

Treasure Valuation Committee Meeting – Minutes 12 August 2010

The meeting was held in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum on Thursday 12th August 2010 at 11am.

Present

Committee

Norman Palmer (Chair)
Jack Ogden (Vice Chair)
Trevor Austin
Ian Carradice
Peter Clayton
May Sinclair

Other

Caroline Lyons (BM)
Janina Parol (BM)
Ian Richardson (BM)
Nicki Fox (DCMS)

Apologies

Tim Pestell
John Cherry (Comments sent)

Item 1: Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday 9th June 2010 – The minutes were passed as a true record of the meeting.

Item 2: Objects

Bronze Age artefacts

1. Bronze Age dagger from Didcot, Oxfordshire (2008 T530)

The provisional valuer suggested £20; the Committee examined the dagger in light of this, and feeling that a modest uplift was in order, recommended £30.

2. Bronze Age metal work hoard from Offham, Kent (2009 T414)

The provisional valuer suggested £250; the Committee viewed the hoard in light of this. It agreed with the suggested value of the socketed axe (£150) but felt that the large overall mass of the hoard warranted a slight increase in total value, and recommended an overall figure of £290. Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

3. Bronze Age palstaves (2) from Llantwit Major, Vale of Glamorgan (09.14)

The provisional valuer suggested £300, the Committee examined the palstaves and took this under advice. It agreed with the comments of the valuer with respect to the patina and also accordingly recommended £300. National Museum Wales hopes to acquire.

4. Bronze Age gold lock ring from Newport, Pembrokeshire (09.04)

The provisional valuer suggested £125; the Committee viewed the lock ring in light of this. It took account of the damage but felt that the appeal of the piece went above the multiplier of bullion value used by the valuer. The Committee recommended £200. National Museum Wales hopes to acquire.

5. Bronze Age gold bracelet fragment from River Perry, Shropshire (2008 T670)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer suggested £300-£350. The Committee recommended £425 (14/04/10). The Museum has submitted a challenge. The Committee considered the comments of the Museum and examined the piece again and found substance in the logic of the argument. As the main bracelet fragment (2006 T34: Treasure Annual Report 2005/6 no. 11) of which this is assumed to be the missing terminal represents 4/5 of the complete bracelet and had been valued at £1000, the Committee felt an appropriate value for the piece under discussion should be nearer to 1/5 of an extrapolated value of the complete item. Allowing for a slight variance in the exact proportion of the bracelet represented by the current piece (2008 T670), the Committee recommended £275. Shropshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

Iron Age artefacts

6. Iron Age bracelet fragment from Boverton, Vale of Glamorgan (09.01)

The provisional valuer suggested £30-£35; the Committee examined the bracelet in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £30. National Museum Wales hopes to acquire.

Roman artefacts

7. Visigothic gold tremissis from Capel le Ferne, Kent (2009 T307)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee inspected the object with this in mind and found it an appealing piece. In agreement with the provisional valuer it recommended £150. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

8. Roman silver finger-ring from Salfords & Sidlow, Surrey (2010 T199)

The provisional valuer suggested £60; this was taken under advice and the finger-ring was seen by the Committee, who in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £60. Guildford Museum hopes to acquire.

9. Roman silver finger-ring from Henley area, Buckinghamshire (2009 T425)

The provisional valuer suggested £30-£35; the Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and on account of its small size, felt a slightly lower value would be more accurate. The Committee recommended £25. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

10. Roman gold finger-ring from Market Weighton area, East Riding of Yorkshire (2009 T743)

The provisional valuer suggested £280-£300; with this in mind the Committee examined the finger-ring. The Committee pointed out the substantial bezel, but also noted the heavy distortion and remarked that it would require a good deal of work to straighten the setting and the band and make this a wearable piece, capable as a result of commanding greater interest on the market. The Committee therefore recommended £200 for the ring. Hull & East Riding Museums hopes to acquire.

11. Roman silver finger-ring from Whixley, North Yorkshire (2009 T554)

The provisional valuer suggested £750-£800; the Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this; taking note of the uniquely coloured quartz and the finely carved intaglio. Before recommending a value, the Committee felt it had to conduct further research on these elements of the ring. The Committee deferred making a recommendation. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

12. Roman gold finger-ring from St. Cuthbert Out, Somerset (2009 T250)

The provisional valuer suggested £1,500-£1,800; the Committee examined the finger-ring in light of this. It pointed out the unique form of this piece and took account of a similar observation by the author of the curatorial report, Dr Ralph Jackson of the British Museum. The Committee felt that it needed to engage on further research on the probable date of the finger-ring. The Committee deferred making a recommendation. Somerset County Museum hopes to acquire.

13. Roman objects from Ashwell, Hertfordshire (2002 T215 (2) (3) (4) (5) (6)) – 2nd viewing

Objects: The first provisional valuer suggested £25 for (6) alone; The first provisional valuer suggested £1,500 for items (2)-(6). Coins: The second provisional valuer suggested £900-£1,000 for (6) alone; the second provisional valuer suggested £1,350 for (5) + (6). The Committee viewed the objects and coins at its meeting of 9th June 2010 and recommended for the entirety of the items £3350 (see minutes of 09/06/10 for complete breakdown).

2002 T215 (2-6) were found by archaeologists engaged in an excavation. However, the Committee felt it needed to consider whether the Finder of 2002 T215 (1), Mr [REDACTED] should be eligible to receive any portion of the reward for these finds. The Chairman drafted a letter to [REDACTED] querying the advice provided in this respect on 2 December 2009. [REDACTED] has responded to the letter, and both were put before the Committee.

In short, the advice maintained its original point, that the Committee should consider Mr [REDACTED] eligible for a reward only for the finds made under the case number 2002 T215 (1), based on the view that at inquest and in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Treasure Act *Code of Practice*, the coroner had considered whether cases 2002 T215 (2-6) were part of the 'same find' as 2002 T215 (1) and judged that they were not. The Chairman asked DCMS to secure from the coroner's office a more explicit account of the Coroner's determination as to whether the subsequent finds 2002 T215 (2-6) should be considered the 'same find' as 2001 T215 (1). The DCMS reported that the request had been made but that the coroner's office had not been able to provide the transcript in time for the 12 August Committee meeting. The Committee decided to defer a recommendation until that material is available to study.

In the meantime, the Committee expressed its view that clearly case 2002 T215 (2), which is the base of the statue uncovered by Mr [REDACTED] in case 2002 T215(1), is part of not only 'the same find' as 2002 T215 (1) but also an original component of the same object. As to whether the Mr [REDACTED] should be given the finder's portion of the reward for 2002 T215 (3-6), the Committee will reserve judgement until the next meeting. A decision on the apportionment of the reward for T215 (2-6) would be made once the Committee had seen the transcript from the Coroner.

The Committee maintained its point of the last meeting, that the reference to the 'same find' in Paragraph 14 of the *Code of Practice* and sections 3 (4) and 3 (5) of the Treasure Act is primarily associated with defining which objects qualify as Treasure, and that these definitions of the 'same find' are not conclusively applicable to the separate exercise of determining the identity of parties who are eligible to receive rewards. Rather, the Committee was minded that in those portions of the *Code of Practice* referring to rewards paid to original finders after archaeological intervention (namely, paragraphs 33 and 78) it would propose that the term 'find' could be construed as 'anything found solely and directly as a result of the reporting of the first find'. It was felt that such a philosophy was more in keeping with the intent of paragraphs 33 and 78, which is to encourage finders to report important finds as soon as possible in the secure knowledge that they will receive a portion of the reward for anything subsequently found by archaeologists, and not, out of fear of losing out, continue digging until everything of value is removed from the site.

The Chairman drew attention to the composite elements of Case 62 on the current Agenda as exemplifying the difficulties that TVC might encounter when seeking to assign particular post-reporting finds to particular original

deposits and as tending to controvert the argument that [REDACTED] analysis would be unlikely to produce serious difficulties in practice.

The Committee resolved to respond to the [REDACTED] advice making the above points.

The Committee again noted that this highlighted an area for consideration in the upcoming review of the *Code of Practice*. To summarise, the Committee feels it is essential for the following points to be reviewed:

- a.) The definition of 'find' and 'same find' for the purposes of apportionment of reward to the appropriate parties, particularly in the context of paragraphs 33 and 78.
- b.) Adding a clear definition of what constitutes a 'site' in terms of size and time span.
- c.) The list of those eligible to receive a reward for a find, as described in paragraph 72. Section 10 (5)(a) of the Treasure Act makes provision for rewards to be paid to 'the finder or any other person involved in the find' whereas paragraph 72 of the Code of Practice says 'Those eligible to receive rewards are the finder(s), landowner and/or occupier'.
- d.) Taking account of the eventuality that a finder locates a non-Treasure item, reports it to the authorities, and then archaeological investigation reveals an item or items of Treasure.

The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Early Medieval artefacts

14. Early Medieval silver ingot from Boynton, East Riding of Yorkshire (2009 T478)

The provisional valuer suggested £120; the Committee viewed the ingot in light of this and compared it against ingots that it has valued in the past. Finding the suggested value to be accurate in that respect, the Committee, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £120. East Riding Museums Service hopes to acquire.

15. Late Saxon enamelled gold mount from Cholsey, Oxfordshire (2008 T749)

The provisional valuer suggested £500-£550; the Committee examined the mount in light of this. It also commented that it would have originally been a very nice item. Finding the provisional valuation well supported, the Committee recommended £500. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

16. Anglo-Saxon silver brooch fragment from Hecklington area, Lincolnshire (2009 T368)

The provisional valuer suggested £80-£100; the Finder submitted comments, and Museum also commented. The Committee took all of these observations into consideration as it examined the brooch fragment. It found the argument of the Finder to be convincing, agreeing that while the provisional valuer may have been aware that this fragment complemented two previously found fragments of the same brooch, this fact was not fully reflected in the suggested value. The Committee recommended £200. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

17. Viking Weight set with Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt pendant from Tadcaster, North Yorkshire (2009 T206)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer suggested £700-£800; The Finder has submitted comments regarding valuation and division of reward. The original landowner has submitted comments regarding division of reward. The Museum has submitted comments regarding the valuation; the Finder has responded to the Museum's comments.

The Committee examined the weight in light of this information. In considering the history of the discovery of this item the Committee agreed that it should be the original landowner, at the time of discovery, who should be eligible for the landowner's portion of any reward. It advised the Secretariat to write to the original landowner and ask:

'Can you confirm your version of the sharing arrangement (50/50) in light of Mrs [REDACTED] (the Finder) letter? Once we hear from you we will make a determination on the apportionment of the reward and this will be in accordance with our conclusion as to the proportions at the time. Please let us know if this is in anyway inappropriate.'

As to the value of the piece, the Committee found the reasoning behind the Museum's submission to be sound, and found the *comparanda* provided to be useful. It felt that it could benefit from the a second independent valuation and so deferred recommending a figure for this piece in order to have [REDACTED] provide a second provisional valuation.

The British Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval artefacts

18. Medieval silver strap end from Great Mongeham, Kent (2009 T533)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee examined the strap end in light of this and found the suggested value to be accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. Canterbury Museum hopes to acquire.

19. Medieval silver-gilt annular brooch from Chalgrove, Oxfordshire (2008 T729)

The provisional valuer suggested £60; The Committee viewed the brooch in light of this and, noting the fragmentary state of the item, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £60. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

20. Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Waltham, Kent (2009 T246)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee took this under advice as it viewed the brooch, commenting on the appeal of the nielloed piece. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. Canterbury Museum hopes to acquire.

21. Medieval silver-gilt roundel from Guildford, Surrey (2009 T266)

The provisional valuer suggested £235; this was taken into account as the Committee viewed the roundel. It felt that the suggested value did not fully appreciate the heraldic interest in the piece, and the Committee recommended £275. Guildford Museum hopes to acquire.

22. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Fyfield & Tubney, Oxfordshire (2009 T113)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee viewed the finger-ring in light of this and considering that the suggested value was accurate, in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £150. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

23. Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Wantage, Oxfordshire (2007 T546)

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee took this under advice as it viewed the finger-ring. It commented on the iconography of the ring. Comparing it to a similar but slightly larger ring from Theydon Garnen, Essex (2003 T84, *Treasure Annual Report 2003*, item 191, valued at £800), the Committee agreed with the suggested value. It recommended £600. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

24. Medieval silver-gilt brooch from Hursley, Hampshire (2008 T516)

The provisional valuer suggested £400-£600; the Committee took account of this as it inspected the brooch. It found the item to be small in size yet attractive, and decided that it fell within the suggested range of values. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £400. Winchester Museum Service hopes to acquire.

25. Medieval silver-gilt annular brooch from Wolverton area, Warwickshire (2008 T588)

The provisional valuer suggested £500; the Committee viewed the brooch in light of this, and also compared it to another medieval brooch at the same meeting (2008 T516 from Hursley, Hampshire; valued at £400). It felt that the damaged state of the brooch impaired its appeal and so recommended £450. Warwickshire Museum hopes to acquire.

26. Medieval silver pendant cross from Souldrop, Bedfordshire (2009 T627)

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee viewed the pendant in light of this and considered past valuations for pendants of similar types, for example that from Orford area, Suffolk (2006 T113, *Treasure Annual Report 2005/6*, item 528, valued at £600). The piece from Souldrop is of good metal and is complete. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £600.

27. Medieval silver-gilt badge from South Leicestershire (2009 T480)

The provisional valuer suggested £1,500; the Committee considered the badge in light of this. The Committee drew the obvious parallel to the badge from Chiddingly, East Sussex (*Treasure Annual Report 2000*, item 155, valued at £3600) which it felt to be of roughly similar appeal. The current example has slightly less gilding, but the Chiddingly boar is missing a leg. The Committee also felt that the find spot of the current example (Bosworth Field) contributed to its appeal. For these reasons, the Committee felt that it should obtain the opinion of a second independent valuer, and asked the Secretariat to commission [REDACTED] to provide a second provisional valuation. Leicestershire County Council Heritage Services hopes to acquire.

28. Medieval gold finger-ring from Calbourne, Isle of Wight (2009 T706)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer suggested £2,000; the Committee recommended £1,650 (9/6/10). TVC extract 9/6/10: '*noticing the crack in the band which would prevent straightening of the piece. The Committee saw an appeal in the impressive emerald but felt that the overall condition of this ring, which it would be dangerous to repair, caused the suggested value to be slightly high. It therefore recommended £1650*'.

The Finder and Landowner submitted a challenge, and the Committee considered the ring again in light of this. In response to the Finder's arguments, the Committee pointed out that there is a difference between something found in an original pristine state and something restored to a comparable state. The fact that a jeweller could straighten the hoop of this ring does not mean that it would be returned to its original state, or that any such restoration could be achieved at a cost that made it economically worthwhile.

The Committee thanked the Finder and Landowner for their letters but found no evidence in the submissions to cause it to reconsider its original recommendation of £1650. It sought to make clear to the interested parties that this figure is a

recommendation to the Secretary of State and the Crown (the owner of the ring) for the market value of the item. It is not an offer to be accepted or refused by those parties. The Isle of Wight Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

29. Medieval gold finger-ring from Tendring District, Essex (2008 T580)- 4th viewing

The first provisional valuer suggested £1,700; the Finder and Museum submitted comments. The Committee recommended £1,700 (10/12/10). The Finder submitted further comments; the Committee requested a second valuation (14/4/10). The second provisional valuer suggested £15,000; the Committee requested a third valuation (9/6/10). The third provisional valuer suggested £2,950; the Museum and Finder submitted comments. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

The Committee re-examined the ring while considering all the evidence and submissions before it. Its own further investigations confirmed a slight upsurge in the market over the last few years as indicated by the second provisional valuer, and the Committee accordingly acknowledged that there was a case for adopting a figure above that of the original recommendation (£1,700). At the same time the Committee did not consider that the market conditions indicated a valuation of the order of the second provisional valuation. Taking account of the most recent comments of the Finder and Museum in respect of the third provisional valuation and the TimeLine auction *comparanda*, as well as the other *comparanda* suggested and similar rings valued earlier by the Committee, the Committee recommended £3000.

Post-Medieval artefacts

30. Post-Medieval silver badge from Saxton with Scarthingwell, North Yorkshire (2009 T176)

The provisional valuer suggested £200; the Committee examined the badge in light of this and found the suggested value to be accurate and so recommended £200. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

31. Post-Medieval silver button from Astley & Dunley, Worcestershire (2009 T434)

The provisional valuer suggested £50-£60; the Committee inspected the button in light of this. It felt the button was worth a slightly lower amount, and recommended £45. Worcestershire County Museum hope to acquire.

32. Post-Medieval silver clasp from Lyford, Oxfordshire (2008 T354)

The provisional valuer suggested £75; the Committee viewed the clasp with this in mind. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £75. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

33. Post-Medieval silver dress hook from Twyford, Hampshire (2009 T126)

The provisional valuer suggested £75; the Committee took this into account as it viewed the dress hook. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £75. Winchester Museum Service hopes to acquire.

34. Post-Medieval silver bodkin fragment from Woolley, West Yorkshire (2007 T648)

The provisional valuer suggested £25; the Committee examined the bodkin in light of this and noted that the suggestion was accurate having regard to the small size of the piece. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £25. Wakefield Museum hopes to acquire.

35. Post-Medieval silver thimble from Hopton, Shropshire (2009 T288)

The provisional valuer suggested £30; the Committee viewed the thimble in light of this and found that for its condition, the suggested value was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £30. Ludlow Museum hopes to acquire.

36. Post-Medieval silver fob seal from Wantage Down area, Oxfordshire (2007 T487)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee took account of this as it viewed the fob seal. The Committee pointed out the scratches to the face of the piece and felt that the suggested value was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £150. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

37. Post-Medieval silver-gilt posy ring from Chilton, Buckinghamshire (2009 T757)

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee viewed the ring in light of this and commented that it was a nice example. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £150. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

38. Post-Medieval silver shilling converted into an object from Towersley, Oxfordshire (2007 T320)

The provisional valuer suggested £225; the Committee inspected the shilling in light of this and found the provisional valuation to be well reasoned. In agreement with the valuer, the Committee recommended £225. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

39. Post-Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Calbourne, Isle of Wight (2010 T70)

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee examined the ring in light of this, finding that it compared well with an earlier iconographic example that also came before it at this meeting (2007 T546 from Wantage, Oxfordshire,

valued at £600). In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £600. Isle of Wight Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

40. Post-Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Llanmaes, Vale of Glamorgan (09.05)

The provisional valuer suggested £800; the Committee took this into consideration as it viewed the finger-ring. It was concerned that the suggested value did not correlate with its own expectations as to what this ring was worth. The Committee therefore decided to seek a second provisional valuation before making a recommendation. National Museum Wales hopes to acquire.

41. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Shalfleet, Isle of Wight (2010 T3)

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee took this under advice as it viewed the finger-ring, noting the suggested parallel in the valuation. It examined the ring alongside a ring from the same period that came before it at this meeting (2007 T488 from Swallowfield, Oxfordshire, valued at £600.) In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £600. Isle of Wight Heritage Service hopes to acquire.

42. Post-Medieval gold posy ring from Swallowfield area, Oxfordshire (2007 T488)

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee examined the ring in light of this. It examined the ring alongside a ring from the same period that came before it at this meeting (2010 T3 from Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, valued at £600.) It commented that the Swallowfield piece was thin but well-decorated, and in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £600. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

43. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from North Petherton, Somerset (2009 T416)

The provisional valuer suggested £4,000; the Committee took account of this as it viewed the finger-ring. It was concerned that the suggested value did not correlate with its own expectations as to what this ring was worth. The Committee therefore decided to seek a second provisional valuation before making a recommendation. Somerset County Museum hopes to acquire.

44. Post-Medieval silver hawking vervel from Worfield, Shropshire (2009 T508)

The provisional valuer suggested £650; the Committee inspected the vervel in light of this, commenting on the fine engraving of the dog. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £650. Shropshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

45. Post-Medieval gold finger-ring from Rowington, Warwickshire (2009 T375)

The provisional valuer suggested £8,000; the Finder submitted comments. The Committee took account of these as it viewed the finger-ring. It thanked the Finder for his comments. The Committee was concerned that the suggested value did not correlate with its own expectations as to what this ring was worth. The Committee therefore decided to seek a second provisional valuation before making a recommendation. Warwickshire Museum hopes to acquire.

46. Post-Medieval gold posy ring from Hailsham area, East Sussex (2009 T85)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer recommended £400; the Committee requested that analysis be carried out on the ring (9/6/10). TVC extract 9/6/10: *'It noticed the inside of the ring has polishing marks and that the lettering is extremely sharp, and wondered whether the engraving might be a recent addition. The Committee asked that the science section of the British Museum examine the ring and to investigate whether the inscription on the inside is consistent with the age of the ring'*.

The Committee viewed the ring again in light of the further information provided by the science section of the British Museum. It found the scratch marks on the inside of the ring, and the very sharp and clean engraving, unusual for recovered artefacts. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £400. Eastbourne Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 3: Coins

Iron Age coins:

47. Iron Age coins (18) from Westerham, Kent (2009 T182)

The provisional valuer suggested £11,120; the Finder submitted comments. The Committee took account of these as it viewed the coins. It thanked the Finder for his letter and was minded to feel that there was some substance in the Finder's comments on the approach taken by the valuer for some of the coins, particularly the valuation of a quarter stater at 1/4 of the value attributable to a full stater of the same type. The Committee felt that the circumstances required it to seek a second provisional valuation before recommending a valuation. Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

48. Iron Age coins (840) from Dallinghoo, Suffolk (2008 T226)

The first provisional valuer suggested £280,000-£320,000; the second provisional valuer suggested £229,435. Both named and unnamed Finders (Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] and Landowner submitted comments. The TVC deferred this

case at its meeting of 10/12/09 to ask ██████████ for advice as to whom it could recommend for a reward, based on the receipt of the coroner's verdict sheet naming only Mr ██████████ as a finder. This advice was provided for the meeting of 26/2/10. Extract from the minutes of 26/2/10: *In summary, ██████████ informed the TVC that the Coroner has the sole jurisdiction to determine the identity of the Finder, and that it is not the role of the TVC to refer matters back to the coroner should it feel that the verdict is inaccurate. The Committee thanked ██████████ for its advice but felt that in order for it to recommend an appropriate apportionment of the reward in this case, it needed clarification from the Coroner as to the person or persons who should be considered as Finder(s) of the coins. The Committee acknowledged that the Coroner's verdict sheet listed only Mr ██████████ as a Finder, and that in the transcript of the inquest Mr ██████████ was referred to as the 'Initial Finder', however it pointed to several passages in the transcript where the Coroner seemed to imply that there was more than one Finder.*

As such, the Committee resolved to draft a letter to the Coroner, highlighting the relevant passages to ask whether the Coroner could confirm that Mr ██████████ was also a Finder of at least some of the coins in this case. This the Committee did and the Secretariat will send it to all members for approval before posting it to the Coroner.

As to the value of the coins, the Committee inspected the hoard and considered the two provisional valuations. It found itself in agreement more with the assessment of the first provisional valuer, especially with the allowance of £300-£320 for coins of lesser value. It felt that the second provisional valuation was slightly low. The TVC therefore recommended a value of £300,000. The recommendation of the apportionment will depend on the response of the Coroner.

The Coroner responded in a letter of 2nd June 2010, included in the papers of this meeting, where he explained that, as the transcript of the inquest makes clear, he understood both Mr ██████████ and Mr ██████████ to be the finders of the majority of the coins. The Chairman had referred the following questions to ██████████ in advance of the meeting of 9 June 2010 :

Is there sufficient material in the Ipswich Coroner's letter of 2nd June 2010 to warrant the Committee's now recommending that Mr ██████████ receive a reward? It is unclear (a) whether the Committee needs a clear finding by the Coroner *as part of his verdict* that Mr ██████████ was a (co)finder, (b) whether this [the letter] constitutes or could be construed as such a finding, or (c) whether any subsequent clarification by the Coroner on this point, even though not part of his verdict, will suffice.

██████████ confirmed that it needed to seek clarification from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) before it could respond. Extract from the minutes of 9/6/10: *In the meantime, the Committee took the view that the Coroner's reply appeared to indicate that Mr ██████████ is a co- and (presumably) equal finder of the majority of the hoard. The Committee then assumed that the coroner expects the Committee to treat Mr ██████████ as a co-finder for everything but the initial nine coins found on the first two Sundays of detecting, where there seems to be no argument that Mr ██████████ was operating alone. The Committee consequently considered it necessary to seek further information as to the sequence of events surrounding the discovery of the hoard and (if obtainable) as to the identity of the nine coins that Mr ██████████ found alone. It noted that whilst Mr ██████████ has provided a post-inquest statement through his solicitors, Mr ██████████ has relied upon the statement he made to the coroner at inquest, while also maintaining in later correspondence that Mr ██████████ submission to the Committee is a complete fabrication. In the light of these circumstances the Committee felt that it should address several questions to Mr ██████████ and it asked the Secretariat to write to him and ask the following:*

- a. *The Committee has seen only a summarised version of your statement to the coroner. Is there an original and complete version that you can supply to the Committee?*
- b. *You state in your e-mail of 25 November 2009 that Mr ██████████ statement of 17 November 2009 is a total fabrication. On what specific grounds is Mr ██████████ wrong? Please provide the Committee with a list of the points in Mr ██████████ submission that you contest, and your reasoning to support this.*
- c. *Was there an agreement between you and Mr ██████████ as to how any coins that either of you found would be divided?*
- d. *Could you identify which of the coins are those nine that were found by you on the first two Sundays of detecting?*

Mr ██████████ solicitor responded with the comments included, and Mr ██████████ also submitted comments through his solicitor. The ██████████ advice and Ministry of Justice advice was also now received.

The Committee acknowledged that the task before it was to determine a distribution of the reward for this case. It noted that it is bound by the coroner's verdict and cannot go behind it. The only variation it can make is when there is an agreement between parties. For this reason it had sought the above advice from ██████████. ██████████ responded that 'in light of [section 10(5)(a) of the Treasure Act], MOJ's advice, the amended inquisition form, and the Coroner's letter dated 2nd June – there is enough to apportion some of the reward to Mr ██████████'. The Committee thanked ██████████ for the guidance provided, though it found the MOJ advice did not fully answer the query put to it.

The Committee felt the inquisition form does not accurately record all of the people involved in the find. The coroner's response of 2 June 2010 to the Committee's letter following the February meeting makes it clear that despite not having been listed on the inquisition sheet, Mr ██████████ was to be regarded as a co-finder of the majority of the coins. The Committee noted that while section 10 (5) (a) of the Treasure Act 1996 contemplates a reward [for a Treasure find]

might be paid to the finder or *any other person involved in the find* – the breadth of the power thus conferred is clouded by the fact that the relevant paragraphs of the *Code of Practice* do not refer to such other person but only to Finders. In the event, however, the Committee took the view that the coroner’s letter of 2 June 2010 entitled the Committee to award a portion of the reward to Mr [REDACTED] as a [co] Finder in his own right, a position confirmed by legal advice from [REDACTED]. The Committee resolved that the Secretariat should send to the interested parties for their records copies of the correspondence between the Committee’s Secretariat and the Coroner.

The Committee noted that based on the evidence before it there was insufficient material to enable the Committee to conclude on a proper standard of proof that there was any variant agreement between Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] as to the proportions in which the reward for the coins should be divided. In accordance with paragraph 72 of the *Treasure Act Code of Practice* the Committee accordingly determined that the finder’s portion of the reward for the majority of the coins should be split 50:50 between Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED]. Evidence from the inquest and the statements of both gentlemen suggested, however, that Mr [REDACTED] originally found 9 coins by himself, before Mr [REDACTED] and he went on to uncover the bulk of the hoard in concert. The Committee resolved that Mr [REDACTED] alone should receive the Finder’s portion of the reward for these 9 coins. Mr [REDACTED] had been invited by the Committee to identify these coins from among the general bulk and had advised that he was unable to do so. Being therefore unable to relate Mr [REDACTED]’s early solo excavation to any particular coins, the Committee recommended that the value of the entirety of the hoard be divided by the total number of coins (840) to work out the average value per coin. Mr [REDACTED] should then receive the whole of the Finder’s share of the reward as for 9 coins, while both Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] should share equally the Finder’s portion of the reward for the remaining 831 coins.

As to the value of the coins, at its meeting of 26/02/10, the Committee had inspected the hoard and considered the two provisional valuations. It found itself to be more in agreement with the assessment of the first provisional valuer, especially with the allowance of £300-£320 for coins of lesser value. It felt that the second provisional valuation was slightly low. The Committee therefore recommended a value of £300,000, with 50% (£150,000) to be rewarded to the landowners and (£150,000) to be awarded to the Finders. Therefore the recommended apportionment of the rewards to the interested parties is broken down as follows:

Total recommended value = £300,000.00

Landowners’ share = £150,000.00 (£75,000 each to Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED])

Finders’ share = £150,000.00

Recommended Finders’ share per coin = £150,000.00 / 840 = £178.57142

Finders’ shares apportioned as follows:

- For the 9 coins found by Mr [REDACTED] alone -
9 coins * £178.57142 per coin = £1607.14278 for Mr [REDACTED]
- For the 831 coins found in concert by Mr [REDACTED] and Mr [REDACTED] -
831 coins * £178.57142 per coin = £148,392.85 combined
£148,392.85 / 2 finders = £74,196.43 each

Therefore:

Mr [REDACTED]’s apportionment is £74,196.43 for his share of 831 coins

Mr [REDACTED]’s apportionment is £74,196.43 + £1607.14 = £75,803.57 for his share of 840 coins

The Committee further stated that it would be useful to write to all of the coroners and provide them with instructions on the method of recording inquests verdicts for Treasure purposes.

Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

Roman coins:

49. Roman silver coins (2) from Bridgnorth, Shropshire (2008 T220)

The provisional valuer suggested £10. The Committee inspected the two coins and thought a slightly higher value was warranted, including a notional amount for the Faustina denarius. It recommended £18. Ludlow Museum hopes to acquire.

50. Roman silver coins (3) from Dodford with Grafton, Worcestershire (2009 T158)

The provisional valuer suggested £55; the Committee considered this as it viewed the coins. It commented that the values attributed to both the Nerva and Domitian coins could justifiably be increased by a modest amount, and it attached a nominal valuation to the Hadrian *denarius fragment*. It recommended £70. Worcestershire County Museum hopes to acquire.

51. Roman silver coin hoard (103) from Thirston, Northumberland (2009 T51 and 2009 T715)

The provisional valuer suggested £1,125 (99 coins) and £Nil (4 addenda coins); the Finder provided a submission as well as catalogues. The Committee considered the coins in light of this and examined the submission of the finder,

thanking him for the letter. Taking account of the several more scarce coins and allocating a nominal sum in regard to the coins to which the provisional valuer had assigned a £nil value, the Committee recommended £1200. The Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle hopes to acquire.

52. Roman silver coin hoard (208) from North Suffolk (2009 T243)- 2nd viewing

The provisional valuer suggested £7,200; the Finders and Landowner submitted comments. The Committee requested the Finders and Landowner supply further information regarding the valuer they used (9/6/10). The Finders and Landowner have submitted comments. The Committee reviewed all of this information and it inspected the coins. It thanked the Finders for their letter and for highlighting the mathematical error in the provisional valuation. Despite the fact there was no information supplied with respect to the identification or credentials of the valuer used by the Finders, the Committee took this under consideration. It thanked the Finders for providing a thorough breakdown of the hoard including multipliers used by the provisional valuer.

Using the breakdown of the coins provided, the Committee noticed that the multipliers applied in the provisional valuation were low for several of the emperors. In its own calculations, the Committee therefore made the following adjustments:

Vespasian £7 each to £13 each
M Antony £6.20 each to £20 each
Domitian £15 to £25
Titus £15 to £25

Taking account of these and of the interest of the hoard in its entirety, the Committee recommended £8,000. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

Early-Medieval coins:

53. Anglo-Saxon silver fused pennies (3) from Henley area, Oxfordshire (2007 T432)

The provisional valuer suggested £100; the Committee considered the pennies in light of this, being particularly interested by the mystery of their fused nature. For this reason, the Committee felt that an uplift was called for, and recommended £150. Oxfordshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

54. Henry I type XV coins from Knaresborough area, North Yorkshire (2008 T271)- Items 80 & 90 only

The provisional valuer suggested £200; the Committee inspected the two coins with this in mind. It found the suggested value to be conservative, noting that the probable contemporary forgery was interesting with a good bust. The Committee recommended £250. The Fitzwilliam Museum hopes to acquire.

Medieval coins:

55. Medieval silver coin hoard (122) from Cramlington, Northumberland (2009 T539)

The provisional valuer suggested £2,717, the Committee viewed the coins in light of this and commented on the thoroughness and accuracy of the provisional valuation. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £2,717. The Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle hopes to acquire.

Post-Medieval coins:

56. Post-Medieval silver clippers hoard from Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire (2009 T466)

The provisional valuer suggested £40; the Committee viewed the clippings in light of this. It noted that clippings are more common from slightly earlier coins. The Committee feeling that there is a story to be told from these and that their anecdotal interest might be reflected in the market, recommended £60. York Museums Trust hopes to acquire.

57. Late Medieval & Early Post-Medieval gold coins (2007 T433)

The first provisional valuer suggested £263,200; the second provisional valuer suggested £280,000-£320,000. The Committee reviewed the coins in detail and felt that the breakdown provided by the first valuer was very thorough and that the rarities were attributed the correct value, but the suggestions for the items of superior quality amongst the more common types were conservative. Allowing for an uplift in that respect, and taking account of the second provisional valuation, the Committee recommended £280,000. The Ashmolean Museum hopes to acquire.

58. Post-Medieval silver sixpences of William III from Westerleigh, South Gloucestershire (2009 T138)

The provisional valuer suggested £125; the Finder and Landowner submitted comments. The Committee reviewed these and took account of the submissions thanking the Finder and Landowner for their letters. The Committee pointed out that the value is the hammer price at auction and not the retail price, hence the discrepancy in the values suggested. It considered that these coins would be likely to go to auction in a group and in agreement with the provisional valuer, it

recommended £125. Bristol City Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 4: Norfolk Cases

59. Bronze Age/ Iron Age/ Roman objects (79) and coins (96) from North West Norfolk (2007 T695)

The first provisional valuer suggested £4,270 for the objects; the second provisional valuer suggested £2,660 for the coins. The Committee viewed the case in light of the provisional valuations and found it a complex find. The Committee took account of the possibility that the gold rod may not be a stylus but agreed with the rest of the provisional valuation, recommending £4,000 for the objects. In agreement with the provisional valuer for the coins, it recommended £2,660. For the entire assemblage, the Committee accordingly recommended £6,660. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

60. Late Bronze Age hoard from North West Norfolk (2006 T441)

The provisional valuer suggested £4,000; The Committee viewed the items in light of this and found the suggested valuation to be well-reasoned. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £4,000. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

61. Iron Age ingot or casting fragments from North West Norfolk (2004 T91)

The provisional valuer suggested £10; the Committee viewed the fragments in light of this. It found itself in agreement with the provisional valuer and recommended £10. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

62. Bronze Age/ Iron Age/ Roman objects (71) and coins (40) from North West Norfolk (2003 T169)

The first provisional valuer suggested £905 for the objects; the second provisional valuer suggested £335 for the coins. The Committee viewed the items in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuers, recommended £905 objects and £335 coins. For the entire group, it therefore recommended £1240. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

63. Bronze Age/ Iron Age objects (42) & Greek/ Iron Age/ Roman coins (65) from North West Norfolk (2005 T487)

The first provisional valuer recommended £1,010 for the objects; the second provisional valuer suggested £1,305 for the coins; the Committee viewed the items and in agreement with the first provisional valuer, recommended £1,010 for the objects. The Committee further agreed with the suggested value of the Greek, Iron Age and Roman coins and found no reason to depart from the valuation of the coins of £1,305. For the entire group, it therefore recommended £2,315. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

64. Iron Age electrum object from North West Norfolk (2003 T89b)

The provisional valuer suggested £10; the Committee viewed the object item with this in mind and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £10. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

65. Roman silver sheet from North West Norfolk (2006 T361)

The provisional valuer suggested £5; the Committee inspected the sheet in light of this and felt that as it contained a recognizable figure, and modest uplift was warranted. It recommended £10. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

66. Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt ball headed pin from Loddon area, Norfolk (2009 T442)

The provisional valuer suggested £100-£110; the Committee examined this item and found the valuation to be high for a fragmentary item. The Committee therefore recommended £60. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

Item 5: Any Other Business

Letters from funding groups = The Art Fund wrote to the Chairman in respect to the recent valuation of a gold figurine from the Tendring District, Essex, expressing its concern that valuations by the Committee should remain broadly in line with the provisional valuations from the experts commissioned. (In this case, the provisional valuations were for £10,000-£15,000 and £6000, and the Committee recommended £18,000). The Chairman proposed to respond to the Art Fund and make clear that the provisional valuation is but one component of the process by which the Committee arrives at a recommended value, and that its own considerable experience plays a large role in determining what it feels is the market value for a case.

The Committee was also made aware that the V&A Purchase Fund denied an application from Leicestershire County Council Heritage Services for aid in acquiring the Rothley Bronze Age hoard and axe moulds (provisionally valued at £5,375 and the Committee recommended £5,375), the implication being that these items were 'overpriced'. However in this case the Committee felt it did not need to address any correspondence to the V&A Purchase Fund, because first, it had recommended that same value that had been suggested by the provisional valuer, and secondly the Committee had learned that the money for the acquisition of the items had in any event been raised without the assistance of the V&A Purchase Fund.

May Sinclair's departure. The Committee expressed its profound regret at the departure of May Sinclair, and its profound thanks for all the excellent work she had contributed to its deliberations during her ten years of distinguished service on the Committee. Mrs Sinclair declared that it had been a privilege to work with so many distinguished colleagues and to be able to see all the wonderful items being found in this country.

Welsh Treasure Reports – The Committee asked the Secretariat to inquire with colleagues at the National Museum Wales and ask whether a more concise report on Treasure items might be produced for the coroner and the Committee. Currently the reports produced are of publishable standard and include much information not necessary for the determination of Treasure or for the valuation.

Nominal value of Treasure items

The Committee invited the Secretariat to remind valuers that it would be preferable to attribute at least a nominal value to items that are considered to be of low or nominal value, rather than a '£Nil' value.

Item 6: Date of next meeting

Friday, 1 October 2010, in the Hartwell Room at the British Museum.