

Alison Vacca

Khurāsānī and Transoxanian *Ostikans* of Early ‘Abbāsīd Armenia

Abstract: This chapter examines the relationship between Armenia and Khurāsān in the early ‘Abbāsīd period by focusing on the Khurāsānī governors (*ostikans*) placed in the north between the rise of the ‘Abbāsīds and the Samaritan period. It argues that the presence of Khurāsānī governors and troops in Armenia challenges the idea that Armenia was separated or isolated from the broader concerns of the Caliphate.

After a brief introduction to the *ostikanate*, the chapter discusses the Khurāsānī governors chronologically along five main periods: (1) the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution; (2) the Battle of Bagrewand in 775; (3) Hārūn al-Rashīd and al-Amin; (4) the fourth *fitna*; (5) the rise of Transoxanian *ostikans*. This discussion demonstrates that ‘Abbāsīd rule relied heavily on Khurāsānī *ostikans* and troops in Armenia. It further establishes the caliphal north as a region where ‘Abbāsīd power and at times intra-Khurāsānī conflict played out.

Keywords: Armenia; Khurāsān; ‘Abbāsīd; ostikan; Bagrewand; fourth *fitna*

Introduction

Sometime in or after the 12th century, an Anonymous Storyteller assembled a treasure trove of Armenian oral histories about the Arcruni nobles of the 8th and 9th centuries. His compilation patches together curious information from a number of early sources and reveals plenty of anachronisms and manifestly incorrect details, preserving tales that aimed to entertain rather than inform. In one story, Arabs from the west chase the king of Baghdad out of his capital. The king decides to flee to Khurāsān, where his relatives could provide funds and troops to retake Baghdad. Along the way, the king’s servants abandon him, so he travels to the city of Van to entreat the aid of Derēn, an Arcruni nobleman. Derēn pays a guide to escort the king safely to Khurāsān, and when the king retakes Baghdad the Armenian nobleman reaps the rewards for his loyalty.

I’d like to extend my thanks to the organizers of the conference *Regional and Transregional Elites—Connecting the Early Islamic Empire* for all the work that went into planning and convening such a fascinating conference. I’d also like to thank Rob Haug and Amikam Elad for reading through the draft of this paper and providing useful feedback

This folktale inserts a celebrated Armenian notable into broader drama of caliphal history. While he never identifies the king by name as al-Ma'mūn, the storyteller suggests the loyalties of Armenian nobles during the fourth *fitna*, and more importantly reveals that even centuries after the war people enjoyed tales boasting of Armenian involvement in the drama of an ousted 9th-century caliph and his relatives in Khurāsān.¹

This paper relies on Arabic and Armenian sources to explore the close relationship between Armenia and Khurāsān throughout the early 'Abbāsīd period, a closeness that did not exist merely in exaggerated popular tales. In particular, it examines the post of caliphal governor (*ostikan*) as evidence of Armenian-Khurāsānī relations and posits that the Arab, Iranian, and Turkish elites in the service of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate served as direct links between the two frontiers. 'Abbāsīd reliance on Khurāsānī troops extended well past the revolution throughout the period of 'Abbāsīd control over the North, not just at moments of Khurāsānī ascendancy such as the reign of al-Ma'mūn. Since most studies of the *ostikanate* center on the Jazarī *ostikans*, this serves as a reminder that 'Abbāsīd Armenia responded clearly to political and military impetuses from the broader caliphate and particularly Khurāsān. As al-Muqaddasī notes in passing, Armenians and Albanians of the 10th century spoke Persian with a Khurāsānī accent: “in Armenia, they speak Armenian and in Albania, they speak Albanian. Their Persian is comprehensible and sounds similar to Khurāsānī [Persian].”² There were direct lines of communication between the two provinces.

1 Anonymous Storyteller 1971, 117–121. Like many of the stories preserved in the Anonymous Storyteller's compilation, this layers several different moments. The most recognizable storyline here is the fourth *fitna*, when al-Ma'mūn gathered his powerbase in Khurāsān before taking the caliphate from his brother al-Amin. The war lasted from 195 H to al-Amin's death in 198 H. The “Arabs from the west” likely refer to the *maghāriba*, also seen in this same work as *matripikk'*. The genealogy provided in this text for the nobleman Derēn presents a number of problems. The best guess is that the Anonymous Storyteller refers to Grigor-Derenik, who ruled from 847 to 887 CE, making it unlikely he would have been old enough to aid al-Ma'mūn. The association between Derēn and Grigor-Derenik presents other chronological and genealogical inconsistencies, too. Interestingly, al-Ṭabarī more believably places Derenik (in Arabic: Dayrānī) in the campaigns of al-Muwaffaq against the Ṣaffārid Ya'qūb b. al-Layth in 262 H and 263 H; al-Ṭabarī 1893, III, 1894–1895. It is likely that the Anonymous Storyteller is conflating the famous war with the actions of a celebrated nobleman who worked in the service of the caliphate half a century later.

2 Al-Muqaddasī 1906, 378.

A Brief Introduction to Caliphal Armenia and the Ostikanate

Khurāsān serves as an excellent model to discuss Armenia as a caliphal province. Khurāsān and Armenia were located on the edges of both Sasanian and caliphal territory, where Islamization and Arabization stalled in the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsīd periods. Once bastions of Parthian society, the Khurāsānī and Armenian elite (the *dihqāns* in the East and the *naxarars* in the North) maintained some semblance of social stability, slowing the effects of regime changes. The provinces were the outskirts of the Iranian *oikoumene*, and while they were culturally distinct exhibited extensive ties to the broader Iranian world. Early Islamic texts use the imprecise and ill-defined catch-all terms *mashriq* (the East) and *jarbī* (the North), underlining problems of mapping imperial power on the edges of the empire, yet both provinces boasted specific frontier outposts (*thughūr*) that delineated Islam/Iran from the “Other.”³ Sources chronicle massive gates along the edges of both provinces, built by the Sasanians to protect Iran from Tūrān and then maintained by the Umayyads and ‘Abbāsīds to safeguard the caliphate from Turkic hordes.

There is some evidence that historians writing in Arabic in the ‘Abbāsīd period also recognized the common ground between Khurāsān and Armenia. Al-Mas‘ūdī, for example, explains that Khurāsān was a model for Sasanian rule in the North:

...when Anushirwan built the town known as al-Bāb with its wall protruding into the sea, and extending over the land and mountains, he settled there various nations and kings for whom he fixed ranks and special titles and defined their frontiers, on the pattern of what Ardashir b. Bābak had done with regards to Khorasan.⁴

The legacy of Sasanian rule has continually informed discussions of caliphal Armenia. In his 7th-century history, Sebēos employs *ostikan* to refer to a Sasanian governor in Armenia. Modern scholars identify the word *ostikan* as an Armenicized version of the Middle Persian *ōstīgān* (trustworthy); it is used to refer to the caliphal governor over the North.

³ On the North, see Ter-Łevondyan 1976b and, independently, Bates 1989; Vacca 2017b. Armenia, Albania, and Azerbaijan continued to be administered together into the ‘Abbāsīd period. The East and the North were both inherited from the quadripartite division of the Sasanian Empire; cf. the Sasanian-era geography by Širakac‘i, who identifies K‘usti Xorasan and K‘usti Kapkoh (Armenicized versions of the MP “direction of Khurāsān” and “direction of the Caucasus,” respectively). See Ter-Łevondyan 1958. The word *jarbī* appears in Arabic texts about the Sasanian North; it renders the Syriac ܝܪܒܝܝܢ, or North.

⁴ Minorsky 1958, 144; al-Mas‘ūdī 1861, II, 3–4.

There are two problems moving the title of *ostikan* into the period of caliphal rule. First, a recent study identifies *ostikan* as a loan word from Parthian, not Middle Persian,⁵ suggesting that the term evokes the memory of Arsacid rather than Sasanian power. Second, we have no evidence that the title was used to refer specifically to the caliphal governor until the 10th century. Most medieval historians who wrote about this period in the North, and in particular Lewond, who wrote his history under the ‘Abbāsids, do not employ *ostikan* in reference to the period of caliphal rule. Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc‘i, writing in the 10th century after the collapse of ‘Abbāsīd control in the North, is the first to reclaim *ostikan* to describe caliphal governors.⁶ Prior to this, governors appear with a number of other Armenian titles, including *hramanatar* (commander), *karcec‘eal marzpan* (the so-called *marzpan*), *zōrawar* (general), *zōraglux* (commander), *verakac‘u* (overseer), *mec hazarpet* (great chiliarch), *išxan* (prince), *marzpan*, and *hawatarim* (trustworthy); in Arabic, the governor appears as *wālī*, *‘āmil*, or *amīr*.⁷ We cannot look to the term *ostikan* to elaborate on the connection between Sasanian and ‘Abbāsīd rule.⁸

The *ostikan* claimed control over two posts. He was responsible for the tax revenues of the province (*‘alā l-kharāj*) and its administration (*‘alā l-ḥarb wa-l-ṣalāt*, literally: over war and prayer).⁹ Sources on the Marwānid and early ‘Abbāsīd periods indicate a preoccupation with the military aspects of the *ostikanate*.¹⁰ *Ostikans* appear in these writings most regularly in response to unrest in the North, including the revolts of Muḥammad b. ‘Ubaydallāh al-Warḥānī or Abū Muslim al-Shāri, and threats beyond the imperial borders posed by the Byzantines, the Khazars, and the Šanāriyya/Canark‘. Quotidian administration seems to have fallen to the regional Armenian, Albanian, Georgian, Arab, or Iranian elites. To facilitate this decentralized model of rule, the *ostikan* appointed or ap-

5 Gippert 1993, II, 217–219.

6 It is not even clear that Drasxanakertc‘i defines the word *ostikan* as “caliphal governor”. Drasxanakertc‘i 1996, 110, specifies that a certain *ostikan* was made governor of Armenia.

7 Ter-Levondyan 1962; Ghazarian 1904, 194; Hübschmann 1908, 215–216.

8 Vacca 2017b deals with the relationship between Sasanian and caliphal rule in the North in depth, including (chapter 4) the position of the *ostikan*.

9 There is only one example in ‘Abbāsīd Armenia of these two posts being separated and given to different individuals.

10 This may relate to the position of Armenia as a frontier. See Nicol 1979, 209: “The very nature of frontier provinces such as Armenia and Khurāsān required a governor with military experience.”

proved one of the primary noblemen as Prince of Armenia,¹¹ thereby freeing himself for his military duties.

‘Abbāsīd *ostikans* served in Armenia for short periods before being assigned to other provinces, usually for only one or two years though sometimes for up to five. They tended to be Arabs or *mawlās*, but there were also Iranian *ostikans*. Only one *ostikan* identified as Armenian, a Muslim named ‘Alī b. Yaḥyā al-Armanī. The position was frequently hereditary, as is easily evidenced by the Shaybānī and Sulamī lines. If we take a step back to view ‘Abbāsīd governors as a group instead of only considering those within Armenia, other families emerge across the caliphate to boast several generations of governors. For example, the family members of one of the more famous *ostikans*, al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba, served over many decades as the governors of Khurāsān, Sistān, Damascus, and Ṭabaristān. Other families, such as the Banū Muhallab, are perhaps better known for their governorship elsewhere, but appear occasionally in Armenia as well. This practice allowed the ‘Abbāsīds to retain power in the hands of a few trusted families, while short tenures kept governors from achieving the kind of local stability that might empower them to threaten caliphal control.¹²

Armenia was frequently ruled as part of a much broader swath of territory. Just as “Greater Khurāsān” or the “East” can refer to territories outside of the traditional boundaries of Khurāsān (encroaching typically over Transoxania), so too does Armenia at times expand to include Caucasian Albania (roughly, the modern Republic of Azerbaijan and eastern Georgia). It was part of a flexible “North” including Armenia, Albania, Azerbaijan, and frequently al-Mawṣil and/or al-Jazīra. It was also sometimes joined with Khurāsān and other eastern provinces; for example, al-Mutawakkil assigned Armenia, Azerbaijan, Rayy, Fārs, Ṭabaristān, and Khurāsān to his son al-Mu‘tazz in 234 or 235 H.¹³ Armenia and Khurāsān were also administered in tandem under al-Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Bar-makī and ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā b. Māhān, as we will see below.

Beginning with the publication of J. H. Petermann’s 1840 *De Ostikanis Arabicis Armeniae Gubernatoribus*, modern scholars have evinced a preoccupation with the incumbents of the *ostikanate*. A number of studies list the *ostikans* chronologically, outlining the relevant primary sources and expounding on each *ostikan*’s relationship with the local nobility. The most obvious threads through the

11 Ter-Levondyan 1964 and 1969. Interestingly, the Armenian word for “prince” (*išxan*) is etymologically derived from Sogdian, like the title *ikhshīd*; see Benveniste 1929. See De La Vaissière 2007, 27 n. 42, for the Sogdian ‘xšyδ.

12 Karev 2015, 346.

13 Al-Ṭabarī 1893, III, 1395; Laurent / Canard 1980, 445–446 n. 76; Nalbandyan 1958, 121 n. 96; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 127 n. 106.

rosters of early ‘Abbāsīd *ostikans* are the Banū Shaybān and Banū Sulaym, two Qaysī (North Arabian) tribes spread across the caliphate but located predominantly in al-Jazīra. The longevity of these family lines demonstrates their significance in Armenian history, the close political ties between al-Jazīra and Armenia, and the apparent preference in the ‘Abbāsīd period for hereditary succession within provincial positions. The Shaybānī and the Sulamī *ostikans* are also significant because they signal the initiation of efforts to Arabize Armenia. Arab tribes moved from al-Jazīra into the North to support the contested claims to power the *ostikans* made against the comparatively stronger local nobility.¹⁴ In later years, the Shaybānī and the Sulamī *amīrs* emerged as the leaders of post-‘Abbāsīd Albania: the Banū Shaybān as the Sharwānshāhs and the Banū Sulaym as the *amīrs* of Bāb al-Abwāb/Darband. Most modern studies therefore understandably center on the Shaybānī and Sulamī *ostikans*, linking Armenia to neighboring al-Jazīra and avoiding the connection between Armenia and Khurāsān.

Khurāsānī and Transoxanian Ostikans and Their Armies

In his study of early ‘Abbāsīd administration, Nicol identifies only two Khurāsānī *ostikans*: ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā b. Māhān and Ḥātim b. Harthama, who ruled Armenia for a combined total of just four years. The present paper challenges and explains Nicol’s conclusion to explore how Armenia integrated into much larger networks of power reaching far beyond its immediate neighbors. The prosopographical study of the early ‘Abbāsīd *ostikans* demonstrates that the political fate of Armenia, like that of the caliphate as a whole, was clearly tied to Khurāsānī generals and armies.

The ‘Abbāsīd period is here divided into subsections: (a) the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution; (b) the Khurāsāniyya at the Battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand; (c) the *ostikanates* of Hārūn al-Rashīd and al-Amīn; (d) Armenia during the fourth *fitna*; and (e) the rise of Transoxanian administrators. These divisions are intended to facilitate discussion rather than impose strict periodization and should consequently be understood merely as an organizational tool.

¹⁴ Ter-Levondyan 1976a.

a The ‘Abbāsīd Revolution

The idea that the ‘Abbāsīds relied on Khurāsānī governors and troops is certainly nothing new. Even the Armenian priest Łewond, writing at the start of Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign, mentions that the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution relied on a Khurāsānī army: the relatives of the Lawgiver called the sons of Hešm “united the troops of the land of Xorasan and appointed generals over them, Kahat’ba [Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭā’ī] and a certain Abu Mslim [Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī], who was cunning in astrological sorcery.”¹⁵

Al-Ya’qūbī dates the appointment of the first ‘Abbāsīd *ostikan* to either 132 or 133 H, when Abū l-‘Abbās appointed Muḥammad b. Šul to govern Armenia.¹⁶ Muḥammad b. Šul belonged to a Persianized Turkish family in Khurāsān. His father Šul, whose name was an Arabized version of the Turkish title Chür, was a king of Jurjān who converted from Zoroastrianism to Islam under the Marwānīds and served as governor of the East. Al-Azdī specifies that there were Khurāsānī troops under Muḥammad when he was governor of al-Mawṣil, before he moved to Armenia. Since al-Ya’qūbī claims that he transferred from al-Jazīra to Armenia with a large force at his command, we may surmise that Muḥammad brought these same Khurāsānī troops into Armenia as *ostikan*. However, no explicit evidence supports this.¹⁷

Al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī both skip over Muḥammad entirely, although al-Balādhurī claims that Abū Ja’far (the future al-Manšūr) sent a Khurāsānī leader (*qā’idan min ahl Khurāsān*) against the Umayyad troops under Musāfir b. Kathīr.¹⁸ M. Canard, while recognizing that this could refer to Muḥammad b. Šul, points out that it could equally mean Šāliḥ b. Šubayḥ al-Kindī. Šāliḥ, who appears in Armenian as the “lawless and bloodthirsty” Calēh. He served as *ostikan* in 133 and 134 H and was apparently appointed on the orders of al-Saffāḥ, although the chain of command is again blurry. Łewond claims that “Abdla” placed Šāliḥ/Calēh over Armenia: while al-Saffāḥ and al-Manšūr share the

¹⁵ Łewond 1857, 156–157. See also Asolik 1885, 131; Vardan 1927, 55.

¹⁶ Al-Ya’qūbī 1960, II, 357. NB: Forand 1969, 91 n. 9, claims that al-Saffāḥ appointed an Azdī governor from Banū Muhallab as the first ‘Abbāsīd governor of Armenia in 133 H based on his reading of al-Azdī, 1967, 145–146. On Muḥammad, see Amabe 1995, 45; Crone 1980, 244 n. 428; Gordon 2001, 157–158; Laurent / Canard 1980, 423–424 n. 24; Nalbandyan 1958, 111 n. 24; Nicol 1979, 89–90 n. 1; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 120 n. 24; Vasmer 1931, 7.

¹⁷ Forand 1969, 91 n. 9.

¹⁸ Al-Balādhurī 1866, 209.

name ‘Abdallāh, here Lewond refers to al-Saffāh as Abdla and al-Manšūr as “the other Abdla.”¹⁹

b The Khurāsāniyya at the Battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand

The reliance of the early ‘Abbāsīd state on its Khurāsānī military persists into the Armenian *ostikanate* well past the revolution. Al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba al-Ṭā’ī, the “ferocious” (*katalī*) son of the famous general of the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution,²⁰ served as *ostikan* twice. His first appointment lasted from 136 to 141 H and his second from 154 to 158 H.²¹ Ibn A’tam explains that al-Ḥasan remained in Armenia and appointed his sons to regional posts in the North, placing Qaḥṭaba b. al-Ḥasan over al-Bāb/Darband, Ibrāhīm over Tiflis/Ṭp’ilisi, and Muḥammad over Qāliqalā/Karin and Khilāt/Xlat.²² Lewond further notes that al-Ḥasan’s army was composed of Khurāsānī soldiers when he entered Armenia: “When the governor Hasan son of Kahadba assaulted this land of Armenia along with a large regiment from the house of the land of Xorasan, who frequently committed lewder and disgusting acts, they also increased the miseries and woes of this land.”²³

According to Lewond, two significant battles between the Khurāsāniyya and Armenian nobles took place in 158 H during al-Ḥasan’s second tenure as *ostikan*, first at Arjish/Arčēš and then at Baghrawand/Bagrewand. In her description of the *ostikanate*, N. Garsoïan claimed that the Armenian defeat at Baghrawand/Bagrewand “marked one of the darkest hours in Armenian history.”²⁴ The Mamikonean family united various Armenian houses there, with the notable exception of the Bagratunis (some of whom abstained from the battle), against the caliphal army.

19 Lewond 1857, 129. On Šālīh, see Ghazarian 1904, 187; Laurent / Canard 1980, 425 n. 26; Nalbandyan 1958, 111 n. 27; Nicol 1979, 91 n. 2(b); Ter-Levondyan 1977, 120 n. 27; Vasmer 1931, 8. 20 Vardan 1927, 56

21 On al-Ḥasan, see Amabe 1995, 72–73; Ghazarian 1904, 187; Laurent / Canard 1980, 426–427 n. 28 and 428–429 n. 30; Markwart 1903, 37; Nalbandyan 1958, 112 n. 29 and 112–113 n. 32; Nicol 1979, 91–92 n. 3; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 121 n. 29 and 121 n. 33; Vasmer 1931, 8 ff.

22 Ibn A’tam 2016, VIII, 366.

23 Lewond 1857, 131–132. Nalbandyan 1958, 112–113 n. 32, claims that these Khurāsānī troops are Arabs, but there is no explicit evidence for their ethnicity. Al-Balādhuri 1866, 187; Nicol 1979, 92 notes that al-Ḥasan was with the governor of al-Jazīra at the head of an army of Khurāsānī soldiers, but these troops were engaged in raids against Byzantium, not Armenia, in 140 H. 24 Garsoïan 2004, 132.

Łewond specifies that the caliphal army was Khurāsānī and under the command of a certain Amr, identified as the Khurāsānī general ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Ĥārithī.

[Abdla, meaning al-Manšūr] gathered the best cavalrymen, some 30,000 choice riders in heavy armor from the regiment of the house of the land of Xorasan. He handed them over to a general whose name was Amr and sent him from him, from the vast and famous city that Abdla had built, fortified for safety with extremely strong and impregnable walls, called by the name Baghdad. The general rose up from the regions of Syria and arrived in the city Xlat’ [Khilāt] in this land of Armenia very cautiously and readily armed. When he arrived in the city, he was informed by the citizens there about the state of the Armenian forces...²⁵

Łewond’s phrase “of the house of the land of Xorasan” (*i tohmē Xorasan ašxarhin*) renders the Arabic *min ahl Khurāsān* and so refers to military units (*gund* in Armenian, analogous to the Arabic *jund*) from the East. These units were comprised in large part of Arab soldiers, many of whom were *banawīs* or supporters of the ‘Abbāsīd Revolution and their descendants.²⁶ We might wonder if the appearance of this phrase in an Armenian history indicates familiarity with Arabic expressions and/or the oral transmission of *akhbār* across linguistic lines. One of Łewond’s sources is “the enemy himself” and the story of Baghrawand/Bagrewand may have served as a shared point of interest between Muslims and Christians in the North.

Al-Balādhurī explains that al-Manšūr sent troops under ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl, allowing al-Ĥasan to defeat Mushā‘il al-Armanī or Mušeł Mamikonean.²⁷ At first glance it seems plausible that the Arabic accounts may well confirm the reference to the Khurāsāniyya found in Łewond’s history. Yet Arabic sources in fact complicate the usual narrative of Baghrawand/Bagrewand. The first clue that there might be a problem with Łewond’s rendition is a chronological hiccup. Łewond claims that the Battle of Arjish/Arčēš occurred on a Saturday, the fourth day of the Armenian month *hrotic’*, while the Battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand was on a Monday, the fourteenth day of *hrotic’*. Modern scholars have identified this as April 15 and 24, 775 CE, which corresponds to the 9th and 18th of *jumādā* II 158 H. Łewond further clarifies that al-Manšūr “received the curses of the prophet and soon died there desperately in that same year.” This confirms the year he

²⁵ Łewond 1857, 177. Vardan 1927, 108 n. 1: Muiyldermans inexplicably labels these forces as Turks.

²⁶ Elad 1996, 98; Elad 2005, 281 and 318 on non-Arab elements (‘*ajam ahl Khurāsān*’); perhaps these were Iranian? See Kennedy 2001, 105.

²⁷ Al-Balādhurī 1866, 210.

is discussing, as al-Manşūr died on the 6th of *dhū l-ḥijja* 158 H, or October 7, 775 CE. However, ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl in fact died in Baghdad in 157 H. The caliph himself prayed over his body and he was buried in the ‘Abbāsīd family cemetery.²⁸ Assuming, of course, that ‘Āmir did not command forces in Armenia after his own death, we are left to either explain away ‘Āmir’s date of death as misinformation, reject Lewond’s date for the battle, and/or revisit the story in a broader context. This latter solution also requires revisiting Lewond’s claim regarding the involvement of the Khurāsāniyya.

Ibn A‘tham supplies pivotal information about the Khurāsāniyya in Armenia during the *ostikanate* of al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba that forces us to reread Lewond’s text. Al-Manşūr appointed al-Ḥasan, who immediately faced a rebellion of the Şanāriyya/Canark’, a Christian people who lived in Khākhīṭ/Kaxet’i, farther north than the Armenian heartland. Ibn A‘tham explains that al-Ḥasan moved against them with a mixed army of 50,000 *min ahl Khurāsān wa-ahl al-Shām wa-l-‘Irāq*, but he was not able to pacify them and wrote to the caliph to request reinforcements. These came in the form of ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Jurjānī [al-Ḥārithī], ‘Īsā b. Mūsā al-Khurāsānī, al-Faḍl b. Dīnār, and Muqātil b. Şāliḥ, along with 30,000 cavalry.²⁹ If we follow the hypothesis above regarding this oral transmission, we may speculate that Ibn A‘tham is reporting the same *khbar* as Lewond: he describes 30,000 cavalry (*fāris*) under the command of someone named ‘Āmir, moving north on al-Manşūr’s orders. Ibn A‘tham’s account, though, has ‘Āmir defeat the Şanāriyya/Canark’ and then return to Iraq without engaging with the Armenians at all.

This campaign is also corroborated in al-Ya‘qūbī’s history. He explains that:

...the Şanāriyya rebelled in Armenia. Abū Ja‘far [al-Manşūr] sent al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba as governor (*‘amil*) over Armenia. He fought them, but he did not have their strength. So he wrote to Abū Ja‘far to inform him of them and how many of them [there were]. He [al-Manşūr] sent to him [al-Ḥasan] ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl al-Ḥārithī with 20,000 [men].

‘Āmir defeated the Şanāriyya/Canark’, killed 1,600 of them, and returned to Tiflīs/Ṭp‘ilisi.³⁰ Like Ibn A‘tham, al-Ya‘qūbī does not place ‘Āmir against the Armenians.

Ibn A‘tham continues his discussion of al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba’s *ostikanate* with the most detailed explanation of the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand extant in medieval Arabic sources. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba (who ap-

²⁸ Al-Ṭabarī 1893, III, 380.

²⁹ Ibn A‘tham 2016, VIII, 366.

³⁰ Al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 372.

pears in Lewond’s history as an unidentified Mahmet) was responsible for administering Qālīqalā/Karin and Khilāt/Xlat’ in his father’s name. The patrician Mūshābidh (read: Muṣeḡ Mamikonean)³¹ challenged his authority. Mūshābidh gathered the Armenian nobles against al-Ḥasan’s rule, inspiring Ḥamra b. Jurjīq (read: Ḥamza b. Jājīq for Hamazasp the son of Gagik Arcruni) to move against Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥasan.³² Al-Ḥasan was not able to rally his forces effectively against the Armenians and so wrote again to al-Manṣūr to request aid. This arrived in the form of 10,000 soldiers *min ahl al-‘Irāq*. They met al-Ḥasan in Khilāt/Xlat’, a detail that aligns with Lewond’s account. After routing the Armenian army, al-Manṣūr’s forces looted a Mamikonean church and beheaded the leaders of the Armenians, including Mūshābidh, sending their heads to al-Manṣūr. Ibn A‘tham’s next *khobar* is the death of al-Manṣūr, which is in line with the traditional date of Baghrawand/Bagrewand.

While modern scholars have long recognized the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand as a significant moment in the history of ‘Abbāsīd Armenia, we learn several things by bringing the Arabic sources regarding it into dialogue with the Armenian. First, and most relevantly for our present purposes, Lewond’s account showcases the significance of the Khurāsāniyya in maintaining the ‘Abbāsīd presence in the North: al-Manṣūr sent a Khurāsānī army under the supervision of several Khurāsānī generals to reinforce a Khurāsānī *ostikan*. Yet the Arabic sources do *not* allow for this. According to Ibn A‘tham, whose history offers the only detailed description of the battle in Arabic, al-Ḥasan relied on Iraqī troops at Baghrawand/Bagrewand. If we create a narrative of al-Ḥasan’s *ostikante* based on Arabic sources, then, we find that ‘Āmir b. Ismā‘īl led the Khurāsāniyya north against the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’, returned to Baghdad, and died in 157 H. In 158 H, the Armenians rebelled. Al-Manṣūr sent Iraqī soldiers north to reinforce al-Ḥasan at the Battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand and died soon thereafter.

It is striking how many common threads are shared in the Arabic and the Armenian accounts, despite a few glaring differences. Stories about the Khurāsāniyya may well have circulated orally in the North, potentially accounting for the common ground between Lewond and Ibn A‘tham. If that is the case, Lewond’s placement of the Khurāsāniyya at the Battles of Arjīsh/Arčēš and

³¹ The corruption of Muṣeḡ’s name here is a result of the similarity of موشابذ and موشائل in Arabic.

³² Hamazasp would have been in Basfurrajān/Vasporakan, so it seems out of place that Ibn A‘tham further identifies Hamazasp as the lord of Georgia. To my knowledge, the Arcruni family did not hold positions in Georgia at this time. It is likely that the title *ṣāhib bilād Jurzān* (صاحب بلاد جرزان) is a scribal error for *ṣāhib al-Basfurrajān* (صاحب البسفرجان), the Lord of Vasporakan. Vacca 2019.

Baghrawand/Bagrewand in fact conflates the *akhbār* about two separate rebellions against the ‘Abbāsids in the North during al-Ḥasan’s *ostikanate*, one of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ and the other of the Armenians. Ibn A‘tham’s version reports the *akhbār* separately but back-to-back; perhaps the stories of both rebellions circulated as a pair.³³ Details about ‘Āmir’s arrival at the head of 30,000 Khurāsāniyya from Baghdad filtered into Lewond’s description of the battle even though the information originally referred to the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’. It is clear Lewond did not preserve the information completely correctly because (1) the rebellion of the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ is corroborated elsewhere in al-Ya‘qūbī’s history and (2) we know from al-Ṭabarī that ‘Āmir was already dead by the date Lewond provides for Baghrawand/Bagrewand.

This reexamination of accounts about the battle of Baghrawand/Bagrewand does not imply that the Khurāsāniyya were not important in enforcing ‘Abbāsīd rule in the North. Indeed, their appearance against the Ṣanāriyya/Canark’ confirms the significance of the Khurāsānī army and its generals in upholding al-Ḥasan b. Qaḥṭaba’s authority. Yet Lewond’s claims regarding their involvement at Baghrawand/Bagrewand cannot be substantiated.

c The *Ostikanates* of Hārūn al-Rashīd and al-Amīn

As both heir apparent and caliph, Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed a number of Khurāsānī *ostikans*. Yaḥyā b. Khālīd al-Barmakī sometimes appears among the lists of *ostikans* under al-Mahdī during Hārūn al-Rashīd’s vicereignty, although there is no compelling evidence for his *ostikanate*.³⁴ However, one of the most famous and well-attested *ostikans* under Hārūn was Khuzayma b. Khāzim al-Tamīmī, whose family was from Marw al-Rūdh. Known in both the Arabic and Armenian sources as a harsh governor, Khuzayma served as *ostikan* for a year and two months in 169 and 170 H. He was associated with over-taxation and severe oppression, so much so that Lewond confirms that his name Xazm referred to his character: the Armenian adjective *xazmarar* means warlike.³⁵ Drasxanakertc’i re-

³³ This is reminiscent of Conrad’s study of Arwād, where *akhbār* about the conquest of one island shift to that of another; Conrad 1992.

³⁴ Laurent / Canard 1980, 429–430 n. 34, has Hārūn al-Rashīd as *ostikan* and Yaḥyā as financial administrator; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 121 n. 37; Nalbandyan 1958, 114 n. 36. The passage in question is al-Ṭabarī 1893, III, 500.

³⁵ Lewond 1857, 195–196; for more on his name, see Laurent / Canard 1980, 430–431 n. 37; on Khuzayma, see also Nalbandyan 1958, 114 n. 39; Nicol 1979, 98–99 n. 13; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 122

counts his residence in Dabil/Duin and details his plots to wrest land from the patriarchate unjustly, since he was “led astray by his wicked desires and demonic avarice.”³⁶ Al-Faḍl b. Yaḥyā al-Barmakī also served as *ostikan* under Hārūn al-Rashīd. He was in Khurāsān in 175 H, but there are Armenian coins minted in his name in the same year; written sources describe him as viceroy over Armenia, Azerbaijan, Jibāl, and Ṭabaristān in 176 H. This list was expanded in 177 H to include Khurāsān and Sīstān.³⁷

Coins minted in Armenia and al-Bāb attest the rule of Yaḥyā al-Ḥarashī, who served as *ostikan* in 178 and 179 H. This Yaḥyā was probably Khurāsānī, but we cannot identify his ancestry or provenance with certainty.³⁸ Regardless, Yaḥyā relied on Khurāsānī troops to face two rebellions in the North. Al-Ya‘qūbī explains that when Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed the Jazarī Aḥmad b. Yazīd al-Sulamī as *ostikan* in 179 H, Aḥmad faced a rebellion of troops *min ahl Khurāsān*: “those who came with al-Ḥarashī and who were there before al-Ḥarashī” (*man kāna fī l-balad min ahl Khurāsān miman qadīma ma‘ al-Ḥarashī wa-qabla al-Ḥarashī*). The fact that he had to face not just al-Ḥarashī’s troops, but also those “who were there before al-Ḥarashī” implies that some of the Khurāsānī troops were stationed there prior to becoming part of the retinue of any particular *ostikan*. Unsurprisingly, they claimed significant political clout. To assuage the displeasure of these Khurāsānī troops in Armenia, for example, Hārūn al-Rashīd recalled Aḥmad b. Yazīd and sent Sa‘īd b. Salm al-Bāhili to serve as *ostikan* in 181 H.³⁹

After Sa‘īd b. Salm’s *ostikanate*, Hārūn al-Rashīd appointed the governor of Khurāsān, ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā b. Māhān, over Armenia. Armenian sources omit the

n. 41; Vasmer 1931, 28–29. Note that Lewond and others claim he was appointed by al-Hādī; others say Hārūn.

36 Drasxanakertc‘i 1987, 115; Drasxanakertc‘i 1996, 114.

37 On al-Faḍl, see Amabe 1995, 79; Laurent / Canard 1980, 432 n. 43; Nalbandyan 1958, 115 n. 45; Nicol 1979, 102 n. 17; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 122–123 n. 48; Vasmer 1931, 32.

38 Studies on the *ostikanate* identify him as Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashī. There are a few Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashīs who could be his father. Al-Ṭabarī 1990, 196–197 n. 637, has his full name as Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd b. Dāwūd; this Sa‘īd was a Turk deployed in Khurāsān against al-Muqanna‘ in 163 H. Amabe 1995, 79 assumes that this identification is correct, but calls him Yaḥyā b. Dāwūd, the son rather than the grandson of Dāwūd. Crone 1980, 144–145 suggests that he was a descendent of Sa‘īd b. ‘Amr, the Qaysī general from Qinnasrīn. Alternatively, he could be the son of Sa‘īd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥarashī, himself the son of a Ḥarrānī *ostikan* named in al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 426 for the year 177 H. I would like to thank Prof. Amikam Elad for sharing a draft of a paper in which he offers another suggestion: that al-Ḥarashī (الحرشي) may be a misreading of al-Khursī (الخرسي), an alternative form of Khurāsānī. He cites al-Tanūkhī re: a Sa‘īd al-Khursī as *min awlād mulūk Khurāsān* under al-Manṣūr. On Yaḥyā, see also Forand 1969, 97–98; Laurent / Canard 1980, 433 n. 48; Nalbandyan 1958, 115 n. 51; Nicol 1979, 105–106 n. 22; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 123 n. 54.

39 Al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 427.

Khurāsānī ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā’s *ostikanate* entirely, but we find Armenian and Albanian dirhams minted in his name in 183 H.⁴⁰ According to al-Ya‘qūbī, “when he arrived, his conduct was terrible. The people of Sharwān rose against him and the land was in disarray. And so al-Rashīd appointed Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī and he returned ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā to Khurāsān.”⁴¹ When ‘Alī returned to the East, he faced more complaints of oppression and tyranny until the caliph himself started the fateful campaign to reign him in.⁴² After the *ostikanates* of three Shaybānīs in short succession, Khuzayma b. Khāzim returned to Armenia as *ostikan* in 187 H. Al-Ya‘qūbī claims that he remained for only a short time, but there are coins minted in his name every year from 187 to 191 H.⁴³ These last two Khurāsānī *ostikans* (‘Alī b. ‘Īsā and Khuzayma b. Khāzim) served as the heart of al-Amīn’s army during the siege of Baghdad. Since Armenian coins survive minted in al-Amīn’s name during Hārūn al-Rashīd’s reign, we can assume that the North entered the fourth *fitna* on his side.

d Armenia During the Fourth *Fitna*

Soon after Hārūn al-Rashīd’s death, though, the North fell squarely into al-Ma‘mūn’s territory. The first *ostikan* under al-Amīn was Khurāsānī: Muḥammad b. Zuhayr b. al-Musayyab al-Ḍabbī. He was appointed *ostikan* before Hārūn’s death in 193 H, the same year that his father and brothers joined al-Ma‘mūn in Marw. We do not know when Muḥammad’s *ostikanate* officially ended, but it is reasonable to assume that he did not remain in control of Armenia long after al-Amīn took office.⁴⁴ In fact, Armenian sources suggest the land was en-

⁴⁰ Vardanyan 2011, 37 n. 52 and 64 n. 127.

⁴¹ Al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 428; Markwart 1903, 456.

⁴² Nicol 1979, 109 n. 29: There is an Armenian coin in his name as late as 187 H. By this point, Muḥammad b. Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī was *ostikan* and ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā was back in Khurāsān. On ‘Alī, see Pellat, “‘Alī b. ‘Īsā b. Māhān,” *EI*; Sourdel, “Ibn Māhān,” *EF*; Laurent / Canard 1980, 433 n. 52; Nalbandyan 1958, 116 n. 55; Nicol 1979, 107–108 n. 26; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 123 n. 59; Vasmer 1931, 39.

⁴³ On Khuzayma’s second tenure, see Laurent / Canard 1980, 433 n. 52; Nalbandyan 1958, 116 n. 55; Nicol 1979, 107–108 n. 26; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 123 n. 59; Vasmer 1931, 39.

⁴⁴ Vardanyan 2011, 123, 71 n. 148, 72 n. 149: There are Albanian dirhams from 194 H in his name, but Zambaur and Vasmer date his *ostikanate* only to 193 H. On Muḥammad, see Crone 1980, 186–188; Laurent / Canard 1980, 435 n. 59; Nalbandyan 1958, 116 n. 63; Nicol 1979, 112 n. 35; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 124 n. 69; Vasmer 1931, 43. On his family’s involvement with al-Ma‘mūn: Elad 2010, 56; Elad 2013, 268.

tirely independent during this time and ruled by local princes.⁴⁵ While al-Amīn did appoint *ostikans*, they were Jazarī or ‘Abbāsīd.

Extant coins provide evidence both for al-Ma’mūn’s contested claims over the North during the fourth *fitna* and for potential ties between Armenia and Khurāsān. There are Armenian coins minted in the name of Aḥmad b. Yazīd b. Usayd al-Sulamī during al-Amīn’s reign,⁴⁶ which led Ter-Ļevondyan and Nicol to conclude that Aḥmad served as *ostikan* in 195 and 196 H despite a lack of written evidence (Aḥmad did in fact serve as a *ostikan*, but earlier—from 179 to 181 H). Aḥmad would later fight alongside Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn. He may have changed loyalty over the course of the war,⁴⁷ but if we assume that he supported al-Ma’mūn even at the start of al-Amīn’s reign, then his Armenian coins potentially add weight to the theory that local powers in the North supported al-Ma’mūn and perhaps even confirm the hypothesis that al-Ma’mūn’s generals were recruiting Arab troops from the North to fight against al-Amīn.⁴⁸

Studies on the *ostikanate* have identified Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad al-Ṣan‘ānī as al-Ma’mūn’s first *ostikan*. His earliest Armenian coins date to 196 H, two years before the death of al-Amīn.⁴⁹ Nicol marks this Ṭāhir as “ancestry unknown,” but Amabe instead renders al-Ya‘qūbī’s text with the *nisba* *al-Ṣaghānī* (الصغاني), meaning that Ṭāhir was from Chaghāniyān in Transoxania instead of Ṣan‘ā’ (الصنعاني).⁵⁰ Whether from Chaghāniyān or Ṣan‘ā’, Ṭāhir’s appointment suggests that Armenia was looking to Khurāsān, not Baghdad, as the center of the caliphate. Al-Ya‘qūbī claims that either al-Ma’mūn or Harthama b. A‘yan sent Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad to the North, where he allied with the Armenian and Albanian pat-

45 Vardan 1927, 58.

46 Vasmer 1931, 54.

47 Elad 2013, 260: “We have no information of his activities during al-Amīn’s rule,” so it is admittedly entirely possible that he had not yet declared for al-Ma’mūn and was in al-Amīn’s service in the North.

48 Elad 2013, 267 and 273.

49 Vardanyan 2011, 72 n. 151, 73 n. 152, 73 n. 153.

50 Amabe 1995, 100 and 131. He cites both al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 461 and al-Ṭabarī, III, 802: the former clearly reads الصنعاني and the latter does not refer to either *nisba* and concerns Ṭāhir b. al-Tāji. Amabe explains that “In Hamadān Harthama sent Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad of Chaghāniyān to Armenia and Adharbayjān as governor.” This relies on his reading of al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 461. Amabe clearly reads Harthama as the subject and Ṭāhir as the direct object of the verb وجيه, meaning that [some say that] Harthama dispatched Muḥammad. Nicol 1979, 113 n. 39 cites the same passage in passive voice: “It is said that Harthama b. A‘yan was sent from Ḥamadān while Ṭāhir was headed for Iraq and then towards Warthān in the prefecture of Azerbaijan.”

ricians in 196 H to lay siege to Bardha'a/Partaw in order to take the province from al-Amīn's *ostikan*.⁵¹

The connection between the administration of Khurāsān and Armenia continued in the first days of al-Ma'mūn's reign. A few curious coins minted without the name of a governor in Ma'dan Bājunays/Apahunik' in 199 H bear the title *dhū l-riyāsatayn*, or "possessor of the two posts." Vasmer concludes that "die Dirhems von Ma'din Bāğunais 199...geben leider gar keinen Aufschluß darüber, wer um diese Zeit Statthalter war."⁵² Yet this title is well attested and commonly refers to al-Faql b. Sahl, who at that time would have been al-Ma'mūn's governor of Khurāsān, where he served from 197 to 202 or 203 H.⁵³ While studies of the *ostikanate* do not typically include al-Faql b. Sahl, these coins suggest that his authority did indeed reach as far as the North. Al-Ṭabarī explains that al-Faql controlled the East from Tibet to the Indian Ocean and the "sea of Daylam and Jurjān."⁵⁴ It stands to reason that Armenia was part of al-Faql's East. The Armenian coins represent an extension of the power of the Banū Sahl, and of course al-Ma'mūn, outside Khurāsān. Furthermore, Ter-Ēvondyan mentions a comparable coin minted with that title in Albania in 197 H, even before al-Amīn's death.⁵⁵

Al-Ma'mūn appointed Harthama b. A'yan's son Ḥātīm b. Harthama as *ostikan* in either 200 or 201 H.⁵⁶ His father, one of the main generals of the fourth *fitna* and former governor of Khurāsān, had fallen out of favor and died in a prison in Marw. When the news of Harthama's death reached Armenia, Ḥātīm wrote to the local patricians (*wa-kātaba al-baṭāriqa wa-wujūh ahl Armīniya*) to muster a

51 On Ṭāhir, see Laurent / Canard 1980, 435 n. 62; Markwart 1903, 457; Nalbandyan 1958, 117 n. 67; Nicol 1979, 113–114 n. 39; Ter-Ēvondyan 1977, 124 n. 75; Vasmer 1931, 55 (his coins read Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad, so they cannot add anything to the discussion of the correct reading of the *nisba*).

52 Vasmer 1931, 58–59; see photos in Vardanyan 2011, 97 n. 217–218.

53 Sourdel, "al-Faql b. Sahl b. Zadhānfarūkh," *EF*; Bosworth, "Faql, b. Sahl b. Zādānfarūkh," *Elr*. On al-Faql's coins with the title *dhū l-riyāsatayn*, see Karev 2015, 322; Nastich 2012, 39–40 (although his Samarqandī coin has since been corrected to Shirāzī online).

54 Al-Ṭabarī 1893, III, 841.

55 Ter-Ēvondyan 1977, 124 n. 76: he attributes this coin to Sulaymān b. Aḥmad b. Sulaymān al-Hāshimī, citing al-Ya'qūbī 1960, II, 462. The passage in question identifies Sulaymān as al-Ma'mūn's *ostikan*. This coin does not appear in Vardanyan.

56 On Ḥātīm, see Amabe 1995, 116; Crone 1980, 177–178; Laurent / Canard 1980, 436 n. 66; Lewis, "Ḥātīm b. Harthama," *EF*; Markwart 1903, 458; Nalbandyan 1958, 118 n. 73; Nicol 1979, 115 n. 44; Ter-Ēvondyan 1977, 125 n. 79; Vasmer 1931, 57.

rebellion,⁵⁷ one that did not survive his death in 203 H. Crone identifies this rebellion as in line with comparable movements in Khurāsān:

It must have been the mutual fear between the caliph and Khurāsān that triggered the surprisingly numerous revolts by apparent pillars of the regime who made sudden changes of allegiance. Ziyād b. Šāliḥ apart, Jahwar b. Marār, Zuwāra al-Bukhārī, al-Ishtākhanj, ‘Abd al-Jabbār, and Rāfi’ b. Layth are all in that category. There is a later example in Ḥātīm b. Harthama, the governor of Azerbaijan who had hitherto been a pillar of the regime along with his father, who planned to rebel when he heard that his father had been executed: he must have assumed (undoubtedly correctly) that he was next on the list. The only reasonable explanation of the behaviour of the earlier Khurāsānīs is that, like Ḥātīm, they suspected that they had fallen out of favour.⁵⁸

Ḥātīm was not dragging Armenian patricians into a battle to pitch the Khurāsānīs against the caliph, but rather into an intra-Khurāsānī struggle for influence over the caliph. Harthama’s main concern was the extensive power the Banū Sahl wielded under al-Ma’mūn. In this he was perhaps similar to Rāfi’ b. al-Layth, whose rebellion against the caliph was sparked by the abuses of ‘Alī b. ‘Īsā. Harthama did not set out to challenge the caliph or even the “Abbasid-Khurāsānī axis of power.”⁵⁹ His fight was to determine who represented Khurāsānī power within that axis. In calling upon the Armenian elites to join his rebellion, Ḥātīm drew the North into broader political patterns, some of which were internal to Khurāsān.

e The Rise of Transoxanian Administrators

In his passage on Ḥātīm’s rebellion, al-Ya‘qūbī explains that he wrote not only to the Armenian patricians, but also to Bābak; Crone dismisses this as “implausible.”⁶⁰ This does mark a shift in the *ostikanate*, though, as the administration of Armenia is certainly sidelined by the ongoing Khurramī rebellion in neighboring Azerbaijan (usually administered with Armenia and Albania as a single province). From that point, all of the *ostikans*, whether Jazarī or Khurāsānī, were generals appointed in hopes of their fighting Bābak. Khurāsānī *ostikans* of this time

⁵⁷ Al-Ya‘qūbī 1960, II, 462.

⁵⁸ Crone 2012, 119.

⁵⁹ Daniel 1979, 157. He calls it “the supposed Abbasid-Khurāsānī axis of power.” I have dropped the “supposed” because it seems quite clear that there was a relationship between ‘Abbāsīd power and Khurāsān. Daniel’s concern is to account for Khurāsānī resistance to the said axis.

⁶⁰ Crone 2012, 65, though she is responding to Ibn Qutayba.

include *banawīs*⁶¹ who were either Arabs or *mawlās* of Arab tribes, such as Yaḥyā b. Mu‘ādh b. Muslim al-Dhuhli (204–5 H),⁶² Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Mu‘ādh (205 H),⁶³ ‘Īsā b. Muḥammad b. Abī Khālid (205–208 H),⁶⁴ Muḥammad b. Humayd al-Ṭūsī (212–213H),⁶⁵ and ‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir (214 H).⁶⁶ Al-Mu‘taṣim named al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Bādhghīsī as *ostikan*; he was either a *mawlā* or a relative of al-Ma’mūn; he appears as Badoḷi in Armenian, where Բադոլի (Badoḷi) is a corruption of Բադլիսի (Badḷsi).⁶⁷

In the wake of the fourth *fitna*, ‘Abbāsīd policy towards Transoxania shifted and the effects are visible in the *ostikanate*. According to al-Balādhurī, al-Ma’mūn and following him al-Mu‘taṣim sent envoys to Transoxania with gifts to encourage Transoxanian leaders to join the caliphal army. They recruited soldiers by entering their names into the *dīwān*:⁶⁸ “cette action d’al-Ma’mūn donne l’occasion à beaucoup de nobles de faire une brillante carrière au califat...mais elle arrive trop tard pour qu’ils puissent rattraper leur position politique et économique au Māwarā’annahr même.”⁶⁹ With the Sāmānīd takeover of Transoxania in 205 H, these generals and soldiers were sent elsewhere, including to Armenia.

Several of the *ostikans* have *nīsbas* from the East, i.e., Khurāsān itself and “Greater” Khurāsān, including Transoxania.⁷⁰ Al-Mu‘taṣim appointed one of the most famous *ostikans*: al-Afshīn Ḥaydār b. Kā‘ūs al-Ushrūshānī, Ap‘šin in Ar-

61 I am using this term as it commonly appears in modern scholarship, though Crone 1998, 5 points out that some of the more famous *banawī* actually do not claim that *nīsha* explicitly in our primary sources.

62 On Yaḥyā, see Crone 1980, 184; Elad 2010, 43; Laurent / Canard 1980, 436 n. 67; Nalbandyan 1958, 118 n. 74; Nicol 1979, 115 n. 46; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 125 n. 80; Vasmer 1931, 59 f.

63 On Aḥmad, see Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 125 n. 81; Vasmer 1931, 60.

64 On ‘Īsā, see Laurent / Canard 1980, 436–437 n. 68; Markwart 1903, 458; Nalbandyan 1958, 118 n. 75; Nicol 1979, 115–116 n. 47; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 125 n. 82; Vasmer 1931, 60–61.

65 On Muḥammad, see Amabe 1995, 117; Crone 1980, 175; Elad 2013, 272–275; Nalbandyan 1958, 119 n. 79; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 125 n. 88; Vasmer 1931, 64–65.

66 On ‘Abdallāh, see Bosworth, “‘Abdallāh b. Ṭāher,” *Elr*; Laurent / Canard 1980, 438 n. 70; Markwart 1903, 459; Nalbandyan 1958, 119 n. 80; Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 125 n. 89; Vasmer 1931, 65 and 71.

67 Dowsett 1957, 457 n. 1 argues convincingly that Markwart’s attempt to read Բադլիսի as Ազլի to refer to Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Azdī al-Samarqandī is incorrect; cf: Markwart 1903, 462. On al-Ḥasan, see Amabe 1995, 140; Crone 2012, 63 n. 118; Elad 2010, 41–42; Laurent / Canard 1980, 439–441 n. 72; Nalbandyan 1958, 120 n. 86; Nicol 1979, 119 n. 51(d); Ter-Łevondyan 1977, 126 n. 96; Vasmer 1931, 81.

68 Al-Balādhurī 1866, 431; Kennedy 2001, 118–119 and 124; Gordon 2001, 31; De La Vaissière 2007, 174–175.

69 Karev 2015, 350.

70 On the definition of Khurāsān, see Rante 2015.

menian, the general who finally routed Bābak and forced him to flee to the Albanian lord Sahl b. Sinbāṭ. This lord, whose name is Persianized in Armenian as Sahl-i Smbatean, offered Bābak sanctuary but then handed him over to al-Afshīn, all while disparaging the idea that caliphal governors could ever hold sway over him. Al-Mu‘taṣīm awarded al-Afshīn the governorship of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Jibāl, and Sind. From 220 to 225 H, al-Afshīn was based in Barzand and sent a number of *ostikans* to rule Armenia in his name, including Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Samarqandī⁷¹ and Muḥammad b. Khālid Bukhārakhudā. This last *ostikan*’s title is corrupted in Armenian to read *Bulxar Xoyta P’atgos*; *p’atgos* is the Armenicized version of the Persian *padhospān*.⁷² Afshīn similarly appointed his brother-in-law Mankjūr al-Farghānī over Azerbaijan in 224 H. This shifts al-Mu‘taṣīm’s *ostikans* from Arabs and *mawlās* to Turks and from Khurāsān proper to the edges: Ushrūshana, Farghāna, Samarqand, and Bukhārā.

These generals were charged with continuing the campaigns against Bābak and other upheavals in the North, but also administered Armenia and Albania. The Albanians assumed that the *ostikans* had a direct line of communication to the caliph himself, not one made via the viceroy al-Afshīn. For example, Dasxuranc’i explains that Badohi (al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī) was established in al-Nashawā/Naxčawan in 283 AE “at the command of the prince of the Tačiks called Amir Mumin,” where he martyred an Armenian Christian.⁷³ The same source claims that the Bukhārakhudā received the catholicos Yovhannēs, whom Dasxuranc’i identifies as “the Lord of Lords, the lord of the Armenians, Georgians, and Albanians,” and served as an intermediary between the Armenians and “the court of the Amir Momnin” in 287 AE (the same year as the sack of Amorium, 223 H).⁷⁴ His attention was pulled north against the Şanāriyya/Canark’ and Işhāq b. Ismā‘īl, the independent *amīr* of Tiflis/Tp’īlisi.

Abū Sa‘īd Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, known as Apusēt’ in Armenian, was another Khurāsānī commander who fought against Bābak. He later returned to Armenia

71 On Muḥammad, see Amabe 1995, 115; Ghazarian 1904, 189; Laurent / Canard 1980, 441–443 n. 73; Nalbandyan 1958, 120 n. 88; Ter-Ēvondyan 1977, 126 n. 98; Vasmer 1931, 63.

72 Dowsett 1957, 459 n. 7 and 461 n. 2 and 3 offer manuscript variants of this title: Բուլխար Խոյտա Փատոզոս, Բուլխար Խոյտա Փատոզոս, and Բուլխարխոյ Տափատոզոս, but Dowsett leaves P’atgos unresolved. Minorsky 1958, 57 identifies the word *p’atgos* as an abbreviation of *padhospān* in reference to another *ostikan* mentioned in Dasxuranc’i’s text: Muḥammad b. Khālid b. Yazīd b. Mazyad al-Shaybānī. On the Bukhārakhudā, see De La Vaissière 2007, 175–176; Laurent / Canard 1980, 441–443 n. 73; Markwart 1903, 461; Nalbandyan 1958, 120 n. 89; Ter-Ēvondyan 1977, 126 n. 99; Vasmer 1931, 84.

73 Dasxuranc’i 1961, 216; Dasxuranc’i 1983, 329.

74 Dowsett 1957, 459; Dasxuranc’i 1983, 330–331: “the court of the Amir Momnin” is rendered as ամիր մոմնոյ դարապաս.

as *ostikan* for al-Mutawakkil from 234 to 236 H. Abū Saʿīd was a *mawlā* of Banū Ṭayy from Marw. Tʻovma Arcruni, the Armenian historian who offers the most extensive discussion of Abū Saʿīd’s *ostikanate*, describes him as a noble (*naxarar*) who was, interestingly, “familiar with Hebrew literature.”⁷⁵ The two main noble Armenian families at the time, the Bagratunis and Arcrunis, refused Abū Saʿīd entrance to their territories and so he returned to Sāmarrāʾ.⁷⁶ Al-Mutawakkil sent Abū Saʿīd’s son, Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Marwazī, Yovsēpʻ in Armenian, to Armenia as *ostikan* following his father’s death in 236 H. Facing the caliphal army, the Armenian families capitulated immediately. Ostensibly in revenge for the humiliation of the Bagratuni patrician, the Khuwaythiyya/Xutʻ (inhabitants of the region of Khoyt/Xoytʻ) killed Yūsuf al-Marwazī, triggering the Caucasian campaigns of Bughā al-Kabīr which devastated the North from 237 to 241 H.⁷⁷ This marked the end of the Khurāsānī presence in the ʻAbbāsīd administration of Armenia, if only because the backbone of the ʻAbbāsīd army had shifted. Bughā entered Armenia with an army of Turkish and Maghribī Arabs (*al-atrāk wa-l-maghāribā*).

Conclusions

This selective narrative of the *ostikanate* demonstrates how early ʻAbbāsīd rule in Armenia relied heavily on Khurāsānī *ostikans* and troops. Nicol has come to the opposite conclusion, i.e., that very few Khurāsānīs served as *ostikan*, for a few reasons. First, he labels *mawlās* as a separate category without recognizing that most of his examples, like Muḥammad b. Šūl and Yaḥyā b. Muʻādh, were also Khurāsānī. Second, some *ostikans* such as the Barmakīs appear in his study as “Iranian” *ostikans* despite their familial ties to Khurāsān. Finally, Arab Khurāsānīs frequently appear in Nicol’s study as representatives of their tribes instead of their regions. This is particularly surprising since he also incorrectly identifies his two Khurāsānī *ostikans*, ʻAlī b. ʻĪsā and Ḥātim b. Harthama, as Arabs.⁷⁸ In order to conclude that Armenia rarely saw a Khurāsānī *ostikan*, we would have to take our cues from al-Jāḥiẓ and draw definitive lines between the

75 Tʻovma Arcruni 1985a, 174; Tʻovma Arcruni 1985b, 170.

76 On Abū Saʿīd, see Ghazarian 1904, 190; Laurent / Canard 1980, 446 n. 77; Nalbandyan 1958, 121–2 n. 97; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 127 n. 107; Vasmer 1931, 92.

77 On these campaigns, see Vacca 2017a. On Yūsuf, see Laurent / Canard 1980, 447 n. 78; Nalbandyan 1958, 122 n. 98; Ter-Levondyan 1977, 127 n. 108; Vasmer 1931, 93.

78 Crone 1998, 8: ʻAlī b. ʻĪsā was Iranian, the son of a *mawlā* of Banū Khuzāʾa. Crone 1980, 177: Harthama b. Aʻyan was a *mawlā* of Banū Ḍabba.

mawlās, the Iranians, the Khurāsānīs, and the Arabs as if these were distinct and mutually exclusive identities.⁷⁹

By focusing on the Khurāsānī *ostikans*, this partial narrative of the *ostikanate* demonstrates how Armenia was integrated into caliphal politics and not just an extension of al-Jazīra or a buffer between the caliphate and Byzantium or Khazaria. Since the *ostikanate* was primarily a military position, these Khurāsānī *ostikans* came from the backbone of the ‘Abbāsīd army and accordingly were usually Arabs or affiliated with Arab tribes through *walā’*.

It is entirely possible to write wholly different narratives about the *ostikanate* than that presented here: for example, the close connection between al-Jazīra and Armenia, focusing on the Shaybānī and Sulamī *ostikans*, would offer significant insight into regional politics. But this paper has sought to make sense of the Khurāsānī element specifically because it has never been noted in the literature on the *ostikanate*. It centers the discussion of Armenia in an ‘Abbāsīd imperial setting.

Along with Islamic numismatics, the *ostikanate* is one of the few well-researched topics concerning caliphal rule in Armenia, but even studies of caliphal governors demonstrate the pervasive presumption that Armenia is separate from the caliphate. Articles on the *ostikans* seek to make sense of discrepancies in the sources, listing dates, sources, and deeds of each incumbent without reference to the broader political schemas in which they lived. Scholars have studied the *ostikans* based on what they did in Armenia and to a lesser extent how they interacted with Armenian and Albanian elites, not for their role in the caliphal administration. Yet without the broader lens of both imperial concerns and transregional elites, we cannot trace responses to political stimuli outside of Armenia such as the fourth *fitna* or the rising influence of Transoxanian administrators. Accordingly, these studies underestimate the significance of the caliphal North as a region where ‘Abbāsīd power and (as in the case of Ḥātim’s rebellion) intra-Khurāsānī conflict played out. Their assumption that Armenia differs from the rest of the caliphate also predicates modern understandings of extant sources. Armenian sources, if “othered,” appear to serve as independent corroboration for the Arabic, but the accounts of Baghrawand/Bagrewand demonstrate discourse and engagement, not isolation. Accordingly, focusing on the relationship between Armenia and Khurāsān can help us maneuver around modern expectations of ethnoreligious borders to tell a story of a far-flung but integrated caliphate.

⁷⁹ Al-Jāhīz identifies the branches of the ‘Abbāsīd army as the Khurāsāniyya, *abnā’*, *mawālī*, Arabs, and Turks. Crone 1998, 5–6; Kennedy 2001, 104.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Arabic

- al-Azdī, Abū Zakariyyā' Yazīd b. Muḥammad (1967), *Ta'riḫ al-Mawṣil*, ed. by 'Alī Ḥabība, Cairo: Dār al-taḥrīr.
- al-Balādhurī, Abū l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Jābir (1866), *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, ed. by M. J. de Goeje, Leiden: Brill.
- Ibn A'tham, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Kūfī (2016), *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, accessed online: <http://ar.lib.eshia.ir/40046/1/5>, last accessed 4 May 2017.
- al-Mas'ūdī, Abū l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī (1861), *Les Prairies d'or*, French translation by Charles de Meynard & Abel de Courteille, Paris: Société Asiatique.
- al-Muqaddasī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr (1906), *Kitāb Aḥsan al-taqāsim fī ma'rifat al-aqālīm*, ed. by M. J. de Goeje, Leiden: Brill.
- al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd (1893), *Ta'riḫ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk*, ed. by M. J. de Goeje, Leiden: Brill.
- al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b. Yazīd (1990), *The History of al-Ṭabarī XXIX: al-Manṣūr and al-Mahdī*, English translation by Hugh Kennedy, Albany: SUNY.
- al-Ya'qūbī, Aḥmad b. Abī Ya'qūb b. Ja'far (1960), *Ta'riḫ*, Beirut: Dār ṣādir.

Armenian

- Anonymous Storyteller (1971), *Patmut'awn ananun zruc'agri karcece'al Šapuh Bagratuni*, ed. by Margarita Darbinjan-Melikjan, Erevan: Haykakan SSH Gitut'yunneru Akademiayi Hratarakč'ut'yun.
- Asolik, Step'anos Tarōnec'i (1885), *Patmut'awn tiezerakan*, ed. by Step'an Malxasyanc, Saint Petersburg: I. N. Skorokhodovi.
- Dasxuranc'i, Movsēs (1961), *History of the Caucasian Albanians by Movses Dasxuranc'i*, trans. by Charles James Frank Dowsett, London: Oxford University Press.
- Dasxuranc'i, Movsēs (1983), *Patmut'awn atuanic' ašxarhi*, ed. by Varag Afak'elyan, Erevan: Haykakan SSH Gitut'yunneru Akademiayi Hratarakč'ut'yun.
- Drasxanakertc'i, Yovhannēs (1987), *History of Armenia*, trans. by Krigor H. Maksoudian, Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Drasxanakertc'i, Yovhannēs (1996), *Hayoc' patmut'awn*, ed. by Gevorg Babkeni T'usunyan, Erevan: Yerevani hamalsarani hratarakč'ut'yun.
- Łewond (1857), *Aršawank' Arabac' i Hays*, ed. by Karapet Chahnazarian, Paris: E. Thunot & Co.
- T'ovma Arcruni (1985a), *History of the House of the Artsrunik': Translation and Commentary*, trans. By Robert Thomson, Detroit: Wayne State Press.
- T'ovma Arcruni (1985b), *Patmut'awn Tann Arcrunec'*, ed. by Vrez Vardanyan, Erevan: Erevani hamalsarani hratarakč'ut'yun.

Vardan Arewelc’i (1927), *La domination arabe en Arménie: extrait de l’histoire universelle de Vardan, traduit de l’arménien et annoté étude de critique textuelle et littéraire*, ed. by Joseph Muyltermans, Louvain: J-B Istas.

Studies

- Amabe, Fukuzo (1995), *The Emergence of the ‘Abbāsīd Autocracy: The ‘Abbāsīd Army, Khurāsān and Adharbayjān*, Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.
- Bates, Michael L. (1989), “The Dirham Mint of the Northern Provinces of the Umayyad Caliphate”, *Armenian Numismatic Journal / Hay dramagitakan handes* 15/1: 89–111.
- Benveniste, Emile (1929), “Titres iraniens en arménien”, *Revue des Etudes Arminiennes* 9: 5–10.
- Bosworth, Clifford E., “Abdallāh b. Tāher”, *Elr*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/abdallah-b-taher-governor> (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Bosworth, Clifford E., “Fāzl b. Sahl b. Zādānfarruk”, *Elr*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/fazlb-sahl-b-zadanfarruk> (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Conrad, Lawrence (1992), “The Conquest of Arwād: a Source-Critical Study in the Historiography of the Early Medieval Near East”, in: Averil Cameron and Lawrence Conrad, eds., *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, Vol. 1: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, Princeton: Darwin Press, 317–401.
- Crone, Patricia (1980), *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crone, Patricia (1998), “The ‘Abbāsīd Abnā’ and Sāsānīd Cavalrymen”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 8/1: 1–19.
- Crone, Patricia (2012), *The Nativist Prophets of Early Islamic Iran: Rural Revolt and Local Zoroastrianism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, Elton L. (1979), *The Political and Social History of Khurasan under Abbasid Rule, 747–820*, Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica.
- Dowsett, Charles (1957), “A Neglected Passage in the ‘History of the Caucasian Albanians’”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 19/3: 456–68.
- Elad, Amikam (1996), “Aspects of the Transition from the Umayyad to the ‘Abbāsīd Caliphate”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 19: 89–132.
- Elad, Amikam (2005), “Mawālī in the Composition of al-Ma’mūn’s Army: a Non-Arab Takeover?”, in: Monique Bernards and John Nawas, eds., *Patronage and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, Leiden: Brill, 278–325.
- Elad, Amikam (2010), “The Armies of al-Ma’mūn in Khurāsān (193–202/809–817/18): Recruitment of its Contingents and their Commanders and their Social-Ethnic Composition”, *Oriens* 38: 35–76.
- Elad, Amikam (2013), “Al-Ma’mūn’s Military Units and their Commanders up to the end of the Siege of Baghdad”, *Abbasid Studies IV*: 245–84.
- Forand, Paul G. (1969), “The Governors of Mosul according to al-Azdī’s Ta’rīkh al-Mawṣil”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89/1: 88–105.
- Garsoīan, Nina G. (2004), “The Arab Invasions and the Rise of the Bagratuni (640–884)”, in: Richard G. Hovannisian, ed., *Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times, Vol. 1: the*

- Dynastic Periods from Antiquity to the Fourteenth Century*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 117–42.
- Ghazarian, Mkrtiĉh (1904), "Armenien unter der arabischen Herrschaft bis zur Entstehung des Bagratidenreiches nach arabischen und armenischen Quellen bearbeitet", *Zeitschrift für armenische Philologie* 2: 149–225.
- Gippert, Jost (1993), *Iranica Armeno-Iberica: Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Gordon, Matthew S. (2001), *The Breaking of a Thousand Swords: A History of the Turkish Military of Samarra, AH 200–275 / 815–889 CE*, Albany: SUNY Press.
- Hübschmann, Heinrich (1908), *Armenische Grammatik*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Karev, Yury (2015), *Samarqand et le Sughd à l'époque 'Abbāsside: histoire politique et sociale*, Paris: Association pour l'Avancement des Études Iraniennes.
- Kennedy, Hugh (2001), *Armies of the Caliphs: Military and Society in the Early Islamic State*, New York: Routledge.
- Laurent, Joseph / Canard, M. (1980), *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886*, Lisbon: Librairie Bertrand.
- Lewis, Bernard, "Ĥatim b. Harthama", *EP*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_2804 (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Markwart, Josef (1903), *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge: Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts (ca. 840–940)*, Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Minorsky, Vladimir (1958), *A History of Sharvān and Darband in the 10th–11th Centuries*, Cambridge: Heffer.
- Nalbandyan, H. (1958), "Arabayi ostikannerō Hayastanum", *Hayastan SSR Gitut'yunneri akademiayi telekagir* 8: 105–24.
- Nastich, Vladimir N. (2012), *Early Islamic Copper Coinage of Transoxiana: A Generic Survey Focused on Newly Discovered Coin Types*, Trieste: EUT.
- Nicol, Norman D. (1979), *Early 'Abbāsīd Administration in the Central and Eastern Provinces, 132–218 AH / 750–833 AD*, PhD Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Pellat, Charles, "'Alī b. 'Īsā b. Māhān", *Elr*, <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/ali-b-isa-b-mahan> (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Rante, Rocco (2015), "'Khorasan Proper' and 'Greater Khorasan' Within a Politico-Cultural Framework" in: Rocco Rante, ed., *Greater Khorasan: History, Geography, Archaeology and Material Culture*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Sourdel, Dominique, "al-Faḍl b. Sahl b. Zadhānfarūkh", *EP*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_2228 (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Sourdel, Dominique, "Ibn Māhān", *EP*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3277 (accessed on 29 April 2017).
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1958), "K'usti kapkoh varĉ'akan miavori veraprunknerō xalifayut'yan žamanak", *Haykakan SSR Gitut'yunneri akademiayi telekagir* 9: 73–77.
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1962), "DitoĽut'yunner 'ostikan' baři masin", *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* 4: 243–248.
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1964), "'Hayoc' iĉxanō' arabakan tirapetut'yun žamanakašrjanum", *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* 2: 121–134.

- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1969), “‘Hayoc’ iṣḥan’ titloṣi caġumə ev Hayoc’ tirut’yunə 7-rd darum”, *Banber Erevani Hamalsarani* 1: 241–247.
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1976a), *Arab Emirates in Bagratid Armenia*, trans. Nina Garsoġan, Lisbon: Livraria Bertrand.
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1976b), “Arabakan xalifayut’yan hyusisayin p’oxark’ayut’yunə”, *Merjavor ev miġin arevelk’i erkrner ev žoġovurdner III: arabakan erkrner*, Erevan: publisher unknown.
- Ter-Ľevondyan, Aram N. (1977), “Arminiayi ostikanneri žamanakagrut’yunə”, *Ĕġmiacin* 3: 34–39.
- Vacca, Alison M. (2017a), “Conflict and Community in the Medieval Caucasus”, *al-‘Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā* 25: 66–112.
- Vacca, Alison M. (2017b), *Non-Muslim Provinces under Early Islam*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vacca, Alison M. (2019), “Al-Basfurraġān and Banū l-Dayrānī: Vaspurakan and the Arcrunik’ in Arabic Sources”, in: Zaroui Pogossian & Edda Vardanyan, ed., *The Church of the Holy Cross of Aġt’amar: Politics, Art, Spirituality in the Kingdom of Vaspurakan*. Leiden: Brill, 67–99.
- de la Vaissière, Étienne (2007), *Samarcande et Samarra: Éġlites d’Asie centrale dans l’empire abbasside*, Paris: Association pour l’Avancement des Études Iraniennes.
- Vardanyan, Aram R. (2011), *Islamic Coins Struck in Historic Armenia. I: Armīniya, Arrān (Madīnat Arrān), Barda’a, Dabīl, Hārūnabad / Hārūniya and Ma’dan Bāġjunays: Early ‘Abbāsīd Period, 142–277 AH / 759–891 AD*, Erevan: Tigran Mec.
- Vasmer, Richard (1931), *Chronologie der arabischen Statthalter von Armenien unter den Abbasiden, von as-Saffach bis zur Krönung Aschots I, 750–887*, Vienna: Mechitharisten-Buchdr.

