REVIEWS


The intellectual attraction of Old English studies lies partly in the restriction and variety of the evidence, which demand that every student should be acquainted with, if not master of, all the avenues, documentary, archaeological, stylistic, linguistic. He needs them all because he works by oblique insights and contingent probabilities. The solvent of a problem outside his specialty may lie in his hands. Accustomed to severe criticism of his own sources he will tend to be critical of those of others. Here he can still breathe the air of the "universal man"—breathe it in poverty, like Hearne, and flourish. The lack of implicit categories impedes specialization: no one can "answer political questions in purely political terms", when, at least before the tenth century, he cannot isolate them. At times the philologist, like an animated air-pump, has tried to gobble all the air, under a species of primacy, since it was largely language that held 'Anglo-Saxon England' together, but from the beginning, in the days of Camden and Cotton, the achievements of others, including numismatists, have kept language in its place and reminded him that Old English culture was receptive and not obstinately insular, and that it is dangerous to hypothesize any uniform 'Englishness' except in speech.

Anglo-Saxon England is a hard-backed annual accommodating all these insights, and many, like the reviewer, will find little of it alien and much of it distinguished by a comparable elegance, transparency, and breadth of reference. It clearly intends to be more than a 'miscellany' and generally, though not invariably, accepts the criteria for inclusion in something more than a local or specialized journal—wide relevance in geography or matter, or the opportunity to illustrate the methods or the present state of more self-bounded studies in wide purview. The numismatic articles generally satisfy one or more of these conditions, as do several others that have some bearing on coinage.

That five out of the six volumes under review contain specifically numismatic contributions testifies to the recognized place of coinage in the Old English field as a source for place-names, personal names, various metallurgical matters and, at least in the eighth century, for insular art, to say nothing of economics and, indeed, the bare structure of institutional history. This has been so ever since the time of Camden and Cotton. There may still be a few 'wise monkeys' covering their eyes and ears in the darker woods; but there is no excuse for such willful ignorance, nor for shyness, deference, and esoteric incommunication on the part of numismatists. Numismatists have no mystique not shared by other practitioners. Yet there are still traces of this unnecessary, and damaging, modesty in the longest and widest-ranging of these contributions, Mr. Lyon's 'Some problems in interpreting Anglo-Saxon coinage', in vol. 5. That our former President, unquestionably the boldest and most stimulating student of weights and standards, should admit to little knowledge of economic history, when in the Old-English field he holds almost all the cards! Imagine a pre-literary philologist addressing himself thus from his quaggy crust when he seeks to knock over a century of stillkritik and I know not what else, with a hand of three or four unintelligible runes! A touch of brashness can even be a virtue in the world of academic 'promotion' and one or two numismatists know this. Mr. Lyon is preaching to a largely converted congregation: his exposition of 'numismatic methods and their limitations' does not need quite that evangelical simplicity. Assemblages (hoards), analyses of metal, partial duplications (die-links), and the rest are commonplaces of archaeology. Coins stand out for having the best and the most of them, and numismatists are the custodians of the largest body of fine metal artefacts and of unrhetorical record-material in the whole Anglo-Saxon field. If his third section, on numismatic methods, seems somewhat naive (these methods are not merely 'like those of archaeology'; by-and-large they are those of archaeology), in the first two sections he is completely master of the application of archaeological evidence to a thinly documented historical theme seen from an economic viewpoint, and is well acquainted with the scattered literature that deserves a critical bibliography of its own. He need not be ashamed of alternatives or speculation on his part or others'; it is the identification of the problem that matters. The
most fundamental problem of the whole series, that of the relation between a fixed pound of silver and the number of coins actually struck from a possibly adjustable pound, is adumbrated in the first section, with several possible solutions to the mystery of Pippin’s pound of 264 denarii. The largest section is in the form of a ‘chronological survey’, and is brilliant: here I can only point out a few faults of omission and commission. To begin, how often must I repeat that the ‘Provençal light coinage’, beginning c. 575, is an original, not an imitative coinage? It is the ancestor of all subsequent western coinage, and its solidi do not weigh ‘c. 3.9 g.;’ they weigh precisely 3.86 g., with a deviation of under 1 per cent and are perhaps the most accurate hammered coins of all time. The pre-Crondall English ‘mintings of a special nature’ are represented by one Frankish-looking piece of Canterbury and possibly the odd mock-solidus; that is all. London was not ‘temporarily lost to Egbert’ (implying union with Wessex); he became king of the Mercians, as far north as Dore, near Sheffield, and his hereditary claim may have been as good as any; but for unknown political or military reasons he resigned it to Wiglaf. The large and well-used coinage of Eadbert is surely the last and more narrowly numismatic advocacy and obscure marginal reservations. This might seem a matter for prudence for two ‘Hand’ varieties, and thereby the defending, in vol. 2, the strictest sexennial periodization by the use of mint-names at two or three towns, all on the frontier. Domesday shillings may imply twelve pence, but certain church dues in Domesday Monachorum only make sense with a six-penny shilling. ‘South-east England’ is too vague a location for the Switmen (‘Witen’) coinage or for any purpose. Kent was an eastern kingdom.

Professor Dolley, on the other hand, has the utmost courage of his convictions in every detail, defending, in vol. 2, the strictest sexennial periodicity for two ‘Hand’ varieties, and thereby the ‘Crux’, of Aethelred, against those who still hold marginal reservations. This might seem a matter for more narrowly numismatic advocacy and obscure the fact that everybody gratefully accepts his general thesis and a chronology as tight as that which we have for Henry III and his three successors. On Plegmund and Edward the Elder in vol. 3 he is simply pointing out the numismatist’s satisfaction with Dr. O’Donovan’s vindication, in vol. 1, of the Archbishop’s well-chronicled death in 923 against the ‘traditional’ date (in fact a modern antiquarian speculation) of 914. Perhaps the same question, whether or not it is in place in Anglo-Saxon England, might be asked about Veronica Smart’s corrections to Hildebrand’s register of moneyers (vol. 4). The reason seems to be the almost biblical devotion, particularly in Scandinavia and among onomastists, to this great, but now antiquated, work. David Hinton’s assessment of ‘late’ Anglo-Saxon metalwork in the same volume is inconclusive and only mentioned for its strange distribution-map of ‘sceattas’, Offa’s pennies and other things ascribed to the eighth century, which is ‘middle’ rather than ‘late’ Saxon anyway. It proves nothing and does not even show the excavated sites (Whitby, St. Augustines), which have produced coins and pins, etc. Dr. Hunter on ‘Antiquity and sense of the past in Anglo-Saxon England’ (vol. 3) is stimulating and uses numismatic material but does not face the fact that the precedents sought and followed by the Saxons and Franks were those of the Christian Dominate of Constantine, not the generalized and idealized Antiquity of the Renaissance and Neo-Classicism. Finally, in vol. 6, is a review-article on the first part of the massive, if belated, publication of Sutton Hoo. Dr. Metcalf covers the discussions of the supremely significant numismatic material on which opinions have swung widely in the thirty years since discovery. It is an exemplar of a proto-historic situation, where judgement must not be hurried, nor delayed by parsi pris.

I have confined myself to the more obviously numismatic subjects, but no student of Old English coinage can neglect this vehicle. He should neglect no part of it, for an unexpected insight may emerge from any subject.

S. E. R.


DR. MALMER explains in a preface that the idea of publishing the coins from the Viking Age found in Sweden goes back to the seventeenth century, but that the credit for establishing their systematic recording belongs to the nineteenth-century scholars Bror Emil Hildebrand and Carl Johan Tornberg. More than 150,000 coins, most of them Arabic, German, or English, have been preserved in Swedish public collections, thanks to the law of treasure trove which requires all coins found in Sweden to be offered to the State for redemption. They have, of course, long been studied in situ by
numismatists and historians interested in the period, and a general evaluation of their evidence for the flow of silver into Scandinavia, first from the Arabic lands and then from Germany and England, can be found in P. H. Sawyer, *The Age of the Vikings* (2nd edn., London, 1971).

It was the late Dr. Rasmusson, Keeper of the Royal Coin Cabinet in Stockholm, together with the late Professor Sture Bolin of Lund and Professor Walter Hävernick of Hamburg, who primarily inspired the ambitious project which is now bearing visible fruit. It dates back to the early 1950s, when scholars from outside Sweden were offered financial assistance to study the German and English coins, the Arabic coins having been worked on since the late 1930s by the Swedish numismatist Ulla S. Linder Welin. The task of classifying the Scandinavian and Byzantine coins in the hoards was given to Dr. Malher (herself now keeper of the Royal Coin Cabinet), and so the coverage of the material was complete.

The formidable nature of the project can be seen from these two volumes. With 538 pages of text and 79 plates between them, they nevertheless cover only 15 out of nearly 100 parishes on the island of Gotland alone. Fifty-nine finds are included, varying from single coins to hoards of over 2,000. The clarity of presentation of the material is exemplary. There is a map of each parish on a scale of 1:20,000 to enable the exact find-spots to be identified. General information about each find includes details of the discovery, a summary of the contents (distinguishing between coins that can be traced and those that have been dispersed), and the total weight of the find, estimated where necessary. In the detailed listings the weight of each traced coin is given, together with the diameter (except for English and Irish coins), die-axis (except for German coins), shape (if a fragment), number of peck-marks (or the existence of nicks or notches in the case of Oriental coins) and, by means of symbols, the presence of cracks, holes, mounts, etc.

The English and Irish coins have been listed by and under the guidance of Michael Dolley, to whom Anglo-Saxon historians and numismatists are greatly indebted for the spirited lead he has continuously given since the project began. The coins are classified in accordance with the nomenclature and sequence of types which is largely associated with Professor Dolley and is now generally adopted by students of the series. It is said to see how much of the Anglo-Saxon content of nineteenth-century hoards has been dispersed without having been properly recorded, but fortunately the hoards from the present century have generally been fully retained.

The illustrations, especially in the second volume, are dominated by Oriental coins, only about 120 English coins and their derivatives being illustrated in the first volume and about 60 in the second. Unfortunately the plates, prepared from direct photographs and printed on glossy paper, are not up to the standard of the text and are far from ideal if one wants to use them for checking for die-links elsewhere.

In the first volume three hoards with a significant representation of Anglo-Saxon coins are recorded, but in the second volume there is only one. From the 1918 Snovalds find from Alskog parish (SHM 16181) there are 57 English coins from Æthelred First Half to William I Profile-Cross Fleury in a total of 1,101; the 1952 Gandarve find from Alva parish (G1C 9851) contained 212 English coins from First Hand to Edward the Conqueror Trifolium Quadrilateral in a total of 693; the 1893 Myrânde find from Altingbo parish (SHM 9392/3) included 510 English coins from Æthelred Reform to Cnut Pointed Helmet in a total of 1,826, but 191 or thereabouts have since been sold or exchanged.

More interesting at first sight than any of these is the 1928 Digerâken find from Barlingbo parish (SHM 18744) which amounted to 1,323 coins in all. This hoard appears to be completely intact, and the 357 (not 358) English coins listed can be summarized as follows:


Among the Second Hand coins is one of classic style by a moneyer Thurmod who seems to be otherwise unknown for any mint in this reign. It bears the mint-signature of York, hitherto unknown for the type, and it weighs 1.35 g. It should be a talking point for some time to come, and one wonders why it has not been noticed previously. The same applies to the four Second Hand Cross mules, which are recorded as including three from the same obverse die. Two are from a common reverse die of Edward of London, and the third is by Sidwine of Rochester. A die-link between mints is curious, to say the least, where mules are involved. Ryan had another mule by Sidwine of Rochester from the same obverse die but a different reverse
C.R. and crinkled writer's collection together with a heavily pecked and reverse (lot 816). This latter coin is now in the coins have 90° or 270°, Benediction Hand coins. All 3 pared with 1 each of 0° and 180° and 2 irregular out that, of the 24 Second Hand/Crux mules have 0° or 180°. These figures do not look random, but no obvious bias can be seen in the Second Hand elements of the hoard. It seemed worth checking the results against the Copenhagen Sylloge, and it quickly emerged that of 65 Second Hand coins listed there, 58 had a die-axis of 90° or 270°. The dies for this type are generally thought to have been cut by a single hand (with one or two obvious exceptions such as Lytelman of Ipswich) and one is forced to the conclusion that they must have been so constructed that only two out of the four axes could be used by the moneyer. The same hand seems to have been responsible for the second phase of First Hand die-cutting in southern England, where the letters are large, the ethnic ends with a saltire X rather than the small curved x of the first phase, and the coins are generally lighter. When the die-axes are examined, 28 out of 33 identifiable coins of this Southern 2 style in the Copenhagen Sylloge prove to have an axis of 90° or 270°. No bias can be detected in coins from dies of the first phase, nor from those of northern or eastern style. There is no clear evidence of bias, either, in the 6 Benediction Hand coins in Copenhagen.

A review is not the place to explore this phenomenon in greater depth, although it is clear that it cannot be attributed to random error. The problem has been laid out as an example of the avenues of research that will surely open up as further volumes appear. More particularly one looks forward to comparing and contrasting the composition of different hoards, with a view to determining whether supplies of coins reaching Scandinavia generally became well mixed with a homogeneous stock of circulating coins, or whether money tended to be hoarded in such a way that different owners would hold their wealth in substantially different combinations of the various issues. For example, the English coins in Digerakra end with a small number of heavy Long Cross pence, most of them unpecked, and one is reminded of some of the Danish hoards—reproduced in the Copenhagen Sylloge—which visibly preserve parcels of such coins in pristine unpecked condition for many years after they were struck.

Yet there are severe limitations to such armchair research. The form of publication chosen for the Swedish hoards is a corpus, not a sylloge. One can tell for each coin the reign, type, mint, moneyer, and the Hildebrand number which reproduces the obverse and reverse inscriptions; where there is no correspondence of inscriptions with a coin in Hildebrand's catalogue we are told what the departures are, and if there is no close equivalent the coin is illustrated. But it was clearly impractical to check systematically for die-links (though some are noted) or to record subjective die-cutting styles, still less to illustrate every coin. Nevertheless long lists of weights, die-axes, peck-marks, etc. are of limited value if the emerging statistical patterns cannot be subjected to the critical interpretation of the human eye. The volumes in this series will make it easier to prepare for visits to Sweden, but will never be a substitute for them. Stockholm will long remain the Mecca of the serious student of the coinage of the Viking age.

C.S.S.L.

SCBI 23 Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, Part III. Coins of Henry VII. By D. M. Metcalf (1976). This Sylloge lists 971 coins of the reign of Henry VII, of which 84 are gold and 887 are silver, no less than 332 being provincial issues of the mints of Canterbury, York, and Durham. As many as 583 pieces are from the E. J. Winstanley collection, purchased and given to the Ashmolean Museum in 1963 by Mr. Herbert Schneider; a further 138 pieces were purchased from the H. M. Lingford collection, made available in 1972 when it was learned that the Ashmolean Museum collection was to be published. Although the terms of the Schneider gift did not allow for the retention of duplicates, there are duplicates listed, e.g. such rare pieces as the sovereigns of type IV, nos. 79–80 and type V, nos. 81-2 and shillings, nos. 759–760, where a university college rather than the University museum is the owner.

Much preliminary work on the coins had been done by Mr. J. D. A. Thompson, who died suddenly in 1970, and Dr. D. M. Metcalf took over the task of publication. Separately listed are the gold coins—angels, angelets, and sovereigns respectively, and the silver coins—open crown, arched crown, and profile portrait issues, the provincial mints of Canterbury, York, and Durham being grouped within these headings. Classification is based on the researches of E. J. Winstanley and W. J. W. Potter, published in BNJ xxx–xxxii, to
which the reader must refer if he is to understand the enumeration of the lettering, cross-ends and so on, and it is in this respect that one major criticism can be made. That Potter and Winstanley's analysis is 'lengthy and cannot be safely condensed' is not much use to the reader who has not the three volumes of BNJ available, so that he may understand what Dr. Metcalf is saying. Potter, and one does not think of Winstanley in this regard, was never explicit when numbering issues, dies, etc., and a summary, perhaps tabular as in J. J. North's 'English Hammered Coinage', would not only have made this volume more complete in itself but doubtless would have made Potter and Winstanley that much easier to use and understand. Also, the mint marks are not given (as subheadings) for the half-groats and smaller denominations: reference to the plates is not always helpful so the reader must refer back to Potter and Winstanley or elsewhere.

Having placed the coins in sequence, Dr. Metcalf tries to fit them into the history of the reign, or rather the history of the workings of the mint(s), as the hoard evidence for this period is meagre. The arguments as to the strict dating of specific issues—such as sequence of the first two issues of sovereign, the date of the introduction of the profile coinism can be made. That Potter and Winstanley's analysis is 'lengthy and cannot be safely condensed' is not much use to the reader who has not the three volumes of BNJ available, so that he may understand what Dr. Metcalf is saying. Potter, and one does not think of Winstanley in this regard, was never explicit when numbering issues, dies, etc., and a summary, perhaps tabular as in J. J. North's 'English Hammered Coinage', would not only have made this volume more complete in itself but doubtless would have made Potter and Winstanley that much easier to use and understand. Also, the mint marks are not given (as subheadings) for the half-groats and smaller denominations: reference to the plates is not always helpful so the reader must refer back to Potter and Winstanley or elsewhere.

Having placed the coins in sequence, Dr. Metcalf tries to fit them into the history of the reign, or rather the history of the workings of the mint(s), as the hoard evidence for this period is meagre. The arguments as to the strict dating of specific issues—such as sequence of the first two issues of sovereign, the date of the introduction of the profile great, and whether it was, in fact, the work of Alexander Bruchsal—are fairly presented and amply supported by references to other works on coins of the reign. It is difficult, if not impossible, not to agree with the initial paragraph of the Summary—'The absolute chronology within the reign, that is to say the precise dating of each of these many varieties, rests upon a complex set of assumptions, which have been explained as carefully as possible in the preceding pages'. The Summary itself is a chronological list of events relative to the coinage into which the issues of coins, or rather their mint marks, are slotted in a most concise and convenient manner.

The fifty-three collotype plates are of a high standard, reflecting the quality of the plaster casts and the Select Bibliography will be a most useful easy reference to students of the period.

P.D.M.


The Royal Society's edition of the correspondence of Sir Isaac Newton, now completed in seven volumes, is both a comprehensive record of Newton's life, scientific interests, business affairs, and friendships, and a central source of information for the history of the Mint during the years Newton held office there, first as Warden (April 1696-February 1700) and then as Master (1700 to death). The last four volumes of the Royal Society's edition cover the period when Newton was at the Mint, and it is only with them that students of the British coinage are concerned. Volume iv, published in 1967, was edited by the late Dr. J. F. Scott, the later volumes by A. Rupert Hall and Laura Tilling, and it is a necessary preliminary to a discussion of their contents to say that Dr. Scott printed documentation on Newton's administration of the Mint only when it shed light on Newton himself or was of intrinsic importance, while the editors of the later volumes state in their preface to volume v (p. xiv) that 'we have omitted no part of the Mint business that was conducted by letter or memorandum, even though a good deal of it is of a more or less routine character', and they therefore print practically all extant documentation of this kind for the years 1709-27 which volumes v-vii cover. An appendix to volume vii prints some of the documentation for the years 1696-1709 passed over by Dr. Scott and summarizes other documentation, but there is still an imbalance between the coverage of Mint business before 1709 and the coverage of Mint business afterwards which makes it difficult, for example, to use the volumes as evidence for the comparative weight of business falling on the Mint up to 1709 and after 1709.

The editors have not themselves been specialists on coinage matters, and it is inevitable that numismatists will see some subjects in sharper focus than is offered by the editorial annotation of particular documents. At a different level, the editors, rightly within their terms of reference, never essay an over-all view of the extant materials on Mint administration for this thirty year period. Consequently the objectives of the present reviewer are twofold: to put on record a number of corrections on points of detail, and to offer a very brief sketch of the documentation as a whole. The corrections will be found together at the end of this review.

The character of the material printed in these volumes is shaped overwhelmingly by the nature of the two major surviving sources for the history of the Mint in Newton's time: the correspondence between the Mint and the Treasury, recorded on the Mint's side in the earliest surviving Mint Record Books and also recorded among the Treasury's archives; and Newton's own official papers, taken
over by his successor at the Mint (and niece’s husband), John Conduitt, and now preserved in the Public Record Office. The correspondence between the Mint and the Treasury is ample, almost completely preserved, and extends over the whole period, but the bulk of it is correspondence between the Treasury and the Principal Officers of the Mint (Warden, Master, and Comptroller acting as a body) and not correspondence between the Treasury and Newton independently as Warden, or, later, Master, and that has consequences for the presentation of it in these volumes: first, the Treasury’s side of the correspondence is often merely summarized by the editors, as not being addressed to Newton personally; second, the Mint’s side of the correspondence is not printed where Newton is not specifically involved as signatory or draughtsman of the letter or memorandum; third, the editors are inclined to pass over the final versions of letters as transcribed in the Mint Record Books or among the Treasury’s archives, in favour of autograph drafts by Newton where these survive, even where the drafts were emended before being sent or were not the basis of letters actually sent.

The collection of Newton’s papers that survives also requires explanation. It is in no sense a comprehensive archive of papers and documents relating to Newton’s years at the Mint, for Newton was not an orderly preserver of archive material. Nor is it a fair cross-section of the papers relating to Mint business that passed through Newton’s hands, for it is fuller on his earlier years at the Mint than on his later years (and not merely because more business was transacted in the earlier years), and it is also concerned more with the Mint’s external business—relations with the Treasury, with the officials of the Edinburgh mint, and with other government departments—than with the day-to-day management of the Mint. Newton’s own attitude to documentation is partly to blame, for he was casual with his papers and he no doubt jettisoned many routine items; but some of the blame must almost certainly be ascribed to Conduitt, who as Newton’s executor would have needed to abstract and file elsewhere any papers that related to Newton’s finances (his finances as Master of the Mint as well as his personal finances), and as Newton’s successor in the post of Master no doubt abstracted and kept elsewhere any papers and documents that he needed for his own management of the Mint.

The result is that the Newton papers are distinctly uninformative on internal Mint routine and on Newton’s relationship with the three senior Mint officials who carried the brunt of Mint business during his years at the Mint: Dr. J. F. Fauquier, Deputy Master c. 1697-1726; Hopton Haynes, Weigher and Teller 1701-23 and Assay Master 1723-49; and Thomas Hall, Chief Clerk (or King’s Clerk) 1682-1718 and Clerk of the Papers concurrently 1684-1718. The absence of material relating to Fauquier and Hall is the more unfortunate since both men were persons of substance outside the Mint; Fauquier a director of the Bank of England and Hallholder of a succession of senior posts in the Excise Office, Customs Office, and Salt Office, and as both were evidently trusted by Newton on a personal level as well as Mint colleagues.

In addition to these two major groups of material there is a scatter of relevant correspondence, memoranda, and the like which the editors have unearthed from a wide variety of other sources. The surviving Mint Record Books are not particularly helpful except for the Mint’s relations with the Treasury, since at this time it was only obligatory on the Mint’s Chief Clerk (King’s Clerk) to register the papers which pass between the Treasury and the Mint—the phraseology is that used by Newton in a memorandum of early 1697 (vol. iv, no. 565)—and Mint business ‘below stairs’ was either not formally recorded or recorded in another series of books that does not survive. The archives of other Government departments provide a small number of items; and some documents have been preserved because of their interest to autograph collectors, e.g., two orders by Newton directing the Provost and Company of Moneyers to change the edge lettering on the larger gold and silver denominations, which are now, without apparent provenance, in the Burndy Library in New York. The assiduity with which the editors have searched for items of Mint interest cannot easily be judged, but a few items which this reviewer thought at first had been omitted are referred to in editorial notes and one or two others have been omitted because they do not fall within the editors’ definition of ‘correspondence’. There is no reason to think that any document of real moment has been overlooked.

The list of corrections that follows gives priority to corrections on points of dating and to corrections affecting the identity of those by whom letters were sent or to whom letters were addressed. The list is by no means comprehensive and numismatists should approach each letter and the editorial annotation of it carefully; the biographical information, for example, provided by the editors on Mint personnel named in the correspondence, is sometimes wrong and sometimes inadequate.
The single most important area of editorial confusion is in their identification of the parties between whom correspondence passes. Where correspondence is signed by the three Principal Officers of the Mint the editors rightly caption the letter as being written by ‘Mint’ to whatever body or person it is directed. Where correspondence is signed by the Warden of the Mint and one only of his colleagues the editors usually caption the letter as being written by ‘Newton and X’ or by ‘X and Newton’, when they should in fact caption the letter as written by ‘Mint’, for the Warden and one of his colleagues formed a quorum of the three officers (see Newton’s memorandum of 1697 already cited). Where the correspondence is signed by the Master and Comptroller only, it is not technically the correspondence of the Mint, since there could not be a quorum of the Principal Officers in the Warden’s absence, and here it is properly captioned as written by ‘Newton and X’. Where, finally, correspondence is signed by Newton only or is not signed but is written in Newton’s hand or is evidenced by a draft in Newton’s hand, it may be Newton’s private correspondence, or it may be official correspondence in relation to matters which fell solely within the province of Newton as Warden (e.g. prosecution of coiners) or as Master (e.g. provision of coronation medals), in which cases it is correctly captioned within the editors’ conventions, as written by ‘Newton’. Often though such correspondence is ‘Mint’ correspondence which for one reason or another does not carry his colleagues’ signatures but is not Newton’s own correspondence—‘Mint’ correspondence which only exists in office copies or in draft obviously would not carry such signatures—and the editors are often in error in captioning these letters as written by ‘Newton’ where they should be captioned ‘Mint’.

The point is by no means technical, since letters to be sent in the name of the Principal Officers (collectively known as the Mint Board) were intended to express a collective view, even if wholly composed by Newton, and in drafting them Newton must have had different constraints to those which governed his own correspondence.

Corrections and notes to Newton Correspondence
The letters of Mint interest begin at letter 544 (of 14 March 1695/6) and conclude in the chronological series with letter 1498 (of 4 February 1726/7). There are a few more among a section of undated letters with numbers from 1500 to 1553, and a rather larger number in a section of additional letters. The numbers of the letters where corrections or comments are required are given here consecutively, but with the additional letters—their numbers are prefixed by the letter X—inserted in their relative chronological position rather than grouped together at the end.

542. (Halley to Newton, undated.) Dr. Scott suggests the date 1695/6, but the letter contains a reference by Halley to ‘the other matter of serving you as your Deputy’, which must place it after Newton had received the offer of the post of Warden of the Mint (19 March 1695/6); and it also contains a reference to Halley waiting on Newton ‘at your lodgings’, which presumably places it after Newton had moved from his college rooms in Cambridge to lodgings in London. Halley was eventually appointed Deputy Comptroller (not Deputy Warden) of the Chester Mint, and the letter most probably belongs to May or June 1696 when the appointment of Deputies at the provincial mints was in process.

553. (Newton to Treasury, undated.) Dated by the editors July/August 1696, but it presumably dates after 18 August 1696, since George Macey, described in it as ‘late Clerk’ to the Warden, was still Warden’s Clerk on that date. It is a draft only and it is not very likely that it is the basis of a letter actually sent.

558. This is a note made by Benjamin Overton, Warden of the Mint from February 1689/90 to March 1695/6, of his expenses for the year 1690/1, on which Newton has written a two-line memorandum of his own. It should not have been printed in Newton’s correspondence, and the editorial caption ‘Newton to the Treasury (2)’, 1696 is quite wrong.

560. This is captioned ‘Newton to the Treasury’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

572. (Noah Neale to Newton, 15 August 1697.) The writer was Noah Neale (1647–1734), of Stamford Baron, Northants.

579. (Manuscript by Newton, undated.) Dated 1697 by Dr. Scott but Newton refers in it to ‘this winter’, so it belongs to the winter of 1697/8 and may belong early in 1698.

609. (Mint to Treasury, 8 April 1699.) The petition to which this refers was one from James Hoare’s daughter and executrix Lady Ashfield for remuneration for her father’s services during the recoinage; not, as Dr. Scott states, a petition on behalf of Hoare’s grandson.

612. This is captioned ‘Newton and Neale to the Treasury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Newton and Neale forming a quorum of the Mint Board.
X616. (Fowle to Newton, undated.) The editors print a grossly inadequate summary of what is quite an interesting letter about Newton's predecessors in the post of Warden. It should be noted that 'the Earl of Denby' is a misprint for 'the Earl of Danby'; that Danby was never Warden, and is not referred to as Warden in Fowle's letter; that the letter does not by any means say, as the summary does, that all Newton's predecessors 'treated the post more or less as a sinecure'; that it does not say, as the summary says, that Fowle himself 'has now been arrested'; and that it is not, as the summary states, 'a petition' by Fowle. The editors date it 1699 but although it must be later than James Hoare's death on 30 November 1696, a date early in Newton's Wardenship, e.g. early 1697, seems likely.

619. (Stacy to Newton, undated.) This letter was dated by Dr. Scott 1699, as it carries the implication that Newton was a J.P. for Middlesex, which he certainly was when Warden; but it is addressed to 'Sr Isaac Newton Knt', which should place it after 16 April 1705, when Newton was knighted, and it seems perfectly possible that Newton was still a J.P. for Middlesex in and after 1705.

X619.2. This is captioned 'Newton to the Treasury', but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

X626.2. (Mint to Treasury, 25 May 1700.) This relates to Robert Weddell's expenses in prosecuting a counterfeiter; 'Thomas' Weddell is a mistake by the editors. They make the same mistake in letters X633.1, X633.2, and X651, and in the index to volume vii.

X630.2. This is captioned 'Newton and Stanley to the Treasury', but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Stanley and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

X631. This is captioned 'Newton to the Treasury', but it is an unsigned copy of a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

X631.1. This is captioned 'Newton and Stanley to the Treasury', but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Stanley and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

X631.2. This is captioned 'Newton to the Treasury', but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

632. (Kemp to Newton, 15 Feb. 1700/1.) Dr. Scott states that this was a letter about the trial of a counterfeiter and that it should have been addressed not to Newton but to the then Warden Sir John Stanley; but there is nothing in the letter itself to show that the trial was for counterfeiting, and it may be relevant that Thomas Kemp, who wrote the letter, was Quartermaster of the Tower as well as a moneymaster of the Mint.

X633.2. This is captioned 'Newton and Stanley to the Treasury', but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Stanley and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

X633.6. This is captioned 'Newton and Stanley to the Treasury', but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Stanley and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

643. This is captioned 'Newton to the Treasury', but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

X650.1. This is captioned 'Newton to Godolphin', but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin (Lord High Treasurer).

654. This is captioned 'Newton to ?Lowndes'—Lowndes was Secretary to the Treasury—but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint, and probably for a letter not to Lowndes but to an official in the War Office. The editors of volume vii record Sir John Craig's opinion that the letter was written in 1717, and not in late 1702 as supposed by Dr. Scott, and it is clear at any rate that the letter was written in or after 1714, for it refers to William III in the past tense and also to 'His Majesty' (sc. George I) now reigning.

656. This is captioned 'Newton to Godolphin', but it is a draft by Newton for a letter to Godolphin.

657. This is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin, and is correctly captioned 'Mint to Godolphin' by Dr. Scott. In fact the letter as sent survives among the Treasury archives, and was signed by Newton alone; but since he drafted it as a letter from the Mint it should be classed as such.

666. This is captioned 'Newton to Godolphin', but it is a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

725. This is captioned 'Newton to Godolphin', but as it is signed by Newton and the Comptroller (John Ellis) alone, its status is uncertain.

726.3. This is an undated draft for a letter from Newton was prone to composing drafts and the Edinburgh mint. The editors suggest the date 'summer 1707' and that the peer is Lord Seafield, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, but say that a date
in 1708 is also possible. This reviewer would like to suggest that it is a draft of a reply to letter 759 below, a letter dated 10 August 1709 sent to Newton by Lord Lauderdale, General of the Edinburgh mint. Letter 763 below is a rather different draft of a reply to Lauderdale’s letter, but Newton was prone to composing drafts and the existence of letter 763 is itself no obstacle to this interpretation of letter X726.3.

729. This is captioned ‘Newton to Godolphin’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

731. (Newton to Gregory, undated.) Dr. Scott rightly suggests that this is a draft of Newton’s reply to letter 727; the editors of volume vii are wrong to raise the possibility that it is a draft of his reply to letter X727.4.

X736. This is captioned ‘Newton to Godolphin’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

740. This is captioned ‘Newton to Godolphin’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

741. This is captioned ‘Newton to Godolphin’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

X744.2. This is captioned ‘Newton to Godolphin’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Godolphin.

754. This is printed again below as letter 964, Newton to Hercules Scott, 28 January 1712/13, and is not, as Dr. Scott suggests, a draft of a letter from Newton to Allardes of April/May 1709.

756. An undated draft of a letter from Newton to an unnamed peer connected with the Edinburgh mint. Dr. Scott captions it ‘Newton to Seafield’, which may well be correct (cf. letter 757), and states that it is given the date 1 June 1709 in the Mint Record Books; that may be a correct statement also, but the date must be wrong, for the letter was not written until after 10 August 1709, when the Mint made a report, mentioned in the letter, on a petition by the moneyers who had been at Edinburgh during the reminting of 1707-9. A date in August or September 1709, rather than June, is also supported by a phrase in the letter about Godolphin being absent from London ‘during this vacation’.

804. This is captioned ‘Newton and Ellis to the Treasury’, which is technically correct. However, the Warden was away from London at the time—this is explicitly stated in letter 806—and the letter is effectively from the Mint to the Treasury.

806. This is captioned ‘Newton and Ellis to Henry St. John’, but the letter says that Newton and Ellis are answering a letter addressed to the Officers of the Mint in the Warden’s absence.

808. This again is captioned ‘Newton and Ellis to the Treasury’, but it is effectively from the Mint to the Treasury.

852. This is captioned ‘Newton to Oxford’, which is correct (cf. Newton’s memorandum of c. 28 July 1711, letter 861), but it was drafted in a form which his colleagues could also have signed and Newton’s memorandum suggests that they deliberately omitted to do so.

867. This is captioned ‘Newton and Peyton to Oxford’, but it is a letter from the Mint to Oxford, Peyton and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

990. This is captioned ‘Newton to Oxford’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from Newton and Edward Philpiss (Comptroller) to the Treasury. As the letter related to a matter specifically referred by the Treasury to Newton and Philpiss, the Warden’s signature was not necessary.

996A. This is captioned ‘Newton to Oxford’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Oxford.

X1006. (Fauquier to Newton, undated.) The editors date this ?July 1713, but the only dating indications in the letter are that gold was shortly to be melted and that the melter at the time was named Cartlitch. As gold was coined every year from 1705 until Newton’s death and John Cartlitch was melter from at least 1707 to his death on 30 September 1726, eight days after Fauquier, the letter could belong anywhere within a twenty-year period.

1030. This is captioned ‘Newton to Oxford’, but it is a draft by Newton for a letter from the Mint to Oxford.

1035. This is captioned ‘Newton and Peyton to Oxford’, but it is a letter from the Mint to Oxford. Peyton and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

1085. This is captioned ‘Newton to Oxford’, despite the fact that it is actually signed by Newton and Philpiss, it is not signed by Peyton but is effectively a letter from the Mint to Oxford.

1098. This is captioned ‘Newton and Peyton to Shrewsbury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to Shrewsbury, Peyton and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.
to an unnamed person connected with the administration of Scotland. The editors make the tentative suggestion that the intended recipient was Lord Lauderdale (see note on letter X726.3 above), but this cannot be right, for the letter starts with the word ‘Sir’, i.e. is addressed to a commoner, and Newton’s correspondent was also evidently a member of the House of Commons. Perhaps he was Sir David Dalrymple, Lord Advocate.

1250. This is captioned ‘Newton and Sandford to the Treasury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Sandford and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

1251. This is captioned ‘Newton and Sandford to the Treasury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Sandford and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

1253. This is captioned ‘Newton to the Treasury’, but it is a draft for a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

1273. This is captioned ‘Charles Stanhope to Newton’, but it begins ‘Gent’ (i.e. Gentlemen) and is obviously a letter to the Mint Board.

1278. This is captioned ‘Newton and Sandford to the Treasury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Sandford and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

1308. (Charles Godolphin to Newton, 17 December 1718.) Charles Godolphin—he was not ‘Sir Charles Godolphin’ as the editors believe—was a brother of Lord Treasurer Godolphin and an old friend of Thomas Hall, the Mint’s Chief Clerk. His letter expresses dissatisfaction at the unwillingness of Hall’s executors, who were Newton himself, Hopton Haynes, Richard Walker (Hall’s clerk and deputy at the Mint), and Revd. George Martin, a London clergyman, to release capital from Hall’s substantial fortune to Hall’s son on his forthcoming marriage, despite the fact that Hall’s will instructed his executors to act in concert with the Godolphin family, who favoured the match. The behaviour of Newton and his fellow executors seems to have been perfectly proper, all the more so because—and this the editors have not noticed—the younger Hall’s bride-to-be seems to have been Frances Quicke, Charles Godolphin’s great-niece, which would give the Godolphins a pocket interest in the wedding.

1312. This is captioned ‘Thompson and Newton to the Treasury’, but it is a letter from the Mint to the Treasury, Thompson and Newton forming a quorum of the Mint Board.

1433. This is captioned ‘The Treasury to the Mint’, but it is a letter from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury jointly addressed to Newton, to the Secretary of the Privy Council of Ireland, and to the Secretary of the Treasury (see letter 1434).

1446. This is captioned ‘Newton to the Treasury’, but although it is signed by Newton alone it was drafted by him as a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

1483. This is captioned ‘Newton to the Treasury’, but this is a draft by Newton of a letter from the Mint to the Treasury.

1495. This is captioned ‘Newton to the King’, but this is a draft by Newton of a letter from the Mint to the King.

1496. (Haynes to Newton, 6 September 1726.) The second paragraph of the letter as printed refers to a ‘Mr. Whitaire’, but the reading should probably be ‘Mr. Whitacre’, for a James Whitaker was Haynes’s clerk and fireman in the Assay Office from some point in the 1720s until his death from rabies in December 1732. At the end of the paragraph the editors do not annotate ‘Mr. Vanderesh’; but this was Henry Vander Esch (c. 1691-1768), Deputy Master of the Mint c. 1727–62. The letter constitutes the only direct evidence that Vander Esch held a post at the Mint before Newton’s death.

H. E. P.
although their page layout is at times rather cramped. It is encouraging to find that a purely scientific exposition, such as Dr. D. M. Metcalf's description of experiments to assess the quality of Scottish sterling silver between 1135 and 1280, can be eminently understandable. Even in an area in which currency and economic policy intertwine closely, clear presentation carries the day. Dr. C. E. Challis contributes 'Debasement: the Scottish experience in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries' and succeeded in disentangling for the present reviewer, who has no claims to be an economic historian, the differences between debasement and currency depreciation. He reminds us that, 'the rot set in during the reign of Mary, but it was in that of her son, James VI, that most damage was done'; a judgment which has yet to be fully appreciated by general historians of later sixteenth-century Scotland. Numismatic and administrative complexities seem rather to outweigh the unappreciated by general historians of later sixteenth-century Scotland. Numismatic and administrative complexities seem rather to outweigh the undoubtedly knowledgeable account which Mrs. Joan E. L. Murray provides of the organization and work of the mint between 1358 and 1603. Her study of the famous and controversial 'black money' of James III tackles a formidable set of problems and tentatively identifies the condemned currency as 'Crux Pellit' 3d. pieces. But the argument here is rather at the level where a historian has to take the numismatic conclusions on trust.

It is natural that for the earlier Middle Ages documentary evidence on coinage should be very thin indeed and here the nervous historian might well expect to find himself awash in a sea of numismatic jargon. But it is not so in the present volume. Dr. Metcalf presents a lucid exposition of the evidence of Scottish coin-hoards for monetary history from 1100 onwards and not only dispenses sound warnings about the pitfalls of interpreting hoard evidence, but also prints a valuable annotated bibliography of known hoards which will be a solid basis for future studies. Mr. N. J. Mayhew offers a broadly based study of 'Money in Scotland in the thirteenth century' which seems to the present reviewer to offer some of the most exciting conclusions to emerge in the volume. In assessing the numismatic evidence for the alleged 'Golden Age' of Alexanders II and III, he concludes that the growth of coinage in the course of the century was eight- or even ten-fold. Making calculations of money supply in relation to the (admittedly speculative) estimates of population, he suggests that if every Scotsman then had 2s. 7d. in his pocket, every Englishman had 3s. 4d. and points out that 'Scotland was by no means as poverty-stricken as has sometimes been suggested'. He wisely also indicates some necessary qualifications to this rosy picture, but even so the historian of thirteenth-century Scotland must be grateful for illumination on an ill-documented era. One of the bases of Mr. Mayhew's study is the fundamental work of Mr. Ian Stewart on the volume of early coinage, calculable from die-analyses. A fuller version of this article is promised for future publication.

Two further articles complete the volume. Mr. S. E. Rigold's brief commentary on the evidence of site-finds and stray losses for currency studies is suitably cautious and reveals the need for proper cataloguing of the nine drawers of envelopes with coins which the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments in Edinburgh holds as a result of finds from 'guardianship' monuments. Professor Ranald Nicholson contributes a general historical survey of Scottish monetary problems in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which presents sane and intelligent conclusions in an area where hard information seems difficult to find among the documents. Professor Nicholson does his best, but it may be that further advances in our knowledge will come, partly at least, from rigorous technical studies such as that of Dr. Challis on debasement. Only after the numismatists have cleared the ground can increasingly effective general work be attempted.

The volume has appeared with speed and inexpensively. Perhaps there has been a little too much haste; there are a number of trifling typing errors; the maps at pp. 5 and 7 lack captions; and in the reviewer's copy pp. 65-6 have been bound in reverse. Editorial work is sound, but it is a little confusing to have not only a general list of abbreviations at the front but also five additional lists for particular articles on other pages.

It is a volume to be welcomed and appreciated. This historian's worries about its contents proved groundless, on the whole. A little effort to discover what an allied discipline can and cannot offer is energy well spent.

G. G. S.


It is an indication of the novelty of this admirable book that one has to go back half a century or more in search of works to compare it with. The literature of English medals as a whole, and of nineteenth-century medals in particular, mostly pre-dates 1930, the year as it happens in which
Forrer wearily terminated his second supplement at the letter S. After that, in 1937, Colonel Grant produced his List as a kind of emergency measure, fearing that for lack of publication the very existence of a whole range of medals would be forgotten and lost beyond recall. The subject then remained dormant until the last decade or two. Now time has been at work: the art history of the nineteenth century has become a lively industry, and we are no longer surprised to find the medals treated with the same serious respect as other arts and activities of that period, but are gratified to find that it has been done so well.

In compiling a medal catalogue of this kind there must be some choice about how much attention to give to the subject matter, and how much to the medals and medallists. The two things can be quite unrelated. However in the present case the architecture (for the most part) and the medals are both seen against the same nineteenth-century background. Dr. Taylor has given due attention to each: and, in his thoughtful introduction, has dealt with the histories of the architecture and of the medals together, showing how here and there they throw light on each other. This is a refreshing approach, and far more productive than imposing a rigid separation of the two subjects. He has also made what he can of the available sources to provide a broad view of nineteenth-century medal production in general such as has hardly been attempted before.

The cataloguing of a substantial body of about four hundred nineteenth-century medals is of itself an important and welcome contribution. For medal studies of this period have long been hampered by lack of publication, and above all of illustration. It is probably true to say that the majority of the medals in this book have not been described in any previous work, and fewer have been illustrated. A good number of them were described and illustrated in Eidlitz, 1927, who is much the most important precursor, although his aims and method were somewhat different. Dr. Taylor has given all the Eidlitz references, about ninety in number, but the chief value here is that Eidlitz illustrates some of the variants on the same building that are not shown in the present book. Otherwise a certain number of the medals have been described, and a few illustrated, in other early catalogues such as 'Medallie Illustrations', Grueber, Hocking, Storer, etc.: and six of them in Mr. Beaulah's article of 1967 on the Art Union Medals. But now the concentrated display of medals in the present work begins to tell more about the character of nineteenth-century medals in general terms, and about the output of certain firms and engravers, than it has been easy or possible to gather previously.

Some judgement and decision are required about what constitutes an architectural medal. Architectural types on medals have always had considerable appeal, but there is no fixed formula. Dr. Taylor has gone to some trouble to define what he does and does not admit, and there are few cases that anyone would dispute. He naturally prefers medals that show the correct architectural form, but accepts indistinct or 'picturesque' views as second best. He understandably bends his own rules once or twice, and I am sorry that he did not bend them to admit Bowcher's fine medal of 1897 showing the Huxley Building at South Kensington.

The medal description, and the transcription of legends and signatures, often so unreliable in the past, appears to have been done with great care, as one would expect in these days. Signatures in particular are critical and are seldom clear in photographs. I have noticed only one misreading of any consequence, where on medal no. 119a GIBSON should read CAIISON (The sculptor. This obverse die dates from 1831). I was doubtful about the reading W. WYON on medal 18a, St. Michael's, Coventry, where earlier writers have seen only wyon. It could perhaps be one of William's early works. Clouds on relief sculpture, for which Flaxman blamed Bernini and his followers, are not part of the neoclassical vision, and I doubt if the mature Wyon would have willingly included them. There are no more clouds in this book until the 1890s.

The catalogue commentary is mainly devoted to the architecture. It informs us about the buildings and the architects, and indicates their place in architectural history. References to standard or special literature are invariably given. The arrangement of the catalogue in order of building date reinforces the theme, and the reader is engagingly conducted, if he so wishes, along the historical path of changing building styles and purposes. We can readily accept Dr. Taylor's discovery that the medals provide an important new window through which the architectural subject can be viewed. This applies more in the early part of the century, before the foundation of the R.I.B.A. in 1834 and of such journals as The Builder in 1843, and before the growth of a general concern about the keeping of public and private records. The medals draw attention to some little-known architects, and to some buildings prestigious in their day but now forgotten and probably pulled down. One or two of the lengthy medal inscriptions that we are familiar with, packed with information but artistically dis-
appointing, provide facts not otherwise known. At the same time the decades 1820 to 1850 were the most productive of architectural medals, as Dr. Taylor has shown, and of course a time of vigorous building activity. As it happens the latest edition of Colvin’s Dictionary has appeared since this book was prepared, and assigns one or two more architects: the Pantechnetheka of 1823, for example (no. 76a), is now known to have been designed by Whitwell.

Photography arranged as here alongside the text seems to me a most welcome feature of the book, although presumably more expensive to do. Half the message is textual and half pictorial, and in such cases it is always frustrating to find the two separated. The photographs are of course primarily intended to illustrate the architecture, and for this reason are confined to the architectural faces of the medals; whereas many of the counterfaces, portraits or compositions, would be interesting to see but are not shown. From the medallic point of view this is a pity. No one will dispute the value of illustration, or that it must contribute to the study of the medals in a number of vital ways, and one trusts that any future catalogues will be fully illustrated. One of the visual exercises is the question of type-sources, which Dr. Taylor discusses in connection with the architectural views, and in a number of cases he has identified the engraving from which the medallist must have worked. This is an interesting pursuit, leading the enquirer into the fields of book and print production as well as of contemporary journals. Artists and engravers were always more numerous than medallists, and quicker off the mark, and it is probable that in almost every case a published print came into existence first and was used by the medallist as his source.

It might be thought that all nineteenth-century medals could be dated with ease, but it turns out that this is far from true. No doubt most of the uncertain cases would yield to perseverance. Prize medals are often deliberately left undated, though the reason escapes me. In some cases Dr. Taylor has quoted the museum accession date, which at least provides a ceiling, as do award dates if given. Provenances and accession dates are often informative if known, and are well worth quoting. Some of the suggested dates probably need shifting considerably. For example it is doubtful if B. Faulkner began his career much before 1819, and he can hardly be given a medal of 1805 (no. 62a). The Beaumont School medal (no. 55a) should be later than 1870 if we take the lettering style as a guide. Grant seems to assign it to the Wyon firm in 1875, but also to Allan Wyon in 1894. Either could be right, though Grant may be using award dates for want of better, as he sometimes does. The date, c. 1824, for the Manchester Royal Institution medal (no. IIIa) is presumably a misprint for c. 1834. Forrer’s Supplement makes this date clear, and of course Wyon only attained A.R.A. in 1831.

The main sources used by Dr. Taylor for his dictionary of ‘medallists, sculptors and publishers’ are Forrer and, as far as applicable, R. N. P. Hawkins’s dictionary. For the nineteenth-century English engravers one realizes that Forrer is still indispensable even if he or his informants are occasionally garbled or inaccurate. Modern research such as that of Mr. Hawkins provide a much-needed certainty about identities and dates, but he does not attempt to cover the medallists systematically since this is not precisely his province. Most of the medal makers and engravers whose signatures appear in this book have been at least noticed by Forrer or Hawkins. A few are to my knowledge still untraced, such as E. Cross and H & SS. But the signature G. L. must surely be the German firm Loos.

The other signatures on the medals, which comprise sculptors, artists, and designers (DEL., DES., or simply D.); and what one might call instigators (direx., or simply d.), are less well covered by Forrer. Some of these have been brought into the dictionary, and some not. It is a pity that more research was not done on some of these names to modernize our knowledge and make the dictionary that much more useful. Tiffin and J. C. Grundy can be identified. Joseph Mayer and James Gamble are given entries but treated as unknowns. This is unfair to Mayer, and not quite fair to Gamble, who worked for years on the architectural ornament at South Kensington, and in particular on the buildings shown on his medal, the Horticultural Buildings and the Albert Hall. John Gibson the sculptor has already been mentioned. This dictionary is nevertheless a fine piece of organization and provides nearly all the needed information or references in a convenient and well laid out form. It could usefully be enlarged and built upon for wider purposes, but a lot more work needs to be done. The Index to this book is extremely comprehensive, and therefore a valuable piece of work in itself; and all names, and even such initials as I have mentioned above, can be traced to their context. (I noticed that ‘James Tate, Headmaster’, of medal no. 163a, is called a bishop in the Index for some reason, but the D.N.B. has no knowledge of it.)
In his Introduction Dr. Taylor discusses the variety of motives and purposes for which the medals were struck. He gives an enjoyable account of Charles Fowler’s rather distinguished Meat Market building at Exeter (completed in 1837), and of Benjamin Wyon’s elegant little medal commemorating it. It is interesting to read in the architect’s own words how the medal came to be commissioned from Wyon. Interesting too that the architect should have stressed the durability of medals as a record—echoing the common sentiment of all writers from Evelyn down to the middle of the nineteenth century—and ironic, as Dr. Taylor tells us, that since the destruction of the building in 1942 ‘the medal now provides a true elevation not published elsewhere’.

Dr. Taylor has in my opinion somewhat over-stated the part played by new technology in medal making at the beginning of the century. It applied to coinage but far less so to medals. The contribution of the reducing machine to the initial cutting of such dies as the Gresham medal of 1844 is also to my mind overstated. There appears to be no first-hand evidence on the interesting question of just how much help the engraver derived from this machine at different periods in its early evolution. All the indirect evidence seems to suggest that it was developed as a really effective tool during the decades 1860 to 1900. Mr. Pollard’s article of 1971 referred to by Dr. Taylor is important but does not answer this precise question.

It should be noted that Britton’s Cathedral Antiquities did not come out in 1818, but was issued in parts over the years 1814 to 1835. This has some bearing on the author’s discussion of the dates of Davis’s cathedral medals.

I would have welcomed a clearer expression of opinion on the intriguing question of how complete the catalogue is likely to be. And did Dr. Taylor exhaust the British Museum Collection? He hints at a second volume, and on page 24 seems to imply that there are plenty more architectural medals. But surely there cannot be a great number still undiscovered, and certainly not medals of any distinction by known engravers. Some prize medals have been issued in such small numbers that examples are hardly known, although they are often well recorded. There are for example the Baly and Moxon medals of the Royal College of Physicians, which show their original building by R. Smirke, now Canada House. The R.I.B.A. George Godwin medal mentioned by Dr. Taylor on page 212 has only been awarded from time to time and is now discontinued. The same is true of the R.I.B.A. Pugin medal, which strangely is not mentioned at all. The author invites his readers to send him details of omissions, and it is likely that he himself is eagerly waiting for a clearer picture to emerge.

But it would be unfair to expect this book to make good all the very considerable deficiencies in our knowledge of nineteenth-century medals. In addition to opening our eyes to many general aspects of this study, the author has handsomely achieved his central purpose of presenting the architectural medal to our view, and the book will without doubt occupy a place of lasting importance in the literature of English medals. The disciplined handling of information, and the standard of presentation do credit alike to author and publisher, and we should be well content if any future publications of a similar kind were to reach the same standards.

T. S.