A LIFE IN ARCHAEOLOGY

by STANLEY E. WEST

I WAS EIGHT years old when Basil Brown opened Mound 1 at Sutton Hoo. Five years later he began to play a major role in developing my interest in archaeology. It is with some alarm that I realise that I provide a link which bridges a great divide in archaeology: between the personalities and practice of the first half of the twentieth century and the onset of the great changes that have taken place since the 1960s.

My life in archaeology began at the age of twelve to thirteen years when, inspired by the programme ‘How Things Began’ on the wireless, I moved from fossil-hunting in the red crag to flint implements and began to haunt the Ipswich Museum. There I came into contact with two very contrasting personalities. Firstly with Harold Spencer, who scorned my heap of flint tools without discussion, and then with Basil Brown, who would talk archaeology with anyone who would listen.

At sixteen I failed to convince my new headmaster that archaeology was not a science in that man is not predictable, and was promptly told that I was wrong and that I would need to study botany, zoology, chemistry and physics. At the end of the first year in the sixth form I achieved a notable average of 15 per cent, which resulted in an embarrassing interview with the head and immediate expulsion.

Guy Maynard, the curator, noticed that I was in the museum rather than at school: he offered me a junior post which, of course, I took. Maynard was a rather remote, formidable figure, who introduced me to order and discipline (not before time, or altogether successfully). He was a man with very wide interests, who had filled Christchurch Mansion with antiques and art and yet developed and maintained connections with archaeologists in Britain and on the Continent. With James Reid Moir he ran the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia before its transformation into the national Prehistoric Society. His vision of history enabled him to prepare drawings of early Ipswich before such reconstructions became fashionable, and to develop educational programmes such as an on-site museum of the Stanton Villa excavation and a loan service of models and artefacts for schools. This was enhanced by free Saturday morning educational film shows to large audiences of school children.

Harold Spencer was a self-taught geologist of some renown for his work on local glacial studies, but he had wider interests concerned with the museum collections of archaeology and ethnography. He was also the conservationist and general factotum. Spencer’s practical skills enabled him to remove the Roman pottery kiln from Wattisfield found by Basil Brown. We spent much time together cataloguing the museum collections and he taught me the very practical arts of pottery and metalwork as well as the typologies of artefacts. He had become intensely frustrated by what he felt were the overbearing attitudes of Guy Maynard and the internal intrigues within the museum, orchestrated by the museum secretary. Subsequently he resented Maynard’s use of Basil for excavations and tensions developed between him and Basil.

Not before time, Basil has now been recognised for his great contribution to archaeology in general and to Anglo-Saxon studies in particular. I need not rehearse that story here, as it has been so well covered in recent times, both in print and at Sutton Hoo. Here I wish to record that it was his boundless enthusiasm, in spite of the bitterness he felt over his treatment at Sutton Hoo, that was to fuel my interests for over ten years and which had a profound effect on my later career (Fig. 165).

Guy Maynard began to employ Basil in 1934 and used him to excavate the Stanton Roman villa in 1938 with the Revd Ivan Moore. He then recommended him to Mrs Pretty to excavate at Sutton Hoo. After Sutton Hoo, Maynard employed Basil, by somewhat unorthodox ways, as a museum attendant, albeit out-stationed for long periods at Rickinghall, interspersed with other spells in Ipswich where he was quartered in a remote part of Christchurch Mansion while working on the Whitton Roman villa.

For me, life in the museum was claustrophobic to say the least, due to the general air of intrigue, gossip and raised tensions among the staff, particularly between Spencer and Basil, with disputes over excavations at Stanton, Wattsfield kiln, Whitton villa and Sutton Hoo itself, and with the attendant staff who found it hard to accept that Basil was ‘extramural’.

On the broader museum front there was continuous, often bitter, rivalry between the Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds (Moyses Hall) museums over territorial issues, with neither side giving an inch – a situation which continued with Maynard’s successor, Norman Smedley. In reality local (county) archaeology was a ‘free-for-all’, ‘get-what-you-can’ scenario, with rushed visits to sites or gravel pits after reported discoveries, relying on local goodwill and a fair amount of quiet trespassing. For me those early years included a lot of unstructured carefree excitement of discovery, like the Harkstead fossil bone bed mudlarking at low tide with Harold Spencer; the retrieval of a Roman lead coffin at Great Wenham; the upheavals surrounding the excavations of the Whitton Roman villa by Basil, whose huge holes caused delays for the builders and considerable disquiet in the Town Hall; and the salvaging of the piles of potsherds discarded by J.D.W. Treherne at Burgh, with the subsequent restoration at the museum of the pots.

My first excavation, with Basil at West Stow in 1948, was that of the two Roman pottery kilns which he had discovered some four years earlier. The Anglo-Saxon settlement was evident from surface finds, but not pursued at that time. The Anglo-Saxon settlement was evident from surface finds, but not pursued at that time. In the 1950s the redevelopment of Martin’s Bank in Princes Street, Ipswich, and work on the Cowells site nearby, meant that much time was spent rescuing pottery from the very jaws of the newfangled JCBs without any form of excavation or recording. It was clear to me that there were serious problems with the archaeological practice that was current at that time; well beyond those caused by disunity within the museum world itself:

1. There was no direction or purpose: collection was haphazard, responding to chance finds or gravel-pit watching in advance of extraction.
2. There was no equipment. Poor Basil’s 100ft tape was 3ft too short!
3. Surveying equipment was not available. I made a primitive instrument to record the sites on Big Mount field in Butley from tubing recovered from a crashed aircraft and a compass rose mounted on a convenient trig point. Finds were bagged in an assortment of boxes, envelopes or other containers scrounged by the museum staff from local shops. On the conservation side, we made glue for pot restoration from celluloid film, and missing pieces were replaced with plaster with added frayed-up blotting paper. Ironwork was heated to redness on a gas ring and then boiled in wax. All taking place in a workroom of Dickensian gloom. The Snape urns were brought from the Aldeburgh Museum for repair, which took months. I mention this to record that the famous red hair was there, in a Swan Vestas matchbox.

4. Above all there were no priorities: levels of recording were poor, consisting largely of entries in the museum’s Accession Books and Basil’s weekly reports. Large-scale excavation was rare and seldom published. However, Maynard began annual archaeological summaries in the Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History; these were continued and have now become a major contribution to the journal, provided by Edward Martin, Judith Plouviez, and other members of the Suffolk Archaeological Unit (now the County Archaeological Service).

It was indeed the ‘Pre-Plastic-Bag-Era’, an ad-hoc approach which could not possibly cope with post-war development without a real strategy. As I began to reorganise the archaeological stores in the museum cellar and remove wartime sandbags, it was the right moment for me to begin to order the records, and to introduce a card index system of sites and finds for the county, organised by parish. This was to become a key to the formation of the ‘Unit’ by quantifying the problems, with the local collections as evidence that could be presented to the local government, thus promoting a real appraisal of the situation. In due course the index became the Historic Environment Record (HER).

I spent my two years of National Service (1949–51) in the RAF at Bawdsey and Trimley, coordinating the defence of the realm against the threat from eastern Europe: it was amazing how a flock of migrating birds could cause the deployment of squadrons of fighters. Spare time was usefully spent in productive fieldwork along the Bawdsey cliffs, finding an early Bronze Age Beaker site and pit-searching in the local area.

A fellow inmate at Trimley was a certain Andrew Saunders, a very self-assured young man who clearly had his career mapped out, with entry to the Ministry of Public Building and Works (eventually to become Chief Inspector). This was a wake-up call for me, who at that time saw little beyond a return to the Ipswich Museum and becoming a Spencer/Brown clone. Once back there I could see that my future needed direction if I were ever to escape the frustrations of such an ‘enclosed order’. Much against local advice (again) I enrolled in the Museums Association and, enabled by Maynard, I duly acquired the Museums Diploma and was given time off to excavate at Great Casterton with Philip Corder, Graham Webster and J.P. Gillam: a rare and illuminating chance to take part in a structured excavation, largely based on Wheeler’s grid system. Emboldened by this, I began to develop ‘Hopes for Change’. However, ideals must relate to money – at that time, what chance was there of ever changing the financial attitudes of local government towards museums, when museums, libraries, paving and public conveniences were all traditionally in the same bag? Beyond that, National Government? No chance! A visiting graduate from Cambridge to study Bronze Age pottery provided another spur. A certain David Wilson, who also had his career planned: the British Museum – University in London – the British Museum as Director.

As my career began to develop, two distinct, but entwined, strands became apparent, ill defined at this stage but clear enough to embolden youthful ambition. I believed that:
1. Practical archaeology, both in the field and in the museum required the use of all forms of study, from developed excavation techniques to the much-loved typologies of artefacts, and that there was a real need for research-led excavations backed up with systematic fieldwork, all, of course, with proper equipment. That may sound obvious now, but not then. The card index was the forerunner of organised recording, but fuller publication was needed to extend the short notes in the *Proceedings*. Importantly, presentation to the public beyond the museum was vital: newspapers, radio, TV (‘Animal Vegetable and Mineral’ with Glyn Daniel and Mortimer Wheeler), lectures and talks. Ultimately all this was to pay off as we shall see.

2. The second strand was political: I rapidly realised that to fulfil these ideals a much wider recognition was required in both local and national Government circles. A further complication was that archaeology was, as ever, the preserve of the major universities which, with the British Museum, shared the responsibility for academic research. To anyone working in local government museums, the management of the Sutton Hoo affair was a clear indication of the balance of power at that time. Still blissfully unaware of the difficulties that lay ahead, I was nevertheless encouraged by acquaintance with M.R. Hull at Colchester, R. Rainbird Clarke at Norwich Castle Museum, and Glyn Daniel (Cambridge) whom I met on a course at Madingley Hall. Once I had my Museums Diploma, Guy Maynard had given me the chance to reorganise the museum's archaeological collection in the store and in the exhibition gallery, which I much enjoyed, moving from endless rows of pots to more explanatory displays. By happy chance, as I was attempting to re-order the so-called ‘Saxo-Norman medieval pottery’, John Hurst (Inspector of Ancient Monuments) appeared, pursuing the same line of ceramic research. This led to a long and productive association, with a joint paper which identified Ipswich Ware as Middle Saxon, followed by the first urban excavations in Ipswich at Cox Lane and the defences of Ipswich at Shire Hall Yard in 1958–59. The last initiated the years of dedicated exploration led by Keith Wade and the Ipswich team.

At Glynn Daniel’s suggestion, I applied for, and was awarded, an Adult Bursary to Cambridge in 1956 to read Archaeology and Anthropology under Professor Graham Clark, whose awesome presence loomed over all aspiring undergraduates at the time. Cambridge was more of a hothouse that I had imagined; not unlike the museum, it was another ‘enclosed order’, riven with rivalries of all kinds and dimensions.

With my artefact-orientated background of museum work, cataloguing, and restoring artefacts of both the archaeological and ethnographic collections, my interests in all aspects of the manufacture and use of artefacts were an important part of my understanding of the past. I was therefore astonished to find that it was possible to obtain an honours degree at Cambridge without (apparently) handling the objects, and, furthermore, that there was no formal training whatsoever in field techniques. Undergraduates were simply expected to labour on the occasional departmental ‘digs’. My outspoken amazement was rewarded with the introduction of a practical examination in my third year – terrifying! By now, the department of aerial photography had already been established under the leadership of Keith St Joseph, and the analysis of food bones had just begun under Eric Higgs as an offshoot from Charles McBurney’s excavation of the Haush Fteah cave in North Africa, so things were starting to move away from a purely academic base.

Anglo-Saxon archaeology, however, was definitely not ‘the thing’, although it was included as an option in the Finals, along with papers on the Iron Age and Roman Britain. Nobody had ever taken this option. When I confronted Professor Clark with my choice he was most certainly not amused: ‘A waste of time, as it has all been done’. What he meant was that the typologies of the principal artefacts had been produced; the Sutton Hoo treasure was unique; and settlements were all like Sutton Courtenay (Berks.), a site excavated in the 1920s. ‘Excavated’ in this case meant a rescue dig in a gravel pit, and not complete at that. However,
he relented and found supervisors for me – Peter Hunter Blair (Anglo-Saxon), Joan Liversidge, (Romano-British) and Audrey Ozanne (Iron Age), together with Brian Hope-Taylor whose ground-breaking work at Yeavering was not yet published, but provided a much needed practical approach for me.

Although I took the Anglo-Saxon option and persuaded the Ministry of Works (John Hurst) to fund some excavation by Vera Evison at the (then) rare settlement site at West Stow, I was lured by my early exposure to the Palaeolithic at Ipswich and the fascinating discoveries by Louis Leakey at Olduvai Gorge. This, coupled with the realisation that any chance of seeing subsistence agricultural and herding societies was likely to be short-lived in view of the evolving state of African politics, led me to take the post of curator of the King George V Memorial Museum in Dar es Salaam in Tanganyika (now Tanzania) in 1960, six months before Independence. I was able to see at first hand the realities of survival in those conditions, thus putting flesh onto the bare bones of the museum collections; an experience which has coloured my approach to the past ever since (Fig. 166).

During my five years in Dar es Salaam I was able to undertake an extended tour of museums in the USA (Ford Foundation Scholarship); to double the size of the now National Museum and to include the famous Olduvai fossils. The originals to be kept, of course) in a purpose-built strongroom – (the door was lost in Mombasa!).

By 1965 it was clearly time to consider my future: I had three offers:
1. By UNESCO to develop a museum service in West Africa (Liberia).
2. To conduct an archaeological survey in the Yemen (funded and staffed by the US).
3. Return to the UK to take over West Stow: this was an offer from John Hurst as Vera Evison wished to relinquish the site.

I had already made preliminary approaches to John Hurst, Glyn Daniel and Mortimer Wheeler concerning the need for a more consistent programme to meet the challenges of rescue work. It really amounted to now-or-never, as any longer abroad would mean an end to involvement in the UK. I returned in October 1965 and immediately began a (cold) winter season at West Stow for the Ministry of Works. It was evident that the techniques of excavating totally by hand in 15ft squares, as employed by Miss Evison, would not be viable in the face of the mounting threat from the Bury St Edmunds rubbish tip, and that the ultimate objective had to be the complete excavation of the five-acre site, with the overlying sand being removed by JCB, and scraping off the surviving ancient top-soil using the long-handled shovels I brought back from Denmark.

Fig. 166 – Stanley West at Dar es Salaam Museum, 1965.
I designed the excavation strategy and recording systems that would be used, virtually on the plane home from Tanzania, based on the area excavation used by Professor Graham Clark at Hurst Fen, Mildenhall. It might be appropriate, to prevent future confusion, to record that an obsidian blade, planted for the professor to find, was not recovered! Within a week we were stripping the first acre with a JCB and establishing a fifty-foot grid over the entire site. All features were to be completely excavated and all material retained, including all the animal bones, against the advice (again) of the Ministry of Works, which was to ‘identify and keep a selection’. That collection was later the subject of a major study by Professor Pam Crabtree and remains the most comprehensive source of environmental material for the early Anglo-Saxons. The excavation closed in 1972 after eight three-month sessions, just as the great revolution in archaeology began with the use of the plastic bag and even computers!

The decade 1965–75 was one of intense activity for me. At this stage excavations were largely funded by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works (later Department of the Environment, now English Heritage), staffed by volunteers with a core of building labourers, convicts and Borstal boys, plus contracted supervisors. Occasionally it was possible to raise funds for small-scale work from private sources (Westgarth Gardens, Bury St Edmunds) but it was not long before problems surfaced with the increasing numbers of artefacts needing to be conserved and drawn, with specialist identifications, storage and, above all, the publication of results. The excavator had, at that time, to write up for a small fee, virtually unaided apart from the finds drawing which was done by the Ministry. Having spent many weeks in a cellar (another one) in an abandoned office block by Westminster Bridge, I can only say that it was unsatisfactory – weird, in fact.

Early in 1966 I began to teach a series of archaeology courses for the Cambridge Board of Extra-Mural Studies organised by David Dymond (based in Bury St Edmunds) which was to have far-reaching results. A three-year course in Bury had three influential members: Dr Marcus Bird, retired anaesthetist and amateur photographer, Henry Lacey Scott, auctioneer, and Alan Skinner, who happened to be the County Clerk for West Suffolk at that time, and also to live in my village of Woolpit. Dr Bird took many of the West Stow photographs; Lacey Scott helped to finance the West Garth Gardens Anglo-Saxon cemetery excavation and Alan Skinner understood the problems of a lack of resources for archaeology and had a critical part to play in the development of my proposals, which were to seek the appointment of a permanent archaeological team within the County Council. This to be within the Planning Department, which would resolve the museum territorial disputes and place archaeology as a legitimate concern within the planning process. It began with my appointment as Consultant Archaeologist to both counties of Suffolk, achieved in 1970, with the knowledge that the forthcoming merger of the two counties could lead directly to the formation of an Archaeological Unit.

In 1968, as part of an effort to develop wider public awareness, I held the first of what were to become annual ‘Conversaziones’, developed from the old style ‘Exhibits at Meetings’ in the early days of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology. As I remember, nearly 100 people attended the first meeting, with a wide range of interests and discoveries, including Sylvia Coleman with her work on vernacular architecture. Eventually this event was adopted by the Suffolk Institute and still continues as the Suffolk Archaeological Field Group.

In 1971 a small group of activists (Alan Carter, Peter Wade-Martins and myself) met to discuss the possibility of County involvement, and then called a meeting to found a joint committee for the furtherance of archaeology in the region. That meeting was held on 6 November 1971 at the Scole Inn, being neutral territory between Norfolk and Suffolk. The meeting was deliberately inclusive, with historians, industrial archaeologists, museums and the University of East Anglia all represented. John Wymer, Norman Scarfe, Elizabeth Owles,
Barbara Green, and Peter Northeast were there. The name the ‘Scole Committee for Archaeology in East Anglia’ was adopted, to the confusion of many who tried to fathom the acronym without success – apart from ribaldry, that is. The formation of this regional committee was warmly welcomed by the Department of the Environment. John Hurst was adamant that this was the only way that the DOE could fund the appointment of permanent staff for county units as well as field work and excavations, with the Scole Committee acting as employer in the hope that County Councils would eventually assume responsibility. The Scole Committee issued two reports in 1973: *The problems and future of Archaeology in East Anglia*, and *Ipswich: the Archaeological implications of development*. Both of these reports were largely funded by Donald Chipperfield, a lifelong friend in Ipswich. They had an important part in influencing the formation of the County units which was, of course, the ultimate goal of the Scole Committee. By 1974 both had been established: Norfolk in 1973 and Suffolk in 1974, with specialist, period-based staff, in spite of much head wagging, claims that ‘this is not the time’, and so on.

But it was the time; the foundations had been carefully laid and all the lobbying finally paid off. In Suffolk, with the encouragement of Lord Cranbrook, then leader of Suffolk County Council, a properly funded Unit with qualified staff in pensionable posts became part of the Planning Department (Norfolk’s was attached to the existing Museums Service). I firmly believed that this was the best home for the Suffolk Unit as it gave access to planning procedures as part of the remit, rather than with a fragmented Suffolk Museum Service. Within weeks the Unit moved from a single desk in Ipswich to a large prefabricated building in Bury, made redundant by the merger of the two counties. The period-based team there included notably, over the years, Robert Carr, Edward Martin, and Judith Plouviez. In addition, Keith Wade was placed in charge of the Ipswich excavations with a separate digging team (Fig. 167).

The West Stow excavations had been concluded in 1972. Every year the Bury Town Council paid a visit (as light relief, I suspect) and finally demanded to know how to preserve the site. Such was their interest that I proposed that we reconstruct a house to test my new interpretation of Saxon architecture (thinking that the mention of money might end the discussion). Such was the enthusiastic response from the assembled councillors that the West Stow Anglo-Saxon Village Trust was established, largely by the efforts of John Knight, to whom we all owe a considerable debt. I little realised the extent of the commitment (Fig. 168).

A timely approach by a dedicated group from Cambridge (later the West Stow Environmental Archaeological Group) enabled the first house to be erected in 1974 to my specifications, with an ongoing programme employing a developed approach from the simplest to the more likely use of the technology available to the Anglo-Saxons.

Now, some thirty-six years later, the oldest houses are still there and the concept has matured into a three-fold approach:
1. Experimental archaeology.
2. Educational facility.
3. Tourism – to broaden awareness and understanding of the Anglo-Saxons and to act as a balance to the Sutton Hoo discoveries, being the other end of the social scale.

The West Stow Trust has control; the council is heavily represented, pays the bills and is justly proud of their commitment. Before I retired, I put in place an academic sub-committee to ensure the archaeological/historical integrity of the site. The project achieved national status with a lottery award to build a site museum in 1987/8. Since 1980, when records began to be kept, some 1,100,000 visitors have come to West Stow, of which about 300,000 have been groups or school visits.12

It is certainly unusual for an archaeologist to put his interpretations to the test, but then, all
Fig. 167 – The Suffolk Archaeological Unit cricket team at Haughley, June 1979.

Fig. 168 – Stanley West and Alan Armer at West Stow. Early stages of reconstruction of SFB12, 1992.
those years ago I believed that archaeologists should learn how things were done in the past. I am relieved to say that the buildings still stand; the oldest for nearly forty years, in spite of the fact that the posts have rotted away below ground. Is there a chance here for a re-evaluation of the timescales relating to the development of the settlement?

In 1975 the Scole Committee introduced a new monograph series called *East Anglian Archaeology*, designed to relieve the pressures of full publication on the existing local societies and to prevent them from being overloaded with endless pots and post-holes. Thirty-four years on, there were 127 volumes and twenty-four occasional papers at my last count, with many more in the pipeline. The series has been extended to include Essex, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Lincolnshire. Responsibility for publication has passed to the Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers, East of England. Since becoming Managing Editor in 1993, Jenny Glazebrook has maintained and developed that service to the highest standards, a truly remarkable achievement from the earliest days of the foundation of the Scole Committee.

The development of systematic field walking begun by Basil Brown in this region, and used so effectively by Peter Wade-Martins in Norfolk, has opened great opportunities for healthy participation in the discovery and interpretation of the past. An important consequence of this has been the co-ordination of the twin strands of artefactual and documentary evidence into a comprehensive whole. All those court rolls, estate surveys, wills and other documentary sources that fill our Record Offices with worthy labourers can be seen in context when placed alongside the field-by-field collections of artefacts. At last we have recognised and implemented the mutual objectives between archaeologists and historians.

I would like to pay tribute to just one of the groups that have been involved in extensive fieldwork surveys. The Haverhill Field Group was led for twenty-four years by the late Brian Charge and covered the immediate area around Haverhill, reaching into Essex and Cambridgeshire. They recorded and published their work in annual reports, funded by local support; now, as an archive, they are a testimony to what can be achieved. There are others, of course: the Colchesters at Mendlesham, the late Mike Hardy in north Suffolk, and the Walsham-le-Willows Field group led by Audrey McLaughlin, to mention just a few with whom I have had most contact.

After Basil’s wife died in 1984, I was able to do a final service for him. With the cooperation of his solicitor, Mr Gandy, I collected every scrap of written material in the house before it could be burnt. Subsequently this was ordered, transcribed and detailed by Shirley Carnegie in the offices of the Suffolk Archaeological Service where it is available for consultation. I delivered his notebooks and correspondence on astronomy to the Royal Astronomical Society and his original notebooks on Sutton Hoo to the British Museum – it was a close-run thing.

Although this is not a record of fieldwork, the most memorable aspects of my life in archaeology include West Stow and the recognition of the high level of Anglo-Saxon workmanship of all kinds; the identification in 1965 of the fragment of the stole of St Cuthbert as a bookmark in Lavenham; and the discovery of the Iken cross shaft.

There are the inevitable clouds on the horizon, of cuts and bureaucracy, of competitive tendering for excavations from freelance units from outside the county, which could lead to the demise of the Suffolk Archaeological Service’s digging team. With an extensive expertise and knowledge of local conditions and a large number of excavations and fieldwork to its credit, the Service has a fine record of achievement, reflecting the commitment of the staff. Now is the time to promote the Archaeological Service and support it in these difficult times. I confess to being unhappy that the control of the Ipswich Museum has passed to Colchester: time will show how that will work.
I retired in 1991 and now live at the high-water mark of the Anglo-Saxon advances to the west, not far from the site of the Battle of Dyrham (577). In view of the recent discovery of battlefield loot in Mercia, surely there should be something from the three British kings who fell there? My study of local molehills has so far been negative! (Fig. 169).

The interwoven strands of my archaeological life as I have outlined it here track the development of my hopes and some of the plotting and planning that preceded the formation of the Suffolk Archaeological Unit. I am conscious of the debt I owe to the many friends and colleagues who have contributed in different ways to this story and have not been identified in this short résumé. They are not forgotten. This then, is my personal celebration of the impact that that most remarkable man, Basil Brown, had on me and ultimately on the archaeology of the region.
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NOTES

1 An updated and revised version of a talk first given to the Sutton Hoo Society on 31 October 2009.
2 Maynard et al. 1935. See also Maynard 1950, 215.
3 Maynard and Brown 1936. See also Maynard 1950, 214.
4 My grandfather (ed.)! He joined the Institute in 1954. For details of his excavations at Burgh, c. 1947–57, see Martin 1988.
5 Maynard 1950.
6 Hurst and West 1957; West 1963.
7 Leeds 1923.
8 Clark et al. 1960.
9 Crabtree 1990.
10 West 1985 and 1990.

By the end of 2014 the totals were 1,250,000 and 350,000.

This was subsequently sent to Durham Cathedral.
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