

HOUSEHOLD CHORES and HOUSEHOLD CHOICES

Theorizing the Domestic Sphere in
Historical Archaeology

Edited by
KERRI S. BARILE and JAMIE C. BRANDON

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA PRESS
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Introduction

Household Chores; or, the Chore of Defining the Household

Jamie C. Brandon and Kerri S. Barile

The household is a school of power. There, within the door, learn the tragic-comedy of human life.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1883

A comfortable house is a great source of happiness. It ranks immediately after health and a good conscience.

Sydney Smith, 1843

Home is a name, a word, it is a strong one; stronger than magician ever spoke, or spirit ever answered to, in the strongest conjuration.

Charles Dickens, 1844

“Home” is any four walls that enclose the right person.

Helen Rowland, 1903

Home is the girl’s prison and the woman’s workhouse.

George Bernard Shaw, 1903

Reflecting upon the quotations that open this chapter, it can be no surprise that archaeologists and historians have a great deal of trouble untangling the terminology and meaning surrounding the words *house*, *household*, and *home*. These terms can point to a simple building, a more ephemeral place (geographically specific or general) connected to emotion and feeling, a “school of power” (as in the Emerson quotation), a terrain upon which culture is learned, a gendered space, shelter against nature, and the sum of its contents (the listing phenomena exemplified by both probate inventories and the “House that Jack Built” nursery rhyme). A household can elicit some of these images or all of these things at once. Above all, house and home can be used as metaphors for almost anything one can imagine—a fact that points toward the all-pervading

nature of the term and the importance of unraveling its multiple meanings in order to understand the past(s).

Although it is a problematic concept, archaeologists have given a lot of thought and effort to households, recognizing almost from the discipline's inception the importance of house and hearth to understanding the past. Likewise, there have been many attempts to deal with this domestic rubric and to untangle that maze of strands that render past households difficult to discern clearly through the historical and archaeological records.

HOUSES, HOUSELOTS, AND HISTORIC HOMES: ROOTS OF HOUSEHOLD APPROACHES FROM ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Within the historic preservation movement, interest in *houses* was a paramount founding focus. In the United States, it is in the early roots of the preservation movement where "Americans developed their own distinctive version of historic preservation while Europeans were restoring their churches and castles or gathering vernacular architecture and folk objects into outdoor museums" (Alexander 1996:88). Alexander is referring to the historic house museum—a single dwelling or group of buildings, surrounded by a house lot or extensive acreage, with historic significance (once inhabited by a famous individual or family; representative of an architectural style or architect; or, signifying a particular historic event). The first historic house museum, the Hasbrook House in Newburgh, New York—Washington's headquarters during the Revolutionary War—was established in 1850. In 1856, Ann Pamela Cunningham began the fight to save Mount Vernon, Washington's plantation on the Potomac River. Her preservation work, and the ensuing creation of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union, was to become the model of household preservation in the United States for the next 100 years (Alexander 1996:89).

Like Mount Vernon, early-twentieth-century projects that involved historical research and archaeology were framed around homes and the "enshrinement of home sites and landscapes belonging to the nation's 'founding fathers'" (Sanford 1999:7), thus bounding the definition and assumed function of the household by gender, race, and status. For example, archaeological and historical research at Stratford Hall Plantation in Westmoreland County, Virginia, home of the Lee family and birthplace of Robert E. Lee, began in 1929 with the creation of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation, a group modeled on the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association. Archaeological excavations concentrated on the area surrounding the Great House in an attempt to reconstruct the outbuildings and landscape built by, and modified by, the Lee *men* and, moreover,

to establish Stratford as “a civic shrine” dedicated to Robert E. Lee (Sanford 1999:7).

Certainly during the mid and late nineteenth century, as modernity solidified and industrialization progressed, “tokens from the nation’s childhood” became symbolic of a dying past that needed to be preserved, catalogued, and recorded “to bolster the mature and rational evolution of the Bourgeois and bureaucratic state” (Boyer 1994:378). Part and parcel of the nation’s new concern for remembrance is its obsession with forgetting and erasure (Flores 2002:20–25; Trouillot 1995). Historic homes, along with battlefield sites, became the perfect venue for both remembrance and erasure. Such strong focus on the white, wealthy male individual (such as Washington, Lee, or Andrew Jackson at the Hermitage in Tennessee) easily created an aggregate household completely subsumed under what the public identified as the “head of household.” Any evidence that might complicate this picture of a harmonious household is “silenced by the weight of its structure” (Flores 2002:21), and the past was presented with idyllic, innocent charm.

Early-twentieth-century household archaeology and historic research was not limited to large-scale plantations and homesteads but also extended to the creation of some of the first historic districts in the country. Even these districts, however, remained focused on the “household as architecture” idea first established in the mid-1800s, one that was directly tied to the “great men of history” myth. The first historic district in the nation was created between 1928 and 1931 in Charleston, South Carolina (Howard 1987:115). Throughout the first quarter of the twentieth century, prominent local citizens of Charleston witnessed the slow demise of large portions of the historic downtown area. The automobile and the creation of new commercial venues caused the widening of roads, the removal of streetside landscaping and ornate ironwork, and the outright destruction of several historic homes once belonging to the Charleston elite. The Charleston Historic District was thus designed to protect both the house structure and house lot from destruction or alteration. (See Brandon’s chapter in this volume for the gendered implications of the Charleston historic preservation movement.) The establishment of local preservation legislation and the protection of household structures soon spread to other American cities, such as New Orleans in 1936, San Antonio in 1939, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, in 1948, and Natchez, Mississippi, in 1951 (Howard 1987:115). Archaeologically, this period is certainly marked by the assumption that investigations into the architectural remains of a dwelling lead to an understanding of domestic behavior in the past (Allison 1999a:4).

From the late 1960s into the 1980s, however, anthropology and prehistoric archaeology attempted to move away from the static concept of household as

architecture and began to address questions beyond the physical fabric and layout of the home and house lot. Simultaneously, these disciplines struggled to achieve a “greater degree of precision” by separating the “two phenomena [encapsulated within the concept of household] that are logically distinct and vary somewhat independently: co-residence and domestic function” (Bender 1967). This distinction between structure and function was sought to “bridge the existing ‘mid-level theory’ gap” (Wilk and Rathje 1982:617) and “replace a culturally defined unit with one that is more based on observation and can be more readily compared across cultures” (Wilk and Netting 1984:1). Here, the “household” became “the most common social component of subsistence . . . [a] strategy to meet the productive, distributive and reproductive needs of its members” (Wilk and Rathje 1982:618), and inevitably households were primarily seen as the basic “measurable socio-economic unit” through which archaeologists could generate understandings of the past (Allison 1999a:1). Yet the conflation of the two “logically distinct” aspects proved difficult to evade, as households were still commonly grouped “on the basis of what kind of family lies at the core” (Wilk and Netting 1984:3).

Historical archaeology, suffering something of an identity crisis at the time (e.g., Honerkamp 1988), saw the deployment of many permutations of the aforementioned approaches. For instance, some researchers continued to “define the household in terms of the household head and his relative rank in society” (Beaudry 1989a:84), while others joined prehistoric archaeologists in attempting to refine definitions and separate function from form—although often falling right back upon the convenient conflation of terms when interpretations are sought (e.g., O’Brien 1984:26–27).

Stanley South’s influential *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology* (1977) is a convenient example of processual thinking on households within historical archaeology. He states that each household “represents a system within a much larger system imposing on each household a degree of uniformity in the relationships among its various parts” (1977:86–87). For South, this uniformity was the basis for the generation of “household patterns” of material culture that could be used to attain his final goal—a clearer understanding of the broad processes of cultural evolution (1977:2–5). Similar sites should produce statistically similar patterns, while unusual sites will have patterns that deviate from the norm.

So it seems that processualists also saw the past as inhabited by “aggregate” households. These households were not necessarily conflated with individuals but rather were (when deployed ideally) entities unto themselves. That is, the processual household is an abstract “unit,” usually a unit of production or consumption that makes rational choices about behavior within its worldview. Unfortunately, although South’s approach was admirable in its attention to site

structure beyond architecture and its emphasis on contexts, the vast majority of those who flocked to his methods “used pattern analysis as if it were an end in itself” (Beaudry 1989a:85; South 1988:27), resulting in many sites being pigeonholed into patterns and a multitude of newly formulated patterns that threatened to outnumber the sites to which they were assigned.

Parallel to these processual approaches stressing artifact patterning is the structural approach to symmetrical patterning in architecture and other material culture advanced by researchers such as James Deetz (1977, 1982) and Henry Glassie (1975). Although Deetz (1982:720) was quick to point out that “households and houses are neither isomorphic with each other, nor with families,” he quickly returned to the idea that *houses* (or the remains of dwellings) are “powerful mirrors for the way in which . . . [people in the past] saw themselves and their world and expressed the values of their culture in substance.” Although he was often defensive of his structural approach (as “non-provable” and “non-predictive”), Deetz’s goals have much in common with the processual approach of South and others. These goals include the positivistic idea of “reading” a knowable pattern “encoded” into material culture (and its patterns) which, in turn, point toward shifts in the larger worldview/belief systems of past peoples. Aside from the “essentially passive, reflective view of style” advanced here (Dietler and Herbich 1998:239), it has been pointed out that the vast majority of individuals will not build the house in which they will dwell (Allison 1999a:4), a problem that plagues both the strict structural approach and the return to houses and the “key” to past household behavior.

THE HOUSEHOLD PERSPECTIVE IN HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY: HOUSEHOLD CORES AS PRACTICE

Given the long associations outlined, it may seem ridiculous to say that “household analysis” has been implemented within historical archaeology only since the mid-1980s, but that is indeed the case (Beaudry 1989a). At that time, historical archaeologists began a critical assessment of the definition of *households* (e.g., Beaudry 1984, 1986, 1989a; Mrozowski 1984; Stewart-Abernathy 1986a). Although somewhat distinct owing to intellectual traditions, these studies did seek to bring a “household oriented perspective” to historical archaeology, but the emphasis was on a “holistic, contextual approach” (Beaudry 1989a:84–85)—one that did not hinge solely on architectural or subsistence remains but employed dynamic, historicizing methodologies. Incidentally, Beaudry’s formulation was set off alongside the idea of artifacts as “active voices” or the material manifestations of social discourse (Beaudry 1996; Beaudry et al. 1991; Yentsch and Beaudry 2001:226). Although it bears the difficulties of using a textual metaphor for material culture (cf. Dietler and Herbich 1998:243–244), this for-

mulation has more to offer than many of its predecessors, as it enables multiple, contradictory meanings within material culture, stresses contextualization, and represents the people who give material culture meaning in different situations.

A plethora of other theoretical forces impacted household archaeology (both directly and indirectly) throughout the 1980s and 1990s; they included consumption, consumer choice (Miller 1991; Spencer-Wood 1987a), feminist issues (e.g., Lawrence 1999; Spencer-Wood 1991a, 1996), and Marxist approaches, often combined with structural positions and utilization of consumer behaviors (Leone 1984, 1995; Leone and Little 1993; McGuire 1992; McGuire and Paynter 1991; Orser 1988, 1996, to name a few). More recent archaeological studies have attempted to look beyond the aggregate household—a view stressing economic production or belief systems painted with a broad brush—toward “the practical actions of daily life” (Pader 1993:114). For example, archaeologies influenced by Bourdieu’s practice theory have become commonplace (e.g., Allison 1999b; Dietler and Herbich 1998; Wilkie 2000a; also see Battle and Stewart-Abernathy, this volume).

THIS BOOK AND THE LIST OF HOUSEHOLD CHORES

Discussion of an explicit “household perspective” seems to have receded somewhat in recent literature in historical archaeology (with some notable exceptions, such as the papers in Allison 1999b). Its most likely successor seems to be studies employing the “landscape perspective,” which have become ubiquitous of late (e.g., Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Shackel 2001a; Stine et al. 1997; Thomas 2001; Yamin and Metheny 1996; Young 2000). Although landscape archaeology, in our opinion, provides a productive ground for understanding past power relationships and ideology, it must be said that many landscape analyses, as well as other recent works dealing with race, class, and gender in a more general way, still rely on household data or have households deeply embedded within their matrices.

The analytical move to landscapes, in fact, opens up interesting possibilities for household analysis—the household as “small” landscape. The same theoretical underpinnings are at work on the household level, no matter how one parses the definition. Practice theory, power relations, gender constructions, and many other subjects that have been treated successfully via landscape analysis beg to be applied in similar fashion to the household. This approach is, no doubt, influenced by Henrietta Moore’s (1988, 1994, 1996) stressing of the symbolic uses of space and the reading of the complete “text” of households and their articulation with gender constructions.

Some of the authors in this volume move toward a landscape perspective,

such as Barile's discussion of plantation *household complexes* and the use of spatial alteration as the response to the fear of insurrection, Battle's focus on exterior, communally used areas, Pappas's interrogation of house plans in logging camps, and Stewart-Abernathy's keen observations about detached kitchens.

In a similar vein, although not overtly spatial, Wood's contributions utilize feminist, Marxist, and practice theory approaches in ways akin to those perusing landscape studies (e.g., papers in Ashmore and Knapp 1999 and Delle et al. 2000).

In addition, while gender is certainly prominent in these papers, we attempt here to see households as not *solely* the locus for an engendered power struggle (although it is certainly an important aspect of household analysis). To be sure, some authors confront gender constructions in the household (Spencer-Wood and Wood), while others examine the intersection of multiple identities in the household (Anderson and Brandon) or address gender in more subtle ways (Davidson, Galindo, and Stewart-Abernathy). Still others eschew gender as a category altogether in favor of other analytical registers (Barile and Bonine).

This book is, then, both in the "household perspective" tradition (as outlined in Beaudry 1989a) and a break with it. Like Allison (1999a:5), we feel that it is important to break free from a household archaeology dominated by architecture-oriented approaches. Further, we feel that we must problematize notions that behaviors of the past are simply "coded" in material culture and their patterns that can be easily "read" by archaeologists. Such notions often lead to disappointment in archaeology's abilities to answer social questions (cf. Allison 1999b; Dietler and Herbich 1998; and papers in Laurence and Wallace-Hadrill 1997), as well as overly simplistic and reductionist explanations of household analyses, which deny that cultural production is accomplished by "socially situated subjects with different cultural competencies and different, often contradictory, interest" (Dietler and Herbich 1998:239).

A variety of papers are included that, in varying ways, grapple with the meaning of household on their own terrain—the only place we believe these meanings can be clarified. We do not believe in a single, universal definition or approach to the household. Rather than presenting one definition of the household, the authors critically examine the concept within their own parameters. This move to the particular enables them to attempt to understand the workings of "house" and "home" in their own terms and the terms of their own data. This approach leads to the most promising and, we believe, the strongest facet of this book: each author first develops a context for his or her project and an understanding of the needed research questions, then attempts to define and analyze the household based on this framework.

In the United States today, there are many definitions of household. According to the U.S. Census, a household includes all those living within one space,

at one postal address. This definition disregards kinship and economics in favor of a spatially based analysis. The Internal Revenue Service, however, believes a household is based on the economic unit and includes all those linked by finances, as well as by kin relations. This system is judged on economic "dependents." Certainly, most people not only define their own household beyond the categories of these government agencies, but, more significantly, change their definition of a household several times throughout their lives. Is the definition of their household at eighteen years of age the same as at age fifty? Likely not.

With this in mind, the authors here recognize that, while they cannot impose modern concepts on their understanding of the past, the household in the past probably had many definitions, as it does today, and, moreover, the boundaries of that household remained fluid through one's life span. The authors clearly establish a context for their projects based on the social and cultural background of the occupants, temporal association of the site, geographic location, social context for which the site(s) was developed, and even the circumstances surrounding the present-day research and excavations. The "household" is then defined based on this context and the research questions are developed accordingly.

This approach seems to agree with Julia Hendon's assertion that "*what* households do [should be] a matter to be investigated rather than assumed *a priori*" (Hendon 1996:46, emphasis added; also see Yanagisako 1979:164). Some authors in this volume do go as far as to say that households are the basic unit of production and reproduction in a given community, but production and reproduction do not stop at the vulgar Marxist conceptions of "producing surplus value" or "reproducing the worker" (Hart 1992, cf. Smith 1978). Here, households are to be seen as the nexus of *social* reproduction and production in the form of practice (Bourdieu 1977). At times, these household activities serve to "produce" material things (such as food, clothing, and shelter), but they do these things in a way that both reifies and transforms the social structure—along with such things as gender constructions and power relations—which, on a grander scale, are shared with the larger community. To evoke the words of Hendon (1996:47) again, we see a household as a "symbolically meaningful social group that forms the next bigger thing on the social map after an individual." In short, it is one of the most basic venues for the sharing of culture (Tringham 1988).

The broad framework outlined here alleviates the need to shoe-horn definitions into universal categories. The reader will note a wide array of definitions and influences in play. Some approaches to households here stretch and make problematic the definitions to include communal households (e.g., Pappas and Spencer-Wood) or entire plantations (e.g., Anderson and Barile), and some attempt to clarify and intensify more traditional approaches (e.g., Bonine,

Davidson, Stewart-Abernathy, and Wood). Not all of these authors separate the structure and function of households, as do economically based approaches, but this entanglement is, in fact, part and parcel of the concept of households, and separation may obscure more than it illuminates.

Finally, while not all of these papers are specifically archaeological in the traditional sense, all approach specific households (in time and space) from an archaeological perspective. Some authors marshal excavated data to discuss households, as Stewart-Abernathy and Wood have done; others have relied on limited excavations (e.g., Battle and Davidson), landscape analysis (e.g., Barile and Pappas), reanalyzed existing collections (Bonine), or utilized the archival record to shed light on little-examined aspects of households (e.g., Anderson, Brandon, Galindo, and Spencer-Wood).

PLACE, SPACE, AND BEING

There are many ways that a volume such as this one can be organized: chronologically, regionally, or topically. After experimenting with many possible permutations, we have settled on an organization based around the subtle and fluid distinction between senses of place, space, and being. Taking our cue from humanist geographers, we regard a “Sense of Place” as the cultural textures that attach themselves not only to “surfaces, processes and structures but also communication acts and the multiple contexts” that create and are constituted by a particular locale (Adams et al. 2001:xiv). For example, Whitney Battle’s chapter is an examination of an enslaved community living within the First Hermitage, a portion of Andrew Jackson’s Hermitage plantation in central Tennessee. She points out that researchers have often concentrated on enslaved families or slave dwellings, but that concrete evidence of shared household space, such as outdoor spaces, has not often been investigated in its role of creating community and giving the enslaved “a place of their own.”

Stewart-Abernathy in “Separate Kitchens and Intimate Archaeology” follows a vein similar to Battle’s by foregrounding the detached kitchens of Old Washington, Arkansas, as places where daily practice and physical separation could create a brief refuge from the intimacy and inherent power relationships at play within the southern urban farmstead. He points toward the little-studied detached “kitchen” as being much more than a place for food preparation in the eyes of the enslaved African Americans who worked, slept, and lived much of their lives in that setting.

James Davidson examines this “sense of place” on a much larger scale—the urban cityscape of Dallas, Texas. He carefully follows the way in which the constantly shifting urban landscape impacts historical memory and the meaning of place. After outlining the transformation and loss of a historical Black

Dallas, he turns toward household-level analysis and urban archaeology as one method that may help expose modern and historical racism at work in our current landscapes.

Finally, Mindy Bonine's analysis of two dwellings excavated in 1949 and 1950 in the borderlands of Starr County, Texas, is bold in its attempts to separate the concepts of family and household using excavated data more than fifty years old. Despite the limitations of her dataset, she manages to pose important questions about family, households, and the limitations of the investigations of activity areas and the aggregate household.

Authors with papers under the heading of "A Sense of Space" actively examine the physical landscape in dialogue with social construction and transformations. Nesta Anderson extends Battle's line of reasoning by questioning the underlying assumptions that the scale of spatial analysis and its reliance on prescribed boundaries that, in certain circumstances, obscure as much as they reveal. She deploys the notion of nested household as an alternative definition of household when working on Bahamian plantations. Her case study suggests that researchers should situationally use different scales of landscape analysis when examining multiscale cases, such as the plantation household. More important, in these situations one must always keep in mind the fluid boundaries between often-fixed concepts such as "house yard" and "slave quarters."

Kerri Barile uses Anderson's "plantation as household" model in her analysis of plantation landscapes and their response to real and imagined threats of slave insurrection. With Middleburg Plantation in South Carolina as her backdrop, she follows plantation layouts through time—particularly following the Denmark Vesey conspiracy of 1822. The culture of fear and the desperate need of secure hegemony are clear in her depictions of white plantation owners.

Suzanne Spencer-Wood, in her chapter on the Cambridge Cooperative Housekeeping Society, provides us with a good example of a situation that confounds traditional definitions of the household. Here, domestic reformers attempt to transform chores commonly classified as "private" and associated with the "household" into "public" and professional activities. While this work could have easily been classified into our "sense of being" section (Part IV) based on the conscious attempt to change the oppressive gender structure of Victorian America, it is Spencer-Wood's examination of the spatial map of the society's activities that places the piece squarely in our "sense of space" section. While many researchers, especially Spencer-Wood herself, have explored the ideological entanglements of feminist thought and domestic reform, it is unusual to encounter a physical mapping of reform-oriented sites. Moreover, Spencer-Wood posits two interesting twists regarding the demise of the cooperative. Male domination within individual households (the realm often deemed

the woman's purview in Victorian ideology) along with the spatial location of these cooperatives are credited with their eventual demise.

Efstathios Pappas provides another unconventional household case study—the Soap Creek Pass logging camp in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California. Here, he attempts to understand variation in the spatial layout of company housing at the camp by examining the interplay between company paternalism and the agency of its employees. The result is an interesting addition to the “archaeology of capitalism,” juxtaposing family-oriented housing with the housing of single male workers, where the company itself takes the place of family—creating a large “household” consisting of labor “children” and management “fathers.”

Papers under the heading of “A Sense of Being” are centered around the more abstract cultural framework sometimes referred to as a “structure of feeling” (Williams 1973, 1977:128–135) that defines the lived experience of people *and* a set of productions (such as strategies of representation) that reflect upon, speak to, or attempt to transform those experiences (Mitchell 2000:13). Jamie Brandon's chapter, for example, attempts to get at the nexus of gender and race construction in the postbellum South by looking at various practices, strategies, and discourses that center around the southern household and enable it to be a locus for resistance while simultaneously feeding into the “strategies of containment” advanced by both Victorian and modern social structures.

Likewise, Margaret Wood's chapter combines perspectives on labor, culture, and gender to examine how failed attempts at antilabor social engineering backfired on the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company by allowing women, in particular, to make friends and take in boarders across ethnic lines. Thus, at the town of Berwind, it was social relations built at the *household level* that enabled the collective action of the mineworkers—an aspect of the Ludlow Massacre that historical literature has erased.

Mary Jo Galindo marshals an impressive set of data from local historians, oral traditions, and archival data to outline an expanded definition of the Spanish colonial household in Nuevo Santander. In her case study of the application of household theory, she surmises that archaeologists concentrating on the ranchos would only understand a part of the household activities, and the remainder of the household tasks took place at a second dwelling spatially removed from the rancho—in town. She follows a complicated network of kinrelationships and landholdings to reveal that these families were certainly joined by all of the criteria used by traditional archaeologists to describe the household. They were economically a unit, and they were related through kinship or fictive kinship, but they lived spatially distinct lives.

The volume concludes with commentaries by two researchers who have done

much to advance the notion of an explicitly household-centered archaeology, Mary Beaudry and Suzanne Spencer-Wood. These summary essays contextualize and critique the case studies included here and stress that this volume “further relates household inequalities to inequalities socially constructed, ideologically justified, and structurally enforced between social groups in the culture as a whole” (Spencer-Wood).

Spencer-Wood examines the papers in this volume for their implicit or explicit reliance on feminist theory. She has shown, in great detail, how different social standpoints are embedded in the different levels of household definitions and that feminist theory has influenced much of the research on power dynamics here. Beaudry’s concluding commentary, on the other hand, parses the volume into three themes (Intimacy and Separation; Patriarchy, Spatial Ordering, and Power Relations; and The Subversive Poetics of Housework), and she deftly points to many of the strong points and weaknesses of each of the chapters within these themes.

A careful reading of these concluding commentaries will show that these authors do not always agree with the other authors in the volume or with each other, but they both feel that “the household is a critical social unit and vital medium for understanding innumerable aspects of social life” (Beaudry). These commentaries, and the case studies they summarize, open a dialogue about how these different approaches and definitions affect our understanding of the past(s). The key here is that a household perspective sensitive to changes in context and structure through time and space is an important framework for historical archaeologists and historians—one whose interpretations will, no doubt, be explored and debated for some time to come.