

slave or servants quarters. The Anthony Hotel achieved a score of .09 which puts 46.41% of the population in a normal distribution below this site. Grant Tenancy achieved quite a high value using this measure. With a score of .86, 80.51% of the population in a normal distribution would have had a lower score. Springdale, projected to be of high economic status, obtained a similar score, .87, with 19.22 of the population falling below. The William Hawthorn site had a score of 3.15 which means that over 99% of the population in a normal distribution would have a lower score. This fits well with the documentary evidence as the site is known to be in the upper percentiles of the tax records. 44PM24 achieved the highest score, 8.89. According to this, 99.99% of the population would have a higher score. It is difficult to say if this attribution is correct as none of the Portsmouth sites had been extensively researched, however, 44PM24 is one of two possible locations for a residence known as Manor Farm. If the results of the combined z scores are correct, 44PM24, appears to be the more likely candidate, as 44PM34, the other candidate, achieved a relatively low score.

Based on the results described above, the Grant Tenancy site appears to have been inhabited by individuals of relatively higher economic status than most of the sites examined. Because the archival records which were examined presented information about the owners of the property, rather than the occupants of the site, it is difficult to say if this attribution of status is correct. Although tenancies are usually thought to be of lower economic status, the fact that an individual does not own his residence does not necessarily preclude a higher economic status (Klein & Garrow 1964).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report has presented the results of data recovery excavations at an archeological site known as the Grant Tenancy site. Documentary evidence during the Phase II investigation had revealed the presence of a structure in this location on an historic map. The name, H. Grant, associated with the house was also associated with other structures in the area and evidence was available which suggested that H. Grant lived elsewhere. Therefore, the site was interpreted to be the remains of a tenancy. Since tenancies were poorly known archeologically, the site was determined to be eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. A considerable amount of documentary research was devoted to an attempt to answer the question of who lived at the site, and what their occupation and position in the community was. This effort was complicated by the fact that during the nineteenth century the excavated site was located at or near the corners of several different pieces of property with different histories. The relatively imprecise nature of nineteenth century property surveys coupled with the fact that some of the principal landmarks, i.e. the Lancaster Pike, had changed location one or more times during and since the period made it impossible to conclude with certainty which property the site was associated

with when it was occupied prior to the map indication of its association with the plantation belonging to Henry Grant in 1860. It seems likely the structure did not represent the principal residence of a property owner as the archival research showed most of the owners lived elsewhere. Thus the assumption that the site was occupied by a renter appears to be confirmed, if only by negative evidence.

The excavations at the site revealed a foundation with the remains of a well and subsidiary structure. Several discrete deposits were located within the foundation including a cellar fill which was assumed to result from the demolition of the structure, a refuse deposit containing ash, brick and artifacts and a cellar floor midden. Based on the volume of stone necessary for a stone house, it appears as if the house was originally constructed of something other than stone or that the stone from the house had been scavenged.

In addition to the historic component at the site, a small prehistoric component was present as well. This was interpreted as a procurement site.

Chemical analysis of selected soil samples at the site revealed the amount of phosphorus and potassium within the soil can be a particularly useful diagnostic tool in determining the presence of either subsurface features or of a structure. At the Grant Tenancy site, both phosphorus and potassium levels in plowzone soil samples were elevated in those parts of the site that contained high concentrations of artifacts and associated features. The levels were especially high from the plowzone samples over the buried house foundation.

The ceramics from the site primarily consisted of pearlware with various decorative methods including transfer printing, hand painting, shell edge and finger painting. Of the decorated pearlware sherds, transfer printing was the most common. Lesser amounts of whiteware and creamware were found. Glass artifacts were relatively sparse and tended to be undiagnostic. Most of the glass artifacts which did contain diagnostic attributes were either from pressed glass pieces or from mold blown pieces. Most of the identifiable nail fragments were cut, although some wrought specimens were present. Other metal artifacts found included coins, can fragments and various miscellaneous hardware and tool fragments. Mean Ceramic Dates of 1814.91 using South's types only and 1816.37 using the "General Pearlware" category were obtained for the site.

The Grant Tenancy site does not conform very closely to South's Carolina Pattern with very large percentages of kitchen items and corresponding low percentages of the other functional classes. Only the furniture and the tobacco pipe groups were within South's ranges.

When the percentages for South's function groups obtained for the Grant Tenancy site are compared to the William Hawthorn

site and the Robert Ferguson tenancy, the following results are obtained. Like William Hawthorn, the Grant Tenancy site contained a high number of kitchen group artifacts with percentages of 62.45% and 77.91% respectively. Coleman et al (1984:170) feel that the high percentage of kitchen items at the Hawthorn site and in South's Carolina Pattern are indicative of the length of occupation at these sites, with both of these sites having origins in the 18th century and extending into at least the mid 19th century. Occupation at the Ferguson site, on the other site, did not begin until 1837 (Coleman et al 1984:176). Although some 18th century materials were present at Grant, they were not particularly numerous and later ceramic types such as whiteware and ironstone were in the minority. Based on this, Grant does not seem to have sustained the length of occupation that the Hawthorn site did. The preponderance of kitchen items at Grant is therefore somewhat puzzling. Grant Tenancy had less architecturally related artifacts than either of the other two sites with a percentage of 18.90%. Robert Ferguson had 45.64% and William Hawthorn had 32.60%. Coleman et al (1984:176) attribute the higher percentage of architectural items at the Robert Ferguson to the site's 19th century origins and the rise in metal and construction materials that would accompany such a site. The low frequency of architectural materials at Grant Tenancy site may be the result of scavenging or it may be the result of its earlier origins. The furniture group percentage (.20%) at Grant is between the two values obtained for the other two sites. Robert Ferguson had a value of .33% and William Hawthorn had a value of .05%. The arms group at Grant was much lower than either Robert Ferguson or William Hawthorn. Grant had .03%, Robert Ferguson had .34% and William Hawthorn had .12%. Grant had a much higher percentage of clothing group items than either of the other two sites, 145%. Both Robert Ferguson and William Hawthorn had values of .19%. No personal group items were found at the Robert Ferguson site. Grant Tenancy had a value of .09% and William Hawthorn had a value of .05%. Grant Tenancy had extremely different values than both the other sites for the tobacco pipe and activities groups. Grant had a value of .29% for activities and 2.17% for tobacco pipes. Robert Ferguson had a value of 2.85% for the activities group and .63% for the tobacco pipe group. William Hawthorn had a value of 4.42% for the activities group and .12% for the tobacco pipe group.

As can be seen from the above, Grant Tenancy is not particularly close, in terms of South's function groups, to either the Robert Ferguson site, a known tenancy, or the William Hawthorn site, one of known high economic status.

Analysis of the faunal remains undertaken at the Robert Ferguson tenancy and the William Hawthorn site indicated cattle (Bos taurus), sheep (Ovis aries) and pig (Sus scrofa) as the major components of animal protein in the diet. A large number of teeth, head and foot elements were found, indicating at-home butchering and rearing of these animals (Coleman et al 1984:180). There was a noticeable lack of butchering or saw marks on the

remains which the authors attribute to the preparation of wholesale meat cuts for marketing (Coleman et al 1984:180). In addition, no evidence of wild food utilization was found, which is attributed to the "settled nature of New Castle County, even in the late 18th century" (Coleman et al 1984:180). High quality meat cuts were absent from both sites and it appears as if the occupants of both sites were consuming inferior cuts such as those used for stews and soups (Coleman et al 1984:180). Coleman et al feel that the higher quality meat cuts resulting from the on-site butchering provided a saleable surplus while the lower quality cuts were consumed by the occupants of the sites. They conclude that, based on the pattern observed at both William Hawthorn and Robert Ferguson, "food consumption habits may not vary with socio-economic status" (Coleman et al 1984:180).

Similar butchering patterns were observed at the Grant Tenancy site; no symmetrically sawed portions indicating systematic butchering was found. However, according to Dr. David Clark (Appendix III), this may be a reflection of the time period during which the site was occupied as evidence of symmetrically sawed butchering techniques is most common after the mid 1800's (Appendix III).

Like the other sites, cow, pig and sheep remains constituted the major domestic food resources at Grant Tenancy. Chicken was also found. However, in contrast to the other sites, Grant Tenancy indicated utilization of wild food sources as well. Rabbit, box turtle, oyster and hard shell clam remains were found. The reason for this difference is unclear. Coleman et al (1984:180) feel that the absence of wild food resources is related to the settled nature of the area as early as the 18th century. Since evidence of wild resource utilization was found at Grant Tenancy which is in a similar rural setting in the same area, this seems unlikely at least in the immediately local setting. The species represented in the Grant assemblage are present even in the more heavily urbanized modern area today. Perhaps the difference is the result of individual food preferences by the occupants of the sites or, at the William Hawthorn site at least, the contexts from which the faunal remains had been taken were disturbed.

Also in contrast to the William Hawthorn and the Robert Ferguson sites, evidence of high quality meat cut consumption was found at the Grant Tenancy site. Although not definitive, this lends credence to the assertion that the site was occupied by individuals of somewhat higher economic status than was originally anticipated.

At the beginning of the 19th century, changing economic conditions and patterns of agricultural production resulted in the consolidation of land tenure into the hands of fewer individuals in northern Delaware. Because the owners of the lands had business interests and frequently lived in the urban centers, it was necessary to maintain a system of tenancy in order to facilitate agricultural production. The Grant Tenancy

site was originally felt to be such a tenancy and the work at the site was designed to allow a more precise documentation of the social and economic status of the occupants of the site. Although somewhat inconclusive, current evidence indicates that the site was not owner occupied and it appears to have been a tenancy. Based on Clark's faunal analysis, at least some degree of agricultural production is evident in the form of animal rearing and butchering, however, it is difficult to say if this was solely for household use or for market.

An examination of spatial patterning and organization at the H. Grant Tenancy site indicates that, in addition to the main structure, the remains of at least one, perhaps two, service buildings were present. A similar pattern of a low number of auxiliary structures was observed at the Robert Ferguson site (Coleman et al 1983:91), a known tenant farm. If a low number of subsidiary structures is characteristic of tenant farms, it would only be representative of those tenant farms at which the tenants were living adjacent to or in close proximity to the main farm, or at those in which the tenants had access to agricultural facilities at a larger farm. It would not be the expected pattern at tenant properties which were leased as working farms. In this case, one would expect a greater number of service buildings. In any event, based on the results of the present excavations, the Grant Tenancy site does not appear to have a sufficient number of service buildings to have been a working farm. However, it is possible that the subsidiary structures were located farther away from the main house, outside the impact zone for this project.

Refuse disposal patterns at the Grant Tenancy site were also examined and compared to other sites in order to determine how closely they conformed. In general, the refuse disposal patterns at the Grant Tenancy site were closer to the Brunswick pattern observed by South (1977) in which refuse was present around all entranceways, than those observed at either the Mudstone Branch (Heite 1984) or the Robert Ferguson site (Coleman et al 1983), at which attempts were made to keep the front yard area clear of refuse. No evidence for temporal or functional separation of refuse deposits was found.

As previously stated, one of the research goals was a documentation of the economic status of the occupants of the Grant Tenancy site. In this research, the economic status was measured by examining the decorative methods on the refined white earthenwares. Based on Miller's (1980) work, this attribute was hypothesized to be an indication of economic status because of the cost differences between these decorative methods.

One way of examining the decorative methods in order to determine economic status is to sum deviation from the mean or z scores for these decorative methods. This gives a single, normalized score by which relative economic status may be attributed. It is, in effect, a ranking method because the

scores are obtained by pooling the data from a group of sites and determining the position of particular sites within the pool, in relation to the others.

Using this method, the Grant Tenancy site appears to be of relatively high economic status. This is supported to some extent by the results of the faunal analysis which indicated the consumption of high quality meat cuts. This does not necessarily contradict the tenant status of the site as there are at least two schools of thought regarding the level of economic status among tenancies. Klein and Garrow (1984:80) feel that the relationship between tenancy and socio-economic status is not clear-cut. They feel that middle and even high status individuals often rented property and that tenancy alone is not a reliable indicator of economic status (Klein and Garrow 1984:80). Coleman et al, on the other hand, feel that tenancies are often lower economic status individuals (Coleman et al 1983:24) at least compared to individuals living in the main house on the same property. The work at Grant Tenancy seems to support Klein & Garrow's contention.

Therefore, based on the results obtained during this research, the Grant Tenancy site appears to have been occupied by individuals of higher economic status than most of the other sites examined in this study. In the absence of documentary evidence and vessel form analysis for cost index values, deviation from the mean in terms of the frequencies of certain kinds of decoration on refined white earthenwares seems to be the most fruitful method tested in this study of obtaining some idea of the economic status of a particular site. However, this method needs to be tested more extensively before it can be determined useful.

At their most basic, the statistical methods used in this study simply demonstrate that ceramic assemblages vary in a significant non-random manner for reasons that have yet to be determined. We have hypothesized that socio-economic status is the reason for this variance. However, other factors exist which cannot be discounted. These include personal preference, relative availability of ceramics at sites, i.e. the distribution of available decorative types based on the proximity of the site to a major trade route or port, and urban vs. rural site position.