

Fractured Britannia: The Twilight of Roman Britain



ARCHAEOPRESS ROMAN ARCHAEOLOGY 137

FRACTURED BRITANNIA

THE TWILIGHT OF ROMAN BRITAIN

Richard Henry

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

13-14 Market Square

Bicester

Oxfordshire OX26 6AD

United Kingdom

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-80583-245-4

ISBN 978-1-80583-246-1 (e-Pdf)

© Richard Henry and Archaeopress 2026

Cover: Items of dress and coinage dating to late Roman Britain (photos: Birmingham Museums Trust, Essex County Council, Hampshire Cultural Trust, Magdalena Wachnik, The MET Museum, Norfolk County Council, The Salisbury Museum, York Museums Trust)



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

Contents

List of Figures.....	v
List of Tables.....	x
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Introduction.....	xii
1. A Brief Outline of the History of Late Roman Britain	1
2. Varying Lenses: Academic Reflections on the End of Roman Britain	3
Narrative approach 1: Continuity of <i>Romanitas</i>	3
An Anglo-Saxon presence in the fourth century.....	5
Narrative approach 2: Catastrophic change or rupture	6
Narrative approach 3: Transformation	7
3. The Diocese of Britain	9
The Governance of Late Roman Britain	11
The political structure	11
Diocesan or local administration?	12
The army in Late Roman Britain	13
The northern frontier – the <i>Dux Britanniarum</i>	15
The Saxon shore – <i>Comes Litoris Saxonici</i>	16
Wales.....	18
The field army - <i>Comes Britanniarum</i>	18
Taxation and the economy	19
Tax in coin.....	20
Taxation in kind and the distribution of goods by the state	21
Urban centres – a decline or a change in function?	23
Major urban centres in the fourth century	23
Other nucleated settlements	25
The countryside	26
Ceasing to be Roman – Evidence of the state in fifth century Britain	28
The administration and the end of the tax cycle	28
The military	29
Conclusions	29
4. Recognising a Soldier or Official.....	31
Crossbow brooches	33
The <i>cingulum militare</i>	33
Spurs	35
Penannular brooches	35
5. Identity and Material Culture	36
Material culture and agency	36
The agency of objects.....	37
Facets of identity	38
Ethnic boundary change	41
Conclusion.....	42
6. Aims, Objectives and Methodological Approaches.....	44
7. Crossbow Brooches.....	46
Typological studies.....	46
Production	46

Distribution.....	47
Spatial distribution.....	48
Social distribution	49
Continuation into the fifth century.....	49
Research questions	50
The dataset.....	50
Analysis and Results	51
PAS Finds.....	54
Comparison by site type	54
Correspondence analysis.....	60
Spatial distribution.....	61
Continuation into the fifth century.....	61
Key observations.....	61
8. The <i>Cingulum Militare</i> and Associated Belt Fittings.....	64
Typological studies	64
Type I belt sets	68
Type II belt sets.....	72
Type III belt sets.....	76
Type IV Belt sets	78
Typological approach.....	78
Production	79
Previous distribution studies.....	79
Types I and II	80
Types III and IV	80
The movement of people.....	82
Social distribution	82
Continuation into the fifth century.....	83
Research questions	83
The dataset.....	83
Analysis and Results	83
PAS Finds.....	84
Comparison by site type	84
Correspondence analysis.....	92
Comparison by type	93
Continuation into the fifth century.....	123
Key observations on belt fittings	125
9. Spurs.....	131
Typological studies	131
Typological approach used	131
Production	131
Distribution.....	131
Status and identity	131
Research questions	132
The dataset.....	132
Analysis and Results	132
PAS Finds.....	134
Comparison by site type	134
Comparison by type	138
Continuation into the fifth century.....	141
Key observations.....	141
10. Penannular Brooches.....	143
Typological studies	143

Typological approach used	143
Production	143
Distribution.....	143
Status and identity	143
Continuation into the fifth century.....	145
Research Questions.....	145
The dataset.....	146
Analysis and Results.....	146
Penannular brooches by context date	147
Comparison by site type	147
Correspondence analysis.....	154
Comparison by brooch type.....	155
Key observations.....	159
11. Coinage.....	163
Typological studies.....	163
Typological approach used	164
Production	164
Distribution	164
Continuation into the fifth century.....	164
Research questions	164
The dataset.....	164
Analysis and Results	165
Comparisons of the British means.....	165
PAS finds.....	169
Comparison by site type	169
Correspondence analysis.....	170
Discussion.....	188
Key observations.....	189
12. Siliquae and Solidi	191
Categorising clipped <i>siliquae</i> – clip factor	191
Distribution.....	191
<i>Siliquae</i>	191
<i>Solidi</i>	192
Continuation into the fifth century.....	192
Research questions	192
The dataset.....	192
Results.....	193
<i>Siliquae</i>	194
<i>Solidi</i>	203
Discussion.....	210
Key observations.....	210
13. A Chronological and Geographical Overview of the Evidence	211
The mid-fourth century.....	213
The later fourth century.....	215
The fifth century transition	221
Conclusions	232
14. Peeling Back the Layers: Roles and Regalia in Late Roman Society	236
High status, high stakes; artefacts and the dynamics of power.....	236
Military.....	237
Nucleated	238
Rural.....	238

Unveiling roles and decoding authority	239
An integrated diocese or a veneer?	240
Military	241
Urban	242
Nucleated sites	242
Rural	243
15. Dissolving Threads, the Transformation from a Roman Diocese to Emerging Post-Roman Polities	246
An imperial presence	246
The taxation cycle	247
Divided paths: Rome's twilight in Britain and on the continent	248
Fifth century transformations	249
Conclusion	253
Bibliography	257
Primary Sources	257
Secondary Sources	257

List of Figures

Figure 3.1	The provinces of the fourth century diocese. The boundaries of the provinces are unknown, the provinces of Britannia Secunda and Flavia Caesariensis have been inverted by some authors. A further fifth province of Valentia might have been created after AD 368 or it could be a rebranding of one of the four provinces. (Map by Richard Henry)	10
Figure 3.2	The strands of the civilian bureaucracy responsible to the Praetorian Prefect and the Count of the Sacred Largesses (including elements from the <i>Notitia Dignitatum</i> © Bodleian Library)	12
Figure 3.3	The commands of the comes litoris Saxonici and the dux Britanniarum	14
Figure 3.4	Depiction of the forts listed in the <i>Notitia Dignitatum</i> commanded by the dux Britanniarum (© Bodleian library)	15
Figure 3.5	The defences of the Saxon shore in Britain and on the continent. In Britain, Walton Castle and Caistor-on-Sea are not listed in the <i>Notitia Dignitatum</i>	17
Figure 3.6	The Saxon shore fort at Richborough (© Richard Henry)	18
Figure 3.7	The solidus, miliarensis, siliqua and nummus. (Copyright the Portable Antiquities Scheme)	20
Figure 3.8	The granaries at Birdoswald fort (© Pete Savin)	22
Figure 3.9	The urban centres and nucleated settlements in Roman Britain based on unpublished data on nucleated settlements provided by Paul Booth	24
Figure 4.1	A late Roman official and two soldiers from the Villa de Romana del Casale villa in Sicily (© José Luiz Bernardes Ribeiro)	31
Figure 4.2	State fabricae derived from the <i>Notitia Dignitatum</i> after Jones (Jones, 1964) and Esmonde Cleary (2013)	32
Figure 4.3	A servant holding their master's cloak on which a crossbow brooch is attached from the Silistra Tomb, Bulgaria (Illustration by Nick Griffiths)	33
Figure 4.4	A servant holding their master's cingulum militare from the Silistra tomb, Bulgaria (Illustration by Nick Griffiths)	33
Figure 4.5	The four male figures depicted on the wall paintings from Mausoleum R8 in Poundbury which have been interpreted as individuals who hold office (© Richard Henry)	34
Figure 4.6	A servant carrying their masters trousers over their shoulder and shoes in their right hand from the Silistra tomb, Bulgaria. Note the belt with a buckle and a strap end. (Illustration by Nick Griffiths)	35
Figure 7.1	Examples of Keller/Pröttel types 1, 2i, 3/4b, 5i and 6ii from Lankhills cemetery, Winchester. Mackrell subtypes are provided within the brackets. (© Winchester Excavations Committee, Illustrations by Nick Griffiths)	47
Figure 7.2	The distribution of crossbow brooches collated by Collins (2017a) of 286 brooches and Carr (2019) of 488. The latter includes earlier light crossbow types resulting in a significantly different distribution particularly in the south of Britain	49
Figure 7.3	The distribution of crossbow brooches in Britain (Total 404)	52
Figure 7.4	The quantity of crossbow brooches recorded from individual sites (with a minimum of three examples)	53
Figure 7.5	Comparison of the dataset collated by Swift and this study divided by Keller/Pröttel/Swift type. There is a significant increase in the proportion of Type 3/4 brooches in Britain	53
Figure 7.6	Comparison of the corpus derived from the PAS (134) with site finds (271)	55
Figure 7.7	Comparison of the proportion of brooch types between Nucleated sites, Rural sites and the PAS Rural datasets	56
Figure 7.8	The proportion of crossbow brooches from military, urban, nucleated and rural sites within the corpus	56
Figure 7.9	Comparison of the proportions of Keller/Pröttel/Swift types from military, urban, nucleated and rural sites	57
Figure 7.10	Comparison of the Keller/Pröttel types from the military sites	57
Figure 7.11	Comparison of the quantities of brooches recovered from Large towns and civitas capitals	58
Figure 7.12	Comparison of the proportions of crossbow brooches from defended vici and undefended nucleated settlements	59
Figure 7.13	The proportions of crossbow brooches recorded within different sub-categories of rural sites	59
Figure 7.14	Correspondence analysis of the crossbow corpus by site type, sub type, the three study areas and sites with six or more brooches against the main types. Sites with high proportions of Type 1 yet with no Types 5 or 6 are plotted in the top left, sites with high proportions of Type 1, 5 and 6 in the bottom left. Higher proportions of Type 2 in the centre and Type 3/4 are located to the right of the plot, those with lower proportions of Type 5 and 6 are located to the bottom and bottom right	60
Figure 7.15	Spatial distribution of the crossbow brooches types	62
Figure 8.1	The typology of late Roman zoomorphic buckles by Hawkes and Dunning (1961). After Hawkes and Dunning (1961), fig. 13-22	65
Figure 8.2	The typology devised by Sommer (1984) dividing buckles into three types (Sorte) and various sub types (Forms). A selection of the forms categorised by Sommer (1984) are included in the figure. After Sommer (1984)	66
Figure 8.3	The typology devised by Simpson (1976) focussing on the buckle shape to define four groups	67

Figure 8.4	Elements highlighted by Laycock (2007; 2008) as indicative of British manufacture. Illustrations derived from Hawkes and Dunning (1961).....	69
Figure 8.5	A reconstruction of how a Type IB buckle and associated strap end nail cleaner may have been worn. Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	70
Figure 8.6	Examples of Type IA, IB and associated strap ends. Latton, Wiltshire (top left), Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire (top centre), Wadley, Oxfordshire (top right), Dorchester on Thames (centre), Bowerchalke, Wiltshire (bottom left) and 'Dorset' (bottom right). Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	71
Figure 8.7	A reconstruction of how a Type II buckle, belt stiffeners and associated strap end may have been worn. Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	72
Figure 8.8	Examples of Type IIA (Lankhills, Winchester), IIB (Colchester), a propeller belt stiffener (bottom left, Standon, Hertfordshire) and associated strap ends (amphora - centre left, Richborough, insular amphora - centre right, Lankhills, heart - right, Ickham, Kent). Illustration by Nick Griffiths and Hawkes and Dunning (1961).....	74
Figure 8.9	A reconstruction of how a Type IIIa buckle, belt stiffeners and associated strap ends and fittings may have been worn. Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	76
Figure 8.10	Example of a Type IIIA buckle, Lancet strap end, associated belt fittings, stiffeners and loops (From Dorchester on Thames excluding one belt stiffener from Richborough (bottom centre)). Illustration by Nick Griffiths	77
Figure 8.11	A reconstruction of how a Type IV buckle, belt stiffeners and associated strap end may have been worn. Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	78
Figure 8.12	Example of a Type IVA buckle (Smithfield, London) and lancet strap end (Mansell Street, London). Illustration by Nick Griffiths.....	79
Figure 8.13	Distribution of insular Types I and II (left) by Hawkes and Dunning (1961, Fig. 9) with the distribution of Type I (centre) and Type II (right) by Leahy (2007, Fig 4 and Fig. 5).....	81
Figure 8.14	The distribution of Type I and II buckles in the northern frontier by Coulston (2010, Fig 6.1). The distribution highlights the general paucity of Type I and II on Hadrian's Wall but highlights other belt fittings have been recovered (the smaller circular dots)	81
Figure 8.15	Distribution of Types III and IV by Hawkes and Dunning, left (1961, Fig. 5) and Leahy, right (2007, Fig. 6)	82
Figure 8.16	The distribution of all belt fittings in Britain associated with the late Roman cingulum militaire (n=1,334)	85
Figure 8.17	The quantity of belt fittings recorded from individual sites (with a minimum of six examples)	86
Figure 8.18	Comparison of belt fittings recorded from excavations and museum collections (543) with those recorded with the PAS (791)	86
Figure 8.19	Comparison of the key belt fitting types recorded with the PAS and excavated datasets	87
Figure 8.20	Comparison of belt fittings from military, urban, nucleated, and rural sites.....	88
Figure 8.21	Comparison of the spatial distribution of belt fittings defined as being produced in Britain or the Continent. Some types such as propeller belt stiffeners or non-zoomorphic buckles have been defined as continental	88
Figure 8.22	Comparison of continental and insular material defined by site type.....	89
Figure 8.23	Comparison of the military sub types. The assemblage of the Saxon shore fort at Richborough dominates the corpus	90
Figure 8.24	Comparison of the continental and insular material recorded within the corpus from urban centres	90
Figure 8.25	Comparison of continental and insular belt fittings from nucleated sites	91
Figure 8.26	Comparison of continental and insular belt fittings within rural sites.....	91
Figure 8.27	Correspondence analysis of all belt fittings from Britain excluding London, the Other military subgroup and Sutton as well as propeller stiffeners and rosette hanger	92
Figure 8.28	The distribution of all Type IIA buckles in Britain.....	94
Figure 8.29	The social distribution of all Type IIA buckles.....	95
Figure 8.30	Comparison of the spatial distribution of continental Type IIA buckles and insular Type IIA buckles	95
Figure 8.31	Comparison of the social distribution of IIA continental and insular buckles	96
Figure 8.32	The spatial distribution of Type IIB buckles	97
Figure 8.33	The spatial distribution of all non-zoomorphic type buckles	98
Figure 8.34	The social distribution of all non-zoomorphic buckles	99
Figure 8.35	The spatial distribution of all non-zoomorphic type buckles divided by plate type	100
Figure 8.36	The social distribution of non-zoomorphic buckles divided by plate type	101
Figure 8.37	The spatial distribution of all amphora strap ends	102
Figure 8.38	The social distribution of all amphora strap ends	103
Figure 8.39	Comparison of continental and insular amphora strap ends	103
Figure 8.40	The social distribution of continental and insular amphora strap ends	104
Figure 8.41	Comparison of the attachment methods of insular and continental amphora strap ends	104
Figure 8.42	The spatial distribution of heart shaped strap ends	106
Figure 8.43	The social distribution of heart shaped strap ends	107
Figure 8.44	The spatial distribution of all propeller belt stiffeners	108
Figure 8.45	The social distribution of all propeller shaped belt stiffeners	109
Figure 8.46	The spatial distribution of propeller belt stiffeners with raised spines	110
Figure 8.47	The spatial distribution of belt fittings associated with Type II belts	111

Figure 8.48	All Type IA buckles	112
Figure 8.49	The distribution of all Type IA buckles against subsets within this dataset consisting of continental and insular IA buckles, IA Lionhead and IA Crescentic	113
Figure 8.50	The social distribution of Type IA buckles	114
Figure 8.51	The distribution of Type IB buckles	115
Figure 8.52	The social distribution of Type IB buckles	116
Figure 8.53	Comparison of the distribution of Prototype Tortworth and Tortworth strap ends	116
Figure 8.54	The social distribution of Prototype Tortworth and Tortworth amphora strap ends	117
Figure 8.55	The distribution of short propeller belt stiffeners less than 20mm. These objects appear to be associated with the Type I belt sets due to their size	118
Figure 8.56	Comparison of all Type IA buckles, Type IB buckles, Prototype Tortworth strap ends and Tortworth strap ends	119
Figure 8.57	The spatial distribution of Type IIIA and IIIB buckles	120
Figure 8.58	The social distribution of Type IIIA and Type IIIB buckles	121
Figure 8.59	The spatial distribution of Type IV buckles	122
Figure 8.60	The social distribution of Type IV buckles	123
Figure 8.61	The spatial distribution of Type VA strap ends	124
Figure 8.62	The social distribution of Type VA strap ends	125
Figure 8.63	The spatial distribution of rosette hangers (Hawkes and Dunning VI)	126
Figure 8.64	The social distribution of Type VI rosette hangers	127
Figure 8.65	Belt fittings associated with Type III and Type IV belt sets	128
Figure 8.66	The distribution of belt fittings from Early-Medieval burials	129
Figure 9.1	A Type C prick super from Lankhills (top) and a D prick spur from Rudston (bottom). Illustration by Nick Griffiths	131
Figure 9.2	The distribution of rivet spurs by Cool (2010a; Figure 1.3)	132
Figure 9.3	The distribution of the corpus of 86 rivet spurs in Britain (site finds and PAS)	133
Figure 9.4	The quantity of sites where two or more spurs have been recorded from Britain	134
Figure 9.5	Comparison of excavated examples of late Roman rivet spurs and those recorded with the PAS	135
Figure 9.6	The proportion of rivet spurs from military sites, urban sites, nucleated and rural sites (n=47)	136
Figure 9.7	Comparison of the proportion of rivet spurs from the military sub types (n=17)	137
Figure 9.8	Comparison of spurs from nucleated sites (n=7)	137
Figure 9.9	Comparison of proportions of rivet spurs from rural sub types. (n=8)	138
Figure 9.10	The distribution of Type C spurs (Eastern Provincial variant)	139
Figure 9.11	The distribution of Type D spurs (Western Provincial variant)	140
Figure 9.12	The social distribution of Type D rivet spurs (n=32)	141
Figure 10.1	The revised penannular brooch typology by Booth (2015, Figure 4.42)	144
Figure 10.2	Comparative chronology of all penannular brooch types considered by Booth (2015, Figure 4.40). The darker areas represent higher quantities	145
Figure 10.3	The distribution of Types C, D, E and M within Booth's (2015) corpus. Type C and D both occur from the first century BC with major peaks in deposition in the first and fourth centuries AD; Types E and M have later fourth and early fifth century peaks. Note the inconsistency in graduation	146
Figure 10.4	Distribution of penannular brooches from Roman contexts (total =454)	148
Figure 10.5	The quantity of penannular brooches recorded from individual sites (with a minimum of five examples)	149
Figure 10.6	Distribution of penannular brooches from all Roman, early Roman, and late Roman contexts	149
Figure 10.7	Comparison of the proportions of each Penannular brooch type from Early Roman and Late Roman archaeological contexts	150
Figure 10.8	Comparison of the social distribution of penannular brooches from early and late Roman contexts. The other category defined here is primarily hillforts	151
Figure 10.9	Comparison of early and late Roman penannular brooches by military sub type	151
Figure 10.10	Comparison of early and late Roman penannular brooches by urban sub type	152
Figure 10.11	Comparison of early and late Roman penannular brooches by nucleated settlement sub type	152
Figure 10.12	Comparison of early and late Roman penannular brooches by rural sub type	153
Figure 10.13	Correspondence Analysis plot of all penannular brooches of Roman date by type and site type	154
Figure 10.14	Correspondence analysis of early Roman penannular brooches	155
Figure 10.15	Correspondence analysis of late Roman penannular brooch types	156
Figure 10.16	The distribution of penannulars from early Roman (top left) and late Roman contexts (top right) Type A penannular brooches and early Roman (bottom left) and Late Roman contexts (bottom right) Type C brooches	157
Figure 10.17	Comparison of the social distribution of early Roman and late Roman Type A, C, D, E and M penannular brooches	158
Figure 10.18	The distribution of early Roman (left) and late Roman (right) Type D and Type E penannular brooches	160
Figure 10.19	The distribution of Type M penannular brooches	161
Figure 11.1	The quantity of coins from parishes where a minimum of 25 coins have been recorded	166
Figure 11.2	Sites in Britain with an assemblage of at least 2,000 coins. A further 681 coins were recorded from the fortress at York	167

Figure 11.3	Comparison of the British means developed by Reece (1991), Walton (2012) which excludes Richborough and this study which also excludes Richborough	167
Figure 11.4	Comparison of the quantity of coins recorded by parish divided by collection method	169
Figure 11.5	Comparison of the nucleated, rural and PAS rural datasets. The PAS material generally appears to include assemblages from a range of site types.....	170
Figure 11.6	Correspondence analysis of the numismatic dataset divided by Reece period	171
Figure 11.7	The quantities of Phase D coins (left) and Phase E coins (right) from parishes with a minimum of 25 coins	172
Figure 11.8	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Phase D (320.033) denoted with a horizontal line. The results emphasise that some regions of the Diocese have significantly lower coin loss.....	172
Figure 11.9	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Phase D (AD 330-364) based on their per mill	173
Figure 11.10	All coin hoards from Phase D (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Phase D (right).....	174
Figure 11.11	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Phase E (AD 364-402) depicted with a horizontal line. The results emphasise that some regions of the Diocese have significantly lower coin loss particularly the North of the diocese	175
Figure 11.12	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Phase E (AD 364-402) based on their per mill	175
Figure 11.13	All coin hoards from Phase E (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Phase E (right)	176
Figure 11.14	The spatial distribution of coinage from Phase F (AD 402-498)	177
Figure 11.15	All coin hoards from Phase F (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Phase F (right)	178
Figure 11.16	The quantities of coins from Reece period 17-21 from parishes with a minimum of 25 coins	179
Figure 11.17	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Period 17 (AD 330-348) depicted with a horizontal line	180
Figure 11.18	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Reece period 17 (AD 330-348) based on their per mill	180
Figure 11.19	All coin hoards from Reece period 17 (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Reece period 17 (right).....	181
Figure 11.20	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Period 18 (AD 348-364) depicted with a horizontal line	182
Figure 11.21	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Reece period 18 (AD 348-364) based on their per mill	182
Figure 11.22	All coin hoards from Reece period 18 (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Reece period 18 (right).....	183
Figure 11.23	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Period 19 (AD 364-378) depicted with a horizontal line	183
Figure 11.24	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Reece period 19 (AD 364-378) based on their per mill	184
Figure 11.25	All coin hoards from Reece period 19 (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Reece period 19 (right).....	185
Figure 11.26	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Period 20 (AD 378-388) depicted with a horizontal line	185
Figure 11.27	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Reece period 20 (AD 378-388) based on their per mill. The lower quartile is 0 for this particular period and in general the coins are rare as site finds.....	186
Figure 11.28	All coin hoards from Reece period 20 (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Reece period 20 (right).....	187
Figure 11.29	Comparison of the mean for each region of Britain against the British average for Period 21 (AD 388-402) depicted with a horizontal line	187
Figure 11.30	The upper and lower quartile of sites from Reece period 21 (AD 388-402) based on their per mill. The lower quartile is 0 for this particular period, these coins are more common than those struck in Reece period 20	188
Figure 11.31	All coin hoards from Reece period 21 (left), the number of nummi hoards, precious metal hoards and mixed hoards of precious and base metal hoards from Reece period 21 (right).....	189
Figure 12.1	The clip factors developed by Guest (2005, 111).....	192
Figure 12.2	The distribution of 700 <i>siliquae</i> analyses by Bland et al (2013, Illustration 10.1)	193
Figure 12.3	A comparison of fourth and fifth century hoards and single finds by Bland and Loriot (2010).....	194
Figure 12.4	The distribution of all <i>siliquae</i> from the PAS database.....	195
Figure 12.5	The quantity of <i>siliquae</i> recorded with the PAS by region	196
Figure 12.6	Comparison of the distribution of <i>siliquae</i> from Phase D (AD 330-364) with Phase E (AD 364-402)	196
Figure 12.7	The distribution of all <i>siliquae</i> mapped against the distribution of Reece periods 17-21	198
Figure 12.8	Comparison of the spatial distribution of all <i>siliquae</i> against unclipped, clipped and uncertain examples. The majority of the latter consist of fragments where it is not possible to state with any certainty if a coin has been clipped or records without images	199
Figure 12.9	The quantity of PAS <i>siliquae</i> divided by clipped, unclipped, and uncertain categories	200
Figure 12.10	The proportion of unclipped, clipped and uncertain <i>siliquae</i> by region	200
Figure 12.11	The proportions of <i>siliquae</i> divided by region and clip factor for Reece periods 18-21	201
Figure 12.12	The spatial distribution of clipped <i>siliquae</i> divided by Clip factor.....	202

Figure 12.13	Coin hoards which include clipped coins mapped against all coin hoards deposited after AD 364	204
Figure 12.14	The distribution of gold coinage from AD 330 in Britain.....	205
Figure 12.15	The distribution of gold Roman coins struck after AD 330 compared with the distribution from Phases D-F..	206
Figure 12.16	The proportion of gold coins by region from AD 330 and from Phases D-F.....	207
Figure 12.17	The distribution of all gold coins and coins from Reece periods 17-19	208
Figure 12.18	The distribution of gold coinage from Reece period 20-23	209
Figure 13.1	The fifteen regions selected to considering the changing regional patterns observed in the late Roman period	212
Figure 13.2	Regions where high coin loss from Phase D occurs (red hatching) compared with regions which tend to have lower coin loss (purple hatching) mapped against coin hoards from Phase D (AD 330-364)	214
Figure 13.3	The distribution of all belt fittings linked with Type 1, 2 and 3/4 crossbow brooches (see Chapter 7) and Type II belt sets (See Chapter 8).....	215
Figure 13.4	Heatmap of regions considered as part of this study based on the number of elements present or absent in Table 13.2.....	216
Figure 13.5	Regions where high coin loss from Phase E occurs (red hatching) compared with regions which tend to have lower coin loss (purple hatching) mapped against all coin hoards from Phase E (AD 364-402). The environs of Richborough has high coin loss from this Phase.....	218
Figure 13.6	The distribution of sheet metal crossbow brooches Type 5 and 6, top left (See Chapter 7), Type M Penannular brooches, top right (See Chapter 10), all fittings associated with Type I belt sets, centre left (See Chapter 8) all fittings associated with Type III and Type IV belt sets in white with solely buckles mapped in red, centre right (See Chapter 8) and rivet spurs, bottom (See Chapter 9).....	220
Figure 13.7	Heatmap of regions considered as part of this study based on the number of elements present or absent in Table 13.3.....	222
Figure 13.8	The distribution of coins struck in Phase F compared with precious metal coin hoards after AD 364, hoards with clipped coinage and the regions where clipped coinage circulated (blue hatching). While the hoard and clipped <i>siliquae</i> both demonstrate widespread circulating currency, in contrast clipped coins within hoards is much more limited to three key regions suggesting the last areas that coinage remained in use. The coastal emphasis of single coins after AD 402 emphasises the pattern seen where by the 460s coinage had become simply bullion	225
Figure 13.9	The distribution of late Roman double sided antler combs in Britain (After Crummy and Henry, 2024, Figure 6.1). While it was suggested that some of the patterns were geological and relate to artefact recovery, note the absence of the material around Lincoln is a pattern seen with clipped <i>siliquae</i> hoards. Similarly, absences of material in parts of East Anglia appears significant.....	226
Figure 13.10	The distribution of the earliest forms of fifth century Cruciform brooches based on data provided by Toby Martin (2015).....	227
Figure 13.11	The distribution of fifth century supporting arm brooches based on data provided by Gerrard (In press)	228
Figure 13.12	The distribution of QBS fittings in Britain excluding D shaped tubes (Swift 2019).....	229
Figure 13.13	The distribution of Roman belt fittings in early-medieval graves	230
Figure 13.14	The core distributions of Group 1.1 cruciform brooches (yellow), Quoit Brooch Style objects (red) supporting arm brooches (blue) and late Roman belt fittings in Anglo-Saxon burials (green). The results demonstrate that in particular areas a complex pattern emerges with all object forms found such as the environs of Winchester, whereas in the environs of Lincoln or in Norfolk and the Suffolk Coast the material considered here is primarily Germanic in origin.....	231
Figure 13.15	Heatmap of regions considered as part of this study based on the number of fifth-century elements present or absent in Table 13.4	233

List of Tables

Table 3.1	The Saxon shore forts of Britain and the latest activity identified through archaeological excavation (Gerrard, 2013, 33; Collins and Breeze, 2014; Drinkwater, 2023). Walton Castle is recorded from antiquarian research but has been lost due to coastal erosion. Clausentum (Bitterne Manor, Southampton) has been previously suggested as a shore fort by Johnson (1976) and Cunliffe (1975), this has been recently questioned (Henry and Russel, 2024)	19
Table 7.1	Revised Keller/Prottel typology (after Swift 2000) and Mackreth (2011). Two definitive type 3.2a are gold, one incomplete possible example of this type is constructed from copper-alloy	48
Table 7.2	Dated examples of crossbow brooches from Britain. As can be seen the vast majority are from a single site; Lankhills cemetery in Winchester. The example from Wroxeter is unlikely to be as late as the sixth century ..	50
Table 8.1	Well dated examples of the different fittings associated with Type I belt sets (derived from Henry 2022b)	70
Table 8.2	Comparison of the elements highlighted by Laycock (2007) to define continental and insular examples of Type IA	72
Table 8.3	Well dated examples of the different fittings associated with Type I belt sets (derived from Henry 2022b Table 8.3)	73
Table 8.4	Comparison of the elements highlighted by Laycock (2007) to define continental and insular examples of Type IIA	75
Table 8.5	Examples of well dated Type III belt fittings derived from Henry 2023b)	77
Table 8.6	The typological approach used within this study for belt fittings	80
Table 11.1	Roman Britain divided by Reece period and ABCDEF Phase	163
Table 11.2	The breakdown of coins that can be identified to a particular Reece period (rather than ABCDEF Phase) within a recent corpus (see Henry, 2024a; Henry, 2024b)	165
Table 11.3	The national mean and the upper and lower quartile for each Phase. The quartiles have been developed as part of the analysis of the top 25 per cent and bottom 25 per cent of sites based on each Phase	168
Table 11.4	The national mean and the upper and lower quartile for each Reece period. The quartiles have been developed as part of the analysis of the top 25 per cent and bottom 25 per cent of sites based on each Reece period	168
Table 12.1	The clip factors defined by Guest (2005, 111) and the three categories used within parts of this study	192
Table 13.1	The material considered as part of the main chronological phases	211
Table 13.2	The presence (green) or absence of different classes of material in the mid-fourth century from the regional study areas	217
Table 13.3	The presence or absence of different classes of material in the later fourth century from the regional study areas, aside from the lower quartile, orange represents an absence of a particular object type from a region	223
Table 13.4	The presence or absence of different classes of material during the fifth-century transition from the regional study areas. Where material is totally absent from a region it is highlighted in orange	234

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my two supervisors John Creighton and Hella Eckardt as well as my PhD Panel Chair Michael Fulford and my two examiners James Gerrard and Gabor Thomas. I'm deeply grateful to John for his invaluable guidance and support throughout the process of refining this thesis. His dedication, patience and expertise have been instrumental in shaping my growth as a researcher, and I truly appreciate his generosity and commitment.

Thank you to all of the specialists who have helped me develop my ideas, provided advice or supplied data since this idea first began. This includes Richard Abdy, Anna Booth, Paul Booth, Julian Bowsher, Hilary Cool, Simon Esmonde Cleary, Nina Crummy, John Cruse, Sam Dumble, the late Bruce Eagles, Diane Eagles, James Gerrard, Stephen Greep, Nick Griffiths, James Harland, Stefanie Hoss, Stuart Laycock, Kevin Leahy, Kris Lockyear, William Manning, Michael Marshall, Sam Moorhead, Quita Mould, Johan Nicolay, Martin Pitts, Richard Reece, Ian Riddler, David Roberts, Nico Roymans, Ruth Shaffrey, Ellen Swift, Marquita Volken, Philippa Walton, David Wigg-Wolf and Barbara Yorke.

I am thankful for all the time Anna Booth, Paul Booth, Ken Dark, Bruce Eagles, Simon Esmonde Cleary, Nick Griffiths, Sam Moorhead, David Roberts and Barbara Yorke have given in particular commenting on various pieces of my work and other publications relating to this wider research.

I want to thank both Paul Booth and David Brear whose help transformed the thesis into this book. Paul proof read this revised version of my thesis and to David's thoughtful input, encouragement and generosity helped bring this book to a broader audience. Similarly, thank you to Danko Josic for his work on preparing this monograph.

The illustrations primarily used here have been produced by Nick Griffiths with thanks to the Winchester Excavation Committee. Part of Nick's work was supported by a Roman Finds Group grant.

Without my family none of this could have happened in the first place. I wish to thank my parents Alison and Chris, as well as Cath and Emma for putting up with all the chats about Romans. Since the thesis which forms the basis of this book was submitted we have had two new arrivals, Chris and Paul, who have shown that sleepless nights and missed deadlines are worth every moment. Finally, without the kindness and generosity of Alan White over the years this PhD would never have come to fruition.

Introduction

This book is an in-depth study of the distribution of coinage and elite items of dress in later and sub-Roman Britain. It builds on previous research on the end of Roman Britain by the author looking at a range of numismatic and artefactual evidence on a regional scale (Henry, 2018b; Henry, 2018a; Henry, 2020b; Henry, 2021a; Henry and Moorhead, 2022) or a national scale (Henry, 2022b; Crummary and Henry, 2024; Henry, 2024c).

The Later Roman world was markedly different from the Principate, as the distinct categories of legionaries and auxilia, and military and civilian, had long since dissolved. Troops were now divided into frontier troops (*limitanei*) and a mobile field army (the *comitatenses*), but identifying them in the archaeological record is notoriously difficult.

Division between military and civilian are problematic too. The military and bureaucracy were merged. Both groups ranked as soldiers and used the same objects to denote their status. Similarly, the local elite, responsible for much of the day-to-day administration of the diocese of Britain, begin to adopt military fashions, leading to an evolution of dress accessories throughout the fourth century.

This book aims to collate and explore the extensive datasets now available, extracting patterns within various forms of material culture associated with soldiers, officials, or high-status local elites, as well as coinage, which reflected the tax system, economic control and engagement with the state. Different denominations performed different roles with gold and silver used for pay and taxation. Base metal coins were used by the rural population as part of the process of converting agricultural surplus into tax. While many of these datasets have been studied in isolation, this study seeks to examine them systematically in combination and make the datasets publicly accessible. It will highlight the value of utilising big data and the opportunities it provides that enables us to engage with the material from a new perspective.

The objects examined serve as key markers of late Roman status and identity. Many remained in use for decades, even when damaged, highlighting their enduring influence. This longevity offers valuable insights into the social and political shifts of the fifth century. The evidence suggests regional variation: while some areas maintained Roman material culture well into the fifth century, others abandoned it as early as AD 375.

These patterns can be better understood through the lens of “ethnic boundary change.” This term was first coined in 1969 by Fredrik Barth and is better described as the changing boundaries which relate to the wider concept of identity. Crucially, ethnic boundary change does not solely concern the ethnicity of an individual; rather, it refers to the broader, often fluid, processes by which group identities are maintained, negotiated, or transformed over time.

In some cases, an endogenous shift occurred, where communities gradually moved away from Roman identities, either by choice or necessity, as imperial structures weakened. In contrast, in other regions, exogenous drift introduced new cultural influences, with communities selectively adopting external practices, whether through contact with incoming groups or evolving local power dynamics. A systematic evaluation of these processes, alongside an analysis of late Roman power structures, provides fresh perspectives on Britain’s transformation from an integrated Roman diocese to smaller post-Roman polities. Rather than a sudden rupture, the evidence points to a complex, regionally varied transition shaped by both internal decisions and external pressures.

This study consists of four sections:

Chapters 1-2 introduces the period and the ways in which it has been interpreted. It provides a brief outline of the history of Roman Britain and the key events of the later fourth and fifth centuries. It then evaluates various historical and archaeological interpretations, focusing on the conceptual frameworks used to understand the transition from Roman rule.

A key theoretical approach in this study is ethnic boundary change, which has been viewed as a flexible concept that must be tailored to specific social and historical contexts (Wimmer, 2013). Applying this to late Roman Britain allows for a broader discussion of how different groups navigated the fragmentation of imperial authority, the collapse of the coin using economy and developed new identities (or modified them), political structures. These shifts were not uniform—some regions experienced endogenous change, where communities redefined their identities from within, while others underwent exogenous drift, adopting new strategies and influences from external sources potentially as early as the 370s.

To ground this theoretical framework, Chapter 3 briefly introduces the structures of the late Roman state in the Diocese of Britain. It explores key aspects such as taxation, major urban centres, and rural economies, identifying the principal actors involved in governance and economic administration. This is followed by a critical assessment of how previous studies have utilised similar datasets to interpret the dissolution of Roman power and the emergence of post-Roman polities.

This study seeks to address four key research questions: Can we establish a connection between particular objects and the Roman state? Can we identify different officials? Was Britain fully integrated into the empire at the turn of the fifth century? And how did different regions disengage from the empire?

Chapters 4-6 focus in on material culture, the aims and objects of this study and the methodology. It considers how those linked with the later Roman state used material culture and specific forms of clothing to highlight their status. While textiles survive poorly in Britain, we have an increasing corpus of objects such as crossbow brooches, fittings from the military belt, spurs and penannular brooches which have all been linked with state officials or the military. The concept of identity is crucial to this study as these objects were used by different individuals to project status and various avowed and ascribed identities within the context of the later Roman world.

The core analysis of these later Roman dress accessories occurs in Chapters 7-12. It commences with an evaluation of the methodologies which have been employed to assess a diverse array of artefacts and currency from Roman Britain, and questions about how issues of chronology running into the fifth century have been tackled. The subsequent chapters then deal with each type of material culture in turn: crossbow brooches (Chapter 7), The *cingulum militare* and associated fittings (Chapter 8), spurs (Chapter 9), penannular brooches (Chapter 10) and then coinage (Chapters 11-12). The structure of each is similar, reviewing existing typologies and revising them if necessary; detailing how each of the individual corpora has been collated (each of which represents a considerable enlargements of the datasets currently available); and then a detailed analysis of geographic and site category distributions of each form of material, pulling out key patterning in the data.

Finally, Chapters 13-15 provides the synthesis and the conclusion. The first chapter in this section (Chapter 13) provides an overview, drawing together all the individual analyses of different types of material culture and coinage to provide a chronological and geographic framework for making this mass of data manageable. The second chapter (Chapter 14) delves into the differential use of material on different types of sites (forts, towns, rural etc.) to consider whether material can be associated with specific different roles in Later Roman society, and how this compared to patterns on the continent. The third chapter (Chapter 15) then focuses on the fifth century and how Roman Britain was transformed into the sub-Roman early-medieval world. This considers Roman and fifth century material linked with various incoming Germanic groups, which while problematic is described here in its broadest sense as Anglo-Saxon to enable comparison (Louviot, 2020). The final conclusions summarises some of the key results and also points to various future avenues of research.

The datasets studied in detail will be made freely available on ADS - <https://doi.org/10.5284/1106784>, <https://doi.org/10.5284/1090416> and an interactive map developed by Maploom - <https://romanfinds.maploom.com/info>