TWO BÜYID COINS IN THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE

NABIA ABBOTT

(I am indebted to Professor Sprengling for the interest he has shown in the publication of these coins and for his confirmation of my reading of their important dates. Likewise, I am indebted to Dr. Boyes for his co-operation in making these coins available and in providing the accompanying photographs.)

1. Oriental Institute No. A. 6858. Silver dirham, 2.5 cm. in diameter. The coin was acquired in 1929 with the Moritz Collection and was recognized by Moritz as unique. It is inscribed in simple Kūfic with hints of elaboration seen in dropping ligatures below the line.

*Obv. Area:*

ط

لا الله إلا الله

وحده لا شريك له

الملك عضد الدولة

واتج الملة

ابن شجاع

*Inner Margin: [سما[ة] بِهِدَاء الدَّرَابِمِ بِفَلَسطِينِ سَنَة]*

احذى وسبع وثلاثمئة

*Outer Margin: Clipped and what is left is smoothed away and is mostly illegible except for few letters سعَ [نَاء]*

*Rev. Area:*

لله

عبد

رسول الله
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2. Oriental Institute No. A. 12231. Gold dinar, 2.4 cm. in diameter. The coin was presented to the Oriental Institute in 1934 by Mr. H. O. Shults of Chicago. Unique? It is pierced through in two places and has a good-sized dent in a third. The inscriptions are in simple Kufic.

Obv. Area:

لا لله إلا الله
الملك صمصام الدو
لة وشمسم الابناء
كاليتچار بن عضد الدولة
ابو سمح

Inner Margin: 

بسم الله ضرب هذا الدينار بسوق الأهواز
سنة أربع وثمانين وثلاثين

Outer Margin: Kur'ān XXX:3-4:

لله الأمر من قبل الحلم

Rev. Area:

حمد
رسول الله
القادر بله
فخر الدولة
وفقك الأمة

Margin: Kur’ān IX:33:

حمد رسول الله الحلم
Islāmic coins have, from time to time, delighted the student of Islāmic history by their remarkable confirmation of the events recorded by Muslim historians.\textsuperscript{1} The coins of the Būyid dynasty, because of their rich and significant inscriptions, are of more than average interest and value in this respect. Less frequently Muslim coins go beyond this confirmation of recorded facts to the more valuable contribution of making definite additions to our historical knowledge. The Būyids now give us a representative coin of this important type.

The great historical value of the Būyid coins was recognized nearly a century ago by Lindberg, who, in an essay as complete as his scanty materials then allowed, sought to bring together the evidence of the coins and the available record of historians.\textsuperscript{2} Since his day much new historical material, both Arabic and Persian, has come to light, as have also other Būyid coins. Nevertheless, there are still too many gaps of dates and representative mints in the various known collections, published or unpublished, to permit as yet the writing of a new and reasonably complete monograph on the Būyid coins and their historical significance. The publication of coins that help to fill in these gaps should be always welcome. The two coins herewith presented are, so far as I am able to ascertain with the limited numismatic materials at my command, indeed gap-fillers. The first and earlier of the two belongs to that rare group of coins that definitely add to our historical knowledge; the second confirms historical records of the period. The historical comments which follow will be of interest for Būyid coinage and history regardless of whether or not there are duplicates, published or unpublished, of these coins.

The first of these coins is a silver dirham of ʿAḍud al-Dawlah (338–72/949–82), the greatest and most powerful of the Būyids, and Amīr al-Umarā\textsuperscript{2} at Baghdad (367–72/977–82) under the ʿAbbāṣid Caliph al-Ṭāʾī (363–81/974–91). It was struck in Palestine, possibly at the capital city of al-Ramlah, in a.h. 371 and bears the names of Ṭāʾī and ʿAḍud only. Moritz, despite the fact that he misread (in a brief note in which the coin was wrapped) the name of the caliph as al-Muṭī\textsuperscript{2} and

\textsuperscript{1} The latest copious illustrations of this confirmation are to be found in the recently published study by George C. Miles, \textit{The Numismatic History of Ragg} (New York, 1938).

the date, therefore, as in the early 360's, had nevertheless recognized the coin as unique and marked it "unicum." The key to its uniqueness is to be found in the fact that it was struck in Palestine—a region supposed to be held by the Fātimid ʿAzīz at this time. I say "supposedly" because the testimony of the present coin proves definitely that for at least a short period in 371 ʿAḍud al-Dawlah considered himself and the ʿAbbāsids as lords of Palestine. Nowhere, so far as I can find, do the numerous histories now available come out explicitly with a statement to that effect. But these same histories paint a background into which the present coin and its political and territorial implications fit as a jewel in its perfect setting. To see this fully and clearly, we must sketch the last stages of ʿAḍud al-Dawlah's successful career. In 365/975–76 ʿAḍud brought about a reconciliation between himself and his estranged father, Rukn al-Dawlah. This was in a sense a prelude to the division of Rukn al-Dawlah's empire among his three sons, ʿAḍud al-Dawlah, Muʿayyad al-Dawlah, and Fakhr al-Dawlah. ʿAḍud was to succeed his father as chief Būyid prince and Amīr al-Umāra at Baghdad, Muʿayyad was to have the provinces of Isbāḥān, and Fakhr those of Hamadhān and the Jabal. But this division of the empire, as others before and after it in Islamic history, did not go through smoothly. After Rukn al-Dawlah's death, ʿAḍud and Muʿayyad opposed Fakhr and defeated him and his allies, driving him for a time for refuge and aid to the Sāmānids farther east. Several of ʿAḍud's coins testify to this fact by the mention of Muʿayyad and the omission of Fakhr. In 366 ʿAḍud started for Baghdad and in the course of the next year he succeeded in dispossessing his cousin ʿIzz al-Dawlah Bakhtīyār, who was ambitious to be the Amīr al-Umāra, and his ally Abū Taghib, the Ḥamdānid of Mosul. Abū Taghib, ousted from his possession, allied himself with ʿAḍud's enemies—the sons of Bakhtīyār.


3 Cf. for instances, Miles, pp. 166 ff., Nos. 193 ff.; Lindberg, pp. 249 ff., Nos. 77 f.

But this party got involved with local politics in Palestine where Ibn al-Jarrāḥ (called now Daghfil, now Mufarraj), an Arab chieftain of the tribe of Ṭayy, was now all-powerful despite a nominal allegiance to the Fāṭimid ʿAzīz. The outcome of the struggle was the defeat and death of Abū Taghib in 369/979–80 and the surrender of his brothers to ʿAqūd, who also got possession of the Lady Jamīlah, sister of Abū Taghib, who was powerful enough to be described by the historians as the only one to share her brother’s authority. The episode further weakened the sons of Bakhtiyār, so that ʿAqūd could justly congratulate himself on being rid of two powerful enemies. But he was not the type to be content with what the wheels of fortune had so far thrown his way. We find him in this remarkable year, 369, at the zenith of his power, politically supreme at Baghdad, while the territories under his control stretched from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf and from Iṣbāḥān to the borders of Syria. This was the year in which Ṭāʾī married ʿAqūd’s daughter, an arrangement by which ʿAqūd hoped to have a Būyid heir to the caliph’s throne—a hope of which Ṭāʾī was very conscious and which he took special care to frustrate.

This and the preceding year was the time in which ʿAqūd persuaded or rather forced Ṭāʾī to increase his public honors and to give him the additional title of Ṭāj al-Millah—a title which appears on our coin. It is also the year in which ʿAqūd arranged a magnificent spectacle for the benefit of the ambassador from the Fāṭimite ʿAzīz of Cairo. ʿAzīz is reported to have written to ʿAqūd addressing him as ʿAqūd Dawlatī, as if the Fāṭimids and not the ʿAbbāsids had conferred that title. But if this was merely an error in the Arabic text, the summary

10 Miskawaih, pp. 396 and 414, n. 1; Suyūṭī, Taʿrīkh al-Khulafāʾ (Cairo, 1888), pp. 163 f.
11 Suyūṭī, p. 164.
12 Wüstefeld, p. 142. I am, at this point, forced to rely in part on Arabic sources as used by Wüstefeld in his Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen. He does not document his individual statements; and, though I have checked on those of his sources that are available to me, I have not come across some of his materials. However, Wüstefeld’s knowledge of Arabic and his reputation as a scholar lead me to accept his statements and to defer the question of specific documentation to Arabic sources for the time being. Some of his information in question undoubtedly comes from Jamāl al-Dīn’s, Al-Duwal al-Munkafāʾ ah (cf. his pp. 1 and 4); for Jamāl al-Dīn cf. Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur, 1, 321, and supplement.
of the contents of the letter show that there was some definite reaching-out at this point between the Shiite Fāṭimids of Egypt and the Shiite Būyids at Baghdad, the ʿAbbāsid Caliph Ṭāʾī being only a figurehead. ʿAḍud sent a courteous letter back to ʿAzīz and made some reference to the Byzantine situation. His ambassador was well received at Cairo, and his letter was acknowledged in another that again made reference to the polytheist. The object of these interchanges of letters and embassies was friendship and union in Islām against the non-Muslims. But, as Wüstenfeld pointed out, there comes into play the essential rivalry of Baghdad and Cairo, and the ambitions of ʿAḍud, who preferred a “heretic” Sunnite caliph—Ṭāʾī—which he could control, to an “orthodox” Shiite—ʿAzīz—to whom he must bow religiously and also politically. Hence it is not surprising that nothing came of these attempts at rapprochement. Instead, the unsettled situation in Syria and Palestine coupled with ʿAḍud’s success and ambition soon led the latter to cast envious eyes on ʿAzīz’s territories, including Egypt itself, and to think in terms of anticipated aggression against both the Byzantine and the Fāṭimids. It is at this point that ʿAḍud is reported as beginning to look into the genealogy of the Fāṭimids and to send a representative to ʿAzīz to request a properly attested documentation of Fāṭimid descent. Yaʿkūb Ibn Killis, a converted Jew and ʿAzīz’s resourceful wāzīr, is said to have drawn up such a document and started it on its way to Baghdad; but it never reached that city, for ʿAḍud’s messenger was poisoned on the way back. This, if some later historical records are to be taken at their face value, was not the first time that the descent of the Fāṭimids had been challenged. Muʿīzz is reported as having to cope with it, and ʿAzīz as having to face it early in his reign. This is not the place to go into the highly controversial question of the truth or falsity of

14 Wüstenfeld, p. 143.
15 Miskawaih, p. 409.
16 Wüstenfeld, pp. 142 f. I am unable to trace Wüstenfeld’s Arabic source. Perhaps he takes the incident from the dynastic history of Jamāl-al-Dīn, Akhbār al-Duwal al-Mun-kafṣah, which also reports the earlier incident challenging Muʿīizz to prove his Fāṭimid descent; cf. Ibn Khalīlikān, ed. De Slane, II, 48.
the Fāṭimid descent. These early *incidents* themselves may be discredited, as indeed some think they should be. What cannot as readily be discredited or overlooked is that doubts were being cast on the Fāṭimid descent—be the descent true or false, and be the motives of the doubts sincere or otherwise. That there was at this time some smoke from a smouldering fire that was to break out into a roaring flame in the famous Baghdad manifesto of 402/1011, in which Sunnites and Shiites alike repudiated the Fāṭimid descent, is hardly to be doubted. Mamour insists on emphasizing the fact that this manifesto of Baghdad was the "first sign of questioning" the Fāṭimid descent. The manifesto was more than a "sign of questioning"; it was a bold and deliberate assertion of the falsity, as its drafters saw it, of the Fāṭimid claim. The first signs of questioning must have preceded this deliberate move. The days of ʿAzīz and ʿAḍud offer an excellent background for the appearance of such signs. ʿAḍud was ambitious and canny enough to capitalize on such signs, perhaps daring enough to start them on their way. ʿAzīz is supposed to have retaliated by having a henchman of his spirit away a lion of silver from the very dwelling of ʿAḍud at Baghdad in ʿA.H. 371, thereby ridiculing, as it were, ʿAḍud’s powers and alertness. Again, if we disregard this incident with the rest, we cannot fail to see that, with ʿAḍud contemplating aggression against ʿAzīz, the inherent rivalry of ʿAbbāsid Baghdad and Fāṭimid Cairo was leading to an open break by ʿA.H. 371, the date of our coin.

Let us turn our attention next to the details of the local situation in Syria and Palestine. Muʿizz and ʿAzīz held these territories only by force of arms. The Ḥarmatians had dealt Muʿizz a severe blow, severing Syria from Egypt in 363/974. Aftakīn (Alptakīn), a former ʿawlā of Muʿizz al-Dawlah had profited by that situation to establish himself in Damascus and to restore the name of the ʿAbbāsid caliph—Ṭāʾī— in that city in 364. Further encouraged by Muʿizz’s death, he advanced on Sidon and Tiberias and thence back to Damascus. It must, indeed, have been at this stage of his career that he wrote

---

19 Wüstenfeld, p. 144.
20 Miskawaih, p. 409.
21 Ibn al-Athīr, VIII, 469 and 483.
cAḍud: "Syria is free (from the presence of foreign troops), it is now within our grasp, and the rule of the monarch of Egypt has ceased therein; aid me therefore with money and soldiers, so that I may attack these people even in the seat of their power." cAḍud, in these critical years (365–67) of Būyid history, coupled perhaps with mistrust of Aftakin, discouraged the idea in a reply which ran: "Thy power has misled thee, and the result of that undertaking would be thy disgrace; fear therefore the dishonour which may attend it. By this, perhaps, thou mayest be guided." But, if Aftakin failed to get help from cAḍud, he was more successful in his approach to Hasan ibn Aḥmad and his Ḧarmatians with whose aid he defeated the Egyptians led by Jawhar only to be in turn himself defeated by cAẓīz in 367/977, to be betrayed by a former friend and ambitious figure in local politics, Ibn al-Jarrāḥ, and to be eventually befriended and won over by cAẓīz. 25 Ḥasan and his Ḧarmatians were bought off with an annual pension. 26 But the removal of these two did not really change the situation for cAẓīz's hold on Syria and Palestine. At Damascus one of Aftakin's counselors, Ḧassām, aspired to the local role of his former master and displayed a defiant attitude. 27 Meanwhile in Palestine, Ibn al-Jarrāḥ's ambitious and treacherous dealings with Abū Taqhlīb the Ḧam- dānid had brought about, as we have already seen, that prince's death in 369. The two continued in their course. Ḧassām, nominally professing allegiance, promised cAẓīz to defend the city against a possible attack by cAḍud al-Dawlah. 28 Thus the fear of cAḍud was felt in Syria at the same time that his unfriendly attitude was no longer to be doubted at Cairo. Ibn al-Jarrāḥ grew in power and became more defiant. Did he at this time, a.h. 370–71, come to terms with cAḍud? Was cAḍud successful in any expeditions against him? I am unable to find the answers to these questions in historical records. But the evidence of our coin points to one or the other of these two alternatives. And the choice will be determined partly by the situation in which cAḍud found himself and partly by the character of both cAḍud and

23 Ibn Khallikān, II, 483.
24 Ibid.
26 Ibn al-Athīr VIII, 487.
27 Miskawaih, p. 401; Wüstenfeld, p. 144.
28 Wüstenfeld, p. 144.
Ibn al-Jarrāḥ. It must be pointed out here that ʿAṣūd’s resources were needed for the fight against his brother Fakhir al-Dawlah, and that an epileptoid malady had overtaken him, though that fact seems to have been carefully kept secret.29 Furthermore, had he actually taken any part of Palestine by force of arms, he would have retained it long enough for that event to make its mark in history and find its way into historical records; for in his own words, in his previous conflict with Abū Taghlib, he says, “When we conquer a region with the sword and after an armed conflict, we do not yield it peacefully.”30 Ibn al-Jarrāḥ as we have seen, was a man of shiftv and treacherous character in his dealings with ʿAzīz, Aftakin, and Abū Taghlib. Money and self-interest were his only objectives. There is therefore nothing in the character of either ʿAṣūd or Ibn al-Jarrāḥ to prevent their getting together diplomatically against ʿAzīz, who stood in the way of both of them. It is in some such setting that one must place the evidence of our silver dirham which in 371 acknowledges Ṭāʾiʿ and ʿAṣūd in Palestine. Perhaps it was this very development which determined ʿAzīz early in 372 once more to make an effort, and a strenuous one at that, to subdue Ibn al-Jarrāḥ. The expedition was successful; Ibn al-Jarrāḥ was put to flight and sought shelter first at Antioch and then with Bajkūr at Ḥoms. Next ʿAṣūm was brought to obedience and replaced by Bajkūr.31 In a few more months ʿAṣūd al-Dawlah was dead, and his sons, as we shall presently see, were too busy at home in fighting one another to take any action against the Fāṭimid ʿAzīz, whose ups and downs with the Ḥamānids carried him to Mosul and back. Thus a situation that made possible the minting of the dirham under consideration was overshadowed by the immediately succeeding events of greater importance, and so was soon forgotten. Thanks to this unique coin it can now, after these long centuries, take its proper place in ʿAbīyid history.

Reference has already been made to the rich and significant inscriptions on ʿAbīyid coins. These frequently contain, in addition to the name of the reigning ʿAbbāsīd caliph and of the ʿAbīyid Amīr al-

29 Miskawah, p. 416; Mīrkhwand, p. 29; Wüstenfeld, p. 144.
30 Miskawah, p. 384.
31 Wüstenfeld, p. 145 and n. 1; Ibn Taghibībīfī, II, Part II, 4 f. Ibn al-Jarrāḥ and members of his family continue to figure in Fāṭimid history, though he was always mistrusted by ʿAzīz and Ibn Killīs (Rūdhrāwārī, p. 195).
Umarā', the names of one and sometimes two other Būyid princes or amīrs—leaders of the different branches of the Būyid family that held sway in the near and remote provinces of the fast disintegrating ʿAbbāsid Empire. Thus these coins indicate the relationship of the different members of this ruling family to the central authority at Baghdad and to one another. They frequently point to existing alliances and indicate the future succession either at headquarters in Baghdad or in the different provinces. They are, therefore, likely to be at times as eloquent by their omissions as by their inclusions. Thus some of ʿAḥud’s coins indicate his alliance with Muʿayyad and omit to mention Fakhrī with whom he was at war. Again others of ʿAḥud’s coins mention the name of his oldest son Abū al-Fawāris Shīr dhīl, the future Sharaf al-Dawlah,32 and still others that of his second son Abū Kālijār al-Marzabān, the future Ṣāmṣām al-Dawlah.33 The question in these cases was not one of preference but rather of actual provincial control exercised at that time, or perhaps even implied for the future, by the respective princes. Our second coin, the gold dinar of Ṣāmṣām, is true to Būyid type and confirms the existing situation at the time and place it was struck. But in order properly to place the coin and the situation it reflects, we must continue with our sketch of relevant Būyid history.

On the death of ʿAḥud in 372/982 the generals and nobles agreed on Ṣāmṣām as Amīr al-Umarā' in preference to his older brother Sharaf, who was then in Kirmān.34 But Ṣāmṣām’s accession was not to go uncontested. Sharaf was not the only rival; there was also Muʿayyad, now the senior member of the family and ambitious to be the real ruler of the ʿAbbāsid Empire.35 His agent in Fārs was soon striking coins in his name.36 Furthermore, Muʿayyad, with ʿAḥud no longer there to back him against Fakhrī, reached out a friendly hand to the

32 Muše-yi-Humayun, Maskūkūt-i-Kadimah-i-Islāmiyyah Katalughī, ed. Ismā’īl Gḥālib (Constantinople, 1312/1894–95), I, 354 f. (cited hereafter as Gḥālib). Wilken (Mīrkhwand, p. 9) makes Ṣāmṣām the oldest son, but this is contrary to the sources; cf. Rūdhrāwāri, p. 124; Abū al-Fidā, Annales Muslemici . . . . . , ed. Reiskīl (Hafniae, 1790), II, 566 and 600, whence it is to be seen that Sharaf was some two years older than Ṣāmṣām.
34 Rūdhrāwāri, pp. 77 f.; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 16; Abū al-Fidā, II, 554.
35 Rūdhrāwāri, p. 91.
36 Ibid. The issue is not represented in the numismatic sources at my command.
latter; but Fakhr, being suspicious of him, did not respond. Muʿayyad’s death in the following year left Fakhr as the senior member of the family who might now aspire to rulership in Baghdad. Muʿayyad’s minister, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAbbād, known as the Ṣāḥib, offered his services to Fakhr and was accepted. He certainly had ambitions for his new master and himself to rule in Baghdad, but this ambition seems to have been kept in the background for the time being. In the meantime Abū al-Ḥusain, another brother whom Ṣaṃsām had appointed to Fārs, was striking out on his own. It was at this point that Ibn Saʿdān, wazīr of Ṣaṃsām, proposed the policy of friendship with Fakhr, which policy was also approved by Fakhr’s wazīr, the Ṣāḥib. Hence negotiations in the course of the years a.h. 373–74 resulted in a definite alliance between these two, in Fakhr’s winning back Abū al-Ḥusain, and in Ṭāʾīc’s recognition and confirmation of Fakhr’s rule in the eastern provinces already in his possession. Along with the recognition and the honor given Fakhr al-Dawlah at this time, Ṭāʾīc conferred on him the new title of Falk al-Ummah. These events were reflected in the coinage. Thus Abū al-Ḥusain strikes coins in Fakhr’s name in 374 at Ahwāz. Fakhr’s coinage in Rayy for that year contains the new title. Despite the new alliance Sharaf continued with his claims and opposition, and in the following year, after a futile effort to win Abū al-Ḥusain to his side, he marched against him and forced him to evacuate Ahwāz. Sharaf continued his advance on ʿIrāk. Negotiations were started between him and the Būyid court at Baghdad which resulted in the two brothers’ coming to the following terms in 376/986–87: The release of Abū Nasr (yet another brother and the future Bahāʾ al-Dawlah), who had been imprisoned by Ṣaṃsām; the recognition of Sharaf as the senior member and as Amīr al-Umarāʾ; the presence of Ṣaṃsām at Baghdad but as Sharaf’s deputy; the declaration of friendship and defensive alliance between the two. It was at this time that Sharaf received his title of Zain

37 Ibid. 38 Ibid., pp. 95–97, 163 f. 39 Ibid., p. 78. 40 Ibid., pp. 97–100.
41 Ibid., p. 99; Mirkhwand, p. 32. The issue is not represented in the sources at my disposal.
42 Miles, p. 170, No. 198.
43 Rūdhrāwarī, pp. 120–23, where the career of this prince can be followed to its end (cf. Mirkhwand, p. 32).
44 Rūdhrāwarī, pp. 118, 124–26; Mirkhwand, p. 36; Ibn Taghrībīrī, II, Part II, 37 f.
al-Millah. The ease with which Sharaf gained his objectives led him to break even these liberal terms and to march once more against Şamsām. Dailmite rebellion and riots complicated the situation for Şamsām. His advisers, nevertheless, urged him to resist Sharaf and to call into effect his alliance with Fakhr al-Dawlah. But the weak Şamsām, losing nerve and patience, decided to surrender in person to Sharaf—a step which he presently had cause to regret. Sharaf deprived him of his powers and imprisoned him in a fortress in Fārs, where he remained until Sharaf’s death in 379/989, at which time he was blinded.45 Doubtless Sharaf struck coins in the period of his amirate. The issue or issues may be represented somewhere in the many İslāmic coin collections. In this period of Şamsām’s misfortunes Fakhr al-Dawlah does not seem to have been doing much to come to his aid. In his own central provinces, however, Fakhr’s affairs, thanks greatly to Ibn ‘Abbād’s wise policies, were progressing favorably. His coins of this period cannot be expected to mention either the imprisoned Şamsām or the enemy usurper Sharaf; and they do not.46

On the death of Sharaf al-Dawlah, Şamsām, though blinded, was restored to power in Fārs. His younger brother Abū Naṣr was accepted as Amīr al-Umarā at Baghdad with the title of Bahā al-Dawlah. Ibn ‘Abbād, in keeping with his long-standing ambition, urged Fakhr to oppose Bahā in his own right. This he did and advanced on Ahwāz in 379, but met with failure and had to retreat.47 He and Şamsām continued to be on friendly terms, but it was the latter who was the more aggressive against Bahā. In 380/990–91 Bahā moved in the direction of Shiraz against Şamsām but was defeated, and the two came to the following terms: Bahā retained ‘Irāk and Khūzistān, and Şamsām was recognized in Fārs and Arrajān; each was to have a fief in the territory of the other; and friendship was to hold between the two.48 The treaty lasted until 383/993. Again Būyid

46 Miles, p. 171, No. 199 of the year 378. Despite their alliance Fakhr’s coins, so far as we can tell, do not seem ever to have mentioned Şamsām’s name.
47 Rūdhra, pp. 163–66, 169–71; Mirkhwand, pp. 32 f.; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 44 f. These three sources say nothing about Fakhr ever being recognized as Amīr al-Umarā; but the much later (730/1330) Ta’rīkh-i-Gusida of the less reliable Ḥamd Allah Mustawfī al-Ḡawrī (ed. Browne [‘Gibb Memorial Series’ (London, 1910)], XIV, Part I, 424), states that peace was made and Bahā acknowledged Fakhr as Amīr al-Umarā. This may be seriously questioned.
48 Rūdhra, pp. 182–84; Mirkhwand, p. 37; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 53 f.
coins reflect these conditions and reflect also the character of the three princes involved of whom Šamsām is by far the simplest; he alone worked in the open without mental reservations. Thus Bahāʾ’s coins for the year 381 included only the caliph’s name;49 Fakhr’s coins for the year 380–81 likewise include only the caliph’s name;50 Šamsām’s coins, however, mention the caliph and Fakhr in the three years 381–83.51 The three princes continued their respective practice of these years in the years that followed.

It was Šamsām’s weakness and Bahāʾ’s cupidity that led the latter to break the treaty between them. Bahāʾ’s men moved on Ahwāz, where they were defeated by Šamsām’s faction, while he himself was advancing from Shiraz.52 While Bahāʾ was making desperate efforts to finance a counterattack, Šamsām arrived at Ahwāz in 384.53 It is here that our second coin fits, struck as it was at Sūḫ al-Alwāz in 384. This is the only time in that year that Šamsām could have issued coins in Ahwāz, for in the course of that same year Bahāʾ’s new army led by Ṭughān ousted Šamsām’s partisans from Sūs, defeated Šamsām at the Battle of Tall Tā’us, and forced him to fall back on Ahwāz and Arrajān with Ṭughān following him up and regaining possession of Ahwāz.54 Šamsām’s troops were able to regain Ahwāz the following year and to occupy Basrah in 386/996.55 But his men and soldiers were not any too faithful, and Bahāʾ gradually won some of them over and, despite outward attempts at negotiations, was actually gaining ground on his uncle. Šamsām’s coins of this year continue to mention Fakhr,56 of whom Bahāʾ had to take note; but Fakhr’s death in the following year (387/997)57 simplified, for the time being, Bahāʾ’s problem, and he is reported once more on the aggressive against Šamsām’s territories. This coincided with a disastrous move on the part of Šamsām to dispossess all of his Dailamites whose pedigree was in any way

49 Lane-Poole, II, 217, No. 317.
50 Miles, pp. 171 f., Nos. 200 f.
52 Rūdhrāwari, pp. 250–53; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 68.
53 Rūdhrāwari, p. 256; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 68 and 73.
54 Rūdhrāwari, pp. 255–57; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 72 f.
55 Rūdhrāwari, pp. 266 and 271; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 78 f., 87 f.
56 Lane-Poole, II, 212, No. 666.
57 Rūdhrāwari, p. 296; Mirkhward, pp. 34 f.; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 93.
doubtful. The rejected Dailamites joined yet another group of Būyids—the sons of Bakhtiyār—whom we have mentioned in connection with Ḥadud and who were at blood enmity with Ṣamṣān. Between the two groups Ṣamṣān was soon captured and speedily put to death.\textsuperscript{58} The way was thus cleared for Bahā\textsuperscript{3}'s complete control over what had been Ṣamṣān's territory.\textsuperscript{59}

We must stop here and take note of the affairs of the caliphs of the period. In 381 Bahā\textsuperscript{3} maneuvered the deposition of Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c} and raised al-Ḵādir to the throne. The nearer provinces under Bahā\textsuperscript{3} and Ṣamṣān accepted the change which was now reflected in the coinage of both.\textsuperscript{60} But Fakhr al-Dawlah's farther eastern provinces, and especially Khurasān, disapproved of Bahā\textsuperscript{3}'s move and continued to acknowledge Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c}.\textsuperscript{61} This situation is reflected in Fakhr's coinage struck at Rayy in 384 and still mentioning Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c}.\textsuperscript{62} Thus we have Fakhr's name appearing in this same year with that of the Caliph Ḵādir on our dinar of Ṣamṣān, and with that of the Caliph Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c} on Fakhr's own coins. Ḵādir was aware of this situation and made some diplomatic efforts to secure universal recognition,\textsuperscript{63} but was unable to make headway until after the death of Fakhr in 387. Fakhr's sons, Majd al-Dawlah and Shams al-Dawlah, succeeded in different provinces of their father's territory, with Majd's mother acting as regent for her minor son.\textsuperscript{64} Fakhr's policy of allegiance to Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c} and opposition to Bahā\textsuperscript{3} was continued. The extent of the opposition is to be judged from Majd's earliest coins issued in 387 or 388, that is, in the interval between the death of Fakhr and the agreement reached with Ḵādir in 388—when Majd is specifically designated as Amīr al-Umārā\textsuperscript{3} on coins still acknowledging Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c}; for it is indeed here that Majd's coins struck at Rayy and described by Miles under No. 202A and 202B must fall (these coins should therefore have been cited after and not before No. 203 of the year 384). When Ḵādir's diplomacy was aided by local conditions at Rayy, then Ḵādir's name replaced that of Ṭāʾī\textsuperscript{c}
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\footnotetext{58} Rūdhrāwī, pp. 311–15; Mirkhwand, p. 38; Ibn al-Athīr, X, 100 f.
\footnotetext{59} Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 107 f.
\footnotetext{60} See specimens referred to above in nn. 49 and 51.
\footnotetext{61} Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 103.
\footnotetext{62} Miles, p. 176, No. 203.
\footnotetext{63} Rūdhrāwī, p. 250; Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 71; cf. also Miles, p. 175.
\footnotetext{64} Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 93; cf. also Miles, p. 178.
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on the coins of Majd and Shams, and the title Amīr al-Umarāʾ was no longer used by these two.\textsuperscript{65} But, though Rayy had made its peace with Ḫādir, and in 389 all Khurasān, thanks to Maḥmūd of Ghazna’s efforts, followed suit,\textsuperscript{66} yet inter-Būyid relationship continued to be mostly one of suspicion and opposition. Thus Bahāʾ’s coins continued to mention none but the caliph at first.\textsuperscript{67} Later he adds that of his son, Ḫawām al-Dīn, as seen on coins of 396 and after.\textsuperscript{68} Majd and Shams have their own ups and downs with their mother, who is in control most of the time. The coins of neither of them mention the other, and we cannot be sure that they mentioned Bahāʾ until the year 400.\textsuperscript{69}

Būyid coins of the reigns after Bahaʾ and Majd are comparatively rare. Some day more of these, along with others, may come to light and help to fill the gaps and so pave the way for a complete study. In the meantime, one of the two coins here presented has helped to represent Ṣamsām’s issue in the Ahwāz mint for the year A.H. 384, and the other gives us the right to add Falastīn to the mint places of the Būyids. Historically, Ṣamsām’s coin confirms his recorded though temporary victory in Ahwāz in 384, and Āḍud’s unique coin records for the first time an even more temporary and apparently merely political victory in Palestine in A.H. 371.

\textsuperscript{65} Rūdhārwarī, p. 311; cf. Miles, pp. 177 ff. (note new titles on these coins).
\textsuperscript{66} Ibn al-Athīr, IX, 103; cf. Miles, pp. 174 f.
\textsuperscript{67} Lane-Poole, II, 213, No. 668; Ghālib, pp. 360 ff.
\textsuperscript{68} Lane-Poole, pp. 214 f.
\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 218; Miles, pp. 177 ff., Nos. 205A–14 (note especially Nos. 208 and 210–13 for Bahāʾ’s name).