

# RAVENS, EAGLES, AND A WAR OF IMAGES BETWEEN VERICA AND EPATICCUS

DAVID WOODS

THE standard reference works agree in attributing to Verica (c. AD 10–40?) a silver minim with an obverse depicting a pine-cone wand (*thyrsos*) between two *cornucopiae*, all rising from a two-handled wine cup, and a reverse depicting a bird with outstretched wing looking over and behind itself (Fig. 1).<sup>1</sup> While the coin does not bear any inscription, the obverse is identical to an obverse of a silver unit issued in the name of Verica.<sup>2</sup> It seems likely, therefore, that he produced both coins. As for the reverse, all of the standard reference works agree in describing the bird depicted thereupon as an eagle.<sup>3</sup> However, none mention the fact that the bird seems to be stretching its head back behind it to pick at a group of four berries, or grains, topping a stem bending under their weight.<sup>4</sup> In fact, two stems can be seen rising over the bird in the space between its tail and its outstretched wing. This is important because the fact that the bird is depicted attempting to pick at a group of berries, or grain, immediately calls into question its identification as an eagle, since eagles are carnivorous and do not pick at fruit or grain in this manner.



Fig. 1. Silver minim of Verica, *ABC* 1322 (twice actual size). (© Chris Rudd.)

Birds do not feature very strongly on Iron Age British coinage, and only one other coin, another silver minim also, depicts a bird picking at vegetation again, although this time the objects of its attention are clearly identifiable as berries of some sort (Fig. 2).<sup>5</sup> The obverse of this type depicts two interlocking squares with either the letter A, most frequently, B or C, at their centre. The reverse depicts a bird facing towards the right and picking at a group of

*Acknowledgements* I would like to thank the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to illustrate Fig. 4, Chris Rudd ([www.celticcoins.com](http://www.celticcoins.com)) for Figs 1, 2, 5 and 7, and Mike R. Vosper ([www.vosper4coins.co.uk](http://www.vosper4coins.co.uk)) for Figs 3, 6, 8 and 9.

<sup>1</sup> VA 555 = *BMC* 1543–58 = *ABC* 1322. The obverse seems to represent an adaptation of the reverse of a denarius issued by Mark Antony in 40 BC (*RRC* 520/1). For the sake of convenience, I follow the regnal dates given in *ABC*, but these are approximate at best.

<sup>2</sup> VA 531 = *BMC* 1393–1419 = *ABC* 1241. The reverse depicts a figure seated right holding spear, with shield behind.

<sup>3</sup> VA, 174: ‘Eagle flying left’; *BMC*, 109: ‘eagle flying l., head & wings r.’; *ABC*, 75: ‘eagle l.’ So also Cheesman 1994, 79: ‘eagle l., wings addorsed’; Bean 2000, 246: ‘Eagle left with wings raised’.

<sup>4</sup> It has been acknowledged in at least one sales catalogue. See *Chris Rudd List* 126 (Nov. 2012), no. 25: ‘The eagle seems to be reaching for some grapes or berries with its beak’. One hesitates to identify the fruit. Certainly, as Williams 2005 has highlighted, vinous symbolism was common on the coinage of Verica in particular, but this scene was a variation on an older theme on the coinage of Tincomarus before reference to wine and grapes became so common. Given the position of the four objects at the top of an apparently leafless stem, one wonders whether they were perhaps intended to represent a head of grain. In that case, this type may conceal an allusion to the reign of king Cunobelinus (c. AD 8–41?) of the Catuvellauni who, to judge from the obverse common to most of his gold coinage, seems to have adopted an ear of grain as his symbol. For the ear of grain, see *ABC* 2771–2804, 2810–25.

<sup>5</sup> VA 561 = *BMC* 1569–71 = *ABC* 1133. A surprising variety of birds appear as a minor feature above the back of the wolf on the reverse of the so-called Norfolk wolf staters (VA 610 = *BMC* 212–78 = *ABC* 1393–99). See Kretz 1999. Other coins attributed to the Cantiaci depict a large goose-like bird above the back of either a horse (*ABC* 231) or a bull (*ABC* 327). Gallic types depicting a large bird either upon or above a horse (DT 356, 587, 2059–65) and upon or above a monstrous quadruped (DT 2611) may have influenced these British types. As a main device, however, when a bird does occur on British types, it is normally readily identifiable as an eagle. For a survey of such types, see Nash Briggs 2013.

berries at the lower part of a branch while another group of berries stretches over its back from a smaller branch projecting from this main branch.<sup>6</sup> One berry is depicted in mid-air as it falls towards the bird's feet from the bunch at which it is picking, while some type of growth sprouts up behind it. The exergual line seems too straight to be intended as anything but the ground, so this growth may be a shoot from the same shrub, or one of the berries already taking root as a new shrub in its own right.<sup>7</sup> None of the catalogues attempts a specific identification of the bird. Allen identified it as a raven, although with no attempt to explain this.<sup>8</sup> However, several factors support such an interpretation. First, it is consistent with the basic profile of the bird. Second, it is consistent with the British habit at this period of preferring subjects that had been sanctioned by Roman use, if not simply copying Roman models. Hence it is arguable that the coins which Mark Antony issued in Gaul *c.*43–42 BC depicting a raven on the obverse may have inspired this British type to some extent.<sup>9</sup> Finally, the ritual burial of ravens, or other corvids, was a not uncommon feature of Iron Age British society that continued into the Roman period.<sup>10</sup> Clearly, therefore, this bird had some form of symbolic or religious significance.



Fig. 2. Silver minim of Tincomarus, *ABC* 1133 (twice actual size). (© Chris Rudd.)

It is not initially clear who issued this last coin. The only inscription is the letter within the interlocking squares on the obverse, and as long as the variants with B or C there instead of A remained unknown, it was possible to presume that Amminus (*c.*AD 30–40?) of Kent had probably issued it.<sup>11</sup> While Van Arsdell and the *BMC* catalogue attribute it to Verica, Bean and *ABC* attribute it to Tincomarus (*c.*25 BC–AD 10?).<sup>12</sup> Tincomarus issued two types of minim with interlocking squares on the obverse, with C.F at their centre in one case and CO in the other, referring in each case to his claim to be a son of Commius, a *Commi Filius*.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Epaticcus (*c.*AD 20–40?) issued a minim with interlocking squares on the obverse also, where he placed TA at their centre, referring to his claim to be a son of Tasciovanus, in direct imitation of Tincomarus' practice in this matter.<sup>14</sup> It seems difficult to believe, therefore, that Verica would have used the interlocking squares type without some reference to his claim to be a son of Commius. Much more importantly, however, a similar system of varying letters on the obverse occurs on a gold quarter stater and a silver unit both firmly attributable to Tincomarus.<sup>15</sup> Hence the interlocking squares type with the letters A, B or C at the centre seems best attributed to Tincomarus at the beginning of his use of this obverse type, before he decided to place reference to his ancestral descent at their centre instead.

The facts that Tincomarus and Verica are the only British rulers to have depicted a bird picking at vegetation, whether grain or berries, as a main device on their coinage, that Verica seems to have succeeded Tincomarus as ruler of the Atrebatas, and that both depicted this type on the same denomination coin, the minim, suggests that the scene on the reverse of

<sup>6</sup> *ABC* describes the bird as 'holding branch', but each end of the branch terminates at the edge of the scene, suggesting that it must be assumed to continue beyond the scene at each end as part of some larger shrub.

<sup>7</sup> Henig 1972, 220, followed by Van Arsdell 1989, 177, interprets the exergual line as another branch.

<sup>8</sup> Allen 1976, 97.

<sup>9</sup> *RRC* 489/1–4. So Bean 2000, 152. Henig 1972, 220 seeks its origin in an intaglio.

<sup>10</sup> Serjeantson and Morris 2011.

<sup>11</sup> Henig and Nash 1982. The significance of these letters is unclear. However, given the alphabetical sequence involved, it seems unlikely that they abbreviate real names.

<sup>12</sup> Bean 2000, 242.

<sup>13</sup> VA 383.1 = *BMC* 981–82 = *ABC* 1136; VA 383.5 = *ABC* 1139.

<sup>14</sup> VA 560 = *BMC* 2351–57 = *ABC* 1367.

<sup>15</sup> For the quarter stater, see VA 378 = *BMC* 811–26 = *ABC* 1076; for the silver unit, see VA 397 = *BMC* 880–905 = *ABC* 1106. In each case, a letter A on the obverse is occasionally replaced by a letter B.

Verica's coin represents a reworking of the earlier scene on the reverse of Tincomarus' coin. However, this still leaves questions in respect both of the ultimate source for and perceived significance of such a scene. No Roman coin had ever depicted a bird picking at vegetation as its main or only device. However, a certain Pixtilos issued a bronze type among the Gallic Carnutes sometime *c.*40 BC whose reverse depicted a large bird perched upon a wrist and with head towards a branch of berries held in the same hand as if about to peck at them (Fig. 3).<sup>16</sup> Hence it is possible that this reverse depicts someone feeding a bird with berries. Alternatively, however, since the bird is not shown actually eating the berries, this reverse may depict the bird on the hand of the figure as he or she offers the branch with fruit to some third person or group. If this understanding of the design is correct, then the type may have some political significance.<sup>17</sup> If the former understanding is correct, however, then the interpretation of this type remains more open. Even if Tincomarus' reverse does not rework this precise example, then it may have been inspired by a similar feeling or sense of purpose. Here one notes that birds feeding upon fruit are relatively common within Celtic art, both British and Continental, often in a religious context. For example, the mid-third-century AD Romano-British temple-hoard from Felmingham Hall contained two bronze figurines of birds (Fig. 4), each with a round object in its mouth, a berry or piece of fruit apparently, where one of these has been said to resemble a raven or dove, the other an eagle.<sup>18</sup> It is possible, therefore, that Tincomarus' depiction of a bird feeding upon berries had some religious significance, as did Verica's reworking of the same theme, even if their precise religious significance is now lost to us.



Fig. 3. Bronze of Pixtilos, DT 2467 (twice actual size). (© Mike R. Vosper.)



Fig. 4. Bronze figurines from the Felmingham Hall hoard (actual size). (© The Trustees of the British Museum.)

<sup>16</sup> DT 2467. In general, see Scheers 1979.

<sup>17</sup> Given both the date of the type and the high degree of Roman influence upon the iconography of Pixtilos' issues otherwise, this type may even have been intended to depict the Carnutes, represented by the bird, supporting Rome as it offers the olive branch of peace to Gaul.

<sup>18</sup> Gilbert 1978, esp. 168-70.

Alternatively, one should not exclude the possibility that these were simply decorative domestic scenes, chosen for no more reason, perhaps, than that their depictions of wild-life appealed to a group interested in hunting and scenes of country-life. Such an interpretation would be consistent, for example, with the depiction of a dog curled up at rest or in sleep on the reverse of another of Verica's minims.<sup>19</sup> This particular device was probably copied from a Roman engraved gem and, whatever its significance in a Roman context, it has been suggested that it may have been intended here in reference to one of the hunting-dogs for which Britain was famed at this period.<sup>20</sup> Here one notes that Anglo-Saxon sceattas from the late seventh and early eighth centuries sometimes return to similar themes of birds picking at berries and quadrupeds of varied, often indistinguishable types which may (or may not) be identifiable as dogs, and a determined effort has been made to detect some form of specifically Christian allusion in all, or most, of these types.<sup>21</sup> Obviously, one cannot place a Christian interpretation on similarly themed types from pre-Roman Britain, but it may be equally erroneous in either case to seek some form of hidden religious meaning, whether Christian or 'druidic', when a simpler explanation may lie in the perennial interest of the elite of such pre-industrial societies in various types of hunting and associated scenes of country-life. True, each society may also have issued types which did have clearer ritualistic or religious significance, but one should beware of assuming a single consistent theme or message when so little is known about the actual production of coins in either societies, that is, who exactly produced them and to what extent, if any, this production was subject to a centralised control.

The attribution of the above-mentioned minim depicting a bird picking at berries to Tincomarus means that he issued two avian types. For in addition to this type, he also issued a silver unit with obverse depicting a laureate head and a reverse depicting a facing eagle with outstretched wings clutching a long snake in its claws (Fig. 5).<sup>22</sup> This resembles a type of reverse featured on several bronze issues by the Carnutes *c.*50–30 BC, where this showed one or two facing eagles with head turned right towards a long snake (Fig. 6).<sup>23</sup> However, there are some differences, such as the fact that the eagle on Tincomarus' coin grasps the snake in its talons, while the eagles on the Gallic coins do not, and, most noticeably, in the style of the birds, so that the eagle on Tincomarus' coin is much more realistic than that on the Gallic coins. Consequently, one cannot exclude the possibility that British and Gallic designers have drawn upon the same Roman model independently of one another.<sup>24</sup> While no Roman coins had depicted a scene of this type, the designers may have become familiar with it by other



Fig. 5. Silver unit of Tincomarus, *ABC* 1106 (twice actual size). (© Chris Rudd.)

<sup>19</sup> VA 557 = *BMC* 1564–68 = *ABC* 1328.

<sup>20</sup> Henig 1988, 255, citing Strabo 4.5.2.

<sup>21</sup> See Gannon 2003, 107–56.

<sup>22</sup> VA 397 = *BMC* 880–905 = *ABC* 1106. Bean 2000, 242, mistakenly claims that the eagle holds the snake by the head in its beak. For a survey of the spread of this symbol, an eagle confronting a snake, across the Mediterranean world from its apparent ultimate origin in the Near East, see Wittkower 1939. For a study of its significance in the Greek world, see Rodríguez Pérez 2010.

<sup>23</sup> On the Gallic issues, see DT 2576, 2582–84; *CCBM* III, nos 128–39. Scheers 1992, 35 declares that 'we must assume a Greek origin for all the representations of an eagle standing on or capturing a serpent', and proceeds to compare this type to the eagle as depicted on the octobol of Euboean Chalcis in the second century BC. Yet once recent Roman usage had set the required precedent for depicting a facing eagle as the main feature on a coin (see e.g. *RRC* 409/1, 428/3, 487/2), it would not have taken a great leap of imagination to depict this eagle clutching a snake in its claws rather than a thunderbolt in the standard Roman fashion. So Laing 1991, 23 seems to imply.

<sup>24</sup> Creighton 2000, 119–21, draws attention to the similarity between Tincomarus' coin and a coin by King Juba II of Mauretania in support of his argument for the use of a common Augustan imagery by a variety of client kings who had spent time as hostages in Rome, where Juba's coin depicts the eagle grasping a thunderbolt in his talons and with head turned towards a long straight sceptre at his right.



Fig. 6. Bronze of the Carnutes, DT 2582 (twice actual size). (© Mike R. Vosper.)

means. For example, Augustus had erected a famous picture of a father and son, above whom soared an eagle with a snake in its talons, in the senate house at Rome, and various delegations may well have witnessed this.<sup>25</sup>

Here one notices a curious point. Despite issuing about ten basic types of silver unit, and about twenty-five basic types of minim, Verica seems never to have issued a type depicting an eagle clutching a snake.<sup>26</sup> He did issue a silver unit with a reverse depicting a facing eagle, but this eagle holds nothing in its talons (Fig. 7).<sup>27</sup> As noted above, he also continued with a variation of the bird picking berries type which he used on the reverse of what seems to have been his largest or most long running type of minim. His variation on the theme depicts a wilder and more aggressive bird, although it is still only picking at berries or grain. Finally, he also issued two types of minim with eagle on the reverse, a different style of eagle in each case, but neither eagle was depicted feeding upon or attacking anything.<sup>28</sup> In contrast, Epaticcus seems never to have issued a type depicting a bird picking at vegetation. However, he did issue a silver unit with obverse depicting a bust wearing an apparent lion-skin and a reverse depicting a variation of the facing eagle clutching a snake (Fig. 8).<sup>29</sup>



Fig. 7. Silver unit of Verica, ABC 1226 (twice actual size). (© Chris Rudd.)

Fig. 8. Silver unit of Epaticcus, ABC 1346 (twice actual size). (© Mike R. Vosper.)

Epaticcus' depiction of the eagle clutching a snake differs from that of Tincomarus in two important ways. First, the snake in the claws of his eagle is much shorter and more subdued. Its head never reaches beyond the eagle's thighs, and is always turned away from the eagle as if looking to flee. In contrast, the head of the snake on Tincomarus' type reaches as high as the eagle's head, and turns directly towards the eagle as if to attack it. Hence Epaticcus' eagle seems to be in much more control of the situation than does Tincomarus' eagle. The second difference lies in the direction of eagle's head. The eagle on Epaticcus' coin looks towards the left, while that on Tincomarus' coin looks towards the right. Since the facing eagle on Verica's

<sup>25</sup> Pliny, *Natural History* 35.28. The painting, by the fourth-century BC Athenian artist Philochares, depicted an otherwise unknown father and son, Glaucio and Aristippus.

<sup>26</sup> For this purpose, I discount ABC 1223 as a minor variant of ABC 1220, ABC 1232 as a minor variant of 1229, and ABC 1247 as a minor variant of ABC 1244. As for the minims, I discount ABC 1283 as a minor variant of ABC 1280, and ABC 1304 as a minor variant of ABC 1301.

<sup>27</sup> VA 471 = BMC 1485–1505 = ABC 1226.

<sup>28</sup> VA 563 = BMC 1572–78 = ABC 1331; BMC 1583–86 = ABC 1337. In the former case, the eagle has been copied exactly from the eagle-standard on the legionary coinage issued by Mark Antony c.32–31 BC (RRC 554/1–11, 13–39).

<sup>29</sup> VA 580 = BMC 2024–2293 = ABC 1346. Evans 1864, 283 comments: 'The eagle holding a serpent in its claws, the ancient ensign of the Spartans, may possibly have been taken from some Greek coin.'

coin turns its head towards the left also, it is arguable that Epaticcus has modelled his eagle upon that of Verica rather than that of Tincomarus, but that he has added the snake in its talons to produce a more aggressive and commanding bird. Two other details reinforce this argument. The first lies in the detailed treatment of the eagle's wings. In the case of Epaticcus' eagle, the shorter feathers at the top of the wing are rendered by a group of dots, but these are replaced about half-way down the wing by several vertical strokes depicting longer feathers. This is exactly the pattern that one finds in the depiction of the eagle on Verica's coin: the dots and vertical lines never mix. In contrast, the dots continue down among the lines on the wings of the eagle as depicted on Tincomarus' coin. The second detail lies in the size and position of the eagle's tail. In the cases of both Epaticcus' and Verica's eagles, a large tail is plainly visible immediately to the left of the eagle's legs. However, in the case of Tincomarus' eagle, the tail is barely visible to the right of its legs. Hence there can be no doubt that Epaticcus' eagle was directly modelled upon, and intended to be contrasted to, Verica's eagle rather than that of Tincomarus.

One could reconstruct the story of a propaganda war between Verica and Epaticcus, running something like as follows: Verica produced a silver unit with a reverse depicting a facing eagle in continuation of the facing eagle type first introduced by Tincomarus, but, for some reason no longer clear, he omitted the snake in the eagle's claws. When Epaticcus was attempting to expand his territory southwards at the expense of Verica, he took advantage of Verica's omission in this matter, and copied his eagle reverse type exactly but for the addition of the snake, in order to emphasize his more aggressive and dynamic rule. In response, when Verica introduced a new minim with raven picking berries in continuation of another basic type introduced by Tincomarus, he depicted a wilder and much more eagle-like raven, toughening his image so to speak. However, Epaticcus did not let things stop at this. He issued a new minim with obverse depicting a bull about to charge and a reverse depicting a side-facing eagle clutching a snake in its claws once more, but tearing at it with its beak also (Fig. 9).<sup>30</sup> It is noteworthy that this eagle faces in the same direction as the eagle-like raven on Verica's minim in the same basic side-facing manner, with wings outstretched above its back, so that it seems to have been influenced by, and intended to be contrasted to, this raven.<sup>31</sup> The main difference lies in the fact that Verica's raven looks back above itself towards some berries or grains, but Epaticcus' eagle tears down at the snake clutched in its claws. Hence Epaticcus triumphs on the minim also, where he again projects the more aggressive and dynamic image.



Fig. 9. Silver minim of Epaticcus, *ABC* 1358 (twice actual size). (© Mike R. Vosper.)

Unfortunately, such a reconstruction is probably too speculative, since one cannot be certain concerning the internal chronology of the coinages of either Verica or Epaticcus, nor concerning the chronologies of the issues by one ruler relative to those by the other. In particular, one should beware of assuming that one type was issued in immediate response to another. For example, Verica's silver unit with facing eagle reverse seems to have been one of his earliest issues, while the fact that the same die-cutter seems to have been responsible for Epaticcus' silver unit with facing eagle reverse as was responsible for the silver unit with facing eagle reverse by Caratacus (*c.* AD 40–43?) suggests that this was probably a relatively late type, so that one or two decades even may have separated Epaticcus' facing eagle type from that by

<sup>30</sup> VA 512 = *BMC* 2366–70 = *ABC* 1358.

<sup>31</sup> Scheers 1992, 35 draws attention to the fact that this scene is similar to that on some bronze coins of Kroton, Akragas, and Chalcis from the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Again, this is purely coincidental.

Verica.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, one should also beware of any easy assumption that Epaticcus and Verica were necessarily as hostile to one another as is sometimes assumed, or that Verica was necessarily the innocent party in any conflict between them. Certainly, Verica, or his moneyer, was capable of projecting a much stronger and more militaristic image when it suited him to do so, as demonstrated by what was probably one of his latest types of silver unit with a cavalryman on each side.<sup>33</sup>

Nevertheless, regardless of the precise sequence of issues, or of the chronological proximity of one ruler's issues to those by the other, the fact remains that the birds depicted on Epaticcus' coinage appear more aggressive and dynamic than do those on Verica's coinage. Since Epaticcus declares himself on his coinage to be a son of Tasciovanus (c.25 BC–AD 10?) of the Catuvellauni, one wonders whether the destruction of a snake could have had some symbolic importance for this dynasty, but this image does not seem prevalent enough on its coinage otherwise.<sup>34</sup> More importantly, Epaticcus' coinage displays a similarly increased aggression when it comes to the depiction of dogs also. One may contrast the sleeping dog depicted on the reverse of a minim of Verica, as already noted above, to the dogs depicted on the reverses of two minims of Epaticcus, one dog standing alert and ready, with one paw raised as if striding confidently forwards, and a second dog depicted crouching back as if ready to spring against some unseen threat.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, the designs of Epaticcus' coinage, particularly those on the reverse, correspond so closely to those on Verica's coinage across all three denominations otherwise that it becomes clear that one ruler, or his moneyers, was deliberately imitating the coinage of the other.<sup>36</sup> Hence it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in those cases where Epaticcus' coinage depicts a more aggressive interpretation of the same basic reverse theme, an eagle claspng a snake rather than an eagle with empty talons, a dog crouched as if to spring rather than curled in sleep, this was deliberate. It is impossible to know now whether it was Epaticcus himself who decided to respond to some of Verica's coin designs with more aggressive interpretations of the same themes, but someone seems to have done so. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to talk of a quiet war of images, even if the action was perhaps a little one-sided, and one cannot now reconstruct the precise sequence of events in this war.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABC*. See Cottam, de Jersey, Rudd and Sills 2010.  
 Allen, D.F., 1976. 'Did Adminius strike coins?', *Britannia* 7, 96–100.  
 Bean, S.C., 2000. *The Coinage of the Atrebates and Regni*, Studies in Celtic Coinage 4 (Oxford).  
*BMC*. See Hobbs 1996.  
*CCBM*. See Mays 1995.  
 Cheesman, C. 1994. 'The coins', in M.G. O'Connell and J. Bird, 'The Roman temple at Wanborough, excavation 1985–1986', *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 82, 31–92.  
 Cottam, E., de Jersey, P., Rudd, C. and Sills, J., 2010. *Ancient British Coinage* (Aylsham).  
 Cottam, G.L., 1997. 'An overstruck silver unit of Verica', *BNJ* 67, 95–7.  
 Crawford, M.H., 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge).

<sup>32</sup> Bean 200, 178–80, dates Verica's facing eagle type among his early silver units, which receives some support from the fact that one example was overstruck with *ABC* 1232. See Cottam 1997. For Caratacus' unit with facing eagle, see VA 593 = *BMC* 2376–84 = *ABC* 1376.

<sup>33</sup> VA 530 = *BMC* 1360–92 = *ABC* 1238. For the dating, see Bean 2000, 179–80.

<sup>34</sup> Cunobelinus issued a silver unit depicting a female dog standing upon and confronting a snake (VA 2069 = *BMC* 1893 = *ABC* 2891), but this may owe more to a denarius of Julius Caesar depicting an elephant about to trample a snake (*RRC* 443/1) than to native traditions. See Woods 2013, 2–4. The reverse of a fractional bronze by Rues displays an eagle with snake in its beak (VA 1903 = *BMC* 1756–58 = *ABC* 2763), but the same type also includes variants depicting the eagle without the snake. See Kretz 2007, 8–9. Furthermore, one of Rues' bronze units also displays an eagle without snake as the main device upon its reverse (VA 1890 = *BMC* 1691–92 = *ABC* 2760).

<sup>35</sup> *BMC* 2358–63 = *ABC* 1364 (dog standing alert); VA 558 = *BMC* 2371–74 = *ABC* 1361 (dog crouching back). In so far as the second type seems to depart further from their common Roman model, it was probably produced later, so that the later image was the more aggressive. See Woods 2012, 6.

<sup>36</sup> See e.g. the reverse of Epaticcus' sole stater (VA 575 = *BMC* 2021–23 = *ABC* 1343) with a cavalry-man thrusting down with spear similar to that on the reverse of a stater by Verica (VA 460 = *ABC* 1187 = *BMC* 1143–44); the reverse of a minim by Epaticcus depicting a boar-head (VA 585 = *BMC* 2331–46 = *ABC* 1370) similar to that on the reverse of a minim by Verica (VA 564 = *BMC* 1579–81 = *ABC* 1268). The initial purpose of this imitation was presumably to increase the acceptability of these coins.

- Creighton, J., 2000. *Coins and Power in Late Iron Age Britain* (Cambridge).
- Delestrée, L.-P., and Tache, M. 2002–08. *Nouvel atlas des monnaies Gauloises*, 4 vols (Saint-Germain-en-Laye).  
DT. See Delestrée and Tache 2002–08.
- Evans, J., 1864. *The Coins of the Ancient Britons* (London).
- Gannon, A. 2003. *The Iconography of Early Anglo-Saxon Coinage: Sixth to Eighth Centuries* (Oxford).
- Gilbert, H., 1978. 'The Felmingham Hall hoard, Norfolk', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 28, 159–87.
- Henig, M. 1988. 'Verica's hound', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 7, 253–5.
- Henig, M., and Nash, D., 1982. 'Amminus and the kingdom of Verica', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 1, 243–46.
- Hobbs, R., 1996. *British Iron Age Coins in the British Museum* (London).
- Kretz, R., 1999. 'On the track of the Norfolk wolf', *Chris Rudd List* 48, 3–8.
- Kretz, R., 2007. 'The coinage of Rues', *BNJ* 77, 1–21.
- Laing, L., 1991. 'Types and prototypes in insular Celtic coinage', *Celtic Coin Bulletin* 1, 19–24.
- Mays, M., 1995. *Catalogue of Celtic Coins in the British Museum, III: Bronze Coins of Gaul* (London).
- Nash Briggs, D., 2013. 'Reading the images on Iron-Age coins: 6. Imperial eagles (Part. 2: Britain)', *Chris Rudd List* 131, 2–4.
- RRC. See Crawford 1974.
- Rodríguez Pérez, D., 2010. 'Contextualizing symbols: 'the Eagle and the Snake' in the ancient Greek world', *Boreas* 33, 1–18.
- Scheers, S., 1979. 'Un monnayage post-césarien des années 40–30 av. J.-C.: les monnaies à légende Pixtilos', *RN*, 6th series, 21, 57–83.
- Scheers, S., 1992. 'Celtic coin types in Britain and their Mediterranean origins', in M. Mays (ed.), *Celtic Coinage: Britain and Beyond. The Eleventh Oxford Symposium on Coinage and Monetary History*, BAR British Series 222 (Oxford,), 33–46.
- Serjeantson, D., and Morris, J., 2011. 'Ravens and crows in Iron Age and Roman Britain', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 30, 85–107.
- VA. See Van Arsdell 1989.
- Van Arsdell, R.D., 1989. *Celtic Coinage of Britain* (London).
- Williams, J., 2005. 'The newer rite is here': vinous symbolism on British Iron Age coins', in C. Haselgrove and D. Wigg-Wolf (eds.), *Iron Age Coinage and Ritual Practices*, Studien zu Fundmünzen der Antike 20 (Mainz), 25–39.
- Wittkower, R. 1939. 'Eagle and serpent. A study in the migration of symbols', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2, 293–325.
- Woods, D., 2012. 'A Roman republican prototype for the animal under-a-tree types of Epaticcus', *BNJ* 82, 1–7.
- Woods, D. 2013. 'Some unidentified Roman prototypes of British Celtic coins', *BNJ* 83, 1–14.