A Survey of the
ABBASID COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA

Kish, 173 AH. Unique
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INTRODUCTION

The suggested survey* deals with a group of early Islamic, mostly 'Abbāsid, copper coins (Arab. sg. fals, pl. fulūs) produced in the towns of Mā warā’ al-Nahr (otherwise Transoxiana)\(^1\) during about a century from the incorporation of the area into the Arab Caliphate till the formation of autonomous Ṭāhirid and Sāmānid states, respectively the middle of the 8\(^{th}\) – first quarter of the 9\(^{th}\) centuries CE. However, the work does not claim to be a detailed in-depth study, which the material definitely warrants and which hopefully will be done in the future.

The traditional written records from the period under review are rather scanty and the information they provide is neither complete nor entirely reliable; in these conditions, the coins can be considered (and often become) a primary historical source. Recent finds in Middle Asia prove once again that in many aspects they fulfil that need. How meager the numismatic research base concerning those remote ages was until lately, can be seen from the comprehensive Type Corpus Early ‘Abbāsid Coinage compiled up to 1986 by the late lamented Nicholas Lowick. Of the 33 entries, covering the copper coinage of Transoxiana [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–85, Nos. 816–48], 4 belong to Ṭāhir’s governorship (205 AH / 820 CE and later), 14 repre-

---

* A considerably revised and supplemented version of the article “Early Islamic Copper Coinage of Transoxiana: A Generic Survey Focused on Newly Discovered Coin Types”, published recently in: Third Assemani Symposium on Islamic Coins [Nastich 2012: pp. 144–90].

\(^{1}\) Also Transoxania (both terms being of Latin origin), equal to Arab. ما وراء النهر mā warā’ al-nahr ‘[the land] that is behind the river [Oxus = Amū Daryā]’; a normal Russian appellation for the region is Средняя Азия ‘Middle Asia’ (see for instance [Bregel 1996: pp. 1–3], including a concise bibliography of the topic). Although the latter term is not basically recognized as common in Western usage, – possibly because it may also embrace some adjacent regions like parts of the Marw oasis, Khorezm or historical ‘greater’ Turkestan (now mostly in Xinjiang, People’s Republic of China, and partly in Afghanistan), I will sometimes mention it instead of the prolix Mā warā’ al-Nahr or heterogenous Transoxiana/Transoxania, especially where it does not imply an opposition to Khurāsān in the proper sense.
sent doubtful, unconfirmable or plainly erroneous attributions, while only 15 descriptions (viz. 12 different types) of copper fulūṣ struck at Bukhārā and Samarqand alone can be considered reliable. Since then, mostly due to private searches rather than regular professional excavations, numerous coins of formerly unknown types and dates of issue, fabricated in a dozen Middle Asian minting towns, have been detected. Many of them bear the names of 'Abbāsid vice-regents, local governors, commanders, prefects, and other figures who held different official posts in the towns and regions of Middle Asia; some of the names are absent from any other written sources relating to those times.

While becoming established in Māwarā’ al-Nahr, the newly conquered province of the Caliphate officially attached to Khurāsān, and arranging the trade and coinage in that region, the Arab officials did not do that job from scratch, since a number of local states and domains had already existed there with somewhat developed political, economic, and social institutions, including coin production and money circulation. By that time,

copper and bronze coins were commonly cast or (less often) struck at Bukhārā, Paykand, Samarqand, Panjikand, Kish (Kesh, later Shahrisabz), Nakhsheb (later Nasaf/Qarshi), more distant Farghāna, Chāch (later al-Shāsh, now district of Tashkent), [al-]Ṭārban[d] (Pārāb/Otrar) (Fig. 1, a–d) and a few other domains, towns and settlements. Silver coins, reportedly

2 The image set normally reflects the relative coin dimensions. Where possible, image sources and metrological data of the illustrated specimens are indicated in the List of Illustrations.
issued only in Bukhāran Soghd and Tokharistan, were conformed to the so-called Bukhārkhudā[t] portrait type, initially imitating the Sāsānian drachms of Varhran V (420–38 CE). The copper coins were furnished with inscriptions in Soghdian, Khwārezmian (Chorasmian), possibly some other Iranian languages, also in various local writing modifications, as well as Turkic and even imitative Chinese.

With the advent of Islam some of the above mentioned mints were closed, but some went on working, as they adapted or reoriented to the production of Islamic money issues (Fig. 2, a–f). The bulk of regional copper coin production in that period, however, came to the markets of Transoxiana from Bukhārā and Samarqand. Even as late as the middle of the 20th century, “only three mint towns in Transoxiana” were recognized in pre-Sāmānīd times [FRYE 1949: p. 30–31, note 108 (with reference to Ibn Ḥawqal), and p. 34] – namely “Bukhārā, Samarqand and Ilāq (al-Shāsh)”; however, the latter’s putative copper fals dated 166/782–3, mentioned in the cited work [FRYE 1949: p. 35], is in fact a result of misreading, as clearly follows from Tiesenhausen’s footnote to No. 1008 [TIESENHAUZEN 1873: p. 110], let alone the fact that Ilāq and al-Shāsh were adjacent, sometimes joint, but never one and the same entity; on this ground, the Ilāq mint must be eliminated from the quoted list. Properly speaking, the two prin-
cipal mints (especially Bukhārā with its wide variety of the names of local officials) were from the very beginning well-known to historians, as their copper production was represented in relative abundance both in archeological findings and numismatic collections. However, a good deal of transitional issues initially using the Arabic script for coin legends cannot be regarded as Islamic in the strict sense – only because they simply gave place to the newcomers’ language, albeit in some cases the script alone.

The first copper coin type, ‘purely’ Islamic by definition that could belong to local production, must be an undated and ‘mintless’ issue, related to the period between 90/709 – 96/715 and cast (not struck!) in the name of al-amīr al-manṣūr (‘the victorious commander’) Qutaybah b. Muslim, a prominent Arab conqueror of Māwarā’ al-Nahr, whose name is written in the Kūfi script in 3 lines, filling the whole area of one side of the coin (just with the victorious commander), while the other side contains an indication of the ratio with silver coins – ‘one hundred twenty to a dirham’ (مائة و/عشرين / بدرهم) (Fig. 3). Two of the three known examples of this highly important and interesting type are posted on [ZENO: #13823 and #13824]. Based on the findspots of the specimens known so far (the Bukhārā oasis and nowadays Turkmenia), the publisher of this coinage [KALININ 2005] implies its Transoxanian provenance, of which however no direct proof exists as yet; besides, it comes from the Umayyad period and formally falls beyond the chronological scope of the present paper; nevertheless I could not leave this noteworthy and historically important coin type, perhaps the first really Islamic issue in the given area, without at least a brief annotation.

---

3 According to E. von Zambaur, “die Kupferprägen von Bukhārā des II. und III. Jhd. H. zeichnen sich durch eine besondere Fälle von Beamtennamen aus” [ZAMBAUR 1968: p. 67]. As we shall see below, the present-day reality proves the truth of these words not only in respect of the mint of Bukhārā but the 'Abbāsid copper coinage of the region in general.
The ensuing survey embraces all copper coin types (fulūs), hitherto known to the author as issued and circulated in Middle Asia during the period of 'Abbāsid rule, with legible mint names, dates (always in Arabic words, never in figures), issuers’ names and titles etc., identified through direct reading of coin legends or verifiable otherwise with more or less confidence (this set is described in part A: MAIN TYPE ASSORTMENT ...). Real coin types, regularly encountered in the area and presumed to have belonged to local production but for different reasons (mainly for the lack of mint names on them) unamenable to precise determination so far, are also included (part B: MORE PUZZLES TO SOLVE). Separate items are arranged in chronological order, according to the succession of governors of Khurāsān appointed by 'Abbāsid caliphs from Baghdad; as now appears contrary to previous notions, the majority of those governors are eventually found mentioned on the inspected coins. The main description is followed by a brief review of doubtful and unconfirmable definitions (part C: COUNTER-DISCOVERIES ...). Many of the latter ones, recognized as plainly erroneous and thus believed to be non-existent at all, still cannot be completely neglected due to rather frequent mentions in numismatic publications (especially those cited and considered as trustworthy4), and therefore obviously require appropriate comments.

The fulūs struck after 205/821 under Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn and his descendants regarded in many aspects as the first autonomous rulers rather than the last legitimate 'Abbāsid governors, as well as the known earliest copper coins of Sāmānid amīr Nūḥ b. Asad, are not considered in the present work. Equally omitted is the copper production of other Khurāsānian or Khwārizmian mints located in greater or lesser proximity west and south of Oxus / Amu Darya (Marw, Balkh, Harāt, Āmul et al.), although significantly represented among the Middle Asian finds, yet still originating from beyond Transoxiana as the strict geographical scope of my survey.

---
A. MAIN TYPE ASSORTMENT, TURNING TO BE TWICE AS NUMEROUS VERIFIABLE ATTRIBUTIONS

'ABD AL-RAḤMÂN b. MUSLIM
(governor of Khurāsān, 131/749 – 137/755)⁵

The first 'Abbāsid governor of Khurāsān, more often called Abū Muslim [al-Khurāsānī], originally was one of the most active leaders of the anti-Umayyad movement. Numerous copper coins issued in his name, dated successively from 131 to 137 AH, representing four different varieties at least, always with Qur'ān, 42:23 in marginal legends, typical for the coinage of anti-Umayyad rebels throughout the transitional period, generally lack the mint name(s) and thus cannot be attributed with confidence to specific Transoxanian localities. Although tentatively believed to be produced at Marw [Vloten 1892: p. 441; Zambarūr 1968: p. 238–39, notes 1, 5, 16; et al.], they are frequently encountered in different places of Middle Asia⁷ and for this reason should be considered an integral part of local monetary circulation. Nevertheless, three distinct coin types struck in Abū Muslim’s name with dates 131, 132 and 137 AH are excluded from this survey, based on the fact that they do not occur among the numismatic finds in

---

⁵ Some of the following dates shown as the governors’ ruling periods (both in the subheadings and the respective list added below) are tentative due to lack of agreement between the basic written sources on the topic (Al-Ṭabarī, Gardızī, Al-Yā’qūbī et al.).

⁶ Sometimes Nīsābūr (Naysābūr) was also suggested as the mint name, however without justification; see for instance [Guest 1932: p. 556].

⁷ In particular, a number of copper fulūs dated 133 to 136 AH is known to me as certainly excavated or lifted in the regions of Surkhān Darya (ancient Ṣaghānīyān), Bukhara and Tashkent (ancient Chach/Shāsh). The same observation for the region of Bukhārā has even enabled Dr. Boris D. Kochnev to admit that at least part of them could have been produced in those locations: “... le grand nombre de ces fels trouvés dans l’oasis de Boukhara permet de supposer qu’une partie d’entre eux au moins étaient frappés dans cette ville” [Kochnev 2001a: p. 146, note 12].
Middle Asia. However, a detailed review of the entire series is well represented in two apparently most informative publications [WURTZEL 1978: pp. 188, 192–93, Nos. 36–37; BATES 2003: pp. 298–99 and 309].

**No mint name, 133–136 AH (Fig. 4, a–d)**

All available dates of issue show the same uniform type.

Obv. field – لا الله / لا الله / وحده (Kalima-I) in 3 lines; a linear or dotted circle around;

Rev. field – محمد / رسول الله (Kalima-II) in 2 lines, divided with a fancy

---

8 Here and elsewhere onward, ‘Obv.’ stands for obverse and ‘Rev.’ for reverse. If not indicated otherwise, the Obv. field would contain Kalima-I لا الله لا الله وحده (normally in 3 lines; sometimes without وحده, often in different line layout and initially without لا شريك له; later, on the fulūs of al-Ṣaghāniyān after 146 AH and elsewhere after 172 AH, with this latter element), the Rev. field is furnished respectively with Kalima-II محمد رسول الله (generally as in the present description but more often in 3 lines, which is specified in every case).

9 In all cases when letter 1 alif indicates the long vowel ā, it is shown in the phonemic transcription of coin legends as ă. However, a few Arabic names and words, pronounced with long ā but traditionally written without graphic indication (for instance الرحمن، اللهم، ابرهم، ولية and some others), as well as the long ā shown by means of final ‘alif maksūra’, as in yahyā or preposition على ‘alā) are indicated with ă instead of ā – respectively allâh، wilâya[i]، yahyā، ʿalâ etc.
ABBĀSID COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA

pattern (horizontal lozenge, often double-line and with a dot in the centre, and two palmettes at the edges); a linear circle around;

Rev. margin – قل لا اسمكم عليه إجرا إلا المودة في القرية – Qur’ān, 42:23), divided into 4 parts with triple annulets.

Coins of this type are relatively widespread and now represented in many collections [FRAEHN 1826: p. 18, Nos. 3–4; TIESENHAUSEN 1873: pp. 65–67, Nos. 665, 673, 681, 687; MARKOV 1896: p. 14, Nos. 16–18, 21; WURTZEL 1978: p. 193, Nos. 38–41; et al.]; see also ZENO: directory » anti-Umayyad rebels.

ABŪ DA’ŪD KHĀLID b. IBRĀHĪM
(governor of Khurāsān, 137/755 – 140/757-8)

According to al-Ṭabarî, Khālid b. Ibrāhīm was Abū Muslim’s lieutenant, after the death of the latter in 137/754-5, the caliph Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr appointed him governor over Khurāsān; he was killed in 140/757-8.

No mint name, 138 AH (Fig. 5, a–b)

Obv. field – standard Kalima-I لا آله / إلا الله / وحده in 3 lines, a dotted circle around;

Obv. margin – باسم الله امر به الامير خالد بن ابرهيم سنة ثمان وثلتين ومية – bismi-’llâh amara bihi al-amîr Ḫālid b. Ibrâhîm and date 138.

Rev. field – Kalima-II ﷺ محمد / رسول / الله in 3 lines; 3 big annulets ئئئئ in a dotted circle around;

Rev. margin – قل لا اسمكم عليه إجرا إلا المودة في القرية – Qur’ān, 42:23), divided into 4 parts with twofold annulets.

Reference: [FRAEHN 1826: p. 19, No. 10; TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 68, No. 695; WURTZEL 1978: p. 196, No. 46]. Initially I could not find a specimen to pic-
nature in the printed article; now I have two of them thanks to the courtesy of Stephen L. Giles (USA) and Leonid N. Shabaev (Puschino, Moscow region), together with a reminder of another similar piece of much worse condition, placed on Zeno (#108508; identified as ‘Marw?’).

It is worth mentioning that all available specimens display the twofold annulets ‿ as delimiters of marginal text on Rev., whereas Tiesenhausen shows in symbols and Wurtzel tells in words about “four pyramids of three points or annulets” ⚯ in the same places. Both authors, however, seem to uncritically follow Fraehn’s passing reference to his description No. 3 as a type parallel. So my opinion is that it should not go about two die varieties, just about a number of wrong definitions arisen under the ‘hypnosis of authority’, without seeing a real coin.

**No mint name, 139 AH** (Fig. 6)

Obv. field – Kalima-I لا اله الا ﷺ وحده in 2 lines, divided in the middle with a crescent flanked with two 8-pointed asterisks;

Obv. margin – ﷺ علي ﷺ اله ﷺ المودة ۰ في القری (Qur’ān, 42:23), divided into 4 parts with single annulets.

Rev. field – Kalima-II ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ ﷺ 

The mint name was not indicated on these coins, so their actual provenance is not established so far, but specimens of this type are rather frequent among the findings in and around Bukhārā. An identical coin is in Tübingen (inventory No. 91-12-1), which M. Bates examined in 1991 and 2002. The date was formerly identified as 129, but on better preserved specimens (including author’s private collection), 139 is clear enough. The
governor’s name has not been preserved in full on any of the accessible specimens, so the proposed reading is in fact a type reconstruction.

**No mint name, no date** (Fig. 7)

Small module, cast.

Obv. field – abridged Kalima-I in 2 lines, divided as لا اله ا/لا الله, a linear circle composed of merged tiny dots around;

Obv. margin – Qur’an, 42:23: قل لا اسألكم عليه اجرا الا المودة في القريب.

Rev. field – standard Kalima-II محمد / رسول / الله in 3 lines, a dotted circle around;

Rev. margin – Bismi-llâh mimmâ amara bihi al-amîr Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm.

Reportedly found in the Surkhan Darya region (ancient Ṣaghâniyân). Two specimens are posted on [Zeno: #111359 and #111360], two more pieces in a private collection (Russia).

**'ABD AL-JABBĀR b. ‘ABD AL-RAḤMĀN**

(governor of Khurâsân, 140/758 – 141/759)

'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān was appointed governor by al-Manṣūr in 140/758, but soon refused to recognize the caliph’s suzerainty and expressed the aspiration for the autonomy of Khurâsân, which resulted in his dismissal and execution in the following year.

**No mint name, no date** (Fig. 8)

Small module, cast.

---

10 Here and further on, anonymous references to private collections imply that the owners of the cited coins did not authorize mentioning their names.
Obv. field – abridged Kalima-I لا الله / إلا الله in 2 lines, 3 beads •• below, a dotted circle around;
Obv. margin – [امر] [ام] الله من وفاء والعد [ل]...
[amara] Allâh bi’l-wafâ wa’l-adl <...>.

Fig. 8

Rev. field – Kalima-II محمد / رسول / الله in 3 lines, a dotted circle around;

A single specimen, reportedly unearthed in the Surkhan Darya region (ancient Ṣaghāniyān. Despite considerable damage, its principal legends are still fairly readable and alongside the ornamental setting coincide with [Lowick 1996: pp. 386–87, No. 869] (identified as Khurasan, ca 140 AH).

MUḤAMMAD AL-MAḤDĪ, SON AND HEIR-APPARENT OF CALIPH AL-MANṢŪR
(governor of Khurāsān, 141/759 – 150/767 or 151/768;
later, until about 155/772, honorary leader of all al-Mashriq)

In 141/759, the second ‘Abbāsid caliph Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr appointed his son and heir-apparent Muḥammad al-Mahdī governor of Khurāsān. During the next 10 years, most of the copper coins in Mā warā’ al-Nahr, perhaps save for the earliest issues, were normally struck or cast with the names of amīr al-Mahdī (placed for the first time on copper fulūs of Buḵhārā in 143/760-1; see below) and regional officials – amīr = ‘commander’, ʿāmil = ‘officer, agent, clerk’, probably also [local or subordinate] governor’, sometimes ‘prefect’, often introduced by [ما] امر به (rarely or just امر بأمر) or else within the clauses (later more correctly ‘during the governorship of …’, ‘in the presence of …’) (literally: ‘on both hands’), etc.

Throughout al-Mahdī’s tenure as governor of Khurāsān, his duties in that capacity were reportedly performed by his deputies, whose names seem to have never appeared on the Transoxanian coins of the cited period; dif-
different sources offer controversial data regarding their terms of service and even their real number (fluctuating from one to four), so I skip them here as irrelevant to the subject.

Apart from the above-reviewed copper fulūs issued without mint name(s), undated or with lost years, let alone an often mentioned but extremely doubtful mystical fals of Bukhārā, allegedly dated 138 AH and very likely nonexistent (see below), the earliest date fixed with confidence for the 'Abbāsid copper coinage in Transoxiana is 142 AH (759-60).

al-Ṣaghāniyān, 142 AH (Fig. 9, a–c)

Cast or struck on cast flans.

Obv. field – a square lozenge with straight (variant a) or concave sides (variant b) and palmettes crowning each of the closed angles or expanding from the unclosed ends (variant c), all variants with a dot in the centre and a circle of merged dots around;

Obv. margin – bismi-ʾllāh ḍuriba hâdā al-fals biʾl-Ṣaghāniyān and date 142.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a circle of merged dots around;

Rev. margin – bismi-ʾllāh amara bihi al-amīr Abā S.k.rah (?) ʿāmil al-amīr al-Ḥasan b. Ḥmrān.

At the time of this publication, 6 specimens are known, all with considerable defects. The type was first published with partially identified date (14×) and wrongly read amīr’s name (instead of Ḥmrān) [RTveladze 1985: pp. 39–40; Lowick 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 837]. Al-Ḥasan b. Ḥmrān is
known as governor of Balkh (fl. 142–45 AH), both from narrative sources [AL-Ṭabarî 1987: p. 350; Gardîzî 1991: p. 43] and coin legends [Nastîc 2000: pp. 106–07; Lowick 1996: pp. 378–79, No. 775; Bates 2003: pp. 295 and 316, note 38; Treadwell 2006 – Bâlkh and al-Tîrmidh]; (see also next entry). In Ta’rikh by al-Ṭabarî [cited above] this name is disfigured into al-Ḥasân b. Ḥamdân (definitely a lapsus calami). M. Bates and L. Treadwell [cit. sup.], obviously in parallel with C.E. Bosworth (The Ornament of Histories, London 2011) and other English language authors, spell the patronymic as Ḥum-rân, whereas I prefer Ḥamrân, as it was given for instance in [Gardîzî 1991: p. 43]. However, it may well happen that either of the latter versions is acceptable.

I could not identify the person hidden behind the name أبو شكره | أبو شكر؟ = Abū Šakrah || Šukrah || Šakarah? The only known person bearing a somewhat similar name – أبو شاكر Abū Shâkir, mentioned by [AL-Ṭabarî 1987: p. 349], was a warlord called to Abû Muslim’s audience in 135 AH on the occasion of his denial to recognize the rebel Ziyâd b. Šālih; however, it seems very unlikely for these persons to be comparable.

**al-Tîrmidh, 142 AH (Fig. 10, a–c)**

Cast or struck on cast flans.

Obv. field – a broad double circle of merged dots (variants a and b – a regular full-line ring, variant c– uneven beaded ovals), virtually empty, save for a dot in the middle (absent in variant b).

![Fig. 10](image)

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب الفلس بالترمذ (١) سنة اثنين واربعين ومئة bismi-llâh ṭuriba al-fals bi’l-Tîrmîd and date 142.

Rev. field – لله al-ḥamdu li’llâh in 2 lines, a circle of merged dots around;

Rev. margin – مما أمر به إبرهيم بن ماهان عامل الأمير الحسن بن جمّان mimmâ
amara bihi Ibrâhîm b. Mâhân 'âmil al-amîr al-Hasan b. Ḥamrân.

Three pieces are known to me thus far; first published in [NASTIĆ 2000: pp. 106–07]. Ibrâhîm b. Mâhân is virtually unknown from other sources; for al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamrân see above, under al-Ṣaghāniyân, 142 AH.

The main peculiarity of these coins consists in using the Arabic article al- preceding the mint name Tîrmid; as far as I can judge, the cited fact is the first and virtually unique that never recurred in the long and various coinage of this town.

**No mint name, 142 AH** (Fig. 11)

A common-looking 'Abbâsid fals without any special features.

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines;

Obv. margin – bismi-llâh duriba 'alâ yaday Mu'âd and date 142; a double-line outer rim.

![Fig. 11](image)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a linear circle around;

Rev. margin – mimma amara bihi al-amir Muḥammad b. amir al-mu'minîn akramahu Allâh.

The only mention of this type I could come across was in [LOWICK 1996: p. 386–87, No. 850], however without any further data, except for vague references to Tübingen (21mm, 1.93g) and Paris (photo). The represented specimen was reportedly found quite recently in the Bukhara region.

The name Mu'âd, despite its solitary use, seems to be identified with enough certitude: taking into account its relative rarity alongside the frequency of mentions in different sources [cf. CRONE 2003: p. 183–84], I would venture to collate it with Mu'âdh b. Muslim al-Dhuhi – a prominent person in the history of Transoxiana, first mentioned in 149–50 AH among the troops defeated by al-Muqanna', later (in 160–63 AH) governor of
Khurāsān, and incidentally father of Yaḥyā (see below, No mint name, 174 AH). So if this comparison makes sense, the fals under review renders the earliest mention of this actor; just no hint could be detected as to where exactly he could strike these ‘mintless’ coins with his own and amīr Muḥammad’s (governor al-Mahdi’s) names as early as 142 AH.

**Bukhārā, 143 AH** (Fig. 12, a–d)

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines with different layout: لا الله إلا / الله / وحده (variant a); لا الله إلا / الله / وحده (variants b and c); لا الله إلا / الله / وحده (variant d), with or without a dot in the centre; a circle of merged dots around.

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب ببخارا في سنة ثلث واربعين ومنة bismi-llāh ḏuriba bi-Buḥārā and date 143.

**Fig. 12**

Rev. field – Kalima-II الله / محمد / رسول / الله, a dotted circle around;

Rev. margin – امر به الاشاعت فِي وِلَیَةَ المهدیَ العَامِر محمد بن امیر المؤمنین – amara bihi al-amīr al-ʾAṣ‘at fī wilāyat al-Mahdī al-amīr Muḥammad b. amīr al-muʾminin (variant a only); known also without the amīr before the الأشعث (variants b–d) and also with one or more omissions and graphic errors – مِر (1) به الاشاعت فِي وِلَهِ (1) المهدیَ العَامِر محمد بن امیر المؤمن|||| (variant c).

Amīr al-Ash’ath b. Yahyâ, witnessed by coins as governor of Bukhārā in 143 AH and of Samarqand in the following year (see below, Samarqand, 144 AH), is a figure scarcely found in historical written sources. No such mentions are known to [Bates 2003: p. 293], while [Treadwell 2006] refers in this connection to [Akhrâr 1997: pp. 221–22], and Ibn al-Kalbî 1408, p. 264 (till now I had no chance to come across the latter source).

**Samarqand, 143 AH (Fig. 13, a–b)**

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, a 6-ray solar rosette with tips curved clockwise (a tamgha?) below, a beaded rim around;

Obv. margin – يسم الله ضرب بسمرقندة سنة ثلاث واربعين ومنة - bismi-llâh ḏuriba bi-Samarqand and date 143.

![Fig. 13](image)

Rev. field – Qur’ān, 42:23 لا أسألكم عليه / اجرا الا المود/ة في القرن in 3 lines, 3 dots • below, a beaded rim around;

Rev. margin – امر به الامير داود بن كرار [[كراز (؟) فی ولیة محمد بن امیر المؤمنین - amara bihi al-amir Dā’ūd b. K.râr II K.râz (?) fi wilâyat Muḥammad b. amîr al-mu’minîn.

Marginal legends on both sides may start at different points relative to the field legends, as can be seen on the represented images a and b; in particular, 1h, 4h, 12h positions for Obv. and 0h 30', 4h, 9h, 11h for Rev. have been observed.

The type is very common [Markov 1896: p. 16, No. 51; Smirnova 1963: pp.
139–41, Nos. 799–814; Lowick 1996: pp. 384–85, Nos. 838–39; et al.]; known in many weight and size varieties (from above 22 down to 15–16mm), thus sometimes looking like different denominations. According to [Treadwell 2006], Arabic written sources citing amīr Dā’ūd (al-Ṭabarī, al-Balādhūrī, Ibn al-Athīr), reflect his patronymic name in a number of graphic (respectively phonemic) varieties – Karār; Karrāz; Karādh; K.wā.rā; K.rā.rā; etc., none of which can be confidently taken for unique and reliable. M. Bates spells it Karār and insists that the person is otherwise unknown [Bates 2003: p. 294]. Russian authors, evidently following [Smirnova 1963: p. 139], without any explanation or reference call him Dā’ūd, son of Gurāz.

Samarqand, 144 ah (Fig. 14, a–b)

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines;
Obv. margin – bismi-llāh ḍuriba bi-Samarqand and date 144.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a Soghdian tamgha below;
Rev. margin – امر به الاشعث بن يحيى فی الولیه المهدي الامیر محمد بن امیر المؤمنین – amara bihi al-Aš'āt b. Yahyā fi wilayat al-Mahdi al-amīr Muhammad b. amīr al-mu’minīn; known also with a few graphic errors – المؤمنین المؤمن المومن or instead of المؤمنین.

Marginal legends on both sides may start at different points relative to the field legends, as can be seen on the represented images a and b; in particular, 2h, 4h, 6h, 11h 30' positions for Obv. and 1h 30', 5h, 8h, 10h, 12h for Rev. have been observed.


For amīr al-Ash’ath b. Yahyâ see above, under Bukhārā, 143 ah.
al-Ṣaghāniyān, 146 AH (Fig. 15, a–b)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, dotted circle around;
Obv. margin – bismi-llāh ṭuriba ḥādā al-fals bi’l-Ṣaghāniyān and date 146.

Rev. field – Kalima-II محمد / رسول الله in 2 lines, divided with a horizontal lozenge-shaped fancy pattern with palmettes at the edges in the middle, almost exactly as on the coins of Abū Muslim examined above, just without a central dot;
Rev. margin – امر به الامیر ابو عاصم (?) فی ویلیه محمد المهدی بن امیر المؤمنین – amara bihi al-amir Abū ’Āṣim (?) fi wilâyat Muḥammad al-Mahdî b. amîr al-mu’minîn.

The type is still unpublished. Three specimens known, all in rather mediocre condition. The legends could be deciphered only through cross-comparison of all partially preserved portions. The name of a local amîr is therefore postulated without full credence.

A certain Abū ’Āṣim (‘Abd al-Raḥmân b. Sulaym) was mentioned in [Al-Ṭabarî 1987: p. 313] as Abū Muslim’s envoy to Ṭâliqân under 129 AH; otherwise this amîr could be identical with the same al-Ash’ath b. Yaḥyā, governor of Bukhārâ in 143/760-1 and Samarqand in 144/761-2 (see above), whose kunya, according to [Akhbār 1997, p. 221], also was Abū ’Āṣim [Treadwell 2006].

Bukhārâ, 148 AH (Fig. 16)

Cast or struck on cast flans.
Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, a 6-pointed asterisk ★ below, beaded circle around;
Obv. margin – بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الْمُرْحِبِ بِبِخَارَةٍ فِي سَنَة٥٨٠٨ وَقِيْلٌ وَمِثْلَهُ وَمِثْلَهُ bismi-’l-lâh ḍuriba bi-Buḥārā and date 148, divided into 3 parts with annulets having a dot inside.

![Fig. 16](image)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, Bukhāran tamgha flanked with two 3-dot sets ◦◦◦ below, beaded circle around;

Rev. margin – امْرُ بِهِ مُعَمَّدُ فِي وَلِيَةِ الْمُهْدِي وَلِيَ عَهْدِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ مُحْمَّدُ بْنِ امْرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ amara bihi Ma’bad fī wilâyat al-Mahdī waliyy ‘ahd al-muslimin Muḥammad b. amīr al-mu’mīnīn.


Ma’bad [b. Khalil] (reportedly born in Marw and died as governor of Sind in 159/776) was a prominent functionary mentioned in a number of sources (al-Ṭabarī, Narshakhī, Ibn al-Kalbī, etc.); the inspected coin shows that in 148/765 he was acting as amīr of Bukhārā.

**al-Ṣaghāniyān (?)**, 148 AH (Fig. 17)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines; a dotted star-like sign ♦ (variant a) or kind of trident ♦ (variant b) above, tamgha-like sign ♦ below;

![Fig. 17](image)

Obv. margin (instead of the circular legend) – a double linear rim with broad zigzag pattern and 3 evenly placed annulets inside.
Reversed field – مَما امْرِهِ / المَهْدِيُ مُحَمَّدُ بِنْ أمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ – mimmā amara bihi al-Mahdi Muḥammad b. amīr al-muʾminīn, in 3 lines, dotted circle around;

Reversed margin – بِسِمِ اللَّهِ . . . الفَلَسُ بَالصَّعَامَسِ (١) سَنَةُ ثَمَانِيْ وَأَرِبَعِينَ وَمِئَةٍ – bismi-ʾllâh <...> al-fals biʾl-ṣ.ğnāy.n (!) [variant b – بالصَّعَامَاسُ, perhaps due to double strike] and date 148.

Four specimens known so far, three of which are present on [Zeno: #25332, #50418 and #105103). First published in [Rtveladze 1985: p. 39 and pl. I] with wrong attribution (the mint name defined as “al-...ra” and the date deciphered as 146). The marginal legend on two of the above inspected specimens is virtually lost, while the other two expose the mint name in blundered spelling, however, conventionally recognizable as distorted al-Ṣaghāniyān, – unlike the issue of 146 AH (see above), showing the mint name in the perfect way, – apropos, also with the Arabic article =لّا, which was regularly used on the coins of Ṣaghāniyān until the early 13th century.

**al-Shāsh, 149 AH** (Fig. 18, a–d)

Obverse field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, beaded circle around;

Obverse margin – بِسِمِ اللَّهِ وَلِيَةُ المَهْدِيَةِ سَنَةَ ثَمَانِيْ وَأَرِبَعِينَ وَمِئَةٍ – bismi-ʾllâh wilâyat al-Mahdī and date 149.

![Fig. 18](image)

Reversed field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, beaded circle around;

Reversed margin – امْرُ سَعِيدٍ بِنْ يَحْيَةِ ضَرِبَ بَالشَّامِ سَتِينَ بَدْرِهِمْ – amara (or amru) Saʾīd b. Yahyā ṣuḥra biʾl-Šāš sittīn bi-dirham.

Recently discovered [Nastič 2000: p. 107] but proved not to be especially
rare (above 30 pieces are presently known to the author). Actually denominated with the clause ستين بدرهم ‘sixty to a dirham’ (variant a), on some specimens carved as ستين بدم (variant b) ستين بدهم (variant c) or even ستين بد (variant d). Separate dies show numerous other errors and omissions in the legends on both sides, most of which were recorded in [FARR, NASTICH 2001: p. 13].

The cited amīr Sa’īd b. Yaḥyā, according to [TREADWELL 2006], may have been a brother of Ash’ath b. Yahyā, governor of Bukhārā and Samarqand in the mid-140s (see above, Bukhārā, 143 AH and Samarqand, 144 AH).

**Bukhārā, 151 AH (Fig. 19, a–b)**

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, no rim around;

Obv. margin بسم الله ضرب بيخارا في سنة أحدى وخمسين وسنة – bismi-‘llāh ḍuriba bi-Buḥrā and date 151.

![Fig. 19](image)

Rev. field – Kalima-II محمد رسول الله in 2 lines, divided by an oblong decorative cartouche in a way similar to the fulūs of Abū Muslim and al-Ṣaghāniyān, 146 AH (see above); no rim around;

Rev. margin امر به الجهيد بن خلد عامل الامام المهدي ولي عهد المسلمين – amara bihi al-Ǧunayd b. Ḥālid ’āmil al-imām al-Mahdī waliyy ’ahd al-muslimīn.

Marginal legends on both sides may start at different points relative to the field legends, as can be seen on the represented images a and b; in particular, 1h to 2h positions for Obv. and from 1h to 4h for Rev. have been observed.

need to give special references to the design analogies, as those are too numerous and easily accessible from many sources, printed or Internet-posted; compare for example with [ZENO: #58415], dated 151 AH as well; see also Samarqand, 172 AH (subtype A) and Kish, 173 AH.

The title al-amîr, normally used in this position (before governor al-Mahdi’s name) on the coins of other types, is replaced on Rev. of the reviewed fals with al-imâm, which in some dies of this type is spelled as al-âma. Separate specimens show considerable fluctuations of weight (from above 2.4 down to 0.7 g) and size (from about 19 down to almost 13mm), virtually looking like different denominations; however, the absence of more or less regular intervals between the real weights allowing rational multiple values actually discounts this observation.

According to [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 354], Ma’bad b. al-Khalil al-Muzānî (see above, under Bukhārā, 148 AH) and al-Junayd b. Khâlid b. Ḥarîm al-Taghlibî were flogged and imprisoned in 140/758 by governor ‘Abd al-Jabbâr; later, in 163/780, al-Junayd b. Khâlid was amîr of Bukhārā [NARSHAKHĪ 1897: p. 92]. The inspected coins show that he acted in the latter capacity for the first time in 151/768.

ḤUMAYD b. QAḤṬABA
(governor of Khurāsān, 151 or 152/768 – 159/776)

According to [GARDĪZĪ 1991: p. 44], caliph al-Manṣūr appointed Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba governor of Khurāsān on the 1st of Sha‘ban 151/768; [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 361] dated the same event to 152/769, while [AL-YA’QUBĪ 2011: p. 69] mentioned him in the same capacity (his tenure having been interrupted once) but without exact dates. Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba held that office until his death in 159/776. It was during his term of service that the religious leader Hâshim b. Ḥâkîm (apud al-Muqanna’) raised his revolt.

[al-]ṢAGHÂNIYĀN, 153 AH (Fig. 20)

Apparently cast.

Obv. field – an 8-pointed design (octogramme) with a bead in the middle, a dotted circle around;
Obv. margin – 

\[
\text{بسم الله ضر ... صفيانان [سنة] ثلث وخمس مئة (!) } \quad \text{bismi-llâh duro[ba etc. <...> bi']-Ṣağāniyân and date 153 in an amusingly wrong spelling, which allows to read it as 503.}
\]

\[\text{Fig. 20}\]

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a beaded circle around;

Rev. margin – 

\[
\text{ما امر به الا} \quad \text{mimmā amara bihi al-amīr <...>, all the rest is gone.}
\]

Three specimens known so far, the first (and the least worn) one of which, unearthed in 2008 on the citadel of ancient Termez, is now kept in the Institute of Archeology, Republic of Uzbekistan (Samarkand). Its surface has been crudely cleaned, the damaged legends only permit guessing rather than coherent reading; nevertheless, the mint name is fairly visible. The year of issue, had it been actually 503 AH, should belong to the Qarakhanid period (respectively 1109–10 CE), which is absolutely impossible for many reasons, including coin type in general, content of legends, writing style, flan and die/mold producing technology et al. These characteristics are normal for the 'Abbāsid time but never observed in aggregate after the middle of the 10th century.

\textbf{Samarqand, 153 AH (Fig. 21, a–c)}

All real specimens known to me are rather neatly cast.

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, no rim around;

Obv. margin – 

\[
\text{ما امر به حمزة بن عمر ولية الامير حمید بن قحطان} \quad \text{mimmā amara bihi Ḥamzah b. 'Amr fi wilāyat al-amīr Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭabah. An outer circular dorder consists of two lines intermittent with several groups of three beads.}
\]

\[\text{11 The image and general information about this fals are available thanks to the courtesy of my Samarkand colleague Anvar Kh. Atakhodjaev.}\]
Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a tamgha-like arabesque ₣ below, a double linear circle around;

Rev. margin – ضرب بسمرقند في ولية المهدي سنة ثلاث وخمسين ومئة – duriba bi-Samarqand fī wilâyat al-Mahdī and date 153.


Obv. shows two names: Ḥamzah b. 'Amr (a local official) and fī wilâyat al-amīr Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭabah (governor of Khurāsān, 151 or 152 – 159 AH), but Rev. definitely contains fī wilâyat al-Mahdī, who was governor of Khurāsān reportedly between AH 141 and 150 (or 151).

The above specimens seem to make obvious that Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba ruled over the whole of Khurāsān, viz. including Transoxiana, residing in Marw (as indicated in reliable sources), while al-Mahdī retained direct supervision of Khurāsān after his resignation as active governor. As for amīr Ḥamza b. 'Amr, no mentions of his name have been found in the written sources. On the presence of al-Mahdī’s title on the coins of Khurāsān in 153 AH see also [BATES 2003: pp. 291–92 and 315, notes 33–34].

**al-Ṣaghāniyān, 155 AH (Fig. 22, a–b)**

Anonymous, cast.

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a double linear circle around;
Obv. margin – blank, three (?) annulets with beads inside Θ, only partially preserved on each specimen.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a dot in the centre, a circle of merged dots around;
Rev. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا بالصغانيان سنة خمس وخمسين ومية – bismi-llâh duriba hâdâ al-fâls bi’l-Ṣâgâniyân and date 155;

Unpublished. Two specimens are known to the author, both in private collections (Russia). The mint name is written in a normal way.

**Nasaf, 157/9 AH** (Fig. 23)

Obv. field – image of a horse walking left, apparently with traces of saddle on back and an unclear signet — above, a beaded rim around;
Obv. margin (legible only in part) – ...الفلس بنصف سنة سع(؟) وخمسين ...<...> al-fâls bi-Nasaf and date [1]57 or [1]59.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 2 lines, a beaded rim around;
Rev. margin (legible only in part) – ما أمر به للعالم... (? ) ... [ال]مهدي – mimmâ amara bihi al-*ā*im (? ) <...> [al-]Mahdî.

Unique until recently, the badly worn and oxidized coin was published as dated 157 AH by [Kočnev 1984: pp. 193–95, Zeimal' 1994: p. 251, note 51; Kočnev 1999: p. 43, type 6]. Another specimen, also with poorly preserved legends, was posted in 2011 on [Zeno: #102443].
Nasaf (Nesef), or Nakhsheb of the pre-Islamic times, was named Qarshī under the Timurids and ever after. A local official’s name cited in Rev. margin, along with the considerable part of the ensuing legend, however finishing with clearly discerned al-Mahdī, could not be reliably deciphered and identified.

However, I would dare express a wild guess regarding this strange coin. It was issued in Nasaf right at the time when the town was a residence of al-Muqanna‘ (see above, under Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba), a vigorous rebel who was renowned for his adherence to the late Abū Muslim, claimed that he was al-Mahdī (the redeemer and just ruler before the Day of Resurrection) and denied his death. It is not improbable that exactly those events could call for the emergence of coins depicting a saddled horse, which was commonly perceived as an allegory of anticipating al-Mahdī’s advent. Hence, the word seen clearly enough at the end of the Rev. marginal legend, might belong to the anticipated prophet, rather than the heir-apparent, former governor and future caliph Muḥammad al-Mahdī. So my assumption is that the above copper struck at Nasaf, especially if its date of issue was indeed 159/773-4, may well be connected with rebel Hāshim b. Ḥakīm, otherwise known as al-Muqanna‘, whose identity is unconditionally hidden behind the following coin type.

**No mint name, no date** (Fig. 24, a–b)

Cast fals of unusual appearance: both sides contain field legends only, encircled instead of marginal inscriptions with linear circles and annulets.

![Fig. 24](image)

Obv. field – ۠مینمّ آمر به حاشم واشیع Abī Muslim, a linear circle around;
Obv. margin – blank, four (?) annulets ☺ with beads inside, only partially preserved on each specimen.
Rev. field – امر الله / بالوفا و/العدل – amara Allâh bi’l-wafâ wa’l-’adl, ‘Allah has commanded the loyalty and justice’, 3 beads • below, a linear circle around;

Rev. margin – same as on Obv.

The clause placed on Rev. is known since as early as 100 AH on Umayyad copper fulûs of al-Kūfa and some other mints [Walker 1956: pp. 241, 260–61, 278–79, 285], often with the same triangle of dots at the bottom; cf. above, description of Fig. 8.

Hāshim was a personal name of rebel al-Muqanna’ (see the comment to the previous entry). The coin of this type was first established without definition in [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 293, No. 2945]; another specimen was later unveiled by B.D. Kochnev in the State Hermitage collection and subjected to detailed investigation in [Kochnev 1995; Kochnev 2001a]. Presently two more pieces are available on [Zeno: #57386 and 74996]. I have virtually nothing to add to Kochnev’s thorough research and well-grounded conclusions about this important coin type, perhaps only correct the wrong reading اب مسلم into actual ابی مسلم, and what is much more substantial, restore the reading وصی (literally ‘inheritor, feoffee in trust, executor [of someone’s will]’ also ‘bequeathed, conferred, endowed’) instead of the inaccurate ولي waliyy (‘mate, cognate, assistant, representative’), consequently, with a challenge to Kochnev’s discourse into the meaning of this wrongly defined term [Kochnev 2001a: p. 147].

'ABD AL-MALIK b. YAZĪD
(governor of Khurāsān, 159/776 – 160/777)

'Abd al-Malik b. Yazid “became governor in 159, only to be dismissed in disgrace in the following year” [Al-Ṭabarî 1987: p. 362; Crone 2003: p. 174].

Bukhārā, 160 AH (Fig. 25, a–b)

Obv. field, instead of the normal Kalima-I – بركة لموسى / ولي عهد / المسلمين – barakah li-Mūsâ waliyy ‘ahd al-muslimîn (a blessing for al-Mahdi’s son, heir and future caliph Mūsâ al-Hādı’), a linear circle around; the heir’s name is encountered in two variants, differing from each other with writing forms
of the same final letter ي – (variant a) and موسى (variant b);

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بيخارا فی سنة سنتين ودنة – bismi-‘llâh duriba hâdâ al-fals bi-Buḫârâ and date 160.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, palmettes ۰ above and ۱ below, a linear circle around;


Different authors dealing with the topic suggest various readings of the name عبده: ‘Abda, ‘Abadah, ‘Abdat and so on. My opinion is that it should be spelled عبده ‘Abduhu – literally ‘His (viz. God’s) slave’ – a fairly common praenomen among the Muslims of Arab origin in the ‘Abbâsid period, being a specific synonym of ‘Abd Allâh, ‘Abd Rabbihi and a number of other theophoric proper nouns.

**Temp. AL-FAḌL b. SULAYMÂN**

(governor of Khurâsân, 166/783 – 171/786)

al-Faḍl b. Sulaymân was appointed by caliph al-Mahdî to Khurâsân, where he stayed until the early years of Hârûn (AL-ṬABÂRĪ 1987: pp. 364–65; AL-YA’QÛBĪ 2011: p. 70).

**al-Ṣagh[ān]iyān (?)**, 166 AH (Fig. 26)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, no circle around;

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالصعيان (؟) سنة ست وستين ودنة – bismi-‘llâh duriba hâdâ al-fals bi’l-Ṣağiyyān (?) and date 166.
A single known specimen is posted on [Zeno: #93027]. The mint name is somewhat blundered but believed to denote al-Ṣagāniyān; for instance, see above, al-Ṣaghāniyān (?), 148 AH.

The officer’s name mentioned on the coin – ‘Amr b. Ǧamāl || Ǧamāl (?) seems to fit with Gardizi’s story about some ‘Amr b. Ǧamīl (sic), belonging to 179 AH [GARDĪZĪ 1991: p. 48–49], meanwhile the coin has the clear date 166. According to [BOSWORTH 1981: p. 3], ‘an ‘Abbasid deputy governor of Khurasan, ‘Umar b. Jamīl, is said to have made Chaghāniyān his special base in 179/795 when his protector al-Ḍa‘l b. Yahyā al-Barmakī was removed from the governorship of the east by Hārūn ar-Rashīd’. The patronymic of ‘Amr is shown on the coin without ḯ between mīm and final lām, so one may suppose either an engraver’s error or a slip in Gardizi’s text; I would prefer the latter, simply because contemporary coin legends are expected to be more precise than a manuscript composed two and a half centuries later… In short, it seems obvious that the person named ‘Amr b. Ǧamāl belonged to the ruling elite of al-Ṣaghāniyān at least since 166/783, consequently much earlier than the narrative source indicated, – sure unless it was a different person with similar name; however, the latter assumption looks rather far-fetched.

**JA’FAR b. MUḤAMMAD**

(governor of Khurāsān, 171/787 – 173/789)

Ja’far b. Muḥammad was appointed governor of Khurāsān by the heir-apparent Hārūn on behalf of caliph Mūsā al-Hādī [AL-YA’QUBĪ 2011: p. 70]; his governorship ended in 173 when Hārūn, then already caliph al-Rashīd,
withdrew him from that office in favour of his son al-'Abbās [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 365].

**Samarqand, 172 AH**

Two closely similar subtypes, however are differing fundamentally through the additional mention of a certain person on one of them.

**Subtype A (Fig. 27, a–b)**

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, no circle around;

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بسرقندة سنة اثنتين وسبعين وسنة bismi-ʿllāh ṣuriba hâdâ al-fals bi-Samarqand and date 172.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, عدل ʿadil below, a beaded circle around;

Rev. margin – مما أمر به الأمير جعفر بن محمد علي يدّ مسعوده بن بجير mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Gaʿfar b. Muḥammad ʿalâ yaday Masʿadah b. Buḥayr.

A well-known type [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 129, No. 1164; MARKOV 1896: p. 27, Nos. 366–67; NÜTZEL : pp. 378–79, No. 2181a; KALININ, TREADWELL 2004: p. 16; SNAT 2008: pp. 62–63, No. 574; ANS, No. 1917.215.68]. Next after Bukhārā, 151 AH (see above), it stands out from other copper coins of the time due to unusual appearance and writing style: “The calligraphy is very similar to the Abbasid dinars of the late 160s and early 170s. Could it be that the dies were cut in Baghdad (Madīnat al-Salām) and shipped to Samarqand, or an engraver from Baghdad or Cairo was sent to Samarqand to continue his practice?” [ALBUM 2011a: Lot 443].

The patronymic of the cited official Masʿada [al-Bakrī], shown on the coins in undotted Kufi as بعجار, was usually read in a wrong way: Buḥayr [NASAFĪ 1999: p. 231, No. 378], Yahyâ [LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, Nos. 844–45 (Limbada’s collection, London); SNAT 2008: No. 574], Zuhayr [SHAMMA 1998:
p. 334, No.(4)], or otherwise. The currently accepted version Buğayr, although looking like a facetious nickname rather than the official noun (literally ‘stout, fat’), still seems to be closest to the truth.

**Subtype B (Fig. 28)**

Similar to subtype A but designed in the style more common for copper coins of the time.

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, عبد ‘adil below, a beaded circle around;

![Fig. 28]

Obv. margin – same as in subtype A, the only difference being ثنتين instead of اثنين in the date.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines; فتح Fatḥ (instead of عبد ‘adil on subtype A) below, a beaded circle around;

Rev. margin – ميممَا بيحي **بي** معادم مُّحَمَّد على يد مسعود بن وجیر ـ mimmā bihi al-amīr Ġa’far b. Muḥannad ‘alā yaday Mas‘ādah b. Buğayr.

Unpublished. Dr. A. Atakhodjaev’s observation shows that this variety is much rarer (about 1:50) than the previous one (subtype A)\(^1\), which is supposed to mean that at least a few more specimens should exist.

According to [NASAFĪ 1999: p. 669, No. 1177], one of Mas’ada’s sons was called *Fatḥ*; it seems reasonable to connect the word فتح on the present fals with that person.

**Bukhārā, 173 AH (Fig. 29, a–b)**

Obv. field, instead of the usual Kalima-I – بركة / لهرون أمير / المؤمنين – barakah li-Hârūn amīr al-mu’minīn (a blessing for the newly enthroned

\(^1\) A. Atakhodjaev’s personal e-mail to the author (a thread dated 29 Jan. – 11 Feb. 2012).
caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; compare with Bukhārā, 160 AH), a linear circle around;
Obv. margin: بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بخارا سنة ثلاث وسبعين ومئة – bismi-ʾllāh ʿuriba ḥāḏa al-fals bi-Buḫārā and date 173; a legend variety is identified without فی this الفلس and with additional سنة before [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 130, No. 1180].

Fig. 29

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a linear circle around;
Rev. margin: مما امر به محمد بن عمر عامل الأمير جعفر بن محمد – mimmā amara bihi Muḥammad b. 'Amr ʿāmil al-amīr Ġaʿfar b. Muḥammad.

The type is long known [Fraehn 1826: pp. 12–13, No. 141; Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 130, Nos. 1179–80; Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 828; Shamma 1998: p. 329, No.(11)] but seems not to be very common. The name Muḥammad b. 'Amr is not encountered in other written sources.

**Kish, 173 AH (Fig. 30)**

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, no circle around;
Obv. margin: بسم الله ضرب [هذا الفلس بكش سنة ثلاث وسبعين ومئة] bismi-ʾllāh ʿuriba ḥāḏa al-fals bi-Kish and date 173, no circle around.

Fig. 30

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, عدل ʿadil below, a beaded circle around;
Rev. margin: مما امر به الأمير جعفر بن محمد على يدي ... أره (؟) مولى أمير المؤمنين – mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Ġaʿfar b. Muḥammad ʿalā yaday ...ārī (?) mawlā amīr al-muʾminīn.
Unique, this coin was unknown before this survey. Acquired in the Moscow coin market (May 2011), now in the author’s collection; also on Zeno: #100891.

The same unusual ‘gold dinar’ calligraphy (if not the same hand) as on Samarkand, 172 AH, subtype A. The local officer’s name, although badly spoiled through casting defect, still seems likely to be Yahyā, definitely following with the prestigious title mawlâ amîr al-mu’minîn.

**Temp. AL-‘ABBĀS b. JA’FAR**

(governor of Khurāsān, 173/789 – 175/791)

**No mint name, 174 AH** (Fig. 31)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, no inner circle;

Obv. margin – بسم الله ﷺ مامير به يحيى بن معاذ سنة اربع وسبعين ومائة ﷺ bismi-llâh mimmâ amara bihi Yahyâ b. Mu‘âd and date 174; an outer linear rim with 7 annulets around (only partly preserved on the available specimens).

![Fig. 31](image)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, Kufic ﷺ above, يحيى Yahyâ below, a thin linear circle around;

Rev. margin – محمد رسول الله porelba al-hadîdî yahye bihim al-hikmah li’lam al-adîn wahâl v’lou krer miskrûn (Qur’ân, 9:33), an outer linear circle with 6 beads on it.

Several specimens known [Markov 1896: p. 27, No. 381; Lowick 1996: pp. 386–87, No. 853; ANS, No. 1971.316.21; et al.]. Rich information about Yahyâ b. Mu‘âd b. Muslim based on different written sources is available in [Crone 2003: p. 184]. According to [Gardîzî 1991: p. 48], caliph Harun gave control of Khurāsān to al-Faḍl b. Yahyâ al-Barmakî who sent Yahyâ b. Mu‘âd to govern there on his behalf in Ramaḍān 177/December 793, which office the latter probably occupied for a few months until al-Faḍl’s arrival there early next year. However, the inspected coin is dated at least
three years before those events when the person named on it should reportedly have been in Jurjān or elsewhere, and in addition it is devoid of the mint name, just given that it was found in the Bukhārā region. On the other hand, taking into account that the dates reported by Gardīzī are very often far from exact, I decided to include this rare type, together with the previous one struck apparently in the name of his father, as related anyhow to the numismatic history of ‘Middle Asia’.

Temp. ḤAMZA b. MALIK
(governor of Khurāsān, 176/792 – 177/793-4)


al-Khuttal, 177 AH (Fig. 32, a-b)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines;
Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالخط ستين سبع وسبعين ومنعة bismi-’l-lâh ḍuriba ḥâḍā al-fals bi’l-Ḥuttal and date 177.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a dotted circle around;
Rev. margin – (؟) بین الحسن عامل الامیر منیف (؟) mimām āmara bihi al-amīr H.*d.r (?). al-Ḥasan ’āmil al-amīr Munīf(?)

Al-Khuttal is a district in Tokharistan with Hulbuk for capital.
Recently discovered, the type is now represented by 4 specimens with clear and unambiguous mint name, all posted on [Zeno: #93024 to 93026, #112432]; however, both names mentioned (where preserved) in the marginal legend on Rev. allow reading of the otherwise obscure legend.
'ALĪ b. 'ĪSA
(governor of Khurāsān, 183/799 – 191/806)

A notorious figure, ill-famed for his exquisite brutality and embezzlement, whose personality and deeds met a detailed account in the basic sources [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: pp. 367–70; GARDĪZI 1991: pp. 49–53; AL-YA’QUBĪ 2011: pp. 70–71; TA’RĪKH-I SĪSTĀN 1974: pp. 166, 427]. “<...> Hārūn appointed 'Alī b. 'Īsā b. Māhān to Khurāsān where he misgoverned the province for eight years, accumulating vast wealth and fighting a spate of rebels until he was finally replaced by Harthama” [CRONE 2003: p. 178].

Bukhārā, 185 AH (Fig. 33, a–b)

Apparently struck on cast flans and partly cast.
Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a linear circle around;
Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس ببخارا سنة خمس وثماني ومئة – bismi-llâh ḍuriba hâdā al-fals bi-Buḥārā and date 185.

Fig. 33

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, palmette ﺗ and date 185 above the upper line, ﺛир below, a linear circle around;
Rev. margin – امر به الامير علي بن عيسى ابقاه الله في ولاية سعيد بن جعفر – amara bihi al-amīr ‘Alī b. ‘Īsâ abqâhu Allâh fī wilāyat Sa’īd b. Ǧa’far. The word wilāyat is written with alif, unlike in the most of other cases.

The type is long known [FRAEHN 1826: p. 25, No. 200; TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 155–56, No. 1391; MARKOV 1896: p. 31, Nos. 491–92; LOWICK 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 829; SHAMMA 1998: p. 329, No.(12); et al.]. Sa’id b. Ja’far’s name was not found in the written sources.
‘ABD ALLĀH AL-MA’MŪN, SON AND HEIR-APPARENT OF CALIPH HÂRŪN AL-RASHĪD
(honorary leader of all al-Mashriq, 186/802 – 198/813 AH)

Binkath, 186 AH (Fig. 34, a-b)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines with the line 1 partly retrograde لا مالا (actually mirrorwise reverted), a thick linear circle around;
Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بينكت سنة ست وثمانين وبالله ( ! ) – 
‘bismi-‘llâh ‘duriba hâdā al-fals bi-Binkat’ and date 186; the deformed word for ‘hundred’ (normally مائة or مئة).

Fig. 34

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, a swastika with rounded hooks ❀ below, a thick linear circle around;
Rev. margin – بسم الله ماما أمر به الامير سباع بن مسعدة إبفاه الله – ‘bismi-‘llâh mimmâ amara bihi al-amîr Sibā’ b. Mas‘ada abqâhu Allâh.

Unique until recently [KALININ, TREADWELL 2004: p. 15–16], today this important coin is known at least in 3 specimens. The name Sibā’ b. Mas‘ada cited in the Rev. legend belongs to another son of Mas‘ada b. Bujayr, mentioned on copper fulûs of Samarqand in 172 AH (see above).

Binkath is universally perceived as the capital of the Shâsh province all until the Mongol conquest.

Bukhārâ, 190 AH (Fig. 35, a-c)

Cast or struck on cast flans.

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a thin linear circle around;
Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بيخارا سنة تسعمين ومئة ‘bismi-‘llâh ‘duriba hâdā al-fals bi-Buḥārâ’ and date 190.
Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, palmette أ含まれ above, عدل ‘adil below, a thin linear circle around;


Fig. 35

A well-known coin type [FRAEHN 1826: p. 33, No. 235; TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 166, No. 1490; MARKOV 1896: p. 34, Nos. 558–59; LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 830; SHAMMA 1998: p. 330, No.(12); et al.]. Judging by the Rev. marginal legend, this coinage was undertaken upon the direct command from the caliph Hārūn, whose name was struck on these coins in full spelling with both matres lectionis (usually without alif after initial hā at that time). The name al-Ḥakam b. Sa’īd seems to be otherwise unknown.

HARTHAMA B. A’YĀN
(governor of Khurāsān, 191/806 – 196/811-2)

Bukhārā, 194 AH (Fig. 36)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a linear circle around;
Obv. margin – بـ[الله ـ ضرب] هذا الفلس بِبِحْرَا سِنَةٌ أَرِبَعٌ وَتِسْعِينَ وَمِنْهَا bismi-\lāh ُduriba hādā al-fals bi-Buḥārā and date 194.

Fig. 36

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, palmette  
عَدَل 'adil below, a beaded (?) circle around;
Rev. margin – مَامَأَا الأَمِير هُرَيْثَة بَنِ اعْيَنٍ [عَلَى بَنِ (ٌ???)] سَكَرْ (؟) بِنِ... mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Ḥarṭāmah b. A’yān [‘alā yaday (?)] *s.k.r (?) b. <...>.

Reported more than once [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 285, No. 2822; MARKOV 1896: p.36, No. 621; LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 831; SHAMMA 1998: p. 330, No.(13)], this type is still represented by a single specimen (State Hermitage, Numismatic department, inv. No. OH-B-M-2948). The coin is badly worn, yet its legends happen to be fairly discernible, which unfortunately applies but partially to the persons mentioned on Rev. Upon my request, V. Kuleshov (State Hermitage) inspected this fals and found out that governor Harthama’s name can be observed there “with highest confidence”13, whereas the second name is barely visible and its spelling remains dubious; I only dare surmise a cautious version يَاشَكُر بِنُ... Yaškur b. <...>, however having no idea whose identity could be concealed behind this uncommon (South Arabian?) name.

AL-FAḌL B. SAḤL (DHŪ’L-RĪYĀSATAYN)
(governor of Khurāsān, 197/812-3 – 202/817-8 or 203/818-9)

A Zoroastrian converted to Islam at the hand of al-Ma’mūn, the influential al-Faḍl b. Saḥl was his wzār and commander-in-chief (hence his title

---

13 V. Kuleshov’s personal e-mail to the author (a thread dated 27–28 Apr. 2012).
Dūl-riyāsatayn ‘the holder of the two highest positions’. Acting as al-Ma’mūn’s deputy governor of Khurāsān (since 197 or 198 AH), he was suspected of double-dealing and murdered at Sarakhs in 202/817-8 or 203/818-9 [Al-Ya’qūbī 2011: p. 71, 209; Zetterstéen 1927: p. 39].

**Samarqand, 198 AH (Fig. 37)**

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a 6-pointed asterisk below, a thin (linear?) circle around;

Obv. margin – the standard legend is replaced by a double linear rim with a few intermittent crescents and annulets.

![Fig. 37](image)

Rev. field – مَّا امَّرَ بِهِ الْمَيْرَضِ ذَوِ الْرِّيْسَاتِينَ / العباس mimmā amara bihi al-amīr ḏū al-riyāsatayn al-‘Abbās in 3 lines, a big dot above and seemingly a smaller one below, a thin circle (of merged dots?) around;

Rev. margin – ضِربَ هَذَا الْفَلِسَ بِسَمْرَقَانِ سَنَةَ ثَمَانِيَةُ وَتَسْعِينِ وَمِئةّ – ḏūriba ḥāḏā al-fals bi-Samarqand and date 198.

One specimen established so far (ex Najaf Coins & Collectibles; image source – [Zeno: #77515]; the general type coincides in all comparable details with the description of two copper pieces unearthed at Persepolis [Miles 1959: p. 81, Nos. 631–32]; however judging by G. Miles’ descriptions, the most significant parts of the legends (namely mentions of persons and the mint name) were not preserved on the published finds.

Although positioned on the coin in close sequence, Dūl-riyāsatayn and al-‘Abbās are definitely two different persons. The first appellation belongs to al-Ma’mūn’s wazīr and deputy governor al-Faḍl b. Sahl who was widely known under this laqab; as to al-‘Abbās, it should be respectively a local officer, probably the then ruler of Samarqand or a person authorized for coinage supervision.
GHASSĀN b. ‘ABBĀD
(governor of Khurāsān, 204/819 – 205/821)

Ghassān b. ‘Abbād was appointed by al-Ma’mūn in 204/819 in order to ‘improve the bad governorship of Rajā’ b. Abīl-Ḍaḥḥāq’ but dismissed in Shawwāl 205/March–April 821 in favour of Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn [GARDĪZĪ 1991: p. 52; AL-YA’QŪBĪ 2011: pp. 71–72].

al-Shāsh, 204 AH (Fig. 38, a–b)

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines, غسان below, a beaded circle around; Obv. margin – محمد رسول الله ارسله باللهديه يودين الحق (part of Qur’ān, 9:33).

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, لله ِلَّاَح above, a beaded circle around; Rev. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالشاش سنة اربع ومائتين – bismi-‘llāh du-riba hâḏâ al-fals bi’l-şāš and date 204; the hundreds ومائتين are often reduced to 2 or 3 first letters.

Known only recently [KOČNEV 1994: p. 102], the coin is now considered moderately rare; see also ZENO: subdirectory » Shash (al-Shash).

Samarqand, 205 AH (Fig. 39, a–d)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, different rims (linear or dotted) or no circle around; Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بعمر قند سنة خمس ومائتين – bismi-‘llāh
duriba ḥāḍā al-fals bi-Samarqand and date 205; a few distortions are observed in the date (ماينتين ماس or ماس ماس) and sometimes without after خمس.

Fig. 39 (variant b)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, اللَّه above, tamgha-like sign ٍ (Arabic letter َال) below, different rims or no circle around;

Rev. margin – وما امر به الامير غسان بن عباد الله – mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Ġassān b. ‘Abbād abqāhu Allâh.

A very common type encountered in quantity [Markov 1896: p. 42, No. 742; Nützel 1898, No. 2212; Kočnev 1994: pp. 101–02; Lowick 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 846; Shamma 1998: p. 335, No.(6); see also Zeno: subdirectory » Samarqand], apparently representing two denominations, perhaps somewhat comparable to later ‘adli (full fals) and pashīz (half fals): all legends are the same, the only distinguishing element, apart from weight and size, is a dot inside ِلَّه above the field legend on Rev. (images a–b – ‘dotted’ variant a, images c–d – ‘undotted’ variant b). Heavier coins (usually 1.9g and up to around 2.5–2.6g, 18–21mm – variant a) are as a rule with that dot, while lighter ones (1.8 and down to 0.88g, 15–18mm – variant b) normally lack it; however, infrequent exceptions exist: for example, 2 of the 13 ‘dotted’ specimens (a fals, recently in R. Cannito’s collection, No. is-613: 1.41g, and a damaged specimen from L.Shabaev’s collection: 1.84g, 17.5mm); on the other hand, 2 of the 10 known ‘undotted’ ones (Zeno: #103591: 2.32g, 20mm, and also in my collection: 2.08g, 17.5mm). One more discriminating feature refers to inner circular rims separating the field from marginal legends (linear, dotted or none at all), just being used in separate dies quite arbitrarily, this element of coin design is hardly relevant in the typological sense.
Naw[i]kat[h] Zakariyā, 205 AH (Fig. 40, a–c)

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, لیث Layţ below, a dotted circle around;
Obv. margin – a decorative double-twisted wavy line instead of the legend.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, غسان Ġassān below, a dotted circle around;
Rev. margin – بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بمَکت رکبا سنة ثمّة ورام (1) bis-
mi-llâh ḍuriba ḥâdâ al-fals bi-Naw[i]kat Zakariyā and date 205; hundreds of
the date shown as مانئین instead of مانئین.

The first coins of this type were brought to light in sequence between 2006
and 2008 and soon caused a lively discussion about the mint name, appearing on some of them as سوکت رکبا, on some others looking more like سوکت نویکت [see Zeno: subdirectory » Navekat (earlier reading Tunkat)]. The
first part of this quite uncommon word combination is definitely نوکت
Nawkat or نویکت Nawīkat14; as to the second component, رکبا or (actually
without reasonable alternative options) زکربا Zakariyā’, it is not estab-
lished in any other written sources; probably the village was named in
this way after a certain person whose activity had been distinguished in
the eyes of its residents, judging by the basic appellation, with a Soghdian
root. The whole toponym Nawīkat (or rather Navēkath)-e Zakariyā may be
translated as ‘Zacharia’s New town (borough or village)’, with =ī (properly
=ē) in the capacity of a Soghdian suffix for feminine nouns.

---

14 The alternative reading of the mint name, Tunket (or Tūnkath) [Kočnev 1994: p. 102;
Ataxodžiev 1998: p. 16] is now abandoned as less consistent in favour of Nawkat [Bates
2011: p. 3].
The name لیث Layṯ placed on Rev. would also require an identification, but this task is rather complicated, as no persons appropriate to the case seem to be mentioned under this name in accessible written sources. It could be a local functionary – city governor, mayor, prefect et al., or else an official endowed with the right of coining.

**TAHIR b. AL-ḤUSAYN b. MUṢ'AB AL-BŪSHANJĪ**

(governor of Khurāsān, 205/821 – 207/822-3)

and his descendants

The Central Asian copper coinage of governor Ṭāhir b. al-Husayn and his descendants, holding that post until 259/873, is not considered here (see *Introduction*, p. 6), in part because it obviously deserves a separate study, for which no more space is left in this article, but essentially because the implied coinage is commonly believed as relating to a particular autonomous dynasty, effectively dissociated from the direct 'Abbasid authority.
B. MORE PUZZLES TO SOLVE

COIN TYPES WITH INCOMPLETE OR UNRELIABLE ATTRIBUTIONS

**Bukhārā, [1]×(?)** **AH** (Fig. 41)

Unique so far (presently in the author’s collection), the coin belongs to the most enigmatic Transoxanian issues for the moment.

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 2 lines, linear circle around;

Obv. margin – bismi-‘llâh (?), ḏuriba bi-Buḥārā fi sanah (?) wa <...> and uncertain date.

![Fig. 41](image_url)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, linear circle around;

Rev. margin – امیر به الامیر ﺗﺤﺪ م ﺗﺮ ﺗﺪ الولد || الامیر (؟) سس حار – amara bihi al-amîr Ḥâlid b. al-<...> (?) – a quite ambiguous portion, ending most likely with ستین چاز ‘sixty [of these coppers are] acceptable [for a dirham].’

Heavy damage affecting the most significant places of coin legends, unfortunately, prevents from adequate attribution of this important specimen. The letter following سس is apparently a wāw, so the cited grapheme, normally perceived in this position as سنة ‘year’, looks more like a unit of the date, namely سس و... sittah wa-<...>, just as if it represented the remnant of the date [1]×6 (?). The second part of amîr’s name cited on Rev. is badly deformed, apparently through illiterate die engraving, but by overall appearance I would surmise here a disfigured ابن‌هیم, and thus relate the item to the coinage of Khâlid b. Ibrâhîm; in this case, reading the date

---

*ABBÂSID COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA*
as $[1] \times 6$ is hardly possible, as no Muslim year ending with 6 fits the tenure of that governor (137–140 AH), – however, unless it is a different Ḥālid: the name (respectively خلد) is shown on this coin without alif, unlike all other coin types definitely related to Khālid b. Ibrāhīm’s reign. For Ḥālid as خالد see above, No mint name, 138 AH; 139 AH; no date (Fig. 7).

**Khujandah (Khojend), 194 AH**

Reportedly with the names of هرثمه Hartamah [b. A’yān] and نعيم Na’īm (or Nu’aym); no further details forwarded.

Reference: the mint name and date – [Ataxodžaev 1998: p. 15]; the names reportedly cited on the coin(s) – A. Atakhodjaev’s private remark alluding to some oral communication by V. Kalinin (late 1990s). However, no real specimens of this type are known to me thus far.

**Far[ghā]nah (?), 204 AH (Fig. 42)**

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines; linear circle around;

Obv. margin بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بفر[غا]نة سنة اربع ومايتيين – bismi-‘llâh ḍuriba ḥâḍā al-fals bi-Far[ğâ]nah and date 204.

![Fig. 42](image)

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, سهل Sahl below, linear circle around;

Rev. margin ما امر به الامير غسان بن عباد ابقه الله – mimmā amara bihi al-amir Ġassān b. ‘Abbād abqāhu Allâh.

The unique description borrowed here entirely from [Lavoix 1887: p. 442, No. 1596] fits well with the known issues of Ghassān b. ‘Abbād (see above) and virtually could match the existing coin type, but the highly questionable mint name, which H. Lavoix doubted himself, reinforced by the unclear image and especially absolute absence of similar known examples among the abundant coin finds throughout Middle Asia, motivates us to
give up the idea about confident fabrication of this fals in Farghāna. Respectively, any speculations regarding the possible lineage of the name Sahl shown on Rev. seem irrelevant so far.

**Haf[t]dih (?), 205 AH (Fig. 43)**

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines (with a few graphic errors), a dotted circle around;

Obv. margin – بِسْمِ اللَّهِ ضَرِبَ هَذَا اِنْفِسٌ (!) بِحَفْدَةٍ (!) سَتَةٌ حَسَنَ وَمَتِينَ (!) – bismi-َّllâh ِduriba ُhâdâ al-fals bi-H.f.d.[h](!) and date 205; graphic deviations throughout the legend.

Obv. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, لله above field, tamgha-like sign ٧ (Arabic hā?!) below;

Rev. margin – امّر بِهِ الأَمِيرِ غَسَانٍ بْن عِبَادٍ ابْقَاهُ اللَّهَ – amara bihi al-amîr Ġassān b. ʿAbbâd abqâhu Allâh.

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, اللّه above field, tamgha-like sign ٧ (Arabic hā?!) below;

Rev. margin – امّر بِهِ الأَمِيرِ غَسَانٍ بْن عِبَادٍ ابْقَاهُ اللَّهَ – amara bihi al-amîr Ġassān b. ʿAbbâd abqâhu Allâh.

One specimen on ZENO: #70610, posted by Ralph A. Cannito. At first glance, the mint name (something like حَفْدَةٍ حَفَذَةٍ) seems to be clear enough on the perfectly preserved unique specimen, yet the entire marginal legend looks so heavily blundered that it does not permit an equivocal reading. The only version I could suggest is Haftdeh or Haftdih (normally حَفْتِدَه, though shown on the coin in a different way), a small town in Fergana, known as coin-producing centre in the late 10th century [Koĉnev 2001: p.67–68; Koĉnev 2006: p.44, 132]. On the other hand, the overall coin type, including the Arabic legends, is very similar to the copper coinage of Samarqand in the name of Ghassān b. ʿAbbād (see above); so even if it is actually not a deadly spoiled سَمْرَقَنَد, its minting place cannot have been too far from it.
al-Ṭārband, no date (Fig. 44, a–b)

Obv. field – abridged Kalima-I لا الله/لا الله in 2 lines;
Obv. margin – ضرب هذا الفلس بالطاربند – duriba hâdâ al-fals bi’l-Ṭârband.

[Image]

Fig. 44

Rev. field – Kalima-II محمد رسول الله in 2 lines;

Three specimens, reportedly found on the site of Kanka (Tashkent region), are placed on [ZENO: #65765, #69951 and #70240]. The overall ‘archaic’ appearance of this interesting coin type, looking rather like an Umayyad one, alongside the absence of date in its legends, leaves no chance to specify the exact time of its manufacture.

The toponym al-Ṭārband is conventionally admitted as the ancient name of later Otrar, capital of the Pārāb region located in the basin of Sīr Daryā River (now in South Kazakhstan). According to some sources, [al-]Ṭārband or Ṭūrārband (presumably from ancient Turkic Kangü Tarban) was once a capital of the vast Shāsh region; the latest and most comprehensive survey of written evidence on the topic see in [KAMOLIDDIN 2006: p. 57, 80].

No mint name, no date (Fig. 45, a–c)

Crude casting.

[Image]

Fig. 45

Obv. field – الله Allâh in a beaded circular border;
Obv. margin – لا الله الا الله محمد رسول الله lâ ilâha illâ Allâh Muḥammad rasûl.
Rev. field – (?) [gh/ḥ.m.r/z[ah] (?) in a beaded circular border, several dots above and below;
Rev. margin – ... امر به الامير سرره (؟) [mimmā] amara bihi al-amīr s/z.zr/zah (?)</...>

Up to 12 specimens known, reported to come from Kanka (the ancient site of Kharashket, Tashkent region), all in private collections (Russia, Sweden, USA); see also ZENO: subdirectory » Coppers from Shash area, obv. "Allah". The word Allâh in the middle of Obv. is an organic completion of the circular formula (Kalima) with محمد رسول الله as the second part.
The word (virtually a personal name) [ḥ.m.r[ah]] || ḥ.m.z[ah] or otherwise, apparently bound up somehow with another amīr’s hard-to-read name (؟) سرره finishing the marginal text remains unidentified (my only acceptable conjecture to read it out being something like شیزانة Šayzarah?), however unless related either to local officer Ḥamza b. 'Amr (see above, under Samarqand, 153 AH) or, apparently less credible, governor Ḥamza b. Malik (176–177 AH).

No mint name, no date (Fig. 46, a–b)
Cast. Linear rims on both sides.
Obv. field, in 2 lines – lā ilâha illâ Allâh;
Obv. margin – an undeciphered legend.

![Fig. 46](image)

Rev. field, in 2 lines – Ḽwāḥduhu lā šarīka lahu (slightly distorted but legible);
Rev. margin – ... الامیر محمد بن ... al-amīr Muḥammad b. ... (?)

No reference. Two pieces, reportedly acquired in early 1990s from a seller in Tashkent. Images and data courtesy – Nikolay N. Ivanov (Moscow).
No mint name, no date (Fig. 47, a–b)

Anonymous, cast.

Obv. field, in 4 lines – لا اله الا / لله نعم الغا / لله و / ستين بدرهم – lā ilâha illâ Allâh ni‘ma al-qâdir Allâh (?) wa-sittîn bi-dirham; all in a beaded circle (instead of marginal legend).

Fig. 47

Rev. field, in 3 lines – بسم الله / محمد ر/ سول الله – bismi’-llâh muḥammad rasûl Allâh; a circular border composed of merged strokes (straight or oblique dashes resembling tiny crosses).

No reference. Three pieces, reportedly unearthed all together in the Surkhan Darya region (ancient Ṣaghāniyân). Images and general data are obtained from a private collection (Russia).

No mint name, no date (Fig. 48)

Anonymous, cast. The legends are distorted through undersized module casting but legible due to standard recognizable content.

Obv. field – full Kalima-I in 3 lines, a fence-like border بَيْن around (instead of marginal legend);

Fig. 48

Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines (slightly distorted but generally legible), three dots • above, a vague signet resembling Kufic below; all in a chain border composed of merged annulets.

No reference. The item was reportedly found in the region of Bukhara.
A few more distinct coin types exist, lifted or excavated in Middle Asia, obviously originating from the period under review but either crudely cast or badly preserved and therefore rendering too little information for confident attribution. The identification of those specimens, no less tempting but unyielding for the time being, is a challenge for the future.
C. COUNTER-DISCOVERIES ALSO HAPPEN...
UNCONFIRMED AND ERRONEOUS ATTRIBUTIONS

Bukhārā, 1×× AH

Obv. field – “tawḥīd II” (لا الله / الا الله / وحده =)

Obv. margin – بسم الله ضرب بخارى في سنة... سن ومثله –

Rev. field – محمد / رسول الله –

Rev. margin – very worn but apparently Qur’ān, 42:23 with four sets of triple annulets dividing the text as on Abū Muslim’s coins (see above).

Reference: [LANE-POOLE 1875: p. 191, No. 80; WURTZEL 1978: p. 194–5, No. 43]. The specimen from the British Museum is heavily worn and for this reason cannot serve as a relevant source of information: the date on it was read as ‘1xx’, so perhaps 13× could be admissible, just only if the rest of the type features had been correctly described, which doesn’t look at all convincing because of almost complete obliteration of the coin. so C. Wurtzel’s speculations on the possible dating within Abu Muslim’s period, as well as the very connection to this personality look virtually groundless.

Bukhārā, 138 AH

The initial reference, [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 68, No. 696], communicates only a partial definition: “Fels of the same year [=138 as in the previous description No. 695. – V.N.] from Bukhārā (بخارا). In the Imper. Hermit[age]”, providing no information about the coin legends. [ZAMBAUR 1968: p. 67] noticed the date 138 for Bukhārā without any references or comments. The fals in question was regarded doubtful as early as in [FRYE 1949: p. 35, note 123]; see also [LOWICK 1996: p. 382–83, No. 817; SHAMMA 1998: p. 327, No.(1)]. A search of this fals was undertaken upon my request by V. Kuleshov in the State Hermitage collection, however to no avail:
“The ‘Bukhara 138’ fals is most likely a result of misreading: such coin type was absent in the Hermitage collection in 1896 and did not emerge later. It is neither indicated in Vasmer’s catalogue nor fixed elsewhere. Judging by [the composition of ] the collection, the copper coinage of Bukhārā proper should have commenced in 143 AH (19 pieces available)…”

Tirmidh / Saghaniyan, 139 AH

Reference: [SHAMMA 1998: p. 337, No. (1)], without any details, ostensibly with the names of Khalid b. ‘Abd Allah and Muhammad b. Tahir (?!); the whole passage looks like a mere mistake and as such hardly needs special explanation.

Bukhārā, 140 AH

Obv. field – Kalima-I in 3 lines;
Obv. margin – mint name and date with في before the numerals.
Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines;

Reference: BM (British Museum collection) 1905 unregistered [LOWICK 1996: p. 382-3, No. 818; TREWDWELL 2006]. Al-Mahdī was not appointed governor of the Mashriq until 141, so the probability is that either the date on this coin was mistakenly engraved or it has been misread. However, all legends presented by N. Lowick, alongside the overall appearance as it can be seen on the image [LOWICK 1996: plate 23] are quite similar to the Bukhāran fals of 143 AH (see above).

Ṣaghāniyān, 140 AH (?)

Reference: [LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 837], mentioning as a source of information [RTVELADZE 1985: pp. 38–40], – in all probability a result of misunderstanding the Russian text where no such combination of mint and date is present at all.

\[15\] V. Kuleshov’s personal e-mail to the author, dated 27 Apr. 2012.
Akhsīkath, 144 AH

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 816], based on [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 73, No. 732], – regarded as suspicious by [Frye 1949: pp. 35–36], also by [Zambaūr 1968: p. 38, note 2]; no coins with this combination of mint and date have ever come to light.

Bukhārā, 144 AH

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 821], based on [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 73, No. 731], – “in the Imperial Hermitage. Handwritten catalogue by M. Brosset”; no details were given by the first publisher and no real specimens emerged ever since anywhere, including the Hermitage collection.

Bukhārā, 145 AH

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 822], based solely on [ANS: Islamic collection, No. 1917.215.65], – now confirmed as dated 143: “Identified by Nicholas Lowick as 145, but this is unlikely: the coin is identical to the issue of 143 and the inscription supports this date”\(^{16}\).

Bukhara (?), 146 AH


Bukhārā, 147 AH

Reference: [Zambaūr 1968: p. 67], without any additional information – seems not to be anything but a misprint for 143.

Samarqand, 149 AH


\(^{16}\) See ‘Notes’ to [ANS: No. 1917.215.65].
Bukhārā, 14× AH

Image source – ZENO: #36026. The image was used in my PPT presentation of the paper to the Third Simone Assemani Symposium (Rome, 2011) where I presented its Rev. marginal legend as ostensibly containing the name al-amīr Yahyā (however, doubtful from the very beginning), which in fact turned to be a half-cut legend, just without normally preceding al-Ash’ath’s name on the fulūs of Bukhārā, 143 AH (see above).

Samarqand, 151 AH

Data source – [ALBUM 2011b: Lot 306]; judging by the image placed in the quoted List 265, the mint name is either misread or simply misprinted as Samarqand, whereas in fact it is Bukhārā, 151 AH (see above).

Samarqand, 154 AH

Reference: [LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 843], based on [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 87, No. 836], citing BARTHOLOMAEI, ‘Lettre à M. Soret’, p. 33, No. 53, tab. I, No. 7; the entry was reported as essentially the same as the preceding item 835 from Nihāwand, just save for the three small annulets instead of two below field on Rev. Taking into account a fairly broad hint at the similarity in all other details, logically implied by such ‘description’, we must conclude that its attribution was erroneous per se, since it is hardly possible even in theory to admit the full coincidence of legends with specific name(s) of local official(s) on the coins of two mints so distant from each other. Therefore my opinion is that either J. Bartholomaei or W. Tiesenhausen merely confused between the mint names, similar to some extent in graphic shape (بنتهاوئند and بسمرقند), especially if those had certain defects on the coins.

Khwārizm, 154 AH

Reference: [LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, No. 848], based on [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 87, No. 837], – seems to be Lowick’s plain misunderstanding, as W. Tiesenhausen had clearly attributed the item as struck at Dabil (Caucasia):
“Фельсъ 154 года, изъ Дебиля”. Anyway, even if the mint place named Khwārizm had existed in that period it should be located outside the geographic range of the present survey.

**Bukhārā, 155 AH**

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, No. 826], based on [Markov 1896: p. 19, No. 141]. According to V. Kuleshov’s notice17, “R. Vasmer and I.G. Dobrovolsky had reportedly read the date on this specimen as 185”, so the basic inventory of the Hermitage collection now contains a record of this piece as **Bukhārā, 185 AH** (inv. No. OH-B-M-2920), whereas the very coin is absolutely similar to the other specimens of this single-year type with the specific names ‘Alī b. ‘Īsâ and Sa‘īd b. Ġa‘far.

**Ilāq (al-Shāsh), 166 AH**

Reference: [Frye 1949: p. 35], – just a result of misreading, as clearly follows from Tiesenhausen’s note to No. 1008 [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 110] (see above, p. 4).

**Samarqand, 185 AH**

Reference: [ErnazaroVa 1974: pp. 184 and 223, No. 191], with partial description due to bad condition (Obv. reportedly worn out), denoting the word عدل and the name Sa‘īd b. Ja‘far on Rev.; certainly a wrong attribution of **Bukhārā, 185 AH**.

**Samarqand, 186 AH**

Reference: [Masson 1933: p. 105], a unique mention without description or any other details; most likely a wrong attribution.

**Bukhārā, 197/9 AH**

Obv. margin – mint name and date with controversial units سبع (تسع؟) ...; Rev. field – Kalima-II in 3 lines, above, الفضل al-faḍl below; other details not specified.

17 K. Kravtsov’s personal e-mail to the author, dated 21 Apr. 2012.
Reference: [TIESENAUSEN 1873: p. 185, No. 1665; LOWICK 1996: pp. 384-5, No. 832; SHAMMA 1998: p. 330, No.(14)], all citing SORET, ‘Lettre à M. Dorn’, p. 15, No. 10, the latter two showing the date as 197/9. The respective copper type has never been confirmed anywhere; taking into account the described details, it looks very plausible that the given definition was treated in error and should belong to a silver dirham.

al-Shāsh, 199 AH

A vague notice in [SHAMMA 1998: p. 339, No.(1)] with no clearer reference to Tabatiba’i; no trace of such copper item or even a hint at its existence has ever been found anywhere. The only explanation seems logical if Mr. Shamma mistook for a copper fals the reference to a silver dirham struck at al-Shāsh in that year [LOWICK 1996: p. 298-9, Nos. 2743–44].

Bukhara, 200 AH

Reference: [FEDOROV 2009: p. 350], based on [TIESENAUSEN 1873: p. 190, No. 1713], judging by the fragmentary reading of legends, misattributed due to heavy damage, otherwise containing the spoiled year indication; in reality it must belong to the early Ṭāhirid coinage with the name (?) (actually طالب طالوت) below Rev., so most likely struck in 209 AH (see ZENO: directory » Ṭāhirid » Talha b. Tahir, 207-213).

Madīnat Khwārizm, 203 AH

Reference: [BALDWIN’S 2008: Lot 315; ZENO: #62837], initially misinterpreted as the fals of Samarqand and later reattributed on Zeno to the tentative mint Kath in central Khwārizm. Being actually a most interesting specimen, in all probability the earliest coin struck in the name of Samanid Nūḥ b. Asad, it definitely falls out of the subject of the present survey, both by minting location and dynastic provenance.
## CONCLUSION

Now we can see that the copper coinage in the north-easternmost regions of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate in the 2nd – early 3rd centuries AH was not sporadic and occasional, as it could have seemed before when we were only aware of a dozen fals types produced at two coin-minting centres (8 of Bukhārā and 4 of Samarqand, let alone the reports of erroneously read mints and dates). Whether any regional copper coin issues in Transoxiana could be defined as strictly Islamic during the Umayyad domination (viz. prior to 132/750) is not certain thus far; by contrast, the ensuing 'Abbāsid coinage looks more or less systematic, internally coherent, rather regular and apparently massive enough, and in the quantitative sense it seems to display no fundamental difference from similar systems of small change money supply in the central parts of the Arab caliphate. In the qualitative sense, however, – political, administrative, actually cognitive in general, providing so many names of provincial and local officials, combined for the most part with attributable places and exact dates, sometimes even showing respectively localizable signs of property (tamghas), it looks much more informative than any other regional set of copper fulūs from the early 'Abbasid period.
Different written sources dealing with the period under review [Al-Ṭabarî, Gardîzî, Al-Ya’qûbî et al.] display considerable variance in the names and especially dates of tenure of many personalities, including governors of Khurāsān; on this basis, the suggested list should be considered preliminary. To complete the picture, apart from the officials whose names are encountered in coin legends, I decided to list also those known from other sources. As for the mentioned inaccuracy and divergence, I attempted to eliminate it as far as possible, or at least minimize it in accordance with the «principle of frequency». Respectively, any indication to the remaining shortcomings and errors in this list, as well as the entire work, will be highly appreciated.

'Abd al-Raḥmân b. Muslim [al-Bāhilî] (Abû Muslim, 131/749 – 137/755)
Abû Da’ûd Khâlid b. Ibrâhîm al-Dhuhlî (137/755 – 140/758)
'Abd al-Jabbâr b. 'Abd al-Raḥmân al-Azdî (140/758 – 141/759)
Muḥammad al-Mahdî (141/759–150/767 or 151/768); honorary leader of all al-Mashriq until about 155/772.

Khâzîm b. Khuzayma or Usayd b. 'Abd Allâh (150/767 – 151/768) (?)
Humayd b. Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭâ‘î (151-2/768 – 159/776)
Abû 'Awn 'Abd al-Malik b. Yazîd (159/776 – 160/777)
Mu‘âdh b. Muslim al-Râzî (161/777 – 163/780)
al- Musayyab b. Zuhayr al-Dabbî (163/780 – 166/783)
Abû’l-’Abbâs al-Faḍîl b. Sulaymân al-Ṭâ‘î’ al-Ṭûsî (166/783 – 171/786)
Ja’far b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash’ath al-Khuţâ’î (171/787 – 173/789)
al-’Abbâs b. Ja’far b. Muḥammad (173/789 – 175/791) (?)
Ghițrif b. 'Aṭā’ al-Kindī (175/791 – 176/792) (?)
Ḥamza b. Malik b. al-Haytham al-Khuzâ’ī (176/792 – 177/793)
Yaḥyâ b. Mu’ādh b. Muslim (177/793 – 178/793) (?)
Maḥṣûr b. Yazîd (179/795 – 180/796) (?)
′Īsâ b. Ja’far (180/796 – 183/799) (?)
′Alî b. ‘Īsâ b. Mâhān (183/799 – 191/806)
′Abd Allâh al-Ma’mûn (186/802 – 198/813-4), honorary leader of all al-Mashriq – beyond the geographic scope (Āmul, 186 AH = ZENO: #84317)
Harthama b. A’yân al-Balkhî (191/806 – 196/811-2) (?)
al-Faḍl b. Sahl (Dhū’l-riyāsatayn) (197/812-3 – 202/817-8)
Rajā’ b. Abīl-Ḍaḥḥāq (203/818-9 – 204/819)
Ghassân b. ‘Abbâd (204/819 – 205/821)
Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn (205/821 – 207/822-3) and his descendants – beyond the chronological scope.
ABBĀSID COPPER-MINTING CENTRES OF MĀ’ WARĀ’ AL-NAHR

a. ANNOTATED LIST OF MINT NAMES

Aḫsīkāt اخسيكث – Akhsikath (Akhsiket), a regional mint of Farghana under the Samanid and Qarakhanid rulers (9th–11th centuries); reported (perhaps erroneously) for 144 AH and could not be confirmed.

Āmul آمل – Amul, town and mint on the left bank of Amu Darya belonging by locality to either Khurasan or South Khwārizm, and as such falling beyond the strict scope of the present survey.

Binkāt بنکث – Binkath (Binket), town and mint in al-Shash, the historic area in the middle reaches of Sir Darya; now overlapped by the old part of Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Bukhara، بخارا – Bukhara, an historic area, town and regional mint; now a region and a city in Uzbekistan.

Fargānah فرغانه – Farghana, an historic area in the Ferghana Valley; now a region and a town in East Uzbekistan.

al-Ḫuttal الختل – [al-]Khuttal (later Khuttalān), an historic area; now the Khatlon region in Tajikistan. Regional mint – Hulbuk (not known on the coins so far; corresponds to ancient remnants 12 km from Kulyab).

Khujandah خجنده – now Khojend in North Tajikistan; reported for 194 AH but did not yet come in sight anywhere to be confirmed.

Kish كش – Kesh, town and mint; now Shahrisabz in Uzbekistan.

Nasaf نصف – Nasaf (ancient Nakhsheb, later Nesef), town and mint; now Qarshi in Uzbekistan.

Navīkaṭ Zakariyā نویکاکت زکریا – Navêkat [Zakariya] (also spelled, perhaps erroneously, Tûnkaṭ / Tunket), town and mint in Ilaq, the historic area adjacent to al-Shash from the east.
الصغانيان (may be differently misspelled in coin legends) – Saghaniyan (ancient Chaghaniyan), an historic area, town and mint in the Surkhan Darya Valley; now the ruined site Budrach in South Uzbekistan.

Samarqand – Samarqand, an historic area, town and mint; now Samarkand, a region and a city in Uzbekistan.

الشاش – al-Shash (ancient Chach), an historic area; now the Tashkent region in Uzbekistan. Regional mint – Binkath (cf.)

الطاربيد – [al-]Tarband (Turarband, also called Parab), an historic area; now the ruined site Otrar-tobe in South Kazakhstan. Regional mint – Keder, later Otrar.

الترمذ (later without article) – Tirmidh, town and mint; now Termez, centre of the Surkhandarya region in South Uzbekistan.
b. SCHEMATIC MAP

(based on Yuri Bregel's *Historical Atlas of Central Asia*, 10. ‘From mid-8th to the end of the 9th century: the early Islamic period in the West, the Qarluqs and Uyghurs in the East’)

- *'Abbāsid copper mints known long before;
- *'Abbāsid mints discovered recently;
- uncertain or requiring further examination
PERSONAL NAMES ENCOUNTERED IN COIN LEGENDS

al-’Abbās
[mentioned after the amīr ذو الرياستين] – Samarqand, 198 AH (Fig. 37)

‘Abd al-Jabbār b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān
- No mint name, no date (Fig. 8)

‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad
- al-Ṭārband, no date (Fig. 44)

‘Abd al-Malik b. Yazīd
- Bukhārā, 160 AH (Fig. 25)

‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muslim
- No mint name, 133–136 AH (Fig. 4)

‘Abduhu b. Qudayd
- Bukhārā, 160 AH (Fig. 25)

Abū ‘Āṣim (?)
- al-Ṣaghāniyān, 146 AH (Fig. 15)

Abū S.k.rah (Šak[a]ra?)
- al-Ṣaghāniyān, 142 AH (Fig. 9)

‘Alī b. ‘Īsā
- Bukhārā, 185 AH (Fig. 33)

al-Amīn Muḥammad
- Āmul, 186 AH [ZENO: #84317]

18 The names Allāh and Muḥammad (rasūl Allāh) are not taken into account.
'ABBĀSID COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA

'Amr b. Jamâl (?)
الامير عمرو بن جمل (?) \(\) عز الله صبره
- al-Ṣaghān[iyān (?)], 166 AH (Fig. 26)

al-ʾAṣʿat b. Yahyâ
الامير اشعث
- Bukhārā, 143 AH (Fig. 12);
- Samarqand, 144 AH (Fig. 14)

Dāʿūd b. K. rār || K. rāz (Gurāz?)
الامير داود بن كرائ[ ] || كرائ (؟)
- Samarqand, 143 AH (Fig. 13)

Ḏūʾl-riyāsatayn
الامير ذو الرياستين
- Samarqand, 198 AH (Fig. 37);
- see also al-ʾAbbās

al-Faḍl
الفضل
- Bukhārā, 197/9 AH (silver dirham?)
- see also Ḏūʾl-riyāsatayn

Fatḥ
فتح
- Samarqand, 172 AH (Fig. 28)

Gaʿfar b. Muḥammad
الامير جعفر بن محمد
- Bukhārā, 173 AH (Fig. 29); Kish, 173 AH (Fig. 30);
- Samarqand, 172 AH (Fig. 27; Fig. 28)

Gassān b. ʿAbbād
الامير غسان بن عباد ابقة الله
- Nawīkath Zakariyā, 205 AH (Fig. 40); al-Shāsh, 204 AH (Fig. 38);
- Far[gḥā]nah (?), 204 AH (Fig. 42);
- Haff[t]dih (?), 205 AH (Fig. 43); Samarqand, 205 AH (Fig. 39, a; 39, b)

al-ʿGunayd b. Ḥâlid
الامير خالد بن خالد عامل الامام المهدي ولى عهد المسلمين
- Bukhārā, 151 AH (Fig. 19)

al-Ḥakam b. Saʿīd
على يدي الحكم بن سعيد
- Bukhārā, 190 AH (Fig. 35)

Ḥālid b. Ibrāhīm
الامير خالد بن ابراهيم
- No mint name, 138 AH (Fig. 5); 139 AH (Fig. 6);
- no date (Fig. 7)
Ḫâlid b. al-<...> (?) - Bukhârâ, [1]××(? AH (Fig. 41)

Hamzah b. 'Amr
- Samarqand, 153 AH (Fig. 21);
- see also below, h.m.r[ah] or h.m.z[ah] (Fig. 45)

Harṭamah b. A'yân
- Bukhârâ, 194 AH (Fig. 36);
- Khujandah (Khojend), 194 AH

Hârûn amîr al-mu’minîn
- Bukhârâ, 173 AH (Fig. 29);
- Bukhârâ, 190 AH (Fig. 35)

al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamrân || Humrân
- al-Ṣaghâniyân, 142 AH (Fig. 9);
- al-Timming, 142 AH (Fig. 10).

Hâšim waṣiyy Abî Muslim
- No mint name, no date (Fig. 24)

H.*d.r (?) b. al-Ḥasan
- al-Khuttal, 177 AH (Fig. 32)

h.m.r[ah] or h.m.z[ah] (Ḥamza?)
- No mint name, no date (Fig. 45)

Humayd b. Qâṭâba
- Samarqand, 153 AH (Fig. 21)

Ibrâhîm b. Mâhân
- al-Timming, 142 AH (Fig. 10)

Layt
- Nawîkath Zakariyâ, 205 AH (Fig. 40)

Ma’bad
- Bukhârâ, 148 AH (Fig. 16)
al-Mahdī Muḥammad

- Bukhārā, 151 AH (Fig. 19);
- No mint name, 142 AH (Fig. 11);
- al-Ṣaghāniyān, 146 AH (Fig. 15);
- Bukhārā, 143 AH (Fig. 12);
- Samarqand, 144 AH (Fig. 14);
- al-Ṣaghāniyān (?), 148 AH (Fig. 17);
- Bukhārā, 148 AH (Fig. 16);
- Samarqand, 143 AH (Fig. 13);
- Samarqand, 153 AH (Fig. 21);
- al-Shāsh, 149 AH (Fig. 18);
- Samarqand, 143 AH (Fig. 14);
- Samarqand, 172 AH (Fig. 27; Fig. 28)

Muʿād

- No mint name, 142 AH (Fig. 11)

Muḥammad al-Mahdī; Muḥammad b. amīr al-muʿminīn
— see al-Mahdī Muḥammad

Muḥammad b. 'Amr

- Bukhārā, 173 AH (Fig. 29)

Muḥammad b. <...> (?)

- No mint name, no date (Fig. 46)

Munīf (?)

- al-Khuttal, 177 AH (Fig. 32)

Mūsā waliyy 'āhd al-muslimīn

- Bukhārā, 160 AH (Fig. 25)

Naʿīm (or Nuʿaym)

- Khujandah (Khojend), 194 AH

Nūḥ b. Asad (Samanid)

- Madīnat Khwārizm, 203 AH
Qutaybah b. Muslim
- No mint name, no date (Fig. 3)

Sahl
- Far'[gh]ānah (?), 204 AH (Fig. 42)

Sa'id b. Ja'far
- Bukhārā, 185 AH (Fig. 33)

Sa'id b. Yahyâ
- al-Shāsh, 149 AH (Fig. 18)

Sayzarah (?)
- No mint name, no date (Fig. 45)

Sibā' b. Mas'ādah
- Binkath, 186 AH (Fig. 34)

Yahyâ
- No mint name, 174 AH (Fig. 31);
- see also Yahyâ b. Mu'âd

Yahyâ (?)
- Kish, 173 AH (Fig. 30)

Yahyâ b. Mu'âd
- No mint name, 174 AH (Fig. 31)

*s.k.r (Yaškur?) b. <...>
- Bukhārā, 194 AH (Fig. 36)

al-*â*im (?) <...> [al-]Mahdî
- Nasaf, 157/9 AH (Fig. 23)

al-amîr <...> (?)
- the proper name is gone - [al-]Šaghāniyân, 153 AH (Fig. 20)
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LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Fig. 1. Pre-Islamic coin issues of Transoxanian mints

a) Bukhārā, ruler Asbar (date uncertain). Image source – ZENO: #21134 (weight 1.68g, diameter 17mm, die axis – 2h)\(^{19}\)

b) Samarqand, ikhshīd Turghar (738–750 CE) [SMIRNOVA 1981: pp. 198–217, Nos. 519–656, type II]. Image source – ZENO: #41898 (3.0g, 19.3mm)

c) Chach, Kabarna principality, unknown ruler (7–8\(^{th}\) century). Image source – ZENO: #15633 (2.4g, 18.8mm)

d) Otrar, unknown ruler (ca. 700 CE). Image source – ZENO: #20482 (1.6g, 21mm)

Fig. 2. Earliest Islamic coin issues of Transoxanian mints

a) Kesh, dihqān Iḥrīd (mid-8\(^{th}\) century; [SMIRNOVA 1981: pp. 416–17, Nos. 1661–66]). Image source – ZENO: #14025 (1.74g, 21mm)

b) No mint, no date; cast (mid-8\(^{th}\) century, ‘sixty to a dirham’); [SMIRNOVA 1981: pp. 420–21, nos. 1677–81]). Image source – ZENO: #71836 (1.54g, 19.5mm; broken)

c) Bukhārā or Paykand, local Arab tributaries (8\(^{th}\) century); ‘sixty to a dirham’. Image source – ZENO: #91060 (1.25g, 15mm; bigger and much heavier specimens exist)

d) No mint name, no date; cast (8\(^{th}\) century; ‘sixty to a dirham’). Image source – ZENO: #30440 (2.0g, 17.7mm)

e) Paykand, with ‘dancing man’ tamgha (8\(^{th}\) century). Image source – ZENO: #29610 (1.1g, 12.3mm)

f) Nasaf, local Arab tributaries (8\(^{th}\) century). Image source – ZENO: #46921 (1.97g, 18mm)

---

\(^{19}\) Metrological data (weight, size and especially die axis, otherwise die orientation angle shown as ‘hours and minutes’ of the clock face) could not be established for all specimens illustrated. Besides, respective indications taken from Zeno postings could not be verified for accuracy and should be left upon their ‘hangers’ ☺️.
Fig. 3. **No mint name, no date**, Qutaybah b. Muslim (c. 90/709–96/715), ‘one hundred twenty to a dirham’. Image source – ZENo: #13823 (2.63 g, 14×15mm, 12h)

Fig. 4. **No mint name, 133–136 AH**, Ḥālid b. Ibrâhîm

a) 133 AH. Image source – ZENo: #106301 (weight and size not indicated)
b) 134 AH. Image source – ZENo: #14022 (2.77 g, 21mm)
c) 135 AH. Image source – ZENo: #14023 (3.40 g, 22mm)
d) 136 AH. Image source – ZENo: #14024 (2.68g, 22mm)

**Note:** common Rev.

Fig. 5. **No mint name, 138 AH**, Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm

a) Image source – courtesy of Stephen L. Giles (USA) (2.1g, 22.8mm, 11h; *double strike on both sides*)
b) Image source – L. Shabaev’s private collection (Moscow region) (3.00g, 20×22mm, 12h; *corroded*)

Fig. 6. **No mint name, 139 AH**, Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm

a) Image source – ZENo: #79762 (2.71g, 16×18mm; *chipped*)
b) Image source – ZENo: #98962 (3.1g, 17×18mm, 2h 30'; *chipped*)

Fig. 7. **No mint name, no date**, Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm

a) Image source – ZENo: #111359 (1.68g, 16×18mm, 10h)
b) Image source – ZENo: #111360 (1.57g, 18mm, 9h)

Fig. 8. **No mint name, no date**, ‘Abd al-Jabbâr b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmân

Image source – a private collection (Russia) (ca. 15mm, 6h)

Fig. 9. **al-Saghâniyân, 142 AH**

a) variant a (lozenge with straight sides and closed angles). Image source – ZENo: #51635 (1.7g, 17.5mm; *chipped*)
b) variant b (lozenge with concave sides and closed angles). Image source – a private collection (Russia) (ca. 18mm)
c) variant c (concave open-ended cartouche). Image source – a private collection (Russia) (ca. 18mm)

---

20 Here and in some other cases, ‘die axis’ value is irrelevant due to the absence of Obv. or Rev. field legends.
Fig. 10. **al-Tirmidh, 142 AH**

a) variant *a* (regular double full-line ring). Image source – ZENO: #87255 (weight and size not indicated)

b) variant *b* (same as a but without a dot in the centre). Image source – author’s collection (1.81g, 18mm)

c) variant *c* (uneven beaded ovals). Image source – author’s collection (1.67g, 15+16mm)

Fig. 11. **No mint name, 142 AH, Mu'ād**

Image source – a private collection (Russia) (2.13g, 19+20mm, 2h 30')

Fig. 12. **Bukhārā, 143 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #25329 (2.7g, 19mm)

b) Image source – author’s collection (2.61g, 20+21mm, 7h)

c) Image source – ZENO: #91090 (1.95g, 19mm)

d) Image source – author’s collection (2.44g, 20mm, 6h)

Fig. 13. **Samarkand, 143 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #25210 (2.5g, 22mm)

b) Image source – ZENO: #123495 (weight not shown, 21mm)

Fig. 14. **Samarkand, 144 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #41860 (2.5g, 19.2mm, 7h 30')

b) Image source – author’s collection (2.75g, 19mm, 6h)

Fig. 15. **al-Saghāniyān, 146 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #23344 (weight not indicated, 20mm)

b) Image source – a private collection (Russia) (weight and size unknown, 4h)

Fig. 16. **Bukhārā, 148 AH**

Image source – author’s collection (1.85g, 21+22mm, 5h)

Fig. 17. **al-Saghāniyān (?), 148 AH**

a) variant *a* (Obv. field – star-like sign 🌟). Image source – ZENO: #50418 (3.1g, 23.6mm)

b) variant *b* (Obv. field – trident-like sign ⚜). Image source – a private collection (Russia) (2.41g, 22mm, 6h)
Fig. 18. **al-Shāsh, 149 AH**
   a) Image source – [ALBUM 2011a: Lot 445] (2.54g, size not indicated)
   b) Image source – ZENO: #25208 (2.1g, 17mm)
   c) Image source – author’s collection (2.49g, 17+19mm, 10h 30')
   d) Image source – [ALBUM 2009: Lot 245] (2.36g, size not indicated)

Fig. 19. **Bukhārā, 151 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #47087 (2.50g, 17.6mm)
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.39g, 18mm, 3h 30')

Fig. 20. **[al-]Saghāniyān, 153 AH**
   Image source – courtesy of A. Atakhodjaev (Samarkand) (1.3g, 19+21mm, 9 h).

Fig. 21. **Samarqand, 153 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #74990 (2.8g, 20mm)
   b) Image source – ZENO: #76025 (2.83g, size not indicated)
   c) Image source – ex R. Cannito’s private collection (USA), No. is-1834 (2.94g, 21.2mm, 10h 30')

Fig. 22. **al-Saghāniyān, 155 AH**
   a) Image source – a private collection (Russia) (weight and size unknown, 6h 30')
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.32g, 19+20mm, 8h)

Fig. 23. **Nasaf, 157/9 AH**
   Image source – ZENO: #102443 (2.49g, ca. 22mm; chipped)

Fig. 24. **No mint name, no date, Hāšim wašiyy Abī Muslim**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #57386 (weight and size not indicated)
   b) Image source – ZENO: #74996 (2.8g, 21mm)

Fig. 25. **Bukhārā, 160 AH**
   a) Image source – author’s collection (2.48g, 21mm, 3h)
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.18g, 21mm, 7h)

Fig. 26. **al-Ṣagh[ān]iyān (?), 166 AH**
   Image source – ZENO: #93027 (weight and size not indicated)
Fig. 27. **Samarqand, 172 AH, subtype A** (Rev. field – 'adil)
   a) Image source – ZENO: #74992 (2.6g, 20.4mm)
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.72g, 22mm, 3h)

Fig. 28. **Samarqand, 172 AH, subtype B** (Rev. field – Fath)
   Image source – ZENO: #75011 (2.8g, 22.7mm)

Fig. 29. **Bukhārā, 173 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #99213 (1.7g, 17.8mm)
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.14g, 18mm, 11h)

Fig. 30. **Kish, 173 AH**
   Image source – author’s collection (2.64g, 19-20mm, 7h 30’)

Fig. 31. **No mint name, 174 AH, Yahyâ b. Mu’âd**
   a) Image source – ANS, No. 1971.316.21 (weight not indicated, 18+20mm, 6h)
   b) Image source – author’s collection (2.42g, 16+18mm, 6h)

Fig. 32. **al-Khuttal, 177 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #93025
   b) Image source – ZENO: #93026
   Weight and size of both specimens not indicated; compare with #112432 (2.34g, 19mm)

Fig. 33. **Bukhārā, 185 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #96941 (weight not indicated, 23mm)
   b) Image source – ZENO: #123408 (2.65g, 22.5mm)

Fig. 34. **Binkath, 186 AH**
   a) Image source – ZENO: #42076 (weight and size not indicated)
   b) Image source – a private collection (Uzbekistan) (weight and size unknown, 11h)

Fig. 35. **Bukhārā, 190 AH**
   a) Image source – author’s collection (3.55g, 23mm, 6h)
   b) Image source – L. Shabaev’s private collection (Moscow region) (4.47g, 21+23mm, 10h 30’).
   c) Image source – ZENO: #127003 (weight and size unknown, 3h)
Fig. 36. **Bukhārā, 194 AH**

Image source – State Hermitage, Numismatic Department, inv. No. OH-B-M-2948 (4.08g, 23mm, 10h 30')

Fig. 37. **Samarqand, 198 AH**

Image source – ZENO: #77515 (1.20g, size not indicated)

Fig. 38. **al-Shāsh, 204 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #28085 (2.6g, 20mm)

b) Image source – ZENO: #42415 (weight and size not indicated)

Fig. 39. **Samarqand, 205 AH**

= variant **a:**

a) Image source – ZENO: #49465 (2.4g, 20×21mm)

b) Image source – ex R. Cannito’s private collection (USA), No. IS-613 (1.41g, 19mm, 1h 30')

= variant **b:**

c) Image source – author’s collection (2.08g, 18×19mm, 3h)

d) Image source – author’s collection (0.88g, 17.5mm, 3h)

Fig. 40. **Naw[i]kat[h] Zakariyā, 205 AH**

a) Image source – ZENO: #27690 (2.7g, 22mm)

b) Image source – ZENO: #55618 (2.65g, 21mm)

c) Image source – ex R. Cannito’s private collection (USA), No. IS-1860 (2.13g, 21mm)

Fig. 41. **Bukhārā, [1]xx (?) AH, Ḥâlid b. al-<...> (?)**

Image source – author’s collection (1.96g, 16×18mm, 10h)

Fig. 42. **Far[ghā]nah (?) , 204 AH**

Image source – [LAVOIX 1887: Pl. IX, No. 1596] (3.10g, 22mm)

Fig. 43. **Haf[t]dih (?) , 205 AH**

Image source – ZENO: #70610 (1.42g, 19.75mm)

Fig. 44. **al-Ṭārband, no date, al-amīr ‘Abd Allâh b. Muḥammad**

Image source – ZENO: #69951 (1.02g, 14×15mm)
Fig. 45. **No mint name, no date, Ḥamzah (?)**

a) Image source – ZENO: #67452 (1.83g, 15.2mm)
b) Image source – ZENO: #86675 (weight and size not indicated)
c) Image source – ZENO: #102856 (2.10g, 16mm)

Fig. 46. **No mint name, no date, al-amīr Muḥammad b. ... (?)**

a) 3.16g, 20+22mm, 11h
b) 2.79g, 19+20mm, 6h

Both images from N. Ivanov’s private collection (Moscow)

Fig. 47. **No mint name, no date, anonymous**

a-b) Image source – a private collection (Russia) (weight unknown, ca. 20mm)

Fig. 48. **No mint name, no date, anonymous**

Image source – author’s collection (1.10g, 15mm, with casting intake remnants – up to 18mm; 12h)

* * *
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