APPENDIX II
IDENTIFICATION OF THE OTHER ISLAMIC COINS
IN MS. C.10.31

1. Sicilian Coins Identified by the Maronites Gabriel Sionite and/or Jean Hesronita (1617)

In fall 1617 the Italian-speaking Maronites Gabriel Sionite and Jean Hesronita worked with Nicolas Peiresc on his northern Mesopotamian coins (see Appendix I). At around the same time they seem also to have worked on the coins described on pages 370–75 of Peiresc’s manuscript inventory. Either Sionite or Hesronita rendered the inscriptions of the coins in a skillful Arabic handwriting. They then translated the Arabic into Latin and made comments in Italian.

The Maronites were well educated in Arabic. Kufic inscriptions, however, are difficult to decipher without special training in numismatic epigraphy. The Maronites sought to deliver something comprehensible and meaningful, which meant they were more inventive than Peiresc’s later assistant Sayet in creating meaning from uncertain reading. The latter was more humble in his endeavors and made drawings of the inscriptions he was unable to decipher, though he, too, could be inventive. Here a comparison with Baroque coin etchings and drawings might be appropriate. These renderings tried to reconstruct the coins in a perfect manner, set in a perfect round circle, with sometimes curious results where the image was shallow, worn, or obliterated.

Around this same time, Peiresc excerpted some information from the book of Filippo Paruta published in 1612, which he had acquired in the spring of 1617 (Grierson and Travaini 1998, 477). The excerpts on page 375 deal with the peculiar Arabic and bilingual Norman-Sicilian coinage of Roger II, William II, and Tancred.

Adjacent, and related, on pages 372–73 we find a listing of coins, presumably all from Sicily, numbered I–VI, as Peiresc and the Maronites had done for the northern Mesopotamian coins. These are probably all Fatimid gold rubaʿīs, quarters, and/or Norman gold tarīs, which is the same denomination in the tenth to thirteenth centuries. Nos. I–IV describe Shiite coins, probably with circular legends. The
Identification: Bronze dirham of Nasir al-Din Mahmud, Artuqid ruler of Amid (present-day Diyarbekr), r. 1200–1222, dated AH 610 (1213/1214). See Artuk 1970, 1212; Lane-Poole 1875, 20; Spengler-Sayles 1992, 15; Ghalib Edhem 1894, 14–16. The obverse shows a double-headed eagle. The Maronites, understandably, took the archaic writing of the “zero” as an Arabic “O,” or five. As late as 1894, Ghalib Edhem suggested reading the “O” as zero.

XIV. Numus aereus (illegible word) formae
   Altera {Aquila biceps, cum eodem luna quadrante, et fragmentis eiusdem inscriptionis.
   Adversa {Inscriptiones duae. i. in medio numo.
   [Rex scientificus ... Rex ... ]
   In limbo intercidit [.....]
Identification: Same as no. XIII.

XV. Numus aereus majoris formae
   Altera {Figura equestris togata, circulo circa facies cincta, sanctorum more, trophaeum um videtur gestans, vel nescio quid aliud informe, cum stella.
   Adversa {Inscriptiones binae, altera in limbo.
   [Nonagesimo et quinto.]
   Alia in medio numo, diversi characteris, principium enim Arabicum est
   [Percussio imperatoris (Sultani) ... solim(an) ... ]
   Reliqua sunt charactere ignoto.
   [transcription of unknown characters].

—JOHN CUNNALLY
Maronites were able to read only one circle of the legend. They got the common religious phrases right, but were unable to read any caliphal name. In no. 1 they rendered the presumed title of the ruler as *al-malik al-washir [sic] amir al-mu'minin* and translated it as *Rex magnificcentissimus Princeps fidelius*. It can be supposed that this translation is inventive for the legend *al-malik Rujar al-mu'azzam*, meaning Roger II (r. 525–548/1130–1154). But in this case the Islamic phrases would be an invention too. Alternatively, nos. 1–iv may simply be Fatimid gold *ruba'is* of the eleventh century from Sicily. Nevertheless, the description is not sufficient to exclude ordinary Fatimid dinars and silver dirhams.

On coins v and vi, the inscription *IC XCN KA* points to gold *tarîs* of the Norman kingdom of Sicily. This type of design was minted from the reform of Roger II in 535/1140–1141 through the reign of Frederick II (r. 594–617/1197–1220) (Grierson-Triviaini 1998, 119), but there are also copper follari with *IC XCN KA*. The Maronites did not attempt to render any of the Arabic inscriptions.

On the continuation of this project (pages 370–71), four coins are described. All of them are from Sicily, naming a “King Roger.” The sequence continues with nos. vii and viii of Arabic coins of Roger II, though giving him the wrong caliphal title, *amir al-mu'minin* instead of *al-mu'azzam*. Also, the Islamic *shahâda*, as on no. 1, is a free misinterpretation of the unread Kufic script.

A new sequence of numbers, nos. 1 and II, indicates a change in the metal because the following coin (no. 1) is of copper. It is a bilingual issue of Tancred (r. 585–590/1190–1191) in Arabic, named together with his son Roger III in Latin. The coin was minted in 588–589/1192–1193. Instead of the Arabic *al-malik Tanqir*, the Maronites deciphered *al-malik al-barbar* or *Rex Barbarorum*. The Latin reverse, by contrast, was clear: *rex Rogerius* (Spinelli 1844, no. 477; Traviaini 1995, no. 399; Grierson-Traviaini 1998, 138, nos. 447–53). The other Roger coins were probably all struck by Roger II; however, the Maronites’ interpretation of the Kufic script is too vague to identify them precisely today.

2. A Single Coin Identified by the Maronites (1617)

The coin documented on page 345 probably belongs to the same group of northern Mesopotamian coins already described on pages 276–83. Again, the persons sending the identification to Peiresc in a
letter are the Maronites in Paris, who acknowledge having Paruta’s book with them. The Latin and Italian hands are not the Maronites’, but the knowledge is. This information places the description in fall 1617.

The coin can be identified: Zengids from Sinjar, Qutb ad-Din Muhammad (r. 594–616/1197–1219), copper dirham, mint of Sinjar, year 596/1199–1200. The other side shows a Roman emperor with a kind of scepter over his shoulder. Instead of Sinjār, the Maronites read a fictitious Sinjād, transcribed in Latin as Sengiad. Although they misspelled the place-name in the first instance, in the Italian text they suggested correctly Sengiar, located three days from Mosul, as a possible mint place. The identification was probably a result of their close acquaintance with al-Idrisi’s Geography, which they were translating into Latin at the time (sponsored by Peiresc and published in Paris in 1619). It is the first recorded instance of the successful use of historical Arabic texts to identify coins.

The Maronites mistook many of the words in the inscription, but the mistakes are quite understandable because no Islamic history was available at that time to correct obvious errors, such as “al-Malik al-Nāṣir li-Dīn al-Salam al-Malik Hishām Fazl al-Dīn” instead of the correct “al-Imām al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh al-Malik al-Mansūr Qutb al-Dunya wa-Dīn.” Curiously, Sayet also seems regularly to mistake al-Imām for al-Malik. Did he have access to the earlier descriptions of the Maronites? Cf. Hennequin 1985, nos. 692–710; Spengler-Sayles 1996, type 81.1.

3. Coins from the Northern Syrian Market Interpreted by Sayet (ca. 1627)

About a decade later, Sayet of Taroudant (Morocco) helped Peiresc with a couple of coins, obviously again from northern Syria (pages 303–300; this section of the manuscript is written from back to front, as in Arabic books). Sayet’s handwriting is a Maghrebi script, which he probably learned in his hometown (Van den Boogert 1989). The Maghrebi script has certain differences from the Kufic or Naskhi script of the East. This is especially obvious in how Sayet rendered the dāl and where he positioned the diacritical dot below the fā’. The Arabic handwriting seems nevertheless a bit awkward, as if Sayet were rendering the characters as carefully as possible without really knowing what he was writing. The drawings seem done for interpretation later. This kind of tentative interpretation by drawing is obvi
ous because Sayet inserted almost no diacriticals to make the letters and words meaningful. Nevertheless, these errors show that he tried hard to perceive anything on coins whose archaic script was rather unfamiliar to him. For example, he knew the word *al-malik* (king) and used it quite often for *al-imâm* (imam or caliph).

Unlike the Maronites, Sayet obviously was not thinking about “completing” or “perfecting” an inscription. He was comfortable leaving it “unfinished.” Also, Peiresc was in Aix at the time and not physically present while Sayet was studying the coins in Marseille. The Moroccan was not a scholar like the Maronites, lacking knowledge of Latin and perhaps of French as well. So there was no attempt at translation, only transcription. That may explain why we lack any evidence for Peiresc’s intervention comparable to what we possess for the 1617 campaign.

Two systems of numbering were applied on these pages, one with Maghrebi numbers and in boustrophedon order, and one by Peiresc with capital letters in Western order. Sayet separated the two sides of each coin with a line at the bottom of the description of one side and then added the legend of the other side below it. The rendering of the inscriptions, with Sayet’s somewhat imaginative approach and without any helpful description of the image, makes a modern identification of these coins quite difficult and in many cases uncertain.

The selection of coins is typical for the northern Syrian antiquities market, perhaps from Aleppo or Antioch, where Provençal merchants were very active.


Page 302, 2. The coin names the caliph *al-Nasir li-Din Allah* (r. 575–622/1180–1225). The second name might be from an Ayyubid, Artuqid, or Zengid king, but it is not yet clear.

Page 302, 3. If the second line is read as *al-mu'azzam*), a Rum-Seljuq copper fals of Kaykhusru I (r. 588–607/1192–1210) might be suggested. The non-Arab Persian name of Kaykhusru might have been unfamiliar to the Moroccan Sayet, and he imagined the word as *al-sultan*. The other side would show a horseman. Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1656.

Page 302, 4. Despite the distorted rendering of the inscription, this coin is identifiable: Artuqids of Hisn Kayfa, Fakhr al-Din Qara
Arslan (r. 539–570/1144–1174), copper dirham, without mint (Hisn Kayfa), struck between 539/1144–1145 and 556/1160–1161. The other side would show an image, but which one cannot be determined, because several types use the same inscription. Cf. Spengler-Sayles 1992, 7–16, types 2–4.

Page 302, 5. This seems to be a Rum-Seljuq coin; the drawing of the first word in the third line suggests a copper fals of Qilij Arslan II (r. 551–588/1156–1192). The other side would show a horseman. Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1604.

Page 302, 6. The much distorted legend gives the impression that this coin belongs to the same group of Rum-Seljuq horseman-type coins. The rendering suggests a fals of Kaykhusru I. Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1668.

Page 301, 7. It is not impossible that this wild rendering and guessing of letters represents another Rum-Seljuq coin of Qilij Arslan II, again with a horseman. Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1610.

Page 301, 8. This represents a Rum-Seljuq copper coin of somewhat bigger size and also with a horseman: Sulaimanshah II (r. 592–600/1196–1200). Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1675.

Page 301, 9. Rum-Seljuqs, Kaykhusru I (r. 588–607/1192–1210) with horseman, copper fals. Cf. Hennequin 1985, no. 1643. This group of Rum-Seljuq horseman-type coins seems to end here or with the next coin.

Page 301, 10. Undetermined lettering in two lines.

Page 301, 11. This legend suggests a Zengid coin of Nur al-Din Mahmud (r. 541–569/1146–1174), Damascus, 558–564/1162–1169. It can be supposed that the first line of the script renders the central legend, and the second line a part of the marginal legend. Cf. Spengler-Sayles 1996, type 74.

Page 301, 12. The Islamic faith (shahāda) in two lines is awkwardly rendered without diacritics as: lā ilāh illā ilāh / malik (!) wāhdahu, lā sarlik [sic] lahu. Because the profession of faith is a standard phrase, this coin cannot be identified with any certainty. Sayet should have recognized the shahāda, but he surprisingly did not. Why? This lapse seems to have had nothing to do with the condition of the coin.

Page 300, 13. This is probably a misunderstood Mamluk silver coin of the late thirteenth or fourteenth century. The first line, probably "al-sultan," is rendered as "al-Hāfiz." Sayet put the diacritical dot for the fā' below the letter as is usual in the Maghrebi script.
Page 300, 14, 15, 16. These, like no. 13, are probably misunderstood and awkwardly rendered Mamluk silver coins.

Page 300, 17. This coin cannot be specified. Sayet gives only the general phrase, “Muhammad ra / sîl / Allâh” (Muhammad is the messenger of God).


4. Glass Tokens Read by Sayet (1627)

On page 289 of his inventory Peiresc gives a raw description of some numismatic objects, which include glass tokens identified by the color of the glass. On page 340 Sayet, working in Marseille, attempted to read the legends, though without following exactly the numbering of page 289.

These were Fatimid, eleventh-century glass tokens. It is still disputed and undecided whether they were used as coin weights (Bates 1981) or had the function of petty coinage (Balog 1981). In addition to the difficulties of Kufic Arabic, the reading of glass tokens is impeded by the very process of their creation: after the imprint, the viscous hot glass mass smoothes the shape of the inscription. Presumably these tokens came back from Egypt with one of Peiresc’s Provençal merchant friends.

Sayet tried in vain to render the script, but he could not identify anything meaningful. With imagination and the knowledge of how certain groups of letters can be misconceived, the following identifications can be hazarded. They tell us more about what Sayet had in front of his eyes than what he understood of them.

**BB, Esmail de verd de mer.** The closest overall rendering of the inscription is a token by Al-Zahir l-A’zaz Din Allah (r. 411–427/1021–1036). Cf. Launois 1960, 30, no. 60; Noujaim-Le Garrec 2004, 130, no. 150.


**DD, Esmail rouge aster.** Here, it seems, Sayet made two attempts to render the script of a token of al-Hakim bi-Amrillah (r. 386–411/996–
Peiresc obviously sent some of his Syrian and northern Mesopotamian coins to Sayet. These may indeed have been some of the same ones the Maronites had read for him in 1617. In August 1627 Baltasar de Vias informed Peiresc that he would return “all the other” coins. In effect, Sayet would have had the opportunity to range over the whole and pick and choose what he thought most interesting to his interlocutors—or what de Vias thought most interesting to Peiresc and himself.


Page 332. Two further examples of the same type on pages 328 and 330, but with countermarks on the reverse, one with a countermark as the preceding coin, the other with a shorter version in one line: Najm al-Din.

Page 336. Artuqids of Mardin, Husam al-Din Timurtash (r. 516-547/1122-1152) or Najm al-Din Alpi (r. 547-572/1152-1176), copper dirham, mint Mardin. The reverse shows a portrait that imitates the portrait of the Seleucid king Antiochus VII (r. 138-129 BC) from a tetradrachm. The difference between both types from Mardin is whether a countermark naming Najm al-Din was applied on the coin or whether the name of Najm al-Din was already engraved on the neck of the portraits of “Antiochus” on the die itself. Probably in this case a countermark was applied, because Sayet drew a square around the name of Najm al-Din. Cf. Spengler-Sayles 1992, type 26 with countermark or type 27.

6. Sayet’s Coin Session of September 6, 1628

Peiresc noted that the following coins were described by Sayet on September 6, 1628, in Marseilles. Again, the inscriptions of the coins were rendered in Arabic only, without any further explanation.
Page 351. Sayet drew a dinar (aureus) of the ninth or tenth century, with four lines on the obverse and at least one marginal legend. Sayet could now read the shahāda in the first two lines and recognize it. The rest are lines of dots. The reverse had at least four lines of inscriptions, which he rendered as “Samāha / ‘Abd / Allāh / amīr al-mu’minīn,” where he probably had in mind the contemporary form of address, Samāḥatuḥū, “His High Eminence.” Sayet’s imagination supersedes his perception. The precise origin of the coin cannot yet be determined.

Page 355. Sayet probably had an Umayyad or Abbasid silver (argentaeus) dirham in front of him and recognized sura 9:33 from the Qur’an as the circular marginal legend and transcribed it without any error and with diacritics. He did not even guess at the four lines in the middle. They might be the Umayyad sura 112, always written in four lines on coins.

Page 359. Sa’dis of Morocco, Ahmad ibn Muhammad (r. 986–1012/1578–1603), dirham (nummus argenteus), Marrakesh, year 1009/1600–1601. Sayet read the three inner lines on the obverse correctly, and the marginal legend with the reading of AH 1009 seems correct. His diacritical dot under the alf makes it clear that he learned his Arabic writing in Morocco. On the reverse he mistook the central legend, reading “’ya‘lam li-’ahd mir / Ahmad ibn ‘Abdallāh / amīr al-mu’minīn,” though it remains recognizable as Abūl-‘Abbās / Ahmād al-Mansūr / amīr al-mu’minīn. The origin of the Sa’di dynasty was Taroudant, Sayet’s hometown, which perhaps explains his surprising ability to render correctly their device in the margin of the reverse. Cf. Lane-Poole 1880, 92, no. 254.

Page 363. Ottomans, Murad ibn Selim (r. 982–1003/1574–1595), silver shāhi, Aleppo. Sayet read the mint name correctly but was not able to decipher the marginal legend. He read the name of Murād as Ahmad; and “‘azza nasrahū” as “nasrahū Allāh.” Cf. Lane-Poole 1883, 93, nos. 243–44; Sultan 1992, nos. 1224–27.

—Stefan Heidemann
LITERATURE


Titus Vespasiani filius reliquus Hierosoli
mita expugnationi iudaeas tandem vict
ut appareat in eius arcu saepe dicatur
est delitiem huius generis prouterea qu
ti disparere omnius quis placere cupiebat.
Hic solitum erat dicere neminem a principe
tristem discere oporere: mortuus est in
eadem vila quae pater est at tatis anno xlii
eum imperiat et annos tres nec absolutis re
lictas Tullia quae Domitianus patrum
apud se educati superavit.