REVIEWS


Although one of the greatest advantages of the Sylloge series lies in the uniform presentation of material, nevertheless the separate volumes have their own character deriving from the nature of the collections they represent. The size of the collections influences the editors' choice—for example the enormous resources of the Copenhagen cabinet made it necessary to devote an entire volume of more than average size to the coins of Ethelred II alone, whereas the smaller quantity of material in Edinburgh allowed the inclusion not only of all the Anglo-Saxon coins but of foreign coins associated with them in hoards. Whilst by no means as vast as the Copenhagen collection, the Ashmolean Anglo-Saxon holding is large enough to demand sub-division. A useful initial boundary has been found in the introduction of the true penny series and the first plate begins with examples of Offa's coinage. Thereafter the volume covers the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Since the Heberden Coin Room has not enjoyed the treasure-trove advantages of the metropolitan museums, the collection published here has been built up by purchase, and by benefactions both to the Bodleian Library and the Ashmolean Museum cabinets, now merged since 1921, and also to the individual Oxford colleges which have deposited their collections on loan. This means that few pieces can be traced back to their find-spots, although some gifts and bequests come from scholars who obtained, and sometimes catalogued or ticketed, coins from hoards. One notices especially the bequest of Sir Arthur Evans with coins from the Sir John Evans collection deriving from the Walbrook, Chancton, and other hoards. A few more can be identified by colour or condition and all such associations are noted both in the introductory text and in the descriptions parallel with the plates.

The Chester volume was local interest writ large, but local interest is by no means submerged in this Ashmolean volume. Both the Stainer gift and purchasing policy have made this book very valuable as a source for the Oxford and Wallingford mints.

The plates are excellent and the reader seldom has difficulty in deciphering the legends on the coins. Additionally, the substance of the reverse legend is transcribed, the mint-name in the capital letters used on the coins complete with the Old English symbols for W and Th, but not consistently with $a$ (472 MAELD but 515 CAEST). The moneyers' names are transcribed in lower-case characters, with no non-Roman forms but $a$ where necessary. Where part of the name is missing, however, or contains a mistake by the die-cutter, the actual reading is transcribed in capitals. The representation of moneyers' names in a work of this kind is no simple matter, especially in drawing the line between errors and legitimate variant forms. One could argue that in the eleventh century -si and -sie belong to the latter category and that normalisation to -sige is unnecessary. Complete consistency is impossible, but if missing letters are to be supplied, Direma (no. 804) deserves his final n, particularly as it is confirmed by Deorman on the previous coin. Where the monetarius contraction appears in an irregular form that too is indicated; one wonders if this is not what has happened on no. 647, and if what is recorded is not a misdivision of words. Grimo for a moneyer's name at this date must be unique, whilst Grim is common and the linking letters are and their abbreviation symbol are going through all kinds of combinations in the changeover to the simple preposition on—in fact on in the same type and mint can be found on Hildebrand no. 2171.

A note by Mr. Dolley in the Numismatic Circular in 1962 argued that a small flan in the Edward Confessor Pyramids type indicated the mint of Stafford rather than Stamford or Steyning. By this token no. 1079 should be attributed to Stafford. Otherwise the arrangement of the volume is well abreast of current literature; to pick out such a small detail is not to be ungrateful for the valuable service Mr. Thompson has done Anglo-Saxon numismatists in placing the rich resources of the Ashmolean Museum at their disposal.

V. J. S.


Throughout the Merovingian age the gold currency (for most of the period the only currency) of the
West consisted of tremisses alone. Solidi of any age or source were used as ornaments or pièces de cérémonie and the very few solidi produced outside the 'pseudo-imperial' mints of the south (Italia verius quam Provincia), such as Dagobert's from Limoges, bear this character. The occasion for this little book is a rough, cast mock-solidus, hitherto unpublished but found in 1948 at Schweindorf, East Frisia, and now in the Emden Museum. It bears garbled Roman lettering and a line of runes. Dr. Berghaus adduces its very close analogues, from Harlingen, West (Netherlands) Frisia, also bearing runes, and from the famous Wieuwerd hoard, without runes. For the burial of the latter he suggests 630-40: it could be a trifle before 629, as it ends a long run of solidi of Chlotar II, in the 'pseudo-imperial' succession, at the beginning of their last phase. It contains earlier material, but most of this is mounted in a different fashion from the mounting of most of the Chlotars and also of the fresh but barbarous, cast mock-solidus. A simple archaeological argument would suggest that all three mock-solidi are of about the same date and of about the age of Chlotar (610s or 620s)—a rare and fortunate link-up for material of this kind.

The distant prototype of these mock-solidi is the late fourth to fifth-century solidus-type, showing the Emperor standing, with labarum, 'victoriola' and prostrate enemy—the type of the Maiden Castle hoard; vast numbers of this type came into the hands of foederati and gold-hungry invaders at this time of summa pericula rerum and it remained the solidus-type most familiar to the barbarians. Colourable imitations of it were made, and Dr. Berghaus shows two from Botes, in ever-münzreich Gotland, buried over a century after the archetype. There is no reason to assume a single series of degeneration in derivatives of so familiar a type, and it is impossible to show the precise inter-relationship of all the more or less apposite material that Dr. Berghaus describes, struck, cast or repoussé, ranging from the neat Botes pieces to wild gold-bracteates, and including the odd die-identical pieces from two Gotland grave-finds (Kålder and Havor), romanizing in technique but quite barbarian in design. One thing, as he points out, they have in common: all were used, and most were made, as ornaments or amulets. Archaeologists will be grateful for this assemblage, but it could be further extended to include pieces of known Frankish origin (Prou 1934, 1944 and 1955, for example), which are surely also made for adornment and perhaps protection. This use is the cue for Dr. Schneider's entry: he suggests that on the more Germanic examples the Roman archetype was transformed into the representation of a tutelary genius for warriors and seafarers, perhaps one of those ever-present northern Dioscuri that we meet on the Vendel-style helms, and that the runes should be interpreted accordingly. This is a plausible hypothesis but the tissue of assurance woven around it leaves scientific caution far behind, ending with statements that must make Anglo-Saxon archaeologists wonder whether they are dreaming.

At the head of the series Dr. Berghaus places the famous 'scenomodu' solidus in the British Museum. Like so many of them, it had a loop-mounting, and its only provenance is 'George III'—probably from his British, possibly from his Hanoverian dominions; it matters little. But it is worth describing it again in detail. It is struck: Dr. Berghaus authorizes me to say he is now satisfied about this, though he felt otherwise at the time of publication and the fact is by no means obvious to the naked eye, nor, in my opinion, archaeologically very important. What is important, and not generally realized, is that the type is a hybrid, like more than one early Anglo-Saxon piece, and this perhaps favours an English origin rather than a Frisian: the reverse is a version of the 'standing emperor' type, rather more barbarian than the Botes pieces, based on a coin of Ravenna or Arles (if so Constantine III); the obverse is romanizing but quite unrelated. The combination could have been made at any time—I once thought of Offa's, on the grounds of the treatment of the features, but I will not ask the runologists to accept that. I would only ask them to accept that there is some doubt whether the 's' is really a rune and that a magical legend is likely to have been copied from one that had already proved its efficacy and to be a poor index of the current state of Anglo-Frisian vernacular, if indeed it was meant to make ordinary 'sense' at all. In any case the 'scenomodu', or 'canomodu', piece is much less rough than the two cast pieces from Frisia, but not for that reason much, or any, earlier. On the face of it, they and all their fellows would fit best somewhere on the Anglo-Frisian-Old-Saxon fringe of the Frankish realm and somewhere around the time of Chlotar II, where and when Roman techniques were not yet quite inaccessible and old solidi were getting worn out and in short supply (witness Wieuwerd and witness Prou 1944, by a croisancré moneyer). Without close archaeological associations one cannot be more precise, and there are far more important problems involving disputes of a generation or so at this period. But faced with the monstrous hypotheses of philologists, arguing from the unknown to the unknown, two centuries before any surviving literary manuscripts, always it appears, assuming that everything is a phonetic
transcription of the current vernacular, and ending up with claims to date short spells within a few years, as though it were Norwegian official spelling that varies with the whims of the Minister of Education, I cannot feel that archaeologists have much to rely on from this side. Indeed, I would rouse their healthy scepticism against the whole inflated mystique of pre-literary philology. When told that ‘on detailed runological and linguistic-historical analysis’ 'scanomodu' dates from c. 500—525, just a century before I would most expect it, I will hold my peace; but when told that a partly Christian object like the Franks Casket dates from c. 540—580, also just a century before the accepted date, and surely historically absurd if, as commonly believed, it is Northumbrian, and barely credible even if it were Kentish, I am inclined to say, 'Die sprach- und religionshistorische Betrachtung ist Bunk'.

S. E. R.


This important monograph on the first Polish coins, struck at the close of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, makes a valued contribution to early medieval numismatics. Eighteen types, represented by 183 specimens now in 20 different collections, are admirably catalogued, and are discussed from various aspects. The coins that will most directly interest British numismatists are the excessively scarce pieces with the portrait and name of Æthelraed II on the obverse. (They were discussed in English in an article in NC 1934, which can still be read with profit.) Suchodolski sees the copying as “typical... in countries which had only recently started to issue their own currency and used as models the coins of countries with longer minting traditions”, and he cites parallel examples from Ireland, Scandinavia and elsewhere.

D. M. M.


Nearly forty years ago Dr. N. P. Bauer published in the Zeitschrift für Numismatik an account of 240 Russian hoards of the eleventh and twelfth centuries containing Western European coins. This has now been brought up to date by Dr. V. M. Potin, Keeper of Coins in the Hermitage Museum at Leningrad, who summarily records in varying degrees of detail nearly 400 hoards, going down to the 1240s, in which Western European coins have been found. The text is in Russian and a full assessment of it has yet to be made, but its obvious importance to students of the later Anglo-Saxon coinage makes it desirable that a preliminary notice of it should be given forthwith.

C. E. B.


This edition is a facsimile of the original one (1955), together with a 31-page supplement and an additional plate. Fortunately the original blocks were still available; the reproduction of the letterpress, however, is somewhat patchy, although entirely legible.

The supplement is of great value in summarising important changes in interpretation of the Scottish coinage. It also draws attention to some new types and major varieties which have come to light, and corrects a number of minor slips. Some changes are attributable to new hoards; or fuller consideration of neglected earlier ones, such as the Scottish part of the Brussels hoard found in 1908, on which is based the revised sequence of types of Alexander III long double-cross sterlings. New ideas about previously familiar material have also been put forward. The arguments for the changes are outlined; full details are in most cases available in one of the articles—published mainly in this Journal, the Numismatic Chronicle, or the Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland—which are listed in the bibliography. The additions to this bibliography bring it to almost double its original size; while this includes some articles previously overlooked, it undoubtedly reflects a most fruitful period for research in the field of Scottish numismatics, by Mr. Stewart himself, Mr. R. B. K. Stevenson and others.

It will be apparent that the form of the new edition means that the user will generally need to refer to two places in the book, even after incorporating the Errata and Corrigenda. Admittedly there is some advantage, in that references by page or figure number will to a large extent apply to either edition. The real justification, however, for the present arrangement lies in the expectation that, in the near future, research in this field will produce as much progress as it has done in the recent past;
thus it would be premature as yet to expend the effort required for an entirely rewritten book on the same lines. Indeed the supplement is already out of date on a few points. It seems appropriate for me to take this opportunity of pointing out that a suggestion of my own, incorporated on p. 206, has now been proved wrong. My husband’s study of mint books preserved in the Scottish Record Office has shown that the values of Charles II’s second coinage—the so-called dollar series—were four marks down to a quarter-merk all the time from its inception in 1675 until 1681. Sir William Denholme’s indication of its minor dangers, it had clearly been probably discouraged original research; and, as one reliance on one accepted authority. Such reliance had justification, although some inherent difficulties remain.

Mr. Stevenson has pointed out that the date 1680, raising the values, referred to the first coinage only. The theories by assuming that the 1681 proclamation, necessarily, was my attempt to rationalise the coinage, although some inconsistencies, is more definable and easier to apply and fits into a logical chronological and historical context.

However, as its title implies Mr. Dolley’s paper is far more than a re-classification of the Edwardian Anglo-Irish coinage. A considerable body of hoard evidence is assembled and analysed which is of the greatest value and interest not only to the student of Irish numismatics but to anyone concerned with the 13th and 14th century numismatic history of the British Isles as a whole.

Mr. Dolley commences by listing alphabetically 69 hoards found in the British Isles and known to have included Edwardian Anglo-Irish coins. In addition to indicating the terminus post quem, approximate size and Irish content of the hoards, Mr. Dolley adopts the novel feature of indicating the ratio between the survivors of different mints, in this case London and Canterbury and London and Durham. Since these ratios vary according to the date at which a hoard was closed they provide a means of estimating the approximate date of deposit of hoards where no better information such as a record of Fox classifications exists but where
numbers of survivors from each mint are known. A geographical analysis of these hoards divided into the three periods 1272–1307, 1307–1350 and post 1350, shows clearly the predominance of finds from lowland Scotland in the middle period and Mr. Dolley draws attention to the interesting fact that the bulk of finds of Irish provenance come from that part of Ireland nearest to lowland Scotland, Ulster, while from Leinster no finds have been recorded at all even though that province included Dublin, the largest of Edward I's Irish mints.

Mr. Dolley then considers a further 65 hoards all apparently without any Anglo-Irish content, although he notes that only 16 of them can be shown positively to have excluded Irish coins. By listing these hoards geographically he is able to show that a higher proportion than normal originate in areas remote from centres of numismatic learning. Probably more significant, he is also able to point out that of the 65 no less than 58 were published before 1899 (most of them long before and many very sketchily recorded indeed). Taking into account the fact that Anglo-Irish coins are missing from only 10% of the Edwardian finds published since 1915 and of that 10% only one find amounted to more than a handful of coins, Mr. Dolley is certainly correct in arguing that a significant number of Anglo-Irish coins must have included in this category of hoards. More speculative but probably not unreasonable, if on the low side, is his conclusion that around 200 Irish coins may have derived from this category of finds. Using this figure he reaches the conclusion that from the 71 finds known to have included Anglo-Irish coins and from the 65 finds apparently without Irish coins a total of some 1200 coins have survived. As Mr. Dolley is able to show that the total Anglo-Irish output of the period under study was of the order of 500,000 he concludes that the 1,200 coins represent roughly one survivor for every 400 coins struck—or, as he points out with due caution, this may not be so far from one coin for every pair of dies used. What is important and seems to emerge clearly from Mr. Dolley's calculations is that the body of survivors represents a useful and random sample representative of the coinage as a whole.

The third analysis made by Mr. Dolley is of 47 finds known to have contained an Anglo-Irish element and for which detailed and generally accurate data is available. These are listed in chronological order and here the technique of comparing ratios of survivors from different mints has been extended to comparing London with Bury St. Edmunds, Bristol and Berwick as well as with Canterbury and Durham. The changing pattern of structure through from the 1280's to the post-1344 period is clearly demonstrated by this method and it is of interest to note how this technique highlights unconventional hoards such as Dover and Benfrew or hoards from which a numismatically biased selection may have been taken, such as Hesleyside and Ayr.

Using the information revealed by the foregoing analysis as well as data from other sources Mr. Dolley then examines in detail each of the 69 hoards with an Anglo-Irish element with a view to correcting or refining dating information given in Mr. J. D. A. Thompson's Inventory, or elsewhere. One might query a few of the points made—for example, the higher proportion of Durham coins of Bishop Beaufort in the Bootham hoard as compared to the Blackhill and Boyton hoards could perhaps be due to the Bootham hoard being deposited later, as well as to Bootham's greater nearness to Durham. (Canterbury closed in 1323, London virtually stopped coining pence in 1324 but, so far as we know, Durham kept on striking. It could be argued therefore, that the later the deposit date, the higher the proportion of Durham coins. Unfortunately, no records of the output of the Durham mint have yet come to light). In his observations on the Loch Doon Hoard Mr. Dolley suggests that on the strength of the single Group XVb coin of York the date of concealment is unlikely to be more than a year or so before 1330. In fact, York did not reopen until after July 1331 so Loch Doon must have closed after that date and most probably in 1332. However, this reviewer must share with Mr. Dolley the responsibility for this error, as at the time the paper was being compiled he provided Mr. Dolley with outline advance information on that hoard.

One minor typographical error which may be noted here is the reference to the Tutbury Hoard securing a terminus post quem of 1321 on the basis of coins of class Xb. This should presumably be XvA.

Mr. Dolley concludes his analysis of the hoard evidence by listing the 69 hoards in order of their dates of concealment, breaking down the Anglo-Irish content by mints and denominations. This shows that roughly two thirds of all the coins originate from the Dublin mint, one third from Waterford and a very small proportion, less than 1%, from Cork. In common with English finds the proportion of halfpence and farthings is tiny, but as Mr. Dolley points out the fractional denominations tended not to be hoarded and the survivors are not likely to reflect their true share of the coinage in circulation.

In revising Mr. Allen's classification of the coins Mr. Dolley has, with one exception, kept to the
Mr. Dolley concludes his description with a comparison of the number of coinages in his series to the Allen classification. He points out that 80-90% of the coins of that phase, all of Dublin, is dominated by the sixth coinage which accounts for 80-90% of the coins of that phase, all of Dublin. Waterford only appears in the exceedingly rare fourth ('rose on breast') coinage apparently in about equal numbers with Dublin; Cork is restricted to the only slightly less rare fifth coinage.

Mr. Dolley then turns to the question of the quantity of money coined in Ireland during the two phases. He points out that there is no exact correlation between the periods of production and the years in which large payments are recorded as having been made to England and suggests that this is most likely to be explained by 'stock-piling' of coins struck when conditions permitted and drawn on for export to England as and when needed. The coins were struck to the current English standard and Mr. Dolley makes a significant point when he shows that Anglo-Irish pence form no significantly greater a proportion of hoards deposited in Ireland than those found in England or Scotland. His arguments that the Anglo-Irish coinage was primarily an instrument for converting revenue won in Ireland into the form in which it could most easily and conveniently be absorbed by England can hardly be doubted, especially as there appears to be considerable historical evidence to support it.

Mr. Dolley makes five separate calculations as to the likely total value of the output. The first is based on the one surviving mint account (December 1280 to June 1282) and extrapolated for the whole output from the likely proportion of it covered by that period. The remaining calculations are comparisons of the numbers of Anglo-Irish survivors in hoards with those of London, Exeter, Bristol and Newcastle for which some mint accounts exist. What is most impressive and utterly convincing is that all these calculations produce answers very close to £50,000—a figure which contemporary historical evidence of shipments of coin out of Ireland would appear also to support. Taking the figure of £50,000 Mr. Dolley also points out that as the Irish internal revenue during the 3½ year reign of Edward I is known to have averaged £6,000 p.a., the Anglo-Irish coinage if all initially exported, would have amounted to about 25% 'profit' to the English crown. He additionally notes that the total Anglo-Irish issue represents some 3⅓% of the total amount issued by Edward I from his English mints.

Mr. Dolley's main conclusions represent several major advances. Thus the entire Anglo-Irish coinage issue of Edward I has been firmly related to two phases dated to 1280-83 and 1294-1302 respectively. Within these two phases six distinct coinages have been identified and dated to within narrow limits. Using descriptions of each coinage individual coins can readily be classified and thus dated to within three years or in most cases less.

The total value of the complete issue has been calculated and the proportions struck in each phase and coinage and at each mint are known with a significant degree of accuracy. Finally, Mr. Dolley has been able to make some interesting deductions as to the circumstances under which the Anglo-Irish coinage was struck, its purpose and its use.
Mr. Dolley's paper is a model of the ways in which hoard evidence can be marshalled, analysed and interpreted to provide a body of data that taken together with other information illustrates and augments the history of a whole coinage period. Its writer has shown the way in so many other aspects of the numismatics of the British Isles and one looks forward to seeing the methods displayed in his paper applied to other late medieval series. For the reviewer it is particularly agreeable to find that, in this case at least, Ireland's gain is not England's loss.

P. W.
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