

fill is a secondary deposit which probably dates to the demolition of the structure early in this century.

Several test units were placed just inside the foundation walls and collectively they produced a wide variety of 19th century artifacts. It is likely that the 800-plus artifacts recovered came from a cellar, although time constraints did not permit the full delineation of a feature or features within the foundation walls. The grading of the site had truncated and blurred the features and made it difficult for the salvage excavators to determine the feature limits.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The interpretation of the features at the Glatz site involved an assessment of the size and shape of the feature, the artifact content, and the spatial position of each feature in relation to the house and to each other. As noted above, functions were ascribed to several features (bottle dump, posthole, general refuse, etc.) and are summarized in Table 2. In most cases, this function was based on the size and shape of the feature and on the quantity of artifacts recovered rather than on the types of artifacts found. The artifacts varied in number from one feature to another but not in type. The overwhelming majority of all artifacts recovered from the features were undifferentiated mid-19th century to early 20th century domestic ceramic and bottle glass fragments, and functional attributes could not be assigned for each feature based upon the recovered artifacts. In fact, it should be pointed out that the majority of artifacts from the site probably

date to the Walker's period of ownership of 1847 to 1912 and that few artifacts clearly date to the Glatz occupation or earlier.

The truncation of the western end of the stone foundation makes it difficult to accurately determine the dimensions of the dwelling, and this problem also prevented the archaeological examination of the possible "ten-footer" (Mulligan 1984), or shoe maker's workshop shown in the 1842 land plat (Figure 2) that may have been attached to that end of the structure. Two of the features identified (Nos. 26 and 27) may be interpreted as being trash pits associated with a shoe shop. Features 26 and 27 both contained shoe buckle fragments, and their location to the southwest of the foundation supports the interpreted location of the workshop on the west end of the dwelling. Feature 28 may have been utilized in the boiling or preparation of shoe leather, a common occurrence on shoe makers' sites (Mulligan 1984).

Numerous middle to late nineteenth century trash pits were located within 20 to 30 feet of the dwelling at this site (Figure 6), which is much closer than those of the same time period found at the Ferguson farmstead in Ogletown, Del. (Coleman et al. 1983:90) or at the Wilson-Slack complex outside Newark, Del. (Coleman et al. 1985:75). At these sites, refuse pits are generally two to three times as distant from the dwelling. The trash deposition pattern at the Glatz site is more typical of sites dating to the 18th and early 19th centuries rather than for the mid-19th century and later. However, this conclusion is admittedly suspect because it is probable that not all of the trash pits were excavated at this site and the data are incomplete.

While the tax assessment records demonstrated that the site was occupied by 1798, practically all of the temporally identifiable artifacts at this site postdate 1830 (primarily ceramics and bottle glass). Creamware (1762-1825) and pearlware (1780-1830), which should have been quite common, are very rare and three explanations for this are possible. (1) The earlier owners simply did not possess much creamware and pearlware. Considering that they were relatively inexpensive and affordable for nearly everyone during the years 1798-1830, this explanation is unlikely. (2) It could have been that on this site creamware and pearlware were little used ceramic types and thus infrequently broken. The owners may have owned sets of these ceramic types, but they may have been used only infrequently, perhaps on special occasions. Inexpensive red earthenwares, tin, and wooden vessels were perhaps used every day, and the redware, which is very common on the site, would have been broken much more frequently and thus discarded in greater numbers. Neither tin nor wood tablewares would likely be recovered archaeologically, and in fact none were. The former are very durable and would have been remelted into other objects by their owners after their lives as table items were exhausted. The latter would not survive in the ground unless contained in an anaerobic environment. (3) It could be that the refuse pits containing these earlier ceramics were not located during the salvage operations. This last explanation is probably the most likely.

Mean ceramic dates [MCD] were calculated for each cultural feature and for the entire site and are presented in Table 3. In most cases, the MCD was based upon large quantities of 19th century red earthenware and whiteware. The year 1785 was used as the mean ceramic date for trailed slip-decorated red earthenware and the year 1860 for all other red earthenwares. Not surprisingly, the calculated dates most often fell into the 1850s and 1860s. Notable exceptions were Features 3, 27, 31, 34, and 35, which yielded dates from 1785 to 1840. However, in these cases, the sample numbered 10 sherds or less and the dates are considered unreliable.

---

TABLE 3

MEAN CERAMIC DATES FOR FEATURES FROM THE GLATZ SITE

Feature	Ceramic Count	MCD
2	244	1854
3	4	1838.8
4	243	1857.5
7	141	1857
11	3	1860
12	6	1856.7
13	6	1855
14	9	1860.6
15	11	1855
18	1	1860
19	6	1860
21	427	1858.7
22	48	1859.7
23	33	1855.2
26	159	1856.7
27	9	1798.1
28	36	1858.5
29	50	1852.8
31	10	1828.5
32	22	1841.8
33	11	1855.9
34 & 35	5	1840
36	29	1856.3
Gen. Surface	231	1852.8
Total Site	1,744	1855.7

The MCD for all ceramics recovered from the site is 1855.7. If 1798 and 1912 are taken as the beginning and end dates of occupation of the site, then the historically documented mean date of occupation is 1855, which agrees very nicely with the MCD. However, the MCD is probably skewed upward due to the absence of pearlware and creamware. Because the site was only partially excavated and the artifact recovery was not systematic across the entire site (due to previous heavy mechanical disturbance and the salvage nature of the archaeological operations), the close agreement of the MCD and the historically documented date is probably more fortuitous than significant.

A comparison between Bernard Glatz's activities as a cordwainer and the economic practices of another small rural business, the Wilson-Slack Agricultural Implement Works (Coleman et al. 1985) serves to bring out several points about the significance of rural artisans and craftsmen in the local demography and economy. Alexander Wilson and his son John T. Wilson operated a wheelwright, blacksmith, and gristmilling operation from the mid-19th century to the 1920s at a location about two miles southeast of Newark, Delaware. Although the site is now completely destroyed, archaeology and archival documentation provided valuable insights into the Wilson business and its place in the economy of northern Delaware. The Wilsons emphasized two markets for their products: (1) the urban areas of Newark and Wilmington and (2) the farmers and other residents who lived close to the Wilson Complex. This is similar to the market pattern of farm products observed by Manning for the Inner Coastal Plain of New Jersey during the mid and late 19th century

(Manning 1984:49). In contrast, the cordwainers at the Glatz site, John Morrell (1821-1830) and Bernard Glatz (1833-1842), probably served only a local market, since their manufacturing capabilities probably were far more limited than at the Wilson-Slack Complex. This is reflected in the tax assessments for the two sites in the 1840s. John R. Hill, the blacksmith who owned the Wilson site in 1845, was assessed for several buildings and a total valuation of \$1,056. In 1841, Bernard Glatz was assessed for just one building and a total valuation of \$363. In sum, cordwainers Morell and Glatz provided a personal service to a local group of residents, while the Wilson-Slack owners provided a commercial community service as well as a manufactured product which could be distributed on a wider basis.

A comparison was also made between Bernard Glatz' inventory of 1842 and those of William Hawthorn of Stanton, whose estate was inventoried in 1840 (Coleman et al. 1985: Appendix VI); John Reed of Ogletown, whose belongings were sold at auction on March 22, 1833 (Coleman et al. 1983: Appendix 7); and Nicholas Lahuray of Ogletown, whose inventory was taken in 1837 (Coleman n.d.). These last three were selected because they were roughly contemporaneous with Glatz' inventory.

There is variation in the values of the personal property: Glatz was valued at \$170.62, Reed at \$533.50, Hawthorn at \$1,357.90, and Lahuray at \$654.49. Their occupations were also different: Glatz was a cordwainer, Reed a tenant farmer, Hawthorn a landed farmer, and Lahuray was both a farmer and watchmaker. It is recognized that the materials in the inventory exclude

forms of wealth like landholdings, bank accounts, mortgages held, and housing, and although there was no means to control for variables like numbers of persons in the household, quality of article, condition of article at time of appraisal, and market fluctuations, a comparison was made between items commonly named on all four lists (Table 4). William Hawthorn was clearly the wealthiest man of the four, which was expressed not only in the quality of items possessed, but in their quantity as well. However, it should be pointed out that this is apparent from only certain items when all four inventories are compared.

TABLE 4

VALUES OF COMMON ITEMS IN THE INVENTORIES OF  
BERNARD GLATZ AND THREE CONTEMPORARIES FROM  
THE SECOND QUARTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Item	Glatz 1842	Reed 1833	Hawthorn 1840	Lahuray 1837
Bed #1	\$11.00	7.75	25.00	14.50
Bed #2	6.00	1.00	18.00	12.00
Bed #3	5.00	1.00	10.00	3.00
Bed #4	1.25	1.75	2.75	9.25
Bed #5	-	.80	-	7.00
Bed #6	-	.60	-	-
Kit. pipe & stove	3.00	4.50	3.00	2.00
Kit and iron shovel & tongs	1.50	1.26	3.50(2)*	1.00
Windsor chairs	-	6.09(19)	6.50(10)	-
Spinning wheels	-	.30	1.50("several")	-
Looking glass	.25	1.20(2)	.75	7.75(3)
Clock or watch	5.00	10.00	6.00	6.00(2)
Riding carriage	6.50	10.00	115.00(2)	-
Horses	45.00(1)	10.00(1)	155.00(4)	100.00(3)
Cattle	12.00(1)	13.81(1)	200.00(20)	98.00(13)
Swine	5.00(2)	-	28.50(8)	6.00(2)
Saddle	3.00	5.00	-	-
Linen sheets	-	3.09(9)	4.50(3)	-
Wash stand	.37	.80	3.00	.37
Card table	.75	5.50(2)	-	-

\*number in parentheses represents multiple items

Utilitarian items like the kitchen stove, kitchen and irons, spinning wheels, and clocks and watches plus individual head of livestock have similar values on all four lists. Hawthorn owned much more livestock than the others and thus his total wealth in livestock is much greater.

From the compared items in the inventory, three things stand out as relative indicators of wealth: the value in beds and bedding, the value of riding carriages, and the quantity of livestock owned. Hawthorn has far more mahogany furniture, which may in part explain the higher assessed values for many of his furniture items, including the bedsteads. He owned two riding carriages worth a combined value of \$115.00, which accounted for 8.5% of the total value of the inventory. Reed owned one carriage worth \$10.00 (1.8% of total value), Glatz one for \$6.50 (3.8% of total value), and there was no listing for Lahuray. Hawthorn apparently placed high value on the display of his wealth through the purchase of fine carriages. Finally, Hawthorn owned 32 head of livestock as against 18 for Lahuray, 4 for Glatz, and 2 for Reed. The value per head of livestock is similar but the greater quantity owned constituted a form of wealth for Hawthorn and Lahuray.

The inferences drawn above from the inventory comparison are not meant to demonstrate that wealthier people own nicer things. Rather, it is intended to show that there is selectivity in which of the personal items will be used for the display of wealth in both interior settings (bedding and other furniture) and exterior settings (carriages) for the 1830s in northern New Castle County, Delaware. Conversely, the apparent value of other more



utilitarian items reflect no selectivity as display pieces on the part of the owners.

The archival documentation and archaeological investigations at the Bernard Glatz site have combined to suggest some interesting patterns in the analysis of small 19th century rural dwellings. Because the site was largely destroyed by the time excavations began, conclusions based upon archaeological evidence are somewhat limited. However, when the archaeological material is combined with a rich archival background, several important questions are raised. Although it is primarily a middle to late 19th century site, the pattern of refuse pits is more similar to the 18th century pattern, where trash deposition occurs close to the house, usually in side or rear yards. Nineteenth and twentieth century trash deposition patterns usually result in the refuse being thrown several hundred feet from the dwelling house. The disposal pattern seen at the Glatz site may be related to the small size of the land holding. Artifacts are common for the period 1830 to 1910, but relatively rare for the period 1798 to 1830, and the cause for this is unknown. Finally, it appears that the wealth of the families who lived here, if Bernard Glatz's inventory can be taken as typical, suggests that during this period, personal wealth was contained in such things as real estate, livestock, interior furniture, carriages, and farm implements, items which Glatz possessed in substandard form or not at all. Other items, such as ceramics, may not be especially useful for determining socio-economic status, even though these other items are often studied for these purposes by historic

archaeologists.

On a local scale, the Glatz property can be viewed as part of the single street village that was growing up around Mermaid Tavern and its attendant structures. The Glatz parcel was apparently never intended to be large or solely devoted to agriculture; rather it was meant from the beginning to be a craftsman's or artisan's landholding. Several other small, non-agricultural landholdings were noted for the area between Mermaid Tavern and Curtis Mill Road for the same time period by Catts, Schaffer and Custer (1986:66). These lots were also owned by craftsmen, or were commercial-oriented and included cordwainers, a clockmaker, a doctor, a mason and a cabinet maker (Table 5). The demise of the Glatz property, with Bernard Glatz's death in 1842, coincides closely with the decline of Limestone Road as a major transportation route in general, and with the Mermaid Tavern intersection in particular. From a regional perspective, the incorporation of the Glatz landholding into the larger Walker property is representative of the massive reworking of Delaware's built environment in the first half of the 19th century. Herman

---

TABLE 5

OCCUPATIONS OF LOT OWNERS BETWEEN MERMAID  
TAVERN AND PAPER MILL ROAD

Date	Name	Occupation	Deed Reference
1811	Simon Hadley	joiner/cabinetmaker	K-3-77
1817	Joseph H. Jackson	clockmaker	T-3-279
1821	John Morrell	cordwainer	Z-3-18
1830	Thomas Lupton	spinner & weaver	M-4-259
1831	William Wood	mason	N-4-112
1853	John McCabe	doctor	M-6-161

(1984:5), Catts et al. (1987), and Coleman et al. (1987) have noted a similar re-shaping in St. Georges Hundred and White Clay Creek Hundred.

During the first decades of the 19th century, population growth, over use of arable land, and poor farming practices caused major social and economic changes in New Castle County's man-made environment. Many farmers and landholders abandoned the land, and by the middle of the 19th century, fewer, large landholders emerged as the owners of the land. The reworking of the landscape effected most of the built environment of St. Georges Hundred (Herman 1984:5), and in the vicinity of Christiana Bridge and Ogletown, (Catts et al. 1987; Coleman et al. 1987) involved the changing of long-established property-lines and fences, tenant dwellings and homes, and road closings and relocations. The Glatz property is thus a small example of these social and economic changes on both local and regional scales.