

A HOARD OF LATE ROMAN COINS  
FROM NORTHAMPTONSHIRE;  
ITS PARALLELS AND SIGNIFICANCE

By B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL

During 1927 and 1928 the Rev. H. O. Cavalier, then Rector of Great Brington, Northamptonshire, partially excavated a large Romano-British building in a field called ' Sharaoh ' at Nobottle, a short distance south of Little Brington.<sup>1</sup>

At the close of the excavation he came upon a hoard of Roman coins, which had obviously been carefully hidden within the building, when it was already ruined. Earl Spencer, who permitted the excavation to take place, very kindly allowed the coins to leave Althorp, temporarily, for purposes of identification. In addition the writer wishes to thank Mr. G. C. F. Hayter, F.S.A., for continuous assistance, also Mr. J. W. E. Pearce, F.S.A., Mr. Harold Mattingly, and Mr. F. S. Salisbury for help in cases of difficulty and doubt.

The hoard, of which a summary has already been published,<sup>2</sup> comprises 814 coins, which commence with an *As* of Lucius Verus but include very few coins prior to the Constantinian period. Even the emperors of this epoch are sparsely represented and little more can be said of the house of Valentinian I. Moreover the coins of these families, which do occur, are for the most part of very small module or broken or clipped to pass as 4 *Æ* of the latest period. All the points of interest in connection with these earlier issues have been set out in the summary, already mentioned, and details are included in the complete list attached to this paper.

<sup>1</sup> *Ass. Archit. and Archæ. Soc. Rep.* xl (1931), 299.

<sup>2</sup> *Num. Chron.* 1930, 275, with a few corrections in *Num. Chron.* 1931, 321.

The importance of the hoard, however, lies in the analysis of the latest issues (A.D. 388-95), and in this connection it has to be compared with similar discoveries, which have of recent years been critically examined.

The known facts<sup>1</sup> may be briefly stated with confirmation from the present hoard as far as is possible owing to its comparative smallness.

After about A.D. 364 Trier ceased to be the chief bronze mint of Gaul, having been replaced by Arles, but became the silver mint for that province until shortly before A.D. 395, when it was closed. After A.D. 388 very little bronze was issued from the second officina at Lyons and by A.D. 395 all the Gallic mints were closed. In the Nobottle hoard there are few coins from Trier mint and very few from the second officina at Lyons. There are no Gallic coins which need be ascribed to a later date than A.D. 395.

'Arcadius had a predominant status in the mints of Gaul and Aquileia<sup>2</sup> and Honorius a similar status in the mint of Rome.<sup>3</sup> With this reservation the officinae of Arles and Rome were assigned to the Augusti in order of seniority'—Valentinian II, Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius after his elevation to imperial rank, although stray coins appear from unusual officinae. In the Nobottle hoard, Arcadius is predominant in Gaul and at Aquileia and the coins of Honorius seem to conform to the rule stated above (but see below, page 284). Otherwise at Arles, Valentinian II is found in Officina I, Theodosius in Of. II and Honorius in Of. III. At Rome, Valentinian II appears in Of. II (he usually has I and II), Theodosius in Of. III (III and IV are usually his) and Arcadius in Of. V.

After the death of Gratian in A.D. 383 two common types of bronze coin were struck in the west of the Empire. The lawful emperors Valentinian II,

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Salisbury on the Weymouth Bay hoard in *Dorset N.H. & A. Soc. Proc.* 1930.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps on account of the provincial command in the three Gauls

having been conferred on him as the elder son. See *Num. Chron.*, 5th Ser., vii, 117.

<sup>3</sup> But see below, page 284, for an alternative explanation.

Theodosius and Arcadius struck a fourth brass coin with legend *Victoria Auggg* and type of two victories meeting and holding wreaths. The usurper, Magnus Maximus, held all beyond the Alps and issued coins of the same size, showing the Camp Gates with a legend *Spes Romanorum*. Consequently, whilst the former type is only found with Italian mint marks, the latter comes from Gallic mints and also, after Maximus' invasion of Italy, from Rome and Aquileia. These last, however, are in a minority, owing to his short period of success in Italy. In the Nobottle hoard, the coins of Maximus and Victor, his son, show a proportion of one Italian mint mark to five Gallic and the Two Victories type does not, of course, occur west of the Alps.

Upon the defeat of Maximus in 388 both these types were discontinued in favour of two new types, *Salus Reipublicae* with a figure of Victory dragging a captive and holding the Christian monogram and *Victoria Auggg* with a single Victory moving left. The former type was confined to Italy and the East, the latter was almost confined to the Gallic Mints; the exceptions are very rare and do not figure in the present hoard. These are the types to which the bulk of the present hoard belongs, 515 in all, discounting those which are illegible but probably of the same class.

The *Victoria Auggg* type ceased to be issued when the Gallic mints were closed in A.D. 395. In any case its legend was unsuitable when there were only two Augusti instead of three. It seems, however, that the *Salus Reipublicae* type continued to be struck at least in Italy if not in the East after that date. No later type occurs in a Vienna hoard which dates probably from A.D. 405-6 (v. *Numismatische Zeitschrift* 58 and *Num. Chron.* 1929, 326).

In the present hoard, as in those found at Icklingham and Weymouth Bay, the coins of Honorius minted at Rome outnumber those of the other emperors, and it is possible that some at least of them were minted after A.D. 395 when the *Victoria* type had been discontinued. Arcadius also continued to use the type, but he had by that time retired from the West to the

eastern half of the Empire and his coins of this period are not to be expected in Britain.



Confirmation is, also, forthcoming from this hoard with regard to the spelling of the name of the emperor Honorius. Mr. Hayter found amongst the Richborough coins a few bearing the legend D N ONORIUS P F AVG. all, apparently, from the Rome mint. More recently, Mr. Salisbury has established from the Weymouth Bay hoard that this spelling is normal at Rome, the only exceptions so far noted belonging to a restricted issue from at least three officinae of that mint, which retains the 'H,' but has the emperor's name in the genitive case:—D N HONORI P F AVG. The present hoard has no instance of this legend in the genitive but of thirty-three Honorius coins with *Salus Reipublicae* reverse sixteen show the obverse legend unaspirated. Of these, seven actually bear Rome mint-marks—RP (2), RT (2), RQ (1), R / (2); those of the remainder are illegible.

This dropping of the 'H' in Honorius is perhaps not so surprising in reality as at first sight it appears. The initial aspirate was not always pronounced at Rome as is shown for example by the word 'arena' (= sand) which appears aspirated and unaspirated indiscriminately in the works of the same writers. It may well be that in the late fourth century A.D. words such as the name of the Emperor Honorius were customarily unaspirated, but spelt with an 'H' until a new fashion was set by those who wished to eliminate a useless survival. Such a fashion may, then, be reflected in this issue of money from the mint at Rome. It does not appear to have penetrated far since it is not known from Aquileia, and so may have been only a passing whim.

The restricted issue in the genitive case wears the appearance of having been minted for some special purpose, on which occasion, naturally, the traditional spelling with aspirated name would be retained.

## LIST OF THE COINS

C = Cohen, *Monnaies frappées sous l'empire Romain* (2nd Ed.)

| NUMBER<br>OF COINS | EMPEROR AND DESCRIPTION  |
|--------------------|--|
| 1                  | Lucius Verus : C. 141. c. A.D. 164.  |
| 2                  | Claudius II : Consecratio type (one barbarous).  |
| 1                  | Allectus : Pax with transverse sceptre $\frac{S/A}{ML}$  |
| 4                  | Radiate Crowns : one each Victorinus (?), Tetricus II, (sacrificial instruments), Allectus, and one barbarous.   |
| 14                 | Constantine I : Gloria Ex. 1 standard $\overline{LVGP}$ , C. 487 (Sarmatia Devicta) $\overline{STR}$ in mint condition, Helena C. 4 $\overline{TRP}$ and ? C. 12 ? $\overline{PTR}$ , Theodora C. 4 $\overline{TRP}$ <br>(2)+2 illeg. (one clipped), Constantinopolis $\overline{PLG}$ , $\overline{PLG}$ , Urbs Roma 2 illeg mm. (1 clipped), Constantinopolis obverse with she-wolf reverse $\overline{PLG}$ , ditto with Gloria Ex. 2 standards reverse mm. illegible. |
| 3                  | Constantine II : Gloria Ex. 2 standards CONSTANTINVS IVN [N C] laureate and cuirassed r., 1 standard bust cuirassed only (2) (all mm. illegible).  |
| 3                  | Constantius II : C. 168 $\overline{SMTSE}$ , Fel. Temp. Rep. emperor spearing horseman $\overline{PLG}$ , $\overline{AQ/}$ .   |
| 2                  | ? Constantius II : <i>Rev.</i> Victoriae Dd. Augg q Nn  ,<br>Spes Reipublice mm. illegible.   |
| 8                  | Constans : C. 106 (mm. illeg.), 179 $\frac{D}{TRP}$ , $\frac{*}{TRP}$ , $\frac{\heartsuit}{TRS}$ , $\frac{\epsilon}{TRS}$ ,<br>$\frac{D}{TR}$ , $\frac{M}{TR}$ (one clipped), one barbarous Fel Temp. Rep. type.   |
| 9                  | Constantius II or Constans : Fel. Temp. Rep. type 8, of which 5 are barbarous. Overstruck coin :—<br><i>Obv.</i> Barbarous bust—legend illegible—superimposed on two Victories type with wreath (DD AVGG legible).<br><i>Rev.</i> Barbarous Fel. Temp. Rep. type with mint mark $\overline{PZV}$ ( <i>sic</i> ) overstruck on diademed bust ([CO] Nstanti/ . . .)  |

| NUMBER<br>OF COINS | EMPEROR AND DESCRIPTION   |
|--------------------|---|
| 11                 | House of Constantine : Gloria Ex: two standards $\overline{\text{TRS}}$ ,<br>one standard ? $\overline{\text{CON}}$ and two illeg., Spes Reipublice<br>mm. illeg. (5), two victories type mm. illeg. (2).   |
| 2                  | Magnentius : C. 68, 70 $\overline{\text{PLG}}$ .  |
| 9                  | Valentinian I : Gloria Ro. $\frac{\text{OF} / !}{\text{CON}}$ + one illeg., Securitas<br>Rei. $\frac{\cdot  }{\text{PCON}}$ , $\frac{\text{N}  }{\text{SCON}}$ , $\frac{ }{\text{CON}}$ , ? $\overline{\text{SMRT}}$ , $\overline{\text{RTERTIA}}$ , $\frac{\text{R}  }{\text{C}   \text{F}}$<br>+ one illeg. ]SISC[ $\overline{\text{R}}$  |
| 12                 | Valens : Gloria Ro. $\overline{\text{SM}} \overline{\text{V}} \overline{\text{RT}}$ , ? $\overline{\text{RQVARTA}}$ , $\overline{\text{OF}} \overline{\text{II}}$ (2) +<br>one illeg., Securitas Rei. $\frac{\cdot  }{\text{PCON}}$ , $\frac{\cdot  }{\text{SCON}}$ , $\overline{\text{RQVARTA}}$ + 3 illeg.,<br>Gloria Ro. but type of Securitas Rei. $\frac{*  }{\text{TRP}}$ . |
| 7                  | Gratian : Gloria Novi Saeculi, $\overline{\text{TCON}}$ + 4 illeg., VOT<br>XV MVLTV in wreath LVGP, LVGS.   |
| 13                 | House of Valentinian I : Gloria Ro. all mm. illeg. (4),<br>Securitas Rei. $\frac{[\text{OF}]}{\text{II}}$ , $\overline{\text{OF}}$ ,<br>$\overline{\text{SM}} \overline{\text{C}} \overline{\text{RQ}}$ , $\overline{\text{RQVARTA}}$ ,<br>+ two illeg. and one barbarous . . . s VIC on reverse,<br>VOT V MVLTV [X] in wreath two with mm. illeg.                                |
| 5                  | Magnus Maximus : Spes Romanorum $\overline{\text{SMAQP}}$ , $\overline{\text{PCON}}$ ,<br>$\overline{\text{CON}}$ , $\overline{\text{SMTR}}$ + one illeg.   |
| 3                  | Victor : Spes Romanorum $\overline{\text{SMTR}}$ (2) + one illeg.   |
| 2                  | Magnus Maximus or Victor : Spes Romanorum $\overline{\text{SCON}}$ +<br>one illeg.  |
| 5                  | Eugenius : Spes Romanorum Victory advancing l. with<br>wreath and palm branch $[\text{R}]^e$ + one illeg., Victoria<br>Auggg. same type LVGP + one illeg, bearded bust<br>Salus Reipublicae type mm. illeg.<br>(See separate table for the issues of A.D. 388-95.)  |
| 45                 | Valentinian II : D N VALENTINIANVS IVN P F AVG. Rev.<br>VOT V MVLTV X in laurel wreath *SISC*, Victoria Auggg.<br>two Victories $\frac{\cdot}{\text{RS}}$ , — (See also table).   |

| NUMBER<br>OF COINS | EMPEROR AND DESCRIPTION   |
|--------------------|---|
| 60                 | Theodosius I : Reparatio Reipub. $\overline{\text{SMTRP}}$ , Victoria<br>Auggg. two Victories $\overline{\text{SMAQP}}$ , $\overline{\text{RP}}$ , $\overline{\text{RP}}$ , $\overline{\text{RT}}$ , — (3),<br>VOT X MVLT XX in laurel wreath $\overline{\text{SMNT}}$ + one illeg.,<br>VOT XV MVLT XX in wreath $\overline{\text{SMRP}}$ (or B), overstruck<br>coin :—Theodosius Victoria Auggg. type made flatter<br>and larger by being overstruck with Theodosius<br>obverse on original reverse. (See also table.) |
| 135                | Arcadius : D N ARCADIS P F AVG unbroken legend<br>Victoria Auggg. type mm. illeg. not barbarous, two<br>with reverse doubtful, one overstruck coin apparently<br>Salus type reverse overstruck on ? obverse and obverse<br>on Victoria Auggg. type (overstruck only on half of the<br>coin). (See also table.)  |
| 68                 | Honorius : [D N H]ONORIS P F AVG normal type Victoria<br>Auggg. reverse mm. illeg. (See also table.)  |
| 235                | House of Theodosius I : Victoria Auggg. two Victories<br>$\overline{\text{RP}}$ , $\overline{\text{RP}}$ , $\overline{\text{RQ}}$ , — + one illeg., VOT XV MVLT XX in<br>wreath mm. illeg., three barbarous viz. (1) barbarous<br>and recognisable obverse—reverse 'LVICTO/—single<br>victory type; row of dots in exergue, (2) reverse<br>]RAIGG single victory type, (3) Two Victories type,<br>good portrait illeg. lettering mm. IIII (see also table).   |
| 96                 | Illeg., probably Theodosian.  |
| 59                 | Fragments.  |
| 814                | Total of hoard.   |

# ANALYSIS OF MINT MARKS. A.D. 388-395

VICTORIA AVGG (Single Victory).

SALVS REIPVBLICAE.

|                          | ARLES    |    |     | LYONS |    | TRIER | No. M.M. | AQVILEIA |    | ROME      |    |     |    |   | ANTIOCH | THESSALONICA | No. M.M. | TOTAL |
|--------------------------|----------|----|-----|-------|----|-------|----------|----------|----|-----------|----|-----|----|---|---------|--------------|----------|-------|
|                          | I        | II | III | I     | II |       |          | I        | II | I         | II | III | IV | V |         |              |          |       |
| VALENTINIAN II .. ..     | 8 — —    |    |     | 3 I   |    | —     | 10       | I I      |    | — 2 — — — |    |     |    |   | —       | —            | 7        | 42    |
|                          | +6       |    |     | +1    |    |       |          | +1       |    | +1        |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| THEODOSIUS I .. ..       | — 9 —    |    |     | 3 —   |    | 3     | 7        | 4 I      |    | — — I — — |    |     |    |   | —       | 2            | 10       | 48    |
|                          | +5       |    |     | +2    |    |       |          |          |    | +1        |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| ARCADIUS .. ..           | 10 6 14  |    |     | 9 —   |    | 2     | 52       | 7 2      |    | — — — — I |    |     |    |   | I       | —            | 6        | 131   |
|                          | +12      |    |     | +7    |    |       |          | +2       |    |           |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| HONORIUS .. ..           | — — 5    |    |     | 2 —   |    | —     | 21       | 2 2      |    | 3 — 2 I — |    |     |    |   | —       | —            | 11       | 68    |
|                          | +6       |    |     | +1    |    |       |          |          |    | +12*      |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| HOUSE OF THEODOSIUS I .. | 10 3 8   |    |     | 2 —   |    | 7     | 72       | I —      |    | 2 I 6 4 — |    |     |    |   | —       | —            | 93       | 226   |
|                          | +5       |    |     | +3    |    |       |          |          |    | +9        |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| OFFICIAL TOTALS .. ..    | 28 18 27 |    |     | 19 I  |    |       |          | 15 6     |    | 5 3 9 5 I |    |     |    |   |         |              |          |       |
| GRAND TOTALS .. ..       | 107      |    |     | 34    |    | 12    | 162      | 24       |    | 46        |    |     |    |   | I       | 2            | 127      | 515   |

\* Includes nine assigned by the unaspirated legend.

N.B.—+ followed by a number below the brackets indicates coins which owing to illegibility can be attributed to mints only and not to *officinae*.



Hoard of this period are the latest Roman coin hoards, which are found in this country, and, quite apart from the assistance which they render in reconstructing the organisation of the mints of the western half of the empire, as outlined above, they form some of the most valuable archaeological material, which is available for the history of the last age of Roman Britain. It is, therefore, unfortunate that, although there are records of the discovery in this country from time to time of some sixty such hoards, few of them have been adequately published and many have been irretrievably lost. For details of these hoards reference should be made to the bibliography at the end of this paper. It includes in the main list only those hoards where coins of Arcadius, Honorius, or Eugenius are specifically mentioned or may reasonably be presumed to have occurred.

It has been necessary to group all the hoards together ; in due course it may be possible to separate them according to date, but at present this can be done only in a few cases. The Terling hoard has been dated to the time of Constantine III (A.D. 408-11) and the Coleraine hoard contains coins of that emperor, but being loot its dating is of little consequence for Britain. For the rest it can only be said that the latest coins (if of Eugenius or Honorius) must have been minted in A.D. 392 or later. A few hoards may date from this decade, but the most likely time for the deposit of the greater number is the traditional last decade of Roman sovereignty, A.D. 400-410. This does not account for long continued use or hoarding unused for a term of years, since this cannot be judged with accuracy.<sup>1</sup>

The comparison of the distribution map of these hoards (Pl. I) with the O.S. map of Roman Britain at once reveals two things. In the first place the hoards are scattered throughout the length and breadth of the province, inland as well as by the coasts, wherever civil settlement, represented by villas or towns, is known to have existed. The area includes the whole of the civil zone with the exception of the north-west

<sup>1</sup> Such circumstances are normally ignored in dating hoards, the date given referring to the minting of the latest coin or a short time afterwards.



DISTRIBUTION OF THEODOSIAN COIN HOARDS  
[ADDENDUM : FILEY II (YORKSHIRE)]



midlands, which on account of the extent of forest are almost a blank in the Roman period, as in prehistoric times,<sup>1</sup> and extends into north-east Yorkshire, that part of the original military zone, which proved suitable for peaceful exploitation and was at this latest period defended by the series of Signal Stations.<sup>2</sup> Apart from the hoards at Zennor, Samson, Fleetwood, Coleraine, and Traprain, all of which are probably raiders' loot, there is only one outlier, Heddon-on-the-Wall.

Secondly, the hoards have almost invariably been found in close proximity to a Roman road, known or presumed. In the latter class may be placed the north-east Yorkshire and Isle of Wight hoards and, probably, those near Taunton. The Reading hoards are ten miles from the nearest probable road and Carleton St. Peter about six miles. Otherwise no hoard is further than four miles, most are within two miles and many were found actually on the line of a road. Yet apart from those found at sites during excavations, Caerwent, Filey, Scarborough, and Richborough (see bibliography) and a few from towns, London, Colchester, Cirencester, Leicester, Dorchester, South Ferriby, hardly any have come from known inhabited sites. Almost invariably the finds have been accidentally made, usually during ploughing, hence the smashing and subsequent loss of the containing vessel. Only in the cases of Mitcheldever, Nobottle, Camerton, and perhaps Terling, were the coins found at a villa-site and even then the evidence, where available, points to the conclusion that the hoards were buried for safety in a ruined and deserted building. It is, of course, true that in time of trouble no man would normally upon deserting his home leave his wealth within or even close at hand. Rather he would take it with him or bury it in a secret spot handy for future recovery. Consequently, hoards are hardly to be expected frequently on villa sites; in the case of the present type they are not found anywhere near villas, but always near a road.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Ant. J.*, 1934, 16; and *Arch. Camb.* 1934 (forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> *A. J.* lxxxix, 251.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Mattingly suggests (*J.R.S.*

1932, 95) that 'the rapacity of the tax-collector may have been as much feared as the fury of the barbarian invader.'

This evidence, it is thought, tends to support the conclusion, based upon the common coin series of villas, that they were for the most part destroyed finally at the time of the great barbarian incursion of A.D. 367. The restoration of the villa at Langton, Yorkshire,<sup>1</sup> and a suspected parallel case at the opposite end of the country are exceptions, which merely serve to emphasize the lack of really reliable evidence from villa-sites in the past, and it is unlikely that the general conclusion will be greatly modified by future discoveries.

The exodus from the villas would naturally tend to swell the population of the towns, which would act as havens of refuge. They escaped during the raids of A.D. 367 and doubtless continued to do so, whilst the raiders consisted mainly of small bands. The little documentary evidence supports this contention; Germanus twice visited Britain on a peaceful mission (A.D. 429 and 447), and Pevensey, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, was not taken until A.D. 491. Between the towns communications must have been maintained, doubtless with hazards at times, but one wonders whether conditions were very much worse on the roads than in eighteenth-century England.

It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the hoards were concealed by persons who were overtaken by fear of molestation on their way between towns or whilst moving from the country to a town. Some of them are small, but others, especially the silver, which predominates, represent, probably, considerable wealth. Their owners, not soldiers, but the ordinary upper-class Romano-Britons, had something to lose and stood in fear of raiding bands.

It is a remarkable fact that although Theodosian coins are exceedingly common in hoards, which are sometimes very large, they are comparatively uncommon on excavated sites, the silver issues being indeed exceedingly rare.<sup>2</sup> It is quite usual for a

<sup>1</sup> *J.R.S.* 1932, 258.

<sup>2</sup> In a similar way the *denarii* of Septimius Severus and his successors are commoner in hoards than on sites.

By bringing into consideration the fact of the paucity of known sites, where the late silver is likely, the parallel seems just.

coin-series to end with a few of Arcadius and Honorius,<sup>1</sup> but sites with more than such a sprinkling are seldom found. The examples which do occur, however, apart from specialised sites such as the Yorkshire Signal Stations<sup>2</sup> and the Jordan Hill Temple, Dorset,<sup>3</sup> fall into two classes, viz. open country sites and towns.

Of the former there are a considerable number. They are settlements, obviously of poor "natives," little removed in type from the villages of their pre-Roman forefathers and entirely different from the villas, which no longer existed. An extensive survey of them has not been attempted, but they certainly appear more commonly in the Midland region of the country, e.g. Thatcham Newton (Berks),<sup>4</sup> Duston (Northants),<sup>5</sup> Woodeaton<sup>6</sup> and Tackley (Oxon),<sup>7</sup> Bartlow (Essex).<sup>8</sup> Their owners are the counterpart of the owners of the hoards. They had no portable wealth and little to lose, so that they could rest comparatively unmolested on their upland farms, which were despised by the intruding Germanic agriculturalists. In course of time a certain amount of the Theodosian bronze coinage reached them and was lost in the usual way. They are not likely to have possessed or used the silver of the period to any extent.

For the towns there is, unfortunately, very little evidence. In accordance with the view taken above of their survival at least well into the fifth century they should provide abundance of this latest bronze coinage. In some cases, however, the top Roman levels have long since been cleared away, e.g. London.<sup>9</sup> In others the records give only a series without the number of each emperor's coins—the curse of the bibliographer. Again many vacant sites remain unexcavated, whilst Verulamium has in this connection been disappointing, and the evidence of Caerwent is practically useless on account of the confusion of

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Lydney, *Report*, p. 111, Wroxeter, 1914, 112.

<sup>2</sup> *A.J.* lxxxix, 251.

<sup>3</sup> *J.R.S.*, 1933, 206; *Dorset N.H. and A.S. Proc.* liv, 20.

<sup>4</sup> *J.R.S.*, 1932, 218.

<sup>5</sup> *V.C.H.* i, 198 (coins seen in Northampton Museum).

<sup>6</sup> *J.R.S.*, 1931, 108.

<sup>7</sup> *J.R.S.*, 1926, 226 and the writer's knowledge of the collection.

<sup>8</sup> *Arch. Camb. Reg.*, 226.

<sup>9</sup> *R.C.H.M.*, Roman London, 64 and 189 ff.



site-finds and hoards.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, except perhaps in the case of the last-named town and of Richborough, it cannot be said that the archaeological evidence is against their survival. Richborough apart, Pevensey alone amongst the Saxon shore-forts has provided any real evidence of Theodosian occupation. It is scanty, but if, after Mr. Bushe-Fox,<sup>2</sup> a certain number of the seventy-two illegible 'minimi,' 'imitations,' etc., which are probably Theodosian coins, be added, a different story can be told. That it is a legitimate inference is suggested by the traditional date of the fall of the fort, A.D. 491. Brancaster<sup>3</sup> is hardly so satisfactory, but the recently published figures of the Silchester coins,<sup>4</sup> which show 368 of the Theodosian family, hitherto unnoticed and certainly not from a hoard, enable a flood of light to be thrown upon the later history of such a site. For a variety of reasons no later bronze coinage reached this country (save for an occasional Byzantine piece), and there is no reason why the Theodosian 4Æ should not have remained in use, doubtless along with a certain amount of local imitations of earlier types, until worn out, clipped to mere fragments owing to the scarcity of metal, melted down or lost. It may be significant that of the Silchester 368 coins, no less than 311, all hitherto classed as illegible, can be referred only generally to the period (A.D. 388-95), not to specific emperors, on account of their worn condition.<sup>5</sup>

Thus it is possible that the careful investigation of selected sites might show this scarcity of bronze Theodosian coinage outside hoards to be more apparent than real. As it is, however, the great massing of the coinage gives the impression that it may have entered the province in bulk, perhaps with Stilicho in A.D. 395, but that before it had time to become dispersed in the normal methods, as its predecessors had been, fresh alarms caused the hoarding of wealth.

<sup>1</sup> But see *Bull. Celt. St.*, forthcoming part.

<sup>2</sup> *J.R.S.*, 1932, 67.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* 68.

<sup>4</sup> *Num. Chron.*, 1929, 330-2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mr. J. W. E. Pearce's remarks on the worn condition of many of the Theodosian coins in the Cirencester hoard, *ibid.* 334.

A useful illustration of contemporary life in Britain at about the period of these hoards is contained in St. Patrick's words at the beginning of his *Confessio*. His father was a *decurio* (town councillor) of a small town, Bannaventa Berniae<sup>1</sup> and had a little estate close at hand, where Patrick was taken captive at the age of sixteen, i.e. probably c. A.D. 405. Life went on in an ordinary way until the raiders arrived, and again in later years, when Patrick was able to return home, he found his kindred still living in the old way. Official connection with Rome was severed, the last governor had gone,<sup>2</sup> but the church remained.

Mr. T. D. Kendrick has recently<sup>3</sup> suggested that the well-known series of hanging-bowls with Celtic ornament, which have hitherto been regarded as Anglo-Saxon, should more properly be termed British. He thinks that 'many of them had been made and were in use before the Romans left this country, that others were made after the Romans had gone and belong to the almost unknown archaeology of the Arthurian period.' He would place the end of the bowl series at about A.D. 600. His arguments are careful and cogent. One great objection, however, which has been raised and will continually be advanced against the suggestion is the character of the associated grave-goods of the bowls or fragments of bowls; these associations are uniformly Saxon, not Roman. Mr. Kendrick himself cites the evidence<sup>4</sup> and explains the occurrence of these objects in undoubted Saxon graves as 'loot.'

<sup>1</sup> The occurrence of the Nobottle hoard, attributable to precisely this time at a spot only four miles from Bannaventa, a known Roman site on Watling Street, strongly supports the contention that the two Bannaventas are identical.

<sup>2</sup> A strangely neglected passage of Socrates (*Ecclesiastical History*, vii, 12) probably gives the name of this man—Chrysanthus. In A.D. 412 he was ordained and made bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople. He had been a good soldier and a loyal servant of the House of Theodosius for many years. He was governor of Italy and then *Vicarius* (= vice-regent) of the British Isles, where he earned

a reputation for wise government. Advanced in years, he returned to Constantinople wishing to hold office in that city 'rather than in far and foreign countries.' The account reads as though he was consecrated not very many years after his return from Britain. Did he retire in A.D. 405? If so, a successor would on account of the condition of Gaul at the time probably be unable to reach the province. Honorius's rescript of A.D. 410 would then have legalised the position of his native deputy.

<sup>3</sup> *Antiquity*, 1932, 161.

<sup>4</sup> *loc. cit.*, p. 182.



The problem is too large a one to discuss in the present context,<sup>1</sup> but it is interesting to compare the map of the Theodosian hoards (Pl. I) with Mr. Kendrick's map of the hanging bowls. Similarity is at once apparent in the two particulars which have been mentioned above: the bowls, like the coins, seem to occur normally within a relatively short distance of Roman roads, and, again like the coins, are distributed throughout the old civil zone of the Roman province with the exception of the N.W. midlands.

It is arguable that these apparent coincidences are more significant than the general coincidence of the bowl-distribution with the area of Anglo-Saxon settlement; for, although the bowls were in use in the pagan Anglo-Saxon period and are therefore found in Anglo-Saxon associations, their distribution does not in detail seem to tally closely with the main body of Teutonic riparian settlement.<sup>2</sup>

The only important difference in distribution between the coins and the bowls is that whereas the former freely occur in the Mendips and are absent from Derbyshire, the bowls tell exactly the opposite story, three coming from Derbyshire and only one from a late grave on the Mendips. It is, probably, significant that both these areas are lead-producing and the source of silver. Coins of silver are very common in the latest Roman period in hoards, as has been shewn, but are rare on the continent. They are particularly common in the region of the Mendip mines and are sometimes associated with ingots of silver, such as Stilicho brought back to Rome in such quantities.<sup>3</sup> It is a legitimate suggestion that the source of much of the silver was that very region and that the coins, although minted outside the province, returned to the mines in payment to the miners or lessees.

Later when a post-Roman coinage appears (the

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, 292 ff. (R. E. M. Wheeler), and 1934, 43 ff. (A. W. Clapham).

<sup>2</sup> This statement represents the impression conveyed by a general survey of the evidence. Admittedly,

much detailed topographical work is required before it can be regarded as proved.

<sup>3</sup> Claudian, *de cons. Stilicho*, iii, 234-6, and *J.R.S.* 1933, 220.

so-called sceattas) they also are of silver. Is it possible that the metal was obtained from Derbyshire, the area of hanging-bowls and also of early Saxon penetration far into the midland hills? <sup>1</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the compilation of this bibliography the writer owes, as must all who deal with this period of history, a great deal to the list of references published by Mr. R. G. Collingwood in *J.R.S.* xii, 92 ff. Further, he is much indebted to Mr. C. E. Stevens, who had already covered most of the ground of the search for another purpose and very generously placed the collected material at his disposal. He desires also to express his gratitude to a number of helpers and correspondents:—Miss M. Kitson Clark, Dr. H. H. E. Craster, Messrs. Frank Elgee, J. W. E. Pearce, F. S. Salisbury, K. St. Joseph, T. Sheppard, G. A. Sherwin, H. J. Small, Frank Stevens and, of course, the staff of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum.

## ABBREVIATIONS.

- A. = *Archaeologia*.  
 A.J. = *Archaeological Journal*.  
 J.B.A.A. = *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*.  
 J.R.S. = *Journal of Roman Studies*.  
 N.C. = *Numismatic Chronicle*.  
 P.S.A. = *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*.  
 V.C.H. = *Victoria County History*.

Emperors (in chronological order) who are referred to under 'Range':—

|           |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|
| Const. II | = | Constantius II (A.D. 337–61).                        |
| Jul.      | = | Julian (A.D. 361–3, Cæsar A.D. 355).                 |
| Val. I    | = | Valentinian (A.D. 364–75).<br>Valens. (A.D. 364–78). |
| Grat.     | = | Gratian (A.D. 367–83).                               |
| Mag. Max. | = | Magnus Maximus (A.D. 383–8).                         |
| Val. II   | = | Valentinian II (A.D. 375–92).                        |
| Theo.     | = | Theodosius I (A.D. 379–95).                          |
| Arc.      | = | Arcadius (A.D. 383–408).                             |
| Hon.      | = | Honorius (A.D. 393–423).                             |

<sup>1</sup> In the Domesday Survey the Ashbourne group of manors in Derbyshire paid £40 'of pure silver,' a phrase which seems to be unique in Domesday. See *V.C.H.* i, 297.

| County               | Find-spot        | Metal       | Number                                      | Range                     | Date of finding |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Berkshire            | Reading I        | Æ           | c. 50                                       | Jul.-Arc.                 | ?               |
|                      | " II             | Æ +<br>I A/ | 120   | Const. II-Arc.            | ?               |
| Cornwall             | Samson<br>Zennor | Æ           | 6   | Constantine II-Hon.       | c. 1874         |
|                      |                  | Æ           | 80  | Val. I-Hon.               | 1702            |
| Devonshire           | Honiton          | Æ           | 21 +  | Jul.-Arc.                 | c. 1923         |
| Dorset               | Dorchester       | Æ           | 53  | Jul.-Hon.                 | 1898            |
|                      | Weymouth Bay     | Æ           | 4,400                                       | Postumus-Hon.             | 1928            |
| Essex                | Colchester       | Æ           | 49  | Constans.-Hon.            | ?               |
|                      | Sturmer          | Æ +<br>I A/ | 30  | Jul.-Hon.                 | 1793            |
|                      | Terling          | A/ &<br>Æ   | 30 and<br>304                               | Const. II-Hon.            | 1824            |
|                      |                  |             |   |                           |                 |
| Gloucester-<br>shire | Cirencester      | Æ           | 924   | Claudius II-Hon.          | ?               |
| Hampshire            | Allington        | Æ +<br>I A/ | 47  | Jul.-Hon.                 | 1869            |
|                      | Mitcheldever     | Æ           | 1,400 +                                     | Chiefly Theo. & Arc.      | c. 1844         |
| Isle of Wight        | Haven Street     | Æ           | Few   | Esp. Theo.-Hon.           | —               |
|                      | Shanklin         | Æ +<br>Æ    | 6 +<br>600                                  | Grat.-Hon.<br>Val. I-Hon. | 1833            |
|                      |                  | Æ           | c. 5,000                                    | Tetricus I-Hon.           | 1863            |
| Kent                 | Gillingham       | Æ           | 722   | Gordian-Hon.              | c. 1909         |
|                      | Richborough      | Æ           | Many thousands (to Hon.) during excavations |                           |                 |
| Lancashire           | Fleetwood        | Æ           | 390   | Const. II-Hon.            | ?               |
| Leicestershire       | Holyoke          | Æ           | 230   | Jul.-Arc.                 | 1799            |
|                      | Leicester        | Æ           | ?   | Titus-Hon.                | 1718            |
|                      | Sproxtton        | Æ           | 100   | Const. II-Hon.            | 1811            |

| Receptacle and its fate                                |                           | Circumstances,<br>Associated Finds, etc.                                    | Present where-<br>abouts of hoard        | References.   |
|--|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Pot  | Reading Mus.              | —   | Reading Mus.<br>(11 coins)               | V.C.H. I, 212   |
| Pot  | Reading Mus.              | —   | do. (50 coins)                           | do.   |
| Unknown  | —                         | —   | Unknown                                  | V.C.H. v, 40  |
| "In a round ball of earth"                             |                           | By side of urn full of<br>ashes under the<br>Giant's Rock                   | Unknown                                  | V.C.H. v, 42  |
| Round receptacle of iron-<br>stone                     |                           | Found in a garden   | Private<br>possession                    | N.C. 1925, 396  |
| —  | —                         | With two spoons and<br>fragments of more                                    | Private<br>possession                    | N.C. 1922, 134  |
| None   | —                         | —   | Various<br>museums                       | (Dorset N.H. and<br>A.S. Trans., 1930   |
| Unknown  | —                         | From West Lodge<br>Road   | Colchester<br>Museum                     | J.R.S. 1926, 230.   |
| Urn  | Unknown                   | Urn covered with part<br>of Roman brick                                     | Unknown                                  | Fox, Arch. Camb.<br>Reg., 226   |
| 2 Pots   | One at Terling<br>Place   | With two gold rings.<br>? near ruined R.-B.<br>building                     | Terling<br>Place                         | N.C. 1933, 145  |
| ?  | —                         | Said to have been<br>found as a hoard<br>2 ft.-3 ft. below<br>ground        | ? Cripps Col-<br>lection                 | N.C. 1929, 332  |
| Pot  | Smashed                   | Amongst foundations<br>of R.-B. building                                    | Unknown                                  | (V.C.H. I, 343.<br>A.J. xxviii, 171<br>Proc. Num. Soc.<br>25, April 1844,<br>V.C.H. I, 307<br>V.C.H. I, 348   |
| Unknown  | —                         | In making railway,<br>Ryde to Newport                                       | Unknown                                  | (Proc. Num. Soc.<br>25 Jan., 1844.<br>J.B.A.A. xix, 307;<br>V.C.H. I, 349<br>N.C. 1933, 220   |
| Pot  | Unknown                   | Ploughed up   | Dispersed                                | (Arch. Cant.<br>xxviii, proc. xcii.<br>V.C.H. iii, 155<br>Richborough<br>Reports, Soc. Ant.<br>Res. Ctee., vi, vii,<br>x and forthcoming<br>Palatine Note<br>Book, iii, 170 |
| Pot  | Smashed                   | In making railway to<br>Ventnor, 'surrounded<br>by a rude stone wall'       | 463 in Caris-<br>brooke Castle<br>Museum | (V.C.H. I, 213.<br>Nichols, Hist of<br>Leics. iii, 535.<br>Nichols, Hist. of<br>Leics. I, 4. V.C.H.<br>I, 204.<br>N.C. 1934 forth-<br>coming (Pot<br>figured).              |
| Pot  | Smashed                   | In grubbing up a tree   | Unknown                                  |   |
| from 1922 onwards; some probably from dispersed hoards |                           |   |  |   |
| ?  | —                         | Between Rossall Point<br>and Fenny and near<br>to the Fleetwood<br>Landmark | Unknown                                  |   |
| "Glass<br>Urn"   | Unknown                   | In ditch in Holyoke<br>Wood (Stockerston)                                   | Unknown                                  |   |
| Pot  | Unknown                   | Near N. Gate. Jug<br>to hold 2 quarts or so.                                | Unknown                                  |   |
| Pot  | Now lost, but<br>see ref. | ? in side of barrow   | Belvoir<br>Castle                        |   |

| County            | Find-spot               | Metal  | Number     | Range                                  | Date of finding |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|--|-----------------|
| Lincolnshire      | Caythorpe               | Æ      | 16         | Faustina II-Hon. or Arc.               | 1857            |
|                   | South Ferriby           | Æ      | 8          | Const. II-Arc.                         | c. 1910         |
| London            | City                    | A/     | 3          | Arc.-Hon.                              | 1777            |
| Middlesex         | Bentley, Great Stanmore | A/     | 50         | Const. II-Hon. and Constantine III     | 1781            |
| Monmouth-shire    | Caerwent I              | Æ      | 4,006      | Gallienus-Hon.                         | 1899-1912       |
|                   | „ II                    | Æ      | c. 1,450   | House of Theodosius                    | „               |
|                   | „ III                   | Æ      | c. 1,000   | Gallienus-Hon.                         | „               |
|                   | „ IV                    | Æ      | c. 430     | „                                      | „               |
|                   | „ V                     | Æ      | c. 250     | House of Theodosius                    | „               |
|                   | „ VI                    | Æ      | c. 200     | Const. II-Hon.                         | „               |
| Norfolk           | Carleton St. Peter      | A/ & Æ | 4 + 10     | Grat.-Hon. Jul.-Hon.                   | 1807            |
|                   | Caston                  | ?      | ?          | Theo., Arc. & Hon.                     | 1816            |
| Northampton-shire | Nobottle                | Æ      | 814        | L. Verus-Hon.                          | 1928            |
| Northumberland    | Heddon - on - the-wall  | Æ      | ?          | Maximian-Arc.                          | c. 1820         |
| Somerset          | Burtle                  | Æ + Æ  | 41 + 7 ? + | “ Late 4th C. or early 5th C.”         | Early 19th C.   |
|                   | Camerton                | Æ      | 26         | — Arc. and Hon.                        | 1814 +          |
|                   | Holway                  | Æ      | 33         | Constans.-Hon.                         | 1821            |
|                   | Lansdown                | ?      | ?          | Incl. 1 of Arc.                        | ?               |
|                   | Milverton               | ? Æ    | 45         | Jul.-Arc.                              | c. 1847         |
|                   | North Curry             | Æ      | 150        | Constantine I-Hon.                     | 1748            |
|                   | North Mendip            | Æ      | 2,044 +    | Constans.-Hon.                         | c. 1866         |
|                   | Polden Hills            | Æ + Æ  | ?          | ‘ Smallest coins ’ Incl. 1 of Flacilla | 1838            |

| Receptacle and its fate |               | Circumstances,<br>Associated Finds, etc.  | Present where-<br>abouts of hoard   | References.  |
|-------------------------|---------------|---|---|--|
| Pot                     | Smashed       | Close by base of stone sepulchral effigy  | Unknown   | A.J. xiv, 142  |
| Pot                     | Hull Museum   | With a ring. Pot and 6 coins (to Gratian) found in river mud. Siliquae of Valens and Arcadius found at another time at the site almost certainly belong ? others also later | Hull Museum   | Hull Mus. Publ. 70 (= Lincs. N. & Q., 1910?) and 80 and private information          |
| None                    | —             | Tower, with silver ingot (B.M.)   | Unknown   | A. v, 291  |
| ?                       | Unknown       | With 2 rings and bracelet (all A/), silver ingot and some $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ of Valentinian  | Unknown   | Gough's Camden II, 30 and fig. opp. I, lxxii   |
| }                       | None          | During excavations but identity lost  | Newport (Mon.) Museum. Caerwent Church (Vestry). National Museum of Wales | Bull. Celt. Studies 2 (1925), 92; 4 (1929), 99                                       |
|                         | Pot           | Unknown   | Exhibited in 1847 to Institute  | V.C.H. I, 314. Norwich, Vol. of Inst. xxvii and liii                                 |
| Pot                     | Unknown       | —   | Unknown   | V.C.H. I, 315.   |
| ? Bag                   | Disintegrated | In ruins of R.-B. building  | Althorp   | A. xx, 579   |
| Unknown                 | —             | At or near Heddon   | Presented to Newcastle Antiq. Soc. In hands of 'McNorris's son' (1914)    | Present paper  |
| Pot                     | Unknown       | Adjoining pottery mounds in marshes between Edington and Chilton  | Unknown   | (Bruce, Guide to the Roman Wall, 3rd ed., 125 P. S. A. <sup>2</sup> xxvi (1914), 142 |
| None                    | —             | During excavation of villa—beneath two tiles  | Unknown   | V.C.H. I, 292n   |
| ? Pot                   | Unknown       | A few more found since 1870   | Some in Taunton Mus.  | V.C.H. I, 356, 363   |
| ?                       | ?             | —   | Unknown   | (Dobson, Arch. of Somerset, 156  |
| Pot                     | Unknown       | —   | Unknown   | V.C.H. I, 356  |
| Pot                     | Unknown       | Ploughed up   | Unknown   | V.C.H. I, 356; Gent's Mag. 1748, 405   |
| ?                       | —             | In vicinity of Bristol or Mendip  | Evans Coll.   | N.C. 1915, 433   |
| Two leather purses      | Unknown       | In pottery mound in marshes near Edington and Chilton (v. Burtle above)   | Taunton and Glastonbury Muss.   | V.C.H. I, 355<br>V.C.H. I, 353   |

| County         | Find-spot       | Metal        | Number                           | Range   | Date of finding |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Suffolk        | Eye             | A/           | -600                             | Val. I-Hon.   | 1781            |
|                | Icklingham I    | Æ            | c. 400                           | Const. II-Hon.  | 1877            |
|                | " II            | Æ            | 1,064                            | Gallienus-Hon.  | 1902            |
| Surrey         | Chobham         | { Æ<br>+Æ }  | c. 200                           | { Val. I and Grat.<br>Val. I-Hon.                           | 1772            |
| Wiltshire      | Amesbury        | Æ<br>+Æ      |                                  | Postumus-Theo. II<br>(sic)                                  | 1843            |
|                | Groveley Wood I | Æ            | 299                              | Const. II-Arc.  | 1906            |
|                | " " II          | Æ            | 954                              | Claudius II-Hon.  | 1906            |
|                | Manton Downs    | Æ            | 26                               | Jul.-Hon.   | c. 1884         |
| Worcestershire | Cleeve Prior    | { A/<br>Æ }  | { 6 lbs.<br>weight<br>c. 3,000 } | { Val. I-Arc.<br>Const. II-Hon.                             | { 1811 }        |
|                |                 | Æ            | 5                                | Jul.-Valentinian III<br>(sic)                               | 1861            |
| Yorkshire      | Filey I         | Æ            | 110                              | Constantine I-Hon.  | 1923            |
|                | " II            | Æ            | 22                               | Constans-Theo.  | 1923            |
|                | Guisborough     | AR +<br>1 A/ | 80                               | Valens-Hon.   | 1856            |
|                | Husthwaite      | Æ            | c. 400                           | Valens, Theo., etc.   | c. 1901         |
|                | Richmond        | Æ            | 600 +                            | Const. II-Victor +<br>'many other of the<br>later emperors' | 1720            |
|                | Scarborough     | Æ            | 57                               | Constantine I-Hon.  | 1924            |
|                | Whorlton        | Æ            | 150                              | Const. II-Hon.  | 1810            |
|                |                 |              |                                  |   |                 |
| Ireland        | Coleraine       | Æ            | 1,506                            | Jul.-Constantine III  | 1854            |
| Scotland       | Traprain Law    | Æ            | 4                                | Valens-Hons.  | 1919            |

| Receptacle and its fate  |                               | Circumstances,<br>Associated Finds, etc.  | Present where-<br>abouts of hoard             | References  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Case covered with lead   | Unknown                       | In sand-pit on Clint Farm ; ? near a burial   | Unknown                                       | V.C.H. I, 295, 305  |
| Pot                      | Smashed                       | —   | Unknown                                       | { V.C.H. I, 309<br>N.C. 1908, 215   |
| Pot                      | Unknown                       | Some silver ; with $\mathcal{R}$ spoon, rings, beads, etc.  | Private possession                            | N.C. 1929, 319  |
| Pot                      | Unknown                       | Ploughed up   | Unknown                                       | V.C.H. IV, 360  |
| Pot                      | Unknown                       | With three $\mathcal{R}$ rings (B.M.)   | Unknown                                       | P.S.A. <sup>1</sup> IV, 27  |
| Pot                      | Now lost ) but do. } see ref. | Within an earthwork of an extensive settlement. With $\mathcal{R}$ rings, etc. (B.M.)                                     | { British Museum (some)<br>British Museum     | N.C. 1906, 329.<br>Pots and rings figured<br>Examined but not published<br>N.C. 1884, 348 |
| Pot                      |                               |   |   |   |
| None                     | —                             | Near find of pewter dishes ; some v. clipped  | Unknown                                       |   |
| 2 Pots                   | Unknown                       | Some used as currency by finders  | Unknown {                                     | V.C.H. I, 217 ;<br>Allies, Ant. of Worcs., 2nd ed. (1852), 91-4<br>V.C.H. I, 220          |
| ?                        | —                             | —   | Unknown                                       |   |
| None                     | —                             | During excavations at the Signal Station  | Mr. F. G. Simpson                             | A.J. 1932, 251-2  |
| None                     | —                             | During excavations at the Signal Station  |   |   |
| ?                        | —                             | Near Ice Ho., Wilton Castle   | Unknown                                       | Elgee, Romans in Cleveland, 14  |
| Bag or box               | Decayed                       | When digging for waterpipes   | Unknown                                       | Haverfield MSS. (Ashmolean Mus.)  |
| None                     | —                             | In horizontal crevice of rock at bottom of hill on which Castle stands  | Unknown                                       | Clarkson, Richmond ed. 1821, 16   |
| None                     | —                             | During excavations at the Signal Station  | Mr. F. G. Simpson                             | A.J. 1932, 251/2  |
| Large $\mathcal{R}$ vase | 'Decayed'                     | Ploughed up on side of Whorl Hill. With $\mathcal{R}$ ingots (1 in Scarborough Mus.) and $\mathcal{R}$ rings, etc. (B.M.) | 40 $\mathcal{R}$ in B.M. (many badly clipped) | Elgee, Romans in Cleveland, 8   |
| None found               | —                             | Many v. badly clipped   | 31 in B.M.                                    | N.C. 1855, 101  |
| None                     | —                             | Amongst hoard of plate  | Nat. Mus. of Ant. Edinburgh                   | The Treasure of Traprain, 5   |



Similar hoards have apparently seldom been noted in Europe outside this country. Mention may be made of two in Austria (Vienna—*Num. Chron.* 1929, 326; *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, 58, 1925/6 [Æ] and Lower Danube (?)—*Num. Chron.*, 1906, 338 [AR]) and one in France (Cazères-sur-l'Adour—*Num. Chron.*, 1906, 339; *Bull de Num.*, 1895, 23). The bronze, however, occurs in hoards in Egypt and Syria, e.g. Hawara (*Num. Chron.*, 1926, 43), Armant (recent E. E. Fund excavations—some recently shown to Roy. Num. Soc. and now in Chelmsford Museum) and elsewhere (*Num. Chron.*, 1931, 318), and Caiffa, Syria (*Num. Chron.*, 1931, 319).

As stated above, only those hoards have been included, of which the latest coins (actual or reasonably likely) were minted after A.D. 388. The following six hoards have, therefore, been omitted, but it is likely that most of them date from the same period as those of the main bibliography:—

*Northamptonshire*, Cosgrave Æ—to Val. II (*V.C.H.* I, 216).

*Northumberland*, Corbridge—A/ to Mag. Max. (*Num. Chron.*, 1912, 275; *A. Ael.* 3<sup>rd</sup> S. V, 351; 1911 *Rep.* 105, 127).

*Somerset*, Bristol (near) Æ—to Mag. Max. (*V.C.H.* I, 355).

*Somerset*, Charlton Mackerell (?) Æ—to Theo. (*V.C.H.* I, 323).

*Sussex*, Cakeham A/—to Mag. Max. (*S.A.C.*, VIII, 290; *J.B.A.A.*, II, 199).

*Warwickshire*, Stratford-on-Avon (near) A/ and Æ—one of Mag. Max. (*V.C.H.* I, 248).

N.B.—This list is not exhaustive.

Similarly hoards of 'illegible *minimi*' (a much-abused word) cannot be included, although they are likely to have been Theodosian 4 Æ, e.g.

*Norfolk*, Southrey (*V.C.H.* I, 321).

*Suffolk*, Bungay (*Proc. Suff. A Inst.* III, 414).

Finally a hoard from Northallerton, Yorkshire (Elgee, *Romans in Cleveland*, 7/8, 14), is interesting. In 1788 a large vessel containing several hundreds of small Roman coins, chiefly of late emperors, was ploughed up close to Castle Hills by Lawrence Leadley. Coins of Antoninus Pius to Geta are recorded, also of Constantius II, but no later emperors are specified. It is likely, however, that Theodosian issues were included, but classed as illegible, in view of the fact that some of the coins were actually put into circulation as 'Lauries' farthings.' A similar use is recorded in the case of the Cleeve Prior (Worcs.) hoard and other parallels from abroad are common (see correspondence in *The Times*, mid and late April, 1933). Bronze currency was, of course, scarce at the time of this find.