DIGGING UP INTEREST IN THE PAST: AN EVALUATION OF PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AND SITE INTERPRETATION AT GRAEME PARK

A Thesis
Submitted to
the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
MASTER OF ARTS

By
Laura E. MacBride
January, 2014

Thesis approval(s):
Dr. David Orr, Thesis Adviser, Department of Anthropology
Dr. Seth Bruggeman, Department of History

ABSTRACT

Both academic and professional archaeologists have realized the need to include the public in their work, whether it be volunteers in the field and/or laboratory, or outreach programs that aim to engage the public in new and innovative ways. Ten excavations were conducted at Graeme Park from 1958 to 1997, yet none of the projects utilized a Public Archaeology approach in the methodology. Although some of the data was used to reconstruct outbuildings and features as well as supplement the way the site is presented to the public, no efforts were made to directly include the staff, volunteers, and/or visitors. There are three glaring reasons as to why the archaeology and site interpretation have lacked synergism over the last fifty years. The first issue is a dearth of academically driven research. The majority of excavations were under the management of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museums Commission; Public Archaeology was not a goal of the state department given limited time and finances. Secondly, the budget of the PHMC has been drastically cut and historic sites across the state have been shut down or forced to function on very limited budgets. This has resulted in the creation of anachronistic or irrelevant programming that brings in revenue, but veer from the mission statement of Graeme Park. Finally, as a result of the budget cuts, the historic site lacks a full-time staff member to oversee programs and archaeological projects. I propose a plan for future site interpretation that brings together archaeology and historic site interpretation, citing Stenton House as an example of successful integration between the two.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my academic adviser, Dr. Dave Orr, for five and a half years of endless support, enthusiasm, and scholarly guidance. I also want to offer my gratitude to Dr. Seth Bruggeman for his unique perspective and academic insight. If it were not for him, my thesis would not have been nearly as meaningful to me and relevant to my professional goals. Thanks to Dr. Richard Lobban and Dr. Carolyn Fleur-Lobban for their financial support and genuine concern for the graduate students in the department. It is imperative that also I mention Carla, Herb, Beth, and the other Friends of Graeme Park that have helped me so much during this long process. I am grateful to call them my friends as well as stewards of Graeme Park's history. I would finally like to thank all of my friends and family, and especially my mother, Joan, for their reassurance, encouragement, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Located in Horsham, Pennsylvania, Montgomery County, Graeme Park is situated approximately fifty minutes north of Philadelphia. It is a 42-acre historic park that features the Keith House, the only surviving residence of a Colonial Pennsylvania Governor. The property also includes a nineteenth-century barn that serves as the visitor's center, as well as a reconstructed features such as the original eighteenth-century summer kitchen. A recent addition to the site is a tent in the rear of the barn that is rented out for special occasions such as weddings.

The site was once populated with colorful characters such as William Keith, the former Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania and the original owner of the property; Thomas Graeme, Keith's son-in-law and prominent Philadelphia doctor; his daughter, Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson, a highly educated and strong-willed woman who maintained the family property until she fell ill during her final years; and Margaret Strawbridge, the woman who realized the importance of the site and donated the property to the state for preservation. The Keith House and its surrounding landscape stand as a testament to the evolution of rural estates over the course of almost four hundred years.

As with most historic sites, it is the responsibility of employees and volunteers alike to interpret and present the past to the public. There are inevitably gaps in the written and verbal records. Things that were considered mundane, such as what types of flowers one planted in the garden, might never have been written down, *or* it was recorded but the document was lost over the years. Additionally, people's memories fade or become distorted. The life history of a site falls victim to the passage of time.

Therefore, it is crucial for all relevant disciplines such as History, Archaeology and Material Culture Studies to work together in order to create the most accurate and complete understanding of these important places.

Unfortunately, such a scholarly synergy has been lacking at Graeme Park. The majority of information that is presented to the public is a result of decades of research firmly situated within the discipline of History. However, the site has experienced over fifty years of archaeological excavations. Since 1958, both academic and professional archaeologists have directed projects at the park, although the majority of them were under the supervision of the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. The results from these excavations are almost completely absent from the site itself. Unless mentioned by the two long-time tour guides, it is virtually impossible to learn about Graeme Park's archaeological background given the information and resources currently available on site.

I believe that the inadequate integration between the archaeological endeavors and site interpretation is the result of three primary deficiencies: paucity of academically-driven projects, lack of funding and consideration by its governing entity, and the absence of a permanent full time employee(s) to initiate and execute archaeology related programming and manage the program offerings on site. My efforts to revitalize the interest in Graeme Park via this thesis project was one step in the right direction; however, in order for the site to reach its full potential, these three weaknesses must be addressed or else the invaluable information gained by the archaeological excavations risks being relegated to the dusty shelves of the state museum in Harrisburg.

CHAPTER TWO
THE HISTORY OF GRAEME PARK, 1721-PRESENT DAY

Keith Period (1721-1737)

“I [William Keith] have lately formed the Design of a considerable Settlement amongst you, in order to manufacture and consume Grain, for which there is at this Time, no profitable Market Abroad” (Pennsylvania Archives 8th series in Blaine and Dolinsky 2000:3). So begins the obscure and compelling history of Graeme Park. William Keith is a notorious figure in the state’s history. Arriving in Pennsylvania in 1717, he was appointed the position of surveyor-general of the royal customs in the American colonies by Queen Anne (Cotter 1993:383). Losing his job only one year later, Keith used the influence and power of some high-ranking friends to help him secure the position of Lieutenant Governor of the Pennsylvania colony. Keith set about sending for his family and belongings that were still residing in his hometown of Aberdeenshire, Scotland. He settled in Philadelphia after his wife, Anne Newberry Driggs, their four sons, his wife’s daughter Ann, and Ann’s future husband, Thomas Graeme arrived in Pennsylvania.

During his appointment as Lieutenant Governor, he attempted to secure his own wealth and status by initiating various real-estate schemes. His questionable acquisition of a 1,200-acre plantation was one such scheme. There is much debate regarding how he came into ownership of the land on Horsham. Some sources claim that he purchased the land from Alexander Hamilton for £500. Other sources assert that he took advantage of back taxes owed by Samuel Carpenter and acquired the land as payment of debt owed to the colonial government. A deed dated March 5, 1719 between Hamilton and Keith documents a monetary exchange of £500 for 1,200 acres. The deed mentions that the government did in fact obtain the plantation before passing into the hands of Hamilton and then Keith. By 1721, Keith has purchased an additional 484 acres of land, resulting in a 1,484-acre plantation.

The greatest mystery surrounding Graeme Park is Keith's development of the property. Construction of Keith's distillery began between 1719 and 1721. During this short period, it is believed that Keith constructed "at least one building and cleared a small area of land in the central portion of his property." By 1721, he announced his intentions to build a distillery to the Pennsylvania Assembly. In a letter dated January 9, 1721, Keith further explained that it was "for the good of the country" and that he had "yet no view to a dwelling house or anything that's ornamental" (Blaine and Dolinksy 2000:2). The following year, Keith wrote another letter revealing that the building was not yet completed and that "our sills are not yet set up for the hard weather does not suffer our people to work" (ibid:3).

A few extant primary sources indicate the general appearance of the property during the Keith era. In an advertisement for the property placed by Lady Keith on September 5, 1737, she describes "a large stone house three stories high, sixty feet in length and thirty-five wide, each story well floored and lighted, originally designed for a malt house" (Wosstroff 1958:26). Additionally, William Rawle wrote of Fountain Low in 1786. He describes, "The front, after passing over a ruined garden, is stopped by the large buildings erected by Sir William Keith for distilleries—in the wild idea of turning a distillery to profit in a place to which there cannot anyway be less than 17 miles land carriage" (Blaine and Dolinsky 2000:28).

William Keith's governorship came to an abrupt end in 1726. He fell under suspicion by the Penn family and other adversaries after issuing paper money without consulting the necessary parties. In June of the same year Keith was removed from office and took up residency at Fountain Low. The property was then placed in a trust for debt repayment. Keith was unable to clear his name and in 1728 he sailed for England, leaving his wife and children with an uncertain future. Overseas, he was able to revive his political career by being elected to Parliament as the representative of Aberdeen (Cotter 1993: 385). Lady Keith was forced to leave the property as reflected in the 1737 advertisement. She lived out her remaining days with her son-in law and granddaughter. She died in 1740 and was buried at Christ Church in Philadelphia.

Graeme Period (1737-1801)

The year 1737 ushered in a period of revival for the incomplete and abandoned industrial site. In 1735, after selling off pieces of the land, the property trustees sold the remaining 835 acres to Joseph Turner for £750. Two years later, Dr. Thomas Graeme, husband of Ann Diggs and Keith's son-in-law, received the property from Turner in exchange for £760. Graeme and his family were prominent members of Philadelphia society. Dr. Graeme served as a port physician for the city, one of the first staff members of the Pennsylvania Hospital, a justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, and a member of the American Philosophical Society (Cotter 1993:385).

Renamed Graeme Park, the most radical and palpable transformations of this site occurred during the 1750s. Under the supervision of Graeme, with influence from his only daughter, Elizabeth, Fountain Low was remodeled from an industrial site into a Georgian country estate. Graeme mentions the alterations in a letter to John Penn: "I have a park which Incloses 300 acres of land" and that "if you consider it as a piece of Beauty and Ornament to a dwelling, I dare venture to say that no nobleman in England but would be proud to have it on his seat or by his house" (July 1, 1755 in Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:6).

Considering Keith's abrupt departure from the colony, it is no surprise that the interior of the mansion and the surrounding property was quite lacking. The construction and renovations included: a summer kitchen, smokehouse and privy; interior wall partitions; a closed stringer scissors stair with continuous run replaced the earlier winder stair; decorative wood moldings, paneling, and mantels in the first and second floor rooms; marble and imported Dutch tiles that framed the fireplaces; and a formal garden on the north side of the house (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:29-37).

These changes have been partly attributed to the fine taste and architectural knowledge of Elizabeth Graeme. In a period where most women lacked or were even denied education, her parents and tutors encouraged her curiosity and desire for knowledge. Elizabeth took it upon herself to expand her comprehension in such areas as literature, history, and foreign languages (Ousterhout 2003:xiii). She also spent countless hours writing poetry at her country estate in Horsham. She wrote under a variety of pen names, frequently using the pseudonym Laura.

For five years Elizabeth was engaged to William Franklin, the son of Benjamin Franklin. However, William broke the engagement during one of his trips abroad. Elizabeth soon became depressed and Dr. and Mrs. Graeme sent her to England and France in 1764 to revive her poor health and lift her spirits. Her charm and whit helped her achieve a name for herself while she was overseas. Elizabeth met such notable individuals as members of the Penn family, novelist Laurence Sterne, King George III and Dr. John Fothergill. She even kept journals of her voyage to Europe and they were distributed amongst her friends and fellow Philadelphians upon her return to Horsham (Ousterhout 2003:xiii)

While she was in France, Elizabeth attended literary salons. These salons were social gatherings where people discussed books, philosophy and other topics of interest. In 1765, Elizabeth's sister and mother died and the unfortunate passing of both women caused Elizabeth to return to Graeme Park. Upon arriving in Horsham, Elizabeth began holding salons of her own. These gatherings were dubbed "attic evenings" (ibid:8). Social and cultural leaders of Philadelphia society, including John Dickinson, Jacob Duché, Francis Hopkinson, Dr. Benjamin Rush, and Annis Boudinot Stockton attended her salons. The pastoral setting, combined with Elizabeth's charm and refinement, fostered intellectual discussion between some of the most influential and profound minds in the region.

At the time, the College of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society did not allow women to partake in their social gatherings. Elizabeth's salon was an important exercise in gender equality; it was one of the few places where men and women were equally encouraged to engage in educational and intellectual discussions. In fact, "Fergusson's salon drew a number of the male Swains [male philosophical group] on account of its mixed gender composition. The salon became the antithesis of a patriarchal establishment" (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:16) and at the center of it all was Elizabeth, "the social centerpiece of the group, drawing them together and presiding over them with unrivaled wit, charm, intelligence and grace" (Cifelli in ibid).

During one of her many attic evenings, Elizabeth met Henry Hugh Fergusson, a

Scotsman and avid Tory. On April 21, 1772, Elizabeth married Fergusson in a secret ceremony. Upon her father's death in September of the same year, the Fergusson's moved to Horsham and Henry took ownership of the estate. Regrettably, her husband's political leanings soon became a cause of contention. Henry traveled to England in 1775 as sign of loyalty to the king. He returned to Philadelphia two years later with General Howe's army in the midst of the American Revolution.

Elizabeth was well aware that her husband's Tory ways would cause her loyalties to be questioned. She in turn became a generous benefactor of the American cause. Unfortunately, Henry managed to persuade Elizabeth to arbitrate two messages across war lines. One of these letters was a bribe attempt that, once revealed, eradicated Elizabeth's patriotic reputation. Her husband permanently fled to England when the Americans took control of Philadelphia in 1778 (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:27). Fergusson requested that Elizabeth join him in England, but she refused to leave the familiarity and comfort of her Horsham estate. She never saw her husband again.

In the midst of political turmoil between America and Britain, Elizabeth was left without a husband and with a questionable standing in Philadelphia society. Under the law, a woman's husband became the owner of her personal property and landholdings, although the husband could not sell it without her permission. Women were denied the ability to manage property they brought into a marriage or take legal action without the husbands' consent (Ousterhout 2003:xvi). In the spring of 1778, this legal system permitted the confiscation of Graeme Park as punishment for Fergusson's treason.

Fortunately, Elizabeth was savvy enough to exercise what little power the law allowed females at that time. Before Henry fled across the ocean, Elizabeth persuaded her husband to sign over power of attorney in his absence, enabling her to manage Graeme Park while he was away. It also provided a way for Elizabeth to regain her family's estate and her reputation. She repeatedly sent petitions to the state legislature requesting that Graeme Park be returned to her. Finally, in 1791, the Pennsylvania court relented and Elizabeth gained full ownership of the estate (Ousterhout 2003:xviii)

Childless and husbandless, Elizabeth spent the remainder of her life with her friend, Eliza Stedman. She continued to write and publish some of her work in periodicals such as *The Pennsylvania Magazine, American Monthly Museum*, *Columbian Magazine*, and *Pennsylvania Packet*. However, after the passing of her father and abandonment by her husband, Elizabeth was left with little fortune. In 1791, she transferred the estate to Dr. William Smith, the husband of her deceased niece. In turn, he settled all of her debts and provided her an income of $200 per annum. Smith rented the land to tenant farmers and the house was used as a dwelling and as a place for storage (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:5). Elizabeth died in 1801, and she was buried alongside her parents at Christ's Church in Philadelphia.

Touted as "one of the most learned women in America," (Anne H. Wharton in Ousterhout 2003:xiii), Elizabeth had two distinct personas. She exemplified what it meant to be an elite female in the eighteenth-century—gentility, refinement, patriotism, and hospitality. However, there was another side to this woman that rejected colonial gender norms. She pushed the judicial limits by fighting the state legislature for what she felt was rightfully hers. This woman also refused to leave her home and follow her husband to England. While her extant personal writings reflect a woman conflicted with her own desires and the expectations of society, Elizabeth stayed true to herself. She was a woman that made an impact during her lifetime and for generations after. The words of one admirer capture her spirit quite well:

> [Elizabeth was] the most gifted and accomplished woman of Philadelphia during the provincial times and for some time after the revolution…She was long remembered with an interest that was bestowed equally upon no other woman in the whole country (Scharf and Wescott in Ousterhout 2003:xiii)

Elizabeth continues to be an inspiration for Graeme Park's many visitors and volunteers.

Penrose Period (1801-1920)

In 1801, Graeme Park evolved from a Georgian mansion that exemplified republican ideals to a landscape that embodied the "noble farmer" (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:28). William Smith, after having sold-off sections of the estate, sold the remaining 205 acres to Samuel Penrose. After the property fell into disrepair during its final years under Elizabeth's care, the archaeological literature (Campbell 1958; Esther 1966) suggests that the Penrose family dismantled many of the Graeme-era outbuildings and garden and repurposed the materials for their own projects. The Penrose family lived in the stone mansion until Samuel Penrose constructed a new dwelling 700 feet southwest of Keith House in 1810. It currently stands as the Penrose-Strawbridge House. The Horsham Township Park System maintains it.

Strawbridge Period (1920-1958) to Present

The property passed through three more generations of the Penrose family until it was sold to Welsh Strawbridge for $33,999 in 1920. The Strawbridge family used the Keith House for social functions and storage while living in the Penrose-constructed farmhouse. In the mid-1950s, the Willow Grove Naval Air Base (which borders the property) showed interest in accumulating the land for expansion. The family chose to protect Graeme Park and donated the Keith House and forty-two adjacent acres to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in 1958. Graeme Park was designed a National Historic Landmark in 1960 and was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1966. It is currently managed by the Pennsylvania Historic & Museum Commission and is open for public tours, school events, and community programs. The Friends of Graeme Park is the volunteer association that oversees maintenance, public outreach, education programs, and fundraising events.

CHAPTER THREE
THE CURRENT STATE OF GRAEME PARK

When visitors approach Graeme Park from the main parking lot, the first thing that greets them is the outdoor bulletin board. Flyers advertising upcoming programs and events are posted and the quarterly newsletter and brochures are placed in the plastic slots along the bottom. Guests can also view the plaque bestowed upon the site when it became a National Historic Landmark as well as the sign that explains Graeme Park's status as a wildlife sanctuary.

From there a sign directs people to the Penrose-era barn. It was partially converted into a visitor's enter when the site was opened to the public. The first floor serves as an office for the staff and volunteers, gift shop, and starting point for visitors. The barn houses a handmade model of the Keith House and a diorama of the property that includes surviving buildings as well as the locations of other buildings based on previous archeological excavations. In addition, there are multiple information panels that trace the history of the property and highlight important individuals. Eighteenth-century ledgers that refer to the Keith and Graeme families are also on display.

Inside the visitor's center, Carla Loughlin, the Museum Manager and tour guide, or Herb Levy, tour guide and unofficial Architectural Historian of Graeme Park usually greet guests. Both Carla and Herb are long time educators at the site. They provide tours of the Keith house and its surrounding structures. The site offers walk-in tours Friday through Sunday and scheduled schools tours throughout the week.

Visitors are directed from the barn along a paved walkway to the south side of the Keith mansion. This side of the building includes a few notable features. The year 1958 marked a turning point at Graeme Park. As previously mentioned, the Stawbridge family gave the Keith Mansion and its 42-acres to the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission. Additionally, the very first archaeological excavation began under the direction of J. Duncan Campbell. The most striking finding from this excavation was the foundation of the 18th-century summer kitchen. It was reconstructed approximately ten years later by the PHMC. Moreover, the remains of a stone carriage turnaround on the south side of the Keith Mansion were uncovered in both the 1958 and 1961 field seasons. The 1967 excavation further revealed the remains of stone walkways and stonewalls also located on the south side of the wall. These were also reconstructed in the following years.

The summer kitchen, stone turnaround, walls, and walkways are the few features that are accurately placed as a result of archaeological investigations. Unfortunately, one outbuilding that remains an eyesore is the privy. Although the construction method is appropriate to the time period, the location is not. The current position of the privy, less than ten feet from the southeast corner of the mansion, lacks any basis in the historical or archaeological record. Excavations have yet to definitively find the remains of a privy related to the Graeme or Penrose periods anywhere on the site. There is no signage that explains this incongruent structure and visitors are left to assume that this was in fact the location of an eighteenth or nineteenth century outhouse.

After exploring the outbuildings and reconstructed colonial herb garden, visitors are led inside the house. They are guided through the first, second and third floors and then escorted out through the rear door on the north side of the house. The north side of the property just off of the home was the former location of the Graeme era formal

Georgian garden. No above ground evidence remains of this landscape feature. At the conclusion of the tour, visitors are often encouraged to wander the nature trails beyond the Keith house.

CHAPTER FOUR
PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS

The archaeological reports included in this section are those that have produced the most significant data, or those that reflect the Cultural Resource Management approach to Graeme Park indicative of the 1980s and 1990s. Other excavations have been conducted on-site that will not be covered because they fall outside the scope of this thesis or they did not yield new data (Witthoff 1964; Borstling 1965; Warfel 1985)

The first formal excavation conducted at Graeme Park occurred from May through August of 1958. J. Duncan Campbell, a historian and author, led the project. His goal was to locate outbuildings that had been mentioned in primary source documents including the summer kitchen, tenant house, and barn. Campbell's hope was to locate these foundations so that a more thorough picture of its appearance during the eighteenth-century could be developed.

Campbell's first concern was finding the foundations of the summer kitchen. One of the first features discovered was the stone walk leading to the backdoor of the mansion. At thirty-three feet from the backdoor of the Keith house an extension of the walk diverged. It widened by one stone course until the foundation of a building was unearthed about twenty-five feet south of the mansion. The foundation measured 20' by 15'. The top layer of dark soil contained twentieth-century artifacts while the level beneath it was lighter in color and contained eighteenth-century artifacts.

The data suggested to Campbell that "the kitchen had been deteriorating for several years and was then pulled down all at once, after which the light-colored dirt was brought in to cover the site; the razing was probably done after 1801" (Cotter 1993:387).

Additionally, the foundation lacked any brick debris, which indicated that the kitchen had been made of stone. The excavation did not reveal a fireplace; Campbell hypothesized that it was either destroyed or was alongside the southwest side that wasn't excavated due to a walnut tree. The project director also noted a watercourse with a partially mortared floor that ran through a corner of the kitchen. It seemed to have originated from a nearby pond, allowing for fresh water in the kitchen or drainage (ibid).

The archaeological data supports primary source documents. The 1737 advertisement placed by Lady Keith Lady Ann Keith makes no note of a summer kitchen. In a 1762 letter from Ann Graeme to her daughter Elizabeth, she asks to postpone a visit because masons and carpenters were working on the kitchen. By virtue of the historical documentation and archaeological fieldwork, the outbuilding was accurately reconstructed by the PHMC in the late 1960s.

Further excavation revealed a stone wall that ran parallel to the walk on the south side of the house. The wall was constructed with a ninety-degree turn toward the stone walk at its terminus. Campbell believed that the wall was meant to create a division between the house and kitchen and that it was built around the same time as the kitchen (Cotter 1993:387). He also found evidence for a similar stone wall that extended from the east corner of the Keith house.

Additionally, Campbell exposed two flagstone walks in front of the two doors on the south side of the house. Within five inches of the 1958 ground level, a large pattern of flat stones appeared with hard black soil between the stones. The soil contained bits of broken china, glass, bone fragments, charcoal, nails, and other man-made materials. Nearby, he also found evidence of a cobblestone road and carriage turnaround. These two features have also been reconstructed under the direction of the PHMC.

Finally, J. Duncan Campbell excavated the remains of two structures. An exploratory trench was created 100 feet north and 100 feet east of the Keith mansion. The two-foot wide trench revealed a mixture of burned earth, ashes, charcoal, and partially burned wood. The burned area increased in width on the north side where a ten-foot square unit was opened. This revealed a stone foundation. Campbell tentatively identified this foundation as the "tenant house" referred to in multiple historical documents.

Another area was opened in an effort to find the former Graeme-era barn. What remained of this structure was a line of rock rubble beginning 110 feet northwest of the Keith house. A candleholder fragment, button from the eighteenth-century, clay pipe stem, china, bricks, bottle glass sherds, and nails were found. The area measured 120 feet forward of and 120 feet to the right of the Keith House. Campbell provisionally identified this feature as the barn. Campbell conducted no further excavations.

Building upon the 1958 excavation, David J. Hally targeted the partially excavated watercourse, "tenant house," and barn for further investigation. He was able to complete excavation of the watercourse feature in 1961, but the "tenant house" and barn were not worked on until the following field season.

Hally and his crew excavated the watercourse along the channel from the southern corner of the summer kitchen, tracing it both north and south. The purpose of this was to discover the source of the water. By finding the source of the water, the function of the watercourse could be determined. If supplied by a spring, the channel would have served as a supply of drinking water and also a place to store perishable food where it flowed through the kitchen (Hally 1961:9).

According to Hally, the first four feet of the watercourse was poorly preserved. The fill within the channel, topsoil above it, and the surrounding subsoil contained fragments of animal bone, china, and glass. Portions of the channel revealed a concave lens of decayed organic material and charcoal. In cross section, the concavity varied between 2.315' and 1.9' below datum. It never rose above the walls of the channel. The author suggested that the channel was constantly refilled with a thin layer of organic material accumulated either naturally or as a result of purposeful refuse disposal (Halley 1961:12).

Hally's work also revealed that the channel was rising to the south. Increasing amounts of stone were found beyond the channel. They were present at much greater depths and abutted the walls of the watercourse. A trench at least five-feet wide was a foot below the subsoil and watercourse by the builders. The walls of the channel were buttressed with heavy stone and they gave support to the channel walls, but it unknown why they are present here and not in the northern section of the watercourse (Hally 1961:12).

On both sides of the channel, cobblestones were uncovered right below the sod level at a depth of 1.04' below datum. Excavation also revealed a cobblestone road from the area of the present barn to the "carriage turn-around" noted in the 1958 report behind the Keith house. The cobblestones were not encountered closer than 1.5' to the watercourse, which indicated that the road was discontinuous where it crossed the channel. The watercourse terminated at the base of the retaining wall of the pond. Therefore, the construction of the pond is responsible for the destruction of the channel.

The pond would not have been constructed until after the watercourse had ceased to be utilized.

Hally explained that, if the road and watercourse were used contemporaneously, an impermanent bridge of planks, or a more permanent stone bridge that was later dismantled, was laid across the channel (Hally 1961:16). The author also included a possible scenario in which the cobblestone road predated the channel in use and it was cut through in the process of constructing the channel. If this is the case, the watercourse could not be a part of William Keith's original building plan and thus not a part of the malt house configuration. The data could not conclusively determine whether the watercourse is related to the Graeme-era construction or if William Keith had built it earlier.

David J. Hally continued his work from June until August of 1962. The "tenant house" and barn received top priority in during this field season since they were largely ignored the previous year. Hally's secondary goals were to potentially locate a malting structure in front of the Keith House associated with the Keith-era construction and to conduct a limited investigation of the Keith House basement.

The first feature he worked on was named Structure A in the report. Structure A was a potential Graeme-period barn that was previously identified by Campbell in 1958. The razed structure was located 143 feet northwest of the Keith house. The measures approximately 34' x 34' and was made of stone. A solid layer of river and fieldstone was .5' below soil. At each end of the trench masonry walls were encountered. The walls were 1.8 feet thick and 33.8 feet apart. At a depth of 3.25' a stone floor was encountered (Hally 1962:7). Further investigation revealed an opening in the east wall 1.1' from the corner which led to a well-constructed drain outside (ibid:9).

An area 6’ by 6’ was cleaned up within this corner and it revealed a number of large flat stones on top of the stone floor that extended west from the corner parallel to the north wall. They were identified as capstones for a channel measuring one foot wide and .5’ deep. The report suggests that the covered channel could have been used in the production of barley malt. Additionally, the original discovery trench was excavated for its entire length down to floor level in hopes of discovering the remains of a kiln or steeping tank. No such features were located. In fact, the stone floor only extended five feet across the basement and the majority of the basement area was a mixture of packed earth, brick dust, and sand (Hally 1961:13).

In the northwest corner, a 6’ wide gap was found between the end of the west wall and the corner proper. A low flat stone existed in place of a wall. A thin veneer of mortar and stone was at an angle of 45 degrees to the original ground surface. Behind this veneer was undisturbed soil. Hally postulates that there was a 6’ wide stairway leading down to the basement, but due to the feature’s poor preservation, this is only conjecture.

Structure A was first considered to be the malt house constructed by Sir William Keith in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It had a large subterranean basement suitable for couching the fermenting barley as dirt floors were often used in malting. In addition, the channels could have functioned in supplying and disposing of water necessary for steeping the barley. The 6’ wide stairway leading into the basement would have assisted in the handling of wood and grain (Hally 1961:20-21).

Contrary to the archaeological evidence, Lady Keith's 1737 advertisement describes the outbuildings a bit differently:

> Twenty miles from town, a plantation called Horsham, consisting of five hundred acres of land, seventy-five of which are clear'd and improved ready and fit for Fall Grain of all sorts; besides twelve acres of well-improved meadow. Together with a large Stone House and a good barn, all in order for a tenant to enter upon. There is also on the said Plantation, a large stone house three stories high, *sixty feet in length and thirty five wide*, each story well floor'd and lighted, originally design'd for a Malt House, but at present seems better calculated for a company of Linen Weavers, having a large stream of water passing by the End of the said house, and a fine spring running by the back part thereof, whereon is a very good bleaching green, which renders the whole extremely commodious for a Linen Manufactory
> (September 15, 1737 in Cliver and Dolinksy 2000:3, emphasis added)

The building Lady Keith describes measures 60' x 35' and not 34' x 34'. The author concluded that, broadly speaking, this structure may have been a site of production that needed water carried into the basement.

Structure B, identified in the 1958 report as the "tenant house," was the second feature to be excavated by Hally. This structure was 120 feet north and 120 feet east of the Keith House. Campbell was able to locate a large burnt soil area and the corner of a stone foundation. In the 1962 excavation, a series of five-foot units were opened along what should have been the west wall of the "tenant house." A concentration of fieldstones and a few building stones were found. They did not exhibit any trace of structural patterning (Hally 1962:23).

The foundation measured 9 by 11 feet and the stone rubble floor was less than a foot deep. Hally unearthed "an iron grate over a shallow stone box set just inside the east foundation wall" (Cotter 1993:388). Hally concluded that the structure had been primarily made of wood. However, he did recover some brick rubble, which suggested that the lower walls around the grate had been made of brick. A well-preserved floor plan was also documented. The floor plan included a channel averaging .8 feet in width. The channel terminated at both ends by the large stones that support the grate (Hally 1962:27).

The report suggests that the cavity and channel served as a means of ash disposal and air circulation. The shallow depression against the outside of the east wall is the "burned area" referred to by Campbell in the 1958 report. The size, interior channel as a means for collecting fat drippings, and the fire-grate and draft-channel indicates that Structure "B" was originally a smokehouse, according to David Hally.

Research was also conducted in the area immediately north of the Keith House. Evidence suggested that a formal garden existed there during the 18th century. A garden wall northwest of the Keith house was unearthed, but no evidence of walkways was found.

Richard Diehl and Richard G. Fidler's 1965 excavation was conducted in three areas: the southeast side of the Keith House where fourteen units were opened, five units between the creek and the present driveway leading to County Line Road, and the basement of the Keith House itself.

Southeast of the mansion, a stone post-base was found. It was made of a single layer of medium sized stones that created a hole in which charcoal was extracted. Charcoal was also found in the immediate area. The authors suggest that it was the base of a wooden post, lamp or fence, and it was burned in situ (Diehl and Fidler 1965:2). Additionally, the remains of a walkway were discovered. This feature consisted of large stones in the base topped off by smaller pebbles. When excavated, Diehl and Fidler encountered the greatest density of artifacts. The objects included ceramics (local and imported wares), bottle glass, window glass, oyster shells, and metal objects such as nails, knives, forks, and a half-cent piece with the date of 1834.

The two archaeologists also worked in the cellar of the Keith house. The first room, Room "A" was associated with the southwest corner of the house and the south, west, and east walls. In Room A, an attempt was made to excavate stratigraphically but it was not successful because the artifact-bearing layer was only fourteen inches deep. Once sterile soil was reached, stratigraphy was abandoned and the soil was removed down to the level of the wall foundations.

Regarding Room "B", the room adjacent to A, no attempt was made to excavate stratigraphically. At the doorway of the south wall the foundation was five feet thick. The depth of the foundation of the wall between the two rooms is 2.8'. The fireplace that was on the south walll extended 2.9' from the wall and the depth of its foundation was 3.9' (Diehl and Fidler 1965:8).

Richard G. Fidler and Lucia Esther's 1966 excavation unearthed three stone retaining walls south of the mansion. They placed a north-south trench that contained a concentration of stones that appeared to be a cobblestone road. Fidler and Esther placed a second north-south trench that overlapped a 1965 trench, resulting in mixed stratigraphy. The archaeologists recovered glass bottle bases, necks, and ceramic sherds. The last trench placed in this area ran east-west. The western ten feet contained a rough stone path next to a stone wall. More than 126 artifacts were found under small stones and on top of the larger stones in the path (Esther 1966:7-8). Esther claims that they appeared to have been built after 1755 based on the artifacts.

Work was also conducted in the area identified in past reports as the "tenant house." No foundations or foot-trenches were found, while artifacts and stones were scattered. The stones appeared six inches below the surface and some protruded into the topsoil. There were no patterns to the stones and the scattering was due to continuous plowing in all directions. Esther asserts that the exact location of the building cannot be determined from the evidence; it is possible that the stones in the field are the remains of outbuildings or they may have come from the smokehouse (Esther 1966:10).

The archaeologists also unearthed another area that was named the "poultry house" by Esther. The excavation area lacked a foundation, but did contain artifacts such as red wares, porcelain sherds, pieces of brick with a blue-gray glaze, lumps of soft lime, and oyster shells. The artifacts span multiple periods so the date of the building is inconclusive. There are no records of an entire building having been constructed for the exclusive use of chickens (Esther 1966:9) and no direct evidence supports its use as a poultry house.

Additionally, Esther and Fidler explored the cellar floor inside the mansion. There they discovered "a recess that bore a resemblance to the seventeenth-century cooling pits found at Jamestown" (Cotter 1993:388). The excavation of a proposed "cow barn" was intended, but it was not excavated due to lack of time.

Prior to 1985, the excavations conducted at Graeme Park primarily focused on the south side of the Keith House and the land well beyond the north side of the house, including outbuildings and landscape features. However, a Cultural Resource Management project was undertaken in 1985 that was concerned with the area immediately north of the Georgian mansion.

In Kardas and Larrabee's, *Exploratory Garden Archaeology at Three Historic*

Sites: Graeme Park, Pennsbury Manor, and Moon Williamson House, the report shows that there is preserved evidence for a formal garden. The archaeologists found stone rubble that had been unearthed in previous excavations (1961, 1962, and 1965). The stone rubble is associated with the dismantling of the stone garden walls. The 1985 report also mentions in situ features such as brick walks and remnants of the stone walls.

The Utility trench and trenches 2, 3, and 5 intersected the earlier stone rubble discoveries. This was the basis for determining the garden perimeter. Brick preservation was poor, but the remains of the brick walkways suggested that the bricks were laid in a flat, longitudinal direction or angled, such as a herringbone or chevron design (Kardas and Larrabee 1986:61-62). A small amount of glazed brick and a greater quantity of orange brick was also found. Two brick walkways were well defined—one running north to south about five to ten feet west of the east garden wall, and the other also north to south projecting from the front door of the house along the central axis of the garden. Both were about five feet wide.

The dates of the artifacts support the idea that the garden was used during the second half of the eighteenth century. The distributional analysis of artifacts indicate that the garden experienced “long-term meticulous care...artifacts were found to cluster along the edges of the walkways, suggesting frequent sweeping of the walks” (Cotter 1993:389).

Conducted by the State Museum of Pennsylvania, the 1989 excavation was conducted in the dirt floor basement of the Keith Mansion. The work revealed that the basement has a mortar floor built either by William Keith or Thomas Graeme during the first half of the eighteenth century. The sand and gravel that was placed on top of the mortar floor was most likely installed to facilitate drainage in the basement after the pond was built during the first half of the nineteenth century (McConaughy 1990).

The final excavation at Graeme Park occurred in 1997 at the request of the PHMC. Excavation revealed no evidence of any artifact deposits or cultural features on the exterior of the southwest and southeast corners of the Keith House. Test unit TU1, which intersected part of 1966 excavation, revealed the depth and condition of the west foundation wall. In addition, a brick feature at the southern edge of TU1 was tentatively interpreted as a brick drain that carried wastewater from the summer kitchen identified in 1958 to the watercourse fifteen feet west of the house (Pennsylvania Historical & Museums Commission 1997:22). The report suggests further excavation of this feature in the future.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE EVOLUTION OF SITE INTERPRETATION AT GRAEME PARK

Interpretation of Graeme Park began as early as the nineteenth century. Carol Kammen maintains, “Local history is the framework in which to practice cultural history in an attempt to understand an area’s distinctive style” (1986:5). One of the defining characteristics of Graeme Park *is* its distinctive style. The progression from a commercial distillery to a Georgian mansion then finally to a National Historic Landmark shaped its unique history that rippled through the local community.

Because scarce documentary evidence exists regarding the work done under Keith and the interior and exterior renovations during the Graeme period, many questions were left unanswered. By and by, Graeme Park was absorbed into the local history and lore; it was shrouded in mystery and was romanticized by scholars:

> The earliest interpretations, appearing in late-nineteenth and early- twentieth century Philadelphia histories, assumed that the building was originally constructed as a residence and that the later renovations were merely augmented its as-constructed elegance. In many of these antiquarian sources, Graeme Park was described as a site of colonial grandeur where the Governor "lived in a state unknown in Philadelphia and more resembling the manorial regime of some of the wealthier southern plantations" and where "lavish entertaining" was carried on in splendor. Although a few new studies have questioned the extent of "lavish entertaining" during the Keith era at Graeme Park, most references to the edifice continue to describe it as both an early eighteenth-century house and as the site of distinctive Keithian entertainment (Cliver and Dolinsky 2000:10)

This idealized perception of the elite families was something that spread through various social groups.

The Mercer Museum in Doylestown, Pennsylvania houses a small collection related to Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson. The collection contains a biography of Elizabeth written in 1809, only a few years after her death, by a man who never actually knew her. He wrote the biography for Rebecca Frazer who was a friend of Elizabeth's. He describes Graeme Park as a place that "afforded her the most delightful opp[o]rtunities for study, meditation, rural walks, and pleasures, and above all, for cultivating a talent for poetry. This retreat, was, moreover, con[s]ecrated to society and friendship. A plentiful table was spread daily for visitors, and two or three young ladies from Phila generally partook with Mi[s]s Graeme of the enjoyments which her situation in the country furnished (Anonymous 1809).

Even during the last years of private ownership, the sentimentality towards the Graeme family, and more specifically Elizabeth, did not waver. This folkloric world that years of interpretation has created still persists today. Volunteers, visitors and newlyweds alike occasionally mention "Elizabeth's curse." Because Elizabeth's engagement to William Franklin and marriage to Henry Hugh Fergusson ended so poorly, some believe that any couple that is married on the property is cursed. While dismissed by most people, this "curse" is rooted in the romanticized history of the property and its people.

When Graeme Park transformed from a privately owned property into a house museum in the 1950s, the way it was interpreted and utilized changed as well. Although still tied to its grandiose past, Graeme Park and its former inhabitants were now part of something more significant and meaningful than ever before:

> Twentieth-century constructs of Graeme Park's history transformed the building into a regional site of public memory....Associations with Governor Keith conjure up images of colonial grandeur, making the mansion house and adjacent grounds at Graeme Park a source of regional identity and pride. Over the years, it has served as a mecca for architects and historians in search of colonial era remnants. Intrigued by its architectural embellishments, unusual plan, and lost lore, they

> have been eager to provide justification for the site's physical realities. However, unless further documentary evidence is uncovered, Graeme Park will remain a valued, but a much contested cultural landscape (Cliver and Dolinksy 200:4)

Graeme Park's place within local, state and national history elevated it from a site of opulence and mystery to a National Historic Landmark, a place where important people gathered and momentous events transpired. Its recently acquired status as "site of public memory" and "mecca for architects and historians" allowed the public to study its idiosyncratic appearance and history in a way that it previously could not. When Graeme Park was opened to the public, it became *accessible*; it became a part of the regional history, a place for scholars and non-scholars alike to engage in the past in a way that was meaningful to them.

For over fifty years, this appeal has remained unbroken. The site is open to guests Friday through Sunday throughout the year for guided tours. During these three days, Graeme Park caters to a variety of visitors. Many of them are locals who have different reasons for stopping by. Some are novice historians who want to learn more about local history, while others have lived in the area for a long time and were finally compelled to see what it was all about. There are even those people who have visited many times before and insist on bringing friends and family from out of town to see this remarkable landmark.

Graeme Park also hosts many events throughout the year. Some take an approach that is rooted in the more traditional history of the site such as the Yellow Fever Living History Theater. At this event the Friends and other volunteers dress up as the Graeme family, friends and servants and discuss the Yellow Fever epidemic that devastated Philadelphia in 1793. Other events have a slightly broader scope of interpretation such as the Homeschool Day. During this program, volunteers discuss various aspects of

Colonial America and Pennsylvania while integrating the history of Graeme Park through activities and discussions.

Additional programs include Valentine's Day tours that emphasizes the compelling, yet ultimately disastrous love life of Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson; Colonial cooking workshops; World War II weekend that includes demonstrations, re-enactments and tours of the Keith house; and Senior Days, a two day event that consists of multiple educational seminars for senior citizens. This program was inspired by Elizabeth's attic evenings and topics range from local history and architecture to military history and colonial gardening.

However, Graeme Park's most popular, and profitable, events are Celtic Fest, a two-day celebration of the Graeme's Scottish heritage, and paranormal investigations. At Celtic Fest, one can expect to see numerous vendors selling food, homemade beauty products, Celtic inspired artwork and other various other items that may or may not be related to the Scottish heritage of the Keiths and Graemes. There is also live music, dancing, and tours of the Keith mansion. On average, the event attracts 1,500 people and raises a few thousand dollars that is used to fund future programming. The paranormal investigations at the Keith home are also incredibly popular. Local paranormal investigation teams lead the sessions and quite often there is a waiting list because it grabs the interests of so many people.

The volunteers and staff at Graeme Park work diligently to provide an educational and enjoyable experience for visitors of all ages regardless of what program they are hosting. Nonetheless, because most sites depend on the income generated by programs and events, many times it is the public who influence the way a historic site is interpreted and what programs are offered, rather than the staff members themselves. As a result, the methods and approaches used in interpretation and outreach can vary depending on the current trends and interests in mainstream culture.

During an interview with Laura Keim, curator at Stenton Historic House and Wyck Historic House, she expressed her concern with the relevance of historic house museums in America. She asserts, “The public doesn’t care about history in the same way” and that historic sites are finding it difficult to stay current with “changing cultural values” (2013). Such is the case at Graeme Park where programs that are seen as less “academic” or demanding of an individual’s preexisting interest in history appeal to a wider spectrum of people. It is not difficult to discern why a festival with food, music and beer would be more attractive to a family looking for something to do over a summer weekend as opposed to a standard tour.

Also, with the popularity and proliferation of paranormal shows currently on mainstream television, it is not surprising that there is usually a waiting list full of people who want to experience the supernatural side of Graeme Park. Such events are a far cry from the days when tours touted the unique and illustrious past of the Graeme family and emphasized the significance of the Georgian mansion within Pennsylvania history. While the financial benefits of such events are undeniable, one is left to wonder just how constructive ghosts and platters of fish and chips are to the advocating the original mission of this National Historic Landmark set in place over fifty years ago.

With at least one major event every month, the staff at Graeme Park is constantly working on ways to attract more visitors. Twenty-first century developments in communication have provided the Friends of Graeme Park with new ways of advertising various events. Most historic sites, historical societies, and even professional groups have joined the world of social networking. The Friends of Graeme Park continue to use traditional methods of advertising events and special programs such as newspaper advertisements, flyers, and large signs placed at busy intersections.

Nonetheless, social media sites offer unique advantages that these forms of promotion cannot. Emma McDonald, curator at the Fort McMurray Historical Society contends, "Several sites were looking for ways to engage with the Internet in ways that were cost effective, technologically simple and had the potential to reach out to the broader museum community. Museums across North America were learning the value in social media resources such as Facebook, My Space and Twitter. Others have established blogs, chat pages and intricate websites" (McDonald 2012:25)

Following a similar approach, Carla Loughlin utilizes social networking sites and digital resources to promote Graeme Park. She created a Facebook page that advertises both the unique and mundane goings-on at the park. Carla also maintains a blog called *The Graeme Park Commonplace Book.* The blog discusses current and historic topics of interest related to the site. Additionally, she manages a Friends of Graeme Park webpage and Pinterest account where photos of on-site weddings are posted. These resources can be easily accessed by anyone with an Internet connection, enabling Graeme Park's presence as a relevant and active historic site to be felt throughout the virtual world.

CHAPTER SIX
THE ADVENT OF PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY AT GRAEME PARK

My involvement at Graeme Park began in 2009 when Joan Hauger, the Site Administrator at the time, contacted my academic adviser, Dave Orr. She was interested in starting a new archaeological project in hopes of generating interest and attracting more visitors to the historic landmark. I was in the process of finding a site for my graduate work and upon visiting the site shortly thereafter, I became captivated by its history and idiosyncratic architecture. I went to work researching the people, site development and prior archaeological excavations. I was fortunate enough to become close to Carla, Herb, and Beth McCausland, the President of the Friends of Graeme Park. They assisted me in countless ways and for that I am truly grateful.

My presence at Graeme Park was erratic for the next two years, although I continued to conduct research and track down sources relevant to the evolution of the site. My enthusiasm for the project was renewed when my proposal for archaeological excavation was approved following a Ground Penetrating Radar survey. Excavation began in May 2012 and came to an end the following September.

During those four months my project was open to the public. Although the Keith house is only open three days a week, the 42-acre landmark is constantly used for its nature trails and idyllic picnic spots. Many times visitors were at Graeme Park taking advantage of the beautiful summer days and happened to stumble upon my project as I was troweling or screening. I would discuss my project with them and provide an overview of archaeology and field techniques if they seemed interested. Frequently, a visitor would ask if he or she could help screen the soil. I enjoyed these interactions because the visitors became quite engaged when the archaeology became hands-on. They were able to connect with the history in a new and unique way; physically holding a piece of the past seemed to resonate with them in a way that my words or a history book could not.

Additionally, I created a blog that tracked my progress throughout the summer. I published entries that described which units and features I was working on; I also wrote specific entries which highlighted artifacts that I felt were particularly interesting or unique to Graeme Park. The blog was linked to my Facebook page and both Graeme Park's and Public History promoted it at Temple University's Facebook page. Carla also printed slips of paper with my blog's web address. They were placed by the cash register inside the gift shop and were tacked to the outside bulletin board. I was pleased to see that multiple people viewed my blog each week and a number of visitors posted positive feedback about my project and blog entries.

In July, The Friends of Graeme Park hosted their annual Celtic Festival. For the first year ever, archaeology was part of this major event. I had a table on the south side of the Keith house that exhibited some of my artifacts. There were multiple trays of ceramics, glass, animal bones and miscellaneous items such as a kaolin pipe stem and the head of a spoon. I also included information describing the different types of ceramics on display and included pictures of their museum quality equivalents. In addition, I mounted a poster that I presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology 2012 conference, and positioned it next to my table. The poster describes the Ground Penetrating Radar survey results conducted in April 2011 by Peter Leach. The poster currently resides in the visitor's center.

The placement of my table was ideal. It was next to the house tour registration table. People were able to walk over to my exhibit and view the material culture associated with the Keith house. They were provided the opportunity to make connections between the sparsely decorated stone mansion and the objects that would have populated the home at one point in time. I was fortunate enough to meet many people, both children and adults, who wanted to learn more about archaeology and the work that I was doing. The venue provided a way for me interact with the public, detail the history of the Graeme family and explain how important archaeology is for improving the future interpretation of the site.

I was also involved in the first annual Graeme Park Senior Days that was held during the first week of October 2012. I led a session titled "Digging for History." I explained the basics of Historical Archaeology and my recently concluded excavation to twelve senior citizens. We also discussed the different types of artifacts that I uncovered while I passed around some examples. The majority of my participants were very familiar with the historic landmark coming into the program. Therefore, my approach to the seminar was to move beyond merely informing them about the site's history; I wanted to use the archaeological data and material culture to enhance their experience. As I had noted from my days doing fieldwork and display at Celtic Fest, it is one thing to learn about past, but it is quite another to hold it on one's hand.

My final program to date was a Public Archaeology Day that I hosted on-site in late October 2012. Again I set up a display with a variety of artifacts that highlighted the breadth of objects I had excavated. Additionally, I set up three activities that were targeted for children. The first activity included two different coloring book pages that depicted an archaeologist excavating a site. The illustrations also incorporated various tools and materials that are typically used during an excavation. The kids were asked to check them off on a list once they identified them. My intention was to familiarize the younger kids with archaeology through something more approachable and age-appropriate such as coloring.

The second activity consisted of broken plates and cups that the kids were asked to put back together (with parental supervision). This was meant to show the methodology behind laboratory work. The final activity was screening. I had placed period-appropriate objects such as reproduced redware sherds in buckets of soil. With the assistance of their parents, the children were able to screen the soil and collect the artifacts. I was able to interact with both the adults and the children simultaneously; the parents were able to learn about archaeology and the history of Graeme Park while they were assisting their children with the activities. Moreover, while the children were occupied with the activities, I talked to the parents and answered any questions they had.

Although the event did not attract as many people as I had hoped, the excitement and interest that the day seemed to generate in both the adults and the kids was very fulfilling. Freeman Tilden (1984) defines interpretation as "An educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than to simply communicate factual information" (8). My goal throughout the entirety of my thesis work was, and still is, to engage the public in ways that have yet to be implemented at Graeme Park. I feel confident that my efforts to expand the audience of my project via social networking and my interpretive programs throughout 2012 were steps in the right direction, but it is far from an exhaustive list of Public Archaeology programs that could be held at Graeme Park given the appropriate resources.

CHAPTER SEVEN
THE FUTURE OF INTERPRETATION: THREE MAJOR OBSTACLES

It is rare for a historic site to truly flourish given numerous hurdles such as the current state of the economy, the cost of maintenance for older structures, and the prioritization of Historic Preservation and education in America. Graeme Park suffers from these issues as well; however, during my time at Graeme Park as a researcher, volunteer and archaeologist, I was privy to many discussions and interactions that underscored the daily struggles of keeping the historic landmark afloat. Although the Friends of Graeme Park are dedicated to the preservation and continued success of the site, there are three fundamental impediments that must be addressed so that Graeme Park's interpretive programming can remain vital and relevant in the public eye.

Dearth of academically-driven research

Only a few of the more recent excavations conducted at Graeme Park have been purely motivated by academic inquiry. The earlier excavations, such as the 1958 excavation directed by J. Duncan Campbell, and the 1961 and 1962 field seasons by David J. Hally, were motivated by genuine interest and the desire to answer some of the site's most elusive questions. However, the majority of the archaeological projects from the last quarter of the twentieth-century were under the direction of the PHMC. They were undertaken as a result of necessary construction and maintenance both inside and outside of the Keith house. I believe that both of these trends are emblematic of their respective time periods.

Graeme Park became a National Historic Landmark in the mid-1950s when

Historic Preservation was a leading concern in the minds of many Americans. During the early 1900s the preservation movement in America was gaining momentum. Grassroots organizations spearheaded campaigns to save sites they felt embodied national pride and the American spirit. They also sought to "stem the tide of destruction endemic to a rapidly growing, industrializing, and urbanizing nation" (Page and Mason 2004:7). The movement morphed into a political powerhouse "with an increasing emphasis on the role of governments--local, state, and federal" (ibid).

The coupling of concerned citizens with the government was cemented in 1906 when the Antiquities Act was passed. Nineteen years later the Historic Sites Act of 1935 came into effect. Additionally, the Historic American Buildings Survey project was launched in the 1930s, the National Trust for Historic Preservation was founded in 1949, and the most comprehensive preservation legislation to date, the National Preservation Act, was enacted in 1966 (ibid).

After obtaining National Historic Landmark status, the goal of the PHMC was to restore Graeme Park to its eighteenth-century appearance (Cotter 1993:386). With the exception of J. Duncan Campbell (1958), the other project directors including David J. Hally (1961-1962), Richard Diehl and Richard Fidler (1965), and Lucia Esther (1966) worked under the direction of the PHMC. The intentions of these earlier projects were to "locate the sites of razed buildings" (Cotter 1993:386).

Within the political and social climate of the 1950s and 60s, it is easy to understand why so many excavations were executed in such a short amount of time. The state wanted to restore the grandeur of such a significant site and archaeologists were eager to be a part of Graeme Park's burgeoning reputation as a valuable archaeological resource. After generations of private ownership, this unique landscape, once populated by the likes of William Keith, Thomas Graeme and Elizabeth Graeme Ferguson, was now accessible to scholars. Graeme Park experienced a renewal in local, regional and national interest. The academic development at the site during these years was instrumental in creating the foundation for its current interpretation.

However, the archaeological endeavors at Graeme Park experienced a lull during the 1970s and early 1980s. In 1985, under the direction of the PHMC, Kardas and Larrabee excavated on the south side of the house, identified in an earlier project as the Graeme's formal garden. Their venture was an extension of a construction project that placed utility lines around the east, north and west sides of the Keith mansion; they "treated the utility trench as a pilot study for exploratory hand trenching which was to follow" (1986:14). The subsequent excavations in 1989 and 1997 were also managed by the PHMC. They were on a smaller scale than the projects from decades earlier and were concerned with the foundation, basement, and exterior corners of the Keith house.

Although all but two of the archaeological ventures were executed under the jurisdiction of the PHMC from 1958-1999, there is a distinct disparity between the 1950s-1960s excavations and the 1980s-1990s excavations. As acknowledged by Cotter (1993), the site's earliest projects were aimed at unearthing the foundations of structures and features in order to reconstruct the Graeme-era landscape. This is evidenced by the reproduced summer kitchen, carriage turnaround, and curved walls on the south side of the house. These projects yielded significant data that helped develop the current interpretation at the site. The summer kitchen and other features are integral parts of the weekly tours and programming. In fact, two to three times a year the Friends host a hearth-cooking workshop inside the kitchen where guests are taught about Colonial cooking and foodways. Although these archaeological projects did not engage the public directly in such ways as allowing volunteers to help trowel, sift, or wash artifacts, Campbell and his contemporaries were crucial in igniting an interest in the historic site as well as providing the PHMC with the data it needed to reconstruct an all but forgotten Georgian landscape.

The passage of the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 was a paramount piece of legislation that ushered in new trends in historic site management and maintenance. One of "the most important contribution[s] of AHPA is that it made it clear that all Federal agencies were authorized to fund archeological investigations, reports, and other kinds of activities to mitigate the impacts of their projects on important archeological sites " (National Park Service 2013). Consequently, these laws helped create a new type of archaeology and archaeologist. "Conservation Archeology," as it was being termed, was the "practice of archeology under the environmental and preservation laws" (King 2008:22). The name morphed into "Cultural Resource Management," or CRM, but the intention was still the same: to save sites with potential cultural significance with time sensitive and budget specific parameters. Archaeology was taken out of the classroom and out of academia and placed in the hands of government employees and CRM companies.

With the NHPA of 1966 and the AHPA of 1974 in full effect, archaeological excavations at Graeme Park and other similar sites were driven by different objectives. Since the reconstruction of the Graeme-era landscape was all but complete in the eyes of the state, modern updates and maintenance became the primary impetus for archaeological monitoring. It is no coincidence that the only two archaeological projects conducted through institutions other than the PHMC took place in 1958 by Campbell and in 1965 by Borstling—both prior to the passage of these two major pieces of legislation.

My contention is not with the laws or with the archaeologists themselves, but with the framework in which they both must operate. Since the development of CRM, it has come under scrutiny by some academic archaeologists as "contract archaeology," a type of archaeological practice that is more concerned with budgets and deadlines rather than the academic integrity. A common gripe is that CRM archaeologists jump from project to project and collections are not properly processed and analyzed. The data is quickly interpreted, thrown together in a report and stuffed on a shelf where no one is to ever look at it again.

While I do not necessarily agree with these assumptions, professional archaeologists do work within a different structure than academics. Contractual obligations are always a concern within the field of CRM. As a result, there is the potential for fieldwork or laboratory work to be rushed or cut short due to a lack of time and/or money. It is my believe that one of the reasons why the CRM driven excavations at Graeme Park were not integrated into the interpretation of the site was due the nature of this type of archaeology.

I recall my visit to the State Museum of Pennsylvania two years ago. My intention was to look at the 1985 collection in hopes of familiarizing myself with the types of artifacts that were found in the formal garden. I remember being surprised, and rather concerned, when I saw the artifacts in such a state of disarray. Almost all of the objects were in brown paper lunch bags, not archival quality bags with archival quality labels. Although the artifacts were clean and labeled, there was no order or organization—redware was with porcelain, nails were with brick, etc. If the artifacts has not been labeled and washed, I would not have been able to tell that they had been processed. It was clear that few people apart from myself had taken an interest in this collection since 1985.

Again, my intent is not to condemn Kardas and Larrabee for sloppy work. I only hope to highlight the bleak future such collections may have given the nature of contract archaeology. It is my goal, once I finish processing my artifacts, to create a display in the visitor's center at Graeme Park. I would like to return the artifacts to their original home, at least temporarily, before they are hauled off to Harrisburg. I must adhere to the same federal and state guidelines as a professional archaeologist. Fortunately, I can work within a different timeline that allows for greater integration between my work and the site interpretation. I feel that it would be remiss of me to follow in the footsteps of previous archaeologists and send boxes of artifacts to the state capital without sharing them with the site's staff and visitors alike.

Lack of Funding by the PHMC

The current state of historic site funding in Pennsylvania is quite depressing for scholars, employees and volunteers alike. Currently, the PHMC administers numerous sites throughout the state and almost all of these sites have suffered from the severe budget cuts. The PHMC staff was "cut by close to half (from 433 in 2006-7 to 223 [in 2010]), resulting in the closure of many of its historic sites because of the lack of paid staff or volunteer 'friends of' organizations to keep the doors open for public visitation" (Harris 2010). Regrettably, "Except for a handful of large institutions - among them the

Franklin Institute, the Academy of Natural Sciences, the University of Pennsylvania Museum, and the African American Museum in Philadelphia - operating and program funding from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission has been eliminated" (Salisbury 2009).

Governor Tom Corbett signed a $28.4 billion dollar budget for the fiscal year 2013-2014. Despite a recommendation of an $18.5 million dollar budget, the governor's initial budget proposal only allocated $17.3 for the PHMC. This was a $507,000 loss from the previous fiscal year (Zeidman 2013). Additionally, the Museum Assistance Grant program remained unsupported for the 2013-2014 fiscal year. The grant program "provided funding support for Pennsylvania's museums and historical organizations including General Operating Support for Museums and County Historical Societies, Statewide Organizations, Project Grants, Statewide Conferences, Historical Markers and Technical Assistance" (PHMC Grants and Funding 2013). One bright spot in the otherwise bleak budget appropriation is the new Cultural and Historical Support line item for PHMC. The grant provides $2 million dollars for grants to eligible museums. It is meant to replace the Museum Assistance Grant program (Zeidman 2013).

The Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission has posted a 2012-2015 strategic plan summary on their website. The plan outlines specific goals that the PHMC hopes to accomplish by 2020, although the proposed strategies explained in the plan are focused on the period from 2012 to 2015. The commission does acknowledge their current inadequacies and weaknesses and they hope to correct, or at least begin to correct, some of them over the next few years. The plan summary explains that, "At the present time PHMC's largest needs are: to gain intellectual control over collections; to improve stewardship collections and facilities; to provide adequate staffing; to secure adequate financial resources; to build a stronger base of private support; and, to reduce many obstacles to efficient operations" (PHMC Summary of Strategic Plan 2012). By addressing these shortcomings, the "hope is that by 2020 the interpretation, programming, stewardship, and accessibility will be improved across all PHMC holdings" (ibid).

So what does this mean for Graeme Park? The PHMC Bureau of Historic Sites and Museums directly manages fourteen sites throughout the state. However, "twenty six sites are operated by partner organizations or 'friends' groups (non-profit organizations that exist to support PHMC, usually on a site-specific basis), but they remain the property of the Commonwealth and a stewardship responsibility of PHMC" (PHMC Summary of Strategic Plan 2012). Graeme Park falls under this classification. For years, the historic Georgian estate has suffered from poor funding, directly affecting the site's accessibility to visitors. According to Carla Loughlin, the hours of operation were cut due to budget changes. Graeme Park used to have interns and summer employees, which allowed for more help during the more demanding programs (2013). Currently, Carla and Mike MacCausland are the only paid staff. While Mike is paid two half-days a week for maintenance and cleaning, Carla works at the site three days a week and is paid by the Friends of Graeme Park—not the PHMC.

Herb Levy vehemently believes that the Friends group is the sole reason why Graeme Park remains active. The public programs, from tours to special events, are dependent on the volunteer group. Levy stresses that, "The site would have been closed down without the friends." In addition to the weekly tours and yearly events, the Friends of Graeme Park also manage the daily maintenance of the site. Both Carla and Herb explain that the PHMC pay for necessary construction, grass cutting and utilities, but everything else is funded by the Friends (2013). From office supplies to cleaning supplies, the funds raised throughout the year are used for the day-to-day needs at the site.

The lack of funding has had a significant impact on the way that interpretation is approached at Graeme Park. In the earlier years when Graeme Park was more financially secure, the interpretive programs were related to the site's mission statement: "The mission of The Friends of Graeme Park is to provide on-going support to the staff of Graeme Park and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission in their efforts to preserve, maintain, develop, interpret, and promote appreciation of Graeme Park (Friends of Graeme Park 2010:4). As financial constraints began to take its toll, the Friends found it necessary to expand their program offerings.

With limited support from the state, it fell on the shoulders of the volunteers and staff to preserve Graeme Park as a functioning house museum. Carla stresses that, "for monetary reasons [the interpretive programs] became broader" and that they "play up" events such as the World War II reenactments and ghost hunts because they are "things people will pay money to see" (2013). While the Friends are passionate about the site and its history, certain events that are anachronistic and/or deviate from the mission statement can be seen as the "necessary evils" of historic preservation. Without funding from the most profitable events, it would be impossible to keep Graeme Park open three days a week for guided tours and to support the more historically-driven programs such as the Homeschool Day and Yellow Fever Living History event.

There is little that the Friends of Graeme Park and staff can do to drastically improve the rather dire fiscal situation. Unfortunately, the policies and budgets are created and implemented by politicians that seem very far removed from the realities that historic sites face on a daily basis. With other concerns looming over their heads, policy makers tend not to consider Historic Preservation and Conservation an immediate concern. Given that each year more and more of these sites have been forced to shut their doors, the fact that Graeme Park is still functioning as successfully as it is, is a testament to the hard work and devotion of Carla, Herb, and the Friends of Graeme Park.

Absence of Full Time Staff

Once upon a time, Graeme Park did have a Site Administrator. Joan Hauger, a PHMC employee, served as a Site Administrator for both the park and Hope Lodge in Fort Washington, approximately twenty minutes from Horsham. She served as Graeme Park's only direct link to the PHMC. Hauger was involved in different on-site improvement and conservation projects. In 2007, Carla and Joan worked together with Robert Bullock in Harrisburg on new display panels for the Visitor's Center orientation area (Friends of Graeme Park 2007:3). The following year, Joan worked with a collections consultant and a PHMC regional curator in assessing the condition of the house museum collections that would in turn provide "better care for the antique objects that [are displayed] at Graeme Park" (Friends of Graeme Park 2008:4).

Due to budget cuts, by 2009 Joan was stationed exclusively at Hope Lodge and Graeme Park lost its only state employee. One of the drawbacks of having an employee split his or her time between two sites is that it is nearly impossible for equal attention and consideration to be given to both sites. Unfortunately, Carla feels that this was the case. She explains that the former site manager was not effective because her main interest was Hope Lodge; she was “not invested” and “not [at Graeme Park] often” (2013). Whatever the case may be, the time that Hauger did invest in maintaining the site, promoting events, and working with other PHMC employees was destroyed when she was permanently relocated to Hope Lodge.

The staff and volunteers at the historic landmark felt the initial complications from the loss of a Site Administrator. Both Carla and Herb were, and are still, concerned with the strained relationship that Graeme Park has with the PHMC. Herb stresses that there is a lack of communication between the state and Friends of Graeme Park. He explains that there “used to be conversations between the two [Graeme Park and the PHMC]” and it is a “secret as to what the state has planned for the future of Graeme Park” (2013). While the presence of a state employee may not have provided complete transparency, that employee served as a liaison between the Friends and the PHMC. Without that connection, Graeme Park lacked representation beyond volunteers and part-time staff.

Yet another obstacle that surfaced as a result of the relocation was conflict within the Friends of Graeme Park. During my interview with Carla and Herb, both indicated that there is a “lack of leadership” at the site and that the volunteers have different agendas. As a result, they are “going in different directions” (2013). This is yet another reason why the programs are so varied and often unrelated to the site’s history. Two of the volunteers are retired schoolteachers and were the ones to create and execute the Homeschool Day. Another volunteer is incredibly interested in World War II and she built the WWII Encampment event from the ground up. Again, with the need for funding throughout the year, if a volunteer is willing to spearhead a program that will turn a profit, the other members usually approve it.

Although unlikely to happen anytime soon, Graeme Park would greatly benefit from a reinstated Site Administrator or a full time employee in another form such as an Education Coordinator. While the Friends and staff do their very best to implement successful programs, the varied topics lack a unifying perspective and interpretive approach. If there was an employee whose job was to promote the site, develop new programs and improve the existing ones, it may one day be possible to expand the offerings that are more history driven. It is unlikely that such successful programs such as Celtic Fest and paranormal investigations would be eradicated and I would argue that they shouldn't be; if the only way a person will visit Graeme Park is because they get to go on a ghost hunt, then at least they experienced the site in some way. However, a dedicated staff member could provide a unique viewpoint and fresh approach to interpretation.

Furthermore, there is no funding for research. Carla and Herb volunteer their time to keep the information updated and accurate. An additional person would alleviate the demands placed on Carla and Herb as well as provide a new perspective to research and possibly contribute new resources previously unavailable. Emerging scholarship could assist in future programs and build upon and/or improve current interpretations of the site.

A few years back, representatives from the PHMC came to Graeme Park to inventory the collections including books and reports in the library. Many critical resources were taken back to Harrisburg such as archaeological reports and building surveys. Any copies of these reports were also taken to the state museum. Consequently, shelves of information were removed from the visitor's center. Copies were promised and have yet to be received. Although Carla and the Friends of Graeme Park understand that the PHMC has the ultimate say, this act was seen to some degree as an exercise in bureaucratic power.

A Site Administrator or Education Coordinator would hopefully renew the dialog between the state and Graeme Park. As Herb revealed, there is a disconnect between the PHMC and Friends group. The state is very distanced from the day-to-day operations at Graeme Park in both the literal and professional sense. Whether the PHMC is aware of this severed relationship I do not know, but the Friends are acutely aware of and concerned with the hands-off approach of the state. Joan Hauger was able to work with fellow PHMC employees and other professionals for the benefit of the site's preservation and development. It is my belief that Graeme Park will continue to evolve, and even thrive, given the proper representation within the pantheon of Pennsylvania's historic sites.

CHAPTER EIGHT
RE-EVALUATING THE PAST THROUGH PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY

Only when the essential meaning of the site and of the people and events associated with it is communicated to the visitor can we truly say we have met our responsibilities

— *William T. Anderson, Interpretation of Historic Sites*

Despite these rather large setbacks, the future of site interpretation at Graeme Park is not destined for failure. With severe cuts to the state budget, it is not likely that the Friends of Graeme Park will witness a financial revival. However, with a bit of effort, imagination and resourcefulness, Graeme Park's Public History and Archaeology programs can keep the site relevant and relatable to visitors both old and new. I would like to use Stenton, the country house of James Logan, as a case study.

Stenton House: A Successful Example of Public Archaeology in Philadelphia

Unfortunately, not every historic site has the same resources and sense of stability as Stenton. With its architecture and original material culture very much intact, Stenton is described by Laura Keim as an "accident of history," in that that the house is very unique—and very lucky—to have attracted such strong stewardship so early on its long life (2013). Since 1899, the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has served as Stenton's steward. As with Graeme Park, guided tours are one of the major draws to Stenton although the site also offers a variety of programming targeted for visitors of all ages. Stenton hosts events such as the Lunch and Learn series in which the public is invited to spend their mealtime learning about specific topics related to Stenton and the eighteenth-century. The staff of the historic site also takes part in the History Hunters Reporter Program, which is "an exciting, literacy-based educational program that takes students to four exceptional historic houses during the school year. Students in the program will become investigative reporters, writing about their experiences with the history, buildings and artifacts of their community" (Stenton 2013). Additionally, seasonal events and workshops are offered throughout the year.

The main period of interpretation at the historic home is the first three generations of the Logan family. While the some of the original objects such as furniture and tablewares have been kept in pristine condition since the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the archaeological collections have an incredibly important supplemental role to play in the site interpretation. The house contains ceramics from both family donations and from archaeological excavations. For example, the buffets in the parlor houses fully intact ceramic pieces. In contrast, the table displays refitted teawares from a previous archaeological excavation.

Jules Prown, a Material Culture scholar, poses, "How does one extract information about culture, about mind, from mute objects? We have been taught to retrieve information in abstract form, word, and numbers, but most of us are functionally illiterate when it comes to interpreting information encoded in objects" (1994:133). The staff at Stenton attempt to address this complex relationship between objects and their meanings through the exhibits. Laura Keim explains that use of museum quality objects intermingled with excavated artifacts not only demonstrates the breath of ceramics at the site, but it also shows the "original stuff in the original place" (2013). Deobrah L. Miller, the principal archaeologist in charge of refitting the collections, and Laura Keim explain that, “Once mending was complete, the majority of reconstructed ceramics were incorporated into the furnishings within the house, restoring them to their above-ground context where they can be appreciated by archeologists and decorative arts connoisseurs alike” (2010:3).

Of course, Stenton is presented in a way that compels non-academics as well. Keim, Miller, and the other staff members are conscious of the need for interpretation appropriate for the general public. It can be difficult for a visitor to see a stand-alone artifact and automatically make the connection to the intact objects on display. By showing guests a refitted teacup rather than a sherd from a teacup, it is not so difficult for them to “make the mental leap.” It is the job of the interpreter to take something that is “very vivid in your own imagination and translate it to [the visitors]” —or to make it “more concrete.” The Public Archaeology approach at Stenton makes the information very accessible to a wide range of guests. Ms. Keim stresses that this type of interpretation is “satisfying” but “it takes a lot of explanation” (2013) since visitors come to the site with different degrees of knowledge.

The effort and care given to the arrangement of Stenton’s collections extends beyond teaching families about the type of tablewares the Logan’s would have used. The goal is to populate the home with figures such as James Logan, William Logan, and Deborah Norris Logan through their material remains. Beyond using the displays to reveal “the range and quality of Stenton’s ceramics,” the mended artifacts placed through the house museum allow the visitors to “see for themselves the actual ceramics used by the Logans and think about the meanings these objects held in eighteenth-century life and discourse (Miller and Keim 2010:3).

During my interview with Ms. Keim, she moved around a cup and candleholder on one of the tables. She lamented that the housekeeper is constantly organizing the objects in a formal table setting after she dusts; Ms. Keim takes it upon herself to then go through the house and position the items in a more naturalistic way, as if the Logans had just finished tea and the visitors walked in before the servants had a chance to clean up. This simple, yet significant approach creates a feeling that the house is an active home. These nuances breathe life into the almost three hundred year old mansion. When we, as educators and interpreters, can come to understand historic homes as more than just old buildings, as more than just house museums, and we recognize them as archaeological collections above the ground, we can move towards a new way of utilizing artifacts and the structures that house them. This is precisely what is being done at Stenton.

An Approach for Future Interpretation at Graeme Park

The people at Graeme Park have become as important to me as the site itself. I have witnessed and experienced the hustle and bustle of pre-program preparation and the effects that a limited pool of resources can have on program offerings. While Graeme Park may not be fortunate enough to have the same financial support as Stenton, it is still possible for the landmark to expand their current program offerings and re-imagine their interpretive approach.

Both Carla and Herb believe that the archaeology that has been conducted over the years does reflect the information given during tours and programs. Many of the ceramics that have been unearthed during excavations have a strong presence inside the summer kitchen. As locally produced red ware was affordable, it is very common at historic sites. It was predominantly used in the kitchen as a utilitarian ware. Carla notes that the reproduced red ware at Graeme Park is scattered throughout the house, but it is most prominently displayed in the summer kitchen. This ceramic type played an important role in the daily life of the Graeme family and their servants. This is reflected by its abundance in the archaeological collections.

More recently, the tin-glazed tiles that I excavated during my 2012 field season are related to the upstairs fireplaces. Only three of the original tiles remain. The bedroom fireplaces are decorated with reproduction tiles that were installed by the PHMC. The newer tiles are not accurate representations of the eighteenth-century ones, as they have slightly different motifs and the surface is glossy unlike the matte finish of the original tin-glazed sherds. My find further supports the use of these tiles by the Graemes, while correcting the appearance of the original tiles.

Unfortunately, apart from the ceramic and reconstructed features such as the summer kitchen and stone walls, the archaeology has been relegated to the storage shelves. This is not for a lack of interest as all of the volunteers and staff at Graeme Park were supportive and quite excited by my work at the site. Both Carla and Herb want Public Archaeology to be a prominent part of their education programs, but it is my job to help kick start this new era in interpretation. After I process and catalog the artifacts, I aim to mend as many of the artifacts as possible and display them inside the Keith mansion. I would like to use the objects that are already on display inside the house to create an atmosphere much like at Stenton. The few objects that are on display are purposely arranged in an orderly way. In order to breathe new life back into the site, I plan to incorporate the archaeological and non-archaeological objects into each room.

After years of giving tours, Herb has noticed that “once you get beyond 5th grade, [the interest in Graeme Park] dies." The site does not attract many high school students and there is "no attempt to engage older kids." As a result, Herb asserts that "maybe more [effort] should be put into outreach programs" (2013). Graeme Park is in desperate need of new programming that grabs the attention of both children and young adults. For the younger audience, an activity should be created that engages them mentally and physically.

Stenton has found success in their Hands on History program. Another historic site has also created a unique program that is targeted as elementary school kids. The Dallas Heritage Village sought an approach to interpretation that "was a way to get the visitors to interact with the spaces without the constant presence of a human guide" (Montgomery and Pryer 2013:50).

Using their General Store building, the staff gradually incorporated "elements of participatory learning" (ibid). The first activity that was implemented was a bartering activity in which the kids were given fake money and they had to trade, barter, or purchase items from the staff and volunteers. The parents also became quite engaged. They would help their kids look through Montgomery Ward catalogs and compare prices with those offered in the General Store. Montgomery and Pryer contend that this activity is different, albeit subtle, to hands-on activities. The experiences of the children were incredibly individualized. The staff and visitors lacked a script and rigid set of guidelines. The loosely structured activity did have "learning goals, but no prescribed path to get there" (Montgomery and Pryer 2013:51). The authors feel that this first effort to provide a truly participatory activity was successful.

Some contend that traditional living history interpretation does not leave room for imagination to roam and explore. Montgomery and Pryer explain that, “A scene is presented, and the visitor moves on. But by giving visitors the tools to engage, they become a part of that scene” (ibid). Graeme Park could greatly benefit from a site-specific interactive curriculum. With such a rich history and long list of men and women who lived or frequented the estate, there are numerous directions that the staff and volunteers at Graeme Park could take when creating future programs.

I also believe that it would be beneficial for the park to partner with other local historic sites such as Hope Lodge, John Priestly House, and even the Mercer Museum and Fonthill Castle. A program that ties together multiple historic sites would encourage tourism. More importantly, however, inter-site programming could inspire visitors to contextualize Pennsylvania history in a broader way and create connections between the locations.

Along those lines, I know that Graeme Park would benefit from a collaborative archaeology themed exhibit that spans multiple sites. For example, the Penrose-Strawbridge house, built on land once part of the Graeme estate, has buckets of artifacts in the basement. A few years ago, a local historical society began an excavation that was led by a self-proclaimed archaeologist. She insisted that she knew what she was doing after years of volunteering at professional digs. After a falling out with the residents of the house, she left the collection in complete shambles. The couple contacted me at one point to see if I was interested in working on the collection. I had to politely decline, but I attempted to find an experienced Anthropology undergraduate to who was willing to make sense of the artifacts. I was not able to find an interested student. The buckets of artifacts remain unprocessed and undocumented.

If the Horsham Preservation & Historical Association, the current stewards of the property, were to find the proper individual to take care of the collection, it would the perfect opportunity to collaborate on a project. The Keith mansion and the Penrose-Strawbridge house reflect two distinct periods in the history of the property prior to 1958. The archaeological exhibits would complement each other by showing the architectural, material, and genealogical changes from the eighteenth to the twentieth century. Incorporating other historic sites in this endeavor could create the opportunity for themed exhibits and events as well—Colonial foodways, trade, gender and class issues, military history, etc. Again, this would attract visitors that may have otherwise never visited Graeme Park, while simultaneously creating professional relationships with other sites.

With regards to younger audiences, programs should be created that attract children to the discipline of archaeology as well as Graeme Park itself. Carla, expressing similar sentiments, suggests "programs targeted for older kids such as an archaeology program with a hand on component" (2013). While my Public Archaeology Day introduced younger children to the discipline, a four-hour program is not enough to thoroughly teach them about the archaeology and its relation to the site. Targeted for middle school age children, an archaeology summer camp would be the perfect way to integrate history and archaeology into a weeklong session. Middle-school age children would have the proper hand-eye coordination for the actual fieldwork and have the background knowledge to interpret their experiences in a proper historical context.

I believe an important component of a summer camp would be for the campers to create interpretive programs by using their own experiences and knowledge in a unique way. Daniel Spock proclaims that, "More even than the skills of reading and writing, analysis and scholarship, imagination is the primary act of thinking historically" (Spock 2010:118). This type of programs offers a unique hands-on-history component that the classroom rarely can. It is not enough to teach children how to dig up old things; it is the responsibility of educators to then show them *what to do with those objects* and how to give them new life and meaning above the ground.

One glaring issue that I observed at both Graeme Park and Stenton is the limited scope of perspectives that are interpreted. In the course of my interview with Laura Keim, the subject of alternative narratives was raised. She explains that some historic sites are struggling to stay relevant in an increasingly diverse society and that some "are becoming community centers," in that their programs offerings radically diverge from their mission statement in order to keep their doors open (2013). In the face of changing cultural values, places like Stenton suffer from "lack of assimilation." The interpretation does not address the issue of slavery or African American history. It is difficult to make Stenton's history pertinent to a diverse population, especially when considering expanding school curriculums.

Graeme Park experiences the same narrow focus. The Graeme family did employ servants and they did own slaves. Little of that is mentioned during tours or programs, save for a mannequin and an enlarged copy of an ad that Thomas Graeme placed in the local newspaper regarding an escaped slave. One of the reasons why the issue of slavery is overlooked is due to the general discomfort museum staff and visitors have when confronted with such a sensitive issue. When "presenting history in a museum setting [it] would be a lot easier if history did not include war, slavery, exclusion, poverty, illness, religion, politics and a number of other emotionally-charged topics" (Cannon 2013:13).

However, history does in fact include all of these “emotionally charged” topics and evading them cannot change the past. It will only present a skewed and misleading account of the past.

The historical research over the years has largely focused on the architectural development of the site and the intriguing history of the Keith, Graeme, and Penrose families. From early on, the primary line of inquiry was whether the Keith house was intended as the Keith-era distillery or if it was another building that has been razed or converted over the years. Other scholars have delved into the renovations that took place under the guidance of Thomas Graeme or were captivated by the captivating and turbulent life of Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson. This tradition still continues at Graeme Park; many of the women at the site, myself included, feel drawn to the story of that prominent woman.

Herb, an Architectural Historian by trade, still searches for evidence to support this theories concerning the malt house and whether the original front of the mansion was the north or south side. Unfortunately, there is an abundance of information for topics that have engaged staff, volunteers, and scholars over the years, while others subjects lack such rigorous research. The “unsavory” topics of servitude and slavery have unfortunately fallen through the cracks.

Another reason why the Graeme family’s story has always been at the forefront of interpretation is that the archaeology has also chosen to largely ignore the non-Graemes. Apart from the Keith house, such buildings such as the summer kitchen, tenant house, barn, smokehouse, and poultry barn have been the focus of interest over the years. The earlier excavations sought out the buildings themselves and did not really consider the people who populated those buildings. The later projects attempted to verify or expand earlier findings, or they seemed preoccupied with the area immediately surrounding the mansion. No questions were asked about the slaves or servants that lived and worked at the estate. Regrettably, the archaeologists did not seem very concerned with these disparate narratives. Susan M. Pearce contends that "Museum material culture studies need to be put upon for a fuller and more secure theoretical basis by a willingness to grasp at the large issues, however difficult or elusive some of these may be" (1994:125). I cannot say whether the archaeological collections in Harrisburg speak to the presence of these individuals, but without further inquiry, we will never know what kind of stories the artifacts can tell us and how we can incorporate them into future interpretation.

While most of what I propose is long term and conditional, one relatively simple way to absorb archaeology into site interpretation is signage. When asked about building a relationship between the site interpretation and archaeology, Carla expressed an interest in signs to "mark out the boundaries" of previous excavations (2013). Apart from the National Historic Landmark plaque, text is absent from the landscape. Even the reconstructed summer kitchen lacks any indication that its existence is the direct cause of the 1958 excavation. The kitchen, carriage turnaround, and stone walls could be easily marked. Slightly more complicated, however, would be locating and marking the foundations of the other outbuildings such as the tenant house, barn, and poultry shed. While some are simply covered by topsoil, the others are obscured by years of plant overgrowth. Trees, bushes and tall grass now crowd what was once open space.

Herb Levy created a comprehensive map that details all of the major archaeological findings from decades of excavation. The map could be used to identify these forgotten features. The Friends of Graeme Park could place signs along the nature trails; each marker would explain what is known about that particular feature, what information the archaeology provided, and what significance it has to the site. Additionally, enlarged photos from the excavations would allow visitors to better imagine what took place in those exact spot years earlier.

An audio tour would be an excellent supplemental resource to the archaeological trail, especially since the guided tour is typically restricted to the house itself. An audio component would provide guests with more information and detail than signage alone. Many people, young and old, visit Graeme Park not for its tours or programs, but simply for its picturesque landscape. By integrating the archaeology into the natural scenery, my hope is that more visitors would be encouraged to engage with the site's exceptional history.

CHAPTER NINE
CONCLUSION

My expectations going into this thesis were not unreasonable. Many of the issues I addressed are simply too complicated to be easily fixed in a forum such as this, while some are simply out of the control of The Friends of Graeme Park, staff, and concerned citizens—myself included. I don't mean to disempower anyone, or diminish the significance of the efforts put forth by all those involved. I truly believe, like Herb, that without the perseverance of such individuals, Graeme Park would no longer be a functioning site. However, despite our best efforts, the fate of such historic sites belongs to the people who are distanced from the realities of the situation. Politicians pass their budgets and legislate laws that profoundly influence places like Graeme Park without really understanding what it all means.

Ultimately, I wanted the issue of budget cuts, undeveloped archaeological projects, and lack of staff availability to be brought to the forefront of house museum interpretation. Graeme Park is only one example; thousands of historic buildings and associations are currently struggling with the exact same issues. I am of the opinion that self-sufficiency and self-reliance are two incredibly important traits in any successful individual. What I have learned through this course of study, however, is that institutions can possess these same qualities. All of those involved at Graeme Park are the ones who fundraise and find the time to keep the doors open. It is my hope that the comments and strategies for future interpretation outlined in this paper will one day be actualized.

As Laura Keim so astutely pointed out, the "public doesn't care about history in the same way" (2013). It is our job as educators and interpreters to present the past in a way that *will* engage the public and that *will* make them care. What is this all for, if not to facilitate relationships between the past and present, to engage the public in a way that makes the past relevant and personal to them? That is our one great challenge and that is our one great reward.

CHAPTER TEN
SUMMER 2012 EXCAVATION

Application of Geophysics at Graeme Park

While the 1985 garden excavation answered some questions about the Georgian garden, it also raised other questions about its layout and use. The Northern and Eastern walls were identified, but what about a Western wall, especially given the Georgian aesthetic of symmetry? Remnants of a few brick walkways remained, but were there others and could they be located using geophysics?

On April 24, 2011, Peter A. Leach, a Geoarchaeologist from John Milner Associates, Inc. conducted a Geophysical survey at Graeme Park. The survey took place beyond the North side of the Keith Mansion in an area previously identified as Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson's 18th century formal garden (Kardas and Larrabee 1985). The results of the Ground Penetrating Radar survey revealed multiple anomalies that appear cultural, not natural.

Leach conducted the GPR survey using a GSSI SIR-3000 GPR system with a 400 MHz central-frequency antenna. He further explains:

> The system was mounted on a Utility Cart and utilized odometer-triggered collection of 12 traces per foot (one reading every inch). GPR data were collected within a single geophysical survey grid measuring 60 feet (x) by 85 feet (y). The geophysical grid was surveyed along both the X and Y grid axes in a bidirectional collection pattern. Geophysical grids were surveyed with surveyor's tape measures and subsequently mapped with a sub-meter GPS unit (Leech 2011)

Unfortunately, field conditions were not optimal for a GPR survey; the presence of fine-grain silty sediment as well as high moisture content proved to be a challenge. In addition, a large tree on the northeastern side of the survey was another source of disturbance. Leach was able to do a depth-correction on the data and found that the depth of GPR penetration was around 3.5 to 4 feet (ibid).

There are anomalies at the Keith House that are consistent with archaeological features. The maps are included in the appendix. Leach summarized: two long, linear anomalies with obvious right angles – these two anomalies could be buried walls; the anomalies are present between 1 and 2.5 feet below surface; an area of possible rubble in the upper right section of the GPR grid; two possible shaft features that extend from roughly 0.5 ft to 2.5 feet below surface; three linear stratigraphic anomalies that may represent the signature of previous excavation trenches; two linear features that run across the yard, which are clearly modern utility lines; and an area of likely root disturbance is present around the large tree (Leech 2011).

These results were not just important to my project, but assists in a general understanding of the site's landscape and land use history. For example, the survey confirms previous assumptions that the area experienced little disturbance and disruption since its conception.   Additionally, it shows that the garden lacked a Western wall. Initially, this seems like a contradiction of the laws of Georgian architecture; however, to the West of the garden is a small man-made bump or hill with a ditch on the Eastern side closest to the mansion. It is possible that this anomaly is a Ha-Ha, a landscape design feature made popular in England and Anglo-America by men like William Kent and Lancelot 'Capability' Brown. The Ha-Ha was used to keep livestock out of gardens without obstructing the natural view from within the garden.

Based on the Geophysics, three initial locations were identified as significant to the research objectives of this project: the terminal South end of the previously identified

Eastern garden wall; the potential shaft feature located closest to the house; and the the potential shaft feature furthest from the house on the Western side of the surveyed area (see Appendix). Two additional units were also established due to the findings of the initial three units. A series of five 5’ x 5’ units were positioned with the intent that larger excavation units would expose the entirety of the identified cultural features.

The test units were completed using shovel and hand excavation. All excavated soils from intact soil horizons and features were screened through a 1/4-inch mesh hardware cloth. Additionally, all recovered artifacts were stored in labeled plastic bags until lab analysis and cataloging could be conducted. Standardized field forms, hand-drawn plan and profile maps, and digital photography were all used to thoroughly document the project. Units 1 and 2 were permanently closed. A piece of clear plastic tarp was placed in Units 3, 4 and 5 before being backfilled.

Preliminary Findings

The first 5’ x 5’ unit was placed in the southeast corner of the GPR surveyed area where Leach identified remnants of the eastern garden wall. A high concentration of modern nails was found close to the surface. The artifacts became more rich and varied as the depth increased. The amount of gravel in the horizon increased and the soil became clumpier as the level progressed, most notably in the northwest quadrant. Charcoal appeared in the southern half of the unit at level closing. Additionally, soil that was lighter in color emerged in the eastern side of the unit at closing, while a half circle of lighter soil (approximately .4’ in diameter) was revealed in the southwest corner. Recovered artifacts included window glass, animal bone, ceramic fragments, as well as modern and historic nail types. Charcoal and mortar was present but not sampled. Brick fragments were sampled.

The second level contained mottled soil. The northwest quadrant continued to have a distinct appearance into Level 2. The soil texture was coarser and was lighter in color, but still mottled. This lens was 1” deep and then disappeared. It contained fragmented ceramic and glass. The remainder of the level was a uniform mottled soil that contained ceramics such as white ware, Dendritic Mocha ware and yellow ware. Other artifacts included animal bone, nails and glass. Larger pieces of window glass that were in a vertical position were also recovered. Additionally, two large stones appeared as the level was troweled; three stones were almost fully exposed at the closing of Level 2. They were aligned in a North-South fashion; at the time of excavation, this was interpreted as possibly indicating the presence of the eastern garden wall. Mortar, quartz and charcoal were present but not sampled. Brick fragments were sampled.

At the opening of Level 3, differences between the eastern and western sides of the unit were emerging. Porous orange brick fragments were evident in the eastern half of the unit. In contrast, the western half contained larger pieces of solid red brick. As the level was brought down, there was an increase in stones throughout the unit, but primarily in the western half and center. The larger stones were more prominent in the center of the unit running North-South. In addition, there was a cluster of stones and chunks of mortar close in the northwest quadrant. At the closing of Level 3, orange brick fragments increased in the northeast corner. The soil in the western half of the excavation unit revealed itself to be a darker soil versus the lighter brown soil in the eastern half. Mortar and charcoal was present but not sampled. Larger pieces of brick,

brick fragments and oyster shell was sampled. Recovered artifacts include ceramic sherds, nails, animal bones and teeth, and glass.

Level 4 was opened in the western half of Unit 1. It was approximately .9’ wide across the northern wall and 1.9’ across the southern wall. There was a lens of darker brown soil from .97 to 1’. Below the lens there was an increase in gravel. Furthermore, larger pieces of brick and additional stones were unearthed. The soil in the southwest corner was grittier and sandier than the rest of the level, but there was no color change. Mortar and charcoal was present but not sampled. Brick was sampled. Ceramics, glass and nails were collected in addition to a metal button that was found in the southwest corner of the level.

Level 5 was opened on the eastern side of the excavation unit. It measured 2.2’ in width along the northern until wall and 1.9’ wide along the southern wall. There was a brick lens at 1.1’ in the northeast quadrant and .9’ in the southeast quadrant. The lens contained a very porous orange brick that crumbled apart and could be sliced with the trowel.   In addition, charcoal appeared in the southeast quadrant of the unit close to the southern wall. This was the final level on the eastern side of the unit; upon level closing we had hit the subsoil. It is worth noting that Level 5 produced significantly less artifacts than in previous levels. One diagnostic artifact, a kaolin pipe bowl fragment, was unearthed. Mortar and charcoal were present but not sampled, while brick was sampled.

The final level to be excavated in Unit 1 was Level 6. Level 6 was opened on the western side of the unit. There was a small semi-circular soil stain in the southwest corner. There was also a large piece of red brick wedged against the wall feature. Upon closing of Unit 6, we had reached the subsoil. The artifact density was low. Artifacts included ceramics and glass. Brick was sampled.

Feature 1 was first encountered in Level 2 as stones oriented in a North-South direction were unearthed. The soil on top of the top level of stones was mottled backfill. Once that was troweled away, it was clear that the soil in between the stones was darker than the surrounding soil. The remnants of the eastern garden wall lacked structural integrity. The wall was collapsed to some degree with stones laying perpendicular to the wall rather than parallel, and others were placed in various angles rather than laying in flat levels. Additionally, some of the stones were still attached by mortar, but the majority was not.

Due to the state of the wall itself, and at the suggestion of my advisor, I excavated this feature. The purpose of this was to determine how deep the wall was constructed and what possible Graeme-era artifacts, if any, had been incorporated into the feature.

The first level of Feature 1 consisted of stones with tightly packed sterile soil between them. The northern half appeared to be more attached by chunks of mortar than the southern half. Mortar dust was minimal. Numerous artifacts were collected as the wall was taken down. They were uncovered along the eastern and western edges of the stone wall. A large animal bone was found on the western side of the feature and a pipe stem was discovered alongside the eastern edge. Additionally, Larger pieces of red brick were wedged against the wall. Ceramic, glass, nails and other animal bones were also collected. At closing, Level 1 of Feature 1 was 1.34’ deep at the northern end, 1.80’ deep in the center and 1.71 at the southern end.

The second level of the feature was comprised of smaller stones, large chunks of mortar and mortar dust. There were minimal artifacts. The second level of Feature 1 was closed at 2.11’ (N), 1.95’ (C) and 1.92’ (S) once subsoil was hit.

The location for Unit 2 was chosen as a result of the GPR survey. Leach identified the area as a possible shaft feature. A 5’ x 5’ unit was placed in accordance with the GPR map. Level 1, the organic A horizon, contained minimal yard scatter. Artifacts include glass, ceramic and nails. There were no disturbances or features.

Level 2 initially appeared to be subsoil, but we continued to shovel the southern half of the unit to ensure that a feature was not overlooked. Additionally, an STP was placed in the southeast corner of the unit. The STP was brought down to 1.37’ below datum. The level was confirmed to be sterile subsoil and no features were identified.

As with Unit 2, the placement of Unit 3 was determined by the GPR survey. This location was identified as another possible shaft feature. Level 1 of the 5’ x 5’ unit was the organic A horizon. There was a lens of mottled soil in Level 1, excluding the northwest corner. Upon Level 1 closing, a noticeable depression in the center of the unit became apparent. Moreover, mottled soil was present in the southeast corner and along the eastern wall. Rocks were virtually absent except for one in the center of the eastern wall and one adjacent to the eastern wall in the unit. Mortar was present but not sampled. Brick was sampled.

In Level 2 there was a lens of porous orange brick in the northernmost section of the unit. It ran east-west approximately 2’ out from the northern wall. There was also a concentration of tin-glazed ceramic sherds in the southwest quadrant of Unit 3 and a concentration of Southeast Pennsylvania slipware in the northwest quadrant. In addition, more stones concentrated in the center of the unit were exposed as the level was troweled. Dense red clay became quite evident as Level 2 was cleaned and closed. The distinct soil indicated that a feature might have been present.

A semicircle of contrasting soil was present along the eastern wall. It was initially treated as Feature 2 until it was troweled. It was a pocket of mottled soil that extended further through the unit as depth increased. The feature was renamed Level 2A and is considered to be part of backfill that extends into the surrounding area.

The soil surrounding the red clay was treated as Level 3. It was a mottled 10YR 6/8 brownish yellow soil. It felt less compact and lacked the gravel texture compared to Level 2. A lens of compact brick fragments was documented in the northern half of the unit; it was concentrated in the northeast quadrant. As Level 3 was brought down, the outline of the stone feature became more prominent. The perimeter of the stone feature was more defined in the southern portion of Unit 3. The red clay that was resting on top of the feature was not as contained in the northern section so the perimeter of the feature could not initially be identified. Level 3 ended just shy of one foot below datum. Brick, mortar and charcoal was present but only brick was sampled. Additionally, there was a concentration of tin-glazed sherds in the southwest quadrant of the unit.

Level 4 was treated in a similar manner to Level 3; the soil surrounding the red clay associated with Feature 2 was identified as Level 4. There was a slight change in the soil texture and color that made it distinct from Level 3. The soil felt less clumpy and appeared to contain more clay. Subsoil was hit 1.1' to 1.34' below datum. An STP was dug in the southwest corner to confirm.

Moreover, the artifact density was lower than in previous levels. Pieces of Southeast Pennsylvania slipware and animal bone were found along the perimeter of the Feature 2. Brick was sampled. Mortar and charcoal were not present in the level.

The fourth unit was opened directly North off of Unit 3. A lens of porous orange brick containing larger pieces of red brick was present in the eastern half of the unit and the northeast quadrant. Beneath the brick lens, the red clay that appeared in Unit 3 also emerged in Unit 4. The southeast corner of the unit contained stones, most of which were sandstone. In addition, the soil was slightly more gravely and reddish in color compared to the rest of Level 1. However, the clay only occurred in the eastern half of the unit below the brick lens. Initially, the western side of Level 1 did not contain any brick and lacked red clay. At the closing of Level 1, the red clay was only present in the southeast quadrant of the unit.

The red clay in the southeast corner was treated as Level 2. The level extended 2.3' wide across the northern edge, 3.4' long across the western wall and 3' wide along the southern edge. The clay was incredibly compact and contained few artifacts. At 1.5' below datum in the northwest corner and 1.2' in the northeast corner, a utility trench was hit. Level 2 was closed upon reaching the subsoil.

Level 3 consisted of the remainder of the unit, including all corners except for the northwest. A vertical stain in the soil was present at the closing of Level 1. It became more prevalent as Level 3 was troweled. The stain revealed itself to be the utility line at

1.18’ below datum. The soil in the northeast corner was a slightly darker color than the rest of the level. This stain contained brick fragments. The brick was found in and around the utility trench, indicating that the soil stain was overflow from the utility trench backfill. The remainder of the level was sterile and closed once it was determined that subsoil was reached.

The second feature, a circular stone anomaly, was contained within Unit 3. Although the red clay that rested on top of the feature continued into Unit 4, the feature itself did not. The red clay in Unit 3 and 4 are part of the same depositional event, however.

The stone feature was first noted at about 1‘ below datum. As the levels around the feature we taken down, the outline of a rounded feature became more prominent. The stones near the center made a clearer pattern, while the stones closer to the northern wall were more haphazard. The feature measured approximately 3.5’ in diameter and 3.5’ long running North-South.

The feature was lightly troweled to better define the layout of the feature. The majority of stones that created the perimeter were flat and laid parallel to the ground. In contrast, the stones in the center of the feature lacked a clear pattern.

Initially, it was my intention to bisect the feature so the stratigraphy could be documented, but after cleaning up the top of the feature, it became clear that it was virtually impossible given the sheer amount of collapsed stones in the center. I then decided take down the center of the feature by natural level(s) as the stones were removed. The soil that was removed along with the stones was screened. The only artifact collected from this feature was found during this time.

Once the stones were removed, there was a soil change. The soil that rested on tope of the feature and in between the stones was 5YR 3/2 Dark Reddish brown, the same red clay that part of the depositional event. However, below the stones the soil changed to 10YR 3/4 Dark Yellowish brown, the same color and texture as the surrounding subsoil.

Unfortunately, due to poor weather conditions, Unit 3 had to be closed shortly thereafter. Despite my best efforts to prevent the rain from seeping into the units, the feature was flooded on a few occasions. I felt that the integrity of the feature was being compromised, so I lined the feature and the rest of the unit with clear plastic tarps before backfilling.

The final unit was placed directly North of Unit 1. Considering the rich density of 18th century artifacts that emerged from Unit 1, it was my hope that a second unit along the wall would prove just as profitable. Due to poor weather conditions and time constraints, only the topsoil was removed from this unit.

The artifacts are currently being processed. The field report is pending prior to the completion of laboratory analysis.

REFERENCES CITED

Anonymous

1809 "An Account of the Life and Character of Mrs. Elizabeth Ferguson." Elizabeth Graeme Ferguson Collection 1766-1809. Mercer Museum Archives, Doylestown.

Borstling, Henry

1965 Resistivity Survey of Graeme Park, Horsham, PA.

Campbell, J. Duncan

1958 Archaeological Investigations at Graeme Park, Montgomery Co., P.A. 26 May—August 1958.

Cannon, Katie

2013 Handle with Care: Living History Museums and Uncomfortable Topics. ALFAM Bulletin Spring 2013 XLIII(1):13-16.

Cliver, E. Blaine and Paul D. Dolinsky

2000 Addendum to Graeme Park Fountain Low, Horsham Plantation, HABS No. PA-579. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

Cotter, John, Daniel G. Roberts and Michael Parrington

1993 The Buried Past: An Archaeological History of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Deihl, Richard and Richard C. Fidler

1965 Graeme Park Report. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

Esther, Lucia

1966 Preliminary Report, Graeme Park Archaeological Excavations, 1967. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

Friends of Graeme Park

2007 The Graeme Park Gazette October-December 2007. http://www.graemepark.org/_docs/_friendsNews/octdec07.pdf, accessed 20 September 2013.

2008 The Graeme Park Gazette April-June 2008. http://www.graemepark.org/_docs/friendsNews/aprjun08.pdf, accessed 20 September, 2013.

2010 The Graeme Park Gazette January-March 2010. http://www.graemepark.org/_docs/_friendsNews/JanMar10.pdf, accessed 26 September, 2013.

Hally, David J.

1961 Archaeological Investigations at Graeme Park, Montgomery County, P.A. June 22—Sept. 5, 1961. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

1962 Archaeological Investigations at Graeme Park, Montgomery County, P.A. June 11—Aug. 31, 1962. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

Harris, Donna Ann
2010 A consequence of massive budget cuts–missing artifacts at the PHMC. Heritage Consulting, Inc. October 29, http://www.heritageconsultinginc.com/blog 2010/10/29/a-consequence-of-massive-budget-cuts-missing-artifacts-at-the-phmc/, accessed 20 September 2013.

Kammen, Carol
1986 On Doing Local History: Reflections on What Local Historians Do, Why, and What it Means. Nashville: American Association for State and Local History.

Kardas, Susan and Edward Larrabee
1985 Exploratory Garden Archaeology at Three Historic Sites: Graeme Park, Pennsbury Manor, and Moon Williamson House.

Keim, Laura C. and Deborah L. Miller
2010 Piece by Piece, Room by Room: Stenton Ceramics Restored. American Ceramic Circle Newsletter, Fall 2010:1-4.

King, Thomas F.
2008 Cultural Resource Laws & Practice. New York: AltaMira Press.

Leach, Peter
2011 Graeme Park Ground Penetrating Radar Summary.

Montgomery, Evelyn and Melissa Pryer
2013 The Participatory Historic Site? Experiments at Dallas Heritage Village. *In* Maintaining Relevance in a Digital Age: Proceedings of the 2012 ALFAM Conference and Annual Meeting, Volume XXXV:50-55.

McConaughy, Mike
1990 The 1989 Excavations for a Proposed Sump Pump and Drain Installation in the Basement of the Keith Mansion at Graeme Park (36Mg167), Montgomery

County, Pennsylvania. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

McDonald, Emma
2012 Virtual Exhibitions: Expanding our Research. *In* Maintaing Relevance in a Digital Age: Proceedings of the 2012 ALFAM Conference and Annual Meeting, Volume XXXV:25-28.

National Park Service
2013 Archeological and Historic Preservation Act. http://www.nps.gov/archeology/tools/Laws/ahpa.htm, accessed 25 September 2013.

Ousterhout, Anne M.
2003 The Most Learned Woman in America: A Life of Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Page, Max and Randall Mason
2004 Rethinking the Roots of the Historic Preservation Movement. *In* Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States. Max Page and Randall Mason, eds. Pp. 3-16. New York: Routledge.

Pearce, Susan M.
1994 Thinking about things. *In* Interpreting Objects and Collections. Susan M. Pearce, ed. Pp. 125-132. New York: Routledge.

Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC)

2012 Summary of Strategic Plan 2012-2015. http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/about_the_phmc/1579/strategic_plan_2012-2015/1249095, accessed 15 September 2013.

2013 Grants and Funding. www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/grants_and_funding/3748, accessed 26 September 2013.

Prown, Jules
1994 Mind in matter: an introduction to material theory and method. *In* Interpreting Objects and Collections. Susan M. Pearce, ed. Pp. 133-143. New York: Routledge.

Salisbury, Stephen
2009 Budget Cuts Endanger Historical Sites in Pa. Philly.com. February 22, http://articles.philly.com/2009-02-22/news/25280841_1_county-historical-societies-budget-cuts-museums, accessed 19 September 2013.

Spock, Daniel

2010 Imagination—A Child's Gateway to Engaging with the Past. *In* Connecting Kids to History with Museum Exhibition, D. Lynn McRainey and John Russick, eds. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press, Pp. 117-136.

Stenton

2013 Stenton: Education. http://stenton.org/index.php/education/, accessed 28 September 2013.

Tilden, Freeman

1984 Interpreting Our Heritage. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Warfel, Steven G.

1985 Archaeological Testing and Monitoring Report: Graeme Park, 36 MG 167. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

Witthoff, John

1964 Notes on Wood Floors at the Keith House. Manuscript on file at the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pa.

Zeidman, Alison

2013 Pennsylvania State Budget Update: What the 2013-14 budget means for arts and culture. Greater Philadelphia Cultural Alliance. July 1, http://www.philaculture.org/groundswell/pennsylvania-state-budget-update, accessed 20 September 2013.