

## SUFFOLK FIND OF ROMAN COINS.

Owing to the dispersal of the type used in the Numismatic Chronicle's article and the fact that the special type required for the mint-marks of certain coins is not available locally, some curtailments have been found necessary in the following reprint. As it stands, however, it gives to members of the S.I.A. a sufficient idea of the variety and importance of the Roman coins recently found at Little Bealings, and expert numismatists can supplement this information by reference to Mr. J. W. E. Pearce's article in its original form to which they probably have access. A note by Mr. V. B. Redstone relating to the find is appended.

F. S. STEVENSON.

[Reprinted from THE NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE, Vol. XV,  
Series V, No. 57, 1935, pp. 49-53].

LATE FOURTH-CENTURY HOARD OF "AES 4" FROM  
LITTLE BEALINGS.

About five hundred coins from what seems to have been originally a larger hoard have been collected by Mr. A. Gerald Smith, of Little Bealings, Suffolk, and sent to the British Museum for examination. The following were wholly or partly decipherable:

Radiate: "Tetricus" type, 5. Three were distinctly barbarous and the other two probably not from recognized mints.

Constantinian: *Gloria exercitus* (two standards) 1; (one standard) 5. *Constantinopolis* 3. *Helena, Securitas reipublice* 1.

Sons of Constantine: *Fel. temp. reparatio* 9. *Spes reipublice* 9. *Victoriae dd. Augg. q. nn.* 3.

Magentius: *Victoriae dd. nn. Aug. et Caes.* 1.

Valentinian I: *Gloria Romanorum* 2.

Valens: *Gloria Romanorum* 2. *Securitas reipublicae* 3. One has been cut down to Æ 4 size.

Valentinianian: *Gloria Romanorum* 1. Cut down. *Securitas reipublicae* 5. All are small.

Gratian: *Vot xx mult xxx* 1.

Theodosian: *Victoria Auggg.* (two Victories). Theodosius I.

Arcadius 1. Emperor illegible, 7.

*Victoria Auggg.* (single Victory). Valentinian II 18.

Two of those with illegible mint-mark have reverse division *Victoria Auggg* and are probably of Treveri. Theodosius 36. Arcadius 104. There was a great preponderance of the undivided *obv.* legend. Honorius 24. His *obv.* legend always, when visible, undivided. Emperors illegible 139.

*Salus reipublicae*. Valentinian II 8. Theodosius 12. Arcadius 13. Honorius 16. In only two of these Rome coins with legible mint-mark is the beginning of the *obv.* legend visible, and in both cases this is "Dn On . . ." Four others with illegible mint-mark begin in the same way. Emperors illegible 95. One with illegible mint-mark has *obv.* legend beginning DO . . . followed by an uncertain letter resembling M, but I feel sure that it has no analogy with the few coins hitherto noted with *Domino* or *Dominis* as the Emperor's style. Probably it is a Rome coin of Honorius, with the first N of **DNON** . . . omitted by mistake.

*Vot x mult xx.* Theodosius I.

*Illegible reverse type.* Arcadius 6.

Magnus Maximus: *Spes Romanorum* 4.

This hoard, though on a smaller scale, falls into line with those from Cirencester and Icklingham described by me in *Num. Chron.*, 1932, pp. 319 seqq., and the large Weymouth hoard, described by Mr. Salisbury in *Dorset Arch. Soc. Trans.*, 1930. It is almost entirely Æ 4 in composition, the pre-Theodosian Æ 3 types being, with about three exceptions, reduced by cutting down or by wear to the lower module. Nine-tenths are Theodosian. Like the Icklingham and Weymouth hoards it shows a predominance of Honorius in the *Salus reipublicae* type. In the Cirencester hoard, which showed evidence of longer circulation and greater wear, there was an unusually large proportion of quite illegible coins. As I showed in my Icklingham report, there is good reason to suppose an increasing illegibility in the coins of Honorius struck at Rome after his father's death, and the Cirencester hoard may well have contained—though this is unprovable—a majority of his later coins.

Neither in site-finds nor in hoards does Honorius ever come up to his brother in the *Victoria Auggg* type. It was—after 388—a Gallic type, and the Gallic mints were closed at about the time of Theodosius's death. It is only in hoards that Honorius predominates in the *Salus reipublicae* type. Site-finds give a picture of the total coin-issues, and Honorius, starting later than Arcadius, never makes up his initial handicap. When his coins became plentiful, the ties between Rome and Britain were looser, and the influx of new coinage was checked with the gradual withdrawal of the troops. But hoards, as a rule, picture the coinage of a given moment, and at the moment when the hoards under discussion were deposited, or amassed, such coinage as did come into Britain was the coinage of Honorius.

The overwhelming preponderance of Honorius in this *Salus* type, especially in the Weymouth hoard, seems to me proof positive of its continuance after 395, but a still stronger proof is given by the comparative numbers of this type for Honorius from Aquileia and Rome. Aquileia struck it in his name during the period between the death of Eugenius in 394 and that of Theodosius early in 395. So, presumably did Rome during the same limited period. But from Aquileia Honorius has always far fewer coins than his father and brother. The

numbers represent the comparative issues for each emperor up to the time the mint stopped, which can hardly have been before, but was probably about, the time of Theodosius's death. If Rome had stopped at the same time as Aquileia, the comparative numbers for the three emperors must have been fairly similar from both mints, but the Weymouth hoard gives Honorius six times as many from Rome as it gives to his brother. From Aquileia it gives him one-third of his brother's number—an extremely generous allowance, as can be seen from the records of the present and other hoards.

An attempt to explain the preponderance of Honorius at Rome by antedating his accession, besides being opposed by all our numismatic, epigraphical, and literary evidence (except the statement of the *Chronicon Paschale*), seems to me sufficiently answered by the evidence from Aquileia.

While, of course—as so common with these late coins—the bad striking renders full description impossible (nearly half the emperors and far more than half the mint-marks being indecipherable), there was only a very small percentage of the coins with quite unrecognizable type. Herein this hoard stands out in strong contrast to the very similar hoard from Cirencester, and supplies no evidence of a prolonged circulation of the coins after the Roman evacuation. I should place its deposition hardly later than about A.D. 400.

J. W. E. PEARCE.

In July, 1934, when sand was being taken from a pit near Little Bealings Church, the excavator dislodged a number of Roman coins. About 500 of them were recovered and placed in the hands of Mr. A. Gerald Smith, owner of the pit, who forwarded them to the Keeper of the Coins and Medals Department, British Museum.

When the coins were returned to Mr. Smith he received at the same time the information that "they were almost all of the fourth century, and as they were so heavily scarred by wear and time they presented difficulties of identification even to the expert. They are, in general, issues of the age of Theodosius the Great, c. A.D. 379-395. It was under Theodosius the Great that the British tyrant, Magnus Maximus, revolted, slew Theodosius's colleague, Gratian, and for some years held the West. In 388 Theodosius slew him and reunited the Empire.

An article on the Little Bealings find appeared in *The Numismatic Chronicle*, Vol. XV, Series V, No. 57, 1935, pp. 49-53. Through the kindness and courtesy of the Council of the Royal Numismatic Society, and the generous permission of the author, a copy of the article appears in this issue of the Proceedings. Cordial thanks are due to J. Allan, Esq., Editor of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, for his generous assistance in elucidating the character of this find of Roman coins in Suffolk.

V.B.R.