each other and against the list of purchasers from the 1805 Darrach sales were aimed at better understanding the stores' customers and how they and other Duck Creek and surrounding hundreds' residents decided where to shop. In addition, in order to compare each merchant's goods, the item and quantity reported in each transaction in 1809 and 1810 were recorded and categorized using the same system employed in analyzing the Darrach sale inventories. Finally, the money and goods received in payment and on account during the same two years were recorded, categorized, and compared between the two merchants. This too yielded interesting results regarding the nature and variability of the local and regional exchange systems.

While the historical account which follows certainly leaves room for the archaeological record to contribute much of significance, it too will enrich the archaeological interpretations of the John Darrach Store site.

THE JOHN DARRACH STORE IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In 1716 Benjamin Shumer purchased a tract of land at the fork of Duck Creek and Green's Branch. Here he laid out the town he named Salisbury, known locally throughout the eighteenth century as Duck Creek Village (Caley n.d.:13). Three years later the town had so developed as a regional shipping center that a road was built from the Chesapeake Bay at the head of the Chester River to Duck Creek, at the request of Maryland and Delaware farmers seeking access to Philadelphia for their produce (Grettler 1991:4). Over the next several years Scottish Presbyterian and French Huguenot immigrants arrived in numbers in the Duck Creek area, among them the Allees, Cahoons, Spruances, McLanes (Caley 1978:125), and at least by the early 1730s, William White. In 1748 when White purchased the property on which the store was constructed, he also was among a small group of fellow Presbyterians purchasing a site on the south side of Pairman's Branch (Gravelly Run) for a meeting house and cemetery (Caley 1978:125). By this time regional farmers, shippers and merchants had already benefited for almost a decade from the canal cut through Bombay Hook. Thirteen tortuous miles of navigation along Duck Creek and much precious time was saved in reaching Delaware Bay en route to Philadelphia. Within a few years, Thomas Green had established a ship's landing east of Duck Creek Village, above the confluence of Duck Creek and Pairman's Branch (Caley n.d.:15). Later owned by John Darrach and just the other side of the Maryland Road which passed in front of his store, this landing site developed in the nineteenth century into the shipping community of Smyrna Landing.

By 1760 Philadelphia dominated a trading area extending over 20,000 square miles and including about 375,000 inhabitants. Grain, tobacco, flour, barrel hoops and staves, and lumber reached the city from the Delaware and Maryland hinterland (Grettler 1991:5-6; Walzer 1972:163, 169) via merchants like William White aboard sloops and shallops such as his Red Cedar and Mulberry. Philadelphia's dominion was further strengthened after the French and Indian Wars. "Prior to 1763, ships bound for the West Indies sometimes left directly from Duck Creek Landing and other Delaware shipping points. After the end of the ...[w]ar, Philadelphia merchants assumed [even] more direct responsibility for shipments and most... were routed through Philadelphia" (Grettler 1991:5, Footnote 3). Duck Creek Village by now was a thriving community boasting a saw, grist and bolting mill, a tanyard, tavern, blacksmith shop and other small businesses, and two churches (Caley n.d.:15). In 1768 Samuel Ball purchased a 15 acre tract of land from James Green at the intersection of the Maryland Road and the north-south King's Highway. Within two years Duck Creek Crossroads (later Smyrna) too was a thriving commercial village (Caley n.d.:15, 1978:76).

Research has unfortunately still not provided definitive evidence that William and/or John White were engaged in shipping and mercantile activities nor that the store was constructed prior to 1775. The Pennsylvania Gazette carried advertisements of John White, apothecary, first in Philadelphia in 1759 and then in Wilmington in 1761, but no Duck Creek Whites appear (Pennsylvania Gazette: May 3, 1759; July 9, 1761). At the same time, at least one Duck Creek area merchant moved in the opposite direction in the 1760s. Benjamin Gibbs and Son, at the Crossroads, Kent County, advertised in 1763 in the Gazette. Their ad suggests the nature of the merchandise offered by the Whites' potential competition:

> Rum, molasses, wine, loaf and muscavado sugar, tea, coffee, chocolate, pepper, cinnamon, alspice, indian, nutmegs, raisins, soap, candles, rice, enamelled, and blue and white China Ware; a large Assortment of both; a variety of European and East India Goods, very suitable for the season, and on lower terms (they think) than such were ever sold for there, or can now be bought, except in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania Gazette: August 4, 1763).

Three years later Gibbs advertised as a merchant in Front Street, Philadelphia (Pennsylvania Gazette: April 24, 1766).

Knowledge of the Whites in the first half of the 1770s comes exclusively from the tax lists. William White appears in the 1770, 1772, 1773 and 1774 tax lists assessed respectively at £40, £50, £50, and £50. John is not listed in the 1772 list, but in the others is assessed respectively at £12, £10, and £12. William White, Jr. also appears for the first time in 1774, assessed at the lowest value of £3. John Darrach is first assessed in 1772, at £15; the following year his assessment remains the same, increasing in 1774 to £20 (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1769-1774). The State Archives hold the probate records of a John White, yeoman of Kent County, who died intestate in 1773, leaving behind a wife Judith and two small children. The records do not note where in the county White resided, and the inventory is that of a yeoman farmer raising grain and livestock (John White, Kent County, 1773-1775). They do not indicate this John White was operating a store, nor that he was the John White noted as the former occupant of the Darrach Store on the 1781 road return.

The 1775 road petition and 1781 return both refer to the public landing across from the store as Robert Holliday's landing (also called Green's Landing and later Smyrna Landing) (Kent County Road Petitions 1781-1793). An advertisement in January of the former year links the landing with the Duck Creek milling operations:

> To be rented for a term of years, the noted grist-mill on Duck Creek in Kent County, on Delaware, within one short mile of the Cross-roads, and two miles of a landing that conveys the flour to Philadelphia market, at a small expense;...[the mill is powered by two water wheels, and features three pairs of stones, including one best French burr stone. It]... is in the midst of a fine wheat country, may have the choice of wheat to make superfine flour, small boats and canoes come to the mill tail... there is a barn, stable, and some fruit trees. About eight or ten acres of meadow to be let with the mill... Enquire of Ann Holliday, administratrix of Richard Holliday or to Robert Holliday and Warner Mifflin, or to William Craig [who advertised as a merchant] in Philadelphia" (Pennsylvania Gazette: January 18, 1775).

Smyrna historian George Caley reports that David Kennedy, a Duck Creek merchant and possibly father of William, who married John Darrach's daughter (who was also William White's granddaughter), began sailing grain vessels from Holliday's landing prior to the Revolution (Caley n.d.:17). Caley also identifies John Darrach and David Kennedy as local patriot leaders during the Revolution, noting that Darrach's tombstone, which survives in the Old Presbyterian Cemetery, reads "soldier of the Revolution" (Caley n.d.:17, 1978:125). The published Delaware military records from the Revolutionary War period, however, do not include any mention of John Darrach (Delaware Archives Military Records 1911:Vol. III). Tax assessment lists indicated William White suffered financially only slightly during the war, while John Darrach prospered. White was assessed at £45 in 1776, his estate at the same amount in 1777. Darrach's assessment increased ten pounds to £30 in 1776 and 1777. John White also appears in both lists, at £15, suggesting he was not the White probated in 1773. William White, Jr. was also assessed in both years, at £8 and £12 respectively (Kent County Tax Records, Duck Creek Hundred, 1776-1777).

On the eve of the Revolution, in 1775, John Darrach married William White's daughter Jane. Darrach's tax assessments, his apparent participation in the Revolutionary War, his nationality (Scotch-Irish) and his religion (Presbyterian) are known, but the documents have yielded nothing of his occupation or business activities prior to his marriage. The tax assessments indicate his father-in-law died in 1777, and White's estate was inventoried in early March of 1778. Valued at £1782.6.7, material symbols of his prosperity included his "wearing apparell"

valued at £57.19, 2 pairs of gold sleeve buttons, a gold ring, a set of silver shoe and knee buckles, a silver watch, a silver tea service, a chest-upon-chest, a desk and bookcase, books, a looking glass, and two maps in the "third room." Evidence of farming activities is clear, however only the two sloops suggest White's involvement in shipping and commerce (William White, Kent County, 1778).

John Darrach was appointed White's administrator. The tax assessments of 1778 reveal that he also benefited by his and his wife's inheritance of perhaps the entire estate. William White's estate is crossed out in the original tax list, and John Darrach's assessment increases from £30 in 1777 to £100 in 1778 (compared to an assessed value of £110 in 1779 for Thomas Collins, Esq., Delaware's governor and one of the largest landowners and wealthiest men in the hundred), while William White, Jr. is still assessed at only £14 (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1778).

In 1778 John Darrach's prospects looked good. Inheritance of White's estate had more than tripled his assets. The previous year 40,000 bushels of wheat and corn had been shipped from Duck Creek landings along with considerable quantities of barley and wood. Duck Creek vessels in 1778 were carrying 1500-2500 tons of grain to Philadelphia, New York and Boston, and Crossroads merchants and shippers held nearly 6000 bushels of grain in five granaries (Hancock 1975-1976:66). The tax records, however, document a continuing erosion of Darrach's assets over the next decade, as his assessment dropped £20 to £80 in 1779 and 1785, and again to £60 in 1788 (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1779-1788). The extent to which the decline should be attributed to personal misfortune, business ineptitude, or general deflation and economic problems of the post-War period is uncertain.

Aside from the growth of his family (four children were born to the Darrachs in the 1780s) (Runk 1899:271) and the decline of his economic worth or devaluing of his assets, little is known of Darrach's activities in the 1780s. The 1781 road petition places him and his family in his father-in-law's former residence, but it is uncertain whether this is the house White was living in at the time of his death or that noted in the inventory as his "New" house. The house was situated along the road leading from Duck Creek Crossroads to the Public Landing on Duck Creek (Holliday's Landing), about one-half mile east of the Crossroads and less than one-third of a mile west of his (formerly John White's) store. The store sat a mere 250 yards from the Landing, at the turn in the road (Kent County Road Petitions and Returns, 1781; Figure 3). Both house and store are among the most substantial structures sketched on the plat. The Crossroads is represented as a village of some 45 structures strung out along the road to the Landing, the County Road to Dover, and Ball Street, with more scattered and larger residences along the road to Farson's Bridge as it led west out of the Crossroads toward Maryland.

Darrach's fortunes improved in the following decades, as he purchased at least four properties in the Duck Creek vicinity between 1790 and 1802, including a 140 acre parcel acquired at sheriff's sale in 1801 (Kent County Deeds, 1750-1811). In all these transactions Darrach was identified as a merchant. The first detailed tax assessment lists survive for Duck Creek Hundred for 1797. Darrach's assets were assessed at £5472.11.8, and included £30 in "profits on goods on hand" (Table 3). He owned ten properties: a 448 acre farm which along with the livestock thereon accounted for almost 60% of the valuation, one unimproved lot, two small lots with tenants living in old log houses, two lots with tenants living in frame houses, a brick house, log shop and lot rented to John McWhister (blacksmith), another brick house valued at the same rate, and two other properties - on one of which was located the Darrach Store. The two candidates are "No. 1 A Lot Ground 4 Acres - whereon is Erected a Brick Messuage store Kitchen etc. in good repair in his own tenure...850," and "No. 3 A Lot Ground 2 Acres whereon is Erected a Brick Messuage and grain store in the tenure of John Griffin @ £60 per Annum...500." In the case of No. 1, the house, barn and store drawn on the 1781 road petition would all be situated on a four acre tract and it would appear no one was living in the store in 1797, while No. 3 suggests either a combination house and store or two separate structures on the same property.

John Griffin's property, also located in Duck Creek Hundred, was valued at £1674.6.8. It included "a Shallop 11 years old 1300 Bushels Burthen" and "A Mill Seat...whereon is erected a frame Grist Mill with 2 pr. Stones in good order" and adjoining lot with a log house and kitchen. Both mill and house were listed as in the

TABLE 3

1797 TAX ASSESSMENT, DUCK CREEK HUNDRED

John Darrach

		£	s	d
N°. 1	A Lot Ground 4 Acres -- whereon is Erected a Brick Messuage store Kitchen & c. in good repair in his own tenure	850	0	0
N°. 2	A Brick Messuage in the tenure of Rachel Parsons @ £20 per Annum	166	13	4
N°. 3	A Lot Ground 2 Acres whereon is Erected a Brick Messuage and grain store in the tenure of John Griffin @ £60 per Annum	500	0	0
N°. 4	1/8 of an Acre Ground a Log House on it No tenant but formerly rented for £6.	50	0	0
N°. 5	A small Lot Ground 1/8 of an Acre with an old Log House and very Indifferent in the tenure of John Poolman @ £6 p^{er}	50	0	0
N°. 6	A Lot Ground 6 1/3 acres whereon is Erected a frame tenement Kitchen and Stables in the tenure of E Reese @ £30	250	0	0
N°. 7	A Lot Ground 6 1/2 acres whereon is Erected a small Brick Messuage and Log Shop in tolerable repair in the tenure of John McWhister at £20 per	166	13	4
N°. 8	A Small frame tenement in the tenure of Francis Hyatt at £6	50	0	0
N°. 9	An unimproved lot 1 Acre in Duck Creek Cross Roads.	50	0	0
N°.10	A Farm containing 448 Acres of Land Marsh & Cripple whereon is Erected A Frame Tenement indifferent w/ a New Barn Stables & c. & c. in good Repair			
	196 Acres Improved @ 150 s.	1470	0	0
	150 Acres timberland @ £10	1500	0	0
	100 Acres Marsh and Cripple @ 3/9	18	15	0
		5122	1	8
	Amt.Brot from folio (33)	5122	1	8
	1 horse 20 yrs. old 150 s. 1 d^{o} 18 years old £20	27	10	0
	1 d^{o} 15 years old £25 1 d^{o} 4 years old £20	45	0	0
	1 d^{o} 4 years old £25.0 2 Bulls £8/10	33	10	0
	2 five year old Steers £8/10 1 Steer 4/5/9	12	15	0
	4 three year old Cattle @ 857 1 yearling 52/6	19	12	6
	6 cows @ 85 s. 25 sheep 8/6	36	2	6
	3 sows & pigs @ 40 s.	6	0	0

TABLE 3 (cont.)

	£	s	d
96 Oz Plate @ 8/4	40	0	0
Personal Tax	100	0	0
	5463	17	11
Neat profits on goods on hand	30	0	0
Personal Property	250	10	0
Lands & c.	5122	1	8
Rate on Person	100	0	0
	5473	17	11

Source: 1797
Duck Creek Hundred Delaware Tax List (microfilm),
Delaware State Archives, Dover, DE.

tenure of Sewell Green, whose property consisted of eight slaves and some livestock. None of Griffin's properties were listed as being in his own tenure, confirming that he rented a house and lot from Darrach (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1797). Although it remains unclear whether Darrach was leasing the present study property to Griffin in 1797, nevertheless something of the economic network of the community is revealed in these assessments. Griffin operated a mill at which local grain was ground into flour, leased a "grain" store presumably near the Landing from Darrach, another merchant, and owned a shallop on which to transport the flour from the mill to the store and Landing, and possibly from there on to Philadelphia.

But what of John Darrach's economic stature in the Duck Creek community at the end of the eighteenth century? For one thing, Darrach's property was valued almost £1700 more than that of David Kennedy, another local merchant and the presumed father of William, who married Darrach's daughter just after his death in 1805. Grettler (1991:19), in his research on central Delaware at the end of the eighteenth century, found that "[i]n Duck Creek Hundred,...only one-third of all taxable people owned land. Two of three farmers were tenants. The wealthiest twenty percent of the population owned eighty percent of all wealth." Grettler based his analysis on the 1797 Tax Assessments from Duck Creek Hundred as well. The mean assessment for the Hundred that year was £478 (compared to Darrach's £5472), but 294 of the 671 taxables (44%) were assessed under £100, and a total of 512, or fully 76% were assessed below the mean value of £478. Perhaps most revealing, however, is the fact that only six Duck Creek Hundred taxables were assessed higher than John Darrach in 1797, with values ranging from £7296 to £12113 (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1797). By the end of the century Darrach had clearly overcome any economic setbacks he experienced in the immediate post-War years.

John Griffin, the Duck Creek mill owner, died in 1798 while resident in one of John Darrach's properties, possibly the Darrach Store. Settlement of the estate took until 1808. In May 1803, £66.1.10 plus interest was paid by the estate to John Darrach to meet an unspecified obligation. The probate records identify Griffin as having been married with two sons still under the care of guardians in 1808. Griffin's "Goods and Chattles" were valued at $574.44 in an inventory taken in March 1798 (Appendix IV). Although not a room-by-room inventory (only a

kitchen is mentioned by name, and that is possibly a separate structure), the quantity of furniture listed does not preclude Griffin and his family lived in the Darrach Store, perhaps occupying one end of the building or the second floor. Three bedsteads, a bureau, two sets of chairs, a corner cupboard, desk, and a few tables and trunks furnished the living quarters. The only livestock listed were two horses; a "Negro Woman" had nine years and ten months yet to serve Griffin at the time of his death (John Griffin, Kent County Probate, 1798-1808).

Another perspective on the Darrachs and on their community is provided by the demographic data recorded in the U. S. Census of 1800. Three thousand seven hundred and eighty-five Delawareans resided in Duck Creek Hundred in that year, one-third of them African-Americans, and almost three-quarters of the African-Americans free (Table 4). White males slightly outnumbered females, and 31% of the European-American population was aged under ten years, as compared to only 8% who lived beyond the age of 44. Darrach was among these latter, living with his family (although comparing the census data with genealogical information suggests his wife is not listed with the family in the census, and a boy younger than any of Darrach's recorded children was present in the household along with four "other free persons except Indians" - presumably free African-American servants or agricultural or maritime laborers).

The year before his death, Darrach's property was again described and assessed for tax purposes, in 1804. Now being recorded in American dollars and cents, his assets are valued at $13,485 (Table 5). The most substantial changes since the 1797 assessment are the additions of 1) a 500 acre plantation in the tenure of John Brush (who may be the husband of Darrach's eldest daughter Ann), 2) twelve acres composing Green's Landing (formerly Holliday's Landing, later Smyrna Landing), 3) a 150 acre tract of marsh near the Thoroughfare and 4) another 150 acre tract of marsh. His eldest son, William White Darrach, now occupied the 450 acre farm also appearing in the 1797 assessment. Research by George Caley suggests "1 house and Lot in Duck Creek Cross Roads and other buildings in Good Repair...$2200" is a new house and store built since the 1797 assessment at the corner of Main and Commerce Streets (Caley, Personal communication, June 1990). The assessment indicates Darrach is also occupying a thirteen acre lot in Duck Creek Cross Roads, but no further information is given. In addition, two unoccupied lots are listed along with four other tenanted properties. Of these, the only one which may be the store is identified as "1 small brick house in the Tenure of Robt. Patterson...$700." The only "small" brick house in the 1797 assessment is that occupied along with a log shop by blacksmith John McWhister. No stores are noted in the 1804 assessment. Either Darrach no longer used the store building as a store after completion of his new residential and commercial complex 'downtown', or perhaps the store sat on the 12 acres "called Green's Land[in]g." The presence of substantial improvements on that tract are indicated by the per acre valuation of $22, the highest of any in the Darrach assessment, although no improvements are detailed. Clearly Darrach is still operating a store, as the item "the neat profits of store...600" is noted (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1804).

John Darrach's increased prosperity and flurry of building and real estate purchases at the turn of the century were not unique. The tax assessments record an increase of almost twenty percent in the proportion of brick to log and frame houses in Duck Creek Hundred between 1797 and 1803, from ten to nearly thirty percent. Grettler (1991:20) attributes the activity to the three years of extremely high wheat prices which accompanied the Napoleonic Wars in Europe. A few years later, straining under the trade restrictions of the 1807 Embargo Act, central and northern Delaware farmers complained that "fashionable luxuries" to which they had become accustomed in recent years had actually become "indispensable articles of real necessity" (Legislative Petitions, January 1807, cited in Grettler 1991:29). Darrach, unfortunately, did not live long enough to become too accustomed to the new amenities, as he died within a year of the 1804 assessment.

By the end of January 1805, the following notice of sheriff's sale was appearing in the local newspaper:

> By virtue of...Public Sale, at the late dwelling house of John Darrach, de'd., in the Village of Duck Creek Crossroads, on Wednesday the 30th day of January (instant) at 10 o'clock, A.M., a variety of valuable household and kitchen furniture, among which are mahogany and walnut tables, mahogany and Windsor chairs, bedsteads, beds and furniture, carpets, looking glasses and

TABLE 4

DUCK CREEK HUNDRED, KENT COUNTY,
IN THE U.S. POPULATION CENSUS
1800-1840

1800 Census

	Ages 0-10	-15	-26	-44	44+	Blacks Free	Blacks Slave	Total Inhabitants
White Males	418	224	277	297	90	892	345	3785
White Females	382	189	284	281	106			

1810 Census

	Ages 0-10	-15	-26	-44	44+	Blacks Free	Blacks Slave	Total Inhabitants
White Males	384	220	267	233	101	1161	167	3690
White Females	356	193	249	240	119			

1820 Census

	Ages 0-10	-15	-26	-44	44+	Blacks Free	Blacks Slave	Total Inhabitants
White Males	410	204	297	249	123	1029	405	3951

Table 4 (cont.)

1820 Census (cont.)

	Ages				
	0-10	-15	-26	-44	44+
White Females	404	179	271	273	107
Male Slaves		117	104	21	10
Female Slaves		85	42	18	8
Free Black Males		209	102	104	105
Free Black Females		[illegible]			98

Foreignors Not Naturalized = 13

Engaged in:

Agriculture		Commerce		Manufacture	
#	%	#	%	#	%
472	76	48	8	100	16

TABLE 4 (cont.)

1830 Census

	Ages											
	0-5	-10	-15	-20	-30	-40	-50	-60	-70	-80	-90	-100
White Males	218	145	179	171	248	158	69	46	18	7	0	0
White Females	190	155	154	125	251	166	76	63	27	3	1	0

	Ages						
	0-10	-24	-36	-55	-100	100+	Total Inhabitants
Male Slaves	44	111	22	2	3	0	3921
Female Slaves	57	67	21	5	9	1	
Free Black Males	146	140	95	93	45	1	
Free Black Females	176	158	116	93	45	1	

TABLE 4 (cont.)

1840 Census

Ages

	0-5	-10	-15	-20	-30	-40	-50	-60	-70	-80	-90	-100
White Males	237	161	168	136	248	143	93	51	27	7	1	0
White Females	197	169	144	135	209	153	96	46	30	16	2	0

Ages

	0-10	-24	-36	-55	-100	100+
Male Slaves	14	21	2	0	1	0
Female Slaves	10	21	8	4	1	0
Free Black Males	201	232	79	94	44	0
Free Black Females	194	210	88	104	40	2

Total Inhabitants

3839

Engaged In:

Agriculture		Commerce		Manufacturing & Trades		Ocean Navigation		Professions	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
630	73	65	7	162	19	1	.3	6	.7

TABLE 5

1804 TAX ASSESSMENT, DUCK CREEK HUNDRED

John Darrach Sen.			
1 plantation w/a frame dwelling house on the same with other bldgs. in Tolerable Good Repair in the tenure of John C [G] Brush 250 acres Cleared and 150 acre woods land		@ $16	$400
100 Acres marsh and Cripple		@ $1	$100
12 acres Land call'd Green Landi[n]g		$22	$264
1 house and lot in duck Creek cross Roads and other buildings in Good Repair			2200
1 small brick house in the Tenure of Robt. Patterson			700
1 lot with a frame dwelling house unoccupied			800
1 Small lot and house in the Tenure of Jonathon Armstrong			175
1 Small house and lot in the Tenure of J.G. Blackshear			350
1 lot of Ground in D Creek X Roads			30
150 acres marsh near the Thoroughfare @ $3			150
8 head horses	320		
72 oz Silver Plate	79/20		
3 oxen	50/ "		
6 head cows	72/ "		
2 head hogs	12		
7 head hogs	7		
the neat profits of store	600		1540/20
Personal tax	400		12709/ "

1804 [Unofficial Workbook]

John Darrach			
A farm of 450 acres			
248 Improved		@ $17	
100 Improved		@ $17	5916
100 marsh & Cripple		@ $1	100
448 whereon is a Frame Barn 30 by 20 occupied by Will W. Darrah			
A lot in Cross roads in Ball Street unoccupied 1 acres			50
A lot in D^{o} adjoining L Hawkins and others of 13 Acres occupied by himself		@ $20	260
150 acre Marsh		@ $3	450
			$13485

Source: 1803-04, Duck Creek Hundred Delaware Tax List (microfilm), Delaware State Archives, Dover, DE.

> silver plate, China and Glassware - also a quantity of store-goods, consisting of dry-goods assorted, groceries, ironmongery, and earthenware - the time of an indented negro man - 2 shallops - corn in the ear; about 472 bushels of corn in granary at Naudain's landing - a phaeton and chaise - a waggon and gears - six head of horses - twenty head of cattle - 2 yoke of oxen - 2 carts - wheat in the store - a quantity of pine boards and sundry farming utensils. Being seized and taken in execution as the property of said Darrach, at the suit of James Robinson and others, and will be sold for cash, by David Lockwood, Sheriff (The Constitutionalist or The Defender of the People's Rights: January 24, 1805).

Two weeks later the same advertisement appeared, with the date of the sale changed to Thursday the 12th of February (The Constitutionalist or The Defender of the People's Rights: February 7, 1805). The sale inventory indicates the first sale was held on the 12th, followed by a second on March 6. Apparently Darrach's estate was to be liquidated to satisfy his debts.

Gerald Carson, author of The Old Country Store, has written that :

> [a]mong his [the country merchant's] chief difficulties were acquiring a stock of goods, transporting them, disposing of the country pay that came into his store, and raising the cash necessary to meet his obligations. Trading areas were established by the distance a farm family could travel... A circle with a five mile radius would represent a fair estimate of the amount of geography in which a country dealer could take a serious commercial interest (Carson 1954:37).

Unfortunately it is only through death that we have acquired any information about how Darrach handled his "chief difficulties" or about his trading networks.

John Darrach died intestate; his son John administered his estate, and along with John Wilds, also a merchant of Duck Creek Hundred, posted £6000 bond of administration (John Darrach, Sr., Kent County Probate, Bond of Administration, February 5, 1805). One hundred eighty-one persons purchased items at the two sales held at Darrach's home early in 1805 (Appendices V, VI and VII). It is likely a substantially larger number of people actually attended the sales, as all but four of the recorded purchasers were men, yet textiles, clothing (men's, women's and children's), ceramics and glassware composed a significant proportion of the items sold. Presumably wives and children attended with the male family head, and participated in the decision-making regarding what items to bid on and at what price. It is interesting to note that among the purchasers were Darrach's sons John and Thomas and his daughter Eleanor, as well as Eleanor's soon-to-be husband William Kennedy. John made the most substantial purchases, of furniture, livestock, the chaise, textiles, clothing, and silver. Eleanor purchased only one "bed and furniture," while Thomas acquired a small assortment of books, ceramics, cigars, and other sundry items. (Appendix VIII).

Among the other purchasers were representatives of all of Duck Creek's leading families, as well as those of lesser stature: Abraham Allee, whose family also included merchants and shippers; Andrew Barrett, the sheriff and an attorney; the Blackistons, another family of Duck Creek merchants; Benjamin Chiffins; William Collins, whose property assessment was almost double that of the next highest of those in attendance; Nathaniel Coombe, from another Duck Creek merchant family; and several Cumminses, including John who went on to become Duck Creek's greatest grain dealer and who was responsible for the development of the village at Smyrna Landing (Caley 1978:41); four Denneys, major Duck Creek landowners and farmers; Sewell Green, the miller; Harpers and Hoffeckers; George Kennard, another merchant, a Methodist visited by Joseph Hemphill a few years earlier on his way through Duck Creek (Munroe 1948:67); the Lockwoods, including David, also recorded at different times as sheriff; the McDowells - James served with William Kennedy as one of Smyrna's first commissioners in the latter 1810s (Caley n.d.:21); Robert Patterson, the third commissioner and another merchant and shipper operating out of the Landing (Caley n.d.:19, 21); Israel Peterson, who owned the mill on Pairman's Branch just below the Darrach property; Abraham Pierce, yet another Duck Creek merchant as well as attorney and hatter (Caley 1978:92); the

Spruances, also a Duck Creek merchant family; and Wild(s) and Stevenson, merchants who purchased both for their business and for themselves. Only two of Darrach's tenants, one listed in the 1797 assessment and one in the 1804 assessment, purchased anything at his estate sales.

Seventy percent of the buyers at the Darrach sales appear in the Kent County tax assessment lists for 1810. Just under half (87 or 48%) were assessed in Duck Creek Hundred, 13 (or 7%) in adjoining Little Creek Hundred, six (or 3%) in St. Jones Hundred along the Delaware Bay below Little Creek Hundred, and 20 (or 11%) from Murderkill Hundred which spanned the state below Dover and St. Jones Hundreds. None were listed in the Mispillion Hundred lists, the southernmost of the Kent County hundreds, and no tax lists were available for Dover Hundred for 1810. These figures are very high, especially considering that Duck Creek is adjoined to the north by New Castle County, and New Castle tax lists were not included in the survey. Many of the 54 purchasers not listed in Kent County would likely appear in New Castle, especially in neighboring Appoquinimink Hundred. The remainder may have come from farther away, possibly including some folks from Maryland, who shared close social and economic ties with the merchants of Duck Creek. Several may not have been "taxables" and therefore would not appear in any of the lists; others assuredly died or moved on between 1805 and 1810.

The property assessments of the buyers provide another insight into both Darrach and his community and the nature of local social and economic exchange. Assessments ranged from $134 to $28,724, the former the lowest observed in the tax lists for a male taxable that year and the latter that of William Collins, mentioned above. The total assessment for all purchasers was $315,834 (of 126 assessed persons); the mean assessment was $2506.62. Sixty-eight percent of the assessees (86) were evaluated lower than the mean, with the remaining one-third (40 or 32%) assessed at a higher rate. The median assessed value, below and above which 50% of the assessees fell, was $1000. Significantly, 44% of the assessees had properties evaluated below $600.

The assessments were also correlated with the assessees' home hundred to determine, for example, whether only wealthy social and business partners of Darrach traveled more than a short distance to attend the sale (Table 6). The distribution indicates that purchasers from outside of Duck Creek Hundred represented an economic cross-section of the community, with the wealthiest buyers coming virtually exclusively from Darrach's home hundred.

The relative importance to the community of sales such as Darrach's as social event and as economic opportunity remains to be explored. Review of the purchase records (Appendix VIII) suggests that the answer depended at least in part on who you were. In general, there was no correlation between the buyers' wealth and the nature or amount of their purchases. Many of the wealthiest buyers, such as Abraham Allee, Andrew Barrett, Ebenezer Blackiston, Miers Casson, William Collins, George Cummins, William Denney, Edward Joy, Ebenezer Needham, Henry Ridgely, James Scotton, and Joseph Whitby purchased only a few inexpensive odds and ends. They appear to have attended more for social reasons. Others came with specific economic motives in mind, such as John and William Torbert who purchased one of Darrach's sloops. Buyers of lesser means also often made only a few small purchases. However, the economic significance of being able to acquire at these sales necessities such as the hat purchased by William Johnson, or a few "fancy" things such as the four "large flowered mugs" William Hall bought, was probably greater for these men. Distance traveled to the sale and the difficulties of transport were also considered in reviewing the purchases. While the buyers from outside of Duck Creek Hundred purchased mostly textiles and clothing, they also went home with a fair assortment of fragile ceramics and bulky items of furniture.

The sale items themselves consisted of the furnishings of Darrach's home and other personal items, the accouterments of farming his plantation, the accouterments of his mercantile and shipping business, the merchandise in his store, and goods he was holding to ship on to Philadelphia. The first sale began with almost 1000 bushels of corn, much of it at Naudain's Landing (near Leipsic) (Appendix VI). This notation is the first evidence we have of Darrach's shipping enterprise operating out of landings along Little Creek as well as Duck Creek. Boards and barrel staves also awaited shipment, some at "F. Landing" (Fast Landing also along Little Creek) (Table 7). Stacks of hay and wheat and Darrach's livestock, including six horses, eight cows, heifers and

TABLE 6

TAX ASSESSMENTS OF KENT COUNTY TAXABLES
WHO PURCHASED ITEMS AT THE JOHN DARRACH ESTATE SALES,
FEBRUARY AND MARCH 1805

	Value of Property in Dollars							
HUNDRED	200	300	400	500	600	700	800	900
Duck Creek	*11	16	6	2	6	1	0	0
Little Creek	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0
St. Jones	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Murderkill	4	1	2	0	0	1	2	0
Total	17	19	10	2	8	2	3	0

	Value of Property in Dollars						
HUNDRED	1000	2000	3000	4000	5000	7000	9000
Duck Creek	1	15	4	10	4	4	2
Little Creek	0	1	2	1	0	2	0
St. Jones	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Murderkill	1	3	1	2	1	0	2
Total	2	20	7	13	5	6	4

	Value of Property in Dollars		
HUNDRED	10,000	15,000	+15,000
Duck Creek	0	3	3
Little Creek	0	1	0
St. Jones	0	0	0
Murderkill	0	0	0
Total	0	4	3

*Number of Taxables

TABLE 7

VALUE BY CATEGORY OF THE ESTATE OF JOHN DARRACH, 1805

	Pounds	Shillings	Pence
Agricultural Gear	84[a]	15	0
Bedding	48	0	6.48
Books	0	15	4.44
*Ceramics	36	4	0.96
*Chaulk	1	8	2.50
*Clothing	135	18	8.40
*Food & Spices	69	17	6.96
Furniture	72	16	4.44
*Glassware	1	12	6.96
**Grain & Crops	359	0	6.96
*Hides	10	0	0
*Kitchenware	6	19	9.48
*Liquor	83	8	0.48
Livestock	196	6	8.40
*Locks	1	10	3.96
*Nails	10	13	3.50
*Paper	1	1	3
Personal	5	5	3.48
*Powder & Shot	1	13	2
*Textiles & Sewing Equipment	468	13	11.40
*Tobacco	6	14	3.60
*Tools & Utensils	17	18	2.40
**Wood/Boards	85	14	1.92
Woodenware	3	11	9
	1709	19	
	*853	*4	*4
	**444	**14	**8

[a] Data compiled from the two inventories of the public sales, February 12 and March 6

* Store inventory; a few categories may include store furnishings and equipment and other personal property. It was not always possible to distinguish these in the inventories.

** Local agricultural and timber products awaiting shipment to Philadelphia.

steer and two yoke of oxen, went to the auction block next along with carts, wagons and Darrach's chaise and phaeton. The auctioneer proceeded to the contents of the house, including 54 Windsor and rush-bottom chairs, a chest of drawers, a clock, a corner cupboard, desks, looking glasses, tables (described as mahogany, tea, dining, oval, dressing and pine), curtains, carpets, bedding, lamps, ceramics and assorted kitchen ware. Only then did the

sale move on to the store merchandise. The sale of this merchandise at Darrach's house strongly suggests Caley is correct in putting Darrach's house and store in town and adjoining each other. Otherwise all the store merchandise would have to have been hauled up from the store near the Landing.

The sale of the store merchandise began with textiles, which accounted for approximately 55% by value of Darrach's inventory (as measured by the prices paid at the sales) (Table 7). Altogether over 2700 yards of cloth were sold, along with numerous odd lots and assorted sewing equipment such as thread, twist and thimbles. The list of fabrics is extensive (Appendix IX), consisting of 54 different types, from velvets and silk nankeens to muslins. Home production of clothing, curtains, linens and other goods definitely formed an important component of the local domestic strategy for members of all economic groups. Darrach's store also carried clothing, which next appeared on the auction block, and accounted for approximately 16% of the value of Darrach's inventory. Yet the limited types of items of apparel sold is striking and confirms the conclusion concerning home production. Only an assortment of hats, hose, women's shawls, shoes, handkerchiefs and a few pairs of gloves appear in the sale inventories. The first sale ended with a wide assortment of different goods, mostly in small quantities, which may have been either store inventory, the personal stock of Darrach, or some combination of both. Included were curry combs, coffee pots, silverware, liquor, sugar and molasses, tea and coffee, tobacco, locks, blankets, spices and nails.

A week after the first sale, on February 19, the remainder of Darrach's "goods and chattles" were inventoried (Appendix VI), and then on March 6 a second sale was held, at which most of the items in the earlier inventory were sold (Appendix VII). This sale began with an assortment of textiles, glassware, chocolate, clothing, silverware, tobacco and snuff, sugar, coffee pots, tin cups, paper, and measuring and weighing equipment. Then the auctioneer moved on to Darrach's quite extensive inventory of ceramic tablewares, the sale of which ultimately contributed 4% of the income from the store inventory's liquidation (the percentage includes those locally produced wares discussed below). Over 40 dozen plates, described as large, small, desert, white, and blue edge, 26 sets plus over two dozen china and white cups and saucers, 27 coffee pots, 36 tea pots, sugar dishes and cream jugs, 29 pitchers, 56 bowls, and 19 dishes, among other entries, were recorded along with a much smaller assortment of glass tumblers and wine glasses. Another group of odd lots of textiles, books, clothing, and sewing equipment appeared on the auction block, and then another group of ceramics. This second assemblage consisted mostly of utilitarian bowls, milk pans, basins, dishes, pitchers and jugs, possibly wares produced by Duck Creek potter William Green (see discussion of Allee and Coombe store accounts below). The sale then ended with a large number of odd lots, ranging from pots of lard and boxes of wafers to scythe stones, tools, pots and pans, buckles, rags, chalk, shot, snuff, textiles, and odd ceramics. One group of lots may identify the furnishings of one or the other of Darrach's stores. They consisted of a trunk and writing desk, a pair of andirons and tongs, a tea pot and dish, brass cocks, tin, funnels, measures, a spirits pump, old bags and cart boxes, barrels, bushels, scales, hinges and locks.

These sale inventories and other probate records have been a rich source of information. They have identified many of the members of Darrach's social and economic world, the community in which he lived and worked. They have illuminated his business activities and identified the goods he sold in his store, and to a lesser extent the produce of the local area which he in turn shipped out for sale in Philadelphia and beyond. They inform us as well on the needs and domestic lives of the Duck Creek and surrounding communities' residents. Identifying ceramics, some clothing, textiles and sewing equipment, iron cooking ware, some domestic and agricultural tools, and a limited range of specialized foods - chocolate, coffee, tea, molasses, rice, spices, and sugar - as the principal goods these folks relied on receiving from the "outside world" through their local merchants, they suggest families and a community well able to provide for their own members. These documents, nevertheless, offer only a synchronic view of Darrach's activities and inventory, a moment in time, at his death. Were the people who attended these sales his regular customers? Was the inventory disposed of at the sales representative of his "normal" merchandise? How had his business changed between the time he inherited his father-in-law's estate, and even before, and his own death more than 25 years later? How did his store inventory compare with that of the numerous other merchants of Duck Creek, and how accurate a view of the community's domestic and economic life do these inventories really provide? To what extent was Darrach's business based on a cash economy, and to

what extent did he barter with local farmers and artisans? Although we can agree with Carson that "[a]s salesman, middleman, issuer of credit, banker, supplier of necessities and some luxuries, as shipper of farm crops and local manufactures, ...[Darrach]...had contacts with all his neighbors and with the larger commercial world" (Carson 1954:117), we must turn to other local merchants who kept accounts of their business activities in life to hopefully better understand John Darrach.

Before doing so, however, there are other family records to consult. Darrach's probate records do not address, for example, the disposition of his extensive real estate. John's son John died only four years after his father, signing his will in September 1809. In it he suggests he was granted "fifth parts" and "fourth parts" of several of his father's lands. He himself was living in Port Penn, New Castle County, with his wife and only child, his son William White Darrach. Upon his death he desired his "real property in Kent County" be sold and the proceeds used to satisfy his debts and support his widow and son (John Darrach, New Castle County Probate, 1809). The following year John's mother, Jane White Darrach, died, and her estate was administered through Orphan's Court. In association with division of the real estate among the surviving children, a "draught" was prepared of a 401 acre tract to be divided into several parcels (Figure 4). This is the land lying between the "Road from Duck Creek Neck over Morris's Bridge to Smyrna" and Pairman's Branch. On a corner of one of the 11 parcels created (or previously created and merely being verified here), an irregularly shaped lot marked "G" assigned to Eleanor Kennedy and containing 44 acres and 42 perches, stood the "old Brick house and Granary." A substantial two story structure with end chimneys, it is similar to another structure down the road (and also appearing on the 1781 road return identified as John Darrach's house) (Figures 3 and 4). A few months after her father's death, Eleanor Darrach had married Duck Creek merchant William Kennedy. Kennedy may have already been using the old granary near the landing, or may have specifically desired the property for use in his business.

Neither the Orphan's Court records nor the 1810 tax lists (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1810) indicate whether the Kennedys were living in the "old brick house" at the time. Kennedy's tax assessment follows:

1 House (Brick) in tenure of Margaret Kennedy and brick shop in tenure of Thomas Dickson	$1200
1 House and Lot in Duck Creek	150
1 Frame Granary	200
A House and lot in tenure of John Cole N.	150
2 Acres Lott in tenure of Thomas Hale	100
	$1800

The listing suggests William Kennedy had inherited his father's house, where his widowed mother Margaret still resided, and that he and his wife were not living on a property that they owned. "John Darrach's Heirs" are also listed in the tax assessments, as follows:

320 Acres of Clear'd and wood land in tenure of Stewart Redman and John Bailey with the improvements thereon @ $22	$7040
80 Acres of Marsh and Cripple @ $2	160
12 Acres Land call'd Greens Landing @ $22	264
1 lot with Frame Dweling [sic] House in bad repair in tenure of Darius Cross	400
150 Acres marsh near the Thoroughfare @ $2	130
	$8164

It does not seem, however, that the Kennedys were resident on any of these properties either, nor is it clear in either listing which property contained the "old brick house and Granary."

Duck Creek in 1810 was not the place John Darrach knew when he married and inherited the Whites' store in the 1770s, nor was it the same Duck Creek he knew on the eve of his death in 1805. The end of the Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, the Embargo Act and European Wars had changed things. Duck Creek Crossroads received formal town boundaries and took on the classical and symbolic name of Smyrna in 1806. The population of the Hundred dropped from 3785 to 3690 between 1800 and 1810, and other significant demographic changes occurred as well (Table 4). African-Americans increased from under 33% to 36% of the population, and over 87% were now free. Nevertheless, the broad patterns of rural family, social and economic life rebounded and persisted, even as the fortunes and circumstances of individual families were altered dramatically; the world was redefined politically, and the names and faces of the community's members changed with the years.

The earliest Duck Creek Hundred merchants' accounts preserved in the State Archives are those of Jonathon Allee and Benjamin Coombe. Allee was assessed at $408 in 1810, with no mention of a store or of real property. His assessment consisted of his personal tax of $200 and some livestock. Coombe's assessment was more than twice as high, at $868. He appears not to have owned any real estate either at the time, but his personal tax was $300, he was assessed for "9 oz. Plate," and the profits of his store were valued at $400 (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1810). The lack of real property already substantially differentiates these merchants from Darrach. Allee died within a few years (Jonathon Allee, Kent County Probate, 1812-1813), but Coombe continued to keep store until his death in 1843, by which time he had amassed some real estate, including a farm (Benjamin Coombe, Kent County Probate, 1843-1846). Caley identifies Coombe's store (at least from near the end of his life circa 1840) as a surviving two story, double pile, three bay brick building on the northeast corner of West Commerce and North Delaware Streets in Smyrna (Caley 1978:68).

Given the size of the Duck Creek community in the early nineteenth century, a sample size of two merchants to compare against Darrach seems more than adequate. Considering, however, the economic function of Smyrna as a nodal shipping and redistribution center, and noting just the number of known local merchants who attended Darrach's sheriff's sales - members of eleven mercantile families - the sample may not be representative. As already mentioned, for example, neither Coombe nor Allee owned real estate in 1810, whereas Darrach had owned ten separate properties as early as the 1790s. Considering the merchant's point in his career at the time of comparison is also important. Coombe was clearly just beginning in 1810, whereas Darrach had reached the terminus of his career five years earlier. Allee also died within a few years, but his age at death is not known. Other problems influenced the comparisons. The records of Coombe were from his account book, those of Allee from a day book. Both differ in nature from the sheriff's sale inventories of Darrach. Coombe's accounts cover the entire 1809-1810 period, while Allee's begin only at the end of November 1809.

Despite these differences, the Coombe and Allee accounts can help reconstruct the social, economic and domestic life of the community in which the Darrachs, Kennedys and their tenants participated. The focus of this analysis is on those research questions relating to the stores' customers, merchandise, and methods of operation and organization.

First, a few qualitative observations from having reviewed the accounts of the two merchants. Coombe's business might best be described as "extensive," with many customers but little activity in any one account. There were few large accounts with entries every few days. With the exception of items like an occasional side of beef, folks were not buying goods in large quantities, even nonperishables. Generally, consumption patterns seem modest among Coombe's customers. One feature of his accounts that hindered comparison was the frequent notation of "Sundries" purchased, without any identification of what composed a "sundry." Finally, Coombe kept his accounts in pounds, shillings and pence. Allee, on the other hand, seemed to have a larger number of customers purchasing large orders on a regular basis in addition to others making small daily or more occasional purchases. "Sundry" notations are not a problem; rather the day book lists every item in order for the day. Allee, unlike

Coombe, kept his day book in dollars and cents (Kent County Private Accounts, Benjamin Coombe, Smyrna, 1809-1817 and Unknown [Jonathon Allee], Smyrna, 1809-1810).

Coombe recorded 344 customers and suppliers in 1809-10, while Allee managed 321 accounts in 1810 and the last month of 1809 (Appendices X and XI). One hundred and two names (or 31.8% of those on the Allee list and 29.7% of those on the Coombe list) appear in the accounts of both men. Another 30 surnames only crossmatch (or 9.3% of the Allee list and 8.7% of the Coombe list). Twenty-six women maintained accounts with Allee (8% of his accounts), compared to 23 listed among the Coombe accounts (6.7% of his accounts). Coombe (and the tax lists) identify eight "Negros" and one "Mulatto" among his customers, compared to 21 "Negros" and one "Mulatto" recorded in Allee's accounts. Coombe also occasionally noted occupation - a gentleman, two sloop or shallop captains, a cooper, a sheriff, five tailors, nine merchants, a hatter, a bricklayer, a carriage maker, a distiller, two constables, a doctor, a tobacconist, a cordwainer, a cartwright, a mantua maker, a carpenter, a nailer, the Governor, a blacksmith, a weaver, and a barber were identified - a cross section both of the economic activities of the community and of the mercantile and artisan associates a storekeeper required in order to carry on his trade. Finally, Coombe noted the location of some of his customers and business associates from beyond the borders of Duck Creek Hundred. Philadelphia was noted for nine supplier/merchants, New Castle County twelve times, Thoroughfare (or Thurrifer) Neck appeared six times, Kenton five times, Dover twice, Camden, Province Branch, Leipsic and Naudain Landing all were listed, along with six references to Head of Sassafras (Maryland), Long Neck in Carlson County, and Washington City.

The names appearing in the store accounts were also checked against the Duck Creek Hundred tax assessment lists for 1810. One hundred seventy-one of Allee's customers (or 53.3%) were in the tax lists, compared to 158 (45.9%) of Coombe's. The range of assessed values among Allee's customers was $134-$28,724 and $85-$28,724 for Coombe. The total assessment of Allee's customers is $230,221 and the mean assessment $1346.32; for Coombe the respective figures are $224,713 and $1422.23. One hundred thirty-six (or 79.5%) of Allee's customers fell under the mean assessment, and only 35 (20.5%) exceeded it, compared to 125 of Coombe's customers (or 79.1%) below and 33 (20.9%) above it. The median assessment for Allee's customers fell below $300, while that for Coombe's customers was closer to $600. The distribution of assessments among the two merchants' customers thus differs. Allee maintained accounts with almost twice as many customers with property assessed at less than $200 than did Coombe. Coombe on the other hand dealt with forty percent more customers with assessments in the $1000-$2000 range than did Allee. Fewer than twenty percent of the customers of both merchants were assessed over $2000.

To summarize, there were differences between the people who patronized and supplied the two stores, while at the same time there was considerable overlap. Virtually one-third of the stores' customers maintained accounts with both merchants. In the case of both merchants, about one-half of the customers were taxables in Duck Creek Hundred. The differences appear when the race and economic position of the two sets of customers are compared. Jonathon Allee's clientele appears to have included both more African-Americans and more of the hundred's poorer folks.

Allee's and Coombe's customers and suppliers were also compared with the list of buyers at the 1805 Darrach sales. Both sets of accounts contain a substantially greater number of names than the number of buyers at the Darrach sales (181 compared to 321 and 344). Thirty-six of the names appear on all three of the lists (or 19.9% of the Darrach names, 11.2% of the Allee names, and 10.5% of the Coombe names). Purchasers at the Darrach sales were also compared separately to each of the two merchants' accounts, in an attempt to determine whether Darrach's customers patronized one or the other of the two merchants after his death. Just under 20% of both Allee's and Coombe's customers had purchased items at the Darrach sales (or about 34% of the Darrach buyers).

The results of the tax assessment analyses were also compared among the three merchants. The percentage of purchasers at the Darrach sales who appear as Duck Creek Hundred taxables fell within the range of those on the other two merchants' customer lists (48%, between 46% and 53%). The mean assessment of buyers at the Darrach sales, however, was over $1000 higher than that of either Allee's or Coombe's customers. In addition,

the percentage of Darrach buyers assessed above the mean was 10% higher than for either the Allee or Coombe customers. Further support for the impression that on the whole the Darrach buyers were a wealthier group than the regular customers of the two other merchants is provided by the median assessed values. That of the Darrach buyers is $1000, as compared to less than $300 and $600 for Allee and Coombe. Finally, more than twice the number of Darrach buyers were assessed at over $4000 than either Allee's or Coombe's customers, even though they were only half as numerous.

Were it not for the difference in context between the regular store customers of the account books and the once-in-a-lifetime liquidation sale at death, it would be easy to conclude that Kent Countians (and their neighbors in Maryland and New Castle County) patronized Duck Creek/Smyrna merchants based on economic and probably associated social status. Darrach was clearly superior in economic position to either Allee or Coombe (at least to the extent that property assessed for taxes is any indication), and so did his buyers include a larger number with substantial estates than numbered among the other two merchants' customers. What cannot be determined based on the available data is the social importance of sales such as Darrach's. The nature of the purchases made by Darrach's wealthiest buyers suggests that to them the social significance of the sale exceeded its economic importance; therefore they may have attended these sales and patronized him to a greater extent in death than they did during his life.

The second question concerned the merchandise handled by the Smyrna merchants. Is there any evidence of specialization among the merchants which would help explain the decisions people made regarding who to patronize? The recorded sales of Allee and Coombe in the 1809-1810 period have been organized into categories to facilitate comparison (Appendices XII and XIII). The following merchandise appears in the Allee accounts and not in Coombe's: Grass Seed (only one entry for 0.5 bushels), Ink (one entry for one "paper"), and Services (one entry for cutting wood). These merchandise categories, on the other hand, appear in the Coombe accounts and not in Allee's: Bricks (1 entry), Feathers and Quills (50 quills), Glue (12.75 lbs.), Lamps and Lanterns (3), Starch (.5 lb.), and Sundries (2175 entries). Thus, by this measure, Coombe appears to have carried a slightly greater diversity of merchandise.

The diversity and quantity of goods each merchant sold within each category also differed:

1) Allee lent and paid out $5360.20 compared to Coombe's $6007.85. Coombe's accounts, however, cover 11 months more than do Allee's.

2) Coombe sold 39 books compared to Allee's 13, including Bibles, Copy books, Introduction books, Testaments and a slate.

3) Allee sold 14.5 lbs. more beeswax and 58.5 lbs. more candles, but Coombe also sold 28.75 lbs. of tallow.

4) Allee sold a far greater number and assortment of imported and locally produced ceramics. Both merchants sold the wares, principally jugs, of Duck Creek potter William Green.

5) The types of clothing articles sold by the two merchants was similar, but Allee sold a greater number of items - for example 24 more pairs of gloves, 88 more handkerchiefs, 53 more hats, 16 more shawls, and 58 more pairs of shoes.

6) Allee sold more of the following food items:

Bacon	219.25 lbs. more
Butter	19.75 lbs. more
Cheese	739.75 lbs. more
Chocolate	11 lbs. more
Coffee	563.75 lbs. more

Crackers	13	lbs. more
Eggs	23.50	dozen more
Lard	5.75	lbs. more
Pickles	100	more
Raisins	9	lbs. more
Rice	113	lbs. more
Spices		
Allspice	5.25	lbs. more
Nutmegs	29	more
Pepper	6.75	lbs. more
Sugar	2093	lbs. more, plus 113 lbs. more loaf sugar
Tea	47.75	lbs. more

Coombe sold more of the following food items:

Beans	1.75	bu. more
Beef	870	lbs., 1 qtr. and 2 entries of unspecified quantity more
Fish	3	barrels, 2 entries of unspecified quantity more
Flour	274	lbs., 3 barrels, 2 bushels more
Herring	2	bushels, 15 barrels more
Pork	3373.25	lbs. more
Spices		
Annisseed	2	gallons more
Salt	24.75	bushels more
Turnips	15.5	bu., 1 entry of unspecified quantity more

7) Allee sold 10 looking glasses, which Coombe apparently did not carry; Coombe sold 2.5 dozen Windsor chairs, while Allee sold no chairs.

8) Coombe sold at least 98 more panes of glass.

9) Allee sold a greater number and variety of glass tableware items.

10) Allee sold more of the following grain/crop items:

Corn	98	bu. more
Flax	157	lbs. more
Flaxseed	8	casks more
Wheat	54.25	bu. more

Coombe sold more of the following grain/crop items:

Hay	1	stack more
Oats	25	bu. more
Ruffins	9.5	bu. more
Rye	25.5	bu. more

11) Allee sold more muskrat skins, Coombe more "ham hides" and "veal skins."

12) Allee sold more agricultural gear.

13) Allee sold a few more items of kitchen equipment.

14) Allee sold considerably more liquor of all types except whiskey, which does not appear at all among his accounts.

Coombe sold 207.5 gallons and a barrel of whiskey.

15) Coombe sold more livestock.

16) Allee sold 348.25 lbs. more of nails.

17) Allee sold much more powder and shot than Coombe.

18) Allee sold 18 more varieties of fabric and sewing equipment items than Coombe. He also sold more than Coombe, substantially so in some categories, with the following exceptions: Coombe sold 7 yds. more Bengall, 4 yds. more catgut, 4 yds. more ferritt, and 16.5 yds. more ribbon.

19) Allee sold more than twice the number of cigars, more snuff, and more than five times more tobacco than Coombe.

20) Allee sold a greater number and variety of household tools and utensils.

21) Both sold woodenware, but different quantities of different items.

Allee appears to have sold more merchandise in more transactions in just over one year than Coombe did in two; however, the 2,175 "sundry" entries in the Coombe account book seriously impede comparison. Several goods of which Allee sold more, for example, could have been purchased in small quantities by Coombe's customers and listed as Sundries in his account book. Such goods include candles, ceramics, clothing, foods, spices, textiles and tobacco. These purchases were probably itemized in Coombe's day book as in Allee's, but Coombe's day book appears not to have survived. The sundry entries, however, most likely do not account for all of the differences that appear between the two merchants' sales. Coombe still sold more books, substantially more beef, pork, fish, and flour, and more oats, rye and livestock. In addition, unless attributable to a difference in emic labeling, Coombe's and Allee's customers preferred different liquors as well. Only Coombe sold whiskey, but Allee sold more of all the other types of liquors he stocked. The Coombe sundry entries probably do not accommodate all the differences between the two merchants in sales of ceramics, clothing, cheese, coffee and tea, rice, sugar, agricultural gear, household tools and utensils, and textiles and sewing equipment. Allee sold substantially more of all these goods over the course of 13 months than Coombe did in two full years of business.

The differences in the consumption patterns of the two merchants' customers were also analyzed in relation to ethnic and economic differences between the groups. In some ways their consumption patterns seem opposite of what would be expected. Allee's customers, who included a greater number of African-Americans and non-landowning tenants of lesser wealth, purchased a greater quantity and diversity of ceramic and glass tablewares, more manufactured clothing, a greater variety and quantity of liquors, and more "luxury" food items such as coffee, tea and sugar. However, they also purchased greater quantities of cloth and sewing equipment, perhaps relying more on home production of clothing and other textile goods, and more agricultural tools and equipment, suggesting differences in the occupational characteristics of the two groups. Coombe's customers purchased more books as well as food staples - beef, pork, fish and flour - suggesting a greater number engaged in pursuits other than agriculture. Again these patterns must be seen as suggestive and tentative, as it is likely that many of both merchants' customers also relied on other Smyrna merchants to provide for some of the needs they could not meet through the production of their own households.

Comparing the sales of both merchants with the inventory of goods sold at John Darrach's estate sales, the most striking feature is the consistency in the inventories of the three merchants. Excluding the items of Darrach's personal estate auctioned at the sales, the major categories of all three stores' merchandise were those outlined above for Darrach - textiles and sewing equipment, clothing, a limited variety of foodstuffs, ceramics, domestic and agricultural tools, and kitchen wares. Darrach's ceramic inventory was more similar to Allee's than to Coombe's; his stock of clothing articles was more limited than either of the other merchants' but in quantity his stock was more similar to that sold by Allee in 1809-1810. As expected, his stock of foodstuffs was comparatively small, with the exception of a few nonperishables such as tea, sugar and pepper; all the food items sold at the Darrach sales also appear in the sales records of Coombe and Allee. The range of dry goods in Darrach's inventory approximated that of Coombe, but the quantities stocked were closer to those Allee sold in 1809-1810. Although the Darrach sales attracted a wealthier clientele than those regularly patronizing Coombe or Allee a few years later, the three groups' consumption patterns suggested by the sales' accounts do not vary substantially. This further supports the notion that Darrach's social peers patronized him (or at least paid him their respects) in death, but in life acquired their necessities (or at least their luxuries) from other sources.

The final question explored through these records concerns the merchant's methods of operation; the nature of the Darrach records precludes comparison. The credit entries in Coombe's account book and Allee's day book included cash paid for goods purchased, bills and invoices for goods delivered by other merchants, manufacturers and artisans for sale in the store, and goods and services both sold for cash and bartered for goods by area farmers (Appendices XIV and XV). The major difference between the Credit accounts of the two merchants was in cash transactions. Coombe recorded receiving $9573.95 in cash payments in 1809-1810, Allee only $879.24. Both merchants relied in part on Philadelphia grocers, tobacconists and general merchants for goods for their stores, in several cases the same merchants. The goods purchased from these merchants have been excluded from the Coombe Credit analysis (Appendix XIV) in order to clearly identify those goods and services being provided by local artisans and farmers. Allee's day book entries do not include itemizations of such goods, merely the notation, for example, "Bill for Hats"; these entries are clearly identified in the credit analysis chart (Appendix XV). An obvious difference in the modus operandi of Coombe and Allee is Coombe's acceptance of discounts on the price of numerous local products he acquired for resale in his store or for shipment on to Philadelphia - everything from a bill for a shave by the local barber to fur, shoes, food, and grain. His credit accounts also include several entries for services rendered, mostly hauling goods but also butchering, grinding wheat, and making clothes and other items.

Both merchants took in locally produced foods, although of somewhat different types and in different quantities. A greater variety of foods appear in the Coombe accounts, but Allee accepted substantially greater quantities of certain foodstuffs -particularly bacon, butter and cheese, and eggs. In addition, with the exception of oats, Coombe took in significantly greater quantities of local grains and crops, most notably corn and wheat. Coombe also reported accepting livestock whereas Allee recorded only one horse in his credit accounts. Unfortunately, to a great extent, these differences may be a function of the nature of the records, the account book versus the day book. Allee's day book recorded daily sales in minute detail, indicating a greater quantity of goods sold over a shorter period of time than covered by the Coombe accounts. On the other hand, Coombe took in more cash, more goods, more discounts on goods, and more services in payment than did Allee. Allee's day book may incompletely record Credit, however a review of the surviving Allee account book for the same period did not reveal additional credit transactions. The differences in the period of time covered by the two sets of records may be significant. As Carson notes, "[t]he accounts were continuous, and settlement infrequent" (Carson 1954:98). A full two year period may be required for both merchants in order to allow for a valid comparison of the credit accounts.

The documents have provided at least partial, tentative answers to many questions about late eighteenth and early nineteenth century social and economic life in Duck Creek and the role of the community's merchants. The community is characterized both by integration and segregation, by homogeneity as well as differentiation and specialization, at least in certain social and economic aspects of community life. The wealthy, middling and poorer

folks, of different ethnic backgrounds (although some evidence of racial exclusion is evident), purchased the same goods at the same stores and attended the same functions, such as the Darrach sales. Merchants did not specialize in certain goods, but rather stocked a more general line. Folks shopped mostly locally, but did not patronize a single merchant exclusively. Neither did they appear to make decisions regarding whom to patronize based solely on their socioeconomic position, although the evidence identifies this as one consideration. Instead, the factors contributing to these decisions were multidimensional, encompassing kin, social and tenancy relationships, the cash or goods one had available for exchange, probably comparative price shopping, and a need to extend one's credit among several merchants.

Doris Fanelli was also interested in the "frequency and intricacy of social interactions in a small community" (Fanelli 1981:212) when she analyzed the accounts of William Polk, a merchant in St. George's, New Castle County. St. George's Hundred is located just north of Appoquinimink Hundred, which in turn adjoins Duck Creek, and Polk operated a store there for eleven months in 1810-1811.

Polk's store was located in the village of St. George's, along a major north-south stage road.

> He drew his customers from the town and the surrounding area that included residents of ...[St. Georges and Red Lion] Hundreds. Some customers' names appear daily in the daybook, indicating their proximity to the store; others, whose names appear less frequently, may have only made occasional trips to town. One hundred forty-seven different names are listed. (Fanelli 1981:215)

Many customers, however, shared common surnames. European-American customers outnumbered African-Americans by two to one. Thus compared to both Allee and Coombe, Polk served a much smaller, more racially mixed clientele.

Polk's accounts indicate he also relied on local manufacturers, artisans and farmers for goods. Those goods, identified as "rum, sugar, Queens ware, Nankeen ware, molasses, and coffee" that Polk acquired from outside the immediate area, Fanelli believes probably came in through Port Penn, then a "port of entry for commercial maritime traffic on the Delaware River" (Fanelli 1981:216). Unlike the Smyrna merchants, Polk's records do not suggest he dealt directly with Philadelphia merchants, suppliers and manufacturers (Fanelli 1981:216-7).

The following excerpts describe Polk's sales:

> Polk's store, centered in a farming community, seldom offered unprocessed farm produce for sale; this was available to most of the clientele at a cost well below any that Polk could charge.... The level of living for Polk's customers was above subsistence, and they were willing to pay for the convenience of having locally made goods and imported goods available at one central supply source. These consumers also supported a flourishing import market that provided luxurious enhancements to their daily lives.
>
> The largest category of goods sold by Polk was textiles and related objects, including yard goods, sewing supplies, dye supplies, and ready-to-wear clothing. Textiles comprised 28.3 percent of all transactions and their dollar value was 55 percent of the store's total sales...
>
> Most of the textiles sold were for home sewing. Yard goods and sewing supplies were sold with the greatest frequency. Thirty-six kinds of fabric were carried; this figure includes several different grades of the same product such as muslin and velvet....
>
> Ready-to-wear garments comprised 20 percent - by frequency - of all textile purchases. Premade clothing was not a large source of income for Polk...

> ...Molasses, rice, raisins, chocolate, coffee and sugar were standard inventory items that required trading at a large port....
>
> Customers supplied some locally available foods for sale as convenience items. Lard and bacon...Butter...
>
> Liquor sales were a large source of gross profit.... Alcohol was sold with greater frequency than any other item... Some kind of liquor was sold daily, usually in pint and quart quantities...
>
> Although profits on rum and gin were high, brandy and whiskey, by sheer volume, yielded the greatest liquor profits for Polk...
>
> Loose tobacco, another luxury item...
>
> Polk did not offer his customers a full complement of household and farm items. He did carry some ceramics, glassware, and eating utensils; he also sold such luxury items as watches and decanters. Nails, gimlets, and grass scythes were available at Polk's, but other farm tools were purchased elsewhere. Tack, hunting supplies, tools, ceramics and miscellaneous items together comprised 11 percent of Polk's total business (Fanelli 1981:217-219).

In general, this summary could apply equally well to Darrach, Allee, and Coombe.

Polk, also like Allee and Coombe, seldom sold items for cash paid upon delivery. "Almost everything purchased was debited to the customer's account, with payment made at a later date.... Accounts were settled by cash 47.6 percent of the time, by barter for goods and services 40.7% of the time, and by assumption of debt 11.7 percent of the time" (Fanelli 1981:219-20). When necessary, Polk lent his customers cash, as did both Allee and Coombe. He bartered principally in agricultural commodities - wheat, corn, flax seed and hides. Fanelli believes farmers sold most of their produce on the "open market" where they could command a higher profit, and that their transactions with Polk represented stock reserved specifically for local barter (Fanelli 1981:220-1). Our assumption was different regarding the Smyrna merchants, i.e., that they served as middlemen in the transfer of local crops and grains from the farmers to the markets accessible through Philadelphia. However, the quantities recorded in their accounts, especially of corn and wheat, may actually suggest a situation more akin to that described by Fanelli. Certainly we can agree with Fanelli that "the key to mercantile success in rural Delaware in 1810 was not specialization, but diversity" (Fanelli 1981:222).

What, then, can be concluded about Darrach, his fellow Duck Creek merchants, and their place and role in their community's social and economic life? In his now classic essay "Farms and Families: Mentalité in Preindustrial America," James Henretta wrote of the "tension between the demands of the market and the expectations stemming from traditional social [and familial] relationships" (Henretta 1978: 15) which permeated northern rural communities in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Duck Creek proved no exception, as the European Wars and the growing urban centers of Wilmington and Philadelphia tempted farm families with the promise of increasing profits. Yet neither were these pressures new, as the agricultural and commercial economy of Duck Creek had been established in the early eighteenth century on the production and distribution of marketable surpluses. The costs, too, must have been known - the ever - decreasing self-sufficiency of the family and community, interrelated by blood, marriage, and other social bonds. The limited documentation on the Darrach family alone demonstrates the extent and depth of these relationships. In the middle stood the merchant, link and mediator between the world market and the traditional community. Men like Darrach may have at the same time introduced and filtered the forces of change as they sought more and more wheat, flour, corn and lumber from area farmers in order to build their businesses and their family fortunes.

By 1815, John Darrach and Jonathon Allee were both dead, Darrach's store was rented to a tenant, and Duck Creek was on the eve of experiencing even more extensive change. At the root lay soils depleted of their productive capabilities and a collapse in the price of grains following the end of the Napoleonic Wars. The agricultural crisis engendered conflict even as it prompted changes and reforms, conflict not so much linked to the structure and values of the family as to the growing void between wealthy landowners and unlanded tenants. These landowners, already firmly entrenched in the market economy, sought to recover from the crisis through reform. They proposed to change the face of the land as well as the social relationships inscribed upon it. Reform and the conflict over it centered on at least four contemporaneous issues - outlawing free-roaming swine, controlling the number of dogs preying upon flocks of sheep, constructing commercial fish weirs, and draining tidal and inland marshes (Grettler 1991:3-4). Grettler charts the relationship of these changes to the increasing economic differentiation of the population:

> Hard times fueled conflict over reform in other ways. The great differences in wealth and landholding evident by 1797 became even greater between 1816 and 1822. As differences in wealth became more pronounced, the ability of a few men to improve increased while the ability of most people declined. Between 1816 and 1822, fewer taxables controlled more wealth than at any other time between 1797 and 1828. In 1822, the wealthiest twenty percent of all taxables in Duck Creek Hundred owned 86 percent of all wealth - gains made largely at the expense of people of middle wealth, typically small farmers and well-to-do tenants (Grettler 1991:173).

By 1815 "John Darrach's Heirs" were left with only one property -"12 Acres Land with Frame Dwelling House in bad Repair in tenure of John Crisp...$500" (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1815) - as the heirs had come of age and become legal owners of the properties assigned them in the 1810 Orphan's Court division of their mother's estate (Jane Darrach, Kent County Orphan's Court, 1810). Hence William and Eleanor Darrach Kennedy now owned (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1815):

1 Brick House and Garden Tenant Self	$ 800.
1 Small House and Garden Tenant by Nance N.--	75.
1 Large Frame Granary tenanted by George Walker (nearly opposite Said Kennedy's dweling [sic])	300.
1 Lot on Landing Road, occupied by Robert Patterson	100.
1 Lot in Duck Creek in tenure D. WmSon	100.
230 Acres Land, 160 Acres Improved, with a brick Dweling [sic] house and outbuildings in middling repair in tenure of John Bailey @ $25	5750.
2 Horses	100.
4 Cows	48.
100 Oz. Plate @ $11	111.
Personal tax	300.
	7684.

The lot on Landing Road or that in Duck Creek was most likely the Darrach Store property. Patterson, a merchant himself, had attended Darrach's estate sales and also maintained accounts with both Jonathon Allee and Benjamin Coombe. His own property holdings were extensive, and included ten adjacent houses and lots along the Landing

Road. Among these were a "2 Story Brick Granary...occupied by Rob't. Patterson ...$300" and "1 frame Granary ...$500" (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1815). Patterson was also assessed for a three year old sloop and the profits of the store of Robert Patterson and Joseph Parsons (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1815). If Patterson was occupying Darrach's store in 1815, it was probably as a granary or warehouse perhaps with live-in tenants. Daniel Williamson, the other possible tenant, was a Negro assessed in 1815 only for one horse, one cow and his personal tax (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1815).

A few years later Eleanor Darrach Kennedy died. The same year William Kennedy was appointed a trustee of the new Smyrna Mechanics Academy, a private school for boys, and elected one of Smyrna's first commissioners (Caley n.d.:21, 43). In 1819 he was appointed to a position in the local Presbyterian Church (Caley n.d.:79), but the following year Kennedy appeared for the last time in the Duck Creek Hundred tax assessments. His property was valued at $7367, $6875 in real estate and $492 in personal property (Kent County Tax Assessment, Duck Creek Hundred, 1820). In 1822 and 1828 neither Kennedy nor any heirs were assessed in the Hundred (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1822 and 1828). In the latter year, however, "John Darrach's heirs" reappeared in the assessment records, listed as owning:

> 320 Acres Land, improved with Log Dwelling, in bad repair, in tenure of Robert Patterson
> Valued at $8. per acre $2560.

In 1810, the same property had been valued at $22.00 per acre (Kent County Tax Assessments, Duck Creek Hundred, 1810). The process of a small elite consolidating property holdings during the agricultural and economic crisis of the 1820s is clearly evident here in the case of Robert Patterson.

Demographic changes also occur in the Hundred over the decades of the 1810s and 1820s. The population first increased by 261 to 3951 in 1820, then decreased by exactly 30 over the course of the next decade (Table 4). The growth in the 1810s occurs in the number of children under 10, in the number of European-American males between the ages of 18 and 26, and in the number of slaves. In fact the slave population of the Hundred increased by almost 250%, from 167 in 1810 to 405 in 1820. Free African-Americans, by comparison, decrease both in absolute numbers and percentage of population. The situation reverses itself somewhat in the following decade, as the number of slaves dropped to 342, and the free African-American population increased to account for over 28% of the Hundred's inhabitants. By 1830, just over one-quarter of Duck Creek Hundred's population resides in Smyrna (U. S. Census of Population, Duck Creek Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, 1820, 1830).

The documents do not identify the occupants and use of Darrach's former store during these decades, but the building probably housed either grain, other goods awaiting shipment to Philadelphia, tenants laboring in agriculture or shipping, or some combination thereof. Reminiscences of a Smyrna resident in the 1830s and the research of other scholars help delineate a picture of life in the community at the time.

In 1880-1881, Colonel Wilmer published [in the Smyrna Times] his "Reminiscences of Smyrna 50 Years Ago, By One Who Lived There." In his introductory remarks, he notes that the landing a few hundred yards from Darrach's old store "was then a great grain depot" (Wilmer, December 22, 1880:1), with grain being hauled from as far away as Cecil, Kent, Queen Anne's and Caroline counties in Maryland for shipment to Philadelphia. Packet sloops "fitted up for passengers" (Wilmer, December 22, 1880:1) also provided service between Smyrna Landing and Philadelphia. John Cummins had become the town's leading merchant, and according to Wilmer, "perhaps never before, nor since, has Smyrna had his peer" (Wilmer, December 22, 1880:1).

Following these opening comments, Wilmer proceeds to take the reader on a walking tour of Smyrna, complete with anecdotes of the inhabitants. He begins in "Wapping," the African-American community located between the Landing and town. On reaching town, he describes the store of Robert Patterson, "one of Smyrna's leading merchants" (Wilmer, December 29, 1880:1), and across the street, that of Mr. Walker. All told in this

journey in his mind's eye, he takes the reader past the one-room schoolhouse; a boarding house; the boy's school; the Academy; the engine house; the Quaker Meeting house and grounds; the grist mill; the "old English church" (Wilmer, January 5, 1881:1); Green's pottery on Main Street near Irishtown (Wilmer, January 5, 1881:1); the shops of two shoemakers, two carpenters, a blacksmith, a milliner, two tailors, a ladies' shoemaker, a turner, two cabinetmakers, a wheelwright, and a sadler; the homes of respectable workers in Irishtown; the stores of merchants Presley and Enoch Spruance, Benjamin Coombe, Lockwood and Blackiston (who "kept the most fancy stock of goods of any merchant in town") (Wilmer, February 16, 1881:1); the doctor's office; the tanyard on the hill; the Methodist, Methodist Episcopal and old Presbyterian churches; Benson and Catts' carriage factory; Coombe's stave, rail and wood yard; a bank; a watch and jewelry shop; a hotel; and a bark mill on the mill pond - all stretched out along three streets, Main, Commerce and Methodist (Wilmer, March 9, 1881:1). His description certainly indicates a community which had recovered from the economic troubles of the 1810s and 1820s.

In 1832, the state manufacturing census identified the only "manufacturing" in Kent and Sussex counties as a few local saw and grist mills and some household and domestic production. While clearly not industrializing to the extent New Castle County was, nevertheless Wilmer's description points up the importance of Kent County's craftsmen and artisans to the state's economy. The preceding decade, in 1820, only 16% of Duck Creek Hundred's employed inhabitants (100 of a total of 620) worked in manufacturing (U. S. Census of Population, Duck Creek Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, 1820).

Agriculture clearly continued to dominate the local economy, despite the fact that the average farmer in the region by 1840 earned less than his nonagricultural neighbor (Lindstrom 1978: 123). Agriculture had recovered from the crisis of preceding decades, emerging as redefined in scope, focus, and method.

> "By 1840 coastal agriculture clearly served the needs of Philadelphia and its satellite cities, providing perishables such as milk, fruit, and vegetables for human consumption, corn for fattening livestock before slaughter, hay for horses (the mainstay of the urban transport system), and wood for heating. With the possible exception of corn, none of these commodities was exported to extra-regional markets in appreciable quantities" (Lindstrom 1978: 125).

Despite the returning prosperity, Duck Creek Hundred's population had dropped again over the course of the 1830s, to 3839 in 1840 (U. S. Census of Population, Duck Creek Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, 1840 - Table 4). As in previous decades, other demographic changes accompanied the overall decrease in population. While the total number of European-Americans remained the same, increases occurred in the categories of children aged under 10 years and adults aged 40-50, while the numbers of young men aged 15-20 and young women aged 20-30 decreased. The most significant change, however, was the drop in the number of slaves in the Hundred, from 342 in 1830 to 82 in 1840. Eight hundred sixty four inhabitants reported occupations, 73% in agriculture, 19% in manufacturing and trades, 7% in commerce, and the remaining few in the learned professions, engineering, and ocean navigation (U. S. Census of Population, Duck Creek Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, 1840).

One young man employed in commerce was John Mason, a European-American male aged 20-30. He appears to have been living with his wife, aged 15-20, a son under 5 years of age, and a free African-American woman between 10 and 24 (U. S. Census of Population, Duck Creek Hundred, Kent County, Delaware, 1840). The 1859 Byles Map identifies a J. Mason as the occupant of the old Darrach store (Figure 6); however, 1840 is the only census year in which J. Mason appears in the Duck Creek Hundred enumeration.

In 1850, Smyrna Landing was at its busiest and new wharves and warehouses were under construction. Bark, grain, lumber and peaches were shipped on as many as seven vessels each day, and regular passenger service was available to Philadelphia (Scharf 1888:1093). Within a few years, however, competition had arrived in the form of the iron horse, the railroad. In 1854, the Delaware Railroad reached Smyrna, passing about two miles west of town (Caley n.d.:23) (and thus decreasing the distance Maryland farmers had to transport their produce).

By the time Byles' map of Kent County was inscribed in 1859 (Figure 6), Duck Creek Hundred had changed dramatically from that which John Darrach had known at the beginning of the century. The agricultural economy had virtually collapsed, and in its recovery, the social order was transformed as well as the landscape. Not only were tracts consolidated during the years of depressed land prices, and then redistributed into smaller tenant farms, but the landscape was rebuilt - new houses, outbuildings, fence rows (Herman 1987:116, 122). Yet the continued importance of agriculture meant families still distributed themselves across the landscape, clustering only in towns such as Smyrna. In scanning the map, another important and remarkable consistency is visible - the Cumminses, Spruances, Reeses, Van Gaskens, Maberrys, Seversons, Cavenders, Cloaks, Hoffeckers, Petersons, Allees, Collinses, Palmaterys, Raymonds, Dennys, Griffins, Letherburys, and Budds - those whose names appeared in the accounts of Darrach, Allee and Coombe, were all still there. The Darrachs, however, had gone, and in 1863 the heirs, now scattered in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Indiana and New York, sold their remaining Duck Creek property to Joseph Comegys (Table 1). The plat accompanying the sale shows that the Darrach store property has been reconfigured since allotted to Eleanor Darrach Kennedy in 1810 (Figure 24). Comegys transfers the tract and others to John Black later that same year, and by the time Beer's Atlas was published in 1868, the "old Brick house and granary" was gone.

FIELD TESTING AND LABORATORY ANALYSIS: METHODOLOGY

The John Darrach Store site was a cornfield, and the corn had been recently cut by DelDOT, when the Phase III excavations began in July 1989. Utilizing the same fixed datum employed in the Phase I and II investigations, a Diamond State Telephone (DST) #32 telephone stub-up along Woodland Beach Road, the field team first established a site grid. This grid employed the same grid north as the Phase I and II investigations had, but not the same grid coordinates. Thus, the Phase I and II shovel test pits did not line up on the 10' grid coordinates of the Phase III grid. The grid base line was established along the eastern edge of the site, with the 0/0 point originally intended to be the northeast corner of the site. Later, the grid was extended 10' to the north, but originally the site boundaries were delimited by a grid extending 190' south of 0/0 and 240' west.

The initial stage of the Phase III excavations consisted of excavating a 25% random sample of the plow zone within what had been designated Area I based on the Phase I and II investigations (Figure 25). This roughly oval-shaped zone around the store (Figure 23) contained all of the features discovered during the Phase I and II excavations and was the area of greatest artifact densities, which ranged between 15 and 50 artifacts per shovel test pit.

Recently, historic archaeologists have begun to recognize the importance, for site interpretation and the identification of intrasite patterning, of adequate and systematic plow zone sampling and surface collections (Lewarch and O'Brien 1981; Moir and Jurney 1987; Riordan 1988; Pogue 1988; Shaffer et al. 1988; Hoseth et al. 1990). In order to sample the plow zone at the Darrach Store site, the grid was conceived of as consisting of 10' by 10' units, each divisible into four 5'X 5' units. One 5'X 5' unit was selected at random from each 10'X 10' for excavation to the base of the plow zone. This sampling scheme constituted a 25 percent stratified, systematic, unaligned sample (Plog 1976:136-144).

One hundred nineteen 5' by 5' units were thus to be excavated; only four in the northwest corner were not excavated due to previous disturbance (Figure 25). All units were excavated by hand to the plow zone/subsoil interface and the soils screened through 1/4" mesh hardware cloth. The surface of subsoil was then scraped, and any features noted, marked and drawn to scale. The only exception occurred in excavating units within the store foundation. The store's cellar was full of brick rubble from the building's demolition. During the plow zone testing, this was removed down to the cellar floor from the nine 5' x 5' units which fell within the foundation. The brick rubble itself was discarded, the soils were screened and artifacts recovered as in the other plow zone tests. Across the remainder of the testing area, all cultural material was recovered, but brick fragments were for the most part weighed in the field and discarded. Soil samples for chemical analysis were taken from the perimeter of the site in the plow zone.