IRON AGE COINS

by Richard Hobbs

INTRODUCTION

The excavations at Elms Farm, Heybridge, led to the recovery of 153 coins of definite, probable or possible Iron Age date, in comparison to 2,910 of Roman date. [Note; three further coins of Cunobelin (11000, SF4600, SF5166 and SF5304) have been extracted from the Roman coin assemblage] Of these, 25 came from stratified contexts, the rest having been recovered by metal detecting from unstratified deposits by either volunteer detectorists or ECC Field Archaeology Unit staff. The assemblage was examined after cleaning work (the extent of which was decided through discussion with the conservator) and analysis of X-rays.

1. NUMISMATIC ASPECTS OF THE ASSEMBLAGE

1.1. Denominations

The vast majority of coins found were low value copper-alloy and potin (a tin-rich copper-alloy) coins, accounting for 93% of the total. In addition, there were four gold coins and four plated, or probably plated, gold pieces and four silver coins (Table 1). This immediately suggests casual loss on a settlement site, as opposed to deliberate deposits such as a hoard or coins used for votive purposes, which tend to consist of a higher proportion of intrinsically valuable pieces.

Type	*AV*	*AR*	*Sn/Cu*	*Cu-alloy*
Gallo-Belgic/ Gallic	3 (2 plated)			1
British LX (probably Addedomaros)	2			
British Potin			12 (1 uncertain)	
British Uninscribed		1		28
Tasciovanus				5 (1 probable)
Cunobelin	1	2		81 (3 probable)
Dvbnovellaunus				4 (3 possible)
East Anglia		1		
Uncertain British	1 (stater core)			10
uncertain if coin	1 (possibly a stater core)			
Total	**8 (3 are AV/CU)**	**4**	**12**	**129**
		Overall Total:		**153**

Table 1. *Summary of coin types*

1.2. Known issuers and common types

1.2.1 Inscribed types

Most of the Iron Age coins were issued by Cunobelin (55% of the total), his predecessor, Tasciovanus (from whom Cunobelin claimed descent), and two lesser-known 'rulers', Dubovellaunus, and coins attributed to Addedomaros (the British LX pieces). All four named issuers have a coin distribution centred on Essex/Hertfordshire and north Kent with pieces also found in Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire and East Anglia (Cunliffe 1981). Dvbnovellaunus' coins are commonly found both north of the Thames and in Kent, and opinions differ as to whether there were one or two individuals of that name. Fitzpatrick (1992, 26) believes they are one and the same. The coins in the Heybridge assemblage are typical of the North Thames 'Dvbnovellanus'.

Two mint names are present on the coins of Cunobelin and Tasciovanus: Verulamium (modern St Albans) and Camulodunum (modern Colchester). However, Verulamium is only known from one example (on Cat. 61 of Tasciovanus as 'VIR'), whilst Camulodumum, in the form of 'CAMVL[OBVNO]', 'CAMVL', 'CAMV' or 'CAML', or 'CAM', is far more common, appearing on 71 examples in the whole assemblage (e.g. Cats. 63, 66, 80, 82, 96), and one addition coin (Cat. 147) may also qualify, if the legend is a version of the mint name (only the 'M' is legible). Colchester is therefore by far the most common named mint source of coins at Heybridge. Most of these common types were probably minted in the decades running up to the Conquest (circa AD10-45).

Most significantly, the Cunobelin types represented at Heybridge are, with only one exception (Cat. 80, SF3573), of the 'CAM/CVN' variety, rather than those which refer to his 'father's' name 'TASCIOVANUS'. This is typical of the circulation pattern of Cunobelin's coins, recently discussed by Creighton (2000, 172-3). Coins which refer to Tasciovanus are in the main found in the area around Verulamium, whilst the 'CAM/CVN' varieties are more often found on the Essex/ Suffolk coastal areas and Kent (ibid., Fig. 6.6; reproduced here as Fig. 1). Creighton suggests that Cunobelin needed to stress his legitimacy for his issues produced at Verulamium, but did not need to for his 'home town' issues from Colchester, as it was around this area that his precedence was established and did not need to be legitimised. If this theory is accepted (and the distribution pattern of the material seems to favour this), this may demonstrate that in pre-Conquest Iron Age Britain, rulers were more than aware of how to use coinage for propaganda purposes.

1.2.2. Early uninscribed AE

Of the earlier coins, many fall into the amorphous category of British uninscribed (at least 27 coins, or 16%, and probably a fair number of the 11 'Uncertain British' pieces as well). These issues are characterised by a retention of a 'Celtic' style prevalent on Continental potin and bronze issues, with rather crude and highly stylised zoomorphic imagery (e.g. the two animals coiled around a wheel, Cats. 19-21). It seems likely that most of the early uninscribed struck bronze coinage was produced soon after the Gallic War (i.e. in the period c. 50-20 BC), but prior to the large scale production of the inscribed types discussed above.

The most up-to-date information on the distribution of these uninscribed types indicates that they fall into two categories: types common to Essex, and types rare to the county (de Jersey, pers. comm.). Cats. 23-26 (BIAC 407) and Cats. 33-38 (BIAC 2491) are relatively well known in Essex, so it appears that this is the area where these coins were probably produced and mostly circulated. The presence of 10 coins at Heybridge for these two types is therefore not unexpected. Cats. 19-22 (BIAC 402) are of a type predominant in Essex and Suffolk, with both counties producing similar numbers.

Cat. 29 (BIAC 2450) is a rare type for Essex, apart from Harlow Temple (Haselgrove 1989). Most examples of this type are from Hertfordshire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. Similarly Cat. 30 (BIAC 2461), as most examples of this type come from Hertfordshire. And finally, Cats. 31-32 (BIAC 2480) are also rare for Essex, with only one other example recorded for the county on the Celtic Coin Index (92.0525), from Harlow. 29 examples have been recorded in Kent, so it may be safely assumed that Kent is the origin of the type.

1.2.3. Potin coins

The potin coins, a cast as opposed to struck coinage, were one of the first indigenous coinages to be produced in Britain and appear to have circulated in reasonable numbers, although the exact function of these pieces remains unclear (Haselgrove 1988). Haselgrove argued convincingly that the two modules of potin coin, the larger module class I and the smaller module class II were produced in two distinct phases, Class I in the early 1st century BC (period 3), and Class II around 50-20 BC (period 6). The implications of this are discussed further below (section 2.2).

1.3. Less common coins and 'new' types

Heybridge also produced some Gallo-Belgic pieces, including a Gallo-Belgic B 'defaced' stater (Cat. 1), and two Gallo-Belgic E's (Cats. 13-4). These are not uncommon finds for the British Isles, and evidence is mounting that both types were either wholly or partly minted here (Haselgrove 1999; Fitzpatrick 1992, 15). Of definite continental origin is a copper-alloy unit attributed to the Remi (Cat. 11, SF2220): examples are usually found in the Aisne and Marne Departements, although a single example is also known from Colchester (BMC III (Bronze): s561).

As for the indigenous coinage, the following pieces are worthy of comment. Cat. 10 (SF7473) is a thin silver coin, and may represent a new type. It has similarities with a metal detector find made at Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex (CCI 90.0685). Although it has strong affinities with the so-called 'Hampshire Thin silver' series (Allen 1965), this can probably be considered a North Thames type unless the discovery and provenance of future finds suggest otherwise. Cat. 65 (SF4355) is a copper-alloy unit, which appears to have an illegible inscription before the bust on the obverse and an uncertain animal on the reverse. The Celtic Coin Index in Oxford does not have any recorded examples. Cat. 47 (SF2993) is a silver unit of common type originating in Norfolk, the tribal area of the Iceni. Hoard evidence indicates that these coins were produced in large numbers and circulated widely (e.g. Chadburn 1992), with Essex often producing the odd single find as is to be expected with a large issue. Cat. 63 (SF7857) is a copper-alloy type of Tasciovanus not published in the standard catalogues, although four previous examples are known; from Essex (Great Canfield, Hatfield Broad Oak), Hertfordshire (Baldock) and Cambridgeshre (West Wickham), all recorded in the Celtic Coin Index (see catalogue section for details).

Cats. 97-102 (SF3002, 3798, 3870, 4330, 7754, 7823) are numismatically the most important Iron Age coins in the assemblage, as they constitute a type of which only one example has previously been recorded (from Little Lather, Essex: CCI 96.3165). The best example here (Cat. 100, SF4330) has a right facing bust on the obverse with the legend 'CAMVO' (?) before, and a bull butting right on the reverse with 'VI.' below an exergual line. This is quite a curious set of legends, because it appears to be the combination of two mint names common to this area, i.e. a blundered 'CAMVL' (Camulodunum), and 'VI.' for Verulamium (which usually appears as 'VIR').

The above type bears strong similarities with another interesting coin (Cat. 73, SF9256), which is either a possible variant of a known type (BIAC 1902) or simply a clearer example of the type itself. This coin also has a right facing bust and the legend 'CAMVLO' before,

and also a bull butting right but this time the more common 'CVN' letters below (cf. Cuddeford 2000).

Finally, cat. 57 (SF9264) is an important piece as it allows the legend on a known type to be extended to 'DVBNOVIII'. This adds weight to the accepted view that these coins can quite rightly be attributed to Dvbnovellaunus (ibid.).

1.4. Condition and wear

Assessment of wear is important to the understanding of Iron Age coin use at Heybridge. Heavily worn coins would imply that they were changing hands on a regular basis, which may in turn imply use for commercial transaction. Alternatively, if coins are generally in an unworn state, this would imply that they were not passing through a lot of hands, which could perhaps be interpreted as deliberate deposition rather than loss or discard after heavy use.

Wear judgements are, however, rather subjective. It is fairly difficult to differentiate between circulation wear, die wear and the effects of corrosion and variable environmental conditions during burial. An example of this is Cat. 124 (SF7778), a bronze coin of Cunobelin. The obverse is completely illegible due to a large quantity of corrosion products adhered to the surface. The edge of the reverse is also illegible as it is chipped and worn, but the centre of the coin is fairly well preserved, and, for a copper-alloy piece, the details of the design are relatively sharp. In this case the coin seems therefore to have suffered greatly from its burial conditions, but appears to have been relatively uncirculated at the time of loss.

Analysis of the variation in the condition of coins of the same type has not proven to be very informative either. One of the largest groups, Cats. 130-36 (BIAC 1991) was minted at the end of Cunobelin's reign (c. AD30-45) and might be expected to be less worn than coins minted in the earlier periods, as they would have quickly gone out of use after the Conquest. One of the pieces, Cat. 132 (SF5019), is probably the most well preserved copper-alloy coin in the whole assemblage with a deep green patina and an appearance not unlike a 'mint' condition. However, Cat. 135 (SF6728) of exactly the same type is extremely worn and appears to have been well circulated. The condition of the other coins in this group vary between these two extremes.

However, although there is a considerable variation in wear on the Iron Age coin assemblage as a whole, the majority of pieces seem to have been either fairly or extremely well circulated. This certainly contrasts with the temple deposits from Harlow in Essex, where the excavators concluded that 'a lot of the bronze coins were recovered in mint condition and must have been offered directly to the deities' (France and Gobel 1985, 137).

The conclusion must therefore be that most Iron Age coins from Heybridge were well circulated, rather than lost or deposited soon after minting.

2. CHRONOLOGICAL, CONTEXTUAL, AND SPATIAL ANALYSIS

2.1. The chronology of Iron Age coinage

Iron Age coins are notoriously difficult to date, because only a tiny fraction can be associated with known historical figures (for example, Cunobelin). Therefore typological sequences, which are usually regional, have had to be developed by looking at stylistic changes (for instance, the simplification of the Apollo head from which much of British coinage was copied), the copying of dated Roman prototypes and links with imported Gallic types. It is in the last area of study where great strides have been made in recent years through the work of Malacher and Collis (1992) and most recently Haselgrove (1999), who have achieved a degree of success in examining Gallic coins in stratified contexts on a number of excavated sites in France.

For the purposes of dating the Heybridge material, a phasing scheme based upon Haselgrove (1987; 1993; 1999) has been used (Table 2). All date phases are approximate to the nearest +- 10 years. Each coin in the catalogue has been placed in a relevant dating period, although some coins have had to be placed in two or three dating periods, simply because there is too little evidence for their likely date of production.

Phase	***Coin Period***	***Duration***	***Site Period***
Phase I	1	mid/ later C2 BC	I
	2	Late C2 BC	
	3	Early C1 BC	
Phase II	4	c. 80-60 BC	
	5	c. 60-50 BC	II
	6	c. 50-20 BC	
Phase III	7	c. 20 BC- AD 10	
	8	c. AD 10-45	

Table 2. *Dating scheme*

In Phase III, issues of Cunobelin can be divided into ‘early’ and ‘late’ (or ‘developed’) types (Haselgrove 1987). This division is based upon stylistic differences between issues which tend to copy the style of his predecessor, Tasciovanus, and issues which borrow heavily from Roman prototypes and tend to have a more ‘classical’ appearance, in combination with an examination of stratifed finds from the Colchester excavations (Allen 1967; Haselgrove 1987,

94). It should also be noted that Haselgrove also includes a period 9, c. AD30-45, for the latest indigenous productions, but as this has overlap with period 8 it is not included here.

2.2. Chronological distribution

Over half the coins date to the latest period of indigenous coin production (period 8: c. AD10-45). Periods 6 and 7 account for at least 20% of the rest of the coinage, because of the fairly high number of uninscribed struck bronzes (some of which may have been produced as late as period 7), and the Class II potin coins. Of the earlier periods 1 to 5, the highest number of coins date to period 3 (3.3% or 5.3%), entirely due to the presence of five, or possibly eight, Class I potin coins.

However, it could well be the case that some or all of these period 3 coins ought to be placed in period 4 (c. 80-60BC), and the apparent gap at this period (which appears to have no pieces ascribed to it) should not be seen as significant.

Thus the bulk of the IA coinage found at Heybridge was produced in the early part of the first century AD, probably before the Roman conquest. Earlier pieces are present in the assemblage but are far fewer in number.

Period	***Date range***	***No. of coins***	***% total***
1	mid/ later C2 BC	1	0.7
2	Late C2 BC	0	0
3	Early C1 BC	5 (8?)	3.3 (5.3?)
3/4		2	1.3
4	c. 80 – 60 BC	0	0
4/5		1	0.7
5	c. 60 – 50 BC	2	1.3
6	c. 50 – 20 BC	24 (32?)	15.7 (20.9?)
6/7		1	0.7
6/7/8		6	3.9
7	c. 20 BC – AD 10	8 (11?)	5.2 (7.2?)
7/8		1	0.7
8	c. AD 10 - 45	83 (84?)	54.3 (54.9?)
-	uncertain date	4	2.6
	Total	**153**	**100**

Table 3. *Chronological distribution*

2.3. Chronology in relation to site phasing and contextual information

Only 25 Iron Age coins at Heybridge were collected from stratified contexts (strictly speaking, Cat. 112 (SF1389) comes from an unstratified machining layer (context 8166), but

it seems likely that this layer dates to the turn of the millenium and certainly not later than the early to mid-first century AD (S. Preston pers. comm.)). Of the remainder, 110 coins were metal detected during topsoil stripping, 12 came from the cleaning layers; two from unstratified fill; two from unstratified layers and one unknown. It should also be noted that 18 unstratified coins were recovered by metal detectorist Mick Cuddeford from the spoil heaps generated during the top-soil stripping (Area X in the catalogue).

2.3.1. The stratified coins

The 25 stratified coins and their contextual details are presented in Table 4. In the comments column, 'contemporaneous' is used to denote coins with a date of issue that corresponds well with the phasing of the feature. 'Slightly residual' is used when there is an overlap between the coin period and the site phase. 'Residual' denotes that the context date is one phase later than the likely date of manufacture and 'highly residual' when the coin is in a context dated to two or more phases later.

Cat. no.	*Area*	*Context no.*	*Coin period*	*Site period*	*Date*	*Signif. finds in association*	*Comment*
18	E	8206	6	II	Late IA	-	contemporaneous
112	E	8166	8 (L)	II	early/ mid. 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
11	F	10213	3/4	II B	mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
115	J	13545	8 (L)	II B	early – mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
114	K	4711	8 (L)	II – III	mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
74	K	14036	8 (E)	II	early – mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
116	L	20197	8 (L)	II C	mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
87	L	20210	8 (E)	II C	mid 1st AD	-	contemporaneous
143	N	11133	8 (L)	II	mid 1st AD	Hairpin (SF5803); 2 sherds CGFCS; 2 sherds AITAL	contemporaneous
119	G	7181	8 (L)	II	mid – late 1st AD	14 sherds CGFCS; 6 sherds NGWF; 7 dressel (various)	slightly residual/ contemporaneous?
135	I	13645	8 (L)	III B	mid 1st – early 2nd AD	-	slightly residual?
124	J	21789	8 (L)	III A	? Roman	-	slightly residual?
71	M	15184	8 (E)	III	early Roman	-	slightly residual
5	F	10103	3	II A	Late 1st BC – early 1st AD	-	residual
6	G	7540	3	II	late 1st BC	-	residual
8	H	6875	3?	II A	late 1st BC – early 1st AD	AITAB	residual?
16	H	6804	6	II B	early - mid 1st AD	-	residual
33	J	5491	6	II B	early – mid 1st AD	-	residual
46	K	4309	6?	III	mid 2nd AD +	-	residual
10	L	20212	3/4	II B-C	early 1st AD	-	residual
7	F	10172	3?	III	Early Roman	-	highly residual?
140	H	6204	8 (L)	IV	late 3rd – 4th AD	-	highly residual
75	J	5377	8 (E)	V	mid 2nd – mid 3rd AD	-	highly residual
2	K	4014	3	IV	early 3rd AD	-	highly residual
117	K	4015	8 (L)	IV	mid 3rd AD	-	highly residual

Table 4. *Stratified coins and their context.*

13 coins (52%) can be classed as contemporaneous or slightly residual and 12 coins (48%) as residual or highly residual.

Contemporaneous / slightly residual coins

All but two of this group of 13 coins (SF6841, cat. 18; SF2220, cat. 11) were issues of Cunobelin, which would therefore appear to have been lost or deposited soon after issue, as Cunobelin was theoretically still minting coinage as late as the AD40s. Three coins provide useful dating evidence for the features in which they were found. SF6841 (Cat. 18), a fragment of a Class II potin coin, helps to date ditch 8208 to the late Iron Age (the feature also containing late 1st century BC pottery), although this coin could still be residual if the feature dates to the immediate pre-Conquest period (AD10-45). SF1171 (Cat. 74) appears to confirm the stratigraphic evidence that pit 14037 (Area K) dates to the early to mid 1st c AD. A bronze coin of Cunobelin (Cat. 112, SF1389), was in a mid 1st century AD layer (8166, Area E) together with a Colchester BB brooch dating to AD65-80.

It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about this group as a whole. A common feature is that these coins are all copper-alloy with no intrinsic value. It is likely that they represent contemporary casual loss during day-to-day use. Equally, given the low value of the coinage, deliberate discard cannot be discounted, especially in a situation where a new coinage was coming in to use alongside the theoretical cessation of indigenous coin production. Copper-alloy denominations must have been able to be changed for higher value silver coinage, otherwise a tri-metallic coinage system cannot have functioned. Therefore, if it no longer became possible to exchange copper-coinage for intrinsically valuable pieces, the deliberate discard of these coins would become entirely reasonable.

Residual/ highly residual coins

As for the 12 coins which can be classed as residual or highly residual, these can be categorised as follows. The first group consist of three period 6 (c. 50-20 BC) coins in early to mid 1st century AD contexts, four Class I (period 3) potins in late 1st century BC to mid 1st century AD contexts, and one Gallic inscribed AE coin (period 3/4) in a mid 1st century AD or later context. All these coins may still have been circulating as some form of currency in the period in which they were subsequently lost, given that this was still pre-Conquest. It is simply unknown if earlier issues of copper-alloy coins were withdrawn from circulation as new power structures emerged – did Cunobelin allow the early uninscribed issues to continue to be used? Potin coins may have been slightly different, if they were a special function coinage (Haselgrove 1988); there is no evidence to suggest that they were part of the trimetallic system which seems to have existed (i.e. gold staters and quarters, silver units, and

three copper-alloy modules; discussed further in Hobbs 1996, 21). So, it may be the case that they were actually lost as opposed to re-deposited because they still had some kind of function a few decades after their date of production.

The rest of the coins in table 4 (Cats. 46, 140, 75, 2, 117) were lost during the post-Conquest period, and therefore must have been re-deposited from disturbed contexts, which is not unreasonable as there seems to have lots of disturbance generally on the site as a whole. In any case it is known from potin coins excavated from floor deposits at Canterbury and Braughing that they continued to circulate in the post-Conquest period (Haselgrove 1988, 103), and potins are also known from late Roman burials at Kelvedon, Essex (Rodwell 1988).

2.4. Spatial distribution of Iron Age coins at Heybridge

	Machine stripping						***Spoil heap***	***Excavated areas***														
Area	*A 1*	*A 2*	*A 3*	*A 4*	*B*	*C*	*X*	*D*	*E*	*F*	*G*	*H*	*I*	*J*	*K*	*L*	*M*	*N*	*P*	*Q*	*R*	*W*	*Total*
No. of coins	14	53	1	9	4	0	21	0	2	6	3	4	4	7	7	4	4	4	0	0	2	2	151
% of total	9	35	1	6	3	0	14	0	1	4	2	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	0	0	1	1	100%

Table 5. *Spatial distribution of Iron Age coins (see Fig.00 for location of areas).*

The spatial distribution of Late Iron Age coins by area is summarized in Table 5. The majority of coins, excluding those detected from the off-site spoil heaps by Mick Cuddeford (Area X), came from Areas A2 (35 %) and A1 (9 %). These were the result of detecting undertaken in parallel with the machine stripping of topsoil across the 1994 site and many may well have derived from Areas D to P that were subsequently sampled by excavation.

The impression given by this distribution pattern is that the earliest areas of high coin loss, and perhaps by implication more intensive occupation, were on the southern and eastern parts of the 1994 site. However, these were also the least stratified parts of the site and it remains a strong possibility that the lack of overlying Roman surfaces and layers may have allowed a greater rate of detection and recovery of early coinage across much of Area A2. The apparent disparity between A1 and A2 may have been further exaggerated by the more rigorous coverage and location of detected finds being adopted across the latter area (S. Preston, pers. comm.). In addition, Area A3 was subject to a much reduced metal-detector survey, being an area that was not subsequently excavated.

Although only a small sample, the 34 coins derived from the specific excavated areas (i.e. Areas D to R and W) may be a more reliable indicator of the relative distribution for the Late Iron Age as a whole. Although the varying quantities are not great, a broad spread may be discerned, diminishing toward the settlement peripheries. While this small sample cannot be used to define temporal variation within the spatial distribution, it may well show that the focus, at least of the 1st century AD settlement, was in and around the Central Zone and extended across the Southern Zone.

A high percentage of Late Iron Age coinage was therefore being lost in 'domestic' occupation areas. Loss within more 'public' areas, such as the religious focus of Area J, did not differ significantly. Thus, deliberate deposition of Iron Age coins does not appear to have been a feature of this religious area of the site, unlike others (e.g. Harlow Temple and Hayling Island). This pattern of fairly uniform loss across much of the settlement area also implies that by the mid. 1st century AD, coins were being used by the settlement population in general for economic transactions.

3. RELATING THE ASSEMBLAGE TO OTHER COMPARABLE SITES

3.1. Coin profile

Following Hazelgrove (1987), an Iron Age coin profile for Heybridge has been constructed using 123 coins from the site (i.e. excluding those coins for which there is too much uncertainty over date) (Table 7 and Fig. 2). While Hazelgrove's approach is based upon methods advanced by Roman numismatists (particularly Reece and Casey), and is somewhat less successful, as comparable assemblages are limited and the dating of Iron Age coinage is far more problematic than Roman material, it is nevertheless a worthwhile exercise. It is clear that there is a peak at period 6 (see also Table 3) and a major peak at period 8 (both 'early' and 'late').

This pattern of loss can be compared with Haselgrove's major and minor site profiles for the Essex-Suffolk coast (1993, 56, Fig. 5, (a); partially reproduced here as Fig. 3). For periods 7 and 8 (both early and late), Heybridge compares very well with the major sites (e.g. Camulodunum), with a slightly higher than average proportion of 'early' 8 coins. For the earlier periods, Heybridge is rather different to the norm: it has potin coins of both classes (I and II), whilst other major settlements do not; and it seems to have a higher proportion of coins of period 6, largely uninscribed early bronze coins.

This pattern in general seems to correspond with Haselgrove's interpretation of evidence from major sites (1993, 57), where he suggests that the high incidence of struck bronze implies a high frequency of transactions. It might be suggested that at Heybridge, given its high number of coins of period 6, this activity seems to have had a longer history than other major sites of the Essex-Suffolk coast. Haselgrove also suggests that bronze coins were released into circulation at the major nucleations first, only gradually filtering out to the rural sites, which Haselgrove believes accounts for the later emphasis (i.e. higher numbers of coins of period 8). Heybridge once more seems to fit this model, and may tie in with the fact that Cunobelin's bronzes are so uniformly the 'CAM/CVN' variety; if Heybridge was a place where coinage ended up having gone through a number of hands, would we not expect to see less uniformity in the types? Equally, it could be argued that if Heybridge is a major centre, why does it not have a higher proportion of types? However, it should not be forgotten that Heybridge does only produce 153 Iron Age coins, which amounts to a very low number of coins in relation to the area excavated. Unfortunately, there is far too little comparable evidence for any firm conclusions to be drawn.

Comparison with the Roman assemblage

The Iron Age coins account for more than 5% of the total number of coins recovered at Heybridge. Consideration of both the relative proportion and of the overlap of Iron Age and Roman coinage is not particularly productive due to the lack of reliable comparable data; Reece's assembled coin profile data (1991, 1) does not consistently indicate which percentage of the coins recorded were Iron Age; sometimes Iron Age coins were included in Reece's period 1, other times they were not (Reece pers. comm). The question of whether some of the Iron Age coins found in early Roman contexts continued in circulation until this date, or are simply residual, clearly needs more research. Table 4 has identified the most likely candidates at Elms Farm for such research (i.e. those considered 'slightly residual' – Cats. Nos 71, 124 and 135). However, with only three examples this data set is clearly too small to define any trends when used in isolation.

References

Allen, D.F.	1960	'The origins of coinage in Britain: a re-appraissal', in Frere, S.S. (ed), *Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain* (University of London Occasional Paper 11), 97-308
Allen, D.F.	1965	'Les pieces d'argent minces du comte de Hampshire: nouveau lien entre la Gaule celtique et le Grande Bretagne', *Revue Numismatique* (Ser. 6), 7, 79-93
Allen, D.F.	1967	'Celtic coins from the Romano-British temple at Harlow, Essex', *British Numismatic Journal* 37, 1-6
Allen, D.F. and Mays. M (eds)	1995	*Catalogue of the Celtic coins in the British Museum. Volume III. Bronze coins of Gaul* (London, British Museum Press)
Chadburn, A.	1992	'A preliminary analysis of the hoard of Icenian coins from Field Baulk, March, Cambridgeshire', in Mays, M. (ed), 1992, 73-82
Creighton, J.	2000	*Coins and Power in late Iron Age Britain* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press)
Cuddeford, M. J.	2000	'Two new legend varieties for Cunobelinos', *Spink Numismatic Circular*, June 2000: 106.
Cunliffe, B.W. (ed)	1981	*Coinage and society in Britain and Gaul* (CBA Research Report 38)
Fitzpatrick, A.P.	1992	'The roles of Celtic coinage in South East England', in Mays, M. (ed) 1992, 1-32
France, N.E. and Gobel, B.M.	1985	*The Romano-British temple at Harlow* (Harlow)
Haselgrove, C.C.	1987	*Iron Age coinage in South-East England: the archaeological context*, British Archaeological Reports 174 (Oxford)
Haselgrove, C. C.	1988	'The archaeology of British potin coinage', *Archaeological Journal* 145, 99-122
Haselgrove, C. C.	1989	'Iron Age coin deposition at Harlow Temple, Essex', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 8 (1), 73-88
Haselgrove, C.C.	1993	'The development of British Iron Age coinage', *Numismatic Chronicle* 153, 31-64
Haselgrove, C.C.	1999	'The development of Iron Age coinage in Belgic Gaul', *Numismatic Chronicle* 159, 111-68

Hobbs, R.	1996	*British Iron Age coins in the British Museum* (London, British Museum Press)
Malacher, F. and Collis, J.	1992	'Chronology, production and distribution of coins in the Auvergne', in Mays, M (ed) 1992, 189-206
Mays, M. (ed.)	1992	*Celtic coinage: Britain and beyond. the Eleventh Oxford symposium on coinage and monetary history*, British Archaeological Reports 222 (Oxford)
Rodwell, K.A.	1988	*The prehistoric and Roman settlement at Kelvedon, Essex*, CBA Research Report 63 (London)
Reece, R.	1991	*Roman coins from 140 sites in Britain* (Cirencester)
Scheers, S.	1977	*Traité de numismatique celtique: la Gaule Belgique* (Paris)
Stead, I. and Rigby, V.	1986	*Baldock the excavation of a Roman and pre-Roman settlement, 1968-72*, Britannia Monograph Series 7 (London)
Van Arsdell, R.D.	1989	*Celtic Coinage of Britain* (London)

Figure captions:

Fig.1 The contrasting distribution of Cunobelin's coins which have his 'father's' name and Camulodunum on them (reproduced from Creighton 2000, Fig.6.6)

Fig.2 Chronological distribution of Iron Age coins from Heybridge by Haselgrove (1987) periods

Fig.3 Haselgrove's major and minor site profiles for the Essex-Suffolk coast (partially reproduced from Haselgrove1993, Fig. 5(a))

5. Catalogue

The catalogue has been arranged in the following descending order: period, in order of certainty (see section above on chronology); metal (from gold to copper-alloy) and denomination (e.g. class II potins come before struck bronze); type, acc. to BIAC etc.; and small find number. A list of abbreviations including references to major catalogues is given at the end of the catalogue listing.

In the 'Season/ context' column, some of the coins have been described as 'MD'. These are coins recovered from excavated spoil heaps from the archaeological excavations and from topsoil stripping. The coins were detected by Mick Cuddeford, and I am grateful to him for allowing me to identify them. Context information is obviously lacking for these finds, but Mick, for what it is worth, has distinguished between coins recovered from area 'A' (the proposed parkland area to the south of the old railway/new access road), and 'B' (all finds from the area north of 'A'), as indicated in the table. Also provided is the year in which the coins were recovered; the 1995 finds were all made between June and October. All metal detected finds recovered from off-site spoil heaps have since been allocated the Area X.

No.	Season/ Context	SFno.	Metal	Denom.	Wt. (g)	Issuer/ Region	Description	Period	Site phase	Ref.
Period 1: Mid./ later C2 BC										
1	93. 400 Area W	29	AV	Stater	7.57	Gallo-Belgic B	*obv.* defaced die; *rev.* stylised horse r.	1	0	Scheers Class II
Period 2: Late C2 BC **Period 3: Early C1 BC**										
2	94, 4014 Area K	379	Cu/Sn	potin	0.97	Class I	*obv.* schematic head l.; *rev.* schematic bull butting r.	3	IV	cf. BIAC 670
3	94, 4004 Area K	387	Cu/Sn	potin	1.49	Class I	*obv.* schematic head l.; *rev.* schematic bull butting r.	3	0	cf. BIAC 670
4	94, 11000 Area A2	2594	Cu/Sn	potin	0.88[b]	Class I	*obv.* schematic bust r.; *rev.* schematic bull butting ?r.	3	0	cf. BIAC 670. Broken
5	94, 10103 Area F	1507	Cu/Sn	potin	1.09	Class I	*obv.* abstract head l.; *rev.* bull butting l.	3	II A	cf. BIAC 674
6	94, 7540 Area G	2429	Sn/Cu	Potin	0.50[b]	Class I	*obv.* schematic head. l.; *rev.* schematic bull butting l.	3	II	BIAC 674 ff.
7	94, 10172 Area F	2208	Cu/Sn	Potin	0.43 frags.	?Class I	*obv.* schematic head (only ring and pellet remain); *rev.* illeg.	3?	III	-
Three fragments of a coin, very coppery in appearance.										

8	94, 6875 Area H	5645	Cu/Sn	Potin	0.26 frag	Class I or II	Fragmentary; also Cu fragment, not associate with coin frag.	3?	II A	cf. BIAC 668 ff.
9	94, 17000 Area Q	6752	AE	Potin?	1.60	?	*obv.* & *rev.* illeg.	3?	0	-
Possible sprue so could be a potin.										
Periods 3/4										
10	94, 20212 Area L	7473	AR	Unit	0.41	-	*obv.* abstract design; *rev.* horse r., above wheel	3/4	II B-C	-
New type. Similarities with CCI 90.0685., fnd. at Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex (TL 5416), 0.2g, a metal detector find. This looks like a Hampshire thin silver, but seems more likely to be a N. Thames type.										
11	94, 10213 Area F	2220	AE	Unit	4.51		*obv.* crude head l., '[ATISIOS REMOS]; *rev.* lion l., illeg.	3/4	II B	Scheers 634, no. 147
BMC III (Bronze), no. 70; Scheers 634, no. 147, pl. XIX no. 524. Attributed to Remi on basis of legend and distribution, which is centred on Dépatememts of Aise and Marne. It should also be noted that BMC S561 is a coin from Colchester.										
Period 4: c. 80-60 BC **Period 4/5**										
12	94, 11000 Area A2	4434	AE	Core?	2.63		core of stater?	4/5?	0	-
not a coin?										
Period 5: c. 60-50 BC										
13	94, 4000 Area A1	723	AV/Cu	Cu core of stater	2.83	Continental	*obv.* plain; *rev.* stylised horse r., above ring and remnants of riders arms holding torc	5	0	Gallo-Belgic E
14	94, 11000 Area A2	3873	AV/Cu	Cu core of stater	3.56	Continental	*obv.* blank; *rev.* stylised horse r.	5	0	Gallo-Belgic E
Period 6: c. 50 – 20 BC										
15	94, 4148 Area K	405	Cu/Sn	Potin	1.24	Class II	*obv.* schematic head l.; *rev.* illeg.	6	0	cf. BIAC 715
Large amounts of corrosion products on surface of coin.										
16	94, 6804 Area H	5624	Cu/Sn	Potin	0.28 frag.	Class II	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* schematic bull l., illeg.	6	II B	cf. BIAC 715 ff.
Fragment, mainly consisting of casting sprue.										
17	95, 10506 Area F	5240	Cu/Sn	Potin	1.00	Class II	*obv.* head r.; *rev.* bull r.	6	0	cf. BIAC 719
18	94, 8206 Area E	6841	Sn/Cu	Potin	0.37[b]	Class II	fragment only	6	II	-
19	94, 11000 Area A2	3577	AE	Unit	1.26	North Thames.	*obv.* two animals coiled around wheel in centre; *rev.* horse r. with wavy legs, before pellet, below ?ring	6	0	BIAC 402 *N. Circ*. 98 (1990), 268, no. 5
20	94, 11000 Area A2	3777	AE	Unit	1.21	North Thames.	*obv.* two animals coiled around wheel; *rev.* horse r., ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 402
The horse is rendered more delicately than on examples in the British Museum collection.										

21	94, 17150 Area A3/4	7149	AE	Unit	0.72[b]	N. Thames	*obv.* 2 animals coiled around wheel; *rev.* horse r. with wavy legs, ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 402
22	94, 4000 not plotted	2174	AE	Unit	0.90 [b]	N. Thames	*obv.* 2 animals coiled around wheel; *rev.* horse r. with wavy legs, ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 402
23	94, 11000 Area A2	4342	AE	Unit	1.45	North Thames	*obv.* animal l. looking back, below tail and below pellet, below head ?pellet-in-ring; *rev.* horse r., below pellet-in-ring	6	0	BIAC 407
24	95, MD 'A'	9252	AE	½ unit	0.78	North Thames	*obv*. animal l., looking back over shoulder, ornaments in field; *rev*. horse r., pellet on shoulder, ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 407
25	97, MD, 'B'	9263	AE	Unit	0.89	North Thames	*obv*. animal l., looking back; *rev*. horse r., ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 407
26	95, MD, 'B'	9253	AE	Unit	1.01	North Thames	*obv*. animal l., looking back ornaments in field; *rev*. horse r., pellet on shoulder, mane joined to ornaments above in field	6	0	BIAC 407 var.
This coin has a very similar obverse and reverse to previous coin and the type (BIAC 407), but has a variant reverse as described.										
27	95, 23000 Area N	7856	AE	Unit	1.57	-	*obv.* head l.; *rev.* horse r., below pellet-in-ring	6	0	-
This coin bears stylistic similarities with BIAC 407.										
28	94, 11000 Area A2	5165	AE	Unit	1.18	N. Thames	*obv.* head l., before star; *rev.* horse l., ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 2450
29	94, 11000 Area A2	4246	AE	Unit	2.26	N. Thames	*obv.* head l., before star; *rev.* horse l., ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 2450
30	96, MD, 'B'	9268	AE	Unit	1.34	North Thames	*obv*. head r.; *rev*. horse l., ornaments in field	6	0	BIAC 2461
31	94, 17000 Area Q	5507	AE	Unit	1.18	Kent	*obv.* wolf (?) l., illeg.; *rev.* horse r., above and below pellet-in-ring, illeg.	6	0	BIAC 2480
32	94, 17000 Area Q	7030	AE	Unit	1.75	Kent	*obv.* boar l., illeg.; *rev.* horse r. illeg.	6	0	probably BIAC 2480
33	94, 5491 Area J	2272	AE	Unit	1.56	North Thames	*obv.* curled serpent l.; *rev.* rider adv. r.	6	II B	BIAC 2491
34	94, 11000 Area A2	3030	AE	Unit	1.53	North Thames	*obv.* curled serpent l.; *rev.* horse r. with rider facing	6	0	BIAC 2491
35	94, 11000 Area A2	4599	AE	Uncert.	1.85	North Thames	*obv*. faint traces of curled serpent (?) l., illeg.; *rev.* horse r. with rider facing, illeg.	6	0	BIAC 2491
36	94, 14326 Area L	5543	AE	Unit	1.55	North Thames	*obv.* curled serpent (?) l.; *rev.* horse r. with rider facing	6	0	BIAC 2491
37	95, 11000 Area A2	7965	AE	Unit	1.47	North Thames	*obv*. curled serpent (?) l.; *rev*. horse and rider r.	6	0	BIAC 2491

38	95, 3999 Area X (spoil heap)	8016	AE	Unit	1.35	North Thames	*obv*. curled serpent (?) l.; *rev*. horse and rider r.	6	0	BIAC 2491
39	94, 4000 Area A1	1027	AE	Unit	1.63	uncertain	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* horse l., front leg raised, pellet-in-ring on shoulder, otherwise illeg.	6?	0	-
Unidentifled type. Probably a North Thames bronze.										
40	94, 4000 Area A1	2773	AE	Unit	1.06 b	uncert.	*obv*. animal l.?, illeg.; *rev*. horse r., illeg.	6?	0	-
41	94, 11000 Area A2	3612	AE	Unit	0.71[b]	early uninsc.	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* horse r., illeg.	6?	0	cf. BIAC 402
42	94, 11000 Area A2	3702	AE	Unit	1.08	-	*obv.* horse l.; *rev.* horse l., above pellets	6?	0	-
Probably a North Thames uninscribed type. There is nothing comparable in the CCI.										
43	94, 11000 Area A2	3825	AE	Unit	1.54	Kent/ Essex	*obv.* possibly traces of bust r.; *rev.* horse r., illeg.	6?	0	-
44	94, 11000 Area A2	4402	AE	Unit	0.77[b]	Kent/ Essex?	*obv.* bust r., illeg; *rev.* horse l., illeg.	6?	0	-
45	94, 11000 Area A2	5079	AE	Unit	0.76[b]	North Thames?	*obv.* head l., illeg.; *rev.* horse l., illeg.	6?	0	-
46	94, 4309 Area K	7435	AE	Unit	1.34	N. Thames?	*obv.* head r.?, illeg.; *rev*. horse r., illeg.	6?	III	-
Period 6/7										
47	94, 11001 Area N	2993	AR	Unit	0.76	E-Anglia	*obv.* head r., ornaments in field; *rev.* horse r., ornaments in field	6/7	0	Allen B/C; BIAC 3605
Period 6/7/8										
48	94, 11000 Area A2	4349	AE	Unit	1.30	N. Thames?	*obv.* bust r., illeg.; *rev.* illeg.	6/7/8?	0	-
49	94, 11000 Area A2	4487	AE	Unit	1.31	N. Thames	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* classical style horse r., illeg.	6/7/8?	0	
50	94, 11000 Area A2	5044	AE	Unit	1.26	N. Thames?	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* horse r.?	6/7/8?	0	-
51	94, 17000 Area Q	6891	AE	Unit	0.71	uncertain	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* horse l., illeg.	6/7/8?	0	n/a
52	98, MD, 'B'	9261	AE	Coin	1.48	uncert.	*obv*. illeg.; *rev*. illeg.	6/7/8?	0	-
Probably Iron Age.										
53	96, MD, 'B'	9269	AE	Unit	0.97	uncert.	*obv*. illeg.; *rev*. uncertain design, illeg.	6/7/8?	0	-
Probably Iron Age due to dished flan.										
Period 7: c. 20 BC – AD 10										
54	94, 12346 Area B	6357	AV	1/4 stater	1.38	attrib. to Added.	*obv*. flower; *rev*. horse r.	7	0	Allen LX; BIAC 2417
55	96, MD, 'B'	9265	AV	Quarter stater	1.29	attrib. to Added.	*obv*. flower; *rev*. stylised horse r., ornaments in field	7	0	BIAC 2417
56	94, 11000 Area A2	3597	AE	unit	1.34	Dvbnov.	*obv.* head l.; *rev*. horse r., with head looking back, below 'DVN?'	7	0	VA 1667; BIAC 2445

57	97, MD, 'B'	9264	AE	unit	2.16	Dubnov.	*obv*. bust r., before ']DVBNOVIII'; *rev*. horse l. looking back over shoulder	7	0	BIAC 2445
BIAC 2445 is erroneously described as a silver coin. This is an important piece because it confirms the fuller reading for the type as 'DVBNOVIII'. On previous known examples, only the letters 'DVBNOV' were visible (Cuddeford 2000).										
58	94, 11000 Area N	5074	AE	unit	0.96	Dvbnov.	*obv*. illeg.; *rev*. horse r. looking back, illeg.	7?	0	cf. BIAC 2445
59	94, 17000 Area Q	5515	AE	unit	1.04	Dvbnov.	*obv*. horse r. looking back; *rev*. illeg.	7?	0	possibly BIAC 2504
60	94, 11000 Area A2	3026	AE	unit	1.64	Tasc.	*obv*. jugate bearded heads r.; *rev*. ram l., above '[TASC]'; below flower	7	0	BIAC 1711
61	94, 4000 Area A1	786	AE	unit	1.18	Tasc.	*obv*. bearded head r., before 'VIR?'; *rev*. ?hippocamp l., above pellet-ring	7	0	cf. BIAC 1714 ff.
62	94, 11000 Area A2	4587	AE	unit	tbc	Tasc.	*obv*. faint traces of star; *rev*. bull l., illeg.	7	0	BIAC 1745
63	95, 23000 Area N	7857	AE	unit	2.42	Tasc.	*obv*. head r., before '[CAMVL]'; *rev*. ram l., before, '[TAS]', below pellet-ring	7	0	CCI 72.0332
New type. Four others known: CCI 72.0332. Fnd. in the Baldock excavations, 1971 (Stead & Rigby (1986), 92, no. 14, 1.68g; CCI 92.0279. Fnd. at Great Canfield, Essex, a metal detector find, 1.30g; CCI 90.0684. Fnd. at Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex (TL 5416), a metal detector find, 1.30g; CCI 97.1098. Fnd. at West Wickham, Cambs., 1997 (TL 6149), 1.19g.										
64	94, 4000 Area A1	934	AE	unit	1.79	Tasc.?	*obv*. illeg.; *rev*. eagle (?) facing, illeg.	7?	0	prob. BIAC 1691-2
Period 7/8										
65	94, 11000 Area A2	4355	AE	unit	1.68[b]	?	*obv*. bust l. with wavy hair, before illeg. inscription; *rev*. uncertain animal r.	7/8?	0	-
Possibly a new type. Nothing comparable in CCI.										
Period 8: c. AD 10 – 45										
66	94, 11000 Area A1	3872	AV	1/4 stater	1.34	Cunob.	*obv*. corn ear, 'CA-MV'; *rev*. horse r., 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	cf. BIAC 1843
67	94, 15044 Area M	5889	AR	unit	0.75	Cunob.	*obv*. curled serpent inside wheel r; *rev*. winged horse l., below 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1857
68	94, 4000 Area A1	910	AE	unit	1.13 b	Cunob.	obv. head l., illeg.; *rev*. horse l., illeg.	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1900
69	94, 5434 Area J	3242	AE	unit	2.19	Cunob.	*obv*. head r., before 'CAM'; *rev*. horse l., below wavy line and 'CVNO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1900
70	94, 11000 Area A2	4564	AE	unit	2.04	Cunob.	*obv*. bust l., before 'CAMVL'; *rev*. horse (?) l., below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1900
71	94, 15184 Area M	6647	AE	unit	1.65	Cunob.	*obv*. head r., before '[CVNO]'; *rev*. bull butting l., exergual line	8 (E)	III	BIAC 1902
72	94, 24138 Area M	7819	AE	unit	1.26[b]	Cunob.	*obv*. head r., before '[CVNO]'; *rev*. bull butting l., below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1902

73	95, MD, 'B'	9256	AE	unit	1.88	Cunob.	*obv*. bust r., before 'CAMVLO[?'; *rev*. bull butting l., below 'C]VNO['	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1902 var.; CCI 96.1074
Obverse legend varies from known type which usually reads 'CVNO'. This seems to be the only example of a coin of this type which reads 'CAMVLO' on the obverse, although the condition of the other regular examples of the type is such that it should not be ruled out that this is not a variant, purely a more legible example (de Jersey, pers. comm.; Cuddeford 2000).										
74	94, 14036 Area K	1171	AE	unit	1.98	Cunob.	*obv.* facing bearded head; *rev*. boar l., below 'CVN'	8 (E)	II	BIAC 1904
75	94, 5377 Area J	1914	AE	unit	1.79	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head facing; *rev.* boar l., below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	V	BIAC 1904
76	94, 11000 Area A2	4112	AE	unit	1.01	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded bust facing; *rev.* boar l., below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1904
77	95, MD, 'B'	9254	AE	unit	1.41	Cunob.	*obv*. bearded head facing; *rev*. boar l., below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1904
78	94, 4000 Area A1	2147	AE	unit	1.92	Cunob.	*obv.* coiled animal; *rev.* animal l. looking back, below 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1906
79	94, 11000 Area A2	3008	AE	unit	1.29	Cunob.	*obv.* coiled animal inside wheel; *rev.* animal l. looking back, above bucranium, below '[CVN]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1906
80	94, 11000 Area A2	3573	AE	unit	1.69	Cunob.	*obv.* head l., before 'CAML'; *rev.* winged Victory sacrificing bull r., below 'TASCI'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1920
Note that in BIAC, the obverse of this coin has been mistakenly described as 'head r.' (1996, 132).										
81	94, 4000 Area A1	935	AE	unit	1.76	Cunob.	*obv*. bearded head r., before 'CVNO'; *rev*. lion crouching r., below 'CAM'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1928
82	94, 4000 Area A1	1238	AE	unit	1.58	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CAMVL [OBVNO]'; *rev*. Sphinx std. l., below 'CVNO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1928
83	94, 17000 Area Q	5980	AE	unit	1.80	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CAMV', '[OBVNO]'; *rev.* illeg.	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1928
84	94, 4000 Area A1	924	AE	unit	2.44	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l., below 'CAMV'; *rev.* winged Victory adv. r., holding wreath, to l. '[CV]', to r. 'NO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1931
85	94, 11000 Area A2	4413	AE	unit	1.80	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l., below 'CAMV'; *rev.* winged Victory r., to l. 'CV', to r. 'NO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1931
86	94, 12250 Area B	6176	AE	large unit	1.65	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l., below 'CAMV'; *rev.* winged Victory adv. r., to l. 'CV', to r. 'NO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1931
87	94, 20210 Area L	7480	AE	unit	2.78	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l., 'CA-MV'; *rev.* winged Victory r., 'CV-NO'	8 (E)	II C	BIAC 1931
88	95, MD, 'B'	9255	AE	unit	1.51 b	Cunob.	*obv*. winged horse l., below '[CAMV]'; *rev*. winged Victory r., to l. 'CV' to r. 'NO'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1931

89	97, MD, 'B'	9266	AE	unit	1.84 b	Cunob.	*obv*. winged horse l., below 'CAMV'; *rev*. winged Victory r., to l. '[CV]', to r. '[NO]'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1931
90	94, 11000 Area A2	3801	AE	unit	1.47[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* griffin l. looking back; *rev.* Victory stg. l., before 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1938
The griffin is incorrectly described in BIAC as a horse.										
91	94, 11000 Area A2	4100	AE	unit	1.93	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l. looking back, below 'CAM'; *rev*. winged Victory stg. l., before 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1938
92	94, 11000 Area A2	4572	AE	unit	1.43	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse l., looking back, below 'CAM'; *rev.* winged victory stg. l., before 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1938
93	94, 4000 Area A1	643	AE	unit	2.06	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., before 'CVN[O]'; behind 'BELIN'; *rev.* horse r. with rider, below 'CAM'	8 (E)	0	BIAC 1984
94	94, 11000 Area A2	4316	AE	unit	0.84[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* bust l., illeg.; *rev.* boar l., below pellet-in-ring	8 (E)	0	VA 1969
95	94, 11000 Area A2	3586	AE	unit	1.29	Cunob.	*obv.* bust l., wreath on head; *rev.* eagle facing, wings spread	8 (E)	0	VA 2087
96	94, 11000 Area A2	4229	AE	large unit	1.73	Cunob.	*obv.* bust l., before 'CAM'; *rev.* horse l., below 'CVN'	8 (E)	0	VA 2131
97	94, 11000 Area A2	3002	AE	unit	1.23	Cunob.	*obv.* head r. illeg.; *rev.* bull r., above ring, illeg.	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
New. type. One other previously known (CCI 96.3165), a metal detector find from Little Lather, Essex (TL 5409), 1.16g. As cat. nos. 98-102 (SFnos. 3798, 3870, 4330, 7754, 7823).										
98	94, 11000 Area A2	3798	AE	unit	0.91[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* bust r.; *rev.* bull butting r., illeg.	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
99	94, 11000 Area A2	3870	AE	unit	1.59	Cunob.	*obv.* bust r., illeg.; *rev.* bull butting r., illeg.	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
100	94, 11000 Area A2	4330	AE	unit	1.57	Cunob.	*obv.* bust r., before blundered legend 'CAMVO' (?); *rev.* bull butting r., below exergue 'VI'	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
101	95, 22060 Area J	7754	AE	unit	1.03	Cunob.	*obv.* bust r., before blundered legend; *rev.* bull butting r., exergual line	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
102	95, 24210 Area M	7823	AE	unit	1.48	Cunob.?	*obv.* head r., before blundered legend; *rev.* bull butting r.	8 (E?)	0	CCI 96.3165
103	96, MD, 'B'	9267	AR	unit	1.16	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CVNO' inside tablet inside wreath; *rev*. winged Griffin r., below '[CA]MV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1868
104	93, 400 Area W	9	AE	unit	1.55	Cunob.	*obv*. griffin r., 'CA-MV'; *rev*. horse r., 'CVN' below	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1909
105	94, 11000 Area A2	4368	AE	large unit	1.79	Cunob.	*obv.* griffin r.; *rev.* horse r., below 'CVN'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1909
106	94, 12220 Area R	4819	AE	unit	1.28[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* griffin r., illeg.; *rev.* horse r., illeg.	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1909

107	94, 10682 Area F	5248	AE	unit	1.73	Cunob.	*obv.* griffin r., above 'CA', before 'MV'; *rev.* horse r., above flower and crescent, below 'C[V]N'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1909
108	94, 12000 Area R	6157	AE	unit	1.99	Cunob.	*obv.* winged horse r.; *rev.* horse r., below '[CVN]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1909
109	94, 11000 Area A2	3028	AE	large unit	1.23	Cunob.	*obv.* griffin r., illeg.; *rev.* horse r., illeg.	8 (L)	0	prob. BIAC 1909
110	94, 4000 Area A1	911	AE	unit	1.03 b	Cunob.	*obv*. bearded head l.; *rev*. horse r. with rider, below 'CAM'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1984
111	94, 7000 Area G	1148	AE	unit	1.69	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., before 'CVNO', behind '[BELIN]'; *rev.* horse r. with rider, below 'CAM'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1984
112	94, 8166 Area E	1389	AE	unit	1.62	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., before '[CV]NO'; *rev*. horse r. with rider, below 'CAM'	8 (L)	II	BIAC 1984
113	94, 11000 Area A2	3672	AE	unit	2.04	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., illeg.; *rev.* horse r. with helmeted rider, below 'CAM'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1984
114	94, 4711 Area K	4146	AE	unit	2.10	Cunob.	*obv*. bearded head l.; *rev*. horse r. with rider, below 'CAM'	8 (L)	II-III	BIAC 1984
115	94, 13545 Area J	4752	AE	unit	1.96	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., 'CVNO-BELIN'; *rev.* rider r., 'CAM' below	8 (L)	II B	BIAC 1984
116	94, 20197 Area L	7481	AE	unit	2.43	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head l., 'CVNO-BELIN'; *rev.* horse with rider r., 'CAM' below	8 (L)	II C	BIAC 1984
117	94, 4015 Area K	401	AE	unit	1.98	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle, all inside wreath; *rev.* horse r., foreleg raised, below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	IV	BIAC 1987
118	94, 4000 Area A1	936	AE	unit	1.46	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev*. horse r. below '[CAMV]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
119	94, 7181 Area G	2385	AE	unit	2.15	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev.* horse r., foreleg raised, below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	II	BIAC 1987
120	94, 11000 Area A2	3047	AE	unit	2.22	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev.* horse r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
121	94, 11000 Area A2	4095	AE	unit	0.93[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev.* horse r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
122	94, 11000 Area A2	4099	AE	unit	1.54	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev.* horse r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
123	94, 17000 Area Q	5465	AE	unit	1.44	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle; *rev*. horse r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
124	95, 21789 Area J	7778	AE	large unit	2.52	Cunob.	*obv.* 'CVNO' inside double rectangle, all inside wreath; *rev.* horse r., foreleg raised, below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	III A	BIAC 1987
The coin is adhered to FE.										

125	95, 3999 Area X	8116	AE	unit	1.47	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CVNO' in tablet; *rev*. horse r., 'CAMV' below	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
126	95, MD, 'A'	9257	AE	large unit	2.34	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CVNO' inside tablet inside wreath; *rev*. horse r., below 'CAMV', pellet border	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
127	95, MD, 'B'	9259	AE	unit	1.63 b	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CVNO' inside tablet; *rev*. horse r., below '[CAMV]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
128	98, MD, 'B'	9262	AE	unit	2.10	Cunob.	*obv*. 'CVNO' inside tablet; *rev*. horse r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1987
129	94, 11000 Area A2	3927	AE	unit	1.41	Cunob.?	*obv*. illeg.; *rev*. horse r. with raised foreleg	8 (L?)	0	BIAC 1987?
130	94, 11000 Area A2	2826	AE	unit	1.45	Cunob.	*obv.* Janus head; *rev.* boar std. r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
131	94, 11000 Area A2	4322	AE	unit	2.25	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded bust r., before '[CVNO]'; *rev.* lion crouching r., below 'CAM'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
132	94, 11000 Area A2	5019	AE	unit	1.88	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head r., before 'CVNO'; *rev.* lion r., 'CAM' below in tablet	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
133	94, 5603 Area I	5145	AE	unit	2.07	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head r., before 'CVNO'; *rev.* lion r., 'CAM' below in tablet	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
134	94, 17000 Area Q	6701	AE	unit	1.22	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head r., before 'CVNO'; *rev*. lion crouching r., below 'CAM'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
135	94, 13645 Area I	6728	AE	unit	1.08	Cunob.	*obv.* bearded head r., before '[CVNO]'; *rev.* lion crouching r., below '[CAM]', illeg.	8 (L)	III B	BIAC 1991
136	95, MD, 'B'	9258	AE	unit	1.65	Cunob.	*obv*. bearded bust r., before '[CVNO]'; *rev*. lion crouching r., below '[CAM]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1991
137	94, 17000 Area Q	6892	AE	unit	1.84	Cunob.	*obv.* Janus head; *rev.* boar std. r., below 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1998
138	95, 3999 Area X	8110	AE	unit	1.50	Cunob.	*obv*. Janus head., 'CVNO'; *rev*. boar std. r., 'CAMV'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1998
139	95, MD, 'B'	9260	AE	unit	2.45	Cunob.	*obv*. Janus head, below '[CVNO]'; *rev*. boar std. r., below '[CAMV]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 1998
140	94, 6204 Area H	2320	AE	unit	1.67	Cunob.	*obv.* Sphinx std. r., below '[CVNO]'; *rev.* fig. adv. l. in field '[CA-M]'	8 (L)	IV	BIAC 2004
141	94, 11000 Area A2	3700	AE	unit	1.58	Cunob.	*obv.* winged Sphinx r.; *rev.* figure adv. l., in field '[CA-M]'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 2004
142	94, 11000 Area A2	4281	AE	unit	1.52	Cunob.	*obv.* winged Sphinx crouching r., below 'CVNO'; *rev.* fig. adv. l., illeg.	8 (L)	0	BIAC 2004
143	94, 11133 Area N	5819	AE	unit	1.95	Cunob.	*obv.* Sphinx std. r., below 'CVNO'; *rev.* fig. adv. l., to l. 'CA, to r. M'	8 (L)	II	BIAC 2004

144	94, 12258 Area B	6171	AE	unit	1.37	Cunob.	*obv.* Sphinx std. r., below 'CVNO'; *rev.* fig. adv. l., to l. 'CA', to r. 'M'	8 (L)	0	BIAC 2004
145	94, 5597 Area I	5136	AE	unit	2.22	Cunob.	*obv*. winged Sphinx crouching r., below 'CVNO'; *rev*. traces of fig. adv. l.	8 (L)	0	BIAC 2004
146	94, 10333 Area F	4387	AE	unit	0.44[b]	Cunob.	*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* fig. stg. l.	8 (L?)	0	probably BIAC 2004
147	94, 5603 Area I	5716	AE	unit	1.79	Cunob.?	*obv*. illeg. (surface corrosion); *rev*. winged Sphinx std. l., before ']M['	8 (?)	0	-
cf. BIAC 1874, but this is not a silver type.										
148	94, 11000 Area A2	3029	AE	unit	1.39	Cunob.	*obv.* bust l., before 'CAOO' (??); *rev.* horse, illeg.	8 (?)	0	-
149	94, 12346 Area B	6420	AE	unit	1.33	poss. Cunob.	*obv.* helmeted bust l., illeg. inscription before and behind; *rev.* illeg.	8?	0	-
? (Period uncertain)										
150	94, 11000 Area A2	4328	AE	unit	1.45	-	*obv.* and *rev.* illeg.	?	0	-
Possibly Iron Age; may however by late Roman.										
151	94, 5000 Area J	341	AE	-	2.78	*obv.* & *rev.* illeg.; v. corroded. Possibly Iron Age.		?	0	
152	94, 6000 Area H	433	AE	-	0.82[b]	Illeg. Possibly Iron Age.		?	0	
153	94, 15016 Area M	4944	AE/ AV	unit?	1.82	Iron Age?	*obv.* & *rev.* illeg.	?	0	n/a
The piece appears to be gilded, but not as you would expect a plated forgery to be.										
~~154~~	~~94, 11373 Area N~~	~~6999~~	~~AE ?unit~~		~~0.47~~	~~uncertain~~	~~*obv.* bust r.??; *rev.* illeg.; ?legend around edge of flan~~	~~?~~	~~H~~	~~not Iron Age?~~
~~**Non Iron Age./ probably not Iron Age coins examined**~~										
~~155~~	~~94, 5746 Area J~~	~~3217~~	~~AE~~	~~unit~~	~~0.45[b]~~		~~*obv.* illeg.; *rev.* uncertain~~	~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~Fragment. Probably late Roman rather than Iron Age.~~										
~~156~~	~~94, 4000 Area A1~~	~~370~~	~~AE~~	~~-~~	~~2.12~~	~~Post med.? Prob. not Iron Age.~~		~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~157~~	~~94, 4000 Area A1~~	~~293~~	~~AE~~	~~-~~	~~0.85~~	~~Illeg., unlikely to be Iron Age.~~		~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~158~~	~~94, 7000 Area G~~	~~507~~	~~AE~~	~~-~~	~~-~~	~~illeg. frags. Could be Iron Age.~~		~~-~~	~~?~~	~~-~~
~~159~~	~~94, 4000 Area A1~~	~~272~~	~~AE~~	~~-~~	~~1.30~~	~~Illeg., possibly Iron Age, more likely Roman.~~		~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~160~~	~~94, 4000 Area A1~~	~~256~~	~~AE~~	~~-~~	~~1.73~~	~~Illeg., v. corroded & dumpy, not a coin?~~		~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~161~~	~~94, 4000 Area A1~~	~~724~~	~~AE~~	~~unit~~	~~0.56[b]~~		~~*obv.* bust r.?; *rev.* illeg.~~	~~-~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~Prob. late Roman rather than Iron Age.~~										
~~162~~	~~94, 11000 Area A2~~	~~4992~~	~~radiate - not Iron Age~~					~~late 3rd. c. AD~~	~~0~~	~~-~~
~~163~~	~~95, 3999 Area X (spoil heap)~~	~~8001~~	~~AE 3~~		~~1.51~~	~~House of Val.~~	~~*obv.* bust r., illeg.; *rev.* >SECVRITAS REIPVBLICAE=, Arles (']CON[')~~	~~AD 364-78~~	~~0~~	~~-~~

~~**Coins examined but not identified as they are not Iron Age**~~

~~SFnos.: 584, 291, 487, 435, 300, 5027, 456, 263, 457, 310, 603, 267, 296, 262, 275, 451, 604, 567, 455, 578, 547, 333, 575, 266, 421, 600, 586, 276, 570, 372, 292, 284, 265, 295, 297, 571, 399, 294, 329, 566, 4856, 4609, 4836, 4844, 4605, 4847, 4830, 4833, 4615, 4859, 4619, 4617, 4835, 4831, 4832, 4865, 4866, 4855, 4630, 4631, 4623, 4622, 4603, 4834, 4621, 4613, 4839, 4629, 4842, 4871, 4870, 4857, 4849, 4845, 4858, 4627, 4872, 4869, 250, 299, 593, 6773, 6770, 6487 (Roman coins, all seen by PG – these can be removed)~~

Additional coins, identified October 2006 and May 2007 (the latter by M. Cuddeford)

	94, 11000 Area A2	4600	AE	unit		poss. Cunob.	illeg.		0	-
	94, 11000 Area A2	5166	AE	unit		Cunob.	*obv*. bearded head r., before CVNO; *rev* .lion crouching r., below CAM		0	BIAC 1991
	94, 11000 Area A2	5304	AE	unit		Cunob.	obv. head r.; rev. ?boar/pawing horse r.		0	

Abbreviations used in the catalogue list

Metal
AV – gold; AR – silver; AE – copper-alloy; Sn – tin; Cu – copper; FE – iron.

Description
obv. – obverse; rev. – reverse; l. – left; r. – right; illeg. – illegible; Cunob. – Cunobelin; Dvbnov. – Dubnovellaunus; Added. – Addedomaros.

Dating

Dating is discussed in section 2.2, Table 3.

Abbreviations used in the discussion and catalogue listing

Scheers	Scheers 1977
Allen	Allen 1960
BIAC	Hobbs 1996
VA	Van Arsdell 1989
BMC III (Bronze)	Allen, Mays (ed.), 1995
Stead & Rigby	Stead & Rigby 1986
N. Circ.	Spink's Numismatic Circular
CCI	Celtic Coin Index, Institute of Archaeology, 36 Beaumont Street, Oxford

Suggested illustrations

- all rare and unrecorded types as listed: i.e.:

Cat. 10 (SF7473) – 'Hampshire thin';
Cat. 65 (SF4355) – possible new cu-alloy type;
Cat. 63 (SF7857) – new type of Tasc. cu-alloy;
Cats. 97 (SF3002), 98 (SF4330), 99 (SF7754) – examples of new Cunob. cu-alloy type;
Cat. 73 (SF9256) – variant of Cunob. AE unit.
Cat. 57 (SF9264) – Dubnov. AE coin.

- all examples of gold and silver, including plated forgeries.

Cat. 1 (SF29) – Gallo-Belgic B stater;
Cat. 13 (SF723) – Gallo-Belgic E core;
Cat. 14 (SF3873) – Gallo-Belgic E core;
Cat. 54 (SF6357) – AV quarter stater;
Cat. 55 (SF9265) – AV quarter stater;
Cat 66 (SF3872) – AV Cunob. quarter stater.

- one or two potins.

Cat. 2 (SF379) – Class I potin;
Cat 15 (SF405) – Class II potin.

- Gallic bronze coin.

Cat. 11 (SF2220) – Gallic bronze.

one Tasciovanus, two or three Cunobelin examples, perhaps the most common types.

Cat. 60 (SF3026) – Tasc. AE unit;
Cat. 74 (SF1171) – Cunob. common AE;
Cat. 117 (SF401) – Cunob. common AE, with CAMV legend.

Richard Hobbs, July 2000; December 2000; July 2001