

## MONEYERS' NAMES ON THE ANGLO-SAXON COINAGE\*

Co-operation between the fields of numismatics and onomastics is not only desirable but essential. The moneyers of the Anglo-Saxon, Norman and early Plantaganet coinages offer an enormous body of material which can for the most part be dated very closely, and must be unparalleled in any other walk of life for its continuity. Some degree of numismatic knowledge, however, is needed to assess its validity and to adduce from it the maximum information. Equally the numismatist is in need of philological assistance in handling the evidence of the moneyers' names, not only to avoid absurd and uninformed etymologies but to answer the quite basic question of how many individual moneyers existed and how many are merely variant forms of the same name. This is by no means obvious to the numismatist. Fortunately contact and consultation seem to be growing between the two fields, and in this as in so much else one must pay tribute to the late Dr. Olof von Feilitzen, not only for his collaboration in the *Sylloge*<sup>1</sup> and his valuable work on the moneyers of Edgar,<sup>2</sup> but also for his great interest and encouragement in numismatic matters.

My purpose here is a simple one - namely to give a brief chronological survey of what material there is and how it differs in quantity and definition from one period to another, and then to consider a few numismatic problem-areas which have a particular bearing on the personal names.

At what point in the seventh century the Anglo-Saxon coinage can be said to have begun has been the subject of some controversy. Sutherland,<sup>3</sup> who published the Crondall hoard from which much of our knowledge of the earliest Anglo-Saxon coin-series is derived, would spread the production of the gold over the first three-quarters of the seventh century with its inception at or even before 600. Kent,<sup>4</sup> basing his arguments on the availability of London as a mint for a Christian coinage, asserts that there is no evidence for a distinct Anglo-Saxon coinage before c. 675. Whatever the exact time at which post-Roman coins were first minted on Anglo-Saxon soil, there is no doubt that the Anglo-Saxon coinage owed its genesis to the absorption and imitation of Merovingian tremisses, and almost certainly it began in Kent. Starting as a gold coinage, it deteriorated rapidly through electrum to silver. The coins were small and thick, the module familiar from the Sutton Hoo purse. At its inception the coins were epigraphic, though in some cases the legends are no more than blundered remnants of the Latin of a Roman imperial prototype, or even a meaningless pseudo-epigraphic arrangement of lines and curves. Only a few of the silver types are epigraphic; much of the series is purely pictorial.<sup>5</sup>

One of the gold pieces bears the legend AVDVARLD REGES, which would seem to indicate plainly enough a royal title. Sutherland very tentatively attributes this to Eadbald of Kent who died in 640. Some of the gold and early silver have some form of *Londonia* and a few pieces are known with *Dorovernia*, but all the other decipherable legends are probably moneyers' names. Both Latin and Runic alphabets appear on both gold and silver, sometimes together. The name which appears most frequently is Pada, always in runes, continuing from the gold into the silver. Early antiquaries, attracted by known historical figures, liked to identify this name with Peada son of Penda of Mercia, but this has been shown to be unlikely on philological as well as chronological grounds.<sup>6</sup> Similar attempts have been made to identify the Ethilræd and Wigræd whose names also appear in runes on the early silver sceats, but all these,

along with the runic Apa, Epa or Lepa are most likely to be explained as having the same function as the rather more explicit EVSEBII MONITA, ABBONI MANET and WITMEN MONITA in Latin letters on the gold.<sup>7</sup> It is probable that at this early phase the Anglo-Saxon coinage, like the great part of the Merovingian, was issued for commercial convenience by the moneyers themselves (in some ways like the trade tokens of much more modern times) without royal commission, since there is a lack of any certain relevant regal inscription, and the moneyer's name is found on the obverse with the head or bust.

The small, thick, so-called Sceat coinage which we have just been considering probably lasted in its silver form no later than the middle of the eighth century. On the Continent the first of the Carolingian dynasty, Pepin, had introduced shortly after 751 a silver denier that was much larger in diameter but thinner than the earlier coins. These were imitated by two obscure Kentish kings Heahberht and Ecgberht but achieved wider circulation when the Canterbury mint came into the hands of Offa about 790.<sup>8</sup> This new penny series is regal and fully epigraphic, with king's name on the obverse and moneyer's name on the reverse. A large number of Anglo-Saxon personal names now begin to appear on the coins. At the same time the archbishops of Canterbury begin to place their names on the coins; there is, however, some reason to believe that some of the earlier anonymous sceats were episcopal. At the outset however the named episcopal coinages do not furnish us with any moneyers' names since their place on the reverse is occupied by the king's name, but during a curious passage in the episcopacy of Wulfred in the early ninth century, moneyers' names take the same place on episcopal coins as on the regal, in many cases the names being common to both coinages.<sup>9</sup>

In Northumbria the early history of the coinage is somewhat different. Some of the anepigraphic silver sceats may well belong to that kingdom but it emerges from numismatic obscurity in the mid-eighth century with inscribed coins in the sceat module in the names of King Eadberht and Archbishop Ecgberht. None of this early Northumbrian silver has a certain moneyer's name; the reverse legend *Cuthbearht* is accompanied by a cross or shrine and is almost certainly a reference to the saint.<sup>10</sup> The next phase of the Northumbrian coinage however is rich in moneyers' names. About 820, presumably without continuity with the earlier silver, the metal becomes much debased with and finally wholly copper, the small thick module being retained.<sup>11</sup> The formula of the Kentish and Mercian pennies, however - king's name on obverse and moneyer on reverse - now became universally adopted not only in Northumbria but also on the rare and sporadic East Anglian pennies and the coinage of Wessex, which was to take over and incorporate the coinage of Kent in 825.

One step now remained to be taken to complete the formula which makes the late Anglo-Saxon coinage a unique source of Old English personal names. This lies in its explicit localisation. As we have seen, mint-names appeared on some of the earliest of Anglo-Saxon coins. Sporadic mint-signatures and monograms appear with or without moneyers' names as the coinage of England is gradually unified.<sup>12</sup> From the time of Æthelstan the naming of mints on the coins becomes more common, and the location of mints can often be deduced from features in the coin's design,<sup>13</sup> but the consistent use of mint-names along with the name of the moneyer, thus identifying the man with a particular borough, is one of the late

tenth-century innovations associated with the reform towards the end of Edgar's reign which geared the Anglo-Saxon coinage for the enormous strain soon to be put upon it by the imposition of Danegeld and Heregeld.<sup>14</sup>

Before passing to this last and richest source of moneyer's names, we must look back briefly to the late ninth century to take cognisance of the coinages of the Viking invaders in England. Independent York produced a moneyer-signed coinage under its Hiberno-Norse kings from c. 920 to the expulsion of Eric Bloodaxe in 954. The Danish Midlands coinage is sparse and mainly composed of imitations of Alfredian and later English pennies, and copies legends as well as design so that we cannot be certain that the named moneyer really had responsibility for the coin. East Anglia, hitherto a shadowy kingdom, now produces one of the most interesting but also enigmatic lists of moneyer's names of the Anglo-Saxon coinage.<sup>15</sup> After the death of Guthrum, who was content to issue coins of the same type as Alfred, in his baptismal name Æthelstan, there then springs up a coinage without a ruler's name - or rather, a living ruler's. The obverse legend names St. Edmund, king and martyr, barbarously murdered no more than twenty years earlier by men of the same race as were now honouring him. The moneyers, however, are not Danish; a good three-quarters of them have Frankish names. Many of these names are intelligible and are comparable with names on the Continent but there is considerable degeneration in this coinage. Probably as dies wore out they were replaced by copies made by die-cutters less literate, or less careful, than the original ones. Thus one gets blundered, extraordinary forms which are difficult to assign to one name or another, or even to be certain if they are to be taken seriously as names at all. To add to the difficulty, the chronology of this series has not been adequately established.

Nor, to my knowledge, has the role of continental moneyers' names in Anglo-Saxon England been adequately investigated. The St. Edmund coinage seems to be unique in the degree to which Continental Germanic names predominate, but such names certainly appear along with southern English moneyers. It would seem, however, that the strongest connection, as in the St. Edmund series, is the areas of Scandinavian settlement. One cannot but be struck by the contrast in the nomenclature of York moneyers in the early tenth and the early eleventh centuries. The names of Æthelred's York moneyers are three-quarters Norse, with no certain Continental Germanic names.<sup>16</sup> Under the Hiberno-Norse kings a century earlier, over half the moneyers bear continental names, none is certainly Norse, the residue being Old English.<sup>17</sup> Continental names seem to play a large part in the coinage from Æthelstan to Edgar but their distribution is not immediately obvious owing to the incomplete mint-identification of this period. In the regular mint-signed coinage after c. 973 their influence seems to be in decline and the numbers of names of this type after the millennium is negligible.<sup>18</sup>

Although the English content of the Scandinavian hoards declines dramatically with the abolition of the Heregeld in 1051, and we are once more dependent on English hoards for our material, the pattern of coinage recording mint and moneyer continues unchanged after the Norman Conquest. With the capture of Carlisle by David I in 1136 it became the model for the earliest Scottish coinage and although during the wars of Stephen and Matilda the coinage became as anarchic as the political situation, and draconian measures against moneyers were formulated by Henry II, the content of the legends remained the same. It is only with the more

radical reorganisation of Edward I in the early years of the fourteenth century that we finally say farewell to moneyers' names on the coinage. By this time, however, the coinage has become fully recorded in government documents, and we are no longer dependent on the physical remains for the names of the operatives. Before this happens, the coins have reflected the breakdown of the Old English variation-method of name-formation, the spread of Norse names outside the area of initial Scandinavian influence, the representation of Old English names when English is no longer an official language, and the final triumph of Norman-French names.<sup>19</sup>

The first problem in the handling of numismatic material is one of authentication. The work of persons such as that ingenious nineteenth-century figure Edward Emery, plate-glass grinder and part-time antiquarian forger, is no more than a minor nuisance, though some of their output may still be gracing various collections undetected. That contemporary forgery was one of the preoccupations of Anglo-Saxon government can be seen from the law-codes,<sup>20</sup> yet few of the products of this grimly risky form of lawbreaking have been identified. The problem is not one of felonious striking, but of copying outside the jurisdiction of the English king. We have already seen this in the Danelaw imitations of Alfred's coinage but in the late Anglo-Saxon period the problem is of much greater magnitude though the same in kind. The Scandinavians initiated their own coinages both in the homelands and in Dublin by copying the English coins with which they had become so familiar, and which were well known and acceptable in European trade. Some of these imitations tell the truth; they bear the name of Sihtric, or Olof, of Cnut with the title Rex Danorum, and the mint-signatures of Dublin, Sigtuna and Lund.<sup>21</sup> Others copy inscription as well as design so that one may find a coin of patently Irish fabric with a Dublin mint-signature proclaiming Æthelred Rex Anglorum or conversely a Sihtric obverse with the name of an English moneyer and mint. These partly explicit pieces are no problem but when two 'lying' dies combine, the legends will profess an English king, mint and moneyer and only style alerts the numismatist to the coin's true origin. Fortunately, once alerted, he has a less subjective weapon. Since 'lying' and 'truthful' dies will be used promiscuously one with another, though both sides of a given coin may lie, the same dies may be used with 'truthful' dies on other coins, and may thus be detected. I have dealt with Irish coins in illustrating this point rather than the probably equally prolific Scandinavian homeland imitations as the picture is clearer and simpler, and there is an agreed corpus of Irish coins one may use as a base. In the Scandinavian coinages there are wide areas of disagreement and a definitive study is yet to appear. In the present state of the subject the fairest thing the numismatist can do is to point out to scholars in other disciplines those coins which we regard with suspicion, so that too much is not made of information that only appears on peculiar or irregular coins and is not corroborated.

When Searle considered moneyers' names for inclusion in the *Onomasticon*<sup>22</sup> he expressed the opinion that many of the forms of the names as appeared in the standard catalogues needed further investigation either because of "the ignorant blundering of the moneyers themselves" or the "misreading of modern numismatists". As we have seen, much of the blundering in fact belongs to the imitative pieces and not to the work of the official moneyers. As to the charge of misreading, the numismatist must often plead guilty on behalf of Hildebrand, Keary<sup>23</sup> and the rest,

while stressing the difficulty of reading a single worn, damaged, low-relief coin-legend. But since the resources of the Swedish hoards and the fully illustrated catalogues of the Sylloge series have become available, it is now possible to compare several specimens struck from the same dies and to supply the deficiencies of one from another. By this means numerous curious and unintelligible forms have been eliminated.<sup>24</sup>

We speak easily of "moneys' names" but in so doing we beg several questions. Have we an almost unbroken record of people in the same line of business, and with the same social status, over six centuries? How far back may we reasonably project the conditions of moneys as recorded in Domesday? How great is the involvement of the man whose name appears on the coin with the actual striking; is he entrepreneur, master-craftsman, or sometimes someone less exalted? Is there a real and universal upgrading of role to be inferred from the difference between the Æthelstan law which enjoins the cutting off of the false moneys' hand "with which he struck the false coin" and 4 Æthelred which makes moneys responsible for the work of their employees - or does it simply reflect a wide and unspecific use of the term "moneys"?

A slightly different aspect of the problem of identification is how to tell when the same name denotes the same person. Patently the activities of some moneys were not confined to one mint alone, though one can work only with the less common names - one could write Godwine Was Here on half the mints in the country. The most complete study of this question appears in Mark Blackburn's tracing of the career of Hunewine at Totnes, Exeter and Watchet, which may well be typical of many moneys.<sup>25</sup>

The question of dating coins and hence the forms which appear on them is one in which broad outlines have been established but the details are still controversial. We have moved on from Searle's obvious remark that coins are datable by the regnal years of the kings who issued them.<sup>26</sup> Hoard-evidence has been studied and in almost every reign it has been possible to establish the sequence of types from which coins are habitually found associated together. In the period of the late Anglo-Saxon coinage studies have been directed towards fixing an absolute chronology. Michael Dolley's proposal of a regular six-year type change was suggested by the six substantive types of Æthelred and three of Cnut in reigns lasting approximately thirty-six and eighteen years respectively. There has been disagreement on the grounds that Æthelred's two Hand types may be two varieties of the same issue, whilst some doubt has been cast on the principle of exactly regular changes of type on the grounds that administrative convenience would have dictated when the re-issue was to be made. It is, however, highly unlikely that several types should crowd closely on one another and others should be unusually extended, and the internal checkpoints such as the removal of the Wilton mint to Salisbury in the year that Wilton was sacked by the Danes,<sup>28</sup> and the fact that the first type of English coin to flood Scandinavia was the Crux type which in Dolley's scheme was first struck in 991, are very convincing, though perhaps we do well to preserve the qualification of "circa" in our use of any such scheme. This is still a considerable improvement on the old "regnal years" position, especially as in some cases it is even possible to indicate the place of individual dies within the currency of one type.

We have remarked on how mint-signatures associate a particular moneys with a borough or boroughs. This is obviously of great importance

in questions involving the actual manning of the mint, whether on the relative sizes of the establishment in different boroughs, or the ethnic composition of the population as suggested by the origin of the moneys' names. Dialectal studies involving the representation of the names on the coins, however, depend not so much on mints as on the location of die-cutting, and this is far from simple. In the early days of the coinage when minting was concentrated in a very few places with little contact between them it is probable that moneys and die-cutters, if not the same persons, would be working within the same borough and the contact between them could well have been verbal, even though scribal assistance may have been called in. At the extreme other end of the period we have the Domesday descriptions of what was customary when the coin-types were changed:- the moneys after payment of the prescribed dues received his dies from London in return for his old ones.<sup>29</sup> A little earlier, in the reigns of Æthelred and Cnut, die cutting, though not coextensive with the mints themselves, seems in most types to have been less centralised, since regional variations are to be observed.<sup>30</sup> Work in this field is far from complete, since in the main only those types where the variation is most obvious have been investigated and only the more prominent variants with a marked local distribution have been published.

In those types which have been investigated most fully the pattern often appears to be confused with mints in a given area receiving dies from several different centres. It appears that the distribution of dies may change within a type, a mint receiving dies first from one centre and later from another. For example, in Æthelred's Last Small Cross type, Stamford takes dies mainly of Northern style but the occasional London and Southern die appears there; Oxford takes most of its dies from a Western centre which supplies Chester and Stafford, whilst the rest are of Southern style. There is a further difficulty to correlating dialectal forms with die-cutting centres, in that the characteristic features of the different centres occur almost wholly in the portrait, that is, on the obverse, whilst the vernacular legend is on the reverse. Whether a study of lettering styles can achieve sufficient definition to distinguish true couplings from mules remains to be seen. Though coins might initially have been struck with the dies correctly paired, the possibility of subsequent muling must be very great.

To test whether any connection between regional die-cutting styles and phonological variants can be valid, one may look at the form LIOF- (instead of LEOF-) where it occurs outside the immediate Kentish and London area. At Stamford the one example of LIOF- under Æthelred and Cnut is on a coin of London style. Cambridge takes dies for Cnut's first type from London, the South-East and East Anglia. All the LIOF- forms occur with London or South-Eastern obverses. The East Anglian obverses are coupled with LEOF- reverses only, but some LEOF- forms occur with London and South-Eastern obverses. At Bedford, which takes Lincoln, East Anglian and London-style dies, most of the LIOF- reverses occur with London style obverses but there also appears to have been some muling with East Anglian dies.

Thus if the philologist takes no account of the possible patterns of die-origin and distribution, and relies on the mint-signature to attribute the form of the moneys' name, he might easily come to the erroneous conclusion that the coin-evidence demonstrates the LIOF- variant in the speech of the southern Danelaw and as far north as Stamford.



An often repeated phrase in many of the papers at the Nottingham meeting was that much work remains to be done. This is particularly true of Anglo-Saxon numismatics where the new insights discovered through the catalyst of the Swedish Viking-Age hoards research project are beginning to be applied. The problems and present confusions must not be minimised but the climate of research is lively and the prospect of interesting results through co-operation is promising.

## NOTES

\*A revised version of a paper given at the eleventh conference of the Council for Name Studies at Nottingham, April 8th 1979.

Abbreviations used in the notes: ASCoins, Anglo-Saxon Coins, Studies presented to Sir Frank Stenton, ed. M. Dolley London 1961; ASE, Anglo-Saxon England; BNJ, British Numismatic Journal; Commentationes, Commentationes de nummis C IX-XI in suecia repertis; SCBI, Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles.

1. SCBI, especially vol. 11, University of Reading collection (1969).
2. O. von Feilitzen and C.E. Blunt, "Personal names on the coinage of Edgar" in England before the Conquest, studies in primary sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock, Cambridge (1971), pp. 183-214.
3. C.H.V. Sutherland, Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage in the Light of the Crondall Hoard, Oxford (1948).
4. J.P.C. Kent, "From Roman Britain to Saxon England", ASCoins pp. 1-15.
5. For the placing of the Runic inscribed coins within the sceatta series see S.E. Rigold, "The two primary series of sceattas", BNJ XXX (1961) pp. 6-63 and BNJ XXXV (1966) pp. 1-6.
6. S.E. Rigold, op.cit. (1961) p. 13 n. quoting Dr. R.I. Page.
7. For a convenient catalogue of the legends on the inscribed types, and for illustrations of examples of most of the coin types mentioned in this paper, see J.J. North, English Hammered Coinage I, London (1963).
8. C.E. Blunt, "The Coinage of Offa", ASCoins pp. 39-62.
9. Archbishop Wulfred's first type omits the royal authority but the circumscription on the reverse is DOROVERNIAE CIVITATIS. On his second type the mint-name, now in monogram form, is removed to become the centre device of the reverse, leaving the circumscription free for the introduction of the moneyer's name. The "anonymous episcopal" issue is placed later in the archiepiscopate and continues to display the name of the moneyer. See C.E. Blunt and B.H.I.H. Stewart, "The coinage of southern England 796-840" BNJ XXXII (1963) pp. 1-74.
10. J.J. North op.cit.
11. For the chronology of the Anglian Northumbrian coinage see C.S.S. Lyon, "A reappraisal of the sceatta and styca coinages of Northumbria",

- BNJ XXVIII (1956) pp. 227-42 and H.E. Pagan "Northumbrian numismatic chronology in the ninth century", BNJ XXXVIII (1969) pp. 1-15.
12. For example, the Canterbury monograms on the archiepiscopal coinages, Alfred's London monogram coins and their Lincoln imitators, Alfred's rare type with EXA and PIN.
  13. For example the pictorial types of Edward the Elder and the variant of a rosette in the place of a small cross in the period Eadred-Edgar, all of which are associated with North-west England by hoard-provenance and were probably minted at Chester.
  14. M. Dolley and D.M. Metcalf, "The reform of the English coinage under Eadgar", ASCoins pp. 136-68.
  15. C.E. Blunt, "The St. Edmund Memorial Coinage", Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology XXXI (1969) pp. 234-55.
  16. V.J. Smart, "Moneyers of the late Anglo-Saxon coinage c. 973-1016", Commentationes II (1968) pp. 227-33.
  17. E.J.E. Pirie, SCBI 21, Coins in Yorkshire Collections (1975), pp. xlv-xlvi. The moneyers cited there are, for Æthelstan with a York mint-signature: Regnald, Æthelred, Arnulf, Athelmod, Berharhd, Enelbert, Isnel, Rotbert, Siverd, Sproc, Heldalt; for the Norse kings 939-954: Athelferd, Ascolv, Farman, Avra, Rathulf, Ba[ldri?], Arnulf, Baciager, Bleseret, Hildulf, Ingelgar, Nothe, Rodbert, Ulfelm, Aculf (= Ascolv?), Leofric.
  18. V.J. Smart, op. cit., especially pp. 271-2.
  19. These developments are well illustrated by the names of the moneyers of Bristol in SCBI 19 pp. xxxv-xxxviii.
  20. R.S. Kinsey, "Anglo-Saxon Law and Practice relating to mints and moneyers", BNJ XXIX (1959) p. 15, 18-19, 24.
  21. On the imitative pieces see especially M. Dolley, "Hiberno-Norse coins in the British Museum" SCBI 8 (1966); B. Malmer, "Olof Skötkonungs mynt och andra Ethelred-imitationer", Antikvariskt Arkiv 27, Stockholm (1965), and "King Canute's coinage in the northern countries", Dorothea Coke Memorial Lecture, University College London (1974); P.C. Hauberg, "Myntforhold og udmyntninger i Danmark indtil 1146", Copenhagen (1900); C.S.S. Lyon, G. van der Meer and M. Dolley, "Some Scandinavian coins in the names of Æthelræd, Cnut and Harthacnut attributed by Hildebrand to English mints", BNJ XXX (1961) pp. 235-51. Mark Blackburn has an important paper on Long Cross imitations in preparation.
  22. W.G. Searle, Onomasticon Anglosaxonicum, Cambridge (1897) p. x.
  23. B.E. Hildebrand, Anglosachsiska mynt funna i Sveriges jord, Stockholm (1881). H.A. Keary and C.F.A. Grueber, Catalogue of English coins in the British Museum, Anglo-Saxon series, London (1916).
  24. See G. van der Meer, "Some corrections to and comments on B.E. Hildebrand's catalogue", ASCoins pp. 166-94; V.J. Smart, "Corrections to Hildebrand's corpus of Anglo-Saxon moneyers from Cnut to Edward the Confessor" ASE 4 (1975) pp. 155-70.

25. M.A.S. Blackburn, "The mint of Watchet", BNJ XLIV (1974) pp. 19-22.
26. W.G. Searle ut supra.
27. First proposed in Dolley and Metcalf, "The reform of the English coinage under Edgar" ut supra; the present position, with bibliographies, is set out in M. Dolley, "An introduction to the coinage of Æthelræd II" in Ethelred the Unready, papers from the Millenary Conference, British Archaeological Reports, British series 59 (1978), and C.S.S. Lyon "Some problems in interpreting Anglo-Saxon coinage", ASE 5 (1976), pp. 173-224. See also B. Petersson, Anglo-Saxon Currency, Lund (1969), for the alternative seven-year based chronology. For the chronology of Harold I, Harthacnut and Edward the Confessor's coin-types, which must have each been current for only about half the period of Æthelred and Cnut's types, see P. Seaby "The sequence of Anglo-Saxon coin-types 1030-50", BNJ XXVIII, (1955-7).
28. M. Dolley, "The sack of Wilton and the chronology of the Long Cross and Helmet types of Æthelræd II", Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Medlemsblad, 1954.
29. For specific instances see V.J. Smart, "Moneyers of the late Anglo-Saxon coinage" ut supra.
30. The pioneer study was M. Dolley's "Some observations on Hildebrand's Type A of Æthelræd II", Antikvariskit Arkiv 9, Stockholm (1958), and the question of regional styles in other types of Æthelred is discussed in M. Dolley's "Introduction to the coinage of Æthelræd II" ut supra. No comprehensive study of Cnut's first type has yet been published, but for the mid type of the reign see M. Dolley and J. Ingold, "Some thoughts on the engraving of dies for the English coinage c. 1025", Commentationes I.

VERONICA SMART

University of St. Andrews

LITERARY NAMES AS TEXT: PERSONAL NAMES IN  
SIR WALTER SCOTT'S WAVERLEY\*

If the age-old role of literature as a deliberately selected, structured and refracted view of the kaleidoscope of human affairs, with its blissful blurring of the invented and the factual, had lost nothing of its force in early nineteenth-century Scotland, then an examination of the significance and function of names, particularly personal names, in Sir Walter Scott's novel Waverley (1814) is, in its own way and when properly pursued, likely to lead us as close to an understanding of, let us say, the relationship between name and personal identity in Scotland as a thorough combing of the Ragman Roll or a set of Kirk Session Records. It also, by and large, makes the question superfluous whether there are any so-called "originals" for fictitiously named persons in this novel, since there are by definition no literary pseudonyms.<sup>1</sup> Even names of historical persons become, between the covers of a work of fiction, as fictitious as invented names, because their content is not shaped by the pronouncements of historical textbooks but by the amount of information provided by the author. It is necessary to remember this dictum especially when dealing with a writer like Scott who uses many devices, in addition to his lengthy introductions and copious notes, to persuade us of the basic acceptability of the pictures he draws and of the historical veracity of his stories. Despite his protestations and discourses, authenticity does not ultimately depend on so-called factual accuracy but on the way in which all the elements in a creative work of verbal art interlace in a reasonable and felicitous synthesis. It is, after all, created not mirrored authenticity! A comparison of Scott's introductions with his own treatment of their seminal biographies and narrative stimuli easily reinforces this contention.

It may be convincingly argued that this kind of manufactured credibility is apparent nowhere more accessibly than in the choice and deployment of literary names. Such a claim is perhaps less true of the infusion of significant individual names, although these are, of course, terribly important, too, than of the total onomastic web which, as a text within the text, frequently foregrounds the less transparent texture of a novel as a whole, metaphorising its social constellations, its personal conflicts, its clashes of status, its fractures and caresses, its woundings and healings, and turning almost iconic in its figurative stylization. Writers of novels, for example, are so much more privileged than registrars since it is not expected of them to be the guardians of a comprehensive, indiscriminate nomenclature but rather the responsible begetters of an onomasticon of their own choosing and delight, a discrete network of names which focuses and highlights, which parades and depicts, which isolates and identifies, which represents and exposes, a network of names which really "works" in its context, thus forming a precisely circumscribed onomastic "field".

Unquestionably Sir Walter is an excellent exponent of this art, and the proposed scrutiny of Waverley from an onomastic point of view therefore not an accidental choice, for surely there is pregnant promise in a writer whose first paragraph of the very first chapter of his very first novel begins with this self-conscious opening statement:<sup>2</sup>

"The title of this work has not been chosen without the grave and solid deliberation, which matters of importance