THE YEARBY (REDCAR) HOARD

By J. P. C. KENT

On 22 March 1954 Mr. Charles Auty, foreman at Yearby Farm, near Redcar, Yorkshire, was ploughing back an old hedge bank when he uncovered the fragments of two pottery vessels, containing between them 1,197 silver coins, dating between 1551 and 1697. A week later, an Inquest held at Redcar declared them to be Treasure Trove.

The composition of the hoard is remarkable in that milled and hammered coins are associated in the one find, and together provide a clear cross-section of the coinage in circulation at the time of the Great Recoinage. Its date of deposition seems to be fairly certainly late in 1697. Although records show that the output of the two years was about equal, our hoard contained 89 coins of 1696, and only 26 of 1697. Another circumstance which is likely to preclude a later date is the fact that the issues of London and York are present in about equal numbers, although London was actually striking about ten times as much as York.

Hammered coins accounted for nearly 87 per cent. of the whole deposit. The proportions between the various issues and years correspond closely to those found in hoards of the Civil War period already published, and the only remarkable feature is the scarcity of the provincial issues of Charles I. I owe to Mr. Ashby the suggestion that these may have been sought after and destroyed under the Commonwealth, much as Parliament’s own coinage, represented in the hoard by only a single specimen, was demonetized by Charles II. The hammered coinage of Charles II, which only occurs in a handful of British hoards, was well represented. Many of the hammered coins were clipped, the total loss of which on all accounts being equivalent to 16 per cent. This compares very favourably with the figure of 47 per cent. quoted by Craig.

It is evident that the milled coins had seen little circulation for the majority were in excellent condition. The metrology of these yielded interesting results. The proportion of over-weight coins, 24 out of 164, corresponds almost exactly to the 15 per cent. that were worth “culling” in 1635. It looks as though the mint erred well on its own side in the weighing of blanks. The following table shows the variation in the weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coin 1</td>
<td>100 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin 2</td>
<td>90 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin 3</td>
<td>110 g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 National Grid reference 598209 (Sheet 45/52 2¼ inch series).
3 See, for example, Upwey (N.C. 1949, p. 261), Orston (N.C. 1952, p. 118), Farmborough (N.C. 1953, p. 150).
4 Mr. J. D. A. Thompson has kindly informed me of the following hoards containing the hammered issues of Charles II: Stedham (N.C. 1926, p. 283), Crediton (N.C. 1897, p. 159), Bristol (N.C. 1923, p. 236), Ballymoney (Trans. Kilkenny Arch. Soc. iii, 1854-5, p. 63), Bampton (N.C. 1851, p. 10), Wrotham (J.B.A.A. 1849, p. 63), Staple (N.C. 1943, p. 107). The only recorded find of milled pieces of the recoinage period is Broughton Astley (N.C. 1882, p. 88).
6 Craig, op. cit., p. 145.
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CHARLES II AND JAMES II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True wt.</th>
<th>Normal variation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2s. 6d.</td>
<td>232.26 gr</td>
<td>226.4–231.2</td>
<td>229.2</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>226.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s.</td>
<td>92.90 gr</td>
<td>88.8–91.2</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILLIAM III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True wt.</th>
<th>Normal variation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s.</td>
<td>92.90 gr</td>
<td>87.8–91.7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>46.45 gr</td>
<td>41.4–46.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main interest of the milled coins centred around a technical problem not hitherto considered in the modern series. Many pieces showed distinct traces of incuse impressions on either, or both, faces and it is not yet established how these were caused. This feature has been observed on Greek and Roman coins, where it has been recognized as being due to the restriking of brockages, but at least until the reign of Anne, when it becomes rare, it seems to be a frequent feature on silver and copper. It has been suggested that it is caused by the “clanging” of dies resulting in impressions being made by one on the other, and this is a known cause of some so-called varieties on pennies of the early nineteenth century. However, the depth of the incuse portions visible on some specimens, and the complete absence of defects in the positive impression makes me prefer the restruck brockage explanation. “Ghosting” such as is found on many thin coins of the Middle Ages, seems unlikely, in view of the relatively thick flans employed, and the fairly abrupt cessation of the phenomenon. The question, however, requires a great deal more study.

Although no new evidence was found bearing on the problem of the so-called “2nd Bust” of William III, several pointers towards the relative chronology of the numerous varieties of 1696–7 were obtained. The tentative suggestions here put forward can only be tested as and when more hoards of this period are recovered, and in the light of further study of the mass of these coins now extant.

The only denomination in which the varieties are sufficiently well defined to permit a detailed classification is the sixpence. Our guide throughout must be the London coins, which present the varieties shown in the first table on p. 296.

Type 1 was certainly in use from the beginning of the year until well after October 1696, when the last of the provincial mints (Chester) was opened, for it is the normal, and at most mints the only variety dated 1696. The introduction of a new puncheon for the Irish harp was rapidly followed by the use of a smaller crown and this Type 3.

2 Noted by me for many reigns between Hadrian (117–38) and Justinian II (685–711). For a different technical interpretation, see N. Dürr, Beobachtungen zur romanischen Münzprägung, Jahresbericht 1953 des historischen Museums Basel, p. 1.
3 Of the copper series in the National Collection, some 50 per cent. show this feature.
4 I owe this information to Mr. C. W. Peck.
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rare in 1696, is normal at all mints in 1697. The experimental Second Bust can be seen to fall at the turn of the year 1696–7 (old style), and the hoard suggests that it was followed by the continued use of the first bust (Type 3). It has already been shown that a date 1697 is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bust</th>
<th>Harp</th>
<th>Crown over shields</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1695-6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1696-7</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1697-9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In the second column are given the numbers in the Redcar Hoard.
2 A mule connects this reverse variety with the obverse of Type 5Y.
3 Type 7 is exclusive to the provincial mints, where it is probably concurrent with 6i.
probable for its deposition. First and Third Bust coins, both shillings and sixpences, are present in about equal numbers. Third Bust sixpences are very rare at the provincial mints, and it seems likely that the First Bust continued to be used by them until the end, for at them alone is it combined with the latest London reverse, on which we find once more the large crowns. The Third Bust alone was used at London for this variety (Type 6) which was probably current from about the middle of 1697. I think that the absence of muling between First Bust obverses and Type 6 reverses indicates that, at London at least, they have a definite chronological importance and that Type 5 intervenes between 3ii and 6. Type 6 of the provincial mints was absent, as were Third Bust sixpences of York, on which the mark Y was revived. The latest issues of 1697 were thus represented by London coins only, a further indication that the successive varieties produced in the capital took time to reach the provincial mints. I subjoin a table of varieties based on my assumption (which does not amount to proof) that the Third Bust superseded the First about the middle of 1697.¹

YEARNING (REDCAR) HOARD

Reference numbers in square brackets are to H. A. Seaby, Notes on English Silver Coins, 1666-1698, and to his English Silver Coinage 1649-1949. Pieces marked with an asterisk have been acquired by the British Museum.

EDWARD VI (3)

Shillings (2): (Fine coinage): Tun 2.


PHILIP AND MARY (3)

Shillings (3): Spanish titles, no date 1; English title only, 155–2.

ELIZABETH I (381)

Shillings (114):

Crosslet *23; Martlet 14; uncertain 1558–60 2; Bell 4; A 6; Escallop over A/Escallop 1; Escallop 6; Crescent/Escallop 1; Crescent 3; Hand 4; Tun 11; Tun/Woolpack over Tun 1; Woolpack II; Key/Key over Woolpack 1; Key 2; I 4; 2 6; Uncertain 1582-1602 8; Uncertain 1558-1602 6.

Sixpences (266):

Pheon 1561 13; 1562 over 1 7; 1562 1; 1563 1; 1564 5; 1565 1; Uncertain 1565 7; Rose 1565 1; Lion 1566 2; Portcullis 1566 8; Uncertain 1566 3; Coronet 1566 1; 1567 10; Uncertain 1567 2; Coronet 1568 II; 1569 2; Uncertain 1569 1; Coronet 1570 7; Castle 1570 1; 1571 7; Ermine 1572 10; 1573 6; Uncertain 1573 4; Acorn 1573 6; 1574 3; Uncertain 1574 2; Eglantine 1574 8; 1575 12; 1576 1; 1577 over 6 1; Uncertain date 3; Uncertain 157–2; Greek Cross/Greek Cross over Eglantine 1578 over 7 1; Greek Cross 1578 II; 1579 5; 157–1; Greek Cross/Greek Cross over Rose 1580 over 79 over 65 *1; Greek Cross

¹ The information on which this table is based is derived from the trays of the National Collection, with additional material from H. A. Seaby’s, English Silver Coinage 1649–1949, pp. 96–97. Mr. P. A. Rayner (for whose treatment of the subject see Seaby’s Coin and Medal Bulletin, September 1954, p. 367) has kindly discussed the question, and approximate degrees of rarity, with the writer.

² One reads REGIN. (sic). Acquired by BM.
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1580 over 70 2; 1580 2; Latin Cross 1580 i; 1581 5; Sword 1582 8; Uncertain 1582 2; Bell 1582 5; 1583 7; Uncertain 1583 i; A 1583 3; 1584 2; A over Bell i; Escallop 1585 5; 1586 over 5 i; 1586 i; Crescent 1587 i; 1588 i; Uncertain 158– i; Hand 1590 4: 1591 over 0 2; 1591 3; 1592 i; Uncertain 1592 i; Tun 1592 2; 1593 5; 1594 over 3 i; 1594 i; Woolpack over Tun/Tun 1594 over 3 i; Woolpack 1594 2; Uncertain 1595 2; Key 1596 3; 1597 I; 1598 i; 159– i; 1 1601 2; 2 1602 5.

Groat (1):
Crosslet i.

JAMES I (164)

ENGLISH (158)

Shillings (103):
1st Coinage: Thistle (1st) 2; (2nd) 7; Lis (2nd) 8; Uncertain (2nd) i. 2nd Coinage: Lis (3rd) ii; Rose (3rd) 3; Uncertain (3rd) 7; Rose (4th) 9; Escallop over Rose (4th) i; Escallop (4th) 6; Grapes (4th) 5; Coronet (4th) 6; Uncertain (4th) 3; Coronet (5th) 3; Key (5th) 2; Bell (5th) i; Mullet (5th) i; Trefoil (5th) 2; Cinquefoil (5th) i; Uncertain (5th) 9.
3rd Coinage: Thistle (6th) 3; Lis (6th) 4; Trefoil (6th) 5; Uncertain (6th) 3.

Sixpences (55):
1st Coinage: Thistle (1st) 1603 5; (2nd) 1603 6; Lis (2nd) 1604 5. 2nd Coinage: Lis (3rd) 1604 3; 1605 i; Rose over Lis/Rose (3rd) 1605 2; Rose (3rd) 1605 8; (4th) 1605 2; 1606 2; Uncertain (4th) 1606 i; Escallop (4th) 1606 2; Grapes/Grapes over Escallop (4th) i; Grapes (4th) 1607 4; Uncertain (4th) 1607 2; Coronet (4th) 1607 i; 1609 i; Key (4th) 1609 i; Mullet (4th) 1611 i.
3rd Coinage: Thistle (6th) 1621 2; 1622 2; 1623 i; Lis (6th) 1624 i; Trefoil over Lis (6th) 1624 i.

SCOTS (3)

Shillings (3): Thistle (English Arms) i; (Scots Arms) 2.

IRISH (3)

Shillings (3):
Uncertain 3.

CHARLES I (449)

TOWER MINT (445)

Half-crowns (73):

Shillings (332):
Sixpences (40):

ABERYSTWYTH (I)
Shilling (1):
  Book I.

OXFORD (I)
Half-crown (1):
  "Declaration" 1644 I.

FALSE (2)
Shillings (2):

COMMONWEALTH (I)
Shilling (1):
  Sun 1653 I.

CHARLES II (75)
HAMMERED (32)
Half-crowns (11):

Shillings (21):
  [1017] 4; [1019] 12; Uncertain 5; False 1.

MILLED (43)
Half-crowns (18):

Shillings (25):

JAMES II (4)
Half-crowns (1):
  1687 [498] I.

Shillings (3):
  1685 [1068] 3.

WILLIAM III (117)
TOWER MINT (55)
Shillings (21):
  1695 [1077] 2; 1696 [1078] 5; [1080] I*; 1697 [1091] 2; [1108] I.

Sixpences (34):

NORWICH (3)
Shillings (2):
  1696 [1085] I; 1697 [1099] I.

Sixpence (1):
  1696 [1538] I.
The pottery found in association with the hoard of coins has been reconstructed at the British Museum and proves to belong to two jugs. Both vessels now consist of several fragments of the body and base, and on each the lower end of attachment of the handle is present. The missing necks, rims, and handles have therefore been added on the drawings (Figs. 1 and 2) by comparison with complete examples.

Fig. 1. Jug of thick sandy buff ware. Dark green glaze covers the outside surface, becoming thinner towards the base. Similar glaze also covers the whole of the inside surface. In shape the jug is ovoid,
with a smooth curve in profile. Two girth grooves, close together, mark the change from neck to body, and a broad shallow groove is on the bulge. The attachment of the handle, marked by a large thumb impression, is just above the body groove. The base is moulded at the edge and slightly hollowed underneath.

Fig. 2. Jug of pink-toned buff ware. Patches of shiny green glaze remain on the upper part of the body; the surface is rather worn below the bulge, but the glaze does not seem to have extended much below this level. Glaze also covers the entire inside surface. The shape is broader than that of the other jug, with a sharper curve above the shoulder. No decoration is present. The lower end of the handle, also marked by the thumb, is attached above the bulge. The base is almost flat; the edge is plain and only slightly moulded.

In character the two jugs have much in common, and evidently they represent the coarse table ware of the late seventeenth century, though still embodying a strong medieval tradition. The leading characteristic, the presence of an over-all glaze on the inside surface as well as outside, occurs frequently on Tudor coarse wares used at the table and in cooking, and this feature lasted well into the eighteenth century. There is, however, little means by which these post-medieval coarse wares may be differentiated, unless they are found in association with the finer imported wares or with coins. The archaeological value of the Redcar find is thus in providing a closely fixed date for the pottery.

G. C. DUNNING