

of the sites under study. The sites used in the derivation of the Carolina Artifact Pattern were all predominantly eighteenth century occupations, with no consideration of late nineteenth to twentieth century data. The Hawthorn site, and the Ferguson site too, were both occupied well into the twentieth century. Thus, the large percentages of kitchen, architecture, and activities related artifacts at Hawthorn are probably due to the longer occupation and the subsequent contribution to the data base of the site. It should be noted that, had the building materials listed earlier, such as brick, plaster, asbestos, etc., been included in the counts for the Hawthorn assemblage, the comparison would not have been with South's Carolina Pattern, but with South's (1977) Frontier Artifact Pattern. This pattern does not accurately reflect the regional or site specific development of the Middle Atlantic area, when considering the occupation period of the William M. Hawthorn site. That the data could be interpreted in this manner points to the need for further research into not only the mechanics, but also the archaeological reality of South's patterning.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This section of the site report will summarize the findings of the excavation, consider the placement and function of the site in the regional settlement pattern and socio-economic activity sphere, and note the implications of these findings for future research.

Generally, the Phase III data recovery program revealed that a historic component of the Hawthorn site existed continuously

from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. Extensive and intensive excavations allowed the determination of a main activity area and several interrelated secondary activity areas thought to be related to the support structures of the later nineteenth century occupation.

Patterns of Artifact Distribution and Spatial Utilization

Excavations within the main occupation area revealed that a major change in the site structure had occurred over time due to changing spatial utilization and functions of the site. A distinct and large scale change was identified to have occurred in the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, signified by a shift in agricultural support buildings and activities from close to the house site to areas separated from the house by yard areas. These yard areas were identified by anomalous, low artifact densities in locations which one would expect to contain much higher frequencies. Earlier changes in spatial utilization were also identified. In particular, the rebuilding and reorientation of the house site circa 1902 provided a distinct benchmark and control over the changes noted in artifact distribution. Two main artifact density areas were identified that were associated with the house site. The first was related to the depositional behavior at the time of the log house occupation, and the second was related to the depositional behavior of the later post-1902 frame house occupation. The concentration of diagnostic ceramic assemblages of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was suggested to have been deposited in the side or rear yard contexts. A change in

artifact dispersal behavior in the mid-to-late nineteenth century was identified in a change in the density distributions to locations as rear and side yard areas of the circa 1902 structure.

Purchase and Consumption Habits

Archival and archaeological research did document the effects of regional socio-economic trends on the occupants of the site. While never actually subsistence oriented in their outlook, the occupants of the Hawthorn site did adapt their agricultural output to the regional economic trends of the period. Thus, they moved from a grain-based economy to a more diversified agriculture, and finally to a dairy-oriented production. These changes were influenced by the demands from urban centers such as Wilmington, Philadelphia and Baltimore.

Economic status of the inhabitants of the site was found to be higher than originally hypothesized. The occupants of the site were found to rank in the upper four to twelve percent of the taxable local population through time. Although G. Miller's (1980) economic scaling of artifacts was not possible, subjective comparisons between the Robert Ferguson tenant house revealed no significant artifact differences in the assemblages. The result is that artifact correlates of social/economic status need to be further examined in the Middle Atlantic Region.

An analysis of the faunal collection recovered in the Phase I/II and Phase III excavations provided little information on changing subsistence or consumption habits through time. Generally the faunal remains were recovered from disturbed contexts and

no features containing significant remains were encountered. The results of this analysis (Appendix 13) do not allow several general statements on food consumption in rural, northern Delaware. First, as with the faunal remains recovered at the Robert Ferguson House, domestic cattle (Bos taurus), sheep (Ovis aries), and pig (Sus scrofa) are represented by a high percentage of teeth and head elements and foot elements indicating at-home rearing and butchering of these animals. However, there is a notable lack of butchering or saw marks on food source bones. It is assumed that these large numbers of uncut bone indicates the preparation of wholesale meat cuts for marketing. There is a definite absence of evidence for the purchasing of meat cuts from retail establishments. Especially absent are cross-sectional cuts indicative of higher quality steaks and roasts. The suggested use of inferior cuts for stews and soups is another fact previously identified on both rural sites and urban sites occupied by persons of lower economic status. That such patterns are present in a higher economic class occupation site shows that food consumption habits may not always vary with socio-economic status. Secondly, both the Hawthorn Site and Ferguson site faunal remains exhibited a total lack of wild food sources in all classes of identifiable bones. This provides a further impression of the settled nature of northern New Castle County, even in the late 18th century.

In sum, the absence of significant differences between the Ferguson (tenant) farmhouse and Hawthorn (individual family-owned farmhouse) and the absence of high quality meat parts at a household in the top 4-12% of the taxable households for White

Clay Creek Hundred, a productive agricultural area, suggest that there are few, if any, archaeological correlates of differential socio-economic status in rural northern Delaware. The residents of the Hawthorn site did not change their purchase and consumption habits as markets change. Agricultural production was reoriented toward emerging urban markets and the Hawthorn Site residents prospered. However, high quality meat cuts from on-site butchering seem to have been salable surplus, while lower quality cuts are consumed at home. A major reorientation of the house structure was undertaken. This reorientation was indicative of changing transportation networks, which in turn were related to changes in the local market economy. Landscaping, rebuilding of the house, and restructuring of farm complex building layout all occur. Yet, several material culture patterns remain the same and there were no changes in material culture indicative of changes in lifeways or socio-economic status. It may be that artifacts' and ecofacts' characteristics were not themselves keys to changing 19th century lifeways. Spatial changes in site structure, which can be identified archaeologically, may be more important in delimiting changes in past lifeways (see Handsman 1981). Traditional and conservative values regarding food consumption, use of food surplus, and purchase of items of personal use may be more resistant to change compared to patterns of spatial utilization.

An additional major accomplishment of the study was the creation of a socio-economic data base derived from archival sources. Historic documentation of socio-economic studies

through the use of tax assessments, orphan court records, estate inventories and the like yielded valuable results, and can be expanded and applied to future sites in the Middle Atlantic area.

Archaeological identification of trade networks through artifacts was not successful due to the fragmentary nature of the assemblages. There were few makers' marks or manufacturers' marks recovered from the site. Generally, however, it can be stated that the inhabitants purchased ceramics from local manufacturers of redwares until the middle of the nineteenth century, then relied heavily on imported English whitewares and ironstone for their consumption.

Suggestions for Future Research

Several suggestions for future research presented themselves through the course of this investigation. First, site specific investigation of the undisturbed section of the farm's outbuildings and artifact disposal areas still present at the Hawthorn National Register Site could be undertaken. This area may be in the near future subjected to development, and any additional information that could be done to aid in the creation and expansion of a data base for socio-economic studies for New Castle County would be informative. This data could be applied to future studies in the area. However, if an arrangement with the owner, Continental Insurance Company, can be reached to preserve the undisturbed portion of the site, it should be left in place. Third, it was found that extensive archival research prior to the excavation of the site would have been most beneficial, and would have reduced unnecessary time and expense. Fourth, a comparison of the Hawthorn site and the Ferguson site

artifact assemblages and socio-economic ranking to other local and regional sites, both urban and rural should be attempted in the future. Finally, there should be general change in the Phase III field methodology to expose more of a large horizontal area instead of isolated test units. This type of methodology is more applicable to South's concepts of artifact patterning and disposal behavior.