(a) An unpublished obolus of Lothaire II recently found in Dorset

The following is a description of a small silver coin which was brought to our notice in the summer of 1963:

**Obv.**

IOTAVSIEIX (retrograde).

Cross pattée with inner and outer circle of pellets.

**Rev.**

PAFA / THIA (in two lines).

Outer circle of pellets.

Diameter 15 mm. (⅜ inch). Weight 0.73 gm. (11.3 gr.). Die-axis 90°.

The coin is illustrated here by greatly enlarged photographs of plaster casts, and it is thought to be unlikely in the extreme that any will wish seriously to challenge the following interpretation of the legends:

**Obv.**

LOTARIVS REX

**Rev.**

PALA / TINA

The find-spot and the circumstances of discovery are sufficiently indicated in the following note which we owe to the kindness of Mr. C. J. Bailey of The School House, Litton Cheney, who actually found the coin in the course of archaeological excavation:

Pin's Knoll, in the parish of Litton Cheney, Dorset, is a greensand spur (at SY (30)541905) which juts southward into the Bride Valley from the chalk hills to the north. On the south-west the scarp side is almost cliff-like, while the less steep slope to the south-east is terraced by a series of strip lynchets running along the contours. Trial excavation of the relatively flat area above the lynchets was carried out in 1959 when the site was established as that of an 'open farm' of the Early Iron Age with a possible continuation into the Romano-British period. It was discovered and established by the writer in time to be included on the Ordnance Survey Map of Southern Britain in the Iron Age. Further work this year has confirmed that occupation continued at least until c. A.D. 350.

The coin was found at a depth of eighteen inches and a few inches above the 'fall' layer associated with a Romano-British building tentatively dated c. A.D. 300. Subsequent disturbance has made stratification difficult, but a section at a point near where the coin was found suggests a relatively
shallow build-up in post-Roman times underlying a deeper layer resulting from medieval ploughing. One finds it difficult, therefore, to divorce the coin from early cultivation of the lynchets, although today no other material has been found which might be in any way associated with it.

The coin was excavated personally by the writer, and the most striking thing would seem to have been its extraordinary good state of preservation. It hardly needed washing.

From the above it should be clear that the circumstances of the coin's discovery, though seeming to establish authenticity beyond all cavil, throw little light upon the problem of its attribution. It can be said, though, that there is a presumption that such an obolus belongs to a ninth-century Lothaire rather than to one of the tenth-century princes of the same name. As is well known, a feature of post-Alfredian legislation was its insistence that foreign money should not circulate within the dominions of the English king, and more than one recent paper has stressed just how few are the tenth- and eleventh-century coins from the Continent that can be fairly associated with finds from the English kingdom proper. The fabric of the new obolus, too, is one that cries out for a ninth-century attribution and for a place of minting north of the Alps, and we ourselves have no hesitation whatever in assigning the coin to the German king Lothaire II (855–69), while the greater probability is that the mint is to be identified as Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle). Even denarii of this king and mint are notably rare, and the obolus was hitherto unknown. However, we should observe that this would not seem to be the first time that coins of the king have been recorded with an English provenance, and Dr. D. M. Metcalf can congratulate himself that this single-find from Dorset may be thought to vindicate his suggestion that the Carolingian coins found in York just over 200 years ago were most probably of Lothaire II.

How the obolus from Pin's Knoll arrived in England and how it came to be lost on a lynchet in the vicinity of the, as yet precisely to be identified, site of the Alfredian burh 'in Brydian' are questions to which answers cannot well be given. One recent paper, however, has argued that far too much weight can be attached to early medieval coin-finds as evidence of commercial intercourse, while another from quite a different standpoint has suggested that there is special need for scepticism where Carolingian issues are concerned. Attractive, then, as the hypothesis of Rhine trade may seem—and we are both convinced of the importance of Frisian merchants as middlemen in the ninth century—it seems to us no less likely that it could have been some Viking raider who had brought the coin to Wessex. In 877 the horsed 'army' of Danes must have passed within miles at most of Pin's Knoll in the course of its headlong ride from Wareham to Exeter, and equally one might well ask whether it is quite impossible for the obolus to have been washed ashore on the person of one of the several thousand (?) corpses from the hundred (?) supporting ships wrecked at Swanage not so many miles to the east. It is not suggested, we would hasten to add, that either of these hypotheses should be taken too

2 Prou 47 = Gariel ix. 2: Prou 148 and 149: Gariel ix. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and lvii. 25 and 26 (which last two issues may well be, as G. suggests, from a later ruler of the same name): Morrison-Grunthal 1183–92. Of these only Gariel lvii. 26 = Morrison-Grunthal 1192 is an obolus, and this may well represent a tenth-century striking for Lothaire of France.
5 K. E. Morrison in *Speculum*, xxxviii (1963), pp. 404–32.
7 Ibid. In The Age of the Vikings, London, 1962, P. H. Sawyer has set out (pp. 120–5) his reasons for our regarding contemporary estimates of the size of major Viking fleets as in the main exaggerated. Even so, the number of the victims of the Swanage débâcle may well have run into hundreds.
seriously, but both of us feel that in the present climate of medieval studies it is still very necessary that there should be put forward at least one plausible alternative to an almost inevitable association of such a discovery with trade-routes and commerce. Especially would caution appear to be indicated since, for reasons that will emerge later in this note, a review of the coin-hoards suggests pretty strongly that already in the ninth century English kings were evincing a desire to exclude continental coins from circulation in England south of the Thames.¹

(b) A summary listing of coin-hoards from Great Britain and Ireland that are on record as containing one or more Carolingian coins.

The Hiberno-Norse fascicle of the British Museum Sylloge will shortly be giving for the first time an abbreviated listing of ninth-, tenth-, and eleventh-century coin-hoards from Great Britain and Ireland with some claim to be considered at once reasonably comprehensive and reliably precise in the datings which are there proposed. Rather more than 200 hoards are there noticed, and in the case of twenty-six of them there is a record of the presence of one or more Carolingian coins. It has occurred to us that a rather fuller and more exact account of this Carolingian content could be of service to students of both the English and the continental series, and in the summaries that follow the Carolingian coins are described in some detail. The references given are not only to such standard works as those of Prou and Gariel but also to the corpus which will, we anticipate, be put out by the American Numismatic Society within the next few months. The following abbreviations are employed:

BNJ British Numismatic Journal.
GM Gentleman's Magazine.
HBN Hamburger Beiträge zur Numismatik.
Morrison–Grunthal K. F. Morrison, with the collaboration of H. Grunthal, Carolingian Coinage, in press.
NC Numismatic Chronicle.
NNA Nordisk Numismatic Aarskrift.
PRSAI Proceedings of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland.
SCBI Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles.
SNC Spink's Numismatic Circular
VCH Victoria County History.

I. DELGANY, Co. Wicklow, Ireland, c. 1874. Deposit: c. 827.

100+ coins—1 Carolingian.

Leo III—Rome(?). Cf. Serafini, iv, p. 11, 4–5 (misattributed to Leo VIII).

¹ Infra, pp. 85–87.
FINDS OF CAROLINGIAN COINS FROM

The papal coin is in the British Museum.

2. GOWER, Glamorganshire, 1948.
Deposit: c. 840.
3 coins—2 Carolingian.
Inventory 305: Bonser 9082.
Date of the English coin c. 830–5 (cf. BNJ xxviii, iii (1957), pp. 467–76).
N.B. The find-spot was the floor of a cave known as Minchin Hole near Penard which is in Gower and hence in Glamorganshire and not Carmarthenshire.
The coins are in the Royal Institution of South Wales at Swansea.

3. LONDON (MIDDLE TEMPLE), 1893.
Deposit: c. 842.
250+ coins—1 Carolingian.
Inventory 366: Bonser 8896: A/S Coins, p. 64.
The Carolingian coin is in the British Museum.

4. MULLAGHBODEN, Co. Kildare, 1871.
Deposit: c. 847.
11+ coins—all Carolingian.
Pippin I or II—Melle (2). Cf. Prou 689: Morrison-Grunthal 606.
3 coins of the same general types.
One coin of Prou 689 is in the British Museum, and examples of 692 and 987 in the Museum at Clongowes Wood College together with tinfoil impressions of 5 of the remaining coins. The three extant coins are illustrated in the two most recent works cited, and the impressions have been photographed for a new note for Univ. Oldsaks. Arbok.

5. DORKING, Surrey, 1817.
Deposit: c. 861.
c. 1000 coins—1 Carolingian.
Pippin I or II—Melle. Cf. Prou 689 var.: Morrison-Grunthal 606.
Inventory 123: Bonser 8907 and 9085: A/S Coins, p. 66.
The Carolingian coin is illustrated by a line-engraving in Archaeologia xix, pl. x. 14.

6. YORK (CONEY STREET), shortly before 1760.
Deposit: c. 870.
c. 100 coins—some Carolingian.
Lothaire II (?)—uncertain mint(s) (Christiana Religio). Cf. Gariel, pl. ix. 6: Morrison-Grunthal 1190 but composition very obscure.
Inventory —: Bonser —: NC, 1957, pp. 199-201.
English coins unfortunately not described in the contemporary account of the discovery.

7. TALNOTRIE, Kirkcudbrightshire, 1912.
Deposit: c. 870.
12+ coins—1 Carolingian.
Inventory 349: Bonser 11709: SCBI Edinburgh i (in the press).
Span of the English coins: c. 840–70. A fragmentary Kufic coin is of consistent date.
The fragmentary Carolingian coin is in the National Museum of Antiquities at Edinburgh. It will be illustrated in the forthcoming fascicle of SCBI.

   540 coins—1 Carolingian.
   The Carolingian coin is in the British Museum.

   c. 120 coins—1 (or 2) Carolingian.
   Perhaps a piece of ‘Pippius’ (= (?) Pippin I or II—(?Melle) cf. the earliest manuscript listing of find.
   Inventory 362: Bonser 8909, 8910, and 11551: Rashleigh MSS. in Dept. of Coins and Medals, British
   A drawing of the coin of Louis the Pious is among the Rashleigh MSS. cited.

   c. 250 coins—8 Carolingian.
   Louis the Pious—uncertain mint(s) (Christiana Religio). Cf. Prou 987 var.: Morrison-Grunthal 472:
   cf. Prou 1009: Morrison-Grunthal 472.
   Charles the Bald—uncertain mint(s) (Christiana Religio). Cf. Prou 1062 varr.: Morrison-Grunthal
   i159 (6).
   and 215.
   A few fragmentary Kufic coins seem all to fall within the bracket c. 800–50.
   The specimen of Prou 987 var. is in the British Museum. Drawings of coins corresponding to Prou
   1009 and 1062 var. are in the Reference Section of Croydon Public Library (Corbet Anderson MSS.).

   A substantial hoard—9 Carolingian.
   Charles the Bald—Quentovic. Cf. Prou 196 var.: Morrison-Grunthal 720: cf. Prou 200: Morrison-
   Grunthal 718 (2).
   ‘Illegible’—uncertain mint(s) ‘Temple’ types (Christiana Religio) (3).
   Inventory —: Bonser —: VCH Suffolk, vol. i, p. 350.
   These coins are described in a list among Banks MSS. in Dept. of Coins and Medals at the British
   Museum. Unfortunately there is no listing of the English coins, but the reigns given suggest a hoard
   of Croydon type with the bulk of the coins from the decade c. 865–75.

   40+ coins—1 Carolingian.
   (1959), pp. 239 and 240.
   Span of the English coins (?) all Danelaw imitations): c. 890–900.
   The Carolingian coin—an obolus—is in the British Museum.
13. Cuerdale, Lancashire, 1840  
c. 7,000 coins—c. 1,030 Carolingian.  
Analysis of Hawkins's account (NC 1843) suggests a total of 1,047+ Carolingian coins, and some 1,003 are listed by Hardy in a manuscript catalogue in the Duchy of Lancaster Office.  
Coins marked * are oboli.  
For the convenience of the user the lists that follow are arranged in the order of the authorities cited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serafini, i, p. 17, 5.</th>
<th>Benedict IV and Louis the Blind—Rome?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNI v, p. 16, 4 and 6.</td>
<td>Louis the Blind—uncertain mint(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 26, 1</td>
<td>Lambert—uncertain mint(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 27, 3-var.</td>
<td>Lambert—uncertain mint(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 31, 38</td>
<td>Berengar I—uncertain mint(s)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 32, 43 var.</td>
<td>Berengar I—uncertain mint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1+1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The above coins of Louis (solus), Lambert, and Berengar are all of the Christiana Religio type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garth</th>
<th>Morrison—Grienthal</th>
<th>Hardy's list</th>
<th>BM. trays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l. 37</td>
<td>1421 Charles the Bald (?) Linoges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxiv. 78 var.</td>
<td>1061 idem Melle</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxvii. 54 var.</td>
<td>1428 idem Boiociuvii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi. 159</td>
<td>804 idem Noyon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxiv. 230</td>
<td>1368 idem Saint-Omer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xl. 18 var.</td>
<td>1447 Charles the Fat (?) Metz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 42</td>
<td>1447 Charles the Simple Beauvais</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlii. 54 var. but obolus</td>
<td>1372 idem Quenitive</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii. 52 var.</td>
<td>1341 idem Toulouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlvii. 56</td>
<td>Cf. 1298 idem Tours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lii. 82</td>
<td>1433 Charles the Simple (?) Tournai (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liii. 13</td>
<td>1275 Odo Compiègne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liii. 23</td>
<td>1276 idem Laon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxiv. 11</td>
<td>1563 Louis the Child Namur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxiv. 13</td>
<td>1236 idem Namur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lxiv. 17</td>
<td>1549 idem Würzburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preu</td>
<td>1546 idem Mainz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 var.</td>
<td>1550 idem Strasbourg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>671 Charles the Bald (?) Cambrai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 var.</td>
<td>1359 idem Metz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>699 idem Bruges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 var.</td>
<td>699 idem Bruges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194 var.</td>
<td>716 idem Quenitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 var.</td>
<td>744 Charles the Simple (?) Arras</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>794 Charles the Bald (?) Laon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>805 idem Soissons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 var.</td>
<td>835 idem Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>831 idem Paris</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344 var.</td>
<td>843 idem Saint-Denis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397 var.</td>
<td>882 idem Evêque</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>895 idem CURTISASONIEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420 var., 422 var.</td>
<td>905 idem Le Mans</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427 var. &amp;c.</td>
<td>910 idem Le Mans</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424 var.</td>
<td>907 idem Angers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>912 idem Angers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432 var.</td>
<td>1291 Odo Angers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>1291 idem Angers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 var.</td>
<td>1292 idem Angers</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 FINDS OF CAROLINGIAN COINS FROM
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Gariel Morrison

Hardy's BM Gariel Grunthal list trays
449 var. 915 Charles the Bald (?) Tours 1 1
453 var. 1255 Louis II or III Tours 3 1
461 var., 462, and 463 1295, 1297, 1298 Odo Tours 3 7
471 923 Charles the Bald (?) Blois 3 2
472 1311 idem Blois 2 1
484 var. 1309 Charles the Bald (?) Chartres 2 1
491 935 idem Orleans 12 2
515 var. 948 Odo Orleans 1
523 1323 Charles the Bald (?) Sens 1 1
577 var. 1007 idem Nevers 1 1
593 1464 Charles the Fat (?) Nevers 1 1
595 1470 Charles the Bald (?) Nantes 1 1
654 var. 1076 idem Melle 561 15
692 and 699 1063, 1064 Charles the Bald (?) Orleans 12 2
745 var. 1480 Charles the Bald (?) Clermont 6 2
749 1084 idem Bourges 17 1
766, 766 var. 1083 Charles the Bald (?) Limoges 7 1
777 var. 1201 Carlogan Limoges 119 2 and 1
779 and 784 var. 1332, 1333 Charles the Bald (?) Toulouse 1 1

821 1488 Charles the Fat (?) Losange 1 1
955 var. 1132 Charles the Bald (?) PORCOCASTELLO 1 1

To the above should be added the following coins not amenable to the classifications here adopted:

Anonymous denarius of the city of Constance

Viking imitations of denarii of Quentovic

Viking imitations of oboli of Quentovic

Viking imitations of denarii of Lambert

Blundered (Viking imitations?)

N.B. A number of coins from the hoard do not appear in the Hardy listing and seem not to have been brought to the notice of the authorities. Others absent from the Hardy listing are in the British Museum and the Asheton cabinet at Downham, though the great majority of the relevant pieces in these cabinets undoubtedly passed through Hardy's hands. Parcels from the hoard were allocated to a large number of institutions and private individuals, but unfortunately there is no complete record of these donations, let alone a listing of the pieces in question. Even the tally of public cabinets in NC 1843 can be shown to be incomplete. However, there is no reason to suppose that the material not seen by Hardy (and Hawkins) included any significant number of rarities, and the figures given above should be sufficiently accurate for most purposes.

Inventory 112: Bonser 5992, 8640, 8871, 8872, 8873, 8874, 8875, 8876, 8877, 8878, 11507, and 11590: A/S Coins, pp. 96-121; NNA, 1957/8, pp. 20 and 21: BNJ xxxix. ii (1958), pp. 240-6, &c. Hardy's manuscript listing of the hoard is in the Duchy of Lancaster archives (set of bound photostats in Dept. of Coins and Medals at British Museum).


A handful of Viking coins seem all to belong to the ninth century, while an obvious sport is a solitary Byzantine issue dated c. 615-30.

Some 130 Carolingian coins from the hoard are in the British Museum (see lists above). Parcels including one or more Carolingian coins are in the public collections at Cambridge, Glasgow, Liverpool, Oxford, Preston, St. Ives (Hunts.), Swansea, Copenhagen, Dresden, Dublin, Leningrad, Paris, and Stockholm.

Forty Carolingian coins from the hoard are illustrated on plates 5, 6, and 7 of NC 1843. In the lists above they are indicated by the symbol 9.
14. HARKIRKE, Little Crosby, Lancashire, 1611.

Deposit: c. 910.
c. 300 coins—3+ Carolingian.

Berengar I—uncertain mint. Cf. CNI v, p. 29, 18 var.

The coins of Louis the Child and of Berengar are both of Christiana Religio type.


The location of Blundell’s drawings (three versions) are as follows: (a) Crosby Hall, (b) County Record Office, Lancaster, (c) Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Engravings appear in: (a) Trans. Lanc. & Ches. Antiq. Soc. v (1887), (b) Chetham Soc. Public, n.s. xii (1887)—identical plate with foregoing. Dingley’s drawings (engraved in History from Marble, Camden Soc., 1867) appear to be purely derivative. The coins were already lost in the seventeenth century.

15. DEAN, Cumberland, before 1790.

Deposit: c. 915.
34 coins—1 Carolingian.

Lambert—uncertain mint. Cf. CNI v, p. 27, 2.
The coin is of Christiana Religio type.


Date of the English coins: all c. 915?


Span of the Kufic coins: 798–906. Bulk of the Kufic coins c. 900(?)

The Carolingian coin is illustrated by a line-engraving in 1790 GM (reproduced in 1955 BNJ note cited).

16. PORT St. MARY (BALLAQUEENY), Isle of Man, 1873/4.

Deposit: c. 960.

8+ coins—2 Carolingian.


N.B. The coin is one of a well-known type immobiliisé issue and belongs to the tenth century (cf. NC 1962 paper cited infra).

Inventory 24: Bonser —: Yn Lioar Manninagli, ii (1892/3) and iii (1897/8), pp. 50 and 279 respectively: manuscript note in Manx Museum: NNA, 1957/8, p. 30: NC 1962, p. 157–60.


N.B. The eight coins described, however, are no more than part of a much larger hoard unfortunately dispersed without proper record.

The sole Carolingian coin is now on loan to the Manx Museum, Douglas. It is illustrated photographically on p. 160 of NC 1962.

17. LOUGH LENE, Co. Westmeath, Ireland, 1843.

Deposit: c. 965.

29+ coins—2 Carolingian.

'Louis the Pious'—Melle(?). Cf. Prou 724/5: Morrison–Grunthal 403.


N.B. The identifications are to some extent intuitive, but tenth-century type immobilisé issues may perhaps be inferred with safety.


A reappraisal of this find is in preparation.

18. MACHRIE, Islay, 1850/2.

Deposit: c. 970

110+ coins—1 Carolingian.


Two Viking coins can be dated c. 920 and c. 950. A Kufic fragment, now lost, would seem to have been of compatible date.

The Carolingian coin will be illustrated in the forthcoming Edinburgh fascicle of *SCBI*, and is in the National Museum of Antiquities.


525+ coins—3 Carolingian.


The coin is of *Christiana Religio* type.


The three Viking coins can all be dated c. 940.

The three Carolingian coins are in the Grosvenor Museum, Chester. The two coins of Melle are illustrated photographically in *NC* 1962, p. 157.


13 coins—12 Carolingian.


The solitary English coin can be dated c. 940.

Five of the Carolingian coins are in the National Museum of Antiquities at Edinburgh, and will be illustrated in the forthcoming fascicle of *SCBI*.


328 coins—3 Carolingian.

sea-norti—RDCCMRCORI. Cf. Poey d’Avant, i, pl. iv, 12 (3).


Five Viking coins can be dated c. 940 (3), c. 950, and c. 953.

The three Carolingian coins, late tenth-century denarii from Normandy, are in the National Museum of Antiquities at Edinburgh. They are illustrated photographically in the *HBN* paper cited.

22. Burray, Orkney, 1889.

12+ coins—1 sub-Carolingian.


The five English coins described range in date from c. 955 to c. 997.

The Carolingian coin is in the National Museum of Antiquities, Edinburgh, and will be illustrated in the forthcoming fascicle of *SCBI*.

23. Dungarvan (Knockmaon), Co. Waterford, Ireland, 1911.

14 coins—7+ sub-Carolingian.

‘Ludovicus’—Paris. Prou —: Gariel —.

Charles the Simple(?)—Senlis(?) Cf. Poey d’Avant, i, pl. i, 14: Morrison–Grunthal 1370.

French piece of uncertain but similar types (3).


Uncertain ruler—Quentovic. Prou —: Gariel —.
Inventory —: Bonser 9245: A/S Coins, pp. 139, 162, 165, and 263, 31.

Span of the English coins: c. 960-70 [sic].
Span of the Hiberno-Norse coins: c. 995-1000.

The present whereabouts of the Carolingian coins, formerly in the Public Library and Museum at Waterford, is unfortunately unknown. They were illustrated by sketches in Journ. Waterford Arch. Soc. xv (1912), pp. 163-7.


90+ coins—8+ sub-Carolingian.

Quentovic 5
Normandy (Rouen?) 1
Strasbourg 1
Uncertain 1

late tenth-century strikings, Prou —: Gariel — &c.


Span of the extant English coins: c. 970-1000 (?) A single Viking coin can be dated c. 950, and four Hiberno-Norse coins c. 995-1000.

The eight sub-Carolingian coins are in the British Museum. One of them, that described as uncertain in the above listing, is illustrated in the second of the HBN notes cited.


860 coins—21 sub-Carolingian.

Uncertain duke—Normandy. (Rouen?) Cf. Poey d’Avant, i, pl. iv. 16.
Uncertain duke—Normandy. (Rouen?) Cf. Poey d’Avant, i, pl. vi. 2.
+19 comparable pieces now dispersed.


Two of the Normandy denarii are in the British Museum and are illustrated in the HBN note cited.

26. Uncertain Site (Northern England?), before 1835. Deposit: after 1050?

Several hundred coins—15+ sub-Carolingian.

Uncertain duke—Normandy [Rouen?] (10+). Uncertain ruler—Quentovic (5+).

No exactly comparable pieces are illustrated by Poey d’Avant, but the coins clearly belong to the eleventh century.

The English coins seem all to have been of Edward the Confessor (1042-66).

Inventory —: Bonser —: John Lindsay, Remarkable Medieval Coins, Cork, 1849, p. 4.

The 13 sub-Carolingian denarii are illustrated by indifferent line-engravings as pl. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 on pl. i of the Lindsay work cited.

INDEX OF MINTS, ETC.

| Angers       | 13 | Limoges          | 13 |
| Arras        | 13 | Mainz            | 3, 13 |
| Beauvais     | 13 | Melle            | 2, 4, 5, 9(?), 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 |
| Blois        | 13 | Metz             | 13 |
| Bourges      | 13 | Namur            | 13 |
| Bruges       | 13 | Nantes           | 13 |
| Cambrai      | 13 | Nevers           | 13 |
| Chartres     | 13 | Nievles          | 11 |
| Clermont     | 13 | Noyon            | 13 |
| Cologne     | 18, 22 | Orléans        | 13 |
| Compiègne    | 13 | Paris            | 13, 25 |
| Constance    | 13 | Pavia            | 2 |
| Evreux       | 13 | Quentovic        | 11, 13, 20, 23, 24, 26 |
| Laon         | 11, 13 | Rouen          | 11, 23, 24(?), 25(?), 26(?) |
| Le Mans      | 13 | Rome(?)         | 1, 13 |
From what has gone before it will be seen that between them these twenty-six hoards have contained rather more than 1,163 Carolingian coins, and, when single-finds are taken into account, it is safe to say that the tally of Carolingian coins found in Great Britain and Ireland is something in excess of 1,200 pieces, the great majority of them being denarii, though the oboli will be found to have an importance out of all proportion to their number. What is not without interest is to break down this basic figure of 1,163+ coins from multiple finds to reveal their distribution as regards the modern boundaries of England, Scotland, Wales, Man, and Ireland. The picture is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Found in</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but it is a picture which is misleading in the extreme where the student of early medieval England is concerned. For this student the true criterion must be whether the find-spot occurs in territory which was effectively within the jurisdiction of an English king at the time when the coins were concealed, and so there must at once be excluded from all our calculations the Viking treasures from York, Laxfield, Stamford, Cuerdale, Harkirke, Dean, and Halton Moor which between them account for at least 1,082 of the coins in question. Surely, too, there should be added to this already significant tally the eleventh-century 'unknown site' hoard with its fifteen late coins from Normandy and Quentovic, for what evidence there is suggests a hoard from the Scottish border if indeed it was...
from England at all. With this our total of Carolingian coins from truly English finds is further cut back, and now stands at a mere sixteen. Even this meagre tally may be thought to be artificially high. Three of the coins concerned are from the find at Chester, a sea-port on the very periphery of English influence, while eight come from the curiously anomalous hoard from Croydon where the Kufic coins and above all the Hacksilber argue for concealment by a Viking marauder. The Trewhiddle hoard, moreover, is from territory only very marginally English, and if this is put on one side the total of Carolingian coins found in contexts that are indisputably English, i.e. in deposits that have every appearance of having been concealed by an Englishman and of reflecting the English currency of the period, stands at precisely three. The three coins in question are from three hoards, those from the Middle Temple, Gravesend, and Dorking, which are on record as having contained English coins to the number of 1,800 at the very least. All three hoards, too, belong to one narrow chronological band, the second and third quarters of the ninth century. Even if we do not take into account the other ‘English’ hoards from the same band—and this we would surely be entitled to do—the ratio of English coins to Carolingian is 600:1, and even the inclusion of the Delgany hoard on the grounds that it is either loot or a payment from Southern England is not enough to raise the proportion of Carolingian to English coins beyond a paltry 1 in 500. We feel that there can be few numismatists today who would echo the claim that coin-hoards ‘show that a certain number of Frankish denier issues of the Emperor Charlemagne, and even papal coins, were current [sic] in the southern Kingdoms of the Heptarchy [sic]’. For us one solitary denarius of Charlemagne and a lone denarius of Pope Leo III no more suggest currency than one swallow makes a summer, and we would suggest that from the time of Offa onwards, and probably from the date of his adoption of the new penny, continental pieces were excluded from currency in Wessex, Mercia, and Kent, and perhaps East Anglia as well, with only less efficiency than that which accompanied their formal proscription in the tenth century by Æthelstan of All England and his heirs. In this connexion it may or may not be significant that the two single-finds of coins of Charlemagne which have been recorded from England south of the Thames have occurred at Southampton, a sea-port opposite France, both coins, too, being early issues of the Frankish king which probably antedate the English penny proper, while the Dorestadt denarius of Charlemagne from St. Albans likewise is an early piece not likely to have circulated beside the English issues of Offa’s last years. Nor should we overlook the circumstance that both the Charlemagne denarius from the Middle Temple and the Louis the Pious denarius from the Gravesend hoard were found quite literally within sight of the Thames, so that it may seem that the only Carolingian coin which seems really to have penetrated ninth-century England south of the Thames is the denarius of Pippin of Aquitaine, a coin singularly associated with Westfalding attacks upon southwestern France, which came to light in the Dorking hoard where the English coins numbered perhaps a thousand. It is not unfair to claim, then, that the serious student

---

1 Cf. North Munster Arch. Journ. viii. ii (1960), pp. 116-33. As there appears, geographically and chronologically this Hacksilber hoard is an ‘outlier’, as also witness the inclusion of Kufic silver coins which are not otherwise found in hoards from southern England nor, Talnotrie apart, of so early a date.


3 Inventory, p. xx where we would suggest that not enough weight is attached to the numerous finds from southern England which do not contain a single Carolingian denarius or obolus.

of Anglo-Saxon coinage will need much more evidence than has yet been adduced before he will be convinced that Carolingian coins ever were current in Wessex and Kent, let alone in Mercia and East Anglia. In conclusion we would observe that a corollary of our findings could be that coin played a negligible part in cross-Channel trade, a conclusion that we believe will be readily acceptable to many of our fellow workers in this field.
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POSTSCRIPT

Since the above was written the suggestion has been made that the obolus of Lothaire is in fact a nineteenth-century forgery, one of a series well-known to French numismatists. This judgement is based on the fact that the coin does not ‘ring’ and that the metal appears to be base. In the opinion of the writers the circumstances in which the coin was found render such a supposition untenable.
PLATE VII

COINS OF THE LONDON MINT