

in size but invariably in a position proving them to be retreating baffled and beaten, were intended to represent the Asuras, powers of darkness and evil, humbled by and retiring before the presence of the life-giving deity.

From my own point of view the most serious mistake in the book is to be found in the note to vol. i, p. 126, where the author, of course by pure accident, does me the entirely undeserved honour of attributing to me the authorship of Mr. Vincent Smith's *Fine Art in India*. The error is much to be regretted.

R. SEWELL.

CATALOGUE OF COINS IN THE PANJĀB MUSEUM, LAHORE.
By R. B. WHITEHEAD. Oxford, 1914.

(Continued from the July Part, p. 795.)

The second volume of this Catalogue deals with the coins of the Mughal Emperors of India, an important series which until recent times has not received adequate attention from numismatists. The revival of interest in the subject may be said to date from the publication of the British Museum Catalogue in 1892 and from the researches of Mr. C. J. Rodgers in the Panjāb. The British Museum cabinet then contained about 1,250 coins, a number now greatly increased. The recent activity in this branch of numismatics may be measured by the fact that the Indian Museum at Calcutta, which contained 863 Mughal coins in 1894, contained 2,560 when Mr. Nelson Wright's Catalogue was issued in 1908, and the Lahore cabinet catalogued by Mr. C. J. Rodgers in 1892, and consisting mainly of his own collection, contained 1,559 Mughal coins, whereas the present Catalogue shows 3,283, the greatest number published as yet in any catalogue. This collection is probably unrivalled in the number of mints and the extraordinary variety of small silver and copper coins which it includes, although it does

not approach the magnificent gold series of the British Museum. A catalogue of the St. Petersburg Collection, which has absorbed many well-known private collections made by British collectors in India, is much to be desired. The number of new mints brought to light during the last twenty years is astonishing. The publication of these, in which the Royal Numismatic Society at one time took a considerable part, has of late been carried on almost entirely in the Numismatic Supplements of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and Mr. Whitehead's share in this work has been a large one. The Lahore Collection has taken full advantage of the recent discoveries, and at present 134 mints, out of 200 known, are represented there. The Indian Museum has fallen behind in the race, as Lahore possesses fifty-four mints not to be found at Calcutta, while Calcutta has only eight which Lahore does not possess.

There are many points of interest in the mints of the Mughal emperors, both those which have long been known and those more recently brought to light, but space does not admit of more than a few of these being mentioned.

Under Multān, for instance, we find that both gold and silver was struck at this mint in 1173 (1759) in the name of 'Ālamgīr II, and we know that at that period Taimūr Shah Durrānī was ruling at Multān as Nizām under his father Aḥmad Shāh, and in fact a rupee of his struck at Multān the same year is in existence. 'Ālamgīr II's rupees were also struck in 1172 (1758) at Dēra (i.e. Dēra Ghāzi Khān), although the whole of that region had for some time been under the Durrānīs.

Muzaffargarh, which lies between Multān and Dēra Ghāzi Khān, affords an even more perplexing problem, for at a much later period, 1209–12 (1794–7), rupees were struck there in the name of Shāh 'Ālam II, although it had long formed an integral part of the Durrānī kingdom, and Zamān Shāh had mints at Multān and Dēra.

The earlier coinage of 1173 may be explained by supposing that some hope existed that the Mughal Empire might be restored, but such could hardly have existed in Shāh 'Ālam's case. It seems probable that this Muẓaffargarh is not the insignificant Panjāb town, never before known as a mint-town, but some other place as yet unidentified. The name Muẓaffargarh, like Zafarābād, Zafarnagar, etc., might be applied to commemorate a victory.

The identification of Zafarābād itself has been the subject of some discussion, and Mr. Whitehead accepts the conclusion come to by Dr. G. P. Taylor in his article in JASB. Num. Supp. No. 12, that it is identical with Bīdar in the Dakkhin. The late Mr. Irvine, who originally made this suggestion, in a note to his translation of *Manucci's Storia do Mogor* (vol. i, p. 322) adopted the view that it was the Zafarābād on the Indus mentioned by Manucci, which he identified with Atak, and pointed out that the gap between the earlier coins of Atak struck by Akbar and the later rupee of A.H. 1158 would be filled if the Zafarābād mint was at Atak. Dr. G. P. Taylor thought that the filling of the gap was very partial, leaving a long interval without coins before 1158, when only one coin is forthcoming. It must be remembered, however, that the Atak mint was in a district under Nādir Shāh's power in 1158, and that it formed part of the Durrānī kingdom soon after the date of the solitary coin of Muḥammad Shāh. Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī struck there both in gold and silver, and there is an Atak rupee of his as early as his 9th year (1169). Unless the mint had been active and in working order it is unlikely that the Durrānīs would have used it, as they had another mint near by at Peshāwar, where Aḥmad Shāh struck in his 2nd year. There seems, therefore, to be good ground for inferring the continuity of the mint, and this is, as far as it goes, an argument in favour of identifying Zafarābād with Atak. I am not now inclined to attach much

importance to the fabric of the coins pointing to a northern rather than a Dakkhinī origin, as Dr. G. P. Taylor, with his great experience, considers that the evidence is not sufficient to justify this view. I may add, however, that a Zafarābād coin in my possession was found in the north of the Panjāb. At present I think the identification of Zafarābād is not fully established either with Bidar or Atak.

Under Haidarābād (Dāru'l-jihād) reference might have been made to my note in "Some Coins of the Mughal Emperors", *Num. Chron.*, 1902, where I described a rupee (pl. lxxii) of Kāmbakhsh of that mint. Mr. Whitehead says that Kāmbakhsh struck in both gold and silver at Haidarābād, but no mention of a silver coinage of Kāmbakhsh at that mint was made in Mr. Burn's list of 1904.

Another mint whose identification is still doubtful is Islāmābād. There can be no doubt that Mathurā was the mint which bore that name in the reign of Shāh 'Ālam II, but Aurangzēb's mint must have been named from one of the towns conquered and renamed Islāmābād by him, viz., Chāknā, Chittagong, and possibly some others. Mr. Whitehead quotes from J. Sarkar's *India of Aurangzēb* a place named Rāiri in the province of Aurangābād, and Jālna might be added, as both Rāiri and Jālna appear in J. Sarkar's list (p. 163, taken from the Chahār Gulshan) of places called Islāmābād in the Aurangābād Sūbah. It is not clear whether these two places were among Aurangzēb's conquests, and as far as the evidence goes I still think, as in 1902, that the probability is in favour of Chāknā, as the earliest of Aurangzēb's conquests which received the name of Islāmābād.

Many such doubtful points must arise as regards the numerous obscure mints which recent researches have brought to light. Some have been dealt with in the

Numismatic Supplements already alluded to, also by Mr. Nelson Wright in his *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*. In this volume Mr. Whitehead has, with great success, endeavoured to summarize all that has been as yet ascertained; and numismatists who have been accustomed to use the lists of Dr. Codrington and Mr. Burn must now supplement their information from his very full notes on the mint-cities of the Mughal Empire. The Catalogue is excellently printed and illustrated with twenty-one plates.

A companion volume on the coins of the Sultāns of Dehlī and the other Musulmān rulers of India would be welcomed by all students of the subject.

M. LONGWORTH DAMES.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE NAWAR OR ZUTT. Gypsy Lore Society Monographs, No. 3. By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER. London, 1914.

The Nawar or Zutt are a nomadic race inhabiting Palestine, and are of undoubted gypsy origin. The word Nawar is an Arabic plural from the singular Nūrī, which may well be identical with the Lūrī of Persia. They call themselves, however, Dōm, and the name Nawar is only applied to them by strangers, as well as the alternative Zutt. The latter word is the Indian Jatt, which took the form Zutt in the writings of the early Arab chroniclers from Tabarī and Mas'ūdi onwards.

Mr. Macalister has been associated with this interesting race, many of whom he employed on excavation work for the Palestine Exploration Fund, and has made a study of their language, the results of which are given in the excellent monograph now published for the Gypsy Lore Society. It includes a full grammar and vocabulary and a large collection of stories and narratives, including some which are of great interest as specimens of folklore.