It was back in 1985 that Michael Mitchiner decided that he wished to relinquish the job of editor of what was then the ONS Newsletter, a publication that had grown from its original 1 or 2 pages to one of 8 pages, with various items of news and some mostly short articles. After some prompting from our founder Secretary-General, the late Michael Broome, I agreed to take over the editor’s job in collaboration with Howard and Frances Simmons. Those were the days without personal computers or digital cameras: everything had to be typed and the images pasted up. Our first jointly edited newsletter was no. 96 (June-July 1985). The plan was to produce six issues a year initially of 4 pages each. This state of affairs lasted just over a year until Howard and Frances found they could no longer devote the time to it. I, therefore, decided to continue as sole editor and was fortunate to get the agreement of ONS members, Paul and Bente Withers, who as well as collecting and selling coins, also ran Galata Print. With their help and hard work, I succeeded in editing six eight-page issues a year until October 1990 (Newsletter 126).

At that point the Society decided that, for financial reasons, the frequency of the Newsletter should be reduced to four a year. To make up for that decrease in frequency, the length of the Newsletter began to vary from issue to issue depending on the amount of material available, with most issues being at least 10 pages, often more. And thus did it continue for another 14 years, with the length of individual newsletters increasing significantly and the publication of supplements from time to time, all facilitated by the development of tools like zeno ru and Jan explained that the ONS had received funds as part of the wrapping up of the Utrecht money museum in order to digitise the Journal. Once these were scanned, including the information sheets (after no.42), occasional papers, and supplementary volumes, the journal would be made available through the society’s web-page with the exception of the three most recent years. Shailendra Bhandare announced that the society planned to award a prize in future for the best paper each year in the Journal, which would be accompanied by a cash award of £200.

Now, 30 years after I first agreed to become Editor, I have decided to hand over the reins. I should like to thank everyone that has made the ONS and its Newsletter / Journal such a success during this period, the authors of articles, our printers (Paul and Bente of erstwhile Galata Print, Tina Stockley and the production and distribution team at Pardy & Son), our Regional Secretaries who do such valuable work in managing their respective regions and posting the Journal to members, my colleagues on the ONS Council and my assistant, Robert.

Robert Bracey will be taking over as Editor and, from now on, articles and correspondence regarding the Journal should be addressed to him at the e-mail address above. Robert will be assisted as required by other ONS Council members with specialist knowledge. Over the past 30 years, there has been a vast amount of publications in certain series, especially concerning the numismatics of the Sub-Continet and China. Much, however, remains to be done, e.g. many Iranian series. It is, therefore, important to maintain the impetus that has been built up in recent decades and not rest on our laurels. The Internet has become a very useful aid in spreading knowledge about coins and numismatics and I wish Robert every success in the years to come.

International Numismatic Congress 2015

The International Numismatic Congress 2015 was held in Taormina, Italy, and included a session on 22 September hosted by the Oriental Numismatic Society.

The session began with Jan Lingen giving an overview of the ONS activities in the last six years, the meetings of chapters (North America, London/Oxford, Leiden, Pakistan and India), and the use of Facebook as a means of communication. The internet has become more important for numismatics in general, with the development of tools like zeno ru and Jan explained that the ONS had received funds as part of the wrapping up of the Utrecht money museum in order to digitise the Journal. Once these were scanned, including the information sheets (after no.42), occasional papers, and supplementary volumes, the journal would be made available through the society’s web-page with the exception of the three most recent years. Shailendra Bhandare announced that the society planned to award a prize in future for the best paper each year in the Journal, which would be accompanied by a cash award of £200.

The ONS session, in the Palazzo Duchi di Santo Stefano, began with an introduction by Shailendra Bhandare and Jan Lingen.
This overview was followed by five papers. The first, by Robert Bracey, was an overview of the Late Kushan period, AD 250-350. In the second paper, Shailendra Bhandare gave a presentation on Post-Mauryan coins in the Deccan. He explained there was a traditional wisdom regarding the events after the end of the Mauryan Empire, which included the so-called ‘Sunga’ dynasty but that this did not fit well with material evidence which showed three broad regions of coin use in the Deccan: Vidarbha, Marathwada, West Maharashtra. He went on to discuss kings known from coins such as Kutapada or Patalatolata and their relationship with the Satavahanas.

The third paper, on ‘Nomadic Rulers, Iranian and Greek Gods, Language and Art on the Coins of Sogd in the first century’, was given by Alexandr Naymark. This was an overview of the rapidly developing iconography of first century coinage which fell between two lengthy periods of imitative coinage. The paper looked at the types of Hyrcoedes, the development of the fire-bird figure, similarities to Kujula Kadphises coinage and the ability of the engravers to hark back effectively to Seleucid types.

The fourth paper, by Sanjay Garg on ‘Couplets without Coins’, examined the many Persian, and other language couplets in preserved texts for which no surviving coin was known. This was a particular feature in the late Mughal period and included both couplets that were considered but ultimately not used as well as deliberate parodies of existing coins.

Jann Lingen finished the session by speaking on ‘The Numismatic Scene in India’ in which he gave his personal reflections on the development of numismatics in India over more than forty years.

The main Congress had two oriental strands, the first taking place on the Monday, and the second, focusing on Islamic material, taking place on the Thursday morning. Attendees from both strands were able to attend the ONS event. Each of the papers was followed by a lively discussion.

ONS Meeting Leiden, 17 October 2015 – a report by Jan Lingen

This year’s meeting took place for the second year running at the premises of Leiden University. Almost 30 members, mostly from the host country, but also from neighbouring countries, assembled for the usual welcome with tea and coffee at the ‘Pakhuis’ restaurant, a short distance from the University. The meeting proper commenced at 10.30 with a series of presentations and short talks held in one of the lecture rooms in the Johan Huizinga building of the university.

Proceedings began with a talk by Rudy Dillen from Belgium who has devoted much time on researching the Coins of Commagene - The Forgotten Kingdom and who was co-author for the section about the coinage of Commagene in Herman Brijder’s book: Nemrud Dagi. Recent Archaeological Research and Preservation and Restoration Activities in the Tomb Sanctuary on Mount Nemrud (ISBN 978-1-61451-713-9).

It was in 1882 when Carl Sester, a German engineer who was exploring parts of SW Turkey for a road programme, that a local shepherd, climbing a goat path, showed him an enormous man-made tumulus and sculptures of an old kingdom on top of Nemrud Dagh. As a result of his notifying the Archeological Society in Berlin about his discovery a preservation and restoration programme was started up which has continued until the present day. According to Diodorus, the ancient historian, it was in 163 BC that the local satrap, Polemaios, son of Xerxes, king of Sophene, declared himself independent from Seleucid rule. Polemaios himself produced no coins bearing his name, which is very odd for a king and founder of a new dynasty. Nevertheless, he must have needed coins for administering his state and building up an army. Oliver Hoover suggests that he ordered local manufacturers to coin imitations of drachms of the Seleucid ruler, Demetrios Soter, and finance his activities. It was his son, Samos II, who was the first Commagenian king to produce bronze coins in his own name. Throughout the history of the Hellenistic kingdom of Commagene, only bronze coins were produced for local use. The lack of silver and gold may have been due to their subordinate or feudatory status under Seleucid rule.

Provided the number of coins found in public and private collections are representative for the coin use in the Commagenean kingdom, as no hoard evidence is known, we may assume that in Hellenistic times there was no real monetary economy and trade mainly happened in barter, although Seleucid, Roman and/or Greek coins could have been in use.

It is only during the reign of the last king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (AD 38-72), when Roman expansion was at its zenith, that we see an increase in the use of coins. This Roman-style coinage with its motif of a scorpion, and which fitted into the Roman monetary system, was the last issued by the Commagenean kings. Thereafter, Roman imperial coins were issued in Samosata, as well as in Zeugma and Doliche.

The third paper, ‘Coins in the Deccan’ by Frank Hendriks, gave an overview of these relatively unknown series of coins, which showed the gradual change from the Byzantine prototype to a basically Islamic type of copper coinage.

For the third lecture of the morning session our minds and attention were shifted to the Far East, with the presentation by Wybrand Op den Velde on the book, Cast Korean Coins and Charms, which had recently been published by him and David Hartill (2013 ISBN 978 0 7552-1594-2). What had happened was that David Hartill had been working on Korean charms and amulets, and Wybrand Op den Velde on a revised catalogue of Korean cash coins. They had discovered this just by chance, and

## Commagene

**Samosata, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, AD 38-72**

**AE 28 mm, 15.60 g, 12 h, diassarion - octochalcus,**

**Obv.:** draped and diademed bust of king Antiochus IV to right, border of dots

**ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΜΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΣ ΕΠΙ**

**Rev.:** scorpion within circle and laurel wreath with diadem, border of dots

**ΚΟΜΜΑΓ-ΗΝΩΝ**

The next talk was given by Frank Hendriks on the rather complex and confusing subject of Arab-Byzantine coinage. It is a series with many varieties and many, so far, unexplained (mint)marks, a situation resulting from there being few if any written sources relating to the coins, particular from the period of the early Caliphate.

In his presentation he followed Clive Foss, who in his book, *Arab-Byzantine Coins*, used the following classification:

1) the Early Caliphate, AD 636-660, obv.: Imperial figure / rev.: M, similar to that seen on the coins of the Byzantine emperors, Constans II (641-668) and Heraclius (610-641), without mint or date.
2) the Caliphate of Muawiya, AD 660-680. A bilingual coinage with mint places Damascus, Homs, Tiberias, Heliopolis, and still with the imperial figures on the obverse.
3) The Caliphate of ‘Abd al-Malik, AD 685-705, known from eleven different mints, with a standing caliph on the obverse and a hitherto unknown symbol on 3 or 4 steps on the reverse.

With this last category the Arab-Byzantine coinage came to an end. Frank Hendriks provided an overview of these relatively unknown series of coins, which showed the gradual change from the Byzantine prototype to a basically Islamic type of copper coinage.

For the third lecture of the morning session our minds and attention were shifted to the Far East, with the presentation by Wybrand Op den Velde on the book, *Cast Korean Coins and Charms*, which had recently been published by him and David Hartill (2013 ISBN 978 0 7552-1594-2). What had happened was that David Hartill had been working on Korean charms and amulets, and Wybrand Op den Velde on a revised catalogue of Korean cash coins. They had discovered this just by chance, and
decided to amalgamate their efforts. A successful co-operation had resulted in this easily accessible guide to both types of objects.

In 1972 Edgar Mandel had published a catalogue of Korean cash coins. That book was largely based on the work of the Japanese numismatist, Hirao Sushen. Though otherwise an excellent work, Mandel failed to explain where the mints were located, and he did not pay attention to minor calligraphic varieties. These script differences were not random, but indicated different production dates. What is more, since 1972, several new varieties of Korean cash had been discovered.

The new catalogue offered a description of Korean political and monetary history, the production of cash coins, and their metal alloy composition. Mandel listed 511 types and varieties; the new catalogue listed over 900 such varieties, all illustrated with coin rubbings or newly-made drawings, a description and rarity rating. The numbering system introduced by Mandel had been maintained, so that collectors were not obliged to change their inventories. New entries were indicated by an additional letter to the decimal number.

The section on Korean charms offered photographs and a description of 689 specimens. These attractive and usually well and finely cast amulets showed great variety in design and shape. Also included was a selection of the rare chatelaines, an assemblage of coins and charms with coloured ribbons, which were given to brides on their wedding day. The iconography of the charms was explained in a separate chapter.

The speaker said that the book was ‘printed on demand’ by new-generation-publishing.com, but that this service was temporarily unavailable. New copies were being offered by Scott Semans World Coins, www.anythinganywhere.com, Amazon.com, and Amazon.co.uk.

After this informative morning session a well-appreciated lunch was taken at a nearby restaurant.

With attendees suitably refreshed, the afternoon session began with Henk Groenendijk drawing everyone’s attention to a small booklet, Palembang Coins (New York, 2015), by Frank S. Robinson. In this 20 page booklet the author had been able to give a good introduction to the tin coinage of this state and had listed 18 basic types with several dozen sub-types, all with rarity ratings from R1 to R10. The booklet was available from the author for US$ 7.00 post-paid.

The next talk was given by the author of this report, on Tranquebar, the small Danish settlement in Southern India.

The initiative for this settlement was taken by a Dutchman captured on Ceylon by the rajah of Kandy. He persuaded the rajah to grant him leave for a journey home and to allow him to negotiate with the “Gentleman Seventeen” for a Dutch military intervention to get rid of the Portuguese who controlled the coastal area of the island. When he arrived back in the Netherlands, however, the “Gentleman Seventeen” paid no attention to him, so he went to Denmark in an effort to persuade Christian IV and a couple of merchants to support his plans. He was successful in this as, soon afterwards, the king allowed them to establish an East India Company. The Charter thus obtained was a close copy of the Charter of The Dutch East India Company of 1602. The first fleet sailed out for the East in 1618.

It was another Dutchman, Roland Crappe who was sent ahead with the yacht Øresund to inform the rajah of Kandy about the treaty made with the Danish king, but, on arrival in Ceylon, he found that the rajah had made peace with the Portuguese and, therefore, refused to accept the treaty agreed in his name by his envoy. Not welcome on Ceylon, they tried to get a foothold on the Coromandel Coast, where they immediately got into conflict with the Portuguese. The Danish ship ran aground and some of the crew were captured and executed by the Portuguese. Roland Crappe, with a dozen of the crew, managed to get ashore and sought refuge at the court of the Nayak of Tanjore. They were well received and, during the following negotiations by Admiral Ove Giedda, a Danish nobleman, they received, under the treaty of 19th November 1620, the small trading post of Tarangambadi, which was soon renamed Tranquebar.

Immediately after the treaty they started to build a fort, which was given the name of Dansborg. When Ove Giedde boarded the ship for his return voyage in February 1622 the fort was not yet finished, but could be used. On Giedde’s departure, the Dutchman, Roland Crappe, obtained full command over Tranquebar and its trade.

In accordance with article 8 of the treaty, the Danes were “allowed to trade in all our countries with his Royal Majesty the King of Denmark’s coins called Danish solv-kroner (silver crowns) as well as with Ceylonese silver larins and each krone (crown) shall be valued 14 or 15 gold fanams according to its price”.

Besides the use of silver crowns (which were not successful) a bewildering variety of lead kas coins were struck for local use. The initial issues bore the name of the fort ‘Dannisborg’ or ‘Dansborg’. That the Dutch governor, Roland Crappe, must have had some influence on the coinage is evident from the lead kas with the name BEW / IN THE / BER (Bewinthebber) on the reverse, which is the Dutch for ‘Governor’.

The “Bewinthebber” lead kas (KM 3; UBJ 2), actual size c16 mm

The first dated lead kas coins appeared around 1644. Before that, the names on the reverse were those of ships. As the arrival dates of the ships are known, most of the undated issues can be reasonably well pin-pointed in time. Several lead kas-coins show the lay-out of the fort or the turreted gate. They may have been used for payment of the labour engaged in the construction of the fort. As such, they may have been the first coins minted in the history of the colony.

Christian IV specie taler, 1627 (KM 101; Sieg 107.1) dia c45 mm

Many lead kas coins of Frederik III (1648-1670) show images of Danish Provincial coats of arms seemingly copied from Christian IV specie talers. It was during his reign that copper kas coins were
introduced for the first time. Thereafter, coins were struck in the name of successive kings of Denmark, generally in small denominations for local use.

A 10 kas coin of Frederik IV (AD 1699-1730) (KM 127; UBJ 203)

The largest copper denomination was 10 kas. For trade, particularly with Bengal, a treaty was concluded in 1753 by which the Danes were permitted to mint royalarne, pagodas, and Pondicherry rupees. As the permission of the Arcot government was needed, the coins were probably like those minted at Arkot. Rupees with a flower mint-mark, between the regnal year and jālis have, by way of elimination, provisionally been identified as the Danish rupees struck at Tranquebar.

In 1845, after 225 years, Denmark sold all its possessions in India. As Tranquebar was commercially not very important to the British, it became a sleepy fishing village, but also an important Lutheran mission post. Despite some damage caused by the 2004 tsunami which had since been well repaired by India’s heritage organisation INTACH, Tranquebar was still a well-preserved “former Danish enclave under the tropical sun” and one of the finest colonial towns in India.

The session at the University ended with an auction of oriental coins and related books. There were 183 lots in total and bidding was keen for many of them. All in all, some 1,150 euros were generated for the ONS. Our thanks are due to all those who supplied or donated material for the auction as well as those who took part in the bidding.

The day was concluded in an oriental atmosphere with dinner at the Asian Palace Chinese restaurant.

Our thanks are particular due to Ellen Raven for being our host at the University of Leiden and also for the confirmation that we shall continue to be welcome at the premises of the University for our annual Leiden meeting. The date for next year’s meeting has been set for Saturday, 15 October 2016. All ONS members are welcome.

ONS Meeting Cologne 14 November 2015

This year’s meeting took place at the usual venue of the Römisch-Germanisches Museum, Cologne. Attendance was down on previous years as the meeting unfortunately clashed with other events and one or two of the usual attendees were unwell.

After some preliminary discussion, the meeting proper got underway with Bernhard Rhode presenting a well-preserved rupee in the name of Shah ‘Alam II, with mintname Murshidabad and dated AH 1178 year 6, that had been specially struck either by the Nawab at his Murshidabad mint or by the the East India Company at their Calcutta mint. At this precise time, the EIC were about to take control of all the Bengal mints. The rupee in question, illustrated below, shows the complete inscriptions and must have been struck for presentation purposes. (Paul Stevens, in his book The Coins of the Bengal Presidency lists, but does not illustrate, such a coin as 2.69 in his table on p. 94, It is described there as a nazara[n]).

The next talk entitled ‘The numismatic scene in India’ was given by Jan Lingen. He described how he, himself, first became interested in Indian coins and went on to relate how numismatics had developed in India since 1947 initially on a fairly limited scale and then, as more and more literature on the subject became available, and how particularly with the growth of the Internet, coin fairs and local auctions, far greater interest was now evident. While the ONS had been present there for a number of years it had now become far more active under its energetic, present Regional Secretary, Mahesh Kalra.

The third talk was by Bernd Czolbe, who presented a varied selection from his more than 300 strong collection of tokens. These included ones relating to various religions, ones depicting animals and even household scenes. Those made from around 1980 onwards were all made from base metal and had probably been made for tourists and visitors to religious sites.

After a pleasant lunch at a nearby hostelry, the afternoon session was devoted to coin identification and the sale and exchange of coins. The next meeting was fixed for 12 November 2016 at the same venue.

N. Ganske

ONS Meeting Oxford 21 November 2015

The Oriental Numismatic Society held a study day at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, on Saturday 21 November immediately following the Annual General Meeting. The first talk was given by Emilia Smaugur on an archaeological exploration of the site of Tilaurakot in Northern India being carried out by Durham University. There had been several previous excavations at the site, many of which had found coins useful not only for dating but also for understanding local chronology. A hoard of thirty-one punch-marked coins had been found in the earliest excavations, and another hoard of the same type had been discovered in the most recent digging.

On this occasion Emilia and the team had been able to cut a block around the hoard and lift it intact. It was then examined on site with layers of the hoard photographed and removed one at a time. Though well-established in the UK, this is an innovative method in South Asia. Once the coins are cleaned and identified it will make it possible to establish if the hoard is a single deposit for safe-keeping or was added to a little bit at a time by its owner.

Recording a hoard layer by layer.

At the end of the talk there was a discussion of the small spoked-wheel coins which are a combination of cast and die-struck and are found only at Tilaurakot or sites very nearby. The question of whether these might be related to Buddhist pilgrimage activity and had only a very local currency was discussed. As the site also yielded a large hoard of Ayodhya/Kushan coins in 1968, which showed, like many Gangetic sites, that there was a strong local demand for copper coinage, the question of whether these spoked-wheel coins were intended to meet a shortage in local currency was also raised.
In accordance with a long tradition, two memorial lectures are always given following the AGM in honour of Michael Broom and Ken Wiggins. The Michael Broom Memorial Lecture was given by Shailendra Bhandare, who also kindly hosted the event in the Heberden coin room, on ‘The Post-Mauryan Epoch in the Deccan: New Numismatic Evidence and its Historical Impact’.

Between the ‘imperial’ punch-marked coins of the Mauryan Empire and the die-struck coins of the Satavahanas there have usually been placed a variety of local Deccan coinages which show a mixture of die-striking, punch-marking, and casting techniques and frequently feature names ending in ‘mitra’ and ‘bhadra’. The traditional reading of this has been to fit them into the very limited textual sources which refer to the Sungas succeeding the Mauryans and to assume that production methods, name endings, and dynasties all succeed each other in a relatively straight-forward and simple manner.

Shailendra gave many examples of new coins, both new types for new kings but also coins naming new kings, and suggested the reality was much more complicated. Firstly there were kings, such as Kutapada, whose names did not end with ‘mitra’ or ‘bhadra’ as well as coins such as those of Bhadravati which were issued in the name of a city-state not a king. There was a wide-spread use of countermarks on the coins, which suggests a complex economic situation in which different currencies had to be validated, and his analysis suggested that in many cases cast or punch-marked coinage continued to be employed after the introduction of die-striking. The conclusion was that the Deccan needed further careful study in its own right and it was likely that, after the Mauryan and even in the early Satavahana period, it had had its own distinct political and numismatic history.

The Ken Wiggins Memorial Lecture was given by Paul Stevens on ‘The Reformation of the Coinage of Madras Early in the Nineteenth Century’. This talk focused on the period from 1807 to 1812 at the mint of the East India Company’s Madra Presidency. Roebeck, assayer master at the mint, had been promoted to mint master shortly after the Board of Governors had issued an instruction for the creation of a single currency based on a silver rupee of 108 grains. However, Roebeck, with the then governor Bentick, had entirely ignored this and made their own extremely complex reform.

The region already had two major currency types in wide use, the first based on South Indian gold pagodas and silver fanams, and the second based on the use of the ‘Arcot’ rupee. Paul gave a careful over-view of the reform that replaced this with two new pagoda denominations, five denominations of fanam, as well as five denominations of rupee, and, in copper, five cash denominations, two annas, and five dubs. The most interesting of these was the last of the copper dub denominations, the so-called ‘regulating’ dub. As the dubs were a third distinct system with no straightforward conversion, Roebeck had this coin marked with the inscription ‘this and three new dubs are one small fanam’.

Needless to say the system had not met with approval from the Board of Governors and had ultimately been discontinued.

The last talk of the day was given by Ellen Feingold on the holdings of the Smithsonian’s National Numismatic Collection. Though not well known to numismatists, the Smithsonian in Washington DC had quite a large collection of oriental material received as parts of large donations or collected by Ray Hebbard in the 1980s. It included a collection of Japanese koban presented to Ulysees S Grant and donated to the institution in 1836. There was a great deal of gold coinage, including a number of gold Mughal coins, which had been donated by the collector, Josiah K. Lilly. Despite this substantial amount of material the only part to have been published in any detail was the holding of Indo-Greek coins, for which a catalogue had been made by Osmund Bopearachchi.

Shailendra Bhandare delivering the Michael Broom Memorial Lecture.

Ellen also spoke a little about the refurbishment of the Museum. This has included a new Gallery of Numismatics that displays a history of coinage and money, including a small part of the oriental collection.

Seventh Century Syrian Numismatic Round Table, Oxford, 17 and 18 September 2016

The Round Table aims to bring together numismatists, historians and archaeologists with an interest in Late Antiquity/Early Islam in Syria/Palestine and the surrounding area. It holds small informal conferences at roughly two yearly intervals which usually include at least ten papers, most of which deal with Early Islamic or Byzantine coins. The central focus is the Syrian Arab-Byzantine coinage, but papers can cover Byzantine or Post-Reform Umayyad coinage, or aspects of the history or archaeology of Syria/Palestine. Papers sometimes present completed pieces of research, but more often they deal with ‘work in progress’ and plenty of time is devoted to debate and discussion. The next conference will be held over the weekend of 17 and 18 September 2016 at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. All are welcome, but pre-booking is essential. There will be a fee of about £25 to cover lunches etc. and limited overnight accommodation is available in the college. If you would like to offer a paper or attend the conference, or would just like more information please contact Tony Goodwin

Entrance to the new Gallery of Numismatics at the Smithsonian.
Members’ News

Congratulations to Irakli Paghava on being awarded his PhD in history, having defended his thesis on 29 October this year. The title of his thesis is “The Analysis of Numismatic Evolution in Medieval Georgia (VIII-XIII Centuries)”. Irakli has provided the following brief summary of his work.

“The 7th century witnessed Georgia’s first contact with Islam: the following centuries were marked by intense interaction. However, our sources are scarce and lacunose, so the coins both minted and circulating in Georgia gain much significance. The circulation of the national currency and transformation of local monetary markets were affected by the ongoing contacts. Hence the coinage that struck and the currency that circulated in 8th-13th century Georgia was carefully studied to determine the nature and extent of Georgian interaction with the world of Islam.

The numismatic data was analysed to ascertain when the Arab administration was established in Georgia: the history of coin-issuing activities in Tbilisi in the Umayyad and Abbasid periods; the circulation areas of the Kufic currency. The thesis also covers the last decades of the Alfarid rule in Tbilisi and the foreign policy and economic life of Muslim Tbilisi after the extinction / expulsion of the Alfarids and before the Georgian conquest. It continues with the last coin issues of the West Georgian kingdom, the monetary reform of David IV and the genesis and evolution of Bagratid coinage in the 12th, early 13th centuries.”

Irakli is planning to publish his thesis as a book, though, initially, probably in Georgian, apart from a summary in English.

News from India

Mumbai revels in Coin Fairs and Opening of the Lance Dane Bequest in September-October. Report by Mahesh Kalra

The two months of September and October saw two annually held coin fairs which enthralled the numismatic community of Mumbai and the rest of India. September saw the third COINEX Fair organised by the numismatic trio of Girish Veera, Abdul Razzak (Razzak bhai) and Sudip Khera, who organised the 3-day event with 3 auctions and as many as 70 Stalls exhibiting various coin series, accessories and the like open to the general public of Mumbai. COINEX was held from 11 to 13 September at the premier location of Sunderbai Hall equidistant from the two train terminals of Mumbai: Church Gate and Chatrapati Shivaji Terminus (earliest Victoria Terminus for old timers who may have visited Mumbai). Needless to say, the 3-day event was a roaring success for one and all including the Oriental Numismatic Society, which signed up its 220th member at the fair!

The month of October saw the the Mumbai Coin Society organise the 13th edition of its famed MCS Coin Fair at the prestigious World Trade Centre at Cuffe Parade from 16 to 18 October. However, the occasion turned bittersweet with the death of Mr Dinesh Hegde, the Secretary of MCS, on the evening of 17 August after a brief illness. He was a veteran collector of Indian coins and ambitious organiser of the activities of the MCS. He was also a keen member of the ONS-SA, which pays homage to his departed soul. An obituary to him can be found below, on page 9.

The MCS Fair received a huge impetus after gaining the support of the trustees of the Hinduja Foundation. The Hinduja Foundation is a philanthropic, non-governmental welfare agency supported by the well-renowned Hinduja family. The Foundation, apart from its many social activities, secured the antique collection of the late Lance Dane, whose large numismatic bequest, comprising some 28,000 coins, has been collated as the “Lance Dane Bequest”. The opening of the Bequest took place on the evening of 15 October at the World Trade Centre at the hands of His Excellency Shri Ch. Vidyasagar Rao, the Governor of Maharashtra and Chancellor to the University of Mumbai (est. 1857). Accompanying the Governor was Dr Sunjay Deshmukh, Honorable Vice-Chancellor, University of Mumbai, who announced the opening of the Collection for public display and the release of a book, Ancient Coins of India – The Lance Dane Bequest, with various dignitaries like Hinduja Foundation Trustees, Mr and Mrs A. P. Hinduja, Mr Paul Abraham, Chief Operating Officer, Indusind Bank (the chief architect behind the acquisition of the Lance Dane Collection by the Hinduja Foundation), Dr Shailen Bhandare, Mr Amiteshwar Jha, Director, Indian Institute for Research in Numismatic Studies (IIRNS), Nashik, joining the release of the book. The audience was regaled by a presentation by Dr Shailen Bhandare on Satavahana Coins and some select Satavahana Coins by Prof. Amiteshwar Jha, who had helped catalogue the collection. The audience then was privy to a select group of ancient coins from Lance Dane’s Collection of ancient Indian coins which was open to the public during the MCS Fair for the following 3 days.

The MCS Fair saw a fair crowd of visitors and 4 auctions. Importantly, the MCS Committee declared their annual ‘Mudra Ratna Puraskar’ (lit. ‘Jewel among Coins’ Award ‘Lifetime Achievement Awards’) to three prominent numismatists: the late Mr Dinesh N. Hegde (posthumously accepted by his niece, Devayani V Hegde), Mr Basil Shanik, ex-Reserve Bank of India, responsible for the establishment of the RBI’s Monetary Museum in Mumbai, and Mr Vinayak Nipasure, for organising exhibitions in rural parts of Western India for the general public on a free-entry basis for over two decades. Needless to say, the awardees were cheerfully applauded for their stellar contributions by all members of the numismatic community present at the well-attended ceremony on the morning of 16 October.

The next two days saw a steady flow of crowds of interested numismatists, coin collectors and dealers from across the world with 4 auctions. The MCS Fair also had a fair share of visitors from the general public who were attracted by the wide range of numismatic stalls and the various coin series on sale or display by the dealers. The organisers at both coin fairs once again extended the courtesy of giving free stalls to the Oriental Numismatic Society for helping it reach out to new and prospective members.

New Members

European Region

From Left to Right: Mr Paul Abraham, Dr Shailen Bhandare, Mrs H. A. Hinduja, H.E. Ch. Vidyasagar Rao, Governor, Maharashtra, Mr A. P. Hinduja, Dr Sunjay Deshmukh, Vice-Chancellor, University of Mumbai and Prof. Amiteshwar Jha

[Image of members]
Acheh coinage alone.

Obituaries

Vasilijs Mihailovs (15.5.1978 - 11.8.2015)

Vasilijs Mihailovs died on 11 August 2015 in Latvia at the age of 37 during surgery. His friend, Veronika Usenko, kindly sent me an English translation of what his mother, Tatiana Mihailova, had communicated to her about Vasilijs' academic and professional career, from which I quote (with edits):

"Vasilijs was born in Riga on 15 May 1978 and until the age of 18 was devoted to this city. From early childhood he loved books, and one of his first words was "read". When he was 18, Vasilijs received a student permit to study in Thailand on a six month UNESCO-sponsored programme at the Kasetsart University, Bangkok. Since then he loved this country, returning there again and again over the course of his career.

He graduated from the University of Latvia and received a bachelor's degree in chemistry and a master's degree in Oriental studies. He also graduated from the University of Hong Kong in Business Administration, after which he joined a four-month exchange programme at the Indian School of Business in Hyderabad. Between 2011 and 2013 Vasilijs worked as Certification & Training Director at ISACA (Information Systems Audit and Control Association) Ireland, in Dublin, thereafter returning to Bangkok. He knew many languages. With his mother he was quite open at times and shared joys and sorrows."

Vasilijs (I am using the spelling of his first name with a final "s" as it appears in his publications) is best known to experts in and collectors of southeast Asian coins as the co-author (with Ronachai Krisadaolarn) of a much praised English-language book on Siamese coins, which presents a scholarly researched historical overview of Thailand's coinage from its beginnings until the 5th reign of the Rattanakosin dynasty. This lavishly produced book is the first comprehensive discussion of the Thai coinage in the English language since 1932, when Reginald le May (1885-1972) published The Coinage of Siam.

It was in London where I met Vasilijs for the first time in June 2013 after having been introduced to him by the Rhodes family. He had understood that I was a collector of Maldivian coins and was interested to hear more, and, being an eager collector, he naturally asked me if I had any duplicates and could help him to improve his own collection. We had dinner together in a restaurant in Bloomsbury and met each other several times in the flat of Deki Rhodes near the British Museum.

Previously, Vasilijs had become a close friend of the late Nicholas Rhodes after they discovered their common interest in the coinage of Aceh (Sumatra). Both were harbouring the idea of producing an extensive catalogue of this coinage and, together with Vasilijs, Nicholas Rhodes had already drafted quite an advanced manuscript before his death in June 2011. Vasilijs explained to me that they were confident of being able produce a much better monograph of the coinage of Aceh than had been done previously by the Dutch Numismatist, J. Leyten. After getting some idea of Vasilijs' competence in southeast Asian numismatics, I had no reason to doubt his optimism paired with self-confidence and could well believe that Vasilijs would be able to complete the book on Aceh coinage alone.
While staying in Bangkok in January 2014 I had another opportunity to meet Vasilij. He took me to the famous Chatuchak market in order to introduce me to the various coin dealers. We wandered around an area in Thonburi, where Vasilij had been living while studying in Bangkok, an area (as Vasilij liked to point out) which was still largely untouched by tourism. He also showed me the fabulous collection of Thai coins of his friend and co-author, Ronachai Krisoladarn. Naturally our day together ended in a restaurant somewhere off Silom Road with a copious Thai dinner which we both thoroughly enjoyed.

The last time I met Vasilij was again in London. He had told me about his plans to visit the U.K. and had suggested that we could arrange a get-together of collectors of Maldivian coins. He had informed Peter Budgen and Gylfli Snorrason about the meeting. Gylfli Snorrason could not come from Iceland, but Peter Budgen was enthusiastic and had come to London, bringing along the manuscript of his book on Maldivian coins of which he presented a copy to both Vasilij and me. We went out for dinner to a Greek restaurant in Bloomsbury and continued discussing Maldivian coins and Peter's book, which consists of a comprehensive study going far beyond the earlier publication in this field authored by Tim Browder.

Two days later I accompanied Vasilij to Euston station from where he took a train to see a friend, before he was due to fly back to Bangkok. He mentioned to me that he was considering having a stomach operation in Latvia; it sounded like a routine operation and of course I never thought that the handshake at Euston station would be our last.

I remember Vasilij as a brilliant and highly intelligent person whom he mentioned to me several times and of whom he was very fond. We left us some additional excellent studies on the coinage of Acheh and the Maldivian coins have lost a very promising expert who could certainly have contributed more to his field authored by Tim Browder.

Vasilij also translated into Russian the article "The Coinage of Bangladesh" authored by his friend, the late Nicholas G. Rhodes. This article was eventually published in a Russian language volume on Asian numismatics which contains collected contributions by various authors: Rhodes, Nicholas (translated and edited by Vasilij Mihailovs): "Bangladesh: Kratkij Historiko-Numismaticheskij Ocherk" ("Bangladesh: A Short Historic-Numismatic History"). In: Historiki-Archeologicheskij Zapiski, Vol. I, edited by E.P. Tokareva, Zimovnikovskij Kraevedcheskij Musej (Regional Museum of Zimovniki), Zimovniki, 2009, p. 129-133.

Wolfgang Bertsch

Dinesh N. Hegde

On 17 August 2015, the Mumbai Coin Society lost its founder member and Hon. Secretary, Mr. Dinesh Narendra Hegde, after a brief illness. Mr. Hegde, known for his gentle demeanour and friendly disposition, was perceived by most Mumbai collectors as "always willing to help and very dedicated to the pursuit of good numismatic practice.

He was born in Mangalore (Mangaluru, Karnataka) on 19 October 1961, but his family soon shifted to suburban Mumbai, where he graduated in Finance from the University of Mumbai before pursuing an L.L.B. from the Government Law College, Mumbai, in the eighties. After his graduation, he joined the Mumbai Port Trust, where he had risen to the post of Senior Auditor in the Finance Department at the time of his passing. In spite of his busy schedule and workload, he looked after the affairs of the MCS with the utmost dedication and was largely responsible for the accounts and administration of the Society. He went out of his way to be helpful to the budding numismatists and was always a through gentleman.

Mr. Hegde's interest in Indian Numismatics began in the eighties when his U.K.-based uncle gifted him a few coins on his trip to Mumbai. He instantly developed a keen interest in the hobby and began collecting world coins. He soon discovered the wonders of Indian numismatics and turned his gaze to British India coinage, Indian Princely States and Portuguese India coinage. His collections and their exhibitions won him accolades wherever he took them, including some national-level competitions. He strove to explain his exhibits to young collectors (including the writer of this obituary during his M.A. in numismatics!) with such interest and patience that it won him many friends and well-wishers in the numismatic fraternity.

Besides his interest in coins, Mr. Hegde was an avid sportsman and excelled in carrom, chess and billiards. He represented the Mumbai Port Trust in competitions across India and went on to win many a tournament. Mr. Hegde will be sorely missed and his loss is irreparable to the numismatic world in general and MCS in particular. He is survived by his younger brother, Mr. Venkatesh Hegde, an Asst. Professor of Zoology, and his beloved niece, Devayani V. Hegde, who helped him in his collection and exhibits. Mr. Hegde was also a member of the ONS-SA, which pays homage to his departed soul.

Mahesh Kalra (with input from Ambrish Thaker and Kaizad Todywalla, Hon. Secretaries of the Mumbai Coin Society)
By any measure, this is a substantial collection, no doubt the most important public collection of these coins in North America, and the authors deserve our thanks for publishing it. Even though the ANS collection is now available online, having the entire collection available in a single catalogue is a great service to all collectors and students of these coinages. As the authors point out, this is the first new listing of Kushan coins since the 1993 publication of Robert Göbl’s catalogue of the coins at Bern,¹ and the first catalogue in English since the appearance of Michael Mitchiner’s catalogue of ancient coins.² Much has been discovered in Kushan numismatics since these dates, and so this new catalogue is especially welcome, especially to readers who do not read German.

Since one of the authors (Joe Cribb) has been at the centre of much of the new research on all three coinages treated here, the catalogue reflects many aspects of a new understanding of them. For instance, this is our first look at the reorganisation of the entire coinage following the results of die studies conducted at the British Museum. Göbl’s system of “officinae” based on the Roman model³ has been abandoned, as there is no evidence that the Kushans and their successors used such a system. Instead, it appears that the coins were struck at the mint (at (typically two) work stations, which shared dies. This discovery has given rise to a much simpler organisation for the coinage. In addition, the catalogue incorporates the chronology and numismatic organisation for the Kushano-Sasanian and Kidarite series developed and published by Cribb.⁴

Apart from the reorganisation of the coinages, the volume incorporates new attributions that have emerged over the past twenty years or so. For example, the coinage previously assigned to a Yuezhi prince “Heraus” has here been merged with the coinage of Kujula Kadphises.⁵ We are now fairly certain that “Soter Megas” was Wima Tako and the catalogue reflects that. The imitation Heliocles coinage, previously assigned to unspecified “Scythian” tribes, has here been divided up between Kujula and Wima Tako. Göbl’s kings “Xodeshah” and “Vaskushana” have been eliminated. Göbl’s category of “Maiores” for the late Kushan kings has been divided up and assigned to the kings Mahi, Shaka and Kipunadha, along with the Kidarite kings Yasada, Kirada, Peroz and Kidara. And these are just the most obvious reattributions!

The foregoing paragraph should give the reader a sense of just how much has changed in Kushan numismatics in the past couple of decades, which is why this volume is so welcome at this time. That being said, it is worth remembering that this is a collection catalogue, not a comprehensive one, which means that it does not give us a complete picture of absolutely the whole coinage. For that, we must wait for the new British Museum catalogue to appear in print; this volume gives us a preview. While the ANS collection 1

¹ Robert Göbl: Donum Burns Die Kušānmonēn im Münzkabinett Bern und die Chronologie, Vienna: Fassbender, 1993. ² Michael Mitchiner: Oriental Coins and their Values The Ancient and Classical World, London: Hawkins Publications, 1978. The listing of Kushan coins in Mitchiner’s newer catalogue, Ancient Trade and Early Coinage, London: Hawkins Publications, 2004, stops with the coinage of Kujula Kadphises. ³ We are now fairly certain that “Soter Megas” was Wima Tako and the catalogue reflects that. The imitation Heliocles coinage, previously assigned to unspecified “Scythian” tribes, has here been divided up between Kujula and Wima Tako. Göbl’s kings “Xodeshah” and “Vaskushana” have been eliminated. Göbl’s category of “Maiores” for the late Kushan kings has been divided up and assigned to the kings Mahi, Shaka and Kipunadha, along with the Kidarite kings Yasada, Kirada, Peroz and Kidara. And these are just the most obvious reattributions!

The foregoing paragraph should give the reader a sense of just how much has changed in Kushan numismatics in the past couple of decades, which is why this volume is so welcome at this time. That being said, it is worth remembering that this is a collection catalogue, not a comprehensive one, which means that it does not give us a complete picture of absolutely the whole coinage. For that, we must wait for the new British Museum catalogue to appear in print; this volume gives us a preview. While the ANS collection


We also regret to report the death in October 2014 of South Asian member, Ramesh Bajaj. Though a new collector to the field he was an enthusiastic learner and could have done well. He was an engineer by training and a great family man.

**Other News**

**Egyptian National Library**

The Collection of the non-hoard numismatic material in the is now online at Enl.numismatics.org.

The catalogue of 6,500 numismatic pieces – coins, glass weights, dies, medals, etc. - is the third major catalogue of Islamic numismatic material held in the Egyptian National Library, formerly the Khedivial Library, Egypt’s most important library. This catalogue differs from its predecessors in a number of ways. First, it is a new catalogue in that the inscriptions had to be read from the digital images which were taken under difficult and rushed conditions and not from the actual objects for reasons which are explained in the section entitled Introduction. Secondly, included in this electronic catalogue are inscriptions in Arabic as Dr Sherif Anwar read them, which was never possible in the previous studies because of costs. Inscriptions in European languages and references are the work of Dr Norman D. Nicol from the 1982 catalogue of the collection. Thirdly, images of every piece are part of this catalogue, which was financially impossible when the earlier catalogues were published. Fourthly, the images are in colour, which modern technology permits at no additional cost. On the other hand, the Egyptian National Library required that all images used on this webpage carry a watermark. Images without watermarks of specific items can be acquired by contacting the Egyptian National Library citing the 1982 catalogue number, which is the last number in the title listing for each item. Fifthly, whenever a mint was named and could be located, an accompanying map is included on the webpage. Finally, as far as possible, all the data and search tools are available in both Arabic and English for the first time in a catalogue. Electronic searches in Arabic and English can be undertaken by going to the category “browse” and then using the various lists to narrow the search. In order to find a specific piece based upon its 1982 catalogue number go to the heading “search” and under “keyword” go to “recordid” and type in the appropriate number.

This project is a result of the co-operation of the Egyptian National Library and Archives and the American Numismatic Society with funding from USAID through the American Research Center in Egypt. This electronic catalogue is made available under the Open Database License. It is powered by Numishare and numismatic concepts defined on Nomisma.org.

Jere L. Bacharach, Sherif Anwar

**Book Review**


This long-awaited and very welcome volume publishes for the first time the collection of Kushan, Kushano-Sasanian and Kidarite coins at the American Numismatic Society. Added to the ANS collection is a small group of coins from the collection of the late Dr Larry Adams. A total of 2,638 coins are catalogued, broken down as follows:

- Kushan (including Da Yuezhi) 1,688
- Kushano-Sasanian 720
- Kidarite 36
- Unidentifiable 26
- Imitations of Kanishka I 168

By any measure, this is a substantial collection, no doubt the most important public collection of these coins in North America, and the authors deserve our thanks for publishing it. Even though the ANS collection is now available online, having the entire collection available in a single catalogue is a great service to all collectors and students of these coinages.

As the authors point out, this is the first new listing of Kushan coins since the 1993 publication of Robert Göbl’s catalogue of the coins at Bern,¹ and the first catalogue in English since the appearance of Michael Mitchiner’s catalogue of ancient coins.² Much has been discovered in Kushan numismatics since these dates, and so this new catalogue is especially welcome, especially to readers who do not read German.

Since one of the authors (Joe Cribb) has been at the centre of much of the new research on all three coinages treated here, the catalogue reflects many aspects of a new understanding of them. For instance, this is our first look at the reorganisation of the entire coinage following the results of die studies conducted at the British Museum. Göbl’s system of “officinae” based on the Roman model³ has been abandoned, as there is no evidence that the Kushans and their successors used such a system. Instead, it appears that the coins were struck at the mint (at (typically two) work stations, which shared dies. This discovery has given rise to a much simpler organisation for the coinage. In addition, the catalogue incorporates the chronology and numismatic organisation for the Kushano-Sasanian and Kidarite series developed and published by Cribb.⁴

Apart from the reorganisation of the coinages, the volume incorporates new attributions that have emerged over the past twenty years or so. For example, the coinage previously assigned to a Yuezhi prince “Heraus” has here been merged with the coinage of Kujula Kadphises.⁵ We are now fairly certain that “Soter Megas” was Wima Tako and the catalogue reflects that. The imitation Heliocles coinage, previously assigned to unspecified “Scythian” tribes, has here been divided up between Kujula and Wima Tako. Göbl’s kings “Xodeshah” and “Vaskushana” have been eliminated. Göbl’s category of “Maiores domus” for the late Kushan kings has been divided up and assigned to the kings Mahi, Shaka and Kipunadha, along with the Kidarite kings Yasada, Kirada, Peroz and Kidara. And these are just the most obvious reattributions!

The foregoing paragraph should give the reader a sense of just how much has changed in Kushan numismatics in the past couple of decades, which is why this volume is so welcome at this time. That being said, it is worth remembering that this is a collection catalogue, not a comprehensive one, which means that it does not give us a complete picture of absolutely the whole coinage. For that, we must wait for the new British Museum catalogue to appear in print; this volume gives us a preview. While the ANS collection
is quite large and has a reasonably representative collection, it is a collection largely curated through a number of separate gifts rather than a steady process of curated purchasing. As a result, there are quite significant gaps in the collection as well.

Many of the ANS collection’s most important coins have previously been published by Göbl, as he had studied the collection in writing his catalogue. But there are still some coins being published here for the first time. The most important of these is coin 374, a quarter dinar of Kanishka I with Helios reverse. This is the first known quarter dinar from the earliest phase of Kanishka’s coinage, when the legends were still all in Greek (recall that, very soon thereafter, the language of the legends was changed to Bactrian). Until now, we have known of only full dinars from this period, so this coin is an important new type that shows the greater complexity of this “Greek” phase. The presentation of the coin as one of several quarter dinars in Kanishka’s “Early Phase,” does not do it justice and many readers are likely to miss its significance. It should have been presented before any other Kanishka coins, as it pre-dates all the other coins listed, being the only coin from the Greek phase in the catalogue. Oddly, the listing of the coin does not inform us (as other such listings do) that an enlargement of the reverse of this important coin is available on page 269.

The quarter dinar of Kanishka
(Actual size: 15 mm; weight: 2 g)

A very welcome feature of the catalogue is that the coin images are presented in colour (albeit on plates at the end of the book, rather than the more-preferred presentation with the listings) and there are enlargements of many of the images of the most important coins. This allows the catalogue to showcase particularly some of the exceptionally rare coins in the ANS collection, such as: the window (258) and enthroned (260) type double dinars and the chariot-type dinar (265) of Wima Kadphises; the Manabago (385) and Mazdooano (386) dinars and the unique Helios quarter dinar (374) of Kanishka I; the Manabago (715, 716), Shankarakam (723), elephant-rider (752, 753) and four-armed Oesho (776) dinars and Serapis quarter dinars (724, 725) of Huvishka; the Vavudeva I dinar with the bull licking Oesho’s feet (1083); the unique dinar of Kanishka II with a B monogram (1201); the Peroz II dinar (2342); the Peroz III dinar (2416); and the extremely rare Kidarite half dinar in the name of Varahran (2431). It is wonderful to see these rarities in colour, and often in enlargement.

The catalogue, including the listing of Kanishka I imitations from northern and eastern India in Appendix A, occupies the first 250 pages of the volume and is followed by several bonus Appendices. Appendix D compiles images of all the tamghas, or dynastic symbols, seen on the coins. Appendix B provides a very useful listing of the portrait types in the coinage of Huvishka. Huvishka had so many portrait types that a collector could become quite easily overwhelmed. This Appendix provides a large colour image of each type in the ANS collection in order to assist in clarifying the differences between the portraits. It might have been desirable to present a similar listing of Kanishka’s portrait types. While there are not that many of them, they play such an important role in understanding Kanishka’s coinage that a convenient listing of them would have been very useful.

Appendix C consists of a truly unique feature of the catalogue and perhaps its pièce de résistance: a 43-page listing of all the deities featured on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins. Colour images are provided and each listing includes a brief introduction to each deity. Deities not represented on any ANS coins are also listed. Since many of the deities on these coins are quite obscure, most readers will find this Appendix to be highly informative and an invaluable reference. In this context, mention may be made of the rather odd choice of cover illustration: the beautiful sculpture of Punchika and Hariti (perhaps Phaoro and Ardoshcho of the Kushan pantheon) from Takht-i-Bahi in the British Museum collection. There is no reference to the sculpture anywhere in the catalogue. Given that it is not a coin, nor even in the ANS collection, one wonders what it is doing gracing the dust cover of the book. It is truly a magnificent object but there are any number of magnificent coins in the collection any one of which may have been a more appropriate choice for the cover.

Following the Appendices, there is a very helpful concordance of the catalogue’s listings to the numbers used by Göbl in his catalogue. These Göbl numbers are also provided with each listing, along with Mitchiner numbers for the coinages of Kujula and Wima Taktso. Such cross-referencing is very useful to collectors who may have classified their coins according to an earlier catalogue and may wish to easily reattribute them according to ANS Kushan. Given that many collectors do use Mitchiner, as Göbl’s catalogue is out of print and hard to find, a concordance to Mitchiner and MAC numbers throughout the catalogue may have been useful. It might also have been useful to provide a listing of the coins from the Adams collection, as these have not been included in any previous studies.

Readers will no doubt have gleamed that this reviewer is delighted with this volume, both with its content and its overall presentation. Any deficiencies noted have been of a relatively minor nature. If there is one drawback that is not so minor, it is that the volume stands to a large extent on the foundation of the as yet unpublished British Museum catalogue. So, while the coinage has been reorganised and many attributions changed from previous studies, there is little detail provided here of the reasons for these changes. The reader interested in the why’s and wherefores will, therefore, be sorely disappointed. This shortcoming in the ANS volume has been caused by the delay in the publication of the BMC, which was scheduled to be released originally in 2013. Had that deadline been met, the ANS catalogue could have referred more fully to it and there would have been no sense of a perceived shortcoming. As it stands, the prior publication of this catalogue increases our anticipation for the BMC. Its authors would do well to prioritise its completion: the world awaits.

Once the British Museum catalogue is published, the ANS catalogue will stand as a very accomplished ancillary, providing valuable data from a very important public collection. In the meantime, it gives us a preview of the thorough reorganisation of the coinage to which the BM research has led. It belongs on the shelf of anyone seriously interested in the coinage of the Kushans and their related dynasties.

Pankaj Tandon

Corrigendum

In his article in JONS 224 ‘Was Tatta the last refuge of Din-i-Llah? – a numismatic perspective’, Mahesh Kalra erroneously included an illustration of a rupee of A.D 1042, regnal year 5, month of Shahrivar, as being of Tatta mint. It is, in fact, a rupee of Patna mint. We apologise for this error.

We should like to send all ONS members and their families our best wishes for the festive season and wish everyone a very happy and satisfying 2016!!!
A SMALL HOARD OF ARCHAIC GREEK COINS: LYCIA TO CILICIA

By Michael Mitchiner

The ten archaic Greek staters (shekels), which make up this small hoard, share many features of general concept and of manufacturing technique among themselves. They were made, from west to east, in Lycia (3 coins), at Aspendos in Pamphylia (2 coins), and at the Cilician mints of Kelenderis (2 coins), Soli (1 coin) and Tarsus (2 coins). The coins minted at Aspendos, Kelenderis, Soli and Tarsus are among the earliest coins struck at those mints, particularly when they are viewed in context with their early manufacturing features. The coins from Lycia occupy a slightly later position in the Lycian coin sequence.

The coins nearly all have dumpy flans, which are smaller than the obverse dies. A noteworthy feature is that the obverse dies remained in use until they were worn, and in some cases, worn out. The reverse dies, in contrast, are much fresher. These are features that the present coins share with those in the large Asyut hoard (Price and Waggoner 1975), which was buried circa 475 BC. Price and Waggoner commented on the continued use of worn-out dies when cataloguing the coins of Lycia.

The Asyut hoard contained a good range of coins minted in Caria, in the cities on the island of Rhodes, in Lycia and in the cities on the island of Cyprus. Apart from one coin of Side (no. 775), the coastal cities situated further eastwards along southern Turkey were not represented in the Asyut hoard (Aspendos, Kelenderis, Soli, Tarsus). Examples of coins with worn out obverse dies include some Lycian issues: Asyut 759 (= Mitchiner 2004, 615), 762 and 769. In Cyprus, the earliest coins of Paphos have a typeless obverse and an eagle’s head on the reverse. See Asyut 784 (= Mitchiner 1978, 148; 2004, 626) and 783. This reverse was copied from the design used at Jalyos on the island of Rhodes. See Asyut 705 (= Mitchiner 1978, 10; 2004, 603), 703, 704 and 706. Some of the typeless obverses just noted were struck from worn-out obverse dies, which had originally been engraved with a design. Other coins were struck from a typeless obverse die, which shows no evidence of ever having been engraved.

Price and Waggoner’s analysis helps to provide a secure chronology for the three Lycian coins in the present hoard. The early Lycian coins had a pictorial obverse design combined with an incuse square, often with geometric engraving on the reverse. The present coins belong to the second series, whose coins are characterised by a pictorial obverse combined with a pictorial reverse, but no inscriptions. Price and Waggoner dated the Asyut coins of this class (752-761: Lycian weight standard) to the period circa 490 to 475 BC. Datings suggested by Head (1911) and by Mitchiner (2004) are not significantly different. Sear (1979) tended to down-date the inception of the various coastal coin series minted in southeast Turkey.

The three Lycian coins in this small group can reasonably be dated to the period circa 490 to 475 BC. The manufacturing features, to which attention has been drawn, also apply to coins minted in the more easterly cities. The two coins minted at Aspendos were struck from worn, though recognisable, obverse dies and from well-preserved reverse dies. The two coins from Kelenderis are the only specimens struck from well-preserved obverse and reverse dies. They share the dumpy fabric of the other coins and the obverse dies are significantly larger than the coin flans. The coin from Soli was struck from a worn, though recognisable, obverse die. The two coins from Tarsus were struck from worn-out obverse dies.

The date of the Lycian coins suggests a reasonable date for the rest of the coins in this small hoard. Head (1911) had earlier dated the introduction of coinage at Aspendos to circa 500 BC (p. 699) and the introduction of coinage at Kelenderis (p. 719), Soli (p. 728) and Tarsus (pp. 729-30) to circa 450 BC for each of these Cilician cities. 

Lycia
Boar / Tortoise: circa 490-475 BC

1. Boar, with head lowered, walking to left
   rev. Inside incuse square; a tortoise viewed from above: in square border of small pellets
   Silver stater, die axes 7, 16 mm, 9.2 g

2. Same obverse, but struck from a worn-out die
   rev. Same tortoise design, struck from a different die
   Silver stater, die axes 9, 17 mm, 9.2 g

3. Same obverse, and struck from a worn-out die.
   rev. Same tortoise design, struck from a different die
   Silver stater, die axes 8, 20x16 mm, 9.2 gm

These coins were minted to the local Lycian weight standard. The heavier, Persian weight standard was used in the region before the burial of the Asyut hoard.

Paphos / Boar / Tortoise: see Head (1911) p. 689; Sear (1979) 5179
Pictorial / Pictorial: Lycian weight standard: see Asyut 752-761; Mitchiner (2004) 616-620

Pamphylia:
Aspendos
Athlete / Triskeles: floruit c. 480 BC

4. Naked athlete running to right
   rev. Inside incuse square, triskeles of three human running legs, in plain field
   Silver stater, 18x16 mm, 10.8 g
5. Similar obverse
   rev. Inside incuse square, triskeles of three human running legs plus symbols in field. The ‘feathers’ between the legs of the triskeles suggest that the triskeles was engraved over a ‘bird with closed wings standing to right’. In field, letter E
   
   Silver stater, die axes 6, 18x16 mm, 10.8 g
   Minted to the Persian weight standard.
   See: Head (1911) p. 699; Sear (1979) 5381-2
   Letter ‘E’. This stands for the city’s name in the Pamphylian dialect: ΕΣΤΕΔΙΩΣ equates with ΑΣΙΠΕΝΔΙΟΣ.
The issue with added symbol and letter on the reverse may have been marginally later than the issue with a plain field around the triskeles.
The obverse dies are more worn than the reverse dies.

   Cilicia:
   Kelenderis
   Horse and rider / Goat: floruit circa 480 BC
   
6. Naked rider dismounting from horse galloping to left.
   rev. Goat seated to left, with its head reverted. Letter, on its side, above goat - Λ
   Silver stater, die axes 2, 18x17 mm, 10.2 g

7. Similar obverse, plus letter below – Π. Part of pellet circular border.
   rev. Similar reverse, plus exergue line beneath goat. Letters above – (Κ)ΠΑ and below - Λ
   Silver stater, die axes 2, 19x15 mm, 10.6 g
   Minted to the Persian weight standard
   See: Head (1911) pp. 719; Sear (1979) 5527-9
   The first coin may be marginally earlier than the second coin.
The obverse and reverse dies used for both coins are well preserved.
The second coin has a small test cut on the obverse.

   Cilicia:
   Soli
   Archer / Grapes: floruit circa 480 BC

8. Nearly naked archer, wearing bonnet, running to left, holding arrow and with bow case at side. Part of pellet circular border
   rev. Inside incuse square, bunch of grapes. To left: ΣΟΛΕΞΩΝ. To right, floral symbol. Square pellet border
   Silver stater, die axes 6, 21x17 mm, 10.5 g
   Minted to the Persian weight standard.
   See: Head (1911) p. 728; Sear (1979) 5601
   The obverse die was worn, but the reverse die was well preserved.
There is a test cut on the obverse. It has been plugged with a putty-like substance.

   Cilicia:
   Tarsus
   Lion on bull / Corn ear: floruit c. 480 BC

9. Bull recumbent to left, being attacked by lion, which mounts its rump. Struck from a worn out obverse die
   rev. Inside incuse square, aligned obliquely, corn ear. To right, in Aramaic: TaRZ. To left, floral symbol. Square pellet border
   Silver stater, die axes 11, 20x19 mm, 10.6 g
   Minted to the Persian weight standard.
   See: Head (1911) pp. 729-30; Sear (1979) 5631
   The first coin has two test cuts on the reverse, both of which have been plugged with a putty-like substance. The second coin has a test cut on the obverse, which has been plugged with a similar substance, and a test cut on the reverse (not plugged).

   The test cuts and the information they provide

   The presence of test cuts on a significant number of coins in this small group would favour burial in a region where coins were not used as money, but only as bullion. The prime candidate at this period was Egypt. Many early Greek coins found in Egypt have had their purity checked by means of test cuts. The provenance of the coins published here has not been recorded. It is possible that they were found in Egypt.

   The test cuts on these coins permit a further suggestion. This comes from the observation that several of the test cuts have been plugged with a putty-like substance. The plugs do not hide any of the test cuts. They merely make them less intrusive. It is unlikely that a dealer would take the trouble to do this. It is more likely that a private collector would have plugged the test cuts. If this is the case, it would follow that the coins were not found recently. They were found some time ago, perhaps in Egypt, and later spent time in a private collection.

   Were the present coins part of the Asyut hoard?

   In order to discuss this possibility, one needs to look at how the coins in the Asyut hoard were dispersed, marketed and later published. Price and Waggoner noted that the hoard of around nine hundred coins was found in 1969. Specimens were first seen in the west during 1970. There appear to have been three finders.
They divided the coins equally. Two of them sold their coins to the same dealer. He sold fifty coins in Beirut and over five hundred coins to a European. Those five hundred coins were later recorded when in various hands, in London. Some of the coins sold in Beirut later reached Europe. Others remain unaccounted. The third finder of the hoard sold his coins separately and they made their way to the USA. They were later recorded by the American Numismatic Society in several groups.

One can reframe the question. Are the coins published here some of the coins originally sold in Beirut? It is a hypothesis that will probably never be proved. Ten coins from the Asyut hoard were sold in Beirut and were then kept in a private collection for several decades before they were eventually taken to Western Europe.

Perhaps the important point is not so much whether the hypothesis is correct, or not. The important point is that this discussion emphasises the close relationship between the coins published here and the coins in the Asyut hoard.

This has implications for dating the introduction of coin minting at the cities of Aspendos, Kelenderis, Soli and Tarsus.
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THE CHRONOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE AKSUMITE COINAGE: THE METROLOGICAL AND TYPOLOGICAL EVOLUTION FROM NOE TO KALEB (C AD 400 – C 540)6

By Wolfgang Hahn

The 5th century AD is a time of extreme paucity in historical sources relating to Aksum, but the coins which have come down to us in fairly large numbers are witnesses of the enduring royal might under the sign of the cross. They show that not even a temporary decline had taken place7 and they enable us to reconstruct the sequence of kings whose names are unknown from other sources; we do not have any other reliable clues for their absolute chronology at our disposal.

6 Continued from JONS (218, 220, 221, 223) and translated with the kind assistance of Vincent West from a slightly revised German version which was originally published in the Mitteilungen des Instituts für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte (part of vol.50a, University of Vienna 2015). With this contribution the series commenting on the history of the Aksumite coinage is completed (the late period being dealt with in JONS 205). The abbreviated quotations are: AC = S. Munro-Hay & B. Juel-Jensen, Aksumite Coinage, London 1995, H. = W. Hahn, Aksumite Numismatics, A Critical Survey of Recent Research, Revue Numismatique 155, 2000, 281-311 (drawings of the main types), EAE = Encyclopaedia Aethiopica, vol. 1-5, Wiesbaden 2003-14, RIE = Recueil des inscription de l’Ethiopie des périodes pré-axumite et axumite, Paris 1991.
7 This impression stems from a contemporary travel account (Pseudo-Palladius) in which it is mentioned that Aksum was ruled by a petty king (basiliskos mikros) ruling in Aksum, but this was based on a rumour (heard by the writer) that there was an “all-Indian” emperor residing in Ceylon.

(VII) Noe bisi Anaaph (1st quarter of the 5th century)

The reason for the name of the acting king reappearing on the gold coins of type H.28 (after a period of posthumous Ezana coinage, as postulated by myself) could be an alteration in the king’s title; this, as well as the clan name (nomen gentilicium) of the new king (bisi Anaaph), seem to have a South Arabian connotation, a point that needs to be raised.

Regarding the personal name of the king, there can be no doubt that it is to be read as Noe, which had already been recognised by the famous Ethiopist, Enno Littmann long ago8. This is the first time we know of that a king’s name was chosen from the Bible, and it carries a programme9. Regrettably, in most of the relevant literature, king Noe figures under “Eon” as a result of an erroneous reading of the legends, without considering which solutions are possible in coin typology, when the image is accompanied by divided legends10. In our case the circumscriptions are split into four parts, divided by four croisslets, as is usual on gold coins following Ezana’s conversion in 360. By this arrangement of the legend (outside the round shield which depicts the king’s image together with the ears of corn) they point towards the four directions of the world and symbolise the universality of the new religion.

What is new in this composition is the transfer of the king’s personal name to the side of the coin with the head-cloth, where it joins Noe’s clan name (nomen gentilicium), whereas the title has been contracted on the side with the tiara, which is the higher-ranking in the hierarchy. This change seems to have been caused by the use of the meaningful term chora in the title; it is the Greek equivalent of an Ethiopic word standing for both the country and the town. It was taken from the main side of the anonymous copper coins (H.33, as also the silvers H.32) where it is connected with the cross on shield (the symbolic imago Christi), and thus carried a special ideology11.

A larger number of dies have blundered legends and this is why the reading has eluded generations of interpreters. But, starting from the good primary (master) dies (H.28.1), we can discern the name of Noe written in the third quadrant anti-clockwise (between 9 and 6 o’clock turned inwards). The first letter is Nahas in Fidal script (instead of a Greek Ny). The personal name is thus distinguished from the clan name which continues the legend but is written clockwise (turned outwards) in quadrants 4, 1, 2, divided into groups of three letters: bis+i+an+i+aap. On the good dies, the Greek letters A, B, C and Ф are written correctly.

8 E. Littmann, Deutsche Aksum Expedition I, Berlin 1913, p.55. Even earlier the reading Noe was proposed by F.W. Prideaux in the Num.Chron. 1884, p.214, but he derived it from an Ethiopian term for wealth. A. Anzani, Riv. Ital. di Num. 1941, p.88 seems to have at last also accepted the form Noe.
10 Several times I have tried to expound this concept, e.g. recently: W. Hahn, The iconographical concept of the Aksumite coin typology, Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on the History of Ethiopian Art and Architecture (Vienna, Sept 2013; to be printed).
though sometimes retrograde. Such a different viewing direction is often adopted when lower circumscription parts are to be stressed; it has the advantage that reading the legend does not require rotating the coin itself. We can find this scheme quite often in the course of numismatic history, e.g. in the exergue of Roman or Himyarite reverses. Thus a reading of our king’s name as Eon is misleading, especially since such a name is attested nowhere else.

Turning to the side of the coin with the tiara, we also observe a four-part legend, starting in the third quadrant, but it runs clockwise throughout, sensibly because it contains a coherent phrase: the new title. It had to be abbreviated in order to fit into the concept of four groups of three letters. The reading is nevertheless obvious: +BA[sileus] X[or] AC+ABA+ Cin[on] = king of the land of the Abyssinians, who take the place of the Aksumites referred to before. The partition of this legend and how it is abbreviated appears to be very artificial, because the genitive of the significant word chōrās is placed where a crosslet could be used as an abbreviation mark, this being a feature of nomina sacra.

We may understand that engravers who were unfamiliar with Greek had their difficulties in the correct writing of these sophisticated legends. Thus we find variously blurred legends on later dies (e.g. H.28.2, possibly frozen for a while after Noe’s reign); the quadrants could be exchanged and simplified letter forms were employed without scruple: Λ can stand for A / ∩ for B, C (Sigma) or E / X for Φ or N / I for N, all of them eventually reversed. The engravers tended to avoid two-storied letters for reasons of space. Anyway, one can easily follow the pattern of the blurrings.

Bisi Anaaaph is the last of the royal clan names which appear on the coins although they were borne by later kings and are known to us from epigraphic sources. On the coins, however, they preferred to use the limited space for a religious message. Noe’s clan name is similar to an epithet (“the Exalted”) used by South Arabian kings and present on many of their coins in the form of a monogram as well as written in full. If the clan names of the Aksumite kings follow a matrilineal genealogy – as has been surmised – one could think of a dynastic link with Yemen, but this would certainly be an over-interpretation.

The new title seems to be of more relevance. Whereas on the monumental inscriptions the Aksumite kings marked out their territorial claims by a long series of titles, on the coins there was only room for the most important region (which in Greek was usually denoted by the people’s name). So the fact that we find the Aksumites replaced by the Abyssinians on the gold of Noe (and his immediate successors) must be scrutinised. The origins of this people’s name are rather uncertain. The geographer Uranus (recently dated to the 4th century AD) mentions Abasseni as a tribe in Yemen; a transfer of the name to the African shore of the Red Sea (recently dated to the 4th century AD) is attested nowhere else.

The origins of this people’s name are rather uncertain. The geographer Uranus (recently dated to the 4th century AD) mentions Abasseni as a tribe in Yemen; a transfer of the name to the African shore of the Red Sea (recently dated to the 4th century AD) is attested nowhere else. However, the form can neither be extrapolated from the spurious ‘kings’ lists, nor is it found in Greek (a hypothesis once favoured by myself so that, regrettably, I am not at all innocent in “Eon’s” propagation).

An alternative reading as a blurred basileus basileon (s. G. M. Browne, Some remarks on Axumite coin legends, Bibliotheca Nubica 3, 1990, 293-6) is not fitting.

A Hern. Onakondom a, Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions ..., Chicago 1974, pp.28f.

BMC (Catalogue of the Greek Coin in the British Museum) 25, Arabia, London 1922 (G.F. Hill) pl. III.

F. de Blou, Clan-names in ancient Ethiopia, Die Welt des Orient 15, 1984, 123-5.


Arabica fragm.19, quoted by Stephanus of Byzantium (6th century).


“South Arabicisms” indicate no more than a desire to recall ancient roots, as a faint memory of a higher ancestor culture.

Another connection with South Arabia, viz. the seemingly very numerous provenances of Noe’s gold coins from there, is irrelevant as they were part of later hoards connected with Kaleb’s expeditions. Thus, we can state that the term Abyssinia was taken up by the Aksumite kings in a similar way to the corresponding term, Aethiopia, used on inscriptions labelled in Greek and referring to the ties with Nubia. The preference to name the region (chōrā) instead of the urban centre (Aksum) perhaps followed a new tendency. In contrast to the attitude of the Roman emperors who addressed the Aksumite kings as lords of a town (tyrannoi), they regarded themselves as great kings (megalo basileis) of “All-Abyssinia”. The title “king of the land of the Abyssinians” was retained during a larger part of the 5th century. Thereafter, a geographical reference was completely dropped on the gold coins until Aksum reappeared in the legends during the last third of the 6th century.

About the same time as Noe’s gold was minted, the silver coinage recommended with a type which is as anonymous (H.32) as the coppers (H.33, which were continued and struck unchanged for many decades). They share the obverse with the preferred cross in round-shield and the chōrā slogan, but, on the silver coins, the double lined cross is gilt. On the triple-ribbed reverse the king’s bust is accompanied by his title, but – differing from the copper coins (on which basi-leus was kept in full) Noe’s new title-version appears abbreviated in a very short form divided into two groups of three letters on both sides of the image: BA[sileus] X[or] – AS A[bassion]24. Many specimens show traces of an earlier under-type which was overstruck, but in general the weight seems to have improved, perhaps by ½ to 1.03g.

If the number of silver coins worth one gold coin (chrysoi) remained stable at 30 this weight could indicate that the ratio of gold to silver had been adjusted to that valid in the Roman empire, i.e. 1 : 18. Possibly the newly-issued silver coins reduced the demand for the previously introduced larger copper denomination (H.26) with the name of Ouazebas and the partial gilding (of the imagos clipeata which probably depicts the divine Ezanas) so that it is uncertain whether they were continued unchanged for a while.

Interpreting the coins of this king has its inherent problems, starting with the Ethiopian legends which must be compared with

12 G. Fiaccadori, who staunchly clings to the Eon reading in the Encyclopaedia Aethiopica II, Wiesbaden 2005, col. 328f regarding “Noe as according to the natural reading direction of the whole legend” refers to C. Conti-Rossini, who brought forward several far-fetched etymologies for Eon. However, the form can neither be extrapolated from the spurious ‘kings’ lists, nor is it found in Greek (a hypothesis once favoured by myself so that, regrettably, I am not at all innocent in “Eon’s” propagation).

13 An alternative reading as a blurred basileus basileon (s. G. M. Browne, Some remarks on Axumite coin legends, Bibliotheca Nubica 3, 1990, 293-6) is not fitting.

14 Cf. A. N. Oikonomides, Abbreviations in Greek inscriptions ..., Chicago 1974, pp.28f.

15 BMC (Catalogue of the Greek Coin in the British Museum) 25, Arabia, London 1922 (G.F. Hill) pl. III.

16 F. de Blou, Clan-names in ancient Ethiopia, Die Welt des Orient 15, 1984, 123-5.


18 Arabic fragm.19, quoted by Stephanus of Byzantium (6th century).


20 Even special issues for Yemen have been considered, cf. S. Munro-Hay, Aksum, A Civilisation of Late Antiquity, Edinburgh 1991, p 190; this idea was first proposed by T.V. Buttery, Axumite Addenda, Rassagge di Studi Etiopici 25(1971)7244-52.


22 Athanasius, Apologia ad Constantium §31, introduction to the letter of emperor Constantius II to Eznas and Saizanas (Patrologia Graeca 33, 1857, 1165).

23 Inscription of Sembrouthes (DAE 3 = RIE 275, line 1)

24 H.26

25 Solidus denomination (1.5g) which was probably the official rate confirmed by an edict of 422 (Codex Theodosianus 8, 4, 27).
the similar, isolated occurrence under Wzb a century earlier. Again, they tell us the name of a king in its unvocalised form only: Mhdys. To know which vowels are to be inserted we should need the corresponding Greek form which, however, is not self-evident. After Noe, the choice of a biblical name would not be improbable, so that perhaps a (very programmatic) Mat(i)thias could fit well.27 Philological arguments for this solution have been adduced by Manfred Kropp, who supposed a voelling as Mahadyas.28 Such a name and the change to Ethiopian legends could have expressed a “national-religious” inclination as in the case of Wzb, but now it is markedly Christian. An additional argument is added by the typology of Mhdys’ coins.

Like Wzb, his Ethiopian-writing forerunner, Mhdys, also struck a gold coin of an extraordinary type (H.A30), completely different from the usual issues and very spectacular, but a little irritatingly, unknown from a single example. On the other hand, the corresponding copper of Mhdys (H.30) is not rare, if not as common as that of Ouzebas. Silver is only represented by a type of dubious authenticity.29 Probably the anonymous argyroi (H.32) which had been introduced by Noe were continued unchanged, as direct overstriking by Mhdys’ successor, Ebana (H.35), can be observed, apparently done on a large scale.

Contrary to the silver type, the gold coin of Mhdys is beyond any doubt: all indicators (except the circumstance of the invented silver) advocate its authenticity.30 The uniqueness may not be attributed entirely to the limited chance of survival. Apparently the Mhdys type, unlike the termite the striking of the gold under the name of Noe31 but was instead restricted to a special issue. In overseas trade, where the traditional gold type with Greek legends was established, the coin must have made a strange impression.

The typological composition of Mhdys’ gold coin clearly imitates the reverse of Romano-Byzantine solidi with a Christian Victory holding a long cross, and this provides a very welcome (though somewhat uncertain) chronological clue. This prototype was first used in the mint of Constantinople to celebrate a victory (or what was styled as such) during a war against the Persians in 422 when emperor Theodosius II held his 10th consulship and also the 7th anniversary of his reign.32 With this he issued a new type of the gold under the name of Noe33 but was instead restricted to a special issue. In overseas trade, where the traditional gold type with Greek legends was established, the coin must have made a strange impression.

The other side of the coin has a complementary figure of the king, and the legend contains the title of a victor (mwa in Ge’ez), which was also used by Roman emperors. As it remains uncertain whether there had been any specific occasion for imitating the Byzantine Victory type the decision on which of the two versions lay behind it, that of 422 or that of 450, is not easy.34 If we consider the difference in the reverse legends, the citation of Theodosius’ vota (and no apparent connection with the image) was entirely inappropriate on an Aksumite coin; the reference to the victoria auggg would have been more convenient—though the abbreviated form of the title augusti was perhaps not comprehensible in Aksum. Therefore, the choice of a proper legend35 may have been more reasonable if the earlier version of the type was at hand. The later version was struck in the Eastern Roman empire over a long period (450-507) and, after a while, such solidi appeared in the Indian trade;36 then a permanent change in the Aksumite coin design would have been more suggestive than keeping to the old type for the long run. In the chronological distribution of Aksumite gold within the 5th century the Mhdys coin seems to be better placed as an episode in the second quarter.

The copper coins of Mhdys (H.30) do not provide any additional hints for the dating; they must be inserted between the two long-lasting anonymous types (H.33 and H.36). In contrast to these coins, the name of the king is quoted—quite naturally as the typology was altered (in combination with the legends becoming Ethiopic). It is possible that it was preceded by a transitory, anonymous type which is only known from two examples (H.P30, not die-identical). It seems to aim at a modernisation of the older, anonymous type: the side of the coin with the king’s bust is that of a transient type. The introduction of the totally new Mhdys coppers which, however, may have been more reasonable if the earlier version of the type was at hand. The later version was struck in the Eastern Roman empire over a long period (450-507) and, after a while, such solidi appeared in the Indian trade;37 then a permanent change in the Aksumite coin design would have been more suggestive than keeping to the old type for the long run. In the chronological distribution of Aksumite gold within the 5th century the Mhdys coin seems to be better placed as an episode in the second quarter.

Thus there is a time difference of almost 30 years between the two possible models providing a terminus post quem for the Aksumite imitation. In both cases such solidi could have reached Aksum, either in the course of an embassy or as souvenirs of pilgrims returning from Jerusalem—as the cross upheld by Victory which is delineated by a double row of dots is symbolising the golden monumental cross erected by Theodosius II on what was left of the Golgotha hill, the site of Christ’s crucifixion, having been inspired to do so by a celestial vision over the Mount of Olives.38 The Aksumite version replaced it with a single-lined processional cross, and there is another legend which is very significant, but—as regarding the time of its appearance in Ethiopia—also surprising, as we are dealing here, as well as on Mhdys’ copper coins, with the famous victory slogan of Constantine the Great. The original version which had been in Latin as hoc signo victorius was translated by Eusebius of Caesarea into Greek as Ἡ σημαίνουσα σημαίνει τοιοῦτον νικήν (mwa in Ge’ez). Now, a hundred years later in Ge’ez it runs “by this cross winning”.

26 Geez written in Fidal letters; on some dies even word divisors (näqet) are noted (i), cf. V. West, Ge’ez punctuation marks on Aksumite coins, Oriental Num. Soc. Newsletter 166, Winter 2001, 4-5.

27 Literally the name means “Donated by God” (Theodore).


29 The origin of this modern invention might be the same as that of the silver coins of Wzb (AC 16). Besides rough castings in different metals and alloys, struck examples (regarded as genuine) are said to exist (AC 69) which would have served as models for the casts. Though it is possible that the better (primary) pieces were produced by professional centrifugal casting they could of course have been struck from dies standing at the beginning of a forgery chain. An ambitious connoisseur of Aksumite numismatics must have been responsible for the typological composition and, for the execution, a workshop with the necessary equipment was necessary; perhaps the inventor knew of a specimen of the gold type and wanted a supplementary silver (as in the case of Wzb). The motives for producing such “documents of national pride” may be imagined and the requirements for the manufacture are likely to have existed (cf. Encyclopaedia Aethiopica 5, Wiesbaden 2014, col. 376). Needless to say such coins have never been found in controlled excavations.

30 After this coin surfaced, much has been written about its typological composition as well as the technical and metallurgical aspects, cf. W. Hahn & M. Kropp. Eine axumitische Typenkopie als Dokument zur spätmittelalterlichen Religionsgeschichte, Jahrb. f. Num. u. Geldgesch. 46, 1996, 85-99. Doubts from an unprofessional viewpoint (EAE 4, 2010, p.651: „most probably a medieval (?) forgery“—seemingly, but wrongly referring to myself!) can not be taken seriously.

31 This is confirmed by the observation of a (tiara side) die reused by Ebana, see Num.Circ. 107, 1999, p.176.


33 To suppose any more than Aksumite sympathy for Rome in the war of 421/2 would be audacious, but news of the preceding celestial vision over Jerusalem (419) could have been impressive.

34 The use of the Constantinian victory slogan must go back to a direct knowledge of Eusebius’ writings because the only earlier numismatic occurrence in Rome (in Latin, on Western billon of the mid-4th century) was too remote to serve as a source of inspiration.

35 For their later presence in South Indian hoards cf. Money Trend 30, 1998, no.11, pp.52f.

36 Apparently this type inspired the fictional Mhdys silver (AC 69).
The gross weight of Mhdys’ copper coins seems to be the same as that of the anonymous lepta, but the small amount of gold used for the central inlay is a factor of uncertainty in the calculation of their value. In comparison with the much larger-sized inlay on the Ouzebas coins there might not have been the intention of adding value, though we have no idea how their value was related to these nor to the anonymous lepta of the early type (H.33).

(IX) Ebana (mid-5th century)

The name of this king belongs to a group of (Hellenicised?) Ethiopian names with -ana forms (like Ousana, Ezana, Thezena). Nevertheless, a Semitic root meaning “stone” might bring to mind the biblical parallel of Kephas/Peter. On Ebana’s silver coins (H.35) the legend with the king’s name starts on the left above the king’s shoulder (following the habits of coin composition) so that EB - ANA is the correct reading.

The silver coinage under Ebana (H.35) underwent another overstriking operation; anonymous coins (H.32) which had been issued under Noe and Mhdys were directly turned into coins of the new king. This procedure was simple but faulty because it increased the fragility of the flan. Nevertheless, the surviving number of anonymous silver coins seems to slightly exceed that of the Ebana type. Perhaps the supply of silver was smaller than the demand for new (updated) coins, which seem to have been highly esteemed for domestic circulation.

The difference between both types of silver coins is remarkable: in common, they have only the triple rim on the side with the royal bust and the gold inlay in the centre of the cross on the other side. There the cypher (round shield) has now disappeared and the four crosslets which interrupt the legend (like the gold type) are joined up to the ends of a rhombus, i.e. the symbol of the world. The briefness of the legends (the king’s name on one side and the title basileus on the other) made the correct engraving of taller letters (B, Ε) possible. The omission of a slogan in favour of the title seems to accentuate the latter which may be seen in correlation with the gold type. The eight letters of the word could easily be distributed into the four angles of the cross-crescent: ba si le us; a special trick seems to be the exchange of the initial and the terminating letters (B, Ε) by which the circumscription is seemingly clasped like a chain. This peculiarity cannot be explained by blundering because it is to be observed on all dies. In this case one may be tempted to think of an encoded basileus basileon.

The copper coinage in Ebana’s time was also innovative. After Mhdys with his legends in Ethiopian, a return to an anonymous coin-type labelled in Greek with the touto arese te chora slogan was perfect (H.36) and perhaps thought reasonable for propagating the message of monetary stability. The gilt dot remained, but on the other side the king was provided with a tiara the height of which made the triple rim less practicable (especially if a continuously written legend was wanted, e.g. H.36.1). The clue as to how to date this return to anonymous copper is the tiara-crowned bust which is to be seen in analogy with Ebana’s silver coins, this king being the first to extend it to the coins of metals other than gold.

(X) Nezana / Nezoöi (last quarter of 5th century)

The names of the kings in the period between Ebana and Kaleb fall into two groups: Nezana/Nezoöi and Ousana(s)/Ousas. Some inherent problems are linked to them. After clarifying the chronological order we have to find out whether these are only variants of identical names or the names of different kings reigning together as co-rulers.

37 Thus, the erroneous reading “Anaeb” which can be found in the older literature is easily dismissed.
38 Cf. Note 8.
40 This could be convenient with the cross symbol as the Hellenistic title basileus basileon had been transferred in Christian context to Jesus as Pantokrator (Apoc. of John 17,14) whereas the Aksumite king on monumental inscriptions used titles of humility (like “slave of the cross”).
The question of the sequence can be answered by observing the typological development. Contrary to what was formerly thought, Ebana was succeeded by Nezana, whereas Ousanas was the predecessor of Kaleb. Under Nezana, two alterations are noticeable at first sight: the gold coins at once omit the inner clypeus and, in the course of his reign, there was a revival of legends containing a religious slogan, a habit continued by Ousanas.

To decide whether Nezūl is only another/the original (Ethiopic) version of king Nezana’s name or that of a co-ruler is less easy. We should proceed from the fact that both names appear together on the same side of one coin in silver (H.40): Nezana in full in the Greek circumscriptio and Nezōl as a monogram in the first letters of the name. Monograms of this kind are frequently found on South Arabian coins but a few other instances can also be found within the Aksumite coinage: Wzb (H.1.5) and Kaleb (H.41a, b) also made use of such double naming. It, therefore, seems more probable that Nezana and Nezūl are one and the same person. The fact that both forms are present in the gold coinage at more or less the same time is likely to be the result of a confused matching of dies, the stock of which was being economically used up.

To begin with dies were still cut with the bachas-formula, for both coin sides, so that in the case of muling (H.39) the anonymous gold coinage had a short continuation, though without the representation of the clypeus. When the order came to include the name of the new king in the legend (‘Nezana basilceus’) this was also done on both sides (H.38a) or in combination with one of the two bachas-sides (H.38c and H.38v). Furthermore, there were other dies made of the side with the head-cloth and the legend Nezōl+basileus starting at 7 o’clock (comprehensibly in parallel to the silver coins) which were matched with a bachas-side as well (H.38e). At last a slogan was reintroduced on the newly cut dies of the side with the tiara and we find them in combination with Nezana sides (H.38b) or Nezōl sides (H.38d); the latter variety seems to have been the one that lasted most of all as it is the most common. Perhaps the duplication can be explained by supposing two engravers: one who provided the king’s name with the customary -ana ending (regarded as Greek sounding?) whilst the other transcribed the native form. The latter was also responsible for the silver coins with the Nezōl monogram. Together with the disappearance of the bachas-legends and the clypeus, its four crosses were dropped. The religious slogan which was propagated by Nezana differed slightly between the gold and the silver coins, perhaps not only due to the available space for the legends: the gold has theou eucharistia, the silver theou charis(s). It could be that we are dealing with two nuances within the imagination of God’s nature: charis is unproblematic and stands for kindness, benevolence, but the interpretation of eucharistia is less easy because it has the sense of thanksgiving in Greek and has taken the special meaning of service in the Christian liturgy so that it points in the direction of man’s relation to God. But we are helped by one of the monumental inscriptions of king Ezanas, the famous “Trinity-inscription”, where eucharistia is clearly (though very exceptionally) used in the sense of beneficence⁴¹. As God’s beneficence is an activity resulting from His attitude of benevolence, both terms might be understood as complementary. The message was: God is benevolent and He is beneficent.

On the silver type (H.40), the symbolism of the cross is further developed: from a girt centre which has a frame with four tails (and a raised central dot on some dies) a large double-lined cross pattee extends to the edge of the coin. The circumscriptio is equally divided into the four angles of the cross as under Ebana, hence the terminating -s has to be omitted. On the other side, which returns to the bust with head-cloth, the triple rim was abandoned as the monogram over the king’s head needed a lot of space and this was also the reason for depicting him with head-cloth instead of the tiara.

The copper coinage continued the anonymous clypeus type in its later version (H.36).

(XI) Ousa(na)s (II, early 6th century)

After a long time this name appears once more. That it is the Greek equivalent of an Ethiopian Wazan (a name which occurs after the middle of the 6th century) has been denied by competent linguists⁴² which, I must concede, is not easy for a person like me, unversed in such a specialism, to understand. The full name in Greek was Ousanas (H.37b), the same as that of the earlier pagan king. The terminating letter -S could have been omitted (H.37d) or a contraction to Ousas (H.37c, a) took place when the engraver preferred a less packed legend.

On the gold coins, the legends of the two sides were interchanged so that the king’s name and title again accompanies the tiara bust and the theou eucharistia slogan is moved to the side with the head-cloth, whereas on the silver coins (H.P37) – which are rather rare and only recently known – the name and the title are divided between the two sides and the slogan is left out.

In the course of Ousanas’ reign, the engraving of the gold coins deteriorated. Improved die cutting returned together with a recourse to clypeus busts (H.37b, a). These, however, do without the cosmological symbol of the four crosses interrupting the legends; only the invocation cross at 12 o’clock marks the beginning of the legend. It is also present on the silver coins (H.P37) instead of the royal monogram.

(XII) Khaleb (after 510 – towards 540)

Saint Kaleb is favoured by an ample variety of sources which have come down to us⁴³, even his full protocol of names is known:

⁴¹ RIE 271, lines 12 and 14.
⁴² EAE 5, p.551 (G. Fiaccadori, with utter conviction). I venture to object that the scribes and engravers who were engaged at that time in Aksum were no experts in linguistics but reshaped what they heard into the sounds they were used to in a Greek dialect; for the use of Z cf. St. Weninger, Sounds of Gəz – How to study the phonetics and phonology of an ancient language, Aethiopica 13, 2010, 75-88 (vgl. p.80).
⁴³ Alas, most of these sources are restricted to his engagement in Yemen: his crusades against the Jewish usurper, Yusuf Dhu Nuwas (Masruk), which he undertook in alliance with the Roman emperor, Justin I, has
Kaleb, Ella Asbeha, hyiios Thezena, bisi Lazan (the personal, regnal, father’s and clan name), all attested by epigraphic evidence. The personal name is full of biblical flavour⁴⁸, the second is a metaphor of (divine) light⁴⁹.

In the external literary sources we find the regnal name somehow disguised through alienation (e.g. Hellestaio in Greek) whereas the coins of all three metals have the personal name Kaleb: it is either written in Greek in full (with aspirated initial as in the Septuagint, but with Eta⁵⁰ instead of Epsilon) or in unvocalised Ge’ez (also as a monogram). On most of Kaleb’s gold coins the name of the king’s father appears too: hyiios Thezena (sometimes with a genitive form Thezenaou). It displaces the slogan on the side where the bust with the head-cloth is depicted (H.41b, c). This conspicuous occurrence of the father’s name is singular in Aksumite numismatics whence a special background may be supposed, perhaps in the sense of legitimising the king. Kaleb seems to appeal to the memory of his father,⁴⁷ who is not likely to have been his direct predecessor – perhaps a rival intervened⁴⁸. Thus the father of Kaleb could have been Nezool (Nezana) rather than Ousanas, though this king’s name does not sound like Thezena. The latter, however, could have been the regnal name (Ella Thezena), similar to the use in other filiations (known from inscriptions).

Kaleb’s accession to the throne must be dated to the 510s. The first, unsuccessful expedition against the Yemenite usurpation (518/19) he did not lead himself. After thorough preparation, he was successful, in 525, in restoring Aksumite sovereignty under Christian auspices and he stayed there for some years (until 528?). After his return home the Aksumite influence decreased and was finally restricted to the receipt of tributes. Kaleb seems to have abdicated in the later 530s; having reigned for more than 20 years,⁴⁸ he is said to have sought a life of pious seclusion.

In the early gold coinage there were still dies of the side with the head-cloth and the theou eucharistia-legend of his predecessor being used up (H.41a) and matched with new Kaleb dies of the tiara side where the legend is again divided into sections – by only three crosslets as a monogram of Kaleb’s name appears at 12 o’clock, written in Fidal letters. The three crosses are likely to invoke the Holy Trinity and thus could indicate an anti-Jewish attitude from the inception of the reign. Very soon the monogram is also placed on new dies of the other side which now carried the filiation in the legend (H.41b), introduced with YIOC (or Y+IOC or Y+OC or ΛΑΙΟC⁵⁰). The orthography rapidly deteriorates: the letters Β, Ν, Κ and Ε were often cut in mirror fashion, and Α and Λ can stand for Α (and vice versa), Α for a contraction of Α with Ά, Ν for Ζ, Ο instead of Ω always instead of Θ, and Ε and Κ were confused.

The gold coins with the monogram are the latest in the Yemenite hoard of Al-Madhariba which, thus, has a closing date in the early 520s. The later dies have the monogram replaced by the three invocation crosslets in the legends joined together at 12 o’clock (H.41c); one of them is also used to form the initial of the king’s name (X turned into +). These chrysoi could have been struck after Kaleb had defeated the Jewish usurper thanks to the support of the Trinitarian God, and he was at the height of his power. At that time he provided the Yemen with newly built or restored churches, such as the largest in the capital, Zafar, the dedication of which, to the Holy Trinity, is significant. The relatively numerous survival of this gold type probably results from lots of coins coming from hoards concealed during the military revolt of Abreha in Yemen, which Kaleb was unable to suppress.

On the latest chrysoi of Kaleb neither the filiation nor a slogan is present, but the basilicus title was repeated on both sides (H.41d). At the end of the legend with the tiara bust, enigmatic letters (Γ, H, I) were sometimes added, perhaps as issue-marks similar to those sometimes visible on the other side above or beside the bust. One die of the side with the head-cloth was also used by the succeeding Alla Amidas, possibly (but not necessarily) hinting at a temporary co-regency.

Kaleb’s silver coins (H.42) copy the double-bust pattern with tiara on one side and head-cloth on the other where a last recourse to the triple rim was made; the shorter image leaving more space. Perhaps this symbol was thought complementary to the Trinity crosses of the gold coins, but most flans are too narrow to receive more than parts of it. The real novelty was the lasting change to Ethiopian legends on the silver coins. The slogan used there could be understood as an adaptation of the old chora slogan into Ge’ez using the term hgr which means the region as well as the town. Of course the slogan refers to the cross, not to the king (who is depicted under it) – we have encountered a similar case on the copper of Ouazebas (H.26). As there was no central cross motif a partial gilding was not appropriate.

The copper coinage was continued by Kaleb with the anonymous type and its Greek legends (H.36). Only one die (H.43) has the king’s name (X-A-NHB) instead of the bachasa formula, probably a mistake by the die-cutter. It shows, however, that the touto arese type was still being struck under Kaleb. A few copper specimens are recorded showing the type of the silver coins, but it is uncertain whether they are proper copper coins for currency.

**THE AFTERMATH OF THE ARAB CONQUEST OF EGYPT AND SYRIA: TWO SMALL SERIES OF BYZANTINE-STYLE LEAD COINS**

By Michael Mitchiner

The emperor Heraclius (AD 610-641) began his reign by getting rid of the detested emperor Phocas (602-610). He continued his reign by consolidating Byzantine finances and by reforming and strengthening his military forces. His final success was in making peace with the Persians (628) and bringing to Constantinople the
relic of the True Cross, which the Persian ruler, Khusru II (590-628), had earlier taken from Jerusalem to his seat at Ctesiphon.

Success turned to failure in the face of the seemingly unstoppable expansion of the Arabs. The Prophet Mohammed had been obliged to leave Mecca and take refuge at Medina in 622. The Islamic era, the Hijra, dates from this event in 622. When Mohammed died in 632 (AH 11), his influence was still restricted to Arabia. His father-in-law and successor, Abu Bakr (632-634: 11-13), had to re-establish Muslim allegiance by force of arms. After this, he campaigned in Iraq (633: 12) and in Syria (634: 14). Caliph 'Umar (634-644: 13-23) consolidated Muslim control over the remainder of Iraq (Battle of Qudsia, Nov. 635) and Syria (Battle of Yarmuq, Aug. 636). He went on to invade and conquer Egypt during 640 to 641, a conquest completed in 642. 'Umar then defeated the Persians at the Battle of Nehavend in 642 (21) and his followers went on to take over the extensive Sasanian lands during the ensuing years (Glassé 2001). Conflicts between Byzantines and Arabs continued for control over such islands as Cyprus and Crete (Georganteli and Shea 2007).

While all this was happening, Heraclius died on 11 January 641, a broken man. The next year was troubled by problems over the succession and most succeeding members of his family became emperors when they were still minors. Heraclius was succeeded by his older son, Heraclius Constantine, who had poor health and died three months later. Then, it was the turn of his younger son, Heraclonas, aged sixteen years. He proved unpopular, mainly due to his mother. Heraclonas was obliged to appoint eleven year old Constans II, son of Heraclius Constantine, in September 641, and Heraclonas was deposed one month later. Then followed Constantine IV, who was fifteen years old at the time of his accession, and Justinian II, who was sixteen years old when he became emperor. In 695, general Leontius led a revolt and expelled Justinian II. This provided an opportunity for the Muslims to intensify the invasion of Carthage, which they captured in 698. The former Byzantine province of North Africa now became a Muslim land. The Muslims went on to conquer most of Spain, mainly from the Visigoths, during 710 to 712 (91-93). The Muslims later crossed the Pyrenees and transiently occupied the adjacent parts of Southern France (Toulouse 721, Carcassonne 725) until expelled south of the mountains by Charles Martel during 752 to 759.

The period relevant to the two series of lead coins discussed here was from the Arab conquest of Syria and Egypt until the reign of Leontius:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin Type</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Monarchs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>610 to 11 Jan. 641</td>
<td>Heraclius constantine (acceded aged 16 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius Constantine</td>
<td>11 Jan. 641 to 20 April 641</td>
<td>Heraclonas (acceded aged 16 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclonas</td>
<td>20 April 641 to October 641</td>
<td>Constans II (born 630; acceded aged 11 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II</td>
<td>Sept 641 to 668</td>
<td>Constantine IV (born 652, acceded age 15 years, died age 33: s/o Constans II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justinian II (first reign) (685 to 695)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leontius (695 to 698)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(General, who revolted against Justinian II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First series: Byzantine-style lead coinage of the seventh century AD: probably Arab-Byzantine**

The author first became aware of this small coin series in 1981 when the majority of the coins catalogued here were seen in London. They were said to have come from Lebanon. Through contact with Niall Fairhead, who had earlier obtained a few coins of this series, the author obtained a copy of Cécile Morrisson’s (1981) paper on this coin series. One of the coins she published (no. 13) was given a Syrian provenance. Ilisch (2007, fig. 13) also noted a Syrian provenance. Morrisson published 28 coins, of which nos. 6 to 28 belong to the present series. The distribution of coin types is similar to the coins published here, but with one significant difference. This is the coin bearing the name of Leontius (695-698), catalogued below. The coins do not bear marginal legends or mint names. Only two groups of coins specify the Emperor by placing his monogram as the main obverse design. These are coins bearing the monogram of Constans II (641-668) and the new coin bearing the monogram of Leontius. Morrisson attributed the coins bearing “Bust / Denomination” designs to Maurice Tiberius (582-602: nos. 6 to 26) and so did Ilisch (2007, fig. 13). This is a small, but coherent, coin series and it seems unlikely that its period of issue was any longer than the span from Constans II (641 - 668) to Leontius (695 - 698); thus approximately AD 641 to 698. The effectively anonymous “Bust / Denomination” coins appear to be best dated to the period of Constans II (641-668), Constantine IV (668 - 685) and the first reign of Justinian II (685-695). The prototype portrait can be debated. It is the portrait of a beardless emperor. In appearance, it could have been based on the portrait of Maurice Tiberius. On the other hand, a beardless portrait was also appropriate for the later emperors of the family of Heraclius, who were minors at the times of their accession. The coin series is best dated to the early aftermath of the Arab conquest.

Some coins in this series bear 12 and 6 nummia denominations that were only used in Egypt, whereas others bear 10 and 5 nummia denominations that were only used outside Egypt.

Morrisson conceived this coinage as being ‘money of necessity’ and linked it with upheavals in the region caused by the Persian invasion. The Persians occupied Egypt from 619 to 628, which was during the reign of Heraclius. With the later dating suggested here, the coin series spans a much more serious episode of territorial loss by Byzantium. This was the Arab conquest of Syria, followed by the conquest of Egypt. The last Byzantine coins of Egypt were minted in Alexandria and bear the designs of Constans II (12 nummia: Sear 1974, 1026-28).

**A small series of Byzantine style lead coins, circa 641 to 698**

*Denominations only used in Egypt*  
**Constans II: 641 – 668**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 nummia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Denomination Letters</th>
<th>Pellet Border</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(K T Ω)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also: Morrisson (1981) 27

The pellet border is only visible on some coins. The official name of Constans was Constantine. This monogram was used on coins of Constans II minted at Syracuse (Sear 1974, 1111-13), and on coins of Constantine IV minted at Carthage (Sear 1198).

Most monograms in the name of Constantine are not so abbreviated (e.g. Zacos & Vegley 1972, mgr. 286-297).
2. Similar 
   Lead coin, design axes 10, 15 mm, 3.27 g

3. Similar 
   Lead coin, design axes 9, 15 mm, 2.69 g

   6 nummia

4. Monogram of Constans II. to left: cross to right: Θ. Pellet border
   rev. Denomination letter: S. Pellet border
   Lead coin, design axes 10, 13 mm, 2.44 g
   See also: Morrisson (1981), 28

Anonymous 

6 nummia

5. Denomination letter (reversed): S. pellet on left. Linear border
   rev. Denomination letter: S. (no pellet). Linear border
   Lead coin, design axes 9, 14 mm, 2.83 g
   Morrison (1981) –

   Denominations not used in Egypt

Anonymous: 
   Period of Constans II, Constantine IV and Justinian II (first reign): 641 to 695
   10 nummia

   rev. Denomination letter: I. small cross above, at sides: E and Δ. No border
   Lead coin, design axes 8, 16 mm, 3.56 g
   See also: Morrisson (1981) 23-24

   rev. Denomination letter: I. small cross each side. Pellet border
   Lead coin, design axes 3, 15 mm, 2.88 g
   Ilisch called it a “little-known Byzantine lead coin type (fig. 13) of which I have seen a few specimens coming from Syria in the 1980s.”

   8. Similar 
   Lead coin, design axes 5, 15 mm, 2.14 g

9. Similar 
   Lead coin, design axes 4, 15 mm, 3.02 g

10. Similar 
    Lead coin, design axes 10, 15 mm, 2.97 g

   5 nummia

11. Imperial bust in profile to right: no headdress and no beard. small cross in front. Pellet border.
   rev. Denomination letter: E. small cross on right. Pellet border
   Lead coin, design axes 5, 14 mm, 2.57 g
   See also: Morrisson (1981) 26

12. Similar 
    Lead coin, design axes 10, 12 mm, 1.23 g

   Leontius: 695 – 698
   10 nummia

Leadbull, 1981 - 
This monogram was used on coins of Leontius minted at Alexandria (Sear 1974, 1343-44). The Syracusan coins are folles, the decanummium denomination being by now largely obsolete.

Morrisson (1981) -
Publication of the lead coins of the first series.

Coins belonging to lower denominations tend to have smaller diameters, but coin weights overlap between the various denominations.

The coin designs are simplified by omission of marginal and exergue legends. The designs are of seventh-century Byzantine form, but they do not correlate with any specific Byzantine coin issues. This is a cohesive small coin series, which was probably all minted at a single location. This place is likely to have been somewhere in the Syria - Lebanon region.

The general period of the coin series, as judged from the dates of the earliest and the latest issues, was around AD 641 (Constans II minting coins at Alexandria) to 695/698 (reign of Leontius). This period is significant in the context of the early Arab conquests, and of early Arab coinage. This small coin series was introduced shortly after the Arab conquest of Syria (636) and Egypt (640-642). It ended at the time when the Arabs introduced the prolific gold and silver reformed coinage of the Umayyad Caliphate. The reformed gold coinage is dated from AH 77 (AD 696) onwards and the reformed silver coinage from AH 79 (AD 698) onwards.

The coins discussed here can reasonably be identified as belonging to a local Middle Eastern series of Arab-Byzantine coins. For a general discussion of Arab-Byzantine coinage, see Walker (1956), and for more recent research see Illisch (2007) and other papers from the same conference.

Second series: Byzantine-style lead coinage of the seventh century AD: probably Arab-Byzantine

The few lead coins belonging to this series do not appear to have been published previously. They came to the west from the Lebanon-Syria region around the same period, the early 1980’s, as the lead coins of the first series.

By contrast with coins of the first series, the flans are much broader and the designs are both simpler and the reverse coin design can be interpreted as an intended coin denomination of Six Nummia. This denomination was only used on Byzantine coins minted in Egypt, lastly during the reign of Heraclius (610-641). The last Byzantine coins of Egypt were 12 nummia issues of Constans II (641-668) minted at Alexandria (Sear 1974, 1026-28). The use of Byzantine-Egyptian coin denominations on lead coins circulating in the Syria-Lebanon region provides a strong link with the lead coins of the first series.

The obverse design is a Greek cruciform monogram. The use of cruciform monograms, rather than rectangular monograms, on Byzantine lead bullae dates from around 550 onwards (Zacos and Veglery 1972). The monogram can best be read ΛΕΓΑΤΩ, of the legate. Legate was originally a Roman term. The legate was the deputy to a provincial governor, or general. The title does not appear to have remained popular in the Byzantine Empire, particularly after the reforms of Justinian. The office of legate persisted in the west, as the representative of a higher authority, who was usually the pope. Later on, the legate was a diplomatic minister. The latest use for the rank of legate in the east was probably around the period of political upheaval related to Arab expansion. As to the identity of the legate, one can suggest that he may have been a Byzantine deputy who administered a town, or a locality, on behalf of an Arab superior.

Legate: circa mid-seventh century

6 nummia

14. Cruciform monogram: ΛΕΑΤΩ

rev. Letter: S

Lead coin, 21 mm, 3.71 g

15. Similar

Lead coin, 19 mm, 2.34 g
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AN UMAYYAD FALS FROM EPHESOS

By Nikolaus Schindel

Since 2001, the present writer has been a regular guest at the Austrian excavations in Ephesos (Turkey). This ancient metropolis blossomed from the 3rd century BC until the 7th century AD, but coins continued to be used and lost also later. It is one remarkable find that I shall discuss here: an Umayyad post-reform fals (fig. 1). While Early Islamic copper coins very often turn up in excavations in the Syrian region, their presence in Western Asia Minor is rather unusual. Our fals weighs 3.97 g, and has a diameter of 17 mm. It was found during the excavations carried out at the Beylik...

51 I have to thank Sabine Ladstätter, the director of the Austrian excavations in Ephesos, for valuable discussion and her permission to publish this coin here.

52 On the end date of Ephesos as a metropolis from a numismatic point of view Schindel 2009.

53 E.g. Bellinger 1938 catalogues 204 Byzantine coins from Anastasius I to Constans II (641-668) as opposed to 188 Umayyad specimens for Jerash in Jordan.
period burial monument (türké) near the Artemision. Despite the fact that this copper piece is rather corroded, an attribution is still possible: this coin belongs to the large group of fulus which lack a mint indication, but which are commonly attributed to the Jarirah, i.e. Northern Syria and South-Eastern Turkey. They are dated 116 AH (734/735) or 117 AH (735/736); a better preserved specimen from 116 AH is shown here as fig. 2 for the sake of comparison. Thus, even if the actual date on our coin cannot be read any longer, we can be sure that it was struck between 734 and 736 AD. Not only is this the earliest safely traceable and attributable Islamic coin from Ephesos – all other specimens date to the Beylik and Ottoman periods –, it is also rather scarce to find any 8th century coins – including Byzantine ones – in Ephesos. Since (as may be known) Umayyad copper coins are of some interest to me, the emergence of this fulus in the excavation material of Ephesos came as a pleasant surprise.

Apart from the purely personal joy, however, this coin, unremarkable as it might appear at first sight, is also of some interest for our historical understanding of coin circulation in the Early Islamic period. When discussing the findings of some Umayyad fulus from Pergamon, Lutz Ilisch posed the following question: “Die wichtige Frage, ob dieses geringe, aber doch nicht isolierte Fundgut im Zusammenhang mit der vorübergehenden arabischen Eroberung gesehen werden muß, oder ob es als Beimengung des byzantinischen Kleingeldumlaufs nach Pergamon gelanget, kann nur durch den zukünftigen Vergleich mit anderen Fundkomplexen aus Westanatolien beantwortet werden.” (“The important question, whether these few, but yet not isolated, finds have to be seen in the context of the temporary Arab conquest (sc. of 717/8 AD), or whether they arrived as an addition to the stock of Byzantine small change in Pergamon, can be answered only through a comparison with further find complexes from Western Anatolia”). Our Ephesian coin helps us to answer Ilisch’s question, at least partially: since it was struck some 16 years after the failed Umayyad siege of Constantinople, it goes without saying that it cannot have come to Ephesos with the invading Arab army. It seems more likely that, to some extent, Early Islamic coins, through trade or plunder, entered into the coin circulation of Byzantine Western Asia Minor in the 8th century. In the case of the Pergamon coins, however, a connection with the Arab invasion is still possible; different coin finds can have different reasons. Still, Umayyad coins are a rare phenomenon in sites in Western Asia Minor: no specimens have so far been published in the three volumes on coin finds from Sardes. It should be added that some Umayyad fulus may possibly have gone unnoticed since one could imagine that site numismatists, used to handling Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine coins, might not always be equally acquainted with Early Islamic coins, especially if they are worn or corroded like the present piece.

Finally, a word should be said about another of Lutz Ilisch’s ideas, namely that the scarce Umayyad post-reform fulus with Greek countermarks received the countermarks in Byzantine territories, and that these counter-stamped coins, therefore, also attest to the use of Umayyad fulus beyond the western border of the caliphate. I have already presented my idea elsewhere that these countermarks – mostly the Greek letter A in more or less correct form – were applied within the Umayyad Empire, on the one hand because they tend to turn up in parcels from the Syrian region, and not from Turkey, and on the other hand because Greek letters as numerals were also used in early Islam. Even if this is certainly only a very minor argument, none of the fulus in Western Asia Minor discussed above (including the Ephesian coin) bear countermarks – but then, these might have been applied in border regions such as e.g. Cilicia, which would mean that we should not expect them to turn up too commonly in Ionia. However, there exists a rare countermark in the form of an eight-pointed star which shares its basic size with the Greek letter countermarks, but which can be typologically linked to post-reform fulus from the Umayyad mint of Aleppo bearing a very similar star (even if a star is a generally common device), which plausibly links these countermarks with Umayyad Northern Syria. Thus, it seems that we cannot rely on fulus with a Greek countermark for providing us with insights into the use of Early Islamic coins within the Byzantine Empire; only the detailed, and continued, observation of excavation coins will enable us – in the longer run – to establish when, where, and to what extent Umayyad coins were used as small change in the Byzantine Empire.
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A CHRISTIAN COPPER COIN TYPE FROM MEDIEVAL CAUCASUS REVISITED: AN ISSUE OF DAVIT IV THE BUILDER OF GEORGIA?

By Irakli Paghava and Goga Gabashvili

A collection of articles devoted to the late Arkadiy Molchanov was published back in 2014 (edited by Tatyana Jackson and Alexander Akopyan). Among other works, it included an outstanding piece of research by Alexander Akopyan; the author made an impressive attempt to reconstruct the 11th–12th c. history of the major Armenian city of Dvin based on an analysis of the corpus of locally found coins.64 Quite recently, at the 15th International Numismatic Congress in Taormina, Italy the author dealt with this issue again.65

Generally speaking, we personally fully agree with the approach employed – the multitude of separate coin finds from the same location, even without the precise archeological / topographical locations, does reveal the local monetary circulation; moreover, if found in quantities, particularly in the case of copper, it is certainly quite safe to consider that these coins had been produced locally as well.66 However, we feel it may be more prudent to exercise more restraint when seeking to attribute previously unknown coinage of which only a limited number of specimens with a limited number of find locations is known.

This short article is devoted to a rare copper coin type with an effigy of a nimble saint on one side and a cross on the other. The only previous specimen known was found on the site of ancient Dvin, and was attributed by its publisher to the latter city and tentatively dated AD 441-445 / AH 1049-1053 (“Type 7. Christian type”).67

Now we have the opportunity to publish a second specimen, discovered in 2015 at ground level somewhere in the vicinity of Samshvilde in the eastern part of Georgia, not far from Tbilisi.68

64 Giorgi Tsereteli Institute for Oriental Studies, Ilia State University, Georgia
67 One of the authors of this short note has analysed (in co-authorship) the monetary issues of Muslim Tiflis right before the Georgian reconquest – cf. Fig. 2.
68 One of the authors of this short note has analysed (in co-authorship) the monetary issues of Muslim Tiflis right before the Georgian reconquest – cf. Fig. 2.

The coin is as follows (Fig. 1): AE, weight 1.79 g, dimensions 22-25 mm (the specimen published earlier weighed 2.3 g and had dimensions of 21-25.5 mm69).

Obr.: Shoulder-length representation of a saint (Holy Virgin?) with a bead-like halo, traces of a legend above the left shoulder? all within a bead-like circle. Traces of a legend in the margin (even the script is unclear).

Rev.: Effigy of a cross, within a beaded circle. ☼ –like graphical element in the upper left quadrant, and seemingly also in the lower left quadrant; a small cross or Georgian letter ☾ (but not Armenian ☼) in the upper right quadrant. Traces of a legend in the margin.

Now, since we have just two specimens, one found in Armenia, the other in Georgia, it would be very risky, in our opinion, to attribute the type to any country, just on the basis of where the coins were found.

However, the iconographic peculiarities suggest that it could have been issued in Georgia, by no other than King Davit IV, the Builder (1089-1125). Setting aside the issue of the legends, of which very little has survived, and even that is barely intelligible, we have two prominent iconographic elements: a complex cross made up of thick arms decorated with “jewels” (i.e. dots) on the reverse, and the saint on the obverse. In our opinion, and in contrast to the opinion of a respected colleague of ours70, it is the Virgin Mary and not the Saviour, depicted on the obverse: unlike our colleague, we personally cannot discern a cruciform halo, so typical for the imagery of Christ on any one of these two coins; what seems to be locks of hair may well be an unskilful representation of the Virgin’s head-covering. Both elements exhibit a striking similarity to the well-known, albeit rare type of Davit IV’s coin type which was minted in silver71 - cf. Fig. 2.

---

69 Cf. Fig. 2.
70 Акопян. “Двин в XI-XII вв. История города в свете нового нумизматического материала” [“Dvin in the 11th-12th C. City History in View of the New Numismatic Material”]. 253.
(silver coins with the effigy of the Virgin were minted by Davit’s predecessors as well – Bagrat IV and Giorgi II73). Therefore, we may conjecture, albeit somewhat tentatively, that this coin type was minted by Davit IV, the prominent Georgian monarch of the 11th-12th c., and not the Dvin authorities. If true, these coins would constitute an absolutely novel class of Georgian coinage of the Byzantine type.

It is hoped that more specimens of this monetary type will become available for study in the future, ideally with a precise find location and better preserved legends.

Bibliography:

THE EARLIEST DATE FOR THE KINGDOM OF K’AKHETI SILVER ISSUES OF THE 16TH CENTURY

By Irakli Paghava and Kirk Bennett

Fig. 1. AR, weight 1.19 g, dimensions 12 × 14 mm, die axis of the date it bears and the technique employed when minting it. The coin is as follows:

Fig. 1. AR, weight 1.19 g, dimensions 12 × 14 mm, die axis

Fig. 2. King Levan (Leon) of K’akheti, a fresco from Gremi

The throne of this Georgian state in that period was occupied by King Levan (1518-1574) (Fig. 2).

This coin provides us with a new date for the Zagemi coining in the name of Tahirşā I (1524-1576), as indicated by the name and the date, both legible on the obverse. In effect, rather than being royal Persian coinage, it constituted a local issue of the eastern Georgian Kingdom of K’akheti, a vassal of the Safavids, issued in the name of the then current overlord.75


74 Новые данные о чеканке сефевидской монеты в царстве Кахети (Грузия)”. [“New Data on Minting Safavid Coinage in the Kingdom of K’akheti (Georgia)”]; Сефевидский временник, 96, 2010. (по данным нумизматики). [Georgia and Safavid Iran (According to Numismatic Data)], 14-25; Пагава Иракли, Туркия Северина. “Новые данные о чеканке сефевидской монеты в царстве Кахети (Грузия)” [“New Data on Minting Safavid Coinage in the Kingdom of K’akheti (Georgia)”].

75 It has already been clarified that it was the local Georgian monarch who controlled the mint of Zagemi (in the Kingdom of K’akheti). Пагава, Туркия. “Новые данные о чеканке сефевидской монеты в царстве Кахети (Грузия)” [“New Data on Minting Safavid Coinage in the Kingdom of K’akheti (Georgia)”], 111-112.
According to the recent literature, this new coin probably constitutes a silver bistí (normative weight 1.17 g) of the fifth western weight standard.

It is quite remarkable that, in terms of the flan shape, this specimen is roundish, whereas all the other Zagemi coins in the name of Tāhmasp I studied by Tinatin Kutelia (26 in total) were rectangular, i.e. “elongated”, 8.9 mm × 11-13 mm, and minted by employing the “wire technique”.

Evidently, this specimen testifies to various minting (flan production) techniques employed at the Zagemi mint in the mid-16th century.

Interestingly enough, various techniques were employed also at some other Safavid mints for producing the low-weight denominations.
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TWO UNUSUAL INDO-SCYTHIAN COINS

By Heinz Gawlik

An unrecorded Æ unit of the Indo-Scythian king, Maues, was published by Senior in his supplement of Indo-Scythian Coins and History, Vol. IV, 2006. The details of the coin named type 2.1 are as follows: Obv: Zeus facing, holding trident in left hand and torque in outstretched right hand. The Greek legend reads ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ with the king's name ΜΑΥΟΥ at the bottom bottom. Rev.: Horse trotting left. The Karoshiti legend starts at 4 o’clock and reads RAJADIRAJASA
MAHATASA with the king’s name MOASA at the bottom. The published coin (26 mm, 9.04 gm) seems to be overstruck on Senior type 5.1 (Elephant head/Caduceus). Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 show two coins of Senior type 2.1 in my collection.

**Fig. 1: Maues Æ unit of type 2.1** in Senior 2006 (26 – 27 mm, 8.06 g)

**Fig. 2: Maues Æ unit of type 2.1** in Senior 2006 (26.5 – 27.3 mm, 7.17 g)

The illustrated coins are struck from different dies and do not show traces of an overstrike as on the coin published by Senior.

A friend from Pakistan has sent me a coin (Fig 3) which, at first glance, is a similar-looking coin to the illustrated Senior type 2.1. The Greek legend is the same on the reverse as on type 2.1, with the king’s name MAYOY at the bottom.

**Fig. 3: Æ unit under discussion** (27 – 27.6 mm, 6.74 g)

The reverse shows the expected trotting horse left. The monogram is not clearly visible but could be similar to the one on Senior 2.1. What really matters is the Karosthi legend. The legend starts at 4 o’clock also but it reads MAHA(RAJASA RAJARAJASA MAHATASA and AYASA at the bottom. The weight (6.74 g), compared with other coins of this type, is slightly on the low side but this is not unusual in general.

Joint issues in Indo-Scythian coinage are known for a few rulers, e.g. Spalirises with Azes (Senior 74 and 75), Azilises with Azes (Senior 45). These coins have been recorded in small numbers but provide scope for plenty of speculation. In this particular instance, the Zeus/horse issue is already a rare coin and a single coin does not provide enough evidence for a joint coinage of Maues and Azes. Otherwise, if the coin is a modern forgery then more such coins will surface because the production cost, let alone any profit, is not covered by a single piece.

Another strange coin is connected to the Æ coin of the Indo-Scythian kings, Vonones with Spalahores, Senior type 66. The standard coin of this type in my collection (Fig: 4) shows the following details: **Obv.:** Hercules facing, holding a club and lion skin, with the Greek legend reading ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ

**Fig. 4: Vonones with Spalahores Æ unit Senior type 66** (22.5 x 19 mm, 7.54 g)

Fig. 5 shows a coin of Senior type 66 which was purchased in an internet auction. The reverse is overstruck with a crude bull in place of Pallas.

**Fig. 5: The Æ unit under discussion** (20.5 x 23 mm, 6.76 g)

The remains of the original Karosthi legend are partly visible above the bull and read SPALAHORA (SA). The obverse is flattened by the restrike of the bull. There is no letter visible of a legend with the bull.

**Bibliography**


---

**THE DATING OF ORTHAGNES AND GONDOPHARES I**

By R. Senior

Nearly half a century ago David Sellwood published a unique countermarked ‘imitation’ Parthian coin [S91.10] bearing the name Orthagnes, which received little attention.88 With his permission I published the coin again and illustrated it as S203.1D in ISCH, 2001 (figs.1and 2).89 In Volume I of the latter work, page 107, I pointed out the significance of the coin and its relationship to the other countermarked coins bearing the same symbol [but without the additional inscription] and the non-countermarked coins that were contemporary [See S201 – 202 for types]. With the dispersal of David Sellwood’s collection I managed to acquire the lot that contained this still-unique coin together and a few of the ‘imitation’ coins both countermarked and non-countermarked.

88 The Coinage of Parthia, see 2nd edition Spink 1980 p. 295
89 Indo-Scythian Coins and History, R. C. Senior pub. CNG 2001 Volume II p. 147
I think this coin is worth noting again, because it is extremely important to the chronology of the period and in particular in the dating of both Orthagnes and Gondophares I. In ISCH and in several articles for the ONS I have given sufficient evidence to show that there was only one king called Azes and that Gondophares I was his contemporary – both were ruling in the last half of the first century BC. There seems little point in me going over all this evidence again but when I read the excellent article by Joe Cribb in JONS 223 on the ‘Dating and locating (of) Mujatria and the two Kharahostes’, I considered that his conclusion is at risk when I see that he dates Gondophares I to c. AD 32 – 60 [JONS 223 p. 31] and repeatedly identifies some Azes coins as being of the non-existent Azes II [c. AD 1 – 30 p. 27]. The latter king has to be created to fill the chronological gap left by his late dating of Gondophares I. Figure 14 on page 111 of ISCH Volume I gives an idea of the relationships between Gondophares I, his sub-kings and successors including the three other kings who subsequently bore the title Gondophares. ‘Gondophares’ meaning ‘winner of glory’ was a title much like that used by the Roman Octavian who called himself ‘Augustus’ – a title then adopted by his successors. We need to date the period when the countermarks were added to the coins and date the undertypes themselves. Of the regular Parthian coinage, so far just two coins have been found countermarked with this Gondopharid symbol [which we call thus because it appears on coins of this dynasty from Gondophares I down through the issues of his subordinates and successors]:

1) S202.2D a coin of Orodes II of type Sellwood 48.9. Orodes II ruled from c. 57 – 38 BC and this issue was probably his last, but a common and extensive issue.

2) S202.3D a coin of Phraates IV (c. 38 – 2 BC) a variety of issue Sellwood 50.15, which is his earliest issue.

Even though countermarks can be added to coins much later than the original undertype’s issue date it seems fairly significant that both these undertypes can be dated to closely around 38 BC. The countermark symbol on both these coins has a squarish border and is closest to the same countermark appearing on the coins of Gondophares I himself S202.4T, the undertype being type S212. This squarish countermark appears on no other known coins.

The commonest Gondopharid-symbol countermarked coins, with one possible, uncertain exception [S202.5D], all appear with a round border, struck on Orodes II coins - Sellwood issue 47 - but bearing two unusual varieties of legend [S201.5 and S201.6] both of which include the title ‘Theopator’. Sellwood listed them as one type – 91.8 – and called them imitations. There is little development of the type and I believe that they are actually contemporary with the official issues Sellwood 47 and 48 but struck for Drangiana on the border between the Parthian and Indo-Parthian [Gondopharid] territories, which was occupied by Indo-Parthian Scythians – the extra epithet referring to their belief in their divine descent. It is probable that this group was independent of their fellow Gondopharids and acknowledged Parthian suzerainty. The countermarks on all these coins would have been added to make the coins current if they circulated in the neighbouring province of Seistan, which belonged to Gondophares, though probably governed by Orthagnes. This is the sum total of all the known coins bearing the Gondopharid countermark and all must fall into a fairly short period of time – around c. 38 BC, ± 10 years.

The unique Orthagnes countermark was applied to an issue of S201.5/6, but which of them is uncertain since the act of striking seems to have caused a large area of the reverse to split off – probably while circulating after the event. Apart from the inscription, the countermark and its round border is identical to all those others applied to issues S201.5 and S201.6. The question to be asked is why Orthagnes added his name to this countermark?

Gondophares I initially struck coins in Seistan and Arachosia but then struck even more extensive coinages in northern Arachosia and the Kabul valley before moving into India and Gandhara. Whilst empire-building, it would seem that he left the western provinces, Seistan and southern Arachosia, to be controlled by Orthagnes/Gadana as ‘King of Kings’ – and this may be when this particular countermark was first used. It would seem that the ephemeral Sarpedones might have been Gondophares I’s son and successor – being elevated from ‘King of Kings’ to ‘Gondophares’ in the west and south while, in the northern and Indian provinces, it was ‘Gondophares’ brother’s son’, Abdagases, who succeeded, but only as ‘King of Kings’ never acquiring the epithet ‘Gondophares’. This ‘brother of Gondophares’ must have been his co-ruler [but subordinate] Orthagnes/Gadana who was himself elevated to being Gondophares on the demise of Sarpedones and who continued living whilst his son, Abdagases, controlled the provinces in India [hence the latter never achieving ‘Gondophares’ status]. Ubouzanes, another son of Orthagnes, was placed in Seistan, but as ‘King’ only. The whole dynasty fell when it was replaced by ‘Gondophares, called Sases’ who was from the line of the Apracharajas [though he could have had a maternal link to the Gondopharids]. It is he, I believe, who is the ‘Gondophares’ referred to in the Takh-i-Bahi inscription of c. AD 19 – 36.

Another border province where a Scythian king countermarked Parthian coins was that ruled by Tanles [Sellwood 91.2 – 6 Otanes] – issue S195 – whose countermark also bore his name, but round a portrait. That countermark was probably issued over a longer period, but not so long as to show any development, and the undertypes known to me date from Mithradates II [c. 123 – 88 BC], S195.2 to a single example of Phraates IV, [Sellwood 54.8, S195.7] which can be dated to c. 24 – 2 BC according to Sellwood. I would suggest that this countermark began to be applied around the same period as the Gondopharid one, c. 45 BC but was in use a little longer, to possibly c. 20 BC. The Orthagnes variant may have been used initially in response to this Tanles countermark, possibly in adjoining territories – to be thereafter replaced by the simpler, more significant symbol alone. In all these examples the countermarks were applied to the necks of the principal rulers suggesting that the issuer was trying not to show opposition but merely confirm that the currency was legitimate in the issuer’s territory.

No countermarks are known on any regular coins later than Phraates IV, and the appearance of the Gondopharid symbol countermark on coins of Orodes II, Phraates IV and Gondophares I himself, plus this issue bearing the name of Gondophares’ co-ruler and brother, Orthagnes, places them both firmly in the two decades 45 – 25 BC.
ABHIMANYU: A NEWLY IDENTIFIED HUN KING

By Pankaj Tandon 90

One of the barriers to the study of ancient coins is that they are often in poor condition. They can be worn or corroded, or critical pieces of their designs could be off the flan. Further, the letter forms used are frequently quite unusual, making it difficult to read them with confidence. We often have to wait until a coin in good condition turns up to make an attempt to adequately read the legend and, once we are able to do so, our understanding of previous coins can improve substantially. Such a coin came my way a few months ago. Now that its legend is read, we can confidently identify a new Hun king named Abhimanyu, 91 and we can reattribute some previously studied coins. I will first illustrate and describe the coin and then proceed to a discussion.

Fig. 1: AR drachm of Abhimanyu, 92 with legend below

Obv.: Bust of king facing right, with elongated head and moustache, wearing round crown with crescent ornaments and a jeweled diadem which has two ribbon ends hanging behind, double drop pearl ear-ring and pearl necklace; flower-topped conch in right field; Brāhmī legend around (at 9 o’clock): jaya / sahyabhi /manyu.

Rev.: Fire altar flanked by armed attendants, mostly obliterated as is usual for these coins.

Details: Weight: 3.30 g, diameter: 27 mm, die axis: 3 o’clock.

The coin is illustrated in Fig. 1. Robert Göbl had published a similar coin as type 75 in his study of Hunnic coins. 93 Göbl had at his disposal just one coin for study and he tentatively read the legend as jaya (tu?) sāḥi, assigning the coin to Khiṅgila. How he read even that much on the coin is a testament to Göbl’s skill, as it was quite worn and most of the legend appears to be off the flan. The coin in Fig. 1, however, is in excellent condition, and the entire legend is visible on the flan. The reading of the legend is mostly straightforward and uncontroversial; the only problematic letters are the last two, ma and nyu. One is tempted to read the last letter as tya, given how many Hun names end in āditya, but clearly the previous letter is not ḍ but ma, pa, or possibly la. The critical feature in the last letter though is the presence of the diacritic highlighted in Fig. 2, which would force tya to tya, thereby making it impossible to get a sensible reading. Rather, it should be read as nyu, which would make ma the logical reading for the previous letter. The letter na often looks like the letter ta; see for example, the letter at 11 o’clock on Figure 3, which is the letter na in the word labhāna on a coin of Udayāditya. Thus the name of the issuing king is Abhimanyu.

Matthias Pfisterer, in his presentation of Göbl’s type 75, 95 assigned the coin to a king he named Avamazha, based on a reading of the legend on a very closely related type, his type 75C. That coin, from the collection of Jean-Pierre Righetti, is illustrated in Fig. 4. The portrait is extremely similar to the one in Fig. 1, but the Righetti coin features a humbled bull in the right field. The Brāhmī legend begins at 8 o’clock, and the first two words, jaya / sa / hya, are quite clear, so Pfisterer’s reading of them is correct. However, the last three letters, illustrated in the detail in Fig. 5, seem to be problematic. Pfisterer reads them as vanazha, while I believe the correct reading is vhimanyu, rendering the entire legend as jaya / sa / hyahvimanyu. The middle letter, ma, is clear and uncontroversial. Pfisterer does not explain how he arrived at his reading, but I do not see how the third letter could be ḍha. Rather, it seems to be nyu, note the diacritic in the same position as the letter ntu in Figs. 1 and 2. The first letter starts clearly with the letter va, modified by a horizontal projection to the right which could perhaps be seen as the right-most part of a letter ha, with a diacritic above. To me, vihi seems to be the most plausible reading. Other Hun coins show an interchangeability between the letters ba and va; for example, the names Baysira and Vaysira seen on Göbl’s types 108-111 are surely the same name, and many observers believe that the names Javukha (in Brāhmī) and Zabocho (in Bactrian) are alternative spellings of the same name. 96 Brāhmī of course has no letter ṣha, although such a letter does exist in Kharoṣṭhī. The die cutter of the Righetti coin may well have been trying to render in Brāhmī a word he was used to seeing in Kharoṣṭhī. Especially in the light of my coin, Avhimanyu is almost certainly an alternative spelling of Abhimanyu, and we can safely attribute the coins of “Avamazha” to the same king.

Fig. 2: Detail showing the diacritic on the letter nyu

Fig. 3: Coin of Udayāditya, showing letter na 94

90 Boston University. I would like to acknowledge helpful discussions with Shailesh Bhandare, Joe Cribb, and Harry Falk and to thank Klaus Vondrovec for furnishing me with some coin images. I would also like to take this opportunity to salute and express my appreciation to Stan Goron for his many years’ service as Editor of this journal.

91 The reading of the legend was a joint effort in which I received valuable suggestions from Shailesh Bhandare, Joe Cribb, and Harry Falk. I think we all agreed with the final reading, but I take full responsibility in case of any errors.

92 Tandon collection, inventory number 675.31.


94 See Göbl, op. cit., types 49-51 and 96-107, and, particularly, types 117-118 and 105-106.

95 Tandon collection, inventory number 547.41.

According to the source from whom I acquired the coin, it was found in Qandahar. Göbl does not record a findspot for his coin, but notes that it was probably from northern Pakistan. There is no indication of how he arrived at this conclusion. The style of the coin is quite distinct and not easily related to other known coins, although the thin spread flan and Brāhmī legend would indicate an origin in Gandhara.

As far as I can tell, this king Abhimanyu is not known from any other sources. The name of course is a familiar one, as it is the name of a son of the Pāñjāva prince Arjuna in the Mahābhārata. It also appears twice in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī. One reference is to a king of Kashmir who ruled c. 958-972 and whose coins are known to us. Clearly this king could not have issued the coins under discussion. However, the other reference in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī is to an early king who is mentioned after the kings Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaniṣka (among whom the Kushan kings Kanishka and Huvishka are surely meant) and before the “Gonandiya” king Mihirakula. Our king Abhimanyu may well have been a Hun king sometime before Mihirakula and it cannot, therefore, be completely ruled out that he is the same king as the one mentioned early in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī. Of course, the coin was almost certainly not minted in Kashmir, but Kashmir was not always an independent kingdom and was often ruled by kings in Gandhara. Mihirakula certainly held sway over a wide territory. If this Abhimanyu is the one mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, and he ruled before Mihirakula, he would have to be dated to sometime during the fourth century AD, which is not an implausible date given the style of the coin. Regardless, we can now add the name of Abhimanyu to the list of Hun kings who ruled in India sometime during the fourth and fifth centuries.

SOME NEW RĀJANYA COINS

By Devendra Handa

The Sanskrit word ‘Rājanya’ literally connoting ‘a person of the Kshatriya caste’ or a ‘royal personage’ is met with for the first time in the Purusha-Sūkta of the Rigveda (X.90, 12) where, dwelling upon the fourfold division of the society, it is stated that the Brāhmana (representing the intellectual and priestly class) sprang from the mouth of the primeval being (Parusha), the Rājanya (representing the ruling or warrior class) from the arms, the Vaiśyas (representing the agricultural and trading class) from the thighs and the Śūdras (representing the serving class) from his feet. The word has constantly been in use in literature from the Rigvedic period. The classical writers seem to refer to the Rājanyas as Xathroi which is identical with Kauṭiyāya’s republic named Kshatriya (Arthasāstra, III.144, xi, 1). Though Rājanya and Kshatriya are regarded as synonyms, the term Rājanya was used for a people or tribe by Pāṇini (circa 400 BC) in his Ganaṇapāha (IV.2, 53).² The Mahābhārata (VII.132, 25) also refers to them along with other tribal republics like the Sibis, Trigarttas, Yauḍheyas, Madrakas, etc. The Mahābhāṣya (IV.2, 52) of Patañjali (2nd century BC), Chāṇḍravākaraṇa (circa 5th century AD), Bṛihatsamhitā (XIV.28) of Varāhamihira (6th century AD), Kāśikā (IV.2, 53) of the 7th century AD, and the 12th century work of King Bhoja the Sarvasvākhyābhārana (IV.2, 86) also refer to them.

The first Rājanya coins were discovered by James Prinsep who drew three specimens in his own hand and read the legend on them as Rājñapadasa. Cunningham noted that these coins, depicting a man standing with a legend around on the obverse, a humped bull surrounded by a radiated circle on the reverse, “are extremely rare” and stated that “I have six specimens with the Indo-Pāli legend, but only one with the Aryan-Pāli legend. The inscription is a rather indefinite one. . . .”³ Rājanya was then read as Rājanya by Cunningham and Jayaswal rightly pointed out that Rājanya here stood for Rājanya and that it was used for the name of a people. He interpreted the legend Rājāna janapadasa as “(coin of) the king of the Janapada” which is the usual reading of the term Rājanya.⁴ According to Wenzel, the term Rājanya is first used in Gupta coins of the 5th century AD and this would be Rājanya jnaksu, the personal name of the king, and the inscription would be a title.⁵

The history of the coin is of great interest as it was discovered by the late R.C. Majumdar during his research in the banks of the Jamna river. The coin was found by a child named Kala and was handed over to the coin collector K.P. Jayaswal, who published it in his Coin Pl. XLIV.19) under the Audumbaras and the second one under ‘Rajaña Janapada’ of Mathurā and read the Kharoṣṭhi legend as Maharajasa Janapa.⁶ J.R.R. Tolkien, a student of Prinsep, who edited the coin Pl. XLIV.19 under the Audumbaras and the second one under ‘Rajaña Janapada’ of Mathurā and read the Kharoṣṭhi legend as Maharajasa Janapada, noted that a similar type with Brāhmī legend was published by Prinsep (Pl. XIV.18), which he himself had earlier (CASR, XIV, p. 151) read as ‘Rajna-Janapada’. On the basis of this second reading, Jayaswal (K.P. Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, Part I third ed., Bangalore City, 1955, p. 152) postulated the existence of the Mahārāja-janapada, besides the Rājanya-janapada, and traced its antiquity to the time of Pāṇini. S.K. Chakraborty also followed him (Ancient Indian Numismatics, p. 189 and NS, XLVI, p. 8). Both were obviously wrong.

9. Dharma Polity, pp. 151-52. It seems that in the first century BCE/CE, aśva was sometimes used for nya, as for example in the words Bṛihatsamhitā (XIV.28), Bṛihatsamhitā (XIV.28), etc., probably because of the impact of Kharoṣṭhi. For details see Devendra Handa, “The Impact of Kharoṣṭhi on the Tribal Coins of North India”, Numismatic International Bulletin, Delhi, Vol. 28, No. 7 (July 1993), pp. 169-71.
10. CAI, p. 85.
11. IMC, L. p. 165.
12. BMAI, c. xxii, See also Jayaswal, HP, p. 152.
15. JNSI, XVI, Pl. 123.

---

97 Jean-Pierre Righetti collection, number 903, in Pfisterer, ibid., p. 261. Photograph kindly provided by Klaus Vondrovec.


the Rājanya tribe. Misled by Cunningham’s statement that his coins came from the Mathurā region, Smith compared them with coins of the Mathurā Satraps and located the Rājanya territory in the old Dholpur State of eastern Rajasthan, though he referred to J.P. Rawlins’s discovery of Rājanya coins from the Hoshiarpur district of Punjab. Allan also noted this fact and, referring to the types and legends of these coins, he observed that “The coins of the first and common types and legends of these with Brāhmī and the other with Kharoṣṭhī legends; the types are the same on both classes: obv. Lakṣmī and rev. a bull. The Lakṣmī resembles that on the coins of Mathurā, but there is no close similarity of fabric. The provenance of the two classes seems to be the same, so that one probably succeeded the other. Those with Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions may be put in the second century BC, and those with Brāhmī in the first century BC.” Since most of the coins in the British Museum came from the collection of J.P. Rawlins from the Hoshiarpur district, Allan stated that “the Rājanya country may be located here.” K.K. Dasgupta felt that “On a review of the available material it will appear that the Rājanyas lived in eastern Punjab and in eastern Rajasthan. Originally they may have belonged to the Punjab whence they probably migrated to Rajasthan along with other Punjab tribes and occupied its eastern part.” Bela Lahiri rightly pointed out that the use of Kharoṣṭhī indicated the Punjab provenance for these coins and, referring to Cunningham’s procurement of these coins from Mathurā, she pointed out that “The presence of the Rājanya coins in Mathurā is not inexplicable in view of the fact that Mathurā was a great mart for trade and commerce, where coins of different places were brought. And, as Allan has pointed out, although there is some similarity between the figure of Lakṣmī on the Rājanya coins and that on the Mathurā coins, there is no close similarity of fabric between the two.”

All known Rājanya coins are characterized by a bull in a rayed circle on the reverse. The obverse shows a human figure with the legend Rājaña janapadasa. The human figure has not been engraved carefully and realistically and some scholars have described the figure as that of a male and the object held in the hand as uncertain. Allan recognised the human figure on the obverse of these coins as that of Lakṣmī holding a lotus? in her right hand, and this view has almost been accepted by most of the scholars.

Recently some more Rājanya coins have come to my notice which have a bearing on their provenance, typology, obverse and reverse figures, minting technique and metrology. All these coins come from the old mound of the village of Charan located about 10 km west of Balachaur on the Ropar-Nawanshahr (now Shahid Bhatag Singh Nagar) highway.

1. Copper, ovalish in shape with a straight cut on the shorter side, 1.25 g

Obv.: A standing human figure with right hand raised to the level of the head and the left hand placed on the waist; Brāhmī legend R[a]j[a]ha from VII to X and padasas from I to IV o’clock position

Rev.: A linear figure of a bull to left with a partly visible rayed circle around

The human figure on the obverse defies proper identification but a partly visible nimbus around the head indicates the figure to be that of a male deity. The extant legend leaves little doubt that it is a part of R[a]j[a]ha janapadasa. The planchet seems to have been prepared by beating a metal globule and cutting it on one side to adjust to the desired weight. The obverse was struck first and then the piece was probably put on a wooden base which, when struck with the hammer die, the hammer die as reverse pressed its centre with a shallow depression.

2. Copper, round, 9-10 mm, 1.56 g

Obv.: A standing male figure wearing circular earrings, with two hands as in the preceding example, Brāhmī legend R[a]j[a]ha ja from VII to XI and na padasas from I to IV o’clock position in bold letters

Rev.: Not clear, probably a lion to left

3. Copper, round, 9 mm, 1.42 g

Obv.: A standing human figure as above and traces of a legend around

Rev.: A linear figure of probably a lion

The human figure on the obverse seems to have been multi-headed with three heads discernible on the extant piece.

4. Copper, round (broken), 12.5 mm, 1.21 g

Obv.: A hexacephalic female figure holding some unidentified object in her right hand raised to the level of the shoulder, left hand not clear but probably akimbo, Brāhmī legend R[a]j[a]ha from VII to X o’clock position and traces on the right.

Rev.: Probably a bull

The six-headed female deity here may be identified as Shashṭhī with some certainty. The multi-headed male figure on the preceding examples may thus be identified with six-headed Kārttikeya. The male figures on the first two coins may also be surmised to be monocephalic Kārttikeya.

We thus see that these coins show, on the obverse not only a male but also a female deity, which, as suggested above, may now be identified as Kārttikeya and Shashṭhī. The depiction of these deities goes very well with the name of the Rājanya i.e. Kshatriya warrior people as Kārttikeya is regarded in Hindu mythology as the war-god and the commander-in-chief of the divine forces. Shashṭhī is his spouse and a form of Lakṣmī.

These coins with Brāhmī legends all coming from Charan on the northern bank of the Satluj bear evidence to the fact that they circulated in the Doab region of the Punjab and there is absolutely no reason to ascribe them to the Mathurā region. Palaeographically they may be assigned to the 1st century BC.
THE VISION OF MAHMUDD OF GHAZNA AND HIS BILINGUAL DIRHAMS OF LAHORE

By Rear Admiral Sohail Khan and Riaz Babar

Introduction

The Ghaznavids served initially as governors of the Samanids in the Ghazna area of Afghanistan. The most notable of these earlier governors was Sebuktegin (AH 366-387, AD 977-997), who, according to his coinage, having been a local ruler in Bust and Gardez, and subsequently seizing Ghazna, became a Samanid governor for Farwan in AH 380, while ruling autonomously in Ghazna until his death. The greatest of the Ghaznavids, however, was Sebuktegin’s son, Mahmud. For the period c AH 367-384 (AD 978-994) he served as governor of Ghazna, then became the Samanid governor, firstly in western Khurasan and then for the whole of Khurasan until, in AH 389 (AD 999) he no longer recognised the Samanid ruler as his overlord and proceeded to rule independently for the rest of his life. He died in AH 421 (AD 1030). For a detailed historical account of the earlier Ghaznavids and Mahmud in particular, please see the works by Bosworth and Muhammad Nazim quoted in the bibliography at the end of this article.

Ghaznavid coinage is extensive with many local issues. Coins were struck in gold, silver, billon and copper from various mints, the most common being gold from Ghazna, Herat, Nishapur; silver from Balkh, Nishapur, Ghazna; copper from Ghazna and Bust. Billon coins were struck by the later Ghaznavid rulers. There is no systematic catalogue of Ghaznavid coins. A useful overview can be found in Stephen Album’s Checklist of Islamic Coins, while a useful listing of Ghaznavid coins in the Tübingen collection can be found in the appropriate catalogues of the syllage (see bibliography). Coins in the name of Mahmud from the main mints are generally common. Additionally there are two types that are particularly striking, namely the multiple dirhams, mostly struck at Andaraba, and the bilingual dirhams struck briefly at Lahore with the mintname Mahmudpur. It is these latter which are the subject of the present article, together with a couple of interesting bilingual lead sealings.

The bilingual dirhams

The arrival of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni into the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent was quite different from that of those who descended prior to him. The Ghaznavids served initially as governors of the Samanids in the Ghazna area of Afghanistan. The most notable of these earlier governors was Sebuktegin (AH 366-387, AD 977-997), who, according to his coinage, having been a local ruler in Bust and Gardez, and subsequently seizing Ghazna, became a Samanid governor for Farwan in AH 380, while ruling autonomously in Ghazna until his death. The greatest of the Ghaznavids, however, was Sebuktegin’s son, Mahmud. For the period c AH 367-384 (AD 978-994) he served as governor of Ghazna, then became the Samanid governor, firstly in western Khurasan and then for the whole of Khurasan until, in AH 389 (AD 999) he no longer recognised the Samanid ruler as his overlord and proceeded to rule independently for the rest of his life. He died in AH 421 (AD 1030). For a detailed historical account of the earlier Ghaznavids and Mahmud in particular, please see the works by Bosworth and Muhammad Nazim quoted in the bibliography at the end of this article.

Ghaznavid coinage is extensive with many local issues. Coins were struck in gold, silver, billon and copper from various mints, the most common being gold from Ghazna, Herat, Nishapur; silver from Balkh, Nishapur, Ghazna; copper from Ghazna and Bust. Billon coins were struck by the later Ghaznavid rulers. There is no systematic catalogue of Ghaznavid coins. A useful overview can be found in Stephen Album’s Checklist of Islamic Coins, while a useful listing of Ghaznavid coins in the Tübingen collection can be found in the appropriate catalogues of the syllage (see bibliography). Coins in the name of Mahmud from the main mints are generally common. Additionally there are two types that are particularly striking, namely the multiple dirhams, mostly struck at Andaraba, and the bilingual dirhams struck briefly at Lahore with the mintname Mahmudpur. It is these latter which are the subject of the present article, together with a couple of interesting bilingual lead sealings.
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The arrival of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni into the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent was quite different from that of those who descended prior to him. The Ghaznavids served initially as governors of the Samanids in the Ghazna area of Afghanistan. The most notable of these earlier governors was Sebuktegin (AH 366-387, AD 977-997), who, according to his coinage, having been a local ruler in Bust and Gardez, and subsequently seizing Ghazna, became a Samanid governor for Farwan in AH 380, while ruling autonomously in Ghazna until his death. The greatest of the Ghaznavids, however, was Sebuktegin’s son, Mahmud. For the period c AH 367-384 (AD 978-994) he served as governor of Ghazna, then became the Samanid governor, firstly in western Khurasan and then for the whole of Khurasan until, in AH 389 (AD 999) he no longer recognised the Samanid ruler as his overlord and proceeded to rule independently for the rest of his life. He died in AH 421 (AD 1030). For a detailed historical account of the earlier Ghaznavids and Mahmud in particular, please see the works by Bosworth and Muhammad Nazim quoted in the bibliography at the end of this article.

Ghaznavid coinage is extensive with many local issues. Coins were struck in gold, silver, billon and copper from various mints, the most common being gold from Ghazna, Herat, Nishapur; silver from Balkh, Nishapur, Ghazna; copper from Ghazna and Bust. Billon coins were struck by the later Ghaznavid rulers. There is no systematic catalogue of Ghaznavid coins. A useful overview can be found in Stephen Album’s Checklist of Islamic Coins, while a useful listing of Ghaznavid coins in the Tübingen collection can be found in the appropriate catalogues of the syllage (see bibliography). Coins in the name of Mahmud from the main mints are generally common. Additionally there are two types that are particularly striking, namely the multiple dirhams, mostly struck at Andaraba, and the bilingual dirhams struck briefly at Lahore with the mintname Mahmudpur. It is these latter which are the subject of the present article, together with a couple of interesting bilingual lead sealings.
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The arrival of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni into the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent was quite different from that of those who descended prior to him. The Ghaznavids served initially as governors of the Samanids in the Ghazna area of Afghanistan. The most notable of these earlier governors was Sebuktegin (AH 366-387, AD 977-997), who, according to his coinage, having been a local ruler in Bust and Gardez, and subsequently seizing Ghazna, became a Samanid governor for Farwan in AH 380, while ruling autonomously in Ghazna until his death. The greatest of the Ghaznavids, however, was Sebuktegin’s son, Mahmud. For the period c AH 367-384 (AD 978-994) he served as governor of Ghazna, then became the Samanid governor, firstly in western Khurasan and then for the whole of Khurasan until, in AH 389 (AD 999) he no longer recognised the Samanid ruler as his overlord and proceeded to rule independently for the rest of his life. He died in AH 421 (AD 1030). For a detailed historical account of the earlier Ghaznavids and Mahmud in particular, please see the works by Bosworth and Muhammad Nazim quoted in the bibliography at the end of this article.
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are the first to have been struck in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent to show this Muslim royal practice in full (i.e. the profession of faith, the name of the caliph, the name of the temporal ruler, and the place and date of striking). This information is clearly visible on the coins discussed below in detail. Mahmud was the first Muslim ruler to assume the title "Sultan". It was Mahmud who boldly broke away from the stranglehold of the puppet Caliphs of Baghdad who were trying to convert the Muslim empire into one governed by an Arabic dynastic aristocracy. He was the pioneer of "The Persian Revolution". His coins, however, never broke away from his ideological and religious sincerity, and, as before him, he kept the Kalima Shahada as central to his coin legends but introduced his name as the temporal head. This he did cleverly also declaring the lawful rights to do so on the coins by using the honorific titles given to him by the Caliph himself; i.e. Yamin al-Daula or Right hand of the Caliph in running the Muslim Empire, and Amin al-Milla or Protector of the Realm.

There are two types of the bilingual dirhems, the second of which has three varieties. The two types are differentiated by Mahmud’s titles on the obverse of the coins. These titles and varieties of bilingual coins of Mahmud are shown below. But first, some information about Mahmud’s titles.

When the Caliph al-Ta’i was deposed in AH 381, the Samanid, Amir Nuh b. Nasr, did not recognise his successor, al-Qadir, and continued to read the khubta in the name of the deposed Caliph. Mahmud defeated ‘Abd al-Malik, the Samanid, at Marv in AH 389, conquered Khurasan and ordered the khubta to be read in the name of al-Qadir, who promptly granted him the patent of the sovereignty of Khurasan and bestowed upon him the honorific title of Yamin al-Dawlah wa Amin al-Millah.

About AH 391, Wathiqi, who was a descendant of the Caliph Al-Wathiqi (AH 227 – 232), claimed the Caliphate and secured the assistance of the Khans of Turkistan, but when he came to Khurasan, Mahmud had him arrested and sent to a fort where he remained till his death. In AH 403, al-Hakim, the Fatimid Caliph of Cairo, sent a letter to Sultan Mahmud, probably with a view to securing his allegiance, but the Sultan forwarded it to Baghdad where it was burnt in public. A little later in the same year, al-Hakim despatched an emissary, called Taharti, with the same object, but the Sultan, in compliance with a religious injunction of eminent theologians, ordered him to be put to death. On such evidence of devotion, al-Qadir further honoured the Sultan by bestowing upon him the title of Nizam al-Din.

But as time passed and the name of the Sultan was surrounded by a halo of glory, the moral support of the Caliph became less important. The Sultan became less obsequious towards him and sometimes months passed before Baghdad was officially informed of his victories. In 414 however, a serious rupture occurred in their relations. Abu ‘Ali Hasan, known as Hasnank, afterwards the wazir of the Sultan, while returning from his pilgrimage to Mecca, received a khil’at from the Fatimid Caliph, al-Zahir. Suspecting that he had done so at the command of the Sultan, al-Qadir addressed a strongly worded letter to him in which he charged Hasnank with belief in the Carmathian doctrines and demanded his execution. The Sultan was at first enraged with the Caliph, but he soon adopted his usual reverential attitude and despatched the offending khil’at to Baghdad, where it was burnt in the public square. This satisfied the Caliph, who, in Shawwal AH 417, expressed his appreciation of the Sultan’s victory of Somnath by bestowing on him the title of Kahl al-Dawlah wa’l-Islam, and other titles on his sons, Mas’ud and Humannad, and his brother, Yusuf.

1. al-qādir (the name of the Abbasid caliph) on the right:

Obv.: In the field, right: al-qādir: top: bi-allah centre: the Kalima followed by yāmin al-daula/ mahmūd right and left of mahmūd: wa amīn al-milla

In the margin the mint and date:

bism allah ḍuriba hadha ‘l-dirham
mahmūdpūr sana ṣhamān ‘ashe wa arba ‘mi’a

"in the name of God this dirham was struck in Mahmudpur the year eighteen and four hundred"

[NB: AH 418 = AD 1027/8]

Rev. in the field:

Albayyāmeka muhammadā avatar nrpati mahamuda
“The Invisible is One; Muhammad is the manifestation; Mahmud is the king”

Marginal legend in Sanskrit:

Albākīyya naa’ma tāka hato mahanudapura
“In the name of the Invisible one this tanka was struck at Mahmudpur”

2. al-qādir on the left:

As previous type except that al-qādir is placed in the field at the left.

3. al-qādir at the top:

Legends as previous varieties but with al-qādir at the top of the field, and bi-allah to the left. This variety is known dated 418 and 419.

---

102 The Conquest was completed in AH 417 / AD 1026. It was the biggest event in Mahmud’s life and the Abbasid caliph was extremely impressed. This was the time when Mahmud became the most powerful ruler of India. All the economic hubs and cities were under his domains. Notably, the bulla was issued in the same year; it might have been used to safely seal all the boxes containing all the bounty which he had collected during his campaign and sent back to his capital Ghazna, and Lahore. The following year, he issued the famous bilingual coins to spread the message to the people of India.

103 Regarding the title Kahl’al-Dawlah wa’ll Islam, the word Kahl derives from Surah 18 in the Quran and means ‘cave’; i.e. a place of refuge and protection in times of danger. Qadir bi-Allah was facing huge opposition from the Fatimids and even from inside the Abbasid family, and Mahmud showed his full support for the Abbasid caliph. The full title should be translated as: The Protector of the State and Islam. So far there is no coin of Mahmud known with this title.
4. al-qādir at the top, but Mahmud’s titles niẓām al-dīn, abū’l qasim

As previous variety but beneath the Kalima: niẓām al-dīn / abū’l qasim
Dated AH 418.
This type may have been the first of the bilingual issues as the coins with his other titles were struck in the following year, too.

Two remarkable lead sealings

Mahmud was well aware of the importance of good government and administration. He saw this as essential in welding the people together by their loyalty to one king in spite of their racial or religious differences. Mahmud had also taken the extraordinary step for those times of separating the civil and military authorities. This excellent administrative measure was the brainchild of the trusted powerful Wazir, Khwaja Hasan Maimandi. This system fully utilised the military vigour of the Turks combined with the administrative genius of the Persians and it worked well throughout Mahmud’s reign.

The Punjab, then called Al-Hind, and Sind had each one central economic hub: the Punjab had the city of Lahore, and Sind had Multan as centres of trade. Ghaznavid government treasuries were also located at these two centres. We should like to present here two lead seal impressions of some “bullae” which were used in recording depository or withdrawal transactions. These impressions of Lahore seals are bilingual and, thus, show remarkable similarity in that respect to the bilingual coins discussed above. The bilingual sealings, both dated AH 417, are shown below:

In the image of the square seal, above the elongated "ya" of the last word mi’ā, we see the signature of the engraver "Turab" at 1:00. This can be seen clearly in the drawing below.104 This practice of inserting the engraver’s name in the marginal legend of Islamic coins is not an unknown practice. Various examples have been noted in the past. George Miles appears to have been the first to note this, in 1938. Another example was published by Stefan Heidemann who discovered the name of the engraver, al-Hasan ibn Muhammad, in tiny lettering on a dirham of Isfahan dated AH 358.

All this raises some interesting questions: was the Arabic and Sharada lettering engraved by the same person on these bullae or by two separate engravers, one specialising in Arabic and one in Sharada lettering? Did the same person or persons engrave the dies of the bilingual dirhems issued during the following two years? As far as we know, no die studies have been done on these coins nor any epigraphic analysis. It may well be that Turab was involved in engraving at least the Arabic lettering of all of these items. This is something that could usefully form the topic of a future article.

By studying the new evidence from these bullae we have come to the conclusion that Mahmud was the first ruler to introduce bilingual inscriptions (Arabic and Sharada script) in the subcontinent of India and Pakistan. His vision was to spread the Tawheed, the Oneness of God, to the peoples of India. To help realise this vision he used this bilingual script for the beaurocracy.105

Nevertheless, the legends of subsequent Indo-Islamic gold and silver coinage issued by the various sultanates were, with very few

---

104 Turab is an Arabic word, which has the meaning “soil, earth”. It was a common name in the Persia and the Arab world. Since early Kufic has no nuqtas, there are many possible words (Tuzab, Turat, Burat, Buzat, Buzab); however, the word Turab is the only one which has a meaning and is attested from the list of known names.

105 A bilingual inscription (Persian and Sharada) was found on a foundation stone at Zalamkot in the Swat Valley. This was installed by Arsalan al-Jadhib, the Governor of Tus, who joined Mahmud’s army on his Indian campaigns in AH 401. Prof. Abdur Rahman has demonstrated that this is the first Persian/Sharada inscription known on the subcontinent.
exceptions, in Arabic. The billon and copper coins were also mainly struck with Arabic inscriptions though various early jitals of the Sultans of Dehli, especially those based on “bull and horseman” prototypes have either simple Sharada legends on one side, or bilingual legends (Arabic / Sharada; Arabic / Nagari).

Persian, however, was not used on the coinage, again with a few exceptions, until Mughal times. It was, however, increasingly used as a lingua franca by the aristocracy, intellectuals and writers, especially those that travelled around Asia. A good early example is Ali Hujwiri, mentioned above, who was born near Ghazna in AD 990 (AH 379/380) and spent most of his life in Lahore, dying there in AD 1077 (AH 469/470).
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THE COINAGE OF QAIŞAR SHAH DURRANI

By Stan Goron and Riaz Babar

When Taimur Shah Durrani died in 1793 (AH 1207) he left twenty-three sons by various mothers and, unfortunately, had not appointed an heir. This inevitably led to succession disputes which went on for 30 years or more with various of the sons battling each and setting themselves up in different parts of the country.

The main protagonists were Zaman and Shuja’, who were full brothers, and Humayun and Mahmud, who were half brothers. Humayun was the eldest son of Taimur. He proclaimed himself king at Qandahar (Ahmadshahi) but was soon defeated and blinded by Zaman, and thus played no further part in the fight for the succession. Zaman was acknowledged king at Kabul but had to contend with constant trouble from his brother, Mahmud, who had set up his base at Herat. Zaman decided to try to regain some of the fading Durrani glory by invading India. Thus, he twice invaded the Punjab, each time capturing Lahore, but each time having to return home to confront his brother. He then made the unfortunate decision to have Payanda Khan, who had been Wazir to both Ahmad Shah and Taimur Shah, executed. This led many to turn against him and it was not long before he was defeated, deposed and blinded by Mahmud.

The succession contest then continued between Mahmud and Shuja’. The former succeeded Zaman at Kabul in 1801 (AH 1216), while Shuja’ proclaimed himself king at Peshawar, with very little support and little success as coins continued to be struck there in the name of Mahmud. No coins of Shuja’s first, ephemeral reign have been reported. Nevertheless, two years later, in 1803 (AH 1218), Mahmud was ousted from Kabul and Shuja’ began his second reign. He appointed Qaisar, a son of Zaman Shah, as governor of Qandahar. At the instigation of the Barakzai Wazir, Fath Khan, Qaisar rebelled, proclaiming himself king and issuing coins in his own name in both silver and gold. The mohur listed and illustrated in PMC is the only specimen hitherto reported as far as the authors are aware.

Gold mohar Ashraf al-Bilåd Ahmadshahi mint AH 1218

PMC 1053, PI. XII/8, 10.80g

The obverse has the following couplet:

‘Silver and gold in the world by God’s command

Became current in the name of Qaiṣar Shâh.’

The reverse had the mint and date engraved within a border of mihrabs all contained within a circle: ḍarb ashraf al-bilåd âhmadshahi 1218

Qaisar’s rebellion was short-lived. In that same year coins were struck at Qandahar/Ahmadshahi in the name of Shuja’ al-Mulk. Four years later, in 1807 (AH 1222) Qaisar again rebelled, this time at Kabul and coins were struck in his name there both in gold and silver, though presumably in small quantities as the mohur is again known from a single specimen, and the rupees are also extremely rare.

Rupee Ashraf al-Bilåd Ahmadshahi mint AH 1218, 11.50g

106 One notable exception the silver coinage of the Suri rulers, which, in most cases, includes a line with the ruler’s name in Nagari.

107 Ali Hujwiri’s mausoleum in Lahore, with its impressive marble courtyard, mosque and other buildings, is said to be the most frequented of all the shrines in the city and a place of pilgrimage for people coming from distant places. One such pilgrim was the Sufi saint, Monuddin Chishti, who subsequently travelled to and settled in Ajmir, where many years later his shrine was visited by the Mughal emperor, Akbar.


109 Sold at Spink Auction 12027, London, 4 December 2012, lot 608.
The reverse of these coins has the usual mint date formula for Kabul. The rupee illustrated has both Ah date and regnal years while the mohur has only the latter visible on the coin. The couplet on the obverse has not yet been determined, though sulān qaïsâr is clear in the central line.

Following his rebellion at Kabul, Qaisar marched on Peshawar. Published here is the first reported rupee struck in his name at Peshawar. The coin is not dated but must surely have been struck on this occasion.

The couplet on the obverse is not fully visible but looks as though it could be the same as used on the coins of Ahmadshahi as rā’ī bi-nām qaïsâr is visible in the middle line, with gasht as the divider below it, and sīm wa .. jahān in the bottom line. On the reverse, only jallâš peshāvar is visible.

At this time, rupees were also struck in Kashmir in Qaisar’s name. These have the same couplet as the Ahmadshahi rupees except that bi-hukm (by the command of) is replaced by bi-faḍl (by the grace of). The reverse has the mint and date formula:

darb (zarb) khīṭā khashmir sanāh.

These rupees were struck with three date combinations: AH 1222 RY ahd, AH 1222 RY 2, AH 1223 RY 2.

Again, Qaisar’s rebellion was short-lived. Shuja’ marched from Sind and defeated him in March, 1808 (early AH 1224). Qaisar then disappears from the scene.

THE MYTH OF THE DIAMOND-SHAPED LAHORE MINT MARK

By Dinyar D. Madon

On pages 170, 192, 195 & 197 of Standard Catalogue of Coins of British India 1835 to 1947, Gev Kais109 has attributed the “tiny diamond-shaped pyramid” appearing on the 2 annas (#1373), 1 anna (#1400) and the ½ anna (#1415) all dated 1946, as the identifying mark of the ½, 1 & 2 annas struck at the Lahore Mint in 1946. I am unable to subscribe to this theory. The author has not given any evidence to support his hypothesis, and rightly so as there is none. It is pure conjecture. In fact all the available material points to one inescapable conclusion, namely that the “tiny diamond-shaped pyramids” are NOT the mint mark of the Lahore Mint nor are they an indication that the coins were struck at the Lahore Mint.

These marks (known as “pyramids”, this being Greek for pyramid) are of various sizes and are randomly placed on the coins. Unlike the dots on the 1862 Rupees, the pyramids are perfectly and proportionately shaped, of differing sizes and resemble a pyramid. The pyramids are raised and not incused. Some coins have them only on the obverse while others on the reverse and still others on both. The number of pyramids on a given coin ranges from 1 to 4.

I must, however, confess that I am at present unable to offer an explanation as to the purpose of these marks. They remain as, if not more, enigmatic than the dots on the 1862 Rupees. But merely because so far no explanation can be given for the pyramids does not mean that they are the mint mark of the Lahore Mint or an indication that the coins were struck there. I base my contention on the following facts.

1. The first reference to these diamond-shaped marks is to be found in two articles published in the Numismatic Circular111. These articles suggest that it may be possible to determine the Bombay and Lahore minted coins from the similar denominations struck at the Calcutta Mint by the presence of these tiny test marks.

2. In 1979, Dr K. N. Sharif112 on pages 179 et seq of his book Hundred Years of Indian Coinage, elaborately set out a study of the pyramids. He does not attribute these marks to the Lahore Mint, in fact he states that he has found them to appear on coins minted by the Bombay Mint only. (I have found them on coins minted at Calcutta and Lahore also). He is unable to throw light on the purpose of these marks. He refers to them as “Pyramids” and I will continue to use the same nomenclature.

---

112 Hundred Years of Indian Coinage, 1979.
3. Major F. Pridmore at page 164 of his work states with regard to the 2 annas dated 1946 of the Lahore Mint – “The 1946 cupro-nickel has no privy mark, but can be identified by tiny diamond-shaped test marks visible on EF/FDC specimens (NUM. Circ., October 1977).” He, however, qualifies this statement while dealing with the 1 & ½ anna of the Lahore Mint dated 1946 and states – “No privy mark denoting the Lahore Mint issue has been noted, but their identification may eventually be determined by test marks (see Num. Circ., 1977 and p.89).” (Emphasis supplied). Possibly Pridmore forgot to correct his note on page 164 in respect to the 2 annas. Thus even Pridmore did not venture to conclude that the pyramis was the mint mark of the Lahore Mint or that they conclusively identified the coins as being struck at the Lahore Mint.

4. Pridmore, on pages 89 and 90, refers to the 2 articles published in the Numismatic Circular and states that, till the date of publication of his book (i.e. 1980), only the Bombay ½ anna, dated 1947, could be identified by this method. It is pertinent to note that no ½ annas were struck at Lahore during 1947.

5. Paul Stevens & Randy Weir also do not subscribe to the theory that the pyramis are an indication that these coins dated 1946 were struck at Lahore. See pages 322 (#9.138 - 2 Annas), 323 & 325 (#9.187 - 1 Anna) and 326 & 327 (#9.213 - ½ Anna) of their book.

6. The Lahore Mint was established in 1943 (see Pridmore page 93). I have examined King George ¼ Rupees dated 1936 of the Bombay Mint with the pyramis marks. If the pyramis is the mark of the Lahore Mint, how could this mark appear on the King George ¼ Rupee dated 1936 minted at Bombay 7 years prior to the establishment of the Lahore Mint in 1943? I have attached an image of the 1936 ¼ Rupee that has one Pyramis on the obverse and two on the reverse. For ease of reference I have circled each pyramis. I have other 1936 Bombay ¼ Rupees with the pyramis in different positions.

7. The pyramis appear in various sizes and in differing places on coins of the same date and denomination. On some, the pyramis is only on the obverse, on others on the reverse, while on several others they appear on both the obverse as well as the reverse. Some coins have more than 1 pyramis on the obverse or the reverse. The number of pyramis on a coin range from 1 to 4. I am unable to comprehend as to why more than 1 mint mark should be placed on a coin, and that, too, in different places and of different sizes. I have noticed the pyramis on some coins that are unmistakably of the Calcutta Mint as they do not bear the Bombay mint-mark. They are the 1942 ¼ Rupee (no coins were struck at Lahore in 1942 as the mint started functioning only in October 1943); the 1943 1 anna (no 1 anna coins were struck at Lahore in 1943); and the 1947 ½ Anna (no ½ anna coins were struck at Lahore in 1947). I have circled the pyramis on the photos appended below. This raises several questions.

(a) If the pyramis is the mint mark of Lahore and it appears on coins minted in Bombay and Calcutta, then were the coins minted in Bombay, Calcutta or in Lahore or in 2 mints? Surely the same coin could not have been struck in two different mints simultaneously!!! A proposition so absurd that it merely needs to be stated to be rejected.

(b) If the pyramis was indeed the mint mark of Lahore, would not the mint mark be of the same size and placed in the same position on all coins, if not at least on all coins of the same date and denomination?

(c) If the pyramis was the mint mark of Lahore, why does it appear in different combinations on coins of the same date and denomination?

(d) What was the necessity of placing a ‘mint mark’ on both the obverse and the reverse of the same coin?


114 The Uniform Coinage of India 1835 to 1947, a Catalogue and Pricelist, 2012.

1942 Calcutta mint ¼ Rupee with a pyramis on the obverse

1936 Bombay mint ¼ Rupee with 1 pyramis on the obverse and 2 on the reverse.
8. The following coins struck at the Lahore Mint are known to bear an “L” raised mint mark:
   (a) Rupee dated 1944 & 1945;
   (b) ½ Rupee dated 1943, 1944 & 1945;
   (c) ¼ Rupee dated 1943, 1944 & 1945;
   (d) 2 annas dated 1944; and
   (e) 1 pice dated 1944 & 1945.

   Why, then, would the Lahore Mint stop using the “L” raised mint mark and use the pyramis in random combinations only in 1946?

9. For the ½ Anna, Gev Kias listed the following coins with “tiny diamond-shaped pyramid” (see page 197):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GK#</th>
<th>Mint / Year</th>
<th>Mint Mark / Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1405</td>
<td>Bombay 1942</td>
<td>Dots by INDIA, dashes by year. Tiny diamond-shaped pyramid on either obv, rev or both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Bombay 1945</td>
<td>Dots by INDIA, dashes by year. Tiny diamond-shaped pyramid on either obv, rev or both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414</td>
<td>Lahore 1946</td>
<td>Dots by INDIA, dashes by year. Tiny diamond-shaped pyramid on either obv, rev or both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Bombay 1947</td>
<td>Dots by INDIA, dashes by year. Tiny diamond-shaped pyramid on either obv, rev or both sides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question that comes to my mind is that if the pyramis is the indicator of the Lahore Mint, why do they appear on the coins minted at Bombay? On page 170, Gev Kias seeks to offer an explanation as to why these pyramis appear on both the Bombay and Lahore coins. According to the author these marks appear on the coins of King George VI minted at Bombay and Lahore during the period 1938 to 1947. He states “These Pyramids were Test Marks on coin blanks embedded during the blank preparation, to detect original coins minted at Bombay mint from forgeries. These blanks were also supplied to the new Lahore mint which started functioning in 1943 through 1947.” This explanation does not appear to be correct.

(a) The author has not given the source of his information.
(b) The pyramis are not “embedded” on the coins but in fact are raised.
(c) If this is true, then the pyramis should appear on all coins struck at Bombay from 1938 to 1947. But that is not so. There are several King George VI coins struck at Bombay which do not have the pyramis.
(d) On page 89, Pridmore suggests that the pyramis is a mark to test the quality of the die. He, however, cautions that this is merely a possible theory and that “No official report has been traced to explain their purpose”.
(e) The pyramis are tiny and can only be observed “on high grade coins and under magnification” as admitted by the author himself at page 170. It would, thus, be impossible to differentiate between a genuine circulated coin and a forgery by this method, and it is highly unlikely that the average citizen of that period would be able to determine the genuineness of a coin by this method. Why then would the authorities devise this method to detect forgeries?
(f) In fact in 1940 it was the security edge that was introduced as a counter-measure to forgery (See Sharif Page 161 & Pridmore page 85). Having introduced the security edge (which is so easy to identify) why would the British have introduced this obscure method in order to detect a forgery?
(g) If this method was indeed required to detect fake coins, then why was it not adopted for use on coins minted at Calcutta also? Why was it restricted to Bombay and Lahore? Were no forgeries made of the Calcutta Mint? But the important point to be noted is that the coins struck at Calcutta also have the pyramis mark! What is the explanation for this?
(h) If the purpose of the pyramis was to “detect” original coins from forgeries, then the pyramis should occur on ALL
genuine coins struck during the period 1938 to 1947. But this is not so. In fact many of the coins struck during this period do NOT have the pyramids. Does this mean that all the coins dated 1938 to 1947 without pyramids are forgeries?

(i) Sharif, Pridmore and Paul Stevens do not suggest that blanks, dies or punches were supplied by the Bombay Mint to the Lahore Mint. In fact a change in the reverse design occurred in the 1943 Lahore ½ Rupee and this was extended to the Bombay Mint issues in the following year (see Pridmore page 130). This would indicate that blanks, dies and punches were supplied separately to the mints.

(j) If the pyramids were introduced on a “blank” (as stated by Gev Kias) then the pyramids (which are raised and not incused) would have been flattened and/or obliterated during the striking process. The only method in which the pyramids could appear on a coin is if it was embedded in the punch itself.

(k) If this was done only on the King George VI coins dated 1938 to 1947, then why is it found on the 1936 King George V ½ Rupee?

(l) Both Pridmore and Gev Kias proceed on the assumption that all coins with the pyramids but without the Bombay Mint mark, were struck at Lahore. If one proceeds on the assumption that only coins struck at Bombay or Lahore have the pyramids and those struck at Calcutta do not, then it follows that coins with a pyramid but without the Bombay mint mark were struck at Lahore. There is no reason to assume this. This is a classic example of putting the cart before the horse. Coins struck at Calcutta also have the pyramids, and, therefore, coins without the Bombay mint mark but with the pyramids would have been struck either at Calcutta or at Lahore.

10. Gev Kias’s treatment of the 1947 ½ Anna is extremely strange. On page 197 he has, inter-alia, stated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GK#</th>
<th>Mint / Year</th>
<th>Mint Mark / Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1415</td>
<td>Bombay 1947</td>
<td>Dots by INDIA, dashes by year. Tiny diamond-shaped pyramid on either obv, rev or both sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1416</td>
<td>Bombay 1947</td>
<td>dots by INDIA, dash-dot-dash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1417</td>
<td>Calcutta 1947</td>
<td>dots by INDIA, dashes by year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The “dash-dot-dash” is the mint mark of the Bombay Mint whereas the “dashes by year” is the mint mark of the Calcutta Mint (see Pridmore page 168).

(b) If Gev Kias’s theory of “detecting forgeries” is correct, then it would appear that the Bombay Mint was not worried about all coins being forged. They put the “forgery” pyramid test marks only on some coins and for some inexplicable reason decided to use the Calcutta mint mark for those coins, and for the other coins they decided to use the Bombay mint mark without any pyramids! How would this help in detecting forgeries? If this were true then all the 12,63,92,000 ½ Anna coins struck at Calcutta in 1947 should be considered to be forgeries as the only difference between #1415 and #1417 is that #1417 does not have the alleged anti-forgery mark.

(c) What possible reason could there be for the Bombay Mint to use the Bombay mint mark on some coins and the Calcutta mint mark on others? It is obvious that all 1947 ½ Annas bearing the Calcutta mint mark were struck at Calcutta irrespective of whether they displayed the pyramids or not. In my view all coins listed by Gev Kias at #1415 were struck at the Calcutta Mint.

11. The 1944 Lahore 2 Annas has the mint mark “L” raised 4 times in the quatrefoil angles. Gev Kias does not record any pyramids for this coin (See #1366 at page 192), even though this coin bears a pyramid. Thus a reverse was prepared and used for the Lahore 2 Annas with 4 “L” raised mint marks. There is no explanation why the Lahore Mint in 1946, would not have used this reverse die by merely changing the date and instead have taken the trouble to prepare a reverse that did not contain the 4 raised “L” mint marks, or use the Calcutta Die and incorporate therein the mysterious pyramids.

Conclusion
In my view the aforesaid can only lead to the inescapable conclusion that the pyramids or the “diamond-shaped test marks” are not the mint mark of the Lahore Mint nor can they be considered to be an indication that a coin was minted at Lahore. Until a logical explanation is found we will have to proceed on the basis that there is yet no method of identifying the ½, 1 & 2 annas struck by the Lahore Mint in 1946.

Articles and other items of interest are required for JONS 226 and future issues of the Journal. Please send
THE COINAGE OF THE SAFFARIDS OF SIJISTAN AND RELATED DYNASTIES, 247h-332h

PART 5

By Stephen Lloyd

The penultimate part of this series of articles covers the mint of Fars only. The question of where the mint which struck these dirhams was located is complex, and Tor’s arguments that they were produced at Istakhr are not convincing. Briefly, the sequence of minting at Shiraz and Fars during the 280s-290s does support her view that these two mint-names must denote different locations at this time, but there is little to indicate that ‘Fars’ must equate to Istakhr. Meanwhile, a newly-discovered coin struck at Fars in 255h (coin Fa255 below) is to be associated with Ya’qub b. al-Layth’s brief occupation of Shiraz in this year. The fabric of the coin suggests that it is an irregular and semi-official issue and it would not do to place too much weight on the evidence of one single piece, but this does nevertheless suggest a connection at this time between ‘Fars’ and Shiraz.

Detailed discussion of Tor’s arguments would go beyond the scope of these articles, but one numismatic point is worth addressing here. This concerns Saffarid dirhams struck at Fars from 267h through 269/270h, which are found with and without the letter shin or shin below the reverse field. Although Tor and others (including Album in the latest Checklist) suggest that this may be an abbreviation for ‘Shiraz’, several reasons may be given why this is almost certainly not correct. Firstly, the varieties of these coins with and without shin are indistinguishable in terms of calligraphy, style and fabric; they give every appearance of having been produced together. Secondly, we have Dulafid issues of Shiraz 270h which have the mint-name ‘Shiraz’ in its usual place within the mint/date formula in the obverse margin, rather than having ‘Fars’ in the margin and a city-name in the field. Moreover, the Dulafid pieces are struck on much broader flans and exhibit markedly different calligraphy from these Fars dirhams, as comparison between Sh270D and Fa270 demonstrates. (If the Saffarid dirham of Shiraz 269h reported by Vasmer could be verified, this in itself would disprove any connection between these Fars dirhams and the mint of Shiraz). Thirdly, the only Saffarid coins which do in fact have the provincial name in the margin and city-name in the field are rare dirhams of Fars/Arrajan 270h (see Ar270), where ‘Arrajan’ does appear in the reverse field but is written in full rather than being abbreviated. Fourthly, and perhaps most tellingly, the same isolated letter sin or shin is also found in the same place on coins of other mints and dynasties, including some Abbasid and Samanid issues struck at Samarqand in the late 270s and 280s; this clearly cannot stand for ‘Shiraz’ here. There are numerous examples of Abbasid-period dirhams with isolated letters in the fields which cannot be explained as abbreviated mint-names, and which are better interpreted as control marks or perhaps officina letters of some kind.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my long-standing gratitude to Stan Goron, who will retire as Editor of the Journal after this issue. Stan has been unfailingly patient in encouraging me to continue working on this series of articles, which without his support and perseverance would never have made it into print.
Fa257A  
Fars 257h (Abbasid)  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*Private Collection, Cambridge (3.13g, 25.5mm)  
Vasmer p.135; SICA IV, 716 (2.96g), 717 (2.97h), 718 (2.77g)

Fa258A  
Fars 258h (Abbasid)  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: جعفر لا شريك له الله وحده لا الله الا الله  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*Baldwin’s auction 26, 9 May 2001, lot 1685 (2.96g, 22mm)  
SICA IV, 719 (3.00g), 720 (2.74g), 721 (2.96g)

Fa259A  
Fars 259h (Abbasid)  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*SICA IV, 722 (2.80g, 24mm)  
SICA IV, 723 (3.12g), 724 (3.02g)

Fa263  
Fars 263h  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

Tübingen 2002-18-9

Fa264  
Fars 264h  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*Private Collection, Cambridge (3.12g, 23.5mm)  
Vasmer – (cf 6, but name read as Ja’far instead of Ya’qub); BMC II, 245 = Walker p.6; Limbada (3.10g); Peus auction 386, lot 1091 (3.01g); Qatar III, 3606 (3.09g); Tübingen 93-22

Fa265  
Fars 265h  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.91g, 23.5mm)  
Vasmer 7 (3 examples cited); Album FPL 157, January 2000, 79 (2.97g); ICA4, lot 374 (3.00g); Limbada (plugged, 4.69g)

Fa266  
Fars 266h  
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
Obv. field: لا الله الا الله وحده لا شريك له جعفر  
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33  
Rev. field: الله محمد رسول الله المعتمد على الله  

*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.85g, 23.5mm)  
ANS 1917.215.104 (with broad margins on obverse); Limbada (3.11g); Spink Zurich 22, lot 386 = Qatar III, 3615 (3.10g)
Fa270  Fars 270h
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | اللهو جهد | لا شريك له | الموق بالي الله | عمر بن الليث
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المعتمد على الله | ش

Private Collection, Cambridge (2.60g, 25mm)
Qatar III, 3621 (3.08g)

Fa272  Fars 272h
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ | ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ | ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ
Rev. field: ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ

Vasmer 32 (1 example cited)

Fa273  Fars 273h
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ | ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ | ﻋﻣﺮﻭ ﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻠﻴﺚ
Rev. field: ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ | ﺍﻟﻠﻪ

Private Collection, Cambridge (2.88g, 25.5mm)
Vasmer 33 (4 examples cited); Artuk 959 (3.20g); ICA 10, lot 263 (3.00g); Miles, RIC 295; SCC 1347 (3.05g); SICA IV, 727a (2.96g)

Fa273A  Fars 273h (Abbasid)
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | اللهو جهد | لا شريك له | الموق بالي الله | الناصر لدين الله
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المعتمد على الله | أحمد بن الموق بالله

*ICA 15, lot 220 (3.13g, 22mm) = ICA 16, lot 297
Private Collection, Cambridge (seen but image not available)

Fa274A.1  Fars 274h (Abbasid)
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | اللهو جهد | لا شريك له | الموق بالي الله | الناصر لدين الله
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المعتمد على الله | أحمد بن الموق بالله

Private Collection, Cambridge (2.72g, 24mm)
Vasmer p.143, 34; ANS 0000.999.3103 (3.31g); ICA 27, lot 306 (3.00g); Miles, RIC 295; SCC 1347 (3.05g); SICA IV, 727 (3.39g), 727a (2.96g)

Fa274A.2  Fars 274h (Abbasid)
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | اللهو جهد | لا شريك له | الموق بالي الله | الناصر لدين الله | الموقف بالي الله
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المعتمد على الله | أحمد بن الموق بالله

*The New York Sale XXX, 9 January 2013, lot 415 (4.16g, 20mm) = Morton and Eden auction 69, 10 April 2014, lot 42

GFa273A  Fars 273h (dinar, Abbasid)
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | اللهو جهد | لا شريك له | الموق بالي الله | الناصر لدين الله
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المعتمد على الله | أحمد بن الموق بالله

*Morton and Eden auction 69, 10 April 2014, lot 41 (4.00g, 20mm)
ICA 19, lot 59 (4.21g)
Fa274  
**Fars 274h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﺇِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

*Private Collection, Cambridge (3.04g, 24mm)
ICA 12, lot 3336 = ICA 14, lot 302 (3.63g)

Fa275A
An Abbasid dirham of Fars 275h is recorded, but not described, by Diler, citing Ahmed Tevhid, *Meskukat-I kadime-i Islamiye*, vol. 4, Istanbul 1321h/1903.

Fa280  
**Fars 280h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

Vasmer 62, citing Tornberg p.150, 17.

Vasmer considered this reading of the date to be questionable and further speculated that it may be a muling or other unofficial issue. Unfortunately, the piece is not illustrated.

Fa283  
**Fars 283h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

Vasmer 54 (2 examples cited); Fölhagen 127 (not illustrated) = Tornberg 21

Fa286  
**Fars 286h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

Vasmer 61 (1 example cited)

Fa289  
**Fars 289h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

Vasmer 73 (1 example cited)
Tübingen 2002-18-10, 2008

Fa290  
**Fars 290h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.83g, 27.5mm)
Vasmer 74 (1 example = BMC (unpublished) = Walker p.8); Limbada (3x: *2.83, 3.26, 4.55g); Lowick 1975, 305-307 (3.03, 3.01, 3.16g); Qatar III, 3632-3634 (3.41, 3.20, 2.70g); Spink Zurich 27, lot 430 (2.98g)

Fa291.1  
**Fars 291h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

*Private Collection, Cambridge (3.10g, 27mm)
Limbada (2.84g); Qatar III, 3638 (3.05g); Tübingen 2008-2009

Fa291.2  
**Fars 291h**
Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ ﻰلا ﻦَ إِنَّ

Vasmer 75 (5 examples cited); BMC (unpublished) = Walker p.8; Limbada (3x: 3.53, 3.01, 2.78g); Lowick 1975, 308 (2.58g); Qatar I, 2115 (2.78g); Qatar III, 3635-3637 (2.12, 2.48, 2.77g)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa291.3</th>
<th>Fars 291h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له | طاهر بن محمد  

| **Rev. margin:** Qur’an ix, 33  
**Rev. field:** 

له | محمد | رسول | الله | المكفي بالله | طاهر بن محمد  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Peus auction 363, lot 6103 (2.98g, 28.5mm)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa291A</th>
<th>Fars 291h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له  

| **Rev. margin:** Qur’an ix, 33  
**Rev. field:** 

له | محمد | رسول | الله | المكفي بالله  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Abbasid dirham of this year has been reported but no details are available and the description above is conjectural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa292</th>
<th>Fars 292h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له | طاهر بن محمد  

| **Rev. margin:** Qur’an ix, 33  
**Rev. field:** 

له | محمد | رسول | الله | المكفي بالله  
|-------------------|-------------------|
| *Private Collection, Cambridge (3.86g, 29mm)  
Vasmer 76 (5 examples cited); BMC (unpublished) = Walker p.8;  
Limbada (h2.93g, double circles around fields on both sides);  
Limbada (2.99g, triplet of pellets below obverse field);  
Lowick 1975, 309 (3.44g); Qatar III, 3639 (2.83g)* |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa292A</th>
<th>Fars 292h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له  

| **Rev. margin:** Qur’an ix, 33  
**Rev. field:** 

له | محمد | رسول | الله | المكفي بالله  
|-------------------|-------------------|
| *Fa294a (ornaments below reverse field): Private Collection, Cambridge (2.94g, 29mm);  
*Fa294b (no ornaments): Private Collection, Cambridge (3.02g, 29.5mm)  
Vasmer 78 (3 examples cited); BMC II, 247 = Walker p.8, two ornaments below reverse field;  
Lowick 1975, 310-311 (3.26, 2.97g); Peus auction 378, lot 1299 (4.39g); Qatar 3640 (1.67g)* |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa293</th>
<th>Fars 293h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له | طاهر بن محمد  

| **Rev. margin:** Qur’an ix, 33  
**Rev. field:** 

له | محمد | رسول | الله | المكفي بالله  
|-------------------|-------------------|
| *Private Collection, Cambridge (3.15g, 28mm)  
Vasmer 77 (1 example cited); BMC (unpublished) = Walker p.8;  
Limbada (3.30g)* |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fa294a</th>
<th>Fa294b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Obv. margin:** Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)  
**Obv. field:** 

لا اله الا الله | الله وحده | لا شريك له | طاهر بن محمد  

| **Rev. field:** [ornaments]  
|-------------------|-------------------|
| *Fa294a (ornaments below reverse field): Private Collection, Cambridge (2.94g, 29mm);  
*Fa294b (no ornaments): Private Collection, Cambridge (3.02g, 29.5mm)  
Vasmer 78 (3 examples cited); BMC II, 247 = Walker p.8, two ornaments below reverse field;  
Lowick 1975, 310-311 (3.26, 2.97g); Peus auction 378, lot 1299 (4.39g); Qatar 3640 (1.67g)* |

---

| Tübingen 95-26-3 |
**Fa295**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له طاهر بن محمد

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسل الله | المقتدر بالله

[*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.59g, 30mm)]

Vasmer 79 (3 examples cited); BMC (unpublished) = Walker p.8; Qatar III, 3641-3643 (2.98, 3.03, 3.04g)

ANS 71.316.46, with letter ﺩ below reverse (3.19g)

---

**Fa296h**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له طاهر بن محمد

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول الله | المقتدر بالله

[*Peus auction 341, lot 1672 (2.81g, 31mm)]

Vasmer 86 (2 examples cited); BMC II, 249 = Walker p.8; Private Collection, Cambridge (3.14g)

---

**Fa297.1**

In outer border on both sides: بالنصر والنصر | السلام | السبت | السعيد

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له الله محمد

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول الله | المقتدر بالله

[*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.91g, 26mm)]

Fa297.1a: Private Collection, Cambridge (2.91g, 26mm)

Fa297.1b (note different arrangement of ‘good luck’ words in obverse border); uncertain image source (28mm)

Vasmer 92 = Walker 2; ICA10, lot 265 (2.06g); Peus auction 341, lot 1673 (3.45g); Peus auction 363, lot 6104 (2.99g); Spink Zurich 22, lot 390 (3.17g); Spink Zurich 34, lot 355 (3.14g); Tübingen 92-25-5, 93-22

---

**Fa297A**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول الله | المقتدر بالله

[*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.80g, 29mm)]

Vasmer 94 (1 example cited)

---

**Fa297.2**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول الله | المقتدر بالله

[*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.96g, 30mm)]

ANS 2000.33.2 (pierced, 3.01g)

---

**Fa297.3**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)

Obv. field: لا الله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له

Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33

Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول الله | المقتدر بالله

Tübingen 93-38-7
**Fa298**

**Fars 298h**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | الله وحده | لا شريك له | ملك
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المقتدر بالله

*Private Collection, Cambridge (3.17g, 29mm)
Vasmer 95 (3 examples cited); Qatar I, 2168 (3.30g); Qatar III, 3645 (weight not given); ICA6, lot 399 (3.71g); ICA12, lot 3344 (3.18g); Tübingen 95-25-3

---

**Fa298A.1**

**Fars 298h (Abbasid)**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 3-4 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | الله وحده | لا شريك له | ابن الأباس بن | أمير المؤمنين
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المقتدر بالله

*Peus auction 392, lot 4727 (2.97g, 22mm), unit of date recut over ‘8’

---

**Fa298A.2**

**Fars 298h (Abbasid)**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 3-4 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | الله وحده | لا شريك له | ابن الأباس بن | أمير المؤمنين
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المقتدر بالله

*Limbada (2.79g); Private Collection, Cambridge (a second specimen with ornament above obverse field, 3.19g); SICA IV, 728 (2.85g), 729 (3.02g), 730 (3.23g)

---

**Fa299A.1**

**Fars 299h (Abbasid)**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 4-5 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | الله وحده | لا شريك له
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المقتدر بالله

*Peus auction 392, lot 4727 (2.97g, 22mm), unit of date recut over ‘8’

---

**Fa299A.2**

**Fars 299h (Abbasid)**

Obv. margin: Qur’an xxx, 3-4 (outer); mint and date (inner)
Obv. field: الله الا | الله وحده | لا شريك له | ابن الأباس بن | أمير المؤمنين
Rev. margin: Qur’an ix, 33
Rev. field: الله | محمد | رسول | الله | المقتدر بالله

*Private Collection, Cambridge (2.87g, 26mm)
ANS 72.79.115 (3.15g); Limbada (2.49g); SICA IV, 731 (4.31g), 732 (2.97g)

---

**Images of Shiraz**

---
Children’s book inspired by Kushan coins

ONS member Peter Linenthal writes -
In 2000 I visited Spain and bought my first ancient coin, a Celt-Iberian with a woman’s Picasso-like profile. Then I came across Kushan coins. Their fusion of Western and Eastern motifs was unexpected and fascinating. I had no idea that the Kushan Empire had been one of four great empires of their day along with the Roman and Parthian Empires and Han China. I found out that some of the first Buddha images appeared on Kushan coins; when I bought a Buddha coin of the Kushan king, Kanishka, I felt that I owned a piece of history which belonged in a museum.

I am an illustrator and I imagined a picture book for children taking place in the Kushan Empire which would introduce both children and adults to the multicultural world of the Kushans, where more than 30 deities from Iranian, Graeco-Roman and Indian religious traditions appear on coins. Jaya’s Golden Necklace: a Silk Road Tale is the book Kushan coins inspired. For many publishers, the history was too obscure, but the book was published recently. In it, a young girl is on a mission for king Kanishka. The deities Shiva, Inanna and Hercules leap from coins on her mother’s necklace, help her achieve her goal and discover strengths she did not know she had. It is the first children’s book about the origin and cultural roots of the Buddha image, a story in which ancient coins play a central role. Back matter gives more information about the Kushans and the Silk Road, including a map and photos of several Kushan coins. I hope the book stimulates an interest in ancient coins and makes an amazing chapter of history connecting East and West a bit more familiar.
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