THE RICHBOROUGH COIN INSCRIBED "DOMINO CENSAURIO CES."

BY ALFRED ANSCOMBE, F.R.HIST.S.

THE SO-CALLED "COIN OF A SECOND CARAUSIUS, CÆSAR IN BRITAIN IN THE FIFTH CENTURY."

T was in the year 1887 that Mr. Arthur J. Evans, M.A. (now Sir Arthur), published a very learned and interesting paper on a bronze coin which was found at Richborough in Kent, on the site of the Roman fortress called Rutupiae, or Rutupium. The obverse of the coin presents a head modelled in a somewhat barbarous fashion on that of a fourth-century Emperor, diademed, and with the bust draped in the *paludamentum*, or military robe of a Roman general. The reverse presents a familiar bronze type of Constans, or perhaps of Constantius II. For these and other well-considered reasons Sir Arthur Evans then assigned the coin to the first half of the fifth century, and quite correctly; but he mistakenly ascribed it to A.D. 409. He also suggested that the *CO/XTA* of the inscription on the reverse should be identified with the Constantine who was ruling in Britain in that year. But this British Emperor who is known as Constantine the Third, and who had won imperial status in Britain, Gaul, and Spain in A.D. 407, had made his own son, Constans, Cæsar in A.D. 408. Consequently Sir Arthur Evans's claim to have discovered another British Cæsar, during the same reign, who was named Carausius but is otherwise quite unknown, must be regarded as inadmissible. Moreover, no historical testimony has ever been adduced in support of this assumption.


B
HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS TO THE IDENTIFICATION PROPOSED.

The years A.D. 407, 408, 409, 410, and 411 are comparatively well illuminated historically, and the story of the Western Constantine the Third is quite precise and is fuller of names and records of events than any other quinquennium in the history of Roman Britain in the fourth and fifth centuries. In A.D. 407 the army in Britain revolted and declared Marcus Emperor. He was soon killed, and a native of Britain named Gratian Municeps was induced to assume the purple. In four months Gratian was deposed and killed. A Constantine of low birth then usurps the purple in Britain, and, after collecting an army and a fleet, invades Gaul and Spain. In A.D. 408, Sarus, the general-in-chief of the Emperor Honorius, despatches against Constantine and besieges him at Valencia, an important city in Hispania Tarraconensis. Sarus was worsted and compelled to flee to Italy. In the same year Honorius recognized Constantine as his partner in the Western Empire, and, as I have said, this Constantine made his own son, Constans, Caesar. In A.D. 409, Gerontius, a Briton, revolted against Constantine, and in A.D. 411 he slew the young Constans Caesar at Vienne, and caused a Maximus to be elected Emperor. In the same year, on September 18th, Constantius, a general of Honorius, defeated and killed Constantine the Third at Arles and also his son Julian. Gerontius, soon after that, was slain by his own officers, and Maximus was deprived of the purple. This event ends the coherent story of Roman Britain, as we know it.

I consider that if there really had been a "Carausius Caesar" in Britain in the reign of Constantine the Third, we might confidently assert that we should find him duly recorded in Gallic or British chronicles.

During the third, fourth, and fifth centuries it was customary for the title of Caesar to be accorded to a high official who was deemed likely to become Imperator. In A.D. 292 the Emperor Diocletian sent Constantius Chlorus into Gaul with the title of Caesar. In A.D. 306 the Emperor Galerius named Constantine, the
son of Constantius Chlorus, Caesar. In A.D. 317 the Emperors Constantine and Licinius gave this title to Constantine the Younger (†340). Valentinian the Third, the son of Constantius the Third and Placidia, was declared Caesar at Thessalonica in A.D. 424. Procopius Anthemius was declared Caesar in A.D. 467. These were all prominent princes or officials, and the title of Caesar, quite apart from kinship with an Emperor, was not at all likely to have been bestowed upon any one, of whom, as in the case of the supposititious "Carausius Caesar," nothing whatever is known.

The spelling "Ces" for Cesar: Caesar, is quite admissible; but no spelling CES for CAES is listed in H. Cohen's Table des légendes de revers.¹

THE MISREADING OF THE INSCRIPTION.

The epigraphical difficulties presented by the Richborough coin are numerous and important. Moreover, the assumptions made by Sir Arthur Evans and Mr. F. S. Salisbury have seriously added to the difficulties of other numismatologists. The reading of the inscription advanced in 1887 by Sir Arthur Evans and accepted by Mr. Salisbury and certain other scholars, depends primarily upon the assumption that the second and third letters in the personal name on the obverse (continuing the reading after ONIMOD from right to left and looking towards the centre) are A and R. Sir Arthur Evans's drawings printed in his 1887 article, on p. 191 and p. 200, differ from each other and also, in some details, from the actual inscription as presented on the obverse of the coin.

When one is commencing the study of a doubtful inscription, the primary question that should be permitted to urge itself forward is, what is the actual lettering? Not what can it be? but what is it? The inscription on the mis-named "Coin of a Second Carausius" is confused and abnormal; and when we approach such problems with preconceptions we quite naturally, though unconsciously,

¹ Description historique des monnaies sous l'Empire Romain, vol. vii, 1868, pp. 438, 439.
fall into the mental condition that Lord Chancellor Bacon characterized as "reasoning as one would." Now, if the coin we are concerned with must be regarded as a coin the inscription upon which presents the name Caraunius, we are constrained to make and adopt five primary assumptions. Otherwise we cannot succeed, in this particular case, in attaining the mental heights of "reasoning as one would." These five tacit assumptions are:

1. That a die-sinker who, according to custom, clearly used uncrossed A for A twice on the same coin, would erroneously have engraved h instead of another A, in one and the same word;

2. That the indistinct crossing of the upper part of the upstanding bar of the second letter of the personal name on the obverse may be ignored;

3. That the reverted letter h misrepresents a majuscule H for A;

4. That the third letter, which is unquestionably an s, is really intended for the curves of an R ligatured to the knee of the unrecognised h; and

5. That the splaying of the foot of the upright stroke in OSVA (i.e. AV SIO, as the reading is declared to be) may be ignored.

I shall deal with these five assumptions in the next section.

THE CORRECT READING OF THE INSCRIPTION.

Ligatures.—With regard to the tied letters, or ligatures, Sir Arthur Evans made the very definite statement in his 1887 article in the Numismatic Chronicle (p. 200) that "Ligatures like the above [in his 'facsimile'] are wholly absent from the imperial series [of coins] of the first four centuries of our era." This, of course, does

1 "The form A is throughout commonly found in place of A." Vide The Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, vol. 1, "Augustus to Vitellius." Epigraphy, by Harold Mattingly, M.A., 1923, pp. lxii, lxxii. A without the cross-bar is quite common in Romano-British inscriptions: e.g. one inscription at Stanhope in Weardale (Hubner, No. 451) presents so many as fourteen uncrossed A's.
not deny that ligatures were used; but admits that Sir Arthur could not produce anything like the AR ligature supposed to be on the so-called “Carausius Coin.” One of the earliest of ligatures in the Christian era occurs on a coin bearing the name of Caius Censorinus who died in A.D. 2. The word “Marcius” occurs on this coin, and M, A and R are all three tied together. Similarly, in Mr. Harold Mattingly’s *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (cp. note, p. 4, *supra*), the tendency of the imperial die-sinkers to abbreviate and tie up the letters in the inscriptions they were directed to prepare is very marked—one might almost say, is unrestrained. Mr. Mattingly elucidates a great number, and I would point out that there really is not one which can be equated with the AR ligature that is postulated by Sir Arthur Evans’s theory.

The Letter E.—Other interesting ligatures are presented by Aemilius Hübner in his *Exempla Scripturae Epigraphicae Latinae* (1885), though these are not from coins. We shall presently see that the ligatured E letters and forms are very important, and that the possibility of the connection of the tied and crossed E with the inscription on the Richborough coin is illuminating. The custom of combining E, either directly (as A/E), or in retrograde (as E/N), with another straight-stemmed letter appears in Romano-British inscriptions at least as early as the third century of our era. It was not confined to Britannia.

The indication of letter E by three arms extending from the upright staff of another letter became corrupted in the course of years. Eventually only one of the three bars, namely, the middle one, was indicated—either by a line, a dot, or a pellet. In his paper on “Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain,” Sir Arthur Evans illustrates a half-silver ingot which came from the Coleraine hoard. The inscription presents HX OF for *ex officina*, and only the middle bar of the E is indicated. Even in Italy examples of a similar treatment of E, sc. by +, an upright staff crossed at the centre, can be found. In the inscribed name of the old Italian town of Teanum Sidicinum only one of the three bars is indicated
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on the upright staff of its E. In process of time it became customary to represent E by ì or 1. In his "Second Carausius" article (p. 206), Sir Arthur industriously gathered together eleven instances of the unbarred 1 occurring for E (cp. IXPICTATE and SIX, for expectate and sex).

This changing peculiarity has not been realized by Mr. F. S. Salisbury. He recently published a short note on "A New Coin of Carausius II," in which he referred to a coin recently unearthed at Richborough which he rightly regards as a similar one to the Evans coin, dealt with in 1887 and 1915 in the Numismatic Chronicle and elsewhere. But this new coin bears no full name upon its obverse, as the Evans coin does; and though Mr. Salisbury accepts Sir Arthur's reading and attribution of the so-called "Coin of a Second Carausius," he says of the inscription thereupon that "it shows greater abnormality in the retrograde lettering with the bottom of the letters to the edge of the flan and the reverse position of some letters due to the engraver's unskilfulness in preparing the die."

The inscription on the obverse of the Salisbury coin reads (from left to right) OLS CESAV. Mr. Salisbury would read from right to left and would "restore" the inscription thus: [DOMINO CAR]AVSIO CES. This restoration (1) postulates an R; (2) requires the arms of N to be ignored; and (3) substitutes 0 for C.

I would prefer to read this inscription in harmony with that on the Evans coin, thus: CES CESAV, and I would expand it and normalize it as [DOMINO] CÆS[ARI] CE[N]SAV[RIO].

The dropping out of N from before S is not at all unusual, and Sir Arthur Evans in his 1887 paper gives six instances of this omission; vide p. 205: Clemes, Cresces, Constas, Libes, Hortaesi, Ories, from each of which the n has been purposely omitted.

There is a similar coin in the British Museum which is at present unpublished. It is of the FEL TEMP REPARATIO type, and presents a soldier standing and spearing a horseman, fallen over a horse.

1 Vide The Students' Manual of Ancient Geography, ed. Dr. William Smith, 1861, p. 569.
2 In The Antiquaries' Journal, vol. vi (1926), p. 312, fig. 2.
inscribed "Domino Censaurio Ces."

The obverse inscription is mutilated; but CENSE stands out clearly. It may be followed by RI and another letter, but that is doubtful. If it really presents CENSERIO it is noteworthy, on the one hand, that that is the rarest of the *Cansari* forms; and on the other that it is preserved in the modern name of Châtel-Censoir, about 6 lieues from Avallon in the Arrondissement of Auxerre (in the Département of the Yonne). Now the phonetic sequence is —Cansari < Canseri < Cansiri < Censerio; and the last form is the forerunner of French Censoir; cp. Latin *sèr-us, hèr-es, fèr-i-a* with French soir, hoir, foire, which present oir for Latin ēr.

*The Crossed and Mounted i.*—Over the whole of the Western Empire the mounting of an upright staff for *i* upon another letter in inscriptions was quite common. Many instances occur in Narbon Gaul¹ and also in Britain.² In No. 965 in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinum*, vol. vii, we get numinit and Aurelio with mounted *i*. In No. 421, Melonius occurs: this has eight letters, normally, but it is represented in the inscription by five, of which only three are uncompounded. In the first 64 inscriptions printed in the above,³ no fewer than 29 occurrences of *i* mounted upon other letters are recorded. There is really nothing locally unusual about this. It was practically universal⁴ (cp. Tav. II, in which instances are given of *i* mounted on nine other letters, viz., ADELMNPQ and T). We find the same custom at Mertola in Lusitania.⁵ In the first sepulchral monument figured, "requieuit in pace" has the three *i*’s mounted above the *u*’s and the *n*. This monument is dated in the Spanish era DIII. (= A.D. 465), and its importance will become apparent later on when we are concerned with A.D. 440, at Mertola. Hübner⁶ gives six instances of the mounting of *i*: upon *n* (3), upon

---

³ Delle Abbreviature nella Paleographica Latina, Studio Zamino Volta, Milan, 1892.
⁵ Noticias Archaeologicas de Portugal, ed. Aemil Hübner, 1871.
P (I), and upon T (2). In *Exempla Scripturae*,¹ pp. lxviii and lxix, *Prolegomena II, Nexus Litterarum*, Hübner refers to the mounting of ı upon so many as ten other different letters: "n passim." He also records the mounting of ı in seven Lusitanian inscriptions,² of which four occurrences on N were inscribed at Viseu (§ xviii).

The crossing of the upright staff in order to indicate an E is of very great importance in connection with the Evans coin. In Britain the very first inscription recorded by Hübner in his *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae* presents + for E (sc. S+NILVS). It is regrettable that the crossing of the upright staff mounted on the N (sc. h) has not been detected with regard to the Evans coin. Its importance should be appreciated by all students of this inscription. As ı on N represents IN, crossed ı on N represents EN. Therefore we have a ligature of two letters between c and s, and the first syllable of the personal name of this fifth-century Caesar is unquestionably CENS. It would have been easier, perhaps, for the engraver to have presented the ligatured EN as EN or -N; cp. CENSORI which occurs on a Romano-British dish.³ Another dish⁴ presents CENSORI FC (Censorius fecit). But h takes up less room, and the engraver was probably actuated by the wish to economize space when the first syllable of the Caesar's name approached the head of the figure.

This brings us to the three final syllables of the Caesar's name. If we read from left to right, looking inward, we get òsvà. The third letter from the right is an inverted R, as on the dish referred to above. The staff of the R is heightened and splayed in two, with one branch beneath the O, and the lower curve is ligatured with the v. The O is smaller than the other letters. These points also have been ignored. I read these bungled letters from right to left as AVPO, for -aurio. This brings us to the name CENSAVRIO.

The spelling AV for o need not be disputed. It frequently occurred in Roman times, and is attributed by Dr. W. M. Lindsay to similarity of sound between au and o. A good many examples of this orthographical confusion are given by him in his admirable and most useful work on *The Latin Language: An historical account of Latin Sounds, Stems and Flexions* (1894), p. 40. A still greater number are recorded by Professor Rudolf Thurneysen in his *Lateinischer Lautwandel* (1887), § 5, p. 157; and *Claudius, Plautus, Flaurus, auriga*, etc., are listed beside *Clodius, Plotus, Florus, origa*, etc.

The three final letters are in ligature. Reading from right to left they are CES.

For the reasons given, which will presently be augmented by historical ones, I submit that the inscription on the fifth-century coin found at Richborough is *DOMINO CENS-AVRIO CES*, and that it should be regarded as dedicatory, and be expanded and normalized as follows: *DOMINO CENSORIO CAESARI*.

**Occurrences of the Name “Censorius.”**

The Latin name *Censorius*, which I have already quoted three times from inscriptions on pottery and possibly on a Roman coin, is remarkably rare among dignitaries in the Western Empire. In Emil Hübner’s *Inscriptiones Britanniae Latinae,* we get *Censorius* and *Censoria*. In Gaul the name *Censorius* is found in the fourth and fifth centuries, and earlier. St. Germanus, who visited the Britannias in A.D. 428 or 429, was bishop of Auxerre for thirty years, viz., from A.D. 418 to 448. One of his successors, who was bishop from A.D. 472 to 502 (thirty years again), bore the name *Censorius*. It was to him that Constantius, the presbyter of Lyons, addressed his *Life of St. Germanus*. The name is also discoverable in Upper Germany (*vide* the “Libri Confraternitatum Sancti Galli Augiensis Fabariensis,” ed. by Dr. Paulus Piper, in 1884, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*). These books go back to the eighth century, and they not only yield the Latin *Censorius* and *Censoria*, but also

---

Old High German names which would superficially appear to present the Latin *Cens* (cp. the names *Caënsili* and *Censaldus*).

The number of inscriptions in Roman Britain that present the name *Censorius* is remarkably small. Not one indicates an official of high status. There was a Marcus Censorius who was a native of Gallia Narbonensis. He was a centurion, and also a praepositus of the First Hispanian Cohort. He was buried at Uxellodunum, the Ellenborough of to-day. At Chichester the name *Censoria* is preserved. At Caerleon-on-Usk a *Caesoria* is recorded. Otto Hirschfeld in his *Index* yields three occurrences of *Censorius*, and *Censorinus* is frequent. But no *Censorius* of such high rank as is demanded for "Censaurius Cesar" is discoverable. I have searched the indexes to the works on Greek and Roman biography and history respectively compiled by Dr. William Smith¹; by Smith, Waite and Marindin,² and by G. E. Marindin³; and by Professor J. B. Bury,⁴ but have not found one occurrence therein of an official named Censorius. It is not until we turn to Henry Fynes Clinton⁵ that we find a *Censorius* recorded. He was of very high station, a count in Gaul and a legate of Aetius in Spain.

Clinton⁶ faithfully includes the five annalistic references made to "Censorius Comes et Legatus" by Hydatius Lemicanus, Bishop of Chaves in Gallaecia from A.D. 427 to c. 460, in his *Continuatio Chronicorum Hieronymianorum ad annum CCCCLXVIII.*

---

¹ *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology* (1844), 3 vols.
² *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities* (1891), 2 vols.
³ *A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology and Geography* (1904), 1 vol.
⁴ *History of the Later Roman Empire from the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian* (A.D. 395 to 565) (1923), 2 vols.; Professor Bury's *Index* covers 37 pp. of two cols. each.
⁶ This fifth-century work is included in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Tom. XI, among the "Chronica Minora," vol. ii, edited in 1894 by Theodore Mommsen. The two oldest manuscripts of Hydatius are cited by Mommsen as B (a Berlin MS., Phillipps, No. 1829, ninth century); and H (a MS. in the University of Madrid, No. 134, thirteenth century).
The Testimony of Hydatius Lemicanus.

Anno VI (Theodosii) : A.D. 430.

Suevi sub Hermerico rege medias partes Gallaeciae depraedantes per plebem, quae castella tutiora retinebat, acta suorum partim caede, partim captivitate pacem quam ruperant familiarum quae tenebantur redhitione restaurant.


Anno VII (Theodosii) : A.D. 431.

Rursum Suevi initam cum Callaecis pacem libata sibi occasione conturbant. Ob quorum depraedationem Hydatius episcopus ad Aetium ducem qui expeditionem agebat in Gallis suscipit legationem.

Anno VIII (Theodosii) : A.D. 432.

Superatis per Aetium in certamine Francis et in pace susceptis Censorius comes legatus mittitur ad Suevos supradicto secum Hydatio redeunte.

Anno IX (Theodosii) : A.D. 433.

Rgresso Censorio ad palatium Hermericus pacem cum Gallaecis quos praedabatur assidue, sub interventu episcopali datis sibi reformat obsidibus. (Censurio, MS. B.)

Anno XIII (Theodosii) : A.D. 437.

Rursus Censorius et Fretimundus legati mittuntur ad Suevos.

Anno XVI (Theodosii) : A.D. 440.

Censorius comes qui legatus missus fuerat ad Suevos, rediens Martyli\(^1\) obsessus a Rechila in pace se tradidit. (Censurius, MS. B\(^a\); Consurius, MS. H\(^m\); Martysi, MS. B\(^a\); Misertili, MS. H\(^m\).)

\(^1\) This is the Mertola of to-day, in Southern Portugal on the Guadiana.
Anno XVIII (Theodosii): A.D. 442.

Cometae sidus apparere incipit mense Decembru quod per menses aliquot visum subsequentis in pestilentia plagae, quae fere in toto orbe diffusa est, praemisit ostentum.

Anno XXIV (Theodosii): A.D. 448.

Per Agiulfum Hispali Censorius iugulatur.

The Testimony of Fredegarius Scholasticus.

Fredegarius Scholasticus flourished in the middle of the seventh century, from A.D. 640 to 658; and the oldest extant MS. copy of his "Chronica" is the Codex Parisinus, which was written in or about A.D. 720. The "Chronica" was edited in 1888 by Dr. Bruno Krusch in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica: "Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum," Tom. II. The murder of Count Censorius is referred to by Fredegari, but the name of the Count is given as "Caesarius." This does not agree with the name of the Count as given five times by Bishop Hydatius. In the annal we are concerned with, Fredegari tells us that Richyla, the king of the Suevi, died at "Aemereta" (i.e., Emerita Augusta, now Merida, on the Guadiana), and that his son Richari succeeded him as king. He then goes on to say—"(Per) Agyulfum nobilem Gothum in Spalae Caesarius comes iugulatur." We are faced here, in the name "Caesarius," by the dialectical operation of the rejection of n from the contact ns. The Suevi, Alamanni, Goths and Vandals preserved this n in their respective dialects. But the Old Saxon, Old Franconian, Old English, and Old Norse dialects rejected it. Now Fredegari was a Frank; hence an Alamannic Cansāri would become Casari in his dialect and that would suggest the Latin metaphony Cēsārius which he employed. With this compare the dialectal forms of the name of the fifth-century King of the Vandals: "Gensemund" and "Gesimund" in Cassiodorus, VIII, ix.1 In

1 Vide "Cassiodori Variarum Libri," ed. Mommsen, 1894, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Tom. XII, p. 239.
Old English the Latin Cæsăr became Casēr. Hence Ĉas in early O.E. Casere (> Cansari) postulates both Latin Cās and Old High German Cans.

**The Testimony of Widsith-Hama.**

In the "Traveller's Lay," or "Widsith," we find a governor of Gaul (O.E. Walarice) mentioned twice. In my revised edition of "Widsith," in the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (1916), vol. ix, pp. 132, 134, we get the following lines:

(l. 20) Casere weold Creac'um ond Caelic Finnum.

(l. 69) Mid Creacum ic wæs ond mid Casere se þe Winburge geweald ahete Wiolan e ond Wilna ond Walarices.

These lines respectively mean: "Casere ruled the Creacas and Cælic the Finns." "I was with the Creacas and with Casere—he who owned the rule of Winburg (*Vinovium*), of Wiola's Island and the Willas, and of Gaul."

The meaning of Cāsēre is disputed. It is customary to equate this three-syllabled O.E. word with Cæsār which has only two syllables. But Cāsār no more equates Cāsēre than Cāsāri(us) equates Cāsār. The phonetically correct O.E. representative of Cāsār is "Casēr," and that occurs in the Liber Vitae Dunelmensis. Scholars who support the error of King Alfred the Great and Abbot John the Old Saxon find it convenient to ignore this.

In The Times Literary Supplement of March 11th, 1920, in a letter 3 ft. 8 ins. long, which concludes with the statement "brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio," the late W. H. Stevenson asserted—

(1) that "Casere is the correct and well-attested form developed in O.E. from καίσαρ" ;

(2) that "O.E. Crēac does not contain Germanic au but e" ;

(3) that "the development in O.H.G. of au to ou is not found until the ninth century."

Now (i) -ās- in O.E. may represent -æs- in Latin, -eis- in O.H.G., and -ans- in those Germanic dialects which, as I have said,
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retained the n before s. Consequently, O.E. Cäsere postulates a non-existent Latin Cäsarius and an Alamannic, Suevic and O.H.G. *Cansari: *Cansări. These are shifted forms of names with GANS. We get one of these dialectical forms in the Sussex “Gensing,” and another in the Middlesex “Kensington.”

(2) O.E. ēa postulates Germanic au, Alamannic ou: *Graug: Almc. “Crouc-” (Latinized Crocus); Suevic “Croug-.” Germanic è remained in O.E.; it did not become ēa, as the late W. H. Stevenson’s theory required (cp. Professor Wright’s “Old English Grammar,” §125). If Latin Grāc- was borrowed without confusion in O.E. it would have become Grāc. That never occurs. Scholars have completely failed to explain King Alfred’s blunder.¹

(3) In the fourth century we get “Gennoboudes” in a Latin panegyric; “Croucintounon” is indicated in Ptolemy and in the Tabula Peutingeriana; “Crougin” (possessive of Crougo), and “toud” occur in a Suevic inscription of Gallaecia in c. A.D. 420; and “Croucingo” is found in the seventh-century work cited as the Ravennate Geography. The late W. H. Stevenson’s assertions are merely instances of “reasoning as one would.”

The passages quoted from “Widsith” indicate, like so many other facts in “The Traveller’s Lay,” that Hama—the sith or companion of Wid-uga, was writing after the death of Censaurus: Cansari, and that Hama knew that Gallic Count. Moreover, in the Legend of the Holy Grail Hama appears as “Camaor” and was the seneschal of Canser, King of Northumberland. As Cäsere was ruler, or Count, in Gaul, and as that form is phonetically correct in O.E. for Cansari, the Latinization of which is Censarius: Censorius, we cannot be wrong if we identify the three rulers of legend—namely, Canser, King of Northumberland; Duke [C]Ansirus of Arthurian Legend; and Casnar Wledic (= Duke) of Old Welsh Genealogies and the Mabinogion, with the historical Censarius Cesar of the Richborough coin.

¹ This failure is admitted by Sievers and by Sweet; cp. An Old English Grammar (1887), §58, note; and Collected Papers of Henry Sweet (1913), p. 196.
The Testimony of the “Beowulf.”

It is assumed that the O.E. poem of “Beowulf” was composed early in the eighth century. It is preserved for us in a tenth-century Cotton MS., *Vitellius A. XV.* Its latest edition is that of Dr. W. J. Sedgefield (1910). Five lines—1197–1201—present a number of historical facts which students of the poem have failed to appreciate. These lines run in half lines, as follows:—

_Nænigne ic under swegle selran hyrde_
_hordmaðm hæleþa syðsan Hāma ætwæg_
_to Herebyrhtan byrig Brosinga mene,_
sigle ond sincfæt; searoniðas fealh_
Eormenrices; geceas e[a]cne ræd._

The opening reference is to jewels presented to Beowulf by King Hrothgar, and the poet says that he had not heard of any so beautiful “since Hāma carried off to Herebertha’s Stronghold the necklace of the Brosingas, jewel and precious work; Hāma detected the wiles of Eormanric (the King of the Götas of Old Saxony) and chose enlarged authority.” Theodric ruled the Franks at Mæringa-burg for thirty misseras (or half-years) = fifteen years. As Theodric ruled the Franks until A.D. 457, we may date his uncle Eormanric’s murder in A.D. 442, and we must remember that it was in A.D. 441 that the Britannias were placed under the authority of Saxon officials of the Roman Empire.¹ Censaurius the Alaman, was prominent in Gaul and Spain at that time, and his former seneschal

¹ “In a Gaulish Chronicle which comes to an end in A.D. 452 it is stated that the provinces of Britain were conquered by the Saxons in the nineteenth year of Theodosius, i.e., A.D. 441–2,” vide *The Origin of the English Nation,* by H. Munro Chadwick (1907), p. 48. The passage cited is: “Brittaniae usque ad hoc tempus uariis cladibus eventibusque latae [rectius satiatae] in dicionem Saxonum rediguntur.” (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica,* Auct. Antiq., Tom. IX, p. 660.) Mr. H. M. Chadwick is one of many scholars who render “Brittaniae in dicionem Saxonum rediguntur,” by—“conquered by the Saxons.” It means nothing of the kind. What we have here is the record of a diplomatic arrangement; the Britannias were placed under the authority of the Saxons, no doubt by Aetius. Hāma, called “Duke Cambines,” and his cousin Scān Omodu, the “Ascanor” of the Grimaud, were two of these “Saxones.”
at Binchester, viz., "Camaor," Háma, was presumably sent into Britain by Aetius and Censaurius when he withdrew from the court of Eormanric, the King of the Gotas, and *geceas eacne ræð*, "chose enlarged authority." I identify "Duke Cambines" of the Morte D'Arthur, Book X, chap. xlix, with the Háma, Camaor and Cham of other documents. Scholars have failed to detect the orthographical modality of eac-, ec, in the phrase "geceas ëcne ræd,\(^\text{3}\) and instead of rendering ëcne as the equivalent of eacne (enlarged, wider), this is spoken of as "a puzzling passage" and we are told that "geceas ecne ræd" means "chose eternal welfare, i.e., died, or went into a monastery." This fumbling with an historical fact is inexcusable. Háma, a duke ("Cambines") in Britain, had a son Alswith whom I identify with Alla the Bretwealda whose rule in Southern Britain began in A.D. 477, presumably at his father Háma's death.

We will now turn to the various forms that the name Cansari takes on in history, numismatics and legend.

*The Variations and Phonetic Connection of the Principal Forms of the Latinized Personal Alamannic Name Cansari.*

\[
\text{GANS} < \text{CANS} < \text{CÆNSI} \\
\text{*Cansari.}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Censaurius} & \text{Censorius} & \text{Cansere.} & \text{Casnar} \\
\text{Cesar.} & \text{Comes.} & \text{Wledic.} & \\
\text{Cæsarius} & \text{Casère.} & \text{Canser.} & \text{[C]Ansirus} \\
\text{Comes.} & \text{Cancer.} & \text{Duc.} & \text{Casnat} \\
& \text{Canfer.} & \text{Wledic.} & \text{Casnauth} \\
& & \text{Wledic.} & \text{Cassanauth} \\
& & & \text{Wledic.}
\end{array}
\]

"Canser" was meaningless to the Brython, and he objected to the contact of ns; so he turned the name into Casnar which could be assumed to equate Old Welsh *casner," "indignation," "wrath."
The Testimony of the "Histoire de Grimaud."

It was in 1874 that Eugène Hucher published his edition of *Le Saint Graal* from a thirteenth-century manuscript preserved in the library of Le Mans. Hucher's edition includes "Le Petit Saint Graal," "La Quête du Saint Graal par Perceval," "Le Merlin," from the MS. of Mr. Henry Huth, and, among others, the "Histoire de Grimaud," pp. 311–738. In the Grimaud we read a great deal about a King of "Nortomberland" called Canfer, Cancer and Kanser. These forms occur so many as 41 times:—Kanser (1); Cancer, Kancer (12); Cancers, Kancers (12); Canfer, Kanfer (11); Canfers, Kanfers (5). (The final "s" indicates the O.F. nominative.)

This king Kanser had a nephew who bore the Alamannic name "Pionius" (O.E. Beona). He was Duke of "Neufchastel" (Newcastle-on-Tyne). When we have consulted the Mabinogion, and also certain Old Welsh pedigrees, we shall find that Casnar Wledig had a son Clarianus who was King of Northumberland when King Arthur was elected "Dux Bellorum" in A.D. 459. Clarianus was one of the eleven kings who opposed King Arthur's election. He had a son named Epinogris by the trouvères. This presents Alamannic Epino for Abino. The end-word gris is an error for Grig. Epino the Grig is referred to in Arthurian Romance as "the King's son of Northumberland." Now Canser is unquestionably the Duke in Britain whose name was Latinized as Censaurius.

The Welsh Mabinogion.

A mabinogi in Old Welsh was an historical story that a young aspirant for the high honour of an official bard was required to learn by heart. We are indebted for our acquaintance with these mabinogion to Lady Charlotte Guest,¹ to Sir John Rhŷs and Dr. J. Gwenogvryn Evans,² and to Messrs. J. M. Dent and Co.³

¹ The *Mabinogion, with English Translation and Notes* (1849).
² The *Text of the Mabinogion and other Welsh Tales from the Red Book of Hergest* (1887).
³ The *Mabinogion, translated by Lady Charlotte Guest*, in Everyman's Library (1906).
In the *mabinogi* of *Kulhwch and Olwen* (1887) (p. 107, l. 23) we read of "Llary mab Kasnar Wledic." In the *Dream of Rhonabwy* (p. 160, l. 2) we find "Llara mab Kasnat Wledic." This presents the scribal error of *t* for *r*. In the *mabinogi* of *Pwyll, Prince of Dyved*, we are told that Pwyll's son Pryderi married Kicva, daughter of "Gwynn Gohoyw mab Gloyw Wallt Lydau (MS. has lydan, in error) mab Kasnar Wledic" (p. 25, l. 17). In the *mabinogi* of *Manawyddan mab Llyr*, Kicva is affiliated to Gwynn Gloyw (p. 44, l. 20, and on five other pages). There is a mnemonic confusion here which certain Old Welsh Pedigrees to which I shall now refer may help us to correct. In any case the connection of Kasnar Wledic with the ruling families in Western Britain in the fifth century is indisputable.

**Old Welsh Pedigrees in the Thirteenth-century Mostyn MS. No. 117.**

Two pages of pedigrees are appended to the copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, which was No. 117 among the Welsh MSS. of Lord Mostyn, at Mostyn Hall in the County of Flint; vide "Report on MSS. in the Welsh Language," vol. i, p. 63. (Now in the Welsh National Library.) The pedigrees are in the same handwriting as the *Historia*, and Dr. Evans, the editor of the Report, assigns them to the last quarter of the thirteenth century. I dealt with them in my "Indexes to Old-Welsh Genealogies" contributed to Stokes and Meyer's *Archiv fur celtische Lexikographie*, Band II, 1900, VI, No. 460, p. 537; "Kasnar wledic mab Gloyw Gwlat Lydau" was father of Llara. In Index X, Band III (1906), I dealt with the Pedigrees in the Book of Llewelyn Offeirad. This is a fourteenth-century MS. (vide Report, vol. ii, part i, p. 31). In my No. 870, p. 68, the scribal error which produced *Kasnat Wledic* is expanded to *Kasnauth* and *Cassanauth*. His parentage is not set down, but he is recorded as father of Kynan the father of Kenelaph Dremrud; and he is said to have married Tewer a daughter of Bredoe a son of Kadell Deernlluc. This Cadel is registered as "mab Cedehern" and Cedehern is confused with Catigern the son of Vortigern. St. Germanus of Auxerre fulfilled the duty in A.D. 429 of
confuting certain heresies in the Britannias, and won the Hallelujah Victory. In the section of the *Historia Brittonum* (cap. 35, ed. Mommsen, 1894, p. 176) which records the doings of Germanus, we are told that Catell Durnluc "credidit et baptizatus est cum omnibus filiis suis et omnis regio cum eis et benedixit ei (Germanus) et addidit et dixit: non deficiet rex de semine tuo." We have three events concerned with this report of St. Germanus’s activities: Censaurius married Tewer whose father Bredoe was converted to Christianity and baptized, with his own father Cadel, and his brothers, in A.D. 429 or 430, in Powys, by St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre; Censaurius was murdered in A.D. 448; Llara son of Casnar, i.e. Cansar, Censaurius, opposed the election of King Arthur in A.D. 459. There is nothing incoherent or dubious about this. If Clari(anus) the King of Northumberland, whose son Epino was known to King Arthur, was about twenty years old when his father Censaurius Cesar was murdered, all is in harmony.

**The Morte D’Arthur.**

The ninth year of King Edward the Fourth ended on March 3rd, 1470, and in that regnal year Sir Thomas Malorye finished his *Book of King Arthur and of his Noble Knights of the Round Table*, which is usually quoted as the Morte D’Arthur. In the Second Book of Sir Tristram of Lyones (Book X, chap. xxxviii) we read of:—

"A duke that hight Ansirus, and he was of the kin of Sir Lancelot. And this knight was a great pilgrim for every third year he would be at Jerusalem. And because he used all his life to go on pilgrimage men called him Duke Ansirus the Pilgrim. And this duke had a daughter that hight Alice, that was a passing fair woman, and because of her father she was called Alice La Beale Pilgrim."

This Alice married Sir Alisaunder le Orphelin the son of the good prince Sir Boudwin who was murdered by his own brother Mark, King of Cornovia, the Mearc who ruled the Healfhundings of "Widsith." Mark was son of Meirchiawn, son of Cystennin Gorneu, i.e. Constantine of Cornovia, King Arthur’s grandfather.
Now what are we to make of "Duke Ansirus"? The title of Duke is infrequent in the Morte D'Arthur. Hama, who became a ruler in the Britannias in A.D. 441, is called "Duke Cambines" in the "Morte," X, xlix. His cousin Scan, who is called "Ascan-or" in the Grimaud legend (similarly to Hama being called "Cama-or"), is the "Scan Omosu" of the oldest English coin, or medal, in the British Museum. This Ascan or Scan appears in the "Morte" (in A.D. 459) as "Duke Eustace of Cambenet" (X, xii, xiii). Scribal errors, phonetic changes and mnemonic confusion have produced this out of Escanus of Cair Benet, i.e., Winchester. Omosu is an Alamannic plural which signifies "of the Omothas." Cp. "Widsith," l. 76 of my revised edition, in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 3rd series, vol. x (1915), p. 134. There Hama tells us that he visited the Amothingas. The b for v occurs in the "Notitia Dignitatum urtiusque Imperii," and we get "Bentensis" in connexion with Ventensis Belgarum therein.

As "Ansirus" is a quite unknown name, I was compelled to leave this problem unsolved for some years. Quite by chance I detected the solution. If we pronounce Duc Ansirus quickly we perceive that Duke [C]Ansirus is the true name. This form Cansirus presents late Low Latin i for older e, and Canser is the name accorded to Casere in the Grimaud legend. Therefore in the Duke Canserus we have another "Saxon" who was placed in a ruling position in Roman Britain in A.D. 441. Hama or Camaor had served under Censaurius as seneschal at "Orberique." This is really Cor Bérique for Cor Benic, i.e., Corbin, or Binchester.

The Brythonic Chronology of Vortigern.

The views of English scholars respecting the history of the mid-fifth century in Britain are dominated by the faulty chronology of the Venerable Bede, who dates the invitation to the "Angli" somewhere about A.D. 449. In this particular, Bede's chronology is unreliable, inaccurate, and self-contradictory. Vortigern never saw the year 449. He married Severa, one of the daughters of Maximus,
the British Emperor who died in A.D. 388. According to Welsh records Vortigern invited the "Saxons" into Britain in the consul-ship of Felix and Taurus, that is in A.D. 428. St. Germanus of Auxerre came in hither in A.D. 429, and Vortigern died before Germanus returned to his bishopric, therefore in A.D. 430 or thereabouts. Twelve years afterwards Vortigern's successor Aurelius Ambrosius died during the appearance of a wonderful and awe-inspiring comet. This comet appeared in A.D. 442. It is recorded by Bishop Hydatus (supra, p. 12); by Geoffrey of Monmouth; and by Chinese astronomers. Arthur, the son of Ambrosius's brother Uthyr Pendragon, was born a year or two afterwards, and Uthyr died in Arthur's fifteenth year—i.e., in A.D. 458 or 459.

It has escaped the notice of students of Arthurian history, which is clumsily deferred for forty or fifty years, that the Morte D'Arthur (Book XIII, chap. ii) dates the reception of Sir Galahad, at King Arthur's Round Table, in the four hundred and fifty-fourth year of the Passion of Our Lord, i.e., in A.D. 482. King Arthur departed ten years later, namely, in A.D. 492.

The above chronological items agree with what we know of Censaurius Cesar, of Canser, of [C]Ansirus, and of Casere; and with the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which dates the arrival in Sussex of Ælle [the son of Háma: Cama-or] in A.D. 477. Ælle is the Ali Duc (i.e., Bretwealda) of the Morte D'Arthur, VI, viii; XVIII, iii, xi. Also compare "Elias," ibid. X, xxviii, xxix and xxx, with the Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 485.
Seven coins are illustrated on the accompanying plate, and I wish to express my grateful thanks to the following scholars for kind help in reproducing them, namely, Sir Arthur J. Evans, the Rev. Edward A. Sydenham, Dr. George F. Hill and his colleagues at the British Museum, namely, Mr. Harold Mattingly and Mr. George C. Brooke, and to Mr. Boeles of the Leeuwarden Museum.

My reason for reproducing the two British Museum runic coins (No. 4 and No. 6) is the need to re-open the discussion respecting the reading of the Leeuwarden coin. Until Mr. Boeles, in 1899, rejected the nineteenth-century reading Hāma, and advanced a new reading “Hada,” the Leeuwarden piece was regarded as a Hāma coin or medal. The Hāma view is now derelict. The name Hāma was very rare in England. But “Hada” is unique, and as the word means a monk (gehada, “fellow-monk”), it must be rejected without prejudice, because it could not have been used as a man’s name till long after the conversion of Kent to Christianity in A.D. 597. It only occurs once in W. G. Searle’s Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum (1897), and it is drawn from the Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis, the manuscript of which was written in the latter part of the eighth century, or perhaps later.

The dag-rune (d) and the man-rune (m), which occur severally in Hada and Hāma, are dissimilar; but in the late runic period they were much confused. The dag-rune, when looked at alone, is a wide, squat letter (cp. Fig. 4) which has four distinct angles—one at the top and one at the foot of each upright stave, and its bars should cross at the centre of the rune. The man-rune, viewed alone, is a tall and narrow letter, the bars of which cross at a point above the centre of the rune, and the upright staves of which descend below the points of contact with the lower part of each cross-bar, and make no angles with the cross-bars like those which appear in the dag-rune. If there are angles at the foot of the staves we undoubtedly have the dag-rune. If there are no angles at the bottom, if the crossing is above the centre, if the lowest portions of the staves are bare, then we undoubtedly have the man-rune.
An inspection of the enlarged photograph on p. 21 will reveal that the crossing is above the centre of the rune; that the lower ends of the cross-bars do not make an angle at the foot of either stave; and that the rune is not wide and squat like the dag-rune, but narrow and stilted as the man-rune should be.

Hence the nineteenth-century runic scholars, Stephens, Haigh, Engel, Serrure, Wimmer and others, were quite right to read the runes as Hāma. Hāma (or “Camaor,” as he is called in the lengthy Histoire de Grimaud) was a cousin of Ascanor; cp. supra, pp. 15 and 17. Both these officials were Dukes in Roman Britain under Censorius Cæsar, i.e., before A.D. 448.