

# Anglo-Saxon Inscribed Sheaths from Aachen, Dublin and Trondheim

By ELISABETH OKASHA

*Department of English, University College, Cork*

*THREE ANGLO-SAXON inscribed sheaths are discussed in detail, and compared with other contemporary sheaths for small angle-backed weapons. An appendix lists all known examples.*

There are in existence three inscribed leather sheaths dating from the 10th or 11th century. None of them was found in Anglo-Saxon England yet all of them clearly form part of the corpus of Anglo-Saxon inscribed artefacts. They are the sheaths from Aachen and Dublin and one of those from Trondheim, Trondheim 1 (see the list in the Appendix). All three have previously been published but none of the works discussing the Aachen and Trondheim sheaths is in English.<sup>1</sup> The first of the inscribed sheaths to be recorded was that from Aachen (Pl. iv, A). This sheath has been kept in Aachen Cathedral Treasury at least since 1860; its previous history is unknown.<sup>2</sup> The next to be found was Trondheim 1 (Pl. v, A, B). It was dug up in 1899 during excavation on the site of the Freemasons' Lodge in Kongens gate and is now in the Vitenskapsmuseet, University of Trondheim.<sup>3</sup> The Dublin sheath was found in July 1974 during the excavation of a stave house on the Christ Church Place site and is now in the National Museum of Ireland, Dublin (Pl. iv, B, C).

These three sheaths contain decorative ornament as well as incised texts. They have thus to be seen in the context of similar contemporary examples which are decorated but uninscribed. Two of the inscribed sheaths were in fact found with or near uninscribed sheaths: Trondheim 2 was found in the same area of the city as Trondheim 1. In the stave house where the Dublin sheath was found there were also recovered 'a number of decorated leather scabbards';<sup>4</sup> the leather artefacts from the Dublin excavations are kept in the National Museum of Ireland but have not yet been published. Altogether twenty decorated leather sheaths of this type are known to me and these are listed in the Appendix. Fifteen of them were found in Anglo-Saxon England, seven in York; five, including the three inscribed ones, were found overseas. Some of the twenty sheaths contain designs similar to those on others but none of them is identical to any other.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SHEATHS<sup>5</sup>

The twenty known sheaths share a number of characteristics. All are made of leather and their surfaces are covered on both sides with embossed and/or incised decoration. All are constructed in the same way, by folding over a piece of leather and securing the join with stitching, clips or rivets. The sheath from Aachen contains gold fittings covering the join and also the point, but these fittings are unlikely to be original. Grimme suggests that the fittings may have come from a reliquary or shrine.<sup>6</sup> All the sheaths are of a size to contain a knife or a dagger, but not a sword; the largest complete sheath, the one from Aachen, is 470 mm long, while the smallest complete sheath, York 4, measures 175 mm in length.

All the complete sheaths, and most of the incomplete ones, indicate by their shape that they were intended for an angle-backed, not a straight-backed, weapon. In the case of the five fragmentary sheaths where only a part of the handle portion survives (Hexham, London 2, 3, 4 and York 2), it is not clear for what shape of weapon they were designed. However the general similarity of these sheaths to the others suggests that they too may have been intended for angle-backed weapons. Twelve of the sheaths, including all the complete ones, indicate within their decoration, on both sides, the division between the handle and the blade of the weapon to be inserted. In the cases of two further sheaths, London 3 and 4, I have seen drawings of only one side of each sheath; this side marks the division. The six remaining sheaths are too fragmentary to be certain whether or not the division was marked: Hexham, London 2, Trondheim 2, York 1, 2 and 5. Again, the general similarity in design of these six sheaths to the complete ones suggests that the division was probably originally indicated on them also.

Most of the sheaths are decorated with interlace on one side, although sometimes it is interlace of a confused nature. Some sheaths, for example Aachen and Trondheim 2, have interlace on one side and foliage motifs on the other. One sheath, London 5, has geometric patterning on both sides. The more usual position, however, is seen in twelve of the sheaths, with interlace on one side and geometric patterning on the other.<sup>7</sup> The geometric patterning can take various forms. It can, for example, be a design of double-line diamonds (York 2 and Gloucester 2, the latter having small circles inside the diamonds); of single-line diamonds (London 5, York 6 and 7) or of single-line diamonds containing small circles (Hexham and London 2); of plaited ribbon effect (Dublin and Trondheim 1); of herringbone (London 3 and 5); or of a net effect not unlike interlinked sprang mesh in textiles (Gloucester 1 and York 3).

Some of the sheaths resemble one another on one side. Instances of similarity in geometric patterning have already been noted and there are also similarities in interlace and foliage design. The interlace sides of Trondheim 1 and York 6, for example, are very similar though not identical. The interlace side of the Dublin sheath is not unlike the interlace side of York 1 while the other side of York 1, containing debased acanthus, resembles one side of York 5 and, rather more distantly, the inscribed side of the Aachen sheath. As already noted, two of the inscribed sheaths, Dublin and Trondheim 1, contain a similar geometric design of plaited ribbon effect. Their inscribed texts are both placed on this geometric side,

each in a panel in exactly the same position, taking up all the lower part of the handle portion of the sheath. The text on the Aachen sheath also takes up all the handle portion of one side of the sheath. In all three cases, the inscribed text reads horizontally from the open to the pointed end of the sheath.

There are two instances where the similarities between the sheaths extend to both sides, although in neither case are the sheaths identical. The first instance concerns the two fragmentary sheaths Hexham and London 2. Both have two rather similar panels of interlace on one side and, on the other, a pattern of single-line diamonds each containing a small circle. In neither case does the blade portion survive. The other instance concerns York 3 and Gloucester 1, although the latter is broken with only the blade portion surviving. The interlace sides of these sheaths are closely similar, both the actual interlace and the panels of incised hatched triangles set beside the interlace. On their geometric sides both sheaths have a panel of design resembling sprang mesh. The handle portion of Gloucester 1 is missing. On the handle portion of York 3 the panels of interlace and hatched triangles continue on the interlace side; on the geometric side, however, the panel of design is less like sprang mesh than like the plaited ribbon effect of Dublin and Trondheim 1. Goudge suggests that Gloucester 1 and York 3 are so similar that they might have 'originated from the same workshop'.<sup>8</sup> In view of the similarity of York 3 to other sheaths and of the fact that only a part of Gloucester 1 survives, this suggestion should be treated with caution. More likely is Tweddle's proposal that there may only have been 'a limited repertoire of designs' which were traditionally used on leather sheaths of the period.<sup>9</sup>

#### TEXTS OF THE INSCRIBED SHEATHS

The texts on the three inscribed sheaths read as follows:<sup>10</sup>

Aachen: + BYRHTSIGE MEC F[E]CIÐ, '+ Byrhtsig made me'.

Dublin: + EDRIC ME FECI[T], '+ Edric made me'.

Trondheim 1: + [-]IC ME [F]EC, '+ [-]ic made me'.

The texts are all in Latin but, while the Dublin text uses correct Latin, the others are less regular in their forms. The Trondheim text has [F]EC, presumably for *fecit*; the word was either abbreviated or left unfinished because the engraver ran out of space. Incomplete words can be paralleled on other inscriptions. An Anglo-Saxon sword-guard from Exeter, for example, contains the text, EOFR[I] ME F[E], with F[E] for *fecit*.<sup>11</sup>

The Aachen text is less regular still. It has the spelling F[E]CIÐ for *fecit*, with the Anglo-Saxon letter Ð (=TH) used for T. This spelling of *fecit* occurs elsewhere, for example on an Anglo-Saxon coin-brooch of the 10th century from Canterbury.<sup>12</sup> The spelling MEC for *me* in the Aachen text is clearly an error, but an interesting error. *Mec* is not a Latin word but an Old English word; it is an alternative spelling for the more usual Old English word *me* meaning 'me'. The usual Latin word for 'me' is also of course *me*. *Mec* is found quite frequently in poetic and inscriptional texts in Old English, but not in any other inscriptional text in Latin. The writing of Old

English *mec* for Latin *me* is an understandable error for an Old English speaker to make, but it is unlikely that anyone else would make it. MEC offers clear evidence that the person who composed this text was an Anglo-Saxon.

The three texts all contain a personal name, in whole or in part. Two of them, those in the Aachen and Dublin texts, are Old English personal names and the incomplete name in the Trondheim text may also have been Old English. The Aachen name is BYRHTSIGE, a form of the recorded Old English masculine name *Beorhtsige*. Spellings of the name element *beorht-* occur with *y* for *eo* in later Old English, that is, from the 9th century onwards.<sup>13</sup> BYRHSIGE, for example, was the name of a moneyer working in Warwick between A.D. 997 and 1003.<sup>14</sup>

The Dublin text contains the name EDRIC, a recorded spelling of the common Old English masculine name *Eadric*. The name in the Trondheim text ends in [-]IC with about four letters lost, of which the last might be R. The element *-ric* is common as a second element of Old English masculine names and occurs also in names of Scandinavian and continental Germanic origin. If the reading is not [-R]IC, then [-]IC could be part of a different element, for example Old English *-lic*, or it could be part of an un-compounded name, for example an Old English name ending in *-ic*.<sup>15</sup>

The word *fecit* ('made') may refer to the physical construction of the sheaths, thus indicating (at least in the case of the Aachen and Dublin sheaths) that the leather-worker himself was an Anglo-Saxon. Alternatively, *fecit* might indicate 'made' in the sense of 'had made for him' and in this case the personal name would be that of the commissioner not the maker of the object. The relationship between the composer of the text on the one hand, and the commissioner or maker of the sheath on the other, is open to conjecture. As argued above, the person who composed the Aachen text seems certainly to have been an Anglo-Saxon.

The linguistic features of the texts afford little evidence for dating them within the Anglo-Saxon period. The only dating feature is the spelling of BYRHT- for *beorht-* in the Aachen text which is typical of later Old English. The formula used in the texts is in accordance with this dating. The three texts each use a Latin maker formula, that is, one where a named individual is said to have 'made' the object which is referred to as 'me'. Although Latin maker formulae occur less frequently than Old English ones in Anglo-Saxon inscriptions, all examples of maker formulae, both in Old English and in Latin, occur in inscriptions dated to the later Anglo-Saxon period, the 9th to the 11th centuries.<sup>16</sup>

The script used in all three texts is known as 'Anglo-Saxon capitals'.<sup>17</sup> Typically, although not invariably, texts in Anglo-Saxon capitals begin with a cross; have no word-division spaces; contain serifs on the ends of some letters; use both angular and rounded letter-forms; may use different forms of the same letter within one text; use an occasional insular letter among the capitals.

Many of these features are observable in the three sheath texts. All the texts begin with a cross and none of them makes use of spaces to mark word-division. All the texts make some use of seriffing although the Trondheim text is more consistent in this than the others. The Aachen text uses rounded and angular letter-forms: rounded ð but angular C, G and S. Similarly, the Dublin text uses rounded D but angular C, although the Trondheim text uses only angular C. The Dublin text has

two different forms of C although the other texts are consistent in letter-form within themselves. None of the texts uses any insular letter-forms.

The three texts use letters of a comparable height, varying between 7 and 10 mm. Two unusual letter-forms are used. The C of FECI[T] in the Dublin text resembles in form the F and may perhaps incorporate an engraver's error. The form of the Y in BYRHTSIGE in the Aachen text is unlike any other inscriptional form of Y, although Y is a letter exhibiting wide variation in form within the corpus of inscriptions.<sup>18</sup>

The dating evidence offered by the letter-forms is inconclusive. This is partly because there are not many separate letters used and partly because useful diagnostic letters, for example A and N, do not occur in the texts. On the one hand, the lack of insular letter-forms might suggest a date later rather than earlier in the Anglo-Saxon period; on the other hand, the majority of angular letter-forms used (for example, C, G and S) could argue for an earlier rather than a later date. One is forced to conclude that the script offers no evidence for dating the texts within the Anglo-Saxon period.

One clear conclusion does, however, emerge from an examination of the texts of the three sheaths: all three fit well into the context of Anglo-Saxon inscriptions. The evidence for this is, in summary, the use of Anglo-Saxon capital script and of a maker formula in all three texts, the use of Old English personal names in the Aachen and Dublin texts and the Old English linguistic features of the Aachen text.

#### DATING THE SHEATHS

None of the twenty sheaths listed in the Appendix can be dated with precision. The most firmly dated is that from Dublin which is the only one that was found in a dated archaeological context. This was found inside a stave house regarded as 11th century; inside the same stave house were found pottery, probably of 11th-century date, and a coin of Sihtric dated to between c. A.D. 1035 and c. A.D. 1055.<sup>19</sup> There is nothing in the language or script of the text of the Dublin sheath to argue against the 11th-century date indicated by the archaeological context. The evidence from the texts of the other two inscribed sheaths, Aachen and Trondheim 1, points towards the later Anglo-Saxon period, the 9th to the 11th centuries, but does not provide a more precise dating.

Artistic evidence does not suggest a close dating for any of the sheaths. The usual date-range given to them on artistic grounds is that of the 10th to 11th centuries. Thus, for example, Lunde suggests a date around the year 1000 for Aachen and Trondheim 1 and 2.<sup>20</sup> A 10th- or 11th-century date has also been proposed for Gloucester 1 and 2 and London 1 and 2.<sup>21</sup> Tweddle proposes a 'broad 10th/11th century date' for York 5 and probably for York 3;<sup>22</sup> he suggests that York 4 might be of similar date although a 9th-century date would also be possible.<sup>23</sup> In summary, the twenty sheaths may all be considered as dating from the 10th to the 11th centuries but only the Dublin sheath can be dated with more precision to the 11th century.



## CONCLUSION

The twenty sheaths are probably all of Anglo-Saxon or Viking workmanship. Most of them were found in Anglo-Saxon England, largely, though not exclusively, in areas of Viking influence. This Viking connection accords well with the find-places of those sheaths from outside Anglo-Saxon England, Aachen, Dublin, Lund and Trondheim. The sheaths thus offer tangible, if necessarily slight, evidence of the nature and extent of late Anglo-Saxon influence in the Viking world.

The three inscribed shapes, Aachen, Dublin and Trondheim 1, are clearly Anglo-Saxon work. Despite their having been found outside Anglo-Saxon England, their texts fit well into the context of Anglo-Saxon inscriptions and two of them contain Old English names. By their nature, small sheaths of this sort are likely while in use to have been worn, or otherwise carried around, by their owners. It would seem likely that these three sheaths were made in Anglo-Saxon England and then taken overseas. Alternatively, one or more of them may have been made outside England, in an area of Anglo-Saxon influence, perhaps where an Anglo-Saxon artisan was working.

## APPENDIX

Listed here are twenty leather sheaths for small angle-backed weapons, all of Anglo-Saxon or Viking workmanship. One publication is given for each sheath, wherever possible a recent work in English containing an illustration. Some contemporary sheaths that do not fit into this category are noted at the end of the list.

1. Aachen (Aachen Cathedral Treasury). Length 470 mm; found before 1860, findspot unknown. E. G. Grimme, *Der Aachener Domschatz. Aachen Kunstblätter*, 42 (Dusseldorf, 1972), no. 12, 18–19 and figs.
2. Dublin (National Museum of Ireland, no. E122:12660). Length 305 mm (broken); found 1974 in Christ Church Place, Dublin. E. Okasha, 'Three inscribed objects from Christ Church Place, Dublin', *Proc. Eighth Viking Congress, Århus 24–31 August 1977* (Odense, 1981), 47–49 and fig.
3. Gloucester 1 (Gloucester City Museum, no. GLRCM 85/1968 sf 65). Length 190 mm (broken); found 1968 in Southgate Street, Gloucester. C. E. Goudge, 'Late Saxon Leather Sheaths from Gloucester and York', in 'Notes', *Antiq. J.*, 59 (1979), 125–27 and figs.
4. Gloucester 2 (Gloucester City Museum, no. GLRCM 19/79 sf 7). Length 415 mm; found 1979 in Berkeley Street, Gloucester. A. P. Garrod and C. M. Heighway, *Garrod's Gloucester: Archaeological Observations 1974–81* (Gloucester, 1984), 98 and figs.
5. Hexham (British Museum, no. M&LA 1935, 5–7, 1). Length c. 100 mm (broken); found before 1902 in Hexham. R. A. Smith, *British Museum: A Guide to the Anglo-Saxon and Foreign Teutonic Antiquities in the Department of British and Mediaeval Antiquities* (London, 1923), 106 and figs.
6. London 1 (Museum of London, no. MOL 11674). Length 390 mm; found 1927 at 99 Cheapside, at corner of Lawrence Lane, City of London. Q. Waddington, 'Viking sheath of leather', in 'Notes', *Antiq. J.*, 7 (1927), 526–27 and figs.
7. London 2 (Museum of London, no. MOL 12516). Length c. 110 mm (broken); found c. 1930–31 at Blossoms Inn, Lawrence Lane, City of London. G. C. Dunning, 'Medieval Finds in London', in 'Notes', *Antiq. J.*, 12 (1932), 177 and figs.
8. London 3 (Museum of London, no. UPT 90 (456) [1250]). Length 105 mm (broken); found 1990 in Bull Wharf, London. Unpublished.<sup>24</sup>

9. London 4 (Museum of London, no. UPT 90 (442) [899]). Length 155 mm (broken); found 1990 in Bull Wharf, London. Unpublished.
10. London 5 (Museum of London, no. UPT 90 (418) [1153]). Length 155 mm (broken); found 1990 in Bull Wharf, London. Unpublished.
11. Lund (Kulturen, Lund, no. KM 12998). Length 285 mm; found 1902 in Laurentiikapellet, Lund. R. Blomqvist, 'Medeltida svärd, dolkar och slidor funna i Lund', *Kulturen* (1938), 151-68 and figs. 20, 21.
12. Trondheim 1 (Vitenskapsmuseet, Trondheim, no. T5918). Length 390 mm; found 1899 in Kongens gate, Trondheim. Ø. Lunde, "Trondheims fortid i Bygrunnen". *Riksantikvarens Skrifter*, 2 (Trondheim, 1977), 136-37 and figs.
13. Trondheim 2 (Vitenskapsmuseet, Trondheim, no. T5919). Length c. 280 mm (broken); found 1899 in Kongens gate, Trondheim. Ø. Lunde, "Trondheims fortid i Bygrunnen". *Riksantikvarens Skrifter*, 2 (Trondheim, 1977), 136-37 and figs.
14. York 1 (Yorkshire Museum, York, accession no. unavailable). Length 100 mm (broken); found 1906 in Coppergate, York. R. A. Smith, 'Anglo-Saxon Remains', *Victoria County History Yorkshire*, 2 (London, 1912), 108 and fig. 27.
15. York 2 (Yorkshire Museum, York, accession no. unavailable). Length 110 mm (broken); found 1906 in Coppergate, York. R. A. Smith, 'Anglo-Saxon Remains', *Victoria County History Yorkshire*, 2 (London, 1912), 108 and fig. 28.
16. York 3 (Yorkshire Museum, York, no. 1976.11.73). Length 340 mm; found 1976 in Parliament Street, York. D. Tweddle, *Finds from Parliament Street and Other Sites in the City Centre. The Archaeology of York*, 17, fascicule 4 (York, 1986), 237-42, 260 and figs.
17. York 4 (Yorkshire Museum, York, no. 1976.11.47). Length 175 mm; found 1976 in Parliament Street, York. D. Tweddle, *Finds from Parliament Street and Other Sites in the City Centre. The Archaeology of York*, 17, fascicule 4 (York, 1986), 237-42, 260 and figs.
18. York 5 (Yorkshire Museum, York, no. 1976.11.48). Length 175 mm (broken); found 1976 in Parliament Street, York. D. Tweddle, *Finds from Parliament Street and Other Sites in the City Centre. The Archaeology of York*, 17, fascicule 4 (York, 1986), 237-42, 260 and figs.
19. York 6 (Jorvik Centre, York, no. 1980.7.8133). Length 340 mm; found 1980 in Coppergate, York. Unpublished.<sup>25</sup>
20. York 7 (Jorvik Centre, York, no. 1981.7.13279). Length 337 mm; found 1981 in Coppergate, York. Unpublished.

In addition, several probably undecorated sheaths have been found. Three are from London, from Milk Street, Pudding Lane and Wood Street.<sup>26</sup> Several plain sheaths have been found at York and also a decorated sheath of a different shape from Lloyds Bank, Pavement, York.<sup>27</sup> This sheath is for a straight-backed, not an angle-backed, weapon and is almost triangular in shape. Some of the 12th- and 13th-century sheaths from York are of similar shape.<sup>28</sup> Two sheaths were found in Saddler Street, Durham;<sup>29</sup> one is plain while the other contains a small quantity of diamond patterning on one side. Tweddle suggests that the latter was similar in shape to the one from York designed for a straight-backed weapon.<sup>30</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The Appendix gives a bibliographical reference for each sheath listed. The sheaths Aachen and Trondheim 1 will be published in English in E. Okasha, 'A second supplement to *Hand-list of Anglo-Saxon Non-runic Inscriptions*' (forthcoming, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 21, 37-85).

<sup>2</sup> Dr Georg Minkenbergh of the Domkapitel, Aachen, writes in a letter dated 25 July 1989: 'Die Messerscheide ist alter Bestandteil des Domschatzes. Wann sie im Mittelalter nach Aachen kam, ist unbekannt'.

<sup>3</sup> I am most grateful to Oddmun Farbregd of the Vitenskapsmuseet for his help when I was examining this sheath.

<sup>4</sup> B O Riordáin, 'The High Street Excavations', *Proc. Seventh Viking Congress, Dublin 15-21 August 1973* (Dublin, 1976), 140.

<sup>5</sup> I have personally examined only the sheaths Aachen, Dublin, Trondheim 1, 2, York 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7. Otherwise I have worked from photographs, drawings and descriptions.

<sup>6</sup> E. G. Grimme, *Der Aachener Domschatz, Aachen Kunstblätter*, 42 (Dusseldorf, 1972), 18–19.

<sup>7</sup> This occurs on the following sheaths: Dublin, Gloucester 1, 2, Hexham, London 1, 2, Trondheim 1, York 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. In the cases of London 3 and 4, I have seen a drawing of only one side of each sheath; both of these contain geometric patterning.

<sup>8</sup> C. E. Goudge, 'Late Saxon Leather Sheaths from Gloucester and York', in 'Notes', *Antiq. J.*, 59 (1979), 126.

<sup>9</sup> D. Tweddle, *Finds from Parliament Street and Other Sites in the City Centre. The Archaeology of York*, 17, fascicule 4 (York, 1986), 240.

<sup>10</sup> The texts of the sheaths have no word-division spaces and some letters are damaged. The texts are printed here with word-division spaces added. Slight damage to letters is ignored but letters whose reading requires editorial reconstruction are bracketed. [-] indicates complete loss of text.

<sup>11</sup> E. Okasha, *Hand-list of Anglo-Saxon Non-runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1971), no. 37, 70–71 and fig.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 19, 58–59 and figs.

<sup>13</sup> A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), § 305, 129, note 1.

<sup>14</sup> V. J. Smart, 'Moneyers of the Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage 973–1016', *Commentationes de nummis saeculorum IX–XI in Suecia repertis 2, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, Antikvariska Serien* 19 (Stockholm, 1968), 221.

<sup>15</sup> O. v. Feilitzen, *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book. Nomina Germanica* (Uppsala, 1937), 17.

<sup>16</sup> See op. cit. in note 11, 8. Those texts with Latin maker formulae which are published in the supplements also date from the 9th to 11th century.

<sup>17</sup> See E. Okasha, 'The Non-runic Scripts of Anglo-Saxon Inscriptions', *Trans. Cambridge Bibliographical Soc.*, 4, pt. 5 (1968), 321–38.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, Table 1a.

<sup>19</sup> See E. Okasha, 'Three inscribed objects from Christ Church Place, Dublin', *Proc. English Viking Congress, Århus 24–31 August 1977* (Odense, 1981), 48.

<sup>20</sup> Ø. Lunde, *Trondheims fortid i Bygrunnen. Riksantikvarens Skrifter*, 2 (Trondheim, 1977), 137.

<sup>21</sup> See for example Goudge, op. cit. in note 8, 126; A. P. Garrod and C. M. Heighway, *Garrod's Gloucester: Archaeological Observations 1974–81* (Gloucester, 1984), 98; A. MacGregor, 'Industry and Commerce in Anglo-Scandinavian York', in R. A. Hall (ed.), *Viking Age York and the North* (London, 1978), 53.

<sup>22</sup> Tweddle, op. cit. in note 9, 238–40, quotation from 240.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 241.

<sup>24</sup> I am grateful to Frances Pritchard, Museum of London, for bringing to my attention the sheaths London 3, 4 and 5 and to the Museum of London for permission to publish them.

<sup>25</sup> I am grateful to the York Archaeological Trust for permission to publish the sheaths York 6 and 7.

<sup>26</sup> F. Pritchard, 'Small Finds', in A. G. Vince (ed.), *Aspects of Saxo-Norman London, II: Finds and Environmental Evidence. London and Middlesex Archaeol. Soc. Special Paper*, 12 (1991), no. 269 (Milk Street), 211–12, 267 and figs.; no. 10 (Pudding Lane), 132–33, 211–12, 267 and figs.; the sheath from Wood Street (ABS86, no. 825) is unpublished. All these sheaths are in the Museum of London.

<sup>27</sup> On the plain sheaths, see K. M. Richardson, 'Excavations in Hungate, York', *Archaeol. J.*, 116 (1959), 86 and fig. 19, no. 25, and also MacGregor, op. cit. in note 21, 53. On the Lloyds Bank sheath, see D. Tweddle, in A. MacGregor, *Anglo-Scandinavian Finds from Lloyds Bank, Pavement and Other Sites. The Archaeology of York* 17, fascicule 3 (York, 1982), 142–43 and figs.

<sup>28</sup> Richardson, op. cit. in note 27, 102–05 and figs.

<sup>29</sup> M. O. H. Carver, 'Three Saxo-Norman tenements in Durham City', *Medieval Archaeol.*, 23 (1979), 28 and figs.

<sup>30</sup> Tweddle, op. cit. in note 27, 142.