THE ST. MARTIN COINS OF LINCOLN

By IAN STEWART

This paper does not pretend to be more than a preliminary enquiry into the date of and background to the very rare group of coins which carry the mint name of Lincoln and an obverse inscription alluding to St. Martin. Although my research into the Viking issues of the first quarter of the tenth century is still far from complete, I have come increasingly to feel that current ideas about the dating of the St. Martins and of the sword St. Peters, to which they are related, are in need of question, if not of revision. I have therefore felt it worthwhile to present the outlines of the case at an early stage, without waiting to fill in all the details. I would like to express my thanks to Mr. Blunt, Mr. Dolley, Sir Francis Hill and Professor Whitelock who have been good enough to comment on and improve a draft of this paper, though they are not, of course, responsible for the conclusions which I have drawn. Since, however, the arguments which follow are partly built on, but in some major points modify, Mr. Dolley’s own work I am particularly indebted to him for confirming his general agreement with them.¹

That the St. Martins represent a Viking coinage of Lincoln in the first half of the tenth century, all writers are agreed, but beyond this there is little direct evidence for their date or of the authority under whom they were struck. Like many Anglo-Viking coins, they present considerable problems of interpretation; they are an isolated issue, and not part of a series; and their dating is complicated by the thinness of the hoard evidence.²

All five reverse dies have readings close to LINCOLIA CIVITAS, and that the coins were struck at Lincoln is beyond reasonable question. The early history of this mint is obscure. It had been active during the time of Alfred, being named on certain Viking coins of the period.³ There is no evidence that it was subsequently in the direct control of an English king before 918, and even then the evidence is not specific. No regular English coinage with the mint name is found before the last type of Edgar, though it is likely that coins without the mint name were struck there for English kings in the mid-tenth century.

Though there is early evidence of a church dedicated to St. Martin within the city, the Cathedral is dedicated to St. Mary, and the coins are the only indication that St. Martin may have been regarded as the local patron saint. ‘The precedence of St. Mary was established

¹ Mr. Dolley authorizes me to say that he would have liked to place the St. Martins in the early 920’s, but was unable to obtain any support for the idea from those historians whom he consulted; he is still attracted to the idea and feels that the tentative suggestion expressed in the last paragraph of this paper could meet the case. Professor Whitelock and Sir Francis Hill have told me that they would regard a date later than 918 for the St. Martins as by no means impossible.


³ ASCoins, pl. x, 6 and 9.
beyond question before the Norman Conquest, after which St. Martin's Church was secured by the bishop apparently by displacement of a private owner.\(^1\) There is, however, no need to dispute the evidence of the coins that in the earlier tenth century St. Martin was venerated as a tutelary saint by some at least of the inhabitants of the city.

The type associated on the coins with the name of St. Martin is a horizontal sword, a device, as Oman remarked, somewhat inappropriate to St. Martin who, although he had been a soldier in his youth, was not a martyr.\(^2\) Its occurrence derives from imitation of the type of the later St. Peter coins of York. Equally, the genitive form of inscription, SCI M\(\text{ARTI(N)}\) appears to be based on the S(an)c(t)i P\(\text{ETRI MO(neta)}\) of the York issues, and although lacking the word Moneta is presumably intended to be read as "(the money) of St. Martin."\(^3\) The Lincoln reverse type is, numismatically, without precedent or parallel, but a similar form of enclosed cross appears over the door of a church at Kirkdale in Yorkshire, said to have been rebuilt by the Danes, and it is also found on Runic monuments in Scandinavia.\(^4\)

The known specimens are:

1. Copenhagen 620, ex Terslev find; 18-6 gr.
2. Norweb collection ex Mossop ex Lockett 451 ex Bascom 31 ex Astronomer 121 ex Montagu 374 ex Brie ex Wigan ex Pembroke 30 (plates: part IV, pl. 2) collections; 19-9 gr.
3. British Museum ex Cotton collection (BMC pl. XIX, 14 = VCDD fig. 27); 17-5 gr.
4. Copenhagen 621 (Bruun gift); 19-1 gr.
5. Sir J. W. F. Hill ex Grantley 934 ex Rashleigh 124 ex Cuff 384 ex Rich ex Dimsdale 344 ex Hollis 66; 16\(\frac{1}{2}\) gr., not a full coin.

All the known obverses are very similar. They read, above the sword, SCI M\(\text{ARTI(N)}\), and below ARTI\(\text{(N)}\); the \(N\) appears only on Copenhagen 620, which also alone has the \(A\) barred. There is a trefoil of pellets above the \(M\), and an inverted \(T\) between two wedges below the inscription. Copenhagen 621 and the Pembroke specimen are from the same obverse die. All five coins have different reverse readings: Copenhagen 620, LINCOLLA CIVITA; Pembroke, LINCOLLA CIVITA; British Museum, LINCOLA CIVITA; Copenhagen 621, LINCOLA CIVITA; and Hollis, LINCOLA CIVITA. On all except the Pembroke coin, the letter \(A\) on the reverse is flanked by large dots at the top; the letter \(N\) is reversed except on the Copenhagen coins.

Nineteenth century numismatists generally avoided venturing a precise date for the St. Martins. Lindsay compared them with the St. Peters dating both to the middle of the tenth century,\(^5\) but Hawkins thought "they were struck about the same time probably as those of St. Peter and Eric [Bloodaxe, 947-8, 952-4], between about 921 and 942, in which latter year Lincoln was conquered from the Danes by King Edmund.\(^6\)

Of recent writers, Brooke was not at his best with the tenth century Anglo-Viking coinages. He ascribed the secular coins with the Karolus monogram and with the hammer and bow on its face two plain incised crosses, one within the other (see Hill, p. 78).

---

\(^2\) Oman p. 46. Mr. Dolley has, however, pointed out that the best known story of his life tells how he divided his cloak with his sword to share it with a beggar.
\(^4\) Baldwin Brown, *The Arts in Early England*, 1, 357. E. Hawkins, *The Silver Coins of England*, 1887, 102. According to Sir Francis Hill, there is a carved stone now in the cloisters of Lincoln cathedral, found in an area once within the church or churchyard of the Saxon St. Mary, which was
\(^5\) J. Lindsay, *A View of the Coinage of the Heptarchy*, 1842, 71.
\(^6\) Hawkins, *op. cit.*, 102. Rashleigh (p. 104) expressed a view close to that of the present paper, though perhaps less conscious of the historical considerations: 'These coins were struck while Lincoln was in the hands of the Danes, and they were issued under their authority, about A.D. 920-930'. For an early discussion of the St. Martins, see S. Pegge, *Assemblage of Coins . . . of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, etc., 1772, 63-7.
to Regnald Guthfrithson (942–4), and then linked the St. Peters to these by the monogram and hammer types and to the coinage of Eric Bloodaxe by the sword type. The St. Martins, too, he associated 'by their adoption of the sword type, with the period of Eric's coinage, the middle of the tenth century'.

Oman, whose treatment of these series laid the foundations for their modern arrangement, brought the whole group back into the first quarter of the century, associating the sword coins in the name of a king Sihtric with Sihtric Gale, or Caoch, of York (921–6), and the secular Karolus monogram coins, which in their more literate versions have a name such as Raienalt, to his brother and predecessor Regnald (919–21), the first of the Hiberno-Norse dynasty at York. The consequent allocation of the St. Peters to the period between the burial of the Cuerdale hoard and the arrival of the Norsemen, though not, as it now appears, exactly correct, was a major step forward.

Mr. Allen a few years later also differed from Brooke’s chronology. Working on the same basis as Oman, that the sword Sihtrics were of the early 920’s, and that the sword St. Peters were more closely related to them than to Eric’s sword type, he felt that the date of the earliest St. Peters had to be 'brought backwards to the period about 925 A.D.', and with them the St. Martins. The period of the St. Peters thus was to stretch from Sihtric to Eric.

Nelson was responsible for an important advance in using the evidence of the Harkirk hoard to demonstrate that the swordless St. Peters included the earliest of the St. Peter series, followed by the Karolus monogram type as being copied from the Cunnetti and Ebraice coins as found in the Cuerdale hoard. Then would come, c. 915, the Cross St. Peters, followed by the Mallet and Hammer coins, but with the swordless series continuing in parallel and lasting until c. 940. Nelson is apparently alone in having considered that the St. Martins (c. 915) were the prototype of the sword St. Peters.

The latest authoritative view is that of Mr. Dolley, expressed in a number of recent studies. As he has remarked, three hoards—Dean, Harkirk and Chester 1882—contained swordless St. Peters with English coins up to Edward the Elder (899–924) and four—Glasnevin, Co. Dublin, Machrie and Trotternish—contained sword but not swordless St. Peters with English elements reaching to Aethelstan or beyond. Mr. Dolley’s unexceptionable conclusion, contrary to assumptions dating back to the British Museum Catalogue, was that all the St. Peters without swords were earlier and not later than those with swords. It followed that, if the sword St. Peters were the later and could be associated with the sword Sihtrics, then the whole swordless St. Peter coinage belonged to the first quarter of the century, but with a longer span than Oman had given it, since Cuerdale is now dated nearer c. 908 than c. 910, and the sword St. Peters need not have ceased with the appearance of a royal coinage at York.

The new pattern was corroborated by the opportune discovery in 1958 at Morley St. Peter in Norfolk of a large hoard, containing St. Peters both without and with the sword, and buried early enough in Aethelstan’s reign to contain only one coin in his name against many hundreds of Edward the Elder.

Together, more or less, with the sword St. Peters must come or go the St. Martins, and these accordingly are also to be placed in the later part of the first quarter of the tenth

1 Brooke, 37.
2 Oman, 50.
3 Allen, 179.
4 Nelson, 116; Rashleigh (p. 98) had also used the Harkirk evidence but his argument had subsequently been overlooked.
5 Nelson expressed his sequence in BMC type nos.—5 (continuing), 4, 1, 2, 3.
6 Geashill, 127.
7 The old dating was based on the battle of Tettenhall as a supposed origin for the Cuerdale hoard.
8 Num. Circ. 1968, 113–4; Antiquity, xxxii, 1958, 100–3.
century. But here an historical problem arises, for the area of the Five Boroughs which were the focus of Danish power in the North Midlands—Leicester, Stamford, Nottingham, Derby and Lincoln—had fallen under English control before the arrival of the Norsemen at York in 919. Derby had been captured by Aethelflaed in 917 and Leicester submitted early the next year. The Danes of Stamford and Nottingham also submitted in 918, to Edward the Elder, but Lincoln is not mentioned specifically. In Sir Frank Stenton's reference to the wording of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'the fate of Lincoln is implied by the contemporary statement that after the surrender of Nottingham, all the people settled in Mercia, Danes and Englishmen, submitted to King Edward. The English frontier had at last been carried to the Humber.'

Both Oman and Nelson believed that the St. Martins must be dated prior to 918; in Oman's words, Lincoln 'would not have issued autonomous coins after that date'.

But for the historical background, Mr. Dolley would have been inclined to date the coins of sword type after the arrival of the Norsemen in York in 919. But the St. Martins seemed to be an obstacle to this idea: 'not only did Lincoln remain outside the sphere of influence of the Hiberno-Norse dynasty, except briefly between 939 and 941, but the city was firmly in English hands by the end of 918, impelled there by fear of the Hiberno-Norsemen who did not make themselves masters of York until the following year'. On the other hand, a date earlier than c. 915 would seem precluded by the evidence of the St. John's hoard from Chester which contains "pictorial" coins of Edward the Elder together with St. Peter pence of the old swordless type. So the St. Martins would have to be dated a year or two before 919, and the earliest sword St. Peters, as their prototype, would need to have appeared c. 915.

To this chronology there are I think more serious numismatic objections than have been apparent hitherto. The matter turns on the relationship of the St. Martins to the St. Peters, and on the sequence of the sword St. Peters themselves. Unfortunately hoard evidence for the duration of the swordless St. Peters is sparse, and the Chester hoard is not precisely datable on the basis of the English coins. If the arrangement of the sword coins proposed in this paper is correct, there would be no intrinsic obstacle to allowing the swordless group a period of issue up to as late as c. 920. This would, incidentally, be more in accord with the proportion of thirteen swordless St. Peters to one with the sword as present in the Morley St. Peter hoard.

No writer has apparently disputed either the typological link between the St. Martins and the St. Peters, or—with the exception of Nelson—that the St. Martins are the derivative group. To give the St. Martins priority would involve the improbable sequence: swordless St. Peters—St. Martins, with sword—sword St. Peters, implying that Lincoln, having borrowed from York the idea and general form of a coinage in the name of the local saint, originated the sword type, which was then in its turn copied by York. The natural direction of influence, politically and numismatically, would be from greater to lesser, from York to Lincoln, and from the relatively abundant and varied St. Peters to the extremely rare and uniform St. Martins.

If this is so, we can attempt to place the St. Martins more precisely, by establishing which of the many varieties of sword St. Peters the St. Martins most resemble and what can be deduced of the sequence and date of the sword St. Peters. These may be described as follows:

1 Sir F. M. Stenton, Anglo-Saxon England, 327. perhaps not be pressed.
2 Oman, 69.
3 Geashill, 131; though Haigh's suggested identification of the symbol as the Sword of Carlus should 4 VCDD, 22.
5 Geashill, 130.
6 Inventory 83; and R. P. Mack in this vol., p. 36.
The **Cross type**—

The obverses have a horizontal sword pointing always to the right, sometimes with an ornament, such as a cross or group of annulets or pellets, at the tip. The inscription above is **SCIE** and below **X III O**, the I of **Petri** being supplied by the shaft of an object which appears to be an inverted mallet.\(^1\) There are sometimes additional ornaments above or below.

On the reverse is a version of the mint name, **EBO RAC E C I** or a derivative form; it surrounds a central design consisting of a cross with either a pellet in each angle, or sometimes a crescent in place of or addition to the pellet in one or two of the quarters.

The coins are mostly of uniform and high quality, the letters being bold and clear, and dies carefully engraved, even when the reverse inscription shows signs of illiterate copying, with the reading corrupted, e.g. to **RORACE** (Glasgow 510). There are often annulets, crescents or pellets in the reverse inscription between letters, but most commonly each side of the letter A.

Some accessible illustrations of coins of the **Cross** type with pure pellet reverse are **BMC** plate xxx, no. 1, Glasgow 513-5 and Copenhagen 584-5; and with the pellet and crescent reverse, Glasgow 516 and Copenhagen 586.

The **Mallet** and **Hammer** types—

The obverses are basically similar to those of the **Cross** type, except that there is no inverted mallet below; the sword sometimes ends in a hook (perhaps a crozier end), and points to the left, e.g. Copenhagen 593 and **BMC**, plate xxx, nos. 3 and 4. There are frequently ornaments at either end of the sword, and sometimes above and/or below the inscription.

The central type of the reverse is commonly an object like the mallet on **Cross** coins, only in an upright position; the head is usually pentagonal as on the **Cross** coins, but occasionally triangular, e.g. on **BMC** plate xxx, no. 3, Glasgow 517 and Copenhagen 593. The shaft is usually shown in double outline—the pure **Mallet** type, e.g. **BMC** plate xxx, no. 2, and Copenhagen 587-92—but sometimes as a single line—the **Hammer-Mallet** variety, e.g. Copenhagen 595-6. There is occasionally an ornament, a bar or trefoil of pellets, each side of the mallet, e.g. Copenhagen 591 and 592. A few coins have a plain hammer, consisting of a single upright shaft, with long wedges on each side just below the top, e.g. **BMC** plate xxx, no. 4 and Copenhagen 597-8.

Some blundering of the legends is normal. On the obverse, P and R frequently decline into single uprights, giving **SCIIE TIIIIO** or similar, a form of corruption curiously rare on degenerate swordless St. Peters. The reverse readings bear little or no resemblance to **Eborace**, being generally composed of a jumble of the letters, I, O, R, V and T.

It is not difficult to see which of these St. Peter varieties is closest to the St. Martins. The inverted T below the inscription on all the St. Martin obverses can, I think, best be interpreted as an equivalent of the inverted mallet on the **Cross** St. Peters.\(^2\) A mark in this form is not found as a casual ornament on coins of the Anglo-Saxon period; and if the St. Martins are copied from the St. Peters, then this mark seems to serve not only to reinforce the connection but to indicate which type of sword St. Peter was taken as a model for the Lincoln coins. That the mallet, the hammer and the Tau-cross, or T, all represented the same object is confirmed by the occurrence of all three as the central type on the reverse of the St. Peter and Sihtric sword coins.

Except in the sense of a cruciform design, the Lincoln reverse does not superficially resemble the **Cross** St. Peters, though it is entirely dissimilar to the **Hammer** and **Mallet** types, to which it cannot look for its model. A small detail, however, finally settles the link with the **Cross** St. Peters: as noted above, it is a common characteristic of these to have small marks flanking the letter A, and there are two pellets beside the letter A on four out of five Lincoln reverse dies.

---

\(^1\) Allen (p. 179) thought this object might be a *pall*. It appears, however, to have been used as an equivalent of the hammer, in which case it can only be a mallet; both forms may be intended to represent Thor’s hammer.

\(^2\) It was so understood by Rashleigh (p. 104). It could conceivably be copied from the cross at the bottom of the obverse of some *Mallet* St. Peters; but if so, why an inverted T and not the obvious cross?
Some thirty or so specimens each of both the Cross and the Mallet/Hammer groups of St. Peters are recorded. The St. Peters with and without sword seem to represent York issues under episcopal authority, although they may have had a rather broader, municipal sponsorship. Although there are several parallel issues of an apparently secular nature, these are never more than fractionally as abundant as the St. Peters. Alongside the swordless St. Peters there was an issue in the name, where not blundered, of an unidentified Regnald (‘Raienalt’, i.e. Ragnald?), with a head or hand on the obverse, and the Karolus monogram on the reverse. Of the period of the sword St. Peters there is another — again very rare — group of secular coins, some of which have the name Sihtric, as noted above, and others of which, with no very intelligible inscriptions, combine a sword or a bow on one side with a hammer type on the other (though the sword on these, unlike the St. Peters and Sihtrics, is enclosed within a circumscription). Surviving secular sword and/or hammer coins, Sihtrics and others combined, number barely a dozen.

Sihtric’s types are comparable to the sword St. Peters. There are Cross coins, one but not others with the inverted mallet on the obverse, suggesting that in the case of this type at least the royal coinage copied the St. Peters and not vice versa; and there are Hammer coins, with several moneyers’ names on them, the hammer being basically in the form of a T. There are also coins of Mallet type, which are rather blundered and probably imitations, perhaps of later date, based partly on St. Peters, though they have unmistakable traces of the name Sihtric on the obverse and one has a reverse inscription apparently indicating a moneyer’s name with the word Mot. It is possible that some of the Sihtrics were not struck at York; Mr. Allen thought they were stylistically close to the St. Martins, and I doubt whether the ‘Castra Eort’ coins can belong to Civitas Eboracis. So the St. Peters and Sihtrics need not be regarded as exactly parallel, though they are obviously related and the date bracket of Sihtric’s reign, 921–6, must apply at least partially to the sword St. Peters.

Before the Morley St. Peter hoard, Mr. Dolley had dated the sword St. Peters to 917–921 — which would just allow an early variety to have appeared in time to be the forerunner of the St. Martins before 918 — and supposed that Sihtric may have suppressed and replaced the ecclesiastical St. Peters in or after 921. More recently he was inclined to date the sword St. Peters c. 915–925, implicitly placing the Cross type (a single specimen of which was the only sword St. Peter in the Morley hoard) towards the end of that period. The arrangement suggested by the editors of the Copenhagen Sylloge is based on a sequence beginning with the Mallet St. Peters, progressing via the Hammer-Mallet to the normal, and commonest, Mallet variety, and ending with the Cross type.

1 The St. Peters are generally assumed to be ecclesiastical. But they were not necessarily so. The St. Martins cannot be issues of the See of Lincoln, which did not exist at the time. It seems possible that the St. Peters were a municipal issue. In this paper ‘secular’ is used to refer to the York issues of the period other than the St. Peters.

2 BMC pl. xxviii, 6–8.

3 The hammer type is not in BMC, and was omitted by Brooke. The Morley St. Peter specimen (B.M.) is figured no. 29 in VCDD; the Glasnevin specimen (now C. E. Blunt), Lindsay, op. cit., pl. 2, no. 52; the Bangor specimen, BNJ xxvii (1955) pl. II, no. 5; another (now Stewart) was in the collection of Lord Grantley whose ticket says it was found near Cambridge.

4 BMC pl. xxviii, 9, and Copenhagen 626.

5 BMC pl. xxix, 13 = VCDD fig. 30.

6 VCDD fig. 31 and Copenhagen 627 (same reverse die).

7 Brooke pl. lxvi, 6 (Aro); BNJ xxvii, pl. II, 4 (Ade—); Hildebrand, Anglo-Sachsiska Mynt, 1881, p. 4 (Sibrant).

8 Edinburgh 70; Copenhagen 594.

9 Allen, 178.

10 Review, 270.

11 Geashill, 130–1.

12 VCDD, 22 and figs 30–1.

13 Copenhagen Sylloge, notes to pl. xx.
Typologically there are reasons for thinking that this may not be the likeliest order. There is, for example, some considerable degeneration of design and literacy within the Mallet series; and on some obverse dies, e.g. Copenhagen 592, there is a triangle below the obverse inscription which is scarcely intelligible except as uncomprehending imitation of the head of the inverted mallet on the Cross St. Peters. There does not seem to me, either, to be any very close link arguing for continuity from late swordless St. Peters to sword St. Peters of the Mallet variety; the latter, as noted above, very frequently show r and s on the obverse as r, a simple error but one not normal on the swordless group, and there are other epigraphical peculiarities which suggest that the corrupted inscriptions on both sides of the Mallet St. Peters are not continuous from those of the swordless group. What is more, in the Mallet series there is a lack of specially well produced and literate varieties which might have been expected to accompany a type change as notable as the introduction of the sword. The natural stylistic arrangement would be to put the Cross St. Peters at the head of the series, for by comparison with the rest they are from consistently well-made dies and even the least good are relatively literate.

The relevant hoard evidence is scanty. Only one of the St. Martins, Copenhagen 620, has a recorded hoard provenance—Terslev (Zealand) 1911, where the English element consisted of ordinary coins of Alfred, Edward, Aethelstan and Edmund and the other Anglo-Viking coins were a swordless St. Peter and a Raven type of Anlaf Guthfrithson. It is notable that most of the St. Martins and sword St. Peters go back to the earlier nineteenth, if not the eighteenth or seventeenth centuries; there must surely have been one or more highly relevant hoards found two centuries ago or more to which we owe most of the extant specimens. The British Museum St. Martin goes back to Sir Robert Cotton (d. 1631); another belonged to Lord Pembroke in 1746; another to Hollis before 1817; and Thoresby illustrated one in Ducatus Leodiensis, 1715. Many of the sword St. Peters also go far back, such as the three Hunter coins at Glasgow, BMC 1811, 1119 and 1120 to Devonshire, BMC 1117 to Tyssen (1802) and BMC 1114, 1116 and 1122 to Hollis. Coins which first appeared in Hollis could, of course, derive from the large and enigmatic Bossall/Flaxton hoard of 1807, which apparently contained English coins from Alfred to Aethelstan, specimens of the Hand/Karolus ‘Raienalt’ type and the secular Bow/Hammer type, as well as some 150 or so St. Peters. But many, perhaps most, of the sword coins must go back to the eighteenth century.

There are, however, three important hoards, all presumably buried in the mid- to later 920’s, which contained sword coins of the period, and the nature of the sword coins is highly revealing. Two of the hoards were small nineteenth century discoveries, at Glasnevin, Co. Dublin, in 1838, and Bangor, North Wales, in 1894; the third is the very large 1958 Morley St. Peter hoard already mentioned. Their respective contents may be summarised in tabular form as follows:—

1 Copenhagen 595 (illustration inverted) has the triangle inverted; this die is retrograde and very blundered, and the triangle seems to me likely to have been copied, again uncomprehendingly, from a coin like Copenhagen 592.

2 I am indebted to Mr. Hugh Pagan for emphasizing this point, and to Mrs. J. S. Martin for helping me to pursue it. It would repay further inquiry, e.g., there are eight St. Peters illustrated in Drake’s Eboracum (1739) (Appendix, p. cix); seven are taken from pl. ix of Fountaine’s Numismata Anglo-Saxonica etc. (1705); the eighth was in the collection of Mr. West. Four have the sword; four are without it.

3 Inventory, 162; Dolley in BNJ xxvii (1955), 11-17; see also BNJ xxx (1961), 360-1.

4 Inventory 89, otherwise known from Lindsay’s reference as the Claremont hoard (corrected by Dolley, British Museum Sylloge, Hiberno-Norse, p. 28).

THE ST. MARTIN COINS OF LINCOLN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islamic</th>
<th>Glasnevin</th>
<th>Bangor</th>
<th>Morley St. Peter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English pre-899</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier Vikings</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward the Elder, 899-924</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swordless St. Peters</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Raienalt' (Karolus monogram)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihtric, 921-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular sword/hammer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross St. Peters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallet/Hammer St. Peters</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martins</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aethelstan, 924-939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of later Viking coins in these hoards is astonishingly consistent, especially in view of the small scale on which these rare coins were present. Two of the three hoards contained a single specimen each of the extremely rare group in Sihtric's name, Glasnevin of the Cross type and Bangor of the T-hammer type. All three hoards contained a single specimen of the even rarer secular sword/hammer group. All three contained sword St. Peters, and all four of these coins were of the Cross type. The hoards were probably all buried in the 920's—ending with their Aethelstans and their Sihtrics—and while none of them contained either a St. Martin or a Mallet St. Peter, all of them contained Cross St. Peters and the secular sword/hammer group, which is known to-day by fewer specimens than either the Sihtrics or the St. Martins.

In a positive sense these hoards prove little beyond that the Cross St. Peters were struck before c. 927, and it is fair to remember that two are very small and the third not necessarily representative as far as its Northumbrian coins are concerned. However, they are indicative on a number of points. Firstly, the Cross type alone of the sword St. Peters is represented in these hoards and again the indication is surely that this type is not the latest of the series. Second, being apparently a fairly compact issue, it should perhaps belong to the 920's rather than stretch back before 918—if it had, Morley St. Peter should have had more than one of the recent sword coins against thirteen of the earlier swordless group. Third, two groups of coins, namely the Sihtric and secular sword coins, managed to be represented respectively in two and three of these hoards, both groups being of equivalent rarity to the St. Martins and of much greater rarity than the Mallet St. Peters. It is negative evidence, but there must be some doubt whether either of these absent series can therefore be dated much before c. 925.¹

Metrology does not help very much. The weights of individual coins vary widely, and there are too few specimens to obtain significant averages. Full specimens of the Cross type of sword St. Peter not infrequently reach 20 gr.; the St. Martins are all under 20 gr.; and the Mallet and Hammer St. Peters are very uneven, usually being in the range of 16 to 20 gr. What evidence there is, therefore, would not be inconsistent with the suggested priority of the Cross St. Peters.

More hoard evidence is needed before we can be at all confident about chronology, but a numismatic pattern emerges which cannot be easily reconciled with a date prior to 918 for the St. Martins and their prototype, the sword St. Peters with the Cross reverse. Instead,

¹The T-hammer Sihtrics may be earlier than the Mallet St. Peters; the only ‘Sihtric’ coins of Mallet type are blundered and perhaps imitative (supra, p. 51).
the indications are that the latter may belong to the earlier 920's, and be of much the same date as the Sihtrics of comparable type. The *Mallet* St. Peters ought not perhaps to be dated much if at all before 925, and in spite of the large York coinage in Aethelstan's name, it may even be wondered if they could have outlasted the period of Viking royal authority at York, which ceased with Anlaf Guthfrithson's first brief tenure in 926-7, or if perhaps some of the more degenerate examples may even have been copies made elsewhere. The varieties are numerous, and though they could belong to a year or two, they give the impression of a longer issue. The suggestions should not be pressed, but though it seems likely that a non-regal issue would have been suppressed immediately by Aethelstan, it would perhaps be wrong in the present state of our knowledge that other possibilities should be entirely ruled out.

To revert to the St. Martins, there are indications against their prototype having been issued before 918, and hoards hint that a date not earlier than the mid 920's could apply to the St. Martins. Whether or not it is thought historically plausible that a Viking coinage of Lincoln could have been struck after 918, say in the period of Northumbrian revolt after Sihtrie's death, the numismatic evidence does seem to tend in this direction. The St. Martins, like the St. Peters, were not a regal issue and if the Danes were allowed to continue their own customs where they caused no trouble, perhaps the ecclesiastical (or municipal) coinages were for a time condoned; they belonged to an age in which there are indications that coinage had still not been brought fully under royal control.