

it was felt that it might be possible to learn more about the spatial arrangement and relationships of the dwelling and other service buildings such as storage sheds, animal pens, privies, etc. to show how these compare to the large complexes of the owners, many of which are still extant. It was also felt that an examination of the discarded material possessions from the site would allow a more precise characterization of the social and economic status of the occupants.

The methodology (which will be discussed in more detail in the Methodology section) was designed to gather data to address these and other questions. The archival research was designed to attempt to identify the occupants of the site and to develop a more general set of data concerning the social and economic conditions under which the occupants, hypothesized as tenant farmers, lived. It was expected that excavations would provide information concerning the characteristics of refuse disposal patterns for 19th century sites such as this. Machine stripping of the area was designed to uncover a maximum number of undisturbed features and deposits which would increase the data base on intrasite patterning and gained from the controlled surface collection. The controlled surface collection preceded the machine stripping and was used as a guide for this activity as well as for providing an independent data set regarding internal structure. An examination of patterning in the distribution of economically significant attributes in the artifacts was made and then compared to data from other sites to see if there are broad patterns which reflect the economic conditions of the occupants.

REGIONAL CULTURE HISTORY

The following is a brief synopsis of the regional cultural prehistory and history.

Delaware's regional prehistory has been subdivided by Custer (1980, 1983) into four major time periods. They are the Paleo Indian Period (ca. 12,000 B.C. - 6500 B.C.), the Archaic Period (6500 B.C. - 3000 B.C.), the Woodland I Period (3000 B.C. - A.D. 1000) and the Woodland II Period (A.D. 1000-1650). The Contact Period, dating from A.D. 1650 to 1750, follows the four major time periods. After about 1750, the aboriginal population in Delaware had ceased to exist as a relatively unacculturated way of life.

Paleo Indian Period

This time period dates to the terminal Late Pleistocene and early Holocene climatic eras, a time that marks the final retreat of the glaciers and the gradual development of modern climatic regimes. The Paleo Indian climate consisted of alternating wet and dry conditions characteristic of the Late Pleistocene and early Holocene and which supported the various extinct species of large game mammals such as mastodon, mammoth and moose. These animals were adapted to the various vegetational communities that

existed at the time, a mixed mosaic of deciduous and boreal forests, as well as grassland environments.

The tool kit of the Paleo Indian was oriented primarily toward the hunting of the various large game animals. Diagnostics are fluted and notched projectile points (the latter characterizing the Early Archaic) as well as several kinds of side and end scrapers. A preference for high quality cryptocrystalline lithic raw material is indicated. This reliance on high quality stone had a great effect on the Paleo Indian settlement pattern; base camps were located in the vicinity of quarries, with radiating hunting camps and special procurement sites located away from the base camp/quarry locale.

Archaic Period

The changes in the climate mentioned previously led to the establishment of modern conditions by approximately 6500 B.C. There was a corresponding change in the adaptive pattern of the aboriginal groups inhabiting the Middle Atlantic. The extinction of the large game species by this time was caused, at least in part, by the reduction in the grassland environments and the development of closed mesic forests. The larger species were replaced by more solitary browsing species such as deer, elk, and moose. Adaptive patterns were geared to the hunting of the more solitary species and the collecting of plant foods. This change in subsistence patterns is marked by the development of various grinding tools, a new technology and variety of new projectile point forms made from a wide variety of lithic materials. Settlement patterns were characterized by small seasonal base camps located to take advantage of seasonally available resources with smaller groups fissioning off in pursuit of other seasonally and locally available kinds of plant and animal foods. In the New Castle County area, sites such as the Clyde Farm and Delaware Park are representative of base camps of this time period and the following Woodland I period.

Woodland I

By 3000 B.C., increasing sea level had caused climatic/environmental changes that led to adaptive changes in the prehistoric way of life. This rise resulted in the development of brackish water estuaries. The mesic forest was replaced by a xeric type characterized by oak and hickory species, with an increase in grasslands. Temperatures were warmer and drier than before. The development of the estuaries created a rich environmental zone that could support large base camps on a seasonal schedule, which was, in part, probably semi-sedentary for a large part of the year. An increase in population is noted at this time.

The Woodland I tool kit is characterized by the broad bladed Savannah River point forms and their derivatives, as well as solid container technology. The solid container technology is first characterized by soapstone bowls in the first phases of the

Woodland I period and later by ceramic containers. Ground stone tools continue to be part of the tool kit.

Woodland II

The main characteristic marking the emergence of the Woodland II period is the development of a stable agricultural adaptation in many parts of the Middle Atlantic. Research in Delaware indicates that such a shift is not as marked as in other parts of the Middle Atlantic and that the Woodland I adaptive systems continue to function, a system characterized by intensive plant cultivation and hunting. Various ceramic types with complex decorations are characteristic of the Woodland II period in Delaware. These wares evolved out of the earlier Woodland I ceramics. Small triangular projectile points are ubiquitous and indicate the use of the bow and arrow.

Contact Period

The Contact period is the time when the Indians were in active interaction with the newly arrived European traders and settlers. The information available is the ethnohistoric sources which show rapid disruption and deculturation brought about by the combination of several factors including, importantly, high mortality rates from European introduced diseases, dependence on European manufactured goods and loss of land. The Indians resident in the northern Delaware area at the time of contact fall into the rather loosely defined Delaware. The Delaware at the early Historic period consisted of widely scattered, rather loosely organized and relatively independent local groups. Only much later did the shattered remnants form a cohesive Pan-Delaware polity. All belonged to a larger linguistic grouping known as the Coastal Algonquin, of which Delaware is a subdivision. Within the category Delaware, are further divisions of which the Southern Unami lived in southern New Jersey and along the southern shore of the Delaware River and Delaware Bay (Goddard 1978). The Minguannan are the mapped groups closest to the project area.

Regional History

Delaware was settled by the Dutch in 1630, with the establishment near Lewes of a whaling station which was soon destroyed by the Indians. The Swedes settled in the vicinity of Wilmington with the establishment of Fort Christina in 1638. This was captured by the Dutch in 1651. Settlement was characterized by scattered farmsteads along the major drainages, the Delaware River, White Clay Creek and Christina Creek (Weslager 1961).

Control of Delaware once again changed hands in 1664 with the ascendancy of the English. In 1682, proprietary rights were granted to William Penn. The axis of interaction, both politically and economically, shifted to Philadelphia and for the remainder of the historic period, at least in the larger scheme

of things, northern Delaware falls into the greater Philadelphia orbit. At the time of Penn's assumption, however, northern Delaware was quite rural, with dispersed farmsteads being distributed along the Delaware and the tributary streams (Catts and Coleman 1986). The focus of settlement was two-fold -- streams for navigation and good agricultural soils. Streams were essential at this time for communication and movement of imports and exports, as overland road systems were virtually non-existent. As a result of this settlement system, waterfront locations became the locus of early town growth. The early population expansion away from the waterfront settings was out from these rivers and streams but still within a short distance of either a mill or shipping wharf.

The second phase of expansion began in the 18th century and reflects several factors including internal population growth, heavy influx of new populations from Europe, crowding along the earlier settled locations, the growth of small population-market centers in these settings, and increases in property costs in the older locations. The interior movement was first to the best available farmlands, but as the interior road system began to grow and expand, settlement became even more dispersed. Land purchases and allocations earlier did not follow the southern system in size and small holdings were the rule. Subsequently in loci closer to the earlier settled areas and the growing market towns, larger land holdings grew as individuals acquired wealth and used this, in part, to acquire land.

Town growth and urbanization underwent several pulses (Catts and Coleman 1986). The first growth related to relationships with Philadelphia and the market and shipping center. There was then a period of stagnation which carried into the first third of the 18th century. Aggregations of populations did continue to grow around mills, transportation nodes, shipping points and bridges and ferries. Following the model presented by the geographer Lemon, Catts and Coleman (1986) noted another period of urbanization between 1730 and 1765. Wilmington saw considerable growth at this time as did a number of other towns. With this, and perhaps as a result or cause, the road system grew rapidly. In the early 19th century, improvements to the transportation system saw the growth of canal and then, in 1839, the start of rail transportation.

Settlement in the 19th century was characterized by the growth of even larger plantations and farming operations and associated small tenant farms. The H. Grant Tenancy site, which is the focus of this report, was originally felt to be one of these small, tenant farms. All of this agrarian economy was nested after a fashion with the large urban centers at the final consumption end and the tenant farms, presumably, at the basic production end. Some of the changes in the role of the farm can be tracked through the 18th and 19th century with the shift from subsistence farming with a move toward production of goods for consumption in the growing regional markets (Fletcher 1950). These changes also tie in with the growing industrial and urban

centers in the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Baltimore corridor underway in the early 190th century. As Catts and Coleman (1986) note, the later 19th century was a period of ever increasing industrialization, population growth and urbanization. Despite this, northern Delaware continued to be primarily agricultural during the 19th century. Interestingly, from the perspective of this report, tenancy continued to be a viable factor in agricultural production into the 20th century.

FIELD METHODOLOGY

Field research at the Grant Tenancy was separated into three steps, each with specific research goals. These include, in order of completion: 1. controlled surface collection; 2. screened plowzone sample; and 3. location, mapping and excavation of the house foundation and associated features. The first step was to obtain a sample of artifacts across the site from a controlled surface collection. This was done to help isolate artifact concentrations that would provide clues to locating activity areas and subsurface features. Since surface visibility was obscured by ground vegetation, the first step required that the site be plowed in order to provide maximum surface visibility and optimal collecting conditions. Once the plowing was completed, a grid was laid out with wooden stakes placed at twenty foot intervals. The grid origin was established near the entrance to the field and was arbitrarily designated as North 100, West 500, to insure that all coordinates from the site would possess a northwest quadrant designation (Figure 2).

Collecting was facilitated by fabricating a movable grid using rope. The grid was stretched from each of the wooden stakes dividing each 20 foot square section into four ten by ten units. Ten by ten foot units were chosen primarily for convenience. Each ten by ten unit was designated with the coordinate of its southwest corner and all artifacts from each unit were collected and bagged separately. Artifact counts were tabulated in the field after each section was collected. Figure 3 shows the foundation and selected features. The results were then plotted on three separate distribution maps, one indicating architectural debris (brick, nails, flat glass), one indicating artifact totals, and one showing ceramics only (Figures 4-6). The maps were useful in making decisions about the placement of five by five foot excavation units utilized in the next step of the field investigations as they delineated "hot spots" or artifact concentrations.

Step 2 was designed to retrieve a sample of artifacts from the plowzone in areas where surface concentrations were high. A total of thirty-seven five by five foot units were excavated by flat shovel and trowel (see Figures 2 and 3). All plowzone soil from the 37 hand excavated 5'x5's was screened through 1/4 inch mesh and all sub-plowzone features revealed in these units were mapped and numbered for subsequent excavation. The screened plowzone units provided additional artifact distribution data as well as giving a more complete sample for subsequent functional