

BOOK NO: 1844783



**FOR
REFERENCE ONLY**



BINDING SERVICES
Tel +44 (0)29 2087 4949
Fax +44 (0)29 20371921
e-mail bindery@cardiff.ac.uk

A revision of the materiality of architecture: the significance of Neolithic long mound and chambered monument building practice, with particular reference to the Cotswold-Severn Group.

Lesley McFadyen

Ph.D. 2003 Volume 1.

SCARAB Research Centre, University of Wales College, Newport.

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed.....*Lalaj K M' Fodjan*.....(candidate)
Date.....*7/4/03*.....

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed.....*Lalaj K M' Fodjan*.....(candidate)
Date.....*7/4/03*.....

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed.....*Lalaj K M' Fodjan*.....(candidate)
Date.....*7/4/03*.....

Abstract

My research is on the significance of building practice at sites that are known as chambered monuments or long cairns and long mounds. In particular, this work focuses on the long cairn sites of Gwernvale, Powys and Hazleton North, Gloucestershire; and the long mound sites of Easton Down, Beckhampton Road, Horslip, and South Street in the Avebury region of Wiltshire, and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294 in Dorset. These sites are considered to be among the first 'architectures' in Britain. These architectures have been considered by archaeologists to characterise part of what we know about the neolithic in southern Britain. There are features and material culture associated with the mesolithic at these sites but this evidence has previously been understood as having made a 'place' for architecture, or as having created a 'setting' for later architectural constructions. I am writing to challenge our architectural understandings of these sites.

In the following chapters trees, the processing of wood, hearth settings, the working of flint, grassland, worked earth, the processing of animal bone are recognised as having been a part of the connective dynamics of architectural construction. I will argue that material culture that was a part of these activities was left in these areas. These small things were parted, re-assembled and entwined together into assemblages that blur archaeologists distinctions between fifth and fourth millennia B.C. lives and that blur distinctions between hunter-gatherer and pastoralist (and partly agriculturalist) practices. Practices of making did not remain the same; neither did practices of connecting, parting, re-assembling and entwining materials. Material culture, as a media for making and understanding connections between people and things, did not remain constant. However, through encounters with the material and historical conditions of others lives, people made something of living and dying during the fifth and fourth millennia.

Contents	
Acknowledgements	1
Prefix 1	3
Chapter 1. (Re)marking architecture and building practice.	4
1.1 <i>Vitruvius</i>	6
1.2 <i>Alberti</i>	13
1.3 <i>Adolf Loos and Le Corbusier</i>	17
1.4 <i>Feminist critiques of architecture</i>	22
1.5 <i>Architectural archaeologies</i>	23
Chapter 2. Architectural templates and excavation field categories: the building blocks to the neolithic.	25
Part One	
2.1 <i>Early antiquarianism and the monumental</i>	25
2.2 <i>Antiquarianism and topography</i>	28
2.3 <i>Antiquarianism, cartography and collecting</i>	33
2.4 <i>The synthesis of a classificatory system</i>	38
Part Two	
2.5 <i>A phenomenology of landscape</i>	48
2.6 <i>Metaphors of measurement</i>	56
2.7 <i>The act of building</i>	64
2.8 <i>Constructional histories</i>	69
Prefix 3	76
<i>Why the Cotswold-Severn group?</i>	76
<i>Why only Gwernvale?</i>	76
<i>Summary of the site of Gwernvale</i>	77
Chapter 3. From Gwernvale to a new focus of inquiry: concepts of neolithic architecture and building sites within the Black Mountains.	79
3.1 <i>Architecture and the historical moment</i>	79
3.2 <i>Gwernvale</i>	81
3.3 <i>Stratigraphy and the geological motif</i>	83
3.4 <i>Stone settings and the architectural template</i>	89
3.5 <i>The sequence of chamber construction</i>	96
3.6 <i>Holding back the revetment walls</i>	101
3.7... <i>and then there were the dead</i>	104
Prefix 4	107
<i>Summary of the site of Hazleton North</i>	107
<i>The recommendations of W.F. Grimes</i>	108
<i>The work of Saville and context recording</i>	112
<i>Themes of construction in the area to the east of the chambers</i>	116
Chapter 4. Dealing with detail: (re)marking Hazleton North.	120
4.1 <i>Fifth and fourth millennia assembly work</i>	120
4.2 <i>Architectural connections</i>	124

4.2.1 Material culture and fire	124
4.2.2 Material culture and middens	126
4.2.3 Material culture and trees	131
4.3 <i>Architectural assemblages</i>	132
4.3.1 'Primary dumps'	132
4.3.2 'Quarry pits'	135
4.3.3 'Turf walls'	137
4.3.4 'Stone fills'	141
4.3.5 'Fin walls'	144
4.4 <i>Fourth millennium entwined assemblages</i>	148
Postscript 4	152
Prefix 5	160
<i>Summary of long mound sites</i>	162
Chapter 5. Earthen long mounds: transformations in understanding the materiality of architecture.	166
5.1 <i>Organic assemblages as architecture</i>	166
5.2 <i>Material culture as architecture</i>	171
5.3 <i>Pit cutting as architectural practice</i>	177
5.4 <i>Reproducing Beckhampton Road</i>	183
5.5 <i>South Street</i>	188
Chapter 6. Re-thinking architectural practice in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C.: a critical emphasis on the proximity of sites.	195
6.1 <i>Assembled pieces</i>	195
6.2 <i>Constructional continuum</i>	198
6.3 <i>Memory</i>	199
6.4 <i>Architectural identities</i>	202
6.5 <i>Making history through lived experience</i>	209
6.6 <i>Images</i>	213
6.7 <i>Unlearning the legacy of history as a monumental form of vision</i>	215
6.8 <i>Narratives for the archaeologist: explanations of architectural objects</i>	219
6.9 <i>Narrative: on histories and stories</i>	
Bibliography	227

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the SCARAB research centre and Miranda Aldhouse-Green for my studentship funding and support whilst at the University of Wales College, Newport. I thank my supervisor Josh Pollard for his knowledge and the care that he has taken over my research and writing. Eleanor Ghey, Angela Morelli and Julia Roberts have been the finest of colleagues and I would like to thank them for making our work space so lively. I also thank Adrian Chadwick for his support.

My thanks to Bill Britnell of the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust for access to the Gwernvale archive held at 7a Church Street, Welshpool, Powys SY21 7DL. Thank you to Paula Gentil for access to the Hazleton North archive held at the Corinium Museum, Cirencester, Park Street, Cirencester GL7 2BC. Thank you to Ros Cleal for access to the South Street archive held at the Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury. Also thank you to Alasdair Whittle for access to the Easton Down archive held at the School of History and Archaeology, Cardiff University, PO Box 909, Cardiff CF1 3XU. Thank you to English Heritage for access to W.F. Grimes' secondary working drawings of Saltway Barn and Burn Ground, archive held at National Monuments Record Centre, Great Western Village, Kembel Drive, Swindon SN2 2GZ. Thank you to Charly French and Helen Lewis for allowing me to work on their excavations of Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294 and for access to the archives held at Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3DZ. Thank you to Ian Kinnes for allowing me to work on La Commune-Seche chambered monument and introducing me to neolithic construction sites. I would like to thank Chris Evans and David Gibson for giving me space to work on my images at the Cambridge Archaeological Unit.

I gratefully acknowledge the following for permission to reproduce material in my thesis: the Bodleian Library, Oxford for Figures 2.4-2.6; Chris Tilley for Figures 2.13-2.17; Julian Thomas for Figure 2.18; Julian Thomas and Alasdair Whittle for Figure 2.19; John Barrett for Figure 2.21; Bill Britnell for Figures 3.3 and 3.11-3.12; Alan Saville for Figures 4.1-4.4, 4.6-4.7, 4.9 and 4.13; Her Majesty's Stationary Office for Figures 4.14-4.21; Alasdair Whittle for Figures 5.1-5.2 and John Evans for Figures 5.15-5.16.

I would like to thank Andy Hall for helping me find a way to refigure the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North. Also thank you to Mark Knight for help in the production of images and for allowing me to use the pixilated art in chapter six. I can't quite find the words to describe my thanks to Chantal Conneller and Duncan Garrow, they have helped me transform what I say in to what I write, I am truly grateful for their editing skills and their insightful comments. Thank you to Anwen Cooper and to Thomas Yarrow. I would like to thank Mark Knight for the ways in which he does his archaeology and for inspiring me to produce my own.

I would like to take the time to thank Louise and José Clements for providing me with a laptop. I also thank my parents Don and Ron Hunter for their support and for funds in order that I could make archaeological journeys to architectural places.

I believe that our histories and stories should be as inspirational as we can make them and full of positivity. I would like to dedicate this piece of work to my little sister Jennifer Ross who has taught me more than anyone else how to make different histories and more imaginative futures. This is for her with love...

'I was taught the right way to do architecture. I was taught how to make things stand up. I was told the amazing story of architecture, of how architects did architecture all on their own. As if by magic, they imagined architecture, and then, with minimal fuss, and certainly no mess, they made it, whole and perfect pieces of it – just like in their dreams. After they had made it, there was nothing to do, but dream some more and make some more' (Jane Rendell 1998:230).

Prefix 1

My thesis is a working through of the ways in which small things became entangled within the construction sites of Gwernvale, Hazleton North, Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294. By focusing on the small things of life, the ways in which things were parted and re-assembled, I hope to allude to a possibility that there were and are other places where architecture resides. That dynamic connections, that were made during the fifth and fourth millennia B.C., created places that we have so far not envisaged within our archaeological accounts but that were vital to how past people made something of their lives. These were spaces of encounter where people made something of living and dying; ways of understanding that were continuously negotiated in relation to other people's lives.

In order to refigure our understanding of what else architecture might be, I have to take you on a journey through the ways in which architecture has been dominantly figured. This journey will take us through architectural and archaeological history and will chart the ways in which a particular and almost exclusive image of a built form has been developed in these works; or has been picked up on and venerated; or perhaps most dangerously of all simply resides in an implicit form. In effect, I will look at the ways in which architecture has been formed as an object of study and the ways in which this has limited our understanding of other practices of constructing and making.

In this work an attempt has been made to use an author's full name on the first occasion in which their work is referenced in the text. Within this thesis the 'mesolithic' and 'neolithic' are written deliberately in small case letters as these words are not used to refer directly to distinct bounded periods of time, or different kinds of people, or separate kinds of economies and lifestyle practices.

Chapter 1. (Re)marking architecture and building practice

I am an archaeologist and my research is on the significance of neolithic long cairn and long mound building practice. These are considered to be among the first ‘architectures’ in Britain. I am writing to challenge our architectural understandings. I wish to demonstrate that the ways in which we understand these sites has been heavily influenced by architectural practice and architectural history; there are links between archaeology and architecture. Just as in archaeological practice we are taught to deal with material culture and features in particular ways, in architectural practice there is a right way to do architecture. I want to look at how architects do architecture, the ways in which a received practice has come about, then I want to go on to explore ways of understanding architecture differently. I will use this work to think about architecture in archaeology in different ways.

‘Be it affirmed:

The built environment is largely the creation of white, masculine
Subjectivity. It is neither value-free nor inclusively human. Feminism implies
That we fully recognize this environmental inadequacy and proceed to think
And act out of that recognition’ (Leslie Kanés Weisman 2000:4).

I am writing at a time when many feminist architects and architectural historians have been critiquing the ways in which architecture is figured, understood, practiced, written about and imagined within the discipline of architecture (Diane Agrest 1991, Jennifer Bloomer 1993 and 1996, Beatriz Colomina 1988a, Elizabeth Diller 1996, Catherine Ingraham 1996, Jane Rendell 1998, 2000 and 2002). I am not an architect but an archaeologist writing in order to make time or a place for archaeologists’ understandings of architecture to be challenged. There are links between architecture and archaeology that have so far not been discussed. I wish to consider the ways in which the histories of both disciplines criss-cross and meet in dealing with ‘architecture’.

In this chapter I will take on what I think are the main points that constitute this legacy within the discipline of architecture. I will build from this critique a diving board or

launch pad in order to create a point of departure into thinking about architecture in other ways within archaeology. I will explore the interstices, and look for the gaps and spaces in which architecture is not supposed to exist; and by making strange the familiar I will escape for a while from the appropriate(d) of architectural study and find for myself something more interesting instead to figure and say about those that made something of their lives during the fifth and fourth millennia B.C. I will become my own architect in attempting to understand architectures of past worlds.

I do not intend to produce any kind of linear trajectory or fully-fledged historical review of architectural practice or the makings of art and architectural history. Instead, I wish to look at what it is that underpins these practices, or more specifically explore which particular images are a part of the production of architectural knowledge. This chapter is a summary of the work of feminist architects' who investigate the reasons for a predominant, or exclusive, image in architectural accounts. I will then consider the ways in which these images cross into our archaeological accounts in chapter 2. In this chapter, I wish to create a place in which to discuss the formulation of these images of architecture so that I can demonstrate the ways in which they move through art, art history, architectural history and into the history of archaeology and the practice of archaeology.

The archaeology of the discipline of architecture, as it has been studied in Western Europe, has its beginnings in the Roman world (Weisman 2000). A Roman from the Augustan period called Marcus Vitruvius Pollio is considered by architectural historians to be one of the first architects. The history of their discipline is traced back to his work. What is deemed original about Vitruvius' work is that he wrote down and figured in images an outline for building practice, and a vision or form that architecture should take. Vitruvius' work became established as 'original' in the writings of the fifteenth century. He was venerated as an 'Architect' in these writings. His work was reformed as essential reference material, and his images were reproduced by Renaissance architects (Joan Gadol 1969). Roman and fifteenth century architectures became established as what was right or proper about architectural form, they became 'Classical', and this influence

extended into Mannerism and the Baroque. The architects of these buildings were referred to in architectural history as 'The Old Masters' (Rendell 2000). In the nineteenth century, due to Western European archaeological excavations in Greece, architecture became increasingly a matter of the revival of 'authentic' Greek forms (Ron Van der Meer and Deyan Sudjic 1997). Modernist architecture was considered to be the very opposite of classicism, but in its rejection of 'Classical' and 'Neoclassical' form, it created another system based on particular proportions (Colomina 1992).

The main points that I will attempt to follow are, firstly, the ways in which a particular exterior surface is understood to be structural or as encapsulating all that is structure. Secondly, the ways in which an external surface is understood to be the 'essence' of architecture, the form and structure of architecture. This understanding has created a structure/ornament divide in architectural practice. Thirdly, due to structure being understood as that which is of primary importance to architects, ornamentation has taken up a secondary (and lesser) position. I will look at the ways in which ornamentation is understood as 'embellishment'. Agrest has critiqued the ways in which architectural practice has received its knowledge; she has termed an exclusive way of thinking about architecture - 'the system of architecture' (Agrest 1991). In her work she states that this 'system' was evident in the fifteenth century use of Vitruvius' text, and that it was returned to in an aggressively stark light during the Modernist period.

1.1 Vitruvius

Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, in his treatise on architecture 'The Ten Books On Architecture' (translated by Morris Hicky Morgan 1914, republished 1960), set out to pull together all the different strands within which he understood architecture to operate. It was his opinion that architecture was a part of drawing, geometry, history, philosophy, music, and medicine. In setting out what the discipline of architecture was and was not a part of, Vitruvius created an order to the ways in which architecture should be practised. He attempted to give architectural study rules of order within a clearly Roman rather than Greek context. I wish to look very briefly at the visual technologies used in the

production of order, and the ways in which a visual order was projected onto the physical reality of a building through the measurement and arrangement of the materials employed in its construction.

I want to consider these technologies of production in terms of ‘the historical relativity of optical forms’ (Anthony Vidler 1996). Within Vitruvius’ work the groundplan, elevation and perspective drawing held sway and held ‘true’ to the representation of the constructed world. Drawings were understood to project buildings and projection was a mechanism for producing a vision or form to the ways in which architecture was thought about (Justine Clark 2002). Exterior surfaces of buildings were produced within this work and façades were elevated from these surfaces and given an exclusive focal perspective. This perspective privileged the façade of a building, the interior of a building was of lesser importance. Architecture was conceived and produced from the outside, you were external to it. For example, Vitruvius wrote:

‘Arrangement includes the putting of things in their proper places and the elegance of effect which is due to adjustments appropriate to the character of the work. Its forms of expression ... are these: groundplan, elevation, and perspective. A groundplan is made by the proper successive use of compasses and rule, through which we get outlines for the plane surfaces of buildings. An elevation is a picture of the front of a building, set upright and properly drawn in the proportions of the contemplated work. Perspective is the method of sketching a front with the sides withdrawing into the background, the lines all meeting in the centre of a circle’ (1960:13-14).

These technologies of production, through geometry and line, these particular optical forms, privileged the exterior parts of a building and mapped its external surface. They created a knowledge about the constructed world that was exclusively understood in terms of the exterior and that which looks out or is projected in front of the viewer. This way of ‘seeing’ used techniques of exteriority to objectify what it was that mattered about architecture. Vitruvius’ vision of architecture stood elevated and externalised in front of you.

I want to list the further 'departments' that Vitruvius enlisted as belonging under 'arrangement'. These are key optical techniques that were and are used in constructing the ways in which we 'see' architecture and so what we understand architecture to be:-

'- eurythmy (beauty and fitness in the adjustments of members)

- symmetry (a proper agreement between the members of the work itself)

- propriety (that perfection of style which comes when work is authoritatively constructed on approved principles and embedded in the 'origins' of the three orders)

- economy (denotes the proper management of materials and of site)' (taken from Vitruvius 1960:14-16)

Within Vitruvius' work his images of architecture form seamless surfaces in plan and façades in elevation. These were transferred onto the ground and set in stone. The transition from drawing to building was unproblematic. Due to a seamless drawing, due to the seamless projection from a drawing to the vision and form of a building, it was considered important to use durable materials. In order to maintain the pristine image of the drawing in reality he stated that an architect should use materials that could be made into seamless surfaces. Vitruvius wrote:

'Durability will be assured when foundations are carried down to the solid ground and materials wisely and liberally selected; convenience, when the arrangement of the apartments is faultless and presents no hindrance to use, and when each class of building is assigned to its suitable and appropriate exposure; and beauty, when the appearance of the work is pleasing and in good taste, and when its members are in due proportion according to correct principles of symmetry' (ibid:17).

Materials were invested with structural meaning and so some were considered more 'architectural' than others. In his discussion of materials, Vitruvius privileged particular (exterior) materials and so themes of façade, structure and exteriority resurfaced. Vitruvius wrote about an order of things within architecture, and the ways in which certain materials predominate as being more architectural rather than others:

'Being engaged in writing a complete treatise on architecture, I resolved to set forth in the first book the branches of learning and studies of which it consists, to define its departments, and to show of what it is composed. Hence I have there declared what the qualities of an architect should be. In the first book, therefore, I have spoken of the function of the art, but in this I shall discuss the use of the building materials which nature provides. For this book does not show of what architecture is composed, but treats of the origin of the building art, how it was fostered, and how it made progress, step by step, until it reached its present perfection'(ibid:41).

External surfaces objectified what it was that Vitruvius saw as architectural about construction, and so there was a negativity attributed to 'indurable' surfaces and a denial of these materials as appropriate to architecture. For example, in Vitruvius' discussion of the architectural properties of bricks, the type of clay matrix used in making bricks was considered, along with when the bricks were made, and for the length of time in which bricks should be curated before construction work started. These considerations were made, or only become an issue, due to a necessity for the permanence or durability of a wall's surface. The veneer must not crack, the finish should only have to be completed once and not have to be returned to. Vitruvius wrote:

'When fresh undried bricks are used in a wall, the stucco covering stiffens and hardens into a permanent mass, but the bricks settle and cannot keep the same height as the stucco; the motion caused by their shrinking prevents them from adhering to it, and they are separated from their union with it'(ibid:43).

The sand used in a wall matrix was not only considered in terms of the cohesion of the matrix but on the outward relationship or effect on the surface or veneer of the wall. For example, Vitruvius wrote that when sea sand rather than pit sand is used in construction 'and these are coated with stucco, a salty efflorescence is given out which spoils the surface' (ibid:45).

He then expounded on the problems of pit sand when considered in terms of its effects on the exteriority of a wall, or its finish:

'Fresh pitsand, however, in spite of all its excellence in concrete structures, is not equally useful in stucco, the richness of which, when the lime and straw are mixed with such sand, will cause it to crack as it dries on account of the great strength of the mixture. But river sand, though useless in 'siginum' on account of its

thinness, becomes perfectly solid in stucco when thoroughly worked by means of polishing instruments' (ibid).

The point of interior materials was to ensure that the exterior ones did not crack. This tension, in the suitability of a material in terms of its durability within the matrix of a wall, and the ways in which this is compared and contrasted with the exteriority of that material and its durability as a veneer, was also considered in his discussion of the properties of lime, pozzolana and stone. In Vitruvius' scheme or hierarchy of materials, a building should only have to be dreamt up and built once in the architect's life (Rendell 1998). The drawing projected the vision or form of the building, and particular materials transcribed or materialised this vision onto the ground. It is interesting to note the contrast in his writing on wattle and daub materials. It is these materials that he has invested or soaked in a Colonialist attitude to the 'barbarian' and the 'primitive'. He wrote:

'as for 'wattle and daub' I could wish that it had never been invented. The more it saves in time and gains in space, the greater and the more general is the disaster that it may cause; for it is made to catch fire, like torches' (ibid).

and if we consider his focus on surface; 'in the stucco covering, too, it makes cracks from the inside by the arrangement of its studs and girts' (ibid:57).

What I have remarked on again and again in Vitruvius' work, is the exclusivity of externalised surfaces, or the effect or arrangement of fronting a particular surface as structural or as encapsulating all that is **structure**. I will now consider the ways in which he created a structure/ornament divide. Vitruvius understood 'structure' to be architecture and 'ornament' was a secondary 'embellishment'. Structure was imbued with masculine connotations and a positivity whereas ornament was imbued with feminine connotations.

These issues of structure/ornament, male/female, were constructed from the architectural metaphors employed in Vitruvius' discussion of the origins of the three orders of Doric, Ionic and Corinthian column and then encrypted within their architectural forms (after

Bloomer 1996). I will concentrate on the ways in which extremes originated in the construction of Doric and Corinthian forms, since Ionic form is understood to be 'in keeping with the middle position' (ibid:15).

Vitruvius wrote of the Doric and Corinthian column:

'Thus in the invention of the two different kinds of columns, they borrowed manly beauty, naked and unadorned, for the one, and for the other the delicacy, adornment, and proportions characteristic of women.' (ibid:104).

What is interesting, is that the proportioned symmetry of man's physical body was employed in the construction of the Doric column, and so man's body was understood to be a part of the natural order of things:

'On finding that, in a man, the foot was one sixth of the height, they applied the same principle to the column, and reared the shaft, including the capital, to a height six times its thickness at its base' (ibid:103).

This central male body was then encrypted with the symmetry, proportions and structural flawlessness of **architecture**. Agrest writes of these processes of naturalisation of the male body, that it was the male body taking up a central position, a focal point, from which an understanding of perfection turned:

'The texts of the Renaissance, which in turn read the classic texts from Vitruvius, develop a logocentric and anthropocentric discourse establishing the male body at the center of the unconscious of architectural rules and configurations. The body is inscribed in the system of architecture as a male body replacing the female body' (1991:359).

The male body was ascribed to the natural order of things and man's body/Doric column was understood to be constructed from the simple transfer or mirroring of one's symmetry/proportion/perfection to the other. However, Corinthian columns were not understood in terms of a woman's body (for that central position had been taken up by the man's body), but womanly characteristics and so these were inherently grounded in artifice. For example, Vitruvius wrote:

'Just so afterwards, when they desired to construct a temple to Diana in a new style of beauty, they translated these footprints into terms characteristic of the slenderness of women, and thus first made a column the thickness of which was only one eighth of its height, so that it might have a taller look' (1960:103).

The proportion of the Corinthian column was constructed from techniques of mimicry rather than the simple transfer or mirroring of the body into the body of architecture. This mimicry was said to revolve not only around 'ideas' of a woman's body, but around the construction of 'femininity'. Nothing was actually pinned down, or physically originated from a woman's body, in Vitruvius' text. What were articulated were the ideals or the desirous effects of a particular construction of femininity:

'The third order, called Corinthian, is an imitation of the slenderness of a maiden; for the outlines and limbs of maidens, being more slender on account of their tender years, admit of prettier effects in the way of adornment' (ibid:104).

This particular construction of femininity, which revolved around techniques of mimicry, was then encrypted in the ornamental of architecture. The male body occupied the central position of architecture, and so there was no position for the female body to take up. The Corinthian column was designed by substituting the physical body for desirous effect and the ongoing artifice that constituted constructions of femininity. Ornamentation was not understood as structural because it had no position within the natural order of things, ornamentation was a construct that existed in the realm of artifice and so was understood as a never-ending embellishment on a theme.

The main points that I have attempted to make about Vitruvius' work were firstly to do with the ways in which a particular exterior surface was privileged. Secondly, the ways in which an external surface was understood to be the 'essence' of architecture, the form and structure of architecture. This understanding created a structure/ornament divide in architectural thought. Doric columns were modelled on the male body and were seen as 'natural', their proportions were harmonious and perfect, these attributes were considered to be the form architecture should take. Corinthian columns were conceived from connotations of femininity. These constructs were not seen as integral to architecture or

as the 'essence' of architecture, they were understood to be superficial and so ornamentation was related to artifice. Bloomer has argued that Vitruvius' writing, or the legacy of this writing, set up a very clear gendered hierarchy within the history and practice of architecture (Bloomer 1996).

1.2 Alberti

Vitruvius' manuscripts were constantly re-copied during the Middle-Ages, however it was Leone Battista Alberti's 'Ten Books on Architecture' (translated by James Leoni 1726, reprinted 1965), that really took on Vitruvius' work and reformulated it within the Renaissance period and in light of a Humanist perspective. Joseph Rykwert has written of the importance of Vitruvius' work to Alberti. Rykwert wrote that Vitruvius' buildings and books became 'the guide and standard of all new buildings, of an architecture worthy of a new and great Rome' (in editor's forward of Alberti 1965:v).

It is interesting that both of these works were produced as ten books on architecture and that in Alberti's work, as with Vitruvius, there is a distinct hierarchical form to a treatise on the subject of architecture. For example, hierarchies first set out by Vitruvius were perpetuated by Alberti - book one was on design, then in book two he discussed materials and not until book eight did he mention ornaments and their relationship to architecture. However, Alberti's work was not just a reformulation of what architecture was within the Renaissance period, but also a reformulation of what it was to be an architect. He wrote:

'But before I proceed further, it will not be improper to explain what he is that I allow to be an Architect: For it is not a Carpenter or a Joiner that I thus rank with the greatest Masters in other Sciences; the manual Operator being no more than an Instrument to the Architect. Him I call an Architect, who, by sure and wonderful Art and Method, is able, both with Thought and Invention, to devise, and, with Execution, to complete all those Works, which, by means of the Movement of great Weights, and the Conjunction and Amazement of Bodies, can, with the greatest Beauty, be adapted to the Uses of Mankind: And to be able to do this, he must have a thorough Insight into the noblest and most curious Sciences. Such must be the Architect (Alberti 1965:ix).

Alberti's architect was an artist. This sentence could also be turned round to state that artists were architects, for Alberti produced written discourses on painting and architecture; also human figures were drawn in Italian art during the fifteenth century within already drawn architectural frameworks, for Filippo Brunelleschi and Alberti both established relations between theories of optics and painting (see Gadol's (1969) work on the painter's perspective). Art was a way of figuring architecture in books for the architect to reference. Architecture existed as images. The idea of architecture as an image persisted and so the architectural object remained. Images illustrated the concept of architecture in its complete and beautiful form, a form which was 'laid out' and 'justly finished'. Alberti wrote:

'We consider than an Edifice is a Kind of Body consisting, like all other Bodies, of Design and of Matter; the first is produced by the Thought, the other by Nature; so that the one is to be provided by the Application and Contrivance of the Mind, and the other by due Preparation and Choice. And we further reflected, that neither the one nor the other of itself was sufficient, without the Hand of an experienced Artificer, that knew how to form his Materials after a just Design' (1965:xi).

It is possible to see from Alberti's work the ways in which a tradition was being created for architecture. Architecture was an art, the art of building, and by discussing the form of architecture in terms of style and aesthetics, architecture could be objectified as a complete, self-contained, object, rather like a work of art such as a painting (after Weisman 2000). It was the design, the look, which mattered. The architect's materials were those of 'nature' and these had to be taken into hand and carved, sculpted, to the architect's design. There is a hierarchy constructed into this architecture that was one of design over matter. Matter was carved and sculpted through measurement and proportion. There was a new visual geometry created within the paintings of this period that was then carved in stone. I have to be careful here, I am not suggesting that there was an explicit opposition in humanist thought between design and matter, culture and nature; art was considered as the mirror of nature (Gadol 1969). However, Alberti's discourse is on the skill of the architect, the architect's mastery was being constructed as a central position. This was at the same time as the male body was being taken up and imaged as the central position in which to understand the body of architecture. This then

lead to binary oppositions as these texts were re-copied and elaborated on in later periods, particularly within modernist thought.

What I want to focus on in Alberti's work is the way in which he used Renaissance geometry, measure and proportion, its 'rational way of seeing', to envisage how Vitruvius and those that built in Roman worlds had gone about their construction. Gadol writes:

'The first book of its kind since antiquity, *De re aedificatoria* became a bible of Renaissance architecture. The soundness of its technical and engineering knowledge, its archaeologically correct rules of classical construction (within the limits of an age which did not know Greek temple construction at first hand), and its coherent aesthetic theory - all earned its author a just reputation as the "Florentine Vitruvius" (1969:99).

Geometry, measure and proportion were not just theoretical ideas which gave direction to Renaissance building work; they gave meaning to the ways in which Alberti could understand the past. These particular technologies were projected not just into architectural practice but archaeological practice. The archaeology of architecture, as a way in which to record and so understand the past, was being expounded in Alberti's books on architecture. Alberti was able to use the 'Reason' of Renaissance architectural theory to explain 'Classical' design.

I have explored the ways in which structure was formed within Alberti's work. Geometry, measure and proportion did not only form structure and give a building its dimensions, they were also the ideas behind a building's beauty, they were what gave it 'body'. Alberti wrote:

'I shall define Beauty to be a Harmony of all the Parts, in whatsoever Subject it appears, fitted together with such Proportion and Connection, that nothing could be added, diminished or altered, but for the Worse. A Quality so Noble and Divine, that the whole Force of Wit and Art has been spent to procure it; and it is but very rarely granted to any one, or even to Nature, herself, to produce any Thing every Way perfect and compleat. How extraordinary a Thing (says the Person introduced in *Tully*) is a handsome Youth in *Athens!*' (1965:113).

Beauty of form was not directly contrasted to ornament as it was within Vitruvius' work. Although, ornament was still understood to be a secondary component, it gave form an auxiliary lustre, and so ornamentation was not integral to the building or the 'body'. Alberti wrote:

'We may define Ornament to be a Kind of an auxiliary Brightness and Improvement to Beauty. So that then Beauty is somewhat lovely which is proper and innate, and diffused over the whole Body, and Ornament somewhat added or fastened on, rather than proper and innate' (ibid).

Gadol argues that the mirroring of nature was Alberti's central concern in expounding an art of building, an aesthetic; and not its metaphysical implications. She writes,

'He developed his theory of beauty only to the point where it could ground and guide practice. How the Idea arises was the question he chose not to pursue, beyond asserting that it has its 'seat' in reason and nature' (1969:234-235).

However, Alberti did take up the central position of the architect and 'his' skill in sculpting the materials of nature, these are not the skills of a craft but more the 'mastery' of the arts, and male mastery (the architect) over female (nature). There was still a hierarchy in terms of masculine to feminine. Materials were natural (feminine) to which the architect/architect's design (male) gave form. What is more beauty was specifically related to light through ornament. Alberti was caught up in an aesthetics of ideas of proportion and light, which became ideas of beauty and goodness in later Renaissance Humanism.

'The aesthetic ideal of decorum, understood as a visible reflection of an 'apt' proportion amongst the powers of the soul, was turned into a principle of conduct by the humanists; and conversely, the visual, artistic image of man was transformed at the same time by the ideal of *humanitas*' (Gadol 1969:240).

Alberti created a model for the painter, architect, man; who through his mastery of the arts created a form of beauty; a model of man restrained in gesture and movement or the measure of man in architecture. Masculinity and architecture were intimately bound up in one another. The architectural object was the measure of man, Gadol goes on to write of Humanism that:

'The pattern of its pictorial, sculptural, and architectural space is one which Wölfflin termed a 'multiple unity'; it is an order which leads to a distinctive perception of the whole in its parts, a relational 'wholeness', a lawful unity, in which each of the parts still remains distinct' (ibid:242).

This 'lawful' unity, a humanist aesthetic where ornamentation adds light, made Alberti's architecture a literal model for law architecture (see Piyel Halder 1999). In Alberti's architecture surfaces were privileged, architecture existed as an image or a design as much as it existed as a building. In the projection of the architect's design onto the reality of a building there existed a hierarchy of design over matter. Designs originated from architects (male) and matter or materials were of nature (female).

1.3 Adolf Loos and Le Corbusier

I 'jump' from fifteenth century early Renaissance Humanism to Modernism in order to demonstrate the ways in which particular images dominate architecture and limit what we can know architecturally. Modernist architects set themselves up as opposed to what had gone before. Modernist architects made a name for themselves and their buildings by denouncing the past. However, I wish to demonstrate that in that denouncement of the past they over-identified with surfaces (Colomina 1992). Modernism attributed 'Classical' design to the ornamental. There is a significant difference here in that 'Classical' structure, its exterior surfaces, or more particularly the ways in which these external surfaces were copied and stuck on to skyscrapers or tall buildings as cladding, became the ornamental. The column, colonnade, architrave, frieze, cornice, portico and cupola were unnecessary ornamentation. Modernist architects got rid of these ornamental surfaces and exposed the bare form of structure. I will take the buildings of Adolf Loos and Le Corbusier as examples of modernist architecture.

Loos' and Le Corbusier's work was about creating visually perfect architecture. Again it was the design, the look, that mattered. Both of these architects worked at 'controlling looking' and the architectures I will discuss were artful in their voyeurism, 'the controlled look' (Colomina 1992:74). Colomina has written of the multiplicity of boundaries that

were established in Loos' architectures. The interior of Loos' buildings were not simply spaces enclosed by façades, there was an 'ambiguity between inside and outside ... intensified by the separation of sight from the other senses' (ibid:86). For example, Loos designed a house for Josephine Baker (Paris, 1928), the interior space was a series of low passages that surrounded a swimming pool, people in the passage were physically separated from the swimming pool but were at the same time visually connected to it. This is what Colomina writes:

'...the eye is directed towards the interior, which turns its back on the outside world; but the subject and object of the gaze have been reversed. The inhabitant, Josephine Baker, is now the primary object, and the visitor, the guest, is the looking subject. The most intimate space – the swimming pool, paradigm of a sensual space – occupies the center of the house, and is also the focus of the visitor's gaze...between this gaze and its object – the body – is a screen of glass and water, which renders the body inaccessible. The swimming pool is lit from above, by a skylight, so that inside it the windows would appear as reflective surfaces, impeding the swimmer's view of the visitors standing in the passages. This view is the opposite of the panoptic view of a theatre box, corresponding instead to that of the peephole, where subject and object cannot simply exchange places' (ibid:88).

This architecture is a viewing mechanism, it is about looking in (to the pool/swimmer), and it has framed the subject (the inhabitant of the house) as an object. Walls were not external surfaces in their own right, walls were split. The surface of the glass lets our eyes into the pool and the surfaces of the swimmer's body. Colomina has called these split wall designs of Loos a fetishisation of surface, we can see but we cannot touch (1992). There is a similar fixation with surfaces with Le Corbusier's house Villa Savoye (Poissy, 1929). It has a machine aesthetic and the surfaces are exposed concrete and horizontal planes of glass, which mean that the external surfaces do not mask an interior but frame it. The house is described in terms of a never-ending series of frames. For example the roof garden is outside but it is constructed as an inside with a wall wrapping the space in which an opening with the proportions of a window frames the landscape. This architecture is about looking out to the Alpine views. Colomina writes, quoting Le Corbusier:

‘ “The view from the house is a categorical view”. In framing the landscape the house places the landscape into a system of categories. The house is a mechanism for classification. It collects views and, in doing so, classifies them’ (ibid:113).

The image, as a finished product, is still everything in these works. The difference is that a distinction between materials and the look has been broken down. I include the viewing mechanisms, framed surfaces, of Loos and Le Corbusier because I think we have to be careful of what it is that planned images frame, classify, objectify and collect in archaeological accounts. All surfaces, all frames, Loos and Le Corbusier, make it difficult to pin down one mechanism of voyeurism in order to be more critical, more reflexive, as a viewing subject. It is difficult to work out what is specific about these views, and perhaps more importantly who it is that has a view, who is objectifying whom? These designs seem to be exercises that excel in objectifying everything and everyone. As Colomina argues, these ocular activities are not reducible to a critique of the Cartesian split between the perceptual and conceptual (ibid:91); where the body is deprived of its status. Loos privileges the bodily experience of space, Josephine Baker is swimming, the guest can move around the passage and look from frame to frame. The tension between physical separation and visual connection fetishises surface but also perhaps more importantly fetishises the surface of Josephine Baker’s body. It is through these complex mechanisms that she is objectified and consumed as an object.

An important point that Weisman (2000) and Rendell (2000) make about these architectures, these ‘controlled looks’, is that they deliberately do not emphasise the unobjective, trivial or intangible aspects of life; they do not work at making these matter. The architectures of Loos and Le Corbusier are still constructions out of place, space, out of context, ‘...we are not talking here about a site but about a sight’ (Colomina 1992:119). I want to spend a little more time discussing these aesthetics. For example, Le Corbusier devised a proportional system, it was not based on compositional rules and symmetry, but crucially an abstract human figure was central in regulating the dimensions of components, (‘Le Modulor’ is discussed in Hubert Damisch 1987). Although abstract, this human figure was located centrally, and in Le Corbusier’s writings he asserts his presence by making statements on the originality of his intellectual

creation. It is hinted at by Colomina, that at times, the central position of the professional architect conflates into the position of the abstract human figure, and so the space that architecture occupies is reappropriated as male. For example, she writes:

'The objects left as 'traces' in the photographs of Le Corbusier's houses tend to be those of a (male) 'visitor' (hat, coat, etc.). Never do we find there any traces of 'domesticity', as traditionally understood. These objects also could be understood as standing for the architect. The hat, coat, glasses are definitely his own. They play the same role that Le Corbusier plays as an actor in the movie *L'Architecture d'aujourd'hui*, where he passes through the house rather than inhabits it.' (1992:123).

It is interesting that despite its anti-Classical stance, the human (male) body metaphor is still at work. The images of his architecture, the photographs, have male gendered material culture in them and there are no signs of domesticity. Connections between architecture and masculinity are still central in these works. The ornament (female) seems to have gone altogether. I hope to demonstrate that specific gendered identities circulate in archaeological accounts where abstract agents are figured in relation to a position that a specific form of architecture occupies. My point is that these positions are always connected and never neutral.

'Culture relies upon architecture as a foundation for the construction of masculinity. Architecture and masculinity, two apparently unrelated discursive practices, are seen to operate reciprocally' (Joel Sanders 1996:11).

I have discussed the complex use of surfaces within Loos and Le Corbusier's work, I will now discuss how this aesthetic was divided from the ornamental. Originality was understood to be the defining characteristic of modernist architecture (Brent Brolin 2000). Le Corbusier designed a proportional system that was opposed to the compositional rules and symmetry of Classical ideas. Loos designed split surfaces in order to frame different interiors. These are spaces where the domestic and the ornamental ought not to reside. The machinic designs of Le Corbusier exercised the function of 'sight' (Damisch 1987) and the split walls of Loos' designs were exercises in complicating 'exteriority' (Safran and Wang 1985). These surfaces had a function; surfaces were exposed in Loos design, stark and unimpeachable in Le Corbusier's. There

was an evolutionary and moral rhetoric to this aesthetic. Walter Gropius wrote in 1935 that these designs were:

‘not the personal whims of a handful of architects avid for innovation, at all cost, but simply the inevitable logical product of the intellectual, social and technical conditions of our age’ (in Sand’s translated edition 1965:20).

Loos wrote in 1908, in an article titled ‘Ornament and Crime’:

‘The evolution of culture is synonymous with the removal of ornament from objects of daily use...What makes our period so important is that it is incapable of producing new ornament. We have out-grown ornament, we have struggled through to a state without ornament’ (in Safran and Wang 1985:100).

To Loos what is externalised or meant by architecture is the way in which it functions as a series of surfaces. There is not only an intellectual premise to this work but, Loos argues, a moral one. His architectures are split surfaces designed to economise on materials and labour; they are designs over matter.

‘The immense damage and devastation which the revival of ornament has caused to aesthetic development could easily be overcome because nobody, not even the power of the state, can stop the evolution of humanity! It represents a crime against the national economy, and, as a result of it, human labour, money and material are ruined. Time cannot compensate for this kind of damage’ (ibid:101).

It is interesting that there is a direct reference made to economy of materials in both Loos’ and Vitruvius’ writings on architecture when they are discussing aesthetics. Loos uses the same justification as Vitruvius, economising and paring down are socially justified. Now I am not suggesting that these architects understand ‘economy’ or ‘aesthetics’ to be the same thing, for example Loos is writing before the world’s first industrial war (Samuel Hynes 1990). However, both employ a rhetoric of design over matter by locating the architect as the central and key figure in the production of architecture. They both create hierarchies between things from this central position; the architect to the environment, design over matter. Loos locates his aesthetic within an evolutionary understanding. Developments in design were seen to reflect social progress, and architecture was understood to reflect differences in different kinds of people’s

ability and labour (see Victor Buchli 2002 for a discussion of the ways in which domestic architecture was understood to reflect the social status of different societies within the history of anthropology and the ways in which this related to the practice of archaeology). For example, Loos writes:

‘The Chinese carver works sixteen hours, the American labourer works eight hours’ (ibid).

In these evolutionary terms people do not have the same access to technical and functional constructions, it is understood that people ‘respond’ in their ability to ‘architecture’ in different ways. From Vitruvius to Loos, statements on architecture, on the aesthetics of architecture, support the classification of ‘architecture’ as ‘an object – driven exercise. The statements being made, speak of ‘architecture’ ‘as an autonomous, distanced process’ (Lesley Naa Norle Lokko 1996:50). In modernist architecture images were important. There was a continuation in foregrounding the male body in these architectures, however, female attributes seem to have gone altogether.

1.4 Feminist critiques of architecture

‘Architecture’s best-kept secret is that it is not only knowledge of form, but also a form of knowledge’ (Bernard Tschumi in Elizabeth Grosz 2001).

Feminist architects have worked at breaking this ‘system’ of architecture. Many feminists have (re)emphasised the unobjective, trivial or intangible aspects of architectural practice and in their work made these aspects to life matter. Rendell has written about D.I.Y and so (un)doing architecture (1998), Rebecca Sinclair has written about connections between body furnishings and household furnishings in Virginia Woolf’s writing (2002). Both Colomina and Rendell have considered architectures as viewing mechanisms. I have discussed the way Colomina’ has looked again at the windows in the walls of Loos’ designs. She has written that:

‘The window in the age of mass communication provides us with one more flat image. The window is a screen’ (1992: 128).

Rendell has done work on eighteenth century arcades in London. She argues that these luxury shopping venues were the focus of upper class male life. By taking promenades through these arcades men would pursue pleasure. Each shop window provided men with a view of working women. Shop-space was occupied by female prostitutes who lingered and chatted to the shop-girls in order to provide male shoppers with a framed image of what was on offer (1996). These architects look again at the ways in which architectures were occupied. These are embodied architectures, they are about lived spatiality (Grosz 2001). These architectures are occupied and contextualised, Rendell writes:

‘Architecture is a subject which demands to be understood in context: that is, within the context of its production (society, economics, politics, culture) and the context of its consumption, representation and interpretation (different academic disciplines, interest groups, institutions, users)’ (2000:xi).

These architectures are not objects of study but spaces of encounter that are always in the process of becoming and so they can be changed and they can be (re)invented. Feminist co-operatives such as Matrix are (re)emphasising building practice in architectural studies and actively encourage women to become involved in the building profession. Rendell on Matrix, writes

‘By revaluing process, the people involved in building production are then as interesting and important to architectural history as those who finance or design buildings’ (2000:230).

1.5 Architectural archaeologies

Issues of context (John Barrett 1987, Ian Hodder 1982), the nature of archaeological evidence (Barrett 1987 and 1994, Julian Thomas 1991 and 1999), and a questioning of archaeological practice and what it constitutes (Barrett 1994, Hodder 1992 and 1999, Michael Shanks and Chris Tilley 1987, Thomas 1991 and 1999) have been critically worked through within post-processual archaeologies. The construction and use of plan drawings have been reviewed and critiqued (Thomas 1993a), but are still ‘seen’ as an important part of our discourse on the past (Barrett 1994, Thomas 1999, Tilley 1994).

How sure can we be of distinctions between our textual discussions of 'process' and our technical diagrams and plans of 'architecture'? Is it not time that we examine the ways in which forms of knowledge within architecture and archaeology criss-cross and meet in dealing with 'architecture'?

I would like to end this chapter with a quote from Frances Bradshaw who is a member of the Matrix co-operative. Bradshaw along with the other Matrix members were concerned with making sure that their clients be involved in the building process in order that they be able to work at creating something other than pre-existing forms of architecture. She writes:

'While we had made a distinction between diagram and building shape, others had not. When we later drew a square café on a plan, several women were disappointed and we were then able to discuss our different mental pictures. This seems quite a good example of accidental miscommunication which provoked useful ideas by chance, rather than the carefully thought-out use of drawings. We were trying to find ways the group could get a feel of manipulating the spaces and take an active part in the process. We found we needed to do drawings that looked as throwaway as possible. We used scrap paper, and unruled lines – anything to overcome the feeling that once something was drawn it could not be changed' (2000:288).

Images of architecture are powerful things and need to be thought about.

Chapter 2. Architectural templates and excavation field categories: the building blocks to the neolithic.

The inspiration for this chapter came from a constant looking at the ‘outside’ of barrow architecture. From antiquarian accounts through to post-processual archaeologies, the dominant image that faces the viewer/reader is that of an extant barrow architecture. This endless array of externalised surface imagery leads to a frustration, or a need, to get inside the image, a ‘what is inside’ effect circulates with each look. I will argue in this chapter that these images are a further extension of the metanarrative that resides in a ‘system of architecture’ (after Agrest 1991), a ‘system of architecture’ that I have attempted to outline and get to grips with in chapter 1. I will now consider the ways in which this ‘system’ has been at work within archaeological accounts of long mounds and chambered monuments. I wish to explore the subtleties and differences in the ways in which this architecture has been conceptualised, in order to consider more fully issues of representation.

Part One

2.1 Early antiquarianism and the monumental

Stuart Piggott has argued that a transformation occurred in the history of the representation of monuments when, during the antiquarian period, it became necessary to visit the architecture in order to be able to visualise its character, rather than relying on or considering a verbal description as information enough in producing an architectural image.

A ‘direct pictorial representation (produced in)...a world in which topographical and landscape draughtsmanship was becoming increasingly commonplace, and into a mood of scientific sophistication in which a structure could be viewed not from the obvious eye-height level, but in the form of an artificial projection from an assumed vantage-point, the better to show detail’ (Piggott 1978: 8-9).

I wish to consider this ‘topographical approach’ in terms of the work of John Aubrey, William Stukeley and Richard Colt Hoare. In particular, I wish to focus attention on the barrow or mound architecture, rather than the stone chambers or stone façades of these areas of construction. This is in part due to a bias in what is termed architecturally relevant in archaeologists’ understanding of barrow architecture (i.e. a

bias towards stone and the chamber and façade elements of architecture exclusively as architecture), and in part due to a history of the representation of these elements within barrow architecture, which has already been critiqued in archaeology (e.g. Piggott 1950, 1976, 1978 and 1989; Chris Evans 1994, 2000).

John Aubrey was active in the seventeenth century compiling a work called 'Monumenta Britannica'. To me, his images of long barrow architecture are not so much of 'earthworks' but are produced to hint at works of earth. They are, if you like, images of artificial hills. The extant barrow architecture seems to defy the laws of gravity. His images of Millbarrow (1982:803) (see Figure 2.1) and Luggbury (1982:805) (see Figure 2.2), in particular, are like water balloons full to bursting, they are bulging forms held in the air without flopping over. It is these areas of full form, that stand up and away from the ground, that are shaded and striped; striped with lines that curve around, in and under these 'loads of earth' (Aubrey 1980: 83). However, it is the artificiality of these 'loads' that is being emphasised. The barrows are like huge pillows that rest on the ground. Evidence for the 'pillow' imagery comes from the barrow architecture being understood by Aubrey as a marker for the dead, he writes that long barrows are, 'the beds of honour where now so many heroes lie buried in oblivion' (1980: 258). Here pillows of earth could be a reference, or a marker, for the dead that lie buried inside in the sleep of death.

It is these subtleties in the bulging of the form that I wish to explore further. For it is easy to establish that techniques of perspective have been employed by Aubrey in producing these pen and ink drawings (see also Piggott 1978), either from view points that are full on from the side, or slightly raised from above and on the side. These images are all about mapping the sheer quantity of external surface imagery, in order to take the length and scale of the barrow architecture as an external surface. However, it is the pillow effect in these images of long mounds that is, I argue, the key in understanding why this architecture is represented in such passive terms; that is, there is artifice in the pillow imagery of the barrow architecture, the long mounds are metaphors for pillows that mark the beds of those dead and sleeping inside. However, the mounds as markers, outside the metaphorical flourish of the images, are understood to be composed of 'loads of earth' and so not as architecture, but as inert or passive dumps of material rather than an architecture that you engage with. There

is a paradox displayed in this imagery between artifice and earth, and it is important to spend some time working it through.

We are presented with images which convey a sheer effect through size and scale, and yet this grandeur is reigned back in through the softness of the image as a pillow. Aubrey is bedazzled by the sheer scale and amount of material used in the construction of these monuments. These long mounds have a powerful presencing effect, which is drawn by Aubrey as a weightiness. I have already said they bulge fit to burst. As well as referring to the make-up of these mounds as 'loads of earth', he writes of their effect on past people's lives as markers for the dead:

'...those visible superviving evidences of antiquities represent unto their minds former times, with as strong an impression, as if they were actually present, and in sight as it were...' (1980:83).

However, this physicality, although it has a weightiness represented in bulk, does not operate on earthly terms through gravity. As I have already said, these mounds pillow. Sarah Tarlow, although writing of late nineteenth century mortuary practices on Orkney, writes

'...to conceive of the dead as merely sleeping is a way of presencing them- refusing to allow them to be only part of the past' (1999: 135).

Roger Bowdler (1991) has written about the ways in which a sleeping metaphor was used in the tomb architecture of aristocrats and senior clergy during the seventeenth century. Aubrey, writing in the seventeenth century, enthuses about 'heroes' in their 'bed of honour', 'as if they are actually present'. Any pillow that invokes the importance of these 'beds of honour' has to be massive and lasting, it has to be monumental. The sheer effect through size and scale is tied into this understanding of mounds as markers for the dead. Large size and scale enhances, and is appropriate to, a proper understanding of the pillow imagery as a metaphor for those who were great and glorious. It also enhances and preserves the memory of them as the great and glorious through sleep. The complexity of the barrow architecture is reduced to only so many layers or blankets, that are heaped on these 'beds of honour'.

I have attempted to work through a paradox that exists within Aubrey's images, the intense artificial form of the mound described through a peculiarly non-complex construction process, but there is also a paradox that exists partly outside these images, in that from the time of Aubrey onwards, there was an immense interest in barrow digging (though very few long mounds had been excavated by antiquarians of Aubrey's time, this interest in excavation really came in to its own during the late eighteenth century). A knowledge of the complexity of barrow architecture was being created through excavation, but at the same time this was being ignored within images and ways of representing this architecture. In Aubrey's writings on Bowl Barrow, he deliberates over the variant complexity within barrow architecture, musing over its composition from materials that would have been at hand in that area:

'Between Edington and Chitterne is an oblong barrow called Bowl Barrow; it lieth [orientation] east, and west. Query if it be not made up of flints, as some of the other are of stones' (1982: 712).

How did this predominance for thinking of barrows as long mounds, with its focus on these mounds as markers for the dead, override the representation of other forms of knowledge of this architecture? Did the form of the architecture, its image, allow for only one dominating form of knowledge?

2.2 Antiquarianism and topography

Stuart Piggott writes of William Stukeley's work that:

'Stukeley's interest in architecture led him not only to make a large series of topographical and architectural drawings throughout his life, but also to more practical essays in actual construction, and of these, the designs in the Gothic manner dating from the 1740s have a considerable importance in the history of eighteenth century architectural modes' (1950: 10).

I will briefly outline several images in Stukeley's work which may have potentially challenged pre-existing architectural modes. I will then consider whether these architectural modes, and ways of representing architecture, were employed in his understanding and portrayal of chambered monument and earthen long barrow architecture.

In Stukeley's 1776 edition of his 'Itinerarium Curiosum', he has drawn details where wood and thatch, as well as stone, are included as architectural materials. In stone architecture he has shown 'the manner of the wall', that is, his images convey details of the ways in which the architecture was constructed, as at Borough Castle, Great Yarmouth (1776:plate 98). The 'geometrical groundplot' of the Roman amphitheatre at Dorchester has step details depicted on it (ibid:plate 53). He has attempted a form of imagery that depicts the fabric of a building, the architecture has a 'constructed' quality and understanding to it. Architecture does not reside solely in the imagery of an external surface. He has included visual information on the carpentry techniques used, in his opinion, to construct Caesar's bridge over the Rhine in the Brill (ibid:plate 50). Within the section of the book entitled 'In the Weddings', there is an engraving 'A perspective section of the Giants Castle in the vale of Glenbegg Scotland' (ibid:plate 82) where he has drawn the section of a broch cloven in two in order to display the various constructed qualities of this piece of architecture. Within this engraving the double walling, and the ways in which step details are woven into this double fabric, along with the compartmentalisation of space within the architecture, are all depicted. Interestingly, these are themes of construction which are understood today to have been used in the building of chambered monuments and earthen long barrows. Piggott records that Stukeley had excavated several Early Bronze Age barrows around Stonehenge and that from this he had knowledge of the complexity of barrow architecture:

'...not only did he write these precise notes, but among his Stonehenge manuscripts there survives a drawn section of the make-up of the mound of the barrow, which must be by far the earliest example in British archaeology, of this essential form of visual record' (1950:93).

Figure 2.3 is a copy of the detail of the drawn section that Stukeley made (after Piggott 1950:93, figure 18). It may come of some surprise to the reader then that within Stukeley's 1743 work entitled 'Abury', chambered monuments and earthen long barrows were represented as topographical features within the landscape.

This passive form of drawn representation is a paradox in Stukeley's work, for he states in text that his intention is to display the various constructed qualities of architecture, visual information on the way in which it was constructed:

‘The subject of antiquities must be drawn out with such strong lines of verisimilitude, and represented in so lively colours, that the reader in effect sees them, as in their first ages: And either brings them down to modern times, or raises himself, in the scale of time, as if he lived when they were made’ (1743:2).

To understand this paradox more fully, I think it is now time to explore the influences and effects of topographical work within antiquarian images. While Aubrey did produce topographical studies of the Stonehenge and Avebury region, his images of long barrows are close-up details detached from the landscape. Stukeley, however, draws this architecture in the landscape. He situates himself in the drawn image so that one point in the landscape references another; that is you look at him looking, you look at his view of a constructed landscape or his earth-work. Piggott has written in detail about the way in which we look at these images. He says, quoting Ernst Gombrich:

‘...we must consider the purpose and requirements of the society in which the given visual language gains currency. The new antiquarianism was intimately bound up with the new topographical approach to the British countryside, and the countryside was becoming the subject of the new landscape artist. Local antiquities were to take their place in the new depiction of landscape, just as classical buildings formed a component in the admired archetypes of the painters, the canvases of Claude or Poussin; a growing pride in the home product, fostered by the moderns as against the Ancients, encouraged the depiction of local architecture and ruins’ (1978:32).

This topographical approach came about through a fascination for collecting ‘artifacts’ (Piggott 1989, Gavin Lucas 2001). Piggott has noted that collections included plants, animals, fossils, as well as human specimens and their possessions. He writes; ‘From antiquities in the museum to monuments in the field was an obvious step in the world of the new topographers’ (1989:25).

From collecting, the assembling or bringing together of things, there is the extension to panorama, as a wide or complete image, drawn in such a way that all parts appear to be in perspective to a viewer at the centre. Stukeley draws himself in front of us because he is the collector, he has made the connection between the ‘artifacts’ in the landscape (this may also have been a way of illustrating the ‘authenticity’ of what he was seeing – he ‘was there’). The two examples of his drawn work that I will use are

(see Figure 2.4) 'Prospect of Bekampton Avenue from Longstone long Barrow 1724' (1743:46, TAB XXIV, plate 46), and (Figure 2.5) 'Stukeley's panoramic view of the Kennet and Beckhampton Avenues' (Alexander Keiller Museum, Avebury; cf. Piggott 1989:plate 13).

In Figure 2.4, Stukeley has drawn himself in the act of drawing, he is facing 'Longstone Cove' and 'South Street' with 'Abury' in the distance, he is sitting at the very edge of the 'Long Stone long barrow'. These references are constructed as deliberate ways of looking, by Stukeley, at his image. These references tell us to look at the connections between places that Stukeley, the artist, has made. Stukeley is showing us the connections between Pre-Roman 'artifacts' in this particular landscape. These monuments are 'artifacts', for although he is informing us of connections that existed in Pre-Roman times he is depicting this in his time. Piggott writes that '...surveying was a country gentleman's accomplishment taught in the seventeenth-century Inns of Court...' (1978: 40).

This is a gentleman's view of an estate, with neatly maintained hedge lines and small wooded copses around estate buildings (see Denis Cosgrove 1998). The patchwork fields are neatly ploughed and crops are in regulated strips. Behind 'South Street', just in view, is the tower of the local church, over the brow of the hill and caught in another straight hedge-line. On view on the rise of the next hill, towards 'Hakpen hill', are neatly boxed-in areas of pasture. There is even a gentleman riding a horse in the foreground. In the centre of the image with the drawn artist, but in the background, is 'Silbury' and behind this monument a windmill. Throughout this image are the gently undulating hills of North Wiltshire, and it is interesting that the extent of the 'Long Stone long barrow' is drawn with the same sloping mannerism, from left to right, as are the hills directly in the background above 'Bekampton' and the 'Roman road', and mirrored again by the sloping plain of 'Wansdike' behind them.

This drawn image manifests what Piggott described as

'...a growing pride in the home product', which, '...fostered by the moderns as against the Ancients, encouraged the depiction of local architecture and ruins' (1978:32).

However, these 'ruins' are not those that are depicted as of a 'lost time' during the later periods of Romanticism. These are 'artifacts' which exist in the landscape as objects, archaic objects perhaps, but the point is that they are not completely lost. They stand out as artificially made, as things made by human workmanship, by darker shading. They stand out in Stukeley's image as a collection, brought together in a panorama, of things to be savoured of the past. It is perhaps due to the allure of his collection that Stukeley has drawn himself in the same dark hatching as the 'Long Stone long barrow', the antiquarian and the antiquated produced in the same weave.

In Figure 2.5, Stukeley has drawn himself with three colleagues on Waden Hill. Once again these figures are in the centre and foreground of the image with Avebury in the background. However, they are pointing at the Kennet Avenue and at the Sanctuary circles and the barrows on Overton Hill. The triptych undulates with the stone avenues snaking through the landscape from the bottom of the image on the right to the top central point of the image and down again to the bottom of the image on the left. Where the avenue dips low the hills bulge with the Overton barrows on the right and Windmill Hill on the left, and where the avenues meet and bulge at the top of the image in Avebury the drawing has been extended below to show a very dark and hatched Waden Hill, with the important figures of the antiquarians upon it, directing us through the collection.

Although the figures are drawn with their backs to South Street and the Longstone long barrow, our eyes are eventually directed to them on our journey along the avenue. The dark shading of South Street makes it stand out in the landscape as an archaic object, so much so that we can see that the road splits it into two separate parts. The Longstone long barrow is hatched along its length which has the effect of making it stand out as an extant object within the landscape. We are told that these objects are 'artifacts' through dark shading and hatching. There is artifice again in this imagery, as topographer Stukeley like Aubrey has drawn these earthworks as works of earth, however there is no soft pillow imagery at work in Stukeley's images, it is the archaic qualities of these objects that is being evoked. These objects are externalised because they are thought of as being outside and different from the present day. However, Stukeley, in his panorama, has brought these archaic objects

together, he has understood them to have a connectedness that was constructed in the past, they are his collection, he has brought this connectedness together as artist.

Stukeley did present long barrows as close-up details, some of which are detached from the landscape. In his 'Intinerarium Curiosum' (1776) there are engraved megalithic drawings of 'Karnedhan Hengum' (1776:plate 94) and 'Coeten Arthur' (ibid) (probably taken from Edward Llyud's 1716 field notes). In 'Abury' (1743) there are images of 'Milbarrow' (1743:TAB XXX, plate 58) and 'An Archdruids barron' (West Kennet long barrow, ibid:TAB XXI, plate 60), and 'Kistvaen' in Clatford bottom (Cornwall) (ibid:TAB XXII, plate 62). There are also other close-up details of long barrows in his field notes. The artificiality of these earth works is evoked through shading or hatching. This shading or hatching is, however, distinct from the sepia that washes over his panoramas to invoke shadows cast across the landscape or the regulated striped hatching of crops or ploughed fields. Indeed, in Figure 2.6 of West Kennet long barrow, 'The head end of the long tumulus South of Silbury hill 17 July 1723' (cf. Piggott 1989:plate 2c), the hatching almost evokes hair. The externalisation of this surface imagery resides in Stukeley's understanding of these areas of construction as archaic, as objects, rather than an architecture which you engage with. They are distanced as 'artifacts', but are collected by Stukeley. It is the subtleties of the practice of collecting which, I argue, objectifies and externalises these areas of construction. The connectedness that these objects shared in the past is displayed as Stukeley's collection. The relationships between things is represented in panorama and in the text of field notes, a text that takes you from one site or 'artifact' to the next, with close-up drawing employed to illustrate the detail of that journey, a journey that represents Stukeley's overall collection. I hope that this is a slightly more critical way in which to understand topographical surveys, one which shows that they are not simply about mapping 'things' in a landscape.

2.3 Antiquarianism, cartography and collecting

I have argued that within Aubrey's work there resided an image and knowledge of long barrows as a passive form of architecture, an understanding of mounds as markers for the dead. I have argued through Stukeley's work that long barrow architecture was objectified, or distanced as an 'artifact', in his collections. For it was

Stukeley's journeys that were mapped, it was his journeys that represented his collection in the topographical image. Stukeley, in his panoramas, had brought 'archaic' objects together, he had understood them to have a connectedness that was constructed in the past, but they were his collection. I now wish to demonstrate how both of these externalised images, passive sepulchral marker and 'archaic' object, operated in Richard Colt Hoare's work, 'The Ancient History of Wiltshire' (1812 and 1819). I find this work to be frustrating reading. Colt Hoare, with William Cunnington, excavated many of the most important long barrows in south-central England and yet there is less detail of the complexity to barrow architecture in his archaeological accounts than in either Aubrey's or Stukeley's published material. Why? What led to such a closure? It is now time to return to and consider more fully the question that I posed earlier in this chapter; did the form of the architecture, its image, allow for only one dominating form of knowledge?

Colt Hoare's journeys through the Wiltshire landscape were campaigns of excavation work which he brought together and published in two volumes (south Wiltshire in 1812 and north Wiltshire in 1819). There is a unifying trait to this work. A great sweep of the landscape and excavation work is brought into order and classified by Colt Hoare. However, it is not the detail of the classification that I wish to examine, it is more the issue of unification. It is the stamp of all barrows, whether a long barrow, bell barrow, bowl barrow or whatever, as 'sepulchral designs' that I wish to explore. Colt Hoare may have argued that there was 'so great a variety of design in the sepulchral memorials of the ancient Britons' (1812:22), however, each distinct entry in his scheme of classification has a unity or uniformity attributed to it. Of the characteristics of long barrows, Colt Hoare writes:

'These indicia attest the high antiquity of the long barrows; and though we clearly perceive a singularity of outline in the construction of them, as well as a singularity in the mode of burial, we must confess ourselves at a loss to determine, or even to conjecture, for what particular purpose these immense mounds were originally raised.' (ibid:21).

This singularity of outline is embedded in many areas of the image Colt Hoare used in his published work to portray the class of barrow that is a 'long barrow' (see 2.7). The length of the barrow is conveyed in this image in a full-on side perspective. The length of the barrow is located in the centre of the image and stretches across both

edges of the frame. It is held between, or holds, the grass and the sky. The cloud cover that is depicted gently mimics the undulations of its outline as does the light that reflects off the outer edge of the flanking ditch. The differentiation between areas of earth and earthwork are much more subtle. For example, there are no coarse specimens of grass growing on the barrow as there are on the earth nearest to the viewer. Techniques of darker or concentrated shading are employed along the base of the extant mound in the areas where it is in contact with the earth (some of this was artistic convention of the time in order to convey relative spatial distance). However, this leads to a tightness of effect in the mounds form and hints at the barrows artificiality as a work of earth. However, this artificiality is not over emphasised to dramatic effect as in the work of Aubrey or Stukeley. I would argue that this subtler use of shading demonstrates a now almost implicit understanding that these mounds are markers for the dead and that any further meaning to this 'architecture' resides inside them, in what they hold or hide. Any complexity to barrow architecture or attempt to understand these mounds as architecture has been closed down. The dominant image is an externalised one. What is more, the barrow is no longer drawn in a landscape. As a point of focus, the object of study, the barrow architecture is now an image constructed in a classificatory scheme of sepulchral design. The landscape is abstracted through cartographic and topographical survey. Distribution maps are produced locating relationships between earthworks. These earthworks are then produced, drawn as if on their own particular plot of earth, in an ordered classificatory scheme that starts with the long barrow. There is an incredible level of abstraction to deal with, that is produced in these images, and is attributable to the ways in which an antiquarian such as Colt Hoare now portrays his collection.

From images like that of Figure 2.7, that exist as examples of a class of 'sepulchral design', Colt Hoare goes on to write; 'Having described the external form of the sepulchral mounds, I shall now investigate their interior, and point out the different modes of burial adopted by the Britons' (23). Indeed, the focus of study is now laden with issues of interiority that arise due to the exclusivity of 'sepulchral remains'. Details that both Aubrey and Stukeley noted in the architectural materials and techniques employed in the construction of long barrows are now ignored. What is of interest 'within' barrows, or within their structure, are marks or materials that relate to the order or sequencing of these 'sepulchral remains'. Colt Hoare writes:

'When the other bodies were interred at a subsequent period, the vegetable mould, of which the tumulus was composed, was dug through, as also about a foot or more of the chalk out of the original cist; and after depositing the latter bodies over the original interment, the earth mixed with the chalk, would be thrown over, and being thus mixed, would make a line of distinction, being different in colour to the vegetable mould composing the tumulus, and the chalk out of the cist; and this distinction was very obvious' (125-126).

Within the two publications of the works of earth that are located in the Wiltshire landscape, most of the images within them are of mapped landscapes that depict the distribution of earthworks and 'Tumuli Plates' which depict the material culture that was retrieved along with 'sepulchral remains' during the excavation of the barrows. These images are the mechanisms whereby Colt Hoare can present us with his collection. From his journeys, to his campaigns of excavation, a level of abstraction is worked through topographical techniques and the objectification of areas of construction within a landscape. Although these images transform this work by abstract means, they are also understood by Colt Hoare to portray the entirety of his efforts. However, his maps and display plates have abstracted the location and meaning of 'artifact' further, so that 'artifacts' come to mean items of portable material culture. Although barrows exist as 'artifacts' in classificatory schemes, as an abstract category they are considered by Colt Hoare to have a singularity of form. Their image can be marked by one long barrow; Colt Hoare does not consider it necessary to represent any variance in barrow architecture, because to him this architecture is marked by a unity. Barrow architecture is also implicitly sealed up in an understanding of 'mounds as markers' and so the focus, or hierarchy, of the classificatory scheme has shifted emphasis on to what barrow architecture marks or contains.

'Tumuli Plates' are highly elaborate abstract engravings of the portable material culture that Colt Hoare 'uncovered' during his excavation of barrows. These objects are portrayed in a clean and shining state devoid of the other materials that were a part of the contexts within which they were found. They are arranged in orders and groups. These items are displayed. They are displayed within the frames of the plate, with brass-effect name plates, as if they were or could equally be in a glass cabinet as part of a private or museum collection. I have chosen to look at, 'Tumuli Plate XXV'

(1812:plate XXV) (Figure 2.8), an engraving that exhibits the portable material culture from two early Bronze Age barrows that Colt Hoare excavated as part of the Normanton Group in Wiltshire. The detail of the engraving is without doubt exquisite; however, I have chosen this plate in order to demonstrate the shift of emphasis in Colt Hoare's work from the study of the barrow as 'artifact' to its 'contents'. In Figure 2.8, the dominant image is the engraving of a pot from 'Tumulus 156'. It is produced in such a way as to mimic the 'actual size' of the pot. However, the large scale of this item is not produced entirely elsewhere in the rest of the image. The pot is displayed centrally and on its own, it is above the other items from Tumulus 156, and it is depicted as if grounded on the earth with dark shading in the areas where it comes into direct contact with the earth. It looks architectural in its detail. Where a piece of the pot is missing, it is shown in section. The same techniques of representation were employed by Stukeley in his images of stone or 'Classical' structures in order to display the various constructed qualities of the architecture. However, these techniques were never employed to display the constructed qualities of barrow architecture and it is now somewhat ironic that they are being used to give further information and detail to the portable material culture found within their structure. Furthermore, this is a time when barrow architecture is understood implicitly in passive terms as a mound of inert material employed simply and singularly as a marker for other things. Eleanor Ghey (pers. comm.) has also noted that the pot is depicted in the form of classical Tholos architecture.

The architecture of this Bronze Age barrow is restricted to a textual account. Colt Hoare writes,

'No. 156 is a fine bell-shaped barrow, 102 feet in base diameter, and 10 feet in elevation above the plain. It contained within a very shallow cist, the remains of a skeleton, whose head was placed towards the west, and a deposit of various *elegant little trinkets*; the most remarkable of which are two gold beads, engraved of their original size in Tumuli Plate XXV. No. 7,8' (1812:202, my emphasis).

The criteria for excavation is now explicitly about the antiquarian's collection. Portable material culture is employed to rank or give order and importance to particular barrows and their associated dead. Barrows have now become markers for grave goods rather than markers for the actual dead. Colt Hoare does not consider the

portable material culture that is a part of long barrow architecture to be of any real 'value'. Of the Lake Group of barrows in Wiltshire he writes that

'No.1 is a long barrow, situated at the south-west extremity of the group, and like many others of a similar form has not been opened, as they have in general proved so uniform in their modes of sepulture, and so very unproductive in articles of curiosity' (ibid:209).

The particular types of material culture associated with long barrows do not seem to enhance antiquarian understanding of their typologies of barrow groups. This particular type of material culture has relegated long barrow architecture to the bottom of the list due to the impoverished 'value' of stone material culture. Colt Hoare's collection is more about representing the subtleties that he has detected in his classificatory scheme of relationships between 'sophisticated' cultures and their more 'valuable' bronze materials. Long barrows, due to the poor 'value' of the portable material culture that they 'contain' are considered 'known', they have been placed at the bottom of Colt Hoare's scheme of culture, they are considered to have been collected.

2.4 The synthesis of a classificatory system

John Thurnam carried out an extensive excavation programme of barrows in Wiltshire during the nineteenth century. He has written of the work carried out by his predecessors that:

'in the magnificent but ponderous and costly folios of his 'Ancient Wiltshire', Sir Richard Hoare printed the details of his researches; but in this work they are exhibited in a far from convenient or accessible form, and they have never been subjected to a full and complete numerical analysis' (1869: 161).

I wish to investigate whether the production of descriptions of long barrows in tabular form led to any transformation in the understanding of long barrow architecture. Thurnam separates his work into unchambered and chambered long barrows. What is of interest is that he uses Colt Hoare's images in his archaeological account of unchambered long barrows. Colt Hoare's 'Bird's eye view of barrows on Winterbourne Stoke Down, Wilts.' (in Thurnam 1896:plate XIII), is an image

employed by Thurnam to represent the geographical distribution of barrows, their disposition and arrangement. Once again, it is a unity to the external form of long barrows that is emphasised in this work. To this end, Thurnam produces only one image of an 'unchambered long barrow' as a type of barrow (see Figure 2.9). The image, which again is Colt Hoare's, is sandwiched within Thurnam's text on 'External form' in order to prop up or validate the claims of the text (1869:172). Part of the text reads: 'The long barrows are for the most part immense mounds...' (ibid). Once again, the descriptive text and externalised imagery evoke an architecture that is passive but large; an external form constituted through dimensions of size, length, breadth and elevation. The image is a re-emphasis of dimensions and these points dominate all other possible forms of interpretation in order to emphasise a singularity of outline. There is no change here from Colt Hoare's work, the exception is that Colt Hoare's 'long barrow' is Thurnam's 'unchambered long barrow'. They are defined by the same traits and these traits are demonstrated through the same images that were produced by Colt Hoare. Figure 2.7, a category of barrow, is reproduced by Thurnam and perpetuates an implicit understanding that these mounds are markers for the dead and that any further meaning to this 'architecture' resides inside them in what they hold or hide.

I wish to return to my question; did the form of the architecture, its image, allow for only one dominating form of knowledge? I think that my response to this question, when looking particularly at the work of Thurnam, has to be yes. I have argued that there is a closure of interest in barrow architecture within Colt Hoare's work. Thurnam, who had undertaken further excavation work and who made it his practice to review previous excavations and create a synthesis of information, does not critique these externalised images or question the ways in which this architecture works. These areas of construction are still understood by Thurnam to be mounds, finished projects, the conditions for the creation of which were simply the quarrying and dumping of lenses of material. This is a passive architecture, or rather a passive object that is an accumulation of inert materials. Long barrows, as understood within this scheme of things, were created in the neolithic as dumps of material to mark something else; something else that resides inside, and so they were built to be looked at from the outside, just as in Thurnam's time he now looks at them from the outside. This is not really an architecture at all, but a system of markers that by their external

form can be fitted into a classificatory system. Excavation is to verify this system and to work out the finer subtleties of classification. Portable material culture, associated with 'sepulchral deposits' (Thurnam's terminology), classifies people into archaeologists' evolutionary schemes of culture (after Lucas 2001). This was Colt Hoare's collection and this is Thurnam's collection.

The only questioning Thurnam makes of the externalised imagery that circulates right through archaeologists' understanding of long barrow architecture is whether or not these 'mounds' were actually created through geological processes. This line of argument is perhaps further evidence for a conceptualisation of these areas of construction in exclusively passive terms. That is, this is not an 'architecture' per se and certainly not an architecture that people engaged with in any complex way. It is only really the accumulation of materials by people for something else, it is only one step away from a drumlin or drift of glacial deposits that were used in the past as markers. What is worse, after refuting a 'geological' mound, Thurnam uses this argument to give further credence to externalised imagery. He writes; 'I believe, however, that when kept within proper limits the distinction by outer form is well founded, and that such will appear in the course of these papers' (1869:167).

An external form allows us as archaeologists to map the distribution of this shape and to focus on the shape itself. This external form gives us two of the criteria for Thurnam's table, 'Geographical Distribution' and 'Disposition and Arrangement'. However, it is only these criteria that are to be employed in the examination of this external form. Indeed, it is the exclusive use of these criteria that defines Thurnam's work as distinct from that of Stukeley and Colt Hoare. Thurnam writes:

'All these varieties and peculiarities of form, however, seem to be very unimportant, and to have depended on the fancy, or the greater or less care and skill, of those employed in their construction' (ibid:173).

For the remaining six criteria in Thurnam's classificatory scheme we have to look 'inside' the long barrow to the expected 'sepulchral deposits' and the items associated with them. These are listed by Thurnam as 'Position of the Interments', 'Excavated Holes or 'Cists' in the chalk', 'Stratum of Black Earth', 'Remains of Funeral Feast', 'Mode of Burial', and 'Associated Manufactured Objects'. Unsurprisingly, Thurnam

states, 'But, though the outer form is important, there can be no satisfactory classification of barrows which does not likewise refer to their internal contents' (ibid:168).

The extant mound is understood to be a marker for the dead and so 'sepulchral deposits' are focussed upon by Thurnam. During the programme of excavation the barrow architecture is trenched and pulled apart until these 'sepulchral deposits' are located. I do not wish to go into a critique of the ways in which this human material evidence is dealt with; suffice it to say that the dominant narrative of funereal burial sets up a particular set of expectations and so the more transformed and unexpected deposits are referred to by Thurnam as 'many bodies promiscuously piled together' (ibid:184). This dominant narrative of funereal burial also effects the ways in which other items of portable material culture are treated by Thurnam. For example, the encounter of animal bone in association with human bone is understood to be the result of feasting. However, only the animal bone that is encountered in association with human bone is considered to be of primary importance since human bone or 'sepulchral deposits' are the focus of excavation work. For example, animal bone that is encountered elsewhere within the 'make-up' of the barrow is explained as the result of excess or discard. In the same way as the materials that comprise the 'make-up' of the barrow, they are simply inert material quarried and dumped in order to make-up a 'mound'. Any other materials that are incorporated into this are seen as secondary or as an elaboration on the theme of funereal burial:

'Altogether, the appearances justify the conclusion that oxen were slaughtered at the time of the obsequies for the supply of the funeral feast, and that the heads and feet, not being used for food, were thrown on the yet incomplete barrow, as offerings, perhaps, to the manes or to other deities' (ibid:182).

This is also the case with other items of material culture:

'The rarity of objects of flint and other stone, and of those of bone, as well as pottery, is also very remarkable; and leads to the inference that those which have been met with have seldom been deposited intentionally, or as a necessary part of the funeral rites' (ibid:193).

I wish to look at the framework to Thurnam's excavation programme a little more closely. One of the criteria within Thurnam's classificatory system is 'Stratum of

Black Earth'. This criteria is placed after the location of the 'Sepulchral deposits' but before the examination of associated portable material culture. It is interesting that Thurnam uses geological terminology when describing the placing of this material. It is a 'stratum' a material laid down by geological processes and yet he realises that this material has been transformed in some way through human practice (ibid:182). It is a material that has been created through conditions half way between deliberate human practice (deposit) and a geological event (stratum). Paradoxically, although he doesn't appear completely to consider this to be an architectural material used in deliberate construction, he does recognise it to be a material that seems to contain the deposits that are the object of his study (i.e. human remains and portable material culture). It is a 'peculiar stratum', in Thurnam's terms, and it is located between the natural land surface and the 'upper strata of the long barrows of Wiltshire' (ibid:181), that is, below the materials of derived chalk and flint that he understands as simply inert materials that have been quarried and dumped in order to make-up a mound. These passive dumps, strata, are removed to reveal a 'peculiar stratum' that contains deposits or the objects of study, which lie on top of the natural. The 'Stratum of Black Earth' is followed and completely excavated by Thurnam since it contains the objects of study, 'artifacts'. Thurnam writes:

'Not far from the human remains, though at a somewhat higher level, but still for the most part in the stratum of black or grey earth, are often found the bones of oxen, those of the skull and the feet being the portions of the skeleton most generally met with' (ibid:182).

Is this 'peculiar stratum' not really just a surrogate chamber? Although it is much more difficult to excavate themes of construction that are worked from more ephemeral earth based material, is there any real difference when more stone based materials are employed? Will stone make any difference to a programme of excavation that goes from strata (mound), to a 'peculiar stratum' enclosing deposits that are 'sepulchral remains' (that which is marked), to the natural surface? Or does the form of the architecture, its image of a mound as the marker for the dead, allow for only one dominating form of knowledge?

Before I go on to a discussion of Thurnam's work on chambered long barrows I would like to make one further note on the building blocks that Thurnam has created

through his excavation programme. The sequence, strata - 'peculiar stratum' and deposits – natural, also represented a stratigraphical sequence of mound - mound marker – (pre)mound. Therefore, the materials that Thurnam encountered underneath the 'peculiar strata' are a problem. Thurnam writes:

'these excavated holes, evidently intended as receptacles for something, were empty when uncovered; i.e. they contained nothing but the loose grey or black soil peculiar to the bottom of these barrows. Sir Richard Colt Hoare observes of these little pits or holes, that they 'denote some particular ceremony that was practised in these tumuli'' (ibid:181).

These are postholes, and would have been a part of the structure of the barrow architecture (see Ian Kinnes 1992). I know that it was much later and in the work of Pitt-Rivers that these negative features were recognised to be structural (in Lucas 2001). However, a stratigraphical sequence has been broken by Thurnam and will be again. I wish to highlight the potency of the focus of these sites as markers for the dead. The stratigraphical sequence is always mound - mound marker - (pre)mound. I will argue that it is only the sequence between mound marker and pre-mound that is transgressed. Due to the inert materials of the mound it is always understood to be a material that seals time, that covers the event of funereal burial. The only event or history is then that of funereal burial and not that of construction.

Figure 2.10, is a ground plan. The ground plan is a very particular kind of image, it is produced using techniques which are all about stating the 'all' in looking. That is, it is an image where everything is presumed to be laid bare and visible. It is about exposing the bare elements and highlighting the essential detail of structure. Metaphors of 'stripping' and 'exposing' resound in these images, and mechanisms of knowledge, of science and excavation (Ludmilla Jordanova 1989, Michael Shanks 1992, Julian Thomas 1993b). Here the external form of the long barrow is redundant, or should I say superficial. The hard line that encloses the shape bound in stone is representative of the make-up of the mound and its collapse. Thurnam writes:

'In the oolitic region, in which these barrows chiefly occur, *the superficial strata*- whether 'corn-brash', 'coral-rag', or 'Stonesfield slate', afford a building material which the architects of these tombs did not fail to utilize' (209, my emphasis).

These images represent, or should I say expose, two new criteria within Thurnam's classificatory scheme: 'External Basement Walls and Peristaliths' and 'Internal Structure'. The internal structure of the chamber and the external basement wall act as dividers or brackets for the interpretation of all other stone-based materials. Material found outside these external walls is understood to be collapse, and material piled up on top of the chamber inside these walls is 'superficial strata'. The external form of the long barrow is replaced by the reconstruction drawing (see Figure 2.11).

In Figure 2.11, the darker shading that had differentiated the extant barrow from the earth underneath and around it is replaced by peristaliths and walling. The ground plan and reconstruction drawing are architectural. These images are used to expose the two criteria that Thurnam understands to be architectural in long barrow construction. Of the 'external walls' he writes:

'Nearly all of them are found to have been surrounded by a dwarf dry wall of this material, laid in horizontal courses, neatly faced on the outside, and carried up to a height of two, three, or four feet. In this way was produced a supporting wall or podium, which, as has been well observed, in regard to the artistic sepulchres of the Etruscans, not only defined the limits of the tomb and gave it dignity, but enabled entrances to be made in it, and otherwise converted it from a mere hillock into a monumental structure' (1896:209-210).

This material is differentiated from 'superficial strata' by having been laid in courses. A façade has been created. A façade is the exterior of a building; as architecture, it is the face that is presented to the outside world. This stone material is seen implicitly as a façade. Nothing outside this can be architectural, and as the external of architecture, it has to have an inside, there has to be an interior to a building.

The chamber and façade walls, as the architecture of the barrow, also bracket off further walling as non-architectural. For example, there are several areas within the barrow structure where further techniques of coursed walling have been employed during the neolithic. These are not understood by Thurnam however to be areas of architecture, they are instead areas of construction which reinforce the make-up between the chamber and its façade:

‘Not only were our chambered barrows surrounded by dry walling, sometimes single, but often double and concentric, but they were often intersected by transverse and longitudinal walls, which seem to have had no particular object, beyond that of giving strength and solidity to the whole; and of forming perhaps temporary causeways, over which those engaged in their construction might convey the stone rubble and earth with which to fill up the entire mound’ (Thurnam 1869:210).

There are also instances where stone-based materials have structure using very different techniques of construction. These techniques would have been recognised as architectural, as corbelling, if they had been employed in the construction of the chamber. However, these techniques are simply noted as of passing interest by Thurnam as they do not fit into the hierarchised scheme of a building with a façade (exterior) and chamber (interior). He writes:

‘At Ablington, in particular, the layers of loose stones had been placed in a slanting position, and converged towards the centre, in a ridge-like fashion, like the roof of a house; giving to the whole, as seen in section, an almost pyramidal aspect. *It is of more interest*, however, to notice the manner in which the enclosing wall was connected with the entrance to the chambers’ (ibid:210, my emphasis).

Chambers are the focus of Thurnam’s study, as a piece of architecture they are the interior of the building. They are important due to that which they house. The further criteria for Thurnam’s classificatory scheme are enclosed within this architecture (‘Mode of Burial’, ‘Remains of Funeral Feasts’, ‘Implements of Flint and other Stone, and of Pottery’). During all of Thurnam’s excavations of chambered long barrows, the chamber is the point of focus, all materials relate to the architecture of the chamber and so we find time and time again within his text the discovery of ‘artifacts’ along similar lines:

‘At the entrance to the Uley chamber, the lower jaws of several wild boar were met with...Bones and teeth of swine, including large tusks of boars, were obtained from the chambers of Littleton Drew, West Kennet, Nympsfield, Rodmarton, and Woodchester’ (ibid:228);

‘It may not excite surprise that at West Kennet, in the heart of the chalk formation, the excavation of the chamber should have yielded so large a number of flint knives and scrapers...’ (ibid:229);

‘the ‘pieces of an unbaked urn of very coarse material’ located in one of the side-chambers at Stoney Littleton; at the bottom of the chamber at West Kennet we found piles of fragments of ancient British pottery...’ (ibid:231).

Chamber construction is glorified in this scheme of things. Thurnam creates three classes of long barrow due to the outline, or form, of the chamber. He writes:

'Internal Structure – The chambered long barrows present three principal types as regards the plan of their internal construction' (ibid:212).

The technique of planning gives form to the chambers that are located 'inside'. However, a planned form always creates a mapped surface. Each mapped surface carries with its dimensions an external and internal perspective, and so chambers come to be in effect their own buildings.

Figure 2.12, 'Ground Plans Of Chambered Long Barrows, And Of Chambers Contained In Them' (1869:212), demonstrates the level of abstraction that Thurnam has reached. There are stone chambers built from hard line blocks, there are external stone walls faced with hard lines and revetted with hatching, and there is a hard line showing the extent of the barrow material that has settled into its final form. These are like a series of Russian dolls, one inside the other, all very pretty and in lacquer, a series of thin veneers which has nothing but emptiness in and around them. When you get to the last doll, you hold on to it a little longer, you know it is the last one, but then you go and pull it open and look inside. Long barrow architecture has been reduced, at times, by Thurnam to this last doll, the chamber. Yes, Thurnam knows that there are a whole series of other criteria and points of interest to these areas of construction, but he believes that the chamber can stand on its own and that it can also stand in for all the other criteria since it holds what is deemed to be of overall interest to archaeologists.

I argued that Thurnam had created with his classificatory system of unchambered long barrows a sequence that reads strata (mound), 'peculiar stratum' (that which is marked), and natural. What is the real difference, for Thurnam, when stone was employed in these areas of construction during the neolithic? Mound collapse, external walling, mound make-up (mound); chamber and its contents (that which is marked); and natural. There are more powerful techniques of imaging employed in the excavation of this stone based architecture: plans, which reduce evidence for

construction work into coursed surfaces of stone or upright orthostats; plans which also give the effect of encompassing everything, a technology which can supposedly pick apart all the detail of the body of the work down to its essentials and display the bare bones. However, although this technology can lead to an abstract classificatory system in which images of chambers are produced in plan, although synthesis is perhaps led by the information and dimensions produced in the form of a chamber plan, the classificatory system still relies on portable material culture. Thurnam's production of descriptions of long barrows in tabular form has not led to any transformation in the understanding of long barrow architecture. Thurnam, as was the case with Colt Hoare, still bases his synthesis on portable material culture. Mounds are still markers for the dead. What the dead carry with them are collected by archaeologists in order to classify people into archaeologists' evolutionary schemes of culture (after Lucas 2001). This was Colt Hoare's collection, this is Thurnam's evolutionary collection, and it is also William Greenwell's collection. In his book 'British Barrows. A Record of the Examination of Sepulchral Mounds in Various Parts of England' (1877), there are no images of long barrows, there are only engravings of portable material culture. I have attempted to demonstrate in this part of chapter 2, the ways in which the form of the architecture allowed for only one dominating form of knowledge. In Greenwell's work, this image is so powerful that the knowledge it has formed is implicit within his text, and so the image does not need to be produced any longer. The image of a sepulchral mound is an everlasting one.

Part Two

'This has been my difficulty. The difficulty with my life. Those well-built trig points, those physical determinants of parents, background, school, family, birth, marriage, death, love, work, are themselves as much in motion as I am. The sensible strong ordinary world of fixity is a folklore. The earth is not flat. Geometry cedes to algebra. The Greeks were wrong' (1997:9-10).

'I was the visceral place between mouth and bowel, the region of digestion and rumination. No doubt it is my spleen that refuses to locate the seat of reason in the head. No doubt it is my natural acidity that fears the milkiness of the heart. This story is a journey through the thinking gut' (1997:13).

('Gut Symmetries' by Jeanette Winterson)

I now wish to look at the ways in which this image is at work in post-processual accounts of long mounds and chambered monuments. The reason for this 'jump' is deliberate and two-fold. Firstly, I do not wish to produce any kind of linear trajectory or fully-fledged historical review of archaeological practice and archaeologists' understanding of these areas of construction. My work is to investigate the reasons for a predominant, or exclusive, image in archaeological accounts. Secondly, I hope that in making a perceived 'jump' in history, it will emphasise with dramatic effect a striking similarity in the way images are employed. I wish to use, brazenly, this shock factor to elucidate why specific images of chambered monuments and long barrows remain as templates for archaeologists' understanding of these areas of construction.

2.5 A phenomenology of landscape

I find it quite difficult to find the words to talk about Christopher Tilley's work; indeed it is going to be quite hard to deal with all the following post-processual accounts of prehistory for these are works that I truly admire. However, there are points of departure that I make in reading such work, there is always a 'but' to my reading and it is that 'but' that inspires the writing of this critique.

Tilley in his 'A Phenomenology of Landscape. Places, Paths and Monuments' (1994), attempted something very different and quite exciting in an archaeological account of prehistory. He attempted to locate our understandings of space and time through human agency, and to take us on a journey through lived prehistoric landscapes. In his work, space and time are dimensions through which lives are lived and are dimensions which are given meaning through that lived practice (see also John Barrett 1994, Chris Gosden 1994 and Julian Thomas 1999). There should then be in Tilley's work no reference to a mapped surface or indeed any landscape that materialises as a geometric skein of measurement. In his work we should never be in danger of moving outside of experienced places; these are places which are brought into being

that 'are always centred in relation to human agency' (1994:10), and so can never be perceived in abstract terms or objectified. Tilley goes on to write, 'Space has no substantial essence in itself, but only has a relational significance, created through relations between peoples and places' (ibid:11). My first query is whether this way of understanding the world is at all approachable through standard textual accounts and the visual images employed in archaeological publications.

Tilley uses narrative as a mechanism to convey understanding and possible past meanings to 'experienced' prehistoric landscapes. He understands narrative to be a mechanism also used by past peoples. He writes:

'Narrative is a means of understanding and describing the world in relation to agency. It is a means of linking locales, landscapes, actions, events and experiences together providing a synthesis of heterogeneous phenomena' (ibid:32).

However, again my query is with whether Tilley is as critical of relations between text and image in his work, and the ways in which these communicate any sense of a lived landscape.

There is a contrast between the images and textual account in chapter two of Tilley's book (living communities and a knowledge of these communities worked through anthropological discourse) and chapters three, four and five (past communities and a knowledge worked through archaeological discourse). I wish to focus my discussion on chapters two and four. The striking difference between these chapters is the sense of movement between places that is represented in chapter two. Tracks are formed and places are connected and intertwined. Figure 2.13, 'Dreamtime tracks, Balgo territory, Western Australia' (Tilley 1994:42, figure 2.1), is not a distribution map. It is entitled by Tilley as 'numbered topographical locales', but these locales are connected by paths, they are not distributed. Although these paths are objectified and so captured in the image, there is a sense of movement. Hard bold lines take us through 'big name' places on well travelled routes. However, these hard line routes are also broken and punctured by dashed lines, the image is in many places interrupted, there is no one totalising view or route. The technology of the abstract image, with its all encompassing perspective, has been broken. Figures 2.14 and 2.15

are images of Ayers rock (Tilley 1994:44 and 45, figures 2.3 and 2.4). Figure 2.14 is a close up photograph of 'the rock' and 'the bush'. Ayers rock is textured, we are pushed into its surface by the telephoto lens and its folds and crevices are brought out and pushed back by light and shade. We only get to this reading after taking in the dense detail of the foliage. Figure 2.15 is another densely detailed image, it is a myriad of multi-layered detail in minutia. The 3-D modelling, the texture of the rock surface, the density of arrows and tagged information that point to places, the detail is almost too much, but it does convey a place that is well worn and known by many different people. Perhaps this is my point, that although these journeys cannot be represented in actuality and although they have by necessity in a book to be abstract, they are inhabited places. The denseness of detail creates a disruptive imagery full of movement. These are places created and moved through by people.

Tilley writes of the evidence for the ways in which mesolithic and early neolithic lives were lived: 'I attempt to trace instead *process* rather than product; the means by which the land became encultured and ultimately transformed into architectural form during the Neolithic' (ibid:73, my emphasis). However, the 'in-process' nature of archaeological evidence is not articulated in the images Tilley uses 'alongside' his text in chapter four. He, instead, reverts back to formal or standard archaeological images. There are distribution maps, photographs of exemplified views of valleys, plans of chambered monuments, a reconstruction drawing of Gwernvale, tables and photographs of views out from chambered monuments. The only transition portrayed visually in Tilley's work is between the distributed locations of abandoned mesolithic flint work (composite flint scatters that are seen as a scatter) and neolithic monumental projects (seen as a completed building).

Figure 2.16, contains groundplans and a reconstruction diagram, it is sandwiched within Tilley's text on 'Chambered Cairns and the Landscape' (Tilley 1994:119, figure 4.6). These chambered cairns are still understood as a 'type' of cairn, 'Cotswold-Severn', and the first term he mentions in relation to these areas of construction is 'stone' and the second is 'morphology'. A groundplan is a very particular image, as I have already argued, that can only be morphological, and the limits or definition of that morphology are set by the archaeologist in stone. This could easily be Thurnam's work. Tilley's text here is a blend of his own experience

of negotiating this 'architecture' and of evidence from excavation reports. However, an area of construction cannot be visited. These areas exist in the present as extant mounds and 'in' some there are exposed chambers. This 'architecture' has form in the present day due to areas left untouched by archaeologists, that were considered as simply mound make-up, and the non-backfilled trenches of previous archaeological excavation that exposed chamber construction. These are the only 'internal structures' (apart from at Pen-y-Wyrlod where a length of the axial divide and compartmental divides were exposed by a farmer during quarrying) that you can engage with in any way due to the excavation programme having created the basic building blocks to the interpretation of these building sites. Tilley writes: 'The chambers, then, and their entrances were clearly not intended to have a *visual impact* in contrast with the orientational long axis of the cairn itself' (ibid:119, my emphasis).

This visual impact depends on a series of particular perspectives. This is a history written from a particular perspective in time when materials from this building site had been meshed together into a more consolidated form, from a time when the stone that had been worked and knitted into an area of walling (a labour that denied access to a chamber but continued a theme of construction in walling) had tarnished. This is also a particular perspective in space, or it is experienced 'as perspective', for it is a view that takes in the whole of the monument full-on from the side, as in Colt Hoare's image, or it is understood through the mechanics of the plan drawing which shows us dotted line walls blocking the 'bones' of internal chambers. Ironically, the orientational long axis of these building sites can similarly **only** be experienced from these fixed perspectives. There is no working of temporality, or inhabitation of these areas through the labour of construction. These building sites are appreciated by Tilley as 'archaic objects' (a practice we have already recognised within Stukeley's collections).

Again I find myself in a difficult situation when discussing the ways in which Tilley has objectified neolithic building sites. I know that there are other exciting dimensions to this work. For example, prehistoric worlds are not in this work divided out into natural and cultural aspects (developed by Richard Bradley 1998 and 2000; Colin Richards 1996b). In Tilley's work, the landscape is not a background or surface on which construction takes place. Instead, construction work mediates between all

aspects of the material world. Construction work at times sets up points of reference between places and connects them through continued building work. Sometimes these themes of architectural practice mimic other areas in the material world, so that a particular direction or axis in construction takes on the visual line of an escarpment in the mountains. Tilley writes:

‘When looked at in the abstract the lack of regularity in the orientation of the cairn axes would seem to suggest that the cairns were orientated at random, that there are no principles regarding their precise directional siting. However, when we begin to consider the relationship between the long axes of the cairns and dominant landscape features an entirely different picture emerges...’ (ibid:123-124).

It is just that, and here is the ‘but’, I do not believe that an entirely different picture has emerged.

To convey this sense of connection between all aspects of the material world, Tilley has produced a series of photographs of views ‘looking out’ from chambered monuments. These are bad photographs, the lens has flattened everything out into a bland space of darker and lighter patches that stretch across the frame. The only two photographs that have produced any of the textured qualities of Ayers rock are both images from the chambered monument of Mynydd Troed (1994:131 and 132, figures 4.13 and 4.14) (see Figure 2.17). At least here monument and mountain seem to undulate. There is a wave effect through the centre of these images that moves over the monument, through darker swathes of foliage and then up over the mountain. There is a visual axis to these images that works the connections that Tilley is making through construction. Yet these photographs were taken from the top of a ‘mound’ after construction work had been abandoned. This particular perspective is a duplicate of the ground plan, the sheer scale of over-all orientation is displayed. This image is not of, but is on, a pre-given form of architecture. The dominance of this particular perspective is also emphasised in the exclusive tight range of the camera frame. We think we are seeing and able to read this image, as if we were there in the landscape and yet we cannot turn round and look elsewhere. There are hardened parameters to this locatedness.

I wish to consider the ‘located’ aspect to Tilley’s work a little more fully. Taken from Heidegger’s (1972) notion of ‘dwelling in the world’ Tilley considers our knowledge

of the world to come about through lived experience. However, I have major problems with the kinds of lived experience that both Heidegger and then Tilley define (see also Brück 2001). This experience is centred or located in and from the 'body', but a person's body can never be 'any old body'. This view of a person and the ways in which they project out and into the world is supposedly a blank position where any other body can step into and occupy that space. These centred positions seem to be employed by Tilley as basic units that are supposed to be devoid of identity, devoid of sexual and racial marks. Yet he also argues, alongside this notion, that these bodies act outwards in an 'experienced' way due to a corporeality which they are deemed to hold. This contradictory way of working is to do with unquestioned and uncritical essentialist understandings of a body as something which we are all supposed to share (critiqued elsewhere by Vikki Bell 1999; Avtar Brah 1996; Judith Butler 1990 and 1993; Elspeth Probyn 2000; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak 1996). The unifying features of people's bodies emphasised by Tilley are encouraged through the medium of photography. That is, we would all see the barrows in these frames if we were there too and yet if we only stopped to think about all of this we would know that people don't see things in the same way. Also within these framed views, set by the photograph, there is no negotiation of places in and between people. These are 'empty' landscapes which are experienced by one person and that person is behind a camera. Where is Tilley's understanding of bodies and places becoming significant through their relation to other bodies? Where is Tilley's understanding of space as having a 'relational significance' rather than any 'substantial essence'? Are there not 'essential' qualities that we are supposed to recognise in these photographs, from a long barrow, a pre-given form or 'mound', to a mountain with its recumbant form, with one pre-given form mimicing the other?

I don't want to sound pedantic or indeed dismissively negative of Tilley's work, but I am alarmed by the fixed conditions to human existence and human practice that are being expounded or created in his work. Bell has written of feminism's anxiety with essentialism and is critical of a 'paranoia' with 'essences' within feminist discourse. She writes that critique should not be a matter of denouncing essentialism but that:

'instead, it is crucial to monitor the way in which ideas about the body, categorisation and possibilities of change are made to function within particular configurations. These are highly political terms, and the way in which they are set to work may take many different forms' (Bell 1999:117).

So to go on, I intend to look at the ways in which this 'locatedness' in Tilley's work becomes fixed in a particular experience of 'architecture' and embedded in notions of the dead. I will argue that these notions are all subsequently given form in one dominant and exclusive image.

'Looking Out and Going In' (Tilley 1994:136), is a synthesis of the nature and significance of the 'burial deposits' in the Black Mountain long barrows, or should I say chambered monuments.

'In the Pipton cairn a deposit of bones was discovered under the floor slabs of the south transept in Chamber I...' (1994:136, taken from Savory 1956);

'Chamber I at Ty Isaf contained the remains of at least 17 individuals...' (ibid:138, taken from Grimes 1939);

'The lateral chambers NEII and NEIII at Pen-y-Wyrlod, Talgarth contained the disarticulated remains of, respectively, six and seven individuals' (ibid:138, taken from Britnell and Savory 1984).

Here the dominant narrative of funereal burial sets up a particular set of expectations which inspired a particular kind of excavation practice and a particular form of 'architecture'. I am not suggesting that Tilley's treatment of human bone material is the same as Thurnam's, for his work with Shanks (1982) (and reference to Thomas's (1991) work) on the fragmentary and ordered nature of this material and its possible meanings is revelatory, but its 'locatedness' is the same. It is interesting to note that a focus on 'burial deposits' located in chambers is understood by Tilley to bracket off constituent parts of these building sites into pre-mound - mound marker (containing burial and chamber) - mound.

'A child burial in a cist in one of the horns of the monument indicates its secondary use after the monument had been closed and blocked off (1994:138, taken from Britnell and Savory 1984);

'Of the large number of Neolithic finds recovered from Gwernvale only a few are contemporary with the use of the monument, the rest dating to pre-cairn-construction occupation levels' (ibid:138, taken from Britnell and Savory 1984).

I would argue that the form of the architecture allowed for only one dominating form of knowledge.

There is something all too legible and familiar to the connections and dimensions, the form, of Tilley's architectural space. He writes:

'Architectural space only makes sense in relation to pragmatic, perceptual and existential space, but involves a deliberate attempt to create and bound space, create an inside, an outside, a way around, a channel for movement. Architecture is the deliberate creation of space made tangible, visible and sensible. This is why buildings play a fundamental role in the creation and recreation, production and reproduction of existential space and have profound structuring effects on perceptual space' (ibid:17).

Tilley writes of buildings not building sites. Areas of construction in the neolithic are to him buildings with chambers inside; or cairn axis orientation and chambers, metaphors of the human body (the spine and ribs), these measurements of the rib cage are plotted out in the geometric skein of the plan (Thomas and Tilley 1993). Did neolithic people objectify human bodies and areas of construction in this way? At these points in Tilley's work, where is an understanding of materiality being worked and where is the 'in-process' nature of archaeological evidence? Everything is reduced to stone and bone, axis and chamber. Surely, due to the materials that are worked in these areas, architectural space can never be pinned down or simply read as metaphor (see Barrett 1997 for a further critique of the different scales at work in Thomas and Tilley 1993). What if construction were about the continual negotiation of materials that were constantly being transformed?

For me, an embedded **form** to material evidence is a problem, and this is exacerbated by the particular kinds of people this writes a history for. This pre-dominance or exclusivity creates 'abject' positions for everything and everyone else (Butler 1993). Tilley writes:

'The placement of the bones of the ancestral dead in the chambers in effect *sedimented* them into the land, and with reference to the orientational axes of the chambers and passages. In this manner the

biographies of *individuals* became *fixed* in relation to particular places and axes of symbolic significance' (1994: 140, my emphasis).

I have attempted to demonstrate several areas of 'fixity' in Tilley's work which arise in his discussion of 'the body' and 'architecture', to carry on further and embed this fixity in the past, and as of that which is of symbolic significance, is to set up hierarchies of people. Those that are buried are more important than those that build. The people that do the burying, that order the bones in the exclusive space of the chamber, are more important than the 'audience' outside the monument. The hegemonic group that orchestrates such practice is supposedly any other group of individuals. However, individuals are never blanks in such work, they are always created through essentialist notions of the body and dominant forms of knowledge (i.e. particular images of 'architecture', see 1.3). These individuals are white and male (Tilley 1996 and 1999, Thomas and Tilley 1993). This non-image of twentieth century discourse, that has fixed and hierarchised bodies, is so powerful that it is implicit within Tilley's text, and so the image does not need to be produced any longer. The image of a sepulchral mound is an everlasting one and so is its creation and control by white male groups.

2.6 Metaphors of measurement

Julian Thomas in 'Understanding the Neolithic' (1999) has created, in Foucault's terms (1991), a 'genealogical' approach in 'attempting to understand how and why spaces were created and experienced in particular ways in neolithic Britain' (1999:37). This is a revolutionary approach in understanding the constitution and negotiation of historical process during the neolithic. Fragments and material conditions of human life are threads that materialise or are knitted together in particular ways. The knit or the weave, the points where different threads cross or are knotted together or indeed are frayed apart, these relationships are points from which people depart into understandings of the world.

My problem is with the ways in which Thomas 'reads' these genealogies, or, more particularly, the particular relationships between people and things that he recognises as material manifestations of human life. I will attempt to argue that there is an

unintentional exclusivity to 'reading' historical process as 'textual' prints or patterns, and that the mechanisms by which human life are materially manifest are not metaphorical, but works of transformation. I will argue that in his 'reading', or taking the measure of people and things as 'read', Thomas flattens architectural space. I will also return to a criticism I made of Tilley's work, asking whether this way of understanding the world is at all approachable through standard textual accounts and the visual images employed in archaeological publications.

Thomas' considers the experience of spatiality in terms of an inscribed landscape. He writes:

'...no discourse can ever refer unproblematically to **an object** which is somehow located outside language, outside time and outside context...The chance that we, existing *outside* the Neolithic social and cultural context, could ever present exactly the same *reading* of **a megalithic tomb** as would an inhabitant of Neolithic Britain is hence extremely slim. However, these remarks are not intended in a negative way, merely to encourage pessimism concerning the interpretation of past *architectural texts*...' (ibid:45-46, my emphasis).

From the outset I do not think Thomas objectifies areas of construction in terms of **a** completed building, nor indeed do I think that Thomas 'appreciates' these building sites as 'archaic objects' in the same way that I have argued Tilley did at particular points in his work. However, I am concerned that his use of literary metaphor can at times ascertain or give dimension to a restricted imaginative context in which we work our understandings of the world. Thomas argues that critics of metaphorical understandings of materiality have misapprehended 'the force of a metaphor', a force which, 'implies similarities between unlike things' (ibid:37). However this implies that the dimensions to our imaginative workings, past and present, are based on parallel notions (hence his notion of us as existing outside the neolithic rather than emphasising shared points of contact in negotiating the material conditions of past lives).

Metaphorical devices are crossings or mechanisms which interject between parallel lines of thought. My argument is not whether or not these are heuristic devices, I understand this to be the case. My problem is that metaphors can only give dimension or make legible particular points of connection. What of the rest of the knit or weave?

I do not imagine this in terms of a 'pattern' so much as a labyrinth of connections or a matrix. Materiality is necessarily about transformation. Thomas writes that 'The starting point for such an argument lies in considering monuments (and architectural forms in general) less as objects in themselves than as transformations of space through objects...' (ibid:35).

I argue that architectural space here is flattened into linear patterns through the restrictive imaginative capabilities of the metaphor, that the only transformation is in the crossing between 'things' and an understanding of where these 'things' end up. Surely this in-between space should mark the first of many points of departure into imagining other ways in which we could be caught up in materialness and each other, rather than being of itself the end-point of investigation. What if there were in the neolithic no forms or things at the outset outside of practice, in the same way that the matrix we negotiate as evidence for construction practice cannot be separated out into constituent parts? What if construction were about the possibilities and impossibilities in imagining architectural space? Working from this point of departure is a practice where nothing is marked from the outset. Areas of construction are then places where irreconcilable dimensions are fused together, and it is these acts of fusing that should be the subject of archaeological study. Construction work can then make statements about the impossibility of building; it pulls us into unimagined points of contact that depart into other articulations of how we might be caught up in materialness and each other (after Probyn 1993:6).

It is not the case that Thomas explicitly considers a material as a metaphor for something else, or that each 'structural shift' that he identifies within construction work breaks up areas into a 'particular phase'. However, he does recognise materials as 'constituent' parts and he does bracket or phase construction work into component parts that then make up a long barrow. These material parts and sequences of activity become fixed, or at least quite tightly restricted, in the ways in which he gives them form. Figure 2.18 represents a composite plan drawing of three earthen long barrows (Thomas 1999:135, figure 6.4). These are stratigraphical representations of staged performances. Each superimposition is taken by Thomas to directly signify a structural shift and a shift of meaning within these areas of construction. There are

pre-chamber – chamber - mound structures (see discussion of Tilley's phasing 2.5).
He writes,

'There is considerable evidence from the British barrows that these structures were open and accessible for some while before the construction of the covering mound. In a sense this confirms Piggott's original suggestion that the throwing up of the barrow might be seen as the equivalent of the blocking of a megalithic tomb, bringing to an end a sequence of depositional acts...' (1999:131).

Patterns of outline and stippling are overlaid in order to demonstrate this sequence. A commanding interest in the study of mortuary practices always leads to human bone material being located inside a chamber, which is situated in the centre of the three tiered structure (pre-chamber – chamber - mound). The chamber is, therefore, represented as a distinct building. Material evidence for work before the chamber is not related to the mound because the chamber has not been constructed and so this activity does not relate to mortuary practice. Since the chamber is the structure that relates to mortuary practice, once there are areas of construction that surround it, the chamber is considered to have been sealed in time. This is a slightly simplified version of Thomas's argument and I do not mean to be disparaging. I do wish to emphasise that there is a separateness that divides each of these structural shifts or structures. This separateness is, I have argued, due to the distinctiveness of the activity that operates within the chamber but also, and this is what I want to explore, the passive terms in which barrow architecture (the mound) is represented and the distinctiveness of the activity defined as pre-chamber. This material evidence is associated with another type of activity distinct from mortuary practices and so is considered by Thomas as not relating to the long barrow in activity, space or time.

I have already started to quote parts of Thomas's work at points in his argument where barrow architecture is reduced to a 'mound' and so as distinctly situated in time as post-chamber. He seems to also separate out the materials that are involved in construction work. He writes,

'The separate stages in the construction of the barrow often made use of distinctive and contrasting materials: chalk, turf, timber, earth, flint, sarsen or the oak brushwood overlying the cairn...It may have been this degree of freedom in interpreting the basic design of the monument which facilitated the eventual broadening of the variability of the long mound architecture...' (ibid:134-135).

However, sarsen is interpreted as already lying in the area of construction work and so is simply incorporated into the 'mound' (as at Beckhampton Road; Thomas 1999:203), or has been previously cleared to these areas during 'pre-mound' activity (South Street; *ibid*:203). Timber is either used to construct chambers and façades, or is employed to construct bay divisions which other distinct materials are then poured into. There is no active engagement with a barrow architecture. The constructed qualities of timber only seem to relate to chambers and façades, and the 'constructedness' of bays could easily be reduced to Thurnam's understanding of these materials being employed as devices to strengthen the solidity of a whole 'mound'. Timber bays and separate events of infilling are a means to an end in working towards a 'mound'; seen here they simply create temporary causeways to convey stone, rubble and earth for the next episode of dumping.

Similarly, why are the cuttings of pits and areas of ditch, along with the more upcast areas of barrow architecture, recognised as bounded entities divorced from each other? Why are these areas of construction separated from pre-chamber and post-chamber areas? Is this not activated or at least solidified in the finality of the composite plans? That is, pits and inter-cutting pits are understood to be worked around a sealed chamber and the material from this action is then structured into an upcast mound. However, construction work is never executed in this clean and precise fashion. Even if areas of construction are defined by the clean and precise outlines on plans, it cannot be worked in such a distinct and bounded way in practice. How do we know, apart from through the technologies of a phased plan, that chambers and bodies were not being worked within these building sites? And, if this architecture does seal chamber architecture, then the mess and disruption caused by construction work in these subsequent areas would have hampered any clean and direct association with bodies sealed inside chambers. Similarly, what clear evidence is there that areas of ploughing or clearance are sealed in time under these areas of construction? Is it not time that we start to consider just how dirty and disruptive these building sites would have been? What of the trample, spillage, breaking, cutting, raking that would have gone on in these areas? To be fair Thomas does discuss the possibility that these marks may 'equally relate to the early stages of mound-building, and might be integral to mortuary ritual' (*ibid*:24). However, this is

in the limited terms of the clearance of trees in preparation for more artificial construction work or as the simple incorporation of these areas into the location of the building site. Similarly, depositional activities outside chambers are considered to take place sequentially. Ditches, an area where a series of pits have been cut, have all to have been completed as a 'length of flanking ditch' before depositional practices commence. Excavation work is not detailed enough to 'prove' that deposits may have been made when pits were being created, or that this act then created the impetus for another pit being constructed. Pits that have already been constructed may have been returned to and reworked before deposition, these kinds of activity are not always made visible through weathering deposits and the propitious locations of offset recuts (see Adrian Chadwick 1999). What of 'structured deposition' within the area of the extant mound or an understanding of a more complex matrix to these worked areas? The dominant and specific images of long barrows, made up of composite plans, remain as templates for Thomas's understanding of these areas of construction.

The impression is of distinctive events of construction fixed as bounded entities through the hardline markings of the drawn plan. Each 'architectural feature' is, I argue, actualised as an architecture in its own right. For there is the accompanying conceptualisation in text that these areas were executed on the ground as on plan in a structurally independent manner (although Thomas has critiqued the 'plan view' 1993a). As I have argued in the case of Thurnam, plans also give the effect of encompassing everything, a technology which can supposedly pick apart all the detail of the body of the work down to its essentials and display the bare bones. This connects us, once again to the question that I have repeated time and time again in this chapter: Did the form of the architecture, its image, allow for only one dominating form of knowledge?

There is no attempt here, or indeed in the previous works I have critiqued, to write dynamic histories of construction. There is no attempt to imagine the potential disarray and disruption of construction work or the potential effects of these areas as construction sites. Instead, a sequence of performances are set out in planned patterns. An understanding of 'modular construction' (Thomas 1999:144) is given form in a series of plan drawings. Plan drawings, and the ways in which archaeologists are trained to approach material understandings of archaeological

evidence through them, have created an understanding of cleanly and precisely executed modules of construction. What of the histories that lie between these modules? Negotiation is a specific way of working and one that works well at an understanding of the practice of excavation and construction. This is a particular engagement where material conditions are worked with in a non-fixed way. These particular engagements create the possibility for other kinds of communication; there is the potential for an encounter with other kinds of relationships than had previously been expected or planned, and so other articulations of how we might be caught up in materialness and each other. What if we were to make more of this way of working, a negotiation of material conditions in the past and present, in our understandings of excavation and construction work? Then, as I have already argued in this chapter, we could open up our questioning of the materiality of architecture. Construction could then be about the possibilities and impossibilities in imagining architectural space. Working from this kind of point of departure is a practice where nothing is marked from the outset. Areas of construction could then be conceptualised as places where irreconcilable dimensions are fused together.

The visceral connectedness to this way of working is what I think Jeanette Winterson is aiming to achieve in her book 'Gut symmetries' (1997). The body metaphor is a measure used in Thomas's work (Thomas and Whittle 1986, Thomas and Tilley 1993). However, this is an analysis of the frame or bare bones rather than the gut. The 'anatomy of a tomb' (see Figure 2.19; Thomas and Whittle 1986:132, figure 2), is an exploration in dissection. Dissection here, however, is the clean and artificial image represented in medical text-books; dissection where no blood is spilt and no body parts or bodily fluids are secreted when an incision is made (see also Jordanova 1989). The commanding interest in the study of mortuary practices has once again lead to a history that centres on the plan of a chamber. Thomas distinguishes between earth-based and stone-based architecture on the grounds that:

'the principle difference between the two is that while the construction of the earthen barrows brought about the effective cessation of mortuary activity at these sites, the Cotswold-Severn tombs had chambers which remained accessible after the building of the cairn'(1999:143).

However, the accessibility and central focus in the study of chambers will remain the dominant and everlasting enterprise in archaeology as long as the technology of the plan drawing endures.

The mechanisms that Thomas has employed to separate out structurally independent 'architectural features' are also used as interpretative techniques in reading these prescribed images. Figure 2.19 is the plan of the chambers at West Kennet which have been separated from other areas of construction and reproduced in a structurally independent manner, a manner where the chamber too has been cut open and spread on a surface to be read. Thomas and Whittle write of this image:

'It is worth emphasising that the apparent internal categorisation is reflected in and is complementary to the architecture of the tomb...the architectural layout in separate chambers allows and emphasises segmentation and opposition, as well as the concealment stressed above' (1986:137).

There is a repeat here of the divisive categorisation employed in the production of the plan; further divisions have been prescribed through issues of interiority which separate out categories of chamber within the overall chamber layout. Secondly, this reading is then tied back in to an overall image 'considering the tomb as a whole' (ibid:130). However, this is a consideration of a complete barrow or mound that exists as an inert entity which had been constructed simply to cover the chamber, the chamber passage having maintained access to the 'interior structure'. In these terms, displayed in this staged setting, there can only be histories written concerning the use of a chamber (how one gained access to a chamber view and what this would have been like to those who had to wait outside faced with a view of a mound). Indeed Thomas and Whittle go on to write:

'All that need be impressed upon those lacking access to the tomb would be the strong continuity within the group constituted by the tomb's users. In addition this communication would be reinforced by the tomb's imposing architecture...The architecture thus serves to dominate as well as to conceal' (ibid:136).

Once again, the impression is of distinctive events of construction fixed as bounded entities through the hardline markings of the drawn plan. As an 'architectural feature', the chamber is actualised as an architecture in its own right. There is the

accompanying conceptualisation in text that these areas were executed in the ground, as on plan, in a structurally independent manner. Thomas goes on to write:

'It is significant that the principal configurations of space represented within the Cotswold-Severn tradition present quite different *potentials for ordering and staging mortuary practice*...These points indicate that these areas were *architecturally defined theatral spaces*...' (1999:146, my emphasis).

My problem with the study of mortuary practice is the stage has already been set by the plan of the chamber. This plan drawing illustrates the bones or the cage (chamber) as distinct and so dissected from the body (tomb/mound). It is impossible to make any visceral connections here. Everything is set and staged in this planned image and is literally a representation of theatrical space rather than lived space. Represented are the staged operations on a pickled cadaver rather than the rawness and fluidity of a living body trying desperately to carry on sputtering for breath. The plan of a chamber is not an image for rumination of the messy, disjunctive, knotted weave of a lived construction site. The measure of the construction sites which are abstracted in plan are not the manifestations of any lived histories.

2.7 The act of building

There would seem to be a problem with an enduring use of the plan drawing in post-processual accounts of construction work during the early neolithic of Britain. Not only is barrow architecture bracketed off into pre-chamber – chamber - post-chamber scenarios, but also the technology of the composite plan is used to illustrate each staged performance in a clean cut, structurally independent manner. There is no engagement with the dynamics of construction in these images and this is evidenced in the textual accounts where there is a written understanding of precisely executed and staged building work. The next archaeologist's work that I wish to consider is exciting specifically because he states from the outset a commitment to accounting for acts of building in his histories of the neolithic.

In a 1997 article Trevor Kirk wrote:

'In this paper I wish to adopt a different position which takes as its starting point Heidegger's proposal that technology and in particular the act of building entails *involvement* with the world rather than detachment from it...' (1997:59).

This is the nearest so far, within archaeological accounts, to the visceral connectedness at work in Jeanette Winterson writing (1997). In his work, Kirk points to these more dynamic connections that are to be made within building practice; connections that must be worked in order to consider the construction of people's identities and that must be negotiated by us as archaeologists in our constructions of social histories of the neolithic. Kirk refers to long mound architecture as a *medium* and outcome of our understandings of the act of building. In his theoretical projection there is no easy objectification of these areas of construction. Indeed, Kirk writes: 'Neither humanity nor materiality exists outside of the dialectic in which they are mutually constituted' (ibid). This would suggest that the subject of our study are the efforts of labour, the potential connections to be made in our encounters with these areas of construction, rather than a focus on things, or objects, or patterns of these in themselves.

However, I would argue that the sense of 'unity' that is emphasised within Heidegger's work is employed by Kirk due to a sense of ontological security with arranging parts or units to a purpose or effect that is ordainly perceived from the image of the plan. I would also argue that there is a connection with this sense of unity and the practice of collecting that I have outlined earlier in the chapter, and a sense that the archaeologist needs to be in control of all aspects of the neolithic s/he is writing. Kirk writes: 'To think and to form an understanding of the world demands a unity of mind, emotion, memory, perception, bodily movement, action and materiality' (1997:59). This is then grounded or 'located' by Kirk in a particular way: 'People and materiality inhabit history; they carry forward and constitute themselves in relation to biographies replete with the *dispositions of habitus...*' (ibid, my emphasis). The continual regimented association between things, which leads to a located understanding of the world, is something that I have found problematic in both Tilley and Thomas's work. Indeed both Tilley (1994) and Kirk (2000) use the terminology of 'sedimentation'. This unified agency is then quite tightly fixed, especially when the arrangement is distributed in a plan drawing. Before I review the

images that Kirk has employed in his texts, I wish to explore what exactly the author means by materiality. Kirk's archaeology is closely linked to that of Tilley's and Thomas's and so the critique is also directed at these works.

What are the differences that I foresee when I suggest that the subjects of our study are the efforts of labour, the potential connections to be made in our encounters with these areas of construction, rather than a focus on things or objects or patterns of these in themselves? I would see this as a fundamental difference in my response to a questioning of what constitutes the 'matter' of archaeological evidence. For example, Kirk also employs the concept of a matrix in his work. He writes:

'The matrix of the mound *draws together* a variety of materials from different locales within the landscape, locales with associated mythological, cultural, political and economic significance and meaning' (1997:60, my emphasis).

Not only does this language lessen the dynamic of the connections that have been **built** within these areas of construction to a simple drawing together of quite separate 'things', but I would argue that his meaning of 'drawing' is here the removal of 'something' from a mould. That is, a 'mound' as a mould, the mass of which contains 'internal structure' that has to be drawn out by the archaeologist (as with the 'Harris matrix', where things have to be carefully drawn apart; Harris et al. 1993). This 'internal structure' also operates as a mould and contains 'fills'. Kirk writes: 'Each bay of the mound contains a fill of rubble and/or earth which is different in character to that of all neighbouring bays' (1997:60). He then goes on in his work to list and define the 'repertoire of materials' that divide up rubble and/or earth 'fills'. These areas of construction have been boxed in by structure::fill scenarios. More portable material culture, as 'finds', have then been separated from these 'fills'. Rather than thinking of the dynamic ways in which all of these materials have been meshed together, everything has been separated out from everything else. This is due to an eternal fixation with materials in themselves rather than the possibility for different architectural construction techniques. Supposedly, the archaeologist can collect together themes that are associated with each of these material items, collect what exactly it is that is drawn on from elsewhere, and then work on what this would mean

when put together. I would argue that this is at the expense of dealing with an encounter with construction work.

Kirk describes a range of activities that he considers to have been involved in the act of building. These include the 'selection and deposition of building materials' (ibid:63), the 'conspicuous consumption of materials' (ibid:60), and 'creating novel forms of engagement with constructional materials' (ibid:61). These are indeed important practices but they are understood by Kirk as particular instances, or additional points of interest, within bay construction. These practices, although illuminating, are ultimately part and parcel of the same mould. Each material is separated out and thought of independently. These materials are thought to have worked a particular building technique in their own limited terms. These are then hidden again when considered overall in terms of the make-up of a 'mound'. Kirk writes: 'We must attempt to clarify here the nature of building as an interlacing of discursive knowledge...and a practical knowledge of 'how to go on'' (ibid:61). The interlacing of knowledge is an exciting and dynamic way of working, but why does this technique not apply to the ways in which materials are connected together within areas of construction. Why are materials not interlaced together?

Kirk goes on to write about particular associations that he has remarked on in areas of 'façade' and 'bay' structure. He notes that:

'the mound revetments are built in short sections, often in starkly contrasting building styles and with little attempt to tie one section into the next...the strategy for building the revetments was primarily geared to marking the limits of the bays which lay behind them' (63).

In Kirk's paper, each material is usually taken to identify a structure, but here the same material is used in the walls as in the bays. However, Kirk does not seem to see any connection between the two, the irony being that one is seen by him to be an external façade wall, the other an internal bay. For the first time, I would agree with following a confidence in a material category with 'walling' twisting into what he understands as 'bay structure'. Surely, given that this sequence is part of the same structure, it is this that is of importance, rather than the symbolic disruption within a supposed overall theme of façade walling. These twists could be understood as

deliberate interventions in the orientation of construction work, that not only act to block the rhythm of wall construction, but also tie it into a more subtle connected fabric within the barrow architecture. I also worked on the excavation of these areas and the following is part of what I wrote of this encounter:

“Transverse structures’ are situated in order to create an *interaction* with the area of the ‘wall’, which physically interrupts an east-west orientation in construction. Construction work in this particular area restricts or mediates access in terms of body movement, transforming the orientation of action. In this case an east-west orientation was blocked-off and action had turned back in on itself to tie up with the rest of the construction matrix’ (McFadyen 1992).

Figure 2.20, is a photograph of a ‘free-standing dry-stone wall feature’ (Kirk 1997:63, figure 3), an area of construction at La Commune-Seche which Kirk argues was ‘conspicuously consumed’ and ‘sealed by the matrix of the surrounding cairn’ (ibid:63). What is interesting about this photograph are the hierarchies of material that are framed and displayed for us to read. In the foreground are the remnants of ‘façade walling’ constructed from regular courses of large blocks of limestone. Behind this are the smaller blocks of limestone that have been worked up in substantial courses and so are deemed to be part of dressed walls by Kirk. Partly in the shadows are the smaller plaquettes of limestone that have been intricately laced together and that have been removed as ‘fill’ in order to expose the ‘dressed stonework’ of structure 375. Façade to bay to fill, what could be simpler, except that the intricate interleaving of materials that resides partly in the shadows will not go away. The textures, from the complex interdigitating of materials, seem to be contained by the coursed stonework rather than the other way round.

If we return to Kirk’s writing on the supposed short sections of facade, he says: ‘The entire fabric of the cairn is therefore inherently unstable. Indeed, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the cairn was designed to decay rapidly’ (ibid:63). I would argue that rather than there being something inherently unstable about this construction site, there is evidence for a deliberate and imaginative working of materials into a precarious weave. If the small plaquettes are understood to be chosen materials within this weave of architecture, rather than being seen as unidentified make-up within an overall body of unstable cairn material, then this material can be understood to have been deliberately angled and threaded through other materials on

more than one level and in more than one direction. By this I mean that the courses of stone and the deposits of earth are interdigitated or interleaved in a highly complex, fluid manner that defies any attempt to create a simple structural or stratigraphic sequence. This matrix, or weave, uses some materials to prop others up. If we look again at what lies partly in the shadows of Figure 2.20, it is not hard to imagine how earthen materials or limestone plaquettes have been employed to prop up further limestone plaquettes on precarious angles that then lean on other materials so that they weave themes of construction through an overall matrix. Simple structure::fill scenarios do not explain this form of architecture. It is the pitching of small plaquettes, held within an entire matrix of laid stone and earth-based materials, that gives the impression of fluidity within this architecture. It is this mesh of things that allows plaquettes to be woven through their make-up and which spiral in and out, below and above, other areas of construction.

I do not mean to demean Kirk's work on construction practice in the neolithic, indeed I am inspired by this work. However, I would argue that his work is ultimately reappropriated into a mould that has been set by the plan drawing. The feminist architect Pia Ednie-Brown says that:

'already-made laws tend to restrain the perceived from flowing out of strictly delimited moulds, and train it to abrogate the shifts that rustle across the surface of perception. They maintain an impeccable garden in which new life is already tame, and *unplanned* emergence is outlawed' (1999: 9, my emphasis).

It is the shifts and rustles, the possibilities for more ephemeral material having been employed in construction practice, that ultimately inspire my archaeology. I would argue that it is of more interest to envisage a construction site during the neolithic where there were encounters between far more varied materials which could not be separated out into their constituent parts but were meshed together from a whole series of architectural principles woven through in twists and turns and spirals.

2.8 *Constructional histories*

I struggle slightly with the archaeological accounts of the archaeologists that I have previously described. I feel I have to partly rework the dynamics of social life that

they imagine back into material and historical conditions. Social histories, of the past and the present, should be able to engage with the dynamics of fragmentation, disruption, interruption, interlacing, interaction, complication, inconvenience, precisely because it is the **negotiation** of material conditions that is the subject of our studies and the dynamics that are activated in dealing with those material conditions. I have been influenced most strongly in envisaging the world in this way, and in working attempts at articulating these kinds of connective theories, by the archaeologist John Barrett. He has written of archaeological projects that ‘we move away from asking ‘what kinds of people made these conditions?’, to an understanding of what the possibilities were of being human within those material and historical conditions’ (1994:5). This way of working is to actively engage with an understanding that people make and are the histories that we study. Archaeological projects are about historical process and so the humanities created during past practice are connected to us in our own struggles to come to know them when dealing with some of those conditions.

Importantly, this way of working has meant that Barrett considers areas of neolithic construction as long-term projects. It is the material efforts of past people, their labour, that is the subject of his study. It is the unplanned nature of these projects, that which is negotiated during construction practice, that has been highlighted and developed in his work (Barrett 1988, 1994). He writes of the Avebury henge complex that:

‘the fallacy has been to convert regularity into a rule and thus to presuppose a planned intention...Avebury is the physical remnant of a number of abandoned projects and not the culmination of a series of planned phases’ (1994:13).

I have argued earlier in this discussion that negotiation is a specific way of working and one that works well at an understanding of the practice of excavation and construction. This is a particular engagement where material conditions are worked with in a non-fixed way. These particular engagements create the possibility for other kinds of communication; there is the potential for an encounter with other kinds of relationships than had previously been expected or planned and so other articulations

of how we might be caught up in materialness and each other. I would argue that this is very close to, and indeed inspired by, what Barrett is aiming at in his archaeology.

An investment in these labours, past and present, means that we should be writing constructional histories for areas of long barrow construction and that we should be thinking critically about the politics of building. Barrett writes:

'The alternative is to recognize that this monumentality originated in neither the idea nor the plan, but rather in the practice and in the project. It existed and it was known only through the moments of its execution' (ibid:23).

Construction could then be about the possibilities and impossibilities in imagining architectural space. Working from this kind of point of departure is a practice where nothing is marked from the outset. Areas of construction could then be conceptualised as places where irreconcilable dimensions are fused together. It is also a line of enquiry that opens up our questioning of the materiality of architecture.

It is not necessarily the case that there is a dramatic difference in the kinds of materials that are recognised over others in this archaeology. It is more that in Barrett's work he has perceived the 'constructedness' of these more ephemeral materials. They are understood by Barrett to have been involved in construction processes, they are architectural. Or more precisely still, the efforts of labour that went into creating this more ephemeral evidence are perceived differently. These more ephemeral materials are not pulled apart into their separate material categories, it is the interstices and the points where they come together that is explored and dynamic technologies in the context of their production are imagined. For example, at the site of Gwernvale, Barrett writes that:

'The traces of timber structures and artefacts indicate that some of those who had participated in those activities did so by positioning themselves to face a natural monolith. The path of approach they took towards that monolith ultimately defined the line of the major axis of the cairn, and the monolith became incorporated within the cairn as the 'blind' façade' (1988:53).

He has taken the initiative from the ways in which these materials connect. In recognising a long constructional history for these areas, he has recognised the

important dynamics of the most ephemeral of traces within the landscape. Barrett has written of these material and historical conditions as part of a particular 'timespace matrix of activity' (1988:32), and not with some preconceived form of a long barrow dominating the narrative. He has also stated of the long constructional history at Gwernvale, that 'it was from these activities that the architectural elements of a chambered cairn also came to be constructed' (1988:34).

Similarly, Barrett has reworked and so transformed archaeologists' perceptions of the constructional histories of Horslip, Beckhampton Road and South Street (cf. Ashbee et al. 1979). Of these he has written, 'These traces are the slight, and apparently inconsequential, remains of the meetings and exchanges between people who by these acts of inscription remembered the significance of each place' (1994:56). With this work, we have a different point of departure; we are now concerned with these 'cultural geographies' (ibid:56) and the humanities created as part of these lived landscapes. However, he then reverts back to writing of the simple and sequential material transformation of these areas:

'The building of the Beckhampton and South Street mounds involved the construction of a series of fenced bays into which were dumped deposits of sarsen, turf and chalk rubble. The Beckhampton mound was further revetted by chalk and turf and the South Street long mound was fronted by a solid mass of chalk rubble. The flanking ditches, whence much of the building material came, were abandoned once the mounds were in place' (ibid:56-57).

Why? Why do I feel so let down, why do I feel such a loss of dynamic here? Where is the sense of frisson in the activities described? I return again to the question that I have recurrently posed within this chapter: did the form of the architecture allow for only one dominating form of knowledge?

The warning signs, in answering 'yes' to this question, are explicit when Barrett writes of the constructional history of Hazleton North. Rather than being concerned with cultural geographies and their histories, he is automatically caught up in processes of integration. More exclusively he is caught up in a process of 'integrating specific activities to produce a monumental form' (1988:34). Interestingly, this shutting down in historical discourse is brought about at the same time as the appearance of architectural themes of enclosure:

‘Two orthostatic chambers were constructed independently, *facing* north and south and lying to the east of a midden of flint, pottery, bone, quernstone fragments and carbonised seeds. The cairn was then constructed from rubble derived from two *flanking* quarries. Dumps of rubble were built up and *revetted* by dry-stone walling. They ran west and east from the chamber before returning to *enclose* the southern chamber...At the western end of the cairn a broad façade was formed, at a point already marked by earlier activity. The whole cairn was again *enclosed* by a revetment wall’ (1988:34, my emphasis).

To Barrett, ‘cairns’ and ‘mounds’ are the efforts of various selected inert materials that have been conflated together to enclose or seal off reserved spaces. I would have to argue that Barrett’s work is ultimately re-appropriated into the exclusive architectural mould due to a focus on the reserved space of the chamber, and a focus on the activities that took place within them. Like Thomas, Barrett is concerned with mortuary practice, particularly with evidence for this from the chamber areas of these sites.

His work is revolutionary in that in it he has distinguished between funerary rites and ancestral practices:

‘The physical remains of the corpse now becomes a medium through which different, if closely related, strategies might have operated. By distinguishing between funerals, in particular burial, and ancestral rites we are in a rather better position to untangle the complexity of the archaeological evidence’ (1994:51).

He is remarkably critical of archaeological evidence of human material remains:

‘We must be more careful in considering the technologies by which these relationships between the living and the dead were structured, because it was through these technologies that the living transformed the material conditions which defined their own existence’ (ibid).

However, this is at the expense of a historical discourse which is concerned with the material and historical conditions of construction in which these treatments of the human body are situated. I repeat the points that I raised within Thomas’ work: How do we know, apart from through the technologies of a phased plan, that chambers and bodies were not being incorporated into building sites? And, if a ‘mound’ was being worked on in order to seal chamber architecture, then the mess and disruption caused

by construction work in these areas would have hampered any clean and direct association with bodies inside chambers.

Figure 2.21 is Barrett's version of Piggott's reconstructed image of West Kennet long barrow (1994:59, figure 2.9). Barrett has employed this image, as indeed did Thomas, to demonstrate how 'chamber', 'façade' and 'forecourt' areas, could have been employed during the neolithic by a select few as a medium:

'to bracket a period of activity which linked the front-space of the stage with the back-space of the chambers...The monument orientated each participant and called upon them to recognize the distinctions which existed between them' (ibid:58).

The image props up the statements that are made in the text. There can be no other history for this particular timespace matrix of activity, due to the particular props that are drawn into the image and which control the ways in which we give dimension to this area of construction. Splayed open and foregrounded are the dominating static forms of the orthostats. These uprights are shaded or lit by a sun which highlights their fixed state; they are the 'sure' immovable foundations of architecture; they are rocks. The techniques of archaeological practice dominate. There are the parallel line neat vertical spade cuts of the archaeologist's trench, a trench that has cut into Stukeley's grassy mound (see Figure 2.6). Indeed, the sections that the spade cuts reveal are all about deturfing inert earth (that redundant and geological category within archaeological practice - topsoil). A deturfing exercise onto an almost natural topography, for the section behind the back chamber reveals to us that there is nothing of consequence here. The people are black hardline outlines on white paper space. Transfixed in this medium they have literally turned to stone, passed over like the orthostats by the light and shade of the sun. The landscape is the white paper of the book, Barrett (1994) and Piggott's (1962) domain, on which all of this is placed and then stippled with shadow. This image says more about the practice of archaeology and archaeologists than it does about the ways in which neolithic people lived their lives. This is the technology of the plan and the only neolithic that it can produce is the clean hard control of one human figure over everyone and everything else.

Barrett has written, 'We must now recognize that funerary and ancestral rites need only have been one part of a broad spectrum of activities which contributed towards this programme of monument building' (1994:54).

My feelings are that things have to change.

Prefix 3

Why the Cotswold-Severn group?

In attempting a re-assessment of the Cotswold-Severn 'monuments' of the Brecknock region, I have had to incorporate an historical perspective, for in so doing, the development of conceptual and analytical categories in the history of architectural research and interpretation can be considered. Any discussion of the construction of these architectures has to be situated with regard to the existing, established, academic tradition of megalithic studies. It is for this reason that I have deliberately chosen to work on more complex architectures which were constructed from small stones and more ephemeral materials that were entwined or knitted together, and where the matrix of materials involved in that construction work was also characterised by earthen materials in addition to stone.

Why only Gwernvale?

Most of the chambered monuments of the Brecknock region are categorised as part of the Cotswold-Severn group due to their perceived similarity with Cotswold-Severn monuments elsewhere (Crawford 1925, Daniel 1950, Corcoran 1972). However, this architecture is understood primarily in terms of the shape and layout of chambers, with discussion of barrow architecture restricted to overall mound shape, façades or to technical explanations for the containment of mounds through revetment. More ephemeral aspects of barrow architecture were only recorded as sketchy additions to schematic plan drawings; or as conventions used in drawing the plans and sections, which ignore the necessary small scale detail (the site of Pipton (Savory 1956) and Penywyrldod II, (Britnell and Savory 1984)). With the exception of more detailed open-area excavations carried out at Gwernvale in 1977 and 1978 (Britnell and Savory 1984), most of the categorisation of these monuments is based on antiquarian investigations or limited trenching. Carn Goch was dug into by estate workers in 1847 (RCHAM (Wales) 1997); Penywyrldod I was excavated in 1920-21 by the Woolhope Club (ibid); Ffostyll north and south were investigated in the 1920s by C.E. Vulliamy (Vulliamy 1922 a and b), who also looked at Little Lodge in 1929 (RCHAM (Wales) 1997); Tŷ Isaf was excavated by W.F. Grimes in 1939 (Grimes 1939); Pipton by H.N. Savory in 1949 (Savory 1956); with sections examined on either side of Mynydd Troed in 1966 (RCHAM (Wales) 1997). I have, therefore, dealt directly in my research work with the evidence at the site of Gwernvale.

Summary of the site of Gwernvale

I would like to acknowledge Bill Britnell from the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust for his work at Gwernvale (Britnell and Savory 1984). The site is located to the south of the Black Mountains, in Powys, Wales, on the northern side of the Usk valley. The predominant features of this site were a red sandstone long cairn (17m in width by 45m in length). The long axis of the cairn was orientated in an east-west direction, with three orthostatic lateral chambers with passage-ways constructed from courses of sandstone plaques. A large quantity of human bone was located in chamber 1, and human bone was also recovered from the buried soil, and the buried soil at the eastern end of chamber 2. The entrance-ways to chambers 1 and 2 faced south, and the entrance to chamber 3 faced north. An inner and outer revetment wall were defined during the excavations as well as a horned forecourt at the eastern end of the cairn. A large stone was identified as a natural monolith and was located between chamber 1 and the forecourt. Below some of the stonework, in what was understood to be a 'pre-cairn' context, were the remains of a timber structure (in the area that would become the northern horn-work of the forecourt) and a six-post timber structure (in what would become the central area of the forecourt). There were a series of inter-cutting pits at the western end of the site which contained several pig bones. Worked flints from the palaeolithic through to the bronze age were encountered during the excavation, along with neolithic pottery and animal bone; several fragments of quernstone and reworked pieces of polished axe were recovered from the matrix of the cairn.

In this chapter I examine the procedures that were involved in the creation and maintenance of excavation categories. It is hoped that detailed analysis at this level will offer an insight into the ways in which excavation categories were directly employed in an interpretative framework of neolithic architecture and how these limit our understanding of the techniques and material resources involved in neolithic construction work. I hope in this chapter to expose a tautological process in the system of archaeology and the methodologies employed during excavation. I have identified in the Gwernvale archive key elements that were assumed to be architectural in archaeological contexts, and then I have attempted to demonstrate the

ways in which, as excavation categories, these dominated excavation and interpretative practice. I re-assessed the Gwernvale archive by a process of re-planning the 1:20 plans in the archive (held at the offices of the Clwyd-Powys Archaeological Trust). This was in order to connect structures from supposed 'pre-cairn' and 'cairn' contexts and in order to draw out the complexities in barrow architecture that had existed. These more complex architectural themes were constructed from a variety of different and more ephemeral materials which were entwined together through a variety of different construction techniques. I then used these more connective plans to digitise different layers of detail onto the original plan of the Gwernvale site. I have also zoomed in on different areas of the construction site in order to demonstrate more fully the intricate ways in which materials were knitted together, and in order to imagine these areas of construction in a more partial way. I also inverted zoomed in plans in order to foreground the materials rather than the hard-line outline of the planner's pencil.

There is still a long way to go with this work. For example, although I have critiqued structure::fill scenarios, I have only represented in text a more dynamic way in which to understand more earth-based substances. This also goes for material culture that had been fragmented and transformed and directly incorporated into the construction matrix. Artefacts were encountered during Britnell's excavation with an intent to pick out and remove them from their associated contexts. A descriptive record was produced of an artefact's specific location (co-ordination within a grid system), and a written note was made on a context index card. However, this technology of representation was an aid in post-excavation finds processing and the interpretation of architectural features, it was not directed towards a more detailed consideration of material culture as an architectural material resource in its own right. It is important that these concepts be followed through within the next two chapters of my thesis.

Chapter 3. From Gwernvale to a new focus of inquiry: concepts of neolithic architecture and building sites within the Black Mountains.

‘I am recommending the ancient tradition of making as big a fuss, as noisy a complaint about the world as is humanly possible. Where Orwell wished quietism let there be rowdyism; in place of the Whale, the protesting wail. Therefore the geography I am examining, so totally outside the whale, is the geography of keening and wailing, of trying to find both articulation and signification for that constant unease between efforts at self-positioning and the languages and knowledges available for us to write these into culture. It is an unease inscribed both with a sense of loss of that earlier seamless emplacement we might have thought we had and with the insecurity of not yet having a coherent alternative to inhabit’ (Irit Rogoff 2000:14-15).

I want to begin this chapter by further questioning what we imagine ‘architecture’ to be. What ‘building blocks’ have to be laid and in place for material workings and traces to be considered ‘architectural’? What time/space perspectives are employed in considering a history of architectural process? Or which historical moments are built? In chapters 1 and 2, I have attempted to elucidate the ways in which particular images of ‘architecture’ come into being and are claimed as vital to the foundations of architectural and archaeological histories. I have also attempted to critically highlight the viewing apparatuses that were employed in representing these ‘architectures’. Moreover, rather than thinking of these apparatuses as separate from ‘architecture’ (as tools at our disposal for representation), I hope I have shown how they are implicated and a part of an architectural regime.

3.1 Architecture and the historical moment

Before working through the detail and the make-up of the building site of Gwernvale, I want to remark again on the particular time/space perspectives that were employed by Tilley, Thomas, Kirk and Barrett. Firstly, from the fixed conditions of Tilley’s work (where there seemed to be the ‘essential’ qualities of the pre-given form of a built monument), there was an opening up of the constructional dynamic in Thomas’s work. However, this dynamic was too tightly staged. Here there was the theatrical space of staged performances that were executed and captured in plan. If you like, whereas in Tilley’s work there was a history of one historical moment (the past experience of a completed building), with Thomas there was a

series of sequential historical moments (between the bounded entities of architectural modules formed in a composite of plans). This unity and boundedness, this sequence of historical moments, also surfaced in Kirk's work. Here, I suggested that the 'unity' in his work was due to a sense of ontological security with arranging parts or units to a purpose or effect, and which was perceived from the image of the plan. The damage and disappointment I felt from these limited histories and limited architectural imagines was most painfully played out in Barrett's work. For here there seemed to be a long constructional history being written that had a constructed quality to it (i.e. Barrett seemed to take the initiative from the ways in which materials connect rather than consider dividuated materials in their own right). However, he did have a penultimate architecture in mind which was ultimately hard-line and about enclosure and control. It shut down the implications of previous ephemeral material connections, and produced a polaroid plan of someone - someone in control of the entrance to a stone chamber, framed by a stone theatral façade, and looked on at by an audience of everyone else (everyone else, the people that archaeologists seem incapable of writing histories for).

In order to strengthen my argument against these neolithic histories, I would like to reference Victor Buchli's archaeologies of architecture (1999). Buchli has critiqued a 'system of architecture' that operates within social theories. He writes:

'...an attraction to 'systemness' within diachronic archaeological understanding favours the continuity of structures rather than adequately understanding nuances of variability- why structures change and why they might be discontinuous or rejected (or why in fact one should evince a structure at all and if so, to what end?)' (1999:10).

He then goes on to suggest that:

'Similarly, ethnoarchaeological and ethnographic understandings, despite the promises of 'structuration principle' and 'habitus', privilege the 'ethnographic moment' or synchronic 'snapshots' of structures that similarly skirt the issue of change and discontinuity...' (ibid).

This is important in terms of my work since views of particular historical moments are taken to stand for all meanings of that constructional space. A snapshot of that constructional history at 'the end' of building work is built into archaeologists'

understanding of monumentality. We witness in photographs and reconstruction drawings a built structure rather than a building site. This structure is represented as a unique design, that has a durable form and a particular and enduring meaning. Instead, Buchli's archaeologies of architecture are works which he hopes:

'...demonstrate, across a spectrum of concerns, the utility of shifting away from our preoccupation with presence (the material record and material culture in general) towards one of absence; that is, to move away from a desire to establish the 'structuration principle' of Anthony Giddens or the 'habitus' of Pierre Bourdieu and other such consensuses over a 'theory of material culture' towards – instead - a sensibility that embraces radical discontinuity, 'undecidability' and conflict' (ibid:5).

Inspired by Buchli, I hope to make more of these more disruptive issues in my critiques of the excavation work at the site of Gwernvale. As I deconstruct these excavation reports, I want you to keep in mind or locate in your imagination a building site rather than a building or monument. Drawing from Buchli's work, I want to tease out long constructional histories for these areas; areas that are never foreclosed and that can never be understood from one historical moment. Instead, these Neolithic 'architectures' should be perceived of as a constructive continuum. In this, emphasis was placed on acts of construction and the continuity of ideas through the practice of construction, rather than focussing on a building in its own right. This shifts the emphasis from the permanence of the material or the planned building. We can then envisage barrows as construction sites, where the politics of building was continually being negotiated. Perhaps it is fitting that our understandings of Neolithic construction sites should always remain fluid, and never fully explained or resolved. After all, this is likely to have been the case in the past too. To quote from Buchli once again:

'... 'outsides', 'spaces' or 'gaps' offer great liberating potential and explanatory power if we move away from thinking about 'presences' (what 'things' are) to 'absences' (how 'things' are not)' (ibid:20).

3.2 Gwernvale

My point of departure has no point of origin, the archaeological evidence that we are dealing with at Gwernvale is, I will argue, always an encounter with previous

assemblages of things. There will be no starting point to this archaeological account but instead a series of journeys within already known landscapes. Woodland, to the south of the Black Mountains, was not some original untouched primary natural area (see critique of this imperialist and social evolutionary politic in Mark Pluciennik 1998). This wooded area was always a part of the lived landscapes of gatherer-hunters. This is in opposition to the views held by Britnell when he writes that:

‘Palaeobotanical research carried out in mid Wales has shown that the woodland or scrub that had developed during the Flandrian- dominated by oak and alder, but with variations in other species such as lime, hazel, and pine probably dependent upon local topography- was eventually superseded from a time following the elm decline, by a landscape dominated by sedges, heather, and grasses. The decline in elm pollen values has been shown to represent a fairly reliable synchronous horizon in the British Isles, dated to about 3300-3100 bc...and it has been argued that in Wales the replacement of woodland by blanket peats in upland areas which began at about this time, was greatly affected by human activity...’ (Britnell and Savory 1984:138).

I will discuss the detailed nature of lived landscapes much more in the following chapter, and I am aware that Britnell had to discuss these matters without work on the pollen sequences and environmental remains from the buried soil having been carried out at Gwernvale. However, even in general terms, there are key ontological problems with the ways in which Britnell understands the landscape that the construction work at Gwernvale is a part of. Wooded areas were not some kind of static, elemental, natural feature that remained inert through changing time-space events. Within the black box bars of pollen diagrams are hidden the minutiae and details of aspects of plant/animal/human lives. The temporality of tree growth is one important aspect to all of this and an awareness that there is a context within which trees are situated. Where is tree growth and tree-fall and the differences this would create to the material and historical conditions to the ways in which people would have negotiated these landscapes? The possibilities for such intimate relations are missing in such static and redundant understandings of the ‘environment’. Anthony Brown (1997, 2000) has written about the ways in which tree life was/is caught up in the dynamics of human life. He details the effects of forest gaps or clearings through tree fall and the particular opportunities this created in terms of human experience. But the point here is that tree fall was not a ‘propitious’ circumstance that people in some way surprisingly stumbled across. With tree life, there is a sense of agency that

has to be taken into account, and where there are agencies there are also histories of past dynamics to be encountered and negotiated. This brings me back to my point that the archaeological evidence that we are dealing with at Gwernvale is always an encounter with previous assemblages of things.

Knowledge of tree/animal/human life within wooded areas was acquired whilst going about everyday tasks and whilst undertaking journeys from place to place (Ingold 2000). These lived landscapes were known in part through encounters with past materialities, be this evidence for the ways in which other people lived their lives in the form of coppiced or fallen trees, the remains of timber structures, hearth settings, debris from flint knapping, tools, dead animals, or the remains of past meals, routeways and paths, recently cleared or partly overgrown by vegetation and saplings. Wooded areas were littered with the remains of past practice, past practice intimately woven with tree as well as animal life. In this way distinctions between tree-fall clearance, the enhancement of tree fallen areas by people, or indeed areas of trees completely cleared by human activity alone are blurred in the fifth millennium B.C. (Brown 1997 and 2000, Evans et al. 1999). Archaeological evidence necessarily has to deal with such busy contexts. As I have already said, there will be no starting point to this archaeological account but instead a series of journeys within already known landscapes. Britnell had a starting point, a point of origin, in an unmarked natural environment. By doing so he might as well already have arrived at his destination. For he has closed down irrefutably the possibilities for the ways in which mesolithic people lived their lives. They are of nature, in his origin myth, but they cannot exactly be nature for he understands archaeological evidence as being proof that there were material 'traces' to their lives. I hope to show how he will separate out a particular type or 'trace' of material as mesolithic, as separate from nature but as distinct from neolithic markings.

3.3 Stratigraphy and the geological motif

'The general location of Gwernvale on the margins of upland Wales, and on a terrace overlooking the Usk, may have provided a convenient vantage point from which the resources provided by several distinct ecological zones could be easily reached. There is no positive evidence of direct continuity

between any of the earlier prehistoric phases; in each case the range and quantity of the material equipment suggests temporary settlements which may have become superimposed by chance' (Britnell and Savory 1984:136).

How does it come about, the expectation by archaeologists that they will encounter different time-space events within distinct soil deposits or layers? Evidence seems to need to be made manifest in clear and distinct time/space layers. Why? This seems bizarre, especially when we consider the contexts that we are dealing with. Most of the evidence for mesolithic lives encountered by Britnell at Gwernvale came from late mesolithic/early neolithic pits. How can Britnell write of the supposed impossibility of there having been connections between different groups of people, when at the same time he finds it so difficult in his own labours with this evidence to extricate different 'types' of material. For example, he writes of his efforts that:

'Late Upper Palaeolithic and Mesolithic Activity Implements characteristic of the Late Upper Palaeolithic, early Mesolithic and Late Mesolithic have been *isolated from the mixed assemblage* of flintwork present at the site...' (ibid, my emphasis).

There are three main problems I have with the ways in which archaeological evidence is recognised and dealt with by Britnell. These are a naturalistic view of palaeolithic and mesolithic landscapes, an assumed contrast in the material conditions between palaeolithic/mesolithic and neolithic lives, and the inability to think that people (other than archaeologists) consciously laboured at coming to terms with evidence from the past. Let us take the first of these. I have attempted to show how landscapes are/were always known, and how these wooded areas were littered with the remains of past practice, past practice intimately woven with tree as well as animal life. So you see, with the ways in which these ontological understandings work, there can never be a starting point. There can never be an understanding of human life as setting out in an already formed yet 'empty' landscape, because people were a part of that landscape and intimately a part of tree as well as animal life. The concept of group after group of people setting out into 'virgin territory' cannot be supported. As I have already argued, these lived landscapes were known in part through encounters with past materialities. Britnell writes of the 'intensity of activity during these periods' as low scale and sporadic, and of the mobility that was a part of these people's lives in terms of 'temporary settlement' (ibid). To me this more than suggests a thinking in terms of

the 'low impact' of these peoples lives *on* the 'archaeological record'. However, after Linda Patrik (1985) and Barrett (1987), there is no archaeological record but instead evidence for the ways in which people negotiated the material and historical conditions of their lives. Thus archaeological evidence is about dynamics or the ways in which bodily dynamics could have been negotiated, it is not about the material effects or outcome of practice, it is about the very conditions in which that practice was created and carried out. If archaeological evidence is about dynamics and agencies, these cannot be assessed in terms of intensity or as one dynamic having more impact in the world than another. There is no essentialism here. The negotiation of different material and historical conditions creates different kinds of humanities, but none of these can be understood as having been more or less intense, for how can one body be more or less intense than another?

I want now to think of the material and historical conditions of fifth and fourth millennia B.C. lives, but through an understanding of people's labour. For these landscapes were lived and known through the efforts of labour; and material culture, historicity and sociability were inspired by tasks and encounters with past materialities. It is the smaller things and deeds that are a part of the routines of peoples lives, that I want to take inspiration from. In so doing, I will aim to pass through a barrier that has been created by archaeologists, a barrier that has been erected from the legacy of monumentality. In Britnell's account I will attempt to show the ways in which layers and surfaces only pick out certain things and certain constructional periods for history. The first problem with Britnell's account is that the material culture and the people that I have discussed above are now resigned to a pre-monumental fate. Layers and surfaces have set up a certain way of knowing long barrow architecture. They have set or sedimented an understanding of these areas of construction into pre-chamber and cairn, chamber and cairn, blocked or post-chamber and cairn temporalities. These dominant building processes have come to characterise our understandings of the neolithic; and as a particular kind of practice they are considered as distinct from our understandings of mesolithic worlds. Below the stone, pre-chamber and cairn activities are held in a buried soil; strata of earth, with material culture supposedly pinned within it, that is used by archaeologists to harken back to early times. However, these fossils never quite lose their geological motif, and so the people that once used them are caught between nature and culture and are in the

process fossilised themselves. How can we change this? I think we can make an important stab at it by unpicking the dominant layers and looking again at the smaller detail, the day to day practices that have been brushed over by the overbearing stone architecture. Let us look again at the efforts of these labours and see where it takes us. What else is there to imagine or to make of a 'buried' soil?

Britnell argued that it was important to mark some activities as particular to mesolithic history, and so we know that people had at least cut into the ground and created one pit on this gravel terrace (1984:50). Nevertheless, I have been attempting to transform that terrace through imagery of human/animal/tree life and the ways in which these were woven together, so that it is no longer possible to think of a so-called original or natural gravel terrace anymore. This lived ledge of land was a part of gatherer-hunter landscapes. You cannot use a landscape, for landscapes are intimately bound to people, you cannot step back or out from them, as Tim Ingold says you can use land but not landscape (landscapes are a part of a person's perception of the world; Ingold 2000). So this area came to be known through a series of journeys and tasks, it perhaps became significant in relation to other places through clearance, more possible than not through tree-fall, and so the ground here was disturbed and transformed. Over time, the fallen trunks rotted, patches of grassland and hazel scrub occupied this spot, and further tree growth was checked by grazing animals. People lit fires and made and repaired tools. We know that these materials were not taken away with them as they moved on through their landscapes. These things, to do with feeding, heating and sheltering the human body were combined with the soil and vegetation of this place.

At some point these archaeological materials become a mesh of things and encounters that cannot be separated out into a mesolithic and then neolithic stratigraphy. For example, we know that a burin was placed in the crevice of an orthostatic stone. However, we cannot as archaeologists pin this act to a particular characteristic point in time. We cannot tag this artefact with the mesolithic alone. For the working of action around that stone set up a rhythm of activity for a far longer period of time (an axial line was constructed that was informed from the echoes and orientation of that activity). Furthermore, the landscape was transformed through construction, the earth was altered and certain of the sandstone boulders that were revealed during that

process were left in place while others were removed. In the working of that soil, microlithic flint tools were encountered from previous activities. We know that neolithic flint tools, the remnants from meals, the pottery used in the preparation and consumption of that food, were also 'left' in these areas under construction for future encounters, creating a taskscape that involved an encounter with past materialities (Ingold 2000).

This material is a web of time-space activity which does not separate out into pockets of time-staged activity. This brings me back to my third point which was that within monumental studies there seems to be a complete inability to think that people (other than archaeologists) consciously laboured at coming to terms with evidence from the past. For example Britnell writes:

'In some instances Mesolithic types were found within undoubted Neolithic features, but the high probability of earlier finds occurring in later features weakens the relevance of this association. Some features contain only characteristic Mesolithic types, but again in most instances where this occurs, there is a suggestion that the features themselves may be Neolithic date...' (Britnell and Savory 1984:50).

I would argue that we need to take the initiative from this mesh of things, rather than time and time again being infuriated by the impossibility of staging these practices as dividuated materials set within their own time-space events. We need to claim a confidence in these contexts, for not only do they represent a web of materials, they are evidence for neolithic encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories in these areas. Time and time again as archaeologists we come across the interweaving of palaeolithic/mesolithic material culture within neolithic architectures. Within pit architecture, Joshua Pollard has written of the deliberate deposition of a tranchet axe with neolithic pottery and flint tools within an earlier neolithic pit at Barleycroft Farm, Cambridgeshire (in Evans and Gibson 1996). There is also an active practice of archiving midden material in early neolithic pits. That is within their own lives, people seem to be holding onto their own material traces and assembling constructions of this material into particular parts of the landscape (see Clark et al. 1960, Evans and Knight 1997). Therefore we have to engage with these encounters and stop denying the past dynamics that created the interweaving of these materials. We cannot keep understanding our continual

uncovering of these patterns of activity within expressions of denial such as the following:

'The focus of activity at this period occupied more or less the same area of ground as the Mesolithic material, without carrying any necessary assumption about the relationship between the two industries' (Britnell and Savory 1984:51).

Britnell has made reference at Gwernvale to the fact that the forecourt had been constructed whilst a six-post timber structure was still standing (see Figure 3.1). This wooden structure is assumed to have set up an approach and orientation to the area that was later formally worked in stone. Whilst I do not disagree with this interpretation, I feel that an attempt has only been made to understand a connection between two different time-space layers. This may be due to the overriding focus and importance that the forecourt area was deemed to hold, but this is perhaps at the expense of other areas. Rather than assimilating two distant historical moments that led to the enhancement of a monument's forecourt, there are other areas of this construction site that have been left 'unbuilt' in terms of a constructional history. These created more of a knotted tangle to the ways in which we understand these building sites. The structure to the north-west of the six-poster has been referred to as pre-chamber and cairn. However, along the line of the post-trench of this structure are a series of postholes that seem in places to have utilised the 'unearthed' boulder sandstone perhaps as props for the posts. Also along this line are a series of large stones that are made up of quarried and the more localised 'unearthed' boulders. This compartment line was at the same time knotted into the axial line that was entwined with the orthostat, and with the long axis of the six-poster. To complicate this even further, both the compartment and axial line in this area were propped up below and above by smaller stone material. It was this mesh of things that allowed smaller plaque material to be knitted through the area (see Figure 3.2).

Here, was evidence for encounters with past material cultures from palaeolithic backed blades and chert tools through to mesolithic microliths, microburins, burins and burin spalls. These and other more miscellaneous flakes were encountered along with 'unearthed' boulders. Wooden structures and larger stones were knitted into the area along with polished axe fragments, leaf-shaped arrowheads, knives, flakes, and

fragments of pottery and animal bone. Fragmented quernstones and smaller stone plaque material were entwined in these assemblages. All of these materials were architectural. I do not wish to suggest that these materials were each understood as independent entities or that they were assembled together from a preconceived plan or mental template of an overall achievable form. These contexts are evidence for encounters with previous assemblages of things, and the negotiation of these conditions led to further connections between things, and things and people. Some of these connections or some of this assembly work led to previously unimagined points of contact and so construction was about the possibilities and impossibilities in imagining architectural space. Construction work pulled those that laboured in these areas into unimagined points of contact that departed into other articulations of how people might be caught up in materialness and each other.

How can you separate out the above into pre-chamber and cairn and chamber and cairn temporalities? How can you seal the above negotiation of material and historical conditions into a soil which was supposedly preserved intact below a stone cairn? These histories defy nature::culture boundaries; cognitive divides in the making and use of particular ensembles of material culture; and these histories break apart the blanket assumption that people did not encounter past materialities and shatter the stratigraphical assumption of stone over soil.

3.4 Stone settings and the architectural template

I hope by now I have demonstrated that there is no stable or sealed pre-chamber and cairn resource which archaeologists can draw upon to represent a distinct form of evidence for palaeolithic and mesolithic lives. This soil is an entwined assemblage of materials that date from the palaeolithic onwards but that crucially have been knitted together from the fifth millennium onwards. It is that dynamic that our archaeological labours should focus on. This soil was not some inert matter where traces of human activity were recorded for the future archaeologist. Instead, it was/is a disturbed and transformed medium. There is evidence for the cut and fill of pits, some sealed by and some cutting this medium. However, if we start to think like Buchli, if we start to think about absences, then, where, for example, is the soil matrix (spoil) from these features? Many of the pit fills contain material from hearth contexts that have been

collected from elsewhere and put there (ibid:54-55). Much of the entwined material culture had previously been 'curated' in some way. And so we also have to start thinking about the kinds of assemblages that the quarried pit material became a part of. Other areas of this medium were quarried and in that unearthing process many of the red sandstone rounded boulders were left in place while others were removed in order to be woven into further areas of construction. The unearthed boulders that were allowed to remain in place propped up posts that were rammed into the soil and both of these directly connected to the layout of further stone work in what Britnell would describe as 'the inner body of the cairn'. This more knitted dynamic, therefore, defies a banded stratigraphical interpretation with its debilitating geological connotations.

I wish now to direct attention to the stone settings that Britnell has described in the Gwernvale archive and monograph. This work will draw in many of the architectural issues that I have been working on in chapters 1 and 2. In particular, the ways in which particular images of 'architecture' come into being and are claimed as vital to the foundations of our archaeological accounts of the neolithic. Once again, plan drawings are culpable in the production of these 'architectures'.

Figure 3.3 is a plan of Gwernvale; there are hard-line conventions that have been employed here to attract your eye to three particular architectural components. These are the chambers, façade walls and forecourt that are understood to be a part of an overall monument. In this plan drawing, we seem to have left the buried soil behind. Yet, unearthed boulders that were not removed from areas where the buried soil was disturbed or quarried, are drawn in as part of the cairn. Crucially these boulders along with the orthostat marked 'M' in the drawing are woven into the axial line and the top right compartmental divide that I have been referring to in my text and that are illustrated in the following figure. Britnell writes of this orthostat:

'This natural stone, which may have provided a focus for some of the earlier pre-cairn activities and even have suggested the siting of the tomb, may have been used for setting out certain elements of the cairn. It lies on the long axis of the cairn and is almost exactly half-way between the south-east corner of Chamber 1 and the portal stone in the forecourt. Moreover, an axial line (*rather than a wall*) of stones lay between this monolith and the south-east corner of Chamber 1...No other axial lines, lateral

lines or internal walling other than the inner revetment wall were noted elsewhere during excavation' (Britnell and Savory 1984:59, my emphasis).

Just like the six-post structure and the forecourt, the monolith is supposed to suggest the siting of the tomb. So many little things, so many smaller details are ignored and brushed over in Britnell's archaeological account, and then one small element is used to stand for the bigger and grander architecture of a monument or tomb. These small things are supposed to explain the beginnings of the grander plan. Let us pull back from this for one moment and take a proper look at Britnell's monument. In text he describes:-

- 'the inner body of the cairn' (58)
- 'the inner revetment wall' (59)
- 'the outer revetment wall' (60)
- 'the forecourt' (63)
- 'the chambers' (64)
- 'the concave wall' (87)

These terms all bind together to form the template of a monument. All of these elements or limits to a building are depicted in hard-line on the plan except, that is, for the inner body of the cairn. It is a mass not a skin, it is the filler between distinct boundaries (in text between the buried soil descriptions and the inner revetment wall). However, it cannot be taken away, for it is the body of the cairn and so in an uneasy relation in text and plan it exists as the flesh of this architecture. When you stop and think about it in this way, this mass of material is what creates the material and historical conditions to any kind of connection with the other supposedly more 'architectural' elements, and yet it is divided in a bizarre hierarchy of worth from them since it is not a layer or a surface but a supposed mass. It is caught between the erect orthostatic stone of the chambers and the walling of the inner revetment. Its mass is escapable and so it has to be reigned in and revetted. It must have form, a plan. It is headed by a facaded forecourt area and tailed by a concave wall. It is hemmed and walled in. Yet all of these layers and surfaces, these architectural elements, do not control the body of the cairn sufficiently to give the other elements form if they stood on their own. So smaller elements are reverted to in order to

connect the monument and this is especially obvious in Britnell's account of an axial orientation to the structure.

I do not want to launch into a repetitive critique of what we imagine architecture to be, suffice to say that the legacy of a particular and dominant understanding to the way in which architecture is conceptualised operates within Britnell's text. He sees a monument. His archive and monograph are processes which culminate in explaining how a building was built. As I have said, the political apparatus of the plan drawing is culpable here in playing out this view of construction. In Britnell's account the chambers are small pieces of architecture in their own right. In microcosm they allow you into a building and access to the more tightly orchestrated activities that were carried out in this space (compared to the orchestrated repertoires performed in the forecourt arena). The orthostatic walls of the chambers project inwards in plan, just as the dry stone walls of the forecourt contain outside activity and draw it nearer to the contained space of the forecourt arena. It is in this way that the chambers become interior worlds of their own and the forecourt becomes the front end of a monument that faces out to an external world. The flanking internal dry 'walls' are deemed to hold in the cairn and offer a seamless façade from which the chamber passage-way entrances occasionally project out from. This is played out in more concrete terms in the 'external revetment'. These 'architectures' are to be viewed and it should come as no surprise now that this is because they can also be viewed in plan.

Imagine, however, that there are no boundaries or limits to the area of construction that Britnell has referred to as 'the internal body of the cairn'. Refuse to look at the plan, for one moment, and imagine an area that is not distinct from other contexts of activity. Do not divide soil, wood, boulder stone and plaque stone materials from one another? I have attempted to write already about the exciting connections between the posts of the timber structure, the unearthed boulders that propped these up and the ways in which these were entwined into a theme of construction that also involved plaque material and which was knotted into an axial line with the orthostat and six-post structure. Britnell on the other hand, seems to focus on the boulders as an overall mass, as a conglomeration of a natural resource that is bonded together with a loamy soil. He writes:

'The stones forming the inner part of the cairn were predominantly of rounded and weathered sandstone boulders or slabs which had been split from such... Similar boulders were also exposed in the vicinity of the site, both on the edge of the terrace where this had suffered erosion, and in places where the terrace has been cut through by streams; it seems certain that the bulk of the inner part of the cairn and the inner revetment wall was of stone gathered from the terrace near to the site' (55-56).

I think that it is important that people incorporated together unearthed boulders with boulders brought from the nearby streams and stream edges; and we have to allow for the possibility that such intermingling of materials was not coincidental (see Richards 1996b references to water architecture). I wonder however if the natural 'origin' of this rounded boulder stone is called up by Britnell to enforce an undifferentiated mass of material, thought by Britnell to have accumulated in one area without any specific architectural technique of construction. By re-planning the 'pre-cairn' and 'cairn' levels from the 1:20 excavation plans, it is possible to see that there are themes and differences in the construction of these areas. In Figure 3.4, I have highlighted an axial line and lines of compartmental division. Though there are many details in material and technique which seem to have worked in combination to enhance these areas of construction, if we look at the supposed front end of the monument I have highlighted three lines of compartmental division to the north, an axial line, and another compartment division to the south.

There seemed to be from the 1:20 plans (visible in Figure 3.5), in the compartmental division to the north, a differentiation between a matrix of large plaquette material/occasional boulders/quernstone fragments and a matrix of smaller plaquette material/frequent boulders to the west. This distinction was not remarkable on its own but was further enhanced by the three compartmental divisions. For example, the north-eastern compartmental division was made out of posts, unearthed boulders and was substantiated by a line of quite distinct very large plaquettes. To the west of this there was once again a line of very large plaquettes but with plaquettes on their sides lining the eastern side of this material (it was also possible that there was some kind of shuttering propped up between the plaquettes on their sides and the more coursed stone work). Then to the west of this there was a line of elongated boulders with very large plaquettes occasionally on top of these along the line of the divide (once again the large plaquettes could have been interspersed between, and so pinning in place, timber posts).

The axial line incorporated all of the material and techniques described above in the compartmental divides. There was the orthostat, very large plaquettes in courses, plaquettes on their sides, elongated boulders, and lines of stone flanked by plaquettes on their sides.

In the compartmental division to the south, there were two overlying courses of large plaquette material. This was enhanced by the differentiation of material and techniques of construction used on either side of this (visible in Figure 3.6). To the east there was a matrix of large plaquettes/occasional boulders/quernstone fragments that had been laid almost course by course. To the west, there was more of a ripple effect, for there were large plaquettes and plaquettes on their sides, then very small boulders, then plaquettes and boulders that were built up against Chamber 1.

However, although I have described themes of differentiation that caught my eye and made me remark on an axial line and compartmental divides, these themes could not be separated out on excavation into structure::fill scenarios. Indeed, much of the axial line and the southern compartmental division were sketched tentatively onto the original plans by B.V. Williams. However, since no clear and deep structure to this differentiation was made apparent in the section that extended across the forecourt area (Britnell pers. comm.), Britnell only discussed in text the occurrence of an axial spine between the 'natural' orthostat and the central forecourt orthostat and he did not (re)present any of this detail in the published images. I would argue that there are further conceptual elements to this that we have to come to understand, concepts that are not easily caught or made apparent to us through section and plan since they did not follow stratigraphical units or building codes. These materials were interdigitated, some were woven and threaded through accumulations of others, in order to span through areas of construction and make connections in different ways. We therefore have to follow ephemeral materials, that were knitted together in intimate ways, and over very large areas of the construction site. What I will continue to highlight are the obstacles to this more woven journey; obstacles created by exclusive understandings of 'architecture' and the particular ways in which excavation of these areas was carried out. The main point emerging from this project so far is that we must no longer carry out excavations of these areas by stripping down to and planning cairn

material and then carrying out latitudinal transects across this in order to prove the existence of differentiation in the form of 'structure'. These transects are also problematic in that they facilitate the division of stone from soil, since they are cut to get at the buried soil. Similarly, materials are not evidence that can simply be used to read off a series of constructional processes; as Buchli says we should be just as concerned with how things are not, with absence as much as presence (1999). As a small example of this, with these themes of differentiation, we should actively be considering the ways in which timbers and wicker work were employed as shuttering to pin and hold together the materials that were assembled and woven together.

These detailed descriptions of the ways in which materials have been knitted together are very complex and not easy to write. It is very difficult to describe interminglings of materials in formal terms and so my text is going to be difficult to read and understand. If we look at the supposed back end of the monument, in Figure 3.4 I have highlighted two lines of compartmental division, one to the north and one to the south, and the continuation of an axial line. Once again, the axial line incorporated very large plaquettes in courses, plaquettes on their sides, elongated boulders, and lines of stone flanked by plaquettes on their sides. However, the compartmental divides were created out of very large plaquettes: in both cases, in places, there were double lines of plaquettes on their sides with distinct voids between them. Also, where there was an interruption in these double lines there was the superimposition of a large plaquette on top of the stone work. I would argue that this is evidence for some kind of shuttering, or wood or wicker work, that was incorporated into these areas of construction (visible in Figure 3.7). Interestingly, this wicker, timber and stone work would have been threaded together immediately to the east of a line of silting (or silted) up pits (see Figure 3.1). The cutting of these pits would have already altered this area perhaps with the upcast or 'spoil' from these labours having been used as a matrix for the incorporation of the wood and stone compartmental divide. To the east of the southern compartmental division there was a continuation in the use of very large plaquettes and also elongated boulders but these were built up against Chamber 2 (visible in Figure 3.8). I do not really wish to incorporate the material on the western side of the southern compartmental divide into this discussion. This area was taken down to a much lower level during the excavation and so is not comparable with the other materials that are entwined with one and

other. On the archive plans this area was shown as having been slightly quarried out leaving the other areas of architecture extant around it.

I feel that I am starting to get a little uneasy with my text, that through the process of describing differentiation, I am in actual fact distinguishing areas from one another rather than creating ways in which to imagine the dynamic processes by which all of these materials were knitted together. It is not my intention to add further layers or surfaces onto our understanding of this architecture but instead to warp its 'structure' by introducing a degree of sinuosity. The fallacy of an archaeology built up around the delimitation of particular structural components within neolithic architecture is demonstrated in the area to the east of the northern compartmental divide, Figure 3.9. How can precedence be given to compartmental divides, when these would not have held together without the much larger so-called 'fill' and 'packing' materials that actually surround them. This area of construction is a parody of structure::fill scenarios within archaeological accounts. The point of the construction work was that it was possible to thread through smaller more ephemeral materials by employing larger stonework to prop them up and structure the continuation of the weave (Figure 3.10). What was of importance was the constructed quality of the movement between these materials. It was the pitching of small plaquettes, held within an entire matrix of laid stone and earth based materials, that gave movement to this architecture. I, therefore, see no particular point in marking out separate layers or components as a chamber surface, or as a layering of stone in order to create an axial line or a compartmental divide. Yes, at some stage during our encounter with this construction work the distinctive constructed quality of these areas shines through. However, and this is what I argue is not adequately discussed within our archaeological accounts, the whole **dynamic** of the ways in which construction has been knitted together is ignored.

3.5 The sequence of chamber construction

'Once the axis of the long cairn had been established and the shape and limits of the intended cairn decided upon, one may suppose that the construction of the chambers began - their disposition being

dictated to some extent by the limits and orientation of the intended cairn' (Britnell and Savory 1984:146).

The phrase 'much was decided before you were born' keeps springing to mind here. There is always a building, a monument to be explained, no matter how tautological these archaeological accounts become. For example, we know that there is no evidence for re-cutting in the so-called cairn material in order to create an area for chamber construction. We have also followed slavishly through Britnell's description of a 'natural' in origin and unconnected 'pre-cairn activity' (deemed to be held within a buried soil) and an unrefined 'inner body of the cairn'. Yet these abstracted elements are then called on by Britnell to mark the setting for a 'monument'. This setting is supposed to be tentatively set before chamber construction begins and yet not fully realised, as the material is also supposed to have acted as 'packing' to prop up and hold in place the chamber orthostats. This does not quite gel.

There is evidence that the orthostatic and coursed plaquette chambers were the first of many points of departure in terms of construction work. Clearings in the woodland had been remarked on, pits had been cut, material had been assembled and worked together, areas had been quarried and some of that material was removed and reworked in other assemblages of things; timber structures had also been assembled and there is no evidence to suggest that this was not also the case for one if not all of the chambers. Britnell writes:

'Most of the orthostats of the chambers were bedded very shallowly in the ground; many of them may originally have been placed directly onto the contemporary ground surface, and like the basal courses of the cairn may have subsequently sunk by their own weight through the buried topsoil. Others were probably set in shallow holes dug down into the subsoil, and propped as necessary by smaller stones wedged against or beneath them. Some stability may initially have been achieved by the stones being propped against each other, in the manner of a 'house of cards', but additional support may have been given by stones built up outside while the next orthostats were manoeuvred into position' (ibid:146).

However, this ignores the weave of orthostat to coursed plaquette construction which the chambers were constituted from (Figure 3.11), where the contours of the orthostat meshed with that of the courses of plaquette material and vice versa. The 'flimsy construction' argument of Britnell's also subsumes all other materials into a secondary role to that of the chambers and consigns them to the redundant category of

'packing' material. These chambers could have been assembled and could have stood for any period of time before they were deliberately incorporated into other areas of construction work. There is also never any problem with free-standing cists in archaeological accounts of the bronze age and so there is no necessity for chamber material to have immediately been propped up by packing. Why do chamber orthostats need sockets in the neolithic but cist orthostats do not need these in the bronze age? After all the 'orthostats' that were incorporated into areas of construction at Gwernvale were really only very large plaquettes of split sandstone, many of which were laid lengthways. It is not, therefore, as if we are talking about the huge orthostatic stones that were a part of, for example, Tinkinswood or St Lythans in Glamorgan (J. Lukis 1875, John Ward 1916 and Audrey Williams 1940).

Britnell also argued that there was an order to the construction of the 'monument', from east to west, or if we have a monument already in mind, from the front to the back. He writes:

'Each of the chambers may well have been set out with regard to the axis of the cairn, which may already have been defined by an axial line of stones. Such a feature was recognized between the forecourt and the south-east corner of Chamber 1, but further excavation of the cairn would be necessary to establish whether it existed elsewhere. No 'primary cairn' material could be found around Chamber 1, but Chambers 2 and 3 were enclosed by different materials: unlike the inner cairn elsewhere, the material enclosing them was distinguished by a high proportion of quarried stone. However, it appeared that this 'cairn' and the chambers which it enclosed could never have been a free-standing structure existing before the erection of the long cairn itself, because on the south-east side of Chamber 3 one orthostat was butted directly against the more usual kind of cairn material...' (Britnell and Savory 1984:146).

Let us look again at the material markers that were supposedly setting out a horned trapezoidal long cairn. The first of these markers was the monolith and the six-post structure. These are used by Britnell to set out the forecourt and Chamber 1. However, these markers would have been superseded if there had been a 'cairn' enclosing Chambers 2 and 3. His excavation strategy was then directed at proving or disproving this theory and the 'cairn' material was excavated to reveal what he has argued to be stone work butting up against boulder cairn material understood to have enclosed Chamber I (see Figure 3.12; Britnell and Savory 1984, figure 32). When working on the 1:20 plans of this area, I was able to distinguish very easily a

continuous axial line which was composed of double lines of elongated boulders which were interrupted in places by very large plaquettes (which were very occasionally superimposed over the double lines, see Figure 3.4). To the north of this axial line, between Chamber 3 and the compartmental divide to the east of this, there was a possible further compartmental divide that could have consisted of elongated boulders (visible in Figure 3.13). This was the northern part of the limit which Britnell had distinguished between possible primary and secondary cairn material. However, this limit was not enhanced by any differentiation in material or techniques of construction used on either side of it. Indeed, the large quarried plaquettes of sandstone that Britnell referred to in the text are a part of the entire area of construction (see Figure 3.4). I found that it was even more problematic to follow the southern part of the limit that Britnell had distinguished. In the area between Chambers 2 and 1, there is a construction sequence that is more akin to that between the extreme north-western compartmental divide and Chamber 3 (where larger materials seemed to prop up more ephemeral compartmental divisions). In my view there was no distinct limit or difference between two kinds of 'cairn' but instead a repetitive theme of large plaquettes/boulders then small tightly knitted material, followed by large plaquettes/boulders then small tightly knitted material, followed by large plaquettes and/boulders (visible in Figure 3.14). I did not carry out further work on the enhancement of this area as so much of it was badly damaged by later activity; this is why there are no distinctions in this area of construction on the digitised plan.

I would strongly argue, therefore, that there was no east::west distinction in the construction work at Gwernvale, that the limit that Britnell demarcated between possible 'primary' and 'secondary cairn' material was a misunderstanding of the complexities in the materials and techniques of construction that were worked in combination to enhance these areas of construction.

If we attempt to make more of the complexities in construction work, then we will begin a process of further complicating sequences of construction, and we will necessarily have to come to terms with non-linear processes to our histories of construction. Britnell was able in his archaeological account to connect up the orthostat and the six-post structure by identifying a spine of stone work or an axial line. He then argued that these processes led to the laying out and siting of the

forecourt and Chamber 1. However, in Figure 3.4 I have indicated that an axial theme was worked throughout the entire area of construction, and that this axial theme was in one area connected to Chamber 1, and a little further to the west it respected Chamber 1 and was connected to the 'packing' material behind it. I would argue that this is evidence for the chamber having been constructed **before** any axial theme knitted together this area of construction; and that the chamber, the timber structure, the orthostat and the six-post structure were all intimately entwined through the dynamics of compartmental and axial themes of building practice. There is no reason to disbelieve that similar assemblages of things were not being constructed in other areas of the site, and as archaeologists we may have to face the fact that our archaeological evidence does not consist of material and historical conditions which allow us to progress through a linear sequence of building work. Indeed, there may be many different points of departure to these areas of construction.

For example, Chambers 2 and 3 were constructed from red sandstone orthostats and smaller plaquettes. The contours of the orthostats flow into the coursed and angled plaquette construction, each enhancing the other. The plaquettes immediately draw your eye to the contours of the orthostats, and the large flat surfaces of the orthostatic stone make you think about the knitted intricacies of the smaller plaquette material (Figure 3.11). These chamber areas should not be considered as starting points but rather as the first of many points of departure into a more knitted and enmeshed neolithic long barrow architecture. For knitted into this material is what was described as 'packing'. This is a term that resounds with inertia and redundancy. These smaller plaquettes and rounded stones were rammed into the interstices of the chamber, and, built up on top of each other, they smothered the surfaces of the chamber. At the same time, these smaller plaquettes were carefully interdigitated between larger stones which were drawn out through an axial theme. At points this axial line was composed of double lines of elongated boulders which were interrupted in places by very large plaquettes that may have held up shuttering. What is of importance, however, is that the axial theme and the chambers at Gwernvale cannot be separated from the 'packing' material; they are knitted together.

We have to erase from our mind set the image that Chambers 2 and 3 were constructed as a pair because they occupy a position to the north and south of a

monument, where they were half way along its length. Such a planned image is ahistorical. Chamber 2 and 3 were associated together due to the connective dynamics that went into the building practice in this area (see Figure 3.15). Within this constructional history it is not possible to say exactly which chamber was constructed first, or whether they were both constructed together. They could have stood as boxed constructions together, or one without the other, for a period of time. What we can work out from the archaeological evidence is the ways in which these chambers were knitted together and how encounters with these areas were negotiated. We can also attempt to explore the ways in which this area was entwined with the assemblage of materials that consisted of Chamber 1, the timber structure, the orthostat and the six-poster. We can also start to appreciate the processes by which these areas were knitted to the pits and compartmental divide to the west of this area of construction. In articulating these encounters, we do not attempt the gradual building up of a monument, or the processes which culminated in a monument. Instead, through a process of entwining, we start to deal with the constructed quality of things and the movement between materials. By focussing on these dynamics we start a process where we are confident that this is evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories. Entwined assemblages were always sites of ongoing partial construction.

3.6 Holding back the revetment walls

If we go back to the excavation categories of the report, or indeed the architectural elements in Britnell's text-

- 'the inner body of the cairn' (Britnell and Savory 1984:58)
- 'the inner revetment wall' (ibid:59)
- 'the outer revetment wall' (ibid:60)
- 'the forecourt' (ibid:63)
- 'the chambers' (ibid:64)
- 'the concave wall' (ibid:87)

-we can see that the cairn material is included with Britnell's discussion of the inner and outer revetment walls. These elements are deemed by Britnell to be stratigraphically, architecturally and chronologically connected. For example, he writes:

'Where part of the inner cairn and the inner revetment wall were totally excavated to the south-east of Chamber 1 it was clear that the inner wall and the body of the cairn had been built simultaneously, because the stones of the wall were interleaved with stones in the body of the cairn' (Britnell and Savory 1984:60).

He has also written about the way in which '...the inner revetment was exclusively composed of weathered sandstone slabs and boulders, like the material forming the body of the inner cairn...' (ibid:59).

I find myself continually at odds with Britnell's interpretations of the Gwernvale archive. When he has made hard-line distinctions between materials, as for example he did between possible 'primary' and 'secondary cairn', I was unable to follow those distinctions as there was a continuation in the use of large plaquette material. Now, when Britnell states that there is no difference in the material used, I can see obvious and very distinct differences in the architectural constructional techniques that were employed in assembling the materials together.

I have attempted to show the ways in which timber structures, chambers, pits, compartment materials, compartmental divides and axial lines were knitted together. We do not know when (or if all of) these elements stood on their own, for the archaeological evidence is a mesh of these things entwined together. As I have already said, by focussing on these dynamics we start a process where we are confident that this is evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories. There is also evidence to suggest that the best way to negotiate these material and historical condition is by imagining that these entwined assemblages were always sites of ongoing partial construction. There is good evidence to suppose that these areas of construction brimmed over, and that they should be just a little bit escapable in terms of our understanding of them. However, I would argue that this was not the case during and after the construction of the internal and external revetment walls and the chamber

passageways (this argument would also include the construction of the forecourt and western concave wall). The material that we encounter here had continually and methodically been laid out in courses and these components came to enclose an area. The construction of these components led to the enclosure of 'an architecture' that most archaeologists, including Britnell, are writing archaeological accounts about.

None of the areas of compartment construction, or indeed the compartmental divides, were directly knitted in to these components. If we do take the 'monument' as a whole for one moment, then the construction work on the northern side of the axial line would seem to have been faced by courses of stone (see Figure 3.9). In each case, whether with the compartmental divides which are highlighted in blue or the compartmental areas highlighted in red, the courses of stone work seemed to have been laid against these areas of construction (they butt up against them). This is also the case for the extreme south-eastern compartmental divide. In no place do these more complex areas of construction continue, or interdigitate with the more coursed stone work of 'revetment'. Indeed, areas look as if they may have been added to and 'finished off' in order to create material for the faced walls to butt up against. For example, Chamber 1 seemed to consist of an elongated structure with two orthostats having been placed at a 'V'-shaped angle to the narrow entrance into it. To the east of these two orthostats, a passage way was constructed that seemed to turn the orientation of this structure more to the south. I would argue that the entranceway and the material to the south (of Chamber 1 and the eastern compartmental divide) was added to at a later date in order to fill in 'an architecture' that was to be enclosed by walling. I would argue that this is why this is the only area that Britnell can describe as having been interdigitated with 'cairn' material. Chambers 2 and 3 also have orthostats which are positioned so that they create narrow entrances to the structures and in both cases these have been extended by coursed walls which interdigitated with the construction of 'revetment' walling. In particular, with Chamber 3, the passage way was constructed, and then was added to with internal revetment stone, was extended, and then was added to with external revetment stone. These were all later additions to what had been a more partial and fragmented construction site. These later additions not only enclosed but they made 'an architecture'.

3.7...and then there were the dead

'Thus upon completion, the tomb probably appeared as a long trapezoidal cairn with sides carefully faced with vertical walling, gradually diminishing in height away from the forecourt at one end. The chambers may still have been empty and un-used, and although provision had been made for their subsequent entry, their entrances were probably successfully concealed' (Britnell and Savory 1984:148).

In Britnell's account, a monument was constructed, which was provided with architectural components for re-entry in the form of passageways, and was then blocked before the use of the chambers. Why? Why is there always a penultimate architecture in mind? This architecture is easily translatable into hard-line conventions on plan, a seamlessly walled architecture, with chambers sealed up, and construction work completed. This historical moment is endlessly repeated in archaeological accounts and so our histories of the neolithic are always ultimately about enclosure and control, the use of a building.

If we go back to the excavation categories of the report, or indeed the architectural elements in Britnell's text:-

- 'the inner body of the cairn' (58)
- 'the inner revetment wall' (59)
- 'the outer revetment wall' (60)

- there is a bracketing within the report and within Britnell's interpretation of 'architecture', a divide between the construction of

- 'the forecourt' (63)
- 'the chambers' (64)
- 'the concave wall' (87)

and the use of a 'monument'. I would argue that Britnell has gone to ridiculous lengths here before allowing into his constructional sequence the reworking and incorporation of materials associated with the human body. There are fragments of human skull associated with the timber structure; fragments of human skull,

vertebrae, sacrum, femur and tibia from the context of the buried soil that is located in Chamber 1; and human skull from the surface of the buried soil in Chamber 2. Once again, I would argue that there is no 'functional life of the cairn' (Britnell and Savory 1984:153) to be explained after a sequence of construction, but that construction work was partial and ongoing and involved the incorporation of bodily materials. Building practice was a matter of assembly work; assembly work that incorporated the human body along with materials that were associated with the human body, in terms of what people put into bodies, what bodies made, what bodies wore and what they were heated and sheltered by. These intimate bodily practices were woven together into the fabrics of pits (e.g. the pig long bones in the pits at the extreme western end of the construction area); into timber structures; into areas where chambers were or were being constructed (perhaps constructed and understood for some time in terms of elongated box like structures). I have also attempted to show the ways in which timber structures, chambers, pits, compartment materials, compartmental divides and axial lines were knitted together. Therefore the incorporation of human bone into these areas occurred while construction work was ongoing. As construction sites, we have therefore, necessarily, to incorporate into these areas smoke, dust, fire, accumulated materials, spillage and excess, disturbed ground, large exposed areas of the ground below the turf line, blocked off paths and routeways, new and sometimes temporary paths and routeways, shoring/shuttering/scaffolding, equipment broken and new, eating, drinking, sleeping, as well as other types of laboured activity, with an animal as well as human presence. This all leads to very different contexts in which to imagine the incorporation of the human body.

There was a much longer and indeed non-linear construction sequence for the building work that was carried out at Gwernvale. I would argue, therefore, that there are other constructional histories to be considered and written where the whole concept of 'monumentality' does not exist at all. This is not to say that there were not activities associated with a more 'complete' building project, where facades had been constructed and where chambers were blocked and unblocked in order to allow the inclusion of human materials. What I am arguing is that these historical moments already exist in our histories of neolithic people's lives. The problem is that these histories are exclusive in terms of representing only a particular historical moment and a particular concept of architecture. In this chapter I have attempted to

deconstruct the excavation categories and architectural elements employed by Britnell. This was in order to demonstrate that the sequence of construction that had been written did not work, and that the historical moments that were focussed on were not exclusive. There is no need to allow particular elements of these architectures to dominate and obscure others. In our own labours with archaeological evidence, it is possible to negotiate more ephemeral and complex material and historical conditions in order to engage with a more intimate understanding of the ways in which people lived their lives.

This is what I will attempt to do more fully in the following chapter.

Prefix 4

The focus to this chapter is the way in which small things became entangled within the construction site of Hazleton North. By focusing on the small things of life, the ways in which things were parted, connected and re-assembled, I hope to allude to a possibility that there were and are other places where architecture resides. Some of the fine detail descriptions that I will refer to will make my writing dense and complicated. These 'other' architectures that I allude to, through the complex ways in which small things were assembled together, were difficult and complex and this makes writing architecturally difficult.

Summary of the site of Hazleton North

In order to create clearer meeting points in the text for writer and reader to understand each other, I will first of all summarise what Alan Saville wrote about his findings at the site of Hazleton North, on the Cotswold Hills, Gloucestershire, England (Saville 1990). I would like to acknowledge Saville for his work. This site was understood to be a limestone trapezoidal long cairn and was excavated between 1979 and 1982. There were two lateral chambers constructed from limestone orthostats within the matrix of the cairn; both chambers had passage-ways constructed out of courses of limestone plaques with opposing entrance-ways, one orientated to the north, and the other in a southerly direction. The long axis of the cairn was orientated east-west, the cairn was 53m in length and 19m in width, and there was a forecourt constructed at the western end of the cairn with northern and southern horn-works. Quarry pits were excavated to the north and south of the cairn. The cairn itself was understood to be composed of cellular units, which had then been enclosed by internal and external revetment walls, these had been constructed from courses of limestone plaques. Both of the chambered areas revealed extensive deposits of human bone; a human skull was also encountered between the orthostats of the southern chamber; and human bone was encountered from the hearth context associated with a timber structure under the stonework of the cairn; and from a formal deposit associated with cattle and pig bones, antler and fire related material from the primary fills at the east end of the southern quarry. The timber structure was located under the stonework to the west of the southern chamber. There was a midden between the southern chamber and the timber structure and many of the worked flints from these three areas connected through refitting. The timber structure and the midden were understood to be

neolithic although they were considered as evidence for 'pre-cairn' activities. There was a pit directly behind the midden and a tree-throw. At the extreme eastern end of the site there were inter-cutting pits under the stonework. Several areas of burning were identified in the forecourt area and to the west of the timber structure, these were associated with mesolithic worked flints.

In this chapter I will compare the excavations at the site of Hazleton North to work that was carried out during the second world war by W.F. Grimes at the sites of Saltway Barn and Burn Ground in Gloucestershire.

The recommendations of W.F. Grimes

'A Note on Technique with Special Reference to Cotswold Long Barrows.

It is a truism that the excavation of a megalithic tomb falls naturally into two parts: the location and examination of the chambers; and the examination of the mound.

In the majority of the long barrows so far excavated, and certainly in all that have been done in recent years, the first part has been simple enough...The second part is another matter; it was here, as it seemed to me, that some modification of technique was required.

The question of the structure and nature of the enclosing cairns or mounds of megalithic tombs has received attention ever since it was realised that such mounds contained walls which not only gave a satisfying shape to the cairn by defining its limits but also, when uncovered, were well built and impressive to the eye. Most excavators in the past have therefore devoted some part of their energies to tracing the walls as well as to clearing the chambers; and the result has been to build up, albeit hesitantly and sometimes confusedly, a gradually expanding body of knowledge of the structural character of the barrow as a whole.

Inevitably the expansion was accompanied by contradictions in the views of the excavators, which on the structural side at least emerge most emphatically in regard to the cairn-walls' (Grimes 1960:1).

This piece of writing by Grimes seems to encapsulate all that I have found problematic about the ways in which archaeologists have conceptualised neolithic architecture and how they have set out to deal with this architecture during their excavation work. 'Cairns' or 'mounds' are seen here as enclosing frameworks for 'megalithic tombs' and so are understood as secondary architectural elements to chambers and are understood as 'masses' which create the final entity of a completed

building. However, Grimes was very creative in the media he used during his excavation work (especially in the use of architectural and photographic mediums). He was, I will argue, actively involved in questioning what it is that we understand as being architectural in these architectures (contrary to what his generalised explanations about 'architecture' would have us think). Crucially, what is exciting, and I think different, about Grimes is that he questioned the nature of our inquiry in order to articulate other ways in which to imagine neolithic architectures. He did not invent different excavation categories or recording systems in order to better record 'a long barrow'. He seemed to be, from the outset, more geared up for an encounter with things that were assembled in such a way as to defy logic. There does not seem to be in Grimes' excavation work the necessity or need to be instantly accountable for the ways in which things were assembled together. There is no overarching plan of action in order to deal with the excavation and recording of these contexts. He did not seem to feel during excavation that he was recording that which was automatically understandable. What was different about Grimes excavation work, and evidence for his positivity and openness in encountering different dimensions to architecture, were his 'second working drawings' which he made on tracing-paper (the drawings of the Saltway Barn and Burn Ground sites are held at the National Monuments Record in Swindon) and his use of photography on uncovering a tangle of architectural materials during excavation (in Grimes 1960). He writes of his second drawings that:

'...a series of measured drawings was made of the actual stones of the cairn, accuracy being obtained by means of a grid. The drawing was accompanied by a study of the cairn-masses, their relationship to one another and to the walls, and first impressions were quickly confirmed that the outstanding feature was **their occurrence in pitched masses**. The essential point to be recorded seemed, therefore, to be **the pitch of the stones, which was indicated on the working drawings by means of coloured arrows as the record advanced**. In this way the structural units would be easily defined; and since the various elements were **closely knit** it was possible to establish their relationship with one another.

The general plans...are therefore of two types and are based upon two sets of working drawings prepared at the time. The first...sets out to render the stonework of the cairn as it actually appeared in plan. The second...is an attempt to **express the plan in terms of structure** and to provide the evidence for analysis in which the structural succession can be determined...No attempt was made to disturb the cairn-remains until this study had been completed. Stones were then removed by hand and from the top for the examination of the underlying construction: **the cairns were in fact picked to pieces by reversing the processes of the builders**. Points which appeared to be of importance were cleaned and

photographed as the work advanced; and where necessary were retained for study in section...All discoveries and finds made in or beneath the cairn-structure were plotted on the second working drawing, which was made on tracing-paper to facilitate comparison with the complete cairn-plan (1960:3, my emphasis).

These second working drawings were, I will argue, architectural drawings (and I will argue that 'architectural drawings' differ from a 'record of architecture' because in their production their arises the problem of making visible something unseen and intolerable about the construction process they are engaged in understanding). Grimes thought that materials were so knitted and entwined together that the dimensions of these architectures could not be followed by the stratigraphic sequence of archaeological excavation in plan (I will discuss this later). He used photography in order to represent the interstices and knot of these architectures because he realised that these could not be captured in plan or section (neolithic construction techniques spiralled in and out of vertical and horizontal dimensions, they were drawn out over large areas of construction, and they employed the smallest of stone materials or earth-based materials). Saville writes at the beginning of his excavation monograph on the site of Hazleton North:

'The excavation methodology was designed to follow the recommendations of Grimes (1960, 1-4), which it did insofar as horizontal stripping and recording were concerned, although the theoretical ideal of dismantling the cairn "...by reversing the processes of the builders" (Grimes 1960, 3) was found to be **logistically, and on occasion conceptually, impractical**' (Saville 1990:4, my emphasis).

I would argue that this criticism rather misses the point of what Grimes was trying to do. Although Grimes could not explain these constructions, he had the ability to conceive of their difference. What was of importance was Grimes' ability to visualise other kinds of architectural practice, even if to him it seemed to be structurally indefensible. This is why his second drawings are more architectural in nature and not simply excavation plans. For example, Grimes wrote:

'These...features are structurally indefensible: the builders have gone out of their way to create problems for themselves, problems which have called for a good deal of skill and ingenuity in the handling of stone. It is as if they had a rooted objection to carrying any wall to a full close...an excavator who has contended with these devices can speak with feeling of their misleading and

disconcerting effect; and it has already been noted that Mr. Hemp records similar reactions to the behaviour of the walls of Bryn-yr-hen-bobl...' (1960:38-39).

I will explore later, and in greater detail, Grimes' work and his understanding of these areas of construction. What I had wanted to point out here was that Grimes' excavation work involved the stripping of the entire area of the 'cairn'. He did not do this in order to simply record a 'cairn mass'. A 'mass' of material could easily have been captured in one over-all excavation plan. Grimes recognised that complex and knitted together construction techniques had been at work in these areas and so he went about carefully recording on a secondary architectural drawing the pitch of small stone material. From the angled points in these architectures, he then began his excavation work, attempting to understand the twisting stonework and using photography to represent the precarious ways in which architectural materials were interdigitated. Grimes knew that once he started to follow the threads of constructional technique that had been spun through large areas he could not stop at these points to record this easily in section or plan. These constructional techniques had already crossed over and returned through too many archaeological stratigraphical dimensions for them to be propped up in an extant fashion and drawn in section and in plan (see Figures 4.14 and 4.18, Grimes photographs of Saltway Barn: 1960). He also deliberately avoided the excavation of trenches across areas of the 'cairn' in order to find evidence of 'pre-cairn activity' (contra the excavation practice of that time and contra the methodology used at the site of Gwernvale: Britnell and Savory 1984). Saville recognised from Grimes' work that any excavation programme of a long cairn site would have to deal with small and complex relationships between materials but which had been assembled together over a very large area. However, Saville felt that the methodologies of a modern archaeological recording system would be able to capture the ways in which these materials had been assembled together. I hope to demonstrate that the use of more modern technology came about in order to better record archaeological evidence. The initiative was, therefore, to better record 'a long cairn' and so with this recording system there was a conceptual shift from excavation work that had been about exploring the possibilities for neolithic architectures to a presumption that excavation operated as a descriptive and recording procedure (Harris et al. 1993).

Saville states that 'No prefixes for pit, posthole, or wall were employed – everything recorded was regarded for the purposes of the record as a context' (Saville 1990:8). However, 'fill' and 'layers' were divided from 'cuts' and 'structures' in that these contexts were not drawn but instead were only written about on the context sheet. They were also removed in order to define 'cuts' and 'structures'. Similarly, material culture was identified as an object that existed in relation to a context. Material culture was not an architectural context, each physical fragment was given horizontal co-ordinates and a vertical height. Behind this modified version of the single context recording system were the unsaid of an organised, planned, externalised on vertical and horizontal planes, 'system of architecture'. For there are no materials or architectures that can simply be identified for what they 'just are', nothing is 'given' or 'pre-given', but there are (as I hope I have demonstrated in chapters 1 and 2) forms of architecture which have been assumed since the governing principles of Vitruvius and which go hand in hand with technologies of objectification and dominant understandings of exteriority.

The work of Saville and context recording

'The whole cairn was planned, stone by stone, at 1:20 scale, to give a complete picture of the uppermost surviving level...**Subsequent plans of the cairn, as stonework was progressively removed, concentrated on recording the internal structural detail**...Excavation of the burial chambers began in 1981 and continued in 1982, as the dismantling of the surrounding cairn continued. After removal of all the burial deposits, the chambers were recorded and demolished, allowing the complete examination of the buried soil preserved beneath the cairn' (1990:5, my emphasis).

There are, then, only two overall excavation plans of Hazleton North, these are of the cairn after deturfing and prior to excavation and of 'pre-cairn' activity.

'Every feature, layer, or constructional element which required separate description was allocated an individual context number in a single continuous sequence...everything recorded was regarded for the purposes of the record as a context. In the case of negative features, separate numbers were assigned to the cut and to the fill. **The context record sheet is therefore the primary source of written information about the excavated site. This is complemented, where appropriate, by site drawings (plans and sections) at scales of either 1:20, 1:10, or 1:5, and by black-and-white photography and colour slides**' (1990:8, my emphasis).

At the start of his monograph, Saville elaborated on the excavation methodology that he employed. First of all, I must say how impressive his excavation archive and publication work are. Saville recognised what a massive undertaking there was in the excavation of a long cairn. His overall excavation plan, and the fact that this plan was made at a scale of 1:20, demonstrates that Saville perceived of neolithic architectures as complex (Gwernvale was also planned at a scale of 1:20 and yet Britnell did nothing with the detail that these plans revealed). However, Saville dealt with this detail by focussing in on architectural elements. He was confident that a context recording system would follow, or record, neolithic architecture. Plans and sections were later employed to **complement** the matrix of contexts that he built up through excavation (drawings were now of secondary importance). These excavation plans were a record of 'architecture', they were not architectural drawings like those of Grimes' which had tried to follow neolithic constructional techniques. Although these excavation plans and sections were drawn again at scales of 1:20 and 1:10, they were now fragmented and broken down into single contexts. On my reworking of the archive, themes of construction could only be followed by pinning together written description on the context sheets. From the contexts sheets, I had to search out relevant drawings of 'architectural elements' and trace them on my own composite plan in order to attempt to retrace some of the dynamic themes that I argue had span through these areas of construction (of course this was only possible when a drawing had been made). Detail was something that was understood by Saville to have operated in isolated units (single contexts), or through the technologies he employed on excavation was something that could be paired down to its constituent parts (or single contexts). Saville believed that this detail operated, or at least was representable within, the same horizontal and vertical dimensions as the excavation recording sequence. Single contexts (architectural elements) were the pared down parts of 'architecture'. These could then be built up or reconstituted through a gridded, linear and progressive matrix sequence (the template in understanding how an 'architecture' was built).

Saville felt encouraged to write 'As soon as the cairn was exposed by excavation, numerous subdivisions were apparent, defined in plan by regular alignments within

the general mass of stonework' (1990:32). He did not feel that his excavation recording system was over restrictive when he wrote:

'The individual dumps were rarely fully exposed in plan, because of the technique of excavation unit by unit, and their edges were later extrapolated where necessary. This is emphasised, because there were problems of reconciling the relationships of individual dump contexts and the plans of the dumps...are in part schematic' (1990:32).

Through my discussion of Saville's excavation process and recording system, I hope to bring to your attention several of the reasons why Saville had the confidence to go about his excavation work on a unit by unit basis. However, I have not looked at why this excavation strategy was implemented in the first place and I would like to spend a little time doing so now.

'2/7/81 HN NE/SW Quads. Procedure for excavation of the cairn tail to examine and reveal the key structural elements...The stonework was then further trowelled to identify/clarify the most obvious structural entities such as the external walls, the internal walls parallel with the external walls, and the offset, or rib walls at right angles to these. This was done to enable the next stage of planning to proceed, the 2nd series plans comprising, in the tail zone the walls, 'extra-revet' And the less stony 'disturbed' areas. The infills to the cells are not planned in any detail at this stage. Side-by-side with the planning, progressive removal of the stonework + 'disturbances' in the cell interiors continued' (Saville 1981 in his director's notebook).

There is a real paradox in trying to figure out why Saville used an excavation strategy on the 'cairn tail' for the rest of the excavation. Firstly, examining the overall excavation plan, there is marked evidence for internal and external walling, an axial line, compartments and compartmental divides in stone material in the western area between the chambers and the forecourt. In the area to the east of the chambers, the 'cairn tail', from the overall excavation plan, there is evidence for more fragmented external walling (especially in the southern area), the axial line is fragmented, and the compartmental divides or cellular revetments are partial and do not always connect directly to the axial line (see Figure 4.1; Saville 1990: figure 57). The potential for stone cell work, and so excavation on a unit by unit basis (where stone 'structures' were identified and then more earth based 'fills' removed), would from the superficial evidence of the excavation plan have been more plausible in the western area between the chambers and the forecourt. Indeed, it would be easier to understand if Saville

had started with the excavation of these areas, and from this marked evidence for construction in stone material, then understood this architecture to be constituted from stone cellular components. However, he did not, and so a paradox is created whereby the lack of stone material in this eastern area is understood by Saville to be the product of 'disturbance'. It was not simply the case either that he thought he would try out an excavation process and recording system on a disturbed area of the long cairn before progressing to areas where the architecture was more intact. For Saville argued that the cellular plan that he produced of this eastern area was proof that there were specific cairn structures that should be dealt with unit by unit. Once Saville was able to prove the existence of these cellular components, which were excavated unit by unit by exposing areas of stone work and then removing the 'fill', he then had confidence in his excavation process and recording system and how it supposedly followed the composition of a neolithic architecture. What Saville's plan of the cairn structure does not tell the reader is that the 'cellular structures' were in areas only one course of limestone high (e.g. [174] in Saville 1990:40). If you look at the detailed overall excavation plan (Figure 4.1), there is evidence for marked distinctions that come about through there being contrasting architectural materials. Why were these distinctions ignored by Saville? Contrasts between materials were most prominently played out between the northern and southern areas of construction, and it is this interplay between materials that would seem to have marked an axial line within the architecture. These distinctions were created from earth-based architectural materials and there was a greater build up of these materials compared with that in courses of stone.

Why do some plans prove the existence of material/architectural distinctions whilst others do not? Is it because the plans that were deemed by Saville to illustrate distinctions are those that were built up through 'cut' and 'structure' context recording? In order to recognise a distinction between materials, there seemed to be a need to be able to identify a 'structure' or 'architectural element', in stone, which was recorded as a context and which could be drawn upon independently of the materials which marked the point of contrast. Is this not more to do with the fact that within context recording systems more earth-based materials were understood as 'fills' or 'layers'? These are secondary or passive construction categories. To have existed at all these had to be in or against something else, such as a 'cut' or a 'wall' (these

construction categories are dependent on other primary activities). So the recording system presupposed that where contrasting earthen materials were recognised, this was due to the primary process of there having been in the past an active structural divide in the form of a 'cut' or a 'wall'. It is then the objective of the excavation process to identify, record and draw these independent activities. These activities had to be activities which could be isolated and objectified out from the entwined assemblage of things. Indeed earth-based materials, since they were relegated to 'fill' or 'layer', were not drawn. They were not objectifiable or extractable as a record of something or someone. They were not deemed to have 'exterior limits' or architectural form, they were given architectural form by structure. They were not drawn, as 'fill' or 'layer' they were the blank areas on a plan. Or are they? For why are there such marked distinctions between materials on the overall excavation plan?

Themes of construction in the area to the east of the chambers

I would argue that there is evidence for themes of construction, or particular architectural dynamics that were at work in these areas of construction, rather than particular 'architectural elements' that were built in stone and which can be defined independently in single contexts. For example, an axial theme had been worked through this area by connecting up areas where fires had been lit in the past, flint had been knapped and food prepared and eaten; to an area where a midden had been built up and had been woven together from residues of life process and fragments of material culture; to an area where a tree had fallen. These connections were made by working different architectural materials together. For example, between the hearths and the midden, an axis was marked through contrasting materials (earth-based [293] to small plaquette based [330]; and directly above these [148] where very large blocks of limestone were propped up against plaquettes [444] (see Figure 4.2; Saville 1990: section 3, figure 42). Some of these architectural materials were constructed together through techniques that we would more readily recognise as constructional. For example, rather than the propping up of materials that were in evidence in Figure 4.2, in Figure 4.3 (Saville 1990: section 2, figure 42), which also represented materials which connected up the area between the hearths and the midden, there was evidence for a divide or theme where plaquettes had been constructed in courses and which had then divided the materials between northern and southern areas, [619]. However,

Saville had not remarked on this kind of theme of axial division in his study of the 'cairn tail' when it came to a divide constructed out of turf, [624], and which connected the midden to a tree-throw (see Figure 4.4; Saville 1990: section 1, figure 42).

Saville seemed to be overly concerned with the identification of stone structure, and so when he could not find evidence for this particular kind of distinction he presumed this to have been due to the later disturbance of the area. However, I would argue that large block limestone compartments had been constructed in the north-eastern area (defined by Saville as unit C, 1990:39). These large block limestone compartments were not definable by the structure::fill scenarios that operate within context recording systems (see Figure 4.5). Just as I have argued with the area of construction to the west of the chambers at Gwernvale, how can precedence be given to structural compartmental divides when these would not have held together without the much larger block stone 'fill' materials that surround them? These large block limestone compartments also had stone 'rubble' and earth based architectural materials propped up against them in the south-eastern area (defined by Saville as unit D, 1990:41). This marked contrast created an axial distinction between materials within this area of construction, rather than a contrast that was dependent on the identification of stone structures. It is interesting to note Saville's words during the excavation of this area:

'The next cellular division to the W, C + D, have a definite limitation on the NW provided by the cross-wall [176], and a possible matching cross-wall not yet defined in the SW, but lack a definite N-S subdivision in the form of a spine wall. The excavation of the small stone patch [177] **showed that there were no large stones at all in this zone**, nor were there any definite indications of disturbance, so the position remains enigmatic' (Saville 1981 in his director's notebook, my emphasis).

I would argue that there are other themes of construction at work in this area than those which Saville had identified. There are areas where an axial divide had been constructed out of turf [624] and which had been ignored due to the passive and secondary ways in which earth-based materials were treated in the recording system. There were also areas where an axial divide was remarked on due to a contrast between materials. These distinctions operated in terms of a dynamic network of materials, and these distinctions are lost when the area is broken down into single contexts. I realise that a context recording system has a matrix in order to reconstitute

the relationships that had existed between things, but I hope to demonstrate a little later how restrictive these matrices are in the kinds of relationships that they recognise. For the moment, I will argue that it is impossible to reduce the weave of these architectures into a series of junctions that either cut, overlay, or abutt other structural elements.

An understanding of these neolithic architectures is not an easy project. I hope I have demonstrated that breaking apart these areas into axial or spine walls, compartmental divides or cross-walls, and internal walling or internal revetment is not always possible. This is not due to the later disturbance of these areas, but because there were other ways in which construction was carried out in these areas. These more elusive themes of construction or architectural dynamics can be remarked on by looking at the ways in which different kinds of material were woven together or by focussing on the gaps and interstices that were created between materials. Encounters with unfamiliar angles can create points within these architectures where we can begin the process of (re)vision, and I would argue that this was what Grimes was attempting to do with his second working drawings. These dynamics are not capturable, or better understood, by having more modern recording systems or technology at hand (contra Chadwick 1997 and Hodder 2000). Understanding these architectural dynamics, or imagining the possibilities for the ways in which themes of construction were at work, is dependent on the ways in which we understand or conceptualise the nature of archaeological evidence. Understanding the excavation process, as Saville did, as being primarily about recording, means that we understand that process, and so the nature of archaeological evidence, as being about the definition of physical entities rather than being an engagement with materiality. An engagement with materiality is where human dynamics, the ways in which active processes are negotiated through particular material and historical conditions, are the focus of our enquiry. We have to tackle the nature of archaeological evidence in order to imagine other ways in which people lived their lives and I think this is what Gill Andrews, John Barrett and John Lewis recognised when they wrote:

'Usual procedure would be to record by excavation a proportion of features- their cuts and fills with their associated artefact and environmental assemblages. Such recording systems are designed to describe the history of the archaeological site as a stratigraphic sequence synthesised by excavation and

post-excavation analysis into a series of phase plans with their associated artefact assemblages. The Perry Oaks recording system, however, has been designed to facilitate the understanding of a human presence that is both referenced against a pre-existing landscape and mapped according to the consequences of its actions (Andrews et al 2000: 8).

I do not want to be overly critical of Saville, especially when I admire the quality of his work so much. I do, however, through critique, want to demonstrate how embedded in his practice conceptions of archaeological evidence, and archaeological and architectural practice were. This is why his confidence in a unit by unit constructed neolithic architecture and excavation practice was not just paradoxical but also tautological. This prefix has hopefully outlined the ways in which I question the nature of archaeological evidence, as it is practiced, in order to create the possibility for different ways in which to imagine neolithic architectures. This is a line of questioning that will continue in chapter 4. However, I would like to start chapter 4 with a discussion of what I really admire in Saville's work, and that was his understanding of the dynamic connections that could be made between areas of the construction site through refitting fragments of material culture.

Chapter 4. Dealing with detail: (re)marking Hazleton North.

‘An assemblage is made up of linked sites, people and activities; in a very important and profound sense, the creation of an assemblage is the creation of a knowledge space. The motley of scientific practice, its situated messiness, is given a spatial coherence through the social labour of creating equivalences and connections. Such knowledge spaces acquire their taken for granted air and seemingly unchallengeable naturalness through the suppression and denial of work involved in their construction. However, since they are motleys, they are polysemous and are capable of many possible modes of assemblage and of providing alternative interpretations and meanings’ (David Turnbull 2000: 19).

4.1 Fifth and fourth millennia assembly work

I have already discussed in chapter 3 how the dominant image of an overall neolithic architecture divided up the excavator’s understanding of the area of construction into (pre)cairn – cairn and chamber – (post)cairn activities. This was also the case with Saville’s understanding of what took place at the site of Hazleton North. However, rather than going over this again, and so as not to risk demoting the positive and imaginative possibilities for working more connective dynamics due to a focus on a critique of Britnell and Saville’s work, I would rather explore other possible histories for the evidence from this site. I intend to work as many connections as I possibly can for evidence for construction at Hazleton North. Some of these connective dynamics will be relatively simple to comprehend as they directly relate to dominant material evidence. However, other themes of construction are woven together from the most ephemeral of evidence and the effectiveness, or the convincing way in which they are presented, works through their repetition and connection to other areas of architecture. This work will require an imaginative encounter by the reader with the evidence in order to imagine the possibilities for different kinds of architecture. It will also require an openness to the possibility that some of the connections that we make or have been made in the past led to previously unimagined articulations. It will not be possible for the reader to simply read off or to expect to find particular architectural regimes, plans or buildings.

Saville writes of the later mesolithic flintwork that was discovered at Hazleton North:

‘The first human activity at Hazleton is recognisable only by the presence of Mesolithic flints. These were scattered throughout the buried soil, with a marked concentration towards the western edge of the

excavation...Residual microliths and a microburin occurred within the area of the Neolithic midden...A similar residual explanation applies to the microlith from the south chamber...Proximity between the Mesolithic flint scatter and the two features 437 and 598...might suggest contemporaneity, and similarly so with context 582...The flintwork involved the preparation of tools, among which microliths appear to predominate. The assemblage could imply a temporary camp for retooling of hunting equipment' (Saville 1990:14).

On the pre-cairn excavation plan (see Figure 4.6; Saville 1990: figure 13), contexts 349, 356, 437 and 598 are described as areas of soil discolouration. However, the original context sheets shows that [349] was 'a slight depression which contained unburnt stones, friable blackened earth, animal bones and two flints'; [356] was an area of 'medium to dark grey brown soil with charcoal flecks and frequent small angular stones'; [437] 'patches of charcoal, charcoal staining spread over the OLS' (old land surface); and 598 was a slight depression 'filled with charcoal staining'. These all seem to indicate that there was indirect evidence for burning. It is possible that this could mean that either hearth or fire material had been deposited in these areas, or that a hearth had been constructed directly onto the old land surface and that the feature had not cut deeply into the natural. When the ground surface was later disturbed, the upper areas of the hearth would have been eradicated leaving the lower partially burnt or unburnt areas intact (see Mortimer and McFadyen 1999 for a discussion of this). These fires were in the same area as the later mesolithic flint scatter. If we also connect up these areas of flint and fire with the microliths found in post-hole [582], the midden [561] and the south chamber then we have a large area of activity. Now I am not suggesting that we use this diagnostic flintwork to directly date the midden and the chamber. However, we need to allow space for the possibility that these areas were occupied in the fifth millennium B.C. and that the activities associated with microliths were later remarked on. Mark Edmonds has argued that the efforts of labour involved in the production and use of microlithic tools may have emerged as a media for the definition of people (1997: 105). Spaces were made for these practices at the site of Hazleton North. These spaces of encounter, in which people were defined and understood in relation to the ways in which flint was worked, were not erased but crucially left in place. The residues of what had gone before, these crucial practices, were woven into areas of the construction. Artefacts and bone from these earlier occupations were worked into stone-earth matrices and axial and compartmental connective dynamics. Some of

these things were no doubt inadvertently incorporated, but their encounter did not go without notice. I am therefore attempting to weave connections between the western area of the site where microliths and other flintwork were produced around fires, to the area that would later become a midden, and the area that would later become a stone chamber. It is interesting to note that, in the context of early neolithic elements, Saville was able to prove links between a timber structure (that was located between the mesolithic hearths [437, 598]), the southern chamber and the midden.

These lithic connections have all sorts of conceptual baggage tied up with them. It is this conceptual baggage that would seem to be of most importance to archaeologists as they attempt to divide out lithic materials from one another in order to tag areas of the site with different kinds of occupation, and occupation that existed in different historical times. So we see a struggle by Saville (and as I also argued in 3.3 by Britnell) with the lithic distribution maps in order to seal off hunter-gatherer camps that existed in the fifth millennium, from pastoralist or agricultural occupation in the fourth millennium, and the later construction and use of a 'tomb'. For example, bipolar bladelet cores were part of the hearth contexts [349, 356] and the midden [561] Saville writes of this that:

'On typological grounds, however, it is judged that the bipolar bladelet cores...are likely to be Mesolithic, and thus it is of interest that all but four of these came from the area of microlith concentration in the forecourt...Of the four non-forecourt Mesolithic cores, one came from the midden, two from the buried soil just north-east of the midden...and one from the topsoil...Cores judged on purely typological grounds to be Neolithic...were all from the buried soil: two from the midden area...one from just north-east of the midden...and one from beneath the east end of the cairn...'
(ibid:157).

Saville is attempting to break apart the entwined fifth and fourth millennia connections that existed between the hearths and the midden. He wants to focus on the bladelet cores that were associated with a concentration of microliths in the area that would later become a forecourt. Microliths were a part of these hearth contexts [349, 356], but they were also a part of the midden [561] and beneath the east end of the cairn near to an area where pits were dug [402]. Bladelet cores were to do with the preparation of tools, and blades and microliths were a part of hunting equipment and fifth millennium lives. Blades and microliths were also a part of gathering

equipment and these lithic technologies and these activities along with hunting were a part of fifth and fourth millennia lives. What we know is that people visited this area and that they lit fires and made and repaired tools. Microliths, microburins, a burin and flint flakes were 'left' there. These things, to do with feeding, heating and sheltering the human body were combined with the soil and vegetation of this place, just as further fourth millennia materials would be 'left' in the area that made up a midden. There was a history to this materiality. In the fifth and fourth millennia forests were lived landscapes, and these lived landscapes were known in part through encounters with past materialities, be this evidence for the ways in which other people lived their lives in the form of coppiced or fallen trees, hearth settings, debris from flint knapping, tools, dead animals, the remains of past meals, or routeways and paths recently cleared or partly overgrown by vegetation and saplings. This evidence would have been encountered time and time again by those that occupied and lived in these forested areas (Edmonds 1997 and 1999; Hind 2000 and my discussion of Hind's work in 6.5). There were different and changeable material resources that were being worked into these construction sites, but crucially as Edmonds writes:

'In tracing these taskscapes, we can explore how the character and tempo of routine tasks was itself caught up in the reproduction of the social world. In other words, we allow that commitments to place and to others may be, quite literally, "worked through" in different ways through different areas of practice' (1997:108).

Probably the most important connection that I want to make between fifth and fourth millennia lives is the use of fire and hearth settings. These were a focus for people as they were kept warm and fed, and given light and safety from their flames. Polished axe fragments became a part of the hearth context [474] that was associated with the timber structure. Polished axe fragments were also a part of the midden context [561] and the south chamber. Polished axes and quern stones were deliberately fragmented before being incorporated into these contexts. Human bodies were broken down, transformed, re-worked and accumulated in very similar ways to these flint and stone objects. Fragments of polished axe and fragments of human skull were located in the context of the hearth that was associated with the timber structure. A flint tool made on a flake struck from a polished axe and the head of a child were a part of the south chamber assemblage. Saville writes of the child's skull, rammed into the interstices of two orthostats that made up the southern chamber:

'The only exception to the normal deposition of burial deposits on the floor of the chambered area was a skull (12527), which was embedded in the pre-cairn soil between the base of the adjacent orthostats on the north side of the south chamber...This belonged to a child, six to nine years old. The skull was positioned on its side, left side downwards, with the mandible adjacent to it, but placed with the left condyle and coronoid process of the mandible in the right eye socket. Thus, the skull and its mandible had been put into this position together but after the mandible had become detached' (Saville 1990:94).

In the accumulating fills of the southern quarry pits were placed similar configurations of material, once again creating points of contact between seemingly disparate substances. Burnt bone and sherds from a single pot were mixed in a spread of charcoal and ashy soil. Burnt bone in burnt soil, and with it sherds from a pot tempered with bone and limestone [040]. Clay, stone and bone were broken down, reformed into a new substance, shaped and transformed by the action of fire. Nearby to this fiery context was a scatter of cattle, pig and human bones [328] that was sandwiched between groups of antler picks.

There were connections between microlithic flint tools and hearths and a midden, to flint tools and hearths in timber structures and a midden, to hearths and fragmented axes and fragmented human bone, to fragmented axes and human bone in the southern chamber, to hearth material and burnt bone and fired pottery that included burnt bone and stone, to human bone that was deposited near this fiery context in a pit that made up the southern quarry. All of these materials were woven together into an entwined assemblage of the material and historical remains of fifth and fourth millennia lives.

4.2 Architectural connections

4.2.1 Material culture and fire

I have attempted to rework Saville's interpretation of the refitting and conjoining of flint material in order to foreground dynamic connections that existed between things. In doing so I hope to break down the 'layered' nature of the conventional narrative of the site. I have foregrounded connections in flint material that connected to specific

fragments of other materials (e.g. human bone, pottery made of bone, polished axehead fragments), or to architectures such as fires or hearths, or indeed materials that were made or transformed by these human architectures (e.g. pottery and burnt bone). Drawn into these connections, along with the hearths, was a midden, timber structure and chamber. Saville's interpretations exclusively focussed on separating out flint materials into time/cultural units: '...the distribution and typology, considered together, do indicate the existence of two separate foci of activity: one is basically Mesolithic and the other basically Neolithic' (1990:169).

Whilst I understand why it is important to mark out some materials and their associated activities as distinct to the 'Mesolithic', I find this marking process problematic. This is 'History', where the creation of histories is exclusively understood in separated out, or sealed in, time/space/cultural dimensions (see Thomas 1988a and 1993, and Pluciennik 1998, for their critiques of the mesolithic/neolithic transition). With this way of working, there was no creation of histories by those that lived their lives across the fifth and fourth millennia (history is supposedly something that 'we' in the present make about 'them' in the past), and so the focus of archaeology cannot be about the ways in which people negotiated particular material and historical conditions. I have already argued against caricatures of fifth millennium lives as 'Mesolithic'; stereotypes of people as flint tool makers and hunters. These stereotypes have an exclusive effect of shutting off past lives to particular things and particular activities. There are other connections between things and people that we can make in the fifth millennium, and many of those connections can also be made in the fourth millennium, but crucially we must envisage all of this work as a process where we are confident that this is evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories. Therefore, our point of departure into writing histories of fifth and fourth millennia lives has no point of origin, but is always an encounter with previous assemblages of things.

'...concern with the definition of kin and non kin; of women and men: of the elders and their subordinates, did not emerge with the first crop of corn. Nor did questions of tenure and renown. Woven into routine practice and explicit in varied rites, these and other themes had been important for many generations. What happened across what we recognise as the transition was a reworking of the practices through which people understood and addressed these issues' (Edmonds 1997: 108).

Dynamic connections, as particular kinds of practice, were also architectural. Connections made through flint working, and that were linked to fires, in some way created spaces in which to combine and transform substances. Places were created where fire and microlithic materials became associated with pottery, quern stones, polished axehead fragments and human bone. It is interesting that polished axes were broken down and reworked in these spaces. Axe production, with its distinct sources where different groups of people might anticipate meeting (Edmonds 1997:105), was another media for the definition of people and was reworked and incorporated into these sites. It is no coincidence that these connective dynamics were also a part of the constructed materials that we more readily recognise as architectural. Woven into these connective dynamics was a midden, timber structure, chamber, pits and I will also include here the tree-throw that was later worked on with stacks of turf. What is interesting is that the pottery, quern stone, polished axehead and human bone materials woven into these areas were all fragmented. So too was the stone and earth taken from the quarry pits. This fragmentation was remarked on by Saville in his work when he attempted to draw out the different histories of deposition of the lithic material. Saville drew a distinction between conjoining work that he was able to do from *in situ* knapping and that of lithics that he could refit but that had been redeposited from elsewhere. He argued that the lithic material from the context of the midden and the timber structure had been redeposited, and that there was a high percentage of refits between these areas and also refits between the timber structure and the area of the southern chamber (see Figure 4.7; Saville 1990:21, figure 20).

4.2.2 Material culture and middens

I would like to discuss in more detail processes of middening, fragmentation and transformation (after Pollard 1993 and 1999, Chapman 2000, and Thomas 1991 and 1999). Saville has argued for an understanding of separate and distinct pasts, or different kinds of occupation, for the evidence from Hazleton North; from gatherer-hunter camps in the fifth millennium, through to a more permanent pastoral or agricultural settlement during the fourth millennium and the subsequent construction and use of a 'tomb' later in this period. However, it is possible to make an important connection through architecture that crosses over these time/space units in which

living has been segregated into different kinds of category. Repeated over and over again in long barrow reports, exemplified by the almost identical repetition at the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North (Britnell and Savory 1984, Saville 1990), is an understanding of fifth millennium life as ephemeral, as life constituted from activities which left only the faintest of traces and which due to the mobility of those lives, cannot be captured in the site report. Instead, the site witnessed the sporadic return of group after group. It is as if the site only comes into being when there is a robust architecture to be dismantled and explained, the architectures of fourth millennium 'ritual' life. However, what of the midden architectures of the fifth millennium, which have been ignored by Britnell and Saville? If we step back from our focus on long barrows and what they are deemed to hold, there are other writers on the fifth and fourth millennia who seemingly discuss the nature of evidence for those lives the other way round (see Pollard 1999). Here late mesolithic coastal shell middens are seen as impressive architectures of fifth millennium settlement practice and evidence for fourth millennium life is understood to be ephemeral and sporadic. Pollard writes:

'Such middens probably accumulated over successive occupations that might have spanned several generations...These sites show a pronounced long-term commitment to particular locales, with middening potentially being employed as a visible statement of occupation and belonging, as well as serving to create a sense of place through a material linkage between the present and past...It can be argued that there is little sense of such rigid long-term commitment to place *through settlement* during the Earlier Neolithic' (1999:82).

I want us to think about mesolithic middens in two ways. The first is to think about mesolithic life architecturally, that during the fifth millennium people negotiated and recreated previous assemblages of things. There are connective dynamics between things, and things and people, that we can encounter and learn from in our thinking of mesolithic life. At sites such as Star Carr in the Vale of Pickering (Clark 1954; Conneller and Schadla-Hall in press), Oronsay in Scotland (Mellars 1987) and Thatcham in Berkshire (Wymer 1962; Smith 1992), complex assemblages of things were negotiated and added to during the eighth millennium B.C. Pollard (2000) has referred to these complex assemblages of things as 'living middens'. These constructions involved the working through of complex issues relating to identity. For example, intimate connections were made between the bodies of humans and deer with the Star Carr 'frontlets' (Conneller 2000). The second point I want to make is

that middens, eighth millennium assemblages, were woven together from the smallest of materials, through actions that were repeated over and over again, and which at some stage involved the incorporation of not only human materials but the human body itself as was the case at the site of Oronsay (Mellars 1987) and Thatcham (Wymer 1962; Smith 1992). These practices were very closely related to the ways in which small things became entangled within the construction site of Hazleton North.

There is evidence for middening practice from the eighth millennium through to the fifth millennium. At Hazleton North, Saville wrote that there was evidence for middening from the fourth millennium. Although microliths, microburins and bladelet cores were found within the area of the midden, he would not use these as diagnostic pieces. These flints remained in Saville's eyes as residual items, despite the fact that it is Saville himself who drew a distinction between conjoining work that he was able to do from *in situ* knapping and that of lithics that he could refit but that had been redeposited from elsewhere. Saville argued that the lithics, pottery, bone and stone that were uncovered from the midden architecture had all been redeposited. What is the difference, I would ask then, between residual and redeposited material culture? How much of a difference should we make between these contexts when we know of middening practices that were carried out during the fifth millennium?

There are distinctions that we need to look at. The midden at Hazleton North was a small material assemblage. The soil matrix of the midden was composed of charcoal and burnt soil fragments. There is evidence of trample between the area of the midden and the timber structure (in Saville 1990:225). Caught up in this soil matrix, which is taken to be successive accumulations of hearth material, were a whole series of charred items ranging from wood, cereal grains, hazelnuts and animal bones. Fragments of pottery, though not burnt, were very abraded and so may have been broken and exposed to the elements for a long period of time before they were brought together as part of the midden architecture. These pots were broken a long time before their incorporation into this area and very few of these fragments were from the same pot (ibid:172). So we have very different processes at work here. First of all, it would seem that there are very direct links between activities that were carried out around the hearth of the timber structure and the gathering of these material remains and their successive deposition in one area behind the timber

structure in what would become a midden. However, there are also activities to do with the use of pottery, which was not 'curated' in the same way; these material remains seem to have become more fragmented and yet these disparate fragments were still gathered together and worked into the area of the midden. It is interesting to think about what has survived. Why are the pots so fragmentary - what has happened to the rest of the sherds? There are fragments of flintwork which were worked into the area of the midden but which we know connect through refitting to the timber structure and the area of the southern chamber. Activities that had been carried out across these areas, in what would seem at first to have been independent architectures, materialise into a more connected architecture through the connective dynamics of partial objects. There are also other associations between particular things and hearth related materials, for the microliths, microburins and cores which were associated with fires in the western area of the site are also present within the burnt soil context of the midden. Then there are polished axehead and quartzitic quern stone materials which had been deliberately fragmented, and then only parts of them had been incorporated into the area of the midden (Saville 1990:178).

There are many concepts within archaeology that have inspired the ways in which I think about the processes that were at work here. Firstly, Saville's distinctions between *in situ* and redeposited flintwork. Then there is evidence for some sense of structured deposition within the context of the midden (after Richards and Thomas 1984, Pollard 1993 and Hill 1995), and there is a need to think about the kinds of things that have been incorporated together into this area. There are ideas of 'curation' (Pollard 1993) and fragmentation (Chapman 2000). However, none of these concepts can be used to understand all of the processes that were at work here or the kinds of connections that materialised out of the different ways in which material culture was parted and reassembled. None of these concepts really look at the dynamics of assembly, but instead concentrate on how the assemblage could have come into being. These works seem to ignore the transmutability of an assemblage, the fact that the midden is a transformed network of things.

The kinds of dynamic connections that materialised out of the different ways in which material culture was parted and reassembled created architectural spaces where the transmutability of an assemblage became the focus for further activities. We are not

simply encountering this evidence in order to understand how these assemblages could have come about, but instead, by focusing on the dynamics of assemblage, we realise we are dealing with a transformed network of things; and so the onus is on us to imagine the possibilities for different kinds of architecture. I would like to give an example of this from a piece of modern art by Cornelia Parker, for it is Parker's imagination that has helped me work through the many dynamic connections that it is possible to think about with the Hazleton North midden. She has produced a piece of work which in one sense is an exploded shed, entitled 'Cold Dark Matter: An Exploded View' (Parker 1996). However, the art is not completely understood by the fact that Parker asked the army to explode a garden shed and all its contents, for the fragmented pieces in the artwork are suspended on metal wires around a light bulb. Although fragments, the pieces hang together like knotted matter. Yet the light from the light bulb picks out each fragment and creates silhouettes against the walls of the room in which the art is displayed. This particular configuration makes material the ways in which these objects have become transformed objects, that are connected in dynamic ways to further assemblages of things. Stuart Cameron writes of her work:

'Parker's concern with the nature of matter and its transmutability determines the physical characteristics of her work. Through her impulse to erode the face value of the concrete by dualistic acts of destruction and creation, she consigns matter to a suspended state' (Cameron in Parker 1996:5).

John Chapman has argued that processes of fragmentation create relations of enchainment between people (2000). To me this seems a very simplistic way of reading process off at face value, and transcribing a basic material act into types of social relations between people. If we think of the transmutability, or transformative powers, of the dynamic connections between things and things and people, then we get at other articulations of the ways in which people may be caught up in materialness and each other. The point that is ignored in Chapman's way of understanding things is that partial connections lead to previously unimagined points of contact (after Marilyn Strathern 1991). This is why Parker emphasises:

'I could rearrange all the objects and make a different show out of it. It's the same with all the work I've ever made. The exploded shed, for example, because it's suspended, when you cut it down it never goes up in the same way twice. It has to 'die' then be resurrected. I've never liked the position of 'the lump'' (Parker 1996:67).

4.2.3 Material culture and trees

I have begun in this chapter to introduce the concept of material culture as architecture, as an entwined assemblage, where materials that were intimately caught up in people's identities were knitted into these areas of construction. There is no end point in thinking about the possible materials that people entwined into these areas of construction: material culture and fires; material culture and a midden; hearth material from the timber structure woven into the midden; fragments of flintwork which were worked into the area of the midden but which we know connect through refitting to the timber structure and the area of the southern chamber. Activities that had been carried out across these areas, in what would seem at first to have been independent architectures, materialise into a more connected architecture through the connective dynamics of partial objects; particular items of material culture, such as polished axeheads, quartzitic quern stones and human bone, were deliberately fragmented and woven into the hearth of the timber structure, the midden and the southern chamber. I have hinted with the site of Gwernvale at the ways in which these assemblages incorporated parts of the landscape. The site of Hazleton North was a forested area in the fifth and fourth millennia. Areas of tree fall, areas of clearance, paths and route ways would have been incorporated into the area of construction: for example, the tree-throw below turf wall [624], marked on section 1 (see Figure 4.4, Saville 1990, figure 42). Richard Macphail said of the fill of this particular tree-throw:

'The fact that the turbation fabric was unworked by later biological activity suggests that the infill of the hollow was rapid and, from the evidence of several other comparable sites, this lack of reworking may relate to human activity...as indicated by the number of Mesolithic flints present in the soil at Hazleton' (Macphail in Saville 1990:224).

Microlithic material culture was associated with fires in the western area of construction, through to the midden, timber structure and chamber, through to the tree-throw and the pits which were sculpted in the eastern area of the construction site. Trees gave density and dimension to fifth and fourth millennia lives. Intimate relations were created as people made something of the changes in tree life; from budding leaves, to green foliage, to the yellow-red-brown dry crackle fall of leaves on

the ground, to bare branches and the myriad of differences in tree and plant cover. Trees had different densities and dimensions (Laura Rival 1998). Intimate connections were made from dealing with tree fall, cut trees, managed trees and processed trees for timber (Brown 1997, Edmonds 1997, Evans et al. 1999). Connections materialised from the smell of trees growing; the smell of trees cut, trees rotting and trees burnt. All of these experiences were negotiated and made sense of by people as they were living and building in these areas. With these experiences came an understanding of the temporality of tree life and a negotiation of the ways in which people had made sense of these connections on previous occasions (Edmonds 1999, Hind 2000).

4.3 Architectural assemblages

'In a book, as in all things, there are lines of articulation or segmentarity, strata and territories; but also lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification. Comparative rates of flow on these lines produce phenomena of relative slowness and viscosity, or, on the contrary, of acceleration and rupture. All this, lines and measurable speeds, constitutes an assemblage' (Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari 1987:3-4).

4.3.1 'Primary dumps'

I have so far foregrounded materials that were transformed through a connective dynamic, and which led to connections with other materials. I have attempted to highlight a partial operative within these connections (after Strathern 1991). Indeed Strathern writes:

'Partial connections require images other than those taxonomies or configurations that compel one to look for overarching principles or for core or central features. Clearly, such imagery is not going to take the form of genealogy or map' (1991:xx).

In my work on Hazleton North, I am attempting to work an understanding of construction through repetition, disruption, transformation and assemblage. The connections that have been articulated so far, although worked from the most disparate or ephemeral of materials, were taken up and woven again and again into

other parts of long barrow architecture. For example, Saville did not connect the midden, the timber structure, the early fire settings in the western area of the site, or the tree-throw, to the construction of the 'cairn'. However, if we look at Figure 4.8, we can clearly see that the north-eastern, north-western and south-western margins of the midden were overlapped by the matrices of [377/379], [269/293/543] and [380] respectively. These materials were woven together in ways that seem to connect in a more physically material way the divided architectures that were previously entwined through material culture (discussed above). The other edge to [380] was formed by propping up stone material against what were probably by this stage the rotting stumps of the timber structure. A compartmental divide of upright limestone plaquettes was held in place between the timber posts and the larger stone block material of [380]. The midden connected to the timber structure. The midden was also connected to the western fire settings by a contrast in material matrices which lean one against the other along the length of the area that had previously separated these architectures: [467] contrasted with [446], and [269/293/543] with [380] (see Figure 4.8). The midden connected to the fires. The midden, fire settings and timber structure were further woven together through the construction of an axial divide of upright limestone plaquettes, which were pinned in place by further emplacements of interdigitated materials. The compartmental divide against the timber structure was directly knitted into the construction of this axial divide (it is interesting to note that the process of entwining these particular materials also occurred at the site of Gwernvale). The matrix of material on the north-eastern margins of the midden, [377/379], was also placed around a pit. Figure 4.8 demonstrates the ways in which this matrix was composed of at least three dumps of material around the pit. The midden connected to the pit. An axial divide was constructed across the midden out of larger plaquette material laid in courses. This part of the axial divide [448] overlay the edges of the turf wall [624], the same turf wall that was constructed directly over the area of the tree-throw. The midden connected to the tree-throw. Axial definition was further created through contrasts between the matrices of [210/225/278/291] and [296/393], which spanned towards the area where pits had previously been sculpted (see Figure 4.8). The midden connected to the pits.

Before I go on to discuss further areas of construction at Hazleton North, I feel I should lay out in more detail the case for parts of the timber structure still standing

whilst further construction work was being carried out. Saville was adamant that this structure was part of a 'pre-cairn' context and that it had decayed or been dismantled before the construction of the 'cairn' (1990:20). He made his argument by stating that there was no evidence for post-pipes in the post-holes that made up the timber structure (*ibid*), and that the post-holes were obscured below an overlying buried soil [211] (*ibid*). However, the excavator's context sheets imply that twelve out of the thirteen post/stake-holes were considered to contain charcoal that had related to the rotting of posts (archive from the Corinium Museum, Cirencester). Saville had gone through these context sheets during post-excavation work and 'corrected' this evidence. However, there was a third review of these contexts after the macro-environmental work had been carried out and there were eight post/stake-holes where both excavator and environmentalist stated that there were considerable amounts of charcoal relating to the fills of these contexts. I would consider [583], [586], [589], [591], [592], [593], [594], [595], and possibly [590] (although the charcoal in this context seemed to relate to burnt material from the hearth) to have had their posts rotted *in situ*. The second point that Saville made was that all of these contexts were overlain by the buried soil [211], indeed in most of the contexts sheets the excavator's wrote that the post/stake-holes could not be seen on the surface of [211]. However, it is interesting that the excavator of the structure's hearth wrote that '[474] originally existed to the top of [211] but the upper portion was destroyed by disturbance of the upper levels of [211]- from possible cultivation or other human activity'. This is something that I pointed out about the buried soil at the site of Gwernvale, these buried soils were not some intact land surface that had formed over and sealed earlier activity. These were disturbed areas which had been transformed through trampling, clearance, cultivation, construction and biological action (Macphail in Saville 1990:225). More integrated material connections between features would have been blurred by those activities since the upper areas of the earlier features would have also been transformed. Saville used this lack of material integrative evidence to argue for distinctions between features. However, he did not explain anywhere in his monograph or archive why the stone material that constituted 'primary dump' [380] was able to hold such a distinct form. Indeed the vertical pitch of this material would suggest that it was propped up against something else. The western edge of [380] was perfectly in line with the line of posts that made up the eastern edge of the timber structure (see Figure 4.8). I find it difficult to understand why it was that Saville had

such a confidence in refitting artefacts but at the same time would not make similar dynamic connections architecturally.

4.3.2 'Quarry pits'

I have a similar problem with the way in which Saville dealt with the quarry pits, quarried material, and the areas where these materials had been woven into the cairn. He wrote:

'Whether the exploitation of the quarries proceeded simultaneously is unknown. The presence of quarries on both sides of the cairn is presumably due to economy of effort, although it cannot be demonstrated that material from the respective quarries was used to construct the corresponding sides of the cairn. The relative equidistance of both quarries in a westerly direction may have been due to the practicalities of extracting appropriate construction material, but the absence of quarrying near the west end of the monument is likely to have been a deliberate design feature' (1990:31).

Saville only seems to attempt to connect entities together, therefore he compares an overall outline of 'the northern quarry' and 'the southern quarry', to a formed 'monument'. There is a real divide in the writing of his monograph between the inert **outline** of quarries and the dynamics of cairn **construction** (1990:23-59). This is despite the fact that Saville himself demonstrated that these areas of quarrying were created through pit construction (ibid:31). I will discuss later in this chapter the ways in which large areas of the construction site were woven together from pieces of limestone. However, the majority of the pieces of limestone that were used were very thin blocks which are referred to in the Cotswold area as 'planks'. Planks were employed by Cotswold masons as roof tiles, and used from the sixteenth century onwards. I use the term 'plaquette' after French archaeologists because they have developed within their archaeologies a more complex terminology for the materials and techniques used within long cairn construction. These thin blocks of material have to be quarried in a very particular way. Edith Brill (1977) has written on the differences between stone quarries and roof tile quarries in the Cotswold area and her work is referenced in Saville (1990:31). Yet Saville did not draw out from her work the fact that these materials are formed through circular pit construction (I will also discuss pit construction in 5.3 in relation to long mound 'ditches'). It is interesting to

note what Brill has to say about the production of roof tiles, in particular how a circular pit is constructed, the edges of which are clamped until a sharp frost:

‘This is the method of leaving the stone exposed during winter so that moisture held by the thin films of clay between the layers of stone freezes and expands, splitting the stone. With the thaw the pendle, as the new stone is called, can be split easily into flakes’ (1977:23).

The architectures of long cairns and roof tile quarries have long been inter-related. I discuss in the postscript to this chapter how long cairns have been used as roof tile quarries and how roof tile quarries have been mistaken for long cairns. So imagine at Hazleton North, pit after pit having been constructed.

‘The complexity of the primary fill arose not only from the interdigitation of material weathered from all horizons of the eroding quarry edge, but also because it included the debris of quarrying activity’ (Saville 1990:23).

There is also evidence that there were activities which connected these more pit-like architectures. For example, it was possible to refit pottery from [563], [212] and [040] within the area that comprised the southern quarry. These contexts were from different levels within the quarry fill. As a circular pit was constructed, there would have been materials that would have been ‘extracted’ and woven into the area that would make up the cairn and there would similarly have been materials that would have been incorporated into earlier cut pits. There would have been processes of cutting, inter-cutting and re-cutting at work within these pit architectures along with processes of extraction, backfilling, weathering and silting. Within the mish-mash of all of these activities there was the incorporation of material culture, fire and human bone. These incorporations made direct reference to the **partial connections** between timber structures, middens, pits, tree-throws and compartmental materials. In the southern area of quarrying, at the base, there was evidence of there having been fires [427]; in the ‘primary fill’ there were cattle and pig bones, a horncore, human bone and charcoal sandwiched between antler remains [328]; there were the remains of fires, animal bones and pottery [040]. It is possible that some of this material was curated from the midden. In no way can these dynamic connections be separated out into quarry and cairn architectures.

4.3.3 'Turf walls'

What we have here of course are differences in the conceptualisation of architectural materials and architectures. I have so far drawn on the impassive ways in which Saville had referred to 'primary dumps' of material within the cairn architecture, in order to demonstrate the ways in which this has set limits to our imagination of these architectures. Similarly, Saville has 'outlined' areas of quarrying without considering the dynamic ways in which these areas were worked on in relation to the timber structure, midden, chambers, pits, tree-throw and upcast limestone and earth-based materials. I have to use Saville's terminology in order to gesture to where these areas of architecture reside within Saville's archive and excavation monograph. I have to use these terms in order to get to evidence for fifth and fourth millennia lives. However, once we have got to these places, found where they are, I want us to begin a process of revision, of reworking what these materials are, how they came to be there, what they connect to, and what they become embroiled in or tie up with through further activities. It is through working in this way, through these dynamics, that architectural materials, architectures and assemblages were and are created. I also want, at this point in my review of these architectures, to really develop dynamics of deterritorialization and destratification and intensities of acceleration and rupture. Deterritorialization meaning that we do not take for granted the location of things, and destratification meaning that we question the ways in which hierarchies of things are set; in order to look at the ways in which materials connect and part and the different rhythms and tempos to that activity. I want to develop these kinds of dynamic in order to reconsider assembly work or the ways in which assemblages were/are constantly brought into being (after Deleuze and Guattari 1987).

'On a first, horizontal, axis, an assemblage comprises two segments, one of content, the other of expression. On the one hand it is a machinic assemblage of bodies, of actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another; on the other hand it is a collective assemblage of enunciation, of acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies. Then on a vertical axis, the assemblage has both territorial sides, or reterritorialized sides, which stabilize it, and cutting edges of deterritorialization, which carry it away' (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:88).

So this is an attempt to indicate where, with what, and how we may make more of a knotted or complicated tangle to our histories of long cairn architectures or assemblages.

I have already made reference to the stacks of turf, [624], that spanned over the area of the tree-throw and that were constructed in a linear direction away from the area of the midden, [561]. This is how the excavator referred to this context:

'No difference between this and the OLS was recorded during excavation. However C/S 3249-3251 suggest that an interface between the surface of the OLS and the material comprising the rise is discernable...This can be interpreted as a turf stack or dump of topsoil used to mark out part of the line of the axial revetment as a preliminary to construction of the cairn in this area. The absence of this phenomenon from other site sections drawings 454, 462 suggest that it was not a continuous feature along the whole length of the cairn, as does its lack of recording in plan with the possible exception of a small area of context 625'.

Context [625] was another stack of turfs. Between them, from [625] drawn in the main section (see Figure 4.9; Saville 1990: figure 56) and [624] drawn in section 1 (see Figure 4.4, Saville 1990: figure 42), was an area at least 15m in length and which incorporated the area of the midden and the stone box chambers of the cairn. I do not wish to suggest that a turf wall had extended through this area, as Saville had identified to be the case with courses of limestone in other or upper areas of the cairn. Instead, I wish to argue for a densely interconnected organic assemblage, which disrupts the clean stone order of Saville's axial structure. [624] was physically stacked partly over a silted up 'tree-throw' and partly over a 'buried soil' [211]. We can look at these materials in different ways, in parts and in connections. We can allow things to be placed next to one another rather than in a hierarchical relation (after Deleuze and Guattari 1987). The rupture of a fallen tree, an area covered in leaves, branches, wood and earth, a pit cut in the kick-back from the root bowl, a pit filled in rapidly due to the movements and energies of people living in and around this area. Tree disturbance connected to human disturbance, these activities could have been remembered and perhaps made reference to. This area continued to come about through disturbances, we know this from the intermingling of the upper 'fills' of the 'earlier' features with the 'buried soil'. Turfs were cut from the ground and stacked one on top of the other in courses. Tree disturbance that connected to human

disturbance was enmeshed architecturally. [625] was physically stacked partly over the 'buried soil' and partly over the 'midden'. The 'buried soil' connected to the 'midden'. Within the living context of the worked earth [211], an 'intensely organic' [561] assemblage was woven together over a long period of time with charcoal from hearths, bone parts from meals and from processing animal materials, worked flints and fragments of pottery. As these materials were 'curated' together, as hearths were scraped out and redeposited in with this matrix of things, blocks of turf were cut and stacked one on top of the other, and were constructed over an area which stretched out from the midden and the stone boxes of the chambers to the area where activities had churned up material where a tree had fallen. In one sense these materials physically lap one over the other, they inter 'leave' from tree-throw and buried soil and turf stack [624], to buried soil and midden and turf stack [625]. In another sense this is a densely interconnected organic assemblage, of leaves, wood, soils, earthed turf, bone, flint, pottery, charcoal, nuts, seeds, grasses and further turves of earth. What was earlier, what was late, this faded away as things were entwined together and the past was worked into the present. These assemblages interconnect in ways that cannot simply be reduced to the mapping or planning of axial activity. Furthermore, these notions of assemblage spill out into stone and disrupt the very fabric of structure. It is not just that there was an axial line of activity constructed out of turf and then out of stone, it is not that there are lines of turf that mark the way for stone structures. These more organic assemblages, played out through dense interconnections between things, can be seen in further turf stacks and further matrices of earth and wood, which spin through the entire web of the cairn.

Context [286] was another stack of turfs. These turves were truly a part of what had become an intensely interconnected assemblage of things. There is no easy way to separate out chronological, as opposed to physical, relationships between things. What I am suggesting, is that it is time within our histories that we embrace the fact that there may never have been any order to or order of things. I embrace the movement and dynamism of Deleuze and Guattari in their writing of what has yet to come (1987). The main section that indicates the location of [625] and [286] (see Figure 4.9, Saville 1990: figure 56), has us looking from the inside out; we want to believe that these were the tentative tracings of an axial line in turf, with 'primary dumps' of soil and stone matrices before the cumulative pinning together of these

materials in coursed stonework. From the interiority of this axial work, we then want to look out for the ends of this process, where further lenses of material held this main axis in place. However, a section does not capture anything except our expectation of this sequence. Why should the entire matrix of activity be held in the sway of a section? What of activities that were carried out in different directions, that penetrate through the latitudinal flow of the section and disrupt its sequential logic? What of the possibility of interior areas having been unremarkable, areas that were only picked up and worked on at a later date? Rather than a sequence of construction, I wish to work with dynamics of deterritorialization and destratification and intensities of acceleration and rupture. To begin with I want to express a free standing and structural nature to many of the earth, turf and soil matrices. This is in order to create other resistances to stonework. Before stone coursing there was turf stacking; [441] was physically stacked over [625]. Rather than the stonework having been freestanding, materials had been interdigitated in order to create a fluid pinning and penetration between materials. Stacks of turf [286] partly on top of soil/stone [294] and stone and void [554], leant on course stone [441], which sat on stacks of turf [625]. The stonework needed to be pinned up by further soil and stone matrices. It looks precarious in the section precisely because each stone plaque in [441] is starkly outlined and brought to the fore. Stones are drawn out of context. Despite the hazy outline that had been drawn around a general context [286], the stacks of turf, the turves stacked, hold their own because there was a verticality to the edges of these contexts that cannot be ignored (see 5.1). Against the odds [286] looks distinct. And yet I react now against what I am writing, because it is not really the distinctness of these materials that I wish to argue for. These materials were entwined. Yes, at some points they seem to break apart from the assemblage, and I wish to use these moments to bring to your attention the dynamic qualities of materials other than stone. However, everything was knitted and woven into a precarious assemblage of things. I am caught between wanting to show you other materials and then wanting to partly deny that by emphasising instead the process over the material, or the materialness of process and the dynamics of assembly work.

4.3.4 'Stone fills'

Let us stay with deterritorialization and destratification a little longer in order to disrupt the fabric of structure. I have attempted to demonstrate, in Figure 4.10, the ways in which materials were at times more substantial in their form than supposed structural divides. From examining Saville's 1:20 excavation plans, and the excavation context sheets, I noticed that many of the supposed 'fill' category materials were larger and structurally more impressive than those that were a part of the 'revetment' category. In Figure 4.10, shown in red, are the areas where very large stone boulders and blocks occurred. This was very similar to the exercise carried out on the Gwernvale excavation plans. At the site of Gwernvale, I was able to argue against precedence being given to compartmental divides, when these would not have held together without the much larger so-called 'fill' and 'packing' materials that actually surrounded them. The point of the construction work was that it was possible to thread through smaller more ephemeral materials by employing larger stonework to prop them up and structure the continuation of the weave. This partly proved to be the case with the site of Hazleton North, the 'fill' and 'revetment' materials seemed to parody structure::fill scenarios. Yet, there was not at Hazleton North the repetitive weaving between materials that seemed to have been assembled at Gwernvale. The construction work at Hazleton North seems to have been a little more deterritorialised and destratified (see Figure 4.10). For example, there was no repetition in the use of larger 'fill' then smaller 'structure' materials. Larger boulders and blocks of stone were used disparately throughout the cairn architecture and these materials often seem to have been used to dispart or disrupt 'revetment' architectures. There are three areas within Figure 4.10 where the larger materials shown in red transgress the 'revetment' material shown in blue (see Figure 4.11 for an example of this).

Within the sections and plans of Saville's monograph are displayed clean cut distinctions between materials due, Saville has argued, to the construction of cellular units and an axial line. However, I have been attempting to argue that there are architectures that disrupt these structures. In Figure 4.10, I not only digitised the larger blocks of stone but also marked in yellow a material that Saville had dismissed as 'rubble'. I digitised those contexts which had more stone than soil in their matrix, but which had within that matrix the smallest size of stone. I chose these contexts

because they verged on being defined as 'soils' or 'dumps' of material. They were given this interpretative description in the context sheets, but due to the stone content the stones were actually drawn and so I could follow these matrices of material visually in plan and in section. What is interesting, in the eastern area of construction, is that the 'rubble' matrix that is shown in yellow and the larger blocks of limestone in red seem to have been used in the construction of the axial line. There is not only a great contrast between these materials, that then marked a distinction architecturally, but these materials physically prop up the thin line of coursed limestone that had been used between them at this point (see Figure 4.5). This is at the very same point in the architecture where the use of large block material had at the same time transgressed a 'revetment' structure to the north of the axial line.

Further to the west, the 'rubble' material had been incorporated throughout the entire matrix of the cairn architecture. It was intermingled and tied up with the axial line at this point, two 'revetment' structures to the north of the axial line, a 'revetment' structure and 'fin wall' to the south (see Figure 4.12). On the one hand, it seems as if this 'rubble' material had seeped or spilled through structural divides. The axial line had still been constructed from a thin course of limestone. However, what is noticeable is the lack of distinction that dramatic contrasts between materials made in other areas of the construction site. The 'rubble' material physically disrupted the cellular 'revetment' that had been constructed directly east of the northern chamber. On the upper level of the excavation plan, there was no direct contact between 'revetment' and axial line. The 'rubble' that had been built up on either side of the axial line had blocked construction of the 'revetment' (see Figure 4.12). It makes one wonder what exactly is being revetted in a coursed plaquette construction, when 'rubble' fills have blocked these connective areas of cellular structure. I have already discussed in the prefix to this chapter my concern for Saville's overconcern with cellular unit construction and a single context recording methodology ascribed to capture these architectural 'elements'. I want to re-use a quote from Saville when he realised that it had not always been possible to simply remove supposed 'fill' material in order to reveal or expose 'revetment':

'The individual dumps were rarely fully exposed in plan, because of the technique of excavation unit by unit, and their edges were later extrapolated where necessary. This is emphasised, because there

were problems of reconciling the relationships of individual dump contexts and the plans of the dumps...are in part schematic' (1990:32).

I attempted this exercise if you like in reverse. It was impossible for me to make plans, as it was for Saville, of materials that had already been removed as 'fill' and so, as I have described above, I went to the upper levels of the excavation plan. What this demonstrates is a further problem of 'reconciling the relationships of individual dump contexts' with particular cellular units. I am not trying to suggest that these architectures of 'revetment' did not exist at all. There are indeed areas where plaquettes of limestone have been built up in courses, but these are partial or a part of other materials and techniques used in construction work. Coursed construction in limestone was not all consuming or all enclosing. Strange anomalies emerge between my digitised version of materials on the excavation plan and Saville's plan of the cairn cellular structure (see Figure 4.10 and Figure 4.13; Saville 1990: figure 46). Firstly, I have brought to the fore areas of blockage created from 'rubble' material and the ways in which this negated a connected 'revetment' of cells. Saville has plaquettes exposed in plan that seem to have knitted in directly to the axial line in order to create cell I/G [195] to [456] (see Figure 4.13). Secondly, I have been discussing the effects of the physical materiality of the 'rubble' material on further construction work. I do not consider this material to have had a distinct form. I do not consider it to have worked in isolation, as an architectural element, as Saville has for plaquette 'revetment'. The 'rubble' material was entwined with other materials to create a dynamic assemblage of things. It was distinct as a material because it leant on and was itself further propped up by other materials. On either side of the plaquette 'revetment' [189], that was located to the east of the blocked 'revetment' [195] (see Figure 4.12), were two distinct areas of 'rubble' material. This 'rubble' material remained distinct due to the other materials that it worked with in the construction of this area. 'Rubble' material was built up against courses of plaquettes that were themselves held in place by further 'rubble' material. These were all held in place or leant on the large blocks of limestone shown in red. There were very connected architectural dynamics played out in this area, but these connections were created along with many other materials that do not reduce down into 'fills' enclosed by 'revetment'. Saville has drawn this particular 'revetment' as having been only partial and not fully connected to the axial materials ([189] in Figure 4.13).

Some of the differences between Saville's plan of the cairn cellular structure and my digitised version of materials on the excavation plan are to do with differences in materials and the ways in which these materials were used at different heights throughout the site. For example, the 'rubble' that blocked [195] from axial line [456] could easily have been built up over earlier courses of [195]. What is of importance, is that put together, my digitised plan and Saville's comments on the escapability of cellular 'fill' material, demonstrate that cellular construction did not completely work. Architecturally it ignores too many other materials and techniques of construction. For example, Saville's plan has removed the 'rubble' matrix in order to expose 'revetment' [195], and on his plan the 'revetment' only tied into an axial area that was constructed out of plaquettes [456] and not turf [624]. Figure 4.5 demonstrated the dynamic of marking processes, where architecture was created through contrasts in materials (blocks in red, plaquettes in blue and rubble in yellow). However, this is an area that Saville remained distinctly unimpressed by:

'To the east in units E and C, the axial zone was disrupted by modern disturbances and was otherwise difficult to interpret because of the shallowness of the surviving cairn: effectively only two or three courses between ploughsoil and buried soil in places' (1990:39).

4.3.5 'Fin walls'

'I discovered that the way a writer positions herself in her writing is architectural and has implications for the way in which the writer meets the reader. Certain forms of writing make walls, others create meeting points; some stories close down possibilities for discussion, while others invite participation' (Rendell 2002:15).

I am just as guilty for overmarking particular material things over others. Saville drew a 'cairn' but outlined a 'quarry'. He drew stones but outlined or removed soil matrices. I have digitised in green in Figure 4.10 a particular kind of stone work, in order, I hurriedly argue, to get at something else, wood panelling or shuttering, but I do not think I have been quite as successful in this exercise as with the digitisation of the other materials and so I must once again resort to text and writing in order to represent these areas of construction. Particular areas of the stone architecture were

referred to by Saville as 'fin walls'. Fin 146 was perhaps the most striking in that an oblique photograph of the stone material was produced in the monograph (Saville 1990:47, figure 55). These 'walls' are referred to in French accounts of long cairn architecture as 'transverse structures' (Chancerel and Kinnes 1992, 1992, 1993 and 1994). However, French archaeologists seemed to have created this terminology in order to allude to what the stonework was propping up rather than the stones themselves. These were transverse structures because large laminated plaques of limestone had been placed on their sides in order to shore up wickerwork, or wicker and wood panels or shuttering. What was important about these structures was the void between them, or between them and other stone/earth materials. A void was usually encountered between two parallel lines of these transverse structures, or between a transverse structure and a compartmental divide ('revetment'), or between a transverse structure and a turf wall. The plaques of limestone collapsed slightly onto each other or the other structural entity as the wood or wicker rotted away and so the limestone plaques always seem to be extremely angled inwards towards the area where the more organic wooden matter would have been. There is no discussion of such a void within the Hazleton North context sheets or monograph. I have marked in green seven 'fin walls' (four of the seven were identified by Saville, [423] [146] [185] and [31]). Within the Hazleton North archive these 'fin walls' were drawn independently of the cairn context, they were understood to be architectural elements similar to cellular 'revetment', and so they were planned as a separate context. I have digitised the 'fin walls' back into the long cairn in order to demonstrate the ways in which they worked dynamically with other materials and techniques of construction, but also to show that these no longer visible parts of the architecture were perhaps the most difficult physically to transgress during further construction work.

Figure 4.10 highlights the way in which the plaques of stone worked in tandem with other materials in order to securely pin the wickerwork or wooden shuttering in place. Five of the 'fin walls' were constructed along with plaquettes that were laid in courses. In all of these cases, from the 1:20 excavation plans, it was possible to identify a void running between the plaques and the plaquettes of limestone. I identified a further two 'fin walls' and these were located to the south of the axial line between the extreme south-eastern and south-western examples. Both of these 'fin walls' existed as a double line of upright plaque stones that were angled inward at the

top of the stone towards each other. It is interesting that the second of these, which was located parallel to the extreme south-eastern example, was a double line of upright plaque stones with a small course of stone plaquettes and a block of large bolder limestone having further propped up these materials from the eastern side. It is also of interest to note that none of the constructional materials, or the techniques used in construction work, ever transgressed these areas of wooden shuttering. The area immediately to the east of the construction I have just described, and also north of the axial line from this area, were points where the large blocks digitised in red transgressed lines of 'revetment'. Perhaps, this was because shuttering or panelling shot up through the matrix of the cairn, the dimensions of the wickerwork or wood panels having been more than the dimensions of any one material; dimensions that would have left behind the stone plaques that would have acted as footings. There is a piercing verticality to these wooden materials and panels that has to be taken into consideration. These are the points in our work on construction where concepts of elevation have to occur. This is also further evidence for a more organic assemblage, played out through dense interconnections between things that can be seen in turf stacks and matrices of earth and wood which spin through the entire web of the cairn.

This focus on 'fin walls' is not about creating further 'walls' out of wood, it is an attempt to create meeting points and invite participation in how we think about the materiality of our evidence. It is about emphasising the process over the material, or the materialness of process and the dynamics of assembly work. Wicker or wooden shuttering, or panelling would have created points where materials would have met. These meeting points were interstices between materials. I do not consider it necessary to search for plaque footings in order to argue that panels had existed within the matrix of the cairn. Other points, places where we can look, are where materials remained distinct within an entwined assemblage of things, or where these materials maintained a verticality to their form (see 5.1). One good place for this would have been in the area of construction I described where rubble, boulder, plaquette, rubble, pitched blocks of plaquette/rubble met (see Figure 4.12). Another would be to the north of [148] and south of [444] on section 3 (Figure 4.2), for how else would you explain the verticality of these materials; surely something must have held them in place?

By considering a movement between materials, by negotiating particular material and historical conditions, we get at the dynamics of people's labour and we create the medium of architecture. By attempting to understand the ways in which materials were connected together, and what kinds of conditions this created, we begin the process of creating different architectural histories. These dynamic connections create ways in which to relate to further architectural materials and architectural techniques. Dynamic connections are in themselves architectural, they are about assemblage. As I have already argued, understanding these architectural dynamics, or imagining the possibilities for the ways in which themes of construction were at work, is dependent on the ways in which we understand or conceptualise the nature of archaeological evidence. This is not a matter of dealing with those things that simply physically exist, in an encounter with these materials we come to realise what else may have been there and what these things may have gone on to become. This is an archaeology of presence:

'Archaeology routinely treats its evidence as a residue which stands as a testimony to the absence of humanity. The archaeology of absence thus seeks out traces which people leave behind them. We would treat that evidence instead as the means by which humanity was made present. Our work has therefore focused upon the development of an excavation methodology which supports the examination of the archaeology of presence' (Andrews et al. 2000: 7).

Construction work carried out at Hazleton North, this construction site, did not work compartmentally. At times themes of compartmentalisation were picked up and worked on materially, however these areas were often transgressed and disrupted. Labour was just as much about an understanding of a permeability between things, the interdigitation of things, the accumulation of things, the creation of transformative spaces through networks of things, the piercing of a matrix through splinters of wood, a piercing, knitting, mingling of materials. I started off the ideas for the text of this chapter by throwing all of the materials and constructional techniques that I could possibly identify from the Hazleton North archive at the one drawing and then trying to create concepts and ways of understanding constructional labour that could keep up with this mesh of things. To me the problem was not in arguing that Hazleton North did not work compartmentally, but it was in attempting to convey how partial and complex the connective dynamics were that were worked through this site, connective dynamics with ever more knotted and frayed threads as constructional work went on

and on. The materialisation of these processes, through ever more dynamic concepts of assemblage, and the ways in which I have gone about writing about these processes, are themselves architectural:

‘All we talk about are multiplicities, lines, strata and segmentarities, lines of flight and intensities, machinic assemblages and their various types, bodies without organs and their construction and selection, the plane of consistency, and in each case the units of measure. Stratometers, deleometers, BwO units of density, BwO units of convergence: Not only do these constitute a quantification of writing, but they define writing as always the measure of something else. Writing has nothing to do with signifying. It has to do with surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 4-5).

4.4 Fourth millennium entwined assemblages

I want now, in conclusion, if there can be such a thing, to discuss the significance of these findings. My work on Hazleton North and Gwernvale has been critical not only of the conceptualisation of the architecture at these sites, but of the phasing of constructional work and the architectural histories that that phasing has created. There was a much longer, and indeed non-linear, construction sequence for the building work carried out there. For example, I have been able to demonstrate that the timber structures, stone box chambers, midden and pits could have stood for some time without the other architectural ‘elements’. I have also shown the ways in which timber structures, stone box chambers, pits, compartment materials, compartmental divides and axial lines were knitted together. The incorporation of human bone into these areas must have occurred while construction work was ongoing, rather than the perceived view of ‘tombs’ having been constructed and then human bone incorporated into them. This transforms our understandings of how the human body was incorporated into these dynamic practices.

My work calls into question the supposed ‘monumentality’ of these sites and places emphasis on acts of construction and the continuity of ideas through the practice of construction, rather than focussing on merely buildings in their own right. This also shifts the emphasis away from the permanence of the material, or the fixed nature of a planned or designed building. ‘Monumentality’ is not a concept that assists in understanding the dynamics of these areas of construction work, nor is it a concept

that would have been understood by people in the fifth and early fourth millennia B.C. It perpetuates a way of thinking that is divisive – that seeks to define mutually exclusive domains of practice (whether these be ‘settlement’, ‘construction’, ‘mortuary ritual’, and so forth), and creates layered biographies of places in which it becomes difficult to see the connections created across time and place through laboured practice. I hope that this work articulates how dynamic and connected mesolithic and early neolithic lives were.

However, there was a point in time within the fourth millennium, or rather material and historical conditions came about, which created a more formal and enclosed built ‘architecture’. It is this historical moment that I argue has endlessly been repeated in archaeological accounts. Within my work I make a distinction between partial construction during the fifth and fourth millennia which can be understood through a process of assemblage, and an architecture or more formal enclosed building project that somehow became a product of that entwined assemblage slightly later in the early part of the fourth millennium. With the site of Gwernvale, I argued that connective dynamics or partial connections were no longer the medium through which to understand these areas of construction during and after the construction of the internal and external revetment walls and the chamber passage ways (this argument also included the construction of the forecourt and the western concave wall). I would argue that this is also the case for the internal and external revetment, passage ways, forecourt and horn works at Hazelton North.

The internal and external revetments at Hazelton North were constructed out of large blocks of limestone that were set horizontally east to west and which were laid in courses. Indeed, I find it difficult to understand how it was possible for the excavators to separate out external and internal revetment and the supposed ‘fills’ between these structures as all of these areas had the same type of material used in their construction and were built using the same constructional technique. None of the areas of ‘primary dumps’, ‘turf walls’, cellular ‘revetments’, ‘stone fills’ or ‘fin walls’ were directly knitted in to these components (see Figure 4.10). The latitudinal axis of several of the ‘primary dumps’, the cellular ‘revetments’ and the ‘fin walls’ was crossed by longitudinally set blocks of limestone that were laid in courses against these materials. The large blocks of limestone that were laid longitudinally and in

courses also butted up against and so faced the large block and 'rubble' fills (see Figure 4.12).

I have argued that the actual chamber areas at Hazleton North had existed for a long period of time within this construction site as boxed chambers. I argued that this had been the case due to the particular kinds of material culture that were incorporated into the box structures, the timber structure, the midden and the quarry pits. I now wish to demonstrate a distinction between the construction of the stone box chambers and the passageways due to the differing physical relationships that existed between particular 'rubble' fills from the matrix of the cairn and their respective relationships to the chamber and the passage way. In particular, with this crucial description in the context sheet of 'rubble fill' [377], 'excavation showed dump [377] to underlie DSW (dry stone wall) [415] but to postdate orthostats [409] and [369] to either side'. [415] was the dry stone walling of the northern passage and [377] demonstrates that the passage was later than the northern stone box chamber.

I am not arguing that the passageways and revetments were constructed significantly later in time (I am not suggesting that these were late fourth millennium B.C. activities). What I am suggesting is that these longitudinal courses of stone were distinctly different from other areas of the construction site. These coursed materials were laid against other materials, they were not inter 'leaved' or interdigitated with other materials, they did not prop other materials up, they were not in any way involved in the precarious knitting together of areas of construction. However, this distinction does not make them more significant. The more intimate and complex connections between materials that I have attempted to describe in this chapter created junctions with the human body itself. Bodies were needed to prop up materials while others were put in place; these messy organic assemblages would have meant that bodies would have been smeared with these materials and so the limits to where bodies ended and materials began would have been confused. Fires, worked flint, processed timber, processed animal bone and pottery all attest to the different ways in which the making and using of things connected things to bodies and played an important part in the construction process. These intimate connections between things and people would have been remembered (see 6.3). These are the spaces where connections were made between humans, animals and materials. These are the spaces

where histories were materially created and the possibilities for different futures were being constructed. By occupying these spaces, rather than constantly 'looking' at the already formed, we engage with material and historical conditions in different ways. Such an endeavour has been the point of this chapter, and I would argue that through these encounters we create a historical perspective and a knowledge of past worlds constantly in the process of becoming.

This chapter has been about dynamics and dynamic connections. It was an attempt to represent bodily dynamics through the ways in which assemblages of things and things and people were entwined. It is an understanding of dynamics where connections were woven together from the small things of life. For in this way things and people became known through their actions, and were marked and became a plausible part of historical process, but at the same time these histories were not created as if they were the only one. I hope to have demonstrated how effective such a medium of architecture was to those making and building during the fifth and fourth millennia B.C. I could go on and discuss other ways of making and using things at these construction sites but that would be another thesis. This thesis is an attempt to demonstrate an effective medium of architecture, but a medium that has previously remained unconsidered within our archaeological accounts of these sites or as that which is incidental to architecture.

Postscript 4

In order to discuss a little more fully Grimes' secondary working drawings, and many of the photographs that he took, I want, first of all, to consider the ways in which he seems to have become intrigued by working on the pitch of stones. In his written text on Saltway Barn Long Barrow, Bilbury, Gloucestershire (Grimes 1960), you get the sense that it was impossible for Grimes to reduce the weave of this architecture into a series of junctions that either cut, overlay, or butt other structural elements. Although Grimes attempted to explore physical distinctions between independent units of construction, recognised by him as places of juncture, he failed time and time again. Reflecting on this failure, his descriptive text started to operate through more inclusive verbs such as incorporating, bridging, and the interlocking of architectural details:

'The lower courses of Wall 1b were prolonged more than a foot beyond the upper part, into the filling of Unit VIII. With 7 and 8, the former of which was prolonged in a similar way, it produced an effect of **interlocking** which may have been intentional' (Grimes 1960:14, my emphasis).

Although confused by these architectures, Grimes paid great attention to angles and points of contact between materials. He was interested in working out a movement between materials, the ways in which materials were set up against each other and played off each other. Grimes' text has these dynamics as its focus, and I would argue that it is because he understands these dynamics to be the medium of architecture. It is this medium that he has to deal with through his ongoing negotiation of these materials during excavation and it is precisely this encounter that Grimes writes about in his text. For example, Grimes wrote:

'The transition from low level to high was contrived by facing at least part of the eastern termination of Unit 6A with a rough wall which made a sharp **angle** at its junction with the outside (north) wall of the unit. How this eastern wall ended on the inside must remain uncertain' (15, my emphasis).

Due to Grimes' narration of the ways in which he encountered a medium of architecture during excavation, we are given the sense of complication and confusion throughout his written description. The immediacy of his writing carries through into several of the photographs he took during the act of excavating architecture. Within text and several of the photographs it is literally and metaphorically as if he has got

his hands full. Figure 4.14 (in Grimes 1960: Plate VIIa) was taken as materials were being removed and where points of contact between pitched and coursed plaquettes of limestone were being revealed. It was taken during the act of excavation, what we would call today an action shot (I would argue that it is unique to have so many action shots published in a monograph), and I would argue that Grimes became reliant on this kind of photography again and again in order to convey the knitted tangle that he understood as having been neolithic architecture. In the text he wrote: 'Structurally, the cairn is an exercise in pitched construction: the cairn-material is everywhere laid against and over wall-faces at an angle, so that the whole formed a closely-knit unity' (1960:24).

Grimes initials were on all of the photographs and drawings that I encountered within the NMR archive held in Swindon (the secondary working drawings state that they were drawn by W.F.G.). I would argue that Grimes himself undertook all of the drawing and photographic work during excavation, because this was a way of representing his encounter with the processes that were negotiated in the construction of neolithic architecture (photography was a way of representing the excavation of construction). And so in his monograph Grimes explicitly writes about the 'action shot' photograph:

'The stones were laid with much care and skill, successive deposits being set to wedge and buttress others in place. Plate VIIb (which is this one) illustrates well how the **angles** between walls were especially carefully treated in this way' (1960:16, my emphasis).

I know that Grimes carried out his excavation work during the Second World War, and that perhaps due to a shortage of labour he was perhaps the only planner and photographer; however he does demonstrate in his text how important this way of working was in order to be able to engage more critically with the complexities of construction sites. Encounters with unfamiliar **angles** in Grime's textual and photographic accounts create points within the architecture where we can begin the process of (re)vision and from where we can depart into imagining different kinds of architecture.

There are other architectural principles, points of tension rather than points of contact, that in their construction denied a movement within the mesh of things. A politics of negation seems to have emerged through blocking possible points of connection and knotting the assemblage of things. This is hinted at in Grimes' text when he wrote:

'In a sense 8 and 9 might be treated as one, for there is no definite structural division between them; but Wall 7 was definitely built before Wall 8, and the effect of its close interlocking with wall 1b is to **shut off** Unit 8 from 9' (1960:17, my emphasis).

During this research I have not been able to locate Grimes' full archive of Saltway Barn Long Barrow (the excavation plans and site notebooks) or indeed that of Burn Ground (the site notebooks). The NMR archive in Swindon holds a scaled down coloured arrow drawing of Saltway Barn only. Grimes was criticised, on his first presentation of his excavation results at Saltway Barn Long Barrow, by members of the Prehistoric Society. Grimes writes:

'Another explanation would regard the site as a quarry of the 18th century (the date being fixed by the objects of that period found in the chamber). This suggestion appeared to find some support when the site was first described to the Prehistoric Society, and to this extent calls for serious consideration here. According to it, the chamber would have been a dwelling or shelter for the workers, while the walls were haphazard and of the purely structural type that quarrymen are supposed to build for the reinforcement of their stone-heaps' (1960:26).

The architectures of long cairns and quarries have long been inter-related (see 4.3.2). Many of these neolithic architectures have been quarried for their stone (e.g. Penywyrlod). A slatter's work shelter was discovered built into the side of Kinton Thorns long cairn in Gloucestershire (Brill 1977:24). Indeed, I have already discussed in chapter 4 how similar the plaquette limestone material is to the roof tile material that has been produced in the Cotswold area from the sixteenth century. There are very particularly connections with roof tile materials and roof tile quarries. The pendle from roof tile quarrying had to be split into slates immediately on extraction. Brill writes of this on-site work that:

'Given the right kind of winter the slatter put up his shelter of straw-covered hurdles or small cave-like structures of stone and having split the pendle into sizable planes would convert it into slates, sitting on a stone or a straw mat.' (1977:24).

This has very serious implications for the 'chamber' at Saltway Barn. The Saltway Barn chamber is distinctly odd in that it had a stone bench built into the fabric of its construction and what can only be described as a window above this (see Figure 4.15; Grimes 1960: Plate IIIb). The compartments that were built up against the western part of this 'chamber' (in particular III, IV, V, VI, VII, VII see Figure 4.16 and 4.17; Grimes 1960: figure 7 and Plate VIIIb) were circular and very similar to roof tile quarry pits which were dug out in order to be clamped (Ian Kinnes pers.comm.). Also the 'rock-cut pit with central island' (8) was very similar to evidence for stone quarrying. Brill writes of later medieval stone quarrying techniques that:

'Before the use of huge excavating machines to extract stone crushed to make artificial stone bricks, a method producing a straight cliff-like edge overhanging a vast pit of rubble, a quarry was opened by clearing away the topsoil in a rough semi-circle. The workings then gradually ate their way into the hillside so that after many years a tall rounded cliff was formed. A cartway of easy gradient grew from the original opening as the sides widened and deepened, leaving a broad flat floor covered with the residue of fine grains of stone immediately in front and a scree beyond, thus providing working space for crane and windlass and room for trolleys and sleds to be driven close to the quarry face' (1977:18-19).

Without the more detailed excavation plans it is impossible to review more completely whether the excavations at Saltway Barn encountered evidence for a long cairn, a long cairn that was later quarried, or roof tile and stone quarries. Grimes was an expert archaeologist and his work was inspirational in taking on the dynamics of construction work. There were parts of Saltway Barn, for example highlighted in Figure 4.18 (Grimes 1960: plates VIb) and Figure 4.14, that look exactly like the precarious mesh of interdigitated materials that were in evidence within areas of the axial line at the site of Hazleton North. In the end, it is the way in which Grimes dealt with these materials and the medium of neolithic architecture that I want to focus on. It is not what the secondary working drawings prove, it is the way they work, not what they record, that is of ultimate importance. These drawings zoomed in on detail and the ways in which materials connected to one another. A set of coloured arrows, arrows drawn on every stone to represent the pitch of the stones, produced a dynamic knitwork rather than a flat two-dimensional plan.

I would even go as far as to suggest that without the complication and ambiguity of Saltway Barn, we would not have the brilliant archive of Burn Ground. For it was at Saltway Barn that Grimes created and adapted techniques of excavation that were directly related to those processes negotiated during constructional work in the neolithic. It is with Saltway Barn that the immediacy and active process of the act of excavation is represented; in the narrative of the monograph, the series of action shot photographs and the dynamic fluidity represented within the coloured arrow scaled-down secondary working drawing. I have shown how there exists within his text a transformation in the language he used from a butting, cutting, overlying verbal dialogue to that of a more complicated and knitted and interlocking dynamic. This is precisely the difference between the excavation plans that he produced of Burn Ground and the secondary working drawings.

At first, the monograph text of the Burn Ground excavations would seem to be less dynamic than that of Saltway Barn. There does not seem to be the narrative of excavation and encounter that there was with Saltway Barn, but more of a formal report with a specific agenda. Indeed, Grimes' text is an attempt to put to bed once and for all a dispute that was running at the time as to whether the materials that were located outside and against the 'external' walls were 'collapse' or additional architectural detail ('extra revetment'). I do not want myself to delve into the debate of walling and whether it was externalised as a revetment or a façade feature. These are architectural details that were constructed after the histories of the fifth and fourth millennium that I am attempting to develop and write in this thesis. What I do find interesting about Grimes' part in this debate is the position he took and the way he went about dealing with the detail in such a debate. Of course Grimes understood the stone material located in these areas to have been deliberately placed and a part of the construction process. To this end, there exists in the monograph not only an excavation plan (see Figure 4.19; Grimes 1960: figure 20), but an amazing drawing of the pitch of materials without the hardline drawn edges of each stone (Figure 4.20; *ibid*: figure 28), and an interpretive detail of the constructional sequence and pitch of construction (Figure 4.21; *ibid*: figure 29). It was seeing these figures that inspired me to search for Grimes' secondary working drawings, which I found in the NMR at Swindon. What I found crucial about these drawings was that it was the relationship between materials, the dynamic ways in which things connected to each other and

played off each other, that Grimes was attempting to represent and not the outline of the materials in themselves. I redrew the secondary working drawing at the NMR (reproduced here as Figure 4.22). I deliberately chose to redraw the secondary working drawing, rather than simply making a scanned or photocopied copy, because in that labour I came to know in the smallest of detail the dynamics that were at work at Burn Ground. Drawing and redrawing are remarkable interpretative practices (after Clark 2002).

During this process of remarking, which I carried out whilst writing chapter 4 on the site of Hazleton North, I noticed that Grimes had done something quite different to Saville in the ways in which he dealt with the constructional processes that were at work within the long cairn. By representing the pitch on every stone, and not simply drawing the outline of laid stones which were deemed to revet cellular units, Grimes noticed that all of the materials were involved in the process of construction. He wrote:

'Distinct masses could be recognized around the transepts, in the angle between transepts and entrance stones, and between transepts and transverse chamber. These divisions were determined by the pitch and direction of the stones, as elsewhere, not by the presence of structural walls' (1960:66).

Even when he presumed certain materials to have been used in processes of infilling rather than as more structural architectural techniques, because he marked the location and direction of each stone as if it had been deliberately placed, he came to realise that constructional work had not operated within the strictly delimitating moulds of structure::fill scenarios. It is this transformation in interpretation, through drawing, that makes the secondary working drawing of Burn Ground so spectacular. In it (see Figure 4.22), the eye is caught by the dramatic contrasts in the types of materials used during construction, by the interplay and movement that exists in areas where materials were pitched rather than laid in courses, or vertically set rather than pitched. It is also interesting that Grimes remarked on the fact that fragments of human skull and long bones, along with part of the femur of sheep/goat, were caught up in these areas of construction: 'Deposit of bones in cairn to west of transverse chamber...' (Grimes 1960:71). Material culture became a part of architecture. As with the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North, but crucially remarked on by Grimes, parts of a

fragmented quern stone were entwined in the assemblage of the stonework: 'Perhaps the outstanding find is the fragment of a saddle-quern which was found incorporated in the material of the cairn on the north side of the main chamber...' (ibid:75).

However, the most vivid distinction between Grimes and Saville, one which brings me back full circle to the start of my enquiry into Saville's excavation practice (in prefix 4), is the way in which Grimes dealt with the 'tail' of the long cairn. He wrote:

'The third area of the cairn comprised the whole of the tail of the monument to the west of the transverse chamber. It was divided structurally into a northern and southern half, the dividing line being down the spine of the mound. But there was no wall to form a demarcating feature. It appeared that a double row of stones had been laid flat on the original surface along the center line, and the stones of the cairn had been pitched inwards against this spine from both sides' (ibid:67).

Laid stone, but more crucially pitched stone, and differences in the size and shape of stones, were all involved in creating a distinction between the north and south of the constructed area. This is not a thing or structural element that could stand by itself, that Saville so desperately searched for, but many materials assembled together and in different ways. Grimes recognised that a contrast in materials and the ways in which they were used within construction, rather than any one thing in itself, demonstrated that an axial spine existed as a gap or as a place between different constructional materials and techniques.

I attempted to represent gaps within my own work on the site of Hazleton North in order to argue that there were other materials and constructional techniques that were not remarked on in the monograph. In particular I asked why Saville only referred to 'fin walls' in passing and why he did not consider the ways in which they existed parallel to cellular revetments or other fin walls. I also remarked on the gaps that existed between these parallel structures. I then looked for other areas where gaps occurred and considered these as a rich source of information. I argued that these gaps indicated more organic materials, and that they were places where wicker shuttering or wooden paneling were a part of the long cairn assemblage. I also argued that I had failed figuratively to represent these areas of construction within my digitised plan. In contrast, Grimes had figured these places within his secondary working drawing of Burn Ground. Ian Kinnes, commenting on the secondary

working drawing, suggested that when a cairn was made predominantly of dry stone construction without other more earth-based materials, that (when wicker shuttering or wooden paneling degraded) the stone work would have pitched inwards as was the case at Burn Ground.

In chapter 5, I have redrawn the Easton Down, Wiltshire and Gussage Cow Down, Dorset long mound sections in order to continue a research that involves finding references to gaps and then speculating on why these gaps exist.

Prefix 5

‘Accounting and bureaucracy proceed by tracings: they can begin to burgeon nonetheless, throwing out rhizome stems, as in a Kafka novel. An intensive trait starts working for itself, a hallucinatory perception, synesthesia, perverse mutation, or play of images shakes loose, challenging the hegemony of signifier. In the case of the child, gestural, mimetic, ludic, and other semiotic systems regain their freedom and extricate themselves from the ‘tracing’ that is, from the dominant competence of the teacher’s language- a microscopic event upsets the local balance of power’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:15).

I have organised the writing of my thesis in the order with which I encountered the different archives, starting with Gwernvale, Hazleton North, Easton Down, then the two Gussage Cow Down long mounds and South Street. From the very start I have been re-planning the excavation and section plans. With Gwernvale, I laid the site plans out on large trestle tables and started a process of drawing, almost of re-excavating, the detail of the cairn architecture. First of all I drew the ‘pre-cairn’ features which were fixed in the text monograph as mesolithic and earliest neolithic, then I noticed the ways in which the axial and compartmental lines that I was marking made reference to these features. I then realised that in part, although I had figured an important tangle and connection between mesolithic and neolithic evidence (i.e. quite literally figured many areas of long cairn construction as worked out of mesolithic architectures), I had in an other sense been looking for images of a cairn with structural detail that had been brought out in other reports, such as that of Hazleton North (Saville 1990) and many of the French excavations I have been discussing (Cassen 1993; Chancerel and Kinnes 1992, 1992, 1993 and 1994). I did not want my work to simply add extra detail to an established perception of monumentality and cairn architecture. I wanted to demonstrate the dynamic ways in which materials connected and played off each other and how this was evidence for a perception of building work as ‘in process’ within the fifth and fourth millennia; a perception, a history, as a lived experience where these areas were being produced as sites of construction. I then started digitising onto the original overall excavation plans the more rebellious detail that I had encountered. These were areas of construction that made a pantomime out of structure::fill scenarios and that were connected to already erected stone box features that were later developed into chambers through the construction of passage ways. On my visits to the Hazleton North archive, to begin

with I tried not to draw at all but to follow a connective narrative that I constructed out of hearths and material culture, a midden, timber structure and stone boxed chambers. I have only really been able to figure these areas of construction within narratives. I think more than anything else, I was shocked by what was not drawn within the Hazleton North archive, due to the routinisation of modified versions of single-context recording systems within our excavation work.

As with Gwernvale, I created a drawing practice that was very like an inverted excavation practice of the Hazleton North site, and noted the ways in which I started to draw or assemble 'pre-cairn' features, primary dumps and axial compartmental lines together. By this process, I noticed that there were particular constructional materials and techniques that I could not draw. These gaps were highlighted by connections between other materials at these points. For example, I was able to demonstrate that fin walls were constructed in tandem with other fin walls or with compartmental lines or cellular revetment. I was also able to produce an image of the ways in which large block or rubble constructional materials maintained a distinct character when used as part of the construction of these areas due, I argued, to the larger dimensions of wicker shuttering or wooden paneling. It was these invisible organic materials that had maintained a distinctness within areas of construction, a distinctness that was transgressed in the parts where cellular revetment was supposed to have acted as a divide. So the areas where gaps were produced also figured at points where 'fill' materials had a distinct form. I deliberately looked for the gaps that I encountered in the plans of the Hazleton North site in redrawing the sections in the Easton Down archive. I encountered more gaps and interpreted these areas as the ghosts of post-holes or as indicating spaces where there had once been wicker shuttering or wooden paneling. Once again these were at points where 'fill' materials had a distinct form of their own.

However, my research work had now changed to a drawing process aimed at remarking sections rather than plans. With the exception of the South Street archive, the drawing work that I undertook was from sites where it had only been possible to carry out limited trench based excavations due to the strict scheduling constraints that now apply to these architectures. Due to this, and due to the particular characteristics of chalk based material, it is more difficult to figure the detailed variations and

differences that are encountered during the excavation of these architectures in plan. Although this meant that I was not able to re-excavate through drawing many of these sites, rather than finding these conditions a hindrance, I found that I really had to focus again on questions of what it is that is at work in our architectural and archaeological drawings.

The work of images has been of key importance to my research. It is a way of questioning, a perspective, which has been foregrounded within recent histories of architectural practice (chapter 1). Through this questioning I realised that there was a legacy to the ways in which we perceive of architecture within archaeological practice (chapter 2). I have never attempted to argue within this thesis that by a critique of the ways in which these legacies are a part of our image making and figuring of fifth and fourth millennia architecture that I am somehow exempt or better able to abstract my work from the messy politics of our practice. This thesis is an exercise in dealing with my own messy practice in figuring and refiguring these architectures. In that vein, chapter 5 is a continuation of that practice. I have chosen to include more earthen or chalk based long mounds in order to really get to grips with the dynamic constructive qualities of these materials. Long mounds, more than long cairns, seemed to have been treated as a very seamless and tidy architectural repertoire. This chapter is an attempt to disrupt these historical accounts.

Summary of long mound sites

Once again, in order to create clearer meeting points in the text for writer and reader to understand each other, I will first of all summarise the findings of the excavations that are mentioned in this chapter. Easton Down long mound is situated on high chalk downland in Bishops Cannings, North Wiltshire. It was excavated by Alasdair Whittle in 1991 and I would like to acknowledge Whittle for his work. This site was understood to be an earthen and chalk-based long mound which was orientated along its long axis in an east-west direction and the upcast mound was 45m in length and 25m in width (Whittle et al. 1993). Two flanking ditches on either side of the mound were recorded. The mound consisted of large blocks of chalk in the upper parts of the construction and finer and smaller pieces in the lower sections. Tip lines were recorded in the chalk that denoted dumping of chalk rubble from the centre of the

mound outwards. Underneath the chalk material of the mound there was a substantial buried soil which sealed two tree-throw features ([247] excavated feature). Two stakeholes [257] and [258] were located near the inner core of the mound cutting into the chalk natural. A dense cluster of worked flint was found within the southern ditch near its base, against the western edge. This cluster was the product of *in situ* knapping and the worked flint was interpreted as the residue of nodule testing and core preparation (Pollard in Whittle et al. 1993:208). Analysis of the soil micromorphology of the buried soil and land-snail evidence demonstrated a meeting point between woodland and grassland landscapes (Macphail in Whittle et al. 1993: 218; Rouse and Evans in Whittle et al. 1993:211).

Two long mounds (Scheduled Ancient Monuments 78 and 294) were investigated in the upper Allen valley on Gussage Cow Down, Dorset, in 2002 by Charly French and Helen Lewis. I would like to acknowledge French and Lewis for their work (French 2002). Long mound 294 was 75m in length and 17m in width and the long axis was orientated in an east-west direction. It was recorded that the mound was flanked by two ditches on either side. On excavation it was found that the visible 'mound' was only a slight contour rise of the higher chalk subsoil surface beneath the modern ploughsoil, due to the mound material having been ploughed out. There was evidence that both ditches had been cut as a series of inter-cutting pits. Four clusters of worked flint were found in primary levels of the ditches. Two clusters were located directly on the base of the ditch, one on the northern side of the northern ditch and the other in the centre of the southern ditch. The other two clusters of worked flint were recorded from pits which cut through the primary chalk rubble fill in the central zone of the northern ditch.

Gussage Cow Down long mound 78 was 50m in length and 22m in width and it survives to a height of 4m above the modern ground surface. It is surrounded by a partially infilled, horseshoe-shaped ditch. The mound was interpreted as having comprised of two phases of construction. The first mound was made up of thin layers of fine, compressed chalk rubble and redeposited turf. The outer edge of the first mound was retained by a large chalk block and flint nodule-lined footing. Two supporting posts were recorded on the inside of the footing and a cluster of worked flints was found within the upper surface of the buried soils just to the outside of this

revetment. A larger and higher second mound was understood to have been built of fine and coarse chalk rubble, and to have incorporated the earlier mound into its construction. This too was understood to exhibit a revetment at its outer basal edge composed of chalk rubble blocks. The buried soils underneath the chalk mound comprised a thin but well preserved rendsina soil profile.

The Horslip long mound was sited on the southern slope of Windmill Hill in north Wiltshire. It was excavated by Paul Ashbee in 1959 and I would like to acknowledge Ashbee for his work. Only an irregular area of the sub-barrow soil, protected by a remnant of the mound, remained (it was orientated in a south-east to north-west direction). However, an arc of seven pits was recorded at the proximal end and on the west side of the mound. Ashbee stated that two of these pits were at a uniform distance west of what would later have become the barrow long axis. This axis was taken as a line equidistant from each flanking ditch (Ashbee et al. 1979:212). Worked flint, antler and deposits of ox bones were recovered from the flanking ditches.

The Beckhampton Road long mound was located in a valley in Bishops Cannings, north Wiltshire. The mound was set along the top of a ridge of glacial drift deposits and was flanked by ditches on either side. It was excavated by Isobel Smith in 1964 and I would like to acknowledge Smith for her work. A round barrow had once stood upon the north-eastern end of the long mound. Smith stated that the mound was comprised of a framework of fencing, the fill placed within the framework, and an outer revetment (Ashbee et al. 1979:234). The framework was interpreted as an axial line of stake-holes which had divided the mound, and offsets from either side of this line subdividing the proximal half into twenty bays. Lateral lines were understood to close the ends of the bays and to carry round the curving proximal end of the mound. Sarsen stone was incorporated into the construction of the mound. This framework was understood to have been filled in with coombe rock, chalk gravel, brickearth and turves. Two ox skulls were recovered from the buried soil, one at each end of what would become the axial line of stakes. Another ox skull was incorporated into the construction of bay XX. Two distinct areas of charcoal were discovered underneath the mound material near the west end of the mound. One had been built next to three stake-holes. It was noted that the post that would have been in the largest stake-hole would have leant in the direction of one of the ox skulls and so there may have been

an ox-hide, with head and hoofs, suspended from the post (Ashbee et al. 1979:245). The other area of charcoal was 4m in length and 2m in width and it lay obliquely across the axis of the mound: this was the area where the ox-skull was actually located. Five stake-holes were encountered underneath this larger area of charcoal.

The South Street long mound was located in the parish of Avebury and the majority of the long mound was to the north of the minor road, South Street. The long axis of the mound was orientated in an east-south-east to west-north-west direction and it was flanked by two ditches on either side. The main excavation of the long mound was carried out by John Evans between 1966 and 1967, and I would like to acknowledge him for his work. The mound was understood to have been constructed from a bay system, which had consisted of an axial line of stakes and offsets from either side of this line. The mound was constructed from this bay system and was filled with turf, chalky soil, coombe rock and chalk. The excavator thought that the distribution of these materials in each bay was to a regular pattern and that this reflected the order in which they were encountered in quarrying (Ashbee et al. 1979: 259). With the exception of bay XIVA, it was noted that there was no chalk rock in the mound on the north side. The front of the mound consisted of a solid mass of chalk rubble. Towards the front of the mound five large sarsen stones and several smaller sarsens had been incorporated into the mound construction. Three of the sarsen stones had been modified by fire. There were three distinct areas of charcoal that were understood to be underneath the mound but these features were at points where the axial line of stakes or the offset lines of stakes were later constructed. One of the modified sarsen stones, Sarsen 1, overlay one of the stake-holes from an offset line (the same offset line that cut through a fire setting). An earlier scatter of worked flints was also in an area that later became part of the long axis of the monument and the other scatter of worked flint that was recovered during the excavation was on the eastern side of an oblique line of stakes that ran from bay III to bay VIII. This oblique structure was thought to pre-date the bay-system but it shared its middle post-hole with the axial line of the bay-system and it respected Sarsen 5. The immediate pre-barrow environment was grassland. A distinct area of cultivation marks were encountered at the base of the buried soil, with casts of old tree roots similarly at the base of the buried soil in another area. An environment of woodland with open areas was inferred from the land-snail evidence (Ashbee et al. 1979:283).

Chapter 5. Earthen long mounds: transformations in understanding the materiality of architecture.

'Deleuze thinks difference primarily as force, as affirmation, as action, as precisely effectivity. Thought is active force, positive desire, thought which makes a difference, whether in the image-form in the visual and cinematic arts, in the built-form in architecture, or in concept-form in philosophy. Deleuze's project thus involves the re-energization of thought, the affirmation of life and change, and an attempt to work around those forces of anti-production that aim to restrict innovation and prevent change: to free lines, points, concepts, events from the structures and constraints which bind them to the same, to the one, to the self-identical' (Elizabeth Grosz 1995:129).

5.1 Organic assemblages as architecture

I knew that I wanted to reinterpret the Easton Down archive before I visited it. Before I started my work on the archive I did not want to prefigure materials in an accumulative sequence of mound construction. I did not want to identify material for what it just was, as 'material'; but instead I wanted to engage with materiality. An engagement with materiality, where human dynamics, the ways in which active processes were negotiated through particular material and historical conditions, were the focus of my enquiry. I wanted to refigure earthen and chalk materials as active, as complex constructional materials that were imbricated in a connective dynamic of construction. I was excited by the prospect of these materials and the ways in which I imagined them to connect. Easton Down long barrow, Wiltshire, was excavated in 1991. Alasdair Whittle had excavated two trenches that were located in the 'tail' or back area of the mound. Trench B, the focus of this study, had been cut perpendicularly, and on the northern side, of the long axis of the mound. The trench extended from the mound to the outer edge of the northern flanking ditch. Trench A was cut latitudinally across the southern flanking ditch. In general terms, the trenches were not located in what is normally considered to be the 'business end of the monument'. To me this was what made the trenches exciting and an ideal opportunity to explore long mound construction for my thesis. In chapter 2, I elucidated the ways in which the materials involved in these areas of construction had been thought about from the antiquarian period onwards as inert materials, as passive dumps of material that in their accumulation led to the build-up of a mound. Even within the social archaeologies that I find so challenging (e.g. Thomas 1991 and 1999), these constructional materials were separated out and histories were created from what each

material was deemed to signify, rather than the dynamic and complex assembly of these materials and the ways in which such a constructive dynamic may have led to previously unimagined points of contact (see my discussion of Thomas' work in 2.6). Saville had assumed that there was a logical constructional sequence to the 'tail' end of the Hazleton North site. I have attempted to argue that there were parts of his work where he had ignored a more densely interconnected organic assemblage of things. I therefore felt that encountering material from trenches located in the 'tail' end of an earthen long mound was an opportunity not to be missed, for figured in these areas were the extremities or boundaries of archaeological perceptions of precisely what materials and constructional techniques matter within neolithic architectures.

Figure 5.1 is a redrawing of the Easton Down Trench B latitudinal section, but with broken lines indicating where posts and shuttering may once have been drawn on it (Whittle et al. 1993:208, figure 3). There are so many different constructional materials represented here from turves, to earth and chalk rubble, to compacted chalk, to cubes of fresh chalk rubble, to chalk blocks. I discovered, while redrawing these materials, that there was a verticality to the limits of many of these materials, and that in these cases there was also a dramatic contrast between things where this limit or edge was made material. In several of the cases there was the ghost or void of where a post had been, but in many other areas I could only imagine that such a clear vertical edge and distinct contrast in things could have come about from there having been some kind of wicker shuttering or wooden paneling as a part of the assemblage at this point. By marking in these areas, by drawing attention to the gaps, I created a whole new vertical dimension to the ways in which things had been put together. The constructional materials no longer looked like bands of material that had been laid down following the contours of the previous layer. There were no longer continuous layers of material, but instead parts and fragments, that broke off and were interrupted by wooden partitions that shot upwards: from the seamless flow of materials that I had seen represented in section after section of long mounds, where dumps of material had gently arched downwards from the inner to the outer areas of a mound; to materials that were pitched at angles and that were disrupted by the vertical lines of shuttering. There was no general flow from an inner area to an outer area, no contour, but a dynamic rearticulation of boundaries. Here the centre was reactive to the façade (Andrew Refiti 2002), and the 'outer' areas were not the edges of construction but

were built up areas which pushed upwards. There was no one movement from inside to outside, or contour from top to bottom, but an infinitude of actions at work (Andrew Benjamin 2002).

'The rest of the mound consisted of chalk above the inner, axial core, rising up to 1.6m above the old ground surface. The chalk was generally finer and smaller in the lower parts, larger and blockier in the upper parts, with lenses and patches of fine grey chalk throughout. Tip lines are clearly visible in the sections and show straightforward dumping from the center of the barrow outwards' (Whittle et al. 1993:200).

I mentioned in chapter 4, that there is a direction of vision that is implicit in section drawing, particularly in latitudinal sections that were cut 'across' cairns or, in this case, mounds. However, the active dynamics archaeologists employ in 'reading' these sections are not exclusive. There are other dynamics at work which have to be considered and which cannot be so easily read or dealt with. If we consider just some of these other dynamics, and the difficulties brought to bear in negotiating our way through these material and historical conditions, then we may just get at something else. If, as Barrett suggests, we consider 'the relationship between our practice as archaeologists and the practices of those whose lives, which although now extinct, we still hope to understand' (1997:121), if we make the effort to overcome some of this distance, then we may go some way in understanding what it was to construct, and what kinds of humanity were constructed out of those diverse practices. If we look at the longitudinal section of Trench B (Figure 5.2), there are many more directions through which we have to follow the efforts of labour. There are tip lines from west to east, and from east to west, and on many levels. These lines of activity, in addition to the tip lines from north to south, and south to north, in Figure 5.1, are evidence that materials were constructed together in many different ways, in all directions and on many levels, that were certainly not constricted to an inside to out, front to back, evolution of a mound. There is no one direction, or any one section, that records a sequence by which a monument or phases of monument building evolve. Instead, there is an intensely complex and densely interconnected assemblage of things that cannot be caught or comprehended in any one way. There is an anxious proximity of things, one precariously propped against another, another pushing in the direction of the other; there are breaks from work with a particular material due to the erection of

shoring and shuttering. There are starts and interruptions, jumps and gaps, precarious proximities and very intimate imbrications between things. These conditions led to further intensities of things. These areas of construction would have constructed very particular kinds of humanity, but more of that later. The verticality that is produced in remarking wooden posts, panels and wicker shuttering refigure the dynamics of this materiality and demonstrate the constructed quality of things.

'Although the barrow looks impressive against the sky-line, the built part is comparatively modest' (Whittle et al. 1993:226).

What is the 'built part' of the Easton Down barrow? Where does landscape end and architecture begin? What of the chalk scarpment? What of the tree throw [247], and what was probably a second tree throw to the south of [247]? What of the grassland and turves of earth? Why are these materials not considered to be part of a densely interconnected organic assemblage of things? What of material culture? What of pit cutting?

Figure 5.3, is an inked up version of a section that I drew from excavation work I carried out with Charly French and Helen Lewis on Gussage Cow Down long barrow 78, Dorset, in 2002. There are many similarities between this section of Gussage Cow Down 78 and that of Easton Down. Although the Gussage Cow Down 78 sections were cut into the eastern area of the mound on the northern side of its long axis, 'the front of the monument', there are many of the same constructional materials from grassland, to turves, to compacted chalk, to cubes of fresh chalk rubble, to earth and chalk rubble, to chalk blocks. It may even seem from the routine drawing of a latitudinal section, located across a mound, that it is simply a case of following the conventions; that as Whittle et al. argued with Easton Down, the tip lines 'show straightforward dumping from the center of the barrow outwards' (1993:200); that the Gussage Cow Down 78 section represents, or in this case would be a 'record of', a small initial mound that was extended and elaborated on at a later date (French 2002).

This section represents an excavation cut of just over four metres in width into an upstanding mound that measures over 50 metres in length, 22 metres in width and four metres in depth.

Only at one point in the Easton Down report did I find any discussion of the practice of the archaeologist and the ways in which that practice routinely promotes the trench based 'reading' of a 'monument'. This was only to indicate an absence, what was not recorded archaeologically, rather than an effort within archaeological labour to engage with human presence and the ways in which lives were lived, there, in the past.

'Caution is needed, however, because some human activities do not result in durable artefact deposition and at some sites artifacts are extremely localized...so artefact absence at Easton Down, with only two cuttings, does not mean that human activity was absent in the upper part of the woodland phase' (Whittle et al. 1993:232).

Why are our archaeological accounts of the construction of these areas so simple, so pared down? Where are the constructional dynamics, where are the efforts of past people's labour presented within these materials? It is not a problem of trenches; it is a problem of us as archaeologists not thinking critically about what our practice produces:

'Archaeology routinely treats its evidence as a residue which stands as a testimony to the absence of humanity. The archaeology of absence thus seeks out traces which people leave behind them. We would treat that evidence instead as the means by which humanity was made present' (Andrews et al. 2000:525).

If we go back to the work carried out on Gussage Cown Down 78, and look at the longitudinal section (this section was located east-west and from the southern end of the first section), in Figure 5.4, we start to notice that materials were built inwards. These tip lines go against the grain of the natural contour. We have to start dealing with conditions where compacted chalk and chalk rubble had been assembled together in many directions. There exists, then, within our archaeological practice, conditions that are embroiled with the efforts of past labour, an imbroglio of presence. It is at this point, only with this realisation, that our efforts at creating histories of past lives should begin.

Imagine grassland, turves, crushed chalk rammed together, tips of fresh cubed chalk, struck and worked flint, flint nodules, chalk blocks, turves laid on chalk blocks, turves cut by wooden posts, wooden posts propped up by chalk blocks, wooden posts precariously propped up against compacted chalk and then pinned in place by earth and chalk, more chalk blocks, some pitched and angled to pin others in place, chalk blocks constructed in courses. Further activities, constructional dynamics, that lean heavily on each other and spiral up and up and away. Can the archaeological section or archaeologist capture these piercing lines of flight? No. But we can imagine, and from that imaginative encounter start to write histories of these labours and of the kinds of humanity that the efforts of these labours construct.

5.2 Material culture as architecture

'...modes of effectivity and action which, at their best, scatter thoughts and images into different linkages or new alignments without necessarily destroying their materiality. Ideally, they produce unexpected intensities, peculiar sites of indifference, new connections with other objects, and thus generate affective and conceptual transformations that problematize, challenge, and move beyond existing intellectual and pragmatic frameworks' (Grosz 1995:126-127).

Figure 5.3 is an attempt to figure the verticality of organic materials. It is an attempt to draw attention to lines of construction that puncture the banded geological and mound contour motif. There are at least four distinct and disruptive vertical lines of construction remarked on within this section. Two of these areas, where large chalk blocks had been knitted together, and had courses of chalk block used in their construction, were commented on by French in his fieldwork report:

'The first mound was made up of a thin layer of fine, compressed chalk rubble capped by one to two redeposited turf lines, at least an 80cm thickness of compressed chalk fragments and then another 70cm of alternating lenses of fine and coarse chalk rubble, all dipping to the west. This outer edge of this first mound was retained and supported by a c.80cm wide zone of large chalk rubble blocks, and both on the stone footing and on the inside of which were located one if not two supporting posts (c.25cm in diameter and present only as 'ghosts' in section). One 'nest' of fresh, primary production waste flints was found within the upper surface of the buried soils just to the outside of this revetment...This first mound sequence appears to represent the western end of a smaller, probably oval, mound at the

western end of the monument. Shortly after the construction of this primary mound, a larger and higher second mound was constructed which incorporated the earlier mound...This too exhibited a revetment or footing at its outer basal edge composed of a low, 60cm wide, 'wall' of chalk rubble blocks' (2002:4-5).

French would have it that there was a buried soil, grassland, on which there was evidence for compacted chalk and chalk rubble having been dumped in lenses to form the contour of a primary mound that had a chalk block footing that skirted around its edge. A straight story comprised of bands of geology, the contours of tip lines and the vertical edges of walls. A forward story, where history was not created through dealing with the materiality of past acts, where referencing of the past was not made material. A story of stratigraphical and not physical relationships. However, what if we understand material culture to have been a part of architecture, rather than as objects that were held in, below or above architecture. What of an assemblage, where material culture is not abstracted to the realm of a find within that assemblage, but is a part of it (Lucas 2001a, Andrew Jones 2002), and where material culture is studied not just by the specialist but is a part of the medium that has to be negotiated by the archaeologist/architect. Although the buried soil was sieved during excavation, the only 'finds' were those of the worked flint that was located wedged under the outer most chalk blocks of the 'wall' and to the north of this 'wall'. This area, where flint was worked and where tools and cores were taken, whilst all other material aspects to that work were left in place, this place was where a wall was constructed. Yet these flints were in the upper part of a buried soil which was underneath the chalk block 'wall'. These worked flints are separated stratigraphically from the chalk blocks of the wall by a grassland supposedly having been constructed on by tipping compacted chalk and chalk rubble. Stratigraphically they are bracketed in time from one another, but also conceptually they are bracketed from one another: [grassland-geology], mound, [wall-architectural detail]; [worked flints on grassland], tips of compacted chalk and chalk rubble, [walling]. Yet there is a physical connection between grass, flint, turf and chalk blocks that cannot be ignored. Flint also figured within the construction of the 'walling'. There were flint cobbles laid out lengthways along the inner edge of the wall. This was the only area of construction where flint material was used. Turf was also at this point not just 'under' a wall, but was also a part of the wall construction, used on top of the upper large chalk blocks. These were fresh

worked flints and fresh chalk blocks which point to dynamic connections in a complex assemblage of things, they were not abraded flint and weathered chalk which would push these dynamics apart and mould them back into the linear evolution of a mound. These worked flints were truly *in situ*. By figuring these freshly worked flints as an event in construction, these complex assemblages invite us to take flint working seriously as a productive, corporeal activity that was a part of construction. They remind us that all practices of making are somehow embodied and a part of construction sites.

Pollard suggested that the flint assemblage at Easton Down, made up of groups of worked flint in the primary ditch fills, were the product of *in situ* knapping. He wrote:

'This group represents the residue of nodule testing and core preparation. Flakes and shatter fragments from perhaps four nodules were present, along with two unworked tabular slabs and a reconstructible shattered nodule. The flint, presumably collected from the ditch sides or primary rubble, was of variable quality.' (in Whittle et al. 1993:208).

Elsewhere Pollard demonstrated within his thesis that these clusters of worked flint were not evidence of single working areas but that these materials created a network of 'groups of debitage' within long mound architecture (Pollard 1993). In particular, he noted the regular spacing of these deposits within the primary ditch fills at Thickthorn Down (Pollard 1993, and in Drew and Piggott 1936). During our excavation of Gussage Cow Down long barrow number 294, we encountered within a one metre wide latitudinal trench across the northern ditch and a two metre wide longitudinal trench through the southern ditch, four clusters of freshly worked flint. One cluster was found centrally on the base of the southern ditch and another was against the outer edge in the base of the northern ditch (very similar in location to cluster [131] at Easton Down). The other two clusters were located in pits that cut into the primary ditch fills. Within each of these four areas the tools and nodules had been taken away. However, although Pollard has drawn attention to the importance of these deposits, he does not see these events or this material culture as a part of architecture, but as the specific action of flint working in a long mound arena (Pollard 1993).

However, it is Pollard's work that has created a focus to the act of flint-working, and the particular spatial and temporal context in which it was carried out (after Edmonds and Thomas 1987, Thomas 1991). It is Pollard's work that considers the small and intimate detail of networks of things that were involved in these areas of construction, what he calls 'a consideration of the context of action' (1993). To a certain extent this chapter has built on the important work that was carried out in Pollard's thesis. I have already described the ways in which he has worked on the flint from Easton Down and how he remarked on the fact that these areas of worked flint connected together into groups of debitage at Thickthorn Down. In his thesis he developed a complex web of associations by remarking on the ways in which these areas of flint-working, this group debitage, was also in association with deposits of other kinds (in particular deposits produced from the processing of animal bones and working of antler). By doing so Pollard animated these contexts of action. For example, groups of debitage on the base of the ditch at Thickthorn Down occurred alongside deposits of antler and worked chalk (Pollard 1993, and in Drew and Piggott 1936). There were similar deposits of animal bone, two cattle skulls were located in the 'pre-mound' context, at Beckhampton Road and it has been suggested that they marked out the long axis of the mound (Pollard 1993, and in Ashbee et al. 1979). There was a third unaccompanied skull in the matrix of the mound material. Pollard has suggested that the retention of the cervical vertebrae indicates the placing of the heads and necks in a fleshed state and rapid incorporation after butchery. He writes:

'In such instances it appears that slaughter, perhaps in the context of sacrifice, was intimately related to activities surrounding the construction and perhaps consecration of the mounds (1993: 166).

As with worked flint, in his thesis, Pollard has demonstrated a formal deposition to the faunal assemblages from ditch contexts. This is important work, for as Pollard argues, with the exception of the work carried out by Thomas (Thomas 1991), these contexts have received little attention since the intentional nature of their deposition is rarely appreciated. Within the long mounds that are considered in my thesis (i.e. Easton Down, Millbarrow, South Street, Beckhampton Road, Horslip, Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294, and Thickthorn Down), it is Pollard that has drawn attention to the small bone groups from ditch ends at Horslip and South Street. There are key aspects that Pollard has remarked on from studying this material culture, the cattle skulls with

cervical vertebrae that were located in what are considered to be 'pre-mound' or 'mound' contexts (Beckhampton Road), the groups of bone that were in primary ditch fills in association with worked flint and worked antler (Horslip, South Street and Thickthorn Down; worked flint only in Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294). Pollard notes that the assemblages of bone in the long mound ditches were not on the large scale, or with the same degree of complexity of mixed groups of bone, or mixed groups of bone selected from middens, that he has remarked on from causewayed enclosures. He writes:

'The inclusion of articulated bone and the butchered remains of single or small numbers of animals, rather than secondary refuse, provides a context for interpretation, in that such deposits are related to temporally specific events of slaughter and (often partial) consumption. Various contexts for deposition could be envisaged, ranging from particular points or junctures in the construction of a monument- hides and skulls placed on turf stacks, prior to the making of a mound; bone groups on ditch bases and low in the primary fills, marking completion- or perhaps events dealing with acts of social transition, such as rites of passage and funerary rituals' (1993: 167).

What is important is that Pollard (1993) and Thomas (1991) have animated these contexts and presented these materials, material culture, as an important part of the histories that we construct of these sites. It is these works that demonstrate that the processing of flint and bone within these areas of construction should not be ascribed a secondary status (contra Piggott 1954), or as Pollard has noted an assumption that the inclusion of material culture within these areas was some kind of equivalent practice to the deposition of human remains (contra Bradley 1984, Barrett et al. 1991 and discussed in Pollard 1993). Work on structured deposition (Richards and Thomas 1984; Edmonds and Thomas 1987; Thomas 1991 and 1999; Pollard 1992, 1993 and 2001; Hill 1995), has refigured the presence of material culture within our histories and created a context of activity through the medium of deposition.

Thomas (1991) and Pollard (1993) have remarked on the spatial organisation of deposition, the ways in which through the medium of deposition, either by incorporation or segregation, correspondences were created between particular substances. For example, Thomas has noted that the processed bones of domestic animals were never entwined with red deer antler within the primary ditch fills of Horslip (1991:78). Although it is important to figure material culture, and to presence

these materials in dynamic ways, I am concerned that in specifying a depositional praxis for the context of activity, these accounts ultimately remain complicit with the dominant accounts they are attempting to subvert. For encounters are expressed here along the lines of things (material culture) in places (long mounds), and I feel that this connects more to the practice of the archaeologist than any lived experience of construction in the past.

Both Pollard and Thomas take their inspiration from the small things of life and the intimate ways in which assembly was at work. However, what materialises in these narratives, through depositional praxis, is an understanding of what goes where and why. The scale changes in these narratives from one of intimacy to the playing out of patterns of deposition. Intimacy changes to a scale of events that existed throughout the entire length of a ditch, or was played out from one end of the ditch to the other, or was maintained as a contrast between one flanking ditch and another (a contrast played out across 'a monument' through much wider 'structural rules'). My problem is that by dividing deposition from construction we seem to have lost specific material and historical conditions that were an intimate part of the context of activity. With a scale of events, activity is enlarged to almost a state of hyper-reality, and in order to understand this new state of things the archaeologist incorporates verbs of incorporation or segregation, and a new grammar is created to understand why some things are always together and why others are kept apart, or how little things come to be a part of a bigger picture.

'There may have been no fixed or universal set of oppositions determining the character of deposits. On the contrary, the material available to Neolithic people provided numerous potential contrasts and juxtapositions, which might be emphasized in particular contexts. As with both pit deposits and causewayed enclosure ditches, general principles rather than prescriptive rules allowed assemblages to be put together through an improvisatory practice which created specific meanings in specific locations. Long mound ditch deposits were the outcome of a creative play, or *bricolage*, which may have been a form of social strategy rather than the routine performance of a series of ritual actions' (Thomas 1991:78-80).

'This patterning in deposition is indicative of a complex system of spatial classification, working along several axes...Contrasts were apparently being drawn between the front and rear of mounds, opposing sides, and perhaps between periphery (the ditches) and center (the mound)' (Pollard 1993: 173).

Patterns materialise that the archaeologist finds it necessary to engage with, but my point is that these patterns may never have been made material within lived experience. Material culture was a part of architecture and so depositional praxis would have materialised through the medium of construction and would never have been understood outside the human scale of things. Depositional praxis was not set up by or acted out within architecture, it was a part of architecture. Depositional practice, as a visceral practice, was a part of the medium of architecture, it was a part of construction or assembly work and so we do not need to invent a language for the pattern of things, or an image making procedure through bricolage, because there may never have been a larger meaning or bigger picture to understand.

5.3 Pit cutting as architectural practice

I discussed earlier in this chapter how, during my work at Gussage Cow Down 78, I encountered a connective dynamic, a verticality from worked flint to chalk blocks, that broke through the bands of geology and the contours of a mound to disrupt the logical evolution of 'a monument'. I want now to discuss my experience of excavating 'a ditch' at Gussage Cow Down 294. There are three aspects to this work that seem to disrupt the concept of 'a ditch' having existed as a distinct element within a 'repertoire' of long mound architecture. Figure 5.5 is a copy of the latitudinal section across the northern 'ditch'. This does not show the simple and straightforward gradual silting of a ditch, where drawn lines follow the mould of a ditch cut. Instead, fills have been disrupted by the vertical lines of a cut feature. A feature cut into the primary fills and within which was located a cluster of worked flint. There was a second cluster of flints within a cut feature approximately 1m to the east of this one and it too cut through the primary fills. The third cluster of worked flint that we encountered was located against the northern edge, at the base, but there looked to be a circular cut to a pit within the base of the 'ditch' at this point (see Figure 5.6). Within the base of the southern 'ditch', there was evidence for what seemed to be three interconnecting pits cut into the base. The primary fills of a ditch could have been cut into at a later date and then within this area someone could have knapped nodules of flint. The marked cut of the pits in the base could simply be evidence for the way in which an overall ditch was constructed. However, in the longitudinal section of the southern 'ditch' (see Figure 5.7), there are contrasting tip

lines (west to east and east to west) within the primary fill and that connect to the circular cuts that were remarked upon in the base. I would argue that this is evidence for pit cutting within these areas, and that as one pit was cut, the activity involved in constructing it created spoil which entered into the previous pit. The action of pit cutting was a part of architectural practice. If we consider the material and historical conditions that would have been negotiated in creating successive pit after pit, no one pit would have been sculpted to squeaky clean chalk and have maintained that pristine state. Within these areas of construction, where pits were being cut, where spoil was being thrown backwards into previous cuttings and where slump occurred, there was the incorporation of worked flint. A connective dynamic was at work which created a verticality, or at least another dimension, to the ways in which we have to imagine connections between chalk blocks and worked flint.

What I am attempting to build here is an image of a construction site as in process, with all the cut chalk, chalk rubble, block chalk, tread, turves and worked flint involved in the efforts of that labour. What I am attempting to do is disrupt the squeaky clean image that is produced within archaeological practice; an archaeological practice where there is a distinct end point to labour, when a feature is revealed, when the worked flints have been removed as 'finds', when all the loose fill material has been removed and the edges and base of the feature have been cleaned, where the tools have been removed, as well as the body of the archaeologist her or himself. Why should we only imagine these areas to have existed as a complete, clear, clean and distinct architectural element? How sure are we that chalk rubble, turves, tread, worked flint are not as much a part of the constructional process as the compacted edges from where chalk had been cut into? Why is the practice of working flint separated from the constructional process? Both Thomas (1991) and Pollard (1993) have spent a long time arguing for a more inclusive understanding of prehistoric productive technology, as a media that incorporated all aspects of social life. Why should this technology, or way of working, be separated from the constructional process and only be reintegrated through the medium of depositional activity? As I have already argued, by figuring these freshly worked flints as an event in construction, these complex assemblages invite us to take flint working seriously as a productive, corporeal activity that was a part of construction. They remind us that all practices of making are somehow embodied and a part of a construction site (as

was also the case with the working of antler at Beckhampton Road and South Street, and cattle hides in south Wiltshire long mounds).

If we consider these more connective dynamics, then we never move away from the intimacy of detail, the messy partial and imperfect dynamics of lived experience. There would be no need for a planned image, a ditch outline, or penciled architecture, within which was marked the relative position or place of material culture. Cutting pits, moving chalk rubble, lifting out chalk rubble, tread, working flint, processing bone, processing antler, preparing hides, eating, drinking, ladders, scaffolding, tools would have created the medium of architecture. By understanding architecture as a medium, a medium created through the efforts of labour, we are then also embroiled in how this medium remained effective. It is not a case of 'X' marks the spot as to where particular items of material culture were placed in respect to others. Instead, whilst cutting chalk, flint was worked and bone was processed and these were incorporated into this medium along with tread and chalk rubble and these made references to particular dynamic connections that further transformed these spaces opening up the possibility for further connections between things and things and people.

In this chapter I want to concentrate on building up a different concept of architecture, architecture as a medium, as in process. I have attempted to do this by figuring a densely interconnected organic assemblage of things, by creating an image of material culture as a part of architecture and flint working and bone processing as productive, corporeal activities that were a part of construction. I will discuss in the next chapter the ways in which this media remained effective, that is I will take account of the ways in which more and more material culture came to be knitted into these areas. At the moment all I will say on this subject is that there would have been a continual negotiation of how to go about remembering or dealing with the materiality of those past lives that were encountered within the constructional process. What I want to concentrate on, to disrupt, is the notion of distinct architectural elements that had an overall bounded shape, that had been sculpted into the chalk, where all the chalk rubble involved in that labour had been removed, and where there existed along the length of this architectural element (and in contrast to an already built opposing element) groups of material culture placed in its base. I want to demonstrate how

anachronistic these accounts are of the ways in which architecture comes into being and how surprised I am that within these archaeologies there does not seem to be an understanding of the historical conditions of architectural construction, or indeed a historical perspective to the ways in which materiality is viewed. Above all, what I want to emphasise is the importance of being conscious of the connections that we make and the ways in which these relate to lives lived in the past. Vital to this process of understanding is the writing of a history through lived experience (Edward Said 2002), a history which **retains** an intimacy in the way in which it is produced and does not jump in scale in the narrative it constructs (Arundhati Roy 1997).

In chapter 3, I remarked on the ways in which pits had been cut within areas of construction that made up the site of Gwernvale. In that chapter I discussed the ways in which shuttering and large sandstone blocks had been propped up against these areas, perhaps using the spoil banked up from the efforts of that earlier labour. I attempted to refigure these pits as early activities, as focal points, along with hearths, a timber structure and stone box chambers, that had then be consciously knitted together through further construction work. In chapter 4, I attempted to build further these architectures into a complex weave of things; where hearths, a timber structure, a midden, a pit, a tree-throw, and inter-cut pits, were knitted together in a densely interconnected organic assemblage of things. However, within these chapters I focused on the ways in which constructions of stone, turf, wood and material culture created connections between pits and other areas of the site. I did not really focus on pit cutting as architectural practice and I wish to do so now. The most spectacular, and densely interconnected assemblage, created through pit cutting, has to be that of work carried out at the site of Horslip.

The plan of these pits formed an arc at the proximal end of the site (see Figure 5.8; Ashbee et al. 1979:210, figure 2). Pit 1 was backfilled from the inner side; pit 3 had partly filled with tread and was backfilled with chalk rubble and earth; pit 2 had cut through these pits and in turn had filled with tread or weathered chalk before being backfilled with chalk blocks, worked flint and a piece of sarsen. Pit 4 was cut and immediately backfilled with chalk blocks; pit 5 had possibly partly silted up with chalk and earth material; pit 6 was backfilled with chalk rubble and earth; pit 7 had cut through pit 6 to complete the arc of pits and was backfilled with chalk blocks,

chalk rubble, earth, a fragment of antler, a flake of sarsen, worked flint and a flint nodule. Two further pits were cut equidistant from both ends of the arc of pits and were later knitted together to form the long axis of the mound. The proximal pit had filled with tread and had been backfilled with chalk rubble and flint nodules. The other pit, that had been cut nearest to pit 1, had been backfilled with chalk rubble. It is not only that these pits had formed an arc, but that they were intimately interconnected. These pits cut one another. Further connections were made through the materials that were a part of their matrix. Earlier pits were backfilled as connecting pits were created, and with the earth and chalk produced from that cutting process. For example, pit 3 had evidence for tread or weathered chalk in the base of the pit (ibid:211), which may have formed before and whilst pit 2 was cut. It was backfilled with chalk rubble and earth that may have come about from the cutting of pit 2. Pit 6 was backfilled and quite possibly with chalk and earth material from the cutting of pit 7 (ibid). What is really interesting is that material culture became a material involved in the constructional process only in these most connective of areas, where pits were being cut in order to physically connect earlier pits together. Material culture was a part of recutting, it was a part of the matrix of pits 2 and 7 (ibid:218).

In his discussion, Paul Ashbee only connected the two outer pits to other areas of construction. Indeed, he noted that these two pits were later connected together and formed the long axis of the mound. That is a narrative or concept of construction that I have already used in my thesis, particularly with the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North in chapters 3 and 4 respectively. However, I want to take inspiration from the verticality that I encountered at Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294, and the ways in which it was at these points where material culture and chalk blocks met; either through worked flint and grassland and the ways in which these events were later remarked on in the construction of chalk block, flint nodule and turf 'walling' at Gussage Cow Down 78; or perhaps more fitting, the points of connection made through recutting pits and the incorporation of worked flint or working flint at these points at Gussage Cow Down 294.

The 'ditches' at Horslip are very sinuous and organic in their shape in plan (see Figure 5.8). The butt ends have very enhanced shapes, they seem very circular and distinct and I can only imagine these areas to have been constructed through pit

cutting (it is possible that the 'ditches' are in fact strings of pits, as with the Windmill Hill causewayed enclosure Whittle et al. 1999 and the Beckhampton enclosure Gillings et al. 2002). In particular, Ashbee's sections across the 'ditches' at the proximal end of the long mound look odd (see Figure 5.9; Ashbee et al. 1979:215, figure 4). In section B'-B, there is an unexplained verticality to the profile of the interface between the primary rubble and silt and the loam accumulation. Indeed, there is a vertical interface within the loam accumulation, drawn as a dashed line, where loam accumulation with larger chalk rubble is vertically distinct to the rest of the materials, located between the inner edge and middle of the feature. Towards the outer edge of the feature, within this same 'fill' there is an unexplained truncation in the tip lines. In Figure 5.10 (Ashbee et al 1979: plate 29b) it is possible to see all of this more clearly: there are distinct recuts that figure within this photograph. I want therefore to refigure pit cutting as an important architectural practice; an architectural practice that was carried out within this area of construction before the knitting together of mound material and also as a vital architectural practice whilst a mound was being created. Pit after pit was cut, and as one was cut the previous pit was part filled with tread and chalk and earth rubble. It is extremely likely that when areas of pit cutting were physically connected together, as with Gussage Cow Down 294, material culture was incorporated into the constructional process through further working, the working of flint or the processing of bone. Thomas has noted the ways in which antler was incorporated as a particular material into these proximal areas of construction at Horslip (1991:78). What I want to concentrate on is the way in which, if we take this evidence for recutting into consideration, we have to make more of a mess or add another dimension to the ways in which we envisage the spatial relationships between material culture in these areas through deposition. I want to build an image of pits rather than ditches, and pit cutting rather than pit features, where further connections were created through refiguring tread, chalk blocks, chalk rubble, earth, worked flint and processed bone as part of the medium of that architectural practice.

In chapter 4 I discussed the pitted shape of the Hazleton north quarries (see 4.3.2). At the site of Beckhampton Road the northern area of 'ditch' was similarly interrupted and was constructed in at least two parts (see Figure 5.11; Ashbee et al 1979:229, figure 11, and noted in Kinnes 1992). The 'ditches' at the site of South Street were

very sinuous in plan and very similar in an organic shape to Horslip. Sections II, III, and VII illustrate areas of pit cutting (see Figure 5.12; Ashbee et al 1979:253, figure 23), and the enhanced ends of the 'ditches' were probably created through distinct pit cutting activities. If we really consider pit cutting as architectural practice, and as a remarkable constructional technique, then we create a medium through which to understand how it was possible in the past for people to have incorporated into these areas parts of the human body itself. In chapter 4, I discussed the ways in which architecture was created through dynamic connections between things, particular items of material culture had been processed and entwined together. These dynamic connections included fragments of human bone entwined in a context associated with fire within the pitted southern quarry. At the site of Millbarrow, there were many phases of pit-cutting and pits [401] and [548] had fragments of human bone incorporated into their matrix (Whittle et al. 1994:18). In the last part of this chapter, I wish to really pull together and demonstrate further connections between 'cairn' and 'mound' sites of construction in order to refigure the dynamic constructive qualities of more earth and chalk based materials. I want to build on the constructed quality of these materials in order for us to imagine these areas of construction in other ways. Following Grosz (1995), my work suggests that attending to processes and practices of production might be a useful way to engage with concepts of architecture beyond the particular and unified architectural object that has been the focus of previous archaeological accounts.

5.4 Reproducing Beckhampton Road

One of the most marked connections, produced within the site of Hazleton North, was worked through fire. At the site of Beckhampton Road, in two distinct areas of a small chalky ridge of glacial drift deposits located in the valley, grassland had been cut into and posts and stakes had been erected (Ashbee et al 1979: 245). A small hearth had been built next to three stake holes, and in another area of five stake holes, which had probably rotted down by this point, a large fire setting was created that spanned over four metres in length and that was nearly two metres in width. At some point this large fire setting was further marked by chalk rubble, timber stakes and coombe rock which were pinned together by stacks of turf and incorporated into this area was a cattle skull with the cervical vertebrae still attached. Grassland, cut chalk,

postholes, chalk spoil, the processing of wood, timber posts, fires and the burning of wood, coombe rock, the processing of cattle meat, a fleshed cattle skull, the preparing of hides, cut chalk, postholes, chalk rubble, cut turves, stacked turves; these actions and materials point to a complex assemblage of things.

It is as if the processing of particular things, and the assemblages that were created from entwining these processed materials together, seemed to further transform the assemblage in other ways, to make further connections, previously unimagined constructions, that made new spaces, that made an architectural space out of a dynamic and complex organic assemblages of things. To me, these are very similar workings to that which went on at the site of Hazleton North, and there are other connections between these sites to be made. For example, more often than not at the site of Beckhampton Road, contrasts in 'fill' materials, rather than actual structural divides, seemed to have marked distinctions within constructional work. In the area that would later become the 'front of a monument', even though this area was disturbed, there seemed to be a marked distinction created from areas where turves had been stacked in comparison to brickearth. For example, within area IX, VIII, V, and III there was evidence for stacks of turf (see Figure 5.13; Ashbee et al. 1979: 235, figure 14). Area X was composed of brickearth and this contrast to the turves had created a marked distinction that defined an axial line. The interface between these materials was constructed on, and maintained by, a line of timber stakes. The 'bay' directly north-east of V, was constructed from coombe rock instead of stacks of turves and it is interesting to note that the contrasting 'bay' II was built up from stacks of turf at this point; the contrast in materials further creating an interface that was worked axially through the site.

Throughout the 'middle of the monument' an axial definition was created through contrasts between coombe rock and brickearth material. It is this area that has been most commented on as having created an asymmetry within the architecture of the mound (Ashbee et al 1979:240; Pollard 1993). There were very connected architectural dynamics at work here, but these connections were created along with many other materials that do not simply reduce down into north::south contrasts in construction. There were areas of construction south of the axial line that involved brickearth material, for example in the northern area of 'bay' XV. There was also an

area where axial definition has been created through a combination of materials, where brickearth, chalk rubble and coombe rock were employed west of XX::XIX. This area was further pinned together by the stacking of turves to the west of the chalk rubble and to the south of the brickearth in order to maintain an axial definition; also turves were stacked in an area to the west of the brickearth in order to prop it up (see Figure 5.13). There were further complexities 'at the back of the monument' which I wish to bring to the fore; turves were stacked north and south of an axial line and these stacks would have held in place the timber posts or stakes used in the axial construction. However, these stacks of turf also pinned together the area where coombe rock, axial timbers and chalk rubble had been built up over the area of an earlier hearth setting and within which was incorporated a cattle skull. I have already mentioned that Pollard had remarked on the placement of two cattle skulls as propped up hides on possible posts surrounded by stacks of turf which seemed to have marked out the axial line of the monument (see 5.2 and Pollard 1993). However, from the detailed plan (see Figure 5.13), both cattle skulls had been incorporated into areas of coombe rock construction that were then enclosed by stacks of turf (the cattle skull had been linked to the turf due to a large post-hole in the turved area not being 'sealed' by a fire setting, unlike the five stake-holes that were physically located in the same area as the skull but under the fire setting). This assemblage is more complicated and imbricated than has previously been acknowledged. The area where stakes had been erected and had rotted, where a large fire setting had been made and where timbers had been burnt, these activities made space in some way for a cattle skull and quite possibly a hide, and this space was remarked on through an intimate knitting together of contrasting materials (coombe rock/axial timbers/chalk rubble) which became enclosed by stacks of turf. There was a similar meeting point between stacks of turf and coombe rock, that transgressed 'bays' V and III, where there were two large sarsen boulders.

There was a dominant theme in construction, or architectural definition, that was played out at Beckhampton Road through contrasts between materials. However, this was not simply reducible to a north::south distinction that worked throughout 'a monument'. Indeed, if we only consider such scales of definition then we miss out on some of the very intimate practices that were being remarked on through contrast, as I have argued were made possible through the processing of cattle meat and the

incorporation of cattle skulls, which made possible the junctures between coombe rock and chalk rubble or turf. There were many more materials that were incorporated into this construction site, through a complex assembly of contrast. I would also argue that these architectural dynamics did not simply reduce down into 'fills' enclosed by bay fence revetments. What has struck me about the lines of postholes and the traces of rods that made up the fence revetments, was the similar way in which they seemed to operate to the 'fin walls' that were a part of Hazleton North (see 4.3.5). In the report it says:

'In discussing the timber framework, the term 'fence' has been used in preference to 'hurdle-work' because it is clear that two quite different methods of using rods and poles are involved. 'Hurdle-work' is appropriate for portable panels made by weaving the rods or withies around slender uprights or sails...the horizontals at Beckhampton Road had all passed along one side of the uprights to which they had presumably been bound individually' (Ashbee et al. 1979: 242).

However, if you look closely at the plan (see Figure 5.13), it is possible to see areas where rods and posts have been utilised between XX and XVIII, XVI and XIV, XIV and XII, XII and X, VII and V, IX and VIII, XI and IX, XVII and XV. It is also possible to see double lines of posts used between V and III; and double lines of rods between XIII and XI. What is important is that in all of these areas rods or posts are used in tandem with further rods or posts. These materials worked in tandem with the constructed qualities of other materials and are very similar to the dynamics that were at work at Hazleton North where 'fin walls' worked along with other 'fin walls', courses of revetment or stacks of turf. What also seems to have been in evidence, with the exception of the rods and posts between XVII and XV, are gaps between these paired constructions. These gaps perhaps point to further organic materials such as shuttering or wickerwork which were held in place between the rods and posts, posts and posts, or rods and rods. What I also remarked on were how partial these constructions seemed to have been, none of these paired wooden constructions really connected to the longitudinal constructions of rods and posts. The latitudinal pairings of rods and posts seemed to have actually connected to longitudinal areas of stacked turves. This would suggest a more knitted and complex assemblage of materials. Indeed, 'bay' XI, in the northern area built up towards the axial line of posts, was an assemblage of knitted together rods, more complex than a lattice, but most definitely

not reducible to the pantomime of a structure::fill scenario (see Figure 5.14, in Ashbee et al. 1979:243, figure 19).

I would also argue, as I did with the stone revetment at Hazleton North, that the rod and post revetment that enclosed and sealed what had been more of a construction site was erected at a slightly later date (see 4.4). The 'smooth curve of the proximal end' and the outer revetment were laid out from closely entwined rods and posts which seemed to have butted up against other areas of construction:

'But it is clear that the revetment had originally been banked directly against the base of the lateral fence, where that feature was present, or, in the distal half of the barrow, against some other form of vertical barrier...The casts lay along or obliquely across the revetment; none was seen to extend through the lateral fence into the mound' (Ashbee et al. 1979:240).

Closely entwined rods and posts simply respected an area where a large sarsen boulder was located, rather than using it as a meeting point or a space in which to work contrasts between materials:

'The largest sarsen on the site lay within a lobe formed at the junction of the south side of the mound and the curve of the proximal end, where the lateral fence had swung outwards in order to embrace it...The boulder rested directly upon the subsoil and had evidently not been moved during construction of the long barrow' (241).

In considering the construction work carried out at Beckhampton Road or Hazleton North, it has become clear that these construction sites did not work easily along lines or plans of bays or compartments. More often, in producing these architectures, areas were transgressed and disrupted. Labour was just as much about an understanding of a permeability between things, the interdigitation of things, the accumulation of things, the creation of transformative spaces through networks of things, the piercing of a matrix through splinters of wood, a piercing, knitting, mingling of materials. I have attempted to figure architectural dynamics, a constructed quality to things, by producing a comparison between 'mound' and 'cairn' architectures. But really, the site of Beckhampton Road, with its grassland, processing of wood as timber posts and charcoal fires, coombe rock, chalk rubble, processed cattle meat and a fleshed cattle skulls, stacks of turf, intimate contrasts between materials, sarsen, timber posts and timber rods, shuttering or paneling, pit cutting, spoil, tread is even more complex.

Boundaries between bodies and materials were blurred whilst they were involved in making these intimate connections. For example, materials spilled onto bodies as they were quarried and piled up, as bodies cut timbers these timbers were also burnt and covered bodies in ash, as the bodies of oxen were broken down and processed they were also re-fashioned into human clothes and consumed by human bodies or knitted into these intimate spaces of encounter as architectural materials. With all of these transformative activities we have a more dynamic and fluid architecture. We have a warped architecture. I feel that I have now reached an intersection between archaeology and architecture, stone and more earth/chalk based constructions. I want now to explore this intersection, what Anthony Vidler would term 'the production of a kind of warping', the

'kind of warping...produced by the forced intersection of different media - film, photography, art, architecture - in a way that breaks the boundaries of genre and the separate arts in response to the need to depict space in new and unparalleled ways' (2000:vii).

5.5 *South Street*

'...the question of the unthought, the outside for *architecture itself*...is a question that I believe needs to be posed in all seriousness whenever the formulaic and the predictable take over from experimentation and innovation, realignment and transformation' (Grosz 1995:137).

South Street (like Hazleton North in the previous chapter) is perhaps the most fluid of all of these construction sites, the one that goes too far, that pushes the limits of our understanding of these areas of construction.

I have attempted so far in my work to suggest that there should be no endpoint to what we perceive architecture to be. I have hinted at the ways in which these assemblages, architectures, incorporated parts of the landscape, or that in attending to the production of landscape, through the efforts of people's labour, we are also caught up within the medium of architecture. There are, therefore, key ontological differences that we have to consider in understanding the landscape that construction work was a part of. These were landscapes of construction, where architectures were escapable and not easily defined by our modern Western limits on where 'architecture'

ends and 'landscape' begins. And so, I have constructed narratives of the past inspired by grassland (Easton Down, Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294, Horslip, Beckhampton Road) and chalk scarpments (Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 294) or small chalky ridges of glacial drift deposits in valleys (Beckhampton Road). However, South Street would seem to force the issue; all varieties or aspects of landscape 'use' were a part of this construction site. This forces me to reassess my perception of architectural landscapes or landscapes of construction. The excavator and Pollard have remarked on the ways in which vegetational boundaries were created between areas of woodland, ploughing and grassland at this site (Asbee et al. 1979: 284; Pollard 1993). However, rather than seeing each of these as different examples of landscape use, or as boundaries between different landscapes, I want to think of the ways in which different kinds of working have been made to come together to create meeting points. This is where managed woodland, cleared ground, maintained pasture or grassland, and turned over and worked earth were made to join. Many different kinds of landscape were being created and were being brought together: woodland met with woodland clearance, with grassland and with ploughed ground. These landscapes were produced and were made to join through further processes of making, with timbers, turves and dug up or quarried earth. Trees were processed as charcoal in hearths or cut for timber for posts or stakes; grassland was cut and turves were utilised as architectural materials; as ground was ploughed, and the earth was turned over, it was also transformed through pit cutting and quarrying and these materials were entwined in upcast banks and mounds. These were not landscapes based on landscape settings but landscapes that were produced architecturally.

In order to explore further points of intersection, I have to introduce a more sinuous dynamic to our understanding of assembly work. There is a focus of a turning, a movement between things at this site. Woodland turns into clearance, which turns into cross-ploughing, which turns into grassland, into working flint, into burning wood, into modifying sarsen boulders, into processing wood, into a timber post line that connects to boulders, into 'fence' lines and the repositioning of processed sarsen. There are many landscapes that meet at this site, there are many processes by which materials are transformed and connected to these landscapes, not by a single strategy, but by a combination of strategic shifts. What is important is that these strategic shifts were material and so were re-encountered and knitted into the present. We cannot

ignore the cross-ploughing in our consideration of grassland, we cannot exclusively term these connections incidental within our narratives of the past. Similarly, we cannot bracket the working of flints located within or at the base of the turf line (Ashbee et al. 1979:264) from further processes of production. The working of flint created a space, a space that was remarked on and refigured within construction work. The western-most flint scatter was located directly under the axial line, and the other flint scatter was directly east of the oblique line of timber posts that connected to the boulders (see Figure 5.15; Ashbee et al. 1979:256, figure 25). The excavator noted the way in which the oblique line of posts respected Sarsen 5 but did not note the way in which the flint scatter seemed to be contained by the fenceline or was contained by something that later materialised into a fenceline (a connection similar to that discussed at Gussage Cow Down 78, see 5.2). Once again the physical relationship between things has been overlooked due to the need for a stratigraphical relationship between things.

Histories of construction, of site after site that I have discussed, have defied our understandings of soil and geological formation. Processes of working flint or the setting of hearths remain as events to be remembered. We have to deal with the historical conditions of the past as well as the material conditions, and incorporate points of connection that defy the bands of soil formation as much as we invite connection between stone boulders that materially protrude above those soils. For whether we like it or not, whether archaeological procedures are in place to explain those connections or not, those connections were made. People in the past attempted to engage with past materialities and create material histories of their own. For this reason, we need to understand the materiality of the past as a part of architecture. Those building uncovered or remembered material culture from long before and incorporated it into the present. But we also have to invert this way of thinking and understand that processing materials, or processes of making, were important events that may have then made it possible, or made space, for further materials to meet through construction.

Connections were made in the excavation publication of South Street between the sarsen boulders and the hearths (ibid:265), and between Sarsen 5 and the oblique line of timber posts (ibid), and yet a connection between the largest western-most hearth

with the axial line and the oblique line of timber posts was not made. A hearth where wood was burnt and at a later date connected to a wooden axial line of posts and an oblique postline. These features not only met at the hearth, but in the space where they met, they shared a post-setting (see Figure 5.15). Why are these connective dynamics overlooked?

‘There were three concentrations of *wood charcoal* which lay *on* the old ground surface...Two of these pre-dated the fence system but not by more than a few years since they would soon have become buried by earthworm activity had they been exposed on the surface for longer’ (ibid: 264-265).

From this quote, we see that we are faced with the same old problem of phasing again, more specifically with the phasing of ‘a monument’, and with what is recognised as part of the constructional process of that ‘monument’ and with what is not. However, South Street is too sinuous for this fixed order of things, the connections that were made there were too slippery for these fixed ideas to stick. For example, sarsen number 1 was located on top of the first posthole of a latitudinal fenceline, the very same fenceline that had cut through the hearth setting that had been identified with the burning and processing of the sarsen stone (ibid: 265). Burnt sarsen stone is located over part of the fenceline that cuts the hearth where the sarsen was probably burnt in the first place. This means that the burnt sarsen was retained and then later reincorporated into the assemblage of activities that were carried out in this area. Rather than dividing things from one another, and thinking of architectural elements as having acted as boundaries, why can’t we think of these processes as having created places for further things to meet, and so look at conjoins and meeting points rather than boundaries? We need to give density to events and dimension to practice and understand that there was no simple juxtaposition between things.

I mentioned in my discussion of Beckhampton Road the ways in which the location of sarsen boulders seemed to create a space, a meeting place, for further constructions of things. This was also the case at South Street. Groups of sarsen created part of the axial line and created an interface where latitudinal fencelines were erected with turf stacked to the east and coombe rock to west. Sarsen boulders were also piled up against Sarsen number 3 and defined, or propped up, a further fenceline which led to further contrasts between things (see Figure 5.15).

Sinuuous and fluid connections were worked through stacking turves and which connected earlier assemblages of things together. There seems to have been a longitudinal demarcation within turf, that was worked through the site, and that seems to shift emphasis away from the bay by bay construction of things. Turves were stacked and were interdigitated, some were woven and threaded through accumulations of other things, in order to span through areas of construction and make connections in different ways.

If for a moment we concentrate on these fluid connections that were knitted together through stacks of turf, if we look at the organic and undulating shape of turf stacks, rather than needing the turf to have acted as a 'fill' within the bay construction, then we can see that there are gaps within the turf, or that the turf stacks undulated:

'In bay IX there was a further peculiarity. In surface plan the turf-stack was in two distinct blocks separated by a wedge of coombe rock, which penetrated almost to the axis, and by a thin line of humic chalk mud extending out from the axis into the mound material. This raises the possibility that the division of the mound into bays may have been initiated in some cases *after* the process of infilling had begun. There were similar internal divisions in bays XI and XIII to XVI south, and in some cases stakeholes were present within the mound along these lines' (ibid:261).

It is interesting that it is at the points where the stacks of turf undulate that coombe rock has been employed to prop up the axial and latitudinal fencelines. These are also the points, or meeting places, where flint scatters were remembered and sarsen boulders re-encountered. These intimate practices of contrast, that were made possible through the remembrance of previous events of making, or through re-encountering earlier constructional materials, were not commented on by the excavator or Pollard in his thesis; just as connections with earlier events or materials were also not remarked on by these authors. Once again, contrast is understood to have been played out on a larger, more monumental, scale:

'The excavator noted pronounced differences in the constructional techniques employed in different parts of the monument (Ashbee et al. 1979:260-261), an observation which has also been commented on by Hodder (1990:245). In particular, there was a marked structural asymmetry between the northern and southern halves of the mound, as demarcated by the axial fence; an asymmetry which is also reflected in the flanking ditches' (Pollard 1993: 42).

I am not suggesting that these processes of contrast did not exist, what I am suggesting is that they ignore previous and more intimate contrasts in things. What is more, these larger scale accounts refer to slightly later events (see the latitudinal sections in Figure 5.16 (Ashbee et al. 1979: figure 28) to see the way in which chalk rubble was a later addition to a more sinuous entwined assemblage). What I have been attempting to describe are lines of connection that stretched **over** (axial post settings to worked flint and a hearth setting, latitudinal fencelines to hearth settings); **under** (processed sarsen to latitudinal fencelines); **in between** (meeting places and intimate practices of contrast created through remembered events or re-encountered materials); a complex of lines; where turf, timber posts, coombe rock, sarsen boulders, processed boulders, timber posts, hearths, timber posts, large sarsens, worked flint were knitted together in an undulating and longitudinal assemblage of things, where the movement between these materials was so fluid that it defied the logic of bay construction. Within this knitted together assemblage of things, pits were cut, their undulating form created through inter-cutting and re-cutting activities.

This construction site was further worked on through the addition of chalk rubble to the south and coombe rock to the north. Chalk was rammed together in the eastern area of the site. These activities have already been remarked on by archaeologists; however, what I am asking is, why should these activities have been more significant than earlier acts of making. Why? Why does the intimate knitting together and longitudinal sinuosity of hearths, worked flint, sarsen, turf, chalk and coombe rock get overlooked? Is this not because we look at a construction site from the outside; so coombe rock and chalk rubble asymmetries are external forms which match this viewing practice, just as we are 'faced' with a frontage or surface of rammed chalk. I have figured earlier acts of making as something which seems to have been incidental to the ways in which archaeologists have previously viewed architecture. However, these practices of making were not incidental, and when we get caught up in imagining the ways in which they knitted together we cannot extricate ourselves from the effectivity of these sites of making. We cannot just look; we are caught up in the labour of building, and so have to start considering the fact that these activities may have been more significant to past people. I have attempted to show historically how architectural spaces were constantly in the process of becoming, because it was

through the efforts of labour, through production, that intentions and understandings materialised in concrete ways. It is perhaps these points that were made to matter. People can also remember acts of making, what was being made of a place; rather than what was 'completed', 'finished' or 'abandoned'. What I am suggesting is that these construction sites were not exclusively exercises in objectification.

Chapter 6. Re-thinking architectural practice in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C.: a critical emphasis on the proximity of sites.

'...in interdisciplinarity individuals move between disciplines and in so doing question the ways in which they work...All these activities require a mode of 'thinking between'. This is what I believe Kristeva is referring to when she argues for the construction of 'a diagonal axis' in 'methodology' between theory and practice. 'Thinking between' demands that we call into question what we normally take for granted, that we question our methodologies, the ways we do things, and our terminologies, what we call what we do. The construction of 'a diagonal axis' is necessarily, then, a difficult business. When Kristeva talks of 'the anxiety of interdisciplinarity', she is referring to the difficulty we have in questioning the disciplines we identify with. For this reason, I am also a passionate advocate for interdisciplinarity, because at best this is a transformative way of working, rigorous and reflective, creative and critical' (Jane Rendell 2002:3).

6.1 Assembled pieces

During my research I have had the opportunity to think through many possible interconnections, concepts and ideas of architecture. I have had the opportunity to take up an interdisciplinary approach which has created many interesting points of interconnection. I have come to realise that architecture is a way of understanding. I want to write in detail about the different disciplines, media and ways in which I have come to understand architecture, I want to elucidate on where these ideas come from, and chart a journey through my thinking architecture. I became attentive to the production of architecture, rather than simply describing a form, through having read feminist critiques of architectural practice. In chapter 1, I described the way in which a 'system of architecture' had operated within architectural practice since the work of Vitruvius or more specifically the ways in which this written and drawn work was picked up and reified by the likes of Alberti during the Renaissance. I then attempted to account for the ways in which this 'system' was at work (in drawings and text) within archaeological practice. I discussed in chapter 3 the ways in which excavation practice was entangled in the production of very particular kinds of architecture. However, I also realised that an attentiveness towards detail, and a consideration of processes of production, made connections in other ways. Detail that had previously been divided became more knitted together. These dynamic connections became the focus of my studies within chapters 4 and 5, and I started to think about architecture as a medium, a medium where things were assembled together and which created previously unimagined points of contact that departed into other articulations of how

things and people could become caught up in each other. This work on dynamics, on assembly, on the production of assemblages was inspired by reading critical theorists such as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) and feminists such as Grosz (1995), but also took its inspiration from understanding identity and the human body itself as forces constantly coming into being, as assemblage, after Probyn (2000). I will develop these ideas, or these active forces of production, further in this chapter. However, at the same time as reading these works I had started to read much anthropology of architecture. I noticed that there was not the same fixity of thought or the exclusive attention to stone amongst other groups of people that build and live in the world. Indeed, the concept of assembly kept appearing in these works. 'Assembly' in a literal sense, in that that was how people described the process by which they constructed, but also in what I would call a Deleuzian sense of things, in that it was the process by which things come into being rather than a description of the form things are deemed to hold that was of importance in these works.

In their work on traditions of architecture, the anthropologists Dora Crouch and June Johnson seemed to separate out building practices with more permanent or solid materials such as stone worked through a process of carving, from that of assemblage which involved wood, plant and textile materials. They write:

'Architecture that has been carved out contrasts vividly with that which is assembled or built up. Carved-out architecture is more like sculpture than construction and has the unique aspect of being seamlessly one with its setting' (Crouch and Johnson 2001:107).

I was particularly interested in the wood and banana leaf Hawaiian lashed-frame construction methods and the interlocking frameworks that were constructed in Japan (ibid:120). When I first read these works I seemed to be more interested in focusing on the types of material that were being put together: leaves, reeds, bamboo, wood were a part of this assembly work. In looking to Japan, I remarked on the ways in which paper and cardboard were being used in modern architectures (Shigeru Ban 2000). However, though it was important to encounter the use of more ephemeral materials within architectural practice and so open up my imagination to the possibility that all materials could be considered architectural, I came to realise that it was the dynamic ways in which these materials were being assembled together that

was of importance (see Roxana Waterson 1990). I came to a point in my thinking where I realised that ephemeral materials were made architectural through the dynamics of assemblage and by that very practice made connections in other ways. It was not the materials in themselves but the ways in which these materials were picked up, parted and reassembled in construction with other materials that was of importance. These were the points, or the architectural spaces, where other life practices, my own practice of constructing the past, and the constructive practices of those that lived in the past met and suggested alternative understandings of architecture. In following accounts of the architectural practices of those that live in other parts of the world, I found the connective dynamics, the verbs, the concepts through which to convey and articulate architectural practices that I had encountered at the site of Gwernvale. In reading these accounts, my work did not collapse these lives onto those lives lived in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C., but instead gave me a confidence in thinking differently about the world and those that live or have lived in it. These anthropological accounts reanimated archaeological accounts and helped me focus on the dynamic ways in which things and people could be connected. Knitting was a dynamic, a way in which to connect materials and particular activities together at the site of Gwernvale. This was not in order to find interesting verbs or metaphors in order to write 'about' architecture but involved finding ways of writing 'as' architecture (after Jane Rendell 1998). In order to write, in order to construct different understandings of architecture, I noticed I had to go elsewhere to articulate the ways in which things could be imagined to connect together, and in that entanglement create other ways of being. I also, in my anthropological reading, noticed more and more how Melanesian architecture was 'woven' together (Martin Fowler 2002). Knitting Gwernvale architecture, weaving Melanesian architecture, in reading Asian-Pacific anthropological accounts, I was starting to ask different kinds of questions (also Tim Ingold's (2000) work on weaving and Susanne Küchler's (2002) work on loops and knots), in particular, how do things realise themselves as architecture?

I found it interesting that in many contemporary architectural writings Deleuze's work was being picked up on, but that this was in the context of the 'fold' not the dynamics of 'assemblage' (see Deleuze 1993, Greg Lynn 1993, Robert Morris 1997, John Rajchman 1993 and Robinson 1993). I wonder if this is because these works are

caught up in future projections, in solely imagining the ways in which things could be, sheer flights of fancy, rather than having to negotiate the material and historical conditions of past lives. These were projected spaces where I did not want to be, I wanted to stay entangled with those conditions particular to past lives, I did not want my work to be contemporary architectural practice (the exception to this has been Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum in Berlin, which I have found both archaeological and inspirational as an architectural project: Libeskind 2001). However, I do return again and again to architectural practice in order to seek inspiration and to remember that it is a necessary part of our work to attempt to imagine the unimaginable.

6.2 Constructional continuum

My reading on Asian-Pacific architectural anthropology led me to the work of Nold Egenter (1992) and the concept of a constructional continuum. I have many problems with the anti-historical or generalising functional aspects to his work, but I have been inspired by the positivity and dynamic way in which he writes of the 'constructive concept of the human past'. Indeed, he writes of this way of working, that it may be 'favoured by the fact that it does not interpret prehistory in a retrospective – and necessarily primitivising – sense, but tries to understand it as a continuous development' (1992:85). In particular, I was interested in his work on Shinto festivals in Japan (1982 and 1992). Egenter argues that the practice of making and using material culture over and over again, what he calls 'object traditions', creates particular spatial temporal assemblages. That knowledge of 'architecture' is understood through assembly work and the rhythms and routines of constructional practice. A knowledge of architecture is created through the ways in which it constantly comes into being, as practice, rather than by studying and recording in words and images a built form. Within Shinto-rites, sacred symbols are annually woven together in a particular way from reed and bamboo, and are then burnt. Egenter argues that it is not the final form of the cult-torches that is of importance, as they are burnt as soon as they are made, what is of importance is the event of making, a constructive practice that is performed annually and so generates and continues a knowledge of these architectures. He writes, 'Object tradition within a cyclic time concept obviously has great continuity and can be used as a valuable source in reconstructing important conditions of cultural history' (1992:183).

Japanese temple sites also interest Egenter, however, it is the activities of the construction site that are of importance and not the built form of any one temple. As soon as work is completed on one temple, construction work starts again on another. The site is then made up of past temples in varying states of disrepair, a temple in present use, with another under the process of construction. These architectures are constantly brought into being and a knowledge of them is created through that labour. There are no plans, images, or written accounts of the temple architectures, they are remembered and re-remembered through practice (ibid:157). However, I would disagree with Egenter's theory that a constructional continuum is a medium through which general traits of the same or analogous feature extend (ibid:85). Although bamboo and reeds are constantly brought into being, through acts of assembly or weaving, the material and historical conditions are never exactly replicated. I would argue that we should focus on the specific material and historical conditions that are or were negotiated through lived experience and look to how these practices remain effective as a medium for those labouring in these areas (Barrett 1994).

6.3 Memory

'While the Western monument in the modern era enabled as much a process of forgetting or collective amnesia as it marked a memory, the Melanesian counterpart enables with its erasure, the creation of an inherently recallable image; it thus instigates a process of remembering that is not directed to any particular vision of past or future, but which repeats itself many times over in point-like, momentary and thus 'animatorical' awakening of the past in the present' (Küchler 1999:63).

What I have found, in all of these works on Asia-Pacific architectural anthropology, is that the writers have highlighted the 'constructedness' of lived space. I want now to return to archaeological work. I do not want to leave archaeological evidence for too long in my attempt to narrate the ways in which I have come to think architecturally. For although architecture is a way of understanding, it has always been for me a way of understanding the material and historical conditions of fifth and fourth millennia lives. In thinking through all of these different media, I remained entangled within the small detail of the sites at Gwernvale, Hazleton North, Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294. I have discussed my and past people's encounters with these

areas of construction as an encounter with previous assemblages of things, that these entwined assemblages were always sites of ongoing partial construction. What has remained remarkable to me is the ways in which people labouring in these areas uncovered material culture from long before and incorporated it into their present. I want now to discuss the ways in which I have tackled thinking about how these practices remained effective as a medium through which to express fifth and fourth millennia life. First of all, I have found it helpful to think of time as a dimension which is given density by the ways in which it was marked through human practice (after Koji Mizoguchi 1993). In my encounters with, and writing and imaging of, long barrow or long mound sites, I have attempted to convey a tension that existed, that was almost tangible or material, between different events of activity. For example, there are distinct points in the construction of these sites that I am able to recall: where quarried sandstone boulders were knitted together with the boulders from the post-settings of the rotting timber structure at the site of Gwernvale, in order to physically entwine areas of the site together; where fragmented human skull was incorporated into the context of the hearth within the timber structure at the site of Hazleton North; the ways in which, through the parting and reassembling of materials, a network of transformed things was created within the midden at Hazleton North, which made possible the incorporation of parts of highly charged or extremely processed materials such as polished axe stone, quern stone, and parts of the human body; the ways in which flint-working, as an event of making situated and performed in the world, was timed or held at the point of re-cutting or connecting pit architectures at the sites of Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 294. Real tensions existed between events in construction, there was a frisson that ran through these visceral, corporeal, material acts of making and constructing. These are points or marks in time where Mizoguchi would argue that memory was being used as a resource (1993:233), or that Young would perhaps recognize as the texture of memory (1993). Past images and things, were encountered again and again, and through the act of remembering (Paul Connerton 1989) or forgetting (Küchler 1999), were made concrete and so got caught up in manipulations of the present. Or put another way, these tensions are evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories; where people attempted to engage with past materialities and create material histories of their own.

'...the past is brought forward to the present not for its past material but for its possibilities' (Lesley Naa Norle Lokko 1998:55).

These spaces of encounter were a necessary and vital medium for different groups of people to create ways in which to understand the existence of others. They were spaces of encounter which represent evidence for work carried out by gatherer-hunters through to pastoralists and agriculturalists; spaces of encounter that generated different understandings of things and people, differences that were constructed culturally and generationally in visceral, corporeal and material ways. People labouring in these areas uncovered material culture from long before and incorporated it into their present. And so to give an example, or to tell a tale of the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North, there was an encounter with material culture that was a part of fifth millennium life, flint tools, such as microliths, microburins, burins and burin spalls. These and other more miscellaneous flakes were remarked on along with 'unearthed' boulders. Timber structures and larger stones were knitted into areas along with material culture from fourth millennium life, polished axe fragments, leaf-shaped arrowheads, knives, flakes, and fragments of pottery and animal bone. Fragmented quernstones and smaller stone blocks were entwined in these assemblages. The negotiation of these conditions led to further connections between things, and things and people. Each of these encounters facilitated acts of remembering or forgetting previous groups of people. There would have been a continual negotiation of how to go about remembering or dealing with the materiality of those past lives. Some of these connections or some of this assembly work led to previously unimagined points of contact and so construction was about the possibilities and impossibilities in imagining architectural space. Construction work pulled those that laboured in these areas into unimagined points of contact that departed into other articulations of how people might be caught up in materialness and each other.

What is crucial here, is that the negotiation of particular material and historical conditions created the medium of architecture, as spaces of encounter. By attempting to understand the ways in which materials were connected together, and what kinds of conditions this created, we begin the process of creating different architectural histories. We should be asking ourselves, what kinds of humanities did these

encounters create? How should we understand bodies building in these knitted together areas of construction? What kind of body dynamics and politics do we have to start imagining in order to understand the ways in which such involved building practice could have taken place? What kinds of negotiations between people would have been worked through in order to create such an intimate and knotted architecture? What kinds of co-operative or disruptive issues are caught up in these sites?

These architectures, as spaces of encounter, incorporate space, time, things and people. I want to think of these spaces of encounter as made up of shards of space, time, material culture and personhood that glance, refract, mirror and interconnect with each other (inspired by Daniel Libeskind's 'Imperial War Museum North'). Or should I say that in order to write about my thinking architecture I have separated out knowledge into different shards for discussion. I have so far in my discussion created spaces or discussed knowledge and the process of encounter in spatial terms, I have marked time by writing through rhythms and tempos of human practice, and this writing has always materialised through encounters with material culture. I want now to deal with concepts of personhood, or as I will deal with it, identity. Later, I will produce a more animated account in which I will focus on the dynamic ways in which these shards are no longer distinctive but are knitted and knotted together through narrative.

6.4 Architectural identities

'...the lines of force that regulate and actually produce us are always in motion; that the entity we call ourself is equally always in motion. It follows that our ways of comprehending these forces will always have to be renewed...' (Probyn 2000:61).

Elspeth Probyn's writings are works of desirous (1993, 1995 and 1996) and visceral (2000) force, which 'look again' at the connections we make between things and people in the world. This has been vital in helping me to imagine ways in which to think through and with bodies that construct. Her works are works of movement, connections and disconnections; and identities come into being through all of this.

Her thinking does not stop at the ways in which things and things and people have become entangled, what is crucial about her work is that she realises that from these processes of entanglement new and previously unimagined connections are made that go somewhere else. This is what she terms her 'point of departure' and it is in 'leaving' in this way that she attempts to grapple with new articulations of how we might be caught up in materialness and each other (1993:6). It is this 'point of departure' that I have attempted to make my own in my attempts to write histories for those that lived during the fifth and fourth millennia, through constructing and building, at the sites of Gwernvale, Hazleton North, Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294.

Within Probyn's work, desire is a force which connects or disconnects images and things, but these forces are visceral and corporeal. I want to discuss the ways in which Probyn makes bodies matter through thinking what parts and bits are picked up on whilst opening up spaces and inducing further intensities of force. Her work is very much produced through Deleuze and Guattari's concept of assemblage (2000), but I would argue that it is only really in Probyn's writings that we come to understand the ways in which assemblages take up and become an intimate part of the production of human bodies or identities. In her work on corporeality, sexuality and eating, or 'FoodSexIdentities', Probyn writes:

'Basic ingestion forces us to think of our bodies as complex assemblages connected to a wide range of other assemblages. In eating, the diverse nature of where and how different parts of our selves attach to different aspects of the social comes to the fore and becomes the stuff of reflection' (2000:14).

In this work, it is possible to see the ways in which the visceral, corporeal and material aspects involved in the production of our identities catch on to different parts of the body and make connections in new ways. I picked up on this immediately in light of my own work on the constructive dynamics of past lives. My literal questioning being what is it to build, rather than what is it to eat. My work has been concerned with studying intersections between people and things through dynamics; more particularly, dynamics of construction, and dynamic connections that were enmeshed in the production of fifth and fourth millennia architectures. I have argued against seeing architecture as a built form, or as an arena in which people and things

were set; or architecture as a response, a response in the ability of particular people. I have attempted to attend to architecture as a medium. So instead of taking a position where architectures construct identities, or identities construct architecture, I want to think about the production of architectural identities; I want to think viscerally, corporeally, materially about the construction process. Before I develop my work on architectural identities, I want to make it clear what I mean by the term identity by using a working definition from Stuart Hall:

'Though they seem to evoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming, rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from' so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves' (1996:4).

I therefore want to work at the intersections between people and things in the process of becoming, through a medium of architecture, in the process of construction. I hope that in complicating the contexts which we encounter as archaeologists, by (over) doing what architecture can be, by going too far in imagining dynamic connections between things at every turn, I will produce a very different account of architectures and identities, architectural identities (after Rendell 1998).

In chapters 3 and 4, I discussed how by processing timbers and setting fires, spaces were created which were an important point of focus for the production of worked flint. I have described how these areas remained important as spaces of encounter for other groups of people as they entwined them into further assemblages of processed, timber, timber structures, pits, pots, fires, worked flint and animal bone. These assemblages can be further intermingled though thinking of the ways in which they relate to bodies. Bodies that chopped down trees and processed wood, that set and lit fires, were kept warm by the flames of that fire, were able to cook and so eat from that heat, were able to see to work flint, worked flint that facilitated the processing of further materials for the feeding, sheltering and clothing of the human body. Thinking of the past, the fires others had lit, the flames that had allowed bodies to process plants and animals in order to eat, the flames that had facilitated the working of flints, the remnants of which were scattered around old fire settings, all of this remembered in the present would have connected to the flames, food and flints that

were in the process of becoming. These encounters with the past would have made concrete what people were making of themselves. People attended to these spaces of encounter, added to them and allowed for the possibilities for further constructions. I cannot emphasise enough how important it is for us to search out the interconnections between people and things and to try to trace where they join and where they disconnect. These visceral interminglings were an important part in understanding for particular groups of people, who they were, and through thinking through the possibilities for further construction, what they could become in relation to others. I cannot tell you if these people lived exactly during what we would call the fifth millennium B.C. or the fourth. What I can tell you, is that in order to understand what it was to live (in what might have been the fourth millennium) people had to take on, encounter and understand evidence for fifth millennium life. These spaces of encounter, created memories, that embedded themselves in the possibility of what people could become. As Probyn would say 'where we start from and what we go with...While this may sound very ephemeral and abstract, I'll wager that nothing could be more concrete' (1995:15-16).

What if we take further, make more of interminglings of small things, small things that were an intimate part of fifth and fourth millennia life and consider the ways in which these were entwined and woven together. What of busy contexts? What if we consider contexts in which trees and scrub grew, where trees fell and were felled, where areas of clearance and grassland were created, where paths and routeways were a part of this lived landscape (Edmonds 1997 and 2000). These are the spaces where animals, plants and humans lived and these are the spaces where timbers, plants, animals and humans were processed, in the setting and lighting of fires, the preparation, cooking and eating of food, the parting and reassembling of the dead. Tree, plant, animal and human life, the temporalities and residues of those lives, were continually encountered (hunting and gathering being here practices of perceiving worlds after Ingold 2000); and in that process new material histories and understandings of the world were created. These are the spaces where we as archaeologists should attend to thinking through the possibilities for different kinds of humanity, through thinking through animal/plant/human/material connections. To quote again from Probyn, we should be thinking about 'ways of living informed by

both the rawness of a visceral engagement with the world, and a sense of restraint in the face of the excess' (2000:3).

Assemblages of things were added to and further connections between things and things and people were constructed. Pits were cut into the ground and upcast earth accumulated on turf. Holes were cut for posts, as was timber. Timber posts were propped up by unearthened boulders. As a landscape was produced, through the tasks and routines that were part of peoples lives, further material remains would have been encountered; encountered as the ground was cut into, and boulders were unearthened, and timbers were set. These spaces of encounter, these sites of construction, which gave dimension to the ways in which people thought about themselves and thought about themselves in relation to others, these are the spaces where we should draw out alternative ways of thinking about an ethics of existence.

These areas of construction connected material assemblages to assemblages of the body. These areas became spaces in which attempts were being made to articulate interconnections between the construction of bodies and bodies that construct, and so parts of the human body itself were entwined into this weave of things. Parts of a human skull were incorporated into the context of a hearth that was within a timber structure at the site of Hazleton North. Large sandstone blocks were split and knitted together with smaller blocks to make elongated box-like structures and human bone was woven into the matrix of these materials at the site of Hazleton North. Fragments of skull and small blocks of stone were propped, pitched and angled between larger orthostatic stone creating an undulating contour of meshed materials. Such interminglings of materials and bodies relate to what I have already argued in chapter 4, where I stated that these dynamic connections were architectural. In some way these connections created spaces in which to combine and transform substances; a space where polished flint axes and quernstones were broken down and processed in similar ways to human bone, and which were then knitted into stone, earth and timber constructions. However, these interminglings also call for a revision of our knowledge of bodily intimacies. If what we are dealing with here is a matter of assembly work then, as I have been attempting to argue, bodies were equally made to matter through the process of assembly. Evidence for bodily remains (labelled by archaeologists as evidence for mortuary practice) are equally a matter of assemblage,

assemblages of the body. Mortuary practice, at these times, and in these spaces was a product of the human body as much as evidence for what people put into bodies, what bodies made, what bodies wore and what they were heated and sheltered by. Understanding of the body was not divided into 'lived' and then what was understood as 'dead', the working of the body in both spheres was entwined in these areas of construction. This is not a dressing down of the body or advocating disrespect for the dead, it is a revision of our knowledge of bodily intimacies, a revision of our knowledge of what past peoples **made** of living and dying.

If we think of building rather than eating here it, '...brings together a cacophony of feelings, hopes, pleasures and worries, as it orchestrates experiences that are at once intensely individual and social' (Probyn 2000:3).

As I argued in chapter 5, by figuring freshly worked flints as an event in construction, these complex assemblages invite us to take flint working seriously as a productive, corporeal activity that was a part of construction. They remind us that all practices of making are somehow embodied and a part of construction sites. I therefore wish to look again at further processes of making as events in construction and how they relate to the production of architectural identities. So as timber posts rotted and decayed at these sites, small blocks of stone were propped up against them, adding to the stones from their post settings. Woven threads of timber and stone were connected to axial themes of stone, quernstone, polished axe stone, turf and wooden shuttering. Stones were pitched, angled and laid in courses, they were propped up by and in turn held in place wooden shuttering and stacks of turf. These materials were interdigitated, some were woven and threaded through accumulations of others, in order to span through areas of construction and make connections in different ways.

By engaging with detail, the small things of life, we realise that we are dealing with a process of entwining; a process that deals with the constructed quality of things and a movement between materials; a process where we are confident that this is evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories; where people attempted to engage with past materialities and create material histories of their own. And so at the sites of Gwernvale and Hazleton North, pits and pig bones were connected to areas of tree fall; and to stone

and human bone box structures; and to hearths and flint knapping areas; and to hearths, human bone and timber structures; and to quarry pits and hearths, antler and human bone.

What can we make of these lived contexts, and what did past people make of living in these ways? For in making, in constructing, in such intimate and demanding ways, we have to start thinking of the excesses of the body whilst building. What of the intensity and entwined movements of people and things, propping each other and everything else up in close proximity? A tactile engagement with matter and substance was created through building and junctions were created between flesh and architecture. Bodies building were smeared with the soil and stone matrix of the worked earth. These were meeting points where distinctions between human bodies and bodies of matter smeared became confusing, and had to be looked at again. Dynamic connections were made, which necessitate the incorporation of smoke, dust, fire, plants and animals, processed parts of plants and animals, consumed parts of plants and animals, accumulated materials, spillage and excess, disturbed ground, large exposed areas of the ground below the turf line, blocked off paths and route ways, new and sometimes temporary paths and route ways, shoring, shuttering, scaffolding, equipment broken and new, eating, drinking, sleeping, as well as other types of activity. Connections between humans, plants, animals and material culture were made that could be felt, smelt, worn and drunk in. All of this and more needs to be woven into our understandings of construction sites. Architecture appears to be living, it is animated. It is not so much that people lived in these areas whilst constructing but that construction work was an integral part of social life. As I have already said, parts of the materials of what people put into their bodies, what their bodies made and wore, what their bodies were heated and sheltered by were produced and woven into these sites. We therefore have to start considering, as a part of our history writing, the transformative possibilities of construction. Building sends us off in unexpected directions and orders alternative connections. Building practice reactivates the force of identities. As a bodily dynamic, it is a visceral reminder of the ways in which we inhabit or are entwined in economies, intimate relations, gender, sexuality, history, ethnicity and class (this is a quite literal taking of a quote from Probyn 2000:9).

6.5 *Making history through lived experience*

Most of all in my work, I hope to have produced an account of the past that is alive and that is to do with those that lived their lives in the past. What I want to emphasise is the importance of being conscious of the connections that we make and the ways in which these relate to lives lived in the past (after Barrett 1997). Vital to this process of understanding is the writing of a history through lived experience (instilled from Edward Said 2002), a history which retains an intimacy in the way in which it is produced and does not jump in scale in the narrative it constructs (remembered from Arundhati Roy 1997). The following is a quote from Roy, where I believe assemblages of things and things and people are intermingled through thinking of the ways in which they relate to bodies. A space of encounter is created in Roy's writing, a space in which memories are created and that embed themselves in the possibility of what people could become, or, sadly in this case, a nostalgia for what people could have become but never did. What is most important of all is the scale of things, the importance of small things:

'Rahel (on a stool, on top of a table) rummaged in a book cupboard with dull, dirty glass planes. Her bare footprints were clear in the dust on the floor. They led from the door to the table (dragged to the bookshelf), to the stool (dragged to the table and lifted onto it). She was looking for something. Her life had a size and a shape now. She had half-moons under her eyes and a team of trolls on her horizon...Rahel groped behind the row of books and brought out hidden things. A smooth seashell and a spiky one. A plastic case for contact lenses. An orange pipette. A silver crucifix on string of beads. Baby Kochamma's rosary...Behind the books, Rahel's puzzled fingers encountered something else. Another magpie had had the same idea. She brought it out and wiped the dust off with the sleeve of her shirt. It was a flat packet wrapped in clear plastic and stuck with Sellotape. A scrap of white paper inside it said *Esthappen and Rahel*. In Ammu's writing' (Roy 1997:155-156).

The reason I include this quote in my work, is first of all to show how such writing has influenced the way in which I have written about spaces of encounter within the fifth and fourth millennia B.C., but also because I believe the scale and 'liveness' of this writing, the intermingling of bodies/architectures/material culture, demonstrate the usable scope of archaeology within the histories and narratives we write. Roy realises that identities can be produced and reproduced through assemblages of small things. But also Roy's story is history as lived experience, which Said would argue is

‘something we should figure as a focal part of our study in this age...this is the way in which we should articulate our works’ (2002).

I have already written in this chapter that the construction sites that I have been involved in detailing, a detail of small things that I have attempted to knit together viscerally, were an important part of a process of understanding for particular groups of people. This process of understanding involved people thinking of who they were and, through thinking through the possibilities for further construction, what they could become in relation to others and involves thinking through the possibilities for further construction in order not just to understand the world but to actively **change** it (Said 2002). Such constructive dynamics were truly helpful in an enterprise of transforming the world. I want now to state that this enterprise, construction as an integral part of social life, the politics of building if you like, was taken up and worked on by ‘children’, ‘women’ and ‘men’ in order to make human/plant/animal/material culture connections in the world. Bodies were made to matter through a negotiation of junctions with other materials or living things. A scale of small things, and an intimacy about this work, makes it possible to see how connections can be constructed between many kinds of humanity, and which intermingle with many kinds of things, thus creating a critical emphasis on the proximity of sites.

‘Let us not take it for granted that life exists more fully in what is commonly thought big than what is commonly thought small’ (Virginia Woolf, cited in Susan Nalbantian 1994:55).

These intimate details do not need the modern western world of construction that is made up of buildings, architects, professional construction workers, technical equipment, the calculation of numbers of ‘man’-hours, and a divide between the architect and the user. Nor do they need the archaeologist’s world of construction that is made up of monuments, templates or planned images, tools, calculations of numbers of ‘man’-hours, and a divide between construction and use (Bradley 1984 and 1993). I do not mean to pick on the work of Richard Bradley, especially as there has been a transformation in his work from *Altering the Earth* (1993) to the *Archaeology of Natural Places* (2000), but I feel that the way in which we articulate our work, by intermingling constructive dynamics so that the points where

architectures end and landscapes begin are further complicated, actually lies somewhere between his two works, perhaps more in the intimacy of scale in Thomas's genealogies of pits, pots and dirt:

'As traces of the activities of the cooking, serving and eating of food and drink and of the burning of fires, the contents of pits were representative of some of the most fundamental aspects of human sociality...items like pottery, stone tools and the bones of cattle were more than simply 'rubbish' in that they stood for a Neolithic way of life. If Neolithic societies were articulated through a changed relationship with the material world, it is to be expected that this would have been appreciated to some extent...things were more evidently integral to social life (Thomas 1999:87),

or Barrett's histories of presence:

'It is this struggle to know the world in certain ways, and to set upon the implications of those understandings, which lies at the heart of historical and cultural dynamics' (Barrett 1994:90).

However, I want to go back to a quote I used at the beginning of chapter 1:

'Be it affirmed:

The built environment is largely the creation of white, masculine
Subjectivity. It is neither value-free nor inclusively human. Feminism implies
That we fully recognize this environmental inadequacy and proceed to think
And act out of that recognition.' (Weisman 2000:4).

Partly, my use of the intimate and visceral ways in which small things were intermingled was in order to make it possible for children and women to be an important part of a construction process through which they understood and changed their worlds. However, to say such a thing, is to say that for me, writing in my time, I feel that I have to extend an anti-sexist struggle into the histories I write about imagining the possibilities for different kinds of humanities in the past. I should probably discuss a little more explicitly this struggle.

In always heeding the warning signs of our own male constructed construction industry, and in wanting to make these sites of production differently, I take on a struggle between essentialist concepts of the 'person' (man, woman, or child) and deconstructive workings of identity. Perhaps I could phrase this another way as a tension that exists in my work, where my attempts to write history as lived experience

are generated from a tension between wanting to write (or make a space for) children and women in history (after Brück 2001) but wanting to further complicate these categories of person by looking at the way in which identities constantly come into being through a myriad of connections and disconnections between things and people that go somewhere else. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has written in an encouraging and positive way about this struggle. Rather than as a failure to work a pure theory, she sees this struggle, or tension in the ways in which we work, as a maturing process in our thinking. She writes:

'You see, you *are* committed to these concepts, whether you acknowledge it or not. I think it's absolutely on target not to be rhetorically committed to it, and I think it's absolutely on target to take a stand against the discourses of essentialism...But *strategically* we cannot. Even as we talk about *feminist* practice, or privileging practice over theory, we are universalising – not only generalising but universalising. Since the moment of essentialising, universalising saying yes to the onto-phenomenological question, is irreducible, let us at least situate it at the moment, let us become vigilant about our own practice and use it as much as we can rather than make the totally counter-productive gesture of repudiating it. One thing that comes out is that you jettison your own purity as a theorist. When you do this you can no longer say my theory is going to stand against anyone else's because in this sense the practice really norms the theory, because you are an essentialist from time to time' (1990:11-12).

So at points within my writing there are images of, or possibilities for, 'children' and 'women' at work. However, my narratives never stop at these points but instead, through further processes of animation, attempt to articulate different understandings of the ways in which people and things could be caught up in materialness and each other. In particular, I have in mind here the parts in my texts within which I activate the excesses of the body whilst constructing, where bodies are in close proximity with everyone and everything else and which seem to question the limits of 'a person'. I want to extend and so loop these productions of bodies back into the practice of archaeology, and the excesses of the archaeologists' bodies whilst excavating, engaged in an encounter with the material and historical conditions of past people's lives. At this point in my work I will entangle this narrative with another kind of imagery that I have been working on. This imagery is very different from the other ways in which I have worked at conveying ideas, concepts and notions of architecture. These images work at producing spaces of encounter through the active forces of bodies that are in the process of becoming.

6.6 Images

A revision of our knowledge of bodily intimacies, and I would argue one of the most dynamic ways to get at an understanding of construction work, is from the connective energies and inspiration in working with other archaeologists whilst excavating (see Figure 6.1). This is where archaeology's 'liveness' is at work, its quality of imaginal engagement with others and with the material conditions through which we continually negotiate the lives of others (see Figure 6.2). The effort of labour involved in excavation, the continual encounter with different material and historical conditions, creates radical ways in which to think of construction as 'in process' (see Figure 6.3). These re-active processes create spaces of encounter in which to work as many dynamic connections as we possibly can. If you like, these dynamic connections are our point of departure into imagining different kinds of architecture and architectural identities (see Figure 6.4).

However, although I want to stress the positive possibilities for the creation of histories through dynamics and stress the proximity of sites past and present, there should also be an unease brought to bear in articulating our efforts at self-positioning and the knowledges and possibilities available to us in building these into architectures. Is it really so easy for me to find different ways in which to represent bodily dynamics? I think the answer to that question is, no it is not. So far I have represented bodily dynamics through the ways in which assemblages of things and things and people were entwined, I have not as yet really dealt with issues of invisibility and anxiety (Probyn 2000).

I am anxious that in attempting to disrupt key stereotypical images, I am unable to gauge the degree to which this remains complicit with the dominant regimes from which they steal (after Butler 1993). This marks an awkwardness to my work, an awkwardness that I want to make use of (see Figure 6.5). And so the images that I have at work here are deliberately awkward, complicated; the pixellation and blur are also a part of the material conditions through which my encounter takes place and this awkwardness makes me realise that there are other people to be imagined who are not remarked on by certainty. It makes me think that it is not the case that I have to

demonstrate **visually** differently constructed worlds through grasping at material certainties (for that leads back to understandings of difference through caricature and stereotype), instead, I would argue that I should come to my understandings of difference through processes of animation. This is an understanding of dynamics, bodybuilding, where dynamic connections are understood to have been woven together from the small things of life. For in this way, things and people become known through their actions and so get marked and become a plausible part of historical process, but at the same time, these histories are not created as if they are the only one (after Roy 1997).

'...we desperately need to reanimate the sites of our analysis...One way of putting this is to think of how we can cross over from the solitary space-time of individual categories in order to renew a critical emphasis on the proximity of sites' (Probyn 2001:184).

What I hope to have articulated is a visceral and urgent need to activate and complicate the materials that we think of in our and past people's encounters with these sites, and why the constructional histories of these areas need to enmesh evidence for all aspects of human encounter. We need to create a confidence in these contexts and take on the responsibility of actively engaging with those material conditions, and in that process make connections in other ways.

It is high time, within our archaeological practice, that we attempted to create a dynamic imagery and to write dynamic histories; dynamic histories that take the initiative from the smaller things of life, the materials that were intimately caught up in people's identities; dynamic histories, where we recognise that the material and historical conditions to life were constantly in flux, and so we necessarily have to take inspiration from unplanned points of contact. We can then start a process of imagining the unimaginable, and really start to consider the kinds of humanities these encounters create. Architecture is here understood as a medium through which to understand all life.

6.7 Unlearning the legacy of history as a monumental form of vision

'But what I should like also to have contributed here is a better understanding of the way cultural domination has operated. If this stimulates a new kind of dealing with the Orient, indeed if it eliminates the 'Orient' and 'Occident' altogether, then we shall have advanced the 'unlearning' of 'the inherent dominative mode'' (Said 1995:28).

I have hinted at the ways in which I have been exploring intersections between architecture, history and writing. I want now to discuss a kind of monumental form of vision that has constructed, and been perpetuated within, many historical writings (after Said 1995). These histories cannot be contained geographically, or said to only belong to Imperialist and Colonialist times, for these are the histories that we have read and the books that we were taught to think and 'see' by. We are '...people whose histories are spongy with the blood of others' (Roy 2002:22). 'Monumentalism' exists in many forms, it is an image at work within discourse, and so it is the legacy of modern Western thought (after Michele le Doeuff's (1989) theory of the work of images). If, as Said is, we are critical of where the narrator stands in and outside of her/his text, then we notice the ways in which what one person does is made to appear as the exposed centre of all 'other' people in general (161); how the author's studies can manipulate the details of many lives into one volume. This is what Said terms monumental description. He demonstrates the ways in which this is produced in a 'classic', and how it is held in place through a monumental form of vision, in Edward William Lane's 1836 volume 'An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians'. Said writes:

'Lane's objective is to make Egypt and the Egyptians without depth, in swollen detail. As rapporteur his propensity is for sadomasochistic colossal tidbits: the self-mutilation of dervishes, the cruelty of judges, the blending of religion with licentiousness among Muslims, the excess of libidinous passions, and so on. Yet no matter how odd and perverse the event and how lost we become in its dizzying detail, Lane is ubiquitous, his job being to reassemble the pieces and enable us to move on, albeit jerkily. To a certain extent he does this by just being a European who can discursively control the passions and excitements to which the Muslims are unhappily subject. But to an even greater extent, Lane's capacity to rein in his profuse subject matter with an unyielding bridle of discipline and detachment depends on his cold distance from Egyptian life and Egyptian productivity' (1995:162).

The successful author will have a vision 'powerful enough to light up both the gross and the refined topographies' (ibid:241). She/he will be able to negotiate different scales of action, the different intentionalities and outcomes of those 'other' people, they will be able to show what needs to be seen of other people's lives without calling into question the fact that this vision is manipulated and understood within their own lifespan. The mechanics of maps and plans are complicit with these kinds of narrative, they facilitate this kind of monumental vision, by showing the academic what needs to be seen despite what 'other' people make of their lives. Said goes on to write:

'The governing verb is 'show' which here gives us to understand that the Arabs display themselves (willingly or unwillingly) to and for expert scrutiny' (ibid).

I have attempted to emphasise the proximity of sites, past and present, in order that we question the limits of our theorising and thinking 'architecture'. We have as Probyn has argued:

'the capacity to be intimately confronted with the implications of our actions. That how and in what combination we eat, think, sleep and live will have concrete consequences that render 'far-off' parts of the world closer to home. In contrast to Diderot's statement, we no longer have the comfort of distance in time and space to assuage 'our guilty conscience' (2001:184).

I would argue that we understand better the medium of architecture through the process of excavation, because through that practice we are in the process of encountering the material and historical conditions of a process of construction. These worlds are always in the process of being made, identities are always in the process of becoming, we cannot escape from such encounters or our entanglement with them. It is by thinking through where else that entanglement might lead, it is by those efforts, that we will come to know and articulate something else about worlds (past and present). There are no histories I can write of a people standing back and having to deal with the material consequences of their actions, there is no point where I can 'see' that people encountered an upcast cairn or mound that was flanked by cleaned out and complete quarry pits or ditches. If you did ask me to stop and take myself out of this context, out of the text, out of the picture and look back, I would never 'see' this. Even if from slightly later in the earlier neolithic you asked me to

arrive and start telling tales of people, I would still see pits some silted up, some partially backfilled, others being cut, banks of material mounded up, scaffolding and shuttering partly covered as other equipment was brought in, walls or facing built up against previous areas of construction, further acts of making. But I would turn that question round to say that it may not have been a question of what I could 'see' at this point but what I could remember; time was perceived and marked through human practice, and so remembering did not exist outside of human practice and the efforts of people's labours. It may have been through making, building the world that I remember, not through what I can 'see', but what I know I can make. Perhaps these are the ways in which these sites remained effective for other kinds of making, as events situated and performed in the world. I am not attempting to write histories for these later periods although obviously my work develops into an understanding of them. I would argue that the degree to which these labours become reflective, is by how successfully they created a medium of architecture through construction, rather than how successfully I have pulled these practices into something the archaeologist wants to match to the more completed form of a monument. I cannot disentangle myself from an encounter with the material and historical conditions of past lives, an ongoing practice of making and changing the world, and so I will not attempt to write another kind of narrative. The anthropologist engaged with understanding the constructive dynamics of Japanese temples would not attempt to extricate her or himself from the production of knowledge in order to explain what she/he saw as a more completed form, for the people constructing did not understand themselves or the remnants of other lives outside of the construction process. So why should the archaeologist?

Danny Hind has written histories for lives lived during the fifth and fourth millennia B.C. in the Peak District of Derbyshire, England. Hind asks the question:

'Could the use of chambers really produce a depth of time beyond that which was already understood in terms of settlements rediscovered through clearance, or monuments of ancestral beings as inferred from landscape features? To suppose so is to reduce the people before mortuary structures to a state of timelessness, a people without history...' (2000:274).

If the people 'before mortuary structures' are reduced to a state of timelessness, a static vision, then the people 'after mortuary structures' are expected to enter into

history, a monumental form of vision. Said uses T.E. Lawrence's 1926 volume 'The Seven Pillars of Wisdom' as an example of this:

'The great drama of Lawrence's work is that it symbolizes the struggle, first to stimulate the Orient (lifeless, timeless, forceless) into movement; second, to impose upon that movement an essentially Western shape...' (Said 1995:241).

At the start of my thesis I took the supposed beginning and ending of monumental form, and considered architecture through that which might be considered incidental to it. I was able to demonstrate that the processing of timber and the working of flint were as architectural as the pining together of stone box structures and that practices from fifth and fourth millennia life could and had been knitted together and by those processes people made something of their lives and an understanding of life in relation to other people who had worked at making. Thus the incidental became the focus of my studies, a refocusing of the margins and those who reside there. Earlier neolithic lives were not separated out from mesolithic lives because these architectures, as spaces of encounter, meant that fourth millennium life was always created through an encounter with other groups of people, living or dead. If bodies were made to matter through processes of making, an animated discourse that emphasised the proximity of sites, these were not piecemeal developments but concrete conditions to understanding life, more concrete than any Westerner's static 'monument'. If I have been able to argue that what seem to be the most ephemeral and abstract concepts and perceptions to ways of living were actually the most concrete, why should I then stop this way of understanding if it remained an effective medium in which to engage with what was to be made of the world. Why should what we 'see' as more complete, or more concrete, have been the case in the past or need thinking about in the pasts we write? Architecture was still a medium, we know that because further pits were cut, and there were further practices of making (working flint, processing animal bone and pottery), and these things were added to and entwined in previous assemblages of things. Lives lived during the later earlier neolithic were equally engaged in an encounter with history making, of understanding their lives in relation to others. People may have moved on to further construction sites, and so still have approached façaded sites through memory rather than what they 'saw' before their eyes. They may have visited these sites from time to time in

other ways and understood them through different processes of making, but they may also have remembered these sites best from when architecture had been living and had made junctions with their flesh and their bodies rather than what they 'saw' as a completed form. Remember, remembering was a process, an active force used in the production of architectural identities, it remained effective as a medium for this reason and not through the vision of some enduring form (even works on modern Western 'monuments' are questioning the concept of there being any inherent enduring quality in the built form, for example Joe Kerr's 1996 critical history of the 'forgotten' Berthold Lubetkin monument to Lenin erected in Holford Square, Finsbury, London during the Second World War: see also Argenti 1999). We will never be able to explore these kinds of 'effectivity' if we reduce this medium to a built form, with a linear construction sequence that had a clear beginning and end, and a common form ultimately to be explained. My thesis has been an attempt to start this process.

6.8 Narratives for the archaeologist: explanations of architectural objects

I discussed in chapters 1 and 2 the ways in which a system of architecture had come about and the ways in which this system had constructed an exclusive image of what architecture was. These images had objectified labour by figuring a built form rather than the process of building. A built building was represented which had an abstract form that was drawn out of context. These practices did not work at representing an ever changing and disruptive construction site that was part of a living landscape. In the writings of these architectural histories, and the images used to figure these architectures, 'architecture' had a clear beginning and end, and detail was drawn in to produce an overall larger scale of things. It therefore seemed impossible not to 'see' or envisage these architectures as the result of a planned building process because the scale at which these images were produced went beyond the 'constructedness' of materials and the labours of past people. Similarly this pristine built form, that figured in images, and which was written about with an easy clarity between construction and use, gave the notion that there had been an exclusive use in mind, or reason behind the 'architecture' having been built. These 'architectures' were certainly not made and remade; they were written and drawn as architectural objects.

'Land, buildings, materials, knowledge, human labour and space all assume the form of the commodity. Thereafter, the production of the built environment can never escape the logic that comes from the unity of mathematical law and exchange value, such that the relation of necessity to the realm of freedom remains purely quantitative and mechanical' (Jonathan Charley 1996:59).

As I demonstrated within chapter 2, we always seem to end up with a monumental form that needs to be explained within archaeological accounts. However, I hope I have demonstrated in chapters 3, 4 and 5 that these accounts are often ahistorical in that they ignore architecture as a process or medium; a medium where different objects were made (such as hearths, worked flint, food, clothing); events of making which have often been considered insignificant historically but which created spaces of encounter between different groups of people (people who lived wholly or parts of what we would recognise as gatherer-hunter, pastoralist and agriculturalist lifestyles) and through which new histories and understanding were constructed. These events of making and constructing the world did not skip in scale in order to become an overall built form, nor did they lead to the inevitable form of a neolithic monument. Although 'seen' that way by many, these intimate, corporeal and visceral practices animated architecture. Practices previously seen as less tangible actually created junctions between bodies/animals/plants/material culture that were concrete, and these remembered events, as concrete memories, embedded themselves in the ways in which people understood themselves in relation to others. These practices involved the negotiation of particular material and historical conditions; material and historical conditions which do not seem to have been encountered in explanations for or narratives which lead up to or evolve into a built form (and this criticism extends to the work of Barrett (1988 and 1994) who articulated so precisely processes of negotiation).

With a 'long mound' or a 'long cairn', especially where there are very impressive physical remnants of an upcast 'mound' and clear depressions from the partial silting of 'flanking ditches', the architectural object on paper and what is understood as the physical product or outcome of history in front of the archaeologist's eyes, conflate and stand uncomplicatedly together. By producing an account of the ways in which modern excavation reverses the process of 'neolithic' construction (after Lucas' (2001b) work on the rhetoric of excavation practice as an exercise in reversing the

processes of the past), the architectural object or archaeological product is taken back to its origins.

'[architecture]...is not made just once, but is made and remade over and over again each time it is represented through another medium, each time its surroundings change, each time different people experience it' (Borden et al. 1996:5).

Archaeologists forget that these architectural objects are the product of archaeological practice. They search for prototypes of these archaeological images and construct narratives to explain how these objects could have originated. The most (in)famous of these is from 'house' to 'tomb' (Ian Hodder 1984, 1990, 1994 and 1998; Bradley 1996 and 1998). Objects (a house or a tomb) are given general traits (length, breadth, orientation etc.) which are considered to help in 'form'-ulating a description of them; and so traits are shared over geographical regions and traced through time. Points of comparison are created and contrasts are remarked on in order that a dialogue is created between similar but different archaeological objects. The archaeologist has then to explain how these similarities and differences could have come about consciously or unconsciously through people's actions in the past. However, Barrett (1987) has fiercely pointed out that there is no way in which the scale of these operations could have been experienced by anyone else other than the archaeologist her or himself (separated as they are by hundreds of kilometers and several centuries).

These are not histories of past lives but narratives that create mechanisms in order to explain to the archaeologist why one architectural object or archaeological product 'looks like' another.

'Eventually, as the process of decay increased, each of the houses would collapse, leaving a gap in the distribution of buildings marked by a long, low mound, much of it contributed by the daub which had covered the walls. The erosion of the barrow pits might even give the impression of side ditches. The very process of decay in the heart of the inhabited area might have given rise to the basic idea of the long barrow' (Bradley 1998:44-45).

They create a vision of the past that is abstracted from the contexts of daily life, and they become a negotiation of archaeological products from different archives over regions and through time:

'Having suggested a mechanism by which longhouses might have given way to long mounds, we need to address the problem of the enclosures' (ibid:48).

These large scale mappings of architectural objects create basic ideas or general principles in order to carry explanations for things through time and space, these formulations (that 'see' why things are the way they are) are then dropped down into the contexts of past people's lives:

'I wish now to look at the linear tombs of northern Europe and the British Isles in order to explore the way in which the general house principles, and especially the continuity of the house, were translated into a particular form of practices suited to a particular set of economic and social conditions within the general frame set by small-scale mixed farming of European domesticates' (Hodder 1998:93).

I want to explore further what I see as a conflation in Hodder's work into one monumental scale. There is an architectural object that was conceived of in the neolithic as what it was to be neolithic, however this object also becomes a cultural setting for the acting out of a neolithic ideology, the architectural object becomes a symbol of a 'myth' (after Barthes 1972) rather than a process encountered and remembered within a living narrative. Hodder states:

'A brief summary of the sequence of activities at Haddenham will indicate the extent to which people participated in the project in different ways at different times, creating an overall narrative and building a common historical experience and memory' (1998:96).

I would argue that Hodder introduces the concept of memory and the idea of history being made at the point of myth making, and so there is no negotiation between different scales (as he argues is the case between the general and the particular) except the monumental. Furthermore, the only person who has the ability to 'see' this object turned symbol, turned myth is the archaeologist; an archaeologist who has constructed not a narrative that was a part of past people's lives but a 'mythology' that existed out of the sphere of their making.

'The narrative history was thus a contested one, but even in the dialectic a common history was created. A continuity through time had been constructed' (ibid:97).

I want to contrast the above two quotes from Hodder with the quote that follows from Charley's 'sentences upon architecture',

'The production of the architectural commodity in the shape of ideal vernaculars, parodies of luxury and historical triumphalism, lies at the center of the construction of a culture based on myths of free markets, heroic individuals and patriotism. In this mythology, powerlessness and non-identity become represented as freedom and happiness' (1996:60).

I would argue that, just as we need to think a little more critically of just what exactly it is that we understand architecture to be, we need to explore more fully intersections between architecture, history and narrative. For a monumental form of vision is at work within all of these disciplines, and the monumental image that resides in each of these ways of working is used to prop up and justify the simple 'just is' existence of the other. Unless we explore critically the intersections between architectures, histories and stories, that are in the process of becoming, and that are intimately constructed from the small things of life through lived experience, we will always maintain the archaeological product of the 'monument'.

6.9 Narrative: on histories and stories

'I discovered that the way a writer positions herself in her writing is architectural and has implications for the way in which the writer meets the reader. Certain forms of writing make walls, others create meeting points; some stories close down possibilities for discussion, while others invite participation' (Jane Rendell 1998).

I hope that in the narrative that I have been constructing I have created many possible meeting points between the past and the present, between the mesolithic and neolithic, between people that went about living their lives in different ways but always in relation to other people, between writer and reader, and that meeting has given density and dimension to other lives and other ways of knowing. Narratives are further spaces of encounter, and just as I have emphasised the proximity of sites and the importance of these meeting points in the past and present, I hope to explore the ways in which narratives from the past and narratives of the past conjoin. For neolithic people were not simply neolithic. They engaged in encounters with their past and

resuscitated it through further acts of construction (taken from A.S. Byatt on writing about the Victorians 2001:47). I want now to think of the intersections between history and narrative, and the new places they create. The first point I want to make is one of scale. This is in order to clarify exactly what I mean by narrative as stories, and so as to keep a small scale of narrative in mind so that it does not slip into the ungraspable realm of mythology. Byatt states that,

'People are excited by millennial events as images of beginnings and endings. There is a difference between these great, portentous histories and the proliferation of small tales that are handed on, like gifts, like objects for delight and contemplation...the small artifices of elegant, well-made tales, and the vulgar satisfaction of narrative curiosity do stand against death' (Byatt 2001:170).

I want to think about small tales, I hope that I have been able to create small stories of the past that are littered with meeting places between past and present, I hope that in meeting there is also the creation of new spaces in which we consider the possibility that past people told small stories too.

'The 'Thousand and One Nights' are stories about storytelling – without ever ceasing to be stories about love and life and death and money and food and other human necessities. Narration is as much part of human nature as breath and the circulation of the blood' (ibid:166).

Some of these stories I imagine to have been like Roy's (1997) assemblages of things and people, where things were intermingled through thinking of the ways in which they related to bodies. A space of encounter was created, where things were named and named in their relation to bodies with names. In Roy's writing, a stool was on top of a table because it has been dragged by Rahel. Her footprints linked the door, table, bookshelf and stool together. Rahel's fingers connected to seashells spiky and smooth, a plastic case, an orange pipette, a silver crucifix that belonged to Baby Kochamma, and a flat packet with the names 'Esthappen' and 'Rahel' written on it in Ammu's writing. Many things and many people were named in this story and there are also things that were identified by particular people's names. A space of encounter had been created by Roy and by Rahel, through the ways in which Rahel related to things and in that process she found her own name on a packet in her mother's writing. So particular relationships between people were named, daughter and mother, 'Rahel' and 'Ammu'.

Things in the past were intermingled through thinking of the ways in which they related to bodies, and some of those encounters would have been named; names of things, names of people, names of relationships. However, these spaces of encounters involved the close proximity of sites past and present and so there would crucially have been encounters with things with unknown names which had related to people whose names were not known. There would have been encounters with parts of people whose names were not known and whose relationships with other people were not known. There was a mystery and ‘unknowingness’ about the past that was part of these encounters and it is not our job as archaeologists, I would argue, to remedy this situation by naming these parts automatically as parts of ancestors. It is the mystery and encounter with the unknown that is exciting about these stories from the past and our own stories of the past. Rather than run away from the fact that we cannot put names to the people that lived in the past, we should use this ‘fact’ as a specific condition that has to be negotiated in archaeological stories (and by this I mean archaeological stories from, as well as of, the past). I argued that this could be the case with the images that we produce of the past, that it is the animation and the dynamic ‘constructedness’ of the image that is of importance rather than any visual certainty. Perhaps it is the condition of the unknown in animated accounts that is what could draw people to histories and stories.

In her work ‘On Histories and Stories’, Byatt writes about historians that write fiction and fiction writers that write history. She says:

‘The writer of fiction is at liberty to invent – as the historian and the biographer are not. Schama’s fiction, mixed with documentary, in ‘Dead Certainties’ lacks the dramatic power and imaginative grasp of his history, as the postmodern dialogues between biographer and subject Ackroyd inserted into his Dickens biography seemed trivial and false beside the mystery of the known facts and the unknown nature of the life being told’ (ibid:54-55).

Perhaps, the scope of archaeology is in the material realisation that there is never any straightforward story to be told; that the production of bodies in the past is forever extended and so looped back into the practice of archaeology, and the excesses of the archaeologists’ bodies whilst excavating, engaged in an encounter with the material and historical conditions of past people’s bodies; that there is a re-active practice to

history and a retelling of stories. People that lived their lives in the past were archaeologists too, the contexts of our work create 'rather dense territories of occupation' (Rendell 1998:232). Spaces of encounter were and are created through a process of negotiating these occupied contexts; contexts where there is evidence for encounters with past materialities and the practices that took place in coming to terms with past histories, where people attempted to engage with past materialities and create material histories of their own. Histories are and were made and understood through lived experience; small stories are and were told from small things and the ways in which things were intermingled in relation to bodies. Histories and stories are and were constantly in the process of being made; they are and were caught up in the process of construction. These meeting points are the construction sites of Gwernvale, Hazleton North, Easton Down and Gussage Cow Down 78 and 294 and the new places they create.

'For a while I swallowed this simple and straightforward story. But then I started to get suspicious, and thought there might be a twist to the tale. I thought the twist most likely involved those busy architects, dreaming and making, dreaming and making, dreaming and making...those busy architects who did not bother about the architecture once it was made, unless other people started doing things with it. These other people, the 'non-architects', were not to be trusted. They were involved in subversive activities which resulted in hideous and frightening things – they were attempting to (un)make architecture, to (un)do it completely, making it almost as silly as themselves. There was only one way to deal with this threat to architecture – ridicule. I went along with this – poking fun at their monstrous (un)doings worked a treat. Although occasionally I could have sworn that I had been involved in some (un)doings myself.

But then one day, in Moscow, something strange happened. I visited Mr Melnikov's house – a symphony of great architectural geometry. A safe haven I thought – no silliness here. But, in the marital bedroom, the very place which Mr Melnikov shared with his wife and two children, Mrs Melnikov had gathered together all kinds of decorative trappings, ornaments and lace, funny old beds and chairs, and, with complete disregard to her esteemed husband's dreamings and makings, she had made a mess. This was architecture (un)done' (Jane Rendell 1998:230)

Bibliography

Agrest, D. 1991. *Architecture from Without: Theoretical Framings for a Critical Practice*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Alberti, L.B. 1965. Rykwert, J. (ed.) *Ten Books on Architecture*. Reprint from the Leoni Edition of 1755, with the addition of the 'Life' from the 1734 edition. London: Alex Tiranti.

Andrews, G.; Barrett, J. and Lewis, J. 2000. Interpretation not record: the practice of archaeology. *Antiquity*. 74: 525-530.

Archer, M.; Brett, G.; De Zegher, C. (ed.) 1997. *Mona Hatoum*. Hong Kong: Phaidon Press Limited.

Argenti, N. 1999. Ephemeral Monuments, Memory and Royal Sempiternity in a Grassfields Kingdom. In Forty, A. and Küchler, S. (eds.) *The Art of Forgetting*, 21-52. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Ashbee, P. 1970. *The Earthen Long Barrow in Britain*. London: Phoenix.

Ashbee, P.; Smith, I.F., and Evans, J.G. 1979. Excavation of Three Long Barrows near Avebury, Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 45: 207-300.

Atkinson, R. J. C. 1961. Neolithic engineering. *Antiquity*. 35:292-299.

Aubrey, J. 1665-1693. 1980 edition. *Monumenta Britannica. Parts One and Two*. Dorset: Dorset Publishing Company.

Aubrey, J. 1626-1697. 1982 edition. *Monumenta Britannica. Part Three and Index*. Dorset: Dorset Publishing Company.

Austin, P. 2000. The emperor's new garden: Woodland, trees and people in the Neolithic of southern Britain. In Fairbairn, A.S. (ed.). *Plants in Neolithic Britain and beyond*, 63-78. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Ban, S. 2000. Paper Palace. *The Architectural Review*. Vol. 1243 (September): 58-60.
- Barker, C.T. 1985. The Long Mounds of the Avebury Region. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*. 79: 7-38.
- Barrett, J.C. 1987. Fields of discourse: reconstituting a social archaeology. *Critique of Anthropology*, 7(3): 5-16.
- Barrett, J.C. 1988. The Living, the Dead and the Ancestors: Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Mortuary Practices. In Barrett, J. and Kinnes, I. (eds.) *The Archaeology of Context in the Neolithic and Bronze Age: Recent Trends*, 30-41. Sheffield: Department of Archaeology and Prehistory.
- Barrett, J.C. 1994. *Fragments from antiquity: an archaeology of social life in Britain 2900-1200BC*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barrett, J. 1997. Stone age ideologies. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia*. 29: 121-129.
- Barrett, J.; Bradley, R. and Green, M. 1991. *Landscape, monuments and society: the prehistory of Cranborne Chase*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barthes, R. 1972. *Mythologies*. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd.
- Bauman, Z. 1992. *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bell, D. and Valentine, G. (eds.) 1995. *Mapping desire: geographies of sexualities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, M. M. 1997. The ghosts of place. *Theory and Society*. 26: 813-836.
- Bell, V. 1999. *Feminist Imagination. Genealogies in Feminist Theory*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Benjamin, A. 2002. Repositioning objects: Architectural history/architectural theory. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.

Bergson, H. 1988. *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone Books.

Berry, J. 1929. Belas Knap long Barrow, Gloucestershire. Report of the excavations of 1929. *Trans. Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*. 51:273-303.

Bestley, N.J. 1993. Type and typology and writing the past: the case of the Cotswold-Severn monuments. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*. 12(1): 91-103.

Betsky, A. 1995. *Building sex: men, women, and the construction of sexuality*. New York: William Morrow.

Betsky, A. 1997. *Queer Space: Architecture and Same-Sex Desire*. New York: William Morrow.

Betsky, A. and Adigard, E. 2000. *Architecture Must Burn. A manifesto for an architecture beyond building*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Binet, H. 1997. *A passage through silence and light: Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum extension to the Berlin Museum*. London: Black Dog Press.

Blier, S.P. 1987. *The Anatomy of Architecture: Ontology and Metaphor in Batammaliba Architectural Expression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomer, J. 1993. *Architecture and the Text: The (S)crypts of Joyce and Piranesi*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Bloomer, J. 1996. The Matter of Matter: A Longing for Gravity. In Agrest, D.; Conway, P. and Weisman, L.K. (eds.) *The Sex of Architecture*, 161-166. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Borden, I.; Kerr, J.; Pivaro, A. and Rendell, J. 1996. Narratives of Architecture in the City. In Borden, I.; Kerr, J.; Pivaro, A. and Rendell, J. (eds.) *Strangely Familiar*, 8-12. London: Routledge.

Bowdler, R. 1991. *Monuments of Decay and Resurrection: Themes of Mortality in Seventeenth Century English Church Monuments*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Cambridge University.

Bradley, R.J. 1984. Studying monuments. In Bradley, R.J. and Gardiner, J. (eds.) *Neolithic Studies*, 61-66. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports 133.

Bradley, R. 1993. *Altering the Earth*. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.

Bradley, R. 1996. Long Houses, Long Mounds and Neolithic Enclosures. *Journal of Material Culture*. Vol.1 (2): 239-256.

Bradley, R. 1998. *The Significance of Monuments. On the shaping of human experience in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bradley, R. 2000. *An Archaeology of Natural Places*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bradshaw, F. (Matrix) 2000. Working with Women. In Rendell, J.; Penner, B. And Borden, I. (eds.) *Gender Space Architecture. An interdisciplinary introduction*, 282-294. London and New York: Routledge.

Brah, A. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora. Contesting identities*. London and New York: Routledge.

Brill, E. 1977. *Cotswold Craft*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.

Britnell, W.J. and Savory, H.N. 1984. *Gwernvale and Penywyrlod: two Neolithic long cairns in the Black Mountains of Brecknock*. Cambrian Archaeological Monograph 2. Bangor: Cambrian Archaeological Association.

Brolin, B.C. 2000. *Architectural Ornament. Banishment and Return*. New York: Norton.

Brown, T. 1997. Clearances and Clearings: Deforestation in Mesolithic/Neolithic Britain. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*. 16 (2): 133-146.

Brown, A.G. 2000. Floodplain vegetation history: Clearings as potential ritual space. In Fairbairn, A.S. (ed.). *Plants in Neolithic Britain and beyond*, 49-62. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Brück, J. 2001. Monuments, Power and Personhood in the British Neolithic. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 7: 649-667.

Buchli, V. 1999. *An Archaeology of Socialism*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Buchli, V. 2002. Architecture And the Domestic Sphere. In Buchli, V. (ed.) *The Material Culture Reader*, 207-214. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Buckman, J. 1865. Notes on an ancient British tumulus at Nympsfield, opened by the Cotswold Club. *Proceedings of the Cotswold Natural Field Club*. 3:184-188.

Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, 1993. *Bodies That Matter. On The Discursive Limits Of 'Sex'*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1997. *'Excitable Speech'. A Politics of the Performative*. New York and London: Routledge.

Byatt, A.S. 2001. *On Histories and Stories. Selected Essays*. London: Vintage.

Calvino, I. 1997. *The Literature Machine*. London: Vintage.

Carpenter, R. 1999. Force Affect. An Ethics of Hypersurface. *Architectural Design*. Vol.69(9-10): 21-25.

Cassen, S. 1993. *Le tertre de Lannec er Gadouer*. Nantes: Service Regional de l'Archeologie, Rennes CNRS, Laboratoire de Pehistoire Armoricaine.

Celant, G. 1996. *Anish Kapoor*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Çelik, Z. 1996. Gendered Spaces in Colonial Algiers. In Agrest, D.; Conway, P. and Weisman, L.K. (eds.) *The Sex of Architecture*, 127-140. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Chadwick, A. 1997. Archaeology at the Edge of Chaos: Further Towards Reflexive Excavation Methodologies. *Assemblage*, 3.

Chadwick, A. 1999. Digging Ditches, but Missing Riches? Ways into the Iron Age and Romano-British cropmark landscapes of the north midlands. In Bevan, B. (ed.) *Northern Exposure: interpretative devolution and the Iron Age in Britain*, 149-171. Leicester: Leicester Archaeology Monographs No.4.

Chancerel, A. and Kinnes, I. 1991. *Colombiers-sur-Seulles. Tumulus Neolithique de la Commune Seche. Rapport de fouille pluriannuelle. 3eme annee de recherche*. Service Regional de l'Archeologie de Basse-Normandie, Conseil General du Calvados et British Museum.

Chancerel, A. and Kinnes, I. 1992. *Colombiers-sur-Seulles. Tumulus Neolithique de la Commune Seche. Rapport de fouille pluriannuelle. 4eme annee de recherche*. Service Regional de l'Archeologie de Basse-Normandie, Conseil General du Calvados et British Museum.

Chancerel, A. and Kinnes, I. 1993. *Colombiers-sur-Seulles. Tumulus Neolithique de la Commune Seche. Rapport de fouille pluriannuelle. 5eme annee de recherche.* Service Regional de l'Archeologie de Basse-Normandie, Conseil General du Calvados et British Museum.

Chancerel, A. and Kinnes, I. 1994. *Colombiers-sur-Seulles. Tumulus Neolithique de la Commune Seche. Rapport de fouille pluriannuelle. 6eme annee de recherche.* Service Regional de l'Archeologie de Basse-Normandie, Conseil General du Calvados et British Museum.

Chapman, J. 2000. *Fragmentation in Archaeology. People, places and broken objects in the prehistory of south-eastern Europe.* London and New York: Routledge.

Charley, J. 1996. Sentences upon architecture. In Borden, I.; Kerr, J.; Pivaro, A. and Rendell, J. (eds.) *Strangely Familiar*, 57-61. London: Routledge.

Chippindale, C. 1983. *Stonehenge Complete.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Clark, J.G.D. 1954 *Excavations at Star Carr.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, J.G.D. 1960. Excavations at the Neolithic Site at Hurst Fen, Mildenhall, Suffolk. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society.* 2:202-245.

Clark, J. 2002. The Origin of Drawing: event, embodiment and desire in architectural drawing. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand.* [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.

Clifford, E.M. 1936. Notgrove long barrow, Gloucestershire. *Archaeologia.* 86:119-62.

Clifford, E. M. 1938. The excavation of Nympsfield Long Barrow, Gloucestershire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 4:188-213.

Clifford, E.M. 1950. The Cotswold megalithic culture: The grave-goods and their background. In Fox, C. and Dickins, B. (eds.) *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe*, 21-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colomina, B. 1988a. Introduction: On Architecture, Production and Reproduction. In Colomina, B. (ed.) *Architectureproduction*, 7-23. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Colomina, B. 1988b. L' Esprit Nouveau: Architecture and Publicite. In Colomina, B. (ed.) *Architectureproduction*, 57-99. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Colomina, B. 1992. The Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism. In Colomina, B. (ed.) *Sexuality and Space*, 73-128. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Colomina, B. 1994. *Privacy and publicity: modern architecture as mass media*. Cambridge, Mass. And London: MIT Press.

Colomina, B. 1996. Battle Lines. E.1027. In Agrest, D.; Conway, P. and Weisman, L.K. (eds.) *The Sex of Architecture*, 167-182. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Colt Hoare, R. 1812. *The Ancient History of South Wiltshire*. London: William Miller.

Colt Hoare, R. 1819. *The Ancient History of North Wiltshire*. London: Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor and Jones.

Conneller, C.J. 2000. Fragmented Space? Hunter-Gather landscapes of the Vale of Pickering. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*. 17(1): 139-150.

Conneller, C.J. 2000. *Space, Time and Technology: The Early Mesolithic of the Vale of Pickering, North Yorkshire*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Cambridge University.

Conneller, C.J. and Schadla-Hall, T. *in press* Beyond Star Carr: The Vale of Pickering in the tenth millennium BP. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 69.

Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cooney, G. 2000. *Landscapes of Neolithic Ireland*. London and New York: Routledge.

Corcoran, J.W.X.P. 1970. The Giant's Cave, Luckington (WIL2). *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. 65: 39-63.

Corcoran, J.W.X.P. 1972. Multi-period construction and the origins of the chambered long cairn in western Britain and Ireland. In Lynch, F. and Burgess, C. (eds.) *Prehistoric Man in Wales and the West*, 31-63. Bath: Adams and Dart.

Cosgrove, D.E. 1998. *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press.

Crawford, O. G. S. 1925. *The Long Barrows of the Cotswolds*. Gloucester: Bellous.

Crawford, O.G.S. 1922. Notes on field-work round Avebury, December 1921. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*. 42:52-63.

Crouch, D.P. and Johnson, J.G. 2001. *Traditions in Architecture. Africa, America, Asia and Oceania*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cunnington, M.E. 1914. List of the long barrows of Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. 38:379-414.

Cunnington, M.E. 1909. Notes on barrows on King's Play Down, Heddington. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*. 36:311-317.

Cunnington, M.E. 1914. List of the long barrows of Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. 38:379-414.

Damisch, H. 1987. *Le Corbusier: une encyclopédie*. Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou.

Daniel, G.E. 1950. *The Prehistoric Chambered Tombs of England and Wales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darvill, T.C. 1982. *The Megalithic Chambered Tombs of the Cotswold-Severn Region*. Highworth: Vorda.

Deleuze, G. 1993. *The Fold. Leibniz and the Baroque*. London: The Athlone Press Ltd.

Deleuze, G. 1999. *Foucault*. London and New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, G. and Guatarri, F. 1977. *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. New York: Viking Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guatarri, F. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London and New York: Continuum.

Diller, E. 1996. Bad Press. In Hughes, F. (ed.) *The Architect. Reconstructing Her Practice*, 75-94. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

Drew, C.D. and Piggott, S. 1936. The Excavation of Long Barrow 163a on Thicket Down, Dorset. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 2: 77-96.

Edmonds, M.R. 1995. *Stone Tools and Society. Working Stone in Neolithic and Bronze Age Britain*. London: Batsford Ltd.

Edmonds, M. 1997. Taskscape, technology and tradition. *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia*. 29: 99-110.

- Edmonds, M. 1999. *Ancestral Geographies of the Neolithic*. London: Routledge.
- Edmonds, M.R. and Thomas, J.S. 1987. The Archers: an everyday story of country folk. In Brown, A. and Edmonds, M.R. (eds.) *Lithic Analysis and Later British Prehistory*, 187-199. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports 162.
- Ednie-Brown, P. 1999. Falling into the Surface. Towards a Materiality of Affect. *Architectural Design*. Vol.69 (9-10): 8-11.
- Egenter, E. 1982. *Sacred Symbols of Reed and Bamboo; Annually built cult-torches as spatial signs and symbols*. Zürich: Swiss Asiatic Studies Monographs (4).
- Egenter, N. 1992. *Architectural anthropology: research series. v.1 The present relevance of the primitive in architecture*. Lausanne: Structura Mundi.
- Evans, C. 1994. Natural wonders and national monuments: a meditation upon the fate of The Tolmen. *Antiquity*. Vol.68: 200-208.
- Evans, C. 2000. Megalithic Follies. Soane's 'Druidic Remains' and the Display of Monuments. *Journal of Material Culture*. Vol.5 (3): 347-366.
- Evans, C. and Gibson, D. 1996. *Floodplain Investigations. Barleycroft Farm, Cambridgeshire*. Cambridge Archaeological Unit, In House Report No 163.
- Evans, C. and Knight, M. 1997. *The Barleycroft Paddocks Excavations, Cambridgeshire*. Cambridge Archaeological Unit, In House Report No. 218.
- Evans, C.; Pollard, J. and Knight, M. 1999. Life in woods: tree-throws, 'settlement' and forest cognition. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*. 18(3): 241-254.
- Fergusson, J. 1872. *Rude Stone Monuments In All Countries; Their Age And Uses*. London: John Murray.

Foucault, M. 1980. Gordon, C. (ed.). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. 1989. *The Order of Things. An archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock and Routledge.

Foucault, M. 1991. Rabinow, P. (ed.) *The Foucault Reader*. Harmondworth: Penguin.

Fowler, M. 2002. Five types of Melanesian traditional architecture of New Guinea. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.

French, C. 2002. *Palaeoenvironmental and archaeological investigations in the upper Allen valley: 2002 fieldwork report on the sample excavations on Gussage Cow Down, Dorset*. McDonald Institute Report.

Gadol, J. 1969. *Universal Man of the Early Renaissance*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Gillings, M.; Pollard, J. and Wheatley, D. 2002. Excavations at the Beckhampton Enclosure, Avenue and Cove, Avebury: an interim report on the 2000 season. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 95, 249-58.

Gosden, C. 1994. *Social being and time*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Greenwell, W. 1877. *British Barrows. A Record Of The Examination Of Sepulchral Mounds In Various Parts Of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grinsell, L.V. 1936. *The Ancient Burial-Mounds Of England*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Grimes, W. 1936. The Long Cairns of Brecknockshire Black Mountains. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*. 259-282.

Grimes, W. 1939. The excavation of the Ty-Isaf long cairn, Brecknockshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 5:119-142.

Grimes, W.F. 1960. *Excavations on Defence Sites, 1939-1945. 1: Mainly Neolithic-Bronze Age*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Gropius, W. 1965. *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*, translated by Sand, P.M. Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press.

Grosz, E. 1995. *Space, Time, and Perversion. Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. New York and London: Routledge.

Grosz, E. 2001. *Architecture from the Outside. Essays on Virtual and Real Space*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

Guidoni, E. 1975. *Primitive Architecture*. London: Faber and Faber/Electa.

Hadid, Z. 1998. *The Complete Buildings and Projects*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Halder, P. 1999. The Function of the Ornament in Quintilian, Alberti, and Court Architecture. In Douzinas, C. And Nead, L. (eds.) *Law and the Image. The Authority of Art and the Aesthetics of Law*, 117-136. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hall, S. 1996. Introduction. In Hall, S. and du Gay, P. (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, 1-36. London: Sage Publications.

Harris, E.C.; Brown, M.R. and Brown, G.J. 1993. *Principles of archaeological stratigraphy*, second edition. London: Academic Press.

Hatoum, M. 2000. *The Entire World as a Foreign Land*. London: Tate Gallery Publishing Ltd.

Heidegger, M. 1972. Building dwelling thinking. In Krell, D. (ed.) *Basic Writings*. London: Routledge.

Hemp, W.J. 1929. Belas Knap long barrow, Gloucestershire. *Trans. Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*. 51:261-272.

Hill, J.D. 1995. *Ritual and rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex: a study on the formation of a specific archaeological record*. Oxford: Tempus Reperatum. BAR British series 242.

Hind, D. 2000. *Landscape and technology in the Peak District of Derbyshire: The fifth and fourth millennia BC*. University of Sheffield, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Thesis 10778.

Hodder, I.R. 1982. *Symbols in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, I.R. 1984. Burials, houses, women and men in the European Neolithic. In Miller, D. And Tilley, C. (eds.) *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*, 51-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hodder, I.R. 1990. *The Domestication of Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hodder, I. 1992. *Theory and practice in archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Hodder, I. 1994. Architecture and Meaning: The Example of Neolithic Houses and Tombs. In Parker Pearson, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*, 73-86. London: Routledge.

Hodder, I. 1998. The Domus: some problems reconsidered. In Edmonds, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe*, 84-101. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

Hodder, I. 1999. *The archaeological process: an introduction*. London: Routledge.

Hodder, I. (ed.). 2000. *Towards reflexive method in archaeology: the example at Çatalhöyük*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Hughes, F. (ed.). 1996. *The Architect: Reconstructing Her Practice*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

Hynes, S. 1990. *A War Imagined*. London: The Bodley Head.

Ingold, T. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment. Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ingraham, C. 1996. Missing Objects. In Agrest, D.; Conway, P. and Weisman, L.K. (eds.) *The Sex of Architecture*, 29-40. New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Isaak, J.A. 1996. *Feminism and contemporary art: the revolutionary power of women's laughter*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jameson, F. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Jones, A. 1998. Where Eagles Dare. Landscape, Animals and the Neolithic of Orkney. *Journal of Material Culture*. 3(3): 301-324.

Jones, A. 1999. Local Colour: Megalithic Architecture and Colour Symbolism in Neolithic Arran. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*. 18(4): 339-350.

Jones, A. 2002. *Archaeological Theory and Scientific Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jordanova, L. 1989. *Sexual visions: images of gender in science and medicine between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Jordy, W.H. 1986. The Tall Buildings. In Wim de Wit (ed.) *Louis Sullivan. The Function of Ornament*, 65-157. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.

Kent, S. (ed.) 1990. *Domestic architecture and the use of space. An interdisciplinary cross-cultural study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kerr, J. 1996. Lenin's Bust! Unlikely Allies in Wartime London. In Borden, I.; Kerr, J.; Pivaro, A. and Rendell, J. (eds.) *Strangely Familiar*, 16-21. London: Routledge.

Kinnes, I. 1992. *Non-megalithic Long Barrows and Allied Structures in the British Neolithic*. British Museum Occasional paper 52.

Kirk, T. 1993. Space, Subjectivity, Power and Hegemony: Megaliths and Long Mounds in Earlier Neolithic Brittany. In Tilley, C. (ed.) *Interpretative Archaeology*, 181-224. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Kirk, T. 1997. Towards a Phenomenology of Building: the Neolithic Long Mound at La Commune Seche, Colombiers-sur-Seulles, Normandy. In Nash, G. (ed.) *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, 59-70. BAR International Series 661.

Kirk, T. 2000. Ritual Process and Social Practice: Monuments and the Dead in Neolithic Normandy. In Ritchie, A. (ed.) *Neolithic Orkney in its European context*, 223-232. Cambridge: McDonald Institute Monographs.

Küchler, S. 1999. The Place of Memory. In Forty, A. and Küchler, S. (eds.) *The Art of Forgetting*, 53-72. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Küchler, S. 2002. Binding in the Pacific: Between Loops and Knots. In Buchli, V. (ed.) *The Material Culture Reader*, 63-80. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Lalvani, H. 1999. Meta Architecture. *Architectural Design*. Vol.69 (9-10): 32-37.

Leach, N. (ed.) 1997. *Rethinking Architecture. A reader in cultural theory*. London and New York: Routledge.

Le Doeuff, M. 1989. *The Philosophical Imaginary*. London: The Athlone Press.

Lee, R.B. and Daly, R. (eds.) 1999. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Libeskind, D. 1997. *radix-matrix*. Architecture and writings. Munich and New York: Prestel Press.

Libeskind, D. 2001. *The Space of Encounter*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Lluyd, E. 1716. *Synopsis methodica stirpium Britannicarum*. Londini.

Lokko, L.N.N. 1998. ResponseAbility: The Ability to Provoke or Provide Response. In Hill, J. (ed.) *Occupying Architecture. Between the Architect and the User*, 39-60. London and New York: Routledge.

Lucas, G. 2001a. *Critical Approaches to Fieldwork. Contemporary and historical archaeological practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lucas, G. 2001b. Destruction and the Rhetoric of Excavation. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*. 34(1).

Lukis, J.W. 1875. St. Lythan's and St. Nicholas' Cromlechs and Other Remains near Cardiff. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* Vol.VI: 171-185.

Lynch, F.M. and Burgess, C. (eds.) 1976. *Prehistoric Man in Wales and the West*. Bath.

Lynn, G. 1993. Architectural Curvilinearity. The Folded, the Pliant and the Supple. *Folding in Architecture. Architectural Design*. 102:8-15.

Mabey, R. 1998. *Flora Britannica. The Concise Edition*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Mach, D. 1997. Fully Furnished. In *Blurring the Boundaries. Installation Art 1969-1996*. San Diego: Museum of Contemporary Art. 157.

Maclean, J. 1880-81. Description of the chambered tumuli of Uley and Nympsfield. *Trans. Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*. 5:86-118.

MacUistin, L. 1999. *Exploring Newgrange*. Dublin: The O'Brien Press.

Massumi, B. 1999. Strange Horizon. Buildings, Biograms and the Body Topologic. *Architectural Design*. Vol.69 (9-10): 12-19.

McFadyen, L. 1992. *From monuments to megaliths: A reconsideration of neolithic building sites on and around the plain of Caen, Normandy, France*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, Glasgow University.

Mellars, P. 1987. *Excavations on Oransay: prehistoric human ecology on a small island*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Merz, M. 1980. *Mario Merz*. London: Whitechapel Art Gallery.

Meyhöfer, D. 1994. *Contemporary Japanese Architects*. Italy: Taschen.

Mizoguchi, K. 1993. Time in the reproduction of mortuary practices. *World Archaeology*. 25:223-235.

Morris, R. 1997. *Recent Felt Pieces and Drawings*. Leeds: Henry Moore Sculpture Trust.

Mortimer, R. & McFadyen, L.K 1999 *Archaeological Investigations at Broom Quarry, Bedfordshire: Phase 4*. Cambridge Archaeological Unit: CAU Report No. 320.

Nalbantian, S, 1994. *Aesthetic Autobiography. From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Anais Nin*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Nicklasson, P. 1999. Excavating Postprocessually – A Theoretical Utopia or a Practical Reality? A Discussion of Barrows in Skarstad, Smaland. *Lund Archaeological Review*. 5: 59-72.

Neumaier, D. (ed.) 1995. *Reframings: New American Feminist Photographies*. New York: Temple.

O'Neil, H.E. and Grinsell, L.V. 1960. Gloucestershire Barrows. *Trans. Bristol Gloucs. Arch. Soc.* 79:1-148.

Oliver, P. 1997. *Encyclopaedia of vernacular architecture of the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neil, H.E. 1965. Sale's Lot long barrow, Withington, Gloucestershire, 1962-1965. *Trans. Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*. 85:5-35.

Parker, C. 1996. *Avoided Object*. Cardiff: Chapter (Cardiff) Ltd.

Parker Pearson, M. and Richards, C. 1994. Architecture and Order: Spatial Representation and Archaeology. In Parker Pearson, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*, 38-72. London: Routledge.

Parker Pearson, M. and Richards, C. 1994. Ordering the World: Perceptions of Architecture, Space and Time. In Parker Pearson, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*, 1-37. London: Routledge.

Patrik, L. 1985. Is there an archaeological record? In Schiffer, M.B. (ed.) *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, 3:27-62.

Perrella, S. 1999. Electronic baroque. Hypersurface II: Autopoiesis. *Architectural Design*. Vol.69 (9-10): 5-7.

Phillips, C.W. 1935. The Excavation of the Giants' Hills Long Barrow, Skendleby, Lincolnshire. *Archaeologia*. 85:37-106.

Piggott, S. 1950. *William Stukeley. An Eighteenth-Century Antiquary*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Piggott, S. 1954. *The Neolithic Cultures of the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piggott, S. 1962. *The West Kennet Long Barrow. Excavations 1955-56*. Ministry Of Works Archaeological Reports No.4. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Piggott, S. 1976. *Ruins in a Landscape. Essays in Antiquarianism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Piggott, S. 1978. *Antiquity depicted: aspects of archaeological illustration*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Piggott, S. 1989. *Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination. Ideas from the Renaissance to the Regency*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Pluciennik, M. 1998. Deconstructing 'the Neolithic' in the Mesolithic-Neolithic Transition. In Edmonds, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe*, 61-83. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

Pollard, J. 1992. The Sanctuary, Overton Hill, Wiltshire: A Re-examination. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 58: 213-226.

Pollard, J. 1993. *Traditions of Deposition in Neolithic Wessex*. PhD, University of Wales College Cardiff.

Pollard, J. 1999. These places have their moments: thoughts on settlement practices in the British Neolithic. In Brück, J. And Goodman, M. (eds.) *Making places in the prehistoric world: themes in settlement archaeology*, 76-93. London: UCL Press.

- Pollard, J. 2000. Ancestral Places in the Mesolithic landscape. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*. 17(1): 123-138.
- Pollard, J. 2001. The aesthetics of depositional practice. *World Archaeology*. 33(2): 315-333.
- Powell, T.G.E.; Corcoran, J.X.W.P.; Lynch, F. and Scott, J.G. 1969. *Megalithic Inquiries in the West of Britain*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Price, T. 1842. *Hanes Cymru, A Chenedl Y Cymry, O'R Cynoesoedd Hyd At Farwolaeth Llewelyn Ap Gruffydd; Ynghyd A Rhai Cofiaint Perthynol I'R Amseroedd O'R Pryd Hynny I Waered*. Crughywel: Argraffwyd A Chyhoeddwyd Gan Thomas Williams.
- Probyn, E. 1993. *Sexing the Self. Gendered Positions in Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Probyn, E. 1995. Queer Belongings. The politics of departure. In Grosz, E. and Probyn, E. (eds.) *Sexy Bodies. The strange carnalities of feminism*, 1-18. London and New York: Routledge.
- Probyn, E. 1996. *Outside Belongings*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Probyn, E. 2000. *Carnal Appetites. FoodSexIdentities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Probyn, E. 2001. Anxious Proximities. The space-time of concepts. In May, J. and Thrift, N. (eds.) 2001. *Timespace. Geographies of temporality*, 171-186. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rajchman, J. 1993. Out of the Fold. *Folding in Architecture. Architectural Design*. 102:61-63.

- Rand, A. 1994. *The Fountainhead*. London: HarperCollinsPublishers.
- RCHAM (Wales). 1976. *An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Glamorgan. Volume I: Pre-Norman. Part 1: The Stone and Bronze Ages*. Cardiff: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- RCHAM (Wales). 1997. *An Inventory of the Ancient Monuments in Brecknock (Brycheiniog). The Prehistoric and Roman Monuments. Part 1: Later Prehistoric Monuments and Unenclosed Settlements to 1000AD*. RCHAM (Wales).
- Reed, R. 1974. Earthen long barrows: a new perspective. *Archaeological Journal*. 131: 33-57.
- Refiti, A. 2002. Uneven boundaries that do not flatten easily. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.
- Rendell, J. 1996. 'Industrious Females' and 'Professional Beauties'. Or fine articles for sale in the Burlington Arcade. In Borden, I.; Kerr, J.; Pivaro, A. and Rendell, J. (eds.) *Strangely Familiar*, 32-36. London: Routledge.
- Rendell, J. 1998. Doing It, (Un)Doing It, (Over)Doing It Yourself: Rhetorics of Architectural Abuse. In Hill, J. (ed.) *Occupying Architecture. Between the Architect and the User*, 229-246. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rendell, J. 2000. Gender, Space, Architecture. In Rendell, J.; Penner, B. And Borden, I. (eds.) *Gender Space Architecture. An interdisciplinary introduction*, 225-239. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rendell, J. 2002. Writing aloud: Architectural history as critical practice. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.

Richards, C. 1992. Doorways into Another World: The Orkney-Cromarty Chambered tombs. In Sharples, N. and Sheridan, A. (eds.) *Vessels for the Ancestors. Essay on the Neolithic of Britain and Ireland in honour of Audrey Henshall*, 62-76. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Richards, C. 1993. Monumental Choreography: Architecture and Spatial Representation in Later Neolithic Orkney. In Tilley, C. (ed.) *Interpretative Archaeology*, 143-181. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Richards, C. 1996a. Monuments as Landscape: Creating the Centre of the World in Late Neolithic Orkney. *World Archaeology*. 28(2).

Richards, C. 1996b. Henges and Water. Towards an Elemental Understanding of Monumentality and Landscape in Late Neolithic Britain. *Journal of Material Culture*. Vol. 1 (3): 313-336.

Richards, C. and Thomas, J. 1984. Ritual activity and structured deposition in Later Neolithic Wessex. In Bradley and Gardiner, J. (eds.) *Neolithic Studies*, 189-218. Oxford: BAR British series.

Rival, L. (ed.) 1998. *The Social Life of Trees. Anthropological Perspectives on Tree Symbolism*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Robinson, C. 1993. The Material Fold. Towards a Variable Narrative of Anomalous Topologies. *Folding in Architecture. Architectural Design*. 102:64-65.

Rogoff, I. 2000. *Terra Infirma. Geography's visual culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Rorty, R. 1982. *Consequences of Pragmatism (Essays: 1972-1980)*. Brighton: The Harvester Press.

Roy, A. 1997. *The God of Small Things*. London: Flamingo.

Roy, A. 2002. *The algebra of infinite justice*. London: Flamingo.

Ruggles, C.L.N. and Whittle, A.W.R. (eds.) 1981. *Astronomy and Society in Britain during the Period 4000-1500BC*. Oxford: BAR British series.

Safran, Y. and Wang, W. (eds.) 1985. *The Architecture of Adolf Loos*. Chicago: Precision Press.

Said, E. 1995. *Orientalism. Western Concepts of the Orient*, fourth edition. London: Penguin Books.

Said, E. 2002. *Humanism and Knowledge*. Series of public lectures hosted by the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities; University of Cambridge.

Sanders, J. (ed.) 1996. *Stud. Architectures of Masculinity*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Sarc Architects. 2000. Natural Heart. *The Architectural Review*. Vol.1243 (September): 68-70.

Saville, A. 1974. *Nympsfield Chambered Tomb: interim summary of the 1974 excavations*. DOE circulated typescript.

Saville, A. 1975. Nympsfield Chambered Tomb. *Glevenis*. 9:18-19.

Saville, A. 1979. Further Excavations at Nympsfield Chambered Tomb Gloucestershire, 1974. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 45:53-91.

Saville, A. 1990. *Hazleton North, Gloucestershire, 1979-82: the excavation of a Neolithic long cairn of the Cotswold-Severn group*. English Heritage Archaeological Report 13. London: English Heritage.

Savory, H.N. 1956. The excavation of Pipton long cairn. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*. 105: 7-48.

Scarre, C. 1998. Traditions of Death: Mounded Tombs, Megalithic Art and Funerary Ideology in Neolithic Western Europe. In Edmonds, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe*, 161-187. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.

Schor, N. 1987. *Reading in Detail. Aesthetics and the Feminine*. New York and London: Methuen.

Schuyt, M; Elffers, J. and Collins, G.R. 1980. *Fantastic Architecture. Personal and Eccentric Visions*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Shanks, M. 1992. *Experiencing the Past: On the Character of Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Shanks, M. and Tilley, C.Y. 1982. Ideology, symbolic power and ritual communication: a reinterpretation of Neolithic mortuary practices. In Hodder, I. (ed.) *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, 129-154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shanks, M. and Tilley, C.Y. 1987. *Re-Constructing Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, R. 2002. Virginia Woolf's Architecture an incidental practice. In Macarthur, J. and Moulis, A. (eds.) *ADDITIONS to architectural history: XIXth annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*. [Available CD-Rom] Brisbane.

Smith, C.A. 1987. *Trefignath and Din Dryfol: the excavation of two megalithic tombs in Anglesey*. Wales: Cambrian Archaeological Monographs 3.

Smith, C. 1992. *Late Stone Age Hunters of the British Isles*. London: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. 1990. *The Post-Colonial Critic. Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York and London: Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. 1996. *The Spivak Reader. Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*. New York and London: Routledge.

Strathern, M. 1991. *Partial Connections*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Strathern, M. 1992. *Reproducing The Future. Essays on anthropology, kinship and the new reproductive technologies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stukeley, W. 1743. *Abury, a temple of the British druids, with some others, described. Wherein is a more particular account of the first and patriarchal religion; and of the peopling the British Islands*. London.

Stukeley, W. 1776. *Itinerarium curiosum: or, An account of the antiquities, and remarkable curiosities in nature or art, observed in travels through Great Britain*. London: Baker and Leigh.

Sullivan, L.H. 1979. *Kindergarten chats, and other writings*. New York: Dover Publications.

Tarlow, S. 1994. Scraping the bottom of the Barrow: An Agricultural Metaphor in Neolithic/Bronze Age European Burial Practice. *Journal of Theoretical Archaeology*. 3(4): 123-144.

Tarlow, S. 1999. *Bereavement and commemoration: an archaeology of mortality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thomas, J. 1988a. Neolithic explanations revisited: The Mesolithic – Neolithic transition in Britain and south Scandinavia. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 54: 59-66.

Thomas, J. 1988. The Significance of Cotswold-Severn Burial Practices. *Man*. 23: 540-559.

Thomas, J. 1991. *Rethinking the Neolithic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. 1993a. The Politics of Vision and the Archaeologies of Landscape. In Bender, B. (ed.) *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, 49-84. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Thomas, J. 1993b. The Hermeneutics of Megalithic Space. In Tilley, C. (ed.) *Interpretative Archaeology*, 73-98. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Thomas, J. 1996. *Time, Culture and Identity. An interpretive archaeology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Thomas, J. 1999. *Understanding the Neolithic*. London and New York: Routledge.

Thomas, J. 2000. Death, Identity and the Body in Neolithic Britain. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. Vol.6(4): 653-668.

Thomas, J. and Whittle, A. 1986. Anatomy of a Tomb – West Kennet Revisited. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*. Vol.5(2): 129-156.

Thomas, J. and Tilley, C. 1993. The Axe and the Torso: Symbolic Structures in the Neolithic of Brittany. In Tilley, C. (ed.) *Interpretative Archaeology*, 225-326. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Thomas, T.; Sheppard, P. and Walter, R. 2001. Landscape, Violence and Social Bodies: Ritualized Architecture in a Solomon Islands Society. *Royal Anthropological Institute*. 7: 545-572.

Thurnam, J. 1860. Barrows of the North Wiltshire Downs. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. 6: 317-36.

Thurnam, J. 1869. On Ancient British Barrows, especially those of Wiltshire and the adjoining Counties. (Part I. Long Barrows). *Archaeologia*. Vol.XLII: 161-243.

Thurnam, J. 1872. On long barrows and round barrows. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. 13: 339-43.

Tilley, C. 1993. Art, Architecture, Landscape [Neolithic Sweden]. In Bender, B. (ed.) *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, 49-84. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

Tilley, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. Providence, RI and Oxford: Berg.

Tilley, C. 1996. *An ethnography of the Neolithic. Early prehistoric societies in southern Scandinavia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilley, C. 1999. *The Dolmens and Passage Graves of Sweden. An Introduction and Guide*. London: Institute of Archaeology, UCL.

Torre, S. (ed). 1977. *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective*. New York: Whitney Library of Design.

Turnbull, D. 2000. *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers. Comparative Studies in the Sociology of Scientific and Indigenous Knowledge*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Tschumi, B. 1994. *Architecture and Disjunction*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

Van der Meer, R. And Sudjic, D. 1997. *The Architecture Pack*. London: Van der Meer Publishing.

Van Zanten, D. 1986. Sullivan to 1890. In Wim de Wit (ed.) *Louis Sullivan. The Function of Ornament*, 13-63. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.

Vidler, A. 1996. The Explosion of Space: Architecture and the Filmic Imaginary. In Neumann, D. (ed.) *Film Architecture: Set Designs from Metropolis to Blade Runner*, 13-25. Munich and New York: Prestel.

Vidler, A. 2000. *Warped Space. Art, Architecture, and Anxiety in Modern Culture*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

Vulliamy, C.E. 1922a. Note on a Long Barrow in Wales. *Man*. Vol.XXII (86): 11-13.

Vulliamy, C.E. 1922b. Excavation of a Long Barrow in Breconshire. *Man*. Vol.XXII(86): 150-52.

Vitruvius. M.P. 1960. *The Ten Books of Architecture*, translated by Morris Hicky Morgan. New York: Dover.

Ward, J. 1916. The St. Nicholas Chambered Tumulus, Glamorgan. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*. Vol.XVI: 239-294.

Waterson, R. 1990. *The Living House. An Anthropology of Architecture in South-East Asia*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weisman, L.K. 1992. *Discrimination by Design. A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made Environment*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Weisman, L.K. 2000. Women's Environmental Rights: A Manifesto. In Rendell, J.; Penner, B. And Borden, I. (eds.) *Gender Space Architecture. An interdisciplinary introduction*, 1-5. London and New York: Routledge.

Whittle, A. 1994. Excavations at Millbarrow Neolithic Chambered Tomb, Winterbourne Monkton, North Wiltshire. *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*. Vol.87: 1-53.

Whittle, A; Rouse, A.J. and Evans J.G. 1993. A Neolithic Downland Monument in its Environment: Excavations at the Easton Down Long Barrow, Bishops Cannings, North Wiltshire. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. Vol.59: 197-239.

Whittle, A; Pollard, J. and Grigson, C. 1999. *The Harmony of Symbols. The Windmill Hill causewayed enclosure, Wiltshire*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Williams, A. 1940. A Megalithic Tomb at Nicholaston, Gower, Glamorgan. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. Vol.VI: 178-181.

Williams-Ellis, C. 1999. *Building in Cob, Pise, and Stabilized Earth*. Reprinted edition. Shaftesbury: Donhead Publishing Ltd.

Winterson, J. 1997. *Gut Symmetries*. London: Granta Books.

Witts, G.B. 1881. Description of the long barrow called West Tump. *Trans. Bristol Gloucs Archaeological Society*. 5: 201-11.

Wymer, J.J. 1962. Excavations at the Maglemosian sites at Thatcham, Berkshire, England. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*. 28: 329-61.

Zvelebil, M. 1998. What's in a Name: the Mesolithic, the Neolithic, and Social Change at the Mesolithic – Neolithic Transition. In Edmonds, M. and Richards, C. (eds.) *Understanding the Neolithic of North-Western Europe*, 1-36. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.