

Minutes for Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting -13th January 2011

The meeting was held in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum on Thursday 13th January 2011 at 11am.

Present

Committee:

Norman Palmer (Chair)
Jack Ogden (Vice-Chair)
Trevor Austin
Ian Carradice
John Cherry
Peter Clayton
David Dykes
Tim Pestell

Other:

Roger Bland (BM)
Michael Lewis (BM)
Caroline Lyons (BM)
Janina Parol (BM)
Ian Richardson (BM)
Helen Loughlin (DCMS)

Item 1: Minutes of the meeting of Friday 26th November 2010

The minutes of the meeting were passed as a true record.

Item 2: Objects

Bronze Age artefacts

1. Bronze Age gold plated penannular ring from Steyning, West Sussex (2010 T148)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75; the Committee viewed the ring in light of this. The Committee agreed that the damage to the gold foil detracted from its appeal but nonetheless felt that the ring commanded a higher value than suggested, and recommended £100. Steyning Museum hopes to acquire.

2. Bronze Age hoard from Calbourne, Isle of Wight (2010 T67)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £140; the Committee took this under advice as it examined the hoard. It commented on the poor condition of the items, pointing to the odd corrosion blisters covering the surface of the pieces. The Committee felt that the global value of the items in this case had been slightly understated, and it recommended £150. Isle of Wight Heritage Museum hopes to acquire.

3. Middle Bronze Age hoard from Uttlesford area, Essex (2009 T498)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £10; the Committee viewed the group in light of this, and agreed with the sentiments of the valuer. The presence of a recognizable axehead (albeit broken) was felt to contribute more to the group's appeal and the Committee recommended £20. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

4. Late Bronze Age copper-alloy hoard from Manningtree area, Essex (2009 T499)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] Ede suggested £50; the Committee inspected the hoard in light of this and finding the suggested figure to be accurate, in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £50. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

5. Bronze Age gold composite ring from Tendring area, Essex (2009 T524)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £650-£700; the Committee viewed the ring in light of this, taking account of the rarity of jewellery of this age on the market. The Committee pointed to similar rings that had come before it in the past (for example, 2007 T118 from Stone, Buckinghamshire, *Portable Antiquities and Treasure Annual Report 2007*, no. 37; PAS no. BUC-9754C7; weighing 7.21g, valued at £800). The ring from Tendring area, though much lighter in weight (3.5g), was judged an attractive piece, but in comparison to other related objects the Committee felt that it justified a value of £600, and the Committee recommended that figure. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

6. Bronze Age hoard (17) from Uttlesford area, Essex (2008 T485)- addenda to 2009 T729

James Ede has valued this item at £1,750. According to the evidence of PC [REDACTED] of the Essex Police, the Finder (Mr [REDACTED]) was approached by the Police in the early hours of the morning, and was found to have possession of the hoard, which was located in his van. On PC [REDACTED]'s evidence, the Finder admitted to PC [REDACTED] that he had not sought permission from the Landowner to detect on the land and/or to excavate objects. The Finder was charged with theft and found not guilty, having testified that he intended to notify

the landowner of the find. Follow up excavations took place resulting in further Treasure finds (2009 T729). The following paperwork is included: Police statement, statement from [REDACTED] regarding the hoard, submission from the Landowner and Museum.

The Committee viewed the hoard in light of the provisional valuation by [REDACTED] for £1,750 and the submissions of the Museum and the Landowner, and it considered the circumstances of the find as it debated a recommendation in this case.

As to the value of the items, the Committee noted that the provisional valuer had allowed £200 for each of the socketed axes, but it felt this was more in line with a commercial price (rather than the price the pieces would expect to fetch at auction) for such examples and so adjusted the global figure downwards accordingly. For the group, the Committee recommended £1500.

The Committee secondly considered the issue of the behaviour of the Finder insofar as it had a bearing on a decision whether to abate the reward normally recommended to a Finder. It noted that Mr [REDACTED] had recovered the hoard through the use of a metal detector without permission on land owned by [REDACTED] in the early morning hours of 24 August 2008. The Committee further took note of the fact that in the Criminal Court Mr [REDACTED] (having testified as above) had been acquitted of the charge of theft for this action. While noting that Mr [REDACTED] defence was material to the issues of dishonesty and intention to permanently deprive, the Committee further noted that it, as juries do not give reasons, it could not identify with certainty the rational basis for the acquittal in this case.

In making a recommendation to the Secretary of State the Treasure Valuation Committee considers all relevant matters in order to reach a conclusion, grounded on the balance of probability, as to the true circumstances and events of the particular case.

In this instance, having heard that Mr [REDACTED] parked his car out of sight in an obscure position on the land in question and recovered the objects prior to daylight, without securing (or even attempting to secure) the permission of the Landowner, and that Mr [REDACTED] initial response to PC [REDACTED] was (according to PC [REDACTED] to say something that was not true about his reason for being on the land, the Committee concluded (i) that Mr [REDACTED] had committed trespass, and (ii) that the Committee had seen no sufficient or compelling evidence to cause it to conclude on a balance of probabilities that, had the pieces not been confiscated by the police, Mr [REDACTED] would have informed the Coroner and [REDACTED] of the discoveries. In each of these respects, the Committee took further note of the fact that Mr [REDACTED] had failed to provide any response to the submissions of the Museum and [REDACTED]

Under the circumstances, and in accordance with the Treasure Act Code of Practice (revised), paragraph 79:

‘Finders may expect to receive no rewards at all or abated rewards under the following circumstances:

- (vii) – where there are reasonable grounds to believe that the finder was trespassing
- (ix) – where there are other factors that the Secretary of State thinks it appropriate to take into account in individual cases’

- the Committee took the view that Mr [REDACTED] should receive no reward and that the value normally attributed to the Finder’s share of the reward should be applied to the Landowner, [REDACTED]. The Committee’s recommendation therefore was that [REDACTED] be rewarded with the sum £1500. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

7. Bronze Age metalwork hoard from Uttlesford area, Essex (2009 T729)- addenda to 2008 T485

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £70; the Committee examined the hoard in light of this. It found itself in agreement with the suggested figure. As this find was made by archaeologists as a direct consequence of the finding of the 17 items under treasure number 2008 T485, the Finder in the original case would normally be entitled to 50% of the reward in this case (rewards not being payable to archaeologists). As the Committee has recommended that Mr [REDACTED] the Finder in the original case, not be paid a reward for those items, and that his portion of the reward be payable to the Landowner [REDACTED] it also advised that in this case [REDACTED] receive 100% of the value of the items. The Committee recommended that [REDACTED] be rewarded with the sum of £70. Saffron Walden Museum hopes to acquire.

8. Bronze Age base metal group from Amport area, Amport area, Hampshire (2007 T704)- 2nd viewing

██████████ valued this item at £1,500; Comments were supplied by one Finder (Mr ██████████), the Landowner and an Archaeologist involved in the case. The Committee felt that the provisional valuation for the axes was accurate, and noted that it agreed with both the global figure suggested (£1,500) and the figures for the individual axes (£200 for the socketed axes, £300 for the palstaves) (14/04/10).

Since full information regarding the identities and roles of the Finders was not before the Committee at the time of its original meeting, the Committee withheld a recommendation pending the gathering of that data.

Pursuant to that decision, the Secretariat established the following:

The Coroner returned the necessary verdict for the outstanding items and a third Finder was named: Mr ██████████

Mr ██████████ has provided a submission regarding his involvement and entitlement to a reward;

The archaeologist, ██████████, has forwarded a submission regarding the involvement of Finders subsequent to Ms ██████████ (initial Finder)

Mr ██████████ Finder, believes that the Finders' reward should go to Ms ██████████ and shall not be seeking his share of the reward.

At this meeting the Committee reviewed this information. The Committee considered whether Mr ██████████ should be entitled to the Finder's portion of the reward for the two axes which he found. It considered that the issue was whether Mr ██████████ could be considered to be engaged in an archaeological excavation or investigation, as detailed in the Treasure Act Code of Practice (CoP) paragraph 81. The Committee accepted that, after the initial discovery of three of the axeheads by Miss ██████████ the Landowner Mr ██████████ requested the assistance of Ms ██████████ to further investigate the site, and that Ms ██████████'s operations fell under the definition of an archaeological investigation. According to the CoP paragraph 81, those taking part in Ms ██████████'s work would not be eligible to receive a reward for any items of Treasure that were found. It was unclear however whether Mr ██████████ should be deemed to have taken part in that investigation, or whether he should be treated as an independent Finder, as from the comments submitted it appears that Mr ██████████ was at the scene of the discovery at the invitation of the Mr ██████████ but not expressly for the purpose of aiding Ms ██████████ in her investigation.

For that reason the Committee instructed the Secretariat to write to both Mr ██████████ (the Landowner) and to Mr ██████████ with the following query:

As you may know the question has been raised as to whether Mr ██████████ was, at the time of his discovery of two axeheads, engaged in the investigation led by Ms ██████████. The Committee would be interested to hear your views on this matter.

The Committee further observed that, where any archaeological work is carried out with the assistance of volunteers, particularly metal detector users, it is highly advisable that the volunteers be asked to sign a waiver, foregoing any claim to items of Treasure which they might discover. The Committee also noted that this clause in the Code of Practice should be examined when the Code of Practice is reviewed.

Hampshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

Roman artefacts

9. Roman silver spoon from Potters Bar, Hertfordshire (2010 T275)

The provisional valuer ██████████ suggested £300. The Committee examined the spoon in light of this. It commented that the spoon is a tidy piece, and drew a parallel to a commercial example listed in *Celtic and Roman Artefacts* by Nigel Mills (Greenlight Publishing, 2000; page 91, ref. RB274) for £420 in 'Fine' condition. The condition of the piece in question warranted a lower figure and the Committee recommended £250. Potters Bar Museum hopes to acquire.

10. Roman gold appliqué from Alciston, East Sussex (2008 T549)

The provisional valuer ██████████ suggested £500. The Committee viewed the item in light of this and found the object to be attractive and by virtue of its unusual appearance and mysterious nature, interesting. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £500. Lewes Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

11. Roman silver finger-ring from Revesby, Lincolnshire (2009 T719)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,000. The Committee examined the ring in light of this and commented on the well-cut intaglio and the substantial heft of the piece. It found the suggested price to be high for a ring made of silver, noting that a broadly similar Roman gold finger-ring with intaglio was sold at the 16 December 2010 TimeLine Auctions sale for £600 (lot 374). The Committee therefore recommended £800. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

12. Roman gold pendant from Maker with Rame, Cornwall (2008 T782)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £900-£1,000; the Finder and Occupier submitted comments. The Committee recommended £1,000 and reaffirmed its acceptance of the curatorial report provided by the British Museum, dating the object to the 1st – 4th centuries (1/10/10). The Occupier submitted a challenge and a private valuation by [REDACTED] and the Museum submitted further comments.

The Committee considered the piece again and reviewed the submissions. It pointed out that the valuation by [REDACTED] did not provide any evidence in the form of parallels to substantiate the figure. In any case, the Committee saw that Mr [REDACTED] suggestion broadly correlated with the figure that the Committee had already recommended, and feeling that there was nothing which would cause it to depart from its previous conclusion, the Committee recommended £1,000. The Royal Cornwall Museum hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval artefacts

13. Viking silver ingot from Yaxley, Suffolk (2010 T365)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £30. The Committee examined the piece in light of this and compared it to similar ingots that it had valued in the past. By virtue of its silver content and weight, this ingot was felt to be worth slightly more than accounted for, and the Committee recommended £35. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

14. Viking silver pendant from Copgrove, North Yorkshire (2010 T224) – Late submission

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £35, the Finder submitted comments. The Committee examined the pendant in light of this and noted the heavy wear, but felt that in keeping with similar examples previously valued (for example, 2005 T575 from ‘near Holt’, Norfolk; *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, pg 94, ref 276, valued at £80) a higher figure would be in order. The Committee recommended £75. Harrogate Museum hopes to acquire

15. Anglo-Saxon silver dress pin from Claybrook Magna, Leicestershire (2009 T28)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40. The Committee examined the pin in light of this and felt that the suggested value was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £40. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

16. Mid/ Late Saxon gold mount from Low Risby area, North Lincolnshire (2009 T639)

The provisional valuer suggested £40. The Committee took this into account as it examined the mount. The poor condition was a factor in the deliberations, but the Committee felt that the date of the piece (the 10th Century) contributed positively to its desirability and value. The Committee therefore recommended £70. North Lincolnshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

17. Viking gold finger-ring from Mid Sussex area (2008 T427)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £2,500. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this. It felt that the parallel suggested by the valuer, to be found in *Benet's Artefacts of England & the United Kingdom* (ed. Paul Murawski, 2003; pg 325) was of a different nature; more similar in style, size and weight, though slightly less ornate, was a Viking twisted gold ring sold in the 16 December 2010 TimeLine Auctions sale for £800 (lot 563, estimate £800-£1200). The Committee compared this with the sale of a further twisted gold ring in the 19 November 2009 Christie's Auction for £1875 (Lot 86; South Kensington). In accordance with this, for the Mid Sussex area ring the Committee recommended £1250. Barbican House Museum hopes to acquire.

18. Early Medieval silver mount from Claythorpe, Lincolnshire (2010 T85)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £650. The Committee considered the mount in light of this and found the suggestion impressively analytical, and in accordance with the valuer, recommended £650. The Collection, Lincoln, hopes to acquire.

19. Anglo-Saxon gold & garnet stud from Northamptonshire (2009 T648)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £850-£950. The Committee viewed the stud in light of this and agreed with the valuer that the parallels cited from the Bonham's auctions were in better condition. It

further felt that the valuer had accurately factored into her suggestion the damage to this piece. The Committee took account of the limited range of Anglo-Saxon gold material available on the open market and, in agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £950. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

The British Museum has withdrawn interest in this item.

20. Early Medieval silver disc brooch from Bredfield, Suffolk (2009 T157)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £9,000. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and though a delicate piece, the attractive design and unique nature of such items on the market were felt to contribute to its appeal. The Committee believed that the brooch could achieve as much as £8500 at auction.

It was noted with concern that the brooch had been both straightened and cleaned by the Finder prior to its being reported as potential Treasure. The Committee appreciated the honesty of the Finder in disclosing his actions to the archaeological officer [REDACTED] but nonetheless resolved to remind the Finder of the guidelines published in the Treasure Act Code of Practice paragraph 47 which urge interested parties *not* to attempt to clean or straighten artefacts of Treasure themselves. As the Code states, ‘inappropriate cleaning can reduce the value (both archaeological and commercial) of finds’ and paragraph 79 of the Code further allows for the abatement of a Finder’s reward should he or she be seen to have ‘deliberately or recklessly’ done damage to an object. In this case the Committee was concerned whether the Finder’s use of Silver Dip and Silvo would inhibit the scientific investigation of some elements of the brooch, in particular whether *niello* had been applied to the decoration. As the Finder appears not to have acted recklessly on this occasion the Committee saw no cause for an abatement, but agreed that the secretariat should remind the Finder, on the Committee’s behalf, that any future incidents of cleaning an item of Treasure prior to depositing it with the appropriate body could result in a reduction of his share of any reward. The Committee recommended £8500. The Committee further expressed the view that the interpretation and use of the terms ‘deliberate’ and reckless’ within the CoP should be revisited as part of the Treasure Review. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

21. Anglo-Saxon gold coin pendant from Billericay area, Essex (2009 T496)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,200; the Museum submitted comments. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this, and reviewed the Museum’s submission. It agreed that the coin portion is quite worn, and also noted that a large part of the item’s appeal may be numismatic. The Committee commented that in good condition such a coin would be worth £1000; the condition of this piece would warrant a figure in the realm of £700-£750. While the modification of a coin would normally reduce its value, the Committee acknowledged that the addition of the suspension ring could enhance the attraction of the piece as an item of jewellery. Under the circumstances the Committee felt that a second valuation would be beneficial to its deliberations, and it asked the Secretariat to approach [REDACTED] for said valuation. Chelmsford Museum hopes to acquire.

*For the subsequent meeting, let it be noted that the Committee generally felt that the price of £1200 was an over-estimation of the item’s worth.

22. Anglo-Saxon gold bracteate from Scalford, Leicestershire (2010 T414)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £6,000-£7,000; the Committee requested a second valuation (26/11/10). The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £1,500. The Committee examined the bracteate again taking both of these into consideration. It noted the first valuer’s praise for the item’s decoration, which she felt justified the suggested price; the *comparanda* she cited which had an estimate of £35,000-£45,000 was deemed to be of a different nature. The Committee was more convinced by the supporting evidence provided by the second valuer. It found the detail to be weak on the bracteate from Scalford but appreciated the item’s rarity. Realising that this piece possessed more appeal than the item mentioned by the second valuer, the Committee recommended £2,300. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

23. Early-Medieval silver-gilt mount from Thimbley, Lincolnshire (2009 T175)

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £22,000-£28,000; the second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £6,000. The Museum submitted comments and the Finder submitted a response. The Museum submitted further comments in response to the Finder’s comments. The Finder also submitted a private valuation from [REDACTED] Bonhams, who valued this item at £10,000.

The Committee considered all of this information as it inspected the mount. It commented that many of the

parallel's cited by the first valuer were not relevant in this case, and that the suggestions of Mr [REDACTED] and Ms [REDACTED] were better reasoned. The Committee identified the mount as an impressive object and on balance, felt that it would demand a sum of £8000 on the open market. It recommended £8000. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval artefacts

24. Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Brill, Buckinghamshire (2010 T204)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £60-£80. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £80. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

25. Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Walgrave, Northamptonshire (2009 T238)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £150. The Committee viewed the brooch and took this under advice. It found the suggested value to be reasonable, owing to its unusual design and good substance. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

26. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Wanborough, Wiltshire (2010 T158)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80; The Committee viewed the ring in light of this and, finding it to be of pleasant construction, recommended £90. Swindon Museum hopes to acquire.

27. Medieval/Post-Medieval silver *fede* finger-ring from Pocklington, East Riding of Yorkshire (2010 T246)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this. It mentioned two Medieval silver-gilt rings that had been sold at the 19 March 2010 TimeLine Auction (Lot 603, £90; Lot 604, £100) as being of the same period and construction, though inferior in style and attraction. The suggested price for the *fede* finger-ring from Pocklington was seen to be high, and the Committee recommended £200. Hull & East Riding Museum Service hopes to acquire.

28. Late Medieval silver seal matrix from Tytherington, South Gloucestershire (2008 T648)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £250. The Committee viewed the matrix with this under advice, and felt that the suggestion was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £250. Bristol City Museum hopes to acquire

29. Medieval silver seal matrix from Colchester area, Essex (2009 T698)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £500. The Committee viewed the seal matrix in light of this. By way of comparison it mentioned a bronze seal which had sold in the 19 March 2010 TimeLine auction for £560 (lot 609). Although in bronze, that piece was much more elaborate the seal from the Colchester area. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £500. Colchester & Ipswich Museum hopes to acquire.

30. Medieval silver-gilt crucifix pendant from Morecambe, Lancashire (2010 T31)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £120; the Finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the pendant in light of this, taking into account the Finder's submission. The Committee commented that much of the gilding had been lost through much wear. The Committee appreciated the fact that the Finder had not attempted to clean the pendant himself and it was felt that the item possessed the potential to be conserved to a more appealing state. The Committee recommended £190. Lancaster City Museum hopes to acquire.

31. Medieval gold finger-ring from Tendring area, Essex (2009 T110)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £2,000. The Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and commented on the unfortunate wear to the inscription on the ring from the Tendring area and felt that this may detract from its appeal on the open market. The Committee drew attention to comparisons from a recent sale, on 9 September 2010 by TimeLine Auctions, of a series of gold Post-Medieval rings (see lots 890-895). Though later in date, these rings were felt to be broadly similar in terms of attraction to the piece in question, and the prices realised in the auction ranged from £800 to £1600. For these reasons, the Committee felt it would benefit from a second independent valuation, and requested the Secretariat to ask Peter Spencer to provide one. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hope to acquire.

32. Medieval gold finger-ring from Eastbourne area, East Sussex (2009 T381)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £1,500. The Committee viewed the ring in light of this

and when reviewing the curatorial report on the item and the results of the analysis, took the view that it was more likely that the bezel was composed of a bezoar (or at least, what the manufacturer believed was a bezoar) rather than the amber suggested by [REDACTED]. The Committee felt that while the bezoar did not make for an attractive setting, it provided for a very interesting example owing to the contemporary significance attached to such 'stones'. In terms of the valuation, then, the Committee found itself in agreement with the provisional valuer, and recommended £1500. Lewes Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

33. Medieval gold badge/mount fragment from Malton, North Yorkshire (2009 T199)- 2nd viewing

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £600-£800; the Committee requested a second valuation (26/11/10). The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £100. The Committee took account of these as it inspected the item again. It felt that in the item's favour were its association with the Virgin and Child and the material of its composition (gold). The poor condition was another factor in the Committee's discussion. In addition to the above factors, the Committee was guided by its decision on other badges which it had valued (for instance, 2008 T71, a silver-gilt pilgrim badge from Tong, Shropshire, PAS ID: WMID-0BD8C0; valued at £200), and it recommended £250. Malton Museum Foundation hopes to acquire.

34. Medieval silver-finger-ring from Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire (2009 T594)- 2nd viewing

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £400; the Committee requested a second valuation (26/11/10), noting that it had valued similar silver-gilt finger rings for less. The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £50, and the Finder submitted comments. The Committee viewed the ring again and considered the Finder's submission. It agreed that the attraction of the ring likely lay between the two suggested values. The Committee commented that the ring was smooth, but wearable, and in the absence of any more decoration than the engraved lines on the bezel, it recommended £150. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval artefacts

35. Post-Medieval silver-gilt medallion and chain from Fleckney, Leicestershire (2010 T341)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £300; the Finder and Landowner submitted comments with commercial examples. The Committee viewed the medallion and chain in light of this, and thanked the Finder and Landowner for their comments and the *comparanda* provided, which the Committee saw were quite similar to the piece in question. The Committee clarified the difference between a commercial price and the market value of an item, the former being the amount set solely by an owner and not being representative of the price that a buyer would be willing to purchase the item at, and the latter being representative of the amount that a willing buyer and a willing seller would agree an item was worth. The commercial price is always higher than the market value of an article. Taking this into account, the Committee, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £300. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

36. Post-Medieval silver seal matrix from Tendring area, Essex (2009 T615)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £400; the Committee inspected the seal matrix in light of this and acknowledged the attraction in its unusual design. Taking account of this and also the relatively later date of the item and the damage that it has suffered, the Committee saw fit to recommend £350. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

37. Post-Medieval silver whistle from Thwing, East Riding of Yorkshire (2010 T127)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £200; the Committee saw this item and recommended £200 (26/11/10) based on a comparison to a whistle from Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, 2005 T96, which it believed had been valued at £350 (this was the amount the Museum acquired the item for and as such was the figure printed in the 2005/6 Treasure Annual Report). The recommended valuation for this item was in actuality £700. The Committee revisited this item and reviewed the recommendation in light of this information.

The Committee noted that the whistle under review was quite damaged, but maintained its view on the whistles' comparative worth against the example from Shalfleet. It therefore recommended £400. East Riding Museum Service hopes to acquire.

38. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Rowington, Warwickshire (2009 T375)- 3rd viewing – late submission

The first provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £8,000; the Finder submitted comments (12/08/10) and the Committee requested a second provisional valuation (12/08/10). The second provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £1,500-£2,000; the Finder submitted comments (26/11/10) and the Committee requested a third provisional valuation (26/11/10). TVC extract 26/11/10: *'The Committee commented that the thin rock crystal design of the bezel is not ideal for a seal. The Committee resolved that, in the light of the significant discrepancy between the two existing valuations, it should commission a third valuation'*. The third provisional valuer, [REDACTED] suggested £600. The Finder and Landowner submitted further comments. The Committee considered this ring again, and commented on the remarkable range of valuations.

To address the Finder's point about the condition of the ring, the Committee took the view that the ring had been distorted through damage and not deliberately manufactured in this fashion, as there are no parallels for offset rings intended for ease of impression of the seal. As to the Finder's criticism of Timeline Auctions, the Committee noted that though the company is relatively new, it has conducted a series of public auctions and the Committee further noted that it is the market which determines the price, not the company.

The Committee commented on the relative brevity of the first two valuations when compared to the reasoned arguments put forward in the third; that is, that the ring was a fine item of some rarity, less substantial than some but of an early and precise date, whose condition was not the best but which overall possessed a certain appeal. The Committee felt that the ring was of an unusual type which made it more desirable than the turquoise parallels cited in the third valuation. Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee recommended £2,000. Warwickshire Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 3: Coins

Iron Age coins:

39. Iron Age silver units (2) from East Leicestershire (2007 T274)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£120. The Committee took this under advice as it viewed the coins and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £120 for these two coins. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

Roman coins:

40. Roman copper alloy coins (10) from Cheltenham area, Gloucestershire (2010 T244)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £20-£30. The Committee viewed the case in this light and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £30. Tewkesbury Borough Museum hopes to acquire.

41. Roman silver coins (3) from Shorwell, Isle of Wight (2010 T395)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40-£60. The Committee inspected the coins with this in mind. It agreed that the coins were in poor condition, but as one was legible, it was felt to justify the price at the higher range of the suggestion. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £60. Isle of Wight Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

42. Roman silver coins (8) from Warburton, Cheshire (2010 T465)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £100-£120. The Committee viewed the coins in light of this and came to the view that they were not particularly rare and expressed the belief that worth of the coins was linked with the degree to which they were legible. It was felt that the coin of P. Plautius Hypsaeus, featuring a camel on the reverse, in any condition would be worth £35-£40 pounds. Taking account, then, of the other coins in the group and in agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £120. Manchester Museum hopes to acquire.

43. Roman bronze coin hoard from Eden Valley area, Cumbria (2010 T355)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £600. The Committee viewed the hoard in light of this, commenting that while the overall condition of the hoard, being fused into a single mass, would require considerable conservation to disaggregate the coins (the likely course of action that would be taken if the group were to be sold on the open market), the coins on the surface of the ball were in fairly good condition. Given that the composition of the hoard is of the most common type of Roman coins, the Committee took the view that, factoring the amount of conservation required, the value of each coin would be close to £1. As the number of coins in the hoard is estimated to be 700, the Committee recommended £700. Penrith & Eden Museum hopes to acquire.

44. Roman coin hoard (662) & pottery from Gussage All Saints, Dorset (2010 T177)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £53,900. The Committee viewed the case in light of this, commenting that the valuation report was well-worked out and rationalised. Inspecting the coins in person, the Committee was impressed with their condition and in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £53,900. Priest's House Museum hopes to acquire.

45. Roman coins from Snodland, Kent: a) 2006 T467= 4643 coins; b) 2008 T285= 10 coins; c) 2009 T94= 16 coins

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested the following: a) 2006 T467= £15,800; b) 2008 T285= £35; c) 2009 T94= £45. These cases are addenda to each other. Following the initial find (2006 T467) archaeologists discovered the coins in cases 2008 T285 and 2009 T94. The coroner named the Finder, Mr [REDACTED] on the inquest verdict sheet for 2006 T467, and the archaeologists as the Finders for the two subsequent cases, 2008 T285 and 2009 T94. The Committee discussed whether, as the Finder of the hoard 2006 T467, Mr [REDACTED] is also entitled to the Finder's share of the subsequent cases, 2008 T285 & 2009 T94.

The Treasure Act Code of Practice paragraph 78 allows for a Finder who does not remove the entirety of a find from the ground but who contacts archaeologists and allows them to professionally remove the material, to be rewarded with the Finder's share of the value of the entire find. In this case, the Committee felt that the coins removed under case number 2008 T285 were part of the same find as the original case, 2006 T467, as the excavation resulting in the discovery of 2008 T285 was a direct result of the reporting of case 2006 T467. Therefore the Committee was minded to treat Mr [REDACTED] as the Finder for both of these cases.

In reviewing the circumstances of the discovery behind case 2009 T94, the Committee arrived at the conclusion that those coins had been found later, by chance, and not as part of any ongoing work into the original find. It concluded that Mr [REDACTED] would not be considered eligible for the Finder's share of the reward for case 2009 T94. In addition, the archaeologists are ineligible for any portion of the reward, as stipulated in *The Treasure Act Code of Practice* paragraph 81.

As to the value of the groups, for case 2006 T467, the Committee noted that the suggested value implied a multiplier of roughly £3 per coin for the most common types, which it considered high in comparison to another group of 4th Century coins, in slightly poorer condition, from the Eden Valley area, Cumbria (case 2010 T355), where the common coins had been valued at £1 apiece. That being the case, the Committee was minded to recommend £14,000 for this group.

For cases 2008 T285 and 2009 T94, the Committee noted that the provisional valuation was accurate, and recommended £35 and £45 respectively.

So, overall, the Committee recommended for Mr [REDACTED] a 50% share of £14,000 + £35 = £7,017.50 and for the Landowner, 50% share of £14,000 + £35 + £45 = £7,040.00

Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

The Treasure Valuation Committee furthermore sought to reemphasise the need for greater clarification of the methodology by which it should decide whether objects recovered by archaeologists should be attributed to an original Finder.

46. Roman coin hoard (7065) & pottery from South Leicestershire (2008 T473)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £17,500; the Museum submitted comments and the Finder also submitted comments. The Committee viewed the hoard in light of these and thanked both parties for their letters. It commented that it was understandable for the Museum to be concerned about the cost of conservation but that nonetheless there was some value inherent in the coins in the pot – for its attraction as a display piece if nothing else. The Committee accepted the Museum's rationale and calculation for the value of the 2388 loose coins, based on the provisional valuation, and agreed that these coins were worth £5970. As for the fused and unidentified coins, the Committee was confident that the contents of the hoard could be assumed, in the manner in which Dr Abdy wrote his report, given the identities of the loose coins. Referring to another case that was considered at this meeting, of a fused ball of 4th Century coins from the Eden Valley area, Cumbria (case 2010 T355), where the common coins had been valued at £1 apiece, the Committee felt that the same value could be applied to the fused coins in this hoard. This multiplier took account of the relative worth and desirability of these coins and the high cost of conservation. It therefore moved that the 4677 coins in the pot were worth £4677. Adding as well the value of the pot, which the Committee agreed with the provisional valuer was worth £40, the grand total of the elements was £10,687. Rounding this off,

the Committee recommended £10,690. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

47. Roman coin hoard (2905) from East Sussex area (2006 T4)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £48,060 for the entire hoard, and £9,736 for a selection of fifty coins. It had been requested that the Committee make a recommendation for a) the entire hoard and b) the 50 coin selection, itemised in the manner of the provisional valuer.

The Finder, Mr [REDACTED] submitted comments regarding the valuation of the entire hoard and a private valuation by [REDACTED]. The Treasure Secretariat was made aware of a disagreement between the Finder and Landowner, Mr [REDACTED]. Both the Finder and the Landowner submitted comments with regard to this. In the event of the hoard not being acquired in its entirety there is a disagreement as to which party the coins would be returned to. The Committee was asked to clarify any issues regarding abatement or division of reward.

The Committee considered the material associated with this case, particularly the submissions of the Finder and Landowner. It commented that if what the Finder said was true, this would not reflect significantly and relevantly to the discredit of the Landowner, and would not have a bearing on the proportion of reward allocated to the Landowner. However, if what the Landowner said was true, then this would reflect discredibly on the Finder and could affect the proportion of the reward being allocated to the Finder. The Landowner's arguments reflected strongly on the conduct of the Finder and his credibility.

The Secretariat noted that the Finder (Mr [REDACTED]) had not had the chance to respond to the Landowner's submission, and upon advising the Committee of this, the Committee instructed the Secretariat to write to the Finder with the following questions:

Do you accept that the account given by the Landowner in his letter of 22nd of December 2010 represents an accurate interpretation of the event relating to your metal detecting on his land?

Had you already been using a detector on Mr [REDACTED]'s land without Mr [REDACTED]'s permission when you called on Mr [REDACTED] on 26/12/2005, and did you abstain from revealing that fact to Mr [REDACTED]?

Did you without further permission (and after being told that Mr [REDACTED] needed to be informed of your next visit and enabled to accompany you) return to the site on 28/12/2005 and detect further?

Did the Sussex FLO concur in the lack of further excavation following the discoveries on 2/2/2006?
Did the FLO express in your hearing the view that there were few coins left in the ground?

Are there any other occasions on which you have detected on Mr [REDACTED]'s land without Mr [REDACTED]'s permission?

The Finder's response to the questions is included.

The Committee also asked the Secretariat to inquire of the coroner whether a transcript of the inquest could be provided. Unfortunately, no transcript was available.

The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval coins:

48. Anglo-Saxon silver coins (fused) from Westfield area, East Sussex (2009 T122)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £120; the Committee viewed the coins with this in mind and felt that the suggested amount was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £120. Hastings Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval coins:

49. Medieval silver coins (6) from Silverdale, Lancashire (2010 T30)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £185. The Committee took account of this as it inspected the

coins and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £185. Lancaster City Museum hopes to acquire.

50. Medieval silver penny from Baschurch, Shropshire (2009 T289)- addenda to 2007 T545, 167 coins, recommendation= £17,500 (provisional valuation by James Morton at £15,000-£20,000)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £220; the Committee examined the coin in light of this. It noted the oxidation on the coin but felt that the coin featured a good portrait, and therefore recommended £250. Shropshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

51. Medieval silver pennies (2) from Lewes, East Sussex (2008 T405)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £2,000; the Finder submitted comments and a private valuation by [REDACTED]

The Committee viewed the coins in light of this information. It noted consensus between the two valuations for a figure of £600 for the Henry I Type I penny of the Lincoln mint, and did not itself disagree with this assessment. As for the mule, the Committee took account of the arguments of both Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] and felt that the true value of the coin was to be found between the two suggestions. The Committee assigned this coin the value of £2000, and the total recommendation was for £2600. Lewes Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval coins:

52. Post-Medieval coins from Kimbolton, Herefordshire (2009 T291)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £75. The Committee examined the coins in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer recommended £75. Herefordshire Museum hopes to acquire.

53. Post-Medieval silver coins (5) from Silverdale, Lancashire (2010 T29)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £175. The Committee inspected the coins in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £175. Lancaster City Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 4: Norfolk Cases [Tim Pestell left the room]

54. Bronze Age spearhead from Broadland area, Norfolk (2010 T333)- addenda to 2008 T273 acquired by Norwich Castle Museum for £100.

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £5. The Committee took this under advice as it viewed the spearhead, and agreed that it had little commercial appeal, but recommended £10. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

55. Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt pendant from Scole, Norfolk (2010 T160)- 2nd viewing

The first provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £800 - £900; the Committee, feeling this was unexpectedly high, requested a second valuation (26/11/10). The second provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £80. The Landowner submitted comments. The Committee considered these as it inspected the pendant. The Committee thanked the Landowner for his letter and suggestion but pointed out that it cannot simply split the difference arbitrarily between the two suggestions. The first valuer's parallels were deemed irrelevant to the piece under discussion and the Committee was more sympathetic to the views of the second valuer. It recommended £120. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire

56. Medieval silver annular brooch from Billingford, Norfolk (2009 T747)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £50-£80. The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and found it to be tiny but attractive artefact, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £70. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

57. Medieval silver annular brooch from Horningcroft, Norfolk (2009 T739)

The provisional valuer [REDACTED] suggested £40-£60. The Committee inspected the brooch in light of this and felt that this brooch compared broadly with two items in the 16 December 2010 TimeLine Auction (Lot 605, £200; Lot 606, £200). Feeling that an uplift was necessary, the Committee recommended £120. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

[Tim Pestell re-entered the room]

Item 5: Any Other Business

*Identities of provisional valuers:

The Committee had instructed the Secretariat to write to the provisional valuers stating that the Committee are minded to disclose the names of valuers to the interested parties in all cases, and enquiring whether the provisional valuers would be happy to continue to value for the Committee under these circumstances.

The Secretariat did so, and shared the following responses with the Committee:

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

