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COMMENT ON
"SOME THOUGHTS ON THEORY AND METHOD IN HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY"
BY CLYDE DOLLAR

Stanley South
The North Carolina Department of Archives and History

In this paper the view is presented that the use of typology and seriation is not able "to produce totally distortion free information when tested at an historical site." (1) I do not think that the seriation technique has been thought to be totally distortion free on any type of site, Indian or historical. The fact that the seriation technique is not totally distortion free, however, has not prevented impressive results being obtained by use of this technique in Indian site surveys. (2) As to its use on historical sites, it is possible that under certain circumstances, carefully controlled data could produce information of value on historical sites, though I know of no specific instances where this has been tried with sufficiently controlled data. (3)

Dollar's Reply: (1) Misstated and quoted out of context. This misinterpretation can be corrected by a careful reading of Thesis #2 - especially the first paragraph. I quote from a portion of this:
"... seriation processes...have not as yet been proven to produce totally non-distorted historical data and therefore must not be used in the construction of historical hypotheses..."

There follows one qualification to the above quoted statement. Note that typological processes are not included within the framework of the sentence. For purposes of clarification in this Reply, I have underlined what I consider to be the key to the understanding of the quoted statement (i.e. the word "proven").

(2) How can such results on any site be 'impressive' if they cannot be verified?

(3) Stan looks at the literature of the profession in a somewhat different light than I. In my opinion, a list of such "instances" would be quite long, if not too impressive.

South's Rejoinder: The fulcrum point of difference here lies in our definition of the word "seriation"; I see this as a tool useful within narrowly qualifying criteria; Clyde's is apparently a much broader use.
I would not like to see a blanket rejection of the seriation technique as applicable to historic sites until it had definitely been proved invalid through trial. (4) Throughout this paper I get the feeling that the word "seriation" is used to apply to attempts to arrive at temporal date from typological patterns without the limiting criteria for use of the seriation studies that must be applied to produce valid data from the technique. (5) In fact, the buttons from Fort Smith were said to have been "typed and analyzed serially in several different ways, and the results of this seriation showed pronounced and unmistakable evidence sufficient to suggest that the greatest inhabitation concentration at this site occurred three years prior to the fort's having been built!" This statement clearly points to a misuse of the seriation technique, since the technique is designed to be used with data distributed over a number of sites under specifically qualified conditions (such as a site survey within a river basin). (6) Significantly the definition of "seriation" as presented in this paper omits reference to the fact that seriation data is areal in nature. (7) Another point to be made here would be that using the seriation technique in a valid manner (i.e. utilizing the limiting criteria of its design), and coming

Dollar's Reply: (4) The work with the buttons of the First Fort Smith produced information that was obviously invalid when compared to the known documented history of the site (see my reply to Moore, section No. 8). While this does not constitute grounds for a "blanket rejection" of all seriation techniques at historical sites (nor do I advocate as such), the situation does raise the question of the validity of results obtained by such means at other sites. It also suggests that the proof of the validity of results derived statistically lies with the researcher and must not be considered an inherent characteristic of the technique being used. (5) Both 'typology' and 'seriation'—as I have used these terms in the "Thoughts" paper—are defined within the text of that paper. Any criticism of these terms, therefore, should be based on their definition, not just on a 'feeling.' (6) The seriation techniques were not 'misused' at the First Fort Site—not even by the criteria contained in the second part of Stan's sentence. (7) The areal nature of the seriation technique is inherent and therefore not necessarily in need of specific definition.
within three years of the known date, would be quite acceptable for the
technique. (8) Of course one would not use such a technique designed to
arrive at broad generalities for the determination of specific historic dates.
The implication in this paper is that such mis-use of the seriation technique
has been extensively used by historical archaeologists. (9) Impressive
percentage relationship studies have been made with historical site materials,
however, and valuable data recovered; these should not be referred to as
"seriation" studies. (10)

There are a number of points made in this paper with which I would
certainly agree. The duo-disciplinary (or multi-disciplinary) nature of
historical archaeology; archaeological data as a statistical sample of a
statistical sample; the subjective nature of the data recovered; the greater
significance of the variant through more intense encounters with individuals
as a characteristic of historical sites; the concern with specifics in
historical archaeology, resulting in a decrease in reliance on some tools
designed to produce generalized data; the greater reliance on written
references for specific temporal determination of sites and artifacts; the
importance of horizontal position of artifact types on historical sites as
significant in interpretive value, are all points obvious to the historical

Dollar's Reply: (8) This statement by Stan is based on a misreading
of my text. The error at the First Fort Smith was in fact a bit more than
seventy (70) years, and for a site only 140 years old, this plus/minus
factor is quite considerable indeed!

(9) Prudence prevents me from attaching a biblio-
graphy of such uses of "seriation.

(10) Percentage relationship studies are indeed in-
cluded in my definition of 'seriation', and I again raise the question of
just how "impressive" can such results be when they cannot be (or have not
been) proven to be totally distortion free.
This paper points out the generalizing nature of archaeological techniques as used by anthropologically trained individuals, and emphasizes that these techniques alone will not produce the specific data desired in the interpretation of historical sites. This is true, however, any archaeologist whatever his background, would surely utilize the specific historical data available to him in his interpretation of his archaeological materials, without a total reliance on the generalizing data accumulation techniques. (12) The critics of the anthropologically trained archaeologist frequently speak as though such archaeologists totally ignore specific historical data at their command, when to do so would, indeed, be the extremely short-sighted approach to historical sites. Such ignoring of specific historical data in total reliance on generalizing data collecting techniques, should indeed, be criticized, but how many historical archaeologists act in such a totally insular manner? This is not a matter of either/or; the point is, where the generalizing techniques functionally serve in the absence of historic references, then they can very well produce useful data; where historic references are available as to the site and the artifacts, then of course, these become a primary tool for temporal

Dollar's Reply: (11) I am glad that Stan recognizes these points as obvious; however, even the briefest glance at some of the other critiques contained in this dialogue should be sufficient proof that such points are by no means universally recognized as 'obvious'.

(12) I only wish that Stan's statement were true! Again, prudence...
placement of the site and the artifacts. (13) The element of common sense is a significant one in the excavation of historical sites; where history serves, use it; where a more generalized tool is called for, use it; where historical references pinpoint the artifact utilize this information; where references are absent utilize provenience, context, stratigraphy, horizontal position and any other technique that has proved or may prove to be a valid approach in the recovery and understanding of the data. (14)

It does not seem wise, therefore, to reject categorically the generalizing techniques to the extreme reliance on history, for too often historical documents do not answer the kinds of questions we are asking on historical sites, or they are absent entirely. (15) In such cases archaeology must be called upon to supply both the general and whatever specific interpretations.

Dollar's Reply: (13) I agree. Unfortunately, the danger all too frequently encountered (and not recognized) is that the generalized information too easily becomes the basis for hypotheses revolving around historical explicitness. This is one reason why I wrote the "Thoughts" paper.

(14) I am torn between answering with a resounding NO! or a qualified yes. I have the initial impression that Stan is advocating a policy of report writing wherein the end product justifies the means of obtaining it, and yet, I know Stan's work to be above this approach. Rather than go into a detailed discussion of Stan's statement, I will instead make one of my own: use any method possible to obtain information about an historical site and its occupants - but use this data very carefully and very explicitly. In other words, if this data can be measured against the standards of accuracy for use as historical data then use it as such. If it cannot, then explicitly say so.

(15) The first part of this sentence is an overstatement; the second part is only too painfully true.
that come from the site. I am thinking specifically of John Goggin’s study on the Spanish Olive Jar, and similar studies that use both the generalizing techniques of anthropological archaeology and the specific knowledge of history to recover data of value in the study of the evolution of ceramic forms over a period of three centuries during the historic period. Goggin’s study is an excellent example of the anthropological combined with the historical approach to archaeological data of the historic period, and although refinement of his interpretation will continue to take place as more information becomes available, his work stands as a valid monument of the study of material culture. I cannot see that the approach used by Goggin is invalid for use on historical sites because of its anthropological orientation! (16)

In thesis #1 the large number of nail manufacturing factories and ceramic factories of the early nineteenth century are seen as producing a confusing picture. For someone not familiar with the means of handling large numbers of artifact forms from archaeological contexts in order to derive the generalized data therefrom, this might indeed present a confusing picture. If Indian site archaeologists treated each pot as his working unit,


Dollar’s Reply: I am not familiar with Goggin’s treatise on Spanish Olive Jars and will therefore reserve comment on it until I have read the work. However excellent it might be as an "anthropological combined with the historical approach to archaeological data", it might still be an exercise in futility when it comes to using this data for specific dating problems found on historical sites. The historian, as well as the anthropologist, recognizes both the existence and importance of broad generalized trends in material (and other) culture. It is when these two specialist descend from the general to the specific planes and begin applying their knowledge to specific problems (of dating or what have you) that the credibility gap between what each will accept as evidence begins to show most. We dare not – at this stage in our historical archaeology research – use locomotive tools to take apart a watch!
they too, would be faced with a phenomenon difficult to handle and interpret. Although each of his pots may have been made by a different Indian, he treats them as types and forms and in this manner derives valid data as to their evolution. (17) The products of a large number of factories in England between 1820 and 1850 would be similar enough so that statements as to the evolution of the ceramic types and forms being made by them could be made. (18) If the historic data indicate that a particular variation as determined by a specific mode was manufactured by a certain factory, then the archaeologist would surely use this information. If this information is not known by him, however, he still can derive certain clues of significant value as to the temporal position of the site and the artifacts through a study of the evolution of forms through time. (19) True, this would not allow him to pinpoint the site to within three years of its date of occupation, but would allow him to arrive at a generalized period involved. (20) It is obvious that to ignore the historically known data which would allow specific dating of a site through artifacts for the sake of generalized techniques would be a mistake.

Dollar's Reply: (17) While this sounds good, and is a basic tenet of prehistoric archaeology, it has never been proven in an historical usage sense.

(18) Evolution in English ceramics made between 1820 and 1850 is detectable only on such a broad and generalized scale as to be unreliable (I am tempted to say worthless) for any dating of historic site artifacts (other, of course, than to "the 19th century"). I am writing these words in July of 1968; it is my hope that additional research into the field of such ceramics will bring about detectable and usable temporal characteristics. Until such time as this work can be done - with enough historical accuracy to be historically usable - I cannot consider ceramics as reliable specific dating tools.

(19) I ask Stan for proof of this statement.

(20) What happens when the information thus derived must be accurate to within three years if it is to be usable at an historic site?
In Thesis #2, typology is said to be "a grouping of artifacts based on similar or like observable physical characteristics," with historical validity not being a consideration. In the creation of the artifact type, historical validity is not a consideration, but in the concept is the assumption that there must be some valid correlation between archaeological types and those created by the manufacturers of the objects; and that types represent only an archaeologist's selection from a continuum. (21) Therefore, mottled-gazed creamware can be seen to fit the continuum from the 1760's through the 1770's as far as its appearance in matrix is concerned. It will not be found on sites of the 1740's or likely seen on sites of the 1790's, not fitting the continuum in quantity other than at a particular temporal range. (22) Historical evidence, of course, is utilized along with the archaeological data to establish this fact, providing the unique challenge of historical archaeology; the correlation between historical data and archaeological data to produce information of feedback value in the excavation of other sites, and in the interpretation of the site and material being studied.

Dollar's Reply: (21) I would want a definition of the terms "valid correlation" before I would accept this statement at face value. There is a correlation, of course, but not of the same type, or perhaps even intensity, as that assumed as a correlation between prehistoric artifacts and prehistoric manufacturers. Here is an area in need of further exploration. (22) While Stan is no doubt referring to an hypothetical situation, I would nevertheless still express doubts as to the universality of such a situation.
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Thesis #4 states that "the finding of a certain type of style of artifact at an historical site is not valid historical proof that that certain type or style of artifact's dates of manufacture have any relationship to the site in question." It seems to me that if an artifact is found on a site it most definitely has a connection to the site in relation to its date of manufacture. (23) It may be a bottle cap, a hub-cap, a mass of nineteenth century artifacts, or a single fragment of mottled-glazed creamware, but its date of manufacture does have a relationship to the site in question. All such artifacts have a relationship to the site, whether dropped by an Indian, a colonist, a Civil War soldier, or by the archaeologist. How did it get on the site? Why was it in a particular provenience? Was its presence the result of individual, or group activity? Was it out of context relative to its date of manufacture, and the dates of manufacture of the objects found associated with it? These and other questions would tend to indicate that any object found on a site is in a definite relation to that site. Such an archaeological context in relation to the site is not, of course, "historical proof"; but are archaeologists required to submit to the fact of "historical proof" to interpret an artifact's significance in relation to the site on which it is found? Of course he utilizes such

Dollar's Reply: (23) I am not talking about a specific artifact's dates of manufacture as having no relation to the site (of course it does!). If Stan would read a bit more carefully the phrase which he has quoted from the "Thoughts" paper, he would discover that I am talking about dates of manufacture of a type or style of an artifact having no relationship to the site at which a specific artifact of that type or style has been found. In other words (using an hypothetical case with mythical designations and dates). Ceramic Type XYZ was manufactured from 1782-1896; does the finding of a piece (or pieces) of Ceramic Type XYZ at a site date that site to the period of 1782-1896? I think not, and before anybody makes the rejoinder that such a proposition is self-evidently incorrect, I would advise that the literature of the profession be skanned to see how many times this error has already been committed!
proof if it can be found in historical references, but should we require that archaeological data furnish "historical proof"? (24)

Thesis #5 describes "provenience" as a period of time. My understanding of provenience is that it refers to the origin or source of a particular artifact or group of artifacts within the matrix of the site (25). The provenience relationships might represent temporal relationships, but not necessarily so; the determination of temporal data relative to artifact proveniences seems to me to be an important aspect of interpretation of an historical site, and to re-define provenience as "a period of time during which any significant cultural expression can be discerned", would seem to be clouding the issue. Obviously, a site that was occupied until the time the archaeologist began his work would have a long span of cultural materials accumulated on it. But should we re-define provenience to refer to that entire time span? The use of careful methodology designed not only to fix the position of artifacts in their vertical position, but to fix them within their matrix or horizontal provenience, can provide data for the separation of these objects in time and space. It is on this point that some archaeologists become bogged down in the excavation and interpretation of data from historic sites. They become involved with the pinpointing of an object within one inch of its vertical and horizontal position in the plowed soil or a mixed soil zone, which may prove impressive to students as a demonstration, but can seldom be demonstrated to have significance.

Dollar's Reply: (24) Yes!

(25) The word "provenience" can also be used to refer to an event, or a chain of events, that occurred at a site in relation to the total historical 'temporal matrix' (if you will) of the site.
commensurate with the effort put into such pedantic exercises relative to the interpretation of an historic site. It is the artifact types in matrix within a dated ruin level that are of significance, not only for the ruin being excavated, but for comparison with artifact complexes from ruins excavated at a later time. It is this process with which the archaeologist on historic sites concerns himself as far as his methodology is concerned. The process is not the goal, but merely a means whereby the understanding of archaeological remains is more successfully accomplished toward the end of interpretation of the broader events and processes of history and culture relating to the site, thereby increasing our knowledge.

The concern with changing forms in time and space through archaeological methods woven with the specific information of history, is a major challenge to historical archaeology at this particular time. Through the recovery of artifacts in matrix within dated sites we have contextual relationships between artifact types representing a span of time, the boundaries of which can be relatively assigned through comparative archaeology and historical research. (26)

When enough controlled site excavations with closed dates have been studied, and the data therefrom fed into the general pool of knowledge of those active in the field of historical archaeology, the fixing of occupation dates of historical ruins can be more easily accomplished through archaeology than is possible in these dawning days of historical archaeology. In years to come, through this approach to historic site artifacts; this combination

Dollar's Reply: (26) The data thus derived will be date of deposition data, and not necessarily either date of manufacturing or use period data.
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of archaeological with historical data; archaeologists will be able to utilize glass beads to fix the date of a site, they will be able to narrow the temporal range for ceramic groupings in context more accurately than we are now able to do, they will utilize bottles, glass seals, buttons, kaolin pipes, and other objects more effectively than is now the case; and this information will come through this process of combining archaeological and historical methods toward a fixing of artifact forms in time and space. (27)

Thesis #6 states that "It seems to be an almost universal characteristic of historical sites that the artifact assemblage is a thorough mixture of historical and alter period artifacts." (28) Part of the challenge of a particular historical site is the discovery of depth deposits where layering has occurred through deposition on that site. Of course when the site is shallow throughout, such as short occupation nineteenth century fort sites might be, then attempts "by the researcher to make use of the depth of artifacts in order to arrive at relative dating usually dissolves into utter chaos." Who would try to stratigraphically study a shallow mixed nineteenth century stratum? Generalizations based on experience with such shallow sites as to the value of stratigraphy on historic sites generally would seem to be a mistake, for many historic sites yield stratigraphy and superposition, both of considerable value in the interpretation of the site.

Dollar's Reply: (27) I agree, and can only look forward with expectation to that day! Right now, however, we are faced with the possibility of too many premature conclusions being jumped to (1) and this information then being used as part of the basic information for any 'feedback' which in turn will then be used to fix artifact forms "in time and space". (28) The question to be considered here is not why should this mixing not occur but rather did it occur.
and the temporal relationship of the artifacts found within it. (29)

Thesis #7 revolves on the word "specific", and makes the point that archaeological sites do not produce specific historic dates for the occupation of the site. Since the pivot of understanding for this statement hinges on "specific dates for a site," then the truth of this statement is obvious, since it is seldom that archaeology can be called upon to independently pinpoint calendar dates for a site. Who expects archaeology to independently supply specific historical dates? (30)

Thesis #8 emphasizes the reconstructive aspect of historical archaeology, and I assume by this that interpretive reconstruction through drawings, sketches, etc. would be within this definition. I seriously doubt, however, whether many archaeologists would be able to construct drawings that would be acceptable by an architect who was charged in restoration of an historic structure. His work would surely be utilized by the restoration architect, but restoration architecture is such a specialized area it would appear unwise for the archaeologist to attempt to make literal reconstruction drawings for the architect. This thesis also states that in this reconstructive aspect the historical archaeologist takes on a far weightier responsi-

Dollar's Reply: (29) The study of shallow and mixed nineteenth century sites, contrary to Stan's opinion, is an excellent testing ground for the generalization represented in Thesis #6. Consider this proposition: if nineteenth century, when excavated today (in the twentieth century) appear to be a thorough mixture of the artifacts, how would these mixed strata appear if they were left undisturbed (after deposition) and not excavated until the twenty-second century? Now apply this answer to seventeenth century sites not excavated until the twentieth century.

(30) I do, for one, if the archaeological data is to be used as specific historical data. Obviously, there are times when this is not possible, but this situation does not negate Thesis #7. For a discussion of my use of the word "specific" in the "Thoughts" paper, see my reply to Jelks, section #6.
bility than the anthropologist who excavates a prehistoric site, implying therein, I suppose, that there is a greater element of reconstruction involved in historical archaeology than in Indian site archaeology.

However, reconstruction of Indian sites throughout the Southeast is being done in the form of dioramas, paintings, models, physical reconstructions, such as the earthlodge at Ocmulgee National Monument in Macon, Georgia, and the ceremonial center at Town Creek Indian Mound State Historic Site in North Carolina (where archaeology for the purpose of interpretive reconstruction as well as literal reconstruction, has been going on since 1937). On such projects there is a strong element of reconstruction involved, and since this type of interpretation is an integral part of the work of these anthropologists, we cannot properly claim that in the reconstructive element the historical archaeologist has a more encompassing responsibility. The reconstructive aspect is a function of archaeology, not historical archaeology alone. (31)

Dollar's Reply: (31) I agree that a reconstructive aspect is a function of archaeology, and not historical archaeology alone. However, and the Ocmulgee and Town Creek Indian Mound sites notwithstanding, the percentage of structured sites that fall under the heading of historical archaeology is vastly greater than those that can be called prehistoric. This situation alone should be sufficient justification for Thesis #8. As for the discussion in the "Thoughts" paper of the relationship between the archaeological report and the architect's use of it, I was describing the ideal conditions (and I specifically stated so in the "Thoughts" paper). Stan knows, as I do and many others, that these 'ideal' conditions are more often than not less than ideal, but this does not let us out from under the responsibility of making the most of what we have to work with. The restoration architect's use of the archaeological report will be limited by at least two factors: 1), the amount of architectural data recovered during the research, and 2), the historical archaeologist's ability to translate his architectural findings into architectural terms. Thesis #8 was certainly not meant to imply that the historical archaeologist must also be an architect (although this would be a definite asset!) in the sense that he draws the final plans for any reconstruction (as for my own ability in this aspect of reconstruction, it would take a great deal of persuasion, perhaps even pushing, to get me to enter any building for which I alone drew the plans!). However, be that as it may, the significant point of Thesis #8 is that the historical archaeologist must be the one to supply the architect with the facts of the situation (both archaeological and historical) and then the architect adds enough of the architectural 'unknowns' to allow the building to safely stand.
Summary

In this paper on theory and method in historical archaeology, archaeology was seen as a field technique only. As a field technique archaeology can be carried out by the anthropologist, the historian, or the classicist, or the interested layman. Walter Taylor is referring to this when he says:

There are also competent archaeologists who have had no specialized academic training, even no "higher" education at all. And these are often among the most capable. While it is probably true that the man with the broadest background of specialized training will obtain the better information, yet it is often the case that the non-academic "field man" with broad practical experience and less formal training will produce the better data. *

Notice that he qualifies his statement with "broad practical experience". There are a number of examples of this type of craftsman who have made contributions to the field of archaeology. However, I would agree also with Willey and Phillips who said:

Acceptable field work can perhaps be done in a theoretical vacuum, but integration and interpretation without theory are inconceivable.***

It is here that even the most experienced field man with a lack of formal training will most often fail to obtain the better information from his data. I would disagree, therefore, with the statement that archaeology is a "field technique only". I would say, perhaps, that archaeology is a field technique only. There are field technicians and field technicians, some can interpret their data effectively and some cannot. Those with a

theoretical base underlying their knowledge of technique are archaeologists who can interpret their data most effectively; those without theory are practicing the ritual of archaeology as a field technique. Historical archaeology theory must be a fabric with a warp of sound common-sense archaeology woven with the woof of history.

This paper has pointed out certain generalized approaches that are not seen as valid when applied to historic sites, and has concentrated on other aspects traditionally associated with anthropology. As has been indicated, there are many points with which I agree, and these have been listed. Other points, however, have seemed to be over-stated, based on an apparent lack of understanding of the anthropological theory involved, or on a lack of experience with a wide variety of sites of the historic period. The impression is almost one that exists when an individual not thoroughly familiar with the Bible attempts to refute the theologians. This comparison however, could be said to be invalid in that what it does is to criticize the author of the paper for not being an anthropologist, and this would be an invalid argument. However, the author may have been able to more successfully challenge certain anthropological concepts as applied to historical archaeology if he were able to demonstrate a greater familiarity with the concepts he has undertaken to criticize. It also appears that a wider background and experience with historical sites might have allowed the presentation of more generalized theoretical statements that would have appeared stronger in their broader

Dollar's Reply: (32) Thank you.
applicability. As it stands, however, the paper is an interesting statement of ideas, many that are basic to historical archaeology, and would be little disputed by historical archaeologists, regardless of their background; others however, are as the author has said, "Some Thoughts", and these will stimulate other thoughts from colleagues. (33)

It seems to me that the archaeologist is concerned with the recovery of his data under controlled conditions from the matrix of the site he is investigating, arranging the data through typology and taxonomy relative to existing contextual relationships, and determining their dimensions and relationships in time and space. The historical archaeologist utilizes historical reference sources in this search for clues to the understanding and interpretation of patterned human behavior, as well as idiosyncratic behavior as reflected in the artifacts and other cultural remains of the communities and individuals he is studying. The historical archaeologist is concerned with the process that is history, "a temporal sequence of unique events, [and] with the process that is evolution, a temporal sequence of forms... [History] deals with phenomena as unique events, with reference to specific time and place; [evolution]...deals with classes of phenomena without regard to specific time and place. The one particularizes, the other generalizes."

Dollar's Reply: (33) How "...little (these ideas are) disputed by historical archaeologists, regardless of their background..." will no doubt come as a surprise to Stan.

As archaeologists, it seems to me that we are concerned with the identification and interpretation of data reflecting patterned human behavior. As historical archaeologists we utilize historical data, and in so doing we can often deal with the unique events of history as well as the generalized cultural patterns. We should not, however, discard all the tools designed for obtaining generalized data merely because some of these may not apply when dealing with specific historical sites; nor should we fail to utilize the wealth of specific historical data that is available to correlate with archaeological discoveries. We should, rather, utilize any approach that will allow us to add to our knowledge in the most effective manner; through the many faceted discipline of historical archaeology.

The concern with artifact types and forms as a means to an end is for the purpose of arriving at interpretations more accurately reflecting the developmental sequence that occurred on the sites we are investigating; and the pivot of this understanding lies in the determination of contextual relationships in time and space.

Archaeology as a technique can be practiced by craftsmen from a variety of backgrounds, but the interpretation of the data so recovered must be based on a firm theoretical base. The fabric of this base must be woven utilizing those concepts and methods that are found useful in answering the questions historical archaeologists are asking, regardless of the origin within a professional discipline of these concepts and methods. Useful concepts, methods and tools from Classical archaeology, architecture, physics, chemistry, biology, zoology, anthropology and history should be
utilized as they are found to prove helpful in our search for knowledge through historical archaeology. Any one approach must not be over-emphasized at the expense of warping our understanding of our archaeological data in our expositions on method and theory in historical archaeology. (34)*

Dollar's Reply: (34) In the above four paragraphs, Stan has written an excellent statement on historical archaeology, and his thoughts are deserving of much serious study. In my opinion, Stanley South, in his Critique of the "Thoughts" paper, has added considerable depth to the professional discussions on the subject of theory and method in historical archaeology, and our entire profession should be indebted to him for his interest, energy, and time expended in getting these discussions underway.

* In order to avoid being influenced by the other critiques this paper was written in December 1967, with the final draft completed January 15, 1968, and submitted to Clyde for rejoinder before any other critiques were received by the Forum chairman.