Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

REGIONAL CULTURE HISTORY

The 17th Century

The first historic settlement in what is now Delaware was established by the Dutch West India Company in 1630 when a whaling station was established near the present town of Lewes. However, this post was destroyed by Indians in 1631 and no settlement in that area was attempted again until 1659. A Swedish colony was established in 1638 at Fort Christiana, near the present site of Wilmington, by the New Sweden Company. Although the land was claimed by the Dutch, it was little used and unsettled when the Swedes arrived. By 1654 a small village, Christianahamm, existed behind the fort, and approximately 400 Swedish, Finnish, and Dutch settlers resided in the area.

In 1655, the uneasy coexistence between the Swedes and Dutch was abruptly ended when the Dutch seized control of New Sweden. Dutch Fort Casimir, established in 1651, and the town of New Amstel (modern New Castle) became the economic and commercial center for the lower Delaware Valley. Ownership of the Delaware region changed hands again in 1664, when the English gained control of all Dutch possessions in the New World. In 1682 the granting of proprietary rights to William Penn and his representatives by the Duke of York essentially gave economic and political control of the Delaware region to Philadelphia, the new seat of government (Munroe 1978).

The settlement pattern for this early period was one of dispersed farmsteads located along the Delaware and its tributaries, such as the Christiana, Appoquinimink, Brandywine,

White Clay and Red Clay, where the land possessed good agricultural qualities (Hoffecker 1977). The Swedish and Dutch settlers had pushed their settlement far up the valley of the Christiana toward the Elk River. The town of Christiana Bridge, so named because it was the crossing place of that river, was established by about 1660 at the head of navigation of the Christiana.

With the arrival of Penn in late 1680's, an individualistic system of land settlement was pursued through the granting by the proprietors of tracts or parcels of land to settlers. Penn usually granted land to families, the standard size tract being about 500 acres (Myers 1912:263). A study of the deed records for White Clay Creek area in the seventeenth century indicates that generally property sizes ranged between 100 and 500 acres, but there were some tracts of over 1000 acres granted. These larger grants usually went to land speculation companies, such as the London Company, who by 1687 possessed a tract of over 1300 acres north of White Clay Creek. The price of land was inexpensive, in the province of Pennsylvania selling for L 5 to L 15 for 100 acres, or about one to three shillings per acre. Unlike colonies to the south, the quality and cheapness of the land discouraged the establishment of large estates and land tenancy (Bidwell and Falconer 1941).

By 1683 the cultivated areas of the region consisted of the three lower counties, New Castle, Kent, and Sussex, and three Pennsylvania counties, Philadelphia, Buckingham (Bucks), and Chester. The total population of all six of these counties in

1683 has been estimated to be about four thousand (Myers 1912:239). In New Castle County five tax districts, called Hundreds, had already been established by 1687. With the growth of the population, four more hundreds were created in 1710, and White Clay Creek Hundred was one of these hundreds (Conrad 1908:287).

With the exception of the port towns of Philadelphia and New Castle, there were no other major commercial or social centers in the area. The small hamlets that were established were situated on the major transportation routes of the period, almost always on a navigable river or stream. Few were located inland, for the road network was almost nonexistent. An exception to this was "Ogle's Town", which was located along the road to the Elk river as early as 1679. The villages of Christiana Bridge and Cantwell's Bridge were the only hamlets of any size in the area and both were located on major rivers and roads; Christiana was located on the road from New Castle to Upland, and Appoquinimink was on the Bohemia Manor cart road to the Chesapeake. The village of Christianahamm, at the mouth of the Christiana, was slowly being eclipsed by the rise of New Castle, and as early as 1690 was a village of only minor importance (Klein and Garrow (Eds.) 1984).

In the New Castle County region water transportation was the major mode of travel and commerce in the late seventeenth century. Most of the farmstead tracts and land grants had frontage on a stream or water course to ensure that communication and the moving of produce to local markets could be accomplished (Hoffecker 1977). In a country that was heavily wooded with a

mixture of oaks, walnut, hickory, chestnut, and maple, water travel was the easiest, safest, and most effective means of transport. Overland travel was extremely difficult, because the roads were few and in very poor condition. Even the road from New Castle to Christiana Bridge, probably the area's major overland transportation route, was in horrible condition. Generally, the roads in the area were simply intra-regional connectors to the coastal towns.

Swedish settlers to the region grew rye and barley on their farms, but these grains were quickly replaced by wheat when it was found that it could be grown more easily than any other product. More importantly, wheat was a marketable commodity, and the farmers and settlers in the area soon shifted from subsistence-oriented to market-oriented agriculture. Wheat, and to a lesser extent, corn and other grains, were grown and then shipped by water to milling sites. Milling sites appeared very early in the region's history; there was a mill in New Castle by 1658, and one on Red Clay Creek by 1679 (Pursell 1958). Villages such as Christiana Bridge grew because of these mills, and became market places and shipping centers for grain from the surrounding country. The processing of the grains into flour and bread was found to be more profitable than just simply exporting wheat. Another export from the area was lumber; a sawmill was located on Bread and Cheese Island by 1679. However, lumber was a more important export from Sussex County, and the lumber mills in New Castle County were probably for local use. Attempts at growing tobacco for export failed early in the region's history. By the

start of the eighteenth century, regional specialization was discernible; the area was beginning to be recognized as a wheat and grain producing region, just as the south was emerging as a tobacco and rice center (Hanna 1917; Loehr 1952; Purcell 1958; Hoffecker 1977).

White Clay Creek Hundred and New Castle County were part of a broader regional economy that was centered in Philadelphia. This city, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, quickly began to dominate the economic scene in the lower Delaware Valley. New Castle County was part of Philadelphia's agricultural and commercial hinterland, along with western New Jersey, northeast Maryland, southeastern and northeastern Pennsylvania, and Kent and Sussex Counties in Delaware (Lindstrom 1978; Walzer 1972). Farmers in the region sent their grains to the local milling centers, where the wheat flour was shipped to Philadelphia for export to the West Indies, other North American colonies, and Southern European countries (Lindstrom 1978; Hanna 1917; Walzer 1972). The farmers in New Castle County quickly adapted to this market system of agriculture; it is estimated that over one-half of the farmers in the area were situated within eight miles (or a half-day's journey) of a mill or shipping wharf (Walzer 1972:163).

In the specific vicinity of the south side of White Clay Creek, one of the earliest English settlers in the area was John Nommers (also spelled 'Nummers' or 'Venomers'), who purchased a tract of land from Governor Edmund Andros in 1676. This was a parcel of 340 acres, 200 of which were located on the south side of White Clay Creek (New Castle County Deed Book Q-1-547).

Nommers paid L55 for this property. Sometime between 1676 and 1697, Nommers bought an additional 100 acres south of and adjoining his present property. In 1697 this acreage was sold to Patrick Woodsgerald for L9 (New Castle County Deed Book Q-1-557). Deed record research combined with two contemporary survey maps indicate that it is within the bounds of Woodsgerald's tract that the present-day W. M. Hawthorn site is located (Figure 5).

The 18th Century

Settlement in New Castle County continued much as it had in the previous century. In the Philadelphia region, there was a large influx of immigrants between 1725 and 1755, particularly Scotch-Irish, most of whom were indentured servants (Munroe 1978:160). As the transportation network improved, colonists began to move inland away from the navigable rivers and streams. Good, productive land was settled first, but as the population began to grow, marginal property was also occupied. Land was still inexpensive, in 1795 selling for L3 to L4 per acre near Christiana Bridge, or about $300 an acre (Strickland 1801:19; La Rouchefoucault 1800). The size of farms in New Castle County ranged between 100 and 200 acres, indicating a decline from the seventeenth century. This was due to a tendency for the large grants and tracts to be divided and subdivided by sale and inheritance (Munroe 1954:19). If Chester County, Pennsylvania, can be used as a comparison, farm sizes there dropped from about 500 acres in 1693 to less than 130 acres by 1791 (Ball and Walton 1976:105). By 1750 it appears that the density of rural settlement in southeast Pennsylvania and New Castle County was

approximately five households per square mile (Ball 1976:628; Lemon 1972).

Demographic data for New Castle County in general and White Clay Creek Hundred in particular is almost nonexistent; hence no information concerning population is available. Tax assessment data for the last quarter of the eighteenth century in White Clay Creek Hundred, however, has survived. This material indicates that the number of taxables in the Hundred fluctuated from 148 persons in 1777 to over 300 by 1780 (see Appendix III). There was a decline in the number of taxables after the American Revolution, indicating the unsettled nature of post war society in the area. This downward trend did not reverse itself until 1789.

In regards to urbanization, Lemon (1967) has divided the eighteenth century in the Philadelphia region into three periods of growth. The first period, from 1700 to 1729, was one of urban stagnancy after the initial rapid growth of the seventeenth century. However hamlets - unplanned towns that sprang up at crossroads and around taverns, ferries and mills did begin to appear at this time. Ogletown is a fine example of an eighteenth century hamlet in New Castle County. It certainly did not deserve the appellation of town "...there being but one Brickhouse & a Few Wooden ones all the property of Thomas Ogle, no tavern in the place...." (Paltsits 1935:7). But Ogletown was, like Red Lion, Middletown, and Aiken's Tavern, located at a crossroads, or on a major transportation and shipping route.

The second period of urbanization that Lemon recognizes, 1730 to 1765, saw a renewal of town growth based on internal

trade. In the Philadelphia region, Lancaster, York, Carlisle, Reading and Wilmington were examples of this period of urban growth. On a more local scale, towns such as Newport, Cuckoldstown (modern Stanton), and Newark were chartered and prospered during this period. Christiana Bridge, stagnating since the 1680's saw growth and prosperity as a major grain transhipment port for produce coming from the upper Chesapeake Bay area. Having only about ten houses in 1737, Christiana blossomed under the trading and shipping industries into a burgeoning town with several large mills, between fifty and sixty houses, and several taverns by the end of the century (Acomb 1958:124; Padelford 1939:11; Conrad 1908.2:495).

Newport, established about 1735, rivaled Wilmington and Christiana Bridge as a grain-shipping and flour milling center during the eighteenth century. Grain was transported to Newport overland from the Lancaster and York areas of Pennsylvania, it being cheaper to ship the resulting flour by water to Philadelphia from Newport than to transport the grain overland directly from Lancaster to Philadelphia. Contemporary travel maps of Newport show it to have been laid out in a regular town plan, consisting of parallel streets extending from the Christiana River, and intersected by others at right angles (Colles 1789:170; Moore and Jones 1804:170; Scott 1807:180). It was described by travelers as being the size of New Castle, with about forty well-built houses, three or four stores and as many taverns (Padelford 1939:11; Scudder 1877:264; Penn 1879:295).

The crossroads town of Newark, chartered in 1758,

represented a shift from the water-oriented shipping town to an inland market town. It was located on the two major overland transportation routes, the road from Dover to southeast Pennsylvania and the road from Christiana to Nottingham. Eighteenth century maps show it to have been at the center of no fewer than six roads (Cooch 1946). Newark was established as a market town that supplied the local population with commodities brought from Philadelphia and the surrounding region. While not quite as large as Newport, it was "...the most considerable collection of houses ... since Lancaster" (Penn 1879:295). Several mills for local produce were found along White Clay Creek in the town's vicinity, and the Newark Academy was established in the town by the early 1760's.

The town of Stanton, originally called Cuckoldstown, became an important milling and grain center in the late eighteenth century. A grist mill was known to be in the vicinity of Stanton as early as 1679, and by 1800 Cuckoldstown rivaled Newport. Ships of moderate draft were able to navigate up Red Clay Creek and take on local as well as southeastern Pennsylvania farm produce. Located at the confluence of Red Clay Creek with White Clay Creek, Stanton was never a large town. A map of the area in 1789 (Colles 1789:170) shows only a mill and ten dwellings in the vicinity of the town. It was described at the end of the eighteenth century as a "...place of little note ... in its vicinity were some good flour mills" (Moore and Jones 1804:6). A map of the New Castle County region, drawn in 1777, does not even show the location of Stanton (Cooch 1946).

Wilmington was by far the largest urban center in New Castle

County that developed in this period. Chartered in 1739, the city's location was considered by one visitor to be "one of the pleasantest and most favorable on the whole continent" (Acomb 1958:123). Wilmington soon became a port of entry and a post town, and was an important link in the Philadelphia trading network. Of special significance to the city's location was its proximity to the Brandywine mills. Located one-half mile north of Wilmington, Brandywine Village was a small town "...chiefly consisting in mills and taverns, eight or ten being within 100 yards of each other" (Chilton 1777:288). Wilmington thus was a receiving center for local and regional farm produce, brought by water from Christiana, Stanton, and Newport, and shipped up the Delaware to Philadelphia (Lindstrom 1978; Walzer 1972).

Lemon's third period of urban development, 1766-1800, was marked by less noticeable town growth which paralleled a more erratic economic pattern. Little growth in the towns of New Castle County took place during this period. However an increase in population and land tenancy was noted. (Lemon 1972:216).

The condition of roads in New Castle County improved considerably over the course of the eighteenth century, but in some locations were unsatisactory even by contemporary standards (Munroe 1954:137; Gray 1961:309). In 1775 the road from Middletown to 'Christeen' was considered good, but from Christiana north "the roads are, in many places, extremely bad and the appearance of the country the same" (Padelford 1939:12). The road from Christiana to Philadelphia, by way of Newport, Wilmington, and Chester, was the post road, but it was described

as a "hilly and rocky road; a better and more pleasant is by New Castle" (Schoepf 1911:376).

The road network in north-cental New Castle County also improved, due to both population growth and interregional trade (Figure 6). A road known as the "New Munster Road" passed through Newark on its way to Lancaster and was laid out in 1765. A road from Ogletown to the Elk River was surveyed in 1774 (Conrad 1908;2:490). From Wilmington, a nexus of roads radiated west, south, and north, connecting the Delaware river with the head of the Chesapeake Bay (Head of Elk), Kent and Sussex Counties, and southeastern Pennsylvania. Christiana was a major crossroads town on the road to Head of Elk, and also on the route from Red Lion to New Castle. Newport was the terminus of the Lancaster Road, and a route from Newport westward to Newark was laid out in 1750. By mid-century, the roadbeds of many of the area's present-day state roads (Routes 4, 7, and 273; portions of Pennsylvania's Route 896), were already established.

Farming in the eighteenth century in New Castle County continued to be a system of mixed husbandry, combining the cultivation of grains with the raising of livestock (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:84). Farming was the most important occupation for between 80 and 90 percent of the area's population (Egnal 1975:201). Wheat remained as the primary grain produced, followed by rye, corn, barley, oats, and garden vegetables. In many areas, generations of repeated tillage had begun to exhaust the soil, and in general, even judged by contemporary standards, "...the business of the inland farmers at the end of the eighteenth century was ineffectively and even carelessly managed.

Only in a few particulars had any noticeable improvements been made over the primitive methods employed by the earliest settlers" (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:84). A French traveler in Delaware at the end of the eighteenth century, reflecting European views of American agriculture, wrote "the farms are in general small and ill-cultivated; they receive little or no manure and are in every respect badly managed. Some English farmers have recently settled in this neighborhood ... they will doubtless make considerable improvements in agriculture" (La Rouchefaucault 1800:511).

Agricultural practices in New Castle County followed an extensive, rather than an intensive, use of the land (Lemon 1967,1972:169). Not until the 1750's did three-field or four-field rotational patterns of planting, and only occasionally six-field rotation, become prevalent and widespread. Contemporaries reported that, through the use of these rotational patterns, a yield range between six and twenty bushels of wheat per acre could be harvested (Bausman and Munroe 1946; Strickland 1801). The extensive use of the land was based on this wheat production, the most valuable and important trading commodity that the region could export. It has been suggested that this pattern of land use was the result of a lack of adequate labor supply, the availability of inexpensive land, household consumption, the market, and the attitudes of the people of the region (Lemon 1972:179).

Research into southeast Pennsylvania for this time period indicates that on an average farm of 125 acres, twenty-six acres

would be in grain; thirteen in meadow for hay; twenty for pasture; eight or nine in flax or hemp, roots, other vegetables, fruits, and tobacco; three for the farmstead; and the remaining sixty acres would be fallow and woodland (Lemon 1972:167; Ball 1976:628).

Studies of the economic development of the region through the eighteenth century (Sachs 1953; Lemon and Nash 1968, Egnal 1975; Ball 1976; Ball and Walton 1976) have found the period to be one of modest changes in agricultural productivity. These changes, based on population growth and the rise in per capita income, can be seen in two distinct periods; 1720 to 1745, and 1745 to 1760. Minor fluctuations throughout the century were caused by King George's War, the French and Indian War, and the non-importation agreements of 1766 and 1769-1770. In addition, colonists were affected by alternating periods of prosperity and depression. Philadelphia continued to be the major urban center in the region, and from about 1750 until the end of the century was the dominant commercial and social center of the eastern seaboard, with a population that was second only to London.

Main (1973) categorizes the New Castle County area as a commercial farm community, or a community that sold a high proportion of its agricultural produce. For this type of community to exist, good farmland and accessibility to markets were necessary. Main's research found that these communities were characterized by high percentages of wealth, rich men, artisans, professionals and merchants, and a high proportion of large vs. small farmers.

In New Castle County, Main (1973) found that the inhabitants

owned properties two to three times as valuable per acre as those in Sussex County, and tax assessment records indicate that seven per cent of those assessed in Sussex County received more than L50 annually. New Castle County had less than one-third of its taxpayers considered as poor farmers or laborers, yet commercial farm societies had a higher proportion of landless men than did other rural areas. Thus, indentured servants and farm laborers were quite common in New Castle County, and occassionally slaves were found as well.

Tax assessment data for White Clay Creek Hundred for the period 1777 to 1798 indicate that over 70 per cent of the taxables in the Hundred were assessed at L10 or less. About seven per cent were worth up to L15, nine percent were assessed up to L30, and only four percent over L30 (Appendix III). This is of particular interest when compared to the findings of Main (1973) noted above.

By the end of the century, Christiana Hundred was the wealthiest of the nine hundreds in New Castle County, being worth L7,673, followed by Appoquinimink Hundred with L5,308. Wealth decreased steadily for the remainder of the hundreds; White Clay Creek was seventh at L1,950 (Delaware State Archives). This ranking was probably a function of the amount of agricultural exporting that a Hundred was involved in, or a sign of greater population.

It is known that Patrick Woodsgerald owned the tract upon which the future Hawthorn site would be located, having bought the land in 1697. However, deed records for the property are

lacking for the period from 1697 to 1723. In that year, Rowland Fitzgerald sold the property, now consisting of 245 acres, to Morgan Morgan for L70 (New Castle County Deed Book Q-1-557). Morgan Morgan sold the tract to Gerit Geritson in 1738 for L174, 10 shillings, because of a debt which Morgan was forced to pay off (New Castle County Deed Book M-1-11). The price of the land in this transaction is interesting to compare to the price of the previous deed. Even taking into account the vagaries of the colonial monetary system of the eighteenth century, it would seem that such a substantial increase in the property sales price (over 100 pounds) would indicate that some sort of improvements had been accomplished on the tract. Perhaps the clearing of fields, the planting of an orchard, or the construction of a dwelling house had occurred. The documentary evidence is admittedly circumstantial and disputable, but the possibility that a house was on the property by 1738 should not be dismissed.

Gerit Geritson held the property for only three years, and sold it to two brothers, William Peery and Jerrard Peery (also known as Jerrard Herron), in August 1741 (New Castle County Deed Book N-1-278). The tract had increased in size to 348 acres, and the Peerys purchased it for L195. Jerrard's date of death is unknown, but he evidently died intestate and the land passed to William. William Peery held the land until his death in 1789, at which time he willed the land to his sons, Jared and Thomas (New Castle County Calendar of Wills N-22). Both Jared and Thomas died "intestate and without issue", and the Peery tract descended to William's daughters, Mary Peery and Sarah (Peery) Hawthorn (New Castle County Orphans Court Records, K-1-244). Sarah was

married to John Hawthorn, who deed research has shown to have lived in Ogletown. By profession, Hawthorn was an "artificer", an eighteenth century term that meant mechanic. He and Sarah had four children: Ephraim, William, Thomas, and Mary.

William Peery's will indicates that he was a farmer. The inventory of William Peery's estate, dated April 1790, is the first detailed information concerning the site that can be analyzed (Appendix IV). Peery's farm was valued at over L673 and consisted of 348 acres. This size is much larger than the average found by Lemon (1972) and Ball (1976) for a comparable period in Chester County, Pennsylvania. In addition, thirty-four acres of the farm were planted in wheat and rye, which is a lower percentage of the property (only ten percent) than Lemon (1972) and Ball (1976) found for Chester County (twenty percent). Peery was obviously a farmer of some wealth, for he had twenty-six head of cattle, thirty-two sheep, thirty-two hogs, and three horses. Lemon (1972) found that a larger amount of livestock was an indication of a better, more wealthy farmer. Peery also had 200 bushels of wheat, 100 bushels of corn, and 700 pounds of bacon on hand at the time of the inventory, revealing that he was probably heavily involved in the market economy of the region. Of particular interest is the information that this inventory reveals concerning Peery's labor force; he employed four bonded servants and owned three slaves.

Not unexpectedly, most of Peery's inventory consists of farm tools or farm-related items. A glance at the list of items from the interior of his dwelling indiates that Peery was definitely a

man of means. Three beds are among the most valuable items on his inventory, and in the eighteenth century were considered as prized possessions. Much of his furniture was made of walnut, a wood that around 1750 was very popular, but expensive.

Tax assessment records (Appendix III) for William Peery for the period 1777 to 1789 show that Peery's income was valued at an average of L52 annually and ranked in the upper four percent of White Clay Creek Hundred's taxable population. As a means of comparison, the Samuel Bradford estate, a previously investigated archaeological site, the Ferguson House (Coleman et al. 1983), was valued at an average of only L15 annually for the same period, placing Bradford in the upper twenty-one percent of the White Clay Creek Hundred taxables.

An incidental fact that comes from this inventory is the listing of "ship carpenters tools". This entry is found later in the inventory for Thomas Hawthorn, and may represent a family heirloom. Its presence could reveal William Peery's former occupation prior to his becoming a substantial farmer in White Clay Creek Hundred.

The 19th and 20th Centuries

In northern Delaware the nineteenth century was marked by industrial growth, urban growth, and population expansion, and was accompanied by a noticeable decline in the number of people engaged in agricultural pursuits. The rapid growth of the population during the early decades of the century forced many farmers in the Middle Atlantic area to clear and farm lands of poor or marginal quality. Many of these farmers were hard-pressed to turn a profit from their farmsteads, and this resulted

in an outmigration of a large portion of the population during the 1820s and 1830s to better lands in the west, particularly in the Ohio River Valley. It has been noted by one author that between 1810 and 1820 the population of Delaware remained stationary and only increased after 1840 (Hancock 1947:374). The westward population shift was partly offset by the development of new sources of income and employment, particularly in urban and industrial contexts (Taylor 1964:441; Lindstrom 1979:300). Thus much of the surplus population that had in previous centuries been farm laborers, tenants, or unemployed, moved into urban and industrial centers where jobs were more plentiful. These trends occurred over the first half of the nineteenth century, and by 1860 were well established.

Urbanization in New Castle County during the first quarter of the century was closely tied to transportation routes and agricultural production. Most of the towns of importance in the eighteenth century - Christiana Bridge, Newport, Stanton, Cantwell's Bridge, Newark - remained major tranportation, milling and shipping centers for only a brief period into the nineteenth century. As early as 1808, it was reported that Christiana Bridge "was formerly the greatest of all the towns across the peninsula," and that its decline was caused by the numerous mills on the Elk River and its tributaries, the rise of Baltimore and the inexpensive cost of shipping produce to that city, and other transportation routes (water and overland) more convenient than the one through the town (American State Papers 1808, Misc. 1: 758). In 1815 however, it was recorded that Christiana Bridge

"is an important place as a depot for goods transporting east or south, as it offers the shortest land carriage between the bays" (Niles' Weekly Register IX, 6:93). Clearly, Christiana remained a major crossroads town, but by the late 1820s was no longer the commercial center it had been in the eighteenth century (Cooch 1976).

The fate of Newport was similar to Christiana's. Transportation costs from southeast Pennsylvania to Philadelphia and even Baltimore (by way of the Susquehanna River) became less expensive, reducing the amount of traffic through the town. By 1809 the village was described as "a small village falling into decay. It once contained five taverns and seven stores, which are now reduced to two of each kind" (Scudder 1877:264).

By mid-century, several of the local towns were experiencing a rebirth as transportation and manufacturing centers. Newport retained some of its importance as a transshipment and milling center because of the construction of the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore Railroad, completed in 1837 (Strickland 1835:225-234; Dare 1856:80). By the end of the century Newport was a "thriving village of 750 inhabitants ... now as prosperous and progressive as ever" and was fast becoming industrialized as a textile milling center (Delaware State and Peninsula Directory 1898:169).

Stanton, like Newport, was saved from total decline by the railroad, and by 1900 was also a manufacturing center of woolen mills, flour mills, and fertilizer works. Its population at this time was two hundred and seventy-nine (DSPD 1898:198). By 1898, "Ogleton" was a tiny village of only eighty inhabitants, and was

strictly an agricultural town. Railroads, canals, and turnpikes had passed it by, and Ogletown did not even possess a bank (DSPD 1989:174). Newark was fortunate to be the home of Delaware State College, later the University of Delaware, and to have two railroads constructed nearby. The town was a manufacturing center like Newport and Stanton, and was located on major transportation routes. Tax assessment data for the end of the nineteenth century show that the Newark area had a larger number of taxables and more wealth than the rest of the Hundred (Appendix III).

In the first half of the nineteenth century, methods and routes of transportation underwent substantial changes in New Castle County, as first turnpikes, then canals, and finally railroads were introduced. Throughout the century, transportation was the key to urban, agricultural and industrial development.

The first successful turnpike in Delaware was the Newport and Gap turnpike, begun in 1808. It was noted in 1809 that the economic situation of Newport was failing and that "the inhabitants hope something from a turnpike road now progressing" (Scudder 1877:264). The Newport and Gap turnpike did slow this process of decay, but it could not halt it.

By 1815, eight more turnpikes, all with roads in New Castle County, had been chartered: the Wilmington Turnpike Company, incorporated 1808; the New Castle and Frenchtown Turnpike company, 1809; the New Castle Turnpike Company, 1811; the Kennet Turnpike Company, 1811; the Wilmington and Great Valley Turnpike

Company, 1813; the Wilmington and Philadelphia Turnpike Company, 1813; the Elk and Christiana Turnpike Company, 1813; and the Wilmington and Christiana Turnpike Company, 1815. It should be noted that economic decline like that suffered by Christiana was often an impetus for the construction of a turnpike. This can be seen in the two turnpikes that were built through Christiana in 1813 and 1815 - which were attempts to get Christiana 'back on the map', and to provide a viable Baltimore - Philadelphia overland connection. Despite the improved transportation routes listed above, it was found that water travel was still the cheapest, fastest, safest, and most dependable means of transport available (Gray 1963:311).

The most significant canal built in Delaware was the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, completed in 1829. Originally planned to connect the Elk and Christiana Rivers, it was later constructed across the peninsula below New Castle, just north of Reedy Island. The canal was expected to bring wealth and prosperity to the communities of northern Delaware, and in fact, two new towns were constructed, Delaware City and Chesapeake City, at the termini of the Canal. Instead of widespread prosperity, however, the canal contributed to the economic decline of Christiana, Newport, Stanton, and New Castle, as goods previously shipped overland across the peninsula could now be sent more cheaply by water. Even Chesapeake City and Delaware City were disappointed in their expected economic boom, and growth in these towns was slow. Only Wilmington, fast becoming an important regional industrial town, benefited from the Canal. Although not an original purpose of its construction, the Canal

also came to serve as a border between two distinct socio-cultural sections of Delaware: the industrial/commercial area of northern New Castle County, and the agrarian communities of southern New Castle, Kent, and Sussex Counties. The Canal would continue to serve in this function throughout the remainder of the century, and does so today.

Railroads came into New Castle County in the 1830s. The first line, the New Castle and Frenchtown Railroad, was constructed in 1832 as a direct result of the opening of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, and was an effort to compete with that transportation route (Hoffecker 1977:43). In 1838, the Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore Railroad was completed, and quickly became the major transportation route across the peninsula (Dare 1856). Throughout the remainder of the century, rail lines continued to be built in northern New Castle County, such as the Baltimore and Ohio, the Wilmington and New Castle, and the Wilmington and Western railroads. As noted previously, the towns of Newark, Stanton, and Newport benefited from their proximity to these railroads, staving off the economic stagnation and decline that were experienced by Christiana, Ogletown, and Glasgow.

New Castle County continued to be predominantly agricultural throughout much of the nineteenth century. In 1815 it was reported that "the greater part of the inhabitants of this state are devoted to agricultural pursuits, and they have rendered it very productive. The principal produce is wheat, rye, Indian corn, barley, oats, and flax. Grasses are abundant, and thrive

very luxuriantly, furnishing food for many cattle - and every sort of vegetable ... thrives well here. The staple produce is wheat, of which a great quantity of flour is made for export" (Melish 1815:181). At the start of the nineteenth century, however, agriculture in New Castle County was in a dismal situation. Farming practices continued much as they had during the previous century with the use of the four field system of cropping, wheat still the dominant crop, the infrequent use of fertilizers, and the large number of tenant farmers working the land. Production was, on the whole, quite low during the first quarter of the century. It was estimated that the average return of crops for all of Delaware was five bushels of wheat per acre, ten of corn, and fifteen of oats, despite the knowledge that the use of fertilizers could increase crop yields to forty bushels of wheat per acre and eighty of corn (Allmond 1958:57).

Demands for American agricultural products was high until about 1815, when the end of the Napoleonic Wars removed the European war market, and by 1819 the country was in an economic depresion. The outmigration of the population that took place at this time, mentioned earlier, can be seen in the tax assessment data for the nineteenth century for White Clay Creek Hundred. A steady rise in the number of taxables is observed from 1800 to 1818, with a sudden drop in 1819 (Appendix III). The assessments also list many of the taxables as no longer being in the Hundred, and often a notation of "gone to Ohio" or "Moved to Indiana" is found.

Contributing to these difficulties were the problems presented by the Hessian Fly and Black stem-rust, both of which

did severe damage to wheat crops. However, it has been suggested that indirectly the Hessian Fly was helpful to wheat cultivation, because it caused increased attention to be given to fertilization and crop tillage, which increased agricultural productivity (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:96).

The revival of the New Castle County Agricultural Society, one of the first such organizations in the nation, in 1818, encouraged farmers in the use of improved drainage techniques, fertilizers, and machinery with these developments. New Castle County was on its way to becoming one of the finest agricultural counties in the United States by 1860. Indeed, between 1830 and 1860, when judged by contemporary agriculturalists, the county was considered to be "far superior to other sections of the state" (Hancock 1947:375), and one newspaper observed that "it will satisfactorily compare, in every respect, with the crack counties in the large neighboring states, or indeed with any of the states" (Delaware State Journal, June 12, 1846). Fertilization, farm machinery, and improved drainage were helpful in this agricultural success, but the county's rich natural resources, its fine transportation network, and the proximity to cities, were advantages that other areas, particularly Kent and Sussex Counties, found difficult to compete with. A traveler through the region summed this up well when he wrote "the northern portion of this little state is generally a fine tract of country, being highly and skillfully cultivated, and well adapted to the growth of wheat and other grains of superior quality. In a word, this portion of the state presents all that

is delightful in agriculture" (Myers 1849:39).

Average farm size remained much as it had been during the eighteenth century, about 200 acres. However, farms of 300 to 400 acres were not uncommon (Bausman 1933:64). By 1900, real estate values for agricultural property ranged from $50 to $125 an acre in the Christiana- Ogletown- Stanton area (DSPD 1898). The system of farming employed in northern Delaware was similar to that used in neighboring Chester County, and was either a cropping system, a mixed system, or a grazing system (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:261). Documentary evidence of the W. M. Hawthorn farmstead indicates that the mixed system of farming was used by the occupants of the farm. In this method, a well-watered portion of the farm was kept as permanent pasture and was frequently manured, with the remainder of the farm cropped in a rotation of corn, oats, barley, wheat, and clover. The Chester County system of farming was widely held in high esteem, and Hawthorn's farm, following this pattern, probably was a clean and well-arranged farm, with well-built fences dividing the farmstead into seven to twelve enclosures, and neatly-constructed farm buildings located near a spring (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:262). As will be seen later, this description is quite accurate.

Livestock production in New Castle County continued to be a major farm occupation in the first half of the nineteenth century (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:394). Prior to 1850, the area of eastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and northern Delaware had been known for its cattle-feeding industry. However, it was dairy-farming that began to predominate in New Castle County, particularly because of the need for fresh butter and milk in the

urban centers of Philadelphia and Wilmington. By 1847, dairies of from fifteen to 100 cows were common in northern New Castle County (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:427).

The rise in the production of dairy goods for consumption in urban markets was also attended by a rise in the production of perishable fruits and vegetables, also for urban consumption. Many farmers had begun to diversify their farm production from strictly cereals to market garden produce. This trend occurred because of the difficulty that regional farmers experienced in attempting to compete with grain production from the western states, such as Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. By 1850, the production of corn in Maryland, Delaware, and eastern Pennsylvania, which had been leading producers of that crop in 1840, had lost that edge to the western states. The Middle Atlantic States in 1840 had only grown enough wheat to supply its own needs, and by 1860 had a deficit of nearly 15,000,000 bushels, which was made up of wheat imported from the west (Bidwell and Falconer 1941:311). Clearly, the dominance of the Middle Atlantic States in grain production, a tradition which they had enjoyed since the early eighteenth century, had been by 1860 replaced by the larger grain producing regions west of the Appalachians.

Between approximately 1840 and 1860 southern New Castle County and Kent and Sussex Counties were large producers of peaches, which were shipped by rail and water to Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore. This "peach boom" was short-lived, however, when a disease called "the Yellows" devastated the

orchards. Some northern New Castle County farmers did grow peaches, but the area did not pattern its agricultural production around the fruit. Thus farmers in this area were less affected by the peach blight than areas further south. Other fruits, particularly apples, were grown for profit in the study area (U.S. Agricultural Censuses, 1850-1880; Myers 1849:39; Hoffecker 1977).

From 1860 until the end of the century truck or market gardening and the orchard industry began to predominate in much of Delaware. This trend saw its largest percentage increase in the state between 1889 and 1899, with an increase of 457.2% (Shannon 1945:260). Northern New Castle County did join this agricultural trend, but still grew a large amount of cereal crops. These grains were no longer for export or widespread consumption, but were for local use in the urban centers, and for cattle-feeding.

Tenant farming, which had been quite common in the eighteenth century, became even more prevalent during the nineteenth century. Large land owners, having acquired much of their holdings during the hard times of the 1820s and 1830s, leased their lands to tenants. Most land owners were white farmers, while the tenants and farm laborers, particularly in Kent and Sussex Counties, were predominantly black. In other cases, the tenant was a member of the land owner's family, as was the situation with the Robert Ferguson farm (Coleman et al. 1983). One author has likened the farm situation in Delaware in the second half of the nineteenth century to that of the antebellum southern aristocracy: "there developed a class of

farm owners who not only did little labor themselves, but required that the hired labor render personal services. They lived on their farms and personally directed their farm businesses. Some of them owned additional farms which they either "carried on" or rented to tenants (Bausman 1933:165). By 1900 over 50% of all the farmers in Delaware were tenants or share croppers. Over the period between 1880 and 1900 this figure represents almost an 8% increase in farm tenancy (Shannon 1945:418). Tenancy remained a dominant farming practice into the twentieth century.

Regional development during the nineteenth century was much more complex than in the previous decades, primarily due to the great strides in industrialization, urbanization, and transportation that were a result of the Industrial Revolution (Taylor 1964; Walzer 1972; Lindstrom 1978, 1979). The first half of the century witnessed a noticeable decline in Philadelphia's economic influence over the region, caused by Baltimore's rise, the competition for markets between the two cities, and a drop in the consumption by foreign markets of Philadelphia's agricultural produce. The area responded by diversifying its agricultural production, but primarily it devoted increasingly more of its resources to manufacturing (Lindstrom 1978:122).

Milling continued to be an important occupation in New Castle County, and manufacturing of all sorts became common as the century wore on. The variety of manufacturing and milling establishments was astounding. In 1815, Niles' Weekly Register observed that the White Clay Creek, Red Clay Creek, and

Christiana River drainages within Delaware were the power sources for forty-six different mills or manufactories: twenty-four grist mills, ten saw mills, five cotton mills, two woolen manufactories, one paper mill, one slitting mill, one snuff mill, one glazing mill, and one oil mill. Less than thirty-five years later, the number of woolen and cotton manufactories had doubled to fourteen, all steam or water powered, and it was recorded that "the manufactures of Delaware are more extensive than its commerce" (Myers 1849:40). Although Beers' Atlas of the State of Delaware shows only a slight increase since 1815 in the total number of mills and factories in the hundreds of White Clay Creek, Mill Creek, Christiana, and Pencader, the diversification of mill types in 1868 reveals a shift in the number of agriculturally-oriented establishments and a rise in the number of manufactories based on an industrially-oriented economy. As noted above, in 1815 there were twenty-four grist mills and, excluding saw mills, only half as many mills of other types. By 1868, there were nineteen grist mills and, again excluding saw mills, fifteen mills of all other types - iron, cotton, woolen, paper, snuff, spice, bark, and phosphate.

The growth of non-agricultural busineses coincided with the decline in agricultural pursuits, which was caused by population expansion and outmigration, poor agricultural production in the early years of the nineteenth century, and urban and industrial expansion (Taylor 1964; Lindstrom 1978,1979). Lindstrom (1978:123) found that in 1820 over 76% of the population in the Philadelphia hinterland were farmers by occupation, and by 1840 this number had declined to about 70%. In addition, the income

per agricultural worker fell well below that of the non-agricultural worker. At the same time the income of farmers in the region who were able to remain productive was higher when compared with other areas of the nation. Thus, while many farmers were forced to migrate west or into the cities, or become tenants, many farmers who were successful enjoyed a substantial income and prosperity.

In New Castle County, these changes had brought an end to export crop production, and areal specialization began to occur. New Castle County became an area that specialized in the production of corn, dairy products, fruits and vegetables, and lumber, while producing much less wheat and livestock (Lindstrom 1978:125). By the middle of the century, the county produced goods that were desired by the urban communities it was in close proximity to, supplying perishables such as milk, butter, fruits and vegetables. This shift from cereal farming to market gardening would continue into the next century, as industrialization and urbanization continued to grow and expand.

During the first years of the nineteenth century, Sarah Hawthorn and Mary Peery, the daughters and heirs of William Peery, held the estate until 1814. Sarah had died in 1799, and her children - Ephraim, Thomas, William, and Mary - were the heirs to her portion of the farm. With Mary Peery's death in 1814, court proceedings were begun by Thomas Hawthorn for the inheritance and equal division of the property amongst the heirs, in accordance with Delaware's intestate laws. However, Ephraim had died in 1813, having been "seized of an incurable malady" and

"nourished and maintained for a space of ten years" by his brothers Thomas and William; William had died in 1815, leaving his wife Jane and four children: John, William (II), Jared, and Emiline; and Mary had married a neighbor, John Jordan. Thus the property was to be divided three ways, but heirs were now Thomas Hawthorn, Jane Hawthorn and her children, and John and Mary Jordan (New Castle County Orphans Court Records K-1-229). In April 1816, the Peery tract of 307 acres was divided by the Orphans Court, with John and Mary Jordan receiving about 84 acres, Jane and her children about 111 acres, and Thomas Hawthorn about 111 acres. In addition, Jane Hawthorn's portion contained "the mansion house and all other improvements" (New Castle County Orphans Court Records K-1-244). Figure 7, drawn by the court-appointed surveyor in 1816, shows the division of the property at this time, and the "mansion house", stable, granary, and spring house are plainly shown. The "post road from Philadelphia to Baltimore" was known then as the Wilmington and Christiana Turnpike, and is present-day Route 7. John and Mary Jordan received the section of the property labelled 'No. 1', Jane Hawthorn was awarded 'No. 2', and Thomas Hawthorn was given the portion labelled 'No. 3', closest to White Clay Creek and including the island.

The 1816 tax assessment for White Clay Creek Hundred lists Thomas Hawthorn as owning 123 acres "without buildings", forty of which were in woodland. Each acre was valued at $22 for a property assessment of $2706. With the addition of the tax for himself and his livestock, Thomas Hawthorn's property, recently acquired, was assessed at over $3100. "William Hawthorn's est."

was recorded as being "111 acres of land at $25.00;" "71 improved with one log dwelling and barn and 40 woodland." The valuation of the land was $2775, with the addition of Jane Hawthorn's livestock (valued at $194.50). The total assessment of William Hawthorn's estate was over $2969. (See Appendix III). This tax assessment for 1816 is the first documentary evidence that a dwelling house was on the property.

An inventory of William Hawthorn's (I) estate was prepared in August 1815, and gives an indication of what type of structure this "log dwelling" or "mansion house" was in which the Hawthorns resided (Appendix V). The house probably was constructed on a one-room deep, two-room plan with a kitchen addition. The inventory is a room-by-room listing of Hawthorn's possessions, and indicates a "front room", "back room", and a "back kitchen". Although not mentioned, there was probably a second story garret or sleeping loft. The inventory reveals that the Hawthorns were still involved in home manufacture of clothing, as they had been in 1790, as evidenced by the "Lot of tow thread", "Lot of Flax thread", thirty seven yards of linen, twenty yards of flannel, and two "wheels and a reel." In regards to livestock, besides the "lot of cattle", "2 spring calves", and a moiety on a pair of oxen, there were seventeen sheep, seven hogs, seven shoats (young weaned pigs), and two horses. He was still producing grain for market because he had 100 bushels of oats, 125 bushels of corn, and 25 bushels of wheat on the property, and owned a moiety, probably with his brother Thomas, on an additional 100 bushels of wheat. Also of note is the inclusion of "carpenter's tools" in

the inventory; possibly the same item listed as "ship carpenter's tools" from the Peery inventory of 1790. A total of five beds are listed in this inventory, and information from the 1810 population census indicates that there were eight persons residing with William Hawthorn (I) in that year. Six of these inhabitants were family members, one was a free person, and the other a slave.

The listing of moieties in several entries - "one moiety and half (on the value) of an 8 day clock", "1 moiety and half value of 1 pair of oxen", "1 moiety and half value of the wheat in this stock..." are probably indications that William (I) and his brother and sister were co-owners. This reveals that the estate of their father, John, who died in 1789, was still not settled in 1815.

Jane Hawthorn had died by 1822, but it was not until 1829 that William Hawthorn (II) petitioned the New Castle County Orphans Court to divide her land between his siblings (N-1-185). The "five sufficient freeholders of the county" appointed by the court, found that the farmstead would "not bear any division without prejudicing and spoiling the whole." Thus ownership of the entire farm was offered to each of the heirs of William Hawthorn (I). John, the eldest son, and Jared, "refused to choose or accept the said Real Estate", and both received remuneration for their portions of the estate. William (II), the second son, did accept the property, and Emiline was apparently not even asked, although she received payment for her part (New Castle County Orphans Court Records N-1-273). The property was valued at over $2,000 and the boundaries were still the same

as those established in 1816 (Figure 8). William Hawthorn (II) married Matilda Morrison in March 1830 (The Historical Society of Delaware, Marriage Records: vol. 11:15). They had three children: Douglas, who lived only until 1832; William Morrison, born in 1833, and George, born in 1838. William (II) died intestate in 1840, and once again the New Castle County Orphans Court was consulted. This time they were required to "estimate the yearly rental value (of the farm) and note the buildings, orchards, and improvements; the estimated portion of cleared land, woodland and of meadow or marsh, whether any or what part may be cleared; and whether any or what repairs are necessary to the tenantable condition of the premises, and the probable cost of such repairs" (New Castle County Orphans Court Records R-1-440). In 1841 the court-appointed freeholders, George Platt, George Janvier, and William Dunlap, made the following detailed review of the "lands and tenements of Wm. M. Hawthorn and George Hawthorn." After inspection of the property, they were able to estimate the yearly rental value at one hundred and fifty dollars.

> On (the) said premises are a rough cast log house two stories high twenty nine by twenty one feet in good order, one frame end adjoining twelve by twenty one feet one story high in good order, one frame kitchen twelve by seventeen feet one story high in good order, one log smokehouse nine by eleven feet in good order, one frame Spring House eleven by eleven feet one story high in good order, one plank granary fourteen by fourteen feet one story high in bad order (and) not worth repair, one log building twenty four by twenty one feet used for Barn and Stable in bad order (and) not worth repair. There is an apple orchard of about one hundred trees, there is no woodland that we think aught to be cleared(.) We estimate about eighty acres of clear land including five acres of meadow, the residue in woodland. We think a new barn with stabling, (a) Granary and (a) CornCrib (are) wanted for the farm(;) probable cost

$450. (New Castle County Orphans Court Records R-1-501)

An inventory of William Hawthorn's (II) estate taken in March 1840 gives additional insights into the log dwelling on the farmstead (Appendix VI). Mention of a "parlor", "parlor chamber", "common room", "entry", "kitchen", and "entry downstairs" indicate that the house was a hall-parlor plan of at least two stories with either a central or sidehall entrance. The frame end and frame kitchen recorded in the Orphans Court description of the farm imply that at least one addition was constructed onto the log core, possibly the common room and kitchen. The information gathered from this inventory compares favorably with the William Hawthorn (I) inventory of 1815. The "front room", back room", and "back kitchen" arrangement of 1815 is similar to the hall-parlor plan pictured in 1840, suggesting that the frame addition may have already been in place as early as 1815. The inventory of 1840 is noteworthy in that, although it doesn't specifically state the fact, it appears to be a room-by-room recording of the contents of the Hawthorn farmstead; house, stable, barn, granary, smokehouse, and springhouse. The appraisers seem to have begun their survey in the parlor chamber, or upstairs bedroom, then progressed downstairs to the parlor, common room, and kitchen, and finally outside to the barn, granary, and other dependencies.

Several other points concerning this inventory should be made. From the entries listing 300 bushels of oats and 300 bushels of corn "subject to the expense of getting out and delivering to market", and the "378 pounds of pickeled pork, hams, shoulders, and fletches", it is clear that Hawthorn was

still involved in the regional market economy. Home manufacture at the Hawthorn farmstead had lost some of its importance as shown by the lack of any flannel, tow cloth, or linen in the inventory, and by the listing of "a lot old spinning wheels". Hawthorn was still the owner of a considerable amount of livestock, including a yoke of oxen (his only means of plowing), thirteen "muleys" (i.e., hornless cattle), two heifers, two steers, one bull, three calves, and an "old pale red and white cow". The pickeled pork mentioned previously is obviously related to the "shoats" listed on the inventory. Transportation for Hawthorn and his family was provided for by four horses - two mares, a horse, and a colt. Archaeologically, the inclusion on the inventory of the terms "ironware" and "cedar and earthenware" are indicative of the types of ceramics and perishable wood objects that were used by the occupants of the site in the mid-nineteenth century.

The population census of 1840 shows that there were seven people residing with Matilda Hawthorn in that year (obviously the census was taken after William's (II) death). Of the seven residents, two are male children - William and George. In addition to Matilda, two adults are listed, one male in his 40s and a female in her 20s. These were probably hired hands and servants for the farm, a practice that continued on the Hawthorn farmstead for quite some time. The census also indicates that there were two slaves, one male and one female between the ages of ten and twenty-four. The 1840 inventory sheds some light on this topic by the inclusion of this entry: "The unexpired time

of a coloured boy named Elias(?) Bundy, who has about eighteen months to serve". This entry has been crossed-out on the inventory, but the reason behind its omission is unclear. The female slave is not recorded in the inventory (Appendix VII).

Tax assessments for the period between 1816 and 1840 (the time span that William Hawthorn (II) resided on the property) show that the farmstead's average valuation throughout the period was close to $2,000 per year (Appendix III). Throughout that period Hawthorn was assessed as being in the upper seven per cent of the taxables in White Clay Creek Hundred. Thus, William Hawthorn's (II) inventory for 1840 reveals the farmstead of a wealthy, productive farmer of New Castle County involved in the market economy of the Philadelphia region. The Robert Ferguson farm (Coleman et al. 1983) for the same period was assessed an average value of over $4200 annually. Thus, the occupants of the Ferguson site were now ranked in the upper seven per cent of the taxables.

The recommendations made by the Orphans Court freeholders in 1840 concerning a new barn and corncrib were evidently carried out by 1845, for the tax assessment of that year recorded a frame barn as being on the property, replacing the log barn. Seven years later, the assessment recorded a frame house on the property, which raised the value of the land from $2775 in 1845 to $3330 in 1852. It seems likely that a completely new house was not constructed to replace the log house. Perhaps the log house was simply framed-over with planking, leaving the original log structure intact. This might have been the result of the desire on the part of the Hawthorn's to have a house that looked

as neat, clean, and new as their frame barn. Certainly, their old log house (at least twenty years old) must have paled when compared to their new barn.

Throughout the period 1850 to 1870, William M. Hawthorn's farmstead appears to have been predominanty a dairy farm. The United States Agricultural Censuses for those years show that Hawthorn's number of milk cows ranged from seven to four, and only in 1860 were there any other cattle listed on the census (Appendix VII). Hawthorn produced during this period an average of 583 pounds of butter for market. The farm was producing wheat, oats, buckwheat, Indian corn, irish potatoes, and, in 1870, sweet potatoes. The average number of bushels per acre rose from ten in 1850 to fourteen by 1870. It should be noted however that this calculation is based on the total amount of improved land on the farm, which may not have been all cultivated fields. Thus the average for bushels per acre may be too low. For more details concerning Hawthorn's production capabilities during this period, and a comparison of the Robert Ferguson farm to Hawthorn's, see Appendix VII.

By 1850, Hawthorn was not producing any market garden goods, nor was he engaged in home manufacture. The census indiates that he was growing a small amount of orchard products which fluctuated in market value from a high of $60 in 1860 to a low of $15 in 1870. The later agricultural census for 1880 records the farm as having twenty-seven apple trees on a one acre plot, which produced forty bushels of apples per year. These orchard products were valued at $20, a similar figure for that seen in

1850. In any case, Hawthorn's orchard was probably small and was not a main cash crop for his farm.

Tax assessments for the period 1850 to 1870 (Appendix III) record an average value of the farmstead as over $4300, a doubling of the recorded value between the years 1816 and 1840. It is interesting to note that the agricultural census for the same period (1850 to 1870) listed the average value as $6533 for the farm, indicating that the tax assessment values given are probably lower than actual market values.

Combining information from the population census and the agricultural census for 1850, it appears that William M. Hawthorn's uncle, John Hawthorn, was managing the farmstead until William came of age. The census shows that three persons were living on the property. John, age 49, was a farmer; William age 17, was recorded as a farm laborer; and a young woman, Margaret Barton, also resided there. Her occupation was not specified. George, William's brother, who was then 12, was not listed (Appendix VII). By 1860 William and George were co-owners of the farm, which was valued at $6100. William's wife, Emma, age 22, and his one-year old daughter Elizabeth were the immediate family members at the house. Two hired laborers, a "domestic" named Eliza Morris, age 32, and a "farm laborer" named John Miredy, aged 52, were also present. It was noted in the census that John Miredy could neither read nor write.

The census of 1870 shows a great increase in the size of William and Emma's family (Appendix VIII). Besides Elizabeth, there were three additional children: John age 9, George age 8, and Annie age 7. George, William's brother, no longer resided at

the farm. As in 1860, two hired laborers were included on the census: a "housekeeper", Adeline Hamilton, age 15, and a 26 year old man listed as "working on the farm", Lesher August. He was evidently an immigrant for the census recorded his place of birth as Prussia.

Official records such as tax assessments and censuses are valuable in the reconstruction of a farmstead such as the William M. Hawthorn property, especially when private or personal accounts, such as letters, diaries, journals, and daybooks do not survive. This lack of personal information is unfortunate because, although much about who lived on the farm, their occupations and their birthplaces, what was produced on the farm and in what quantity, and what structures stood on the farm and their assessed values, are of immense research value, they are of an official nature and do not reveal the triumphs and tragedies of the people involved. This failing becomes obvious in the case of the William M. Hawthorn farmstead in 1872. In that year, William, his wife Emma, and his brother George were forced to sell their farm for $2500 to James Springer (New Castle County Deed Book D-10-489). This action was caused by a "certain debt of one thousand five hundred dollars" incurred in 1866 to Springer by the Hawthorns, which the Superior Court of Delaware ruled should be levied out of the Hawthorn farm. Thus, although all official records indicated a prosperous, well-run farm, definitely not in any financial or economic difficulties throughout the 1850s and 1860s, the truth of the situation was entirely different. The farmstead, which had belonged to a

Hawthorn since 1816, and to their relations, the Peery's, for 60 years previous to that, passed out of the family.

Springer held the title to the property until 1874, when he and his wife Sarah M. and Matilda Henry (the widow of William Hawthorn (II)) sold the 111 acres to Arnold Naudain, Senior, of Mill Creek Hundred for $4000 (New Castle County Deed Book G-10-38). Naudain continued to farm the land and graze livestock, but the agricultural census for 1880 valued the property at only $6000, a loss of $4000 from its market value in 1870 when William M. Hawthorn still owned it. Naudain had introduced sheep to the farm by 1880, but dairy farming was still the major agricultural ocupation; it was recorded that Naudain produced 1,000 pounds of butter in 1880 (Appendix VII).

Arnold Naudain, Sr., his wife Esther, and their three daughters, Ellen T., Annie M., and Elizabeth T. remained on the farm until Arnold's death in 1898 (Appendix VIII). The tax assessments for that period (1874-1898) show that the farm buildings consisted of a frame house and frame barn. The average value of the property for that period was about $4500 (Appendix VII). Throughout this period, the Naudain farm rated in the upper twelve percent of the taxables in the Hundred (Appendix III).

An inventory of the estate was prepared in 1898 when Arnold died. No description of the house is given, only an entry for "goods in house". Livestock on the property included four horses (all named), four hogs, and four shoats, and no milk cows, but an entry of "dairy fixtures" indicates the major produce of the farm. Most of the inventory is devoted to farming tools and

machinery, and is a good example of the mechanization of a turn-of-the-century small farm. Grains were still being produced, evidenced by the entries for corn, wheat, and oats. The barn, house, and a two-story granary were the only structures mentioned in the inventory. The total valuation of the property was $1040. (Appendix VIII).

In regards to the frame house and whether or not this was a new structure or a framed-over log house (see above), the tax assessment for 1899 is most illuminating. Ellen T. Naudain, daughter of Arnold Naudain, Sr., was recorded as the owner of the property, and a "frame log house and barn" were listed for the farm. Obviously, the log farmhouse of the early nineteenth century and possibly late eighteenth century was simply planked over in 1852, as had been surmised, and was still in use at the end of the century.

In August 1899 Ellen, Annie, and Elizabeth Naudain sold their farm to their brother Arnold, Jr., and to Jonas and Mary Klair, and McCoy and Susan Yearsley. Arnold, Jr. owned the farm southeast of his father's farm, on the Christiana-Stanton Road (Figures 11, 12). The purchase price at this time was again $4000 (New Castle County Deed Book A-18-393). The new buyers appear not to have occupied the house, but instead leased the property to tenants, a practice Bausman (1933) stated was increasingly common in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The house was thus occupied when it burned in 1902, destroying the log dwelling. A frame house was erected soon thereafter, partly on a new brick foundation and apparently

incorporating portions of the older stone foundation. The house had a full cellar in the stone foundation section, and was a center hall, two room plan with a back kitchen ell. It was two stories high with an attic.

The Naudains, Klairs, and Yearsleys sold the farm to Oliver C. Lynam for $6000 in 1917 (New Castle County Deed Book Z-26-108). He purchased the property for his son Raymond, who resided there with him family until about 1928. From that time until 1940 the property was in the tenancy of William Morrison. In 1940, Richard C. Lynam became the tenant, and he and his family lived there and worked the land until 1961 when they moved to Appoquinimink Hundred. In 1962 the heirs of Oliver C. Lynam sold the farm to the Magnus Shopping Mart, Inc. for over $300,000 (New Castle County Deed Book U-69-400). Three years later, in 1965, the now abandoned farm was purchased by the Welfare Corporation, Inc. (New Castle County Deed Book K-75-31).

In an interview with Richard C. Lynam and his wife Elsie and son Carl, it was reported that when they moved to the farm in 1940, there were six standing structures (Figure 13): the post-1902 house, a large frame barn on a one story stone foundation, a frame granary, a stone springhouse, an "old privy" and an "old chickenhouse". These last two structures were removed by the construction of New Churchman's Road in 1954. The Lynam's stated that the granary was constructed on a cobble pier foundation, and a date ranging from 1800 to 1809 was carved in one of the hewn timbers inside the granary. While they lived there between 1940 and 1961, the Lynams constructed three 10 foot by 14 foot chicken houses, one larger chickenhouse, a privy west of the main house,

a small french drain near the highway, and in 1949 or 1950 a 26 foot deep, 6 foot diameter well close to the barn, which was their main source of water. In 1944, the barn was struck by lightning and burned, but was rebuilt on the same foundation, with a milkhouse placed adjacent to it. The Lynam's indicated that the stone springhouse was not used by them for water, and they were unsure when it was constructed of stone. They indicated that their new privy was rather shallow and was emptied frequently, the contents being spread over the fields. Plates 2 through 6 illustrate the farm and its buildings during the Lynam occupation.

The Lynam farm in the 1940s and 1950s was predominantly a dairy farm, consisting of 20 to 25 cows. Dairy products were sold to a variety of small, independent local dairies. Market gardening was also an occupation, and trips to Wilmington to sell vegetables were weekly occurrences. The farm was inhabited by only three persons, and there was no hired labor. When extra help was needed, such as at haying time, local farmers and family would cooperate with each other. Grain production on the farm was mostly for cattle feed and for personal consumption. Wheat, however, was sometimes taken to Stanton where it was loaded at the railroad depot there for distribution. As Bidwell and Falconer (1941:262) had indicated about the Chester County farm system (see above), the Lynam property was divided into nine enclosures, with two fields held as permanent pasture, five fields cultivated in a rotation pattern of wheat, corn, and clover, and the two remaining fields as a hog pasture and a

vegetable garden. The location of the hog pasture was on the east side of New Churchman's Road, where the stone springhouse is now located, and in an area that used to be an apple orchard. Figure 14 is a representation of the layout of the Lynam farm land-use patterns in the mid-twentieth century.

Summary

Although land surveys and warrants record transactions involving the property in the late seventeenth century, documentary evidence point to the presence of a dwelling house on the Hawthorn site as early as 1738. From that time until 1960, the farm was continuously occupied. By the mid-nineteenth century, the dwelling was a log house, which was later framed over. This house evidently burned in 1902, and it was replaced by a frame house constructed on approximately the same foundation. In addition to the house, other agricultural related buildings were present on the property. Orphans Court Records show that there were at least three additional structures besides the house on the farm by 1816 (Figure 7). This number of structures had grown to over thirteen by 1960 (Figure 13). Some of these buildings were of a quite substantial nature, while others were of a more ephemeral character.

When viewed from a broader regional perspective, through the long occupation of the Hawthorn site the occupants show a remarkable ability to adapt through time to the varied and changing regional economic conditions. During a period of economic change and population shift, when many farmers were abandoning the land, the Hawthorn farm remained productive and occupied. Inventories and the Agricultural Censuses show that

the farm went through a period of grain production in the eighteenth century, followed by a period of crop diversification and livestock raising in the first half of the nineteenth century, and then switched to dairy farming until the mid-twentieth century. These changes are the result of the extensive involvement of the occupants of the Hawthorn farm within the regional economic framework, caused by the proximity of the site to urban centers like Philadelphia and Wilmington. Throughout the history of the site's occupation, changes in the market demands of these cities were reflected by changes in the products of the farm.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Peery, Hawthorn, and Naudain families were consistently ranked in the upper four to twelve percent of the local taxable population. These families were thus able to maintain a fairly high socio-economic standing, despite the changing local and regional economic conditions. Not until the end of the nineteenth century does it appear that the property became a tenant farm; prior to that time the Hawthorn site was a family run enterprise with little need for hired labor. This is in marked contrast to the Robert Ferguson site (Coleman et al. 1983), a nearby tenant farm.

The Hawthorn site is representative of a moderate-sized, independent, family-owned farm that was highly successful, probably because of its adaptability in the face of shifting economic fortunes and trends. The productivity and viability of the Hawthorn farm lasted into the twentieth century, when the encroachment of road construction (both I-95 and New Churchmans

Road) reduced the tillable acreage to a non-productive level. Finally in 1960, after over 200 years of continuous occupation, the Hawthorn farm was abandoned.

CURRENT RESEARCH

Introduction

To satisfy the project's research design and methodology, archaeological data recovery was accomplished through 1) a stratified sampling scheme utilizing shovel/postholer units. This extensive excavation of areas outside the main activity area was accomplished in conjunction with the preliminary testing of prehistoric site 7NC-E-46 (O'Connor et al. 1983; Custer and Bachman 1984); 2) a purposeful, non-random excavation of site areas separated from the main activity area utilizing measured excavation units and shovel/postholer units; and 3) an intensive sampling of the main activity area, utilizing measured excavation units. Intensive exavation within the main house foundation with a backhoe accomplished the final stages of data recovery (Figure 15).

This section of the report will detail the findings of the archaeological excavations at the William M. Hawthorn site. Prior to the presentation of these results and interpretations, general comments will be made in regards to areas of the site with no relevant cultural material, to site description and site structure as related to the project area, and to methods of artifact description and analysis.

Areas with no Relevant Cultural Material

The final data recovery concentrated on areas known from the