SAXON SCEATTAS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

By PHILIP V. HILL

The difficulties presented by Saxon sceattas have been tackled by many numismatists during the past century, but it must be admitted that, with the notable exception of Dr. Sutherland's war-time paper in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, our knowledge of the series has not been appreciably extended. Indeed, we may even say that the more we know about sceattas, the more we realize we do not know. To me their study is but a side-line (albeit a necessary one) to my researches into the barbarous Roman coins, since I believe that both series can be linked far more closely than many students are prepared to admit. Still, I am hardly justified in making any dogmatic assertions or in imagining that I can dispose for all eternity of the problems which beset us! I can only hope that this paper will present a more qualified student with a few pointers and will lead to a greater understanding of these difficult coins.

Dr. Sutherland has already dealt with the problems of the earlier gold thrymsas, so that we need not traverse that ground again but refer those interested to his valuable monograph on the Crondall hoard.¹ We shall therefore take up the story with the silver coins and, after a few preliminary remarks on the types of sceattas and their art, proceed to a consideration of their problems.

Since in this country sceattas are usually studied in connexion with our own coinage, our English sense of insularity often blinds us to two facts: that they were not peculiarly English, and that the same types were frequently produced on both sides of the Channel. That the Saxon sceattas were part of a far greater whole will be especially apparent when we come to touch upon the commercial relations of England and the Continent. Yet, in spite of this, they are stylistically in a class apart, being far superior in treatment to those of Merovingian Gaul and Frisia. For the most part, Merovingian sceattas, having been more thoroughly subjected to Romanizing influences, bear the names of mints and often of moneyers, which enable them to be identified and geographically classified, if not dated. Frisian sceattas, on the other hand, present the same difficulties as are presented by their Saxon cousins, without even the vague leads which the latter occasionally give. So it will be convenient for us to return to our insularity for the time being and bring our minds to bear upon our own problems.

First, a word about prototypes. Although most sceatta types were of purely native origin, some were obviously inspired by Roman, Byzantine, or Merovingian prototypes. The centaur of *B.M.C.* type 47 (Pl. IV, 19) is clearly derived from just such a Carausian
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antoninianus as Pl. I, 1. I believe it was the eminent nineteenth-century numismatist C. F. Keary who suggested that the familiarity of the Teutonic invaders with the coins of Carausius began with his employing large numbers of Saxons for the purpose of manning the Saxon Shore—a political measure which was in full accordance with the dangerous practice under the Late Empire of using outer barbarians in the imperial defences. It is an ingenious and attractive theory and may well account for the Carausian origins of certain types, such as the “clasped hands” on a thrymsa (Pl. II, 2) and the “centaur” and “wolf and twins” (Pl. II, 37) on sceattas. (The last, however, may more reasonably be traced to the Constantinian Urbis Roma (Pl. I, 4), which was struck in considerably greater quantities than the Carausian “wolf and twins”\(^3\)). The Constantinian Virtus Exercit. (vexillum and captives, Pl. I, 2) served as the model for the “radiate bust—standard” type (Pl. II, 7–10, 13–17, 19–21; cp. Pl. IV, 34, 38 (obvs.) and Pl. II, 22–32, 34–6, 38, 41; IV, 18, 24, 33, 36 (revs.)), and it is possible that the obverse also owes something to some fourth-century obverse, although its more obvious derivation from the third-century radiates,\(^3\) including, again, the antoniniani of Carausius, must not be overlooked. The “bird-on-vine” of B.M.C. type 7 (Pl. II, 37) has no prototype but is a Saxon design borrowed from Late Antique art and occurring on Saxon crosses. In B.M.C. type 1 (Pl. II, 6) we have a stylized copy in miniature of the late fourth-century Victoria Augg. solidus (Pl. I, 5). This particular specimen, being struck in silver, falls within the sceatta series, but thrymsas are also found with the same types (Pl. II, 5), thus proving Brooke’s contention that the sceatta coinage was in its origins merely a debased thrymsa coinage.\(^4\) The seated figure on one of the “London” sceattas (Pl. III, 1) was probably derived from one of the many figures on the Roman fourth-century issues, such as the Roma on the Constantinian Romae Aeternae coins (Pl. I, 3), while the “man with cross and bird” reverse (Pl. III, 9–11) undoubtedly originated in the fifth-century solidus with a figure of the Emperor holding a Victory and a labarum (Pl. I, 6). The main Byzantine prototypes were the Victoriae Augg. solidus (Pl. I, 7) for the “man with crosses” reverse (Pl. II, 42, 43; III, 3–8, 12–20; IV, 6); the “two Emperors—cross on steps” of the silver of Heraclius and his son (Pl. I, 8), which seems to have served

---


2 Baldwin Brown (The Arts in Early England, vol. iii (London, 1915), pp. 87, 110) regards the “centaur” as a late type, and I see no reason to disagree with his opinion. Not only is the “wolf—whorl” reverse “in an advanced state of morphological change” and therefore seems to be late, but also the “centaur”, in spite of its classicism, is not an early type but may show the influence of the Carolingian renaissance of the latter half of the eighth century.

3 If this is the case, the “radiate bust—standard” sceattas provide the logical consequence of the presence of the mules, partly from radiate and partly from fourth-century prototypes, in the Richborough radiate hoard (p. 135, below).

4 English Coins (1st edition, London, 1932), p. 5. Of two specimens of type 1 in the British Museum, one was found to have a specific gravity of 11.5 (i.e. c. 11 per cent. gold); the other is apparently entirely of silver.
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as the original for the “two men with crosses”\(^1\) (PI. II, 33; III, 34, 35; IV, 7–9, 24, 30), and the solidus with the bust of Christ on the reverse (PI. I, 9), which degenerated into various “facing heads” (PI. III, 32–7), which are probably Frisian. Merovingian prototypes include the gold triens with obv. bust with cross (PI. I, 10), for the “diademed bust—standard” (PI. II, 22–7); and that with rev. cross (or cross chrismée) and pellets (PI. I, 11), for the common “cross and pellets” type (PI. II, 11, 12, 18, 38; IV, 23).

The most interesting feature of Saxon sceattas is the so-called “degeneration” of types. This, as Baldwin Brown has observed,\(^2\) is not so much degeneration as the evolution of a new type by constantly copying the original. Admittedly the original “degenerates”, in the accepted sense of the word, but it finally gives birth to an entirely new composition, which is often artistically superior to its progenitor. In continental specimens, unrelieved degeneration sets in, so that the derived type is nothing more than a travesty of its model. This, as we shall see, was by no means the case among the Saxon artists, whose flair for symmetry and originality often produced most pleasing results. A prototype was never slavishly copied but was endowed in imitation with a native charm and delicacy rarely met with in the dull, stereotyped productions of the late Roman and Byzantine mints. Occasionally the originality of the Saxon engravers over-stepped itself, as is shown in B.M.C. type 24\(b\) (PI. III, 22), an English copy of an infinitely more dignified Merovingian silver piece of Auxerre (B.M.C. type 24\(a\)—PI. III, 21): the oddments which the artist has crammed around the cross on the reverse—the annulets and the quite inappropriate “inscription” (TT) from the “standard” reverse—give a sense of overcrowding which completely spoils the dignified simplicity of the prototype. This, however, is an exception and many examples are forthcoming of the enhancement of the original at the hands of the Saxon copyists.

A remarkable series of the “bust with cross—standard” type shows the evolution from a Romanized to a Saxonized treatment of the bust (PI. II, 22–6). PI. II, 22 seems to be the earliest of the group, but, in spite of its Roman appearance, it is not without the charm of pure Saxon portraiture. The question whether this diademed bust was the ancestor of the spiky composition (PI. II, 29–33; IV, 26, 39–41), which for sake of convenience we may call the “porcupine” type, is a matter of opinion. Some numismatists, following Dirks and other continental scholars, are inclined to trace the origin of the “porcupine” to the “wolf and twins” (PI. II, 37), but many examples are forthcoming (e.g. B.M.C. type 10, PI. II, 40 (rev.), and B.M.C. type 3\(b\), PI. II, 27, (obv.)) which connect it rather with the diademed bust (B.M.C. 3\(a\)). The possibility is that, although the type sprang directly from the diademed bust, it was also influenced by the “wolf and

\(^1\) Alternatively the “two men” type may be merely a duplication of the “one man” type.
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twins"), as is shown by a Frisian piece from Domburg,\(^1\) which re-
sembles a disintegrated wolf more than anything else. Thus we have
what is known as a "contaminated type"—one which shows con-
nexions with two or more prototypes. Eventually the "porcupine"
sprouts a head, tail, and legs and becomes a plumed bird (Pl. II, 34–6).

The main objection to this hypothesis is that the "standard" re-
verses of the "porcupine" types (B.M.C. 3b, 4, and 5) very rarely
possess stylistic affinities with their supposed prototype, the "stan-
dard" of B.M.C. 3a; they are far more frequently allied to the
"standards" of the radiate series (B.M.C. 2a, 2b, and Runic). On the
other hand, the "plumed bird" type—the obverse of which is
farthest from B.M.C. 3a, the original—has reverses which are nearest
in style to those of B.M.C. 3a. (Cp. Pl. II, 27, 29–32 with Pl. II, 9,
10, 13, 14, 17, 19–21 and Pl. II, 34–6 with Pl. II, 22–6.) This would
suggest that the obverses of the "porcupine" types were derived
directly from the obverse of B.M.C. 3a, influenced by the "wolf and
twins", while their reverses came from the "radiate bust" series, and
that the reverse of B.M.C. 3a was utilized as a prototype only for the
reverses of the "plumed bird" type.

I am making the variations and significance of the "standard"
type the subject of a future paper, the foregoing remarks being merely
the bare outlines of a very complicated subject. Even as they stand,
however, without having been marshalled in any order, they cast
doubts upon another accepted theory, that which derives the "Celtic
cross" from the "standard". Now, this theory hinges upon the
modification of one of the two reverses of the "plumed bird" type
and, as that reverse cannot have been directly obtained from those of
the "porcupine" type, the connecting links necessary for a lineal
descent from the original "standard" to the "Celtic cross" are
naturally missing. We must now consider the origins of the "Celtic
cross" type in detail.

Typologically there seems at first sight to be nothing wrong with
the sequence illustrated in Pl. IV, 36; II, 7, 17, 13, 20, 22–6, 30, 35;
III, 2; IV, 20, 30, with intermediate stages in Pl. II, 32, 9, 27, 38 (a
Frisian piece), 29, and 34. Yet, as we have seen, such an argument is
open to question and I am indebted to Mr. R. L. S. Bruce-Mitford,
of the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities in the British
Museum, for having cast doubts upon a not very satisfactory hypo-
thesis and for having suggested to me the outlines of an alternative
one. In deriving the "Celtic cross" from the "standard", students of
early Saxon numismatics seem to have overlooked one important and
obvious fact—that while the obverses associated with the "standard"
reverse are mainly radiate or diademed busts in various stages of
degeneration, the "Celtic cross" is never found with an obverse even
remotely resembling that of its supposed ancestor. It is used with
the "London" bust, with or without the mint-name, a bird type, a

\(^1\) Dirks in *Revue belge de numismatique*, 1870, Pl. F. 18, and Baldwin Brown, op. cit.,
Pl. vii. 9.
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wolf-whorl, and two men with crosses—compositions which were at the same time less Romanized than the earliest obverses with which the "standard" reverse was used and more artistic and mature than the later "porcupines". Another explanation for its origin, then, will have to be sought. Mr. Bruce-Mitford suggests that its prototype, like that of the reverse of B.M.C. 53 (Pl. IV. 26), may be found in other branches of Saxon art—a reasonable conclusion which we shall discuss in a moment. Before doing so, however, let us see if we can hazard any hypothesis to support the original theory, apart from the typological similarities upon which it is based. Now it is probable that the early "radiate bust-standard" sceattas (B.M.C. 2a) originated in Kent, and it is certain that the "Celtic cross" design is a native of London, whither the Kentish type, having been modified as far as the "square with annulets" (B.M.C. 6), could conceivably have migrated; it might be argued that the change from the square to the circular form was made then. However, this hypothesis presupposes too much—the migration of a type, after considerable modification, from Kent to London; its further modification by the Londoners; and their exclusive use of the newly evolved design with entirely different obverses. Chronologically, it fits: the reopening of the London mint took place at about the same time as the "porcupine" types were being produced—but that can be no more than a coincidence of date. It is far more likely that, instead of having been evolved from the imitations of a Roman type, the "Celtic cross" was directly copied from other forms of Saxon art, since, long before the introduction of sceattas, it was widely used on jewellery (such as pectoral crosses\(^1\)), in the decoration of manuscripts, as a variety of the stone cross-head itself, and even on such early objects as the two scabbard-bosses from the Sutton Hoo burial.\(^2\) Therefore, instead of seeking its origin in the "standard" type, through various complicated changes, we need look no farther than contemporary art—and, indeed, its use at London, where types of a decidedly Christian character were commonly employed on both thrymsas and sceattas, is natural enough, in view of the distinct possibility that the London mint operated under the aegis of the ecclesiastical authority.

Other favourite methods of the Saxon artist for varying and improving upon an uninteresting type are to duplicate the design and, having done that, to make the whole composition turn on its own axis, as has happened in Pl. IV, 1-3, where a single bird becomes a rose of four birds. Similarly, the "wolf and twins" (Pl. II, 37) is changed. First the twins are omitted and the wolf develops long hind-legs and short fore-legs (Pl. III, 38, 39), next it loses first its hind-legs (Pl. III, 40) and then its fore-legs as well (Pl. IV, 33; III, 41) on the way to becoming a wolf-headed serpent (Pl. III, 42-4) which is duplicated

---

1 \(\text{Antiquaries Journal, 1937, pp. 283-93, especially Pl. LXVII, c-d (the Ixworth cross).}\)

and varied on one sceatta as two bird-headed serpents (Pl. IV, 32): the head then occupies all the flan (Pl. III, 45, 46), and it is finally quadrupled or triplicated to become a wolf-whorl (Pl. III, 20; IV, 19, 20). The “bird and branch” type is another which undergoes considerable modification. Pl. IV, 13 may possibly be the earliest, judging from its style, and soon after there may have been produced the less naturalistic Pl. IV, 14 with the spaces in the field covered with pellets. The linear designs of B.M.C. types 23c and 23b (Pl. III, 18, 17) seem to have been derived from it and already show a tendency to revolve, which is particularly obvious in the (probably later) B.M.C. 23b. The “star-fish” appearance of the birds on, first, B.M.C. type 49 and, later, B.M.C. type 39 (Pl. IV, 21, 22, 5) carries this effect a stage farther, so that eventually the bird almost turns into a whorl (Pl. III, 19). With this metamorphosis may perhaps be connected the wolf-whorl motif of Pl. III, 20; IV, 19, 20 which we have just considered and which, although it is not derived from the bird-whorl, exhibits the same tendency. The amalgamation of two types is shown by the “facing head” of Pl. III, 32 merging into the “Celtic cross” (Pl. III, 2, 47, 48; IV, 5, 20, 30) to form the “face in shield” (Pl. IV, 21, 22). Mere degeneration of the type, resulting in no new motif, is seen in continental sceattas, as for example the “facing heads” of Pl. III, 33–7, although occasionally the English artist seems to have lost his usual aptitude for originality in copying his models, as is shown by some of the varieties (Pl. III, 29, 30) of B.M.C. 27b (apparently a Saxon derivation of the ?Merovingian B.M.C. 27a (Pl. III, 25, 26)). The earliest of this type with a charming little head in a serpent-torque on the obverse and an equally delightful little bird on a cross, also in a torque, on the reverse (Pl. III, 27), is a very different matter and ranks amongst the finest productions of pre-Conquest moneyers. This type may be traced through successive degenerations (Pl. III, 28, 29) until the crude and inartistic sceatta of Pl. III, 30 was produced.

We must now turn our attention to the problem before us, the first of which is that of dating. When did a native English coinage begin? Were the thrymsas the earliest Saxon coins or were there tentative issues in bronze—at least in south-east England—as early as the third quarter of the sixth century? We cannot here go into the position thoroughly, but recent research¹ may be summarized as follows:

1. Sutherland, op. cit., p. 67.

* The earliest of this type with a charming little head in a serpent-torque on the obverse and an equally delightful little bird on a cross, also in a torque, on the reverse (Pl. III, 27), is a very different matter and ranks amongst the finest productions of pre-Conquest moneyers. This type may be traced through successive degenerations (Pl. III, 28, 29) until the crude and inartistic sceatta of Pl. III, 30 was produced.

1. Sutherland, op. cit., p. 67.

- c. 575–600. Production of thrymsas copied from Roman and Merovingian prototypes. (I do not altogether agree with this dating, as nearly a century seems too long for the production of thrymsas, however sporadically they may have been struck: c. 600–630 may be nearer the mark.)
- c. 610–650. Mint operating in Kent.
- c. 675. Sceattas finally supersede thrymsas.
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So much, then, for the issues which are admittedly Saxon. However, further complications have now set in, in the shape of the Richborough radiate hoard of 1931. In their account of this hoard Messrs. Mattingly, Stebbing, and (in an appendix) Derek Allen put forward a most revolutionary theory,¹ a theory which may alter our entire conception of the earliest Teutonic coinages in this island. The hoard contained some 800 barbarous imitations in bronze derived from third-century Roman prototypes and a few derived from fourth-century reverses muled with radiate obverses (Pl. I, 16, 17). These latter coins convinced the writers that it was a late deposit, since otherwise the imitations of the Fel. Temp. Reparatio and Gloria Romanorum types would not have failed to present the correct (diademed) obverse. Mattingly put the date of the hoard to c. 450, but Allen went even farther and preferred a late sixth-century date. Now there were in the hoard numerous imitations which had stylistic affinities, some very definite, with Saxon sceattas (Pl. I, 12-15), and similar pieces have been noticed from other sites, mainly in the south and east. These coins, in the authors’ view, not only corroborated the late date suggested by the radiate/fourth-century mules but also were most likely to have been the products, not of the Romano-Britons, but of the Teutonic invaders at a time when, the first flush of conquest over, they were beginning to settle down and to feel the need for a medium of exchange. It was suggested by Keary² that Roman solidi were used as currency as well as ornaments, and if this were so it must have familiarized the English with coins even though it did not directly influence the beginnings of the thrymsa coinage, which derived its initial inspiration from Merovingian Gaul. This suggestion certainly links up with the theory of the sceatta-like imitations, since it makes more feasible the possibility that towards the end of the sixth century tentative attempts to institute a coinage were made by the English themselves. Indeed, it may well have been that, while using solidi for transactions involving large sums, the more civilized amongst them followed the example of the Romano-Britons in striking bronze imitations of the Roman coinage for everyday use. These attempts led to a more stable gold coinage about a generation later, which in its turn was superseded by silver by the third quarter of the seventh century.

Assessing a date for the beginnings of the sceatta-series is made more difficult by the fact that, sceattas having been originally only debased thrymsas, the process was a gradual one and not a sudden change. For a number of years thrymsas and sceattas must have been contemporary and, indeed, the earliest sceattas should more correctly be described as silver thrymsas. When the name “sceatta” was first applied we cannot say: perhaps it was about the time when they finally superseded the thrymsas—in other words, when no more pieces containing even the slightest admixture of gold were being

¹ Num. Notes and Mon., no. 80, pp. 13, 117. See also Num. Chron., 1948, pp. 148 sqq.
struck. Various transitional pieces exist as evidence of this debase-
ment of thrymsas into a purely silver coinage. The “Crispus”
thrymsa from St. Albans in very pale electrum (PI. II, 1) and the
“clasped hands” thrymsa (PI. II, 2) in both gold and electrum may
probably be assigned to the transitional period (c. 655-75), although
no sceattas are known with the same types. Nevertheless, the “Cris-
pus” piece bears very strong stylistic resemblances to the Pada
coins in both electrum (PI. II, 3, 4) and silver (with which we shall deal
later), and the “clasped hands” thrymsa to early sceattas. The
Victoria Augg. type is found first in gold (PI. II, 5), then in electrum,
and finally in silver (PI. II, 6), which is only to be expected since it is
one of the latest types of “Romanizing” thrymsas: it should perhaps
be placed to some years later than the other “transitional” pieces.
On the whole, then, the evidence tends to point to the origins of the
sceatta coinage soon after 650 and to the fact that it did not com-
pletely oust the thrymsa coinage until about twenty years later.
However, we must beware of imagining that the economic difficulties
which replaced gold by silver were simultaneous throughout the
English parts of this island. As we shall see, it is possible to place
them in middle Anglia and southern Mercia between the limits of
Peada’s reign (?632-56), but elsewhere their chronology is quite im-
possible to determine.

It may be objected that a period of twenty years for the replace-
ment of thrymsas by sceattas is too long when only three sceattas
with thrymsa types are known—the Victoria Augg. and the two Pada
coins. Nevertheless, this is hardly a serious objection, since the
thrymsa coinage was not a prolific coinage in spite of its compara-
tively long life and, in any case, the sceattas themselves were probably
struck equally sporadically in their earlier years. Moreover, there is
no reason why a thrymsa mint, having been forced by economic
conditions to fall back upon a silver currency, should not have got
completely away from the thrymsa types and changed the types with
the change of metal. If that were the case, sceattas with thrymsa
types would naturally be few and far between.

So much for the upper limit for the dating of sceattas. The lower
limit is not so difficult to determine. Except in Northumbria, the
series finally ended when, towards the close of the long reign of Offa
of Mercia (757-96), the penny gained general acceptance—although,
we must remember, the end of the sceatta period, like its beginning,
was not the result of a sudden movement but of gradual change.

We may digress for a while to consider the problems raised by two
coins which should be dated to the second transitional period before
the penny successfully ousted the sceatta at the end of the eighth
century. The first is the piece inscribed “Beonna” (or, on another
specimen, “Benna”; PI. IV, 42) in Runic and the other is that which
reads “Æthelberht” in Roman letters with the moneyer’s name, Lul,
in Runic (PI. IV, 43): the reverse type of the latter is the Wolf and
Twins in a beaded panel with the legend REX above. If Keary is
right in regarding the "Beonna" coin as having been struck by Beorna of East Anglia, who is mentioned by Florence of Worcester s.a. 758, we may reasonably assume that it was produced c. 760 under the influence of Pépin's new denier (c. 755), to which it conforms in weight, module, and even types. Brooke's reason for giving to Northumbria—that there is no evidence for an East Anglian mint before the end of Ccenwulf's reign (822)—is hardly sufficient to negative Keary's attribution: indeed, the similarity of "Beonna" to Florence's "Beorna" and the coincidence of date (assuming 758 to be reasonably accurate) are too strong for Brooke's contention. The second coin Keary attributes to Æthelberht of East Anglia (d. 794), while Brooke gives it to Æthelberht II of Kent (748–62) in spite of Keary's argument that palaeographically it is twenty to thirty years later than the "Beonna" coin. On the whole, Keary's opinion seems to be the more logical. The legend—in Roman letters for the more important name of the king and in Runic for the less important name of the moneyer—indicates a date considerably later than the "Beonna" coin with its regal name in Runic and moneyer's name in Roman script. It clearly belongs to a time when the Roman alphabet had nearly superseded the Runic and was probably regarded as the fitter medium for the king's name and title. Since Æthelberht of Kent died c. 762, he does not fulfil these conditions. Moreover, despite Brooke's statement to the contrary, the portrait has very definite stylistic affinities with Offa's portraits and, as a more mature form of art, it is quite different from the sceatta busts. Finally, as Mr. Blunt has pointed out to me, the name Lul appears as a moneyer's name on the pennies of an unknown king, Eadwald, as well as on the later pennies of Offa and the earlier pennies of Cœnwulf—although only on the "Æthelberht" coin is it in Runic letters. It is reasonable enough therefore to assume that the Lul of the coins of Offa and Cœnwulf is the same as the Lul of the "Æthelberht" and "Eadwald" coins. If so, he would be striking during the last decade of the eighth century, first for Æthelberht of East Anglia and Eadwald (whoever he was) and then for Offa and his son and successor, Cœnwulf. Weighing the evidence, therefore, we may say that both these pieces are undoubtedly transitional and that they are pennies which had not yet become "formalized", as it were, into the weight and modules of later pennies. A consideration of their weights does not tell us very much. Brooke has noticed a considerable depreciation in the weight and fineness of many sceattas which appear to be late in style (e.g. Pl. III, 18–20), and it may well be that these two pieces represent attempts inspired by the new coins of the Carolingian monarchy in France to remedy the effects of a depreciating sceatta.

1 B.M. Catalogue, Anglo-Saxon, i, p. 83; see also Introd., pp. xxiii–xxiv.
coinage. Although the "Beonna" and "Æthelberht" controversies may never be completely solved, one cannot help thinking that these coins represent early tentative efforts, made in East Anglia by Beorna (c. 760) and Æthelberht (? just before 790), towards a penny coinage.

But to return to the lower date for sceattas: if we assign c. 790 to this event, we shall probably not be far wrong, and certainly the 140 years which we thereby postulate for the duration of the series is not too long a time for the numerous varieties which are still extant. In Northumbria copper sceattas lasted for another eighty years until they too came to an end in 867.

Have we any clues for the dating of individual types? Much depends upon whether or not we are prepared to accept the interpretation, made by Keary\(^1\) but rejected by Brooke,\(^2\) of the Runic Pada and Æthiliræd on certain sceattas as the names of Mercian kings (Pl. II, 3, 4 for thrymsas reading Pada and Pl. IV, 35–41 for the Pada and Æthiliræd sceattas). Numismatists have since returned to the earlier view, and certainly if we study the coins closely there is much to be said for it. Let us assume for the sake of argument that Pada and Æthiliræd are Peada and Ethelred of Mercia, who reigned 654–6 and 675–704 respectively. (Peada had already been appointed by his father Penda to the vassal kingdom of the Middle Angles some years earlier, probably on the latter's accession to the Mercian throne in 632.) Three of the four varieties of the Pada coins are closely allied to the best-style "radiate bust—standard" type (cp. Pl. II, 7 with Pl. IV, 35, 36 (revs.) and 38 (obv.)). Now this type was undoubtedly early in date, and from its contemporary, the "diademed bust" (Pl. II, 22–6), was eventually developed, as we have seen, the "porcupine"—the universal obverse of the coins reading Æthiliræd (Pl. IV, 39–41). The twenty years which separate the reigns of Peada and Ethelred are just such a period of time as would be required to effect this development and, moreover, both the early "Romanizing" style of Peada's sceattas and his two varieties of electrum thrymsas with sceatta types suggest the mid-seventh century as the starting-point of the sceatta series. However, it has been put forward\(^3\) that the electrum thrymsas were struck by Peada and the silver pieces by Wulfhere, his successor after a short interregnum when Mercia was under the heel of Northumbria. This would imply a date between 657 and 675 for both the Pada and the early "radiate bust—standard" sceattas. If this is the case, the Pada sceattas must have been struck early in Wulfhere's reign: otherwise there would hardly have been sufficient time for the development of the diademed bust into Ethelred's "porcupine" type. Nevertheless, whether or not we place the beginning of the sceatta coinage in the reign of Peada or in that of Wulfhere, we can still say that stylistically the Pada and Æthiliræd coins fit completely into our chronological framework and that soon


\(^3\) Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage, p. 55.
after the middle of the century the debasement of thrymsas into sceattas had begun—at least in Mercia. The further development of the "porcupine" obverse into the "plumed bird" should be assigned to the first years of the eighth century and, as we shall see, certain hoards from Frisia and Gaul undoubtedly support this dating.

_Pada_ and _Æthiliræd_ are not the only Runic inscriptions on sceattas. There are several others: _Epa, Apa, Lepa, Wigraed_ (Pl. II, 13–21) and numerous uncertain or blundered readings. The question arises as to whether these names are to be regarded as those of moneyers or kings. As far as _Pada_ and _Æthiliræd_ are concerned, the objections given by Brooke to their being regal names—that the title _Rex_ is absent and that they are placed on the reverse, the less important side of the coin—will not stand, in view of the fact (as Sutherland has pointed out) that the _Pada_ sceattas at least were struck before any conventional forms or formulae were evolved as to the respective places of king's and moneyer's names. The same must be equally true of the _Æthiliræd_ coins, even though they were produced twenty years or more later. That being the case, the other coins bearing names in runes on the obverse, which fall stylistically between Peada and Ethelred, can hardly have been subjected to any conventional formula either. Indeed, such a convention had apparently not been worked out even as late as Offa's time, since his early pennies, both with and without portraits, have the king's and moneyer's names indiscriminately on obverse or reverse, according to the whim of the engraver. The possibility therefore exists that _Epa, Wigraed, _&c., are regal names. Can this be proved? In 1869 Daniel Haigh made out a case for such an hypothesis, but it will not bear too critical an examination. _Epa_ he assigned to a Mercian king, Eoba, brother of Penda and therefore uncle of Peada, but this attribution does not fit into the sequence based upon the later style of the Runic sceattas. A misreading of _Wigraed_ made him reconstruct the name as _Answiguard_ (= Answigu, chief), whom he regarded as Oswiu, king of Bernicia, father-in-law of Peada. Keary dates the _Epa_ and _Lepa_ pieces on palaeographical grounds to the time of Peada, and there is indeed no reason why the better-style Runic sceattas, poor though they may be compared with, say, the early "radiate bust—standard" (cp. Pl. II, 17, 19 with 7), should not be assigned an early date. Grueber concurs in this dating and identifies _Epa_ and _Apa_, which are probably different variations of the same personal name, either with Penda's brother Eoba, killed at the battle of Maserfeld in 642 (Grueber wrongly calls him Peada's brother), or with Eba "who is mentioned after the death of Peada as 'Dux Merciorum'". The first attribution is the same as Haigh's and can scarcely be maintained. The second is certainly more feasible, since it is corroborated by the later style of the _Epa_ 1

---

1 Num. Chron., 1942, p. 44.
and *Apa* coins. All the same, in such attempts to argue from style we should remember the warning of Baldwin Brown when he stressed the dangers attendant on a too rigid and dogmatic argument from typology, which “takes no account of the possibility of variations due to differences in skill and practice among craftsmen, and to their location at places near or remote from the centres where art and learning were at each epoch chiefly flourishing”.

As regards Roman legends, Haigh’s attributions to Nunna, king of the South Saxons (c. 710), of the London-inscribed sceattas with the blundered forms of the original legend *LVNDONIA*+ (*VNOONN*+, *JNDONN*+ (Pl. II, 43), &c.), and of others reading *IN*+ to Ine of Wessex (688–726), are quite fanciful, although his dating is probably near the truth.

Another “legend” in Roman letters which at first sight appears to mean something is that on the early “radiate bust—standard” sceattas, *TIC* before the bust and *A* behind (Pl. II, 7). This legend Le Gentilhomme has reconstructed as *TICA*, which is also found as a personal name in a charter (c. 780) of Ecgberht, king of Kent. These sceattas are mainly found in Kent, where, therefore, they probably originated. The earlier *Tica*, according to Le Gentilhomme, was a moneyer who, like his namesake of the charter, lived in Kent. There are several objections to this hypothesis. First, the *A* behind the bust is common both to the degraded versions of this type and to the Runic types and seems only to serve the purpose of an ornamentation, perhaps with a vague memory of the *A* in the field of the fourth-century Roman coins of Constantius II, Magnentius, &c. Secondly, although the coins are quite common, the only “legend” found on them is *TIC* and it is hardly possible that a single moneyer could have been responsible for all of them. Thirdly, there are many stylistic varieties which would not have existed had the whole issue emanated from the same workshop—even if we make allowances for inexpert workmanship and illegal copying. We must therefore regard it as a meaningless legend designed to fill up the flan: it may even be the remains of the legend of some third-century prototype (e.g. *[TE]T[R]-IIC[VS]*).

The question of the Runic names on sceattas, then, must remain open for the present as much can be said in favour of both sides. Yet we should not dismiss altogether the possibility that they are names of rulers (though not necessarily, with the exception of *Pada* and *Æthibriæd*, of kings), if only because such early pieces would hardly have been signed by moneyers, when for nearly a century afterwards, until the advent of the penny coinage, no other examples of this practice are forthcoming. Moreover, the paucity of intelligible signatures is such as to preclude the possibility that the numerous Runic

---

3 A piece in my collection (Pl. II, 8) of inferior workmanship is plated and seems to be a contemporary forgery.
sceattas were produced by a mere handful of moneyers. It is far more likely that they were the coins of vassal-kings, like the Eba of Grueber's suggestion, or even of Ealdormen. Who they really were and, if they are known to history at all, what their historical names are must remain matters for conjecture. In any case, we know too little about these early English princes to be able to attribute coins to them with any degree of certainty as yet. If we could discover these facts, we could go far towards dating a large and important group in the series. Failing that, we shall have to do the best we can with typological arguments, constantly bearing in mind the timely warning of Baldwin Brown.

A good starting-point is the very degraded form of the diademed bust, Ethelred's "porcupine" type, which we have dated to the end of the seventh century and which is important since it is found in conjunction with several types other than the normal "standard" composition (Pl. II, 30-2). In an earlier form, when it had not yet lost the resemblance to a head, it is used as a reverse (Pl. II, 40) with a Runic (Apa) obverse, so that it is quite reasonable to place this sceatta to the third quarter of the seventh century, probably c. 670. Secondly, the same type is found as an obverse with a "stepped cross" reverse (Pl. IV, 26), although it is still not so degraded as it had become by the time of Ethelred. Now, this cruciform design bears remarkable similarities to certain Kentish cloisonne brooches which have usually been dated to the seventh century, although authorities are at variance on the subject. It is likely that, if the die-engraver had intended to copy jewellery at all (and there seems little doubt that he did), he would have copied contemporary models: as Sutherland has pointed out, the date usually given to the brooches is therefore in full accordance with the date of the coins. Thirdly, the "porcupine" is used in conjunction with two designs of the "London" type—as a reverse with a London-inscribed obverse (Pl. II, 44: cp. Pl. II, 39) and as an obverse with a "two men with cross" reverse (Pl. II, 33). The variety of the "porcupine" type is in both cases the more degraded variety, like that on Ethelred's sceattas, although the London bust is stylistically early, very "Romanized", and with a reasonably good legend. On the other hand, the "two men" reverse of the second coin is considerably later in style, and the possibility must not be overlooked that it is a Frisian copy of a "London" type. Single specimens of both were in the Hallum hoard which, owing to the inclusion of a few transitional silver pieces current at the time of the introduction of the new denier by Pepin (c. 755), has been dated to c. 740-50. The fact that the London obverse of the first piece is of an early style does not seriously challenge this dating, since due allowances must be made for circulation and for time-lag in arriving at its place of burial. If our dating of the "porcupine" type is correct,

1 Num. Chron., 1942, p. 46.
2 By Keary, op. cit., p. xxii n. Another example came from Domburg, which strengthens the possibility that they are Frisian copies.
it is obvious that the earliest London sceattas fall within the last quarter of the seventh century, perhaps c. 690. When the series ended we can only guess, but the importance of London as a commercial centre may have given it a life of at least fifty years, perhaps nearly a hundred, until the penny finally superseded the sceatta. The comparative rarity, however, of the inscribed pieces may indicate a very much shorter life, although the uninscribed “London” types and their connexions probably continued to be struck (not necessarily at London, of course) until the end of the series (c. 790).

Another group is the “wolf and twins—bird on vine” sceatta (Pl. II, 37) and the various wolf-motifs which were derived from its obverse. The original may be regarded as quite early, probably contemporary with the other undoubtedly early pieces—the Victoria Augg., the early “radiate bust” and the issues of Peada. Its derivatives—“curved wolf”, “wolf-serpent”, “wolf-whorl” (Pl. III, 38-40; IV, 33; III, 41-4; IV, 32; III, 45, 46, 20; IV, 19, 20)—may therefore successively fall towards the end of the seventh and during the first half of the eighth centuries and, as most of these types are connected by either the obverse or the reverse with the London group, this dating coincides with that which we have assigned to the London pieces.

Finally, the “bird and branch” type may be traced through successive stylistic variations, several of which are linked with the uninscribed London sceattas (Pl. IV, 13, 14; III, 18, 17; IV, 21, 22, 5; III, 19). This London connexion, common to all these groups, may place them in the first half of the eighth century. The possibility that some of these pieces may be the latest of the series is borne out by the fact that the majority are of extremely low weight and often struck in very base metal. We have already seen that some time during the eighth century the sceatta series underwent depreciation and it is likely that the almost consistently low weight of these coins places them well after the middle of the century.

Summarizing the foregoing remarks, we may give to the main types the following dates, which are to be regarded as symbolical rather than actual:

| B.M.C. 2a. | Early radiate bust—standard, c. 650-60. (Pl. II, 7, 8.) |
| B.M.C. 7. | Peada, c. 654-6. (Pl. IV, 35-7 and *IV, 38.) |
| B.M.C. 2b, 2c, 50. | Wolf and twins, c. 660. (Pl. II, 37.) |
| B.M.C. 3a-6. | *Helmeted bust—small cross, c. 660. (Pl. IV, 28.) |
| B.M.C. 2b, 2c, 50. | Later radiate bust, c. 660-80. (Pl. II, 9-12; IV, 23.) |
| B.M.C. 3a-6. | Runic, c. 660-700. (Pl. II, 13-21.) |
| B.M.C. 3a-6. | Diadem bust, degenerating into plumed bird, c. 660-720. (Pl. II, 22-7; 29-36.) |
| B.M.C. 10. | Runic—porcupine, c. 670. (Pl. II, 40.) |
| B.M.C. 1. | Victoria Augg., c. 670. (Pl. II, 6.) |
| B.M.C. 53. | Ethelred, c. 675-704. (Pl. IV, 39-41.) |
| B.M.C. 23e, 32a-33, 47, 48. | Porcupine-stepped cross, c. 680. (Pl. IV, 26.) |
| B.M.C. 12-23e, 32a-34, 38-42, 47-9, 51, 52. | Derivatives and connexions of wolf and twins, c. 690-750. (Pl. III, 20, 38-46; IV, 19, 20. Also* Pl. IV, 32, 33.) |

London and derivatives and connexions,
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B.M.C. 35–7. Porcupine—two men, c. 710. (Pl. II, 33.)
B.M.C. 23b–23d, 39, 44, 45, 49. Bird and branch and connexions, c. 720–90. (Pl. III, 17–19; IV, 5, 13–17, 21, 22. Also, probably, Pl. IV, 34.)

* = Not in B.M.C.

With the exception of London, mints did not sign their coins. We may, however, be reasonably certain that the more important centres for the production of thrymsas—Canterbury (?) or Rochester), a Mercian mint, and, possibly, York—continued in action during the period of the sceatta series. More than that we cannot say at present—at least, not until hoards are more fully written up than they have been and until a close watch is kept for die-links in hoards and site-finds.

The problems of the dating of barbarous imitations of Roman coins can often be dealt with by a study of hoards, but owing to the impossibility of determining, with one or two exceptions, the burial dates of sceatta hoards, this method of approach is quite out of the question. Thus we have had to do the best we can with the study of individual types as a criterion for dating and reverse the usual order by considering hoards and site-finds after the problems of chronology.

The types of sceattas are so numerous and varied that in studying their distribution it would be better to borrow Sutherland’s simplified classification. He has condensed the fifty-four types of the British Museum Catalogue into five main groups, but for the sake of clarity the order and the designations have been changed slightly here and an extra group added:

1. Radiate, diademed, or helmeted bust—(i.e. “wolf—standard”) (e.g. Pl. II, 7, 22, 27, 32; IV, 28, 35).
2. London (e.g. Pl. II, 42; III, 6).
3. Animal (i.e. “bird—beast”) (e.g. Pl. IV, 8, 13, 15, 31).
4. Saxon derivatives of Merovingian (e.g. Pl. III, 22, 27; IV, 27).
5. Frisian (i.e. “Wodan—monster”) (e.g. Pl. III, 36, 73, and probably IV, 12.
6. Merovingian (e.g. Pl. III, 21, 31, and probably II, 28, 41; III, 23, 24).

Most of these groups contain numerous derivative types and in many cases one type may be affiliated with two or more groups.

As will be seen from the map (Map 1), the main concentration is

---

1 Anglo-Saxon Gold Coinage, pp. 41 sqq.
2 Num. Chron., 1942, pp. 58–9. Several new types have turned up since the publication of B.M.C., but they all fit into the five main groups.
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south and east of the Fosse Way, coins from other sites being with one exception (to quote Sutherland) “leakages from the main reservoir of currency further south”. The exception is Whitby, but it is an isolated instance and does not alter our general argument in the least. Class 1, as may be expected from such a large class, is evenly
distributed over the whole area, with several “outliers” in Warwickshire, Staffordshire, and Lancashire. It appears to be particularly concentrated on the coast from the Thames estuary to Dorset and especially in Kent—whence its more degraded varieties seem to have travelled to the Low Countries and Gaul. Class 2 is naturally common in London and also, rather unexpectedly, at Southampton, though rare in Kent. Elsewhere it is fairly evenly distributed, with outliers at Whitby. Class 3 is also evenly distributed, and is especially concentrated in Kent and the Thames Valley, with Whitby and York

outside the main area. Class 4 is almost exclusively within a square, the northern side of which runs east from north Suffolk to the Severn and the western side due south to the Dorset coast: one outlier is noted from Somerset. Again the emphasis is on the coastal hoards, owing to the fact that this class is mainly imported. The purely Frisian class 5 is very rarely found in this country: it is recorded from Dorset, Wiltshire, Oxfordshire, and Hertfordshire, and then only in stray examples. So much for sceatta-distribution in England. We must now turn our attention to the continental provenances.

From the Continent we have several sceatta hoards (Map 2). Among the Frisian deposits are several from Duurstede and Domburg, and others from Terwispel, Hallum, and Franeker. In the last two were included numerous pieces in mint state. The most important French hoards are those from Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux (Cher), Plassac (Gironde), Bais (Ille-et-Vilaine), and Cimiez (Alpes Maritimes), now a suburb of Nice.¹

Let us now examine some of these finds more closely. As we have seen, one of those from Duurstede and the Hallum and Franeker hoards have been dated to c. 740–50. Apart from the Frankish and Frisian pieces, the first contained sceattas of our Class 1; the second, of Classes 1 and 4, including the two pieces, noticed above, which are allied to Class 2 by their “London” obverse or reverse; and the third, of Class 1 (“porcupine”, most of which were undoubtedly Frisian copies). Now, as several of the Hallum and Franeker pieces were in mint state, it may be assumed that the date of their production was not long anterior to that of the burial of the hoards. If this is roughly the mid-eighth century in both cases, the “porcupine” type and its Frisian imitations appear to have continued in circulation until well into the century. From Domburg have come examples of Classes 1 (including one Ethelred), 2, and 4, while the Terwispel hoard was composed entirely of the Frisian “Wodan—monster” type (Class 5).

Le Gentilhomme has dated the French hoards, reasonably enough, to the first half of the eighth century and has even assigned one of them, the Cimiez hoard, a precise date—737, the year of the destruction of the town by the Lombards.² Moreover, from a study of their contents he concludes that the Bais hoard was buried later than the Plassac but earlier than the Cimiez. He has not dated the Saint-Pierre-les-Étieux hoard. Rather unexpectedly, the Cimiez hoard contained three Peada sceattas—coins which are normally only from English sites, thus showing that they actually travelled as far afield as Provence. (Two were silver and the third silver gilt (a thrymsa?)). An English sceatta rarely found in France is the early “radiate bust—standard” type (Pl. II, 7, 8), but the Cimiez and Bais hoards nevertheless each contained one example. Altogether no less than seventeen English sceatta-types have been discovered among the

¹ For the Frisian hoards see Dirks, op. cit., pp. 55 sqq., and for the French hoards, Le Gentilhomme, op. cit., pp. 71 sqq.
contents of hoards and finds from France and the Low Countries, which indicates a surprisingly wide circulation outside England.\(^1\)

Of all the continental hoards, however, that from Cimiez is by far the most important, since it is of great assistance in throwing light upon the chronology of sceattas. If Le Gentilhomme's estimate of 737 as its burial-date is correct (and there is no reason to doubt it), not only were the Peada and early "radiate bust" sceattas circulating in southern Gaul eighty years after their original appearance in England, but the other types present in the hoard (the later "radiate bust" (Pl. II, 9), the "diademed bust" and its derivatives (Pl. II, 22–7, 29–32, 34–6), and various examples of Classes 3 and 4) must have been struck some years before 737, perhaps c. 720 at the latest. In any case, 737 is the *terminus ante quern* for the production of these types. In so far as some of them (the "diademed bust" and its degraded copies) are concerned, this certainly fits in with the dating suggested by the Frisian hoards.

The distribution of English sceattas on the Continent (Map 2) and, to a lesser extent, that of Merovingian and Frisian sceattas in England, gives some idea of the commercial activities between the two sides of the Channel in the seventh and eighth centuries. The Frisians were active merchants, their main article of commerce, as in later times, being cloth, and it is possible that even before 700 their depots had spread not only around the coasts of the Channel, Atlantic, and the North Sea, but also as far east as the Baltic seaboard.\(^2\) Their principal trading-centre was Duurstede, where three important trade-routes met—from the east, the Baltic, and England—and it is possible that Frisian sceattas were mainly produced there. Trading colonies were established by the Frisians at various places in England and Gaul, the most important being at Strasbourg, Mainz, St. Denis, London, and York. Colonel Belaïew suggests\(^3\) that the trade between England and Frisia never completely passed out of the hands of the Frisian merchants during these centuries, as is shown by their trading-centres in both countries, their single currency, which varied in output according to the volume of trade, and their control of shipping and of

\(^1\) *B.M.C.* types represented from the various foreign sites are as follows:

Duurstede. (Class 1) 2a, Runic, 4; (class 5) 31.

Hallum. (Class 1) 3a, 4, 5, 6; (classes 1/2) mule 5/51; (classes 2/1) mule 12/5; (class 4) 27b; (class 5) 31.

Franeker. (Class 1) 4, 5.

Domburg. (Class 1) 2a, 2b, 2c, Runic, 3a, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 53; (classes 2/1) mule 12/5; (class 4) 27b. [Site-finds also included one 19, one 32a, and one Ethelred.]

Terwispel. (Class 5) 31.

Bais. (Class 1) 2a, 2c, 2c var., Runic, 4, 5 var., 8; (class 4) 27b [2c var.—obv. bust to I. (Pl. II, 12); 5 var.—"porcupine" type to I. (Cp. pl. II, 31)].

Plassac. (Class 1) Runic; (class 4) 27b.

Cimiez. (Class 1) 2a, Runic, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 8, 53, Peada; (class 3) 23e, 37, 41b; (class 4) 27b; (class 5) 31.

St.-Pierre-les-Étieu. (Class 1) Runic, 5, 8; (class 4) 27b.

\(^2\) For the question of commercial relations between England and the Continent during the seventh and eighth centuries see Belaïew in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, xxxvii, 1932, pp. 190–215.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 197.
cross-Channel traffic. Their activities in Gaul are well attested by the large number of hoards containing Anglo-Frisian types buried there during the first half of the eighth century. For example, Le Gentilhomme pointedly observes that the "porcupine" sceattas were prob-

![Map 2](image_url)

ably struck even more abundantly in Frisia than in England, although their type is strictly speaking Anglo-Saxon. On the other hand, he continues, the "cross and pellets" reverse may belong to Frisia or even perhaps to the Frisian emporia on the coasts of Gaul.¹

Thus the interchange of Saxon, Frisian, and Merovingian types implies considerable commercial intercourse between England, Frisia, and Gaul, no less than the hoards and individual finds from Yorkshire to Provence.

We have here attempted a brief survey of Saxon sceattas from various points of view—stylistic, chronological, and geographical. It does not pretend to be conclusive, merely a pointer to future study, and we can only hope that one or two more pieces have been added to the complicated jigsaw of Saxon sceattas. Yet what we really need are more scientific records of finds than we have had in the past and a careful, patient study of die-links and identities. Only then will we begin to approach the truth about sceattas without having to base our arguments upon the uncertain foundations of style and technique such as we have tried to do in this paper.

For their kind co-operation I should like to thank: the Keeper of Coins, the British Museum; Miss A. Robertson, of the Hunter Coin Cabinet, Glasgow University; Miss G. V. Barnard, of Norwich Castle Museum; M. Jean Babelon, Director of the Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; and Mr. F. Elmore Jones. A word should also be given in appreciation of the excellent work of Mr. K. Howes, of the Department of Coins and Medals, the British Museum, who prepared the numerous casts, and my thanks are also due to Mr. B. E. Lynch, of the Map Room, the British Museum, for his invaluable assistance in the preparation of the maps.

APPENDIX A

Sceatta-groups

(Numbers indicate B.M.C. types.)
1. Radiate, diademed or helmeted busts: 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, Runic, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 10, 50, 53, Peada, Ethelred, helmeted bust—small cross.
2. London: 9, 12, 13, 14, 15a, 15b, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 32a, 32b, 33, 34, 38, 39, 42, 51, 52, two men—rosettes.
5. Frisian: 8, 30a, 30b, 31.
6. Merovingian: 24a, 25, 26, 27a, 28, 29a, 29b.

APPENDIX B

Index of Main Types

"Bird and branch": 23b, 23c, 23d, 39, 44, 49.
Bird motifs, various: 7, 35, 36, 37, 38, 46.
Bust, diademed: 1, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 26, 27b, 53, Peada, Ethelred, diademed head—two bird-serpents.
,, helmeted: 24b, Peada, helmeted bust—small cross.
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Bust, "London" (or "Saxon bust"): 9, 12, 15a, 15b, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 32a, 32b, 33, 34, 38, 42, 52, head in cable border—dragon.

,, radiate: 2a, 2b, 2c, Runic, 10, 50.

Cross and pellets: 2c, 8, Runic, 50.


Dragon: 23a, 31, 40, 41a, 41b, 43, 45, head in cable border—dragon, dragon—standard.

Head, facing: 29a, 29b, 30a, 30b, 51.

Man: 12, 15a, 15b, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23a, 23b, 23c, 23d, 23e, 40.

Men, two: 30a, 30b, 41a, 41b, 51, two men—rosettes.

Standard: 2a, 2b, Runic, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 46, 51, Peada, wolf-serpent—standard, dragon—standard.

Wolf-motifs: 7, 23e, 32a, 32b, 33, 47, 48, diademed head—two bird-serpents, wolf-serpent—standard.

KEY TO PLATES

The following abbreviations are used in the Key to plates:
F.E.J.—F. Elmore Jones collection.
H.M.—Hunterian Museum.
P.V.H.—Own collection.

PLATE I

11. Sion, tremissis. Rev. SIDVNINSI IN CIVI VA Cross chrismee on steps. B.M.; as Prou, no. 1284.

**PLATE II**


22-4. Sceattas, type 3a. *Obv.* Diademed bust r. with cross; *rev.* Standard. F.E.J.; as B.M.C., no. 50.


27. Sceatta, type 3b *Obv.* Diademed bust r. with cross; *rev.* Standard. B.M.; B.M.C., no. 52.

28. Sceatta, type 3b. *Obv.* Diademed bust r. with annulet; *rev.* Standard. [— B.M.C. type 11, below.] B.M.; B.M.C., no. 53.


32. Sceatta, type 5 *Obv.* Diademed bust r. ("Porcupine"); *rev.* Standard. P.V.H.; as B.M.C., no. 60.
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PLATE III


22. Sceatta, type 24b. Obv. Helmeted bust r.; rev. Cross on steps. B.M.; B.M.C., no. 120.


34. Sceatta, type 30a. Obv. Facing head; rev. Two men with staffs. (Frisian) B.M.; B.M.C., no. 145.

35. Sceatta, type 30b. Obv. Facing head; rev. Two men with crosses. (Frisian) B.M.; B.M.C., no. 146.


44. Sceatta, type 32b Obv. Diademed bust l. with rosettes; rev. Wolf-headed serpent curved l. B.M.; B.M.C., no. 156.


32. Sceatta. Obv. Diademed head r.; rev. Two bird-headed serpents. H.M.; Ruding, Pl. 11, 1; B.B., Pl. viii, 6 (rev.).

The Hunterian coin illustrated in Pl. IV, 28 has the helmet off the flan, but it is clearly shown on a coin formerly in the Grantley collection (lot 739 in the Sale Catalogue).
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SAXON SCEATTAS: PROTOTYPES AND “SCEATTA-LIKE” IMITATIONS
SAXON THRYMSAS AND SCEATTAS
SCEATTAS AND EARLY PENNIES