

The archaeological remains recovered at the Heisler Tenancy Site (7NC-E-83) were found predominantly in the context of a secondary refuse trash midden, and, like the artifact assemblage found at the Patterson Lane Site, span a long period of occupation and disposal. However, the Heisler Site is nearly contemporaneous with the black occupation of the Dickson Site, and in its later years was in fact a black domestic household as well. Thus an inter-site comparison of these two artifact assemblages may prove fruitful and beneficial in the study of late nineteenth century rural households of the Middle Atlantic.

METHODOLOGY

ARCHIVAL METHODS

Background and archival research undertaken by both DelDOT and UDCAR archaeologists was similar, and consisted first of consultation with the staff of the Delaware Bureau of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (BAHP), and a review of all the pertinent inventories of prehistoric and historic cultural resources maintained by the BAHP within the vicinity of the project area. Historic research consisted of an examination of all historic atlases and maps of the Patterson Lane and Christiana Bridge area, interviews with local landholders and persons knowledgeable in local history, and intensive examination of "official" records, such as deeds, probate documents (wills, administrations, inventories, estate sales, etc.), tax assessments from various years for White Clay Creek Hundred, U.S. census data, New Castle County Road Petitions and Returns, and other court records. Other historic records that were utilized

in this study include Delaware State Directories published between 1865 and 1898 (sort of informal censuses, recording name, address, occupation, and general local information), and the personal papers of various members of the Read family, which are housed at The Historical Society of Delaware and The Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Aerial photographs obtained from the U.S. Conservation Service (Glasgow, Delaware), dating from the 1930s to 1950s, were used for identifying site localities and occupations, and land use and landscape changes. The background research for prehistoric sites included the review of prehistoric archaeological literature on applicable predictive models (Custer 1983, 1984; Custer and Wallace 1982; Custer and DeSantis 1986; Gardner 1978), and a review of the known prehistoric sites within the project area.

FIELD METHODS

Field methods utilized for the Phase I investigations conducted by DelDOT archaeologists in 1982 consisted of a pedestrian survey of the proposed ROW within the project area, surface collection of artifacts where surface visibility was good, and excavation of shovel test pits (STPs) and 1x1m excavation units in areas of poor visibility or high site probability. After the initial pedestrian survey of the Patterson Lane Site, DelDOT archaeologists superimposed an excavation grid over the ROW, and established a datum point. This excavation grid was also utilized by the UDCAR archaeologists in the subsequent investigations of the shifted ROW. All units and STPs were excavated in arbitrary levels of .4' in depth, or natural

levels if of a shallower depth. All soils were screened through 1/4 inch wire mesh by excavation level, and all artifacts recovered were bagged according to unit coordinates and levels. All features and selected soil profiles and plan views from each STP or test unit were mapped. Black and white photographs and/or 35mm color slides were taken of recorded features and excavation profiles and plan views.

The field methods used by the later UDCAR Phase I archaeological investigations were designed to conform where possible to those utilized by DelDOT archaeologists. The grid system was simply extended into the new proposed area of ROW, and standard 3x3 foot test units were excavated at set intervals. Like the DelDOT methods, UDCAR archaeologists excavated in 0.4' arbitrary levels, or in natural levels if they were of a shallower depth. All soils were screened through 1/4 inch wire mesh, and all artifacts recovered were bagged according to test unit provenience and grid coordinates. All features were mapped as were selected soil profiles, usually two contiguous walls, and plan views of all test units. Black and white photographs and/or 35mm color slides were taken of selected features, soil excavation profiles and test unit plan views. Landscape features were mapped in relation to the site areas, and topographical maps of the area prepared. Additionally, DelDOT personnel from the Office of Locational Studies took 35mm aerial photographs of the site locations and environmental settings.

The methodologies for Phase II investigations for the Patterson Lane Site Complex differed between the UDCAR and DelDOT excavations, primarily because of varying scopes of work for the

two projects. These Phase II methods will be explained in detail in the report sections dealing with the individual sites.

LABORATORY METHODS AND ARTIFACT ANALYSIS

Prior to a detailed artifact analysis, the standard artifact processing procedures of the Delaware Bureau of Museums were applied to all artifacts recovered from the Phase II excavations. All artifacts, bone and shell were cleaned in the lab with plain water, or, in the case of deteriorating bone, damp-brushed. Bone and shell were then placed in labeled bags, while other artifacts were themselves labeled with the site numbers and three digit provenience number. Artifacts were sorted into categories for cataloguing based on their material composition. The total artifact count for each unit and feature is provided in Appendices I through III.

Ceramic artifacts were catalogued on one or two different catalogue sheets, depending on their provenience, for all of the Patterson Lane Site Complex. Ceramics from the Dickson Site were catalogued according to their contexts, those from above the earlier structure, and those from within the earlier structure. Ceramics from both proveniences were included within a form tabulating the relative frequencies of different artifact classes. A preliminary analysis on the sherd level was made for all sites, and the nature of the archaeological remains from the Patterson Lane Site (7NC-E-53), precluded any additional levels of analysis for the artifacts from this site. Ceramics recovered from the Dickson Site and the Heisler feature fill were sorted as

to ware type, and vessel reconstruction and cross-mending were carried out to arrive at minimum vessel estimates using standard techniques. Vessels were then coded to a set of standard descriptive terms for analytical purposes. An example of the vessel analysis form is included in Appendix IV.

In the designation of the South number for sherds and vessels, an effort was made to maintain South's original numbering scheme (Appendix V). Mean ceramic dates were obtained from South (1977) or the adjusted dates found in Carlson (1983). The time-sensitive attributes and use-related descriptor vessel attributes were entered into a computer data base program. Economic scaling of the ceramics recovered from the Heisler and Dickson Sites was conducted utilizing the index values from Miller (1980), and was coded and entered into a computer data base program. The artifact data was organized into the functional group and classification system of South (1977), but no comparative analysis was employed (see also Majewski and O'Brien 1987).

Attributes recorded for each ceramic sherd, if identified were:

WARE - a combination of paste and glaze characteristics that serve to separate types on a basic level.

PLASTIC DECORATION - records decorations involving the paste of the ceramic item. Examples include bat-molded plate rim treatments such as shell- and feather-edging and overall ribbed decoration such as that found on some teapots.

COLOR OF DECORATION - refers to the color of painted, or otherwise applied, decoration, including slips and glazes.

APPLIED DECORATION - includes all non-plastic decorations, having to do with applied color.

VARIETY - records certain types of decoration, for instance a specific, named transfer print such as the "Willow" pattern.

SOUTH TYPE NUMBER - Stanley South codified the ceramics described by Noel-Hume (1978) in A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America. Additional ceramic codification and dating were obtained from Carlson (1983). These types are useful as time markers and are used in South's Mean Ceramic Date Formula. The numbered types found in the Dickson and Heisler assemblages are contained in Appendix V.

USE/SHAPE/FUNCTION - these codes classify sherds according to the shape of the vessels they belong to and the use to which the vessels are put. Examples are chamber pot and milk pan.

COUNT - sherd counts according to their positions on the vessel-- rim, base, body, other (including handles and spouts, for instance), and total.

VESSEL NUMBER - in addition to provenience labeling reconstructed vessels were assigned unique numbers to identify groups of mended sherds.

DATE RANGE - range of time during which a particular type or variety was manufactured.

MEDIAN DATE - median date of manufacture, from South (1977), used to calculate Mean Ceramic Dates for the early nineteenth century contexts (see section on dating). Carlson (1983) has refined some of these dates, particularly for later nineteenth century wares, and these dates are used here.

Attributes recorded for each ceramic vessel were:

- A) Minimum number of vessels estimated
- B) Mean Ceramic Date on (A)
- C) Vessel form i.e.,
 - (1) flatware vs. hollowware
 - (2) Drinking form - cups vs. mugs and jugs

- D) Vessel Function
 - (1) dining (tablewares)
 - (2) drinking (tea and coffeewares)
 - (3) food preparation (dairy/kitchen)
 - (4) food storage (includes ceramic bottles)
 - (5) medicinal (chamber pots, hygiene)
 - (6) other

The data set derived from the vessel analysis was basic to inter-site assemblage comparisons or as outlined later in the discussion.

The large number of buttons recovered from both occupations of the Dickson Site presented an opportunity to catalog these artifacts in detail. Dates, form, and button attribute data used in the analysis were based on the work of South (1964), Noel-Hume (1978), Stone (1974), Olsen (1963), and Wyckoff (1984). The buttons were cataloged according to the following characteristics:

SHAPE -- geometric, circular

DECORATION -- plated, embossed, other

FASTENING -- number of holes, shank, other

MANUFACTURE -- cut, stamped, molded, hollow, other

FUNCTION -- cuff, coat, shirt, adult/child, other

MATERIAL -- mother of pearl, bone, brass, copper, iron, rubber, glass, plastic, composite, other

SOUTH TYPE -- the number that South assigned to buttons recovered from Brunswick Town and Fort Fisher, North Carolina (1964).

An example of the catalog sheet utilized for this button analysis is contained in Appendix VI. Figure 14 illustrates the button profiles identified in this study.

PATTERSON LANE SITE (7NC-E-53) INVESTIGATIONS

SITE HISTORY

The earliest deed reference for the Patterson Lane Site is dated 1737, when John Read, a merchant of Christiana Bridge, purchased two tracts on the east side of the village at a sheriff's sale (New Castle County Deed L-1-120; hereafter cited NCCD). One of the tracts Read bought was a 150 acre plantation bordering on Eagle's Run; the other was a small 3 1/2 acre parcel situated on the west side of Eagle's Run, bounded by that creek, John Lewden's marsh, and the Christina River. On the small parcel were erected "houses, wharves, and other improvements". Both tracts had belonged to Nicholas Hayman, a transplanted Dutch yeoman. Originally, the tracts were part of a large 300 acre plantation surveyed to John Ogle early in the eighteenth century. Ogle in turn sold the 300 acres to Nathaniel Pope, and in 1720, Pope sold it to William Parsons. The metes and bounds recorded in Parsons' survey of that date indicate that a landing place was already in use on the property. Sometime between 1720 and 1737, Parsons sold the two tracts mentioned above to Nicholas Hayman (Miscellaneous Land Records 1760). However, Hayman lost the property because of a debt of over 111 pounds that he owed William Patterson. Since the debt could not be paid, the Court of Common Pleas at New Castle ordered that Hayman's lands be sold to recover the debt. Strangely, in 1750, Peter Hayman, a