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ABSTRACT

A NUMISMATIC HISTORY OF SOUTHEASTERN CAUCASIA
AND ADHARBAYJAN BASED ON THE ISLAMIC COINAGE OF THE
5TH/11TH TO THE 7TH/13TH CENTURIES by Dickran Karnick
Keuymjian

The study is a numismatic history of five Islamic
dynasties which flourished in southeastern Caucasia and
Adharbayjan from the Seljuq invasion to the Mongol con-
quest of the Middle East, that is roughly from the mid-
5th/11th to the mid-7th/13th centuries. It is based on
the corpus of coins of each of the dynasties, which are:
the Shirvanshahs; the Maliks of Darband; the Ildegizids,
atabegs to the Seljuqs of Iraq; the BishkInid Maliks of
Ahar at Ahar now in Iran; and an unidentified vassal of
the Ildegizids.

The characteristic features of this coinage are
its almost exclusive copper composition, its careless
minting, and its purely epigraphical legends. These
qualities separate it from the coinage of the neighboring
Islamic areas. In the adjacent regions of eastern Ana-
tolia, though the coinage was also exclusively copper, it
was fairly carefully and regularly struck and usually
carried some anthropomorphic or zoomorphic motifs; in cen-
tral and western Iran, though strictly representational,
it was usually regular and gold was struck as well as copper.
Because of these distinct numismatic features the area and
the dynasties under consideration represent a geographical and historical unit.

Some of these coins were struck "regularly", i.e., approximately round and originally intended to carry a complete die impression, while others were struck "irregularly", i.e., extremely diverse in shape and size and almost never bearing a full die impression. The Ildegizids and the Maliks of Ahar, both located to the south of the Araxes River, struck the former type; the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvānshāhs, situated north of the Kur River, struck the latter, irregular type. With the exception of those of the Maliks of Darband, the overwhelming majority of coins lacks the mention of a mint name or date.

Throughout the work the numismatic tradition and political history of the neighboring Christian Kingdom of Georgia and the Seljuq Sultanate of Iraq, situated to the northwest and southeast of the region respectively, are referred to; the economic and political relations of the five dynasties with these neighboring powers is discussed and analyzed.

Chapter One lists and evaluates all references to these dynasties in the medieval Islamic and Christian (Armenian, Georgian, Syriac) sources, which are shown to be inadequate for a comprehensive history of these dynasties with the possible exception of the Ildegizids. Therefore, the numismatic evidence proves to be indis-
pensible for an accurate, if still incomplete, history of these dynasties. The chapter also contains a review of all previous numismatic and historical literature on the subject.

Chapter Two presents an historical and numismatic background to the problem with emphasis on Seljuq institutions and select numismatic questions of the period, such as the so-called "silver crisis", irregular copper coinage, mints and coin hoards.

The next five chapters are devoted to the corpora of the respective dynasties. Each one is preceded by an introduction and followed by a short conclusion and a genealogical table. Within the corpora proper each important coin or issue is followed by an historical and numismatic commentary in which new information presented by the coinage is discussed and evaluated.

A concluding chapter contains observations on the political history, the social and economic structure, and the monetary circulation of the area based on the numismatic evidence presented in the study. At the end there is a map, photographs of selected coins from each of the corpora, and a bibliography.
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<td>n.a.</td>
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<td>obv.</td>
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</tr>
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<td>rev.</td>
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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

For Arabic and Persian the system of transliteration used has been that of the Encyclopaedia of Islam with some modifications. The underlining of double consonant forms has been dropped, i.e., dh is represented by dh. The c and j are represented by j and q, the c by a c raised one half space above the line, and the hamzah by ' . Compounds with Allāh have usually been rendered as one word, e.g., lilāhilāh. Certain frequently used nouns have been purposely left without markings or allowed to stand in their Western form. They are Seljuq for Seljūq, Turkoman for Türkoman, Kipchak for Qipchāq, Tabriz for Tabrīz, Baghdad for Baghdād, Iraq for Įrāq, Islam for Islām, caliph for Khalīfa, atabeg for Atābahk, sultan for sultan, and vizir for wazīr. However, when such words have been translated directly from a source or a coin, the exact transliteration is used.

For Armenian the standard Hübßmann–Meillet transliteration has been employed with certain modifications adapted to the standard typewriter keyboard. The inverse circumflex has been replaced by an ' over the letter, e.g., ژ, Զ, Հ, and Զ are ژ, Զ, Հ, and ژ respectively.

The Library of Congress system of transliteration has been followed for Russian with the following changes. The Ь has been changed from Ь to ь, and the Ъ to ьа without the
connecting segment above, i.e., ğa. Turkish words have been left in their modern orthography with the accommodations ğ for ğ, ğ for â, and commas for the cedillas in the letters ç and ş.

A final note on usage, the medieval city of Baku is spelled with the long vowels while the modern city is in its Russian form. The same distinction is made with Darband and the modern Derbend and Adharbayjan and the Soviet Republic of Azerbaycan.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to bring to the history of southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjān from the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th century all information which can be obtained from the Islamic coinage struck during that period and in that area. It is a numismatic history based on the corpora of all known coins of five dynasties. The initial task and basic research of the study, and, therefore, its core, is the identification and classification of several thousand unpublished and published coins. The resultant corpus is a body of specialized numismatic data; this in turn is explained and interpreted. Therefore, the preparation of the corpus, its explanation, and the historical, economic and social interpretation of the data in this study constitutes its thesis.

In this work southeastern Caucasia¹ and Adharbayjān signifies the geographical area south and east of the

---
¹The area bounded on the north by the Caucasus, on the west and on the east by the Black and Caspian Seas, and on the south from west to east, Anatolia (Asia Minor), Syria, Mesopotamia, and Iran, it is marked by a cultural and historical unity and individuality of its two parts Armenia and Georgia which distinguish it from the neighbouring areas. I have adopted this usage and terminology from Cyril Toumanoff who points out the cumbersomeness of the term "Ciscaucasia" and both the awkwardness and the late Russian imperial expansionist point of view of "Transcaucasia." See a full discussion in C. Toumanoff, "Introduction to Christian Caucasian History," Part I, Traditio, XV (1959), p. 2 and n. 1.
Caucasus extending from the city of Darband in the north to Marāgha in the south, from Dvin in the west to the Caspian Sea in the east. This region encompasses the 'Abbāsid provinces of Sharvān (including Darband), Arrān, Mūqān, the eastern tip of Armenia (Armeniā) lying north of the Araxes River, and Adharbayjān. The period covered is roughly from the arrival of the Seljuq in the latter half of the 5th/11th century to the definitive Mongol, i.e.

2 Known to the Arabs as Bab al-Abwāb, the Gate of Gates, because of its natural mountain barrier reinforced by the construction in Sasanian times of walls and fortifications extending into the Caspian Sea. It served as both the frontier and gateway between the northern nomadic steppe zone and the settled Middle East. The modern Derband, spelt in its Turkish vocalization, is the capital of the Dagestan Autonomous Region of the U.S.S.R.; see W. Barthold's article "Derband" in EI².

3 To the east of Lake Urmiya, it is now in Iran; see W. Barthold's article "Marāgha" in EI².

4 Known to the Arabs as Dabīl, it was the capital of the province of Armeniā situated north of the Araxes River. The ancient site now in Armenia S.S.R. has been recently excavated. See K. Yafadaryan, Dvin k'ala'k' eyn parenumere (The City of Dvin and Its Excavations), I, (Erevan, 1952), and, Kh. Mushegian, Denizhnoe ebrashchennie Dvina po numizmaticheskim dannym (The Monetary Circulation of Dvin according to Numismatic Data), (Erevan, 1962).

5 The area which lies north of the River Kur beginning from the confluence of the Iora River to the Caspian Sea.

6 Arrān lies on the south bank of the Kur up to its confluence with the Araxes; Mūqān is east of Arrān still on the south bank of the Kur extending to the Caspian.

7 See V. Minorsky's article "Adharbājījān" in EI². For the whole geographical layout see G. Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate (London, 1905), map I.
Il-Khānid, occupation of the area in the mid 7th/13th century, about 200 years.

The Islamic dynasties whose numismatic corpora will be presented in this thesis are the Ildegizid atabegs, the so-called Kasrānid branch of the Shirvānshāhs, the Malik of Darband, the Bīshkīnids (also referred to as the Malik of Ahar), and a still unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids. These will be discussed in detail in the introductory remarks preceding each corpus. However, since most of these dynasties are unfamiliar even to Middle East historians, a few comments will be made to facilitate the reading of the introductory chapters. The Darband Malik and the Shirvānshāhs took their names after the regions they ruled. The Bīshkīnid Maliks of Ahar as mamlūks (military slaves) to the Ildegizids had as fief an area west of Ardabil and north of Mt. Sabalan with the city of Ahar as its capital. The locality of the

---

8 The Mongols in Iran were called Il-Khāns after the title of Hūlāgbā, a grandson of Chingiz-Khan, sent as governor of Iran by his brother Mengü, the Great Khan, in 652/1256; for a discussion and references on the title see *Atš-Malik Juvaini, The History of the World-Conqueror*, trans. J.A. Boyle (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), Vol. II, 632, n.55.

9 If not the actual capital certainly the city where the dynasty's coins were minted. The city is in present day Iran mid-way between Tabriz and Ardabil.
unknown vassal of the Ildegizids probably should be looked for in Mūqān as will be discussed later. The Ildegizids themselves had Arrān and especially Adharbayjān as their power base including the cities of Tabrīz, Ardabīl and for periods Marāgha, Mazijavan\textsuperscript{10} and even Dvin. After 555/1160 when as atabegs to the Seljuqs of Iraq they became the power behind the sultanate, they had virtual control of all of al-Jibal, including the main cities of Rayy, Hamadān and Isfāhān.

The selection of this geographical area and these dynasties was made in the following manner. An examination of the Islamic coinage of all minting authorities in eastern Anatolia, northern Syria, Caucasus, upper Mesopotamia and northwestern Iran during the 6th/12th and first quarter of the 7th/13th centuries showed the overwhelming majority\textsuperscript{11} of coins to be copper issues. These in turn fell into two

\textsuperscript{10} Arabic: Makhjuwān, on the north bank of the Araxes now in the region of the same name within the borders of Armenia S.S.R., but belonging to Azerbaycan S.S.R.

\textsuperscript{11} More than 95%, the exceptions (to be discussed later) being base gold issues of the Seljuqs of Iraq and the Ildegizids; the former fall outside the central area of this study and the latter are exactly three in number. There are also some dozen silver coins of the Shirvanshahs from the 5th/11th and the very early 6th/12th centuries, which along with the Ildegizid gold, are included in the corpus.
discernable categories: a representational group portraying human and/or animal forms and a purely epigraphical group. The former were further differentiated by their generally regular size and shape and nice striking, while the latter were usually irregular in size and shape and very poorly struck. These distinctions will be examined in more detail in the body of this study, but for our present purpose they are important because the two categories separated themselves geographically. The coinage of southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan without a single exception was non-representational; that of eastern Anatolia, northern Syria, and upper Mesopotamia was for the most part representational. Therefore, the research project started by an examination and classification of all purely epigraphical copper coinage of the 6th/12th and early 7th/13th centuries which happened to coincide with all Islamic coinage of southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan.

These coins originated from the five dynasties enumerated above. There were in fact other Islamic dynasties in the area during this period, the Shaddādids of Ganja.\(^{12}\)

---

and Ani\textsuperscript{13} and the Ahmadīs of Marāgha,\textsuperscript{14} but their numismatic tradition is either unknown or limited to one or two recorded examples.\textsuperscript{15} Therefore, solely on the basis of numismatic evidence in the 6th/12th and the early 7th/13th centuries this area forms a single unit striking irregular, epigraphical copper coinage.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} Ani was the capital of the Bagratid Kingdom of Armenia situated on the right bank of the Araxes; its ruins are now on the Turkish side of the Turko-Armenian frontier. The Shaddādīs began to rule in Ani after its capture by Alp Arslān in 456-7/1064. For this branch of the dynasty see also Minorsky, "The Shaddādīs of Ani," part II of \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 79-106.

\textsuperscript{14} The dynasty takes its name from a Turkish (Oghuz-/Turkoman ?) mamluk of Ahmadī b. Ibrāhīm (a Kurd by origin) with the name Āq-Sunqur, who because of this relationship was known as "al-Ahmādīf." Marāgha was the capital of the dynasty which also controlled Tabriz for much of the 6th/12th century. See Minorsky, "Marāgha," \textit{XI}, "Ahmadīfīs," \textit{XI}.

\textsuperscript{15} For the Shaddādīs of Ganja we know three rulers who struck coins few of which have survived; see E. de Zambaur, \textit{Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie (Wahnsin;}, 1927), pp. 184-5; for the Ani branch there have been no coins published thus far. What may be the first known numismatic specimen from this dynasty, a copper of Minūchīhr b. Abūl-Aswār, is discussed in the corpus of the Shirvānshahs, \textit{infra}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{16} The Christian Kings of Georgia in neighbouring central and western Caucasus minted bilingual (Georgian and Arabic) coppers and the Seljuqs of Iraq also struck some copper pieces. Though these are really outside the geographical area of this work, they will be discussed for comparative purposes in the chapter on the numismatic background.
However, this numismatic unity, based perhaps on
an arbitrary system of consolidation, is not paralleled by
a similar uniformity in other features of these dynasties.
Ethnically they seem to have quite different origins.
Shams al-Din Ildegiz, the founder of the Ildegizid dynasty,
was a Kipchak Turkic 17 Mamlûk. 18 The Bishkinids are reputed

17 On the Kipchaks (Qipchaqs) see V. Minorsky, Rûdûd
al-Čâlam (London, 1937), pp. 315-317. Terms such as Kipchak
and Oghuz/Ghuzz (see infra, n.20). Turkic were originally
ethnic or tribal denominations which have since become
linguistic labels. On phonetic grounds the Turkic languages
can be divided into an eastern and western group. The
western was historically important, but today is only
represented by the small Chuvash group of Orthodox Christian
Turks in central Russia. The more important eastern
group is composed of the Turki, Oghuz, Kipchak, Sayan and Yakut
Turkic languages. The last is confined to a small group in
northeastern Siberia and stands linguistically apart from
the other four. The Sayan group is also small and usually
associated with Buddhist elements. In terms of their
historical role the three most important groups are the
Turki Turks, to which belong the historical Uighurs and
Uzbeks; the Kipchak Turks including the Kirghiz, Khazar
(though among Turkologists there is still not complete
agreement), Pechenegs, Kumans, the Golden Horde, Kipchaks
proper, and Mamlûk Dynasty of Egypt; and finally the Oghuz/
Ghuzz, which number in their ranks the Seljuqs, the Safavids,
the Ottomans as well as the various Turkoman (see n.20)
tribes. The Oghuz and Kipchak Turks are the only groups which
had a significant effect on the Middle East in our period.
For a concise statement on the Turkic languages and their
literature see T. Halasi-Kun's introduction to J. Németh,
Turkish Grammar, trans. T. Halasi-Kun ('S-Gravenhage, 1962),
pp. 13-18. For the division of Turkic languages today with
bibliography see J. Bensing, Einführung in das Studium der
Altaischen Philologie und der Turkologie (Wiesbaden, 1953).

18 For Shams al-Din's Kipchak origin see S. Lane-
Poole, The Mohammadan Dynasties, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1925),
p. 171; M. Bala, "'Il-Deniz," IA.
to have been of Georgian origin, while the other unidentified vassal of the Ildegiside may be of Oghuz/Turkoman Turkic origin. The Malik's of Darband were Arabs, though later they

19 Qazwini, *Muzkat al-Qulub*, ed. G. Le Strange, Gibb Memorial Series, XXIII (London/Leiden, 1919), p. 82; see the introduction to their corpus for a full discussion.

20 The Turkoman (also Turkmen) were of Oghuz (referred to as the Ghuzz/Ghuz in the Arabic and Persian texts respectively) origin; see n. 17 supra. The distinction between the two usages is by no means clear in the early sources. According to Claude Cahen the term Turkoman designated those Oghuz who were descendents of groups which followed the Seljuqs from Transoxiana (the area north of the Oxus/Syr Darya) into Iran even if they later abandoned the Seljuqs to go off on their own into Asia Minor. Oghuz referred to all others, especially those who stayed on in Central Asia. Later in the 6th/12th century and afterwards the term Turkoman became generalized to apply to all Oghuz tribal units, usually nomadic, in the Middle East; see C. Cahen, "Ghuzz," El2. The same author's latest word on the Turkoman question is that it is a term "...obscure alike in origin and meaning, which designates the nomadic Muslim Turks, contrasting them on the one hand with the sedentarized Turks and on the other with those nomads who had remained unbelievers," *idem*, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, trans. J. Jones-Williams (London, 1968), p. 8. There is a generally accepted theory that the home-base of the Turkomans after their migration into the Middle East was in Adharbayjan, precisely the area under consideration in this work; see most recently Cahen, *idem*, p. 33, and more generally the section "The Seljukid Empire and the Turks" in *idem*, pp. 32-50. On the general subject of the Oghuz and the Oghuz Turkomans see also I. Kafesoglu, "A propos du nom Türkmen," *Oriens*, XI (1958), pp. 146-150, in which the author suggests that Turkoman is a political rather than ethnic term; and also F. Sömer, *Oguzlar (Türkmenler)* (Ankara, 1967), an exhaustive historical study.
adopted a Turkic veneer by the choice of their names. The Shirvānshāhs were also originally Arabs, but later became Iranized.

Further, there is a dissimilarity in the dimensions of the political sovereignty of each dynasty. The Maliks of Darband controlled a single city; the Bīshkīnids, several towns clustered around Ahar. The Shirvānshāhs controlled a whole province, while the Ildečizids the provinces of Arrān and Adharbayjān with suzerainty after 555/1160 over most of al-Jibāl. We cannot say what territory was under the control of the unidentified dynasty. The longevity of each dynasty also varied. As will be shown later only the Shirvānshāhs existed both prior to the Seljuq invasion and after the Mongol occupation. The other four originated in Seljuq times and pass out of existence just before or during the devastation of the area by the Khwārazmshāhs, Jalāl

---


23 Khwāram is the fertile delta area formed by the Oxus River (Amu Darya) where it empties into the southern part of the Aral Sea. Khīva is its most famous city and the Khwārazmshāhs reigned from the 5th/11th century until they were destroyed by the Mongols. For a comprehensive study see I. Kafesoğlu, *Haremsahlar Devleti Tarihi* (485-617/1092-1229) (Ankara, 1956).
al-Dīn, in the first quarter of the 7th/13th century. Again, in their relations with non-Muslim powers our dynasties display divergent attitudes. The Ildegizids had hostile relations with their Christian neighbours despite the praise they receive for their benevolence from some Armenian historians.\footnote{Mit'ar Gol in his Chronicle says that Ildegiz put an end to the troubles in Arrān and stopped the looting in Caucasian Albania; see the translation of the text in C.J.F. Dowsett, "The Albanian Chronicle of Mit'ar Gol," BSOAS (1958), p. 488. Vardan calls Ildegiz (Eltkuz), along with two other Muslim rulers, "lover of Christians and (one who) causes a country to flourish (K'ristoneaser ev akrabaten.") Vardan Vartapet, Hayak'wayn Patmut'yan (Universal History), ed. (Venice, 1862), p. 124. For friendly relations between the Armenians of Siunik' (Arrān) and the Ildegizids see Stephanos Orbelian, Patmut'yan nabangin Sisakan (History of the Province of Siunik'), trans. M. Brosset, Histoire de la Siounie (St. Petersburg, 1864), pp. 195, 222-223. See also the remarks by H. Mamandian, The Trade and Cities of Armenia, trans. M. Garsoian (Lisbon, 1965), p. 182, and Kumakan tesut'yun bay alov'i dia patmut'yan (Critical Survey of the History of the Armenian People), Vol. III (Erevan, 1952), p. 106; and further remarks by Dowsett, ibid., n. 6, pp. 487-8.} We have no concrete evidence of contacts between the Bishkūnids or the unidentified vassal with Christians. Both the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvānshāhs had marital and other connections (to be discussed later) with the Georgians.\footnote{For details see the respective corpora; according to Ibn al-'Athīr, al-Kamil, ed. Tornberg, XII, p. 160, even the Ildegizid Abu Bakr married the daughter of a Georgian King, but the Georgian sources are apparently silent on the matter, see the reference in V. Minorsky, "The Georgian maliks of Ahar," BSOAS, XIII/4 (1951), p. 873.}
Yet in spite of these differences our dynasties can be treated as a unit. By the mere act of minting coins they all expressed some degree of political autonomy, for in Islam the two traditional ways of demonstrating sovereignty were the mentioning of the ruler's name in the khutbah and the striking of coins. Thus, these dynasties form a unit because of their geographic proximity, their common Islamic religious affinity, and their independent sovereign authority.

For the Middle East as a whole, the political unity brought to it by the Seljuq conquest was to come to an end after the death of Sultan Malikshah and his Persian vizir Nizam al-Mulk in 485/1092. By the beginning of the 6th/12th century the empire was already breaking up into numerous self-governing areas. This disintegration and its consequences will be discussed in a later chapter. The broad pattern of events was that on the one hand rulers from the indigenous populations of more remote areas of the empire were able to realize various degrees of autonomy and on the other Seljuq princes and Seljuq affiliated

---

26 *A special homily and prayer usually delivered at a cathedral mosque by an official preacher (khattab) before the midday prayer on Fridays, see A.J. Wensinck, "Khutbah", EI 1.

military chieftains were able to carve out independent domains throughout the empire. By the end of the century this trend had reached its maximum proportion, but was then reversed in the 7th/13th century by the succession of the Khwārazmshāh and then the Mongol invasions.

The major part of the study will deal with this complicated 6th/12th century, when the remarkable proliferation of dynasties produced a confused and complex historical tradition. After enumerating and identifying the various sovereign forces operative in that century, there will be an endeavour to simplify some of the historical problems through an examination of the numismatic evidence to establish as clearly as possible the de jure and de facto sovereign authorities and determine the relationship of one

28 A third event which took place just after the death of Malikshah, but which was not directly related to it was the phenomenon of the Crusades, the first of which began in 489-490/1096. Though their effect was considerable along the Mediterranean coast and northern Syria, the Crusades had no effect on our dynasties. For an exhaustive treatment of the Crusades in the Muslim east see C. Cahen, La Syrie du nord à l'époque des Croisades (Paris, 1940); see also the articles by C. Cahen and H.A.R. Gibb in A History of the Crusades, ed. K. Setton, Vols. I and II (Philadelphia, 1955 and 1962).

29 By the 6th/12th century is meant the period up to the arrival of the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn in the first quarter of the 7th/13th century.
to another. In the first three centuries of Islam, the orthodox caliph, first in Medina, then Damascus under the Umayyads, and finally, at Baghdad under the Abbāsid, was the supreme political and religious authority in all the lands of Islam. The weakening of the Abbāsid Caliphate in the 3rd/9th century still left the caliph *de jure* sovereign, but *de facto* authority was in other hands, at first the all-powerful Turkic bodyguard, and later the Shi'ite Iranian Buyid dynasty. The Seljuqs, as self

---

30 They were brought in, in great numbers, from Central Asia as purchased slaves or captives of war to take the place of the Persians and remnants of the Arabs in the standing army of the caliph. By the beginning of the caliphate of al-Mu'tasim (218/833-228/842), they had become the most powerful element in the army and were soon to direct the political affairs of the Abbāsid caliphate. This pattern of a Turkic mamluk army which eventually obtained military and then political control of their original master's state was to be repeated many times in the subsequent history of Islam. On this general question see R.N. Frye and A. Sayili, "Turks in the Middle East before the Seljuqs," IOAS, LXIII (1943), 194-207, and, S. Handi, *Die Entstehung und Entwicklung des türkischen Einflusses im Abassidenreich*, unpublished thesis (Tubingen, 1954) (reference from B. Spuler, *The Muslim World*, Part I, trans. F.R.C. Bagley (Leiden, 1960), p.62, n.1.

31 The family which took control of the Dailamite dynasties of Iranian origin from the southern Caspian province of Dailam around the year 308/920. The name originates from Buya, the father of three sons who began successively taking control of the important cities of al-Jibal and Iraq, culminating in the occupation of Baghdad in 334/946. In time they too were to fall under the control of their Turkic army, but in name at least were able to keep control of the caliphate until the arrival of the Seljuqs in 447/1055. This period when the independent Iranian Samanid dynasty (to be discussed later) was in control of Khorasan and Transoxiana and the
appointed saviours of the orthodox Sunni caliphate, maintained the fiction of this de jure sovereignty, while subtly changing the function of the office to a predominantly religious one, gathering for themselves de facto and to some extent a newly justified de jure political authority under the enhanced title of sultan.

During the Seljuq decline two sultanates were formed, one in Khorasan, one in al-Jibal. The former had precedence over the latter, therefore creating an echelon of authority starting with the caliph as token leader of all Islam, then the sultan of Khorasan with the title the Supreme Sultan (sultan al-a'zam), and finally the sultan of Iraq (al-Jibal), the Exalted Sultan (sultan al-mu'azzam). As the 6th/12th century grew older a fourth level was added when atabegs and other Seljuq military leaders gained authority over or independence from their masters. Finally, as in the case of the Buyid in control of Iraq and Iran has been labeled as the Iranian Intermezzo by J. Minorsky. See V. Minorsky, "La domination des Dailamites," Publications de la Société des Etudes Iraniennes, No. 3 (1932), 26 pp., reprinted in Idem, Iranica, (London/Teheran, 1964), pp. 12-30; and now the excellent article by C. Cahen, "Buwayhid or Buyid," EJ2.
achieved a fifth level in the chain of sovereign authority. In addition to a consideration of the question of authority, the economic and social relationships among the five dynasties and between them as a unit and their neighbours will be studied. However, it must be emphasized that it is not the intent of this study to present a systematic historical account of these dynasties, for our present knowledge of them is still too incomplete for such an undertaking. In the following chapters the sources will be discussed and the historical and numismatic background presented.

32 However, by the time the Buwayhids achieve autonomy in the late 6th/12th century the Seljuq sultanates have disappeared, replaced by the Khwarezmshahs who assumed the title of sultan, but played no role in the affairs of southeastern Caucasus until the arrival of Jalāl al-Dīn in the first quarter of the next century.
CHAPTER ONE

THE SOURCES AND LITERATURE

In this chapter the primary written sources including epigraphy and the secondary literature, historical and numismatic, will be discussed and evaluated. The sources are arranged according to language: Islamic (Persian and Arabic), Georgian, Armenian and Syriac. The first of these is by far the largest group and will be sub-divided according to type, e.g. historical, biographical, poetical.

I. THE ISLAMIC SOURCES: ARABIC AND PERSIAN

The principal sources for the Islamic dynasties of southeastern Caucasian and Adharbayjân are the Muslim writers of the 5th/11th to the 8th/14th century. However, it must be stated at the outset that for our purpose they are fragmentary and full of lacunae. They are exclusively written in Arabic or Persian, there being no relevant sources in Turkish for the period. ¹ Arabic and Persian sources will be

---
¹Even though a Turkic language was unquestionably, the everyday speech of the Seljuqs and the Ildegizid ababegs, Arabic and especially Persian were the official languages of the court and literature of these dynasties. There was an Islamic Turkic literature as early as the 5th/11th century among the Qarakhanids whose state included both sides of the Altai Mts. in Central Asia, but none of the three major works (the Divan Lughat at-turk by Mahmud of Kashgar, the Gutağtu Bilik of Yusuf of Balasaghun, and the mystical poems of the
treated together since no valid distinction in grouping can be made between them. For instance even though the court poets of the Shirvānshāhs wrote principally in Persian in the 6th/12th century, the only narrative history treating this dynasty is the 5th/11th century Arabic Ta'rikh al-Tabar.\(^2\) Since most of the sources are narrative histories written for the caliph in Baghdad or the Seljuq sultan, minor dynasts are only mentioned if they should affect or be effected by events around the sultan or the caliph.

The Islamic sources fall into several categories. Narrative histories of a general nature represent the bulk of these; local histories, biographies, diwāns (collections) of court poets, travel accounts, and geographical works make up the rest. Correspondence and documents, especially the

\[6\text{th}/12\text{th century Ahmad Yasavi}\] concern us. Turkic literature begins anew in the 8th/14th century, but again it is beyond the scope of this study. The best general work on Turkic literature is A. Bombaci, Storia della Letteratura Turca, trans. I. Melikoff, Histoire de la littérature turque (Paris, 1968); for the qarakanids see Chapter VII, pp. 65-89. See also T. Halasi-Kun, op.cit., p. 17; and, C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 11-13.

\(^2\)See infra, nn. 40-45.
insha' collections, though they contain some indirect references to the Iraqi Seljuqs, they contain nothing directly concerning our dynasties.

In the following discussion emphasis will be on material directly pertaining to the dynasties in this work. Two of these, the Bishkinds and the unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids, lack any direct source. Therefore, the latter will not enter into the subsequent discussion, and the fragmentary references to the former will be mentioned in passing.

A. General Narrative Histories

The only narrative source for the history of the Shirvanshahs is the 5th/11th century Ta'rikh al-Bāb, which has not come down to us, but which has been preserved in the Jami' al-duwal, an Arabic work by Ahmad ibn Lutfullāh

---


4 Also referred to as Ta'rikh Bāb al-abwāb (Minorsky, Sharvan, p. 2) and Ta'rikh al-Bāb wa Sharvan (ibid., Arabic text, p. 1).
Mūnejjim-bashī, d. 1113/1702. Until recently the work was only known in a Turkish abridgement of 1142/1730 by Ahmad Nādīm entitled Sāhīf al-akhbār. Mūnejjim-bashī states that the Ta'īrīkh al-Bāb was compiled in Darband circa 500/1106, but the events in it only reach the year 468/1075. The Arabic text of the section of the Ḥamīfa-al-duwal comprising the Ta'īrīkh al-Bāb has been published with translation and copious notes in two separate studies.

The Ta'īrīkh's account of the Shirvānshāhs begins with the founder of the dynasty, the amīr Yazīd b. Mazyād, in the 2nd/8th century and continues to the time of Farībūrz b. Sallār, the third quarter of the 5th/11th century.

---

5 Even the Arabic original said to be the author's (Mūnejjim-Bashī's own draft), seems to abridge the original Ta'īrīkh al-Bāb: see V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History (London, 1953), p. 4. The MSS are listed in Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 1. The Turkish abridgement was published in Istanbul, 1285/1868.

6 Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 41, text p. 16.

7 V. Minorsky, Studies, op. cit., deals with the section on Arrān, i.e., the Shadādids of Ganja and Ani, and, Sharvān, op. cit., with Darband and Sharvān.

8 His son Afrīdūn is actually mentioned as succeeding his father, but the date is not given, Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 41, text p. 16.
rich history is full of details on monetary matters while describing the Seljuq conquest of Caucasus. Unfortunately, the Ta'rikh al-Bab stops just short of the important and fully independent period of Shirvānshāh rule. Munejjim-bashī tries to fill in the dynasty's genealogy during the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries, but he has no reliable guide like the Ta'rikh al-Bab and, therefore, produces a confused and inaccurate list of rulers.9

Likewise, the sections in the Ta'rikh on Darband (al-Bab) and a half century before the rule of the Maliksh of Darband. There is not even a "confused" genealogy to fill the gap, for Munejjim-bashī was seemingly unaware of these rulers. In fact there is not a single source directly concerned with the events in Darband for the whole of the 6th/12th or 7th/13th centuries; the same is true for Shirvān.

Other important Muslim narrative sources of the 6th/12th to the 8th/14th centuries are those which discuss the events of the Seljuqs of Iraq.10 After the mid 6th/12th


10Also sometimes referred to as the Seljuqs of Iran. In reality they are the Seljuqs who controlled the province of Al-Jībāl which included territory of both Iran and Iraq.
century this part of the Seljuq family falls under the control of their Ildegizid atabegs. Therefore, the history of the latter is sprinkled throughout the history of the former. Unfortunately, there is no work devoted specifically to the Ildegizid atabegs like Ibn al-Athîr’s history of the Zangid atabegs of Mosul (Mawsil). The work closest to a history of the dynasty is the Arabic Akhbar al-dawlat al-saljûqiyya attributed by Muhammad Iqbal to ‘Alî ibn Masîr al-’Rusaynî. The work was probably composed by some one who was very close to the Ildegizids. It is a general history of the Seljuqs, but only the last third discusses the Seljuqs of Iraq and the Ildegizids. The narrative ends at 590/1193


13 The first part of the work from the death of Malikshah in 485/1092 to 547/1152 is borrowed, with acknowledgement, from İmâd al-Dîn al-İsfahâni’s Nusrat al-fatra, which will be discussed shortly; see Cahen, Ibid., p. 70, and idem, Syrie du nord, Op.cit., p. 50.
though the text continues to the first quarter of the 7th/13th century. Most of the information in this section is first hand and original, with many details about the campaigns of the Ildegizids against the Georgians and about events in Adharbayjān and Arrān. However, there is not more than the mere mention of Shirvān and nothing at all about Darband. Unfortunately, the Akhbār suffers from confused chronology and the survival of a unique manuscript (B.N., 2145).

The Persian Bābat al-sudūr by Muhammad al-Rāwandī is rich with material on the Ildegizids, though there is almost nothing on either the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvānāshāhs. Al-Rāwandī, a native of al-Jibāl, was a close friend of the last sultan of Iraq, Tughril b. Arslānshāh (d. 591/1194), and was in a position to witness the events of the latter part of the 6th/12th century. The second part of the Bābat, especially the events of 555/1160-595/1199, is the original work of Rāwandī; for the prior period, including the history of the Great Seljuqs, he

---


15 For the details of his life see Iqbal’s introduction, Turkish ed., pp. XIII-XVIII.
reproduces the *Saljūq-nāmah* of *Zāhīr al-Dīn Mīshāpūrī*.

The latter was himself the tutor of Sultan Ārsānshāh (555/1160-571/1176) and provides an outline of his reign.

Rāvandi is overloaded with verse and excessive moralizing which greatly reduces the work’s utility as an historical source.

The Arabic *Musrat al-katra* by ʿImād ad-Dīn (519/1125-597/1201), already discussed as a source for the *Akbār* (supra, n.13), comes down to us in an abridged form, the *Zubdat al-musrah* by al-Bundārī.

ʿImād ad-Dīn was in the service of the Seljuqs of Iraq for about ten years until 560/1165, after which he left Iraq and entered the service of the Ayyūbids.

Despite his long winded style, there is

---

16 The original text, long thought lost, has now been published by Gelāleh Khāwar (Tehran, 1332/1953).

17 See the long discussion in Cahen, "Historiography," op. cit., pp. 73-76.


20 See Houtsma’s introduction; Cahen, "Historiography," pp. 68-69; Luther, 279-280. The original of ʿImād al-Dīn’s *Musrat* has come down to us (MS, B.N., Arab 2145); for an interesting comparison of it to al-Bundārī’s version, see Cahen, p. 68, n.14, and *Idea, Syrie du Nord*, pp. 50-53.
much material on Shams al-Dīn Ildgiz. Once again there is only a passing reference to the Shirvānshāhs and nothing on the Malikis of Darband.

The universal history, al-Kāmil fi al-ta'rikh, of Ibn al-Athīr\(^\text{21}\) is of course useful for the period. Although the focus of attention in the 6th/12th century is on the events around the Ayyūbid and Zangid abegs in western Iraq and Syria, much interesting material is to be found on dynasties in this study. al-Kāmil was finished in 619/1222; it covers events up to the arrival of Jalāl al-Dīn Khwārazmshāh. Of particular interest are the descriptions of several campaigns of the Ildgizids and the Seljuqs of Iraq against the Georgian Kingdom and a very interesting passage on "Darband of Sharvān" in the first quarter of the 7th/13th century. Most of the material related to events in Adharbayjān and more northerly provinces are scattered and isolated. Taken as a whole, Ibn al-Athīr, though often very biased and seldom citing his sources, is a critical historian who tries to understand

---

\(^{21}\) Ed. C.J. Tornberg, Ibn-al-Athiri Chronicon, 14 Vols. (Leyden/Upsala, 1851-76). For translation of passages of interest to Caucasus and Adharbayjān see C. Defrémery, "Fragments de géographes et d'historiens Arabes et Persans inédits", JA, Series IV, Vol. XIV (1849); extracts in BCH, Historiens Orientaux, I (1872), II (1876); most recently P.K. Zhuze, Materialy po istorii Aserbaidzhana is Tarikh-al-kāmil' Ibn-al-Asira (Baku, 1940).
the motivation behind events in history. 22

The Ta'rikh-i guzida compiled in 730/1330 by the Persian Hamdullah Mustawfi al-Qazwini23 has a long section of the Seljuqs of Iraq. Qazwini's source was probably either the Râhat al-sudur by Rawandi which terminates at 595/1199, or, Mishapuri's Saljuknamah also used by Rawandi. 24 The narrative on the Ildegizids terminates around 590/1194 with the death of Sultan Tughril b. Arslanshah and the mention without details of the deaths of the Ildegizids Abû Bakr and his brother eUzbek in 607/1210-11 and 622/1225 respectively. 25 The Ta'rikh-i guzida also contains one of the rare references to the Bishkînîd Malik of Ahar in which the Georgian origin of the dynasty

22 Francesco Gabriesi remarks, "He remains... perhaps the only real historian of Islam in the earlier Middle Ages," see "The Arabic Historiography of the Crusades," in Lewis and Holt, op.cit., p. 104. See also Cahen, Syrie du nord, pp. 58-59.


24 Sanaullah, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

is given. On the Shirvânsâhs and the Maliks of Darband there is nothing.

The two great Persian historians on the Mongols, Čâtı-Malik Juwainî and Rashîd al-Dîn, have details of interest to us during the period of Jalâl al-Dîn, the first quarter of the 7th/13th century. Juwainî's Ta'rikh-i Jahân-Gushâ, written from 650/1252 to 658/1260, contains details on the fall of the Ildegizid dynasty and the last of the Bîshkinids. Since he was appointed by the Il-Khânîd Hûlâyî as governor of Baghdad and its surroundings, he unquestionably had access to documents and histories in the possession of the caliphate. In addition there are passing references to Shirvân, Darband and Georgia. The Jâmi' al-Tavârîkh of Rashîd al-Dîn has a section on the Seljuqs,

---

26 Ibid., p. 441; the same material but in more detail is given by Nasawi, Sirat, ed. Houdas, p. 18 (for full citation see below and for complete details see the Introduction to the Bîshkinid corpus).


28 The duties of his office finally forced him to put aside work on the history. For the details on his life and work see the introduction to Boyle's trans., pp. xv-xxxv, especially p. xxv.

29 Part I, ed. and trans., E. Quatremère, Histoire des Mongols de la Perse (Paris, 1836) is of no interest to this work. For reference to the ed. and tr. by I.N.Berezin
"Tawārīkh-i-Ṯāle-Ṣeljuq," which has much information on the Seljuqs of Iraq and the Ildegizids, but it is directly drawn from the Ṣahābat al-sūdūr of Ṣawāniḍ or from the latter's source, the Saljūqnamah, and therefore, contains nothing new.31

Finally there are a large number of narrative histories which mention in passing one or more of our dynasties or the Seljuqs of Iraq. Those from later centuries (after 7th/13th) are derivative, using one of the above mentioned sources for their information on our period. These works will only be listed here; full citations will be given as they are used in the corpus and in the bibliography. They are Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam fī Taʿrīkh (events up to 573/1177 mostly centered around Baghdad); Sibt ibn al-Jawzī (Syrian of the 7th/13th century, the son-in-law of the former), Mīrāt al-zamān; al-Mhamāvī (d. 1252), al-Taʿrīkh al-Mansūrī; Abu'l-Fidāʾ (d. 732/1331), al-Muntazam fī taʿrīkh al-baṣhar; Ibn Khaldūn (732/1332-1858) see Boyle, p. xiiiv; for Part II, ed. E. Blochet, CMS, XVIII (London, 1912). For a new trans. by the Russians, Sbornik istorii, I/i, A.A. Khetagurov, I/ii, O.I. Smirnova (Moscow, 1952).


31 Samsullah, p. xxvii.

B. Local Histories

Because of its importance to the history of Shirvān and Darband, the Taʾrīkh al-Bāb has already been discussed above. There is also a collection of poems, letters and a narrative for Shirvān and Arrān, especially the city of Baylaqān, for the end of the 5th/11th century by an official of the latter city, Maṣʿūd b. Nāmdār, a Kurd by birth.32 Ibn al-ʿAthīr's famous study on the Zangid atebegs of Mosul, Taʾrīkh al-dawlat al-atābakiyyah: Muḥāfaẓ al-mawṣīl,33 which covers the same period as the last books of his al-kāmil, though often with different facts contains many details on Ildegizids. The Taʾrīkh Mayyāfāriqīn by Ibn Azraq al-Fāriqī (510/1117-572/1176)34 discusses Georgia's relations with

32The B.N. MS has now been completely rearranged and analyzed with an excerpt and translation of the text by V. Minorsky and C. Cahen, "Le Recueil Transcaucasien de Maṣʿūd b. Nāmdār," JA, CXXVII/1 (1949), pp. 93-142.

33Ed. and trans., "Histoire des Atabeks de Mossoul," RCC, Historiens Orientaux, II (1876); see also Cahen, Syrie du nord, p. 58.

34The section for the years 559/1164-571/1175-6
Shirvān and hostilities against Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz. The author was in the service of the Georgian King Dimitri in the years 548-9/1153-4, during which time he accompanied the king of Darband. In describing his visit he identified the ruler of the city as Malik Muṣaffar, a very important fact for the history of the Maliks of Darband.35 Ibn Isfandiyār's Ta'rifk-i Tabaristan (first quarter of the 7th/13th century) has interesting material on the later Ildegizids and the Seljuqs of Iraq.36 Finally, though not of much direct use for our dynasties, the Badā'ī al-azmān fi vaqā'ī Kirman (events up to 612/1215) by Afdal al-Dīn Kirmani37 is important for relations between the Seljuqs.


35 Minorsky, Sharvan, p. 139 and p. 170.

36 The first part is available in an abridged trans., E.G. Browne, History of Tabaristan, CMS, III (London, 1905); however, the more interesting second part is only available in the ed. by A. Iqbal with few notes and no index (Tehran, 1320/1902-3 ?), see Luther's remarks, p. 281.

37 Ed. M. Bayani (Tehran, 1326/1908); see comments by Cahen, "Historiography," p. 76 and Luther, p. 282.
of Iraq and the Seljuqs of Kirmān.\textsuperscript{38}

C. Biographies

Nasawī's biography of the Khwāramshāh Jalāl al-Dīn, \textit{Gīrat al-sultān Jalāl al-Dīn Manguberī},\textsuperscript{39} has the most detailed account of the last days of the Ildegizid and Bishkīnid dynasties. The author who died in 647/1249, was the secretary of the Khwāramshāh and provided a direct account for the years 615/1218 to 629/1231. The text and translation are based on a single manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale.\textsuperscript{40} Another biography, Juwainī's \textit{Jahān-Gushā}, is more a history than a biography and, thus, has been discussed above.

D. Geographies

Two geographical works afford some minor data, but little which is not already available from other sources.

---

\textsuperscript{38}A city and province in southeastern Iran, where a prince of the Great Seljuq dynasty, Qawurt b. Chagri Beg, had already by the 430's/1040's carved out an independent Seljuq state which was to last for almost 150 years; for details see Cahen, \textit{Pre-Ottoman Turkey}, p. 22; S. Lane-Poole, \textit{The Mohammadan Dynasties}, p. 153; I. Kafesoglu, "Selçuklular," \textit{IA}, Vol. 10, pp. 378-379.


\textsuperscript{40}"The French translation...teems with misunderstandings and needs a thorough revision," Minorsky, \textit{"Caucasica II"}, \textit{BSOAS}, XIII/4 (1951), p. 868, n.2.
Yaqūt's Maqām al-buldān⁴¹ written about 621/1224, has some fragmentary comments on the Shirvānshāhs and Bīshkīnids. The Mubtāt al-qulūb of Qazwīnī⁴² (d. 740/1340) is a late Il-Khānīd source with interesting sections on Adharbayjān, the tūmān (district) of Bīshkīn, Shirvān, Darband, Arrān, and other areas of Caucasia. Its greatest use is the comparison of the revenue from each province and district of the Il-Khānīd empire with the tax collected in Seljuq times.

E. Travel Accounts

The Spanish traveller Abū-Hāmid al-Andalusī al-Gharnātī (d. 565/1169-70) visited Darband some time between 524/1130 and 545/1150.⁴³ In his Tuhfat al-Albāb⁴⁴ he

---


⁴³ Minorsky, Shirvān, p. 139.

mentions the name of the Malik of Darband, which along with Ibn al-Azraq's testimony (supra p. 12) helps us establish the line of these rulers. As an example of negative evidence, demonstrating the remoteness of this area from the caliphate, another Spanish traveller to the Middle East, Ibn Jubayr, visited then Baghdad between 578/1183-
581/1185, but does not mention a single person or place from southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan, not even the Seljuqs of Iraq.45

F. The Divans of the Court Poets

This material is especially important for the history of Shirvan in the 6th/12th century when Minuchihr II graced his court with Persian poets; of these two most famous were Falaki-i Shirvan and Khagani.46 Their


46 One of Minuchihr's royal titles was Khagani, thus Khagani, the poet of the Khagan; his real name was Afdal al-Din Ibrahim Badil b. 'Alf Shirvani, see Ahmed Ata, "Hakan!", IA. A third poet in the court was Abu'l-Cai, regarded as the teacher of the other two; for an important surviving fragment in the Haft Iliam (dated 1002/1593-4; MSS, B.M., Or. 203 and Or. 4902) by Amin Ahmad-i Bazi, see Hasan, Falaki, "Appendix," pp. 95-96.
Divāns (collected poems) are full of historical references not only of importance to the Shirvānshāhs, but also to the Ildegizids, the Maliks of Darband, and the Georgians. The historical data in their poems have been the subject of several important studies. To a lesser extent the famous Mīzāmī's works are helpful; his Laylá va Majnūn was dedicated to Akhsātān b. Mināchihr II, while his Khusrav va Shirīn and Iskandarpānah were dedicated to the Ildegizids Muhammad Pahlavān and Abū Bakr respectively.

The Ildegizids and their overlords the Seljuqs of Iraq had also a large number of panegyrists besides Mīzāmī; unfortunately, they have not received any systematic study from an historical point of view. Their divāns may prove to be a fruitful source for this period. The following list

---

47 For Falaki, Divān-i-Falaki, ed. H. Hasan, Royal Asiatic Society (London, 1930); for Khācānī, "Falātīt-i-Khakānī" ( Lucknow, 1295/1876), and more recently, Divān, A. A. Abdorrasuli (Tehran, 1316/1937-8).


49 Mīzāmī flourished from the mid-6th/12th to the early 7th/13th century. For his life, works (including editions and translations) see Ahmed Atşe, "Mīzāmī," IA.
is neither complete nor detailed, but gives some idea of what is available for study. ʿImādī-ı Shahriyārī, Dīvān (MS, B.M., Or. 298) was a panegyrist of Muhammad Pahlavān b. ʿIldegis; Ṭūhrīr al-Dīn Akhshākī, Dīvān (MS, B.M., Or. 268), panegyrist of Qīṣī Arslān b. ʿIldegis and Sultan Arslānshāh b. Ṭūhrīr; the brothers Ẓahīr al-Dīn and Ẓahar al-Dīn Shuhrūwah (MS, India Office, no. 240 for the former; no reference for the latter), wrote for sultans Arslānshāh b. Ṭūhrīr II and Ṭūhrīr III b. Arslānshāh; Ẓahīr al-Dīn Pārīyābī, Dīvān (MS, B.M., Add. 19, 498) was the court poet of ʿAbū Bakr the ʿIldegisid.50

Finally, the Lubāb al-ʻAlbāb51 of the poet from Transoxiana, ʿAwfī (572/1176–635/1232–3), has a section on the Seljuqs with information on the ʿIldegisids, and, the Tadhkīrat al-Shuʿarāʾ (of 892/1487)52 of Dawlatshāh contains many interesting excerpts from poets like Pārīyābī with details on the ʿIldegisids.

50 Ed. (Tehran, 1324/1906). The manuscript references for these poets were taken from Hasan, Fālsāfī, Dāsim.


52 Ed. E.G. Browne, The TadhkīratuʿAb-Suʿarāʾ (*Memoires of the Poets*) (Leyden/London, 1901). Like ʿAwfī, Dawlatshāh was from Transoxiana, but Samarqand instead of Bukhārā like the former.
G. *Collections of Sources*

There are several collections of Islamic sources relative to southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjân. The long article by C. Defrémyer\(^ {53} \) already cited (supra, n.21) has relevant passages from Ibn al-Athîr, Ibn al-Jawzî, and Ibn Khaldûn. Sections XIII, XVII, XXII, and XXXIII of M.F. Brosset, *Additions et éclaircissements à l'Histoire de la Géorgie*,\(^ {54} \) contains extracts from Arabic and Persian sources. The four volumes of M.Th. Houtman's *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Salioucides*,\(^ {55} \) are not all useful for this study, but these authors which are, have been discussed under "General Narrative Histories" above. The *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Orientaux*,\(^ {56} \) contains some important texts and excerpts, such as works by Ibn al-Athîr, with translations. Finally,

\(^ {53} \) "Fragments de géographes et d'historiens arabes et persans inédits, relatifs aux anciens peuples du Caucase et de la Russie méridionale, traduits et accompagnés de notes critiques," *JA*, Series 4, XIII-XVII (1849-1851).

\(^ {54} \) St. Petersburg, 1851; for full citation see the next section on Georgian sources.

\(^ {55} \) *Vol. I*, *Histoire des Salioucides du Kermân par Muhammad Ibrahîm* (Leyden, 1886); *II*, *Histoire des Salioucides de l'Irân* d'après Maâd ad-Dîn al-Kâtîb al-Islâhî, abridgement by al-Bundârî (1889); *III*, Turkish adaptation of Ibn HBî by Yâsîji-oğlu (1902); *IV*, *Histoire des Salioucides d'Asie Mineure d'après l'abrègé du Salioucidesgah d'Ibn HBî* (1902).

there is M.A. Karaulov's rare Information of Arab Writers concerning the Caucasus, Armenia and Adharbayjian (in Russian). 57

II. THE GEORGIAN SOURCES

The principal Georgian source for the whole medieval period is the Georgian Royal Annals ( Kartlis C'xovreba), a collection of histories. 58 There are various recensions including an Armenian translation of the 6th/12th to 7th/13th century. 59 The most famous redaction of King Vartang VI (1703-1761) has been edited and translated by M.F. Brosset in his monumental Histoire de la Géorgie depuis l'antiquité jusqu'au xix siècle with a volume of Additions et Éclaircisse-

57 Svedeniia arabskikh pisatelei o Kavkase, Armenii i Azerbeidzhanе, Sbornik materialov dlia opisania nasposob i plemen Kavkaza (Collection of Material for the Description of Places and Peoples of the Caucasus), Vols. XXIX (1901), XXX (1902), XXXII (1903). I have not been able to make use of the copy of this work supposedly in the Yale University Library. See also the handy guide on the Arab sources, Z.M. Buniistov, Obzor istochnikov po istorii Azerbeidschana: istochniki arabskie (Outline of the Sources concerning the History of Adharbayjian: the Arab Sources) (Baku, 1964), 36 pages.


59 Juaqser, Yrač patav'tiwn (History of Georgia), ed. (Venice, 1884).
ments. The Annals are an invaluable source for our whole
period and all the dynasties whose coins are treated in
this study. The Bishkhinid Maliks of Ahar and the
Ildegizids are discussed in relationship to military
hostilities carried out against the Georgians, while the
Maliks of Darband and especially the Shirvanshahs both
with Georgian matrimonial ties, are regarded almost as
cousins.

Other Georgian sources might prove interesting
if they were more accessible. An excellent list of them
with editions and translation (in so far as they exist)
is given by Toumanoff in the work cited supra, n. 58.
One notes for instance the 7th/13th century Khwarazmian
Invasion of Georgia by Abuserije, Bishop of Tbet'i, which
is available only in an old Georgian edition. Like the

60 Part I, Books 1 and 2, Ancient History until 1469
(1849–1850), Georgian text; Part II, Modern History 1469–
1800 (1854), Georgian text; trans. Part II, Books 1 and 2,
with additions in each, Modern History (1846, 1857);
Additions et éclaircissements, for the Ancient History
(1851); Introduction et tables de matières (1858); in all
nine volumes, a reprint of which is announced. For a
complete table of contents of all volumes see M. Miansarov
(Miansareanç), Bibliographia Caucasica et Transcaucasica,
Tom' I, Otd'ly I i II (all published), (St Petersburg,
1874–1876), pp. 564–578. The work is in French, Russian and
Armenian; reprint (Amsterdam, 1967).

61 Ed. in T'. Zordania, Chronicles and Other Materials
for the History of Georgia (in Georgian), 2 vols. (Tiflis,
1892–1897), Vol. II.
divine of the poets discussed in the last section, the
Georgian material could contain new and interesting
historical information on the dynasties in this work.

III. THE SYRIAC SOURCES

The Syriac chronicles, so useful for the history
of the Crusades, Zangids, Ayyûbids, Great Seljuqs, Seljuqs
of Rûm, and Mongols, are disappointing for events in
Caucasia and Adharbayjân. The two important sources for
our period are the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian
(520/1126-595/1199) reaching the year 592/119662 and the
Chronography by Gregory Aḥū 'ʾl-Faraj, called Bar Hebraeus
(Arabic: Ibn al-Ṭbrî), (622/1225-685/1286), continues the
narrative to 685/1286.63 There is an early abridged version
of Michael the Syrian with a short continuation by the
Armenian priest Isahak to 646/1248.64 It has a very confused

62 Ed. and trans. (partial), J.B. Chabot, Chronique
de Michel le Syrien, 4 vols. (Paris, 1899-1910); for Russian
trans. of sections dealing with Adharbayjân, see Guseinov
(Huseinov), op.cit. (infra, n.133), pp. 25-52.

63 Ed. (facsimile) and trans., E.A. Wallis Budge,
The Chronography, 2 vols. (London, 1932); Arabic abridgement
by the author, Ibn al-Ṭbrî, ed. A. Salihani, Taʾrīkh
mahkhtasar al-duwal (Beirut, 1890); Russian trans. (excerpts),
Guseinov, ibid., pp. 64-89.

64 Mik'ayêl Azori, Patmûtsîvû ikanaktsarakan
(Chronicle History) (Jerusalem, 1871), trans., Victor
Langlois, Chronique de Michel le Grand (Venice, 1868), and
also in HPC, Documents arméniens, Vol. I.
allusion to Ildégiz and some poor bits on the Seljuq sultan Mas'ūd b. Muhammad; the Syriac version contains little more.

The generally rich Chronicle of Bar Hebraeus has scatterings of details of relations between the 'Abbāsid caliphate and the Seljuqs of Iraq from 516/1122 to 575/1180. Then two or three more elaborate scraps, but not more than a few lines each, about the Ildégizids Pahlavān and his sons Abū Bakr and Qutlugh Inānj. The sections on the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn are fruitless for our purposes and dwell particularly on the lasters' involvement in the affairs of the city of Akhlāt. Perhaps one should not expect more from a Christian living and writing near Māvṣīl. There is no mention of events in Shirvān and Darband, and hardly anything on the Christian kingdom of Georgia.

IV. THE ARMENIAN SOURCES

The late 5th/11th century writer Aristakes Lastivertci (464/1071) relates the taking of Ani by Sultan Alp Arslān in 456/1064, but unfortunately nothing about Seljuq relations with the Shirvānshāhs.65

---

century sources, so useful for the southern areas of Armenia, are disappointing for eastern Caucasus and Adharbayjān. The Chronicle of Matthew of Edessa (Ματθαῖος ἔρεως) from 341/1952 to 531/1136 with a continuation by Gregory the Priest (Γρηγόριος Πρίγγας) to 563/1168 has accounts of the Georgian raids against Arrān, Shirvān and Ani in circa 518/1124 and 557/1161-2. Though Ildəqiz was involved in the latter episode, he is not mentioned by name and likewise there is no mention of other personalities in this study except for Seljuq sultans of Iraq in passing. Samuel of Ani’s (Σαμουήλ Ανετι) Chronology to 575/1179 with an anonymous continuation to 759/1358 has some abbreviated notices on Georgian-Muslim conflicts mentioned by Matthew.

The most interesting 6th/12th century source is the incomplete Chronicle of Mət’ar Goš. It was written


67 Zarmakagruzt’ ina (Chronology), ed. A. Tər-Mərt’čan (Vagharšapat, 1893), ed. (extracts) and Fr. trans. in BHC, Doc. arm., I; Latin trans., J. Zohrab and A. Mai (Milan, 1818); Fr. trans., M.F. Brosset, Collection d’historiens arméniens, Vol. II (St. Petersburg, 1876).

68 The text is given in Z. Alişan, Hayapatu, patmɔt’ ina Hayec (History of the Armenians), Vol. II (Venice, 1901), pp. 276-278 and 338-353. There is now an English translation with introduction and elaborate notes by C.J. F. Dowsett, “The Albanian Chronicle of Mət’ar Goš,” BSOAS, XXXIII (1958), pp. 472-490. The appellation “Albanian” (Arm.: Mət’ar) is Dowsett’s; the work has no title and was appended to the same author’s Dastanagirk (Book of the Tribunals) in a Venice MS, see ibid., p. 473 for details.
circa 580/1184, but relates events in Arrān, especially the city of Ganja (Arm.: Ganjak), in great detail from about 533/1139 to 557/1162. Relations between Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz and the Ahmadīf atabegs (supra, "Introduct."), n.14) are discussed as are those between these two atabeg dynasties and their Iraqi Seljuq overlords. Ildegiz's rise to the leadership of the Seljuq domains is presented in most clear terms. The narrative breaks off abruptly with the Georgian-Muslim raids and counter-raids in the area in 557/1162.69

Mention has already been made of the Armenian abridgement of Michel the Syrian with continuation (supra, n.64) and the Armenian adaptation by Juañīr of the Georgian Annals (supra, n.59). For the 7th/13th century the History of Kirakos of Ganja (Ganjakeçî), 70 a narrative to 663/1265, though rich about events in Ganja is disappoint- ing for our purpose. Beside the Khvārasmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn, there is no mention of persons in this study. There is the occurrence of the name Bešken, not the same as our Bīshkīn, but of interest to the general questions of the latter name.

---

69 The work is furthermore full of personalities, mostly Turkic, not found in other sources, see ibid., p.475.

On the other hand Vardan Vardapet, an exact contemporary of Kirakos (both died in 670/1271), has written extensive passages on Ildegiz and his two sons Pahlavan and Qiz Arslan and their relationships with the Seljuqs of Iraq and the Shaddadids of Ani (supra, "Intro.," n.15) in his _Universal History_ to the year 663/1265. Vardan must have had access to a history of the period which has not come down to us. Stephen Orbelian (Step'annos Orbēlean) seems also to have had access to an earlier source which may or may not have been the same. In his _History of the Province of Siunik_ written in 697/1297 the Ildegizids have a prominent place in the events from 540's/1150's to the 580's/1180's. Like Hrit'ær Goš and Vardan, Stephan has kind words for the atabegs on several occasions. What is unique in his account is the relationship, friendly and protective, of the Ildegizids toward the Princes of the

---


72 For ed. and trans., see supra, "Intro.," n.24. Both Step'annos and Vardan may have had access to the now lost _History of the Origin of the Turks_ by Vardapet Yovhanan Sarmawag who died circa 523/1129. For details on his life and work see G. Z(arshambeleian), _Haykakan bprut'ean patmut'iyan_ (Literary History of Ancient Armenia) 2nd ed. (Venice, 1897), pp. 606-616, esp. p. 609.
house of Siunik. There is also a curious reference to an Abriton "who ruled the Persians and Georgians and Albanians," which could be an exaggerated allusion to Afrîdûn b. Farîbûrû, Shirvânsâh at the end of the 5th/11th century, q.v., the Corpus. Beside this there is, as with Kirakos and Vardan, no mention by name of a Shirvânsâh.

An anonymous chronicle of the late 6th/12th or perhaps early 7th/13th century, recently published, also considers Ildegiz along with the Shâh-i Armen (6th/12th century Muslim rulers of Akhlat) and Saltûq, ruler of Erzerûm (d. 560/1165), as philo-Christians. Another very

73 Ildegiz sent an army with Liparit Orbëlean against the Georgian King, but upon its defeat Liparit and his son Elikyû take refuge with the Ildegizids Pahlavan and Qizl Arslân; the date for this is around or after 573/1177 two years after the death of Ildegiz, but this mistake in chronology does not take away from the importance of the content. See ed. K. Shahnazaryan, Vol. II (Paris, 1859), pp. 136-138, trans., Brosset, pp. 221-222; cf. V. Minorsky, "The Prince Orbeli in Persia," "Caucasia II/2," BSOAS, XIII/4 (1951), pp. 874-877.


75 Ananûn jamanakârût'yun (Anonymous Chronicle), ed., H. Manvelyan and H. Abrahamyan (Erevan, 1940); but see more recently V. A. Hakobyan, Manûr jamanakârût'yunûn XIII-XVIII dd. (Minor Chronicles of the XIII-XVIII Centuries), Vol. II (Erevan, 1956), No. IV, pp. 115-172.

76 Ed. Hakobyan, p. 134; cf. supra, "Introd.", n.24, for the statement of Vardan.
short anonymous chronicle shows Ildegiz still alive in
571/1175, laying siege to Ani; the same notice also rightly
indicates that the Seljuk sultan Arslânshâh b. Tughril
(though not named) was also still alive. 77

A search through the published colophons of
Armenian manuscripts has turned up little. A 5th/11th (?)
century manuscript has the spelling Siruan (pronounce:
Sirvan) 78 which will prove interesting to a later discussion. Another dating from 574/1178-9 79 refers to qizi
Arslân and Liparit together confirming the testimony of
Step'anos Šrbešlan, supra, n. 73. Some early 9th/15th
century colophons are also interesting for the confirmation
of the name B̄ešken (B̄shk̄in) among Siunik' princes. 80

77Nakobyan, II, No. XXIV, pp. 499-504. The entire
chronicle takes up two MS leaves, four pages. The narrative
ends at 572/1176; curiously the last year given is 619 A.D.
as the year when Muhammad (Mehmet) appeared, p. 502. Ildegiz
died at the end of this same year; this is one of the few
sources, Armenian or non-Armenian, which is accurate on this
point; see for instance Hakobyan's own note, p. 504, n.18,
where following Lane-Pool, Dynasties, he states Ildegiz is
dead by 568/1172 and suggests the anonymous chronicler is
in error.

78Garegin I Kat'oykos (Yossep'ean), Višatskarank'
jeragrâc (Colophons of Manuscripts), Vol. I, Fifth Century
until 1250 A.D. (Ant'ilius, 1951), No. 76, Col. 191; cf.,
Šrben, No. 75, Col. 180, of the same period.

79Ibid., No. 216, Col. 473.

80L'A. Xatikyan, Je dari Hayeren jersagrei višatsak-
aranmer (Colophons from XV Century Armenian Manuscripts),
Vol. I (1401-1450) (Erevan, 1955), see index under Bešk'ên,
p. 683, for other forms, e.g., Pešk'ên, and references.
Finally, the voluminous 13th/18th century History of the Armenians by Fr. Mik'ayel Çamdean\textsuperscript{81} discusses in some detail the Ildegizids. On the whole question of the attitude of the Armenian sources toward Ildegizids one should see the remarks of H. Manandean already cited.\textsuperscript{82}

V. EPIGRAPHY

The Muslim inscriptions of southeastern Caucasia were studied in the mid-nineteenth century in a series of articles by N.V. Khanykov\textsuperscript{83} and B. Dorn.\textsuperscript{84} They are listed, though not exhaustively, in Mansarof’s Bibliographia.\textsuperscript{85} Various recent monographs on specific monuments especially in Adharbajjan will be listed in the notes as they are used.

\textsuperscript{81} Patmut'iyen Hayeoc (History of Armenians), 3 vols. (Venice, 1784–1786).

\textsuperscript{82} Supra, "Introd.,” n.24, esp. Critical Survey, III, pp. 106–107 and n.1 with reference to a work of 1903.

\textsuperscript{83} The most important and comprehensive is "Mémoire sur les inscriptions musulmanes du Caucase," JA (1862).

\textsuperscript{84} See especially, "Bericht über eine wissenschaftliche Reise in den Kaukasus..." Bull. de l’Acad. imp. de St. Peters., Mélanges asiatiques, Vol. IV.

and in the bibliography. A new work by L.I. Lavrova has brought much of this material together. The collective Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe is very incomplete for the Caucasus, though a few of the inscriptions published by Khanykov have been reproduced making them somewhat more accessible. In general the inscriptions are useful for the Shirvānšāh dynasty for which it is a great aid in establishing the chronology and genealogy. Finally, the numismatic data, which are epigraphical, will be presented in the corpus.

VI. NUMISMATIC LITERATURE

The numismatic literature falls into three categories: the pioneer identification of these dynasties' coins in the early and mid-nineteenth century, catalogues of the great museum collections which began to appear toward the end of the same century, and the recent Soviet studies done almost exclusively by E.A. Pakhomov. The principal reason for the


87. Eds. Mt. Combe, J. Sauvaget, G. Wiet, Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 16 vols. (Cairo, 1931-1964), thus far to 764/1363; see especially vols. IX-XII (1937-1942), which cover the years 550/1155-653/1255.
comparatively late identification and categorizing of these coins is their bronze and copper composition. Early numismatic collections, especially the royal 'Cabinet des Médailles', concentrated on the precious, more beautiful gold and silver pieces. Only in the nineteenth century is the historical value of all Islamic coins appreciated.

The first publication of an Ildegizid coin was by C.M. Fraehn in 1821; unfortunately, five years later he misattributed another specimen to this dynasty. However, by the publication of his *Nova Supplementa* in 1855 coins struck by each of the five Ildegizid atabegs had been identified. Coincidently the just mentioned misattribution was in reality the first published issue of the Ishkhânids, but it was not until the *Nova Supplementa* that the dynasty, called the Maliks of Ahar after the

---

88 *Das muslimischen Münzen des asiatischen Museums* ..., (St. Petersburg, 1821), p. 42; a coin of Muhammad Pahlavan b. Ildegiz.

89 Attributed to ʿUzbek b. Muhammad, see infra, n.91.

90 *Nova Supplementa ad Recensionem numorum Muhammadanorum*, posthumously edited by B. Dorn and often cited under his name (St. Petersburg, 1855), pp. 275-276.

prevalence of the mint name Ahar, was firmly established. The name BishkIn was incorrectly read as "Meschtegin." Since literary references to the dynasty were not established until the thirties of this century, mistaken and guessed readings continued for more than eighty years.

Fraehn was also first to publish coins of the Shirvanshahs, once again in the Nova Suplements. These coins and those of the above mentioned Ildegizids and BishkInids were more precisely identified and described in a series of articles, in the form of letters or reports, by A. Bartholemaei and F. Soret appearing in the Revue Numismatique and the Revue de la Numismatique Belge from 1858 to 1864. In these same articles the coins of the Malik of Darband were identified and published for the


93 I. P. Petrushevskii, "Bezokhny-Pishtegeniday," in 1937, full reference, infra, n.138, and bibliography; the numerous incorrect variants of the name will be treated in the introduction of the BishkInid corpus.

94 Dorn, pp. 403-404, no.351. Actually, the first published example seems to have been by Fraehn earlier, Orient. Würs. Arbeiten der Kurändischen Gesellschaft (Mitu, 1847), II, p. 57; reference from Dorn, ibid., and E. Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 28 with a vague reference to Fraehn's work in the "40's;" for Excursus, see infra, n.107.

95 BN (1859-1860); BM (1858-1862)(1864).
first time under the nomenclature the "Kings of Karabagh," though later "Seljuqs of Adharbayjan" was also used. Soret and Bartholomaei also published the first coin of the unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids, but incorrectly as an issue of the Bishkinids. This error was carried into modern times until Pakhomonov pointed out that they were not coins of Bishkin b. Muhammad, but belonged to an unknown vassal.

Except for a few short articles, the numismatic

96 *BM* (1858), pp. 105, 258-259; actually first mention was a year earlier, Bartholomaei, *Bull. hist.-phil. de l'Acad.*, XIV (1857), p. 249, the report of a hoard found near Tiflis; reference from E.A. Pakhomonov, "O derbendskom kniazhestve XII-XIII vv.," *Izdanie stvo AN USSR*, II/1 (Baku, 1930), p. 12, n.1.


98 Soret, *BM* (1860), pp. 70-71, where first identified as Ildegizid coin, but later, *BM* (1864), pp. 56-57, n.1, corrected, i.e., changed, to a Bishkinid piece; see another *BM* (1861), p. 49, no.25.


work done on these dynasties for the next sixty years is confined to their appearance in the catalogues of various famous Islamic collections, technically starting with Frahm's *Regensio* in the *Nova Supplementa*, which represented the collection of the Imperial Academy in St. Petersburg.\(^{101}\)

Then, O. Blau's catalogue of the Odessa Museum, 1876,\(^{102}\) for the Bishkūnids and Shirvānshāhs; S. Lane-Poole's catalogue of the British Museum collection, Vol. III (1877)\(^{103}\) for Bishkūnīd coins; Istanbul Museum catalogue of 1894 by I. Ghālib\(^{104}\) again for Bishkūnīd coins; the catalogue of the Hermitage Museum by A. Markov\(^{105}\) of 1896 for all dynasties except the unidentified vassal; and J. Østrup's catalogue of the National Museum in Copenhagen

\(^{101}\)*See *supra*, nn.90-91.

\(^{102}\)*Die orientalischen Münzen des Museums der Kaiserlichen Historisch-Archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Odessa.*


\(^{104}\)*İsmā'īl Ghālib, Müze-yi-Rūmâvûn, Meşkükât-i-Gadīme-i-Islâmiyye, Cataloghi (Constantinople, 1312/1894–1895).*

\(^{105}\)*Inventarnyi Kataloq Musul'manskikh' Monet' Imperatorskogo Ekaterga (St. Petersburg, 1896-1904), with three supplements; legends of coins are seldom given.*
of 1938\textsuperscript{106} with coins of the Ildégizids, Bishkînids and Maliks of Darband.

However, most of this early identification and classification work has been superseded starting in the 1920's in a series of numismatic and historical monographs by the late E.A. Pakhmov. In 1923 he published his short history of Adharbayjân with an \textit{Excursus} on the Shirvânsâhs of the 5th/11th-8th/14th centuries.\textsuperscript{107} Mostly based on newer numismatic material, the \textit{Excursus} is a numismatic and epigraphic history organized chronologically by ruler. It contains a completely reorganized and augmented genealogy subsequently adopted by Minorsky in his \textit{History of Shârvân and Darband}.\textsuperscript{108} Then in 1926 there appeared the first fascicule of Pakhmov's monumental \textit{Coin Hoards of Adharbayjân and the Caucasus};\textsuperscript{109} it listed those hoards found prior to

\textsuperscript{106} Catalogue des monnaies Arabes et Turques du cabinet royal des médailles du musée national de Copenhague (Copenhagen, 1938); the work redounds with errors.

\textsuperscript{107} Partially cited supra, n.94, \textit{Kratkii kurs istorii Azerbaizhana, s priloženiiem ekskursa po istorii shirvanshakhov XI-XIV vv.} (A Short Course of the History of Adharbayjân, with an Excursus on the Shirvânsâhs of the XI-XIV Centuries) (Baku, 1923); for the \textit{Excursus} see pp.25-48.

\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Excursus}, pp. 45-46; Shârvân, p. 135; also reproduced in Z.M. Bumilatov, "Nekotorye dopolneniia k genealogii shirvanshakhov-kesranidov," \textit{Iskusstvo}, 1965, no.6, p. 48, cf. infra, n.159.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Monetye klady Azerbaizhana i Zakavkaz'ja} (Baku, 1926).
1920 reaching back to the early nineteenth century. The subsequent fascicles recorded new finds as they were discovered. In the series the hoards are numbered consecutively (2,160 by the end of fascicle IX) and arranged in each fascicle chronologically by period and dynasty in so far as that is possible, i.e., a single hoard often contains Byzantine, Georgian and Islamic coins, making it difficult to choose a completely satisfactory location. As might be expected of any work endeavouring to digest so much material, its use for a corpus of specific coins is often frustrating. In some fascicles details are minute, both obverse and reverse legends as well as weight, diameter and thickness being given; other times there is an abbreviated description not allowing precise classification, or even worse, entries such as "26 (coins of) Abu Bakr with caliph al-Mansir." On the other hand the date, place of discovery, finder and present provenance of almost every hoard is indicated. It is the largest single source of references for coins of all the dynasties represented in the corpus of this work. The thoroughness of Pakhomov's indefatigable industry gives one the secure feeling that

110Fasc. II, Klady Azerbaidschana i drugich respublik i kraev Kavkaza (Baku, 1938); III (Baku, 1942); IV (1949); V (1949); VI (1954); VII (1957); VIII (1963); IX (1966) posthumously, Pakhomov having died in the spring of 1965. The fascicles have varying titles; they are indexed by dynasties and proper names.
all such coins unearthed in Caucasus are listed in one place or another in this work.

In 1930 Pakhomov turned his attention to the Maliks of Darband by way of a short monograph on their coinage,\textsuperscript{111} which properly identified the dynasty for the first time. A one page table\textsuperscript{112} broadly enumerates the coin types of the dynasty, but unfortunately like the \textit{excursus} on the Shirvanshahs only partial and generalized legends are given. Nevertheless, this article like the \textit{excursus} are excellent checks for a corpus; of course in the past four decades much new material has been found, all of which will be presented in the respective corpora of the two dynasties.

Finally, throughout his long career as numismatist and economic historian, Pakhomov published scores of monographs on specific coins, important hoards, chemical analyses, and monetary circulation; these will be cited as they are used in the corpus and will be found in the bibliography.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Op. cit.}, supra, n.96.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Tbid.}, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{113} A rather complete list of his publications can be found in I. Spasskii and V. Yanin, "Sovetskaiia numizmatika bibliograficheskii ukazatel' 1917-1958 gg.," \textit{Numizmatika i epigrafia}, II (Moscow, 1960), pp. 155-209, which includes the work on Armenian, Georgian and Azerbayjani numismatics.
Regretably, Pakhomov was never able to prepare a corpus of any Islamic dynasty like his work on the coins of Georgia; furthermore, during his life time not a single study devoted to the coinage of the Ildegizids or Bishkënids appeared. Most recently an Armenian scholar Kh. Mushegian in his Monetary Circulation of Dvin according to Numismatic Data has provided a minute and precise description of the hundreds of Ildegizid coins found in the excavation of this medieval commercial center. It is curious that not a single coin from any of the other dynasties in this study is represented in the finds at Dvin; the implied isolation of Shirvan and Darband will be discussed later. For its scientific presentation and description of coins and for its discussion of the relevance of the numismatic evidence to the economic history of the area, Mushegian’s work should serve as a model.

In addition to this specific numismatic literature

114 Money Gruzii, chast’ I (domonskis’ky period), (The Coins of Georgia, Part I (The Pre-Mongol Period), all published (St. Petersburg, 1910).

115 In a personal communication from Baku dated 22 July 1965, Z.M. Buniatov informed me of a manuscript (incomplete?) among the papers of Pakhomov (he had died two months before) about the Maliks of Ahar and the Ildegizids. In the same letter Buniatov remarks that he is working on a history of the Ildegizid atabegate.

various historical monographs have included material on the coinage of this area. The work of H. Hasan and V. Minorsky have already been cited; other studies, mostly Russian and Persian, will be found in the bibliography and as used. As for general numismatic questions which effect southeastern Caucasian and Adharbayjan, the only one on which there is any significant work done is the disappearance of silver coinage in the Middle East in the 5th/11th-6th/12th centuries, the so-called 'silver crisis.' There have been important studies by Robert P. Blake, M. Koliava, Pakhomov, E.A. Davidovich, and Mushegian considering the question and its relation to Caucasia. Most recently Andrew M. Watson

117 For Hasan, see supra; Chap. II, n.48; Minorsky, Shervan, esp. Annexes I and II, pp. 129-141, and "Caucasica II," op. cit.

in a long monograph.\textsuperscript{119} has tried to offer a reasonable solution to the problem. The question will be discussed in detail in the "Numismatic Background."

VII. GENERAL LITERATURE

Since scholarly studies have never treated these dynasties together, existing literature will be grouped by dynasty.

A. The Ildegizids

As a dynasty the Ildegizids are mentioned in the early histories of J. Deguignes\textsuperscript{120} and G. Weil;\textsuperscript{121} they are more extensively treated in Défrémery's translation of excerpts from the \textit{Ta\'rikh-i guzide} of Qaswin.\textsuperscript{122} Lane-Poole

---


\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Geschichte der Chalifen}, 5 vols. (Mannheim/-Stuttgart, 1846-62), see esp. Vol. III.

\textsuperscript{122}IA (1847-48).
included their genealogy under the rubric the "Atabegs of Adharbījān" in his *Muhammadan Dynasties* and discussed their dynasty in a brief, but interesting paragraph.\(^{123}\) Barthold repeated the dynastic table in his Russian edition of Lane-Poole;\(^{124}\) the Turkish edition by Halil Edhem has a fuller account of the atabegs and a more detailed genealogy.\(^{125}\) E. de Zambaur's genealogy is identical to Edhem's, but with the addition of the numismatic and epigraphical data for each ruler.\(^{126}\)

A more detailed discussion of some of the historical problems connected with the Ildegizids is presented by Th. Houtsma in an article reviewing the *Rābat al-ṣudūr* of al-Bāwandi.\(^{127}\) This is the first major attempt to compare

\(^{123}\) *Dynasty no.66*, p. 171. The Kipchak origin of Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz is mentioned here.

\(^{124}\) *Kusul'manskie dinastii* (St. Petersburg, 1899).

\(^{125}\) *Düvel-i islāmiye* (Istanbul, 1927), pp. 208-216.

\(^{126}\) That is, if coins are known for any ruler they are marked with a circle, if inscription, with a rectangle; *Manuel*, dynasty No. 222, p. 231; the article by Bergmann referred to in the bibliography contains nothing on the Ildegizids.

various sources on the events surrounding the relationship between the Seljuqs of Iraq and their atabegs. The first edition of the Encyclopaedia of Islam does not have an article devoted to the Ildegizids as a dynasty and the individual articles on Shams al-Din Ildegiz by Barthold and Muhammad Pahlavan and Qizl Arslan b. Ildegiz by K. Zetterstoen present little new material. However, the article "Maragha" by Minorsky presents some interesting items on the relations of the later Ildegizids with the Ahmadis.

The single monograph written exclusively about the Ildegizids by K. Chaikin, unfortunately appeared in a somewhat obscure Soviet journal; it is well informed and detailed. M. Bala's article "Il-Deñiz" in the Turkish version of the Encyclopaedia of Islam, much more detailed than its counterpart in the EI, contains little which is new. The studies of H. Hasan and V. Minorsky also discuss the dynasty. In recent years Azerbaycan scholars have

128 "Ildegiz," "Pahlewan," "Kizil Arslan," EI.

129 See supra, "Introd.," n. 14.


131 Hasan, Falahi, passim; Minorsky, Studies, pp. 92-100, see also Aida, "Caucasica II," op. cit.
been most interested in the Ildegizids for obvious national interests. The multi-volumed History of Adharbayjan has a brief section on them.\textsuperscript{132} More recently R. Huseinov has a short chapter on the Ildegizids in his Syrian Sources concerning Adharbayjan.\textsuperscript{133}

The most comprehensive treatment of the Ildegizids by way of analysis, comparison and interpretation of the sources, as well as a study of the relationship of the atabeg dynasty with their Seljuq overlords is a doctoral thesis by Kenneth A. Luther.\textsuperscript{134} Unfortunately, the work stops with the death of Sultan Tughril b. Arslānshāh in 590/1194. Finally, there is a genealogical table in C.E. Bosworth's The Islamic Dynasties.\textsuperscript{135} One awaits the forthcoming fascicules of the Encyclopaedia of Islam for J. Boyle's article on the Ildegizids as well as the same author's section on the dynasty in the Cambridge History of Iran\textsuperscript{136} and the History of the Ildegizid Atabeg State.

\textsuperscript{132}Istoriia Azerbaidzhana, eds. I. Guseinova and A. Sumbat-zade, Vol. I (Baku, 1958), pp. 142-144.

\textsuperscript{133}Guseinov, Sirifskie istochniki ob Azerbaidzhane, (Baku, 1960), "Ob Il'degizidakh (Concerning the Ildegizids)," pp. 119-127.


\textsuperscript{135}A Chronological and Genealogical Handbook (London, 1967)

\textsuperscript{136}In volume V, forthcoming.
promised by Z. Buniatyev\textsuperscript{137}

B. The BishkInid Maliks of Ahar

Beside the numismatic literature already discussed the historical literature on this dynasty is confined to two articles. The first by I. Petrushevskii is almost unknown;\textsuperscript{138} it presents the theory of the Georgian origin of the BishkInids with all the essential facts about its two most important members, Bishkin b. Muhammad and his son Mahmūd, with citations from Qazwīnī, Mas'ūdī and the few other sources in which they are mentioned. Minorsky, in a more detailed article,\textsuperscript{139} discussed much the same material and in much the same way. It is curious that he did not cite Petrushevskii's article; one cannot imagine that it missed the great scholar's attention. Zambaur

\textsuperscript{137}See supra, n.115.

\textsuperscript{138}Beshkenidy-Pishtegenidy, gruzinskie melikhi Akhara v XII-nach. XIII vv. (Beshkenids-Pishtegenids, the Georgian Maliks of Ahar in 12th beginning of the 13th Centuries), "Materialy po istorii Gruzii i Kavkaza, fascicule 7 (1937), pp. 585-593.

lists the two rulers of the dynasty mentioned above who
struck coins, but with no details.\textsuperscript{140} Besides this there
is nothing, but since the town and territory of Ahar still
exist in Iran, perhaps some modern Persian scholar will
pursue their history.

C. The Shirvānshāhs

Though the source material on the Shirvānshāhs for
our period is poorer than for the Ildegizids, the liter-
ature is considerably greater. The reasons for this
phenomenon are the continuous use of the title Shirvānshāh
by collateral branches of the dynasty extending beyond our
period into modern times, and, the mere duration of the early
Shirvānshāhs from the 3rd/9th to the 7th/13th centuries. The
preliminary history of the dynasty was published by B. Dorn
in 1851;\textsuperscript{141} it was based primarily on late sources (9th/15th,
10th/16th centuries), inscriptive material, and some court
poets. The use of the term Kasrānīd for the 6th/12th–7th/13th
century Shirvānshāhs, from Ghaffārī’s Jabān-ārā adoption,
where Minūchihr (II) is referred to as b. Kasrān.\textsuperscript{142}

\textsuperscript{140} Manuel, dynasty no. 184, p. 194.

\textsuperscript{141} Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kaukasischen Länder
und Völker aus Morgenländischen Quellen, I. "Versuch einer
des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, Series VI, Vol. IV (1840),
pp. 532–602; see especially pp. 550–563 for our period and
p. 555 for the dynastic list.

\textsuperscript{142} Dorn, Versuch, p. 550, Ghaffārī was XVI century;
This questionable usage from a late source has been followed blindly into our own time. N.I. Khanykov, using more inscriptional material and especially the court poets, refined Dorn's genealogical schema, while K. Salemann's work on Khāqānī was helpful in clearing up more of the historical confusion. Lane-Poole did not include the Shirvānshāhs in his Mohawadan Dynasties, which did both F. Justi in his Iranisches Namenbuch and Barthold in his augmented Russian edition of Lane-Poole did.

Zambaur gives much the same dynastic list as his 19th century predecessors with the usual additional indication

he was used by Mūnejim-bashi (10th/16th century). The text is reproduced by Minorsky, Sharvan, pp. 27-28, trans. p. 129. For details on these early sources see Pakhomov, Excursus, pp. 26-27, and "Chapter I," supra, section I A.


144 K. Zeleman, Chetverostishhiia Khakani (The Quatrains of Khāqānī) (St. Petersburg, 1875), see pp. 13-14 for earlier bibliography.

145 (Marbourg, 1895), p. 454, early part of dynasty only.

146 Ausul'manskie dinastii, p. 295. See also Sachau, Ein Verzeichnis Mohawedanischen Dynastien (Berlin, 1923), Nos. 18 and 19.
of the numismatic and inscriptive evidence. 147

The task of sorting out the genealogical mess in the Shirvānshāhs' dynasty for the 5th/11th-7th/13th centuries was left to Pakhomov; his excursus, 148 relying heavily on newly discovered numismatic evidence, but at the same time reexamining the work of predecessors, solved most of the problems in the chronology and succession of rulers. Six years later in 1929, Hadi Hasan made use of the excursus and other numismatic material supplied by N.R. Vasmer from the Hermitage Museum collection, for his study on the Shirvānšah poet Falaki. 149 This study and its two supplements 150 have utilized all the divāns of the time as

147 Manuel, dynasty no.167, "Khaqanides" (after a title of Minuchihr, see supra, "Sources," n.46), "Prémière Race, Ieranides," p. 182.

148 For full reference see supra, n.107.

149 Falaki, p. 40, n.3.

150 For the original study see supra, n.48; idem, "Muhammad Falaki-širvānšah and His Unique Divān in Madras," Islamic Culture, April (1950), pp. 77-107; idem, July (1950), pp. 145-186.
well as later authorities like Dawlatshāh\textsuperscript{151} to establish
the facts of the poet's life and the historical events effect-
ing the court of the Shirvānshāhs in the 6th/12th century.\textsuperscript{152}

A full length Turkish study, based mostly on second-
ary Russian source material, by Z. Çibangir appeared in
1931;\textsuperscript{153} it is a popular work with little that is new
and much which is old and wrong. The article "Shirvān-
shāh" in the Encyclopedia of Islam by Barthold\textsuperscript{154} is

\textsuperscript{151}See supra, n. 52.

\textsuperscript{152}Unfortunately the work lacks an index so it is
difficult to check single items; it also lacks a bibli-
ography and not all works are fully cited in the notes.
Errors in the original study (to be discussed in the
introduction to the corpus) have been corrected in the
supplementary articles. Hasan has gone through most of
the Russian literature as well as Brosset's trans. of the
Georgian Royal Annals (see supra, n. 60) to confirm the
historical material contained in the diwans of Falaki and
Khaqani. His article "Falaki Shirwani," II, repeats in
a shorter form his original study, including the mistakes,
e.g. the death of Minūchir II, which he partially corrected
in his first supplementary article.

\textsuperscript{153}Shirvanshalar yurdu, Vaktile Albania, Arran ve
Sirvan diye anilan "Kafkas Azerbaycani"nin tarihcesidir
(The Land (Settlement) of the Shirvanshah, being a Short
History of Caucasian Adharbayjan, Known in the Past as
Shirvan, Arran and Albania) (Istanbul, 1931); see pages
87-109 for the "Kesraniler Hanedani."

\textsuperscript{154}Ill, English ed., III, pp. 383-385; the comple-
mimentary article "Shirwān" by Barthold ignores our period.
extremely detailed on the 5th/11th-7th/13th century Shirvān-
shāhs (the so-called Kāsrānids); he utilizes the earlier
studies of Dorn, Khanykov, and Pakhomov, but brings fresh
details from the sources. Minorsky devotes a very inter-
esting passage to a commentary on the section in the
anonymous 4th/10th century geography Ṣudūd al-Ṣalām about
Shirvān;\(^{155}\) his main secondary sources are Dorn, Pakhomov
and A.Z. Validi (Toğan).\(^{156}\) The study is most useful for
the location of certain areas within Shirvān and the rest
of Caucasus and also for the vocalization of proper names.
Minorsky also reviewed most of the literature, emphasizing
the literary research of Hasan and the numismatic work of
Pakhomov, in Annex I of his Shirvān and Darband;\(^{157}\) in
addition to reproducing and translating Münnejhm-bašhi's


\(^{156}\) "Azerbaycanın tarihi çografyası," Azer. Yurt
Bilgisi (Istanbul, 1932), No.1, pp. 35-48, No.2, pp. 1-15,
No.3, pp. 132-132, No.4, pp. 145-156; also idem, "Azerbaycan
etnografisine dair," ibid., No.14 (1933), pp. 49-56; cf.,
Minorsky, Ṣudūd al-Ṣalām, p. 393.

\(^{157}\) Pp. 129-138. The new dynastic element discovered
by Pakhomov, "Shirvanshakh Shakhanshakh (The Shirvanshāh
Shāhnshāh)," Iz. Azer. Arkeologcheskogo Komiteta (Baku,
1925), pp. 69-70, is included in Minorsky's study.
section of the later Shirvanshahs, he provided a commentary which reproduced Pakhomov's revised genealogy for the 5th/11th-7th/13th century rulers.

Recently Azerbaijani scholars have produced a host of studies, monographs and books, which directly or indirectly deal with the Shirvanshahs. The more important are Abdul-Kerim Ali-Zade's *Social-Economic and Political History of Adharbayjani 12th-13th Centuries* and Z.M. Buniatov's "Some Additions to the Genealogy of the Shirvanshah-Kesrânids." The later work revises the dynastic table of Pakhomov by the addition of two new "Shirvanshahs" for the early 7th/13th century. Other articles will be cited as used and in the bibliography.

D. The Malik of Darband

As a result of the late identification of this dynasty, there is only a single monograph devoted to it, E.A. Pakhomov's "On the Principality of Darband." The

---

158 Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaya i politicheskaya istoriya Azerbaizhanna XIII-XIV vv. (Baku, 1956), see esp. pp. 351-399.

159 "Nekotorye dopolneniiia k genealogii Shirvanshakhov-Kesrânîdov," Iz. Akad. Azer. SSR, no.6 (Baku, 1965), pp.47-52. For additional general information see Istoriia Azer., op.cit., I, pp. 128-172, the bibliography; and bibliography in Ali-Zade, supra.

160 See reference, supra, n.96.
article, based primarily on numismatic evidence, established these maliks as rulers of al-Bāb (Darband), rather than "Seljuqs of Adharbayjān" \(^{161}\) or "Maliks of Karabagh." \(^{162}\) Minorsky devotes Annex II of his *Sharvān* to these maliks, essentially summarizing Pakhomov's work, but making a valuable addition by way of a reference to them by Ibn al-Azraq Fārīqī, \(^{163}\) which he translates in Annex V. \(^{164}\)

Prior to these studies H. Hasan in his work on *Falākhī* \(^{165}\) had already given a few details of relations between these maliks and the Kingdom of Georgia and the Shirvānshāhs. Barthold's article "Derbend" in *EI* \(^1\), though ignorant of the dynasty qua dynasty, contains interesting details on events in Darband toward the end of the 6th/12th century. Minorsky's earlier article on Khāqānī and Andronicus Comnenus also has some details on the rulers of


\(^{163}\) For Fārīqī see *supra*, n.34; Minorsky, *Sharvān*, "Postscript on Darband," pp. 139-141.

\(^{164}\) Ibid., "Ibn al-Azraq's Visit to Darband in 549/1154," pp. 170-172.

\(^{165}\) *Falākhī*-1-Shirvānī, p. 1 and passim.
Darband at the time of the invasion of the Rūs in the same 6th/12th century. There are minor references in the articles of Khanykov and Chaikin already cited. Other passing references to these dynasties, ever so few, will be given as used and in the bibliography.

In summary, then, the sources are wanting. There is no single source dealing in a comprehensive way with any of the dynasties in this work for the 6th/12th-7th/13th century. In general, except for the Ildegizids, the sources offer no narratives, only scattered bits of information and fragmentary, vague allusions to individual rulers. The Ildegizids are better treated because of their close relation to an eventual domination over their Seljuq overlords. The history of all these dynasties must be pieced together from diverse literary, epigraphical and numismatic sources.

As for the literature, the situation is about the same. Not one of the dynasties in this work is as yet graced with a history, though the four main ones have at

---

166 Op. cit., supra, n. 48, see especially, reprint, pp. 128-129.

167 Khanykov, "Inscriptions musulmanes," op. cit., (supra, n. 83), p. 140; Chaikin, op. cit. (supra, n. 130), passim.
least one short monograph written about them. But unfortunately, not only are these studies almost exclusively in Russian and in Soviet journals extremely inaccessible to western scholar, but most of them are now dated due to new numismatic, epigraphal and even textual material which has become available.

Through their coins two of the dynasties, the Malik of Darband and the Rûshûnîd Malik of Ahar, were made known to Islamic history; the unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids is of course in this same category. However, the numismatic scholarship, even some of the work of E.A. Pakhomov, needs revision and correction. As yet no scientific corpus of coins has been prepared for any of these dynasties, though Pakhomov's monographs on the Malik of Darband and Shirvânshâhs of the 5th/11th-7th/13th centuries were good preliminary studies in the right direction.

Thus far, except for Vladimir Minorsky, only Soviet, i.e., Azerbayjani, Armenian and Georgian, scholars have been concerned about the economy and history, therefore the coinage, of this area. Certain fundamental defects

168 Of course even Minorsky was of Russian origin and traveled extensively in Caucasus and Adharbayjan while working in the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, serving in Persia from 1908 to 1912.
often mark their work. First, since these scholars seem primarily interested in the past events of their own Republic, they ignore contemporary events in neighboring areas, resulting in a very parochial kind of history. Secondly, the economic interpretation of facts is almost exclusively made in Marxist terms, which are not always the most valid or the best. On the other hand the work of these regional scholars is very careful and indeed thorough; excavations are abundant, complete and well reported.

The situation outside of Soviet Caucasasia is much worse. Due to a lack of funds and an over-abundance of historical sites and monuments from other periods, there has been no concentrated Turkish or Iranian archeological work in the area. For the Ildegizids and their vassal dynasties there is a crucial need to determine if systematic excavation will not uncover fresh and startlingly new (especially numismatic) material. The numismatic history of the area is now based exclusively on the intensive work done by Soviet scholars in the area of southeastern Caucasasia and Adharbayjan north of the Araxes and Kur Rivers, which serve as the geographical boundaries between present day Iran and Turkey and the Soviet Union, i.e., the Republics of Azerbajyan, Armenia and Georgia.
Ideally, what needs to be done is the following: excavation of such medieval cities as Ahar, Marāgha, Hamadān and Salmas in Iran and Akhlāt and again Ani in Turkey; a reexamination of all the source material of the 5th/11th-7th/13th and even later centuries viewing the area and its Islamic dynasties as a unit; finally, the compilation of a corpus of all inscriptive and especially numismatic data from the area.

This thesis attempts to fulfill the last of these requirements by presenting a systematic and scientific corpus of all known monetary issues of these dynasties. Although it is still too early to write a comprehensive history or histories on the basis of the evidence at hand, this work will also try to illuminate selected historical questions from the positive facts contained on these coins. In a much less complete fashion it will also discuss in a general way questions of monetary circulation and the social and economic history of southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjān during the 5th/11th-7th/13th centuries.

The following chapter will be devoted to an historical and numismatic background to serve as a framework and reference for the corpus.
CHAPTER TWO

THE HISTORICAL AND NUMISMATIC BACKGROUND

1. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The following survey of the political events in the 5th/11th-7th/13th century Middle East will emphasize factors which had an effect on the history of southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjan during this period.

A. The Pre-Seljuk Period

The Caucasus takes its name from a high and forbidding mountain range which runs diagonally from the Cimmerian Bosphorus on the Azov Sea to the Baku Peninsula on the Caspian Sea, effectively cutting off the Middle East, especially the adjacent areas of eastern Anatolia, Armenia, Adharbayjan and Iran, from the southern steppes of Russia. Its difficult terrain has not only isolated it from the neighbouring regions, but has also created numerous small ethnic and national units. It is therefore, a region of numerous languages and diverse customs and religions. The area, which had been Christianized very early, became a buffer zone between the contending Roman and Sasanian Empires. It was composed of the three major units, from the northeast to the southwest: Georgia, Armenia and Caucasian
Albania: (Arm. ARVANK¹). ¹

In the 1st/7th century the Islamic Arab Empire destroyed the Sasanians and replaced them in Caucasia. For the next three centuries Caucasia was contested by the Byzantines and the Arabs, the latter in control of the southeastern part. ² During the period of Arab domination Albania became known as Arran and later separated into Arran, Shirvan and Nukan; Adhharbayjan designated an area south of the Araxes River. The period to the 3rd/9th century was characterized by a political status quo in southeastern Caucasia; the area was administered by


appointed by the caliph. The Arabs were in a continual state of hostilities with the Byzantine Empire, while at the same time engaged in a series of bitter wars with the Khazars to the north, who for much of this period were allies of the Byzantines.

In the 3rd/9th century the long process of the political disintegration of the Abbasid caliphate began.

---

3 For a list of these governors see, Zambaur, Manuel, pp. 177-179; R. Vanser, Chronologie der arabischen Statthalt- en von Armenien unter den Abbasiden 750-887 (Vienna, 1931), based on numismatic evidence, but to be supplemented now by E.A. Pakhomov, Monete Aserbaidzhana, I and II (Baku, 1959, 1963).

4 See the special study by A.A. Vasiliev, Byzance et les Arabes, Fr. Trans. H. Grégoire, M. Canard and others, I. La Dynastie d'Amorium (820-862) (Brussels, 1935), II. La Dynastie Macédonienne (867-959), Part I (announced, 1966), Part II (Brussels, 1936), III. A. Ronigmann, Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1081 (Brussels, 1950).

5 A people believed by some Turkologist to be of Turkic (i.e., Kipchak, gunja, "Introd."

As the Turkic slave bodyguard started assuming control of the functions of the caliphate, Iranian elements achieved de facto autonomy in southeastern Iran, Khorasan and Transoxiana—the Tahirids (205/821-259/873), the Saffārids (253/867-290/903), and the Sāmānids (261/875-389/999).

At the same time in southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan, the weakening of Arab rule resulted in the semi-independent rule of the Sajīd governors, Muhammad Afshīn and his brother Yūsuf (276/889-318/930), from Shirvān to Mārāgha; while in central and northwestern Caucasus, there began a revival

---

6See supra, "Introd.," n.30.


10V. Minorsky, Studies, pp. 118-120; see also C. Huart, "Sajids," EI1 and IA; Zambaur, No.163, p. 179.
of Armenian independence under the native Bagratid house.\footnote{11} By the 4th/10th century an expansionist movement of Iranian elements in the Caspian provinces of Daylam and Gilan under the leadership of the family of Bu'a (thus Bu'iyid) pushed into central Iran, north Mesopotamia and al-Jibal, finally seizing Baghdad in 334/945.\footnote{12} This Sasanid domination in Khorasan and the east and Bu'iyid control of the heartlands of the caliphate has been termed the "Iranian Intermezzo" by V. Minorsky.\footnote{13}


12 The Bu'iyids were Shi'i, but during their whole domination of the caliphate, to last until 447/1055, they never once tried to change the Sunni 'Abbasid Caliph for a Shi'i Caliph. Eventually, in the early 5th/11th century they lost control of all eastern and central Iran, having fallen under the power of their own Turko slave army; for an excellent discussion, Cahen, "Bu'iyids, Buwayhids," El2. See also supra, "Introduct. n.13, and, Zambaur, Nos. 204-205, pp. 212-215.

13 See supra, "Introduct.," n.31. By "Intermezzo" Minorsky means the period between the Arab control of the Middle East, and the Turko, i.e., Seljuq, control after 447/1055. It should be remembered, however, that the 'Abbasid caliphate had already fallen into Turko hands a full century before the Bu'iyid capture of Baghdad. Therefore, the "Intermezzo" is more properly an interlude between two Turko movements, see supra, n.12, and "Introduct.," n.31.
In this period, the 4th/10th century, the Armenian Bagratids achieved independence, controlling Ani, Kars, Lori and Dvin, while another princely family, the Arruni, created a small kingdom around Vaspurakan (Van). The areas to the west and southwest of the Caucasus remained in Byzantine hands. Already in the previous century the Arabs appointed governors of Shirvān, the Yazidids, and of Darband (al-Bāb), the Arab Hashimids, had shown signs

---


15 After Yazid b. Mazyad...b. Shaybān al-Shaybānī (probably a client [mawāli] attached to the Shaybani tribe) appointed governor of Armenia, Adharbayjan, Shirvān and al-Bāb definitively in 183/799 by Harūn al-Rashīd (He had already been governor of Armenia, dismissed by Harūn in 172/788). See the *Tā’rikh al-Bab*, Minorsky, *Shirvan*, text, p. 1, trans., p. 22; see Minorsky’s comments and cross references, p. 56. This dynasty is of course one and the same as the Shirvanshahs, a title first taken by Baytham b. Khalīd b. Yazīd after 247/861, *Tā’rikh al-Bab*, p. 4, trans. 26; it is the first part of the 5th/11th-7th/13th century Shirvanshahs and not another branch, as traditionally and erroneously thought, see supra, "Chap. I," n.142; Zambaur, No.166, pp. 181-182.

16 After Hāshim b. Surāqa al-Sulami who was appointed governor (amīr) of Darband (al-Bāb) in 255/869, *Tā’rikh al-Bab*, p. 16, trans., p. 4; according to the same source the dynasty comes to an end in 470/1077, when Darband was given as fief to one of the Seljuq generals, *ibid.*, and p. 27, trans., p. 55. However, about fifty years later when the Malikis of Darband are the rulers of al-Bāb, there seems to be a link to the earlier Hashimids by the use of the name [nisba] al-Sulami, see infra, Intro. to the Darband Malikis’ corpus; also Zambaur, No.172 "Bāmu-Hāshim," pp. 185-186.
of self-determination. Under the Sājids, mentioned above, an attempt was made to keep the area united and under the nominal control of the Abbāsids; however, with the death of Yūsuf in 315/928, "the Yazīdids and the Hāshimids restored their de facto independence." It was then that the Sallārids (also referred to as Musāfīrids), an Iranian tribe from Daylam seized control of Adharbayjān. "Under Marzubān b. Muhammad b. Musāfir, surnamed Sallār (330–46/941–57) the Musāfīrids expanded not only over the whole of Azarbayjan and up the Araxes valley, but even into the eastern part of Transcaucasia (Arrān, Sharvān) and up to the Caucasian range. Both the Armenian royal houses, the Bagratids and the Artsruni were their tributaries."  

Sallārid rule was short lived. In 360/970 the Kurdish Shaddādids took Arrān from the Musāfīrid branch of the family, leaving southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjān partitioned into three autonomous Muslim principalities:

---

17 Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 19.

18 Idem, Studies, p. 114.

19 For whom see supra, "Introd.," nn. 12 and 15.

20 Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 20.
the Arab Ḥashimids of Darband,\textsuperscript{21} the Arab Yazīdids of Shirvān,\textsuperscript{22} and the Kurdish Shaddādids of Arrān (Ganja and Dvin). To the northwest Tiflis by the mid-4th/10th century was in the firm control of the Arab Ja'farīs\textsuperscript{23}; it remained under their control until 454/1062 when the citizens of the city threw them out.\textsuperscript{24} At about the same time in 345/956 the Rawādī Kurds\textsuperscript{25} took possession of Tabriz and by 373/983 all of Adharbayjān;\textsuperscript{26} they retained control of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{21} Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}, points out they became mixed with local Dagestani (the people around and north of Darband) influences and interests.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22} The Shirvānshāhs were to gradually become integrated into the local Iranian tradition; see \textit{supra}, "Intro.," n.22, and Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{25} Mūnejjim-baṣṭī, using the \textit{Taʿrīkh al-Bāb}, regards them as a tribe named after their first ruler, Muhammad b. Husayn al-Bawādī (Minorsky, \textit{Studies}, p. 167), but Minorsky himself (quoting S.A. Kasravi, \textit{Shahrvaran (?) [Fārsbābān-i Kum-nam]} ; Vol. II (Tehran, 1929), p. 157) connects them with Rawwād al-ʿAzdī and his family, who were 3rd/9th century rulers of Tabriz; \textit{Studies}, p. 169.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Studies} (trans. by Minorsky of Mūnejjim-Baṣṭī), p. 167.
\end{flushright}
the area until Sultan Alp Arslân arrested their last ruler and his children in 463/1073.\textsuperscript{27}

In the years just prior to the Seljuq invasions, the great rival of the caliphate,\textsuperscript{28} the Byzantine Empire, attempted to regain long lost territories by an eastern expansionist policy. By various means all the Armenian principalities, including the Bagratid and Arcruni, had been absorbed by the 430's/1040's.\textsuperscript{29} However, the Georgians retained their newly acquired independence under another branch of the Bagratid house and began establishing a powerful kingdom in western Caucasus.\textsuperscript{30} On the Muslim side, the Abbāsid caliphate under very much weakened, ineffectual Buŷid control exerted only minimal and token authority in southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjân. Tiflis

\textsuperscript{27}Studies, p. 169, Minorsky's trans. The family did not die out, but was to continue as rulers of Marâgha until the early 7th/13th century, ibid., see also supra, "Introd.," n.14.

\textsuperscript{28}Of course the "great rival of the Abbāsid caliph was the Shî'ī Fatimid caliph in Cairo (358/969-567/1171), but the Fatimids do not effect the events in this study.


was in the process of ridding herself of her Arab amir. Darband, Shirvān and Arrān remained under the control of local dynasties, the Arab Hāšimids, Shirvānshāhs (Yazīdids), and Kurdish Shaddādīds respectively. Ādharbayjān was under Kurdish Rawādī rule. The stage was set for the Seljuq invasion and the short lived political unification which came with it. In less than half a century this unification of the area as well as the rest of the Middle East once again disintegrated into many small autonomous feudal units.

B. The Seljuq Conquest

As we have seen the Turkic penetration of the Islamic Middle East dates back at least to the caliphal bodyguard of the 3rd/9th century.31 In the same century generals from that Turkic army had seized semi-autonomous power in outlying areas of the caliphate.32 By the end of the 4th/10th century

31 Supra, no.6, and "Introd.," n.30.

32 Ahmad ibn Tūlūn after 254/868 refused to relinquish his post in Egypt, thus beginning the Tūlūnid dynasty which was to continue until 283/896; see B. Spuler, The Muslim World, Part I, *The Age of the Caliphs*, trans. F. Bagley (Leiden, 1960), p. 69, for a capsule history. Shortly after, in 323/935 another Turkic governor of Egypt, Muhammad ibn Tughj, assumed autonomous power and was confirmed by the caliph at Baghdad with the ancient central Asian title ikhshid, hence giving rise to the so-called Ikhshīdīd dynasty which ruled Egypt until the arrival of the Fātimids in 358/969; see ibid., p. 71 for brief details. Cf., Cahen *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 6-7.
the Turkic Ghaznavids\textsuperscript{33} had taken power from their S\textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{a}n\textsuperscript{id} overlords\textsuperscript{34} and established a strong dynastic state in Khor\textsuperscript{a}s\textsuperscript{a}n and Transoxiana. But they in turn were soon replaced, at least in Khor\textsuperscript{a}s\textsuperscript{a}n and Transoxiana by the Oghuz Turkic Seljuqs\textsuperscript{35} after the decisive battle of Dand\textsuperscript{a}nq\textsuperscript{a}n in Khor\textsuperscript{a}s\textsuperscript{a}n in 432/1040.\textsuperscript{36}

Already prior to this important battle, large groups of Oghuz Turkoman\textsuperscript{37} had penetrated into the Middle East often settling in Adharbayj\textsuperscript{a}n. The Byzantine frontier in recently acquired Armenia was especially harrassed, being the border between the lands of Islam and the infidels

\textsuperscript{33}Seb\textsuperscript{u}\textsuperscript{k}tig\textsuperscript{\i}n and his son Mahm\textsuperscript{u}d were hired by the Persian S\textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{a}nid to ward off the growing Qara-Kh\textsuperscript{a}n\textsuperscript{id} danger (q.v. supra, "Chap. I", n.1); in time they dislodged their masters and seized the lands south of the Oxus River. Their name comes from their capital city of Ghaz\textsuperscript{a}h in present day Afghanistan; see now C.E. Bosworth, The Ghaznavids (London, 1963).

\textsuperscript{34}On the S\textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{a}n\textsuperscript{id}s, see supra, n.9.

\textsuperscript{35}On the origins of the Seljuqs see C. Cahen, "Le Malikn\textsuperscript{a}meh et l'histoire des origines seljukides," Orients, II/1 (1949), pp. 31-65, and, idem, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 19-22.

\textsuperscript{36}The Ghaznavids moved into the Indus Valley area where they continued to rule until the late 6th/12th century, As to the Turkicness of there state see Cahen's recent remarks, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 9-11.

\textsuperscript{37}See supra, "Introdon.," n.20.
by groups of Oghuz Turks, who prior to the early raiding parties officially organized and directed by the Seljuqs, made their own sorties to acquire quick booty. These Turkomans, to be found in large numbers in Adharbayǰan, lived in a tribal nomadic fashion without political power, often even after their Seljuq brothers firmly subdued the area.

In 447/1055 Tughril Beg marched peacefully into Baghdad and received the title sultan. His nephew and successor Alp Arslan (455/1063-465/1072) captured Ani from the Byzantines in 456/1064 and two years later the Seljuqs entered Shirvān. In 460/1067-8 Georgia came under Seljuq control and shortly after in 463/1071 the Byzantine army


40 A title in use before, e.g., Ghaznavids, but officially conferred for the first time; it granted the fullest secular powers of the state; Cahen, ibid., p. 24; Spuler, ibid., p. 79. The sequel to this story is that when Tughril Beg had to leave Baghdad to tend to an internal revolt, Basasiri, the Turkic commander of the Shi'ite Buyid army, returned with Fatimid support, seized Baghdad and for one year had the khutbah read in Fatimid Caliph's name; in the next year 450/1059 Tughril retook the city; see M. Canard, "Basasiri," EI2.

41 ta'rikh al-Bāb, Minorsky, Shārvān, text, p. 12, trans., p. 20.
was completely defeated by Alp Arslân at Manzikert, leaving Christian elements in Caucasia isolated from outside help. The Seljuqs consolidated their hold on the whole area by appointing their military commanders, whether Seljuq, other Oghuz Turkoman, or even Kiptchak Turks, as governors in the various occupied areas. ⁴²

By 485/1092 the death of Malikšâh, son and successor of Alp Arslân and the last undisputed Great Seljuq Sultan, the situation in southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjân was broadly as follows. Shirvân was still in the hands of the local Yazídîd Shirvânhâhs, who had given allegiance and tribute to Alp Arslân and Malikšâh. ⁴³ The situation in Darband was not so clear. In 468/1075 it was given by Alp Arslân to one of his closest generals, Bau-tegîn, as fief, which put a temporary stop to the long ambition of Shirvân to annex it. ⁴⁴ We do not know how long he or other Seljuq appointees governed there, but by about 530/1136, local dynastic elements, claiming descent from the Hashimids, were

---


⁴³ Ta'rifîn al-Bab, text, p. 14, trans., p. 38.

⁴⁴ Minorsky, Shirvân, p. 74; and text, p. 27, trans., p. 55.
once again in control and striking coins.\textsuperscript{45} Georgia eventually overcame the effects of the Seljuq invasion and under King David the Builder (482/1089-519/1125) some victories were won against the Turks. By 516/1122 Tiflis was regained and the Georgians were to remain the only non-Muslim power to maintain independence in the area.\textsuperscript{46} Arrān, including Ganja, was lost by the Shadāddids to the same Seljuq amīr Sau-teğīn mentioned above.\textsuperscript{47} Shortly after it was granted to Muḥammad b. Maškashāh as a fief by his brother Barkiyārūq.\textsuperscript{48} In 500/1106 Ganja was at least temporarily in Shirvānshāh hands.\textsuperscript{49} The Shadāddids however, did not fade out after their loss of Ganja; a branch of the family bought Ani from the Seljuqs in 465/1072 and kept it despite occasional Georgian occupation for about 120 years.\textsuperscript{50} Adharbayjān was also

\textsuperscript{45} See supra, n.16; cf. Minorsky, ibid., p. 139.

\textsuperscript{46} For general references see Allen, op. cit., Chap. VIII, and Lang, op. cit., p. 20.

\textsuperscript{47} Tarīkh al-Bāb, in Minorsky, Studies, text, p. 17, trans., p. 24.

\textsuperscript{48} W. Barthold/A. J. Boyle, "Gandja" EI\textsubscript{2}; actually in 486/1093 according to Ibn al-Āthir, I, 194, as cited by Minorsky, Studies, p. 67, n.4. See also C. Cahen, "Barkyarūk," EI\textsubscript{2}.

\textsuperscript{49} According to Mašcūd b. Nāmār, V. Minorsky and C. Cahen, "Le Recueil Transcaucasien de Mašcūd b. Nāmār," op. cit., p. 120.

\textsuperscript{50} See reference under supra, "Introd.,” n.13.
completely in Turkic hands, generals and guardians of Seljuq princes ruling in various areas. By the early 6th/12th-century Shams al-Dān Ildégiz was in control of the northern part, while the Ahmadīlī the southern, resident at Marāgha. The area around Ahar was presumably in the hands of the Bishkīnids.51

C. Fragmentation and Dissolution of the Great Seljuq Empire

With the death of Malikshāh and his vizir Nizām al- Mulk in the same year 485/1092, the unity of the Seljuq Empire began its rapid disintegration. The wife of Malikshāh supported her own younger son Mahmūd, while followers of Nizām rallied around the sultan’s eldest son by a previous marriage, Barkīyārūq. The latter finally won the struggle, but his reign was marred by hostilities among the various emīrs of the empire. Upon Barkīyārūq’s death in 498/1105 his infant son Malikshāh II reigned for a few months, but was replaced by Muhammad b. Malikshāh, who restored some order in the affairs of state in an attempt to reunify under a single central administration all Seljuq lands. However, his death in 511/1117 brought an end to solidifying endeavours and led to a division of the central

51 General references will be found in the introductions to the relevant corpora and a fuller discussion infra.
lands of the Empire between his brother Sanjar, who ruled in Khorāsān and the east with the title of the Greatest Sultan (sultan al-ażam), and Muhammad's son Mahmūd, who ruled al-Jibāl and Adharbayjān, the Sultanate of Iraq, with the title of the Supreme Sultan (sultan al-mu'azzam). 52

Already under the three great sultans, Tughril, Alp Arslān and Malikshāh, other members of the family had started semi-independent rule in various parts of the Middle East. After Malikshāh's death, these Seljuq cousins became virtually independent rulers, at first aspiring to succeed to the Great Sultanate, but as that institution fragmented, content to rule in their own domain. They were the Seljuqs of Rûm, controlling the lands of western Anatolia with Konya as capital, but often engaged in quarrels as far east as Erzerum and Akhlāṭ; 53 the Seljuqs of Kirmān; 54 and the Seljuqs of Syria in Aleppo and Damascus, who flourished only through the reign of Barkiyārūq. 55

52 General references to the sources for this entire section can be conveniently found in M. Sanaullah, op.cit., pp. 82-132.

53 For their political history see now C. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 15-138.

54 On the Seljuqs of Kirmān see supra, "Chap. One," n. 38; Lane-Poole, Dynasties, p. 153; Zambaur, Manuel, No. 213, p. 222.

55 Sanaullah, Decline, pp. 85-90; Lane-Poole, p. 154; Zambaur, No. 212, p. 221.
By the end of the 6th/12th century only the Seljuqs of Rûm continued to exist. Sanjar's empire gave way to a fresh invasion of Oghuz Turks and by 552/1157 the sultan was dead and the Great Seljuq Sultanate in Kharasân destroyed. 56 The Seljuks of Kirmân succumbed to the same Oghuz menace about 583/1187. 57 After the death of Sanjar, the Seljuks of Iraq assumed his title of Greatest Sultan, though lands of the sultanate fell eventually into the hands of the Khwârazmshâhs, who also assumed the title of sultan as heirs to the Seljuq tradition. 58 Four decades later the last Seljuq of Iraq, Tughril b. Arslânshâh was himself to die at the hands of the Khwârazmshâhs in 590/1194. 59 The Ildegizid atabegs of the former had already seized much of the land of the sultanate, now they began to usurp the titles and royal prerogatives. 60

The whole of this Seljuq period is characterized


57 Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*, pp. 48-49.

58 On the assumption of the title by Muhammad b. Mahmûd, Sultan of Iraq, see Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 333, n.2. For a general discussion of relations between the Khwârazmshâhs and the Seljuqs of Iraq see, *ibid.*, pp. 333-347.

59 Ibn al-Athîr, XII, 70; Barthold, p. 347.

60 This included the minting of base gold dirâs in imitation of their former overlords; for a full discussion see the Ildegizid corpus under Abû Bakr.
by two institutions which are fundamental for the understanding of events once the central authority of the state began to weaken. They are the atabeg and müteferrika system. When disintegration started these institutions contributed to the rapid fractionalization of the Empire. The essentials of the atabeg system have been nicely summarized by Sanaullah:

The institution of the Atabegate which was peculiar to the Seljukid system of administration was a necessary corollary to the conception of the empire as a paternal property. Each prince of the blood-royal was placed under the care of a Turkish general. During his infancy the Atabeg acted as his regent, and after his father's death his mother married, as a matter of course, the prominent Atabeg who in his turn sometimes gave one of his daughters in marriage to his ward... This system of the Atabegate had a detrimental effect on the imperial structure as it turned the princes into mere puppets in the hands of the adventurous Amirs... On the other hand, sometimes the more virile wards even fell out with their Atabegs and put them to death if such an outrage was possible...

The Atabegate system was moreover responsible for the investiture of several Seljukids slaves with kingship if their wards suffered premature death. The Atabegs were the real rulers and their wards were so many figureheads. May, often an Atabeg deposed one prince and promoted another in order to safeguard his own interests, as he naturally preferred the weak one over whom he could exercise his absolute authority to the strong one who might be a constant danger to his autocracy... This kind of diarchy was one of the most potent factors in the political disintegration of the Seljukid empire, as it gradually substituted for the element of unity supplied by the family ties with the central government a large number of disconnected and often hostile dynasties. 61

By the mid-6th/12th century the whole empire was in the hands of these atabegs. Often they were Kipchak Turks recruited or bought by the Oghuz Seljuqs for their army. This was the case of Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz, who gained favor in the court of the Seljuq Sultan of Iraq, Masʿūd b. Muhammad b. Malikshāh (527/1133-547/1152) and eventually established an hereditary dynasty which ruled much of the land and governed many of the affairs of their Seljuq overlords. The same is true of other atabegs: Ṭuğteğin was appointed atabeg to the Seljuq prince of Damascus, Duqqāq; upon the latter’s death in 497/1103 he succeeded him as ruler, establishing the Būrid dynasty after his son Ṭāj al-Mulūk Būrī, 62 which in turn was absorbed in 549/1154 by the Zangid atabegs. Zangī was the son of Āq-Sunqur, a Turkish mulūk of Malikshāh, who was appointed governor of Iraq in 521/1127 and annexed the same year Mawsil, Sinjar, Jazīra and Harrān. The area was later divided among Zangī’s descendent, who were finally conquered by either the Mongols or the Ayyūbids in the 7th/13th century.63 So too, one may enumerate the Begteğinids at Harrān, 

---

62 For the Būrids see Sanaullah, Decline, pp. 5-11; Zambaur, Manuel, No.217, p. 225; Lane-Poole, Dynasties, p.161.

Irbil and Takrit; the Artuqids at Diyār Bakr, Hīsn-Kayfa, Kharpert, and Mardin; the Shāh-i Arma at Akhлат; and Salgharids in Fars and the Hazaraspids in Luristān.

The second factor which contributed to the territorial fragmentation of the Seljuq empire was the awarding of iqtā (revenue fief) to commanders of the army. Since the empire was essentially structured around a military organization, requiring the cooperation of diverse Turkic elements, it was compelled to insure the allegiance of these forces and to recompense them for their services by payment either in money or kind. The method chosen was the granting of a portion of conquered land, an iqtā, to a military leader, who was to receive its revenue as pay and at the same time be solely responsible for its administration and maintenance. It was not hereditary, but determined by its fiscal value. The iqtā was the revenue from the land itself. It might

64 See C. Cahen, "Bagytaginaids," HL2; Zambaur, No. 219, p. 228; Lane-Poole, p. 165.

65 See now C. Cahen, "Artukids," HL2, which supercedes parts of the same author's "Le Diyār-Bakr au temps des premiers Urtukides," op.cit.; Lane-Poole, pp. 166-169; Zambaur, No. 221, pp. 228-229.

66 Minorsky, Studies, passim; Lane-Poole, p. 170; Zambaur, No. 221, p. 229. They are sometimes called the Bektimurids; their residence was at Akhlat on Lake Van.

67 Lane-Poole, pp. 172-173 and 174-175; Zambaur, Nos. 225 and 227, pp. 232 and 234-235 respectively.
be withdrawn and pay given in money or it might be exchanged for another iqta-\(^c\) providing the same or different revenue.\(^68\)

The granting of such fiefs dates back to earliest Islamic times, but in a somewhat different form; the type of iqta-\(^c\) granted by the Great Seljuqs was like that employed by the Buyids before them, but modified to account for a much larger army.\(^69\)

The inherent weaknesses of this distribution of military fiefs became obvious as the central Seljuq authority crumbled; after the death of Malikshah the entire empire was visited by civil wars by which great a\(^f\)irs and atabegs tried to annex the iqta-\(^c\)s of lesser fellow fief holders (muqt\(^c\)a\(^\prime\)s) and form them into appanages. The central government's control was uncertain and at times even contested. Under these conditions the iqta-\(^c\)s, contrary to the original intention of the donor, often became de facto hereditary.\(^70\)

\(^68\) There has been much recent work on this institution, especially by Anne K.S. Lambton and Claude Cahen: Lambton, Landlord and Peasant in Persia (Oxford, 1953), Chap. III, "The Iqta\(^c\) System and the Seljuqs," pp. 53-76; Cahen, "L'évolution de l'iqt\(^c\) du IX au XIIIe siècle," Annales Économies-Sociétés-Civilisations, VIII (1953), pp. 25-52; Lambton, "Reflections on the Iqta\(^c\)," Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of H.A.R. Gibb (Leiden, 1965), pp. 358-376; Cahen, "Iqta\(^c\)," EI\(^2\). The material for this section has been abstracted from these sources.

\(^69\) See the observations on iqta-\(^c\) in C. Cahen, "Buwayhid/Buyid," EI\(^2\); see also idem, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 40.

\(^70\) The later developments [of the iqta-\(^c\)] which are to be seen in the twelfth century and which led to the
In this manner in the 6th/12th century most of the land of the Great Seljuq Empire was in the hands of the most powerful military commanders. Often they had the added honor and power of being the atabeg to a prince of the Seljuq House.

The result of this fissiparous tendency in the central areas of the Middle East as the 6th/12th century grew older was that besides the de jure ruling authorities, the Abbasid caliph with token power, the Seljuq sultans and princes, and their Turkic generals, there were the following autonomous or semi-autonomous sovereign powers. In central Caucasus the Christian Kingdom of Georgia, under the surviving branch of the Bagratid dynasty, established...

establishment of hereditary domains were the result of the decline of the Seljukid régime, not of its power, and of the new conception of the régime that arose precisely from its dismemberment?" Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, p. 40. See also idem, "L'évolution de l'Iqtae," p. 44.

71 Toward the end of the century, under caliph al-Masir (575/1179-622/1225), the caliphate was able to take advantage of waning Seljuq power to strengthen the power and influence of its authority beyond the confines of Baghdad; F. Taeschner, "Futūwwa," EI2; Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 40, 196-197.

72 After Ani and other Bagratid cities were taken over by the Byzantines, most of the Armenian nobility were given fiefs in the west, mostly in Cappadocia; see supra, nn. 11 and 29 and references therein.
the most powerful non-Muslim state in the area, extending its influence over Darband and Shirvān in the east, the Shadāddīs of Ani in the south, and even the Ildegizīds to the southeast. Darband was in the hands of local Arab Maliks,73 with matrimonial ties to Georgia and unfriendly relations with Shirvān. The latter was in the hands of the now iranized Shirvānshāhs,74 who also had matrimonial ties with the Georgians and like them aggressive inclinations toward Darband in the north, Mūqān in the south, and Arrān, Shakhī and Baylaqān in the southwest.75 Both these Islamic dynasties expressed token submission to the Ābbāsid caliph and the Seljuq sultan of Iraq. In central Adharbayjān the Bīshkīnīds, who had originally received a fief around Ahar from Alp Arslān,76 emerged from a century of obscurity as vassals to the Ildegizīds, but with semi-autonomous power.77 In southern Adharbayjān the Ahmadīls kept control of Marāgha and the surrounding region until the

73 See supra, nn. 16 and 45.

74 Minorsky, Shavvan, p. 134, and supra, n.22.

75 Ibid., p. 117; Cahen and Minorsky, op.cit., passim; see their corpus for further discussion.

76 Masawi, Šīrat, op.cit., text, p. 18, and see introduction to their corpus.

77 They began to strike coins in the 590's/1190's, dār al-šifa, "Corpus," by which they emerged from their obscurity.
end of the century when they were forced by the Ildegizids
to move to areas west of Lake Urmia around Salmas. 78

The situation in Anatolia was still more confused.
In addition to the Seljuqs of Rûm around Konya, various
ghāzi 79 Turkoman states were formed around the principle
cities. They were the Saltūqids at Erzerum; 80 the
Dânishmendids at Sivas and Malatya; 81 and the Mangujekids
at Erzinjân and Divrîgî. 82 Farther to the west was the
much diminished Byzantine Empire; to the south the rising
Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia; and along the Syrian and
Palestinian coast the Crusader principalities. Add to this
mosaic of political entities the Circassians, Alans,
Kipchaks and Rûs north of the Caucasus, but raiding into


79 Traditionally known as volunteer fighters for the
faith, they were usually found along the marches, using the
ghârâ, the raid, usually for booty as a means of carrying
the holy war to the infidel. However the distinction here
is individual Turkomans who through chance banded together
under a strong usually charismatic leader to form a unit,
as opposed to a tribal Turkoman unit which moved on mass
into the area from Central Asia. See Paul Wittek, The
Rise of the Ottoman Empire (London, 1938) and Fuad Koprâla,
Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman (Paris, 1935) for the
theory and argument of this distinction. For general materi-
also the ghâzis see C. Cahen, "Ghâzi," EI 2.

80 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 106-108; Zambaur,
No. 131, p. 145.

81 I. Melikoff, "Dânishmend," EI 2; and the more
detailed idem, Le Geste de Melik Dânîshmend, 2 vols. (Paris,
1960).

82 Cahen, ibid., pp.108-112; Zambaur, No.132,pp.145-146.
Caucasia; the Khwarazmshahs, Qarakhunids and nomadic Oghuz in Khorasan, Transoxiana and the trans-Caspian areas; the remnants of the Ghaznavids in northern India and the Fatimids in Egypt, the result is that the 6th/12th century has the honor of the most confused and politically heterogeneous one in the history of the Islamic Middle East. By the end of it the Seljuqs of Iraq have died out and Darband and its Malikhs have been absorbed by the Shirvanshahs.

D. The Khwarazmian and Mongol Invasions

In the second quarter of the 7th/13th century political unity was finally restored by the all inclusive Mongol conquest. However, just prior to this event, the last Khwarazmshah, Jalal al-Din, fleeing before the Mongols, subjected the whole northern tier of Islam, from Iran to Lake Van, and from upper Mesopotamia to the Caucasus, to a series of disruptive campaigns and ephemeral occupations lasting the decade from 618/1221 to 628/1231. After the death of his father, Muhammad b. Takash (596/1199-617/1220), on an island in the Caspian Sea where he had sought refuge from the Mongols after they had seized Khwarazm, Jalal al-Din moved first into the Indus valley, but then into Pars and al-Jibal. There he came into conflict with the caliph

83 See supra, "Introd.," n.23.
al-Nasir, who had regained much of the authority of the caliphate at the expense of other regional powers, and al-Nasir's ally, the Ildegizid 'Uzbek b. Muhammad. In 622/1225 he defeated 'Uzbek and occupied Adharbayjan as a base for operations against the Georgians. Thus, some thirty years after their Seljuq overlords were extinguished, the Ildegizid atabegate was ended.

Already prior to 'Uzbek's defeat, his general and vassal, Mahmud b. Bishkin of the Malik of Ahar, had secretly pledged allegiance to the Khwarazmshahs, and when 'Uzbek was killed stepped forward and joined Jalal al-Din. Nevertheless after 623/1226 we hear nothing more of the Bishkinids.

In the same year, 623/1226, the Khwarazmshah moved north against the Georgians, seized Tiflis, and at the same time reimposed the original tribute of Alp Arslan and Malikshah.

84 Supra, n.71.

85 For the surviving members of the dynasty see their corpus and genealogy.

86 After the defeat of 'Uzbek by the Khwarazmshah Muhammad at Ispahan in 614/1217, Mahmud was captured by the Khwarazmians, to whom he related the story of how his ancestors, who were Georgian princes, converted to Islam after being captured by Alp Arslan and rewarded by the latter with the fief of Ahar and the surrounding areas. The Khwarazmians upon hearing this story, reconfirmed the fief with a document which Mahmud produced after 'Uzbek's death. See Nasawi, Sirat, ed. Houdas, op.cit., pp. 3, 14, 16-18; cf. Minorsky, "Caucasica II.," op.cit., p. 868.
on the Shirvanshahs. The first raid was in 617-8/1220-1 under Yeme (Jebe) and Gubetei coming from Iran, but, after ravaging Tabriz, Haragha and Mazijawan, their path led through Arran, Shirvan, and finally through the Darial pass of Darband to join the army under Tushl in the steppe north of the Caspian and from there rejoin Chingiz-Khan. See Ata-Malik Juwaini, Boyle's trans., op. cit., I, pp. 145-149.

88 The first raid was in 617-8/1220-1 under Yeme (Jebe) and Gubetei coming from Iran, but, after ravaging Tabriz, Haragha and Mazijawan, their path led through Arran, Shirvan, and finally through the Darial pass of Darband to join the army under Tushl in the steppe north of the Caspian and from there rejoin Chingiz-Khan. See Ata-Malik Juwaini, Boyle's trans., op. cit., I, pp. 145-149.

89 Ibid., II, p. 459; see also Nasawi, trans., pp. 409-410.
the Middle East for another generation offering their services to any ruler who might give them refuge. The last survivors are found at the victory of the Egyptian Mamluks over the Mongols at Cā'īn Jālūt in 657/1260.90

Fifteen years after their first raid in 618/1221, the Mongols came again to Caucasus by way of the Middle East, this time sweeping all before them. By 633/1236 they had captured Ganja and moved north to Tiflis forcing the Georgian Queen Rusudan and her court to western Georgia; however, after a few years she offered submission to Mongol representatives and sent her son David to Qaraqorum to pay homage to the Great Khān.91 In 634/1237 Shirvān was subjugated and, most likely for tax purposes, unified under a single rule, probably Akhsatān II;92 Darband was by then considered part of Shirvān.93

90 The details for this whole section will be found in Juwaini, tr. Boyle, II, pp. 396-460, also summarized in idem, "Djalal al-Din Khwaraqm-shah," EI; Minorsky, "Tiflis," EI1; Cahen, "The Turks in Iran and Anatolia before the Mongol Invasions," A History of the Crusades, op.cit., II, pp. 661-692.

91 Minorsky, "Tiflis;" O. Lang, Numismatic History of Georgia, op.cit., p. 34.

92 A full discussion of fragmented and then unified rule in Shirvān during this period will be found under their corpus.

93 Around 600/1203 or somewhat earlier, but surely by 618/1221, when the lord of Darband is brother of the
During the next decade the Mongols were relatively inactive in the Middle East, but conquered central Russia, the Ukraine and went on to Poland and Hungary. However, by 640/1242 they were again busy, now in Anatolia, where in 641/1243 they met and defeated the Seljuq army under Kay-Khusraw II at Kösedağ; through the cleverness of the latter's vizir, the Seljuqs of Rûm became the tax collectors of the Mongols in western Anatolia. At about the same time the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia also offered submission and King Het'um journeyed to Qarāqorum. After another quiet interval during which Möngke was chosen Great Khân (649/1251), the Khân's brother Hūlagū moved into Iran and destroyed the Assassins in their mountain fortress of Alamût in 654/1256;


94 Cahen, Pre-Ottoman, pp. 138-139, 269 ff.


96 An Isma'i'I Shi'I sect also known as the Bāṭinīs, spread throughout the Middle East, but especially important in Iran, who justified assassination as a political tool. They were extremely annoying to the Seljuqs who never succeeded in destroying their power; the first important victim they claimed was Nizām al-Mulk. See now Bernard Lewis, The Assassins (London, 1967), but for a more penetrating study, Marshall G.S. Hodgson, The Order of the Assassins (The Hague, 1955).
two years later the final death blow was given to the long moribund Abbāsid caliphate at Baghdad. After the death of Möngke in 657/1259, Hūlagū became the autonomous ruler of Iran, Mesopotamia and the surrounding regions. Thus started the Il-Khan dynasty\(^7\) which soon brought under its control all the area north of Mamlūk Egypt and ruled them until the 8th/14th century. During the Il-Khan occupation, among the dynasties whose coins are studied in this work, only the Shirvānshāhs and the Kings of Georgia survived, both of which preserved a degree of autonomy by the regular payment of tribute.\(^8\)

II. THE NUMISMATIC BACKGROUND

A. The Pre-Seljuq Period

Not having any coinage of their own, during most of the 1st/7th century, the Arabs modified or imitated the

\(^7\)On the title and name see supra, "Introd."

\(^8\)On this tribute and comparative figures for Shirvān see Hāmdu'llah Mustawfi Qazwīnī, Ṭuzhbat al-gulub, trans. G. Le'Strange, p. 93. This work compares for each Il-Khanid province the tax during Seljuq times and the early 8th/14th century, see also supra, "Chap. One," n.42.
Byzantine and Sasanian coins then in circulation. The Byzantine gold *denarius aureus*, later to become the Arab *dīnār*, was modified by replacing the emperor with cross in hand by the caliph with sword on the obverse, while the reverse substituted a ball for a cross on top of a column; the legends on both sides were changed to Arabic in Kūfī characters. Sasanian silver coins, retaining the portrait of the king, altered by the addition of crescents and stars and the words "in the name of 'Allāh" (*bismillāh*), became the model for the Arab *dirham*.101

In circa 76-77/695-696 the Umayyad caliph ʿAbd-al-Malik introduced a reform in the coinage replacing all representational motifs with pure epigraphy.102 Silver *dirhams* carried the mint name and date already from these early

---

99 Modifications in coin types were gradual, probably in order to make the Islamic coins appear somewhat similar to the existing coinage to which the people in the conquered territories were accustomed. For a survey of this coinage see John Walker's definitive *Catalogue of the Arab-Sassanian Coins* (London, 1941) and *idem, Catalogue of the Arab-Byzantine and Post-Reform Umayyad Coins* (London, 1955); also P. Grierson, "The Monetary reforms of ʿAbd al-Malik," *JESHO*, III (1950).

100 See ibid. for examples and a discussion in George C. Miles, "Dīnār", *El*, and Miles, "Dirham," *El*.


102 The obverse almost uniformly had the formula, "There is no god but 'Allāh alone; he has no associate," with the date and mint place in a circular marginal legend. The reverse also carried a formula, in later times
times; the gold динár did not carry mint names until about a century or more later, the first mint seemingly being Еgipет (Misr) circa 198/813. Finally, there was from the earliest years a copper coinage known as fals, pl. fulüs. These coins, especially the динár and dirham, retained almost the same size and appearance with modifications only in the formulae until the 4th/10th century. The reigning caliph's name was always mentioned, even in later times by such autonomous dynasties as the Сāmānids, Бūyids and Seljuqs. As stated before the striking of coins along with the saying of the ruler's name in the Friday prayer (khutbat) were the two overt signs of sovereignty or change

often "Muhammad is the messenger of Аллāh," with the name of the caliph and a pious legend from the Qur'ān, usually Сūrah IX, verse 33. See the works of Walker cited above and now for the динár see George J. Miles, "The Earliest Arab Gold Coinage," Museum Notes of the ANS, 13 (1957), pp.205-229, Pls.XLV-XLVII; and Grierson, op.cit.

103 Mint names on динârs became common about twenty years later; for a list see Miles, Rayy, pp.118-119.


105 Actually only the style of epigraphy changes. The 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries present various problems because of the disappearance of the silver dirham and the rarification of the динár to the advantage of the fals, which traditionally tended to vary in style more than its more valuable cousins. The plates at the back of Miles, Rayy, or any other illustrated catalogue of early Islamic coins will demonstrate the point quickly.
thereof. 106

In southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayján up to the early 4th/10th century almost no gold was minted. The dirham was the most common and after it the fals. The first and largest mint was Armíniya, actually located at Dvin (Arabic: Dabīl); 107 it had a continuous minting tradition from 81/700–1 to 333/944–5. 108 The other mints in the area struck coins at various times during these same years. 109 They are Darband (al-Bāb), Arrān, Yazīdiya (i.e., Shamākhiya), Ganja (Janza), 110 Barda'ā (Bardh'ā), Tiflis,

---

106 Supra, "Introd.," n. 26.

107 There is actually a dirham for the year 240/854–5 with the mint name "Dabīl;" reference from the private files of George C. Miles at the American Numismatic Society (henceforth: "Files" and ANS respectively).

108 See E.A. Pakhomov, Monety Azerbaizhana, 2 vols. (fascicules) (Baku, 1959, 1963); this is a modified corpus of all official Ummayad and Abbasid coinage arranged by year and mint place for Adharbayján, by which is meant the present territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan with Dvin and Darband thrown in. Places, i.e., mints, such as Ardabīl and even "Adharbayján" itself, because they are in Iran today, are not included. Miles, "Files," have been of great use to fill in gaps in Pakhomov.

109 A fairly accurate list of the northern cities as qualified in n. 108 can be found in Pakhomov.

110 The ANS has a dirham of "Janza" dated 94/712–3; George C. Miles, Rare Islamic Coins, ANS (New York, 1950), p. 23, no. 76; with another in the British Museum; a third is found in Pakhomov, Monety, I, p. 46 with refs. This should settle once and for all the question of
Ard al-Khazar (?), Ardabil, Hamadhan, "Adharbayjan" and 'Urmia. All of these were struck by caliphal officials with full authority.

There was in addition the following independently struck coinage. For the Ja'farid amirs in Tiflis we have dirhams from 342/953-4 to 394-414/1003-1023. There is also an anonymous Georgian issue, probably of Bagrat III (364/975-404/1014), and another of Bagrat IV (418/1027-465/1072) of Byzantine affinity; both issues are silver. There is a single copper issue of the Armenian King Korik (which one is not certain). The silver coins struck by the Shirvanshahs in this early period will be discussed in the corpus. Dirhams were struck by the Sallarids, probably the founding of that city. It would not appear to be in 245/859 as maintained by V. Minorsky, Studies, p. 80, n.3; idem, Sharvani, p. 57; Barthold/Boyle, "Janji," E12; but at least 150 years earlier.

111 D. Lang, Numismatic History of Georgia, pp. 13-17.

112 Ibid., pp. 18-20.

at Ardabil; and the Shadüdds of Arrán at Ganja and Dvin are represented by silver (?) from circa 375/985 to circa the 450's/1060's. Finally, Byzantine gold, silver and copper seem to be in circulation in the entire area.

What is very striking about these statistics is that for about 120 years before the arrival of the Seljuqs, that is from about the 330's/940's to the 450's/1060's, and for another seventy years after until the 520's/1120's, there was very little coinage of any kind struck in the area. The reasons and the consequences of this phenomenon have not yet been satisfactorily explained. It was a period of flourishing trade, at least for Armenian cities like Ani and Dvin, and one would think that coinage would be of paramount importance. The explanations for this dearth of coins usually are involved with the so-called silver crisis or silver famine (to be discussed below) which begins in this period.

B. The Seljuq Period

The Great Seljuqs almost exclusively struck gold

---

114 See Zambaur, Manuel, No. 165, p. 180; at least it was their capital.

115 Zambaur, No. 171, pp. 184-185.

116 The information is abstracted from Pakhomov, Klady, op.cit., the nine fascicules of hoards.
Dinārs of a high quality; minting started under Tughril Beg as early as the 430's/1040's and continued in good quantity until shortly after the death of Malikshāh. Then their coinage almost stopped; the few pieces of poorly struck gold have been described as "miserable."\textsuperscript{117} As for the Seljuqs of Iraq, almost all known issues are badly struck and often clipped, debased dinārs;\textsuperscript{118} they do not extend beyond the 560's/1160's. In Caucasus and Adharbayjān all of the coinage in the Seljuk period up to the Mongol invasions was, with two exceptions,\textsuperscript{119} entirely copper and mostly irregularly struck. This generalization includes the Ildeghizids, Bīshkīnids, Shirvānshāhs, Malik of Darband, an unidentified vassal of the Ildeghizids and the Kings of Georgia, who for the whole period struck exclusively bilingual coppers.\textsuperscript{120}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{117}George C. Miles, \textit{Rayy}, p. 216.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{118}Ibid., p. 217; very few have come to light.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{119}Both to be discussed in the corpus; silver issues, mostly base, of the Shirvānshāhs until circa 514/1120, and three very base gold dinārs (?) of the last Ildeghizids, Abū Bakr and 'Uzbek.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{120}The Arabic-Georgian bilingual coinage "did not, during Georgia's Golden Age, imply political dependence on the Muslim powers. Indeed the Georgian dynasts took pride in their Arabic legends in vaunting their role as Defender of the Christian Faith. Sometimes the Caliph's name was included as a gesture of conciliation to Georgia's many Muslim subjects, as well as to the inhabitants of neighbouring states, among whom economic considerations made it desirable that Georgia's coinage should circulate as widely as possible;" D. Lang, \textit{Numismatic History of Georgia}, p. 2.
\end{flushright}
Other Islamic minting authorities were the Khvārazmshāhs, who struck dīnārs from the 550's/1160's to just after the turn of the 7th/13th century;\textsuperscript{121} The Assassins, represented by a rare small gold issue from Alamūt in the 530's/1130's;\textsuperscript{122} and the Salgharid atabegs at Fārs, who issued gold (?) just after mid-century.\textsuperscript{123}

In Anatolia, northern Syria, and upper Mesopotamia, there was an entirely different and numismatically interesting phenomenon during this period. Large copper coins were struck of near uniform size and thickness perhaps representing token dirhams in lieu of silver.\textsuperscript{124} Almost without exception the obverse bore a portrait or other representational motif. The portrayal of human or animal forms on coins was de facto prohibited in the post reform period.\textsuperscript{125} If we discount the pre-reform issues of Byzantine and Sasanian affinity, there is only one previous instance of representational coins. These were large gold pieces struck

\textsuperscript{121}Zambaur, No. 199, D., p. 209.

\textsuperscript{122}Zambaur, No. 209, pp. 217-218; specimen listed in Markov, \textit{Inventarny\textsuperscript{4}}, \textit{op. cit.}, and another in the ANS, unpublished.

\textsuperscript{123}Zambaur, No. 225, p. 232.

\textsuperscript{124}For which see below.

\textsuperscript{125}\textit{See supra}, n.102.
in the 4th/10th century by the Buyids; on one side there was usually a portrait of a Buyid prince, Sasanian in manner, and on the other often some animal(s). The few existing pieces more than likely are commemorative medals rather than coins struck for monetary usage. 126

As for the 6th/12th century representational coppers under discussion, their minting follows a rough chronological pattern, starting in western Anatolia and gradually moving east as the century wears on. That is those areas furthest removed from orthodox Islamic authorities, the caliph in Baghdad and the sultan in Isphahan or Hamadan, were the first in which portraiture was used and the movement eastward, even closer to these religious centers, probably reflects the diminishing power of a weakened central government to oppose such practices. The minting pattern is as follows: in the first years of the century the Danishmandids of Sivas and shortly after the Seljuqs of Rum; in the 510's/1110's the Artuqids of Mardin; the 530's/1140's the Artuqids of

---

126 See George C. Miles, "A Portrait of the Buyid Prince Rukn al-Dawlah," ANS, Museum Notes, XI (1964), pp. 283-293. The reversion to a Sasanian style reflects the interest in imitating things Persian during the so-called "Iranian Intermezzo;" see supra, "Introd.," n.31, "Chap. Two," n.12 (on the Shia origin of the Buyids, which may be a factor here) and n.13.
Åmid-Khayfa, the Zangids at Aleppo, Damascus and Mawsil; the 540's/1150's the Dānishmandids of Malatya; the 550's/1160's the Saltūqids at Erzerum, the Mangujekids at Arzinjān and Divrīz; the 560's/1170's the Zangids at Sinjar; and finally after 570/1180 the Zangids of Jazīrah, the Artuqids of Kharpert, the Ayyūbids at Sinjar and Mayyāfāriqīn, the Shāh-i Armen at Akhlāṭ, and the Begteginids at Irbil. 127

These representational coins were all struck in a geographical area which, prior to the end of the previous 5th/11th century, was Christian and under Byzantine dominion; it was also an area of Crusader activity. Thus far the only reasonable explanation proposed is the desire on the part of the new Turkic rulers to provide a coinage not too dissimilar from the Byzantine copper to which the indigenous population had been accustomed for centuries. 128

127 The material for this section has been taken from Günar Inal, "A Study of the Iconography of Some Turkish Coins from the 12th and 13th Centuries," an unpublished paper prepared for the Summer Seminar in Numismatics of the ANS (New York, 1962), see especially the chart. See also Zambaur, Manuel, passim under the respective dynasties.

128 See now Claude Cahen's preceptive, but frustrating review and analysis of the possible explanations of this peculiar coinage; Pre-Ottoman Turkey, pp. 168-171. It is frustrating for even Cahen is unsure. One of the problems in his discussion of this most complex problem is to assume that "copper was of no commercial importance," (p. 169). As mentioned above, there was almost no other coinage being struck. Some of these copper issues even had "dirham" written on them (see infra, n. 148) indicating that they were substitutes for them. Before any serious work can be done
A detailed discussion of this interesting coinage is not within the scope of this study, but on the surface it would seem that the uniformity of the coins allowed their commercial use throughout the general area. As will be shown later in this chapter some of it even made its way into southern Caucasia.

These coins are of interest to us for two reasons. First they clearly demonstrate the ever diminishing power of the central Seljuq authority and the proliferation of local dynasts, unhindered by any other major power of the period. The second reason why this representational money is of importance is the contrast they provide with the coins in the corpus. It is precisely this contrast which produced the original inspiration and structuring of this work. It was observed by examination that in the whole of the 6th/12th century, distinguished by the exclusive striking of copper by almost all dynastic authorities from western Anatolia to Caucasia, Adharbayjân and areas immediately south, that the coins divided themselves into two distinct groups: a representational or semi-representational group and a purely epigraphical group. Furthermore, the groups

---

on this problem, corpora of these coins must be prepared, and hoards analyzed. See also Cahen's similar and less complete earlier remarks on the subject in "Artukid," 43. Cf., supra, n.120, discussion of the reverse tendency in the same century, namely Christian coins modified to conform to Muslim criteria.
separated themselves into two geographical areas: Anatolia, northern Syria and upper Mesopotamia, representational; Caucasia and Adjharbayjân, completely inscriptive. It is the corpus of this purely non-pictorial coinage which forms the body of this study.

C. The Khwarazmshah and Mongol Period

The very beginning of the 7th/13th century had only slight modifications over the previous one and numismatically could be regarded, at least for the first two decades, as an extension of the 6th/12th. The Seljuqs in the east had completely disappeared. The Khwarazmshah Jalâl al-Dîn during his decade of ravages in the Middle East, 129 struck large, very irregular coppers reminiscent of the copper coinage of the Georgian Queen T'amâr (580/1185-610/1213) 130 and somewhat less those of Shirvân of the same period; they were probably produced exclusively by those mints. While Shirvân and Georgia continued to issue their own coinage right throughout this whole period, Ildégizid and Bîshkînîd minting came to an abrupt stop,

129 See supra, "Section I.: D."

130 Illustrations of this coinage can be found in Lang, Numismatic History of Georgia, Pl.II, figs. 4, 5; for those of the Khwarazmshah see ibid., Pl.II, fig. 9, and pl. III, figs. 1, 2.
even though the latter gave homage to the Khwārazmshāh and joined his forces. The Maliks of Darband had already faded into obscurity; the few rare and undated fals of their last ruler, ʿAbd-al-Malik b. Bekbārs, probably are to be assigned to the decade before the appearance of Jalāl al-Dīn.132

However, there is a radical change in the coinage of Caucasia and Adharbayjān which coincided with the final Mongol occupation and that change is the reminting of silver. Already in the Ayyūbid controlled areas of Syria and the Seljuq areas of Anatolia it was minted somewhat earlier,133 but for Caucasia the coincidence is exact.134 The Shirvānshāhs, the one surviving dynasty in this study, continued to mint copper coins; the first mention of the

131 The last Bīshkīnīd issue is dated 623/1226; the last undated issues of the Ildegizid, Uzbek, were most likely struck shortly before his death in 622/1225; for details see the corpus.

132 Perhaps even before 600/1203, see supra, n.93, and their corpus.

133 The Ayyūbids in Damascus in 570/1174-5, the Seljuq at Konya, 581/1185-6; see Andrew Watson, "Back to Gold--and Silver," op. cit., pp. 5-6 for detailed accounting of this resumption of silver minting in the Middle East.

134 A dirham of Queen Rusudan of Georgia, "Tiflis," 627-8/1230, Lang, p. 31, no.14, and not 638/1240-1 as Watson, p.6, indicates.
Mongol Great Khan on these issues was rather late, 653/1255-6, and then still together with the Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad.\(^{135}\) The last existing issues of the Shirvānshāhs seem to date from the 660's/1260's, though the dynasty rather lamely survived into the next century.\(^{136}\) The Georgians also continued to mint right through this period, but in silver and with the name of the Mongol overlord recorded a decade earlier, 642/1244-5.\(^{137}\) To complete the picture after the Mongol invasions, in the west the Artuqids at Mardin, the Zangids at Mawsil, the Seljuqs of Rûm at Konya,\(^{138}\) and the Armenian Kingdoms of Cilicia,\(^{139}\) continued to strike coins, the latter two

\(^{135}\) Just two years before the death of the last Abbāsid caliph, al-Mustaṣfī, during the destruction of Baghdad by Hulagu in 656/1258.

\(^{136}\) Perhaps an anonymous coin of Farrukhzād II b. Akhsatān II, q.v., the corpus, where further details on the last Shirvānshāhs will be found.

\(^{137}\) See Lang, p. 35, no.15, a dirham.

\(^{138}\) For the Artuqids, Zangids, and Seljuqs of Rûm, see Zambaur, Manuel, under the respective dynasties.

\(^{139}\) For the coinage of Cilician Armenian see now the near definitive, Paul Bedoukian, The Coinage of Cilician Armenia, AMS (New York, 1962); Arm. trans. (Vienna, 1965).
having switched completely to silver. Finally, during the whole period under consideration in this study there is also an uninterrupted coinage, gold and later silver, in Egypt, Palestine and southern Syria, by the Fātimids, Ayyūbids, and Mamlūks successively.

D. The Silver Crisis

Reference has been made several times to the silver crisis or famine. Shortly before the end of the 4th/10th century a remarkable, omnipresent shortage of silver affected the entire Middle East. In a short time it practically ceased to be coined anywhere in the Muslim world. Fractional currency in base metals, mostly copper, took its place, alongside gold dīnārāt which continued to circulate. 140 In southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjān only in Georgia and Shirvān was any silver minted and this only to the first quarter of the 6th/12th century, in very limited quantities, often base. This was probably due to the indigenous silver mines in Georgia. 141 It is curious that

140 See R. Blake, "Circulation of Silver in the Moslem East..." op.cit., p. 291 ff.; E.A. Pakhmov, Money in Crusil, I, pp. 79-80; idem, Kroatii kurs, p. 16, 27; idem, Klady, I, pp. 24-26; V.V. Barthold, Istorii kul'turnoi zhizni Turkestana (History of the Cultural Life of Turkestan) (Leningrad, 1927), pp. 82-83; Pakhmov, "Monetnoe obrashchenie," op.cit., pp. 84-85; Mushoglian, Denezhnoe, op.cit., pp. 26-30; the material for this section has been abstracted from these sources and A. Watson, "Back to Silver," pp. 1-7. See supra, "Chap. One," n.118, for complete citations of these articles and further references.

141 Pakhmov, "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 84.
the contemporary sources are completely silent on this silver deficiency in the Near East.

This silver shortage has still not been adequately explained. Robert Blake attributed it to the expansion of Russian and Scandinavian export trade to the Islamic world draining off silver currency to the North: the loss of the Caucasian and the famous Zarafshān (in Goghdiana) silver mines in the 3rd/9th and late 4th/10th centuries respectively; the general disintegration of the Abbāsid caliphate; and the Seljuq invasions which drove a wedge between the Slavonic and Arab worlds. Soviet scholars led by Pakhomov add economic deterministic reasons, heavily Marxist in their interpretation. For them the fractionalization of the area into small political entities resulted in an isolated feudal situation where local lords exploited the masses by strengthening the barter economy which was fully in their control at the expense of a moneyed economy

142 Indeed the loss of silver dirhams to the north was enormous; at least 120,000 of these have been found in Russia and another 85,000 in Scandinavia; Watson, p. 4, n.4 and 5 with references. Pakhomov remarks that more of these dirhams are found outside the Middle East than where they were originally minted, ibid., p. 83.

143 Blake, p. 328; a short summary can also be found in Lang, p. 22.
based on fixed silver and gold coinage. The recent argument of Watson is that essentially silver had a higher value relative to gold in Europe, so that all the Muslim silver found its way north and west, while the opposite flow of gold east was the result of gold having a higher value there. His discussion may be valid for the late 7th/13th century and after, but it is not convincing for the 5th/11th–6th/12th centuries. Whatever the solution of this complex problem may be, for our purposes the fact of the silver shortage rather than the factors which caused it, is more important.

That copper was intended to replace silver as a commercial currency, contrary to the suggestion of C. Cahen that copper was of no commercial importance, is attested to during the period of the silver crisis by the corollary phenomenon of the copper or token dirham. From Anatolia

---

144 Pakhomov, "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 90.


146 See supra, n.128. Of course normally copper was not of commercial importance, but at a time when there was no silver and the gold was rare or very base, as was the case in Anatolia, Caucasus, Adharbayjian and al-Jibal in this period, copper had to serve for commercial purposes, i.e., trade, exchange. For more information see the following notes.

147 Pakhomov refers to these as "credit dirhams" and adds that they were struck by Zangids, Begteginids, Artuqids, Suqmanids (? = Shab-i Armen), Ayyubids, Danishmendsids and others; Klady, I, p. 25. See the next note for more details.
to Central Asia copper coins were struck with the words *dirham* or "this is a *dirham.*"\(^{148}\) In the early 7th/13th century, Nasawi says that the representative of the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn collected in one year 200,000 "barbaric *dīnārs*" in Shirvān.\(^{149}\) We know of no *dīnārs* struck in the area; this is perhaps another reference to substitute copper coinage; it was probably "regularly" struck copper.

E. **Copper Coinage. Regular and Irregular**

During the silver crisis only copper was coined in southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjān.\(^{150}\) Pakhomov was the first to notice that this coinage fell into two

---

\(^{148}\) [nāḥab al-*dirham*] a coin of qūtb al-Dīn Il-Ghāżī, of the Artuqids of Mardin dated 579/1183-4; see Kh. Musheghian, *Denezhnoe*, op.cit., p. 85, no.111, illustrated with three references. Coppors with *"dirham*" were also struck by the Zangids of Sinjar (ibid.); the Seljuqs of Iraq by Ma'sūd b. Mūhammad (527/1132-547/1153) at Ardashīl (ibid., p. 149, no.958, illustrated); the Georgian Queen Tamār, and Queen Rusudan, the latter in the name of Jalāl al-Dīn, dated 623/1226 (Lang, p. 28, n.12, illustrated, note that it is of the "irregular" type); other examples in Pakhomov, *Monety Gruzii*, I, p. 108 and D.G. Kapanadze, *Gruzinskaia numizmatika* (Moscow, 1955), pp. 64-66, cf. Musheghian, p. 27, n.6; the Qarakhanids in the 7th/13th century, see reference to an article by Davidovich in Musheghian, p. 27, n.4.

\(^{149}\) Ed. Houdas, text, pp. 173-174.

\(^{150}\) Note the exceptions given in supra, n.119.
categories, which he distinguished as "regularly" struck and "irregularly" struck copper.\textsuperscript{151} He defined them thus: "regularly" struck copper was money of a definite form, usually circular, and near uniform weight, which he conjectured allowed these coins to be regarded as money with a definite unit value; "irregularly" struck copper were bits of the metal, of diverse form, size and weight, rarely containing the impression of a whole die,\textsuperscript{152} and whose largely fluctuating weight did not suggest the possibility of their use as unit currency of a definite value. Rather this irregularly struck copper was sold or exchanged by weight of minted metal, irrespective of the number of pieces in a given weight.\textsuperscript{153} Furthermore, irregular copper is almost

\textsuperscript{151}\textit{Monety Gruzii}, p. 82; cf. "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 87.

\textsuperscript{152}In the hundreds of irregular coppers examined during the course of this study, not one contained a complete obverse and reverse die. Almost without exception the planchet (the die of metal on which a coin is struck) is too small for the die. The striking of these "coins" was so careless that often coins are found with the same die, sometimes the obverse sometimes the reverse, used on both sides (see the Darband Malik's corpus). These conditions have made it necessary to reconstruct legends from various specimens, and naturally, when only one or a few specimen exist, have made proper, fully accurate readings almost impossible.

\textsuperscript{153}See the previous note; in an isolated local barter economy it would make little difference.
never found in hoards outside the area in which it was struck; therefore, it was probably used not as units of money, but in weight—lots of stamped copper in an area of local barter economy.  

This prevalence of irregular copper in Caucasus is unique in the numismatic history of the Middle East. It is confined to an area north of the Kur River and includes eastern Georgia, Darband, and Shirvān. The entire output of the Maliks of Darband and the 6th/12th century Shirvān-shāhs consists of this irregular copper. The Ildegizids and the Kings of Georgia both struck regular and irregular copper, the latter type unquestionably designed for use in trade or barter with Darband and Shirvān. The Bīshkīnid Maliks of Ahar, because of their position south of the Araxes, struck an exclusively regular copper token dirham type coinage. The as yet unidentified Ildegizid vassal

154 See previous note. Pakhomov's distinctions have been liberally paraphrased, modified and added to from personal observations of the coins under study.

155 For the Ildegizid, Pakhomov, "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 87, and the discussion to follow; for the Georgians, Pakhomov, Monetnaya Gruzii, pp. 79-82; Lang, pp. 24-25. Lang says these may have been hastily minted in large quantities to be provided for the areas conquered during Queen T'amar's time. They may have been struck under Georgian supervision at mints in Shirvan and Darband, which were more or less under Georgian suzerainty. "The first irregular coppers were struck under Dimitri I (519/1125-550/1155), who employed some mint-masters from Shirvan;" ibid., p. 25, n.1, citing A. Bykov, "Gruzinskie monety XII-XIII vv. (Georgian Coins XII-XIIIth Centuries)," Pamiatniki epokhi Rustaveli (Leningrad, 1938), p. 80.

156 In size, texture and style of epigraphy these coins
minted a copper coinage somewhere between regular and irregular like certain types of their atabeg overlords; since most of the coins of this dynasty originate from the Mūqān steppe just south of the Kur, it would appear to be a compromise area where both types were in use.157

Among the Ildegizid coins, which are of both varieties, Pakhomov distinguishes four types. The first is large, heavy and regular, often with the mint name Ardabīl and the date. These coins usually bear in addition to the name of the Ildegizid atabeg, that of the reigning caliph and Seljuq sultan. They are not found north of the Kur and rarely in Arrān, i.e. Ganja, which is a neutral area similar to Mūqān. This Ardabīl type is most abundant in the south: Ardabīl, Naxijawan and Lenkoran. The second type is thin, regular and circular without mint name or date, with the mention of the Seljuq sultan, but without the caliph. It is found predominantly

are very much like the token dirham coppers of eastern Anatolia and northern Syria. Of course they do not have any representation, but as a group they stand out from the rest of the coins in this study.

157 The whole region along the length of the right bank of the Kur, including Ganja, Bardaša and Mūqān seems to be an area where both regular and irregular coins circulated. It is the buffer zone between exclusively regular and exclusively irregular copper coinage.
in Armenia, especially Dvin, and bordering areas along the Araxes, but not in other parts of Soviet Azerbaijan. Because this type is so different from the previous Ardabil variety, Pakhomov ruled out their being struck there and favored a large Ildegizid city like Tabriz. The third type is rather thick, angular, and therefore, irregular; few of the coins in this group show a circular border with mint name and date. Struck in the late 6th/12th century and bearing the caliph al-Nasir’s name, they are found almost exclusively in the territory of Soviet Azerbaijan, i.e., Arran, especially the cities of Ganja, Barda and Baylaqan and in large hoards along the banks of the Kur. The fourth and final type is composed of small regular coins of Shams al-Din Ildegiz with the caliphs al-Muqtadif (530/1136-555/1160) or al-Mustandjid (555/1160-566/1170) found exclusively in Ganja, and, therefore, known as the "Ganja" type.

---

158 The overwhelming majority of the 359 Ildegizid coins found in the excavations are of this type; see Mushegian, passim. Perhaps the Christians felt better without the name of the caliph, nor Allah or any other Muslim characteristics.

159 These are in such bad condition and so carelessly struck and clipped on the borders, that Pakhomov knows only one with the mint name, and that is Shamkur, on a copper in the Hermitage; "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 87, n.1. I know of no other reference or description of this coin and even though Pakhomov says the coin is very carefully minted, the statement must be approached cautiously.

160 But in another place he refers to these coins as angular: Klady, II, H415, pp. 28-29.
Caution must be exercised in the use of these distinctions; the evidence is based on archeological work done north of the Araxes. Excavation of cities in Iranian Adharbayjān such as Ahar, Ardabīl, Tabrīz, and Hamadān, may turn up different and conflicting data. For example, the three gold Ildegizid coins described for the first time in this corpus are totally unknown to Soviet scholars.\textsuperscript{161}

F. \textit{Tamghās, Mints, Hoards and Monetary Circulation}

A \textit{tamghā}\textsuperscript{162} was a tribal mark common to the Turks and Mongols of Central Asia; it was usually made by stamping or branding and most likely originated or was made popular because of its use as an identifying sign for the horses and

\textsuperscript{161} Nor to western scholars for that matter; see the Ildegizid corpus under Abū Bakr.

\textsuperscript{162} This is not to be confused with the \textit{tughrā} which was also used by Turkic peoples, but more as an official monogram at the top of written documents. It was more an individual than a tribal mark; in the case of the Seljuqs, the bow was used for both \textit{tamghā} and \textit{tughrā}; see C. Cahen, "La Tugrā seljukide," \textit{JA} (1943-1945), pp. 167-172; Jean Deny, "Tuğrā," \textit{EI}_{1}. 
cattle of each tribe. The Turks brought the custom with them into the Middle East and in the 6th/11th century often used it on coins they struck. The practice of using it on coins was not universal among the Turks, nor of course did all tribal units or even non-tribal units strike coins. The two major sources for these tamghās are the 5th/11th century *Dictionary of Mahmūd of Kūshghar*¹⁶³ and the *Universal History* of the late 7th/13th century Mongol historian Rashīd al-Dīn.¹⁶⁴ The Great Seljuqs used as their tamghā a bow and arrow usually placed above both the obverse and reverse of each coin.¹⁶⁵ The Ildegizid atabegs used two major tamghās, a trident, though sometimes with only two prongs, and a bow;¹⁶⁶ they are used on their coins, though not universally. The Bīshīṅīds, though originally of Georgian origin,¹⁶⁷ also

¹⁶³ Q.v., "Chap. One," n.1. The tamghās from both authors' work as well as that from the 9th/15th century Ottoman historian Yazıcıoğlu's *Oğuzname* are given in tabular form in Faruk Stümer, *Oğuzlar (Türkmenler)*, op. cit., Tables I-III, after p. 208.

¹⁶⁴ Q.v. supra, "Chap. One," n.29 and the preceding note.

¹⁶⁵ See examples, Miles, *Bayy*, nos.222-234, Pls. IV-V.

¹⁶⁶ As Pakhomov rightly adds sometimes a dagger and even sometimes a curved sword were also used; "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 89.

¹⁶⁷ See supra, n.86.
employ a *tambā*, consistently on their coinage, probably indicating a Turkification of the clan within what was supposed to be an active Turkic environment. These *tambās* are of great assistance in the correct identification of many coins from these dynasty, coins which often are in such a worn state that other parts of the legend are illegible. The Maliks of Darband and the Shirvānshāhs being of non-Turkic origin of course do not utilize such symbols on their coins. The unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids seems not to employ such markings, but there are too few known examples, and these are in poor condition, to be definitive on this.

Because of its lesser intrinsic value copper coins traditionally have been more carelessly and casually struck. One of the consequences of this has been the general neglect of mint names on the coinage of south-eastern Caucasia and Adharbayjān. There are a handful of fully attested mints for as many dynasties. All Bīshābīnid coins carry the mint name Ahar. Not a single specimen of the Maliks of Darband has the mint indicated, but since they controlled no other major city besides

---

168 See supra, "Introd.," n.20; for examples see corpus.
Darband, we assume that all their numismatic output was minted there. The numismatic literature known only of one late mint name for the Shirvānshāhs, namely two anonymous coins struck in the late 650's/1250's or 660's/1260's with the mint Shīrvān,169 which at this period could mean any place in the area, but probably Shamākhīya. Pakhomov has speculated that this city would be the most likely candidate for the Shirvānshāh mint of the 6th/12th century.170 His speculation is now confirmed by a unique coin of billon (a mixture of copper or tin with some silver) struck by Minūchīhr II b. Afrīdūn dated 555/1160 with the mint Shamākhīya quite clear.171 Other mints may have existed at such cities as Baku. The only clearly attested Ildegizid mint is Ardabīl, though Pakhomov indicates that Shamkur also is found.172 Ganja, Tabriz and perhaps other cities also seem

169 In the Hermitage, see Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 401, no.123 (two examples); see also infra, the Shirvanshah corpus, no.47.

170 "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 86.

171 The coin is remarkable in a number of ways; see the full discussion in the Shirvanshah corpus, no.13.

172 See supra, n.159.
likely candidates. We have no evidence on the unidentified mamlūk of the Ildegizids, but the most likely place seems to be in Mūqān. If all coins in this study were not in such poor condition, so badly struck and so often clipped around the edges, it is certain that more mint names would be known and also more dates. Usually on Islamic money both mint name and date are found written in the outer margin in a fixed formula: struck in (name of city) in the year (the year written out).

The question of discovering and properly recording coin hoards is closely related to the general interest in scientific archaeology in a given area. In this century Soviet scholars have been especially keen about the historical past of the various peoples in the Soviet Union and, therefore, have exploited the auxiliary discipline of archaeology to the utmost. In southeastern Caucasus and Soviet Azerbaycan the work has been intense; the situation in Iranian Azerbaycan has not been as fortunate. The result is a lopsided and perhaps distorted body of evidence. As mentioned before the comprehensive collection of all known coin finds, hoards or single examples, by Pakhomov has resulted in a vast and rich reservoir of data for the area.

---

173 See the discussion supra, in paragraph which contains n.158.

174 See supra, n.157 and text there.

175 [duriba bi ...(city) fi sanah (the year)].
This work together with the model reporting of the numismatic evidence from the medieval Armenian city of Dvin by Mushegian will serve as the major sources of information for the following discussion.

The hoards have shown that irregularly struck copper tends to remain in the area where it was originally minted. The coins of the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvanshahs, exclusively irregular, are rarely found south of the Kur and almost never near the Araxes. Irregular Georgian copper is found only in eastern Georgia, Shirvan and Darband, but rarely in western Georgia or south of the Kur. At Dvin, somewhat west on the Araxes, where some 360 Ildegizid coins were found, most of them were of the regular variety; there was not a single example of Shirvanshah or Darband coinage among the more than 1,100 found. Furthermore, in Shirvan and Darband regular Ildegizid, Georgian or Bishkinid copper is rare, and copper dirhams from areas outside the Caucasus extremely rare.

This indicates that first the area functioned in a rather isolated, very local economic pattern. Commercial dealings of these areas were limited and confined, or perhaps better monopolized by the Georgians and the Ildegizids. Secondly, since the irregular copper was probably utilized
by bulk weight of stamped metal, the economy was a barter one rather than a moneyed one.

On the other hand the Georgians, the Ildegizids and the inhabitants of such commercial cities as Dvin, with a mixed Christian and Muslim population, were involved in inter-regional commerce, even if somewhat limited, as attested by the increased frequency of copper or token dirhams found in the area along the Araxes and between the Araxes and the Kur, namely Arrān. In Dvin itself nineteen such copper dirhams were found: twelve Seljuqs of Iraq, four Artuqid, two Zangid and one Mangujekid; this besides the hundreds of Ildegizid and thirty-one regular Georgian coppers.

The prevalence of Ildegizid, Bīshkīnid, and Georgian regular copper as well as a sprinkling of irregular copper from Shirvān, Darband and the unidentified vassal in the area between the Kur and the Araxes seems to indicate that during this whole period a modus vivendi had been reached between these opposing forces in the area; a fact confirmed by the sources which represent it as the continuous battle ground between the Christian Georgians and the Muslim Ildegizids. However, the final balance of power seemed to be with the Ildegizids until the very end of the 6th/12th century, at least in eastern Arrān and Mūqān and along the southern bank of the Kur as far as Ganja.
The irregularly struck copper of Shirvān and Darband has much closer affinity to that of Georgia's irregular coinage than to that of the Ildegizid variety, which is the most regular of the irregular type; this, and the much larger number of Georgian bilingual irregulars, compared to Ildegizid types, found in Darband and Shirvān seem to indicate that, even though the latter areas were Muslim, they had closer ties to Georgia.

It is unfortunate that we have no comparative material south of the Araxes. If we were to find large numbers of Shirvānshāh or Darband coins in cities like Ahar and Ardabīl, it might change our whole notion of the relations of these areas with each other. Also it would be very instructive to know if any of the dirham type coppers of the Bishkīnids were to be found in such more western areas as Mawsil, Sinjar, or Akhlat to see if these vassals of the Ildegizids conducted any trade outside of this area, independent from their overlords. The large size and regularity of these coins give reason to believe they were struck with more than just local trade in mind.

It is interesting that the Rayy excavations have turned up no Ildegizid coins; since we now know that

---

they struck gold at the end of the century, it is more likely that it was intended for areas of al-Jibāl rather than for commercial cities along the Araxes or for Arrān or Shirvān. Hamadān and Tabriz would be likely places to circulate such money. In any case there are infinite possibilities for conjecture, but until we have some definite facts on coin hoards and circulation in the cities of northwestern al-Jibāl and Persian Azerbayjān, we can only guess.\footnote{The material for this section was drawn from E.A. Pakhomov, Klady, \textit{op.cit.}, I-IX, and discussion, I, pp. 26-27; \textit{idem}, "Monetnoe obrashchenie," \textit{passim}; Kh. Mushegian, \textit{Denezhnoe}, \textit{passim}.}

As final observations on these coins, it should be emphasized again that all the coins in the study, even the so-called regular copper were originally poorly and carelessly minted. Through wear and corrosion their condition has worsened. For the irregularly struck specimens, without the aid of many, many examples, it is at times virtually impossible to complete accurately a legend. In the corpus which constitutes the remainder and core of this study, coin descriptions are often pieced together in a less than satisfactory fashion. The work, especially the readings of previous numismatists, though certainly a thankless effort, must often be corrected. At times the material is
meagre, almost of no help; occasionally very rich, but in
an historical context where the sources are unusually silent,
and in a century which is extremely confused, it is the most
significant bulk of data available on these dynasties and in
some instances the only data. The corpus, by identifying and
organizing this extremely obscure and diverse matter, and then
commenting on its more uncertain aspects, tries to present
for the history of the area a handy store of information.
INTRODUCTION TO THE CORPUS

The corpus is composed of five separate corpora: that of the Shirvānshāhs, the Maliks of Darband, the Ildegizids, the Bīškīnids and an unidentified vassal of the Ildegizids. Each will be preceded by a short historical and numismatic introduction. At the end there will be some brief observations and a genealogical chart.

The corpora are arranged chronologically by ruler, starting with the first whose coins have survived. Previous rulers for whom no coins exist will be discussed in passing, though later rulers lacking coins will be treated in their proper place but with only a short notice. The corpora formally stop with the last sovereign in each dynasty for whom coins exist; surviving members will be treated summarily at the end.

Under each ruler there will again be a chronological arrangement in so far as it is possible. Since most of the coins under consideration are undated the reigning years of the caliph and/or sultan (these will be given at their first appearance in each corpus) whose names appear on the coins, will serve as references for the earliest and latest possible date of striking. When these sources of reference are missing, style alone will be the criterion for the relative chronology.
The coins in the collective corpus have certain general characteristics. They are all copper, irregular and in very poor condition; few issues are dated, but even those which bear dates are often so irregular, badly clipped, worn or carelessly struck, that part or all of it is lacking. Almost all legends display errors in Arabic orthography or spelling.

Only the Shirvānshāhs have a numismatic tradition starting before the 5th/11th century and continuing on after the first quarter of the 7th/13th century. The Malik's of Darband and the unidentified Ildegizid vassal coined entirely within the limits of the 6th/12th century. The Ildegizids themselves began minting circa the 530's/1135-1146 and the Bīshkīnids the 590's/1190's; both stopped by 623/1226. Therefore, the bulk of the coinage is stuck in the ninety year period from the 530's/1130's to the 620's/1220's.

The different specimens in the corpus are numbered consecutively. Variations in the arrangement of a legend are indicated by letters A, B, C and so forth, after the number; coins which are not fully described in the literature or are in a condition where further classification is impossible are assigned the letters X, Y, and Z. Each year in a dated issue is given a separate number even though
the legend is otherwise invariable. Every different listing will have an assigned number followed by the metallic composition (95 per cent are copper, AR); a question mark (?) indicates the attribution is not absolutely certain. Then follows the mint name and date, the names of the reigning caliph, the Great Seljuq sultan and the Seljuq sultan of Iraq; all coins listed under a ruler carry his name unless otherwise stated. The description proper gives the obverse side first, by which is meant in this study that side which carries the name of the striking authority, the design, if any, around the central field, the legend and marginal inscriptions. The reverse follows in the same fashion. After which the references to all known existing coins are listed, with the published literature first in chronological order and then the unpublished specimens; the diameter, weight and thickness are indicated, when available, as well as other pertinent remarks.

After each issue or series of similar issues, there is a discussion of the numismatic problems, i.e. doubtful attribution, misattribution. Finally, there is an historical commentary wherever the occasion warrants it.
CHAPTER THREE

THE SHIRVÄNŠHÄH CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

The early Shirvänšhâhs have been traditionally divided into two dynasties, the Yazîdids\(^1\) from the 2nd/8th to the 5th/11th century, and the so-called Kasrânids\(^2\) from

\(^1\)See supra, "Chap. Two," n.15 for complete details and references.

\(^2\)See supra, "Chap. One," the text at n. 142; also n. 46, and "Introd.," n. 22. The term was first used by B. Dorn, "Versuch," op.cit., p. 550, using as his source Ghaffârî's \textit{Jahan-ara} (10th/16th century; MSS B.M., Or.141, f.157a, Cambridge, Browne, G10 (13), f.76a; ref. from Minorsky, \\textit{Sharvan}, p. 134) in which the Shirvänšhâh genealogy is given as Minüçhîhr b. Kasrân b. Kâvûs b. Shahriyân b. Garshâsf b. Afrîdûn b. Faramarz (read: Farîburz, cf. Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}) b. Sâlûr b. Yazîd b. Mazyad...back to Anushirvan the Just; \textit{ibid.}, text, p. 27, trans., p. 129. Ghaffârî was in turn used by Mûnejîm-bâshi in his \textit{Jâmiʾ al-duwal}; \textit{ibid.} This terminology was continued by Khanykov, \textit{Mel. asiat.}, III, op.cit., Salemann, op.cit., Markov, \textit{Inventarny}, and Zambaur, \textit{Manuel}. As for the reliability of Ghaffârî Minorsky says, "It is a meritorious work, though its author on reaching the period of the 'Kasrânids'...is entirely at sea," \textit{ibid.}, p. 134. As will be stated in the text above the numismatic evidence does not support a Kasrân, but indicates clearly that Minüçhîhr b. Afrîdûn b. Farîburz b. Sâlûr etc., is correct, leaving out the series Kasrân b. Kâvûs b. Shahriyân b. Garshâsf, for whom there is no other testimony. Pakhomov, \textit{Kratki}, p. 32, suggests that Kasrân might have been another name for Afrîdûn; Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}, p. 134, adds, "perhaps a posthumous title?" For further details see Pakhomov, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 26-27; H. Hasan, \textit{Falakî}, p. 4, n. 1; Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 10, 132-134."
the 5th/11th to the late 7th/13th century. The numismatic evidence demonstrates that there was no break between the two branches, and, therefore, they are one.³ In his pioneer study B. Dorn began the genealogical table with Abū-‘l-Muzaffar Minūchihr Akhsatān b. Kasrān.⁴ Somewhat later Markov headed the Hermitage Catalogue with an issue of Afrīdūn b. Minūchihr as no. 1, but then finding a coin with the name Minūchihr b. Farīburz and not knowing exactly how to fit it into the accepted genealogy, created a no. 0 without explanation.⁵ Zambaur began his chart with Minūchihr, but separated Akhsatān, following Markov presumably, as the son of Minūchihr, but retained Kasrān as the latter's father.⁶ Pakhomov, working with coins from Caucasian hoards, totally revised the early genealogy as follows: Minūchihr b. Kasrān became Minūchihr II b. Afrīdūn, and Afrīdūn and his brother Minūchihr I were correctly identified as sons of Farīburz b. Sālār.⁷

³See the coins under Farīburz b. Sālār; Corpus nos. 3A, 4A-B, 5B, 7A-C.


⁵Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 394, Suppl., p. 932.

⁶Zambaur, Manuel, p. 182.

⁷Pakhomov, ibid., pp. 45-46; cf., Buniatov, p. 48.
Curiously Pakhomov did not complete the connection between the two parts of the dynasty. At the time of his *Excursus* the coins of Faribuz with the added b. Salar were not yet known; also he may not have had access to the *Ta'rīkh al-Bāb* as preserved by Mūnejjim-bashī. It was V. Minorsky who from the translation of the sections of the *Ta'rīkh* on Shirvān signalled the cohesion in the two branches. "One fact is now certain, namely that there was no interruption between the earlier Yazīdids and the later 'Kasrānids'..., the only difference between them being the degree of their iranisation: for a long time the dynasty had been cut off from Arab territories and of necessity had been intermarrying with local families." Minorsky unfortunately did not go a step further and print a complete dynastic table bringing together both elements of the dynasty. Recent works still retain the usage "Kasrānid" without demonstrating an awareness of the uninterrupted continuity in the genealogy.

---

8 Of course it was Pakhomov himself who published these coins. Also note that *Excursus* and *Kratkii* refer to the same study.

9 Minorsky, *Sharvān*, p. 134. Some of the information was already reported by Minorsky in his earlier study based on the *Ta'rīkh*, i.e., *Studies*, p. 58.

This corpus also begins with Farīburz b. Šālar and neglects the earlier part of the dynasty. There is no justifiable reason except convenience. Before Farīburz the dynasty goes back some 275 years to Yazīd b. Mazyad; only a few rare coins have been discovered for five of the seventeen rulers. There are dirhams for Khālid b. Yazīd,\(^{11}\) Haytham b. Muhammad b. Haytham,\(^{12}\) Yazīd b. Ahmad,\(^{13}\) Abū Mansūr Cālī b. Yazīd,\(^{14}\) and Šālar b. Yazīd.\(^{15}\) Perhaps then the corpus should have started with Šālar b. Yazīd or even Cālī b. Yazīd, from whom there is an almost

---


\(^{13}\) With the caliph al-Qādīr, Markov, 1909(?), reference from Minorsky, *Sharvān*, p. 64. I have not been able to trace the reference, perhaps in a supplement of the *Inventarnyi*.

\(^{14}\) Cālī's dates are 425/1033-435/1043. The dirham was found in 1958 near Shamākht, Azerbaijan; Pakhomov, *Klady*, IX, H2109, the coin is described and carries the title Shirvānshāh.

continuous numismatic tradition. However, since the corpora of the other dynasties in this work fall within the period between the Seljuq and Mongol invasions, it has been practical to start the Shirvânshâhs corpus with Farîburz.

The last Shirvânshâh for whom we have coins is Akhsatâh III b. Farîburz III who ruled in the mid-7th/13th century. The dynasty continues to the end of the century and after a break again in the 8th/14th century. The establishment of the genealogy, though still full of uncertainties, has been principally the result of numismatic investigation. The most interesting periods numismatically are those of Minûchihr II, for whom there is in the corpus a unique coin in the American Numismatic Society dated 555/1160 with the mint Shamâkhiya, and the years during the caliphate of al-Nâsir (575/1180-622/1225) when there is great confusion in the Shirvânshâh state which seems to have fragmented into a feudal system.

---

16 Pakhomov, *Excursus*, pp. 43-46, repeated in Minorsky, *Shirvan*, pp. 135-136. There is also a later dynasty of Shirvânshâhs ruling from the 8th/14th to the end of 10th/16th century, after which Persian governors rule to the 11th/17th century and a final dynasty in the 12th/18th and early 13th/19th centuries; see Zambaur, pp. 182-183.

17 See *infra*, n. 89 and the corpus under Jalâl al-Dîn Sultânshâh.
Except for silver and billon issues minted up to the mid-6th/12th century, the coinage is exclusively copper of the irregular variety. Only three issues have the mint place and date, two of Minūchihr II (see supra) and another of Akhastān III b. Farīburz (also supra). The reigning caliph and the Great Seljuq sultan appear by name. But after the mid-6th/12th century the Seljuq sultan of Iraq is mentioned only by title and never by name.

In this work the form Shīrvān has been used throughout as opposed to Sharvān. Minorsky, who earlier used Shīrvān (praedid, passim), justified his use of the Sharvān form on the basis of the early sources Sāmānī and Yāqūt, on a pun in Khaqānī on Shārvān - Shīrvān, and an article by Sā'idī. Nafīsī.18 H. Hasan, citing the passage from Khaqānī as well as another from Falāki, considers Sharvān a variant, using Shīrvān himself.19 One of the last coins in this corpus has the mint name Shīrvān; a 5th/11th century Armenian colophon uses Sirvān.20 Since the tradition is not clear, the pronunciation closest to the modern has been


19Falāki, op. cit., pp. 2-3, where the passages are given in the original. In general I have followed Hasan on the vocalization of the names of the Shīrvānshāhs.

20See supra, "Chap. One," n. 78.
chosen.

At the end of the corpus there will be some observations and a genealogical table.

II. THE CORPUS

A. Farīburz b. Sālār (455/1063 to 487/1094–489/1096)

Ia-C. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā'im (422/1031–467/1075) and Seljuq sultan Alp Arslān (455/1063–465/1072).

The coins are only described as issues of a Shirvānshāh whose name is not visible and containing the caliph's and sultan's names.

Pakhomov, Kladъ, VIII, p. 112, K vvp. VII, H1783, nos. 1,2,4; no. 1 (d=23.0–23.5 mm., t=1.6 mm., w=7.10 gr.), no. 2 (one side has a three-cornered design inscribed in a circle with dots in the center and at the edges traces of the formula of faith) (d=21.0–23.0 mm., t=approx. 1.4 mm., w=3.91 gr.), no. 4 (the reading Alp Arslan is not certain; one side has the formula of faith circularly displayed) (d=17.0–18.0 mm., t=1.5–2.0 mm., w=4.43 gr.).

The three coins might be of the same issue or of totally different issues. I have placed them together for convenience since they were found in the same hoard.

Though the name Farīburz is not visible on these coins there is now every reason to accept them as such, because of Pakhomov's complete revision of the dynastic
table of the Shirvānshāhs. Yet even in this work Farīburz's dates are given as 467/1074–485/1092 to 487/1094–511/1117. Minorsky reproduced this table with the error in the first date, though he added certain corrections based primarily on his studies of the Ta'rikh al-Bāb. "[Sālār] died on Sunday, 18 Safar 455/20 February 1063 after having ruled some fifteen years. After him ruled his heir-apparent Farīburz b. Sallār b. Yazīd, in whose charge all (the) affairs were even in his father's time." It is curious that Minorsky in correcting Pakhomov's table says, "we now know of Farīburz I...that he succeeded his father in 455/1063;" for Zambaur had already listed the beginning of Farīburz's rule at circa 455/1063. Since Alp Arslān began his reign in the same year, all the above coins must be ascribed to Farīburz and must be dated during the ten years of Alp Arslān's reign.

2A. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā'īm and Seljuq sultan....

---

21 Excursum, op.cit., pp. 45-46.

22 Minorsky, ibid., Arabic text, p. 11, trans., p. 34.

23 Ibid., p. 136.

24 Manuel, p. 182.
Coins 2A–C. are described in Russian; transliteration to Arabic is mine.

_Oby._ (the center is occupied by an ornament, around it the formula of faith).

_Rev._ (in a linear border)

لا للإله إلا الله There is no god but Allah.
al-Qā‘im bi-amrillāh.
[The Sultan Supreme.]

Pakhomov, _Klady_, VIII, H1968, no.1 (d=19.5–20.5 mm.,
t=1.2–1.9 mm., w=4.81 gr.) (circular margins worn).

2B. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā‘im and Seljuq sultan....

_Oby._ (four ovals surrounding a central dot). Around it are fragments of the confession of faith, other inscriptions being worn.

_Rev._ ......... .........

القائم بأمر الله al-Qā‘im bi-amrillāh.
[The Sultan Supreme.]

Pakhomov, _Klady_, VIII, H1970 (d=up to 14.00 mm.,
t=approx. 1.0 mm., no weight given).

2C. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā‘im and Seljuq sultan....

_Oby._ (in the center of a circle, a smaller circle made of fairly large dots).
There are fragments of a legend circularly around this.

Rev.

٠٠٠

victory (pobeda) (?)

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah
al-Qā'im bi-amrillāh.
The Sultan the...

Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, Hl969 (the silver is greyish; d=19.0-20 mm., t=approx. 2.0 mm., w=6.21 gr.).

3A. AR. No mint name or date. Without the name of caliph or sultan visible.

Obv.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah the Just...

[Farīburj] zar son of Sālār.

Rev. (four-pointed rosette interlaced with two lines of dots)

Legends worn.

Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, Hl968, no. 2 (d=20.5 mm., t=1.0-1.2 mm., no weight given).

3B. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā'im.

Obv. (four-pointed rosette in the petals (?) on which rest the legend).
Presumably the caliph's name appears.

All coins in nos. 2 and 3 should be regarded as issues under sultan Alp Arslan, that is dating from 455/1063-465/1072. There is the possibility that some may have been struck under sultan Malikshah during the two years, 465/1072-467/1074, when al-Qa'im and Malikshah were both ruling.

On coin no. 3A we find very clearly Fariburz b. Salar, thus establishing the connection link between the 5th/11th-7th/12th century Shirvanshahs and the earlier part as discussed above.25

There is much interesting material in Ta'rikh al-Bab on the paying of tribute by Fariburz. In 437/1045 (?) the Shirvanshah Qubad b. Yazid built a strong wall of hewn stones around Yazidiya (Shamakhi) and fixed on it iron gates through fear of the Oghuz Turks.26 Later in 459/1066 the Turks

25 see supra, nn. 1 and 3.

entered and looted Shavân. Farībūrż spent much money to make the Turks leave, but in the same year the Turk Qarā-tegin came and laid siege to Yazīdiya. 27 In the next year Farībūrż spent 6,000 dinārs for the capture of his paternal uncle Mamlān b. Yazīd who was in league with Qarā-tegin. 28 In the same year Farībūrż is visited by the representatives of the Turk El-Basān (?) "...to collect the tribute which he had agreed to pay, namely 30,000 dinars yearly, in order to ward off the evil of the Turks." 29 Since we have absolutely no evidence of gold being minted in this period in Adharbayjan or the Caucasus, perhaps Seljuq or Byzantine gold served to pay these sums. 30 Toward the end of this same year, 459/1067, Sultan Alp Arslān proceed to Arān. Farībūrż came forward with presents and offerings and accompanied him on his campaign of 460/1068. 31 Surely some of the above coins were struck in the name of Sultan Alp Arslān for the payment of these various tributes.

27 Ibid., text p. 12, trans. pp. 35-36.
28 Ibid., text p. 13, trans. p. 36.
29 El-Basān is refered to as the master of Qazvīn and was probably like the other Úghuz of this period in the service of the Seljuqs, ibid., text p. 13, trans. p. 37.
30 Coin hoards have turned up much Byzantine gold, but little Seljuq.
4A. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Qā'im and sultan Malikshāh (465/1072-487/1092).

No further description except "Farīburz b. Sālār."

Pakhomov, Kladv, VIII, k yvp. VII, H1783, no. 7
(d=18.5-21.0 mm., t=0.6-1.0 mm., w=2.49 gr.).

4B. AR. No mint name or date. With either caliph al-Qā'im or al-Muqtadī (467/1075-487/1094) and with sultan Malikshāh.

No further description except "Farīburz b. Sālār."

Pakhomov, Kladv, VIII k yvp. VII, H1783, no. 5
(d=24.5-27.5 mm., t=0.6-0.9 mm., w=4.51 gr.).

Assuming 4B. to be an issue under al-Qā'im, the coins must date from the two years between beginning of Malikshāh's reign and the death of al-Qā'im, i.e. 465/1072-467/1074.

5. AR(base). No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī and sultan Malikshāh.

Oby. (in the center of a rosette in two lines)

Farīburz

Rev.

لا الدلالة اللہ محمد
 رسول اللہ
المتند بعمر اللہ
السلطان مک

There is no god but Allāh, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh. al-Muqtadī bi-amrillāh

The Sultan, Malik-

shāh
Pakhomov, *Excursus*, p. 28; a general description with no references to where such coins are to be found; cf., also H. Hasan, *Falaṭī*, p. 4(A) with ref. to Pakhomov.

5B. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī and sultan Malikshāh (?).

No further description except Farīburz b. Salar.

Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, k vvp. VII, H1783, no. 6 (the reading of Malikshāh is doubtful; (d=24.0-25.0 mm., t=approx. 1.0 mm., w=4.88 gr.).

6. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

What I assume to be the obverse is described as having two birds, facing each other (?) (obrashchenye drug k drugu), and between them a flower (?). The reverse presumably bears the caliph's name.

Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, k vvp. VII, H1783, no. 11 (Pakhomov guesses about the flower; d=21.5-23.0 mm., t=1.2-1.5 mm., w=6.22 gr.).

Though there is no Shīrwānshāh mentioned the coin is presumed to be an issue of Farīburz, who was the only ruler during the whole caliphate of al-Muqtadī. One must, however, consider, with this coin and even the earlier issues with al-Qāvim and sultan Alp Arslān, in which Farīburz is not specifically mentioned, the possibility that Afrīdūn b. Farīburz who was on-and-off ruler of al-Bāb (Darband) from sometime before Ramadān 460/July 1068 to 467/1074, also
struck coins.32

7A-C. AR. No mint name or date. With sultan Malikshāh.

**Obv.**
No description except "Farīburz b. Sālār."

**Rev.** (in a four-pointed rosette made of two lines
interlaced with dots)

```
.....
The Supreme

Mālik-

... shāh...
```

Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, k vvp. VII, H1783, no. 8
(first and part of fourth line worn; d=21.5-22.5 mm.,
t=1.0-1.5 mm., w=5.35 gr.), no. 9 (only first two lines
of reverse visible; d=22.0-24.5 mm., t=8.5-0.6 mm.,
w=2.87 gr.), no. 10 (third line of reverse worn;
d=17.5-23.5 mm., t=0.8-1.0 mm., w=3.45 gr.; "irregular").

Coins under nos. 5-7 can all be broadly dated between
467/1074, the first year al-Muqtadī's reign, and 485/1092,
the death of Malikshāh. No. 5 is placed first only because

July 1068 Afrīdūn son of Farīburz left the citadel of al-Bāb
and returned to Shirvān. Later in 461/1068-9 Farīburz
captured the citadel and sent Afrīdūn as governor; after
464/1071 Afrīdūn became the autonomous governor. Finally in
467/1074 al-Bāb was granted as ḫāṣī to the sultan's
lieutenant Sau-Tegīn, amīr of the two Iraqs, and Farīburz
was forced to give up claim to al-Bāb and his son Afrīdūn
presumably returned home.
of the completed legend. One might justify placing it last in the series, because according to Pakhomov it is made of base silver of a leadish color. Since the subsequent issues of Farīburz, to be discussed below, are also of base silver, billon and finally copper, we may see in coin no. 5 the beginning of this debasing process. Indeed it seems to coincide with the beginning of the so-called silver crisis in the Middle East.\textsuperscript{33}

During the reign of Malikshāh Farīburz was forced to pay a considerable tribute. We have already discussed how in 460/1068, when Alp Arslān came to Arrān, Farīburz came forward with offerings and then joined his campaign. When Alp Arslān returned from this campaign of 460/1068, probably in Georgia, the people of al-Bāb complained to him of the Shirvānshāh. The sultan imprisoned the latter, but then released him, "but imposed on him a great sum of money to be paid yearly."\textsuperscript{34} It is mentioned again when Darband was lost to Farīburz in 467/1074-5. "After this, the sharvanshah, despaired of occupying al-Bāb, remained in his dominions and paid the yearly tribute imposed on him to the sultan's

\textsuperscript{33}See supra, "Chap. Two," section II D.

\textsuperscript{34}Minorsky, \textit{ibid.}, text p. 14, trans. p. 38.
We know the size of this tribute from al-Bundārī, "when Malikshāh crossed over to Arrān there came before him the king Farīburz, ruler of Shirvān, who had previously offered resistance; and Farīburz covenanted to pay 70,000 dinārs (annually) to the royal treasury. But from time to time remissions were allowed in that sum till it stood at 40,000 dinārs." Much the same testimony is found in the Akhbar al-dawlat al-saljuqīya: "when (Malikshāh) happened to be passing through Arran, he sent (someone) to the shavvanshah. The latter submitted to him...and (the Sultan) imposed on him a yearly contribution of 70,000 dinars." This expedition of Malikshāh's has been established at about 471/1078–9. A final reference to this tribute is found in Nasawī's Siṣrat al-Sultan Jalāl al-Dīn. In 622/1225 the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn demanded of Garshāsp b. Farrukhzād a tribute equivalent to "the sum


36Histoire des Seljoucides de l'Iraq, ed. T. Houtsma (Leiden, 1889), p. 140, Turkish tran., pp. 132–133; cf. Hasan, Felekî, p. 5, text excerpted in n. 1 with trans. (used above); Minorsky, ibid., p. 68; Ali-Zade, op. cit., p. 355 where n. 1 p. 40 for p. 140. Khaqānī while confirming that Farīburz went before Malikshāh, says that he went to Işpahan for the visit, Hasan, p. 5; also, Minorsky, p. 68.

37Ed. M. Iqbal, p. 73, cf. Minorsky, ibid., p. 68, quotation exact.

previously fixed to be paid in the treasury of Malikshāh" by Farīburz.39 Certainly some of the coins above were minted to pay this tribute; one would expect that many more of these will turn up even in areas outside of Adharbayjān.

8A. AR (base). No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustazhīr (489/1094–512/1118).

Oby. (in the center of a rosette)

الملك The Malik
فَرِیبِرُز Farīburz.

Rev.
لا اَلله الاَللَّه محمد There is no god but Allāh, Muhammad
رسُول اللَّه al-Mustazhīr
المستَعْرَف billāh.

Pakhomov, *Excursus*, p. 29 (described as a general type rather than a specific coin; "lead colored"); Hasan, *Kalakī*, p. 5, no. II (because of Hasan’s comment "recently discovered," the coin(s) are probably in the Hermitage).

8B. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustazhir.

---

39 Ed. 0, Houdas, *Arabic text*, p. 175; the tribute is described as being 100,000 dinārs.
Oby. (rosette of interlaced lines)
Center and circular legends illegible.

Rev.
[Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah
al-Mustaz[hir]
by Allah.

Pakhomov, *Kladn*, IX, H2110 (all that remains of the reverse
legend; d=12.0-13.5 mm., "small," t=1.0-1.1 mm., w=1.27
gr.).

These coins are probably to be dated to the two years
487/1094-489/1096. We have no testimony on the death of
Farīburz. Pakhomov, and Minorsky after him, assumed sometime
between 487/1094 and 511/1117. However, an inscription,
seemingly neglected by Azerbayjani scholars, carries the name
of his son Minūchihr and the date 489/1094. 40

40 An exact drawing of it is reproduced with a
caption which states that it is a construction inscription
from the time of the Shirvanshāh Kasrānīd Minūchihr I;
last three lines of the inscription clearly read "Minūchihr
b. Farīburz in the year 489." This does not mean that
Minūchihr was actually the Shirvanshāh, nor that his father
was dead, but there is a strong likelihood of it. Further-
more, in the correspondence of Māsūd b. Nāmdār, Farīburz
can be traced to the late 480's/1090's, but after the chrono-
logy becomes unreliable; V. Minorsky and C. Cahen, "Le ré-
cueil Transcaucasien," op.cit. (supra; "Chap. One," n. 32),
9X.(?)AR. No mint name or date.

Nothing legible except part of the word sultan.

Pakhomov, Klady, IX, H2108, four examples (very small pieces ranging d=9.5-12.0 mm., t=0.7-1.2 mm., w=0.34-0.91 gr.).

These coins could belong to any of the issues of Fariburz or even his successors.

B. Minūchihr b. Fariburz (487/1094-489/1096 to 489/1096-511/1117)

There is a small copper coin with Minūchihr on the obverse and Malikshah on the reverse which Pakhomov has tentatively attributed to Minūchihr I. He further asserted that the sultan on the reverse is Malikshah II b. Barkiyarūq who ruled in 498/1105, and, therefore, the coin is from that year. In the present study the coin is reattributed to Minūchihr II b. Afrīdun; the full description and commentary will be found under that ruler, infra, Section D.

10. AR. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustazhir and sultan Muhammad b. Malikshah (496/1105-511/1117).

---

41 See supra, "Chap. Two," Section III, the first paragraph, for a full discussion.

42 Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 30.
Qby. (in a cartouche)

ملك
Minūchihr

the son of Farīburz.

Rev.

[Muhammad] is the Messenger of [Allāh],

al-Mustazhir billāh

سلطان محمد...

Markov, Inventarnyi (Supplement), p. 932, no. 0 (sic); see Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 30 (reference to Markov); Pakhomov, "Shirvanshakhs Shavanshakhs," Iz.Az.A.K. (Baku, 1925), p. 69 (ref. to Markov, p. 934 (sic, read p. 932), no. 0); Hasan, Falakî, p. 7, with the curious remark "a coin recently acquired by the Ermitage Museum," but no reference to Markov's catalogue; Minorsky, Sharvan, p. 68.

This coin is to be dated between the overlapping years of the reigns of sultan Muhammad and al-Mustazhir, i.e., 498/1104-511/1117. H. Hasan who was aware of this coin, but not of the inscription of Minūchihr of 489/1096 (supra, n. 40) came to the following erroneous conclusions. "The caliph al-Mustazhir ruled from 457 to 512 A.H., and Sultan Muhammad b. Malikshah, the Seljuq from 498 to 511 A.H.; therefore, in 498 A.H. Minūchihr I was the Shāh of Shirvān."43 But before even stating this

43 Falakî, p. 7, italics Hasan's.
information he had used its conclusion on an earlier page. "Further, as the caliph al-Mustazhir ruled 487-512 A.H. and as Minūchihr I b. Farīburz I was the Shirvānshāh in 498 A.H., it is obvious that Farīburz I must have died between 487 and 498 A.H."\(^4\) Logically, coin no. 10 only indicates that Minūchihr could have been Shirvānshāh at any time during the thirteen year period and that Farīburz could have died in any year up to 511/1117. We know now of course that Minūchihr was ruling already by 489/1096 and assume that his father had died (supra, n. 40).

C. Afrīdūn b. Farīburz (post 489/1096-514/1120)

Farīburz had at least two sons, Minūchihr, who is known only through the numismatic and epigraphal evidence given above, and Afrīdūn, mentioned often in the sources. The Georgian Chronicle reports that Afrīdūn was killed in a battle against Darband in 514/1120.\(^5\) As mentioned earlier (n. 32) the Ta'īrīkh al-Rāb says that between 460/1068 and 467/1074 Afrīdūn tried to secure himself as governor of

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 5, italics Hasan's.

\(^5\) M. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, trans. 1/1, p. 360; cf., Pakhmov, Excursus, p. 31; Minorsky, Sharvan, p. 68; Hasan, Falaki, p. 8.
al-Bāb, but that it was finally awarded as an iqta to a Seljuq lieutenant. It is possible that during the internecine wars after the death of Malikshāh and the general chaos which accompanied them, the Shirvānshāhs tried once again to take control of Darband and that Afrīdūn again became ruler there. Therefore, it would be conceivable that after the death of Farīburz, Afrīdūn ruled in one part of the Shirvānshāhs' domain, al-Bāb, while his brother Minūchīhr ruled in another, perhaps Shamākhi. According to the Ta'rikh al-Bāb, Farīburz was succeeded by his son Afrīdūn, but Minorsky believed this to be an addition by Mūnejjam-Bāshī in the late 11th/16th century and not part of the original, which, since Farīburz was still alive, ends its narrative prior to 489/1096. Thus far no numismatic evidence has been discovered for Afrīdūn to help solve the problem.

---

46 At the end of the 6th/11th and the first quarter of the 7th/13th we also seem to have more than one Shirvānshāh ruling at a time, see supra, n. 17 and infra, n. 81.

47 See, n. 32, for more details from the Ta'rikh al-Bāb on Afrīdūn.

48 Of course if Pakhomov was right on his tentative attribution of a copper coin to Minūchīhr I with a striking in 498/1105, then this whole discussion must be revised; see supra, Section B, and infra, under coin no. 12.
D. Minūchihr II b. Afrīdūn (514/1120–circa 555/1160)

11A. AR (base). No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtafī (530/1136–555/1160) and sultan....

**Obv.** (rosette?)

الملك
منجهر
فریدون

The **malik**

Minūchihr the son of A-
frīdūn

**Rev.** (rosette?)

لا للإله إلا الله
محمد رسول الله

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is Messenger of Allāh.

(ṣīc) al-Muqtafī billāh (sic).

Hermitage Museum, H. Hasan, Falakī, p. 9 ("These coins, recently discovered... are of silver, small value, and defective."); Minorsky, Gharvān, p. 69 (not described). The caliph's name should be al-Muqtafī li-armillāh.

11X. AR (base). No mint name or date. With caliph al-
Muqtafī and sultan....

Several varieties, described as having various types of rosettes and inscriptions differently arranged. A generalized legend similar to 11A is given, but without arrangement. The word "al-sultan" is in the last line of the reverse. Original marginal legends have not been preserved.

Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 32; the correct al-Muqtafī liamirillāh is given.
The coins fall broadly within the caliphate of al-Muqtadî (530/1135-555/1160); of course if an example is found with the sultan's name intact, we could narrow the period considerably. Their silver content would suggest a date closer to 530/1135 since this metal is gradually replaced by billon and copper toward mid-century. It is strange that no coins have survived for almost the whole of the first quarter of the 6th/12th century.

12. (?) AE. No mint name. (547/1152-3). With Seljuq sultan of Iraq Malikshāh b. Mahmūd (547/1152-3).

Oby.

Minūchihr

Rev.

Malik-

shāh

Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 30 (a small copper; no provenance in this general description); Pakhomov makes the following "probable" attribution. "Perhaps small copper coins were also struck by Minūchihr with his name without title on one side and Malikshāh, probably the second (about 498 A.H.-1104/5), on the other.".

If for the moment we assume Pakhomov's attribution correct, then because of Malikshāh b. Barkiyārūq's short reign the coin would date from 498/1104-5. Though H. Hasan does not refer directly to this coin, his conclusions about the death of Farīburz and the reign of Minūchihr I are untenable without it (supra, under no. 10).
There are certain difficulties with this assumption. First, the coin is copper and not silver. It would be the first copper issue of the Shirvānshāhs which has come down to us. Under Minūchihr II b. Afrīdūn we begin to see the appearance of billon and later by mid-century a full copper coinage. Thus, from the point of view of the metal used the attribution becomes suspect. Secondly, and perhaps more seriously, the events around the sultanate of Malikshāh b. Barkiyārūq are not very encouraging to conjecture that he is the Seljuq sultan referred to on this coin. In 498/1104 sultan Barkiyārūq b. Malikshāh (487/1094-498/1104) who lay dying in Burūjird 18 farsakhs from Hamadān, "summoned his amīrs and declared to them his intention to nominate his son Malikshāh (sic) a boy of four years and eight months as his successor." ¹⁴⁹ The sultan died on 12 Rabī’II 498/2 January 1105 and five days later, on 12 Rabī’II 498/7 January 1105, Malikshāh, escorted by the amīrs, arrived in Baghdad where the Khutba was read confirming him in office. ⁵⁰ The next month, 23 Jumādā I 498/11 February 1105, Muhammad b. Malikshāh b. Barkiyārūq after attempts by supporters of the


⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 113, 12 Rabī’ II fell in 1105 not in 1104 as Sanaullah reports; he also began Muhammad’s reign in 1104.
latter to resist Muhammad came to nothing. 51

Therefore, Malikshāh b. Barkiyarūq's short reign lasted for some 35 days. It is highly improbable that in this brief period coins could have been struck. The distance from Baghdad to Shirvān was great; the position of the young sultan too precarious. We must, therefore, look for another candidate to whom to ascribe this coin. There are two possibilities for the coincidence of a Minūchihr and a Malikshāh. We cannot accept as one Minūchihr b. Farīburz and Malikshāh b. Alp Arslān, since the former struck coins in the time of al-Mustazīhir whose reign began after the death of the great sultan.

First, if we leave the Shirvānshāhs for a moment and turn to their neighbors, the Shaddādids of Ani, we find a Minūchihr b. Abūl-Aswār (who ruled from after 457/1064 to circa 512/1118). 52 We know that in 479/1086 Malikshāh the great confirmed the rights of Minūchihr to govern Ani. 53 This small copper coin with the names of Minūchihr and


52 Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian History, p. 80 ff.

Malikshāh could have been struck in Ani to commemorate that occasion. If our assumptions are correct this would be the first example of money struck by the Shaddādids of Ani.

The second and more likely possibility for this coin, especially if Pakhomov, though hesitant about its attribution, felt it to be a Shirvānshāh issue by its texture and general appearance, would be to ascribe it to Minūchihr II. During this long reign there was another Malikshāh (b. Mahmūd), Seljuq sultan of Iraq for three or four months at the end of 547/1153. One might argue against the possibility of coins in Malikshāh b. Mahmūd's name during this short period on the grounds that three or four months is not much longer than the month or so of Malikshāh b. Barkiyārūq's reign. However, the former was sultan of Iraq in Hamadān and not Baghdad, a city much closer to Adharbayjān and Shirvān. Furthermore, apparently Muḥammad b. Mahmūd, his brother and eventual successor, did not seem to oppose Malikshāh. Finally, and

---

54 Ibn al-ʿAthīr, IX, 32; cf., Luther, op. cit., p. 26, who says Malikshāh's rule began just after the death of sultan Masʿūd I Rajab 547/2 October 1152, following Ibn al-ʿAthīr, IX, 31, but citing other sources; Zambaur, Manuel, p. 221, following Ibn Khallikan, III, 335, gives the date 11 Jumāda/13 September for Masʿūd's death. Muḥammad b. Mahmūd became sultan sometime in Shawwāl 547/December-January 1152/3 or a bit later, Luther, pp. 29 - 31. Thus the short rule was of three to five months duration. Houtsma says three months, "Muḥammed b. Mahmūd," IA.

55 Luther, p. 27.
most important, Malikshāh and his uncle Sulaymānshāh b. Muhammad b. Malikshāh, were both supported by the amīrs of the north and northwest, especially Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz, who was now gaining ascendancy over the Seljuqs of Iraq from his base of power in Ṭabārōnī, against Muhammad b. Mahmūd who was at the time in the south in Khūzistān. These same amīrs remained hostile towards Muhammad even after he became the sultan in Shawwāl 547/December 1152-January 1153 or perhaps in very early 548. We know that Ildegiz had close relations with the Caucasian areas including Arrān and Ganja, and it is not unlikely that in the adjoining region of Shirvān his influence was felt. Whatever all the details may be, it is quite plausible that Minūchihr II b. Afrīdūn struck coins in honor of Malikshāh b. Mahmūd, the sultan in Hamadān. Therefore, without having actually seen the coin, and for the moment putting aside an attribution outside the realm of Shirvān, i.e., the Shaddādids of Ani, this coin will be cautiously attributed as an issue of Minūchihr II struck in late 547/1152-3 or early 548/1153.


Finally, it must be added that Pakhomov failed to suggest Minūchihr II as the minter of this coin, because in his study he made the assumption that this ruler had died about 544/1150. 58


Obv. (in a double linear circle)

The Malik
The Supreme
Minūchihr.

Margin: (circularly within a third linear circle)

...... Shamākha in the year fi(ve)...

Rev. (in a double linear circle)

al-Mustanjid.
The Sultan
[Sul]aymān.

58 Pakhomov, *Excursus*, p. 34 and p. 45 (table); reproduced (that is the table of dates) by Minorsky, *Sharvān*, p. 135 and Pumiatov, op. cit., p. 48.
Margin: (circularly within a third linear circle)

لا الله محمد رسول الله

but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

ANS (very dark grey color, "irregular"; d=27-33 mm., g=10.62 gr.).

This coin is unique and remarkable in many respects. The date is confirmed by the names of caliph al-Mustanjid (555-1160-566/1170-71) and especially that of sultan Sulaymān-shāh b. Muhammad b. Malikshāh (555/1160). It is furthermore, the only coin to my knowledge of this dynasty to bear the mint name Shamākhiya.

Upon the death of the Iraq Seljuq sultan Muhammad b. Mahmūd in 554/1059 the amīrs of al-Jibal and Adharbayjān finally opted in favor of his uncle Sulaymānshāh, the same Sulaymānshāh who was involved in the events of 547/1152-3 discussed under no. 12. He became sultan on 12 Rabi' I 555/22 March 1160.59 His drinking and general conduct soon displeased these same amīrs, with whom Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz was in close contact. Sulaymānshāh was imprisoned in Shawwāl 555/October-November 1160 and Arslānshāh b. Tughril (555/1160-571/1176), whose atabeg was Ildegiz, declared sultan.

59Luther, op.cit., p. 117 citing Rawandi, Rāhat-us-Sudur, p. 275.
Sulaymānshāh was put to death in Rabī' al-awwal 556/February, March-April 1161. Since al-Mustanjīd became caliph at almost the same time as Sulaymānshāh sultan, i.e., 2 Rabī' al-awwal/12 March, the above coin must date from the seven month period Rabī' al-awwal/March-Shawwal/October-November, 555/1160.

Accordingly Minūchihīr's reign must extend from 514-/1120, the year his father Farīburzd died, to 555/1160 and perhaps a little after. The previously accepted date of his death was circa 544/1150, based on an elegy for Minūchihīr by Khāqānī in which the poet says Minūchihīr ruled for thirty years. Khanykov was the first to point this out and both Pakhomov and Hasan followed him. However, Hasan revised his entire early study of Falakī on the basis of a new manuscript of the poet in Madras which contains hitherto unknown verses.

---

60 Ibid., pp. 126-128, for a general discussion of the events surrounding Sulaymānshāh's accession see "The Death of Muhammad and the Accession of Sulaymānshāh," ibid., pp. 114-128.


63 Excursus, p. 34.

64 H. Hasan, "Muhammad Falakī-i-Shirvānī and His Unique Dīwān in Madras," Islamic Culture, April, 1950, pp. 77-107.
Falaki on the death of King Dimitri of Georgia, the poet states that his brother-in-law Minúchihr was still alive and that Dimitri died at the age of sixty-three. Through some rather doubtful reasoning he established that Dimitri was born between 484/1091 and 486/1093, therefore dying in 548/1154–550/1156. He chooses the latter date and concludes that Dimitri, Falaki and Minúchihr died in quick succession in that year. Curiously Minorsky in a note to Pakhomov's dynastic table of the Shirvânshâh's says about Minúchihr, "we now know that he was still alive in 555/1160 (H. Hasan), "but without giving the exact source. He is right in fact, but how or why Hasan came to this conclusion is a mystery.

With this coin the acceptance of no. 12 with Malikshâh b. Mahmûd becomes reasonable from the point of view of chronology. It is a curious irony that Minúchihr in his reign had

65 Persian text and trans., ibid., p. 80.

66 Ibid., p. 79, citing Allen, History of the Georgian People, op. cit., p. 101, who in turn used the Georgian Chronicle. Hasan makes some dubious conjectures about whether Christian kings became fathers at 18 or 20 years of age; he says the latter is more likely!

67 Ibid., pp. 82 & 97.

68 Minorsky, Shirvân, p. 135, n. 4 and p. 136, n. 4; cf., idem, "Khâqânî and Andronicus Comnenus," reprint, p. 130, n. 6 for Minorsky's weak justification at an earlier date (1945).
struck coins in honor of two Seljuq sultans who at times were allies and who both ruled for a few months.

E. Akhsatān b. Minūčihr II (post 555/1160 to 593/1197-600/1203-4)

14. AE. No mint name. (5X)5(11X)0. With caliph al-Mustanjid and Sultan Arslānshāh b. Tughrul (555/1160-571/1176). Plate I

Obv. (under intersecting lines which look like crossed swords) (part of six-petalled rosette?)

The Malik
The Supreme
Akhsatān son of
Marginal segments (between intersecting lines)

five (?)

Rev. (in a linear circle)

al-Mustanjid
llāh. The Sultan
rslānshāh.

ANS (tear shaped; d=20-25 mm., w=6.34 gr.) (could be read Aslan or [A]rslān).

Akhsatān was the son of Minūčihr and his Georgian wife Thamar, sister of King Dimitri. He succeeded his father
sometime after 555/1160. The above coin must fall in the reigns of al-Mustanjid (555/1160-566/1170) and Arslānshāh (late 555/1160-571/1176), which leaves us two possibilities if the Khams, five, is correctly read, 555/1160 and 565/1169. The first date would be more interesting for us, for it would allow us to precisely date the death of Minūchihr II and the beginning of Akhsatān's reign. Unfortunately, the facts of Arslānshāh's succession in that year tend to militate against it. The two contemporary sources, Ibn al-Jawzī's Al-Muntazam and al-Bundārī's Zubdat al-Nusrah, give the date of the sultan's succession as Dhu al-Qa'dah/November 555/1160,69 while Rāwandī's says Ramadān/September of the same year.70 That leaves us up to four, but more probably two months, for the striking of this coin. However, since Sulaymānshāh did not die until 556/1161 and Minūchihr had already struck a coin in his honor in 555/1160 (no. 13 above), we must conclude that the facts are against the striking of a coin with Arslānshāh and Akhsatān in the same year. Therefore, our coin must date from 565/1169.

15A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and sultan Arslānshāh.

---


70 Rāhat, p. 279, ed. M. Iqbal; cf. ibid.
Obv.

The Malik
The Supreme
Akhsatan son of
Minushir.

Rev.

al-Mustanjid
billah. The Sultan
Arslanshah.

Margin: (circular and half erased)

There is no god but Allah...

Markov, Inventarnyi', p. 394, no. 1; Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 36 (his first type; legend complete, but no arrangement given; indicates that the full formula of faith appears in the reverse margin) (reference to Markov).

15B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and sultan Arslanshah.

Obv. (in a six petalled rosette made of two intersecting triangles)71

The same field as 15A.

Rev. (in a linear circle)

71 This may be the same design as on the obverse of no. 14.
The same as 15A. except Arslān written "Aslān", اسلام

Margin: (circular)
لا الإله الا الله
There is no god but Allāh.
محمد...
Muhammad...

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhdki 1924," p. 72, no. 2 (2 examples, w=1.81, 2.87 gr.; copper with a trace of silver)(reference to Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 394, no. 1 for general type).

15C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and sultan Arslānshāh.

Obv. (the same as 15A-B, except in linear rosette is doubled)

Rev. (linear circle doubled)
Seemingly the same as those above, but only the last two lines are visible; "Aslān" instead of "Arslān."

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhdki 1924," p. 75, nos. 6-7 (under no. 6 references to others in the "Vil'jaminov-Zernov" collection at the Hermitage).

15D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and sultan Arslānshāh.

Obv. (same legend as 15A-C., but in a linear circle)

Margin: (circular, worn)
Rev. (in a double linear circle)
Same as 15A, except Arslân spelt .fs , "Aslā."

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," p. 72, no. 1
(w=5.45 gr.; Pakhomov has seen several others in various collections); H. Hasan, Falākt, p. 29, A, and the same on on p. 25, I, (presumably in Hermitage).

15x. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and sultan Arslānshāh.
The same as either 15B, or 15D.
Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," p. 75 (8 examples).

All these coins must date from 556/1161-566/1171, the effective years of Arslānshāh's sultanate, matched with those of al-Mustanjid (555/1160-566/1171). During this decade we have little information on the events in Shirvān. H. Hasan has found two references which state that Ildegiz took all of Shirvān, Arrān, Ganja and Bākū,72 which 'story is based, probably on the defeat inflicted by Ildegiz on Giorgi III, son of Dimitri I and grandson of David II, in 558 A.H. 1163 A.D. ..., but there is no evidence that Ildegiz ever marched against Akhsātān I or seized his territory."73

---


73 Ibid.
16. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustādī (566/1170-575/1179) and sultan Ṭughril b. Arslānshāh (571/1175-591/1194).

Ovy. (in an eight-pointed rosette formed by the intersection of two squares)
The same as 15A-D.

Rev. (in a double linear circle)

al-Mustadī
bi-armillāh A (sic)
The Sultan A (sic)
Ṭughril. (sic)

Margin: circular legend clipped

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," p. 73, no. 3 (two examples; w=2.64, 5.24 gr.), p. 75 another example; H. Hasan, Falaki, p. 29, B (probably same coins, but without reference).

By comparing the reigns of al-Mustadī and Ṭughril, these coins must date from 571/1175-575/1179. Unfortunately again we have little information on this period. Just prior to these years, there is the famous attack of the "Khazars of Derbend" on the Shirvānshāh Akhsatān. Ṭughrānī speaks of the same attack and couples it with the raid of the "Rūz"

---

74 M. Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, I, 1, p. 397, cf. Hasan, Falaki, p. 37 where the passage is also given.
by sea into Shirvān. Pakhomov has suggested that the Malik of Darband, Bek-Bārs b. Muṣaffar, in alliance with the Russian "Brodi," invaded Shirvān. Akhsatān called on his cousin Giorgi, King of Georgia for help. Giorgi brought with him Andronicus Comnenus, the Byzantine Prince and later emperor, who helped in defeating the invaders and restoring the raided areas. The date for this invasion of the Rus and the Malik of Darband has now been placed at circa 569/1174 (the early part) or late 1173. Unfortunately, we have no dated coins of Akhsatān from this period.

17. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Maṣir (575-1180-622/1225) and sultan Tughril b. Arslānshāh.

Obv. (in an eight-pointed rosette made by the intersection of two squares)

75 In three victory odes of Khāqānī discovered by Khanykov, Mélanges Asiatiques, III, pp. 117-118 and pp. 125-134; see also Hasan, ibid., pp. 37-39 where excerpted passages are given in the original and translation; see also V. Minorsky, "Khāqānī and Andronicus Comnenus," op. cit.


78 Minorsky, ibid., p. 129; idem, Shārvān, p. 140.
Allāh
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah
The Malik, the Supreme
Akhsatān son of Minuchihr.

Rev. (in a double linear border)

Allāh
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah
al-Nāṣir al-dīnillāh
The Greatest Sultan
Tughrīl. (sic)

Margin: (circular legend within a third linear circle)

Qur'ān, IX, 33 and LXI, 9, but with many letters omitted
and with distortions, e.g., ... ṣiṣi ṣiṣi ṣiṣi ṣiṣi ṣiṣi ... ..

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodi 1924," p. 73, no. 4 (eight examples; w=0.84, 1.50, 1.51, 1.83, 2.40, 2.92, 4.61, 11.72 gr., obviously irregular); Hasan, Falaki, p. 30, C (no margin indicated, but probably the same coin and from Pakhomov, but no reference given); Istoriia Azerbaidzhana, I, p. 137 (illustrated, but not described).

18. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir and
sultan Tughrīl.

Obv. (rosette form not visible)

Same legend as 17 except the addition of a fifth line:
Shirvānshāh.

Rev. (the same as no. 17).
Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," p. 75, no. 8; Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskij klad 1926 g." (Baku, 1928), p. 31, no. 1 (weight 2.48 gr.) (with reference to his Mon. nakh. 1924, p. 73, no. 4, which probably should be p. 75, no. 8).

Pakhomov points out that this is the first issue of the dynasty to use the title Shirvānshāh. It in fact is not, if we consider an unbroken line of descendence in this dynasty. Though not formerly part of the corpus for reasons explained above, a silver coin of Abū Mansūr Calī b. Yazīd, first reported by Pakhomov himself at a latter date, has the title Shirvānshāh.

19. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir and sultan Țughril

_obv._ (eight-pointed rosette with circles placed in the clusters)

\[\text{Allāh}\]

\[\text{Muhammad is the Messenger of}\]

\[\text{The Supreme Malik}\]

\[\text{Akhastān son of Minūchihr}\]

_rev._ (in a double linear circle)

---

79Pakhomov, Monetnye nakhodki 1924, p. 75.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah. (sic)

The Greatest Sultan.

Tughril. (sic)

Margin: (as no. 17 above, with Qur'an IX, 33, and LXXI, 9, badly written).

Pakhomov, "Monetnysye makhodki 1924," p. 75, no. 9, (note the correct spelling of al-Nasir lidin).

(Since the coin is described as the same as his no. 4, ibid., p. 73, our no. 17, it is assume that other than the differences described, the coins are identical, including the reverse margin with Qur'anic inscription).

Coins nos. 17-19 must all date from between 575/1179-
80 and 591/1194, that is the beginning of al-Nasir's reign to the death of Tughril.

20A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir and sultan Tughril.

Obv.

لا اله الا الله
محمد رسول الله
الله محمد
الله محمد
محمد رسول الله
الله محمد
محمد رسول الله
There is no god but Allah.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

The Supreme Malik

Akhsatân son of Minâchihr.

Rev.

الناصر الدين الله
al-Nasir al-dînillah. (sic)
... The Sultan the...

Tughril. (sic)

(words thus distributed?)

Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 36 (I have arranged the order on the reverse; no specific coin is mentioned, just the type).

20B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāssid and sultan Tughril. Plate I

Obv.

 Ramsey  
The Supreme  
Minūchih... (?)

Rev.

[al-Ḥāssid...  
The Sultan the Great [est] Tughril. (?)

ANS, (tear shaped, with probably not enough silver to be called billon; d=12-17 mm., w=1.77 gr.) (clipped).

Numbers 20A. and 20B. could be the same type, but the description of 20A. and the state of 20B forces us to be inconclusive.

21. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāssid.
QBY. (in a double linear circle)

المحمد رسول
الملاك المعظم
اينشتان بن منوجير
شیرانشاه

**Allāh**
Muhammad is the Messenger of
The Supreme Malik
Akhsatān son of Minuchihr
Shirvānshāh.

**Margin:** (circular, clipped)

Rey. (in a double linear circle)

لا العالا الله
محمد رسول الله
(ṣīc)
الناصر الدين الله
اميرالمؤمنین

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Nāṣir al-dīnillāh. (sic)
Commander of the Faithful.

**Margin:** "...snatches of the same circular inscription on no. 4 (our no. 17) and again a double linear edge."

Qur’ān IX, 33, and LX, 9 (?).

Pakhomov, "Monetnve nakhodki 1924," p. 74, no. 5 (ten examples; w=3.47, 4.16, 4.27, 4.96, "and so forth") (It is not absolutely clear if the Qur'anic passages are to be found on the reverse margin.); Pakhomov, *ibid.*, p. 75 (the majority of a board of about 50 pieces, perhaps 35); H. Hasan, *Palaki*, p. 30, D (no margins and no references, but either from Pakhomov or else in the Hermitage).

**Margin:**

22X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Akhsatān not further identified or not described enough to categorize.
This completes the series for Akhsatān b. Minūchihr.

Once again we must try to establish some chronology and offer some data on the length of his reign. No. 21, complete without the mention of sultan Tughril b. Arslānshāh, probably indicates that the coins were struck after the latter's death in 591/1194. Upon the death of Tughril the central branch of the Seljuqs come to an end with the Ildegizid atabegs taking over the area of al-Jibal and Adharbayjān and the Khwārazmshāh, Takash, taking over the eastern part of the Seljuq Empire (see under coin no. 41B in the Ildegizids corpus). Of course we have no guarantee that the above coins were not struck before the sultan's death and with the omission of his name. Beside the numismatic testimony we have an inscription date 583/1187-8 from near Baku, and the dedication of Nisāmī's Laylá va Majnūn to Akhsatān I in 584/1188-9. We also are told that Akhsatān,

---


under the pressure of the Ildegizid atabeg, Qızıl Arslân (582/1186-587/1191), who occupied Shamākhi, transferred his residence to Bəkü. 83 Finally, since there is no reference to Akhsatân's death in Khāqānî's Dīvān, H. Hasan infers that the king must have survived the poet, who was still alive in 592/1196. 84 As will be seen below we have an inscription of the year 600/1203-4 showing that Farrukhzād b. Minūchihr was the Shirvānshāh. 85 Therefore, the probable dates of Akhsatân's reign are after 555/1160 to 593/1197-600/1203-4.

Several numismatic points should also be discussed. Note the spelling of Tughril, تغریل, on the coins of the Shirvānshāhs in distinction to those of the Ildegizids (see nos. 18-20). We have now come into a full copper coinage with only traces of silver, actually an average of 9.34% of the metal composition. 86 Note has already been made of the use of the title Shirvānshāh on the coins. 87 Hasan also pointed out that Akhsatân's

---

83 V. Barthold, "The Place of the Caspian Provinces in the History of Islam" (in Russian) (Baku, 1925), pp. 46-47; cf. Minorsky, Sharvan, p. 85; Pakhomov, Excursum, p. 360. Hasan rejects the occupation because it is based on a misinterpretation of Khāqānî, ibid., p. 35.

84 Hasan, ibid., pp. 32-33.


87 By Pakhomov, supra, n. 79 by Hasan, in connection with coin no. 21, but with no reference, Falak, p. 31.
predecessors bear the simple title al-Malik and that he now takes the title "al-Maliku'l-Mu'assam"; he, however, did not have access to our unique no. 13, which shows that Minūchihr had already taken the latter title by 555/1160.

The next forty years in the history of the Shirvānshāhs is a period of total confusion. The literary sources afford only fragmentary material, but unfortunately no separate or consecutive sequence of events in Shirvān. The numismatic evidence seems often to be in conflict with the literary and inscriptive. During the period the Khwārazmshāhs and the Mongols make their appearance in the Caucasus. As Z. Bumiatov has recently shown, for the single year 622/1225 it is possible to find seven rulers who are called Shirvānshāhs. We have not a single fixed date for the beginning or end of the rule of any of these rulers, including the above mentioned seven. Reigns seem to overlap and fathers and sons appear to rule at the same time; there are many internecine conflicts.

The only reasonable conclusion is that some sort of feudal fragmentation must have taken place under which various members of the ruling dynasty reign in the different cities of Shirvān. In this Buniyatov concurs. We do not have coins for all of these dynasts; some are known through the literature, others by inscriptions. In the corpus every effort will be made to follow a chronological sequence and when a ruler is not represented by numismatic evidence, a brief résumé will be given of whatever other source material exists. The order of succession through the reign of Farīburz III b. Ṣarshāsp will be tentative, speculative and subject to later amendment.

F. Shāhānshāh b. Minūchihr II (circa 575/1180 to circa 600/1203)

23. AE (with trace of silver, billon?). No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāṣir.

Obv. (in a double linear circle)

Allāh

Muhammad is the Messenger of

The Supreme Malik

Shāhānshāh son of Minūchihr Shirvānshāh.

90 Ibid.
Rev. (in a double linear circle)

لاَ الْاَنَّ لِلِّلَّهِ
محمد رسول الله
الناسر الدين الله
امير المؤمنين

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Ḥāṣir al-dīnillāh (sic)
Commander of the Faithful.

Margin: (circular) Qur'ān IX, 33, and LXI, 9

Pakhomov, "Shirvanshah Shakhanshah," pp. 69-70, five examples, irregularly struck (on obverse in third line below the َ, ُ, occasionally, ُ, ُ, and between the lines are found sometimes dots and decorations (w=3.34, 4.49, 5.92, 6.27, 8.66 gr.), cf., to the same coins Pakhomov, Kladov, I, H108 (no descriptions); Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," p. 75 (two examples, not described, but "almost no difference to those above"), cf., to the same coins, Pakhomov, Kladov, I, H109 (no descriptions).

The first five of these coins were from a hoard discovered in 1907 at Alti-Agach in the Shamākhā region of Azerbaijan and placed in the Hermitage. Pakhomov had not seen the hoard at the time he wrote his Excursus and, therefore, this Shirvānshāh was completely unknown. We know from Falākhī that Minūchihr II b. Afdūn is supposed to have had five sons,91 whether they were all by his Georgian wife Thāmar is not known. Four of these are known, all from numismatic

91Hasan, Falākhī, p. 15, the text with trans. is given.
evidence; the coins of Akhsatān and Shāhānshāh have already been presented; Afrīdūn from a coin of his son, Farīburs II b. Afrīdūn b. Minūchihr; and finally, Farrukhsād from a coin of his son, Garshāsp b. Farrukhsād b. Minūchihr, and an inscription (see below for discussion).

Pakhomov placed Shāhānshāh's rule after Akhsatān's and Minorsky following him adds this Shīrvānshāh to the dynastic table he reproduced from the Exкурс, adding, "from c. 575 1179-80 to 575-83 1179-1187-88". The literary sources are mute and there have been no inscriptions found; we have only the coins. From an analysis of the silver content we see that these coins contain 10.75% compared to 9.34% for Akhsatān I, 3.91% for Garshāsp, and 1.5% and less for subsequent rulers. The results show an even higher silver content than his brother and supposed predecessor Akhsatān. Perhaps in the period after the beginning of al-Māsir's caliphate, 575/1179-80, Shāhānshāh and Akhsatān were already ruling in different parts of the empire. The other possibility, the one already put

---

92 Minorsky, Shārvān, p. 135; Minorsky's dates are based simply on the start of al-Māsir's reign and the supposition that Shāhānshāh must have ruled before his brother Afrīdūn II.

93 Pakhomov, "Khimicheskii analiz shīrvānshakhshikh monet," op.cit., pp. 36-37; copper content: 82.4, 84.96, 90.7%, respectively.
forth by Pakhomov, and tacitly supported by Bunilatov, is that after Akhsatān's reign, which ended probably sometime after 592/1196, Shāhānshāh ruled for a short period, during which he increased the silver content of the coins he struck. The possibility of a dual rule has already been suggested for the sons of Farīburz I, namely, Minūchīhr I perhaps in Shamākhi, and Afrīdūn I in Darband (supra, n. 46). In the present case there is a question as to where Shāhānshāh might have ruled contemporaneously with his brother. We know firmly that Minūchīhr in his last year had his capital in Shamākhi from the mint name struck on coin no. 13. We also know that Akhsatān used the same city as his residence at least until 582/1186–587/1191, when sometime during those years it was occupied by the Ildegizid Qızl Arslān; the residence was then transferred to Bākū. Whether or when it was transferred back we are not sure; we know that Bākū's rise as a major city dates from this period.

94 See discussion, supra, at nn. 85 and 86.

95 See supra, n. 83, with references to Minorsky, Pakhomov, Barthold, and Hasan, who reject this assumption.

However, assuming the occupation was short and that Akhsatān returned to Shamākhī, then it doesn't seem likely that Shāhānshāh ruled at the same time. The seven coins we have were all found near Shamākhī, indicating that they were probably struck in that city. It is also Buniyatov's feeling that Shāhānshāh also ruled at Shamākhī. We are back where we began with the uncertain supposition that Shāhānshāh ruled after his brother sometime before 600/1203. Later we shall have more to say about the possibility of the realm being distributed among the sons of Minūchihr II upon his death.

G. Afrīdūn II b. Minūchihr II (sometime during 583/1187-600/1203)

Our only information on this Afrīdūn is from the coins of his son Farīburz II b. Afrīdūn b. Minūchihr Shīrvānshāh. We do not know if he actually ruled. Khanykov and after him Pakhomov pointed to a possible reference to him (though not by name) in an ode by Khāqānī addressed to Akhsatān.98

97 Z. Buniyatov, op. cit., p. 52.

Pakhomov, for whom the possibility of overlapping rulers did not exist, placed him before his brother Farrukhzād, prior to 600/1203 for which year there is an inscription for Farrukhzād.\textsuperscript{99} Nasawī in his Sīrat al-sultan Jalāl al-Dīn relates that when in 622/1225 the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn was in Arrān the Shirvānshāh "Afrīdūn b. Farīburz" came forward uninvited and with tribute.\textsuperscript{100} There is no further explanation or comment except the reimposition of the tribute first levied by Alp Arslān upon Farīburz b. Sālār.\textsuperscript{101} We have no record of another Afrīdūn. Could this be a confusion on Nasawī's part of Afrīdūn b. Minūchīhr II with his ancestor Farīburz and somehow the creation of a composite name for our Afrīdūn b. Minūchīhr? If so this would probably mean a residence in the western part of Shirvān, perhaps Shakkī.

\textsuperscript{99}Ibid., p. 37; the inscription from Mardakān near Baku is dated 600 (presumably A.H.)/1203. The text is reproduced and translated by H. Hasan, Faralā, pp. 31-32.

\textsuperscript{100}Z. Buniyatov, op. cit., p. 52, citing Nasawī p. 175 and Ibn Khaldūn, V, p. 137.

\textsuperscript{101}Ed. O. Houidas, text p. 175; cf. A. Ali-Zade, op. cit., pp. 363-364, who also used a MS in the "Vostokovedenija AN SSSR," f. 105a and 105b; also Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 136, citing Nasawī p. 174 and trans., p. 290 (who this Afrīdūn might be doesn't seem to bother Minorsky); cf. also, Z. Buniyatov, op. cit., p. 52, citing Nasawī p. 175 and Ibn Khaldūn, V, p. 137.
H. Farībuz II b. Afrīdūn II b. Minūchihr II (sometime during 583/1187-600/1203)

24A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāṣir.

Plate I

Oby. (in a square made of three lines, the center one of dots)

The just Malik
Jalāl al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn
Farībuz son of Afrīdūn
son of Minūchihr Shirvānsāh.

Rev. (in a square made of three lines, the center one of dots)

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

al-Ḥāṣir al-dīnillāh (sic)
Commander of the Faithful.

(sic)

Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, ex-Thomson collection (four examples, poorly struck, three of them "irregular");
ANS (poorly struck, one side clipped; d=15.0-21.5 mm.,
w=4.43 gr., "irregular").

24B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāṣir.

Oby. ("in the usual four-petaled [4-sepato] rosette")
Same legend as 24A.

Margin: (circular within a double linear border)

qur'an LXXI, 9 (?) لیحسرهء على الدين ... Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskin monetnyi klad 1924," Iz. Askoi. (Baku, 1928), p. 32 (26 examples) (obverse: edges of rosette or circular inscription, if any, are effaced; Shirvanshah, found only on two, the rest clipped; Pakhomov has written "Faribuz), which I assume is a typographical error) (reverse: "(sic)" in Pakhomov) (weights for all 26 are given; w= between 1.18-7.35 gr., average=3.13 gr.), cf.; same hoard, Pakhomov, Klady II, H4:29 (not described).

24C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Legends the same as 24A. and 24B., but no design around field nor margins indicated.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RMB, 1861, p. 70, no. 72 (illus.; fig. 20) (first line of obverse missing; last line and parts of second and third lines missing); Markov, Inventarnii, p. 396, no. 32 (on reverse al-Nasir' Edin is properly spelled, but I assume by mistake); nos. 33-34 ("same, different die"), nos. 35-37 ("same, irregularly struck"); Pakhomov, Kratkiy, p. 38 (general description with references to Bartholomaei and Markov).

25X. AE. Coins attributed to Faribuz b. Afridun, but not described for further classification.

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924", p. 76 (six examples not described); cf., same hoard Pakhomov, Klady, I, H11; Pakhomov, Klady, II, H431 (1 ex.); Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H633 (3 ex. with al-Nasir); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1613 (4 ex. with al-Nasir); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1972 (one ex. with al-Nasir); d=10.0-14.5 mm, t=1.5-2.0 mm, w=1.60 (sic) cf., which hardly seems possible, "irregular".)
About Jalāl al-Dunyā wal-Dīn Farīburz II b. Afrīdūn b. Minūchīhr II we know almost nothing beyond the information on his coins. Pakhomov places his reign in that crowded period between the death of Akhsatān and 600/1203, the supposed beginning of Farrukhsād's reign.  

Hasan has nothing more to add except that he was one of the six Shirvānshāhs to rule during the time of caliph al-Ḥāsir (575/1179-90 to 622/1225). Pakhomov, perhaps a bit too imaginatively, tries to associate Farīburz II with a passage in the Georgian Chronicle which is as follows. Amīr-Mirān, who Pakhomov is unable to identify except as being from the family of Ildegiz, but who most certainly was Amīr-Mirān b. Pahlavān b. Ildegiz, was married to a daughter of the Shirvānshāh (not specified); he fought a battle at Baylaqān against his step brother Abū Bakr, undoubtedly for the succession of the atabegate. He was supported by queen Thamar; the armies

102 Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 38.

103 Hasan of course doesn't include the two new rulers found by Buniyatov, op.cit., pp. 51-52; see also supra, n. 89; this would bring our total to eight; Buniyatov, for reasons unknown, doesn't allow that Farīburz II was living in 622/1225.

104 Hasan, Palāki, p. 40.


106 Georgian Chronicle, ibid.; Minorsky, ibid.
of Amir-Mirān lost. After this, an earthquake in Shamākhi killed many of the inhabitants including the wife and son of the Shirvānshāh. Then Pakhōmov concludes, but without being explicit, that Amir-Mirān was probably the son and that he was the successor to the Shirvānshāh throne. "Thanks to this catastrophe the throne of Shirvān passed to the family of Farrukhzad." 107 The whole argument is very unconvincing.

The logical explanation is that once again we have a situation where different members of the ruling dynasty were reigning and striking coins in different parts of the country. Exactly where Farīburz was ruling cannot yet be known. If we assume that Afrīdūn II was somewhere in the west, then Farīburz was probably ruling there to. If there is some connection between him and the Ildegizid Amir-Mirān, then the southern areas would be more likely.

There is the final but doubtful, possibility that the testimony of Nasawi quoted above 108 about an "Afrīdūn b. Farīburz," the Shirvānshāh, coming forward, when the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-dīn was in Arrān, with tribute, is a reference to Farīburz b. Afrīdūn and that either the writer

107 Pakhomov, Kratikl, p. 38.
108 Supra, n. 100.
or a copist juxtaposed the two names. If this should prove possible, then it would be concluded that Farībars reigned in the southwest of Shirvān.

I. Farrukhsād b. Minūchihr II (583/1187–600/1203 to before 622/1225)

Once again we come across a Shirvānshāh for whom we have not yet found any coins. He is mentioned on the coins of his son Garshāsp b. Farrukhsād b. Minūchihr II. But unlike Afrīdūn b. Minūchihr, who is also known by the coins of his son, we have some concrete testimony on Farrukhsād by way of an inscription dated 600/1203. In the inscription his name and title are given, "...the victorious Pakhrū al-Dunyā wāl-Dīn [Farrukhsād] b. Minūchihr, helper of the Commander of the faithful...," as well as the date and the fact that the tower on which the inscription is found was built by "Garshāsp, possessor of troops, commander-in-chief, the most glorious person of the world, the aided, the plentifully equipped..."\(^{109}\)

The inscription was found at the village of Mardakēn near Bākū.

\(^{109}\)Khanykov, Měl. asiiť., III, p. 119; cf. with text and translation, Pakhomov, Krakhīl., p. 39; Hasan, Fārāb., pp. 31632. However, a different text is given in Répertoire chronologique d'épigraphie arabe, IX (1937), no. 3580, p. 258, where the name Garshāsp b. Farrukhsād is clear; both Pakhomov and Hasan have omitted this important detail.
The duration of his rule is not certain. Dorn had given the dates 1205/601-2 to 1233/630-1, which Pakhomov, in light of the Mardakan inscription, corrected to at least two or three years earlier at the beginning, and, at least ten years and perhaps more at the end. That is Farrukhzād is not ruler later than 622/1225, based on the fact that the coins of his son Garshāsp have caliph al-Nāṣir's name on them. However, with our new assumption that Shirvānshāh rule overlapped, because various members of the family ruled in different cities of the state, we must re-appraise our attitude toward Farrukhzād's reign.

In fact from more recent research it seems that the father of Garshāsp did rule after 622/1225. There is a report in Ibn Aṯīr under the year 622/1225 which says, "in this year against the Shirvānshāh rose his son, banished him from the country and began to reign after him." Pakhomov had speculated that these unnamed Shirvānshāhs might be Garshāsp and his son Farrūburz III. But according to P.

---

112 Pakhomov, Kratki, p. 41 (using Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, I/1, p. 397 as his reference to Ibn-Aṯīr); cf. also in Bumiatov, ibid.
Zhuze the dethroned Shirvānshāh was Farrukhsād.\textsuperscript{113} Unfortunately, the latter confuses the issue by giving Dorn's old dates (1205/601-2 to 1233/630-1) for Farrukhsād's reign, seemingly ignoring the inscription of 600/1203.\textsuperscript{114} Whatever the details may be, it seems reasonably certain that Farrukhsād was ruling in one part of Shirvān, probably in Baku, which is near Mardakān,\textsuperscript{115} while other members of the dynasty were ruling elsewhere.

J. Garshāsp b. Farrukhsād b. Minūchihr II (from sometime after 600/1203 to circa 630/1233-4)

26A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāsir.

\textit{Oby.} (in an eight petalled rosette made of two lines the center of which is filled with dots)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}

الله \\
محمد رسول \\
الله عليه م \\
كرباسبي فورخراذ \\
بن متروجر

\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}

Allāh \\
Muhammad is the Messenger of \\
The Supreme Malik \\
Garshāsp son of Farrukhsād \\
son of Minūchihr.

\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{113} P.K. Zhuze (translator), \textit{Materialy po istorii Azerbaidscharti is "Tarikh al-Kamil" Ibn al-Aṣira}, (Baku, 1940), p. 151, n. 2 (I have not seen this work.); cf. Bumiatov, \textit{ibid.}, p. 51; cf., also Ali-Zade, pp. 360-361.

\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{115} Bumiatov concurs in this opinion, \textit{ibid.}, p. 52.
Rev. (in a four petalled rosette surrounding a square)

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

al-Māsir al-dīnillāh (sic)
Commander of the Faithful.

Pakhomov, Monetnaya pakhodka 1926, pp. 75-76, no. 10
(three examples); cf., also Pakhomov, Klady, I, H109
(no description); Blau, Odessa, p. 29, no. 341
(probably this type, not fully described); Oxford,
Ashmolean Museum, two examples, unpublished.

26B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Māsir.

Obv.
The same as 26A, but above the سب of کرنسپ, Garshāsp, there is the word الله, Allāh, and above the ك of the word al-mālik, there is an extra ك.

Rev.
The same as 26A.

Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskii klad 1926 g.," p. 33, no. 7
(eight examples; w=1.58, 2.83, 3.23, 3.70, 3.83, 3.96, 4.90, 6.41 gr.) (Pakhomov indicates there might be a six line on the obverse), see also Pakhomov, Klady, II, H429
(no description).

26C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Māsir.

Obv.
Like 26A, but a knot, سب, above the سب of کرنسپ, Garshāsp.
Rev. (Double linear circle instead of rosette)

Like 26A, above the first line is the beginning of a half-clipped word, ... حِو.

Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskij klad 1926 g.", p. 33, no. 5 (two examples; w=3.25, 3.37 gr.), same in Pakhomov, Klad, II, E 29 (no description); Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, ex-Thornburn collection (unpublished), one example (only knot visible; coin in perfect condition, almost mint condition, but badly struck). In Pakhomov's examples p. 33, no. 5 Mun%c5%b1%c5%b9%c4%b0r is spelled مونور, Mun%cc%85ch%cc%81h%cc%81r, probably due to a typographical error.

26D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-%c4%b1sir.

Obv.
Same as 26A, but with ك over ك in the لَمْبَل, over ك in the لَمْبَل.

Rev. (border of dots, neither rosette nor square, but haphazard combination of both)

Same 26A, except first line, لَمْبَل لَمْبَل, has some words (a bit garbled) vertically written to form a square design.


26E. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-%c4%b1sir.

Obv. (border design )

As 26A, with small ك above ك of the لَمْبَل.

Rev. (border design like 26D.)

Same as 26A, but die very carelessly cut.
Margin: circularly, only the word ملك, malik, remains.


27A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Masir.

Oby. (border not indicated) (legend in four lines)

محمد رسول الله
الملك المصمم
كرناسب بن فخرزاد
بن منوجهر

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.
The Supreme Malik
Garshasp son of Farrukhsâd
son of Minuchihr

Rev. (border not indicated)

لا إله إلا الله
محمد رسول الله
الناس لدين الله
امير المؤمنين

There is no god but Allah.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.
al-Masir lidInillâh
Commander of the Faithful.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, pp. 403-404, no. 351 (several examples mentioned giving one composite description; all are badly deformed; with reference to C. Frahm, Arbeiten der Kurländ. Gesellschaft für Literatur und Kunst, II [Mitau, 1847], p. 57); Bartholomaei à Soret, Num., 1859, pp. 454-455, no. 116, (illus. Pl. XVII, fig. XVII, fig. 38) (many examples to complete the legend, which is still well bracketted) (typographical error in first line of reverse, for الله, Allah) (reference to Frahm=
Dorn, p. 404, with curious, "qui diffère d'ailleurs, du notre, par la première ligne de l'avers," which might indicate that coins are like our nos. 26 with الله, Allah, on a fifth line above.).

Such irregular coins, with floral or animal shaped planchets, are illustrated in V. Langlois, Numismatique
Note the correct spelling of al-Masir-lidin, ـ الناسر لدين, one wonders if the coins actually had been struck with correctly cut dies. Blau (Odessa, pp. 29-30) doubts Dorn's transcription and corrects it. Bartholomaei indicates that he was conscious that he was reading لدين, -lidin.

27B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Masir.

The same as 27A, but لدين, for لدين.

Blau, Odessa, pp. 29-30, nos. 323-340 (eight examples, some with the ت of the fourth line of the obverse placed in the third line; expected comment that planchet are too small for dies and that all are irregularly struck) (reference to Dorn, M.S., p. 404 with correction as note above).

One suspects that some of these may be of the type no. 26 above. No border designs are indicated.

---

de la Géorgie au moyen âge (Paris, 1852), pl. II, no. 10, III, no. 2, also for Giorgi Lasha (1212-1223), Pl. IV, nos. 1-2; D. Lang, op. cit., pl. II, figs. 4-5, for Lasha, Pl. III, fig. 1. The first irregular copper of Georgia was struck under Dimitri (1125-55). They are small, roundish, but struck on planchets which are still too small; illustrated in V. Langlois, ibid., Pl. II, nos. 3-4. The AMS has three of these pieces which were not identified at the time of Lang's study based on the AMS collection. On these irregular types in Georgia, A. Bykov, keeper of coins at the Hermitage, has commented that Dimitri employed some mint-masters from Shirvan, see supra, "Chap. Two," n. 155 for reference. Since Dimitri's sister Thamar was married to the Shirvanshah Minuchir II, this borrowing from a relative and neighbor is quite reasonable.
28A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. (in an eight-petalled rosette)

[الله] [Allāh]
[محمد رسول] [Muhammad is the Messenger of]
[الله] [The Malik the Supreme]
[كـر] [Garshāp son of Farrukhzād]
[بن منو] [son of Minū] [Shirv....]

Rev. (in a four petalled rosette)

لا الإله إلا الله Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
محمد رسول الله al-Nāṣir al-dīnillāh (sic)
الناسر الدين الله Commander of the Faithful.
أمير المؤمنين

Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskii klad 1926," p. 33, no. 6, (w=2.88 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H429 (same hoard, coin not described); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1803 (d=19.0-20.5 mm., t=2.2-2.5 mm., w=6.71 gr.).

28B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. (in eight-petalled rosette)

[الله] [Allāh]
[محمد رسول] [Muhammad is the Messenger of]
[الله] [The Supreme Malik]
[كـر] [Garshāp son of Farrukhzād son o]
[بن منو] [son of Minū]
[شیر] [Shirv....]

Rev. Same as 28A.

28Ba. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

What appears to be the same coin, though design around the fields are not given, but with typographical error(?) शीर, Shīr-, for शीर, Shir-, of Shirvān in fifth line.

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 394, no. 2.

28C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

The same as 28A, except of six line of obverse moved up to the end of the fifth line.

Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskii klad 1926," pp. 32-33, no. 4, (three examples; w=1.87, 1.91, 2.98 gr.), the same in Pakhomov, Klady, II, H429 (no description); Hasan, Falaki, p. 16, no. IV (probably from the Hermitage).

28D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Obv. (border not indicated)

محمد رسول الله
الله المعصوم
... بن أبو حرب بن
منوجهر
... وار... Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
The Supreme Malik
... son of Farruqhrād son of
Minūchīhr
Shirv...

Rev. Presumably the same as 28A.
Blau, Odessa, p. 29, no. 342 (illus., Pl. I, no. 7)
(reference to Fraehn (Dorn), N.S., p. 150 for "Shirvān").

28E. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

Shirvān, شرو, moved up to fourth line, of
obverse, otherwise the same as no. 28D.

Blau, Odessa, p. 29, no. 343.

28X.(?)AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

Obv.

الملك الو... The Malik the Su...

...rshāsp son of Farr... d son of Minūchīhr

د بن منوچهر Shā(ha)nsāh.

(sic) شاهنشاه

Rev. Same as 28A(?)..

Bartholomaei & Soret, RNB, 1859, pp. 454-455, no. 117.

This coin is certainly of very doubtful attribution. Pakhomov says, "Probably this same variety was described
by I. Bartholomaei, but with an imperfect example, thanks to
which he read the last line شاهنشاه (Shāhanshāh)."117

29. AE. With no mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

117Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskij klad 1926," p. 32 under
no. 3.
Oby.  
لا اله الا الله  
محمد رسول الله  
الملك المعتمم  
كرناسب بن نرخزاد بن  
منوهر شير وانشاء (sic)

There is no god but Allah.  
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.  
The Supreme Malik  
Garshasp son of Farrukhzād son of  
Mīnūchihr Shīrvānshāh. (sic)

Rev. (same as above types)  
لا اله الا الله  
محمد رسول الله  
الناعرام البين الله  
أمير المؤمنين (sic)

There is no god but Allah.  
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.  
al-Nāṣir al-dīnillāh (sic)  
Commander of the Faithful.

Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 40 (general description without reference to specific coins; since there are no other specimens of this type, one suspects a careless attribution by Pakhomov of one of the above types probably 28A.)(reference to Fraehn, 1847(?)= Arbeiten der Kurîān, op.cit., Mitau, 1847).

All of the above issues of Garshasp b. Farrukhzād, nos. 26-29, are dateless; our only firm evidence once again are the years of caliph al-Nāṣir's reign (575/1180-622/1225).

Pakhomov was forced to place his rule between these dates, because he had already placed Farrukhzād as ruling by 600/1203 and also because Garshasp's son Farīburz III struck coins with caliph al-Mustansir's (623/1226-640/1242) name, all of which when considered in the context of successive rather than simultaneous rule, does not permit Garshasp's rule beyond
622/1225. Minorsky accepted these dates. New information which will be discussed under the next issue, has, perhaps predictably, changed or cast doubt on the above dating.

30X.(?)AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir (623/1226-640/1242).

The coin is not fully described. The obverse is presumably similar to nos. 26-29, with part or all of the formula of faith, the title al-malik al-mu'azzam, and the name Garshasp b. Farrukhzad b. Minuchihr Shirvanshah. The reverse is also probably of the exact type as nos. 26-29 in four lines, but with the substitution of al-Mustansir billah, for al-Masir lidinillah.

Blau, Odessa, p. 29, no. 344.

This unique coin is of course suspect and may have to be rejected. However, a new inscription, first reported by Pakhomov, from a tower in Mardakan (the same tower on

---

118 Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 40.

119 Minorsky, Shavvan, p. 135.

120 E. Pakhomov, "Starinnye oboronnye sooruzheniiia Apsherona," Trudy In-ta istorii im. A. Bakikhanova AH Azerb. SSR, I. (Baku, 1947), p. 72; I have not been able to secure this article, but cf., Buniyatov, op.cit., p. 49, n. 6.
which the inscription of Farrukhsad is found?) in the Baku area indicates that Garshasp b. Farrukhsad was still living (ruling?) in 630/1233-34. The inscription tends to add credence to Blau’s coin and encourages the possibility of other such coins being found. It certainly seems to show that Garshasp was ruling at the same time his son Fariburz III (for whom see below) was and perhaps also at the same time as his father Farrukhsad. Of course Baku would be the natural seat for their administration.

31X. AE.  

Plate I

Coins of Garshasp b. Farrukhsad b. Minuchihrr insufficiently described for further classification.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, p. 149, no. 1 (eight examples with reference to Verbandl. der mitschinen Ges. and Bullat. sc., VI, p. 223); Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 394, nos. 2a-31 (31 examples, nos. 14-31 irregular); Pakhomov, "Montetnye nauchdki 1924," p. 76 (88 examples), see also same hoard Pakhomov, Klady, I, Hill; Pakhomov, "Sabir-abadskij klad 1926," pp. 31-34 (154 specimens beside those listed above; weights for 23 given ranging from 0.97-7.35 gr., see also for the same hoard Pakhomov, Klady, II, H429; Pakhomov, Klady, I, H112 (two examples); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H427 (one with al-Nasir), H428, H430, H431 (11 examples with al-Nasir); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1104 (d=14.0-18.0 mm., t=30 mm.; "irregular"), H1105 (one with al-Nasir), H1106 (one example, with al-Nasir, irregularly struck), H1107 (three examples; d=12.2, 14.5, 16.7 mm., w=1.07, 1.92, 2.50 gr.), H1108, H1113, no. 3 (with al-Nasir); Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H1613 (11 examples with al-Nasir; d=up to 25.00 mm.; "very small" (?) w=between 2.07-7.37 gr.). H1614 (d=9.0-12.5 mm., t=1.5-2.0 mm., w=1.36 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 406-410 (five examples), H1802 (with al-Nasir, d=approx. 17.0 mm.), H1804 (six examples, with al-Nasir; 18 more probably Garshasp with al-Nasir); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1973 (d=11.5-13.0 mm., t=approx. 2.5 mm., w=2.57 gr.), H1974
(six examples; two almost round, d=10.0-10.5, 12.0-13.0 mm., t=2.0-2.3, 2.7-3.0 mm., w=1.30, 3.08 gr.; one very irregular, d=9.5-18.0 mm., t=2.0-2.2 mm., w=3.14 gr.; one oval, d=14.0-16.0 mm., t=2.5-2.7 mm., w=3.76 gr.; two almost round, d=12.0-12.5, 10.0-11.0 mm., t=2.5-2.7, 1.5-2.0 mm., w=2.50, 1.57 gr.), H1975 (probable; d=16.0-18.0 mm., t=2.5-2.9 mm., w=5.55 gr.), H1976 (with al-Hasir, "irregular"; d=18.0-23.0 mm., t=2.0-2.8 mm., w=5.69 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, IX, H11 (with al-Hasir; d=19.0-20.0, t=2.2-2.9 mm., weight not given), H2112 (irregular; d=12.0-17.0 mm., t=1.9-2.2 mm., weight not given), H2113 (with al-Hasir, probably Garshasp; d=15.0-24.0 mm., t=2.5-3.5 mm., w=7.13 gr., "very irregular"); BM, AE 1, AE 8, access. It. Col. Jackson, 1933 (two examples, unpublished, irregular; my notes indicate they are of a common type); Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, five examples (unpublished) ex-Thorburn Collection (all irregular, not enough remaining on coins for further classification); ANS, nine examples, all irregular and fragmentary, no further distinctions are possible (w=3.21, 3.74, 3.94, 3.96, 4.53, 4.61, 4.85, 4.94, 5.94 gr.).

K. Akhsatān II b. (Farīburz II b) (circa 582-3/1187)

We are not sure who this Akhsatān was; there are no coins known to exist. He is mentioned in the Georgian Chronicle as the "Shirvānshāh" who was one of the suitors of Queen Tāmar after her divorce from the Russian prince Giorgi in 582-3/1187. He is referred to as a relative, "the mother of his father, sister of King Dimitri, was daughter of the great King David." Pakhomov postulated that he might be the son of Farīburz II b. Minūchihr II, who was married to

121 Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 39, quoting Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, 1/1, pp. 419-420.
Thamar, daughter of David and sister of Dimitri. Of course he could have been the son of any of the other known sons of Minūchihr II, namely, Shāhānshāh, Akhsatān, or Farrukhzād. Beyond this we know almost nothing, except that he was unsuccessful in his matrimonial pursuit of Thamar, who married a native, David Soslan in 589/1193.

L. Rashīd b. (Farrukhzād ?) (circa 618/1221)

In 618/1221 Yeme (Jebe) and Sūbetei led the first Mongol raid into the Caucasus. Moving from Iraq they subjugated Tabriz, Marāgha and Naxijawan, received submission from the Ildégizid Khāmūsh b.'Uzbek, pushed into Arrān, took Baylaqān, and then went by way of Shirvān to Darband. In Shirvān they sacked Shamākhi before continuing up to al-Bāb. At Darband they couldn't go through the pass and according to Ibn al-Athīr they sent to the "Shirvānshāh, ruler of Darband of Shirvān" who could lead the army through the pass. According to Kirakos Ganjakeçi the pass

122 Ibid., further references to Brosset, pp. 437-439.

123 Juwainī, ed. trans. J. Boyle, I, pp. 148-149, see especially n. 29.

124 Rashīd al-Dīn, tr. Smirnova, p. 228.

125 Ibn al-Athīr, XII, p. 159; Rashīd al-Dīn, ibid., pp. 228-229.
was occupied by "Tajiks" who would not let them pass. The "Tajiks" were the Kipchak allies of the Khwarazmshahs, who were latter routed by the Mongols. The remnants of these Kipchaks came back to Darband and sought refuge with the ruler of that city called by Ibn al-Athîr "Rashîd-Shirvânshâh malîk Darband Shirvân" and "sâhib Darband Shirvân." The later refused and the Kipchaks seized Darband by cunning and Rashîd fled. According to Bunjiatov, Rashîd probably fled to Shamâkhi, which according to Yaqût, a contemporary of these events, was "the principle city of the land of Shirvân. It [Shamâkhi] is one of the regions of Bâb al-abwâb. Its ruler is the brother of Darband."

Rashîd later returned and routed the Kipchaks with the help of his allies, the Georgians, Lezgians and other nations. Pakhomov cited a brief version of this account from Ibn al-Athîr in his monograph on Darband. However,

---

127al-Hasawî, pp. 172-173; Ibn Khaldûn, V, pp. 124-125; cf., Bunjiatov, p. 50, n. 11. For Kipchaks, see supra, "Introd.," n. 17.
unable to explain the possibility of two Shirvānshāhs at the same time, he dismissed the whole episode as "probably simply a mistake of Ibn al-ʿAthīr," and concluded by saying we do not know who this Rashīd was. Bunniatov now points out that not only does Ibn al-ʿAthīr mention this episode, but other sources do also: al-ʿAɪnī, Ibn Khaldūn, and Muhammad al-Ḥamavī. To add final support to his argument that Rashīd was indeed the Shirvānshāh, ruling from Darband, Bunniatov brings a new passage from a manuscript of al-ʿAɪnī. In this passage, which is quoted in full, we find that in 622/1225 the Georgians and the Muslims (i.e., Shirvānshāhs) were at war. The reason was that the Shirvānshāh Rashīd, ruler of Darband, was defeated by his son with a coalition of the army and was driven out of the capital because of the bad life he led. Rashīd begged the Georgians to come to his aid; the latter sent an army, but in a ferocious battle the Georgians and Rashīd lost. Prior to the conflict Rashīd's son has advised his father to retire to one of the fortified

131 ibid.


133 see n. 127.

castles of the country, where he would see that Rashīd would be well taken care of. After his defeat Rashīd wandered from pillar to post, while his son ruled, strengthening the country and returning to the people all the things his father had taken from them.\textsuperscript{135}

From the testimony of all these sources it is Bunniatov's contention, that Rashīd and not Garshāsp, as Pakhomov and Ali-Zade stated,\textsuperscript{136} who was the senior member of the Shirvānshāh dynasty in the year 622/1225. Furthermore, since Yaqūt tells us that ruler of Darband, the Shirvānshāh, was brother of the ruler of Shamākh, Bunniatov concludes that either Garshāsp or Farīburz b. Garshāsp was Rashīd's brother. I would think that since Rashīd himself had an adult son, as will be seen just below, that Garshāsp is a more likely candidate and that Farrukhzād was the father of them both. Unfortunately we have neither numismatic nor inscriptive evidence on Rashīd.

M. Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh b. Shirvānshāh (Rashīd?) (circa 622/1225)

Al-Nasawī relates that when the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl

\textsuperscript{135}Bunniatov, ibid., p. 51, who also cites an article with the same reasoning, I.M. Dzhafarzade, "Arkheologicheskie raskopki v Baksinskoj bukhte," \textit{Izv. AN Azerb. SSR} (1947), III, no. 7, pp. 7-8 (not accessible to me).

\textsuperscript{136}Ali-Zade, op.cit., p. 360 and his "Iz istorii gosudarstva Shirvanshahov v XIII-XIV vv.," \textit{Izv. AN Azerb. SSR} (1949), vyp., 8, p. 90 (not available to me); cf., Bunniatov, op.cit., p. 52, n. 22.
al-Dīn seized Tiflis in his campaign of 622/1225, he released a certain Jalāl al-Dīn Sulṭānshāh b. Shirvānshāh, who had been delivered to the Georgians as a hostage by his father, and gave him as the area of Shirvān called Gushtasfī. Pakhomov had mentioned this Sulṭānshāh, but without further comment, in the same paragraph where he presents another episode from Ibn al-Athīr, recorded under year 622/1225, "in this year against the Shirvānshāh rose his son, robbed his kingdom, banished him from the country and after began his own rule." Pakhomov felt it was probably Garsāsp who was dethroned by his son Farīburz III. If we turn again to Buniyatov's short article, we see that he assumed that the events related by al-ʿĀʾimī, Ibn al-Athīr, al-Nasawī all in the same year, 622/1225, must be interrelated. Therefore, the ruler of Darband, the Shirvānshāh Rashīd is the father of

---

137 Al-Nasawī, ed. Houdas, p. 174, trans. p. 290; Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 136, n. 5, calls him an "orphan prince of Sharvān... who had been brought up as a Christian in order to be able to marry a daughter of the queen Rusudan;" cf., Buniyatov, same citation from al-Nasawī, and also Ibn Khaldūn, V, pp. 136-137.

138 Gushtasfī is on the lower Kur, Minorsky, Sharvān, p. 136, no. 5.


140 Pakhomov, Exercursus, p. 41.
Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh b. Shirvānshāh. Then we must conclude that the events of 622/1225 went something like this. Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh b. Shirvānshāh (i.e., b. Rashīd), who had been held hostage by the Georgians having been given to them by his father Rashīd (perhaps at the time the latter asked for Georgian help to drive out the Kipchaks from Darband), was released in that year by Jalāl al-Dīn the Khwārazmshāh when he captured Tiflis. Sultānshāh was awarded the fief (iqṭā′) of Gushtasfī from which in the same year he moved against his father in Darband and drove him out of the city and ruled in his place.

There are some problems with Buniatov's very interesting thesis. Not one source mentions the father and son's name together; we are not sure that it is these two persons who are related, especially if as Minorsky says, Sultānshāh was an orphan at the time of his release by the Khwārazmshāh. If as Ibn al-Athīr says and al-Ǧāhimī infers, Sultānshāh did not return to Gushtasfī, but stayed on and ruled in Darband, his rule must have been very short, for according to al-Nasawī about 624/1227 an infant prince was the titular ruler of Darband, but the actual governor was his atabeg al-Asad.

---

141 See supra, n. 130 and text there.

142 See supra, n. 137.

In fairness to Buniiatov it must be stated that his article does not involve itself with the events after 622/1225; indeed, Sultānshāh may have been an infant in the hands of the army and his atabeg, and therefore, one and the same son as mentioned in Ibn al-Athīr and al-Qāmīsī.

Finally, as with Rashīd so with Sultānshāh, there is no numismatic evidence. If Shirvān was in the region of Darband (al-Bāb) and Rashīd was the senior member of the Shirvānshāh dynasty, why then don’t we have any coins? Are we to assume that Garshāsp and his son Farīburz III, probably ruling in Shamākhī, were striking coins for use in all of Shirvān? If so, why didn’t they include Rashīd’s name if he was really the theoretical overlord? We just do not know the answers to these questions. It is interesting, but perhaps jumping too far ahead, to note that after Garshāsp, the title Shirvānshāh is not used on coins. Rashīd probably came to power in Darband in the later part of al-Nāṣir’s caliphate, perhaps just before 618/1221, and then assumed hegemony over the rest of the dynasty. We know that there was an independent dynasty in Darband ruling for almost a century from the first quarter of the 6th/12th century to the beginning of the 7th/13th century, the Maliks of Darband (see corpus, infra).

Though many of the details of Buniiatov’s thesis are still in doubt, Rashīd should probably be accepted as a member
of the Shirvān dynasty and placed in the dynastic chart as either a brother of Garshāsp or Farīburz III. It is also reasonably certain that for the period at hand several members of the dynasty were ruling simultaneously, perhaps with the same title of Shirvānshāh. For the year 622/1225 Bunniyatov places them as follows: in Darband, Rashīd; in Gushtasḵī, Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh; in Shamsḵī, Shāhānshāh, or Garshāsp or his son Farīburz III, or, one might add, Farīburz II b. Afrīdūn; in Bākū, Farrukhsād I or his son Garshāsp; in Shakhk and Kabali, in the west, "Afrīdūn b. Farīburz." By way of final proof Bunniyatov mentions a

---

144 Bunniyatov does just that, placing Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh just below him, op. cit., chart p. 52.

145 See supra, n. 100, where, as explained, Farīburz II could have been ruling as late as 622/1225 and perhaps in the west. He may be the same as al-Nasawi's "Afrīdūn b. Farīburz," see the next note, ruling in the west.

146 Bunniyatov has added on this ruler on whom we have no information except the testimony of al-Nasawi and Ibn Khaldūn (supra, n. 100) that the Shirvānshāh "Afrīdūn b. Farīburz" came forward with tribute to the Khwarazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn in 622/1225. Not knowing exactly who this "Afrīdūn" is Bunniyatov has made him Afrīdūn III the son of Farīburz III b. Garshāsp without explanation. This must certainly be revised. Since Farīburz III could have ruled up to 653/1256 (see infra under Farīburz III), he probably would have been too young in 622/1225 to have an adult son. Bunniyatov's dynastic table contains another error. He has listed Afrīdūn II and his son Farīburz II as son and grandson of Akhsatān II b. Minūchīhr II. But we know that Afrīdūn II was Akhsatān II's brother as attested by the coins of Farīburz II b. Afrīdūn II b. Minūchīhr II (supra, coins under no. 24). I would suspect this to be the mistake of a careless printer. Cf., also Minorsky, Shavān, p. 120 and Hasan, p. 40, n. 3.
group of stones, reported by Pakhomov, rising out of the bottom of the Bay of Baku. They seem to date from a somewhat later period, 632/1234-5, but they are important to the present discussion, because they contain the names of four of the above mentioned Shirvanshahs: Fariburz, Garshasp, Jalal al-Din, and Shahanshah.\textsuperscript{147}

\textbf{N. Fariburz III b. Garshasp b. Farrukhzâd b. Minûchihr II (circa 622/1225 to 641/1243-653/1255)}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{32A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Oby.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{sic} The Supreme Malik
\item Fariburz son of Garshasp
\item son of Farrukhzad son of Minuchihr.
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Rev.}

\begin{itemize}
\item [There is no god but Allah].
\item Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.
\item al-Nasir al-dinillah (sic)
\item Commander of the Faithful.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{147} Buniatov, \textit{ibid.}, p. 52, n. 25, citing E.A. Pakhomov, "Utochnenie daty kreposti v Baksnskoi bokhote," \textit{Izv. ASPAN} (1941), no. 1, p. 90. Unfortunately, I have not been able to examine this article at first hand, and, therefore, I am very uncertain as to the juxtaposition of these names. Does this indicate that all of these rulers were living at the same time in 632/1134-5? If so the dates of all four of these Shirvanshahs must be revised and reorganized.
Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 396, no. 39 (on the reverse the first line of the formula of faith is worn off on Markov’s example; the reading supplied by Pakhomov); Pakhomov, Excursub, p. 40 (a general type rather than specific coin) (reference to Markov).

32X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Masir.

Insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 396, no. 39 (“same, different die”); Pakhomov, “Monetnye nakhodki 192+ III,” p. 76 (five examples), cf., to the same hoard, Pakhomov, Klady, I, H11 (neither citation has description); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H431 (two examples, no description); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1804 (one example, no description).

These coins might indicate that Garshasp died shortly before 622/1225 and Fariburz III began his rule in Shamakh. However, if the inscription that Pakhomov reported in 1947 with the name of Garshasp and the date 630/1233-4 indicates that he was still ruling at that date, then we must reexamine these coins of Fariburz III with al-Masir’s name. They may indicate that Fariburz began ruling in another part of the state and only later, after his father’s death, came to the capital. On the other hand Garshasp himself may have given up the central government to his son and then retired to the Baku area. If he were living as late as the above mentioned inscription would indicate, the fact that we have no coins struck under the caliphate of al-Mustansir (623/1226-640/1242), would tend to support the idea of a less active life. We simply can give no definite answer to the question

148 supra, n. 120.
of how long and exactly where father and son ruled.

Around 1223/620 according to the Georgian Chronicle, the Shirvānshāh asked to marry the Georgian princess, Husadān, sister of King Giorgi Lasha and daughter of Queen Thamar. The offer was accepted, but on his way to the ceremony King Giorgi died at Bagavan and the wedding was called off.¹⁴⁹ Perhaps this Shirvānshāh was Farīburz III, but then again it could have been Garshāsp or any of the other "Shirvānshāhs" of the period.

33A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir (623/1226–640/1242).

Obv.

The Supreme Malik
Cālāʾ al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn A (sic)
Farīburz son of Garshāsp
Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

Rev.

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Mustansir billāh
Commander of the Faithful.

¹⁴⁹ Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 41 with reference to Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, I/1, pp. 495–496.
Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 398, no. 42 (note the extra 'alif at the end of the second line of the obverse; since Pakhomov does not note it, we are not sure if it is a mistake); Pakhomov, *Excursus*, p. 140 (a general type rather than a specific coin; no 'alif in second line of obverse).

33X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir. Insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 398, nos. 43-54 (12 examples; "same, different dies").

34A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir.

**Obv.**

The Supreme Malik

'Alā' al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn Abū Muzaffa

Farīburz son of Garshāsp

Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

**Rev.**

Field as no. 33A.

**Margin:** on four sides the design . ☺ .


34X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir. Insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 398, nos. 56-65 (12 examples; "same, different dies").
35. AE. No mint name. (6)40/(12)42-3. With caliph al-Mustansir.

Obv.

...(The Malik), The Just
Ca'Ala' al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn Abūl Muzaffa
Farīburz son of Garshāsp son of
Farrukhsād
Defender of the Commander of
the Faithful.

Rev.

Same as no. 33A for field.

Margin: .... أربعين ...forty....

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 397, no. 40 (two examples;
"place of striking clipped"), no. 41 (two examples;
"same").

36X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustansir.

Insufficiently described for further classification.

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhotki 1924," III, p. 76 (23
examples not described), cf., the same hoard Pakhomov,
Klady, I, H11; Pakhomov, Klady, II, H431 (four
examples); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1804 (22 examples);
BM (unpublished) AE 85 and AE 8 John Riley pres. (both
show parts of the bead-square surrounding the reverse
field; both irregular, w=5.84, 5.50 gr.); ANS, two
examples (one oval-shaped with design above "Farīburz"
on obverse and similar design or word (?) above al-
Mustansir on reverse)(second very irregular with
obversé field surrounded by a linear circle and with
design over nasir in last line and reverse in usual
beaded square)(w=4.02, 3.89 gr.), the second coin has
part of the circular margin the obverse with the letters
الد, al-d, showing.
The coins 33A-36 all date during the caliphate of al-Mustansir (623/1126-640/1242). During this period beside the dated coin of 640/1242 we have an inscription of 632/-1234-5 found on a fortress on an island in the Bay of Baku. Between 633/1235 and 637/1239 the Mongols completed their conquest of the Caucasus. With the taking of Darband in 637/1239, the conquest of Shirvan and all of Adharbayjan had been completed. Coins bearing Mongol names are actually not found in Shirvan until 653/1255-6, but their presence was felt everywhere.

As mentioned elsewhere the Khwarazmshah Jalal al-Din, after a dozen years of busy activity in the Caucasus, Adharbayjan, al-Jibal, met an insignificant end at the hands of some Kurds in 629/1231 near Diyarbaker. If we look back at his activities in Shirvan, we see that according to al-Nasawi, in 624/1226-7, his vizir, Sharaf al-Mulk, expelled

---


151 Istoriya Azerbajdzhana, op.cit., p. 178.

152 See infra, Akhsatan II b. Fariburz III.

the finance officials of Shirvān from Gushtasbī and collected 200,000 "barbaric" dīnārā. It is interesting from our point of view that the irregularly struck coppers were perhaps considered nominally as dīnārā. Since we have little gold and no silver struck during this period, the reference is either to these or, more probably, to Byzantine gold circulating there.

37. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustaṣsim (640/1242-656/1258).

Obv.

[The Supreme Malik]
Jalāl (ṢAlā' giv.) al-Dunyā wa al-Dīn
[Farīburz] son of Garshāsf (sic)
[Defender] of the Commander of the Faithful.

Margin

الله
There is no god but....

Rev.

al-Mustaṣsim billāh
Commander of the Faithful.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, p. 149, no. 2 (Garshāsf, instead of Garshāsp, in third line of obverse).

---

38. AE. No mint name or date; with caliph al-Musta'sim.

**Obv.**

الملك المنعم
علا الدنيا والدين
Farīburz son of Garshāsp
Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

**Margin:** on four sides لا الإلّا الله, there is no god but Allāh.

**Rev.**

لا الإلّا الله
 محمد رسول الله
 al-Musta'sim billāh, Commander of the Faithful.

There is no god but Allāh.

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 398, no. 66 (the third line of reverse seems too long as it is and might actually be put into two, adding a fourth line).

39X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Musta'sim.

Insufficiently described for further classification.

Dorn, *Nova Supplementa*, p. 149, no. 3 (six examples); Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 398, nos. 67-86 (20 examples; "same, different dies"); Pakhomov, *Excursus*, pp. 40-41 (not fully described); BM, AE 7 (John Riley pres., k906), two examples (unpublished) (AE 7, w=7.34 gr.; both irregular and clipped); ANS (w=8.46 gr.).

40X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Musta'sim.
Oby.

الدِنيَا وَالرَّزْقِ بِنَ كُرَمْ...  
...rz son of Gar...

Rev.

اللهُ  
Allāh

محمد رسول الله  
Muhammad is the Messenger of God

الصَحِيَّةُ  
al-Musta'sim

أمير المؤمنين  
Commander of the Faith....

BM, AE 95, M. Soret pres., 1865 (somewhat tear-shaped) (unpublished?).

41. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Musta'sim.

Oby.

السُلطَانُ الاعْتِضَامُ  
The Greatest Sultan

علَّامَ الدِنيَا وَالجَهَّالِ  
'Alî al-Dunyâ wa al-Dîn

فِرْسَزُ بِنَ كُرَمْ...  
Farīburz son of Garshâsp

نصر أمير المؤمنين  
Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

Rev.

لا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ  
There is no god but Allāh

محمد رسول الله  
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh

الصَحِيَّةُ  
al-Musta'sim billâh

أمير المؤمنين  
Commander of the Faithful.
Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1859, pp. 455-456, no. 118 (ills. Pl. XVII, fig. 39, a, b, c) (three fragmentary examples).

The word al-Sultan in the top line of the obverse is very curious. One cannot imagine to whom it might refer, unless to FarIburz himself. But certainly with the end of the Seljuq and Khwarazmian sultamate, the title had little importance. One cannot imagine that FarIburz felt the inheritor of this tradition. It must also be noted that a careful examination of the three fragmentary examples that Bartholomaei described reveals neither the word, nor any part of the word, "Sultan." On nos. 118a and 118b, the entire top line of the obverse is effaced; on no. 118c, we read only (sic) لعظم... for الأعظم... Instead of supplying al-sultan, probably al-malik, as on the other issues of FarIburz, would have been more correct.

42. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Musta'sim.

**Obv.**

سلطان (؟) Sultan (?)
مالک المعظم Malik the Supreme
بیورس بن کوتر... Iburz son of Garsh...
العُو... the Faith...

**Rev.**
The same as no. 41? "Semblable à celui de la première variété."
Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1862, pp. 98-99, no. 157
(the reading of "sultan" in the top line is questioned by the author).

As with the previous specimen, the title sultan does not seem reasonable. Even Bartholomaei seems to be doubtful. One also wonders about the reading al-, malik. It should either be al-malik or have dots before indicating a worn area.

43X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Musta'sim.

Insufficient description for further classification.

Plate I

Blau, Odessa, p. 30, no. 345 (partially described; reference to Fraehn [Dorn], Nova Supplements, p. 149, no. 2); Pakhomov, "Monetnye nahodki 1924", III, p. 76 (110 pieces, not described) cf., same hoard, Pakhomov, Klady, I, H111 (also not described); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H430 (one example), H431 (11 examples); Klady, IV, H1221 (two examples; d=13.5-18.0, 15.5 mm., w=3.36, 2.85 gr.), H1222 (three examples; d=22.5, 18.0, 22.0 mm., w=3.93, 5.49, 5.42 gr.), H1223, nos. 1-3; Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1804 (80 examples, not described); ANS, two examples (obverse of the first indicates a design of dots, perhaps part of a rosette, around the field, the other shows part of a square (?) of dots around the reverse field)(d=18.0-24.0 mm., w=6.55 gr.; d=13.5-25 mm., w=5.94 gr.).

The mention of caliph al-Musta'sim (640/1242-656/1258) limits the issues nos. 37-43 to the years 648/-1243-653/1255. The first year of possible striking is obvious; for the last we have a coin of that date for
Faribuz III's successor Akhsatān III. The only concrete information on Farīburz III during the caliphate of al-Musta'ūsim is an inscription found at the village of Khanakag by Dorn dated 641/1243-4 with the name Farīburz b. Garshāsp b. Farrukhsād b. Minūdīhr.\textsuperscript{155}

We do not have enough information to know whether Farīburz was the only Shirvānshāh ruling at his death. The last piece of evidence which could allow for more than one Shirvānshāh ruling simultaneously is the inscription(s) dated 632/1234-5 in the Bay of Bākū\textsuperscript{156} mentioning four Shirvānshāhs including Farīburz and his father Garshāsp. Perhaps just after this date, or with the final Mongol occupation in 637/1239, Shirvān was unified with a single ruler for the purpose of collecting tribute. In any case after the late 630's/1230's the literary, inscriptiveal and numismatic evidence is silent on matters of multiple rule.

44X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Farīburz III b. Garshāsp insufficiently described.


\textsuperscript{156}\textit{Supra}, n. 147.
for further classification.

Blau, Odessa, p. 30, no. 346 (fragment); Pakhomov, "Monetnje nakhođki 1924," III, p. 76 (31 examples, not described), cf. to the same hoard. Pakhomov, Klady, I Hill (also not described); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H121 (one example), H122 (one example); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1977 (d=17.0-28.0 mm., t=2.0-2.7 mm., w=6.46 gr.); H1978 (d=11.0-11.5 mm., t=2.0-2.5 mm., w=1.71 gr.). Pakhomov says, "From the inscription only the name Farîburg is understood," but the size and weight probably indicate Farîburg I or Farîburg II; Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H2114 (Pakhomov says, "Farîburg III b. Garshasp with the caliph al-Mustâsid (556-575=1170-1180)" (sig); the reading must be rejected for that of either al-Mustansir or al-Musta'sim. The mistake I think can be excused for Pakhomov was in his 80's when he wrote this last in his series on hoards in the Caucasus.) (four examples; d=12.0-13.0, 9.0-14.0, 8.0-25.0, 12.5-15.0, t=2.3-2.5, 1.5-2.5, 1.0-2.0 mm., only three given, w=2.75, 1.67, 2.14, 1.85 gr.); BM, AE 8 and 9, R.E. Way pres., 1906, (two examples (unpublished), irregular, beaded borders); ANS, (two examples, irregular, beaded border on first; d=18.0-21.5, 19.0-22.0 mm., w=6.13, 5.51 gr.).

0. Akhsatân III b. Farîburg III b. Garshasp (circa 653/1255-circa 665/1266)

45A. AE. No mint name. 653/1255-6. With the Great Khân Möngke (646/1248-655/1257) and caliph al-Musta'sim.

Obv. "L'avers est semblable à celui de la monnaie précédente." (our no. 40)(?)

[لا اله الا الله] [There is no god but Allâh].

[محمد رسول الله] [Muhammad is the Messenger of Allâh].

[الملعتم بالله] [al-Musta'sim billâh].

[أمير المؤمنين] [Commander of the Faithful].

The coin creates many problems. If the obverse is like Barthomaei's no. 118 (our no. 40), how then is the coin attributed to Akhsatān? Surely, instead of amīr of the faithful, one would expect "Akhsatān b. Fariburz" as found on other coins, see below.

45B. AR. No mint name. 653/1255-6 with caliph al-Mustaṣsim and the (Great Khan Mongke).

Obv. (in a square frame)

لا اله الا لل محمد رسول الله
اللاه بالله
استعانت

There is no god but Al...
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Mustaṣsim billāh.
Akhsatān...

Rev.

Semblable au revers d'une monnaie de la même date que nous avons décrite dans notre première lettre, no. 119.
La place a manqué pour le nom de Menkou Qaan, et, en
outre, il ne paraît pas que le mot تاريخ , ait pu trouver place. À l'avers du no. 119, nous avons lu, à la quatrième ligne, les mots: Enir des Fidèles, qui certainement ne figurent pas sur ce nouvel exemplaire."

Bartholomaei à Soret, BM, 1864, p. 352, no. 42, (no. 119 is of course our no. 45A).

45C. AE. No mint name. 653/1255-6. With caliph al-Musta'sim and Great Khan Möngke.

**Obv.**

لا اله الا الله
محمد رسول الله
المتعم بالله ضرب (؟)
احسن بن فرجر

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Musta'sim billāh, struck (?)
Akbastān son of Fariburz.

**Rev.**

منكأ قائن
العادل الاعظم
في تاريخ سنة ثلاث
خصص ستamuة (sic)

Mūngkā Qā'ān
The Just, the Greatest
In the year, year three
fifty, six hundred.

Markov, Inventarnyi, pp. 399-401, no. 87 (two examples) (note the peculiar placing of year, struck, on the obverse, but the actual date on the reverse).

45D. AE. No mint name. 653/1255-6. With caliph al-Musta'sim and Great Khan Möngke. Plate I
Oby. (in a double linear circle)

...[Messenger of Allâh].
...Cîsim billâh.
...khsatân son of Farîbu

Rev. (border design clipped)

... The Just, the Greatest
... In the year, year three

ANS (observe first and last lines clipped, in obverse the گ of Akhsatan, گîstan, is placed above the گ, stâ, instead after the 'alif) (d=17.0-27.5 mm., wt 4.46 gr.).


Insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, Inventarnyi, pp. 399–400, nos. 88-101 (two examples under no. 96, therefore, 25 altogether);
Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 42 (a general description rather than specific coin; spelling of Môngke, مونگكه); V. M. Sysoev, Kratkij ocherk istorii Azerbajdzhana (governogol) (Baku, 1925), p. 73; A. Ali-Zade, Soc.-ekon...., op.cit., p. 367 (no specific coin, with references to Pakhov, Excursus, and Sysoev, Kratkij);
Pakhomov, Klady, IV, Hl123, nos. 6-7; Pakhov, Klady, VII, Hl1804 (16 examples from hoard at Jagan in the Shamakhi region, with 653/1254, al-Musta‘sim and Môngke).

It is not altogether clear why the coins of this issue are dated 653/1255-6. The great Mongol Khan Môngke ruled from
649/1251-657/1259. The caliph al-Mustaṣim remained ruler in Baghdad until its capture by Hūlagū in 656/1258. Perhaps it was to honor the date of Akhsatān II's succession. Our only other piece of information for the early period of Akhsatān's reign is an inscription found by Dorn in the village of Khanekag dated 654/1256 mentioning Akhsatān and his father Farīburz III.\textsuperscript{157} As with Farīburz III, Shirvān seemed to keep a degree of autonomy under Mongol rule. The very fact that the caliph's name is mentioned with the Mongol Khān not only indicates the relative autonomy of Shirvān, but also a sensible policy of respect to all potential centers of authority.

46. A.E. No mint name or date. With the Great Khān Kubilāy (658/1260-693/1294). Plate I

\textbf{Obv.}

\begin{align*}
\text{قā'ān} \\
\text{The Just.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Rev.} (in a double linear circle)

\begin{align*}
\text{لَا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا الَّلَّهُ} \\
\text{Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.} \\
\text{مُحَامَّدُ رَسُولُ الَّلَّهِ} \\
\text{Akhsatān son of Farīburz.}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{157}Dorn, Bull. de l'acad., IV, pp. 362 and 368 (makes the usual reading of Farāmarz for Farīburz); cf. Pakhomov, Excursus, p. 42 and Ali-Zade, Soc.-skon..., op.cit., p. 368.
In 656/1258 Hulagu took Baghdad and ended the Abbāsid caliphate. Then and especially after the death of Möngke in 657/1259, he began to rule in Iran and the Middle East independently.\(^{158}\) These coins were most certainly struck after the death of al-Musta'ṣim, the last Abbāsid caliph, since there is no mention of his name, and under the direct suzerainty of Hulagu or his son and successor Abāghā Khan (663/1265-680/1285), but the Qā'an al-'Adil, refers to the Great Khan Kubilai.\(^{159}\) Since we have an inscription of of Farrukhzād II b. Akhsatān II dated 665/1266-7 (for which

\(^{158}\) For an excellent summary of these events see the standard source, B. Spuler, Die Mongolen in Iran (Leipzig, 1939), see sections in first chapter on Möngke, Hulagu, and Abagha; Turkish, trans., C. Köprüla, Iran Müculları (Ankara, 1957), pp. 49-89. See also supra, "Intro.," n. 8, and "chap. Two," nn. 97-98 and text.

\(^{159}\) G. Lang, op.cit., p. 41, speaking of Georgian issues under Hulagu says "In spite of the practically independent status of Hulagu and his line, they continued for the time being to acknowledge the supreme overlordship of the Great Khāqān Khubilai at Daidu. The formula Qā'an al-'Adil' on the coins of Hulagu and Abagha refers not to the Il-Khāns themselves, but to Khubilai."
see below), this issue must date from the years 656/1258-665/1266-7. The striking may have taken place specifically after 662/1263 Yeshmūt, Abāghā’s brother, was made governor of Arān and Adharbayjān. 160

Finally, we have as our last known issue of this branch of the Shirvānshāhs, the following anonymous coppers.

47. AE. Shīr vān. Date effaced. With the Great Khān Kubilay.

Oby. (in a square)

لا الوالا
الله محمد
رسول الله

There is no god but Allah. Muhammad
is the Messenger of Allah.

Margin: ...

Rev. (border not indicated, a circle ?)

قابان

The Just.

Margin: ضرب , struck (position not stated)

right: شیروان Shīrvān

top: floral design, .

160 B. Spuler, op.cit., trans., p. 386.
Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 401, no. 123 (two examples).

These anonymous coins bearing the mint mark Shirvan were struck either during the reigns of Akhsatan III or perhaps his son Farrukhsad II. Perhaps other examples, in which the date is legible, may some day be found which will help us date them more precisely.

P. Farrukhsad II b. Akhsatan III (circa 665/1266)

We are not sure when Farrukhsad became Shirvanshah, but it was certainly by 665/1266 for which date we have an inscription from Khanakag first reported by Dorn. The inscription read Farrukhsad b. Akhsatan b. Fariburz b. Garshasp. Another inscription was reported by Berezin from the village of Bibi-Kibat with Farrukhsad b. Akhsatan b. Fariburz, but there is some controversy about it.

During this period Shirvan seemed to be caught in the middle of the struggle between Berke Khan of the Golden Horde and Abagha of the Il-Khanids. Shirvan seems to have

---


changed hands several times in this period.\textsuperscript{163}

We have no numismatic data for Farrukhsād II, unless some of the anonymous Qā'īn type, no. 47, were struck under his rule; this would seem to be a distinct possibility.

48X. AE. AR. No mint names or dates

Coins ascribed to the Shirvānshāhs but insufficiently described for further classification.

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," III, (54 examples; 22 with al-Nāsir, 32 with name of Shirvānshāh and caliph worn); cf., same hoard, Pakhomov, Klady, I, H111; Pakhomov, Cabinet of the Univ. of Baku (Baku, 1928), (4 examples, one copper, three billion); Pakhomov, Klady, I, H108 (346 copper and billion coins belonging to the 6th/12th-7th/13th centuries, including Minūchīhr b. Afrīdūn, Akhsatān b. Minūchīhr, Shāhānshāh b. Minūchīhr (these published, see no. 23 above with references), etc.; for the most part now in the Hermitage) (with reference to I.A.A.K., 1907, pp. 118 and 136; I have not seen this article); H119 (33 "funtas": pounds (?) of shirvānshāh coppers) (reference to I.A.A.K., 1895, pp. 53 and 179; I have not seen this article); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H431 (six examples, no names visible), H432 (16 examples, 6th/12th-7th/13th centuries, Garshāsp, Farīrbūz III, Akhsatān II) with references to Zap. iz. rus. arkh. obshch., III (1887), vyp. 2, p. 278, and I.A.A.K., no. 14, no pages; I have seen neither of these); H433 (278 dark bronze 7th/13th cent. Shirvānshāh coins (same references as hoard H432, except first is on p. 279); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H102 (d=12.5 mm., w=1.07 gr.), H121 (one example), H122 (three examples, one with al-Nāsir, w=1.72), H123, nos. 4-5 (caliph's name worn); Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H615 (one example), H616 (one example), H617 (one example), H618 (d=9, t=12 mm., t=2.4 mm., w=1.91 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799 (two examples), H804 (30 examples, either Garshāsp or Farīrbūz III); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1799 with al-Nāsir (d=12-14 mm., t=2.5 mm., w=1.71 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, IX, H2113 (irregular with al-Nāsir; d=15.0-2.4 mm., t=2.5-3.5 mm., w=7.13 gr.)

\textsuperscript{163} Ali-Zade, ibid., p. 369 ff. for discussion.
The dynasty continued into the late 8th/14th century, but there is at least one lapse in the genealogy and in general very little material. From another inscription at Khanakaz we have the names malik Garshasp (?) or Gushtasp (?) b. Akhsatân; the inscription is dated 693/1293-4. After there is a break from the main branch and then three more rulers: Kay-qubâd, Kâ'üs b. Kay-qubâd, and Hushang b. Kâ'üs. It is not within the scope of this thesis to discuss these rulers. What information we have and an analysis of it will be found in the pages of Dorn, Pakhomov, Minorsky, and Ali-Zade.


165"Bericht," op.cit. ("Chap. One," n. 84); also idem, "Versuch," op.cit., pp. 554 ff.

166 Excursus, pp. 17-19, 26, 43-46.


III. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

All the new details uncovered by the preparation of the corpus will not be presented here, but only the most significant points. The first among these is the continuity in the Shirvānshāh dynasty from the 2nd/8th to the late 7th/13th century. The various issues of Farībuz b. Sālar effectively bridge the gap artificially created by later sources between the earlier so-called Yazīdid branch and the 5th/11th-7th/13th century Shirvānshāhs, the so-called Kasrānids or Kháqānids. By the 5th/11th century the formerly Arab origin of the dynasty has become completely submerged under the iranizing influence of the local population.

The general chronology of the dynasty has been completed almost exclusively from numismatic evidence. In the corpus the reigning years of Farībuz I, Minūchihr I, Minūchihr II, Akhsatān I, and Garshāsp I, have been revised and corrected from those given in the previous literature. Furthermore, the theme that more than one member of the family was ruling simultaneously with the title of Shirvānshāh has been developed. This multiple rule may have started at the beginning of the 6th/12th century among the sons of Farībuz I. A century later, in the early 7th/13th century, as many as eight can be shown to be Shirvānshāhs at approximately the same time.

A unique coin of Minūchihr II firmly shows for the first time that Shamākhi was the capital of Shirvān during
the mid-6th/12th century. The same coin also demonstrates that Shirvān was in close touch with events in Adharbayjan and al-Jibal surrounding the Seljuqs of Iraq and their Ildegiz atabegs by the mention of sultan Sulaymān b. Muhammad who ruled for only a few months in 555/1160. The names of the reigning caliph and the ruling Seljuq sultan are mentioned on the coins without exception, indicating that Shirvān was during the entire period firmly within the Islamic community. However, they maintained their independence, if at times limited, throughout these troubled years, even during the Khwārazmian and Mongolian occupations, as attested to by a continuous minting of coins.

By a reattribution of a copper coin from Minūchihr I to Minūchihr II, a consistent pattern of decline in the metal composition has been demonstrated by the corpus. Silver became debased towards the end of the 5th/11th century, turned to billon in the early 6th/12th century, and finally, exclusively to copper in the middle of the same century. Of all the dynasties in this study, this was the last to show the effects of the silver crisis. The copper coinage is exclusively irregular, reflecting the isolated, local economy of the area. Shirvānshāh money has not been found in hoards outside the immediate territory of Shirvān; none was found at Dvin.
The Shirvānshāhs displayed aggressiveness during the whole of the 5th/11th-7th/13th centuries, especially towards Darband. They definitely absorbed the latter city by the beginning of the 7th/13th century. The numismatic data is of little help in this respect. The lack of mint names, except for the unique Shamākhī and a late "Shīrvān," deprives us of one of our best numismatic tools. The corresponding lack of dates has also made the task of chronology more difficult than normal.

Dorn’s original list of Shirvānshāhs from the so-called Kasrānīd dynasty had five rulers up to the end of the 7th/13th century; this corpus listssixteen. The majority of them were discovered through numismatic investigations. Even now with our much improved understanding of Shirvān history, there is much basic information that needs to be known. Little is to be expected in the way of new literary sources, but there is hope that more numismatic discoveries will clear up some of the problems of sovereignty and chronology.
THE DATES OF THE SHIRVĀNSHĀHS LISTED IN THE CORPUS

A. Farīburz b. Sālār (455/1063 to 487/1094-489/1096)
B. Minūchihr b. Farīburz (487/1094-489/1096 to 489/1096-511/1117)
C. Afrīdūn b. Farīburz (post 489/1096-514/1120)
D. Minūchihr II b. Afrīdūn (514/1120-circa 55/1160)
E. Akhsatān b. Minūchihr II (post 555/1160 to 593/1197-600/1203-4)
F. Shāhānshāh b. Minūchihr II (circa 575/1180 to circa 600/1203)
G. Afrīdūn II b. Minūchihr II (sometime during 583/1187-600/1203)
H. Farīburz II b. Afrīdūn II b. Minūchihr II (sometime during 583/1187-600/1203)
I. Farrukhzād I b. Minūchihr II (583/1187-600/1203 to before 622/1225)
J. Garshāsp b. Farrukhzād b. Minūchihr II (from sometime after 600/1203 to circa 630/1233-4)
K. Akhsatān II b. (Farīburz II ?) (circa 582/1187)
L. Rashīd b. (Farrukhzād ?) (circa 618/1221)
M. Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh b. Shirvānshāh (Rashīd ?) (circa 622/1225)
N. Farīburz III b. Garshāsp b. Farrukhzād b. Minūchihr II (circa 622/1225 to 641/1243-653/1255)
P. Farrukhzād II b. Akhsatān III (circa 665/1266)

See the genealogical table on the following page.
The early genealogy of the dynasty is based on the Ta'rikh al-Daw, ed. Minorsky, Sharvan, op. cit., pp. 22-41; Zambaur's table (Manuel, pp. 181-182) needs correction. The names written in capital letters are listed in the corpus under the lettered section. A small circle (o) before a name indicates that coins exist for that ruler. The dates for the Shirvânsâhs considered in this study are given on the previous page.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE MALIKS OF DARBAND CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

The 6th/12th century Malik of Darband claimed
descendence from the 3rd/9th-5th/11th Arab amīrs of that
city. The Ta'rijāh al-Bāb as preserved by Munajjim-bashfi
contains a detailed history of these rulers.¹ Amīrs,
appointed as representatives of the Umayyads, and then of
the Abbāsids, succeeded one another, until 255/869 Hāshim
b. Surāqa al-Sulami became the ruler of al-Bāb and the
marches. He gained independence and after him his descend-
ents possessed Darband one after another. Their end came
about 470/1077; their domination lasted 215 years.² In
the late 470's/1070's the city was caught in a struggle
between these local amīrs, the Shirvānshāhs and the Shaddādids
ruling in Arrān.³ For a short period Afrīdūn b. Farīburz I

¹On the Ta'rijāh see supra, "Chap. One", nn. 4-7
and the text there.

²These details have been excerpted directly from
the Ta'rijāh; V. Minorsky, Sharvān, text, p. 16, trans., p.
41.

³On the Shaddādids, supra, "Introd.," nn. 12, 13, 15.
was appointed as local governor in Darband.⁴ But the age-long ambition of Shirvān to annex al-Bāb was temporarily thwarted when sultan Malikshāh gave Darband and the surrounding areas to his lieutenant Sau-tegīn as iqtāʾ.⁵ This was in 1075, the year in which the narrative in the Taʾrīkh al-Bāb on Darband ends; unfortunately, Munемjīm-bashī provides no further information to bring the history of al-Bāb into the next century.

Only after the first quarter of the 6th/12th century is there any concrete reference to the rulers of Darband. The Hispano-Arab traveler Abū-Hāmid al-Andalūsī al-Ghranṭī visited al-Bāb sometime between 524/1130–545/1150. In his Tuḥfat al-Albāb he says the local ruler was Sayf al-Dīn Muhammad b. Khalīfa al-Sulāmī. ⁶ The nisba is characteristic and suggests that this Muhammad was a continuator of the dynasty of the Sulāmī Hashimids described in the Taʾrīkh al-Bāb.⁷

---

⁴Ibid., text, pp. 14–16, trans., pp. 38–41; the details are given supra, "Chap. Three," n. 32.

⁵On Sau-tegīn, the amīr of the two Iraqs, see supra, "Chap. Two," nn. 44 and 47 and discussion there. On the revenue grant (iqtāʾ) system, loc. cit., nn. 68–70 and text there.


⁷Minorsky, Sharvān, ibid. The nisba is that part of a name which shows the family or geographical origin.
A few years later Ibn al-Azraq, while accompanying King Dimitri of Georgia on an inspection tour of the northeastern frontier near Daghestan, met the ruler of Darband, Amir Abūl-Muzaffar, when the latter came forward to greet Dimitri, his father-in-law.\textsuperscript{8} This Abūl-Muzaffar is one and the same as Muzaffar b. Muhammad Khalīfa, the Malik of Darband whose coins begin the corpus.

A. Bartholomaei was the first to report on coins of these maliks. Unfamiliar with the names on the coins he designated the dynasty the Kings of Karabagh, after the area near where they were first found;\textsuperscript{9} he later changed Kings to the less pretentious Maliks.\textsuperscript{10} P. Soret, unsatisfied by this attribution and at the same time noting the regular mention of the Seljuq sultan, speculated that the dynasty might be a branch of the Seljuqs in Adharbayjan.\textsuperscript{11} Both names remained in use up to this century.\textsuperscript{12} Pakhomov finally

\textsuperscript{8} Ta'rikh Mayyūsūrīn (supra, "Chap. One," n. 34), MS, BM, Or.5803, f. 64a; reference from Minorsky, ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} Bull. hist.-phil. de l'Acad., XIV (1857), p. 249; see also supra, "Chap. One", n. 96 for discussion.

\textsuperscript{10} RNR (1859), p. 435.

\textsuperscript{11} BM (1859), p. 482.

\textsuperscript{12} Markov, Inventarnyi', pp. 390–391, and Pakhomov prior to 1930, use Seljuqs of Adharbayjan; Zambaur, Manuel, p. 194, and Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, op.cit., pp. 133–134, use Kings and Princes of Karabagh respectively.
solved the riddle of these rulers and properly named them the Maliks of Darband. 13 Minorsky has followed this appellation. 14

Besides the coins and the three sources cited above, the Ta’rikh, Ibn al-Azraq, and Abū-Hamid al-Gharnatī, there is mention of these sovereigns by the poets Baylaqānī, Khāqānī and Nizāmī, 15 and the Georgian Chronicle. The latter work refers to the ruler of Darband just before our corpus begins. "In 1120 A.D. = 514 A.H. the rulers of Shirvān and Darband having come to blows, Afrīdūn was killed and the people of Shirvān cut to pieces." 16 The amīr of Darband was perhaps Muhammad b. Khalīfa the father of Muzaffar; since Muzaffar ruled until at least 559/1164, as attested to by dated coins, he probably would have been too young in 514/1120.

There is numismatic evidence for the three subsequent Maliks, Muzaffar, his son Bekbārs, and ʿAbd-al-Malik b. Bekbārs. For the last ruler there is only a single rare issue struck during the caliphate of al-Ḥāṣir. Beyond this we know


15 Minorsky, ibid., p. 140 with reference to Badiʾ al-Zamān, Sokhna ṭarār (no plate or date given), II/1, pp. 261, 342.

nothing more about these *maliks*. By the end of the first quarter of the 7th/13th century Darband was under the control of Shirvān. 17 Perhaps the dynasty in a very much weakened condition continued to survive. Two rulers of al-Bāb in the early 7th/13th century, now with the title Shirvānschāh, had the names Rashīd and Jalāl al-Dīn Sultānshāh b. Shirvānschāh, which stand out sharply against the unbroken series of Iranian names during this period. Is it possible that the Maliks of Darband formed an alliance by marriage with the Shirvānschāhs? This could explain their Arab names because they would have been descendants of the Maliks of Darband, and their title because of marital connections with the Shirvānschāhs. Whatever may have happened, Darband remained firmly in the control of Shirvān for the rest of the 7th/13th century.

The coins of this dynasty are exclusively of the "irregular" copper variety. 18 Their shape and striking are totally haphazard; their size usually very small. Round shaped specimens are sometimes encountered, but their regular form is completely accidental. On most coins about half of

---

17 For a full discussion of the two rulers Rashīd and Jalāl al-Dīn, both called Shirvānschāhs, see supra, "Chap. Three," Section II, L and D.

18 For a discussion of "regular" and "irregular" copper see supra, "Chap. Two," Section II E.
any die appears; the planchets of the more than 200 hundred pieces examined during this study were, without a single exception, inadequate to receive a full die impression. Often the obverse and reverse were struck with the same die. Therefore, all legends in the corpus are composites, formed by the use of many samples. Only a single issue of Muzaffar is dated; there are no mint names. The reigning Abbāsid caliph is consistently mentioned as well as the Seljuq sultan of Iraq, but only one sultan, Muhammad b. Mahmūd, is referred to by name. The coins are found mostly around Darband, sometimes in Shirvān, and rarely south of the Kur River.

The corpus will be followed by some observations and a genealogical table.

II. THE CORPUS

A. Muzaffar b. Muhammad b. Khalīfa (circa 530/1136 to circa 566/1170)

1A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī (530/1136-555/1160) Plate II

Obv.

The Just Malik

Rev.

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

al-Muqtasī li'amīrillāh.

The Supreme Sultan.

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 390, nos. 7-8 (irregular and defective; obverse, first line and chain missing, second and third lines partial; reverse, last line missing); Arms, five examples (area where س, bin, should be on third line, clipped on all specimens; all irregular, d=16-17, 14.5-16, 16-23, 19-21, 19-24.5 mm., w=4.43, 4.71, 5.54, 5.86, 7.91 gr.; floral designs found here and there on obverses).

IX. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtasī.

Obv.

The Just Malik.

Muzaffar son of Muhammad son of Khalīfa, Helper of

the Commander of the Faithful.

(Words thus distributed?)

Rev.

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

al-Muqtasī li'amīrillāh.

The Supreme Sultan.

(Words thus distributed?)
Pakhomov, "O derbendskom", p. 3, type II (not referring to any particular coin and not broken down into lines; note the bin in the second line of the obverse.)

2A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

**Obv.**

[The Just Malik]

[Muṣaffar son of Muḥammad son of]

Khalīfa, Helper of

Aībīr [the] Faithful.

**Rev.**

[There is no god but A[lāh].

[alone. He has no associate.]

[al-Muqtaṣār li amr allāh].

[The Sūltān The Sup[reme].]

ANS, one example (very irregular and badly struck; d=15.0-20.5 mm., w=4.15 gr.).

2B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

**Obv.**

Like 2A, but al-muṣīnī, al-muṣīnī, moved up to fourth line; the chain slants left, ١١١١١١١
REY.

As 2A.

ANS (circular and seemingly regular, but struck badly; first and second lines of obverse missing, the last two partial; first line of reverse missing, others partial) (d=14.0-14.5 mm., w=3.10 gr.)

We are not sure when Muzaffar began his reign, probably not earlier than the first year of al-Muqtadir’s caliphate, 530/1136, before which date no coins have come to light. The reign of his father Muhammad b. Khalifa may have extended back to 514/1120 when the Georgian Chronicle refers to Darband as though it were independently ruled.\(^{19}\) Therefore, sometime during the weakening of the authority of the Great Seljuq Empire after the death of Malikshah in 485/1092, the descendants of the Sulami Hashimid amirs succeeded in regaining control of al-Bab from the Seljuq governor, Sau-tegin or one of his successors,\(^{20}\) and revived the local dynasty. Whether this was done by Muhammad or his father Khalifa is at present unknown.

Until the dated issue of 555/1160 there is no guide for the chronological arrangement of Muzaffar’s coins except the dates of the reigning caliphs. The positioning of the legends and the ornamental motifs have also been used

\(^{19}\) Supra, the text at n. 16.

\(^{20}\) See supra, n. 5.
in classification. The order of issues is at best tentative; of course those with al-Muqtadī on them were struck before those which mention his successor, al-Mustanjid.

3A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

**Obv.** (in a circular chain)

الملك The Malik

عمر Muzaffar

ابن محمد son of Muhammad.

**Rev.**

لا الإله إلا الله There is no god but Allāh, alone. There is no associate

وحده لا شريك to Him. al-Muqtadī [liamn-]

الله السلطان Allāh. The Sultan

المعظم the Supreme.

ANS, four examples (one has an almost complete obverse, but the rest have fragmentary legends throughout; obverse occasionally has three dots scattered here and there between the lines)(d)12-14, 12-15, 15-16, 20-21 mm., w=2.02, 2.17, 7.09, 7.30 gr., all irregular).

3B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

**Obv.** same as 3A.

**Rev.** same as 3A, but with chain slanting to the left and the error لام- for لام in the third line.
ANS (fragmentary; d=15-20.5 mm., w=4.81 gr.).

3C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obverse and reverse the same, but apparently no chain on reverse side.

ANS, two examples (one seems to have a floral design outside the circular chain of the obverse; both are fragmentary)(d=16-21, 18-21 mm., w=5.14, 5.39 gr.).

3D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. (in a circular chain)

الملك The Malik
مظفر بن Muzaffar son of
محمد Muhammad.

Rev. same as 3C, no chain visible.

B.N., M2010 (fragmentary, irregular d=approx. 15.5-18.5 mm.; cast in ANS); ANS, two examples (fragmentary, on one does not actually show; d=15-16, 17-19 mm., w=3.86, 5.02 gr.).

3X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Full obverse legend and last three lines of reverse given, but not distributed into lines.

Pakhomov, "O derbendskom," p. 3, type III (a general type rather than specific coin).
4A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtasir.

Obv. (in a linear circle)

لاِ اللَّهِ لا َاللَّهِ

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

[The] Just Malik Mu'azzar

[The] Just Malik Muazzar

son of Muhammad.

Rev. (in a linear circle)

لاِ اللَّهِ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

[There is no god but Allāh].

[There is no god but Allāh].

alone. [He has] no associate.

al-Muqtasir liamillāh.

اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ

The Supreme Sultan.

The Supreme Sultan.

ANS, six examples (four are very fragmentary; if they were more complete they might show other variations) (floral designs and stars scattered here and there; d=10-14, 13-15, 15.5-18, 16-21, 14.5-24, 20.23.5 mm., w=1.65, 2.03, 4.12, 4.37, 5.32, 7.27 gr.).

4B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtasir.

Both obverse and reverse struck with an obverse die similar to obverse of 4A.

ANS, three examples (on all three the dies on each side are different, though similar; all are fragmentary; d=14-17, 11-24 (sic), 20-25 mm., w=2.73, 4.91, 7.57 gr.).

4C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtasir.

Both obverse and reverse struck with a reverse die similar to the reverse of 4A.
ANS (the dies are different on each side, fragmentary; d=10.5-19 mm., w=2.38 gr., very irregular).

4D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. Like 4A. The al- of al-malik, الملك is clearly visible.

Rev. Same as 4A, but the third line is misspelled, the first line لا بالا اللّ is quite clear on some examples.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1859; p. 436, no. 89 (illus. Pl. XVI, fig. 24), a line drawing which clearly shows the spelling error, even though the description proper indicates.; Oxford, Ashmolean, ex-Thornburn collection (irregular); ANS, five examples (all irregular and fragmentary, floral designs, dots and other markings scattered here and there; d=11-12.5, 15-15.5, 15-19.5, 17 (sic, quite round, but still irregularly struck), 18-20.5 mm., w=1.74, 3.25, 3.97, 5.04, 6.67 gr.).

4F. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Both obverse and reverse struck with a reverse die similar to the reverse of 4D.

ANS (the dies are different on each side, fragmentary; d=13-17.5, w=3.27 gr.).

4F. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. (in a linear circle)

لا للّ إلا محمد رسول الله

محمّد ﷺ is the Messenger of Allāh.

الملّك

The Malik

العدل مظفر بن محمد

the Just, Muzaffar son of Muhammad.

Rev. Like 4D, with same misspelling, لا أمر .
ANS, three examples (on two the al-malik, the king
and bin, بن, do not actually appear, but on the
subsequent lines there is no room for them.) (the
floral design above Muhammad is clipped on two; all
fragmentary, d=15.5-18, 19-20.5, 21.5-27 mm., w=5.29,
6.51, 7.78 gr.).

4G. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. محمد رسول الله
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.
الملك العادل
The Just Malik
مُسَافَر بن محمد
Muzaffar son of Muhammad

Rev. as no. 4A; correct spelling of لا أمر

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 390, nos. 1-6; ANS (fragmentary;
d=18.5-21.5 mm., w=5.54 gr.).

4H. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. (in a linear circle)
[لا الإله الله]
[محمد رسول الله]
الملك العادل
[There is no god but Allah.]
[Muhammad] is the Messenger of Allah.
The Just [Malik].

محمد
Muhammad.

Rev.

. . . . . . .
[الله] لا شريك [له]
[alone]. [He has] no associate.
لا أمر الله
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
...la-amrilāh (sic). The Sultan
*
. . . . . . .
...reme
ANS (badly clipped, but clear that sultan and al-mu'azzam are on separate lines; fragmentary, d=20.5-24.0 mm., w=9.37 gr.).

4I. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mu'taṣafī.

Obv.

لا اله الا الله There is no god but Allah.

محمد رسول الله ... Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah...

العادل المظفر (sic) ... the Just, al-Muṣaffar (sic)

Rev. As no. 4D, with spelling error لا أمر

B.N., M2009 (d= approx. 17-24.5 mm.) (cast in ANS); ANS, three examples, (all fragmentary, but the mistake al-Muṣaffar clear on all; d=13.5-17.0, 16-18.5, 15-19, w=3.34, 4.14, 4.58 gr.).

4J. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mu'taṣafī.

Obv. Like no. 4I, but with the addition of a chain slanting to the left ١١١١١١١١ , between the second and third line.

Rev. [...............] [...............]

... وحده alone...

[له المعتمي] to Hīm. al-Muṣafī

* The Sultan [n]...

B.N. M2007 (fragmentary); cast in ANS; ANS (fragmentary, not clear if لا أمر is misspelled; d=14.5-18.5 mm., w=3.59 gr.).

4K. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mu'taṣafī.
Obv. Legend arranged like 4A(?), with the addition of a chain slanted left in between the third and fourth line.

Rev. Like 4A(?), fragmentary, but with error.

B.M., M2008 (d=approx. 11.16 mm.; cast in ANS); ANS (fragmentary, position of bin on obverse not certain; d=16-17, w=4.30 gr.).

4L. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Obv. Like no. 4A(?), fragmentary.

Rev. Like no. 4D(?), with error ⣿ and with the addition of chain slanted left between the second and third line.

ANS, two examples (very small and very fragmentary; d=10-12, 11 (sic, round but irregularly struck) mm., w=1.08, 1.48 gr.).

4X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī.

Only the last two lines of obverse and the last two lines of the reverse given, but without distribution.

Pakhomov, "0 derbanskam," p. 3, type I (a general type rather than a specific coin).

5X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī and Seljuq sultan of Iraq Muhammad (b. Mahmūd?) (548/1153-554/1159).
Obv.

... A A...

Muhammad is the Messenger of A...

[Ma]lik the Just, Mu... 

Rev.

alone. No associate

al-Muqtatf Hàn ri... 

The Tān (sic) Muḥamm[ad]

k bek (?)

Soret, RN, 1859, p. 483, no. 2 (two examples).

Soret is not at all sure whether the reading of the name should be Muhammad or Mahmūd. He made no suggestion as to the meaning of the strange last line. This reading may have to be rejected. As so often happens with these poorly struck coins, a floral design at the bottom looks like a word. In addition the writing is so badly executed that the letters do not look as one is accustomed to seeing them. The beginning of Muhammad/Mahmūd might be a carelessly written al-muṣṭazīm. The "s" in al-Sultan is lacking probably due to a printing error.

6X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtatf and

Seljuq sultan of Iraq Muhammad (b. Mahmūd ?).
Oby. (in a linear circle)

\[
\text{There is no god but Allah.}
\]
\[
\text{Muhammad...Allah}
\]
\[
\text{...Zaffar}
\]

Rev. (in a linear circle)

\[
\text{y...}
\]
\[
\text{La (but)}
\]
\[
\text{Le...to him.}
\]
\[
\text{Rallah...er of Allah.}
\]
\[
\text{The Supreme Sultan}
\]
\[
\text{Muhammad.}
\]

B.N., M2006 (the coin is as usual fragmentary) (cast in the ANS; d=approx. 21.5-29 mm.).

This issue seems to gainsay the remarks made under no. 5X. The reading is again questionable; however, assuming "Muhammad" was correctly read and that it belongs with the sultan al-mu'azzam on the previous line, then it can only refer to Muhammad b. Mahmūd (548/1153-554/1159). Thus it would be placed just prior to the next major series of Muzaffar b. Muhammad which is dated beginning in 555/1160.

In 549/1154 Ibn al-Azraq accompanied the Georgian King Dimitri for a few days visit to the region of "Darband-i Hazaar." In his account of the visit, Ibn al-Azraq mentions the following very interesting information; "And the malik of Darband Amīr Awul-Muzaffar came out to present his respects to the king of Abkhaz and carried to him servants (and things
necessary for) his sojourn and feasts, for he was the son-in-law (ṣibr) of the king of Abkhāz being married to the latter's daughter.  

Thus we find that King Dimitri was not only related to the Shirvānshāh Minūchīhr II who was married to his sister Thamar, but also now to the Malik of Darband. Dimitri had apparently followed the policy of his father David the Restorer (1089/482-1125/519) in spreading the sphere of influence of the Georgian Kingdom. Furthermore, he married off another daughter, Ceta, to Alexios, the son of the Emperor Nicephoros IV Bryennios. Therefore, we see that during this period of the middle 6th/12th century, relations between Shārvān, Darband and Georgia though not always friendly were certainly close.

7X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī. 

Coins of Muzaffar with caliph al-Muqtadī, but not described sufficiently for further classification.

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1099, a) (four examples);
Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 413-415 (3 examples);
Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1988, nos. 1-5 ("irregular"; w=2.59, 2.65, 3.45, 3.97, 5.02 gr.); Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, ex-Thorburn Collection (one example; li-amr is spelled correctly).


---

21Ibn al-Azraq, Taʿrīkh Mavāraḍis, B3, EM, CR, 5802, p. 64a; cf. trans., Minoisky, Shārvān, p. 170, also, supra, n. 8.
23Eroset, Hist. de la Géorgie, I/1, p. 360; the same passage tells of Thamar's wedding; cf. Hasan, Fazāki, p. 12.
Obv. (in a circle made by the joining of six tri-petalled flowers)

The Malik

Muzaffar

son of Muhammad.

Marginal segments: (around a linear circle, within the areas formed by six petals, the first area starting at about 11 o'clock)

1. غرب, struck

2. (sic) الدرهم, the dirāhām (sic)

3. في سنة, in the year

4. خمس و, five and

5. خمسين و, fifty and

6. خمساً, five hundred.

Rev. (within the fields of three intersecting circles, the first at the top, the second at the lower left and the third at the lower right).

1. لا إله إلا الله, There is no god but Allah

2. محمد رسول الله, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

3. المستنصر بالله, al-Mustanjīd billāh.

Marginal segments: (counterclockwise along a linear circle, in three areas the first at the bottom)

Obv. Field as no. 8.

Marginal segments: (counterclockwise along a linear circle)

1. ضرب, struck
2. (sic) الدراهم, the digābam (sic)
3. في سنة, in the year
4. سبع, seven
5. وخمسين, and fifty
6. خمساية, and five hundred

Rev. Field as no. 8.

Marginal segments: not indicated, probably clipped and presumably as no. 8.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1859, p. 437, no. 90 (illus. Pl. XVI, fig. 25, but illustration shows a composite of the issue no. 8 for year 555/1160; cf., no. 8).

24 RNB, 1859, p. 437; cf. supra, p. 247.
25 Ibis., p. 438.
10X. AE. No mint name. 55X/1160-1164. With caliph al-Mustanjid.

Plate II

Obverse and reverse the same as no. 8 with changes only to accomodate the different dates, if any.

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 390, no. 13, (5)5X/(11)6X; B.N., M2013, 55X/116X; ANS, three examples, very fragmentary, (5)5X/(11)6X, 5(5)X/11(6)X, and 55(5)X/116X (d=13.5-22, l=23, 18-31 mm., w=2.76, 4.13, 7.06 gr.).

Though only the dates 555/1160 and 557/1162 have been recorded, Bartholomaei says, "J'ai rencontré des variétés de ce type pour les années 555 à 559 1160-1164." 25

11X. AE. No mint name or date legible. With caliph al-Mustanjid.

Obv. Field and margins like no. 8, but area of date clipped.

Rev. (in three intersecting circles)
The same as no. 8 except that in circle no. 2 the field is arranged:

محمد رسول الله
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

Pakhomov, "Monetnye nachodki 1924," p. 76 (two examples); cf., the same board Pakhomov, Klady, I, 111 (described; 25 ibid., p. 438.)
Åstrup, Cat., Copenhagen, pp. 133-134, nos. 1387 and 1388 (reading from photographs supplied by Anne Jacobsen); 26 ANS (d=18-21 mm., w=3.44 gr.)

12X. AE. No mint name or date indicated. With caliph al-Mustanjid.

Coins of the above rosette type, but either too fragmentary or not further described for finer classification.

Soret, RM, 1859, p. 482, no. 1 (illus.; obverse only by a line drawing, pl. XXII, no. 1), cf., the same illustration copied in Valentine, EMC, Pl. 13, no. 5); Markov Inventory; p. 390, nos. 9-12 (not described); Pakhomov, "O derbendskom," p. 3, type IV (a general and incomplete description rather than a reference to a particular coin); Åstrup, Cat., Copenhagen, p. 134, no. 1389 (reference to Soret, RM, 1859, p. 476 ff.);

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1098 (nine examples, "rosette"); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, see under nos. 416-445 (30 examples, with reference to his own "O derbendskom," p. 3, type IV); RM, two examples unpublished(?), one presentation by Soret, 1865; Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, ex-Thorburn Collection (part of the date may remain); B.N., M2011, M2012, M2014-2020 (nine examples in all; acquisitions of 1898)(unpublished)(all very fragmentary); ANS, four examples (two with the error, al-dirham, clear; d=18.5-22.5, 18-25, 18.5-21.5, 23-27 mm., w=3.72, 5.26, 5.32, 8.85 gr.).

The general type represented by nos. 8-12 is the most interesting and carefully struck of the Malik of Darband coinage.

26 Åstrup was apparently ignorant of Pakhomov's article of 1930 (supra, nn. 6 and 13); he refers to the dynasty as "Princes de Karabag (Azerbaiyjan)."
Though the sizes of these highly irregular coppers vary, many of them are very large, almost the size of the "token dirhams" struck in eastern Anatolia, northern Syria and by the Seljuqs of Iraq in al-Jibal. It is quite remarkable that the word dirham, i.e., the misspelled form diraham, appears on the copper issues of this dynasty. Since so few of these coins are found outside the immediate territory of Darband, they seem not to have been minted for external commercial use; their irregular shape would seem to militate against that anyway. Perhaps these token dirhams were used to pay tribute or some other fixed obligation of the state. It is notable that even this little city state with a local barter economy should feel the need to create some substitute for the long vanished dirham during the period of the silver crisis.

l3A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid.

Obv. (in a linear circle)

لا إله إلا الله There is no god but Allāh

---

27 See supra, "Chap. Two," nn. 146-149, for a full discussion of these "token dirhams."

28 If they were struck for tribute, only the Georgian Kingdom or the Shirvanshāhs would have been in a position to force payment.

29 On this crisis or silver famine see supra, "Chap. Two," Section II D.
alone. He has no associate.

The Just Malik
Muzaffar son of Muhammad

Rev. (in a linear circle)
There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Mustanjid billāh.
The Supreme Sultan.

B.N., 2023 (cast in the ANS, approx. d=13.5-17.5 mm.);
ANS, five examples (fragmentary; d=12-13, 12.5-16,
12-20, 17-19.5, 20-23 mm., w=2.72, 2.91, 3.90, 5.12,
7.76 gr.).

13B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid.
The same as no. 13A, but with the al of the
second line of the obverse moved down to the begin-
ing of the third line.
ANS (fragmentary; d=16.5-18.5 mm., w=4.58 gr.).

13C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid.
The same as 13A, but with Muzaffar on the fourth line
of the obverse moved up to the end of the third line.
ANS (fragmentary; d=14-17 mm., w=2.58 gr.).

13D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid.
The same as no. 13C, i.e., with Muzaffar on the third line, but the obverse chain slants to the right, ~~~~ ~.

ANS (fragmentary; d=15.5-21 mm., w=4.69 gr.).

It is very curious that neither Pakhomov nor other numismatists who have worked with these coins have called attention to this variety of Muzaffar b. Muhammad and with caliph al-Mustanjid, but without the rosette. This issue is probably to be dated from the period 559/1164-566/1170-71, that is from the last date we have recorded for the rosette type issue until the death of al-Mustanjid. It seems less likely that this issue and the rosette issue were minted simultaneously. Unfortunately we have no information on this period of Muzaffar's reign; he must have ended his reign sometime around 566/1170-1, since we have no coins with subsequent caliph al-Mustadī, nor any coins of his successor and son Bekbars with caliph al-Mustanjid.

14X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid.

Coins of Muzaffar b. Muhammad with caliph al-
Mustanjid, but not further described.

Pakhomov, Klady, I, H115 (one example); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1096 (d=8.4 mm., w=1.97 gr.); H1099 (12 examples); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1087 (d=17-19 mm., t=0.6-1.0 mm., w=1.56 gr.); H1988; nos. 6-20 (15 examples, not described).
15X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Muṣaffar but without an indication of caliph.

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1097 (one example), H1098 (one example), H1099 (12 examples); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1800, no. 4.

B. Bekbār b. Muṣaffar (circa 566/1170 to 575/1180-618/1221)

16A. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadī (566/1170-575/1180).

**Obv.**

لا اللّٰه عالِم
محمد رسول اللّٰه
 الملك العاد
بكرس بين
مكر

There is no god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

The Just Malik,

Bekbār son of

Muṣaffar.

**Rev.**

لا اللّٰه عالِم
وحده لا شر
بت له المستضيء
بأسر الله

There is no god but Allāh alone. No associate has he. al-Mustadī bimrillāh.

Soret, BN, 1859, p. 48纽约, no. 3 (casual reference to others in the Hermitage); B.N., M2021 (fragmentary, with last line of reverse clipped).
16B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadî.

The same as no. 16A, but with the incorrect

ةاسمٍ الله

أَمِرْتُ اللَّهَ

باسم الله

باسم الله

Bartholomaei & Soret, AEB, 1859, pp. 438-439 (illus.,
Pl. XVI, fig. 26; the error is clear in the line
drawing).

16C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadî.

Obv. (in four lines)

لا إله إلا الله

محمد رسول الله

الملك العادل بكار بن

محمود

There is no god but Allah.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

The Just Malik Bekbars son of

Muzaffar.

Rev. Same as 16A, with correct spelling.

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 391, no. 14; ANS (very fragment-
ary; d=14.5-17.5 mm., w=4.82 gr.)(last line of the
reverse is clipped).

16D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadî.

The same as 16A, but with initial اٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍٍ.png
Pakhomov, "O derbendskom," p. 3, type V (the essentials of the legends are given, but not the distribution; a general description rather than a specific coin); Pakhomov, Khādi, VII, H1799, nos. 446-451 (six examples) (reference to "O derbendskom," type V).

We can only date these coins broadly during the reign of the caliph al-Mustadī, that is in the decade from 566/1170 to 575/1180. The salient event of that period for the history of Darband, Shirvān and Georgia was the combined attack on Shirvān by the forces of Darband and the Russian brodniki.\(^\text{30}\)

The Georgian Chronicle speaks of the invasion of the "Khazars of Darband;"\(^\text{31}\) while in three odes of Khāqānī,\(^\text{32}\) we hear of the invaders as Rūs and Khazars, Rūṣ and Sarīr,\(^\text{33}\) and Rūṣ and Alān.\(^\text{34}\) The facts surrounding this episode are not altogether

\(^{30}\) Bands of free-lance warriors who wandered through southern Russia.

\(^{31}\) Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, I/1, p. 397; cf., Hasan, Fālakī, where the whole passage is translated, p. 37; see also Minorsky, Shirvān, p. 141; and also Pakhomov, "O derbendskom," pp. 8 and 12, n. 26, where the reference to the Georgian text is given, p. 272. For the Khazars, see supra, "Chap. Two," n. 5.


\(^{33}\) The Sarīr made up the Avar principality in Dagestan, north of the Caucasus.

\(^{34}\) The Alāns, who were of Iranian origin, occupied a large area in the North Caucasus; their present day descen-dents are the Ossets.
clear. The Rūs probably came down from the north separately and by sea, then allied themselves with the forces of Darband which included the Sarīr, the Alāns, and the Khazars. By the Khazars is most probably meant the Kipchak Turks roaming around the southern steppes of Russia; the Khazars had already faded out and it is not likely that these were remnants of them.35

It is Hasan's opinion that these Khazars (Kipchaks), "either on their own initiative or as allies of the Brodniki, occupied Derbend, and advancing twenty leagues south of the town, seized the citadel of Shābarān."36 However, Hasan wrote his study on Khāqānī before the publication of Pakhomov's article on the Malik of Darband and he was not fully aware of an independent dynasty in al-Ṣāb at the time of the invasion. Pakhomov suggested that the invasion of Shirvan was initiated by the Malik of Darband Bekbārs b. Muzaffar; Minorsky seems to adopt this notion.37

35 This according to Minorsky, "Khāqānī...," p. 128. These Kipchaks were probably Polovtsi — Comans. For a discussion of the whole Khazar problem see the chapter, "End of the Khazar State," in D.M. Dunlop, The History of the Jewish Khazars (Princeton, 1954), pp. 237-263, and especially, pp. 256-258 for the events around the invasion on Shirvan. On the Kipchak Turks see, supra, "Introd., n. 17.

36 Hasan, Falākī, p. 37.

The invaders were finally repulsed by Akhsatān b. Minūchihr, the Shirvānshāh, but only with the help of Giorgi III, the King of Georgia, and Andronicus Comnenus who was then a guest of Giorgi’s.\textsuperscript{38} The invasion of the Rūs took place circa 569/1173-4;\textsuperscript{39} Hasan, probably reading too much into the sources, said that after the defeat of the Khazars (Kipchaks) and Russians, "Shabarān and Derbend were handed over to Akhsatān."\textsuperscript{40} If Akhsatān did hold Darband, it must have been for only a short time, for Bekbārs minted coins, presumably at Darband, during the caliphate of al-Māsīr, which began in 575/1180 (see infra). In conclusion it should be noted again that nowhere in Khāqānī or the Georgian Chronicle is Bekbār’s name mentioned in connection with these events.

17A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Māsīr (575/1180-622/1225).

\textsuperscript{38} Minorsky, Shārvān, p. 140; Hasan, Falākī, p. 37 ff.


\textsuperscript{40} H. Hasan, Falākī, p. 37.
Obv.  
There is no god but Allāh.  
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.  
The Just Malik  
Bekbārs son of  
Muzaffar.

Rev.  
There is no god but Allāh, alone. No associate has he. al-Nāsir  
li-dînillāh.

Soret, RM, 1859, p. 484, no. 4 (two examples; one "très-tronqué") (I have been unable to verify the correct spelling of al-Nāsir on any example); Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, p. 134, no. 1391 (Østrup fails to give a reading of the reverse saying "légende illisible"; my reading made from a photograph supplied by the museum) (al-Nāsir not visible); ANS, two examples (very fragmentary, "al-Sādîl" clear on both, al-Nāsir not visible; d=8-16, 14.5-17 mm., w=1.47, 2.45 gr.).

17B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

Obv. Like no. 16C.  
There is no god but Allāh.  
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.  
The Just Malik Bekbārs son of  
Muzaffar.

Rev. (in a linear circle)
There is no god but Allah alone. No associate has he. al-Nasir al-dinillah (sic).

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 391, nos. 15-20 (six examples; al-din is as indicated the proper spelling of al-Cadil and al-Nasir are questionable); ANS (very fragmentary, but obverse arrangement seems to be like Markov's; al-Nasir might be spelled correctly, but the coin is too worn to be sure; neither al-din nor the first part of al-Cadil are visible) (d=15.5-19 mm., w=3.11 gr.).

17C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Plate II

Obv. Like 17A, but with clear error لاعدل
l-Cadil for al-Cadil العادل

Rev. (in a linear circle)
Like 17A, but with clear error لناسر
l-Nasir for الناسر , al-Nasir.

B.N., M2025 and two others, unpublished (fragmentary, but errors quite visible; cast of M2025 in ANS); ANS, seven examples (all very fragmentary; d=12.5-19, 18.5-20.5, 13.5-17.5, 15.5-18, 16-18, 17.5-23.5, 17.5-21.5 mm., w=3.12, 3.42, 3.60, 3.92, 4.43, 5.94, 7.00 gr.).

17X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Coins of Bekbars with caliph al-Nasir but insufficiently described for further classification.
Pakhomov, "O Derbendskom," p. 3, type VI (a general type without complete legends or distribution; al-\(\text{f}id\)il and al-N\(\text{a}\)sir 1\(\text{f}id\)in are all correctly indicated); Pakhomov, Kl\(\text{a}\)dy, VII, H1799, nos. 452-470 (19 examples, no details); B.N., unpublished (probably like 17C, but al-C\(\text{a}\)dil clipped); ANS, four examples (very irregular and very fragmentary; d=9-12, 11-15.5, 12-21.5, 18-21 mm., w=1.63, 1.83, 3.61, 7.23 gr.).

18. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-N\(\text{a}\)sir.

**Obv.** (in a double linear border)

\(\text{sic}\) لا الله لله

\(\text{sic}\) محمد رسول الله

(Punched) 0 العرش

\(\text{sic}\) الملك العادل

Bekb\(\text{a}\)rs son of Muzaffar.

\(\text{sic}\) الله

There is no god but ll\(\text{a}\)h (\(\text{sic}\)).

Muhammad is the Messenger of ll\(\text{a}\)h (\(\text{sic}\)).

Allah Messeng (punched)

The Just Malik

Rev. (double struck and slightly overlapping, each field in a double linear border)

\(\text{sic}\) لا الله لا الله

\(\text{sic}\) وحده لا

\(\text{sic}\) يه لنا

\(\text{sic}\) الدنيا

There is no god but A alone. No

iata he has 1-Na

id\(\text{in}\)ill\(\text{a}\)h.

Soret, RN, 1859, p. 484, no. 5 (illus. Pl. XXII, fig. 2, a line drawing); illustration reproduced in Valentine, EWC, Pl. 13, no. 26 (the coin is not fully described and my readings are taken from Soret's drawing; the coin is punched).
Concerning the third line of the obverse Soret says, "...au-dessous de la seconde ligne on en voit une nouvelle qui paraît être le résultat d'une double frappe et se composer des mots le رسول , empruntés aux troisième et seconde lignes." In his drawing instead of al-malik the word Allah, الله , is clearly indicated. Soret also adds, "Cet exemplaire, unique dans ce module, doit avoir servi à représenter une monnaie d'une valeur double des précédentes [i.e., our no. 17A]." Since these irregularly struck coins seemed to have no value as unitary coins, but as bulk weight of stamped copper, Soret's conjecture is probably to be rejected. Unless others of this type are found, the coin will remain an interesting curiosity.

19X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Bekbârs insufficiently described or too fragmentary for further classification.

Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, pp. 133-134, no. 1390 (too fragmentary); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1098 (one example, not described); H1099 (eight examples; not described); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 471-483 (13 examples, not described); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1988 (two examples (too fragmentary; w=7.28, 11.42 gr.); ANS, two examples (too fragmentary; d=9-12.5, 14.5-22.5 mm, w=1.04, 6.19 gr.).

41 See E.A. Pakhomov, "Monetnoe obrashchenie Azerbaivdzhana v XII i nachale XIII veka," Numiz. sbornik, vyp. xxvi (Moscow, 1957), p. 87. See also discussion of the entire question of monetary circulation and regularly and irregularly struck copper, supra, "Chap. Two," section II, E and F.
This completes the coins of Bekbārs b. Muzaffar. The numismatic evidence is as silent as the literary sources on the fate of Bekbārs. When or how he died is not known. The ample quantity of coins struck in the name of al-Ḥāsir would suggest a considerable time after 575/1180. A date in the late 580's/1190's would seem likely. As we shall see the same problem will be encountered in estimating the duration of the rule of his son and successor, Ḥādī al-Malik.


20A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Ḥāsir.

Obv.

عبد
الملك بن
بكمار

al-Malik son of
Bekbārs.

Rev.

لاِ اللَّهِ لاَ شَرِيْعَةِ
وَحده لا نَخَّازِ
لدين الله

There is no god but Allāh
alone. No associate
has He. al-Ḥāsir
lidīnillāh.

Soret, BN., 1859, p. 485, no. 6 (illus. Pl. XXII, fig. no. 3; a line drawing of obverse only (see the same drawing reproduced in Valentine, EMC, Pl. 13, no. 27) (Soret indicates, "Sous ce nom il y a encore quelques traces de lettres indéchiffrables."); B.N., M2022, unpublished (clipped, top line of reverse missing; cast in ANS; d=approx. 18-21 mm.).
20B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. (in two lines)

عبد الملك بن بكبار
\(c^\text{Abd-}

al-Malik son of Bekbārs.

Margin: circular

لا الإله الا الله There is no god but Allah.

محمد رسول الله Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

Rev. Like 20A, but with correct spelling of al-Nāṣir indicated.

Markov, *Inventarnyi*, p. 391, nos. 21-24 (four examples; the two line reading of the obverse is questionable as is the spelling of al-Nāṣir).

20X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. (distribution not indicated)

عبد الملك بن بكبار Ḥabd-al-Malik son of Bekbārs.

Rev. (only partially indicated)

النائس ار لم الحلا al-Nāṣir lidīnillāh.

Pakhomov, "O Derbendskow," p. 3, type VII (a general type which is most probably like our no. 20A).

21. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. (in a linear circle inscribed within a six-petalled rosette)
عبد المطلب بن بيكارس
Abd-al-Malik son of Bekbār.

Margin: the formula of faith.

Rev. (in a linear circle, enveloped with dots)
لا إله إلا الله There is no god but Allāh alone.
وحده No associate has he.
لا شريك له al-Māsir
الناصر
لدي الله lidīnillāh.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, Hl799, no. 484 ("This example was subjected to a double strike of the die on both sides, and the legend is somewhat shifted.") (d=27.0-28.5 mm., t=1.0-1.5 mm., w=6.52 gr.), nos. 485-488 (four more examples, but much smaller, d=approx. 21 mm., with the diameter of the field about 16-17 mm.; only parts of the legend and rosette are visible).

22X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Māsir.

Oby. (distribution not indicated)
عبد الملك بن بيكارس Abd-al-Malik son of Bekbār son of Muzaffar.

Rev. (only part of legend indicated)
الناصر لدين الله al-Māsir lidīnillāh.

Pakhomov, "O Derbendskom," p. 3, type VIII (a general description rather than a particular coin; I would imagine the obverse to be in four lines).
23X. AB. No mint name or date, with caliph al-Nāṣir.

Coins with insufficient description for further classification.

Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, Bl988, no. 23 (cut from a bar 17.5-19.5 in width, d=(of the die?) approx. 25 mm., t=2.5-3.0 mm.).

We are completely at a loss to suggest the years of 'Abd-al-Malik's reign, beside saying it was sometime during the caliphate of al-Nāṣir (575/1180-622/1225). The literary sources are absolutely without reference to this ruler. Since his father Bektārs struck so many coins during the same caliph's reign, one might guess that 'Abd-al-Malik began his rule not earlier than the late 580's/early 1190's.

We are sure that his rule ended before 618/1221, the year of the first Mongol incursion into the Caucasus, when the ruler of Darband is "Rashīd Shirvānshāh malik Darband Shirvān."42 When Darband came under the suzerainty of the Shirvānshāhs is not known, but certainly some little time before 618/1221.43

The scarcity of coins of 'Abd-al-Malik b. Bektārs would seem to indicate a very short rule; perhaps the dynasty of the independent Malikis of Darband ended at the

---


43 See supra, discussion in text after n. 17.
turn of 6th/12th century. The coin lately published by Pakhmov, our no. 21, is most interesting. It is the only known Darband issue having a rosette design around the border. This motif is very characteristic of the Shirvānshāh issues of the late 6th/12th century; perhaps already in ʿAbd-al-Malik’s time Darband had come under Shirvān control. It certainly would seem to indicate that Shirvān die cutters were used for that issue. Except these meagre facts, we simply have no idea of the events in al-Bāb during the last years of this dynasty. We must hope that some forgotten manuscript or some new coin will help shed light on the rule of ʿAbd-al-Malik and the arrival of Rashīd Shirvānshāh.

24X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of the Maliks of Darband but without indication of ruler or caliph.

Pakhmov, "Monetnye nakhodki 1924," III (two examples, cf.: to the same hoard, Pakhmov, Kladv, I, H111), H113 (one example); Pakhmov, Kladv, IV, H1098 (19 examples, worn), H1099 (18 examples, no names visible), H1131 (two examples); Pakhmov, Kladv, VII, H1804 (two examples); Pakhmov, Kladv, VIII, H1988, nos. 24-48 (25 examples, names missing).

---

III. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Though it was originally through numismatic investigations that this dynasty was made known to Islamic history, the information obtained directly from their coinage is slight. Bekbār and CAbd-al-Malik are unknown in the literary sources, but their coins give us little else beside their names. There is only one dated issue, that of Muzaffar from the years 555/1160-559/1164. This same issue is the most elaborate of the coins of the dynasty; it is of a generally large size with "al-dirāham" in the obverse margin. Because of their extremely irregular shape and poor striking, these coins, reminiscent of the "token dirhams" of southeastern Anatolia, were perhaps struck for the payment of tribute, rather than for commercial trade transactions.

The hoard finds indicate that very few of these coins circulated outside the immediate area of al-Ṭāb. They fit well into the general pattern of "irregularly" struck copper coins in eastern Caucasia during the 6th/12th century which reflects a self-sufficient area with a local barter economy. One of the last issues of the dynasty struck under CAbd-al-Malik, displays a rosette design around the
obverse field similar to that employed by the Shirvānshāhs.\footnote{45}
Furthermore, though it is not apparent in the corpus, the
color and texture of the late issues of Bekbārs and ʿAbd-al-
Malik are similar to those of the Shirvānshāhs, that is dark
brown, almost black, with a smooth, oily surface like bronze.
The two factors may indicate that Darband had already fallen
under the control of the Shirvānshāhs even while their own
Maliks were ruling.

We are not certain when the dynasty came to an end,
but most certainly by 618/1221 when the ruler is referred
to as Shirvānshāh. The facts surrounding the beginning of
the dynasty in the early 6th/12th century are also in doubt.
The numismatic data have been of no help in these problems.
The area and the dynasty were too far removed from the main
centers of Islam to receive more adequate attention from
travelers and historians of the age. Even the Arabic employed
on the coins, so full of misspellings and misunderstandings,
demonstrates the remoteness of al-Bāb. Yet the caliph in
Baghdad was consistently and dutifully mentioned on all the
coins of the dynasty, even though after 566/1170 reference
to the Seljuq sultan of Iraq is completely dropped. This
was a full twenty-five years before the last of these Seljuqs

\footnote{45 Supra, n. 44.}
was to lose his life. This is in sharp distinction to their southern neighbors the Shirvānšāhs who continued to mention the sultan's name to the very end. The Seljuqs and their Ildegizid atabegs were seemingly helpless in enforcing their authority even by pressure in this distant area. The mention of the caliph can be explained on purely religious grounds. Darbandi in this period was probably as much in the Georgian orbit as in the Islamic polity of southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjān. Muzaffar himself was married to a Georgian princess and perhaps his successors followed his example.

A final word must be said about Bekbares and his Turkic name. The name means Mīzer (bārs) Prince, and stands out sharply against the usual Arabic names of the dynasty. Minorsky comments that it "reflects the usual Turkicisation of the names under the influence of the overlords." One is not sure what he meant. Who were these Turkic overlords? Surely not the Christian Georgians, nor the iranized Shirvānšāhs, nor even the Ildegizids, who had no authority in this extreme northern area. Rather the Turks responsible for this sort of Turkification were probably the Kipchaks who had entered Caucasia from the north

---

16 Sharvān, p. 140.
in large numbers during the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries as attested by the Ta'rīkh al-Bāb, the Georgian Chronicle, Ibn al-Athīr and other sources. It was from these same Kipchaks, in southern Russia and along the northern shores of the Black Sea, that the Egyptian Mamlūk dynasty was descended. Among them the name Beybārs is quite common.
THE MALIKS OF DARBAND: GENEALOGY

The Hashimid Amir of al-Bab
(starting with Hashimid b.
Suraqa al-Sulami 255/869-
circa 470/1073)

(?)

Khalifa al-Sulami

Muhammad (circa 514 ?)

A. MUZAFFAR = daughter of King Dimitri of Georgia
(circa 530/1136 to circa 559/1164-566/1170)

B. BEKBARS (circa 566/1170 to 575/1180-618/1221)

C. ABD-AL-MALIK (sometime during 575/1180-618/1221)

(?)

Rashid (Malik Darband Shirvan) (circa 618/1221)

(?)

Jalal al-Din Sultanshah b. Shirvanshah (circa 622/1225)

For the genealogy and dates of the Hashimid Amir see the Ta'rikh al-Bab, ed. Minorsky, Sharvan, op.cit., pp. 41-55, and Zambaur, Manuel, op.cit., No. 172, pp. 165-186.

The Maliks whose names are written with capital letters struck coins; the appropriate section in the corpus is indicated by a letter preceding their names.

On Rashid and Jalal al-Din see supra, "Chapter Three," Sections II, L and M respectively and the discussion after n.17 in the introduction to this corpus.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE ILDEGIZIDS CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

Of the dynasties treated in this study, the Ildegizids are the best known and most discussed by the sources. This is the result of their association with and eventual control over the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq.\(^1\) Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz\(^2\) was a Kipchak Turkic slave of Kamāl al-Dīn Abū Tālib Sumayramī, the vizir of sultan Mahmūd b. Muḥammad b. Malikshāh. After Sumayramī's death in 515-6/1121-2 he entered sultan Mahmūd's service and finally that of sultan Masʿūd b. Muḥammad (527/1135-547/1152). The latter appointed Ildegiz governor of Arrān probably around 530/1136; from there Ildegiz gradually extended his power and independence until he controlled most of Adharbayjān and eventually al-Jibāl.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) On this sultanate see supra, "Chap. Two," n. 52 and the text there.

\(^2\) The Arabic sources use Ildegiz, the Persian Eldegiz and the Armenian Eltguz. Modern Turkish historians insist on the form Il-deniz; A. Z. V. Toğan, İslâm-türk ansiklopedisi (Istanbul, 1940), I, p. 715; M. Bala, "Il-Deniz," IA. V. Minorsky in rejecting this form says, "The reading El-deniz ... is obviously modernizing and impossible;" Studies, p. 92, n. 2. See also RHC, Historiens Orientaux, I, p. 831, on the name.

\(^3\) Ibn al-Athīr (IX, 119) in his obituary of Ildegiz
Shams al-Dīn further extended his influence in the area by marrying the widow of Tughril b. Muhammad (526/1132) and becoming the step-father of the sultan's son Arslānshāh. During the next two decades he strengthened his position in Arrān and Adharbayjān at the expense of other local amirs such as the Ahmadīlī. His large and strong army based in these provinces was soon to play the major role in reinforcing and preserving the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq.

Shortly after Muhammad b. Mahmūd (548/1153-554/1159) became sultan, Ildegiz obtained the actual custody of his step-son and thereby became the prince's de facto atabeg. When Shams al-Dīn's ambitions became clear a state of continuous hostility began between him and his Seljuq overlord,

under 568/1172 (actually he died three years later, see supra, "Chap. One," n. 77, and discussion infra) gives us most of this information. See also Lane-Poole, Mohammadian Dynasties, p. 171; H. Edhem, Islamic Dynasties (Turkish ed. of Lane-Poole), op.cit., pp. 208-216; W. Barthold, "Ildegiz," EJ; K. Luther, op.cit., pp. 137-138. Mašūd did not actually become undisputed sultan of Iraq until 530/1136; Luther, p. 138.


5This army schooled in the best ghāzi (q.v., supra, "Chap. Two," n. 79) tradition, numbered as many as 50,000, during its best days; Luther, p. 139. In general Luther's study is the best work on the Ildegizids up to 587/1191; it has been used as a check against the sources for that period.

6Bundārī, Zubdat al-Nusrah, ed. T. Houtsma, op.cit., p. 239. Luther maintains that the use of the title atabeg by
sultan Muhammad. During this period and for the rest of the 6th/12th century the Abbāsid caliph and the Ildegzids were allies against the Seljuqs. The enmity between the caliphate and the sultanate originated from the violent deaths of caliphs al-Mustarshid (529/1135) and al-Hāshid (530/1136), the blame for which was placed on sultan Mašūd 7.

After the death of sultan Muhammad, Ildegziz was a member of the coalition of amīrs which supported Sulaymānshāh b. Muhammad who served as sultan for a few months in 555/1160. 8 These same amīrs later dissatisfied with Sulaymānshāh invited Arslānshāh, the ward of Ildegziz, to come to Hamadān and assume the power of the sultanate. 9 With the help of Shams al-Dīn's

Ildegziz before 549/1154 is a result of Nishāpūrī and following him Rawandī (c.f., supra, Chap. One, no. 14–16 and text there) reading back the title into the days when Ildegziz did not yet possess it, "a natural gesture of a court historian living and writing in the shadow of the Ildegzids;" op.cit., p. 138. The numismatic evidence corroborates this assumption; the first verifiable use of the title atabeg by Shams al-Dīn is on a coin probably to be dated from 549/1154; see infra, coin no. 2.

7 Nishāpūrī, pp. 176–178.

8 Rawandī, Rawandī, supra, Chap. Three, under coin no. 13.

military strength, the danger of the sultanate breaking up among warring factions was averted. In his new role as atabeg and step-father, İldegiz kept the military power in his hands, but was careful to maintain the new sultan's position as the symbol of unity and the formal source of authority. Thus began the dual system of sovereignty, characterized as the dyarchy,\textsuperscript{10} which was to give the sultanate renewed viability for the next three decades, preventing both the Georgians in the northwest and the Khwārazmshāhs in the northeast from seizing the provinces of Arrān, Adharbayjān and al-Jībāl.

After the deaths of İldegiz and sultan Arslānshāh in 571/1175,\textsuperscript{11} their sons Muḥammad Pahlavān and Ẓughril preserved the dynasty as atabeg and sultan respectively. However, Pahlavān, afraid of the constant possibility of revolt by the amīrs of al-Jībāl, initiated certain changes in the system of rule which eventually caused the weakening of the

\textsuperscript{10} See supra, "Chap. One," n. 134.

\textsuperscript{11} For İldegiz, by careful and correct deduction from Rawandi, pp. 300-301, Luther arrived at the date Rabī‘ II/October-November, 571/1175; \textit{ibid.}, pp. 201-202. However, a very short anonymous Armenian chronicle, presumably written in the following year, 572/1176, gives 571/1175 as the correct date of the atabeg's death; V.A. Hakobyān, \textit{Minor Chronicles}, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 502, see supra, "Chap. One," n. 77. M. Čamčen, \textit{History}, \textit{op. cit.}, III, p. 147, confirms the month and date. Arslānshāh died two months later; Luther, \textit{ibid.}
central authority of the state. He left his brother Qızıl Arslan in control of Arran and Adharbayjăn\(^{12}\) and, desiring to insure that each of his four sons equally shared the resources of the sultanate, he assigned control of its territory among them. Abu Bakr, who was to receive Arran and Adharbayjăn, was entrusted to the care of his uncle Qızıl Uzbek was given Hamadan and Pahlavan's other sons by Inan Khatun, Qutlugh Inan Mahmud and Amir Amirun Cumar, were given Rayy, Isfahan and the rest of al-Jibal.\(^{13}\)

After Muhammad Pahlavan's death in 583/1187, sultan Tughril, having come of age, wished to free the sultanate from Ildegizid control and, therefore, refused to cooperate with the new atabeg, Qızıl Arslan. The latter proclaimed Sanjar b. Sulaymanshah sultan in 584/1188\(^{14}\) and two years later imprisoned Tughril. In the same year or the beginning of 587/1191 Qızıl married Inan Khatun, the widow of his brother, declared the end of the Seljuq dynasty, and at the same time proclaimed himself sultan.\(^{15}\) It is reasonable

\(^{12}\) Apparently Qızıl was assigned all the northwestern areas and Pahlavan the southeastern; this is explicitly confirmed by the Armenian historian Vađan, History, or. cit., ed. Venice, pp. 130-131.

\(^{13}\) Rawandi, p. 336; Akhbar, pp. 172-173.

\(^{14}\) Rawandi, p. 363.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., Qızıl was probably prompted and supported by the caliph al-Nasir; Luther, p. 252.
to assume he struck coins to commemorate such an august occasion, but unfortunately we have no such evidence. His sultanate was short-lived, for in Shawwal/October-November, 587/1191 he was murdered by his new bride.\textsuperscript{16} 16 Tughril was released from prison and for the next four years battled continually with Qutlugh Inānj b. Pahlavān for the control of al-Jībāl. Qutlugh allied himself with the Khwārazmshāh, who had already taken advantage of the disorder in the Seljuq state by occupying Rayy. In 590/1194 Tughril, foolishly, but bravely, engaged his superior adversaries in battle; he was killed 29 Rabī\textsuperscript{I}/24 April.\textsuperscript{17} 17

The Seljuq sultanate in the east had come to an end. The Khwārazmians eventually withdrew to Khorāsān and al-Jībāl was left in the hands of its feuding amīrs. During these same years Abū Bakr b. Pahlavān strengthened his control on Arrān and Ḍaharbayjān; Marāgha and the Ahmadīlī lands were acquired by 605/1208.\textsuperscript{18} 18 When he died in 607/1210-1,

\textsuperscript{16} Rāwandī, p. 343; Akhbar, p. 181. She in turn was married by sultan Tughril, who fearing the same fate as Qizil, took the preventative action of murdering her. For details see T. Houtsma, "Some Remarks on the History of the Seljuks," op.cit., pp. 142-143, 151.

\textsuperscript{17} Juwainī, trans. J.A. Boyle, op.cit., I, p. 303; Houtsma mistakenly indicates 25 March; ibid., p. 151.

\textsuperscript{18} Minorsky, "Marāgha," EI\textsubscript{1}, citing Ibn al-Athīr, XII, XII, p. 157, 182.
his brother 'Uzbek was heir to a much reduced Ildegizid state in Adharbayjān with Ardabil as capital. The dynasty feebly continued as a regional power until 'Uzbek was killed by Jalāl al-Dīn Khwārazmshāh in 622/1225. 19 The Ildegizid atabegate was destroyed, even though a son, Khāmūsh, 20 survived. The latter may have been appointed to a token position by the Khwārazmshāh, but we have neither coins nor testimony in the sources which would indicate that the Ildegiz state was operative. Juwainī has a short account about Nusrat al-Dīn b. Khāmūsh which indicates that either he or his father sought refuge in the west, probably with the Seljuqs of Rūm. "He [Qadaq Noyan, a Mongol general] also procured a firman with al-tamgha appointing as the commander of the tūmen in Tabriz and Azerbaijan the atabeg Nusrat-ad-Dīn, son of the atabeg Khāmūsh, who had come out of Rūm and after remaining in hiding had shown his face again as an opponent of the malik Sadr-ad-Dīn." 21 This was in the year 641/1243-4; beyond this we know nothing about the Ildegizids.

19 Juwainī, II, pp. 425-426; the narrative claims a non-violent death: "An internal pain, which was irremediable, was aggravated by this external cause, and on that very day, out of grief and chagrin, he delivered up the ghost." Boyle's trans., II, p. 426.

20 Meaning "silent" in Persian; he was a deaf mute. H. Edhem, Islamic Dynasties, op. cit., I, p. 248 and index, has Jamūs, "buffalo", which should be corrected.

21 Juwainī, II, p. 511; brackets not in original, Minorsky adds that Khāmūsh later joined the Assassins; "Ahmadīs," EI2, citing Nasawī, pp. 129-130.
Throughout their history these atabegs were involved in a continual struggle with Christian Georgia for the control of Armenia, Arran and Shirvan. The population of these areas was forced to maintain a guarded neutrality towards the opposing forces. The Armenians often expressed benevolent feelings toward the atabegs.22 It was only at the end of the 6th/12th and the early 7th/13th century, when the Ildegizid state had lost its control of al-Jibal and much of its vitality, that the Georgians were able to exert their power south of the Kur and even make raids south of the Araxes.

The coinage reflects this situation. A regular copper coinage was struck for dealings in Adharbayjan, Arran and the Armenian commercial cities such as Dvin, and an irregular one for use along the Kur and in Shirvan and Mqan.23 Furthermore a large number of the former omit mention of the caliph and the Seljuq sultan presumably as a concession to the local Christian population in places where these varieties circulated, e.g., at Dvin. Their rivals the Georgians employed a similar policy by the consistent use of both Arabic and Georgian legends on their coins throughout the 6th/12th century.24

The only firmly attested mint is Ardabil.25 Dated

22 For a full discussion, supra, "Introd.," n. 24 and "Chap. One," n. 73.

23 See supra, "chap. Two," Section II, E, especially nn. 152, 155, 158.

24 In addition to the references in the previous note see, supra, "Chap. Two," n. 120.

25 See the discussion, supra, pp. 121-123.
issues are found for all members of the dynasty except Shams al-Dīn, but because of the comparative richness of the literary sources even those which are undated can be more easily assigned an approximate period of minting than the coins of the Shirvānshāhs or Maliks of Darband. Of particular interest are the three unique gold pieces in the collection of the American Numismatic Society. They were struck at the turn of the 6th/12th-7th/13th century by Abū Bakr and perhaps 'Uzbek and though they are very base, they reflect the Ildegizid desire to assume the authority and glory of their recently departed Seljuq overlords. But the meagre quantity and poor quality of 'Uzbek's coinage clearly reflects to what extent the power of the dynasty declined during the last fifteen years of its existence.

The corpus will be followed by some observations and a genealogical table.

II. THE CORPUS

A. Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz (circa 530/1136-571/1175)

1.(?)AE. No mint name or date. With Great Seljuq Sultan Sanjar (511/1117-552/1157) and Seljuq Sultan of Iraq Mas'ūd (527/1133-547/1152).

Obv. (in a linear circle)
السلطان
 больший
 سنجر

To the left: a dagger

Rev. (in a linear circle)
"obscure"
"obscure"

العظم
Mas'ūd.

The Supreme

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, Hl101, pp. 37-38 (d= 26-29 mm.,
t=2.0-2.5 mm.) (now in the regional museum of

Since neither the name Ildegiz nor an appropriate
title such as at'abak is overtly legible, we must conjecture
that Pakhomov’s attribution is based on the tamgha\textsuperscript{26} to the
left of the obverse which he described as a kinzhal, a
dagger. However, as will be seen below the usual form of
the Ildegizid tamgha\textsuperscript{27} is a three-pronged spear. Inclusion

\textsuperscript{26} See supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, F.

\textsuperscript{27} But see, supra, loc. cit., n. 166.
here will have to be tentative until closer examination or another specimen produces more conclusive evidence. If Pakhomov is correct, this is the only issue of Ildegiz which can be definitely dated prior to 548/1153 because of the dates Mas'ud I reigned. This coincides with Ibn al-Athîr's information that when Mas'ud became sultan he appointed Ildegiz governor of Arrân, probably after 530/1136.  

2. AE. No mint name or date. With Great Seljuq Sultan Sanjar.

**Obv.**

```
ابک
الاهم
الذكر
Atâbak
the Greatest
Ildegiz.
```

**Rev.**

```
سلطان
سنجرين
Sultan
Sanjar son of
```

Mushegian, *Denezhnoe*, nos. 126 (d=25 mm., w=4.9 gr.), 127 (d=29 mm., w=4.8 gr.), 145 (d=26 mm., w=6.4 gr.).

From rubbings supplied by Mushegian the readings have been completely verified. The issue is not only interesting

---

28 *Al-Kāmil*, IX, p. 119; see supra, n. 3.
for the mention of Sanjar b. Malikshāh, but because of Ildegiz's title atābak al-ašrām. In the first half of the 6th/12th century the title atābak was still only awarded to actual guardians of Seljuq princes. 29 Ildegiz married the widow of sultan Tughril b. Muhammad sometime after the latter's death in 528/1136 or 529/1137. 30 Since Ildegiz became the step-father of her son Arslānshāh b. Tughril, he may have assumed, or been given, the title of atābak. However, even if this assumption should be correct, a second problem arises namely, the title atābak al-ašrām, "the Greatest Atabeg," which was not officially awarded to Ildegiz until the accession of Arslānshāh to the sultanate in 555/-1160. 31

The issue should be dated prior to 552/1157, the year of Sanjar's death, and probably after 548/1153, when Muhammad b. Mahmūd succeeded Masʿūd as sultan of Iraq. The omission of Muhammad's name is reasonable and perhaps expected for he and Ildegiz were enemies. 32 Specifically, this could be an issue of 549/1154 when Ildegiz became de facto atabeg by

29See supra, "Chap. Two," n. 61 and text there.

30The date is disputed; cf., for the date from the various sources, G.C. Miles, Rayy, p. 214. See also supra, Introduction.

31Al-Bundarī, p. 297; Akhbar, p. 145. See also supra, n. 6.

32See discussion, supra, at n. 7.
obtaining actual custody of Arslānshāh.33

3. (?) AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī (530/1136-555/1160) and Great Seljuq sultan Sanjar.

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, II114, no. 6, p. 41 (not described except for "Ildegizid, probably - Ildegiz...").

The attribution is questionable because of Pakhomov's doubtful reading of a seemingly poor unique specimen. As with the previous coin the name of Sultan Sanjar would make this an issue of 552/1157 or before and more accurately between 549/1154-551/1156 because of the close cooperation of al-Muqtadī and Ildegiz against sultan Muhammad.34

4. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtadī and Seljuq sultan of Iraq Muhammad (548/1153-554/1159).

Obv. (in a linear circle)

السلطان العظيم
محمد ملك
الأمراء البلدكر

The Supreme Sultan
Muhammad. Malik
of the amīrs Ildegiz.

Rev. (in a linear circle)

33 Supra, n. 6.

34 Supra, at n. 7; Luther, pp. 71-72, has an interesting discussion of the power politics played by the caliph against the sultan.
I have made the reading from a photograph supplied by Anne Jacobsen, Assistant Keeper of coins of the National Museum in Copenhagen; the weight was also supplied by her.

This coin is almost certainly an issue of late 551/1156 or early 552/1157. In mid-551/1156 a scheme by caliph al-Muqtadî to replace sultan Muhammad b. Mahmûd with his uncle, Sulaymânshâh b. Muhammad, brought together an army under the leadership of Ildegiz, Malikshâh b. Mahmûd (the sultan's brother) and Sulaymânshâh against the forces of Muhammad. The battle was fought on the banks of the Araxes River near Naxijawan and resulted in a clear victory for Muhammad. After his defeat Ildegiz sought pardon from the sultan and received it on condition that he would send his oldest son, Muhammad Pahlavân, to the sultan's court.35

Thus, the coin should be dated after Muhammad's victory of 551/1156 and before the death of sultan Sanjar in Rabî' I/April-May, 552/1157, because the Great Sultan's name does

35 Akhbar, p. 141; Râwandi, p. 266; Ibn al-Athîr, IX, p. 49.
not appear along with his title, sultan al-azam; the Greatest Sultan," on the reverse, and also because upon Sanjar's death Muhammad appropriated the hegemony of the entire Seljuq dynasty and its title, which he substituted for that of the cadet branch of the Seljuqs of Iraq, al-sultan al-mu'azzam," the Supreme Sultan."36

5. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Muqtasimi

The coin is only partially described as bearing the names Ildegiz, al-Muqtasimi and a sultan whose name is worn off. There is also a laudatory expression subhan allah, "glorification of God."

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 1-2, p. 46 (described as large coins; a v. d=29-32 mm., av. t=2.5-3.0 mm.) (now in the regional museum, Derband, Dagestan, U.S.S.R.)

These coins are very interesting because of the first and, I believe, only appearance of the laudatory expression subhan allah in Islamic coinage. The reading seems to be firmly attested on these two and the six specimens described below. The issue should be assigned to 555/1160, the year of al-Muqtasimi's death, or a little before, because in the same

hoard are coins with the name of his successor, caliph al-Mustanjid, of similar weight and fabric.

6. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid (555/1160-566/1178).

This issue is only partially described as bearing the names Ildegiz, al-Mustanjid and the name of a sultan which is effaced, but probably Arsalānshāh. These coins are from the same hoard as those of no. 5 and have the same size and fabric along with the unusual laudatory subhān Allāhī.

Pakhomov, Kladív, VII, H1799, nos. 3-4 ("large coins"; av. d=29-32 mm., av. t=2.5-3.0 mm.)(four more coins, nos. 5-8, with the same fabric and size, but only the laudatory subhān Allāhī is legible).

After sultan Muhammad b. Mahmūd's death, Sulaymānshāh b. Muhammad b. Malikshāh reigned for a few months;37 in 555/1160 the principle amīrs, disenchanted with Sulaymānshāh, appointed Ildegiz's son-in-law, Arsalānshāh b. Tughril, sultan.38 It was the culmination of Ildegiz's efforts to become the power behind the Seljuq throne and began the dyarchy.39 Shams al-Dīn

---

37 See discussion in Shirvānshāh Corpus, supra, "Chap. Three," following coin no. 13; see also n. 8 above.
38 See supra, n. 9.
39 See supra, "Chap. One," n. 134 and the discussion above at n. 10.
was given the official title of the Greatest Atabeg in the same year.\textsuperscript{40}

7. EA. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustanjid and Seljuq sultan Arslānšah (555/1160-571/1175).

\textbf{Obv.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{السلطان}
  \item \textbf{العظم ارسلان}
  \item \textbf{ملك امراء اثن }
  \item \textbf{[...]}\textbf{[... ]}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Rev.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{المستجد}
  \item \textbf{بالله [امير}}
  \item \textbf{المؤمنين}
  \item \textbf{[...]}\textbf{[... ]}
\end{itemize}

Bartholomaei à Soret, \textit{RNB}, 1861, no. 22, pp. 47-48 (my completed reading based on this specimen); Pakhomov, \textit{Klady}, VI, H1611 (single example, poorly struck - "Ganja" type); Pakhomov, \textit{Klady}, VII, H1799, no. 9 ("al-Mustanjid," d=22.0-23.0, t=approx. 1.0 mm., w=3.47 gr.); Pakhomov, \textit{Klady}, VII, H1801, B) no. 166 (caliph's name worn off, "Ganja" type), G) no. 53 (al-Mustanjid, "Ganja" type).

If Bartholomaei's assumption is correct that the last three letters of the third line of the obverse are to be read "[... ] [... ]".

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{See supra}, n. 31.
as the beginning of the word atabak, then the completion of the legend is fine. However, it would appear by analogy with no. 4 above that line three is more correctly Malik al-asrar al-Idrak, the Malik of the amirs, and that line four carried the characteristic trident, the Ildegizid tamgha. The same may also be true of the fourth line of the reverse, a tamgha instead of a word. Pakhomov's coins may deserve a separate category, but I believe they belong here. He calls them the "Ganja" type because they are found exclusively in hoards around that city.

Chronologically, I have kept the al-Mustanjid issues together for two reasons; first, the similarity between "large coin" types with al-Muqtadī's name, and, secondly, the striking silence of the literary sources about relations between Baghdad and the Seljuqs of Iraq during the eleven years of al-Mustanjid's caliphate, 555/1160-566/1170. The next two issues described below, which represent by far the greatest number of the coins of Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz that have come to light, are completely devoid of any mention of the caliph's name or title.

8. **AE.** No mint name or date. With Sultan Arslānshāh.

**Obv.** (in a linear circle)
Sultān
Arslān.
Atābak Ildegiz.

Rev. (in a linear circle)
la dīnālā
Al-ḥamīd
Al-ḥamīd

There is no god but
Allāh. Muhammad
is the Messenger of Allāh.

Bartholomaei & Soret, RNB, 1862, nos. 53-54, pp. 52-54 (only the second example has a tamghā)(part of a fourth line on the obverse is indicated "... loggedInUser", fils(?)(de Soleiman"; Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 3, p. 430 (not described, but see Mushwegian, p. 88, for verification); Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, no. 1544, (wrongly attributed to Qızı Arslan b. Ildegiz, but from photograph supplied by Miss Jacobsen in Copenhagen and comparison with Mushwegian's illus. for no. 1043, there can be no doubt of the present attribution)(w=5.78 gr., d=approx. 25-27 mm.); Mushwegian, Denezhnog, nos. 128-144, 562-573, 1043 (illus., Pl. XI, fig. 106), 1044-1110 (107 examples all with weight and diameter given, varying d=25-31 mm., w=3.5-10.4 gr.)(tamghā illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 112); ANS, two examples (w=5.82, d=27-29.5 mm., tamghā not visible; w=5.59 gr., d=25-27.5 gr.).

Bartholomaei's reading "son of (Sulaymān)" cannot be accepted because the sources are mute on the subject of Ildegiz's father.\(^{41}\) Surely what he read as bin, son of, was most probably a worn tamghā or a floral decoration often

\(^{41}\) On his origin see supra, Introduction.
encountered on Ildeqizid coins.42

9A. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Arslānshāh.

Obv. (in a linear circle)

أتابک
the Greatest

Ildeqiz.

Rev. (in a linear circle)

سلطان
Arslān

son of Tughril.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1862, no. 52, p. 52; Markov, Inventarv, no. 1, p. 430 (twelve examples) not described, but cf. Musheghian, no. 115, p. 87; Musheghian, Denezhnoe, nos. 115-118, 959 (illus. Pl. XI, fig. 107), 960-1042, 1112-1113 (91 examples with variations: d=26-30 mm., w=3.77-10.6 gr.) (tamghā illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 112).

9B. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Arslānshāh.

Same legend as 9A, except tamghā on obverse faces right instead of left.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1862, no. 51, p. 52 (illus., Pl. III, fig. 7); Musheghian, Denezhnoe, nos. 119-124, 125 (illus. Pl. XI, fig. 108), (seven examples with variations: d=25-39 (sic) read 29 mm., w=5.0-7.75 gr.) (tamghā illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 113); Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H1610 (single example, d=26-29 mm.); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1986, no. 2 (d=28-30 mm., w=8.27 gr.).

42 Some are illustrated by Musheghian, Pl. XVI, figs. 107-8, 116-119.
9X. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Arslānshāh.

Like 9A or 9B, except that the tamghā on the obverse is either illegible or not indicated.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no. aa, 6, pp. 273-274 (The reading of obverse garbled; reference to a specimen in silver cannot be accepted, nor has the piece ever been located.) 43 Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 2, p. 430; Mushegian, Denezhnoe, nos. 551-561, p. 114 (but reference to Markov, no. 1, p. 430 creates ambiguity and could mean these are like type 9A) (variations in d=25-30 mm., w=5.6-10.0 gr.) (11 examples); Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H1109, nos. 4-22 ("n" [sic] read 19 examples); ANS (d=26-28 mm., w=5.85 gr.).

This issue and the previous one, no. 8, are the atabeg's most numerous. They are characterized by their simplicity with only the unadorned titles sultan and atabak and the lack of any reference to the caliph. Both issues must be broadly dated from the beginning of Arslānshāh's sultanate to the death of Ildegiz, 555/1160-571/1175. They were found in large quantities at Dvin and were struck for use in areas of dense Christian population. 44

10. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Arslānshāh.

43 Soret made an intensive search for the coin in the museum in St. Petersburg, but was unable to find anything resembling it, RNE, 1862, note on pp. 53-54.

44 They have also been found in quantity around Naxijewan; Pakhomov, "Monetnoe obrazshchenie," p. 87. See also supra, n. 23, and Mushegian, passim.
Obv. (in a linear circle)

أتابك
Ildegiz.

Rev.

سلطان
Sultan
Arslan.

Mushegian, Deneghnoe, no. 1111, p. 150 (illus., Pl. XI, fig. 109, very poor) (tamgha, illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 113, pointing right; other markings on obv. illus., Pl. XVI, figs. 118, 130) (d=27 mm., w=10.3 gr.).

11. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadfi
(566/1170-575/1180).

Obv.

عظم... [The Greatest (?)
أتابك
Ildegiz.

Rev.

المستى
al-Mustadfi.

السلطان
The Sultan

العظم
the Supreme

.............. .........

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no.a,6, pp. 273-274
(with typographical error: al-sultan for al-sultan).

If the reading is to be trusted the coin must date from
the five year period between the occasion of al-Mustadī to the death of Ildegiz (566/1170-1 to 571/1175). It is interesting because of the title given to the sultan (who must be Arslānshāh for this period), al-mu'azzam instead of al-a'ẓam. It could indicate a striking during one of the many periods of struggle and illwill between the sultan and his atabeg. A more precise date might be 568/1172-3, when al-Mustadī, afraid that Ildegiz might be intent on plundering Baghdad, sent the atabeg a robe of honor and titles.45

12.(?) AE. No mint name or date.

This type is characterized by the counterstamp

, shams (short for Shams al-Dīn)

usually over anonymous Byzantine bronzes.

G.C. Miles, "Some Islamic Coins in the Berne Historical Museum," Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau, XLV (1966), no. 14, p. 136 (on a bronze assigned to Basil II and Constantine VIII, circa 976-989 A.D.; cf., Margaret Thomson's Class A, intermediate type in The Athenian Agora, Coins from the Roman through the Venetian Period (Princeton, 1954), pp. 112-113 (illus., fig. 14) (d=29 mm., 7.57 gr.); Miles in this same article says he has seen the counterstamp on anonymous bronzes of Class K, circa 1081-1118 A.D.

These coins are only conjecturally ascribed to Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz. Shams and Shams al-Dīn were very common names

45Ibn al-Athīr, IX, p. 121.
in Eastern Anatolia during this period, cf., Zambaur, Manuel, index under "Schams-", pp. 370-371. However, these counter-stamped anonymous bronzes turn up in great quantities in northeastern Iran and Adharbayjan, militating for Ildegiz. Attention should also be drawn to another group of anonymous Byzantine bronzes with the counterstamp, \( \text{d.t} \), \( \text{atābak} \), which are also found in this same region; they may also be attributed to Ildegiz or one of his successors when they are more thoroughly investigated.

l3X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Ildegiz not sufficiently described to be more accurately classified.

Pakhomov, Klady, II, H415 (several, some with al-Muqtafī, others with al-Mustanjid); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1098 (one example), H1109 (three examples, one counterstruck "Abū Bakr"), H1110 (five large pieces, "probably struck at Ardabil" (?) ; Pakhomov, Klady, VII; H1799, no. 10 (one example with \( \text{tamghā} \) under "Ildegiz") (d=18.5-27.0 (sic) mm., w=5.72 gr., t=approx. 1.8 mm.).

Finally, a word should be said about coins misattributed to Shams al-Dīn. One of the first published references to the coins of the Ildegizids, i.e., "Atabegs of Adherbayjan," by Fraehn, Recension, Cl. XIV, no. 6a, p. 618 (not described), was; unfortunately, not an Ildegizid coin at all. It was struck by the Malik of Ahar, Mahmud b. Bishkīn. Another was originally published by S. Lane-Poole, Coins of the Urtukī
Turkmans (London, 1875), no. 87, p. 42 (with other references), and attributed by him to Shams al-Dīn Dā'ūd, 691/1292-693/1294. Unfortunately, Blau, NZ, no. 60, pp. 65-66, thought to change it to Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz; it is not a coin of Ildegiz.

Finally, Lane-Poole himself made an error in ascribing a copper, E.M., III, no. 675, p. 240 (illus. Pl. XIII), to Ildegiz. N.M. Lowick, Keeper of Islamic Coins in the British Museum, in a letter dated 27 July 1965, says the coin has now been reattributed to the Dānishmandid Ismāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm, who was also known as Ismāʿīl Shams al-Dīn b. Ibrāhīm. 46

B. Muhammad Jihān Pahlavan b. Ildegiz (571/1175-582/1186)

14. (?) AE. No mint name or date. With sultan's name lacking.

Obv. محمد ملك
الامير يلدير (sic)

Muhammad Malik
of the amīrs Ildegiz (sic).

Rev. ملك الامرا
السultan ال (عظم)

Malik of the amīrs.
The Gr(eatest) Sultan

46 Zambaur, Manuel, p. 146.
Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1864, no. 28, pp. 342-343; the extra "l" in Ildegiz is probably a typographical error.

The attribution to Muhammad, based on the appearance of the name in the first line of the obverse, is doubtful. The coin could easily be an issue of Shams al-Dīn similar to no. 4 above with the first line, sultan al-aḍ zm, referring to sultan Muhammad b. Mahmūd, effaced. However, if we assume an accurate reading, we may have evidence of a subsidiary issue during Ildegiz's life time. Since Muhammad does not take the title atabak and since his father is assumed alive by the mention of his name on the coin, we may conclude that this was a special issue of Muhammad Jihān perhaps from Ardabīl, which was awarded to Muhammad after it was taken by Ildegiz in 560/1165.\(^\text{47}\) If the above assumptions are true, the coin is to be dated from 560/1165 until the death of Ildegiz, 571/1175.

15X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadī and Seljuq sultan Arslānshāh.

No further description is given.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1801, B, no. 240 (one example).

\(^\text{47}\) Akhbar, p. 157.
If the attribution is correct, then we have further evidence to support the hypothesis of more than one minting authority in the Ildegizid realm. The coin can be more narrowly dated than the previous example from the first year of al-Mustadī's caliphate, 566/1170, to 571/1175. Of course there is the rare possibility that the coin was struck by Muhammad during the two month period in late 571/1170 between the deaths of his father and sultan Arslānshāh, Rabī' II/October-November, 571/1175 to Jumādā II/December-January, 571/1175-1176.48

16. AE. No mint name. (572)/(117)6-(117)7.

The coin is not described, but probably has legends similar to the dated coins which follow.

Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 5, p. 430.

17. AE. No mint name. (573)/(117)7-(117)8. With caliph al-Mustadī and sultan Tughril b. Arslānshāh (571/1175-6 to 590/1194).

Obv.

الملك
The Malik

العظماء
The Supreme, A-

تابك أعظم
tābak-ī ʿazam(?) (the Greatest

محمد
Atibak)

Muhammad

48 See supra, n. 11.
Margin: "the year (573)."

Rev.

بَلْ يَا اللَّهِ biamrillāh
أَمَانَ مُستَخْبَطَ السُّلَّمَ The Supreme Sultan
تُغْرِيّ būghrīl.

Soret, RN, 1859, no. 1 (third specimen), pp. 485-486.

18. AE. No mint name. (5)74/(11)78-(11)79. With caliph
al-Mustadī.

Obv.

الملك The Malik
المعظم the Supreme, Atā-
بِكَ ۴ bak I....
[......] [......]

Margin: أرِب، four, s[eventy]...

Rev.

الإِسْرَّيْل al-Mustadī
بِلَآ أَمِير biamrillāh. Commander
المُؤْمِنِين of the Faithful.

Margin: A trace, but undecipherable.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1862, no. 55, pp. 54-55.
19. AE. Ardabil. (57)5/(117)9-(118)0.

The coin is not described, but probably has legends similar to the dated coins above.

Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 4, p. 430.


**Obv.** (in a double linear circle)

المالك The Malik

المعظمة the Supreme, Ata-

بات الاعظم bak the Greatest

محمد Muhammad.

**Margin:** أردبيل Ardabil, within a double circle.

**Rev.**

باسم الله biamrillah

الستض al-Mustadfi.

السلطان The Sultan

طغرل Tughril.

Soret, RN, 1859, no. 1 (second example); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799 a) nos. 11-50 (40 examples, some with "Ardabil" clear, two with the mistake billah instead of biamrillah; on the reverse of some can be seen animal figures) (now in the Derbend, Dagestan, U.S.S.R. Museum); Berlin, unpublished, Access.; Cegarín 320/1885 (cast in ANS; a few letters of Ardabi(?) are legible in the margin) (w=15.17 gr.).
20B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Mustadī and sultan Tughril.

Obv.

The Malik
the Supreme A-
reik the Greatest
Muhammad.

Margin: ..... [falls, year (?)]

Rev.

bismillāh
al-Mustadī.

The Supreme Sultan
Tughril.

Soret, RN, 1859, no. 1 (first specimen).

Soret reads the fragmentary first word of the obverse margin as either ہلاس fās, or, خبر Toprīz. His preference is for the latter reading, but I would suspect that this like the previous specimen is an issue of Ardabīl and that the reading fās is to be chosen since it is found on a later issue of Muhammad, cf., no. 21, infra.49

49 However, it should be noted that Pakhomov had suggested Toprīz as a likely mint; "Monetnoe obrashchenie," p. 100, cf., supra, "chap. Two," n. 173.
20C. AE. No mint name or date. Names effaced.

**Obv.** (in a double linear circle)

الملك The Malik

المعظم the Supreme, A-

اتبک اعظم tābak-i aʿzam

Margin: some letters visible between the two circles, but not readable.

**Rev.**

السلطان The Sultan[n]

عظم........... the [Supreme

Margin: ...

Güstrup, Cat. Copenhagen, no. 1542, p. 163 (obverse
legend completed from a photograph supplied by
Miss Jacobsen) (w=16.45 gr.).

20D. AE. No mint name or date. Names effaced.

**Obv.** (within two linear circles)

الملك The Malik

المعظم the Supreme

اتبک اعظم Atābak-i aʿzam

محمد Muhammad.

Rev. completely effaced.
Mushegian, *Denezhnoe*, no. 146, pp. 89-90 (illus., Pl. XII, fig. III, very poor) (the coin is compared to Markov's no. 5, cf. no. 16 above) (d=30, w=16).

Mushegian points out that these coins which he considers to be of the type struck in Ardabil, are very rarely found in Armenia.50 Of the hundreds of Ildeghizid from the Dvin excavations, there is only this single example of Muhammad.

The above issues, nos. 16-20, can be safely assigned to the first four years of Pahlavan's reign, 571/1175-575/1180, the latter year being that of caliph al-Mustadi's death. They are also probably from Ardabil; unfortunately, their poor striking and worn condition do not permit accurate readings of the margins where the date and place of striking are found. Ildeghiz, in order to assure a position of primacy for his family in the lands of the Iraq Seljuq state, had wisely placed sultan Arslanshah's son, the young Tughril, in the custody of his own eldest son, Muhammad. Thus, as atabeg to the prince who was most likely to succeed to the Seljuq sultanate, he was in an excellent position to take advantage of the fortuitous death of sultan Arslanshah

---

50 *Denezhnoe*, p. 90.
shortly after that of his father. Within the dyarchy, there existed a bitter antagonism even during Ildegiz’s time. The sultan aware of the historical grandeur of the Great Seljuq Empire, resented his dependence on the atabeg, a mamlūk by origin, for the maintenance and defense of his empire.

There were three contending forces in Iraq, al-Jībāl and Adharbayjān, the caliphate, the Seljuq sultanate and the Ildegizid atabegate. The last was trying to consolidate its newly secured political power, while at the same time trying to establish its own dynastic empire. The sultanate was working to regain its military independence from the atabegate. The caliphate was endeavouring to restore its position, held in name only under a hundred years of Seljuq hegemony, as the supreme political, administrative and religious force in the traditional Islamic heartland. As al-Muqtadī and Ildegiz worked together against Sultan Muhammad b. Māmūd,51 so now we might assume that al-Mustadī and Muhammad Jīhān were on good terms. Unfortunately, the literary sources afford almost no information on their relationships. However, the consistent mention of the caliph’s name on all the Ildegizid coins of this period indicates a

51 See supra, nn. 6, 7, 32, 34.
very friendly relationship. On at least one issue, no. 18 of 574/1178-1179, the caliph's name is followed by the honorific, amīr al-mu'mīnīn, "Commander of the Faithful," where we would expect to find the title and name of the Seljuq sultan. Just the opposite was true during the last years of Shams al-Dīn and Arslānshāh when the largest issues omit any reference to the caliph al-mustanjid. But now, during sultan Tughril's minority, Muhammad Pahlavān had full control of the state. In addition to his father's title of atābak al-āẓam, he took a new one, perhaps confirmed by the caliph al-Mustadī, al-malik al-mu'azzam, "the Supreme Malik," firmly attested to by our coins.52

21. AE. Ardabil. No date. With caliph al-Nāṣir (575/1180-622/1225) and sultan Tughril.

Obv.

الملك
العظم
تباك الأعظم
محمد

The Malik
the Supreme, A-
tābak the Greatest
Muhammad.

Margin: illegible.

Rev.

الناصر
أبدين الله

al-Nāṣir
lidInillāh

52 Kenneth Luther has informed me that Muhammad's assuming of this new title is now confirmed by a reference in Ta'rikh al-Azarāʾ, an anonymous continuation of anu-shirwān b. Khāliṣ's Futūr Zaman al-Judūr, which is
Sultan
the Supreme

Margin:
"copper of Ardabil."

Soret, RN, 1859, no. 2, p. 486 (Soret does not supply the obverse reading, but says it is like his no. 1, pp. 485-486, i.e., our no. 20B).

22. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Obv.

السلطان
The Sultan

العظم
the Supreme

بک ای ایزام
Muhammad.

Rev.

الله
Allah

الناصر
al-Nasir.

السلطان
The Sultan

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no. 6, aa, p. 274 (logically there should be a forth line indicated on the reverse even if not legible; Dorn omits such indication). Soret suggests changing the first line

a newly discovered and valuable source on the Seljuqs of Iraq. This Persian manuscript is now in Cairo; Luther reported on it briefly at the 1967 convention of the American Oriental Society in New Haven, Connecticut.
of the obverse from al-sultan to al-malik in conformity to his no. 2 our no. 21 above, BN, 1859, p. 486.

If the reading al-sultan al-mu'azzam should be correct, the only possible historical explanation would be that Muhammad's power and arrogance had reached the point where only the same title as that of his charge Tughril would satisfy him. Of course the consent of caliph al-Nasir would have been necessary.

23. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir.

Obv.

محمد
Jihān Pahlavān
عظم
Greatest...

........................................

Rev.

........................................

الناسر
al-Nasir
لدين اللہ
lidīnillāh.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no. 6, a, p. 274.

The last three issues, nos. 21-23, are to be roughly dated from the beginning of al-Nasir's caliphate to the death of Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān, i.e., 575/1180-582/1186.
24X. AE. Ardabil or unknown mint. No date(s).

Coins of Muhammad insufficiently described to be more accurately classified.

Fraehn, *Das Muh. Münzen des Asiatischen Museum der K.A. der Wissenschaft zu St. Petersburg*, 1821, p. 42 (one example, unedited); Markov, *Inventarnji*, no. 6, p. 430 (not described); Pakhomov, *Klady*, IV, H114, no. 8 (with Tughril); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VII, H1790, no. 2 (one example), H1799 b) nos. 51-55 (five examples, one with Ardabil), v) nos. 56-63 (eight ex., all worn), g) no. 64 (d=27-29 mm., t=approx. 3.0 mm., w=15.39 gr.), d) no. 65 (d=approx. 30 mm., t=3.6 mm.), H1800, no. 2 (five examples, date and mint worn, but "Ardabil" type).

C. QIZL ARSLĀN CUTHMĀN b. ILEDGAZ (582/1186-587/1191)

25. AE. No mint name or date.

**Obv.**

QIZL.

**Rev.**

Atābak

Mushegian, *Denezhnoe*, no. 180, p. 93 (marking on obverse illus. Pl. XVI, fig. 119) "irregular," d=2.1 (sic) read 21 mm., w=6.75 gr.).

26A. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Sanjak b.

**SALAYMAN.**

Plate III

**Obv.** (in a linear circle)

Greatest

Atābak QIZL

ARSLĀN.
Rev. (in a linear circle)

سلطان
Sanjar son of
Sulaymān.

Mushegian, Deneghnoe, nos. 147-159, 160 (snake like marking under first line of obverse, illus. Pl. XVI, fig. 117), 161-173, 174 (marking as no. 160), 175-179 (33 examples, tamgha illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 113)(with variations of \( d=24-29 \) mm., \( w=4.25-9.25 \) gr.); Pakhomov, Kladv, VI, H1612, p. 49 (one example); Pakhomov, Kladv, VIII, H1986, nos. 3-8 (one of five specimens); ANS
\( (d=23-25 \) mm., \( w=6.67 \) gr.).

26B. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Sanjar b. Sulaymān.

Obv.

اعظم
Greatest
اتابک قزل
Atābak Qızl
ارسلاان
Arslan.

Rev.

سلطان سنجر بن
Sanjar son of
Sulaymān.

Mushegian, Deneghnoe, nos. 574-584 (11 examples)
(variation of \( d=24-30 \) mm., \( w=3.0-8.0 \) gr.) (like Markov, nos. 9-10, pp. 430-431, cf., p. 115, which is confusing because of the similar reference to Markov, no. 9-10, under our no. 26B) (tamgha illus. Pl. XVI, fig. 113).

26C. No mint name or date. With sultan Sanjar b. Sulaymān.
With the same legends as no. 26A except that the 
tamghā on the reverse faces left instead of right.

Markov, Inventarny1, no. 9, p. 430 (cf., Mushegian,
Denezhnoe, p. 150); Mushegian, Denezhnoe, nos. 1114
(illus., Pl. XI, fig. 110), 1115-6, 1117 (star under
aczam)(tamghā illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 113)(with variations
of d=24-28 mm., w=5.67-7.20 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady,
VIII, H1986, nos. 3-8 (one of five specimen).

26X. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Sanjar b.
Sulaymān.

With the same legends as nos. 26A and B, but tamghā
on the reverse is either illegible or not indicated.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, no. 6, b (second example only),
pp. 274-275, Markov, Inventarny1, nos. 9-12, 13 (counter-
stamped atabak/Abū Bakr); Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, no.
1543, p. 162 (Sanjar is incorrectly read "Muhammad;"
from photograph supplied by Anne Jacobsen, tamghā looks
as though it might face left)(w=9.06 gr.); Pakhomov,
Klady, IV, H1109, nos. 23-72 (50 examples, two counter-
stamped Abū Bakr; these could be of the subsequent or
even a different type); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1986,
os. 3-8 (six examples, but one with tamghā right and
left as indicated above)(variation of d=25-27 mm.,
w=5.78, 6.32, 6.35, 6.70, 7.90 gr., only five given);
Istoria Azerbaidzhana, 1, p. 144 (illus., not described);
ANS, four examples (d=25-26, 25-26, 26-27, 25-26 mm.,
w=6.85, 7.99, 9.96, 10.30 gr.).

Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān died in early 582/1186 and was

succeeded by his brother Qızıl Arslān CʿUthmān. Relations
between the sultan and his atabeg had degenerated; Tughril
was afraid that Qızıl wanted to replace him.⁵³ Even under

⁵³Rāwandi, p. 338.
Ildegiz the dual system of rule relied on a delicate balance of power among the various territorial amīrs in the provinces of the Iraq sultanate. Sultans Muhammad, Arslānshāh and Tughril tried to win the allegiance of as many of these amīrs as possible to counterbalance the forces of the Ildegizids, who were also part of the amīral structure. After the death of Muhammad Pahlavān, Tughril, still a youth, but obtaining ever more authority, tried to obtain enough support from the various amīrs to achieve independence from his atabeg. However, these efforts failed and Qızıl Arslān maintained the upper hand, virtually keeping the young sultan as a captive. The final rupture between Qızıl and Tughril came in mid-583/1187 when sultan Tughril managed to make his escape from Qızıl's custody. This touched off two decades of hostilities between Tughril and the Ildegizid atabegs in the area of al-Jibāl. As the above coins indicate, Qızıl's reaction against Tughril was total and swift. In Rajab/August-September, 584/1188, Qızıl appointed Tughril's uncle Sanjar b. Sulaymān sultan.

27. AE. No mint name. (58)5/(118)9. With sultan Sanjar b. Sulaymān.

---

56 See supra, n. 14.
Obv.

five
The Supreme Malik
Qizl Arslān
son of Il...

Rev.

[Allāh (?). The Sultān
the Greatest Sanjar
son of Sulaymān.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNE, 1864, no. 29, p. 343.

In the turmoil Tughril tried to make peace with
caliph al-Nāṣir, even sending his small son to Baghdad, but
to no avail. Qizl reaffirmed his appointment of Sanjar
b. Sulaymān as sultan with the full title of sultān al-azam
as indicated by this coin.

28. AE. No mint name or date. With sultan Sanjar b.
Sulaymān.

Obv.

[qizl Arslān]  

57 See Luther, pp. 251-253, for a discussion of these
events.
Pakhomov, Klady, VI, H1799, nos. 66-67 (undescribed except for the following: "With the names Qizl-Arslan C'Uthman, sultan Sanjar and caliph al-Masir the name of the city is not visible; from the date on one example there is preserved the number '80'; 686(1287/8)" (sic) should be read (?) 586(1190); ANS (d=25-26.5 mm., w=7.86 gr.)(my reading from this example).

If Pakhomov intends by his reference to indicate that he reads "C'Uthman," cf., p. 47, then my reading of the second and third lines is almost surely correct. However, if he just adds this as part of Qizl's full name, then the state of preservation of the coin in the American Numismatic Society does not allow for a conclusive reading of "C'Uthman." This is the only example known with qizl's full name.

Pakhomov's dating is curious. There is an obvious error, but not merely a typographical one of the wrong century. It is not clear how he reasoned from "80" to (6)86 (sic). However, assuming that the "80" was an error for "86" there is still difficulty for 586 is 1190 A.D. and not
1187-8 A.D. Since 686 is 1287/8 I assume that Pakhomov meant 586 which is 1190 A.D.

Finally, it is not unreasonable to assume that nos. 27 and 28 are similar and complementary issues. Pakhomov probably read "six," " — — " above the obverse and we should complete the reverse legends of the Bartholomaei coin and the ANS coin with the names of Sanjar b. Sulaymān and caliph al-Naṣir.

29. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Naṣir.

Obv.

الله
The Malik the
الملك آل
Qizl Ars-
فرز ارس
... د... د... د... د...

Rev.

... ال... ال...
الناسر آل
[ ...] al-NAṣir [...]
السلط... Allah. The Sult...
الأعظم... the Greatest

... ... ... ... ...

Soret, RN, 1860, no. 3, pp. 68-69 (we are told that the coin has a counterstamp on the obverse, but not what it is).

29. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-NAṣir.
Oby. (with highly stylized Kufi script)

The Supreme Malik Qızıl Arslan [son of Ildegiz].

Rev. (with highly stylized Kufi script)

[al-Šāhir idī-Ayn] [al-Lāh. The Sultan] [Allah. The Sultan]

Gre[a]test... (?)

ANS (d=23.5-28 mm., w=8.02 gr.).

I have completed the last line of the obverse on the basis of the incomplete legend of no. 29A. These two issues seem to be the same, but the vagueness of Soreth's reading and the state of preservation of the ANS example do not allow more certainty. I have placed these coins after the previous issue, but with no concrete justification. They could date from any of the five years of Qızıl Arslan's rule, 582/1186-1187 to 587/1191. We know that Tughrîl was taken prisoner by Qızıl in the third quarter of 586/1190 and held captive in Adharbayjan. In the same year Qızıl, seemingly prompted by al-Šāhir, declared the end of the Seljuq dynasty
and at the same time his own sultanate. One would expect that coins were struck to celebrate this occasion, but no such numismatic evidence has come to light. However, as mentioned above, Qizl married Inanı̇j Khâtûn. The act was symbolic, reminiscent of İldeğiz's marriage to the widowed mother of the future Sultan Arslanşâh. There was apparently little love in the new union, for Qizl Arslan was poisoned by İnânj Khâtûn in the next year, Shawwâl/October-November, 587/1191.

30X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Qizl Arslân ʿUthmân, but are insufficiently described to be more accurately classified.

Markov, Inventarnyi, nos. 7-8, p. 430; Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1110, no. 5, pp. 39-40 (not described except for ʿUthmân, i.e., Qizl Arslân ʿUthmân, which may be like no. 28, see discussion there); H1144 no. b, p. 47 (one example); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1982, p. 35 (one example); cf., B. Piotrovskii, Karmir-blur, III (Erevan, 1955), p. 13.

The following coins have been misattributed to Qizl, Arslân, Dorn; Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no. 6, b (first specimen).

58 See supra, nn. 14 and 15.

59 See supra, n. 16 and the general discussion of this type of marriage between the atabeg and his ward's mother in Sanaullah, Decline, p. 5, quoted in full supra, p. 89.
Obv.  
Nāsir al-Dīn, Qızl Arslān Muhammad  
son of Seljūq.  

Margin:  
السلطان المعظم طغرل بن  
Arslan  
The Supreme Sultan Tughril Son  
of Arslān.  

Rev.  
Warrior on horseback galloping to the left while  
executing the Parthian shot.  

Soret, with uncertainty, describes a similar coin in the  
collection of M. le Marquis de Lagoy, RN, 1860, no. 4,  
p. 69 (illus. Pl. (RN, 1859) XXI, fig. no. 4). The same  
type with an illustration (drawing) is found in Valentine,  
Early Muhammadan Coins, (manuscript in the ANS),Pl.13,  
fig. 28. The coin in question should be attributed to  
the Saltūq dynasty of Erzerum, cf. A. Ziya, Constantinople,  
IV, no. 93.  

Finally, there is the coin of Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen,  
no. 1544, p. 163, attributed to Qızl Arslān, but now corrected  
and ascribed to Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz, see supra no. 8.  

D. Abū Bakr b. Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān b. Ildegiz (587/1191- 
607/1211)  

31. AE. No mint name or date.  

Coins of Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz counterstruck
Atābak
Abū Bakr.

Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H109, of nos. 1-3 one example.

32. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of Qızıl Arslan CUTHMĀN b. İLDEGIZ of varieties 26A-X, likewise counterstruck as above.

Bartholomae à Soret, RRE, 1862, no. 56, p. 55 (illus., fig. 8); Markhov, Inventarnyi, no. 13, p. 431 (illus.);
Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H109, of nos. 23-72 two examples;
Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1986, no. 9 (d=25-26 mm., w=6.60 gr.);
Musheglian, Deneghno, nos. 585-587, p. 115 (3 examples overstruck on obverse, variations of d=25-29, w=4.5, 5.87, 6.70)(overstrike illus., Pl. XVI, fig. no. 3), nos 214-218, p. 96 (5 examples not specifically identified as coins of Qızıl Arslan because of their state of preservation, d=26, 28, 26, 27, 26 mm.; w=6.2, 7.6, 6.4, 5.2, 6.8 gr.);
Berlin, Münzkabinett, unpublished, access. no. 919/1902 (overstrike on obverse, d=approx. 27-29 mm., w=9.35 gr.)(cast in ANS).

This simple counterstruck issue of Abū Bakr is placed chronologically first because the sudden death of his uncle Qızıl Arslan must have necessitated a quick assertion of Abū Bakr's authority. The coins were probably struck in Adharbayjān; upon Qızıl's death Abū Bakr immediately left Hamadān for the northwest where he founded a separate state which outlasted the Seljuq sultanate of Iraq.60 The five years after Qızıl's death in late 587/1191 are ones of constant turmoil between Abū Bakr and his two step-brothers Qutlugh İnānj and

60 See supra, the text at n. 18.
Amīr Amīrān. In fact it was Qutlugh Inānj and not Abū Bakr who was the chief Ildegizid atabeg working in the dyarchy system against sultan Tughril. Because of this internal conflict within the atabeg house, Tughril was able to assert control of the central Iraq Seljuq lands in al-Jibal. Thus while the conflict between Qutlugh and the sultan raged in the southeast, Abū Bakr was secure in Arrān and Adharbajjān. Unfortunately, no coins of either Qutlugh Inānj nor Amīr Amīrān are known to exist.

There is also the possibility that these coins were struck before Qizl’s death and in fact any time after 582/1186, the year of Qizl’s succession. It is quite possible that Abū Bakr took command of the northern sector of the Ildegizid domain and struck his own coins even though his uncle was titular head of the whole family. In conclusion these coins are probably issues of 587-8/1191-2, but could have been struck a few years before or after that date.

33. AE. Ardabīl. (58)8/(119)3. Probably with caliph al-Ñasir.

The coin is not further described.

Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 14, p. 431.

61 Luther, pp. 253-254.
62 See supra, text at n.12, p.292.
34A. AE. No mint name but probably Ardabil. (5)8X/(11)9X.

Obv. (in a circle of dots)

( Jahān Pahlavān

(Gjr) (east) Abābak (sic)

(Abū Bakr) son of Muhammad.

Rev. (in a circle of dots)

(al-) Nāsir (lidīn)

Commander of the Faithful.

Margin: below bow,

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1859, no. 88, pp. 434-435 (illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 23) (the illus. shows an animal figure placed sideways to the left of the third line of the obv.).

Bartholomaei read the date as 580/1184 which can hardly be correct since Muhammad was still alive. The date is more probably 587-8-9/1191-2-3 and, in view of the discussion, supra, under nos. 31-32, possibly 582/1186-586/1190.

34B. AE. No mint but probably Ardabil. Probably (58)X/(119)X.
Field as in 35A.

Bartholomaei à Soret, BNR, 1861, no. 23, p. 48.

Since Bartholomaei gives Abū Bakr's dates as 587/1191-594/1198 (sic), it is strange that he does not correct or at least explain his reading of 580/1184 on coin no. 34A to which he compares this coin.

34C. AE. Mint name worn, probably Ardabil. (5)8X/(11)9X. With caliph al-Nasir.

Obv. Abbreviated description, "...ahzam...
Abū Bakr, son ... [أعظم ...أوبكرين ...];
below a tamghā..."

Rev. Abbreviated description, name and title of al-
Nasir with trace of tamghā.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, no. 69 (d=23-26 mm., t=2-2.2
mm., w=9.63 gr.).

35. AE. Ardabil. (5)9X/(11)9/(4)-(12)03.

No further description.

Markov, Inventarnyi, nos. 15 and 16, p. 431.

36A. AE. Ardabil. No date.

Obv.

الله

Allāh

جہان پحلوان

Jabān Pahlavān
Greatest Atābak
Abū Bakr son of Muhammad.

Rey.

للله
الناصر لدين
أمير المؤمنين

Allāh
al-Násir lidīn.
Commander of the Faithful.

Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 17, pp. 431-432 (Ardaβīl legible, but no tāmgha direction indicated, however, by Mushegian's reference we can assume it is toward the left, cf., infra); Mushegian, Deneghnoe, no. 212, p. 96 (tāmgha illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 114), with reference to Markov, no. 17 (d=24 mm., w=5.05 gr.); Yapī ve Kredi Bankası, İstanbul, no. 12/2, only tāmgha on reverse clear (d=approx. 23 mm., w=3.85 gr.).

36B. ĀE. (Ardaβīl). No date.

Same legend as no. 36A, the bow is below the last line of the obverse; area where the reverse bow should be found is worn.

Berlin, Münzkabinett, no. 7, access. Gutherie 1876, (d=approx. 22.5-24 mm., w=7.42 gr.) (cast in ANS).

36C. ĀE. (Ardaβīl) No date.

The same except mistake al-dīn for lidīn in the second line of the reverse.


37A. ĀE. No mint name. No date. With caliph al-Nāsir.
Allāh
Jihān Pahlavān
Greatest Atābak
Abū Bakr son of Muhammad.

Allāh
al-Nāsir al-dīn (sic)
Commander of the Faithful.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, no. 6, c, p. 275 (two examples)
typographical error al-mu‘min for al-mu‘min ǧīn.
Mushegian, Deneghnoe, no. 213, p. 96 (tamghā illus.,
Pl. XVI, fig. 115; bow illus., Pl. XVI, fig. 116)
(d=21 mm., w=3.25 gr.); Paris, B.N. (unpublished),
E.2840, access. Souchet, Lenoir 1864 (poor specimen, area
of lidīn worn); Berlin, Münzkabinett, no. 6,  access.
Gutherie 1876 (d=approx. 22–26.5 mm., w=6.27 gr.) (cast in
ANS); ANS (very poor specimen)(d=24–27 mm., w=5.24 gr.).

37X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.
Probably the same, but no further description except
the characteristic error al-dīn for lidīn.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1797, under II.

38A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.
Plate III
[Jihān Pahlavān]
[Gr]eatest Ātābak

[Al]lāh
[al-Nā]sir lidīn
[Commander] of the Faithful.

Margin: Above and to left.

لد عن بن سف (؟) 63  ID CN BN SF (?) 63
ANS (d=24–28 mm., w=9.09 gr.); the letters are guessed at.

38B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

OBY.

[?]  Jihān Pahlavān
[Gr]eatest Ātābak
[A]bu Bakr son of Muḥammad.

Rey.

63 G.C. Miles very tentatively suggested 63
C Umar b. al-Suf (؟).
38C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv.

Jihān Pahlavān
[Greatest Atābak].

Rev.

Allāh
al-Nāṣir lidīn
Commander [of the Faithful].

Istanbul, Yapı ve Kredi Bankası, no. 2/1 (d=approx. 27 mm., w=7.65 gr.).

39X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Plate III

Coins of the same general type as nos. 36-38, but insufficiently described for further classification. Their common element is the name of caliph al-Nāṣir lidīn. The words "or 'Uzbek" in parenthesis indicate that those specimens might have been struck by Abū
Bakr or his brother and successor 'Uzbek, their state of preservation being too poor to distinguish which name appears on the coins.

Markos, Inventarnyi, nos. 18-29, pp. 431-432 (12 examples); Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, no. 1945, p. 163 (w=6.12 gr.); Mushegan, Deneshnoe, nos. 589-591, p. 115 (d=25,26,28 mm., w=4.35,7.2,9.2 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, I, H115 (32 examples), H123 (one example), H125 (3 examples, probably Abu Bakr); Pakhomov, Klady, II, H423 (one example, or 'Uzbek), H425 (8 of 20 specimens either Abu or 'Uzbek); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1109, no. 102, H1101, no. 1, H1114, nos. 9-12 (eight examples), nos. 29-82 (54 examples either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 70-80 (11 examples with tamgha visible), nos. 105-215 (111 examples either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek), H1800, no. 3 (two examples either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek), H1801, no. 223, nos. 19, 49 (two examples), 60,85,86, nos. 149,167,207,230, and 14 more examples without number, either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek; Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1985 (eight examples either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek), H1984 (three examples either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek); Pakhomov, Klady, IX, H2115 (one example, d=19-24 mm., t=2.0 mm.), H2117 (either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek, d=23-25, w=5.05 gr.), H2118, nos. 1-2 (d=20-24, 17-20 mm., t=approx. 2.5, 2 mm., w=8.41, 6.07 gr.), no. 3 (either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek; d=18-22 mm., t=approx. 1.5 mm., w=4.88 gr.), nos 5-6 (Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek; d=18-24.5, 18-18.5 mm., t=approx. 1.5, 3.0 mm., w=1.06, 1.15 grs.); ANS (5 examples, one with al-din; d=24-39.5, 22-25, 22-24.5, 22.5-24, 20-23 mm., w=10.58, 8.47, 8.28, 7.80, 7.38 gr.).

Not only is there the problem of attribution of so many of these coins to either Abu Bakr or 'Uzbek, but also because of their poor striking and state of preservation, one often finds them attributed to Muhammad Jihan Pahlavan since his name is also given as part of Abu Bakr's. It is almost impossible to date the coins of this issue more specifically than between 587/1191-607/1211, the years of
Abū Bakr's reign, even though none have been found dated after 600/1203.


OBY.

السلطان المعظم
Shāhanshāh the Greatest
Al Ḥārūn bīn
Muḥammad.

Margin: bottom: سنة, year; right: ب... for اربع, four; top: سعين, ninety;
left: effaced but probably ضرب, struck.

REV.

لا الإله إلا الله
There is no god but Allāh.
Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
الناصر لدين الله
al-Nāṣir lidīnillāh.
 Margin: top: باربيل, at Ardabil; nothing in the others.

Soret, RN, 1860, no. 5, pp. 69-70 (Obverse, illus.; RN, 1859, Pl. XXII, fig. 5) (conjecture in obverse margin in Soret's); reference to the same coin with a copy of the line drawing illustration of obverse in Valentine, E.M.G., no. 29, Pl. 13.

40B. AE. No mint name, probably Ardabil. No date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.
Obv.
السلطان الأعظم (?).
شاه نناء المفظم (?).
أبو بكر (بن محمد).

Margin: worn

Rev.
لا اله الا الله
محمد رسول الله
الناصر لدين
أمير المؤمنين

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
al-Nāsir lidīn
Commander of the Faithful.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, pl. 799, no. 68 (question marks on obverse are Pakhomov's; it is not clear if he means the reading is doubtful or the meaning is doubtful) (d=26-27 mm., t=2.5-3.1 mm., w=14.50 gr.).

Except for reversal of al-`azam and al-mu'azzam in the first two lines of the obverse and the lack of marginal readings on Pakhomov's specimen, nos. 40A and B seem to be of the same type. The latter specimen is now in the regional museum in Derbend and probably can be checked. We do not know the present location of Soret's coin. As Soret pointed out, Abū Bakr has taken the exalted title

شاه نناء, Shāh of Shāhs, for himself. We have no other reference to his use of this title. In 590/1194 Tughril b. Arslānshāh, the last Sultan of Iraq, died in battle.
against the Khwārazmshāh. 64 Abū Bakr gained control over the lands of Arrān and Adharbayjān; his step-brother Amīr Amīrān, had died trying to resist him with Georgian help, 65 while another step-brother Qutlugh Inānj, failed to keep his newly obtained power over al-Jibāl. 66 The sultan alluded to in the first line of the obverse is no longer a Seljuq, but Khwārazmshāh Takash (586/1172-596/1199), who had already taken Rayy in 588/1192 from Tughril. 67 Soret, RN, pp. 69-70, mistakenly supposed the sultan to be the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn, who did not begin to rule until 617/1220.

41A. AE. No mint name or date.

Obv. (in a double circle, the outer formed of dots)

ابو بكر  
Abū Bakr

بن محمد  
son of Muhammad.

Rev. (in a double circle, the outer one of dots)

أعظم  
Greatest

أبا بكر  
Abā Bakr.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RN, 1862, nos. 57-58, p. 56; Markov, Inventarnyi, no. 30, p. 431 (ref. from

---

64 See supra, n. 17.
65 Akhbar, pp. 185-190.
66 See supra, text at nn. 16 and 17.
Mushegian, Denezhnoc, nos. 181 (with snake-like marking below "Muhammad"; illus.; Pl. XVI, fig. 117) (with one reference to Markov), 182 (illus.; Pl. XII, fig. 112), 183-190, 193-195, 196 (with tamgha-like marking under "Muhammad"; illus.; Pl. XVI, fig. 120), 198, 199, 200 (with same tamgha-like marking as no. 196), 202-211, 219-227 (36 examples in all with variations of d=22-28 mm., w=3.65-7.50 gr.); ANS (with tamgha-like marking under "Muhammad" and other markings, most notably stars above the Ы of Bakr and after atebak; d=24-26 mm., w=4.56 gr.).

41B. AE. No mint name or date.

The same as 41A, except that the reverse field is surrounded by three circles, the middle one is made of dots.

Mushegian, Denezhnoc, no. 1119, p. 151 (with reference to Markov, no. 30, p. 431, but probably only for the legend) (d=2.5 mm., w=5.20 gr.).

41C. AE. No mint name or date.

The same as 41A, but both obverse and reverse are mistakenly stamped with an obverse die.

Mushegian, Denezhnoc, no. 197 (d=24 mm., w=5.55 gr.); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H1114, no. 83.

41D. AE. No mint name or date.

Obv. (same legend as in 41A, but field enclosed by triple circle, the center composed of dots).

Rev. (as 41A, but with legend reversed)

اعظم  GREATEST

Atabak
Mushegian, Deneznoe, no. 191 (d=26 mm., w=7.5 gr.) (reference to Markov, *Invetarny*, p. 431, no. 32, but presumably this is to the general type rather than a reversed legend).

42A. AE. No mint name or date.

**Obv.** (in double linear circle)

- Abū
- Bakr son of Muhammad

**Rev.** (in a triple circle, the center of dots)

- Greatest
- Atābāk

Mushegian, *Deneznoe*, no. 192, with snake like figure above (illus.; Pl. XVI, fig. 117) (d=24 mm., w=4.6 gr.), no. 201 (d=25 mm., w=5.7 gr.), no. 588 with reference to Markov, *Invetarny*, no. 30, p. 431, but this reference already alluded to supra no. 41A (d=25 mm., w=6.35 gr.); ANS (d=24-26 mm., w=8.16 gr.).

42B. AE. No mint name or date. Plate III

The same as 42A, except that the obverse field is enclosed in two intersecting squares, forming an eight pointed star with a dot in each point.

ANS (d=25-26.5 mm., w=10.24 gr.).

43. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins which are probably of the simple variety like those of nos. 41 and 42, but insufficiently described for further classification.
Markov, *Inventarnyi*, nos. 30-32, p. 431 (Musheghan's references to these coins, *supra*, are too vague, thus their inclusion here); Pakhomov, *Klady*, I, H116 (one example), H124 (one example); Pakhomov, *Klady*, II, H418 (one example), H419 (one example, "probably Abū Bakr"); H420 (five examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, IV, H1144, b) (three examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VII, H1793 (two examples), H1795 (one example); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, H1983 (one example), H1984 (d=21-22 mm., t=approx. 2 mm., w=6.49 gr.).

43Y. AE. No mint name or date.

As 43X, but even less precise, being coins attributable to either Abū Bakr or 'Uzbek.

Pakhomov, *Klady*, II, H424 (one example), H425 (some from 30 examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, IV, H110 (98 examples), H112 (one example), H113 (one example), H116 (11 examples), H1144 (one example); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VII, H1790, no. 2; H1795 (four examples), H1798, nos. 3-5, H1799, nos. 216-282 (67 examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VIII, H1983, nos. 2-11 (10 examples), H1984, no. 2 (w=5.90 gr.); Pakhomov, *Klady*, IX, H2116, no. 3 (d=18-22 mm., to approx. 1.5 mm., w=4.88 gr.).

The only guide we have for dating the coins nos. 41-43 is the title ٱظمَّ اباک, Greatest Atābak.

The lack of a more pretentious title for Abū Bakr probably indicates a date prior to sultan Tughril's death in 590/1194. Of course provincial mints may have continued to strike these simple coins for very local usage after this date and in fact right through to the end of Abū Bakr's reign in 607/1210. There is also the possibility that they were struck during Qızıl Arslan's reign 582/1186-587/1191 as discussed *supra*, under no. 32.
44. AE. No mint name or date.

**Obv.** (in a linear circle)

أبنك  
Atābak

أعظم  
Greatest

أبو بكر  
Abū Bakr.

**Margin:** trace which Bartholomaei distinguishes as  
ضرب  ; struck.

**Rev.** (in a linear circle)

ملك الأمراء  
Malik of the amīrs

(sic)  
المملس  (?)

(sic)  
ملس (?)

Bartholomaei à Soret, *RNB* 1861, no. 24, p. 48  
(reverse illus. by line drawing, Pl. III, fig. 3

(sic)  
ملس  (?).

The reading of the last two lines of the reverse was  
a riddle for Bartholomaei and remains so until now.

45. AV. No mint name or date. With caliph al-ʿNāṣir.

**Plate III**

**Obv.** (in a square surrounded by a triple circle the  
center one made of dots)

السلطان  
The Sultān

ابعوبک بن محمد  
Abū Bakr son of Muḥammad

جهان بهلوان  
Jīhan Pahlāvān.

**Margin:** between the square and the first linear  
circle to the right, a sword representing a
tamghā, (?) 68

Rev. (in a square surrounded by a triple circle the center one composed of dots)

لاَ اللَّهَ لاَ اللَّهَ [Allāh].
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

[al-]Nāṣir lidīnillāh.

Margin: between the square and the first circle at the bottom, a floral design.

ANS (d=28.5-30 mm., w=3.65 gr.).

46. AV. No mint name or date. With caliph al-NESSIR.

Plate III

Obr.

[Muhammad] is the Messenger of [Allāh].
Sultān the Supreme.

[Abū Bakr?]...
Jihān Pahlavān

Rev.

[There is no] god [but Allāh].
[alone. [He has] no associate.

[al-]Nāṣir lidīnillāh.
Com.ander of the Faithful.

68 Pakhomov confirms the use of a sword as tamghā by the Ildegizids; see reference, supra, "Chap. Two," no. 166.
ANS (note the animal head in the third line of the obverse and what appears to be the Ildegizid tamghā in the fourth line of the obverse) \(d=18.5\text{ mm.}, w=1.54\text{ gr.}\).

47. AV. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Plate III

**Obv.**

\[\text{Albū Bakr}\]

\[؟\]

**Margin:** further traces to the left

**Rev.**

\[\text{Muhammad} \text{ is the Messenger of Allāh}\]

\[\text{al-Nāṣir līdīni Allāh}\].

**Margin:** at top, the decoration.

ANS \(d=19.5-20.5\text{ mm.}, w=1.75\text{ gr.}\).

These unique coins are of very base gold, worn and thin. The large no. 45 seems to be about twice the weight of the smaller nos. 46 and 47. All three coins are poorly preserved, and carelessly struck. They raise questions and present problems which cannot be solved until more specimens are found to complete the legends and margins, which should contain the date and place of striking.

The largest, no. 45, is also the best preserved. There can be little doubt about the reading of the obverse. Further-
more, though the left side of the coin is worn, there does not seem to be enough room for another word or words after al-Sultan. Therefore, we must conclude that Abu Bakr took the title of sultan clearly to indicate his sovereignty over the lands of the Seljuq Sultanate. If this is the case it should be dated at least after 590/1194, the death of Sultan Tughril, and probably after the death of Qutugh Inan in (?) 592/1196. But we know from Juwaini that in 594/1198 the caliph al-Nasir had given the title of Sultan of Iraq, Khorasan and Turkestan to the Khwarazmshah Takash. The latter died in 595/1200, and, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Abu Bakr assumed the title sometime after this date or perhaps between 590/1194-594/1198. Unfortunately the literary sources make no mention of this event. If indeed Abu Bakr assumed leadership of all or part of the former Seljuq domain, the striking of gold would be understandable even though the area was in decline. The Seljuqs of Iraq struck golden dinars, but already in the early half of the 6th/12th century the quality of the coinage was very inferior. C.C. Miles underlines this fact in his study on the mint of Rayy.

70 Ibid., p. 312.
71 Ibid., p. 315.
This phenomenon is doubtless in part due to the decentralization of the Seljuk Empire and the continually harassed state of the eastern lands; but perhaps even more to the degeneration of the coinage (for we are no better supplied with Seljuk issues of other Persian mints during this period). Between the last date entered here, 555/556, and the end of the 6th century, Rayy was nominally in the hands of the Seljuqs of 'Iraq, and such specimens of their coinage as have been preserved are so miserably designed and struck that it is not at all surprising that there is this long lacuna in the history of the Rayy mint. The quantity as well as the quality of the output must have fallen off considerably, for relatively very few of the coins of the 'Iraq Seljuqs have come to light. This degeneration is to me remarkable in view of the superior quality of the artistic products, of pottery at least, at Rayy during this period. Very probably the old gold, the good gold of the earlier Seljuqs and perhaps even of earlier dynasties, continued in use even into the beginning of the Mongol Period. 72

These gold issues indicate further minting of gold in the former Seljuq lands at the very end of the 6th/12th and the beginning of the 7th/13th century. To be sure, the quantity and quality is limited and poor with only these three specimens so far preserved. Thus in conclusion this dinar (no. 45), if we can call it that, is to be dated from the ten year period from the death of the Khwarazmshah Takash to the end of Abu Bakr's reign, 596/1200-607/1211, less probably to 590/1194-594/1198 as stated above.

The two smaller gold pieces are much harder to read for their condition is even worse than no. 45. Considering no. 46 first, because it is more legible and better struck, we note the following. In the last line of the obverse the n of Jahān has a spear through it forming what resembles the Ildegizid tamghā. The fourth line of the obverse, if it is indeed a line of inscription and not a floral ornament, is very compressed. There seems to be almost no room for the insertion of letters between the third and fifth lines. However, under the forced condition of having to read something to make sense out of the fifth line, one can defend the reading Abū Bakr to the right of what appears to be an animal head. The head itself might be composed of letters which have melted together from wear. In that case one could imagine the top of the head being the first three letters of Muhammad, and the "chin" being bin, son of, which would give us the logical reading of Abū Bakr b. Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān.

The possibility that this is an earlier issue of Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān himself is ruled out by negative evidence, namely, that Muhammad never employed Jihān Pahlavān on his own coins.\(^{73}\)

\(^{73}\)See supra, nos. 14–22.
There remains a final possibility that the coin is not an issue of Abū Bakr, but of his brother 'Uzbek b. Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān; this will be discussed below.

The last of the three, no. 47, is the least legible and therefore presents the greatest problems. Its weight, style, fabric and texture are very similar to no. 46. Perhaps these conditions compel one to read the fragmentary legends so that they conform to the other two. On the obverse at the beginning of the first visible line there is an ٧٧ and what looks like a ب for a reading of أ bū. This is followed by three very clear letters, ٧٧٧, which can be read as Bakr, with the stylized ٧ not attached as it should be. Then there are two very rounded letters, the lower one can be read as a contracted بین and the upper as the first three letters of Muhammad. The line below has an ۲ Allah at the end, written sideways, and before it three letters which I read as the دین of İl-Nästr lildîn. All other areas of the obverse are rubbed smooth, except at the very top a loop is visible which is probably part of the formula of faith. On the reverse at the top is a stylised design; underneath, in the first readable line there is the د of Muhammad, followed by a very clear علی, Messenger, and the أ of Allah. Below are the clear letters ۲٧, which can be interpreted several ways. The first, as the ۲ of
al-Nāṣir, and then lid- of hidān, with the din unclear and very much cramped, followed by the Al- or Allāh. The same line can also be read as the لا ينادي رأك ... of لا ينادي رأك, he has [no associate]. There is the further possibility of reading that line as ['U]zbek, and, of even reading the first line of the obverse as ['U]zbek son of [Muḥammad].

All the readings present difficulties. The legend of the other small gold piece, no. 46, follows the customary pattern of Seljuq of Ḥarām. There is the formula Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh, then the title and name of the ruling sultan and any other name which might be appropriate. The other side contains the full formula of faith, followed by the name and title of the caliph. If we accept the first reading for the last line of the reverse namely al-Nāṣir lidinillāh, then we have the unexpected and highly unusual mention of the caliph on both sides of the coin. The second reading does not fit either, for one seldom finds the formulas with "Messenger" and "no associate" on the same side of a coin. The third possibility 'Uzbek, with a forced b. Muhammad out of what is left on the line,

74 For a comparison with Great Seljuq coins, G.C. Miles, op.cit., pp. 196-217, may be consulted.
would give an obverse with the name of Abū Bakr and a reverse with 'Uzbek. One might imagine that the brothers got along so well that they struck coins together, but this refutes the literary sources which tell us the contrary. Perhaps a fresh eye looking at these gold issues may solve their riddles; if not, we must wait for more specimens to be found.

In summary it is clear from these gold issues that Abū Bakr and perhaps 'Uzbek made a last try to revive the power and unity of the Iraq sultanate, at least in the northwestern areas, after the death of the last ruler of Seljuq blood at the hands of the Khwārazmshāhs. Perhaps these coins represent the final grand sovereign gesture of the atabegs of a great dynasty, for we know that even in their own hereditary lands, Adharbayjān and Arrān, the Ildegizids were losing control and mastery. During the reign of Abū Bakr and 'Uzbek, their vassals, the Bīshkīnids at Ahar and another in Mūqān, began striking their own coins. This problem will be discussed later when the corpus of these coins is presented. By the time of 'Uzbek's succession to the head of the Ildegizid domains in 607/1211, the atabegs had much less control of the political events in Southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjān and almost none in al-Jibāl.

---

75Juwainī informs us that 'Uzbek came to the Khwārazmshāh Takash for help after having fled from Abū Bakr in Adharbayjān, trans. Boyle, I, p. 305.
48. AE. No mint name. 609/1212 or 619/1222.
With caliph al-Nasir.

**Obv.** (in a double linear circle)

Greatest A[tābak]

Uzbek son of [Muhammad].

**Margin:** trace...

**Rev.** (in a double linear circle)

Allāh

al-Nasir lid[In]

Commander of the Faith[ful].

**Margin:** 

Ostrup, *Copenhagen Cat.*, no. 1547, p. 163 (my reading from a photograph supplied by Copenhagen) (w=8.12 gr.).

Ostrup mistakenly attributed this coin to Abū Bakr and therefore supplied the date (5)90. He was not able to read the obverse, "...dans le champ et au bord, fragments de légende indéchiffrables." On many of these coins the 'U and 2 of 'Uzbek are incorrectly attached. In general the coins are hard to distinguish from those of Abū Bakr, especially when the obverse side is worn.

Abū Bakr died in 607/1210 and his brother 'Uzbek
took over the leadership of the declining Ildegizid realm. We do not know if he ruled part of the Ildegizid lands prior to his brother's death, but this is a possibility. We are not sure where any of his coins were struck. He had control of Hamadân which was awarded him in 592/1195 by the Khwārazmshāh Takash when 'Uzbek came to him fleeing before Abū Bakr in Adharbayjān.76 However, by 614/1217 Hamadân was in the control of the Khwārazmshāh Muhammad.77 Later towards the end of his life we find him resident in Tabriz, 621/1224.78 The best likelihood is that he controlled Ardabil and perhaps Marāgha, which had been acquired by Abū Bakr shortly before his death.79

49. AE. No mint name. 618/1221. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Obv.} & (\text{ملك الأعظم}) \\
\text{'Uzbek son of Muhammad.} \\
\text{Margin: traces of a legend}
\end{align*}\]

76 Juwainī, Boyle trans., I, p. 308.
77 Ibid., II, p. 366.
78 Ibid., II, p. 424.
79 See supra, the text at n. 18.
Allāh
al Nāṣir lidīn
Commander of the Faithful.

Margin: the date, not described.

Pakhomov, Kladv, VII, H1799, nos. 81-83, "large coins" (d=21-26, 22-28, 27-28 mm., t=2.5-3.0, 2.5-3.0, 2.0-3.0 mm., w=12.95, 13.65, 12.24 gr.).

Again the place of minting is unknown. In this year the Mongols under Jebe (Yeme) subjugated Tabriz, Marāgha and Nasijawan. While they were in this area the Ildegizids came forward, tendered submission and were in turn rewarded with a letter and an al-tamghā. Juwainī reports that it was Khāmūsh b. 'Uzbek who came forward, but Rashīd al-Dīn says it was 'Uzbek himself. As for the coins supposedly struck in Adharbayjān by 'Uzbek some three years earlier in the name of sultan Muḥammad Khwārazmshāh, we have no trace.

---

80 See supra, "Chap. Two," n. 88.
81 Juwainī, I, p. 148.
83 Juwainī, II, p. 366.
50A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

Obv. (in double linear circle)

Greatest Abu Bakr

Uzbek son of Muhammad.

Rev. (in double linear circle)

Allāh

al-Nāsir li-dīn

Commander of the Faithful.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, nos. 6, ab (written

reverse), 6, ad, 6, ae (margin of reverse), 6, af (with
typographical error amr for amīr), 6, ag (1c examples, not described because of condition), pp.

275-276; Markov, Inventarnyi, nos. 33 (Ardabil?) 34-38 (not described), p. 432; Østrup, Copenhagen Cat., no. L546, p. 163 (wrongly attributed to Abu Bakr; marking over azam on obverse)

(w=8.98gr); Pakhomov, Kladiv, VII, H1799, nos.

84-104 (2l examples with tamghā on both obverse and reverse).

50B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāsir.

The same as 50A, except that obverse die is

stamped on both sides.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, Cl. XIV, no. 6, aa, p. 275;

Pakhomov, Kladiv, IV, H114, no. 83 (this coin cannot be absolutely placed here for Pakhomov indicates it could be one of Abu Bakr as well; there is also the possibility that its obverse may be our reverse, which would offer a new variety, 50C.).
50C. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv. same as 50A.

Rev.

Allāh

الناسر لدين

الناصر لدين

al-Nāṣir lidīn

Commander of the Faithful.

Butak, Regimli, no. 98, p. 84 (illustrated with line drawing and photograph of very poor quality) (now in the collection of the Yapı ve Kredi Bankası, Istanbul, no. 571, in very good condition; d=approx. 25 mm., w=8.30 gr.).

50D. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir.

Obv.

اتبک

Atābak

أعظم

Greatest

أزلك بن محمد

'Uzbek son of Muhammad.

Rev.

[الناسر لدين]

[a-Nāṣir lidīn]

[Commander of the Faithful.]

Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1862, no. 59, p. 56. Despite the lack of tamghas, this coin may be of the same variety as 50A, for on the examples from Copenhagen, no. 49 and under 50A, atābak, is written slightly above the ā zam and could be interpreted as forming part of a separate line.
51X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of 'Uzbek insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, Inventarnyi, nos. 34-38, p. 432; Pakhomov, Klady, II, H120 (three examples); Pakhomov, Klady, IV, H110 (four examples), H1114, nos. 17-28 (11 examples with al-Nasir), H1115 (one example with al-Nasir), H1137 (one example); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1796 (two examples with al-Nasir), H1798, nos. 1-2, H1801, b (six examples); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1984, no. 3 (d=19-25 mm., t=approx. 2 mm., w=6.89 gr.; trace of a counterstamp), no. 4 (d=21-24 mm., t=approx. 2 mm., w=7.29 gr.), H1985 (eight examples); Pakhomov, Klady, IX, H2116, no. 4 (d=19-23 mm., t=approx. 3.0 mm., w=7.77 gr.).

51Y. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins poorly preserved which can be ascribed to either 'Uzbek or Abū Bakr.

A complete list of these will be found under nos. 34X and 43Y above.

In 621/1224 'Uzbek fled Tabriz before the army of the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn, leaving his wife Malika b. Tughril behind. 84 In the next year, 622/1225, 'Uzbek died in the fortress of Alinja in the vicinity of Naxijawan. 85

---


85 Ibid., II, pp. 425-426; on the precise location of the fortress, see n. 11 with reference to Minorsky, Transcaucasia, JA (1930), Section 4, "La forteresse Alindjak," p. 93.
The ruling power of the Ildegizid atabegs had ended. His son Khamush and grandson Musrat al-Din are mentioned in the sources until the 640's/1240's after which they fade into obscurity. The territory of the atabegate was added to the Mongol empire.

52X. AE. No mint name or date.

Ildegizid coins found in the hoards collected by Pakhomov, but not further attributed.

Klady, I, H114 (one example), H120 (one example, H121 (several, irregular), H122 (a large group); Klady, II, H420 (23 bits of oxidized metal), H421 number unspecified), H423 (one example with al-Nasir), H436 (several in a Georgian hoard); Klady, IV; H1098 (one example), H1109 (13 examples one with al-Nasir), H1110 (six examples), H1111 (one example), H114, no. 7 with caliph al-Mustadi (14 others), H1117 (one with al-Nasir), H1118 (one example), H1130 (eight examples, probable), H1131 (16 examples), H1134 (two examples); Klady, VII, H1793 (two examples), H1796 (46 examples, 38 with "atâbah"), H1798, nos. 8-9, H1801 (one example and "five more either of XII-XIII century"); Klady, VIII, H1904, nos. 6-10 (size and weight of nos. 9-10 given); Klady, IX, H2116 (one example, no. 6, with size and weight given).

See supra, n. 21.
III. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The Ildegizids represent an archetypal atabeg dynasty. The progression of Shams al-Dīn from the mamlūk of a Seljuq vizir, to a commander and governor of the sultans, to guardian of a prince of the royal house and, finally, a dyarch of the Seljuq Empire in al-Jibal and Adharbayjān is truly remarkable; yet, it is characteristic of the Seljuq dominated Middle East of the 6th/12th century. The process did not end with the dyarchy. As the numismatic evidence so vividly shows, after the final demise of the Seljuqs in the east, the last Ildegizid atabegs, Abū Bakr and "Uzbek, assumed the title of Sultan, even though they did not possess the power to enforce its authority. Already the coins of Qızıl Arslān struck in the 580's/1180's demonstrated the power and ambition of the atabegs; nos. 26-27 graphically show Qızıl's ability to replace the uncooperative sultan Tughrīl with his more malleable uncle, Sanjar b. Sulaymān; Qızıl even went a step further by declaring himself sultan while Tughrīl was still alive, and though we are not now fortunate enough to have any numismatic evidence to verify this act, there is reasonable chance that some day we shall possess it.
As has been repeated several times in this study, the literary sources on the Ildegizids are comparatively rich. Unlike the other dynasties in this work, their coins are not necessary for identifying the ruling members of their family nor for the dates of their reigns. However, without the numismatic data certain changes in the power and ambition of the dynasty as reflected in the varying titles used on their coins, would not be as apparent. Furthermore, the prevalence of the mint name Ardabīl indicates that despite their involvement in affairs in al-Jibal, they regarded Adharbayjān as their personal territory.

Ildegizid relations with the Abbāsid caliphs are often made clear by the mention or lack of mention of their names on the coinage. At least for Shams al-Dīn and Qizl Arslān the omission of the caliph's name reflected a conscious rebuff by the atabeg rather than a careless omission, e.g., nos. 8, 9, 25, 26. Changing attitudes towards the sultan are also expressed in the same way, e.g., nos. 2, 26, 27. The majority of Ildegizid issues also lack any pious Islamic formulas, even the common formula of faith; some of these do not bear the caliph's name and others neither the caliph's nor the sultan's, e.g., 25, 41-43. Such coins clearly reflect the double foreign policy of the
atabegate; on the one hand they were working to obtain and maintain the power of the Islamic sultanate of al-Jibal, on the other to cultivate the Christian population of Arran and Armenia. The praise given to the Ildegizids by some of the Armenian sources (they are twice referred to as philo christians) bears witness to the success of this policy. 87

The inscriptions on the coins and the hoard finds also indicate an accommodating policy in their minting. In northern Arran, along the Kur, and in Shirvan a very irregular, carelessly struck copper coinage was used, while in Dvin and the area of Naxijawan a regular, religiously inoffensive type circulated, e.g., nos. 8-10, 25, 26. 88

Unfortunately we do not have any scientific information on hoards around Ardabil or other areas of Adharbayjan now in western Iran; however, future archeological investigations there will most certainly result in new and valuable numismatic data, for our use.

---

87 See supra, "Introd.," n. 24 and "Chap. One," n. 73.
88 See supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, E and F, especially n. 158.
GENEALOGY OF THE ILDEGIZIDS

A. SHAMS AL-DIN ILDEGIZ
   *circa* 530/1136-571/1175

   B. MUHAMMAD JIHAN PAHLAVAN
   C. QIZL ARSLAN *UTHMAN

D. ABU BAKR 89
   587/1191-607/1211
   Beshken

E. 'UZBEK QUTLUGH INANJ
   607/1211-622/1225
   Khamush

   Nusrat al-Din

Rulers who struck coins are indicated by capitals; the letter before their names refers to the section the corpus assigned to each.

---

CHAPTER SIX

THE BISHKINID MALIKS OF AHDR CORPUS

I. INTRODUCTION

Coins of the Malik of Ahar were identified in the mid-nineteenth century because of the constant appearance of the city's name on them. Ahar, in Iran today, has had a continuous existence since medieval times; the title malik was the one assumed by these rulers. Thus associating the city with the title produced the dynasty. The continuous mention of the atabegs Abū Bakr and 'Uzbek on the coinage also led to the logical conclusion that these Malik were Ildegizid vassals. Beyond this nothing was known about the dynasty until 1937 when I.F. Petrushevskii published the first monograph on the Bishkinīd Malik of Ahar.\(^1\) In 1951 Minorsky prepared the only other article on them\(^2\) in which he affirmed Petroshevskii's conclusions;\(^3\) quoted more extensively from the same sources (adding other minor

---

\(^1\)"Beshkenidy-Pishtegenidy, gruzinskie melikhi Akhara v XII- nach. XIII vv. (Beshkenids-Pishtegenids, the Georgian Malik of Ahar in the 12th Beginning of the 13th Centuries)," \textit{op.cit.}, \textit{supra}, p. 60, n. 138.

\(^2\)"The Georgian maliks of Ahar," \textit{op.cit.}, \textit{supra}, p. 60, n. 139.

\(^3\)As already stated before, Minorsky does not once mention Petroshevskii's name or the article.
references), and discussed the origin of the name.

In 614/1217 the Khwārazmshāh Muḥammad expelled the Ildegizid 'Uzbek from ʿIṣpahān. His vassal Nusrat al-Dīn Mahmūd b. Bīshkīn led the army back to Adhārbayjān and by so doing enabled his master 'Uzbek to escape with a small detachment. Shortly after Mahmūd was taken prisoner by the Khwārazmians and brought to ʿHamādān. There the interest of the Shīʿah was aroused by the pair of unusually large earrings which Mahmūd was wearing. Nusrat al-Dīn related that his ancestor (jād) was captured by the Great Seljuq sultan Alp Arslān while on an expedition to Georgia, and though they were later released, as mamlūks of the sultan they were ordered to wear earrings with his name on them. When the Seljuq Empire declined these slaves abandoned their obedience and the external sign of it, the earrings. Only Mahmūd's ancestor, who had been converted to Islam, continued to wear them as a token of the benefits of being a Muslim. When the Khwārazmshāh heard all of this, he rewarded Nusrat al-Dīn Mahmūd by restoring him his possessions among which were the towns of Aḥār and Vārāvī, and added to them the neighboring

---

Sarah which was at the time in the control of 'Uzbek. Later when the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn, son of Muhammad, overthrew 'Uzbek in 622/1225, 5 Mahmūd produced the document presented to him by the Shāh's father and without formality Jalāl al-Dīn recognized his claim and treated him with particular sympathy and generosity. Thus Nusrat al-Dīn passed into the service of the conqueror. 6

Qazwīnī has a much shorter version of the same story. After Alp Arslān's campaign into Georgia, a number of Georgian princes were taken prisoner. Some of these converted to Islam and among them was Bīshkīn. "Instead of the ring of slavery..., (the sultan) fixed in his ear a horse-shoe, and his progeny similarly have worn large earrings. As a fief (the sultan) gave him the town of Varāvī which is now known as Bishkin." 7 In another place Qazwīnī adds, "the tūmān [a division of Mongol times] of Bīshkīn comprises seven towns, namely: Bīshkīn, Khīyāv, Anād, Arjaq, Ahar, Telega, and


7Tārīkh-i guzīda, ed. E. Browne, op.cit., p. 441; cf., Minorsky, p. 868, whose translation is used.
Kalaybar. Bīshkīn [the town] originally bore the name Varāvī, but after Bīshkīn came to be governor there, it was called after his name."8

Finally, Ya'qūt in his Muṣjam al-buldān under the entry Ahar says that in circa 608/1212 the town's ruler was an Ibn Bīshkīn.9

From these sources we know of three of these Malikis, the original Bīshkīn, the father of Ṭahmūd, also Bīshkīn, and Nusrat al-Dīn Ṭahmūd himself. We have the name of a fourth member of the dynasty Muḥammad, the grandfather of Nusrat, from his father's coins. About Muḥammad we know absolutely nothing and about Bīshkīn b. Muḥammad only the information found on his coins. Al-Bundārī mentions still another Bīshkīn (Bīshṭakīn), an āmīr of Adharbayjān who sought refuge in Ardabīl in the year 527/1133 during the civil strife between the sultans Ṭughril b. Muḥammad and his brother Mas'ūd.10 There is no further reference to this Bīshkīn.

There does not exist another scrap of historical

8Nuzhat al-qulūb, trans. G. Le Strange, p. 85; cf., Minorsky, ibid., p. 869. Le Strange points out that the names have numerous variants in the manuscripts; I have used Minorsky's reading of them.


10Zubdat al-nusrah, ed. Houtsma, op.cit., p. 165.
information on the Bīshkīnīd Maliks of Ahar except the dates on the coins of the last two: Bīshkīn, 591-2-4-7-1194-5-6-8-9; Mahmūd, 609-10-12-13-14-23/1212-3-5-6-7-26. Both rulers had the title of the Malik of the amīrs, though under Jalāl al-Dīn, Mahmūd took the title of the Just Malik. There is also a curious and still obscure reference to an ṡIzz al-Dīn Abū Nasr...Muhammad on the coins of Bīshkīn, nos. 1-3.

The name Bīshkīn was arrived at by Petrushevskii and Minorsky; its origin is the Georgian or perhaps Armeno-Georgian (to be discussed below) Beshken. This reading should replace the attempted readings by earlier numismatists who tried to see a -tekin/-tegin, a Turkic word meaning lord, as the suffix. Thus: Fraehn, Blau and Karabacek - Neschtcheghin; Soret - Netcheghin; Lane-Poole - Nutshegen; Markov, Pakhomov, Zambaur - Pishtegan; Galiba - Netishehin; and Østrup - Nitsheger. Qazwīnī and by implication Nasawī make it clear that the original Bīshkīn was of Georgian origin. We know from the Georgian Chronicle that a son of Abū Bakr, the Ildegizid atabeg and overlord of Bīshkīn, b. Muhammad, was called Beshken (Bīshkīn) the Brave, which seems to indicate that the dynasties were related.11

11 Béchken, le brave," I/1, p. 443, see supra "Chap. Five," n. 89. K. Chaïkin even thought that there was a possibility of identifying this Beshken, son of Abū Bakr, with the Ibn Bīshkīn mentioned by Yaqūt; "Musul'manskie dinastii...Il'degizidy," op.cit., pp. 36-37; cf., Petrushevskii, p. 589; see also, infra, n. 26.
Minorsky found other allusions to the name, but confused some of the facts in the process. He said the name Bishkin is of Iranian origin, but without stating his reasons.\(^{12}\) He then cited a Beshken from the *Georgian Chronicle*,\(^ {13}\) who was killed by the Turks in 512/1118, and another from the same 6th/12th century.\(^ {14}\) Minorsky also mentioned a Peşğen in the 7th/13th century Armenian historian Stephan Orbelian, whom he placed, surely by inadvertence, in the 9th/15th century.\(^ {15}\) Finally, he referred to the village of Beshkenashen, "built by Beshken," in the 18th century Geography of Georgia by Vakhusht.\(^ {16}\)

\(^{12}\) Nasawi confirms that the first comer to Persia was Nusrat al-din's grandfather of whom no coins have come down to us. The actual founder of the principality, to which he gave his name, was Nusrat al-din Mahmud's father Bishkin. His name, which stuck in the memory of the contemporaries, is of Iranian origin and originally must have sounded Beshken as attested by its Georgian form." *Ibid.*, p. 870; in a note to this statement Minorsky cites a reference to a Beshgen in the 9th/15th century Armenian historian Thomas of Metrope (T'ovma Metsop'aci), this being his only justification for the Iranian origin.

\(^{13}\) Brosset, I/1, p. 360; Minorsky, p. 870.


\(^{15}\) "Circa 1483," *ibid.*, but 682/1283 would be more correct, since Orbelian wrote in 696/1297 and died in 703-4/-1304; see supra, pp. 42-43. The name Peşğen was restored by Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I/1, p. 351, from Pelgene.

In addition the Persian poet Nizāmī dedicated his Iskandar to Abū Bakr, but apparently later changed this dedication of the second part to Fīshkīn, who was one and the same as Beshken the Brave, son of Abū Bakr. Also the court panegyrist of the Ildegizids, Zahir al-Dīn Fārābī, refers to his patron Abū Bakr as the ferocious lion, his majesty Nusrat al-Dīn Bīshkīn.

The name Bēšk'ēn is also found frequently in the Armenian sources. Kirakos Ganjakeți mentions a Bēšken as the 6th/12th century catholics of Alvan' (Caucasian Albania, i.e., Arrān). Also an inscription at Ani dated 611-12/1215 refers to a place (town?) Bēšk'ēnakap ("tied or bound to Bēšk'ēn"). There is a Bēshk'ēn of circa 746/1345


18 Dīwān, ed. (Tehran, 1324/1906/7), p. 334, cited by Petrushevskhi, p. 589, who in turn cites Chakhin, op. cit., p. 37. "Professor E. Berthels, in his recent book Roman ob Alexandre i Yego glavnîye versii na Vostoke, Moscow, 1948, pp. 50-52, solves the difficulty by assuming that Fīshkīn was the name of Nusrat al-Dīn himself. I do not know the authority for such a statement;" Minorsky, p. 873, n. 1. The authority is obviously Fārābī.


in the later Orbelian family of Siunik' and another more famous Bēshk'ēn son of Smbat who died in 842-3/1438.\(^{21}\)
This latter prince is mentioned regularly in 8th/14th century Armenian colophons with the variants Bēshk'ēn, Bēsk'ēn, Bēsgēn, Bešk'ēn.\(^{22}\) Another Pēsgēn with variant Pēsk'ēn is also referred to in a colophon of 847-8/1444.\(^{23}\) Mention has already been made of the Beşgēn in Thomas of Mecop'.\(^{24}\) The prevalence of this name among the Armenian Georgian Orbelians in Siunik' would lead one to conclude that the original Georgian princes captured by Alp Arslan were probably of mixed Armeno-Georgian origin.

What is more interesting than the Islamization of these Armeno-Georgian princes is their pseudo-Turkification. Pseudo- because though they never adopted Turkic names, they did employ on all of their coins a tribal or family marking, the tanghā. As mentioned previously these semi-heraldic symbols were used exclusively by Turks or Mongols originating from Central Asia.\(^{25}\) Perhaps by marital ties,\(^{26}\) or imitation,

\(^{21}\) See the dynastic table in Step'anos Orbel'ean, trans. Brosset, II (Introductory), p. 182.

\(^{22}\) L.A. Xačikyan, Colophons from XV Century Armenian Manuscripts, op. cit., I, index p. 683 under Bēshk'ēn for a complete listing and references in the colophons proper.

\(^{23}\) ibid., p. 565 and index.

\(^{24}\) supra, n. 11.


\(^{26}\) Chaikin had suggested that there were ties of marriage
or by pressure, they copied the usage of their Turkic Ildégizid overlords.

On the numismatic side the recorded coin hoards only confuse our notions on circulation. Since there has been no systematic reporting of finds in and around Ahar, now in Iran, our information is distorted by the exclusive reliance of hoards from the Soviet Union; i.e., the Caucasian areas. Except for one large hoard, the finds have been limited to a few examples. In 1953, an early 7th/13th century hoard of 543 copper coins was found in Derbend, Dagestan A.S.S.R.; forty-two of the coins were worn beyond identification, of the rest, 284 were Ildégizid, representative of all the atabegs, but mostly Abū Bakr and 'Uzbek; 117 Bīshkīnids; four of an unidentified vassal of the Ildégizids; seven Shirvānshāh; 77 Maliks of Darband; and 13 miscellany, including five of a token dirham type. It is difficult to imagine that Bīshkīnid coins were more in use in al-Fāb than Shirvānshāh or Maliks of Darband coins. The only reasonable explanation is that this was a cache of money, mostly of the regular Ildégizid and the very regular and

between the Ildégizids and the Georgian house already in the time of Muhammad Jihan Pahlavan b. Ildégiz which would of course explain his son's name, Abū Bakr Nusrat al-Dīn Bīshkīn, ibid., p. 37; cited by Petrushevskii, p. 589.

27 Pakhomov, Klady, VII, HL799, pp. 45-46.
large Bīshkīnīd types, being carried by a merchant or traveler on his way to the north, Russia or Scandinavia. For such a person the irregular copper pieces of the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvānshāhs would be of little value, hardly worth transporting and hardly exchangeable as money beyond Caucasus. However, we must wait for reports of Iranian hoards before we can fully discuss the question of the monetary circulation and economic and commercial relations of the Maliks of Ahar with the surrounding areas.

The corpus will be followed by a few observations and a genealogical table.

II. THE CORPUS

A. Bīshkīn b. Muḥammad (circa 591/1194-5 to circa 608/1212)


Obv.

Arabic:

The Greatest Atābak

Abū Bakr son of Muḥammad.

Malik of the amīrs

Bīshkīn son of Muḥammad.

Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.
Rev.

لا اله الا الله
محمد رسول الله
على الله عليه
الناصر لدين الله
أمر المؤمنين

There is no god but Allāh.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.
God bless him.
al-Nāṣir lidīnillāh
Commander of the Faithful.

Margin "in circular legend the name Īzz al-Dīn
Abū Naṣr...Muḥammad."

Pakhomov, *Kladv*, VII, H1799, nos. 285-288 (4 examples); the date is not certain.

Pakhomov does not give the legends; I have supplied them from the other coins of Bīshkīn listed below, all of which seem to have the same obverse and reverse field.

With regard to the curious marginal legend on the reverse, all coins of Bīshkīn which I have seen have the marginal legends in four segments and never in a really circular fashion. Does Pakhomov also mean to imply that the obverse margin has a circular legend for the date? It is possible that these early coins were struck with such margins, but not likely. The originals will have to be checked.


Obv.
As no. 1.
Rev.

As no. 1.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, Hl799, nos. 280–291 (three examples).

Again Pakhomov does not supply the full legends, but says that the coins are the same as those dated 591/1194–5.

Of course the obverse margin containing the date must be different. Once again the name ١Izz al-Dīn Abū Naṣr...

Muhammad appears on the reverse, but Pakhomov (p. 49) is unable to identify the person.


Oby.

The Greatest Aṭābak

Abū Bakr son of Muhammad.

Malik of the amīrs.

Bīshkīn son of Muhammad

Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

Marginal segments:

top: struck at Ahar, year ١١٩٤

left: ١٤٧٤... أربع وتسعين

bottom: Defender of the Commander of the Faithful.

right: ١٠٠٠ Ê tamghā.
Rev.
لا لله ما
محمد رسول الله
عليه السلام
الناصر لدين الله
القائد المؤمنين

There is no god but Allah.
Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.
God bless him.
al-Nāṣir lidDīnillāh.
Commander of the Faithful.

Marginal segments:
right: ئيزالدنه
wa'l dīn
left: effaced.
bottom: أمير المؤمنين
Commander of the Faithful.

Soret, RN, 1860, pp. 71-72, No. 1 (three examples used in the reading) (reference to the same coins, Pakhomov, Klady, I, H124); Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 433, no. 1 (not described).

Soret reads Bīshkīn as "Netchegin." He reads a variation on Pakhomov's Izz al-Dīn Naṣr...Muhammad namely Izz al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, but hesitatingly suggests that it is a reference to Bīshkīn himself.28

4. AE. (Ahar). (5)9(7)/1201(?). With caliph al-Nāṣir and atabeg Abū Bakr.

28 "Si la lecture des deux segments Izz edjounia qua eddin de l'avers est exacte, je ne saurais à quel autre prince l'attribuer qu'à Netchechin lui-même; mais alors il se serait donné un double titre, puisque nous le voyons figurer au revers comme appui de l'émir des fidèles." RN, 1860, p. 72.
Obv.
As no. 1.

Rev.
As no. 1.

B.N., M2030 (1898), unpublished.

The coin is in very poor condition with only the first three lines of the obverse readable. There seems to be part of the obverse margin which might be the same as the top segment of no. 3. The notation with the coin indicates the above date, but the reading is doubtful.

5. AE. (Ahar). (5)9X/(11)9(4)-(12)0(3). With caliph al-Āṣir and atabeg Abū Bakr.

Obv.

[A]bn Bk rṣm[m]
[M]bn M[ḥm].[d]
[Ma]lik of[t]e amīrs A... (?)
[Mu]tshkīn (Bīshkīn) son of Muḥammad
[Ab]n Mbn Mḥm[d]
[Ab] Bakr son of Muḥammad
[Amr al-mūs[līm]]

Marginal segments:
bottom: ... ninety.

Rev.
As no. 1.
**Marginal segments:** none visible.

Lane-Poole, *PM*, III, 1877, no. 689, p. 250 (illus., Pl. XII).

In the last line of the obverse legend Lane-Poole suggested the reading عسسراي (?) for نصير, defender. Furthermore, upon examination of the coin at the British Museum only the...of نسرين is visible. For Bishkin Lane-Poole read الشكين, "Nutshegeen."

6X. AE. (Ahar). No date. With caliph al-Nasir and Abū Bakr. Plate IV

Oby.
Same as no. 1, but the last line is effaced.

**Marginal segments:**

- top: ضرب...السنة, struck at Ahar, year.
- right: $\frac{f}{t}$ tamghā

Rev. (enclosed in a double circle, the outer one made of dots).
Same as no. 1, but with Q-Nasir for al-Nasir in the fourth line.

**Marginal segments:** None, but the last line of the legend appears as though it were the bottom segment.

ANS (d=27-29 mm., w=16.83 gr.).

6Y. AE. (Ahar). No date. With caliph al-Nasir and atabeg
Abū Bakr.

Obv. (in a triple linear circle the middle one formed of dots).

Marginal segments:
right: \( \frac{\text{tamghā}}{\text{f}} \).

Rev.
As no. 1, but with 1-NASIR for al-NASIR.

Marginal segments: none visible.

B.N., no provenance indicated; in very poor condition, unpublished.

7x. AE. (Ahar). No date. With caliph al-NASIR and atabeg Abū Bakr.

Obv.
Same as no. 1, but with last line illegible.

Marginal segments: lacking.

Rev.
Same as no. 1, except al-dīn for lidīn.

Marginal segments: lacking.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, vol. I, p. 27, no. 6, ab. (Bīshkin is read "Neschtegin," نشتينكن)

Oby. (in a double linear circle, the inner one made of dots).

As No. 1.

Marginal segments:
right: \( \frac{4}{4} \), tamghā, but facing as in no. 3.

Rev. (in a double circle, the inner one composed of dots).

As no. 1.

Marginal segments: none visible.

Østrup, Cat. Copenhagen, p. 163, no. 1548, with references to Lane-Poole, BM, III, p. 250, no. 689, and, Soret, BM, 1860, p. 71, no. 1; (w=16.54 gr.).

The coin is in very poor condition. Østrup made several errors, reading the tamghā on the obverse as عشر, ten, which he considered as part of the date; he also read Ỉshkīn as "Nīsēgin." Corrections and completed legends have been made from a photograph supplied by the Copenhagen Museum.


Plate IV

Oby. (in a double circle, the inner one made of dots).

As no. 1.
Marginal segments:

top: خربة باهرصة, struck at Ahar, year
right: $\frac{4}{3}$, tamghā

Rev. (in a double circle, the inner one made of dots).
As no. 1.

Marginal segments:

top: سلملد (؟)
left: لنملد (؟)

ANS (d=28-31 mm., w=17.24 gr.).

The coin is very badly struck; the last line of the reverse and the last two of the obverse are missing. Thus far neither George C. Miles nor I have come up with a reasonable reading of the curious reverse segments.


Obv.

...بيك إلا ... [Ata]bāk the Gr[east]
...بوبكر ... [Ajbū Bakr...]
...ملك الأمار ... Malik of the amīr [s]
...كين ... [B]shki[n...]
...لطان (؟) ... [sulṭān (?)]

Marginal segments: none.
Rev.
As no. 1.

Marginal segments: none


The coin is in very poor condition. If the word sultān is read correctly, it is curious and could only refer to the Khwārazmshāh. Perhaps the last line is to be read Ṣāfīr, which would eliminate the problem.

11X. AE. (Ahar). No date. With the caliph al-Nāṣir and atabeg ʿAbd ʿAbd al-Bākr.

These are described as bearing the names Bīshkīn, ʿAbd al-Bākr, the caliph al-Nāṣir, and the curious Izz al-Dīn Nasr... Muhammad as in nos. 1 and 2. They are placed here because, since the dates are not legible; they may be issues of any and various years.

12X. AE. (Ahar?). No date.

Coins of Bīshkīn b. Muhammad which are insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 433, nos. 2-6 (probably with Ahar and perhaps dated 594/1198, see discussion below);

---

29 Either Takash or Muhammad b. Takash; the last Seljuq sultan, Tughrīl b. Arslānshāh, died in 590/1194, see supra, "Chap. Five," n. 17.
Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 301-325 (25 examples, all in poor condition), H1800, no. 1a, with Abu Bakr (w=17.27 gr.).

Markov's no. 1 is definitely dated 594/1198, but nos. 2-6 have his characteristic and frustrating description, "Tozhe - raznykh' matritz'!" "Also - different dies!" Minorsky, ibid., p. 870, concludes, "one of them...bears the date 594/1198," while Petrushevskii, ibid., p. 592, says, "No No 1-6...all 594 A.H. (1198 A.D.)."

The Bishkin b. Muhammad of these coins reigned from at least as early as 591/1194 to circa 608/1212. In the latter year Yaqut tells us that Ibn Bishkin was the ruler of Ahar.30 Perhaps our Bishkin was the grand-son of the Bishkin mentioned by Bundarī in 527/1133.31 The gap of some 62 years does not appear excessively long for two generations. Even though Minorsky seems to have rejected this idea, feeling the period was too long and that Bundarī's Bishkin was still an earlier link,32 one must consider the possibility.

We know nothing more about Bishkin. The identity of 'Izz al-Dīn Abū Naṣr...Muhammad or 'Izz al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn

30 See supra, n. 9.
31 See supra, n. 10.
32 Minorsky, ibid., pp. 871-872.
on coins nos. 1-3, IIx, remains unknown except for Soret's suggestion that it might be a title applying to Bishkān himself.


Obv. | The Greatest Atābak
---|---
أباهك الأعظم | 'Uzbek son of Muḥammad.
أباهك محمد | Malik of the amīrs
ملك الأسراء | Nusrat al-Dīn Māhmūd
نصرة الدين محمد | son of Bishkān son of Muḥammad.
بن بيستکن محمد |

Marginal segments:

| top | [المومنين (؟)] Defender of the Commander of the Faithful (؟). |
| left | نصر أمیر |

Rev. | There is no god but Allāh. Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh. God bless him. Commander of the Faithful.
---|---
لا اله الا الله | al-Nāṣir liDīnillāh.
مهد رسول الله |
عليه الصلاة و السلام |
الناصر لدين الله |
أمير المومنين |

Marginal segments:

| top | نسم (؟) nine |
| left | ستانة six hundred |
Paris, B.N., E2836 (Souchet, Lenoir 1864) unpublished; M. Curie and I (reluctantly) read 609/1212, but the 
١٠ , nine, could easily be ١٠ , ten, for ١١٠/١٢١٣.

Previous numismatists such as Soret, Markov, Zambaur and Pakhomov have traditionally assigned the year ١٠٧/١٢١١ as the first of Mahmūd's reign probably by analogy with his overlord 'Uzbek who became Ildegizid atabeg then. We have no evidence indicating when Bīshkīn died or when his son began to rule except the report of Yāqūt's already referred to, that the son of Bīshkīn was ruling in the following year.


Oby.

............. ........................
أتابك الأعظم
أرك بن محمد
ملك الأشر
نصرة الدين بن محمد
بن بيشكن بن
محمد

The Greatest Atābak
'Uzbek son of Muhammad.
Malik of the amīrs
Nusrat al-Dīn Mahmūd son of Bīshkīn son of Muhammad.

Marginal segments:
top: illegible traces.
Rev.
Same as no. 13.

Marginal segments:
right: ضرب ... , struck...
top: سنة عشر , year ten
left: وستازة , and six hundred

(this may be the same as Ghālib's coin).


Obv.
Same as no. 14A.

Marginal segments:
top: نصر أمير , Defender of the Commander
left: الموتین , of the Faithful
right: ۴ tamghā

Rev.
Same as no. 13.

Marginal segments:
right ضرب تاهشر , struck at Ahar
top: سنة ... ... year
left: عشرة, ten and
bottom: ستمائة, 600.

ANS (d=28-30.5 mm., w=16.76 gr.).


None of the coins of this issue is fully described in the literature, but the obverse must be either like the five line variety of no. 13 or the six line variety of nos. 14A and B. The reverse should be like no. 13.

Dorn, Nova Supplementa, p. 276 with references to Fraehn, Recensio, p. 618, no. 6, a and Bull. de l'acad., III, p. 256 (The coin in question may be the same as Fraehn's no. 6, a, dated 613/1215, see below, with a printing error of 612/1215 for 613/1216 in Dorn); Blau, Odessa, p. 21, no. 244a (reverse top segment indicated: سنة اثنين, year two) with references to Friehn, p. 168 (sic, read 618), 6, a, and Dorn, p. 276; Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 433, no. 7; Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 330-335 (six specimens, Ahar worn off on the last two); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1988 (d=27.5-29.0 mm., w=16.39 gr., t=2.6-3.0 mm.).

16A. AE. Ahar. 613/1216-17. With caliph al-Nāṣir and atabeg 'Uzbek. Plate IV

Obv.

Same as no. 13 in five lines.

Marginal segments:

top: نصار ايبر, Defender of the Commander
left: المومنين, of the Faithful.
right: تامغه, tamghā.
Rev.
Same as no. 13.

Marginal segments:
ri.: غرب، struck at Ahar, year

left: ستان، and six hundred.

top: ثلاثة عشر, thirteen

Soret, RN, 1860, p. 72, no. 2 (three examples) illus.,
RN, 1859, Pl. XXII, fig. 6) (see discussion); ANS
(obverse left segment worn; reverse right segment
worn) (d=27.5-29.5 mm., w=14.93 gr.).

Soret originally read the date as ثلاثة عشر / ستان،
623/1226; however, he corrected it to 613/1216 (RN, 1861,
p. 49, n. 2) on the grounds that the caliph al-Nāsir, who
appears on this coin, died in 622/1225. This really does
not suffice as an argument, for on extant coins of Mahmūd b.
Bīshkīn dated 623/1226 with the name of the conquering
Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn (see infra, nos. 22-24X)
the dead caliph al-Nāsir's name is still retained. Unfort-
unately, of the three coins the one used for the illustra-
tion, a line drawing, is of no help in the matter. The
above details are related because there is reason to accept
Soret's original reading of 623/1226 as tenable; Pakhomov
has in fact published a similar coin, for a discussion of
which see below, no. 24X.

**Obv.**
Field and marginal segments same as no. 16A.

**Rev.**
Same as no. 13.

**Marginal segments:**
right: سنّ ثلاث , year three
top: عشر , ten

Soret, *RN*, 1860, p. 72, no. 3 (originally read as 623/1226, but corrected as above, *RNB*, 1861, p. 49, n. 2).


**Obv.**
Same as no. 14A, six lines.

**Marginal segments:**
top: نصر أبیر , Defender of the Commander.
left: النّونين , of the Faithful.
right: § , tamghā.

**Rev.**
Same as no. 13.

**Marginal segments:** Same as no. 16A.
Berlin, Münzkabinett, no. 3, access, no. 455/1881, unpublished (w=16.39 gr.) (on obverse tamgha to right effaced; reverse left segment effaced); cast in ANS; ANS, observe left segment effaced (d=28.5-30 mm., w=15.9 gr.).


Obv.

Same as no. 14A, six lines.

**Marginal segments:** Same as no. 16C.

Rev.

...god but Allāh.

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allāh.

God bless him and peace (be upon him) al-Nāṣir lidīnillāh.

Commander of the Faithful.

**Marginal segments:** Same as no. 16C.

Fraehn, *Recensio*, p. 618, no. 6, a (no obverse segments given; reverse segments show only part of the right and top); Karabacek, *MM*, 1868, pp. 70-71 (all segments indicated, but not direction of tamghā).

Fraehn wrongly attributed the coin to the Ildegizid atabeg 'Uzbek; Dorn, *Nova Supplementa*, p. 276, corrected the attribution. Fraehn also read (?) al-malik for al-ṭālī, atābek, in the first line of the obverse. Dorn failed to correct this error, but Karabacek did, *ibid.*
Unfortunately, despite Dorn's correction, Karabaceck followed Fraehn's error and attributed the coin to the atabeg 'Uzbek.

Though the addition of wa salam, "and peace (be upon him)," in the third line of the reverse is quite interesting, I would guess that both Fraehn and Karabaceck read more than really was there.


There is no description of the coin beyond the names of the principles.

Pakhomov, Klad, VII, H1799, nos. 336-344 (nine specimens; only on no. 336 is the mint Ahar readable).


**Obv.**

Same as no. 14A, six lines.

**Marginal segments:**

right: \( \frac{n}{4} \), tamgha.

**Rev.**

Same as no. 13.

**Marginal segments:**

right: خرب بآهرا سنة, struck at Ahar, year

top: أربع عشر, fourteen

left: وستمائة, and six hundred.
Bartholomaei à Soret, RNB, 1861, p. 49, no. 26 (illus., Pl. III, fig. 4, a line drawing) (with reference to Fraehn, Recensio, p. 618), cf., Pakhomov, Klady, I, H124."

In the description the date is printed in error as 514 (sic; read 614). This typographical mistake is curiously unexpectedly continued by Pakhomov, Klady, I, H124, p. 53.

18. AE. Ahar. 616/1219(?). With caliph al-Nāsir and atabeg 'Uzbek.

*Obv.*

Same as either no. 13 or no. 14A, five or six lines.

Marginal segments: tamghā, to the right.

*Rev.*

Same as no. 13.

Marginal segments:

- top: عشر ... ست, sixteen (?)
- left: وستانة, and six hundred.


The notation in the box is marked 616/1219. Upon inspection of this coin the top reverse segment was not at all clear. My inclination was to read, عشر عشر, thirteen, for 613/1216, or, عشر عشر year ten, for 610/1213; it may have to be rejected as an issue of 616/1219.
According to Nasawī in 614/1217 Mahmūd was captured on his way back from Ispāhān by the Khwārazmshāh Muhammad, but was later released and granted his former fief.\(^{33}\) The numismatic evidence underlines the events of that year. Up to 613/1216-17 there is a steady and comparatively heavy minting by Mahmūd, but after that there is a sharp decline, almost a stop. For 614/1217 we have the single specimen of Bartholomaei. If we reject no. 18 from the Bibliothèque Nationale, very doubtfully attributed to 616/1219, we have no record of a new minting for nine years until 623/1226. Of course it is always possible that coins were minted in those years without dates or that they have not come down to us. However, barring those possibilities, it would appear that economic and political conditions were so unsteady and uncertain that a new minting was impossible.


The coin is not further described.

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, no. 361.


\(^{33}\)See supra, n. 5 and the text there.
Neither the obverse or reverse field is described, but the inference is that it is quite the same as general type above.

Marginal segments: obverse completely worn; reverse, right: \( \text{ثلاثة (sic for ثلاث)} \), year three
top: ... عشرين و... twenty and...

Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 345-347 (three examples); no. 345 has only \( \text{ثلاثة (sic read ثلاث)} \), three, preserved on the right segment; nos. 346-347 have on the right segment, "in the year three...؟"

If, as it seems, the date is read correctly the coin is very interesting. Two of the rulers mentioned on the coin are already dead and an actual ruler is not mentioned. The caliph al-Nasir died in Ramadān/September, 622/1225\(^{34}\) and 'Uzbek in the same year.\(^{35}\) In that same year Jalāl al-Dīn had already taken Tabriz and Naxiawan.\(^{36}\) How then are we to account for the striking of these coins? There are issues of the same year, 623/1226, which were struck by Māhūd in the name of Jalāl al-Dīn, and without 'Uzbek. Pakhomov suggests it could simply be the negligence of the minters; "less

\(^{34}\) Zambaur, Manuel, p. 5.


\(^{36}\) Ibid.
likely it is the deliberate action of the supporters of the overthrown atabeg, not wishing to acknowledge the authority of the conqueror." Neither notion is very likely. Negligence could hardly explain the cutting of a die with the year 623/1226, especially since we have no other coins dated in the 620's/1220's. The suggestion that it could be an act of defiance must be rejected on the grounds of the immediate acceptance by Jalāl al-Dīn of Maḥmūd's sovereignty over the lands around Ahar. The contrary would seem to be true, namely, that Maḥmūd was waiting for the overthrow of his overlord 'Uzbek by the Khwārazmshāh.  

There is a third possibility; perhaps the coins are really issues of 613/1216 mistakenly read. A similar mistake was made by no less an authority than Soret, who was confronted with the same set of improbable facts. He changed his opinion from 623/1226 to 613/1216. I have myself mistakenly read , twenty, for , ten, on a specimen of 613/1216 in the American Numismatic Society collection. Pakhomov's coins do introduce a new element, the , "in," which appears before the word year. This does not appear in any of the other coins of

---

37 Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, p. 50.
38 See supra, n. 6 and the text there.
39 See supra, under coin no. 16A.
Mahmūd; it could also be a mistaken reading for the هر, of the often found بارحة, "[struck] at Ahar, year."
Until we find more coins or new historical information the questions raised by these coins must remain unanswered.

21A. AE. (Ahar). 6XX/12XX. With caliph al-Nāṣir and atabeg 'Uzbek.

Same as no. 13, five lines.

Marginal segments:
obv. left: المُهِمِّين, the Faithful.
rev. right: سنة ... six hundred.

E. Zygman collection, New York (d=26.5-28.5 mm., w=15.79 gr.).

21B. AE. (Ahar). (6)XX/(12)XX. With caliph al-Nāṣir and atabeg 'Uzbek.

Same as no. 13, five lines.

Lane Poole, BM, III, 1877, p. 250, no. 690 (first line of obverse is read al-malik for atabak, continuing the error of Praehm and Karabacek, cf., supra under no. 16B) (all segments worn).


Same as 14A, six lines.

Ghālib, Naskhīrāt-ī Islāmīyeh, p. 144, no. 186 (segments worn smooth), no. 187 (obverse segments, top: nāṣir amīr, Defender of the Commander; left: al-mu'mīnīn, of the Faithful); Istanbul, Archeological Museum, unnumbered,
unpublished(?), obverse right segment, *tanghā*; reverse right segment *dārābā*; struck (possibly the same coin as Ghālib no. 166); Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, access. Tehran 1956, unpublished (very poor condition, no margins visible); Paris, B.N., M 2036 (unpublished) (obverse segments: *tanghā* on the right and *al-mu'minnin* on the left; reverse segment: to the right *dārābā bī...* struck at (Ahar); ANS, (d=26-28.5 mm., w=16.48 gr.) (part of *tanghā* on obverse right; *bi-Ahar same* at Ahar the year, on reverse right) (d=26-28.5 mm., w=16.8 gr.).

211. AE. Ahar. 62X/122X. Probably with caliph al-Ḥāsir and atabeg 'Usbek on all.

These coins are either not fully described or are in such poor condition that it is impossible to distinguish whether the obverses are of the five or six line variety.

Blau, *Odessas*, p. 21, no. 244b (badly worn); Markov, *Inventarzvi*, pp. 433-434, nos. 8-17 (10 examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, IV, H108 (2 examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VII, H1799, nos. 348-353 (Ahar visible), nos. 362-362, nos. 383 (Ahar visible), no. 384 (in all 29 examples); Pakhomov, *Klady*, VII, H1800 (2 examples; w=14.93, 16.09 gr.); Berlin, Münzkabinett, unpublished, no. 2, access, no. 153/1880 (w=16.40 gr.), no. 4, access, no. 154/1880 (w=16.00 gr.), no. 7, access, no. 154/1881 (16.91 gr.) (right segment reverse: *dārābā bī-Ahar same*, struck at Ahar the year (3 specimen, casts in ANS); Paris, B.N., M 2029 Guillemin 1898, unpublished (obverse top segment: *al-sādir asār*, Defender of the Commander); ANS, (d=24.5-30.0 mm., w=16.82 gr.; in poor condition).


**Obv.**

السلطان الأعظم

MUKBRNY Ṣon of

The Greatest Sultan

MUKBRNY

Jalāl al-Dīn's personal name as it appears on the coins is MUKBRNY. The pronunciation remains uncertain.
Forms such as Mangüberti are derived, according to Boyle, from an etymology first proposed by d'Oisséan from Turkic Mengü in the sense "Eternal (God)" and biri (for bird), "(he) gave," but this etymology is now discredited, he says; J.A. Boyle, "Djalal al-Din Qwarazm-shah," NL2. However, the same author in another place says, "It appears to be derived from the Turkish Mong 'mole' and burum or bariin 'nose' and so to mean 'the man with a mole on his nose.'" See idem, trans. of Juwaini, op. cit., II, p. 434, n. 31, in which Boyle follows the usage of M. Qazvini in his edition of Juwaini, The Ta'rikh-i-Jahan-Gusha, GMS, II (London, 1916), pp. 284-292. Most recently Ch. Cahen, Pre-Ottoman Turkey (London, 1968), p. 127 ff., uses Mangüberti.

41 The tamghā on this issue appears slightly different than on other issues of Mahmūd; the three little prongs seem to be missing or to have merged into a dot.
Marginal segments:

right: ١٢٠ هـ in or [at] al-Dira, year three

top: ٢٠ twenty

left: ١٢٠٠ six hundred.

Soret, RR, 1860, p. 73, no. 4 (illus., line drawing of reverse only, R, 1859, Pl. XXXII, fig. 7) (obverse segment only found to right; reverse, sittania, 61X); Markov, Zavetarnyi, p. 433, no. 12 "Aabar, 6(1)3" and possibly nos. 19-22; Ostroumoff, Cat. Copenhagen, pp. 163-164, no. 1549 (obverse segment only found to right; reverse either fi sana thalatha, in the year three, or, bi-abar sana thalatha, at Aabar the year three (my readings from a photograph of the coin) (w=18.45 gr.). Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 385-394 (ten examples with Aabar worn on all) (no. 385 date 62(3)), no. 386 date (6)2(3), nos. 387-8 date 6(23), no. 389-94 all dates worn); Pakhomov, Klady, VIII, H1988, one example, worn (d=30-32 mm., w=16.60 gr., t=2.0-2.5 mm.). Paris, B.N., unpublished, 12031 (Guillemot) 1898 (obverse segment on left al-mu'minin, the Faithful; reverse, traces at top and right); AME, two examples, no. 12 (obverse: field in double linear circle, the outer one, twice the thickness of the inner, top segment, manir dahir, "Defender of the Commander; reverse field has ḫim for lidin (d=28-31 mm., w=14.77 gr.), no. 13 (reverse field in double linear circle like no. 12 obverse, badly worn) (d=27-30 mm., w=14.90 gr.).


Obv.

السّلاطين الأعظم
منكرنی بن
السّلاطین محمد
المک العادل
محمود بن بیشاکین
بن محمد

The Greatest Sultan
Mukarram son of the Sultan Muhammad.
The Just Malik
Mahmūd son of Bishkîn
son of Muhammad.
Marginal segments:

top: [Defender of the Commander], نصر أمير
left: of the Faithful, المؤمنین
right: (?), تنگٰی. (?)

Rev.
Same as no. 22.

Marginal segments:

right: باهر (?) سنة الثالثة, Ahar, year three

top: [twenty]

left: [وستمانان], [and six hundred].

Markov, Inventarnyi, p. 434, no. 23 (place here on basis of his indication "variant"); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, E1799, nos. 395-401 (seven examples), no. 399 (with Ahar and full date); 396 (Ahar and 6(23)); no. 397 (only 62(3)), no. 398 (only 6(2)(3)); no. 399 (only 6(23)), nos. 400-401 (neither mint nor date); Paris, B.M., unpublished, E.2835 (Souchet, Lenoir 1864) (only obverse left segment, al-mu'minin, the Faithful, visible).

24X. AE. (Ahar ?)(623/1226 ?)

Coins of Mawjud b. Bishkhin with the Khwarazmshah
Jalal al-Din, probably on type no. 22 or no. 23
but insufficiently described for further classification.

Markov, Inventarnyi, pp. 433-434, nos. 19-22 (four examples, probably like no. 23); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, E1800, under no. 1 one example (w=16.15 gr.).

In 622/1225 Jalal al-Din overthrew the Ildegizid
'Usbek; on 17 Rajab/25 July he entered Tabriz. Later in Rabi’¹ C I/March, 623/1226, he captured Tiflis.⁴² Possibly before his march against the Georgians, Mahmūd gave obedience to the Khwārazmshāh and was reconfirmed in his fief at Ahar as related by Nasawi.⁴³ These coins were surely struck to honor this occasion. Whether the mentioning of the caliph al-Māsir’s name was out of ignorance of his death or because Mahmūd or the Khwārazmshāh did not wish to recognize his successor, al-Zahir, who only reigned for a short time from Ramadan/September, 622/1225 to Rajab/June, 623/1226,⁴⁴ is not certain. Some of these coins could have even been struck in late 623/1226 in which case al-Mustansir would have been caliph.

Of more interest still is why this is the last issue of the Maliks of Ahar. Did they stop striking coins after 623/1226? Or did they just keep using the same date? If they stopped minting, why? We do not know; there is no further information in the sources. Jalāl al-Dīn remained very active in the region until his death in 628/1231.⁴⁵ Whether Mahmūd accompanied the Khwārazmshāh on the campaigns

⁴³See supra, n. 6.
⁴⁴Zambeur, Manuel, p. 5.
⁴⁵See supra, "Chap. Two," n. 89 and text there.
of these five years remains a mystery. It has been suggested that perhaps Qazmī’s passage in the Ta’rīkh-i-qusīda implies that the descendants of the Bishkhīmid Maliks of Ahar continued to exhibit their large earrings even in Mongol times, i.e., that remnants of the dynasty survived.46

25x. AE. (Ahar?).

Bishkhīmid coins insufficiently described for further classification.

Pakhomov, Elady, VII, B1800, under no. 1 (five examples, one with date (6)X3).

III. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The coinage of these vassal Maliks clearly demonstrates the decline of the Ildegizid state at the end of the 6th/12th century. The atabegs Ābū Bakr and Ḥūzbek were apparently unable to prevent the striking of coins, a symbol of sovereignty, by this dynasty on their home territory of Adharbayjān, so near to the capital cities of Ardabil and Tabrīz. The Bishkhīmids must have represented very important

46 Minorsky, ibid., p. 874. The Ta’rīkh-i qusīda was written in 730/1330; we know from the same author’s Nuzhat al-qulub, trans. Le Strange, p. 85, that the original lands of the Bishkhīmids were kept together as the tumān of Pishkīn/Bishkīn during the Mongol occupation.
element in the atabeg state. Since Mahmud b. Bishkin appears to have been commander of the army under Usbek as implied by Nasavi in his telling of the events of 614/1217, it is quite possible that these vassals could have obtained the power of the atabegate in the first quarter of the 7th/13th century, just as the Ildegisids themselves took control of the sultanate in the previous century.

The coins, by their large size and comparative regularity, indicate that the Bishkinid state was relatively prosperous. All issues are dated and show the place of minting; they belong to the token dirham type of copper coins minted in eastern Anatolia and northern Mesopotamia during the 6th/12th century.\(^\text{47}\) Commercial and economic relations of the Maliks of Ahar must have been directed toward these latter areas rather than the traditional areas exploited by their overlords: Shirvan, Arran and Mijăn. However, the lack of archeological data from Turkey and Iran make it impossible to be authoritative on this question. The excavations at the Armenian city of Dvin, about 125 miles to the northwest, did not turn up a single coin of this dynasty, although close to 400 Ildegizid coppers were found there. As with every other dynasty treated in

\(^{47}\text{See supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, D, pp. 115-118.}\)
this corpus, the Maliks of Ahar inconspicuously disappear, leaving no trace in the pages of later histories.
GENEALOGY OF THE BİŞKİNİD MALIKS OF AHAR

BİŞKİNİ (I) Enfeoffed by sultan Alp Arslân in circa 456/1064; Nasawi, p. 18, Qaswînî, Ta'Rih-i "Azida, p. 441.

a gap of unknown generations

BİŞҚİNİ (II) Sought refuge in Ardabil in 527/1133; Bundari, p. 165.

perhaps a gap

Muhammad Sometime before 591/1193-4: from the coins of his son BİŞҚİNİ (III).

A. BİŞҚİNİ (III) From circa 591/1193-4 to 599/1203-608/1212: Yaqut, I, p. 409 and from his coins.

B. MAHMOÐ From 599/1203-608/1212 to circa 623/1226: Yaqut, I, p. 409 and from his coins.

The table is tentative in its earlier segment. The rulers who struck coins are indicated by capital letters; the letter before their names refers to a section in the corpus. The justification for the reign of each ruler is given after the date.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CORPUS OF AN UNIDENTIFIED ILDEGIZID VASSAL

1. INTRODUCTION

The coins of this dynasty, or perhaps better, minting authority, since only a single ruler is known, are included in this study not because the numismatic evidence is of historical importance, but almost as an appendix to confirm some general conclusions already arrived at about the economy and history of southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjian in the 6th/12th and 7th/13th centuries. They are all small, irregularly struck copper,\(^1\) apparently lacking the place of striking and date; this information may have been on the original dies, but the consistently small planchets used for these coins have resulted in circular margins which are either completely lacking or so partial that they cannot be deciphered. On the obverse is the name of the unidentified ruler, \(\ldots\text{Hin(?)}\) b. Muhammad with an illegible circular marginal legend. The reverse bears the names of the caliph al-Māsir and the Ildegizid atabeg Abū Bakr.

\(^1\) Throughout this work the term fals, fulūs, has been avoided for the designation of this coinage. In a period and area where neither dirhams nor dinars were struck, copper coins were used as a substitute. We have already mentioned the so-called token dirhams and "barbaric" dinars; see supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, D, esp. nn. 146-149.
These coins were first published in the 1860's by F. Soret and A. Bartholomaei, but the conjunction of the names Abū Bakr and al-Nāṣir and the clear "-ḵīn" b. Muhammad led to their wrong attribution to Bishkīn b. Muhammad, the Malik of Ahar. In the course of the research for the Bishkīnīd corpus, it became clear that no matter how badly these coins were struck, the name on the obverse could not be read Bishkīn. The obvious conclusion was that they represented the coins of a minor independent ruler, in a vassal status to the Ḩildegisids, who probably controlled one of the larger towns of southeastern Caucasus; E.A. Pakhomov arrived at the same conclusion in 1957.

On the coins the -ḵīn is quite clear, though the last letter may be a ḍ, dh, ḍ, or ġ for -ḫīd, -ḵīdh, -ḵīr, or -ḵīg. Visible on some specimens is what looks like an accent sigu above the syllable. The ꞌ could also be pronounced ġ for -gīn, -gīr, etc. The first part of the name presents greater difficulties. It is formed of two letters, the first of which can be b, ḍ, th, g, or ḍ. The second is either ġ, dh, ġ, ꞌ, k, ḍ, or d; on the type no. 1A in the American Numismatic Society it looks most like ꞌ or ṯ, on the Berlin specimen, no. 1B, like ḍ or ġ. Pakhomov suggested B.rḵīn/B.ṛḵīn and...

---

2_II, 1860, pp. 70-71, no. 6, and, RM, 1861, p. 49, no. 25 respectively.

3_Kday, VII, H1799, pp. 51-52.
N. rkin/N. rgin,¹ but B. lkin, B. dkin, Y. dgin, Y. rkin, T. rkin are among the more reasonable of the numerous possibilities. The inclination has been to look for a Turkeic type name with the ending -kin or -tekIn, but the search for a likely candidate should not be limited in this way, for just as Beshken became Bishkin, so too some Iranian name may be behind these enigmatic letters.

The coins themselves, though poorly and carelessly struck pieces of copper, smaller than the dies employed for the striking, are near uniform in size and weight. Some of the coins directly examined appear to have been clipped to adjust them to an approximate standard. Though the dozen or so specimens, the weights of which are recorded, vary from 4.11 to 7.87 grams, both the average and median is a little more than 6 grams. Their diameters are seldom larger than 20 or smaller than 15 millimeters. Therefore, they are of the hybrid type, in between regular and irregularly struck copper, similar to certain Ildegizid issues which circulated in the numismatically neutral area of northeastern Arrân especially along the south bank of the River Kur.⁵ Beside the five pieces found in the Derbend hoard discussed

¹Ibid., p. 51.
earlier, most specimens have been found in or near the Mūqān steppe, that is from the triangular area formed by the confluence of the Kur and Araxes Rivers extending due east to the shores of the Caspian Sea. The cities of Baylaqān (west of the Araxes in Arrān proper) and Kabali would be likely places for these coins to have been minted.

They had to have been struck during the years of Abū Bakr's atabegate, 587/1191-607/1211, and like the Bīshkinīd coinage, which started to appear in the 590's/-1190's, ⁷ they expose the inability of the weakened Ildegizid state to prevent local rulers in their own provinces of Arrān and Adharbayjān from issuing their own money.

The eventual fate of this Ildegizid vassal is of course unknown. He probably stopped minting coins around the very end of the 6th/12th century, about the same time as the Malikīs of Darband. The Shirvānshāh expansionist policy which resulted in the acquisition of Darband, ⁸ in the first quarter of the 7th/13th century, seems also to have brought southern areas, including Mūqān, under the control of Shirvān. ⁹ This vassal of the atabeg Abū Bakr was probably absorbed by its northern neighbors.

---

⁶Klady, VII, H1799; see supra, "Chap. Six," n. 26 and text there for its composition.

⁷See supra, loc. cit., coins nos. 1-5.

II. THE CORPUS

...Kūn (?) b. Muḥammad (sometime during 587/1191-607/1211)

1A. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nāṣir (575/1180-622/1225) and Ildegisid atabeg Abū Bakr (587/1191-607/1211). Plate V

Obv. (in a single linear circle)

\[\textbf{ب محمد} \quad \text{...Kūn (?)}

\text{son of Muḥammad.}

Margin: in a circular margin, the indecipherable letters \(\ldots(?)\ldots(?)\).

Rev.

\[\text{الناصر لدين}

\text{Commander of the Faithful.}

\text{أمير المُؤمنين}

\text{The Greatest Āṭābak}

\text{أبو بكر بن محمد}

\text{Abū Bakr son of Muḥammad.}

Margin: There is no sign of any.

Bartholomaei à Soret, RMR, 1861, p. 49, no. 25 (three examples, illegible traces in the obverse margin); ANS, the indicated obverse marginal legend is from this coin \((d=19-20 \text{ mm.}, \, w=6.56 \text{ gr.}).\)

Bartholomaei attributed the issue to the Malik of Ahar "Netchekin" (Bīshkīn) b. Muḥammad. This is impossible as the extremely clear ANS specimen indicates.
1B. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir and atabeg Abu Bakr.

Plate V

Obyv. (in a double linear circle)
The same two line legend as no. 1A.

Margin: indecipherable letters.

Rev.
Same as no. 1A.

Soret, RE, 1860, pp. 70-71, no. 6 (misattributed to the atabeg Usbek b. Muhammad, but later changed, again incorrectly, to "Hetchechin" (Rishehin) b. Muhammad, RNB, 1864, pp. 56-57, n. 1) (Soret read "Pahlavan" in the margin); Pakhomov, Klady, VII, H1799, nos. 403-404 (w=5.52, 6.10 gr.); Berlin, Hänzkabinett, unpublished, no. 13, access. Gagarin 320/1885 (obverse very clear, reverse worn) (w=6.45 gr., cast in the ANS); ANS, two examples (no. 1, obverse has the marking above Muhammad and fragments of a marginal obverse legend, (?) ; the reverse is badly struck) (no. 2, obverse margin has fragmentary legend, (?) (d=16-19, 13-19 mm., w=4.18, 4.35 gr.).

Soret's reading as Pahlavan is quite acceptable as part of the name of Abu Bakr b. Muhammad Jihan Pahlavan. A case could be made for reading Jihan Pahlavan on the ANS specimens.

2X. AE. No mint name or date. With caliph al-Nasir and atabeg...b. Muhammad Jihan Pahlavan.

Obyv.
Same as no. 1A.

Margin: illegible.

Rev.
"On the preserved part the usual title of the Ildegizids of the end of the (6th)/12th beginning of the (7th)/13th centuries: ...Jihān Pahlavān..."

Pakhomov, Kladý, VII, H₁799, no. 402 (w=7.87 gr.).

Since Pakhomov found these specific words on the reverse of this coin, it must be of a different issue. It is possible that nos. 1A and B had a fifth line in the reverse legend which has not been preserved because the planchets were too small to receive the full impression of the die. Of course Jihān Pahlavān could be a title assumed by Ābu Bakr or his brother 'Uzbek, but more reasonably it is part of their father's name: Muhammad Jihān Pahlavān b. Ildegiz. Since the name of the atabeg in question is worn off there is the very remote possibility that it was 'Uzbek instead of Ābu Bakr; many of their own issues are indistinguishable when worn, e.g., under no. 39X of the Ildegizid Corpus.

3X. AE. No mint name or date.

Coins of the unidentified Ildegizid vassal insufficiently described for further classification.

Pakhomov, Kladý, II, H₁26, the obverse field was read as "...l-qin b. Muhammad" (it was found near Baku); Pakhomov, Kladý, IV, H₁₁₁, one example, worn and not attributed (d=14.0-17.5 mm., found near Baylaqān); Pakhomov, Kladý, VII, H₁799, no. 405, only "Muhammad" preserved (d=approx. 18 mm., t=approx. 3 mm., w=5.86 gr.) (Pakhomov, ibid., p. 51, mentions the weight
of three others in various collections (?) as w=4.11, 5.55, 7.04 gr., and together with those in H1799 an average weight of approx. 6.03 gr. is obtained.), H1801, no. 169 "unattributed label, with the names ... b. Muhammad and caliph al-Nasir," another is mentioned under the same hoard, p. 59 (found at Örenkale, the site of the ancient Khylaqan); Pakhomov, "Monety iz raskopok 1959-1960 gg. v kreposti Kabaly (Coins from the 1959-1960 Excavation in the Ruins of the Kabali Fortress)," Materialy, Kultur, Azerbaidzhana, V (1964), p. 183, (obverse completely worn, reverse "/Atabak/Abu Bakr") (d=approx. 15.0-17.0 mm. on a piece of metal 13.5 by 20.0 mm., t=3.5-4.0 mm., w=6.75 gr.).

The planchets of the coins of this dynasty were probably cast from bevelled moulds of about 20 m. diameter, with a striking surface of 15-17 mm.; the dies themselves are consistently larger.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Southeastern Căucasia and Adharbayjān formed a separate and distinctive entity in a remote frontier region of the Islamic empire during the 6th/12th and early 7th/13th centuries. Protected on the north by the Caucasus and the east by the Caspian Sea, the area was exposed to the influence of the Christian Kingdom of Georgia in the northwest and the Ildegizid atabegate in the southeast. Of its major cities only those along the Araxes River or south of it had active contact with Anatolia, northern Mesopotamia and al-Jibāl. Arrān, in its broadest meaning of the territory between the Araxes and the Kur Rivers, engaged in limited commercial activities with these peripheral cities, as well as with the Georgians and the Ildegizids. The latter states were involved in a major political and military struggle during these centuries. The battle field was Arrān; the prize was the control of the main commercial centers of mixed Armenian and Muslim population: Ani, Dvin, Naxijawan and Ganja.

North of the Kur was the economically and politically isolated core of this Caucasian complex; its two components were Shirvān and Darband. The latter was continually threatened and finally absorbed by the former at the end of the 6th/12th century. Mūqān, the steppe area east of the Araxes and south of its confluence with the Kur, was a buffer area
between north and the south and should be considered as an extension of Arrān during this period. Like Darband Mūqān was also absorbed by Shirvān at the end of the same century.

The cities of Armenia and Arrān, though ruled by Muslim amīrs, were under constant pressure from the Georgians who captured them several times in this period. These Muslim rulers did not mint their own coinage; in Dvin, Naxijawan, and Ganja, Georgian, Ildegizid, Byzantine and assorted Islamic coins from the neighboring areas circulated freely. These cities tried to maintain an independent and neutral status. Likewise, Shirvān and Darband, which were theoretically part of the Islamic community under the Seljuq-Ildegizid protectorate, had close though limited commercial relations with the Georgians and often inter-married with them.

Secure in their forbidding mountainous country, the Georgians preserved a unique position as the only indigenous Christian state in the Middle East. Their power increased as the 6th/12th century matured, yet they never risked a complete break with the Muslim traditions which had permeated the life of many of their own citizens and those of the adjacent areas which they wished to conquer or at least to control. This fact was dramatically demonstrated by the uninterrupted minting of bilingual Arabo-Georgian coins.

The Ildegizids indulged in the same policy of concession towards their Christian subjects, but not so conspicuously. For Armenia and Arrān they struck special
issues which omitted all pious Islamic legends and often
the name of the caliph and even of the Seljuq sultan who
was directly under their own control.

From the end of the 5th/11th century, when the central
authority of the Great Seljuq Empire began to weaken until
the first quarter 7th/13th century when all of the Near
East was brought under the Mongol yoke, the struggle for
power in Caucasus between the Georgians and the Ildegizids
continued unbated. In this study the monetary and political
history of southeastern Caucasus and Adharbayjan was investig-
egated based on the Islamic coinage of the period. The
research has revealed the following conclusions.

I. THE COINAGE

A. The Silver Crisis and Copper Coinage

The major numismatic generalization of the 6th/12th
century, that no silver money was struck in the Middle East
during the so-called silver crisis, has been confirmed by
this study. The monetary output of the five dynasties
examined was completely of copper with only two exceptions
which themselves prove the general statement. The first of
these are silver issues of the Shirvānšāh continuing in
small quantities right on to the mid-6th/12th century.\(^1\)

\(^1\)See suya; the Shirvānšāh Corpus, "Chap. Three,"
nos. 1-11.
This is contrary to the information given in the most recent study of this question which asserts that only in Ghuramid India was silver minted after 467/1075.\(^2\) Admittedly in the 6th/12th century silver of the Shirvānshāh coinage becomes gradually more and more debased culminating in a unique specimen of Minūchīhr II, dated 555/1160, which is made of billon,\(^3\) an alloy of silver, tin and copper. After this issue, copper with increasingly smaller traces of silver,\(^4\) was minted exclusively in Shirvān even after the Mongol conquest when the neighboring areas had switched back to silver.\(^5\)

The other exception to copper exclusivity is represented by three unique dinārs of very base gold struck at the end of the 6th/12th century by the Ildegizid Abū Bakr b. Muhammad.\(^6\) They probably originated from a city in al-Jībāl, perhaps

\(^2\)A.H. Watson, "Back to Gold—and Silver," \textit{op.cit.}, p. 3, and nn. 3 and 4.

\(^3\)See \textit{supra}, \textit{loc. cit.}, no. 13.


\(^5\)\textit{Supra}, \textit{loc.cit.}, nos. 43-47. The Georgians had already minted silver by 642/1245-5, while a decade and a half later the Shirvānshāhs were still using copper; for the Georgian issues see Lang, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 35.

\(^6\)See \textit{supra}, the Ildegizid Corpus, "Chap. Five," nos. 45-47, pp. 349-351; no. 47 may belong to 'Uzbek rather than Abū Bakr.
Hamadān, rather than Adharbayjān proper. On at least one and maybe two of these, the atabeg has assumed the title of "sultān," revealing the Ildegizid desire to succeed their recently destroyed Seljuq overlords. The striking of these gold coins was a futile gesture, an attempt to display the sham power of a state which soon was to decline and retreat before the pressures of its neighboring rivals and finally to succumb to the force of the invading Khwārazmshāhs.

During this silver crisis in the Middle East, the entirely copper coinage of its entire northern belt, including Anatolia, northern Syria, upper Mesopotamia, Adharbayjān, Caucasia and al-Jībāl was divided into two very distinct categories which coincided with two specific geographical regions. West of Lake Urmīya and south and west of the upper Araxes, a large, uniform, and regular copper coinage was in circulation, which was characterized by representational motifs, usually human, on at least one side of each issue. In contrast to this, Caucasia including Christian Georgia, Adharbayjān, al-Jībāl and the other Muslim territories to the east and southeast, remained faithful to the de facto Islamic prohibition against imagery and employed, as was previously the case, only Arabic epigraphy on their coins.

Many of these representational issues, despite their copper composition, were regarded not as fals, but rather as
substitute dirhams struck in lieu of silver. This is attested by their comparative uniformity and great size, and especially by the words "dirham" or "this is a dirham" found on issues extending from al-Jibāl in the east to Anatolia in the west. This fact, coupled with the portraiture, which was vaguely and probably intentionally reminiscent of the Byzantine copper previously circulating in these formerly Christian border areas, certifies that the token dirhams had a definite monetary value and were used for intra- and inter-regional commercial transaction.

Furthermore, the strictly non-representational coined copper of Caucasus and Adharbayjān, was itself separated into two broad types: regular and irregular. The former variety was minted to conform to certain standards of size, shape and weight, while the irregular type was struck without regard to any such criteria, except that each piece of copper should bear some part of a normally engraved die impression. Even among the regular type certain issues are very carelessly and haphazardly struck giving the impression of irregularity when compared to the token dirhams originating from the contiguous areas.

---

7 See supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, D and E, pp. 115-123. The Georgians also employed this technique, putting the word "vetakhli," which signifies a silver piece, on their fractional copper coins; see Lang, p. 21.
The pattern of monetary circulation in Caucasus and Adharbayjān naturally follows the political and economic conditions which evolved from the power struggle between the Georgians and the Ildegizids. This is not to say that the type of coinage minted or used in any area was determined by this conflict, but rather that the numismatic evidence often defined the nature of this struggle. In Darband and Shirvān, the areas northeast of the Kur, only irregular copper was struck, and, as mentioned before, southeast of the Araxes only regular copper was issued. The territory in between the two rivers, that is Armenia, Arrān and Mūqān, was a mixed or neutral region where both regular (predominantly in the southern cities along the north bank of the Araxes: Ani, Dvin, Naxijawan) and irregular (mostly in the northern towns on the southern bank of the Kur: Ganja, Barda’ā, Baylaqān) varieties circulated.

This monetary duality is emphasized by the minting policy of the rival powers. The Georgians issued regular copper for the use in western and southern Georgia, Armenia and Arrān, but also struck irregular copper for circulation in eastern Georgia, Darband and Shirvān. The Ildegizids minted a regular type for use in cities like Dvin and Naxijawan, as well as for southern Adharbayjān and northern al-Jibāl, i.e., cities like Ardabīl and Tabriz. Still a third type, found in
northern Arrān, Ganja, Barda, and Baylaqān, was of a hybrid variety, carelessly struck on angular and distorted rather than round planchets. These have not been found in the excavations in Dvin nor along the Araxes.

The geographical position of the two Ildegizid vassals studied in this work also affirms the foregoing hypothesis. The Bishkīnid Maliks of Ahar, situated south of the Araxes, produced only very regular large copper coins of the token dirham type; they are well struck, dated and carry the mint name Ahar. The other as yet unidentified vassal issued coins at the end of the 6th/12th century which seem to have originated from the eastern corner of Arrān or across the Araxes in Mūqān. They exhibit the expected characteristics of Ildegizid coins from that area, casually minted, irregular, but conforming to certain loose standards of weight and diameter.

In this broad and consistent pattern it is difficult to explain the issues of 555/1160 to 559/1164 of the Maliks of Darband, not only are they among the rare dated strikings of the totally irregular copper group, but these bits of copper bear the word dirāham. Were they really intended to be used as token dirhams for commercial transactions? It does

---

8 This assumption is based on the location of the boards which contain these coins, see supra, "Chap. Seven," n. 3.
not seem likely; coin hoards have revealed that Gesham's Law\textsuperscript{10} was operative in the area.\textsuperscript{11} After all: why should someone have accepted or hoarded scraps of irregular copper, even if they had "dirāham" on them, when they could have saved regular, round and uniform Ildegizid, Georgian, and foreign coins. As was suggested previously these may have been issued to pay a specific tribute or debt which was expressed in terms of so many dirhams.\textsuperscript{12} Another puzzle of these coins, the use of the plural dirāham instead of the customary singular dirham, remains inexplicable. It may have simply been a spelling error, so common in the Arabic legends of this dynasty's coins.

B. Minting Data and Epigraphy

Dated issues are rarely found and when they are it is only among regular copper coinage. Those struck by the Ildegizids are from Ardabīl and have that mint name indicated, 

\textsuperscript{9}See their corpus, "Chap. Four," coins nos. 8-10, pp. 261-264.

\textsuperscript{10}"When two coins are equal in debt-paying value but unequal in intrinsic value, the one having the lesser intrinsic value tends to remain in circulation and the other to be hoarded or exported as bullion." Webster's Seventh New College Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1965), p. 367.

\textsuperscript{11}See Pakhomov, Klaq, VII, B1799; of the more than 500 copper coins found in a hoard near Darband, fewer than 20 per cent were of the indigenous irregular type of the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvanshahs; half were Ildegizid and 25 per cent were the very regular Fīshkīnid type. See supra. "Chap. Six," the text at note 26.

\textsuperscript{12}See supra, "Chap. Four," n. 28 and text there.
the recorded dates are 572/1176-1179-80, 585/1189, 589-1193, 594/1198. Two other issues of Abū Bakkār but without a mint are dated 609/1212 or 619/1222 and 618/1221. All Bishānīid coppers, as might be expected from their regularity, are dated and bear the mint name Ahar. More than 100 remaining issues of these dynasties, mostly of the irregular variety are undated and without mint; the exceptions once again illustrate the general principle. There are the "dirāhem" series of the Malikīs of Darband just discussed; the unique coin of the Shirvānshāh Minūchīhr II dated 555/1160 (supra, n. 3) and minted at Shamākī, which is very carefully struck; another unique Shirvān issue of about the same period, but irregular; and finally an issue of the Shirvānshāh Akhsatān III under the Mongol protectorate, dated 653/1254, but without any mint. The coins of the unidentified Ildegizid vassal bear neither date nor mint.

The actual technique of coin production varied. Most copper was coined on planchets cut or broken off from larger pieces of the metal. However, the Shirvānshāhs and the unidentified vassal used cast planchets. Casting often left an

---

15 Supra, loc. cit., no. 45.
extra globe of metal on one end of the coin from the side of the mould where the molten copper was poured. This gave such coins a tear drop effect. Many irregular Georgian issues also were struck on cast planchets,\textsuperscript{16} suggesting the use of common minters by both dynasties and reflecting the close relations of the two.\textsuperscript{17} The Ildegizid vassal also may have borrowed the same Shirvān minters.

The epigraphy on most coins from this region is similar. The angular Kūfī is still used, but is much broader in its strokes than that utilized in the standard Abbāsid dirham and dīnār of pre-Seljuq times. This is partly a function of the intrinsically ruder quality of copper as opposed to that of the precious metals. Besides this rather angular type there was the widespread use of a very cursive, rounded style of epigraphy; it was especially used on the coinage of the Ildegizid and their unidentified vassal. The Maliks of Ahar employ a semi-cursive or well rounded Kūfī throughout; it is stylistically identical to that used on the representational, token dirham coppers of eastern Anatolia and upper Mesopotamia.

Errors in spelling are never found on Bīshkīnid coins and rarely on Ildegizid coins, reflecting their proximity to the main Islamic culture centers. However, the regions more

\textsuperscript{16} See Lang, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23, no. 10.

\textsuperscript{17} See \textit{supra}, "Chap. Two," n. 155.
removed from the mainstream of this culture revealed their imperfect understanding of both the spelling and meaning of certain Arabic words. Errors such as al-Masir al-dīnillāh for al-Masir lidīnillāh, al-umrillāh for li-umrillāh, Tughrīl for Tughril, and Aslān for Arslān occurred regularly in the Darband, Shirvān and Georgian coinage; this may also indicate that Christian mint masters from Georgia, with a less than perfect knowledge of Arabic, were employed by them.

C. Titulature

The rulers of Darband used the title the Just Malik or simply the Malik. The Bīshkhāns called themselves the Maliks of the aṣīrs except under Jalāl al-Dīn of 623/1226. Māhmūd b. Bīshkhān also called himself the Just Malik. The unidentified vassal of Abū Bakr assumed no honorary titles on his coins.

The Shirvānshāhs were Just Maliks, but also very commonly the Supreme Maliks. The title Shirvānshāh was only used on two issues dating from the turn of the 6th/12th century.¹⁸ For the Ildegisids there is a wide range of titles which change as the political conditions around them altered and to the degree that they were successful in manipulating the affairs of the Seljuq sultanate or winning the favor of the caliph in Baghdad. In order of the greatest frequency they were, the

Greatest Atābak, the Supreme Atābak, Atābak, Malik of the amīrs, Jihān Pahlavān, Shāhanshāh(?),¹⁹ and sultān.²⁰ Thus, these rulers were all Maliks, except the Ildegizids who in addition, by virtue of being guardians of Seljuq princes, were also atabegs

II. POLITICS AND HISTORY

The Ābbāsid caliph in Baghdad was theoretically still the supreme Islamic ruler. By tradition his name was mentioned in the khitbat at the Friday prayer and on all coins. Of the 125 or more varieties which make up the corpora of this work only about ten omit the mention of the caliph's name; these are Ildegizid issues intended for use in large Armenian commercial cities like Dvin where almost all of them have been found.²¹ After the caliph's name that of the Seljuq sultan, the secular arm of the Islamic commonwealth, was mentioned. Prior to the death of the last Great Seljuq, sultan Sanjar, in the mid-6th/-12th century, very often in southeastern Caucasus, Adharbayjān and al-Ǧībāl, both the names of the Great Sultan and the sultan of Iraq were placed on coins. This was especially true of issues of Shams al-Dīn Ildegiz. The most distant of

²⁰ Found on two of the three base dīnārs of Abū Bakr, see supra, n. 6.
²¹ Loc. cit., nos. 8-10, 14, 25, 26, 41-43.
the dynasties, the Malikis of Darband, mentioned the sultan by title, but only once by name under Muhammad b. Mahmūd at mid-century; after the death of İldiniz (571/1175) they dropped all reference to the sultan. This pattern reflected the relative strength of the İldinizids who were the power behind the sultanate in the dyarchy established by Shams al-Dīn. As Georgian influence increased and İldinizid power declined, remote Darband, unfearful of atabegs' ability to enforce allegiance to the sultan, discontinued this outward show of loyalty.

The situation and position of the Shirvānshāhs was quite different. They were the immediate neighbors of the İldinizids and felt their power and authority and at times called on them for protection from external invaders. They were never remiss in mentioning the sultan's title and name; from Alp Arslan to the last sultan Tughril b. Arslanšāh the succession of names was regular. İldiniz's influence in Shirvān was highlighted by the mention of sultan Sulaymān b. Mahmūd, who ruled for a few months in 555/1160, on the unique coin of Minūchihr II already mentioned (supra, n. 3). Sulaymān was originally supported by İldiniz; it is clear that the atabeg was able to exert enough pressure on the Shirvānšāh to have him quickly mint this issue. Coins of Darband of the same year did not honor the sultan. Both İldinizid vassals, the Rūshkhīnids and the unidentified one, began minting after
the fall of the Iraq sultanate; however, the Bīshkīnids placed the title "the Greatest Sultan" on the issues of 623/1226 struck in the name of the Khwārazmshāh Jalāl al-Dīn.

Though the Georgians consistently used Arabic legends during the whole 6th/12th century never did once did the name or the title of the caliph appear, or the word Allāh or any other Islamic religious expression. However, under Khwārazmian rule, coins honoring Jalāl al-Dīn, "the Greatest Sultan," were struck; under Mongol domination both the Georgians and the Shirvānshāh mentioned the ruling Great Khan and his title.  

The actual sovereignty of the Ildegizid atabegs extended to the Bīshkīnids at Ahar and the unidentified vassal. The mention of Abū Bakr and 'Uzbek was absolutely consistent until 614/1217-18 when much of al-Jibāl was lost by the latter to the Khwārazmshāh Takash; according to Nasawī Mahmud b. Bīshkīn was captured by the Khwārazmians and upon his release became a sworn ally of theirs. Unfortunately, we have not a single absolutely verifiable issue from the nine year period 614/1217-8 to 623/1226, so we are not sure of the relationship of the vassal to 'Uzbek.

Shirvān and Dārband were certainly under the political influence of the Ildegizids for major portions of the second

---

half of the 6th/12th century, but never was there a de jure dependency or vassalage; not once was the title or name of an Ildegizid found on their coins. Thus the Maliks of Darband and the Shirvanshahs were able to remain neutral and independent in their corner of Caucasus during the whole century.

If any definite upset to the balance of power between the Ildegizids and the Georgians occurred it was during the reigns of Queen T'amar (580/1184-610/1213) and the atabeg Abū Bakr (587/1191-607/1210). The power of Georgia was at its peak and that of the Ildegizids in decline. Ani was taken by T'amar in 1201; by 600/1203 she had annexed Ganja, Dvin, and most of Arrān. Abū Bakr, tired of these Georgian raids and incursions on his lands, married a Georgian princess in 602/1205-6, but to no avail.24 Losing lands in the north the atabeg moved south and in 604/1207 took Marāgha from the Ahmadīls. In the next year he attacked Ani and massacred thousands of its inhabitants. For the next two years the Georgians in a series of reprisal raids ravaged the Ildegizid lands in Adharbayjān carrying the war all the way to Ardabil and Tabriz.25 The Georgians were now the masters of the lands

24 Ibn al-'Athīr, XII, p. 160; the Georgian Chronicle does not refer to such a marriage in T'amar's time, cf., V. Minorsky, "Caucasica II/1," p. 873.

between the Araxes and the Kur as well as the de facto overlords of Shirvān who were also related to them by marriage. The Ildegizid state was reduced to the area of Adharbayjān south of the Araxes and even there the Ahar region was semi-independent. However, the new arrangement was short-lived; the coming of the Khwārazmians resulted in the downfall of the atabeg dynasty and the retreat of the Georgians back to their mountain strongholds. Political unity was again brought to the whole area but only under the forced conditions of the Mongol conquest.

III. THE ETHNIC COMPOSITION

It is perhaps true and certainly fashionable to assume that Adharbayjān became turkified by the Oghuz Turkomans beginning with the Seljuq invasions of the 5th/11th century. Whatever the merits and proofs of this theory may be, up to the Mongol invasion there is no ostensible proof that these Oghuz elements had any political or economic power in the area. The lands north of the Kur were controlled by a local Arab dynasty in Darband and an Iranized Arab dynasty in Shirvān. The occurrence of the Turkic name Bekbārs in the Darband line was probably due to a passing influence, perhaps by a marriage

---

26 See supra, "Introd.," n. 20.
to a Turkic woman on the part of Bekbār's father Muhammad.
The name of Bekbār's son, Ābd-al-Malik, shows no trace of a lasti
turkification in the area. Even assuming the name Bekbārs was
a sign of a Turkic environment in the ruling circles of al-Bāb,
it appears to be of Kipchak rather than Oguz origin.

The region between the Araxes and the Kur was populated by
indigenous Armenians in the southwestern cities, ruled over
by the Kurdish Shaddādids; the northern and northeastern areas
had a Muslim population, but with a large Armenian minority
and little evidence of Turkish inhabitants in the cities. In
Adharbayjān proper, the Ahar district was controlled by Georgian
converts to Islam. There is no indication of a Turkification
of the Bīshkīnids except their use of a dynastic ūmghā. 27
Only the Seljuqs themselves and their Ildegizid atabegs had
any political power. In Adharbayjān under the latter's protect-
orate, it is quite possible that Turkomans were encouraged to
settle so that they could be exploited as a natural source of
fighting men for the large Ildegizid army. But Shams al-Dīn
was himself a Kipchak and not an Oguz Turk. To the south,
the Kurdish Ahmadīs at Marāgha had gradually lost control
of the land in favor of their Turkic mamlūks; however, the
population seemed to have remained Kurdish during this period.

27See supra, "Chap. Two," Section II, F.
Though we read of nomadic Turkomans in the Islamic and Christian sources, it is clear that besides the Seljuqs, Oghuz Turkic elements had no political authority in Caucasus and northern Adharbayjan after the middle of the 6th/12th century. They did not really take control of the area until two centuries later when, as Il-Khanid rule declined and retreated, Turkoman elements seized control of the region. Perhaps in the 8th/14th century there was an Oghuz Turkification which eventually led to the creation of the present day Azeri language area, but from the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th century, Caucasus and much of Adharbayjan were not dominated by a Turkic ethnic and cultural milieu.

In conclusion the coinage of these centuries not only accurately reflected the primary political and economic conditions in the area - the Georgian-Ildegizid conflict and the isolation and localization of the economy - but it enriched the history with fresh data about individual rulers and dynasties, data which are lacking in the scant medieval literary sources. The numismatic evidence has clearly shown the broad pattern of alliances and allegiances in these provinces and has indicated from what direction more comprehensive histories of this region and its dynasties should be approached. The study has repeatedly emphasized that many of its generalizations about coin types and monetary circulation are based on detailed and well reported archeological evidence.
from the Soviet area of Caucasia, and, therefore, such general statements may be completely invalidated or drastically revised when systematic numismatic work is done in eastern Anatolia and northwestern Iran. There is every reason to believe that new and historically interesting coins from this area will continue to come to light.
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TABLES OF THE REIGNING YEARS OF NEIGHBORING RULERS

A. Abbasid Caliphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caliph</th>
<th>Reign Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al-Qa'im</td>
<td>422/1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muqtadî</td>
<td>467/1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustazhir</td>
<td>487/1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustafshid</td>
<td>512/1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rashid</td>
<td>529/1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Muqtadî</td>
<td>530/1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustanjid</td>
<td>555/1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustadi</td>
<td>566/1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Masir</td>
<td>575/1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Zahir</td>
<td>622/1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Mustansir</td>
<td>623/1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Musta'lim</td>
<td>640/1242 to 656/1258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Great Seljuqs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tughril Beg</td>
<td>429/1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alp Arslan</td>
<td>455/1063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikshah</td>
<td>465/1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>485/1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkiyarugh</td>
<td>487/1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikshah II</td>
<td>498/1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>498/1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjar</td>
<td>511/1117 to 554/1159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Seljuqs of Iraq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahmud</td>
<td>511/1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawud</td>
<td>525/1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughril</td>
<td>526/1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas'ud</td>
<td>527/1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikshah</td>
<td>547/1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>548/1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaymânshah</td>
<td>555/1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arslânshah</td>
<td>555/1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tughril II</td>
<td>571/1176 to 590/1194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Khwarazmshahs

Takash  
Muhammad  
Jalal al-Dīn  

568/1172  
596/1199  
617/1220 to 628/1231

E. Kings of Georgia

Bagrat IV  
Giorgi II  
David  
Dimitri I  
Giorgi III  
T'amar  
Giorgi Iasha  
Rusudan  

418/1027  
464/1072  
482/1089  
519/1125  
551/1156  
580/1184  
610/1213  
620/1223 to 642/1245
THE PLATES

The following photographs illustrating coins described in the corpora are all from specimens in the American Numismatic Society.
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