then from *c*. 800 Arab silver in the form of dirhems from Central Asia poured into Russia along the Volga, and from Russia spread westwards into Europe, reaching, as Biddle has shown, even as far as Winchester (the 10th-century reconstruction of Winchester is contemporary with the foundation of Kiev and Novgorod). From about 1000 there was a great reverse flow of silver into north Russia, largely pennies from England. The movements are well recorded at Novgorod, where, it will be remembered, two substantial 10th-century Kufic hoards occurred in the second street, there was a scatter of western coins in the 11th- and 12th-century streets, and a practically coinless period from the 13th century onwards. The flow of Byzantine coins into Russia almost ceased after the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders in 1204, while the Mongol conquest of south Russia in the 1240s cut off the north from further contact.

The distribution of coins as shown in map 2 of Kropotkin's work reveals various interesting points. The concentration in the middle Dnieper valley around Kiev indicates one of the main trade routes with Byzantium, while the single finds on the lower Volga, particularly on its elbow, reflect its importance as a trade-route and the transhipment between this river and the Don. The absence of gold hoards in the north has been noted above. The silver hoards shown in the north are misleading, since they normally consist of merely one or two Byzantine coins among several hundred dirhems and pennies. The reader should perhaps be warned that the maps accompanying these two studies have been very carelessly compiled, as obvious mistakes, or checks against the inventory, show; it is a very great pity that such a worthwhile piece of work should be so wretchedly marred in this way.

<div align="right">M. W. THOMPSON</div>

A PORTION OF AN INSCRIBED PRE-CONQUEST CROSS-SHAFT FROM LANCASTER (PLS. IX, A–D, X, A)

In 1963 I was asked by the Ministry of Public Building and Works to watch the contractor's excavations for the building of a new vicarage at Lancaster, W. of the previous vicarage, and N. of the parish church, formerly the church of the alien priory.[2] It was hoped that some traces would emerge of the other buildings of the priory, of which nothing was known, except that they presumably lay N. of the church, since the adjacent castle precluded their having lain to the south. It was also hoped to find further evidence for the course of the N. wall of the late Roman fort, known as the Wery Wall, which, as the *vetus murus*, formed one of the features defining the land with which the priory was endowed at its foundation in 1094.[3]

Work began in March, 1965, and its nature, which involved cutting a platform in the hillside before orthodox foundation trenches could be laid, made observation difficult. The only structure revealed was a substantial stone-built drain, running on a line a few degrees out from that postulated by Richmond for the Wery Wall.[4] The filling of this drain contained only medieval pottery. This does not, of course, preclude its having been Roman in origin, and Sir Ian Richmond, who saw a small portion of it, thought that it probably was. In addition, the positions were noted of a number of areas in the sections which may have represented robber-trenches or pits. One of these, in particular, was noted in the N. section of the platform.

The site was not visited again for some weeks, as digging ceased when building began. On 16 June, I was told by Mr. G. M. Leather that excavations for drains surrounding the house had revealed an inscribed stone. Mr. Leather secured the stone, and it was immediately recognized as a pre-conquest monument. The following day I visited the site, and was shown exactly where the inscribed stone was found. Masonry

[2] NGR SD(34)/4747 6198.

[3] W. O. Roper, *Materials for the History of the Church of Lancaster* (Chetham Soc., 2 ser., 26, Manchester, 1892), p. 8.

[4] I. A. Richmond, 'Excavations on the site of the Roman fort at Lancaster, 1950', *Trans. Hist. Soc. of Lancs. and Ches.*, 105 (1954), fig. 1 (upper).

was visible in the section of the drain-trench, and it was thought at first that this represented a wall crossing the drain-trench at or near a right angle. Clearance showed, however, that the drain-trench had cut through the centre of a masonry structure, $4\frac{1}{2}$ ft. square internally, the interior of which was filled with liquid mud and rubble among which the inscribed stone was found. Some of this filling was removed, revealing that the structure had been built without mortar, but had had a clay lining, in which a scrap of a Roman grey cooking-pot was recovered. It was considered that this structure (PL. X, A) was a well of Roman date, and the indication in the section mentioned previously was caused by the infilling of the shaft round its masonry lining. There was no means of knowing how deep this well might have been, and with the labour and time available it was not possible to clear any more of the filling.

The stone itself (PL. IX, A–D) is a portion of a cross-shaft, $10\frac{3}{8}$ in. ($26 \cdot 3$ cm.) by $5\frac{5}{8}$ in. ($14 \cdot 3$ cm.) in section. The overall length of the surviving portion is $16\frac{7}{8}$ in. ($42 \cdot 8$ cm.). The sides of the inscribed area, which bears an inscription on all four faces, are concave in both directions, and it seems possible that the fragment formed the lower arm of a cross, inscribed in the same way as the cross from Dewsbury in the British Museum. The material is a grey gritstone, with some red areas.

The inscription is carefully cut and spaced in Anglo-Saxon capitals, the only minuscule form being the G on side IV.[5] The epigraphic evidence for dating is inconclusive. The straight medial cross-bar of the A, the use of V = U, and the forms of R and B suggest a date late in the period, while the pointed top of the A and the form of the N point the other way.

The reading would seem to be:

Side   I   + ORAT[E] / PANIM [A] / CYNIBÂ[D] (Inset) /ÊT P E – – –
Side   II   – ᶜ·³ – / HOC OPV[S]
Side III   – ᶜ·² – ERF . . . /[P]ERPE / ᶜ·¹/²ABAT
Side IV   [A]DG / LORI / ÂDŇI

The interpretation of this gives rise to certain difficulties, and it should be said at once that two assumptions have been made throughout, after consideration. These are (i) that the inscription is a continuous whole, and (ii) that it reads in the order given, i.e. with the observer passing anti-clockwise round the stone, when it was set up.

Side I seems clear, except for the exact form of the name. CYNIBAD is suggested since there seems insufficient room for any form, inflexional or otherwise, of any longer name, such as CYNIBALD. It is possible that the reading was CYNIBADI.

Side II is the most badly damaged one, and no trace can be recovered of the first line. HOC OPVS in the remaining two lines presumably refers to the cross itself. In view of the verb, which is presumed to have been on side III, a relative pronoun may have occupied the first line of side II.

Side III is the most difficult side. It seems impossible to avoid the reading FILI for the last four letters of line 1, since what remains after F consists of the lower portions of three vertical strokes, the centre one of which turns at right angles at the bottom. This letter could, therefore, formally be C or E. This leaves the significance of the remaining two lines uncertain. In general on the stone there seems to be an attempt to make word endings coincide with line endings, though this is abandoned on side IV. The possibilities are thus either that PERPE represents an abbreviation, and that a verb of 5 or 6 letters stood on the last line, or that a verb of 10 or 11 letters is represented by the two lines together. In either case the apparent reading of ABAT for the last four letters introduces the possibility of a verb in the unlikely imperfect tense.

5 The Ruthwell cross also has minuscule G among capitals.

11

This must not be unduly stressed, since the first two letters of these four are repre-
sented by 'ghosts' where the area enclosed by the letter has flaked away from the
surface of the stone. The reading may have been ARAT, and it is this possibility which
is used in the tentative reconstruction below.[6]

Side IV is not in doubt, but is interesting in that it has the only certain example
on the stone of a word continued from line to line, the only examples of contraction
marks, and the only minuscule letter form.

A tentative reading is, therefore, as follows:

Orate p(ro) anima Cynibad qui hoc opus per fili(um) perpetuarat ad gloria(m)
D(omi)ni.

This may presumably be translated as follows: 'Pray for the soul of Cynibad,
who had promised (that) this work (should be made) through his son to the glory of
the Lord.'[7]

The inset between lines 2 and 3 of side I is presumably a later insertion, though
how much later it is not possible to say. It has a compendium for ET which is paralleled
at Kirkmadrine four times on three stones, all of which are probably 200 years earlier
than the stone under discussion. This may be a capital version of what Nash-Williams
calls[8] 'the usual compendium for *et*' in half uncials, which occurs also in the Latin text
of the Ruthwell cross, also earlier than our stone, and in MSS.

> *The decoration.*[9] 'This fragment belongs stylistically to a distinctive north-
> western group of crosses from Lowther Castle,[10] Heversham, Kendal and Lan-
> caster, all of which, in the Hexham tradition, are decorated on each side of the
> shaft with a continuous pattern of vine-scroll. This piece (cited here as Lancaster C)
> is most closely linked within the group with two other crosses from Lancaster.[11]
>
> 'The composition of this fragment (PL. IX), with medallion vine-scrolls of the
> type of the Acca cross at Hexham on one broad face, and spiral plant trails on the
> other broad and both narrow faces, most closely resembles Lancaster A. What
> little remains of the double-stranded medallion (side III) suggests that the carver
> of C reproduced the Hexham motif with more assurance than did the carver of A.
> Lancaster B does not use the difficult medallion scroll, and although it has, like C,
> a well-cut inscription, the composition and carving are cruder than on A or C.
> It is unfortunate that so little remains of the decoration of C, so that not only is it
> impossible to say whether the carver varied the design on each face, as on Lan-
> caster A, but also it is impossible to see the disposition of the grape bunches,
> which are very distinctive in this western group. Only one side (IV) shows a leaf
> type, and this is the simple ivy-leaf form of Kendal and Lancaster A, and not the
> fronded type used on Lancaster B, Heversham and Lowther. If one can judge
> from the tiny part remaining, the scroll used by the carver on the narrow faces
> was a simple alternate-facing plant spiral with one drop leaf, such as is found on
> Lancaster B, and not the delicate spray tendrils which Lancaster A shares with
> Lowther, Heversham and Kendal—a scroll type which seems to be a local inven-
> tion of the north-west.
>
> 'The new fragment from Lancaster, then, seems to stand stylistically between
> Lancaster A, which is linked with the more elegant and inventive western school

[6] J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, IX (Leiden, 1962), *s.v.*

[7] Dr. O. A. W. Dilke, Dept. of Humanity, Glasgow University, has pointed out to me that PERFICI
PERPETRABAT, using the imperfect tense of PERPETRARE ('to accomplish') and the passive infinitive
PERFICI ('to be completed'), makes good sense and good dark-age Latin.

[8] V. E. Nash-Williams, *The Early Christian Monuments of Wales* (Cardiff, 1950), p. 154.

[9] I am greatly indebted to Miss R. Cramp of the University of Durham for the text of this note on
the decoration.

[10] The crosses from the castle collection are now in private possession.

[11] W. G. Collingwood, *Northumbrian Crosses of the Pre-Norman Age* (London, 1927), fig. 46 (cited here
as Lancaster A) and fig. 74 (cited here as Lancaster B).

of the 9th century, and Lancaster B, which is linked with the immediately pre-Viking crosses of the West Riding. It is impossible to provide accurate dating for sculptural fragments on stylistic grounds alone, but C would seem to fit best into the mid 9th century.'

In conclusion two further points may be noted. First, as Miss Cramp has pointed out to me, the new stone adds weight to Collingwood's suggestion that there must have been a foundation of some importance at Lancaster in the pre-conquest period.[12] Secondly, in view of the situation of Lancaster, it is interesting that, despite its distinctive north-western style, the new stone has three features which recall the inscribed monuments of early Christian Wales: (a) the long and complicated inscription; (b) the formula 'Orate pro anima . . .' which is fairly frequent there, though occurring elsewhere, including on Lancaster B; and (c) the inscription on all four faces of the stone. It is also worth recalling the occurrence, on the 10th-century runic cross from Lancaster, in the British Museum, of the name Cynibalþ.

<div align="right">B. J. N. EDWARDS[13]</div>

A CATERPILLAR-BROOCH FROM OLD ERRINGHAM FARM, SHOREHAM-BY-SEA, SUSSEX (PL. X, B, C; FIG. 60, a–d)

The bronze bow-brooch which is the subject of this note was found in a Saxon weaving-hut in an emergency excavation at Old Erringham undertaken by E. W. Holden, which is briefly mentioned in *Med. Archaeol.*, IX (1965), 175, and will be more fully published in a forthcoming number of the *Sussex Archaeological Collections*.

The brooch (PL. X, B, C; FIG. 60, a)[14] is 4·5 cm. long, the head and foot being similar in width and design to the bow. Two lines of slashes run the length of the convex surface. There is a transverse double raised band at the middle of the bow and at each end of the bow a transverse raised band nicked to indicate beading; the terminals are also raised and trefoil in shape. At the back is a pin catch under the foot and double perforated lugs under the head with remains of an iron pin.

This is a variant of the ansate brooch current on the continent from the late 7th century to the 9th century in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Scandinavia, Switzerland and Italy. 'Ansate' is the description given to a bow-brooch which has a head identical in shape and size to the foot, these terminals assuming a variety of shapes, circular, oblong, etc., and the whole object having the appearance of a handle. A date for the beginning of the series can be established at about the end of the 7th century by their occurrence in the latest graves of the Merovingian cemeteries, and an indication that they continued in use until the 9th century is given by the ornate pair of silver, disc-ended brooches found at Muysen-les-Malines (Brabant) with a silver bead, a strap-end, and a hoard of coins of Charlemagne (768–814), Pepin I (817–38), Lothar I (840–55), Charles the Bald (840–77) and Louis II (849–75), and an Arab dinar of 866.[15] They occur rarely in this country, e.g. at Totternhoe, Beds.[16]

The variety found at Old Erringham has terminals of equal width to the bow, so that its appearance is very much that of an arched caterpillar. The range in date of this form is attested in much the same way as the date of the other ansates, the earliest occurring in late Merovingian graves, and the 9th century being indicated by one

[12] Collingwood, *op. cit.* in note 11, p. 36.

[13] Numerous people have helped me in preparing this note, but I would like to record special thanks to the contractors, the Heysham Building Company, for their cooperation; to Mr. G. M. Leather, but for whose prompt action the stone would have been lost; to Miss E. Barty, on whose notes much of the foregoing has been based; and to Miss Cramp for the note on the decoration. All opinions are, of course, my own.

[14] The drawings, FIG. 60, a–d, are by Mr. David Neal.

[15] Baron de Loë, *Belgique ancienne, iv, La Période franque* (1939), pp. 149–151, figs. 117–121.

[16] *Dunstable Library and Museum Annual Report* (1925–26), p. 7, fig. 9.