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Introduction

In contrast to other North Thames rulers, notably Cunobelinus and Tasciovanos, the gold coinage of the Trinovantian king Dubnovellaunos has to date received scant attention. Until recently, this may at least in part have been due to an insufficient number of coins being available to facilitate a detailed study. At the time that Derek Allen published ‘Cunobelin’s gold’, just forty-one staters of Dubnovellaunos had been recorded, compared to the 159 of Cunobelinus forming the basis of Allen’s investigation. Since then, however, the growth of metal-detecting has seen a steady rise in the number of recorded Dubnovellaunos staters, and this study thus comprises a total of 113 coins.

There may, however, be another factor at play in the lack of scholarly interest in Dubnovellaunos. To the casual observer all of his staters tend to look more or less identical, thereby seemingly offering little scope for original research. To this must be added the fact that due to their inherently simple design, many of the obverses are extremely difficult to identify and die-link, which makes any attempt at a detailed study a laborious and time consuming task. Coupled with Dubnovellaunos’s uncertain position within the North Thames hierarchy, and faced with the additional prospect of a Cantian dimension, this quite possibly persuaded most would-be researchers to concentrate on easier and ostensibly more rewarding subjects.

This long overdue investigation has several aims. It will attempt to identify typologically and stylistically distinct phases within the development of Dubnovellaunos’s Trinovantian (or Essex) stater series and place these into approximate chronological order. This will be supported by a detailed study of the surviving legends, together with a close look at their orthographic development over the life of this series, a feature which to date has rarely received the scholarly attention it undoubtedly deserves. Furthermore, the study will re-examine the numismatic evidence for the suspected, though still controversial, Cantian dimension to Dubnovellaunos’s rule, as well as discussing his position amongst the other protagonists on the North Thames stage in the last quarter of the first century BC.

Earlier work

It was Sir John Evans who originally equated the British ruler Dubnovellaunos with Dumnobellaunus, a supplicant king whose name is mentioned in the Res Gestae Divi Augusti and preserved in an inscription from Ancyra, Galatia (modern Turkey). Ever since then there has been a general acceptance that the two names as well as their respective owners are most probably synonymous.
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Evans was also the first to realize that of the two stater types then known, one was found exclusively in Kent and the other predominantly in Essex. Of the two, he considered the Kentish stater to be the earlier, dating from the middle of Tasciovanos's reign, whereas he placed its Essex equivalent just prior to Cunobelinus. Evans felt that Dubnovellaunos might originally have been 'a Kentish prince . . ., who, from some cause or other, either was driven out of Kent into Essex, or else annexed a portion of the country north of the Thames to his dominions in Kent'. Ever since then, scholars have been unable to agree on that vital question: were both series struck under one and the same ruler, or were there two rulers named Dubnovellaunos?

Allen concluded that Dubnovellaunos's main kingdom lay in Kent and that at some stage he had conquered the Trinovantian territories north of the Thames estuary. He felt that the Essex stater betrayed the hand of a Kentish craftsman and that the lettering on the staters suggested that they began later than the Kentish series. As the Cantian stater (V169) shows close parallels with the early staters of Tasciovanos (V1680/1682) on which the bucranium occupies the same position, he considered both Tasciovanos and Tincomarus to be close contemporaries of Dubnovellaunos, placing all three in the last three of the first century BC and the early years of the first century AD. Mack, closely following Allen, suggested that there was a single Dubnovellaunos, who returned to his native Kent after losing his kingdom to the expanding Catuvellauni.

Rodwell expressed the view that the Essex series owed nothing to the Kentish series and concluded that there is 'no reason to see 'Dubnovellaunos' as one person; indeed the evidence is substantially to the contrary. Once freed from the untenable Essex-Kent link, it is not difficult to see Dubnovellaunos as the Trinovantian successor to Addedomaros, who ousted Tasciovanus (sic) from Camulodunum'. Nash also considered the one king scenario less likely, while Van Arsdell (see below) rejected it altogether. Hobbs, on the other hand, favoured the idea that both series were issued by the same person.

Van Arsdell argued that the Cantian Dubnovellaunos was probably a different ruler to the contemporary Trinovantian king of the same name, suggesting that the two coinages are completely different in style and that the Cantian one was issued for a longer period. Whilst accepting the possibility that Dubnovellaunos succeeded Tasciovanos, he thought it more likely that Dubnovellaunos's reign fell between that of Addedomaros and Tasciovanos. He was also the first person to split Dubnovellaunos's Essex stater issues into two basic types: V1650 consists of two variants and a plated version, whilst V1655 contains a further three variants. Unfortunately his identifications are for the most part imprecise, with the plate coins occasionally contradicting the notes, especially with regard to the legends. As part of this process he also created the myth of the DVNOVILLA legend, which on occasion still finds its way into catalogue entries but in reality does not exist. Whilst credit is undoubtedly due for attempting to tackle an evidently tricky and complicated subject, the resulting classification is of limited use in trying to identify an unusual variant or in untangling the complexities of Dubnovellaunos's Essex stater series. It is clear then from this brief summary of previous work that there is much confusion and precious little agreement amongst scholars concerning virtually all aspects of Dubnovellaunos's reign. Furthermore, all of Dubnovellaunos's numerous issues, including his Essex staters, have until now escaped closer scrutiny. Apart from the author's own cursory investigation into the relationship between his Trinovantian and Cantian issues,
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which resulted in the identification of an ‘Early’ and ‘Late’ stater type (see below), no serious attempt has been made to investigate what is clearly a much more complex and quite possibly longer lived series than previously thought.

This paper identifies six distinct classes of Dubnovellaunos’s Trinovantian stater, together with a total of twenty-three individual variants, a classification based overwhelmingly on a combination of stylistic and orthographic factors. Of necessity, much of this arrangement is speculative and as such represents a personal view of the likely chronological development of Dubnovellaunos’s Essex stater during the period of its production. Whilst the discovery of new die varieties will undoubtedly necessitate adjustments to the order here proposed, I am hopeful that the division into six basic types will continue to form the framework for the classification of this series for some time to come.

**Background**

Having become intrigued by the contrasting views described above, I carried out a brief examination of the available numismatic evidence. Following a comparison of the typological, stylistic and iconographical features of the two series as well as their respective metrolology, metallurgy and legend development, I concluded that the Trinovantian and Cantian issues shared too many close parallels for the similarities to be coincidental, leading to the conclusion that there was only one Dubnovellaunos. Having now had the opportunity to study the Essex issues in much greater detail, I have become aware of some shortcomings in my previous line of reasoning, which I will address in due course.

Of the coins that can be attributed to Dubnovellaunos with any degree of certainty, around eleven types were struck in Essex and perhaps fourteen in Kent. In Essex, we have just one type each of stater and quarter stater, three silver units and six bronzes, whereas in Kent there are two staters, two quarter staters, six silver units and four bronzes (Table 1). Kent therefore has twice the number of both gold and silver issues and whilst some doubt remains over the ultimate origin of a small number of types, it would appear that Kent led the way in the number and variety of coin types produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly attributable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1650/1655 stater</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Various versions and abbreviations, including garbled forms, of DVNOVELLAUNOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1660 quarter stater</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>No legend but stylistically very close to V1650/1655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1663 silver unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Rev. legend [DVNOV]ALLAVNOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1665 bronze unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>No legend, but similarity to V1663 and palm leaf below horse indicate issue of Dubnovellaunos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1667 bronze unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Obv. legend DVNOVIIII, rev. legend DVBN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1669 bronze unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Rev. legend uncertain but perhaps DVNO above horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V164 silver unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No legend, but depiction of horse in some respects similar to V1667, suggesting issue of Dubnovellaunos; majority of findspots in Essex and Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interestingly, this trend is reversed when looking at the total numbers of coins recorded for each region up to the end of 2004. Here we have 318 units for Essex against 268 for Kent, with the greatest discrepancy in numbers occurring amongst the gold issues, where the Essex staters outnumber the Cantian ones by almost three to one. The difference is further amplified by an estimated twenty-five of the thirty-seven recorded Kent staters originating from a single undeclared hoard found around the mid 1990s. However, the balance is somewhat restored by the greater number of Cantian quarters staters (fifty-eight) recorded when compared to the Essex quarters (thirty-eight). Mindful of the inevitable uncertainties in a number of the attributions and the potentially different levels of metal-detecting activity in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCI 88.0148</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Legend DV[...]. Unique coin, which may be either an Essex or a Kent issue. Iconography suggests Cantian mint but findspot is in Herts. Early Cunobelin silver (V1947) has a similar obverse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V167</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No legend, but shares pentagram with V164 and has a palm leaf above boar on obv.; findspots mostly Essex and Suffolk, but four from Kent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 01.0217</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Horse stylistically close to other Dubnovellaunos issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 94.1182</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBN, may be either a North Thames or a Kentish issue. Obv. shared with a SAM bronze but V1667 also depicts an animal of similar style. Two findspots in the North Thames region and one in Kent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KENT**

Directly attributable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V169</td>
<td>stater</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBNOVALLAVNOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V176</td>
<td>stater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBNOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V170</td>
<td>quarter stater</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>No legend but horse almost identical to V169. Obv. DVNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V165</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V171</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V178</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 03.0693</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBN, cross-hatched box identifies it as Cantian issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 92.0698</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Obv. legend ...NOVALLA[...], style of horse's head and legend around circumference suggest Cantian issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 89.0026</td>
<td>silver unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBN. Both records from Kent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V166</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V180</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBNOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V181</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVBNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI 94.0381</td>
<td>bronze unit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rev. legend DVNOVALLAVNOS, similar reverse including full legend to V169 indicating Cantian origin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Number of coins</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V163</td>
<td>quarter stater</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>No legend but stylistically close to V170; perhaps second quarter stater associated with V169?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, this trend is reversed when looking at the total numbers of coins recorded for each region up to the end of 2004. Here we have 318 units for Essex against 268 for Kent, with the greatest discrepancy in numbers occurring amongst the gold issues, where the Essex staters outnumber the Cantian ones by almost three to one. The difference is further amplified by an estimated twenty-five of the thirty-seven recorded Kent staters originating from a single undeclared hoard found around the mid 1990s. However, the balance is somewhat restored by the greater number of Cantian quarters staters (fifty-eight) recorded when compared to the Essex quarters (thirty-eight). Mindful of the inevitable uncertainties in a number of the attributions and the potentially different levels of metal-detecting activity in the
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two regions, perhaps the most sensible conclusion at present is that the overall size of Dubnovellaunos’s North Thames output appears to have been broadly similar to the Cantian output.

There has been some speculation that the elusive DIRAS stater (V162), known from only three examples, may be connected to Dubnovellaunos. Evans tentatively read the incomplete inscription as DIBORIG.24 He saw an analogy with the gold issues of Dubnovellaunos and Vosenos, whilst accepting that its home was more likely in the North Thames area than in Kent. Allen catalogued the coin as a North Thames issue and suggested an alternative reading of the legend as ?DIRAS.25 By contrast, Van Arsdell had no hesitation in assigning this type to the Cantian issues of Dubnovellaunos.26 Having modified Evans’s reading of DIBORIG to DVBORIG, he speculates that this may represent an abbreviation of DVBNOVELLAVNS RIGONIS. More recently Hobbs retained Allen’s reading of DIRAS and once again considered this type to be an Essex issue stylistically related to Dubnovellaunos.27 I too believed this stater to be a North Thames issue,28 and was doubtful of any relationship to the issues of Dubnovellaunos, from which it appeared typologically and stylistically distinct.

Until now, the recorded provenances have been of little assistance in solving this mystery. One of the staters was found near Colchester (Essex) and of the three fairly recently discovered matching quarter staters (CCI 96.1358, 96.2276 and 97.0783), one was found near Stevenage (Herts.) and one near Ashford (Kent), thus leaving the question of the ultimate origin of this type unresolved. It is much the same story with the DIRAS stater’s composition of 41% gold, 13% silver and 46% copper.29 Although close to Cantian issues such as the Early Weald stater (V144) and Van Arsdell’s Ornamented Type (V142), a similar composition is also shared by a number of North Thames staters of Addedomaros (cf. BMC 2466, 2472 and 2391–2404).

Fortunately, several new discoveries have recently come to light, which would seem to point increasingly towards a Kentish origin. The Brasted hoard, found near Westerham (Kent) between 2000 and 2005, contained one DIRAS stater (CCI 06.0849) and two matching quarter staters (CCI 06.0856–7), thus giving a total of four provenances for Kent against two from the North Thames region.30

Regrettably, the newly-discovered DIRAS stater shows only a tiny fraction more of the inscription than the British Museum specimen (BMC 2449), thus leaving the question of the legend unresolved. On examining all three known DIRAS staters, John Sills has offered an alternative reading of DVB RIG,31 which I believe may well be nearer the mark. There can be little doubt that the first letter is a D, the second could conceivably be a rather narrow V, while the third, looking to all intents and purposes like an R, closely resembles the B on some dies of Dubnovellaunos’s Cantian first coinage stater (V169).32 There then appears to be a gap before the next word, the first letter of which may well be an R, the second an I and the third a C or a G.

Whilst entirely hypothetical, a reading of DVB RIG or DVB RIC has a close parallel in the Dobunnic coinage, where staters inscribed with the names of ANTED (V1066/1069) and possibly EISV (V1105) are followed by the epithet RIG or RIC. Should a reading of DVB RIG/RIC eventually be confirmed, it would raise the question as to whether this represents Dubnovellaunos himself or perhaps a slightly earlier ruler named Dubnorig or Dubnoric.33 I believe the similar names are probably too much of a coincidence for there to have been two
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separate individuals but the possibility cannot be ruled out. At the present rate of discovery, i.e. three staters over a period of two hundred years, it could be a while yet before we know for sure, but it is just possible – as Van Arsdell suggested – that we are looking at the first Cantian stater issue of Dubnovellaunos.\textsuperscript{34}

The coins

Dubnovellaunos’s Trinovantian staters feature relatively immobile designs for both obverse and reverse. Whilst the obverse remains essentially the same – except for a brief directional change to the wreaths – the reverse experiences a greater degree of change with minor design elements added or removed. There are some standard design features, which are a component of every reverse die so far recorded. These include the wreath below the horse, the large pellet under the horse’s head, the ringed pellet directly above the horse and the two ringed pellets in the exergue below the wreath. These invariables are not referred to in the text unless they help to differentiate one type from another or have been modified in some way.

A. Early type

This can be divided into three variants, all of which feature a similar Celticized horse which differentiates them stylistically from the remainder of the series.

A1 \textit{Obv.} linear design with central back to back crescents flanked by two ringed pellets, the wreaths with outward pointing leaves ending in ringed pellets. A distinctive groove runs parallel on either side of the design.  
\textit{Rev.} Celticized horse l., ringed pellet in front, on horse’s shoulder and under end of tail, three pellets under head, legend \textit{DVBOVALAVNOS} or similar.

A2 \textit{Obv.} as A1  
\textit{Rev.} as A1 but no ringed pellet on horse’s shoulder, two pellets under head, legend probably similar ending in \ldots \textit{OOS}.

A3 \textit{Obv.} as A1  
\textit{Rev.} Celticized horse with prominent elongated muzzle l., ringed pellet on horse’s shoulder, two pellets under head, legend unclear.

![Class A types. All coins are illustrated at approximately twice actual size.](image.png)
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B. Transitional type

This type is characterized by the leaves of the wreaths on the obverse pointing inwards – the only type to feature this arrangement. The distinctive obverse is coupled with both an Early and a Letter A type reverse.

B1  
Obv. as A1 but leaves of wreaths point inwards rather than outwards.
Rev. as A2, but three pellets under head, small letter S below top of tail, legend DVBNOVALA(V?)NOS.

B2  
Obv. as B1
Rev. Spidery horse with griffin-like head, single pellet under head, ring in front, legend unclear.

C. Letter A type

This is defined by the first letter A in the legend DVBNOVALA VNOS and the stylistic changes to the reverse. Here the horse has become rather spidery when compared to the Early type and the treatment of the head now gives it a griffin-like appearance. Orthographic errors are common and on some dies the critical letter A is missing altogether. However even without the defining A, the type can be easily identified by the unmistakeable style of the horse. Apart from the differing spellings and types of script, this class appears to be largely homogenous.

C1  
Obv. as A1, with some dies rather carelessly engraved.
Rev. As B2, but ring in front of horse missing, ringed pellet under end of tail, legend DVBNOVALA VNOS or corrupted versions thereof.
D. Letter II type

This type is identifiable by the letters II in the legends DVBNOVIIA, DVBNOVIIAV, DVBNOVIIAVN and DVBNOVIIAVNVS. The reverse now features a more elegant, Romanized horse with the associated ornamentation determining the number of variants. Orthographic errors are rare.

D1  
*Obv.* as A1, stylistically similar to Class C obverses.  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse, small pellet in front of forelegs, legend unclear with only DVB[. . . visible.

This variant is difficult to place and its attribution to Class D remains uncertain until an example with a fuller legend becomes available.

D2  
Ringed pellet between two pellets above horse.  
D2–1  
*Obv.* as A1, but wreaths poorly engraved.  
*Rev.* ringed pellet between two pellets above horse, pellet triad under end of tail, pellet under stalk of wreath, legend unclear with only . . .LLAV visible.

Reverse is off-struck with only part of the design visible. However, attribution to Class D is confirmed by arrangement above horse being similar to D2–2.

D2–2  
*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* ringed pellet between two pellets above horse, pellet below horse and two pellets or possibly pellet triad under end of tail, legend DVBNOVIIAV or with recut die DVBNOVIIAVN with ligate ending.

D3  
Legend DVBNOVIIA

D3–1  
*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse with pellet below, pellet triad after legend DVBNOVIIA and ringed pellet under end of tail.

D3–2  
*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse, pellet after legend DVBNOVIIA and another pellet under end of horse's tail.

D3–3  
*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* slender and elegant naturalistic horse, pellet triad after legend DVBNOVIIA, pellet under horse, under end of tail and in between the two ringed pellets below wreath.

D3–4  
*Obv.* as A1 but all known examples feature a die-break across the centre.  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse; pellet under end of tail but unclear if pellet after legend DVBNOVIIA.

If future discoveries were to show a pellet after the legend, this variant would become synonymous with D3–2.

D3–5  
*Obv.* same as D3–4  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse, pellet below and perhaps also under wreath stalk, letter A under end of tail, legend most probably DVBNOVIIA.

D4  
Legend DVBNOVIIAVN

D4–1  
*Obv.* same as D3–4  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse, pellet below and under end of tail, legend DVBNOVIIAVN.

D4–2  
*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse with at least one pellet under end of tail. Legend unclear, seemingly ending in . . .JN but with traces of one or two more letters (VS?).

D5  
Legend DVBNOVIIAVNVS

*Obv.* as A1  
*Rev.* naturalistic horse, ringed pellet in front of forelegs, pellet under end of tail, latinized legend DVBNOVIIAVNVS with traces of a ligate V between letters A and N.
E. Letter E type
This is characterized by the letter E in the legend DVBNOLLEA4, DVBNOLLEA or DVBNOVE. The reverse features the same Romanized horse as the Letter II type with the associated ornamentation determining the number of variants. Orthographic errors are rare.

E1
Obv. as A1
Rev. naturalistic horse, legend DVBNOLLEA1.

E2
Obv. as A1 but wreath segments shorter.
Rev. naturalistic horse, ringed pellet in front, pellet after legend DVBNOLLEA and under horse's tail.

E3 Star under tail type
E3–1
Obv. as A1
Rev. naturalistic horse, ringed pellet in front and star under end of tail, legend DVBNOLLEA.

E3–2
Obv. as A1 but four added pellets in the shape of a cross, two within the crescents, the others between crescents and ringed pellets.
Rev. naturalistic horse, ringed pellet above set within a pellet triangle, star under end of tail, legend DVBNOLLEA.

The single known specimen is struck from a debased coppery alloy, suggesting a date towards the end of the series.

E4
Obv. as A1
Rev. naturalistic horse, ringed pellet in front, abbreviated legend DVBNVE.

F. Late type
An extremely rare light-weight issue struck from debased alloy, with uncertain and most probably confused legend.

F1
Obv. as A1
Rev. naturalistic horse with shortened tail, legend probably DVBNO... with garbled ending.

Die study
As I have already indicated above, the die study presents considerable problems, almost entirely due to the inherent simplicity of the obverse design. This, in combination with worn or damaged dies and sometimes less than adequate photography makes it a difficult and laborious task. Whilst every care has been taken over die determinations, there will undoubtedly be errors in the attribution of some of the more problematic obverses which can only be rectified as and when more examples struck from those dies become available for comparative study.

Given the present level of information, any serious attempt at ascertaining precisely how many die-cutters may have been involved in the production of the Essex series and which die-cutter engraved what die, would be an extremely difficult – if not impossible – undertaking.
and as such falls outside the scope of this study. However, having studied the series in considerable detail, I believe some broad-brush observations can be made. Due to the close similarities between many of the obverse dies and the associated problems of interpretation, the following comments tend to focus on the more variable reverses.

Beginning with the short-lived class A, it would seem a reasonable guess that all reverse and most probably also obverse dies, with the exception of var. A3 (dies D4), originate from the same hand. The treatment of the horse on the reverse of A3 is unique and although it shares

Fig. 7. Class E types.

Fig. 8. Die-links for Classes E and F.

Fig. 9. Class F type.
features with subsequent classes, it has no obvious parallels elsewhere. The two recorded class B reverse dies are representative of classes A and C respectively.

Despite some apparent variation in the form of the lettering, class C is largely homogenous. The treatment of the horse is stylistically distinct from the previous class, suggesting that the dies must be the work of a different engraver. I believe the majority, if not all of the dies, are the work of a single die-cutter.

Class D features the change-over to a more naturalistic horse and gives every impression of originating from a different hand. Although there are some subtle stylistic differences in the rendition of the horse and associated legends, it is conceivable that all of the dies belonging to this class were engraved by just one or two craftsmen. An oddity here is obverse die P, of which a total of ten examples have been recorded. Curiously, all surviving examples feature a significant die break across the centre of the obverse and as yet no coin struck from the die in its original, undamaged state, has been recorded. This may suggest that the die was damaged early on in its life and that despite the obvious damage and the disfigured coins produced, it continued in use to the very end. If correct, this confirms dies as high value items, which were neither instantly nor easily replaceable. It may also indicate that whatever triggered the decision to coin in the first instance, once the process was under way, it continued at a steady pace and occasionally without too much regard for the quality of the output.

Judging by the close stylistic similarities, especially in the rendition of the horse, between classes D and E, I suspect that the die-cutter(s) who engraved class D may also have been responsible for several of the class E dies.

The die chains indicate a fairly simple production process. Class A was quite possibly struck from just a single pair of dies at any one time, while class B consists of a single obverse die paired with one class A and one class C reverse die (Fig. 2).

Class C exhibits a greater degree of die-linking, indicating that more than one pair of dies was in use at any one time. This suggests that production was now of a more continuous nature and that this class may have been struck within a relatively short space of time and in response to a particular need (Fig. 5). Although most of the die-links for class D are fairly simple, there is once again evidence of more than one pair of dies having been in use at the same time (Fig. 5).

Class E also features simple die-links suggesting that half of it was struck from single pairs of dies, pointing towards a return to a more sporadic production (Fig. 8). At present class F is only recorded from a single pair of dies.

**The evolution of the design**

The obverse of the Essex stater represents a new development in British Iron Age stater design. Likely prototypes include the later varieties of Whaddon Chase stater (especially V1487 and V1493), featuring a cruciform wreath design, but the most likely candidate is Addedomaros’s first coinage stater (V1605). The die-cutter simply eliminated one of the wreaths, added two strategically placed ringed pellets and was rewarded with an extremely simple, yet highly effective new design, which remained virtually unchanged throughout the entire production period of this stater.\(^{35}\)

The reverse also remained essentially the same, although its detailed design underwent a considerable degree of stylistic change between the early and later issues. This is not only evident in the changing depiction of the horse and its associated ornaments, but also in the orthographic changes to the legend. This process of evolution can be divided into a number of distinctive phases, which in turn form the basis for my classification of this series into six types.

The question as to which coin type might have served as the prototype for the reverse has not been addressed until now. In fact, there exists one British stater whose reverse closely
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\(^{35}\) The design was later adopted and modified by Cunobelinus’s mint, and forms the basis of his celebrated series of corn-ear staters.
resembles that of Dubnovellaunos’s earliest Essex staters (Groups A and B) and, perhaps significantly, this is a Cantian issue. The Early Weald stater (V144, BMC 2466) features a horse which is stylistically so similar to some of the animals on Dubnovellaunos’s Early and Transitional types, that it might almost have been executed by the same hand. Remarkably, both Cantian and Trinovantian issues also include die varieties with and without the ringed pellet on the horse’s shoulder.

The similarities do not end there, however. The Early Weald stater, on some examples at least, features ‘banding’ across the obverse, a characteristic for the most part closely associated with the Cantian gold coinage. Whilst the ‘banding’ phenomenon also occurs on two potential, though extremely rare, North Thames issues (V162 and V1509), it is otherwise only recorded from Dubnovellaunos’s Essex stater series, where it forms a standard feature of virtually every recorded obverse die. Seeing an Early Weald and an Early type Essex stater side by side, it is hard to escape the notion that they must be directly related, with the latter quite possibly a direct descendant of the former (Fig. 10). If correct, this would in turn strongly suggest a Cantian dimension to Dubnovellaunos’s Trinovantian issues and lend further support to my hypothesis that there was only one Dubnovellaunos.

Late in the production of the Early type (class A), the mint experimented with a modified reverse design (type A3), featuring a stretched version of the horse more reminiscent of the later types, with a strangely elongated muzzle and once again a ringed pellet on its shoulder. Just two coins of this type (CCI 68.0347 and 02.0476) are known, indicating that this design change was short-lived. Dubnovellaunos’s Early type must have been a comparatively small and short-lived issue as only a handful of examples have survived. Legends are rarely visible and only one garbled form of the name is recorded. There are just six examples in all, struck from four obverse and four reverse dies with an average weight of 5.51 g.

The Early type was quickly succeeded by the Transitional type (class B). This has an almost identical obverse except for the leaves of the wreaths, which are now pointing inwards – the only type to feature this arrangement. This modified obverse is coupled with both an Early type reverse (B1) and the new Letter A type reverse (B2) and marks the transition from Early type (class A) to Letter A type (class C). The four recorded examples are struck from one obverse and two reverse dies and have an average weight of 5.46 g.

The Letter A type (class C) obverse shows the wreaths restored to their original outward pointing position where they stay for the remainder of the series. Apart from differing spellings and types of script, this series is largely homogenous with the majority of dies having no special distinguishing marks. They all feature a coarser, longer-limbed and generally less attractive horse. The often beak-like depiction of the horse’s muzzle, which is a special feature of this type, tends to give the horse’s head a griffin-like appearance. This may have been intentional but might equally well represent the die-cutters’ individual artistic preferences. Thirty-one examples struck from four obverse and seven reverse dies, with an average weight of 5.42 g, are recorded.
The next in line is the Letter II type (class D), so called because as part of the orthographic evolution of the legend the letter A has now been transformed into II. The quality of the engraving tends to be of a higher standard than the previous type and the reverse now features a more elegant Romanized horse. Whereas the previous type was notable for its highly immobile design, the Letter II type was produced in a bewildering number of variants, the result of a range of different legends and associated pellet combinations. With forty examples struck from seven obverse and eleven reverse dies and an average weight of 5.41 g, this forms the most sizeable group within the series.

The Letter II type gives way to the Letter E type (class E), which marks the final stage in the evolution of the legend. All the legends are now truncated and a particular feature of this series is that two of its constituent types have a star under the end of the horse’s tail, thus making them instantly recognizable. One of these (E3–2) features additional pellets added to the central crescents of the obverse, the only modification of this kind in the entire series. The E type comprises twenty-two examples struck from nine obverse and nine reverse dies, and has an average weight of 5.35 g.

The Late type (class F) is at present represented by just one example (F1). As the only legible part of the legend is DVBNOV and the rest appears to be garbled, it does not fit in with any of the other categories but appears to form a lightweight, debased straggler at the very end of the series.

The evolution of the legend

Only a handful of Early type (class A) staters are known and the only substantially complete legend recorded is the badly corrupted DVBOVALA[...], with both N and second L missing. The evidence from the other remaining fractions of legend suggests that at this early stage in the production it was common practice to engrave the full name ending in –OS.

The even rarer Transitional type (class B) once again provides us with just one substantially complete legend in the form of [DV]BNOS[...], this time containing the formerly missing N in retrograde but still missing the second L.

The Letter A type (class C) is the third and last type to habitually feature the name in its entirety. The spelling of the legend has now progressed to the more familiar DVBNOS or blundered versions thereof. Orthographic errors in the form of transposed and missing letters are a frequent occurrence and the type of lettering employed may vary considerably.

It is clear from the first three types that garbled legends were relatively common at this stage in production, suggesting that the art of writing was very much in its infancy with neither die-cutter, mint master nor commissioning authority – presumably Dubnovellaunos himself? – possessing the necessary degree of literacy to accurately convert the familiar Celtic phonetics into the Latin script. However, the degree of orthographic incompetence demonstrated here appears to be unique among British Celtic issues and although misspelled inscriptions occasionally occur amongst Addedomaros’s and Tasciovanos’s early issues, they are rare by comparison. The early orthographic treatment of the DVBNOS legend offers us a fascinating insight into the difficulties faced by native Britons when transliterating their hitherto purely oral language into an unfamiliar Latin alphabet. Table 2 suggests a hypothetical course which the orthographic evolution of the legend might have taken.

There is no evidence to indicate that the engravers of Dubnovellaunos’s Cantian stater (V169) experienced similar problems, which leads me to question whether Allen’s view that, based on the lettering, the Cantian stater preceded the Essex one is in fact correct. If anything, the legends of the Early type Essex stater in particular would appear to exhibit more archaic features than the corresponding Cantian stater and both the typological and orthographic evidence would seem to suggest that it was struck prior to the commencement of the Cantian series.

36 Allen 1944, 31.
The Letter II type (class D) is characterized by a shift from the median A of the previous type to II, representing E. Orthographic errors have now ceased, suggesting that the engravers had developed an improved grasp of the Latin alphabet, or that guidelines for the correct spelling of the ruler’s name had been issued. With one exception, the legends recorded within the Letter II type are all abbreviated, ranging from DVBNOVIILLAVN to DVBNOVIILLA and DVBNOVIILLA, the last being the most common form. Late in this series another significant shift takes place when the termination briefly changes from the Celtic –OS of the previous three types to the Latinized –VS. This is important evidence for a gradual adoption of Roman practices, brought about by increased contact with the Roman world, which also left its mark in the rapidly changing iconography of the bronze and silver coinage. The promotion of a supposedly superior culture together with a rapidly increasing trade in luxury goods via conquered Gaul was designed to persuade the British nobility of the benefits of Roman civilization, a process instrumental in preparing the ground for the inevitable conquest to follow. One by-product of this steadily creeping Romanization was that personal names – on coin legends at least – which would previously always have terminated in the Celtic –OS were now beginning to adopt the Latinized –VS. The reason for this was most probably that the British elite
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**TABLE 2. Suggested order of reverse legends.**

Probable legends based on die reconstructions and, in cases where there can be little doubt about the final formation, a small element of conjecture. (V) indicates that its presence in the legend is uncertain.

A. Early Type
1. DVBNOVALA(V)NOS
2. DVB...V...S
3. ...NOS
4. –

B. Transitional Type
5. DVBNOVALA(V)NOS
6. DVB...

C. A type
7. DVBNOVILLANOS
8. DVBNOV... with first V blundered
9. DVBNOVALLAVNOS
10. DVBNOVALLAVNOS
11. ...OVISSANOS
12. DVBNOVALLAV(V)NOS
13. ...NOS?

D. II type
14. DVB...
15. ...LLAV...
16. DVBNOVIIALLAV[N] – N added when die was recut
17. DVBNOVIIA
18. DVBNOVIIA
19. DVBNOVIIA
20. DVBNOVIIA
21. ...LIA
22. DVBNOVIIAVN
23. ...N with traces of VS? behind
24. DVBNOVIIAVNVS

E. E type
25. DVBNOVILLAVNI
26. DVBNOVILLA
27. DVBNOVILLA
28. DVBNOVILLA
29. ...VELLA
30. DVBNOVILLA
31. –
32. ...VELLA
33. DVBNOVE (abbreviated legend)

F. Late type
34. DVBNOV... with ligate but garbled ending
was becoming increasingly familiar with Roman coins and their inscriptions and decided to follow the Roman lead in much the same way that the rest of the world now copies American ways.

The obverse die associated with the Latinized termination is thought to die-link with an early Letter E type. If correct, this would indicate that the –VS ending belongs to the very end of the Letter II type and, as far as we can tell, most probably forms a unique and short-lived experiment. Before we are tempted to view the DVBNOVIIA\text{AVNVS} legend as potential evidence for the large scale Latinization of British personal names at or around this point in time, we should remember that the evidence is based on just a single reverse die out of a present total of thirty-four used to strike this series.

The Letter E type (class E) marks the final orthographic development within the series, by which the characteristic II of the previous type now evolves into a more modern E. All legends are abbreviated, ranging from an early DVBNOVELLAV3 to DVBNOVELLA and finally the heavily truncated DVBNOVE. The final Late type (class F) features a garbled legend and hence does not feature in this discussion.

Although Dubnovellaunos's Cantian staters (V169/176) also show the transition from the earlier DVBNOVALLAVNOS to the final DVB\text{NOVELLAVNOS}, there is no evidence here of Latinized legends nor for the use of II instead of E. The extreme rarity of V176 would seem to suggest that although the Cantian issues ran more or less parallel with much of the Essex series, they came to a fairly abrupt end shortly after the change-over from A to E and possibly about two-thirds of the way through the production of the Essex stater. The short-lived nature of the Cantian first coinage stater is also implied by its highly immobile reverse design, which remained static throughout its lifetime.

Interestingly, a similar evolution in the written form of the legend to that discussed here can be found on the coins of Tasciovanos, where the letter X changes to S, the A changes to O and eventually the I to II. Thus TAXCIAVAN becomes TASCIAVAN and TASCIOVAN\textsuperscript{37} before eventually changing to TASCIOVAN\textsuperscript{38} sometime around the middle of Cunobelinus's reign.\textsuperscript{39} It is yet another illustration of how orthographic practices – presumably arising from phonetic shifts in the spoken language – were evolving over a broadly similar timescale.

**Metallurgy**

Cowell\textsuperscript{40} and Northover\textsuperscript{41} both analysed a sample of Dubnovellaunos’s Essex staters with very similar results (Table 3). They found that the coins varied little in fineness, lying mostly between 39 and 42% gold, with the majority showing a copper/silver ratio of around 2:1.

Cowell also examined Dubnovellaunos’s two Cantian stater coinages (V169 and V176) and found that they were produced to two different standards of fineness. The two baser coins belonging to V169 contained 39–40% gold, while the two coins of V176 plus one coin of V169 showed an improved fineness of 45–48%. Cowell presumed that the finer coins were also the earlier ones, which would put Van Arsdell's classification of V169 being followed by V176 into question. An earlier date for V176 is also supported by the consistently higher weight of 5.55 – 5.62 g for the three genuine examples when compared to an average weight of 5.43 g for V169. On the other hand, the typological evidence would seem to point towards V176 being the later issue and if our reading of DVBNOVE... is correct, it also possesses a later type of legend.

It must also be remembered that an increase in fineness does not necessarily indicate an earlier date, as both Tasciovanos's RICON stater\textsuperscript{42} and the Cantian Weald stater illustrate. The Early Weald stater (V144) shows a fineness of 41% gold, whereas the one gram lighter and

\textsuperscript{37} Kretz 1998a, 4.
\textsuperscript{38} This indicates that II was never entirely displaced by E but continued in occasional use.
\textsuperscript{39} de Jersey 2001, 13, 32.
\textsuperscript{40} Cowell 1992, 216.
\textsuperscript{41} Northover 1992, 287.
\textsuperscript{42} Cowell 1992, 225–6.
presumably later V150 contains between 49% and 52%. V176 thus remains something of a conundrum and all we can say at this stage is that the jury is still out on the question of where exactly it fits into Dubnovellaunos’s Cantian issues.

Cowell concluded that apart from three aberrant Addedomaros coins, the issues of Addedomaros, Dubnovellaunos and Diras are not distinguished by either fineness or alloy. He went on to say that ‘it is significant that the base issues of the Cantian Dubnovellaunos are identical in fineness and alloy to Dubnovellaunos under the Trinovantes’. His statement supports my theory of one king ruling two kingdoms and suggests that the long held view that Addedomaros was (at least in Essex) succeeded by Dubnovellaunos is correct and that the latter may have withdrawn some of the former’s issues from circulation before re-coining them in his own name.

There are too few analyses of Essex staters to build up a clear picture of the changes to the metal composition during the production period. However, if we look at the analyses in typological order something of a trend seems to emerge. Whilst the silver content fluctuates widely between 31% and 20% during the early part of the production (classes A – C), it appears to fall from 20% to 13% in the latter part (classes D – E), the loss of silver compensated for by an increase in the copper. Whether this is indeed a genuine trend or simply a chance occurrence, only further analyses can determine.

The visual evidence suggests that a small number of coins were struck from a debased alloy towards the end of the series although none have been analysed so far. If correct, this may be indicative of Dubnovellaunos – for whatever reason – running out of gold bullion sometime towards the end of his reign.

Metrology

The average weight of the 90 Essex staters for which we have the necessary data is 5.40 g, which compares well with that of the main Cantian series (V169) at 5.43 g. Table 4 shows the weight of every type and variant I have identified but as the majority of these are recorded in
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44 Cowell 1992, 225.
relatively small numbers, their widely fluctuating individual weights tend to obscure any potential underlying trend. However, when the weights of the six main classes are singled out and put into chronological order, the results would seem to point towards a steady, albeit very slight, decline in weight over the lifetime of this coinage.

### TABLE 4. Average weights of Dubnovellaunos’s Essex staters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>var.</th>
<th>no. of coins</th>
<th>wt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2–1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2–2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3–1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3–2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3–3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3–4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3–5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4–1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4–2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3–1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3–2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>no. of coins</td>
<td>wt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All coins</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contexts

As one might expect, any contextual information providing worthwhile information towards the establishment of a relative chronology for the series is largely absent. According to CCI records a single stater (CCI 67.0153) was found in excavation, but on closer investigation this proved not to be the case. The situation with regard to the multitude of single metal-detector finds is equally unsatisfactory. In the unlikely event that any contextual information was ever recorded, it must now be considered lost.

The situation in respect of hoards is only marginally better (Table 5). It is well known that hoards containing gold staters of Cunobelinus are comparatively rare, and those containing Trinovantian staters of Dubnovellaunos would appear to follow the same pattern, with only three small deposits having been discovered so far. The Marks Tey II hoard found in 1843 contained one Dubnovellaunos stater together with many first and second coinage staters of Addedomaros (V1605 and V1620). Although Addedomaros’s third coinage staters (V1635) are strangely absent from the assemblage, the hoard is significant in establishing a tentative successional link between Addedomaros and Dubnovellaunos. More than a century and a half
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45 W. Rodwell, pers. comm.
passed before the next discovery, the Heybridge hoard of five Dubnovellaunos staters. This was found in two parcels, three staters which came to light in 1999, and two more in 2002. A report on this hoard is now in preparation and due to be published shortly.47

A third hoard consisting of at least five Dubnovellaunos staters and eighteen Cunobelinus ‘biga’ staters (V1910) was found over several years (1999–2001) in Great Waltham near Chelmsford, Essex, and is now in Chelmsford Museum. An amateur excavation at the site revealed late Iron Age and Roman occupation.48 As the coins of Dubnovellaunos and Cunobelinus had not been found together previously, this discovery adds further support to the widely held view that Cunobelinus directly succeeded Dubnovellaunos at Camulodunum.

There are some other sites which also have produced multiple finds of Dubnovellaunos staters, most notably Cambridge and a site near Chelmsford, Essex, which may conceivably also constitute hoards.

### Distribution

The distribution map for Dubnovellaunos’s North Thames stater issues, based on some fifty-two provenances, is heavily centred on Essex and supports the widely held belief that he ruled over the Trinovantes (Fig. 11).

The principal concentrations of findspots are in the Colchester and Chelmsford regions. Whilst it is generally assumed that Dubnovellaunos was based at Camulodunum, none of his coins make any reference to either his capital or mint. Perhaps contrary to expectations, there are almost twice as many provenances from the wider Chelmsford area (twenty-four) than the Colchester region (thirteen), but the former figure is distorted by the presence of at least two hoards. Although a base and mint at Camulodunum continue to remain the most likely scenario, the supporting evidence for this is still missing. There are a handful of findspots for Essex staters from the Icenian and Catuvellaunian borderlands but these are on an insignificant scale.

Whether Camulodunum already had the same importance during Dubnovellaunos’s reign that it later possessed under his likely successor Cunobelinus also remains unclear, and might
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>site</th>
<th>CCI no.</th>
<th>var.</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marks Tey, Essex</td>
<td>61.0215</td>
<td>D3–2</td>
<td>also included many Addedomaros staters (V1605 and V1620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heybridge, Essex</td>
<td>05.1014</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>contained no other coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05.1015</td>
<td>D3–4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05.1016</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0644</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0645</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>02.0929</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>also included 18 ‘biga’ type staters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.0930</td>
<td>E4</td>
<td>of Cunobelinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.0931</td>
<td>D2–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.0932</td>
<td>D4–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02.0933</td>
<td>D2–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible hoards</td>
<td>83.0246</td>
<td>D2–2</td>
<td>found with two others (one plated) and an uninscribed quarter stater of Addedomaros. Shown to BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>06.0116</td>
<td>D3–4</td>
<td>no further details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0117</td>
<td>D3–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0118</td>
<td>E3–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0119</td>
<td>E3–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06.0120</td>
<td>D4–1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ultimately only be revealed by an excavation of Cunobelinus’s base at Gosbecks, Colchester. Interestingly, the earliest reference to its existence comes from an early stater and quarter stater of Tasciovanos (V1684 and V1694) which carry the legend CAMVL in monogram form and can be dated to around 20 – 10 BC, a date which I would suggest is likely to overlap with Dubnovellaunos’s period of rule. Exactly why this reference to Camulodunum – assuming that is what it is – appears on two rare coins of Tasciovanos, yet is entirely absent from the issues of Dubnovellaunos, remains one of the great mysteries of the North Thames series.49

In contrast, the provenances of Dubnovellaunos’s Cantian staters (V169/176) are almost exclusively located in the easternmost portion of Kent, with only the occasional stray find outside this area. Four Essex staters have been found in Kent whereas no Cantian stater has been found in Essex, an indication that the gold issues at least circulated almost exclusively in their own respective tribal areas.

Discussion

The distribution of Dubnovellaunos’s Essex staters confirms him as ruler of the Trinovantes, although the exact location of his capital and mint remain uncertain. He is likely to have been succeeded by Cunobelinus, an event that is thought to have occurred some time before Augustus’s death in 14 AD. The Res Gestae Divi Augusti, recording the achievements of Augustus, were written by the emperor in the years prior to his death and mention the names of a number of kings who sent supplications to him, including one Dumnobellaunus. We know from the numismatic evidence that both Dumno- and Dubno- forms of the name occurred in Britain. There is also evidence that Roman historians may on occasions have

49 Kretz 2006b, 202.
substituted B for V, as a later document (Cassius Dio, *Roman History* LX, 19) lists another supplicant by the name of Berikos who is commonly assumed to be the Atrebatic chieftain Verica. As discussed above, Evans had no hesitation in equating Augustus's Dumnobellaunus with the British ruler Dubnovellaunos and ever since then the two individuals have generally been considered synonymous.50 Unfortunately Augustus's account gives no hint as to the chronology of the events he describes and whilst a date for Cunobelinus's accession of between 7 and 10 AD has gained a broad consensus amongst scholars, the actual date of this event may conceivably be a good deal earlier.

Crummy has speculated that Camulodunum may have been a Catuvellaunian settlement from the very start, c.25 BC, and that both Addedomaros and Dubnovellaunos may have been of Catuvellaunian origin.51 However, it is hard to see how a relatively small Catuvellaunian settlement could have survived surrounded by a huge tract of presumably hostile Trinovantian territory. Such a scenario is in my view only conceivable if we accept that the Trinovantes and their territories had already been annexed and subsumed into the Catuvellaunian kingdom at this early stage.

There is today a general consensus amongst numismatists that Addedomaros produced the first inscribed coinage north of the Thames, and that by implication at least the earlier part of his coinage must predate that of Tasciovanos.52 Although a number of scholars have been reluctant to associate him with a particular tribe, several have viewed him as a ruler of the Trinovantes.53 More recently de Jersey has shown that the existing findspot evidence for Addedomaros's coins is largely inconclusive, with slightly more of the inscribed types being found in Catuvellaunian than in Trinovantian territory.54 If his and Crummy's hunch that Addedomaros might have been a member of the Catuvellaunian elite is correct, he may in addition to his Catuvellaunian kingdom also have held part or all of the Trinovantian tribal lands, before Dubnovellaunos laid claim to them by marriage, inheritance or some other means. Such a scenario would suggest that following Caesar's withdrawal from Britain, Cassivellaunos (or his successor) quickly resumed his policy of aggression towards his eastern neighbours, which in turn led to the demise of the Trinovantian king Mandubracius and was to be followed by the gradual incorporation of the Trinovantian territories into the rapidly expanding Catuvellaunian kingdom.

As Crummy has suggested, it is entirely possible that Dubnovellaunos was also a member of the Catuvellaunian dynasty.55 Indeed for all we know, both he and Tasciovanos may have been brothers and sons of Addedomaros.56 Although pure speculation, it is thus conceivable that on the death of Addedomaros, Dubnovellaunos inherited the eastern portion of the enlarged kingdom, Essex, with Tasciovanos retaining the Catuvellaunian heartlands. The numismatic evidence appears to suggest that Dubnovellaunos ruled over both Essex and Kent at broadly the same time and that his rule ran more or less in parallel with that of Tasciovanos. However, a Catuvellaunian origin would still require an explanation as to how Dubnovellaunos came to develop such an early presence in Kent and why the design of his earliest Essex staters appears to have been based on an uninscribed Cantian prototype. With so few facts to go on and so many potential scenarios to construct, it will be a while yet before we finally get near the truth.

As I have previously pointed out, except for the CAMVL legend on one of Tasciovanos's rare early stater and quarter stater types (V1684 and V1694), there is no evidence that he ever gained control of Camulodunum.57 Indeed his gold and silver issues are rarely found in Trinovantian territory and just a single quarter stater is recorded from Colchester itself. The
reference occurs early on in Tasciovanos's coinage, and assuming that he succeeded Addedomaros as ruler of the Catuvellauni, it is possible that at this point in time he was destined to inherit the Trinovantian domains. Perhaps the CAMVL issues were struck to celebrate his accession before some major political upheaval occurred, changed these plans and resulted in their hasty withdrawal? Such a scenario would at least go some way towards explaining the extreme rarity of these types. Had Tasciovanos managed to gain lasting control of Camulodunum, surely he would have celebrated his success by striking a sizeable quantity of CAMVL gold? Whatever the case may be, his ambition to capture the Trinovantian capital seemingly remained unfulfilled for much of the remainder of his reign until his son and heir Cunobelinus was finally installed as ruler of the Trinovantes.

There are a number of features shared by both Dubnovellaunos's Essex and Kent issues, which I have already dealt with elsewhere and will therefore not repeat here. Readers who wish to explore these similarities in greater detail are referred to my earlier article on the subject.58 Whilst none of those pointers, nor indeed the evidence presented here, is capable of proving a direct connection between Dubnovellaunos's Essex and Kent issues on their own, I believe in combination they point overwhelmingly towards one Dubnovellaunos ruling two separate but affiliated kingdoms.

The dating of Dubnovellaunos's issues has long been the subject of considerable controversy. Mack dated his Kent issues to \( c.15 - 1 \) BC and the Essex ones to AD 1 – 10.59 Van Arsdell placed Dubnovellaunos-in-Kent around 30 – 10 BC and Dubnovellaunos-in-Essex \( c.30 - 25 \) BC.60 More recently, Hobbs dated the Essex issues to the late first century BC with the broadly contemporary Kent issues extending into the early part of the first century AD.61 In a previous article I expressed the belief that Dubnovellaunos, having originally ruled the northern part of Kent, then annexed either all or part of the Trinovantian territories and established himself at Camulodunum whilst continuing to rule his Cantian domains.62 This view was based on only a comparatively cursory examination of his Essex staters and, I now believe, probably mistaken. Based on the present in-depth study of the stylistic development and the evolution of the legend of the Essex stater, I have come to the conclusion that the two series of staters most probably developed broadly in parallel and that both display archaic features within their iconography and orthography which would suggest a starting date similar to that of Tasciovanos’s earliest stater issue (V1682) or perhaps a little later.

Unless there are a good number of uninscribed Dubnovellaunos types still waiting to be identified, it becomes clear that he issued comparatively few types and, judging by their present day survival rate, in relatively small numbers. In terms of the number of different types issued, Dubnovellaunos’s combined output is less than half that of his direct neighbour and likely contemporary Tasciovanos. There is an obvious temptation to conclude that his reign must therefore have been no more than half of the twenty or thirty years normally allotted to Tasciovanos, but does this necessarily follow? The answer is that we simply do not know, as our knowledge of the multitude of factors influencing Iron Age coin production is so inadequate, that this cannot be considered a safe assumption.63 Judging purely by the number of types, the complexity of the legends and number of dies, the development of Dubnovellaunos's Essex stater resembles that of Tasciovanos's first coinage stater, to which I have tentatively allocated a production period of around ten years. However, given the antiquated nature of Dubnovellaunos's earliest Essex staters, the protracted evolution of the legend and the likelihood of him being succeeded by Cunobelinus in the early years of the first century AD, the real time span may well have been twice that.

As I have demonstrated, the reverse of Dubnovellaunos’s earliest Essex staters (types A1, A2 and B1) is stylistically extremely close to the Cantian Early Weald stater (V144), thus sug-

---

59 Mack 1975, 97, 105.
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suggesting some kind of connection between the two coinages. It is tempting to see this similarity as evidence of Dubnovellaunos originating in Kent and taking part of his artistic heritage with him before acceding to the Trinovantian throne. On the other hand, it may simply reflect the personal choice of a king with Cantian ambitions or connections when confronted with a range of potential designs by his moneyer. In the event the copied Cantian design had but a short lifespan – only four dies are recorded – before it was replaced by the Letter A type, in my view an artistically inferior and altogether less attractive design.

The idea that Cunobelinus’s reign at Camulodunum might have overlapped with the last years of Tasciovanos’s rule is not entirely new. It was first touched upon by Evans and more recently alluded to by de Jersey. Backdating the accession of Cunobelinus has also received support from Haselgrove, who considered a date before AD 6 plausible. I too have for some time suspected that this overlap may have been greater than previously anticipated, with Cunobelinus taking control of the Trinovantes and establishing himself in Camulodunum while Tasciovanos was still at the height of his power in Verulamium. A more substantial overlap is also suggested by Cunobelinus’s earliest issues, which feature an antiquated iconography including serpents and bucrania strongly at odds with his later issues, and thus ‘recall earlier Iron age coinages of the North Thames region’. In many ways these highly distinctive designs hark all the way back to some of Tasciovanos’s earlier issues rather than those of his final years. If correct, this would move the presently favoured date of AD 7–8 by around five years to shortly after the birth of Christ, whilst in the process also shortening Dubnovellaunos’s own reign and thus going some way towards explaining the comparatively small size of his coinage.

The recent discovery of the East Leicestershire hoards, containing three previously unknown quarter staters of Cunobelinus carrying the legend CVNO/DVBN has only served to confuse an already problematic situation still further. Apparently combining the names of Dubnovellaunos and Cunobelinus on one coin for the first time, it has raised the question whether the two rulers were in fact contemporaries. However, the coin in question is stylistically closest to the ‘classic’ series and on currently accepted stylistic chronology would belong to the very end of Cunobelinus’s reign. This in turn raises the question why

---

Fig. 12. Proposed phasing of Dubnovellaunos issues relative to the coinages of his contemporaries.
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Cunobelinus would make reference to his predecessor on the Trinovantian throne several decades after his own accession, when the rule of Dubnovellaunos had become but a distant memory. I do not believe that he did, and have suggested that the CVNO/DVBN quarter, whilst closely related to the ‘classic’ series, represents a new development and may have been intended as either a special issue or the prototype for a new series.72 Whilst the DVBN reference at this late stage in Cunobelinus’s long reign is puzzling to say the least, there are alternative explanations for its occurrence, e.g. a possible reference to his son Togodumnus,73 or even a previously unknown son.74

But what about Kent? Whether Dubnovellaunos came to rule this kingdom by inheritance, marriage, conquest or any other means remains unclear. However, I think it likely that at some stage – perhaps midway through the production period of his Essex stater – Dubnovellaunos lost control over his Cantian domains to the Atrebatic king Eppillus, who subsequently controlled parts of Kent for a number of years and in the process issued a fairly substantial quantity of coinage.75 This would go some way towards explaining the rarity of Dubnovellaunos’s second Cantian stater issue (V176), the production of which may well have been curtailed by such an event. It seems likely that Eppillus was still in charge of his Kentish dominions at the time Cunobelinus took control of the Trinovantes, before being forced out some years later. Such a scenario receives support from the distribution of Cunobelinus’s earliest issues, which are notably absent from Kent.76 Fig. 12 illustrates how the two Dubnovellaunos coinages might have chronologically interlinked with the issues of Tasciovanos, Epillus and Cunobelinus.

As is unavoidable when discussing personalities and events lost in the dense fog of British prehistory, much of the above is of necessity conjecture. Whether the assumptions made and hypotheses here presented are getting us any nearer the truth of what actually took place in these fascinating but poorly understood last few decades of the late Iron Age, only time and the emergence of new evidence will tell.

APPENDIX 1. Corpus.

Safe for the brief directional change to the wreaths mentioned in the notes, the obverse remains essentially the same throughout the series and is therefore omitted from the type descriptions. All of the reverses contain a number of standard design components, which feature on every coin so far recorded. These include the wreath below the horse, the large pellet under the horse’s head, the ringed pellet directly above the horse and the two ringed pellets in the exergue below the wreath. These invariables are not referred to in the classification unless they help to differentiate one type from another or have been modified in any way.

Although this information is arranged in hypothetical chronological order, it would be a mistake to assume that Dubnovellaunos’s Essex stater developed in such an organized and simplistic fashion. In reality, the sequence of production would have been considerably more complex, with areas of overlap between some of the classes and different types or variants being issued concurrently or perhaps even recurrently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Dies</th>
<th>CCI</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Legend/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Early type – obv. has leaves of wreaths pointing outwards, rev. design based on Cantian Early Weald stater (V144), legends most probably garbled forms of DVBOVALLAVNOS, ending in -OS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Ø on horse’s shoulder, under end of tail and in front of forelegs, · · · under head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A1    | 94.1252 | 5.40 | DVBOVALA[...]
| A1    | 66.0130 | 5.54 | DVBOV[...][V][...][S], remainder unclear |
| A2    | no Ø on horse’s shoulder, · · · under head |
| C3    | 68.0346 | 5.52 | ...[OS] |

72 Kretz 2006a, 3.
73 Kretz 2006a, 2–4.
74 de Jersey 2006a, 4.
75 de Jersey 2006b, 3.
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A3  Ø on horse’s shoulder, elongated muzzle; ⋆ under head

D4  02.0476  5.51  legend unclear
D4  68.0347  –  legend unclear

Average weight: 5.51 g

B  

Transitional type – the only type where leaves of wreath on obverse point inwards rather than outwards. Reverses of both Early and Letter A type, legends probably garbled forms of DVBNOVALLAVNOS, ending in –OS.

B1  rev. features Early type horse, Ø on horse’s shoulder now missing, ⋆ under head, small letter S below top of tail.

E5  94.0884  5.28  ..]VBN0VALLA[...
E5  06.0645  5.51  mostly missing, but ending in . . .]OS

B2  rev. features Letter A type horse, O in front and ⋆ under head

E6  68.0336  5.44  DVB[. . .
E6  02.0929  5.59  –

Average weight: 5.46 g

C  

Letter A type – legend DVBNOVALLAVNOS or corrupted versions thereof, horse’s head resembles that of a griffin, Ø under end of tail, orthographic errors are common. Apart from the differing spelling arrangements and types of script, this series is largely homogenous with the majority of dies possessing no special distinguishing marks.

C1  F7  06.0644  5.49  legend unclear
F7  61.0216  5.53  –
F7  94.0981  5.40  DVBNOVLL[. . ., badly garbled
F7  68.0334  5.52  . . .]LLANO[. . ., with V missing
F7  66.0129  5.28  . . .]LLAN[. . ., with V missing
F7  05.1014  5.39  –
F7  61.0218  5.56  D[. . .]NO[. . .
F8  06.0584  5.51  DVBNOVL[. . ., first V blundered
F8  66.0126  5.48  –
F8  68.0329  5.57  DV[. . ., V blundered
F8  89.0505  5.42  –
G8  66.0127  5.54  DV[. . ., V blundered
G8  68.0330  5.51  DVBNOV[. . ., first V blundered
G8  94.1052  5.20  –
G9  68.0333  5.52  DVB[. . .
G9  68.0331  5.53  DVBNOVALLA[. . .
G9  68.0332  5.35  . . .]ALLAVNOS
G9  02.0990  5.49  DVB[. . .
G9  72.0999  5.38  DV[. . .
G10  03.1074  5.56  . . .]VBN0VALLA[. . .
G10  03.1386  –  DVBN0VALLAVNOS
G10  98.0119  5.45  DVBNOVALLA[. . .
H10  05.1016  5.44  . . .]NOVALLAVNOS[. . .
H11  61.0214  4.54  . . .]OVLLANO[. . ., A and V missing, ⋆ in front of horse’s head
H12  68.0338  5.45  legend missing, O in front of horse?
H12  73.0317  5.31  –
I12  94.0802  5.42  . . .]VBN0VALL[. . .
I12  68.0335  5.52  –
I12  04.0588  –  legend unclear
I12  06.0600  –  –
I13  94.0737  5.40  . . .]NOS?

Average weight: 5.42 g
D Letter II type – abbreviated legend DVBNOVILLA, DVBOVIILLAV, DVNOVIILLAVN or DVNOVIILLAVNVS – featuring double I instead of E, there are no orthographic errors

D1 classification uncertain, small ⦿ in front of forelegs, legend incomplete

| J14  | 66.0128 | 5.45 | DVB[...]
| J14  | 94.0832 | 5.39 | –

D2 ⦿ above horse, legend DVNOVIILLAV or occasionally DVNOVIILLAVN

D2–1 ⦿, under end of tail

| K15  | 02.0933 | 5.40 | ...]LLAV

D2–2 ⦿ under horse and ⦿ or perhaps ⦿, under end of tail

| L16  | 83.0246 | 5.46 | ...]OVIILLAV
| L16  | 68.0343 | 5.35 | ...]NOVIILLAV
| L16  | 68.0342 | 5.23 | ...]IILLAV
| L16  | 68.0337 | 5.47 | ...]VIILLAV
| L16? | 02.1028 | 5.37 | ...]VNOVIILLAVN, last three letters ligate – recut die

D3 legend DVBOVIILLA

D3–1 ⦿ after legend, ⦿ below horse and ⦿ under end of tail

| N17  | 05.0809 | 5.30 | ...]OVIILLA

D3–2 ⦿ at end of legend and ⦿ under end of horse's tail

| N18  | 93.0898 | 5.42 | DVBNOVIILLA ⦿
| N18  | 61.0217 | 5.61 | ...]IILLA ⦿
| N18  | 61.0215 | 5.25 | ...]NOVIILLA ⦿
| N18  | 90.0802 | 5.39 | ...]OVIIILA ⦿
| O18  | 01.0548 | 5.45 | ...]OVIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 73.0319 | 5.48 | ...]VIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 05.1017 | 5.48 | D[...]]NOVIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 68.0341 | 5.45 | ...]NOVIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 97.1864 | 5.50 | ...]OVIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 67.0154 | 5.51 | ...]NOVIILLA ⦿
| O18  | 05.1010 | 5.44 | ...]IILLA ⦿
| O18  | 96.1097 | 4.60 | ...]NOVIILLA ⦿

D3–3 ⦿ after legend, ⦿ below horse, ⦿ under end of tail and ⦿ ⦿ below wreath

| O19  | 97.1718 | 5.49 | –
| O19  | 68.0340 | 5.41 | ...]VIILLA
| O19  | 06.0117 | – | –
| O19  | 04.2295 | – | –

D3–4 ⦿ under end of tail, perhaps ⦿ after legend?

| M20  | 81.0063 | 5.46 | ...]NOVIILL
| P20  | 05.1015 | 5.35 | ...]NOVIILLA
| P20  | 06.0116 | 5.50 | ...]NOVIILLA
| P20  | 95.1050 | 5.50 | ...]OVIILLA
| P20  | 97.1376 | 5.52 | ...]VIILLA
| P20  | 02.0042 | 5.43 | –

D3–5 ⦿ below horse and letter A under end of tail

| P21  | 95.0083 | 5.38 | ...]LLA

D4 legend DVBOVIILLAVN

D4–1 ⦿ under horse and ⦿ under end of tail, legend DVBOVIILLAVN

| P22  | 68.0344 | 5.52 | ...]AVN
| P22  | 02.0932 | 5.43 | –
| P22  | 01.1558 | 5.36 | ...]OVIILLAVN
| P22  | 06.0120 | – | DVB[...]]OVIILL[...]
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D4–2 · under end of tail, legend unclear, seemingly ending in . . .N, with traces of one or two more letters (VS?) to follow

Q23  94.1253  5.38   . . .]N with traces of VS? behind
Q23?  94.0228  5.42   –

D5 legend DVBNOVIILLAVNVS

Ø in front of horse’s forelegs, · under end of horse’s tail, Latinized legend DVBNOVIILLAVNVS with traces of a ligate V between letters A and N

Q24  61.0213  5.50   . . .]OVIIAVNVS
Q24  96.2647  5.40   . . .]VII[. . .

Average weight: 5.41 g

E  Letter E type – abbreviated legends ranging from DVBNOVELLA, DVBNOVELLA or DVBNOVE, orthographic errors are extremely rare.

E1 legend DVBNOVELLAVNI

Q25  73.0320  5.44   DV[. . ]VELLIAVNI

E2 Ø in front of horse, · under end of horse’s tail, legend DVBNOVELLA ·

R26  06.0474  –   . . .]NOVELLA ·
R26  67.0153  5.35   DVBNOVELLA

E3 ★ under end of tail, legend DVBNOVELLA

E3–1 Ø in front of horse, legend DVBNOVELLA, rev. die no. 27 has tiny · under horse.

R27  95.0671  5.30   . . .]OVELLA
R27  89.0226  –   . . .]OVELLA
R27  96.3130  5.35   . . .]NOVELLA
- 27  06.0119  –   . . .]BNOVELLA
- 27  73.0322  5.18   . . .]OVELLA
S28  01.0962  –   DVBNOVELL[. . ]
S28  73.0321  5.30   . . .]BNOVELLA
S28  01.0935  –   . . .]BNOVELLA
T28  68.0339  5.46   . . .]BNOVELLA
T28  97.1688  5.49   . . .]BNOVELLA
T28  06.0118  –   DVBNOVE[. . ]
U29  01.1986  5.33   . . .]VELLA
U29  73.0318  5.25   –

V30  97.1013  5.47   . . .]BNOVELLA, error on horse’s tail
- 30  98.2051  –   . . .]OVELLA, see above

W31  01.0777  5.22   –

E3–2 Obverse has four additional · in shape of a cross, reverse has Ø surrounded by ··, above horse, debased coppery alloy, legend DVBNOVELLA

X32  01.1985  5.33   . . .]VELLA

E4 Ø in front of horse, abbreviated legend DVBNOVE

W33  02.0930  5.44   . . .]BNOVE
W33  97.1095  5.40   . . .]BNOVE

Average weight: 5.35 g

F  Late type – debased alloy, light weight

F1 legend DVBNOV . . . with seemingly ligate but garbled ending

Y34  00.1069  4.53   . . .]NOV[. . .
APPENDIX 2. Findspots and sources of information.

The gazetteer contains details of all examples of Dubnovellaunos staters recorded in the Celtic Coin Index (CCI) at the Institute of Archaeology, Oxford, up to the end of 2005, together with several examples which have come to the author’s attention during 2007. In addition to the usual bibliographic notes, the final column contains references to a number of auction catalogues, dealer’s lists and museum collections with the abbreviations explained below:

- **BDW**: Buckland, Dix and Wood auction catalogues
- **CNG**: Classical Numismatic Group auction catalogues
- **Cummings**: John Cummings sales lists
- **LHS**: LHS Numismatik (Zurich), formerly Leu Numismatik
- **NCirc**: Spink Numismatic Circular
- **Rudd**: Chris Rudd sales lists
- **SCBI**: *Sylloge of the Coins of the British Isles*
- **SCMB**: Seaby Coin and Medal Bulletin
- **Vosper**: Mike Vosper sales lists

References to earlier gazetteers are abbreviated as *Origins* (Allen 1960) and *Suppl. III* (Haselgrove 1989).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCI</th>
<th>wt</th>
<th>provenance</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00.0309</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>bronze core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.1069</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>CNG Triton I, 3.12.1997, lot 2213; Rudd list 52, no. 69; base gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.0548</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>Kelvedon, Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 60, no. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.0777</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 68, no. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.0935</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.0962</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.1558</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>nr Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 65, no. 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.1985</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>CNG 57, 4.4.2001, lot 1711, base gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.1986</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>CNG 57, 4.4.2001, lot 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0042</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>Orsett, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0476</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Rudd list 64, no. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0990</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>Abbess Roding, Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 67, no. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0929</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum, <em>BNJ</em> 74 (2004), pl. 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0930</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum, <em>BNJ</em> 74 (2004), pl. 12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0931</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum, <em>BNJ</em> 74 (2004), pl. 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0932</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum, <em>BNJ</em> 74 (2004), pl. 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0933</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>Great Waltham, Essex</td>
<td>Chelmsford Museum, <em>BNJ</em> 74 (2004), pl. 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.0990</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>Abbess Roding, Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 67, no. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.1028</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>Orsett, Essex</td>
<td>Rudd list 78, no. 61, with provenance ‘Kent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.1074</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>Little Laver, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.0588</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Great Finborough, Suffolk</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.2295</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>east of Colchester, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.0809</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Ightham, Kent</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.1010</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Scheers, <em>Péronne</em>, pl. XXIV, no. 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.1014</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>Heybridge/Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin no. 1, Colchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.1015</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>Heybridge/Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin no. 2, Colchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.1016</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>Heybridge/Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin no. 3, Colchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.1017</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Tkalec Zurich auction 9.5.2005, lot 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0116</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>nr Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0117</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>nr Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0118</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>nr Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0119</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>nr Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0120</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>nr Chelmsford, Essex</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0474</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Alpheton, Suffolk</td>
<td>Suppl. III, 34; <em>Britannia</em> 18, 331; CBA Group 6 <em>Bulletin</em> 31 (1986), 53; Moyse’s Hall Museum, Bury St Edmunds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0584</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>Heybridge hoard? CNG 66, 19.5.2004, lot 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0600</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0644</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>Heybridge/Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin no. 4, Colchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.0645</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Heybridge/Maldon, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin no. 5, Colchester Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0213</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Glendining (Lockett coll.), 6.6.1955, lot 37, casts in BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0214</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Ashmolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0215</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>Marks Tey, Essex</td>
<td>hoard coin, Colchester and Essex Museum; casts in BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.0216</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam Museum, <em>SCBI</em> 1, no. 135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
61.0217 5.61 – Fitzwilliam Museum, SCBI 1, no. 134
61.0218 5.56 – Fitzwilliam Museum, SCBI 1, no. 136
66.0126 5.48 – Hunterian Museum
66.0127 5.54 – Hunterian Museum
66.0128 5.45 – Ashmolean
66.0129 5.28 Canterbury, Kent Ashmolean, acc. to Evans fd at Dorchester, Oxon.
67.0153 5.51 – Nat. Mus. of Wales, ex Mack; SCBI 20, pl. IV, 122
68.0329 5.57 – BMC 2434
68.0330 5.51 – BMC 2429
68.0331 5.53 – BMC 2428
68.0332 5.35 – BMC 2427
68.0333 5.52 – BMC 2425
68.0334 5.52 – BMC 2433
68.0335 5.52 – BMC 2432
68.0336 5.52 – Glendining, 4.7.1939 (Drabble coll.), lot 33; casts in BM, Evans IV.6
68.0337 5.47 – BMC 2438
68.0338 5.45 – BMC 2431
68.0339 5.46 Walton on the Naze, Essex BMC 2440, Evans IV.7
68.0340 5.41 Marks Tey, Essex? BMC 2435, provenance recorded as Toy Hall, Essex
68.0341 5.45 – BMC 2426, Evans IV.8
68.0342 5.23 Colchester, Essex BMC 2439, Evans IV.9
68.0343 5.35 Colchester, Essex BMC 2437
68.0344 5.35 – BMC 2436
68.0345 5.56 – BMC 2430
68.0346 5.52 – Rudd list 31, no. 63, ex Baldwin 14, 13.10.1997, lot 130; casts in BM
68.0347 – – casts in BM
68.0348 3.85 Birling, E. Sussex plated, hoard coin, BMC 2441
72.0098 2.95 – bronze core, Colchester and Essex Museum
72.0099 5.38 – Colchester and Essex Museum
73.0317 5.31 – ex Mossop, ex SCMB Oct. 1968, G1595
73.0318 5.25 – ex Mossop, Eslen 49, 19.4.1997, lot 89
73.0319 5.48 – Fitzwilliam, SCBI 1, no. 133
73.0320 5.44 – ex Norweb coll., SCBI 16, no. 27
73.0321 5.30 Rayleigh, Essex Nat. Mus. of Wales, ex Glendining (Lockett coll.) 6.6.1955, lot 38
73.0322 5.18 – Budapest Mus. (?), Dessewffy (1910), pl. XXXIX, 952
79.0023 5.50 – probably a modern fake
81.0063 5.46 Soham, Cambs. Sotheby's (Stack coll.) 22.4.1999, lot 71
83.0246 5.46 Cambridge, Cambs. shown to BM, found with two others (one plated)
84.0029 5.42 Little Wakering, Essex platted coin
89.0050 5.42 Little Wakering, Essex BNJ 57 (1987), pl. 1.25 with provenance of Barking, Essex
89.0226 – – New Chetney Island, Kent Kent Arch. Rev. 54 (1978), 97
90.0802 5.39 Woodham Mortimer, Essex shown to BM
93.0094 – – bronze core, Rudd list 8, no. 59; NCirc June 1992, no. 3544
93.0898 5.42 Soham, Cambs. Glendining's (Mossop coll.), 6.11.1991, lot 283
94.0737 5.40 Weeley Heath, Essex Rudd lists 10, no. 45 and 12, no. 40
94.0822 5.42 nr Chelmsford, Essex Sotheby's (Strauss coll.) 26.5.1994, lot 37
94.0884 5.28 Weeley Heath, Essex Vecchi auction 2, 12.9.1996, lot 1091; Rudd list 53, no. 83
94.0981 5.40 Kent The Searcher, June 1994, 28
94.1052 5.20 – BDW, 1.6.1994, lot 712 and 21.9.1994, lot 11
94.1254 5.40 Colchester area BDW, 21.9.1994, lot 9
94.1253 5.38 Colchester area BDW, 21.9.1994, lot 10
95.0083 5.38 Isle of Sheppey, Kent –
95.0671 5.30 – Vosper list 83, no. 26
95.1050 5.50 – Vosper list 84, no. 30
96.1097 4.60 – Vosper list 88, no. 97
96.2647 5.40 – Vosper list 91, no. 36
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| 96.2688 | 3.16 | Ashwell, Herts. | bronze core, Rudd list 23, no. 70 |
| 96.3130 | 5.35 | – | Vecchi auction 2, 12.9.1996, lot 1092 |
| 97.1013 | 5.47 | – | Noble Numismatics 52, 13.11.1996, lot 1073; Rudd list 27, no. 91 |
| 97.1095 | 5.40 | Essex/Suffolk | Cummings list February 1998, H7 |
| 97.1376 | 5.52 | – | Rudd list 28, no. 156 |
| 97.1688 | 5.49 | – | Bank Leu 59, 17.5.1994, lot 5 (listed as 4) and LHS 95, 25.10.2005, lot 412 |
| 97.1718 | 5.49 | – | Baldwin’s 14, 13.10.1997, lot 129; Rudd list 33, no. 57 |
| 97.1864 | 5.50 | Braughing, Herts. | – |
| 98.0119 | 5.45 | – | – |
| 98.2051 | – | – | Colchester, Essex | Origins | 216, as perhaps in Colchester Museum? Check revealed this not to be the case |
| – | – | Colchester, Essex | Origins | 216, Evans 1864, 203, plated coin originally in Pollexfen coll., perhaps 72.0098? |
| – | – | Marks Tey, Essex | Origins | 216, Evans 1864, 203 and 1890, 527, a second coin in Colchester Museum? Check revealed this not to be the case. Perhaps identical with 68.0340? |
| – | – | Essex | Origins | 216, Evans 1864, 203, JBA A XVII, 69; no image shown, but described as almost identical to BMC 2440 |
| – | – | – | – | – |
| – | – | Thackway, Oxon. | Origins | 216, a mistake for Tackley, Oxon.? |
| – | – | Cambridge, Cambs. | Suppl. III, 34 quite possibly 83.0246 but no star below tail |
| – | – | Cambridge, Cambs. | Suppl. III, 34, fd together with previous entry |
| – | – | Cambridge, Cambs. | Suppl. III, 34, plated coin, possibly same as 84.0029 but no star below tail |
| – | – | Barking, Essex | Suppl. III, 34, BN J 57 (1987), pl. 1.25, same as 89.0050 fd at Little Wakering, Essex |
| – | – | Billericay, Essex | Suppl. III, 34, same as 67.0153 fd. at Wickford, Essex |

REFERENCES

Dessewffy, M., 1910. Barbar Penzei (Budapest).
Evans, J., 1864. The coins of the ancient Britons (London).
THE TRINOVANTIAN STATERS OF DUBNOVELLAUNOS

Wellington, I., 1999. ‘An addition to the Trinovantian coinage’, NCirc 107, 47.