

## MINUTES

The meeting was held in the Sackler Room at the British Museum on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009 at 11am.

### Committee

Norman Palmer (Chair)  
Trevor Austin  
Ian Carradice  
John Cherry  
Peter Clayton  
Tim Pestell  
May Sinclair

### Other

Andrew Basham (BM)  
Roger Bland (BM)  
Janina Parol (BM)  
Ian Richardson (BM)  
Helen Loughlin (DCMS)  
Maria Mourin (DCMS)

### Apologies

Jack Ogden (comments posted)

**Item 1: Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2009** – Corrections were submitted by the Committee and the minutes were passed as a true record of the meeting.

### **Item 2: Discussion about valuation of Anglo-Saxon Hoard from Staffordshire**

An overview of the current progress of the case was provided by Dr. Roger Bland, head of Portable Antiquities and Treasure. The hoard was discovered by a metal detectorist, who uncovered the first 300 objects. Archaeologists were subsequently called in and excavated most of the remaining objects. Currently there are 1340 discrete objects, and 49 blocks of soil with objects contained therein. We have 660 images of all the important finds. An agreement has been reached, to which the BM is party, that the hoard will be shared by Birmingham Museum & Art Gallery and Stoke-on-Trent (Potteries Museum). The British Museum has waived its interest in acquiring any of the objects in this case. A selection of the objects is currently on display in Birmingham Museum, and the British Museum is considering putting some on display when they come down to London for valuation. Subsequent to valuation and prior to formal acquisition, the Potteries Museum wishes to put some objects on display to aide in fundraising.

The archaeologists and Dr. Kevin Leahy, author of the preliminary report and primary researcher of the hoard, are satisfied that there is no archaeology within the soil blocks. The Finder and Landowner wish the objects to be excavated prior to valuation. Birmingham Museum will pick apart the blocks before they are delivered to the British Museum.

It has been made public that the hoard will be valued by the Committee at its meeting of 25 November 2009. The Committee expressed its belief that this task may take the entire day and so therefore resolved to schedule another meeting for the 9<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> of December, 2009, to handle its normal predicted case load. The Secretariat will coordinate the scheduling of this added meeting.

The Committee also discussed the issue of media interest in the hoard and in the Treasure Process in general. The Chairman has been approached by the Guardian newspaper with a request to attend a valuation meeting as a silent observer. The object of the request was to observe the general valuation process and not to witness the treatment of any particular find. Dr Bland also told the Committee how he had been approached by various television stations wishing to film the valuations, and other film companies wishing to make a documentary about the hoard. The Committee discussed the issue of media access to valuation meetings, touching upon the fact that in 2003 a documentary film maker was allowed to film a staged version of such a meeting. Members of the committee spoke about the virtues of allowing media access, such as an increased public awareness of how the process works and the anticipated benefits of being seen to be more 'open'. They also expressed concern about the potential drawbacks, such as misrepresentation by the press, giving access to confidential information, and the broader implications of opening the process to public access for example through the incidence of multiple requests for presence on future occasions. In the course of this discussion the members also sought clarification as to how they should respond to individual inquiries from the media for information on the valuation. The Committee realised that it had no established policy on how it should respond to requests from the media and public for access to its meetings. Therefore the Committee decided that:

- a.) In the case of the request from the Guardian, the Chairman will inform the newspaper that the TVC cannot give a definite answer at this time until it has the opportunity to formulate a general policy with respect to this issue.
- b.) If members of the Committee are individually approached for information on the valuation of the hoard, they should refer the inquirer to the British Museum Press Office
- c.) The Chairman will draw up a list of positives and negatives of the different options available to the

Committee with respect to the decision to allow media access to its meetings. He will circulate the list among the Committee with the intention of establishing a policy before the next meeting. The DCMS will be included in this discussion as its advice will also be important in the process.

The Secretariat had already approached three valuers with requests to value the hoard; [REDACTED]. The Committee requested that a member of staff at Bonham's also be approached; the usual contact [REDACTED] may be on maternity leave so it is hoped that the Secretariat can secure the services of her second. The Committee also instructed the Secretariat to ask the valuers, given the importance of this case, whether they would be content to have their names attached to the valuations they provide.

### **Item 3: Objects**

#### **Prehistoric artefacts**

##### **1. Bronze Age hoard from Little Hempden, Buckinghamshire (2008 T779)**

The provisional valuer suggested £100; the Committee viewed the hoard in light of this. Given that pieces represent a virtually complete sword, the Committee agreed with the provisional valuer's suggestion, and recommended £100. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **Iron Age Artefacts**

##### **2. Iron Age gold/ silver alloy torc from Telford area, Shropshire (2008 T557) – 3<sup>rd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £1,350; The TVC recommended £1,800 (17/06/09). The Finder submitted a challenge and the TVC recommended £1,800 (12/08/09). The Finder submitted a further challenge. The TVC considered the torc again in light of this.

In response to the Finder's submission the Committee first clarified that the proposed value is not an 'offer' but its recommendation to the Secretary of State for the amount of *ex gratia* reward to be paid to the interested parties.

With regards to the point raised by the Finder in his letter about the advice received from an expert in 'The Treasure Hunter' magazine, it mentioned that without the knowledge of the identity and expertise of the person consulted by the Finder (and indeed, without being provided with his or her opinion directly) it was impossible to attach any material weight to this advice.

The Committee pointed out that the case cited in the Finder's letter of 1<sup>st</sup> September, which was acquired by the Potteries Museum for £8000, involved fragments of three torcs superior in quality and with a higher gold content than the piece under discussion.

In response to the request that the Committee provide in writing the way in which the valuation was arrived at, it asks the Finder to draw his attention to the provisional valuation supplied at the beginning of this case, which it took under advice, and to the minutes of the meetings of 17 June 2009 and 12 August 2009 (sent out in letter form), where the Committee's deliberations and reasoning are clearly set out.

In conclusion the Committee found nothing in the Finder's letter to cause it to change its recommendation of £1800.

#### **Roman artefacts**

##### **3. Roman silver finger-ring from Winteringham, North Lincolnshire (2008 T591)**

The provisional valuer suggested £80; the Committee viewed the item in light of this and felt that a more accurate figure was £85, which it recommended. North Lincolnshire Museum hopes to acquire.

##### **4. Roman silver finger-ring from Snodland, Kent (2008 T286)**

The provisional valuer suggested £50; the Committee inspected the finger-ring in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £50. Maidstone Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **Early Medieval artefacts**

##### **5. Viking silver ingot from Burgate, Suffolk (2008 T719)**

The provisional valuer suggested £30; the Committee viewed the ingot in light of this and felt it was an

accurate value. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £30. Colchester & Ipswich Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**6. Viking hack gold fragment of gold strip from Aldborough, North Yorkshire (2008 T315)**

The provisional valuer suggested £150; the Committee took this into consideration when viewing the strip. It was felt that the small size of the piece made it worth a bit less, and it recommended £125. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

**7. Anglo-Saxon silver hooked tag from Norbury, Staffordshire (2008 T242) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £60; the TVC recommended £60 (12/08/09). The Finder has submitted a challenge. The Committee thanked the Finder for his submission. It acknowledged that the illustrations provided by the provisional valuer were from twelve years ago and considered both this in arriving at its recommendation, as it also did for the relative rarity of the piece. The Committee sought to emphasise that the hooked tag should be regarded and valued as an artefact, not as a coin, and that as such although it would generate some interest, it is unfortunately fragmentary. In the absence of any further evidence that would persuade the Committee to alter its previous recommendation, the Committee maintained that recommendation of £60. The Potteries Museum hopes to acquire.

**8. Viking gold finger-ring from Weston Colville, Cambridgeshire (2008 T141) – 3<sup>rd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £2, 000-£2, 200; the Finder submitted comments. The TVC requested a second valuation (24/04/09). A second provisional valuer suggested £4, 000. The TVC recommended £3, 500 (17/06/09) and the Finder has submitted a challenge. The Committee viewed the ring again and took this information under advice. It thanked the Finder for his letter and sought to clarify several points raised therein.

The modern fake ring sold at the Olympia Art and Antiquities Fair was not known to be a forgery at the time of purchase. The buyer assumed that he or she was purchasing an authentic Viking ring and therefore the subsequent revelation of its forged nature is inconsequential.

The Finder sought to make a comparison of this piece to case 2002 T262, a gold medieval ring (with gemstone), valued at £6000, in the sense that both are outstanding examples for their period and whose values would equally reflect that. The Committee explained that such a cross-period equation is not valid in the antiquities market, as the demand varies according to period, type, and other characteristics.

The Committee also drew attention to case 2007 T19, a similar gold Viking ring, which it valued at £4000 and which it considered a more substantial piece.

It therefore saw nothing that would cause it to change its original recommendation, which it maintained at £3500. The Fitzwilliam Museum hopes to acquire.

**9. Anglo-Saxon grave assemblage from Ringlemere, Kent (2006 T30) – 4<sup>th</sup> viewing**

Grave 40 (Claw Beaker only)- The first provisional valuer suggested £400,000- £500,000; the second provisional valuer suggested 500,000; the third provisional valuer suggested £400,000. Both the Museum and Landowner submitted comments regarding the valuations. The Committee also sought advice from [REDACTED] on the approach it should take when presented with a provisional valuation that pays specific regard to the application of the export licensing regime as part of the rationale underpinning its valuation

[REDACTED]

Several specific points were raised in the submissions by the Museum, and the Committee desired to know whether, after being made aware of these points, the provisional valuers would in any way alter their suggestions. It drafted a letter with the factual points that it wished the provisional valuers. The valuers responded to this letter and their submissions are included.

The Committee examined the Claw Beaker once again, taking into consideration all the provisional valuations, the submissions of the Landowner and Museum and its own knowledge and experience. It expressed its satisfaction with the answers received from the valuers in response to the points raised by the Museum, and noted the clear matching suite of suggested values. It also took account of the conviction with which the provisional valuers reaffirmed and corroborated their original estimations. It factored in the relative improbability of the prospect that a complete piece of this type would become potentially available on the market and pointed out the considerable variation in the prices that glass vessels fetch at auction, which added to the difficulty of this recommendation. It also raised as point of comparison the Bury St Edmund's glass bucket, sold at auction in 2004, which was not simply unique on the market but also unique in absolute terms and which nevertheless achieved a price of £100,000. Taking all of these factors into consideration the Committee felt that £400,000 was a fair value for the Claw Beaker.

The other objects in this grave group were seen at the meeting of 27 February 2009. At that meeting the Committee recommended:

Footed glass beaker:	£700
31 amber beads, 42 glass beads, 3 decorated beads:	£250
8 silver rings with glass beads:	£400
Rock crystal bead:	£300
Remaining items:	no commercial value
	-----
	£1,650

Taking into account the Committee's recommendation for the Claw Beaker, the total recommendation for Grave 40 was therefore £401,650. The British Museum hopes to acquire.

## **Medieval artefacts**

### **10. Medieval silver pilgrim badge from Eye area, Suffolk (2008 T711)**

The provisional valuer suggested £200; the Committee viewed the pilgrim badge in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer that this was a fair value, recommended £200. Moyses Hall Museum hopes to acquire.

### **11. Medieval silver mount from Hound, Hampshire (2007 T455)**

The provisional valuer suggested £55; the Committee viewed the mount in light of this. It pointed out that a similar piece of slightly more substance, 2006 T349 from Pulham, Dorset (2005/6 Treasure Annual Report fig. 551), was valued at £200. It therefore felt that £55 was too low and recommended £100. Hampshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

### **12. Medieval silver hawking bell from Melbourne area, Derbyshire (2009 T148)**

The provisional valuer suggested £300; the Committee viewed the bell in light of this and expressed its concern that it was very difficult to assert definitively that this piece was used in hawking, an association which admittedly might be of interest to some collectors. The Committee felt that it might tentatively be a clothing accessory. The Committee was concerned that the provisional valuation gave too great a weight to this potential hawking association and was inclined to believe that the value should be lower. However it thought prudence demanded another expert's opinion, and asked the Secretariat to commission a second provisional valuation. Derby Museum hopes to acquire.

### **13. Medieval silver coin brooch from Tenby, Pembrokeshire (08.18)**

The provisional valuer suggested £400; the Committee inspected the coin brooch in light of this and found the suggestion to be accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, the Committee recommended £400. National Museum of Wales hopes to acquire.

### **14. Medieval silver finger-ring from Kilmore, County Armagh (NI08.3)**

The provisional valuer suggested £220; the Committee inspected the ring in light of this. It commented that the crosses were capably and attractively executed and that it was an unusual piece, but nonetheless felt that the suggested value was slightly high for such an example. It recommended £200. Ulster Museum hopes to

acquire.

**15. Medieval silver shield shaped plaque from Wiston, North Yorkshire (2008 T206)**

The first provisional valuer suggested £5,000; a second provisional valuer suggested £3,000. The Committee viewed the plaque in light of these. It felt that the plaque was a lovely piece and agreed that given the substantial size, the higher figure suggested is justified. In agreement with the first valuer, the Committee recommended £5000. Yorkshire Museum Trust hopes to acquire.

**16. Medieval silver-gilt pilgrim badge from Edwinstone, Nottinghamshire (2008 T299) – 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £300; The TVC recommended £300 (17/06/09). The Finder has submitted a private valuation of £480. The Committee considered the case again in light of this and accepted the points of the private valuation with reference to case 2004 T455 (fig. 229 in the 2004 Treasure Annual Report), namely that 2004 T455, valued at £300, was smaller and less fine. It also considered the *comparandum* quoted by the private valuer and another example NM 269 in *Medieval Artefacts* (Mills 2003) listed at £400 in fine condition. Having had a chance to inspect the object again and in light of this information, the Committee revised its recommendation to £460. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

**17. Medieval gold locket from Newark area, Nottinghamshire (2008 T506) - 3<sup>rd</sup> viewing**

The first provisional valuer suggested £800 - £1,000; the TVC requested a second provisional valuation (17/06/09). The second provisional valuer suggested £500. The Finder provided comments including a private valuation. The TVC recommended £1,600 (12/08/09) The Finder submitted a challenge. The Committee took this into consideration when viewing the object again.

The Committee thanked the Finder for his further submission, but felt that there was no evidence in the correspondence which would cause it to revise its opinion. It assured the Finder that it had taken into account the uniqueness of the item, the fact that it was still a working mechanism and the effect (if any) that publicity would have on its market value. It recommended £1600 for this piece. Newark Museum hopes to acquire.

**Post-Medieval artefacts**

**18. Post-Medieval silver buckle from Droxford, Hampshire (2007 T453)**

The provisional valuer suggested £25; the Committee viewed the object in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, recommended £25. Winchester Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**19. Post-Medieval silver fob seal from Stoke Mandeville, Buckinghamshire (2009 T82)**

The provisional valuer suggested £220; the Committee viewed the fob seal in light of this. It cited a large number of other fob seals auctioned in Woolley and Wallis' silver sale 31/10/07 with prices ranging up to £170. An example from Timeline Originals, with a dancing bear mark, was being offered at £160 at retail. It agreed that this is an attractive piece, but felt that on the basis of those commercial parallels the suggested value was slightly high. It recommended £200. Buckinghamshire County Museum hopes to acquire.

**20. Post Medieval silver seal die from Narborough, Leicestershire (2008 T268)**

The provisional valuer suggested £250; this case was deferred at the request of the Finder. Leicestershire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**21. Post-Medieval silver dress pin from Beccles area, Suffolk (2008 T445)**

The provisional valuer suggested £80; the Committee viewed the object in light of this. It cited a comparable example, case 05.11 from Portskewett, Monmouthshire (ref. 1240 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) that is slightly finer and which was also valued at £80. The Committee therefore recommended £70. Beccles Museum hopes to acquire.

**22. Post-Medieval silver dress hook from Beccles area, Suffolk (2008 T446)**

The first provisional valuer suggested £165; the second provisional valuer suggested £80-£100. The Committee took these into consideration when viewing the dress hook and cited several comparable examples it had previously valued: 2006 T468 from Swainsthorpe, Norfolk (ref. 657 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) valued at £150 and 2006 T292 from East Dean, Hampshire (ref. 669 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) also valued at £150. The Committee felt that this dress hook was similar to those two examples and that the value should be the same. The Committee recommended £150. Beccles Museum Hopes to acquire.

**23. Post-Medieval silver lace tag from Easton, Wiltshire (2008 T276)**

The provisional valuer suggested £25; in addition the valuer would like the Committee to know that he provided his services for this case *pro bono*. The Committee expressed its appreciation of the provisional valuer's generosity in making no charge and furthermore felt his valuation to be reasonable. In agreement with the provisional valuer the Committee recommended £25. The British Museum hopes to acquire. The Committee asked the Secretariat to express its thanks to the provisional valuer for valuing this *pro bono*.

#### **24. Post-Medieval silver possible whistle fragment from Wonston, Hampshire (2008 T227)**

The provisional valuer suggested £200; the Committee took this under advice when viewing the fragment. It cited a comparison in *Benet's Artefacts of England & the United Kingdom* (Paul Murawski, Ely, pg 601) of a pewter whistle for £80-£100. A complete silver example valued earlier by the Committee, 2005 T54 from the West Charleton area, Devon (ref. 859 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) had been valued at £650. A closer *comparandum* (given that it too was incomplete) was felt to be 2006 T177 from Stalbridge, Dorset (ref. 858 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) and this was valued at £175. Even so, the Stalbridge example was still felt to be more substantial than the piece in question, and the Committee felt that £100 was a more appropriate value in the instant case. It recommended £100. Winchester Museum Service hopes to acquire.

#### **25. Post-Medieval silver-gilt finger-ring from Vernham Deans, Hampshire (2007 T533)**

The provisional valuer suggested £400; the Committee examined the finger-ring in light of this and agreed that it was a nice example, and that the suggested value was accurate. It recommended £400. Hampshire Museum Service hopes to acquire.

#### **26. Post-Medieval gold posy-ring from Lingfield & Dormansland, Surrey (2009 T39)**

The provisional valuer suggested £600; the Committee took this under advice when examining the object. It agreed with the valuer's suggestion that the ring in question would be more desirable than the example cited from the Woolley & Wallis auction of 26 July 2007. The Committee also compared the Surrey ring with 2002 T211, from Pulham, Dorset (ref. 155 in the 2002 *Treasure Annual Report*) which while valued at £750, had a more distinct maker's mark, possibly attributable to a local artisan. It therefore found itself in agreement with the suggestion of the provisional valuer, and recommended £600. Guildford Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **27. Post-Medieval silver pendant/ vervel from South Herefordshire area (2007 T544) – 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £1, 200; The Finder and Landowner submitted comments seen at 17/06/09 TVC meeting. The TVC allowed the Finder and Landowner extra time to carry out research into the find, however this proved difficult. The Treasure Registrar contacted the College of Arms for information and their response is included. The Finder and Landowner submitted further comments. The Committee took all this into consideration when viewing the object.

The Committee thanked the Finder and Landowner for their submission. Having regard to the evidence from the College of Arms the Committee was willing to accept that the vervel probably was associated with a Duke of Norfolk. However it noted that the provisional valuer took this into account, and agreed that there is no evidence that this particular association translates to an exact monetary value. In fact it pointed out that hawking vervels by their nature were intended to be traced to individuals, and this is already a factor contributing to their general worth. Most of the *comparanda* discussed at the meeting of 17 June 2009 and sent to the interested parties on 31 July 2009 could also be attributed to named individuals or families. It drew attention to piece 2005 T529, an almost identical vervel from (ref. 778 in the 2005/6 *Treasure Annual Report*) which was valued at £600, but accepted that in light of the auction results cited by the provisional valuer, this may have been undervalued.

Given these considerations the Committee agreed with the provisional valuer and recommended £1200. Hereford Museum hopes to acquire.

#### **28. Post-Medieval gold crucifix from Tuxford area, Nottinghamshire (2008 T512) – 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

Mark Bowis valued this item at £1, 000-£2, 000; the Committee recommended £1, 200 (12/08/09). The Finder and Landowner have submitted a challenge. This case was deferred at the request of the Finder and Landowner. Bassetlaw Museum hopes to acquire.

### **Item 4: Coins**

#### **Medieval coins**

**29. Medieval silver coins (30) from North Cave, East Riding of Yorkshire (2009 T59)**

The provisional valuer suggested £1, 000-£1, 500; the Committee viewed the coins in light of this. It found that the provisional valuer gave proper credit to the rare mints of several of the coins, and felt the suggested range was accurate. In agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £1300. East Riding Museum Service hopes to acquire.

**Item 5: Norfolk Cases [Tim Pestell left the room]**

**30. Anglo-Saxon silver-gilt disc brooch fragment from Aldborough area, Norfolk (2008 T611) - 2<sup>nd</sup> viewing**

The provisional valuer suggested £100; The TVC recommended £100 (17/06/09). Subsequent to the meeting, it was revealed that the complementary fragment of the brooch mentioned in the provisional valuation (2002 T31) was valued at £600 by the Committee. The Committee requested to see this object again and consider this new evidence. The Committee did view the fragment again in light of this and felt that the fact that the piece under discussion compliments the first piece, adds to its value. It is a smaller piece and so normally would be worth in the range suggested by the provisional valuer, but (taking into account the fact that it complements the earlier piece), the Committee recommended £400. The British Museum hopes to acquire. NB: Tim Pestell was consulted because Norwich Castle Museum had originally pursued acquisition of the 2002 piece. However he left the room again whilst the Committee arrived at a recommendation.

**31. Bronze Age hoard from Feltwell, Norfolk (2009 T161)**

The provisional valuer suggested £250; The Finder and the Museum have submitted comments. The Committee viewed the pieces in light of this and agreed that the axe head is indeed a sharp piece but did point out the chips in the blade detracted somewhat from its appeal. The Committee acknowledged that the axe head is larger than the example from Timeline Originals provided by the Finder, but clarified that the price on Timeline Originals is a retail and not a market value. It felt that the addition of the fragment of a butt of the rapier contributed to the group's appeal and was therefore minded to go above the suggested value. The Committee recommended £280. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

**32. Early Medieval fused silver pennies (2) from Swaffham area, Norfolk (2009 T31)**

The provisional valuer suggested £30-£50; the Committee examined the pennies in light of this and in agreement with the provisional valuer, it recommended £40. Norwich Castle Museum hopes to acquire.

**Item 6: AOB [Tim Pestell re-entered the room]**

**2002 T215 – Romano-British items from Near Baldock, Hertfordshire** 2002 T215(1) was found by [REDACTED] in 2002 and acquired by the British Museum. Further excavations by an archaeological team revealed five further separate suffixes – 2002 T215 (2 -6) (see reports and images to be circulated at meeting). The archaeologist has been named as the finder in these cases, but given the connection between these items and the original case, the Secretariat proposes to include [REDACTED] in correspondence about the valuation in recognition that he is an interested party (and addressing him as such) until it has been decided whether he is entitled to a share of any reward. Does the Committee agree to this course of action?

The Committee agrees that he should be included in correspondence as an interested party.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] The Committee acknowledges [REDACTED] that it is not within TVC's remit to exclude relevant or potentially relevant evidence on the grounds of unreasonable lateness and that the TVC's role and function do not provide a basis for the TVC to exclude potentially relevant evidence out of concern for fairness to 'non-delaying parties'. Rather, this will be a factor considered by the Secretary of State as part of the overall decision on the valuation.

**2007 T388 – Ceramic urns and associated items from Stanbury, West Yorkshire**

Trevor Austin has visited the Archaeological archive and seen all of the assemblage in person, making notes on the items. The Committee is content that the provisional valuer should base his or her valuation on the items seen in person (those due to be brought down to the British Museum) and on photographs of the ceramic pieces. At the appropriate meeting, the TVC will consider the suggestion, examine the

photographs of the ceramics and view the other objects in person, and rely on Mr Austin for a first-hand perspective in arriving at its recommendation.

**Date of Next Meeting:** Wednesday 25 November 2009, 11:00am. Hartwell Room, The British Museum

In addition, an extra meeting date has been added to the calendar; Thursday 10 December 2009, 11:00am Hartwell Room, The British Museum.