

volume in front of my eyes I had an impression that it should not be treated as the final work.

Commemorative coins were mentioned in the last report. This is again a certain issue which was treated marginally. It was not presented as it should have been, though for the modern period it is a significant if not the central problem. I would like to refer to the discussion which took place yesterday. We discussed the number of the biggest gold specimens of forty- or hundred-ducats. The question arises if there is some critical, quantitative mass which determines the coin and the medal. The circulation of two, three or ten specimens does not fulfill one of the basic functions specific for a coin and necessary to call a specimen a coin.

The problem of defining the border between a coin-money, a coin-a piece of art and a coin-a technical test is, for sure, the aspect which requires close analysis, not only theoretical one but also based on economics. It is necessary to establish when the given object *de facto* becomes a coin in terms of currency. Although this problem has some impact upon all the issues debated at the Conference, unfortunately it was not discussed here.

Let me refer to my first talk when I quoted one of the first sentences from the latest book of Assistant Professor Mikołajczyk writing about these hostile parties of numismatists and historian-economists working independently of each other. Mrs. Męclewska corrected this, calling them not two hostile parties but two parallel tracks. In our case we spoke about the other aspect, purely historical, but still treated it from a certain distance. We should have looked for colleagues-historians who also dealt with this aspect of the problem. Their point of view, not in terms of a coin but in terms of the written source, could have been presented and confronted with strictly numismatic aspect. If full integration of these two research trends is not a fact, they both will be deficient, they both will be rightly criticised by the opposing party.

All our reports were unanimously stressing the state of investigations and perspectives. Some lecturers treated this common denominator in an individual way since each report presented it differently. It was a happy coincidence since, due to this, we have a variety of opinions supplementing one another. Can we draw a common conclusion unconnected with the state of investigations which was presented and cannot be changed but connected with perspectives?

It was stated here, and nobody doubts it, that there is still a lot of work to do. The epoch we were talking

about is not a fully discussed epoch where nothing can be added, on the contrary there is still a great deal of possibilities for the research work. These possibilities are dependent, as it was underlined in almost each report, upon the enlarging of source basis, its elaborating, presenting, recording and publishing despite the fact that this basis is sometimes enormous.

The second stage consists of various aspects of interpretations of these sources which, however, should be more related to main trends of economic history and the social history of our country.

It would be my main conclusion, perhaps optimistic, since these problems are not solved today but they will be studied in the future. Whether this research would be realized and how depends on you, ladies and gentlemen, gathered in this room and also on other colleagues who deal with these problems.

Finally, I would like to thank the organizers of the Conference for enabling us to exchange our points of view. May positive effects for the branch of science represented by us result from this.

TADEUSZ POKLEWSKI

On the behalf of the organizers I would like to thank you all, ladies and gentlemen, for the trust in us and also for your reports, their delivery and for your taking part in this discussion.

Thank you on the behalf of the Presidium of the Department of Polish Academy of Science in Łódź, and the Department of the Polish Archaeological and Numismatic Society in Łódź.

STANISŁAW SUCHODOLSKI

I would like to look ahead to the future since we face the necessity of organizing the last conference of this cycle devoted to the Polish coins after the Partition i.e. from the 19th and 20th centuries.

On the behalf of the Main Board of Polish Archaeological and Numismatic Society I would like to thank the organizers of the Conference and all the present, ladies and gentlemen, for the participation in it. Let me encourage all the gathered to consider the possibilities of organizing this last fifth meeting which would complete the survey of the state and perspectives of investigations of the Polish coins and the coins in Poland. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

*Translated by
Elżbieta Lubińska*