TABLE 27

ARCHIVAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSEMBLAGE OF CERAMIC VESSEL FORM PROPORTIONS AND DIFFERENCE-OF-PROPORTION TESTS

Vessel Form	Archive Assemblage	Archaeological Assemblage
Flatware	233 (69%)	62 (23%)
Hollowware	105 (31%)	204 (77%)
Mugs and Jugs	41 (69%)	73 (72%)
Cups	18 (31%)	29 (28%)

Flatware/Hollowware Test Statistic = 11.13 ($p < .01$)
Mugs and Jugs/Cups Test Statistic = .28 ($p > .05$)

CONCLUSIONS

Certain general conclusions can be reached about the artifact assemblage of the earlier ca. 1730 - ca. 1780 Ogletown Tavern component of the John Ruth Inn Site. The relatively low percentage of eighteenth century bottle glass from the site is consistent with other tavern sites (see Bragdon 1981). The method of transportation for most alcoholic beverages was in wooden casks or hogheads. The contents were then transferred to barrels, casks, bottles and decanters by the tavern keeper. In combination with the high cost of bottles in eighteenth century America and the rural nature of the Ogletown Tavern, these results are not surprising.

The relatively high frequency of coins at the site also could be anticipated from the tavern function. Although the cash/barter ratio of colonial transactions was approximately 1:3 (Rice 1983), the sheer number of such transactions would allow significant loss to occur.

Kaolin tobacco pipe frequencies also fell within expectations based on the tavern assemblage concept. The large number of pipe stems are traced to the widespread practice of smoking in the eighteenth century which translated into consumption of large quantities of pipes and subsequent breakage through use and reuse. Tavernkeepers frequently broke off pipe stems for reuse by customers (Rice 1983) thus contributing to an even greater representation of pipe fragments in the archaeological assemblage.

The Ogletown Tavern ceramic assemblage supports several previously made statements concerning eighteenth century food consumption (Otto 1975). The everyday use of both pewter and wooden vessels in the eighteenth century has recently been well documented (Smart 1984). Based on their rigorous use in a tavern setting, it is assumed that their relative percentage in an archaeological assemblage would exceed that of a typical household. The same reasoning also governed the frequent use of

the leather bombard and black-jack in the seventeenth century taverns (Singer et al. 1956).

In Delaware in particular, and within the Mid-Atlantic in general, the early eighteenth century use of locally produced earthenwares in place of imported wares on rural sites was supported by the Ogletown Tavern assemblage. Not only was redware the dominant ceramic type based on percentage of sherds (54%) but it also comprised 136 out of 382 total vessels (approximately 35%). In addition, the intensive use of red earthenwares in place of imported wares was evidenced by the wide range of vessel forms manufactured from this ceramic type. When the John Ruth Inn ceramic assemblage is compared to probate inventory records compiled by Rice (1983) and by this study, several items become apparent. The number of tin-glazed (delft) punch bowl vessels in the Ogletown Tavern assemblage was consistent with that expected for a tavern assemblage. The inventories from New England indicate an average of seven bowls per establishment of delftware or porcelain. The Delaware inventories record on average four delft punch bowls per establishment. When the Ogletown Tavern assemblage was analyzed, fragments of at least six one quart or two quart bowls were noted. When the high known rates are considered, the Ogletown assemblage is represented by a below average number of delft or china bowls. The percentages of mug and drinking pot forms of foreign manufacture was also found to be below the mean values for New England, but consistent with that for Delaware. The everyday use of both pewter and wooden vessels in the eighteenth century has recently been well documented (Smart 1984). The results of the tavern records research supports this contention and indicates that taverns utilized an even higher percentage of these materials than residential sites of a similar time period.

The deposits recovered from the Phase II excavations are indicative of secondary deposition. Secondary deposits are characterized by a low frequency of reconstructable vessels, fragmentary faunal and floral remains, and pedological indications of prior deposition and subsequent disturbance. Use of the cellar throughout the life cycle of the structure seems very likely. Infilling of the cellar began circa 1780. The source of the soil for this fill most likely was derived primarily from the soil excavated for the cellar hole of the John Ruth Inn structure which was under construction. These subsoils were found interstratified with more organic rich soils interpreted to have been derived from topsoils surrounding the cellar hole. The artifacts recovered from within Feature 1 were derived from existing sheet midden deposits surrounding the cellar hole and an unknown number may have been purposefully included during pre-construction site cleaning. It remains an unlikely possibility that the soil and artifacts making up Feature 1 were derived from an area spatially separate from the cellar hole. However, the identification of a significant 'tavern' component in the ceramic assemblage in conjunction with the archival research makes this hypothesis even more unlikely.

At some time after a majority of the cellar hole was filled, a decision apparently was made to salvage the still standing foundation walls. Trenches were excavated adjacent to the walls. The deposit resulting from the backfilling of these trenches, the intermixed deposit, was created at this time. This deposit was characterized by mottling, much less compaction than Feature 1, and a straight sided interface with the adjacent subsoil. The deposit was noted to thin horizontally as the depth below ground surface increased. Ceramic sherds from this intermixing were noted to cross-mend with those from the main Feature 1 deposit. Other characteristics of the intermixed deposit indicate a formation through an intermixing of Feature 1 with the adjacent subsoil. Salvage of the hearth foundation wall was not completed for unknown reasons. It is possible that the large size of these stones precluded their removal. After the infilling, the Feature 1 deposit became a part of the backyard area of the nearby constructed John Ruth Inn. During the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century, a large number of postholes and trash pits were excavated into Feature 1. Several fence lines also criss-crossed the deposit during this time period. At the time of destruction of the John Ruth Inn, ca. 1955, the uppermost port of the feature was disturbed by grading activities. While extensive subsurface excavation occurred on all sides of the feature, none caused appreciable disturbance with the exception of a ceramic pipeline laid through the feature.

The reason for the construction of a new tavern, on the lot, the John Ruth Inn structure, was probably a result of several interrelated factors. The structural fabric of the ca. 1730 structure had most likely deteriorated at a rate comparable to other frame (log) structures. These buildings usually had a lifespan of 40-50 years (Carson et al. 1981). The death of Thomas Ogle in 1771 and the subsequent financial difficulties of his heirs, especially sons James and Joseph necessitated the liquidation of the mansion plantation on which the tavern was located. In 1803, the lot containing the site was sold to Samuel Hopper. With the structure having probably not been occupied for the intervening years 1771-1795, it was most likely in a poor state of repair. Based on the condition of the building and the then current economic property within Ogletown and northern Delaware in general, a decision was made to construct a larger structure.

One of the most important factors to the construction of a new building relates to a change in the expectations of the late eighteenth century clientele. By the 1770s, privacy of accommodations was a much larger concern and many urban and rural taverns were renovated or remodeled to provide private rooms (Rice 1983). The expansion from a 18' X 15', two room structure to a 50' X 30' would have fulfilled this need. The number of bedrooms in the new structure most likely represented a three-fold increase from the single upper floor chamber in the Ogletown Tavern. The size of the quarters for the innkeeper's family was also expanded. The center hall plan of the new structure

provided both an expanded socializing/meeting area and a larger parlor and barroom. A detached or at least removed kitchen was probably constructed. This would have been a major change from the combination kitchen/dining room present in the west room of the first floor of the Ogletown Tavern. The storage and preservation qualities of the cobblestone lined cellar present in the John Ruth Inn probably was equal to the fairly good storage conditions within the Ogletown Tavern cellar. The material furnishings of the new tavern probably changed little except for an increase in number. Tables, chairs, and beds remained the predominant furniture forms.

The artifact assemblage of the Ogletown Tavern and the architectural reconstruction of the tavern structure indicate that the Ogletown Tavern is most accurately characterized as a rural tavern serving both travelers and the local community. The assemblage is comprised predominantly of ceramics, glass, and bone with low percentages of metal and other architectural group artifacts such as nails, hinges, and lock parts. From the average percent reconstruction per vessel, it is estimated that approximately 25% of the actual artifact assemblage produced by the ca. 1730-1780 occupation was deposited within the cellar fill. This deposition is indicative of the careful disassembly of the structure to provide material for the ongoing construction of the John Ruth Inn.

A functional analysis of the artifact assemblage indicated a close similarity to other contemporaneous archaeological sites of known tavern function. Specifically the assemblage showed a high correlation based on artifact frequency distribution with taverns in rural settings especially the nearby Riseing Son Tavern. Further inter-site vessel level comparison indicated that when the ratio of flatwares to hollowwares and of serving to storage preparation vessels were compared, the assemblages associated with higher economic status occupations compared favorably with the Ogletown Tavern assemblage. The single comparative tavern assemblage (Wellfleet) included in the sample was not similarto Ogletown Tavern assemblage except for the ratio of cups to drinking vessels. A significant contribution of pewter and wooden vessels to the true vessel population which existed at Delaware taverns was found through tavern records research. Also supported by this research was the infrequent occurrence of bottles on average mid-eighteenth century tavern inventories. A conclusion can be reached that based on the analysis of certain ceramic vessel forms (cups versus mugs/jugs), a tavern component can be identified. However, a similar patterning of vessel forms was noted for the slave occupied sites and the known tavern assemblages.

From a larger perspective, the comparative analyses of numerous assemblages from tavern sites, and other sites, show that there is a great deal of variability in historic site ceramic assemblages that cannot be explained by simple differences such as tavern versus non-tavern sites or urban

versus rural sites. Indeed, the analyses described in this report suggest that it is difficult to isolate a "tavern pattern" except at a somewhat trivial analytical level. Furthermore, statements of correlation between socioeconomic status and hollowware versus flatware use and status and storage and preparation vessels versus serving vessels are not generally supported by the analyses presented here. In contrast a focus on mug and jug use versus cup use shows promise for studying meaningful variation in ceramic assemblages. Thus, an important implication of the analyses presented in this report is the recognition that historic ceramic assemblages show a great deal of variability which earlier studies have missed due to the techniques of analysis used. There are no simple correlations between patterned variability in historic ceramic assemblages and socioeconomic status, site function, regional location, or cultural geographic context. Future research should seek to more completely document this variability, through the use of appropriate analytical techniques, in order to better understand its meaning.

In conclusion, Phase II archaeological excavations, and particularly archival research associated with the excavation at the site produced very useful comparative information on the material culture, activities, and architecture of an eighteenth century, rural tavern. With regard to cultural resource management issues, it can be noted that the nineteenth century component of the site lacked sufficient integrity to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. On the other hand, the eighteenth century component of the site did possess integrity and is eligible for the National Register. However, the excavations which were required to generate the information needed for a determination of National Register eligibility, and to develop a suitable data recovery plan, were sufficiently extensive to constitute data recovery and no further work at the site is recommended.

It is important to note that at the John Ruth Inn Site, as at many other sites excavated in cultural resource management studies, the distinction between Phase II testing for determination of National Register eligibility and Phase III data recovery excavations can become blurred. This blurring is due to the fact that Phase II studies must not only provide data on National Register eligibility, but must also provide sufficiently detailed information for the development of data recovery plans. Quite often the eligibility of a site is apparent with only limited Phase II excavations. However, development of a detailed data recovery plan to guide Phase III excavations requires a knowledge of site limits and site structure which entails additional excavations beyond those needed to determine National Register eligibility for a small site like John Ruth Inn, it is very likely that the additional Phase II excavations will actually constitute the data recovery and this is what did indeed happen at John Ruth Inn. In sum, as long as there is close cooperation among the archaeologists, the funding agencies, and

the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the cultural resource management framework is sufficiently flexible to deal with the "blurring" of tradition phase definitions for archaeological research and still gather meaningful and useful archaeological data.