

## PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS 2005

### CURRENCY UNDER THE VIKINGS. PART 2: THE TWO SCANDINAVIAN KINGDOMS OF THE DANELAW, c.895–954

MARK BLACKBURN

In last year's Address I discussed the earliest phase of Viking coinage in the Danelaw, which was essentially imitative, initially of the Carolingian Temple type, but then in a series of substantial coinages inspired by contemporary issues of King Alfred. I suggested that there was continuity of minting in East Anglia from King Edmund through into the Scandinavian period, and that that was the reason why the traditional East Anglian weight standard (c.1.35 g) survived and was used in preference to Alfred's reformed (c.1.60 g) standard of c.880. Today I want to address the succeeding phases in which the Scandinavian kingdoms of the Danelaw adopted their own distinctive coin types in what one might describe as 'national' coinages, issued between c.895 and the final subjection of the York kingdom in 954. As before, I will only have time to probe certain aspects in detail.<sup>1</sup>

Historical accounts of the Danelaw in this period, relying on the extant written sources which are essentially Anglo-Saxon, typically focus on the demise of the Scandinavian kingdoms as a result of the campaigns of Edward the Elder and Æthelflæd during 912–19 and Athelstan's capturing of York in 927. The reestablishment of the York kingdom after 939 is often treated as something of a postscript, of interest for the relations the Norse kings enjoyed with Edmund and Eadred. However, the coins are one of the few contemporary sources to survive from the Scandinavians themselves, and they provide an opportunity to focus on the nature and achievements of the Danelaw kingdoms.

#### Numismatic Literature

The coinage of Scandinavian York has always attracted interest among numismatists, and a review of the literature, with the rather tortuous steps forwards and backwards that the subject took, could well fill a whole lecture. Key players have been Daniel Haigh, Jonathan Rashleigh, George Brooke, Charles Oman, Derek Allen, Michael Dolley, Christopher Blunt, Stewart Lyon and Lord Stewartby.<sup>2</sup> The early regal coinage of York, so well-represented in the Cuerdale hoard, although much debated in the nineteenth century, was the subject of such a comprehensive review and die-study in 1961 by Lyon and Stewart that little more of significance has been added since then.<sup>3</sup> The dating of the St Peter coinages and those in the names of Ragnald, Sihtric and St Martin was for a long time seriously adrift, as the Sword types were thought to be late and associated with that of Eric Bloodaxe (947–8, 952–4). It is only in the last 35 years that a consensus has formed for a chronology that seems reasonably secure. Allen (1936–7) had had misgivings, but Dolley's 1958 essay on 'The Post-Brunanburh Viking coinage of York', systematically reviewing the hoard evidence, represented a turning point in sorting out the chronology.<sup>4</sup> The finer tuning of the

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised and extended version of the paper read at the Anniversary Meeting in November 2005.

<sup>2</sup> See, in particular, Haigh 1839–40; Rashleigh 1869; Haigh 1876; Brooke 1932; Oman 1934; Allen 1936–7; Dolley 1957a, 1957b, 1957–8, 1965, 1978, 1982; Lyon and Stewart 1961; Stewart 1967, 1982; Blunt and Stewart 1983; Blunt, Stewart and Lyon 1989; Stewart and Lyon 1992.

<sup>3</sup> This was a remarkable study for its time, prepared in the 1950s, based on a detailed die-analysis of a substantial corpus, the results of which were presented clearly and concisely. It remains a showpiece of methodology, marshalling statistical arguments to guide historical interpretation. However, the absence of an illustrated catalogue of the die study is felt, and would still justify publication. Blunt 1985 argued persuasively for the coins in the name of *Ahvaldus* to be attributed to the ætheling Æthelwold.

<sup>4</sup> Dolley 1957–8, heralded by two short articles, Dolley 1957a and 1957b.

various issues of the 920s has been discussed in a number of articles, mainly involving Lord Stewartby, while the publication in 1989 of Blunt, Stewart and Lyon's *Coinage in Tenth-Century England* marked a significant development in our understanding of the post-939 issues of York. One series that has remained particularly neglected was the Swordless St Peter type, but I am glad to say that that is now being studied by Megan Gooch for her PhD.

From the Southern Danelaw, the large St Edmund coinage was reviewed by Blunt in 1969, the 1100th anniversary of Edmund's death, and recently Hugh Pagan and I published two new hoards that have shed light on the later phases of the coinage,<sup>5</sup> but it is a series in which a full analysis and die-study is badly needed. Recent work has begun to assess the economic, administrative and political aspects of the Scandinavian coinages, and it is in these areas that as numismatists we have most to offer the general historian.

### The Establishment of Distinctive Scandinavian Coinages

The mid-890s saw important developments in the establishment of distinctive 'national' coinages in the two main kingdoms of the Danelaw. In East Anglia and the east Midlands the St Edmund coinage replaced issues imitating Alfred's coins,<sup>6</sup> while in York the regal coinages in the names of Sigferth (c.895–900) and Cnut (c.900–5) probably represented the first minting in the city for some thirty years, since the end of the styca coinage.<sup>7</sup> This was an important stage in the development of these kingdoms, recognising their political maturity and confidence. The Christian features of the St Edmund coinage, endorsing the cult that had grown rapidly in the twenty-five years since the death of King Edmund (855–69), have long been recognised by numismatists and historians, but the equally strong Christian traits in the York regal coinage have, until recently, received less attention.<sup>8</sup> The bold designs, in some forty different types, with cross-crosslets, Patriarchal crosses, standing crosses etc., as well as the liturgical legends, represent real innovations in coin design, and owe much less to Carolingian precedents than has previously been argued. Those designing the York coinage were determined to make it distinctive from contemporary Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian issues, and to emphasise in a sophisticated way the Christian convictions of the leaders in York. There is little doubt that the church in York, one of the few bishoprics in the Danelaw to survive the Scandinavian period, influenced this agenda and perhaps even the details of the designs. But I would take issue with Professor Rollason,<sup>9</sup> who argues that this and the succeeding St Peter coinages are essentially ecclesiastical issues from a city where the archbishop's power was greater than that of the Scandinavian kings. The coinage of Sigferth and Cnut is overtly regal, and its size, sophistication and economic reliability point to a strong government, and one that is saying to its people and to neighbouring countries that it can be counted as a member of the circle of Western Christian states.

The same I would suggest is true of the St Peter coinage: that is, it is essentially a royal coinage. Minting was a royal prerogative, and a lucrative one, and while kings did occasionally make limited grants of minting rights to particular churches or monasteries, just as they granted land to them, it would be quite exceptional for a state to alienate its entire coin production for decades as would be implied if the St Peter, and by analogy the St Edmund, coinages were regarded as church issues. Yet this debate will continue to run inconclusively,<sup>10</sup> pending the discovery of new evidence.

### The Reconquest and Assimilation of the Danelaw

The period from which there have been most significant finds in recent years is that of the 910s and 920s – an important time historically as the Anglo-Saxons reconquered and assimilated the

<sup>5</sup> Blackburn and Pagan 2002.

<sup>6</sup> For the dating of the introduction to the mid-990s see Blackburn 1989, 25.

<sup>7</sup> The question whether any imitative issues preceded the introduction of the regal issues of Sigferth at York in c.895 is considered in Blackburn 2003, 327–9.

<sup>8</sup> Blackburn 2004, 329–32; Blackburn forthcoming.

<sup>9</sup> Rollason 2004, 313.

<sup>10</sup> For the most recent discussion see Stewart 1982b, 249–50; Abrams 2001, 37; Blackburn 2004, 333; Rollason 2004, 313–14.

southern Danelaw. Until 1993 the only hoard of this period from the southern Danelaw was that from Morley St Peter (Norfolk), discovered in 1958.<sup>11</sup> This large hoard, deposited *c.*925, at the beginning of Athelstan's reign, had a great variety of coins, some up to fifty years old, and it was questionable whether this was likely to be representative of the currency circulating in Norfolk in the 920s. During the last twelve years no less than five new hoards of this period have been discovered (Table 1), and they provide us with a much fuller picture of developments in the currency.

TABLE 1. Hoards from the Southern Danelaw deposited *c.*910–30

	wt standard (approx.)	Manningtree (Essex) <i>c.</i> 1995	'Baldwin' Parcel ( <i>c.</i> 1993)	Brantham (Suffolk) 2003	Framingham Earl (Norfolk) 1994–7	Morley St Peter (Norfolk) 1958	Thurcaston (Leics.) 1992–2000
Athelstan (924–39)	1.60g	–	–	–	–	1	–
Edward the Elder (899–924)							
Horizontal (MNE)	1.60g	–	–	85+	–	35	–
Horizontal (MSE)	1.60g	–	–	1	–	2	–
Horizontal (other)	1.60g	–	–	–	–	15	3
Horizontal (blundered)	1.65g	–	–	4	–	43	–
East Anglian Portrait	1.35g	–	–	–	21	663	–
Other Portrait	1.60g	–	–	–	–	5	–
Alfred (871–99)	1.60g	–	–	–	–	77	–
Ceolwulf II (874–9)	1.40g	–	–	–	–	1	–
Anglo-Scandinavian							
St Peter (Sword)	1.30g	–	–	–	–	1	2
Sihtric Caech	1.30g	–	–	–	–	–	5
Anonymous Sword	1.30g	–	–	–	–	1	–
St Peter (Swordless)	1.10g	1	–	–	–	13	–
St Edmund	1.35g	<i>c.</i> 89	44	–	–	19	–
Other	1.35g	–	–	–	–	7	–
Islamic dirhems	2.97g	–	–	–	–	–	2
Total		<i>c.</i> 90	44	90+	21	883	12
Date of deposit		<i>c.</i> 915	<i>c.</i> 915	<i>c.</i> 923	<i>c.</i> 923	<i>c.</i> 925	<i>c.</i> 925

Mention has already been made of two St Edmund hoards, one from Manningtree on the Essex-Suffolk border<sup>12</sup> and the other without known find location (the 'Baldwin parcel').<sup>13</sup> Both hoards comprised mainly later coins of the St Edmund issue, with only a few specimens dating from the early (Cuerdale) phase, and just a single coin from another issue, a St Peter penny present in the Manningtree hoard.<sup>14</sup> Together they emphasise the homogeneity of the currency of East Anglia in the mid 910s, from which 'foreign' coins – even those from Scandinavian York – had been largely excluded, while most of the earlier St Edmund coins had left circulation. That does not mean that the mixed bullion economy redolent of the Scandinavians had completely disappeared, for it appears to have subsisted in the Danelaw among certain elements of society or for certain transactions into the 920s.<sup>15</sup> The later St Edmund coins have generally been thought of as being

<sup>11</sup> The hoard, which is divided between the British Museum and Norwich Castle Museum, has been fully published in Clough 1980 (*SCBI* East Anglian Museums).

<sup>12</sup> Blackburn 1996, Blackburn and Pagan 2002, 4. The hoard has been dispersed save for a parcel of ten coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum.

<sup>13</sup> Blackburn and Pagan 2002, 5–8, 11–14. The hoard has been dispersed.

<sup>14</sup> There was said to have been only one coin of another type (a St Peter issue) among the *c.*90 pennies in the Manningtree hoard, and none among 44 pennies in the Baldwin parcel. Only one St Edmund coin from a sample of twelve from Manningtree and one out of the 44 from the Baldwin parcel were of the earlier (i.e. Cuerdale) phase.

<sup>15</sup> Graham-Campbell 2001a; Blackburn 2001a, 134–5.

struck on smaller, lighter flans, but our study of the 'Baldwin' parcel suggested that reduction in the flan size was minimal (about 5%), and that the weight standard actually rose, rather than fell. The main change was in the diameter of the inner circle and the thickness of the letters.

TABLE 2. Brantham (Suffolk) Hoard 2003

90 coins, deposited c.920–24

Edward the Elder, Horizontal type:

Midlands North-East (MNE) style, all HT1 variety:

Adalbert	1
Badda	16
Domences	1
Gunter	10
Harluin	1
Landuc	7
Pitit	21
Warner	9
Willuf	12
Winegar	2
Winele	5

Midlands South-East (MSE) style, HQ1 variety:

Maginhard	1
-----------	---

Blundered imitations:

4

In 2003 a fascinating hoard was discovered at Brantham in south-eastern Suffolk, the neighbouring parish to Manningtree, and deposited only a few years later than the Manningtree hoard. It comprised some 90 late Horizontal coins of Edward the Elder (Table 2).<sup>16</sup> The hoard must have been deposited between c.920 and 924, yet there was not a single St Edmund coin, although these would only have gone out of production after 917. On the face of it, the Brantham hoard suggests that the local Scandinavian currency was very quickly demonetised and replaced with regular coins of Edward the Elder on the higher Mercian/West Saxon weight standard of c.1.60 g. Eighty-five of the 90 coins are of one consistent style, labelled by Stewart Lyon 'Midland North-East' (MNE) (Fig. 1).<sup>17</sup> Three of the moneyers have names also found on the St Edmund coinage: Alalbert, Bada and Winegar, which suggests continued minting from a Viking mint. But where was the MNE style being struck? Given the location of the Brantham hoard, close to the Essex border near Colchester, it would be tempting to see the mint as Ipswich. But Lyon rightly argues for associations with the Stamford area, as several of the moneyers went on to strike coins of NE I style under Athelstan, including the prolific Pitit and Willuf. One other coin belongs to Lyon's 'Midlands South-East' (MSE) style which is perhaps from Bedford or Northampton, and four are blundered imitations.

In the Morley St Peter hoard the MNE group also dominated the official Horizontal coins of Edward the Elder (Table 1). However, this was only a small element of total hoard, and it was well outnumbered by the 663 coins of the East Anglian Portrait type in the name of Edward. These were struck to the lower East Anglian/Scandinavian weight standard of c.1.35 g, and with mainly derivative or blundered legends, many copying names of London moneyers. The Morley St Peter hoard also differed from Brantham in containing a substantial number of pre-conquest coins – some late St Edmund and St Peter coins, and Danelaw issues of the 880s and 890s, as well as a tranche of Alfred's official coinage, particularly Winchester coins of the late 890s. Morley St Peter was evidently a savings hoard, drawn from different sources at different times, and so not necessarily representative of the currency circulating in Norfolk in the 920s. However, the very presence of such a mixed hoard with coins of varying weights, new and old, shows that they were available and suggests that the owner participated in the bullion economy referred to already.

<sup>16</sup> The hoard has been acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum and will be published by Dr Anna Gannon in *BNJ*. A preliminary report has appeared in 'Coin Hoards', *NC* 164 (2004), 279, no. 18. Four additional coins, reported to the Fitzwilliam Museum as single finds from Suffolk during 2005 and early 2006, appear to be strays from the hoard, and there may well be more.

<sup>17</sup> *CTCE*, 52–4.



Fig. 1. Coins from the Brantham hoard.

Insofar as a coin economy was also active in Norfolk, one would expect this to have been based on the local East Anglian Portrait issue that was evidently being struck on a substantial scale. Another of our new hoards conveniently confirms this. The Framingham Earl hoard, discovered 1994–7, comprised 21 of these East Anglian coins.<sup>18</sup> Like the Brantham hoard, it must have been deposited in the earlier 920s, and again we find that the St Edmund coinage is absent and there are no coins from neighbouring regions. The fact that the East Anglian Portrait issue retained a similar weight standard to that of the St Edmund coins makes the latter's absence still more significant, for it suggests that they were driven from general circulation not by economic forces but by a deliberate recoinage. The numismatic evidence, then, suggests that after the reconquest of East Anglia in 917 there was a rather delicate balance of power in Norfolk. Edward the Elder had sufficient authority to order a general recoinage of the Scandinavian currency, replacing it with a coinage in his own name, yet he was unable to place the administration of the local mints and the monetary system under full West Saxon/Mercian control. His new coinage had many of the hallmarks of earlier Scandinavian issues, the design and often the inscriptions copied from London coins, exhibiting very poor standards of literacy and following the local East Anglian weight standard. By contrast, in the East Midlands Edward had been able to extend normal standards of weight, design and literacy to the former Scandinavian mints that then struck Horizontal MNE coins, and so too was Athelstan when he took York in 927, although there the weight standard had to be raised in two stages over a period of several years.<sup>19</sup>

Why were the compositions of the Brantham and Framingham Earl hoards so very different? Should we take them at face value as indicating that the East Anglian Portrait type was confined to the north of East Anglia, while in the south the currency was based on the Horizontal type? The single-find evidence may help to determine this one day, but presently it is rather thin. From Suffolk there are only two reliable reports of Edward the Elder coins, a blundered Horizontal penny and a remarkable halfpenny of the north-western Hand type, while from Norfolk there are three Horizontal coins, two East Anglian Portrait coins and an imitation of the Flower type.<sup>20</sup> If the Brantham hoard does reflect local currency, the dominance of an East Midlands style and the total absence of more southern issues is surprising. This might have been because the recoinage in Suffolk was implemented by moneyers operating at mints in the East Midlands, or the hoard may simply represent a sum of money brought into the region from eastern Mercia. This fascinating find will require further evidence before it can be really understood.

<sup>18</sup> The hoard was acquired by the British Museum and will be published by Miss Marion Archibald. A preliminary report, with addenda, has appeared in 'Coin Hoards', *NC* 156 (1996), 291, no. 130; 157 (1997), 231, no. 49; 158 (1998), 298–9, no. 37.

<sup>19</sup> At York, Athelstan's first issue, the Church type, was struck to an intermediate c.1.45 g standard, shortly succeeded by his Circumscription Cross type at c.1.60 g; Blackburn 2004, 335 and 340.

<sup>20</sup> Based on finds recorded on the *Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds from the British Isles* ([www.fitmuseum.cam.ac.uk/coins/enc/](http://www.fitmuseum.cam.ac.uk/coins/enc/)).

### The Five Boroughs in the 920s

The last of the new hoards of this period comes from the East Midlands, specifically from Thurstaston, some five miles north-west of Leicester.<sup>21</sup> This hoard was also deposited in the early to mid 920s, and in an area of the Danelaw that should have come under Mercian control in 918 when Æthelflæd took Leicester. It comprises just twelve coins, but they are a fascinating mix representing three quite different monetary systems (Table 3). The Anglo-Saxon element is three coins of Edward the Elder's Horizontal type, not issues of the East Midlands, but ones in the styles of London, Winchester and West Midlands die-cutters. Then there are seven Anglo-Scandinavian coins, contemporary issues of the 920s rather than earlier ones that might have remained in local possession since the reconquest. Two are Sword St Peter coins of York, and five are rare coins of Sihtric Caech, king of York (920/1–7). The last two coins are fragments of Samanid dirhems, struck in Samarqand 913–16, which will have arrived recently in England via Scandinavia and Russia. They provide clear evidence that the group represents a purse of current money used in a bullion (or money-weight) economy. This suggests that a dual economy persisted for at least five years after the reconquest in certain areas of Danelaw, perhaps limited to individual villages or families. The name Thurstaston ('Thorketil's tun')<sup>22</sup> itself suggests there were Scandinavian residents, and a silver Thor's hammer found nearby reinforces this.<sup>23</sup>

TABLE 3. Thurstaston (Leics.) Hoard

12 coins, deposited c.925	
Sihtric Caech (920/1–7), Five Boroughs, <i>Sword/Cross</i> type	5
Sword St Peter (921–7), York, <i>Sword/Cross</i> type	2
Edward the Elder (899–924), <i>Horizontal (Late)</i> types	3
Islamic, Samanid, dirhams, 913–16	2

The Scandinavian element is important, adding five new specimens of Sihtric Caech's *Sword/Cross* type, of which only three were known previously. They provide additional evidence for the chronology and origin of this coinage, in particular adding further weight to the arguments that it was struck south of the Humber in the Five Boroughs. Such a conclusion is not to be drawn lightly, in view of the remark in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for 918 that 'all the people who had settled in Mercia, English and Danish, submitted to [Edward the Elder]', which had been taken by historians as indicating that all the Southern Danelaw, including Lincolnshire, had been conquered.<sup>24</sup> The numismatic case for part of this region remaining in Scandinavian hands after 918 is now very strong, but some historians may remain uncertain or sceptical, in part because in the 1970s and 80s some prominent numismatists were still debating the chronology and attributions.<sup>25</sup> In the light of recent finds I would like to survey the evidence.

There are four distinct series of Anglo-Scandinavian coins produced during the 920s, each prominently using a sword as the central design on the obverse (Fig. 2 and Table 4). By far the largest number of surviving specimens belongs to the series in the name of St Peter, with *Eborace* (York) on the reverse of many. There are three types within this series, each with different reverse designs: a cross and two versions of Thor's hammer – one in outline like a mallet and one that is linear. There are also a few coins that are transitional between the Mallet and Hammer types, with a linear handle and a hollow mallet head. In 1992, Stewart and Lyon published a corpus and die-study of the series, with 83 specimens,<sup>26</sup> and only a handful more have since been found. In the St

<sup>21</sup> Blackburn 2001b. The hoard is in the Fitzwilliam Museum.

<sup>22</sup> Ekwall 1960, 471.

<sup>23</sup> Donated by the finder, Mr Brian Kimberley, to Leicestershire Museums Collection (L.A151.1993).

<sup>24</sup> E.g. Stenton 1971, 331.

<sup>25</sup> Lord Stewartby was the first to recognise that Lincoln remained a Scandinavian mint into the 920s (Stewart 1967), and the argument was developed in Dolley and Moore 1973; Dolley 1978, 27; and particularly Stewart 1983. However, it was not accepted by Archibald 1980, 107–8, whose comments prompted replies by Dolley (1982) and Stewart (1991).

<sup>26</sup> Stewart and Lyon 1992. The utility of this excellent paper is unfortunately impeded by the absence of illustrations of the coins listed in the corpus.





Fig. 2. The four series of Sword types of the 920s.

TABLE 4. The Sword Types of the 920s

	<i>Sword/Cross</i>	<i>Sword/Mallet</i>	<i>Sword/Hammer</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
St Peter	37	43	6	86
Sihtric	8	4	5	17
St Martin	7	—	—	7
Anonymous	—	—	5	5

Peter issue, the Hammer coins are so much scarcer than those of the Mallet type (six compared with 43 specimens) that Stewart and Lyon were inclined to treat the Hammer type as a variant within the more substantive Mallet type.

The next most prolific series is that in name of Sihtric Caoch (920/1–7). The style and quality of die-cutting is quite different from that of the St Peter series, and the inscriptions are mostly very blundered. When the reverse inscriptions can be read, they mostly give the name of a moneyer; a practice not found on the Scandinavian York coinage before 927. As in the Sword St Peter series, there are three reverse types – with a Cross, Mallet or Hammer – plus a transitional Mallet-Hammer variety, and it looks as if these were intended to mirror the three St Peter issues. A corpus of Sihtric's coins was published by Dolley and Moore in 1973, but since then the number of known specimens has grown from nine to seventeen (listed in Appendix 3). As well as the five specimens from the Thurstaston hoard, additions have come from a single-find from Swallow (Lincs.), an excavation find from the Coppergate site in York and the reattribution of a coin in the Edinburgh collection.

The other two series of Sword types are that in the name of St Martin and an Anonymous (or Circumscription) Sword issue. The St Martin coins name Lincoln as their mint on the reverse (*Lincolla civita(s)*), and when in 1967 Stewart first tentatively suggested that they may date from

the 920s only five specimens were known. Today there are seven, after the addition of a fragment from the Dunmore Cave hoard (1973) and an unprovenanced specimen that appeared in the coin trade in 1978 (Appendix 2). The Anonymous Sword issue was discussed by Stewart in 1983 and no further examples have been added to the five then known (Appendix 1). The circular inscriptions on both sides are mostly garbled, but one (A4) recognisably copies the name and title from coins of Edward the Elder.

The dating of these four Sword series to the 920s can be established from the hoard evidence, which has been reviewed by Stewart and Lyon.<sup>27</sup> There are no less than six hoards deposited during the 920s that contained various combinations of these issues: Thurstaston (Leics.) 1992–2000, Bangor (Caerns.) 1894, Morley St Peter (Norfolk) 1957, Glasnevin (Co. Dublin) 1838, Bossall (Yorks.) 1807 and Dunmore Cave (Co. Kilkenny) 1973 (Table 5). Within the sequence of issues at York, the Sword St Peter types were produced between the coinage of Ragnald I (919–20/1) and Athelstan's taking York in 927, and so they date to the reign of Sihtric Caech.<sup>28</sup> Sihtric's named coinage belongs, of course, to the same period. On typological grounds the St Martin coinage must be contemporary with or follow the St Peter Sword/Cross type which inspired it – shown by details such as the pellets flanking the As in  $\text{H} \text{L} \text{I} \text{N} \text{C} \text{O} \text{L} \text{L} \cdot \text{A} \cdot \text{C} \text{I} \text{V} \text{T} \cdot \text{A} \cdot$  also found on several St Peter reverses. The Anonymous Sword type is not closely associated, typologically, with the other issues, as the Hammer side appears to be copied from the last of Ragnald's three types, while the sword enclosed in a circular inscription is treated rather differently from that on the other Sword issues. The design link with Ragnald and the presence of the type in the Morley St Peter and Bangor hoards point to a date for the Anonymous type in the early 920s, perhaps before the Sihtric and St Martin issues.

TABLE 5. Hoards of the 920s containing coins of the Sword types

(Source: Stewart 1982, Stewart and Lyon 1992, amended)

	<i>Thurstaston</i>	<i>Bangor</i>	<i>Morley St Peter</i>	<i>Glasnevin</i>	<i>Bossall</i>	<i>Dunmore Cave</i>
ENGLISH						
Pre-899	–	–	77	–	1	–
Edward	3	3	763	–	5	2
Athelstan	–	–	1	2	2	1
SCANDINAVIAN						
Earlier issues	–	–	26	–	3	–
Swordless St Peter	–	2	13	–	13	–
Ragnald	–	–	–	–	12	–
Sword St Peter						
Cross type	2	2	1	2	2+	1
Mallet type	–	–	–	–	10+	1
Hammer type	–	–	–	–	–	–
Anonymous Sword	–	1	1	1	–	1
St Martin	–	–	–	–	–	1
Sihtric						
Cross type	5	–	–	1	–	–
Mallet type	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hammer type	–	1	–	1?	–	–
ISLAMIC AND OTHER	2	5	–	2	2	2
Total	12	14	883	8/9?	c.270	9

Within the St Peter issue the sequence of the three types could not be determined by Stewart and Lyon. On the one hand the typological affinities might suggest that the Hammer-Mallet group may have succeeded Ragnald's Hammer/Bow type and the composition of the Bossall hoard

<sup>27</sup> Stewart 1982a, 110–11; Stewart and Lyon 1992, 61–2.<sup>28</sup> Dooley 1982; Stewart 1991.



could be interpreted as supporting that. On the other hand, they argued that the overall composition of the five hoards known to them (excluding Thurstaston) and the die-survival rates pointed to the Cross type coming before the Hammer-Mallet group. The Thurstaston hoard with its seven Cross coins and no Hammer or Mallet types must support the earlier dating of the Cross type.

The case for attributing the Anonymous, St Martin and Sihtric issues to a mint or mints south of the Humber is based partly on hoard evidence and partly on their inscriptions. The dominant hoard of this period is that from Bossall, situated ten miles north-east of York, deposited c.927. Although we have details of only some 50 of the c.270 coins present in the hoard, the majority of extant Sword St Peter and Ragnald coins must be from this source.<sup>29</sup> What is remarkable for a hoard of this size is that it appears to have contained no coins of the other three Sword series,<sup>30</sup> although they were represented in each of the other five hoards. Bossall must have been drawn largely from the local currency, where York coins dominated. If we compare this with the Thurstaston hoard, the only contemporary hoard from the Five Boroughs, Sihtric coins outnumber Sword St Peters by five to two. The single-find evidence does not add anything to the arguments, as the finds are too few in number and all types, including the Sword St Peter, are better represented in finds from south of the Humber.<sup>31</sup>

The coin inscriptions point to a similar division. Two of the four issues are mint-signed: St Peter (York) and St Martin (Lincoln). The York Scandinavian coinage before 927 never carries the name of a moneyer, but there are five moneyers named on the Sihtric coins. Three of these (Are, Eric and Manna) are moneyers attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan and his successors (Table 6). A fourth, Sibrant, is not otherwise recorded on coins from central or northern England, while a fifth name (Æthel ... d) is ambiguous and could be identified with known moneyers of York, Lincoln or Leicester. There can be no doubt that Lincoln was operating as a mint for the Scandinavian kings of York during the early 920s, and in view of the way in which Sihtric's coin types parallel those of St Peter minting at Lincoln may have continued down to Athelstan's taking of York in 927.

TABLE 6. Moneyers named on Sihtric Caech's coinage

ADEI[ ID	Possibly Æthelferth, at York under Athelstan (BC) and Anlaf Guthfrithsson; or Ædelwerd attributed to Lincoln under Eadred (BC) and Eadgar (HT1 (NEV)); or Æthelred, attributed to Leicester(?) under Eadred (HR1) and Eadgar (R/HC4).
ARE	Are, attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E)), Eadmund (HT1 (NE I), HT1 (E)) and Eadred (BC mint-signed).
ERIC	Eric, attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1) and Eadmund (HT1(E)).
MANA	Manna attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E)), Eadmund (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E), HR1), Eadred (HT1 (E), BC), Eadwig (BC) and Eadgar (HT1 (NEV)).
SIBRANT	Sibrant not otherwise recorded.

### Divisions within Sihtric's coinage

With the discovery of several new coins of Sihtric, it is appropriate to take this opportunity to list and illustrate all the known specimens, to see what light they may shed on the structure of his coinage. The coins are listed in Appendix 3, and their provenances are set out in Table 7. Although Sihtric's coinage is divided into the same three types as the Sword St Peter issue, there is a wide variation in design, style and legends within the coinage. Some features seem to link coins of different types, and it is not easy to arrange the seventeen coins in a meaningful order. In

<sup>29</sup> Blunt and Stewart 1983; Stewart 1991; Graham Campbell 1993; Graham Campbell 2001b.

<sup>30</sup> As Table 7 below shows, all the extant coins of Sihtric and the Anonymous Sword types have recorded find provenances save for one (SH1) where the provenance is tentative. While five of the St Martin coins do not have findspots, three of these can be traced back before the 1807 Bossall find, and one was probably a recent discovery in the mid-1970s. This leaves only one St Martin coin (M5) and possibly one Sihtric (SH1) that could have come from Bossall, but there is no positive evidence to associate either with the hoard.

<sup>31</sup> Sword St Peter (3 finds): Louth (Lincs.), Northampton and Littleborough (Notts.), plus the St Peter obverse die from York (Coppergate); Anonymous Sword (1 find): near Cambridge; Sihtric (4 finds): Swallow (Lincs.), Threkingham (Lincs.), 'Derbyshire' and York (Coppergate).

Appendix 3 they are catalogued by type, but on the plates I have arranged them in three groups, A to C, that cross the types. These do not necessarily signify that the coins within a group are contemporary or that different groups are the product of separate workshops or mints. If we had a much larger sample of the coinage, I am sure the pattern would be clearer.

TABLE 7. Sources/present locations of coins of the Sihtric Caech, St Martin and Anonymous series

<i>Finds</i>	Sihtric	St Martin	Anonymous
ENGLAND			
Thurcaston, Leics., hoard	5	—	—
Morley St Peter, Norfolk, hoard	—	—	1
Threkingham, Lincs.	1	—	—
Swallow, Lincs.	1	—	—
Cambridge, near	—	—	1
'Derbyshire'?	1	—	—
York (Coppergate)	1	—	—
WALES			
Bangor hoard	1	—	1
SCOTLAND			
Skye hoard	2	—	—
IRELAND			
Glasnevin hoard	1 or 2?	—	1
Dunmore Cave hoard	—	1	1
'Ireland'?	1	—	—
SWEDEN			
Birka	1	—	—
DENMARK			
Tersley hoard	—	1	—
ITALY			
'Italy'	1	—	—
UNKNOWN	— or 1?	5 <sup>32</sup>	—
Total provenanced	16 or 17	2	5
<i>Present locations</i>			
British Museum, London	3	1	1
Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge	6	—	1
National Museums of Scotland	2	—	—
Bangor University	1	—	—
Yorkshire Museum, York	1	—	—
Lincoln Museum	—	1	1
National Museum, Dublin	—	1	1
Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm	1	—	—
National Museum, Copenhagen	2	2	—
University Coin Cabinet, Oslo	—	1	—
Private coll.	—	—	1
Unknown/disintegrated?	1	1	—
Total	17	7	5

The first group (A) on **Pl. 29** has a literate obverse legend, **SITR / IC REX**, and a sword pointing right with a simple blade and single bar to the hilt. The two obverse dies of the Cross type (SC1–2) are linked by a single reverse with the enigmatic **†CASTDAEQRT** legend, retrograde. In the Hammer type there are three coins with this arrangement of obverse legend (SH1–3), but they lack the trefoils above and below and a cross at the tip of the sword. It seems likely that these three coins represent a later revival of this literate obverse inscription. Two of the Hammer coins have moneyers' names – Are and Sibrant – the first one indicating the mint was Lincoln.

<sup>32</sup> The dates these five coins were first recorded are: 1631, 1733, 1774, 1923, 1978

The second group (B) comprises four coins of the Cross type which have in common the inclusion of a small mallet in the obverse inscription. This is inspired by obverses of the York St Peter coins of the Cross type, where the mallet appears in the centre of the lower line, standing for the letter I (Fig. 2, no. 1). It appears in the same position on three of the Sihtric coins, standing in for a T on SC3 with its unique legend  $\tau$  / LVDO / SI  $\mathbb{D}$ IRC, while SC5–6 are rather blundered. On the fourth coin (SC4) the mallet has transferred to the top line, where it also stands for the letter T. SC3 names the moneyer Eric, a Lincoln moneyer in later reigns. The other three coins have garbled reverse inscriptions, though SC4 may perhaps include a reflection of the name Eric. The significance of the form *Ludo Sitric* has been much discussed. *Ludo* is normally taken to be some unknown form of title,<sup>33</sup> but more plausibly it stands for *Ludovicus* (note the contraction mark above LVDO) and that this was a baptismal name taken by Sihtric, just as the *Carolus* monogram on coins of the York kings Cnut and Ragnald may represent a baptismal name Charles. This was a period when Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon kings often tried to form alliances with the Vikings through bonds of baptismal sponsorship giving them Frankish or Old English names.<sup>34</sup>

The third group (C) on Pl. 30 is more diverse, with ten coins spanning all three types, plus an imitation of the St Peter Cross issue. Four of the coins are linked by their inclusion in the centre of the lower line of the symbol  $\mathbb{D}$ , which probably developed through the fusing of CR in *Sitric Rex*, but was then copied without meaning. A coin from the Thurstaston hoard (SC7) probably represents an early stage in the use of this symbol, in which the foot of the R has been understood as a crescent in the lower field. It occurs on a coin of the Hammer type from Swallow, Lincs. (SH4), combined with features that link more coins with the group, namely a central spine on the sword blade and a double bar to its hilt. Among the other Sword coinages, the central spine is only found on one specimen (A2) of the Anonymous Sword type, while the double hilt is exclusive to coins of Sihtric's Group C. Two coins of Sihtric's Mallet type have the  $\mathbb{D}$  symbol (SM1 and SM3), both with the central spine and double hilt. The reverse of SM1 might be described as transitional between the Hammer and Mallet types, since it has a solid shaft to the mallet, and the same design with identical ornamentation in the field (two trefoils by the shaft and a crescent above the head of the mallet) is found on the drawing of the lost coin from Threkingham, Lincs. (SM2). While, according to the drawing, this lacks the  $\mathbb{D}$  symbol on the obverse, it does have the central spine and double hilt. The fourth mallet coin (SM4) lacks these two features, but its obverse inscription is so close to that of SM3 that it is clearly associated with the group. All four of the Mallet coins have reverse inscriptions that start with the letters  $\mathbb{H}$ IEIV or similar, followed by IIO or MOT suggesting it is derived from a moneyer's name and *moneta*, albeit heavily blundered. Finally, two additional coins can be associated with Group C, one with a blundered obverse (SH5) that does not reflect Sihtric's name yet seems to be associated with his coinage. It has a central spine, though only a single hilt, and it is by the Lincoln moneyer Manna. The second is formally a St Peter Sword/Cross coin, but, as Stewart and Lyon have pointed out,<sup>35</sup> its style is out of place in that series, and it appears to be an imitation from the same workshop as this Sihtric group of coins. It has the characteristic central spine and double hilt to the sword, and the lettering is also similar. The central cross on the reverse is larger than on the York prototype, but if produced when Sihtric's die-cutter was making dies of the Hammer type, he would have been accustomed to engraving on the reverse a long thin shaft rather similar to the arms of the cross on this die.

How are we to account for these three strands within Sihtric's coinage? Could they represent different mints operating in the remaining Scandinavian-held territory south of the Humber? Could they be the work of different die-cutters? Or can they be explained as chronological developments? Does the presence of an overt imitation of St Peter indicate that the coins in Group C are all unofficial imitations? All three groups include coins that show poor literacy, as indeed is typical of Anglo-Scandinavian coinages struck between c.880 and 927. Many of those

<sup>33</sup> E.g. Dolley 1965, 22.

<sup>34</sup> The suggestion that LVDO might stand for *Ludovicus* was first made by Marion Archibald, cited in Stewart 1982a, 114; and the argument has been developed in Blackburn 2004, 331 and 334–5.

<sup>35</sup> Stewart and Lyon 1992, no. 19, 'unusual style (cf. Sitric)'. It may be noted that its provenance goes back to the Bergne collection, just as another coin in this group (SM4) does, and perhaps they derive from a common find.

coinages also have imitative elements to them, and not only in the pre-895 phase, for copies of Alfred's Canterbury and Oxford types, the York Cnut issues and Edward the Elder's Portrait type were made in parts of the Southern Danelaw after 900, and even after the reconquest. The same was often true of coinages in Scandinavia and in Scandinavian Dublin. The coinages were perfectly good from an economic point of view, but monitoring standards of literacy on coins was not a priority for Scandinavian administrators, and indeed the meaning of the inscriptions seems at times to have been of such little importance that direct copies were tolerated.<sup>36</sup> The implication is that the Scandinavian elite ruled by word of mouth, not through written documents. Given the size of Group C, embracing all known specimens of Sihtric's Mallet type, I would regard this as part of the official series, rather than an unauthorised imitative group. Each of the three Sihtric groups include the names of moneyers who in subsequent reigns are associated with Lincoln, and it would be rash to propose the existence of a further mint south of the Humber in this period without firm evidence. Stamford has already been proposed as the origin for Edward the Elder's MNE style coins, and the other main towns in the Five Boroughs are said in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to have fallen to Edward by 918. The inscription on SC1-2, if correctly interpreted as *Castra Eort* or similar, may represent the name of a mint and if so it was a Roman fort or town. Whether this was a name for Lincoln or some other town in the region has not been determined.

Sihtric's Cross type, despite the range of literacy and style, appears to have been a distinct, early phase at Lincoln following on from the Anonymous Sword and St Martin issues. It probably started with the more literate coins of Groups A and B, and continued with the more blundered forms within Groups B and C. The three coins of the Hammer type in Group A may represent a reestablishment of literate inscriptions at the start of the new issue, while the bulk of Group C coins constitute the later phase of Sihtric's coinage with a new style of sword.

### The pattern of minting in the Five Boroughs before 927

The Scandinavian coinages of the Five Boroughs have proved somewhat difficult to identify, but there is a sequence of issues that can plausibly be attributed to the region, starting with imitations of Alfred's London Monogram and Horizontal types, some of which have a Lincoln monogram or a Leicester mint-name.<sup>37</sup> The unique coin of Guthfrith of York (c.883–95) on stylistic grounds appears to belong to a Five Boroughs group.<sup>38</sup> After 895, when St Edmund coins were being struck further south and regal coins of Sigefrith and Cnut were being struck in York, the Five Boroughs probably continued striking an imitative coinage, in particular the *Orsanaforda* type and the large group of Canterbury imitations may well come from this area.<sup>39</sup> These were substantial coinages, but after c.905 there seems to be no significant group of coins that can be given to the Five Boroughs between the deposit of the Cuerdale hoard and the Sword types of the 920s. Did Lincoln remain an active mint? Might the production of St Edmund coins have extended that far north? One critical hoard from the region could change our perception of this, and even reveal a coinage of which little now survives.

At present the evidence suggests that minting in the Five Boroughs, and probably only at Lincoln itself, was resumed c.920 with the Anonymous Sword type, possibly as a reaction to the Anglo-Saxon reconquest of the rest of the Southern Danelaw. In the 920s Lincoln would have been the centre of a fairly small territory remaining under Scandinavian rule south of the Humber, yet Lincoln was growing in importance as a town, and that alone may largely account for the substantial coinage struck there in the 920s and subsequently.

<sup>36</sup> I would draw a distinction between the deliberate copying of successful neighbouring coinages during an imitative phase of a newly established coinage, when this could enhance the status of the new coinage, and a case like this where an independent coinage was already established, but copying was for some reason tolerated.

<sup>37</sup> Mossop 1970, pl. I, nos. 1–6 (Lincoln mint); Grierson 1957, 488, no. 35 and Pl. 28, no. 35, now in Fitzwilliam Museum, ex Blunt (Leicester mint).

<sup>38</sup> Blackburn 1989, 18–20.

<sup>39</sup> Blackburn 2001a, 131–2; Blackburn 2005, 22.

I have commented previously on the relative size of the coinages of Scandinavian York from the late ninth to the mid-tenth century.<sup>40</sup> For many of the issues the surviving sample is too small for any useful estimate of the original number of dies to be given, and where figures can be ventured, the probability range may still be wide (Table 8). However, there is enough evidence to show that the issues of Scandinavian York were very substantial. For the later period, 939–54, the number of dies being used per year seems to have equalled or even exceeded the rate of die use at York between Edgar's coinage reform and the Norman Conquest. Ragnald's coinage also seems to have been quite large, considering it lasted for only two years or so. By contrast, the Sword St Peter coinage was significantly smaller, especially if it was spread over six years. Thanks to the Bossal hoard, this issue has the best survival rate of any since the Cuerdale hoard, and although today the coins are quite plentiful, their strong die-linking indicates that the number of dies in use was not large.

TABLE 8. Die Estimates

Coinage	Length of issue (years)	No. of extant coins	No. of dies represented		Estimated total dies	
			Obv.	Rev.	Obv.	Rev.
Early York regal	10	3,043+	c.250	c.400	c.275?	c.550?
Swordless St Peter	15	c.200	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Ragnald I	2	23	19	22	52	too
					[28–400]	uncertain
Sword St Peter	6	83	38	56	48	95
					[40–59]	[67–156]
Anon (Circumscription)	1–2?	5	5	5	too	too
Sword type					uncertain	uncertain
St Martin	1–2?	7	4	6	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain
Sihtric Caech	4–5?	17	16	16	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain
All Southern Sword types	6	29	25	27	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain
Athelstan (York issues)	12	c.150?	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Anlaf Raven type	2	36	31	35	122	too
					[68–550]	uncertain
Triquetra type	2	20	19	20	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain
Circumscription Cross/Cross Moline types	2	16	13	16	41	too
					[21–444]	uncertain
Anlaf Southumbrian types	2	12	12	12	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain
Eric Horizontal type	2	23	15	18	26	51
					[17–54]	[31–152]
Anlaf (restored) types	2	26	20	20	59	59
					[34–233]	[34–233]
Eric Sword type	2	16	15	14	too	too
					uncertain	uncertain

## Notes:

1. This table is adapted from Blackburn 2004, Table 5.

2. The die-studies are drawn from Lyon and Stewart 1961; Blunt and Stewart 1983; Stewart and Lyon 1992; *CTCE*, ch. 14; and Appendices 1–3 below.

3. In the 'Estimated dies' columns, the most probable estimate of 'equivalent dies' is given, and below in square brackets the range implied by the 95% confidence limits. The number of 'equivalent dies' means the total number of dies assuming that the unknown dies struck on average the same number of coins as those represented in the surviving material. Almost certainly they will have struck fewer, so the result will be an under-estimate of the original dies, but this is a fairer way of representing the likely size of the coinage. Calculations are based on Esty 1986, formulae J2, J3 and K1. For the Early York regal coinage information about singletons and doubletons has not been published, and the estimates of dies are a guess.

<sup>40</sup> Blackburn 2004, 342–4.

For the Southumbrian issues of the 920s the survival rate is poor, and no die estimates can be calculated. Yet, from the very low degree of die-linking among them (29 coins of all the southern Sword types were struck from 25 obverse and 27 reverse dies), we can say that the coinage must have been quite substantial, and probably rather larger than the York Sword St Peter issue. It is fascinating to think that in the 920s Lincoln mint may have been more productive than York – reflecting the situation that would often occur in the eleventh century, when York and Lincoln would jostle for second and third place in the national ranking of mints.<sup>41</sup>

### The post-939 coinages of York

The death of Sihtric in 927 provided Athelstan with an opportunity to move on York, ousting Sihtric's short-lived successor Guthfrith, who was possibly his brother. We are told that one of Athelstan's first tasks was to destroy the city's defences, and he seems to have been equally determined to remove its Scandinavian coinage and replace it one in his own name, just as we have seen Edward the Elder had done in East Anglia after 918. Six moneyers struck Athelstan's first issue at York, the Church type, some it seems having been drafted in from mints in the Midlands,<sup>42</sup> but it was concerted production of the Circumscription Cross type under the 'master moneyer' Ragnald that probably completed the recoinage. Interestingly the move to the full English weight standard was achieved in two stages, the Church type taking it from c.1.30 g to c.1.45 g, and a few years later the Circumscription Cross type raising it to the full c.1.6 g standard.<sup>43</sup> Again there may be a parallel from 918 in the way the East Anglian Portrait issue respected the prevailing local standard.

Just as Athelstan was determined to establish an Anglo-Saxon monetary system at York in 927, so Anlaf Guthfrithsson (939–41), on the restoration of Norse rule in 939, was moved to bring back a distinctive Scandinavian coinage struck to the previous c.1.3 g weight standard. His Raven coinage had both a Scandinavian design and its use of the title *cununc* for 'king' today represents the earliest surviving use of Old Norse in the Roman alphabet. This was a large coinage – estimates indicate at least one hundred obverse dies in use during one or two years (Table 8) – and it could well have succeeded in replacing the stock of Athelstan's coins circulating in York.

The following issue, the Triquetra/Standard type of Anlaf Sihtricsson (941–44/5), Sihtric Caeoch's son, struck with two other kings, a Sihtric II (c.943–4) and Ragnald II Guthfrithsson (943–44/5), had similar properties – employing Scandinavian iconography, the Old Norse title *cununc* and minted at a lighter weight standard. It too was struck on a very substantial scale, but perhaps the viability of maintaining an independent system at York had become unviable, as the third issue – Anlaf Sihtricsson's and Ragnald II's Cross types – was struck to a higher standard, c.1.4 g, comparable with contemporary coins of Edmund elsewhere in England, where the standard was gradually falling. Subsequent issues at York, whether under English or Scandinavian authority, used the prevailing English standard of the day.

The post-939 coinages of the York kingdom have been carefully described by Blunt, Stewart and Lyon in *CTCE*, with a corpus of known specimens for each type.<sup>44</sup> Since the publication of *CTCE* in 1989 there have been no fresh hoards with coins from this phase of Scandinavian rule. There have, however, been several single finds including some significant coins. Three coins of the Triquetra/Standard type are of particular note. One of Sihtric II is only the third specimen known for this ruler (Fig. 3, no. 2). It was found near Doncaster in 1990<sup>45</sup> and is by the same moneyer, Farman, as the example found in the York (Coppergate) excavations in 1981. A third specimen of the type for Ragnald Guthfrithsson (Fig. 3, no. 3) was found in 2002 at Middleton on the Wolds, E. Yorks., and provides the name of a new moneyer, Durant, for the Scandinavian coinages.<sup>46</sup> Another

<sup>41</sup> Metcalf 1980, 32–3, 49. On Lincoln as a ninth-century town, see Sawyer 1998.

<sup>42</sup> For a discussion as to whether some of the Church type coins were struck in the Midlands rather than York see Blunt 1974, 88–9, 92; Blackburn 2004, 335.

<sup>43</sup> *CTCE*, 235–45.

<sup>44</sup> *CTCE*, ch. 14, 211–34, building on the work of Dolley 1957–8; Dolley and Yvon 1971; Dolley 1978. The sequence of Anglo-Saxon and Viking issues at York is conveniently summarised in Stewart 1988, 204–6.

<sup>45</sup> Sotheby, 4 October 1990, lot 398; EMC 2001.1065.





Fig. 3. The recent finds of York coins of 939–44/5.

significant example of this coinage (Fig. 3, no. 1) is in the name of Anlaf Sihtricsson. It was found near Beverley, E. Yorks., in 2004,<sup>47</sup> and is by the rare moneyer Ascolv, who is known from only one other coin of Anlaf – a die-duplicate in the British Museum – and one of Sihtric II. From the next issue – Anlaf's Circumscription Cross type – a fragmentary specimen found by Peter Woods at Grendon, Northants, in 2000, provides a fourth example by the moneyer Rathulf (Fig. 3, no. 4).<sup>48</sup>

### The Final Phase of Scandinavian Rule in the Five Boroughs

The Five Boroughs were held under Scandinavian rule for one final phase, following Anlaf Guthfrithsson's successful military campaign in the region in 940, and although it was lost again within two years by Anlaf Sihtricsson, their hold was secure enough for the local mints to acknowledge the authority of the York king on the coins. Four groups of coins have been attributed to the Five Boroughs during this period: three continue typical Anglo-Saxon designs used under Athelstan from separate mints – Derby, and probably Lincoln and Stamford – while the fourth is a coin of Anlaf Guthfrithsson's Raven issue apparently struck at a Southumbrian mint, possibly Lincoln.<sup>49</sup>

Each group is known from just a handful of coins, so that the recent discovery of what appears to be a further specimen, albeit unusual and somewhat enigmatic, is a welcome event, and the more so when it is the first round halfpenny known for the series. This coin (Fig. 4, no. 1) was found by a metal-detector user in 2005 by the east bank of the Dee Estuary, near Neston (Flintshire), at the base of the Wirral, and it has been acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum.<sup>50</sup> It combines an obverse in the name of Anlaf Guthfrithsson (939–41) or Anlaf Sihtricsson (941–44/5) with a reverse from the time of Ragnald I (919–20/1).

Obv. **ANLAF CV[ ] NEO** (double struck and moved in the die), central small cross; with a double border outside the inscription.

Rev. **ÆTRICE C[ ]** (retrograde), around a Carolus monogram (with reversed S; the whole monogram may be reversed, i.e. facing left).

Weight: 0.68 g; diam. 17 × 18 mm.

The obverse inscription is complicated to read as the coin was struck once, the obverse die twisted about 45°, and struck again. The coin literally reads **ANLAF/NEAFCV/NEO**, but having taken account of the dislocation (indicated by / and /) and repetition of the letters **NEA**, it gives as the legend *Anlaf Cununc o* (the 'o' being a space-filler). This is a typical form for York coins of Anlaf Guthfrithsson and Anlaf Sihtricsson in the period 939–44/5, and the design with a small cross on the

<sup>46</sup> Lyon and Holmes 2004. The coin was acquired by the Yorkshire Museum.

<sup>47</sup> Coin Register 2005, no. 168, *BNJ* 75 (2005); EMC 2004.0181.

<sup>48</sup> Coin Register 2000, no. 88, *BNJ* 70 (2000); EMC 2000.0048.

<sup>49</sup> *CTCE*, 216–21.

<sup>50</sup> I am grateful to Mr Roderick Blunt for recognising the significance of this coin and referring the finder to me at the Fitzwilliam Museum. I am also grateful to Dr Stewart Lyon for discussing the interpretation of this coin with me.





Fig. 4. The Anlaf-Ragnald I mule halfpenny (no. 1) and related coins.

obverse would associate it with the last of the three issues of this period, the Circumscription Cross types. However, the style of epigraphy, with simple small chunky letters, a lack of wedges at the points of the Vs and As, and an inverted L, is not that normally found on York coins. Extra letters or symbols are often found at the end of the legend on York coins, but 'o' or an annulet is unusual.

There is a closer parallel for the exact form of the obverse inscription which is on the Circumscription Cross coins in the name of Anlaf struck at Derby. Four coins have been attributed to this mint in the period 940–2 when Anlaf Guthfrithsson and Anlaf Sihtricsson held parts of the Midlands.<sup>51</sup> Two of the four have an obverse inscription that exactly parallels that of the new coin, with an inverted L, a round C and square E at the beginning and end of *cununc* and a terminal O or annulet (Fig. 4, no. 2).<sup>52</sup> A fragmentary specimen in the Manx Museum has a longer but related inscription, again with the round C and square E.<sup>53</sup> The simple letter forms of the new coin are also similar to those on the Derby coins of Anlaf and Athelstan,<sup>54</sup> although they appear more cramped. The reason for this is that the obverse die is evidently much smaller than those used for normal coins of this period: the diameter of the inner circle is 7 mm compared to the usual 12 mm or 13 mm, and the diameter of the outer border is 17 mm compared to 21 or 22 mm normally. However, these dimensions are comparable to those of the few known round halfpennies of Athelstan (Fig. 4, no. 3) and Edmund.<sup>55</sup> The weight of the new coin is 0.68 g, which is appropriate for a halfpenny.<sup>56</sup> This is the first round halfpenny in the Anglo-Scandinavian coinage to be recorded since the St Edmund issue, in which they were quite prolific. On stylistic grounds, then, an attribution to Derby seems the most probable one.

<sup>51</sup> For discussion of this group and a listing of the coins see *CTCE*, 216–18, 229.

<sup>52</sup> *SCBI* 34 (British Museum) no. 1245 and Rome. Forum hoard no. 446 (both illus. *CTCE*, pl. 27, nos 1–2).

<sup>53</sup> Carlyon-Britton 1908, 86–8 and pl. 1, no. 1.

<sup>54</sup> For Derby coins of Athelstan see Blunt 1974, pl. 7, nos 161–74. The style used at Derby by Edmund after he had retaken the area is somewhat different: see Pagan 1995.

<sup>55</sup> Two halfpennies of Athelstan are known, one of the moneyer Clip (Blackburn 1993) and one of Rihard (Coin Register 2003, no. 167, *BNJ* 74 (2004)). For Edmund there are also two, by the moneyers Baldwin (*SCBI* 34, no. 347) and Biorhtulf (*CTCE*, pl. 9, no. 102).

<sup>56</sup> This is comparable to the weight of halfpennies of Athelstan and Edmund, and might seem on the high side for a halfpenny of Viking York, but at Derby under Anlaf the mint seems to have retained Athelstan's weight for the penny, since Anlaf's coin of the moneyer Sigar (*SCBI* 34, no. 1245) weighs 1.53 g.

The reverse is most unusual. On first sight it is very difficult to understand, as the design and letters appear to be drawn in outline. Eventually, one can decipher it as a *Carolus* monogram, surrounded by a degenerate York mint signature *Earice C(ivitas)*, retrograde. This monogram was used on the York coinage of Cnut c.900 and again on a rare late group of Swordless St Peter coins and on the first two types of Ragnald I, i.e. in the period c.918–20.<sup>57</sup> On these latter three sequential issues the form of the monogram becomes progressively more stylised and simplified, while the reverse legends progress through various forms from *HEBRÆICIT* through *HEARICECT* to *HEIORÆCII*. Among the extant specimens, the design of the monogram and inscription on the new coin most closely matches one of the St Peter/Monogram coins (*SCBI* Copenhagen no. 600; Fig. 4, no. 4) or the two of Ragnald's first issue, the Bust/Monogram type (*BMC* 1082–3; Fig. 4, no. 5).<sup>58</sup> These examples are not retrograde, but the inscription and the position of the letters would be very similar to those on the new coin if reversed. Reversal of the inscription or the monogram or both does occur on the St Peter/Monogram type and Ragnald I's types.<sup>59</sup>

The reverse die used for the new Anlaf coin, then, appears to have been an official one from the around the beginning of Ragnald I's reign, i.e. c.918–20. It must have been twenty years old when used to strike this coin of Anlaf, and its age explains the strange appearance of the reverse. The coin itself is of good solid silver and under a microscope shows no signs of corrosion, yet the reverse design and inscription is damaged, and it would seem that the die must have been so rusty that centres of letter strokes and elements of the monogram had become pitted and their surfaces flaked, leaving their harder edges to give an outline or sketch effect. In terms of size, this Monogram die was quite a good choice for a halfpenny as the diameter of the outer border (19 mm) was smaller than on current penny dies from the Midlands, hence most of the design and inscription is on the flan. There is one further twist, however, as it seems from the die-linking statistics that in both the Swordless St Peter and Ragnald coinages the Monogram side of the coin may well have been the lower (longer lasting) die, so technically the obverse.<sup>60</sup> If so it would have been necessary to cut off the tang that goes into the anvil on one of the dies before they could be used together.

What was the status of this coin, which combines an obverse of c.940 probably of Derby with a rusty die from the earlier Scandinavian kingdom of York, used together to strike a rare halfpenny denomination? Well, Derby was an odd mint during the brief revival of Scandinavian rule in 940–2, as Blunt, Stewart and Lyon have explained.<sup>61</sup> Of the four coins of Anlaf previously known, two are by regular Derby moneyers, but the other two have unusual reverses. One from the Forum hoard has the name and titles of King Athelstan retrograde, while the other from the Chester 1950 hoard has a retrograde obverse inscription and a blundered reverse. The status of the new halfpenny mule is likely to be similar to these two coins. However, these have also to be set in the context of a larger group of imitative coins in the name of Athelstan, some with double obverses, some copying coins of southern mints, and others based on coins from the Midlands, particularly Derby, Shrewsbury and Chester. Blunt has suggested that part of this group of irregular coins may be associated with Derby at the time that Anlaf took control.<sup>62</sup> Whether this was sanctioned or encouraged by the Scandinavian rulers or represents irregular and opportunistic activity by some of the official Derby moneyers, or other people, is unclear. This whole group of irregular issues is ripe for further research. If the obverse die used for the new coin was an official halfpenny one, it would originally have had a reverse to match it. One could speculate on various circumstances in which the older York die came to be used instead. However, it is surely significant that someone had acquired and kept an old, rusty coin die from the heyday of the earlier York kingdom, and produced it for use after the restoration of Norse rule in East Mercia. For those involved with its production, this coin was no doubt heavily symbolic, an augur for the success of the new dynasty. Alas it was not to last!

<sup>57</sup> Stewart and Lyon 1992, 58–9; Blunt and Stewart 1983. I have suggested that the St Peter/Monogram type may have been introduced by Ragnald at the beginning of his reign to mark a reform of the weight standard; Blackburn 2004, 334.

<sup>58</sup> These two coins are from one reverse die, *BMC* 1082 being illustrated here; Blunt and Stewart 1983, nos 2–3.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Blunt and Stewart 1983, nos 13 (monogram), 15 (inscription and monogram); pl. 23, A (St Peter/Monogram with reversed monogram).

<sup>60</sup> Stewart and Lyon 1992, 54; Blackburn 2004, 335 (based on the statistics in Blunt and Stewart 1983, 146). The evidence that this was the lower die is not entirely conclusive, as the survival rate in these issues is poor.

<sup>61</sup> *CTCE*, 217–18.

<sup>62</sup> Blunt 1974, 108–9, 113.

## Conclusions

In this paper I have sought to examine, in the light of new find evidence, what impact the Anglo-Saxon reconquest of the Danelaw and the assimilation of the Scandinavian territories had on the production and circulation of coinage in the decade after 917. Several new hoards from East Anglia have demonstrated the homogeneity of the currency under Scandinavian rule, and the effectiveness with which Edward the Elder swept this away after 917. The finds also point to a dramatic difference in the treatment of the southern and northern parts of East Anglia. If we take the Brantham hoard at face value, in the south the currency was fully integrated with the monetary system of Mercia and Wessex, through a recoinage organised from another part of the reconquered Danelaw, the north-east Midlands. By contrast, the new Portrait coinage in the north, although in the name of Edward, has features suggesting that the previous Scandinavian mint administration had retained responsibility for the coinage. Was this a result of incompetence on the part of Edward's government, was it a recognition of sensitivity in the region, or did Edward's writ not run fully in all parts of his extended kingdom?

At any rate, the numismatic evidence makes clear that Edward's authority did not run to parts of the East Midlands, and that Lincoln in particular remained a Scandinavian mint under the authority of York kings for much of the 920s. Even in areas that had been absorbed into Mercia by Æthelflaed and Edward during the 910s, Scandinavian culture, as indicated through monetary practice, survived to some extent. The use of Anglo-Scandinavian coins, and even remnants of the dual economy (coinage and bullion), are indicated not only by the hoard from Thurstaston, near Leicester, but also by the scattering across the East Midlands of single-finds of Sword coins of the 920s.<sup>63</sup> The special status that the Five Boroughs enjoyed in the Danelaw throughout the Scandinavian period is well demonstrated through the coinage. It remained distinct from the two main kingdoms of the southern and northern Danelaw, although for much of the time it fell under the control of the York kings. The pattern of minting there *c.* 885–*c.* 927 and again in 940–1 has been elusive, but with new finds and further research its products are becoming clearer.

If Edward the Elder's determination to renew the coinage of the southern Danelaw was impressive, then so too was Athelstan's when taking York in 927, and Anlaf Guthfrithsson's on his recovery of it in 939. Each wished to impose their own monetary systems. The city's traders must have grown weary of change, though by the mid-940s things had settled down, and although authority continued to oscillate between Anlaf Sihtricsson, Edmund, Eadred and Eric, the coinage conformed essentially to the Anglo-Saxon system. Even Eric's last ditch reversion to the iconography of the Sword types of the 920s was not accompanied by a return to the Anglo-Scandinavian weight standard.

It is no wonder that the coinages of Scandinavian York in the period 939–54 have only a low survival rate, since their area of official circulation was limited to Northumbria (broadly the modern county of Yorkshire). Most of the pieces that have survived are ones that escaped into the bullion economies of the Irish Sea or Scandinavia. With more specimens there would be much more to learn, but our knowledge of the political history of the period is equally wanting. Recently Peter Sawyer reviewed the documentary sources for the period 947–54 and demonstrated that the sequence of changes in rule at York between Eadred, Anlaf and Eric generally accepted by historians is only one of several possible interpretations, and he concluded with the hope that numismatic evidence might provide the decisive arguments the historians lacked.<sup>64</sup> Unfortunately, at present it cannot. Still more recently Clare Downham has questioned the identity of the Eric who twice ruled in York and suggested that rather than being the colourful ex-king of Norway known as Eric Bloodaxe, he is more likely to have been a less glamorous member of the Dublin royal house.<sup>65</sup> This Anglo-Scandinavian coinage will continue to provide material for fruitful research for generations to come.

<sup>63</sup> See n. 31 above.

<sup>64</sup> Sawyer 1995. See also Downham 2003.

<sup>65</sup> Downham 2004.

## APPENDIX 1

## CORPUS OF COINS OF THE ANONYMOUS SWORD TYPE

*Note on Arrangement:* Appendices 1–3 present die studies. The numbers in the first column represent different die combinations. The second column designates the dies with an upper case letter for the obverse die and a lower case letter for the reverse. The legends and descriptions of the obverse and reverse are set out in columns three and four, and below them each specimen from that die combination is cited as a), b), etc. All the coins are illustrated on Pls 28–30.

*Circumscription Sword/ Hammer type*

A1	Aa	†CICICICIC (retrograde) Sword without spine	†CICICICIC (retrograde) Hammer
		a. Cambridge; ex Blunt; ex Glasnevin hoard 1838. Stewart 1982, no. 1; <i>CTCE</i> , pl. 26, no. 23. 1.25 g (19.3 gr).	
A2	Bb	†EIEI JIVE Sword with spine	†EVIVEI ] Hammer
		a. Bangor University collection; ex Bangor hoard 1894. Blunt 1954, no. 5; Stewart 1982, no. 2. 0.82 g (12.7 gr), fragment.	
A3	Cc	†ENVEI ] Sword without spine	[ ]HIDIVI ] Hammer
		a. Stewartby collection; ex Grantley lot 958b; found near Cambridge. Stewart 1982, no. 3.	
A4	Dd	†ERDVÆRIX Sword without spine, 2 pellets in field	†EIIIVE-RHE Hammer
		The obverse inscription seems to be based on those of Edward the Elder reading †EADVVEARD REX. a. British Museum; ex Morley St Peter hoard ( <i>SCBI</i> 26, no. 39). Stewart 1982, no. 4. 1.22g (18.9gr), 180°.	
A5	Ee	[ ]RÆVIE [ ] (E reversed) Sword without spine	[ ]IDE-TER [ ] (retrograde except D) Hammer
		a. Dublin (NMI); ex Dunmore Cave hoard 1973. Dolley 1975, fig. 5b; Stewart 1982, no. 5. 0.70 g (10.8 gr), broken fragment, 90°.	

## APPENDIX 2

## CORPUS OF COINS OF ST MARTIN

*Sword/Cross type*

M1	Aa	∴ / SCIT M / ARTIN / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine Same obv. die as M2–3	†LINCOLL'A' CIVT'A' Voided cross, interlaced clockwise, with linear cross in centre
		a. National Museum, Copenhagen ( <i>SCBI</i> 4, no. 620); ex Terslev hoard 1911. Mossop 1970, pl. 1.10; Stewart 1967, no. 1. 1.21 g (18.6 gr), 180°.	
M2	Ab	∴ / SCIT M / ARTIN / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine Same obv. die as M1 and M3	†LINCOLL'A' CIVT'A' Voided cross, interlaced clockwise, cross in centre Same rev. die as M3
		a. Oslo University Coin Cabinet; B.F. Brekke collection; ex Spink 1978. Cited in Norweb sale (Spink 13 June 1985, note to lot 34 'appeared in commerce in 1978'); <i>CTCE</i> , pl. 26, no. 18. 1.42g (21.9gr), 280°.	
M3	Ab	[ ] / ARTIN / ' T ' (T inverted) Same obv. die as M1–2	[ ]A' CIVT'A' Voided cross, with linear cross in centre Same rev. die as M2
		a. National Museum of Ireland; ex Dunmore Cave hoard 1973. Dolley 1975, fig. 4b. 0.46 g (7.1 gr), fragment, 270°.	

M4	Bc	∴ / SCIT M / ARTI / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine Same obv. die as M5	+LINCOLIA CIVT Voided cross, interlaced anti-clockwise, with linear cross in centre
		a. Ex Norweb (Spink sale 45, 13 June 1985), lot 34 (SCBI Norweb no. 129); bt Baldwin 1966; ex Mossop; ex Bagnall; ex Lockett 451; ex Bascom 31; ex McClean ('Astronomer') 121; ex Montagu 374; ex Brice; ex Wigan; ex Pembroke (d.1733; sold 1848) 30. Mossop 1970, pl. 1.8; Stewart 1967, no. 2. 1.29 g (19.9 gr), 270°.	
M5	Bd	∴ / SCIT M / ARTI / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine Same obv. die as no. M4	+LINCOLIA CIVT Voided cross, interlaced anti-clockwise, with linear cross in centre
		a. National Museum, Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 621); lent Bruun (d.1923) no. 247. Mossop 1970, pl. 1.9; Stewart 1967, no. 4. 1.24 g (19.1 gr), 90°.	
M6	Ce	∴ / SCIT M / ARTI / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine	+LINCOLIA CIVT Voided cross, interlaced anti-clockwise, with linear cross in centre
		a. British Museum (BMC 138, no. 698); acq. 1753; ex Sir Robert Cotton (1571–1631). Dolley 1965, no. 27; Mossop 1970, pl. 1.7; Stewart 1967, no. 3. 1.13 g (17.5 gr), per BMC 1.21 g (18.6 gr), 180°.	
M7	Df	[ ] / SCIT M / ARTI / ' T ' (T inverted) Sword right, without spine	+INCOLIA CIVT Voided cross, interlaced clockwise, with linear cross in centre
		a. Lincoln (SCBI 27, no. 5); ex Hill; ex Grantley 934; ex Rashleigh 124; ex Cuff 384; ex Rich 29; ex Dimsdale 344; ex Hollis (d. 1774; sold 1817) 66. Mossop 1970, pl. 1.11; Stewart 1967, no. 5. 1.07 g (16.5 gr), chipped, 270°.	

## APPENDIX 3

## CORPUS OF COINS OF SIHTRIC CAOCH (920/1–27)

## Sword/Cross type

SC1	Aa	∴ / SITR / IC REX / ∴ Sword right, without spine, cross at tip	+CASTDAEQRT (Castræ Eort?), retrograde Pellets and crescents in opposed angles of cross. Same rev. die as SC2.
		a. British Museum; ex Lockett (1955) 439; ex Bascomb (1914) 46; ex Rashleigh (1909) 170; ?ex Stretton (1855) 409; ? found in Ireland. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 8. 1.13 g (17.5 gr).	
SC2	Ba	∴ / SITR / IC REX / ∴ Sword right, without spine, cross at tip	+CASTDAEQRT (Castræ Eort?), retrograde Pellets and crescents in opposed angles of cross. Same rev. die as SC1
		a. Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 627); ex Bruun 192; ex Montagu (1895) 423; ex Brice; ex Borghesi (1880) 1372; ? found in Italy, possibly from the Rome (1846) hoard (Blunt 1986, 162 and 169). Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 9. 1.50 g (21.3 gr).	
SC3	Cb	~ / LVDO / SI ↓ IRC (where ↓ stands for a mallet, representing T), sword right, without spine, 3 pellets at tip	+ERIC M:OTI Pellets and crescents in opposed angles of cross
		Moneyer Eric, attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1) and Eadmund (HT1(E)). a. British Museum (BMC 238, no. 1113); ex Glasnevin hoard 1838. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 7. 1.11 g (17.2 gr).	
SC4	Dc	+ / SIſſE / I RM / + (where ſſ stands for a mallet, representing T), sword right without spine, with cross at tip.	+ ERBI CEI CRR Cross with pellet in 1, 3 and 4, crescent in 2.
		a. Cambridge; ex Thurstaston hoard, found 23 September 1998. Blackburn 2001, no. 3. 1.06 g (16.4 gr), chipped, bent and broken, since repaired.	

- SC5 Ed • / I ERI / D↓II + ICIA RDol ··E·  
(where ↓ stands for a mallet), Cross with pellet in 1 and 4, annulet in 2 and 3.  
sword right without spine, with  
trefoil at tip.  
a. Cambridge; ex Thurstaston hoard, found 25 September 1998. Blackburn 2001, no. 4. 0.89 g (13.7 gr).
- SC6 Fe [ ] I RI / [ ] ↓EI [ ] ·ICERI [ ]  
(where ↓ stands for a mallet), Cross with pellet in 1, 2, and 3, T in 4.  
sword right without spine, with  
inverted T (Thor's hammer) at tip.  
a. Cambridge; given by Brian Kimberley and David Petty 1997; ex Thurstaston hoard, found 26 August 1994. Blackburn 2001, no. 5. 0.51 g (7.9 gr), fragment.
- SC7 Gf • / SETR / ICID+ / ~ (E reversed) +IEDREICIRI  
Sword left without spine, with cross by Cross with pellet in each angle.  
pommel and three pellets at tip.  
Same obv. die as SC8.  
a. Cambridge; ex Thurstaston hoard. Found 18 December 2000. Blackburn 2001, no. 1. 1.15 g (17.7 gr), bent.
- SC8 Gg [ ] / [ ] I+ [ ] RIDE [ ]  
Sword left without spine. Cross with pellet in one quarter.  
with cross by pommel.  
Same obv. die as SC7.  
a. Cambridge; given by Brian Kimberley, David Petty and F. Chantrell 2002; ex Thurstaston hoard, found 2 December 1999. Blackburn 2001, no. 2. 0.20 g (3.1 gr), fragment.

*Sword/Hammer type*

- SH1 Aa [ ] ITR / [ ] C RE [ ] AREMO [ ]  
Sword right, without spine  
Moneyer Are, attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E)), Eadmund (HT1 (NE I), HT1 (E)) and Eadred (BC).  
a. British Museum; ex H.R. Dawson (1842), lot 216; ?ex Glasnevin hoard 1838. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 1. Fragment.
- SH2 Bb SITR / IC REX +SIBRANT·  
Sword right, without spine  
Moneyer Sibrant.  
a. Stockholm; found at Birka (grave 845), 1879. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 2. 0.89 g (13.7 gr), chipped.
- SH3 Cc SITR / IC R [ ] +ADEI [ ] DM [ ] (retrograde)  
Sword right, without spine  
Moneyer Æthelferth, at York under Athelstan (BC) and Anlaf Guthfrithsson; or Ædelwerd (?) attributed to Lincoln under Eadred (BC) and Eadgar (HT1 (NEV)); or moneyer Æthelred, attributed to Leicester ? under Eadred (HR1) and Eadgar (R/HC4)  
a. Bangor University collection; ex Bangor hoard 1894. Blunt 1954, no. 4; Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 3. 0.86 g (13.2 gr), fragment.
- SH4 Dd • / SITR / ICIDII / • +IOIIIOIIAIII  
(lower line retrograde)  
Sword left, with spine and double hilt  
a. Cambridge; bt finder 1995; found at Swallow, Lincs. 1994 (*Fitzwilliam Museum Annual Report* 1995, p. 27). 0.75 g (11.6 gr), chipped and bent.
- SH5 Ee EDIIA / IDIED +HANA MO·T·  
Sword left, with spine  
Moneyer Manna attributed to Lincoln under Athelstan (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E)), Eadmund (HT1 (NEI), HT1 (E), HR1), Eadred (HT1 (E), BC), Eadwig (BC) and Eadgar (HT1 (NEV)).  
Stewart (1982, 112) suggested this coin should be associated with Sihtric's coinage notwithstanding the blundered legend, which he thought might perhaps be reflecting the name of (St) Edmund. However, in the East Anglian or St Edmund coinages Edmund's name had not occurred as a Two-Line inscription, and the absence of 'Sci' before the name would imply that an invocation of St Edmund was not intended in this inscription.  
a. Edinburgh (SCB/ 6, no. 71); ex Skye hoard (1891). 1.06 g (16.3 gr).

*Sword/Mallet type*

SM1	Aa	∴ / SITEI / RCDIX / ∴ (top line retrograde, R reversed and inverted) Sword left, with spine and double hilt a. York; found in excavations at Coppergate, York 1980. Pirie 1986, no. 44. 1.07 g (16.5 gr).	†HIEBIAHIOEIX Solid handle to mallet
SM2	Bb	∴ / SITR / IC REX / ∴ (R inverted) Sword right, with spine and double hilt a. Unknown (probably disintegrated); found Threkingham, Lincs, 1794. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 4. Known only from a line drawing. Weight not recorded.	†HIEIVIIIOIMI Solid handle to mallet
SM3	Cc	∴ / †ITR / RCDL / ∴ (in bottom line R reversed and inverted) Sword right, with spine and double hilt a. Edinburgh (SCBI 6, no. 70); ex Skye hoard (1891). Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 6. 1.39 g (21.4 gr).	†HIEVICRIMOT Hollow handle to mallet
SM4	Dd	∴ / †ITR / RRC / ∴ (in bottom line R's inverted and first R reversed) Sword right, no spine a. Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 594); ex Bruun; ex Montagu (1895) 424; ex Brice; ex Bergne (1873) 101?; ? ex Hurt (1853) 40 or 43; ?found in Derbyshire. Dolley and Moore 1973, no. 5. 1.15 g (17.7 gr), 180°.	†HINEIAHIOIN Hollow handle to mallet, pellet on mallet head

*Imitation of St Peter Sword Cross type*

ImStPI	∴ + ∴ / SCIE / TR↓MO / ∴ ∴ Sword right, with spine and double hilt; cross at tip a. Copenhagen (SCBI 4, no. 584); ex Bruun 217; ex 'Astronomer' 118; Montagu (1895) 440; ex Brice; ex Bergne (1873) 99. Stewart and Lyon 1992, no. 19. 1.15 g (17.7 gr), 90°.	†EBOIR~ACEII (lozenge O) Large central cross
--------	--	---

## REFERENCES

*Abbreviations*

BMC	Keary 1887; Grueber and Keary 1893
CTCE	Blunt, Stewart and Lyon 1989
SCBI	<i>Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles</i>

- Abrams, L. (2001) 'The conversion of the Danelaw'. In J. Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw. Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York 21–30 August 1997* (Oxford), 31–44.
- Allen, D. (1936–7) 'Northumbrian pennies of the tenth century'. *BNJ* 22, 175–86.
- Archibald, M.M. (1980) 'Coins and currency'. In J. Graham-Campbell (ed.), *Viking Artefacts* (London), 102–22.
- Blackburn, M. (1989) 'The Ashton hoard and the currency of the Southern Danelaw in the late ninth Century'. *BNJ* 59, 13–38.
- Blackburn, M. (1993) 'Two new halfpennies of Edward the Elder and Athelstan'. *BNJ* 63, 123–4.
- Blackburn, M. (1996) 'A hoard of late St Edmund coins from near Colchester'. *NC* 156, 289–91.
- Blackburn, M. (2001a) 'Expansion and control: aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian minting south of the Humber'. In J. Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw. Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York 21–30 August 1997* (Oxford), 125–42.
- Blackburn, M. (2001b) 'A Viking hoard from Thurstaston, Leics.: preliminary report'. *NC* 161, 349–52.
- Blackburn, M. (2004) 'The coinage of Scandinavian York'. In R. Hall *et al.*, *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York* (York, Archaeology of York 8/4), 325–49.
- Blackburn, M. (2005) 'Currency under the Vikings. Part 1: Guthrum and the earliest Danelaw coinages'. *BNJ* 75, 18–43.
- Blackburn, M. (forthcoming) 'Crosses and conversion: the iconography of the coinage of Viking York c.900'. In K.L. Jolly, C.E. Karkov and S.L. Keefer (eds), *The Sign of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England* (Morgantown).
- Blackburn, M., and Pagan, H. (1986) 'A revised check-list of coin hoards from the British Isles, c.500–1100'. In M.A.S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History* (Leicester), 291–313.



- Blackburn, M. and Pagan, H. (2002) 'The St Edmund coinage in the light of a parcel from a hoard of St Edmund pennies'. *BNJ* 72, 1–14.
- Blunt, C.E. (1969) 'The St Edmund memorial coinage'. *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* 31, 234–55.
- Blunt, C.E. (1974) 'The coinage of Athelstan, 924–939. A survey'. *BNJ* 42 (special no.), 35–158.
- Blunt, C.E. (1985) 'Northumbrian coins in the name of Alwaldus'. *BNJ* 155, 192–4.
- Blunt, C.E. (1986) 'Anglo-Saxon coins found in Italy'. In M.A.S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History* (Leicester), 159–69.
- Blunt, C.E. and Stewart, B.H.I.H. (1983) 'The coinage of Regnald I of York and the Bossall hoard'. *NC* 143, 146–63.
- Blunt, C.E., Stewart, B.H.I.H. and Lyon, C.S.S. (1989) *Coinage in Tenth-Century England* (Oxford).
- Brooke, G.C. (1932) (1st edn). *English Coins* (London).
- Carlyon-Britton, P.W.P. (1908) 'On some coins of the tenth century found in the Isle of Man, with special reference to a penny of Anlaf struck at Derby'. *BNJ* 5, 85–96.
- Clough, T.H.McK. (1980) *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* 26. *Museums in East Anglia* (Oxford).
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1957a) 'A note on the date of the so-called "Raven" pence of Anlaf Guthfrithsson'. *NCirc* 65, 189–94.
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1957b) 'An unpublished Irish hoard of "St Peter pence"'. *NC* 6th ser., 17, 123–32.
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1957–8) 'The post-Brunanburh Viking coinage of York'. *Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift* 1957–8, 13–88.
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1965) *Viking Coins of the Danelaw and of Dublin* (London).
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1978) 'The Anglo-Danish and Anglo-Norse coinages of York'. In R.A. Hall (ed.), *Viking Age York and the North* (London, CBA Research Report 27), 26–31.
- Dolley, R.H.M. (1982) 'Dateringen af de seneste St Petersmønter fra York'. *Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Medlemsblad* 1982, 82–92.
- Dolley, R.H.M. and Moore, C.N. (1973) 'Some reflections on the English coinages of Sihtric Caech, king of Dublin and York'. *BNJ* 43, 45–59.
- Dolley, R.H.M. and Yvon, J. (1971) 'A group of tenth-century coins found at Mont-Saint-Michel'. *BNJ* 40, 1–16.
- Downham, C.E. (2003) 'The chronology of the last Scandinavian kings of York'. *Northern History* 40, 25–51.
- Downham, C.E. (2004) 'Eric Bloodaxe-axed? The mystery of the last Viking king of York'. *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 14, 51–77.
- Ekwall, E. (1960) (4th edn). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names* (Oxford).
- Esty, W.E. (1986) 'Estimation of the size of a coinage: a survey and comparison of methods'. *NC* 146, 185–215.
- Graham-Campbell, J. (1993) 'A "vital" Yorkshire Viking hoard revisited'. In M. Carver (ed.), *In Search of Cult: Archaeological Investigations in Honour of Philip Rahtz* (Woodbridge), 79–84.
- Graham-Campbell, J. (2001a) 'The dual economy of the Danelaw'. *BNJ* 71, 49–59.
- Graham-Campbell, J. (2001b) 'The Northern hoards, from Cuerdale to Bossall/Flaxton'. In N.J. Higham and D.H. Hill (eds), *Edward the Elder 899–924* (London and New York), 212–29.
- Grierson, P. (1957) 'Halfpennies and third-pennies of King Alfred'. *BNJ* 28, 477–93.
- Grueber, H.A. and Keary, C.F. 1893. *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum. Anglo-Saxon Series II* (London).
- Haigh, D.H. (under pseudonym 'LYH') (1839–40) 'On the pennies of Regnald'. *NC* 1st ser., 2, 7–11.
- Haigh, D.H. (1876) 'The coins of the Danish kings of Northumberland'. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 2nd ser., 7, 21–77.
- Keary, C.F. (1887) *A Catalogue of English Coins in the British Museum. Anglo-Saxon Series I* (London).
- Lyon, C.S.S. and Holmes, S. (2004) 'A new moneyer for the Post-Brunanburh Viking rulers of York'. *BNJ* 74, 178–80.
- Lyon, C.S.S. and Stewart, B.H.I.H. (1961) 'The Northumbrian Viking coinage in the Cuerdale hoard'. In R.H.M. Dolley (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Coins* (London), 96–121.
- Metcalf, D.M. (1980) 'Continuity and change in English monetary history c.973–1086'. *BNJ* 50, 20–49.
- Mossop, H.R. (1970) *The Lincoln Mint c.890–1279* (Newcastle upon Tyne).
- Oman, C. (1934) 'The Danish kingdom of York, 876–954'. *Arch. J.* 91, 1–21.
- Pagan, H.E. (1995) 'Mints and moneyers in the West Midlands and Derby in the reign of Eadmund (939–46)'. *NC* 155, 139–61.
- Pirie, E.J.E. (1986) *Post-Roman Coins from York Excavations 1971–81* (York, Archaeology of York 18/1).
- Rashleigh, J. (1869) 'Remarks on the coins of the Anglo-Saxon and Danish kings of Northumberland'. *NC* 2nd ser., 9, 54–105.
- Rollason, D. (2004) 'Anglo-Scandinavian York: the evidence of historical sources'. In R. Hall et al., *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York* (York, Archaeology of York 8/4), 305–24.
- Sawyer, P. (1995) 'The last Scandinavian kings of York'. *Northern History* 31, 39–44.
- Sawyer, P. (1998) *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire* (Lincoln).
- Smart, V. (1985) 'The moneyers of St Edmund'. *Hikuin* 11, 83–90.
- Smart, V. (1986) 'Scandinavians, Celts, and Germans in Anglo-Saxon England: the Evidence of Moneyers' Names'. In M.A.S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History* (Leicester), 171–84.
- Stewart, I. (1967) 'The St Martin coinage of Lincoln'. *BNJ* 36, 46–54.
- Stewart, I. (1982a) 'The anonymous Anglo-Viking issue with sword and hammer types and the coinage of Sihtric I'. *BNJ* 52, 108–16.
- Stewart, I. (1982b) 'The Nelson collection at Liverpool and some York questions'. *BNJ* 52, 247–51.
- Stewart, I. (1988) 'English coinage from Athelstan to Edgar'. *NC* 148, 192–214.
- Stewart, I. (1991) 'On the date of the Bossall hoard'. *NC* 151, 175–82.
- Stewart, I. and Lyon, S. (1992) 'Chronology of the St Peter coinage'. *Yorkshire Numismatist* 2, 45–73.

PLATE 28

*Anonymous Sword/Hammer type*



*St Martin's type*



A. With  
SITRIC RE

Cross type



Hammer type


B. With  
Mallet in legend

Cross type



# PLATE 30

*Sihtric Caech (cont.)*

C. With  and related coins

Cross type



SC7



SC8



SC7

Hammer type



SH4



SH5



Mallet type



SM1



SM2



SM3



SM4



St Peter imitation



ImStP1



ImStP1