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The territory of the present-day Soviet republic of Azarbajjan roughly corresponds to the ancient Caucasian Albania (in Armenian Ալբան-կ', or Ալվան-ք', in Arabic أرّان > al-Rān). Twenty-six languages were spoken in Albania and it had its own kings (Strabo, xi, 4). However, during the seven centuries between Pompey’s expedition in 66–5 B.C., to which we owe most of our information on the ancient life of the country, and the Arab invasion in the 7th century A.D., great changes had taken place in the area, under the influence of the Persian expansion up to the Caucasian passes, the Khazar and Alān inroads from the north, and the Armenian cultural activities which resulted in the conversion of the surviving Albanians to the Armenian form of Christianity. The Arab geographers refer to the Arrānian language as still spoken in the neighbourhood of Barda’a (Persian: Pērōz-ābdāh, Armenian Parta'i), but now only the two villages inhabited by the Udi are considered as the direct continuators of the Albanian linguistic tradition.

Our object being the study of the conditions in the 9th–10th centuries, we are not concerned with the further great changes brought about by the invasion of the Turkish Oghuz in the 11th century and the subsequent Turkicization of the area.

Both the Armenian and the Arabic sources show that the Arab occupation did not do away with the old Arrānian and Armenian dynasties, which continued their existence as vassals of the conquerors. Profiting by every occasion to assert their hereditary rights, they succeeded in ‘tiding over’ the Arabs, the Seljuks, and the Mongols, and even now the so-called ‘Qarabagh highlands’ form an autonomous area within the Soviet Republic of Azarbajjan.2

The period of decline of the semi-independent principalities presents great difficulties for study. Both in Arabic and Armenian sources the light is turned on to special episodes and we are left to conjecture as to the connecting links. The work of the indigenous historian of ‘Albania’, Moses Kalankatvats’i, who wrote in Armenian (10th century), contains many important data, but his obscure hints and sudden breaks in the main thread are often exasperating.5 A particular complication results from the contemporary Armenian fashion of assuming Arabic patronymics (kunya) (such as Abū-Mūsā, Abul-Asad, etc.),

1 Cf. Plinius, X.H., 6, 13, 16: Otene; Arm. Geography: Utī. This ancient province extended probably on both banks of the Kur, whereas the surviving villages lie in the Shakkl district near to the passes leading into southern Daghestan.
2 To say nothing of the numerous Armenian villages in the whole of Eastern Transcaucasia.
3 Baladhuri (d. 279/892), Ya’qūbī (d. 284/897), Tabari (d. 311/923).
4 Thomas Artsruni (before A.D. 1000), Asolk (soon after A.D. 1000) and some later historians, like Stephanos Orbelian (about A.D. 1300).
5 I am using his History of Albania in the Russian translation of K. Patkanian, St. Petersburg, 1861; for a number of clarifications I am obliged to Mr. C. Dowsett, who is preparing a new edition of the Armenian text.
without any connexion with the original Armenian names. These latter too often recur in otherwise unrelated families, and it becomes difficult to discriminate between several Sahls, Vasaks, and Smbats living at the same time.

On the Islamic side, we have chiefly to profit by the moments when some violent events cut across the local divisions. Such were: the revolt of Bābak (822–837) and its repression; the overthrow of the independent Arab amir of Tiflis (852); the severe measures which the caliph's general Bugha took against his earlier allies, ending in the deportation to Mesopotamia of nearly all the Armenian princes (854 ?); and finally (in the early 10th century) the great movement of Iranian tribes leading to the short-lived rise of the Daylamite chief Marzubān ibn Muḥammad ibn Musāfir, whose sway in Azarbayjan spread across the Araxes and even the Kur up to the foot of the Caucasian range.

Of the two studies which follow, one is devoted to the sudden elevation of Sahl, son of Sunbāt, at the period of Bābak's revolt, and the second to the list of Marzubān's tributaries preserved in the text of the geographer Ibn Ḥauqal (A.D. 977).

### I. Sahl ibn-Sunbāt of Shakki and Arrān

#### § 1. General Situation on the Araxes and the Kur.

#### § 2. Elevation of Sahl.

#### § 3. His successors.

#### § 4. 'Isā ibn-Iṣṭifānūs.

#### § 1. General Situation

Before introducing Sahl, son of Sunbāt, it will be useful to enumerate the protagonists among the Arab vassals about the year A.D. 820. On the southern bank of the Araxes, in the mountainous region now called Qaraja-dagh ¹ and extending north of the line uniting Ardabil and Tabrīz, we are soon to hear of the great rebellion of Bābak against the caliph's representatives and troops. Opposite Qaraja-dagh, on the northern bank of the Araxes and up to the course of the Kur, there lies another hilly tract which, at the time in question, was studded with small principalities. In its north-eastern corner (on the Tertar) lay the dominions of the descendants of ancient Albanian kings issued from one Mihran (of Sasanian times). In the south-eastern corner of Albania, along the banks of the Araxes, we hear of several princes (of Xtiš, of Varthān) whose origin is not quite clear. In the west ² stretched the country called Siunia (in Armenian Siunik') whose rulers belonged to a special Armenian family of descendants of Sisak.³

The southern bank of the Kur seems to have depended on the Mihranids, but the situation here was unstable. Beyond the Kur we find the considerable Muslim principality of Sharvān, a survival from Sasanian times, but now ruled by

---

¹ I am inclined to think that Turkish Qaraja- stands here, as a popular etymology, for some ancient name, cf. the second element of B.laşan-karaj (?), quoted in E.I. under Urm.

² Chiefly to the west of the Akera.

the family of the Yazidids of the Shaybani tribe. West of Sharvan was situated Qabala, with a mixed population (including even some Khazars) but ruled by a Christian prince. In the west it bordered on Shakkri, also with a Christian dynasty. The origins of the princes of Qabala and Shakkri are little known, but in view of constant intermarriage we have to assume their manifold links with the princes of the right bank.1 The special 'Albanian' patriarchate of the Armenian church formed the link between the two banks. Still more to the west, in the basin of the Alazan, the situation is obscure, and there seems to have existed there a special fief called in Georgian Hereti. Still further to the west lies the present-day Kakhetia, now inhabited by Georgians; at the time in question it was ruled by a korikoz (χωρεπικηροσ),2 possibly of the Armenian faith, and the leadership there belonged to a tribal group called Ts'anar, in Arabic al-Şanarīya.3

§ 2. Elevation of Sahl

The energetic Sahl ibn Sunbat, who in the beginning of the 9th century played an important rôle in the affairs of Arran, is mentioned both in the Armenian and Arabic sources, and though the records are patchy, they throw a vivid light on the march of events in Arran.

The exact origin of Sahl 4 is not explicitly stated. Thomas Artsruni, iii, § 11, calls him ruler of Shak'ē,5 and we must remember that the Hudud al-'Alam, after having spoken of Shakkī, refers (§ 36, 32) to 'Sunbat-mān, a town at the farther end of Shakkī, with a strong fortress'. The name Sunbat-mān means 'Sunbat's house' and is likely to refer to the home of Sahl's ancestors.

According to the Georgian Chronicle (Brosset, i, 249–250), during the reign of king Archil II (668–718) three brothers, who had deprived of sight their uncle Adarnase-the-Blind, 'came from Taron to the country of Sakix . . . because all that country of the Caucasus in the neighbourhood of Ran (i.e. Arran) had no masters. Hereti and Kakheti had only a few inhabitants who had fled to the woods and the three brothers occupied the country down to Gulgula'.6 The

---

1 It is quite possible that the Mihranids at times controlled the left bank of the Kur. Of one of their descendants Hamam (Grigor), son of Adernerseh (a contemporary of Muhammad Afshin, 889–901), Moses, iii, ch. 22 (trans. 278) says that he spread his sway 'on to the other side', i.e. apparently to the left bank of the Kur.
2 The title has hardly any ecclesiastic connotation in this case.
3 This people is already mentioned by Ptolemy, viii, ch. 8, § 13, Σαβαπαιον. According to the ancient Armenian geography, the Darial pass was situated in their country, see Hudud, pp. 400–2, but in the 9th and 10th centuries the centres of the Ts'anar/Şanar must have moved eastward to the region of the passes connecting Kakhetia with Daghestan, i.e. nearer to Shakkī.
4 His real Christian name is doubtful. Sahl seems to be an Arabic 'mask'.
5 See Minorsky, Shakkī in E.I. (1926), and A. E. Krimsky, Sheki, in the memorial volume Pamyati N. Y. Marra, 1938, 369–384. My teacher Krimsky's article is very valuable for the number of sources consulted, but contains quite a few risky identifications.
6 In the Armenian version Gulp, possibly Khalkhal, on the right bank of the Kur, now Khilkhina, on the Dzegam river, some 60 km. west of Ganja. Cf. Hübeschmann, Die altarmenischen Ortenamen, 272. Also Brosset, 1/2., 49.
exact filiation of the brothers presents considerable difficulties but, as between 700 and 800 we hear of no changes in Shakki, we might assume ex silentio that Sahl sprang from this house. In fact, his designation as ibn Sunbat (Moses Kalan.: Smbatean) may be his family name rather than a direct patronymic and point to the name of one of the three brothers (Smbat ?), or even to that of their father.

Perhaps the earliest reference to Sahl is found in the 'History of Albania (Arrân)' of Moses Kalankatvats'i. In his enumeration of Albanian patriarchs (iii, ch. 23), he says that Ter-David (822–850; according to C. Dowsett, 821–849) blessed the unlawful marriage of the prince of Shak’ë and was cursed by his (own) brother. Shak’ë is definitely Shakki, and the reference may be to Sahl at the early period of his life when he lived in his original fief.

According to the Arabic History of Sharvan (§ 2), some time after 205/820, a revolt broke out in Shakki, whose people killed the ‘emil appointed by Khalid b. Yazid. Ya’qubi, ii, 579, writes that when Ashun entered Azarbeyjan (in 220/835, see Tabari, iii, 1171) he appointed to Armenia Muhammad b. Sulaymân al-Azdi al-Samarqandi. By that time Sahl b. Sunbat had already revolted and seized Arrân (qad khâlafa ... wa taghallaba). He ambushed Muhammad at night and defeated him, cf. Baladhuri, 211. On the Armenian side, Moses Kalankatvats'i, iii, ch. 9, adds that towards the end of the Armenian year 270 (822–3) some Arabs from Partav (Barda’a) destroyed Amaras, took 1,000 prisoners, and fortified themselves in Mets-Arank’ (on the Terter, upstream from Barda’a). ‘Then the manly and handsome prince Sahl-i Smbatean Eranshahik, with his strong brothers and their troops, attacked them at dawn, scattered them and saved the prisoners’ (tr. Patkanian, p. 266). To accomplish this feat, Sahl must have crossed over to the right bank of the Araxes and, if Khalkhal (see above, p. 506, n. 6) did form a dependency of his dominions, his task was rendered much easier.

The title Eranshahik, under which the historian of Albania presents him in...
this passage, is probably given him in anticipation, for immediately after, and under the same year, Moses speaks of the murder of the last Mihranid Varaz-Trdad by a certain Ter-Nerseh P’ilippean. We do not know whether the latter acted on behalf of Sahl, but Sahl surely profited by the crime, as he assumed the title of the victim. As Varaz-Trdad is called the last Mihranid, it is clear that Sahl did not belong to that house.

About that time the Arab Sawāḍa (b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Jahhāfi) raided Siunia and the local ruler Vasak appealed for help to Bābak. The famous rebel responded to this call and married Vasak’s daughter, but himself committed all kinds of excesses in Balk and Gešam (in 828), where he destroyed the great convent of Mak’enots.

These names indicate how far his sway expanded between the Araxes and the Kur. The Muslim sources only indirectly hint at the facts which Moses Kalankatvats’i has recorded in great detail, and which throw a lurid light on Bābak’s activities.

Bābak himself came to live in Amaras, but the Armenians continued the struggle and even defeated his lieutenant Rostom. In the course of these events Sahl’s name is not mentioned, but under Mu’taṣim (218–227/833–842) he is definitely said to have revolted in Arrān (see above, Ya’qūbi, 579) and it appears that for a time the interests of Sahl and Bābak coincided. When in 222/837 Afšīn defeated Bābak and, across the dominions of the Armenian

1 S. Orbelian (tr. Brosset, i, 95) calls him ‘Ter-Nerseh, the Siunian (?)’, son of P’ilippe’, though Moses who is Orbelian’s source, says nothing about the origin of Nerseh. According to Marquart, Streifzüge, 457, he was one of the (Arrānian ?) bytrigs whom Ya’qūbi, 562, mentions among the supporters of the governor appointed by Amin, and who were opposing the new governor appointed by Ma’mūn (circa 198/813). cf. Brosset in Orbelian, i, 96, ii, 25.

2 His widow fied to Khāch’en (south of the Terter) and there married her daughter Spram to Artnærseh, son of Sahl [*Sahak] ‘head of the Siunians’, see Moses Kalankatvats’i, iii, ch. 22 (see below, p. 522).

3 Tabari, iii, 1221, refers to Bābak’s wife who accompanied him on his flight as ibn al-Kalandaṇīya (!). If an Armenian, she might have been useful to him in his dealings with his countrymen north of the Araxes, but it is difficult to identify her with Vasak’s daughter, in view of Bābak’s polygamous habits described by Tabari himself, iii, 1223 (see below, p. 510).

4 But not ‘Tavusin’, as in Patkanian’s translation, p. 268. C. Dowssett tells me that Tavusin/Tosin in some MSS. of M. Kalan. must stand for *Tūsī. In fact Tabari, iii/2, 1099, says that in 211/826 Ma’mūn appointed Muhammad b. Ūmaýd al-Tūsī to fight Bābak, and further, p. 1101, that on 26 (?) Rah‘ I 214/3 June 829 Bābak killed him near Mt. Hashtā-sar and scattered his troops. After *Tūsī’s defeat, Moses records another success of Bābak over Abrahīm, son of Lēt’ (Dowssett). This man is surely Ibrahim b. al-Layth b. al-Faḏil (the editor suggests *al-Taǰibī?) whom Ma’mūn appointed to Azarbayjan in 209/824, see Tabari, iii, 1072, and who later is referred to in the enumeration of the generals killed by Bābak. See Tabari, iii, 1233 (year 223/837) where his name comes at the last place, after Zuraqy b. ‘Ali b. Sādaga and Muhammad b. Ūmaýd al-Tūsī, cf. I. Athir, vi, 275, 338. Among the coins which Khalīd b. Yazīd struck in Armenia about 212–217/827–832 his name is associated with that of a certain Ibrāhīm, whose father’s name cannot be read clearly. R. Vaśmer, Chronologie der arabischen Statthalter, Wien, 1931, p. 72, suggested that on the coin of 213 the name should be read: Ibrāhīm b. Zayd, and on those of 215 and 217: Ibrāhīm b. ‘Attāb, whereas, in Tiesenhausen’s idea, ibn-Ghiyāth or ibn-‘Ayān should be read on all the coins. The absence of al- before these names stands in the way of their identification with Ibrāhīm b. al-Layth.
princes, Bābak tried to escape to the protection of the emperor Theophile, he
sent a message to Sahl b. Sunbat and the latter came out to meet him.

Ṭabarī’s report on Bābak’s flight (iii, 1223, year 222/837) contains interesting
details but does not indicate the exact route which he followed before reaching
the mountains (jibal) of Sahl b. Sunbat. ‘ On meeting him Sahl recognized
him, kissed his hand and said: “O Lord (ya sayyidāh) . . . there is no one
worthier to receive you than myself. You know my place. I have nothing to
do with the government (sultān) . . . You know what has happened to me and
you know my country. All the batrīqs who are here are related to you, and
children have been born to you from their (houses),’—(and this because,
whenever Bābak heard of a pretty daughter or sister of a batrīq, he sent to him
a request for her, and should he not send her, he visited him and took the girl
together with the batrīq’s other belongings).’ All this suggests that Sahl was
established south of the Kur and had had personal relations with Bābak.
While accepting the invitation to Sahl’s castle (hiṣn), Bābak took the precaution
of sending his brother ‘Abdullāh to stay at a different place, namely with
Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs.¹

Both the chiefs, who probably had sufficient grievances against their guests,
surrendered them to Afshin. For the signal service rendered, Sahl was highly
honoured by the Arabs,² who forgot his previous misdeeds. In the additional
passage inserted in some MSS. of Moses Kalan., iii, ch. 20, these facts are
confirmed and it is said (with obvious exaggerations) that Sahl ‘obtained
sovereignty over Armenia, Georgia, and Albania, to rule authoritatively and
royally over all’.³ He must have enjoyed his new position for some fifteen
years for, according to Thomas Artsruni, iii, ch. 11 (tr. Brosset, 153) : ‘Sahl,
son of Smbat, lord of Shak‘e, who captured Baban (Bābak), ’ was included in
the great deportation of Armenian princes carried out by the general Bugha
(in 854 ?), though in Ṭabarī’s list, iii, 1416, his name is replaced by that of his
son Mu‘awiya b. Sahl b. Sunbat (who once escorted the captive Bābak to
Afshin’s camp).

§ 3. Sahl’s Successors

After this there is a considerable gap in the history of the successors of Sahl
until, in the beginning of the 10th century, we hear of the lord of Shakkī called
Adamnāsē (Adhnarshē). To render the situation comprehensible we must
survey very briefly the changed, but still chaotic, state of the country.

In the beginning of the 9th century a new dynasty, the Bagratids, became
prominent in the affairs of Georgia (Kart‘lī). Bagrat, son of Ashot (826–876)
joined Muḥammad b. Khālid in the early operations against the amir of Tiflis,
Iṣḥāq b. Ismā‘il, and, at this price, survived the period when Bugha, having

¹ On him see below, p. 512.
² Ṭabarī, iii, 1272 : Sahl’s son (Mu‘awiya) received 100,000 dirhams and he himself 1,000,000
dirhams, a gem-studded belt, and the title of batrīq with a tiara appertaining to it. Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs
was possibly confirmed in his fief, see below, p. 512.
³ I owe this quotation to C. Dowsett (12th August, 1952).
occupied Tiflis (in 852), wrought havoc among the Christian (chiefly Armenian) princes suspected of opposition. The new and energetic dynasty of rulers appointed from Baghdad, the Sājids, subjected the Christian Caucasus to new trials. Between 902 and 914 Yūsuf b. Abīl-Sāj devastated both Armenia and Georgia, took Tiflis, and invaded upper Kakhetia. The Georgian Chronicle, with its typical legitimism, narrates the events under the phantom reigns of the main branch of the Bagratids of Kart'li. Thus under the reign of Adarnasē II (881–923), grandson of the above-mentioned Bagrat, it gives an account of the happenings in Kakhetia, see Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, i, 273–9. Some time after the execution of the Armenian king Smbat by Yūsuf (in A.D. 914), the local king Kuirike invited the king of western Georgia (‘Abkhaζ’) Constantine (then in occupation of Kart'li) to take part in operations in Lower Kakhetia (Heret'ī). The allies were besieging the fortress of Vejin, when ‘the patrician Adarnase’ suddenly arrived on the spot, and by ceding to them three fortresses secured peace. Though according to Brosset, loc. cit., 277, note 3, ‘the genealogy of this personage is unknown’, it is very tempting to follow A. E. Krimsky in identifying him with that Ādhrarnasē b. Hammām whom Mas'ūdī mentions in Shakki, for there was no other neighbour who might have encroached on Heret'ī. The latter place has been specially mentioned in connexion with the domains of the ‘three brothers’ and it seems probable that this Adarnasē was a direct, or lateral, descendant of Sahl b. Sunbat. Mas'ūdī wrote in 332/943 but, as in some other cases, he possibly used previous records, and this would settle the difficulty, if the period between circa 914 and 943 appeared too long for one reign.

The Georgian Chronicle (op. cit., 279) ends the chapter by saying that until the reign of Ishkhanik (an Armenian diminutive of iştan ‘prince’) all the inhabitants of Heret'ī were heretics (apparently of Armenian creed), but this son of the Georgian princess Dinar converted them to (Greek) orthodoxy. The source is again silent on the relation of this new prince to the above-mentioned ‘patrician Adarnasē’ but it gives a precious synchronism by adding that his contemporaries in Barda'a and Azarbayjan were the ‘salars’, i.e. the Musafīrids. In fact in the list of feudatories of the Musafīrid Marzūbān b. Muḥammad (dated 344/955), preserved in Ibn-Hauqal, 254, there is an ‘Ishkhāniq, known as Abū ‘Abd al-Malik, lord of Shakki’. With Ishkhāniq

1 i.e. Smbat Nahatak, Smbat-the-Martyr (890–914), killed by Yūsuf b. Abīl-Sāj; see Grousset, Histoire de l’Arménie, 1947, 397–441.
2 The dynasty of ‘Abkhaζia’ was of local origin, with some Khazar parentage. Its family tree is given in the document called Dīzan, discovered by Taqishvili, see Jour. As., 1927, cox, 357–368. The ‘Abkhaζian’ dynasty ruled over the territories including Western Georgia, and even expanded into Eastern Georgia. In 978 the Georgian Bagratid Bagrat II, whose mother was an Abkhaζian princess, succeeded to the throne of her ancestors, and thus united the state.
3 Vakhusht’s witness, see above, p. 508, note 2, if true, might be taken as an indication of the persistence of the name Ādhr-Narsē in the family. The fact must still be borne in mind that there were two streams of immigrants into Kakhetia and Shakki: from Taron and from Klarjet, see above, p. 508, n. 1.
4 See below, p. 521.
we reach the time of the events recorded in the *History of Sharvān*. The conversion of Ishkhānīq to orthodoxy was apparently a symptom of the growing influence of the Georgian neighbours, and it looks as if a radical change had taken place in the relations between Shakki and Kakhetia. The latter seems to have absorbed the former, for in the *History of Sharvān* (under a.d. 1068) the title ‘ruler of Shakki’ refers definitely to Aghsartan, ruler of Kakhetia.\(^1\)

§ 4. *'Isā ibn-Istīfānūs*

It remains to say a few words about Ibn-Istīfānūs, whom we mentioned in the story of Bābak’s extradition to Afshīn (year 837).\(^2\) In the passage on his capture by Bugha (year 852), Ṭabarī calls him more explicitly *'Isā b. Yūṣuf b. ukht-Istīfānūs*, which apparently means a *nephew* of Iṣṭīfānūs, born to Yūṣuf of a sister of Iṣṭīfānūs (less accurately ibid., iii, 1228: *'Isā b. Yūṣuf b. Iṣṭīfānūs*). In fact, Moses Kalankatvats’i, ii, ch. 19, mentions ‘Step’ānno called Ablasad’, who brought in Bābak against the ‘Balakanians’ (the people of Baylaqān?) and was killed in 828. The murderers, Davon and Shāpuh, fortified themselves in Horoz and fought Bābak. For twelve years they ruled over a combination of districts of Arts’ākh,\(^3\) until the dependants of Step’ānno (?) murdered them and the ‘peacefully minded’ *nephew* of Step’ānno, ‘Isay, called Abu-Muse’ recaptured the districts which Davon and Shāpuh had seized and ‘ruled over them all’. This is the man whom Ṭabarī calls ‘*Īsā ibn Iṣṭīfānūs*’. Step’ānno brought in Bābak in 828; two years later Bābak defeated Tūsī and in the year after ‘Abraham, son of Let’’, see p. 509, note 4. In the same year Step’ānno was murdered and for twelve years his murderers held his districts. According to these indications, *Įsā’s* succession took place about 841, i.e. after the liquidation of Bābak, and he must have remained in power for another thirteen years.

Thomas Artsruni (iii, § 10, tr. pp. 145–150) relates how, after a disastrous campaign against the Ts’ānār, Bugha marched to Albania, ‘the major part of which was ruled by Abu-Muse, known as the priest’s son’.\(^4\) Then he describes the heroic resistance of Abu-Muse and his ‘Albanians’ to the caliph’s troops (reinforced by some Armenian princes). Abu-Muse was victorious in 28 skirmishes and the siege of his fortress Xtiš (Ṭabarī: كتیش Khtīsh) lasted a year. Abu-Muse wrote to the caliph protesting against the attack (and, probably, referring to his own services in 837) and the caliph sent him a safe-conduct. He then went to Bugha’s camp and was sent to Mesopotamia. The

---

1. See my *Studies*, p. 30, 66.
2. Brosset did not know his filiation. Grousset, p. 364, note 2, wrongly calls him ‘son of Aternarseh of Western Sīnīa’.
3. Verin-Vaykunik’. Berdzor, (*Lesser*) Sissakan, Hābad, Amaras, Pažkank’, Mxank’, and Trip, of which the latter belongs to the province of Uti, and the others to Arts’āx—all of them situated in the basin of the Kur (and not of the Araxes).
4. Brosset suspects this qualification of being a tentative *translation* of Arabic ʿAbū-ʿMūsā, which is hardly possible.
pivotal role of Abu-Musâ is shown by the fact that his surrender was followed by the deportation of eight other princes.

Abul-Asad Step'annos's origin is unknown, though the fact is interesting that he invoked Bâbak's help against those of Balak (or Balakan). I am tempted to connect this name with Arabic Baylaqân, i.e. the town which lay in the present-day Mil steppe on the road from Varthân (now Altan, on the southern bank of the Araxes) to Bardâ'a (Partav). It had a very mixed population, known for its turbulence. I feel the strength of C. Dowsett's objection when he writes to me that 'it is rather unexpected to find an Arabic form of the name in Armenian, when they have their own P'aytakaran'. However, I am not quite convinced of the philological identity of P'aytakaran with Baylaqân (Bêlâkân), of which the former is the name of the province and the latter primarily the name of the town (though occasionally referring to its district). A later source (Orbelian, ch. 33, tr. i, 96) presents the events in a slightly different form: 'the people of the district of Balasakan [sic] refused to obey Baban (i.e. Bâbak) and, with the assistance of the Albanian (Alovan) Aplasad, he mercilessly devastated the district and massacred even women and innocent children.' Orbelian's Balasakan (?) is probably a mistake, though it points to the same direction. In fact Balâsajan must have lain in the Mîqân steppe and the Armenian Geography quotes it under P'aytakaran, see Marquart, Erânsâhr, p. 120.

Coming now to Abu Miîsa 'Isâ himself, we have to admit that he was rather remote from any princely house. Though his mother was a sister of Step'annos, his father, whom Tabarî calls Yusuf, seems to have been a priest (see above, Thomas, p. 145). As the point of his resistance to Bugha was Xtiš, it is interesting to quote Tabarî's parallel indication, iii, 1416 (year 238/852), that 'Isâ b. Yusuf was 'in the castle of K.thish, belonging to the kûra of Baylaqân and standing at a distance of 10 farsakhs from Baylaqân and of 15 farsakhs from Bardâ'a. Bugha fought him and conquered (his) castle, and carried him off, together with his father and his son'. The distances given by Tabarî point definitely to the region of the present-day Shusha (Shushi). It is characteristic that the castle is placed in the district of Baylaqân. Finally, according to Mas'ûdî, ii, 75, the Araxes flows between the country of Bâbak (namely the region of Badhdhayn, on the southern bank) and 'the mountain of Abu-Musâ', who can be only our 'Isâ. Mas'ûdî's text seems to indicate that this mountain (jabal) bordered on the river.

These details suggest that the nucleus of Abul-Asad's and Abu-Mûsâ's possessions was particularly connected with the south-eastern corner of Albania, namely with the region of the left bank of the Araxes, where this river debouches from its gorges into the plains.

1 Its ruins are known as Mil-i Baylaqân.
3 The original fief of Ibn-Istifânûs might correspond to the still mysterious fief of Khayzân/ Jaydhan, etc., referred to in I. Hauqal (see below, p. 525).
One further observation can be made. The tenor of Ţabari’s narration might suggest that the castle of Sahl where Babak went himself, and the dominions of Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs, where he sent his brother, were contiguous. In his list of the deported notables, Ţabarî, iii, 1416, quotes in the same breath Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs; Sunbāṭ b. Ashot called Abūl-ʿAbbas al-Ｗāṭhi (?) ; Muʿāwiya b. Sahl b. Sunbāṭ, bāṭrīq of Arrân; and Adhār-Narsē b. Ishaq al-Khāsīnī (*of Khachen).* Consequently, we should assume that Khachen formed a special enclave, though perhaps under the influence of Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs. If the latter possessed all the territories enumerated in Moses Kalankatvats’i, the dominions of Sahl must have lain nearer to the basin of the Kur.

II. The Caucasian Vassals of Marzubān in 344/955


Babak’s revolt in northern Azarbayjan (820–837) was one of the forerunners of a whole series of opposition movements which very soon, and especially in the following century, were to come to light on the Iranian plateau and its periphery.

For a long time, the attention of the historians (van Vloten, Wellhausen, Barthold) was attracted chiefly to ‘Khorasan’, until the publication of Miskawayh’s Tajārib al-Umam projected a new light on the more westerly areas, whose destinies had remained somewhat hazy in Ibn al-Athīr’s conscientious epitome. The title given by Amedroz and Margoliouth to their excellent edition of Miskawayh, namely ‘The eclipse of the Abbasid caliphate’, still reflects the traditional engrossment with the centre of the Islamic theocracy, whereas, with a more generous allowance for ethnology, economics, and human nature, an historian should give more attention to the awakening of more ancient traditions and to the emergence of entirely new elements which sapped the fabric of the caliphate.

The Būyid period looks now considerably more clear and, in its wake, we distinguish a growth of other political formations which sprang up in Kurdistan,

---


2 The river Khachen flows south of, and parallel to, the Teter on which stands Barda’a (Partav).

Azarbayjan, and Transcaucasia. Among them the minor star of the Musâfirids shone brightly for a short period. I have recently followed in the footsteps of my predecessors 1 to explore the further repercussions of the rise of this independent Daylamite dynasty 2 and, in the present instance, I wish to comment on an important document which has survived in the geographical work of Ibn Ha'ujal.3

It is a list of the tributaries of Marzûbân ibn Muhâmmad, with the amount of tribute they agreed to pay to Marzûbân's treasury.

When, circa 330/941, Marzûbân and his brother Vahsûdân imprisoned their father in the castle of Shîsajân (Sîsakân ?), Vahsûdân remained in the hereditary fief of Târm (Târom, on the middle course of the Safîd-rûd), whereas Marzûbân moved north and west into the area then controlled by the khârijîte Kurd Daysam. Ardabil (in eastern Azarbayjan) became Marzûbân's capital but he crossed the Araxes and penetrated deep into Transcaucasia. We know that the great centre of the former Muslim administration Barda'a (Partav) was in his hands, for here he sustained in 332/943 a prolonged attack by the Russians, so dramatically described in Miskawayh, ii, 62-7. We now know also that his Daylamite garrison was in occupation of the other great centre, Dvin (before 337/948), and that up to 360/971 Ganja (Janza) was administered by his representative al-Tâzî.4

Ibn Ha'ujal's list reveals the far-flung system of border principalities reduced to the position of tribute-payers. Thus, for a time, the ephemeral Musâfirid organization acquired the proportions of a very sizable body politic.

§ 2. The vazîr 'Alî ibn-Jâ'far

No doubt the preparation of numerous arrangements for the payment of tribute required a long series of diplomatic and financial negotiations, and the credit for this achievement is attributed by Ibn Ha'ujal to Abûl-Qâsim 'Alî b. Ja'far, on whose career we possess some information.

According to I. Ha'ujal, he was first employed by the Sâjjid Yusuf. Then (Miskawayh, ii, 31) he passed into the service of the khârijîte Daysam b. Ibrâhîm, one of Yusuf's generals, who succeeded the Sâjids and occupied the stage of Azarbayjan between 326/937 and 344/955 (with considerable interruptions).5 Miskawayh reveals the interesting fact that 'Alî b. Ja'far

---

1 See Huart, 'Les Musâfirides', in A Volume to E. G. Browne, 1922, pp. 228-256; Sayyid A. Kasrawi, loc. cit., i, 1307/1928; Minorsky, 'Musâfirids'; in E.I.
2 See my Studies, 1953, pp. 158-166.
3 His work was completed in 367/977. The chronology of his peregrinations, as indicated by himself, is desultory: see Barthold, in his Introduction to the Hudud al-'Alam, p. 29; cf. also Barthold's repeated references to the fact that in 358/969 Ibn Ha'ujal (p. 282, less clear on pp. 14 and 281) was in Gurgân.
4 See my Studies, p. 38.
5 The father of Daysam was an associate of the well-known Khârijîte rebel Harûn al-Shârî and, after his death, fled to Azarbayjan, where he married the daughter of a Kurdish chief. See Miskawaih, ii, 32. The said Harûn (whom I. Mu'tazz surnamed 'the caliph of the Bedouins and Kurds') was active between 272/885 and 283/896, when he was captured by the caliph Mu'tazzid, see Tabari, iii, 2109, 2141, 2149-2151. cf. M. Canard, Histoire des Hamdânides, i, 1951, pp. 308-311.
was a bāṭinī preacher, and this circumstance may explain the intrigues of his enemies while he was serving his khārijite lord. In fear of Daysam, ‘Alī b. Ja’far fled to Tārom, under the protection of Muḥammad b. Musāfir. But he arrived at the moment when Muḥammad’s sons, Marzubān and Vaḥsūdān, revolted against him and occupied his capital Samiran. Miskawayh has recorded these events under 330/941-2. ‘Alī b. Ja’far incited Marzubān to conquer Azarbayjan, and Marzubān followed the advice of the crafty refugee the more readily as he himself was a bāṭinī. He allowed his new vazir to preach his doctrines openly. ‘Alī wrote letters to those of Daysam’s supporters whom he knew to be disaffected and, when the ground was sufficiently prepared, Marzubān marched against Daysam. Daysam’s army went over to Marzubān, or fled, and Daysam himself escaped under the protection of the Armenian (Artsruni) princes of Vaspurakan (near Lake Van).

Marzubān seized Azarbayjan, but his relations with his vazir were soon poisoned by intriguers who pointed particularly to ‘Alī’s wealth. To thwart their designs, ‘Alī played on Marzubān’s greed by promises to subdue the great city of Tabriz, and Marzubān sent him there together with some of his generals. Once established in Tabriz, ‘Alī hastened to patch things up with his old master Daysam. At his request he incited the townspeople to exterminate the Daylamites whom Marzubān had sent with him, and when this plan succeeded, he went over to Daysam. Now Marzubān regretted his discord with his co-religionist ‘Alī. He besieged Tabriz and, in the meantime, began secret negotiations with ‘Alī, invoking the community of their creed and offering him the post of vazir. ‘Alī modestly asked for a guarantee of his life and property alone. Having obtained it, he escaped from Tabriz, and Marzubān kept his word. Miskawayh reports on all these events (ii, 31–5) under the year 330/941-2 but does not subsequently mention ‘Alī b. Ja’far.

Many events happened during the following fourteen years, and great disturbances followed on Marzubān’s unsuccessful march on Rayy and his captivity (Miskawayh, ii, 115, under 337/948). During his imprisonment, Daysam reappeared in Azarbayjan and several other chiefs became independent. The Būyid of Rayy, Rukn al-daula, intervened in the affairs of Azarbayjan and in 339/951 sent there the well-known dihqān of Tūs, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, who ‘grew weary of Azarbayjan’ and returned to Rayy in 342/953.2

Only in 342/953-4 did Marzubān escape from his prison (Miskawayh, ii, 149) and restore his position. Before he died in Ramadan 346/Dec. 957 (Miskawayh, ii, 166) we hear of his operations against some rebels in the neighbourhood of Bāb al-abwāb (Darband). ‘He settled his affairs and conquered his enemy,’ and then returned to Azarbayjan to deal with Daysam. The khārijite chief fled again to his Armenian friends of Vaspurakan, but the latter

---

1 Which probably depended on the Rawwādī family, see my Studies, 158.
2 Miskawayh, ii, 119, 132, 135–6, 148 (omitted in Margoliouth’s index). This is the famous dihqān of Tūs for whom the Book of Kings was translated from the Pahlavi. Firdausi’s Shāh-nāma is based on this translation.
broke faith and surrendered him to Marzubān who is said to have put him to death. All these events are related by Miskawayh (ii, 161) under 344/955–6, and this is precisely the year quoted in I. Ḥauqal’s text. I. Ḥauqal refers even to Daysam’s extradition.

It looks then likely that, after Marzubān’s escape, ‘All b. Ja’far was restored in his position as vazir, and that the settlement with the tributaries was connected with Marzubān’s expedition towards al-Bāb and the liquidation of Daysam.

§ 3. Passages on Armenia and the Caucasus from Ibn Ḥauqal’s Kitāb al-masālik wal-mamlāk.

Ibn Ḥauqal’s text is full of difficulties and on some points of the first passage which I quote (A.) I consulted the greatest living authority on Arabic, M. William Marçais, who most kindly has sent me its full translation into French. I have decided to incorporate it in my text, mindless of the disadvantages of such neighbourhood for my own translation of the passages which follow.

A. (Kramers, p. 343 ; de Goeje, p. 245) : ‘La ville (et région) de Dvin appartenait autrefois à Sembat b. Achot, roi de toute l’Arménie, comme elle avait appartenue à ses ancêtres. Elle ne cessa pas d’être au pouvoir des chefs de cette famille jusqu’à ce que Abul-Qāsim Yūsuf le Sajide la leur enleva et l’arracha à leur domination, alors qu’ils avaient par devers eux des pactes remontant au premier siècle de l’hégire, consacrant leur maintien dans l’état (où les avait trouvés la conquête arabe), et l’obligation de payer la jizya conformément aux clauses du covenant par eux contracté (muqāta’āt). Omayyades et Abbasides les avaient maintenus dans leurs résidences, et percevaient d’eux les diverses catégories de contributions (rusūm) qui leur étaient imposées (jibāyāt). Yūsuf s’attaqua à eux et fit d’eux l’objet de ses entreprises.1 Depuis lors, leur bonne fortune d’autrefois cessa et nul redressement d’étendard n’est intervenu pour elle (لا يعفل) jusqu’à l’heure présente. C’est la religion chrétienne qui domine en Arménie. Sur les deux parties de ce pays,2 l’état suzerain (sultan) perçoit annuellement ce qui peut être assimilé au kharāj. Les Arméniens aujourd’hui encore seraient donc sous le régime d’un pacte (‘ahd) comme ils l’étaient antérieurement ; mais d’un pacte, dont en réalité,

1 Comp. I. Ḥauqal, p. 61, ll. 14–15 : وقصدم المدعو.

2 I thought that *wa là yuflih ba’du ‘udhrum* (لا يعفل) could be improved as *ba’da ghadrihim* (لا يعفل) with the meaning : ‘and he (Yūsuf) did not prosper after his treachery towards them and no banner was raised to help him (ilayhi) until to-day.’ (Yūsuf died in 315/927). However, M. Marçais writes : ‘Je crois que le mot تعرث est à conserver. Il n’a pas ici le sens de “ excuse ” mais celui de “ réussite, bonne fortune ”, les lexicographes le glosent par le mot nujh.’

3 See the next paragraph.

4 Théoriquement, du point de vue juridique.
les effets sont nuls, car les états voisins (salāfīn) les attaquent,\(^1\) font parmi eux des captifs, les maltraitent, et foulent aux pieds le devoir de les protéger. Les captifs faits parmi eux ne pouvaient être mis en vente comme esclaves à Baghdad et j’ai connu cet état de choses jusqu’à l’année 325/936, personne n’admettant le trafic comme licite en raison de leur qualité bien établie de protégés et de la pluralité des pactes (ługr-‘umid) dont ils étaient détenteurs.’

‘There are two Armenias, one called Inner, and the other Outer. In some parts of the Outer Armenia Muslims have towns which are in their hands, and the Muslims have ruled over them without interruption, (though sometimes ?) the Armenians have been holding leases. (Such towns) belong to the kings of Islam, as is the case in Arjish, Manâzjird, and Khīlāt.\(^2\) The frontiers of the Outer Armenia are clear, the frontier in the east reaching Bardha’a; in the west, the Jazira; in the south, Azarbayjan; and in the north, the districts of the Rūm on the side of Qālīqalā. This latter used to be a great march in the middle of the Rūm country, (as against) the people of Azarbayjan, the Jibāl (Media) and Rayy etc. And this is the city (capital) of the Inner (Armenia). It has (already) been stated that there are two Armenias, and the Inner Armenia consists of Dabīl (Dvin), Nashawā (Nakhchavan), Qālīqalā and what follows it in the north, whereas the Outer Armenia consists of Bergrī, Khīlāt, Arjish, Wāstān, al-Zawāzan (Andzavatsik’), and the places, fortresses, districts, and provinces lying between them. (P. 344) And their access to the sea is at Trebizond . . .’

B. (K., 348, G., 250) : ‘There used to be imposed on most of these kings some sort of tribute (darā‘īb) and additional (contributions), which every year were carried to the king of Azarbayjan—regularly (sahlatan), without interruption or hindrance—all of them (i.e. the Armenian kings) obeying him who was ruling (over Azarbayjan) and securing its prosperity.\(^3\)

‘Ibn Abīl-Sāj contented himself now with a little, and now with a minimum by way of presents (ḥadiya) from them.\(^4\) But when this region (mamlaka) fell to the lot of Marzubān b. Muhammad b. Musafir, known as Sallār, he instituted in it revenue offices (diwān), surveys (gāmnān), and the additional levies (lawzāzin), while he discussed (yukhātib) (the details of) “douceurs” (marāfīq), supplementary sums (tawābī) and arrcars.

1. And the greatest of the kings (malik) of the region, so far as I could ascertain,\(^5\) is the sharvānsdshāh MUHAMMAD B. AHMAD AL-AYDĪ.

2. After him (geographically ?) comes the king of LAYZĀN, whose kingdom is adjacent to some part of Mt. Qabq, and his districts are known as LAYZĀN-shāh [sic].

\(^{1}\) J’ai eu un instant l’idée de lire : ‘ leur font des invasions sur les bords de leur territoire ’ (de même ‘ tātarraqu ’ originerairement a le sens de ‘ ronger sur les bords ’) mais tātarraqu ’ attaquer, envahir ’ est connu ; et quant à tātarraqu > tātarraqu ’ attaquer, envahir ’ il est courant : firāran min trāqub al-mithlāyān, c’est à dire ’ par dissimulation’.

\(^{2}\) On the Arab families settled north of Lake Van and belonging to the Qays tribe (with the exception of Borgī, which was originally held by the family of a certain ‘Othmān), see Marquart, Südarmenien, 299–304, 501–8.

\(^{3}\) De Goeje, 250, adds ‘ the lords of these districts, who were kings of the marches (atrāf), were obeying the king (malik) of Azarbayjan, Armenia, and the two Arrāns ’.

\(^{4}\) This is strange in comparison with the earlier passage, p. 517.

\(^{5}\) De Goeje omits this limitation, which might suggest that I. Haqal did not visit the region.
3. After him follows 1 the ŞANÀRIAN, known as Sanhārīb, who is a Christian
by religion, similarly to
4. İBN AL-DAYRÄNĪ, the lord of al-Zawazān (Andzavatsik’), Van, and
Wasṭān.

‘I shall explain the rank of each of these (kings or kingdoms), while
mentioning what his obligations are and what is (additionally) imposed on
him, by way of taxes in money (māl), tribute (darība), and presents—when
(the time comes to explain) the revenue (irtīfā') of the (whole) region, and when
I have finished with the distances and (general) conditions.’

C. (K. 350, G. 252) . . . ‘The road from Bardha'a (de Goeje : Barzandj) to
Dabīl crosses Armenia,2 and all the villages and towns on this stretch belong to
the kingdom of the Armenian Sunbāt b. Ashōt, which was taken away from
him by Yūsuf ibn Abil-Sāj (de Goeje : Ibn Divdād) by treachery and oppression,
and contrary to the (commands) of God and his prophet which say . . .
[Kramers’ edition quotes here the traditions concerning the strict duty of the
Muslims to protect the dhimmīs].

D. (K. 354, G. 254) : ‘As regards the situation obtaining (in Armenia)—
so far as I could ascertain—its contributions (jībdīdt) and the tributes imposed
on the (vassal) kings of the marches (mulūk al-ʿatrāf), clearly explain the position
of the region and point to the correctness of its description. Although at times
(the tribute) increased or decreased, the average of what was contributed and the
highest standard of what was levied from (the region) in the year 344/955, by
virtue of the agreements (muwaqafāt) which Abul-Qāsim ʿAlī b. Ja'far,
(a former) steward (ṣāhib al-zimān) of Abul-Qāsim Yūsuf b. Abil-Sāj—effected
on behalf of Marzubān b. Muḥammad, whose vazir he (later) was, were as
follows:—

1. He (Marzubān) agreed with Muḥammad b. ḌHMAD AL-ʿAZDĪ, lord of
Sharvān-şāh [sic] and its king, for a payment of 1,000,000 dirhams.
2. *ISHKḤANIQ,3 lord of Shakkī, known as Abū ʿAbd al-Malik, also entered
dakhala into an agreement with him.
3. He agreed with Sanhārīb, known as IBN-SAWĀDA, lord of Al-RUB‘ (?),
for a sum of 300,000 dirhams, plus some additional offerings (alāfāj).
4. (Similarly) the lord of Jurz (?), VASHAQĀN (Vach’agan ?) b. Mūsā—
200,000 dirhams.
5. He agreed with Abul-Qāsim AL-WAYZÛRĪ, lord of Wayzûr (*Vayots-
dzor) for 50,000 dinārs plus offerings.
6. (Similarly) Abul-HAYJĀ b. RAWWĀD, from his districts in Ahr and
Varzuqān—50,000 dinārs plus offerings.
7. (Similarly) Abul-Qāsim AL-JYDHĀNĪ from his districts and (on account
of) the arrears (baqāyā) due from them—400,000 dirhams, but he wanted (this
sum) to be diminished and was importunate in (his) begging; therefore, in
spiteful reaction (tabarrum) to his behaviour, the sum was increased by another
300,000 dirhams plus 100 cuts of Rūmī brocade.

1 Instead of یهلا I read یهلا.
2 In fact, Muqaddasī, 382, describes the road from Barda'a to Dabīl across the Arrānīan
highlands (via Qalqātās—i.e. Kalankatuk’, the birthplace of the historian of Albania—M.trīś,
D.mīs, and Kīlkūnī, i.e. Gelak'uni). On Smbat’s expansion, see Grousset, loc. cit., 401, 419, but
I.H. exaggerates his power, for since 893 the kingdom of Albania was restored under Hamam (see
Asolik (Macier), iii, ch. 3), and in Siunia Smbat met with resistance, see Grousset, loc. cit., 421.
3 Spelt: ishkhānīq; already de Goeje suggested Ishkhānīq.
8. He (Marzubān) bound over (alzama) the sons of AL-DAYRĀNĪ to pay according to the (previously) agreed (sum), 100,000 dirhams yearly, but exempted them from the payment for four years, in recompense for their having surrendered to him Daysam b. Shādhlūya, who had sought their protection but whom they betrayed.

9. He agreed with the sons of SUNBĀT, with regard to their districts in INNER ARMENIA, for 2,000,000 dirhams (p. 355) but afterwards remitted 200,000 dirhams.

10. He agreed with SANHĀRĪB, lord of KHACHEH, for 100,000 dirhams, plus offerings and horses (to the value of) 50,000 dirhams.

The tributes in gold and silver, with supplements (tawābi') and offerings consisting of mules, horses, and ornaments (huliyy) amounted to 10,000,000 dirhams.

And the kharāj of the whole of Azarbayjan, Armenia and the two Arrāns, with their environs (kawāli), together with the amounts of their taxes (reading wa wujūd amwālihā) and the "doucours", amounted to 500,000 dinars.

This is all that I have learned concerning the situation, and on which I had reports and statements, as much as my opportunities admitted and my understanding encompassed.'

§ 4. Commentary

As is known, Ibn Ḥauqal had undertaken to revise Iṣṭakhri's book, but in his chapter on Armenia, Arrān, and Azarbayjan only the details on the towns and distances follow those of his predecessor. For the rest, the chapter is brought up to date and is based on entirely new material.2 It is doubtful whether Ibn Ḥauqal himself penetrated deep to the north of the Araxes.3 At the end of his chapter he refers to the akkābār 'reports' which he used. There is no doubt that these reports were of different dates and reflected different situations. In his description of the great market-centre Kūrsāra (between Marāgha and Miyāna) he refers (K. 352) to what he heard from the 'master of the merchants of Azarbayjan Abī-Āḥmad b. Abī al-Raḥmān of Shīz and Marāgha' on the days of Yūsūf b. Abīl-Sāj. The curious pro-Armenian leanings noticeable in I. Ḥauqal's text may be due to this source of his information. However, the severity of Yūsūf b. Abīl-Sāj towards the Armenians in passages A. and C. (which may date back to Yūsūf's time) is in contradiction with his financial clemency described in passage B. The names of the principal Transcaucasian rulers (passage B.) do not tally with those in the list of Marzubān's vassals (passage D.).4

1 Perhaps *jewālī, a term which I.H., 216, substitutes to jīzya used by Iṣṭakhri, 166, in the corresponding passage on Fars.

2 For comparison with the first passage of our translation I shall quote Iṣṭakhri, 188 : ' (In Armenia there ruled) Sunbāt b. Aśhōt, and (Armenia) never ceased to remain in the hands of the seniors (kubārā) from among the Christians and these prevail (ghalāb) over (among ?) the inhabitants of Armenia.' Only isolated words of Iṣṭakhri have survived in Ibn Ḥauqal's expanded and original report (cf. K. 343).

3 He certainly visited the environs of Mt. Sabalan (near Ardabil), p. 249 (347).

4 In (B.) Sharvān-shāh is the prince and in (D.) his principality. Lāyžān is the present-day Lāhjān (west of Shārvān proper). According to the History of Sharvān, the Lāyžān branch of the Yazdī family had dispossessed the branch of Sharvān by 304/916; cf. Masūdī, ii, 5, and it is characteristic that in (D.) (referring to 344/955) Lāyžān is no more mentioned. The Sanhārīb of Ṣanāriya also seems different from the two Sanhārīb in Marzubān's list.
As regards the list of Marzuban's tributaries (D.), it cannot be taken for an original document from Marzuban's chancery; more probably someone versed in local affairs dictated the details of various financial agreements from memory. This would explain certain misunderstandings and omissions in our text, without detracting from the importance of this valuable estimate.

The list presents numerous difficulties; the readings of some names are uncertain and the Christian tributaries are referred to with the current Arabic kunya, which disguise their identities and make it difficult to identify them with the persons known from Armenian sources.

1. The subjugation of Sharvān was a major achievement of Marzuban, by which his treasury secured a contribution second only to that promised by the Bagratids (see point 9.). Sharvān is the usual designation of the territory lying to the north of the Kur, which only in the 15th–16th century was renamed Shīrvān. The mistake about Sharvān-shāh being the name of the kingdom and not of the king also occurs in Masʿūdī, ii, 69. The prince who was ruling in Sharvān in 344/955 was Muḥammad b. Abū-Ṭāhir Yazīd b. Muḥammad (337–345/948–956), and he was succeeded by his son Aḥmad (345–370/956–981).

The ancient History of Sharvān (§ 9) mentions the invasion of Sharvān by the Daylamites under Muḥammad's father Abū-Ṭāhir Yazīd b. Muḥammad, some time between 334/944 and 337/948, and he is said to have expelled them and made a peace and an alliance with them. Another invasion of Ibrāhīm b. Marzubān took place circa 357/968, when Aḥmad b. Muḥammad had to make peace with the attacker and offer him money. Consequently, the arrangement referred to by I. Ḥauqal may have been the result of the first invasion, but it seems to have been concluded under Muḥammad b. Yazīd, and possibly renewed under his son Aḥmad. The name in I. Ḥauqal (Muḥammad b. Aḥmad) does not fit into the detailed genealogy of the sharvān-shāhs, and more particularly the tribal appurtenance of the dynasty is wrong, for it should be Shāvdīnī, instead of Aẓdī. The latter may be a mistake for *Yazīdī, as the family was generally known. This might be an instance of the mistakes resulting from dictation.

2. Shakki. Instead of the form Ashās given in the first edition of I. Ḥauqal (de Goeje), the better manuscript used by Kramers in the second edition gives Ishjanīq, which can be easily restored as *Ishkhānīq—a good Armenian name. His Arabic kunya AbūʿAbd al-Malik is of no importance for his nationality, in view of the general onomastic fashion of the age. The name does not fit into Masʿūdī's indication (ii, 18) that, practically at the same time, the ruler of Shakki was called Ādhar-Narsē.

The text is somewhat misleading. As the words ودخل في مواقفه * اشخائي

1 Translated into modern Persian and partly commented upon by Kasrawī, Pādshāhān-i gum-nām, i, 101. Cf. also Krimsky, Sheki, pp. 377–8.
2 According to Masʿūdī, ii, 5, Muḥammad b. Yazīd was ruling already in 332/943.
3 See above, p. 508, n. 4.
4 Even their capital was called Yazidiya.
follow immediately after the words واقع ... صاحب شروان شاه, one might be tempted to explain the passage as indicating that Ishkhâniq was a party to the agreement concluded with the šharvānšāh. This interpretation is impossible for, as we now know from the History of Sharvān, Shakki, separated from Sharvān by Qabala, was independent of Sharvān, and needed a special arrangement. Therefore the words wa dakhala fi muwāqafatihi are only a modified formula of wa-wāqafa, and the personal pronoun (‘his agreement’) must refer again to Marzūban. Consequently the sum of Ishkhāniq’s contribution was left blank.

As shown by the History of Sharvān, the contemporary use of the term Shakki was vague. Following the vicissitudes of local struggles, it covered even some territories of Kakhetia. Moreover, the special territory of Heret’i, lying between Shakki proper and Kakhetia, was not clearly distinguished by the Muslims.

The name Ishkhāniq, as connected with Shakki, evokes the memory of the prince Isxanik of Heret’i, who was a contemporary of Marzūban (see above, p. 511).

3. The name of Sanharib ibn Sāwāda coincides with that of a Christian prince who must have lived about the middle of the 10th century.

The old pre-Islamic dynasty of Mihran which was ruling in Arrān (ancient Albania, Armenian Alvanq’) came to an end with prince Varaz-Trdat, who, together with his infant son, was assassinated in 822 by (his relative?) Nerseh P’ilippean. His widow took her daughter Spram to Khachen, where she married her to Atr-Narseh, son of Sahl (read: *Sahak, as suggested by Marquart, Streifzüge, p. 457). According to the local historian Moses Kalankatvats’i, the offspring of this couple took up the succession of the Mihrandis. In the fifth generation, we meet Hovhannes, called Senek’erim, son of Isxan-Savada, through whom, according to Moses, God wished to restore the long extinct kingship. ‘The king of Persia conferred upon him great honours, gave him the crown of his own (?) father and his (?) steed. In the same year the Greek magistros, David, sent him the royal crown and a sumptuous purple . . .’

The period of 131 years (from a.d. 822 to 953) is not too short for five generations, and it looks as if the ‘king of Persia’ who honoured Sanharib was precisely Marzūban, who used favours in exchange for tribute.

If the coincidence of the names guarantees the identification of the prince, the name of his kingdom remains a puzzle. البِرِّ (with the Arabic article) looks like *Rub‘ a quarter’, or *Rub‘ a territory, a custom-house. 4

1 Accepted by A. E. Krimskey, and apparently by Spuler, Iran in fruh-islam. Zeit, 467.
3 Except perhaps in an addition to Istakhri’s text, 193a; see my commentary in Hudūd, p. 402.
4 The term rub‘ (plural arbd‘), as a territorial unit, is used by Ibn Rusta, 171, who says that Nishāpūr has thirteen rustāqs and four arbd‘, as against Muqaddas, 300, who counts twelve rustāqs and four khānāt; cf. Hudūd, § 23, 1, and p. 325. [However, rub‘ can refer to the quarters of the town.]
de Goeje, iv, 224), but the bare skeleton of the name admits of manifold readings
(Kâgh, R.n.gh, Ziğh, Z.n.gh). The same name occurs only in one other source,
namely in Abû-Dulaf Mis'ar b. Muhalhil’s ‘Second risâla’.¹ This traveller (§ 15)
reports that, on his way from Tiflis to Ardabil, he visited ‘the mountains of
Wayzûr, Qabân, Khâjm, ħudán ‘al-râb’ and the two Badhû’. With the
exception of the last name, all the other names seem to refer to the highlands of
Arrân separating the Kur from the Araxes.

Abû-Dulaf must have travelled circa A.D. 950 and this increases the interest
of his evidence.

My first idea was to compare al-râb with the name of the capital of Arrân
ædææ (variant ædææ, see Iṣṭakhri, 182, note g). Abû-Dulaf could have copied
the name from the same source, but, in all probability, his risâla was written
before I. Ūauqal had completed his work (in 367/977). We know, however,
that, at the time of the Russian invasion, in 332/943–4, Barda’a was governed
by Marzûbân’s representative (Miskawayh, ii, 62), and it is unlikely that
Marzûbân would have left this key-town in the hands of a rather insignificant
prince like Senek’erim.²

According to the historian Moses, Spram married ‘Atr-narseh, son of Sahl
(read: *Sahak*?), lord of Siunia, who had seized by force the canton of Gelam’,³
and whose residence was Tohak. In the record of the deportation of Armenian
princes to Mesopotamia, Ţabarî (III/2, 1416: under 238/852) mentions
‘Adhâr-Narse b. Ishaq [sic] al-Khâshîn’, and thus connects Senek’erim’s
putative ancestor with Khachen (see below, 10), but Adhâr-Narse (and his
family) may have still retained the region of Gelam (Lake Sevan). For Moses,
too, the restoration of the kingdom under Senek’erim may have taken place in
the dynastic, and not in the geographical sense, and this would leave us some
latitude in identifying the territory of Senek’erim. Abû-Dulaf—if he can be
trusted—refers to al-râb separately from Khajin (Khachen), and, in this case,
Senek’erim’s fief might be looked for in Gelam, though the final identification
of al-Rub’ should be left to the Armenian scholars on the spot (see also below,
under 10.).

4. In the first edition of I. Ūauqal, 254, there stood ḏawāb ḍirzan wa saghiyân
mûsî, and in my article ‘Musâfîrî’ in E.I. I took *Jurzân wa Saghiyân for

¹ Which at this moment I am publishing in Cairo after the unique MS. of the Mashhad
sanctuary.
² Unless he was an entirely subjected ruler, with some independence in local and internal
affairs. [Cf. al-râb ‘a custom-house’.]
³ Brosset, in his notes to Orbelian, ii, 24, contests his appurtenance to Siunia and prefers to
take him for a scion of the Albanian house who encroached on the territory of Siunia (‘profita
de quelque bonne occasion pour se caser en Siounie’). Brosset’s surmise suits well the illuminating
identification of Adhâr-Narse Khâshîn by Marquart. Moses himself is silent on the appurtenance
of Khachen, but even if Spram’s marriage was arranged with a prince outside Khachen, it is
possible to imagine that, after the marriage, Khachen—undoubtedly friendly to the Mihranids—
was included in the dominions of Spram and her husband.
the villages Gurzivan and Saghyan (?), lying to the west of Shamakhi. However, the designation of the prince as *Ibn-Müsâ*, without his personal name, would be strange. The second edition gives *Vashaqan b. Müsâ*, which suggests the reading *Vaśaṣaṇa*, a name popular among the princes of Arrân.\(^1\) But what of *J.rz* (which de Goeje restored as *J.rzān*)? Normally it would refer to Georgia (*Jurz*) but Marzubân never penetrated so far as Georgia, and *Vaśaṇa* is a non-Georgian name. As a mere surmise, one might think in our case not of *Jrž*—though not in its direct sense of the Khazar kingdom, but in the local use, as applied to the town of Qabaḷa lying between Sharvān (*v.s. 1.*) and Shakki (*v.s. 2.*). This was a place where Khazars were probably settled, for Baladhuri (194) says wa madīna Qabaḷa wa-hiya al-Khazar.\(^2\) This suggestion is purely tentative, but it would be strange if Qabaḷa, mentioned by Mas'ūdī (ii, 68) as a separate principality, were unrepresented in I. Ḥaqqal’s document.

Mas'ūdī calls the prince of Qabaḷa ‘Anbasa—the-One-Eyed and the History of Sharvān refers to his son Ibn-‘Anbasa. ‘Anbasa (‘the lion’) is definitely only a nick-name, and the corollary of our surmise would be that his real name was *Vaśaṇa*, son of Müsâ, and that in some way he was connected with the princes of Arrân.

5. With Wayzūr we are on firm ground, for it is a usual Arabic form for the basin of the ‘Lower Arpa-chay’, which in Armenian was called Vortex-ձոր (Const. Porphyrogenitus *Bair̄wp*: see Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen*, No. 111). About the middle of the 10th century its ruler was definitely connected with the Musāfīrids (see my Studies, pp. 36, 69–70, where I suggest tentatively his identity with Vasak, son of Smbat, of the local Armenian dynasty of Siunia). For purposes of identification, the kunya Abul-Qāsim is worthless.

6. Abul-Hayja b. Rawwād is a well-known member of the originally Arab, and later Kurdicized, family, which, after the eclipse of the Musāfīrids (circa 373/983), became the leading dynasty in Azarbayjan down to the Seljuk invasion.\(^3\) The capital of the Rawwādīs was Tabriz, but the early fief of the family comprised Ahır, and Ya’qūbī (*History*, pp. 446–7) avers that the governor Yazīd al-Muhallabī (about the middle of the 8th century A.D.) allotted to Rawwād b. al-Muthannā al-Azdi a tract of territory stretching from Tabriz to al-Badhdh. The latter place, known as the residence of Babak, lay in the

---

\(^1\) This restoration was already proposed by Saint-Martin, *Mémoires sur l’Arménie*, 1818, i, 231. He thought that this Vach’agan might be the son of the rebellious governor of Uti against whom Ashōt II, son of Smbat, led an expedition in 922. cf. Grousset, *Histoire de l’Arménie*, 431. St. Martin leaves, however, the name Jurz/Khazar in the air.

\(^2\) According to the newly discovered Arabic text of Ibn A’ṭham, Jarrāb (appointed by Yazid II, 101-5/720-4) reduced the people of M.ṛghāma (Tarqi ?) and moved its population to the village of Ghasānīya in the rustāq of Qabaḷa (see A. N. Kurat, in *Ankara Univer. D.T.C. facult. dergisi*, 1949, p. 269).

\(^3\) See my *Studies*, p. 167.
neighbourhood of Mt. Hashtād-sar, on the eastern ridge of Qaraja-dagh, and Ahr (even now the capital of Qaraja-dagh) was certainly within this zone. The village of Varzaqān (Varzuqān) lies some 35 km. higher up on the river of Ahar.

7. The case of Abul-Qāsim Jydhanī is similar to that recorded under 3. The other manuscript gives Ijdānī, which de Goeje restored as Khayzānī. Abū-Dulaf undoubtedly refers to the same place under the name of Ijdān, though this part of his report is still subject to caution. In most of the early Islamic writers, Ḫayzān (Baladhuri, 204, 206–7), Ḫaydāq (Masʿūdī, ii, 7) and similar forms stand for Khayzān, a Daghestanian people living immediately north of Darband. It is true that, under 344/955, Miskawayh (ii, 161) refers to some operations conducted by Marzubān in the region of al-Bāb (i.e. Darband), but it is highly improbable that he could have reduced to vassalage a people beyond the ‘gate’ of Darband.

To the south of the Caucasian range, the existence of a Khayzān (Jīdān, Jandān?) is implied by I. Khurdadhbih (123–4), who tries to locate the story of Moses and the prophet Khidr (Qorān, xviii, 59–81) in Shārvān: ‘that rock is the rock of Shārvān, that sea is the sea of Gīlān; that village is the village of Bājrāvān; and when they met the young man and he (Khidr) killed him, it was in the village of Khayzān (var. Ḫīzān, Ḫaqūt, iii, 252, Ḫīzān?)’. (Cf. also Nuzhat al-qulūb, 90: Khayzān, Chandān.) The rock in question is possibly Besh-barmaq (standing some 70 km. north-west of Baku in the coastal region), near which lies the village of Khidr-Zinda. A short distance to the west lies a village called Khizi, and one might compare this name with *Khayzān, Khīzān. Nothing, however, is known of a sizable principality having ever existed in that region in Islamic times.

On the other hand, in Abū-Dulaf’s itinerary, Ijdān (which could easily be a mis-spelling of the name quoted by Ibn Ḥauqal) comes between Khachen and Bābak’s capital al-Badhdhayn and, provided the itinerary is not a fake, this place might be looked for on the left bank of the Araxes, somewhere in the present district of Jibrail.

8. The ‘sons of al-Dayrānī’ are the rulers of Vaspurakan (the region of

---

1 Bājrāvān ‘the bazaar place’ is a common name. The best known Bājrāvān lay south of the Araxes on the way to Ardabil, but the legend may have in view some different place, nearer to Shārvān. The starting point for the strange location is the term majma‘ al-bahrāyn (Qorān, xviii, 59), ‘the junction of the two seas, or rivers,’ which the sages took to be the confluence of the Kur and Araxes, see I. Khurd., 175. Cf. Minorsky, Mūsān in E.J. (Supplement).

2 This is a conspicuous landmark, and in 1948 a Latin inscription of Legio XII Fulminata was found in the same neighbourhood. See Vestnik drevney istorii, 1950, No. 1, p. 177.

3 Which stood south of the Araxes, near Mt. Hashtād-sar (between the districts Hūrān, Kalaybar, and Garmādūz).

4 Circa a.d. 835 we hear of a Christian prince in this region called ‘Isā b. Yūsuf (or Ibn-Iṣṭifānūs, because his mother was a sister of Iṣṭifānūs). On him and his dominions see above, p. 512, but I have not been able to trace his succession.
Van) of the Artsruni family. In 344/955 the ruling prince was ʿAbū-Ṣahl Hamazasp (953–972), who succeeded his brother Derenik Ashot (937–953). Both were grandsons of Grigor Derenik (in Arabic al-Ḍayrānī) (874–886). The reference to the circumstances in which Daysam was extradited is a welcome detail in favour of I. Haouqal’s accuracy.

9. The ‘sons of Sunbat’ are certainly the ARMENIAN BAGRATIDS of Ani. Ibn Ḥauqal himself (passages A. and C.) refers to Smbat-the-Martyr (890–914), whose grandson Ashot the Merciful (Olormadz) was ruler in 952–977. The sum which the Bagratids agreed to pay, and which was lowered by 10 per cent of the amount originally stipulated, was most probably only security money which the Bagratids paid to ward off Daylamite inroads. From the History of Sharvān (see my Studies, pp. 10–11) we know that Marzbān kept a Daylamite garrison in Dvin and that Ashot kept an unsuccessful attempt to take the town.

10. Ḫāǰīn is a good transcription of KHACHEN (Arm. Xač’enk’), independent from Tābarī, who calls it Khāškin.

Professor I. A. Orbeli ¹ writes that the old principality of Siunik’ collapsed in 1166. ‘At this time begins the elevation of the small principality of Arts’ax, or Xač’en. This latter name was possibly derived from the name of a fortress. The centre of the principality, which was apparently a part of the ancient Albania (Alvank’), was the basin of the Xačeṇa-jur (now Khachen-chan) and partly that of the T’art’ar (now Terter). This region belongs to the territory of the present-day district of Javanshir. In the present state of the historical geography of Armenia, it is almost impossible to indicate its frontiers, because, in the course of almost perpetual wars, the frontiers were moved very often.’

To this statement one has to add that the Islamic sources clearly hint at the existence of a special fief-holder of Khachen already in the 10th century.

Under 3. we have discussed the identity of Sanḥāriḥ, son of Sawāḍa, whose characteristic name is a strong clue to his identity. We know that the widow of the last Mihranid married her daughter Spram to the ancestor of Sanḥāriḥ in Khachen. He is said to have been of the branch of the Siunian (?) house and to have seized Gelam, but Khachen apparently also belonged to him.² And yet in 10. we hear of another (?) Sanḥāriḥ of Khachen who paid a smaller sum of tribute to Marzbān. One is tempted to assume that I. Haouqal, in his hurriedly taken notes (cf. 1.), reported twice on the same prince. In view of the difference in the tribute, one might surmise that one single tributary was paying for two different fiefs (Gelam (?) and Khachen).

The inclusion of horses in the tribute of Khachen must be connected with the excellence of the Qarabagh breed. In the 13th century the husband of Queen T’amar of Georgia, David Soslan, gave the fortress of Jarmanam and one village for a steed which he acquired from Vakhtang of Khachen (see Brosset, Histoire de la Géorgie, i, 441).

² Unless he happened to be there on a visit at the time of his bride’s arrival. See above, p. 522.
§ 5. Conclusions

(A) Technical Terms.

The technicalities of Islamic taxation are still insufficiently known and the translation of the financial terms used by I. Hauqal can be only tentative. I have quoted the original terms used by I. Hauqal and for their translation I have used the experience of the editors of similar texts (de Goeje's index to B.G.A., iv; index to Ṭabari; the list of terms quoted by Amedroz in his edition of Hilāl al-Šābī's Kitāb al-sejarā).

(a) alzama—'solve coegit, solvendum imposuit' (Ṭabari).

(b) amwal—'revenue (probably in cash)'; de Goeje, iv, 357: 'reditus'.

(c) altdf—'offerings, douceurs'.

(d) dariba—according to de Goeje, iv, 285, is not properly 'revenue' (reditus) but rather 'tribute', because it can be paid in various ways—for example, in customs duties ('de variis rebus solvitur, speciatim portorium').

(e) ḍīwān—'revenue office'.

(f) jībāyat—de Goeje, iv, 202, suggests 'tributum non canonicum', and Ṭabari: jabā, ijtabā 'tributum exeqit'. I translate the term by a less definite 'contributions'.

(g) jizya is the poll-tax paid by non-Muslims, and its amount was apparently fixed by special agreements expressed in leases (see below muqāta'āt).

(h) lawdīm 'additional levies'; de Goeje, BGA., iii, 348: 'varia alia tributa'.

(i) muqāta'ā—'a lease', by which the suzerain confirms someone in his principality, subject to the yearly payment of the poll-tax; de Goeje, iii, 329: 'pactum cum aliquo initi, quo concedit ei principatum sue regionis servare, conditione ut quotannis censum capitis sive alium tributum solveret'. I do not think that in our case the term is used in the strictly technical sense, as in I.H., 216 (K. 302): al-qawā'nīn allātī hiyya al-muqāta'āt, meaning 'a fixed sum of taxes evaluated according to a standard value ('ibrā) per lunar year'. Cf. Cl. Cahen, L'évolution de l'iqṭ', in Annales (L. Febvre), 1953, pp. 29 and 46, and A. K. S. Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, 1953, p. 33.

(j) marāfūq—'douceurs'; de Goeje, iv, 349: 'emolumenta, tributa diversa non canonica'.

(k) muwāqafāt—(restored by Kramers, possibly following Dozy, instead of muwāqafā) has a meaning similar to muqāta'āt, though the latter seems to stress the element of investiture, whereas the former stresses the financial conditions established by the parties.

(l) rusūm seems to be used in the sense of the sums usually collected, 'dues'. De Goeje, iv, 346, equates it with 'tribute'.

(m) qānūn—'survey of landed property and revenue based on it'; de Goeje, vi, 333: 'census soli si quotannis fixa pecuniae summa solvenda est'.

(n) tawābī—'supplements'. Ṭabari: tavābī al-khāraj 'increments tributi, quod ad tributum accedit'. Possibly also the percentage added for the benefit of the agents collecting the tribute (mu'āmara, Hilāl).

(B) Amount of Payments.

Only for Vaspurakan does I. Hauqal clearly explain that the tribute was paid every year but, as admitted by de Goeje, the payment of all the tributes
was also on an annual basis. Converting the dinars (quoted under Vayots-Dzor and Ahr) into dirhams (at the rate of 1 dinar = 15 dirhams, see Qudâma, 249) we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tributary</th>
<th>Output (Dirhams)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharvân</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakki</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Rub'</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qabala (?)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vayots-Dzor</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahr and Varzaqân</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaydhan (Khayzan?)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasprakan</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagratids</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khachen</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Total: 5,750,000 dirhams}\]

Even with the lacuna of Shakki and the addition of the occasional offerings, we are very far from 10 m. dirhams, which I. Hauqal gives as the total of Marzubân's revenue. It is possible then that the list of the tributaries is not quite complete, or that it includes the kharâj paid by his direct subjects. My final impression is that the amount of 'tributes' should be separated from the amount of the kharâj.

As regards the 'kharâj for Arrân, Armenia, and Azarbayan', evaluated at 500,000 dinars (i.e. 7.5 m. dirhams), this item added at the end of passage D. seems to refer to the time when the three provinces were ruled by governors appointed directly from Baghdad.

According to Qudâma, the average revenue (irtifā') of Azarbayan was 4.5 m. dirhams, and of Armenia (including Arrân) 4 m. dirhams—totalling 8.5 m. dirhams, a sum approaching that of I. Hauqal. Qudâma is supposed to have composed his book shortly after 316/928 (see de Goeje's Preface, p. x) but, according to von Kremer, his data go back to a much earlier time (circa 204/819), and the well-known later budget (of 306/918) gives an

---

1 Also Miskawayh, ii, 34, for the year 332/943; I. Hauqal, 146 (K. 218), for the year 358/968. cf. A. Dûrı, Ta'rikh al-عراق, 222.
2 Malik-shah (1072–1092) tried to obtain from the sharvan-shah Farîburz 70,000 dinars, but the contribution gradually dwindled to 40,000, see Bundârî, 140. According to Nasawî, 160, 175, the original sum was 100,000 dinars, but in 622/1225 the khwârazm-shâh Jalâl al-din requested the sharvân-shâh to pay 50,000, and then further reduced this sum by 20,000 dinars. The real value of these nominal sums is difficult to ascertain in view of the silver crisis of the 12th century, see E. Pâkhomov, Moneti Gruzii, 1910, pp. 79, 118.
3 According to Barthold's estimate of 4 dirhams = 1 rouble, this would give 1,437,500 roubles, or over £140,000 (at the pre-1914 rates).
4 Qudâma, 244, enumerates its provinces: Ardabil, Jâbarvân (apparently the region to the south of Lake Urmîya) and Warthân (on the Araxes), adding that its capital is Bardhâ'a. Ya'qûbî, in his Geography, B.G.A., vii, 274, puts the kharâj of Azarbayan at 4 m. dirhams.
5 Qudâma, 246, enumerates its provinces: Jürzân (Georgia), Dâbil (Dvin), Barzand, Sirâj-Tâyr (Shirak and Taik'), Bûjunays (Bununik'), Arjîsh, Khîlât, Sisajân (Sianik'), Arân, Qâliqâlâ (Erzerum), Basfurrajan (Vaspurakan)—with its capital at Nashawâ (Nakhchavan).
6 See Qudâma, 236, line 20. Cf. also the unusual indication concerning the administrative centres (qasabâ) of Azarbayan—at Bardhâ'a, and of Armenia—at Nakhchavan.
impression of considerable recession (*Verfall*) of income. In practice the revenue must have greatly depended on circumstances. When in 296/908 Yusuf b. Abil-Sāj was confirmed in his governorship, the sum of his farm was fixed at only 120,000 dinars (1·8 m. dirhams), and already towards 299/912 Yusuf tried to evade even this reduced responsibility.

In any case, I. Ḥauqal’s item on the general revenue must belong to a source entirely different from that of his data at the time of Marzubān.

(C) General Interest of the Passages.

1. Though admitting that the list is not the original document, but possibly a series of items communicated, or even dictated, to our geographer, one should consider it as a valuable picture of the political structure of a region on which we are insufficiently informed.

2. In view of the great scarcity of financial statistics for the 10th century, I. Ḥauqal’s data merit attention both as an illustration of the politico-financial methods and as material for assessing the comparative importance of the principalities.

3. It is hoped that our identifications will be of utility to local historians working on Christian sources. The figures of Ishkhānīq of Shakkī and of Sanhārīb, son of Sawāda, seem to fit into the pattern of the Georgian and Armenian sources.

Incidentally, our analysis is a preparatory work for the publication of the 11th-century *History of Sharvān*.

---


2 In his chapter on taxation Spuler, loc. cit., 467, has quoted I. Ḥauqal’s table only for the tribute of Sharvān. Ghazarian’s reference to I. H.’s passage is incomplete, see his ‘Armenien unter d. arab. Herrschaft’ in *Zeit. f. arm. Philologie*, 1903, ii/3, p. 205.

3 See above, p. 508, n. 4. The chapters on Sharvān and al-Bāb complete the chapter on the Shaddādids of Ganja published in my *Studies in Caucasian History*, 1953.
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