

GEORG LEUBE

UNIVERSITY OF BAYREUTH

Supplementary Note to the Article “Prolegomena on Ibn Ajā’s Journey to Tabriz: Chronology and Itinerary according to the *Tārīkh al-Amīr Yashbak*,” *Mamlūk Studies Review* 26 (2023): 117–53

POSTSCRIPT: THE TOPONYM OF MLShKRD

On pages 138–39 of my contribution, I discuss the toponym spelled MLShKRD in Ibn Ajā’s itinerary to and from Tabriz. Although I rejected the proposed identification of this toponym with Malazgirt/Muş or Walashjirt (contemporary Toprakkale/Eleşkirt/Ağrı), I was unable to offer a better identification of this stage of Ibn Ajā’s journey.

Based on comparison with the early seventeenth-century Armenian travelogue of Simēon Lehac’i,¹ the toponym can confidently be identified with the fortress and village of Manuşkut,² which is, according to the *Index Anatolicus*, modern Yeşilova/Solhan/Bingöl. Within the itinerary of Simēon, this toponym constitutes one of the stations on the way from Čapaļjur (contemporary Bingöl) to the monastery of Surb Karapet at the modern village of Yukarıyongalı/Merkez/Muş.³

Due to this identification, the reconstruction of Ibn Ajā’s itinerary between Bingöl and Aktuzla/Malazgirt/Muş proposed on page 140 of my article has to be amended, as he evidently did not follow the Göynük river in a northeasterly direction from Bingöl. Instead, he travelled east from Bingöl and likely continued beyond Yeşilova to the monastery of Surb Karapet, which continued to flourish in the fifteenth century. While he did reach Yeşilova from Muş during his return from Tabriz (see page 150 of my article), he does not mention Muş among the stations of his journey to Tabriz. Accordingly, he and his companions likely cut across the difficult terrain after departing from the area of Yeşilova and the monastery of Surb Karapet to the area of contemporary Varto/Muş, before continuing to al-Mallāḥah al-Bayḏā’ (modern Aktuzla/Malazgirt/Muş), roughly along the itinerary suggested on p. 140 of my article.

¹Simēon Lehac’i, *Ulegrut’yun*, ed. N. Akinean (Vienna, 1936).

²Ibid., 196.

³Ibid., 196–97. Simēon summarily condenses the first 50 km from Bingöl to Yeşilova, before describing in vivid detail the following 20 km from Yeşilova via a spring named Şak’arlu (Turkic “sugar-sweet”), the village of Kuar’s (according to the *Index Anatolicus*, this is contemporary Arakonak/Solhan/Bingöl), and a mountain named T’ōzlu Tał (Turkic “dusty mountain”) to the monastery of Surb Karapet. This narrative focalization should not be misunderstood to suggest that the later part of the journey was longer than the first.



©2024 by Georg Leube .

DOI: 10.6082/p32s-c708. (<https://doi.org/10.6082/p32s-c708>)

DOI of Vol. XXVII: 10.6082/msr27. See <https://doi.org/10.6082/msr2024> to download the full volume or individual articles. This work is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC-BY). See <http://mamluk.uchicago.edu/msr.html> for more information about copyright and open access.

Identification of Ibn Ajā’s MLShKRD with Yeşilova is particularly intriguing due to Ibn Ajā’s description of his meeting with an individual called al-shaykh Muḥammad al-Kurdī, said to be a descendant of Muḥammad’s uncle al-‘Abbās, whom he met after climbing a high mountain after continuing his journey from Yeşilova. If this mountain could be identified with the *t‘ōzlu taḷ* that constitutes the final stage before the monastery of Surb Karapet in Simēon’s itinerary,⁴ the meeting of Ibn Ajā and this shaykh would have taken place in the immediate vicinity of the monastery, if not at the monastery itself. A similar sojourn of Ibn Ajā at a Christian village (*qaryat naṣārā*) is mentioned during his return from Tabriz (see p. 148 of my article). While it is very plausible that Ibn Ajā’s journey followed established routes including Armenian Christian monastic centers as far as possible, I am not aware of any further information that could enable the identification of the Kurdish shaykh he met at Yukarıyongalı.

⁴Ibid., 197.

