SO: Anglo-Saxon coins; studies presented to F.M. Stenton on the occasion of his 80th birthday, 17 May, 1960.

VO: N/A **NO:**

DA: 1961 **PG:** 1- 22

AU/TI: Dolley, Michael, ed. JPC Kent; From Roman Britain to Saxon England

I

From Roman Britain to Saxon England

by J. P. C. KENT

[Plates I and II]

'A dim mist hangs over the history of the island from the fourth to the seventh century.'[1] In the year A.D. 400, Britain was an integral part of the Roman Empire. Though already rocked by the storms that were soon to bring about its severance from the imperial government, the province was still the seat of an elaborate administrative and military structure, to maintain which heavy taxation was levied, and to pay which coin flowed into local coffers in an undiminished stream. Before the year A.D. 700, Britain had become a collection of warring Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, among some of whom at least had begun the use of national currency that was to be the ancestor of our medieval coinage. The purpose of this paper is to trace the transition between the classical and the medieval – between Roman and Anglo-Saxon. Its aim is to consider a series of important archaeological and numismatic problems whose solutions inevitably affect our interpretation of how and when Roman Britain came to an end. There remains the question of what came after. Did Roman coins continue to enter Britain after its abandonment? Were imitations of Roman coins made here on a large scale in the fifth and sixth centuries? If so, by whom were they made, and what economic and social implications can one draw from this? Then, at the other end of the scale, we must ask how Anglo-Saxon coinage began. How far does it derive from a Roman or sub-Roman predecessor? What does it owe to continental contemporaries? Above all, when did it begin? Should we associate it with the coming of Christianity to Kent, just before 600, or should it be some seventy or eighty years later? These are questions which have a peculiar relevance to Britain. Indeed, it may be said that only in Britain do these problems exist. For somewhat over a hundred years successive generations of scholars have propounded various solutions, and so fundamental has been the failure to agree even on the distinction between fact and hypothesis that I can scarcely hope that my own particular interpretation will achieve universal or unqualified acceptance. But in offering one that reconciles the supposedly conflicting claims of history, archaeology, and numismatics, it is my aim to find a

measure of common ground that may perhaps serve as a basis for future advances.

Before the problems of the Dark Ages can be elucidated, it is necessary to determine what was the composition of the currency of Britain at the end of the fourth century. We are fortunate that there exists an abundance of evidence from hoards and site-finds from which it is possible to draw some general conclusions.[2] As elsewhere in the Roman Empire, there was a pronounced increase in the amount of gold coin in circulation after *c.* 370, and though finds are naturally not numerous in an absolute sense, there are enough to demonstrate that in and after 400 the coin most readily available was the *solidus* '*Victoria Auggg*' coined principally at Milan from 394 to 402, and thereafter mainly at Ravenna. Ravenna *solidi* of this type fall into three groups, of which only the first, which dates between 402 and about 409, occurs in British finds within a Roman context.[3] Britain's main wealth, however, lay in silver. She provided most of the silver for the abundant coinages of the second half of the fourth century, and herself absorbed most of the mint's output.[4] By the end of the century, though earlier pieces were still abundant, the characteristic coin was the *siliqua* '*Virtus Romanorum*' of the Milan mint. Seen rarely as site-finds, these pieces are found hoarded together in large numbers, and are at once the last considerable issue of silver from a Roman mint until the sixth century, and with rare exceptions the latest silver coins to be found in this country. It is clear that soon after 400 something happened in Britain to check the flow of silver to the imperial treasury, for the silver coined at Rome and Ravenna after 402 was both meagre in quantity and unavailable to British hoarders. The bronze coinage was necessarily more miscellaneous in character, and did not even present a uniform picture throughout the country.[5] In addition, the evidence of hoards and site-finds is not quite the same. We find that around 400 the complementary issues of '*Salus Reipublicae*' from Italian mints and '*Victoria Auggg*' from Gaul were readily available to hoarders in the south and east, and that in the great towns considerable quantities of these tiny pieces circulated freely. But though the newness of this coinage made it specially attractive to the hoarder, it formed but one part of the currency. A major part of this was composed of well-worn pieces of the later years of the House of Constantine. Even at Richborough, where late fourth century coins are notoriously common, finds suggest that the bulk of the circulation of this period consisted of '*Gloria Exercitus*' and '*Victoriae*' types, together with the coins commemorating the foundation of Constantinople, and other issues of *c.* 330–45. Of earlier coins, very few now survived – mainly a handful of radiates of the third century and their copies. Strangely enough, later coins too had become uncommon, except

for some of the '*Gloria*' and '*Securitas*' issues of the House of Valentinian. The '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio*' series of 345 to 360, so abundant in hoards when it first appeared, was now virtually extinct. Only the varieties bearing the 'Phoenix' type and a few of the later 'Horseman' issues still rarely persisted in currency. Such was the state of British coinage at the moment when the island was about to be cut off from Rome for ever, and the essential background against which we must consider the problems of the fifth century.

We must begin with a brief consideration of the historical circumstances under which Roman Britain came to an end, and our starting-point is the year 394, when Theodosius I reunified the Roman world for a moment, only to split it finally into two parts when at his death in 395 he divided it between his sons Arcadius and Honorius. The long and futile reign of the latter spelled disaster for the Western Empire, and when at length he died unmourned in 423, not only was Britain lost beyond recovery, but imperial rule in Gaul, Spain, and the North Balkans was rapidly declining into a meaningless fiction. It is not surprising that Honorius' reign was much troubled by usurpers. From our point of view the most important was Constantine III.[6] Britain had flared once more into revolt in the year 406. An invasion of Gaul by a confederate body of Germans seemed to have as its target the Channel ports, and giving vent to its well-founded lack of confidence in the Roman high command, the British army proclaimed its own nominee emperor, and in self-defence seized the Channel ports and successfully repulsed the invaders. Two candidates for power fell in rapid succession, but the third, Constantine, managed to survive his unpromising start. Elevated solely on account of his auspicious name, Constantine attempted to emulate the feat of his predecessor, the great Constantine of exactly a century before, and abandoned the province he was supposed to defend. He embarked on a gamble for power in Gaul, and at different times controlled (and minted at) Trier, Lyons, and Arles. At the zenith of his fortune he was master of Spain, and actually invaded Italy, but in 411 he was trapped with part of his army in Arles by the generals of Honorius, and his empire crumbled away. But Britain had already slipped from imperial hands. In 410 the civil authorities in Britain expelled the neglectful Constantine's governors, and besought Honorius to resume control. But at this very moment Rome itself was in the hands of a Gothic army and its puppet emperor Priscus Attalus, and Honorius could do no more than authorize the 'cities of Britain' – in effect the tribal aristocracies – to take measures for their own defence. With this pronouncement, the history of Roman Britain comes to an end. The famous theory of the reoccupation of a part of Britain between *c.* 417 and 428, originally propounded by Professor Collingwood in an attempt to reconcile the seemingly

divergent evidence of documents and coins, need no longer be maintained.[7] Both the interpretation of the *Notitia Dignitatum* and the theories of coin-drift and survival which underlay it are now recognized to be mistaken.[8] Between 417 and *c.* 430 Honorius and his successors maintained precarious rule in Gaul as far as the Rhine, but Britain was lost for ever.

Apart from a very brief period under Magnus Maximus, Britain had possessed no official mint of her own since the reign of Constantine the Great, and the political severance of the province from the central government in 406 meant the practical cessation of coin import to this country. This surprises us less in these days than it did the antiquaries of a previous generation, for we have now been shown that Roman coppers seldom wandered far from their place of issue,[9] and, of course, in the late Empire circulation beyond the limits of a single province (of which there were five in Britain) was restricted by law. Furthermore, the main function of imperial bronze disbursements was the recovery of gold coin paid out to functionaries and the soldiery,[10] and the letter of 410 is a clear intimation that no further official payments were contemplated. A closer analysis of the latest Roman coins to be found here is therefore of prime importance, and the evidence of the coppers is particularly significant.[11] The issue of the types '*Victoria*' and '*Salus*' so abundant in hoards and on town sites came to an end about 396 and 402 respectively. Of the two major obverse varieties of '*Salus*', reading DN ONORIVS PF AVG or DN HONORI AVG, many thousands of specimens have come down to us. Following coinages are by contrast found but rarely, '*Urbs Roma Felix*', struck between 404 and 408, is known in Britain from two examples only. '*Gloria Romanorum*', a rare type struck in Gaul after 417, is known from but one. The large issues minted in Rome from 420 onwards in the names of Honorius, John, Theodosius II, and Valentinian III are virtually unrepresented in Britain. It is, therefore, possible to say with some certainty that the import of copper coins to Britain ceased soon after 400. In view of the 'stock-piling' of coppers by the Treasury that can be demonstrated in the late fourth century, there seems no reason to doubt that 406 is the crucial date at which this abrupt end took place. Their evidence is therefore exactly in line with that of the *solidi* already discussed. The evidence of the silver coinage is somewhat harder to assess. We have seen that the last Roman silver occurring in abundance in Britain is the Milan *siliqua* '*Virtus Romanorum*', the issue of which terminated *c.* 402. There are, however, found not infrequently silver coins of Constantine III, and, most significantly, the three known examples of the Trier '*Urbs Roma*' *siliqua* of Honorius all have a British provenance.[12] In the light of this it is important to remember that no single specimen of the ensuing issue, in the names of Theodosius II and Valentinian III, struck at Trier

between 425 and 428, comes from this country. Practically all are from the Upper Rhine.[13] Britain, I conclude, was still able to absorb much of the Gallic output of silver coin down to *c.* 420 – then that too came to an end.

There remains only the question of how long these latest coins persisted in circulation, and to this the answer can be subjective only. With regard to the coppers, it depends much on the interpretation of their condition. They are almost always found, even in hoards, in poor condition, and it has been disputed whether this is the result of wear in circulation or due to the extremely defective technique of the Rome mint, which generally led to substantial portions of legend and type on the '*Salus*' issues being missing.[14] Though wear is not absent in most cases, it is my opinion that poor striking is a very important factor. It is otherwise impossible to explain why the Gallic '*Victoria*' coins should so often appear to be found in better condition in the same hoards as the Roman '*Salus*' type, since the bulk of the latter coinage is beyond doubt later in date. The latest finds of silver coin generally contain a very high proportion of clipped pieces, reducing the average weight to the very low standard of the latest Trier coins. Clipped and worn *siliquae* were in fact associated with the three finds containing these pieces, which were themselves virtually uncirculated. It seems legitimate to deduce that both silver and copper coin of the latest types to enter Britain had disappeared from circulation by *c.* 430. No such pieces are habitually found, for example, in the earliest pagan Anglo-Saxon graves to indicate that they were more available as ornaments to the new settlers than any other of the common coins of Roman Britain. It has been suggested that the mention of *denarius* and *obolus* by Gildas is evidence that silver (clipped *siliquae*) and copper (barbarous imitations) coin was familiar in sixth-century Britain.[15] The completely coinless sixth-century royal site of Castle Dore hardly lends credence to this proposition. We should not suppose Gildas incapable of metaphor here, any more than we believe that Constantine of Dumnonia's mother was really an unclean lioness!

When in 1844 Akerman wrote his account of Roman coins relating to Britain, the possibility of a sub-Roman coinage, made by the Britons in an attempt to supply the currency suddenly denied to them by severance from the Empire, had not yet been considered. It first appears as a developed hypothesis in Roach Smith's *Antiquities of Richborough, Reculver, and Lymne*, published in 1850. Roach Smith was struck by the comprehensive nature of the Richborough coin-list, which covered the entire range of the Roman occupation, and restarted with the earliest Anglo-Saxon coins, then believed to have begun not later than the end of the sixth century. He was also faced by a mass of barbarous copies, which seemed to fill the gap, and it was natural for him to devote attention to

the '*minimi*; so named on account of their small size'.[16] His conclusion was that these 'very small coins in brass . . . from their barbarous execution, or imperfect design, can only be considered as imitations, of a late date, of the commoner kinds of third brass coins', and that they should 'possibly be ascribed to unknown princes or rulers of Britain, after the departure of the Romans, and before the establishment of the Saxons'.[17] Subsequent scholars have on the whole tended to elaborate this hypothesis, though Roach Smith himself was later to reject it.[18] Sir John Evans[19] included with the *minimi* the ordinary barbarous third brass, 'like the times in which they were struck, barbarous and rude'. Two classes of prototype are copied above all others, late-third-century radiates, and one variety of the '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Falling Horseman' series, and though hoards of these are commonly found, the two designs are never found together in the same deposit in numbers which suggest their contemporaneous currency. This mutual exclusiveness has given rise to singular conjectures, such as that since the former were derived from pagan prototypes and the latter from coins of a Christian emperor, the ones were attributable to the pagan Anglo-Saxons, the others to the Christian Britons. Dr Mattingly went so far as to call the famous Richborough radiate hoard,[20] 'the coinage of Hengist and Horsa with their Jutes', and this in spite of the stratigraphic evidence for third-century date he himself records, and of the absence of similar pieces in pagan Kentish graves (see Appendix). Dr Sutherland has recently defended the notion of a Dark Ages coinage on the grounds that the Britons cannot soon have lost the 'habit' of using money,[21] but when it is clear that the entire administrative and economic machine was in dissolution, it is difficult to be persuaded that coinage must have continued, when there may have been no function for it to perform. Furthermore, there is a significant concentration of imitations of both classes in the southern and eastern parts of the country – not exclusive, but enough to show two facts clearly. First, that the area of circulation of both types was the same, and that in consequence of their to all intents and purposes never being found hoarded together they must be appreciably separated in date. Second, that the attribution of either class to the Anglo-Saxons is negatived by their virtual non-appearance in Anglo-Saxon graves, and to the Britons of the later fifth century by their predominantly eastern and southern distribution. Indeed, if either class were to belong to the fifth century, it could only be to a fairly early part of that century; as Roach Smith saw, they must fall 'after the departure of the Romans, and before the establishment of the Saxons'. But we have already seen that down to *c.* 430 the currency of Roman coins remains probable, and that at this date neither radiates nor '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio*'s formed more than the minutest proportion of

the coins in circulation in the south. With the extreme position formerly adopted by Hill in seeking to date hoards containing substantial numbers of barbarous coins to the late fifth and sixth centuries we need no longer concern ourselves. It is no longer maintained by its author, and is in any case not supported by other than subjective evidence.[22] Its corollary – the so-called '*sceatta*-like imitation' – is another snare.[23] A relationship between barbarous coins and *sceattas* suggests nearness of date, but we shall see that the latter can hardly start more than a decade before 700 – more than fifty years later than would have been admitted twenty years ago – and that their prototypes are never barbarous pieces. We are left with the fact that both are very roughly engraved and struck, evidently the flimsiest basis for associating them with one another.

The evidence that many of the third- and fourth-century copies were contemporary with their prototypes is already substantial and incontrovertible and accumulates with every publication of stratified material. It rests on the secure basis of stratification, sites with abruptly ending coin-series, overstriking of barbarous on regular pieces, and the invariable association of copies with their prototypes in hoards and on sites.[24] Not even the most ardent supporter of the Dark Ages dating has seriously challenged this body of evidence, and it is admitted that nothing can be adduced either from archaeology or numismatics to support the contrary view. In short, the onus of proof rests squarely on those who wish to date any barbarous copies of these classes substantially later than their prototypes. In my opinion, such proof is not likely to be forthcoming, and in its absence the last hope of discovering and defining a barbarous Dark Ages coinage, whether for Anglo-Saxons or Britons, must perish.

I have offered evidence that the import of Roman coins to Britain fell abruptly to negligible proportion soon after 400, and that their circulation came to an end by *c.* 430. I have shown that not only is there evidence that the barbarous pieces formerly attributed to the Dark Ages did not circulate then, but they are in fact all contemporary with the currency of their prototypes. I will now demonstrate that the characteristic coinages of the other barbarian successor kingdoms to the Western Empire were scarce, high-value issues of gold, and quite removed in kind from the common everyday coppers postulated for England. Many were simple copies of Roman *solidi*. Such was the coinage of the Visigoths in South Gaul from *c.* 440 onwards.[25] The prototype, even to the mint-mark, is closely followed, and though fineness and weight often leave something to be desired, it is not until the sixth century that style and fabric become increasingly distinct. Not until well into the second half of the sixth century did the practice of coining in the name of the reigning Roman emperor come to an end. While they lasted, the Kingdoms of the Ostrogoths

and Burgundians produced even more reputable copies, no more than the royal monogram marking the piece as of non-imperial origin. Only in the urban centres of Africa and Italy did silver and copper coinages of non-imperial character flourish. In Gaul they are confined to Lyons, and can have no place in Dark Ages Britain. A transient attempt of the Merovingian Theodebert around 535 to issue *solidi* and *tremisses* in his own name failed in the face of diplomatic and no doubt commercial opinion.

However, the last quarter of the sixth century saw the emergence of national coinages in France and Spain, along quite different lines. Most distinctly national were the Visigothic *tremisses* with the name, title, and effigy of the king, combined with the name of the mint-town. The Merovingians struck few coins in the names of the kings. Not only was coinage vastly decentralized, but there is no indication of an authority other than the moneyer and the town of issue. There was naturally a great variety of design and style. Most of these pieces were *tremisses*. When *solidi* were required, it was customary until the reign of Heraclius (610–41) to coin them in the name of the reigning emperor.[26] Though on account of their situation among the latest peoples to abandon the imitation of Roman *solidi* and *tremisses*, the Lombards of Italy have a great importance in our survey. If the influence of Roman and Merovingian coins rests heavy on the earliest Anglo-Saxon pieces, yet it is from the eighth-century Lombard *tremisses* – the *solidi stellati* – that the typical *denier* coinage of the Middle Ages most directly derives its weight and design.

The marriage of the Merovingian princess Bertha with King Æthelbert of Kent *c.* 580 marks the re-emergence of England into a place in European affairs. But this country was still unready for a coinage, and it is generally agreed that the St Martin's (Canterbury) hoard, on a piece in which we read the name of Liudhard, Bertha's chaplain, is medallic in character.[27] For the start of a true coinage we are confronted by two principal pieces of evidence – the great hoards of Sutton Hoo and Crondall.[28] Since the dating of their contents by the Merovingian pieces is illusory in the absence of a firm chronology for these, we must rely on other grounds. In the first place, the complete absence of Anglo-Saxon coins from the Sutton Hoo purse seems to me to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that *c.* 650, the accepted date for the burial, such coins did not yet exist. The provenance of most Anglo-Saxon gold coin from Kent is demonstrated by finds, and hinted at in Bede's story of the mid-seventh-century Kentish princess in Normandy – 'aureum illud nomisma . . . de Cantia'[29] – and yet in the assemblage of purely Kentish jewellery we find nothing but Merovingian coins. In support of this, we may note the use of Roman, Byzantine, and Merovingian *solidi* as jewellery, often with the characteristic gold-and-garnet

mounting, down to the mid-seventh century. So far as I am aware, there is no example of the use of an Anglo-Saxon gold coin by the Kentish jewellers, and this as surely denotes the non-currency of the former, as it shows that the latter did not yet exist. Our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon gold coinage is of course very imperfect. Many types hitherto unknown came to light in the Crondall hoard, while many well-known types were not represented in that find, and no doubt others will appear to fill some apparent gaps in the series. *Tremisses* only were of constant weight and could serve as coin. The so-called *solidi* were made to no fixed standard. All those of certain English origin seem to have been mounted and to have been intended as jewellers' pieces. Crondall presents some difficult problems, but its basic evidence may be stated as follows. Apart from the worn and mounted Lombard copy of a Ravenna *tremissis* of Phocas (602–10)[30] all its contents, Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon alike, are completely free from wear. Furthermore, its Anglo-Saxon element divides itself into die-linked groups, some of which seem already to have derived series showing marked typological degeneration. The question is important, because one of its groups, consisting of pieces with a facing bust, inscribed LONDVNIV, has been attributed to Bishop Mellitus of London (604–16). The issue is evidently Christian, although I can distinguish neither the pallium nor tonsure claimed by Dr Sutherland. Since London was in a virtual state of apostacy between 616 and 670, the limits outside which its date must fall are fairly fixed. For my part, I cannot believe even with the very limited amount of currency these coins must have achieved that they could have stayed together in a close die-linked group and remained without trace of wear for more than half a century. Once this series is displaced from the first quarter of the century, the last evidence for the start of an Anglo-Saxon gold coinage before *c.* 675 is removed.

The names of these coins remains uncertain. Conventionally they are referred to as '*thrymsas*', as though derived from the Roman *tremissis*. But the only authorities for the word *thrymsa* appear to be eleventh-century legal sources, which equate it with a unit of account of three pence,[31] and this seems a far cry from seventh-century Kent.

In his as yet unpublished Ford Lectures for 1957, Grierson proposes to call them 'shillings'. Perhaps he was influenced by the Western tendency to use the term *solidus* not only for the whole piece, but also for its subsidiary units the half (*semissis*) and third (*tremissis*) – a practice attested in Africa, Spain, and Italy. When we find an early eighth-century Merovingian silver coin inscribed DENARIVS, the origin of the universal West European accounting equation 1 *solidus*=12 *denarii* becomes easier to understand, though 20 *solidi* to the pound is readily explicable only in terms of a relatively debased gold alloy, and a high

valuation of gold in respect of silver. However, neither premiss is alien to our knowledge of the eighth century, and there is much to be said for the suggestion that '*thrymsas*' were none other than the *solidi* of account.

The earliest Anglo-Saxon gold naturally drew on a wide range of prototypes, the availability in England of which can either be demonstrated or reasonably assumed. Many were simple derivatives or copies of seventh-century Merovingian pieces, and their existence does nothing but to emphasize the direction whence the stimulus to coinage came. Let us rather concern ourselves with the feature of this coinage that is truly its own, the copying of Roman imperial types of the third and fourth centuries. To a large extent this copying is haphazard. We find, for example, a piece probably not itself English on which an obverse derived from an Italian gold *tremissis* of the time of Justinian (527–65) is combined with a reverse copying the late Constantinian bronze type of '*Gloria Exercitus*' with one standard.[32] The letter M on the standard enables us to define the issue copied as the Trier mint $\frac{M}{TRP\smile}$ series of *c.* 339 (**Plate I, 1–3**). Even greater confusion is revealed in my next two examples, the '*solidus*' from Markshall, and the 'Licinius' group from the Crondall hoard. The Markshall piece copies closely but illiterately the obverse of the bronze coinage of Helena of the 324–9 period. But its reverse, evidently derived from a '*Vot X*' piece of the Constantinian Caesars of *c.* 321–4, bears a legend adumbrating that of the *Beata Tranquillitas* issue of 320–1 (**Plate I, 4–6**). The Crondall examples have a tolerably correct 'Licinius' legend on obverse and reverse, of the 320 period, but the actual portrait is that of one of the sons of Constantine, as they appeared at Trier *c.* 324–6 (**Plate I, 7–9**). Such mixed copying suggests that all the prototypes drawn upon were available at the same moment to the copyist, and it is therefore significant that all were types that are regularly found together in hoards, and are by no means the commonest coins from sites. A single hoard could adequately account for the Roman elements in both the Markshall and Crondall pieces. Surely the hoard must have been laid before the puzzled copyist in its entirety as suitable material to imitate, and we have here plausible evidence for the official character of this interest. At this date Roman coins were considered more worthy prototypes for the new coinage than Merovingian, not least, perhaps, because they came to official hands more readily.

The transition from a gold to a silver coinage was a steady and, it seems, a rapid process. It is principally illustrated by a quite common, yet completely self-contained series, that imitates the *Victoria Augg* 'Two Emperors' *solidus* of the late fourth century (**Plate I, 10–11**). We find that although there is no perceptible degeneration in design, the metal varies in quality from good gold

to silver, with intervening gradations in electrum. The rapidity with which the standard changed is paralleled in the runic series inscribed with the name 'Pada', which occurs in various qualities of electrum, and continues well into the series of silver so-called '*sceattas*'. 'Pada's' coins have also a Roman prototype, a bronze piece in the name of Crispus of about 319, with reverse '*Virtus Exercit*'. The earliest examples show clearly the 'helmeted bust' of the original, and the legend '*Crispus Nob Caes*'. At first it looks as though the copyist produced a number of variations based on the reverse. In some, the influence of the Crondall '*Vota*' type is apparent, and it is noticeable that some of the earliest silver pieces are closer to the prototype than the electrum (**Plate I, 12–14**). Again, it looks as though the electrum coinage must have been very short lived. We turn now to a consideration of its date. An initial date for the gold of *c.* 675 has been argued earlier in this paper. We have seen that although pieces heralding the transition to electrum and silver do not occur in Crondall, ample evidence has been adduced to suggest that when either typological or metallic degeneration occurred, its progress was rapid. Either we must postulate a gap between the issue of the purely gold series and that initiating the transition, or assume that the whole process, from the start of gold coinage to the conversion to silver, took place over a brief period, for which ten or fifteen years would seem ample. The coincidence of this dating with that deduced by Le Gentilhomme for the same transition from gold to silver among the Franks (*c.* 680–700) goes far to confirm its accuracy. One group of rather base gold alone is hard to fit in with this dating, and it is itself gravely anomalous in many ways. First is its provenance – York and its immediate environs. Second is its alloy, which looks like copper and not silver. Third is its apparent date, for it seems to be imitated from a *solidus* now attributed to Justinian II's second reign, around 705–6 (**Plate I, 15–16**). Even granted the authenticity of the group, which has never been questioned and which was certainly known by the last quarter of the eighteenth century, we should not perhaps argue from the conditions prevailing in the relatively impoverished north, which to judge from such finds as the single base *tremissis* from Yeavering, and the story of King Oswald's silver dish,[33] was to all intents and purposes void of coin in the seventh century, and which could not even afford to maintain a silver coinage in the eighth.

The evidence for the inauguration of the '*Sceatta*' series around 680–90 seems conclusive, and we have to consider how long it may be supposed to have continued. English '*sceattas*', as was well shown by Hill,[34] fall into two major classes, the so-called 'Standard' group of 'Crispus' imitations, which leads straight out of the electrum coinage, and the 'London' group. The latter is

miscellaneous in character, but type mules and a falling weight standard indicate that chronologically its earliest pieces succeed the latest 'Standard' varieties. Very important is the Cimiez hoard. This contained several varieties of 'Standard' '*sceattas*', also some apparently latish examples of the 'London' group. But, according to Le Gentilhomme, this hoard must have been buried at or before the destruction of the town in 737, and it looks as though the whole life of the '*Thrymsa*'–'*Sceatta*' coinage must have been relatively short and compact. It is difficult on this chronology to protract this coinage beyond 750, if so late a date is possible, and just as a large gap looms between the Roman and Anglo-Saxon coinage, so a shorter one seems to intervene between '*sceatta*' and penny, despite the manifest influence of the one on the other, and their probable identity of denomination.[35]

Silver issues of the 'Standard' series are directly imitated from two Roman bronze prototypes. The earliest, as we have seen, is the 'Crispus *Virtus Exercit*' discussed above. Direct English descendants fail early in the series, and the ultimate derivatives (the 'Porcupine' group and cognates) are found predominantly in Frisian hoards. Our second group begins with a rare gold or electrum piece imitating a late-third-century radiate, probably Marius or Carausius. Its reverse type, 'Clasped Hands', did not persist, but the radiate obverse rapidly superseded the 'Helmeted head of Crispus', taking over its characteristic 'Standard' reverse (**Plate I, 17–19**). A rapid declension of style followed, with the radiate head acquiring first a debased runic legend EPA, APA, etc., in place of the meaningless 'Roman' TIC, and finally becoming anepigraphic. Late derivatives, specially in Frisia, combine two obverses or two reverses.

The 'London' series seems to contain three main streams. First there is the profile bust with legend adumbrating LVNDONIA, or some corruption of it. Its reverses are principally 'Man holding Cross and Bird', 'Man with Two Crosses', etc., the figure often standing in a ship that suggests the influence of the '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Galley' type of *c.* 348–50.[36] 'Men with Crosses' or 'Man with Cross' is a substantive obverse in its own right, being accompanied by the so-called 'Fantastic Animal', 'Celtic Cross', or 'Wolf-whorl'. The 'Celtic Cross' itself seems to originate with the third main obverse of this series, the moustached and bearded facing bust through a degenerate 'Bust on Shield' form. Its earliest reverse is 'Men with Cross', but it commonly occurs with 'Bird on Cross' 'Fantastic Animal', and 'Wolf-whorl'. There is to be observed a typological unity within the whole series, though it may be doubted whether it emanated from the mint of London alone.[37] It owes much less to Roman prototypes than its predecessor. The origin of the 'Facing Bust' type is probably to be sought in *solidi* of Constans II (641–68), but it is likely that the '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio*' coinage

played its part, and at least one rare variety has an unmistakable Roman 'Victory' (**Plate I, 20–3**; **II, 1–5**). Its dating we have already considered, and in support of it we may observe that the base silver Northumbrian '*stycas*' of about 750 and later exhibit the use of the same sort of 'Fantastic Animal' as the Cimiez hoard shows to have been current in the south some fifteen years before.

The subsequent development of English coinage shows that the interest in antique Roman coin-types we have noted so far did not cease with the '*sceattas*'. The rest of European coinage went its way under the influence of current Arabic, Byzantine, Italian, or Frankish prototypes. England was not unaffected by contemporary trends, but remained faithful to the direct and often renewed influence of Roman coinage to an unparalleled extent. The characteristic late Roman diademed and draped bust remained a direct source of inspiration not only for the pence of Offa, where its influence is palpable, but for a large majority of the royal heads of the late Anglo-Saxon series. Indeed, I would go so far as to assert that the predominance, and ultimate triumph, of the royal effigy in profile on the Early English coinage was conditioned by respect for Roman practice, and that groups in which aniconic types prevailed stand outside the normal pattern of development. It is, however, true that with the coming of the penny the influence of Roman reverse types becomes only sporadic. The very common 'Wolf and Twins' reverse of the Constantinian '*Urbs Roma*' was copied not only by late '*sceattas*' but also by the penny of Æthelbert of East Anglia (**Plate II, 6–8**). But apart from his direct imitation of Roman busts (**Plate II, 9–10**) and the occurrence of the Roman '*Vota* wreath', Offa seems to rely for inspiration only on the '*sceattas*'. Otherwise he looks towards contemporary Europe, and particularly Italy. The 'Celtic Cross' type seems to find its latest expression in the rosettes spacing the legend on several of his pence (**Plate II, 11**), while the 'Standard' design is clearly the source of others, and through them of the 'Three-line' series (**Plate II, 12–14**). The linear layout of the inscription has Frankish affinities, though I at least would be prepared to see in it the direct inspiration of the abundant coinage of Byzantine silver *miliaresia* introduced by Leo III (717–41) towards the end of his reign, an influence still strong as late as Ælfred. Similarly, the lettering often found on Offa's coinage (and never later), not least on his celebrated *dinar*, can be most easily paralleled on the contemporary Byzantine-Italian coinage of Rome, though a manuscript source may have furnished the actual models. Manuscripts or pictures rather than Papal coins must surely also be the inspiration for the treatment of the portraiture of the ninth-century archbishops of Canterbury. Essentially these effigies are but full-face versions of the regal portraits, the drapery, for example, remaining unaltered. But we notice that

on occasional dies the archiepiscopal bust has acquired pendants below the ears derived from and only appropriate to imperial Byzantine features (**Plate II, 15–18**). Later copying does not call for much comment. The *Victoria Augg* 'Two Emperors' prototype – its later variety with the angular drapery covering the legs is clearly discernible – reappears on a famous penny of Ælfred, which was itself subsequently subject to Danish imitation (**Plate IX, 5**). The derivation of Edward the Elder's 'Burgh' type from the '*Providentiae Augg*' issue of Constantine the Great and his family is well known. Less famous but no less real is the exact imitation by the obverse of Æthelræd II's 'Radiate Helmet' penny of a pre-Reform *double denarius* of the Lyons mint, bearing the name of Maximian (**Plate II, 19–20**). Edward the Confessor looks more towards the German emperors than to Rome except on his 'Radiate Bust' type (**Plate II, 21**), but it is appropriate that the very last of our Saxon kings, Harold II, should model his effigy on a Roman bust of the first century, even though he decks it with the crown and sceptre of his own day, and the diadem tails proper to fourth-century Rome (**Plate II, 22–3**). The first type of William I was merely a modified version of Harold's bust, and effectively, all imitation of Roman coins stopped for good with the coming of the Normans.[38] The laureate effigies of the Stuart kings and the advent of Britannia are due to an antiquarianism remote from the immediacy of the tradition represented by Anglo-Saxon practice.

An endeavour to form a synthesis from the conclusions reached above forms a fitting end to my essay. We notice above all that the Anglo-Saxons had an intense interest in and admiration for things Roman. 'The Ruin', that famous poem on the remains of Bath, and the *tufa* carried before King Edwin, that he rightly or wrongly believed to be a Roman emblem,[39] continue with the coin-evidence to testify to a feeling far more profound than the qualified respect evinced by the more sophisticated barbarians for the relics of Roman greatness. St Cuthbert, we remember, was taken on a conducted tour of Roman Carlisle.[40] The unknown is always held by primitive man to be wonderful, but the phenomenon demands some explanation. That we are dealing in some way with a policy or state of mind is evident when we consider its effect on the choice of the first coin-types. Roman types abound, those of Merovingian Gaul seem to be of decreasing importance. Sutton Hoo shows that this was not due entirely to the small numbers in which Merovingian coins entered this country and the greater availability of Roman coins for copying. The very character of those copies is in itself revealing. It is clear that nothing of Roman date or type had remained in circulation. The copies have the appearance of having derived from quite a small number of hoards of limited range, for certain features emerge clearly. First, the earliest Anglo-Saxon coins do not on the whole (in

some cases, at all) copy either the latest Roman coins to circulate in Britain, nor those of classes of Roman imitation that are sometimes (I hope to have shown erroneously) held to have been produced by Briton or Saxon in the fifth or sixth centuries. Second, the combination on individual pieces of features, common to two or three Roman originals close to one another in date, suggests that much of the imitation was inspired by discovery at critical moments of hoards of late Roman coins, such as the words of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* imply were not unfamiliar. There is no predominance of the very commonest Roman pieces such as should have occurred had casual site-finds furnished the inspiration. Third, these discoveries must have been made known to high authority to inspire coin-types, particularly in the later period, and we may perhaps venture to see in this the early stages of a law of Treasure Trove embracing *all* antique coin, as well as that authority's interest in Roman works.

The doctrine of the Dark Ages hiatus in coinage as in other classes of finds has already proved acceptable to Roman archaeologists. I hope that its implications will find favour with Anglo-Saxon scholars, and that we may come to appreciate our penny not merely as a by-product of the Merovingian *tremissis* and Carolingian *denier*, but as a true successor by descent and choice of types of the coinage of imperial Rome.

REFERENCES

1. H. M. SCARTH *Roman Britain* p. ix
2. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain* (*CCRB*) J. P. C. KENT 'Coin Evidence for the Abandonment of a Frontier Province' *Carnuntina* 1956 p. 85
3. e.g. at Richborough (Report IV p. 317) and Maiden Castle (Report p. 334)
4. *CCRB* pp. 90–1
5. The 1929 excavations at the Hadrian's Wall fort of Birdoswald suggest that in the north the currency developed a very miscellaneous character, with the continued circulation of obsolete pieces. Mrs Alison Ravetz, who has recently examined a large part of the north country evidence, kindly informs me that she has noted this phenomenon at other sites. However, it should be observed that the supposed association of barbarous radiates with worn coins of Valentinian at Carrawburgh (*NC* 1933 p. 81 *CCRB* pp. 116 and 121) is now recognized to be mistaken (*NC* 1937 p. 144; 1958 p. 184), and there is absolutely no reason to suppose that imitation in the north followed a different course from that in the south
6. C. E. STEVENS 'Marcus, Gratian, Constantine' *Athenaeum* 1957 p. 316
7. COLLINGWOOD and MYRES *Roman Britain and the English Settlements* ch. xviii. The late B. H. St J. O'Neil, a distinguished student of Early Dark Ages problems,

was good enough to write to me (1 February 1954) that in his experience this view, though widely publicized, achieved little recognition in academic circles

8. J. P. C. KENT 'Coin Evidence, and the Evacuation of Hadrian's Wall' *Trans. Cumb. and West. Arch. Soc.* 1952 p. 4
9. C. M. KRAAY 'The Behaviour of Early Imperial Countermarks' *Essays in Roman Coinage presented to Harold Mattingly* p. 113
10. J. P. C. KENT 'Gold Coinage in the Later Roman Empire' ibid. p. 190
11. J. P. C. KENT 'The Search for Fifth Century Coins in Britain' *Arch. News Letter* December 1954 p. 115. A forthcoming note in *NC* will endeavour to justify the redating of '*Urbs Roma Felix*' from 393–396 (*RIC* IX pp. 113–14)
12. Terling, Coleraine, 'St Pancras' (*NC* 1959 p. 15)
13. H. A. CAHN 'Trierer Siliquen des Valentinianus III. und des Theodosius II.' *Rev. Suisse de Num.* 1937 p. 425
14. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND 'Coinage in Britain in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries' *Dark Age Britain: Studies presented to E. T. Leeds* p. 5
15. GILDAS *de excidio Britanniae* ch. 66, p. 107
16. p. 151
17. p. 156
18. *Arch. Cant.* 1889 p. 72
19. *NC* 1859 p. 140
20. H. MATTINGLY and W. P. D. STEBBING 'The Richborough Hoard of "Radiates", 1931' *Num. Notes and Mon.* no. 80 p. 13
21. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND see *supra* note 14
22. P. V. HILL '"Barbarous Radiates": Imitations of Third-Century Roman Coins' *Num. Notes and Mon.* no. 112. Cf. E. J. W. HILDYARD and P. V. HILL 'A Radiate Currency Hoard from Yorkshire' *NC* 1958 p. 183
23. P. V. HILL '"Sceatta-like" Barbarous Imitations' *NC* 1949 p. 142. Cf. D. F. Allen's observations on the Richborough hoard, note 20
24. J. P. C. KENT 'Barbarous Copies of Roman Coins' *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Roman Frontier Studies* (*Rheinfelden*) p. 61
25. P. LE GENTILHOMME *Le monnayage et la circulation monétaire dans les royaumes barbares en occident* (*V^e–VIII^e siècle*) Paris 1946 provides a concise, amply documented, and reliable introduction to sub-Roman coinage on the Continent
26. S. E. RIGOLD 'An Imperial Coinage in Southern Gaul in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries?' *NC* 1954 p. 93
27. P. GRIERSON 'The Canterbury (St Martin's) Hoard of Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Coin-Ornaments' *BNJ* XXVII, i (1952) p. 39
28. Sutton Hoo: P. GRIERSON 'The Dating of the Sutton Hoo Coins' *Antiquity* 1952 p. 83. Crondall: C. H. V. SUTHERLAND *Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage in the light of the Crondall Hoard* (*ASGC*)
29. BEDE *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 8. The setting of the story of her death must be, *pace* SUTHERLAND (*ASGC* p. 50 note 1), Brie in France, and not York. *Eboriacum*, the name of her monastery, has been confused in *ASGC* with *Eboracum*

30. As G. C. BROOKE *English Coins* p. 4, J. D. A. THOMPSON *Inventory of British Coin Hoards, A.D. 600–1500* p. 38. Sutherland's ascription to Leo I is based on his meticulously accurate transcription of the legend, but is negatived by its type, and its characteristic 'Ravenna' style
31. *English Historical Documents* I p. 432
32. For its date, see GRIERSON, op. cit. p. 43 (other examples)
33. BEDE op. cit. 3, 6
34. P. V. HILL 'The "Standard" and "London" Series of Anglo-Saxon Sceattas' *BNJ* XXVI, iii (1951) p. 251
35. A Merovingian coin of Orléans (Belfort no. 542) of generally similar size and appearance is inscribed DENARIVS AVRILIANI
36. A more immediate prototype should perhaps be sought in the Merovingian issues of Campbon (Belfort no. 1345)
37. The distribution of certain types has led to the suggestion that they were struck at Southampton also (HILL note 34 p. 271). Canterbury, too, is a probable mint from the start of the Anglo-Saxon coinage
38. Type II of Henry I is no more than a rough copy of type I of the Conqueror
39. BEDE op. cit. 2, 16. The Byzantine *tufa* was probably itself of Germanic origin
40. *Vita* ch. 27

Appendix

ROMAN COINS FOUND IN ANGLO-SAXON CEMETERIES

It was recognized many years ago by J. G. Milne* that the incidence of Roman coins and their imitations in Anglo-Saxon graves should have a considerable bearing on the question of a sub-Roman coinage in Britain, and with this in mind, the contents of some forty cemeteries have been analysed, providing a 'sample' of about one-third of the available evidence. Milne's conclusion, that *minimi* of radiate or Constantinian derivation form the characteristic coin association of the Anglo-Saxon grave, is hardly borne out by the totals revealed. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that the list exemplifies my earlier assertion,† that it contains 'a random assortment of all the commonest pieces of the Roman coinage'. It is unusual for more than two per cent of the graves to contain coins at all, and in several cases it appears that the discovery of a hoard by the family of a single individual, and its conversion into a necklace is the cause of its association with a burial. The ten early third-century *denarii* and '*antoniniani*' from Brighthampton (no. 10), pierced and found in a single grave, are a clear instance. The one grave accounts for all but five examples of this period. Much the greater number of coins have been pierced at least once, thus emphasizing their use as ornaments rather than currency. One specimen from Sleaford (no. 37, grave no. 191) retains on the back traces of the fabric to which it had been sewn, while post-Roman gold, e.g. the Merovingian pieces from Sibertswold (no. 36, grave no. 172) is often equipped with added gold loops. Not until later in the seventh century do we find contemporary, unpierced coins, evidently withdrawn from currency. The Sutton Hoo burial contains one of the earliest deposits of this character. Finds of unpierced '*sceattas*' occurred in graves at Broadstairs,‡ Sarre,§ and elsewhere. A subsidiary use for Roman coins was as weights, and in four finds, Ash (no. 2), Gilton (no. 23), Ozingell (no. 33), and Sarre (no. 34), they occurred in company with balances and scale-pans, accounting for almost half of the coins of Æ 1 and Æ 2 size.

The overall picture shows coins of the later years of Constantine I and the first years of his successors to be substantially the most common. Second in numbers come radiates of the third century. In all but a few cases these are of

* *JRS* 21 (1931) p. 106; cf. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND in *NC* 1934 p. 104

† J. P. C. KENT 'Barbarous Copies of Roman Coins' *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Roman Frontier Studies (Rheinfelden)*

‡ H. HURD *Some Notes on Recent Archaeological Discoveries at Broadstairs* p. 24

§ *Arch. Cant.* 1864–8 (grave no. 226)

the Gallic Empire, and, with a mere handful of exceptions, regular. Those few barbarous pieces are on the whole of equal size with their prototypes, and all come, by an odd coincidence, from the Oxford region.* Similarly, '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Horseman' imitations are notably uncommon outside that area – though no more so than one would expect from their relative scarcity on sites, as opposed to hoards – and we are entitled to wonder why such copies are comparatively unusual. In the first instance, though absolute abundance is undoubtedly reflected to some extent, we can observe that large coins, such as *folles*, seem to be over-represented. Similarly, really small coins, such as radiate *minims*, 'Falling Horseman' copies, and those of the House of Theodosius, are uncommon. It was formerly suggested that the *presence* of copies was evidence for their Dark Ages date. Now that it has been shown that this was essentially a mistaken notion, we must beware of the contrary viewpoint, that it is on account of their *absence* that their Dark Ages currency can be postulated. The presence of undoubted seventh-century coin in such graves as Sutton Hoo, Broadstairs, Sarre, and most recently Driffield, completely negatives such a view. Whatever coin was available was evidently acceptable as grave furniture. If it was current, it was kept intact, if not, then it was liable to be pierced or mounted as necklace or disk-brooch. In this telling neither regular Roman coins nor their copies achieved any currency, for the vast majority are pierced. And, if anything, copies seem to have been scarce because their insignificant size and shabby appearance led to their being overlooked and neglected, except in the 'back-woods' regions of the Upper Thames.

I conclude that this evidence confirms the absence of a coinage in Britain between the advent of the Anglo-Saxons, and the main influx of Merovingian coins in the first half of the seventh century. We have seen that distribution alone prevents the attribution of any coinage to the Britons of the post-Roman era. I hope it is now apparent that the Anglo-Saxons are equally ineligible. The contents of their graves combine with the evidence of their earliest copies to illustrate the haphazard character of their association with Roman coins.

* Abingdon (no. 1), Brighthampton (no. 10), Wheatley (no. 41). The identification of the Wheatley coin is somewhat uncertain

TABLE I

		First century		*Second century*		*Third century*						*Fourth century*						
						AR		*Æ*										
									Radiates									
		AR	*Æ*	*AR*	*Æ*	*Denarii*	*'Antoniniani'*	*Aes*	*Regular*	*Barbarous*		*Folles*	*House of Constantine*	*'Fel. Temps.' and Magnentius*	*House of Valentinian*	*House of Theodosius*	*Post-Roman*
1	Abingdon (Berks.)								1	1			4	1			
2	Ash (Kent)				2							1			1		1
3	Barfriston (Kent)					1											
4	Barham Down (Kent)				1							2					
5	Barrington (Cambs.)							no coins									1
6	Bekesbourne (Kent)								1								
7	Bishopsbourne (Kent)					7	3		6	1		2				1	
8	Blood Moore Hill (Suff.)												3				
9	Breach Down (Kent)				3	2											
10	Brighthampton (Oxon.)							no coins									
11	Burwell (Cambs.)		1						3						5		1
12	Caistor (Norf.)		1		1			1	1				1				
13	Chartham (Kent)				1								1				
14	Chatham Lines (Kent)				1							1	2	1			
15	Chessel Down (I.O.W.)								1						1		
16	Croydon (Surrey)								2			1	4				
17	Crundale (Kent)								2						7		
18	Droxford (Hants)			1									1	5	4	2	
19	Dunstable Downs (Beds.)		3		4				1			2	2				1
20	East Shefford (Berks.)							coin illegible					5				
21	Fairford (Glos.)												1				
22	Frilford (Berks.)												2	1			
23	Gilton (Kent)												1		1		
24	Girton (Cambs.)				7				1			2	20				
25	Guildown (Surrey)								1			1	5				
26	Harnham Hill (Wilts.)								2					1?			
27	Holywell Row (Suff.)												1				
28	Howletts (Kent)		1		1				1			1	2	1			1
29	Little Wilbraham (Cambs.)				4								3				
30	Long Wittenham (Berks.)												1	1			
31	Marston St Lawrence (Northants.)						1		4			1	6	1			2
32	Mitcham (Surrey)												1				
33	Ozingell (Kent)				1	1							1		1		
34	Sarre (Kent)													2			
35	Shudy Camps (Cambs.)													1			
36	Sibertswold																
37	Sleaford (Lincs.)																
38	Stapenhill (Derb.)																
39	Stowting (Kent)																
40	West Stow Heath (Suff.)																
41	Wheatley (Oxon.)																
		–	6	1	26	11	4	1	27	3		14	66	13^{42}	20	3	7

century			
'Fel. Temps.' and Magnentius	House of Valentinian	House of Theodosius	Post-Roman
1			
	1		1
			1
		1	
	5		1
1			
	1		
	7		
5	4	2	1
1			
	1		
1?			
			1
1			
			2
1			
	1		
2			
13^{42}	20	3	7

NOTES TO TABLE

1. E. T. LEEDS and D. B. HARDEN *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Abingdon, Berkshire*
2. REV. J. DOUGLAS *Nenia Britannica*: ground to serve as weights
3. B. FAUSSETT *Inventorium Sepulchrale*: includes an Ostrogothic Æ of Rome. The coin of Theodosius I in this grave is a '*Reparatio Reipub*' – a House of Valentinian type of *c.* 380
4. ex Mantell Coll. in BM
5. In BM – a probable identification
6. B. FAUSSETT op. cit.
7. Ibid.
8. REV. J. DOUGLAS op. cit. suppl. Pl. 5.2 (BM edition). This is a Late Visigothic copy of Justinian, and not a coin of Avitus as reported, and commonly stated
9. In BM
10. Ashmolean Museum
11. T. C. LETHBRIDGE *Recent Excavations in Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries in Cambridge and Suffolk*
12. C. H. V. SUTHERLAND *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain*
13. B. FAUSSETT op. cit.
14. REV. J. DOUGLAS op. cit. Douglas's material is now mostly in the Ashmolean Museum, but the coins seem to have become separated at an early date, and cannot now be found. The seeming coin of Anthemius does not correspond in style, type, or conventions with known pieces of that Emperor and his times, and remains a puzzle
15. In BM
16. E. A. MARTIN *Anglo-Saxon Remains in and around Croydon*
17. B. FAUSSETT op. cit.
18. In BM
19. (SIR) R. E. M. WHEELER in the *Fourth Annual Report* (1928–9) of the Dunstable Museum Committee
20. No coins are quoted by H. PEAKE and E. A. HOOTON *A Saxon Graveyard at East Shefford, Berkshire* but BM acquired some in 1893
21. W. M. WYLIE *Fairford Graves*. One coin (Gallienus) in BM
22. Ashmolean Museum
23. B. FAUSSETT op. cit.: several (in grave no. 66) had been ground and marked for use as weights
24. E. J. HOLLINGWORTH and M. M. O'REILLY *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Girton, Cambs.*
25. *Surrey Arch. Coll.* 39 (1931): probably a mutilated Æ 2
26. In BM
27. T. C. LETHBRIDGE op. cit.
28. In BM
29. HON. R. C. NEVILLE *Saxon Obsequies, etc.*; T. C. LETHBRIDGE op. cit.
30. In BM
31. *Arch.* 38 (1860)
32. *Surrey Arch. Coll.* 21 (1908)=*Arch.* 60 (1882)
33. C. ROACH SMITH *Collectanea Antiqua* III: most of the coins were ground and marked to serve as weights. There was also a Constantinopolitan *solidus* of Justinian I, type as *BMC* 16
34. *Arch. Cant.* 1864–8: Grave no. 26 contained a balance and scales, and twelve coins, several now illegible, ground down and marked to serve as weights
35. T. C. LETHBRIDGE *A Cemetery at Shudy Camps, Cambridge*
36. B. FAUSSETT op. cit. Roach Smith correctly read the coins, and attributed them to Verdun and Marsal. At one time, the latter was attributed, for example by Douglas, to Clovis
37. In BM. Grave no. 85 contained (out of a total of six) an example of the extremely rare 'Lugdunum' *follis* of Maxentius (see J. P. C. KENT 'Bronze Coinage under Constantine I' *NC* 1957 p. 42 no. 251), the first known to have been found in Britain
38. *Trans. Burton-on-Trent Nat. Hist. and Arch. Soc.* 1 (1889)
39. *Arch.* 31 (1846); 41 (1867)
40. *Proc. Bury and West Suff. Arch. Inst.* 7 (May 1953): six Roman coins, perforated from one to three times

41. Ashmolean Museum. I could not find the 'Radiate' copy mentioned by C. H. V. SUTHERLAND in *NC* 1934 p. 104

42. This figure may be further broken down in chronological order as follows:

'*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Hut type': Constans 2 (Holywell Row, Sleaford)
'*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Phoenix/Pyre' type: Constans 3 (Frilford, Wheatley)
'*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Galley' type: Constans 1 (Sleaford)*
'Two Victories' type: Magnentius 2 (Abingdon, Frilford)*
Uncertain type: Magnentius 1 (Sarre)
'*Fel. Temp. Reparatio* Falling Horseman' type: Constantius II 1 (Droxford)
'*Fel. Temp. Reparatio*', but barbarous – 2 (Frilford)*

Barbarous examples are asterisked

The negligible impact of the '*Fel. Temp. Reparatio*' coinage and its barbarous copies is well exemplified. The classic 'Falling Horseman' copies occur in one cemetery – probably one grave – only. Their relative undesirability and non-availability stands out. The Mitcham coin is of Constantius II, but may equally belong to the preceding period