

*Reprinted from*

**THE BRITISH  
NUMISMATIC JOURNAL  
2010**

Available online at <http://britnumsoc.org/publications/Digital%20BNJ/2010.shtml>

VOLUME 80

---

2010

# ANGLO-SAXON GOLD COINAGE. PART 1: THE TRANSITION FROM ROMAN TO ANGLO-SAXON COINAGE

GARETH WILLIAMS

## Introduction

BETWEEN around AD 600 and 675 a substantive Anglo-Saxon gold coinage developed, although the fact that most of the coins are anonymous issues means that these dates can not be regarded as precise. This gradually became debased across the period until the levels of gold in the coinage became so low that numismatists recognise a transition from 'gold' to 'silver' coinage. Gold coins reappear alongside silver from the late eighth century to the eleventh, but these are extremely rare, with only eight certain surviving examples, together with some anonymous imitative issues which may also be of Anglo-Saxon manufacture. These later gold coins seem to have fulfilled a slightly different function from the coins of the main gold period, and are the subject of a recent major study by Mark Blackburn.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, with so few definite later Anglo-Saxon gold coins, it seems worthwhile to include them together with the earlier gold coinage, if only to consider how their design and use differed from that earlier phase.

Although an extensive literature already exists on many aspects, a combination of recent developments have made it possible to reconsider the subject in some detail. This is the result partly of the opportunity to revisit the question of the gold content of the Anglo-Saxon gold coinage, which has formed the basis for much of the previous discussion of the chronology of the coinage; partly of a desire to take account of a steadily growing body of finds evidence; partly of a growing body of research into coin use and monetisation in the Viking Age which appears to have some resonance for the early Anglo-Saxon period; and finally of the fact that the last few years have seen a lively discussion on the nature of coin use and precious metal economies in the fifth and sixth centuries. The development of Anglo-Saxon coinage did not take place in a vacuum, but as a response to monetary contacts beyond the English Channel, as well as to the legacy of Roman Britain in the period of the early Anglo-Saxon settlement of the fifth and sixth centuries. As a result, the study has expanded to a point at which it seems more appropriate to publish it in three parts, as it seems too large for a single article, but not quite large enough to justify a book or monograph in its own right. Part one begins with a brief survey of previous research on the Anglo-Saxon gold coinage, but its main focus is on coin-use in the fifth and sixth centuries, before the introduction of the Anglo-Saxon coinage *c.*AD 600, together with the continued importation of foreign coins in the early seventh century. Part two will consider the typology, geographical distribution and the attribution to particular kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxon coinage itself. Following XRF-analysis of the metal content of a significant number of gold coins by my colleague Duncan Hook, it will also reconsider the question of the relative chronology of the early gold issues. Part three will look at the function (or rather, functions) of gold coinage in Anglo-Saxon England, and will draw some more general conclusions.

Unlike both earlier and later periods, in which gold coins circulated in Britain as high-value denominations alongside less valuable issues in other metals, the only coinage to be issued

*Acknowledgements.* The author has benefited in the preparation of this paper from discussion with Sam Moorhead, Richard Abdy, Peter Guest, Nick Wells, Roger Bland and Philippa Walton. Lauren Bishopp and Tom Williams provided valuable assistance in preparing the tables, and Sam Moorhead, Richard Abdy and Elina Screen commented on this paper in draft. Any mistakes are of course the responsibility of the author.

<sup>1</sup> Blackburn 2007.

in Anglo-Saxon England before the late seventh century was struck in gold. Some finds of imported Byzantine bronze *folles* (and lower denominations) are recorded, and the questions of continuity and re-use of late Roman silver and bronze coins will be discussed in more detail below. Those questions aside, the finds record is dominated by gold coins, both Anglo-Saxon and imported issues. The Anglo-Saxon coinage followed the established trend of imported coins in the sixth century, and like all of the main imported gold currencies, the Anglo-Saxons adopted a currency based on the two main gold denominations of the Late Roman/Byzantine coinage. These were the *solidus*, and the rather more common *tremissis*, representing a third of a *solidus*. The smaller coin is variously described in numismatic literature as shilling, *tremissis* and *thrymsa*, representing one-third of a *solidus*. Although the Old English term *scilling* may originally have referred to the larger *solidus*, Philip Grierson argued convincingly that references in the early Kentish law-codes were to the smaller denomination, corresponding to the Byzantine and Frankish *tremissis*, and it is likely that *scilling* was used to refer to these coins in Old English, and *tremissis* in Latin.<sup>2</sup> The term *thrymsa* has been taken to be an Anglicisation of Latin *tremissis*, and is widely used by modern numismatists for gold coins of this period. However, the term is only used in much later Anglo-Saxon documents, apparently as a unit of account rather than an actual coin, and there seems to be little point in perpetuating the misapplication of this term to the early Anglo-Saxon gold coinage. Both shilling and *tremissis* appear to be appropriate, and it can be helpful to use shilling to distinguish Anglo-Saxon coins from continental *tremisses* of the same size and weight. However, since a few issues of this period can not be attributed with certainty as Frankish, Frisian or Anglo-Saxon, the term *tremissis* is used for consistency throughout this paper, regardless of the place of origin.

### Survey of existing literature

Although the number of Anglo-Saxon gold coins is steadily increasing, they have always been comparatively rare, and the corpus continues to be dominated by the only substantial hoard of the period, discovered at Crondall in Hampshire in 1828, which contained 69 Anglo-Saxon coins out of a total of 101 recorded coins/pseudo-coins. Prior to the discovery of the Crondall hoard, although individual gold coins were recorded as curiosities, and were also included in general surveys of the coinage, there were simply not enough coins to permit (or justify) a detailed study of the series as a whole. The Crondall hoard itself attracted considerable attention, and a number of articles were published on the subject in the years which followed its discovery.<sup>3</sup> Even then, the corpus remained small, and there was no attempt in the nineteenth century at a serious study of early Anglo-Saxon coins along the lines of the great studies of the contemporary Frankish coinage by Belfort and Prou.<sup>4</sup> The fact that the Crondall hoard had been acquired by the Ashmolean Museum meant that gold coins were still poorly represented in the British Museum Catalogue of 1887, and it was not until 1948 that Humphrey Sutherland produced the first major study, both of the Crondall hoard itself, and of Anglo-Saxon gold coinage more generally.<sup>5</sup>

Sutherland's book was a major undertaking, and included a detailed classification of the coinage, linking individual related types into larger groups, carrying out die studies within each type and, where possible, recording find-spots for the coins. Although elements of Sutherland's classification have now been superseded by more recent research, this remains the foundation on which all subsequent studies have been built. No further substantial work on the gold coinage as a whole was undertaken for several decades, although various articles looked in more detail at a number of individual coins, especially in the later gold series from the reign of Offa onward.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Grierson 1961. An important discussion of monetary terminology relating to this period is provided in Hines forthcoming.

<sup>3</sup> Akerman 1843–4; Akerman 1855; Lefroy 1870; Ponton d'Amecourt 1872.

<sup>4</sup> Belfort 1892–5; Prou 1892.

<sup>5</sup> Sutherland 1948.

<sup>6</sup> Grierson 1953; Blunt 1961; Blunt and Dolley 1968; Pagan 1965.

The next influential addition to the study of the early gold period was an article by Philip Grierson in which he sought to provide social rather than economic explanations for the deposition of both the Crondall hoard and the contents of the purse in the Sutton Hoo ship burial, arguing that the Crondall hoard represented a Kentish wergild of 100 shillings, while the Sutton Hoo purse represented a payment for the ‘crew’ of the ship in the afterlife, by analogy with the Greek tradition of Charon’s obol.<sup>7</sup> There are major problems with both arguments, but although Grierson’s interpretation of the Sutton Hoo coins was convincingly challenged by Alan Stahl in 1992, the problems with his interpretation of Crondall have only recently been addressed in print.<sup>8</sup>

The early 1970s saw a number of contributions to the subject, linked to the study and interpretation of the Sutton Hoo burial. Although the purse from the ship-burial contained no Anglo-Saxon coins, the presence of the coins raised questions about the nature and extent of coin use in England in the seventh century, while pressure to provide a firm date for such an important burial led to the development of a chronology for the Merovingian gold coinage which could be extended to the Anglo-Saxon series. This chronology was based on a discernible reduction over time in the gold content of dateable Merovingian coins, with other coins dated by their gold content in comparison. This approach was considered by John Kent and Andrew Oddy in a number of articles, as well as in the main Sutton Hoo publication of 1975.<sup>9</sup> Subsequent studies have questioned the reliability of the method, and also whether (even if the method is accepted) the evidence supports Kent’s conclusions in regard to the dating of Sutton Hoo.<sup>10</sup> However, while the detail of this approach is certainly open to challenge, a broad correlation between chronology and debasement does appear to be justified, both in the Merovingian and Anglo-Saxon gold coinages. While the majority of Merovingian *tremisses* cannot be dated precisely, the existence of some coins which can be attributed to dateable rulers provides some dating evidence for hoards, and therefore for associated *tremisses* in these hoards, and there appears to be at least partial correlation between debasement and dateable hoards, even if one needs to be wary of the precision of some of the published dates.<sup>11</sup>

In addition to Kent’s work on the Sutton Hoo coins themselves, the Sutton Hoo volume also included an important contribution by Stuart Rigold.<sup>12</sup> With the two major finds of Crondall and Sutton Hoo now catalogued by Sutherland and Kent respectively, Rigold provided an important survey of smaller hoards and single finds of both Anglo-Saxon and imported gold coins from the sixth and seventh centuries. While a significant number of additional finds have been recorded since its publication, Rigold’s survey still provides valuable information, as well as a pointer to the direction which was to follow, of using recorded find-spots as a key to the attribution of anonymous coin-types, as well as placing the development of the Anglo-Saxon coinage firmly in the context of related imported material found in England. Rigold made another important contribution to the field, developing a detailed typology for the series which followed on chronologically from those studied by Sutherland.<sup>13</sup> Although this was mostly concerned with the so-called ‘sceatta’ (now considered a spurious name for Anglo-Saxon pennies) coinage in silver, it included the Pada and Vanimundus types, which can be seen as transitional issues between the gold and silver issues (to be discussed further in Part two of this paper).

The Anglo-Saxon gold coinage was revisited by Ian Stewart in a Festschrift in honour of Sutherland in 1978.<sup>14</sup> Stewart extended Sutherland’s corpus with some additional finds, and raised some useful points about aspects of Sutherland’s classification. He also included discussion of the later Anglo-Saxon gold coins, and considered the application of Kent and Oddy’s

<sup>7</sup> Grierson 1970, building on Grierson 1961.

<sup>8</sup> Stahl 1992; Williams 2006, 174–9.

<sup>9</sup> Oddy *et al.* 1972; Oddy 1972; Kent 1975a; Kent 1975b.

<sup>10</sup> Brown 1981; Stahl and Oddy 1992; Williams 2005.

<sup>11</sup> Grierson and Blackburn 1986, 109.

<sup>12</sup> Rigold 1975.

<sup>13</sup> Rigold 1960–61 and 1977.

<sup>14</sup> Stewart 1978.

progressive debasement model to the chronology of the early Anglo-Saxon gold. Probably the most influential element in this article was the division of the coinage into a number of phases. Reflecting the fact that the Crondall hoard dominated the corpus of Anglo-Saxon gold coinage, Stewart defined the phases in terms of the hoard. Those types which actually featured in the hoard were defined, reasonably enough, as ‘Crondall’ types. Those which did not were divided into ‘Pre-Crondall’, ‘Post-Crondall’ and ‘Ultra-Crondall’. This classification will be discussed in more detail in Part two of this paper.

A slightly different approach was taken by Michael Metcalf, who considered the early gold in his 1989 article, ‘The availability and uses of gold coinage in England, c.580–c.670: Kentish primacy reconsidered’ and in the first volume of his three-volume work *Thrymsas and Sceattas in the Ashmolean Museum*, published in 1993.<sup>15</sup> Metcalf did not set out a corpus, in the style of Sutherland and Stewart, although he did note that a number of additional finds had been recorded since Stewart’s 1978 article. Metcalf was able in *Thrymsas and Sceattas* to draw on the recent discovery of a number of pale gold issues from the productive site at Coddensham in Suffolk, but these were part of a wider trend, which saw the recording of a growing number of both Anglo-Saxon and Continental gold coins, mostly as a result of metal detecting. Both the growth in the number of finds and improvements in the consistent recording of finds since the 1980s have led to a recognition that hoards and single finds provide very different types of evidence, and that the overall corpus of single finds probably provides more reliable evidence for the general pattern of coin circulation within a given period than any specific hoard from the same period. Metcalf has been one of the pioneers of this approach, and he correctly predicted that the corpus of single finds would continue to increase dramatically, and that this new evidence might demonstrate that the Crondall hoard was not necessarily particularly representative of the gold phase of Anglo-Saxon coinage taken as a whole, or even of the more limited sub-phase represented within the hoard. At the same time, Metcalf recognised that Crondall continued to dominate the corpus, and that there were not yet enough well-provenanced single finds to provide a statistically-convincing reinterpretation of coin circulation on the basis of the distribution of individual types. He did not depart significantly from the established Crondall-based classifications. However, he did note that, although the total number of finds remained low in comparison with other periods, the growing body of evidence was beginning to suggest that the early gold coinage might have had greater monetary significance than had been generally accepted following Grierson’s earlier interpretations of the more restricted ‘social’ functions of both Sutton Hoo and Crondall.

While short notes and articles have appeared on various individual coins and types,<sup>16</sup> the next major work to deal with the early gold was Anna Gannon’s 2003 book, *The Iconography of Early Anglo-Saxon Coinage, Sixth to Eighth Centuries*.<sup>17</sup> In this book and in various articles, Gannon has compared the iconography of coin design with the wider use of imagery in early medieval art, both in Anglo-Saxon England elsewhere, and she has particularly emphasised the strong Christian element in early Anglo-Saxon coin design, exploring the association between the issuing of coinage and Christianisation, and the possibility that certain coin types may represent ecclesiastical issues. Because her book is arranged thematically rather than chronologically, discussion of the various gold types is spread throughout Gannon’s work alongside the silver series that followed. Nor is the gold series treated as a whole, but there is useful discussion of several important types.

The publication at the beginning of 2006 of a Festschrift in honour of Marion Archibald provided a concentration of papers relating to the use of coinage in early Anglo-Saxon England.<sup>18</sup> A catalogue of hoards and single finds between AD 410 and 675 by Richard Abdy and the current author extended the corpus of recorded finds of both Anglo-Saxon and imported coins, although more were discovered in the interval between completion of the

<sup>15</sup> Metcalf 1989 and 1993.

<sup>16</sup> Stewart 1986; Pirie 1992; Tweddle and Moulden 1992; Blackburn 1994; Blackburn 1998; Williams 1998; Williams 2007.

<sup>17</sup> Gannon 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Cook and Williams (eds) 2006; the individual papers in the volume are listed in the references under author.

catalogue and publication, while several others have been discovered since, emphasising the need to revisit the subject periodically to see how new finds may affect our interpretation of the existing material. In addition to the catalogue, Richard Abdy and Sam Moorhead contributed papers on the use of coinage in post-Roman England prior to the introduction of Anglo-Saxon coins. Mark Blackburn, Nick Mayhew and Arent Pol each discussed specific Anglo-Saxon or Continental types, while Anna Gannon considered the role of imitation in the development of early Anglo-Saxon coin design.

The early section of the Archibald Festschrift also included a longer article by the present author, entitled 'The circulation and function of coinage in conversion-period England, c.AD 580–680',<sup>19</sup> although the paper also included some discussion of coin-use in the fifth and earlier sixth centuries to provide context for developments in the period discussed in the title. The current paper to some extent draws on that earlier paper, combined with more detailed analysis of the chronology, scale, and attribution of the various Anglo-Saxon gold issues, which was excluded from the earlier study for reasons of both time and space. The conclusions drawn there are further modified here by the discovery and recording of several more examples of both Anglo-Saxon coins and continental imports since the previous catalogue and article were completed, as well as by the work of various colleagues working on Roman and sub-Roman material (see below, pp. 56–7).

The last work on early Anglo-Saxon gold that must be mentioned here is Anna Gannon's forthcoming *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* volume covering the early Anglo-Saxon collections in the British Museum.<sup>20</sup> This will include a section by Duncan Hook on his metallurgical analyses of gold coins in the collections of the British Museum, together with coins of the same period in the Fitzwilliam Museum and a number of private collections. Between them, these collections provide a good cross-section of the whole of the main gold coinage, providing the opportunity to revisit earlier work on the relationship between debasement and chronology. Although the full discussion of this material will appear in the *Sylloge* volume, the results of the analysis will appear in Part two of this paper, and form the basis for the discussion of the chronology there.<sup>21</sup>

In addition to work on the early gold period, mention must also be made of a recent major article by Mark Blackburn on the later period of gold use from the reign of Offa onwards.<sup>22</sup> This considers the eight definite late Anglo-Saxon gold coins, together with the use and imitation of imported issues in this later period, in particular the solidi of Louis the Pious, as well as the wider use of gold for economic purposes. The article combines coinage with other archaeological material and contemporary written records of coin use to provide a comprehensive discussion of gold coinage in the later period, so that an extended discussion of the later coinage here is unnecessary. This paper is now supplemented by the publication of the metallurgical analysis of these later coins, carried out as part of the process of authenticating the gold mancus of Coenwulf of Mercia.<sup>23</sup>

### The problem of the fifth century

The use of coinage was well established in Britain long before the Anglo-Saxon settlements of the fifth century, with coinage attributed to various southern British communities in the Late Iron Age being gradually superseded by the developed Roman imperial coinage. Some Roman minting did take place in Britain, but the majority of Roman coins in Britain were always imported, and the withdrawal of the Roman armies in the early fifth century undoubtedly caused severe disruption both to the coin supply and to the nature of the monetary economy in fifth-century Roman Britain. This has often been interpreted as a complete break in both

<sup>19</sup> Williams 2006.

<sup>20</sup> Gannon forthcoming.

<sup>21</sup> I am grateful to Tony Abramson, Stewart Lyon and Lord Stewartby for making their collections available for the purposes of this analysis, and to Mark Blackburn and Martin Allen for facilitating the analysis of the Fitzwilliam coins.

<sup>22</sup> Blackburn 2007.

<sup>23</sup> Williams and Cowell 2009.

coin supply and coin use until the reintroduction of coinage in Kent at the very end of the sixth century.<sup>24</sup> This approach fit into a much wider view, which saw an abrupt end of Roman Britain around AD 410, but which struggled to provide a convincing explanation of the gap that this imposed in the archaeological evidence between the ‘Roman’ layers and the evidence of identifiable Anglo-Saxon material culture. This apparent gap has sometimes been described as the ‘problem of the fifth century’. However, reinterpretation of the dating of some of the hoards from the end of Roman Britain combines with an accumulation of site finds, provenanced stray finds and an important mixed hoard from Patching in Sussex (deposited *c.*475) to suggest both that the existing coin stock continued to circulate for longer than was formerly recognised, and that imported coinage continued to enter southern Britain throughout the fifth and sixth centuries, albeit in much smaller quantities than in the period before *c.*410.<sup>25</sup>

A cluster of hoards terminating in issues of the beginning of the fifth century have traditionally been linked with the turmoil surrounding the departure of the Roman army in 410. The historical narrative of a straightforward withdrawal is no longer widely accepted, and the significance of the year 410 in particular for Britain has been questioned, although the sack of Rome in that year had implications for the whole empire.<sup>26</sup> While interpretations vary on the exact nature of what followed,<sup>27</sup> it now seems clear that there was some element of continuity in government, and some sort of continued military presence, even if a large proportion of the army was withdrawn, and payment to the army from central imperial authority certainly ceased. Continuity was by no means uniform, and Ken Dark has argued the need to recognise regional differentiation, with Romano-British communities in western and northern Britain perhaps retaining more elements of late Roman structures, while the south-east and east were more heavily influenced by the Anglo-Saxons from an early date.<sup>28</sup> More recent work by Rob Collins and Matt Chesnais argues for a distinct post-Roman militarised society in the fifth century in the area around Hadrian’s Wall.<sup>29</sup> However, the apparent fragmentation of Roman Britain in the early fifth century does not necessarily mean that there was a complete breakdown of Roman authority, or that there ceased to be a need for means of payment. The silver siliquae which made up a large part of the currency in this period are frequently found clipped in British finds (both hoards and single finds), a pattern which is rarely observed on the Continent. Peter Guest has argued that the clipping can be divided into four categories of severity, reflecting repeated clipping over time.<sup>30</sup> Guest argued that the bulk of this clipping took place after the cessation of coin imports in the first decade of the fifth century, and that the deposition of the hoards featuring these coins could be several decades later than the *tpq* suggested by the minting of the coins, although there is no reliable method of telling exactly how long they continued to circulate. Guest’s interpretation has been followed by other Roman numismatists, and is reinforced by recent analysis of single finds of siliquae by Sam Moorhead, Roger Bland and Philippa Walton.<sup>31</sup> This shows that while clipping probably began as early as the fourth century, there was a significant increase in clipping in the fifth. Furthermore, the distribution of late siliquae, including clipped examples, shows continued widespread use of coin in southern and eastern Britain, although coin seems largely to have disappeared in the West Midlands and the North-West.

Clipping is often associated with unofficial abuse of the coinage, as in late medieval and early modern England, and the same assumption has sometimes been made for the clipped siliquae. Clipping begins in the fourth century, and this may well have been undertaken for nefarious purposes. However, Richard Abdy has argued (convincingly, in my opinion) that the clipping phenomenon of the fifth century was carried out officially, as a means of extending

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Kent 1961.

<sup>25</sup> Guest 2005; Abdy 2006, 2009 and Abdy forthcoming; Williams 2006.

<sup>26</sup> Salway 1984; Moorhead and Stuttard 2010.

<sup>27</sup> For a summary of different approaches, see Dark 2000.

<sup>28</sup> Dark 2000. See also Harris 2003, 139–88.

<sup>29</sup> Collins 2006; Chesnais 2008.

<sup>30</sup> Guest 1997 and 2005.

<sup>31</sup> Moorhead, Bland and Walton, forthcoming.



Fig. 1, a–c. Three siliquae, showing varying degrees of clipping. (a) A siliqua of Constantius III (407–11) from an unknown findspot has only been slightly clipped, suggesting a comparatively short circulation; a second (b) from the Hoxne hoard is rather more heavily clipped, suggesting that the hoard was deposited some time after that reign; a siliqua of Julian (360–3) from the same hoard (c) is even more heavily clipped, with only the centre remaining.

the limited coin stock, while enabling the clipping to be recycled, either as further siliquae or as bullion.<sup>32</sup> ‘Imitation’ siliquae are sometimes found in the hoards, and while some of these are probably contemporary imitations of the fourth and very early fifth centuries, it is possible that some of these are local issues of the fifth century. Since these too are vulnerable to clipping, it would require a very detailed study, which has not yet taken place, to ascertain whether any of these imitations could indeed date from after the interruption of the coin supply at the beginning of the fifth century. The use of bullion, however, is certainly a possibility, as the fifth-century hoard from Coleraine in Ireland contains ingots and hack-silver as well as coins.<sup>33</sup> The late Roman economy also seems to have been geared towards payment by weight, both within the empire and especially beyond the frontiers, even when payments were made predominantly in coin.<sup>34</sup> Interestingly a short-lived period of use of hack-silver is visible in the Anglo-Saxon homelands of southern Denmark and northern Germany in this period, as well as in hoards on the fringes of Roman Britain, such as Coleraine and Traprain Law.<sup>35</sup> Hack-silver also appears together with coinage in the Patching hoard, *tpq* c.475, which weighed very close to one Roman pound in total, while the slightly later (and much smaller) hoard from Oxborough probably also reflects re-use of coins, first as ornaments, then as jewellery. However, Abdy argues that the clipping phenomenon was over by the time that Patching was deposited, since it combines clipped siliquae from the existing coin stock with more recent imports which have not been clipped, although it is impossible to say how long before deposition these had been imported.

### Imported coins

This brings us on to the subject of imported coins, a number of which were included in Rigold’s 1975 listing of coin finds in the Sutton Hoo volume. A more extensive list was published by Abdy and Williams in 2006 (closing with finds around the beginning of 2004), and this can now be supplemented with new finds recorded on both the EMC and PAS databases. A further listing, including only imperial and pseudo-imperial gold coins, will appear as part of a larger forthcoming study of Roman gold coins in Britain by Bland and Lorient,<sup>36</sup> and I am grateful to the authors for sharing their data in advance of publication. Both Abdy and Williams 2006 and the EMC database include a certain amount of double counting. Tables 2–5 in the Appendix below (pp. 61–73) present a new listing of the hoards and single finds of

<sup>32</sup> Abdy 2006, 2009 and Abdy forthcoming.

<sup>33</sup> Abdy forthcoming. Analysis of the Coleraine ingots has recently been carried out at the British Museum, to permit direct comparison of their composition with late siliquae, but results of this analysis are not yet available.

<sup>34</sup> Kent and Painter 1977; Guest 2007.

<sup>35</sup> A series of papers discussing the hack-silver phenomenon in this period from different perspectives will be published in Hunter and Painter (forthcoming).

<sup>36</sup> Bland and Lorient forthcoming.

imported coins, and attempt to provide a concordance of the gold coins included in these various existing lists. A recent study of imported bronze coins by Sam Moorhead indicates that these also continued to enter the country in the fifth and sixth centuries, and their distribution broadly reflects that of the latest phase of the *siliquae*.<sup>37</sup> I have argued elsewhere that Roman bronze coins of the fourth century and even earlier may also have been re-used throughout this period. Earlier Roman bronzes were certainly widely used as weights in this period.<sup>38</sup>

Turning to the gold, this comes from a variety of sources. Official late Roman/Byzantine coins predominate in the fifth century, although they are joined by pseudo-Imperial issues in increasing numbers in the late fifth and sixth centuries. These have a variety of origins, including Frankish, Visigothic, Burgundian and probably Frisian issues, as well as some which cannot be precisely identified. Provençal pseudo-imperial issues are particularly well represented and these, together with the official Byzantine issues, point to trading links down the west coast of France and into the Mediterranean, as well as directly across the Channel. Two finds of Sasanian drachms probably reflect the same route. Imports of imperial issues continue through the sixth century, with peaks under Justinian (527–65), and Maurice Tiberius (582–602), followed by only three coins of Phocas (602–10), and the coin supply apparently ended almost completely during the reign of Heraclius (610–41). Single coins of Tiberius III (698–705)<sup>39</sup> and Leo III (717–41)<sup>40</sup> fall so long after the main series had stopped (and outside the Anglo-Saxon gold period) that on current evidence they can be seen as exceptions, and thus have been excluded from the main catalogue. As noted by Bland and Lorient,<sup>41</sup> the density of finds per regnal year drops dramatically from Maurice Tiberius to Heraclius, and while this could indicate gradual tailing off, it might also indicate an abrupt end to the imports somewhere comparatively early in the reign of Heraclius, suggesting the termination of direct trading contacts with the Mediterranean. If so, the cut-off must post-date 613, since examples of the joint issue of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine (613–32) are represented.

The sixth century also saw the emergence of distinct Frankish and Visigothic coinages, and the former came to dominate the assemblage of imported coins toward the end of the sixth century and into the seventh. There are a few examples of Frankish regal issues, but the majority are coins of the mint and moneyer type, produced across the Frankish kingdom from *c.*580 onwards, and represented extensively both in Sutton Hoo and Crondall. The steady increase in finds of this type shows that the coins in Sutton Hoo and Crondall are rather more representative of circulating currency than was recognised in earlier publications. In the latter part of the period, from *c.*630 onwards, Frisian issues of the Dronrijp and Nietap types also become relatively common.



Fig. 2. Gold and garnet pendant cross from Wilton, Norfolk, containing a gold solidus of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine. This is both the most ornate example of a coin re-used as jewellery, and one of the last of the imported imperial issues.

<sup>37</sup> Moorhead 2009. Unpublished data collated by Nick Wells (pers. comm.) complements Moorhead's article.

<sup>38</sup> Moorhead 2006; Williams 2006.

<sup>39</sup> Bland and Lorient forthcoming, no. 867.

<sup>40</sup> Rigold 1975, no. 25; Abdy and Williams 2006, no. 78; Bland and Lorient forthcoming, no. 868.

<sup>41</sup> Bland and Lorient forthcoming.



Fig. 3. Gold solidus of Anastasius from Shorwell, Isle of Wight. Although the coin comes from a grave, it shows no sign of secondary use.

The function of the coins will be discussed in more detail in Part three, but for now it is useful to make some preliminary points. At the time of the Sutton Hoo publication, the corpus of finds of this period was dominated by excavation finds, predominantly from burials. A large proportion of these had been re-used as ornaments (see Fig. 3), along with some earlier gold coins which were also re-used as coin-jewellery, again indicating the availability and re-use of coin-stock from before the termination of the Roman coin supply. However, the single finds evidence reveals a very different picture. Grave finds now represent a much smaller proportion of the corpus, and most of the coins with secondary usage as ornaments either come from graves or have uncertain provenances, although a small number of stray finds also show this treatment. The vast majority of stray finds do not, however, indicating that coins circulated predominantly as coins, and although in burial practice coin-jewellery is more prevalent, even coins from graves do not all show secondary treatment (see Fig. 3). However, even where coins do show such secondary treatment, which includes piercing, mounting with suspension loops and occasionally mounting in frames, this re-use demands that coins be available in the first place. Although re-used coins of this type should no longer be considered as currency by the time they were deposited, it is reasonable to assume that they had at least entered the country as currency, even if we cannot say how long they may have circulated.

Another aspect which has changed significantly in recent years is the distribution. Rigold's listing was completely dominated by coins from Kent, reflecting both a focus on Kentish cemetery sites amongst early excavators and continued interest amongst more recent excavators in an area known to produce large amounts of interesting material. No other county at that stage had significant numbers of finds (counting the hoards of Sutton Hoo, Crondall, and Kingston on Thames as one find-spot each). With the number of finds now so much greater, and based on a full decade of national finds reporting under the Portable Antiquities Scheme (as well as the more extended period of recording through the Coin Register and EMC), we now probably have a more realistic picture of the distribution (see Table 1), although one still skewed by the volume of the Kentish excavated material. Kent remains far and away the most popular area, and this probably genuinely reflects Kent's proximity to the continent, and perhaps both political and economic links, in addition to any bias in the recording. Whether this amounted to full-blown Frankish hegemony may be disputed but there certainly seems to be a link between Frankish influence and the Christianisation of Kent.<sup>42</sup> At the same time, a number of other areas emerge with significant numbers of coins finds from this period. Interestingly, Sussex and Hampshire have a relatively low density of finds, despite the fact that they might also benefit from a relatively short and easy crossing. Other southern counties also have relatively light distributions. A sprinkling of finds in the south-west, Wales and Ireland points to access via Cornwall and the Atlantic coast of France, reflecting archaeological evidence for trading routes between the Mediterranean and western Britain and the Irish Sea.<sup>43</sup> Anthea Harris has also argued that these finds represent continued political and cultural contacts between Byzantium and western Europe, including

<sup>42</sup> Wood 1983; Yorke 2006.

<sup>43</sup> Lane 1994; Campbell 1996; Wooding 1996; Dark 1996; Dark 2000.

Britain, rather than trade alone.<sup>44</sup> This point is particularly significant given the role of coinage as a public expression of both identity and authority, and will be explored in more detail in Part three of this paper.

TABLE 1. Imported coin finds, c.410–675, arranged in order of number of finds per county.

<i>Finds per county</i>	<i>County</i>
More than 100	Kent
More than 35	Norfolk
More than 20	Suffolk, Lincolnshire, Essex
More than 10	Yorkshire, Uncertain
6–10	London, Cambridgeshire, Isle of Wight, 'East Anglia'
2–5	Sussex, Surrey, Nottinghamshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Leicestershire, Oxfordshire, Derbyshire, Hertfordshire, Wiltshire, Co. Meath
1	Anglesey, Buckinghamshire, Durham, Co. Leix, Middlesex, Northumberland, Pembrokeshire, Warwickshire

The significant change, however, is in the east. Norfolk, Lincolnshire, Suffolk, Essex and Yorkshire all have significant numbers of finds, followed by Cambridgeshire, with a limited amount of penetration into the East Midlands and the Home Counties, but virtually nothing further west. This reflects the importance of the North Sea as another major sailing route, and it comes as no surprise that mint-and-moneyer coins from Dorestad, as well as the anonymous Frisian types, are concentrated in these eastern counties. Coins from Quentovic, further south and west along the Channel coast, are more evenly distributed between these counties and Kent. However, the presence in these eastern areas of coins from Provence and the Mediterranean indicates that the East Coast did not simply benefit from the North Sea trade, but provided the ultimate destination for shipping coming up the western route round Brittany and the English Channel. Alan Stahl has noted, in the context of the Sutton Hoo coins, that by the early seventh century there was widespread circulation of coins within the Frankish kingdoms, so that the wide variety of mints represented within the Sutton Hoo purse is consistent with an entirely random distribution of coins drawn from the Frankish currency, rather than pointing to specific links with any particular area.<sup>45</sup> Thus, coins from southern mints could also have arrived in eastern England via northern Frankish ports such as Dorestad and Quentovic. However, the presence of southern issues from the earlier phase of imperial and pseudo-imperial coinage in the fifth and early sixth centuries, when western Europe was both politically and economically more fragmented, must surely point to direct contacts with the south.

### **The influence of Roman and sub-Roman coinage in early Anglo-Saxon England: preliminary conclusions**

The role and significance of coinage in this period will be considered in more detail in Part three of this paper in a later volume of the *Journal*, but I think that it is helpful to note some preliminary conclusions at this point, as a background to the analysis of the Anglo-Saxon gold coinage which will appear in Part two.

Firstly, as mentioned above, it now seems clear that, while there was an undoubted break in the coinage supply around the beginning of the fifth century, and with it a significant drop in the volume of circulation, monetary activity continued through the fifth and sixth centuries on a smaller scale, based on a combination of re-use of the existing coin-stock, and the continued small-scale importation of continental coinage. This importation continued well into the seventh century (after the introduction of the earliest Anglo-Saxon issues) as far as Frankish coins were concerned, but there was a dramatic drop in the volume of imported gold from the

<sup>44</sup> Harris 2003.

<sup>45</sup> Stahl 1992.

Mediterranean early in the seventh century. This fits neatly with the mixture of coins in the Crondall hoard, and it is also tempting to link the pattern of importation of Byzantine gold coins with the apparent ready availability of gold for ornaments, etc., in northern Europe up to the early seventh century, with a decline in the gold content of both coins and ornaments following once the coin supply had dried up.

Secondly, there is a consistent distribution pattern, which shows continued use of *siliquae* across much of southern and eastern Britain in the fifth century, and mirrored to some extent in the distribution of imported coinage, particularly in gold, but also to some extent in bronze, although this has not been studied so intensively. This pattern sees a virtual abandonment of coin use in the highland zone of central England, and the West Midlands, but continued coin use and contacts with the Continent, not just in Kent, but across the south and east. Interestingly for discussion of the question of continuity at the end of Roman Britain, the new finds evidence shows the concentration not in those areas which according to archaeologists remained initially in the hands of the Romano-British, but in the areas which were first conquered and settled by the Anglo-Saxons (see above, p. 56).

Thirdly, both the chronological and geographical distribution indicate a widespread familiarity with coinage in several of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms by the early seventh century. That provides a context for the coin deposits from Sutton Hoo and Crondall, but it also provides a context for the shift to locally produced coinage. This is important as most of the early Anglo-Saxon coinage lacks literate inscriptions, and is thus difficult to attribute to particular kingdoms with certainty. The plausibility of individual kingdoms beginning to issue coins is enhanced considerably if they were already using imported coinage. We can now see that in addition to the obvious example of Kent, that there was extensive coin use across East Anglia, and in the kingdom or sub-kingdom of Lindsey. On a slightly lesser scale we see coin use in Deira, the southern of the two main kingdoms which formed the larger kingdom of Northumbria, and in the kingdom of the East Saxons, and on a reduced scale again in the northern Northumbrian kingdom of Bernicia, in the kingdom of the South Saxons, and in the various petty kingdoms of the Middle Angles. By contrast we see little use of coinage in the kingdom of the West Saxons, and virtually none in the heartland of Mercia. We shall return to these factors when we consider the distribution and attribution of the Anglo-Saxon coins themselves in Part two of this paper in the next volume of the *Journal*.

#### APPENDIX. REVISED LIST OF IMPORTED GOLD COINS, c.410–675, WITH CONCORDANCE TO PREVIOUS LISTS

TABLE 2. Hoards containing imported coins minted 410–675

*Note.* Hoard is defined here simply as two or more coins found in association, and therefore not single finds. Nothing is implied about the purpose of deposition by inclusion in the list. No. 15, Horndean, has been published as a hoard, but may represent single finds from a productive site, or even false reporting. Doubt has also been expressed as to whether the coins from Sarre (no. 10) come from a single deposit, as other coin pendants are recorded from the same cemetery. See fuller discussion of both groups in Bland and Loriot forthcoming. Cross-references to the listings of hoards in Abdy and Williams 2006, Rigold 1975 and Bland and Loriot forthcoming are provided.

<i>No.</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Summary of contents</i>	<i>Abdy and Williams</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>Bland and Loriot</i>	<i>Grave deposit Yes/No</i>	<i>Date of deposition or tpq</i>
1	Sussex	Patching	1 denarius, 23 solidi, 3 miliarenses, 23 <i>siliquae</i> , 2 gold rings, 50 pieces of hack-silver	H1	–	569	N	tpq 470
2	Norfolk	Oxborough	1 denarius, 1 solidus, 1 tremissis (all mounted/ pierced for suspension), 1 piece of hack-silver	H2	–	445	?	tpq 475
3	Surrey	Kingston-on- Thames	10+ tremisses	H3	3–12	860	N	c.530?

No.	County	Findspot	Summary of contents	Abdy and Williams	Rigold	Bland and Loriot	Grave deposit Yes/No	Date of deposition or tpq
4	Kent	Chatham Lines	3 siliquae (all pierced), one bronze coin (details unrecorded)	H4	43a	–	Y	c.530–40
5	Kent	Canterbury (St Martin's)	1 solidus, 3–4 tremisses, 1 'medalet', 1 gold pseudo-coin (all looped)	H5	16, 46, 65, 73, 77, 115	789	Y	c.600–30
6	Kent	Faversham	6 tremisses (all looped)	H6 66, 69, 78	48–9, 51,	799–801	Y	c.600
7	Essex	Prittlewell	2 tremisses	H7	–	–	N	c.600–30
8	Essex	Chipping Ongar	2 tremisses	H8	–	–	N	c.600–30
9	Essex	Birch	2 tremisses	–	–	–	N	c.600–30
10	Kent	Sarre	4 solidi (looped), plus other jewellery	H9	54, 56, 58–9	809, 810, 865	Y	c.615–30
11	Suffolk	Sutton Hoo	37 tremisses, 3 blank tremisses, 3 gold ingots	H10	–	–	Y	c.610–40
12	Hants.	Crondall	101(+) tremisses, plus remains of gold purse fittings	H11	–	858	N	c.640
13	Kent	Sibertswold	2 tremisses (looped), with other pendants	H12	85, 98	–	Y	tpq c.650
14	Kent	Finglesham	1 solidus, 1 Anglo-Saxon tremissis	H14	62, 132	–	Y	c.670
15	Hants.	Horndean	4 solidi	H15	–	859, 867	N	c.670–85

TABLES 3–5. Single finds of imported coins found in the British Isles

*Note.* Tables 3–5 present a revised and expanded list of the imported gold coins found in the British Isles. In Table 3, imperial and pseudo imperial issues are listed together chronologically by ruler, then alphabetically by county and findspot. Other rulers are listed chronologically at the end. Table 4 lists Merovingian mint-and-moneyer issues, arranged in alphabetical order by mint and moneyer. Table 5 lists the Frisian coins (by type) and imported gold coins of uncertain type. The coins have been assigned a single running number, and cross references have been supplied to the earlier listings in Abdy and Williams 2006, Rigold 1975, the EMC and PAS databases, and to Bland and Loriot forthcoming. Cross-references to coins from the hoards listed in Table 2 are given in italics. The following abbreviations are used:

Denomination. S = solidus, T = tremissis, Sil = siliqua, D = drachm  
 Secondary treatment. L = looped, M = mounted, P = pierced

TABLE 3. Finds of gold and silver imperial, pseudo imperial and regal coins (excluding hoards), c.410–675.

No.	Ruler	Denom.	Secondary treatment	County	Findspot	Abdy and Williams	Rigold	EMC	PAS	Bland and Loriot
1	Constantine III	Sil	–	Kent	Richborough	52	–	–	RICX-1538	–
2	Jovinus	S	–	Kent	Ashford	53	–	–	KENT-DEF360	259
3	Honorius (pseudo-Imperial)	S	–	Kent	Richborough	114	–	–	–	324
4	Theodosius II	S	–	London	Camden	–	–	–	–	383
5	Theodosius II	S	–	Kent	Richborough	–	–	–	–	325
6	Theodosius (pseudo-Imperial)	S	–	Norfolk	Winterton	55	–	1994.0105	–	–
7	Valentinian III	T	–	Cambs.	Barrington	256	–	–	–	33
8	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	S	P	Essex	Castle Hedingham	6	–	–	–	153
9	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	T	–	IOW	Seaview	117	–	–	–	254
10	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Kent	Higham	115	–	–	KENT-2452	274

No.	Ruler	Denom.	Secondary treatment	County	Findspot	Abdy and Williams	Rigold	EMC	PAS	Bland and Lorient
11	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Kent	Uncertain	141	–	1992. 0209	RICX- 3715	330
12	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Suffolk	Bury St Edmunds	–	–	–	–	533
13	Valentinian III (Pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Sussex	Chichester	116	–	–	–	566
14	Valentinian III	S	–	Warw.	Tatton, Tredington	257	–	–	–	580
15	Avitus	S	–	Kent	Hoo	62	36a	–	–	275
16	Avitus	S	–	Kent	Ash	63	–	–	KENT- 3419	257
17	Majorian	S	–	IOW	Carisbrooke	118	–	–	–	249
18	Libius Severus (pseudo-imperial)	S	–	IOW	Carisbrooke	108	–	–	–	250
19	Libius Severus (pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Kent	Minster	119	–	–	–	279
20	Libius Severus (pseudo-imperial)	S	–	Kent	Sittingbourne	120	23	–	–	327
21	Libius Severus or Zeno (pseudo-imperial)	T	–	Kent	Canterbury (Marlowe Theatre)	121	–	–	–	262
22	Libius Severus (Visigothic)	T	P (×9)	Kent	Chapel le Ferne	–	–	–	LON- 1C22F5	884
23	Anthemius, Germanic imitation	S	P	Durham	Piercebridge	7	–	1986. 8334	–	85
24	Leo I	S	–	Kent	‘East Kent’	64	21	1982. 9013	RICX- 605	269
25	Leo I	T	–	Kent	Richborough	65	22	–	–	326
26	Julius Nepos	S	–	Essex	Wickford	66	–	–	RICX- 3244	179
27	Julius Nepos	S	L	Kent	Ash	14	24	–	–	258
28	Zeno	S	–	Uncertain	Probably not British find	–	–	–	–	772
29	Anastasius	S?	L	Essex	Little Burstead	–	–	–	ESS- 10F463	883
30	Anastasius (Gallic)	S	L	Hants.	Cheriton	15	–	1995. 0061	–	782
31	Anastasius	S	–	IOW	Shorwell	–	–	–	–	–
32	Anastasius (Gallic)	S	–	IOW	Shorwell	–	–	–	IOW- D7CB55	785
33	Anastasius	?	–	Kent	Canterbury	–	–	–	–	791
34	Anastasius	S	–	Kent	Eastry	–	–	1996. 0266	–	796
35	Anastasius (Visigothic)	T	L	Kent	Worth	–	–	2007. 0274	KENT- C37138	816
36	Anastasius	S	–	Leics.	?	–	–	–	–	820
37	Anastasius (Merovingian)	T	–	Norfolk	Uncertain	–	–	2005. 0104	–	834
38	Anastasius	T	(M)	Norfolk or N. Suffolk	Uncertain	–	–	–	–	835
39	Anastasius	T	–	Suffolk	Coddenham	67	–	2001. 0014	MIBE- 12	838
40	Anastasius	S	–	Sussex	East Sussex	–	–	–	–	845
41	Anastasius/ Justinian	T	–	Kent	Canterbury	144	39	–	–	794
42	Justin I	S	–	Essex	Colchester	68	1	1975. 7001	MIBE- 3	775
43	Justin I (Visigothic)	T	–	Essex	Jaywick/ Clacton	124 and 146	41	–	–	778
44	Justin I	T	–	Essex	Uncertain	70	–	–	–	779

No.	Ruler	Denom.	Secondary treatment	County	Findspot	Abdy and Williams	Rigold	EMC	PAS	Bland and Loriot
45	Justin I	T	–	Kent	Ash	–	–	–	?	787
46	Justin I (Visigothic)	T	–	Kent	Northbourne	123 and 145	40	–	–	806
47	Justin I	S	–	Norfolk	Wiverton	–	–	–	NMS-14E85	833
48	Justin I	T	M?L	Yorks.	Uncertain	16	–	2004. 0205	–	850
49	Justin I or Justinian (Gallic)	T	–	Lincs.	Cleethorpes	138	–	2003. 0135	–	825
50	Justin I or Justinian (Alemannic)	T	–	Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	–	–	2000. 0533	–	824
51	Justin I or Justin II	S	–	Kent	Richborough	69	2	–	MIBE-3	807
52	Justinian I (Visigothic)	T	P	Kent	Ash	8	38	1982. 9014	–	786
53	Justinian I (Burgundian or Merovingian)	T	–	Kent	Ashford	127	–	2004. 0007	–	788
54	Justinian I (Burgundian)	T	–	Kent	Canterbury	250	32	1986. 8373	–	792
55	Justinian I (Alemannic)	T	L	Kent	Canterbury St Martin's	H5	46	–	–	790
56	Justinian I	T	–	Kent	'East Kent'	73	14	–	–	817
57	Justinian I (Gallic)	T	–	Kent	'East Kent'	125	29	–	–	818
58	Justinian I (pseudo-Imperial)	T	–	Kent	Eastry	143	37	–	–	–
59	Justinian I	T	–	Kent	Eastry	–	–	1996. 0266	–	797
60	Justinian I (Frisian?)	T	–	Kent	Higham	140	36	–	–	803
61	Justinian I	T	L	Kent	Sarre	21	–	1990. 0165	–	811
62	Justinian I	S	–	Kent	Ozengell Grange, nr Ramsgate	71	13	–	–	808
63	Justinian I (Gallic)	T	–	Kent	Tankerton	126	31	1974. 0002	–	815
64	Justinian I (Alemannic)	T	–	Kent	Sturry	149	45	–	–	813
65	Justinian I (Alemannic)	T	–	Kent	Sutton by Dover	148	44	–	–	814
66	Justinian I (Merovingian)	T	–	Kent	Kent	–	–	2009. 0321	–	–
67	Justinian I	S	–	Lincs.	Riby	–	–	–	NLM-400892	823
68	Justinian I	S	–	Pembs.	Tenby	72	–	–	–	851
69	Justinian I (Visigothic)	T	M, L	Suffolk	Bloodmoor Hill	20	42	1758. 0001	–	837
70	Justinian I (Visigothic)	T	–	Suffolk	Coddenham	142	–	1990. 0164	–	839
71	Justinian I	T	–	Yorks.	Temple Newsam	74	15	–	–	849
72	Justinian I ? (Burgundian)	T	–	Yorks.	York	137	34	–	–	846
73	Justinian I (Visigothic/ Gallic)	T	–	Yorks.	York	–	–	2008. 025	–	847
74	Justin II (Gallic)	T	–	Essex	Jaywick	130	30	–	–	778

<i>No.</i>	<i>Ruler</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy and Williams</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>	<i>Bland and Lorient</i>
75	Justin II	T	–	Essex	Uncertain	128	–	1998.0006	–	780
76	Justin II	T	L	Kent	Canterbury	H5	46	–	–	789
77	Justin II	T	L	Kent	St Martin's Dover (Buckland)	29	35	–	–	795
78	Justin II (Provençal)	S	M, L	Kent	Faversham	22	47	–	–	798
79	Justin II (Provençal)	T	L	Kent	Faversham	H6	49	–	–	800
80	Justin II (Gallic)	T	–	Kent	Kemsing	131	–	–	KENT- A936A7	804
81	Justin II (Burgundian)	T	–	Kent	'East Kent'	136	33	–	–	819
82	Justin II ? (Gallic)	T	–	Lincs.	Market Rasen	–	–	2007.0209 = 2008.0035	–	822
83	Justin II (Provençal)	T	–	Suffolk	Coddenham	129	–	1990.1290	–	840
84	Justin II		–	Suffolk	Southwold	–	–	1983.0001	–	841
85	Justin II	S	–	Uncertain		–	–	–	–	852
86	Justin II or Tiberius II (Provençal)	T	L	Kent	Faversham	H6	48	–	–	799
87	Tiberius II	S	–	IOW	Shalfleet	–	–	–	IOW- 5B4395	783
88	Tiberius II	S	M, L	Norfolk	Northwold	–	–	–	–	830
89	Maurice Tiberius	S	P	Bucks.	Aylesbury	–	–	–	–	773
90	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	T	–	Essex	Chelmsford	133	–	2001.1063	–	774
91	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	–	Essex	Hawkwell	134	–	–	–	776
92	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	M	Essex	Essex/ Suffolk border	37	–	2000.0110	–	843
93	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	T	P	Gloucs.	Naunton	9	–	1999.0001	WMID- 265	781
94	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	T	–	Kent	Ham	132	–	2001.0950	–	802
95	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	T	L	Kent	Faversham	H6	51	–	–	801
96	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	L	Kent	Sarre	H9	54	–	–	809
97	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	L	Kent	Sarre	H9	56	–	–	810
98	Maurice Tiberius	S	L	Kent	Selling	?	–	–	KENT- EF4810	812
99	Maurice Tiberius	S	L	London	Rainham	23	52	–	–	827
100	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	M, L	Norfolk	Bacton	27	55	–	–	828

<i>No.</i>	<i>Ruler</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy and Williams</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>	<i>Bland and Lorient</i>
101	Maurice Tiberius? (Frankish)	T	–	Norfolk	Brancaster	135	–	2001.1302	–	–
102	Maurice Tiberius	S	–	Oxon.	Dorchester on Thames	75	17	–	–	836
103	Maurice Tiberius	T	–	Suffolk	Woodbridge	–	–	–	–	–
104	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	T	L	Sussex	Salehurst and Robertsbridge	–	–	–	KENT-8	844
105	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	M, L	Uncertain		24	53	–	–	854
106	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	–	Uncertain		25	50	–	–	853
107	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	M, L	Uncertain		26	–	–	–	855
108	Maurice Tiberius (Provençal)	S	–	Uncertain		–	–	1998.0030	–	856
109	Phocas	T	–	Uncertain		–	–	–	–	857
110	Phocas	T	–	Suffolk	Uncertain	–	–	–	–	842
111	Phocas	S	–	Yorks., N	Bossall	–	–	–	NCL-6A6EF5	848
112	Heraclius (Provençal)	S	L	Kent	Sarre	H?	58	–	–	865
113	Heraclius (Provençal)	S	(L)	Oxon.	Boar's Hill	28	57	–	–	864
114	Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine	(S)	–	Suffolk	Ingham	–	–	–	DUR-EBAF01	888
115	Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine	S	M,L	Norfolk	Wilton (Hockwold cum Wilton)	17	18	–	–	861
116	Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine	S	M,L	Kent	'East Kent'	18	19	1982.9015	–	862
117	Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine	S	L	Uncertain		19	20	–	–	863
118	Uncertain (Visigothic)	T	–	IOW	Shalfleet	–	–	–	IOW-715794	784
119	Uncertain Gallic	T	–	Kent	Lympne	139	–	–	–	805
120	Uncertain Gallic (Visigothic)	T	–	London	London, St Peter's Hill	175	–	1991.0201	–	826
121	Uncertain Gallic (Visigothic)	T	L	Norfolk	Little Walsingham	46	–	2003.0001	–	829
122	Uncertain Gallic	T	P	Norfolk	Thetford	10	–	2001.1153	–	832
123	Uncertain (Lombardic)	T	–	Yorks.	Sheffield	151	26	–	–	–
124	Theodoric, imitating Anastasius	S	L	Norfolk	Reepham	–	–	–	–	821

<i>No.</i>	<i>Ruler</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy and Williams</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>	<i>Bland and Lortot</i>
125	Merovingian copy of Theodoric, imitating Anastasius	S	T	Norfolk	'Norfolk'	–	–	2005.0104	–	–
126	Gondemar II	T	–	Norfolk	Congham	147	–	1998.0085	–	–
127	Theodobert I	T	–	Kent	Ash	152	27	–	–	–
128	Theodobert I	T	–	Middlx	Pinner	153	28	–	–	–
129	Chlotar II	S	L	Kent?	Anglo-Saxon grave. East Kent?	31	9	1982.9016	–	–
130	Chlotar II	S	L	Notts.	Balderton	32	61	–	–	–
131	Chlotar II	S	L	E. Anglia?		33	–	1990.0166	–	–
132	Dagobert	S	M, L	Surrey	Merton	34	64	–	–	–
133	Clovis II	T	–	Kent	Reculver	154	83	–	–	–
134	Sigebert III	S	L	Suffolk	Ipswich	35	–	–	–	–
135	Chosroes (Khusrow) I	D	–	Anglesey		253	–	–	–	–
136	Chosroes (Khusrow) I	D	–	Sussex	Winchelsea	252	–	–	–	–

TABLE 4. Merovingian mint-and-moneyer issues

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy Wms</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
2.5	AGENNO ( <i>Agen</i> )				Kent	<i>St-Martin's</i>	<i>H5</i>	<i>65</i>	–	–
2.6	AGENNO				Kent	<i>Faversham</i>	<i>H6</i>	<i>66</i>	–	–
137	ARGENTON	Emerio	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	236	–	2000.0069	–
138	ARVERNUS (Clermont-Ferrand)	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	Brancaster	135 and 155	–	2001.1302	–
139	AVRELIANVM (Orleans)	Uncertain	T		Uncertain	–	–	–	2006.0301	–
140	BAIOC	Allacius	T		E. Anglia	East Anglia	–	–	2007.0292	–
141	BANACIACO (Banassac)	Uncertain	T		Kent	Hollingbourne	156	–	2001.0561	–
142	BELLOFAETO (Beaufay)	Fredomundus	T		Co. Meath	Near Trim	157	66a	–	–
143	BELLOMO	Uncertain	T		Suffolk	Rendlesham	–	–	2009.0093	–
144	BELLOMONT	Uncertain	T		York	York, near	–	–	2009.0328	–
145	BETORGAS (Bourges)	Mummolos	T		Leics.	Market Harborough, near	–	–	2007.0083	LEIC-6BAA 60
146	BLANGVICO (Blangy-sur-Ternoise)	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	158	–	1998.0022	–
147	BODESIO VICO (Vic-sur-Meuille)	Madelinus	T		Suffolk	Bury St Edmunds	159	67	–	–
148	BODESIO VICO	Waltechramnus	T				160	–	–	–
149	BRIODURUM (Briecully-sur-Meuse)	Audomlus	T		Gloucs.	Bourton-on-the-Water	161	67a	1986.8490	–
150	BRIOSSO (Brioux)	Chadulfus	T	P	City of London	Thames spoil: Billingsgate	162	–	1989.006	–

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy W<sup>ms</sup></i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
151	BRIVATE (Brioude)	possibly copying Manileobus	T		Kent?		163	68	–	–
152	BRIVATE	Mariulfus	T		Kent	Kent	–	–	2005. 0152	–
153	BURDIGALIS (Bordeaux)	Seggelenus	T		Kent	Kent	–	–	2008. 0033	–
154	CABILONNO (Chalons-sur-Saône)	Bonifacius	T		Uncertain	Uncertain	164	–	1990. 1291	–
155	CABILONNO	Emmes	T		Norfolk	Thetford	165	–	1998. 0042	–
156	CABILONNO	Wintrio	T		Essex	Southminster	166	–	1986. 0201	–
157	CABILONNO	Wintrio	T		Norfolk	Banham	–	–	2009. 0015 and 1998. 0098	–
158	CAMBIDONNO (Campbon)	Francio	T	L	Kent	Faversham	167	69	–	–
159	CANNACO (Cannac)	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	‘Lincs.’	168	–	1998. 004	–
160	CATOLACO (St Denis)	Ebrigelsus	T	M?	Kent	Rochester, near	43	–	1989. 0061	–
161	CENNOMANNIS (Le Mans)	Mellio	T		Co. Leix	Near Portlaoghise (Maryborough)	169	70	–	–
162	CHOAE (Huy)	Bertoaldus	T		Northum- berland	Kirk Newton (Old Yeavinger)	170	71	–	–
163	CHOAE	Bertoaldus	T		Kent	Isle of Sheppey	171	–	1989. 0059	–
164	CHOAE	Bertoaldus	T		Norfolk	Holme next the Sea	–	–	2006. 019	–
165	CIVITATE GAVALORVM (Javouls)	Uncertain	T		Cambs.	Stapleford, near	172	–	2003. 0152	–
166	CLIMVNIV (?)	Ansulis	T		Kent	Birchington	230	102	–	–
167	COLONIA (Köln-am-Rhein)	Guacamares	T		Kent	Swalecliffe (on beach)	173	72	–	–
168	COLONIA	Uncertain	T		Cambs.	Stapleford, near	174	–	2003. 0056	–
2.5	CONBENAS ( <i>St Bertrand de Comminges</i> )				Kent	<i>St-Martin's</i>	<i>H5</i>	<i>73</i>	–	–
169	CORMA (?)	Gundric	T		City of London	St Peter's Hill excavation	175	–	1991. 0201	–
170	DARANTASIA (Moutiers- tarantaise)	Optatus	T		Norfolk	Near Diss	176	74	1986. 8411	–
171	DORESTATE (Dorestad)	Madelinus	T		Norfolk	‘Norfolk’	177	–	2003. 0173	–
172	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T		Yorks.	‘North Yorkshire’	178	–	2004. 0008	–
173	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T		Suffolk	Rendlesham	–	–	2009. 025	–
174	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T		Norfolk	Foulsham	–	–	2006. 035	–
175	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T		Lincs.	Dry Doddington	–	–	2002. 0292	–
176	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T	P	E. Anglia?	Uncertain	11	75	–	–
177	DORESTATE	Madelinus	T	P	Yorks.	Pontefract	12	76	–	–

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy W'ms</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
178	DORESTATE	Rimoaldus	T		N. Yorks.	Cawood	–	–	–	SWYOR- B5O2C5
179	HELORONE (Oloron)	Uncertain	T	L	Kent	Canterbury	41	77	–	–
2.6	<i>LEXSOVIAS</i> (Lisieux)				Kent	Faversham	H6	78	–	–
180	LOCO SANCTO (Lieuxaint-en-brie)	Dagoaldus	T		Kent	Folkestone	179	79	1913. 0002	–
181	LOCO SANCTO	Dagoaldus	T		Kent	Folkestone	180	80	1913. 0003	–
182	LOCO SANCTO	Dagoaldus	T		Kent	Folkestone	181	81	–	–
183	LOCO SANCTO	Dagoaldus	T		Lincs.	Lincs., near	182	82	1980. 0012 and 1975. 0082	–
184	LOCO SANCTO	Dagoaldus	T		Hounslow	Heston	183	–	1989. 0058	–
185	MALLO CAMPIONE (?)	Landilino	T		Notts.	Newark, near	–	–	2008. 0316	–
186	MARCILIACIO	Odmundus	T		Kent	possibly Dover	184	84	–	–
2.13	<i>MARSALLO</i> ( <i>Marsal</i> )					<i>Sibertswold Down</i>	<i>H12</i>	<i>85</i>	<i>1982. 9018</i>	–
187	MARSALLO	Landoaldus	T		Medway	Rochester, south of	185	–	2001. 0017	–
188	MARSALLO	Gisloaldus	T		Uncertain		186	–	1998. 0086	–
189	MARSALLO	Oitadenus	T		Kent	Reculver	154	83	–	–
190	MARSALLO	Uncertain	S		Kent	Kent	–	–	2005. 0212	–
191	MARSALLO	Uncertain	S	L	Kent?		31	60	1982. 9016	–
192	MARSALLO	Uncertain	S	L	Notts.	Balderton	32	61	–	–
193	MARSALLO	Uncertain	S		E. Anglia?		33	–	1990. 0166	–
194	MELDUS (Meaux)	Bettonus	T		N. Yorks.	Borrowly	–	–	–	NCL- 674AC1
195	MELINUS (St Melaine)	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	Watton	187	–	1998. 0021	–
196	METTIS (Metz)	Theudelenus	T	M	Kent	Higham Upshire	39	–	2003. 0222	–
197	METTIS	Anoaldus	T		Surrey	Brockham	188	86	–	–
198	METTIS	Audoaldus	T		Bromley	Farnborough	189	–	1987. 0035	–
199	METTIS	Theudelenus	T		Lincs.	Riby	190	–	1998. 0001	–
200	METTIS	Theudelenus	T		Kent	Higham Upshire	–	–	2003. 0222	–
201	METTIS	Theudelenus	T	L	Uncertain		38	87	–	–
202	MOGVNTIACVM (Mainz)	Martinus	T		Lincs.	South Lincs., productive site	191	–	2001. 0895	–
203	MOSOMO (Mouzon)	Theodamarus	T		Suffolk	Friston, near	–	–	2009. 0010	SF- EB1217
204	NENTERACO (Nitry)	Uncertain	T		Essex	Prittlewell	–	–	–	–
205	NENTERACO	Uncertain	T		Kent	Littlebourne	192	88	–	–
206	ODOMO (Chateau Thierry?)	Wulfolenus	T		Essex	Cranham	193	–	1987. 0032	–
207	ORIONE (?)	Uncertain	T		Kent	Reculver	194	89	–	–
208	PALACIOLO (Palaiseau)	Domolenus	T		Kent	Reculver, productive site	195	90	1986. 8465	–
209	PALACIOLO (Pfalzel)	Domogiselus	T		Essex	Probably Waltham	196	91	–	–

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy W<sup>ms</sup></i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
210	PALACIOLO	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	Caistor-by-Norwich / Caistor	197	–	1989. 9002	–
211	PARISIUS (Paris)	Audegiselus	T		Kent	St Edmund Herne Bay (possibly Reculver)	198	92	–	–
212	PARISIUS	Eligius	T		Kent	Faversham (Simpson's Oast)	199	93	–	–
213	PARISIUS	Eligius	T		Kent	Wingham	–	–	2007. 0272	–
214	PLATILIACO (Plailly)	Deairenasea	T		Essex	Great Bromley	–	–	2007. 0069	–
215	PETRAFITTA (Pierrefitte)	Vinoaldo	T		Suffolk	Rendlesham	–	–	2009. 0125	–
216	REMVVS (Rheims)	Felcharius	T		Northants.	Desborough	200	–	1996. 0059	–
217	REMVVS	Filamarius	T		Kent	Whitstable	201	–	2004. 0076	–
218	ROTVMVS (Rouen)	Aigoaldus	T		Oxon.	Knighthon	202	–	1988. 0100 and 1989. 9003	–
219	RVTENIS (Rodez)	Vendemius	T	L	Kent	Ash (near Sandwich)	40	–	1994. 0111	–
220	RVTENIS	Vendemius	T	L	Kent	Sandwich	203	–	1995. 0064	–
221	RVTENIS	Vendemius	T		Kent	Eastry, productive site	204	–	2001. 0813	–
222	RVTENIS	Rosolus	T		Wilts.	Wiltshire	–	–	2007. 0084	–
223	SAREBURGO (Sarrebouurg)	Bobo	T		Suffolk	Probably Felixstowe (Walton Castle)	205	94	–	–
224	SAXBACIO (?)	Ciungilinus	T		Kent	Rainham (Lower Rainham)	206	95	–	–
225	SAXBACIO	Uncertain	T		Kent	Rainham	207	–	1986. 8499	–
226	SEDUNIS (Sion)	Gratus	T		Wilts.	Near Devizes	208	96	–	–
227	SEDUNIS	Betto	T		Lincs.	Irby-upon-Humber	209	–	2001. 0847	–
228	STADVNSEPI (?)	Wulchramnus	T		Notts.	Collingham	–	–	2005. 0189	–
229	SVLIACO (?)	Aleopus/Opusale	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	–	–	2004. 0188	LIN-B70DC6
230	TEODERCIACO (Trizay-sur-le-Lay)	Teodiricus	T		Kent	Broadstairs (Bradstow School cemetery, grave 55)	210	95a	–	–
231	TIDIRICIACO (Thiré)	Aegulfus	T		Kent	Whitstable	–	–	–	KENT-E1FA56
232	TIDIRICIACO	Gundobodus	T		Uncertain		211	–	2004. 003	–
233	TRIECTO (Maastricht)	Uncertain	T	M, L	Kent	Ash (near Sandwich)	36	–	1996. 0060	–
234	TRIECTO	Thrasemundus	T		Lincs.	South Lincs., productive site	212	–	2003. 0161	–
235	TRIECTO	Domaricus	T		Lincs.	South Lincs., productive site	213	–	2001. 0848	–
236	VIENNA VICO (Vienne-en-Val)	Vivatus	T		Norfolk	Watton	214	–	2003. 0042	–

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy W'ms</i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
237	VIENNA VICO	Gundomarus	T	L	Surrey		44	97	–	–
2.13	VIRDUNO (Verdun)		T			Sibertswold Down	H12	98	1982. 9017	–
238	VIRONIO.M (Noyen?)	Visionius	T		Kent	Reculver	232	104	–	–
239	VVICCO (Quentovic)	Dagulfus	T		Kent	Birchington	215	99	–	–
240	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Derbyshire		216	100	–	–
241	VVICCO	Dagulfus	T		Kent	West Hythe	–	–	1970. 2127	KENT- 1850
242	VVICCO	Ela	T		Lincs.	Caistor-on- the-Wolds, near	218	–	1996. 0058	–
243	VVICCO	Ela	T		Kent		219	–	–	–
244	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Kent	Great Mongeham, near Deal	220	–	1993. 0136	–
245	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Suffolk	Kelsale-cum- Carlton	221	–	1994. 011	–
246	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Kent	Minster, on Sheppey	222	–	1988. 0101	–
247	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Norfolk	Holme next the Sea	223	–	1999. 018	–
248	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Kent	Great Mongeham, near Deal	224	–	2002. 0288	–
249	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Lincs.	South Lincs., productive site	225	–	1970. 1131	–
250	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Norfolk	Congham	226	–	1994. 0109	–
251	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Lincs.	Sleaford, near	227	–	1998. 0041	–
252	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Kent	Thanet	228	–	–	–
253	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Suffolk	Barham	229	–	–	–
254	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Cambs.	'Cambridge- shire'	–	–	2007. 017	–
255	VVICCO	Dutta	T		Lincs.	Nettleton	–	–	2009. 0011	–
256	VVICCO	Anglus	T		Norfolk	Postwick	–	–	2009. 0236	–
257	VVICCO	Dutta	T	M	Suffolk	Aldeburgh	42	101	1840. 0001	–
258	VVICO PONTIO (?)	Daculfus	T		Suffolk	Barham, near Ipswich	–	–	2005. 0102	–
259	VIVA (Viviers)	Uncertain	T		Cambs.	'Cambridge- shire'	–	–	2006. 0161	–
260	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Cambs.	Great Shelford	–	–	2006. 0219	–
261	Uncertain	Protadius	T	P	Cambs.	Stapleford, near	238	–	2003. 0055	–
262	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Essex	'Essex'	–	–	2008. 0034	–
263	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Essex	Southend, near	–	–	2007. 0085	–
264	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Essex/ Herts. border	-	–	–	2005. 0041	–
265	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Herts.	Ware, near	–	–	2007. 0002	–
266	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Kent	Canterbury	250	32	–	–
267	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Kent	Cliffe	–	–	2007. 0267	–
268	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Kent	Near Rochester	231	103	–	–

<i>No.</i>	<i>Mint</i>	<i>Moneyer</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy W<sup>ms</sup></i>	<i>Rigold</i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
269	Uncertain	Telafius	T		Kent	Between Sandwich and Dover	239	–	2003.0058 and 1998.0084	–
270	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	–	–	2004.0192	LIN-B72977
271	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	–	–	–	LIN-DDE216
272	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		London	London (St Peter's Hill excavation)	–	–	1991.0200	–
273	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		London		233	105	–	–
274	Uncertain	Uncertain	T	M	Norfolk	Great or Little Walsingham	46	–	2003.0001	–
275	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	Ormesby, near	–	–	2007.0144	–
276	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	West Acre (parish)	234	–	1987.0033	–
277	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	'Norfolk'	–	–	2004.0163	–
278	Uncertain (Arvernus?)	Aribaudus	T		Suffolk	Akenham	235	–	2003.0212	–
279	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Suffolk	Rendlesham	–	–	2009.0341	–
280	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Suffolk	Rendlesham	–	–	2009.0257	–
281	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Suffolk	'Suffolk'	–	–	2009.0181	–
282	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Surrey	Warlingham	–	–	–	KENT-33C0D2
283	Uncertain	Uncertain	T		Yorks.	Skipton	13	–	1997.0992	–

TABLE 5. Frisian and uncertain imported coins

<i>No.</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Denom.</i>	<i>Secondary treatment</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Abdy</i>	<i>Rigold and W<sup>ms</sup></i>	<i>EMC</i>	<i>PAS</i>
284	Dronrijp type	T		Kent	Faversham (King's Field Cemetery)	240	107	–	–
285	Dronrijp type			Lincs.	Ludborough, near	244	–	2001.0978	–
286	Dronrijp type	T		Lincs.	Riby	243	–	1998.0043	–
287	Dronrijp type	T		Lincs.	South Lincs., productive site	242	–	2000.0536	–
288	Dronrijp type	T		Norfolk	Norwich	241	108	–	–
289	Dronrijp type	T		Suffolk	Wetheringsett	–	–	2007.0291	–
290	Dronrijp type	T	M, L	Uncertain		45	109	–	–
291	Nietap type	T		Derbyshire	Hasland	247	–	1997.9919	–
292	Nietap type	T		Kent	Hollingbourne (Pilgrims' Way)	248	110	–	–
293	Nietap type	T		Suffolk	Coddenham	245	–	–	–
294	Nietap type	T		Suffolk	Sudbourne	246	–	2004.0113	SF-F8EA61
295	Nietap type	T		Uncertain		–	–	1990.1292	–

No.	Type	Denom.	Secondary treatment	County	Findspot	Abdy	Rigold and W'ms	EMC	PAS
296	Uncertain	T		E. Anglia	'East Anglia'	–	–	2009.0016	–
297	Uncertain Merovingian			Kent	Faversham (King's Field Cemetery)	264	114	–	–
298	Uncertain (Frisian?)	T		Kent	Hollingbourne	–	–	1992.7453	–
299	Uncertain Merovingian			Kent	Lympne ('near Hythe')	262	112	–	–
300	Uncertain Merovingian or Frisian			Kent	Lympne (probably Belle Vue cemetery)	263	113	–	–
301	Uncertain	T		Kent	Rochester	–	–	1974.0001	–
302	Uncertain	T		Kent	'Kent'	–	–	–	–
303	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	Market Rasen, near	–	–	2007.0209 and 2008.0035	–
304	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	South Lincs.	–	–	2009.0021	–
305	Uncertain	T		Lincs.	South Lincs. productive site	–	–	1970.1065	–
306	Uncertain	T		Norfolk	Bawsey	–	–	2002.0171	–
307	Uncertain (Frisian?)	T		Yorks.	Malton, near	251	–	2001.1094	–
308	Uncertain	T		Yorks.	Pontefract	–	–	1913.0004	–
309	Uncertain	T		E. Yorks.	North Cave	–	–	–	SWYOR-236F00

## REFERENCES

- Abdy, R., 2006. 'After Patching: imported and recycled coinage in fifth- and sixth-century Britain', in Cook and Williams 2006, 75–98.
- Abdy, R.A., 2009. 'Patching and Oxborough: the latest coin hoards from Roman Britain or the first early medieval hoards from England?', in R. Abdy, E. Ghey, C. Hughes and I. Leins (eds), *Collection Moneta 97: Coin Hoards in Roman Britain XII* (Wetteren), 394–5.
- Abdy, R.A., forthcoming. 'The Patching Hoard', in F. Hunter and K. Painter (eds), *The Traprain Law Hoard*, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph (Edinburgh).
- Abdy, R.A. and Williams, G., 2006. 'A catalogue of hoards and single finds from the British Isles, c.AD 410–680', in Cook and Williams 2006, 11–74.
- Akerman, J.Y., 1843–4. 'Description of some Merovingian, and other gold coins, discovered in the parish of Crondale, in Hampshire, in the year 1828', *NC* 6, 171–182.
- Akerman, J.Y., 1855. *Remains of Pagan Saxondum* (London).
- Belfort, A. de, 1892–5. *Description générale des monnaies mérovingiennes*, 5 vols (Paris).
- Blackburn, M.A.S., 1991. 'A survey of Anglo-Saxon and Frisian coins with runic inscriptions', in A. Bammesberger (ed.), *Old English Runes and their Continental Background* (Heidelberg), 137–89.
- Blackburn, M.A.S., 1994. 'A variant of a seventh-century 'York' group of shillings found in Lincolnshire', *NC* 154, 204–208.
- Blackburn, M.A.S., 1998. 'A new coin of King Eadbald of Kent (616–40)', *Chris Rudd List* 34, 2–4.
- Blackburn, M.A.S., 2006. 'Two new types of Anglo-Saxon gold shillings', in Cook and Williams (eds) 2006, 127–40.
- Blackburn, M.A.S., 2007. 'Gold in England during the age of silver', in J.A. Graham-Campbell and G. Williams (eds), *The Silver Economy in the Viking Age* (Walnut Creek, CA), 55–98.
- Bland, R. and Lioriot, X., forthcoming. *Roman and Early Byzantine Gold Coins found in Britain and Ireland, with an appendix of new finds from Gaul* (London).
- Blunt, C. E., 1961. 'The coinage of Offa', in R.H.M. Dolley (ed), *Anglo-Saxon Coins: Studies Presented to F. M. Stenton* (London), 39–62.
- Blunt, C.E. and Dolley, M., 1968. 'A gold coin of the time of Offa', *NC* 8, 151–60.

- Brown D., 1981. 'The dating of the Sutton Hoo coins', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 2, BAR British Series 92 (Oxford), 71–86.
- Bruce-Mitford, R.L.S., 1975. 'Introduction and observations on the dating of the hoard and the burial', in R. Bruce-Mitford *et al.* (eds), *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, vol. 1, *Excavations, background, the ship, dating and inventory* (London), 578–88.
- Campbell, E., 1996. 'Trade in the Dark-Age West: a peripheral activity?', in B.E. Crawford (ed.), *Scotland in Dark-Age Britain* (St Andrews), 79–91.
- Chesnais, M., 2008. *A critical review of the data for the period of abandonment and the Sub-Roman period of Hadrian's Wall (AD 367 to AD 685)*. University of York: unpublished MA Dissertation.
- Collins, R., 2006. 'Late Roman frontier communities in northern Britain. A theoretical context for the "end" of Hadrian's Wall', in B. Croxford, H. Goodchild, J. Lucas and Nick Ray (eds), *TRAC 2005: proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference which took place at the University of Birmingham, 31st March–3rd April 2005* (Oxford), 1–12.
- Cook, B.J., and Williams, G., (eds), 2006. *Coinage and history in the North Sea World, c.500–1200. Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald* (Leiden and Boston).
- Dark, K.R. (ed.), 1996. *External Contacts and the Economy of Late Roman and Post-Roman Britain* (Woodbridge).
- Dark, K.R., 2000. *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire* (Stroud).
- Gannon, A., 2003. *The Iconography of Early Anglo-Saxon Coinage. Sixth to Eighth Centuries* (Oxford).
- Gannon, A., 2006. 'Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery', in Cook and Williams (eds) 2006, 193–208.
- Gannon, A., forthcoming. *SCBI. British Museum Anglo-Saxon Coins, volume 1, c.600–750*.
- Grierson, P., 1953. 'A new Anglo-Saxon solidus', *NC*<sup>6</sup> 13, 88–91.
- Grierson, P., 1961. 'La fonction sociale de la monnaie en Angleterre aux VII<sup>e</sup>-VIII<sup>e</sup> siècles', *Moneta e scambi nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto), 341–85.
- Grierson, P., 1970. 'The purpose of the Sutton Hoo Coins', *Antiquity* 44, 14–18.
- Grierson, P. and Blackburn, M.A.S., 1986. *MEC*, vol. I, *The Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge).
- Guest, P., 1997. 'Hoards from the end of Roman Britain', *Coin Hoards of Roman Britain* X, 411–23.
- Guest, P., 2005. *The Gold and Silver Coins from the Hoxne Treasure* (London).
- Guest, P., 2008. 'Roman Gold and Hun Kings: the use and hoarding of solidi in the late fourth and fifth centuries', in *Roman coins outside the Empire: Ways and Phases, Contexts and Functions*. Collection Moneta 82 (Wetteren).
- Harris, A., 2003. *Byzantium, Britain and the West: the archaeology of cultural identity AD 400–650* (Stroud).
- Hendy, M.F., 1989. 'The Administration of Mints and Treasuries, fourth to seventh centuries, with an Appendix on the Production of Silver Plate', in M.F. Hendy, *The Economy, Fiscal Administration and Coinage of Byzantium* (Northampton), 1–18.
- Hines, J., forthcoming 2010. 'Units of Account in Gold and Silver in Seventh-Century England: *scillingas*, *sceattas* and *paningas*', *Antiquaries Journal*, 153–73.
- Hunter, F. and Painter, K. (eds), forthcoming. *The Traprain Law Hoard*, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph (Edinburgh).
- Kent, J.P.C., 1961. 'From Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England', in R.H.M. Dolley (ed.) *Anglo-Saxon Coins: Studies Presented to F.M. Stenton on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday 17 May 1960* (London), 1–22.
- Kent, J.P.C., 1975a 'Catalogue of the Sutton Hoo coins, blanks and billets', in R. Bruce-Mitford *et al.*, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, vol. 1, *Excavations, background, the ship, dating and inventory* (London), 607–47.
- Kent, J.P.C., 1975b 'The date of the Sutton Hoo hoard', in R. Bruce-Mitford *et al.*, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, vol. 1, *Excavations, background, the ship, dating and inventory* (London), 588–607.
- Kent, J.P.C. and Painter K.S., 1977. *Wealth of the Roman World AD 300–700* (London: British Museum Publications).
- Lane, A., 1994. 'Trade, gifts and cultural exchange in Dark-Age western Scotland', in B.E. Crawford (ed.), *Scotland in Dark-Age Europe* (St Andrews), 103–15.
- Lefroy, J.H., 1870. 'Further notice of gold coins discovered in 1828, by the late C.E. Lefroy, Esq.', *NC*<sup>2</sup> 10, 164–151.
- Mayhew, N. 2006. 'A pale gold thrymsa in the name of Vanimundus', in Cook and Williams (eds) 2006, 141–4.
- Metcalf, D.M., 1989. 'The availability and uses of gold coinage in England, c.670: Kentish primacy reconsidered', *Festschrift till Lars O. Lagerqvist, Numismatiska Meddelanden* 37, 267–74.
- Metcalf, D.M., 1993–4. *Thrymsas and Sceattas in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford*, RNS Special Publication 276, vols. 1–3 (London).
- Moorhead, T.S.N., 2006. 'Roman bronze coinage in sub-Roman and early Anglo-Saxon England', in Cook and Williams 2006, 99–109.
- Moorhead, T.S.N., 2009. 'Early Byzantine Copper Coins Found in Britain: A review in the light of new finds recorded by the Portable Antiquities Scheme', in O. Tekin (ed.), *Ancient History, Numismatics and Epigraphy in the Mediterranean World: Studies in memory of Clemens E. Bosch and Sabahat Atlan and in honour of Nezahat Baydur* (Istanbul), 263–74.
- Moorhead, T.S.N., Bland, R. and Walton, P. forthcoming. 'Finds of late Roman silver coins from England and Wales' in F. Hunter and K. Painter (eds), *The Traprain Law Hoard*, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph (Edinburgh).
- Moorhead, T.S.N. and Stuttard, D., 2010. *AD 410: The year that shook Rome* (London).
- Oddy, W.A., 1972. 'The analysis of four hoards of Merovingian gold coins', in E.T. Hall and D.M. Metcalf (eds), *Methods of Chemical and Metallurgical Investigation of Ancient Coinage*, RNS Special Publication 8 (London), 111–25.

- Oddy, W.A. *et al.*, 1972. 'Analyses of the Sutton Hoo gold coins and of other Merovingian gold coins in the British Museum', in E.T. Hall and D.M. Metcalf (eds), *Methods of Chemical and Metallurgical Investigation of Ancient Coinage*, RNS Special Publication 8 (London), 96–107.
- Pagan, H.E., 1965. 'A third gold coin of Mercia', *BNJ* 24, 8–10.
- Pirie, E.J.E., 1992. 'The seventh-century gold coinage of Northumbria', *Yorkshire Numismatist* 2, 11–15.
- Pol, A., 2006. 'Twenty-two soldiers, a goddess and an emperor: a small group of pseudo-imperial tremisses with an unusual reverse type', in Cook and Williams (eds) 2006, 111–26.
- Ponton d'Amécourt, le vicomte de, 1872. 'Farther notes on the gold coins discovered in 1828 at Crondal, Hants', *NC* n.s., 12, 72–82.
- Prou, M., 1892. *Les monnaies mérovingiennes. Catalogue des monnaies françaises de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris).
- Rigold, S.E., 1960–61. 'The two primary series of English sceattas', *BNJ* 30, 6–53.
- Rigold, S.E., 1977. 'The principal series of English sceattas', *BNJ* 47, 21–30.
- Rigold, S.E., 1975. 'The Sutton Hoo coins in the light of the contemporary background of coinage in England', including 'Finds of gold coins in England other than Sutton Hoo and Crondall', in R. Bruce-Mitford *et al.*, *The Sutton Hoo Ship Burial*, vol. 1, *Excavations, background, the ship, dating and inventory* (London), 653–77.
- Salway, P., 1984. *Roman Britain* (Oxford).
- Stahl, A.M., 1992. 'The Nature of the Sutton Hoo Coin Parcel', in C.B. Kendall and P.S. Wells (eds), *Voyage to the Other World: The Legacy of Sutton Hoo* (Minneapolis), 3–14.
- Stahl, A.M. and Oddy, W.A., 1992. 'The Date of the Sutton Hoo Coins' in R. Farrell and C. de Vegvar (eds), *Sutton Hoo: Fifty Years After* (Kalamazoo), 129–47.
- Stewart, B.H.I.H., 1978. 'Anglo-Saxon gold coins' (with appendix by W.A. Oddy), in R.A. Carson and C.M. Kraay (eds), *Scripta Nummaria Romana. Essays Presented to Humphrey Sutherland* (London), 143–72.
- Stewart, I., 1986. 'A solidus from Yorkshire', *BNJ* 56, 182–3.
- Sutherland, C.H.V., 1948. *Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage in the Light of the Crondall Hoard* (Oxford).
- Tweddle, D. and Moulden, J., 1992. 'The Seventh Century Gold Coins from York', *Yorkshire Numismatist* 2, 17–20.
- Williams, G., 1998. 'The gold coinage of Eadbald, king of Kent (AD 616–40)', *BNJ* 68, 137–40.
- Williams, G., 2005. 'Sutton Hoo: The Coins', in *Hoops-Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 30, 150–3.
- Williams, G., 2006. 'The circulation and function of gold coinage in conversion-period England, c.AD 580–680', in Cook and Williams (eds) 2006, 145–92.
- Williams, G., 2007. 'The Gold Coinage of Seventh-Century Northumbria Revisited', *NCirc* cxv, no. 1 (February), 6–8.
- Williams, G., forthcoming. 'Hack-silver and precious metal economies: a view from the Viking Age', in F. Hunter and K. Painter (eds), *The Traprain Law Hoard*, Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph (Edinburgh).
- Williams, G., and Cowell, M.R., 2009. 'Analysis of a gold mancus of Coenwulf of Mercia (AD 796–821) and other comparable material in the BM collection', *British Museum Technical Research Bulletin* 3, 31–6.
- Wood, I., 1983. *The Merovingian North Sea* (Alingsås).
- Wooding, J., 1996. *Communication and commerce along the western sealanes AD 400–800* (Oxford).
- Yorke, B., 2006. *The Conversion of Britain, 600–800* (Harlow).