

in contexts where one would expect the reverse, must indicate a lowering of the latter's status, who by then had lost many of his duties. It is hard to believe that Ibn Zaydūn, appointed by Abu 'l-Walid Ibn Dīahwar to "enquire into certain affairs of the *dhimmis*" (Ibn al-Abbār, *I'tāb al-kuttāb*, 212-13), can have had the title of *kūmis*. Indeed, if he had really fulfilled this role, it would have been indicative of a profound change, since Christians would have become subject to a Muslim and not to one of their coreligionists. It is very possible that Ibn al-Kallās, *kabir al-mu'āhidin* of Granada in 1125-6, at the time of Alfonso the Warrior's Andalusian expedition, was *comes* of the Mozarabs (*Ihāfa*, 113, 116). The disorders of the period of *fitna* [q.v.], conducive to rebellions, the emigration of native Christians to the kingdoms of the north, and the severities of the Almoravids and Almohads, explain the silence of our sources for the later periods.

The term *kūmis* was applied not only to the head of the Mozarabs, however, but also to the counts of the Christian kingdoms. Ibn Ḥayyān (*Muḥtabas*, v) says that Ordoño II rallied for warfare all his counts at the siege of Evora in 301/913. He gives this title to the counts of Alaba and Dīallīkiya, to the Banū Gūmis and Banū Anshūr, and cites by specific name Sandjo b. Gharsiya (Banbalūna), Fardhīland b. Ghundishalb (Kashṭiliya), Barmundh b. Nuño (Shalamanka), Abu 'l-Mundhir (Gormaz), Fortūn b. Gharsiya known as Amāt al-*kūmis*, Rudhmīr al-*kūmis* alias Ibn Mamma Ṭūta, the counts Manyūra and Falīn, and above all, al-*Kumṭ kūmis Djarisha*. At the time of al-Hakam II (*Muḥtabas*, vi), the same author gives this title to Bon Filyo, Gundishalb b. Munyo, Esimeno b. Gharsiya and Ashraka b. 'Umar b. Dāwūd. Ibn Khaldūn, in his chapter in the *K. al-'Ibar* on the Christian kings of Spain, speaks of Fernan Gonzalez and Garcia Fernandez *kūmis Alaba wa 'l-Kīla'*, Menendo Gonzalez *kūmis Ghāliisiya*, Henry of Burgundy, and the Banū Gūmis and Banū Fardhīland, as well as Alvar Fañez. Ibn Bassām spoke in ca. 1020 of the *kūmis* Raymund, lord of Barcelona. Speaking of events from the beginning of the 6th/12th century, Ibn Khaldūn uses *kumṭ*, *akmāt* for Raymond of Burgundy, Don Nuño (Gonzalez de Lara) and Henry of Trastamara. The *Vocabulista* attributed to R. Martí gives *kumṭ*, *akmāt* as the equivalent of *comes*; P. de Alcalá has *conde o condesa* = *cōnd*, *aqnāt*; whilst the *Fragmento . . . reyes nazariés* published by Müller and re-edited by Bustani-Quiros (Larache 1940) translates "count" by *kundī*.

Bibliography: In addition to sources mentioned in the article, see Fr. Simonet, *Glosario de voces ibéricas*, Madrid 1888, 125-6; idem, *Historia de los mozárabes de España*, Madrid 1903, 111-13; Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. mus.*, iii, 218-19; A. Fattal, *Le statut légal des non-musulmans*, Beirut 1958; A. S. Tritton, *The caliphs and their non-Muslim subjects*, Oxford 1930; I. Cagigas, *Los mozárabes*, Madrid 1947-8; E. P. Colbert, *The martyrs of Cordoba (850-859)*, Washington 1962; *Bol. R. Acad. Cordoba*, lxxx (1960), dedicated to St. Eulogius; J. Gil, *Corpus scriptorum Muzarabicorum*, Madrid 1973. (P. CHALMETA)

KŪMIS, a small province of mediaeval Islamic Persia, lying to the south of the Alburz chain watershed and extending into the northern fringes of the Dasht-i Kavīr. Its western boundaries lay almost in the eastern rural districts of Ray, whilst on the east it marched with Khurāsān, with which it was indeed at times linked. It was bisected by the great Ray-Khurāsān highway, along which

were situated the chief towns of Kūmis, from west to east *Khuwār* or *Khawār* (classical *Χοαρωνή*, modern Aradūn), Simnān [q.v.], Dāmghān [q.v.], and Bisṭām [q.v.], whilst at its south-eastern extremity, out in the Great Desert, was the small town of Biyār [q.v. in Suppl.], modern Biyārdjumand. The administrative capital of Kūmis was Dāmghān, which is often accordingly called in the sources *Madīnat Kūmis* or *Shahr-i Kūmis*, according to a well-known toponomastic process (cf. the town of Bardasir/Kirmān). The name Kūmis is obsolete today, and the lands making up the mediaeval province are included administratively in the *farmāndāri-yi kull* or governorate of Simnān and the *ustān* or province of Māzandarān. The present-day town of Shāhrūd, just to the south-west of Bisṭām, does not seem to have been in existence as such in mediaeval times.

The province was one of considerable importance in pre-Islamic times. In Greek sources it appears as *Κωμισσηνή*, and in Armenian writers like Sebeos and Moses of Khoren as *Komsh*. H. W. Bailey, in *JRAS* (1970), 61-2, has suggested that the name derives from an Old Ir. root *ka-*, *kaur-*, conveying the idea of "hollowness", plus a passive or agental suffix, whence *Komish* "opened up, excavated place". Seleucus Nicator seized the satrapy of Parthia between 311 and 302 B.C., and it was allegedly he who founded the "city of a hundred gates", Hecatompylos, although it almost certainly existed before then; a legend retailed in the 8th century A.D. Middle Persian catalogue of the towns of Iran says that Kūmis "the five-towered" (*panj-burg*) was built by the sorcerer Azh-i Dahāk, whilst from later Islamic times, Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Nuzha*, 161, tr. 157, attributes the building of Dāmghān to the hero Hūshang. Such classical authors as Strabo, Pliny, Ptolemy, etc. mention Hecatompylos as the royal city of the Parthians, and some of these sources give the distance of the city from the Caspian Gates (e.g. Strabo, 1260 *stadia*, and Pliny, 133 *milia passuum*; the consensus of modern opinion tends to identify the Caspian Gates with the Sar-Darrah defile through the Kūh-i Namak spur of the Alburz). But the site was never properly identified with any reasonable certainty, although it was thought that it probably lay somewhere between the towns of Dāmghān and Shāhrūd, until recently, however, Hansman and Stronach have examined and excavated the site of the modern spot called *Shahr-i Kūmis*, near Kūsha to the south-west of Dāmghān on the Simnān road. It seems that this very extensive site could well be the ancient Parthian capital, apparently largely abandoned around the middle of the 1st century B.C. when the Arsacids moved their winter capital to Ctesiphon. See A. D. Mordtmann, *Hekatompylos*, in *SB Bayer. Akad. der Wiss.*, Phil.-Hist. Cl. (1869), 497-536; Pauly-Wissowa, xii/2, cols. 2790-7, s.v. (Kiessling); Markwart-Messina, *A catalogue of the provincial capitals of Ērānshahr*, Rome 1931, 12, 55-6; R. N. Frye, *The heritage of Persia*, London 1962, 183-4; J. Hansman, *The problems of Qūmis*, in *JRAS* (1968), 111-39; idem and D. Stronach, *Excavations at Shahr-i Qumis*, 1967, in *JRAS* (1970), 29-62; idem, *A Sasanian repository at Shahr-i Qumis*, in *ibid.*, 142-55; S. Matheson, *Persia: an archaeological guide*, London 1972, 191-2.

In Sāsānid times, there seems to have been a refounding of *Kōmish*, perhaps by Yazdagird I (399-421) as a defensive post against the Turks and Hephthalites [see *ḤAYĀṬĪLA*] who were threatening the north-eastern frontiers of his kingdom. The region