



RECEIVED  
OCT 16 1981

Maryland Historical Trust

OFFICE OF PLANNING  
DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

October 14, 1981

Ms. Susan L. Henry  
Project Archeologist  
Division of Highways  
Box 778  
Dover, Delaware 19901

Dear Sue:

I have reviewed your historic research design for Del/DOT and found it a very useful document. My knowledge about central place theory and location theory is secondary and has been expanded by your well written paper. The comments which follow were typed as I read the paper and responded to the points raised. They represent my initial, uncensored reactions. I hope this frank response will be of greater value than a more contrived response.

I. Introduction: This is a fine introductory statement about the model, but a paragraph concerning the need for such an approach from both a significance and predictive model standpoint might be useful. I agree that both intra and inter-site settlement pattern concerns should be addressed, and I agree that the road transportation routes lend themselves to this task, but with diminishing applicability through time.

II. Location Theory: Hudson's three stages of rural settlement apparently hold all factors static, except the nature of the population increase. As you point out on page 3, this static model must be modified by evaluating conditioning factors which better reflect a real world situation. I feel that the spread stage, as outlined in your paper, does not apply to 17th century Chesapeake society, although it would be of value for New England studies. A number of studies have been conducted in Maryland which deal with these factors in greater detail and which might provide useful elaboration for the three stages discussed (historical geographers and historians).

Do you really think that the coastal plain is uniform, particularly with the tidal areas and interior upland swamps providing such contrasting desirability factors to settlement? The Piedmont in Maryland did not result in regular spacing, for much of the barren areas were avoided during initial settlement, with the new settlers repeating the coastal plain example of preference for the fertile river valleys. Yet through time, spacing did become regular, but this reflected the crops under cultivation, the tenant system, and other factors. Your seven factors would make interesting themes for expansion as part of a state plan.

Ms. Susan L. Henry  
October 14, 1981  
Page 2

1. Economic: Your central place theory is an important model for the late 18th century to the present, but it does not apply very well to the 17th and early 18th century situation, as town development in the Chesapeake was virtually non-existent. This rather significant period, therefore, needs to be discussed by reference to more appropriate models. Moreover, the most important factor in affecting early site settlement, dispersal, etc., was the agricultural produce grown and the system of land tenure, which should be given equal importance in economic consideration.

2. Geography: In this section, you seem to be supporting my earlier doubts about the uniform nature of the landscape in Delaware which seems to be the prime assumption for your location theory. Given this, why even use location theory other than to say that it does not apply (unless it does for certain periods in history).

3. Population size and density: I have expressed my problems with Hudson's assumption about this subject. I suggest that this section could be expanded to say how this may not be applicable for certain periods while appropriate for others.

III. Settlement Development: I like your typology for transportation routes, but the brief introduction of the typology leaves the reader wondering how the categories will be of use in location on central place models.

The settlement typology is also a good ideal which researchers interested in prehistoric archeology should strive to do (instead of the big-little division now used). Your definition of hamlet and village are fine for the modern period, but are they equally applicable for earlier periods? Perhaps discussion like you give for the definition of town should also be applied to 17th and 18th century difference in hamlet and villages. Where does non-residential site consideration enter into your settlement pattern types for such things as the various mills which were prevalent in the 18th and 19th century in the rural landscape?

The section of factors affecting settlement development provides a framework for addressing many of the questions raised above, and as such is a useful and vital section to the discussion. Your artifact distribution factors are also well considered, although here you may wish to mention gravity models and how they should apply in a market system (I see you do mention this).

Conclusions: As always, this section could probably need expansion. How will these models be applied for the Del/DOT project to be studied? Like most models, your paper provides a fine framework

Ms. Susan L. Henry  
October 14, 1981  
Page 3

for you, but will it be of any meaning to highway planners? I think that the work could also be improved by using historical research to provide examples of the model applicability to Delaware. I refer you to the University of Maryland, Department of Geography papers No. 4 on a historical demographic analysis of Maryland's growth for many useful references for your study.

In summary, this is a well written document for the archeological community and provides a useful framework for understanding the range of settlement types expected and the modifying factors which enable the general model to be refined to better reflect historical fact. More detailed historic document research of the modifying factors should result in a better assessment of the settlement pattern of the area.

I hope these thoughts are useful. I look forward to discussing these points with you in greater detail. Keep up the great work!

Yours,



Wayne E. Clark  
State Administrator  
of Archeology

WEC/mf

cc: Mr. Daniel Griffith