



**HAL**  
open science

## Publishing and analyzing coin finds: Xanten and beyond

Stéphane Martin

► **To cite this version:**

Stéphane Martin. Publishing and analyzing coin finds: Xanten and beyond. *Journal of Roman Archaeology (JRA)*, 2017, 30, pp.710 - 715. 10.1017/S1047759400074626 . hal-01671943

**HAL Id: hal-01671943**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01671943>**

Submitted on 22 Dec 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Stéphane Martin, “Publishing and analyzing coin finds: Xanten and beyond”  
[review-article of Holger Komnick, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit aus dem Bereich der Colonia Ulpia Traiana* (Xantener Berichte, Bd. 29; Verlag Philipp von Zabern; Darmstadt 2015)],

Journal of Roman Archaeology 30, 2017, p. 710-715

Version *post-print*, produite par l’auteur / author-produced, post-print version

*N.B. : les numéros de pages, en gras entre crochets, indiquent le début d’une nouvelle page / page numbers, in bold between square brackets, indicate the beginning of a new page.*

**[p. 710]** *The coins from the Colonia Ulpia Traiana (Xanten, North Rhine-Westphalia)*

The latest book by H. Komnick is a welcome and massive addition to our understanding of coin circulation in the western provinces of the Roman Empire. Until the end of the programme in 2009, Komnick collaborated in the *Fundmünzen der Antike* project, authoring or co-authoring 4 volumes of the *Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Deutschland (FMRD)* series. As he explains in the introduction to his new monograph, the coins from the civilian settlement of Xanten were initially to be published in the *FMRD* (it would have been part of vol. VI.3, 3), but several factors (not least the death of V. Zedelius who was in charge of the publication) considerably delayed it. After the termination of that project, the Xanten museum took over the project, and we should be grateful, for the result will be most useful to scholars.

The introduction (1-8), which gives a complete history of the study of coin finds from Xanten, from a first mention in 1587 to the completion of the present book, will be most useful for tracing the various publications on the subject. This volume comprises coins from Xanten held by the museums of Bonn and Xanten, as well as coins mentioned in the literature as coming from the site, up to the year 2012. It is important to stress that only the coins from the civilian settlement, named *Colonia Ulpia Traiana* (henceforth *CUT*) from Trajan onwards, are published here. Coins from the military camp of *Vetera*, lying south of the *colonia*, are still to be published; a sample of them can be found in the 1995 monograph by N. Hanel.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Hanel, *Vetera I. Die Funde aus den römischen Lagern auf dem Fürstenberg bei Xanten* (Rheinische Ausgrabungen 35; Bonn 1995) 3-26.

Komnick's catalogue makes up the bulk of the book (9-504; the catalogue itself, including notes, is on pp. 31-462). Basically it follows the *FMRD* template, and anyone familiar with that will have no trouble finding his or her way,<sup>2</sup> while for those unfamiliar everything is explained at the beginning (11-29, including literature cited in the catalogue; the literature cited in the commentary is cited in a separate list at the end of the book). Coins are first catalogued by type of find: "*Einzelfunde*" (single finds, 31-402), "*Grabfunde*" (finds in funerary contexts, 403-9), hoards (414-49) divided in "*Schatzfunde*" ('proper' hoards) and "*Kollektivfund*" (several coins found together but not constituting a 'proper' hoard), to which Komnick adds (450-52) the several forgers' moulds found on site. Coins for which the origin is unclear are listed separately (452-62). For each coin, a note gives various information, mainly metrology, archaeological context and previous literature. As is usual in the *FMRD* publications, there is no extant description of the coin types and legends, only a reference to a standard catalogue, and coins are not illustrated. All peculiarities (non-Roman coins, forgeries, halves, countermarks, etc.) are listed on 463-65. Finally, scholars interested in the coins from a particular sector or excavation on the site can make use of the extensive concordance tables on 466-504.

The catalogue is followed by a commentary which is intended by Komnick as a first approach to the material (507, where he describes his commentary as an "*Einstieg*", a starting point). In a way, this is a bonus since the *FMRD* volumes did not include commentaries; indeed, it proves a very helpful and welcome bonus. Komnick has a simple but important research question (507): how typical are the coin finds from the *CUT* of the Lower Rhine region? In order to decide, he compares coins from the *CUT* with finds from a number of regional sites in Germany (507 and pl. 1). From his study it is clear that the *CUT* does fit some regional pattern.

**[p. 711]** The commentary is threefold. First, Komnick goes through the various types of find ("*Einzel-*", "*Grab-*", "*Kollektiv-*" and "*Schatzfunde*") to compare the situation in the *CUT* and on the other sites systematically for each emperor or period and for each metal (511-77 with tables 1-47, pp. 607-31, and pls. 4-5). Although it is a little repetitive, it proves useful given the length of the catalogue; it is a good way to navigate within the finds and obtain an overview of the situation. In this first part, Komnick also discusses at more length some particular coin types, such as Julio-Claudian bronze imitations ("*Barbarisierungen*", 522, 525-26 and pl. 4; see further below), the orichalcum-*asses* from Trajan (534-35 with the extensive n.314, and pl. 5), or some periods tied to known historical events such as Magnentius' reign (551-54 for single finds, 573-77 for the hoards). The author is always cautious and thoughtful, basing his claims

---

<sup>2</sup> See the presentation of the *FMRD* project by J. Aarts in *JRA* 17 (2004) 652-54.

on an extensive material basis. His discussion of hoards in relation to potential historical events, for instance, is balanced; only when there are sufficient grounds is he willing to see a link. In the second part, he turns to the coin profiles of the *CUT* and the sites for comparison (577-88 with tables 48-49, p. 632, and pls. 6-18). He compares the general coin profiles, from the Republic down to late antiquity, before proceeding to an examination of the profiles for the first two centuries A.D. (down to the year 192), for the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. (from 192 to 294), and for the 4<sup>th</sup> c. (from 294 to 403). This allows a finer view of the dynamics of coin circulation between the various sites and for a better contribution of numismatics to the sites' histories. The influence of the period of foundation, in particular, is very clear, leading him to divide the sites into 5 rather neat groups, with only two groups proposed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> c. The third part of the commentary is a comparison between two *insulae* from the *CUT* (588-93 and pl. 19), highlighting the differences and setting the results of his numismatic study against those from the excavation. The book ends with the literature cited in the commentary, followed by the tables (607-32), the list of countermarks (633-34 and pls. 2-3, with photographs that advantageously replace the drawings found in the *FMRD*),<sup>3</sup> an index of place-names cited in the commentary (635-38), and the plates.

Of course, it is always possible for a reviewer to add something or suggest a missing reference. Thus:

- One wonders if the 3 pre-Roman Greek coins (cat. 3003,1, 1-3) should not be linked with the few Greek provincial pieces of a later date found on site (cat. 3003,1, 2543, 3735, 3775, 3833, 444 and 3003,14, 2).<sup>4</sup>
- I was struck by the 7 Republican *asses* struck after the 91 B.C. reform on semuncial standard (cat. 3003,1, 91-97), usually rare finds: is it because they go unnoticed on other sites?
- Cat. 3003,1, 1374 is a rare *quadrans* struck by Claudius at *Lugdunum* (*RIC* I<sup>2</sup>, 1)<sup>5</sup> and to my knowledge perhaps the only one to come from a modern excavation outside Lyon itself; a word on the context of the find might have been interesting.

---

<sup>3</sup> It is not clear from this list, but Komnick does make use in the catalogue of the latest and most complete typology, by U. Werz, *Gegenstempel auf Aesprägungen der frühen römischen Kaiserzeit im Rheingebiet — Grundlagen, Systematik, Typologie* (Winterthur 2009).

<sup>4</sup> It would have been interesting to interpret these finds in light of M. Bar, *Monnaies grecques et assimilées trouvées en Belgique* (Travaux, Cercle d'études numismatiques 11; Brussels 1991); *id.*, "Monnaies grecques et assimilées trouvées en Belgique. Supplément I," *Bulletin du Cercle d'études numismatiques* 33 (1996) 1-20; *id.*, "Monnaies grecques et assimilées trouvées en Belgique. Supplément II," *ibid.* 39 (2002) 233-40.

<sup>5</sup> C. H. V. Sutherland, *The Roman imperial coinage*, vol. I (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 1984).

- The *follis* struck in Carthage (cat. 3003,1 3965) can probably be added to the corpus of a recent but still unpublished French doctoral thesis.<sup>6</sup>
- In the commentary (514, n.129), the author still identifies *RPC* 533<sup>7</sup> as minted at Orange/*Arausio*, but V. Geneviève has convincingly demonstrated that it was struck in Toulouse/*Tolosa*.<sup>8</sup>
- [p. 712] Reference to G. Rasbach's work, based on the neighbouring site of Moers-Asberg/*Asciburgium*, would have been welcome to expand the commentary on coins in funerary contexts.<sup>9</sup>

But these are minor remarks and do not distract from the high quality of the book. One could perhaps wish that the author had attempted a more general study, such as the one M. Peter produced for Augst and Kaiseraugst after writing the coin catalogue some years earlier,<sup>10</sup> or the more recent book by J.-M. Doyen on coin finds from Reims with extensive commentaries on coin circulation in Gaul as a whole.<sup>11</sup> But it would be most unfair to reproach Komnick in this regard, for this was not his aim: he set to catalogue the coin finds, and to establish whether they constituted a representative sample of the coins circulating on the Lower Rhine during the Roman period, and he has fulfilled both goals brilliantly.

A more serious criticism might arise from the way the book is organized, which I do not find very practical. As I have indicated, to each catalogue number corresponds an endnote with more details on the coin. Given the number and length of the notes, one can understand the choice of end- rather than footnotes, but the constant to and fro does become tiring. Similarly, all tables

---

<sup>6</sup> G. Malingue, *Production et circulation du monnayage de l'atelier de Carthage, à la fin du troisième et au début du quatrième siècles, par l'étude des trésors et des monnaies de fouilles* (Thèse de doctorat, Univ. Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne 2014).

<sup>7</sup> A. M. Burnett, M. Amandry and P. P. Ripollès, *Roman provincial coinage*, vol. I (London–Paris 1992).

<sup>8</sup> V. Geneviève, “Le monnayage colonial d’Octave à la proue et ‘à la tête de bélier’ (*Arausio*?, *RPC* 533). Une nouvelle proposition d’attribution: *Tolosa*?,” in M. P. García-Bellido, A. Mostalac Carrillo and A. Jiménez Díez (edd.), *Del imperium de Pompeyo a la auctoritas de Augusto. Homenaje a Michael Grant* (Anejos del ArchEspArq 47, 2008) 191-208; id., “Les bronzes d’Octave à la proue et à la tête de bélier (*RPC* 533) attribués à Toulouse-*Tolosa*: nouvelles découvertes,” in N. Holmes (ed.), *Proc. XIV<sup>th</sup> International Numismatic Congress, Glasgow 2009* (Glasgow 2011) 685-95.

<sup>9</sup> G. Rasbach, *Römerzeitliche Gräber aus Moers-Asberg, Kr. Wesel. Ausgrabung 1984 im nördlichen Gräberfeld* (Funde aus Asciburgium 12; Duisburg 1997); ead., “Zur Münzbeigabe in Brandgräbern des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel der Gräberfelder von Asciburgium,” in O. F. Dubuis, S. Frey-Kupper and G. Perret (edd.), *Trouvailles monétaires de tombes. Actes du deuxième colloque international du Groupe suisse, 1995* (Études de numismatique et d’histoire monétaire 2; Lausanne 1999) 215-27.

<sup>10</sup> M. Peter, *Augusta Raurica I. Augst, 1949-1972* (Inventaire des trouvailles monétaires suisses 3; Lausanne 1996); id., *Augusta Raurica II. Kaiseraugst, 1949-1972* (Inventaire des trouvailles monétaires suisses 4; Lausanne 1996); id., *Untersuchungen zu den Fundmünzen aus Augst und Kaiseraugst* (SFMA 17; Berlin 2001).

<sup>11</sup> J.-M. Doyen, *Économie, monnaie et société à Reims sous l’Empire romain* (Archéologie urbaine 7; Reims 2007), with review at *JRA* 24 (2011) 703-7.

and graphs relevant to the commentary are placed at the end of the book, not in the text next to the corresponding paragraphs. Not only is it annoying; one feels that the commentary could have been shortened by the use of tables in the text, giving the author more space to develop the less descriptive parts of his study. One can cite, for instance, his very interesting comments on the Claudian imitations (526-27 and pl. 4.1-2), that offer strong confirmation to previous suggestions from D. Wigg-Wolf.<sup>12</sup>

This precise example leads to a second criticism: the absence of photographs from the coins (bar the countermarks). Of course, it is not practical to print a photograph of each and every one of the more than 5200 coins catalogued. But why not offer pictures of selected items or series of items that could be of particular worth to scholars? I think, for instance, of the rare *quadrans* of Claudius (cat. 3003,1, 1374), or of cat. 3003,1, 4444, unidentified and bound to remain so if no one knows what it looks like. In the case of Claudian imitations, we know at least since 1975 that there are die-links on finds from various sites.<sup>13</sup> The circulation of such imitations is of great interest: since they are rather easily recognizable and locally produced, a thorough study could lead to the identification of the regions from which they originate and provide precious information on the mechanisms of coin circulation. Even a partial photographic coverage of the numerous imitations from the *colonia* would have been a great step forward. Whether these were choices made by the author or by the editor of the series, I do not know, but these are editorial matters to be thought about for any future coin publications in the same series. Beyond this specific volume, however, these reservations also raise more general issues regarding the publication of coin finds.

*“Where do we go from here?”: 10 years after Lockyear*

In 2007, K. Lockyear published an important paper in *Britannia* (“Where do we go from here? Recording and analysing Roman coins from archaeological excavations”). Initially intended as a critical review of the guidelines promoted by the English Heritage (now Historic England) for the publication of Roman coin finds, it expanded into a survey of the work done from the 1980s

---

<sup>12</sup> D. G. Wigg, “The function of the last Celtic coinages in northern Gaul,” in C. E. King and D. G. Wigg (edd.), *Coin finds and coin use in the Roman world* (SFMA 10; Berlin 1996) 415-36. I have independently arrived at similar conclusions to Komnick’s work: *Du statère au sesterce. Monnaie et romanisation dans la Gaule du Nord et de l’Est (III<sup>e</sup> s. a.C.–I<sup>er</sup> s. p.C.)* (Scripta antiqua 78; Bordeaux 2015) 294-307.

<sup>13</sup> J.-B. Giard, “La pénurie de petite monnaie en Gaule au début du Haut-Empire,” *Journal des Savants* 1975, 81-112, with reference to his previous work.

to the early 2000s, in both the publication and the analysis of numismatic material.<sup>14</sup> I would like to build on his comments and offer a short survey, however partial and subjective it may be, of the last 10 years.

In an age where digital databases are more and more common, does it make sense to publish a catalogue such as the one reviewed here in print only? Although some recent publications include CD-ROMs with digital files,<sup>15</sup> this is still not customary.<sup>16</sup> This is not simply a question of innovation *versus* tradition, digital *versus* paper. I am deeply convinced of the usefulness of — even the need for — printed books, which remain essential for long-term archiving, as well as giving those not able easily or not willing to work in a digital manner access to the information. But the lack of data in digital form has a serious impact on the way in which researchers work.

First of all there is the question of access to the books, particularly at a time when libraries possess less and less financial resources. Having done most of my research in France, I know how difficult it can be to access foreign publications, no matter how important they are. This is particularly true when they are not written in English; German publications can be especially hard to find.<sup>17</sup> Conversely, I now experience some difficulty in accessing French publications while working in the Netherlands. As a result, scholars often tend to limit themselves to national scholarship, because it is the most accessible. Digital publications — or at least the dissemination of the core data in digital format, and if possible in open-access — are a way towards more internationalized research, at least in terms of the data processed, if not in terms of methods.

---

<sup>14</sup> K. Lockyear, “Where do we go from here? Recording and analysing Roman coins from archaeological excavations,” *Britannia* 38 (2007) 211-24, taking R. J. Brickstock, *The production, analysis and standardisation of Romano-British coin reports* (Swindon 2004) as his starting point.

<sup>15</sup> The CD-ROM attached to S. Krmnicek, *Münze und Geld im frühromischen Ostalpenraum. Studien zum Münzumschlag und zur Funktion von Münzgeld anhand der Funde und Befunde vom Magdalensberg* (Kärntner Museumsschriften 80; Klagenfurt 2010), contained photographs of the coins. M. Alram and F. Schmidt-Dick (edd.), *Numismata Carnuntina. Forschungen und Material* (Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Österreich, Abt. III, Niederösterreich, Bd. 2. Die antiken Fundmünzen im Museum Carnuntinum) (DenkschrWien 353; 2007), as well as M. Nick, in *Die keltischen Münzen der Schweiz. Katalog und Auswertung* (Inventar der Fundmünzen der Schweiz 12; Bern 2015), all offer a digital copy, in Excel format, of their massive catalogues.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., Doyen (supra n.11); D. Gricourt, J. Naumann and J. Schaub, *Le mobilier numismatique de l’agglomération secondaire de Bliesbruck (Moselle). Fouilles 1978-1998* (Blesa 5; Paris 2009); J. Chamerois, *Les fouilles de la cathédrale de Rouen, 1985-1993. t. 1, Le numéraire antique* (Mont-Saint-Aignan 2013); D. Frascione, *Zeugma IV. Les monnaies* (Travaux de la Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée 63; Lyon 2013) (the volume is available online but the data still need to be converted).

<sup>17</sup> For instance, volumes of the *Xantener Berichte* (of which the book here reviewed is part) are hardly available in France outside of Paris, Lille and Strasbourg, according to <http://www.sudoc.abes.fr>, the collective catalogue of French universities and research institutes.

This leads to the second point. Although all those working on ancient coin finds use more or less the same reference books, there is still no standard way of describing and publishing coin finds. This is all the more frustrating since most of us use the same descriptive fields; furthermore, the digitization in the form of online open-access databases of some reference works paves the way for a growing standardization.<sup>18</sup> But publications continue to follow either a [p. 714] national or a regional tradition when it exists, or simply the author's particular preference when it does not. Such is the case in France, where one only needs to leaf through the recent books on Reims, Bliesbruck-Reinheim and Rouen<sup>19</sup> to see the differences. Britain is divided between numismatists using P. Casey's scheme in the north and those following R. Reece in the south. Switzerland generally follows the model of the Swiss Inventory of Coin Finds.<sup>20</sup> The German model of the *FMRD*, used by Komnick, has over the course of time expanded to several other countries, from the Netherlands to N Italy and Slovenia, and as far east as Poland. Should there be an attempt at unity on a European level, it would be worth considering the *FMRD* as a model, but, as Lockyear has highlighted, there would be no need to choose between one model or the other if the data were available digitally. A well-conceived database would allow for exportation in any relevant format, for exploiting the material according to whatever scheme the researcher might find best. Yet most field numismatists use either a spreadsheet or a relational database, generally of our own design. In spite of the growing number of online databases, most do not concern coin finds, and the few that do were each developed separately without being designed for the export of data.<sup>21</sup> D. Pett was indeed right when he said that we are re-inventing the wheel on a regular basis.<sup>22</sup> It is to be hoped that in the coming years a common model will finally become a reality — if possible, one linked to the CRRO and OCRE databases of the American Numismatic Society.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Coinage of the Roman Republic Online (CRRO): <http://numismatics.org/crro/>; Online Coins of the Roman Empire (OCRE): <http://numismatics.org/ocre/> (viewed 26 April, 2017).

<sup>19</sup> Doyen (supra n.11); Gricourt, Naumann and Schaub (supra n.16); Chameroy (supra n.16).

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.coinfinds.ch/> (viewed 26 April 2017); the website is also available in French, German and Italian.

<sup>21</sup> Nummus (Université de Caen): <https://www.unicaen.fr/crahm/Nummus/>; NUMIS (De Nederlandsche Bank): <https://www.dnb.nl/over-dnb/nationale-numismatische-collectie/numis/numis-database/index.jsp>; *Antike Fundmünzen Europa* (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut/Goethe Universität): <http://afe.fundmuenzen.eu/>; Swiss Inventory of Coin Finds: <https://www.fundmuenzen.ch/dienstleistungen/datenbanken/muenzen.php>. The one exception is the Portable Antiquities Scheme where data export is possible after registration: <https://finds.org.uk/database>. I could not find a working URL for the *Digitale Fundmünzen der Römischen Zeit in Österreich* (all links viewed 26 April, 2017).

<sup>22</sup> D. E. J. Pett, "Numismatics, computer and the internet," in C. Arnold-Biucchi and M. Caccamo Caltabiano (edd.), *Survey of numismatic research 2008-2013* (International Association of Professional Numismatists, Special Publication 16; Taormina 2015), especially 766-69.

<sup>23</sup> See above n.18.

The third point is concerned with the scientific exploitation of the data. Anyone familiar with the publication of coin finds knows that it generally consists of a largely descriptive commentary, with a varying number of tables and graphs, often fresh out of the spreadsheet without further modification. Despite the various ways we have of cataloguing the coins themselves, our commentaries follow a broadly similar script. There are various reasons for this. We often model our study on existing ones, and the influence of Reece cannot be underestimated; but we should not underestimate the time factor — in particular, for the conversion of data from the original catalogue to a digital form, which can be made worse by the need to update old references, supply missing references, or work out which chronology is used for a particular issue. Because it becomes so tedious to extract data, less time is devoted to finding new ways of analyzing the finds. In 2000 Lockyear presented some interesting techniques widely used in archaeology but not in numismatics, but since then they have seldom been used.<sup>24</sup> We barely go beyond the usual line or bar charts because getting our hands on the data and then converting it to a spreadsheet already requires so much work. Only for Britain is a numerical summary of coin finds from sites across the country readily available — thanks, again to the work of Reece:<sup>25</sup> it is precisely this data-set that was used by Lockyear in his paper, but even in this case [p. 715] the information was minimal. What is needed is a much fuller catalogue, like the one produced by Komnick for Xanten, but in digital form, to allow for various techniques of analysis.

A final point needs to be made. In 2007, Lockyear called for better integration of numismatic data with the rest of the archaeological evidence, a view which I fully support.<sup>26</sup> Progress has been made in this direction over the last 10 years. This trend began in Celtic numismatics and spread towards Roman, and now Greek coins, as is evidenced by a recent edited volume.<sup>27</sup> Recent monographs now generally include, to a varying extent, some commentary on the

---

<sup>24</sup> K. Lockyear, “Site finds in Roman Britain: a comparison of techniques,” *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 19 (2000) 397-423.

<sup>25</sup> R. Reece, *Roman coins from 140 sites in Britain* (Cotswold Studies 4; Cirencester 1991); Reece has recently put the data online, in Excel format, at <https://www.academia.edu/25222330> (viewed 26 April, 2017).

<sup>26</sup> S. Martin, “Circulation de la monnaie et données archéologiques. L’apport de la stratigraphie à l’histoire monétaire,” *Pallas. Revue d’études antiques* 99 (2015) 157-73. This approach does not always yield immediate results, as Komnick himself experiences at 537, concerning the dating of anonymous *quadrantes* of the late 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> c. A.D. This is no reason to discard the method altogether (Komnick certainly does not): science is cumulative, and it is from the collection of coins from well-dated stratigraphical contexts that new interpretations can arise.

<sup>27</sup> F. Duyrat and C. Grandjean (edd.), *Les monnaies de fouille du monde grec (VI<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> s. a.C.). Apports, approches et méthodes* (Scripta antiqua 93; Bordeaux 2016).

archaeological context of the coins,<sup>28</sup> but it is not yet standard and seldom constitutes the bulk of the study.<sup>29</sup> This is in part due to the persisting divide between field archaeologists and numismatists, but the latter are not always to be blamed. More often than not, coins are published before the complete excavation report(s) are available, numismatists having to make do with what little information they have.<sup>30</sup> Although they are careful in giving all the necessary information to link each coin back to its context,<sup>31</sup> I believe that publishing the material before the archaeological contexts can prove detrimental to research in the long term. It is difficult to imagine that, after a monograph has already been published on the coin finds from a particular excavation or series of excavations, someone else will pick up the work to carry it further. Again, making the data available in a digital format would be a big step forward, as it would ease the painstaking process of linking manually each archaeological context to its finds by going through several books and articles to note down (often diverging) inventory and catalogue numbers and making a concordance, work that not only is rather ungratifying but can lead to mistakes easy to avoid should the data be digitally available and importable in a database. The preceding remarks should not detract from the quality of the monograph written by Komnick: without a doubt, we need more catalogues such as the one he has masterfully produced for Xanten. But in reading and using it, I could not help feeling that its form and structure do not do justice to the great amount of work he has put in it; nor does it do justice to the material. As computers and databases have taken on even greater importance, too little has changed in the publication and analysis of coin finds since Lockyear's article of 2007. His recommendations are still the best way forward to try and get more out of the enormously interesting material that are coin finds.

---

<sup>28</sup> See, e.g., M. Py, *Les monnaies préaugustéennes de Lattes et la circulation monétaire protohistorique en Gaule méridionale* (Lattara 19; Lattes 2006); K. Gruel and L. Popovitch, *Les monnaies gauloises et romaines de l'oppidum de Bibracte* (Bibracte 13; Glux-en-Glenne 2007); Doyen (supra n.11); Gricourt, Naumann and Schaub (supra n.16); Krmnicek (supra n.15); Chameroy (supra n.16); Frascone (supra n.16); R. Hobbs, *Currency and exchange in ancient Pompeii. Coins from the AAPP Excavations at Regio VI, Insula I* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, Suppl. 116, 2013).

<sup>29</sup> The book under review is only marginally concerned by this criticism since it is a general catalogue of all coins found on the site since the 16<sup>th</sup> c., many of which do not have a precise archaeological context. When available, the author does make use of the archaeological information at his disposal.

<sup>30</sup> Such was the situation, for instance, for Hobbs (supra n.28) and Chameroy (supra n.16).

<sup>31</sup> Doyen (supra n.11), as well as Frascone (supra n.16), even catalogue the coins by trench or excavation site. The latter also provides a traditional catalogue by minting authority and date, but only as an appendix.