

Northeast Historical Archaeology

Volume 29

Article 1

2000

Editor's Introduction

Mary C. Beaudry

Follow this and additional works at: <http://orb.binghamton.edu/neha>

 Part of the [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Beaudry, Mary C. (2000) "Editor's Introduction," *Northeast Historical Archaeology*: Vol. 29 29, Article 1.
<https://doi.org/10.22191/neha/vol29/iss1/1> Available at: <http://orb.binghamton.edu/neha/vol29/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). It has been accepted for inclusion in Northeast Historical Archaeology by an authorized editor of The Open Repository @ Binghamton (The ORB). For more information, please contact ORB@binghamton.edu.

Editor's Introduction

Editor's Introduction

As you can see from the masthead of this volume, I relinquished the editorship of the journal to David Landon in mid-stream, as it were. He has put in a near super-human effort to bring it to its final form. It is inevitable that a new editor will end up with quite a few loose ends and various "works in progress" during the transition phase. But I think David is as proud and happy as I am to have both our names attached to this volume of the journal.

Every historical archaeologist will be delighted to have ready access to George Miller's famous but until now *sub rosa* TPQ List. In this issue George introduces his list of manufacture dates of all sorts of material culture, something he has been compiling throughout his professional career, with a discussion of why archaeologists need to attend to dating artifacts as accurately as possible in order to delineate the life histories of their sites, among other things. He has added to his list contributions by his colleagues that help refine dates for decoration of commonly recovered types of ceramics. I know that the information in "Telling Time for Archaeologists" will prove invaluable, and the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology hopes to promulgate the TPQ List widely and, we hope, in easy-to-consult formats beyond its initial publication here.

There has been a great deal of ink spilled of late on 19th-century farms (more coming in the next volume of this journal, in fact), and we know from a variety of publications about farms on the 17th-century Chesapeake frontier. Eighteenth-century farms are another matter altogether, however, so it is a pleasure to include here John Bedell and Gerald Scharfenberger's essay on 18th-century farms in Delaware. They have taken the results of excavations at three Delaware sites and compared them with other 18th-century farm sites in the mid-Atlantic to address what some have taken for a truism, the shift to "Georgian" values in the 18th-century American colonies. Those who have written about the Georgianization of America have insisted it was a sweeping and all-inclusive phenomenon, affecting all aspects of life, material and ideo-

logical. But here we learn that middling and poor farmers in Delaware, far from being swept up in a massive change of "mindset," adopted both the artifacts and ideas of the new order selectively and idiosyncratically.

Wendy Harris and Arnold Pickman's fascinating overview of the Hudson River ice-harvesting industry presents readers with a challenge—to examine the physical remains of an industry whose products and by-products are never preserved archaeologically—as well as a way of conceptualizing and addressing the challenge. They show how study of the remains of the ice industry can shed light not just on technology but also on workplace issues, transport, and changing attitudes towards riverine landscapes, their interpretation, and their preservation.

We all have an image of what Shakers and the Shaker lifestyle was all about, but David Starbuck has turned up evidence to dispel yet another myth about the Shakers. Here he discusses early findings from two blacksmith shops at Canterbury Shaker Village in New Hampshire. One of the shops had a sideline producing clay tobacco pipes, the other soapstone grave markers. It turns out that early Shakers of both sexes were enthusiastic smokers and even after use of tobacco was banned at Canterbury, production of stub-stemmed pipes continued, so it must have been profitable. Starbuck notes that the two smithies were so different from one another that it would be unwise to consider there was any prescribed manner of building and running a blacksmith shop even among the Families at Canterbury, so each site needs to be given individual attention as the contexts and finds can vary dramatically.

James Gibb and April Biesaw's article on the archaeology of schoolhouses presents an overview of work at such sites and proposes a coherent approach to the archaeology of educational institutions that is based in contemporary ideas about educational practice. Their essay is an important contribution to the burgeoning literature and interest in the archaeology of institutions (cf. the two recent thematic issues of the *International Journal of*

Historical Archaeology edited by Sherene Baugher and Suzanne Spencer-Wood).

The journal closes with an insightful review essay by Edward Bell of two recent handbooks for cultural resource managers followed by a lively and substantive book review section. I cannot help but point out that while many of the books reviewed are aimed at people who work in CRM, the line between CRM and academic archaeology (if the latter can be said to exist in anything like a "pure" form) is thoroughly and utterly appropriately blurred in all of the articles that appear in this volume.

Mary C. Beaudry, Outgoing Editor