The title *Smoking and Culture* is also the loosely unify-
ing theme of the 11 essays contained within this volume. Originally a symposium at the Society for American Archaeology conference in 2001, this collection challenges
the notion of how smoking pipes have traditionally been viewed and reported in archaeological literature. The stud-
ies focus on smoking pipes of many varieties from eastern North America, specifically the Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Great Lakes regions.

In their introduction, Sean Rafferty and Rob Mann state that the overwhelming majority of previous studies have been little more than culture histories, focused on typologies and chronometric aspects at the expense of behavioral studies. They explain that pipes are essentially drug-delivery devices that create altered states of consciousness. This nonutilitarian function was problematic to positivism and the functionalist archaeologists of the 1960s and 1970s. A lack of previous interpretive studies was the result, and pipes were relegated to cultural and chronological markers. The editors’ stated intent in this volume is to illustrate that the smoking pipes are ideal for more “ideational issues that are becoming more and more significant to archaeologists today” (p. xiv).

The essays are roughly arranged in chronological order. The first two essays, by Rafferty and Jeffrey Irwin, use mul-
tiscalar approaches to give cultural and ideological meaning to pipes recovered in prehistoric mortuary contexts beyond previous interpretations as a cultural marker or status grave good. Offering a broad range and depth of pipe examples from the Adena, Middlesex, and Delmarva cultures in the late archaic and early woodland periods, Rafferty’s essay attempts to explain mortuary pipes as archaeological evi-
dence of ritual. The operational role functioned to create an altered state of consciousness, while symbolically pipes acted as “a conduit to communicate with spiritual beings who might have sanctioned or even been seen as active participants (as something akin to clan totems) in the code-
pendence between neighboring groups” (p. 29). Although working with a significantly smaller sample of pipes, Irwin notes similar incised decorative motifs on pipes in the southern North Carolina coastal plain during the late woodland period to neighboring cultures and asserts ritual smoking as a symbolic act to seal intersocietal relations. While both authors offer plausible interpretations, it would be interest-
ing to see if this concept could likewise be demonstrated with other specialized artifacts or decorative motifs across cultural lines, or with other goods recovered from mortuary contexts to further solidify their arguments.

Drawing on ethnohistorical and archaeological examples, five of the essays in this collection center on the protohis-
toric era. In a similar vein as Rafferty and Irwin, Penelope Drooker traces forms and materials of pipes across the Great Lakes region to illustrate native cultural interactions, with pipes active as status indicators, ritual tools, and in gifting practices. Michael Nassaney presents a fascinating treatise on how native men, women, and children all adopted pipe smoking in 17th-century southern New England as a way to strengthen ethnic identity and reverse the negative influences of cultural conflict. The presence of native pipes on archae-
ology sites until the 19th century leads Neal Trubowicz to the conclusion of a “pipe/tobacco/smoking complex” as the most persistent form of Native American material culture (and subsequently, beliefs on ritual smoking) to survive after European contact. In the fur trade between French and native groups in the Great Lakes region, Mann deftly argues the pipes from the Cicott Trading Post site were evidence of a ceremonial “smokescreen,” where the needs of social relations and material goods between capitalist and reciprocity-based economies could both be temporarily facilitated by ritually changing gifts into commodities and vice-versa through smoking. Richard Veit and Charles Bello investigate commonalities among archaeologically elusive lead and pewter pipes, all recovered from Native American burial contexts from Carolina to Canada, and hesitantly suggest the possibility of native manufacture. While well researched, Veit and Bello’s essay is a break in the cohesion of the volume, as it tends toward more typological issues than behavioral or cultural ones.

The final four essays focus on pipes from the histori-
cal period. Diane Dallal offers a perspective on gender in the production of pipes, illustrating that women had a much larger role in traditional 17th-century Dutch pipe production and were symbolically represented in icons and makers’ marks. Examining nationalistic symbols on pipe bowls recovered in two residential blocks from Paterson, New Jersey, Paul Reckner effectively shows the active use of Irish and American iconographies as ethnic and class markers in the latter half of the 19th century. Anna Agbe-Davis uses a series of independent features of locally made “Chesapeake” pipes to measure variation but admits not being able to make a clear distinction between possible manufacture at each site or consumption from different production centers. Finally, Patricia Capone and Elinor Downs use petrographic analyses to demonstrate standardized manu-
facturing techniques, yet localized production, of red clay pipes samples from Virginia and New England. Like Veit
and Bello’s essay, contributions by Agbe-Davis and Capone and Downs are well done but are perhaps more thematically appropriate for a different volume.

Unfortunately, a moderate degree of carelessness in this volume must be noted. There were several notable errors in references, such as the publication of Lewis Binford’s seminal pipe-dating formula in the *SEAC Newsletter* cited in the introduction and by Agbe-Davis as 1961 (it was actually 1962, referenced correctly by Veit and Bello, and Dallal). With the volumes of archaeological publications every year, incorrect citations are becoming a more common and bother-
some trend, and devalue the overall academic merits of a publication. Another example of carelessness was the pagi-
nation of figures 3.1, 3.2, and map 3.2, which did not agree with the table of contents. As a number of overlapping references were present, mildly irritating qualms that do not detract too greatly from the strong content, the volume could have been improved with a central bibliography rather than citations for each essay.

It is understandable that some archaeologists may not be comfortable with the postmodern ideological and contextual
interpretations presented in many of these essays. What this publication makes apparent is that pipes should no longer be considered simply as cultural markers or chronometric tools but as artifacts that played active and different roles in past cultural behaviors. In that regard this volume indeed achieves its stated intent. Kafferty, Mann, and the other contributors are to be lauded for raising the bar on studies of smoking pipes.

THOMAS E. BEAMAN, JR.
TAR RIVER ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH
5210 CARR ROAD
WILSON, NC 27893
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The Archaeologist’s Manual for Conservation is an interesting contribution to the material conservation literature by archaeologist Bradley Rodgers who has a lot of experience in the conservation of artifacts from underwater sites. The intent of the book is to “bring conservation back into archaeology” (p. x). This focus is largely a matter of perception for conservation of the material from archaeological sites has never been divorced from archaeology. For many excavations the conservation phase is viewed as a continuation of the fieldwork. In the foreword by Stanley South, it is obvious that he is unaware of the published conservation literature since 1975 and this book is not the “first attempt to bring conservation back into archaeology” as stated. No new data or conservation procedures are presented in Rodgers’s book, but they are presented in a practical and easily understood manner. The book relies heavily on a number of commonly referenced conservation precedents that are presented from a practical perspective, which do not require a substantial background in artifact stabilization as proposed in the introduction.

As in archaeology, different conservators will conserve the same artifacts in different ways, and no two conservators will set up a laboratory the same way. It all depends on experience, funds, and available facilities. A philosophical approach is espoused in the book that calls for minimal intervention techniques using nontoxic processes. Many conservators take the approach that in many cases there is only one chance to successfully treat archaeological material, especially material from underwater sites, so all options should be on the table for consideration. For these reasons, every conservator will find something to like in the book and every conservator will find something to disagree with in the book—especially the conservators associated with the laboratories that Rodgers refers to as comprehensive facilities.

This book is directed primarily to the small, minimal intervention laboratory with a small staff, limited budget, and little in the way of elaborate equipment. For these laboratories and individuals who want a basic introduction to artifact conservation, setting up a small laboratory, and utilizing tried and true processes, this book is a good introduction. It is strongly recommended that the extensive references following each chapter be consulted for further elaborations.

The book is divided into an introduction and eight chapters: (1) “The Minimal Intervention Laboratory,” (2) “Archaeological Wood,” (3) “Archaeological Iron,” (4) “Archaeological Copper and Copper Alloys,” (5) “Miscellaneous Archaeological Metal,” (6) “Archaeological Ceramics, Glass, and Stone,” (7) “Organics Other Than Wood,” and (8) “Archaeological Composites.” An appendix contains a list of journals. As a general comment, the citation style is such that it is often difficult or impossible to determine the original source of the presented data from the extensive list of references that follows each chapter. By far the most exhaustive chapters are the ones on archaeological wood, iron, and copper. The remaining chapters are more cursory in nature.

From the viewpoint of one archaeologist/conservator, the practical recommendations on how to set up a conservation laboratory, ways to cut costs by limiting the number of techniques, chemicals, and equipment used makes reading the book worthwhile. As is the case with all conservation manuals, there is always the potential that they may cause as much damage as good. This applies to this manual as well, even though Rodgers recommends that more complex conservation problems be referred to comprehensive laboratories or conservators with more experience.

While this reviewer agrees in principle with the stated mission of the minimal intervention laboratory and most of what is presented in the book, there are areas where differences exist. For instance, Rodgers states the common misconception that burned artifacts reach a natural chemical and electrical equilibrium with their environment. Yes, a state is established where corrosion and deterioration is considerably slowed, but the breakdown does not cease altogether. Along this same vein, it is recommended that the concretion formed on iron and other metals be removed as soon as possible or it will continue to promote corrosion in storage. By far, most conservators recommend that marine concretion formed on iron be left on during storage and not be removed until the conservation actually starts. In essence the recommendation to remove the encrustation contradicts the earlier statement that an equilibrium was established, even considering the fact that the iron artifact has been removed and placed in a new storage environment.

Rodgers adheres to the tenet that all treatments be reversible. This is a tenet that is under much discussion in the conservation community. Is any treatment truly reversible? Treatments that were once thought to be reversible are not. In conservation there are always those cases where there is no alternative but to use a nonreversible process. For many conservators the notion of reversibility has been replaced with the concept that all conserved artifacts should be retreatable by the same or some alternative process. This is a much more realistic and achievable concept than reversibility.

This book, especially if used in combination with other published manuals and manuals posted on the Internet, provides a basic introduction to artifact conservation. It takes the mystery out of many of the commonly used processes. If a novice wants to know how to stabilize