part. The results of this historical inquiry can then be contrasted to the investigations conducted at the two black sites on Patterson Lane, outside of Christiana (Catts et al. 1989a), and to other black sites in the Northeast (Geismar 1982).

METHODOLOGY

ARCHIVAL METHODS

The Phase I and II archival research conducted by Lothrop et al. (1987) provided an excellent basic chronology of site occupation and function from 1835 to about 1925, and that report includes a summary of the background research undertaken. Therefore, archival research undertaken for the data recovery investigations of the Williams Site focused on identifying the period of occupation prior to 1835, and on providing more detailed historical data about the site's occupants and function through time. To obtain this information, additional historic sources not utilized by the Phase I and II investigations were consulted, including Pencader Hundred tax assessments from the nineteenth century, New Castle County deeds and probate documents (wills, administrations, inventories, estate sales, etc.), the U.S. manuscript census returns from 1850 to 1900, the Dr. Thomas Evans account book dating from the late eighteenth century, housed at the Special Collections of the Morris Library, The University of Delaware, several published church histories of the Pencader Presbyterian Church and that church's records, and interviews with several local residents. Beyond the immediate history of the site, research into the growth and

development of the crossroads village of Glasgow was also conducted in order to provide a regional and local historical context into which the Williams Site investigations could be viewed. This research included examinations of deeds, New Castle County Road Petitions and Returns, Delaware State Directories published in the second half of the nineteenth century (sort of informal censuses, recording name, address, occupation, and general local information) for the area, secondary literature on the area, and several maps not examined by the Phase I and II investigations. Due to the large amount of prehistoric material recovered during the data recovery program, background research was conducted into the region's prehistoric sites, and included a review of the prehistoric literature dealing with settlement and subsistence in the Upper Coastal Plain, and a review of the known prehistoric sites within the area for comparative purposes.

FIELD METHODS

Field investigations at the Williams Site began with the re-establishment and superimposition of the site grid which had been originally utilized in the Phase I and II investigations. This grid consisted of a 100' x 100' grid system, further divided into 10' x 10' sub-units. Next, in order to implement the research design and collect data on spatial organization and artifact distribution, a 25 percent stratified, systematic, unaligned sample (see Plog 1976) of the plowzone from the main portion of the site was conducted through the excavation of randomly selected 5' x 5' units from within the larger 10' x 10'

sub-units. Recent research utilizing plowzone soils and artifacts derived from plowzone contexts have suggested the importance of sampling this stratum of a site (Moir and Jurney 1987; Pogue 1988; Riordan 1988). Plowzone test units were excavated in one soil level, and all soils were screened through 1/4 inch wire mesh, and all artifacts recovered were bagged according to test unit provenience and grid coordinates. Following the sampling of the plowzone, the remaining plowzone was carefully removed mechanically with a grade-all, and all subsurface features were identified and mapped. Larger features were fully excavated and recorded, and all features were sectioned, plan viewed, and profiled. All soils from the features were screened and artifacts bagged in a similar fashion to that described for the plowzone units. Soil samples were collected from all cultural features, each of the 5' x 5' plowzone test units, and from the subsurface 10' x 10' sub-units. Chemical analyses of the soil samples were conducted by the Soils Laboratory of the University of Delaware College of Agriculture. Black and white and/or 35-mm color slides were taken of selected features, soil excavation profiles, and test unit plan views, and DelDOT personnel from the Office of Locational Studies took 35-mm and large format aerial photographs of the site and its environmental setting.

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 data recovery

excavations. All artifacts, bone and shell, were cleaned with plain water or, as in the case of deteriorating bone, were damp-brushed. Bone and shell were then placed in labeled bags, while other artifacts were themselves labeled with site numbers and a three-digit provenience number. Historic artifacts were sorted into categories for cataloguing based on their material composition; i.e., ceramics, bone, shell, nails, and glass. Prehistoric artifacts were processed and catalogued following the Island Field Museum guidelines. All lithic artifacts were catalogued according to raw material and functional categories including projectile point/knives, early and late stage bifaces, flake tools, debitage, and fire-cracked rocks (FCR). Total artifact counts of both historic and prehistoric artifacts for each unit and feature are provided in Appendix I.

Ceramics recovered from Features 2, 12, and 17 of the Williams Site were sorted as to ware type, and vessel reconstruction and cross-mending were carried out to arrive at minimum vessel estimates. 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 (South 1977), and additional numbers were obtained from Carlson (1983) (see Appendix V). Mean ceramic dates (MCDs) were obtained from South (1977) or from the adjusted dates found in Carlson (1983). The time-sensitive attributes and use-related descriptive vessel attributes were

entered into a computer data base program. Economic scaling of the ceramics recovered from the features at 7NC-D-130 was conducted utilizing the new index values provided by Miller (1988), and was also coded and entered into a computer data base program. The artifact data generated by the data recovery excavations of the Williams Site were organized into the functional group and classification system developed by South (1977), but no comparative analysis of artifact patterns was attempted (Majewski and O'Brien 1987).

Attributes recorded for each ceramic sherd and/or minimum vessel, if identified, were:

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

PLASTIC DECORATION: records decorations involving 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 in A Guide to the Artifacts of Colonial America (Noel-Hume 1978). Additional ceramic codification and dating were obtained from Brown (1982) and Carlson (1983). These types are useful as chronological markers and are used in generating

South's Mean Ceramic Date (MCD) Formula. The numbered types found in the Williams ceramic assemblage 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 position on the vessel; rim, base, body, or other, including handles and spouts, and totals.

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), and Brown (1982), used to calculate Mean Ceramic Dates for early nineteenth century contexts. Carlson (1983) has refined some of these dates, particularly for later nineteenth century wares, and these refined dates are used in this report.

Attributes that were recorded for each ceramic vessel that was reconstructed were:

A) Minimum number of vessels estimated
B) Mean Ceramic date on (A) above
C) Vessel Form, i.e.,
    1) flatware or hollowware
    Drinking form - cups, or mugs and jugs
D) Vessel Function
    1) dining (tableware)
    2) drinking (tea and coffeeware)
    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 of the Williams Site was basic to intra-site and inter-site ceramic assemblage comparisons, which will be explained more fully later in this report.

SITE HISTORY

The Williams Site did not exist as a separate tract of land before the last decade of the eighteenth century. Prior to that date, the property, located in the Welsh Tract, was part of a larger plantation which could trace its history back to the early 1720s, when Roger Williams consolidated two tracts into a 137 acre farm (NCCD G-1-244). In 1741, Williams willed the land to his son, Thomas Williams, who in turn willed the property in 1766 to his sons William Williams and Morris Williams, stipulating that it be sold for the use of his three daughters, Margaret, Elizabeth, and Jane. On February 16, 1768, the Williams brothers conveyed the land to John Bowen. Bowen in turn sold the plantation to William Thompson of Pencader Hundred in December 1782 for £525 (NCCD E-2-218).

Two years later in 1784, Thompson's will indicated that his property was to be sold and divided among his children, James, Ann, and Elizabeth Thompson, except for two parcels, consisting of a "store house, new house and lot adjoining in Aikentown and one lot of woodland". These parcels were to be appraised, allowing for the repairs recently made by James, and the first right of refusal was to go to his son James Thompson. If any of his heirs kept the house and lot, then Jane Thompson, William's wife, was to have access to "that one Room + fireplace up