EARLY ISLAMIC COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA
A GENERIC SURVEY FOCUSED ON NEWLY DISCOVERED COIN TYPES

The suggested paper deals with a group of early Islamic, mostly ’Abbāsid, copper coins (Arab. sg. fals, pl. fulûs) produced in the minting towns of Transoxiana (otherwise Transoxania1) during about a century from the incorporation of the area into the Arab Caliphate till the formation of autonomous Ṭāhirid and Sāmānīd states, resp. middle of the 8th – first quarter of the 9th ct. CE. However, the proposed survey does not claim for a detailed in-depth study, which the overviewed stuff is definitely worth and which hopefully will be done ahead.

The traditional written records from the period under review are rather scanty and the information they provide is far from desired completeness and reliability; in these conditions, the coins can be considered (and often become indeed) a primary historical source. Recent finds in Central Asia prove once again that in many aspects they fairly comply with that purpose. How meager was until lately the numismatic research base concerning those remote ages, can be seen

1 Arab. مَ وَرَاءُ النَّهْرُ [the land that is behind the river] [Amū Daryâ]; a normal Russian appellation for the region is Центральная Азия ’Middle Asia’; see e.g. [Briegel 1996: pp. 1–3], including a concise bibliography of the topic. Although the 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 Turkestan), I will sometimes mention it in the text instead of the prolix Mā warâ’ al-Nahr or heterogenous Transoxiana/Transoxia, especially where it does not imply an opposition to Khurâsân in the proper sense.
from the comprehensive Type Corpus *Early ‘Abbāsid Coinage* compiled up to 1986 by the untimely gone 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 governorate (205 AH/820 CE and later), 14 represent doubtful, unconfirmable or plainly erroneous attributions, while only 15 descriptions (viz. 12 different types) of copper *fulās* struck at Bukhārā and Samarqand alone can be considered reliable enough in the scholarly respect. Since then, mostly due to private search rather than regular professional excavations, numerous new coin types fabricated in a good dozen of Central Asian minting towns have been detected. Many of them bear the names of ‘Abbāsid governors, commanders, prefects, and other figures who held different official posts in the towns and regions of Middle Asia; some of those names are absent from any other written sources relating to those times.

While getting established in Mā warāʾ al-Nahr, the newly conquered province of the Caliphate officially to Khurāsān, and arranging the trade and coinage in that region, the Arab officials hardly did that job from scratch, since a number of local states and domains had already existed there with rather developed political, economical and social institutions, not excluding coin production and money circulation. By that time, copper or bronze coins were cast or struck at Bukhārā, Paykand, Samarqand, Panjikand, Kish (Kesh, later Shahrisabz), Nakhshab (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 issued only in Bukhāran Soghd and Tokharistan, were shaped 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.

In the further course some of the above mentioned mints were closed, but some went on working, adapted or reoriented to the production of Islamic money issues. The bulk of regional copper coin production in that period came to the markets of Transoxiana from Bukhārā and Samarqand. Properly speaking, the latter two mints (especially Bukhārā with its exquisite 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 writing for coin legends cannot be regarded Islamic in the strict sense — only because they simply gave place to the newcomers’ language, albeit in some cases the script alone (Fig.2, a-d).

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 90–96 AH / 709–15 CE and struck (or rather cast) in the name of
الامير المنصور قتيبة بن مسلم  al-amir al-manṣūr (the victorious commander) Qutaybah b. Muslim, the prominent Arab conqueror of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr. Two of the three known examples of this highly important and interesting type are posted on [ZENO:
#13823 and 13824]. Basing on the finding places of the specimens known so far (the Bukhara oasis and Turkmenia), the publicator of this coinage [KALININ: 2005] confidently implies its Transoxanian provenance, of which, however, no direct proof exists as yet; besides, it comes from the Umayyad period and for this reason also falls beyond the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless I could not leave this important coin type without a quick mention at the least (Fig.3).

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 and dates and/or issuers’ names and titles, identified through direct reading of coin legends or verifiable otherwise with more or less confidence (I would call it conditionally ‘List A’). 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

2 According to E. von Zambaur, “die Kupferprägen von Buhārā des II. und III. Jhd. H. zeichnen sich durch eine besondere Fälle von Beamtenamen aus” [ZAMBUR 1968: p. 67]. As we shall see below, the present-day reality proves the rightfulness of these words not only towards the mint of Buhārā, just the ‘Abbāsid copper coinage of the region in general.

3 Still as late as the middle of the 20th century, “only three mint towns in Transoxiana (in the pre-Sāmānid times)” were regarded available [FRIE 1949: p. 30–31, note 108 (with reference to Ibn Ḥawqal), and p. 34] — namely Buhārā, Samarqand and ʿIṣb (al-Shāsh); however, the latter’s copper fals dated 166/782-3, mentioned in the cited work [FRIE 1949: p. 35], is in fact a result of misreading, as clearly follows from Tiesenhausen’s footnote to No. 1008 [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 110].
precise determination so far, are also included. 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 list is followed by a brief review of doubtful and unconfirmable definitions (‘List B’). Many of the latter, 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 considered and cited 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 ruling dynasty rather than the last legitimate ‘Abbāsid governors, are not considered in the present work. Equally omitted is the copper production of other Khurāsānian mints located in greater or lesser proximity west & south of Amū Daryā (Amul, Marw, Balkh, Harāt, &al.), as well as Khwārizm, although significantly represented among the Middle Asian finds, yet still originating from beyond the strict geographical scope of our survey.

A. VERIFIABLE ATTRIBUTIONS

'*Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muslim [al-Bākhili], governor of Khurāsān (131/749 – 137/755)'

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 three different varieties at least, always with Qurʾān, 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 due confidence to certain Transoxanian localities; although tentatively believed to be produced at Marw [VLOUEN 1892: p. 441; ZAMBAUR 1968: p. 238–239, notes 1, 5, 16; &al.;]⁷, they are frequently encountered in different places of Middle Asia⁷ and for this reason should be considered an integral part of local monetary circulation. However, the distinct coin types dated 131, 132 and 137 AH [WURZEL 1978: p. 192, nos. 36–37; BATES 2003: p.309] do not occur among the numismatic finds in Middle Asia, and on this basis they are excluded from the following survey⁸.

No mint name, 133–136 AH (Fig.4, a-c)

All dates show the same uniform type:

Obv.⁴, field — لا اله إلا الله / وحده (Kalima-I) in 3 lines;

⁷ Some of the following dates shown as the governors’ ruling periods are tentative due to lack of compliance between the basic written sources on the topic (al-Ṭabarī, GARDÉZI, al-Yaʿqūbī, &al.).

⁶ Sometimes Nisābūr was also presumed, however without any argumentation; see e.g. GUEST 1932: p. 556.

⁷ In particular, a perceptible number of copper fulūs dated 133–136 AH is known to me as certainly originating from the regions of Surkhān Darya (ancient Saghāniyān), Buhkārā and Tashkent (ancient Chach/Shash). The same observation for the region of Buhkārā has even enabled Dr. Boris D. Kochnev to admit that at least part of them could have been produced in situ: “... le grand nombre de ces fèls 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].

⁸ A detailed review of the whole series is well represented in two recent and apparently most informative publications [WURZEL 1978: pp. 188–93; BATES 2003: pp. 298–99 and 309].

⁹ Here and elsewhere on ‘Obv.’ stands for obverse and ‘Rev.’ for reverse. If not indicated otherwise, the Obv. field would contain Kalima-I (often without لا شريك له), later, on the fulūs of al-Saghāniyān after 146 AH and elsewhere after 172 AH normally with it), the Rev. field — resp. Kalima-II (generally as in the present description but also with different line layout, which is not separately specified).
margin — بسم الله امربه الامير عبد الرحمن مسلم سنة ثلث وثلاثين ومئه bismi'llah amara bihi al-amir 'Abd al-Rahmân b. Muslim and date 133 (resp. 134 to 136, in words).

Reverse, field — محمد رسول الله (Kalima-II) in 2 lines, divided with a fancy pattern (double-line horizontal lozenge with a dot in the centre and two palmettes at the edges);

margin — فل لا استلوك عليه أرجوا الا الوعد في القربي، Qur’an, 42:23, divided into 4 parts with triple annulets.

Coins of this type were relatively wide-spread and are now represented in many collections [FRAEHN 1826: p. 18, nos. 3–4; TIESENHAUZEN 1873: pp. 65–67, nos. 665, 673, 681, 687; Markov 1896: p. 14, nos. 16–18, 21; WURTZEL 1978: p. 193, nos. 38–41; &al.].


According to al-Ṭabarî, Khālid b. Ibrāhim was Abū Muslim’s lieutenant; after the death of the latter in 137/754–55, he was appointed governor over Khurāsân by the caliph Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣûr; killed in 140/757-8.

No mint name, 138 AH

Obv. margin — بسم [...] امر به خالد بن ابراهيم سنة ثمان وثلاثين ومئه bism... [a]mara bihi al-amîr Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm <...> and date 138 (in words).

Rev. margin — Qur’ân, 42:23, divided into 4 parts with triple annulets ۴۴.

Reference: [FRAEHN 1826: p. 19, no. 10; WURTZEL 1978: p. 196, no. 46].

No mint name, 139 AH (Fig.5)

A small crescent with two 8-pointed asterisks in the middle of Obv. field, dividing the Kalima-I into two lines; a fancy pattern flanked also with 8-pointed asterisks in the middle of Rev. field, dividing the 2-line Kalima-II, as on the coins of Abî Muslim (see above).

Obv. margin — Qur’ân, 42:23, divided into 4 parts with single annulets.

Rev. margin — بسم الله امر الامير خالد بن ابراهيم سنة ثمان وثلاثين ومئه bismi’llâh amara al-amîr Ḥâlid b. Ibrâhîm and date 139 (in words).

The mint name was not indicated on these coins, so their actual provenance cannot be 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 was not preserved in full on any of the accessible specimens, so the proposed reading is actually a type reconstruction.

**No mint name, no date (Fig.6)**

Obv. margin — Qur’ān, 42:23.
Rev. margin — َبِسْمِ اللَّهِ َمَا امْرَىِّ بِهِ الامْرَىِّ خَالِد بْن أَبِي هِمَسَى َبِسْمِ َالْمَلَّى َمِمْمَى امَّارا بِيْهِيِّ الْمَلَّى َخَالِد بْن أَبِي هِمَسَى َبِسْمِ َالْمَلَّى َمِمْمَى امَّارا بِيْهِيِّ

Small module (16–18mm), cast. Reportedly found in the Surkhān Darya region (ancient Šaghāniyān). Two specimens are posted on [Zeno: #111359 & 111360], two more pieces in a private collection (Russia)\(^\text{30}\).


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

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

Small module (16mm), cast.

Obv. margin — [َأَمَرِّ] الله بالوفاء والعدل[...] َبِسْمِ اللَّهِ َمَا امْرَىِّ بِهِ الامْرَىِّ خَالِد بْن أَبِي هِمَسَى

Rev. margin — َبِسْمِ اللَّهِ َمَا امْرَىِّ بِهِ الامْرَىِّ خَالِد بْن أَبِي هِمَسَى َبِسْمِ َالْمَلَّى َمِمْمَى امَّارا بِيْهِيِّ الْمَلَّى َخَالِد بْن أَبِي هِمَسَى

A single specimen, reportedly unearthed also in the Surkhān Darya region (ancient Šaghāniyān), was fixed by the author in a private collection (Russia).

---

\(^{30}\) Here and further on, anonymous references to private collections imply that the owners of the cited coins did not agree to mention their names
Despite considerable damage, its principal legends are still fairly readable and along with ornamental setting exactly coincide with [Lowick 1996: pp. 386–87, no. 869] (identified as Khurasan, ca 140 AH).

Muḥammad al-Mahdi, heir-apparent and honorary governor of Khurāsān (141/759 – 150/767 or 151/768; later, until about 155/772, actual supreme leader of all al-Mashriq)

In 141/759, second ‘Abbāsid caliph Abu Jaʿfar al-Mansur appointed his son and heir-apparent Muḥammad al-Mahdi governor of Khurāsān. During the next 10 years, most of the copper coins in Mā warāʾ al-Nahr, perhaps save for the earliest issues, were normally struck or cast with the names of amīr al-Mahdi (placed for the first time on copper fulūs of Bukhara in 143/760–1; see below) and local officials — amīr = ‘commander’, ʿāmil = ‘officer, agent, clerk’, probably also ‘[local/subordinate] governor’, sometimes ‘prefect’, often introduced by [ما] ʿāmer bi ʿāmer (rarely or just ʿāmer) or elsewhere within the clauses ʿāmil ʿaṭīla ‘during the governorate [of ...]’ or (for minor executives) عامل الابن ‘in the presence’ (literally: ‘on both hands’) [of ...]’, etc.

Throughout al-Mahdi’s tenure as governor of Khurāsān, actual office in that capacity was reportedly executed by his deputies, whose names seem to have never appeared on the Transoxanian coins of the cited period; 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 of issue, let alone an elusive, nay even illusive Bukhārā, 138 AH11, the earliest date fixed with confidence for the ‘Abbāsid copper coinage in Transoxiana is 142/759–60:

---

11 For this often mentioned but extremely doubtful item see below, under ‘Unconfirmable Attributions’ (List B).
**al-Šaghāniyān, 142 AH (Fig.8, a-b)**

Cast or struck on cast flans. The obverse is adorned by a square lozenge with straight or concave sides and palmettes crowning each of the closed angles (variant A) or expanding from the unclosed ends (variant B), all with a dot in the centre.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ﷺ ضرب هذا الفلس بالصغراني سنة اثنين وأربعين ومتّة — *bismi’llah ḍuriba hāḏā al-fals bīl-Šaghāniyān* and date 142 (in words).

Rev. margin — بسم الله ﷺ أمّر به الأمير الوصي (؟) عمّام الأمير الحسن بن حربان — *bismi’llah amara bihi Abū S.k.rah (?) ʿāmil al-amir al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamrān*.

Up to 6 specimens known so far, all preserved with considerable defects. The type was first published with partially identified date (14) and wrongly read amir’s name (Hamrān) instead of (Hamrān) [RvELADZE 1985: pp. 39–40; LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, no. 837]. Al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamrān is known as governor of Balkh (fl. 142–145 AH), both from narrative sources [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 350; GARDĪZĪ 1991: p. 43] and coin legends [NASTIĆ 2000: pp. 106–07; LOWICK 1996: pp. 378–79, no. 775; BATES 2003: pp. 295 and 316, note 38; TREADWELL 2006 — Balkh and al-Tirmidh]; see also under al-Tirmidh, 142 AH. In Taʿrikh by al-Ṭabarī [cit. sup.] this name is disfigured into al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamdān (definitely a lapsus calami) . M.Bates and L.Treadwell [cit. sup.] use to spell the patronymic as Ḥumrān, whereas I would still prefer Ḥamrān, as it was given for instance in [GARDĪZĪ 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 ﺍﺑﻮ ﺗﺤﺮك / امو سكره؟ = Abū Ṣakrah/Sukrah/Ṣakrah? The only person known to me bearing a more or less resembling name, encountered in [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 349], is a warlord called for Abī Muslim’s audience in 135 AH on the occasion of his denial to recognize the rebel Ziyad b. Salih, whose name was Abu Shakir, but the latter is very unlikely to be the figure in question.

**al-Tirmidh, 142 AH (Fig.9, a-b)**

Obv. field — a broad double circle (variant A — a regular full-line ring, variant B — uneven beaded ovals), virtually empty save for a dot in the middle, however absent in some dies;

margin — بسم الله ﷺ ضرب الفلس بالترمذ (؟) سنة اثنين وأربعين ومتّة — *bismi’llah ḍuriba al-fals biʿl-Tirmīd* and date 142 (in words).
Rev. field — المحمد / لله al-ḥamdul-lāh in 2 lines;
margin — ما أمر به إبراهيم بن ماهان عامل الامير الحسن بن حران
mimmā amara bihi Ibrāhīm b. Māhān ʿāmil al-amīr al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamrān.

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

The main peculiarity of these coins consists in using Arabic article =ال preceding the mint name Tirmidh; as far as I can judge, the cited fact is the first and virtually unique that would not take place ever after in the long and various coinage of this town.

**Bukhārā, 143 AH (Fig.10)**

The type is encountered rather frequently (e.g. 19 specimens in the State Hermitage alone). First published in [FRAEHN 1826: pp. 21–22, no. 22], since then more than once in [TIESENAUZEN 1873: pp. 71–72, no. 724; MARKOV 1896: p. 16, nos. 49–50; LOWICK 1996: pp. 382–83, nos. 819–20; SHAMMA 1998: p. 327, no.(3)] &al.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب بيخارا في سنة ثلاث واربعين ومسنة

Rev. margin — اسمه الامير الاشعث في ولية المهدي الامير محمد بن امير المومنين

Amīr al-ʿAshʿath b. Yahyā, witnessed by coins as governor of Bukhara in this and of Samarqand in the following year (see below, under 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 [AKHBĀR 1997, pp. 221–22], and Ibn al-Kalbī 1408, p. 264, which I myself had no chance to come across so far.

**Samarqand, 143 AH (Fig.11)**

A 6-ray solar rosette with tips curved clockwise (a tamgha?) below field on Obv.; 3 dots • below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب بسمرقند سنة ثلاث واربعين ومسنة

bismi’llāh ẓuriba bi-Samarqand and date 143 (in words).
Rev. field — Qur’ān, 42:23 in 3 lines; margin —
امرأة به الأمير داود بن كرارة/كراز (؟) في وليمة محمد بن أمير المؤمنين
amara bihi al-amir Da‘üd b. Krâz (؟) fī wilāyat Muhammad b. amir al-mu‘minin.

According to [TREADWELL 2006], Arabic written sources (al-Ṭabarî, al-Balâdhurî, Ibn al-Athîr), citing amir Da‘üd, reflect his patronymic name in a number of graphic/phonemic varieties — Karâr; Karârâz; Karâdh; K.wâ.râ; K.râ.râ; etc., none of which can be confidently taken for unique and reliable. M. Bates spells it Karâr and insists that the person is otherwise unknown [BATES 2003: p. 294]. Russian authors, evidently following [SMIRNOVA 1963: p. 139], without any explanation or references call him ‘Da‘üd, son of Gurâr’.

**Samarqand, 144 AH (Fig.12)**

A Sogdian tamgha below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب بسرقندة سنة أربع وأربعين ومنة bismi’llâh ādurâ bi-
Samarqand and date 144 (in words).

Rev. margin — امرأة به الآشقم بن يحيى في وليمة المهدى الأمير محمد بن أمير المؤمنين
amara bihi al-Aš‘ât b. Yahyâ fī wilāyat al-Mahdi al-amir Muḥammad b. amir al-mu‘minin; known also with a few graphic errors — المهدى الأمر مؤمنين or المهدى المؤمنين instead of المؤمنين.


For amir al-Ash‘ath b. Yahyâ see above, under Bukhârâ, 143 AH.

**al-Ṣaghāniyân, 146 AH (Fig.13)**

A lozenge-shaped fancy pattern with palmettes at the edges in the middle of Rev., almost exactly as on the coins of Abî Muslim examined above, just without a central dot.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالصغانيان سنة ست وأربعين ومنة bismi’llâh ādurâ hâdâ al-fals bi‘l-Ṣaghāniyân and date 146 (in words).
Rev. margin — 

امرة به الأمير أبو عاصم (?) في ولية محمد المهدي بن أمير المؤمنين — amara bihi al-amir Abu ‘Ashim (?) fi wilâyat Muḥammad al-Mahdi b. amir al-mu’minin.

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 amir is therefore clarified without full credence.

A certain Abu ‘Ashim (‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Sulaym) was mentioned in [Al-Ṭabarî 1987: p. 313] as Abû Muslim’s envoy to Ťaliqân under 129 AH; otherwise this amir could be identical with the same al-Ash’ath b. Yahyâ, governor of Bukhara in 143/760-1 and Samarqand in 144/761-2 (see above), whose kunya, according to Akhbar 1997, p. 221, reportedly was also Abu ‘Ashim [Treadwell 2006].

**Bukhârâ, 148 AH (Fig.14)**

A six-pointed asterisk * below field on Obv., Bukhâran tamgha ☩ flanked with 3-dot sets below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب بيخارا في سنة ثمانية وأربعين ومينة bismi’llâh āduriba bi-Buhârâ and date 148 (in words), divided into 3 parts with annulets stuffed with dots.

Rev. margin — امر به معيد في ولية المهدي ولي عهد المسلمين محمد بن أمير المؤمنين — amara bihi Ma’bad fi wilâyat al-Mahdi walîyy ‘âhd al-muslimin Muḥammad b. amir al-mu’minin.

The type is well-known and spread [Fraehn 1826: p. 24, no. 35; Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 81, no. 779; Markov 1896: p. 17, nos. 91–92; Smirnova 1963: pp. 149–50, nos. 903–10; Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, no. 823; Shamâ 1998: p. 328, no.(6); & al.]. Ma’bad [b. Khalîl] (reportedly born in Marw and died as governor of Sind in 159/776) — a prominent functionary mentioned in a number of sources (al-Ṭabarî, Narshâkhî, Ibn al-Kalbî, etc.); the inspected coin shows that in 148/765 he was acting as amir of Bukhârâ.

**al-Šaghâniyân (?) 148 AH (Fig.15)**

A star-like dotted sign above field on Obv., tamgha-like sign ☩ below.

Obv. margin, instead of the circular legend, a broad zigzag pattern rim with 3 evenly placed annulets inside.
Rev. field in 3 lines — *mimmā amara bihi al-Mahdi Muḥammad b. amīr al-muʾminīn;* margin — بسم الله ... الفلك بالصغام (1) سنة ثمان واربعين ومنئة *bismi’llāh <...> al-fals bi’l-s. ḡnāy.n (I) and date 149 (in words).

Three specimens known so far, all present on [ZENO: #25332, 50418 & 105103]. First published in [RTVELADZE 1985: p. 39 & pl. I] with wrong attribution (the mint name defined as “al-...ra” and the date deciphered as 146). Of the above inspected specimens, the Rev. marginal legend is virtually lost, while the other two expose a blundered graphic for the mint, which is conventionally recognized as distorted al-Ṣaghāniyān, — unlike the above described issue of 146/763–64, showing the mint name in the perfect way, and apropos, also with Arabic article الل، which was always inherent to the coins of Ṣaghāniyān up until the early 13th ct.).

**al-Shāsh, 149 AH (Fig.16)**

Obv. margin — بسم الله ولية المهدى سنة تسعة واربعين ومنئة *bismi’llāh wilāyat al-Mahdi* and date 149 (in words).

Rev. margin — اُمِرْ سُعِيد بن مَحَيِّي ضرب بالشاس ستين بدرهم *amara (or amru) Saʿīd b. Yahyā ḍurība biʾl-ṣās sittīn bi-dirham.*

Recently discovered [NASTIČ 2000: p. 107] but proved not to be especially rare (about 20 pieces presently known to the author). Denominated ستين بدرهم *‘sixty to a dirham’ (on some specimens carved as ستين بدرهم). Separate dies show numerous errors and omissions in the legends on both sides, most of which were detalized in [FARR, NASTIĆ 2001: p. 13]. The cited amīr Saʿīd b. Yahyā, according to [TREADWELL 2006], may have been a brother of Ashʿath b. Yahyā, governor of Bukhāra and Samarqand in the mid-140s (see above, under Bukhāra, 143 AH and Samarqand, 144 AH).

**Bukhāra, 151 AH (Fig.17)**

An oblong decorative cartouche on Rev., dividing the Kalima-II into two parts in a way similar to that on the fulās of Abī Muslim and al-Ṣaghāniyān, 146 AH (see above).

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب بخارا في سنة احدي وخمسين ومنئة *bismi’llāh ḍurība bi-Buḥāra* and date 151 (in words).
Rev. margin — امر به الجند بن خلد عامل الإمام المهدي ولى عهد المسلمين amara bihi al-ʿUnayd b. Ṣāʿidʿ āmil al-imām al-Mahdī walīyyaʾ ʿahd al-muslimīn.

The type is wide-spread and known since long [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: pp. 83–84, no. 802; MĀRKOV 1896: p. 18, nos. 112–13; SMIRNOVA 1963: pp. 151–53, nos. 916–28; LOWICK 1996: pp. 382–83, no. 825; SHAMMA 1998: p. 328, no.(7); & al.]. The calligraphic style of Kūfi inscriptions exposes an obvious similarity with late Umayyad and contemporary ʿAbbāsid gold dinār issues. I feel no need to give special references to the design analogies, as those are too numerous and easily accessible in lots of respective matters, printed or Internet-posted; however, compare e.g. with [ZENO: #58415], dated 151 AH as well; see also below, Samarqand, 172 AH (subtype A) and Kish, 173 AH.

The governor’s title الامام al-imām, placed on the reviewed fals instead of الامام, rather expected in this position, in some dies of this type is carved as ʾāmil. Separate specimens show considerable fluctuations of size and weight (from above 2.4 down to 0.7 g), looking like different denominations.

Al-ʿUnayd b. Khālid b. Ḥarīm al-Taghlibī was mentioned by [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 354] as flogged and imprisoned by governor ʿAbd al-Jabbār in 140/758 together with Māʾbad b. al-Khalīl al-Muzānī (see above, under Bukhārā, 148), later as amīr of Bukhārā in 163/780 [NARSHAKHĪ 1897: p. 92]. The inspected coins show that he was acting in the latter capacity for the first time in 151/768.

Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭāʾī, governor of Khūrāsān (151/768 or 152/768 – 159/776)

According to [GARDĪZĪ 1991: p. 44], caliph al-Manṣūr appointed Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba governor of Khūrāsān on the 1st of Shaban 151/168; [AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: p. 361] fixed the same event for 152/769, while [AL-YAʿQĪBĪ 2011: p. 69] mentioned him in the same capacity interrupted once for a while, but without exact dates. Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭaba held that office until his death in 159/776. It was in his term of service that the religious pretender Hāshim b. Ḥakīm (apud al-Muqannaʾ) had raised his revolt.

[al-]Ṣaghāniyān, 153 AH (Fig.18)

Obv. field — an 8-pointed linear design (octogramme) with a dot in the middle;
margin — بسم الله ضرب...داغانیان [سنة] ثلاث وخمس مئة (1) bismi‘llāh duri[ba etc. 
<...> bi'l]-ṣağāniyan and date 153 (in words) in an amusingly wrong spelling, which allows its reading as 503.

Rev. margin — ...mimmā amara bihi al-amîr <...>, all the rest is gone.

The only specimen known so far (cast; 1.3 g, 19-21 mm), unearthed in 2008 on the citadel of ancient Termez and is now kept in the Institute of Archeology, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan12. Its surface has been heavily cleaned, the legends are damaged and yield guessing rather than coherent reading; nevertheless, the mint name specified with reasonable confidence. The year of issue, had it been actually 503 AH, should belong to the Qarhakhanid period (resp. 1109-10 CE), which is absolutely impossible for many reasons, viz. coin type in general, content of legends, writing style, flan & die/mold producing technology &al., normal for the ‘Abbāsid time but never fixed in aggregate after the middle of the 10th ct. CE.

Samarqand, 153 AH (Fig.19)

A tamgha-like arabesque ٍ below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — مَلِكٌ بِهِ فِي وَلَدی الامیر حمزة بن حمزة في مئة mimmā amara bihi Ḥamzah b. ‘Amr fi wilāyat al-amir Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭabah.

Rev. margin — ...ضرب بسمرقد داغانیان في وَلَدی المُهَدی سِنَنَ ثَلَاث وَخَمْس مِئة ... duriba bi-
Samarqand fi wilāyat al-Mahdi and date 153 (in words).


Obv. shows two names: Ḥamzah b. ‘Amr (a local official) and al-amir Ḥumayd b. Qaḥṭabah (governor of Khurāsān, AH 151 or 152–159), but Rev. definitely contains fi wilāyat al-Mahdi, who was governor of Khurāsān reportedly between AH 141 and 150 (or 151).

12 The image and general information about this unique fals are available thanks to the courtesy of my Samarkand colleague Anvar Kh. Atakhodžaev.
The above specimen seems to make obvious that Ḫumayd b. Qaḥṭaba ruled whole Khurāsān, including Transoxiana, residing (as indicated in reliable sources) in Marw, while al-Mahdī retained direct supervision upon Khurāsān after his resignation as active governor. As for amīr Ḫamza b. Ṭā’īr, 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-Šagḥāniyān, 155 AH (Fig.20)**

Anonymous.

Obv. margin blank, otherwise without external peculiarities.

Rev. margin — dispatcher  bismi’llāh ḍuriba hādā al-fals bi-l-Šagḥāniyān and date 155 (in words).

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

**Nasaf, 157/9 AH (Fig.21)**

Obv. field — image of a horse walking left, apparently with traces of saddle on back and an unclear signet above;

margin (legible only in part) —  al-fals bi-Nasaf and date [1]57 or [1]59 (in words).

Rev. margin (legible only in part) —  mimmā amara bihi al-āsim (?) <…> [al-]Mahdī.

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 weakly preserved legends, is posted in 2011 on [Zeno: #102443]; now supposedly in a private collection.

Nasaf (Nesef) was named Nakhsheb in pre-Islamic times and Qarshi (Karši) 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), a vigorous rebel who was renowned for his adherence to the late Abū
Muslim, claimed him to be al-Mahdi (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-Mahdi’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-Mahdi. So my assumption is that the above copper struck at Nasaf, especially if its date of issue was indeed 159/773–74, may well be connected with rebel Ḥāshim b. Ḥākim, otherwise known as al-Muqanna’, whose identity is unconditionally hidden behind the following coin type.

**No mint name, no date (Fig. 22)**

Cast copper fals of unusual appearance: both sides show field legends only, encircled by double linear rims with 4 dotted annulets ○ between the lines instead of marginal inscriptions.

Obv. field — ʼumma ʼamr bnh / Ḥāshim waṣiyy Abī Muslim.

Rev. field — ʼumr lhlh / bālwfn tw I , the word ʼadl, ‘Allah has commanded the loyalty and justice’, 3 dots • below.

The clause placed on Rev. was first used in 100 AH and later on Umayyad copper fulūs 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.

The coin of this type was first fixed without definition in [Tiesenhausen 1873: p. 293, no. 2945]; another specimen was later unveiled by B.D. Kočnev in the State Hermitage collection and subjected to detailed investigation in [Kočnev 1995; Kočnev 2001a]. Presently two more pieces are available on [Zeno: #57386 and 74996]. I have virtually nothing to add to his thorough research and well-grounded conclusions about this important coin type, perhaps only correct the erroneous of ʼuma al-Mūsulmān ‘Ibā Mūsulmān, and what is much more substantial, the reading waṣiyy (literally ‘inheritor, feoffee in trust, executor [of someone’s will]’ also ‘bequeathed, conferred, endowed’, & sim.) as ʿUmar b. ʿUmar (mate, cognate, assistant, representative’), with respective abolition of Kočnev’s discourse into the meaning of this wrongly defined term [Kočnev 2001a: p. 147].
Abū 'Awn 'Abd al-Malik b. Yazīd, governor of Khurāsān
(159/776 – 160/777)

'Abd al-Malik b. Yazīd “became governor in 159, only to be dismissed in

Bukhārā, 160 AH (Fig. 23)

Palmettes ʿab above and ʿab below field legend on Rev.

Obv. field, instead of habitual Kalima-I — بركة لوسي / ولي عهد / المسلمين —
barakah li-Mūsā / walīyy ‘aḥd / al-muslimīn (a blessing for al-Mahdi’s heir and future
caliph Mūsā al-Hādi); the heir’s name is encountered in two graphic varieties —
and لوسي;

margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بخنارا في سنة ستين ومنه — bismi’llāh ʿuriba ḫūḏā
al-fals bi-Baḥrā and date 160 (in words).


A well-known coin type [FRAEHN 1826: p. 33, no. 75; TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 97, no.
906; MARKOV 1896: p. 20, no. 185; LOWICK 1996: pp. 382–83, no. 827; SHAMMA 1998:
p. 329, no.(9); & al.].

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

(166/783 – 171/786)

al-Faḍl b. Sulaymān was appointed by caliph al-Mahdi to Khurāsān, where he
stayed until the early years of Hārūn (AL-ṬABARĪ 1987: pp. 364–65; AL-YA’QŪBI 2011:
p. 70).

al-Ṣagh[fān]iyān (?), 166 AH (Fig. 24)

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالصغىان! (؟) سنة ست وستين ومنه —
bismi’llāh ʿuriba ḫūḏā al-fals bi-l-ṣaghiyān (?) and date 166 (in words).
EARLY ISLAMIC COPPER COINAGE OF TRANSOXIANA

Rev. margin — "ما أمر به الامير عمرو بن جهل؟" (مٓمّاء عّمّار بيِّه الامير عّمّر بن جهل؟) عز الله نصره

A single unpublished specimen is posted on ZENO, #93027. The mint name is somewhat blundered but believed to denote al-Šagāniyān; compare for instance above, al-Šagāniyān (?), 148 AH. The officer’s name ‘Amr b. Ğamal / Ğamal (?) mentioned on the coin is otherwise unknown.

Ja’far b. Muḥammad b. al-Asḥ’ath al-Khuzā’i, 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-Hādi [AL-YA’QUBI 2011: p. 70]; his governorship ended in 173 when Hārūn, then already caliph al-Rashid, 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 differing fundamentally through the additional mention of a certain person on one of them. First mentioned without any details in [MARKOV 1896: p. 27, nos. 366–67].

Subtype A (Fig.25, a)

‘adīl below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — bismi’llah duriba hāḍa al-fals bi-Kish and date 173 (in words).

Rev. margin: “ما أمر به الامير جعفر بن محمد علي يدی مسعده تجری" (مٓمّاء عّمّار بيِّه الامیر جعفر بن محمد علمی یدی مسعده تجری)

A well-known type [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 129, no. 1164; 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 below), it stands out of the bulk 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 (Madinat al-Salam) and shipped to Samarqand, or an engraver from Baghdad or Cairo was sent to Samarqand to continue his practice?” [ALBUM 2011a: Sale 10, Lot 443].

**Subtype B (Fig. 25, b)**

Similar to subtype A but designed in the style common for copper coins of the time; Obv. with inner beaded rim and عدد ‘adil below field;

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

Rev. فتح (instead of عدد ‘adil) below field;

margin: مَا الْهَـِّ (ِ! ) الاَلْمِيْر جَعْفُر بن مَحْمُود عَلِي ِبَيْدِى يَسِعِىُّهُ بِعَجْر: mimmā a-mara bihi al-amīr Ğa’far b. Muḥammad ‘alā yaday Mas’ada b. Buğayr.

Unpublished; image source — [*Zeno:* #75011]. Dr. A. Atakhodžaev’s observation shows that this variety is much rarer (about 1:50) than the previous one, which means that at least a few more specimens should exist.

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

**Kish, 173 AH (Fig. 26)**

عدد ‘adil below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — پسم الله ضرب [هذَا الفَلِسَ بَيْنَ سَنَةٍ ثَلَثٍ وَسِبْعِينٍ وَمِمَّةٍ] bismi’llāh ʾduriba ḥāda al-fals bi-Kish and date 173 (in words).

Rev. margin — مَا اَمَر بِهِ الْاَلْمِيْر جَعْفُر بن مَحْمُود عَلِي ِبَيْدِى (؟) مَوْلَى اَمِير الْمُؤِمْنِينِ mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Ğa’far b. Muḥammad ‘alā yaday (Yahyā (?) ma’wlā amīr al-mu’mīnīn.

Unique, unknown so far. Acquired in the Moscow coin market (May 2011), now in the author’s collection.

---

13 A. Atakhodžaev’s personal e-mail to the author (a thread dated 29 Jan. – 11 Feb. 2012).
The same unusual “dinar” calligraphy (if not the same hand) as on Samarqand, 172 AH, subtype A. The local officer’s name, although badly spoilt through casting defect, still seems to be Yahyā, apparently following with the prestigious title mawla amīr al-mu’minin.

**Bukhārā, 173 AH (Fig.27)**

Obv. field, instead of habitual Kalima-1 بركة / لهرت أمير / المؤمنين — barakah li-Hārūn / amīr / al-mu’minin (a blessing for the newly enthroned caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd; compare above, Bukhārā, 160 AH);

margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بخمر سنة ثمان وسبعين وستة mimea al-fals bi-Buhārā and date 173 (in words); a legend variety is fixed without


**No mint name, 174 AH (Fig.28)**

Obv. margin — بسم الله ما أمر به يحيى بن معاذ سنة أربع وسبعين وستة mimea al-fals bihi Yahyā b. Mu‘ādh and date 174 (in words).

Rev. field — Kufic above, يحيى Yahyā below;

margin — Qur’ān, 9:33.

Several specimens known [MARKOV 1896: p. 27, no. 381; LOWICK 1996: pp. 386–87, no. 853; ANS, no. 1971.316.21; &al.]. Rich information about Yahyā b. Mu‘ādh b. Muslim based on different written sources is available in [CRONE 2003: p. 184]. According to [GARDIZI 1991: p. 48], caliph Harun gave control of Khurāsān to al-Faḍl b. Yahyā al-Barmaki who sent Yahyā b. Mu‘ādh to govern there on his behalf in Ramaḍān 177/December 193, which office the latter should be executing during a few months until al-Faḍl’s arrival there early next year. However, the inspected coin is dated at least 3 years before those events when the person named on it
should reportedly sojourn in Jurjân or elsewhere, and in addition it is devoid of the mint name, just given that it was found in the Bukhara region, and on the other hand, taking into account that the dates reported by Gardizî are very often far from exact, I decided to include this rare type as related anyhow to the numismatic history of ‘Middle Asia’.


**al-Khuttal, 177 AH (Fig. 29)**

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس باختلال سنة سبع وسبعين ومائة bismi’llâh duriba hâdâ al-fals bi-l-ḥuttal and date 177 (in words).

Rev. margin: ( ) مَما اَمْرَ بِهِ الامِيرْ هَضْرُ (؟) بِنِ الْحَسنِ عَامِلِ الامِيرِ مَنِيفِ (؟) b. al-Ḥasan ʿāmil al-amîr Munîf (?).

Recently discovered, the type is now represented by 4 specimens with clear and unambiguous mint name, all posted on [ZENO: #93024–26, 112432]; however, both names mentioned (where preserved) in the marginal legend on Rev. allow quite obscure reading.


**Bukhârâ’, 185 AH (Fig. 30)**

A palmette ﮐ above the upper line and عدل ‘adîl below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بيخا ئ سنة خمس وثمانين ومائة bismi’llâh duriba hâdâ al-fals bi-Buḥârâ and date 185 (in words).
Rev. margin — amara bihi al-amir ʿAli b. ʿIsā abqāhu Allāh fi wilāyat Saʿīd b. ʿAfār. The word wilāyat is written with alif, unlike in the most of other cases.

The type is known since long [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); & al.]. Saʿīd b. Jaʿfar’s name was not found in the written sources.

Binkath, 186 AH (Fig.31)

A swastika with rounded hooks א below field on Rev.

Obv. field — Kalima-I with first line partly retrograde لَا حَامَلَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ ; the rest is as usual;

margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بينكت ست وتمين وبه(!) bismiʾllāh ḏuriba ḥāḏā al-fals bi-Buḫārā and date 186 (in words); the deformed word for ‘hundred’ (normally مائة or مائة).

Rev. margin — بسم الله بما أمر به الأمير سباع بن مسعدة إبقاء الله bismiʾllāh mimmā amara bihi al-amir Sibāʾ b. Masʿādah abqāhu Allāh.

Unique until recently [KALNIN, TREADWELL 2004: p. 15–16], today this important coin is known already in 3 specimens. The name Sibāʾ b. Masʿādah cited in the Rev. legend belongs to another son of Masʿāda b. Buḥayr mentioned on copper fulūs of Samarkand in 172 AH (see above). Binkath is universally perceived as the capital of the Shāsh province.

Bukhārā, 190 AH (Fig.32)

Palmette اُح above and عدل below Rev. field.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بيخارا سنة تسعين وتمان bismiʾllāh ḏuriba ḥāḏā al-fals bi-Buḫārā and date 190 (in words).

Rev. margin — وما أمر به هارون أمير المؤمنين على يدي الحكم بن سعود mimmā amara bihi Ḥārūn amir al-muʾmininʾalā yaday al-Ḥakam b. Saʿīd.

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); & 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. The name al-Ḥakam b. Saʿīd seems to be otherwise unknown.
Harthama b. Aʿyān al-Balkhī, governor of Khurāsān
(191/806 – 196/811-27)


Bukhārā, 194 AH (Fig.33)

Palmette ﷲ above and ﷼ below Rev. field.

Obv. margin — بسمل الله ضرب] هذا الفلس بخارا سنة إربع وتسعين ومنه bismi’llāh ḍuriba ḥādā al-fals bi-Balḥārā and date 194 (in words).

Rev. ﷼ below field;

margin — مما أمر به الأمير هرثمة بن [عثين علي بدي(؟) سنكر(؟) بن ...] mimmā amara bihi al-amīr Harthamah b. [Aʿyān ʿalā yaday (?)] *s.k.r (?) b. <...>.

Reported more than once [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p. 285, no. 2822; MARKOV 1896: p.36, no. 621; LOWICK 1996: pp. 384-5, 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. Mr. Vyacheslav Kuleshov from the State Hermitage inspected this fals upon my request and found out that governor Harthama’s name can be observed there “with highest confidence”14, whereas the second name is barely visible and its spelling remains dubious; I only dare surmise a cautious version ... يشكور بن ... yashkur b. <...>, however having no idea as yet whose identity could be concealed behind this uncommon (Arabian or Yemenite) name.

14 V. Kuleshov’s personal e-mail to the author (a thread dated 27-28 Apr. 2012).
'Abd Allāh al-Ma‘mūn (as honorary leader of all al-Mashriq, 193–200 AH)

Al-Faḍl b. Sahl, governor of Khūrāsān
(197/812-3 – 202/817-8 or 203/818-9)

A Zoroastrian converted to Islam by hand of al-Ma‘mūn, the influential al-Faḍl b. Sahl was his wazīr and commander-in-chief (hence his nickname dhū‘l-riyāsatayn ‘the holder of the two highest positions’. Acting as al-Ma‘mūn’s deputy governor of Khūrāsān (since 197 or 198 AH), he was suspected in double-dealing and murdered at Sarakhs in 202/817–18 or 203/818–19 [Al-Ya’qūbī 2011: p. 71, 209; Zetterstēen 1927: p. 39].

Samarqand, 198 AH (Fig.34)

A 6-pointed asterisk below field on Obv.; marginal legend replaced by a double linear rim with a few intermittent crescents and annulets.

Rev. field —  مِسْمَّى امْرِيَةٌ ذَوَّ الْرَبِّيْسِيْنِ الْعِيْبَاسٍ — mimmā amara bihi al-a/mīr ḍū al-riyāsatayn / al-‘Abbās;

margin — ضَرِبَ هذَا الْفِلَسُ بـِسْمِ رَبِّيْسِيْنِ سَنَةٌ ثَانِيَةٌ وَسَمِعَنَ وَمَنُةٌ dūriba hādā al-fals bi-Samarqand and date 198 (in words).

One specimen fixed 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, Dhū‘l-riyāsatayn and al-‘Abbās are definitely two different persons. The first appellation belongs to 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 Khūrāsān
(204/819 – 205/821)

al-Shāsh, 204 AH (Fig. 35)

Obv. below field — غسان Ǧassān;
margins — محمد رسول الله ارسله بالهدى ودين الحق (part of Qur’ān, 9:33).
Rev. above field — لله ʿillāh;
margins — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بالشام سنة أربع ومائتين bismiʿllāh ʿuruba ḫāḏā al-fals bīl-Šāš and date 204 (in words); the hundreds and thousands are often reduced to 2 or 3 first letters.

Known since recently [KOČNEV 1994: p. 102], the coin is now considered moderately rare.

Samarqand, 205 AH (Fig. 36, a-b)

_above field, tamgha-like sign d (Arabic letter hāʾ) below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بسرقند سنة خمس وأمانتين bismiʿllāh ʿuruba ḫāḏā al-fals bi-Samarqand and date 205 (in words); a few distortions are observed in the date (خمس مائتين or مائتين, sometimes without wāw after خمس).

Rev. margin — وما أمر به الأمير غسان بن عباد أبيه الله Ǧassān b. ʿAbdāb ḍbāḥu Allāh.

A 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)], apparently representing two aliquot denominations, perhaps somewhat analogous to later ʿadli (full fals) and pashīz (half fals): all legends are the same, the only distinguishing element, apart from weight and size, is a dot inside ʿillāh above the field legend on Rev.; bigger and heavier coins (usually 2g and more, 19–21mm — variant A) are always with that dot, while smaller and lighter ones (up to 2g, 16–17.5mm — variant B) never have it. One more discriminating feature refers to circular inner 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.

Nawīkat[h] Zakariyā (?), 205 AH (Fig. 37)

Obv. field — Kalima-I. للہ ِلطیف; a decorative rim (double-twisted wavy line between dotted and beaded circles) instead of marginal legend.

Rev. field — Kalima-II. غسان Ǧassān below;
margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بو[ء]كت زكريا سنة خمس وخمس (1) bismi’llâh 
duriba hâdâ al-fâls bi-Naw[î]kat Zakariyâ and date 205 (in words); hundreds of the date 
shown as مائتين instead of ماس.

Four specimens known to me in kind, three of which posted on [ZENO: no. 55618]; at least one more piece is reportedly present in a private collection (Uzbekistan); first mentioned The mint name appears on some of them as بوکت زکریا. The first part of this quite uncommon word combination is definitely نوکت Nawkat or نوکت Nawikath15; as to the second component, زکریا or (actually without reasonable alternative options) زکریا, it is not fixed in any other written sources; probably the borough
was named in this way after a certain person whose activity had been distinguished in the eyes of its dwellers, judging by the basic appellation, of Soghdian root. The whole toponym Nawikat (or rather Navêkath)-e Zakariyâ may be translated as ‘Zacharia’s New town/borough/village’, with =i (properly =î, otherwise =aî) in the capacity of Soghdian suffix for feminine nouns.

The name لیث Layt placed on Rev. would also require an identification, just 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, praepostor &sim., or else an official endowed with the right of coining.

Ţâhir b. al-Ţusayn b. Muṣâab al-Bûshanjî, governor of Khurâsân (205/821 – 207/822) and later

The Middle Asian coinage of governor Ťâhir b. al-Husayn and his descendants holding that post until 259/873 is not reviewed here (see above), in part because it obviously deserves a separate study, for which no more space is left in this article...

15 The alternative reading of the mint name, Tunket (or Tünkath) [KOCHNEV 1994: p. 102; ATAKHODZAEV 1998: p. 16] is now renounced as less consistent in favour of Nawkat [BATES 2011: p. 3].
MORE PUZZLES TO SOLVE
(Addition to List A. Coin types with incomplete or unreliable attribution)

Bukhārā, [1]–(?) AH (Fig.38)

Unique so far (1.96g, 16–18mm; in the author’s private collection), the coin belongs to the most enigmatic Transoxanian issues for the moment.

Obv. margin — بسم الله (؟) ضرب بیخارا فی ... бісмі’ллāх (?) дуриба бі-
Buhārā fi sanaḥ wa (?) and uncertain date.

Rev. margin — امر به الامیر حلالن س الرباط/الولن /الرک (؟) سس حار amara bihi al-
سّتین جاز sittin ġāz ‘sixty [of these coppers are] acceptable [for a dirham].

Heavy mechanical damage having affected the most significant places of coin legends, unfortunately, prevents this important specimen from adequate definition. The letter after سُه, is by all features a wāw, so the cited grapheme, otherwise normally perceived in this position as سنة ‘year’, looks here more like a unit of the date, namely ... ستین wa-sittah wa-<...> just as if it represented the remnant of the date [1]–6 (?). The second part of amir’s name cited on Rev. is badly distorted, apparently through illiterate carving, but by overall appearance I would dare surmise here a broken تربهيم, and thus relate the item to the coinage of governor Khālid b. Ibrāhīm; in such case, however, reading the date as [1]–6 is hardly possible, — sure unless it should be another Khālid, which is tantamount here: the name خلال (resp. خلال) is shown on this coin without alif, unlike all other coin types definitely related to Khālid b. Ibrāhīm’s reign (see above).

Far[ghā]nah (?), 204 AH

Sahl below Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس بفرغاشیة سنة اربع ومايين بہ biсмі’ллāх  ámbir
hāḏā al-fals bi-Far[ghā]nah and date 204 (in words);

Rev. margin — لما امر به الامیر غسان بن عباد رضی الله b. مّینّا amara bihi al-amīr
Gāsān b. ’Abbād ąbqāhu Allāh.

A unique description given in [Lavoix 1887: p. 442, no. 1596] fits well to the known issues of Ghassan b. ’Abbād (see above) and could actually match the existing coin type, just the questionable reading of the mint name by H. Lavoix himself, strengthened by the unclear image on Pl. IX and especially the absolute
absence of similar examples findable till now among the abundant coin finds throughout Middle Asia, compels us to refrain thus far from perceiving with full confidence the idea about the fabrication of this fals in Farghāna proper.

**Haftdih (?)**, 205 AH (Fig.39)

above field, tamgha-like sign ٠ (Arabic letter hā’) below field on Rev.

Obv. margin — بسم الله ضرب هذا الفلس ب حمد (؟) سنة عُموم ومتين (١) bismi’llāh ādurba hādā al-fals bi-h.f.d.[h]? and date 205 (in words); graphic deviations throughout the legend.

Rev. margin — امر به الأمير غسان بن عباد ابنا الله ‘Abbād abqāhu Allāh.

At first glance, the mint name (something like حمد or حفظ) seems to be clear enough on the perfectly preserved unique specimen, yet the entire marginal legend looks so heavily blundered that it cannot afford a univocal reading. The only version I could set forth is Haftdeh or Haftdih (normally حفظ، though shown on the coin in a different way), bearing in mind a small town in Fergana, known as coin-producing centre in the late 10th century [Kočnev 2001: p.67–68; Kočnev 2006: p.44, 132]. On the other hand, the overall coin type, including all Arabic legends, is very similar to the copper coinage of Samarkand in the name of Ghassān b.’Abbād (see above); so unless turning out a terminally spoiled سميرقند، its minting place must have been anyway not too far from it.

**al-Ṭarband, no date** (Fig.40)

Obv. margin — ضرب هذا الفلس بالطاربند ādurba hādā al-fals bi’l-Ṭarband.


Three specimens are placed on [Zeno: 65765 | 69951 | 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 real time of its fabrication.

The toponym al-Ṭarband is conventionally admitted as the ancient name of later Otrar, capital of the Pārāb region located in the basin of Sir Daryā River (now in South Kazakhstan). According to some sources, [al-]Ṭarband or Ṭurāband (presumably from ancient Turkic Kangū 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.41)**

Cast. Linear rims on both sides.

Obv. field — لا الله الا الله lä ilāha illā Allāh;
margin legend undecipherable.

Rev. field — ولا شريك (?) له wahduhu lä šarika lahu (slightly distorted but generally legible);

margin — ... al-amīr Muḥammad b. <...> (?).

No reference; reportedly acquired in early 1990s from a Tashkent seller. Image and general data courtesy — N.N. Ivanov (Moscow).

**No mint name, no date**

Rough casting.

Obv. field — الله Allāh in a beaded rim;
margin — لا الله الا الله محمد رسول lä ilāha illā Allāh Muḥammad rasūl.
Rev. field — (؟) ح[m]r or h.m[z]h (?), three dots below;
margin — ... [amara] bihi al-amīr <...> (?)

Known in relative quantity but hardly ever published; reportedly originating from Shāsh region (Kanka, the ancient site of Kharaṣhket) [Zeno: directory [http://www.zeno.ru/showgallery.php?cat=8371]], also in a few private collections (Russia). The name Ḥamr (Hamz[ah] or otherwise) remains unidentified.

**No mint name, no date (Fig.42)**

Anonymous, cast.

Obv. field, in 4 lines — لا الله الا الله علم الله في القرآن / الله و السطين بدرهم lä ilāha illā A/llāh nī’ma al-qādir Allāh wa / sittin bi-dirham; all in beaded circle without a marginal legend.

Rev. field, 2 lines — بسم الله محمد ر/سول الله bismi’Ilāh muḥammad rasūl Allāh; no marginal legend around.

No references. Two pieces, reportedly unearthed in the Surkhān Darya region (ancient Ṣaghāniyān). Image and general data from a private collection (Russia).
B. UNCONFIRMABLE ATTRIBUTIONS

Bukhārā, 138 AH

The initial referent, [TIESENHAUSEN 1873: p.68, no. 696], communicates only partial information: “Fals of the same year [=138 as in the previous description no. 695. — V.N.] from Bukhara (بخارا). In the Imper. Hermit[age]”, providing no information about the coin legends. In [ZAMBAUR 1968: p. 67] the date 138 is noticed 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)]. Upon my request, a search of this fals was undertaken by Mr. Vyacheslav Kuleshov in the State Hermitage collection, however without result: “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 Bukhara proper should have commenced in 143 AH (19 pieces available) <...>”16.

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 an overt mistake and hardly needs a special explanation.

Bukhārā, 13× AH

Reference: British Museum collection [LANE-POOLE 1875: p. 191, no. 80]. The date 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 any convincing because of almost complete obliteration of the coin.

Bukhārā, 140 AH

Rev. margin — … الامام محمد بن أمر المؤمنين — <...> al-‘Aṣṭāf fi wilāyat al-Mahdi al-amīr Muḥammad b. amīr al-muʾminin.

Reference: British Museum collection, 1905 unregistered [LOWICK 1996: p. 382, no. 818; TREADWELL 2006]. Al-Mahdi was not appointed governor of the Mashriq

16 V. Kuleshov’s personal e-mail to the author, dated 27 Apr. 2012.
until 141, so the probability is that either the date on this coin was mistaken
ably engraved or it has been misread. Its legends are similar to the Bukhārān fals of 143
AH (see above).

Șaghāniyān, 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.

Akhsikath, 144 AH

73, no. 732], — regarded as suspicious by [Frye 1949: pp. 35–36], also by [Zambaur
1968: p. 38, note 2]; no real coins with this combination of mint and date have ever
come to light.

Bukhārā, 144 AH

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 as well.

Bukhārā, 145 AH

— 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”17.

Bukhārā (?), 146 AH

table, nos. 3–4], — an interrogatory assumption in the Russian original, now proven
as related to the copper issue of al-Șaghāniyān, 148 (see above).

Bukhārā, 147 AH

Reference: [ZAMBAUR 1968: p. 67], without any additional information — seems to be nothing but a misprint for 143.

Samarkand, 149 AH


Bukhārā, 14X AH

Image source — [ZENO: #36026], — now reattributed as related to the common type dated 143 AH (see above). The item was used in my PPT presentation of the paper to the 3rd Assemani Symposium in Rome, where I presented its Rev. marginal legend as seemingly containing the name al-amīr Yaḥyā (however, doubtful from the very beginning), which in fact turned to be a half-cut al-amīr al-ṣāḥib, normally preceding al-Ash‘ath’s name on the fulās of Bukhārā struck in 143 AH.

Samarkand, 151 AH

Image source — [ALBUM 2011b: item No. 114990 (lot 306)], — evidently an erroneous reading of the mint name, which is actually Bukhārā, 151 AH (see above).

Samarkand, 154 AH

Reference: [LOWICK 1996: pp. 384–85, no. 843], based on [TIESENAUSEN 1873: p. 87, no. 836], citing BARTHOLOMAEI, ‘Lettre à M. Soret’, p. 33, no. 53, tab. 1, no. 7; the entry was reported as essentially the same as the preceding item 835 from Nihāwān, 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 admit that its attribution was erroneous per se, since it is hardly impossible 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 depending on him W. Tiesenhausen could merely confuse between the mint names, similar to some extent in graphic shape (بی‌هاوند and پسرقند), especially if those had certain defects on the coins.
Khwārizm, 154 AH

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 384–85, no. 848], based on [Tiesehausen 1873: p. 87, no. 837], — seems to be Lowick’s plain misunderstanding, as W. Tiesehausen had clearly attributed the item as struck at Dabil (Caucasia): “فَلْسُ 154 سنة، إِلَى دِبِيلِهِ”.

Bukhārā, 155 AH

Reference: [Lowick 1996: pp. 382–83, no. 826], based on [Markov 1896: p. 19, no. 141], — “R.Vasmer and I.G. Dobrovolsky had reportedly read the date on this specimen as 185”. According to V. Kuleshov’s note”, the basic inventory of the Hermitage collection now contains a record of this piece as Bukhārā, 155 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. Ḥaṣā and Saʿīd b. Ǧaʿfar.

Samarkand, 186 AH

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

Khujandah (Khojend), 194 AH

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

References: [Atakhodžaev 1998: p. 15], supported with the author’s quick note of alleged V. Kalinin’s oral communication (late 1990s).

Bukhārā, 197 AH

Rev. الفضل al-fadl below field, other legends reportedly worn out.

References: [Tiesehausen 1873: p.185, no. 1665], citing Soret, ‘Lettre à M. Dorn’, p. 15, no. 10; [Shamma 1998: p. 330, no.(14)], showing the date as 197/9. The item has never been confirmed anywhere.

18 K. Kravtsov’s personal e-mail to the author, dated 21 Apr. 2012.
19 V. Kuleshov’s personal e-mail to the author, dated 27 Apr. 2012.
al-Shash, 199 AH

A misty discourse in [SHAMMA 1998: p. 339, no.(i)] with no clearer reference to Tabatiba’i; no trace of such copper item or even a slightest 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].

CONCLUSION

Now we can see that the copper coinage in the north-easternmost regions of the ‘Abbāsid Caliphate in the 2nd – early 3rd cts. AH was not sporadic and occasional as it could have seemed before when we were only aware of about half dozen separate fals types produced at two or three coin-minting centres. 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; on the contrary, 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 expose 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 ‘Abbāsid period.
‘Abbāsid Copper-minting Centres of Mā warā’ al-Nahr (Transoxiana)

A schematic map (based on Yuri Bregel’s *Historical Atlas of Central Asia*)
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ILLUSTRATIONS
Illustrations:

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

- **a)** Bukhara, ruler Asbar (date uncertain). Image source — ZENO: #21134;
- **c)** Chach, Kabarna principality, unknown ruler (7–8th ct.). Image source — ZENO: #15633;
- **d)** Otrar, unknown ruler (c. 700 ce). Image source — ZENO: #20482.
Fig. 2. Earliest Islamic coin issues of Transoxanian mints:
  b) Kesh (?), sixty to a dirham', (mid-8th ct.; [SMIRNOVA 1981: pp. 420–21, nos. 1677-81]). Image source — ZENO: #71836;
  c) Bukhārā or Paykand, local Arab tributaries (8th ct.; 'sixty to a dirham'). Image source — ZENO: #30440;
  d) No mint, no date; cast (8th ct.; 'sixty to a dirham'). Image source — ZENO: #91060.
  e) Paykand, with 'dancing man' tamgha (8th ct.). Image source — ZENO: #29610;
  f) Nasaf, local Arab tributaries (8th ct.). Image source — ZENO: #46921.

Fig. 3. No mint, no date, Qutayba b. Muslim (c. 90/709–96/715), one hundred twenty to a dirham. Image source — ZENO: #13823.

Fig. 4. No mint, 133–136 AH, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muslim (Abū Muslim):
  a) 134 AH. Image source — author’s private collection;
  b) 135 AH. Image source — ZENO: #14023;
  c) 136 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Note: common Rev.

Fig. 5. No mint, 139 AH, Khālid b. Ibrāhīm. Image source — ZENO: #79762.

Fig. 6. No mint, no date, Khālid b. Ibrāhīm. Image source — ZENO: #111360.

Fig. 7. No mint, no date, 'Abd al-Jabbār b. 'Abd al-Rahmān. Image source — a private collection (Russia).

Fig. 8. al-Saghāniyān, 142 AH:
  a) variant A (lozenge with closed angles);
  b) variant B (concave open-ended cartouche). Both images from a private collection (Russia).

Fig. 9. Tirmidh, 142 AH:
  a) variant A (regular full-line ring);
  b) variant B (uneven beaded ovals). Both images from the author’s collection.

Fig. 10. Bukhārā, 143 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig. 11. Samarqand, 143 AH. Image source — ZENO: #25210.

Fig. 12. Samarqand, 144 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig. 13. al-Saghāniyān, 146 AH. Image source — a private collection (Russia).

Fig. 14. Bukhārā, 148 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig. 15. al-Saghāniyān (?), 148 AH. Image source — ZENO: #50418.

Fig. 16. al-Shāsh, 149 AH. Image source — ZENO: #25208.
Fig.17. Bukhārā, 151 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.18. [al-]Saghāniyān, 153 AH. Image source — courtesy of A. Atakhodžaev (Samarkand).

Fig.19. Samarqand, 153 AH. Image source — R. Cannito’s collection (USA), no. 1S-1834.

Fig.20. al-Saghāniyān, 155 AH. Image source — a private collection (Russia).

Fig.21. Nasaf, 157/9 AH. Image source — ZENO: #102443.

Fig.22. No mint, no date. Hāshim wasiyy Abī Muslim (al-Muqanna’). Image source — ZENO: #57386.

Fig.23. Bukhārā, 151 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.24. al-Ṣagh[ān]iyyān(?), 166 AH. Image source — ZENO: #93027.

Fig.25. Samarqand, 172 AH:
   a) subtype A. Image source — ZENO: #74992;
   b) subtype B (with the name Fath). Image source — ZENO: #75011.

Fig.26. Kish, 173 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.27. Bukhārā, 173 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.28. No mint, 174 AH, Yahyā b. Mu‘ādh. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.29. al-Khuttal, 177 AH. Image source — ZENO: #93025.

Fig.30. Bukhārā, 185 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.31. Binkath, 186 AH. Image source — ZENO: #42076.

Fig.32. Bukhārā, 190 AH. Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.33. Bukhārā, 194 AH. Image source — State Hermitage, Numismatic Department, inv. no. OH-B-M-2948.

Fig.34. Samarqand, 198 AH. Image source — ZENO: #77515.

Fig.35. al-Shāsh, 204 AH. Image source — ZENO: #42415.

Fig.36. Samarqand, 205 AH:
   a) variant A, bigger flan with a dot inside l’llāh on Rev. Image source — Zeno: #75009;
   b) variant B, smaller flan without dot inside l’llāh. Image source — R. Cannito’s collection (USA), no. is-6322.

Fig.37. Nāw[i]kat[H] Zakariyā (?), 205 AH. Image source — ZENO: #55618.

Fig.38. Bukhārā, [1]x (?), Khālid b. <...> (?). Image source — author’s collection.

Fig.39. Haf[t]dih (?), 205 AH. Image source — ZENO: #70610.

Fig.40. al-Ṭārband, no date, al-amīr ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad. Image source — ZENO: #69951.

Fig.41. No mint name, no date. Image source — N.N. Ivanov’s collection (Moscow).

Fig.42. No mint name, no date. Image source — a private collection (Russia).