Circumstances of the find

The hoard is said to have been found in March 1977 at Scarlett's Farm, Weycock Hill, Waltham St Lawrence, Berkshire (approximate grid reference SU 818777), in the same field and slightly to the west of the Roman temple. Temple sites are not uncommon locations for Iron Age hoards.3

There were, however, anonymous rumours at the time that coins were not, in fact, found at Waltham St Lawrence, and that many coins were concealed. As usual, it is hard to know what, if any, credence to attach to such rumours, which often accompany finds of coins or antiquities.

At about the same time, however, large numbers of similar coins appeared on the market. These were supposed to have been found in London, at a site near Kew, and said to be from an area of about 80 x 25 yards of gravel exposed when a mudbank was washed away by the river. The following letter from A. Robinson was published in *Surrey Archaeological Society Bulletin* 148 (June 1978), 3-4:

In the summers of 1976 and 1977, silver coins were found on the banks of the Thames in the vicinity of Brentford and Kew (c. TQ 17NE-TQ27NW). The coins were found by metal detectors, and the quantity is unknown since many have been sold without any record. Those that are known include five silver coins of Verica, identified as Mack 115, 118, 120, 123, 128: three silver coins of Eppillus, identified as Mack 107 and 108; one silver coin of Caralla, identified as Mack 265; and a silver minim of 3.5 gm. ob. CARA rev. Pegasus. All are in the possession of, and have been identified by, Mr H. Mossop (South Humberside).

Of these coins one is particularly interesting. It is a coin of Verica (Mack 120) which gives an unrecorded reverse; the details of this coin are published in *Seaby's Coin and Medal Bulletin*, March 1977.

The coins are of especial archaeological interest, since coins of the Atrebates found this far east are extremely rare. I am concerned that the existence, location and details of these coins are not recorded. Since they are often of considerable monetary value it is not surprising that archaeologists are seldom informed, but I would like to stress that we should be very grateful just to be told of their existence. Similar coins may be being found in other reaches of the Thames, and elsewhere, so please could anyone who finds or knows of such finds please contact their local archaeologist or museum.

The relevant article in Seaby's *Bulletin* adds no further information:

---

1 I would like to thank Edward Besly, Mike Cowell and particularly Clive Cheesman for their help in the preparation of this article. The photographs were taken by Chaz Howson of the BM Photographic Service. The following abbreviations are used: M. = R.P. Mack, *The Coinage of Ancient Britain* (1964); VA. = R.D. Van Arsdell, *Celtic Coinage of Britain* (1989).

2 The temple has been known since the seventeenth century. The excavations of 1953 were published by M.A. Cotton, 'Weycock Hill, 1953,' Berkshire Archaeological Society 55 (1956-7), 46-68. See also S. Ford, *East Berkshire Archaeological Survey*, Dept. of Highways and Planning, Berkshire County Council, Occasional Paper No. 1 (Reading, 1987), pp. 83-96 and Fig. 30: this shows the temple in the context of a 14ha settlement. (I owe these references to Michael Fulford.)

3 See, e.g., the hoards from Lancing Down, Farley Heath, Harlow, Savernake and Alresford (bibliography in D F Allen, The origins of coinage in Britain: a reappraisal, in *Problems of the Iron Age in southern Britain*, edited by S.S. Frere (Institute of Archaeology, London, Occasional Paper no. 11, 1960)); and, most notoriously, the recent Wanborough Treasure Trove. The Wanborough hoard, much of which has been acquired by the BM, is in the course of study and it is hoped that the account of it by Clive Cheesman will be published soon. It is a very close parallel to the Waltham St Lawrence hoard, though larger and of a different internal composition, at least as far as the portions preserved in the BM is concerned (less gold, more "minims").

4 H. Mossop, 'A new coin of Verica', *SCMB* (March, 1977). Curiously it seems to have been omitted by VA and is a variant of his 511: vir var on obverse, but co and lion to left on reverse (rather than co and pegasus to right).
The year 1976 was outstanding for the number of silver Ancient British coins, mainly from the Atrebates, which were found in the mud, on the banks of the Thames in the vicinity of Brentford and Kew.

Clearly one's attitude to these reports about the finds at Kew must be influenced by one's view of the likelihood of there being two such similar and unusual finds within so short a space of time. This might just be coincidence; on the other hand, the Kew coins might represent a further parcel of the Waltham St Lawrence hoard, and indicate that the find was considerably larger than the portion preserved in the BM.\textsuperscript{5} If they were, then the question of the find-spot also becomes even more confused. A find-spot in London seems, as has been observed, unexpectedly far east, but, even so, one would still have to choose between the finder's testimony in court that the BM coins were found at Waltham St Lawrence and the story that the others were found elsewhere. There is no way of reconciling all these stories; each reader will have to consider for himself between the evidence given in court, through hearsay and by anonymous rumour, and judge for himself whether there was one find or two in 1976–77, and whether they were (or it was) made at Waltham St Lawrence, Kew, or somewhere else. The view taken here is that there was probably one find, at Waltham St Lawrence, and that it was somewhat bigger than the portion in the BM.\textsuperscript{6}

Summary of contents

The coins declared Treasure Trove and subsequently acquired by the BM consisted of the following rulers and denominations:

1. Iron Age coins (175)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Gold staters</th>
<th>(\frac{1}{2})-staters</th>
<th>Silver units</th>
<th>Silver ‘minims’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British (early)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tincommius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eppillus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verica</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunobelin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epaticcus</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Miscellaneous objects (5)

3. Roman coins (23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denarius of Roman Republic</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Antony (32–1 BC)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Wars (AD 68–9)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitellius (AD 69)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabina, wife of Hadrian (117–38)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faustina I, wife of Pius (138–61)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{5} E.g. VA, p. 545: 'The coins were found at the Weycock Hill Temple site, and were dispersed after recovery. Some were reported as from the ‘Thames Gravels’, but all are believed to have come from Weycock Hill.'

\textsuperscript{6} The sixteen coins in the National Museum of Wales from 'Kew and Waltham have therefore been included here as an appendix, nos 204–219 (photographs by the N.M.W. Photographic Service).
Parallels

At its time of finding there was no very close parallel to the Waltham St Lawrence hoard. The hoard found either at Wallingford, Berkshire or Watlington, Oxfordshire in c. 1890 contained a mixture of gold staters and quarter-staters of Tincommius, Verica, Eppillus and Cunobelin. A better parallel was provided by the finds from Selsey, Sussex, from 1873 onwards, which had many of the same gold issues; there were, however, only a few silver coins and the balance of the gold belonged to the earlier uninscribed period of issues. But since the Waltham St Lawrence hoard was discovered, two other hoards have come to light with a much more closely similar composition, generally speaking a mixture of quarter-staters, silver units and silver 'minims'. One of these was a small hoard of seventeen found in 1986, also from Selsey: this had the same mixture of rulers and denominations, and in much the same proportions. The second is the very large hoard from Wanborough, Surrey, though it has a much greater proportion of silver (units and 'minims') than gold. But the three hoards between them suggest a common circulation pool existed over virtually the whole of southern England, south of the Thames and between the Durotriges and Kent.

The Iron Age issues

The hoard contained coins of four denominations. There were a few gold staters, from the early phase of British coinage, but the bulk of the hoard consisted of gold quarter-staters and silver 'units'; there were also a considerable number of the smaller silver denomination, generally known today as 'minims' from their tiny size. The hoard therefore contained all the coin denominations in use in England south of the Thames during the late Iron Age; no bronze coinage was produced or circulated in this area, unlike north of the Thames in the kingdom of Tasciovanus and Cunobelin; the smallest denomination was, instead of bronze coins, the small 'minim'.

The earliest coins in the hoard were some of the anonymous southern district gold and silver; gold 'Q' staters and quarter-staters (cat. nos 5–14), which with their characteristic triple-tails stand at the head of the gold of Commius and his sons, and a number of anonymous uninscribed silver issues, with Celtic (as opposed to Romanised) style (cat. nos 15–25). Most of these belong to rare issues whose attribution is unclear, but there was a block of four pieces bearing the letter E with a dropped bar (cat. nos. 19–22). These are generally attributed to Commius, and are linked to him by the presence of the same letter on a stater whose style is extremely close to the rare pieces inscribed with Commius's name.

The three sons of Commius, Tincommius, Eppillus and Verica are well represented in...
the hoard; the issues of Verica are particularly numerous, though the number of coins of Eppillus is scarcely less impressive, given their rarity. Apart from two stray silver coins of Cunobelin, the rest of the hoard was made up with issues from the southern extension of the ‘Catuvellaunian’ kingdom, the coins minted by Tasciovanus’s son Epaticcus and the extremely rare coins of Cara... What do these issues mean in political terms? Their appearance in relatively large numbers in this hoard naturally prompts speculation about the inter-relationship of the different rulers and their coins. This is, of course, one of the, if not the, central questions concerning the coinage of the period, for it is only from a close examination of the coins that we can hope to make any reconstruction whatsoever of the political history of Britain in the half century or so which preceded the Roman invasion.

The key question seems to lie in the understanding of the mint-structure of the coinage of the sons of Commius. The starting-point must be the coinage of Eppillus. We are reasonably certain, from the inscriptions CALLE and CALLEV on his gold and silver, that the coinage of Eppillus was minted at Silchester, and one can also attribute, with some plausibility, some of his other quarter-staters to the same mint on the basis of their similar thick and dumpy fabric. It seems reasonable to suppose that most if not all of Tincommius’s coinage comes from the same mint; at any rate the fabric of the quarter-staters is very similar. And what is the relationship between the coinage of Eppillus and of Verica? It is not difficult to see a strong similarity in the fabric of some of Verica’s quarter-staters; the type, common in Waltham St Lawrence, with COM F and VI with horse is the dumiest and most like that of Eppillus; one might think that it comes at the beginning of the reign. They also share the same weight standard with coins of Eppillus and the other rare quarter-staters of Verica with vine-leaf or horseman, but have a different weight standard from the other two types of quarter-stater in the hoard. These, with ‘thunderbolt’/horse and inscription/horse, are rather heavier and have thinner and wider flans; in addition the standard of engraving on the inscription/horse coins is often rather crude. For these reasons it is tempting to think that they may have emanated from a different mint.

If it is possible that Verica had two mints, then how do they relate to the coinage of Epaticcus (which is itself closely linked typologically to the rare coinage of Cara..) ? Although Epaticcus was, as his coins tell us, a son of Tasciovanus, his kingdom was different from that of Tasciovanus and Cunobelin, since his coins circulated south of the Thames and since he also made ‘minims’ whose production was also confined to the same area. It seems clear from the distribution of the find-spots of his coins that his kingdom must have been more or less the same as that of Verica. One is obviously tempted to

14 There were several types which were new when the hoard was found: the quarter-stater of Eppillus (cat. no. 46 = now VA 409), two silver types of Verica (cat. nos 97–102; i03–4 = now VA 506; 471), and four types of silver ‘minim’, one of which is still unpublished (cat. no. 106 = VA 555; cat. nos 107–8 = VA 557; cat. no. 557 = VA 550; the unpublished type is cat. no. 109).
15 His Kentish issues were absent, since they belonged to a different monetary structure (which included bronze coins). VA 435 = M 302 has traditionally been included in the Kentish issues, but seems actually to be from the Calleva group (see commentary on cat. nos 41–5).
16 Obviously, this excludes his Kentish issues, for which see note 15. We cannot be absolutely sure that the inscriptions name the mint, since the legend rex Calle on the silver might just mean ‘King of Calleva’, and his kingdom be named after the town, rather like ‘Emperor of Rome’. But even if this were the case, it is still very likely indeed that the mint would have been situated at the principal city.
17 This has already been done for VA 409 – Waltham no. 46. VA 435 = M 302 = Waltham nos 41–5 should also be transferred to the Calleva series for the same reason and by the very fact that they were included in the Waltham St Lawrence hoard, which excludes Kentish issues. All his silver ‘minims’ can presumably be attributed to Calleva on grounds of their denomination, since minims were not made in Kent.
18 VA 466–7, M 112–3; Waltham 56–69.
20 VA 468, M 114; VA 501, M 122.
21 See the maps in Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul (1981) edited by B. Cunliffe, pp. 75 and 86. This view depends, of course, on the assumption that kingdoms can be defined by coin distribution. In general this seems likely for Iron Age Britain, given the discrete circulation areas for most of the coinages.
associate these patterns of circulation with what we read in Dio of 'a certain Berikos, who was expelled from the island [of Britain] as a result of an uprising, persuaded Claudius to send a force to it.' The vacuum caused by the displacement of Verica would presumptively have been filled by Epaticcus. It would be satisfying to be able to support such a model from a detailed examination of the coins. One can indeed hypothesise that Verica was forced to move his mint from Calleva and set up a mint elsewhere, perhaps further south, before his final expulsion, but it does not seem to be the case that Epaticcus took over the mint at Calleva. All his coins seem to have been minted at a single mint since they all share one stylistic feature, the use of an A without a bar but with a dot, which does not occur on the main series coinage of Verica; assuming that it is correct to think that the main series of Verica’s coinage was produced at Calleva, then the coinage of Epaticcus cannot have been, unless there was a change in engraver. Such a change is not impossible, but it does make a difficulty in the attribution of Epaticcus’s and Cara...’s coins to Calleva. Thus while the general outline of the political history seems likely enough, it is not possible to provide detailed confirmation of it from the coins.

Metrology

The occurrence of a relatively large number of coins in the same hoard enables some light to be thrown on their metrology. First, the hoard indicates that there were two standards of weight for the gold quarter-staters of Verica (the numbers in brackets indicate the numbers of coins in the hoard from which the average is derived):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coin</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Gold Percentage</th>
<th>Silver Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tincommius</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>47% Au</td>
<td>19% Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep pillus</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>46% Au</td>
<td>21% Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verica (light)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>47% Au</td>
<td>13% Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verica (heavy)</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>43% Au</td>
<td>6% Ag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analyses seem to indicate that the heavier coins were a little more base, but it is difficult to be sure of this on the basis of such a small sample. If the average figures were pressed then the heavy coins would contain about 4 per cent less bullion than the light ones, but the sample is too small to justify such a conclusion and the figures are quite compatible with the same amount of bullion in each group. The coins of Eppillus and Tincommius were struck to the lighter standard, and at the same fineness, whereas the heavier standard seems to correspond to that used by the Q quarter-staters (here cat. nos 10–13).

Second, we can use the relatively large numbers of ‘minims’ to compare their weights with those of the silver ‘units’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver (Verica)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eppillus)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Minims’ (all rulers)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A silver ‘unit’ therefore contains 4.4 times as much silver as a ‘minim’, suggesting almost exactly the same relationship as light quarter-staters bear to staters of Verica. It also

22 Dio 60.19.1.
23 This figure should not be taken at face value, since it is an average of only two pieces, one of which has the abnormally low weight of 0.76g.
24 Assuming that the slightly greater average silver content of the Eppillus coins is insignificant statistically. The bullion value implied by a 7 per cent difference in silver would not be significant in coins which contained so much gold. The Waltham St Lawrence specimen of Eppillus (VA 409) is rather heavy (1.22g), but the specimen in the NMW (here no. 205; 1.14g) shows that the issue belongs to the lighter standard.
seems clear that the silver unit was produced at the same weight as the (light) quarter-stater. It is hard to be sure, however, what this means in terms of the relative values of the coins, as a bullion value of 4:4:1 could be interpreted as indicating either that the unit (stater or silver) was valued at 4 of the smaller denomination (which thereby contained more bullion than a strict weight relationship might suggest) or at 5 of the smaller (on the hypothesis that the larger denomination contained less than the bullion one would have expected on a strict weight relationship). One's inclination would be to prefer a value of 4, since 'quarter-staters' were historically quarters, at any rate in Britain; this seems to be the case with the Gallo-Belgic A coinage and with Cunobelin's gold.

A more difficult question is the relationship of the gold to silver, since we have no information about the gold:silver ratio in pre-Roman Britain. However, a gold:silver ratio of 1:12 would give, allowing for the alloy of the gold, a ratio of 5.9 quarter-staters to the silver unit of the same weight, and thereby to encourage one to think in terms of 6 silver units to the quarter stater. We might hypothesise:

\[
\begin{align*}
96 \text{ minims} & = 24 \text{ silver units} = 4 \text{ quarter-staters} = 1 \text{ stater} \\
24 \text{ minims} & = 6 \text{ silver units} = 1 \text{ quarter-stater} \\
4 \text{ minims} & = 1 \text{ silver unit}
\end{align*}
\]

The circulation of Roman and Iron Age coins together is demonstrated by hoards like Waltham St Lawrence and Wanborough, and raises the next question of the relative value of Iron Age and Roman coins. The Roman coins from Waltham St Lawrence have an average weight of 3.02g, which is approximately 2.5 times the weight of an Iron Age silver unit. One could therefore think of an equivalence between 1 denarius, 2.5 silver units and 10 silver minims. The superficially neat system suggested by these figures would, however, be spoiled if one tried to extend it to cover the British gold; it would be neater if one thought of 3 silver units to the denarius, which is also possible. It is hard to know which of these possibilities should be preferred; simplicity is not necessarily the best criterion, given the many similar difficulties of integration which occur elsewhere in the Roman world in the early empire.

The Roman coins and the date of the hoard's deposition

The group of Roman coins is potentially of the greatest importance for dating the hoard's deposition. There can be little doubt that these or some of these coins represent part or all of a hoard, since, although Roman coins have been found in the area, these are generally of bronze, and a group of as many as 23 silver denarii of a relatively tight chronological span can only be explained in terms of a hoard.

As the Roman coins were recovered from the same site as the Iron Age ones, it would seem that they represent a part of the same hoard, and, indeed, there is no reason why Roman coins should not have formed part of the same deposit. Mixed hoards of Roman and Iron Age coins are well-known from Norfolk (mixed hoards of Roman and Icenian silver); from the area south of the Thames, one also finds some mixed hoards, though of rather a different character. In such southern hoards there has tended to be only a
handful of Roman coins, sometimes bronze. But a fairly close parallel has recently been found with the hoard from Wanborough.\(^{32}\) We shall obviously never know exactly how many coins there were in the Wanborough hoard, but about 1000 Iron Age pieces have been preserved in the BM. In addition the BM has acquired 62 Roman denarii, a slightly lower proportion but of the same general magnitude as the number of Roman coins from Waltham St Lawrence.

It is, however, hard to make sense of the group of denarii from Waltham. The bulk of the coins form a coherent group, 11 denarii of the Roman Republic minted in the first century BC and 8 of the common legionary denarii struck by Mark Antony in 32–1 BC. But the remaining Roman coins are a puzzle, both for what they are and for what they are not. First of all, I think that there is no alternative to dismissing the coins of Faustina and probably also Sabina as intrusive (in some sense) strays. Republican denarii continued to circulate throughout the first century AD, but in most of the empire do not seem to have survived Trajan’s reform of 107, although some British hoards deposited in the reign of Hadrian still contain them;\(^{33}\) moreover the complete absence of Flavian coins is impossible to explain, as other hoards show that, typically, these would account for about a third of a hoard of this period. In addition, the Sabina and Faustina coins are more worn than the earlier coins of the Civil Wars and Vitellius. It therefore seems most likely that they are strays and should be disregarded.

The position with the two denarii (one each of the Civil Wars and of Vitellius) is, however, more complicated. Both coins are in very good condition, especially the rare piece of the Civil Wars, and it is therefore tempting to see them as the latest pieces in the hoard, which could thereby be dated to c. AD 69. Indeed the relative state of wear on the Republican and legionary pieces is consistent with such a date, as a comparison with the Flavian hoards from Mildenhall, Cambs. or Howe, Norfolk\(^{34}\) can make clear. But the difficulty with regarding the hoard as one closing in AD 69 is the absence of any of the Julio-Claudian issues. Silver of Caligula, Claudius and Nero was minted in only small quantities and is only poorly represented in later denarius hoards, but the issues of Augustus and Tiberius were relatively common and well-represented in hoards. This can be seen from a comparison of the Eriswell, Mildenhall and Howe hoards, and also the Wanborough hoard:\(^{35}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>Antony</th>
<th>Augustus</th>
<th>Tiberius</th>
<th>Caligula</th>
<th>Claudius</th>
<th>Nero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eriswell</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanborough</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of coins in Augustus and Tiberius is not easy to explain, and we are left with three possible alternatives for the Roman coins from Waltham St Lawrence:

1. they consist of a hoard of Republican and legionary denarii, which was formed in 32/1 BC; the remaining four denarii are all intrusive strays;
2. they consist of a group deposited in c. AD 69, which for some reason omitted coins of Augustus and Tiberius; or
3. they consist of a group deposited in c. AD 69, from which the coins of Augustus and Tiberius have been removed in modern times.

\(^{32}\) See note 1.  
\(^{34}\) For references, see above notes 30 (Eriswell), 34 (Mildenhall, Howe) and 3 (Wanborough, unpublished).
There are problems with all these views. The first seems the least plausible. Apart from the unlikely deposit in Britain of a denarius hoard in c. 31 BC (a hoard without any parallel, as all hoards of denarii seem to be post-invasion), the worn state of the Republican and legionary coins indicates that they must have been withdrawn from circulation considerably later. But if the first possibility seems unlikely, the plausibility of the other two explanations seems about the same. On the one hand (explanation 2) it is hard to see why a hoarder should have failed to include the Augustan and Tiberian pieces; on the other hand (explanation 3) it is hard to see why, for example, these issues should have been concealed from the rest of the find, since they would not have been particularly valuable, compared to the Iron Age coins or even the Civil Wars denarius. But it is perhaps unnecessary to choose between possibilities 2 and 3, as their chronological implications are the same. Both suggest (and I would put it no stronger than 'suggest') a deposition date of c. AD 69. Some further support for this view can perhaps be derived from the unworn denarius of Claudius (IMPER RECEPT, RIC 7: AD 41–2) in the National Museum of Wales, from 'Kew Bridge' (here, cat. no. 219).

The unusual composition of the group of Roman coins therefore precludes its use as a conclusive guide to the date of the deposition of the hoard, but it does seem to provide some evidence for a deposition in c. AD 69. The fragile nature of this conclusion cannot be stressed too strongly, but it is the only direct evidence we have for the dating of the hoard.

The associated objects

Five miscellaneous objects were recovered at the same time as the coins. One is part of a Middle Bronze Age gold ring (cat. no. 176); there are also one or two fragments of an early Roman snake ring (cat. nos 179 and, perhaps 178). The origin of the other objects is uncertain; one is not definitely ancient and might be modern, perhaps a button (cat. no. 180). The other is a coin-like disc, but made of an alloy (27% gold, 55% silver, 19% copper) which is not that of any British Iron Age coin (cat. no. 177). As snake rings date to the first and second centuries AD, it is chronologically possible that 178 and 179 belong to the hoard of coins; this is obviously less likely for the gold strip (176). If it is correct to regard 180 as modern rather than ancient, then clearly it can be disassociated. The position of 177 is less clear. It might well be thought that 177 and the fragmentary 178–9 belong to the hoard, and the implication that the hoard can, at least, in part be associated with metalworking could be supported by cat. no. 1, a coin to which lumps of metal adhere. But while this association is possible, the evidence is hardly strong enough for it to be pressed.

Conclusion

The importance of the Waltham St Lawrence hoard is apparent from the foregoing discussion. It has produced new types and given important new information about the structure and metrology of the pre-Roman coinage of Britain south of the Thames. If, and one must stress if, it is correct to date the hoard’s deposition to c. AD 69, then it also plays an important part in our understanding of the currency and politics of Britain immediately after the invasion, since it shows that south of the Thames Iron Age coinage was allowed to remain in circulation. This conclusion is also supported by other hoards, and in particular the Wanborough hoard. In this respect the pattern of circulation south of the Thames resembles that in Norfolk, where Icenian and Roman silver circulated together until AD 61, and contrasts with the picture from elsewhere in the newly conquered island, where

---

36 Though its deposition may be somewhat earlier, as a consideration of the Roman coins indicates (see above). 37 See J.P.C. Kent, Cercle des Etudes Numismatiques, Bulletin 1973, pp. 2ff.
Iron Age gold and silver was replaced with Roman coinage. It has been suggested by Kent\(^37\) that we should interpret these contrasting patterns in terms of the political arrangements set up in Britain by the Romans. In areas which were annexed, Iron Age gold and silver coinage was demonetised;\(^38\) elsewhere, in client kingdoms, Iron Age coinage was able to continue in circulation. We are reasonably well informed about the client kingdom of the Iceni, but the position south of the Thames is less clear. That there was a client kingdom is indicated by the evidence for the position of Cogidubnus; if it is correct to generalise from the similar composition of the hoards from Waltham St Lawrence, Selsey and Wanborough that the same circulation pattern existed over this very large geographical area of southern England, south of the Thames and between the Durotriges and Kent, then it is tempting to conclude that this area defines the extent of the kingdom of Cogidubnus; no mere princeling, but a rex magnus indeed.\(^39\)

CATALOGUE\(^40\)

IRON AGE COINAGE

Gallo-Belgic gold (1-4)

1. 2.70g. Stater. 41.7% Au, 44.3% Ag, 14% Cu. The coin seems to resemble that published by S. Scheers, *Traité de Numismatique Céltique. II. La Gaule Belge* (Paris, 1977), pp. 230-3 and pl. II.35. Specimens of this rare coinage are attested 'from Picardy' and from the Pas-de-Calais. This coin is worn almost smooth, and the attribution not certain. Lumps of metal are attached to the coin, though it is not clear whether by design or by accident.

2. 1.82g. Quarter-stater. A quarter-stater of the same type as Scheers pl. II.37. Both stater and quarter-stater have been attributed by Scheers, pp. 27-37, to the Ambiani. She regards them as the earliest coins struck by the Ambiani, being derived from gold staters of Tarentum and made in the late third or early second century BC.

3. 6.17g. Stater. 59.4% Au, 29.3% Ag, 11.3% Cu. A Gallo-Belgic 'E' or uniface stater of the Ambiani, of class II (see Scheers, pp. 334-58). This type is widely diffused throughout Belgic Gaul and south-east England, and has been dated by Scheers to the time of Caesar's Gallic War, in the 50s BC. See also BNJ 58 (1998), p. 9.

4. 1.19g. Quarter-stater. 46.2% Au, 18.3% Ag, 35.5% Cu. A gold quarter-stater of a type well known from southern England. The letter on the obverse has been read as a V and the type used to be attributed to Verica, but it seems more likely to be an A with a dropped bar. Staters of this type (Scheers, p. 338 class VI) are found on the continent, but the quarter-staters are known exclusively from Britain, and may perhaps have been made here (so Scheers p. 358 etc.). The cross-channel distribution has invited an attribution to the Commius of Caesar's time, and even speculation that the A might stand for Atrebates.

British Uninscribed gold (5-14)

5. 5.80g. Stater. 41.4% Au, 38.6% Ag, 20.1% Cu.
6. 5.70g. Stater. 42.0% Au, 38.0% Ag, 20.0% Cu.
7. 5.40g. Stater.
8. 5.64g. Stater.
9. 3.50g. Gold-plated contemporary forgery of a stater.

\(^{37}\) Just as Punic gold and silver was demonetised in 146 BC with the Roman annexation of north Africa.

\(^{38}\) For the title and its implication of more than one territory, see J.E. Bogaers, 'King Cogidubnus in Chichester', *Britannia* 10 (1979), 243-54.

\(^{39}\) The catalogue numbers represent the latest element of the BM registration number; thus cat. no. 23, for example, is BM 1978-1-8-23. The photographic negative numbers to the group shots of the BM coins are PS 228924 to 228941 inclusive (Celtic coins) and 230800 (Roman coins).
Wreath pattern/triple-tailed horse galloping r.
12. 1.32g. Quarter-stater. 44.0% Au, 38.8% Ag, 17.2% Cu. Allen Q, M. 70, VA. 222.
13. 1.34g. Quarter-stater, as no. 12.

There are two other pieces of this type in the British Museum; one was found at Farley Heath (= J. Evans, The Coins of the Ancient Britons, p. 85 and pl. D.9 = Allen p. 202), but the other has no find spot. The light weight cannot just be explained by the very worn state of the coin, since the better preserved BM specimens weigh 0.71g and 0.89g.

British Uninscribed silver (15-25)

Head r./horse with double tail galloping r.; human head above; boar below. M. -, VA. -
15. 1.16g. Silver unit.

Three other specimens are known, all from Sussex. One was found in 1989 at Alciston (information from D.R. Rudling) and the other two were found in 1989 and 1990 at the same site near Chichester (BM records). The type is similar to a coin found at Richborough (Allen, Origins..., p. 268 and pl. XIII.22 = M. 87, regarded as not British by VA).

Two horses (?) rearing up on their hind legs, face to face/triple-tailed horse galloping l. M. -, VA. -
16. 0.81g (broken). Silver unit.

A silver coin with a generally similar obverse occurred in the Le Catillon (Jersey) hoard (= M. 87A = SCBI 20, Mack Collection, no. 83), but the origin of this piece is unclear. Another roughly similar piece was found in 1989 near Kingsclere, Hampshire. It may be continental rather than British. See the discussion by Allen, p. 298. Compare also the continental bronze type (Scheers, Pl. XVI, 429-31).

Head r./horse galloping l. M. 88, VA. 262
17. 0.97g.
18. 0.81g.

Head l./horse galloping l.; above, E with broken central bar. M. 446B, VA. 355
19. 0.90g.
20. 0.83g.
21. 1.04g.
22. 0.89g.

The same E occurs on some rare gold staters (VA. 352), whose similarity to the staters of Commius (VA. 350) has suggested an attribution to that ruler.

Horse r./horse l. Allen Lx14, M. 443, VA. 474.
23. 0.40g. Half-unit (?)\.

The type was attributed by Evans (p. 394, p. XVI.3) to the Iceni, though no find-spot was known to him. This attribution seems less likely in view of the occurrence of this piece at Waltham St Lawrence. VA. drew a stylistic parallel with larger coins which he thought were inscribed with the name of Verica (VA. 473), but D. Symons has published a clear specimen of VA. 473, with the legend Tincomi. The southern provenance of this half-piece accords well with an attribution to Tincommius, but this cannot be regarded as certain.

Uncertain/uncertain
24. 0.46g. (broken) A spoked wheel can be made out on the reverse, but the main type is unclear. The part of the obverse type that can be seen is also enigmatic: perhaps the back of a neck?

Uncertain/horse galloping r.
25. 0.55g. (broken).

Tincommius (26-31) (perhaps also 23)

Gold staters
COM F on tablet/TINCO (clockwise) around horseman galloping r. M. 100 var., VA. 385 var.
26. 5.30g. 46.0% Au, 20.4% Ag, 33.6% Cu.
As 26, but tin underneath horse. M. 100, VA. 365
27. 5.31g.

TINC on tablet/c f below horsemans galloping r. M. 96, VA. 375 or 376.
28. 2.10g. (broken) Gold-plated contemporary forgery of a stater.

Gold quarter-staters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>VA.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>TINC on tablet/TINC; horse r. M. 104, VA. 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>375 or 376</td>
<td>TINC on tablet/c f below horsemans galloping r. M. 96, VA. 375 or 376.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>Gold-plated contemporary forgery of a stater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gold quarter-staters (32-47)

Eppillus (32-47)

Gold quarter-staters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>VA.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>EPPIL COM F/Winged horse prancing r. M. 302, VA. 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Same dies as 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 35 and 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 32 and 33; perhaps same rev. die as 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 39 and 40; same rev. die as 39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 36 and 40; same rev. die as 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 36 and 39.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Silver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.</th>
<th>VA.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>Faceing head/TINC; bull r. M. 106 var., VA. 370.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>Same dies as 32.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eppillus (32-47)

Gold quarter-staters (32-47)

Verica (48-110)

Gold quarter-staters (48-69)

Heavy series (48-55)
CELTIC COINAGE IN BRITAIN III

Com fili on either side of ‘thunderbolt’/VIRI above horse galloping r. M. 114 var., VA. 468 var.

48. 1.29g. AH$^{41}$ 145.

As 48, but VIR. M. 114, VA. 468.

49. 1.31g. AH 146.

VERIC COM F between crescent and star/REX below horse walking r. M. 122, VA. 501.

50. 1.36g. Same obv. die as 54–55. AH 147.
51. 1.26g. 43.4% Au, 5.9% Ag, 50.7% Cu. AH 148.
52. 1.33g. AH 151.
53. 1.31g. AH 152.
54. 1.31g. Same obv. die as 50 and 55. AH 150.
55. 1.36g. Same obv. die as 50 and 54. AH 149.

Light series (56–69)

Com F in tablet between circles/vir; horse rearing r. M. 112, VA. 466.

56. 1.18g. Same obv. die as 57–59, 61 and 63; same rev. die as 57–9 and 61. AH 131.
57. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 56, 58–9, 61 and 63; same rev. die as 56, 58–9 and 61. AH 132.
58. 1.19g. 46.5% Au, 16.1% Ag, 37.7% Cu. Same obv. die as 56–7, 59, 61 and 63; same rev. die as 56–7, 59 and 61. AH 133.
59. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 56–58, 61 and 63; same rev. die as 56–8 and 61. AH 134.
60. 1.18g. AH 137.
61. 1.16g. Same obv. die as 56–59 and 63; same rev. die as 56–9. AH 133.
62. 1.14g. AH 138.
63. 1.20g. 46.6% Au, 12.4% Ag, 41.0% Cu. Same obv. die as 56–59 and 61. AH 136.

The final letter of the obverse legend is usually engraved as an I rather than an F, but there is a specimen in the BM with an F. Presumably the I is therefore just a weakly engraved F.

As 56–63, but no circles on obv., and, on reverse, horse is bridled and walks r. M. 113, VA. 467.

64. 1.18g. Same obv. die as 68; same rev. die as 65–68. AH 139.
65. 1.21g. 47.4% Au, 10.9% Ag, 39.0% Cu, 2.70 Sn. Same obv. die as 66; same rev die as 64 and 66–8. AH 141.
66. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 65; same rev die as 64–5 and 67–8. AH 142.
67. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 69; same rev. die as 64–6 and 68. AH 143.
68. 1.20g. Same obv. die as 64; same rev. die as 64–7. AH 140.
69. 1.16g. Same obv die as 67. AH 144.

Silver (70–110)

Com F between two crescents and dots/viri; boar running r. M. 115, VA. 470.

70. 1.13g. VA. 470–3 (no anulets).
71. 0.95g. VA. 470–1 (anulets on obv.).

VERICA COMMI F around circular object/REX below lion prancing r.; crescent above. M. 123, VA. 505.

72. 1.03g. Possibly same die as Wanborough 383, which has a dot at the end of the legend.
73. 0.88g (broken). Traces of dots between the words in the legend.
74. 0.80g.

COMMI F; naked horseman with shield, r./VERICA; naked horseman with spear, r. M. 128, VA. 530.

75. 1.10g. Same dies as 83.
76. 0.68g (broken). Same obv. as 84.
77. 1.21g. Same dies as 82.
78. 1.12g.
79. 1.18g. Dies illegible.
80. 1.06g.

81. 1.00g. Dies illegible.
82. 1.20g. Same dies as 77.
83. 1.10g. Same dies as 75.
84. 1.10g. Same obv. as 76.
85. 1.11g.

COMM F: Two cornucopias and thyrsus (?) on vase/VERICA; female figure seated r. with shield and spear. M. 129, VA. 531.
86. 1.16g.

COMM F: Male figure standing l., head to r., holding lutiis and raising arm/VERICA around laureate bust. M. 131, VA. 533.
87. 1.16g (broken).
88. 0.73g.
89. 0.97g. Perhaps same obv. as 93.
90. 1.05g.
91. 1.14g.
92. 1.05g.
93. 0.70g (broken). Perhaps same obv. as 89.
94. 1.03g.
95. 1.18g.
96. 1.11g.

VERICA REX; bull, butting r./COMM F; half-naked male figure standing l., holding palm branch; to r., head on pole with spike. M. -, VA. 506.
97. 1.19g. Same dies as 100.
98. 1.07g. Perhaps same obv. as 101.
99. 1.10g. Perhaps same obv. as 102.
100. 1.20g. Same dies as 97.
101. 1.06g. Perhaps same obv. as 98.
102. 1.03g. Perhaps same obv. as 99.

COMM F in rectangle between decoration/VI-Ri; eagle standing r., head 1., with spread wings. M. -, VA. 471.
103. 1.11g.
104. 1.13g.

CF in torc/VERIC; laureate bust r. M. 132, VA. 551.
105. 0.50g.

The reverse legend has a ligatured VE, followed by RIC (see also D. Symons, NCirc 1990, p. 48 no. 26).

Two cornucopias and thyrsus (?) on vase/eagle l. with head turned back. M. -, VA. 555.
106. 0.23g.

CF: Sphinx seated r./VERI above sleeping dog. M. -, VA. 557 ('animal')
107. 0.20g.
108. 0.32g. Different dies from 107.

Panel with star/VI CO; bull r. M.-, VA. -.
109. 0.21g.

The reading is confirmed by a specimen in the Wanborough hoard. The obverse is very close to that of VA. 383-7, which is attributed to Tincommius because the reverse legend is read TIN. It might, however, be possible to read the legend on the illustration of VA. 383-7 as VIR, even if this is possible, however, the coin would still be a little different from the Waltham St Lawrence and Wanborough pieces, since they have a star rather than a C- on the obverse panel, and there is definitely no R after VI on the Wanborough piece.

110. 0.18g.

The reading seems to be CO F, rather than CF, as there seems to be a letter O to the right of the vine stem.
Cunobelin (111–2)

Silver

[CVA]NO; winged bust r./[TASC]IO; sphinx seated l. M. 237, VA. 2057.

111. 1.00g (broken).

112. 1.11g.

Epaticcus (113–71)

Silver

EPAT; bust r., wearing animal-skin / eagle r. with snake. M. 263, VA. 580.

113. 1.22g.

114. 1.03g. Same obv. die as 118, 124, 128, 155; same rev. die as 118, 128.

115. 1.07g. Same obv. die as 140; same rev. die as 140.

116. 1.13g. Same obv. die as 121, 127; same rev. die as 120, 127.

117. 1.08g. Unusual style.

118. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 114, 124, 128, 155; same rev. die as 114, 128.

119. 1.22g. Same obv. die as 130, 144; same rev. die as 130.

120. 1.23g. Same obv. die as 122, 137, 142; same rev. die as 116, 127.

121. 1.11g. Same obv. die as 116, 127; same rev. die as 137, 142.

122. 1.20g. Same obv. die as 120, 137, 142.

123. 1.07g. Same obv. die as 148, 150; same rev. die as 150.

124. 1.18g. Same obv. die as 114, 118, 128, 155; same rev. die as 129, 132.

125. 1.07g. Same obv. die as 133–4; same rev. die as 134.

126. 0.83g. Same obv. die as 139, 152, 154; rev. die illegible.

127. 1.14g. Same obv. die as 118, 121; same rev. die as 116, 120.

128. 1.20g. Same obv. die as 118, 118, 124, 155; same rev. die as 114, 118.

129. 0.98g (broken). Same rev. die as 124, 132.

130. 1.24g. Same obv. die as 119, 144; same rev. die as 119.

131. 1.11g. Same dies as 149.

132. 1.07g. Same rev. die as 124, 129.

133. 1.19g. Same obv. die as 125, 134.

134. 1.11g. Same obv. die as 125, 133; same rev. die as 125.

135. 1.07g. Same obv. die as 151.

136. 0.82g (broken). Dies illegible.

137. 1.00g. Same obv. die as 122, 120, 142; same rev. die as 121, 142.

138. 0.99g (broken) (doublestruck).

139. 0.94g (broken). Same obv. die as 126, 152, 154.

140. 1.15g. Same obv. die as 115; same rev. die as 115.

141. 1.18g.

142. 1.17g. Same obv. die as 120, 122, 137; same rev. die as 121, 137.

143. 1.17g.

144. 1.23g. Same obv. die as 119, 130.

145. 1.13g. Unusual style.

146. 0.98g (broken).

147. 1.20g. Same rev. die as 153.

148. 1.11g. Same obv. die as 123, 150.

149. 1.25g. Same dies as 131.

150. 1.15g. Same obv. die as 123, 148; same rev. die as 123.

151. 1.05g. Same obv. die as 135.

152. 1.13g. Same obv. die as 126, 139, 154.

153. 1.04g. Same rev. die as 147.

154. 1.00g. Same obv. die as 126, 139, 152.

155. 0.70g (broken). Same obv. die as 114, 118, 124, 128.

156. 0.78g. Lead forgery.

157. 0.23 (broken). Lead forgery, possibly of this type.

TAS-CIO-V; Victory seated r., half-naked, holding wreath/EPAT; boar r., underneath branch; in exergue, row of dots. M. 263A, VA. 581.

158. 1.10g. Same dies as 164.

159. 1.23g.
CELTIC COINAGE IN BRITAIN III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>0.84g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>1.07g</td>
<td>Perhaps same dies as 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>1.13g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>2.17g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>1.03g</td>
<td>Same dies as 158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>2.08g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>1.06g</td>
<td>Perhaps same dies as 161.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>1.25g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>1.02g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>1.17g</td>
<td>Perhaps same dies as 166.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>1.13g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>1.17g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>1.13g</td>
<td>Same dies as 158.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>1.17g</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 171. Rev. die different from 113-55 (Epaticcus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>1.16g</td>
<td>Same dies as BM 1919-2-13-329. Same obv. die as 171. Rev. die different from 113-55 (Epaticcus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>1.03g</td>
<td>Same dies as 174.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EPATITA;** boar's head. M. 264, VA. 585.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>0.19g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EPATIX;** griffin r., on pole (?). M.-, VA.-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>0.30g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cara... (171-6)

**Silver**

Cara; bust r., wearing animal-skin/eagle r. with snake. M. 265, VA. 593.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>1.09g</td>
<td>Same obv. die as 173. Rev. die different from 113-55 (Epaticcus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>1.12g</td>
<td>Different dies from 171, 173; rev. die is very similar to 121, 137, 142.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>1.06g</td>
<td>Same dies as BM 1919-2-13-329. Same obv. die as 171. Rev. die different from 113-55 (Epaticcus).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cara around pellet in ring/winged horse prancing r. M.-, VA. 595.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>0.25g</td>
<td>Same dies as 175.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>0.26g</td>
<td>Same dies as 174.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>3.84g</td>
<td>A flattened part of a multiple ribbed penannular gold ring of Middle Bronze Age date. 77.7% Au, 18.0% Ag, 4.3% Cu. The composition conforms to the normal composition of such pieces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>1.23g</td>
<td>Base gold disc. 54.7% Ag, 18.7% Cu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>0.19g</td>
<td>Silver 'globule', possibly part of a snake ring, as 179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>1.06g</td>
<td>Part of a Romano-British snake ring. This type can be dated to first and second century AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>4.03g</td>
<td>Convex silver disc. Not definitely ancient; probably a button?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROMAN COINAGE**

**Republican**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>337/3</td>
<td>D. Silanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Cn Lentul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>364/1b (H before head on obverse)</td>
<td>Q Anto Balb pr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>409/1</td>
<td>M Plaetorius Cestianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>M Sciar, P Hypsaeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>428/3</td>
<td>Q Cassius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188.</td>
<td>449/1</td>
<td>C Vibius Pansa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>M Poblici leg propr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190.</td>
<td>480/9</td>
<td>Sepullius Macer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>480/17</td>
<td>M Mettius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legionary denarii of Mark Antony**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192.</td>
<td>544/19</td>
<td>LEG VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193.</td>
<td>544/21</td>
<td>LEG VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 Identification by Stuart Needham, British Museum.
43 Identification of 178 and 179 by Catherine Johns, British Museum.
CELTIC COINAGE IN BRITAIN III

194. LEG VIII 534/22 2.70g
195. LEG X 544/24 3.10g
196. LEG XVII 544/32 2.80g
197. LEG XX 544/36 2.94g
198. LEG [ ] 544 2.76g
199. [ ] 544 1.90g (broken)

Civil Wars (AD 68–9)

200. FIDES PRAETIT /FIDES EXERCITVVM BMC 65 3.00g

Vitellius

201. XVVIR SACR FAC BMC 17 2.78g

Sabina, wife of Hadrian

202. CONCORDIA AVG BMC 932 2.66g

Faustina I, wife of Antoninus Pius

203. AETERNITAS BMC 345 2.64g

APPENDIX

The following coins were acquired by the National Museum of Wales between 1977 and 1980 as coming from either 'Kew Bridge' or Waltham St Lawrence. The appearance of the coins is similar to that of the coins in the BM. The following list also gives the NMW accession numbers. 'As W . .' refers to the similar coins in the catalogue above.

Eppillus

204. 77.27H/1. Quarter-stater. 1.15g. M. 107, VA. 407. As W 32-40.
206. 77.24H/1. Silver. 1.22g. M. 108, VA. 415. As W 47.

Verica

207. 80.4H/2. Quarter-stater. 1.30g. M. 114, VA. 468. As W 49.
208. 80.4H/1. Quarter-stater. 1.15g. M. 115, VA. 466. As W 56-63.
209. 77.18H/2. Silver. 1.23g M. 115, VA. 470-3. As W 70.
210. 77.6H/1. Silver. 1.10g. M. 123, VA. 505. As W 74-8.
211. 80.78H/2. Silver. 1.22g. M. 128, VA. 531. SCMB 1980, E42 (this coin). As W 86.
212. 77.18H/3. Silver. 1.10g. M. 131, VA. 533. As W 87-96.
213. 80.1H. Silver. 1.29g. M. 139, VA. 556. As W 97-102.
214. 80.79H/1. ‘Minim’. 0.22g. M. 139, VA. 555. As W 106.
215. 80.4H/3. ‘Minim’. 0.26g. M. 139, VA. 557. As W 107-8.

Epaticcus

216. 80.4H/5. Silver. 1.19g. M. 263A, VA. 581. As W 158-68.
217. 77.18H/1. Silver. 1.28g. M. 263A, VA. 581. As W 158-68.

Cara

218. 78.73H. ‘Minim’. 0.21g. M. 263A, VA. 595. As W 174-5.

Claudius I

219. 80.4H/6. IMPER RECEPT. 3.09g. RIC 7 (AD 41-2).