 8th century, which is implied in a eulogy

on Zubaidah quoted by Waki'. Al-Muqaddasi remains silent on this point. The tendency of the pilgrims to neglect Dhāt'Iraq is motivated solely by their concern for their own comfort for, by beginning the pilgrimage rites so far ahead of the assigned place, they succeeded in shortening their journey by virtually a whole day.

A similar controversy exists on whether it is preferable to visit Mecca or Medina first. The majority are of the opinion that, as Mecca is the target, it should be visited first. This of course does not apply to the Syrian pilgrims who easily visit Medina before and after Mecca, as their route led through Medina already before the 8th century.

Camel-driving as a profession apparently goes back to the 8th century, i.e., the time of Abū Ḥanīfah. Before that time, pilgrims used to keep their own camels ready for the pilgrimage journey. By the time of al-Hamdānī, this profession had acquired a high prestige since not only al-Hamdānī himself, but even his father and some of his own teachers were all camel-drivers, and were familiar with the literary and administrative circles in Iraq, Syria and Egypt. Nevertheless, many camel-drivers were so notorious that, for some pilgrims, the journey was not regarded as perfect without beating the camel-driver.

1. Waki', Manāzil, fol. 34.
The pilgrim amirate was founded in the early days of Islam for the pilgrims to be led, on their pilgrimages rites, by a representative of the absent head of state. This prime religious function was soon to become a minor duty. By the early Abbasid period, the governor was entrusted with more administrative and political power. They used to be very important dignitaries, as only the ablest administrators or the relatives of the caliph were appointed to this post. This was done, apparently, to familiarise the Hijazis with the Abbasid dynasty. Later, the custom developed into a sort of appeasement of the tribes on the route. By the 10th century, the governor was more concerned with the actual journey to Mecca than with the rites of pilgrimage. Instead of one governor for all pilgrims, it became almost necessary to have a governor for every pilgrim party such as the Egyptian, the Syrian, the Maghribi, the Yemenite and of course the Iraqi caravans. Fighting broke out in 341 A.H. (952), between the Egyptians and the Iraqi governors, both acknowledging the sovereignty of the same Abbasid caliph.

The administration of the pilgrimage used to be a major topic of discussion not only among the officials but also among the religious authorities. They laid down some rules to be followed in appointing governors of the hajj, their main concern being the political aspect of this office.

such as protection from highway robbery and the appeasement of the tribes on these routes, by offering them money on behalf of the pilgrims. The governor should also be efficient in allotting camping spaces to different groups of pilgrims and providing facilities for caravans. Abū Ḥanīfah and his followers were rather meticulous with respect to the details of contracts between pilgrims and camel-drivers, especially with regard to provisions and camping apparatus, the welfare of the servants, presents taken from Mecca to Iraq, transport charges and times of departure. It can be deduced from their account that the first ten days of Dhul Qi'dah were considered the usual time to set out from Kufa, with the fifth as the ideal date. To leave earlier was regarded as harmful for the pilgrims, and to leave later as inconvenient for the camel drivers who had to feed their camels at Kufa. It was ruled that the distance from Kufa to Mecca amounted to a journey of twenty-seven days, except for the route via Medina which lasted thirty days. The ḥajj rites at Mecca added six days to the journey. If a pilgrim died at Mecca after the completion of the ḥajj rites, the camel driver was, according to the Hanafis, entitled to \( \frac{11}{20} \) of the cartage only on the direct route to Mecca: to \( \frac{12}{21} \), if the route led through Medina on the return journey: to \( \frac{11}{21} \), if the stay in Medina happened during the outward trip: to \( \frac{6}{11} \) if the circular route via Medina was planned.

1. Al-Farra', Ahkām, pp. 92-95.
There were several settlements on the pilgrim routes whose only purpose it was to trade with the pilgrims. With the passage of time some of these settlements, such as Faid and al-Juhfah, became permanent. The former, half-way between Kufa and Mecca, used to be the residence of the governor of the pilgrim route who was usually a member of one of the dominant local tribes such as B. Asad and B. Tamīm. The Basra - Mecca route led to Dhāt 'Irq, but some pilgrims used to follow a diversion to the north west in order to join the pilgrims arriving by the Kufa - Mecca route to visit Medina. In times of crisis, the Iraqi pilgrims followed the Syrian route to avoid the menacing tribes, but did so with little success, as disorder was by no means limited to one region of Arabia.

PART THREE

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS
I - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ARAB GEOGRAPHERS

The Arab geographers differ widely in their treatment of the Northern Hijaz. Some of them are inconsistent in their treatment of separate parts of this region, and various aspects of its geography. Moreover, cases are not rare where their own reports about this region are found to conflict not only in different works, but also within one and the same work.

In the majority of geographers, Arabia is by no means the most discussed part of the empire, Nor is the Northern Hijaz always the most discussed of the regions of Arabia. Besides, the attention accorded to different parts of the Northern Hijaz varies. The southern part of this region is understandably treated in most detail, since it is the stretch of territory between Mecca and Medina more frequented by the pilgrims than any other part of the Northern Hijaz. Hence the abundance of information which renders this region the least disputed among the authors. The localities are generally known, and mistaken locations, though by no means occasional, are often easy to detect and rectify.

The information on the Northern Hijaz can be divided into five categories:

1. pre-Islamic, mainly derived from Jāhili poetry and vague Arab conceptions of the pre-Islamic Northern Hijaz;
2. purely Islamic in nature, originating in the hadīth and tafsīr;

3. stemming from the first-hand knowledge of early Arab authors who frequented Arabia for literary reasons, and of well-informed natives who resided outside Arabia;

4. archives of administrative departments; and

5. the personal experience of the geographers themselves.

Jāhili poetry represents the main source of information for the early works on Arabia. This is true of al-ʿAsmaʿī and Abū ʿUbaidah whose influence on literary circles was prominent, and whose data are often very detailed. As to Arabia's pre-Islamic past, the Northern Hijaz is fortunate in that the ancient caravan routes from Mecca and Medina to Syria used to be of great importance to the people of the Northern Hijaz, so that many towns on these routes were both flourishing and famous. It is mainly data derived from the pre-Islamic legacy that have now made possible the location of the southern frontier of "Provincia Arabia" or "Qurāʾ ʿArabiyyah" and, indeed, illuminated the origin of the words ʿArab and ʿArāb. That this concept of Qurāʾ ʿArabiyyah was so soon disregarded is ascribable to numerous alterations which rendered it so unacceptable that many geographers do not seem to be conversant with the meaning of Qurāʾ ʿArabiyyah or even the accurate form of its name.  

the Hijaz by Ibn 'Abbās is no doubt inherited from pre-Islamic times. This demarcation has been accepted by most geographers, though the transmitters have obscured its meaning by one or two uncalled-for additions. There are also the translations of the works of Dioscorides, Ptolemy and Hermes which have been utilized by both al-Bakrī and al-Hamdānī insofar as the Northern Hijaz is concerned. Ibn al-Kalbī is the most quoted source on pre-Islamic information about this region. Ibn al-Muqaffa' of the 8th century refers to the very ancient past when he states that the Arab steppe used to be covered with water. The great al-Bīrūnī adds colour to the story by referring to actual finds of marine life among the excavated remains of that region which led him to the same conclusion. There are also the references to archeological discoveries and ancient monuments in this region which were known to the Arabs and are mentioned by al-Zurqī, al-Mas'ūdī, al-Hamdānī, al-Muqaddasī, Ibn Hauqal and al-Iṣṭakhrī. Both al-Bakrī and al-İdrīsī seem to draw on this information.

As to purely Islamic sources, the commentators on the Qur'ān as well as the Muhaddithūn and the early historians

1. Hermes, the herald of the Greek gods, trismegistos = the thrice greatest, the Egyptian Thoth, is, to some Arabs, Hermes the philosopher and a reliable source on science. Hermetica, or part of it, seems to have been translated into Arabic.


derive their information from a number of geographical references with a bearing on many localities in the Northern Hijaz, their proximity to Medina, their population and the revenue they yield. Among the Arab geographers, al-Mas'ūdī is alone in exploiting this aspect of information in both his available works. Whenever possible, he ekes it out with contemporary data on the inhabitants of these localities.

It is, however, the works of the early Arab authors who resided in Arabia as well as the native Arabian scholars, e.g. 'Arrām of the Northern Hijaz, who emigrated from Arabia, which represent the real progress in the development of Arab geography. These authors, mainly men of letters, catered for the demands of their disciples by giving accurate descriptions of the localities mentioned in Arabic poetry up to the early 8th century. This school has produced many important works on the geography of Arabia. The work of 'Arrām, in particular, is the most advanced among them in that it pioneers regional geography proper. He is naturally interested in his native land which forms part of the Northern Hijaz. The influence of 'Arrām's work has been so great that no author has pointed out the many erroneous locations, ingrained in this work as early as the 10th century. The only exception is al-Bakrī's above-mentioned groundless criticism of al-Sakūnī. 'Arrām's work has been borrowed almost in its entirety by al-Bakrī; some of

1. Supra, p. 368.
is also to be found in Nasr's Jībāl. The description of Yanbu' and Raḍwā is quoted by Wākī'.

The administrative archives were utilized with respect to the Hijaz by the official geographers of Baghdad as well as by al-Muhallabī. They form, indeed, an important source of information about the mileages on the pilgrim routes measured up to their respective times. Many data proffered by the official geographers of Baghdad on the dependencies of Medina and Mecca are clearly taken from lists and records of the administration. It is only in the lists of the Medina dependencies as compiled by the official geographers that Qurā 'Arabiyyah is mentioned. Similar is the case with al-Wahīdah which does not figure in any other geographical work except theirs. Admittedly, al-Idrīsī mentions both, but there is no doubt that, in doing so, he draws on the official geographers. It is noteworthy that al-Wahīdah has the distinction of being the subject of a very detailed and meticulous document, allegedly going back to a pre-Islamic date.

The most interesting kind of geographical information is, of course, that supplied by geographers who are personally acquainted with the area. The dominant figure among them after 'Arrām is the late 9th century author Wākī' whose mapping of the Iraqi pilgrim routes in the Northern Hijaz surpasses the description of this region by any other author except perhaps al-Sakūnī of the early 10th century. Though

1. Supra, pp. 364-5.
he has first-hand knowledge of the routes frequented by
the Iraqi pilgrims, Waki' also relies on the data proffered
by native scholars, such as Ibn al-Sabbāh, Ibn Jumai', Abū
Ishāq al-Bakrī and a certain Nādir to whom Ibn Jumai' refers
as the most reliable authority on the route between Medina
and Mecca. Waki' describes these mosques with meticulous
care and equal accuracy in the assessment of the distances.
Halts, springs, wells and cisterns are also most carefully
listed. Poems in metre are recorded to serve partly mer-
techanical purposes for the better retention of the names of
the halts on the Iraqi pilgrim routes. With respect to the
distances, Waki' is the most consistent of Arab geographers.
There is absolutely no danger of confusion, since he states
the distance between two major halts before he starts giving
the distances of the intervening places, always in the direc-
tion of Mecca. Analogously to the official geographers, the
information proffered by Waki' on the Iraqi pilgrim routes is
superior to that he provides on the Syrian and Egyptian
routes. Data on the Yemenite routes are even more exiguous
than those proffered by Ibn Khurramadbeh or Qudāmah. This
is of course due to Waki'ís inability to utilize the official
archives on the routes of which he has no personal experience.
The few cases of inconsistency found in Waki'ís work are
mainly due to scribal omissions. The MS. teems with mis-
readings; some of its folios are misplaced and others

1. Waki', Manāzil, fol. 46.
missing. Wakī’, followed by al-Asadī and al-Sakūnī, combines successfully the method of the literary circles with the approach of the official geographers. Wakī’ seems to be a very important source to al-Asadī whose additions are often brief but always valuable. Al-Sakūnī also appears to have relied heavily on this work, though his description of the whole region is comparatively more detailed, since he describes even those parts of the Northern Hijaz which are not situated on the pilgrim routes. Al-Sakūnī is unique in that he combines his own experience with that of ’Arrām, al-Asma’ī, Wakī’, Ibn Shabbah and Abū Ziyād al-Kilābī as well as that of his own masters.

Al-Hamdānī’s early profession as a camel-driver is likely to have taken him to at least some parts of the Northern Hijaz. He gives data on the genealogy of the local inhabitants and their way of life which are of the highest value, though inferior to his information on other parts of Arabia. Here, he differs from al-Muqaddasī whose work is richer in detail on the Northern Hijaz than on other parts of Arabia. Al-Muqaddasī is alone among the Arab traveller-geographers in paying more attention to the parts north of Medina than to the stretch between Medina and Mecca on which his information is unreliable. Ibn Hauql and al-Isṭakhrī resided there, so that their information is generally trustworthy. Al-‘Udhrī lived in Mecca for several years, and the quotations

1. Yāqūt, Mu’jam, vol. 2, p. 582; and see al-Bakrī, Masalik, fol. 74.
attributed to him by al-Bakrī are informative. He seems to be al-Bakrī's source for the coastal route from ḫilah to ḫubā. Al-Zamakhšarī also lived in Mecca, and his enumeration of the localities between Yanbu' and Mecca is orderly and accurate.

Those are the main geographers to discuss the Northern Hijaz. No doubt there are other authors whose information on that region is valuable, but they do not treat it as a geographical entity, and merely refer to particular localities in connection with some event or statement. Nevertheless, they have exerted some influence on succeeding geographers. The influence of Wahb, Ibn al-Musayyib, Mālik, al-Shāfi'ī, al-Wāqīdī, Shabīb, and even Ibn Ishāq is observable in the works of most Arab geographers. Authors of literary works have influenced both al-Bakrī (in the Mu'jam) and Nasr. Prominent among these authors are Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Ḥarbī, al-Sukkārī, Ibn al-Sikkīt, Ibn al-ʿAnbārī, and Ibn Jinnī. There are also other authors such as al-Muhallabī — not to be confused with the geographer —, Ibn Wāllād, al-Suhailī, 'Iyād and al-Samʿānī, whose works contain many valuable references to the Northern Hijaz. However, these works are not devoted to geography.

Apart from al-Bakrī — on many occasions — and Nasr — on very few — none of the Arab geographers of the period under consideration seem to doubt the trustworthiness of their sources. True some of them, like Ibn Ḥauqāl and al-Muqaddasī, voice some criticism, but it is symptomatic of a
tendency to condemn a work as a whole which suggests other motives than a desire to rectify a particular mistake. Thus it is not surprising if al-Muqaddasī condemns the very work of al-Jāhiz which Ibn Ḥauqal praises. The faith of the majority of these geographers in their sources is so profound that they have even attempted to reconcile diametrically opposed statements found in different sources. This is true of al-Bakrī and al-Idrīsī with respect to some localities in the Northern Hijaz. Al-Muqaddasī's respect for his sources is even deeper since, though possessed of personal experience, he not only follows them in including descriptions of what he has already declared to be derelict routes, but also adopts Ibn Khurradadbeh's erroneous order of the halts of the Naqirah-Mecca route. Al-Hamdānī does not question the erroneous definition of Najd, Tiḥāmah and the Hijaz by three allegedly native poets of these regions. The most influential, and the least correct, source on the Northern Hijaz is 'Arrām's Jībāl which not a single author has dared to put right. The book itself contains conflicting statements on Mts. Thāfīl, Radwān and 'Azwar, and on Qu'aʾiqiʿān, Turabah and the Bustān of Ibn 'Āmir as well as Kūlāyyah and al-Juḥfah.

Understandably, the traveller geographers are not so deeply influenced by their sources as the compilers of geography or geographical references. The information of

'Arrām, al-Asadī, al-Sakūnī, and, to a lesser extent, of al-Asna'ī, Abū 'Ubaydah, Ibn al-Kalbī, al-Zubair and al-Hamdānī, dominates the part of al-Bakrī's Mu'jam devoted to the Northern Hijaz. This Mu'jam is the most important work to discuss the whole region in detail. Because of its numerous entries and manifold sources, its statements on localities in the Northern Hijaz are not always correct or even consistent. The influence of Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh, al-'Udhri and al-Masūdī dominates the other geographical work of al-Bakrī, al-Masālik, which cannot compete with al-Mu'jam except in inaccuracy and the number of misreadings. As regards al-Idrīsī's Nuzhah, the influence of Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh, Ibn Hauqal and al-Bakrī is coupled with that of private informants, and to a lesser extent, that of al-Muhallabī. Nasr's sources are also numerous, but he finds it easier to avoid inconsistency, as the statements in his book are relatively concise.

No geographer, except al-Idrīsī, is equally exhaustive in his treatment of all parts of the Northern Hijaz. Being officials about to map the pilgrim routes, Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah exhibit a natural tendency to discuss the southern parts of this region on which their departmental archives supply more information than on the northern parts which are not frequented by Iraqi pilgrims. Though Wakī' is not an official geographer, his original information is limited to the Iraqi pilgrim routes. On the northern parts, al-Ya'qūbī, al-Muhallabī and al-Bakrī, in al-Masālik, seem
to have had access to new sources. Al-Hamānī is unable to provide on the northern parts of this region the same degree of information as on its southern parts, namely the stretch between Medina and Mecca. Dr. Husain Nassar rightly observes that 'Arrām is more informative on Tihamah than on the Hijaz. This is difficult to explain, since the Hijaz is his native land. Nor can it be accounted for by the scarcity of sources, as he is a pioneer in this respect. Al-Muqaddasī does pay attention to the northern parts of this region, and not only to the pilgrim routes there. Though one has the impression that Ibn Hauqal and al-Istakhri accord equal treatment to all parts of the Northern Hijaz, their information on the south is, on the whole, superior to that provided on the north where they resort to traditions. Al-Zamakhsharī is most informative on the region between Yanbu' and Mecca of which his location is more accurate than the available MS. of 'Arrām. Al-Idrīsī is intent on describing the localities in a way which would permit him to accord to many of them the same amount of attention and consults, so it appears, many sources to achieve this objective at the expense of accuracy. Nasr's treatment of this region is also even, but he often neglects to describe its localities. Al-Bakrī's sources for his Mu'jam are richer in information on the south of this region than on its north.

Not all the Arab geographers deal with the Northern Hijaz, or even the Hijaz as such. The official geographers mention it mainly for the purpose of pilgrimage. They pay more attention to the pilgrim routes and the localities situated on them than to localities not frequented by pilgrims. Al-Sakūnī and al-Handānī, on the other hand, also seem aware of the need to describe localities and routes which are not connected with the pilgrims. Ibn Ḥauqal and al-İṣṭakhrī dismiss the pilgrim routes in the Northern Hijaz with a few lines, and recoil from recording the tribal routes on the ground that their use was limited to the natives. Al-Muqaddasī’s original information is mainly on the localities on the pilgrim routes, but has little bearing on the routes themselves. He allot[s] to the Hijaz a fairly sizeable section of his book. Al-Handānī also treats the Hijaz as a region of Arabia. Al-Sakūnī seems to be very meticulous in delineating the frontiers of every region, if not every individual locality. This is also the pattern observable in the works of 'Arrām, Waki', Lughdah and al-Asadī and, to a lesser extent, al-İṣṭakhrī and Ibn Ḥauqal. On the works of the authors who follow the climate system, the treatment of the Northern Hijaz is spread over two climates which, owing to the lack of first-hand knowledge of the region, gives rise to the erroneous location of parallel towns in two different climates. This occurs in the Zīj of al-Battānī, the Qānūn


Finally, it can be said that almost every Arab geographer of the period under consideration has his own special contribution to make to the geography of the Northern Hijaz. 'Arrām pioneers the regional geography proper. He is also informative on the fauna and flora of this region, its trade, agriculture and the ownership of its grazing lands. Wakī' excels in measuring the distances even between almost contiguous localities, and in indicating the milestones and postal stages on the Iraqi pilgrim routes, and in mentioning the wells and springs in the Northern Hijaz. He is alone in locating all the mosques of the Prophet between Medina and Mecca including their respective distances. He is the first Arab geographer to record poems in the metre for the purpose of enumerating, in successive order, the halts on the pilgrim routes, in the form of 'مــ ـ hudā', to entertain pilgrims by praising the caravan leader. Al-Asadī makes few, but important additions to Wakī' s work. Al-Asadī's information has provided al-Bakrī with most of his successful passages on this region. Al-Asma'ī, followed by Lughdah, delineates the tribal boundaries, and Abū 'Ubaidah enumerates, and

1. Al-Bīrūnī, Qānūn, pp. 551, 557.
comments on, the ancient battlefields of Arabic. By relying on many natives and tribesmen, al-Hajari revives, at Medina, the old system of the Iraqi scholars. Ibn al-Kalbi records the early Arab conceptions of their peninsula. Ibn Khurradadhbeh is the pioneer of official geography whose main concern was the global aspect. He mentions the distances and quality of water on the pilgrim routes and refers to the local revenue as well as the dependencies of Medina and Mecca. Ibn Rosteh proffers more historical information than Ibn Khurradadhbeh, whereas Qudamah surpasses the latter in matters relating to revenue and the residences of local postmasters. Al-Yaqubil is the first to record the coastal halts between Ailah and al-Jar as well as their original descriptions, agriculture, mines, trade and inhabitants. Al-Jahiz is the first to allot to Arabia geographical precedence over the rest of the world because of the religious prominence of Mecca and Medina. Ibn al-Faqih records additional eastern dependencies of Medina. Al-Hamdani is the most reliable source on the demarcation of the Hijaz, and the inhabitants of its northern region. He records the latitude of all halts on the Iraqi pilgrim route from Kufa. He is also the first to record exclusively geographical poems. Ibn Hauqal and al-Istakhri resided in the Hijaz and recorded the ways of tribal life there. Al-Masudi regards Medina as the centre of the region, and gives distances from it. He

mentions the tribal descendants of the caliph Abū Bakr and of Talhah. Unlike al-Muqaddasī and al-Bakrī, al-Masʿūdī is generally consistent in both his works. Al-Muqaddasī is the most disciplined among the Arab general geographers, as he consistently follows the system and phraseology he promises to adopt. He integrates the Hijaz into the general classification of all regions of the empire. Indeed the information he proffers on social life there is unparalleled. As regards the sectarian aspect of his work, it suffices to record that he was regarded as a source on theology. No other geographer has mentioned more routes in the northern parts of the region than al-Muqaddasī. His careful consideration of its citadels, its main mosques, its guest-houses and the public baths is original. Al-Muhallabī proffers valuable and original information based on new surveys of the distances, inhabitants and sources of revenue as well as the climates in which its localities are situated. Al-Bakrī's Masālik is valuable in that he gives a new description of the Egyptian pilgrim routes from Lilah to Dubā, and mentions the ancient monuments of the Northern Hijaz. In the Muʿjam, al-Bakrī is the first Arab geographer to arrange entries in alphabetical order. Contrary to some opinions, it is to the advantage of Arab geography that al-Bakrī tends to record long geographical statements on many localities under the

1. See al-Asfarayīnī, al-Tabsīr, p. 4.
entry for one locality and then refers to them wherever the need arises. This is very valuable if one considers the possibilities of omission, misreading, misquotation and erroneous location which result from dividing such statements. Al-Zamakhsharī accurately enumerates the valleys, wells, mountains and hills between Yanbu' and Medina. Naṣr's Jibāl is a most reliable guide in defining the forms of the place-names. Al-Idrīsī's information on the contemporary standard of life of the natives, and on the treatment of the pilgrims at the hands of the ruler of Mecca, is both detailed and original.
II - DESCRIPTION OF LOCALITIES

The Arab geographers vary in their approach to the description of localities. The early authors are mainly concerned with locating the places covered by their literary works. Chief among them is al-Âsma'î whose detailed description of Arabia represented the main source of information for literary circles for a good many centuries. He defines the locality, its watering places, mountains and inhabitants. Abu 'Ubaidah seems to have followed the same pattern. 'Arram is more interesting in this context since his work deals solely with parts of the Northern Hijaz. He follows al-Âsma'î in beginning with the definition of the locality with its watering and grazing places and the genealogy of its inhabitants, but goes further and discusses trade, agriculture, drinking water, administration and the actual size of the towns and villages he deals with. He even seems surprised, on one occasion, that a certain village has not been accorded the status of a town in spite of its size. His reference to the flora and fauna of this region is also of interest, since no other Arab geographer has tried to record information of this kind about the Northern Hijaz.

Wakî', followed by al-Âsadi, shares the concern for the description of many localities in the Hijaz, large and small, with his predecessors, but is unique in paying great

1. 'Arram, Jibal, p. 414.
attention to the mosques of the Prophet. No other geographer can claim equality with him in recording the actual location of the mile-stones and postal-stage-points and in enumerating the wells on the pilgrim routes. His local character is more pronounced than that of any other geographer concerned with mapping these routes. His description of localities is more meticulous than that of any other except al-Sakūnī whose range is wider than that of Waki', since he seems to have covered, among other things, virtually the whole of the Northern Hijaz. Unlike his contemporaries or even immediate predecessors, al-Sakūnī's concern is not limited to the pilgrim routes. Indeed the delineation of the zakāh collectors' routes is, for the most part, traceable to him. His detailed description of the Himās (reserves or state-owned grazing lands) is far more efficient than that of al-Asma'ī who describes it. Al-Hajari's description of localities in his Nawādir is of considerable value, though by no means equal to that of al-Sakūnī. What remains of al-Zubair's geographical work on al-'Āqīq is similar in approach to that of al-Asma'ī. Lughdah follows al-Asma'ī with respect to the description of locality according to the territories and watering places of particular tribes. Besides, he mentions the mines of Arabia and their products. He even refers to the methods used in exploiting these mines, and to their ownership.

Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh, al-Ya'qūbī, Ibn Rosteh and Qudāmah supply very little information about localities which are not situated on the pilgrim routes of the Northern Hijaz, except for the enumeration of the dependencies of Mecca and Medina. Even as regards localities situated on the routes, al-Ya'qūbī is alone in describing the towns and villages on the coastal route from Ḥilah to Mecca which are only listed by Qudāmah, and ignored altogether by the other two. Al-Ya'qūbī does not attempt to provide original information about the Iraqi pilgrim routes, apparently because he feels satisfied with that proffered by Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh. Al-Ya'qūbī's description covers the watering places, agriculture and mining. On the region between Mecca and Medina, his sole concern is the genealogy of the inhabitants. Ibn Rosteh adds some historical information on the halts listed by Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh. Qudāmah ekes this out by some administrative details such as the places of residence of the local postmasters and the size of towns and villages. By the time of Ibn Rosteh, one of the villages listed by Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh had acquired the status of a town, and by Qudānah's time a second. None of these "official" geographers can compete with 'Arrām, Wakī', al-Asadī, al-Sakūnī or al-Muqaddasī as regards the excellence of the geographical description of towns and villages in the Northern Hijaz. Ibn al-Faṣīḥ's information on the localities in Northern Hijaz apart from Mecca and Medina is limited ... and is similar to the available abridgement of al-Jāḥiz'
'Ajīb al-Amsār. The former attempts to list the dependencies of Medina. It is in his work that some dependencies added to Medina such as al-Dathīnah, Faljah and Ma'dan al-Hasan in the distant south west appear for the first time.

Al-Hamdānī is alone in recording the latitude of virtually every halt on the Iraqi pilgrim route in the Northern Hijaz. Another, no less unique, aspect of his work is the revival of the ancient Arab approach of using poetry in defining the localities in their actual geographical order. The Hijaz gets a lion's share of attention in a whole poem which enumerates almost all the major Hijazi localities as known to the poet. Al-Hamdānī tries to distinguish between different homonymous places, an attempt further pursued by al-Bakrī and perfected by Nasr. On the whole, Al-Hamdānī's description of localities in the Northern Hijaz is less informative than that of 'Arrām, Wakī', al-Asadī or al-Sakūnī. It is also inferior to his own description of the Yemen, Tihāmah and Najd. That of al-Masūdī is limited to the distances between one locality and another, for which he apparently relies on al-Wāqidi and Ibn Sa'd. He occasionally refers to the genealogy of the inhabitants.

With the advent of the Fatimid geographers, the description of locality takes a new turn. The old method of describing the towns and villages individually within the

framework of the provinces with more or less detail, is replaced by a commentary on maps provided for every region. Ibn Hauql (and al-Istakhri) give original information about localities in the Northern Hijaz. Indeed, they seem to be the first general geographers to have travelled widely throughout the area. Thus the description of the towns and villages in the Northern Hijaz gradually assumes equal importance with the actual location which has been left to the maps - which are subject to alteration from one scribe to another. There is the mention of the size of every locality, its inhabitants, trade, agriculture, history and even antiquities. There is also the recurrent remark that certain places are only occasionally inhabited. Equally important is the reference to some "Beduin" tribes descending from eminent early settlers, and to the tribes which inhabit different parts of the area. In the last mentioned respect, al-Hamdani is superior to Ibn Hauql.

Al-Muqaddasi's description of localities is by far the most exhaustive not only among the Fatimid geographers, but also among the general as well. It is also more varied than any other description. He seems to have a unique flair for the definition of towns and villages in the Hijaz, since he divides the region according to its provincial capitals to which he subordinates many towns, large and small. He speaks of the locality, its citadel, mosque, agriculture and

trade. He is also interested in the drinking water, the guest-houses and the public baths. Al-Muqaddasi allots the ports in the Northern Hijaz to corresponding inland capitals. His description is also unique in its inclusion of customs, costume and weights and measures. Indeed, the information he provides gives more space to social than to geographical details at the expense of the actual location which is not always accurate. Al-Muhallabî seems to draw on information found in al-Ya'qûbî's Buldân. Nevertheless he has also something new and valuable to offer such as the degrees of latitude and the climates, the inhabitants and the revenue. He also gives the distances on the Egyptian route to Mecca which is new, and the revised distances on the Iraqi routes.

Al-Bakrî has no first-hand knowledge of the region and the subject matter of his Masālik is almost alien to the description of localities with respect to the Northern Hijaz except that he mentions some specialities and antiquities, and describes two or three towns in the extreme Northern Hijaz, a description which is partly borrowed by the author of Ākān al-Murjān. In his Mu'jam, al-Bakrî is more concerned with the literary heritage of the region. Nevertheless, the geographical value of al-Mu'jam is very considerable indeed because he quotes many sources which are not available elsewhere. Al-Idrīsī's description of locality is often
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derived from early geographers whom he sometimes misquotes. It is his merit that he proffers new information about many towns and halts in the Northern Hijaz, especially as regards the conditions of life of the natives and the treatment to which pilgrims were subjected. Al-Zamakhshari's main concern is to list the place-names, often without even locating them. He, however, adds a very valuable section in which he describes the mountains, valleys and watering places on the route between Yanbu' and Mecca. Nasr's approach is mostly limited to clearing up the confusion surrounding the forms of place-names which he locates in their respective regions. His locations are often correct, and his delimitation of the place-names is almost always accurate.

III - POETRY AS A MEANS OF LOCALITY DEFINITION

Ulrich Thilo believes that ancient Arabic poetry is richer than any other poetry in place-names because of the conditions of life which compelled the Arabs of the desert to move from one place to another and required that poets should record their previous dwellings in their poetry. Their longing to revisit these places, together with their desire to preserve for posterity the "tribal register" led them to produce elementary "maps" of numerous parts of Arabia which helped to entertain their audience who were well acquainted with these parts. This was the early stage of Arab geography in which poets of the Jāhiliyyah and early Islam realized the importance of accuracy in recording the places in their geographical order, though they felt entitled to distort the names occasionally to meet metrical requirements. This often led to different versions of one and the same name which is a trivial loss compared with the valuable basis provided by the rhyme and metre of poetry when it is a question of the right pronunciation of place-names. In research on the topography of this period one is, however, threatened by the ever-present danger of not only misreading a name, but of making unjustified assumptions about the vicinity of two places whose names occur in juxtaposition.

This should be carefully examined, because it often happened that a tribe, driven or migrating from its habitat, longed for the localities it had left and gave their names to some of the localities where they had just settled. Similarly, there are always places named after plants, colours, after their size, the direction in which they lie or even after historical events, and this is not confined to a particular region. In the Northern Hijaz alone there is more than one place called 'Is, Suqyā, Ruhbah, Marwah, 'Uwainid, Suwaiqah, Bustān, Ḥunain, Ḥaql, Jār, Ma'dan, Marr, Rābigh, Ailah, Shajarah and Nakhlah, to name but a few. When al-Surair was mentioned beside al-Jār, for example, al-Bakrī located al-
Surair near the sea which is wrong, as al-Jār in question is the inland place near Khaibar and not the port of Medina.

It is obvious that the "literary" geographers were those most interested in this aspect of location, as it was conducive to a full understanding of the text. It was this motive that drove them to visit Arabia and linger there to collect more convincing data which would enable them to compete with their rivals in Basra, Kufa and even Baghdad. Thus Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' was rightly regarded as a great authority in expounding poetry up to his own time, because he had travelled widely throughout Arabia, and was able to locate most places mentioned by the poets. After Abū 'Amr, it became almost
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obligatory on those of his contemporaries and disciples who aspired to fame to follow his example. It was this movement that produced the earliest and most influential literary work on the geography of Arabia, Jazīrat al-'Arab of al-Asma'ī, parts of which are reserved in Lughdah's Bilād al-'Arab. Soon many prominent men of literature in Arabia itself realized that they would find it more profitable to take their knowledge to Iraq instead of waiting for potential disciples to come to them in search of it. Thus many well-informed Arabian men and women moved to Iraq where their residences were frequented by numerous scholars in pursuit of knowledge. Those men, termed "A'rāb", were a great source of geographical information for literary circles. They penetrated as far to the east as Naisābūr, and many a prominent author studied under them. One of those "A'rāb", 'Arrām, was so filled with local patriotism that he dictated a book on Tihāmah and the Hijaz, which marked a further stage in the development of regional geography. In this work 'Arrān quotes only a few verses with a bearing on the definition of localities. Nevertheless, he was an important source for commentators on early Arab poetry, especially that of al-Khansa’ whose poems he expounds, describing the localities whose names occur in them.

The early Arab poets were very conscientious in their mention and definition of localities. They rarely mentioned one beside another unless there was actual proximity to warrant it, except when they explicitly voiced their despair at the long distance separating them. Even the town-settlers of Iraq of the early 9th century were not happy listening to a poet who listed localities between which there was no obvious connection. Thus Ibn Munādhīr was obliged to change Ḥabbūd, a spring in al-Yamāmah, into 'Abbūd, a mountain to correspond with Radawā, which is not, even with this alteration, typical of the early Arab poets whose sense of locality was precise.

Arab general geographers did not study poetry in order to define names of places in Arabia or to locate them. Ibn Khurraḍadhbeh quoted some verses containing place-names, and Ibn Rostēh, Ibn al-Faqīh and al-Muqaddasī recorded some verses of poetry, but in so doing, their aim was solely to clarify a story. It was the regional geographers who partly relied on poetry as a basis for mapping the localities. Chief among them was al-Hamdānī who recorded many poems relevant to this. Indeed, he quoted three Arab poets from Najd, Tihāmah and the Hijaz, enumerating their respective regions in strictly geographical order. It is almost certain that these poems were composed by one poet. Wakī' records

1. Yāqūt, Mu'jam, vol. 4, p. 951.
many poems in metre for the purpose of mapping the Iraqi pilgrim routes. Some of these poems go as far back as the 7th century. Al-Hamdānī also records a long poem by al-Radāʾī, where the Yemenite pilgrim route was mapped. As to the other pilgrim routes through the Northern Hijaz, they had to wait for many centuries before being mapped in poetry. Al-Hamdānī rejected two poems mapping some of these routes, because he considered that they fell below the required standard. Indeed, al-Hamdānī was very careful in choosing the "geographical" poetry to utilize in his book. This caution ensures that one can trust him as to the correct geographical order of the localities in the Northern Hijaz in the poems he quotes.

Al-Hajari's locations of place-names mentioned in poetry are numerous and correct. Though his poets are generally more or less his contemporaries, their sense of location is perfect. Al-Sakūnī also relies on poetry, and, indeed, records a story in which poetry has been used as a guide for discovering many localities. Among the Arab geographers, al-Bakri makes by far the most use of poetry in connection with defining localities in the Northern Hijaz.

1. Waki', Manāzil, fols. 75-90, 103-112.
Owing to this fact, al-Bakrī's success in his Muʾjam is marred by many mistakes as regards the location of places. There is a particular poem about localities in the Northern Hijaz, which is unlikely to have been composed by an early Arab poet, since no such poet could have committed the mistake of listing a medley of place-names from different regions in an arbitrary succession. In this poem, the following localities are listed apparently on the Mecca-Medina route—from south to north—: al-Safh, al-Naʿf, Ghaul, Yalyal (near Yanbu'), Birām (south of Taif), Kudayy, Batn Marr, Masdūs, Khulais, Wajj (near Taif), Qudaid, Usfān (south of Qudaid), al-Juhfah, Kudaid (south of al-Juhfah), al-Rauhāʾ, al-Ruwaithah, al-ʿArj, al-ʿAbwāʾ (the order of the last four localities is reversed), al-Sayālah and al-Suqyā (north of al-ʿAbwāʾ alone among the last five halts). This poem is absolutely devoid of any sense of location, and seems to have been an attempt to discredit Ibn al-Ruqayyāt's eulogy of the Zubairīs. In the prelude, Ibn al-Ruqayyāt lists the localities between Mecca and Medina—south to north—as follows: Usfān, al-Juhfah, al-Qāʾ, al-ʿAbwāʾ, Tiʾhan and al-Suqyā. A list of this kind, perfect in respect of the geographical order, is representative of that type of poetry which is so helpful in locating ancient places, and
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which modern scholars have come to appreciate for its topographical value. Al-Bakrī often quotes a verse connected with another homonymous place. He also tends to locate a place in the homeland of the poet in whose verse it occurs, which is not always safe. Thus he places wādī al-Daum, mentioned by Kuthayyir, at the land of B. Damrah. Kuthayyir was not talking to 'Azzah, his Đamrī love, but to Buthainah, an 'Udhrī beauty, on behalf of Janīl, an 'Udhrī poet. Wādī al-Daum is situated in the 'Udhrīrah land. In his Masālik, al-Bakrī refrains altogether from reciting poetry for the purpose of defining localities in the Northern Hijaz. Both al-Zamakhsarī and Nasr quote "geographical" poetry to locate a place or to vocalize the form of its name.

In brief, it can be said that poetry was the most reliable source of locality definition in the early stages of the period under consideration. The existence of homonymous places in poetry induced authors to engage on al-Mu'talīf and al-Muṣhtarīk, which deal with the enumeration of homonymous places. The Northern Hijaz abounds with localities mentioned by poets, such as Kuthayyir and the Hudhailīs, which became a subject of lengthy studies by prominent authors, such as al-Sukkārī, Ibn al-Anbārī, Ibn al-Sikkīt and al-Bakrī. It was natural that the need to locate place-
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names occurring in poetry, for the purpose of which many scholars visited Arabia, should give rise to regional geography among the Arabs even before general geography. The Northern Hijaz, in particular, gained immensely from this development.
During the period under consideration, a number of towns and villages appeared, while some others disappeared. In both cases the primal cause was often the position of the place on one of the routes. The movements of the tribes to and from the Northern Hijaz was another determining factor. A third cause was the political and economic situation in the area in question.

The convenience of the increasingly large pilgrim caravans required that a number of towns and villages corresponding, if possible, to the stages of the journey, should be found along their routes. The decisive factor was, naturally, water; if water was within easy reach, the halt would develop into a small village and, later, into a town provided that the prospects for agriculture and trade were promising there, as happened at Suqyā b. Ghifār, al-Sayālah, al-Rauhā' and Nakhlah. In some cases, halts on the ancient trade routes in the Northern Hijaz which were followed by pilgrim caravans grew into flourishing towns and villages such as Dhul-Marwah, al-Ruhbah and Suqyā al-Jazl. The religious requirements of al-Hajj necessitated the establishment of villages at the mawāqīt (the starting points of pilgrim rites), since pilgrims had to bathe and change their garments there. Thus al-Juhfah and Dhāt 'Irq changed into permanent settlements able to cope with the needs of
the pilgrims, some of whom indulged in trade.

Nevertheless, the pilgrim routes also exacted their toll. The number of villages on the ancient routes dwindled as they were abandoned in favour of newer, more convenient sites. In order to pass through Medina, the ancient caravans from Syria to Mecca were diverted at Dhul-Marwah from the ancient trade route to Mecca. Consequently, some thriving towns on the deserted part of this route, such as Ras al-'Ain, al-'Iṣ, Badr and Waddān were reduced to minimum proportions. Badr and Waddān were to thrive in later years in consequence of the re-routing of the pilgrim caravans which by-passed all towns and villages between al-Rauhā' and Qudaid in favour of the coastal route. These localities even lost their agricultural importance, so that most of their inhabitants moved to halts on the new diversion or migrated to other regions. It is noteworthy that two large towns of considerable religious importance on that conventional route fell into oblivion as a result of the abandonment of the part on which they are situated. Those two towns, al-Abwā', where the Prophet's mother was laid to rest, and al-Juhfah, a prominent miqāt, were so thoroughly forgotten that it was not until very recently that they were correctly located. Such fluctuation in the course of the routes often caused a change of place-names. Thus al-Abwā', Waddān and al-Jār became al-Khuraibah, Mastūrah and al-Rā'īs respectively. The diversion of the inland route
from Ailah to Medina caused the dereliction of many towns and villages between Madyan and Medina such as Shaghaib, Badā, al-Baidā', Suqyā al-Jazl, al-Ruhbah, Dhul-Marwah and al-Marr, all of which still flourished as late as the early 10th century. After the establishment of the coastal route at approximately that time, these ancient trading centres began to lose their importance. Most of them have not yet been definitely located.

The movement of the Arab tribes to the new Islamic region caused the decline of some ancient settlements, chief among which had been the mining centres in the Northern Hijaz. The newly emerging centres were rich in mineral resources and therefore attractive to expert miners of the Northern Hijaz who were fascinated by the wealth of the new mines. Besides, famines, by no means infrequent in the Northern Hijaz, drove many inhabitants out of this region. Emigration was easy after Islam and the Arab tribes became free, and sometimes were paid, to emigrate to other parts of the empire, especially to Egypt and North Africa where they were sometimes politically useful. This occurred as late as the 11th century. There had been numerous local mines in the Northern Hijaz, but they appear to have been deserted by the 9th century as they were neglected by their ancient owners, and disregarded by the nomadic newcomers, mainly B. Harb and

the Beduin descendants of the Companions. Thus while the Arab miners were busy exploiting the mines of North Africa, the mines of the Northern Hijaz fell into the hands of inexperienced immigrants. The rich mines of the Northern Hijaz and the surrounding settlements were so far forgotten that succeeding generations believed them to be derelict from times immemorial.

Among the political and economic causes of these vicissitudes in the life of towns and villages in the Northern Hijaz was the rise of the new wealthy class in Medina in the 7th and 8th centuries, which consisted of descendants of the Prophet's prominent Companions. Their wealth was so enormous that many a valley was irrigated and settled by them and their families. The valley of Yanbu' was developed by 'Alī and his descendants; al-Ṭīs by the descendants of Ibn 'Auf; al-Fur' by the descendants of al-Zubair; al-Juhfah by those of Ja'far; al-Suwārīqiyyah by those of Abū Bakr and Talhah; and Waddān by those of Ibn Mūṭī'. Many prominent Companions possessed shares in Khaibar and Wādī al-Qurā. Some descendants of Abū Bakr, 'Alī, Ja'far and Talhah, and some Ḍārsan became nomads and were officially encouraged to remain so by the Abbasids. Those of 'Alī and Ja'far became prominent with settlements of their own, famous examples of which are Waddān, al-Abwā', Yanbu'
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and Suwaiqah, which was twice destroyed in the course of little more than a century by al-Mansūr and by al-Mutawakkil. Al-Mansūr himself decreed that Medina should be deprived of the use of its natural port, al-Jār, in an attempt to nip potential rebellions in the bud. Al-Wāthiq had a number of settlements in the Northern Hijaz destroyed in the aftermath of another serious rebellion. Bughā, the leader of this expedition, slew or captured many Arabs which accounts for the subsequent desertion of these settlements.

One remarkable aspect of the procedure of establishing new settlements in the Northern Hijaz is that a number of places thought to be new and virgin sites were, in fact, ancient thriving settlements. Clear examples are the valley of Yanbu', Shaghb, Badā, al-Suqāya (of B. Ghifār) and al-Juhfah which are said to have been cultivated, populated and provided with springs by 'Alī, al-Zuhrī, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Hasan and Ibn 'Āmir respectively. What the latter did, apparently, was merely to restore the previous prosperity of these settlements. It is probable that stories of their ancient wealth were still vivid in the memory of their inhabitants after they had long ceased to flourish. Besides, the advice of the engineers was sought with respect to irrigation, especially along the pilgrim routes.

V - THE DEPENDENCIES OF MEDINA AND MECCA

To denote the dependencies of Medina, Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh, Qudāmah and al-Bakrī use the word عرض ird. To denote those of Mecca, they apply the term مخلاف mikhlaṣ. ird and mikhlaṣ convey the same meaning, i.e. "dependency" or "district", but the distinction made by the Arab geographers is dialectal, since ird is used in connection with the Northern Hijaz, whereas mikhlaṣ is applied to Mecca and the Yemen apparently because of closer proximity of the Yemen to Mecca. Al-Hamdānī uses a third term, جرح hauz, to denote the dependencies of Mecca, but applies none of the three to those of Medina. Nor indeed does he attempt to give any details of these dependencies. He speaks of the lands of Yathrib (Medina) and its properties without considering the usual list of its dependencies. Both Ibn Khurradadhbeh and al-Ya‘qūbī list the dependencies of Mecca in detail, but later describe some of them as dependencies of the Yemen. Referring to the dependencies of the Yemen, al-Ya‘qūbī uses the term mikhlaṣ, but عص 'amal for those of Mecca. Contrary to Ibn al-Faqīh who speaks of the 'amals of Medina, but not those of Mecca, al-Ya‘qūbī does not mention the dependencies of Medina. Al-Muqaddasī's terminology differs
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from that of all his predecessors. He regards the Hijaz as one of the four provinces (kurab) of Arabia, but when he attempts to divide the Hijaz into regions (nahiyah) he mentions Qurh only. Later he adds Yathrib (Medina) which he describes as a region, though he describes both Qurh and Yathrib, in another passage, as mere towns of Mecca. He regards the dependencies of Mecca, Medina and Qurh as towns which he classifies as large and small. Al-Idrisi, on the other hand, uses one term, mikhlaif, to denote the dependencies of both Mecca and Medina. Nasr refers to some dependencies of Medina as 'irds and to those of Mecca as mikhlaifs.

What the Arab geographers, apart from al-Muqaddasi, seem to have in mind when they speak of dependencies, are the regions which used to have minbars or governors of their own. If their appointment was made by the governor of Medina, then they were considered part of the Medina administration; if their governors were appointed by the amir of Mecca, then they were regarded as dependencies of Mecca. This is not always clear, not only because these dependencies were sometimes brought in connection with Mecca and sometimes with Medina, but also because Mecca and Medina often had the same governor. Similarly, some of the Medina dependencies had governors who were subordinated to the Egyptian administration.

such as Madyan, 'Minūnah and al-Haurā' in the 9th and 10th centuries. Obviously, this was a definition handed down from the early days of Islam when Mecca was ruled by a governor of its own, while Medina was directly subject to the head of the state himself.

It is noteworthy that al-Ya'qūbī is the only "official" geographer to mention any locality north of Mecca when listing its dependencies such as al-Juḥfah and 'Usfān. Ibn Khurra ῦadhbeh and Qudāmah list Sāyah and Ruhāt among the dependencies of Medina, though they lie nearer to Mecca than al-Juḥfah. Ibn Rosteh also mentions Sāyah as a dependency of Medina. 'Arrām, followed by al-Bakrī, even includes 'Usfān among the minbars (dependencies) of Medina. Al-Handānī, however, regards the localities north of Mecca as far as al-Juḥfah as dependencies of Mecca. It should be noted that, at one time or another, these dependencies were assigned to one or the other of the two cities. Thus it would be unjust to accuse those authors of error, even though it can hardly be assumed that this happened in the life-time of all of them. It is clear that most of them
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used earlier sources, or may have been misled by the mention of the governor of Mecca or Medina in connection with the administration of these dependencies, especially as both offices were often conferred on one person. The mention of many of these dependencies is traceable to al-Ähwål who no doubt relies on Ibn al-Kalbí. It is unlikely that he mentioned all the dependencies of Medina which are mentioned by his successors, since al-Bakrî's quotation from al-Ähwål speaks of examples only. As to those of Mecca, he describes them in detail, though his list is not exhaustive so that his successors add a few more localities. It is most likely that they also utilize official archives for their information on dependencies unknown to ordinary scholars, such as Qurā 'Arabiyyah, which may have been the responsibility of the revenue departments. Had Ibn al-Kalbí included the name of this dependency in his list, al-Bakrî would have known that it did not denote "all villages in the Arab lands".

Al-Bakrî states that al-Fur', a dependency of Medina, had twelve minbars or dependencies of its own. This can only mean that, at one time, the governor of al-Fur' was so influential and powerful as to gather in his hands the administration of a large area stretching from 'Usfân in the south
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to al-Sayālah in the north. This must have occurred - if it ever did - in the 10th and 11th centuries, when the Northern Hijaz suffered desperately from the despotism of tribal chiefs. The dependencies of Najd are listed in al-Bakrī's Ṣu'jam. Since these dependencies are those of Mecca, and listed by him as such in another passage, it is obvious that he errs here. They should be listed as "the dependencies of Mecca in Najd", a definition by which they were known at that time. He seems to have relied on al-Handānī whose concept of Najd is, however, different from that of al-Bakrī.

As to the eastern Medinese dependencies, they used to stretch as far as al-Tīff in Iraq until the reign of al-Mutawakkil. By the time of Wākī', no Najdī locality was regarded as a dependency of Medina. There is no doubt that his list of the Medinese dependencies is accurate, since he relies on a native scholar, Ibn al-Sabbāh. In this list, the descriptions of some of these dependencies, termed minbars, contain details of their administration, agriculture, springs and even the genealogy of their inhabitants. 'Usfān is mentioned as having been a dependency of Medina before it became a Meccan minbar. Wākī' is more accurate than his
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contemporary, al-\textit{Fākihī}, who seems to rely on ancient sources when he describes the Janābidh of Ibn Ṣaifī, halfway between Mecca and 'Usfān as the northernmost Meccan territory. Wakī'ī's list is superior to those of the officials, because it contains none of the classical names which, though mentioned by Ibn Khurradadhbeh and his successors, had ceased to correspond to the actually known dependencies such as those listed by Wakī'.

\footnote{Al-Fākihī, \textit{Tārīkh}, p. 50.}
VI - QUOTATIONS, MISREADINGS, BORROWINGS AND DISPUTED WORKS

One cannot expect the Arab geographers of the period under consideration, or indeed any authors of that period outside the circle of the Muhaddithūn, to conform to present-day standards of research. Their way of imparting information does not always disclose whether it is their own or has been borrowed from other authors. Thus unless the source is explicitly mentioned, or the said piece of information traceable to an available work, its origin and sometimes its real significance are impossible to ascertain.

Ibn Khurradadhbeh utilized official archives and the reports of the caliph's envoys. He was also conversant with the hadīth. Nevertheless, he seldom names his sources. Al-Ya'qūbī no doubt used the libraries of the Tulūnīds of Egypt and the Tāhirīds of Məsābūr, with both of whom he maintained friendly relations. It is probable that he read 'Arrām's book which was available in the Tāhirīd library, since his information about the tribes inhabiting the stretch of territory between Medina and Mecca is similar to that of 'Arrām. Al-Mas'ūdī relied on al-Waqīḍī and Ibn Sa'd with respect to localities in the Northern Hijaz, whereas Ibn al-Faqīh seems to have depended on al-Jāhiz.

Except when it is a question of personal experience, Wakī' is both consistent and conscientious in naming the sources of almost any statement in his Manāzil. It is to his
credit that he has preserved the names of a number of yet untraced sources, such as Nādir on the mosques of the Prophet; Ibn al-Sabbāh on the dependencies of Medina; Abū Ishāq al-Bakrī on the Najdī route between Medina and Mecca; and al-Hasanī on the Khai bar region.

Al-Hamdānī is superior to all other geographers except Wāqī' in that he often names his sources. He does not limit himself to contemporary transmitters such as al-Khuza'ī, al-Jarmī, al-'Ādī and his own father, but also consults two Iraqi and six Yemenite astronomers, comparing their estimates with those of Ptolemy. He also quotes Hermon, Dioscorides and such Indian and Chinese works as were known to his contemporaries. Al-Hamdānī is unique in vocalizing the names of localities quoted from Roman sources in as faithful a transliteration as the difference between Latin and Arabic script allows, and gives their equivalent in Arabic if he knows them. His version of Ptolemy's name is surprisingly accurate. Very interesting is his attempt to explain the Greek reference to spices which abound in "Najd and the Hijaz and its Tihāmahs". Al-Hamdānī translates "spices" as afbāwīh (spices or aromatic plants), but explains their nature by reference to "scented plants of the desert such as UGHwān, khuza'mā and the like". This is a strong indication that, by the time of al-Hamdānī, the ancient Yemenite trade in spices had fallen into oblivion. Al-Hamdānī also
translates "Arabia Felix" by "fertile land of the Beduins. Najd and the Hijaz". Al-Bakrī's translation is more accurate, since he renders the epithet as al-ārabiyyah al-Sa'īdah, applying it, however, to Arabia as a whole.

Ibn Hauqal claims to have read the geographical works of al-Jaihānī, Ibn Khurrahadadhbeh, al-Ḍāhī, Qudāmah and al-Ka'bī. Though he does not hesitate to admit that the work of al-Ḍāhī is "valuable" and that of Qudāmah "impeccable", he states in no equivocal way that he never borrows from them under any circumstances, as he disdains the prestige to be gained by appropriating other people's work. Apart from some references to matters of common knowledge in his book, and the mention of the "sweet smells" of Medina, and Ibn Judān's guest-house at Mecca, which are traceable to al-Ḍāhī, and the demarcation of the Hijaz which goes back to Ibn al-Ka'bī, there is little reason to question the sincerity of Ibn Hauqal's bold statement as far as the Northern Hijaz is concerned. As to his liberal adoption of al-Ḍistakhiri's work which he neither tries to conceal nor apologises for, he may have considered himself entitled to it since he regards it, for the most part, as his own, with al-Ḍistakhiri's contribution amounting to no more than four maps, two of which are hopelessly wrong. But his claim to

2. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 23.
the sole authorship of al-Istakhri's commentary cannot be fully accepted as far as the Northern Hijaz is concerned, because of the presence of unmistakable signs of al-Istakhri's hand such as the reference to the Hasanī and the Ja'farī tribes who had been subordinated to B. Harb before Ibn Hauqal started on his travels. Besides, Ibn Hauqal himself quotes al-Istakhri on Radwānī, al-Hijr and Madyan. Nevertheless, Ibn Hauqal is definitely the main contributor of information about Arabia. As to Abū Zaid to whom Yaqūt attributes most of the information contained in the work of Ibn Hauqal (and al-Istakhrī), he is unlikely to have been a co-author of this work. Indeed, not even the copy utilized by Yaqūt was that of al-Istakhri, but that of Ibn Hauqal, since the quotation contains the same slight variations which appear in Ibn Hauqal's copy, such as unmistakable stylistic and linguistic differences.

Al-Muqaddasī also consults the geographical works of his predecessors, including Ibn Hauqal's, though he attributes the latter to al-Istakhri and two other authors, Ibn al-Marzubān of Karkh and Abū Zaid. This is probably a deliberate attempt to deny the actual authorship of Ibn Hauqal, which is in line with the political position of Ibn Hauqal, if one considers that al-Muqaddasī wrote his book in Egypt, in 375 A.H. (985), immediately after Ibn Hauqal's denunciation of its rulers, the Fatimids. It is probable that it was this allegation of al-Muqaddasī that prompted Ibn Hauqal to explain the nature
of his relationship with al-I斯塔kh्रī. As to Ibn al-
Marzubān, Ibn Ḥauqal is full of praise for him and his
family, which suggests that a copy of Ibn Ḥauqal's work
was presented to this influential secretary by Ibn Ḥauqal
himself, a presentation which may have led to al-Muqaddasī's
false accusation. The alleged authorship of Abū Zaid is
mentioned for the first time by al-Muqaddasī and seems to
be the basis for Yaḥūṭ's acceptance of Abū Zaid's authority
on the Northern Hijaz. The extent of al-Muqaddasī's in-
fluence on Yaḥūṭ can be realized from the fact that he pre-
tends to have read the work of al-Jaiḥānī, when in fact his
only quotation of al-Jaiḥānī is to be found in al-Muqaddasī's
work. It is noteworthy that Yaḥūṭ does not mention Ibn
Ḥauqal when he refers to the authorship of the work in
question as being disputed between Abū Zaid and al-I斯塔kh्रī,
a statement which is in line with al-Muqaddasī's claim. Its
trustworthiness, however, can be judged by the fact that
Yaḥūṭ himself attributes the same work to Ibn Ḥauqal on
numerous occasions.

Al-Muqaddasī's information about the Northern Hijaz is
derived from personal observation and theological literature,
though his description of Jiddah bears some similarity to that
given by Ibn Ḥauqal. He also depends on the author of the
history of Medina. Al-Muqaddasī criticises an alleged state-

ment of Ibn Khurradadbeh in which the latter assesses the kharāj (land tax) of the Yemen at 600,000 dinārs, though the term kharāj does not apply to Arabia whose tax is defined as irtifā' (revenue). To do justice to Ibn Khurradadbeh, he does not use term kharāj, merely states that the archives of the "Kharāj Department" in Baghdad show that the "revenue" of the Yemen once reached the peak of 600,000 dinārs, which means that both kinds of tax, "land tax" as well as "revenue", were collected under the supervision of the Kharāj Department.

Al-Muqaddasi's estimate of the distance between Jiddah and the town of al-Gulzum by sea at 300 parasangs is untraceable to other sources. Similarly, his claim that it takes between twenty-five and sixty days to cross this distance is made in defiance of Ibn Rosteh's assessment of twenty-four hours. Though both assumptions are incorrect, the former is far more so.

Al-Muhallabī's information about the region preserved by Yāqūt and Abū al-Fidā'ī is not exhaustive, apparently because Yāqūt gives, with respect to the Northern Hijaz, preference to Abū Zaid's (Ibn Hauqal's) work who has first-hand knowledge of it. Abū al-Fidā'ī also prefers Ibn Hauqal's information to that found in other geographies. To judge by the information he himself proffers, al-Muhallabī seems to have relied, among others, on al-Ya'qūbī and Ibn Rosteh. Al-Muhallabī's

original information, though scant, is of the greatest value, since it indicates the existence of new sources for writing about the Northern Hijaz. He gives the distances there in miles, and brings the data on the tribes in that area up to date. He also seems to be interested in revenue. Not only does he point out the climate in which a locality is situated, but also its latitude, a distinct improvement on previous authors on the Northern Hijaz. This is likely to be the result of a new survey.

Al-Bakrī's sources on the Northern Hijaz differ from work to work. Whereas he quotes Ibn Khurraładhbeh, Ibn Qutaibah, Ibn Rosteh, al-Mas'ūdī and, most important, al-'Udhrī in al-Masālik, he relies on al-Asma'ī, Abū 'Uba'idah, Ibn al-Kalbī, 'Arrām, al-Sukkarī, and, also most important, al-Sakūnī. There is no doubt that he also utilizes al-Asadī's work, especially on the pilgrim routes and the mosques of the Prophet in the Northern Hijaz. As to al-Hajari's Nawādir, it is likely that its complete text was unknown to al-Bakrī, not only because al-Hajari is so rarely mentioned in al-Mu'jam, but also because there are few similarities between al-Hajari's and al-Bakrī's geographical statements. It is most probable that al-Bakrī quotes al-Hajari through Qāsim b. Thābit or the latter's father, as both were disciples of al-Hajari, and often quoted by al-Bakrī. Nasr relies on many authors, mostly of a literary nature. His chief sources on the Northern Hijaz are al-Sukkarī, 'Arrām and al-Bakrī, though
he never mentions the names of the last two. He quotes al-
1 'Udhrī, but through Ibn Hazm. Al-Zamakhsharī quotes 'Ulayy
as the authority for the most original passages of his jībāl.
Al-Idrīsī's description of the Northern Hijaz is mainly de-
uced from Ibn Khurradadhbeh, Ibn Rosteh, Ibn Haqal and al-
Bakrī. Nevertheless, there are several occasions on which
he proffers new information whose source is untraceable.

As regards numerous misquotations and misreadings it is
obvious that they are, to a great extent, attributable not
so much to the authors themselves as to the scribes who were
by no means always well-informed on the Norther Hijaz. When
a mistake is committed in a highly respected work, either by
the author or by a scribe, the chances are that it will sur-
vive unnoticed. A clear example of this is the alleged
existence of كتب كثيرة kuthubun kathīrah (several mounds)
on the trunk of the famous tree at the mosque of the Prophet
near al-Ruwaiṭah which figures in al-Bukhārī's Sahīh. It
is of course a question of كتب كثيرة kutubun kathīrah
(several inscriptions) though all transmitters and commen-
tators of al-Bukhārī as well as authors quoting from him — not
excepting al-Bakrī — appear to be convinced that it is a matter
of mounds. Another example is the erroneous assumption of
both al-Ĥasmā'ī and Abū 'Ubadah that the proper name of the

1. Nasr, Jībāl, fol. 130.
2. See al-Bukhārī, Sahīh, vol. 1, p. 134; al-Qastallānī,
Irshād al-Sārī, vol. 1, p. 533; al-Bakrī, Mu'jam, p. 686;
halt between al-Ghamrah and Mecca is not the Bustān of Ibn Ṭūmīr, but the Bustān of Ibn Maʾmar. Al-Bakrī does not seem to be aware of the contradictions between certain statements in his Muʿjam with regard to several localities in the Northern Hijaz such as Kulayyah, Radwā, 'Azwar, al-Ṣafrā', al-Juhfah, al-Mushallal and Qudaid. On some occasions, he admits his inability to choose between conflicting statements, e.g. commenting on al-Qāhah and al-Suqyā. He is, nevertheless, the first geographer to subject many statements to a thorough vetting. The defects, and they are many, in his own pronouncements, are the consequence of the large size of his Muʿjam and the magnitude of his task, for he attempts to locate a vast number of places. As is evident from the differences between the MSS, his Muʿjam teems with scribal mistakes.

Al-Bakrī's quotations are not always exactly as they appear in their original sources, e.g., some of his quotations from al-Bukhārī, 'Arrām and al-Sakūnī. Though it is al-Bakrī's prime objective in compiling his Muʿjam to forestall the mis-reading of place-names, it happens that he himself commits mistakes of this kind. The most striking example is his confusing Jumrān in Najd, with Jumdān in the Hijaz, although the

1. See al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, p. 1266.
very misreading of Jundān itself by Yazīd b. Hārūn is an example of mistakes he himself indicts in the very first pages of his Mu'jam. He corrects Dharah to Dharwah, but misreads al-Shanā'ik as al-Sanābik, al-Nijār and al-Nujair as al-Thijār and al-Thujaier, and Ghurān as Ghurāb, to mention only a few alterations in statements he attributes to 'Arrām. A very shocking misquotation of 'Arrām is al-Bakrī's location of Mt. Wariqān as the first mountain encountered by travellers from "Mecca to Medina". Al-Bakrī's rearrangement of directions in this statement indicates his awareness of the alteration he has made, but this rearrangement increases the disorder. In this corrupted form, the statement has found its way into Nasr's Jibāl. The same is true of Dharwah, but not al-Nijār and al-Nujair which means that Nasr consulted the works of both 'Arrām and al-Bakrī. Nasr also misreads Marjih as Muddajjaj, though on the whole, his misreadings are rare indeed. Al-Zamakhsharī seems to alter Sāyah into Sayyā'ah, and fails to distinguish between the two Nakhlahs. Al-Hamdānī alters Ḥasīn into Ḥunain. His confusing demarcation of Wādī al-Qurā and its surroundings is most likely to be caused by a scribal omission.

1. Ibid., p. 3.
3. Ibid., fol. 144.
4. Ibid., fol. 137. Nasr records the erroneous assumption that the Prophet obviated this valley when he emigrated from Mecca.
Al-Idrīsī's text abounds in misreadings of place-names in the Northern Hijaz some of which are scribal mistakes. Nevertheless, numerous mistakes suggest the direct responsibility of al-Idrīsī himself. Most important among them is his failure to distinguish al-Rauhā', the inland town on the route from Medina to al-Jār, from al-Haurā', the port between al-Wajh and al-Jār which prompted him to assume that al-Ṣafra' and al-'Udhaibah, which lie between al-Rauhā' and al-Jār, must also be ports, which is of course erroneous. It is perhaps this reading of al-Rauhā' as al-Haurā' that accounts for the mention, for the first time, of an alleged port called al-ʻUtūf to the north of al-Haurā'.

There is a halt called al-Munsaraf in the proximity of al-Rauhā' which he might have misread as al-ʻUtūf. There is also his misinterpretation of the sentence: "잔 잖 개최 thumma ajāza al-Qāhah (thence he crossed al-Qāhah) from which he concludes that there are two halts: Adhān and al-Qāhah or al-ʻAṣjah. Similarly, he splits the name Thaniyyah al-Marah into two place-names: Thaniyyah and al-Marah, thus erroneously assuming the existence of two places. In the other MS, al-Idrīsī seems to have corrected the erroneous location of Waddān east of the lands of the Hasanīs by Ibn Hauqal. Al-Idrīsī, however, deliberately alters Ibn Hauqal's sentence about Radwā' and أته من ينبع كخضرة البقاء:"

1. Supra, p. 424.
2. Supra, p. 354.
(I saw it from Yanbu' looking like a green meadow) into:

1. 

The fords have rendered its summit like a green meadow). He also tries to reconcile two contradictory statements about whetstone. Ibn Ḥauqal says that it is carried from Radwā, whereas al-Bakrī believes that it is found near Khaibar. In a compromise solution, al-Idrīsī locates Khaibar near Radwā, and finds hence no difficulty in assuming that whetstone is carried from both. It is perhaps this, or some inaccurate maps, that prompted a later geographer to locate Yanbu', the port on the route between Khaibar and Medina. Other misreadings of al-Idrīsī have already been listed.

'Arrām's erroneous locations are not only surprisingly numerous, but also unchallenged by other authors. He locates 'Azwar close to Radwā, Kulayyah south of al-Juhfah, Turabah west of Mt. al-Sarāh, Mt. Qua'iqi'ān as a village twelve miles from Mecca, the two Mts. Thāfil at two days distance from Radwā in one passage and seven days distance in another, and al-Safrā' east of Radwā. Since 'Arrām is a native of the Northern Hijaz, these mistaken locations are likely to be the result of erroneous pagination of the original MS., as has already been discussed.

In his Masālik, al-Bakrī lists the mosques of the Prophet between Mecca and Medina, but in an extremely corrupted

---

1. Supra, p. 375.
2. Supra, p. 132.
form such as al-Muqawwas (al-Mu'rrias), and 'Irq al-Tīb ('Irq al-Zabyah), al-Makhdūb (al-Munsarraf), al-Inābah (al-Īthāyah), al-Mushkil (al-Mushallal), Ain ābī Rabī'ī ('Ain Ibn Bazi') and Thulthat Ka'b (Thaniyyat Kuft). Many other localities in the Northern Hijaz are treated in the same manner in al-Masālik. While it is possible to blame a scribe for most of these corruptions, there is no doubt that al-Bakrī follows al-Mugaddasī in altering Suqyā al-Jazā'ī into Suqyā Yazīd. Al-Samhūdī attributes to al-Suhailī the location of a mosque of the Prophet bi-Ba'ilā yālī (at Ba'ilā). What al-Suhailī says in reality is merely that such a mosque is situated bi-'Alā'ī (at 'Alā'). The latter form figures in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, and is no doubt the accurate name.

Not all mistakes and erroneous assumptions recur in the work of compilers. Such was the fate of Lughdhah's mention of a silver mine in Mt. Shaibān, near Wādī al-Qurā, which does not seem to have been accurate. Ibn Rosteh states that rice is reaped three or even four times a year in the Yemen. Apart from the impossibility of three annual harvests of rice, it was not until five centuries later that rice was introduced

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fols. 74-75.
to the Yemen and only as an experiment. Dr Serjeant believes that the word ٣٢ aruzz = rice here is a misreading of ئر ٣٢ dhurah = maize, which is very likely. This statement of Ibn Rostah is not repeated by the compilers; nor is that of al-Idrisi on the existence of the alleged port of al-'Utīf north of al-Haurā'. Neither is al-Bakri's erroneous assumption that al-Suwaydā' is the border of the Hijaz repeated by any of his successors.

An error or misquotation leads sometimes to far wilder errors not only by successive authors, but even by the author who gives rise to the misquotation. Al-Bakri's misquotation of 'Arrām's statement on Mt. Wariqān and the consequent rearrangement of localities following it is an example. Another is al-Idrisi's compromise solution in locating Khai bar near Radwā, and his failure to distinguish between al-Haurā' and al-Rauhā', which have already been mentioned. An even more erroneous assumption springs from Ibn Fadālah's reference to حد الحجاز الأول (the first frontier of the Hijaz) which has been interpreted, possibly by 'Iyād, as being "the frontier of the first Hijaz". The author of Akām al-Murjān describes the "first Hijaz" as comprising "al-Qairawān, Egypt and Ailah", which is a misinterpretation of asfal al-ārd.

1. Al-Ghassānī, Bughyah, fol. 32.
2. Private communication.
(the lower Province of Egypt) changed by al-Idrīsī to asfāl and al-Hijāz (the lower territories of the Hijaz).
It is certain that this conception cannot be earlier than the 12th century, which means that the author of ʿĀkān al-Murjān must have lived no earlier.

Some place names are misread as a result of philological errors. Thus the definition of Shaghb, Riʿm and Tās (Dās) as Shaghbā, Riʿmā and Tāsā respectively is due to an alteration of Shaghban, Riʿman and Tāsan, which is the accurate reading if accompanied by فتحة تنوين fathah nunation.

In many cases an author, after releasing the first version of his work, became aware of some errors he had committed or reiterated. It is natural that he should have corrected these errors in the later versions. This is a great help in the study of the provenance and history of the manuscripts of these works. Thus the manuscript of al-Idrīsī's Muzhah, in which he corrects Ibn Hauqal's erroneous location of the Ḥasānī lands, is a later version. Similarly, al-Bakrī's distinction between al-Naqī' and al-Baqī' cannot have occurred in his earliest versions, on one of which 'Iyād has relied, but in the later which al-Suhailī has utilized.

Some authors borrow an entire statement which betrays their reliance on certain sources, such as al-Bakrī's refer-

once to an ancient place at Medina being "identical with the palace of B. Ḥudailah today", the mention of the descendants of Sabrah b. Ma'bad as inhabiting Dhul Marwah" until the present day"; several references to the year A.H. 332 (943-4), altered once to A.H. 432, as "our present day". These are verbatim quotations from Ibn Ishaq of the 8th century, Ibn Sa'd of the 9th century and al-Mas'ūdī of the 10th century respectively. Al-Bakrī's comparison of the size of the Thamūdite dwellings with "our own houses" is also traceable in al-Mas'ūdī's Murūj. The geographical references to the Northern Hijaz provided by 'Iyād and al-Suhailī are mostly traceable in al-Bakrī's Mu'jam, though the MSS. on which they rely are definitely not identical.

There are many authors whose information has been borrowed, in its entirety, by other writers who can be classified merely as transmitters. Such connections are, on some occasions, easy to verify, as, for instance, in the case of al-Kindī who, though quoted on the Northern Hijaz by both al-Bakrī and Yāqūt, is no more than a transmitter of Ṭarrām. It is also easy to establish that al-Ahwal is a transmitter of Ibn al-Kalbī, since the quotations attributed by al-Bakrī to al-Ahwal are, when mentioned by Yāqūt, attributed to Ibn al-Kalbī. In other cases, the connection is not so easily determined. It has already been mentioned that the information on the Northern Hijaz which Yāqūt attributes to Abū

1. Al-Bakrī, Masālik, fol. 39.
Zaid is, in fact, taken from Ibn Hauqal's own draft. However, he attributes the quotation on al-Hijr, not to ābū Zaid, but to al-Iṣṭakhrī. Several quotations are given without a source being named. It is most likely that Ibn Hauqal is the main author of that work. What is difficult is to ascertain how much was contributed to it by al-Iṣṭakhrī, since Ibn Hauqal had ascribed his own findings to al-Iṣṭakhrī before deciding to adopt the whole work. The available MS. of Nasr's Jibāl is clearly the abridgement made by ābū Mūsā al-Iṣfahānī, because only the information that Yāqūt attributes to Nasr is to be found in this MS. Yāqūt states unequivocally that it is through this abridgement that his knowledge of Nasr's Jibāl has come to him. There is a possibility that Nasr is not, in fact, responsible for this work at all, and that it was ascribed to him in order to throw doubt on al-Hāzimī's Ankinah which, apart from some alterations, might well have been the origin of this abridgement. Yāqūt accepts this claim with the same sincerity with which he accepts the authorship of ābū Zaid in reliance on al-Muqaddasī.

It may not be amiss to draw attention to the recent controversy over the identity of the author of Manāẓil Tariq Makkah (the halts on the route to Mecca). Since the intro-

---

duction as well as some folios are missing so that the name of the author does not appear in the MS., different scholars have tried to ascribe it to different authors. It was thought to have been a copy of Ḥkbār Makkah of al-ʿAzraqī, but Dr. H. Mahfūz, who familiarized the Arab scholars with this MS., attributes it to Ibn al-Kūfī al-ʿasadī 254–348 A.H. (868–959). Dr. Mahfūz seems to have relied on Shaikh Ḥghā Buzurg who recalled having read such a work by Ibn al-Kūfī. Other scholars, however, see in this MS. the work of al-ʿasadī to whom al-Samhūdī attributes a number of statements found in it. Shaikh Hamad al-Jāsir rightly disagrees with either side, but insists on attributing it to al-Ḥarbī 1 199-285 A.H. (813-898). In so doing, he relies first on the report attributed to ʿĀbd Allāh b. Shabīb by the author of this MS. and, according to al-Bakrī, by al-Ḥarbī. Secondly, he is led by the lengthy chapter on the pilgrimage rites to identify its author with al-Ḥarbī who is said to have compiled a book on these rites. Shaikh Hamad lists the names of thirty scholars quoted in this MS. all of whom are contemporaries of al-Ḥarbī, to suggest that they were his teachers.

The attribution of this work to al-Ḥarbī cannot be accepted for the following reasons:

2. Fol. 72.
3. Al-Bakrī, Muʿjam, pp. 6, 7.
1. al-Harbi himself is one of the scholars on whom the author relies, though his name does not figure in Shaikh Hamad's list;

2. Ibn Shabib's report as recorded by the author differs in places from Ibn Shabib's report as transmitted by al-Harbi;

3. the author states unequivocally that he does not intend to write more on the pilgrimage rites than necessary, and declares emphatically that these rites are not what his book is about;

4. some reporters on whom the author relies are younger than al-Harbi and some of them lived years after him, facts which do not tally with the theory that he was their disciple; and

5. some of the scholars whom the author quotes are not regarded as trustworthy enough to have been quoted by an authority so highly respected as al-imam al-Harbi. Indeed, one of them is so notorious for his untrustworthiness that he was deemed by a trustworthy scholar to deserve capital punishment.

As to the identity of the real author, it is certain that he is no other than Muhammad b. Khalaf b. Hayyan (or Jiyyan), best known as al-Qadi Waki', who died in 306 A.H.

1. Fol. 62.
2. Fol. 46.
Wakī' showed great interest in the routes and travels, and compiled two works of this kind, one of which is Kitāb al-Musafir (the book of traveller), and the other Kitāb al-Tarīq (the book of the route). The latter is almost certainly the one whose MS. is the subject of this controversy. That Wakī' is the author of this work is borne out by a juxtaposition of this MS. with Wakī'’s other work Akhbār al-Qudāh. The method of reporting used in both works is the same, and even the introductory formulac of the author’s reports are identical, e.g. حددتني hadhathāni, حددتنا hadhathana, الخبرنا akhbaranī, and زعم za`am. Moreover, most of the author’s teachers quoted in al-Manāzil MS. are quoted by Wakī' in Akhbār al-Qudāh, and in reports attributed to him by Abū al-Faraj, al-Khatīb and Hamzah al-Isfahānī. The few names of authorities - 9 out of 76 - which do not appear in Akhbār al-Qudāh are either detected there with additives, or in shortened or corrupted forms, or are entirely redundant as they are quoted in the MS. when information on localities or "geographical" poetry is provided, information which differs, by the nature of its subject matter, from the theme of Akhbār al-Qudāh. Wakī' is known to have relied, beside highly respected authors such as al-Harbī, on some transmitters whose standards fall below the requirements of the strict 'Ulamā'. As to al-Bakrī's assumption that al-Harbī

quotes ‘Abd Allāh b. Shabīb on the account which Wākī’ also attributes to Ibn Shabīb, al-Bakrī might have been misled by the chapter on the pilgrimage rites on which al-Ḥarbī compiled a book. It is possible, however, that al-Ḥarbī has recorded this report in his work Gharīb al-Hadīth which al-Bakrī quotes on many occasions. Wākī’’s Manāzil appears to have been enlarged by both al-Asadī and al-Sakūnī.

Al-Sakūnī has been the subject of three assumptions. The first is based on al-Bakrī’s remark that virtually all the information he derived from al-Sakūnī was drawn by the latter from the book of ‘Arrām on the Hijaz and Tihāmah which he dictated to al-Kindī. Since a substantial part of this information is not to be found in ‘Arrām’s work, some scholars, notably Professor Harūn, believe that al-Sakūnī enriched this work with information of his own. There is, however, no doubt that the MS. of ‘Arrām’s work which al-Bakrī utilized is identical with the available MS. Almost all the information as well as all the mistakes and defective passages in this MS. reappear in the quotations attributed by al-Bakrī to al-Sakūnī, al-Kindī or ‘Arrām. Moreover, the majority of al-Sakūnī’s statements describe localities outside the scope of ‘Arrām’s work, such as Taimā’, Khaibar, Faid, al-Yamāmah and Fidak and even localities in Syria and Iraq. There are, in al-Mu’jam, some quotations concerning

---

2. Al-Bakrī, Mu’jam, p. 5.
localities covered by 'Arrām's work, which al-Bakrī attributes to al-Sakūnī, but which do not figure in 'Arrām's work. On many of these particular occasions, al-Bakrī plainly states that al-Sakūnī's information is derived from "his own sources", "from the ārabs", from Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Zurqī or Mūsā b. Ishāq. Because al-Bakrī regards both Faid and Khaibar as part of the Hijaz, he takes the precaution of mentioning al-Sakūnī's "book" in connection with both localities, to prevent the information he attributes to al-Sakūnī from being ascribed to 'Arrām. This book of al-Sakūnī is clearly an independent work, compiled by al-Sakūnī himself and different from that "dictated" to him by al-Kindī, to quote the actual words of al-Bakrī, which is positive evidence that al-Sakūnī did not enlarge 'Arrām's work.

Secondly, this book of al-Sakūnī is the one utilized by Yāqūt who does not seem to have seen al-Sakūnī's version of 'Arrām's work which Yāqūt attributes only to 'Arrām and al-Kindī. Yāqūt is so fervent in his admiration for al-Sakūnī that he would hardly have neglected to ascribe some of these quotations to him had he been aware of his connection with 'Arrām's work. Yāqūt, in fact, mentions al-Kindī and al-Sakūnī as authors of two separate works. Thus al-Sakūnī's

---

2. Ibid., pp. 260, 523.
3. Ibid., p. 655.
5. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 7.
information on the Northern Hijaz is not part of his version of 'Arrām's work, but part of another work by al-Sakūnī himself. Recently, Dr. Husain Nassar found in Yāqūt's Irshād an extremely important reference to a work on Arabia by a certain Sakūnī. He believes that this may be the Sakūnī on whom Yāqūt relied for his information, and who is not identical with the transmitter of 'Arrām's work on the grounds that al-Bakrī's Sakūnī is called 'Āmr b. Rishr, whereas this Sakūnī is called Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan, and that al-Bakrī's Sakūnī lived many years before Yāqūt's Sakūnī who was a contemporary of al-Muqtadir, 295-320 A.H. (907-932). The reasons for this assumption are by no means cogent. That al-Sakūnī's name differs from al-Bakrī to Yāqūt is true, but al-Bakrī and Yāqūt often give different names and cognomens to one and the same author. As to the period in which al-Bakrī's Sakūnī and Yāqūt's Sakūnī lived, it is almost the same, since al-Zurqī, quoted by al-Bakrī's Sakūnī, was still alive in 309 A.H. (921), which suggests that his disciple, al-Bakrī's Sakūnī, could be identical with Yāqūt's Sakūnī.

The third assumption is the charge raised against al-Sakūnī, that he borrowed the work of al-Hajarī, to whom al-Samhūdī ascribes most of the information on the Himas (preserves) which al-Bakrī attributes to al-Sakūnī. Consequently, Shaikh Hamad al-Jāsir concludes that al-Hajarī is

2. See al-Sam'ānī, Insāb, fol. 274 and al-İsfahānī, Aghānī, vol. 4, p. 16.
the original author because he is more famous and more closely connected with the Hijaz than al-Sakūnī "of whom we know nothing in this respect," and because al-Samhūdī names, not al-Sakūnī, but al-Hajarī as his source. It is certain that al-Samhūdī attributes these quotations to al-Hajarī alone. What is not above suspicion, however, is the reliability of this attribution. Al-Hajarī was highly respected in al-Andalus, since he was the teacher of two famous Andalusian scholars, Thābit b. Hazm and his son Qāsim. Al-Bakrī quotes al-Hajarī on some geographical references on the Northern Hijaz which are in line with al-Hajarī’s Nawādir. The geographical references in al-Nawādir prove that al-Hajarī is, in fact, well informed on the region. Nevertheless, the information attributed by al-Bakrī to al-Sakūnī, and by al-Samhūdī to al-Hajarī, definitely differs from data found in al-Nawādir where there are some attempts at mapping routes in the Northern Hijaz or references to the Himas which cannot have been written by the same author whom al-Bakrī quotes on the routes in the Northern Hijaz, and whom both al-Bakrī and al-Samhūdī quote on the Himas. Since al-Hajarī himself is an original source, it cannot be assumed that the discrepancies between his own work, al-Nawādir, and the alleged information attributed to him by al-Samhūdī, or to al-Sakūnī by al-Bakrī, are the result of variations in al-Hajarī’s sources. There

are some occasions on which the information provided by al-Hajari in al-Nawādir conflicts with data attributed by al-Bakrī to al-Sukānī and by al-Samhūdī to al-Hajari. This happens in the cases of Baidān which is described as a mountain by al-Hajari, and as a well by al-Sukānī; of al-Munyah, which is described as a hill by al-Hajari, but figures, in al-Sakūnī, as Minā with a very detailed demarcation; of al-'Aqīq which is briefly described by al-Hajari, but in full detail by al-Sakūnī; and of the Basra-Mecca route, of which al-Hajari merely enumerates the halts, but on which al-Sakūnī offers ample information. It suffices to read al-Hajari's Nawādir to establish that the geographical references there, original and valuable though they are, cannot have been written by the same author whose information about the Northern Hijaz is attributed to al-Sakūnī by al-Bakrī, and to al-Hajari by al-Samhūdī.

The above-quoted instances represent cases of direct borrowing, or accusations of borrowing, by transmitters from authors, or even by authors from other authors. Apart from those, there are numerous quotations on the Northern Hijaz recorded by al-Bakrī, Nasr and Yāqūt which are definitely traceable to certain sources, though none of them names these sources. One example will be cited here. There is first al-Sakūnī himself. Both al-Bakrī and Yāqūt quote from him

2. See al-Bakrī, Mu'jan, pp. 291, 877, 1324-1333, 496, 868.
in a vast number of entries, though his name is omitted from many of these entries. Fortunately, it has been possible to detect many of these quotations not only by juxtaposing the two *Mu'jans*, but also by comparing the entries within each *Mu'jan*. Al-Bakrī sometimes records a statement without references to its source, but refers to it, on another occasion, as having been derived from al-Sakūnī. Yāqūt, on the other hand, records parts of statements attributing them to al-Sakūnī, but records the identical parts in other entries, without naming al-Sakūnī. Sometimes al-Bakrī or Yāqūt attributes to al-Sakūnī information ascribed to other authors in other entries of the *Mu'jan*. This means that the information in question has reached al-Bakrī or Yāqūt from al-Sakūnī.

---
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