Barforth described as a West Riding village and Farnham as in Lancashire; the former was in the North Riding and the latter in Yorkshire. The lack of both an index and a bibliography adds to the frustration. I cannot help but feel that an opportunity for the English Surnames Survey to break new ground has been squandered.

GEORGE REDMONDS


Campbell’s Old English Grammar, first published in 1959 but still in print and in use as a standard textbook, is dismissive of coin-evidence in its survey of sources, because of its ‘abnormal and bad spelling ... so frequent’ in the legends.¹ For a long time Sir Frank Stenton’s was a lone voice in advocating its value, and onomastics, with a few honourable exceptions, tended to ignore or avoid its potential. Stenton was a prime mover and first chairman for the Sylloge series, which continues to profit from his bequest. Fran Colman has been a tireless worker at the interface of numismatics and linguistics, and this volume makes welcome inroads into the vast collection of Viking Age English coins in Sweden, joining Talvio’s Sylloge 40 which covers the reigns of Harthacnut and Harold I. Sadly the tens of thousands of pennies of Æthelred and Cnut in Stockholm remain easily accessible only through Hildebrand’s 1881 lists (where only types are illustrated) and the uncompleted hoard project.

All the surviving personal-name data for Edward the Confessor’s coinage has been available since 1992 through Colman’s Money Talks in de Gruyter’s Trends in Linguistics series (no. 56), but whilst her Sylloge volume is confined to the Swedish material, it scores in that every coin is illustrated, so that readings can be verified. Money Talks was designed to open up the numismatic sources to the linguistic community: the introduction to the Sylloge volume, on the other hand, addresses a numismatic audience to show the methods by which onomasts interpret the evidence of the coin legends. There is an extensive section explaining the criteria for selection of head-forms, and discussions on the difficulties in determining the language of origin of names, as well as the possibilities and limitations for prosopography exhibited by similar personal names in diverse places.

It must be admitted that to onomasts more used to dealing with documents, coin evidence does raise some hurdles. Colman’s section on epigraphy goes a long way towards rebutting Campbell’s complaint of bad spelling and abnormal forms. When letters are made up from mostly straight-line punches, and on a minute scale, many errors are apparent rather than real. The numismatist treasures difference, and will record a die as reading, for example, ‘WING’ when the name is clearly intended for -wine in order to differentiate one coin from another. The photograph of the coin however is user-neutral, and the onomast can then recognise the misplaced punch and restore the form.

Another reason personal- and place-name students may have shied away from coin evidence has been the often rather esoteric nature of numismatic study and the fact that current information is scattered throughout journals and monographs. Again, in the specific instance of place-names, there are the additional disincentives of abbreviation and monotony, as well as the suspicion that since most of the mint-towns were major centres, the place-names must already be so well documented as to render the mint-signatures superfluous. The task that Parsons and Carroll have taken on will be enormously useful to scholars of many disciplines, and the results will play in many directions. Numismatists will welcome having readily to hand the history of the mint-town as a context for the coinage, whilst the certainty and contemporary closeness of dating which the coins provide must be of great value to the toponymist. To be able to compare at a glance the coin forms with documentary instances serves all interests, and confirms Colman’s and my findings with the personal names, that ‘the coins are less conservative in their presentation of language than contemporaneous manuscripts’.

There is little one can find fault with in the method. The authors have assimilated current numismatic research and use it with clarity, without on the whole smoothing over areas of uncertainty. I am however slightly uneasy over the decision to omit the use of c. in the date-ranges. The rationale that ‘for our purposes it makes little difference whether a coin is dated c.1040-c.1042 or 1040-42’ may be fair enough in Edward the Confessor’s reign when the type-changes are frequent, but for the longer running, earlier issues there is a greater margin of uncertainty, especially as regards Æthelred. Dolley’s establishment of the order in which the substantive types were issued, and hence their relative chronology, was definitive, but his deduction of absolute dating based on an immutable six-year cycle has been seriously challenged. Stewart Lyon summed up the controversy by saying that the six-year theory might

‘obscure the economic purpose behind the series of type-changes which began with Edgar’s reignage’. Whilst applauding the fact that the authors wished to give weight to the immediacy of coin-evidence, and to produce the material in the least cumbersome form, I think some indication of these doubts might have been aired. Colman’s *Sylloge* avoids dates in the body of the work, and sticks to *circus* in the Introduction.

This is my only criticism of a very welcome enterprise, and I look forward greatly to seeing it completed.

VERONICA SMART


There is a certain poignancy attaching to this volume. In his General Editor’s Foreword Richard Coates informs us that materials for *The Place-Names of County Durham* were collected by Victor Watts over a period of some thirty years, but that his sudden death on 20 December 2002 meant that the first volume was unfinished, albeit ‘nearly ready for publication’. Just how near to publication it was is clear from Victor Watts’s own Preface, which is dated the month before his death (p. xiv). Nevertheless, the very final stages of publishing anything, especially a work as complex and wide-ranging as a place-name survey, can be long-drawn out and demanding, especially if the work itself is not your own, and this ‘difficult and onerous task’ was carried out at the University of Nottingham by Paul Cavill, with significant assistance from Paul Cullor, David Parsons and Diana Whaley. From the outset, we should acknowledge a great debt to those who ensured this excellent and scholarly volume did make it through that last, often thankless, stage. Certain minor points raised below may well be the result of the difficult gestation of this work. Several other points are as much to do with the general editorial policy of the English Place-Name Survey (EPNS) volumes as they are with this individual volume.

Although Victor Watts did not live to see any of *The Place-Names of County Durham* volumes in print, his *A Dictionary of County Durham Place-Names* (with contributions by John Insley), also published by the English Place-Name Society, did appear earlier in 2002, and allows access to his thinking on other names in the


county. It also has a very good Introduction (pp. xi-xix), which I would recommend that the user of the volume under review refer to for the wider framework and context, both historical and linguistic, of the place-names of the Stockton Ward.

The book contains only one map (p. xxv) which shows the 22 parishes in the Stockton Ward surveyed in the volume. While this is extremely useful, it does presuppose some local knowledge, such as where the survey-area lies within County Durham as a whole, and, more importantly, where the coast is: the map gives absolutely no indication that the survey-area’s eastern boundary is largely the North Sea! Other simple additions would also have made it more useful, such as the main water-courses, an indication of the highest land with one or two spot heights, and last but not least an indication of scale.

Given the somewhat stark nature of this map, the next step is of course to turn to the relevant Ordnance Survey map. However, when this is consulted, the result is confusion rather than clarification. The 22 parishes dealt with in this volume, and shown on its map, do not correspond with the widely available mid-twentieth century OS maps such as the 1 inch 1961 edition. One of the problems is that the boundaries which OS defines as civil parish-boundaries are in fact, in the terms of the volume under review, mainly townships. Furthermore, the map and the lay-out of the names in the EPNS volume reflect various stages in the evolution of the parishes, rather than the parishes in their latest form.

This confusion between parish and township is sometimes reinforced by the text: for example, the introduction to the parish of Grindon informs us that in 1831 it ‘contained the townships of Grindon and Whitton. Whitton was subsequently transferred to Stillington and Embleton was added from Sedgefield parish in 1908’ (p. 87). The careful wording here should warn us that Stillington is not a parish (although shown as such on OS 1 inch 1961), and in fact when we look Stillington up in the index we find that it is a township in Redmarshall parish.

With this information it becomes clear why there is a detached part of the parish of Redmarshall shown on the map on p. xxv: although not marked as such, it must be the township of Stillington separated from Redmarshall by the township of Whitton, which according to the OS map is in Stillington parish, but in the EPNS volume is dealt with as a township of Grindon parish. Confused? I certainly was, and somewhere in the volumes dealing with County Durham it would be useful to have a note on the dichotomy between township and civil parish on OS maps versus EPNS volumes. Furthermore, a clear time-frame should be given for the administrative units depicted on any map.

The volume follows the tried and tested EPNS conventions and lay-out. It starts with the most extensive names, in this case that of County Durham itself and Halifaxfolk (‘the saints’ or monks’ [of Lindisfarne] people’ or ‘the saint’s