

2001

Introduction: The Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads in Northeastern Canada and the United States

Sherene Baugher

Terry H. Klein

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



Part of the [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baugher, Sherene and Klein, Terry H. (2001) "Introduction: The Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads in Northeastern Canada and the United States," *Northeast Historical Archaeology*: Vol. 30-31 31, Article 1.
<https://doi.org/10.22191/neha/vol31/iss1/1> Available at: <http://orb.binghamton.edu/neha/vol31/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.

Introduction: The Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads in Northeastern Canada and the United States

Cover Page Footnote

We would like to thank everyone who participated in the farmstead workshop held during the 1997 CNEHA meetings in Altoona, especially those who helped in organizing the workshop and facilitated the small group discussions: Mary Beaudry, Wade Catts, Lu Ann De Cunzo, Dena Doroszenko, George Miller and Mark Shaffer. We also acknowledge our colleagues who continued the momentum of the Altoona workshop by presenting papers on farmstead site research and preservation issues at CNEHA's 1998 annual meeting in Montreal. These papers served as the impetus for this special double issue of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*. This issue truly represents a team effort. The authors read and commented on each other's articles and highlighted links between the articles in their final manuscripts. In addition, five anonymous reviewers evaluated several of the articles and offered excellent comments. Two reviewers were kind enough to read the majority of the articles, and we appreciate their time and effort. We also offer thanks to Ann-Eliza Lewis for undertaking the enormous task of copy editing all of the revised articles. Finally, special thanks go to Mary Beaudry, former editor of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, for initiating this project, and to David Landon, the current editor of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, for making this volume become a reality.

Introduction

The Archaeology of Nineteenth-Century Farmsteads in Northeastern Canada and the United States

Sherene Baugher and Terry H. Klein

The articles presented in this issue of *Northeast Historical Archaeology* grew out of a workshop held at the 1997 annual meeting of the Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology (CNEHA) in Altoona, Pennsylvania. The workshop involved several "brainstorming" sessions in which the participants examined research topics and problem statements associated with current approaches to the archaeological investigation of 19th-century farmsteads in the CNEHA region of Canada and the United States. The primary goal of the workshop was to discuss the significance of 19th-century farmsteads in the Northeast in the context of federal historic preservation laws and regulations. The workshop participants were asked the questions, "What are the research values of these sites?" and "Are these sites significant?" These are questions often posed by agencies and archaeologists involved in historic preservation. As John Wilson noted in 1990, many are asking: "Why study farmsteads, particularly those dating to the 19th and early 20th centuries? They are so common and so well documented!"

To continue the dialogue on farmstead archaeology that was begun in Altoona in 1997, several of the workshop attendees presented papers at a session at CNEHA's 1998 annual meeting in Montreal. The purpose of this session was to discuss a variety of approaches to the archaeology of 19th-century farmsteads in the Northeast region, approaches that were new and innovative and that showcased the preservation value of these sites. These papers also examined various methodological issues associated with the study of farmsteads. This double volume of *Northeast Historical Archaeology* presents revised and greatly expanded papers from the

Montreal session plus other articles on recently completed farmstead site research.

The research value of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast has been a topic of concern among historical archaeologists for many years. The earliest and among the most comprehensive reviews of the "farmstead problem," arose out of a symposium held in 1983 at the California University of Pennsylvania, as part of the 19th-Century Farmstead Model Development and Testing Project (Grantz 1984). One of the primary results of the California University of Pennsylvania symposium was the publication of a series of research objectives for the investigation of 19th-century farmsteads in Pennsylvania (Grantz 1984: 49-52). It was postulated that these objectives could be tested with archaeological data. Examples of these research objectives included:

- 1) The procurement of wild game as a dietary supplement to domestic food sources. This topic was to be examined in the context of the integration of farms into a market economy during the 19th century.
- 2) Comparisons of urban and rural dietary assemblages. Which assemblages exhibited a more varied diet? Do urban assemblages reflect greater access to imported foods?
- 3) What types of goods were most common on the farmsteads? Were there preferences for locally-made items, such as local redwares, as opposed to imported refined ceramics? How do these assemblages compare to urban assemblages? Did the increasing industrialization of the region affect farmstead assemblages?

4) What was the physical plan of the farmsteads, especially in terms of outbuildings?

In 1986, Custer and Cunningham edited a volume that presented a comparison of four rural sites, consisting of farmsteads, a school, and a mixed commercial and residential site, in northern Delaware. Based on the comparisons of these four rural sites, Custer and Cunningham concluded that some of the general historical archaeological methods used on such sites, like South's pattern analysis, resulted in only trivial findings. Even though the sites had different functions and were occupied by different social and economic groups, virtually no differences were found among them in terms of the character of the ceramic assemblages. They attribute these findings to the small, fragmentary nature of the ceramic assemblages from all of the sites, and note that "non-traditional" ceramic analyses, such as Miller's economic scaling analysis (1980), could not be performed. Custer and Cunningham then recommended that the investigation of diet, food processing, consumer behavior, and use of space within these sites would be important avenues for future archaeological research. Further, these investigations should be performed by placing the material culture within the context of the emerging local market economy (Custer and Cunningham 1986).

Since the 1983 California University of Pennsylvania symposium and Custer and Cunningham's 1986 volume, there have been number of individual publications that examine the research issues associated with the archaeology of 19th-century farmsteads in the Northeast. There is Bedell, Petraglia and Plummer's 1994 article on the Shaeffer Farm in Pennsylvania; Freidlander's 1991 article on the Hamlin site in New Jersey; Leedecker's 1991 article on consumerism for both urban and rural 19th-century households; Grettler et al.'s published report (1996) on the Benjamin Wynn, Moore-Taylor, and Wilson-Lewis farms in Delaware; and Scholl's (1998) study of a Methodist Farm in Delaware. Of particular note is research conducted at the Spencer-Peirce-Little Farm in Massachusetts which examined the transitions during four centuries

of farming and highlighted the diversity of research questions that can be applied to farmstead sites (Beaudry 1995, Mascia 1996).

The 1997 Altoona workshop built upon these and other studies, and developed an action agenda with recommendations on how we, as a discipline, and CNEHA, as an organization, should proceed with the research, interpretation, and preservation of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast. All of the workshop participants agreed that these sites were important and must be considered as part of current national historic preservation efforts. The workshop's participants identified many reasons why these sites should be considered significant:

- 1) The majority of the population in the Northeast during the 19th-century were farmers.
- 2) Farmsteads are often some of the earliest sites within the region.
- 3) These sites often have local importance and value.
- 4) These sites help connect the present with the past.
- 5) Nineteenth-century farmstead sites can provide important information on:
 - a) Transitions from subsistence to market farming;
 - b) Use of space and its economic, social and cultural meaning;
 - c) The nature of rural social classes;
 - d) The reflection of ethnicity on the rural landscape;
 - e) Impacts of technology on agrarian society.

Workshop participants agreed that the most compelling reason for preserving and conducting research on these sites is that between 1600 and 1900 the majority of the population of the United States and Canada was involved in farming. In order to understand local, state, provincial, or regional history one must understand agrarian society.

On October 24, 1997, an unrelated colloquium titled "Nineteenth-Century Domestic Archaeology in New York State" was held at the New York State Museum in Albany. This colloquium examined many of the same issues discussed during the Altoona workshop.

The goal of the colloquium was to determine what we know, do not know, and want to know about nineteenth-century domestic archaeology in New York State. The colloquium was organized in response to a growing concern among some archaeologists and cultural resource managers in New York State agencies for better data planning and management of that particular category of site, which appears to be ubiquitous. (Hart 2000: xi).

In their colloquium paper on the current state of knowledge on domestic sites in New York State, Wurst et al. compared site listings on file at the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) with historical data on the numbers of domestic sites (including farms) that existed within the central region of the state. Wurst et al. (2000: 26) found "a surprising deficit in the recording and attention paid to domestic sites in central New York." They also note that the site file data and the case studies presented in the colloquium volume

...indicate that domestic sites are not, nor should we consider them, a unified site type. From the Five Points in New York City to farmers in Oneida County, domestic sites exhibit an incredible amount of diversity. Given the small sample of domestic sites listed across a large area of the state, it is clear that it is far too early in the game to begin to exclude sites based on notions of redundancy, especially since we do not even have a clear idea of the nature of the diversity relating to these sites (Wurst et al. 2000: 26).

These varied efforts highlighting the importance of 19th-century farmstead sites and the current state of our knowledge on these sites are in no way unique to the Northeast. There have been several articles, Cultural Resource Management (CRM) reports and papers on these issues, involving farmstead sites in other regions of the country (see Cabak, Groover and Inkrot 1999; Crass and Brooks 1995; Heath 1999; Orser 1990; Stewart-Abernathy 1992). Of particular note is a comprehensive bibliography on the architecture

and archaeology of farms, with a primary focus on Wisconsin, compiled by Peggy Beedle and Geoffrey Gyrisco in 1996.

Given this consensus among historical archaeologists on the value of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast, and other regions, is there still a need for this volume of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*? Looking at current issues and concerns within historic preservation in the region and other areas of the country, the answer is yes. Though historical archaeologists are in general agreement about the significance of these farmstead sites, the value of these sites has, in most cases, not been clearly articulated within the overall preservation and regulatory community. Federal and state agencies and even some cultural resource management consultants still question the value of these sites. For example, documentation produced by the Second Conference on "Renewing Our National Archaeological Program" stated that nineteenth-century farmsteads, like prehistoric lithic scatters, individually had "minimal research potential" (Anzalone, Stumpf and McManamon 1997). In addition, CRM practitioners continue to bemoan the lack of tools and guidance for evaluating farmstead sites as they are encountered on historic preservation compliance projects. The Transportation Research Board (TRB) held a "National Forum on Assessing Historic Significance for Transportation Programs" in Washington, D.C. in 1999. The forum, attended by historic preservation specialists from across the country, consisted of several separate brainstorming sessions that focused on the issues associated with different resource categories (Draft Transportation Research E-Circular, 2002). The group examining archaeological resources identified the issue "Common Site Types/Research Issues" and defined this issue as "How do we deal with archaeological sites that are considered relatively common?" Nineteenth- and early 20th-century farmstead sites were prominent in these discussions. This working group and various speakers at the forum noted that there was a lack of usable historic context for sites like farmsteads, and as a result, significance evaluations were being performed on an ad hoc basis, without any reference to past studies or knowledge.

Even though there are a number of articles and CRM reports on the research and preservation value of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast, many of these works are widely dispersed and often not readily accessible. For example, hundreds of CRM reports sit on the shelves of SHPOs and other state and federal agencies, generally unused and rarely synthesized so we can build upon what has been studied and previously learned. For example, Louis Berger and Associates, Inc.'s (1993) important Fort Drum Cultural Resource Project, which examined many 19th-century farms in northern New York State, suffers from the limited visibility of a CRM report. This project provides a rare example of the use of archaeological data to examine a wide range of farmsteads linked by kinship and economic partnerships.

It is hoped that the articles in this volume, along with other efforts such as the New York State Museum colloquium, will serve as a framework for explicitly defining the significance of 19th-century farmstead sites in the Northeast. The articles present many of the key concepts that are critical to any evaluation of site significance: historic context, research value, public value, site integrity, and a description of the elements within a farmstead that contribute to its importance.

This volume is divided into three sections: 1) preservation and management issues; 2) technical and cultural studies of farmsteads and rural society; and 3) approaches to the evaluation and management of these sites.

The first section includes two articles, one by Terry Klein et al. and a second by Karen McCann and Robert Ewing. The first, by Klein et al., presents a brief summary of the 1997 farmstead workshop held at the 1997 annual CNEHA meeting in Altoona. The workshop addressed such questions as "What is a 19th-century farmstead?" "What are the research and public values of these sites?" "Which sites should be examined?" and "How should these sites be investigated?" The workshop ended with the development of an action agenda with recommendations on how historical archaeologists should proceed with the research, interpretation, and preservation of these sites.

The article by Karen McCann and Robert Ewing succinctly addresses the dilemma of our colleagues within state and federal agencies who are continuously grappling with what to do when faced with evaluating farmstead sites. What criteria should be used to determine significance? How do you determine if a farmstead has "integrity." What research questions should be used? What have we learned about these sites based on years of investigations? Have we found some research questions to be too simplistic or inappropriate for this resource? These are important questions that need to be addressed. The concern is that if the archaeological community ignores these questions, then these questions will eventually be addressed by agency personnel with no archaeological background and perhaps no sensitivity to these 19th-century archaeological resources.

The second section presents two technical studies of farmstead sites, the first by Sherene Baughner and the second by Dena Doroszenko. These are followed by articles on the cultural aspects of farmsteads and agrarian society in general. Baughner's article on drainage systems addresses a resource found on 19th-century farms that has been often overlooked or missed. Drainage systems were a component of the 19th-century scientific revolution in American agriculture. The investment (in time and money) in a drainage system could vary from very modest to quite expensive. The use of agricultural drainage was not only a monetary investment but also involved a mindset change in how the farmer saw his use of the agricultural landscape. There was tremendous diversity in the physical form of the agricultural drains. While more modern and expensive tile drains are easily recognizable as drains, many drains look like the shallow remnants of a fieldstone foundation. To prevent archaeologists from unnecessary excavation to determine the size of these "wall-like" features, Baughner provides very useful sectional diagrams of what archaeologists might find if they unearth part of an agricultural drainage system.

Dena Doroszenko address an issue that archaeologists encounter at both rural and urban sites—the evidence of fire. However,

she approaches this issue with extensive information gleaned from fire prevention specialists, including insurance companies' analysis of fires, their causes, and aftermath. She provides a very useful guide to the evidence archaeologists should look for to determine: 1) evidence of fire; 2) location of the fire; 3) extent of the fire; and 4) the aftermath—how the building collapsed and if the fire spread to other outbuildings. Doroszenko provides two case studies from Ontario. The purpose of Doroszenko's article is to provide archaeologists with another, but little used tool to interpret the history of a site, focusing on a rather catastrophic event in the lives of farm families.

Gerald Scharfenberger and Richard Veit ask whether Dutch ethnicity is reflected in the material culture of the Luyster farmstead in New Jersey. They compare this site with neighboring English farmers to determine if there were differences between these two ethnic groups in terms of material culture, foodways, and even the animals raised. However, no individual, family, or community is static, all change over time. Because the Luyster site was owned by the same family for over two hundred years, the site's large and diverse artifact assemblage enabled Scharfenberger and Veit to address lifestyle changes within this Dutch family. They discuss the assimilation of the Luyster family into the larger English-American culture and how that assimilation is reflected in their farmstead.

Class differences and inequality are the focus of Maria O'Donovan and Lou Ann Wurst's article. They investigate the Pittsley family who were agricultural laborers and poor farmers living on a small 13-acre parcel in Coventry in central New York State. O'Donovan and Wurst compare and contrast the ceramic assemblage from the Pittsley family with the middle class Porter family from the same time period and region. Not surprisingly, the assemblages were noticeably different. However, the Pittsley assemblage was then compared to the early 19th-century Kortright site occupied by a rural entrepreneur and local government official, and the similarities in the two assemblages were striking. The Pittsley family owned ceramics that were more typical of an early 19th-century assemblage,

which caused the authors to question how this happened. In this article O'Donovan and Wurst challenge ideas about consumer choice among the rural poor.

Lu Ann De Cunzo provides a broad overview of the "cultures of agriculture" in Northern Delaware from 1800 to 1940. Her three case studies allow her to address class and racial differences among farms in Delaware. The Cazier family were wealthy successful farmers, the Buchanans were middling farmers, and the Stumps were African-American farm laborers. De Cunzo highlights the benefits of undertaking a "landscape archaeology," and discusses what this approach means in terms of the scope and nature of archaeological studies of farmstead sites. She uses archaeological evidence, coupled with historical data, to tell the story of how these three diverse families transformed their landscapes and the meanings they endowed to their land.

Julia King also looks at meaning, values, and symbolism in terms of an agrarian landscape. She notes how everyday sites can be remade into historic places and how a farmstead can contain multiple layers of meaning. Her case study is an antebellum tobacco plantation in St. Mary's County, Maryland. King uses archaeological, documentary, and literary evidence to show how this 19th-century farmstead was widely recognized as an important historic site prior to the Civil War. King believes that in studying how 19th-century Americans dealt with and created their colonial past, we may understand how we in the 21st century are creating our more recent agricultural past through the preservation choices we are currently making.

Mary Beaudry also advocates looking at farmsteads as landscapes, consisting of a whole system with many subsystems. She also notes that we need to consider farms as farms, focusing on issues associated with agrarian life. Through a comparison of farmstead research in North America and in Great Britain, Beaudry highlights her interest in "reading the evidence of massive reorganization of farm layout and landscape" resulting from innovations in farm management practices. She states that the areas away from the

main farmhouse and associated outbuildings are the locations that have the most to tell us about farming.

Wade Catts' article places farmsteads within the broader context of "rural places" and evaluates various research questions that might be applicable to these sites. He uses many archaeological farmstead studies conducted within the Middle Atlantic region for his examples. Catts discusses two areas of research that have not been commonly addressed by archaeologists: 1) the advent of mechanization on farms; and 2) long-term effects of warfare on rural places. Like Beaudry and DeCunzo, Catts stresses the importance of the entire farm as the unit of study. Catts also notes that archaeologists' research has a unique opportunity to bring to light the historical roots of a local community.

The final section of this volume focuses on the issues of evaluating significance and historic preservation in general. Though there are a wide range of research values associated with 19th-century farmstead sites, as the articles in this volume clearly demonstrate, there are very few syntheses that evaluate the efficacy of conducting this research in the context of historic preservation/compliance driven archaeological investigations. There are also few viable historic contexts that can be used as guides and tools to link important research issues with the archaeological record present within these sites, and thus provide a framework for evaluating the significance of these sites. George Miller and Terry Klein's article presents an approach to evaluating the significance of farmstead sites. They recommend the use of a ranking system based on a wide range of criteria that historical archaeologists both explicitly and implicitly use in making decisions on site significance; however, these criteria are not linked to specific research topics or questions. Miller and Klein see this approach as an interim step until the necessary tools for evaluating and managing these farmstead sites are developed and implemented widely.

The volume's summary, by Terry Klein and Sherene Baughner, reviews the primary themes found in each of the volume's articles, themes that have an important role in addressing the preservation value of 19th-century farmstead

sites in the Northeast. Klein and Baughner also present recommendations on how these important themes should be woven into the tools and strategies which historical archaeologists and review agencies need to more adequately identify and evaluate these sites within the framework of historic preservation laws and procedures. Not surprisingly, some of these tools are usable historic contexts and syntheses of previous archaeological and historical investigations. Engaging the public as partners in our work is another critical component of our historic preservation efforts that is too often ignored. Klein and Baughner note that if the public does not become a stakeholder and partner in the preservation of 19th-century farmstead sites, then these archaeological resources will continue to be seen as ubiquitous and of little value to decision makers within local, state, provincial, and national agencies.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank everyone who participated in the farmstead workshop held during the 1997 CNEHA meetings in Altoona, especially those who helped in organizing the workshop and facilitated the small group discussions: Mary Beaudry, Wade Catts, Lu Ann De Cunzo, Dena Doroszenko, George Miller and Mark Shaffer. We also acknowledge our colleagues who continued the momentum of the Altoona workshop by presenting papers on farmstead site research and preservation issues at CNEHA's 1998 annual meeting in Montreal. These papers served as the impetus for this special double issue of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*. This issue truly represents a team effort. The authors read and commented on each other's articles and highlighted links between the articles in their final manuscripts. In addition, five anonymous reviewers evaluated several of the articles and offered excellent comments. Two reviewers were kind enough to read the majority of the articles, and we appreciate their time and effort. We also offer thanks to Ann-Eliza Lewis for undertaking the enormous task of copy editing all of the revised articles. Finally, special thanks go to Mary Beaudry, former editor of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, for initiating

this project, and to David Landon, the current editor of *Northeast Historical Archaeology*, for making this volume become a reality.

References

- Anzalone, Ron, Gary Stumpf, and F. P. McManamon
1997 Improving Archaeological Resource Stewardship and Study Under the National Historic Preservation Act. In Report of the Second Conference on "Renewing Our National Archaeological Program," February 8-11, 1997, ed. by Bill Lipe. Report on file at the National Park Service, National Center for Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, Washington, D.C.
- Beaudry, Mary
1995 Scratching the Surface: Seven Seasons at the Spencer-Peirce-Little Farm, Newbury, Massachusetts. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 24: 19-50.
- Bedell, John, Michael Petraglia, and Thomas Plummer
1994 Status, Technology, and Rural Tradition in Western, Pennsylvania: Excavations at the Shaeffer Site. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 23: 29-58.
- Beeble, Peggy Lee, and Geoffrey M. Gyrisco (eds.)
1996 *The Farm Landscape: A Bibliography of the Architecture and Archaeology of Farmsteads and Settlement in Wisconsin and in the Areas of Origin of its Settlers in the United States and Europe*. Division of Historic Preservation, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Cabak, Melanie A., Mark D. Groover, and Mary M. Inkrot
1999 Rural Modernization During the Recent Past: Farmstead Archaeology in the Aiken Plateau. *Historical Archaeology* 33(4): 19-43.
- Crass, David Colin and Mark J. Brooks (eds.)
1995 *Cotton and Black Draught: Consumer Behavior on a Postbellum Farm*. Savannah River Archaeological Research Papers 5. South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Custer, Jay F. and Kevin W. Cunningham (eds.)
1986 Current Research in the Historic Archaeology of Northern Delaware. *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Delaware* 21.
- Friedlander, Amy
1991 House and Barn: The Wealth of Farmers, 1795-1815. *Historical Archaeology* 25(2): 15-29.
- Grantz, Denise L.
1984 Final Report, Nineteenth Century Farmstead Model Development and Testing Project. Prepared for the Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission, Harrisburg.
- Grettler, David J., George L. Miller, Wade P. Catts, K. Doms, M. Guttman, K. Iplenski, A. Hoseth, J. Hodny, and Jay F. Custer
1996 *Marginal Farms on the Edge of Town: Final Archaeological Investigations at the Moore-Taylor, Benjamin Wynn (Lewis-E), and Wilson-Lewis Farmsteads, State Route 1 Corridor, Kent County, Delaware*. Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series, No. 124. Delaware Department of Transportation, Dover.
- Hart, John P. and Charles L. Fisher (editors)
2002 *Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Domestic Site Archaeology in New York State*. New York State Museum Bulletin 495. The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany.
- Heath, Barbara J.
1991 Nineteenth-Century Small Farms and Plantations. In *The Archaeology of 19th-Century Virginia*, ed. by John H. Sprinkle, Jr. and Theodore R. Reinhart, 53-76. Special Publication No. 36 of the Archaeological Society of Virginia. Spectrum Press, Richmond.
- Leedecker, Charles H.
1991 Historical Dimensions of Consumer Research. *Historical Archaeology* 25(2): 30-45.
- Louis Berger and Associates, Inc.
1993 The Cultural Resources of Fort Drum: Introduction to the Program and Synthesis of Principal Findings. The Fort Drum Cultural Resource Project, Task Order 17. Report for the US Army, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, New York, and the National Park Service, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia, from Louis Berger & Associates, Inc., East Orange, NJ.
- Mascia, Sara F.
1996 "One of the Best Farms in Essex County": The Changing Domestic Landscape of a

Tenant Who Became an Owner. In *Landscape Archaeology: Studies in Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape*, ed. by Rebecca Yamin and Karen Bescherer Metheny, 147–174. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Miller, George L.

1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th-Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14: 1–40

Orser, Charles E., Jr. (ed.)

1990 Historical Archaeology on Southern Plantations and Farms. *Historical Archaeology* 24(4): 1–126.

Scholl, Michael D.

1998 "In Delaware the Millenium Has Begun": 19th-Century Farmstead Archaeology and the Methodist Discipline. *Northeast Historical Archaeology* 27: 12–13.

Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.

1992 Industrial Goods in the Service of Tradition: Consumption and Cognition on an Ozark Farmstead Before the Great War. In *The Art and Mystery of Historical Archaeology: Essays in Honor of James Deetz*, ed. by Anne Elizabeth Yentsch and Mary C. Beaudry, pp 101–126. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Transportation Research Board

2002 National Forum on Assessing Historic Significance for Transportation Programs—Proceedings. Draft. Transportation Research E-Circular, Washington, D.C.

Wilson, John S.

1990 We've Got Thousands of These! What Makes an Historic Farmstead Significant *Historical Archaeology* 24(2): 23–33.

Wurst, LouAnn, Douglas V. Armstrong, and Elizabeth Keller

2000 Between Fact and Fantasy: Assessing Our Knowledge of Domestic Sites. In *Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Domestic Site Archaeology in New York State*, ed. by John P. Hart and Charles L. Fisher, 17–28. New York State Museum Bulletin 495. The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany.

Sherene Baughner is an associate professor at Cornell University in the Department of Landscape Architecture. She is also affiliated with Cornell's Archaeology Program and Department of City and Regional Planning. From 1980 to 1990, she served as the first official archaeologist for the City of New York. Since coming to Cornell in 1991, her research area has switched from urban archaeology to rural archaeology. Her research interests focus on ethnicity and class issues especially in relationship to cultural landscapes studies. She works with planners, preservationists, and Native Americans to excavate and preserve endangered Native American, colonial, and 19th-century archaeological sites.

Terry H. Klein is the Assistant Executive Director of the SRI Foundation, a nonprofit organization dedicated to the advancement of historic preservation through education, training, public outreach, and research. Prior to joining the SRI Foundation, he directed and managed two large Cultural Resource Management organizations. He received his bachelor's degree from the University of Arizona with a major in anthropology and his master's degree in anthropology from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. His primary interests are in historic preservation planning, and the archaeology of farmsteads and urban sites.

Sherene Baughner
Department of Landscape Architecture
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14853
sbb8@cornell.edu

Terry H. Klein
SRI Foundation
333 Rio Rancho Drive
Suite 103
Rio Rancho, New Mexico 87124
Tklein@srifoundation.org