

RESEARCH CONTEXT AND CONSIDERATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The Phase III historic archaeological investigations of the A. Temple Site were guided by several research perspectives which

dealt with local and regional historic issues. Broadly defined, the research perspectives employed to interpret the Temple Site included both historic research and archaeological research perspectives. Both of these categories are interrelated and data generated from each relies on the other to be most effective. The historical research perspectives presented below should be regarded as part of the broader themes of American history which can be addressed through the historical and archaeological investigations of the A. Temple Site. On the other hand, the archaeological research perspectives should be viewed as the framework of topics and issues of narrower scope that, combined together, help to shape and define the overall interpretation of larger historical processes.

HISTORICAL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

While the A. Temple Site was part of the 739 acre patent sold in 1739 to Thomas Ogle II, deed research and artifact distributions show that site occupation only spanned approximately 100 years, starting in the early-to-mid nineteenth century. By this time, with the completion of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal (1829), and the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore Railroad nearing completion, the hamlet of Ogletown was beginning a period of stagnation and would not see a revitalization until the 1920s. The A. Temple Site can provide researchers with an opportunity to examine in detail a tenant farm run by absentee landowners with other tenant farms and non-tenant occupations located within the region. Such comparisons can provide insights into spatial, social-economic, and cultural

aspects of tenant life in northern and central Delaware in the nineteenth century. Since the site is located in an area of relatively little growth, the A. Temple Site provides an opportunity to study the local, regional, and national economic and social developments.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

Research at eighteenth and nineteenth century historic sites in northern Delaware has indicated that some of the most significant information to be derived from historical archaeological investigations is related to patterns of spatial utilization and their changes through time. One aspect of spatial utilization can include the analyses and comparison of faunal remains and other ecofacts indicative of diet, food processing and consumption habits, and use of space at the site (Custer and Cunningham 1986). Detailed oral history accounts of the farm complex in the second quarter of the twentieth century can give researchers an opportunity to compare nineteenth and twentieth century farm complex layouts and agricultural practices. This research can then be compared to data obtained from work done in the surrounding region (Manning 1984; Glassie 1972; Herman 1987a).

Another set of comparisons will investigate questions about rural cultural processes and cultural change such as:

- 1) Are changes present in refuse disposal processes and techniques? Can changes be observed in the patterns of artifact distribution, and are these changes indicative of varied spatial utilization at the site? Furthermore, can such changes in

patterns be related to historically-documented economic and social changes in the surrounding area or to changes in a larger area?

2) Are there changes in the presence/absence or frequency of certain artifact classes among the various historic sites? Can these changes be related to the socio-economic position of the site's inhabitants or to local and regional economic conditions?

3) Can changes in either of the above categories of data be analyzed for meaningful covariance?

The A. Temple Site will be compared on an intersite level with other local and regional nineteenth century archaeological sites: Robert Ferguson/Weber Site (Coleman et al. 1984), the Grant Tenancy Site (Taylor et al. 1987), and the Block 1191 excavations in Wilmington (Beidleman et al. 1986). The site will also be compared to non-tenant occupations in the area, such as the Wilson-Slack Site (Coleman et al. 1985), the William M. Hawthorn Site (Coleman et al. 1984), and the Mudstone Branch Site in Kent County (Heite 1984).