At a meeting of the Numismatic Society on 25 April 1844 Charles Roach Smith brought to its notice a number of coins either found in or relating to Kent. They included three gold coins, mounted with loops to serve as ornaments, which had been found in the churchyard of St. Martin's, in the eastern suburb of Canterbury on the north side of the Sandwich road. These coins, which had come into the possession of an eminent local antiquary, Mr. W. H. Rolfe of Sandwich, were exhibited at a meeting of the British Archaeological Association at Canterbury on 13 September 1844, and Roach Smith published and illustrated them the same year in an issue of his *Collectanea Antiqua*. Shortly afterwards, Mr. Rolfe managed to obtain three more looped coins and two other ornaments which had all made part of the original find. The three new coins were duly inserted on a further plate in the *Collectanea Antiqua*, and finally Roach Smith published and illustrated the whole find in the *Numismatic Chronicle* in 1845.

The list of coins and ornaments, in the order given by Roach Smith but with revised identifications, is as follows:

1. A tremissis, of Italian fabric, of the Emperor Justin II (565–78).
2. A "medalet" of Bishop Liudhard.
3. A gold imitation of a fourth-century bronze coin of the two-soldiers-and-standard reverse type.
4. A solidus with a facing bust and the legend +IVESIO VICO.
5. A Merovingian tremissis struck at St. Bertrand-de-Comminges.
6. A Merovingian tremissis struck at Agen.
7. A Roman intaglio set in gold.
8. A circular brooch.

Nos. 1–3 were the ones first published in 1844; the remainder were added in 1845. Nothing is recorded regarding either the precise date or circumstances of the find. Roach Smith, writing in 1844, says that the coins were discovered "a few years since", and of those published in 1845 he says that they had been "with" the others. This is borne out, as we shall see, by the fact that all the coin-ornaments can be assigned to approximately the same date, the third quarter of the sixth century. Presumably they all came from a single grave of this period. It cannot be taken for granted that they represent all that were found. There are good reasons for believing that a looped coin

---

3 *Collectanea Antiqua* (1848), pp. 63–64, Pl. xxii. 1–3. The bound volume of the *Collectanea* is dated 1848, but the fascicules of which it is composed were being published from 1843 onwards.  
5 "Merovingian coins, &c., discovered at St. Martin's, near Canterbury", *N.C.* vii (1845), pp. 187–91, Pl. [viii].
of Oloron, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, is from the same deposit, and in the description of the coin ornaments that follows, this piece is added as no. 9.

Roach Smith's article in the *Numismatic Chronicle* is the only one that has been devoted to the find as a whole, but subsequent authors have discussed parts of it in some detail. Five of the coins it contained were reproduced by Cartier in the *Revue Numismatique*, and four of these passed from there into the standard work of Belfort on Merovingian coins. D. B. Haigh revised one of Roach Smith's attributions in 1869. Sir Arthur Evans, in an unfinished article published posthumously in 1942, discussed the characteristics of several of the pieces in the hoard, and Dr. Sutherland headed his catalogue of early Anglo-Saxon gold coinage with the "medalet" of Bishop Liudhard.

It seems worth while reconsidering the hoard as a whole, and examining the light it throws on early Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon coinage. Fortunately it has remained together as a unit. It passed from Rolfe to another great collector, Joseph Mayer, and is now in the Rolfe-Mayer collection in the City of Liverpool Public Museums. I am indebted to the Libraries, Museums, and Arts Committee, Liverpool, for permission to publish it here. I am also indebted to the Director of the City of Liverpool Public Museums, Mr. J. W. Iliffe, for most kindly allowing it to be deposited in the British Museum for me to examine, to the Keeper of the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities for accepting its custody, and to the staff of this department and that of Coins and Medals for giving me much assistance in the study of the coins. I must also express my gratitude to M. Jean Babelon, the head of the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris, for permitting me to publish here the tremissis of Oloron in that collection.

The coins and other objects may be described as follows:

(1) *Italian tremissis of Justin II (565-78)*

*Obv.* DNIVSTI NVSPAVG Bust of Justin II r., wearing diadem, cuirass, and paludamentum. Plain raised border.

*Rev.* VICTORIAAVGVSTORVN Victory advancing to front, looking l., holding wreath in r. and globus cruciger in l.; in field r., star; in exergue, CONOB. Similar border.

Broad fluted loop attachment.

1.33 gm. ↑↓ Rolfe-Mayer Coll., M. 7019. (Pl. VI, 1.)

1 E. Cartier, "Notice sur les monnaies mérovingiennes trouvées en Angleterre", *R.N.*, 1847, pp. 17-21, Pl. 1. The article is no more than a translation and conflation of several articles of Roach Smith. The coins reproduced on the plate are nos. 2-6 of the list given above.

2 A. de Belfort, *Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes* (5 vols. Paris, 1892-5), nos. 479, 1614, 2074, 3570. These correspond to nos. 2, 4, 5, and 6 respectively in Roach Smith's list.


This coin requires little comment. Sir Arthur Evans followed earlier writers in assigning it to Justin I (518-27), but it is manifestly later, and belongs to the class which Wroth ascribed to the mint of Ravenna, or possibly Rome, under Justin II. The final N (for M) in the reverse legend and the form of B in CONOB—it is a sort of D with a horizontal stroke through it—are characteristic features of this Italian group of coins. They are common, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that one should have found its way to England.

(2) "Medalet" of Bishop Liudhard

Obv. LEV·DAR·DV·EPS (backwards) Bust r., wearing diadem and neatly rendered robe. Border of dots.

Rev. Ornamental patriarchal cross on base, two short pendants hanging from the upper arm, each end of the lower arm terminating in a vertical bar, a circle cutting the junction of this arm and the upright of the cross, and two half-circles joining the upright to the exergual line. Above the cross, wv; to either side, NIN; in ex., VAV. Border of dots. Broad fluted loop attachment.

1·57 gm. †† Rolfe-Mayer Coll., M. 7018. (Pl. VI, 2.)

This "medalet" is to an Englishman the most interesting piece in the find, for it is an authentic relic of the first introduction of Christianity into Anglo-Saxon Britain, antedating even the coming of St. Augustine. Roach Smith read the legend as +EVPARDVS EP(iscopu)S, and referred it to a sixth-century bishop of Autun of this name; this error passed into Belfort, and retains its place in French numismatic works of reference. Haigh proposed to read LYVDARDVS EPS, and identified the bishop in question with the Bishop Liudhard who, according to Bede (Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, i. 25), accompanied the Frankish princess Bertha to England as her chaplain when she married King Æthelberht of Kent. This identification—with the improved reading LEVDARDVS—was accepted by Brooke and Sutherland and arrived at independently by Evans. It may be regarded as certain, for the reading is not open to doubt and the dates of the other coin-ornaments fit in with the period to which Liudhard’s residence in England must be assigned.

The many interesting features of this "coin" have been discussed at some length by Sir Arthur Evans and Dr. Sutherland, but there still remain a few points that can usefully be made.

The style of the lettering is very distinctive, with clearly emphasized vertical strokes and with a tendency for the loops of letters like D, R, and P to become angular; the forms of some of the letters—L, the first E, and the second P—are very peculiar indeed. The reason is

1 W. Wroth, Cat. of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum, i (1908), p. 104, nos. 291-3 (Pl. xiii. 16).
2 e.g. A. Blanchet and A. Dieudonné, Manuel de numismatique française, i (1912), p. 302, the place of minting being, by a misreading of the reverse legend, given as Ninua.
probably that the artist was accustomed to forming runic letters, and
tended to accentuate the vertical strokes and the angularity, both of
them features characteristic of the runic alphabet, and to assimilate
his letters to runic ones. Hence we find the strange crossed L—it is
identical with the runic \( \text{N} \), which is written \( \text{I} \)—and the P which
resembles the Anglo-Saxon \( \text{p} \), while the first E seems to owe something
to the rune for æ (\( \text{r} \)). The lettering is quite different in appearance
from that of any Merovingian coin known to me.\(^1\)

The style of the bust, with the broad chest and the almost complete
elimination of the neck, so that the head seems attached directly to
the shoulders, is also not in the least Frankish; it recalls a number of
sceatta types, and even some of the earliest pennies of Kent and
Mercia.\(^2\) The thin fabric and broad flan of the coin differentiate it
likewise from the great bulk of Frankish coinage, which consists of
thick tremisses rather smaller in diameter than the Roman tremisses
from which they evolved. They are features which link it up with the
coinage of Visigothic Spain and that of those parts of southern Gaul
subject to Visigothic influence; we shall see something of this in other
coins from the St. Martin’s find. The use of the cross motif on the
reverse, as Sir Arthur Evans has pointed out, likewise differentiates
the coin from that of contemporary Gaul, where Victory types were
still dominant. In any case, the form of the cross on this “coin” of
Liudhard is quite peculiar to itself, and has no parallel abroad.

These considerations are relevant to the question of who produced
the “coin”, and where. That it was minted in England, and
presumably at Canterbury, seems scarcely open to doubt. Dr. Suther-
land conjectured (p. 32) “that it was executed by a technically com-
petent though not highly literate member of Liudhard’s household—
presumably a Frankish metal-worker”. With the first part of this
statement one can agree, but the second is more open to question. It is
much more likely that the workman was English and little influenced
by continental techniques and traditions. All he got from his Visi-
gothic or South Gaulish models was the module of his coin and idea
of a profile bust with surrounding legend as a suitable obverse type.
The rest he owed to his own ingenuity, taste, and skill.

That the “coin” was intended to be used as money is very doubtful.
Of course it could serve as such, just as could any other piece of gold
of suitable weight and fineness, but it seems unlikely that at this date
a Frankish bishop resident in Kent would have seriously considered
the introduction of a gold coinage of his own. There is great cogency
in the view of Dr. Sutherland (p. 32). “It is probable that Liudhardus
caused these medalets to be produced for presentation to those who,

\(^1\) Evans, pp. 25–26, cites a similar form of L on a coin attributed by Ponton d’Amécourt
to Luxeuil (Belfort 2198), but the attribution is in fact incorrect. The coins are blundered
imitations of a common series from Quentovic (cf. M. Prou, Catalogue des monnaies fran-
caises de la Bibliotheque Nationale. Les monnaies merovingiennes (Paris, 1892), nos. 1140–1),
and the letter is not meant to be L at all.

\(^2\) It somewhat resembles also the bust of the Scanomodu solidus (Sutherland, op. cit.,
p. 79, no. 22; Pl. II. 1).
by loyalty to Berchta's creed and piety towards her infant church, earned his regard and favour; the use of coins and medallions (looped or otherwise) for such purposes was not uncommon from Roman times onwards'.

(3) *Imitation of a fourth-century bronze coin*

*Obv.* ƠІІІІРІ ĲIIIVC  Crude bust l., wearing crested helmet and formalized degeneration of cloak and armour. Plain raised border.

*Rev.* ƠІТІXCIIOXITІIC  Two crudely designed figures standing facing, looking at each other; between them, square standard (on which, N) on beaded column between two X's; below, ι. Similar border.

Plain flat loop attachment (apparently nineteenth century). 1.29 gm. †† Base gold. (Pl. VI, 3.)

This coin is an imitation in base gold of a bronze coin of the Constantinian period, with reverse showing two legionaries on either side of a standard and the legend *GLORIA EXERCVTVS*. The legends on this specimen are so corrupt that it is impossible to say precisely what was its prototype, more particularly since it seems to be of a composite character, this reverse type not being associated with a helmeted obverse bust on the coins of any of the rulers of the Constantinian period. Possibly a helmeted bust of Crispus—the short legend and the occurrence in it of $S$ and $P$ suggest this sovereign—supplied the model for the obverse, while the reverse is that from a 'fourth brass' of one of the mid-century emperors. Examples of such mixing of types, obverse and reverse being taken from different models, are of fairly common occurrence in the coinage of the Dark Ages.

This particular coin is not unique, but is decidedly rare. There was a specimen, with bust right, in Lord Grantley's collection; it is illustrated on Pl. ii (no. 596) of the catalogue of the second of the sales (27 January 1944) in which this collection was dispersed. Lord Grantley acquired it from the dealer Egger, of Vienna, and since Vienna was never a great centre of the coin trade it is probably fair to assume that the coin had been found in Austria or south Germany. It is now in the British Museum. A third specimen, with much cruder bust and obverse legend and without any reverse legend at all, was found at Domburg in the last century, and is now in the museum at Middelburg.1 A fourth specimen, with obverse copied from a tremissis of Justin I (518–27), was found in a grave at Soest in Westphalia, and is now in the Landesmuseum at Münster.2 Like the one from Canterbury, it has a loop attachment so that it could serve as an ornament.3

1 Belfort, op. cit., no. 5442.
3 Although the loop attached to the Canterbury coin appears to be modern, it clearly takes the place of an older one which has been broken off.
A search through local museums in western Europe would probably bring to light a few, but not many, more.

It is difficult to suggest a place of origin for the coin, but we would probably not be far wrong in ascribing it to western Germany, somewhere between Frisia and the Black Forest. Sir Arthur Evans was disposed to assign it to England, but his opinion cannot be sustained. He observed, rightly, that the helmeted bust, which struck him as the most remarkable feature of the coin, is scarcely ever found on Merovingian coins, and the fact that two other sixth-century coins with helmeted obverse types had been found at Sutton, near Dover, and Sturry, near Canterbury, seemed to him to justify assigning a Kentish origin to all three. But although similar coins are rare in France, they are common enough farther east, on the German side of the Rhine; my own opinion is that they originated in Alamannia (Swabia). In any case, it is doubtful if these helmeted types which have a facing-Victory reverse should really be associated with the helmeted types with two-legionaries-and-standard reverse; the style is very different—it is much influenced by the jewellery of the period—and the prototypes from which they are copied are sixth- and not fourth-century coins. There are therefore no sound reasons for supposing that either the Canterbury coin or other helmeted coins found in Kent originated in England.

(4) Solidus with facing bust and legend +IVEΣΙΟ VICO

Obv. +IVEΣΙΟ VICO Facing bust of crude design, with a double line of pellets representing a helmet, an equal-limbed cross on the breast and in the field r., and a Latin cross in the field l. Plain raised border.

Rev. +LEVDVLFO|M]O ΝΙΤΑΙΙΟ Nimbate figure, wearing cloak, galloping r. Similar border. Broad fluted loop attachment, with pearl ring around the whole circumference of the coin.

5·46 gm. Rolfe-Mayer Coll., M. 7017. (Pl. VI, 4.)

The prototype of the obverse of this coin is a follis or half-follis of Justinian (527-65), of the facing-bust type which was introduced in 538. This provides the general outline of the fully facing head and bust, with the three-quarters facing helmet; the cross in field right is

---

1 Evans, art. cit., pp. 38-40; the presentation of the argument is not very clear. The two helmeted coins to which he alludes are illustrated on his Pl. 1, 10, 11.

2 See, for example, Werner, op. cit., Pl. 11, 44-48 (M. 200-2), and the specimens illustrated by W. Reinhart, 'Die frühere Münzprägung im Reiche der Merowinger', Deutsches Jahrbuch für Numismatik, ii (1939), p. 51, and Pl. iv. 38-42.

3 See the references in Reinhart, art. cit., pp. 50-52, though he himself does not fully accept this opinion.

4 Reinhart notes 'die Stilverwandtschaft zur germanischen Schmuckindustrie des 6/7. Jh.'

5 The obverse is from a sixth-century tremissis, the 'helmet' having developed from a diadem bust by a process of exaggerating and stylizing the lines of the hair. The reverse is taken from the solidi of Justin I and Justinian.
Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Coin-ornaments

as in the original,¹ but the Latin cross in field left is a simplified version of the globus cruciger which the emperor holds in the Byzantine original, the emperor’s right hand and the globus having disappeared. The cross on the breast, however, is not found on the Byzantine coin,² and betrays, as Evans noted, “Visigothic” influence, a conspicuous cross on the breast of the obverse profile bust being a regular feature of “Visigothic” coinage of the middle third of the sixth century.³

The prototype of the reverse of the coin is harder to identify. Evans compared it with the representations of fourth-century emperors riding in triumph which figure on a number of fourth-century medallions, and which have been found in a whole succession of Central European hoards; their interest to the Germans as jewellery is shown by the elaborate mounts with which they are provided and the imitations of them that were frequently made.⁴ The galloping horse of the IVEGIO coin, however, is utterly different in appearance from the dignified and high-stepping imperial mount, and it is difficult to imagine one of the great fourth-century medallions being available for imitation in late sixth-century Gaul or Britain.⁵ As an alternative, it may be suggested that it derives from a Gaulish coin with a galloping horseman, the most likely possibility being the “horseman” series of the Rhône valley.⁶ It resembles these very markedly in general appearance, though the lance has disappeared and the rider’s head has been provided with a nimbus, as on many Roman coins. There is no intrinsic difficulty over such an hypothesis, for Gaulish coins were undoubtedly picked up occasionally in the Dark Ages and their types influenced a few coins in the Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon series.

The coin itself is probably to be assigned to Francia rather than England, despite the fact that it resembles nothing in the entire

¹ It is this feature which shows that the prototype was a follis or half-follis, and not, as one would suspect, a solidus, since a cross in this position is never present on the latter coin.
² Save on the profile series of Carthage (A.D. 533-8), which scarcely come into the picture.
³ Evans, art. cit., pp. 22, 32-34. He cites a bronze coin of Baduila (Totila) from his own collection, with a facing bust showing a cross on the breast, but it is not likely that this had any influence on the IUEGIO coin. The word “Visigothic” in this connexion must be used with some reserve. W. Reinhart, in his studies on early Visigothic and Merovingian coinage (especially “Die Münzen des tolosanischen Reiches der Westgoten”, in Deutsches Jahrbuch für Numismatik, i (1938), 107-35, and “Die früheste Münzprägung im Reich der Merowinger”, already cited), has shown that a whole series of coins formerly assigned to the Visigoths must in fact have been struck by the Franks after their conquest of southern Gaul (507), and argues that the cross-on-breast motif was first introduced by the Catholic Franks in opposition to the Arian Visigoths. “South Gallic” would probably be a better name.
⁴ See notably A. Alfoldi, “Nachahmungen romischer Goldmedallions als germanischer Halsschmuck”, Numismatikai Kozlony, xxviii–xxix (1929–30), 10–25. The piece which Evans had particularly in mind was the Antioch medallion of Valens found at Szilagy Sómló in 1797 and now at Vienna.
⁵ Though it is fair to remember that as late as the second half of the sixth century Tiberius II (578-82) presented a large medallion to the Frankish king Chilperic II (Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum, vi. 2).
Merovingian series. The nearest thing to it is a tremissis showing a facing oval head, with the helmet and outline of bust composed of pellets and a cross on breast, which came to light in the find of Monnoren (dép. Moselle), in Lorraine, shortly before the Second World War. The reverse of this coin is of the decorated “Victory facing” type which must be associated with the Rhineland or Alamannia.

Unfortunately the place where the coin was struck has so far not been satisfactorily identified. Belfort equated it with IVEDIO VICO, found on a Merovingian coin of the seventh century. This is philologically possible, since there are other examples of the alternative use of -di and -gi to indicate the same palatal sound, and it is perhaps supported by the fact that the moneyer of this seventh-century coin was a Leodolenus, whose name has affinities with the Leudulfus responsible for the coin found at Canterbury. It is accepted by Holder, who proposed to identify Ivedio/Ivegio with either Ivoiy-le-Pré (dép. Cher) or Iwuy (dép. Nord). M. J. Vannérus, who has been kind enough to give me his advice in the matter, is also in favour of Ivoiy-le-Pré. But the position of this place, in the neighbourhood of Bourges, is rather remote from the other three named mints of the Canterbury coins, which are all in the extreme south-west of France. I am therefore inclined to question the identification, though without having anything better to put in its place; there does not seem to be anywhere in Gascony or Languedoc that would suit. It seems wiser to leave the matter in suspense, pending the discovery of another coin bearing the same place-name and with it other characteristics which will enable us to localize it with precision.

(5) Merovingian tremissis of Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges (Haute-Garonne)

Obv. +ICONBENAS+FI§H Diademed bust r., with well-marked hair curling upwards and backwards, two pendants of diadem hanging down behind, and large brooch at the front of the cloak on shoulder.

Rev. NONNIT[ ]MONITARVS (sic) Two crudely designed winged Victories standing facing one another on an exergual line and holding a tree.

Broad loop attachment, with fluted central band.

1·71 gm. †† Rolfe-Mayer Coll., M. 7016. (Pl. VI, 5.)

The mint of this coin was Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, in the Pyrenees, a city which was totally destroyed in 585 by the troops of

1 It is illustrated by Reinhart, art. cit., Pl. iv. 42.
2 Belfort, op. cit., no. 2073. The coin in question is now in the Bibliotheque Nationale (Prou, no. 2576), classified under “ateliers incertains”.
3 A. Holder, Alt-Celtsicher Sprachkunde, ii (Leipzig, 1904), col. 99.
4 It is certainly not the much more important locality Ivois-Carignan (dép. Ardennes), since this figures regularly on Merovingian coins in the form of Epocium.
5 M. Vannérus queries the identification of Ivedio with I vegio, and suggests that Ivedio vico is a misreading for Medio vico, i.e. Moyenvic (dép. Moselle). But I am assured from Paris that the reading Ivedio is certain.
King Guntram of Burgundy for having sheltered the pretender Gundovald, who gave himself out to be the son of Chlotar I. The place does not again appear in our written records till the eleventh century, when the Bertrand who gave it its modern name became its bishop and restored its fortunes. Gregory of Tours depicts its destruction as complete. The whole population was put to the sword, the priests were slaughtered at the very altars, the entire city with its churches and other buildings was burnt to the ground; nothing was left but the bare earth when the troops of Guntram had done their work. As is so often the case, such a picture is exaggerated, for we have Merovingian coins of Comminges of the early seventh century. They are of a different type to the one found at Canterbury, being derived from the Provençal coinage in the name of Maurice Tiberius, but the moneyer's name is the same—possibly the same man, but more probably a son or other relative—and one of the letter forms, the square c, is identical on the two coins.

The style of the bust on the St. Martin's coin is very markedly "Visigothic", with its peculiar manner of doing the hair and its accentuation of the brooch on the shoulder. So also is the manner in which the letters are formed, the ends being often produced by wedge-shaped punches which caused a small crack in the metal of the die beyond the end of the letter. This is a feature that is very common indeed on Visigothic coins, but which is not found, or at least is very rare, on Merovingian ones. Visigothic influence is what one would expect, since Comminges is situated in the Pyrenees. On the other hand, the coin has broken away from the "Visigothic" preference for a dragon-like Victory, or rather has remodelled it to produce two Victories, probably following in this some coin of a fourth-century emperor like Decentius showing two Victories or a Victory and Libertas with a shield between them.

Though the coin from Canterbury is unique, there is one other coin known from the same moneyer. It shows a bust of identical style, and the reverse legend +NONNITVSMONITARI, but the reverse type is a winged figure right holding a cross. There is an A in the field of the obverse and VS in that of the reverse. It was found near Mâcon.

(6) Merovingian tremissis of Agen (Lot-et-Garonne)

Obv. Au ENO FETO Bust r., with short, closely cut hair; cross, cutting the legend, above forehead; cross on shoulder, and semicircular attachment (brooch) on breast and back. Pearl border.

Rev. +LEONARDOMON TARII Victory advancing r., holding wreath, the head enormously exaggerated in size and resembling that on the obverse of the coin, the legs and body, and what in the Roman original was the lower part of the trophy

1 Belfort, nos. 1616–17; Prou, nos. 2428–9.
2 Belfort, no. 1615. It was then in the Protat collection at Macon.
carried over the shoulder, being reduced to simple strokes. Similar border.
Broad fluted loop attachment.
1-50 gm. ↑↓ Rolfe-Mayer Coll., M. 7015. (Pl. VI, 6.)

The obverse legend of this coin was misread by Roach Smith as PASENO, a place which French numismatists naturally failed to identify. What was taken to be a P is in fact a brooch on the lower part of the bust, and the S is really a G sideways. The mint is Agen, then an important episcopal town on the Garonne. Several coins of it from the seventh century are known, but this is much earlier in date than any other which has so far been recorded. The last letter of the obverse legend has been obliterated by the LE of the die of the reverse, but is probably R., the legend being a compromise between FECIT, the legend CIT being written in one letter as a monogram, and FEITOR (for fitur). The thin, spread fabric of the coin, the style of the obverse bust, and the nature of the reverse type are all "Visigothic" in character.

(7) A Roman intaglio set in gold (Pl. VI, 7.)

This is a small classical gem of debased style, dating from the third or fourth century A.D. It depicts a seated figure, probably Dea Roma, with helmet, spear, and shield. The stone is one of the sard variety and is enclosed in a gold mount with pearl border and flat gold back, fitted with a broad fluted loop for suspension.

This intaglio requires no comment; it is one of many similar objects which have survived from ancient times, and been found by later generations and turned into ornaments. The gold mount appears to be older than the loop, which, as in the case of the other mounted coins of the find, is of the sixth century.

(8) A circular brooch (Pl. VI, 8.)

This ornament consists of a circular gold plate with raised rim, having fixed on it, in gold mountings, a square green stone or piece of cobalt glass and three triangular and three lozenge-shaped red stones (garnets). There is no sign at the back of any pin attachment, the two projections being part of the sockets for the irregularly shaped stones. The weight is 3-80 gm.

This appears to be a Frankish import, and not a native product; it is quite unrelated to the magnificent series of Jutish brooches which have been found in graves in Kent. Proper comment upon it must be left to the archaeologist.

1 Belfort, nos. 43-45 (43 and 44 are duplications of the same coin); Prou, nos. 2174-6. One of these coins has a Nonnitus as moneyer.
2 Belfort, nos. 41-42, are earlier in date, but their ascription to Agen is without justification.
3 Cf. Prou, no. 2548 (Dorio fitur).
4 I am indebted to Mr. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford and to Mr. B. Ashmole for their advice in the description of this object and the one following.
(9) Tremissis of Oloron (Basses-Pyrénées)

*Obv.* HEŁOROCIVET Bust 1., with thin neck and nape curled backwards, cross in field 1. Fish-tail border.

*Rev.* L AVNEB OII Two nude figures facing each other, in the attitude of running, holding a cross on a support between them. Similar border. Broad fluted loop attachment.

1.52 gm. ↑↑ Bibliothèque Nationale, acquired in 1848 from the dealer Jean Rousseau.1 Prou, no. 2437; Belfort, no. 2021. (Pl. VI, 9.)

This curious piece was clearly struck at Oloron, but it does not seem possible to make sense of the moneyer’s name; it is presumably short for some name like Launebertus. The type is unique, but seems to be derived from that of a fourth-century coin showing two legionaries facing one another and holding a standard between them. The thin, spread fabric is “Visigothic,” and the date must be soon after the middle of the sixth century, when the “Victory” types were going out and before the “cross” types had come in.

My belief that the coin is a stray from the St. Martin’s find is based on three considerations. In the first place, it has a loop attachment, a feature virtually never found on Merovingian coins in their homeland, though common enough in England, the Low Countries, and Germany. Secondly, it is from a south Gallic mint not far distant from Agen and Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, and is of a similar date to the coins of these mints found at Canterbury. Finally, it was acquired by the Bibliothèque Nationale from a Paris dealer in 1848, only very shortly after the Canterbury coins are known to have come to light. None of these considerations in isolation would be worth much, but taken together they justify us in concluding that the piece is a stray from the hoard.

With this piece from Paris we can conclude the actual description of the St. Martin’s find, and pass to a few final considerations regarding the find as a whole.

The probable date of burial must have been c. 580, or at least between c. 570 and c. 590. The tremissis of Justin II is necessarily post 565, and the medalet of Bishop Liudhard about the same date, for he came to England c. 560. The Merovingian tremisses of St. Bertrand-de-Comminges, Agen, and Oloron belong to the same period, when the tradition of the facing or profile Victory as the reverse type was going out of fashion and that of a cross type had not yet come in. This latter process occurred in the last two decades of the century, and no specimens of the new style of coin figures in the St. Martin’s find. There is always an element of uncertainty in saying that a find cannot be later.

---

1 I am indebted to Mlle. Gabrielle Fabre for having consulted the register of acquisitions and other relevant literature on my behalf.
than a particular date, but in this case a probable date of c. 580 cannot be far wrong.

Such a date is confirmed by the metrological evidence, imperfect though this is. Between c. 560 and c. 585, the imperial solidus of 24 siliquae, 72 of which were struck to the Roman pound, was being displaced in Gaul and some other parts of the west by a light-weight solidus struck 84 to the pound and weighing between 20 and 21 siliquae, but for convenience usually equated with one or other of these figures. The light tremissis of this new system weighed about 1-3 gm., as opposed to the 1-5 gm. of the Constantinian system. The reasons for this change we can guess at—it marks the victory of a traditional Germanic weight, originally based on the Roman Republican denarius, over the slightly heavier solidus which the invaders had found in use in the imperial provinces they had occupied—but regarding the circumstances of the change and the methods by which it was carried out we are almost entirely in the dark.¹ The Canterbury coins belong for the most part to the new system. We do not know their exact weights, since they are all mounted, but it would seem reasonable to allow about 0-2 gm. for the weights of the loop attachments. This places in the light-weight group the Italian tremissis of Justin II (1-33 gm.),² the two-soldiers-and-standard coin (1-29 gm., with lighter modern loop), and the tremisses of Agen (1-50 gm.) and Oloron (1-52 gm.). The tremissis of Comminges (1-71 gm.) belongs to the older system, and so probably do the solidus of Ivecio vico (5-46 gm.) and the medalet of Liudhard (1-57 gm.). This mixture of weights indicates a period when the new coins were already in general use, but had not completely ousted their heavier predecessors, and brings us back again to a date of c. 580.

This means that it is much the earliest find of coin-ornaments of the Dark Ages to have been made in this country. A number of isolated looped Merovingian coins have come to light in Kentish graves, but almost all belong to the seventh century. The largest after this one, four looped Frankish solidi and a gold ornament from a grave at Sarre, belongs to a date about 625, rather earlier than that of the great Wieuwerd hoard of elaborately mounted coins from the Low Countries. Numerically, of course, it is much smaller than the finds of Merovingian coins at Sutton Hoo and Crondall, but these belong to a period when coins circulated as money and not as potential jewellery or bullion; they are finds of quite a different character. It would be profitless to conjecture who the owner of the necklace of mounted coins may have been. Clearly it was a person of some wealth, probably connected with the Kentish court, but the ornament

¹ I hope to discuss the problem of the light-weight solidus more fully elsewhere, so abstain from saying more about it here.
² From the reign of Justinian to that of Constantine IV (668–85), the Imperial mints struck a small number of light-weight solidi, marked OBXX (i.e. obryzum, “pure gold”, and xx siliquae) or in some similar fashion, apparently for the use of merchants trading with the Germanic world. There is therefore nothing surprising in a tremissis from an imperial mint belonging to a lighter weight-system.
is not fine enough to justify our trying to connect it with Queen Bertha herself or a member of her family.

On the purely archaeological aspects of the find I am not competent to speak. We know from the evidence of other finds how flourishing was the trade between Kent and the Continent, and in particular between Kent and the Garonne region, in the sixth century. The cemeteries have brought to light an abundance of valuable objects of the most varied origin, gold bracteates from Scandinavia, glass vases and beads, “Coptic” bronze bowls, Frankish brooches, cowries from the Indian Ocean—imported largely in exchange for the cargoes of slave-boys which Pope Gregory the Great saw in the market-place at Rome. The Merovingian coins from St. Martin’s are not therefore necessary to prove the existence of intercourse between England and the Continent.

We cannot in any case be certain that they came through trade at all and were not simply the property of some Frankish visitor or a gift from some Frankish source. I am myself inclined to the belief that this may have been the case. The spread fabric of the Liudhard “medalet” connects it up with the coinage of southern Gaul and Visigothic Spain; the three coins from St. Bertrand-de-Comminges, Agen, and Oloron are of a similar fabric. Sir Arthur Evans has emphasized certain “Visigothic” features in the solidus of IVEGIO VICO, and has called attention to the fact that the dominions of Charibert of Paris, which, incidentally, included all the places just named, extended to the Pyrenees. Bede does not say of what French see Liudhard was bishop, and our Frankish sources throw no light on the point. This is not surprising, for the episcopal lists of this period are very imperfect, but this remarkable “Visigothic” preponderance amongst the coins from St. Martin’s suggests a close connexion with southern Gaul such as might have arisen if Liudhard himself came from that part of King Charibert’s dominions.