The Myth of a Coinage of the Ostmen of Dublin in the Name of Tymme Sjællandsfar

By R. H. M. Dolley

In his account of a further parcel of coins from the Sand hoard from Stiklestad to the north of Trondheim, the late talented amateur V. Ronander has suggested that we associate with the Danish hero Tymme Sjællandsfar a little group of coins with obverse legend +BYMN— which seem to be certainly Irish.¹ The suggestion was a novel one, and scarcely to be taken seriously, and no less an authority than Dr. Georg Galster has as lightly dismissed it with the words ‘den Gastning kan vel være ligesaa god som saa mange andre’.² The purpose of this note, however, is not to explain the obverse legend on the Irish coins in question—that is something that awaits a numismatist versed in the niceties of Old Irish and Old Norse—but simply to suggest that there are some purely numismatic considerations which render impossible this attribution to the historical Tymme Sjællandsfar. Incidentally, it should perhaps be put on record at the outset that the suggestion that any coins bear the name of Tymme or were struck by his authority is ignored by the editors of the Dansk Biografisk Leksikon, the appropriate fascicule of which appeared in 1943.

Virtually the sole source of our knowledge concerning Tymme Sjællandsfar is the History of Saxo Grammaticus. From this work it is clear that Tymme did not achieve prominence until the war between Cnut and Eadmund Ironside, until, that is, the summer of 1016. In the course of a particularly hard-fought battle—in all probability that fought at Ashingdon on 18 October—he is supposed single-handed to have rallied the Danish line at a critical juncture, and it would seem that his personal gallantry played a decisive role in the ensuing victory. It is natural that a feat of this description should have received a lavish reward, and Cnut himself was not a leader slow to honour a faithful follower, but one cannot help wondering if it is historically very plausible that the hero, a man apparently altogether without experience of authority and still less of diplomacy, should have received, as Ronander suggests, the vice-gerency of the Ostmen of Dublin, a notoriously turbulent race with whom the Danish masters of England appear ever to have been peculiarly chary of becoming embroiled. At this very time, too, it was the House of Munster that was in a position to have imposed a governor upon the Hiberno-Norsemen, but it seems to have been content to have left Dublin to the wily Sihtric III Silkbeard who would not have been likely to go wooing new masters when Brian’s heirs had extended such surprising clemency after the debacle of Clontarf.

In this connexion we should register an emphatic protest at the assump-

tion, by no means confined to Ronander, that the existence of Hiberno-Norse coins with the names of Æthelræd and Cnut, the latter, incidentally, very rare indeed, implies that either king ever claimed, let alone enjoyed, the least degree of sovereignty, albeit nominal, over the Hiberno-Norsemen of Leinster, the Ostmen. To the best of my knowledge no student has ever suggested that Æthelræd the Unready was recognized as, or even claimed to be, overlord of Skåne, and yet Lund coins in his name are far from uncommon. In the same way, coins of the Ostmen with his name and of English type bear witness only to the esteem which the heavier English pence enjoyed among Scandinavian traders generally. In this context, too, we should not lose sight of the fact that the ‘Irish type’ par excellence in the first half of the twelfth as well as throughout the eleventh century was a more or less faithful imitation of the Long Cross type of Æthelræd II, the only English substantive issue after 973 consistently to have been struck on a weight-standard approaching 27 grains (= 1.75 grammes).

This is not the place to essay a full-dress study of the Hiberno-Norse coinage, but it may be as well briefly to indicate the principal outlines as regards the period c. 990–1020, the period to which the BYMN coins must on any telling belong. Such a sketch may seem the more desirable since there is as yet no survey of the Hiberno-Norse coinage which has taken into account the hoards, and perhaps we should also add the circumstance that even before 1750 at least one of the BYMN coins had been found in Ireland, an example being illustrated as no. 30 on Plate 2 of Simon’s Essay towards an Historical Account of Irish Coins. The first edition of this work appeared in 1749, before, that is, coins from Scandinavian hoards had begun to find their way into the cabinets of English and Irish collectors, and in passing we may remark that Simon attributed the coin in question to ‘one Donald, king of Monaghan’, a prince no less shadowy than many others that grace the pages of the history of Ireland’s golden age. In 1872 three further coins of BYMN were found together in a small hoard from Derrymore in Westmeath and the reason for their non-publication would seem to be that no less an authority than Aquilla Smith found their attribution impossible.

It is now established that the coinage of the Ostmen in Ireland began not later than the middle of the last decade of the tenth century. The first emission seems to have been on quite a considerable scale, and is best known from a large early nineteenth-century find from Clondalkin just outside Dublin. It consists of crude but more or less faithful copies of the Crux issue of Æthelræd II, most of the coins but not all replacing the name of the English king by that of Sihtric, while on some the mints and moneyers of the English prototypes appear in blundered but still recognizable form. There is here, of course, a neglected analogy with the first Sigtuna coinage of Olof Skotkonung, a coinage which I believe to be almost exactly contemporary with the Irish

1 Op. cit., 1st ed. 1749, p. 5; 2nd ed. 1810, p. 5. The coin appears to be a duplicate of the Stockholm fragment Hild. 14 (infra, p. 287, no. 20). This and two more coins (infra, pp. 286–7, nos. 10 and 15) appear on the White/Duane Plate dated 1758 which is included in the 1810 edition after the ‘Second Additional Plate’. That the coins were found in Ireland is probable, but White’s reputation is such that his explicit statement must be taken with caution—hence the (?) after the relevant entries in the ‘Check-List’.

2 Infra., p. 284.
issues derived from the same prototypes. Most of the Irish coins weigh 1.40 grammes or more, and a very high proportion 1.60 grammes or more, and it is clear that the weight-standard aimed at must have been in the region of 27 grains, higher, that is, than that achieved by the prototypes. Examples in Swedish hoards are very rare indeed, and it is a curious circumstance that the half a dozen specimens that have come to my notice should include two pairs of die-duplicates (Pl. XVII, 1-4), though in one case there has been an alteration to the reverse die. One is indeed tempted to infer that import of coins of this class may have been confined to one or two occasions. There is, incidentally, a remarkable lack of continuity, stylistic, formal, metrological, and prosopographical, as regards this first of the Dublin coinages and the second, but it is impossible to intercalate a numismatic vacuum embracing more than a very few years. The Crux imitations cannot have begun before 992—the English prototypes not having been put into circulation before Michaelmas 991—and there is some reason to think that their issue may have extended over a number of years. The Long Cross imitations which succeeded them, on the other hand, had been put out in considerable quantity by the time that the great hoards from Igelosa, Gaulverjabær, and List were deposited, i.e. by 1005 at the very latest.

To the earliest phase of these Long Cross imitations—probably to be dated not more than a few months after the emission of the English prototypes at Michaelmas 997—would seem to belong a few heavy coins with inscriptions SIHTRIC CUNUNG (Pl. XVII, 5), SISIG (Pl. XVII, 6) and OGSEN (Pl. XVII, 7), most of which make some attempt to approximate to the 27 grain (1.75 grammme) standard of the prototypes, but the bulk of the coinage consists of slightly lighter coins with legends such as SIHTRC REX and ÆDELÆRÆD REX, the final ‘X’ of the royal title being written almost invariably ‘+’.1 Some of these pieces (Pl. XVII, 8) make no attempt to conceal their Irish origin, but others (Pl. XVII, 9) are dangerously close imitations which even deceived authorities of the calibre of Bror Emil Hildebrand. In between come coins in the name of Sihtric which have reverses directly copied from those of English coins (Pl. XVII, 10)—and the students who have postulated an English hegemony over Dublin should surely reflect whether these coins do not demand acceptance of Irish sovereignty over Derby!—and also coins in the name of ÆEthelræd with the Dublin mint-signature (Pl. XVII, 11).

In England at Michaelmas 1003 the Long Cross pennies were called in, and their place taken by coins of the so-called Helmet type struck on a notably lighter weight-standard. Imitations of these are known from Ireland (Pl. XVII, 12 and 13) but are far from common even in the Scandinavian hoards, and we may suspect that there was prejudice against the new type on account of its inferiority of weight. It is just possible, too, that some of the lighter Long Cross imitations of good workmanship were struck parallel with these, but unfortunately there is not as yet the hoard-evidence that will enable us to establish exactly when these copies began to be ‘differenced’ by the addition of four pellets to the reverse type. In England at Michaelmas 1009 the

1 On the importance of this criterion, cf. C. A. Nordman, Anglo-Saxon Coins Found in Finland, p. 83.
Helmet coins were in turn called in, and an issue began of the so-called Last Small Cross coins. It was doubtless the fact that for a short time these were struck and issued on a 27-grain standard that explains why Irish imitations are relatively common, and again we may distinguish coins in the name of Sihtric struck at Dublin (Pl. XVII, 14), coins purporting to be struck for him at English mints (Pl. XVII, 15), and other ‘mules’ purporting to be struck for Æthelraed at Dublin (Pl. XVII, 16). From the Tjøre find from Norway it is clear that these imitations were struck within a year or two of the English prototypes, and also that parallel with them were issued the ‘differenced’ copies of the earlier Long Cross coins of Sihtric (Pl. XVII, 17) of reasonably good weight and style.

On 23 April 1014 Hiberno-Norse military supremacy in Ireland, already mauled at Tara in 980 and Glen Mama in 1000, received a crippling blow in the course of the day-long Good Friday fight at Clontarf. Few coins struck by the Ostmen after that date have been found in Scandinavia, although the Irish hoards reveal that Dublin continued to strike coins in very large numbers indeed. The reason for the discrepancy must surely be sought in a drastic reduction of the weight of the Irish penny, a reduction due in part doubtless to the military disasters that clouded the latter part of Sihtric’s reign but even more to sharp fluctuations in the weight of the English pennies which still provided one last prototype.¹ A handful of Irish imitations are known of the Quatrefoil issue of Cnut which was probably put into circulation at Michaelmas 1017, and the solitary specimen found in Sweden weighs no more than 13·1 grains (0·84 grammes) and the single specimen from Finland 15·1 grains (0·98 grammes). Such light-weight pieces (Pl. XVII, 18) could not have hoped successfully to compete with English coins of the same period, let alone those of a decade earlier, and in fact the moneyers of Dublin seemed to have preferred striking even more degenerate copies of Sihtric’s First Long Cross issue (Pl. XVII, 19–21). Irish finds suggest that these were struck for as much as two decades before being replaced by even lighter coins again ‘differenced’ by the addition of either one or two ‘hands’ in opposite quarters on the reverse (Pl. XVII, 22), and not only are the latter completely lacking from Swedish finds, but the few coins of the earlier class found in Sweden seem all to belong to the earliest group, and it is my belief that there has still to be found in Sweden a Hiberno-Norse coin of Dublin struck after 1030 at the very latest.²

It is against this background that we must set the coinage in the name of DYMN which Ronander has attributed to Tymme Sjællandsfar and dated in consequence to the period after 1015. In an appendix I have sought to list every known die of this coinage, and the principal varieties are illustrated on the accompanying plate (Pl. XVIII). Leaving aside the hoard-evidence—and this as we shall see would be decisive in itself—there seem to me to be two lines of argument which are fatal to the Tymme hypothesis. The first concerns

¹ Recent work has established that the Last Small Cross issue was struck on two weight-standards (27 grains and 22·5 grains), and, though it is not yet possible to achieve the same precision, there is reason to think that Quatrefoil was struck in part at least on an 18-grain standard.

² In the Copenhagen collection I have noted two of the 'hand' coins, one from the Sandød hoard from the Faroes, and one from the Stora Taarnby (Valø) hoard from Sjælland, both hoards to be dated ±1050.
the style and the fabric of the coins. All of them are imitations of the Long Cross type, but none appear to be ‘differenced’ by the addition of pellets to the reverse type, although such a ‘difference’ would seem to have been an essential of the Sihtric Long Cross coins at least from c. 1010 onwards. Moreover, stylistically the BYMN coins seem much more closely linked to the early Sihtric coins of the type than to the later issue, and epigraphical arguments appear to point in the same direction.\(^1\) There is, too, the question why the BYMN coins struck c. 1015 should not only be qualitatively better than, but in the Swedish finds heavily outnumber, the ‘sub-Sihtric’ coins which Irish hoards suggest were struck in far greater quantity; ‘but that is another story’, and one that there is no need to go into here at any length.

The metrology of the BYMN coins may seem to provide other arguments why they should be dated earlier than is consistent with any attribution to Tymme Sjællandsfar. In Sweden I have noted the weights of twenty specimens, and a frequency-table constructed on this basis has the following pattern:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{-0.949} \\
0.95-1.049 \quad \times \\
1.05-1.149 \quad \times \times \\
1.15-1.249 \quad \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \\
1.25-1.349 \quad \times \times \times \times \times \\
1.35-1.449 \quad \times \times \times \times \\
1.45- \\
\end{array}
\]

The pattern is not seriously modified if we add the weights of two coins in the British Museum (both found in Ireland?), of five coins in the Royal Coin Cabinet at Copenhagen, of one coin at Oslo (purchased in Sweden), of two coins at Dublin and one at Belfast, of four coins at Schleswig recorded as occurring in the List hoard from Sylt in North Frisia, and of the three coins found at Derrymore which cannot now be traced:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{-0.949} \\
0.95-1.049 \quad \times \\
1.05-1.149 \quad \times \times \times \\
1.15-1.249 \quad \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \\
1.25-1.349 \quad \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \\
1.35-1.449 \quad \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \times \\
1.45-1.549 \quad \times \\
1.55- \\
\end{array}
\]

From the above table it would seem that all the BYMN coins were struck on an approximation to one weight-standard, and that this last was perhaps as high as 1.45 grammes (or 22.5 grains). In this connexion it will not be forgotten that the Quatrefoil coins of Dublin—the one issue which we can be certain was contemporary with the period of Tymme’s alleged vice-gerency—seem to have been struck on a weight-standard that certainly was not in excess of 1.12 grammes (or 18 grains) and may have been appreciably lower.

Prima facie, therefore, the BYMN coins are quite appreciably earlier than the fourth lustre of the eleventh century, and in fact metrological arguments reveal their approximate date with rather more precision than might have been

\(^1\) A further point that might be made is that the average diameter of the earlier Long Cross coins is 19 mm. and of the ‘differenced’ later issue only 18 mm., the ‘Tymme’ coins approximating much more closely to the former.
expected in the case of an imitative series. The following frequency-tables are based on the Hiberno-Norse coins that I examined in the course of my last visit to Stockholm, the coins in the Systematic collection being supplemented in every case by material from the hoards:

**Crux (‘Clondalkin’) Type—all before a.d. 1000?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25-1.349</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35-1.449</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45-1.549</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55-1.649</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly the weight-standard cannot be postulated on the basis of so few coins, but an analysis of the weights of a number of these coins in the British Museum collection and in the possession of a London dealer enable me to hazard a guess that it was in the neighbourhood of 1.75 grammes (or 27 grains).

**Long Cross Type—all before a.d. 1005?**

(a) with obverse legend SISIG...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45-1.549</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55-1.649</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65-1.749</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recorded weights are too few for statistical purposes but may indicate that these coins come at the head of the series.

(b) with obverse legend OGSN...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25-1.349</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35-1.449</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45-1.549</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55-1.649</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again the recorded weights are too few although suggesting a comparatively early date for the coins in question.

(c) with obverse legend SIHTR(1)C...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05-1.149</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15-1.249</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25-1.349</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35-1.449</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45-1.549</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55-1.649</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65-1.749</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern suggests that the coins may have been struck over a certain period, and that the weight-standard was reduced—or not very strictly maintained. In this connexion we may note that coins reading SIHTRIC and with the title CUNUNG are generally ‘heavy’—and early?
(d) with obverse legend ÆTHELRÆD ... 

-1.049
1.05-1.149 x
1.15-1.249 x
1.25-1.349 x x x x x
1.35-1.449 x x
1.45-1.549 x x x x x
1.55-1.649 x
1.65-

If anything, the possibility is heightened that this class of Long Cross imitation was struck on two weight-standards, but it would be dangerous to claim more than that the weights of coins of the whole grouping show a tendency to fall between 1.15 and 1.55 grammes (say 18 and 24 grains).

HELMET TYPE—all before a.d. 1010?
(a) reading SIHTRIC ...   (b) reading ÆTHELRÆD ...

-0.949
0.95-1.049 x
1.05-1.149 x
1.15-1.249 x x x
1.25-1.349
1.35-1.449 x
1.45- 

The coins are perhaps too few for the weight-standard to be deduced, but it is clear that they are generally ‘lighter’ than those of the preceding issue.

SMALL CROSS TYPE—all before a.d. 1015?
(a) reading SIHTR(l)C ... 

-0.949 x x x
0.95-1.049 x x
1.05-1.149 x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
1.15-1.249 x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
1.25-1.349 x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x
1.35-1.449 x x x x
1.45-1.549 x
1.55-

(b) reading ÆTHELRÆD ...

-0.949 x x
0.95-1.049 x x x
1.05-1.149 x x x x x
1.15-1.249 x x x x x
1.25-1.349 x
1.35-1.449 x
1.45-

Both these issues clearly are contemporaneous—and as in the case of the Long Cross imitations already discussed there are reverse dies used with both obverses—and the pattern of the frequency-table may suggest that they were struck on a falling weight-standard. Even at the outset, however, this cannot have been in excess of 1.35 grammes (21.0 grains), and one suspects that it may have been no more than 1.30 grammes (20.1 grains).
THE MYTH OF A COINAGE OF THE OSTMEN OF DUBLIN IN

‘DIFFERENCED’ LONG CROSS TYPE—NONE BEFORE A.D. 1010?

(a) reading SIHTR(l)C •••
(b) reading ÆTHELRÆD ••

(The later coins are progressively more blundered.)

From Irish hoards it is clear that there was a very drastic and apparently progressive fall in the weight-standard throughout the currency of this type, but this does not emerge from a frequency-table constructed on the basis of specimens in the Swedish hoards, probably because the handful of coins concerned seem all to have left Ireland before degeneration became really pronounced.

From the above tables it should be clear that the natural position for the ÆYMN coins is one broadly contemporaneous with the main first issue of ‘undifferenced’ Long Cross imitations in the name of Sihtric and of Æthelræd, an issue which must have begun within a year or two at most of the inception of the English prototype at Michaelmas 997. In other words, their issue may have begun as much as fifteen years before Tymme Sjællandsfar achieved fame overnight by rallying the Danish line when Cnut and Eadmund Ironside disputed the English throne. On any telling, too, they seem to antedate his first recorded appearance in history by more than a decade, and it is particularly satisfactory to be able to point to hoard-evidence which seems once and for all to demolish any association with the hero of Ashingdon.

The presence of ÆYMN coins in hoards deposited in the reign of Cnut or of his successors, for example those from Nesbo¹ and Sand² in Norway, Store Frigaard³ in Denmark, Stige,⁴ Garde,⁵ Botvalde⁶ and Grausne⁷ in Sweden, and from Nousis in Finland,⁸ gives no real indication of date, as in every case there are present in the finds English and German coins going right back to the last quarter of the tenth century, and also others which must be dated well after the normal deadline for the occurrence of Irish coins in Scandinavian hoards. Four hoard-provenances, however, are critical. In the archives of the State Historical Museum at Stockholm there is listed a Swedish find of

¹ G. Gustafson, 'Myntfundet fra Nesbo', Bergens Museums Arbok, 1891.
² V. Ronander, op. cit., p. 7, no. 97.
³ G. Galster, op. cit., p. 305.
⁴ Unpublished hoard found in 1903 at Stige in the parish of Indal in Medelpad (SHM Inv. 12079).
⁵ Unpublished hoard found in 1861 at Garde in the parish of Stenkyrka on Gotland (SHM Inv. 3544).
⁶ Unpublished hoard found in 1943 at Botvalde in the parish of Vate on Gotland (SHM Inv. 23228).
⁷ Unpublished hoard found c. 1887 at Grausne in the parish of Stenkyrka on Gotland (SHM Inv. 8214).
⁸ Nordman, op. cit., p. 6.
unusual composition and provenance. The English element comprised 77 pennies of Æthelræd II, 8 belonging to the Crux issue, 49 to the Long Cross issue, and 20 to the Helmet issue. There were present no coins whatever of Hildebrand Type A, and it is clear that the hoard was deposited before 1010, it is just conceivable in 1007 when there is a Saga tradition that Olaf the Saint fought a sea-fight in the vicinity of Stockholm. With the English coins were two Irish ones, a penny of Sihtric and a penny of ÆYN—-the last being a die-duplicate of Hild. I, if not the very coin. Already, therefore, we have one hoard-provenance which places the ÆMN coins at least five years before Ronander's quite hypothetical vice-gerency of Tymme Sjaellandsfar over the Ostmen of Dublin.

In 1924 there was discovered at Igelosa near Lund in Skåne a huge hoard of just over 2,000 coins, the majority (roughly 1,750) of them English. All these last were of Eadgar, Edward the Martyr, and Æthelræd II, and the latest coins were of Long Cross type which is believed to have been withdrawn from circulation in England at Michaelmas 1003. The Arabic and German coins agree with the English ones, and it is impossible to date this great treasure later than 1005. Among the dozen Irish coins was one of ÆYN, a die-duplicate apparently of Hild. 12, and the weight was as low as 1.26 grammes (19.4 grains). Incidentally, the other Irish Long Cross imitations, all but one in the name of Sihtric, range in weight between 1.33 and 1.64 grammes (20.5 and 25.5 grains) which may seem to bear out my contention that some at least of the 'undifferenced' but 'light' Long Cross coins from Dublin are quite early, and not contemporaneous with later issues which seem to approximate to the same weight-standard. The importance of the Igelosa hoard for the student of the ÆYN coins, however, is that here we have an impeccable indication that one at least of them was struck ten years before Ashingdon and Tymme's legendary exploit. As it happens, too, corroborative evidence is supplied by yet another hoard, the 1937 List find from the German Frisian island of Sylt. Again, English coins predominated in a hoard of close on 850 coins, there being 655 of them, the great majority belonging to the Long Cross issue and none to the Helmet or Last Small Cross types. Accordingly it is almost impossible to date this hoard later than the autumn of 1003, and it may well prove to have been deposited a year or two earlier, though a date before 1000 seems precluded by the range of the Long Cross coins which seem to comprise both 'early' and 'late' varieties of epigraphy, etc. No fewer than 26 of the coins in the hoard were Irish, all of them of Long Cross type. On 19 there appears the name of Sihtric, on 4 that of the mysterious ÆYN, and on 3 that of Æthelræd II. The weights range from 1.61 grammes down to 1.14 grammes (say 25 grains down to 18) with a preponderance at or around 1.30 grammes (say 20 grains). In other words, the date of the ÆYN coins is pinpointed within a year or two at most of the millennium, and it is beyond dispute that they antedate by as much as fifteen

1. Unpublished hoard found in 1868 at Karlberg in the parish of Solna just outside Stockholm (SHM Inv. 3861).
2. SHM Inv. 17532—the hoard is from the actual churchyard.
years Tymme Sjællandsfar’s alleged rule at Dublin which even on historical grounds is far from plausible.

In 1872 a small hoard was found at Derrymore in Co. Westmeath in Ireland which consisted of two Long Cross pennies of Æthelræd II, four Irish imitations still with his name and a fifth with that of Sihtric, one penny of 'Ogse' and three of ÆYMN. All the coins are described as being in splendid condition, and obviously they were deposited within at most a few years of the introduction of the English prototype represented in the hoard. A date of deposit c. 1000–2 thus seems closely indicated, and of course is consistent with the evidence from Igelösa and Sylt. Indeed, that the hoard was a year or two earlier than its continental counterparts may be suggested by the proportions in which the different classes of Irish imitation occur, but this paper is not the place for a discussion of this kind which would have to range over series not strictly relevant to the ÆYMN coins as such.

It is not for the numismatist to dabble in historical science, and least of all a student totally unfamiliar with the principles of Old Irish and Old Norse. Consequently, I must decline to advance any positive suggestion as to the identity of this ÆYMN beyond hinting that there is a possibility that in fact we are dealing with an anonymous coinage. There is, for example, often a marked resemblance between the initial element of the obverse legend on the ÆYMN coins and the version of the Dublin mint-signature which appears on the reverse. Historically there would seem to be a very plausible occasion for such a temporizing coinage at just the right date, the Irish victory at Glen Mama which brought home to the Ostmen of Dublin the bitter realization that it was from despised Munster and not from royal Ulster that the long-delayed liberation of Ireland from the Scandinavian yoke would very soon be achieved. For a few months Brian Borumha’s intentions as regards Dublin may have hung in the balance, and pennies such as the ÆYMN coins might be supposed to have been struck during such a period of uncertainty. It is not pretended, however, that this theory is more than a working hypothesis, and it may well be that many will echo Dr. Galster’s remark that ‘den Gastning kan vel være ligesaa god som saa mange andre’. It would be pleasant indeed if some linguist could explain the ÆYMN legends which remain baffling, and more pleasant still if some historian could date the coins more narrowly yet. I venture to suggest, though, that the evidence published in this paper makes it unlikely in the extreme that many if any of the ÆYMN coins will be found to lie outside the quinquennium c. 998–1003.
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APPENDIX A

CHECK-LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL VARIETIES OF HIBERNO-NORSE COINS WITH OBVERSE LEGENDS BEGINNING BYMN... ETC.¹ (cf. Pl. XVIII)

A. 'CRICKLADE'

(1) Obv. +BYMNRO/E+MNEM

Rev. +/E|LRN|EM-Ø|GRØ

(a) SHM, 1.38 grammes
(b) K, 1.23

(a) ? 1868 Karlberg find (Stockholm)
(b) 1928 Store Frigaard find (Bornholm)

Hild. 1: Roth 26 (Pl. XVIII, 1)

B. 'DUBLIN'

(2) Obv. +BYMNRO/E+MNEDI

Rev. +FIE|NEM|NM-Ø|BYMI

(a) SHM, 1.38 grammes
(b) K, 1.37
(c) SHM, 1.29
(d) SHM, 1.23
(e) SHM, 1.20
(f) SHM, 1.15

(a) K, 1.29 grammes

(a) 1924 Igelosa find (Skåne)
(b) 1895 Nousis find (Finland)
(c) 1872 Derrymore find (Westmeath)

Hild. 12 (Pl. XVIII, 2)

(3) From the same obv. die as (2)

Rev. +EMI|RNIE|M1-Ø|MND

(a) K, 1.29 grammes

Hild. -- (Pl. XVIII, 3)

(4) Obv. +BYMNRO/E+MNEDI

Rev. +FIE|NEM|NM-Ø|BYMI

(a) K, 1.37 grammes
(b) SHM, 1.34
(c) Schl., 1.32

From the same rev. die as (3), (5), and (6)

(c) 1937 List find (Sylt) (Pl. XVIII, 4)

¹ The following abbreviations are used to indicate the collections where the specimens are preserved:

B Belfast Museum
BM British Museum, London.
BU University Museum, Bergen.
D National Museum, Dublin.
G Hunterian Museum, Glasgow.
H National Museum, Helsinki.
K Royal Coin Cabinet, Copenhagen.
L University Coin Cabinet, Lund.
O University Coin Cabinet, Oslo.
Schl. Landesmuseum, Schleswig.
SHM Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm.
T Historical Museum, Trondheim.

The following abbreviations are used to indicate relevant literature:
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(5) Obv. +DYMNROE+MNEGHM

From the same rev. die as (3), (4), and (6)

- behind neck

(a) SHM, 1·40 grammes

Hild. 3 (Pl. XVIII, 5)

(6) Obv. +DYMNROE+MNEGHM

From the same rev. die as (3), (4), and (5)

- behind neck: •• on neck

(a) SHM, 1·04 grammes

Hild. 4 (Pl. XVIII, 6)

(7) From the same obv. die as (6)

Rev. +F-/E|MEN|MN'O|DIEM

(a) SHM, 1·16 grammes
(b) O, 1·14
(c) D, 1·43

(b) From a Swedish hoard?

Hild. 8 (Pl. XVIII, 7)

(8) Obv. +DYMNROE+MNEGHM

- behind neck

(a) D, 1·49 grammes
(b) SHM, 1·24

(b) Grausne find (Gotland)

Hild.—: O’Sullivan 9 (Pl. XVIII, 8)

(9) From the same obv. die as (6) and (7)

Rev. +F-/E|MEN|MN'O|DIEM

but with symbol behind neck altered to <

(a) Schl., 1·22 grammes
(b) SHM, 1·21
(c) B, 1·36

(a) 1937 List find (Sylt)

Hild. 7: Roth 28 (Pl. XVIII, 9)

(10) From the same obv. die as (9)

Rev. +F-/E|MEN|MN'O|DIEM

(a) Schl., 1·21 grammes
(b) SHM, 0·97
(c) G, wt. not recorded.

(a) 1937 List find (Sylt)

Hild. 11: Simon, Duane Pl., 3 (Pl. XVIII, 10)

(11) Obv. +DYMNROE+MNEGHM

- behind neck

Small crosses pâtes on drapery

(a) SHM, 1·14 grammes
(b) BU, wt. not recorded

(b) 1891 Nesbo find (Cent. Norway)

Hild. 10 (Pl. XVIII, 11)

(12) From the same obv. die as (11)

Rev. +F-/E|MEN|MN'O|DIEM

(Bar from D erased—die-flaw across neck)

(a) BM, 1·34 grammes
(b) D, 1·01

(b) ‘Found in Ireland’—before 1758 (?)

Hild. — (Pl. XVIII, 12)

(13) Obv. +DYMNROE+MEGISM

- behind neck

Small crosses pâtes on neck

(a) SHM, 1·25 grammes

Hild. 9 (Pl. XVIII, 13)
(14) Apparently from the same obv. die as (15) through Aquilla Smith read the last element of the legend as DYFII.

This coin (wt. 1.35 grammes) was in the Derrymore (Westmeath) hoard of 1872 with specimens of nos. 2 and 15 but cannot now be traced in any public collection.

C. ‘London’

(15) Obv. +DYMN+O/E+MNEGMI
Rev. +EMI|RNIE|MIO|VND

(a) SHM, 1.37 grammes
(b) K, 1.35
(c) Schl., 1.26
(d) T, broken
(e) ? 1.24 grammes

Hild. 5

Obv. +EMI|RNIE|MIO|VND

(? another state of die used for previous coin)

Small cross pommée in 2nd heraldic quarter

(a) BM, 1.26 grammes
(b) G, wt. not recorded.
(b) ‘Found in Ireland’—before 1758 (?)

Hild. —: Roth 27: Simon, Duane Pl., 2. (Pl. XVIII, 16)

D. ‘Wilton’

(16) From the same obv. die as (15)

Obv. +EMI|RNIE|OMN,O|YIL
Rev. +EMI|RNIE|MIO|VND

(a) SHM, 1.14 grammes

Hild. 6

(17) From the same obv. die as (4)

(18) Obv. +DYMNROEBERMNO
Rev. +EML|RNIE|MIO|OENM

(a) SHM, 1.22 grammes

Hild. —: cf. Simon, Add. Pl., 9 (Pl. XVIII, 18)

E. ‘Uncertain’

(19) Obv. +DYMNROEBERMNO
Rev. +LEI|FSTE|MN|O|SEMI

(a) SHM, 1.42 grammes
(b) SHM, 1.31
(c) SHM, fragment (cut halfpenny?)

Hild. 13: Roth 30

(20) Obv. +DYMN[R+O/E+MNEGMI]
Rev. [+]ODI]|VLFE|OIMP|VYRI

(a) SHM, fragment (cut farthing?)
(b) G, wt. not recorded.
(b) ‘Found in Ireland’—before 1758 (?)

Hild. 14: Simon Pl. ii. 30; Duane Pl., 11

Pl. XVIII, nos. 1, 2, 4–11, 13, 15, 17–19 by courtesy of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet; no. 3, by courtesy of the Royal Danish Coin Cabinet; nos. 12 and 16 by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

1 On the latter plate with ‘normalized’ obverse legend.
KEY TO PLATE XVII

1. Dublin penny of Sihtric III ('Silkbeard') c. 995? (From the 1924 Igelosa hoard (Skane) deposited c. 1004?, and from the same dies as the following coin but before addition of pellet to rev. die.)

2. Die-duplicate of the preceding coin from the 1942 Halsarve hoard (Gotland) deposited c. 1120? (Struck after addition of pellet to rev. die.)

3. Dublin penny of Sihtric III ('Silkbeard') c. 995 Hild. 10. (From the same dies as the following coin.)

4. Die-duplicate of the preceding coin. Hild. 10 'var'.

5. Dublin penny of Sihtric III ('Silkbeard') c. 1000. Hild. 99. (The prototype is a Winchester penny of Æthelraed, cf. Hild. Æthelraed 4160.)

6. Dublin penny c. 1000 with enigmatic legend SISIG . . . Hild. 3. (The prototype is a York penny of Æthelraed, cf. Hild. Æthelraed 901.)


9. Dublin penny c. 1000 copied from a Derby penny of Æthelraed II. Hild. Æthelraed 348.

10. Dublin penny of Sihtric III ('Silkbeard') c. 1000. Hild. 1—from the same reverse die as the preceding coin.

11. Dublin penny c. 1000 with the name of Æthelraed II. Hild. Æthelraed 372.


13. Dublin penny c. 1005 with the name of Æthelraed II. Hild. Æthelraed 383.


15. Dublin penny of Sihtric III ('Silkbeard') c. 1010 with reverse copied from a coin of Æthelraed II of Chester. Hild. 77.

16. Dublin penny c. 1010 with the name of Æthelraed II. Hild. Æthelraed 382.


21. Dublin penny c. 1030?


Plate XVII, nos. 1–18, and 20 by courtesy of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet; nos. 19, 21, and 22 by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.
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