Around the houses. Towards a more robust interpretation and analysis of the Early Neolithic domestic settlement record in Britain – lessons from Orkney

by GILES CAREY

The emerging narrative for Early Neolithic settlement across Britain is becoming richer, particularly with the investigation of a wide range of structural evidence from developer-funded excavation, a renewed interest in exploring landscape settlement traces and increasingly refined chronological frameworks for discussing the evidence.

In this paper, the case study of Early Neolithic Orkney provides a starting point for a critical analysis of the heterogeneity of the evidence. Recent discoveries across the archipelago are providing a picture of considerable variability in fourth millennium BC domestic practice, with an increasingly wide architectural repertoire now evident. The nature of the evidence provides the impetus to reconsider the apparently self-evident nature of the autonomous house in Orkney – the picture is one of considerable variance in domestic arrangement. The implications are wide-ranging for Early Neolithic Britain, and will be considered in the emerging research context, with particular reference to the expanded evidence base provided by developer-funded excavation. It is argued that a more robust interpretation of the heterogeneous nature of settlement practice requires both our prospection strategies, and our strategies for interpreting ‘domestic’ activity, to be flexible and nuanced.
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Introduction: About the house

The announcement of a fresh wave of Early Neolithic settlement evidence from Kingsmead Quarry, Horton, Berkshire (Chaffey and Brook 2012; Barclay et al. 2012) along with the previous discovery of a series of houses from this site dating to around 3800 BC, comes at an exciting time for the study of the fourth millennium BC across Britain. The publication of a significant re-dating programme of causewayed enclosures across Southern Britain and Ireland (Whittle et al. 2011a), has done much to highlight the potential in redressing previous synthesises of the period which ‘have operated within a very coarse chronology’ (Whittle et al. 2011b: 14). Reliance on traditional chronologies has long inhibited a much fuller understanding of the pace of change in the insular Earlier Neolithic (Bradley 2007a: 33); now is the time to write ‘[m]ore detailed Neolithic histories’ (Whittle et al. 2007: 123).

This paper takes as a starting point a collation of the settlement evidence that is now evident from the Orkney Isles, located off the north coast of Scotland. This newly emerging evidence forces us to reconsider not only the structural evidence for settlement in the fourth millennium BC, but the approaches we take to effectively deal with a multiplicity of domestic practices. At a wider scale, in Britain, similar issues are coming to the fore with the rapidly expanding evidence-base provided by developer-funded excavation. At the same time, attention has returned to analyses at a landscape scale, considering the roles of pits, lithic scatters and their relationship with the structural evidence.

Ultimately, the aim is to shift attention away from one interpretation of the house, and one interpretation of domesticity. This wider focus will truly allow us to begin to interpret, on an equal basis, as wide a range of settlement traces as possible, in all the guises in which they appear (Barclay 1996: 75).
The example of Early Neolithic Orkney: methodological and interpretative possibilities

The well-known, well-studied (e.g., Card 2005a) stone-built ‘permanent house architecture’ of the Orkney Islands has seemingly provided an unparalleled opportunity to explore the ‘house societies’ of early Neolithic communities (Noble 2006a: 38). This research has presented the ‘house’ as a self-evident category of analysis (Thomas 1996: 11-12), an unchanging cosmological referent, which, as we shall see, belies the diversity of domestic practice that is now beginning to emerge. The variability inherent in this emerging dataset requires us to re-evaluate not only how we think about Early Neolithic settlement evidence in Orkney, but also how we look for such sites.

The research context

The Orkney Islands form one of the most intensively studied archaeological areas in north-west Europe (Card 2005a). Key to their continuing attraction, as a ‘core area’ for research (Barclay 2004: 34-37) is the exceptional survival of above ground remains (Cummings and Pannett 2005: 14; Parker Pearson and Richards 1994: 41). The Later Neolithic monuments which form the Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site (WHS) have dominated interpretation of life across the whole Neolithic (Barclay 2000: 275; Downes 2005: 2; McClanahan 2006: 102). The evidence for the Orcadian Early Neolithic in contrast, has often been seen as epiphenomenal, on the periphery of academic discussion.

For nearly 70 years, the interpretation of domestic life in Early Neolithic Orkney has been predicated on a single site, the Knap of Howar, on Papa Westray (Figure 1). After an erosion event exposed the area in the 1930s, local landowner William Traill and the antiquarian William Kirkness cleared and carried out initial excavations on two conjoined stone buildings (Traill and Kirkness 1937: 309). Subsequently, Anna Ritchie’s excavations, between 1973 and 1975, aimed to ‘elucidate further the nature and date of the two-stone built houses’, interpreted as the farmstead of an extended family (Ritchie 1973: 68).

Both stone-built houses at Knap of Howar are constructed of double-skinned walling, cored with midden material. They are rectangular in form, with rounded corners, and sub-divided by orthostats set into the ‘pinched’ wall form. Overall, House 2 was interpreted as a possible workshop, with House 1 forming the main dwelling house, an understanding influenced by analogy with living arrangements in the

Figure 1 The architectural repertoire of Early Neolithic buildings in Orkney, as exemplified by Knap of Howar, letters on plan (left) correspond to photographs of the structure (left, image base plan redrawn by author, after Ritchie 1983; right, photographs by G. Carey).
Hebridean blackhouses (Dalglish 2003: 20). This architectural repertoire is taken as typical, providing a blueprint for what an Orcadian Early Neolithic house should be like (Downes and Richards 2000: 167). The landscape context of Knap of Howar is also ‘consistent with the generally accepted framework’ for small, dispersed, self-sufficient farmsteads in the Early Neolithic (Bradley 2007a: 40; Richards 1993: 89), giving ‘the impression of isolated communities living largely independent lives’ (Noble 2006b: 111 cf. Sturt 2005: 73).

Knap of Howar has provided a powerful legacy for interpreting the nature of settlement in Early Neolithic Orkney. However, emerging evidence is challenging the very notion of the ‘house’, as a physical structure and as a ‘resource used in the structuring of the social interaction that reproduces society’ (Ferguson 1996: 7) across the archipelago. The variety of house and settlement forms now evident (Thomas 2009) demonstrate both the interpretative challenges in dealing with the architecture of the period (Jones and Richards 2000: 164) and the methodological challenges in consistently identifying and recording domestic activity in the archaeological record (Bradley 2003: 221).

In the 1980s, Colin Richards started to re-examine the evidence for other Early Neolithic houses in Orkney, such as the structure underlying the complex Iron Age site at Howe, near Stromness (Ballin Smith 1994; Richards 1993). This structure was initially interpreted as a mortuary structure, but similarities in architectural form with the Knap of Howar houses might suggest an Early Neolithic date. More recently at Knowes of Trotty, Huntiscarth, a small rectangular structure, securely dated to c. 3500 – 2910 cal. BC, underlies one of the barrows in this Bronze Age cemetery, constructed nearly a millennium later (Card 2005b: 177; Card and Downes 2006: 27; Sheridan and Schulting 2006: 205).

Subsequent excavations on a number of sites have begun to further demonstrate the variability of occupation practice in the fourth millennium BC. These discoveries are par-
particularly associated with Colin Richard’s programme of survey work in Orkney, using a nested programme of systematic fieldwalking and geophysics (Richards, 1986: 21-2, 2005: 9).

A site at Stonehall, on the slopes of Cuween Hill, rather than being an ‘isolated’ farmstead appears to represent a much more clustered settlement arrangement, usually associated with the Late Neolithic, as at Skara Brae. The remains of up to seven possible houses were recorded at this site (Carruthers and Richards 2000: 64), within an area of 150m by 150m and with a rapid sequence of rebuilding and several shifts in settlement focus.

Perhaps the most important findings of Richards’ excavation programme, however, were the discovery of a primary timber phase of construction to the Early Neolithic settlement on the slopes of Wideford Hill, overlooked by the famous tomb. For the first time, this was unequivocal evidence that timber did form part of the architectural repertoire in the islands in the fourth millennium BC, and that traces of such structures can survive (Wickham-Jones 2006: 26). Three post-built structures were recorded, two of similar sub-circular form (Structures 1 and 2), with a third that, at least in its latter phase, resembles a rectilinear organisation of space (Structure 3). The decaying remains of Structure 2 formed a focus for the construction of a stone-built longhouse (House 1), probably constructed whilst the decaying posts of the earlier timber structure were still in situ. This all reveals a ‘close grained sequence of building replacement and continuity of occupation’ (Richards 2003: 6), spanning c. 3350 – 2920 cal. BC, with a complex interplay between construction materials.

The emerging picture

Recent excavations on Wyre, a small island in between Mainland and Rousay, have revealed a similarly fluid and complex relationship between timber and stone-built elements of the architecture at the settlement of Braes of Ha’Breck (Lee and Thomas 2012). In one trench, a post-built longhouse with a central fire pit was rapidly dismantled and its posts were ripped out prior to the construction of a stone-built house on almost exactly the same footprint, although a new hearth was constructed. In another trench, a short-lived timber house, consisting of 14 post-holes around a scoop hearth, seems to have been replaced by two conjoined stone houses. Whilst post-exavation analysis of these results is still ongoing, it is clear that selection of construction material is not simply a material consideration, but also relies upon a series of socially embedded decisions.

This evidence for the use of timber in house construction is of particular importance in light of recent palaeo-environmental studies, which point to the fact that Orkney may not have been as treeless in the Neolithic as previously thought (e.g., Keatinge and Dickson 1979; Davidson and Jones 1990). Current evidence indicates a diverse pattern of woodland survival that existed, in some areas into the Bronze Age (Farrell et al. in press). Thus, the timber buildings at Wideford Hill and Braes of Ha’Breck may be ‘representative of a much broader distribution’ (Richards 2003: 19).

Undoubtedly, the emerging evidence represents a securely-dated Early Neolithic phase of occupation in Orkney, of considerable variety, in settlement morphology, house form and, in construction material, c. 3400-3100 cal. BC. The construction of timber buildings at both Wideford Hill and Braes of Ha’Breck presents a radical challenge to an established image of substantial stone-built houses representing year-round sedentary permanence in the earliest Neolithic. This new picture of Early Neolithic houses also has wide-ranging implications for how such sites are prospected, particularly given their ephemerality set against the high visibility of stone in the archaeological record of the Northern Isles.

The variability of settlement practice

The ‘standard’ architectural repertoire, typified by the type-site of Knap of Howar, was subject to significant reinvention at a local level. Much has been written on the cosmological ‘decoding’ of the Early Neolithic house, with the stone-built houses of Neolithic Orkney forming a key part of this narrative (e.g., Richards 1990, 1993, 1996). However, it is evident that, even when we are dealing with stone-built architecture, we are not dealing with a static, homogenous codification of meaning, or a set of ‘rules’ for construction and dwelling (Garrow et al. 2005: 251; cf. Bourdieu 1990: 26-27). Early Neolithic buildings went through cycles of change, use, and abandon-
ment, which can be studied at a range of different timescales. Buildings are, after all, an element of a material culture, a specialised artefact entwined with ‘distinct practices and human identities’ as well as the self-images of the societies that created and lived in them (Thomas 1999: 74; Richards 1998: 525).

In addition, the analysis of settlement layout across Early Neolithic Orkney poses significant challenges to a generally assumed model of a segmentary society in fourth millennium BC Orkney, living in isolated, dispersed settlements such as at Knap of Howar (Farrell 2009: 32; Renfrew 1979: 205-208; Richards 1998: 524; Sharples 1985: 72, 1992: 323). This picture of settlement might just possibly be an atypical arrangement, as suggested by the conglomeration of houses at Stonehall and Braes of Ha’Breck and from the shifting nature of the Early Neolithic building phases at Pool, Sanday (Hunter 2007: 63-64). As noted elsewhere in Britain, the extent to which Early Neolithic structures were isolated or part of a larger group (Armit et al. 2003: 147; Grogan 2002: 522) remains a very active research question. A range of concerns associated with, for example, gender, kinship, and ancestry may well have determined settlement layout (cf. Bourdieu 1990: Appendix 1). All of these have been stressed as important in the Early Neolithic (e.g., Edmonds 1999: 16), but our understanding of the actual mechanics of these ‘systems’, and their relationship with architecture, remains limited (e.g., Fowler 2005: 115-116).

The rapidly changing use of space at many Early Neolithic settlement sites in Orkney does much to highlight the limitations inherent ‘in the use of a particular functionalist conceptualisation of settlement involving permanent bounded spaces and sedentism’ (Pollard 1999: 76).

At Stonehall, this is evident in the close spatial and chronological connection noted between the three phases of building in Trench Z (Richards 2003: 13). At Pool, the general absence of internal ‘structural features and materials’, together with the use of small and thin stonework in wall construction is seen as indicating the ‘shifting’ nature of these impermanent structures, perhaps with seasonal occupation (Hunter 2007: 64). At Wyre and Wideford, the use of timber architecture clearly required episodes of repair and replacement, with the use of a variety of different softwoods for different purposes, creating structures with different life spans (Dickson 1983, 1994; Miller and Ramsay 2000; Richards 2003). Ultimately, timber buildings appear to possess ‘a life-cycle of their own, perhaps linked to those of their owners’ (Lee and Thomas 2012: 16).

Against such a background, the impressive Orkney-Cromarty tombs may have provided some fixity in the landscape, drawing ‘additional symbolism from [their] very permanence’ (Whittle 1988: 85), particularly when viewed as integral to the construction of place and time in the Early Neolithic (Bradley 1998: Chapter 1). The evidence is perhaps suggestive that a more nuanced approach is required to the concept of ‘house’ (Bradley 2007b: 354) which integrates evidence from a variety of unstable settlement practices. It is the prospection and interpretation of these unstable settlement practices that lie at the heart of developing a more robust model for domestic life in the fourth millennium BC across Britain.

Figure 3 Main Early Neolithic structures at Stonehall. Clockwise from top-left: Location of Trenches C and Z, with approximate location of Early Neolithic buildings; Trench C, showing C1 and C2; Trench Z showing phase 2 (buildings B, and C); Trench Z showing phase 1 (Building A). After Richards et al. 2001: Figs 2, 3, 5, 7.

What can we learn from Early Neolithic Orkney?
The well-preserved, well-studied stone-built houses of Neolithic Orkney may appear to be an odd place to start a discussion of the domestic settlement record of Britain. However, I would argue their impact on settlement studies has been critically influential, whether they are considered an ‘unusual domestic arrangement’ (Clarke 2003: 86), or typical of how Early Neolithic houses were internally organised, if such features could only be more consistently recognised in the archaeological record (Barclay 1996: 74; Darvill 1987: 57; Gibson 2003: 138).

In Scotland, up until recently, discussions of Early Neolithic ‘houses’ were dominated by stone-built forms of architecture, mainly from the upland zone, and the monumental timber halls of Aberdeenshire (Barclay 1996; Brophy 2007; Gibson 2003: 138; Murray and Murray 2009: 62-63). However, significant developments have led to a more nuanced understanding of domestic architecture and in the more consistent recovery of evidence, particularly associated with open area excavation on developer-funded projects (e.g., Phillips and Bradley 2004). This excavation has involved the identification of both ‘sturdy’ and ephemeral remains, of both rectilinear and circular forms, which potentially use a wide range of construction materials (Barclay 2003; Loveday 2006: 100). This flurry of developer-funded excavations uncovering remains is mirrored across the rest of Britain as well as Ireland (Smyth 2006: 229).

Since the advent of large-scale evaluation; strip, map, and sample exercises; and excavations enabled by developer-funded archaeology, the evidence-base has substantially grown, and there has been considerable ‘lag’ in incorporating these results into mainstream academic discussion. As Richard Bradley has commented, ‘the expansion of developer-funded archaeology has also been liberating for prehistorians. It has not been based on the old orthodoxies, but on the requirements of the planning process, with the result that unfamiliar kinds of material have been recovered and new areas have been investigated that had been neglected before’ (Bradley 2007a: xv-xvi). This new material has led to detailed discussion of settlement outside intensely studied regions (Barclay 2003), the reconsideration of spatial patterning of building types (Kirby 2011: 26), and the placing of ‘type-sites’ into a much more representative context.

This emerging dataset can move studies beyond an impasse which has, for too long, centred on the nature of sedentism in the Earliest Neolithic (Thomas 2008: 69), with lines clearly drawn between proponents of a ‘settled’ Irish/Northern British model (Barclay 2000; Cooney 2000) and a ‘transient’ Southern English/Wessex model (Thomas 1996, 1999). The argument pursued here is not designed to marginalise this crucial debate, or to encourage uncritical acceptance of the structural evidence as indicative of the house as a ‘unitary phenomenon’ (Cooney 1997; 26). Rather, it is an attempt to use the full depth of the information gleaned to more fully explore the ways in which the house ‘gained its social and cosmological relevance’ (Hoffman and Smyth 2013: 1) across Britain. This will allow us to explore trajectories of sedentism and house building, which clearly were subject to significant regional differentiation (SCARF 2013). The challenge is to explore these trajectories of change at local and regional scales of analyses (Pollard 2008: 6), tacking between short and long-term chronologies (Whittle et al. 2008: 69). By doing so, we can explore the dynamic interrelationship between ritual and domestic life, a key theme of recent studies (e.g., Bruck 1999; Bradley 2005), which has formed the crux of interpretation for some of the earliest identified Neolithic structures in Britain (e.g., at Hazelton North, Gloucestershire (Thomas 1996: 8 contra Saville 1990: 17, 268); or Padholme Road, Fengate, Cambridgeshire (Pryor 1982: 20, 63)). Developer-funded fieldwork, largely focusing away from extant above ground monuments, or protected in situ belowground deposits, has the potential to explore the wider landscape environs of recorded monuments. This comes at a time of resurgence in research-led fieldwork centred on well known monuments—Stonehenge, Avebury, Durrington Walls, Woodhenge and Marden Henge (Pollard 2012: 93), to name just a selection in Wessex—or their immediate environs, e.g., the Ness of Brodgar excavations in Orkney (Card 2012), all of which have recorded substantial structures. Taken together, the cumulative evidence may well allow an exploration of the complex interplay of contextual and contingent meanings between ritual and domestic structures and landscapes in use by the earliest farmers.

**Unpacking Architecture**

Whilst there is a clear recognition that Neolithic settlement in Britain is not a ‘unitary phenomenon’ (Cooney 1997: 26), some prehistorians have struggled to move towards...
a more nuanced understanding of architectural signatures within different study regions.

Arguably, an unhelpful dichotomisation ‘between mobile hunter-gatherer and settled agricultural societies’ (Bruck 2008: 250) is still rigidly maintained in some existing dialogues of British prehistory (Barclay 1997: 148), not least as an artificial disciplinary boundary (Armit and Finlayson 1996: 269-270). Conceptualising an absolute ‘contrast’ between Mesolithic and Neolithic architecture is problematic (Armit and Finlayson 1996: 276); the wide range of evidence from sites with both ‘Mesolithic’ and ‘Neolithic’ dates shows a complex interplay of both sedentary and transhumant strategies. As an example, the depth of stratified occupation deposits and repeated use of the hearth at a Mesolithic building at Howick, Northumberland, is perhaps suggestive of ‘permanent or semi-permanent occupation of the site over many years’ (Waddington et al. 2003a: 11; Waddington et al. 2003b); conversely, the slight structural remains surrounding Neolithic hearths at Bharpa Carinish, North Uist, can be interpreted as representing ‘a short-lived transient settlement’ (Crone 1993: 380).

In Scotland, it is rapidly becoming clear that structures do not ‘fall into a series of clearly defined types’ (Phillips and Bradley 2004: 40), rather we are dealing with a ‘series of ‘levels’ of settlement of varying degrees of permanency and range of functions’ (Brophy 2006: 18). Some of these settlements may not have functioned as autonomous domestic units, an understanding potentially only valid in a modern context (Brophy 2006: 19; Whittle 1996: 70).

To illustrate this variability, Figure 4 shows a sample of structures that have been variously interpreted as house structures across Scotland. Whilst it is flawed to ascribe a uniformity of function to these buildings, it is clear that there is no fixed architectural blueprint for the dwelling structure.

Figure 4 The diversity of the architectural record for Early Neolithic Scotland. A selection of 10 Early Neolithic sites for which a domestic function has been inferred. Selected house plans redrawn from sources listed; see Appendix 2 for full information and references. (image redrawn by author; after references listed in image).
In this sample, for instance, structures range vastly in size, shape, and permanence. Structures vary from the substantial co-residences of perhaps up to 50 people (SCARF 2013)—the longhouse at Lockerbie Academy measures at least 19 x 8m (Kirby 2011: 7), to the temporary dwellings of a much closer kin group—the ovoid structures at Cowie measure from just 3.6 x 2.4m (Structure A; Atkinson 2002). In addition to dry-stone walling (Eilean Domnuill), wall construction varies from the use of substantial posts (e.g., Lockerbie Academy) to stake-built structures (e.g., Cowie or Raigmore) including the use of slot trenches (e.g., Kingarth Quarry). The architectural evidence from other sites is very fragmentary; domestic function is inferred from the presence of a hearth (Bharpa Carinish), or through associations between structural evidence and crop-processing refuse, food remains and hearth debris (at Wardend of Durris; Russell-White 1995: 20).

At Garthdee Road, Aberdeen, a small ovoid timber building, measuring c. 11 x 8-10m has been securely dated to c. 3800–3650 cal. BC (Murray and Murray 2005: 9). The excavators noted that 'the artifactual and environmental data demonstrate considerable cultural and economic similarities between the occupants of this small building and of the two massive early Neolithic timber halls only a few kilometres away at Balbridie and Warren Field, Crathes' (Murray and Murray forthcoming; see Sheridan 2013: 294). The latter buildings, largely contemporaneous, measure at least 24 x 12m, completely dwarfing this structure. The excavators conclude that 'while there are indicators of “domestic life” at both Warren Field and Garthdee, there are also indications that Warren Field had other more complex roles' (Murray and Murray 2009: 63).

Even the hearth, perhaps seen as central to the concept of home, is not necessarily architecturally part of the ‘house’. One interpretation of the external hearths excavated in association with possible small Neolithic houses at Beckton Farm, Lockerbie is that they ‘may have been used like indoor hearths, providing cooking facilities, light and a social focus’ (Pollard 1997: 83).

The picture of what type of settlement architecture ‘characterises’ the English and Welsh Early Neolithic is also a constantly changing one, as demonstrated by the example of Kingsmead Quarry, Horton, Berkshire. The most recent discovery at Horton is a substantial building dating to the 38th to 37th centuries BC, formed of 27 postholes, with wattle walling (Barclay et al. 2012: 1). This method of construction differs from the first Early Neolithic house discovered at Horton, a plank-walled structure measuring c. 9.8 x 6.5m (Chaffey and Brook 2012). These hall-like structures are in close proximity to each other, and there is also the suggestion of a very different building recorded close by, as a ‘house void’ between a formal arrangement of Early Neolithic pits, measuring c. 4 x 5m (Chaffey and Brook 2012: 205). In addition, the excavation of a large number of pits in the wider landscape at Horton, spanning the fourth and third millennia, has revealed a ‘picture of temporary settlement, of mobility and people gathering in chosen places and times before perhaps dispersing to other locales within the wider landscape’ (Chaffey and Brook 2012: 210).

At a wider level, in the well-studied region of the Upper Thames Valley (Figure 5), a number of strands of evidence attests to the diversity of domestic practice (Bradley 2010: 10). Traces of domestic activities in a wider landscape include lithic scatters, interpreted as seasonally occupied hunting camps, pits involved in ‘household rituals’ at Yarnton, and repeated visits to the middens at Eton Rowing Lake (Hey and Barclay 2007: 404, 410, 412). Architecture itself ranges from ‘insubstantial, short-lived structures’ (Hey 1997: 106) alongside both very small circular structures (Lambrick 2010: 26) and a substantial timber longhouse at Yarnton (Hey and Barclay 2007: 415), to the smaller rectilinear buildings at both Hazelton North (Saville 1990: 20) and a substantial timber longhouse at Yarnton, and the buildings at Horton (Chaffey and Brook 2012). All seem to be in broad contemporaneous use and can tentatively be identified as belonging to the same settlement tradition, both for the ‘mundane’ diurnal activities of the household as well as ‘being the locales of formal activities within the domestic sphere’ (Hey and Barclay 2007: 416).

A considerable number of architectural examples may be added to the last gazetteer of Early Neolithic buildings compiled by Darvill (1996: Fig.6.3, Appendix 1), and it is possible that some re-evaluation of the building types identified in his assessment is required.

Recently it has been possible to postulate two distinct architectural groups in England and Wales, with increasing chronological resolution. Longhouses at sites such as White Horse Stone, Kent, Yarnton, Oxfordshire and Lismore Fields, Derbyshire, date between 4000 and 3750 cal. BC; smaller buildings from
sites such as Horton, Middlesex, Gorhambury, Hertfordshire and Llandygai, Gwynedd have been dated to the second quarter of the fourth millennium (Last 2013: 274-275).

Developer-funded excavation has allowed the evaluation of a range of these building ‘types’. In particular, the rewards of exploring previously under-investigated areas have been reaped. Of particular interest is the geographical spread of ‘halls’ or ‘large houses’ (vide Sheridan 2013 for discussion); they are clearly not confined to Scotland, but have now been recorded in Derbyshire, Oxfordshire, Kent, Cornwall and Wales (Myers 2006: 4; Hey and Barclay 2007: 415; Hayden 2008; Sheridan 2013: 284; Kenney 2008), all on developer-funded projects.

The interpretation of these structures is complex, with discussion being polarised between those who believe them to be houses (Sheridan 2013) and those who interpret them as communal ‘feasting’ halls (Barclay et al. 2002; Thomas 2004: 122), potentially associated with the very initial stages of the transition, dating to the 38th and 37th centuries (Whittle 2003: 41).

These ‘communal residences of pioneering groups of colonists’ (Sheridan 2013: 293) have understandably formed the focus of discussion, but this has tended to sideline the investigation of smaller, flimsier structures of multiple form, temporalities of occupation and potentially of multiple usages (Sheridan 2013: 295). This picture of variability is a constant reminder that strategies of permanence of inhabitation and transhumance were complementary features of the Early Neolithic landscape.

The ever-expanding evidence base requires us to pursue a more nuanced understanding of all these structures, and locales for domestic activity, rather than relying upon convenient labels. Clearly, not all ‘houses’, ‘halls’, and ‘habitation structures’ were the same (Sheridan 2013), and the full characterisation of the structures involved in differing strategies of dwelling is a prerequisite of unpacking the notion of the fully autonomous house containing a fully autonomous household. The full publication and synthesis of a number of sites is eagerly anticipated and, no doubt will feed into narratives at multiple scales of analyses. It is, however, immediately clear, that there are significant limitations with
a continued overemphasis on one standard ‘type’ of house structure, in the Early Neolithic, as well as one interpretation of domestic activity.

Diversifying the Approach

Houses did not provide the ‘only setting for domestic activity in the early Neolithic’ (Smyth 2010: 5). Different practices, carried out in a variety of buildings and places in the wider landscape, and involving changing relationships with ritual monuments, are all likely to have contributed to a notion of ‘domestic’ life.

Ephemeral scatters of pits and postholes, ubiquitous across large parts of lowland Britain and mainland Scotland (Bishop et al. 2009: 48), have been uniformly interpreted as representing temporary, sporadic and peripatetic occupation of the landscape. However, do these forms of evidence necessarily indicate the same phenomenon?

Recently, interest has been rekindled in the studies of pits of all types, including their interrelationship with domestic architecture (see papers in Lamdin-Whymark and Thomas 2012), as a frequent feature of Early Neolithic sites. There has been an explicit attempt to move beyond binary notions of mundane and ritual or structured deposition (Garrow 2007, 2012). The detailed analysis, and cumulative study of pits excavated by research and commercial archaeologists has revealed ‘consistent patterns of domesticity’ (Chaffey and Brook 2012: 213) across large parts of Britain, with especial concentrations in East Anglia, Clackmannanshire and Herefordshire, for example. Work in East Yorkshire, for instance, points to the role of pit digging as part of a social strategy to ‘come to terms with’ a developing sense of permanence. Pits are used to develop a nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between an ideology of permanence, the act of ‘settling down’ and sedentism as it has traditionally been envisaged (Carver 2013: 131).

It is clear that to provide a more holistic view of what constitutes settlement in the Early Neolithic, we must deal with pits in a more detailed way—‘it seems pits are not just the surviving components of Neolithic settlement; they were the major structural component of [these sites]’ (Last 2012; contra Kenney 2008: 26).

The same is true of the way that lithic scatters have been dealt with in the archaeological record. They remain a key part of the evidence base for the period, but there seems little agreement on what kinds of activity they might actually represent or their direct relationship with structural settlement evidence (Barclay 2003: 72). General analogy with deposition in present-day agrarian societies suggests that ‘dense flint scatters which produce a variety of implements’ most likely represent domestic sites (Holgate 1987: 260), with ‘small dense clusters of artefacts peaking above the background-scatter’ (Zvelebil et al. 1992: 215) characterising a pattern of isolated farmsteads, the perceived ‘standard’ model for Early Neolithic settlement.

Thomas has argued that lithic scatters, in themselves, are not necessarily direct evidence of fixed settlement, and are instead potentially related to the ‘repeated, sporadic frequenting of a place’ (1999: 18). Indeed, the interpretation of deposition of quantities of tools of different types representing domestic sites presupposes ‘continuous co-residence within a dwelling structure’ (Thomas 1999: 18), which may not represent the sole component of Early Neolithic settlement activity. The difficulty might lie in our ability to define domesticity; the functions of ‘home’, rather than confined to a single locus might be atomised across landscape; the challenge is to interrogate the data as fully as possible to be able to identify all traces of domestic occupation.

To return to Orkney, the challenges of fully identifying the range of domestic activity in the Early Neolithic settlement record are clear. The ephemerality of the remains of timber buildings, particularly set against the ‘hyper-visibility’ of stone architecture in Orkney (Wickham-Jones 2006: 26), poses challenges which provide lessons for the whole of Britain. Of particular note is the importance of a nested methodology, with fieldwalking and geophysical survey forming key tools for identifying sites, allied with programmes of aerial survey. The use of multi-faceted, multi-scalar programmes of investigation help redress a bias towards more substantial, extant structural evidence. Such an approach has recently located a new site at Smerquoy, on Wideford Hill (Gee 2013) and has allowed the re-evaluation of a possible site at Deepdale, near Finstown (Carey 2012), as well as suggesting sites for further research (as at the possible remains of a large timber structure at Saviskaill Loch, Rousay (Edwards 2012)).
Conclusions

It is clear, then, that the narrative for Early Neolithic settlement across Britain is suddenly becoming richer, particularly with the advent of a wider range of structural evidence from developer-funded excavation, and increasingly refined chronological frameworks for discussing this evidence.

The integrated interpretation of ‘houses’ with elements of domestic activity present in the wider landscape presents a challenge to the orthodoxy of what constitutes Early Neolithic settlement across Britain. However, by directly dealing with the heterogeneity inherent in the record we can move discussion away from a few type-sites, to provide a much more holistic picture of different modes of dwelling in the 4th millennium BC.

‘A great deal has been written about Early Neolithic habitation structures in Britain and Ireland over the past 20 years’ (Sheridan 2013: 283). It is likely that, over the next 20 years, much more will be added to the subject. The variability of the evidence must have a starring role in this emerging narrative, and this must engage fully with the study of both ‘sturdy’ and ephemeral remains. There is also clearly much to do to refine exactly what we mean by ‘domestic activity’, incorporating transient activity in the landscape with more persistent settlement traces at specific locales.

Ultimately, the heterogeneous nature of settlement practice (Thomas 1996: 2) requires both our prospection strategies, and our strategies for interpreting ‘domestic’ activity, therefore, to be flexible. There is much to be learnt from Early Neolithic Orkney in this regard.

Appendices

Appendix 1: A gazetteer of Early Neolithic structures in Orkney

Buildings for which sufficient evidence is available for interpretation only are included, based on the survival of sufficient structural material, and an adequate chronological framework. Plan, dimensions, orientation and construction material details have been extracted from available sources. Dating gives information on whether absolute/relative dating methodologies have been applied to the structures, with lab numbers for radiocarbon dating samples given in [square brackets]. All sites are located on Mainland unless otherwise indicated.

Appendix 2: Diversity in the Early Neolithic architectural record across Scotland

A selected sample of 10 Early Neolithic sites for which a domestic function has been inferred. This appendix is not designed as a collation exercise, but to demonstrate the difficulties associated with both identifying and interpreting this material. See Figure 4 for locations and an illustration of selected house plans.

Notes

Unless otherwise stated, all radiocarbon dates, stated as xxxx BC, have been calibrated, using OxCal 3.10 (Bronk Ramsey 2001), atmospheric data from Reimer et al. (2004), and are given to 2σ.

The unpublished reports listed in the references are all held by Orkney Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) c/o Orkney College, East Road, Kirkwall, unless otherwise noted. Unpublished PhD theses have been obtained from The British Library’s EthOS service, at http://ethos.bl.uk.
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# Appendix 1: A gazetteer of Early Neolithic structures in Orkney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Trench / Phase</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Width (m)</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Construction Material</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>Geophysical Survey</th>
<th>Main Reference(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braes of Ha’Breck, Wyre</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>House 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NNW / SSE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>4495 +/- 40 BP [SUERC-34504]; by kind permission of A. Thomas, prior to publication</td>
<td>Fluxgate gradiometer undertaken with a programme of intensive fieldwalking, with a close correlation noted between the two datasets (Ovenden 2006; Thomas 2006). Subsequent, targeted, resistivity survey was undertaken in 2010 to investigate potential structural elements to the site (Brend and Saunders 2010).</td>
<td>Lee and Thomas 2012</td>
<td>House sub-divided into two unequal 'rooms'. Appears to respect the ground plan of House 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>House 4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NNW / SSE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>4510 +/- 40 BP [SUERC-34503]; by kind permission of A. Thomas, prior to publication</td>
<td>Truncated beam slots on WSW and NNW wall lines. Linear arrangement of postholes projecting into interior, mirroring central orthostats in the stone-built structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>House 5</td>
<td>c. 4.8</td>
<td>c. 3.2</td>
<td>NNW / SSE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>Relative chronology - stratigraphically later than House 3</td>
<td>Appended to the south of House 3, but although stratigraphically later, there does seem to have been a period of overlap in the occupation of the two houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House 1</td>
<td>c. 6.5</td>
<td>c. 3.7</td>
<td>NW / SE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>4395 +/- 40 BP [SUERC-35990]; by kind permission of A. Thomas, prior to publication</td>
<td>Rapidly dismantled, its posts were removed before the construction of a stone-built house on the same footprint (House 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>House 2</td>
<td>c. 6.5</td>
<td>c. 3.7</td>
<td>NW / SE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>4435 +/- 40 BP [SUERC-34506]; by kind permission of A. Thomas, prior to publication</td>
<td>Built on the same footprint as the post-built building (House 1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Where possible, this refers to an internal measurement as the most consistent comparator between buildings with walls of substantially different thicknesses, and is taken across the widest point. In some instances, external measurements are given where interior measurements cannot be determined. In most instances these are the dimensions given in the text of the reports, if measured off reproduced plans, then the measurement should be considered approximate and is marked with c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dating Notes</th>
<th>Method Notes</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green, Eday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure 1</td>
<td>c. 13</td>
<td>c. 7</td>
<td>NNE/SSW</td>
<td>sub-rectangular stone</td>
<td>Dating is problematic. No absolute chronology but now interpreted as EN, with later Neolithic finds coming from other occupation deposits associated with the later Structure 2.</td>
<td>Fluxgate gradiometer survey, with subsequent targeted resistivity survey to &quot;investigate the apparent structures suggested by the gradiometry&quot; (Moore 2006: 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>‘Mortuary Structure’</td>
<td>c. 5.4</td>
<td>c. 4.5</td>
<td>NNE/SSW</td>
<td>sub-rectangular stone</td>
<td>Unfortunately, no dating evidence was recovered from Phase 1 at Howe. However, this structure predates the ‘Stalled Tomb’.</td>
<td>Miles 2008, 2010, 2011; Not fully excavated as of 2012, and post-exavcation studies are still in their infancy. Superficial similarities can be noted with House 1 at Knap of Howar, which is also noted in the original geophysical survey report (Moore 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howe</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>‘Stalled Tomb’</td>
<td>c. 15</td>
<td>c. 5</td>
<td>NNW/SSE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular stone</td>
<td>Unfortunately, no dating evidence was recovered from Phase 1 at Howe. However, this structure post-dates the ‘mortuary structure’, which it is suggested changes function at this stage in the building process.</td>
<td>Ballin Smith 1994: 11-13; Originally interpreted by the excavators as a mortuary enclosure, but, a domestic function has been suggested by Colin Richards, on the basis of the presence of the hearth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowes of Trotty</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>?cult house</td>
<td>c. 5.5</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
<td>NNE/SSW</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>4480 +/- 35 BP [SUERC-18233]; by kind permission of J. Downes, prior to publication</td>
<td>Card and Downes 2002, 2005, 2006; Card et al., 2006</td>
<td>A stone building with a hearth and orthostatic divisions, originally interpreted as a 'cult house' associated with the LN/ERA use of the barrow cemetery, but absolute dating indicates it is Early Neolithic, and affinities with Knap of Howar and Stonehall are noted (Card et al. 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool, Sanday</td>
<td>Phase 1.2</td>
<td>Structure 1</td>
<td>c. 2.5</td>
<td>c. 2.5</td>
<td>NNE/SSW?</td>
<td>sub-circular</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Problems with dating, although TL dating of pottery from phase 1 points to c. 3650 BC (see Hunter and MacSween 1991; Hunter 2000)</td>
<td>Fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity surveys covering similar areas, with good correspondence between anomalies (Hunter 1983: 3-4, Fig. 4; 2007: 14-16, Illus 2.4)</td>
<td>Hunter 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool, Sanday</td>
<td>Phase 1.2</td>
<td>Structure 2</td>
<td>c. 2</td>
<td>c. 2</td>
<td>NNE/SSW?</td>
<td>sub-circular</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Problems with dating, although TL dating of pottery from phase 1 points to c. 3650 BC (Hunter and MacSween 1991; Hunter 2000)</td>
<td>Fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity surveys covering similar areas, with good correspondence between anomalies (Hunter 1983: 3-4, Fig. 4; 2007: 14-16, Illus 2.4)</td>
<td>Hunter 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool, Sanday</td>
<td>Phase 1.2</td>
<td>Structure 3</td>
<td>c. 4</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
<td>E/W?</td>
<td>sub-circular?</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Problems with dating, although TL dating of pottery from phase 1 points to c. 3650 BC (Hunter and MacSween 1991; Hunter 2000)</td>
<td>Fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity surveys covering similar areas, with good correspondence between anomalies (Hunter 1983: 3-4, Fig. 4; 2007: 14-16, Illus 2.4)</td>
<td>Hunter 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonequoy</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NNW / SSE</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>No absolute chronology yet available, but diagnostic finds and architecture/Fluxgate gradiometer and resistivity surveys covering similar areas; midden 'signature' noted (C. Gee, pers. comm.)</td>
<td>C. Gee, pers. comm.</td>
<td>Site currently undergoing excavation and analysis (2013).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehall</td>
<td>House 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>4510 +/- 39 BP [AA-51376] Jones 2003: 163</td>
<td></td>
<td>Found under midden underneath elements of the Late Neolithic settlement at Stonehall. Suggested as Early Neolithic based upon orthostat at right angles to collapsed walling, although plan is not clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>sub-rectangular?</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>Stratigraphically earlier than C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavily truncated but hearth setting and some orthostats seems to suggest sub-rectangular structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Building A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>sub-rectangular</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>predates Building C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small length of walling, reused in the later phase, Building C. Two entrances; primary one to the north (later blocked) and one in the E wall which was the later entrance for Building C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Building B</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ESE/ WNW?</td>
<td>sub-rectangular?</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>directly associated with Building C, although probably the primary structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably contemporary with Building C but primary. Wall cored in a similar way to C1 and C, and at Knap of Howar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>c.</td>
<td>NE/SW?</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>Date [SUERC-4868]</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NE/SW?</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>4490 +/- 35 BP</td>
<td>Jones 2005: 178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/W?</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richards 2003: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENE/WSW</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richards 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>House 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NNE/SSW</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>4425 +/- 30 BP</td>
<td>Jones 2005: 178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wideford Hill

Proton magnetometer survey undertaken in 1992 revealed "a clearly defined magnetic anomaly" (Richards 2003: 2).

Consisted of 9 posts supporting a sloping roof. Scoop hearth in centre, from which all dating evidence was recovered.

5 post-holes, found directly underlying Stone built House, and posts had rotted in situ, suggesting only just out-of-use when Stone Built house was built. Interpreted as slighter construction than Structure 1.

*A circular structure might have formed the initial phase of this building, centred on the scoop hearth, subsequently rebuilt in a more rectangular form. The remains were difficult to interpret.

A stone built house, quickly following the abandonment of structure 2, which it overlay. No apparent subdivisions, unlike other Knap of Howar style houses, but a rectangular form with pinched walling and rounded corners.
Appendix 2: Diversity in the Early Neolithic architectural record across Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Nature of evidence</th>
<th>Nature of discovery</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bharpa Carinish, North Uist</td>
<td>No coherent structural evidence could be located, but a series of hearth complexes were identified</td>
<td>Located during prospection in peat-cuttings</td>
<td>Crone 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cowie, Stirlingshire</td>
<td>A series of very slight oval structures, defined by stakes and 'pressure trenches'</td>
<td>Evaluative fieldwork, ahead of development</td>
<td>Barclay 2003: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eilean Domnuill, North Uist</td>
<td>A succession of rectilinear/oval stone-built buildings on an islet, with superficial similarity to Knap of Howar buildings</td>
<td>Research fieldwork: Originally interpreted as an Iron Age dun, subsequently re-excavated</td>
<td>Armit 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Garthdee Road, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Small ovoid timber building, ‘in permanent use over at least a generation’</td>
<td>Evaluative fieldwork, ahead of development</td>
<td>Murray and Murray forthcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kinbeachie, Easter Ross</td>
<td>Small rectangular building, defined by pits</td>
<td>First recorded through fieldwalking, subsequently excavated</td>
<td>Barclay et al. 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kingarth Quarry, Isle of Bute</td>
<td>Small oval structure, formed by a continuous slot trench, similar to other possibly turf-built structures in Argyll and Ireland</td>
<td>Evaluative fieldwork, ahead of quarry expansion</td>
<td>Mudie and Richardson 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lockerbie Academy, Dumfrieshshire</td>
<td>Longhouse of possible ‘domestic’ use</td>
<td>Evaluative fieldwork, ahead of development</td>
<td>Kirby 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raigmore, Inverness-shire</td>
<td>Rectangular building, with two double-rows of posts; a central hearth is taken as indicative of a domestic function</td>
<td>Encountered during rescue excavation of overlying kerbed cairn</td>
<td>Simpson 1996: 62-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ratho, Edinburgh</td>
<td>Two rectilinear buildings, defined by slot trenches but with no internal features</td>
<td>Evaluative fieldwork, ahead of development</td>
<td>Smith 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>