

Historical Archaeology

Edited by

Martin Hall and
Stephen W. Silliman

© 2006 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING

350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

The right of Martin Hall and Stephen W. Silliman to be identified as the Authors of the Editorial Material in this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, except as permitted by the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988, without the prior permission of the publisher.

First published 2006 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

1 2006

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Historical archaeology / edited by Martin Hall and Stephen W. Silliman.

p. cm. — (Blackwell studies in global archaeology ; 9)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-1-4051-0750-1 (hardcover : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 1-4051-0750-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)

ISBN-13: 978-1-4051-0751-8 (pbk. : alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 1-4051-0751-0 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Archaeology and history. I. Hall, Martin, 1952- . II. Silliman, Stephen W., 1971- . III. Series.

CC77.H5H565 2006

930.1—dc22

2005017584

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10 on 12.5 pt Plantin

by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd, Hong Kong

Printed and bound in India

by Replika Press Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on

Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:

www.blackwellpublishing.com



Chapter I

Introduction: Archaeology of the Modern World

Martin Hall and Stephen W. Silliman

Introduction

“Historical Archaeology” means different things to different people. For some, the field is the archaeology of European colonial expansion and subsequent post-Columbian peoples (Falk 1991; Leone 1995; Paynter 2000a). For others, it is the archaeology of capitalism (Leone and Potter 1988:19). For yet others, historical archaeology is the outcome of the rich play between word and object, text and artifact (e.g., Andr n 1998). Many believe that this latter aspect defines historical archaeology by its method rather than its content (Orser 1996a:23–24; see also Schuyler 1978) or by the uniqueness of the written word for inscribing history (Funari et al. 1999a:9–10).

At the same time, many who study the periods for which documents exist, particularly those outside of the Americas, do not in fact refer to themselves as “historical archaeologists.” Instead, they label their work by general period, such as Roman or Post-medieval, or by regional focus, such as Egyptology or Classical Greek studies. Primarily in North America, with the advent of the Society for Historical Archaeology and its journal in 1967 (Pilling 1967) and particularly with the work and influence of James Deetz (1994), does the label “Historical Archaeology” come to demarcate the study of post-Columbian, literate colonial societies as distinct from the study of precontact indigenous ones. It is also in this context that debates about historical archaeology’s disciplinary alignments flare, as practitioners variably propose allegiances to anthropology or history. This “New World” usage has, as of late, proven to be problematic given the rigid, artificial boundary set up between “prehistory” and “history” (Lightfoot 1995; see also Funari 1999:39) and given the literate traditions among the Maya in Mesoamerica that render them part of a historical archaeology defined by the presence of writing. Yet, few historical archaeologists would consider Mayan archaeology part of their subdiscipline. Our purpose in this volume is neither to presume to resolve such questions of

delineation, nor to map the field. Our objective is rather to stretch and further complicate questions such as these in the belief that dissent at the frontiers of knowledge creation is the symptom of a healthy field of enquiry with a long and valuable life ahead of it.

This said, we do need an organizing concept to frame and introduce the chapters that comprise this volume. Here, a useful framework is that of an archaeology of the modern world (cf. Hall 2000; Orser 1996a). Archaeology as a discipline is conceptualized within the epistemology of modernity, and depends on the precepts of intellectual enquiry launched in the Renaissance and reformulated in the Enlightenment. Early modern modes of enquiry were inseparable from the economic and political interests, and technological advances, that impelled exploration, trade, and conquest first from the Mediterranean region and then from northern Europe. The combination of such economic imperatives and new technologies – primarily in shipbuilding and navigation – enabled the collections of curiosities and written records of encounters that were to become the substance of subsequent intellectual work. Hans Holbein’s magnificent portrait of *The Ambassadors* captures this conceptual transition (Figure 1.1). Clothed in all the finery of the “rich trade” to exotic lands, the ambassadors pose with the instruments of navigation that enable their prosperity and the maps of their new geographies. But their celebration is qualified by the certainty of death and loss – Holbein’s tantalizing visual trick of a skull suspended in the foreground of the picture, forcing a second and distorted perspective on this new world of discovery (Berger 1972; Hall 2000).

Understood in this way, historical archaeology is about a process rather than an era or a condition. Instead of introducing a classic archaeological “age” or historian’s “period” or even a notion of “literacy” as primary, the contributors to this volume explore differing perspectives on the processes that have formed and shaped modernity, and the way that the past is understood from the perspective of the present. This, of course, means that the chapters negotiate the various definitions of historical archaeology by taking up issues of texts and artifacts, of colonialism, and of capitalism, but not by restricting or organizing every theme around them. In the second section of this volume, five contributors explore aspects of the modern world from some of the differing and often overlapping intellectual strands of modernity and postmodernity: class (Wurst, this volume), labor (Silliman, this volume), ideology (Burke, this volume), the Foucauldian institution (De Cunzo, this volume), and gender (Voss, this volume). Other chapters pursue additional strands, sometimes complementary, sometimes contradictory: the role of environment (Mrozowski, this volume), space as a formative dimension (Pauls, this volume), and identity and nation (Johnson, this volume; Loren and Beaudry, this volume; Lydon, this volume). The point is not that these different strands can, or should, be reconciled as a synthesis, as a grand narrative of an age. It is rather than these chapters demonstrate, through richly worked cases, the diverse archaeological and material ways in which we try to understand the modern and postmodern world which enables and advances the practice of archaeology itself. As a result, historical archaeology helps track the role of these histories in the present world, not only as precursors and trendsetters, but also as public memories and heritage that are



Figure 1.1 *The Ambassadors*, Hans Holbein, 1533, Oil on wood, National Gallery, London

sometimes forgotten, sometimes memorialized, sometimes distorted, but always mobilized for a multitude of purposes.

Eras, Periods, and Processes

Thinking about modernity as process rather than period helps avoid a trap to which archaeology seems particularly vulnerable. Our discipline's obsession with "ages" has the most practical of lineages: any science of the past with a claim to Enlightenment respectability required a chronology and, before the revolution of radiometric dating techniques, chronology depended on stratification and the geological principle of uniformitarianism. In turn, the need to be able to distinguish

the earlier from the later made the easy identification of the “typical” imperative. Despite new dating techniques, statistical and computer-based approaches to artifact classification, and a large literature on the theory and practice of typologies, archaeologists often focus on the “normal” and “representative,” and discount the evidence for history on the margins and in times of transition. Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, has long lineages of “Stone Age Archaeology” and “Iron Age Archaeology” that are reinforced by the design of university curricula, museum collections, specialist conferences, and editorial policies for academic journals (Trigger 1990). Comparatively few archaeologists study the dynamics of transition and change at the margins of these Ages – what happened when “Stone Age” hunter-gatherers and pastoralists encountered and interacted with “Iron Age” farmers and herders (Hall 1990). Similarly, American historical archaeologists such as Stanley South (1977, 1978), who sought to develop “pattern analysis,” emphasized the normative material culture signature of colonizing groups in North America, such as Spanish and British, rather than the complex interdigitations of cultures and practices and the multiethnic interactions in colonial communities. But it can be argued that these processes at the “margin” are the more interesting incubators of historical process, and the more profitable places to develop interpretations of process.

Historical archaeology has an ambivalent relationship with chronology and typology. On the one hand, it is sometimes assumed – erroneously – that chronology is not an issue in historical archaeology since we have texts and well-known industrial manufacturing dates to aid us, and because many historical archaeologists pursue whole projects that could be contained within the standard deviation of a single radiocarbon date. This misses two points. Firstly, many “texts” are in fact constructed archives that themselves require interpretation (Galloway, this volume; Johnson 1999). Neither chronology nor anything else can be simply “read” from the written word. Secondly, the degree of precision required is context specific – ten years either way can matter a great deal in interpreting, for example, early Spanish or Russian settlement on the Pacific coast of North America (Lightfoot, this volume).

Further – and perhaps because chronology is as challenging for historical archaeology as for other archaeologies – interest in normative types as definitive and diagnostic of periods is as alive in the archaeology of the 18th century C.E. as it is in the 18th century B.C.E. Standing backstage in many of the chapters of this volume are the eminences of historical archaeology’s formative years – influential actors such as Ivor Noël Hume, Stanley South, and James Deetz. Their archive and patrimony are the stacked volumes of the journal *Historical Archaeology*, and the debates over ceramic classifications, patterns in artifact assemblages that can be read as typical of plantation slavery or culture contact, or the “Georgian Order” as manifestation of a “worldview” diagnostic of emerging colonial identities. But as several contributors to this volume show, attention to identifying “patterns,” “worldviews,” and “orders” can sacrifice process – the interpretation of history and the awareness of change – to classification and stasis. Thus Beaudry and Loren (this volume), evoking Deetz’s emphasis on the explanatory power of “small things,” disaggregate the concept of a unified “American identity” and introduce a set of more complex questions about identity formation and difference within the idea of

a nation. Silliman (this volume) shows how models of “acculturation,” which assume that colonization brings together different ethnicities that easily meld into new and distinct “types,” can render invisible the labor relations that were definitive of historical process at the frontier. Similarly, Pikirayi (this volume) shows how the conventions of an earlier historical archaeology have exiled African societies from the storyboard in a double colonization that has seen conquest followed by the denial of a place in history, the rendering of Africa as the timeless continent of Conrad, Ridder Haggard, and Disney (Hall 2001).

The re-centering of process that is a strong, directing current beneath the surface of these chapters unveils mirrors that can reflect back on modernity in fresh ways. Funari (this volume) explores an Iberian intellectual tradition given emphasis by contemporary debates in Latin American archaeology and still under-appreciated in the Anglophone literature. Here, historical archaeology has remained connected with history and therefore with narrative and the exploration of change. This has promoted a reading of colonial life in Latin America that is integrated with the early modern state in Spain and Portugal, the interaction of Catholicism and Islam, and the formative influence of the Roman Empire. This same frame of reference has stimulated inquiry into slave runaway communities as societies-in-the-making, precisely those people who are rendered “atypical” in earlier archaeological conventions that sought the artifact patterns or worldviews of “normal” slave communities in the Chesapeake or Caribbean (if, that is, the concept of “normal” slave life is to be allowed).

Lightfoot (this volume) argues for shifting the experience and perspective of Native Americans to center stage in the archaeology of conquest and colonial settlement along the Pacific seaboard. He shows how typological conventions serve to render Native Americans invisible in archaeological conventions once they are assumed immersed in colonial life (see also Silliman 2005). What, Lightfoot inquires, if we were to shift the register, and see the process of colonization from the perspective of the colonized? Lydon (this volume) asks the same question from the vantage point of the Pacific’s 7,500 islands, pointing out that the ethnography of the Pacific has long shaped Europe’s view of itself as civilized and as a civilizing agency. How can archaeology provide a different, more critical, mirror on modernity? And Johnson (this volume), reflecting self-critically on his own work and others’, peels open Britain’s obsession with itself, and the assumption that process and change are driven from within. How, Johnson asks, is social and economic change in port cities such as Bristol to be explained when existing interpretations deny the slave trade that made merchant families rich beyond their dreams, and the far-away plantations where they developed their own savage society of colonization and left their genes?

These concerns with the way that history unfolds as narrative have at their heart a common interest in the material world, an interest with what Arjun Appadurai has termed the “social life of things” (Appadurai 1986). This materiality is appropriately eclectic, ranging from thimbles (Loren and Beaudry, this volume) to cities and landscapes (Pauls, this volume), and from the residues of first colonial contact by Portuguese adventurers touching the shores of West Africa (Pikirayi, this volume) to the architecture of Victorian England (Johnson, this volume). Other work – not represented here – connects us to our individual pasts: to industrial

archaeology (Casella and Symonds 2005; Gordon and Malone 1994; Stratton and Trinder 2000) and the post-industrial world (Casella and Symonds 2005). James Deetz recalled an existential moment when, excavating a pit in the Chesapeake, he unearthed a vertically buried Buick with a registration plate younger than he was (personal communication to Hall, 1989). For archaeologists, as professionals in a quintessentially modernist discipline, an archaeology of the modern world is an archaeology of ourselves.

The Direction of Historical Archaeology

Historical archaeology is practiced the world over in a myriad of forms, and this volume attempts to capture some of that diversity. As a theme-driven volume, we do not pretend that this book covers all the permutations and possibilities of global historical archaeology, although we have designed it to chart the terrain of contemporary theory and practice and to outline a variety of ways forward. We have also taken a distinctly global approach in coverage within and across chapters. Even though it complicates any easy historical synthesis of the field as a whole (see Andr n 1998 for an attempt), this focus helps to fill a current lacuna in the historical archaeology literature that can service advanced students, scholars in other disciplines, and a broad public audience.

Readers will realize that the book means “global historical archaeology” in two senses: first, to emphasize the nature of worldwide connections in the modern world that structure but do not determine the on-the-ground lives of people; and second, to introduce the varieties of historical archaeology practiced in different parts of the world today. The intersections, parallels, contrasts, and cross-fertilizations should prove fruitful for readers and contributors alike since historical archaeologists, particularly Americanist ones, often do not know much about historical archaeology outside of North America. Chapters in the first two parts of the book draw on cases from a multitude of geographical areas, but the final section grounds a number of the historical archaeological themes and theories in particular regional settings. We made conscious decisions to include those areas with substantial historical archaeological research – Eastern North America, Western North America, Latin America, Africa, the Pacific, and England – realizing that this would necessitate leaving out critical research elsewhere due to space constraints.

In its focus primarily on themes and secondarily on geography, the book also does not provide chapters geared toward specific topics that otherwise comprise distinct subfields within historical archaeology. This does not mean that the content of those distinct fields cannot be found throughout the book. A prime example is the historical archaeology of the African Diaspora, a topic that has assumed a prominent role in contemporary archaeology with respect to slavery and race in the Americas (Mullins 1999; Orser 1999; Singleton 1995, 1999, 2004; Singleton and Bograd 1995; Wilkie 2000, 2003) and in African homelands (DeCorse 1997, 2001; Kelly 1997, 2001). This broader theme informs many of the chapters that follow. For instance, Palus, Leone, and Cochran (this volume) discuss critical theory with

respect to African-American archaeology in Annapolis, Pikirayi (this volume) synthesizes the historical archaeology of Africa, and Silliman (this volume) considers the lives and struggles of enslaved and emancipated laborers of African descent in the context of racializing discourses and work experiences in the USA.

Another example of a topical realm not foregrounded as a distinct chapter, despite its exponential growth in recent years, is the archaeology of “culture contact,” or what might be more properly labeled the historical archaeology of indigenous people or the archaeology of colonialism (Cusick 1998; Lightfoot 1995; Murray 2004; Rubertone 2000; Silliman 2004b, 2005). Instead, various chapters pick up the relevant themes that pertain to Native Americans and other indigenous people in the context of historical archaeology, such as labor (Silliman, this volume), gender (Voss, this volume), and space (Pauls, this volume). In addition, the geographically centered chapters deal with indigenous experiences in the American West (Lightfoot, this volume), parts of the Eastern United States (Loren and Beaudry, this volume), Latin America (Funari, this volume), Africa (Pikirayi, this volume), and the Pacific (Lydon, this volume).

As a complement to this volume, readers can consult introductory texts for basic information on historical archaeology (Orser 2004), compilations (De Cunzo and Jameson 2005; Orser 1996b), encyclopedic versions for brief synopses (Orser 2002), or offerings for precollegiate students (Greene 2001). In addition, several extended review articles cover theoretical trends in the discipline (Little 1994; Paynter 2000a, 2000b). Moreover, this is also not a “methods” book because we do not define historical archaeology by its method and because the choice of methods depends on the context and focus of specific archaeological research. Besides, other books have already captured some of the diverse material culture studies that fall under the rubric of historical archaeology (Brauner 2000; Karklins 2000) and have placed them into student-friendly exercises (Barber 1994). Yet, Galloway’s chapter (this volume) does carefully consider the theoretical process that undergirds archaeological methodologies for combining written documents and material artifacts. This builds on the work of other historical archaeologists who have devoted effort to carefully examining the methodological interplay of things and words (Andr n 1998; Beaudry 1988; Deagan and Scardaville 1985; Johnson 1999; Leone 1988; Leone and Potter 1988; Little 1992).

Themes in Historical Archaeology

Given this context, there is, then, an openness in the themes that follow, representing a field of enquiry that is resistant to classification. Some might even link the openness to the particularity and the beneficial fragmentation of historical archaeology that was poignantly identified by Johnson (1999). The extent of the project that lies ahead is well captured by Johnson (this volume:page 316) once again, looking outward from the point of origin of colonial expansion: “the theory underlying European historical archaeology, whether implicit or explicit, has tended often to militate against explicit consideration of things colonial. This has been such

a dominant and implicit position in most of the literature that Europe, and even countries and regions within Europe, could be mistaken for hermetically sealed units rather than engaged in a web of social and material relations that by the end of our period and arguably soon after the start of it stretched across the globe.” This promise of an enhanced understanding can be expressed in six dimensions of inquiry: scale, agency, materiality, meaning, identity, and representation.

Scale

Firstly, the dimension of scale. How does a historical archaeology of the modern world hold in the same frame attention to the “small things forgotten” of everyday life and particular individuals and the global system of distribution characteristic of modernity? The biography of that most ubiquitous of objects – the clay tobacco pipe – captures the possibilities inherent in such issues of scale. Mass produced in 17th-century Dutch cities and branded with distinctive maker’s marks, crates of tobacco pipes on a wharf in Amsterdam could be dispatched to New Amsterdam (New York), Mauritzstad (Brazil), the Cape of Good Hope at the southernmost tip of Africa, the Indonesian entrepôts of the Dutch East India Company, or an underwater Australian reef. As artifacts, they provide information on chronology, trade and barter, individual habits or global trade patterns, and can be “read” at the level of the feature, site, or region.

Several chapters in this volume explore the properties and possibilities of scale. As Johnson (this volume:page 318) puts it, “the major task facing European historical archaeology, and indeed historical archaeology in general, is not to shift focus to an exclusively larger scale, but to grasp the relationship between the small-scale and local, wider processes of transformation, and the colonial experience.” Pauls (this volume:page 67), in her essay on space in historical archaeology, has a similar concern: “At what locus does the action of the human experience truly take place? Which scale of analysis holds the most explanatory power?” Pauls sees value in distinguishing between “space” and “place,” with the latter imbued with the consequences of experience – the artifacts, mementoes, and memories that are the grist of archaeological interpretation. In a complementary fashion, Funari (this volume) moves across both the grand sweep of colonialism – the ties that bind together the histories of Spain, Portugal, and Iberian America – and the detailed formation of culture and language, the modes of expression at the level of the individual. For his part, Mrozowski (this volume) uses the scalar qualities of historical archaeology skillfully to reintroduce the contentious issue of the environment as a factor in history. Accepting that the individual body is the core site at which nature and culture intersect, Mrozowski widens the frame to include landscapes, cities, and industrial complexes as interactive ecologies.

It is clear that there has yet to be a full appreciation of the inherent possibilities of scale in historical archaeology. At one level, there are clear omissions. Historical archaeology tends to be both Eurocentric and Anglophile (Funari 1999). While this can be mitigated by associating the field with modernity – understood as a par-

ticular non-exclusive mode of thought – there is as yet little engagement with the other world systems of the past millennium. Both Pikiyai (this volume) and Funari (this volume) show the rich possibilities of the interface with Islam, whether in the syncretic cultural traditions of the East African littoral, the cultural landscapes of North Africa, or the historical archaeology of Andalusia, and the symbolic politics of mosques and cathedrals. At another level, rich possibilities rest in as yet unrealized connections across scales. For example, historical archaeology now has as established subfields the study of plantation slavery in the Chesapeake and Caribbean (Singleton 1999, 2004; Singleton and Bograd 1995), the study of maroon societies in Brazil (Funari, this volume), and the archaeology of Gold Coast slave castles in Africa (DeCorse 2001; Pikiyai, this volume). But these have yet to be integrated into a comprehensive archaeology of slavery that links these local manifestations as an archaeology of both local servitude and the reach of the triangular trade that connected Europe, West Africa, and the Caribbean, and enabled the emergence of new elites in Europe's port cities (Hicks 2000; Johnson, this volume).

Agency

A second dimension of the chapters in this volume is agency – how to interpret the “absent presence” behind the artifacts, the force driving the process of history. This is a key issue for all archaeology, for the artifact is usually part of an assemblage, and the assemblage is a palimpsest of individual activities. It is an accentuated issue for historical archaeology for two reasons. Firstly, there are again the properties of scale, since historical archaeology works both at the point of individual action and at the scale of world systems. Secondly, historical archaeologists usually work with both artifacts and texts, and texts often identify individuals. For example, a household assemblage may invite interpretation as a “pattern” – a statistical representation of inferred behavior, drawn from the proportional recovery of different types of artifacts. At the same time, the site from which the assemblage came may have a probate record, listing the possessions of a named individual. How is the archaeologist to use these rather different categories of evidence to interpret the agency shaping the processes of history? This was the question so eloquently tackled by James Deetz (1994) in his *In Small Things Forgotten*, and the continuing challenge of agency in interpretation accounts for the continuing relevance of Deetz's essay, some thirty years on.

Pauls (this volume), in her chapter on landscape, architecture, and social life, sees space as a way of conceptualizing the various expressions of agency that shape the archaeological record. Pauls perceives space as the connection between the individual and the world, the significance of “the connections between physical space, the constant negotiation of individual and group identities, and the bodily experiences associated with specific spaces and activities” (Pauls, this volume: page 70). She stresses the “tangled, recursive web” of these interactions – a theme taken up by Mrozowski (this volume) in his consideration of environment as agency. Mrozowski notes that structuralist archaeology left little role for environmental

influence, since the search for the abstracted, structural determinants of “worldview” assumed the preeminence of culture over nature. One could extend Mrozowski’s criticism to the Marxist tradition of archaeological interpretation: for Palus, Leone, and Cochran (this volume) and Wurst (this volume), the determinant of change in history is the dialectics of class. For this Western tradition of Marxist interpretation, the economic and social relations of production are the key to understanding agency. Mrozowski seeks to reinsert the environment into archaeological interpretation by differentiating between different regimes of interaction with the natural world, avoiding the dangers of a generalizing essentialism. Both Pauls and Mrozowski, along with Galloway (1991, this volume) in her consideration of the relationship between texts and artifacts, stress the importance of archaeological technique in opening up new windows on agency: advances in geographical information systems that allow the command of vast arrays of new data on landscapes, improved excavation techniques, and the detailed environmental evidence that comes from palynology, botany, parasitology, soil chemistry, zooarchaeology, and similar fields.

Materiality

In many respects, these approaches are still works in progress, but they hinge on the third theme, that of materiality. Historical archaeology’s challenge and perhaps its strength is that it does not have a dominant theory of the material world to call its own. In this respect, De Cunzo’s (this volume) essay on the archaeology of the institution is provocative. For De Cunzo, studies of institutions “share a concern with the culture and economy of capitalism and relationships of power in the modern world. They recount the social, political, and moral acts of establishing institutional places. They outline the goals and purposes of these ‘places of Othering,’ ‘power containers,’ and ‘protected places of disciplinary monotony.’ They explore their missions to create and maintain the social body through action on individual bodies, souls, and minds. They probe acts intended to transform, reform, and punish. They seek to understand conceptions of identity, madness, deviance, and normalcy in different times and places” (De Cunzo:page 182). Building on Foucault, De Cunzo shows how a range of studies have used the concept of the institution to connect, on the one hand, the individual and collectivized manifestations of power in actions and behavior with, on the other hand, the material manifestation of the institution. Places such as prisons, schools, hospitals, churches, and mosques evidence a collective agency – individualized actions shaped and regulated by the forces of modernity. Landscapes, as De Cunzo shows with the evocative example of the work of convict gangs in Australia, can be interpreted as both the consequence and determinant of institutionalized behavior.

To grapple with materiality, historical archaeology owes much either directly to Marx, or to subsequent theorists writing in, or in response to, Marx’s work: Louis Althusser, Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu. The other major theoretical thread is structuralism: Claude Levi-Strauss via Henry Glassie to James Deetz. Often seen

as incompatible, with archaeological structuralism trending to the ahistorical, it has been Johnson's self-depreciated achievement to incorporate the Georgian Order into an archaeology of capitalism (Johnson 1996, this volume). What still remains incomplete, however, is a distinctively archaeological theory of materiality. The contributions in this volume have benefited from conceptual bricolage, drawing profitably from other disciplines for theoretical tools that open valuable windows of interpretation on the complex world of objects. However, the subject matter of historical archaeology allows an understanding of the nonverbal language of things through both space and time, offering exciting theoretical possibilities for the future.

Meaning

A fourth dimension follows from this concern with agency and materiality: in looking for meaning, how do historical archaeologists read and interpret their various sources of evidence – text, oral tradition, artifact, landscape – to write their stories? Because archaeology is an eclectic discipline, lacking a dominant theoretical consensus, concepts of what constitutes meaning can be quite varied. Several contributors make this point. Funari (this volume), for example, points out that while North American archaeologists tend to be strongly influenced by anthropology, their Latin American counterparts are more strongly influenced by history, art history, and architecture. For Johnson (this volume), the disjunction between historical archaeology and post-medieval archaeology in Britain is due to the latter's alignment with history. For his part, Pikirayi (this volume) questions the appropriateness of privileging texts in searching for meaning, and argues for an archaeology that finds meaning in the past through looking at material culture alongside oral history and ethnography. Palus, Leone, and Cochran (this volume), as well as Wurst (this volume), approach the past from a Marxist tradition and therefore seek meaning in the dialectics of this historical process. But Burke (this volume) makes the point that there is little evidence of a consensus around concepts critical to interpretation: "Is ideology just another word for ideas? Is there a standard of accuracy relevant to ideology, or is it all necessarily 'false consciousness'? Does ideology require that its constituent beliefs be clearly articulated, or can it rely on implicit beliefs? Does ideology only refer to shared beliefs, or is it ever possible to refer to an individual's ideology?" (Burke, this volume:page 130).

Identity

The variations in approaches to meaning in the chapters in this collection are a microcosm of debates within the discipline as a whole. This is an openness that is stimulating, but which may need to find some resolution if historical archaeology plans to make significant progress in its core intellectual project – understanding the underdetermined spaces within and between material culture and text that Galloway (this volume) has explored. What form might such progress take? Here,

some convergence is evident, providing the fifth dimension that draws together the contributions to this book. Concerned as they are with the meaning to be read from the play between things and words, historical archaeologists are increasingly concerned with identity – with the intersection of race, class, gender, and ethnicity and the ways in which the material world is deployed as a form of expression (Delle et al. 1999; Jones 1999; Scott 1994).

Silliman's (2004a, this volume) work on labor and identity serves to frame the issues. In his own research on a large, mid-19th-century hacienda near San Francisco Bay in California, Silliman found evidence that men and women had alienated their labor in different ways. Adult Californian Indian men, who spent time managing livestock and plowing fields, left little trace in the archaeological record. In contrast, adult women brought needles, scissors, and other sewing items into the home, directly relating to tasks in and around the residential and working areas under the management of resident settlers. Silliman notes that this resonates with similar evidence in other early colonial situations. For example, while Australian Aborigines and white settler Australians participated together in the pastoral industry, indigenous workers retained distinctly Aboriginal practices, rendering them almost invisible in the historical record (Harrison 2004). Hall's (1999, 2000) work in the Dutch colonial Cape has shown that, when an assemblage from a backyard well is compared with the material culture listed in a contemporary probate record, distinct and different material identities emerge: the traces of female slave domestic labor in the well assemblage, and an overwhelmingly male, and master, identity in the probate listing. As Voss (this volume:page 119) articulates it, "archaeological research on gender has also firmly demonstrated that gender identities are dually shaped both by daily practices and by institutional forces. And, perhaps most importantly, historical archaeological research has brought to the forefront the vital connections between gender and other aspects of social identity such as race, class, ethnicity, and occupation."

We see in these examples the complex intersection of gender and class, played out through the words and things that serve to constitute identity. In such examples, we are a long way from the generalized pattern recognition of early historical archaeology, or the simple acculturation models that assume that the outcome of contact between Californian Indians and Spanish settlers, or Aboriginal Australians and settler pastoralists, or Indonesian slaves and Dutch patriarchs, will be mixed assemblages showing a little of each culture. Many times, the nature of these interactions, whether struggles with identities or expressions of agency, grows out of labor relations. As Silliman's (this volume) chapter implies, we need to think of these intersections as the outcomes of "individuals negotiating the terrain of colonial and industrial labor through material culture and lived experience."

As Voss (this volume) and Wurst (this volume) show in their chapter contributions, gender and class are well-understood concepts, buttressed by a rich theoretical literature, and with strong lineages of interpretation in archaeological work. Ethnicity seems a more slippery concept, both self-apparent and elusive. Just as simple acculturation models now lack explanatory power, so are simple material markers of ethnicity unlikely. This has been demonstrated through many years of

plantation archaeology: initial assumptions that slaves would, or could, retain possessions that marked West African tribal identity in any straightforward way have been shown to be simplistic. But at the same time, people do clearly use material culture to claim an affinity and shared history with others, as historical archaeology has shown over and over again.

An excellent case study in historical archaeology's potential to track and interpret identity-in-the-making is Funari's (this volume) summary of his own work at Angola Janga, or Little Angola, the Brazilian runaway settlement forged by escaped slaves and indigenous South Americans as a contrapuntal community to the oppression of the plantations. Here, archaeological fieldwork has proved a vital addition to Dutch and Portuguese documents in showing how a new identity can emerge. There is surely considerable potential in extending this approach to other situations in which a shared history of oppression provides a cauldron for culture formation, both beyond the boundaries of a dominant society, and within its borders, as minorities deploy what James Scott (1996) has called the "weapons of the weak." Loren and Beaudry (this volume:page 256) take this approach in rethinking American identity, seeing not a unifying trend, but rather the differing experiences of distinct groups: "the process of becoming American drew on the knowledge of these different identities and involved the strategy of purposeful manipulation of material culture to represent oneself in a particular fashion for personal, sexual, economic, or political reasons." Their study of the eastern seaboard is matched by Lightfoot's (this volume; see also Lightfoot 2004) essay on identity formation on the North American Pacific coast. Here, and reminiscent of runaway communities in earlier Brazil, some California Indians distanced themselves from the new settler communities by opting for rugged, rural locations away from the missions, such as the far eastern hinterlands of San Francisco Bay. In addition, Lydon (this volume: page 296) shows how the historical archaeology of the Pacific itself must be understood both as a region of diverse, shifting, and ever-migrant identities, and as an image against which European identity was itself formed: "images of Pacific peoples provided the materials for Western identity-making, as the diverse cultures of Oceania were fundamental to a developing 19th-century European anthropology charting humanity according to increasingly rigid categories of biological race. Explorers' accounts of these 'savages' formed a counterpoint to a European identity that was modern, rational and progressive – everything they were not."

Representation

Lydon's perspective on the Pacific serves well to introduce the sixth dimension unifying the essays in this volume – representation. How do historical archaeologists represent the past to the present and how, as agents themselves, do they read the past in relation to the present? An emphasis on the relationship between the present and the past is, of course, definitive of critical archaeology and Marxist method. Key here has been Mark Leone's long engagement with the archaeology of Annapolis – the "critical archaeology" well represented in this volume in the chapter

by Palus, Leone, and Cochran (see also Handsman and Leone 1989; Leone et al. 1987). Many of the other chapters have a clear authorial position in relation to the politics of the present day (Lightfoot, this volume; Lydon, this volume). Wurst (this volume) argues that, as a concept, class must be understood as a set of relationships to be explored by dialectic method, leading to an inevitable connection between the past and present as history is born from an awareness of conflict and contradictions. For Palus, Leone, and Cochran (this volume) as well, archaeology must always have a political purpose, and must therefore be a public archaeology, finding and exploring the experiences, aspirations, and interests of the present. The emblematic project for critical archaeology is the Colorado Coal Field investigation, starting with the concerns of the labor movement today, and exploring backward in time for the reassurance and dignity of history (Ludlow Collective 2001; McGuire and Reckner 2002; Saitta 2004). As Wurst (this volume) and Silliman (this volume) summarize herein, the example of the Colorado Coal Field Archaeology Project as an “engaged archaeology” does not compromise either evidence or interpretation. It rather sets up what Palus, Leone, and Cochran (this volume) see as a public dialogue, contributing to a critical citizenship that is at the heart of democracy. But an appreciation of the connection between present and past is by no means the preserve of Marxist archaeology, and most authors in this volume, implicitly or explicitly, frame their enquiries within the concerns of the present. Some historical archaeologists have sought the link between past and present in a critique of critical archaeology (Wilkie and Bartoy 2000), while others have pursued issues in public history, heritage, and collaboration (McDavid 2002; Wilkie 2001) or in personal, narrative, and politicized accounts of archaeological practice and results (Schrire 1995; Spector 1993). If post-processualism and postmodernism have taught us anything, it is surely that the implication of the present in interpretations of the past is both inevitable and beneficial.

In this last respect, the essays in this volume can be seen as an expression of the world in which they are written. Early historical archaeology was the child of high modernism and the search for general, unifying principles, whether the law-like generalizations of the New Archaeology of the 1960s, pattern recognition, or a wide-ranging structuralism that sought the cognitive systems shaping culture, and consequently the human condition. Contemporary historical archaeology is shaped in an unconfident world of fragmentation, contradiction, and conflict. This sea-change is captured by Lydon (this volume:page 306) in her overview of the archaeology of the Pacific region: “the current academic concern with the rootless, deterritorialized character of identity has replaced essentializing conceptions in pursuing themes such as displacement and dislocation. Yet as a number of scholars have pointed out, Oceania has always been characterized by processes of migration, colonization, and diaspora, leading to calls for a rediscovery of these transnational contexts. . . . Where an earlier historiography had stressed the ‘fatal impact’ of European encounters in the Pacific, analysis now emphasizes the diversity, adaptability, and autonomy of local forms of culture, and the agency of Indigenous peoples.” The challenge that Lydon sees for Oceania is a challenge for historical archaeology in general – that of holding the frame of a world system that

linked all continents in a reciprocal network, while paying attention to the diversity of local agency and keeping in view the complex relationships between past and present.

Epilogue

Historical archaeology's "present moment" is captured by another portrait of early modernity: Albert Eckhout's portrait of a Tupi woman, painted in 1641 (Figure 1.2). Part of the brief Dutch colonial adventure in Brazil, Eckhout represents his image of a savage sexuality against the backdrop of earlier Portuguese plantations. As with



Figure 1.2 *Tupiweib* (1641) by Albert Eckhout. Thomsen, Thomas. "Albert Eckhout." (c) Levin OG. Munksgaard, Copenhagen, 1938. Courtesy of The Chief Librarian, Erland Kolding Nielsen, of the Kongelige Bibliotek, Copenhagen, Denmark

Holbein before him, Eckhout seems ambivalent about this new world of conquest, and about the crate-loads of botanical and zoological specimens, ethnographic collections, drawings and paintings that Prince Mauritz would ship back to The Hague to found the museum that still bears his name (Thomsen 1938). Rather than a skull in the foreground of his painting, Eckhout depicts a bloated toad (Hall 2000). Historical archaeology has the conceptual tools to analyze Mauritz's artifact assemblage, the colonial landscape, and the archive of contemporaneous texts and commentaries. But other views of this world – represented here by the Tupi woman looking back at Eckhout from his canvas – remain to be further explored more deeply.

REFERENCES

- Andrén, Anders 1998 *Between Artifacts and Texts: Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. New York: Plenum Publishing.
- Appadurai, Arjun, ed. 1986 *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barber, Russell J. 1994 *Doing Historical Archaeology: Exercises Using Documentary, Oral, and Material Evidence*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.
- Berger, John 1972 *Ways of Seeing*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Brauner, David R., ed. 2000 *Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists*, 2nd edition. Tucson: Society for Historical Archaeology.
- Beaudry, Mary C., ed. 1988 *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Casella, Eleanor Conlin, and James Symonds, eds. 2005 *Industrial Archaeology: Future Directions*. New York: Springer.
- Cusick, James G., ed. 1998 *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology*. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper No. 25. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Deagan, Kathleen, and Michael Scardaville 1985 *Archaeology and History on Historic Hispanic Sites: Impediments and Solutions*. *Historical Archaeology* 19(1):32–37.
- DeCorse, Christopher R. 1997 *Historical Archaeology in West Africa: Culture Contact, Continuity and Change*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- 2001 *An Archaeology of Elmina: Africans and Europeans on the Gold Coast, 1400–1900*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- De Cunzo, Lu Ann, and John H. Jameson, Jr. 2005 *Unlocking the Past: Celebrating Historical Archaeology in North America*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Deetz, James F. 1994 [1977] *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday.
- Delle, James A., Stephen A. Mrozowski, and Robert Paynter, eds. 1999 *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeologies of Race, Class, and Gender*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Falk, Lisa 1991 *Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Funari, Pedro Paulo A. 1999 *Historical Archaeology from a World Perspective*. In *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. Pp. 37–66. *One World Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

- Funari, Pedro Paulo A., Siân Jones, and Martin Hall, eds. 1999a Introduction: Archaeology in History. *In* *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. Pp. 1–20. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
- Galloway, Patricia 1991 The Archaeology of Ethnohistorical Narrative. *In* *Columbian Consequences*, vol. 3: *The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective*. David Hurst Thomas, ed. Pp. 453–470. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Gordon, Robert B., and Patrick M. Malone 1994 *The Texture of Industry: An Archaeological View of the Industrialization of North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greene, Meg 2001 *Buttons, Bones, and the Organ Grinder's Monkey: Tales of Historical Archaeology*. North Haven: The Shoe String Press, Inc.
- Hall, Martin 1990 *Farmers, Kings and Traders: The People of South Africa, 200–1860*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1996 *Archaeology Africa*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- 1999 Subaltern Voices? Finding the Spaces between Things and Words. *In* *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. Pp. 193–203. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
- 2000 *An Archaeology of the Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- 2001 Timeless Time – Africa in the World. *In* *Archaeology: The Widening Debate*. Barry Cunliffe, Wendy Davies, and Colin Renfrew, eds. Pp. 439–464. London: British Academy.
- Handsman, Russell G., and Mark P. Leone 1989 Living History and Critical Archaeology in the Reconstruction of the Past. *In* *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology: Essays in the Philosophy, History, and Socio-Politics of Archaeology*. Valerie Pinsky and Alison Wylie, eds. Pp. 117–135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, Rodney 2004 *Shared Landscapes: Archaeologies of Attachment to the Heritage of the Pastoral Industry in NSW*. Hurstville, New South Wales: Studies in the Cultural Construction of Open Space 3, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service.
- Hicks, Dan 2000 Ethnicity, Race, and the Archaeology of the Atlantic Slave Trade. *Assemblage: The Sheffield Graduate Journal of Archaeology* 5. www.shef.ac.uk/assembly/5/hicks.html
- Johnson, Matthew H. 1996 *An Archaeology of Capitalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1999 Rethinking Historical Archaeology. *In* *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. Pp. 23–36. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
- Jones, Siân 1999 Historical Categories and the Praxis of Identity: The Interpretation of Ethnicity in Historical Archaeology. *In* *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Siân Jones, eds. Pp. 219–232. One World Archaeology. London: Routledge.
- Karklins, Karlis, ed. 2000 *Studies in Material Culture Research*. Tucson: Society for Historical Archaeology.
- Kelly, Kenneth G. 1997 *The Archaeology of African-European Interaction: Investigating the Social Roles of Trade, Traders, and the Use of Space in Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Hueda Kingdom, Republic of Benin*. *World Archaeology* 28(3):77–95.
- 2001 Change and Continuity in Coastal Benin. *In* *West Africa during the Atlantic Slave Trade*. Christopher R. DeCorse, ed. Pp. 81–100. London: Leicester University Press.
- Leone, Mark P. 1988 The Relationship Between Archaeological Data and the Documentary Record: 18th Century Gardens in Annapolis. *Historical Archaeology* 22(1):29–35.
- 1995 A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism. *American Anthropologist* 97:251–268.

- Leone, Mark P., and Parker B. Potter, Jr. 1988 Introduction: Issues in Historical Archaeology. *In* *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*. Mark P. Leone and Parker B. Potter, Jr., eds. Pp. 1–22. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Leone, Mark P., Parker B. Potter, Jr., and Paul A. Shackel 1987 Toward a Critical Archaeology. *Current Anthropology* 28(3):137–145.
- Lightfoot, Kent G. 1995 Culture Contact Studies: Redefining the Relationship between Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 60(2):199–217.
- 2004 *Indians, Missionaries, and Merchants: The Legacy of Colonial Encounters on the California Frontiers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Little, Barbara J. 1994 People with History: An Update on Historical Archaeology in the United States. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 1:5–40.
- Little, Barbara J., ed. 1992 *Text-Aided Archaeology*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Ludlow Collective 2001 *Archaeology of the Colorado Coal Field War 1913–1914*. *In* *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. Victor Buchli and Gavin Lucas, eds. Pp. 94–107. London: Routledge.
- McDavid, Carol A. 2002 Archaeologies That Hurt; Descendants That Matter: A Pragmatic Approach to Collaboration in the Public Interpretation of African-American Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 34(2):303–314.
- McGuire, Randall H., and Paul Reckner 2002 The Unromantic West: Labor, Capital, and Struggle. *Historical Archaeology* 36(3):44–58.
- Mullins, Paul 1999 *Race and Affluence: An Archaeology of African America and Consumer Culture*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishing.
- Murray, Tim, ed. 2004 *The Archaeology of Contact in Settler Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orser, Jr., Charles E. 1996a *A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*. New York: Plenum Press.
- 1996b *Images of the Recent Past*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- 1999 The Challenge of Race to American Historical Archaeology. *American Anthropologist* 100(3):661–668.
- 2002 *Encyclopaedia of Historical Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- 2004 *Historical Archaeology*, 2nd edition. London: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Paynter, Robert 2000a Historical and Anthropological Archaeology: Forging Alliances. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 8(1):1–37.
- 2000b Historical Archaeology and the Post-Columbian World in North America. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 8(3):169–217.
- Pilling, Arnold R. 1967 Beginnings. *Historical Archaeology* 1:1–12.
- Rubertone, Patricia 2000 The Historical Archaeology of Native Americans. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:452–446.
- Saitta, Dean J. 2004 Labor and Class in the American West. *In* *North American Archaeology*. Timothy R. Pauketat and Diana DiPaolo Loren, ed. Pp. 359–385. London: Blackwell.
- Schrire, Carmel 1995 *Digging Through Darkness: Chronicles of an Archaeologist*. Richmond: University of Virginia Press.
- Schuyler, Robert L., ed. 1978 *Historical Archaeology*. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood.
- Scott, Elizabeth M., ed. 1994 *Those of Little Note: Gender, Race, and Class in Historical Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Scott, James C. 1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Silliman, Stephen W. 2004a *Lost Laborers in Colonial California: Native Americans and the Archaeology of Rancho Petaluma*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- 2004b *Social and Physical Landscapes of Contact*. In *North American Archaeology*. Timothy R. Pauketat and Diana DiPaolo Loren, eds. Pp. 273–296. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- 2005 *Culture Contact or Colonialism? Challenges in the Archaeology of Native North America*. *American Antiquity* 70(1):55–74.
- Singleton, Teresa A. 1995 *The Archaeology of Slavery in the United States*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:119–140.
- 2004 *Before the Revolution: Archaeology and the African Diaspora on the Atlantic Seaboard*. In *North American Archaeology*. Timothy R. Pauketat and Diana DiPaolo Loren, eds. Pp. 319–336. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Singleton, Teresa A., ed. 1999 *“I, Too, Am America”: Archaeological Studies of African-American Life*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia.
- Singleton, Teresa A., and Mark D. Bograd 1995 *The Archaeology of the African Diaspora in the Americas*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Society for Historical Archaeology.
- South, Stanley A. 1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press.
- 1978 *Pattern Recognition in Historical Archaeology*. *American Antiquity* 43(2):223–230.
- Spector, Janet D. 1993 *What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.
- Stratton, Michael, and Barrie Stuart Trinder, eds. 2000 *Twentieth-Century Industrial Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Thomsen, Thomas 1938 *Albert Eckhout; ein Niederländischer Maler und sein Gonner Moritz der Brasiliander*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Trigger, Bruce 1990 *The History of African Archaeology in World Perspective*. In *A History of African Archaeology*. Peter Robertshaw, ed. Pp. 309–319. London: James Currey.
- Wilkie, Laurie A. 2000 *Creating Freedom: Material Culture and African American Identity at Oakley Plantation, Louisiana, 1840–1950*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- 2001 *Communicative Bridges Linking Actors Through Time: Archaeology and the Construction of Emancipatory Narratives at a Bahamian Plantation*. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(2):225–243.
- 2003 *The Archaeology of Mothering: An African-American Midwife’s Tale*. London: Routledge.
- Wilkie, Laurie A., and Kevin Bartoy 2000 *A Critical Archaeology Revisited*. *Current Anthropology* 41(5):747–777.

