THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE HIBERNO-DANISH COINAGE.

By H. ALEXANDER PARSONS.

The series of coins attributed to the Danish, or, more strictly speaking, Norse kings ruling in Ireland has always been a difficult problem, and its chronology has not so far been satisfactorily elucidated. Passing by as unsubstantiated and impossible the fanciful attributions of early writers on Irish coins, such as Simon and Lindsay, by whom meaningless letters or parts of letters were translated into the names of known chiefs, and imitations of Anglo-Saxon types were anachronistically given to Hiberno-Danish princes who held sway in Ireland before the introduction of the prototypes in England—we arrive at what must be regarded as the first step towards a proper view of this difficult series of coins. It was the work of the late Mr. Bernard Roth, F.S.A., who, in this Journal, brought together, at considerable expense and great labour, a complete description, with numerous illustrations, of all the varieties of these coins known at the time. Whilst every student of Irish coins must be grateful for the work of Mr. Roth, we must remember that it was offered by its author, with all the wealth of material it contains, not as any attempt to solve the insistent questions of sequence of the types and their chronology, but, as he tells us, in the hope that it might "prove to be of some use to future students." The author states, indeed, that he was no nearer a solution of the matter than was Dr. Aquilla Smith, who, writing on the "Human Hand on Hiberno-Danish coins," considered that the only Irish

2 Numismatic Chronicle, 1883.
prince of the period to whom coins could be allocated with certainty was Sihtric III, A.D. 989-1029. With this view, however, Mr. Roth did not agree, and, in a footnote, he demurred to it, but as his object was to collect materials for others rather than to express his own views, he gave no reasons for such dissent, and, indeed, he attempted to treat the conflicting theories of all previous writers impartially throughout his paper. For example, one is constantly met by remarks implying that other writers and collectors, whose works or opinions Mr. Roth had consulted, did not consider some of the coins were Hiberno-Danish, and although Mr. Roth inserts the pieces, he gives no reasons for so doing. The result is that many continental Danish, Norwegian and Swedish coins have been admitted into the monograph and rendered the subject more complex than before. In other words, Mr. Roth's purpose was descriptive rather than constructive.

The chief value, therefore, of Mr. Roth's work is undoubtedly his collation in one general view of practically all the known varieties of Hiberno-Danish coins, and, with its aid, supplemented by application of data available from continental coinages of the same epoch, it will, I think, be possible to place the Hiberno-Danish coins in their proper periods. In the process I desire to give full justice to Mr. Roth's labours, without which a further advance towards a solution of the subject would not have been possible.

The first step is to eliminate from Mr. Roth's work the coins which are certainly continental, and, for the sake of clarity, those which can only doubtfully be ascribed to Hiberno-Danish kings, for no reliable deductions can be made from coins which are not undoubtedly of the country treated.

In that relation it will be useful to refer to an article on the weights of the coins of the period which appeared in the Numismatic Chronicle of 1871. It is there shown that the imitations of Anglo-Saxon coins of very high weight are those of the primary issues of Sweden and Norway. As the undoubted coins of Ireland never exceed the weights of the relative types in England, and, as time

1 “Some account of the Weight of English and Northern Coins in the tenth and eleventh centuries,” by C. J. Schive.
progressed, came very far short of them, it follows, I think, that the coins of high weight are not Hiberno-Danish. This is proved by the fact that all these heavy pieces included in Mr. Roth's work have unintelligible legends, and the undoubted coins of Dublin with unintelligible inscriptions not only do not come up to the English weights, but fall, generally speaking, much below them. The anomaly of giving to Ireland a series of unintelligible coins of high weight—some run to 40 grains—at one extreme, with unintelligible coins of low weight—down to 5 grains—at the other, whilst, the coins with intelligible inscriptions only follow the weights of the Anglo-Saxon prototypes, will disappear if we assign to their true countries the coins of abnormal weights.

From various remarks made in Mr. Roth's work, it will be seen that the late Mr. L. E. Bruun, of Copenhagen, was also of opinion that some of these debatable coins of high weight belong, not to Scandinavian Ireland, but to Scandinavia proper. Further peculiarities about them are that the sites of their discovery are generally in Scandinavia and Finland. Their artistic feeling is also quite different from that of the true Irish coins, as a glance at the relative plates in Mr. Roth's paper will show. Whilst admitting that many undoubted Hiberno-Danish coins have been unearthed in the great northern peninsula, this seems no adequate reason why these heavy pieces, which differ in weight and artistic feeling from the true Hiberno-Danish coins, should be allocated to Ireland.

Applying the principle of high weight now enunciated, the undermentioned coins in Mr. Roth's work must be regarded as continental: 2, the last of his series 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 25, 77, two coins of series 185, 186 and 190. The other coins included in Mr. Roth's work which, in my view, although not on the weight test, are either certainly not, or in some cases are very doubtfully, Hiberno-Danish, are given hereunder. In this connection it should be observed that Mr. Roth explained that his group 53, Plate X, 235 to 242, were not Hiberno-Danish, but "Danish types that have been erroneously attributed to the Hiberno-Danish series." This group will not therefore be further referred to here.
Roth, Plate I, 11.—This is a very interesting and rare coin of Henry, Count of Stade, 976–1016. It was misread by Mr. Roth, and should be corrected to—

Obverse:—X HEINRICVS : CM = Henricus Comes.
Reverse:—X HROSA ME FEC retrograde = Hrosa made me.¹

Roth, Plate I, 14.—This is one of the very few types in the great series of Hiberno-Danish coins brought together by Mr. Roth which does not bear on one side a figure, more or less rude, of the prince under whose rule the coins were issued. On the other hand, there are numerous coins of Denmark on which this important detail is omitted, and, if one views the series of early bracteates of that country, there is sufficient in their designs to warrant an assumption that the obverse of number 14 was inspired by some of them, although the reverse no doubt had its prototype in the crux issue of Æthelred II. I think we are more justified in considering this a Danish, than a Hiberno-Danish, piece.

Roth, Plate III, 74, 75, and Plate IV, 80.—The workmanship of the bust and lettering marks these coins as distinct from the Irish series. The two latter were found in Finland. To which continental Scandinavian kingdom they belong is an open question.

Roth, Plate IV, 88.—This coin also stands quite alone in the series given in Mr. Roth’s work, at least as far as the obverse is concerned. It portrays a full-faced bust with a good representation of a tall crown. There is a far more life-like expression in the face than is usual on the coins of this period, and I feel that it belongs to a later age than that we are considering. It has much in common with the long-cross coins of Henry III, struck in the thirteenth century. I have little hesitation in saying that it is not Hiberno-Danish, and possibly not Scandinavian at all.

¹ These coins were ascribed by Schive in Norges Mynter i Middelalderen to Jarl Eric of Norway, A.D. 1009–1015, but it was demonstrated by Dannenberg in Die Deutschen Münzen der Sächsischen und Fränkischen Kaiserzeit that they belong to Henry the Good, Count of Stade, a town near the estuary of the Elbe.
Roth, Plate VIII, 182 and 183.—It is an open question whether these probably unique coins belong to Ireland. They do not directly follow Anglo-Saxon types, although the original of the obverse might have had its inspiration from the Agnus Dei design of Æthelred II. It is, however, more like the coins with galloping horse of Magnus the Good, A.D. 1042–1047, illustrated in Hauberg, Plate VII, 15. The quatrefoil ornament of the reverse of number 182 is undoubtedly taken from some types of the Danish Kings, Magnus the Good and Swend Estridsen, A.D. 1047–1075.

Roth, Plate VIII, 184.—This is a well-formed and well-struck specimen of the coinage of King Harthacnut of Denmark, A.D. 1035–1042. It clearly bears his name on the obverse, and is as clearly inscribed on the reverse side with the name of a well-known Danish moneyer of Lund, in East Denmark, and with the initial letter of the mint-place.

Roth, Plate VIII, 185 and 187.—Although these pieces weigh only 19·3 and 21 grains respectively, they are of the large module and general style of design and lettering of number 186, and of two other similar coins referred to by Mr. Roth on p. 124 of his paper following number 185. The weights of these latter are of the high standard of the earliest coinage of Sweden and Norway, to one of which countries they no doubt belong. All three coins, numbers 185, 186 and 187, are in the Helsingfors Museum and were found in Finland, which strengthens their attribution to one of the continental Scandinavian kingdoms.

Roth, Plate VIII, 191 and, in text, 191 A.—Here again, although the weight of the coins allows of their admission into the Hiberno-Danish series, the workmanship and lettering are so essentially different as to force them out of those coinages. They are associated in design with number 190 which, on the weight test, belongs to Scandinavia.

Roth, Plate VIII, 194.—Another specimen of this coin, in the R. Carlyon-Britton collection, is illustrated below, and in
my view belongs to the Norwegian series, ascribed by Schive\(^1\) to the
time of Harold Hardrada, very similar examples of which appear on
Plate III of Schive’s work. The specimen illustrated by Mr. Roth

![Norwegian Coin of the Time of Harold Hardrada, A.D. 1047-1066.](image)

should, I consider, follow this attribution; as also should numbers
192, 193 and 196, which, although their obverses approximate to the
Hiberno-Danish series, have reverses of the Norwegian coins.

Roth, Plate VIII, 195.—This coin is treated on the obverse
in quite a different style from that of the true Hiberno-Danish
pieces, and is a penny of Norway of the time of Harold
Hardrada, or soon after. Numerous examples are extant in Norway
—see also Schive, Plate III.

Roth, Plate IX, 201, 207 and 215.—These are so uncertain
in design, as well as in lettering, that I doubt whether they were
officially struck, the general workmanship and weight pointing to
contemporary forgery.

Whilst on the subject of misattributions, it might usefully be
mentioned that the coins illustrated in Lindsay\(^2\) as number 22,
plate 1; number 26, plate 2; number 28, supplementary plate 2;
and number 49, supplementary plate 3, are Anglo-Saxon coins of
Edward the Confessor. They are of the early types of that king on
which the royal name was often blundered. They are not referred
to therefore by Mr. Roth. Neither is the coin of Stephen’s period
illustrated in the "Rashleigh Sale Catalogue," plate IX, 601, which

\(^1\) Norges Mynter i Middelalderen, 1865.

\(^2\) A View of the Coinage of Ireland, 1839.
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was described as "Baronial, or possibly Irish." Although the legends on this latter coin are meaningless, the piece is far too well designed to be Irish.

Having eliminated the Danish, Norwegian and Swedish coins embodied in Mr. Roth's work, an analysis of the remainder discloses, besides a few apparently original or Danish designs, a number of imitations of Anglo-Saxon and Norman coins given in the standard works as follows:—

Æthelred II.—Hildebrand,¹ A, C, D and E; "British Museum Catalogue,"² i, iii variety a, iv variety a, and viii; Parsons,³ 2, 3, 4 and 5.
Cnut.—Hildebrand,¹ E, "British Museum Catalogue,"² viii.
Harold I.—Types not followed in Ireland.
Harthacnut.—Types not followed in Ireland.
Edward the Confessor.—Hildebrand¹ A, A variety c, and H; "British Museum Catalogue,"² i, ix and xiii; Carlyon-Britton,⁴ 2, 8 and ro.
Harold II.—Hildebrand¹ A; "British Museum Catalogue,"² i.

An allocation of these imitations, and others of native or Danish designs, to their approximate periods of issue can, I think, be secured, not merely by their association with the above related Anglo-Saxon issues, but also, and so far as the unintelligible pieces are concerned, mainly on consideration of the weights of the coins.

⁴ "Edward the Confessor and his Coins," Numismatic Chronicle, 1905.
In no instance does it appear that any Anglo-Saxon types issued prior to the crux coinage of Æthelred II were copied in Ireland, in proof of which it should be noted that the distinctive "Hand of Providence" design of Æthelred II fails to make its appearance. A rude type of hand does occur on a later series of Hiberno-Danish coins of low weight and with meaningless inscriptions, but it is entirely different from the "Hand of Providence" of the Anglo-Saxon coins, and it never appears as a sole type. It is derived from a Danish issue. The first deduction which can be made is, therefore, the important one as to when the Hiberno-Danish coinage was initiated. Clearly, it is after the time when the "Hand of Providence" issue was in circulation in England, and as the immediately succeeding type, the crux issue, is in evidence on Hiberno-Danish coins, the issue of that type in England, or soon after, witnessed the inception of the coins of Ireland—cp. Plate I, 1, the Anglo-Saxon prototype, and Plate I, 2, the Hiberno-Danish imitation. In fact, it can be proved that all the nations of the North commenced a metallic medium of exchange with imitations of this Anglo-Saxon crux type, and at much the same time as each other, namely, in the last decade of the tenth century. The first King of Norway to issue a coinage was Hakon the Bad, who was killed in A.D. 995, and it was based solely on the Anglo-Saxon crux type. The first King of Denmark to strike coins was Sweyn Forkbeard, A.D. 986-1014. His sole type is also based on the crux issue of England. The first monarch of Sweden to institute a coinage was Olaf Skötkonung, A.D. 995-1021 or 1022. Most of his coins follow the crux type. I have reason to believe that at least two other northern monarchs of the period instituted ephemeral coinages in imitation of the same Anglo-Saxon crux type.

In my article on the coin types of Æthelred II, I gave reasons for suggesting that the time of issue of the crux type in Britain was

---

1 The Earliest Coins of Norway, by H. Alexander Parsons, published by the American Numismatic Society in 1926.
2 Numismatic Chronicle, 1910.
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in or just prior to A.D. 991. It seems clear that the type is commemorative of the Danish raids of the time, and the trouble they brought on England. These raids first recommenced largely from the western islands, and there is little doubt that a proportion of the great Danegelt payment of A.D. 991 was participated in by many vikings from the west, which includes Ireland.

These Hiberno-Danish imitations of the crux type all bear inscriptions more or less intelligible, most of which read, on the obverse, +SITIR DIXFLML-O = Sihtric, King of Dublin, Plate I, 2. The paramount Norse king in Ireland at the time was Sihtric Silkbeard, who reigned from A.D. 989 to 1029 or 1035, and to him, therefore, is due the credit of first introducing, into Ireland, a metallic medium of exchange. In addition to the crux coins of Dublin bearing the name of Sihtric, a few others, all apparently from the same die, Plate I, 3, and unpublished by Mr. Roth, slavishly copy the name of ÆTHELRED on the obverse, although a Dublin moneyer’s name, and the Dublin mint-name, occur on the reverse. On one of Sihtric’s crux coins the bust is, by a die-sinker’s mistake, to the right instead of to the left (Roth, Plate I, 13).

The Dublin moneyers known of this crux issue are Arcetel, Ascetel, Fastolf, Lioelf, Reolece and Wulfgar. The latter is not given by Mr. Roth, but is in the British Museum. It has the name of Sihtric on the obverse. On the evidence of the prototype, this crux issue in Ireland belongs to the last decade of the tenth century. This is rendered certain by the date of Sihtric’s accession to the throne of Dublin.

Although Mr. Roth places the imitations of the quatrefoil type of Æthelred II (Hildebrand E) long after a succession of indecipherable pieces of the Irish long-cross issue of low weight— notwithstanding that the former are all of good weight and workmanship and bear intelligible legends—under the present writer’s arrangement of the coins of Æthelred II this quatrefoil type

---

1 This is virtually accepted by Mr. C. A. Nordman in his work on Anglo-Saxon Coins found in Finland, p. 31, published by the Finnish Archaeological Society in 1921.
succeeds the *crux* issue, and the imitations of it in Ireland should, therefore, follow those of the *crux* design. That they did so actually is, I think, indicated by the moneyers' names and by the absence of English town-names on this and on the preceding *crux* type, whereas on the imitations of the remaining types of Æthelred we get such names; also by the rarity of the coins, which is about the same as that of the *crux* imitations, whereas the imitations of Æthelred's two remaining types are of frequent occurrence; and by the fact that all the undoubted Irish imitations of the quatrefoil type invariably bear intelligible inscriptions.¹ For the Anglo-Saxon prototype, see Plate I, 4, and for the Hiberno-Danish imitation see Plate I, 5.

The Dublin moneyers of the quatrefoil type are Car, Eiomns, Fænemin, Færemín and Sivulf. The coins all belong to the reign of Sihtric Silkbeard, although some are inscribed on the obverse with the name of Æthelred. Their date is probably the very beginning of the eleventh century.

The imitations, in Ireland, of the Anglo-Saxon long-cross type follow those of the quatrefoil type, and so popular and constant did this become that it is as often as not called the "Irish" type, a description also alternatively given to the Anglo-Saxon prototype. The coins were, in Ireland, headed by a series of well-executed pieces of good weight and design (see Plate I, 6, for the Anglo-Saxon prototype, and Plate I, 7 to 11, for the first imitations). Plate I, 8, is a specially interesting and very rare instance of the use of the northern word, CUNUNG, for REX.

The names of the following Dublin moneyers occur on this first issue of well-struck intelligible long-cross coins: Car, Edric, Fænemin, Færemin, Ndremin, Godric, Goldstegen, Herm, Steng, Stireirn and Sivlt (Sivulf). Only such names as are clearly shown on the coins are given here. Those struck in conjunction with English mint-towns—which is a special feature of this and of the imitations of

¹ The coin of this type described as last of the series under Roth's number 181, and stated to have been found in Finland, is continental.
Æthelred’s remaining type, that of the small-cross—are excluded, on
the ground that they are merely slavish imitations, and do not
represent actual moneyers working in Dublin.

On the evidence of the prototype, the long-cross or Irish type
commenced approximately at the end of the first decade of the
eleventh century, the type in England probably dating round about
A.D. 1006.

The only two remaining types of coins struck in Dublin with
intelligible inscriptions are imitations of Æthelred’s small-cross issue
and Cnut’s quatrefoil type¹ (see Plate I, 12, for the Anglo-Saxon
prototype, and Plate I, 13, for the Hiberno-Danish imitation of the
small-cross issue, and Plate I, 14, for the Anglo-Saxon issue, and
Plate I, 15, for the imitation of the quatrefoil type of Cnut). That
the issue of the latter in Ireland came after the inception of the long-
cross issue is a self-evident proposition; and that the small-cross
issue does not come first in the Hiberno-Danish series, as it is placed
by Mr. Roth, is proved by the fact that no coins of Dublin imitating
Æthelred’s “Hand of Providence” issue are in evidence. That it
comes last is shown by the following Table of moneyers. The
significance of the epigraphic change in England of M-O to ON
between the moneyers’ and mint names was very largely lost in
Ireland. In this respect the Dublin moneyers remained conservative,
as was the case with some towns in England, especially those of the
north, e.g. York and Lincoln. The coins of these towns would reach
Ireland in larger numbers than specimens of the southern mints.

The Dublin moneyers of the Irish imitations of Æthelred’s
small-cross issue and Cnut’s quatrefoil type are as follows:

Small-cross issue.—Ælfelm, Fænemin, Færemín and Ndremin.
Cnut’s quatrefoil issue.—Stegn and Feremin.

The four readings of the last-mentioned type and moneyer,
on p. 212 of Hildebrand, were unaccountably omitted by Mr. Roth.

¹ This is Type E in Hildebrand, but it can be shown to be the first real type of
Cnut.
The moneyers' names on the four Dublin types imitating Æthelred's coins corroborate the sequence of the arrangement herein given, viz. in the order of Hildebrand C, E, D and A = Parsons' 2, 3, 4, and 5,¹ instead of Mr. Roth's disposition of the types in the order of Hildebrand A, C, D and E. This is demonstrated by the names of which specimens are known of at least two types, and which only can afford the necessary evidence.

They are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. —“Hand of Providence” Type.</th>
<th>C. —“Crux” Type.</th>
<th>E. —Quatrefoil Type.</th>
<th>D. —“Long-Cross” Type.</th>
<th>A. —“Small-Cross” Type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Dublin coins known of the type</td>
<td>No moneyers common to other types</td>
<td>Car Fænemin Færemín Sivulf</td>
<td>Car Fænemin Færemín Sivulf (Sivulf) Ndremín</td>
<td>— Fænemin Færemín — Ndremín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these names appear on the coins quite clearly. I think there is little doubt that Fænemin and Færemín are two different names, having regard to their clarity and to their constant repetition on many coins and types.

It will be seen from the above table that there is a clear run of the names through my revised types, whereas, under Mr. Roth's arrangement, the following improbable combination would be evolved:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. —“Small-Cross” Type.</th>
<th>B. —“Hand of Providence” Type.</th>
<th>C. —“Crux” Type.</th>
<th>D. —“Long-Cross” Type.</th>
<th>E. —Quatrefoil Type.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— Fænemin Færemín — Ndremín</td>
<td>No Dublin coins known of the type</td>
<td>No moneyers common to other types</td>
<td>Car Fænemin Færemín Sivulf (Sivulf) Ndremín</td>
<td>Car Fænemin Færemín Sivulf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is a significant fact that all the moneyers cited above are not only associated with the Dublin mint-name, but appear to be, with the possible exception of Car, exclusively Hiberno-Danish, being unknown on Anglo-Saxon and continental Danish coins. The moneyer Car comes in the same category if it is not an abbreviation of Carla, Carel, or Carig. Having regard to the small size of the three latter names, which renders abbreviation unnecessary, quite probably Car is the full name, more especially as the contemporary name of Dublin, viz. Dyflim, is also not a long one. The fact of these names being exclusively Hiberno-Danish conclusively proves that the coins on which they appear are not mere copies of names on the Anglo-Saxon prototypes, but that they were struck by native Dublin moneyers held responsible for their work by the striking of their names on the coins. The evidence for the sequence of the types shown by the run of these moneyers' names is, therefore, very striking.

No Hiberno-Danish coins imitating Cnut's second Anglo-Saxon Type—the Pointed Helmet issue, Hildebrand G—are extant, the one coin of this type in Roth, number 191, being, as already explained, a continental coin. This fact makes it clear that the intelligible coins of good weight ceased to be struck in Ireland by the time of the issue of Cnut's Pointed Helmet type in England. The period of circulation of this type in England was, on the evidence of the Swedish money of Cnut, brought to a close before A.D. 1027. How long before is a problem to be solved in connection with the contemporary English coinage, but it is evident that all the intelligible coinages of Dublin in the Hiberno-Danish period belong solely to the reign of Sihtric Silkbeard, who died in A.D. 1042, although he does not appear to have held the throne of Dublin later than A.D. 1035, if so long.

Before leaving these well-struck imitations of Anglo-Saxon types, which all come into Sihtric's regnal period, reference should be made to certain specimens of all the types enumerated, upon which appear

1 "Some Coins of Sigtuna inscribed with the names of Ætheired, Cnut and Harthacnut," British Numismatic Journal, 1915.
the names of Æthelred or Cnut, as the case may be, instead of Sihtric, cp. Plate I, 9, for a specimen bearing the name of Æthelred. So far as the long-cross or Irish type is concerned, specimens also exist formerly ascribed to a Donald, King of Monaghan, but of more recent years allocated to an unknown King Æynn, Plate I, 10. In connection with the first two kinds of inscriptions, those having the names of Æthelred and Cnut, I think there can be little doubt that as the Saxon designs of the relative coins were slavishly copied, so also were the obverse inscriptions, and instead of placing on the coins the name of their reigning prince, the die-sinkers of Sihtric copied the legends of the prototype as well as the designs, and so introduced the names of Æthelred and Cnut on Irish coins. In proof of this, it is certain that, whatever Cnut might have claimed as paramount King of the North, Æthelred II had no jurisdiction in Ireland. The charter upon which is founded a claim that Eadgar, his father, was lord over Ireland is, beyond question, a forgery, and although, in an expedition against the Northmen of Cumbria and the Isle of Man in A.D. 1000, Æthelred punished the marauders of those districts, he went no further than this, for he was soon called upon to deal with an enemy combination in the south, and immediately after the Isle of Man expedition went in hostile array to Normandy.

That these Irish coins, bearing the names of Æthelred and Cnut, are merely the result of imitation carried to mechanical excess, is also proved by the existence of pieces which, although struck, on the obverse, with the name of Sihtric, bear, on the reverse, the names of English towns and English moneyers. Plate I, 8, is an illustration. The reverse reads +GODPINE M'O PINT. No shred of evidence exists that Sihtric Silkbeard, however powerful he might have been in Ireland, had the slightest authority in England, and it cannot be argued that he placed his orders for coins in those towns, for the system of die-making at the time is against this. Neither can it be considered that some English die-sinkers were in his service, for the workmanship of the Anglo-Saxon coins is, as a rule, quite distinct in feeling from Sihtric's issues. As in the case
of the slavish imitation of the Æthelred and Cnut inscriptions of the obverses, so the cause of the introduction, on Irish coins, of these English mint-towns is due to mechanical imitation of the reverses. The die-maker in Dublin simply had in front of him, for guidance, Saxon coins with these names upon them, and he copied them without noticing, or troubling about, the lack of appositeness.

The reason for the insertion, on some of the long-cross type coins, of the name of ÆYMN is not so easy of explanation. The coins clearly come into the series of the Sihtric intelligible issues, and must belong to that period. Some of them bear the name of Sihtric's well-known and common moneyers Færemin and Fænemin. Having regard to the high grade of work of the coins, as a whole, and to the certain fact that they belong to Sihtric's time and to Sihtric's city, my alternative suggestion is that ÆYMN indicates Dublin, at the time known as ÆYFLIM, and frequently shown on the coins as ÆYFLMN. The crossed D is also not unknown on coins where the word can be no other than Dublin, e.g. on the reverse of a penny of Sihtric reading +ÆLFELM MO ÆYFELI, but almost conclusive proof of this new proposition is afforded by the coin figured below—

A PENNY OF DUBLIN, READING "ÆYMN." (R. C. LOCKETT COLLECTION.)

which on the obverse reads +SIHTRIC REÔX ÆYM = Sihtric, King of Dublin. A similar abbreviation of the name of Dublin also occurs on some of these Æymn coins, viz.—number 13, p. 76, in Mr. Roth's monograph, which has an obverse inscription of ÆYMN ROÔDER MNO. On these Æymn coins a usual word following the letters ROE+ is MNEîLMI. This reading is closely associated with a common form of obverse inscription on Sihtric's coins ending MO for MONETA, e.g. SIHTRIC RE+ ÆYFLN MO, i.e. King Sihtric's Dublin money. A still closer analogy is furnished by coin number 88, on p. 67 of
Mr. Roth’s work which, on the reverse, reads +SIHLO DIL MIELMI, i.e. Sihtric’s Dublin money. The obverse of the coin reads +SIHTRRE+ DYFLN for Sihtric, King of Dublin. These analogies are so close that I think we are justified in interpreting the reading ÆYMNRÆ+ ROE+ MNELMI, and variations, on this Æyrmn coinage, as the Dublin king’s money.

The history of the Norse kingdom of Dublin at the time of the coins would not be opposed to such an explanation. Both before and after this period, the Dublin kings were often temporarily displaced, and Sihtric himself does not appear to have retained the regnal office to the end of his life. The whole period is one of extreme confusion and, what with native Irish antagonism—and successful antagonism, for the Æyrmn coins were certainly struck within ten years before or after the battle of Clontarf, in A.D. 1014—and what with internal strife, a time when an inscription of “the Dublin King’s money” was suitable and applicable could easily have occurred in the history of the colony. That looseness of royal control existed in the Dublin mint is evidenced by the presence of the names of Æthelred and Cnut on the obverses and of English town names on the reverses of the Dublin coinage. I see less reason for inserting the names of Æthelred and Cnut on the coinage, than the stamping of an inscription meaning “the Dublin King’s money.” In fact, the latter is obviously far more applicable.

Although with the end of Sihtric’s reign we quit the era of coins definitely attributable to Norse kings in Ireland, it is possible to divide the remaining body of numismatic remains of that people and country into quite distinct periods, based upon the designs and workmanship and, more especially, upon the weights of the coins. Owing to the absence of any intelligible legends, I place the weight-test as of first importance at and from this period, because of the economic fact that the weight of a coin would be the prime factor in its retention or otherwise in currency. As regards this test, the ranges of weights given will be general. Isolated specimens in each of the weight groups may be outside the range given for the groups, but these exceptions do not invalidate the general rule.
The era of intelligible coins was, as will have been seen, on the
evidence of type-imitation, brought to a close at the earliest in
about A.D. 1020, and latest in about A.D. 1030, and immediately
following it there was continued a series of coins of the long-cross
or Irish type, which discloses a considerable amount of trueness to
type, and was fairly bold in workmanship. The Norse moneyers
seem to have made this type peculiarly their own, and when they,
for a time, ceased to imitate Anglo-Saxon types—for none of the
later types of Cnut and of the types of Harold I and Harthacnut were
imitated by them—they took for inspiration the most frequent of
the types with intelligible legends circulating in their country, viz.
the long-cross issue, and made that the basis of imitation for a long
period. In fact they never wholly relinquished it. The coins
following the era of intelligible legends have also many well-formed
letters in the inscriptions, Plate I, 16, but these letters are, with a
few rare exceptions, so mixed or imperfect, especially in the later coins
(cp. Plate I, 17), as to render the legends meaningless. With one or two
unauthorized deviations, the weights of the coins show a very decided
drop from the standard of the previous issues, and vary from 10 to
15 grains. These weights follow the lowering of the weight of the
coins in the contemporary Anglo-Saxon issues. After the first
real issue of Cnut, Hildebrand E, up to and including the primary
types of Edward the Confessor, the average weight of Anglo-Saxon
coins runs only to 16 or 17 grains each.

A special feature marks most of the specimens of this period
of unintelligible Hiberno-Danish coins. It is that on the reverse
now appears a distinctive design, generally in two quarters, of
what has been called a branched hand containing 3, 4, 5, or 6
fingers (Plate I, 17, 18, and 19). I do not think that there is real
justification for continuing this description. Quite apart from the
fact that on some of the coins the object has only 3 or 4, and on some
6, members, instead of the 5 necessary for a hand, there occur side
by side with these coins others which bear quite a realistic presenta­
tion of a small open hand. Those coming at the beginning of the
period disclose this appendage on the reverse in one quarter with
the thumb shown in its proper size and position, and with a clearly defined palm and wrist (Plate I, 20). This coin is closely associated both by workmanship and weight with Plate I, 11, which was probably the last of the long-cross coins to be struck at Dublin with intelligible inscriptions. Plate I, 20, was followed later in the period by coins illustrated by Plate I, 21, which disclose a small hand of rather ruder work, which is the general characteristic of the coins, in each of two quarters of the reverse. If the branch-like objects shown in Plate I, 17, 18, and 19, were intended to represent hands, they would be of the clear type shown on the coins of their period as represented in Plate I, 20 and 21. If any further demonstration of this is required, it is supplied by Plate II, 22, on which a clear hand showing the back appears on the neck, with the branch-like objects, as usual, on the reverse. These latter therefore clearly indicate something different from a human hand. The same conclusion was arrived at by Dr. Aquilla Smith when contrasting the hand shown on the obverse of our Plate II, 23, with the branch-like objects on its reverse.

The clearly marked hand introduced on the obverse in front of the bust (Plate II, 23) is an idea taken from a similar design on some of Harthacnut's coins of Denmark (Plate II, 24). Counting his rule in Denmark during his father's lifetime, Harthacnut reigned there from A.D. 1028 to A.D. 1042. The Hiberno-Danish coins with the hand on the obverse, therefore, on this ground come into a period not earlier than 1028 and not later than a few years after 1042. The coins of the 10-grain to 15-grain period we are now considering are also noticeable for the numerous subsidiary marks, such as pellets, annulets, and crosses, scattered over the field of the obverse, or reverse, or both. They do not, in my opinion, have any special meaning as is undoubtedly the case of symbols on the Anglo-Saxon and Norman prototype coinages. They should, it is thought, be regarded as the effect of slavish imitation and the play of fancy on the part of illiterate die-sinkers. Some of the objects appear on
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the metal ornaments of the time. Generally speaking, the bust on
the long-cross type coins of this period is to left, but on a few rare
exceptions it is cut to right (Plate II, 32; also numbers 117, 137,
156, 157, and 161 in Mr. Roth's article).

The circulation of the Hiberno-Danish coins under notice
certainly lasted several years into the reign of Edward the Confessor
in England, and this is demonstrated, not only by the absence
of imitation in Ireland of the late types of Cnut, and of the issues
of Harold I and Harthacnut, but also by the composition of the
Dunbrody (Wexford) find of 1837. This hoard contained over 1,000
pennies of Edward the Confessor, several of each of the kings Harold I
and Harthacnut, and some hundreds of the Hiberno-Danish series.
These latter appear to have been all of the long-cross type under
notice. From the meagre details known of this hoard, the first three
real types of Edward the Confessor were certainly in evidence.
This excludes the ephemeral or interim Harthacnut type. On the
analogy of other hoards of coins of Edward the Confessor, probably
that of Dunbrody included two further types of Edward at the
most. The Hiberno-Danish coins we are now considering appear,
therefore, on the various grounds mentioned above, to range from
about A.D. 1025 or 1030 to A.D. 1050. During the later years two
noticeable variations were adopted. The first was the introduction of
a crozier-like object in front of the bust (Plate II, 25), and the second
combines a similar kind of obverse with a reverse of the small-cross
design (Plate II, 26). This latter is evidently taken from the first
small-cross issue in England of Edward the Confessor (Plate II, 27)
assigned by Major Carlyon-Britton to the years 1042-5.1

Although all unintelligible, the earlier coins of this period disclose
fairly distinct traces of the elements of the name of Sihtric (Plate I, 16),
and this links the issue on to the period of intelligible coins, which
probably ceased to be struck between A.D. 1020 and A.D. 1030. At
the other extreme, the legends are composed almost entirely of
straight strokes (Plate II, 23, 25, and 26). These earlier coins, with

1 "Edward the Confessor and his coins," Numismatic Chronicle, 1905.
the elements of Sihtric’s name on them, must have been issued at
the end of the reign of Sihtric Silkbeard, and they were the first
step in the degradation of coin design, and of the weight standard, in
Ireland, which ensued after the first abandonment of imitation of
current Anglo-Saxon types. The Hiberno-Danish die-sinkers now
evidently selected specimens of the well-struck intelligible native
imitations of the long-cross type mainly in circulation (Plate I,
7 to 11), and imitated them instead of the Anglo-Saxon issues of
the time. The imitations being lighter than the preceding currency,
speedily drove out the latter, and were left as a sole type in the
period between 1025 and 1050 named above. As a result, the coins
of good weight and with intelligible inscriptions are all rare, and
this is especially the case with the crux and quatrefoil types which
come first.

It is evident that a new era of weight-reduction occurs in the
Hiberno-Danish coinage about A.D. 1050. The coins are not reduced
in size, except at the end of the period, but are of more slender
fabric. Some of them appear also to be of baser metal. At first the
influence of the long-cross or Irish type of design maintained its ground
on coins illustrated by Plate II, 28, which, on the obverse, repeated
the Irish bust with the crozier-like sceptre in front. The reverse,
however, introduces a new and characteristic type in the form of a
cross-botonné in two of the angles, and of a trefoil of pellets in the
other two quarters. A variation of this is noticeable in Plate II, 29,
whereon the crozier-like object is placed on the neck.

Several other distinctive types occur in this period, and they
serve to indicate the approximate limits of it. The first presents
imitations of the martlet device on the coins of Edward the
Confessor (Plate II, 30), which would be known and seen in Ireland
before A.D. 1060. Plate II, 31 and 32, illustrate this new departure,
but it will be seen that the conventional “Irish” type of obverse is
maintained. Plate II, 33, still follows the martlet design on the reverse,
but introduces a new type on the obverse, which consists of a full-
face bust, the inspiration of which is probably derived from the only
full-face type of the late-Saxon period, viz. Edward the Confessor’s
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type 10¹ (Plate II, 34). Beyond the fact that both designs are full-face ones, there is, however, little in common between the Saxon prototype and the Irish imitation. Coins similar to Plate II, 35, are connected with those like Plate II, 33, but eliminate the martlet, whilst coins illustrated by Plate II, 37, are connected with Figs. 33 and 35 by their identical obverses. A continuation of the full-face type, although varied, occurs in coins illustrated by Plate II, 36, and a new type belonging to the period, and inspired from continental Danish sources, is illustrated by Plate II, 38. The obverse depicts the Irish bust of the period, but with various large ornaments on the neck; and on the reverse there is a sort of expanded quatrefoil, like the well-known Danish type of Swend Estridsen, A.D. 1047–75 (Plate II, 39). A variation of this reverse is to be seen in Plate II, 40, on which the quatrefoil is closed at the ends. This reverse links on to an issue of coins of small module, but of the same weight, represented by Plate II, 41. This in turn is, by its obverse with the hand on the neck, linked on to coins illustrated by Plate II, 42, and Plate III, 43 and 44. The reverse of Plate III, 44, is connected with the issue of coins represented by Plate III, 45 and 46, which latter commence a new period on the ground of their increased weight and size.

Notwithstanding the variety of design of the period just dealt with, I am not of opinion that any real division of the coins amongst the kings of Dublin of the time can be made. The designs are not only more crude than those of the preceding period (cp. Plate II, 28–42, and Plate III, 43–44, with Plate I, 16–21, and Plate II, 22–26), but the inscriptions are, in every case, quite frankly reduced to mere strokes. The rude departures from type are simply evidence of the weakness and lack of control over the coinage of the time. The weight of the pieces again seems to be the proper basis of separation from preceding and succeeding periods. In this period these weights reach the lowest ebb of decay in the Hiberno-Danish coinage, generally descending to the level of from 5 to 10 grains, although a few go a little above. On the basis of type-imitation of

¹ "Edward the Confessor and his coins," Numismatic Chronicle, 1905.
both Anglo-Saxon and Danish coins, I would place the period we have been considering to approximately A.D. 1050–65.

The next period of the Hiberno-Danish coinage is marked by an improvement in the weight standard, for the coins run from 10 to 15 grains. They are also brought back to their ordinary size, as pointed out in connection with Plate III, 45 and 46, which probably commenced the series. That the other issues I am now about to describe were struck after A.D. 1065 is evident from the prototypes, which are to be sought in the coinages of Harold II, William I and William II; but they are generally made up of hybrid designs which, in conjunction with their variety, make it probable that there was no regularly authorized succession in the issues, the dies being cut with designs just as fancy dictated them to the die-sinkers and limited only by the prototypes which were available for suggestion. Hence, although the types are numerous, a period of issue based not upon the succession of kings, but upon the general weight, is again the only certain method of division.

Harold II’s *pax* type is imitated, so far as the reverse is concerned, on coins represented by Plate III, 47, as will be seen from the prototype (Plate III, 48), but, on the obverse, the Irish type of bust still holds its ground, as was the case with the coins represented by Plate III, 45 and 46.

The first recognizable Norman coinage imitated in Ireland is William I’s type III (Plate III, 49), which inspired the imitations represented by Plate III, 50, for the reverse, and by Plate III, 51, for the obverse. The obverse of Plate III, 50, links the issue to coins represented by Plate III, 52, whilst the reverse of the latter, with the characteristic branch-like object in one quarter, shows that there is a near connection with coins of the preceding weight-period A.D. 1050–65. The reverse of Plate III, 51, also indicates the same fact by its similarity to the reverse of Plate II, 31. But its obverse design and weight brings it into the period after A.D. 1065. The reverse of Plate III, 52, links up with the issue of coins represented by Plate III, 53, on the obverse of which appears a design comparable with the pennies of William I, type V (Plate III, 54). The issue
of coins represented by Plate III, 53, is connected with those represented by Plate III, 55, by the identical obverses. The reverse of Plate III, 55, has something of the appearance of the *paxs* type VIII of William I (Plate III, 56), of which a decided Hiberno-Danish copy appears in the unique coin represented by Plate III, 57. In the meantime, or concurrently with the latter, there appears an issue of Hiberno-Danish coins represented by Plate III, 59, clearly copied from William I’s type IV (Plate III, 58). The only other recognizable Norman type is represented by coins illustrated as Plate III, 61, which has fairly clear points of resemblance with Plate III, 60, the prototype, which is William II’s type II.

The coins of the period we are now considering may have resulted from an attempt to restore the integrity of the money of Dublin, but it seemingly failed, for extremely few pieces have come down to our times. Some of the types enumerated above are, indeed, represented only by single specimens. Plate III, 61, being an imitation of a penny of William II’s second coinage in England, proves that this period lasted to about A.D. 1090-95, and the absence of copies of the subsequent English types indicates that the Hiberno-Danish coinage practically ended then.

To the few years following, however, and immediately prior to the introduction of the bracteate money of the twelfth century, I would attribute the coins similar to those illustrated by Plate III, 62 and 63; also a further specimen, still more crude, figured in Simon¹ as No. 2 on the editor’s additional plate. They are all of extremely rude workmanship, even for the Hiberno-Danish coinage, and some are even without strokes for the legends, a feature which connects them with the bracteate issue. Although, generally speaking, the weight of these coins might justify placing them in the period A.D. 1050-65, their abnormally large size, and the absence, in some cases, of strokes, not to speak of letters, for the legends, render an attribution to that period improbable. These features, indeed, place them in a category of their own and, in these particulars, as well as by weight, they

¹ Essay on Irish Coins, 1810.
are similar to the bracteate money of the twelfth century. The evidence is therefore strong that they immediately precede that curious issue, which was, in the twelfth century, not only a feature of the Hiberno-Norse currency, but also of that of Norway itself.

As a result of the arguments advanced in the foregoing pages we arrive at the following conclusions:—

1. The first independent coinage of Ireland, so far known, commenced in the last decade of the tenth century, and was struck in Dublin\(^1\) under the Hiberno-Danish king, Sihtric Silkbeard. It was an imitation of the crux type of Ethelred II (Plate I, 2 and 3). Sihtric Silkbeard was made king in Dublin in A.D. 989, dethroned for a time and restored in A.D. 994. He died A.D. 1042. He does not, however, appear to have reigned later than A.D. 1029 or possibly, according to some authorities, A.D. 1035. His coinages are divisible into five distinct types (Plate I, 2, 5, 7, 13, and 15). They are composed of coins of good weight and workmanship, which all bear more or less intelligible inscriptions. They come to an end between A.D. 1025 and A.D. 1030.

2. Coinages subsequent to those of Sihtric Silkbeard are all without intelligible inscriptions, although some of the early ones bear the elements of Sihtric’s name on the obverse. These subsequent coinages are divisible into four periods based on the weights of the coins, as follows:—

\((a)\) Coins of weights ranging from 10 to 15 grains each, and issued probably from about A.D. 1025 or 1030 to A.D. 1050 (Plate I, 16 to 21, and Plate II, 22, 23, 25, and 26).

\((b)\) Coins of weights ranging from 5 to 10 grains each, and issued from about A.D. 1050 to A.D. 1065 (Plate II, 28

---

\(^1\) I can trace no evidence that any coins were struck in the Norse settlements of Wexford, Waterford and Cork. Limerick had certainly passed to the control of the native Irish before the date of the earliest Dublin money.
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and 29, 31 to 33, 35 to 38, 40 to 42, and Plate III, 43 and 44).

(c) Coins of weights ranging from 10 to 15 grains each, and issued from about A.D. 1065 to A.D. 1095 (Plate III, 45, 46, 47, 50 to 53, 55, 57, 59 and 61).

(d) Coins of large module, but of low and very variable weight, approximating to the bracteate issue, struck perhaps for a few years after A.D. 1095 (Plate III, 62 and 63).

Applying the conclusions arrived at above to the coins described by Mr. Roth in vol. VI of the Journal, except of course those of continental origin already dealt with, the periods of issue of those coins are as shown in the Appendix. This list, if consulted in conjunction with the detailed description of the coins in Mr. Roth's article, and the generous array of plates illustrating it, will enable students and collectors to ascribe similar coins to their proper chronological periods.

The coins used in illustration of this paper are in the following cabinets. My thanks are due to the Institutions and collectors mentioned for the kindly help afforded. It would have been impossible adequately to demonstrate the sequence of the issues without the aid which the complete set of illustrations affords.

The British Museum ... ... Numbers 15 and 41.
The late Mr. L. E. Bruun ... ... , 20, 21, 45, 46, 53 and 59.
Mr. R. Carlyon-Britton ... ... , 5, 22, 26, 37, 38, 42, 43, 50 and 55.
The Copenhagen Royal Collection ... ... , 33, 35 and 40.
Mr. R. C. Lockett ... ... ... , 31, 61 and 62.
Mr. H. A. Parsons ... ... ... , 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 44, 47, 48, 49, 52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60 and 63.

The Royal Irish Academy ... ... ... ... 25, 29 and 51.
The Stockholm Royal Collection ... Number 11.
Mr. E. H. Wheeler ... ... ... ... 24.


### APPENDIX.

**Chronological Arrangement of the Hiberno-Danish Coins figured on Plates I to X in Vol. VI of this Journal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period—Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Type or Weight</th>
<th>Numbers of the Coins given in Vol. vi, pp. 55—146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 995—1000 ...</td>
<td><em>Crux</em> type</td>
<td>9, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1000—1005 ...</td>
<td>Quatrefoil type</td>
<td>181.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1005—1015 ...</td>
<td>Long-cross type</td>
<td>16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1015—1020 ...</td>
<td>Small-cross type</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1020—1025 ...</td>
<td>Cnut type</td>
<td>189.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 1095—1100 ...</td>
<td>Bracteate type...</td>
<td>180, 188, 223, 224, 225, 226, 234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All periods ...</td>
<td>Alien or doubtful Irish types</td>
<td>2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 25, 26, 27, 75, 77, 80, 82, 83, 88, 142, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 201, 207, 215 and 235 to 242.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COINS OF EDWARD IV AND HENRY VI ILLUSTRATING THE SEQUENCE OF MINT-MARKS PRECEDING, DURING AND SUCCEEDING THE RESTORATION OF HENRY VI