

Wiadomości Numizmatyczne, R. LXVI, 2022, z. 210

Polish Numismatic News X (2022)

DOI 10.24425/wn.2022.141938

STANISŁAW SUCHODOLSKI

**A NEW/OLD COIN TYPE OF BOLESŁAW I THE BRAVE,
AND A HOARD THAT WAS NOT THERE**

ABSTRACT: The starting point for this text was the publication of a coin, assigned to Bolesław I the Brave (992–1025), Prince of Poland, with the name BOLEZLAV and a two-side representation of a chapel (Grossmanová, Matejko-Peterka, Kašparová 2018; Fig. 4). It is currently stored in the Moravian Museum in Brno. This coin has been known in the literature since the mid-19th century (Cappe 1850). Former researchers assigned it either to Boleslav III in the Bohemia (Cappe 1850; Hanka 1856) or to Bolesław I the Brave in Poland (Stronczyński 1884; Fiala 1895; Gumowski 1939). Newer researchers ignored it completely, suspecting that it was some kind of imitation or contemporary falsification. However, its authenticity is supported by the fact that it was originally in the collection of H. Dannenberg. Finally, the matter was decided by the publication in the auction catalogue (Warszawskie Centrum Numizmatyczne, Auction no. 67, item 132) of a coin minted on one side with the same die as the coin from Brno (Fig. 5). This allows us to postulate the existence of a new fourth die-chain in the coinage of Bolesław I the Brave (Fig. 6).

ABSTRAKT: Punktem wyjścia do napisania tego tekstu była publikacja przypisanej Bolesławowi Chrobremu (992–1025), księciu Polski, monety z imieniem BOLEZLAV i obustronnym przedstawieniem kaplicy (Grossmanová, Matejko-Peterka, Kašparová 2018; Fig. 4). Jest ona obecnie przechowywana w Muzeum Ziemi Morawskiej w Brnie. Moneta ta znana była w literaturze już od połowy XIX w. (Cappe 1850). Starsi badacze przydzielali ją bądź Bolesławowi III w Czechach (Cappe 1850; Hanka 1856), bądź Bolesławowi Chrobremu w Polsce (Stronczyński 1884; Fiala 1895; Gumowski 1939). Nowsi badacze w ogóle ją ignorowali, podejrzewając, że jest jakimś nieokreślonym naśladownictwem lub nowożytnym falsyfikatem. Za jej autentycznością przemawia jednak fakt, że pierwotnie była ona w kolekcji H. Dannenberga. A ostatecznie sprawę przesądziła publikacja w katalogu aukcyjnym (Warszawskie Centrum Numizmatyczne, aukcja 67, obiekt 132) monety, której jedna strona została wybita tym samym stemplem co i moneta z Brna (Fig. 5). Pozwoliło to postulować istnienie nowego, już czwartego łańcucha powiązań stempli monet Bolesława Chrobrego (Fig. 6).

KEYWORDS: Poland, 10th/11th centuries, Bolesław I the Brave, coin dies, imitation of coin dies, die-chains

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Polska, X/XI w., Bolesław Chrobry, stemple mennicze, naśladowanie stempli, łańcuch połączeń stempli

The appearance of a new type among the oldest Polish coins issued by Bolesław I the Brave (992–1025) does not happen often. However, all indications suggest that we are dealing with it now. This is due to a unique specimen, which underwent a turbulent fate after its discovery in the first half of the 19th century.




Fig. 1. Bolesław I the Brave's denarius according to K. Stronczyński (1884, type no. 12); scale 1.5:1

This specimen is a unique coin with Bolesław's name and an illegible image referred to as a chapel or a head on one side and a representation of a chapel on the other. It is one of the most mysterious specimens included in the corpus of the oldest Polish coins. It was first described as a coin of Bolesław I the Brave by Kazimierz Stronczyński, but only in his later works¹ (Fig. 1). He did not see the original and the drawing was taken, supposedly, from the work of Heinrich Cappe.² It was previously published in 1850 as a Czech coin of Boleslav III (999–1002, 1003). The basis of this attribution was the name BOLEZLAV, which is clearly legible around the image of the chapel. Only Václav Hanka accepted Cappe's view³ (Fig. 2). Eduard Fiala, on the other hand, described this coin first as "Handelsmünze mit Otto-Adelheid-Typus",⁴ and then assigned it to Bolesław I the Brave.⁵ Subsequent Czech researchers (Josef Smolík, Viktor Katz, František Cach, Jan Šmerda) showed no interest in this specimen. Following Stronczyński, it was recognized as a Polish coin by Marian Gumowski⁶ (Fig. 3). However, in his last work, this author no longer maintained such an attribution.⁷ It was also not mentioned by any of the Polish authors writing after the World War II (Zygmunt Zakrzewski, Ryszard Kiersnowski, Stanisław

¹ Stronczyński 1884, p. 22, no. 12.

² Cappe 1850, p. 101, no. 33. Gumowski however (CNP, p. 35, footnote 1) quotes *Mitteilungen I*, 1846, p. 42, where Cappe mentions another type of Bolesław I the Brave's coin – Str. 13* = CNP 24.

³ Hanka 1856, p. 142, no. 18, tab. VII, 18 (Boleslav III).

⁴ Fiala 1891, no. 327.

⁵ Fiala 1895, p. 262, no. 398 (without illustration).

⁶ Gumowski 1939, p. 33n., no. 27.

⁷ Gumowski 1960.

Suchodolski⁸). This coin, whose original was unknown, was considered the product of Cappe's imagination.



Fig. 2. Boleslav III's Czech denarius according to V. Hanka (1856, no. 18); scale 1.5:1



Fig. 3. Bolesław I the Brave's denarius according to M. Gumowski (1939, CNP 27); scale 1.5:1

The disappearance of the coin from both the Czech and later Polish literature, i.e. its total non-existence, is explained by its suspicious form of type that could not be verified. The situation totally changed in the 1970s, when the original coin described by Cappe was found in the collection of the Moravian Museum in Brno. The work on this relic was facilitated by documentation received from Prague and Brno⁹ (Fig. 4).

A description of the coin can be made on the basis of this information. Unfortunately, the image of the obverse is illegible. It shows only two parallel lines, the lower one shorter than the upper one, located off-center near the edge. Perpendicular to them, on both sides, are two further lines running parallel to the center of the field, which are very poorly marked. These may be a schematic outline of the stairs and side walls of the chapel. There are barely visible traces of two roof tops at the top. The inner circle made of thick pearls. Around the edge there is an inscription which, though not very clear, can be undoubtedly read as: BOLEZLAV...

⁸ In the work of 1967, I placed it in the section *Coins attributed to Mieszko I and II and Bolesław I the Brave* (Suchodolski 1967, p. 125).

⁹ František Cach was the first who informed me that the coin was in his collection and is currently stored in Brno (in a letter dated 13 November 1969). I also got a picture of it from him. I owe the plaster cast to prof. Jiří Sejbal, and a perfectly faithful galvanic copy to Dr. Jan Šmerda.



Fig. 4. Bolesław I the Brave's denarius in the collection of Moravian Museum in Brno (courtesy of D. Grossmannová); scale 1.5:1

The upper part of the letters B, E and Z (inverted) are invisible. The remaining part of the legend is also invisible, which represents about half of the total.

On the reverse, in a continuous circle, there is a Saxon-type chapel with balls at the end of the side arches. Inside the chapel there are two lines running diagonally, which cross in the middle. Four points were placed between the arms of this cross. The bottom of the chapel is not very legible because of the large rectangle placed inside it, which extends to the right beyond the outline of the building. In the ring, only the letter D with backwards-extended horizontal lines is visible in the inscription.¹⁰

The dies are therefore quite mysterious, as they appear to contain architectural motifs on both sides. There is certainly no head, which Hanka drew more from expectation than poorly-visible realities. I do not know any closer analogies to the dies presented here. Most likely, they are a modified and simplified reflection of the Saxon patterns – the denarii of Otto and Adelaide, and perhaps also *Sachsenpfennige* of type II (Hatz III, 4c; CNP 428, 429, 454). On these last coins, the letter D is also analogous, the only one that is legible in the ring of the reverse. However, one should also mention here a similar motif of a chapel filled with the sign ·X· between two points on the later coin of Archbishop Pilgrim (1022–1036) and King Konrad (1024–1027) from the mint in Andernach (Dbg 447, Hävernick 726). A particularly noteworthy feature is the internal circle made of thick pearls, appearing only on the obverse. It does not appear on the denarii of Otto and Adelaide. Most often, however, it can be found on *Sachsenpfennige* of type I from the end of the 10th century (CNP 324, 355, 358, 364 and others).

The name of Bolesław arouses particular interest on the obverse. It is spelled *Bolezlav*, a form used in Bohemia. Occasionally, however, it also occurs in Poland. Not only its iconography, but also the “style”, i.e. the way the die is made, and the epigraphy, speak against the Czech origin of the coin. It draws the attention that some letters seem to be made not with punches, but with a burin.

¹⁰ Cappe read the legends a little more boldly: BOLEZLAVS D... and ...A.A.D (inverted). He also had no doubt that the chapels were on both sides (cf. above footnote 2).

The incomplete coin legend begs the question of what the continuation of the ruler's name actually was. First of all, we would expect a title. However, judging from the free space, it would have to be longer than a conventional *dux*. It could also contain other content, e.g. the name of the town or the name of the moneyer.

Despite the great diversity of Polish coins during the reign of Bolesław I the Brave, the discussed coin clearly stands out. It is not necessarily more primitive, but was evidently made in a different way. For example, none of the previously known Polish coins from the 10th/11th centuries has an internal circle made of disconnected pearls.¹¹ Therefore, the question arises whether the specimen is authentic or whether it was made in the first half of the 19th century, or maybe even earlier.

Here, we need to consider both the origin of the coin and its subsequent fate. In 1850, in addition to the description of the oldest Czech coins, Cappe lists the Bolesław coin among eight specimens that Hermann Dannenberg kindly lent him for research. At the beginning of this text, however, Cappe informs us that the addition of 43 new items was possible thanks to the discovery from the previous year (i.e. 1849) of a new hoard near Gdańsk.¹² Unfortunately, we don't know what treasure he had in mind. In their inventory of early medieval hoards from Pomerania, T. and R. Kiersnowski include it under the name "Gdańsk – vicinity II", and date it back to 1004.¹³ It is interesting, however, that they exclude from this hoard the eight coins which Dannenberg made available. The authors of the new inventory did the same, including this hoard under the name "Gdańsk – Umgebung I".¹⁴ However, no one except Cappe mentions this discovery. This raises the suspicion that it is, in fact, some other treasure, but known by a different name.

The key to solving this puzzle seems to be the information about the use of coins from Dannenberg. Unlike previous researchers, I believe that these coins were part of this hoard. It is easy to guess which find is it after reading the bibliography of Hermann Dannenberg's works. In 1848, he published a study of the hoard found "in the previous year" in Słupsk.¹⁵ It was hidden between ca. 992 and 996 or not much later (lack of Otto III's imperial coins), and it contained, among others, several dozen Czech coins of Boleslav II (972–999; but lack of late Aethelred type). Among them, several can be matched to the specimens described by Cappe. The matter seems simple – Dannenberg, as we know, was not only an excellent researcher of coins, but also their collector.¹⁶ He included in his collection some coins, mainly German, from the described hoard, but probably also others

¹¹ Suchodolski 1967.

¹² Cappe 1850, p. 103 and 96.

¹³ PSW II, no. 37, p. 45.

¹⁴ FMP II, no. 61, p. 193.

¹⁵ Dannenberg 1848, pp. 96–109 (Reed. B. Kluge, Leipzig 1984); PSW II, 153; FMP II, 185 (incorrect year of finding – 1837 instead of 1847).

¹⁶ Cf. Kluge 1984, pp. VIII–XVII.

that interested him. Whether a specimen with the name BOLEZLAV was also present among them, of course, is unknown. However, this seems plausible. In 1848, the twenty-four-year-old Dannenberg had been a collector for a long time, but only a novice researcher: the monograph of the Słupsk hoard was his scientific debut. It was also his first opportunity to access more coins from the 10th century. Admittedly, an important fact speaks against our conjecture: there is no mention of the examined coin in the published description of the hoard content. However, we must bear in mind that, out of approximately 3000 coins, only around a hundred were described, most only as coin types. Moreover, Saxon coins in the name of Otto and Adelaide and their imitations were the basic composition of the hoard from Słupsk.

Six years after Cappe's publication, Hanka¹⁷ wrote about the coin with the image of the chapel and the name of Boleslav, but he did not even mention the previous author. The coin was then stored in the collection of the "museum". However, it was probably not a museum in Brno, but *Vlastenecké Museum* in Prague, the predecessor of the National Museum in which Hanka worked since 1829.¹⁸ It is notable that in Hanka's description the chapel appears not on both, but only on one side. On the other side, according to the description, there is supposed to be a bust, but the attached drawing shows a blurred outline of a head (Fig. 2). This begs the question of whether this is the same specimen that was in the possession of Dannenberg and was described by Cappe, or whether it is a new specimen.

In the latter case, further questions are raised concerning the origin of the coin. Hanka does not give this information, only describing its current place of storage in the museum. However, he does mention the coins he used from foreign collections, which included the collection of Hermann Dannenberg.¹⁹ While this coin does not appear in this context, we are made aware of Hanka's contacts with Dannenberg, acting on behalf of the museum. It is therefore possible that Hanka had previously bought some specimens from Dannenberg. The identity of both specimens is to a greater extent evidenced by the similarity of the legends, and it is particularly meaningful that on the side with a clearly outlined chapel, only the backwritten letter D is clearly legible. Therefore, the suspicion that this rather unusual specimen was produced by Hanka himself should be dismissed at once. It is known that he was the creator of historical texts of Czech literature, which he miraculously discovered. There are also suspicions – true or not – that he was involved in the falsifying of coins.²⁰

¹⁷ Cf. footnote 3.

¹⁸ Such an opinion was expressed by Dagmar Grossmannová from the Moravian Museum in Brno (in a letter of 26 May 2021). Dr. Luboš Polanský, on the other hand, did not reply to my question on this issue, which was sent twice.

¹⁹ Hanka 1856, p. 143.

²⁰ Cf. Fiala 1895, p. 12n. ("Hanka did not hesitate to include in his descriptions and among his ideas also numerous falsifications closely related to then popular Killian, whose friend he was"); V. Křižová

Careful viewing of the original currently stored in the museum in Brno, as well as faithful copies, did not provide arguments for the modern production of the coin (Fig. 4). Its authenticity is supported by the presence of small incisions on the surface, the so-called pecks, which have been ignored almost until recent times. The illegibility of large batches of images and legends also seems to confirm the medieval origin of the relic. If someone tried to fabricate it before the middle of the nineteenth century, he would probably try to put some attractive inscriptions and images on it.

Therefore, I assume that the specimen is authentic and that it was made in Poland during the reign of Bolesław I the Brave. The place of its production cannot be determined even roughly, although Greater Poland seems to be the most likely source. However, some provincial centre, in which it was even more difficult to start a mint than in larger centres, may be taken into consideration. We do not know when it was produced: the chronology of patterns could suggest that it was made at the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries, or even in the second half of the reign of the Bolesław I the Brave, or on the contrary at its very beginning, if the coin actually came from the hoard found in Słupsk (*tpq* approx. 992–996).

The coin is evidently a hybrid: on both sides it has the image of a chapel, typical for the reverse of denarii with the names of Otto and Adelaide. However, this should normally be complemented with a representation of a cross with letters or points between the ends of the arms. I do not know any other coin from that time with a bifacial image of a sacred building. Since the dies have been mixed, we might suppose that at least two pairs were originally made, with chapels on one side and with crosses on the other. They should be based on the denarii of Otto and Adelaide.²¹

However, one more objection can be raised here. Even an authentic coin from the time of Bolesław I the Brave did not have to be made in his official mint, although his name, meticulously reproduced, could indicate this. One of the numerous workshops of a semi-official or even unofficial nature, with a completely unrecognized status, may also be considered.

The renewed interest in this coin was due to the recent publication of Polish coins, medals and banknotes from Czech museum collections. It was put on the first place on the list from the Moravian Museum in Brno as an unpublished Polish denarius of Bolesław I the Brave with a representation of a sword (sic!) and a chapel.²²

This fact was vividly commented on by Borys Paszkiewicz in an extensive review published in *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*.²³ Paszkiewicz agrees with the opinion of the author, Dagmar Grossmannová, that we are dealing here with a Pol-

(1970, pp. 44–48), rehabilitates Hanka, releasing him from the charge of falsifying the said coins.

²¹ Cf. Hatz 1961; Hatz *et al.* 1991.

²² Grossmannová, Matejko-Peterka, Kašparová 2018, p. 10.

²³ Paszkiewicz 2020.

ish coin of Bolesław I the Brave. At the same time, however, he rightly corrects the identification of the representation on the obverse – it is not a sword, but “vague outlines of a four-sided figure with a short additional step”, i.e. the second church structure. He also supplements the description of the coin with very important information, that is about the presence of a number of incisions on the surface, so-called pecks. This proves the circulation of the coin in the Middle Ages, and thus its authenticity. Another addition concerns – contrary to the author’s opinion – earlier publications of this extraordinary specimen. Therefore, the works of Cappe from 1850, Stronczyński from 1884 and Gumowski from 1939 were mentioned. However, the Czech works were omitted: Hanka’s from 1856 and Fiala’s from 1891 and 1895.

In this context, the triangle of works by Cappe (the first publication of the description of the coin), Hanka (its first picture) and Stronczyński (including it in the orbit of the interests of Polish numismatics) seems to be particularly important to us. It can even be guessed that Stronczyński used the publications of both authors mentioned earlier. Namely, he took the description from Cappe, to whom he refers, and the image from Hanka, who he does not mention at all. But only Hanka, using the unique specimen kept in Prague, drew its picture. Cappe’s text was not illustrated, and on the obverse the author saw not the head, but the chapel again. This leads to the same conclusion as Borys Paszkiewicz: namely, when Stronczyński wrote his work 30 years later, his memory failed him.

Summing up our considerations, we can conclude that it is not possible to fully explain the problems relating to the origin of this coin, the place and time of its creation, and even its fate after its discovery. How did it happen that the coin stored in the museum (Prague) was in the possession of a private collector (F. Cach)? Nevertheless, when examining the history of Polish coins in the 10th/11th century, it clearly should not be ignored. Thanks to this coin, our field of vision has been expanded: it is clear that atypical specimens and the possibility of extraordinary circumstances at the time of their creation, as well as complicated fates after discovery, should be considered.

But this is not the end of the story. In 2016, at the 67th auction of the Warszawskie Centrum Numizmatyczne, a fairly homogeneous group of four coins imitating Saxon denarii with the names of Otto and Adelaide appeared (nos 129–132).²⁴ Their character and patina seem to suggest that they come from one hoard. Subsequent inquiries confirmed this conjecture. The coins were part of a large hoard found before 2015 in the Łomża district, perhaps in the vicinity of Wizna. This collection contained a large number of coins from the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries, especially from the first quarter of the 11th century, including Polish coins. It was hidden after 1034.

²⁴ Warszawskie Centrum Numizmatyczne, Auction no. 67, 26 November 2016.

Among these imitations, specimen no. 132 is distinguished (Fig. 5). On one side, it has the image of a chapel and a barbarized legend. The other side was minted with the same die as the coin discussed here, currently stored at the Moravian Museum in Brno. The new coin is better preserved than it and thanks to this we can get to know part of the completely barbarized legend: ...IIIΘIIII~IC...



Fig. 5. Denarius offered at Auction no. 67 of WCN, item no. 132; scale 1.5:1

However, there are two further benefits of the new discovery. Firstly, we learn that the mint workshop where this coin was minted used more than one die at the same time. Thanks to the unplanned connection of two of them, we receive an image of a small die-chain. We might suppose that it was originally larger, because the new coin, like the previous one, is a hybrid of two reverses. So probably both still had their obverse dies, presumably with an image of the cross. Between its arms, we might expect to see the more-or-less distorted letters O-D-D-O. The basis for these assumptions are analogies in the form of the three related imitations mentioned above (nos 129–131). These coins show features of the die that are not found elsewhere, which can be recognized on the examined coins of Bolesław I the Brave. They include, for example, the finishes on the headbands with marbles at the roof of the chapel (nos 131 and 132), and the sign or pseudo-letter O with a point in the middle (nos 129 and 132).

In this way, we can obtain information about the use of another, fourth, set of interrelated dies-chains in Bolesław I the Brave's coinage. In the light of the currently available materials, we can guess that it consisted of at least six dies, of which we so far know only three (cf. Chain 4 – Fig. 6).

Thanks to the new discovery, we can obtain some new information about the chronology of the examined coin. As already mentioned, the four coins offered at Auction 67 probably come from one find, and show a certain homogeneity in terms of style and method of die-production. They belong to a large group of imitations of Saxon denarii with the names of King Otto III and his grandmother Empress Adelaide, which were minted on a massive scale between 983 and ca. 1040 at Goslar and other mints.²⁵ “Our” imitations were created, it seems, in the middle period, i.e. at the turn of the 10th and 11th centuries or at the beginning of the 11th century.

²⁵ Cf. footnote 21 and Bogucki 2012.




Fig. 6. The fourth die-chain of the coins of Bolesław I the Brave: 1/2 coin in Brno (two reverse sides); 2/3 alleged coin, minted using the missing obverse; 1/4 alleged coin, minted using the other, missing obverse; 2/5 coin from Auction 67 of WCN (two reverse sides); 5/6 alleged coin, minted using the missing obverse

This is also supported by, among other things, the presence of an internal ring of thick pearls on one side, which is quite often found in the second half of the 10th century, and later in fact no longer appears. Dr. Peter Ilisch, a great connoisseur of such coins, hypothetically dates them to around the year 1000.²⁶

This suggests that the analogies with much later coins from Andernach, which show the sign X in the chapel (from 1024–1027, because they could be minted later with an unchanged die), are probably coincidental. Otherwise, we would have to assume that the Brno coin in the name of Bolesław, which was once in the possession of Dannenberg, was minted after the death of Bolesław I the Brave in 1025. This is barely possible. However, if this coin was part of the hoard from Słupsk (*tpq* 992–996?), it would not be impossible, although it is also not most likely. It is also necessary to consider its poor state of preservation, and the presence of numerous pecks on the surface and incisions on the edge. Even if this coin was minted at the turn of the centuries, it ended in the ground a dozen, if not several dozens, of years later after a long circulation.

And finally, information that seems obvious, but which is worth recalling. Thanks to the combination of the dies with a coin of unquestioned authenticity

²⁶ In a letter dated 9 August 2021, he writes: *Eine Datierung ist sicher schwierig und kann nicht ganz präzise sein. Um 1000? Viel später kann es nach meiner Meinung kaum sein.*

(no. 132), we obtained an absolute certainty that our coin, currently stored in the museum in Brno, has an origin in the early Middle Ages.

We can therefore make a final summary on the basis of this new information. We are dealing with a previously unknown minting workshop operating in the state of Bolesław I the Brave at the very end of the 10th or at the beginning of the 11th century. It used at least a few pairs of dies. They imitated the most popular coins used at that time with the names of Otto and Adelaide. They were therefore similar to the already known, maybe slightly older, group of coins with the legend of АЯСАHLAT and the head of the ruler (types III and IV). These, however, were made by other, more experienced engravers and moneyers, i.e. from another mint. Nevertheless, it seems that a similar, lower weight standard was applied to the production of coins of both groups (coins of new type weigh 1.245 and 1.27 g, while additional coins in the Auction 67 offer: 0.89, 1.07 and 1.24 g). This standard was in force in Poland at the beginning of the reign of Bolesław I the Brave.

Last but not least, the hoard allegedly discovered before 1850 in the vicinity of Gdańsk, and deposited after 1004, must be definitively removed from the inventory of early medieval coins discovered in Pomerania. This is undoubtedly a hoard found in 1847 in the vicinity of Słupsk. As we can see, the term “vicinity of Gdańsk” can be understood differently depending on the distance between this place and the location of the author of these words.²⁷

ABBREVIATIONS

CNP –	Gumowski 1939.
Dbg –	H. Dannenberg, <i>Die deutschen Münzen der sächsischen und fränkischen Kaiserzeit</i> , vol. I, Berlin 1876 (reprint Aalen 1967).
Hatz –	V. Hatz, <i>Zur Frage der Otto-Adelheid-Pfennige. Versuche einer Systematisierung auf Grund des schwedischen Fundmaterials</i> , Commentationes de nummis saeculorum IX–XI in Suecia repertis I, Stockholm 1961, pp. 105–144.
Hävernich –	W. Hävernich, <i>Die Münzen von Köln vom Beginn der Prägung bis 1304</i> , Köln 1935.
PSW II –	T. i R. Kiersnowscy, <i>Wczesnośredniowieczne skarby srebrne z Pomorza. Materiały</i> , Warszawa-Wrocław 1959 (= <i>Polskie skarby wczesnośredniowieczne. Inwentarze</i> , vol. II).
Str. –	Stronczyński 1884.
WCN –	Warszawskie Centrum Numizmatyczne.
WN –	Wiadomości Numizmatyczne, Warszawa.

²⁷ Cf. footnotes 12–14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bogucki M.

- 2012 *Some Polish imitations of Otto-Adelheid-Pfennige*, [in:] *Nummi docent! Münzen – Schätze – Funde. Festschrift für Peter Ilisch zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. April 2012*, eds G. Dethlefs, A. Pol, S. Wittenbrink, Osnabrück, pp. 111–126.

Cappe H.Ph.

- 1846 *Die ältesten Münzen Böhmens, insbesondere diejenigen der ersten christlichen Herzöge und Könige, von Boleslav I. bis Wenzel II.*, Mittheilungen der numismatischen Gesellschaft in Berlin I, pp. 29–74.
- 1850 *Nachtrag zu der Beschreibung der ältesten Münzen Böhmens*, Mittheilungen der numismatischen Gesellschaft in Berlin II, pp. 96–104.

Dannenberg H.

- 1848 *Der Münzfund von Stolpe*, Mémoires de la Société imperiale d'Archéologie et de Numismatique de St. Pétersbourg, vol. II, St. Petersburg, pp. 96–109 (re-edition B. Kluge, Leipzig 1984).

Fiala E.

- 1891 *Beschreibung böhmischer Münzen und Medaillen*, Prag.
- 1895 *České denáry*, Praha.

FMP II

- 2016 G. Horoszko, J. Piniński, P. Ilisch, D. Malarczyk, T. Nowakiewicz, *Frühmittelalterliche Münzfunde aus Pommern*, Warszawa (=Frühmittelalterliche Münzfunde aus Polen. Inventar II, eds M. Bogucki, P. Ilisch, S. Suchodolski).

Grossmannová D., Matejko-Peterka I., Kašparová D.

- 2018 *Polské mince, medaile a papírová platidla z muzejních sbírek. Moravské zemské muzeum. Slezské zemské muzeum / Polskie monety, medale i banknoty ze zbiorów muzealnych Muzeum Ziemi Morawskiej, Muzeum Ziemi Śląskiej, Częstochowa*.

Gumowski M.

- 1939 *Corpus Nummorum Poloniae, I, Monety X i XI w.*, Kraków.
- 1960 *Handbuch der polnischen Numismatik*, Graz.

Hanka V.

- 1856 *Popsání i vyobrazení Českých mincí*, Památky archeologické a mistopisne II, pp. 141–143.

Hatz *et al.*

- 1991 G. Hatz, V. Hatz, U. Zwicker, N. Gale, Z. Gale, *Otto-Adelheid-Pfennige. Untersuchungen zu Münzen des 10./11. Jahrhunderts*, Stockholm (=Commentationes de nummis saeculorum IX–XI in Suecia repertis. Nova series 7).

Kluge B.

- 1984 *Hermann Dannenberg (1824–1905) – Sammler und Gelehrter*, [in:] H. Dannenberg, *Studien zur Münzkunde des Mittelalters (1848–1905)*, selected and initiated by B. Kluge, Leipzig.

Křižová K.V.

1970 *Hanka a zlaté mince, zvane Rastislavovy*, Moravské Numismatické Zprávy 12, pp. 44–48.

Paszkiwicz B.

2020 review: *Dagmar Grossmannová, Ilona Matejko-Peterka, Dagmar Kašparová, Polské mince, medaile a papírová platidla z muzejních sbírek. Moravské zemské muzeum. Slezské zemské muzeum. Muzeum Ziemi Morawskiej. Muzeum Ziemi Śląskiej. Polskie monety, medale i banknoty ze zbiorów muzealnych, Częstochowa 2018, 381 s. ISBN 978-83-945669-1-3, WN LXIV (208), pp. 357–365.*

Stronczyński K.

1884 *Dawne monety polskie dynastyi Piastów i Jagiellonów*, part II, Piotrków.

Suchodolski S.

1967 *Moneta polska w X/XI wieku (Mieszko I i Bolesław Chrobry)*, WN XI/2–3 (40–41), pp. 65–194.

2015 *The beginnings of Polish coinage in the light of recent research*, WN LIX/1–2 (199–200) (=Polish Numismatic News IX), pp. 67–94.

2019 *Początki polskiego mennictwa w świetle nowych badań*, Slavia Antiqua LX, pp. 193–219.

NOWY/STARY TYP MONET BOLESŁAWA CHROBREGO I SKARB, KTÓREGO NIE BYŁO

(Streszczenie)

Punktem wyjścia do napisania tego tekstu była publikacja przypisanej Bolesławowi Chrobremu (992–1025) monety z imieniem BOLEZLAV i obustronnym przedstawieniem kaplicy (Grossmannová, Matejko-Peterka, Kašparová 2018; Fig. 4). Jest ona obecnie przechowywana w Muzeum Ziemi Morawskiej w Brnie. Moneta ta znana była w literaturze już od połowy XIX w. (Cappe 1850). Starsi badacze przydzielali ją bądź Bolesławowi III w Czechach (Cappe 1850; Hanka 1856), bądź Bolesławowi Chrobremu w Polsce (Stronczyński 1884; Fiala 1895; Gumowski 1939). Nowsi badacze w ogóle ją ignorowali, podejrzewając, że jest jakimś nieokreślonym naśladownictwem lub nowożytnym falsyfikatem. Jej autentyczność została jednak przesądzona dzięki publikacji w katalogu aukcyjnym (WCN, aukcja 67, obiekt 132) monety, której jedna strona została wybita tym samym stemplem, co i moneta z Brna (Fig. 5). Strony odwrotne są odmienne. Ciekawe jednak, że wszystkie cztery stemple obu monet noszą przedstawienia kaplicy, a więc rewersu. Pozwoliło to postulować istnienie nowego łańcucha powiązań stempli monet Bolesława Chrobrego. Zostały w nim uwzględnione również nieznanne dotychczas stemple awersowe, zapewne z wyobrażeniem krzyża (Fig. 6). Chodzi tu bowiem o naśladowanie saskich monet z końca X w. – tzw. typu Ottona i Adelajdy.

Odmienny problem stanowi pochodzenie monety przechowywanej obecnie w Brnie, a pierwotnie będącej w posiadaniu Dannenberga. Tekst Cappego (1850) sugeruje, że mogła ona wchodzić w skład skarbu znalezionego w okolicy Gdańska w 1849 r. Skarb ten został uwzględniony w obu inwentarzach znalezisk monet wczesnośredniowiecznych z Pomorza (PSW II, 17 i FMP II, 61). Autor niniejszego tekstu sugeruje jednak, że takiego skarbu nie było, a Cappe pod określeniem „okolice Gdańska” rozumiał Słupsk i że chodziło mu o skarb odkryty w tej miejscowości w 1847 r. (Dannenberga 1848; FMP II, 185). Nie znaczy to jednak, że omawiana moneta na pewno pochodziła z tego skarbu (*tpq* ok. 990). Co prawda mogła ona powstać już w tym czasie, ale ślady intensywnego obiegu (liczne *pecksy*) wskazują, że trafiła do ziemi dużo później.

Styl wykonania wszystkich trzech, znanych dotychczas stempli, które wchodziły w skład łańcucha 4, jest mocno uproszczony. Pod tym względem wyróżniają się one od innych, znanych dotychczas monet Bolesława Chrobrego, a w dodatku nie są z nimi połączone w tych samych łańcuchach. Z tego powodu autor przypuszcza, że monety z łańcucha 4 powstały w jakimś innym, może prowincjonalnym, warsztacie mennicznym. Tym niemniej, był on czynny zapewne również w Wielkopolsce.

Adres autora/The author's address:

prof. dr hab. Stanisław Suchodolski, em.

Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology

Polish Academy of Sciences

Al. Solidarności 105, PL 00–140 Warsaw, Poland

suchodol7@gmail.com