



ANNALES ISLAMOLOGIQUES

en ligne en ligne

AnIsl 25 (1991), p. 203-240

Ahmet Zeki Validi Togan, Gary Leiser

Economic Conditions in Anatolia in the Mongol Period; introduction et traduction par Gary Leiser.

Conditions d'utilisation

L'utilisation du contenu de ce site est limitée à un usage personnel et non commercial. Toute autre utilisation du site et de son contenu est soumise à une autorisation préalable de l'éditeur (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). Le copyright est conservé par l'éditeur (Ifao).

Conditions of Use

You may use content in this website only for your personal, noncommercial use. Any further use of this website and its content is forbidden, unless you have obtained prior permission from the publisher (contact AT ifao.egnet.net). The copyright is retained by the publisher (Ifao).

Dernières publications

9782724711622	<i>BIFAO 126</i>	
9782724711059	<i>Les Inscriptions de visiteurs dans les Tombes thébaines</i>	Chloé Ragazzoli
9782724711455	<i>Les émotions dans l'Égypte Ancienne</i>	Rania Y. Merzeban (éd.), Marie-Lys Arnette (éd.), Dimitri Laboury, Cédric Larcher
9782724711639	<i>AnIsl 60</i>	
9782724711448	<i>Athribis XI</i>	Marcus Müller (éd.)
9782724711615	<i>Le temple de Dendara X. Les chapelles osiriennes</i>	Sylvie Cauville, Oussama Bassiouni, Matjaž Kačičnik, Bernard Lenthéric
9782724711707	????? ?????????? ??????? ???? ?? ???????	Omar Jamal Mohamed Ali, Ali al-Sayyid Abdelatif
???	????? ?? ??????? ??????? ?? ????????? ?????????????	
????????????	???????????? ??????? ??????? ?? ??? ??????? ??????;	

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN ANATOLIA
IN THE MONGOL PERIOD *

BY

AHMET ZEKI VALIDI TOGAN
(Translation)

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Presented below is a translation of Ahmet Zeki Validi Togan's (d. 1970) article "Moğollar devrinde Anadolu'nun iktisadî vaziyeti" in *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası*, 1 (1931), 1-42. This was the first modern attempt to investigate the economic history of Anatolia under Mongol rule, roughly 1243 to 1340 A.D. Curiously, very little work has been done on this subject in the six decades since this study appeared. In fact, the only major work in 60 years to examine the economic history of Anatolia under the Mongols and, as far as I can determine, consider even part of Togan's article is Claude Cahen's *La Turquie Pré-Ottomane* (Istanbul, 1988). The present article, which brought to light several primary sources, has thus remained the starting point for research on the economic conditions in Anatolia under the Mongols. Despite its inherent importance in this respect, this article has been almost inaccessible to all but a few determined readers of Turkish. There are two reasons for this. First, the journal in which it appeared ceased publication after the second issue (1939). Second, Togan's style is somewhat "archaic" compared to modern Turkish, for he wrote before the language reform movement really got under way in Turkey. This was also the time of the transition of Turkish from the Arabic to the Latin alphabet, when the Latin orthography for many words was not yet firmly established. In short, even if one could find the article, it was difficult to read. Altogether, a translation into a Western language is easily justified.

It must be stressed, however, that this translation is not meant to imply that all of Togan's assertions, conclusions, and generalizations will be readily accepted today. Although it represents a benchmark in the field, this article does reflect the "state of the art" around 1928. Modern specialists in İlhanîd coinage, for example, will no doubt take issue with some of the author's conclusions, as does Mr Steven Album to whom I am indebted for critical comments on an earlier version of this translation. In addition to making Togan's article more accessible, this translation is, in fact, intended to facilitate the criticism of its contents.

* This paper is based on a communication entitled "Anadoluda Moğol hâkimiyeti" (Mongol rule in Anatolia), which was read

at a meeting of the Turkistan and Āzarbāijān Learned Society on 9 March 1929.

It should be mentioned that, to a certain extent, Togan meant this article to supplement W. Barthold's study "Persidskaya nadpis na stene Aniyskoy mecheti Manuche" [The Persian inscription on the wall of the Manuchehr Mosque in Ani] in the fifth volume of *Aniyskaya Seriya* (St. Petersburg, 1911). This study was also published in Turkish in *THITM*, 1 (1931), 135-159, under the title "İlhanlılar devrinde malî vaziyet" [Financial conditions in the İlkhānid period]. Togan refers to the original Russian as "Ani". W. Hinz translated Barthold's article into German as "Die persische Inschrift an der Mauer der Manūčehr-Moschee zu Ani" in *ZDMG*, 101 (1951), 241-269.

In the course of the present article, Togan promised several more studies on the economic history of Anatolia in the Mongol period, but he apparently only published "Reşideddîn'in mektuplarında Anadolu'nun iktisadî ve medenî hayatına ait kayıtlar" [References to the economic and cultural life in Anatolia in the letters of Raşid al-Dîn], *Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 15 (1953-1954), 32-50.

While the study of the economic history of Anatolia in the Mongol era has generally been neglected in the past half century, research on the economic history of Mongol Iran has made considerable progress. Iran was, of course, much more central to the Mongol Empire than Anatolia and it was under much firmer Mongol control. In any case, the economic life of Iran and Anatolia under the Mongols was closely related, so the modern research on Iran is important for understanding what occurred in Anatolia. This point is made by Togan himself. It is not possible to list here all the publications on Iran that are relevant to Togan's article. Suffice it to mention the following: J. Masson Smith and F. Plunkett, "Gold Money in Mongol Iran", *JESHO*, 11 (1968), 275-297; J. Masson Smith, "The Silver Currency in Mongol Iran", *JESHO*, 12 (1969), 16-41; Michael Bates, "Islamic Numismatics," *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*, 13 (1979), n. 2, pp. 1-3; Stephen Album, "Studies in İlkhānid History and Numismatics", *Studia Iranica*, part I, 13 (1984), 49-116, and part II, 14 (1985), 45-76; I.P. Pertrushevsky, "The Socio-Economic Conditions of Iran under the İl-Khāns" in J.A. Boyle ed., *The Cambridge History of Iran* (Cambridge, 1968), V, 483-537; Ann Lambton, "Mongol Fiscal Administration in Persia", *SI*, 64 (1986), 79-99, 65 (1987), 97-123, and *idem*, *Continuity and Change in Medieval Persia* (Albany, NY, 1988).

Finally, let me state that I have attempted to translate Togan's article into idiomatic English. His style, however, does not always make for easy transition from topic to topic. I have also indicated in the translation the most recent editions of the texts to which the author refers and I have recast his footnotes, which are sometimes rather opaque, according to modern practice. All additions to the text and notes, except for corrections of minor oversights and typographical errors, have been placed in braces.

TRANSLATION OF THE ARTICLE

I

Before discussing this subject, a few words of explanation are in order concerning the fiscal and economic systems of the Mongol-Ilhānid state.

Although information exists which would be of use in describing the fiscal system of the Mongol state, it has not yet been thoroughly studied and is in a state of some disorder. Even the conclusions of the scholars who have tried to clarify this confused information, with respect to determining the basic standard of the Mongol fiscal system and the value of Mongol coinage, need to be reexamined. Among these conclusions are those of A.K. Markov and W. Barthold who believe that the basis of the Iranian Mongol financial system was the silver *dīnār*. Both state categorically that the Ilhānids did not use gold coins for commercial transactions. Instead, they were only struck to be used for gifts and ceremonial purposes¹. Barthold relies on Rašīd al-Dīn who refers in one place {*Jāmi' al-tawārīḥ*, for work on this text, see for example John Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan* [New York, 1971]} Topkapı MS, f° 323b) to large gold coins of 100 *mitqāls* called «درست» (درستهای طلا), and a Byzantine source cited by J. von Hammer-Purgstall (*Geschichte der Ilchane* {Darmstadt, 1841-1843}, II, 159). However, Ġazan's statement چون درحق کسی انعامی فرماییم اورا ازان درستها بدیم does not indicate that gold coins were made only for gifts. These words do not pertain to all gold coins. There is a misunderstanding here. Ġazan's aforesaid statement, "I am going to give some of these *durust* {"perfect" a coin of the best standard} to a man on whom I am going to bestow a gift," does not pertain to all gold coins, but only to large beautiful "*nūmune paralar*" {"mode" coins} weighing 100 *mitqāls*. Rašīd al-Dīn is simply praising their beauty

(و فرمود تادرسهای طلاهریک صد مثقال زدند و بخطوط تمامت ولایات نام خود برانجاسکه زد تادرهمه مواضع چون بخوانند دانندکی ضرب اوست و آیات قرآن و اسامی دوازده امام عه . م . بر آن سکه منقوش است و سکه بغایت خوب و لطیف چنانکه هرکس کی بیابد اورادل ندرهرکه بگذارد و خواهدکی البته نگاه دارد و فرمودکی جهت اوازه چون درحق کسی انعامی فرماییم اورا ازان درستها بدیم) .

The Byzantine author Pachymeres, who is cited by Hammer (p. 205), simply says, "among them {i.e., the Ilhānids} are gold coins called *casaneus* which are of high grade." This statement only shows that Ġazan's gold coinage was readily accepted. It cannot be evidence for the conclusion that this money "was struck only for ceremonial purposes."

There is considerable evidence to prove that both silver and gold were used in commercial transactions in the Mongol period. Indeed, the prevailing standard was the gold standard. It disappeared during financial crises but reappeared when conditions

1. Markov, *Katalog djelairidskihi moneti* {St Petersburg, 1897}, p. LXXX; Barthold, "Persidskaya nadpis," p. 18, hereinafter referred to as "Ani."

improved. According to Rašid al-Dīn, the gold that disappeared during the economic crises and disorders in the reigns of Argūn and Geiḥatu reappeared after Ġazan's reforms. In fact, all business transactions were conducted with it

(... و بیش ازین جهت انک زر سرخ در بازار هانادر افتادی واکر قدری درآوردندی آراصد مشتری پیدا شدی .. این زمان در بازار هابردست هروستای چندان زر سرخ می کرددکه نهایت ندارد وتمامت معاملات بدان میکنند).

While mentioning the expenses of Ġazan at the assembly {*kurultay*} at Ūjān, Rašid al-Dīn clearly distinguishes gold from silver خریطهای زر سرخ و نقره جدا جدا باوزان مختلف. We also find references to 300 *tūmens* of gold coins (زرنقد) {for the council?} and, in another place (fol. 299b), to 10,000 and 20,000 gold coins (زرنقد) for travel expenses. He also uses this expression for the taxes collected from the people (fol. 315b, زرنقد از رعایا). There are further references to “1,000 *tūmens* of gold” with regard to Šams al-Dīn {Juvainī} during the time of Abaqa (fol. 153b) and to “20 *tūmens* of gold” and “250 *tūmens* of gold” in the work entitled *Tasliyyat al-iḥwān*, {extracts published in Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī's edition of 'Aṭā' Malik Juvainī's *Ta'riḥ-i Jahān-Guṣā* [London, 1912-1937]} which 'Aṭā' Malik Juvainī wrote about his own life. There is even the phrase

در ضمیر آباقاخان چنان نشانده بودند که این توفیرات زرنقدی ست که بخانه برده ام و در زیر زمین دفن کرده

in Qazvīnī's edition of *Ta'riḥ-i Jahān-Guṣā*, introduction, I, pp. ۳۰۰، ۳۰۱، which means, “they told Abaqa Ḥān that I brought a lot of money, namely, 20 *tūmens* in gold, to my home {*ḥāna*} and buried it”. In Vaṣṣāf, *zar* (gold) and *dīnār* (i.e., silver *dīnār*) are always mentioned separately ({*Tajziyat al-amṣār*} Bombay ed. {1852-1853}, pp. 336, 337, 349, 362, 384, 390, etc., «نومن زر»؛ p. 368, «خزائن زر و دینار»؛ p. 436, «اخراج زر و دینار».) A penalty of 15 *tūmens* of gold was imposed on the Turkmen and “Šūl” {tribesmen} who revolted at one time in the province of Fārs. According to the accounts of Rašid al-Dīn and Vaṣṣāf, the cruelties of the *basqaqs* {provincial revenue officials} in the province of Fārs were for the most part unprecedented. Vaṣṣāf cites a verse of a folksong {*türkü*}, which was probably in the language of the Turkmen of Fārs, on the tyrannous demands of the tax collectors. He wrote it in the following manner من جان چقرم التون ایچون * اشم من ورايم من آلم. This should be translated, “I would give up my life for gold, my task is to strike and take”. In other words, the tax collectors demanded taxes or “fines” from the people in the form of gold. There is also Persian poetry about these tax collectors, namely, وکه ادا طلا چهره شان زر مضروب * بوجه طلغمشان سیم غم شده مسبوك, in which it is said that they demanded *ṭilā* {redgold} and *ṭalgam* silver from the people. In another place (p. 123), when mentioning the payment of 500 *tūmens*, Vaṣṣāf says that سه صد تومن زر عیار were surrendered.

A document which definitely shows that gold and silver were used together in Ilḥānid territory is a work called *Sa'ādatnāma*, which 'Alā-i Tabrīzī wrote on the financial affairs of the Ilḥānids of Iran. A unique copy of this work, which I shall discuss below, was found by me in the Yusuf Aḡā Library in Konya (registered in the library's MS index under the title *Inṣā'-i fārisī*, with the number 1756 {now see Mirkamal Nabipour, *Die*

beiden persischen Leitfäden des Falak 'Alā-ye Tabrizi über das staatliche Rechnungswesen im 14. Jahrhundert [Göttingen, 1973]). In this work, the « طلا » and « طلغمه » accounts are placed side by side in the lists of expenses. In fact, dues were collected in mixed gold and silver coins or in mixed property and livestock. Among the Arabs, the coins were converted to *dirhams* or *mitqāls* and the animals to horses or sheep. The author says that in his time the financial officials did not like this system and that every category of money and goods was recorded separately in the Mongol system (fol. 49a),

دیگر هروقت که اصناف نقود مختلف و انواع مواشی محرر تفصیلی دهد در عرب مشهور آنست کی نقود مختلف را بدرهم یا مثقال جمع کنند و مواشی را برأس همچون اسب و کوسفند .. و استاذن صنعت استیفا آرا می پسندند بلکه امثالی چنین جمعها را بعد دصنف یا بلفظ کما ذکر اوین یاز نبشند و اگر حکم بحسب اعتبار مغول جمع مختلفان یکی ازین ارقام خمول را باز نبشند آنرا در حشود ذکر کند و در بارز بعدد صنف کما ذکر اوین باز نبشند و ثبت کند .

He also gives some examples, for instance on fol. 57b,

	صورت مصارف و صبوغ	
	جمعاً	
فی تاریخ کذی	علی خراج فلان الدین الصراف	
	النقود	
صنفان	الرابع	
الطلغمه	* الطلا	
الف دینار	مایة مثقالا	

As I shall discuss further on, the word *zar* does not always mean gold. In many places, it is simply used to mean “money.” For example, in 'Alā-i Tabrizi, fol. 75b, we find the following :

فائده دوم آنست کی چون در برات یاورق هم زر رابع وهم اجناس بیاید وزر رابع را تفصیلی بسیار باشد وقتها باشد کی چون ناظر بران برات یا ورق نگاه کند (76a) و تفصیل رابع بسیار باشد نظر او باجناس نیاید و از درجه اعتبار ساقط شود در مقام طریق رفع آن اشتباه این باشد کی کاتب زر رابع و اجناس را برهم کیرد و در بارز هر دو ذکر عدد و صنف بنویسد بعد از آن « رابع » را بر میان نبشند و تفصیل آن عدد زر رابع کتر بنویسد .

Then, under the term *rābilh*, the number of *dīnārs* or the amount of sheep, soap, wood and so forth is recorded. When it is necessary to specify that the money is gold, the words *ṭilā*, *aḥmar* {“red” in Arabic}, or *surh* {“red” in Persian} are used.

II

In the Mongol period, the terms *dirham*, *mitqāl*, *dānaq*, *dīnār*, *bālīš*, and *tūmen* are used in the silver and gold money accounts. It is rather difficult, however, to determine the real meaning and value of these terms, and especially the relationship of gold and silver coins to each other with respect to their values. One person who provides information on the economic conditions in Iran and Anatolia in the Mongol period is Ḥamd

Allāh Mustawfī Qazvinī, one of the financial officials of Sultan Abū Sa'īd. E. Blochet, G. Le Strange and Barthold have analyzed or touched upon the material that Ḥamd Allāh and others have provided on the budget of the Ilhānids of Iran. The financial account in Ḥamd Allāh's list is shown in *dīnārs* and *tūmens*. Barthold was the first to prove that the *dīnārs* in this list were silver *dīnārs*.

Despite certain changes and transformations that I shall describe later, the silver *dīnār*, which was called the *dīnār-i Tabrīzī* or *dīnār-i rābiḥ* of the Mongols, basically consisted of six silver *dirhams*. During the reign of Ġazan, the weight of this *dīnār* was definitely set at three *mitqāls*. While mentioning the terminology of Ġazan's coinage, Rašīd al-Dīn says the following (f° 323 b) :

کچون پیش ازین هر درمی چهار دانگ می زدندی و بی انک مصلحتی در ضمن آن باشد بنیم ونیم دانگ کردندکی هیچ عقدی نیست. این زمان نیم مثقال راست بزندد وانج نیم ونیم دانگ مغشوش بود نیم مثقال طلغم صافی می باشد وچون اعتبار زر ونقره بمقدار عیارست هرکس که نیم ونیم دانگ مغشوش دارد ویک درم خرج میکند صافی کردانیده تانیم مثقال کند وپهان یک درم خرج کند وچون احتیاط رفت نزدیک بکاربود وزیادت زیانی نه مردم برغبت سه مثقال ونیم نقره کی بیش داشت بسه مثقال مضروب مسکوک بدل میکردند... وحکم بران جمله فرمودکی اگر در دست انواع زرهای مغشوش موجود بود واین زمان حکم آنست کی هیچ آفریده بغیر از طلاو طلغم معامله نکنندوانک نشناسد بدیکری نماید تا احتیاط کند وچون چنین باشد هیچ قلابی زرقلب نزنند چه محقق دانندی ازوی نخواهد سندی همه احتیاط میکنند ودرین مدت کی چنین امری معظم در تمامت ممالک جاری کشت و محتاج نبودکی کسی را بکشند وچنان تمشیت پذیرفت کی در جمیع ممالک بغیر از سکه وعیار مذکور هیچ سکه وعیار دیگر نیست وفرمود تانقره مسکوک نیز بوزن خرج کنند سه مثقال بیک دینار رابع تا هیچ آفریده نبرد وچون در تمامت ولایات متساوی کشته مردم آسوده حال شده اند.

The Egyptian historians al-Nuwairī {*Nihāyat al-'arab*} and al-Qalqašandī² also provide information to the effect that the *dīnār-i Tabrīzī* and *dīnār-i rābiḥ* consisted of six *dirhams*. Furthermore, the statements of al-Aqsarāyī {*Musāmarat al-ahbār*, ed. Osman Turan [Ankara, 1944]} and Ḥamd Allāh {*Nuzhat al-qulūb*} corroborate each other in this matter. According to al-Aqsarāyī, 200,000 Mongol *dīnārs* were equal to 1,200,000 Seljuk *dirhams*. While comparing the money of Sāsānid Iran with that of the Mongols, Ḥamd Allāh refers to the Mongol *dīnār* as the *dīnār-i rābiḥ* and says that one gold *dīnār* of the Seljuks (*zar-i surḥ*) was the equivalent of two *dīnārs* and two *dānaqs*, that is, 2.33 {*dīnārs*}, in Mongol money (Bombay ed., p. 132)³. By this Seljuk *zar-i surḥ*, he meant the *dīnār-i surḥ 'awwāl* used in Baghdad, which was 12 *dirhams*⁴. One Mongol *dīnār* equalled six

2. *Ṣubḥ al-a'šā* {Cairo, 1915}, IV, 422.

3. The Bombay edition of this book has many mistakes. I have corrected the copy of the 1894 {or 1898?} edition in my possession by comparing it to numerous manuscript copies.

4. In Ḥamd Allāh 800,040,000 *dīnār-i 'awwāl* = 400,020,000 Mongol *dīnārs*. In the MSS, « هفتاد » is mistakenly written in place of

« هشتاد ». Furthermore, in the tax bill given there, 21,500 red gold pieces of the Seljuk period are mistakenly shown as the equivalent of 50,000 *tūmens* in the Mongol period. This should definitely be « پنجاه هزار تومن » and not « پنجاه هزار دینار » because one gold Seljuk *dīnār* was three silver Tabrīz *dīnārs* and two *dānaqs*, that is, 14 *dānaqs*, which would be $21,500 \times 14 = 50,166$ {sic}.

dirhams in the accounts that he cites on p. 133, from the time of ‘Umar and al-Ḥajjāj, and on p. 170, from the time of the ‘Abbāsīd caliph al-Muqtadir (Barthold has shown Ḥamd Allāh’s mistakes in calculating the Sāsānid and Seljuk accounts with gold). ‘Alā-i Tabrīzī uses *dānaq* as a standard of weight and describes the *dīnār* in like manner, saying (fol. 60a),

دينار باصلاح اهل ديوان عبارتست از شش دانك و هريك دانك چهار تسو و هريك تسو چهار جو .

The definition of *dānaq* found here is certainly that of the term that was generally used in the government {*dīwān*} and financial {*istifā*} institutions of the Ilḥānid state. One encounters this in other contemporary works⁵. From the list that I shall add at the end of this article, which I have cited from Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-‘Umārī on the salaries of Ilḥānid officials, we shall be able to see more clearly that *tūmens* and *dīnārs* were calculated according to the Tabrīzī *dīnār* of six *dirhams* in the official departments of the Mongol government. This author also records that Abaqa gave ten *tūmens* to a man as a gift⁶, that Geiḥatu gave three *tūmens* to another man as a gift, and that these *tūmens* were recorded as *dīnārs* of six *dirhams*⁷. We can deduce from this that the aforesaid calculation was used throughout the history of the Ilḥānid state. The silver *dirham* of Ġazan, which has come down to the present time, was two grams and 150 milligrams and the average weight of the silver *dīnār* was 12 grams and 900 milligrams. In other words, it had the value of three gold francs or three *qirāns* of today’s Iranian money.

The standard of measure in Mongol gold money was the *miṭqāl*. This is confirmed by the information provided by ‘Alā-i Tabrīzī. In all of his accounts (fols 37a, 55b, 57b, 58b, 69), he writes *miṭqāl* for gold (*ṭilā*) and *dīnār* for silver (*ṭalḡam*). Vaṣṣāf (p. 349) indicates that Ġazan’s {standard of} coinage “was a *miṭqāl* of gold which was equal to four *dīnār-i rābiḥ*, that is, silver *dīnārs* — and one *miṭqāl* of pure silver was equal to one *dīnār*”

(طلاء جايز و نقره طلغ تسليم نواب خزانه دارند . هر مثقال طلا مساوی چهار دينار رايح و هر مثقال طلغ موازی ديناری و تعيين ضرب اين نقود در ساير ممالك ايلخانی سمت عموم يافت) .

The last sentence must be « هر سه مثقال طلغ موازی ديناری » but in the manuscripts that I have seen, it is always written as « هر مثقال طلغ ». In any case, one *miṭqāl* of gold was equal to 12 *miṭqāls* of silver.

5. For example, *Miftāḥ al-ḥisāb*. ‘Alī Jamšīd al-Kāšī, Esad Efendi MS. 3195, fols 15b :

« و اهل السياقة و المعاملات بل العامة استعملو الدوانيق و الطسوجات و الشعيرات ، دانق اربع طسوج و الطسوج اربع شعيرات . »

See also H. Sauvaire, “Matériaux pour servir à l’histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes,” *JA*, [7th series, 19]

(1882), I, 72, II, 80, 172 {sic, pages do not match pt. II}.

6. {*Masālik al-abṣār*} Topkapı, Ahmet III MS. 2797, II, 295, {now edited by K. Lech as *Das mongolische Weltreich* [Wiesbaden, 1968]} « و امر (اباقا) له بعشرة توامين عنها مائة الف رايح بستائة الف درهم . »

7. *Ibid.*, V, 296, « فامر (كيخاتو) له بثلاثة توامين وهي ثلثون الف دينار بمائة الف درهم . »

In the Mongol period, only the word *dīnār* or the expressions *dīnār-i rābiḥ*, *dīnār-i surḥ*, *dīnār-i aḥmar*, and *dīnār-i zar-i naqd* were used. Sometimes the attribution *dīnār-i surḥ* is referred to as the Baghdad *dīnār-i 'awwāl*, as is the case for example in Ḥamd Allāh (p. 132), or is used to mean “Mongol gold *dīnār*”. These expressions refer not only to coins of one *miṭqāl* of gold but also to larger weights. Of the Ilḥānid gold coins which have been published to date, the 4.401 to 6.923-gram coins struck in Tabrīz and Baghdad in the name of Hūlegü and Abaqa, and the 6.5-gram coins of Ġazan in Baghdad, bear the inscriptions *ḍuriba ḥādā 'l-dīnār* or *ḍuriba ḥādā 'l-dīnār al-mubārak*⁸. Furthermore, the 8.7-gram gold coins of Ġazan and the 8.5-gram gold coins of the Jalāyirids were also called *dīnārs*. In my opinion, the largest Ilḥānid gold *dīnārs* were probably the large gold coins weighing three *miṭqāls* (12.750 grams), which were worth 12 *dīnār-i rābiḥ* at the time of Ġazan and Öljeitü (Mübarek Galib, *Meskūkāt-i {kadīme-i islāmiyye katalogu, müluku cengiziyye ve} 'l-ilḥāniyye* {Istanbul, 1318}, p. 63), or about 36 gold francs. This type of gold *dīnār* was the counterpart of the *som* in the *ulus* {coalition of tribes subject to a ruler, his territory} of Jochi. In the *ulus* of Jochi, one-third *miṭqāl* of silver was called a *dānaq*, and 108 *dānaqs* of silver were equal to a *som* weighing 36 *miṭqāls*. This *som* had the value of 36 francs, each *miṭqāl* of silver being equal to a gold franc. In other words, during the reign of Ġazan one *miṭqāl* of gold was equal to four *dīnār-i rābiḥ* (or 12 *miṭqāls* of silver), as Vaṣṣāf says, and coins of three *miṭqāls* of gold, being equal to 12 *dīnārs* (or 36 *miṭqāls* of silver), were used in the Golden Horde.

The basis and value of the coinage used throughout the Mongol state was uniform. At the beginning, the basis for the western *ḥānates* was probably the *yasīk/bāliš* {“pillow”, applied to an ingot of gold or silver}. The *bāliš* was also readily accepted among the eastern Mongols but was used very little in Ilḥānid territory. According to Rašid al-Dīn (fol. 253b), in the last days of Abaqa, the chief vizir, Şāḥib Şams al-Dīn Juvainī, gave the gold *bāliš* to someone whom he sent to Anatolia. Ġazan himself distributed one hundred “red gold *bāliš* at the Ūjān assembly (Rašid al-Dīn, fol. 299b). According to Vaṣṣāf (p. 22) and Juvainī (I, 16), the gold *bāliš* was equal to 500 *miṭqāls* of gold and 2,000 paper *bāliš*. In other words, one *miṭqāl* of gold was equal to four pieces of paper money. Thus, by Ilḥānid calculation, this meant one silver *dīnār*. According to Vaṣṣāf (p. 22) and Juvainī (I, 16), each *bāliš* of gold or silver weighed 500 *miṭqāls* (two and a half kilograms). In the east, at the time when Kubla Ḥān ascended the throne, one *bāliš* had the value of 2,000 silver *dīnārs* (i.e., one *miṭqāl* of gold was again equal to four silver *dīnārs*). According to Juvainī, in the city where he was (Baghdad), a silver *bāliš* weighing 500 *miṭqāls* had the value of 75 *dīnār-i ruknī*, each of which had the value of four *dānaqs*, that is, one silver *bāliš* was 300 *dānaqs*. Therefore, the *dānaq* mentioned by Juvainī was 1.66 *miṭqāls* and the *dīnār-i ruknī* was 6.64 *miṭqāls* of silver, which was approximately one *dīnār-i 'awwāl*. In the eastern Mongol Empire during the reign of Kubla Ḥān, one

8. E. Drouin, « Notice sur les monnaies mongoles », *JA*, {9th series, 7} (1896), pp. 515, 520; S. Lane-Poole, {*Catalogue of Oriental*

Coins in the British Museum (London, 1875-1890)} X (additions to V-VII), 89, 95.

piece of paper money was equal to ten *dīnārs*. In the Mongol Empire, bills of ten *dīnārs* must have been a common form of exchange. When an attempt was made to use paper money in Iran during the time of Geiḥatu, this money was printed in denominations of one half *dirham* to ten *dīnārs* (Vaṣṣāf, p. 272).

Generally, large amounts of Mongol currency were calculated by *tūmens* or ten thousands. The eastern Mongols used the *bāliṣ tūmen* (Vaṣṣāf, p. 506). In Iran, the “*dīnār tūmen*” was used. When this expression was used, it meant strictly the silver *dīnār tūmen*, but when “*tūmen-i zar-i surḥ*” or “*tūmen-i dīnār-i aḥmar*” was mentioned, the meaning was gold *dīnār tūmen*. When “*tūmen-i zar*” was used, it must have simply meant “money” or the silver *dīnār tūmen* based on the gold standard. While speaking about the taxes collected in ‘Irāq al-‘Ajam during the time that Bahā’ al-Dīn Juvainī was governor {*mutaṣarrif*}, ‘Aṭā’ Malik Juvainī says in his *Tasliyyat al-iḥwān* that 600 gold *tūmens* were equal to six million *dīnārs* (ششصد تومان زرکه شش هزار هزار دینار باشد). Mirzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī understands this *dīnār* to be the gold *dīnār*, but he is mistaken. Vaṣṣāf says (p. 336) that the revenue from the *mamālīk-i barr u baḥr*, that is, the territory of Fārs, was 200 *tūmens* of gold (دویست تومان زراز توفیرات مقاطعة برویجر) and that the jewelry tax on the coast was 1,500 *man* of pearls. In another place (p. 349), he says that the taxes for three years, 1298-1300 A.D., for this region amounted to 1,000 *tūmens* of gold (هزار تومان مقاطعه) and that a charge of 45 *tūmens* was levied against Šīrāz. As for Ḥamd Allāh (p. 170), he records that the revenue from *bilād-i Fārs* was 287 *tūmens* and 1,200 *dīnār-i rābiḥ*, and the tax of Šīrāz was 450,000 *dīnārs*. This would agree with Vaṣṣāf. Furthermore, Vaṣṣāf records that 185 *dīnārs* = 61 *dīnārs* and four *dānaqs*, a pair of oxen, and seed = were collected from each *faddān* of arable land leased from the treasury and that in years of famine the government valued at six *dīnārs* a donkey-load of wheat that could not be found for 30 *dīnārs*. There is no doubt that these calculations were made in silver *dīnārs*. In addition, the “100 *tūmens* of gold” (p. 384, هر سال زیاده از صد تومان زرم توجیهات آنست) regarding the expenses of Šanbī-Ġāzānī, and the 20,000 *tūmens* from the *zakāt* tax introduced by Ġazan, of which four *tūmens* of gold (p. 389) were sent to the province of Fārs and another amount (p. 39, “12 *tūmens* of gold”) was sent to Mecca, must all have been silver *dīnārs* shown at their gold equivalent.

During the time of Timūr, *tūmens* of silver money were calculated according to Ilḥānīd *dīnārs* of six *dirhams* each and were circulated with *dīnārs* called *kepekī dīnārs*, which were named after the Chagatay Ḥān Kepek (1310-26 A.D.).⁹ {Ruy Gonzales de} Clavijo

9. Pétis de la Croix, E. Quatremère, P. Saveliev and Charmay, and J. von Hammer-Purgstall read the name of this *ḥān* as “Kopak /Küpek”. Quatremère referred to a MS. in which he found the form كپك marked with the vowel sound *ḍamma* (*Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque*

Nationale du Roi}, XIV {which is the work *Maṭla’ al-sa’dain* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Samarqandī, 1843}, 74, but in Ibn Baṭṭūṭa {*al-Riḥla*} (turkish trans. {Istanbul, 1333-1335}), I, 418, this name has been combined with the word at the end of the verse فی ای صورة ماشا رکبک, so it must certainly be read “Kebek”,

indicates {*Narrative of the Embassy to the Court of Tamerlane at Samarcand, A.D. 1403-1406*, trans. from the Spanish by Le Strange [London, 1928]} that the *dirhams* (aspres) that Tīmūr demanded from the Christians in the city of Sivas and the town of Pekkeric {or Bogarich} near Erzincan were equal to half a Castilian real¹⁰.

These *dirhams* must also have been the same as the Tabrīz *dirhams*. In addition, the money that Tīmūr demanded from Mardin is described by Ibn ‘Arabšāh as “100 *tūmens* of silver *dirhams*, each *tūmen* being 60,000 (*dirhams*)”¹¹.

Accounts in *tūmens* of *kepekī dīnārs* are found in all histories and documents from the time of Tīmūr¹².

III

The history of Ilhānid coinage and the changes in its values and the role of gold in these changes are subjects which essentially have not been addressed. Rašid al-Dīn, in reference to Ġazan’s reform of the coinage, says that both gold and silver money were based on a certain standard. According to certain documents in our possession, the gold standard prevailed throughout the Mongol monetary system even though it was used less than silver. While studying the {various} crises and revolutions, and the changes in the coins and their values {which took place} under these circumstances, we certainly must examine the coins themselves and conduct chemical analyses. This is the most reliable approach, but one which has not yet been attempted.

In the event, we know that the Ilhānids experienced financial crises during the reigns of Arġun and Geiĥatu. Ilhānid historians provide considerable information on this. The material written on this subject at the end of the Ilhānid period must be used with caution, however.

It was the custom of Orientals to be unanimous in their praise of a contemporary ruler or statesman and to refer to the time prior to him as a period of terrible conditions. This contrast is always exaggerated. Ĥamd Allāh says that conditions in Anatolia were extremely bad before the appearance of Šāhib Faĥr al-Dīn Qazvīnī and only he was able to rectify the situation and, thus, Anatolia became the envy of other countries (*Ta’rīḥ-i*

that is, “Kepeĥ”. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa adds that the wife of Özbek Ĥān had such a name, which he vocalizes as “Kepek” and translates as كعك . Furthermore, Schiltberger writes the name of Toktamiš’s son Kebek as “Tchebek” {*Reisebuch*, Eng. trans. as *The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger . . . 1396-1427* [London, 1879]} and it is written as كيبك on some coins (Ch. Frähn, *Über die Münzen der Chane vom Ulus Dschutschi’s {oder des Goldenen Horde* [St Petersburg and Leipzig, 1832]}, p. 33.

10. Šaraf al-Dīn al-Yazdī, *Zafernāme* (Calcutta, 1887-1888), II, 561, hereinafter referred to as ZN; Quatremère, *Notices et extraits*, XIV, 74, 303; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Samarqandī, {*Maṭla’ al-sā’dain*}, Esad Efendi MS. 2128, fols. 311b, 312b.

11. {‘*Ajā’ib al-maḡdūr*}, edition of the Russian Academy, pp. 140, 149.

12. Egyptian edition of 1305 {Cairo}, pp. 48-49,

فطلب منه في مقابلة الامان من الدراهم الفضة مائة تومان
كل تومان ستون الفا .

Guzīda, pub. ed. {London, 1910}, p. 485 « وملك رومرا محسود ممالك كردايد ». On the other hand, al-Aqsarāyī and the sources used by the author {Müneccim-başı} of *Jāmi' al-duwal* state that this man simply brought Iranian, Armenian and Georgian officials to Anatolia and that he continuously plundered and completely crushed the people. While praising Ġazan, Rašīd al-Dīn describes the disorders and financial crises of the reigns of Arġun and Geiḥatu and refers very somberly to the economic life of their reigns. It would appear from a study of the coinage and records dating before Ġazan that it would certainly not be correct to generalize about the 40 years of the Ilḥānids prior to that ruler as Barthold has done, for he was deceived by Rašīd al-Dīn. At that time, different coins were found in Rūm (Anatolia), Kars, Kirmān, Georgia, and Mardin; and according to Rašīd al-Dīn, the Rūm *akcha* was considered to be the soundest of all of them, but the specie holding the highest position was Mongol gold. Ġazan's monetary reform did not result in a completely new monetary system. He struck gold coins of a high standard of purity to replace the debased money of the time of Arġun and, especially, Geiḥatu, and other gold coins of poor quality, like the gold of Hurmuz. He also replaced the debased silver with pure silver *dirhams* and *dīnārs*. In addition, he eliminated the autonomous provinces along with their separate coinage and made all currencies uniform. Apart from these measures, the monetary system was more or less as it had been. Before and after Ġazan, there was a certain contention in Iran between the *dirham* and *dīnār* system used in the *uluses* of Chaġatay and Jochi and the "Ilḥānid system", which had originated from it and from the systems which had prevailed in Iran before the Mongols. In this respect, Ġazan merely gave special attention to Iranian and Ilḥānid traditions. Furthermore, the striking of *durusts* weighing 100 gold *miṭqāls* might not be an innovation peculiar to Ġazan. Such *durusts* were known in other places, like Kashmir¹³. After Tīmūr occupied Damascus, he struck gold and silver *tankakjas* {sic} (تنكجات زرونقره) weighing 10, 50, and 100 *miṭqāls* and distributed them throughout his state¹⁴.

The Byzantines called the Ilḥānid silver *dīnār* the "casaneus". It was named after Ġazan because he fixed the value of this coinage. The doubt about the value of Ilḥānid silver money before Ġazan does not prove there was a loss of confidence in the value of this money among the Mongols {Togan's meaning here is unclear: "*Gazandan evvel Ilhanī tip gümüš para kıymetinin tereddüdü Moğollardaki kıymetinin tereddüdünü göstermez*"}. The reign of Arġun had witnessed the development of an Ilḥānid commercial fleet. Sometimes the government tax accounts in Vaṣṣāf are all shown as "gold". On the subject of the circulation of paper money during the reign of Geiḥatu, Vaṣṣāf says that this money was issued as the equivalent of gold (p. 272, چاورد عوض زر روان (کرداند) and that, in place of this paper money, gold money was taken from the treasury for transactions abroad and given to representatives of the southern Iranian commercial fleet which did business with foreign countries (p. 273, وتجار بحار ملك فارس راکه

13. ZN, II, 164,

امرای دیوان اعلیٰ مقرر فرموده اندکه سی هزار اسب و صد هزار درست زر هر ایک بوزن دو

مقال ونیم از اکشمیر نسق نمایند.

14. *Ibid*, II, 336.

We shall cite below a source concerning مسافران و مجتازان بلاد یاغی اند زربدهند و چاو از ایشان ستانند). the collection of taxes in the form of gold money in Anatolia during the reign of Batu. From one passage in Pachymeres, it appears that, during the period of Ġazan, transactions with the Byzantines were in gold, that is, in Ġazan's gold currency ¹⁵.

As far as we can tell, the standard of value in the commerce and in the Mongol and Uighur tax systems in Ilhānid territory was exactly the same as that in {the rest of} Mongol territory. The market was in the hands of Mongol “*ortaq*s” {partnerships, companies} which conducted thriving commercial relations with the Oriental countries. Rašid al-Dīn mentions that banking was controlled by these *ortaq*s, that they gave credit to merchants of modest means who became their virtual slaves, and that only in Ġazan's time did Muslims have any hope of being saved from this humiliation (fol. 330b,

کسانی که درین مدتها زر بسود میدادند اکثر مغول و اوویغور بودند و هرآینه مدبران چون زر بسود گیرند مقبل چگونگی توانند شد و عاقبة الامر از ادا عاجز می آمدند و بازن و چه در ذل اسیری ایشان گرفتار می ماندند. و همین معدلت پادشاه اسلام خلد ملکه [i.e., Ġazan] آن مذلت از اهل اسلام مندفع کشت ... و ربا و معاملات نامنصفانه کمتر شد و یقین حاصل شد که زودتر بکلی آن شیوه برافتد ...).

We know that among these *ortaq*s were men who worked in the Mongol government and that they used the *bālīš*. Furthermore, one must assume that the paper money (*ch'ao*) of the eastern Mongols was exchanged among them. In my opinion, the paper money of the eastern Mongols must have been in circulation among the Mongols and Uighurs in Ilhānid territory before 1294 A.D., as it was in the Golden Horde. If not, Geiĥatu and the great Mongol leaders would certainly not have ventured to put into the market money which had never been in circulation. It was only as a result of the gradually spreading financial crisis during the reign of Geiĥatu that these banknotes suddenly multiplied and local Iranians who were not Mongols could have gone bankrupt when forced to use them. The currency reform carried out by Ġazan was, in fact, aimed at reforming the financial system, but after his death the coinage returned to the previous systems in the various Mongol countries, as was the case in the Golden Horde (when the silver *dirhams* of one-half *miṭqāl* reverted to one-third *miṭqāl*). Around the second quarter of the fourteenth century A.D., the financial system of the Ilhānids of Iran experienced a new period of crisis. The standard of value became confused and probably changed from gold to silver. At the end of the period of Öljeitü, importance was given only to the form and standard of silver coins. In Abū Sa'īd's reign, gold coinage completely lost its continuity. During this period, gold *dīnārs* of a half *miṭqāl* (2.125 gr.), one *miṭqāl* (4.250 gr.), two *miṭqāls* (8.500 gr.), and three *miṭqāls* (12.750 gr.), were used. Later, however, the weights of these gold coins became so unreliable that sometimes it was not possible to determine if a *dīnār* were one or two *miṭqāls*. The discontinuity in the weights of Abū Sa'īd's gold money can clearly be seen in the following list [in grams] provided from Markov's work (*Djelairidskihi moneti*, p. LXXXI) :

15. G. Bratianu, *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la Mer Noire au XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1929), pp. 322-323.

1.101	5.600	6.804	7.970	8.350	8.650	10.300
2.125	5.700	7.257	8.100	8.359	8.680	
3.045	6.200	7.300	8.164	8.375	8.900	
4.017	6.250	7.450	8.175	8.488	9.265	
4.211	6.500	7.900	8.229	8.610	10.200	

We must search for the secrets of the fall of the Ilhānid state not on the romances of Baġdād Ḥātūn and Dilšād Ḥātūn, as even some European scholars have done by following the medieval Iranian historians, but in certain economic changes such as the disappearance of the old Mongol standard in both Iran and the Dašt-i Qīpchaq. This was no doubt caused by the breaking of the economic bonds between the eastern and western Mongol states as a result of events in Central Asia. The most important factors in this were Tīmūr, who united most of the three Mongol nations {*ulus*} toward the end of the century, and the formation of the Tīmūrid state. I do not wish to exaggerate this crisis, however, despite these great political changes. Those who went from the provinces of the Ilhānid state to Mecca in order to perform the pilgrimage were regarded as the richest men in all the Muslim countries. They even filled the mouths of sleeping Arabs with silver *dirhams*. When they arrived, the Meccan money changers lowered the price of exchangeable currencies and their money fetched a high price¹⁶. The unparalleled silver money crisis which began in Egypt in the second half of the fourteenth century A.D.¹⁷ did not appear with the same force in any of the *hānates* or *beyliks* within the Ilhānid state.

IV

When one examines the material on the financial system, coinage, credit, taxes and state commercial affairs of the Mongols, and especially the Ilhānids, one is struck by how it all resembles contemporary European systems rather than those of other Muslim peoples, above all the Arabs. Among the noteworthy practices in this respect were that the ruler was able to ensure the fineness of his coinage and, as Rašīd al-Dīn says (fol. 323a), retain the minting of money as a government monopoly by placing symbols on the coinage which were difficult for ordinary people to duplicate. In addition, commercial companies called “*ortags*” carried out transactions by means of “checks”, government “letters of credit” {*havale*} and patents {*berat*}. Mongol and Uighur capitalists, who monopolized the business of giving credit to merchants and other people, exploited the use of interest like modern bankers and enslaved small merchants to themselves. Furthermore, during the periods of Arġun, Geiġatu and Ġazan in particular, the tax problems of the province of Fārs, for example, and the questions of raising or lowering its

16. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, C. Defrémery and B. Sanguinetti ed. {Paris, 1853-1859}, I, 403, Turkish ed. {Istanbul, 1333-1335}, I, 184.

17. Sauvaire, “Matériaux”, {*JA*, 7th series, 19 [1882]}, I, 302-317 (information cited from al-Maqrīzī).

taxes were examined by commissioners or a special council in the presence of the sultan. They carefully drew up accounts (budgets) which were refined down to not only the *tümen* and *dīnār* but also to the *dirham* and *dānaq* (for information on these matters, see Vaṣṣāf, pp. 236, 349, 363). Altogether, we could claim that, in the Mongol period, a radical change took place in the economic thought of Iran and probably the entire Muslim world. This is quite clear in the works of Ilhānid historians like Rašīd al-Dīn, ‘Abd Allāh Kāšānī, Ḥamd Allāh, and Vaṣṣāf. The latter two authors tried to learn about economic conditions in earlier times as well as their own. According to both writers, if the revenue of a country were high, this indicated that its government was just. While discussing the sultanate of Ġazan, Vaṣṣāf provides information on the revenue of earlier Muslim rulers (pp. 440-446), citing figures that he found in Qudāma b. Ja‘far {apparently his *Kitāb al-Ḥarāj*}, the *Fārsnāma* [of Ibn al-Balḥī], and other works. According to Vaṣṣāf, the revenue of Iraq during the reign of Caliph ‘Umar was 160 million *dirhams* because of his justice and efficient organization, but during the reign of Mu‘āwiya it dropped to 50 million because of his oppressive régime and under al-Ḥajjāj fell to 17 million. Ḥamd Allāh recommended looking at the budget figures of a country when it was governed by ‘Umar in order to learn if he were oppressive, as the Shī‘īs said, or just, as the Sunnis claimed (*Nuzhat al-qulūb*, p. 133). Neither of the aforesaid writers had the necessary means, of course, to learn the financial conditions under the early dynasties. Consequently, Ḥamd Allāh, for example, mistakenly believed that accounts were kept in gold in Sāsānid, ‘Abbāsīd and Seljuk times and tried to prove that the world was gradually coming to an end. Nevertheless, the ideas of these two writers about the special historical facts that could be learned from a study of economics are worthy of note.

‘Alā-i Tabrīzī’s work entitled *Sa‘ādatnāma*, the manuscript of which, as I mentioned, was found in Konya, is very important. As Kātib Chelebī says, this book was composed in the year 700 {1300-01 A.D.} on the orders of Ġazan’s vizir, Sa‘d al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Tāj al-Dīn ‘Alī al-Sāwajī, in order to teach his son, Šaraf al-Dīn, the science of finance and accounting {*maliye, istīfā ilmini*}. The second part of this work, which mainly concerns the art of accounting, is very important (fols 35-95). Here we find an explanation of the financial terms used in Vaṣṣāf. According to what we understand from this book, the Mongol financial system of the Ilhānids was administered in Arabic by Iranian comptrollers {*mustawfīs*}. The author mentions seven ledgers which were used to keep track of income and expenses (دفتر جامع، دفتر مقرر، دفتر اوارجه، دفتر خرج مقرر دیوان، دفتر قانون، دفتر توجیحات ودفتر روزنامج) and indicates that they were recorded in Kāšān *tümens*. ‘Alā-i Tabrīzī wrote this work for beginning students of accounting. On folios 50a and 95a, the author recommends that those who wished to supplement this summary work should study his book entitled *Qānūn al-sa‘āda* (کتاب قانون السعادة که در استیفا مشتمل است بر اصول کلی وصد معظمت محاسبات). It is well-known that works on accounting problems were also written in the time of the Jalāyirids and Timūrids. Unfortunately, none of these works have come down to us. According to information provided by Kilisli Rifat and Ismail Saib, such a work written by ‘Iwād Falakābādī Ḥulwānī existed among the books of Halis Efendi. However, it was lost among the books and property sequestered and sold by

his heirs. This is especially to be regretted because this copy was in the author's own hand. ('Iwād Falakābādī was a contemporary of the lexicographer Fīrūzābādī. The authorization {*icazetname*} to teach linguistics that Fīrūzābādī gave to 'Iwād Falakābādī is recorded at the end of the copy of the *Takmilat Tāj al-luġa li-'l-Şuġānī*, MS. 1522 in the Köprülü Library. I am indebted to Kilisli Rifat for the information recorded in this manuscript). Nevertheless, it is very likely that similar works will be discovered in the libraries of Istanbul and Anatolia.

This work of 'Alā-i Tabrīzī was copied in the Anatolian writing style {*Anadolu yazısilel*} in 815 {1412-13 A.D.} in Bursa. Judging from the careful and accurate way in which it was written, it was undoubtedly copied by someone who specialized in Iranian İlḥānīd finances. This could indicate that the Ottoman government learned about financial affairs during its Bursa period from works composed at the time of the Mongols of Iran.

The disastrous effects that the nomadic Turkish tribes (among whom were very few true Mongols) had on the civilized countries in western Asia in the Mongol period are well-known. However, despite all the imprecations heaped upon them by their contemporary neighbors, we find that construction continued in western Asia and far outpaced whatever destruction occurred. Mongol rule resulted in the economic advancement and enrichment of Iran and Anatolia. We can prove this by means of the budgets and financial records from that time. Before the Mongols, Iran and Anatolia were in a state of economic anarchy. Every region had its own coinage and tax systems. This was a period of gradually intensifying financial crisis. In the Mongol period, the obstacles to the expansion of trade were eliminated. There was one monetary system, one method of taxation, and the same commercial laws and financial system prevailed everywhere. Before the Mongols, there was a crisis of silver coinage. For this reason, Islamic silver coins no longer travelled to Europe after the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. According to the research of Barthold, this silver crisis spread from the east to the west. The various phases of this silver money crisis can only be determined, however, by a chemical analysis of the coinage of the dynasties which ruled Iran and western Asia before the Mongols. Such an analysis has only been done so far, in 1926, in Baku on the coinage of the Şarvān-Şāhs in Āzarbāijān during the years 575-653 {1179-1255 A.D.}. Although this was a very fragmentary analysis, it showed clearly that the silver crisis worsened in the course of the century. The percentage of silver in the coinage for the aforesaid [*sic*] years was as follows : 10.755, 9.342, 3.083, 0.265, 1.551, 0.177¹⁸.

In order to end this crisis, gold coins began to be struck in the eleventh century A.D. in Anatolia, Syria and Iran. These coins were called “*dīnārs*” (or even *bizants*) because they were made on the Byzantine pattern. This, however, did not solve the monetary

18. *Izvestiya Azarbayjanskago Komiteta okhrani pamiataikov straini, isskusatava i prirodi* (= Azkomstaris), nr. 3 (1927), 59-62 {not further identified, Proceedings of the Āzarbāijān Committee for the protection of the monuments of the country, art and nature}.

crisis, because the main reasons for it were the conflicting economic needs of the Muslim countries, the gradually diminishing power of these countries and, in this respect, their inability to reach a political union. The great transformation that began in Mongolia at the beginning of the thirteenth century A.D. completely broke the barriers between the Far East and the Western countries. Economic and cultural contacts were immediately established in a rather revolutionary manner and became increasingly close. This transformation, which began in order to satisfy the needs of merchants from central and eastern Asia (Ḥwārazmians, Uighurs, Chinese) developed in its own natural way. From the very beginning, it stressed the importance of properly organizing international finances and commercial relations. This was truly the fruitful result of the efforts made by the Uighurs, Ḥitai, and other civilized elements (including the Turks and Tajiks from western Turkestan), rather than the nomadic Mongols, who actually were responsible for this transformation.

It is well-known that the influence of the Mongol-Uighur financial system was even felt in Egypt, which never fell under Mongol rule. The Ayyūbid *dirhams*, the content of which had been only one-half or one-third silver, were reformed in the reign of the Mamlūk Sultan Baybars and were struck with a silver content of 70 percent (*bunduqiyya, darāhim zāhiriyya*)¹⁹. The same influence was felt in India and later in Europe.

According to Professor Bratianu, it is very significant that the economic measures that regulated commercial relations in eastern, central and western Asia were coincident with the occupation of Beyoğlu (Pera {in Constantinople}) by the Latins. As the Mongols advanced toward the Bosphorus from both directions, close contacts were established between the Genoese and the Ilhānids of Iran on one hand, and between the Dašt-i Qipchaq Mongols and the Venetians on the other. For the Genoese, the caravan road going from Ayas at the port of Iskenderun to Tabrīz via Sivas, Erzincan, and Erzurum was important, although the lack of security on land made the sea route preferable²⁰. Customs duties were very light. W. Heyd has determined that for the journey between Ayas and Tabrīz a total of 203 *dirhams* in customs duties was paid for one animal-load of goods, of which 153 were given to the government and 50 to the Mongol (probably Qaramānid) brigands²¹ (in fact, it was paid to guards for protection from brigands, A. Togan)²². In 1276 A.D., the Genoese established a commercial consulate in Sivas (Gabire de Savasto)²³. A similar consulate was also opened in Tabrīz in 1304 A.D. According to Bratianu, the wealth of the country of the Mongols attracted the Italian merchants²⁴. The transfer of the Muslim center of commerce from Transoxiana to the

19. Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Nuqūd al-islāmiyya*, al-Jawā'ib ed. in *Talāḥa rasā'il* (Cairo, 1298), p. 14.

20. *Recherches*, pp. 158-159.

21. *Histoire du commerce du levant au moyen-âge* {1885; rpt. Paris, 1923}, II, 111.

22. Rašīd al-Dīn, fol. 322b,

بعد ازان فرمود (غاران) تادر تمامت ممالک راهها نهر موضع که بخوف باشد راه داران معین نشینند نهر چهار سردر ازکوش که بار بسته کاروان باشد نیم اقچه و بهر دوسر شتر نیم اقچه باسم باز ستانند و قطعاً زیادت نکیرند.

23. Bratianu, *Recherches*, pp. 166-198.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 182.

region of the Black Sea, namely, to the Ilhānid capital, Tabrīz, and Mongol actions which were favorable to people of various religions, including Christians and Jews, encouraged the development of commercial relations between Europe and the Mongols. Because of their rivalry with Egypt and the Mamlūks, the Ilhānids gave considerable attention to improving relations with European countries. The special gifts they sent to the kings of Sicily, France and England were also significant for the development of trade.

Some of the Genoese in Tabrīz were in the service of the Mongols. The Oriental scholars at Marāḡeh benefited from the Genoese who, in turn, learned about charting the seas from these scholars. The Ilhānids gave the Genoese positions in their navy. In 1289 A.D., Argun and his chief vizir, the Jew Sa'd al-Dawla, sent Genoese master craftsmen to Baghdad and instructed them to build ships that could be used at Aden to prevent Egyptian trade with India²⁵. Furthermore, the Genoese equipped ships for Argun to use against the pirates in the Quban region and the Caucasus. Trade in the Black Sea and with the Kingdom of Trebizond grew in importance. There was an economic agreement between Tabrīz and Trebizond. By means of the Genoese, commercial relations were established between Tabrīz and the Crimea. There exist Italian promissory notes {*senet*} that were used between Tabrīz and Kefe {Theodosia} in 1289 A.D.²⁶ Notarized documents belonging to the Genoese at Kefe have come down to us and generally show that the Mongol economic system was a compelling factor in the great development of Black Sea trade. An observation of Barthold's is noteworthy with regard to the history of Ilhānid-Mongol-European relations. As a symbol of Iranian influence at that time, he has drawn attention to the manner in which the word *chek* was more widely adopted in the Middle Ages by Europeans than by Muslims outside Iran²⁷. This word entered Europe not according to its Arabic pronunciation of *ṣakk* (صك), but according to its Persian pronunciation of *chek* (چك). The use of this Persian form in European languages before the Mongol period is unknown. The advance of the Turkmen tribes toward Constantinople via the Ankara-Eskişehir-Edrimit, Eskişehir-Iznik, and Bursa roads was a consequence of the economic relations between Iran and Europe that developed in the Mongol period.

V

The part of Anatolia that was directly under Mongol administration consisted of the provinces to the east of a line running from present-day Zonguldak to Bolu, Eskişehir, Kütahya, Afyon, Beyşehir, Larende {Karaman} and Mersin. Before the appearance of

25. Bratianu, *Recherches*, p. 188; G. Ferrand, (Note) « Une navigation européenne dans l'océan indien au XIV^e siècle, » *JA*, 11th series, 20 (1922), 307.

26. Bratianu, *Recherches*, p. 189.

27. Barthold, *Musulmanski Mir* {St Petersburg, 1922}, p. 25; Iran, Tashkent, pp. 30-32 {reference unclear, perhaps the same work}.

Hülegü, the Seljuks of Rûm were subject to the *hâns* of the Golden Horde. For the people of Anatolia, Batu was the ruler of the world (“*pādišāh-i rûy-i zemīn*”) and they paid taxes to his officials²⁸. At first, the Mongols left the financial and economic affairs of Anatolia to an autonomous governor {*muhtar*}; but after the establishment of the Ilhānid state, they gradually reduced his autonomy.

The Mongols struck coins in Anatolia as early as the time of Hülegü. Under the Ilhānids, all the mines there were made a state monopoly. Nevertheless, it appears that the Mongol economic system was not imposed in that country until 1277 A.D., at the start of Abaqa’s Egyptian campaign. After Abaqa returned from this campaign in the same year and went to his summer quarters in Ala-Doğ in eastern Anatolia, he appointed prince Qongqurtai governor-general of “*mamālik-i rûm*” and sent Şāhib Şams al-Dīn Juvainī there as well (17 September) to undertake public works, win the hearts of the people, and organize the tax system. Commenting on this, Rašīd al-Dīn states that until that time there had been no special tax {*tamğa*} for *mamālik-i rûm* and that Şāhib Şams al-Dīn Juvainī imposed one for the first time²⁹. The Mongol forms of taxation consisted of the following : 1) *qalan* levied on land, 2) *qubchur* levied on livestock in the territories of the nomads, and 3) *rusūmāt* {customs charges} and *tamğa* and *bāj* {taxes, tolls} in the modern sense, all of which were levied on city dwellers, especially the merchants.

In addition to the material on Mongol taxes collected by Quatremère (*Histoire des Mongols* {Paris, 1836}, p. 256) and Barthold (“Ani”, pp. 24-44), let me mention that Juvainī provides information on the decisions that were made concerning taxation upon Möngke Qa’an’s accession to the throne on pages 78-79 of the third volume of his still incompletely published work and that Rašīd al-Dīn discusses this as well on pages 313-314 of the Blochet edition of his work. It appears from these and other references, from the decrees of the Golden Horde, and from the documents concerning commercial transactions found in East Turkistan in the Mongol period (W. W. Radloff began the publication of these documents and S. Je. Malov completed this task in 1928, *Uigurische Sprachdenkmäler* {Leningrad}) that there was a uniform tax system in the Mongol domain. The state tax, which was levied according to the wealth of the people, was in the form of money (*qalan*, *qīlan*) in settled areas — 1-11 *dīnārs* in China and Transoxiana, 1-10 *dīnārs* in Iran (according to Rašīd al-Dīn, 1-7) — and livestock, one percent, from the nomads (*qubchur*). From the Uighur documents, it seems that the terms *qalan* or *qīlan* for the taxes on arable lands and gardens and *qubchur* for the taxes taken from nomads had preserved their old meanings in Turkistan (Radloff-Malov, *qalan*, pp. 17, 30-32, 50,

28. Al-Aqsarāyī, *Musāmarat al-ahbār*, Ayasofya MS. 3143, p. 87, باتجو نوین و نوینان، دیگر انکورک و خراج نوین و غیرهم از حضرت پادشاه روی زمین باتو ایلیچیان آمده اند و نوین اعظم پاجوری رسد و یرلیغ آورده اند که باقیاتی زر که بخزانہ پادشاه دادی بود بر سانند .

29. Rašīd al-Dīn, fol. 251b, صاحب شمس الدین

راجہت استالت رعیت وقہر اعدا وضبط مملکت روم فرستاد صاحب انجارت و شہرہای خراب راجال عمارت باز آورد و در ممالک روم تمغاکي معہود کی نبود بنہاد . In the copy sent to me by my colleague Molla Şadr al-Dīn Taškandī, which he made from the Mašhad MS, we find « و در ممالک روم » p. 47. « تمغا کی معروف نبود بنہاد »

56, 131; *qubchur* [according to Radloff, *qopchir*], pp. 9, 57, 90-92, 111, 146). The term *qubchur* was used to mean both of these taxes among the Ilhānids, as was *qalan/qilan* in the Golden Horde (Rašīd al-Dīn, fol. 318a; {Abdullah Battal, “Sāhib Giray Han yarliḡi” [The *yarliḡi* of Şāhib Giray Hān]}, *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 2 {1928}, 94). According to Rašīd al-Dīn, the *qubchur* of the villagers was collected twice a year; the first within twenty days following the vernal equinox, and the second within twenty days following the autumnal equinox. The *qubchur* of the nomads was collected at the beginning of the {Persian new} year, that is, within twenty days of the vernal equinox. Rašīd al-Dīn uses *qubchur* as a synonym for *tamḡa* with the meaning “*harāj wa wujūh al-‘ain*”, which corresponds to Blochet’s “*capitation impôt*” (p. 314, note). In ‘Alā-i Tabrīzī, the taxes that are the equivalent of the *tamḡa* are also generally called *qubchur*. While describing the “Avarice” {sic} account book, he tells how different kinds of taxes were recorded in it (fol. 90a)

حق آنست کی مقرر اموال هر جا اعتبار یست بعضی آنست کی بادراک ارتفاع تعلق دارد آنرا بوقت ادراک در وجه نهد و بعضی آنست کی معاملات تعلق دارد همچنانک تمغا کی آنرا بقسط توان دروجه نهاد و بعضی آنست کی از رعایا بدو سه قسط می توان ستدن چنانک قوبچور کی آنرا بنسبت آن قسط دروجه باید نهاد و تا ضرری برعامل ورعایا نیفتد و حسارتی حادث نشود .

In his description of *defter-i müfred*, he explains how « حساب مال وقوبچور ولایتی » and « حساب تمغای ولایتی » were to be recorded in this account book. Prior to Ġazan, the Mongols not only collected *tamḡa* from city dwellers, but they also wanted *qubchur*. Rašīd al-Dīn reports, for example, that before Ġazan the Mongols were very oppressive in their demands for overdue taxes from the people of Tabrīz, that the Mongol “ambassador” demanded *qubchur* from them in addition to these outstanding taxes, and that this caused people to flee their homeland (fol. 314a (واضعاف قوبچور بتمهدازایشان بستند)). Ġazan abolished such irregularities. He ordered that only the *tamḡa* tax be collected—in somewhat greater amount—from the city dwellers and that they be exempted from the *qubchur* tax. Ḥamd Allāh attributed this policy to the vizir, Ḥwāja Šadr al-Dīn³⁰. Later, in the reign of Abū Sa‘īd, this law was usually not respected. Indeed, Abū Sa‘īd had to distribute an edict {*ferman*} throughout the realm forbidding the *amīrs* from collecting both *tamḡa* and *qubchur*. He had inscriptions to this effect made in stone and iron and they were placed in public view. Such edicts were found in Persian on the wall of the city mosque of Ani and in Armenian on the gate of that city’s fortress. These edicts have been studied by N. V. Khanykov, M. Brosset, and Barthold. Another copy of such an edict in Anatolia is found on the gate of the citadel of Ankara. An unreadable photograph of it was published by Mübarek Galib (*Ankara* {Istanbul, 1341}, II, plate 2) and

30. *Ta’riḡ-i Guzīda* :

و چون اکثر بلاد عراق بواسطه مقررى قبيچور خراب شده بود و مردم جلاً وطن کرده بمرتبه که در قزوین نماز جماعت جمعه حاصل نمی شد خواجه صدر الدین قبيچور را از شهرها برداشت و تمغا مکرر کرد و ازین تدبیر مال مضاعف حاصل می شد و مردم در اسایش و راهها ایمن شده .

as in the Ayasofya MS. 3072. In the *Gibb Memorial Series* edition, which is a facsimile edition of a MS. having many gaps and mistakes, « علفخوار » is written instead of « قبيچور » and « بلاد عجم » instead of « بلاد عراق » p. 542.

Q. de Jerphanion (*Mélanges d'Archéologie Anatolienne* [Beirut, 1928]). Mübarek says that he could not read the inscription (p. 4, note). A photograph that was later taken by P. Wittek was generally legible, however. The Mongol government in Anatolia set up this inscription in accordance with the order of the *pādišāh-i a'zam ḥallada 'llāhu mulkahu* on *awwal-i ādār*, 730, or 12 April 1330 [*sic*, *awwal-i ādār* = 1 March, on this date cf. Wittek, "Ankara'da bir İlhanī kitabesi" [An İlhanid inscription in Ankara], *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası*, 1 [1931], 161-164, who reads this passage slightly differently}. It states that the people of Ankara (Ankūriyya) had previously complained about the collection of the *qubchur*, that henceforth only a fixed city *tamğa* would be recorded in the account books (نقود جنس مال که در دفتر ثبت کنند که تمغا شهر باشد) and that those who took « قوبچور و تمغا محدث » ، « قوبچور و عشر محدث » would be cursed by God. It ends with the Koranic verse « فن بدله بعدما سمعه ». These last words are also found in the version of Ġazan's edict cited by Rašīd al-Dīn (fol. 318a,

مأخوذات تمغا بموجبی که هر يك على حده مناسب هر ولایت بر ظهر نوشته شده بر لوح نویسند و بر در هر موضعی کی بدان تمغا مخصوص باشد هیند تابدان موجب بقسط برسانند هیچ آفریده بدعت و رسم محدث هیند و مقاطعان بهانه آنک تمغا زیادت کرده ایم زیادت از مأخوذات لاجرم هر کس کی تغییر و تبدیلی کند در لعنت : fol. 319a ؛ نستاند و رسم محدث هیند و سخط خالق و خلاق باشد فن بدله بعد ما سمعه فانما اثمه على الدين يبد لونه ان الله سمیع علم).

The tax systems, like the economic systems that were established in the Mongol period, remained in effect within the borders of the great Mongol state until the end. *Tamğa* survived in Turkey as *damga* and in Russian as *tamujni*, both of which had the same meanings as the original Mongol term. The words *qılan* and *qıla* have survived among the Turks of Āzarbāijān and the Bashkurts with the meaning of "land tax". We know from an inscription found on the gate on the market side of the great mosque in Niğde that the system of collecting *qubchur* in sheep continued in Anatolia until the time of Mehmet II. I learned from Fuad Köprülü that this inscription had previously been published by Halil Edhem in *Tarih-i 'Osmānī Encümeni Mecmuası* { "Karaman oğulları hakkında vesai-k-i mahkūke" [Inscriptions of the Qaramānids] (nr. 14 [1328], 873). It was installed in 1469-1470 (874 A.H.) on the orders of the last Qaramānid *hāns*, Pir-Ahmet and Qāsim. The late Ottoman historians describe the Qaramānids as constituting a Turkmen state which struggled against Mongol rule in Anatolia in the most forceful manner, but their own histories (Şikāri {see Rudi Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* [Bloomington, Indiana, 1983], pp. 145-147}) state that they were, in fact, subject to the Mongols and were more friendly and loyal to them than anyone else. The latest documents concerning the Mongol *qubchur* system belong to them. It is rather curious that the Niğde inscription is in Persian and in virtually the same spirit as the aforesaid well-known Mongol tax edict {apparently Ġazan's} and the other inscriptions, and that the İlhanids again used the term *bid'a* (وقبچور اغنام که ازین بدعتها) for this non-canonical method of taxation and cursed those who did not respect the edict (ومن سعی فی ابطاله فعليه لعنة الله وملائكته). In Turkistan, the *tamğa* and *qubchur* taxes were described by other terms, but I think this occurred after the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries A.D.

VI

The geography of Ḥamd Allāh, which was written in 1336 A.D. and entitled *Nuzhat al-qulūb*, contains the budget for 1336 for all Ilhānid countries except Ḥurāsān. The section of this budget concerning Asia Minor is very important, for it shows specifically which provinces and cities of this region were, in fact, subject to the Mongols in the Ilhānid period. It is difficult to use this text because the author was not consistent in listing the cities in alphabetical order; and in the various manuscripts of this work these names are frequently misspelled. Furthermore, it is not possible to get a clear understanding of this material from Le Strange's edition or translation of this work. Consequently, I tried to determine properly the information on Anatolia by comparing the manuscripts of *Nuzhat al-qulūb* found in Istanbul. Perhaps one day I shall publish my fully collated text of this budget. But for now, I shall give only the figures it contains and try to list the provinces in geographical order instead of alphabetical order. The texts that I used were the following :

- 1) Nuruosmaniye MS. 2992, copied by someone from Işfahān in 1080 {1669-1670 A.D.}, = A; 2) Nuruosmaniye MS. 3036, = B; 3) the Bombay edition of 1893 A.D., = C; 4) Ayasofya MS. 2131, a fine copy made by a certain 'Alī Tabrīzī in 1072 {1661-1662 A.D.}, = D; 5) Büyük Müze Library MS. 534, incomplete, = E; 6) Fatih Camii MS. 4518, a fine copy dated 887 {1482-1483 A.D.}, = F; 7) Le Strange edition and translation in the *Gibb Memorial Series*, = G and GT, respectively; 8) the copy of Reisülküttab Mustafa Efendi found in the Evkaf Müzesi, MS. 575, = H; 9) Esad Efendi MS. 2505, dated 1229 {1814 A.D.}, = I; 10) and the Lala Ismail Efendi MS. 230 in the Hamidiye collection, dated 1008 {1599-1600 A.D.}, = J. Among the other works that were used here was F. Taeschner's *Das anatolische Wegenetz* (Leipzig, 1924), = Taesch.

In addition to the material that Ḥamd Allāh provides on central and eastern Anatolia, which he calls "*mamālik-i rūm*", I have also included his data on regions that now lie wholly or partially in Turkey, namely, Greater Armenia and Aḥlāt, Lesser Armenia, Diyār Bakr and Diyār Rabī'a.

According to Ḥamd Allāh, it appears that the general tax bill for *mamālik-i rūm* was 3,300,000 *dīnārs*. Part of this amount was levied from certain provinces as shown below :

	<i>dīnārs</i>		<i>dīnārs</i>
1) Erzurum (ارزن الروم)	222,000	3) Bayburt ³²	21,000
2) Tercan ³¹	15,000	4) Erzincan	332,000

31. C : شهره ; F : ذیرجان ; D : دیرجان ;
ترجان دیرجان , Taesch., II, 8, دیوجان

32. Thusly, in B; in A, D, H : باهرت ;
in C : بایرت .

	<i>dinārs</i>		<i>dinārs</i>
5) Karahisari Kuğuniye ³³	blank	13) Gab ⁴¹	21,100
6) Kemah ³⁴	435	14) Karahisari Behram Şah ⁴²	11,600
7) Harput ³⁵	215,000	15) كدوك ⁴³	16,500
8) اراك ? ³⁶	10,800	16) Toz-Ağaç ⁴⁴	90,500
9) Divriği ³⁷	40,300 ³⁸	17) Kır Şehri	57,000 ⁴⁵
10) Sivas	not shown	18) Karahisar ber sih merhelei	
11) Niksar	187,000 ³⁹	Kaysariyya ⁴⁶	25,000
12) Kumenat ⁴⁰	14,000		

33. بحدود اقمهر ارزنجان. This is certainly *Asie Mineure, description géographique, historique et archéologique* [Paris, 1862], Turkish ed. {Istanbul, 1339-1340}, III, 114. Cf. *Bazm u razm*, pp. 198, 279, 296.

41. According to Le Strange, the “Gab” between Tokat and Zile. Münecim-başı, *Jāmi' al-duwal*, II, Esad Efendi MS. 2103, fol. 283 : والبيجاق نويين في ناحية كراب من توقات .

42. Taesch., I, 243. Subject to Çorum north of Yozgat. Cf. *Bazm u razm* pp. 253, 527.

43. According to Le Strange the “Gaduk” north of Kayseri. Cf. *Bazm u razm*, pp. 300, 385, 505.

44. Thusly, G; A, B, D : طور اغاچ ; C : طورغاچ . According to Le Strange, it is next to Hacı Bektaş between Ankara and Kayseri or near Afyon Karahisar. A place with this name near Akşehir is mentioned regarding the uprising of Jimrī (oral communication from Mükrimin Halil Yinanç). Cf. Ibn Bibi, {*al-Awāmir al-'alā'iyya*, Persian abridgement in} Th. Houtsma ed., {*Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjucides* (Leiden, 1889-1902)}, IV, 281.

45. H, 27,000 *dinārs*.

46. According to Le Strange and Taeschner, Develü Karahisar. Münecim-başı, *Jāmi' al-duwal*, II, Esad Efendi MS. 2103, fol. 384b, قلعة دولو بقرب قيسارية, 385b,

which is mentioned on p. 534 of {‘Azīz b. Ardaşir Astarābādī’s} *Bazm u razm* {Istanbul, 1928} (probably also on pp. 313, 317, 475, 477). This would be at the border {?} of اشقر اوره سي between Erzincan and Sivas. See Taesch., II, 2, 8. Le Strange believes it to be Şebin Karahisar. According to Ahmet Tevhit, *Meskūkāt-i islāmiyye katalogu* {Istanbul, 1321}, IV, 439, who cites Aşık Chelebī (*Manāzir al-'awālim*, Ayasofya MS. 3466, fol. 234b), and Halil Edhem, {“Merzifonda Pervāne Mu‘in al-Dīn Süleymān namına bir kitābe” [An inscription in Merzifon in the name of Pervāne Mu‘in al-Dīn Süleymān]}, *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası*, 7 {1333}, nr. 43, p. 49, كوگونيا = قره حصار شرقی .

34. Thusly, G; C : كاخ .

35. G : حمريوت ، حريرت ، خرپوت ; C : سرپرت ; H : حررت .

36. It is stated آپش ازفرات وهوايش بسردى ماييل حاصلش غلة واندىك ميوهباشد . In many MSS, this city’s tax is confused with that of Ermenak, which follows it., e.g., C.

37. Thusly, G; A, D, H : دو برلو ; C : رويركى .

38. D : چهل هزار دينار : .

39. D, 187,300 and confused with Niğde.

40. قومناات the old “Pont-Jumana” on the Yeşil Irmak near Tokat, Ch. Texier

	<i>dinārs</i>		<i>dinārs</i>
19) Kaysariyya	140,000 ⁴⁷	23) Niğde	41,500
20) Zamandu ⁴⁸	14,600	24) Karahisari Yevaş ⁵¹	14,000 ⁵²
21) Develu ⁴⁹	40,300 ⁵⁰	25) Lu' lu'e ⁵³	{blank}
22) Aksaray	51,000		

قد جمع (ای جمری) جمعاً عظیماً بنواحی قراحصار الدولة
وفی یومنا مشهور بدوه لی قره حصارى.

In al-Aqşarāyī's *Musāmarat* and Aflākī's {*Manāqib al-ʿarīfīn*}, قره حصار دولة is definitely Afyon Karahisar. See Ismail Hakki {*Uzunçarşılı*}, Afyon *Karahisar*, ... *Kitabeler* {Istanbul, 1929}, pp. 4, 10. Jimri's headquarters was there. In Müneccim-başı, قلعة دولو and قره حصاره دولی cannot be two separate cities.

47. GT, 104,000 *dinārs*.

48. According to Le Strange, it is the present-day Aziziye east of Kayseri on the Zamanti River (formerly the Greek Tzmanti). In Evliyā Chelebī {*Seyāhatnāme*}, ضمانى, Taesch., table 49.

49. A, C: ذولو.

50. D, GT, confused with the dues of Harput.

قره حصار یواش is قرا حصار بواسى بحدود نیکده. 51. In al-Aqşarāyī's *Musāmarat* (Ayasofya MS. 3143 p. 158) and is on the road from Niğde to Tarsus; *Bazm u razm*, p. 278, قره حصار یواس. If this word is in fact یراش, یوراس, it might be identified with Ivris, which is 20 km. south of the present-day Niğde Ereğli. Cf. Carl Baedeker, {*Konstantinopel und das westliche Kleinasien* [Leipzig, 1905]}, p. 297.

52. GT, 4,800 *dinārs*.

53. W. Ramsay, ("Cilicia, Tarsus, and the Great Taurus Pass,") *Geographical Journal*, 22 (1903), pp. 401, 404, and Le Strange, {*The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* (London, 1903)}, pp. 135, 152, show the

location of Lu'lu'e (the Byzantine Lulum or Loulon) to be presently around Buzantī. According to Ibn Ḥurradāqbih's description (text, 150 {*Kitāb al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik* [Leiden, 1889]}) {see Le Strange, p. 134}, this must be north of the pass {Cilician Gates} through Bolkar Dağı connecting Tarsus with Konya. On « معسر الملك » (Ulu-Kişla), it states على حمة لؤلؤ والصفصاف وتصير الى معسر الملك. Concerning the affair of Şaraf al-Dīn b. Ḥaṭīr, al-Aqşarāyī writes that while going from Niğde to Tarsus and Syria, one goes first from Niğde to "Karahisar Yavaş" and then to Lu'lu'e. It must be around present-day Hoca Oluk, which is roughly north of this fortress-like pass which was probably associated with the present-day mine in Bolkar Dağı. The sources that Hammer used show this city to be part of Cilician Armenia (Turkish ed., I, 73). Ḥamd Allāh is satisfied with merely saying the following about this city: هوایش بسردى مايل . وغلف زار بسيارد دار وشكا ركاه بيحد و شمار ومع نواب بيت جنكيز. Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-ʿUmarī says, خان بالروم ثلثه معادن فضة احدها باراضى مدينة لولوه والثانى باراضى مدينة لمس (كمش) والثالث باراضى مدينة باحرت قال (ای شيخ حيدر العريان السبر حصري) وهي الى ان فارقتها في حدود سنة ثلاث وثلثين وسبعائة عماله مستممه العمل يخرج الفضة الخالص بها.

Ayasofya MS. 3416, fol. 98a. While mentioning the province of Şujā' al-Dīn Uğrlu, which was west of the Torgutids (who had a state that was subject to the Mongols at the time of Temür-Taş), he indicates that

	<i>dīnārs</i>		<i>dīnārs</i>
26) Ermenak	7,000	32) Koçhisar ⁵⁷	27,000
27) Konya	not shown	33) Kastamonu	15,000
28) Akşehir	135,000	34) أفسك ? ⁵⁸	5,000
29) Eğridir ⁵⁴	4,000	35) زرفرلو ? ⁵⁹	40,300 ⁶⁰
30) Sivrihisar ⁵⁵	25,000	36) زیارت بازار ?	1,600 ⁶¹
31) Ankara ⁵⁶	72,000		

These amounts total 1,915,134 *dīnārs*, which means that 1,384,866 *dīnārs* of the full amount of 3,300,000 are lacking. Ḥamd Allāh mentions the names of a few cities for which he gives no figures. These include Sivas and Konya. The shortfall in *dīnārs* must lie with these cities.

لؤلؤ (Cod. {?}) (لوليا) and كمش شهر (Cod. {?}) were cities belonging to him (fol. 104a) and says وهذه كمش شهر هي ذات معدن تخرج منه الفضة هذا ما ذكره بلبان (الحنوي) واما ما ذكره العريان فانه قال تخرج من لوليا وقد تقدم ذكره . While discussing the Germiyānids, he states that they had their own silver mine which was even more important :

وله مدينة كمش شاراي مدينة الفضة وهي غير ما بابدى بيت جنكيز خان وهو معدن كثير التحصيل جليل الفايده جزيل العايده اعظم من الذى بابدى بيت جنكيز خان واجود فضة

(fol. 106a). Was this mine, which was near Kütahya, Seyid Ömer or was it around the town of Gümüş in Güney Dağı? The name of the province that had the third mine that was directly controlled by the Mongols is written as « .بأرت . » If we read this as “Bayburt”, then this mine must be today’s Gümüşhane. In fact, the English embassy that was sent to Ġazan in 1292 A.D. mentioned in their report that Gümüşhane was an important locality together with Sivas (Bratianu, *Recherches*, pp. 173, 178). In my opinion, the يمش بازار (see Ismail Galib, *Takvīm-i meskūkāt-i selçukiyye* {Istanbul, 1309}, p. كا) and لمس بازار, that is, Gümüş-Bazar, which are barely legible on

Mongol coins, must be this place, for there is also a لؤلؤ on their coins. But where is كمش شهر, which is a separate place from لؤلؤ in the country of Šujā° al-Dīn Uğrlu? There were probably two mines in Bolkar Dağı. These mines were monopolized by the Mongol government and it guarded them with a special garrison. The “*kütüival*” of one of these places seized Šaraf al-Dīn b. Ḥaṭīr and turned him over to the government (al-Aqsarāyī, *Musāmarat*, p. 158).

54. C : اكرندول .

55. C : شعري حصار ; A, D : شعري حصار ; B, H : سو حصار .

56. Ḥamd Allāh believes that عموريه and الكوريه are the same while انكوريه and Ankara are different. He mentions Ankara instead of عموريه as being in the fourth clime.

57. Written as قوشحصار . It must be Koçhisar between Tosya and Bolu. H : كوشحصار .

58. Thusly, in A and D; C : اقبك .

59. Thusly, in C; A, D : زرفرلو .

60. H, 20,000 *dīnārs*.

61. H, 14,000 *dīnārs*.

The tax of Lesser Armenia, or the Kingdom of Sis, is given as only three *tūmens* or 30,000 *dīnārs*. The general tax bill for Greater Armenia and Aḥlāṭ is 390,000 *dīnārs*. This bill was divided in the following manner :

	<i>dīnārs</i>		<i>dīnārs</i>
1) Aḥlāṭ	51,500	10) خر سمر مت ولو قیامات ? ⁶⁷	16,600
2) ایتوک ? ⁶²	1,000	11) هتکاماباد ? ⁶⁸	900
3) Arciṣ	80,000	12) سلم ? ⁶⁹	7,200
4) ارسوک ? ⁶³	13,600	13) عین	15,000 ⁷⁰
5) Ala-Tağ	6,500	14) کبود	4,300
6) Bargiri ⁶⁴	25,000	15) Malazgird ⁷¹	14,000
7) بیان ? ⁶⁵	16,000	16) Van and Vastan	53,400
8) خرادین ? ⁶⁶	5,300	17) Alağgird ⁷²	7,000
9) Hoşap	1,000		

This amount totals 317,800 *dīnārs*, so 72,200 *dīnārs* of the full bill of 390,000 are lacking.

The total tax bill of Diyār Bakr and Diyār Rabī'a is given as 1,925,000 *dīnārs*. It was divided in the following manner :

	<i>dīnārs</i>		<i>dīnārs</i>
1) Mosul	328,000	10) جزیره ابن عمر ? ⁷⁹	170,200
2) Irbil	22,000	11) خانی و سیون ? ⁸⁰	171,000
3) Arzan	275,000	12) Harran	blank
4) Amid ⁷³	30,000	13) Hasankeyf	82,500
5) باصیده ? ⁷⁴	4,300	14) Habur	blank
6) ناظر نوح ? ⁷⁵	15,000	15) Ra's al-'Ayn	blank
7) برطلی ? ⁷⁶	10,200	16) Raqqa = Collinicus	blank
8) جاسار ? ⁷⁷	blank	17) Urfa	blank
9) برازیج ? ⁷⁸	14,000	18) Siirt	46,500

62. GT, Abtut, unknown; H : ایتوک .
 63. برکنار تحیره اختلاط و جای عظیم سخت نیکوست ; GT, Armuk, unknown; probably ارچک .
 64. Thusly, in GT; C : نهر کوی ; H : سیر کیزی .
 65. GT, Bayan, unknown.
 66. GT, Ḥaradin, unknown; H : خراوین .
 67. H : جوهر بت و توفیانات ; GT, Ḥarmaramt and Luqiamat, unknown.
 68. GT, Hangamabad, unknown.
 69. GT, Salam, unknown.
 70. H, 7,200 *dīnārs*.
 71. C : بلاد جرد .
 72. ولا شجرد . GT : unknown (why?).
 73. ایسو : C .
 74. GT, Basbdah.
 75. GT, Batar-Nuh, unknown.
 76. GT, Bartalla.
 77. GT, Jasar; H : جار .
 78. Thusly, in H; G : تواریخ ; GT, Bawazij.
 79. Thusly, in H; C : جزیره ; GT, Jazirah ibn 'Umair.
 80. H : جانی و سیوان ; GT, Hani and Siwan, unknown.

	<i>dīnārs</i>		<i>dīnārs</i>
19) Sanjar	147,500	24) Keremelis ⁸¹	11,200
20) Sūq al-samānīn	blank	25) Mardin	236,200
21) °Aqr	27,400	26) Muş	69,500
22) °Imadiyya	68,000	27) Mayyāfāriqīn	224,000
23) Qirqisiyya = Circesium	blank	28) Nasibin	blank

Instead of 1,925,000 *dīnārs* for Diyār Bakr and Diyār Rabī'a, this totals 1, 782,000 *dīnārs*, so that 132,700 are lacking. The difference must lie with the cities for which no amounts are given.

VII

If we sum up these accounts, in 1336 A.D. the budget for Turkey, excluding the western provinces of Anatolia and including certain provinces of present = day Syria and Iraq, was 3,300,000 *dīnārs* + 30,000 + 390,000 + 1,925,000 for a total of 5,645,000 *dīnārs*, that is, 16,935,000 gold francs {cf. Cahen, who questions the date of 1336 for these figures, *La Turquie*, p. 314}. The revenue in that year from Āzarbāijān (2,384,000 *dīnārs*), Arrān and Mūğān (303,000), Šarvān, Kustāšfi (113,000), Abhāz and Georgia (1,202,000) totalled 4,002,000 *dīnārs*, that is, 12,006,600 gold francs. With regard to their size, Āzarbāijān and southern Caucasia, which were much smaller than Anatolia and Diyār Bakr, produced a very large revenue. Cities whose budgets were between 180,000 and 300,000 *dīnārs* included Erzincan, Erzurum, Harput, Nıksar, and Akşehir in Anatolia; Bargiri in Armenia; Arzan, Mardin, and Mayyāfāriqīn in Diyār Bakr and Diyār Rabī'a. Although their (individual) revenue is not given, Sivas and Konya were certainly exceptional cities, for their shares together came to 1,384,866 *dīnārs*. Genoese sources confirm, in fact, the importance of Sivas at that time ⁸². As for the budget of the capital, Tabrīz, and its districts, which were in Āzarbāijān, it was 1,390,000 *dīnārs*, that is, 4,170,000 francs. According to the economic data that Barthold cites from W. Sombart, this was slightly more than the budget of the Kingdom of England in 1300, which was 4,000,000 francs, and much more than that of France in 1311, which was only 3,000,000 francs ("Ani", pp. 22-24; {cf. Turkish translation, p. 147}). In other words, the budget of a city like Tabrīz was equal to that of England.

Compared to the earlier years of Ilhānid rule, does the budget for Anatolia for 1336 show an expansion or decline in the economy? Or, is it in any way exceptional? In order to answer these questions, one must examine the conditions in the Ilhānid state as a whole. In 1336, the revenue bill for the rest of Iran, exclusive of Ĥurāsān which had a completely separate budget, was as follows: the region of Fārs, 2,871,200 *dīnārs*; Kirmān, 676,500; Ĥuzistān, 325,000; Šabānkāra, 266,100; and Kurdistān, 200,000. The

81. H : کربليس .

82. Brătianu, *Recherches*, pp. 158 ff.

total amounts for 'Irāq al-'Arab and 'Irāq al-'Ajam are not specifically given. Ḥamd Allāh himself is content with stating that the budget for 'Irāq al-'Arab in 735 {1334-1335 A.D.} was a little more than 3,000,000. The amount for 'Irāq al-'Ajam is lacking in all the texts that I examined (for example, in G, (سى وپنج تومان بجامع الحساب). If we add together the bills of the provinces of 'Irāq al-'Arab, the total comes to 3,260,515; and the total for the provinces of 'Irāq al-'Ajam comes to 2,421,800. With the exception of Ḥurāsān, the budget for the entire Ilhānid state in 1336 was 19,668,315 *dinārs*, or 59,004,945 gold francs, of which about 29,000,000 came from regions within modern Turkey, Āzarbāijān, and the southern Caucasus, and 30,000,000 from other regions of the state.

As far as we can determine, this figure for 1336 came about as a result, on the one hand, of the economic development of the Ilhānid state in general and, on the other, as a result of the transfer of wealth from the southern regions of the country to its northern regions. Let me explain. According to Ḥamd Allāh, the revenue from Iran was only 17 million *dinārs* prior to Ġazan {1295-1304 A.D.}, but thanks to his justice it rose to 21 million (p. 132). The same writer says that after Ġazan a great many provinces were pillaged by the army because of various disturbances and the lack of order and, consequently, this revenue dropped to half of what it had been during the reign of Ġazan (واکنون همانا نیمه آن نباشد چه اکثر ولایات ازین تحکمت و تردد لشکرها برافتاده است دست اززرع برداشتند). These words must pertain to the year 1339 A.D., when he wrote his book, for on the same pages the author reports that the revenue of the country decreased because of the confusion following the death of Öljeitü {1317 A.D.}, that agricultural land went out of production, and that the budget for 'Irāq al-'Arab in 1336 A.D. was more than three million, but it fell because of the subsequent oppression of its governors (حقوق آن ملک درسته خمس وثلثین خانی سیصد وچند تومان رایج بوده ازان نیز بسبب ظلم حکام بسیار منکسر می شد). We have mentioned above that in 1336 the general tax dues for Iran, excluding Ḥurāsān, amounted to 19.6 million. The budget for 1336 was clearly less than Ġazan's budget. The complaints of Iranian historians against the Mongol army concern mainly southern Iran. Indeed, the province of Fārs suffered the most under the Mongols. According to Vaṣṣāf's account, the revenue of this region was the same in the time of Ġazan as it was in the time of Argūn, or perhaps had declined a little (Vaṣṣāf, pp. 335, 349, 363). Ḥamd Allāh reports (pp. 170-171) that the budget of "*barr u baḥr-i mamlakat-i fārs*" for 1336 was recorded as 2,871,200 *dinārs* in the tax ledger. This country could not, in fact, pay its taxes. The situation of 'Irāq al-'Arab must have been relatively better. Dahabī and Rašīd al-Dīn provide very important information on the public works that were undertaken in this province during the time of Hülegü, Abaqa, and Ġazan. Dahabī states that, by digging irrigation canals from the Tigris at great expense, the uncultivated area stretching from "Anbār" to Kūfa and Najaf was developed, about 150 new villages were established, and the revenue of the country increased, indeed, this country became more prosperous than it had been in the time of the 'Abbāsīd caliphs (Juvainī, *Ta'riḥ-i Jahān-Guṣā*, I, introduction, pp. لا - لب). Rašīd al-Dīn mentions the canal called "Nahr-i Ġazanī", which Ġazan brought from Karbalā, and the revenue derived from

it (fol. 303); and the canal called “Nahr-i Ġazanī suflā”, which the same ruler brought from Mašhad Sayyid Abū 'l-Wafā around Sib and Wāsiṭ (fol. 289). He also says that the population increased and that land which had previously been valued at 100 *dīnārs* rose in price to 1,000 *dīnārs*. In 1336, the budget for Baghdad was 800,000 *dīnārs*; for Nahr-i 'Isā, 876,000 *dīnārs*; for Wāsiṭ, 448,000 *dīnārs*; and for Baṣra, 441,000 *dīnārs*. This shows that the cities of 'Irāq al-'Arab maintained their former importance in the Mongol period. There is no doubt, however, that the center of wealth had shifted from there to the areas around Tabrīz, Erzincan and Sivas. While the budget of Baghdad was 800,000 *dīnārs*, the revenue of Tabrīz, which had no economic significance before the Mongols, rose to 1,400,000 *dīnārs*. We know the events which made it impossible for the province of Baghdad to pay the taxes that were levied on it. Indeed, in 1270 A.D. a commission composed of Ilḡānid Mongol officials investigated the problem of the inability of the people to pay taxes that year and exempted 'Irāq al-'Arab from about 2.5 million *dīnārs* in taxes (introduction to *Ta'riḡ-i Jahān-Guṣā*, I, p. ۴; Vaṣṣāf, p. 97). The records concerning the economic conditions of Anatolia and its taxes indicate that the revenues from this region gradually increased. According to Badr al-Dīn al-'Ainī, when the Mongols first appeared, the tax from “Rūm” was only 360,000 *dirhams* in cash, 10,000 sheep, 1,000 oxen, and 1,000 horses (*'Iqd al-jumān*}, Veliyeddin Efendi MS. 2392, p. 155). Later, according to al-Aqṣarāyī, in the time of Bayju Noyan, the tax from *mamālik-i rūm* was 20 *tūmens* (= 200,000 *dīnārs*, that is, 1,200,000 *dirhams*). This was the tax until 1256 (654 A.H.). At the beginning of the sultanate of Ġazan, the revenue from *mamālik-i rūm* was only 60 *tūmens* (600,000 *dīnārs*) of “*māl-i maqtū'*” {fixed revenue} (Rašīd al-Dīn and Mūneccim-baṣī). Mūneccim-baṣī writes that in 1295 A.D. Ġazan divided *mamālik-i rūm* into four parts; gave them to Pervaneci Mehmet Bey, Vizir Jamāl al-Dīn, Kamāl al-Dīn Tiflisī, and Defterdār Šaraf al-Dīn as 60-*tūmen maqtū's*; and that these men were more oppressive than the previous *mustahṣils* {tax collectors} (II, 574). Ḥamd Allāh (*Ta'riḡ-i Guṣida*, p. 486) says that Vizir Ḥwāja Faḡr al-Dīn Aḡmad Rākūšī Tabrīzī collected the tax of *mamālik-i rūm* by selling *amlāk-i dīwānī* {state property} to *arbāb-i manāṣiba* {notables} and that the treasury benefited greatly from this. He adds that if the *mulkiyyat-i dīwān* of Anatolia had remained as it had been previously, no public works would have been possible. If the governors did not know that they would remain for long in one place, their only concern was to plunder the region under their authority and quickly fill their pockets. He says that this, in fact, was the case for all places connected with the *Dīwān*. Mūneccim-baṣī and Ḥamd Allāh must both be talking about the same subject here. This would mean that the development and enrichment of Anatolia would belong to the time that local historians, including al-Aqṣarāyī, described as the worst period of Mongol rule.

It is well known that, at the beginning of the Mongol invasion, the people of Āzarbāijān abandoned their lands to the newly arrived Turkish and Mongol elements and scattered in various directions. This did not, however, result in a loss of population for Anatolia or Āzarbāijān. On the contrary, the population of this region increased very rapidly.

Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umārī states that when the Mongol state collapsed, the *beyliks* in western Anatolia made no attempt to escape from Mongol government and recover their independence, (Ayasofya MS, fol. 115a

ثم لما آن لدولة چو بان وبنيه الزوال وكان منهم ما كان ، قويت امرأ الاتراك بالروم وانتعشت قواهم ثم هم الى الآن على هذا الحال على كثرة اضطراب امر المغل وتفرق اهلهم في هذه المدد كلها ومع هذا ما استطاع احد من امرأ الاتراك ان يلتفت الى شئ مما بايدهم من الروم لا ولا ارتجاع شئ مما كان تمر تاش بن چوبان قدا بان ملوكه وافتتحة واستضافه الى ما بيده).

Taking note of this reference, Barthold believes that the attachment of the people of Anatolia to the Mongols was related to the economic development of the country, especially at the time of Temür-Taš {1317-1328 A.D.} (“Ani”, pp. 23-24). We have shown, however, that the economic development of Anatolia must have been continuous even before the government of Temür-Taš. At the time when southern, and especially south eastern, Iran went bankrupt and was plundered, the population as well as the revenue probably increased gradually both before and after Ġazan in the northern and north western regions where the Ilḥānid Mongols and Turks settled.

VIII

In the course of doing research for this article, I examined the mathematical manuscripts in the libraries of Istanbul and came across a very important work on the Ilḥānid methods of fiscal administration and book keeping. This work, which is listed in the index of the Ayasofya Library as MS. 2756 under the title *Kitāb fī 'l-Ḥisāb*, was written by 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Kiyā,⁸³ who was related to the Kārkiyā'i family of Māzandarān, between 1340 and 1367 A.D. After his death, it was completed by the vizir of the Kārkiyā'is, Falak al-Ma'ālī, and acquired the name *Risāla-i falakiyya*. Later, between 1450 and 1463 A.D., this work was revised by a third person who added an introduction and certain details to the first part {now see W. Hinz, ed. *Die Resāla-ye falakiyya* [Wiesbaden, 1952]}. According to the writer of the introduction, who had a thorough knowledge of the arts and sciences of his time, the original author, 'Abd Allāh, grew up in Tabrīz. The work is composed of 139 folios. As is clear from their dates, documents written between 735 and 765 {1334-1363 A.D.} were incorporated in the first version and others written between 840 and 884 {1436-1480 A.D.} were incorporated in the second. It is obvious from this work that Māzandarān and Gilān, which were described in particular by Egyptian and Syrian writers as not being subject to the Ilḥānids, were, in fact, completely subject to the Mongol state and its system of economic administration. Furthermore, this work shows that the budget of 1336, which I discussed above, was by no means exceptional. Indeed, it was an integral part of the fiscal system that was uniformly respected in the Ilḥānid state.

83. The descendants of Kiyā-Afrāsiyāb. See Ḥāhīr al-Dīn Mar'ašī, *Ta'riḥ-i Ṭabaristān*, ed. B. Dorn {St Petersburg, 1850}, p. 350.

Various documents from the Ilhānid period reveal that the taxes which were collected in the form of cash, livestock, agricultural products and property were inspected and analyzed with information that was found in the *Dīwān-i Buzurg* {Great *Dīwān*}. There was probably statistical data in the *Dīwān-i Buzurg* on the population, livestock, and agriculture of all provinces. In the *Risāla-i falakiyya*, there are examples of accounts of livestock and agricultural products. This work also provides more detailed information on the account books {*defters*} that we learned about from the work of 'Alā-i Tabrīzī (fols. 51a-99a). Indeed, it completes this information while discussing the *jāmi' al-ḥisāb defters* {sic} (fols. 78a-87a). It also includes a summary of the Iranian budget for 1349-1350 A.D. Here we find the major cities of each country, the method used to collect the tax (*muqāṭa'a* {tax farming of revenue of a district for a fixed sum} or *ḍamān* {revenue farm}) the person to whom tax collection was assigned for each country; and the amount of the tax. It shows the total budgets of Ḥurāsān, Māzandarān and Gīlān, which are lacking in Ḥamd Allāh, and also gives the general tax bill for 'Irāq al-'Ajam and Fārs. As for Anatolia, this work reveals that a number of important *beyliks* in western Anatolia were among the countries from which taxes were collected. These *beyliks* included those of the Qaramānids, the Aydınid Umur Bey and the Ottoman Bey of Bursa, Orhan. They were part of the Ilhānid territory of the *ujat* {marches} and were subject to Tabrīz. This material is certainly an important addition to the evidence showing that the Qaramānids and *uj* beys of İn-Önü and Bursa were considered to be within the Mongol sphere of government in the fourteenth century A.D. The *Risāla-i falakiyya*, like the work of 'Alā-i Tabrīzī, needs to be studied and fully published. Here we shall cite only the information it contains on the regions of *mamālik-i rūm*, Armenia, and Diyār Bakr :

Fol. 90 b :

ولایت ارمن

في عهدته عبد المسيح النصراني على حسب المقاطعة . بموجب الحجة المسجلة عنه العين الصحيح ؟
 احدى واربعين الف ⁸⁴ بالتومان
 وجه مذکور از موضعی که ذکر می رود حاصل شده است :
 بر کرّی . اخلاط . ارچیش . بلاس (بتلیس؟) . ملازکرد . حتوس (؟) .
 اربع تومان

Fol. 91 a :

ولایت دیاربکر عربی

في عهدته خواجه عزالدين الموصلی علی حسب المقاطعة والضمان . - بموجب الحجة المسجلة عنه
 ثلثمائة واربعين الف بالتومان
 دینار
 وجه مذکور از مواضعی که ذکر می رود حاصل است :
 ماردين . اربیل . حوی (موش = حوش = Fol. 77 a) . میافارقین .
 رأس العين . سنجار . حران . محدود حاصه دیار بکر عربی تمام شد .
 اربع وثلثین تومان

84. These numbers are written in the *siyāqat* script.

Fol. 93 a :

ممالك روم المحروسة

على عهدة خواجه نجم الدين جوبى على حسب المقاطعة والضمان . بموجب الحجة المسجلة عنه
 ثلاث الف (?)
 (الف آلاف؟)
 وجه مذكور از موضعی كه ذكر ميروود حاصل ميشود :

ثلثاية تومان

الوسطانية⁸⁵ :

امد (آمد؟) . مجنکرد . كيغى . سپهر (اسپر؟) . منورس؟ .
 دبرجان . طرابزون . اترک ولات ارزن الروم .
 ارزنيان . کاخ . خربرت . ملاطيه . جمسکزک .
 دفرکی . بابت . سيواس . نکسار . قيصريه .
 دوولو . توقات . اماسيه . مروان⁸⁶ . عثمانجق .
 انكوريه . قنقره . آقسرا . قونيه . اقشهر .
 سفر الحصار . قراحصار . قراجه طاغ . معدن کش بازار⁸⁷ .

Fol. 93 b :

الاجات :

قرامان . اولاد حميد . طغزلو . امور بيک
 کرميان . اورخان . کردويه بولى⁸⁸ . قسطنونيه
 اکريدر . سينوب . محدوده اوج تمام شد

This bill was drawn up at the beginning of 751 (March, 1350) upon confirming that the taxes for 750 were handed over to the state treasury by the tax collectors. Over the tax dues for each province the word *hāşil* {revenue} was written in red ink. This document is worthy of note. It coincides with the time in which Togha-Temür, who struck coins in his own name in various Anatolian cities, was the Bey of Erdene in Anatolia. In another place in this work (fol. 57a), the tax bill (مقرر اموال الديوانية) of the province of Diyār Bakr (Sinjār, Ra's al-'Ain, Mayyāfāriqin, Muş, Mosul, Irbil) in 1430 A.D. is given.

IX

Here we should also like to add the information on the salaries of the state officials in İlḥānid territory provided by Ibn Faḍl al-'Umarī, who cites them from Niẓām al-Dīn

85. This must mean central Anatolia.

86. مرزوان = Merzifon.

87. It is noteworthy that this Gümüş-Pazar is listed with Karaça-Dağ (probably between Afyon and Eskişehir).

88. Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umarī, کردله ; کردی بولی ; Ibn Baḥḥūta, Turkish ed., I, 350 ; H. A. Gibbons, {The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire (Oxford, 1916)}, Turkish ed. {Istanbul, 1928}, pp. 267, 269, Kürede and Boli.

al-Ṭayyārī (T {sic, reference unclear, not Taeschner}, II, 279; A, fols. 66-67b). This information is also partially included in al-Qalqašandī's *Ṣubḥ al-a'šā*⁸⁹ { = Q below } :

وحدثني هذا الفاضل نظام الدين ابو الفاضل يحيى بن الحكيم الطياري بكثير من احوال هذه المملكة وقواعد ملوكها وترتيب جنودها وجيوشها فما حدثني ان السلاطين بها لا التفات لهم الى امر ولا نهى في البلاد ولا في متحصلات الدخل والخرج فيها بل الوزير هو حامل هذه الاعباء وله التصرف المطلق في الولاية والعزل والعطا والمنع لا يشاور السلطان الاعلى ما جل من المهمات وفي ما قل من الامور بل هو السلطان حقيقة وصاحب البلاد معنى واليه ترجع الامور كلها واليه عقدها وحلها فاما امر الجيوش والعساكر فالى كبير امراً الالوس وهو المسمى بكلارى بك اى امير الامراء كما كان قتلوا شاه مع السلطانين محمود غازان واخيه محمد خدابنده وجويان مع خدابنده ثم بعده مع ولده السلطان بوسعيد بهادر خان وهذا القايم الآن الشيخ حسن بن حسين بن آقباغا مع قانه السلطان محمد بن طشتمر بن اسننمر بن عنبر جى⁹⁰ واما الالوس اربعة بكلارى بك وثلثة آخر ويسمى هولاء الاربعة امراً القبول ويشترط ان يكون هولاء هم الذين تكتب اسماؤهم في البرايغ والفرمانات بعد اسم السلطان ثم بعد اسم الوزير ولا يتوقف في كتابة اسم من الاسماء ممن هو غايب منهم عن الاردو بل تكتب اسماؤهم كلهم حضر منهم من حضر وغاب من غاب وكل ذى سيف لا يخرج امره عن القايم بهذه الوظيفة التي هي امرة امراً الالوس وكل ذى قلم ومنصب شرعى لا يخرج عن الوزير وطبقات الامراء اعلاها النونين وهو امير عشرة آلاف ثم امير الف ثم امير مائة ثم امير عشرة هذه طبقات رتبهم لا نقص فيها ولا مزيد عليها وعامة العسكر لا تزال اسماؤهم في دواوينهم على الافراد بل كل طايفة عليهم في الديوان فارس معين اذا رسم له بالركوب ركب منهم العدة المطلوبة .

وسالت الفاضل ابا الفضائل يحيى بن الحكيم عن مقدار عدة الجيش فقال اما المنزل في دواوينهم فا يبلغ عشرين تومانا واما اذا ارادوا ركبوا بثلاثين تومانا وما يزيد عليها وهم اليوم اليوم (يعنى بعد موت ابي سعيد خان) في اثبات شمل وشتات آراء لا يلبث لهم جمع ولا يضمهم وفاق . قلت له فكيف من مقدار ما هوّلا من الارزاق فقال اما ما هو مستقر لهم في دواوينهم من زمان هولاء كوفلا يرضى احد من كبارهم به ولا باضعاف مرات واما الصغار فا يتجاوز منهم ما استقر له قلت فكيف هو المستقر في الديوان وبكم تقنع كبارهم الآن فقال المقرر من قديم لكل نويين امير تومان تومان وهو عشرة آلاف دينار رايح⁹¹ عنها ستون الف درهم واما اليوم فا يقنع النونين الا بثمانين تومان وهي خمسة الف دينار رايح عنها ثلاثة آلاف الف درهم ومن خمسين تومان الى اربعين تومان واما كبيرهم بكلارى بك فالذى استقر لجويان ثم

89. *Ṣubḥ al-a'šā*, IV, 423-426. This author used Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-'Umari's *Tārīf bi'l-muṣṭalaḥ al-šarīf* (Cairo, 1312).

90. T, A : عر جى ; Q : غير جى ; al-'Aini, 'Iqd al-jumān {Veliyeddin Efendi MS. 2374-2396}, events for the year 737 {1336-1337 A.D.}, محمد بن عنبر جى ; Mīrḥwānd {*Rawḍat al-safā*} and Ḥwāndamīr {*Ḥabīb al-siyar*} : Muḥammad b. Toḥ-Qutluḡ (Yol-Qutluḡ, C. d'Ohsson, {*Histoire des Mongols*}

[The Hague and Amsterdam, 1834-1835]}, IV, 723) b. Esen-Temür (in d'Ohsson, Qoyji) b. Mengü-Temür b. Hülegü.

91. T : رايح ; A, Q : رايح . Both of these are correct, but in the official Ilḥānid government financial account *rābiḥ* is used. In the Topkapı MS. written in Rašid al-Dīn's own time, in 'Alā-i Tabrizī, and in *Risāla-i falakiyya*, it is clearly written as رايح .

لمن بعده ثلث مائة تومان وهي ثلاثة آلاف الف دينار عنها ثمانية عشر الف الف درهم مع ما يحصل لكل من امرا الالوس الاربعة من الخدم الكثيرة في البلاد جميعها عند تقييرات الضمان بها على ضمانها . قال (اي يحيى بن الحكيم) واما امير الالف ومن دونه فلا يتجاوز احد منهم مقررة القديم في الديوان لامير الالف دينار رايح عنها ستة آلاف درهم . واما امير الماية والعشرة وكل واحد من العسكرية اى الخند فاية دينار عنها ست مائة درهم لا تفاوت بينهم هذا هو المقرر الجارى من قديم وانما تبقى مزية امير الماية او العشرة انه يأخذ لنفسه شيئاً مما هو للعسكرية ولكل طائفة ارض لنزولهم توارثها الخلف عن السلف منذ ملك هولاء هذه البلاد وفيها منازلهم ولهم بها مزدراع لاقواتهم لكنهم لا يعمشون بالحرث والزرع . هذه جملة مما هو لعساكر ايران ما ازداد وما هو مستقر في الديوان واما الخواتين فالذى لهن الآن منه ما يبلغ للخاتون الواحدة⁹² مائتا تومان وهو الف الف⁹³ دينار رايح عنها اثنا عشر الف درهم وما دون ذلك الى عشرين تومان وهو مائتا الف دينار عنها الف الف⁹⁴ ومائتا الف درهم . وقال لى الفاضل ابو الفضائل يحيى بن الحكيم وهذا قد يزيد وينقص واما الوزير فله مائة وخمسون تومانا وهو الف الف وخمماية الف دينار رايح عنها تسعة آلاف الف درهم قال ولا يقنع بعشرة اضعاف هذا في تقارير البلاد واما الخواجكية من ارباب الاقلام فمهم من يبلغ في السنة ثلاثين تومانا وهي ثلثماية الف دينار عنها الف الف وثمانماية الف درهم .

ثم قال والذي للامراء والعسكرية لا يكتب به مرسوم لان : Q; T. 282; A 69^b] كل طائفة ورثت ما لها من ذلك عن آباؤها وهم على الجهات التي قررهما لهم هولاء لم تتغير بزيادة ولا نقص الا اكابر الامراء الذين حصلت لهم الزيادات فانه في ذلك الوقت كتب لهم بها بامر القان اصدرها الوزيراً عنه ومن الخواتين من اخذ بما له او ببعضه بلاداً فهي له].

واما الادارات من المبلغ والقرى فانها تبقى لصاحبها كالمملك يتصرف فيه كيف شأ من بيع وهبة ووقف لمن اراد والمعاش لمدة الحياة لاغير والمرسومات والانعامات قال وهي ما لا يحصى قال ومن هولاء المستوفين من له الضبط على اتساع اقطار الممالك قال واما وظيفة القضاة فعادة هذه المملكة ان يكون بها في صحة السلطان قاضى قضاة الممالك وهو يولى في جميع المملكة على تنائى اقطارها الا العراق فان لبغداد قاضى قضاة مستقل بها وفي بلادها جميع عراق العرب وقال لى قاضى القضاة ابو محمد الحسن الغورى ان آخر ما استقر له ست قرى وتومان عشرة آلاف دينار في السنة .

This translates as follows {this is more of a very detailed summary than a literal translation; a few things are left out and Togan attempts to integrate logically the information in all the above texts} :

Al-Fāḍil Nizām al-Dīn Abū 'l-Faḍā'il Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥakīm al-Ṭayyārī gave me considerable information on the conditions of this country [the Ilḥānid state], on the regulations issued by its rulers, and the organization of its army. Among the things he told me was that the rulers {*salāṭīn*} there do not become personally involved in the administrative and financial affairs of the countries subject to them. Instead, these matters are in the hands of the vizir. He has absolute authority with respect to financial matters and appointing and dismissing officials. He only consults with the sultan over the most important issues. In other affairs, he is the real sultan.

As for the army, it is under the command of the *beylerbeyi* who is the highest ranking *amīr* of the *ulus*. This position was held by Qutluḡ-Şāh under Ġazan and Ḥudā-Banda [Öljeitü], and by Choban under Ḥudā-Banda and Abū Sa'īd. It is presently held by al-Şaiḥ Ḥasan b. Ḥusain b. Aq-Buqa [Jalāyir] under Sultan Muḥammad b. Taš-Temür b. Esen-Temür b. 'Anbarjī. The *amīrs* of the *ulus* are four : one is the *beylerbeyi*. He

92. Q : للخاتون الواحدة في السنة .

94. Thusly, in Q; Cod : الف .

93. Thusly, in A, G footnote; T : الف لف .

and the other three are called “*qol*” *amīrs*. On *yarlıġs* and *fermans*, the names of these four *amīrs* follow the name of the ruler {sultan}. The name of the vizir follows the names of these *amīrs*. When these *amīrs* are absent from the ruler’s headquarters, their names are still signed [Q : by their representatives]. The *beylerbeyi* approves all appointments to military positions and the vizir selects all religious {*şar’i*} and government functionaries [Q : but they participate jointly in issues concerning the country as a whole]. The highest ranking *amīr* is the “*noyīn*” who commands 10,000 men. Then come the *amīr* of 1,000, the *amīr* of 100 and the *amīr* of 10. The ranks in the army are no more and no less than these. The names of all the men in the army are recorded in *dīwāns*. Indeed, there is a special officer {*fāris*} in the *Dīwān* for each section. When he is given the order to mount the troops, he readies the required number.

I asked the aforesaid Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥakīm about the size of the army. He said, “the standing army as recorded in the *dīwāns* does not exceed 20 *tūmens* [200,000]. But if necessary, 30 or more *tūmens* could be mobilized. Now [that is, following the death of Abū Sa’īd], the army is in a state of disorder and disarray.” I asked Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥakīm how much their salaries were and he said, “previously, beginning with the reign of Hülegü, the salaries were specified and confirmed in the *Dīwān*. Each *noyīn*, who was the *amīr* of a *tūmen*, received 10,000 *rābiḥ dīnārs*, that is, 60,000 *dirhams*. But now the *noyīn* is not satisfied with less than 40 or 50 *tūmens*, that is, 500,000 *dīnārs* or 3,000,000 *dirhams*. As for the *beylerbeyi*, his salary was set in the time of Amīr Choban and has remained in effect at 300 *tūmens*, that is, 3,000,000 *dīnārs* or 18,000,000 *dirhams*. Furthermore, the four *ulus beys* also receive a share of the taxes collected in the provinces, and participate in arranging the *ḍamāns*. The salary of the *amīrs* of 1,000 and officers of lower rank does not exceed the amount that was previously specified in the *Dīwān*. The salary of an *amīr* of 1,000 is 1,000 *dīnārs*, that is, 6,000 *dirhams*. The salary of an *amīr* of 100, an *amīr* of 10 and individual troops is only 100 *dīnārs*, or 600 *dirhams*. In other words, there is no difference in salary among the lower ranking officers and men. This is the system that has been in effect for a long time. However, the *amīr* of 100 and the *amīr* of 10 now take a share of the money that goes to their troops. Each section of the army has certain lands [*īqtā’s* {Togan’s term, not in text}] on which to live. Since the time of Hülegü, these lands have been inherited by each generation in succession. The troops have their homes there. The food that is necessary for them to live comes from these lands, but they do not live by agriculture. These are the salaries of both the standing army and the other troops {who could be called up} in the army of Iran. As for the women, they receive an income ranging from, 200 *tūmens*, which is 2,000,000 *dīnārs* or 12,000,000 *dirhams*, to 20 *tūmens*, which is 200,000 *dīnārs* or 1,200,000 *dirhams*. But one can receive more or less than this.

“As for the vizir, his salary is 150 *tūmens*, that is, 1,500,000 *rābiḥ dīnārs* or 9,000,000 *dirhams*. But he is not satisfied with ten times as much. There are government officials known as *ḥwājakiyya* [*i.e.*, Iranian secretaries and civil servants] whose salary is 30 *tūmens*, that is, 300,000 *rābiḥ dīnārs*, meaning 1,800,000 *dirhams*. In this country, salaries, which are given for life, *timars* and *zeamets* {these are Togan’s terms, meaning,

respectively, small and large “fiefs”; in the text we find only *al-marsūmāt*, “pensions”, and other grants [*suyurgal*] are innumerable⁹⁵. Grants in the form of cash or villages are considered the property of the owner. He can dispose of this as he likes; give it as a gift or set it aside as an endowment {*waqf*}. The *iqṭā’s* {Togan’s term; in the text, “that which they possess”, *i.e.*, lands which} have been given to the *amīrs* and soldiers are not used in place of the *suyurgal* {*marsūm* in the text} because they have long since been considered hereditary property. This system was established in the time of Hülegü and has no provision for change, neither for expansion nor contraction, except for the great *amīrs*. Despite the large size of the Ilhānid state, its control and administration are in the hands of capable financial officials {*mustawfiyīn*}.

“With respect to the salaries of the *qādīs* {judges}, it is customary for the chief *qāḍī* to be in the company of the ruler. He has jurisdiction over all parts of the state except ‘Irāq al-‘Arab, because Baghdad has its own chief *qāḍī*. The chief *qāḍī* Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-Ġūrī said that the salary which was recently allotted to him was six villages {*iqṭā’s*} and 10,000 *dīnārs* in cash each year”.

The system of providing compensation to military and civil officials in the country of the Ilhānids was established in the reign of Mōngke Qa’an for the entire Mongol state. Those who most closely followed this specific system of compensation were the eastern Mongols, especially during the time of Kubla Ḥān and Timūr. We have no information on the system of compensation in the *ulus* of Čaġatay before the time of Timūr. With regard to the *ulus* of Jochi, we have only a short passage which Ibn Faḍl Allāh al-‘Umārī cites from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Tarjumān al-Ḥwārazmī. It mainly concerns Ḥwārazm and reads as follows (T, 273; A, 62b) :

مقی صارت هذه المملكة بعد ملوك الخوارزمية الى بنى جنكيز خان استمروا بعساكر خوارزم على حالهم على اقطاعاتهم وكل من كان بيد آبايه شئ هو الان بيد أبنائه . والامرا منهم لهم بلاد منهم من يعمل بلاده في السنة مايتي الف دينار رابجا وما دون ذلك الى مائة الف دينار رابج واما الجند فليس لاحد منهم الا نقود تؤخذ على النطع وكلهم سوا لكل واحد منهم في السنة مايتا دينار رابج .⁹⁶

This translates as follows :

After this country [Ḥwārazm] passed from the possession of the Ḥwārazm-Šāhs to the descendants of Čingiz Ḥān, the soldiers of Ḥwārazm preserved their former *iqṭā’s* [*i.e.*, from the time of the Ḥwārazm-Šāhs]. What had been in the hands of the fathers was now in the hands of the sons. The *amīrs* in the *ulus* of Jochi [or in Ḥwārazm] had *iqṭā’s* that produced a revenue ranging from 100,000 to 200,000 *rābiḥ dīnārs* per year. As for the men in the army, they were all given the same amount, that is, 200 *rābiḥ dīnārs* of pure silver coins each year.

95. On the terms *idrārāt*, *marsūmāt*, *ma’išāt*, *kirek-yaraq*, *mawājib*, *suyurġamisāt*, and *waṣā’if*, see *Risāla-i falakiyya*, fol. 30a, and ‘Alā-i Tabrizī, fols 53 ff.

96. W. Tiesenhausen, *Recueil de matériaux relatifs à l’histoire de la Horde d’Or* {St Petersburg, 1884}, pp. 223, 224.

The Mongols adhered very closely to the practice of giving *iqṭā's*. This system was reconfirmed under Chingiz, Möngke and Hülegü. When Hülegü marched into Iran, he gave Tabriz and Marāḡeh as *iqṭā's* to the soldiers of the *ulus* of Jochi who were in his army. This matter became a subject of continuous dispute between the *ulus* of Jochi and that of Hülegü. Nevertheless, the *iqṭā'* revenue of these places was given to the sultans of the *ulus* of Jochi. It was Ġazan who definitely took these two cities away from them⁹⁷. According to the campaign chronicles of Timūr, indeed, also the book of travels of Evliyā Chelebī, the *iqṭā's* that were established in the time of Hülegü remained in effect until fairly late times. The information inserted in Rašīd al-Dīn (fols 327a-30a) and *Risāla-i falakiyya* on the subject of the army's *iqṭā's* in Anatolia at that time needs to be studied and compared to the traditions of the Russians, Ottomans and Šafavids. For now, we can say that the salaries of civil servants and military officers in Anatolia and the rest of the Ilhānid state reached, in gold francs,⁹⁸ the following amounts from the time of Hülegü to the time of Sultan Muḡammad and Šaiḡ Ḥasan Jalāyir, who were contemporaries of Ibn Faḡl Allāh al-'Umarī :

	<i>Per Year</i>	<i>Per Month</i>
<i>Beylerbeyi</i>	9,000,000	750,000
<i>Noyin</i> , the <i>amīr</i> of a <i>tūmen</i> , before 1340 A.D.	30,000	2,500
<i>Noyin</i> , in the 1340s	1,500,000	6,500
<i>Amīr</i> of 1,000	3,000	250
<i>Amīr</i> of 100, 10, and soldiers	300	25
Women (<i>ḡātūnlar</i> , the great <i>ḡātūn</i>)	6,000,000	500,000
Minor <i>ḡātūn</i>	60,000	5,000
Head vizir	4,500,000	375,000
Chief civil servants	900,000	75,000
<i>Qāḡī 'l-quḡāt</i> whose salary was the same as the earlier salary of the <i>amīr</i> of a <i>tūmen</i>	30,000	2,500

Munši' Muḡammad b. Hindūšāh⁹⁹ records among the information that he gives on the organization of the Ilhānid and Jalāyirid states that only for 1360 A.D. was the

97. *Ibid.*, pp. 217-218 (information from Ibn Faḡl Allāh al-'Umarī).

98. For information on the contemporary purchasing power of the *rābiḡ dīnār*, which was used in the Ilhānid state, and on its rate of exchange with the gold coinage of Egypt, Byzantium, India, North Africa and Genoa, see my article "Mongol ülkele-rinde para sistemi" { [The monetary system

in the Mongol countries], apparently never published}.

99. On this author's work, *Dastūr al-kātib fi ta'yīn al-marātib*, see Hammer, *Geschichte der goldenen Horde* {Pest, 1840}, p. 192; Flügel, Hammer-Handschriften, pp. 171-177 {reference unclear, cf. G. Flügel's *Die arabischen, persischen, türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlichen und königlichen Hofbibliothek*

annual salary of the *ulus beyi* 100,000 *dīnārs* (ده تومان) and the salary of the *mustawfī 'l-mamālik* {chief revenue officer} 25,000 *dīnārs* according to the old system. The salaries of other officials are not given. Addressing the people in the *Dīwān*, he simply writes that “such and such” amount of *dīnārs* would be given each year according to the established budget (چندین دینار، کذا دینار). Muḥammad b. Hindūšāh, however, lists one by one the officials who received a salary from the state budget. He also mentions persons who received salaries from sources outside the state budget, such as the ‘*ulamā*’ {religious scholars} and *šaiḥs* {leaders of mystic brotherhoods} who were supported by *waqfs*; or those who derived their livelihood from the villages and markets.

Those who received salaries from the budget were the *ulus beyi*, *tümen beyi*, *amīrs* of 1,000, 100, and 10, *ülke beyi* (governor), *yarguči* (head of the law court), *daruḡa* (سخنه, chief of the garrison, commander {cf. Lambton, “Mongol Fiscal Administration,” *SI*, 64 [1986], 80, nt. 2}), *basqaq* (governor and tax collector), *baḡši* (Mongolian and Turkish for “secretary”), provincial governors, director of the mint, *bükavul* ({commissariat official} intendant), *yasavul* (inspector of the army), *yurtçi bey* {official in charge of setting up camp}, *bularguči*, vizir, vicegerant, comptroller and financial officials, *uluḡ bitikçi* {chief scribe, accountant}, *nāzir-i mamālik* {head of comptroller office}, *mušrif-i mamālik* {similar to previous position}, *munši'-i mamālik* {chief secretary}, assistant vizir, *defterdar-i mamālik* {head of treasury}, *tutkavul* (gendarme), chief (police), *qādi 'l-quḡāt*, and *qādi*.¹⁰⁰ Those who received salaries from *zakāt* {obligatory alms}, *ušr* {tithe} or *waqfs* were *naqīb al-nuqabā* {chief of the ‘Alids}, director of *waqfs*, professors of law (*mudarris*), preachers {*ḡaṭīb*}, jurists, the heads of dervish lodges {*hanekah şeyihleri*}, directors of hospitals, secretaries of judges, *zakāt* collectors, prayer leaders {*imāms*}, and muezzins.¹⁰¹ As for the *muḥtasib* {supervisor of the market place}, money was collected for him from shops and vendors.¹⁰² A certain salary was also set aside for the *kervansalars* and *tutkavuls* who provided security for commercial caravans when they were on the road. The money for their salaries was collected from the caravans and paid by the government.¹⁰³ It appears from the edicts (*yarliḡ*) which were issued concerning the officials whose salaries came from the budget that the Jalāyirid sultans adopted the practices of the Ilḡānids as the basis for their salaries. Indeed, it was clearly recorded that salaries which were established according to the Mongol account books had to be increased each year. It was also recorded whether or not an official wanted the revenue of a certain place instead

zu Wien [Vienna, 1865]}; and Catalog {sic}, I, 235; Ch. Rieu, {*Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum* [London, 1879-1883]}, *Supplement* {London, 1895}, p. 122; {P. Melioransky, “O Kudatku Bilike Chingiz khana,” [On the *Kutadgu Bilig* of Chingiz-Ḥān]}, *Zapiski Vostochnago Otdyeleniye*, 13 (1900), 015. There are excellent MSS in Istanbul, e.g., Ayasofya MS. 3869.

100. Ayasofya MS. 3869, fols. 177b-211a.

101. *Ibid.*, fols. 212b-25b.

102. *Ibid.*, fol. 219b.

103. *Ibid.*, fol. 208 : جماعت کروایان رسمی که معموداست واز دیوان مقرر شده وصورت آن برلوحی که منقوش ومعلق است نوشته بی زیادت ونقصان با او جواب کویندتا او بدیوان رساند دیکری درکار او دخل نکند.

of cash, and if this were permitted ¹⁰⁴. There is no doubt that very serious attention was given to adhering to the system of salaries that was established in the budget of the Ilhānīd state.

In addition to this, there are lists of personnel and their salaries in 'Alā-i Tabrīzī (fols 65-66, 85-88, 91-98) and *Risāla-i falakiyya* (e.g., fol. 77). These lists will be the subject of a separate study {apparently never published}.

104. Ayasofya MS. 3869, fol. 183: اصحاب دیوان مرسومی که بنام بخشی کاتب مغولی نویس که در دفاتر مغولی مقرر بوده باشد سال بسال با او جواب کویند .
And on *bükavul*, fol. 185b: اصحاب دیوان بزرك : مرسومی که بنام بو کاول مقرر باشد ودر دفاتر مثبت با او جواب کویند .

اصحاب دیوان مرسوم بکاولی بموجبی که :
And also : دفاتر مثبت و مسطور باشد با او جواب کویند و چیزی قاصر نکنند بنام او مقرر کردانید .

اصحاب دیوان مرسوم بوکاولی در :
And on fol. 186a : دفاتر ثبت کنند وچنان سازند که سال بسال از موضعی مرجو الحصول بدو واصل کرد و بفراعت خاطر بدین حظیر قیام تواند نمود تا محمدمت پیوندد .

اصحاب دیوانی بزرك :
On *yasavul*, see fol. 186a : مرسومی که در دفاتر بنام یاساول مجری و مقرر باشد سال بسال بر مواضع مرجو الحصول حوالت کنند تا یاسانی بدورسد واکر در عوض مرسوم موضعی دیوانی باتمغا التماس کنند تا تصرف گرفته هر سال مرسوم خوداز مباشران آن موضع و تمغا استیفا نماید ملتسمس او مبدول داشته .

مقرر و مسلم دارند اصحاب دیوانی بزرك :
Fol. 197a : واز دیوان برانجا حوالتی نکنند و مزاحم نشوند مرسوم یا ساولی که بموجبی که دفاتر دیوان بر کیت آن مشتمل است سال بسال با او جواب کویند واز نقص و تنقیص مختبر و محتجب باشند .

و مرسوم مالی و رسوم :
On *uluğ bitikçi*, see fol. 196a : خارجی که این منصب را مجری و مقرر باشد ودر دفاتر بنام الخ بتکجیان سابق مضمی و مثبت شده بر همان قرار با او وکاشتکان او جواب کویند و پروات بر مواضعی اطلاق کنند که ارادت او با شد .

On *mustawfi 'l-mamālik*, see fol. 194a :
وهر سال از اصل مال و متوجهات دیوانی مبلغ بیست هزار دینار زر رابع با رسوم خارجی که مرسوم مستوفیان بوده با او ونواب وکاشتکان او که در هر طرف از اطراف ولایات باستیفا تعیین کرده باشد جواب کویند واکر او را ارادت با شد که بمتوجهات مواضع مرجو الحصول مقاصه و مستفرق کردانیده سال بسال ازانجا تصرف نماید بر آن موجب بتقدیم رسانند واجابت ملتسمس او لوازم شیرند .