

“*a dínár.*”¹ When anyone finds that notes of this kind in his possession are worn or torn he takes them to a certain public office analogous to the Mint in our country, and there he gets new notes for his old ones. He incurs no expense whatever in doing this, for the people who have the making of these

¹ I do not understand the text to mean that a *balisht* is precisely worth a *dinar*, but that it is the unit in which sums are reckoned by the Chinese as the *dinar* is with the Mahomedans. Paper money has been spoken of at pp. 287-89, and at p. 116 some speculations were ventured on the origin of the term *Balisht* or *Balish*. I have since been led to believe that it must be a corruption of the Latin *follis*.

The common meaning of that word is a *bellows*; but it was used also by late classical writers for a leather money-bag, and afterwards (in some sense) for money itself, “just as to this day the Italians apply the term *purse* to a certain sum of money among the Turks” (*Facciolati*, Lipsiæ, 1839). Further, the term *follis* was also applied to a certain “*pulvillus, sedentibus subjectus, qui non tomento aut plumâ inferciebatur, sed vento inflabatur,*” or, in short, to an *air-cushion*.

Now we have seen (p. 116) that *Balish* was also applied to a kind of cushion, as well as to a sum of money, such as in later days the Turks called a *purse*. This double analogy would be curious enough as a coincidence, even if we could find no clearer trace of connexion between the terms; but there seems ground for tracing such a connexion.

Follis was applied to money in two ways under the Byzantine Emperors.

In its commoner application (*φόλλις, φόλλη*, etc.) it was a copper coin, of which 288 went to the gold *solidus*; and in this sense probably had no connection with the original Latin word. But *follis* was also used as a term for a certain quantity of gold, according to one authority the weight of 250 *denarii*, and was especially applied to a sort of tax imposed on the magnates by Constantine, which varied from two to eight pounds of gold, according to rank and income (see *Ducange, De Inferioris Aevi Numismatibus*, in *Didot's ed. of the Dict.*, vii, pp. 194-5.)

If the *denarii* mentioned here were gold *denarii* or *solidi*, then we have the Byzantine FOLLIS=250 *mithkâls*, just as the BALISH of the Turks and Tartars in later days was=500 *mithkâls*. The probability that the latter word is as directly the representative of the former as *Dinar* and *Dirhem* are of the (gold) *Denarius* and *Drachma* seems very strong, and probably would not derive any additional support from the *cushions* with which both words have been connected.

Follis, again, in the sense of a copper coin, appears to be the same word as the Ar. *fals*, spoken of at pp. 115-116, found also formerly in Spain as the name of a small coin *foluz*. And *follis* also in this sense, through the forms *Follaris* and *Folleralis* which are given in *Ducange*, is the origin of the *folleri* of *Pegolotti* (*supra*, p. 296).