

APPENDIX A
ARTIFACT CATALOG

Summary of Historic Artifact Assemblage (Table 12) 135
Artifact Cataloging and Methods 138

This section contains a summary listing of the historic artifacts recovered during the Phase I, II, and III investigations at Site 7S-F-68, together with a description of the methods used for cataloging and analysis.

A complete computer catalog listing of the assemblage, together with translations of codes, is available at the following locations:

Archaeology Laboratory
The Cultural Resource Group
Louis Berger & Associates, Inc.
100 Halsted Street
East Orange, New Jersey 07019
(201) 678-1960

Division of Highways
Delaware Department of Transportation
U.S. Route 113
Dover, Delaware 19903
(302) 739-4642

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF HISTORIC ARTIFACT ASSEMBLAGE

GROUP/ class	COUNT	WEIGHT (kg)	ARTIFACT TYPE
KITCHEN/ceramics			
	1		Buff/Yellow Bodied - Lead Glazed
	1		Creamware - Plain
	1		Delftware - White Glazed w/ Polychrome Decoration
	1		Redware - Brown Glaze
	1		Redware - Dark Brown to Black Glaze
	1		Stoneware - Gray Body w/ Albany Slip
	1		Whiteware - Other Embossed Rims
	1		Whiteware - Shell Edge - Blue
	1		Whiteware - Sponged
	1		Whiteware - Transfer Printed - Clobbered/Filled in
	1		Whiteware - Underglaze Handpainted
	1		Yellowware - Plain
	2		Ironstone - Transfer Printed - Overglaze Polychrome
	2		Whiteware - Transfer Printed - Black or Brown
	2		Yellowware - Dipped - Simple Bands
	3		Stoneware - Plain - Gray Salt Glazed
	4		Ironstone - Plain
	8		Delftware - White Glaze w/ Blue Decoration - General
	13		Delftware - White Glaze
	30		Whiteware - Plain
KITCHEN/bottles			
	1		Bottle Cap
	1		Kitchen - Other
	2		Jar/General
	2		Screw Top Jar Lid
	3		Pry-off Jar Lid
	5		Soda
	6		Crown Cap Closure
	6		Pop Top
	247		Unidentified Bottle/General
KITCHEN/kitchenware			
	1		Can Key
	2		Miscellaneous Cookware
KITCHEN/misc. glasware			
	5		Unidentified tableware/general
KITCHEN/tableware			
	1		Fork
KITCHEN/other			
	2		Metal Can/Container
	37		Total Unidentified Gglass/General
ARCHITECTURAL/window glass, coming, etc.			
	9	0.013	Broad Glass
	11	0.009	Modern Window Glass

TABLE 12--continued

GROUP/ class	COUNT	WEIGHT (kg)	ARTIFACT TYPE
ARCHITECTURAL/nails, spikes, tacks, etc.			
	1		Bracket/Band
	1		Miscellaneous Fastener
	1		Unidentified cut nail
	2		Clinch Nail
	2		Early Machine Cut Coffin Nail with Applied Head
	2		Roofing Nail
	2		Unidentified Coffin Nail
	4		Unidentified Nail
	7		Handwrought Nail
	9		Machine Cut/Wrought Nail
	14		Wire Nail
	36		Machine Cut Nail
	359		Handwrought Coffin Nail
ARCHITECTURAL/electrical related.			
	1		Miscellaneous Electrical Hardware
	7		Light Bulb Parts
ARCHITECTURAL/misc. building material			
	1	0.002	Mortar/Plaster
	3	0.075	Glazed Brick
	4	0.065	Mortar
	5		Asphalt Roofing Tile
	26	0.208	Brick
ARCHITECTURAL/decoratotive elements			
	2		Paint
FURNISHINGS/lighting related			
	1		Lamp Globe/Chimney
FURNISHINGS/furniture hardware			
	1		Furniture Hardware - Miscellaneous
ARMS/ammunition			
	1		16 in. Gauge Shotgun Shell
ARMS/gunflints			
	1		Gunflint - Whole
CLOTHING/fasteners			
	1		Hook
	2		Glass Button
	2		Wedge Type Button
	3		Eyelet
	6		Tombac Button
CLOTHING/misc.			
	1		Woven Cloth
CLOTHING/other			
	3		Clothing Accesory

TABLE 12--continued

GROUP/ class	COUNT	WEIGHT (kg)	ARTIFACT TYPE
TOBACCO PIPES/white clay pipes			
	1		Stem - Unmeasurable Fragment
	1		Unident Shape without Heel
TOBACCO PIPES/other smoking related			
	2		Tobacco Related - Not Pipes
ACTIVITIES/household related			
	1		Scissor
	1		Vessel
	46		Misc. Metal Cans
ACTIVITIES/toys			
	1		Toy Parts
	2		Machine-Made Glass Marble
ACTIVITIES/writing related			
	2		Graphite Pencil
ACTIVITIES/heating related			
	1	0.001	Coal/Cinder/Clinker/Slag
	4	0.001	Charred Wood
ACTIVITIES/sewing related			
	27		Straight Pin With Wrapped Head
ACTIVITIES/recreation			
	1		Fishing Related
ACTIVITIES/commercial -- manufacturing byproducts			
	5		Button Blank
	98		Button Waster
ACTIVITIES/transportation related			
	1		Miscellaneous Auto Related
ACTIVITIES/other			
	1		Miscellaneous Wire
	1		Nut
	1		Padlock
	1		Pin
	2		Bolt
	2		Washer
	23		Miscellaneous Hardware
FLORAL/FAUNAL			
		0.001	Clam
		0.001	Oyster/Clam
	2	0.043	Oyster
	3	0.051	Hard Shell Clam
	862	0.316	Dog
		0.001	Unidentified Shell - Unspecified
	1		Medium Mammal
	1		Unidentified Bird/Rodent
	1		Unidentified Mammal - Medium
	3		Unidentified Bone
	28		Unidentified Mammal - Unspecified

TABLE 12--continued

GROUP/ class	COUNT	WEIGHT (kg)	ARTIFACT TYPE
OTHER/UNIDENTIFIED			
	1		Foil
	1		Tar
	2		Paper
	3		Unidentified Material
	11		Plastic
	30		Unidentified Metal
	33	0.235	Unidentified Wood

ARTIFACT CATALOGING AND METHODS

A. INTRODUCTION

A computerized data management system developed by LBA was used to compile an artifact inventory for data manipulation. The system is written on an IBM PC-XT using R:Base System V, a relational database development package. Artifact information (characteristics) recorded on the data entry forms by the analysts was entered into the system. The system was then used to enhance the artifact records with the addition of provenience information. A second program added dates (when applicable) and translations for all artifact Type and Subtype codes.

Pattern (group and class) codes were automatically assigned by the computer to each artifact entry, based on form or material type, although for non-kitchen-related ceramics, Pattern codes, based on identified forms, were entered by hand. The purpose of artifact pattern analysis is to organize an assemblage and to provide a description of its contents. The pattern categories used follow the work of South (1977), as modified by LBA (1987).

Artifact Function codes were generated only for ceramics and glass. Functional analysis is used as a supplement to pattern analysis to examine the proportions of vessel functional categories within assemblages. The functional categories used follow Beidleman et al. (1983) and Klein and Garrow (1984), as modified by LBA (1986). Ceramic Function codes are linked to identified forms and were entered into the system manually. The Function codes for glass, however, are linked to the Type/Subtype codes and were therefore assigned automatically by the computer.

Procedures for artifact analysis, including descriptions of the analytical fields (with all modifiers or variables [VAR]), are presented below.

B. CERAMIC ANALYSIS

The ceramic collection from the site was analyzed using a standardized format developed by the LBA Cultural Resource Group. This format is based on the South/Noel Hume typology (South 1977), as modified for use in a computerized system (Louis Berger & Associates 1987; Stehling in Geismar 1983; Stehling and Janowitz 1986).

The ceramic tabulation was performed at a Stage 1 level of analysis. Stage 1 analysis provides the following information: identification of ware types and techniques of surface decoration; dates based on manufacturing techniques and, if present, makers' marks; identification of vessel forms

and functions; and description of decorative motifs. The following are the variables used in the computer coding process.

TYPE/SUBTYPE. The ceramic Type/Subtype is entered as a five-character alphanumeric code that consists of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always C, for Ceramic. The second letter refers to general ware groups: E for Coarse Earthenwares; R for Refined Earthenwares; S for Coarse Stonewares; F for Refined Stonewares; P for Porcelain; and O for Other and Unidentified. The third letter refers to specific ware types: e.g., R for Redware, L for Gray Salt-Glazed Stoneware, C for Creamware. The numbers following the letter code refer to particular decorative treatments or named types: e.g., CER 62 - Redware with Brown Glaze; CRW 70 - Whiteware with Sponged Decoration. Type/Subtype may have specific dates or may be descriptive and undated. Sources for the dates include, but are not limited to, Cameron (1986), Denker and Denker (1985), Ketchum (1983), Miller (1980), Noel Hume (1970), and South (1977).

COUNT. The number of sherds in each category was recorded in this field.

BEGIN DATE/END DATE. The begin and end dates were automatically assigned by the computer to each dated Type/Subtype. When more precise dates could be determined from makers' marks or particular decorations or forms, this field was filled in on the coding sheet and the more specific dates were entered into the computer.

FORM (VAR 5). Form indicates the shape and possible function of the complete vessel as represented by the sherds present. General categories, such as Body - General, were used for sherds whose small size or ambiguous characteristics make determination of form problematical. Definitions of forms are based on Greer (1981), Ketchum (1983), and Towner (1963).

DECORATION/MOTIF (VAR 4). This field includes descriptions of specific decorations (e.g., Landscape - General), pattern names when identifiable (e.g., Willow), and general descriptions (e.g., Blue).

COMMENTS. The Comments code is numerical and refers to information not covered in the other fields. The most common entry in this field is 19, which translates as See Written Comments.

NOTES. The Notes field allows for individual written comments applicable to a specific entry. In general, notes were used to describe particulars of decorative motifs or unusual characteristics, or to record bibliographic references used for identification or dating.

C. GLASS ANALYSIS

The glass assemblage from the site was broken down, for analytic purposes, into functionally distinct groupings based on Bottle, Table, Lighting, and Other use categories. Window glass, considered more functionally inclusive under an architectural group of artifacts, was subsumed for analysis under Small Finds/Architectural Materials.

Identification and tabulation of the glass under this section proceeded according to a Stage 1 level of analysis. This involved, in addition to Type/Subtype, Date, and Count designations, the recordation of select descriptive attributes of the sherds.

The glass analysis utilized the typology and attribute list designed by LBA for all its projects. In addition to catalog and provenience information, a total of 15 fields of discrete glass data were available for recordation on the computer data entry sheets. Only the Wear (VAR 3) and Maker's Mark (VAR 1) fields were not utilized for this site. As previously stated, Pattern (group and class) and Function codes for glass were assigned automatically by the computer, based on the

Type/Subtype entered for each artifact. The only category of glass which did not receive a function designation was totally unidentified glass. A brief description of coding procedures follows.

TYPE/SUBTYPE. Tabulation of the glass proceeded according to artifact codes determined by function (Type) and form (Subtype). Codes are alphanumeric, consisting of three letters and a two-digit number. The first letter, G, standard for all codes, denotes the artifact as Glass. The second letter denotes the general functional category in which the artifact falls: B for Bottle, T for Table, L for Lighting Related, and O for Other glass. The third letter denotes specific function, e.g., C for Carbonates, under the general Bottle heading; U for Unidentified Table Glass, under the general Table heading; L for Lamp, under the general Lighting Related heading; and U for Unidentified, under the general Other heading. The two-digit number completes the identification and denotes vessel form: e.g., GBC 01 - Soda Bottle; GTU 01 - Unidentified Table Glass/General; GLL 24 - Lamp Globe/Chimney; and GOU 01 - Total Unidentified Glass.

All artifacts identified as to specific function and form were coded as such regardless of the degree of fragmentation. The specific vessel part(s) encountered are inferred by the coding of the appropriate field(s), e.g., Base or Finish. Whole and fragmented bases, finishes, rims, and body sherds for which specific functional forms could not be identified were accommodated under the Unidentified and Miscellaneous categories. Non-form-specific vessels and sherds were coded as above, when appropriate, or under expanded codes such as Wine/Liquor Bottle.

COUNT. The number of sherds in each category was recorded in this field.

BEGIN DATE/END DATE. Dating of the glass assemblage proceeded according to established diagnostic criteria. These criteria, utilized either singly or in combination, can include various technological aspects of glass manufacture such as finish treatments and mold markings, datable bottle embossments and makers' marks, and various stylistic elements associated with certain tablewares. In instances where no end date of manufacture was available, only the beginning date or Terminus Post Quem (TPQ) for the artifact was recorded. The single source used for dating was Jones and Sullivan (1985).

COLOR (VAR 6). In general, color was assigned to glass sherds purely for descriptive purposes and is broadly defined for this collection. All shades of olive green, for example, are coded under Light Olive/Dark Olive Green.

FINISH (VAR 8). Finish types in the collection fell within both the One-Part and Two-Part categories. Coded descriptions relate, for the most part, to the shape (in side profile) of the element comprising each finish.

BASE (VAR 7). Base types in the collection refer to the marks on the basal surfaces of both bottles and tablewares. The lack of any markings on several bottle bases indicated that a "snap case" device had been used to hold the bottles in place while their finishes were formed. Base fragments which could not be associated with a diagnostic piece were coded as Unidentified.

MANUFACTURING TECHNIQUE (VAR 5). Manufacturing technique refers to the distinctive mold seams and markings found on the bodies (and sometimes on the basal surfaces and over the finishes and rims) of completed glassware. Mold-Blown (Mold Type Indeterminate) was used to describe vessels for which a specific mold type could not be discerned. The code Unidentified was used to denote a totally unidentifiable manufacturing technique.

MOTIF (VAR 4). The Motif codes assigned to the collection refer to the general decorative patterns evidenced.

EMBOSSMENT (VAR 11). Only incomplete embossments which could not be identified in their entirety were encountered and were coded Unidentified/Partial, with the legible portions written out in the Note field (see below).

COMMENTS. Numerical Comments codes were utilized to convey additional descriptive or explanatory data not covered in the standard coded fields. The coded information recorded in this field for glass includes, for example, Straight-sided.

NOTES. For the most part, notes were entered into the glass data base to record descriptive information for sherds, to record partial embossments, and to document dating references.

D. SMALL FINDS/ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS

The small finds/architectural materials received a Stage 1 level of analysis using the coding system created by LBA, based on the South/Noel Hume typology (South 1977). The Stage 1 coding system allows for a maximum of 14 fields of information for each artifact. Minimally, each artifact was identified by its group and class, material type, and characteristic, and received a count. For certain artifact types additional descriptive information, such as weight and color, were coded. The remaining fields of information were used only if further information was provided by the artifact. Presented below are the utilized codes and their translations. Pattern (group and class) codes were automatically assigned by the program.

TYPE/SUBTYPE. The Type/Subtype code is alphanumeric, consisting of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always S for smallfinds/architectural. The second letter denotes Group, e.g., A for Architecture. The third letter denotes a class within a group, e.g., F for Fasteners. The numerical Subtype code denotes the specific artifact type, e.g., SAB 01 - Architectural Building Material, Brick.

COUNT. All artifacts were counted with the exception of heating by-products and coffin wood fragments which were always weighed.

WEIGHT. Weights were recorded for brick, mortar, window glass, heating by-products and coffin wood.

BEGIN DATE/END DATE. Dates for certain artifacts are generated automatically by the computer based on their Type/Subtype. References used for dating of artifacts included Bridgewater and Kurtz (1967), Johnson (1942), Luscomb (1967), Munsey (1970), Nelson (1968), Noel Hume (1970), Panati (1987), Pepper (1971), Randall (1971), and Randall and Webb (1988).

MATERIAL (VAR 3). The material composition of each artifact was determined and recorded.

CHARACTERISTIC (VAR 5). A modifier was used to best describe the form or manufacturing technique of each artifact. If no diagnostic attribute was evident, the artifact was simply described as being whole or fragmented.

DECORATION (VAR 4). Any decorative characteristic not related to the form or manufacture of an artifact was described if present.

COLOR (VAR 6). Color was recorded for window glass and for other artifacts such as marbles.

MAKER'S MARK (VAR 1). Makers' marks are recorded if present, though none were noted for this project.

BACKMARK (VAR 11). Any mark other than a maker's mark is recorded here if present, as in the case of a brand name, e.g., Budweiser.

COMMENTS. A standard set of numerical Comments codes is used for noting additional data not accommodated in other fields of information. For example, the comment 99 translates as "Burned."

NOTES. The Notes field allows for additional, written comments.

E. FAUNAL ANALYSIS

The faunal material received a modified Stage 1 level of analysis using the coding system created by the LBA Cultural Resource Group. The analysis allowed for identification of species, element, and modifications to the specimens such as evidence of burning and weathering. In the case of the three dog burials, it was necessary to use an adjusted count in order to quantify the actual number of bones identified from each. For each burial the number of fragments corresponding to a particular element was counted. Then the number of bones they formed was recorded within the Minimum Number of Units (MNU) field, which for this site is described as the Minimum Number of Elements (MNE). Shell material was treated differently. While only valves were counted, all shell was weighed as well. Identifications were made with the aid of a comparative faunal type collection and the use of reference materials which include Abbott (1968), Gilbert (1973), Kent (1988), Olsen (1964, 1968, 1979), and Walker (1985).

TYPE/SUBTYPE. The Type/Subtype code is alphanumeric, consisting of three letters and two digits. The first letter is always Z, which indicates Faunal; the second letter denotes the Class, and the third letter distinguishes groups within a class, e.g., M for Mammal and D for Domestic. The numerical Subtype code specifies species, e.g. 60-Pig.

COUNT. The Count indicates the Total Number of Fragments (TNF).

ELEMENT (VAR 5). This field indicates what bone, or element, is being quantified.

PART PRESENT (VAR 6). This field indicates whether the specimen is whole, fragmentary, or a butchered section.

BURNING (VAR 7). This field is used to record any modifications to bone or shell by heat.

WEATHERING (VAR 9). This field notes the presence of weathering.

TYPE OF MNU - (VAR 10). This variable indicates the type of minimum number of units being quantified in the actual MNU field. For this site its use was restricted to the dog burials and was limited to minimum number of elements (MNE).

MNU. This field contains the adjusted bone count derived from mending bone fragments of specific elements. For example, in Feature 35 there were 91 rib fragments which mended to a total of 21 ribs. Another way of saying this is that there were a minimum of 21 rib elements present.

COMMENTS. A standard set of numerical Comments codes is used for noting additional data not accommodated in other fields of information. For example, the comment 25 translates as "Conserved".

NOTES. The Notes field allows for additional, written comments.

F. PIPES ANALYSIS

Pipes under analysis are tabulated by morphological type, decorative motif, maker's mark and use-wear. Stem bores are measured and, when appropriate, Binford's (1978) straight-line regression formula ($Y=1931.85-38.26X$) is utilized to calculate mean dates. The following standardized methods are used when entering pipe data into the LBA computer coding system. The utilized codes and associated translations are presented below. Pattern (group and class) codes, assigned automatically by the computer, are listed in the following section. For this site, pipes were tabulated at a Stage 1 level of analysis, which included the following variables.

TYPE/SUBTYPE. As with the other artifact types, the Type/Subtype code is alphanumeric and consists of three letters and two-digits. The first two letters are always PT, indicating Pipes-Tobacco. The third letter identifies the artifact as a stem (S), or an English-shaped white clay bowl (E). The Subtype further defines the artifact. A numerical code is given which highlights specific bowl shapes, e.g., PTE 92 Unidentified Shape without Heel, or stem characteristics, e.g. PTS 98, Unmeasurable Fragment.

COUNT. The number of pipe fragments was recorded in this field.

BEGIN DATE/END DATE. Dates for pipes were generated automatically by the computer based on their Type/Subtype. If a manufacturing range for a specific pipe could be determined, the date was coded and recorded. Sources used include, but are not limited to, Jackson and Price (1974), Noel Hume (1970), and Walker (1977).

MAKER'S MARK/DECORATION (VAR 1). This field is used to describe the maker's marks ("McDougall/Glasgow) and/or decoration ("fleur-de-lys") found on bowls and stems. However, no maker's marks were present in the collection from this site.

USE (VAR 7). This modifier describes the types of evidence of use found on the pipes, such as discoloration from heat.

BORE DIAMETER (VAR 9). The bore diameters of stems were measured in sixty-fourths of an inch, using a set of drill bits ranging from 4/64 to 9/64. This measurement was recorded simply as the numerator (for example, 4/64-inch bores were recorded as 4).

COMMENTS. A standard set of numerical Comments codes was used for noting additional data not accommodated in other fields of information.

NOTES. This is a write-in field used to record additional information or references employed in identification.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, R. Tucker
1968 *Seashells of North America*. Golden Press, New York.
- Beidelman, D.K., T.E. Davidson, R. Napoli, R. Wheeler, and M. Weiss.
1983 *Creating A Database: The City's Test Square*. In *Approaches to Preserving a City's Past*. Alexandria Urban Archaeology Program. City of Alexandria, Virginia.
- Binford, Lewis R.
1978 A New Method for Calculating Dates from Kaolin Pipe Stem Samples. In *Historical Archaeology: A Guide to Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*, edited by Robert L. Schuyler, pp. 66-67. Baywood Publishing Co., New York.

- Bridgewater, William, and Seymour Kurtz
1967 *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Cameron, Elisabeth
1986 *Encyclopedia of Pottery & Porcelain: 1800-1960*. Facts on File Publications, New York.
- Denker, Ellen, and Bert Denker
1985 *The Main Street Pocket Guide to North American Pottery and Porcelain*. The Main Street Press, Pittstown, New Jersey.
- Gilbert, Miles
1973 *Mammalian Osteo-Archaeology*. The Missouri Archaeological Society, Inc., Columbia, Missouri.
- Greer, Georgiana
1981 *American Stonewares, the Art and Craft of Utilitarian Potters*. Schiffer Publishing Ltd., Exton, Pennsylvania.
- Jackson, R.G., and R. Price
1974 *Bristol Clay Pipes: A Study of Makers and Their Marks*. Bristol City Museum Research Monograph, No.1. Bristol, England.
- Johnson, D.F.
1942 *The American Historical Buttons*. David F. Johnson, New Market, New Jersey.
- Jones, Olive R., and Catherine Sullivan
1985 *The Parks Canada Glass Glossary*. National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Ottawa.
- Kent, Brett, Ph.D.
1988 *Making Dead Oysters Talk*. Maryland Historical Trust. Historic St. Mary's City, Jefferson Patterson Park, Maryland.
- Ketchum, William C.
1983 *Pottery and Porcelain*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Klein, Terry, and Patrick H. Garrow
1984 *Final Archaeological Investigations at the Wilmington Boulevard, Monroe Street to King Street, Wilmington, New Castle County, Delaware*. Delaware Department of Transportation Archaeology Series No. 29. Dover, Delaware.
- Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. [LBA]
1987 *Druggists, Craftsmen, and Merchants of Pearl and Water Streets, New York: The Barclays Bank Site*. Prepared for London and Leeds Corporation and Barclays Bank PLC.
- Luscomb, Sally C.
1967 *The Collector's Encyclopedia of Buttons*. Crown Publishers, Inc., New York.
- Miller, George L.
1980 Classification and Economic Scaling of 19th Century Ceramics. *Historical Archaeology* 14:1-40.

- Munsey, Cecil
1970 *The Illustrated Guide to Collecting Bottles.* Hawthorn Books, New York.
- Nelson, Lee H.
1968 Nail Chronology as an Aid to Dating Old Buildings. *Historic News* 24:11.
- Noel Hume, Ivor
1970 *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Olsen, Stanley J.
1964 Mammal Remains from Archaeological Sites. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology* Volume 56, No. 1 , Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1968 Fish, Amphibian and Reptile Remains from Archaeological Sites. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology* Volume 56, No. 2 , Cambridge, Massachusetts.

1979 Osteology for the Archaeologist. *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology* Volume 56, Nos. 3, 4, and 5. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Panati, Charles
1987 *Extraordinary Origins of Everyday Things.* Harper & Row, New York.
- Pepper, Adeline
1971 *The Glass Gaffers of New Jersey and Their Creations from 1739 to the Present.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Randall, Mark E.
1971 Early Marbles. *Historic Archaeology* 5:102-105.
- Randall, Mark E., and Dennis Webb (editors)
1988 *Greenberg's Guide To Marbles.* Greenberg Publishing Company, Inc., Sykesville, Maryland.
- South, Stanley
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology.* Academic Press, New York.
- Stehling, Nancy A., and Meta F. Janowitz
1986 A Coding System for Computer Tabulation of Historic Ceramics. Paper presented at the 1986 CNEHA conference at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York.
- Towner, Donald
1963 *The Leeds Pottery.* Cory, Adams and Mackay Ltd., London.
- Walker, Iain C.
1977 Clay Tobacco Pipes, With Particular Reference to the Bristol Industry. *History and Archaeology* 11. Parks Canada, National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Ottawa.
- Walker, Rikki
1985 *A Guide to Post-Cranial Bones of East African Animals.* Hylochoerus Press, Norwich, England.