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ADVERTISEMENT.

By a mistake, for which neither the editor nor the author is responsible, the three engraved plates were compressed into two. Consequently the first part of Plate II. is to be found in the first plate; and the second part of Plate II. together with Plate III. in the second plate. Fortunately the blunder will occasion little or no confusion.

S. L. P.
EDITOR'S NOTE.

It is to be understood that, in this collection of memoirs, authors have the entire credit, and are in the same degree responsible for their own contributions. In the present article, the author has throughout maintained his right of freedom from editorial control. The leading difference, however, has only extended to the severity of the treatment of a subject which the Editor desired to have cast into a more popular form.

A concession has been made in the appended Table of Alphabets to the demands of the contributors to purely Arabic Numismatics, who hesitated to accept the less elaborate Persian system of transliteration suggested by the Editor in the opening Essay; and, at the same time, advantage has been taken of the opportunity to improve some of the minor details of the latter scheme, so as to bring it more into harmony with the newly adapted Arabic compromise, especially in regard to the group of letters م suitcase، which will now be ranged in more complete unison with the fellow alphabet by the use of single dots below their corresponding Roman letters.

As the retention of the old title of "Marsden" has been misunderstood on the one part, and found to be altogether out of place under the altered conditions of the present publication, the Editor has reverted to the more appropriate term of an International Edition of the "Numismata Orientalia."—[E. T.]

The distribution of the sections of the entire work already undertaken comprises the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Author/Contributor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coins of Southern India</td>
<td>Sir Walter Elliot, late Madras Civil Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam, etc.</td>
<td>Sir Arthur Phayre, late Commissioner in British Birmah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Indo-Scythians</td>
<td>General A. Cunningham, Archaeological Surveyor of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Mr. T. W. Reys Davids, late Ceylon Civil Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Bengal Sultans</td>
<td>Dr. Blochmann, the Madrassa, Calcutta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the early Arabico-Byzantine adaptations</td>
<td>M. de Savigny, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Russo-Tatar Dynasties</td>
<td>Professor Gregorietz, St. Petersburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Khalifs of Spain, etc.</td>
<td>Don Pachaly de Gayangos, Madrid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Fatimides of Egypt</td>
<td>M. Sauvaire, late Consul for France at Cairo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the T'ubin Dynasty of Egypt</td>
<td>Mr. E. T. Rogers, Director of Public Instruction, Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Saljuqis, Uruqis, and Atabegs</td>
<td>Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, Oxford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Sassanians of Persia</td>
<td>Mr. Edward Thomas, London.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTRASTED METHODS OF TRANSLITERATION VARIOUSLY ADVOCATED FOR ARABIC AND PERSIAN, WITH THE SYSTEMS FINALLY ADOPTED FOR THE INTERNATIONAL NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

(Cols. 8, 9.)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir W. Jones</td>
<td>Miss Fardan</td>
<td>Mr. P. Johnson</td>
<td>M. A. Ghadkhe</td>
<td>Dr. Wright</td>
<td>Dr. Farnes</td>
<td>Mr. Lane</td>
<td>Pernaut</td>
<td>Arabic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th or š</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>ř</td>
<td>th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>tch</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diacritical data may be omitted at option, but preferentially where the original text accompanies the romanised version.

No. 4.—Grammaire Persane. Paris, 1852.  
No. 5.—Arabic Grammar. London, 1874-75.  
No. 6.—Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. London, 1867.  
No. 8.—The International Numismata Orientalia—Persian, etc.  
No. 9.—The International Numismata Orientalia—Arabic.
**THE SANSKRIT ALPHABET,**

WITH THE CORRESPONDING SYSTEM OF ROMAN EQUIVALENTS ADOPTED IN THE INTERNATIONAL NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gutturals</th>
<th>ख,</th>
<th>खkh,</th>
<th>ग,</th>
<th>घgh,</th>
<th>ङ,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palatals</td>
<td>चch,</td>
<td>चchh,</td>
<td>जj,</td>
<td>जjh,</td>
<td>जā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebrals</td>
<td>टt,</td>
<td>टṭh,</td>
<td>डd,</td>
<td>डdh,</td>
<td>ढ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentals</td>
<td>ठt,</td>
<td>ठṭh,</td>
<td>डd,</td>
<td>डdh,</td>
<td>ण,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labials</td>
<td>चp,</td>
<td>चph,</td>
<td>चb,</td>
<td>चbh,</td>
<td>म,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semivowels</td>
<td>यy,</td>
<td>रr,</td>
<td>लl,</td>
<td>लv,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilants and Aspirate</td>
<td>घgh,</td>
<td>ङ,</td>
<td>ङ,</td>
<td>ङ,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

The present Essay is based upon an article on the coins of the Urtuki princes which I contributed to the Numismatic Chronicle in 1873. The earlier treatise was little more than a catalogue of the series of these coins in the British Museum; but in the present work much has been added from the cabinet of the late Colonel C. Seton Guthrie and from foreign collections described either in published catalogues or in the letters of correspondants abroad. It is needless to say that the whole work has undergone a thorough revision, several errors have been rectified by the acquisition of fresh details, and the historical Introduction has been entirely re-written after a second and more complete examination of the original authorities, and has been supplemented by a comparative table of the contemporary dynasties, including the Kings of Jerusalem and the Emperors of Constantinople; thus bringing the Turkumán highlandmen into relations with names which are more familiar to English readers, and with which these semi-barbarous chieftains had much more to do than is commonly supposed.

The system of transliteration adopted in the present Essay demands some explanation from me. I am unwilling that it should go forth as my own production, for it is not such a system as I should choose for myself. It does not appear to me to answer what I consider a very important end of transliteration,—a true image of the pronunciation. However, it fulfils the at least equally important object of giving an accurate and consistent reproduction of the original orthography. On the whole, in a composite work like the Numismata Orientalia, wherein essays by writers of widely differing languages will have a place, the system of transliteration proposed by the Editor is as satisfactory as need be. As I am at present making use of four different systems of transliteration in four different publications, I am inclined to view with equal toleration all systems that are consistent and intelligible.
The mixture of plates, three autotype-photographic, and three copper-plate, is due to the necessity of supplementing the original engravings of Marsden's work by representations of those additions which have been made to the series of numismatic monuments since his time, and to the superiority of photographic over engraved plates. Of the perfect fidelity and clearness of the autotype photographs it is needless to speak; but with regard to the copper-plates it is necessary to say that whilst in many cases the engraver has succeeded in an admirable degree in representing the coins, in some he has been unfortunate. In such cases the student must trust rather to the description than to the engraving.

In the composition of the Essay I have received valuable assistance, in the way of notes upon the earlier article and references to coins with which I was unacquainted, from M. W. Tiesenhausen, of Warschau; Dr. O. Blau, German Consul-General at Odessa; Dr. E. Ritter von Bergmann, Custos of the Imperial Coin-Cabinet at Wien; and from Mr. J. W. Redhouse. I take this opportunity to express to them publicly the thanks which they have already received in private.

STANLEY LANE POOLE.

 Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
 October, 1876.
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Six Plates.
CORRECTIONS.

P. 2, line 15, for "Ukayil," read "Ukayiil."

P. 4, line 24, for "Dhanith," read "Dinith."

P. 7, note 5. For "The histories can give no information as to the date of Alpi's death, but the coins prove it was 572;" read, "The date here given is the traditional one, and I have adopted it as founded probably on some authority with which I am

unacquainted. The testimony of Ibn-al-Athir, indeed, is adverse to the date 572; for although he nowhere records the death of

Alpi, he mentions his son Kōb-ud-din as ruler of Maridin in 569. The coins afford us no help in this matter. On the whole

I have thought it better to follow Maseden in adopting the date 572, for which he probably had some authority, in spite of the

solitary notice which Ibn-al-Athir opposes to it."


P. 14, lines 2 from bottom, for "Kārā-Aralān," read "Kārā-Aralān."

P. 16, note 1, dele comma after "deutsche."

P. 19, no. 15, rev. area, for "al read "al."

COINS OF THE URTUKÌ TURKUMÁNS.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. Oriental coins seldom possess artistic merits, perhaps least of all the coins of the Urtukîs, for these have not even the excellence of calligraphy to recommend them. Yet they are far from being the least interesting of their class. The Urtukîs are among the few Muhammadian dynasties who ventured to introduce images on their coins. So strong was the stigma attached to representations of living things by the Prophet of Islam, that the most disreputable prince would not venture to engrave his own or any one else's head upon the currency; for had not the Prophet said that for every image of a living thing that a man made he would be required to find a soul on the day of resurrection; and did not the people believe him? Partly from the fear of offending this prejudice, and partly from a natural predilection for whiting sepulichres and combining questionable practices with an unimpeachable orthodoxy, arose the peculiarity of Muhammadian coins, the absence of images. The Urtukî princes were almost the first to despise the popular belief, and to introduce figures on their dies. But they did not, except perhaps in one or two ill-established instances, engrave their own heads, or those of their suzerains; but chose instead the types of the gold issues of the Byzantine emperors, and sometimes of the Seleucidae, or again of the Sassanian kings. Not only do we find heads of Byzantine emperors and other 'miscreant' rulers, but even Christian religious types, the Virgin, and Christ, with sometimes the inscription 'Emmanuel' in Greek letters. The princes who struck these unorthodox coins could have had no idea of what heresies they were circulating; although, perhaps, after the first step of admitting images at all, they might not stick at the propriety of any particular representation. The issuing of imaged-coins had probably very little to do with either the orthodoxy or the self-exaltation of the issuers,—it was almost a commercial necessity. The Urtukî Turkumans (as well as the contemporary image-coinimg dynasties) had frequent intercourse with the Greeks and other Christians of the coasts of Asia Minor. To facilitate their monetary exchanges some currency intelligible to both had to be devised. The result was a mixed coinage—Arabic inscriptions with European, generally Byzantine, images. It is true that the Urtukî copy represented a widely different metal-value from the Byzantine gold
original; but the object was merely to give the Greek merchant some intelligible and distinguishing mark, when he could not read the Arabic inscription.

§ 2. The history of the Urtuḳi princes is not eventful. It is precisely the history of all the other petty chiefs of Syria—a series of raids, of guerrillas, of small jealousies, and large crimes. The important part the dynasty played in the wars of the Crusades is the redeeming feature. The influence of the Crusades on Europe has been so great and so many-sided that an interest is imparted to many things which, were it not for their connexion with these wars, might seem uninteresting enough. The annals of this Turkumán must claim our attention as the history of the most powerful and vigorous enemies the Crusaders encountered before the coming of Şalâh-ad-dîn.¹

The first mention we find of Urtuḳ, the founder of the dynasty,² is when he was serving in the Saljûḳi armies under the generalship of Fakhur-ad-daulah ibn Juhayr. When first he came before us, in the year of the Flight 477 (A.D. 1084–5), he must have already risen high in the service, for at that time Fakhur-ad-daulah was besieging Anad, and Urtuḳ possessed sufficient influence to be able to effect the escape of the besieged, the 'Ukayli Sharaf-ad-daulah Muslim, who had bought the Turkumán's favour by a bribe.³ Knowing that this connivance, if it took wind, would compromise him in the eyes of his master, Sultan Malik Sháh, Urtuḳ changed his service for that of Malik Sháh's brother, Tutush, Sultan of Damascus. In 479 Tutush captured Jerusalem, and made Urtuḳ governor in his name,⁴ a post which the Turkumán held till his death in 484;⁵ and which his sons Sukmán⁶ and Il-Gházî filled till Al-Âqâla, the son of Badr Al-Jamáli, added the Holy City to the dominions of the Fâtimi Khalifah (489),⁷ whereupon Sukmán departed to Ar-Ruḥâ (Edessa), and Il-Gházî to Al-Trầk, where he possessed some territory.⁸ When Sultan Muhammad came to Ḥulwân in 494, Il-Gházî entered into his service, and in the following year was made the Sultan's shâhânah or agent at Baghjaq,⁹ the Saljûḳi capital being Ịshbahân. In the same year (496) the other son of Urtuḳ, Sukmán,¹⁰ rendered assistance to Mâṣû when besieged in Al-Mausil (Mossoul) by Jakarmish, and received as reward 10,000 dinârs, together with Ịsîn Kayfî, a fortress in Diyar-bakr, on the road between Anad and Jasarrat-ibn-''Umar.¹¹ He had previously possessed, since 488,

¹ My principal authority is Ibn-al-Âṭhîr's Kâmûl (to which I refer by the initials I.A.); but I have also made use of Abu-l-Fidâ's Amâles; Ibn-Khaliḳîn's Biogr. Dict., tr. De Slane; Reimsell des Historiens des Crusades, vol. I.; and, for the Christian side of the Crusade episode, Michaelis' Histoire des Crusades, 1867 edition.

² The Urtuḳs are vulgarly called the Ortekites.

³ Ibn-al-Âṭhîr, x. 86.

⁴ Ibn-Khaliḳîn, art. Ortek.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Sukmán is written سکممان on coins, but generally (though not invariably, cf. Ibn-al-Âṭhîr, x. 195, 296) سکممان in MSS.

⁷ I.A. x. 195. Ibn-Khaliḳîn gives 491; and Abu-l-Fidâ 490.

⁸ His father had formerly possessed Ḥulwân and Al-Jabal, according to Ibn-Khaliḳîn, and they apparently descended to Il-Gházî. Ḥulwân is a town on the verge of the Sâwâd (or district of Al-Trầk, extending from Hadrîth-al-Mausil to 'Abbaṇâ, and from Al-ʿUḏayb to Ḥulwân, cf. Lane's Lex. v. 172). Al-Jabal is not so easy to define. It appears to be the province in which are Ar-Ruḥâ and Ịshbahân, and, in fact, to correspond pretty nearly to Persian Trầk. See Yâkût's Msâ'am-al-balâdîn (Facet. Geographischen Wörterbuch) s.v.

⁹ I.A. x. 210, 225.

¹⁰ Ibn-al-Âṭhîr mentions a third son of Urtuḳ, named Sulaymân. But I am inclined to believe this is a scriber's mistake for Sukmán; for at the end of the passage in which Sulaymân is mentioned, the name of Sukmán is introduced in a very similar manner (I.A. x. 188–90). Two other sons of Urtuḳ are known, ʿAbd-al-Ịbâṣir and Bahram (see the Genealogical Table).

the town of Saruj,1 in Mesopotamia. Soon afterwards Mirdin fell into his hands.2 War had broken out between Sukman and Kurbugh, lord of Al-Mausil, and the latter had made prisoner a certain Yakati, son of Il-Ghazi, and incarcerated him in the fortress of Mirdin, which at that time was attached to the territory of Al-Mausil. At the entreaty of the widow of Urtak, however, her grandson was set at liberty, and shortly rewarded his liberator by seizing the fortress in which he had been confined. Dying before long, he was succeeded by his brother ‘Ali, who, however, did not keep his possession beyond a very short time. He went to Jakarmish of Al-Mausil, leaving Mirdin in the charge of a lieutenant, who promptly handed it over to Sukman.3

It is not certain at what time Mirdin passed into the hands of Il-Ghazi, the founder of the Mirdin branch of the dynasty. Abu-l-Fidah states4 that when Sukman died in 498, he was succeeded by his son Ibrahim in Hish Kayfa, and that Mirdin went to Il-Ghazi; but we cannot infer from his words (وسائر ماردين لأخمه إيلغاد واقتصرت لولده إلى يوما وله سنه خمس عشر ربع عانة) that it passed into his possession immediately on the death of his brother. Ibn-Khillikan5 says that Il-Ghazi became master of Mirdin in 501; and he certainly is mentioned by Ibn-al-Athir in 502 as being lord of that fortress. It seems probable that 502 is the true date, for it was in that year that Muhammad-ad-din Buhruz was made sheikh at Bagdad6 in the room of Il-Ghazi, and it would be reasonable to suppose that the latter, on leaving Bagdad, was presented by his nephew Ibrahim with a fortress, or that he took it whether presented or not. In any case, Mirdin must have come into his possession between 498 and 502. Another difficulty is raised by the uncertainty of the date of Ibrahim’s death. All that is known is that he succeeded his father in 498, and that in 508 his brother Rukan-ad-daulah Dawud was governing Kayfa when Il-Ghazi applied for help against Aksumk Al-Barsak.7

In 511 (A.D. 1117–8) Il-Ghazi obtained a considerable increase to his possessions, by the acquisition of the city of Halab (Aleppo), which the inhabitants, on the death of their governor Lu-Lu, voluntarily handed over to the Urtaki, who left his son Timurash in charge.8 This Timurash was in 515 sent by his father to the court of Sultan Mahmud, the Saljuki, to intercede for the Arab prince Dubays ibn Sadaqah; and the Sultan took the opportunity of investing Il-Ghazi with the government of Mayyafirkin,9 a very important town in Al-Jazirah, which remained in the possession of the Urtakis until 580, when Salah-ad-din (Saladin) took it. In 516 Il-Ghazi died.10

Il-Ghazi, well-named ‘Star of the Faith,’ was certainly the most considerable man of the house of Urtak, and one of the most powerful chiefs of Syria and Mesopotamia. It is true his possessions were not many; but it must be remembered that power at that time meant not territorial sway, but the possession of a few impregnable fortresses, from which the neighbouring country could be secured.

---

1 Abu-l-Fidah, ann. 488 (iii. 239). Cf. I.A. x. 222, from which it may almost be inferred that Sukman was suzerain of Saruj, see p. 6, note 5.
2 Between 495 and 498. The date is fixed by the fact that Jakarmish was ruler of Al-Mausil at the time, and that he did not succeed to that government till the death of Kurbugh in 495; and by Sukman’s death in 498.
3 The whole story, which is hardly worth enlarging upon here, may be read in Abu-l-Fidah, ann. 488 (iii. 450–5).
4 Ansar, iii. 350.
5 Abu-l-Fidah, xi. 331. Il-Ghazi seems also to have possessed Najaf at that time.
6 I.A. x. 340. In Abu-l-Fidah, iii. 306, line 14, should be corrected to Najaf.
7 I.A. x. 352–3.
8 I.A. x. 418.
9 I.A. x. 418.
10 I.A. x. 426.
NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

Few fortresses were better fitted for this purpose than Mâridin; and to the possession of this stronghold much of Il-Ghâzi's reputation must be ascribed. It has already been mentioned that the Urtukis took an important part in the wars with the Crusaders. This was chiefly during the period between the First and the Second Crusade, when the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem was in the zenith of its short-lived prosperity. Sukmán distinguished himself in 1197 by relieving the Muslims who were besieged in Hârrân (Carrahs) by Bohemond of Antioch, Baldwin du Bourg of Edessa, his cousin Joceline de Courtenay, and Tancred of Laodicea. Sukmán headed an army of seven thousand mounted Turkumáns, and joining his forces to those of Jakarmish of Al-Manjil defeated the Christian army and took Count Baldwin (called by the Arab writers Al-Kummaš or Al-Kāmaš, the Comer) and his brother Joceline prisoners.1

But Il-Ghâzi had very much more to do with the Crusaders than Sukmán. Michaud characterizes him as 'le plus farouche des guerriers d'Islamisme'; and he was certainly the most formidable enemy the Crusaders encountered before Salâh-ad-dîn arose and drove them before him. The greater part of Il-Ghâzi's life was spent in fighting with the infidels; but his principal victory was in 1198, when the Crusaders were besieging Hašab.2 It will be remembered that in 511 the Halabis voluntarily accepted the Urtukis as their master. But when they found the city surrounded by the armies of the Franks, instead of appealing to their sovereign, they asked help from Baghâl.3 But none was given. In this emergency, Il-Ghâzi, hearing of their distress, marched from Mâridin at the head of three thousand horse and nine thousand foot. On his approach the Crusaders beat a retreat to a strong position on a hill called 'Irîn, where they did not expect the Turkumans would venture to attack them. Nothing daunted, Il-Ghâzi led his men up the hill and gained a signal victory. Among the slain was Roger, Regent of Antioch during the minority of Bohemond II. Soon afterwards, however, Baldwin II. (du Bourg), King of Jerusalem, retaliated by obtaining a victory over Il-Ghâzi and Dubays at Dhânish-al-bakîl.

When Il-Ghâzi died,4 his elder son Sukaymân succeeded to the government of Mayyâfâriqin.

---

1 I. A. x. 366-7. Michaud thus describes the battle, or rather the surprise:—'Au printemps de l'année 1184, Bohémund a cousins romains, Tancred, alors seigneur de Laodice et d'Aramés, Bandour du Bourg, comte d'Edesse ou Raha, et son cousin Jocelin de Courtenay, maître de Turbé, se réunirent pour passer l'Exublante et pour mener le siège devant la ville de Charrân ou Carrahs, occupée par les infidèles. . . . Quand les princes chrétiens arrivèrent devant la ville, ils la trouvèrent en proie à la disette et presque sans moyens de défense. Les habitants avaient envoyé solliciter les seigneurs de Mâridin, de Mossoul, et chez tous les peuples musulmans de la Mésopotamie. Après quelques semaines de siège, ayant perdu l'espoir d'être secourus, ils résolurent d'abandonner la place et proposèrent une capitulation, qui fut acceptée. Tandis qu'on jurait de part et d'autre d'exécuter fidèlement les conditions du traité, il s'éleva une vive contestation entre le comte d'Edesse et le prince d'Antioche, pour savoir quel drapier flottait sur les murs de la ville. L'armée victorieuse attendait, pour entrer dans la ville, que cette contestation fut terminée; mais Dieu voulut punir le fol orgueil des princes, et leur retirer la victoire qu'ils leur avaient enlevée. Bandour et Bohémund se disputaient encore la ville conquise, lorsque tout à coup on aperçut sur les hauteurs voisines une armée musulmane s'avançant en ordre de bataille et les enseignes déployées. C'étaient les Turcs de Mâridin et de Mossoul qui venaient au secours de la ville assiégée. A leur approche, les chrétiens, frappés de stupeur, ne s'occuper plus qu'à fuir. En vain les chefs chrétiens, au nom de leurs soldats, en vain l'évêque d'Edesse, parcourant les rues, voulu relever les courageux abattus; dès la première attaque, l'armée de la croix fut dispersée; Bandour du Bourg et son cousin Jocelin furent faits prisonniers; Bohémund et Tancred échappèrent presque seuls à la poursuite du vainqueur.'—I. 306, 301.

2 I. A. x. 389-90. Michaud (I. 317, 318) gives a somewhat different account of the battle, calling all mention of the provocation offered by the Crusaders in besieging Hašab, and attributing the defeat partly to a sand-storm. This explanation seems, ci es, el jibâl imara il ibir, to put the cart before the horse. It was doubtless the vigorous action of the feet of the flying Crusaders that stirred up the sand, not the sand that caused the flight.

3 Dieu permit alors que le redouâble chef des Turcennans, Ylgary, terminât sa carrière, frappé par une mort subite et violente.'—Michaud, I. 319. But he does not give any authority for the 'subite et violents' nature of the death.
Timurtash to that of Maridin, and their cousin Salaymán ibn 'Abd-Al-Jabbar ibn Urtuk to that of Ḥalab.\footnote{I. A. x. 426.} This Salaymán ibn 'Abd-Al-Jabbar had been made governor of Ḥalab by Il-Ghazí in 515, when his son Salaymán (who afterwards succeeded to the government of Maysafirikín) had endeavoured to stir up a revolt in Ḥalab against his father.\footnote{I. A. x. 417, 418.}

We have now to notice another member of the family of Urtuk, the true successor of Il-Ghazí in his wars against the Crusaders.\footnote{"Nouveaux et successeur d'Ugary,... semble la fin de l'Écrisire, qui rôde sans cesse pour chercher sa proie."—Michaud, i. 319.} This was Balak, son of Bahram, and grandson of Urtuk. He first comes into notice in 497 (A.D. 1103-4), when he possessed himself of 'Anah and Al-Ḥadithah, in place of Sarúj, which had been wrested from him in 494 by the Crusaders.\footnote{I. A. x. 293. Cf. x. 222. Perhaps Balk governed in Sukmán's name. Cf. p. 5.} He again appears in 515 (A.D. 1121-2) as having made prisoner Joceline de Courtenay, Count of Edessa, and his brother Galeran, and shut them up in a fortress called by the Crusaders Qaart-Pierre, by the Muslims Khartapir, in Diyar-Bakr.\footnote{I. A. x. 252. Cf. x. 222. Perhaps Balk governed in Sukmán's name. Cf. p. 5.} Baldwin, King of Jerusalem, marching to relieve Kar-kar, which was being besieged by Balak, was defeated and made prisoner, and he too was confined in Khartapir, where Joceline and Galeran were already incarcerated.\footnote{Joceline had been the chief advocate of the claims of Baldwin du Bourg, Count of Edessa, to the throne of Jerusalem, left vacant by the death of Baldwin 1., and was presented with the principality of Edessa by Baldwin 11., in gratitude for his friendly services. He was also master of Sarúj, formerly the possession of Balak, who owed him a grudge for the loss of the place. Joceline had before been made prisoner by Sukmán, and had been sent to Bighhait, where he remained five years.} 'Les vieilles chroniques ont célèbré la valeur héroïque de cinquante Arméniens qui se dévouèrent pour la délivrance des princes chrétiens. Après avoir invoqué la protection du Tout-Puissant, ils s'introduisirent dans la forteresse de Qaart-Pierre, déguisés, selon quelques historiens, en marchands, selon d'autres, en moines. A peine entrés dans la citadelle, cette élite de braves, quittant leur déguisement et montrant leurs armes, massacreront la garnison musulmane, et rendirent la liberté aux illustres prisonniers. Ce château, dont les chrétiens venaient ainsi de se rendre maîtres, renfermait des vivres en abondance et toutes sortes de munitions de guerre. Balak y avait laissé ses trésors, ses femmes et les plus précieuses dépouilles des pays dévastés par ses armes. Les guerriers chrétiens se réjouirent d'abord du succès de leur entreprise; mais bientôt les Turcs du voisinage se réunirent en foule et vinrent assiéger la forteresse où flottait l'étendard du Christ. Le sultan Balac, qui, selon les récits du temps, avait été averti en songe des projets formés contre lui, rassembla son armée et jura d'exterminer Baudouin, Jocelin et leurs libérateurs. Ceux-ci ne pouvaient résister longtemps à toutes les forces réunies des Turcs, s'ils n'étaient secourus par leurs frères les chrétiens. On décide alors que Jocelin sortira de la forteresse et qu'il ira dans les villes chrétiennes explorer le secours des barons et des chevaliers. Jocelin part aussitôt, après avoir fait le serment qu'il laissera croître sa barbe et qu'il ne boira point de vin jusqu'à ce qu'il ait rempli sa mission périlleuse; il s'échappe à travers la multitude ménagante des musulmans, passe l'Euphrate, porté sur deux ouvertes de peau de chèvre, et, traversant toute la Syrie, arrive enfin à Jérusalem, où il dépose dans l'église du Saint-Sépulcre les chaines qu'il avait portées chez les Turcs, et raconte en gémissant les aventures et les périls de Baudouin et de ses compagnons. A sa voix,
un grand nombre de chevaliers et de guerriers chrétiens jurèrent de marcher à la délivrance de leur monarque captif. Joscelin se mit à la tête; il s'avança vers l'Euphrate; les plus braves de guerriers d'Édesse et d'Antioche avaient réjoint ses drapeaux, lorsqu'on apprit que le farouche Balak venait de rentrer de force dans le château de Quart-Pierre. Après le départ de Joscelin, Baudouin, Galéran, et les cinquante guerriers d'Arménie avaient soutenu longtemps les attaques des musulmans; mais les fondements du château ayant été minés, les guerriers chrétiens se trouvèrent tout à coup au milieu des ruines. Balak, laissant la vie au roi de Jérusalem, l'avait fait conserver dans la forteresse de Charan. Les braves Arméniens étaient morts au milieu des supplices, et la palme du martyr avaient été le prix de leur dévouement. Quand Joscelin et les guerriers qui le suivaient apprirent ces tristes nouvelles, ils perdirent tout espoir d'exécuter leur projet, et retournèrent les uns à Édesse et à Antioche, les autres à Jérusalem, désœuvrés de ne savoir pu donner leur vie pour la liberté d'un prince chrétien.  

Balak's career was brilliant but short. Whilst besieging Mamaj in 518, he fell by the hand of that very Josceline whom he had formerly imprisoned. His head was carried in triumph before the walls of Tyre, which was then besieged by the Crusaders. His cousin Timurtash succeeded him in his possessions, of which the most important was the city of Halab, which Balak had taken from Badr-ad-daulah Salaymân ibn 'Abd-Al-Jabbâr in 517, considering him incapable of protecting it from the Franks. Halab did not long continue in the possession of the Urtukis. Timurtash returned to his favourite heights of Diyâr-bakr; and Halab, thus left to take care of itself, when besieged not long afterwards by the Crusaders, opened its gates to Al-Barsâki, and never again owned a member of the house of Urtuk for its master.

Husam-ad-din Timurtash died in 547 (A.D. 1152–3), prince of Máridin and Mayyašärîkin, as Ibn-al-Athir expressly states. It will be remembered that when Ǧabiz died, his elder son Sulaymân succeeded him in Mayyašârîkin. At what time, then, did the town pass into the hands of Timurtash? The only clue is supplied by a record by Ibn-al-Athir of the death of a certain Shams-ad-daulah, son of Ǧabiz, in 518. As the death of Sulaymân is nowhere mentioned, one cannot help conjecturing that this Shams-ad-daulah was none other than he. Timurtash was succeeded by his son Nejim-ad-din Alpî.

Meanwhile, Dâwid of Kayfā was gathered to his fathers, and Kārā-Arsân, his son, ruled in his stead. The death of Dâwid must have taken place about 543; for he is mentioned by Ibn-al-Athîr in 541, and in 542 the “lord of Al-Hişn”  is spoken of, but his name is not given, from which we may infer that it was still the name which had been referred to before; and in 544 mention is made of the new ruler Kārā-Arsân. Fakhr-ad-dîn Kārā-Arsân governed Kayfâ and the greater part of Diyâr-bakr11 till the year 570, when he died; and his son Muhammad ruled after him.12

6 I. A. xi. 116.  6 I. A. x. 441.  7 I have treated the two as identical in the Genealogical Table.  8 I. A. xi. 73.  9 I. A. xi. 81.  10 I. A. xi. 92.  11 إخْتَالْنَاهِرِ.Fatalf-ad-dîn.  12 Ibn-al-Athîr, xi. 287, gives the date 562, but the coins prove it to have been 576, or perhaps 571.
Not long after, the Urtuḳši heard the first whirr of the machine that was eventually to grind them to powder. It came about in this way. The town of Al-Birah on the Euphrates (not that near Aleppo) was being besieged by 'Imād-ad-dīn Zangī in 539, but matters needed his presence at Al-Mausil, and Zangī abandoned the siege. The 'Franks' who held the town knew well that if Zangī returned, they could not hold out against him; so, making a virtue of a necessity, they handed the place over to Najm-ad-dīn Alpī, who is called by Ibn-al-Athīr in this instance 'Lord of Al-Hiṣn', although Timurtāsh was still alive. Some time before 565 Al-Birah was in the possession of Shihāb-ad-dīn, a son of Ḥāfiz, who had distinguished himself under the great Nūr-ad-dīn (Nourreddin) of Ḥalab in war with the Crusaders. The time of Shihāb-ad-dīn’s death is not accurately known, but his son, who appears to be nameless, was governing Al-Birah in 577 (A.D. 1181–2), when his kinsman Kūṯb-ad-dīn Ḥāfiz of Māridin, who had come to the throne on the death of his father Najm-ad-dīn Alpī in 572, laid siege to the town. Shihāb-ad-dīn’s son, finding himself deserted by his liege-lord, the Atābēq of Al-Mausil, called in the help of the world-famous Sālāḥ-ad-dīn, who summarily ordered Kūṯb-ad-dīn back to his own territory, an order with which the Urtuḳši thought it prudent not to quarrel. It was thus that the first contact between the houses of Urtuḳ and Ayyūb came about.

The princes of Kayfā were more far-sighted than their kinsmen of Māridin, and took all pains to keep on good terms with the Ayyūbīs. When Sālāḥ-ad-dīn came northward in 578, Nūr-ad-dīn of Kayfā was quick to pay homage and to assist in the siege of Al-Mausil. The politic prince was rewarded with the important town of Āmid, which the Ayyūbī gave him in the following year (579). Nūr-ad-dīn enjoyed his new possession for two years, and then died and left it to his son Kūṯb-ad-dīn Sukmān (581).

Here I must notice a small branch of the Kayfā dynasty, which came into existence on the death of Nūr-ad-dīn in 581. This prince had a brother, 'Imād-ad-dīn, who was at the camp of Sālāḥ-ad-dīn (again lying before Al-Mausil) at the time of Nūr-ad-dīn’s death. In the hope of succeeding to his brother’s power, 'Imād-ad-dīn immediately set off to Kayfā, but finding his nephew in full possession, he concealed himself with the fortress of Khartapirt, which it will be remembered belonged formerly to Balak. It is not certain when ‘Imād-ad-dīn died; but in 601 his son Niẓām-ad-dīn Abū-Bakr is recorded to have been besieged unsuccessfully by Mahmūd of Kayfā and Āmid. Khartapirt remained in the family of ‘Imād-ad-dīn till 620, when it seems to have passed into the hands of the Māridin dynasty; for when it was taken in 631 by Kay-Kubād, the Saljukī Sultan of Ar-Rūm, the governor was of the family of the Urtuḳši of Māridin.

---

1 I. A. xii. 67, 98. 2 Ct. xi. 115.
3 Ibn-al-Athīr, ann. 565, xi. 392, speaks of Sālāḥ-ad-dīn Ḥāfiz ibn Ḥāfiz possessing the fortress of Al-Birah.
4 Some MSS. of Ibn-al-Athīr give the date of Alpī’s death, but the coins prove it was 572.
5 I. A. xi. 314.
6 I. A. xi. 313, 311.
7 The khatārīs give no information as to the date of Alpī’s death, but the coins prove it was 572.
8 I. A. xi. 333.
9 I. A. xi. 339.
10 This, the Khartapirt branch of the dynasty, was entirely un-
11 known to numismatists before the publication of my Essay on the Urtuḳši in the Numismatic Chronicle, vol. xii. p. 1873. The coins struck by Abū-Bakr of Khartapirt have always been a puzzle to numismatists, and have given rise to the wildest misreadings.
12 I. A. xi. 339.
13 I. A. xi. 339.
14 Abu-l-Fāhā, iv. 404.
15riz: تراث
16ة. ماردین
The death of Ḫūṭb-ad-dīn ʿAlī-Ghāzī ii. in 5801 was followed by the loss of Mayyās fārikīn, which the Shāh-Arman took, and which subsequently was given up to Šalāḥ-ad-dīn. Ḫūṭb-ad-dīn was succeeded by his son Yūḥūk- (or Būlūk- or Būlūk-) ʿArslān; whose brother Urtuḳ-ʿArslān next followed, some time between the years 596 and 598, as the coins prove. In 599 Al-ʿAdīl, the brother of Šalāḥ-ad-dīn, gave orders to Al-ʿＡṣhraf to besiege Māridīn; but by the mediation of Aẓ-Zāhir Ghāzī of Ḥalab an accommodation was arrived at. Urtuḳ-ʿArslān agreed to insert the name of Al-ʿAdīl in the Khutbah and Sikkah, or public prayer and coinage, and to pay a fine of 150,000 dinārā. This is well borne out by the coins. A coin of 599 (which must refer to the early part of the year)5 bears the name of Aẓ-Zāhir as well as that of Urtuḳ-ʿArslān, thus showing the friendly relations which subsisted between the two. Further, another coin of 599 (which must have been struck rather later in the year) bears the name of Al-ʿAdīl as suzerain, thus fulfilling one of the two stipulations of the treaty. After this the Urtuḳis of Māridīn withdrew from the affairs of Syria, and kept within the limits of their mountain fastness. Abu-I-Fidā continues the list of princes down to his own time (715 = A.D. 1315–6) when an Urtuḳi prince was still ruling in Māridīn; and, for aught I know, the family may still have its representative there.

The Kayfā branch came to an end in 629 (A.D. 1231–2). Sukmān ii. was killed in 597, by falling from a horse-tipt.7 He had himself appointed as his successor a Mamlūk named Ayās, to the exclusion of his own brother Maḥmūd; but the amirs of Amid invited Maḥmūd to come and take possession, and he did not decline. Maḥmūd died in 619, and his son Al-Malik Al-Masʿūd Maʿṣūd succeeded. But in 629 Al-Kāmil the Ayyūbī marched upon Amid, and took it together with its dependencies, which had been diminished by the inroads of the Sultān of Ar-Rūm. Maʿṣūd was imprisoned until the death of Al-Kāmil, when he escaped (635), and took refuge with Al-Muẓaffar of Ḥamāh, and eventually died at the hands of the Tatar invaders. So ends the history of the Urtuḳis.

§ 3. Five mint-names are found on Urtuḳi coins.

Urtuḳis or Hūn Kayfā.

The Fortress (sc. Kayfā).

Urtuḳis or Māridīn.

Maḥmūd.

Maḥmūd

Dināyarīn.

Kayfā.

Kayfā.

No mint-name has as yet been deciphered on the few coins at present extant of the Urtuḳis of Khartapirt.

It is difficult to explain the occurrence of the name Kayfā on silver coins of Urtuḳ-ʿArslān.

2 Written in Ibn-al-ʿAṭār ʿAbbās without discripical points to the first letter. 5 I.A. xii. 393. "Ibid.
3 Ibn-al-ʿAṭār mentions Yūḥūk-ʿArslān being alive when Māridīn was unsuccessfully besieged by Al-ʿAdīl in 594–5.— xii. 98. 8 I.A. xii. 117.
4 It was in the first month (Al-Muharram) that Al-ʿAdīl gave orders for the siege of Māridīn.—I. A. xii. 117.
The Urtuqui Turkumans.

There can be no doubt whatever about the reading of the name. The letters " буквa are perfectly clear, and that is sufficient to establish the reading, although the last letter seems to resemble a ى rather than an ی; it may perhaps be the beginning of the final letter ى, which ends the word according to the Kânu's orthography. But how did Kayfâ come into the possession of the princes of Máridin? Abu-l-Fidâ tells us that in 629 Al-Kâmil took Ámid and its dependencies, among which was Hişn Kayfâ.1 His son Ay-Salîh was left in possession of Ámid, and (we infer from Abu-l-Fidâ's account) of Hişn Kayfâ also. But this coin shows that Kayfâ belonged to the prince of Máridin in 638, the year before the taking of Ámid. Either, then, we must suppose Manâdd of Ámid to have recovered Kayfâ from his kinsman before Al-Kâmil's arrival; or else that Abu-l-Fidâ, accustomed to regard Kayfâ and Ámid as belonging to the same master, erroneously classed Kayfâ among the dependencies of Ámid when the latter was taken by Al-Kâmil. With our present data it is impossible to decide the question.

Three other mints have been wrongly attributed to the Urtuqui princes: — حمّات Hamâh, دیوار-بکر Dîyâr-bakr, and ماگیفاکیم Maygûfâkîn. Hamâh is a misreading due to imperfect specimens. Dr. Blau2 inferred from the letters ١ that the mint was حمّات; when in fact the letters were ١١٠ and from other specimens I proved the mint to be مازیدین Máridin.3 At the time Dr. Blau's coin was struck (645), the Ayyûbî prince Al-Manşûr Muḥammad (uncle of the historian Abu-l-Fidâ) was ruling Hamâh, and his name would certainly appear on any coin struck there. By Dîyâr-bakr I believe Sceut simply to have meant a town in Dîyâr-bakr, namely Kayfâ, or Ámid, or Máridin, or Dunâysir. Maygûfâkîn (ماگیفاکیم or مایغافکین میغافکین, ie!?) is a magnificent blunder for the words ملیعون میغافکین of the dammatory formula ملیعون میغافکین.

§ 4. The principal ornaments used on the coins of the Urtuquis are the Urtuqui damghah or badge (۸); an ornament which I have called 'feuion' (۸); an inverted chevron, like the orthographical sign آه or مهعتل (۸); a semicircle (۸); and points, singly or in groups. Discretional points are used sparingly on the coins, but they are recorded when they occur. There is generally a centre-point, where the point of one limb of the compasses was placed when the marginal circles were being scored. Near the edge of the coin is generally a circle or several circles, usually of dots.

§ 5. To what denomination the Urtuqui copper coins are to be referred is not an easy question to answer. Almost all Muḥammadan coins up to the time of these princes belonged to one of the three classes — ذکر (gold), دیرام (silver), سک (copper). It would be natural to attribute the large copper issues of the Urtuquis (and some of the contemporary dynasties) to the class of سک; but this is clearly forbidden by the fact that some of these copper coins are inscribed with the words "یون سک ملیعون میغافکین". Cursed be he who tests this دیرام.4

1 See p. 19, 2nd edition.
3 Names of the Chaldeans, xii. p. 296.
4 Dr. Rambach's rendering of the words تکیف من غافکیه (ئین کیف من غافکیه) is strictly accurate; and it is quite possible that in this

Urtuqui Turkumans.

formula the Urtuquí prince intended to forestall any imprecations that might be heaped against his copper coinage, by taking the initiative himself in cursing. I think, however, that a more probable rendering is that of testing the coin. In Lane's Arabic Lexicon, part v. art. یون, we find the very expression that occurs in the coin: "یون سک ملیعون میغافکین".
This inscription, which occurs on several plain copper coins, suggested the theory which Dr. Joseph Kara-Beecok has ably put forth in the Numismatische Zeitschrift of Wien,\(^1\) that the copper issues of the Urtuqis, etc., were intended to pass as dirhams. There is much in favour of this view, besides the occurrence of the word dirham on some of the coins. There can be no doubt that dirham at that time meant the same thing as on the coins of the 'Abbâsi Khalifâhs, namely, a silver coin, and that it was not used in a general way (like the plurals of fals and dirham in modern Arabic) to mean any kind of money. Nor can we suppose that the word was introduced by mistake, instead of fals; for it occurs on too many coins to be explained by any hypothetical carelessness of the engravers. Granting, then, that when the Urtuqis put the name dirham on their coins they meant dirham and not fals, and rejecting the suggestion that the name was inserted by mistake, it is difficult to see how to arrive at any conclusion except that these coins were intended to pass for the same value as silver dirhams. And it would be absurd to limit this to the coins that bear the word dirham, for the other copper coins are precisely similar in size and general aspect, with the exception of the curse-formula. We must, therefore, in all reason extend the denomination dirham beyond those coins on which the word is found to the whole class of large copper of the same series. A circumstance much in favour of the theory is that many of the large copper coins are covered with a thin coating of silver,\(^2\) and those that are thus ornamented do not bear the name dirham. Of course a difficulty arises from the fact that only some, and not all, these coins are silvered. Yet this may perhaps be explained by supposing them to have been silvered with a view to giving a look of respectability to the rest. The entire absence of silver dirhams during the period of the issuing of the large copper coins by the Urtuqis is greatly in favour of Dr. Kara-Beecok's theory; but it is almost counterbalanced by the fact that after the introduction of a silver coinage by Urtuq-Aralân of Mâridân, the copper coinage still continued, though certainly in lesser numbers and perhaps smaller size. It is difficult to believe that silver and copper dirhams should circulate together, issuing from the same mint; or, on the other hand, that copper coins which had recently possessed the value of silver dirhams should suddenly, on the introduction of silver dirhams, be degraded to the value of ordinary fals. This, in fact, taken together with the small number of silvered dirhams that have been preserved, forms the main obstacle to Dr. Kara-Beecok's view of the denomination of the Urtuq coinage. With regard to the origin of the copper image-coinage, Dr. Kara-Beecok thinks it may be traced to the copper issues of the Latin princes whom the Crusading mania had brought to Syria; and that the principal reason of the substitution of copper for silver was the general exhaustion which oppressed the countries afflicted by the so-called 'Holy War,' and which rendered a silver coinage impossible.

Whilst acknowledging the strength of the arguments in favour of the dirham-view of the

---

1. Bd. i. (1869) pp. 266-300.
2. In the British Museum there is one Urtuq coin which is "gold" instead of silvered.
Urtuķi coinage, it is to be regretted that we have not more positive evidence on the subject. At present, though the weight of the evidence leans heavily to Dr. Karabacek’s side, it must be admitted that his point is not yet absolutely proved.

§ 6. The copper coins, which form the great majority of the Urtuķi mintage, range in weight from 28 to 170 grammes (43 to 263 English grains); and in diameter from iv to xi on Miomnet’s scale (4 to 1½ English inch). The average weight may be placed at about 11 grammes (170 grains), and the average diameter at about viii (1⅓ inch) of Miomnet’s scale.

The few silver coins of the series weigh about 2-4 grammes, and are of the diameter of Miomnet’s v. The weight, it will be observed, nearly corresponds with that of the old Amawi and Ābbāṣi dirham.

---

**Table I.—Suzerains to Whom the Urtuķis Did Homage on Their Coins.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUZERAIN</th>
<th>VASSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayyūbis</td>
<td>M. 1    Yūluq-Arslan, 581, 583, 584, 585, 586.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.  Sukmán n., 581, 584.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Āḍil</td>
<td>M.  Yūluq-Arslan, 589.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.  Urtuķ-Arslan, 599, 606, 611.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.  Mahmūd, 615.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Kāmil</td>
<td>M.  Urtuķ-Arslan, 615, 620, 628, 630.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.  Mahmūd, 610, 617, 618.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ṭāhir</td>
<td>M.  Urtuķ-Arslan, 599.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-ʿAzīz (of Ḥalab)</td>
<td>M.  Urtuķ-Arslan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An-Nāṣir Salāḥ-ad-dīn n...</td>
<td>M.  Najm-ad-dīn Ghāzī, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-Ṣādiq Ayyūb</td>
<td>M.  Najm-ad-dīn Ghāzī, 645, 646.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Alḫal and Al-Ṭāḥir</td>
<td>M.  Yūluq-Arslan, 596.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Kāmil and Al-Ashrāf</td>
<td>K.  Maudūd, 621.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seljūk of Ar-Rūm</td>
<td>Kay-Kāwus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay-Kubād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay-Khusraw n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Najm-ad-dīn Ghāzī, 640-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moğuls of Persia</td>
<td>Hūlāgū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 M. represents Māridān; K. Kaykāy. The figures after the name of the Urtuķi vassal show the years in which he acknowledged the suzerainty of his liege-lord on his own coinage. I have not included the Ābbāṣī Khālidān among the suzerains of the Urtuķis, although their names often appear on the coinage of these princes; they merely exercised a spiritual suzerainty, and barely that.
2 This name appears on the same coin as the names of Al-Alḫal and Al-Ṭāḥir, mentioned above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>A.I.</th>
<th>Urutçuğ of Kayfa</th>
<th>Urutçuğ of Mardin</th>
<th>Urutçuğ of Halab</th>
<th>Atabegs of Sivas</th>
<th>Atabegs of Hamah</th>
<th>Salahis of Arns</th>
<th>Salahis of Damascus</th>
<th>Ayyubids</th>
<th>'Abbasid Khulfa</th>
<th>Kings of Jerusalem</th>
<th>Emperor of Constantinople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1022</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malik-Shah</td>
<td>Tutash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexius I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1074</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1081</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Konstantin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Godfrey of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bouillon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>487</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isabellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1106</td>
<td>502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114</td>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1118</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1125</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133</td>
<td>528</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134</td>
<td>529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135</td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1139</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1142</td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1146</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1159</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Historian</td>
<td>Monarch</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1170</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1172</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1173</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1174</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1179</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1180</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1183</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1184</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1185</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1186</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1187</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1188</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1190</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1191</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1193</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1197</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1198</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1221</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1231</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Salâh-ad-Dîn (Saladin).
- Saûd ad-Dîn takes Jâlah.
- Sükâm II.
- Ustûrûsh of Khârûta[rî].
- Aûbô-Dakî.
- Sâliûn II.
- Aûlân-Shâh.
- Mûjaamad.
- Kay-Khawd r.
- Aûlân-Shâh II.
- Mahmûd.
- Şâhîn-Shâh. Mahmûd or 'Umar. Surrender to Ayyûbîs.
- Al-Mustâ'îm.
- Al->Mainûf.
NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

TABLE III.—CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF THE URTUK PRINCES.

I. KAYFĀ LINE. A.H. 495-629.
   1. Sukmān i. 495.
   2. Ibrāhīm. 498.
   5. Muḥammad. 570.
   7. Maḥmūd. 597.

III. MāRĪDĪN LINE. A.H. 502-715, etc.
   1. Il-Ghāzī i. 502.
   2. Timūruḍdīsh. 516.
   3. Alpī. 547.
   4. Il-Ghāzī ii. 572.
   5. Yūluk-Arslān. 580.
   6. Urtuk-Arslān. c. 597.
   7. Ghāzī. 637.
   9. Dāwūd. c. 691.
   10. Ghāzī ii. c. 693.
   11. 'Alī Alpī. 712.
   12. Sāliḥ. 712-715, etc.1

II. KHARTAPīR LINE. A.H. 581-620.
   1. Abū-Bakr i. 581.
   2. Abū-Bakr ii. c. 600-620.

1 Shams-ad-dīn Sāliḥ was still reigning when Abū-l-Fāsīd wrote his history in A.H. 716.

TABLE IV.—GENEALOGICAL TREE OF THE HOUSE OF URTUK.

URTUK

[Jerusalem, 479-484.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sukmān</th>
<th>Abū-Al-Jahābīr</th>
<th>Il-Ghāzī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Abd-al-Jahābīr</td>
<td>Nusr-ad-dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shams-ad-dīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>495-500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bahrīn</th>
<th>Bakr</th>
<th>Shams-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | Sulaymān | Hāshim-ad-dīn |
|        |          |              |
|        |          | 511 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | Yūluk-Arslān | Mārīdīn |
|        |              | 560 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mārīdīn</th>
<th>Mārīdīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ghālī</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | Karā-Arslān | Mārīdīn |
|        |            | 658 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maḥmūd</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mārīdīn</th>
<th>Mārīdīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'Alī</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sāliḥ</th>
<th>Nāṣir-ad-dīn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>712-715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Shams-ad-dīn Sāliḥ was still reigning when Abū-l-Fāsīd wrote his history in A.H. 716.
III. URTUKIS OF KAYFA.

IV. FAKHR-AD-DIN KARA-ARSLAN. A.H. 548-570.

Type I.


Obv. Half-figure to right; in left hand, sceptre; in right, orb.

Rev. [Copied, probably, from a common late-Byzantine type, seen on the coins of Constantine vr. and Eirene.]

Below, fleuron.

No points except the discritical points of قرآ and نم. The litre represents 556; the numerical value of ت being 500, of نم 50, and of قرآ 6. The 1 of قرآ is omitted, as on many other examples.

Type II.

2. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 1.) A.H. 559. (The late Col. C. S. Guthrie's Collection.)

Obv. Half-figure, facing, crowned.

Rev. A. Half-figure, facing, bare-headed.

The first stroke of the س of سنة is taller than the others; the قرآ of قرآ and the نم of سنة are dotted; so, too, the نم and نم of سنة. (الخمس ماهية) خمسة سنة.

Type III.

3. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 2.) A.H. 560. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 3.)

Obv. Head, facing.

Rev. ملك الاصرار.

دال بن سكمان

بئس ارتفع

بئس ارتفع.

Discritical points on reverse to of سنة and of قرآ of قرآ of قرآ of سكة, and a line (representing the two points) over of سنة. The قرآ of أرسا is prolonged into a foliate ornament.

1 It is remarkable that this simple explanation has never before been proposed, except by myself in the Num. Chron. vol. xiii. p. 284.

2 In the British Museum there is another specimen similar to this, but rather inferior in condition, which has been described by me in the Num. Chron. vol. xiii. p. 380.
NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

Type IV.

1. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 3.) A.H. 532. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 6.)

Obv. Half-figure, facing.

[ Copied, perhaps, from a Byzantine coin representing the Virgin. ]

Rev. ملكة الأمرا

The of سنة, the and of نف ت نف, the and of المستنجد, have their proper diacritical points; though in the case of the المانی the diacritical points can scarcely be called proper, as the letter serves for the base of hinz and therefore should not be dotted.

A variety in the British Museum differs only in points, and not much in them, so far as the indistinctness of the coin permits me to judge.

2. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 4.) A.H. 570. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 7.)

Same: but small winged figure, to left, behind left shoulder of central figure; and, on the opposite side of figure, date. سبعین و خمساً

Diacritical points to the left and to the right.

3.

6. Copper. A.H. 570. (Fabia Collection, 420.)

Same as preceding, but rev. marg. الإمام | المستنجد بالله | الإمام | المستنجد بإمر الله

and rev. area. داوود instead of داوود.

Until I was informed of the existence of this last coin I was inclined to think that Ibn-al-Athir was correct in his date of Kará-Aralán’s death (A.H. 562), and that the occurrence of that prince’s name on a coin of the year 570 (no. 5) was to be explained by Núr-ad-dín having omitted to alter the reverse of his father’s coin when he changed the date. But no. 5, besides confirming the date 570, brings further evidence by the name of the Khalifah Al-Mustañji, who did not begin to reign till 565, three years after the death of Kará-Aralán, as recorded by Ibn-al-Athir. We cannot choose but to accept the testimony of these two monuments, and to place the death of Kará-Aralán at 570, or the earlier part of 571. No coin of Núr-ad-dín is known of an earlier date than 571, and this too goes to support the evidence of the two coins of Kará-Aralán. One difficulty remains—the coincidence of the name of the Khalifah Al-Mustanji, who died in 565, on the coin bearing the date 570. This I think must be explained by the suggestion I offered before as to the reverse of Kará-Aralán’s fourth type having been left unchanged when the date on the obverse was altered; the difference I now make in the explanation is that it was left unaltered by Kará-Aralán himself, whereas before I supposed that it was his son Núr-ad-dín who had altered the date, but not the reverse.

The orthography داوود is very unusual. Ordinarily the name is written داوود, in which case the ر should be marked with maddah (داوود) to show that it is a contraction for داوود. The transliteration Dáwûd (based upon the vulgar pronunciation داوود) is incorrect; it should be Dáwôd.

1 Brought to my notice by Dr. Blau, Kaiserlich deutscher, General-Collol, Odessa.
THE URTUKI TURKUMANS.

Type V.

7. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 5.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 9.)

Obr. A. Full figure of winged Victory to right; holding in right hand tablet inscribed \( \times x \times x \times \), and in left hand wreath; beneath \( \times \times \times \times \).

M. VICTORIACONSTANTIvincia.

[Copied from a coin of Constantine, struck at Siscia, in Pannonia.]

Rev.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{الملك} & \quad \text{ال حكم} \\
\text{العدل} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{العدالة} \\
\text{ين} & \quad \text{يا} \\
\text{الملك} & \quad \text{الحكم} \\
\text{العدل} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{العدالة} \\
\end{align*} \]

Type VI.

1.

8. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 11.)

Obr.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{الملك} & \quad \text{ال حكم} \\
\text{العدل} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{العدالة} \\
\text{ين} & \quad \text{يا} \\
\text{الملك} & \quad \text{الحكم} \\
\text{العدل} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{العدالة} \\
\end{align*} \]

The common late-Byzantine type of Christ, seated, sitting on throne, holding book.

[The type may be seen on coins of Manuel I. Comnenus.]

REV.

On the obv. discernible points under the three \( \times \times \times \) and over the first of \( \times \times \times \).

On the rev. semicircles under the \( \times \times \times \) of the alam and the \( \times \times \times \) of the \( \times \times \times \), and shaddal over the \( \times \times \times \) of the \( \times \times \times \). The \( \times \times \times \) and of both \( \times \times \times \) are dotted, also the \( \times \times \times \) of the \( \times \times \times \) of the \( \times \times \times \).

2.

9. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 13.)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{الملك} & \quad \text{ال حكم} \\
\text{العدل} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{الخير} \\
\text{الدين} & \quad \text{العدالة} \\
\end{align*} \]

Points, etc., as (8).

3.

10. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 6.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 14.)

Same as (9), but a countermark, of unintelligible device, is struck on the obv. left, near the bottom.

No munhilas, etc.

The letters and ciphers on the obverse of these coins have never been interpreted, and I do not think any meaning can be attached to them. The explanation of their occurrence which I venture to offer is that the Oriental engraver, unable to decipher the Greek inscriptions \( \times, \times x \), of the original Byzantine coin, substituted whatever Arabic letters or ciphers first came into his head. The analogy of other coins of the series does not permit us to assume that religious scruples were the cause of the change. It is worth noting that the ciphers which occur on (9) comprise the ten digits, neither more nor less:

\[ 1-3-7-8-9 \]

1 The two dots under \( \times \times \times \) are blundered, so as to form a short horizontal line.

2 It has been suggested that the letters on (8) are arranged regularly in the order of the older \( \times \times \times \times \), etc. There is certainly something to justify this view. The four letters on the left-hand-side might very well be an, though it is hard to see why the \( \times \times \times \) and \( \times \times \times \) are not connected. Beyond the first four letters, however, the order of the abjad is not easily discovered. We should have to change \( \times \times \times \) and \( \times \times \times \) into \( \times \times \times \) and \( \times \times \times \).
Type VII.

11. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 7.) (Col. Guthrie's Collection.)

Osv. Bust of Christ, head surrounded by an aureole of six rays; two dots between alternate pairs of rays. In the field, UNCTION OF CHRIST, and signs designed apparently to represent the letters EMMANONYHA. [A common Byzantine type.]

Rev. 

A specimen (a) in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 16) differs from that described above only in having a line over XC as well as over IC. Another specimen (b) differs from (11) in having four dots instead of two between the alternate rays of the aureole, and two inserted between X and Y (ibid. no. 15).

The expression "in the days of Karā-Ardān" seems to point to the coin not having been struck by Karā-Ardān himself, but by some governor under him.


Type I.

12. Copper. (Pl. i. fig. clxii.) A.H. 571. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 17.)

Osv. Angel, aureolate; right wing raised; left hand holding scroll, which hangs over right arm.

Rev. ملكت امرا محمد

بي ترا ارسان بن

دارد بن سكما

بن بن ارتش تصر

امير الموسيسن

تزا

In the Guthrie collection there is a specimen (a) differing from (12) only in omitting the اَل of تزا.

Type II.

13. Copper. (Pl. i. fig. cxxv.) A.H. 576. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 19.)

Osv. Within cusped pointed arch of double lines, figure, seated on throne; in right hand orb, in left sceptre. Two balls represent the arms of the throne. Above the arch two angels, each spreading a wing over the scene of the arch.

Rev. 

On this coin the final letters اَل and اَل and the of the throne terminate in an ornament; which, however, Marsden's engraver has omitted to represent in the plate.
THE URTUKI TURKUMANS.

Type III.


Obv. A. Head to left, diademed.

[Copied from coin of Seleukos II., but reversed; the engraver having copied the coin directly on to the die, without first reversing it.]

Rev.

[al-aṣ-ṣīlā ][ bi-ini-līyā]

Mill. al-muḥāṣib

al-adl nuqal al-dīn

Muḥammad bīn ʿUmar ar-Rasul

Bīn ar-ṣīrāt nṣīr

al-amām al-ṣanāṣir

[Līdīn llāh]

Wāsiʿūn wa-khams māṣaṭa

The expression al-al-aṣ-ṣīlā [ bi-ini-līyā] is most uncommon. The curse [al-al-aṣ-ṣīlā ], which so long puzzled numismatists, is translated (in its full form as it occurs on coins of Al-Ghāzī II. of Māridin—no. 35 f.) by Dr. Karabacok (Num. Zeit. Wien, 1869) Verfuscht sei, vor diesem Dirchen einen Schimpf anthat, Cursed be he who puts an affront upon this dirhem, i.e. dishonours it, or damages its credit. It may better perhaps be rendered Cursed be he who tests this dirhem (see p. 9, note 4).
The reviser of equity has been differently read, but there can be no question that this, which was published by Castiglioni, is the true form; and that the other suggestions, such as 'ulūm al-adl, were founded on ill-preserved specimens.


Type I.


Obv. A. Bearded head of king to left.

[Copied from Sasanian coins.]

Rev.

[līdīn llāh]

Mill. khams māṣaṭa

The last two words (khams māṣaṭa) are in an inner line, for want of space in the outer.)

Ornament attached to the end of the date.

2. Copper. (Pl. iv. fig. 9.) Al-Hisn. [Kayf.] A.H. 581. (Guthrie Collection.)

At side of rev. Mill. instead of al-adl al-muḥāṣib, and the proceeding khams māṣaṭa in obv. marg. is in the inner line with khams māṣaṭa.

This is the first occurrence of the name of a liege-lord (except the spiritual suzerain, the Khalifah) on Urtuqui coins. In the same year Sulāh-ad-dīn's name occurs also for the first time on the coins of Yūnūk-Arališ of Māridin (ep. no. 42).

1 A similar coin belonging to the British Museum is published in the Num. Chron. xii. 283, no. 24.
Type II.

17. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 1.)<sup>1</sup> a.h. 584. (British Museum, Num. Chron. no. 25.)

Obv. 

مست اربع وخمس وخمسمة

Rev. 

لدين الله

المملكة العادل ندب

الدين سكمان

محمص دين فارس

بن ارتيل معين الامام

يم الساصر

Two heads, back to back.

[Copied from coin of Augustus and Agrippa struck at Numausus (Nisius).]

Another specimen (a) in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 26) differs only in having the م in the same line as لام; and the م in the same line as مم.

Type III.

18. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 2.)<sup>2</sup> a.h. 594. (British Museum, Num. Chron. no. 28.)

Obv. A. Half figure facing, with helmet, and aurole; holding in right hand sceptre; in left, orb.

[The idea seems to have been taken from a Byzantine type of about the time of Justinian r.; but the aurole is unaccountable.]

Rev. 

المملكة المسعد

قنب الدين سكمان

محمصر بن صمود

يزل معين

ترز

Arsalan

Over the first letter of سكمان, ornament like the sign for Aris, between two points.

In the Gauthier collection there is a specimen (a) similar to (18), but the points in the field of the reverse are wanting, although the ornament remains.


Type I.

19. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 3.) Amid. a.h. 614. (British Museum, Num. Chron. no. 31.)

Obv. A. Two-headed Imperial Eagle

Rev. 

الامام النا

السلطان الغالب

غز دنيا والدين

كباش بن كتشور

بن تاب ارسلان

سمود بن مصعود بن ارتيل

(Each wing formed by a man's bearded head) standing on pedestal of interwoven lines.

Another example (a) in the British Museum has a mahmilah over the ه of كتشور. A third example

1 An imperfect specimen belonging to the Marsden Collection is engraved in Pl. i. fig. cli

2 An imperfect specimen belonging to the Marsden Collection is engraved in Pl. i. fig. clx.
(8) differs from (19) in that the lower line, and of the upper is divided, with being put in the lower line; and of the upper is treated in like fashion.

This is the only occasion on which the name of the Seljuk Sultan of Anatolia (or Rum) appears on the coins of the Kayfa and Amud family.


Onv. Imperial eagle as before, but wings not human; pedestal different from preceding; and on eagle's breast.

Rav. اوبينکر المملكت النصالح محمود بن أرنب المملكت العادل 613.

V over of the first and of of the second, and of of the second. Points over of the second and of the second.

Another specimen (a) in the British Museum (Pl. v. fig. 4) differs in having no muhuilahs over the two firsts, and no point over of the second.

Al-Malik Al-Adil Aba-Bakr, whose name appears on this coin as that of liege-lord, was the brother of Salih-ad-din. He died this same year 615.

21. Copper. (Pl. i. fig. etv.) Amid. A.M. 617. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 36.)

Onv. A. Imperial eagle as before, but smaller, and inclosed in a circular figure formed by the intersection of two quas-ovals, which are surrounded by a plain circle and an outer dotted circle.

Rav. Hexagram, within circle.

In centre:

In the triangular spaces between lines of hexagram,

In spaces between hexagram and circle,

Point over of of of of of of.

A variety (a) in the British Museum has the obverse margin divided of , instead of of (Num. Chron. no. 39).

Al-Malik Al-Kamil Nisir-ad-din Muhammad was son and principal successor of Al-Adil.

22. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 6.) A.M. 610? (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 39.)

Onv. A. Imperial eagle within circle.

Rav.

The two-headed eagle was apparently the armorial badge of the city of Amid. The first coin struck
at that city since the introduction of images on Muḥammadan coins bears this eagle; and Ramusio\(^1\) records that he observed it on many parts of the walls of Amid. He does not seem, however, to have remarked any eagles with grotesque wings formed of the bearded heads of men, such as appear on the coin described above (19).

The origin of the two-headed eagle is very obscure. One thing alone is certain, that it was known in the East long before it was adopted by the Emperors of Germany. We find it on coins of Imād-ad-dīn Zangi of Sirjār, struck in the year 1190 (A.H. 586), and on Urtuḳi coins of 1217 (614); whilst the Emperors did not make use of it till the year 1345.\(^2\) M. de Longpré\(^5\) believes that he has discovered the clue to the history of this eagle in a relief at the village of Boghar Kiien, in Asia Minor, on which are represented two attendants of one of the principal ancient divinities, placed upright on a two-headed eagle. Further, on the side of a block of stone (the front of which is hewn into the form of a giant bird), at Legnico, is cut the figure of a two-headed eagle, which M. de Longpré conjectures to have been sculptured by the Saljiḳis in imitation of the ancient relief at Boghar Kiien, which may very probably have struck them by its resemblance to the fabulous bird the 'Ānḳā, described as the greatest of birds, carrying off elephants as a kite carries off a mouse.\(^4\) The Urtuḳis and Atābēgs then copied the eagle from the Saljiḳis; and, finally, the Flemish Counts, in their intercourse with the Saljiḳis, became acquainted with the device and introduced it to Europe.

**Type II.**

23. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 6.) A.H. 618? (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 40.)

Obv. Man on lion, holding in right hand short sword; behind, ٥٠٠٠٠ Urtuḳī damaghah.

Rev. A.

Nāṣir al-malik al-kāmil

M. al-ṣāliḥ al-nāṣir al-maṭṭās al-musīn | Nisb | ٣٨٠٠٠ | م. | ٣٨٠٠٠ | سِتْ | ثمانِ٣٠٠٠

**VIII. RUKN-AD-DIN MAUḌŪD. A.H. 619-629.**

**Type I.**


Obv. Small Imperial eagle, in circle, within square, within second circle, the whole surrounded by dotted circle.

In spaces between inner circle and square.

Rey. Same arrangement of circles and square as on obv., except that the centre circle is ornamented with four loops.

Within inner circle,

In spaces between inner circle and square,

In spaces between square and outer circle,

Another specimen (s) in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 44) has the date reversed (124). (Pl. v. fig. 7.)

The use of ciphers instead of the regular numerals is very unusual on these coins.

\(^1\) Delle Navicelle e viaggi raccolti da G. Batt. Ramusio, ii. 70 (Veron. 1606).


\(^3\) Longpré, (Review of Taxier and Hamilton), Rev. Archéol. ii. (old series).

\(^4\) LANE, Thousand and One Nights, xx. note 22. In the Ghalib Collection is a remarkable coin representing the Hōk or 'Ānḳā carrying off several elephants in its talons.
II. URTUKIS OF KHARTAFIRI.

1. 'IMĀD-AD-DĪN ABŪ-BAKR. A.H. 581—sūrā 600.

Type I.

25. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 8.) A.H. 585. (Guthrie Collection.)

Obv. Figure, almost naked, on serpent; tail of serpent coiled six times; extremity held in left hand of figure. | Rev. 

The British Museum possesses an example of this excessively rare coin,¹ but its condition is not quite equal to that of the specimen contained in the Guthrie Collection.

Type II.

26. Copper. (Pl. v. fig. 9.) A.H. 586. (Guthrie Collection.)

Obv. Head to left, diadem.

Rev. 

There are two specimens of this type (Num. Chron. nos. 47, 48) in the British Museum, but neither of them is quite equal in preservation to that of the Guthrie Collection.

¹ It is described in the Num. Chron. xiii. p. 301, no. 49; but the illustration of the obverse in the plate accompanying the article was photographed from a cast of Col. Guthrie's specimen, of which both sides are now exhibited in Pl. v. fig. 8.
III. URTUKIS OF MARIDIN.

II. HUSAM-AD-DIN TIMURTASH. A.H. 516-547.

Type I.

27. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 49.)

Oev. Head to right. 

[Copied from coin of Antiochus VII.]

Rev. يُدْخَلُ الَّذِينَ يَحْتَكَرُونَ 

Beneath rev. fleuron; muhamilah over حسن.

28. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 51.)

Same: but counterstamp, upside-down, upon the neck.

The British Museum possesses a variety (c) which differs from (27) only in the addition of ٣ over the ٥ of the world (Num. Chron. no. 52)—Pl. ii. cii.

The coins with the counterstamp are none the less to be attributed to Timurtash because (as the stamp shows) they were in currency during Najm-ad-din's reign. To attribute them to the latter would clearly be an error.


Type I.

29. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 53.)

Oev. Head as on preceding coins of Timurtash; on neck تَحْمُّمُ الْدِّينِ, but not upside-down and not as a counterstamp, there being no sign of the edge of the punch such as is seen on the last two coins of Timurtash.

Rev. يُدْخَلُ الَّذِينَ يَحْكُمُونَ 

Beneath rev. fleuron. Muhamilah over μ of μονεμεντα and of first 

30. Copper. (Pl. ii. on.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 55.)

Same: but, on the check, (shown by square edge of the punch), counterstamp, (nearly obliterating the name on the neck). يُدْخَلُ الَّذِينَ يَحْكُمُونَ مَلِكُ دِيْبَالِكَر

It is evident that Najm-ad-din at first used his father's coins, merely counterstamping them with his own name. When it became necessary to issue fresh money, he struck coins of the same type as those which he had been using; but he altered the reverse, by substituting his own name and titles for those of Timurtash; and he also incorporated into the dies of the obverse his own name, which before had only been counterstamped. He then appears to have made some acquisition to his territory, and to have commemorated the accession by putting on his coins a counterstamp which gives him the title of King of Dijur-bahr. After this he used other types than that of Timurtash.
Type II.

31. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 57.)

Osv. 

Two busts, diademed, face to face.

[Copy from coin of Gratian and Valentinian II.]

Rev.

Two figures, standing, facing.

[Copy from coin of John II. Comnus, representing the emperor and Virgin crowning the emperor standing on her right, his right hand on his breast, his left hand holding the cross-bearing orb.]

ملك دیاربکر

ارتق

Discritical points to ش of عمران.

The British Museum possesses two varieties (Num. Chron. nos. 58 and 59) of this coin just described, of which one is represented in Pl. ii. cv. They both differ from (31) in writing ارتق instead of عمران. A further distinction between the three coins is to be observed: the first represents the cross on the orb by three points ⬝, the second by two ⬝, the third by one.

I have put this type before the next, because I consider the simpler arrangement of its inscriptions, and their shortness, and the absence of any year of issue, as indications of an earlier date.

Type III.

32. Copper. A.H. 558. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 60.)

Osv. A. Head, diademed, nearly facing.

میلک دیاربکر

المکت العالم العادل نجم الدين ملك

Rev. A. Bust, crowned, facing.

[The dress seems to be Byzantine.]

M.

ابو العظيم ابلى عمران بن ابلى غازي

Within margin to dext.

و خمسانة

و خمسانة

There are two varieties of this coin in the British Museum—(a) Pl. ii. cv. (Num. Chron. no. 61), same, but rev. margin ابلى الغازي بن ابلى عمران and within margin to sin. نُمَّان و خمسانة, and within margin to dext. نُمَّان و خمسانة, and within margin to sin. Nāmān and Khamsa are transposed and ست is omitted.

2.

33. Copper. A.H. 559. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 64.)

Same as (32b): but ست is substituted for Nāmān and ست is inserted.
Type IV.

34. Copper. (Pl. ii. cxxl.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 65.)

Obv. ناسم الدین Two heads facing, slightly turned away one from the other.

[Common Byzantine type.]

Rev. Head facing, crowned ; within small circle of dots.

There are three varieties in the British Museum—(a) (Num. Chron. no. 68), same, except that the limestone and the Αμήρ ουμονινς and mastaxipdav λαλς are transposed.—(b) (Ibid. no. 69), same as (34), but the limestone is substituted for the limestone in (a) and the Αμήρ ουμονινς and mastaxipdav λαλς is substituted for the limestone in (a).—(c) (Ibid. no. 70), same as (34a), but the limestone is substituted for the limestone in (a).

The occurrence of the name of the Khalifah Al-Mustazjed limits the date of 34 and 34a to 555—566; whilst that of Al-Mustafia limits the date of 34b and 34c to 566—575. But it is clear that the whole of Type IV. must have followed Type III., for we cannot suppose that 34 and 34a were struck before 558, whilst 34b and 34c were struck after 559. Granting, then, that 34 and 34a were struck after Type III., i.e. after 559, their date is limited to 559—566. On the other hand, 34b and 34c must have been struck between the accession of Al-Mustafia and the death of Nujm-ad-din, i.e. between 566 and 572.

IV. KUTB-AD-DIN 'IL-CHAZI II. A.H. 672—580.

Type I.

1.

35. Copper. a.H. 577. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 71.)

Obv. ناسم الدین بخس Two busts, diademmed, facing; one larger than the other.

[Copy from coin of Heraclius I. and his son Heraclius Constantius; but the Emperor's beard has been shaved, and the diadems have been much altered.]

Rev. ناسم Ad-din ملمع ممن Αμήρ ουμονινς This is the date, See the Emperor and Munilahs above.

2.

36. Copper. a.H. 578. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 72.)

Same: but instead of ناسم and Νυμιν, and inserted before Νυμιν. No munilahs.

3.

37. Copper. a.H. 579. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 73.)

Same as (35): but instead of ناسم, and Νυμιν and Νυμιν. No munilahs.
I suspect that the dates of the last two coins are blundered. As they stand, they are undoubtedly incorrect.

On the curse-formula, which appears in its entirety on these coins (الله يعمر) see above (Introduction, p. 9 and note, and no. 14 of the coins of the Kayšū dynasty).

The name of the Khalifah An-Nāṣir has been the subject of a very common mistake among numismatists. Instead of the full surname An-Nāṣir-li-din-illāh they have sometimes found (as on the coin just described) a form which they read An-Nāṣir-ad-din. This is painlessly plain, is a solecism of a grave nature; and numismatists have made a great point of the ignorance or carelessness of those who had to do with the striking of the coins. It seemed to me highly improbable that any one entrusted with the designing or engraving of an Arabic coin should have been so ignorant of the Arabic language as to doubly define a noun; and I therefore thought it worth while to look into the matter a little more closely. The coins in the British Museum bearing the surname of the Khalifah An-Nāṣir, about 250 in number, form quite large enough a collection to allow one to lay down general principles for the orthography of the name. By examining these 250 coins I found that what I had at first suspected was in fact correct — (1) in every instance of the supposed "الله يعمر" there was a connection between the base of the (supposed) "الله يعمر" and the following "الله يعمر" which, showing the word to be "الله يعمر" and (ii) consequently numismatists, ignorant or forgetful of the elementary rule of Arabic orthography, that the alif of the definitive "الله يعمر" is elided, were unable to see the reason for the two llms occurring in juxtaposition, and accordingly attributed a solecism to the designers of the coin by reading "الله يعمر-ad-din". After having investigated the question for myself, I discovered that Fruch Der, with his usual accuracy, had already adopted the true reading "الله يعمر-ad-din". The correct form, then, of the contracted surname is An-Nāṣir-li-d-din. In the full name the word "الله يعمر" was defined by the following word "الله يعمر". But that being removed in the contracted name, it became necessary to define "الله يعمر" in some other way, and the definitive "الله يعمر" was accordingly prefixed, the resultant meaning being to the religion, i.e. Islam, whereas "الله يعمر" alone would mean to a religion.

1 An indistinct specimen of this type is engraved on Pl. ii. fig. cviii.
NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

Type II.

41. Copper. (Pl. ii. fig. cxl.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 77.)

Obv.  Within dotted square, head to right, diademed.  [Copied from coin of Constantine I.]

Rev.  ايل خاق
لمالك المملك العالم
العادل قطب الدين
ملك المملاك شاد
داريكر

There are some varieties in the incorrectness of the spelling of the word الملك المملك. On no example is it correctly spelt.

The unusual form [Belonging] to our lord the king, the assemblage of titles, and other peculiarities, induces the opinion that these coins were struck by some governor or chieftain tributary to the Urtaki Kutb-ad-din.


Type I.

1.

42. Copper. (Pl. ii. fig. cxii.) A.H. 581. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 85.)

Obv.  Half-figure, right hand on breast.

Rev.  Within hexagram of dotted lines, لطالما
من الناصر
حافظ الدين
والدما يوسف
بين
Between hexagram and outer dotted circle,

2.

43. Copper. (Silvered)1 A.H. 581. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 83.)

Same: but different obv. inscription, and differently divided: حسام الدين يوثق ارالان.

3.

44. Copper. A.H. 582. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 86.)

Same as (43): but ثلث instead of احد.

1 A duplicate of this coin in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 84) is similarly silvered.
45. Copper. A.H. 584. (British Museum. *Num. Chron.* no. 87.)

Same as (43): but اربع instead of احد.


Same as (43): but خمس instead of احد.

Pietrazewski (*Num. Muh.* no. 264) publishes a coin (a) which resembles (43) in everything but the date, which is 586 (اسد instead of احد).

It has already been noticed (cp. no. 16) that the name of شاذل-ad-دين as liege-lord occurs on the coinage both of Kayfā and of Māridīn in this same year 581.

Type II.

47. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 2.) A.H. 587-9. (British Museum. *Num. Chron.* no. 93.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>حسام الدين ملك ديار بك</td>
<td>المملك الناصر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two heads: that on the right, profile to left; that on the left, smaller, nearly facing, crowned. [The profile is probably copied from a coin of Nero; but the head on the left is clearly Byzantine;—apparently a mixed type.]</td>
<td>صالح الدين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>مصي ديلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ايام الموسياء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above, fleuron.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over صالح on rev., muhmilah.

Three other examples in the British Museum differ slightly from (47):—(a) omitting the fleuron and the muhmilah; (b) gulf, substituting a pellet for the fleuron, and retaining the muhmilah; (c) transposing يوسف بن أبوب and substituting pellet for fleuron (like b), and retaining muhmilah.

We can scarcely suppose that this type was issued before the last coin (46a) of Type I. was struck; the *terminus a quo* of the date is thus fixed at 586. But it is probable that, in the absence of political changes which might necessitate an alteration in the coinage,—and we have no knowledge of such changes in this instance,—a fresh coinage would not be issued till the former one was exhausted, for which we may allow a year. Hence we may fix the earliest date at which Type II. was likely to be struck at the year 587. The *terminus ad quem* is easily seen to be 589; for the name of شاذل-ad-دين occurs on the coin, and he died in 589. Further, a new type of coinage (Type III.) was introduced by Yūluq-Araldīn in 589. There remains therefore the narrow range of between two and three years (587, 588, and part of 589) during which Type II. must have been struck.
Type III.

1.

48. Copper. a.h. 589. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 94.)

Obv. Four full figures: one is seated in the midst, with head dejected; behind stands another, with face in profile and right arm upraised; two other figures stand one on each side of the sitting one, the figure to dexter with arms raised, that to sinister with arms down.

Rev. A. 

الإمام السلاّم
سر للديني
امير المؤمنين
محمّد بن أبي بكر
الخليفة
تسع وخمس

Of two varieties in the British Museum (Num. Chron. nos. 95, 96): — (a) (Pl. iii. fig. cxxv) differs from (48) in having a star before the sitting figure, and inserting in the text: نص نص العين before أَرْتَنَى رُبُعَةً تسع وخمسة, and also inserts a muhimlah over صم.

2.

49. Copper. a.h. 589. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 97.)

Obv. Same as (48):

but no star, and slight alterations in the figures, outer drapery being added to the side figures.

Rev. A. 

الملك العادل
الإمام السلاّم
سر للديني
امير المؤمنين
تسع وخمس
م. Same as on (48), but inserted in the text: 

أَرْتَنَى رُبُعَةً تسع وخمسة, and the century of the date illegible.

Two other examples in the British Museum slightly differ from (49): — (a) (Num. Chron. no. 98) is stamped with a countermark GG (inverted): (b) (Ibid. no. 99) silvered, omits the fleuron on rev. area.

3.

50. Copper. a.h. 590. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 100.)

Same as (49): but date تسع وخمسة instead of تسع وخمسة.

A variety in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 101) adds a pellet under rev. area.

It has been suggested that this group is intended to record the lamentation of the Muslims on the occasion of the death in the year 589 of their great champion Salih-ad-din, who had so long led their triumphant armies against the infidel Franks. This is by no means disproved by Dr. Scott's discovery (Revue Archéologique, x. 296) that the representation on these coins bears a strong resemblance to a relief in term-cotta (in the British Museum) representing the mourning of Penelope for the absent Odysseus. The Upuikia may have been anxious to engrave on their coins some mark of their regret (whether sincere or merely politic) for the death of the great Saracen leader, and they found a suitable model in the relief above mentioned, of which they may very possibly have seen an example.
Type IV.

1.

51. Copper. A.H. 596. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 102.)

Obv. Helded figure, seated cross-legged; holding, in right hand, sword horizontally behind his head; in left hand, a trunkless, helmeted, head, by the plume of the helmet; handle of sword crossed, tasselled.

Rev. A. 

النامير لدين
الله أمير
المرميين

M. (Inner). 
الملك الأئلف على والملك النامير
غازي بن الملك النامير

(Outer). 
حسام الدين يوليت بركان إبن غازى
بن [أرتق] تمر بسنة مست
وتسعين وخمساً

To dex., stem with three buds.

Beneath figure, fleuron.

2.

52. Copper. A.H. 596. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 103.)

Same: but inserted between إبن غازى, and a inserted in إرتق.

3.


Same as (51): but on rev. to dex. (Instead of stem with buds) the words written sideways. 
Also on rev. area muhamilah over the ملك دياركرين.

Rev. marg. as on (51), but dates stops at .

4.

54. Copper. (Pl. iii. fig. cxx.) A.H. 596. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 103.)

Same as (53): but with ملك دياركرين inserted as on (52).

A variety (a) in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 106) omits the muhamilah over the ملك دياركرين.

5.


Same as (53): but obverse type reversed; sword in left hand, trunkless head in right, etc.

Pallet above rev. area.

6.


Same as (55): but stem of buds restored in place of side-inscription.

Rev. A. 

الله
الإمام السحس
سرليدين
أمير المؤمنين

The supposition that this type refers to a scene which took place in the tent of Salih-ad-din (Abú-l-Fidáé, ann. 582) appears to me improbable, as the event took place fourteen years and the principal actor died seven years before the coin was struck.1

1 Before leaving the coins of Yalāh-Aralan, I must mention that Scerri (Le Lettre, no. 59, Rev. Num. Belge, iv. 29, note 5ecris) attributes to this prince a silver coin which I have no hesitation in assenting should properly be assigned to Az-Zahir Ghārî, the Ayyūbi prince of Halab. The word Scerri reads بركة should be بركان, and يوليت should be يوليت.

Type I.

1.

57. Copper. A.H. 598. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 110.)

Obv. Bust, facing ; on each side, star. Rev. A. Within hexagram,

M. In the spaces between hexagram and double dotted outer circle,

2.

58. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 3.) A.H. 599. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 111.)

Obv. Same. Rev. A. Within hexagram,1

M. العربية | سنة | نتتت | تسع | خمس | مائت

Another specimen (a) in the British Museum differs from (58) only in dividing ارتنق | ارتنق | لابشر | ارتنق | A third example (b) substitutes for the words in which the name ناصر الدين on the obverse. On the reverse, the inscriptions of Urtūk-arslan’s die are nearly obliterated, whilst those of the earlier die are more than half legible:—


This inscription clearly indicates the date 584; and the earlier die may be attributed without hesitation to

1 A distinction may be noted between this and the preceding hexagram. That of (67) is triple, being formed by two hexagrams of single lines, including one of dots. The hexagram of (68), on the other hand, is composed of the two lines without the dots, as in the photographic representation on Pl. vi.
Al-Malik Al-Muqaffar Sinjar-Shâh, the Atâbég of Al-Jazîrah, as a comparison with the coins of that prince clearly shows. It may perhaps seem strange that the earlier inscription should be preserved whilst the later inscription struck over it has almost disappeared; but this may perhaps be accounted for by supposing that the later inscription preserved the older one by undergoing the wear of circulation which would otherwise have fallen upon it. There can be no doubt whatever that the die of Urtûk-Ârsân is the super-imposed one: this is proved not only by the date of the other die, but by the nature of the surface of the copper, which renders it usually an easy task to determine which of two dies struck on the same place is the older one.

The word الله at the top of the reverse of the preceding four coins must be taken with the aslâd al-nâsrâd. Its unusual position, separated from its connected words, is, we may suppose, due to an attempt at symmetry.

Type II.

1.

59. Copper. (Pl. iii. fig. cxxv.) a.h. 599. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 114.)

Ovb. Crowned or helmeted centaur-archer [Sagittarius] to left, head turned facing, stretching with right hand the string of a bow which he holds in the left, with the intent of shooting down the throat of a dragon with jaws a-gape. The dragon is nothing else than an extension of the centaur's tail. To the left of the centaur's head is a large point.

In the spaces round the figure, بعازدين | ستة | تسعم | و | خمس | مأ

The first component of the numeral خمسة on this coin is reversed (سمى); and the second, though not reversed, is curtailed to ما.

A variety (a) in the British Museum (Num. Chron. no. 115) differs from (59) in that ناسار is removed from the right side to the same line as دیاربکر, thus ملك دیاربکر ناسار. A third example (b) (Num. Chron. no. 116) is similar to (a), but سمى is changed to خمسة and inserted after تسعم. A fourth (c) (Num. Chron. no. 117) is like (b), except that ناسار is at the side as on (59).

2.

60. Copper. a.h. 599. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 118.)

Same as (59), but the centaur-archer is reversed, to right, bow in right hand, string stretched with left; and the obv. inscription is thus distributed in the spaces—بعازدين | ستة | تسعم | و | خمس | مأ | مائة—and on the rev. ناسار is moved to the line of ملك دیاربکر as on (59a).

Of two varieties of this coin (Num. Chron. nos. 120, 121) in the British Museum, the first (a) divides the obv. inscription thus، بعازدين | ستة | تسعم | و | خمسة; and the second (b) thus، بعازدين | ستة | تسعم | و | خمسة | مائة، neither of which arrangements in the least affects the meaning of the date: (a) places ناسار as on (59), but (b) as on (59a).

The patronymic من ابن آبوب on the rev. belongs of course to the Ayyûb Al-Malik Al-Âdil Abdâ-Bakr, not Urtûk-Turkumans.
to Nasir-ad-din Urtak-Aralin, although at first sight it might seem from its position to be a continuation of the latter name.¹

It is perhaps noteworthy that the piece (no. 59) struck by Urtak-Aralin at Maridin in the year 598 is the earliest instance of a coin of the princes of Maridin bearing a mint-name: their Kayfa kinsmen introduced Al-Hus twenty years earlier (see no. 14).

Type III.

61. Copper. (Pl. iii. fig. cxxxii.) Maridin. A.H. 606. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 123.)

Obv. A. Man seated on lion to left, hands raised, ends of girdle flying behind.

M.ملك العادل سيف الدين ابن بكر أبي

Rev. A. وكست

المؤمنين

ابن الامام الناصر

V. diploma above lowest line of rev. area. (Num. Chron. 125, 126.)

A duplicate of (61) in the same collection is plated with silver.

The expression سنة سخت, though ungrammatical, is by no means a unique solecism: similar mistakes are not uncommon on coins.

Type IV.

62. Copper. (Pl. iii. fig. cxxxvi.) A.H. 611. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 127.)

Obv. A. Head, laureate, facing (slightly turned to left).

M. الناصر الدين والدين ابن بكر ملك

Rev.

* * *

ابن الامام أحمد

الناصر الدين الله

امير المومنين

ملك العادل أبو

(بيك بن ايويد)

(The words in parentheses are inserted from duplicate specimens.)

¹ It is a graceful office to comment on the mistakes of those scholars who formerly directed their labours to the same field as oneself, but I cannot forbear to mention that in describing the preceding coin (in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 3. 13. 28), Reiske seems to have tried to make as many egregious blunders as he possibly could. Certain it is that scarcely a line but offers a tempting subject for criticism. Whether Reiske was an Arabic scholar or not, though a sufficiently debatable question, is not one with which we are at present concerned; but that he was no Arblie numismatist is a patent fact, and every numismatic statement or theory of his demands the most cautious scrutiny.

² Some numismatists, with singular infidelity, have read the top line، أمير الفضل أحمد، and the engraving in Pl. iii. is likely to confirm this mistake. I need only say that the coins unanimously give the reading ابي الفضل أحمد، the names of the Khalifah An-Najaf, and that the other reading is not only unauthorized but ungrammatical.
Another specimen (a) has annulets instead of stars above rev. \( (\text{Num. Chron.} \, \text{no. 129}) \). The photograph (Pl. vi. fig. 4) will convey a better impression of the obverse than the engraving.

2.

63. Copper. A.H. 611. (British Museum. \( \text{Num. Chron.} \, \text{no. 132} \).)

Observ.: Head as before, but slightly turned to right.

Reverse: 

some illegible characters in the margin.

Type V.

64. Copper. A.H. 615. (British Museum. \( \text{Num. Chron.} \, \text{no. 135} \).)

Observ.: Within octogram,

\[
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah} \\
\text{al-mulk al-mustawr} \\
\text{al-mulk al-kamal} \\
\text{al-mulk al-kamal}
\]

Reverse: Within octogram,

\[
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah} \\
\text{al-mulk al-mustawr} \\
\text{al-mulk al-kamal} \\
\text{al-mulk al-kamal}
\]

Between octogram and outer double circle.

\[
\text{lar} \quad \text{al-} \quad \text{lar} \quad \text{al-} \quad \text{lar}
\]

Another example in the British Museum \( (\text{Num. Chron.}, \, \text{no. 137}) \) is struck over a coin of Type IV.

Type VI.

65. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 5.) A.H. 620. (British Museum. \( \text{Num. Chron.} \, \text{no. 138} \).)

Observ. A. Head to right.

Reverse:

\[
\text{sharshin} \\
\text{amir al-muminin} \\
\text{al-mulk al-kamal} \\
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah} \\
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah}
\]

[Placed over the preceding.

\[
\text{lar} \quad \text{al-} \quad \text{lar} \quad \text{al-} \quad \text{lar}
\]

\[
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah} \\
\text{nasser ad-din al-lah}
\]
Type VII.

66. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 6.) A.H. 623. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 140.)

Obv. A. Bust facing, with long locks of hair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>معمر والامام المستنصر بالله</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المسمى والمسبق على الدنيا</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On left side of head, خسرو = خسر
On right side of head, خسر

The British Museum possesses two varieties of this type besides that just described (Num. Chron. nos. 141, 142): of these (a) is noteworthy only because the obv. is struck over a rev. of Type VI., and the rev. over an obv. of Type VI.; and (b) differs from (66) in having two mahmillahs (V), one over the امیر المؤمنین, the other over the المستنصر بالله, taking the place of the ر which is on this coin (unlike the preceding) written in line with the rest of the word.

Type VIII.

1.

67. Silver. (Pl. vi. fig. 7.) Dunaysir. A.H. 625. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 143.)

Obv. بدل نصريستة

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>السلطان العظيم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المملك المستنصر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The points on this coin are diacritical: viz. obv. المملك المستنصر, rev. السلطان العظيم. A variety (a) in the same collection (Num. Chron. no. 144) differs only in omitting the points over the خ and the ن.

2.

68. Silver. Dunaysir. A.H. 626. (British Museum.)

Same as (67), but instead of خسرو on obv. Points as on (67a), but none to the المستنصر بالله.

3.

69. Silver. Dunaysir. A.H. 628. (Fahn Collection, no. 440.)

Same as (67), but instead of خسرو on obv.

1 Cp. Freihm., Resevois, ch. xiii. 11.
2 I am indebted to Dr. Blau for a description of this piece.
4.

70. Silver. Dunay-Sir. A.H. 632. (British Museum. Invited.)

Same as (67), but instead of

"النفي والمثل" instead of the

المستنصر. Star over

"النفي والمثل" instead of the

المستنصر.

These silver coins—the first in the Urtuqi series—are precisely after the model of those issued by the Saljuq Sultan of Anatolia: the size, the peculiar ornamentation with three stars, the arrangement of the inscriptions, the style of the writing, all are Saljuq. In explanation of this, we see the name of Kay-Kubad on the reverse, showing that at the time these coins were struck the Urtuqi prince was doing homage to the Saljuq Sultan. The acknowledgement of suzerainty seems to have been accompanied by a change in the coinage in imitation of that of the suzerain. In the like manner, a little later, we see the same Urtuqi prince copying the well-known type of coinage peculiar to the Ayyubid princes.

Type IX.

1.

71. Copper. A.H. 626. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 147.)

Obv. Man seated on lion, similar to Type III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>جزء سنة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>المستنصر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بالمثل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العومنسي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (لشير)

Circular marginal inscription on obv. and rev., but nearly effaced and quite illegible.

2.

72. Copper. A.H. 627. (Müller Collection.)

Same as (71), but instead of

"سبع عشر" instead of

"سبع عشر" instead of

Type X.

73. Silver. A.H. 628. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 150.)

Obv. A. Within triple hexagram composed of a dotted line between two plain lines,

الأمام
المستنصر
بالله امیر العومن

M. In spaces between hexagram and triple circle similarly composed,

لا لله (ناد) لله | مبتعد | رسول | لله

(as on obv.).

(The words in parentheses are, as before, inserted from other examples.)

1 Formerly belonging to Dr. O. Blu, German Consul-General at Odessa.
Dr. Blau mentions to me a similar dirham formerly in his possession, bearing the date 625
خمس عشرات وستمائة. Can this be a misreading for 628
ثمان عشرات وستمائة? At least, of the reading
of the coin described above I have no doubt.
The photograph (Pl. vi. fig. 8) is taken from a second specimen in the British Museum.
This type of coinage is an exact copy of that characteristic of the Ayyúbís, and seems to have been
adopted in token of homage, in the like manner as Type VIII. appears to have been adopted in honour of
the Saljúqís.

Type XI.

74. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 9.) A.H. 628. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 154.)

Obv. Figure seated cross-legged, within
square of dotted lines, head pro-
jecting above square; star on each
side of head; annulets on each side
of figure within square.

Rev. 

بالله
الإمام المستنصر
بهم
أمير المؤمنين
المملكة الكامل
محمد

Another example (a) in the same collection differs only in transposing
اكران امرؤ الدين
and
ناعر الدين اكران.

Type XII.


Obv. A. Head to face, diademed, similar to
Type VII., but broader.

Rev. 

تَورَبُ بِمَبادِينِ
الإمام
المستنصر بالله
قَسَمُ أمير المؤمنين
المملكة الكامل
أرْض

A variety (a) in the British Museum divides the date thus
ستمائة وثمانؤع [تَورَبُ] and omits in
obv. margin (Num. Chron. no. 159); and a third (b) omits
المملكة الكامل in obv. margin, and turns the date round,
beginning at left instead of top,

The engraving (Pl. iii. fig. cxxiv) is from a considerably less perfect specimen than that described above (75).
Type XIII.


Obv. A. Figure seated, cross-legged, holding orb in left hand.

Rev. (عربي) (برادرین)

The British Museum possesses eight specimens of this type, differing only (so far as can be seen) in degree of indistinctness. It is from a comparison with the other seven pieces that the words in parentheses have been inserted. One of the eight is struck over Type VI. (obv. over obv., rev. over rev.). From another of these eight pieces, the representation in Pl. vi. fig. 10 is taken.

The decimal of the date on these coins is so very obscure that there might be some uncertainty as to whether the year were 694, 614, 624, or 634, if it were not for the circumstance that one of them is struck over a die of Type VI. Now Type VI. was issued in 620, and Type XIII. must therefore have been issued later than 620. But the name of Kay-Khusru occurs on it. This cannot be Kay-Khusru II., for he reigned from 600 to 607, whereas it has already been shown that Type XIII. must have been issued later than 620. The alternative, Kay-Khusru II., began to reign in 634. The date of Type XIII. must therefore be 694. A later decree is precluded by the death of Urtuki Arslān in 637.

Type XIV.

77. Copper. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 169.)

Obv. (العمر البالغ)

Rev. [عماد]

[ارتق]

Type I.

78. Copper. A.H. 640—3. (Soret, IVe Lettre, no. 100, Rev. Num. Belge, 2e sér. ii. 222.)

Osv. Within square,

السلطان

غيات الدين الملك

المblind

Rev. Within square.

الامام ا

المستصم

بالله أمير المو

Traces of marginal inscriptions.

The date of this coin is limited to 640—3 by the accession of Al-Musta’ṣim in 640 and the death of Ghiyāth-ad-din (Kay-Khusrū ii.) in 648.

Type II.


Osv. A. ﷺ

الامام المستصم

امير المومنين

Rev. A. ﷺ نجم الدين ابن الملك

السعيد غازی

بين ارتقن

M. ﷺ (الله ﷺ محمد رسول الله)

M. ﷺ (سنت وربعي وستعا ؛)

(The words in parentheses are inserted from another specimen in the same collection.)

In the late General Bartholomaei’s IVe Lettre à M. Soret (Rev. Num. Belge, ii. 340, 4e série) is a description (no. 23) of a coin resembling the preceding, but with date 645 and a different reverse inscription.

Type III.

80. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 11.) Māridīn. A.H. 634. (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 172.)

Osv. A. Head, facing.

Rev. Within dotted square.

• ﷺ

الامام المستصم بالله أمير المومنين

Above, two stars.

In the spaces between square and outer dotted circle,

نسر بعدين | سنة | اربع | خمسين سنة
THE URTUKI TURKUMANS.

Type IV.

1.


Obv. Within triple hexagram composed of dotted line between two plain lines,

الإمام
المستمع
بالله اسمه
منين

In spaces between hexagram and outer circle similarly composed,
لا إل形态 | الل | محمد | رسول | الل

Rev. Within hexagram (as on obv.),

يصف
الملك الناصر
ملك السعد
خازن

In spaces (as on obv.),

(مَتَّى) بعمران | سنة | خمس وخمسين (وستمائة)

2.


Obv. In hexagram (as before),

الله
لا إلا
الله محمد
رسول

In spaces (as before),

صل | الله | عليه | وسلم | الل

Rev. As on (81), but سمت instead of خمس.

The rev. marg. inscription has been made out by comparison with other specimens.

3.


Same as (82), but سمت instead of سبع (or rather سبع, it might perhaps be سبعة) instead of سمت.

4.


Same as (82), but نعم instead of سمت.

The reason for the alteration of the obverse inscription and for the omission of the Khalifah's name is to be found in the fact that Al-Musta'ṣim, the last of the Khalifahs of Baghda'ī, was murdered by Hūlāgū in 656.

URTUKI TURKUMANS.
NUMISMATA ORIENTALIA.

VIII. Karā-Arsān. a.h. 658–691.

Type I.

85. Silver. (Pietrzakowski, Num. Math. 308.)

Obv. A. Within hexagram (as on 81).

Rev. A. Within hexagram (as on 81).

و vận
المظفر

قلارسح

Marginal inscriptions nearly effaced.

Pietrzakowski wrongly attributed this coin to Kılıç-Arslan, the Saljūq Sultan of Ar-Rum.

Type II.

86. Copper. (Pl. vi. fig. 13.) (British Museum. Num. Chron. no. 179.)

Obv. A.

Rev. A.

المملك
المظفر

ترارسح

M. Illegible.

M. Illegible.

Another example (a) has \( \varpi \) beneath obv. area.

IX. Šams-ad-dīn Dāwūd. a.h. 691–693.

Type I.


Obv. Christ, seated on throne;

similar to Type VI. of Karā-Arsān of Kayfa.

Rev.

المملك العا...

المعدل ضم...

الدنيا والدين.

It must be admitted that this is only a conjectural attribution. The titles and style of the coin lead one to the supposition that it was issued by Šams-ad-dīn Dāwūd the Urtuḵ; but the evidence is anything but certain. In the absence, however, of a more positive attribution, we may provisionally assign it to the Urtuḵ prince.
APPENDIX A.

TURKISH NAMES.

In writing Turkish names I have adopted the orthography of the Arabic historians, some of whom were contemporaries of the princes who bore these names and may therefore be supposed to have known how they were pronounced. As, however, this orthography differs considerably from the Turkish, I insert below a list of the names as given by Mr. J. W. Redhouse, who has kindly furnished me with the Turkish orthography and probable meaning of each word.

1. أوئرة أرسلان = covered or hairy lion.
2. بيروت أرسلان = plucked or bald lion.
3. نزرا أرسلان = black lion.
4. سودمان = an overcoat; but
5. (Pers.) = dog-like; or perhaps
6. (Pers.) = an attendant on hounds.
7. نيمورتانش = iron-stone, or perhaps [can'a] companion-in-iron.
8. إليس = probably one who has served under Alp-Arislan, a follower of Alp-Arislan.
9. إيل إزار = hand-victor, or tribe-conqueror. The significations of the Turkish names are too numerous to enable one to determine with certainty the meaning of the name.

APPENDIX B.

PALÆOGRAPHY.

The style of Arabic writing employed by the Urtuğsha on their coins was of a mixed nature. The old rigidly-simple Kūfī character was passing away, and the transitional Kūfī was preparing the road for the Naṣkih. We find all three kinds on Urtuğ coins. A few present the old Kūfī in very nearly its pristine simplicity, a few on the other hand the Naṣkih in almost its modern form, but the majority employ the transitional Kūfī, in which the simplicity of the old character is destroyed by the addition of ornamental turns and other embellishments. All this may be seen at once by a glance at the plates.

Discritical points are very sparingly used on these coins. The following are all I have met with: (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس, (ق) مس. Of orthographical signs, shaddā occurs once (ت), and šudl (or mishdalah, as de Sacy calls it) frequently (ٜ). When employed in grammatical works, šudl shows that a letter is pointless; but on the coins, though it is generally used in this manner, it is not always. The examples of its occurrence furnished by the Urtuğşi coinage are:

1. أورهان: أورهان (from اورهان) to cover, conceal, veil.
2. بيلمة: بيلمة (from بيلم) to pluck (hairs or feathers).
APPENDIX B.

Many of the types on the coins described in the preceding pages have been shown to be copies of Byzantine or Selenicid or Roman originals; but many have been left unidentified. Of these I am now in a position to prove that some are astrological. Dr. E. von Bergmann lately called my attention to the astrological character of some of the Urutki types, and referred me to a plate at the end of Reinaud's Monuments Arabes et. du cabinet de M. le duc de Blacas. This engraving represents an astrological mirror, belonging to an Urutki prince, Nūr-ad-dīn Urutki-Shihāb, great-grandson of Abū Bakr r. of Khartoum. One side of this mirror is of course polished; but on the other, besides inscriptions, are two zones or bands, of which the inner contains seven busts representing the planets, and the outer twelve medallions including figures representing the signs of the Zodiac combined with the seven planets.

Chez chaque planète un signe du zodiaque qu'elle affectionne de préférence et dont elle se rapproche autant qu'il est possible; plus elle est près de ce signe, plus elle conserve l'influence; plus elle s'en éloigne, plus elle s'affaiblit. ... La planète a reste demeure toujours, et la signe est entièrement sous sa dépendance' (Reinaud, ii. 408 ff.). Cancer is under the dominion of the Moon, Leo of the Sun, Virgo of Mercury, Libra of Venus, Scorpio of Mars, Sagittarius of Jupiter, Capricornus of Saturn. But as there are twelve zodiacal signs and only seven planets (in this system) the remaining five signs are distributed to the planets again, beginning with the last: Saturn has Aquarius, Jupiter Pisces, Mars Aries, Venus Taurus, Mercury Gemini.

This curious mirror throws light on more than one of the unexplained Urutki types. Mars in Aries is represented by a man seated on a ram, holding in one hand a sword and in the other a truncheon head. There can be no doubt, therefore, that Type VI. of Yūšūk-Asalān, which represents a similar figure, though without the ram, is intended for the planet Mars. Again, Type II. of Yūšūk-Asalān is clearly meant for Sagittarius, and exactly corresponds to the representation of that sign on the astrological mirror: Jupiter, to whom the sign Sagittarius belongs, being sufficiently represented by the man-element in the figure. In a similar manner we shall be able in a future part of the Numismata Orientalia to explain some of the astrological types which occur on the coins of the Atabegs.
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