

1946 *Excavations at Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala*, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 561, Washington D.C.

Kidder, Alfred Vincent and E. M. Shook

1952 *Mound E-III-3, Kaminaljuyu, Guatemala*, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 596, Contribution 53, Washington D.C.

Taylor, Walter W.

1948 *A Study of Archeology*, American Anthropological Association, Memoir 69, Menasha, Wisconsin.

Wauchope, Robert

1965 "Alfred Vincent Kidder, 1885-1963," *American Antiquity*, 31(2): 149-171.

Willey, Gordon R.

1967 "Alfred Vincent Kidder", in *National Academy of Sciences Biographical Memoirs*, 39:292-322, Columbia University Press, New York.

Woodbury, Richard B.

1973 *Alfred V. Kidder*, Columbia University Press, New York.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03113>

*The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, by Mark P. Leone and Parker B. Potter, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C. 1992. No Price Given (Cloth ).

by Susanne M. Spencer-Wood

Schleisinger Library

Radcliffe College

Cambridge, Massachusetts U.S.A. 02138

This volume contains some interesting chapters, including an introduction that presents useful critiques of the functionalist, symbolic and structural approaches. The introduction raises some important issues, particularly the political uses of historical archaeology, while acknowledging this issue is seldom addressed in the volume. For the unknowledgeable reader who assumes that the introduction provides an overview of an apparently comprehensive volume, this first chapter is very partial and at times misleading. For instance, the introductory overview of theoretical approaches in the volume appears complete and objective, but does not include the Marxian theoretical approaches that are either explicit or implicit in 9 of the 14 chapters (Brenner, Orser, Paynter, McGuire, Leone and Potter, Leone, Little Palkovich, Anderson and Moore). The dominant ideology thesis used in many of these chapters, and the critique of this approach, are not discussed, except by McGuire. The introduction doesn't state that most of the chapters focus on relationships between power, class structure and ideology, which are often related to underlying economic relationships. Given the editor's expressed concern for political implications of historical archaeology, why doesn't the introduction to the volume present its Marxian orientation overtly? The careful reader will find hints of the editors' standpoint, such as the specification of "non-Marxist" definitions of ideology.

It would have been useful if the editors had demonstrated some awareness of the political implications of their Eurocentric viewpoint and language in the introduction, instead of using language and structure that give the appearance of objective authority. The Euro-American male editors should have clearly stated their viewpoint in the beginning, rather than having it unreflexively leak out by calling natives "the other" and referring to "our culture" (meaning Euro-American, p. 9). From the native viewpoint Europeans were "the other." Since the introduction stresses the importance of constructing the past from a native viewpoint, it would have been useful to demonstrate some awareness of their own European viewpoint and contrast it with the viewpoints of others. Further, after emphasizing the importance of understanding the native viewpoint, how could the editors judge South's use of the Eurocentric World Systems approach appropriate for analyzing early Spanish settlements that incorporated Indians?

The introduction stresses the importance of constructing the emic native viewpoint through detailed documentary symbolic analysis, in contrast to etic functional analysis and the indeterminate nature of structural analysis. Yet in this volume only Crosby reconstructs a really emic native viewpoint of the past. In contrast to the editor's claims, Brenner uses Western categories to etically reconstruct the functions of European artifacts in developing and expressing status in native cultures. Neither Brenner nor

Orser reconstruct non-white cultures from an emic viewpoint, although both do use abstracted emic statements for perspectives to validate parts of their etic constructions. While Brenner's and Orser's interpretations of the social and economic functions and meanings of material culture are both thought-provoking, neither claims to be taking the emic viewpoint claimed for them by the editors. While some of the volume's chapters analyze ethnic material patterns as resistance to dominant ideology, they do not construct any alternative non-dominant view of ideology (cf. McGuire, Palkovich). Singleton alone examines the dominant European group's adoption of some material culture and foodways from non-dominant cultures of African slaves.

Most chapters in this volume are concerned with dominant ideology and its degree of adoption, or occasionally resistance to it by non-dominant classes and ethnic groups. While the introduction recognizes the existence of different native Indian viewpoints and ideologies, and differential penetration of dominant ideology across classes (Leone) and ethnic groups (McGuire), there is no awareness that ideology is often fundamentally gendered. Most chapters convey a completely ungendered construction of the past. The significance of gender relations and ideology are not considered, although gender is fundamental to social relationships and cultural beliefs analyzed by most chapters. As a result most of the chapters in this volume present as holistic a very partial male-focussed perception of historic American culture. In most chapters only classes and cultural ideology of men are analyzed. This is most overtly expressed by Leone, who states his analysis and conclusions pertain to all social groups, dismissing as insignificant the admitted exclusion of slaves, poor whites and blacks, and women.

Very few chapters in this volume address gender roles (Crosby and McGuire) and none reconstruct historic gender systems or analyze their importance to the extent that class is analyzed in this volume. Only McGuire considers the material expression of some gender ideology. South identifies the presence of Indian women in Spanish households from discarded Indian pottery, but does not analyze gender roles and relationships as Deagan did. Two authors in this volume consider an unusual widow or unmarried woman at one site, but do not analyze the gender system (Little, Anderson and Moore). Crosby presents Indian women's and men's subsistence roles, but does not consider these roles as sources of power as does Handyman (cf. 1992). Nor does Crosby discuss Indian women's power as spiritual leaders whose manit was often super to men's (cf. Volmar 1992), although this certainly significantly alters her portrayal of leaders in the normatively male terms of shamans, powwows, and chiefs. McGuire gives the most consideration to changes in gender and familial relationships and ideology, as expressed in gravestone inscriptions 1830-1970. However, most chapters in this volume miss essential insights for understanding historic cultures because they overlook the significance of gender roles and ideals.

Most chapters in this volume would gain fundamental cultural insights by gendering their analyses of cultural ideology. It would be better to overtly state the assumption in many chapters that both ideology and power are controlled by public men, while women remain at home, dependent on men. Perhaps Deetz, Leone, Little, and Palkovich are not aware that they equate the Georgian with values that were emically identified with men's capitalism, including individualism and man's control of nature. In contrast, the egalitarian ideology Anderson and Moore found expressed in the Georgian Federal, Roman and Greek Revivals, was defined by values that were emically labeled feminine, including voluntary obedience, cooperation, and suppression of expressions of individuality, personal success, or self-reliance. Further it is historically documented that women and the domestic sphere as men became identified with the sinful practices of capitalism in the public sphere. Whiteness in houses and ceramics can be further connected with the century movement for home religion (Rothman 1978:68; Spencer-Wood 1993). Neither Deetz nor Leone discusses the fact that teaware usually was not plain white, but often was decorated with Chinese or floral designs as tableware became less decorated (Wall 1989). The shift from predominately Chinese export porcelain to mostly floral designs around the turn of the century corresponds to a shift in the European ideal gendering of the tea ceremony from an initially male ritual in the 16th century to a female ritual by the late 18th century. Chinese export porcelain represented the fruits of mercantile capitalism, as well as the origin of the tea ceremony. The shift to consuming mostly floral pattern teaware in the early 19th century expresses the home religion ideology that glorified nature, women, and their domestic sphere as closer to God than men's development of sinful capitalism in the public sphere (Spencer-Wood 1993). The authors in this volume missed insights afforded by recognizing that cultural ideology, mirroring society, is fundamentally gendered. The struggle between male capitalistic individualism and female egalitarian values also illuminates the shift McGuire analyzes from egalitarian gravestones in 18th century community graveyards to overt express of social hierarchy in 19th century capitalistic graveyards, followed by the 20th century resurgence of egalitarian gravestones as women's moral values were increasingly brought into the public sphere, culminating in female suffrage in 1920. This volume is concerned only with dominant white male ideology and completely overlooks the ongoing struggle, negotiation, and cultural mediation between feminine versus masculine values, which is as fundamental to cultural ideology as the power struggles between classes and ethnic groups.

A large section of the introduction proposes the use of middle range theory in more detail than previously (Leone and Crosby 1987), although it is not used in the volume's chapters (perhaps) implicitly in Palkovich). Portrayed as something new, middle range theory is actually Binford's original hypothesis testing methodology using ethnographic analogy, stated in non-positivist language that can be understood and accepted by anti-processual archaeologists. The formulation of expectations (hypotheses) from documentary data, comparing these expectations to archaeological data (testing), finding ambiguities that don't fit expectations (data that don't fit hypotheses), and then re-examining the documents to create explanations that include the ambiguities

(revised hypotheses) is the normative methodology of good processual historical archaeologists, found in many publications (cf. Spencer-Wood 1987a). Potter himself notes that he used middle-range theory without that language. The back and forth between documents and archaeological data has been normative, despite the previous neglect of documents by South (cf. 1977) and others who emphasize the methods of prehistoric archaeology. In their loose borrowing of middle range theory Leone and Potter obfuscate the significant difference between their uncritical use of documents to construct ideological and social interpretations of artifacts, uncritical use of documents to construct ideological and social interpretations of artifacts, and Binford's use of ethnographic analogy for behavioral inferences, including site formation processes.

Although Leone and Potter fault positivist historical archaeologists for seeking universal functional explanations, they advocate the use of Binford's middle-range theory to develop monolithic cultural explanations, such as *the* worldview of "the other," or the Marxian function of worldview in masking capitalist hierarchy. Ambiguities or deviations from norms that cannot be explained as part of large-scale historically documented patterns are still considered non-data and dismissed as "idiosyncratic" or "particularistic." Contrary to Leone and Potter's claim to treat documentary and archaeological data as independent sources of information. They still dismiss archaeological data that cannot be explained with the uncritical use of documents. Thus archaeological data can add no new information that isn't already in documents. Further, the bias against the particularistic and idiosyncratic make it difficult to impossible to analyze material expressions of cultural diversity. A singular coherent etic explanation with essentialist constructions of class is sought rather than the multiple, conflicting, often undocumented emic voices and views sought rather than the multiple, conflicting, often undocumented emic voices and views within each culture. In contrast to Leone and Potter's dismissal of idiosyncratic variation, Singleton made a very significant connection between the increasing idiosyncratic variation in African American settlements and the freedom brought by emancipation. Singleton corrects Leone and Potter's oppositional thinking that led them to exclude the possibility that idiosyncratic variation can be meaningful. In fact, non-linear systems theory has demonstrated that small-scale individual variation may be extremely significant, particularly in explaining processes of change (Spencer-Wood 1989, 1990).

In this volume archaeological data often simply materially embody interpretations of written records, which are occasionally innovative. The source of these interpretations of documentary and archaeological data, as usual, is the theoretical approach that leads to the kinds of questions asked, which determine the relevant kinds of data selected for analysis in order to reach conclusions addressing those questions. The unexpected, even for Leone and Potter is only sought within the aspects of material culture that have been selected for analysis. The real question is why Leone as a critical archaeologist uncritically accepted 20th century garden researchers; two dimensional framework when the rules of perspective were clearly stated in garden manuals (cf. Leone p. 251)? Why were these documentary data not considered significant until perspective was noticed in actual physical gardens? In most chapters the archaeological data are explained by a neat etic categorization framework and ambiguities aren't presented, or aren't explained by further documentary analysis. The closest to using middle range theory is Palkovich, who speculates a German immigrant's resistance to the dominate Georgian ideology based on a creative interpretation of documents. Only Palkovich, Singleton, and Thomas explicitly use archaeological data independently to compare and contrast actual historical material culture with material culture specified in idealistic documents. Anderson and Moore by accident also found some archaeological data that corrected errors in documents.

This volume demonstrates that attempts to reconstruct historic ideologies, including worldview, are convincing only to the extent that they are supported by historic documents. Leone and Potter correctly critiqued Deetz for failing to demonstrate that his structural analysis represents an emic worldview. Lacking historic documentation of his construction of worldviews, Deetz cannot show that his categories and interpretations are not just modern structures of meaning imposed on the material data. In fact, other gendered meanings of white are supported in historic emic documents, as mentioned above. The more directly and completely an emic document expresses an archaeologist's construction of worldview, the more convincing that construction is. Thus Anderson and Moore's interpretation of classical revival styles as symbolizing egalitarian values in the early American republic is more convincing than Leone's less well documented argument that the Georgian naturalized overt status display. But in all cases historic documentation is essential to the credibility of any construction of worldview, which is then used to explain archaeological data. Thus, as in middle range theory, archaeological data contribute no information that is not available or interpretable from documents.

**Part I.** In the section introduction to chapters on Spanish settlements by South and Thomas, the functionalist shortcomings of these authors are considered mitigated by the provision of historical and theoretical context. The editors consider this context unusual, which it may be for South, but not for most processual historical archaeologists. South and Thomas both demonstrate that functionalism is not just concerned with universals as claimed in the volume introduction, but also with the particular cultural functions of artifacts in symbolizing socio-political position and ideological affiliation, very similar to the concerns of most authors in this volume.

South is concerned with validating a universalizing world systems energy efficiency model and does not provide the understanding of Spanish culture developed by Thomas. Thomas, while making more use of emic documents in constructing Spanish culture, does not critique their idealism, but emphasizes the extent to which archaeological data conform to Spanish ideals. The

importance of variations from these ideals is dismissed or explained with topographic constraints. Thomas just notes in passing that Spain did not control daily actions in the Florida settlements, and that the Spanish suppressed an Indian rebellion. But he fails to deal with problems in Spanish law. Thomas focused on the Spanish ideals of Indians into tax-paying citizens, overlooking the exploitation involved in requiring tribute from them. Neither Thomas nor South conveys an understanding of Indian cultures for their viewpoints.

The Introduction to Part II textually gives equal space to European and Native views but emphasizes the European view by starting and ending with it, totally surrounding the Native viewpoint unconsciously creating a textual metaphor of the European enclosure of Native communities in the U.S. The volume editors over-represent the extent to which Brenner's perspective is emic. She creates an etic Western interpretation of the function of European artifacts in shaping and expressing Indian social hierarchy. Brenner uses a prehistoric-type analysis of persistent associations among grave goods, and etic status and information flow models developed by prehistoric archaeologists. An etic archaeological construction of the past is supported by documented Indian behaviors. Brenner's etic approach is clear from the Western categorization of artifacts as either utilitarian or decorative. This leads to certainly non-emic classification of a bag containing infant bones as utilitarian (used for what?) instead of ideological. Similarly effigy pestles with animal heads are classified as utilitarian when they were none of women's greatest sources of power (manit), as recently demonstrated by Volmar's (1992) analysis of Algonquian historic legends and myths. Brenner does accomplish an interesting synthesis of oldfashioned hypothesis-testing positivism and symbolic structuralism. Brenner demonstrates that functional interpretations need not be opposed to symbolic meanings, as they are in the volume Introduction.

While Brenner analyzes the social functions of European material culture in Indian culture, focuses more on symbolic functions and showing how ideological and social functions of material culture were interrelated. In contrast to Brenner's analysis of Indian use of European goods for establishing social status, Crosby demonstrates that the Indian meaning of these goods was connected with spiritual power very different from the European meaning of status. Crosby presents a true emic understanding of Indian culture and worldview, which puts Indians' interest in status into a larger ideological context that isn't presented by Brenner. Crosby also gives an overview of Indian culture, including sexual division of labor, which is missing from Brenner. However, Crosby does not consider women's importance and power in Indian social stratification and ideology. The Indian power structure is implicitly male gendered with terms such as shaman, powwow, and chief. Volmar (1992:4) has recently pointed out that some "colonists and later scholars suggest that both men and women were spiritual leaders in Algonquian society. Other reports suggest that the most effective mediators with the spiritual realm were women." Crosby relies on otherwise excellent critical analysis of historical documents and linguistics much more than on excavated remains to construct an emic view of the use of European goods to promote individual spiritual power and status, bringing deeper historical context to Brenner's etic functional analysis.

Part III, the archaeology of Georgian Worldview claims that variation is the theme of this section, but the overriding argument is rather for a monolithic dominant ideology that not everyone could afford to fully express in the case of Leone, and that some people rejected, in the case of Palkovich. Georgian is still the only worldview analyzed, whether accepted or rejected. There is no analysis of alternative worldviews based on differences in material culture among classes or between urban and rural areas.

In the volume introduction Leone and Potter justifiably critique Deetz's structural analysis as ahistorical, universalizing, and not demonstrably emic. In fact, Deetz and Glassie are unconsciously representing mostly modern sexist and racist structural oppositions as a progressing development in worldview. House, ceramic and gravestone styles are described as evolving from chaotic, emotional, natural, colors, which are stereotypic adjectives for women and non-whites, to stereotypic adjectives for white men, including orderly, cultural, intellectual, white. It appears that Deetz is unconsciously reifying gender and racial stereotypes as universal bilateral structures of thought, mystified as worldview and embodied with material culture. This does not increase our understanding of the past. More convincing are the historically contextualized explanations of Anderson and Moore, Leone, or of Deetz himself in 1977 (p. 38) when he explained Georgian as the result of re-Anglicization of the colonies. This made sense in the context of the development of crown colonies and the Navigation Acts. Unfortunately Deetz inaccurately dismisses macro-economic factors involving changes in the relations of production, and improvements in production and distribution technologies, as particularistic explanations for the adoption of white marble (pp. 223-234), when they are in fact significant large scale factors facilitating the use of this stone throughout the United States. Similarly Deetz inaccurately dismisses the importance of mass production which was actually essential to produce individual white ceramic place settings at a reasonable cost, so they would be bought and discarded on site. Mass production was at least necessary for the material realization of the Georgian worldview, and may have contributed to the development of this ideology (Miller 1991). Deetz idealistically focuses on ideology as the single cause of culture change, when many factors were involved. It is impossible to claim ideology causes all other change. What causes ideology to change?

Leone makes the Marxian etic argument that the function of the dominant 18th century Georgian Worldview was to mask mercantile capitalist relations of inequality as natural. However, the naturalization of hierarchy should promote over material expression of wealth differences, as found by Anderson and Moore in the second half of the 19th century. In contrast, Leone found

evidence of the rapid spread of Georgian status items, including scientific instruments and matched sets of tableware, through virtually all social groups. This material equality is more congruent with Anderson and Moore's argument that the Georgian masked social stratification in an egalitarian ideology. Material culture expressed Enlightenment beliefs in the equality of men and a natural law permitting the perfectibility of society. Thus, the gardens of Annapolis elite, by replicating natural law, covertly symbolized leadership in promoting the natural equal rights of men in the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. Anderson and Moore argue convincingly that material expression of individual wealth differences was suppressed and minimized in the egalitarian rules for uniformly symmetrical, white houses. Further, it could be argued that matched sets of tableware materially expressed the ideology of equality through absolutely identical individual place settings.

It is interesting that the volume introduction critiques functionalism and structuralism for constructing the past in ahistorical universals, while at the same time Leone interprets material culture as expressing an expanded version of Deetz's ahistorical Georgian worldview. Leone does provide much more historical context than Deetz. However, after criticizing Deetz, Leone himself does not explain the reasons for the origin and demise of the Georgian worldview, as interpreted from style in material culture. Certainly natural science continued to develop as the Georgian was replaced by the federal. And in contrast to the section introduction's claim that Leone addresses variation in worldview between classes, Leone presents a monolithic Georgian worldview as the only and dominant ideology controlling all classes and materially expressed by them to varying degrees. Although Leone mentions the possibility of resistance, no alternative worldviews are considered. Leone admits not including slaves, the poor, and women in his analysis. Yet he further disfranchises these groups by discussing his research as if it represented all of Annapolis. Leone states that the Georgian worldview, simplistically represented in matched sets of tableware "was largely absorbed by 1830 and completely absorbed by 1860." (p. 247). Other possible meanings of matched sets are not considered. As Martin has noted, it is "almost as if the possession of matching tableware turned the worker into an automaton, as if the capitalist had won the struggle for ideological control as soon as he had persuaded his laborer to adopt good table manners." (Beaudry et. al. 1991:178, quoting Hall 1992:13). He dismisses as exceptions the free property-holding blacks who did not have matched sets. Leone does not qualify his discussion for conclusions as applying only to white males from the working class to the wealthy. Yet this will explain why he finds some evidence of the Georgian worldview "had spread deeply through all wealth groups [i.e. those that he analyzed] by 1775" (p. 245).

Little is one of the few authors who to some extent addresses the political use of the fragmentation of the discipline of history in naturalizing capitalism by alienating labor history from the history of technology (means of production), and the history of products. Little demonstrates more awareness than Leone of the social segments among which cultural patterns may vary including not only classes, but also between genders, and between urban and rural. Little also acknowledges inaccuracies in probate records more than does Leone, but has uncritically trusted the documentary information about the Greens. Further, Little only interprets the increasing standardization and segmentation of newspaper as evidence of an increasing Georgian, without analyzing the earlier worldview represented by non-standardized text, or other factors involved, such as technological developments and learning curve. While concluding that the meaning of vertical lines was ambiguous, Little does not consider possible systems of meaning outside of the Georgian worldview, such as the fact that the use of space between columns is more cost-effective than vertical lines, congruent with her point that horizontal lines involved less waste (i.e., were more efficient) than space. Also, Little does not discuss the ideological implications of Anne Catherine Green's being appointed state printer on the death of her husband. Why wasn't one of her sons appointed? This case strongly supports feminist historians who have found the Colonial women, especially widows, often operated public businesses, correcting previous histories that portrayed as universal fact the Victorian ideology identifying women as solely domestic and men as public. In contrast, the mixing of domestic and printing discards suggests a mixing of private and public which Little discussed in a paper on the Green printshop and household presented at the 1991 Society for Historical Archaeology meetings.

Little transforms the simple bilateral structure of Deetz's opposition between individualism and corporate ideologies into a continuum, and contrasts this with a modern etic model and language developed by Douglas, which she uses as a framework for categorizing historic social groups. Unfortunately, the language of this model needlessly obfuscates what Little is trying to say, and could say in simpler, more readily understood layman's terms. Why is individualism masked as grid? Such jargon makes simplistic overgeneralizations about social groups appear more objective, less readily accessible and therefore apparently more complex and sophisticated than they are. For instance, the contention that merchants, shop owners, and the government elite had few group restraints is stated as fact without evidence, although this is certainly debatable. The fact that Jonas Green's son Frederick's probate inventory included more Georgian luxury dining items indicates rather than more specialized etiquette rules and material culture were required to belong to the high status group (after Leone). It would be far clearer to talk about these groups as powerful, and the association of the Georgian worldview and material culture with powerful groups who usually had exclusionary rules that worked by requiring expensive material culture, which could not be afforded by individuals in less wealthy classes. Little's connection of the most powerful social group with the most Georgian material culture is more convincing than Leone's conclusion that the most Georgian material culture expressed insecurity on the part of parvenus.

Palkovich shows that Georgian architecture was required by law in Virginia. This is a much more compelling reason for the rapid spread of Georgian architecture than the unexplained voluntary adoption of a new worldview conveyed by Deetz and Leone. It is



unfortunate that this was not mentioned in the introduction to this section or the volume. Further, Palkovich should have pointed out that the legal requirement of Georgian structures shows that this style was imposed by the English colonial elite, which is congruent with the Georgian as an expression of re-Anglicization as England increased its control over the colonies. Palkovich speculates that in rural areas the construction of apparently Georgian structures that were actually asymmetrical was an act of subtle resistance to the law. This chapter could be considerably strengthened by establishing the reason for resistance. Was the German immigrant at this site a Colonial patriot, or was he maintaining an earlier ideology or method of construction that resulted in asymmetry? Or was the law simply less enforced in rural areas by officials who were less closely tied to England? Was accurate symmetry not important to this German immigrant, or were accurate measuring instruments not available? Palkovich notes the high rate of illiteracy, but doesn't consider the implication of some mathematical illiteracy that could result in asymmetry. Palkovich makes a mistake in disfranchising this individual of the possibility of idiosyncratic variation, which has cultural meaning in its existence along, as much as large scale changes in worldview. Less idiosyncratic variation in urban areas could well indicate stronger enforcement of the law and less liberty than in rural areas. In my research I have found similar slight asymmetry in elite structures built in rural Vermont villages in the 19th century. This suggests that while the appearance of symmetry was valued, actual symmetry was not.

**Part IV.** The introduction to the archaeology of the nineteenth century plantation slavery correctly points out the need to be aware of the political uses of language and categories used to analyze slavery. Unfortunately the editors demonstrate no awareness of the politics of their own dominant language, categories, and viewpoint. On p. 310 the editors fail entirely to point out the importance of Singleton's empowering view of slaves as active social agents shaping their own lives, and instead suggest "that allowing African cultural patterns to persist was a strategy employed by the white gentry to reconcile the glaring contradiction in the fact that men who owned other men wrote with conviction 'all men are created equal'" (emphasis added). In this statement the editors disfranchise slaves, portraying them as passive pawns of dominant white men. Further, this statement ignores normative histories that have established how whites justified slavery by considering slaves subhuman. The editors are apparently unaware that they are viewing slavery, as they did native Americans, from the viewpoint of the dominant white culture that controls "the other."

Orser's etic analysis of the spatial expression of power in the social relations of production demonstrates some of the archaeological insights to be gained from a Marxian historical materialism. Orser analyzes the relationships between degree of ownership of the means of production by African American tenant farmers, the size of their dwellings, and their greater freedom from supervision, reflected in increasing distance of tenant dwellings from the manager's residence, and closer location to the fields being worked. Orser's chapter is the first to discuss economic relationships as the basis for social power relations.

Singleton uses a feminist theoretical approach to advance beyond the focus on the dominant European ideology in most chapters in this volume. While not denying the historical dominance of Euro-Americans, Singleton rejects the frequent portrayal of slaves as passively dominated, and analyzes how they acted as social agents to shape their own lives and sometimes to influence Euro-American material culture. This suggests that acculturation occurred in both directions, as Euro-Americans assimilated some African lifeways, such as some food dishes prepared by slaves. Singleton is one of the few authors in this volume who demonstrates that archaeological data can contribute information beyond that available in documents. Archaeological data corrected inaccuracies in historical documents' descriptions of white control over slave life, including statements that slaves were not allowed either to own guns or to be taught to read and write. Besides outlining slave lifeways, Singleton deals with the complexities of variation in the construction of slave dwellings due to reform ideology, and different types of settlements following emancipation (not just freedmen who were materially poorer than slaves, as noted in the section introduction, but also a free settlement with much better economic and material conditions than slavery). Perhaps most importantly, Singleton connects freedom to increased idiosyncratic variation in material culture. This implicitly critiques and corrects the views of Leone, Potter, Deetz, Palkovich and others that idiosyncratic variation is meaningless, particularistic, non-data. Finally, Singleton discusses the significance of the archaeology of slavery for modern African American communities and museums.

**Part V.** Anderson and Moore's Marxian interpretation of Georgian style as symbolizing egalitarian ideology is the most convincing explanation in his volume because the origin of Georgian, Federal, Roman and Greek revivals is correctly identified as romanticizing classical egalitarian democratic republics that were emically viewed as models for American democracy. However, the origin and existence of Georgian in the early 18th century is not explained. Georgian arose out of the egalitarian philosophy of the Enlightenment, stimulated by classical discoveries and England's social contract. Typical of most historical archaeologists, Anderson and Moore analyze the Brown family's socio-economic status only in terms of Mr. Brown's occupations and income. The importance of Mrs. Brown's roles in social rituals necessary for maintaining high social position, such as Victorian dining and teas, are not considered (cf. Clements, 1993, Wall 1989). Anderson and Moore also misinterpret Bettie Brown's late 19th century shift to Catholicism and philanthropy as giving up on maintaining the appearance of great wealth in the face of family economic losses. In fact, philanthropy was fashionable for wealthy women. Bettie may have become more religious in dealing with the deaths of the rest of her family, a need for community, and/or for doing something more meaningful with her life than being a social butterfly. Further, reform women had transformed gender ideology, rejecting the capitalist ideal for the idle decorative woman as sinful, and instead creating an alternative religious ideal that accorded higher status to women who used their superior

morality to work at rectifying the inequalities produced by capitalism, particularly preventing the exploitation of women and children. Anderson and Moore are apparently unaware that the 19th century the authoritarian ideology valuing individual ambition, achievement, and personal statements of success was gendered as male capitalism, while the egalitarian ideology valuing voluntary obedience, cooperation, and suppression of statements of individuality was identified with the superior morality of women. Anderson and Moore also appear unaware of the gendered ideological significance of the gothic revival, which in the U.S. expressed the ascendancy in American social ideals of women's religious-domestic values over men's capitalistic values (Spencer-Wood 1991, 1993).

Paynter's model of the social relations of production offers valuable insights for production sites and the context of market availability of goods, although it does not explain consumer choices at the consumption sites predominately excavated by historical archaeologists. Happily, the introductory description of Paynter's chapter as replacing market models with the social relations of production was a simplistic portrayal of Paynter's analysis of pros and cons of idealist models, market models, and Marxian class models. However, Paynter makes an error in separating market models from capitalism. Market models assume capitalism, as has most classical economic theory, and the entire American culture, as Paynter notes. In fact, since the social relations of production are intimately related to market forces, Paynter incorporates the concept of economic markets into his model, while translating supply and demand into production and consumption. I do not agree with Paynter's claim that it is controversial to state that the U.S. society is capitalistic, although in the 20th century laissez-faire capitalism has been controlled to some extent by laws and some social overhead (the addition of programs such as welfare, Medicaid, social security). The insights Paynter offers stem from his consideration of negotiation of competing interests in industrial production between labor and capitalists and among capitalists. Thus Paynter is examining economic relationships underlying social relationships within the capitalist class and between the classes of capitalists and labor, who are also sometimes a major consumer market for their products. These economic relationships can productively be combined with market models to bring a new dimension of insight into consumer analysis that have tended to focus on material expressions of class affiliation and distinctions. It is unfortunate that Paynter only considers Marxian class analyses and does not seem to realize that consumer class analyses had been conducted in market frameworks (cf. Spencer-Wood 1987a). Further, Paynter does not point out that the struggle between capitalists and labor applies best to 19th century large scale industrial production and much less to rural manufacturing or mercantile capitalism in which capitalists are also often at least part of their own labor force. This model also only considers domestic sites as consumption sites, when they were also frequently production sites for both women and men either working for others or for themselves.

In this volume that mostly analyzes only dominant ideology McGuire's rejection of the controlling dominant ideology thesis is refreshing. His view that ideology is only part of culture and that cultural classifications of reality are always partial and vary among classes and ethnic groups is more sophisticated and useful than Deetz's belief in universal bilateral categories of thought. Similar to Anderson and Moore, Leone, Little and Palkovich, McGuire applies a Marxian framework that finds the function of dominant ideology is to mask social hierarchy either by naturalizing its material expression, or suppressing it with egalitarian ideology. McGuire's analysis of temporal changes in monuments erected by ethnic groups, while not informed by documentary data on ideological differences, reveals complexity in material culture patterning that is overlooked by most authors in this volume. McGuire's explication of his theoretical approach is useful in understanding not only his interpretations, but also the emphasis by other authors on the control of society by dominant ideology (Leone, Little, Palkovitch, Paynter, and Anderson and Moore). McGuire analyzes some changes in gender relations visible in gravestone inscriptions, but only relates patriarchal patterns to male ideology, apparently unaware of female gender ideology valorizing community, equality and morality, expressed in white and egalitarian stones; and stones with revival religious symbolism. While McGuire notes that originally the rural cemetery movement stipulated egalitarian memorials he does not relate this to emic ideology connecting God, nature, beauty, women, and morality. McGuire is unconsciously androcentric in portraying women as passively "given a new public roles" as consumers (presumably) by all-controlling dominant men). McGuire does not discuss how women were active social agents, developing ideologies of domestic reform that created acceptable "domestic" public professions for women, and brought women's moral-domestic values to the public sphere, including cemeteries and gravestones (Spencer-Wood 1987b, 1991, 1993). Most importantly, McGuire does not address how gravestone and cemetery styles express the fundamental struggle, negotiation and cultural mediation between the gendered ideologies of male capitalistic materialistic display and female moral egalitarianism that suppressed display.

In sum, this volume includes a mix of chapters that are interesting in many cases for their shortcomings and in some other cases for their insights about the past. However, the editors present only very partial constructions of the volume and its chapters. Very few authors overtly discuss the Marxian theory that shapes the interpretations in many chapters. The editors would have done better to overtly discuss their own Marxian and male Eurocentric orientations, rather than having their viewpoint leak out in an apparently objective presentation. This review would have been more positive if the editors had made more accurate claims for the chapters in this volume. This volume also testifies to the widespread lack of awareness that the cultural construction of gender is as fundamental to society and culture as class and ethnicity. Gender has been increasingly analyzed since the mid-1980s (cf. Handsman 1984; Spencer-Wood 1982), and especially in annual gender sessions at the meetings of the Society for Historical

Archaeology, the first of which I organized in 1989. Hopefully in the near future it will be as unacceptable to neglect gender as it already is to ignore class and ethnicity.

### References Cited

- Beaudry, Mary C., Lauren J. Cook, and Stephen A. Mrozowski  
1991 "Artifacts and Active Voices: Material Culture as Social Discourse," in *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by Randall M. McGuire and Robert Paynter, Basil and Blackwell, Limited, Oxford, pp. 150-191.
- Clements, Joyce  
1993 "The Cultural Creation of Gender: An Example from 19th Century Military Households at Fort Independence, Boston, in *Historical Archaeology*, in press.
- Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*,  
1987 edited by Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, Plenum Press, New York.
- Deetz, James  
1977 *In Small Things Forgotten*, Anchor Doubleday, Garden City.
- Hall, Martin  
1992 "'Small Things' and 'The Mobile, Conflictual Fusion of Power, Fear and Desire'", in *Material Culture, World View and Cultural Change*, edited by Mary C. Beaudry and Anne E. Yentsch, CRS, Boca Raton.
- Handsman, Russell G.  
1984 "Merchant Capital and the Historical Archaeology of Gender, Motherhood, and Child Raising," Paper for the Annual Meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology.  
  
1992 "Mohegan Women in the Last 100 Years," Paper presented at the Massachusetts Archaeological Society annual meeting, 24 October.
- Leone, Mark P., and Constance A. Crosby  
1987 "Epilogue: Middle-Range Theory in Historical Archaeology," in *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*, edited by Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, Plenum Press, New York, pp. 397-410.
- Miller, George L.,  
1991 "A Revised Set of CC Index Values for Classification and Economic Scaling of English Ceramics from 1871-1880," *Historical Archaeology*, 25(1): 1-25.
- Rothman, Sheila M.  
1978 *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present*, Basic Books, New York.
- South, Stanley  
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, Academic Press, New York.
- Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M.  
1982 "Preliminary Site Survey of 19th Century Material Feminist Movements in Cambridge and Boston," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology, Amherst, October 16-17.  
  
1987 "A Survey of Domestic Reform Movement Sites in Boston and Cambridge,



c. 1865-1905, *Historical Archaeology*, 21(2):7-36.

---

1989 "Culture and the Chaos Paradigm," Paper invited for the 1st joint Archaeological Congress, Baltimore, January 7.

---

1990 "Non-Linear Dynamics in Cultural Processes: Implications for Theories of Culture and Cultural Evolution," Paper Invited for the Conference on Dynamical Description and Human Systems, University of Cambridge, December 10-13.

---

1991 "Towards an Historical Archaeology of Domestic Reform," in *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by Randall M. McGuire and Robert Paynter, Basil and Blackwell, Limited, Oxford.

---

1993 "A Feminist Approach in Historical Archaeology: 19th Century Domestic Reform," in *Historical Archaeology and the Study of American Culture: Proceedings of the 1991 Winterthur Conference*, Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, in press.

Volmar, Michael A.

1992 "Effigy Pestles from Massachusetts," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, October 24, in press.

Wall, Diana DiZerega

1989 "The Ritualization of Family Dinner in New York City," Paper presented in the symposium "Making Women Visible through Historical Archaeology," paper presented at the 1989 Conference of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Baltimore, January 8.

## VII. Activities of Various Academic Gatherings Related to the History of Archaeology

Dr. Bruce G. Trigger delivered a paper to the Society for Antiquaries of Scotland in Edinburgh in November 1992 titled "Daniel Wilson and the Scottish Enlightenment". The paper is scheduled to be published in a future issue of the Society's *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*. Below is an abstract of his paper:

The career of Daniel Wilson (1816-1892), the English-speaking world's first scientific archaeologist, embraced two continents and drew on his other skills as an artist, antiquarian, anthropologist, and university teacher. While Wilson's approach to archaeology was based on the work of the Scandinavian archaeologists Christian and Jens Worsaae, his understanding of human behaviour was shaped by the popular culture of early nineteenth-century Edinburgh, especially the thinking of Scottish primitivists and common sense philosophers and the romanticism of Sir Walter Scott. Like eighteenth-century Enlightenment philosophers, Wilson believed in cultural evolution but retained a creationist view of human origins and regarded human evolution, but his refusal to adopt an evolutionary view of the origin of the human mind led him to reject the racism that was introduced into studies of cultural evolution by Darwinians such as John Lubbock. By advocating the integration of aboriginal peoples into what he hoped would become a multiracial society in North America, Wilson continued to champion the concepts of the Enlightenment at a time when such ideals had become unfashionable.

On 16 April 1993 The Society for American Archaeology's Committee on the History of Archaeology held its symposium "Archaeology in Museums: Dynamic Interactions and Mutual Constraints." The symposium was chaired by Ms. Elin Danien (University of Pennsylvania) and Ms. Eleanor King (University of Pennsylvania). An abstract of the symposium is below:

The history of archaeology has long been intertwined with that of museums. As the cabinet of curios displaying archaeological artifacts gave way to the larger, more formalized institution we know today, archaeology found an operational home. Museums provided a professional habitat and material resources to archaeologists, who in turn generated fresh collections of ancient items for their sponsors. They also fired public imagination with tales of their exploits, thereby helping to fill museum coffers. The symposium will explore this symbiotic relationship and its lasting impact on the development of both the discipline and the harboring institution. Individual papers will examine different facets of their complex association to create a dynamic, diachronic picture of a still-evolving interaction.