ART. XIII.—*On the Sites of Brahmanábád and Mansúrah in Sindh ; with Notices of others of less note in their Vicinity.*
By Major-General M. R. HAIG, M.R.A.S.

NOTWITHSTANDING the labours of the various authorities who have from time to time written upon the ancient topography of the lower Indus Valley, the subject remains in much need of further investigation. Attempts to identify places mentioned by the historians of Alexander's Expedition, by the author of the *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea*, the geographer Ptolemy, the Chinese pilgrim Hiouen Tsang, the historians of the Arab conquest, and by later writers, have not usually been attended with the happiest results. Nor, when the difficulties which beset investigation are considered, is it at all surprising that this should be so. It is hard enough to have to contend with the vagueness, inconsistencies and contradictions of old writers; but these are as nothing compared with the obstacles which the physical characteristics of the country itself oppose to the inquirer. For ages the Indus has been pushing its bed across the valley from east to west, generally by the gradual process of erosion, which effectually wipes out every trace of town and village on its banks; but, at times also, by a more or less sudden shifting of its waters into entirely new channels, leaving large tracts of country to go to waste, and forcing the inhabitants of many a populous place to abandon their old homes, and follow the river in search of new settlements. In course of time the forsaken channels are, in some parts wholly, in others partially, filled up by the action of the dust-laden winds that prevail for many months during the hot season, so as to leave but the vaguest traces of a former river-bed; or, perhaps, the retiring stream will leave behind

it vast quantities of drift-sand which is swept by the high winds over the surrounding country, completely burying the sites of the abandoned towns, and transforming the once fertile fields into a blank waste of sand-hills where the explorer may search in vain for any record of the past.

Having had, as an inquirer, experience of the difficulties here described, and knowing the errors which even eminent authorities have not been able to avoid, I am bound, in attempting to throw some additional light on a very interesting portion of the ancient topography of Sindh, to admit that I am very far from feeling any undue confidence in the soundness of my conclusions. The most I can hope for is that the views submitted in this paper may attract the compliment of criticism, and so give rise to further and more satisfactory investigation.

Brahmanábád was probably one of the oldest cities in India; and, whether or not there is sufficient ground for regarding it as "the city of the Brahmins," which played its part in the events of Alexander's Expedition, the Harmatelia of Diodorus, as Gen. Cunningham thinks,¹ there can be little doubt that it was then in existence. The fame of great antiquity attached to it at the time of the Arab conquest, and the historian Biládhúrí, writing a thousand years ago, calls it "Brahmanábád-al-a'tíqah," "Brahmanábád the ancient."

The neighbouring fortress of Mansúrah was but short-lived in comparison, but it possesses historical interest from the fact of its having been the Arab capital, and, so far as we know, the first important stronghold built by Muslims in India.

Sir Henry Elliot's identification of Brahmanábád with the modern Haidarábád was unfortunate. There is really nothing to support it, and the evidence against it is overwhelming and conclusive. It was an unlucky circumstance that, several identifications being to some extent dependent on that of Nerún, Sir Henry fell into a mistake regarding this place. No fact is more certain than that the present fort of Haidarábád occupies the site of Nerún, and Sir Henry

¹ Ancient Geography of India, p. 268.

would have had no difficulty in admitting it, but for one obstacle that seemed insurmountable. Nerún was certainly west of the river, and Haidarábád is unquestionably east of it. He was not aware that the Indus had changed its course about the middle of last century, from the east to the west of Haidarábád.¹

By others it has been supposed that the question of the site of Brahmanábád was settled by the labours of the late Mr. Bellasis, of the Bombay Civil Service, who, in 1854 and subsequent years, carried out some excavations in the ruins situated in the Shahdádpur Parganah, which go by the name of Brahmanábád. The result of his operations was to lead Mr. Bellasis to believe that these ruins were indeed the remains of the ancient city. His published accounts of the matter, as well as those of Col. Sykes, are extremely interesting, if not entirely convincing.² Here it will be sufficient to say that a large number of coins found in the ruins were submitted to Mr. Thomas, who, from an examination of them, formed the opinion that the identification of the ruined site with Brahmanábád was questionable.³ This opinion is confirmed by the results of my own study of the question and observation of the locality.

In one of his interesting papers on Sindh, published in the first volume of this Society's Journal, Captain McMurdo, after describing the situation of Brahmanábád, says (p. 232), "Bhamana⁴ was afterwards called Díbal Kángara." I have not been able to discover his authority for this statement, but I conclude it was some local history which I have not been fortunate enough to meet with. If his statement is correct, the site of Brahmanábád is at once ascertained. Not "Díbal Kángara," but "Depál Gángarah" is to be read. Capt. McMurdo found it written دیپال گانگرہ, and, naturally enough, trans-

¹ See History of India, vol. i. Appendix, *s.v.* Brahmanábád and Nerún.

² Mr. Bellasis, in Journal Bomb. As. Soc. vol. v. pp. 413, 467. Col. Sykes in *Illustrated London News*, Feb. 21st, 28th, 1857.

³ See Thomas's Prinsep, vol. ii. pp. 119-124.

⁴ Bhamana, Bhámbanah, Bhámbar-wáh, Bhaman-wáh, Bhamanwási are variants of the name of the old city. Bahmanah is the name in vogue among Sindhís.

literated it as above.¹ The place is frequently mentioned in the local histories, and it must have been of some little importance, as it gave its name to the Parganah—or part of the Parganah—which in recent times has been called Shahdád-pur, from a town founded by Mír Shahdád, one of the first chiefs of the Talpur family. Depál Gángrah was probably some petty Rájput chief. Nothing is known of him, but his name survives under the modified form of Depar (د پير) Gángro, and it pertains to a ruinous site of considerable area, and apparently of great antiquity, the crumbling remnants of houses, walls and bastions having been worn down nearly to the level of the surrounding country. Here, then, if Captain McMurdo's authority may be trusted, is the site of Brahmanábád, and if so, then the ruins now bearing that name are almost certainly those of the Arab capital, Mansúrah. For convenience sake I shall so far assume these identifications to be made out as to name each site in accordance with them in the further discussion of the question. The exact positions are

Brahmanábád 25° 56' N. 68° 54' E.

Mansúrah 25° 53' N. 68° 49' E.

Mansúrah is ten miles E. by S. from Shahdád-pur, and Brahmanábád is six miles and a half N.E. from Mansúrah, both measurements being in a direct line. The distance between the two sites is thus in agreement with that stated by Biládhúrí, namely, two farsakhs. General Cunningham considers the O-fan-cha of Hiouen Tshang to be Brahmanábád, and Pi-ta-si-lo to be Nerún. According to the Pilgrim the distance between the two places was 300 li, or 50 miles, O-fan-cha bearing N.E. The Brahmanábád of this article is 49 miles, in a direct line, N.E. from Haidarábád. Abu-l-fida quotes a writer named Muhalabi to the effect that Mansúrah was fifteen farsakhs from Nerún. The Mansúrah of this article is a little under forty-four miles in a direct line from Haiderábád. Idrísí says that Mansúrah was “rather more than three days' journey” from Nerún, but he

¹ He took great pains to collect local histories and acquire correct information, but never was in Sindh, and doubtless never heard of a place which in modern times has sunk into obscurity.

puts the distance from Nerún to Debal at three days, and Ibn Haukal, from personal observation, states that Nerún was nearer to Mansúrah than to Debal. At the present day, by the most direct route, viâ Nasrpur, English officials do the distance in three journeys, averaging sixteen to seventeen miles. Thus, as regards distance between given points, the proposed identifications are quite consistent with the data supplied by old writers. Further evidence may be derived from the Chach Namah, a chronicle which treats of events prior to the founding of Mansúrah.

After relating the capture of the fort of Dhalíl, the last of the strong places taken by the Arab army before reaching Brahmanábád, the historian says: "Some relate that when Dhalíl was captured, Muhammad Kásim called for Núbah, son of Dháran, and, after giving him strict injunctions, entrusted to him the charge of the business of the boats, along the bank of the river, from that point to a place called Dúhátí, and from that place to Brahmanábád there was a space of one farsang."¹

There is no place in the neighbourhood of Brahmanábád called Dúhátí, but there is a township named Dúfání, and this I have no doubt is the name intended. A glance at the two names written in Persian shows how easily one might be substituted for the other by a copyist, *دوفانی* for *دوہانی*, in consequence of the dot of the *ف* in the latter word having been placed too close—perhaps joined—to the *ل*, and an extra dot given to the penultimate letter. The township of Dúfání is two miles and a half S.W. from Brahmanábád, and by writers who never employ a fraction this distance would be called a farsang. Now the Arabs were advancing from south to north, and while it would be intelligible that the commander should assign to one of his officers the duty of watching the communication by river up to Dúfání, if that place were *short* of—that is, south of—Brahmanábád,

¹ I have translated this from the copy belonging to the India Office Library. Sir H. Elliot's copy appears to have been defective at this place, and his translation would make it appear that *Dhalíl* was a farsang from Brahmanábád, while the general tenour of the narrative shows that it was at some distance from that place. See his *Hist.*, vol. i. p. 176.

it would have been a useless and absurd proceeding on his part if Dúfání had been some way *beyond* the great fortress, held, as we are told it was, by a strong garrison. Dúfání is four miles N.W. of the place popularly supposed to be the site of Brahmanábád, but which I believe to be that of Mansúrah.

Another piece of indirect evidence from the Chach Námah. It states that when the Arab army left Brahmanábád, its first march was to a place called Mathal (متهل). We are told that it was advancing towards the capital, Alor, by way of the districts of the Sahtá and Samá, that is, through the modern Parganah of Naushahra, in which the Sahtá have had their home from time immemorial. This lies N.W. from Brahmanábád, but it would doubtless be an object to strike the main stream, then flowing in the Luháno (see sketch-map), as soon as possible, consequently the first two marches would be nearly due westward. Now, a little short of seven miles west by south from Brahmanábád, there is a township called Mutahlo (in Persian written متهل), which is most probably the place referred to. The march would be a short one, but this is just what we should expect in the case of an army breaking ground after a detention of many months at Brahmanábád. On the other hand, if the site I assume to be that of Mansúrah is really that of Brahmanábád, the march would be little more than two miles (Mutahlo is two miles and a quarter N.W. from Mansúrah), and so short a move is highly improbable.

From the account given by the Chach Námah it appears that Brahmanábád was on the west side of a stream called the Jalwáli. It is stated that "Muhammad Kásim marched from Dhalíl, and halted on the bank of the river Jalwáli (نهر جلوالی) on the east of Brahmanábád," whence he sent to summon the town. Most probably this was a stream coming from the branch of the Indus now known as the "Eastern Nárah." Portions of a channel which left the Eastern Nárah about twenty-one miles N.E. from Brahmanábád, and took a south-westerly course, are yet to be seen between Brahmanábád and Mansúrah. These I conjecture to be the remains of the Jalwáli channel.

Here we may inquire what led to the ruin of Brahmanábád? All that we know is that when Biládhúri wrote his "Futuh-us-Sindh"—perhaps about 870 to 880 A.D.—Brahmanábád was in ruins, for so he says shortly, and without a word as to the cause of such a calamity. The Arabs, it must be remembered, destroyed none of the places which they captured. Each fortress, as it was taken, received an Arab governor and garrison, and became a centre of civil administration of the kind understood by Arabs, that is to say, a place for the reception of the tribute due from the surrounding district. Brahmanábád was thus treated, but the complete submission of the people on their first experience of Arab prowess was of no long duration, and within two years the native prince, Jesíyah (or Jai Sinh), son of Dáhir, had re-occupied the town and expelled the foreigners. This prince soon afterwards became a Muslim, and he appears to have been allowed by the Khalifah to retain some kind of regal authority, but he was eventually killed in an action with the forces of the Arab governor, who evidently could not brook a rival. The prince's brother was a little later treacherously murdered by the same governor, and with him the native dynasty seems to have ended.¹ But the struggle

¹ Biládhúri calls this prince Sasah (صصه), which is the Arabic transliteration of Chach. He must have been so named after his famous grandfather, the founder of the Brahman dynasty. According to Ibn Khallikan, he was the inventor of Chess (Elliot, *Hist.* vol. i. p. 409). Sir Henry Elliot had evidently forgotten what Biládhúri shows to have been the fact, that there was really a "Chach son of Dáhir," as stated by Ibn Khallikan, and he thought that it must have been Chach, the first Brahman prince, who invented the game. On this point I may observe that, whoever invented the game of Chess, prince Dáhir, if we may credit the Chach Námah, certainly played it, and was much too fond of it. In that chronicle we are told that when the Arabs were preparing to cross the Indus to attack him, Dáhir manifested the utmost indifference to the peril of his situation, so that at last a "Samani" made bold to remonstrate, and roundly charged him with spending his whole time in hunting and Chess when the enemy were almost at the gates. The passage is not among the extracts translated by Sir H. Elliot. It is as follows:

سمني بنزدیك داهر آمد و گفت ای شاه تراهم روز بصید واجب
مشغول می بینم و در شطرنج و نرد بازی مانده و لشکر عرب رسید
و بر دل تو نزول کردند

Among the relics exhumed by Mr. Bellasis from the ruins of the so-called Brahmanábád was a set of ivory chess-men.

for national independence continued, and it would seem that Brahmanábád was never recovered by the Arabs, who, during the reign of the Khalífah Hisham (723–742 A.D.), had to construct, first, the fortress which they named “Al-Mah-fúdhah,” and, afterwards, the more celebrated “Mansúrah,” as places of refuge in the midst of the rebellious Sindhians. From this time nothing more is heard of Brahmanábád. Its name, linked to that of the neighbouring Arab fortress, long survived the ruins of the ancient city, and even at last extinguished the proud title given by the conquerors to their capital. Bahmanah-Mansúrah in process of time became Bahmanah only, and at this day no native of Sindh has any notion where Mansúrah stood: very few are aware that such a place ever existed.

What had happened between the founding of Mansúrah and the period at which Biládhúrí wrote—an interval of about 150 years—to bring about the ruin of Brahmanábád? The stale fiction of wicked prince Dalú Rái and the earthquake has been current for centuries, and has amply satisfied all popular curiosity on the subject. If it were thought worth while to examine a story of such suspicious appearance, it would suffice to observe that an earthquake violent enough to have totally wrecked Brahmanábád must have done as much for Mansúrah. A more prosaic and much more probable cause may be suggested, namely, the failure of the stream on which the city stood. This would do the work of desolation quite as effectually, though less cruelly than it would be done by an earthquake. A similar catastrophe befell Alor, the capital, and there is no reason to seek further for an explanation of the ruin of Brahmanábád. Both calamities, indeed, may have happened simultaneously, in consequence of a sudden change in the course of the Indus above Alor, resulting in the main body of water being forced some distance westward, and the Nárah and Alor channels being left dry.

Let us now turn to Mansúrah. Biládhúrí says this city was built by A'mrú, a son of Muhammad Kásim, the conqueror of Sindh. Its site is described as “on this (the west)

side of the *buhairah*” (دون البكيرة). A little before it has been said that Mahfúdhah was built on the “far side of the *buhairah*” (ورا البكيرة). “Buhairah” is properly “a lake,” but there is no appearance of a lake having ever existed in the surrounding country, and it is probable that what was intended was some old river-channel containing standing water, a common enough feature in Sindh landscapes. Now, at Mutahlo (close to Mansúrah) there was, according to the Chach Námah, “a delightful piece of water (آبگیر) called a ‘*dhandh*,’” on the banks of which the Arabs encamped. *Dhandh* is the Sindhí word for such a pool as I have above described, and it seems probable that Biládhurí and the Chach Námah refer to the same piece of water. On the bank of this Mansúrah was built, and at a later period the hollow was no doubt connected with the river (in the Luháno channel) by means of a canal, for the Arab Geographers describe Mansúrah as encircled by a canal (Khalij) from the Míhrán, so as to make the land in which it stood an island. Of this canal there is now no trace, except at Mansúrah itself, where, on the north side of the ruined fortress, the channel is plainly distinguished. Standing at the north-west angle of the fortifications, one can just see that the channel came from the direction of Mutahlo, though at this point the trace northward gradually fades and disappears.

The old fortress itself is in a better state of preservation than would be expected, considering that its abandonment dates back several hundreds of years. The curtain and bastions are clearly traceable in their entire extent, rising to a height of thirty to forty feet above the level of the surrounding country. There appears to have been an inner citadel, and the whole interior area is a mass of brick heaps, the remains of dwellings which must have held a large population. To the south-east of the fortress, at the distance of about a mile, are the remains of a smaller stronghold, which may have been the Al-Mahfúdhah which was the predecessor of Mansúrah. The country to the north and east of these sites, for a distance of a mile and a half, is

covered with the ruins of small forts and dwellings.¹ Here no doubt, in those unquiet times, many thousands of traders and peasantry gathered for safety, under the shadow of the great fortress. Of the later history of Mansúrah little is known, and of the cause of its abandonment nothing. It appears to have been at the height of its prosperity in the tenth century, when it was visited by Másúdi, Istakhrí and Ibn Haukal. From the commencement of Arab dominion in Sindh, that country, separated by so many leagues of sea, and such vast deserts, from the central power of Islám, became a convenient refuge for the rebellious and the unorthodox subjects of the Khalífah. In the early part of the eleventh century, when Mahmúd passed through Sindh on his return from the Somnáth expedition, a Karmatí was ruler in Mansúrah, and was deposed by the strictly orthodox Ghaznavide. This is among the latest authentic particulars we have of the Arab capital. If Mír M'asúm, the historian of Sindh, is correct in his statement that the rule of the Súmrah chiefs in lower Sindh dates from the reign of Mahmúd's son 'Abd-ur-Rashíd (1049-1051 A.D.), Mansúrah can, by this time, have no longer had a title to be regarded as the capital. The events, indeed, of the reigns of Mahmúd and his successors caused the political current which had hitherto flowed from 'Irák to set in strongly from the north, and Bhakar, which the restless river had now encircled with its waters, and made a position of great natural strength, supplanted the Arab fortress. By 1203 A.D., when Násir-ud-dín Kubáchah took possession of Sindh, Mansúrah had become a place of secondary importance, and was perhaps merely the principal town of a small surrounding district. Its final abandonment I should conjecture to have been occasioned by the drying-up of the Luháno channel, the date of which event is unknown. The failure of this channel would render it quite impossible for a large population to occupy any longer the position of Mansúrah and its

¹ It is possible that Al-Mahfúdhah occupied a position opposite the northern face of Mansúrah. It seems to have been a mere temporary place of refuge, and was doubtless small and poorly fortified.

environs. At the present day, though this part of the country is well fertilized by inundation-canals, the supply of water is very scanty during half the year, and, as a consequence, the tract is but thinly populated. It is popularly believed that the fortress was destroyed by an earthquake, and, indeed, Mr. Bellasis, during his excavations, found evidence of such a catastrophe. It is not unlikely that portions of the town may have been destroyed in this way. The fortifications cannot have suffered materially, their present condition appearing to be rather the result of the wear and tear of time than the consequence of a convulsion of nature. An earthquake may indeed have caused the shifting of the Indus from the Luháno to a new channel. A similar occurrence took place in 1819, when the earthquake, the central force of which was experienced with such terrible results in Kach, occasioned the abandonment of the branch of the Indus running by Sháhbandar. The injury caused by earthquake is in time repaired, but the deprivation of water is irremediable, and in such a case a population has no choice between perishing and migrating. I think, then, that the drying up of the Luháno channel was the effectual cause of the ruin of Mansúr.

The mention of earthquake recalls the legend of Dalú Rai. The name of this semi-mythical prince cleaves to nearly every ruined site in Sindh, and a "mound of Dalú Rái" is met at every turn in the neighbourhood of Brahmanábád and Mansúrah. It is said that after his sins had brought about the ruin of Alor, he transferred his residence and his vices to Brahmanábád, and eventually caused the destruction of his second capital. The earthquake, as we know, is a terribly stale ingredient in the legends of ruined towns, though here there may be a slight foundation of fact for that part of the story. But the character of Dalú Rái seems to me susceptible of rehabilitation. That such a prince lived, and acquired wide-spread fame, good or bad, cannot be doubted. It is a misfortune that he is unknown to authentic history. Some conjecture that he lived in the early days of Arab rule; others would put him so late as the time of 'Ala-

ud-dín Khaljí of Delhi (end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century). What is certain is that the common stories about him are of Muslim origin, and I am disposed to infer that Dalú Rái headed some of the popular risings against the Muslim rulers, and to conjecture that in the obloquy which has been heaped on his name, we may perhaps have a measure of the prince's patriotism and success. Such a treatment of history would be quite in accordance with the methods of Muslim chroniclers, with whom the credit of Islám is the first consideration, and the interests of truth of secondary importance, and it is allowable, I think, to interpret the legend of Dalú Rai in the light afforded by our knowledge of these tendencies.

Leaving the twilight of legend and conjecture, I may pass on to the mention of another identification of some interest, which I think offers fair ground for acceptance. I refer to the site of Sáwandí. This place is mentioned in the legends of the "*Mujmal-al-tawárikh*," as having been built by the King of Kashmír during an expedition to Sindh. The legend is full of absurdities, but we may perhaps safely infer from it the antiquity of Sáwandí. It is twice mentioned in the *Chach Námah*. On the first occasion it is stated that after the capture of Brahmanábád (about the middle of the seventh century), Chach paid a visit to a Buddhist devotee of great reputation, who lived a little way from that town. The devotee, after declining the prince's offer of high dignity in the State, went on to observe: "As your mind is inclined to charitable deeds and the promotion of beneficent works, there is the temple and monastery of Sáwandasí—an ancient place of worship—in which for some time a breach has appeared due to the wear of time. It ought to be repaired," etc. We may suppose that the buildings in which the devotee was interested were somewhere in the neighbourhood of his residence, and therefore not far from Brahmanábád. Now the Mathal which I have identified with Mutahlo is described as being "in the environs of Sáwandí," and near Mutahlo (about a mile east of it), there is a mound, perhaps a square mile in area, evidently the site of some long ruined

town. This I take to be the site of Sávandí, and I would suggest that Sávandí may be the *O-fan-cha* of Hiouen Thsang, which Stanislas Julien renders by *Avanḍa*. As the pilgrim cared for nothing but what was Buddhist, he would be more likely to visit a town containing at least one ancient temple and monastery, than one abounding with Brahman abominations.¹ The distance from Pi-ta-shi-lo—if that represents Nerún—suits quite well. In a direct line it is forty-five miles, but, as the pilgrim travelled, it would be over fifty miles. At the conquest Sávandí received an Arab Governor. Nothing more is said of it.

In the accompanying sketch-map, the line which I conjecture the Mansúrah canal (Khalij) to have taken is shown to leave the Luháno channel about twenty miles N.W. from Mansuráh. At this point there is a township called Kalro, which extends for a few miles east and west of the Luháno. Idrísí says that at one day's distance from Mansúrah, at a place called Kálari, the river sent off a branch to Mansúrah. This place may have been in the township above mentioned, but the names given by the old geographers are evidently terribly corrupted, and identifications based on them can hardly be satisfactory.

One other place in this neighbourhood I mention for the purpose of pointing out a mistake made by others regarding it. This is Manjábarí. I am not able to identify this place with any existing site; but we have two indications from the Arab geographers which will guide us to its situation approximately. Ibn Haukal says it was west of the Mihrán, and opposite to Mansúr, at the point where travellers to the latter city from Debal crossed the river (Elliot, vol. i. p. 37). Idrísí says the distance from Sharusán (Sehwan) to Manhábarí (Manjábarí) was three days' journey (ibid. pp. 79, 80). A point opposite to Mansúrah is about sixty to sixty-four miles from Sehwan, so there can be no doubt that the site may be fixed within a short distance of accuracy. But Idrísí goes on to say that Manhábarí is

¹ General Cunningham, it will be remembered, considers *O-fan-cha* to be *Brahmanábád*.

only two days from Debal, whereas, by his own statement of the distance from Sehwan to Manhábárí, the latter could not have been less than five or six days from Debal. The fact is, as will be seen by comparing the account of the different geographers, there were two places of this name, or, at least, nearly similar in name, and the geographers got confused about them. There was the town above described, and another (sometimes called Manhátar), two days *west* of Debal, on the road to Makrán. Idrísí himself says: "In going from Debal to Firabuz (in Makrán) the road passes by Manhábárí." This settles the question, but General Cunningham, misled by the confusion of the geographers, has identified Manhábárí with Thatha, and he considers, too, that it was probably the Indo-Scythian capital Minnagar. If he were again examining the question, he would doubtless admit that this identification cannot stand.

I have only further to point out that in the sketch-map there will be noticed the traces of a channel taking a south-easterly course, that apparently came from Mansúrah. I have not myself seen this remnant of an old branch of the river, but it is shown in the Survey-maps. Al-Birúní says that at Mansúrah the Indus divided into two branches, one of which went east (south-east) to the borders of Kach. This is not consistent with the accounts of the older geographers, but there is no doubt that the latter gave a very imperfect description of the river, as they make no mention of a great eastern branch, which, nevertheless, we know existed. Indeed, several ancient channels taking this direction are still traceable from middle and lower Sindh to the Ran of Kach, and a portion of one of these is shown in the map a few miles south of the old channel to which I have been referring, and which I think may have been an affluent of the eastern branch described by Al-Birúní.