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Introduction

This Interim Report outlines work done on the site to date, preparatory to the commencement of archaeological excavation.

Excavation Equipment

Considerable work has been carried out in organizing excavation equipment from the Dept. of Public Works, BC and M, from the Heritage and Conservation Branch of the Department of Environment and Planning, and the Aboriginal and Historic Resources Section of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, NSW, which has kindly agreed to lend me some material.

Volunteer Assistants

So far thirteen student archaeological assistants have been organized to assist in excavating the site.

Conference on the 1838 Volume of the Bicentennial History

As a member of the Collective writing the 1838 Volume of the Bicentennial History, on 3 and 4 February I attended a two day conference at the ANU in Canberra. At the conference, attended by eighteen historians specializing in the early colonial period, that is, the period of the life of the First Government House, I outlined the project and asked the participants whether they had any research questions which might be investigated during the excavations. One of the members of the Committee, Sandy Blair, of the Department of History, University of New South Wales, is writing a doctorate on the history of the Sydney Gazette, the first newspaper, which was printed in one of the outbuildings of Government House from 1803 to about 1807. Ms. Blair has committed herself to join the excavation as a volunteer for the full fieldwork period. Her assistance will be invaluable in interpreting any of the press material which might be found in the course of the excavations.

It was suggested by Dr. Barrie Oyster of the University of New South Wales that it would be important to know whether the governor’s dairy cattle were housed in the outbuildings of government house at night. The governor’s herd grazed in the Domain, for during the time of Governor Gipps a trade union leader who hanged himself in the Domain was found one morning by the Governor’s dairyman who was looking after the cattle.
The Draft Historical Report by Helen Proudfoot has been analysed with particular attention being given to the number of plans and speculative reconstructions discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 of her Report.

By comparing certain aspects of the plans, which are all at different scales, using proportional dividers, it seems that the privy block shown in Mortimer Lewis' 1845 Plan was still standing in the 1880s. The block is shown on the Trig Survey of 1865; the plan published in H. Percy Dove's Directory of 1880, and the City of Sydney Plan of 1884.

I present these plans on the following pages. The privy block is circled on the plans.

The plan of 1845 in the Frank Walker papers of the RAHS does not accord with this speculation. By projecting the position of the block in the Walker plan on to a present day plan you reach the position for it speculated by Bob Irving in his Report Old Government House Site for New World Properties, 1982.

I present these plans following the others on the preceding pages.

It seems to me that Brian Roser's superimposition of the Lewis main building and kitchen block on the City of Sydney 1884 plan gives the most likely actual position of the First Government House. Here, the extant privy block lies behind the kitchen block, as it does in Lewis' 1845 plan.

I will carry out more detailed and accurate superimposition work on these plans with a copying machine held at the Design Section of the NSW and kindly made available to me. In my Draft Final Report to the Heritage and Conservation Branch I will outline this question in more detail.

My conclusion now is that Brian Roser has pointed to the most likely location of the First Government House.

His theory coincides with the work I have done so far.

The final plan I present in this section is the present day plan with the site of the privy block marked on it. This accords with the Trig Survey of 1865, and the City of Sydney Plan of 1884. The measurements were taken from the H. Percy Dove plan of 1880.
Prior to the demolition of Old Government House in 1845, the Colonial Architect, Mortimer Lewis, was commissioned to make this drawing of the building. It is a confusing drawing because the upper floor plan is shown rotated and does not 'fit' the ground floor plan, and there are no site boundaries shown. This makes it impossible to reconcile accurately with the nearby street alignments. (State Archives).
This plan, drawn by an unknown surveyor in 1845, shows the relationship of the new parts of Phillip, Elizabeth (now Young) and Castlereagh (now Loftus) streets to the old buildings of Bridge Street, including Old Government House. The purpose of the drawing was to illustrate yet another proposed new street "at right angles to those leading to the Circular Quay". (R.A.H.S. Collection).
A modern attempt to reconcile accurately the outline of Old Government House with the present boundaries and services. (David Logan, 1982).
The site as it is today, from a recent study. The cut-off north east corner helped trains to turn the corner (see xxxix). (NSW Government).
Preparation of Site for Excavation

Photographs were taken in Ektachrome 35mm film of various aspects of this process.

Thursday 27 January

I inspected the site and worked out in which areas to remove bitumen, leave baulks, and so on. The GAB had organized with a contractor to remove and take away all the bitumen from the site.

I decided to leave a baulk of about 50 cm around the perimeter of the whole parking lot, plus baulks in several areas as reference sections. These can be easily removed later if future research dictates it. So plan following for a plan of the site showing bitumen, blinding, area of blinding removed, test holes, etc.

Friday 28 January

I discussed progress with the Historic Buildings Group of the GAB, particularly Geoff Griffiths and Brian Roser, and picked up several copies of a large scale plan of the site.

I photographed the site from the roof of the Chief Secretary’s Building in Phillip Street.

I checked further photographs of the site in the Government Printer photograph section at the Archives Office of NSW.

Monday 31 January

I designed a pro-forma sheet for the excavators and contacted some prospective volunteers.

Tuesday 1 February

On site 7am. The bulldozer driver and truck driver who was to remove the bitumen from the site had already entered the site by cutting the padlocked chainsto both double gates in Raphael Place with bolt cutters.
The site as it is today, from a recent study. The cut-off north east corner helped trams to turn the corner (see xxxix). (NSW Government)
The bulldozer driver removed the bitumen according to the plan I gave him. The carpark had lines 2m 40cm apart painted on the bitumen - for cars to be parked between. The driver was able to use these lines as a guide when leaving the baulks, with bitumen intact. He worked most carefully and efficiently, making sure that he knew exactly what I wanted before he continued digging.

When I arrived at the site he had already dug two test holes to see the depth of the blinding. This mixture of gravel and sand, laid down before the bitumen to make a flat surface for it to be poured onto, was seen to be about 30cm (1 foot) deep, in both places.

It had been supposed by the GAB that the blinding would be only about 10cm deep at the most. At the request of Geoff Griffiths, GAB, a further test hole was dug on the northern part of the site about 2 m from the north wall, at a point between the two gum trees. This hole too went down about 30cm before reaching the brown sand and clay deposit beneath the blinding.

It had at first been decided that the blinding would be removed all over the site where it was exposed. With its unpredicted depth now realized, and the unacceptable increased cost of removing it all, I was asked by Geoff Griffiths to designate one area where it could be removed. I decided on the northern part of the site - that being most likely to reveal evidence of the main building and the kitchen block.

The south-east corner of the site was decided on for the temporary storage of the blinding as it would allow the most efficient removal of the material from the site, by a truck being able to back in through the double boom gates right up to the pile.

**Wednesday 2 February**

All the bitumen to be removed had been removed from the site. On this day the blinding was to be removed from the agreed on northern area of the site, and piled in the south-east corner.

On site 8am.

When the blinding was removed it revealed a mixture of orange/yellow clay and sand with brick rubble visible. This deposit was to the touch. Even in this time of drought, on a site on which the sun...
beats down from 10am to about 5 or 6 pm - the deposit was damp. Perhaps this is why the blinding was so surprisingly thick - to protect the bitumen from damp.

This shows clearly that the dampness of the site, which plagued the governors from 1798 onwards, rotting the timber floors of government house, is still present.

Embedded in the surface of the sand/clay deposit were sandstone rocks; broken bricks - some very roughly made hand-made sandstocks, and some which could have been made in the last ten years; sherds of blue and white transfer printed pottery; bases and parts of the body of black glass bottles; pieces of light blue moulded glass. In other words - artifacts from all periods of the site's use.

A surface collection of some pieces was made.

Test Trench

In order to test the depth and consistency of this northern deposit a test trench was ripped using one tyne, about 7cm wide, of the bulldozer. This penetrated the ground about 30 cm and was run about 2m from the northern brick wall, and parallel to it.

In the north-east part of the site the trench revealed bedrock, or perhaps fill of large stones; flagstones like those on the bike parking lot to the east of the site, thick mortar made with broken shell for lime, bricks and other material filling a hole to the west of the site, at the level of the two trees. In this fill was a fragment of what appears to be a clayroof tile, in that it looks like the pieces of clay roof tile I excavated at Elizabeth Farm. If this is the case this fragment is very early - of the 1788 period. At that time some buildings were covered with clay roof tiles, which were seen to be unsuitable, and soon replaced with wooden shingles.

Further to the west recent stoneware drainpipes were revealed. These would be from the period of the "T in shed" and are marked on the M2 and DB plan of services for that building.

The trench was completed as the bulldozer couldn't manoeuvre any further. Work was completed with the bulldozer on the site.
At about 11am on this day Mr. Tom Forgan, the Project Director for Hongkong Land Australia visited the site. He wishes to consult me about continuity of work on the site by me perhaps being engaged by his company to complete the archaeological research. Mr. Forgan is familiar with archaeological processes, having worked on many sites at Chichester, where Roman ruins were revealed in the course of excavation for buildings.

3 and 4 February

For these two days I attended the Committee meeting for the 1838 Volume of the Bicentennial History at the ANU in Canberra.

Monday 7 and Tuesday 8 February

On these days I organized equipment, sought more volunteer excavators, and compiled and wrote this Report.

Excavation Plans

The site will be laid out in a grid pattern of 2m squares.

Excavation will concentrate on the northern part of the site where the blinding has been removed, excavating in a chequerboard pattern, so that the largest area possible can be explored.

Excavation units will be stratigraphic layers, spits, or features, according to what is found.

Some squares will be opened up to the south of the site in the region of the privy block. However, this area of the carpark has been dug up to one metre's depth into the sandstone bedrock, probably for flattening out the site when the "tin shed" was built in 1912. See air photo of the site taken in January 1947, showing the "tin shed" building covering the site. It is possible then that all evidence of the privy structure has been removed.

Squares will be opened to the south-west section of the site, simply to sample the area.

The northern portion, that with the blinding removed, seems to me the most crucial in revealing any evidence which may be left of the First Government House. Excavation here may reveal both the main building and the kitchen block, following the speculative reconstructions of Brian Roser and myself.
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INTRODUCTION

The Site

The site to be investigated under this Contract is the NSW government property on the corner of Bridge and Phillip Streets (Fig. 1). It includes the Car Park, the rear of the Phillip Street and Young Street terraces, and that area outside the Car Park brick wall and inside the wooden hoarding along Bridge and Phillip Streets between the terraces.

The First Season of Excavation, Stage I

The Department of Environment and Planning engaged me to carry out a preliminary excavation of the site, following the completion of the historical research by Ms. Helen Proudfoot - The First Government House, Sydney, and the Subsequent History of the Site, After 1845, 17 March 1983. The excavation commenced on Tuesday 15 February 1983 and was completed by Wednesday 2 March 1983.

On 20 February 1983 the footings of the rear wall of Governor Phillip’s house were first revealed. These were further explored, their excavation reaching its final form as shown in Figure 2c.

The continuation of these footings was revealed to the west in area 38R26 (Fig. 2d).

Other in situ features of the First Government House exposed in the first season’s excavation were:
- a brick barrel drain in trench 32R31.50
- a brick sided drain capped with sandstone blocks in trench 30.5R36. (See Figs. 2a and 2b for locations).

Constraints of funding restricted this excavation season to sixteen days. At the end of this time, the beginning of March, the excavated trenches were covered with galvanized iron and heavy duty plastic weighed down with stones.

The Second Season of Excavation, Stage IIa

On 30 May 1983 I was engaged by the Department of Environment and Planning for a further 12 weeks excavation of the site.

Before excavation was to commence, a two week preparatory period was provided for, to arrange for supervisors and volunteer workers, and to organize the equipment and logistics to set up the site for work. The second season of excavation commenced on Wednesday 15 June.
CHAPTER I. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Issues - actually the importance of the site

Colonisation

How England placed a colony at Sydney Cove, 12,000 miles from home, in another hemisphere, in an alien clime; and how those people so placed attempted to deal with their situation.

How some continued to struggle and call England home;

How some came to terms with the situation, and adapted their new knowledge to the immediate problems and possibilities of the environment.

This site contains material evidence from the very first year of settlement to the symbolic creation of Australian self-confidence by the construction of the new government house - the great Gothic stone pile in the Inner Domain - and the destruction of the first government house as it stood in 1845.

Technological Evidence

The site embodies technological evidence, and can answer many questions not solved by research into the written documents, pictures, maps, and plans. It reveals how footings, walls and drains were constructed, what materials were used, what were their sources, what were the processes in making and using these materials, what English models were followed, what adaptations of those models took place, what forces demanded these changes, and what new materials and processes were developed - i.e. what artifacts were Australian made, and what imported from Europe.

Such information can only be revealed by combining what is known from the diarists' and governors' reports with the evidence revealed by meticulous excavation and scientific tests of materials.

Symbolic Value

The First Government House is of great symbolic value.

It was not only the home of the governors and their families and servants for the first fifty years of settlement. It was also the centre of administration - the place
where decisions were made on the management and fate of the convicts, military, free settlers, and Aborigines.

The journals of Watkin Tench, who wrote of the first four years of settlement, make vividly clear Governor Phillip's attempts to understand, incorporate, and control the Aborigines. Aboriginal people lived in his house for long periods of time; they visited him, asked after him, and Arakanoo (Manly), the first man captured by Phillip, was buried in the garden of government house. Indeed, they did.

The Evidence of First Government House Revealed in the Excavations of February 1983 (Figs. 2a, b, c, and d).

The house foundations revealed in the first season in the northern part of the site are interpreted as being the back wall of Phillip's house by two primary elements of evidence:

1) In the 1845 Plan of the house by the Colonial Architect, Mortimer Lewis (Fig. 3) the front three rooms of Phillip's house are shown. The back wall was removed in Macquarie's extensions of 1811. (Fig. 4)

In 1891 the foundation plaque laid by Phillip on May 15 1788 was found between the foundation stones revealed near the present corner of Bridge and Phillip Streets during the excavation of a tunnel along the Bridge Street footpath to lay telephone cables. Phillip laid the plaque at the south-east corner of his house.

By orienting and scaling the 1845 plan with the present site plan it can be seen that the foundations revealed in excavation are footings of the back wall of Phillip's house. (Fig. 5 and 6)

2) The footings revealed contain mortar of pure pipeclay, containing no lime. This indicates a very early date for these footings as the early diarists were often commenting on the lack of lime to be found. Dr. George Gibbons, Chairman of the Materials Conservation Group of the Heritage Council, considers that these must be before 1806, and are consistent technologically with a 1788-1789 date. The diarists record that bricks were being made in the Colony as early as February 1788. (See Appendix 3).

Other structures revealed in the February season were a brick barrel drain cut into the bedrock, and a stone capped brick drain lying on bedrock.

Artifacts from the period 1788-1983 including bottle glass, window glass, clay tiles, clay smoking pipes, bones, ceramics, metal, and building materials, were revealed in the excavation.

Historical research carried out by myself and Ms. Helen Proudfoot which revealed early documents, drawings, paintings, engravings, photographs, maps, and plans of the site, and published by Ms. Proudfoot in her report - The First Government House, Sydney, And the Subsequent History of the Site After 1845, 17 March 1983, support this excavated evidence.
Aim of The Second Season Excavation

The primary aim of this season's excavation is to continue to explicate the Lewis 1845 plan of the First Government House, and the other associated illustrations and descriptions of the house and outbuildings from 1788 until its demolition in 1845.

This research will make a substantive contribution to our understanding of Australia's early technological processes and contribute to the development of middle range theory in historical archaeology in Australia.

Methodology

A grid of 2 metre squares has been laid out over the site. This is a reference datum system which is infinitely extendable.

Trial trenching of trenches 50cm wide within the grid has taken place in order to trace walls and features of the First Government House following the overlay of the 1845 plan to test the maximum area in the minimum time. When features have been revealed the trenches are opened out and the structures followed.

The site team works Wednesday to Sunday so that volunteers who can only work on weekends can be used. The Administrator works at the Site Office Tuesday to Saturday. Official working hours are 8am to 4pm, but the site supervisors usually stay back sorting and describing finds to 5.30 or 6 pm each night, and so work a 9 or 10 hour day. I have been working that 9 to 10 hour day five days a week on site as a minimum per day, and have been working on administrative work, meetings, or research, on Mondays and Tuesdays, our rest days, as well, working a seven day week. I do not envisage continuing to work on this project for seven days a week in the future, as in the long term it can only lead to decreased efficiency.

The site is excavated by trowelling, picking with geology picks, adzes, miners picks, or crowbars, as appropriate. Earth-moving machinery is to be used in the south-east corner of the site and in the Phillip Street area between the brick wall and the hoarding - to remove any overburden, thereby speeding up the excavation process, so that excavation by hand is used only where necessary.
Constraints on The Research Design

On Friday 3 June I was rung by Mr. J. Moore, Premier's Department, and asked if I could "clear" the column sites in the north-west section of the site for the 38 storey office block to be constructed by the Joint Venturers. At the Joint Steering Committee Meeting on site on Friday 17 June I indicated that, as requested by the Premier's Department, I would give this my first priority. The surveyors employed by the architects for the Joint Venturers - Jackson, Teece, Chesterman and Willis, were pegging out the three three metre square areas to be so excavated on that day.

Consequently, to date excavation has centred on the eastern and central pillar sites. The third site, in the backyard of Young Street terrace No. 36, has yet to have its bitumen and concrete covering removed, and has therefore not yet been examined.

The remainder of the work has consisted of revealing the outbuildings shown on the 1845 plan by trial trenching and excavation of squares in the south-west half of the site.

Further work on the northern part of the site, excavating the 1788 footings revealed in February 1983, was attempted in Week 2 but forced to cease, as the trees impinging on the area were in danger of being undermined and destroying the footings. Further, the brick wall to the north of the footings was yet to be demolished. The real possibility of falling brickwork damaging the fragile excavated areas was avoided by concentrating all excavation in the area on the pillar sites which had top priority, and placing the remainder of the team in the south-west area of the site. Once the brick wall has been demolished, efforts will be concentrated in further revealing the 1788 building and its additions in the northern part of the site.
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Archaeological Plan of First Government House Site, March 1983, showing the stone and brick foundations so far revealed in the trenches excavated on the site. The broken line shows the probable position of Phillip's 1788 Government House.

FIG. 6. FEB. EXCAVATIONS IN RELATION TO THE 1788 BUILDING.
CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SITE

Like any building site in use over a long period of time this site reveals a series of clearings, erections, and demolitions, with all the building work associated with such constructions.

1788 Clearing of the site for building the Governor's house.

1788-1789 Building the Governor's house, outbuildings, drains, and well.

1794 Addition of verandah by Governor Hunter.

1801 Additions by Governor King.

1811 Additions by Governor Macquarie.

1816 Further additions by Governor Macquarie.

1826-1827 Further additions by Governor Darling.

1827-1845 Further minor additions and repairs by later governors.

Throughout this period there were constructions, demolitions, and alterations to the gardens, drains, and outbuildings, which are not recorded in the documents but revealed only through excavation. Further works are likely to be revealed as excavation continues.

1845-1847 Demolition of the First Government House and sale of the bricks.

1847 c.1865 Abandonment of the site.

1865 First evidence of subsequent buildings on the site in the form of sheds shown in the 1865 Trigonometrical Survey of Sydney plan. The site was then occupied by Bernard McGlade, a carter and drayman.

1880s-1890s The site was occupied by John McHugh, fuel merchant, Luigi Garrino, fruiter, and J. McGlade.

c.1912 Demolition and clearing of the site for the construction of the Public Works Department (PWD) "Tin Shed".


1970 Demolition of the Tin Shed and clearing of the site.

1979 Construction of the Public Service Car Park.

1983 Demolition of Car Park for excavation.
FIG. 4. DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE OF FIRST GOVERNMENT HOUSE 1788 - 1849.
CHAPTER III

THE FIRST FIVE WEEKS OF EXCAVATION, TO 17 JULY 1983

Introduction

Under the terms of my contract the area to be investigated archaeologically is to include the Car Park, the area inside the hoarding and to the east of the brick wall in Phillip Street, the area inside the hoarding to the north of the brick wall in Bridge Street, and the area at the rear of the terraces in Phillip and Young Streets.

To date the excavation has taken place in the Car Park within the brick wall. On Sunday 17 July the brick wall to the east of the site was demolished by the contractor by hand and with a bulldozer. The demolition spoil is still over the area, which has not yet been investigated.

The Excavation Team

The team consists of myself as Director; Ms. Robyn Stocks and Ms. Alexandra Kelly as Assistant Directors; Mr. Denis Gojak, Ms. Sue McIntyre, Ms. Danielle Lautrec, and Mr. Andrew Wilson as Supervisors; and Ms. Joanna Lewis as Administrator. An average of twenty volunteers, only three of whom had had previous excavation experience, came to work five days per week, and an extra fifteen or so people volunteered for weekend work. The Conservator, Ms. Glennda Marsh, was seconded from the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Michael Pearson from the National Parks and Wildlife Service, and Ms. Helen Temple from the Department of Environment and Planning were seconded to the excavation as experienced archaeologists. Ms. Marsh commenced work at the beginning of the season, and Dr. Pearson and Ms. Temple commenced work on Wednesday 13 July.

Specialist assistance has been given by Ms. Lindy Kerr, Photographer, DEP, who photographs the site four days per week; Mr. Roy Lawrie, Soil Scientist, NSW Department of Agriculture, who has attended on site one day per week; Dr. George Gibbons, Head of the School of Economic Geology New South Wales Institute of Technology, and Chairman of the Materials Conservation Group, Heritage Council of NSW, has attended on site for three days; and several surveyors from the Department of Lands, under the head surveyor Mr. Barry Preston, have surveyed the site and prepared a contour plan and base map.

Informal assistance in scaling off the Lewis...
1845 plan and providing us with blueprints, plus giving
useful historical references has been provided by Mr.
Brian Roser, architectural historian of the Historic
Buildings Group, GAB, under Mr. Geoffrey Griffiths, who has
kindly made available the facilities of his office. The
Aboriginal and Historic Resources Section of the NPWS, NSW,
has generously loaned the excavation nine sieves, several
shovels, tapes, and other excavation equipment, while that
equipment owned jointly by the PWD and the DEP and stored
by B C and M, PWD, was being sought.

Plan of Action

1) Clear the south-east corner of the Car Park whose
sandstone base had been dug deeply to flatten out the site
to take the Tin Shed, for the excavation spoil heap.

Any evidence of the First Government House would
have to have been dug into the bedrock some one or two
metres deep and would be visible in plan. This area was
an ideal place to train the volunteers, for any errors made
would relate to the bulk of the material from the demolition
of the Tin Shed.

2) Excavate the eastern and central pillar sites in
the northern part of the site as requested by the Premier's
Department.

3) Excavate the remainder of the spoil heap area by
mechanical excavation, following the bedrock.

4) Lay out 50cm trial trenches in the south-west part
of the site and excavate the outbuildings drawn in the
1845 plan. Once walls or features from the pre-1845
occupation are found, open out the trenches and follow the
evidence.

5) At the same time as 4) follow on any evidence of the
First Government House in the northern part of the
site exposed in the pillar squares, and further examine
the 1788 footings and other structures exposed in the
February excavation season, once the brick wall has been
demolished.
The Excavation

Week 1: Wednesday 15 - Sunday 19 June

On site: Supervisors, Administrator, Conservator, and Director.

The excavation grid was set out in preparation for the 20 volunteers to commence work on 22 June.

The trenches and squares excavated in the February season were cleaned out of the mud and debris which had collected in them since the end of the season. Although covered with galvanized iron and heavy duty plastic weighed down with stones, the mud and leaves had made their way into the trenches following the torrential rains and winds experienced between February and the middle of June.

Excavation commenced in the south-east corner of the site to clear the area for the spoil heap.

Several trips to hardware stores and stationers were made by the Director and the Administrator to purchase equipment, as the Establishment Fund cheque, to be made available at the signing of the Contract on 30 May, was not provided until Friday 10 June. Therefore there was no money available to set up the excavation.

Surveyors from the Lands Department began their survey of the site.

On Friday 17 June Surveyors Frank Mason and Co. surveyed in the pillar locations for the Project Architects.

At the first meeting of the FGH Joint Steering Committee held on site at 10am on Friday 17 June I reported that many facilities which were agreed to be organized by various government departments at the joint meeting of 24 May had not yet been provided i.e. electricity, telephone, hot water, office and laboratory furniture, heating, plastic to cover the trenches, and the access entry in the wall between the site and the Young Street terraces. This made site work most difficult, as the weather was extremely cold, and there had been intermittent rain, and no office facilities or site amenities were available to keep the staff warm and victualled.

On Saturday it rained heavily all day and Sunday the rain continued intermittently. Work continued in the rain, or in the Young Street terraces, being set up as the site offices.

On Tuesday 21 June, a rest day, the Administrator and myself purchased stationary and field equipment and the two Assistant Directors continued to set up the site offices, now that some furniture had arrived, and the electricity had been provided.

The surveyors from the Lands Department continued to survey the site.
Meetings and Visitors

Wednesday 15 June  Meeting: 12.00 Mr. Jack Darby, Surveyor General. 2.00 Mr. Barry Preston, head surveyor, Department of Lands, and two others. 3.00 Dr. Alan Atkinson, Dr. Marion Aveling, Dr. Stephen Foster, and Ms. Beverley Earnshaw, Editors of the 1838 Volume of the Bicentennial History.

Visitors: to offer assistance as needed - Ms. Helen Bauer, Premier's Department, and Mr. Geoffrey Griffiths, GAB.

Thursday 16 June  Meetings: Two surveyors from the Lands Department. Mr. G. Griffiths, GAB.

Visitors: Mr Robert Hawkins, Project Architect; Mr. Tom Forgan, Northpoint Holdings; Mr. David Hurst, journalist with The Australian.

Friday 17 June  Meetings: 10.00 Joint Steering Committee, First Government House Site: Cairnes, Temple, Moore, Bauer, Pomeroy-Smith, Wade, Griffiths.

11.30 Frank Mason and Co. Surveyors for the Project Architects.

Week 2: Wednesday 22 - Sunday 26 June

Volunteers arrived. Continued excavating the spoil heap area in trenches 2m wide and 8m long.

Excavations commenced on the eastern and central pillar locations.

The area 38R26 excavated in the February season was further investigated down to the red and white clay layer which appears over most of the area and immediately overlies the 1788 footings. Excavation here was forced to stop as the roots of the tree in the northern part of the square made further excavation difficult and dangerous to execute.

The eastern pillar location revealed stone footings of the back wall of Phillip's house in line with those parts excavated in the February season, plus the side wall running north-south. (See Fig.6, Helen Proudfoot's projection from the February excavation season of where the building might lie). The area was much disturbed by later intrusions of stoneware drainage pipes for water and sewerage for the Tin Shed, and many post holes of various periods.

Further excavation equipment was purchased throughout the week, as were paper bags, plastic bags, cardboard boxes, and other site equipment.
500 site record sheets and other excavation record sheets were printed.

On Wednesday 22 June and Saturday 25 June the site Bookkeeper, Ms. Helen Gillam, worked on the records in the site office.

On Saturday 25 June Australian Heritage Commissioner Professor Isabel McBryde visited the site to inspect the works and to excavate for the day. Commissioner Joan Domecilj also visited the site in the afternoon.

On Saturday and Sunday the first group of weekend volunteers commenced work.

Saturday and Sunday were very cold on site and the team was forced to dig in most difficult conditions.

On Monday 27 June, a rest day for the team, I carried out research in the Mitchell Library pictures collection, and found the only known early photograph of the Tin Shed, taken in 1926.

Meetings and Visitors

Wednesday 22 June  Mr. R.B. Smyth  Director, DEP.
4.00 L.Cairnes and H. Temple.  5.00 L.Cairnes, H. Temple, S. Sullivan, M. Shearman, M. Pearson.
10.00am Site Meeting - Moore, Bauer, Pash, Forgan, Burkitt.
Visitors: Mr. Bob Irving and Mr. Alan Roberts, Councillors RAHS, F.J. and H.I. Everingham, Fellowship of First Fleeters.

Thursday 23 June  1.30 H. Gillam, Bookkeeper.
3.00 Dave Morrisey, Tranby College.

Friday 24 June  Meetings: 12.00 Archaeological Advisory Panel, FGH Sub committee.
2.00 Joint Steering Committee Meeting - Moore, Bauer, Cairnes, Temple, Pomeroy-Smith, Wade.

Saturday 25 June  Visitors: Professor I. McBryde, Commissioner J. Domecilj, Ms. Meredith Walker.

Sunday 26 June 1983  Visitors: Mr. R.B. Smyth plus two children. Mr. R. Rowe plus two children.

Week 3: Wednesday 29 June - Sunday 3 July (See Fig. 7)

By Wednesday 29 June the train strike had started. This effected the number of the excavation team, which was virtually cut in half. Because of transport problems workers arrived late and had to leave early. Nevertheless, the work proceeded at a steady progress.

On Wednesday the site telephone was installed, and all the equipment that could be found in the stores of BC&G that had been deposited there by the GAB following the conclusion of the Mint and Barracks excavation was delivered to the site. (See Fig. 8). This equipment, of trowels, shovels, buckets, brushes, seives, etc. was to have arrived at the site for the beginning of the excavation on Wednesday 15 June. All that could be found and were delivered to the site were two large frame seives, plus some extra frames, with mesh too fine to be used on this site. The excavation equipment used to replace this lost material was either purchased from the Establishment Fund, or borrowed from the National Parks and Wildlife Service through the Aboriginal and Historic Resources Section.

Excavation continued in four areas of the site:

A 50cm trial trench running north-south was continued from the northern trench in the south-east corner of the site for 8 metres. The northernmost two metres revealed evidence of the First Government House occupation deposit.

The trial trench in the south-west segment of the site, set out to reveal walls of the outbuildings shown in the 1845 plan, began to show what appeared to be First Government House deposits, so the team in the eastern north-south trench was moved parallel to the south-west trench, but 2 metres to the west.

Excavation continued in the eastern and central pillar locations in the northern part of the site. Both revealed much disturbance from the Tin Shed drains and entrance areas off Bridge Street. These later structures lay above, and cut into the FGH footings of walls, and drains.

On Monday 4 July and Tuesday 5 July, our rest days, I worked in my office studying the journals of the early diarists - Watkin Tench and George Worgan, and took site film to the processing laboratories.

On both days there was heavy rain.

Meetings and Visitors

Wednesday 29 June Meeting: 2.00 Bauer, Cairnes, Temple.
Thursday 30 June Meeting: 12.00 Archaeological Advisory Panel FGH Subcommittee: Sullivan, Pearson, Cairnes, Temple.
2.00 H. Bauer, Premier's Department.
Visitors: Ms. J. Birmingham, Mr. Geoff Armstrong, NPWS.

Friday 1 July Meetings: 2.00 Joint Steering Committee: Moore, Bauer, Cairnes, Temple, Wade, Griffiths, Pomeroy-Smith.
4.00 Professor K. Cable, Heritage Council.
4.00 Mr. Brown, City Council, to inspect trees for demolition.
Visitors: Paul Johnson, Ms. J. Birmingham, John Pash.

Saturday 2 July Meetings: Dr. George Gibbons.
Visitors: Professor RVS Wright and wife and son. Professor Sandy Yarwood. Ms. Helen Proudfoot.

Sunday 3 July
Visitors: Mrs. Nell Sansom and husband.

Week 4: Wednesday 6 July – Sunday 10 July (See Fig. 9)

The train strike continued, as did the rain.
The rain was so heavy on Wednesday it was impossible to work, and those volunteers who arrived were sent home. The first half of the following day was taken up with cleaning and mopping up from the previous three days of rain.

The excavation followed the work of the previous week, concentrating on the south-west half of the site, plus the central and eastern pillar sites to the north.

In the south-west section the rubble from the collapse of the FGH outbuildings was revealed, and three trenches opened out to further explore this evidence.

In the central pillar site footings of a wall plus an early brick stone-capped drain with pipeclay mortar and a clay and sandstone rubble base was followed west.

To the north of this pillar site a blackish sandy clay fill was excavated which contained many early artifacts including pottery of about 1800, clay pipe stems and bowls, bottle glass, window glass, clay tiles, and a coin of 1806.

The eastern pillar site continued to reveal the western and southern wall of Phillip's house, with a tamped sandy clay and pebble floor inside the footings, and a sandstone rubble fill to the south of the south wall, with heavy random coursed rubble laid next to the footings.
Meetings and Visitors

Wednesday 6 July Meeting: Heritage Council FGH Advisory Committee: Cable, McDonald, Cairnes, Blair. 8:30.
2:00 H. Bauer, Premiers Department.
Visitors: Helen Proudfoot, Wendy Thorpe.

Thursday 7 July Visitors: Channel 10 TV Crew filmed the site from the top of their vehicle parked on the Bridge Street footpath, and interviewed Mr. Ian Bloodworth and Mrs. Nell Sansom in Bridge Street outside the site.
Mr. Singh of Sydney City Council inspected the site. He was writing a report on the site for the Council.
Greg Reilly, "Sunday Telegraph" reporter. I informed him I was under a directive from the Premier's Department that neither I nor my staff were able to communicate with the media. He interviewed members of the Bloodworth Association outside the site gates in Bridge Street, and his photographer photographed the site over the Bridge Street wall.

Friday 8 July Meetings: 12.00 Archaeological Advisory Panel FGH Subcommittee: Sullivan, Cairnes, Temple, Whitehouse, Pearson.
2.00 Joint Steering Committee: Moore, Bauer, Wade, Griffiths, Temple, Cairnes, Whitehouse, Pomeroy-Smith.
3.00 Roy Lawrie, Soil Scientist.

Saturday 9 July Meeting: Dr. George Gibbons, bricks and mortar.

Sunday 10 July Visitors: Graeme Andrews, author, photographed the site from the Bridge Street fence. Helen Proudfoot and James Rhodes, American visiting keynote speaker from the Historic Interiors Conference, who had requested to see the site. Other personnel from the Conference joined Rhodes on a tour of the site - Ian and Masie Stapleton, Peter Watts, Patricia Macdonald, Peter Freeman, Sha Jones, Anne Philp, James Broadbent.

Week 5: Wednesday 13 July - Sunday 17 July (See Fig. 10)

The train strike continued until Saturday 16 July.

Two of the seconded government archaeologists, Ms. Helen Temple, DEP, and Dr. Michael Pearson, NPWS, entered on duty on 13 July. They extended the area 38R26 previously dug by Dr. Pearson in the February season, to examine its relationship to the back wall of Phillip's house exposed in the eastern pillar site.
Work continued on the eastern pillar site, further recording the footings of Phillip's south and west wall, and the rubble packing to their south.

In the central pillar location the two stone-capped drains were followed to the west, and the foundation trench of the northern drain was further exposed.

The construction sequence of this drain is:
1) A trench was dug into the natural soil.
2) A drain with sides of sandstock bricks, and capped with rectangular dressed stones was laid in the trench. A thin layer of mortar of sandy clay with shell grit lime was laid over and around the drain.
3) The foundation trench beside the bricks was packed with sandstone rubble.
4) The trench was filled in with the deposit which was dug out to cut the trench.
5) At a later date part of this deposit was cut through, possibly to inspect and clean the drain for a blockage.
6) The area opened up was backfilled with a blackish sandy clay deposit, perhaps from a rubbish dump, which contained much glass, ceramics, and metal, including two wine bottle seals - one stamped "Chateau Lafitte" and one stamped "St. Julien Medoc", plus an 1806 coin.

Dr. George Gibbons has suggested that the drain is pre-Macquarie from its style of construction.

The stone wall between these two structures was also further explored to the west, and found to end at about the location of the brick steps, returning to the south.

This wall appears to be that on the 1845 plan of the outbuildings running east-west, directly to the east of the three-hole privy, and allows us to overlay the Lewis 1845 plan over the present-day plan of the site with yet more confidence. (See Fig. 5).

In the south-west segment of the site the outline of the building marked in the 1901 Plan was traced out on the site (See Fig. 10 and Fig. 11). The concrete footings revealed in square 17R6 appear to be those of the Tin Shed which was built flush up against the eastern side of this 1901 structure.

In square 17R4 the layer of brick rubble, possibly of the destruction of the FGH outbuildings contained many sawn fragments of large cow bones, plus bottle bases and ceramics.

On Sunday 17 July Aardvark Contractor John Pridgeon arrived on site with a bulldozer and demolished the eastern brick wall.
On Monday 18 and Tuesday 19 July, our rest days, I delivered film to Kodak for processing, and studied the Supervisors' field records and notebooks in preparation for the writing of this Report.

Meetings and Visitors

Wednesday 13 July 1983 Meeting: 9.00 Andrew Andersons, GAB, appointed by the Premier's Department as liason person for publicity concerning the site, had arranged television interviews for myself and himself with Channel 2 News, Channel 7 News, and the editor of the journal Historic Australia. Helen Proudfoot and Geoff Griffiths were invited to this meeting.

Visitors: Tom Forgan, Robert Hawkins.

Thursday 14 July Meetings: 2.00 Rod Climo, GAB, and Alvin Wilson, BC&M re work to be done on the site.

4.30 FGH Joint Steering Committee Meeting: Moore, Bauer, Whitehouse, Cairnes, Temple, Wade, Pomeroy-Smith.

Visitors: 12.30 Professor K. Cable, Heritage Council, and 2.00 Mr. David Hill, Head of Conservation Section, MAAS. I conducted both of these gentlemen around the site.

Friday 15 July Meetings: 9.00 Archaeological Advisory Panel FGH Sub committee: Sullivan, Lampert, Hennessy, Cairnes.

10.30 Roy Lawrie, Soil Scientist.

3.15 Alvin Wilson BC&M and John Prigeon, Contractor.

4.00 Heritage Council FGH Sub Committee: Cable, Hawkins, Junor, Forgan, Cairnes, Blair.

Visitors: 10.00 Dr. Keith Mulett, Chief Scientist, NPWS, (conducted around the site by Ms. L. Cairnes)

3.00 Mr. David Connolly, Federal Liberal Member for Bradfield, Shadow Minister for the Environment. Mr Connolly arrived about 12.15 and was asked by me to seek permission from Andrew Andersons to see the site. He did so, and returned at 3.00 to be conducted around the site by me.
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, N.S.W.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION EQUIPMENT

Following the completion of the archaeological excavation at the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks, the following equipment is now available for other Departmental excavations.

Archaeological Equipment as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Small nylon hand brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small hair hand brushes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Small millet hand brushes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; small hand picks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plastic dish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Plastic buckets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Metal buckets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Round sieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electric power lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large gauges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Small gauges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Square mesh sieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Square wire sieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frame sieves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Box of wedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Small iron shovels (length 24&quot;mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Small painting trowels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(note:- 3 broken trowels included in the total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timber stands to suit square wire sieve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above may be requisitioned from Mr. J. Dalley, B.C.&M., Metropolitan Branch Gloucester Street. The equipment should only be used on large "digs" where the consultant archaeologists are unable to supply the necessary implements. Individual project architects should note any losses or damages and report these to B.C.&M. when returning the equipment after use.

For your information:

1. Inspecting Architect,
   Special Projects
   For inclusion in GAB circular;

David Turner
Project Architect.
CHAPTER IV

CONTINGENCIES

The Deed of Agreement between myself and the Director, DEP, states in Section 10a, b, and c, that contingencies will include wet weather, extraordinary archaeological finds, or other unpredicted events.

The contingencies applied for up to 17 July 1983 are extensions of time because of:

1) Establishment Fund According to the Deed of Agreement Section 6, the Establishment Fund of $4,900 for the purchase of equipment was to be provided on the signing of the Agreement, i.e. Friday 30 May. The cheque was received 10 days after that date, on June 9, and cash of $500. was not available from the account until Tuesday 14 June. The account was not fully operable until Friday 17 June, 19 days from the agreed date of receipt of the funds.

The absence of this funding has caused loss of time in
a) many attempts to plead, cajole, inveigle, demand etc. the funds so that work could be set in train.

b) spending time set aside for the excavation period in finding and purchasing equipment, rather than being able to use the time set aside for this in the two weeks pre-excavation preparatory phase.

Contingency time is applied for in respect of time lost in not having the Establishment Fund available at the signing of the Contract as agreed in the Deed of Agreement.

2) The "Lost" Equipment Stored by BC&M The BC&M Metropolitan Branch, Gloucester Street (See Fig. 8) was to have stored this equipment. I searched for it at the start of the February 1983 season and found only the large seives which would not be moved to the site. As the February season was a small-scale excavation I was able to carry on by using that equipment held by the DEP plus some kindly lent by the Aboriginal and Historic Resources Section, NPWS.

From the commencement of this second season I asked the DEP and the Historic Buildings Group, GAB, to locate and deliver this equipment to the site. After weeks of searching, all that could be found and were delivered to the site at the commencement of Week 3 of excavation, were the 11 square mesh seives, 1 square wire seive, and two frame seives.

Contingency time is applied for in terms of lack of the necessary equipment expected to be provided at the commencement of work. Funding for purchase of equipment to replace this lost equipment not provided for in the Establishment Fund estimates has been requested from the DEP.
3) Site Works Which Were to Have Been Provided

And Which Were Not Provided by the Commencement of Excavation

Besides having no Establishment Fund or excavation equipment
to be provided by BC&M by the end of Week 1, there was
also no telephone, electricity, hot water, office furniture,
laboratory furniture, heavy duty plastic to cover the
trenches, water pumps, or passageway between the site
and Young Street terraces provided.

The lack of prohibitive notices and locks on
external gates has also delayed the work, with members of the
public and other visitors entering the site at will.

There was also a delay of several weeks on planks
for covering baulks and trenches, and step ladders for above-
ground photography. These were ordered at a site meeting
on 22 June and delivered on Tuesday 19 July.

Contingency time is applied for in respect of the
delays to the work caused by the lack of this necessary
equipment and facilities.

4) Train Strike. The train strike took place
from Wednesday 29 June to Saturday 16 July.

Volunteer numbers on site dropped by about 40%
and most workers were forced to arrive late and leave early
to arrange transport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Volunteers expected</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 June</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 July</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July (heavy rain)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 July</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This of course has severely diminished the amount
of deposit predicted to be excavated with an average of 25
volunteers during that time.

Contingency time is applied for in respect of
time lost due to the train strike.

5) Rain On Wednesday June 15 and Thursday June
16, work was delayed because of rain. On Monday 4,
Tuesday 5, and Wednesday 6 July heavy rain fell all day.

After each of these rain periods at least half a
day's work was lost in bailing out the trenches and cleaning
up the excavated areas from rain damage.
Contingency time is applied for in respect of time lost due to rain and subsequent mopping up operations.

6) Extraordinary Archaeological Finds
In excavating the pillar areas in the northern part of the site the west and south wall of Phillip's house have been revealed. Two drains, built into the natural soil, and a stone wall have also been excavated in the second pillar location. In both areas the stratigraphy is most complex, particularly because of the intrusions and disturbances from the building of later drains and walls for the tin Shed.

Consequently, only experienced archaeologists could be deployed in these areas, and because of the complexity and significance of the evidence these people were obliged to proceed most carefully.

Contingency time is applied for in respect of these extraordinary archaeological finds, whose existence could not have been predicted at the commencement of the work, and whose complexity and intactness have necessitated meticulous and detailed recording and excavation.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS ON WORK PROGRESS

The Pace of the Excavation

Compared with other excavations, the work here has proceeded at a fast pace. (See Appendix 1, Report by Supervisor D. Gojak).

Morale

Many professionals, both archaeologists, administrators, and experienced members of the excavation team, have commented to me on the high quality of morale they have observed on this excavation. Few volunteers have ceased to continue to come, and all who have participated have freely worked well over eight hours per day; the weekly volunteers receiving only $10.00 per day expenses, and the weekend volunteers no remuneration at all.

The Supervisors are working well together and there has been no conflict within the team so far.

At least twice a week I conduct the team around the site, explaining what is happening in each area, and discussing progress with the workers. I have pasted up in chronological order over thirty of the sketches, photographs, maps, and plans of the FGH and the subsequent development of the site, around the walls of the sorting room, used as the recreation room by the team, so that team members have available to them as much information as possible about the history of the site, and they can check back to the early references in relation to the areas they are excavating. When Australian Heritage Commissioners Professor Isabel McBryde and Ms. Joan Domecilj visited the site I gave an illustrated lecture of the history of the site, which was attended by all of the site workers.

Liason

My commitment to liaise with the Public Works Department, the Project Architect, the Site Developer, the Premier's Department, and attend meetings as required by the Project Director as listed in the Brief - clauses 4 e, i, j, and m, has been time consuming, and these are matters which cannot be delegated to other personnel.
The Consultant's Workload

I have been working a minimum of ten hours per day seven days a week. I am not always the first to arrive, but am the last to leave the site each night.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS ON THE EXCAVATED EVIDENCE

The first season's excavation in February revealed several features of the FGH.

Interpretation of the footings revealed strongly suggested that they were the south wall of Phillip's building.

Excavation so far in Stage II has confirmed this, revealing the south-west corner of the building and further footings of the back and side wall.

Phillip's Building

The footings of the west and south wall of Phillip's building as revealed in the eastern pillar excavation are consistent with those footings already excavated in the February season, and would have been constructed at the same time.

The floor revealed here, inside the building, of tamped earth and clay with a pebble surface, lies directly over the natural soil.

Drains to the West of Phillip's Building

The two brick sided stone capped drains revealed in the central pillar location to the west of Phillip's building, are of unknown date, though certainly before the destruction of the FGH.

Dr. George Gibbons has suggested that the larger drain to the north, cut into the natural soil, is pre-Macquarie because of its construction techniques.

The smaller drain, built on natural soil, using pipeclay as mortar without any lime, may be earlier, and could be of the Phillip period, based on its construction and they type of bricks and mortar used.

The Outbuildings

Between the two drains discussed above is a sandstone wall 60cm or 2 feet wide running east-west, with the western side forming a corner returning south. This wall appears on the 1845 plan (See Fig.3). The wall is of unknown date but the evidence suggests that it is the wall illustrated in the Bradley drawing of 1791 and that c.1794 by Watling.
The area excavated in the south-west of the site, in the rear half of the Lewis outbuildings, has revealed an east-west wall, possibly of pre-1845 date, and floors containing ceramics, the latest of which are of the 1830s and 1840s, dating the areas to this period.

Other Features of the 1845 Plan

The extensions of FGH added by Macquarie and Darling have not yet been excavated because of constraints on the research design as outlined in Chapter I.

It is becoming apparent that the dimensions of the FGH can be related to the site. The work is progressing in such a way that it will be possible to relate the Lewis 1845 plan to the evidence in the ground.

It must not be assumed that the 1845 plan shows all that was built on the site from 1788-1845.

Four drains have already been excavated which were not marked on the plan, nor was the back wall of Phillip's house, our greatest find, having been covered over by Macquarie's extension walls in 1811, and therefore not drawn.

The Watling drawings of 1789-1794 show outbuildings to the east and south of Phillip's house, a well, and other structures of unknown use. The 1845 plan shows outbuildings only to the west of the house.

The documents, while they are many, form a very inadequate record of the details of the FGH.

The remainder of the site within the Car Park and behind the hoarding must be tested to discover whether evidence remains of any other structures or works not drawn on the 1845 plan.

Constraints of Time

The allocation of twelve weeks excavation plus contingency time severely restricts the time available to refer back to the documentary evidence as the excavation proceeds, to check on, and to expand the knowledge of the features under excavation.

The time allotted for examining and interpreting the artifacts excavated has been allocated to Stage IIb, at the completion of the excavation phase. Therefore, the full information which can be extracted from these artifacts will not be available for interpretation of the excavation until it has ceased.
The First Government House Outside the Area Available for Excavation Under This Contract

From the level of the footings and other evidence it is clear that the level of FGH is substantially below the current level of Bridge and Phillip Streets.

Whilst it may be tempting to surmise that there is no evidence of the FGH under the footpath or streets, or that what further evidence there is will remain safe and untouched, we will only know if anything remains, and its nature and extent, by excavation.

Such an excavation will also add to the interpretation of the area already excavated and extend our knowledge of the issues raised in the research design.

Research Design

From the excavation so far it is clear that the evidence revealed of structures, works, and artifacts and their interpretation will work towards answering many of the broader questions raised in the research design.

The Time Scale

In the light of the evidence outlined above revealing that the remains of the FGH have proved more extensive and complex than were envisaged, the design of the time scale for the completion of this excavation must be reviewed.

The Excavation

Excavation so far in Stage II has already confirmed what was predicted at the end of Stage I in March 1983. (See Appendix 2). Whereas at that time some may have had doubts about the significance of the site no doubt can now remain that the excavation has been a task worth doing, and that the site of the First Government House is of outstanding heritage significance.
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In an article in *Holier Than Thou: Proceedings of the 1978 Kialoa Conference on Australian Prehistory*, Ian Johnson (1980) presented a list of excavation rates for some selected prehistoric sites in Australia. He lists 11 sites from the Rocky Cape middens to rockshelters at Capertee and gives the excavation rates for these in terms of how many person-days it took to excavate 1 cubic metre of deposit.

From the data presented in Johnson (1980: p.106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range of excavation rates</td>
<td>10-50 person-days/cubic metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average excavation rate</td>
<td>26.09 person-days/cubic metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>±12.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking Richard Stafford’s (volunteer 6th Year Architecture Student, U.N.S.W.) plan of the excavation to the end of week 4 (ending 10/7/83) a total c.200 square metres within the carpark area had been excavated or tested by trenching. If we take the average depth of deposit removed as being c.30 centimetres this means that the total volume of deposit excavated is 60 cubic metres of soil and rubble.

To calculate the number of person-days I used the Site Attendance records:

| Total person-days of volunteers, during Phase 2 | 350 person-days |
| 6 Site Supervisors over 5 weeks @ 5 days per week | 150 person-days |
| Phase 1 excavation, average of 8 people for 10 days | 80 person-days |
| Total | 580 person-days |

The total number of person-days is a misleading figure and should be regarded as a maximum limit only, for the following reasons. Firstly, the Supervisors spent much of the first week setting up the site grid, cleaning the first season trenches out and establishing facilities in the Young Street terraces. They also spend up to c.50% of their time each day in non-excavation duties eg. record keeping, comparing notes with adjacent squares, dealing with visitors etc. The figure regarding volunteer attendance is also a maximum possible value. It takes no account of the time lost due to late starts and early finishes due to the train strike. Rain also cancelled excavation for one day and necessitated spending half of the following day bailing out water and cleaning up the trenches.

To calculate the rate at which excavation has been proceeding to date we have to divide total person-days by the total volume of material excavated.

Total person-days of excavation | 580 |
Total volume excavated | 60 |
Total person-days/cubic metre | 9.66 |
Therefore it can be seen that it takes just under 10 person-days to excavate 1 cubic/metre of deposit. As stressed earlier the figure for person-days is a maximum estimate; a better and more realistic estimate would be in the order of 7.5-8.5 person-days/cubic metre.

Several points should be noted in relation to this excavation rate:

1. The rate is 20-25% faster than the fastest prehistoric excavation listed (Freshwater Creek 1 @ 10 person-days/cubic metre).
2. Excavation of prehistoric sites can be done in a very mechanical fashion due to the absence of structural remains, which makes the excavation rate fast. In fact the Freshwater Creek 1 site was an open, stratified site that was recorded using a system designed for fast excavation and, in any case, open sites are relatively "fast" to excavate compared with rockshelter and midden deposits.
3. All or most of the personnel on a prehistoric excavation would be qualified, trained or experienced excavators, as distinct from this site where the majority of the volunteers have had no previous academic or practical experience of any form of archaeological excavation.
4. This site presents particular problems in terms of the succession of rubble layers that have been deposited. Most of the layers look superficially identical in colour, texture and composition and only careful excavation has been able to provide solutions to the complex stratigraphic problems of multiple rebuildings, demolitions and so on.

Therefore, it can be seen that the excavation rate of this site is not only extremely fast, compared to prehistoric sites, but it is also already slowed down by a number of factors that cannot be helped. Any complaints as to how slow excavation is proceeding are quite spurious and are based on total ignorance; as we are digging as fast or faster than any archaeologist should have to.

D. Gojak 16/7/83

Reference

APPENDIX 2. REPORT BY EXCAVATION DIRECTOR TO: DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENT & PLANNING. 8 MARCH 1983.

FIRST GOVERNMENT HOUSE, ARCHAEOLOGY STAGE 1.

Preparation of site = 4 days.

Excavation days = 16.

Average excavation team = ten persons.

Area excavated = north east sector of site.

Area tested for depth of deposit and limit of sandstone = southern 2/3 of site.

Results:

1. Four in situ features of the First Government House period (1788-1846) have been revealed.
   b. Footings in squares 40R30 and 38R30.
   c. A brick barrel drain in trench 32R31.50, which extends down the trench excavated to the west.
   d. A stone covered drain with brick sides in trench 30.5R36.

2. With so much revealed in a small area excavated to some depth, on or just above bedrock, it is highly likely that much more of the First Government House exists on the site.

3. Artifacts from the excavation reveal disturbance in the upper layers of strata - indicating disturbance of the area for a series of demolitions and clearings of the site, from 1846 onwards. Fragments of clay tiles used at the earliest period on Phillip's house are scattered throughout the deposit, but concentrated in the govt. house stratigraphic layers.

4. The bricks and mortar revealed in the footings are of great scientific significance as they give us the only evidence of this early building period in materials and techniques, besides that provided by Elizabeth Farm.

5. Scientific samples of materials have been taken by Dr. George Gibbons of the NSWIT, and Heritage Council Technical Advisory Panel,
Appendix 2. (continued)

and by Mr. Roy Lawrie, Soils Chemist, of the Dept. of Agriculture, Rydalmere. Mr. Lawrie has done work on the brick barrel drain excavated Parramatta, and at Elizabeth Farm, for the Heritage Council.

ARCHAEOLOGY STAGE 2

1. The footings and drains already revealed in the trench excavations are to be followed to determine how they relate to the Mortimer Lewis plan of 1845, so that the rest of the house and outbuildings can be plotted in and excavated.

2. The area at the south east of the site where the privy has been speculated to be, is to be cleared and examined for evidence of the privy, which would probably have been cut into the sandstone bedrock.

3. An overlay plan of the Mortimer Lewis plan with the excavated trenches so far is to be prepared to assist in interpreting the location of the footings excavated.

4. The excavated finds are to be washed, conserved, catalogued, and analysed. The plans and sections of all excavated areas are to be prepared and drawn up.

5. This material is to be analysed and written up into two reports:
   a. A full report of the excavation and the finds detailing the material and analysing it.
   b. A report summarising the finds and the conclusions of the work for non-specialists.

6. Recommendations are to be made concerning the preservation of the structures and finds revealed in the work.

7. Recommendations are to be made concerning the pictorial, textual, and artifactual material to be used in the display to be established in the Commemorative Area to be established in the building.

Anna Eichholz
8 March 1983
Dear Miss Bickford,

I have completed x-ray diffraction studies of eight of the brick and mortar samples collecting during Stage 1 excavation of the First Government House site at Phillip St., Sydney. Locations and essential mineralogy of the eight samples, together with excavation grid references, are listed in the enclosure with this letter.

DISCUSSION

1. The two brick samples differ in that the samples have clay which is not present in the clinkers; whereas the clinkers have cristobalite which is not present in the samples.

When a normal brick-clay "burns" in the kiln, the clays convert to glass-like compounds and then to tridymite or cristobalite plus mullite, while quartz gradually changes to tridymite or cristobalite.

The two brick types could therefore correspond to the same brick clay having been fired to different degrees. The apparently stronger haematite in the clinkers could be simply a result of better crystallinity in those bricks, again consistent with a greater amount of firing.

2. The possible ridge cap does not correspond to any normal clay ceramic pattern; it is probably a natural quartzose ironstone.

3. The mortar samples from the "old wall" consist of quartz plus a mixture of residual clays, including appreciable 14\(\text{A}\) (montmorillonite-type) clay. The samples are virtually identical, and are completely devoid of calcite (lime). They are also essentially identical to the white silt found in an auger hole in the centre south of the site.

The mortar from the east-west brick drain is quite different, with appreciable lime and a clay mineralogy with low 14\(\text{A}\) clay, more typical of Sydney mortar sands.
Appendix 3 (continued)

INTERPRETATIONS:

1. It is extremely unlikely that the lack of lime in the mortars could be a result of total leaching, so it must be deduced that the bricks were bedded in simple clay-sand mortar, apparently dug from the sub-soil on site.

2. It follows that the mortar (and brickwork) are very early, very possibly 1788, almost certainly pre-1806.

3. The two brick types could well have originated from the same brick-kiln. Certainly the mineral constitution of the samels is similar to that of later underburnt Sydney bricks; and since the clinkers are clearly of low quality it is safe to assume that they are also local.

4. In addition, the identical mortar indicates that both brick types were laid at or about the same time.

5. The geometry of the footings is unusual. Its width indicates a major structure, and the well-formed samels indicate quality; yet the clinker section is little more than rubble. The solution may lie in assuming that what remains is the residual after salvaging of re-usable bricks.

6. On this assumption it is possible that the clinkers formed the core of a wall with leaves either side (perhaps in Old English bond) supported on the stone sections of the basecourse.

FURTHER WORK

1. Similar provenance for the two brick types may to some extent be checked by comparison of Al:Si:K:Fe ratios (which are unchanged by firing).

2. The identity of mortars and nearby natural silt may be verified by grainsize analysis.

I shall send results of further studies as I am able to have them processed.

Yours sincerely,

G.S. Gibbons,
Head of Department.
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ENCLOSURE

Mortar between same bricks laid askew between stone footings.
Quartz, kaolinite, illite, degraded illite, 14A clay.

G9: Western exposure of old wall: G.R. 38R26
Mortar between broken, purplish, clinker-like bricks in
crude wall-like structure.
Mineralogy identical to G8.

G9A: Same location as G9.
Mortar between same bricks below G9, similar structure to G8.
Identical clays to G8, G9; slightly greater quartz/clay ratio.

White silt at depth 30-40 mm.
Mineralogy identical to G8, G9.

G11: East-west brick drain: G.R. 32R28
Mortar between bricks.
Quartz, calcite, minor kaolin, minor mixed-layer clays.

Same brick between stone footings.
Quartz, minor kaolinite, minor mixed layer clays, minor
or poorly crystallized haematite/limonite.

G15: Same location as G14.
Purplish (clinker) brick from wall above G14 bricks.
Quartz, cristobalite, crystalline haematite.

Red ceramic-like fragment, possibly ridge-cap.
Quartz, haematite/limonite, trace of mixed-layer clays.
7.6 Availability of Staff
7.7 Submission of Drafts

8.00 LIST OF REFERENCES REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT

Figure 1 Work Flow Diagram
1.00 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Brief

This Report fulfils that part of the Contract between Anne Bickford and the Department of Environment and Planning (NSW) for the Fourth Phase of the archaeological investigation of the First Government House site (FGH) which states:

The Consultant will:
3.3 Prepare a Report in draft form which discusses the themes of analysis and particular research questions to be addressed in Phase V and the proposed methodology.
3.4 Prepare a draft detailed work programme for Phase V identifying specialist staff to be employed in a month by month outline of work to be completed in chapter form. This will also include a work flow diagram and an outline of the proposed methodology.

1.2 The Work

The work was undertaken by Anne Bickford assisted by Robyn Stocks as research assistant.

A bibliography of over 550 items relevant to Phase V concerning theory and methodology of the analysis of excavated material was prepared from library research in the State Library of NSW, Fisher Library University of Sydney, Macquarie University Library, and private collections.

Over 100 journal articles were photocopied and catalogued.

In the preparation of this Report about 100 books and articles were consulted, consisting mainly of archaeological site reports and theoretical articles on the analysis of excavated data.
2.00 THEMES OF ANALYSIS, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 The First Government House Excavation

The excavation of the FGH site was a salvage excavation. In Phase I excavation took place for 14 days. The extremely limited budget did not provide for analysis of the finds. At the end of the excavation season a further season was planned to continue to sample the site for any additional FGH features.

The Phase II excavation season continued for 22 weeks, from the middle of June to 22 December 1983. At the conclusion of Phase II a further excavation in those parts of the development site not yet sampled was planned for early 1984.

This season covered the period 14 February to 12 May 1984, for 12 weeks.

In all three Phases excavation took place for 36 weeks, or 9 months, with an average of 15-20 fieldworkers over the three seasons.

In this 9 months analysis of the finds was at a minimum. Each day the finds for that day were examined, bagged, the bags counted and recorded, and the finds stored in the site offices. Because of the pressure to complete the excavation and vacate the site, this was the most cursory examination of the finds.

On wet days the field staff were employed in packing finds, and washing and cleaning the ceramics, glass, and clay pipes.

A system of "Special Finds" for diagnostic artifacts such as marked sherds, marked bottle glass, and clay pipes, coins, buttons, and so on, provided a terminus post quem for some of the layers and closed contexts excavated.

2.2 Themes and Research Questions

On a site such as this, of such historical significance and spanning almost 200 years of European history, in a venerable and intensely used part of the urban environment, one has a unique opportunity to trace the process of the development of the city from remote prison, to village, to urban centre, through time.
The specific themes and research questions which emerge from an analysis of this site can take many directions. I have referred to some of these in my previous Reports.
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CHAPTER 1. RESEARCH DESIGN

The Issues

Colonisation

How England placed a colony at Sydney Cove, 12,000 miles from home, in another hemisphere, in an alien clime, and how those people so placed attempted to deal with their situation.

How some continued to struggle and call England home;

How some came to terms with the situation, and adapted their new knowledge to the immediate problems and possibilities of the environment.

This site contains material evidence from the very first year of settlement to the symbolic creation of Australian self-confidence by the construction of the new government house - the great Gothic stone pile in the Inner Domain - and the destruction of the first government house as it stood in 1845.

Technological Evidence

The site embodies technological evidence, and can answer many questions not solved by research into the written documents, pictures, maps, and plans. It reveals how footings, walls and drains were constructed, what materials were used, what were their sources, what were the processes in making and using these materials, what English models were followed, what adaptations of those models took place, what forces demanded these changes, and what new materials and processes were developed - i.e. what artifacts were Australian made, and what imported from Europe.

Such information can only be revealed by combining what is known from the diarists' and governors' reports with the evidence revealed by meticulous excavation and scientific tests of materials.
Symbolic Value

The First Government House is of great symbolic value.

It was not only the home of the governors and their families and servants for the first fifty years of settlement. It was also the centre of administration - the place where decisions were made on the management and fate of the convicts, military, free settlers, and Aborigines.

The journals of Watkin Tench, who wrote of the first four years of settlement, make vividly clear Governor Phillip's attempts to understand, incorporate, and control the Aborigines. Aboriginal people lived in his house for long periods of time; they visited him, asked after him, and Arabanoo (Manly), the first man captured by Phillip, was buried in the garden of government house.

Aim of The Second Season Excavation

The primary aim of this season's excavation is to continue to explicate the Lewis 1845 plan of the First Government House, and the other associated illustrations and descriptions of the house and outbuildings from 1788 until its demolition in 1845.

This research will make a substantive contribution to our understanding of Australia's early technological processes and contribute to the development of middle range theory in historical archaeology in Australia.

4 March 1984: 5

2.2 The Evidence Provided by the Excavations

The excavation of the site in Phase IIa was oriented towards answering:

- historical questions about the location of the FGH, how it was built, and how it was used
- questions about the location of features on the 1845 Lewis plan, posed by the Premier's Department.
Many other relevant questions could be, and have been proposed for examination. (e.g. see Judy Birmingham's paper delivered to the FGH Seminar held at the DEP in May 1984 Research Design in Urban Salvage Excavations; Pearson (1984:28), and Bickford and Sullivan (1984:24).)

2.3 Phase V: A One Year Programme

Constraints of funding and time indicate that all of these issues cannot be examined during the course of Phase V. But certain aspects of the analysis of the excavation must take place.

Therefore I am proposing for Phase V a period of 12 months duration during which the essential aspects of analysis will be completed. Following the submission and consideration of the Phase V Report the Department may consider that the material be further examined and the research results expanded to consider wider questions. If this is the case then a subsequent analysis phase or phases may be planned and executed using the additional knowledge gained in the intensive Phase V analysis period.

Such a multi-stage research design allows the information gathered at different phases of laboratory analysis to be integrated in an on-going process of evaluation of research strategies.

This type of multi-stage investigation, phasing both the fieldwork and laboratory analysis, is commonly used in American research programmes, by e.g. Rubertone and Gallagher (1981), and its value as a research tool is extensively discussed by Binford (1964), Redman (1973), and Goodyear Raab and Klinger (1978).

2.4 Essential Aspects of the Analysis Phase

Archaeology is not merely the study of material objects, but the study of human behaviour through material remains. Before any answers to questions about human behaviour can be developed the material remains must be catalogued and classified so that they can be manipulated to examine behaviour.

2.41 Catalogue of Finds All finds must first be cleaned and labelled. The label will consist of the name of site, square number, and feature number. e.g. FGH 24R6 Q.2.
2.42 Conservation Some finds will need conservation treatment eg. Consolidation of fragile surface of ceramics or glass, or cleaning of corrosion from metals, before they can be labelled and sorted. Once labelled, broken fragments excavated from the same feature can be mended.

2.43 Description of finds Once labelled the finds will be described, and if possible dated contextually, or through the analysis of marks. Large numbers of finds of the same kind will be counted and tabulated.

Grinsell et al (1974:67) provide a format for description:
(a) Material of which it is made. Spectrographic and other analyses can often assist.
(b) Function, if known; if not, the fact must be stated.
(c) Form: size and shape.
(d) Technique of manufacture: this should not be guessed. In some instances it will form the subject of a specialist report.
(e) Decoration.
(f) Method of use.

Internal dating and context: what dating can be assigned to the object at this site, from its context.
(h) External dating and parallels: comparison with similar objects from other sites, and how they were dated there.

2.431 Estimated number of portable finds excavated The finds are stored in Archive Boxes in the site offices in Young Street. There are over 1100 of these boxes of finds awaiting analysis. Each box is about the size of two shoeboxes.

A rough count and weighing of the material from two layers in two 2m squares (22R4 13 and 20R4 11) took one person two full days. The 5 Archive Boxes for 22R4 13 contained 1154 fragments of pottery; 71 fragments of clay pipes; 14.55 kg of glass; 61 fragments of bone; plus building materials, and metal. 20 boxes were needed to store the finds from 20R4 11. Some sorting and cataloguing of this material had already been done by the Area Supervisor, Susan MacIntyre. These two layers, about 2-5cm thick, were some of the most densely packed on the site.

At an estimate of about two such layers to each square, and estimating about 50 squares excavated on the site, at a rate of one feature per day the result is a figure of 100 days for one person simply to roughly count and weigh the excavated finds.

At an estimate of about 225 working days in 12 months, taking in to account annual leave and public holidays, then one person would take about 50% of the year allotted in this most elementary initial task.

This estimate indicates the scale of the task of the cataloguing and description of the finds. Labelling can be done by any methodical person, but description and dating needs archaeological artifact skills.
The number of staff recommended to be employed for this and other tasks in Phase V is discussed in detail below. A team of about 20 people is recommended.

2.44 Historical research

In all of my previous Reports I have stressed the necessity for further historical research.

Research relating to the FGH site can range widely. In Phase V the time available will necessitate a concentration on historical information relating specifically to a history of the site and the excavated data.

The British arrived with a set of late 18th century spatial and social templates. To examine the changes which took place from these British models we must know what these models were. More information needs to be researched concerning the form, construction, and layout, of late 18th century houses and ancilliary buildings, particularly in relation to the structures excavated – footings, drains, walls, pathways, privies, and the printing office. The technological history of brick and tile making must also be examined.

I refer below in Section 5.00, Site Formation Processes, to the use of layers of fill in the post FGH occupation, and the provision of water, sewage, garbage collection, and other municipal services to the occupants. This area of research too needs to be expanded.

Pictorial collections in the Mitchell Library, National Library of Australia, Allport Library, La Trobe Library, and British Museum of Natural History need to be searched, and colour reproductions of the FGH pictures obtained, so that details of materials used and construction can be examined.

2.45 Description of Structural and Stratigraphic Relationships

The stratigraphy will be organized in terms of periods, starting with the earliest. The main features of each period will be described, followed by the subsidiary ones. Wherever possible, drawings or photographs will illustrate these relationships.

The depositional patterns on a site such as this are complex, due to the frequent rebuilding, demolition, deep excavation, and clearing of the site.

The depositional history and extent on the site of the major archaeological layers will be plotted.
2.46 **Integration of Stratigraphic and Material Evidence**

The in situ and portable artifacts will be analysed in relation to their stratigraphic context, and described as part of the periods in which they occur. Thus, they will be treated as dating evidence, and also as evidence for the social behaviours which were practiced at that time.

2.47 **Integration of Historical and Archaeological Data**

The historical data will be integrated with the archaeological evidence. This synthesis of the two sets of data will allow more substantive statements to be made about activities at the site.

3.00 **A CONSIDERATION OF INTER AND INTRASITE RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

3.1 **Historic Sites Excavations in Australia**

Many historic sites have been excavated in Australia since the beginning of historical archaeology in the mid 1960s. In considering the FGH site up to the 1845 demolition only, many of these excavations have produced useful comparative material for the FGH site. Some which come to mind are: Port Essington, Risdon Cove, Elizabeth Farm, the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks, Irrawang, Wybalenna, Moore's Bond Store, Fort Dundas, Port Arthur, and Norfolk Island. Only the first four in this list have been published, with the last two of these in a cursory, unintegrated fashion.

Intersite research questions of a more general nature concerning the development of particular architectural forms, or the comparative distribution and patterning of artifacts both horizontally and chronologically, are difficult to formulate in the absence of published interpretative comparative data.

To compare the FGH evidence with for example these sites listed above would involve access to the records and the collections, some stored as far away as Hobart, Perth, Brisbane, and Canberra.
In the 12 months recommended for Phase V this would not be possible except perhaps with Port Essington, and the ongoing analysis at the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks.

I propose therefore to concentrate on intrasite analysis - to look at the patterns and relationships between areas of the site - at activity areas in the house, outbuildings, and stables areas, and at the spaces between them.

4.00 INTRASITE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

4.1 Artifacts and Ecofacts

The classes of artifacts and ecofacts excavated which will be used to examine the site-specific research questions are:- ceramics, glass, building materials, dietary remains, clay pipes, and other recreational items, coins, personal items, and other small finds.

4.2 Spatial, Frequency, and Relational Dimensions

Intrasite patterning of the artifacts and other aspects of behaviour will be examined by analysing their:
- spatial location in activity areas ie. rooms, outside rooms, outbuildings, yards, printing office, stables
- the frequency of artifacts in these areas
- their relational dimension - how and what are associated together eg. food preparation items and eating utensils.

4.3 Technological and Mercantile History

As well as analysing intrasite patterning and behaviour using the chronological and spatial location of the artifacts, technological and mercantile history will be examined through an analysis of the finds. Times, places, and methods of manufacture, the functions for which the artifacts were made, colonial import and export strategies, markets, and the horizon concept and time - a consideration of time lag, will be documented for all artifact classes.
4.4 Ceramics

The work of George L. Miller (1980 and 1983) will be used in the analysis of the ceramics. From the preliminary examination during excavation it appears that the bulk of the ceramics are blue underglaze transfer printed wares. Saltglazed stoneware is also present in some quantity. There appears to be very little Australian pottery of the FGH period, with marked stoneware becoming more frequent in the McGlade period and after.

Miller states that England dominated the world ceramic tableware trade by the 1790s. (1980:1) Some of the research questions posed in relation to Miller's work will:

- research the identification of the transformation between English and Australian/other ceramic artifacts
- research the identification of socio-economic status in the FGH ceramics, and explore the correlation between activity areas and ceramic indicators of socio-economic status.

5.00 SITE FORMATION PROCESSES

5.1 Environmental and Cultural Site Formation Processes

Site formation processes can be environmental or cultural. On this site the effects of environmental formation processes such as wind, rain, movement of groundwater, and bioturbation, have been minimal, compared with cultural formation processes - the activities of people on the site.

An archaeological site is basically a natural setting modified to a greater or lesser degree by a human agency. To the archaeologist, the site is a physical matrix that reflects human behaviour, and the intelligibility of the data contained in that matrix is a matter of the way space and the materials in that space have been arranged into the whole. Time, in the archaeological site, is a passive quality, fixed in the physical relationship of soils and artifacts. Time and behaviour, then, are translated into spatial dimensions and matter.

In basic terms matter can be introduced into a site, removed from a site, or redistributed within a site. (Honerkamp, Council and Will, 1982:102)

The accurate interpretation of the archaeological remains at FGH requires the explication of the site formation
processes, as these activities formed the archaeological record. The ways in which the materials participating in the cultural system entered the archaeological record must be explained. Site formation processes can be divided into four basic categories - reuse, deposition, reclamation, and disturbance.

Some examples of reuse for instance are:
- the use of clay tiles for lining for drains in 36&38R23
- the use of FGH sameel bricks in the garage behind No. 39 Phillip Street, built post 1880.

Urban historic sites are characterized by intensive land use and extensive rebuilding and levelling through time. Such disturbance creates upward migration, so that many clay tile fragments, for instance, appear on the bulldozed surface just below the car park gravel layer.

Three main building phases have been identified for the FGH complex - 1788, 1811, 1830s (see Bickford 1984a). These involve redistribution of existing soils, construction, and demolition. The 1845 demolition took two years to complete, and the materials which could be salvaged were sold.

The post 1845 occupation is characterized by layers of fill. These may have been redistributed from other parts of the site, or brought in from other parts of Sydney. The site of the Colonial Secretary's Office was used as a rubbish dump from the 1850s, and fills may have been transferred from here. Landfills are common feature of high-density urban sites, and Deetz records the excavation of a fill which had been transported from a site over 15 miles away (1977:15).

5.2 Cultural Behaviour and Site Formation Processes

The people who occupied the FGH site followed cultural practices which caused artifacts and soils to be moved around the site in certain ways. The search for patterning on historical archaeological sites is a search for this cultural regularity as it is expressed in artifact deposition.

The limited information so far to hand concerning the Domestic life of 19th and early 20th century urban Australians results in the fact that predictive models for refuse dispersal cannot be hypothesised. We do not know:
- how people disposed of their household refuse
- when municipal garbage collection was introduced, and how often it operated
- did people compost household refuse, or nightsoil, on to the gardens, as was the practice in Medieval England
- where was nightsoil deposited
were privies filled with soil or refuse, flushed out or dug out, when no longer able to be used
- what were the practices for keeping clean a house, offices, yard, privy area
- when were municipal services such as sewerage, drainage, and water reticulation introduced

There is a need for further archaeological and historical research on these matters in Australian historical archaeology so that the cultural behaviour which produces site formation processes can be better understood.

6.00 FORM OF THE REPORT

6.1 Form

In preparing this section I rely to a large extent on my reading of Grinsell et al (1974), Barker (1982), White (1983), and Webster (1974).

As White comments - Grinsell et al assume that any excavation will be published fully, in as much detail as possible, in a permanent form, and available in a good library (1983:172). This is the ideal state. In the 12 months proposed for the preparation and publication of the FGH Report it will not be possible to document and publish the material in such detail.

Barker discusses the method of publication proposed by the British Department of the Environment in their Principles of Publication in Rescue Archaeology, a report by a working party of the Ancient Monuments Board for England Committee for Rescue Archaeology (Barker 1982:228). This document argues that the results of excavation are successively, in practice, refined through four levels of records, as follows (Barker 1982:229-230)
### Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Site descriptions</th>
<th>Loose material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>The site itself and general notes, old letters, previous accounts, etc.</td>
<td>Excavated finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Site note-books, recording forms, drawings, sound-recorded tapes.</td>
<td>Finds records, X-rays photographs, negatives colour transparencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Full illustration and description of all structural and stratigraphical relationships.</td>
<td>Classified finds-lists and finds-drawings, and all specialist analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Synthesised descriptions with supporting data.</td>
<td>Selected finds and specialist reports relevant to synthesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It goes on to define what the working party sees as the future objectives for the organisation of this material:

Although publication at Level III, i.e. in full detail, has not yet become an economic impossibility for small excavations, we are agreed that, provided certain conditions are fulfilled, refined publication at Level IV should be the objective in future for all rescue excavations and indeed, for archaeological excavations in general. The conditions, which are essential, are:

- that all the original records of the excavation, properly organised and curated, are housed in readily accessible form in a permanent archive,
- that data at what we have described as Level III are readily available on request.
Appendix I summarizes its recommendations for the storage and availability of excavated data thus:

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ARRANGEMENTS FOR STORAGE AND AVAILABILITY OF EXCAVATION DATA**

(See paragraph 2.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Site Descriptions</th>
<th>Loose Material</th>
<th>Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>The site itself and general notes, old letters, previous accounts, etc.</td>
<td>Excavated finds</td>
<td>Storage in museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Site note-books, recording forms, drawings, sound-recorded tapes</td>
<td>Finds records, X-rays, photographs, negatives, colour transparencies</td>
<td>Available for inspection inspection at museum or regional or national archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Full illustration and description of all structural and relationships</td>
<td>Classified finds - lists and finds - drawings, and all analyses</td>
<td>Publication in journal or occasional papers, as required, or available as duplicates, microfiche, microfilm or computer print-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Syntheses descriptions with supporting data</td>
<td>Selected finds and specialist reports relevant to synthesis</td>
<td>Publication in multiple copies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By applying the recommendations in this DOE Report a manuscript for the publication of a Report on the excavation of the FGH site should be able to be produced in 12 months. One of the essential conditions concerning the Level III data - that all the original records of the excavation be properly organized - has been met during this current phase (Phase IV) of work, when the records filed in Phases II and III were checked, indexed, and a guide written (Bickford 1984b).

For convenience of organization and understanding the material will be divided into three periods of occupation:
- the FGH period
- the McGlade period
- the Tin Shed period

Each of these will be further subdivided into phases. eg. three main phases have been defined in the FGH period:
- 1788 Phillip
- 1811 Macquarie
- the 1845 Mortimer Lewis plan period


In the same way, the site will be divided into three activity areas:
- house
- outbuildings
- stables

and the features discussed in relation to these three sectors of the site.

The Report will be organized in a systematic form leading the reader from the general to the particular, and back to the general.

Many authors refer to Mortimer Wheeler's famous introduction to the Maiden Castle report where: "a concise but readable account of the results of the work and a brief review of the wider implications" (Webster 1974:124) led readers into the report and enabled them to grasp the full significance of the work before being confronted with interminable lists of artifacts and layers.

The FGH Report will open with a similar abstract of the whole work; follow this with a history of the site and its significance, and then follow Webster's general outline arrangement, which is consistent with the DOE Level IV publication recommendations:
1. Reasons for the excavation and a concise, intelligible account of the
main results achieved.
2. A general description of the site, including the main geological and
topographical features and a note of previous discoveries with full
references.
3. Acknowledgements.
4. The main body of the report, which in many cases might be arranged
on a chronological basis, the remains of each period being described in
sequence. The chief structural elements should be considered first,
followed by the dating evidence and any special finds, and if necessary
with a section on interpretation.
5. Specialist reports which could not be reasonably contained in 4.
6. General conclusions, and a discussion of the wider implications when
appropriate.

6.2 British and American Excavation Literature

The authors I have referred to for the organization of
the publication are all British. I read several British site
reports - of Roman, Romano British, and Anglo Saxon
excavations, which are sites most comparable to the FGH
site. There were two such reports in the State Library
of NSW, and many in Fisher Library. I found no detailed
reports referring to Medieval or Post Medieval sites.

American historical archaeological site reports were most
difficult to obtain. There are none in the State Library
of NSW or in Fisher. Tim Murray of the Dept of Anthropology,
Sydney University, lent me photocopies he had of parts of
the Academic Press Studies in Historical Archaeology by
Geismar, and Deagan, but unfortunately he did not copy the
excavation descriptions, analysis, or synthesis chapters.

I contacted Professor Carmel Schrire at Rutgers University,
Princeton, USA, who sent me four CRM site reports.
Those I have used for this Report are Honerkamp, Council,
and Will, and Rubertone and Gallagher.

These two reports, and many articles I have read derived
from American historical archaeological excavations use
South's pattern recognition approach (South 1977, 1978 a&b),
which is based on the quantitative analysis of artifacts
aimed at recognizing patterns in frequency variations of
artifact types, groups, and classes. These writers also
use South's Mean Ceramic Date Formula to calculate the mean
occupation period of their sites. (see Honerkamp, Council
and Will 1982; Rubertone and Gallagher 1981; Handsman 1981;
South's work deals with 17th and 18th century American sites. It may not be applicable to the 19th century, when the British ceramic industry flooded the world's markets, and the frequency of ceramic types persisted for far longer than in the developing years of the 18th century.

The use of South's formulae, and the classification of artifacts into functional groupings, will be explored with the FGH material. Even though no rooms were excavated as a complete entity, the concept of activity areas in space - inside and outside rooms - and through time - will be tested with the excavated material.

The lack of available current American site reports has been a problem in preparing a Report of this kind, as the study of a variety of approaches to the analysis of historic sites is most important at this stage. I have consulted Academic Press on the availability of Geismar, Deagan, and their new publication of Kenneth Lewis' adaptation of his PhD thesis on the Frontier Period Model (1975). An analysis of these works may assist in refining the specific applicability of South's pattern recognition studies and the Mean Ceramic Date formula to the FGH site.

7.1 Types of Artifacts and Ecofacts to be Analysed

Ceramics, glass, tiles, brick, stone, mortar, plaster, flints, animal, bird, and fish bone, shell, seeds, wood, charcoal, coal, metal, buttons, clay pipes, coins, brushes, combs, shoes, leather, pencils, toys, soil samples, pollen sample, assorted small finds.
7.2 Specialist Staff

Specialist staff will have to be employed as advisors, or to analyse specific artifact groups which need special expertise.

At the Australian Archaeological Association Annual Conference I discussed the analysis of the bones with Dr. David Horton, Research Fellow at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies. Dr. Horton has offered to analyse the bones, and should be approached on this matter, once the quantity of bone excavated is known.

The soils and mortar samples have already been scientifically analysed by Mr. Roy Lawrie and Dr. George Gibbons. Dr. Helene Martin of the UNSW Botany Department has written a Report on the pollen sample collected. Soils, mortar, and pollen evidence must be integrated into the stratigraphic and structural analysis by the archaeological staff compiling the stratigraphic report.

The coins will have to be sent away to a specialist. Mr. Pat Boland, the Numismatist at the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, should be approached about working on them.

Mrs. Joanna Capon is a specialist in the history and manufacture of colonial plaster and paint. Last year she was invited to examine the fragments of plaster cornice excavated from the Macquarie bay window area. Mrs. Capon should be approached concerning a detailed analysis of this material.

The assistance of Mrs. Marjorie Graham will need to be sought in relation to ceramics analysis. She is one of the few people in Australia who can identify and date certain unmarked pieces by ware and decoration.

Funding should be set aside to pay these specialists for their advice. Other specialist advice may need to be sought on other classes of artifacts, and these people too may need to be paid.

7.3 General Staff

As was the case with the excavation phases, the staff available for this work are mostly inexperienced recent graduates. Therefore they will have to be instructed in how to analyse the materials they are to organize, and be guided to the literature which will assist them in understanding the subject matter.
7.4 Chapter Headings and Staff

As outlined in 2.4 to 6.00 above the Report will be organized in Chapters, and following the recommendations of Grinsell et al, Barker, and Webster.

The labelling and cataloguing of finds must take place first. These finds catalogues will be written by archaeologists under my supervision.

Recommended personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>No. of archaeologists</th>
<th>No. of assistants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ceramics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clay pipes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small finds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bricks, tiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapters on:
- history of the site
- general description, geology, topography, site formation processes
- reasons for the excavation and summary
- acknowledgements
- general conclusions

will be written by me.

The chapter on stratigraphic and structural relationships will be written by an archaeologist, with the help of two assistants. The chapter integrating the stratigraphic and material remains will be written by myself and this archaeologist.

7.5 Technical Specialist Staff

Architectural draftsman - to prepare the section and plan drawings for publication.

Artist - to draw selected finds for publication.

Conservator - ongoing conservation work will be needed, particularly on the metals, ceramics, plaster and paint.

Photographer - to complete the photography of the Special Finds, and photograph any finds for publication.

Administrative assistant - to organize the office, coordinate staff, arrange pay, purchase equipment and stores, and act as a research assistant.

Bookkeeper - to keep a record of the accounts.
7.6 Availability of Staff

As it was in the Phase II and III excavation periods, it will be a difficult task to find enough and adequate staff to do this work. Staff trained in the last two seasons are already finding other semi-permanent work. A lead-up time of 2-3 months to the beginning of Phase IV is necessary so that prospective staff will be able to organize their work commitments so that they will be available at the start of this work.

7.7 Submission of Drafts

Most staff will be inexperienced in preparing and writing reports, and in writing grammatical and clear English. Their reports will have to be submitted and re-submitted to me before they can be submitted to the Department for comment. The writing, typing, and re-typing of these Reports will take several weeks, and ample allowance must be made for this in the work programme, so that the final report will be submitted within the agreed time.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PREFACE

This Report details the excavation of designated areas of Raphael Place, Sydney, from Wednesday 18 to Tuesday 24 March 1987. The Excavation Director and author of this report is Anne Bickford, and the client the Department of Environment and Planning, NSW.

The project has been brought to a successful conclusion, within the designated time frame. The Excavation Director worked from Monday 16 March through to Friday 27 March. A team of five assistants worked a total of 38 person days.

1.2 FORMAT OF REPORT

The plans, sections, and photographs of relevant features are included after the text.

2.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In situ remains of the First Government House (FGH) period were found in the excavated areas of Raphael Place. [See Plans]. These were:

- the footings and wall of the southern wall of the southern outbuildings, of an early date, between 1795 and 1807

- the southern privy sump, reused as a sewage sump at a later date, at least up to 1901

- outcrops of bedrock modified for the footings of the stable building

- the steep cut in the bedrock about 2.5 metres behind the stable building

- an oviform brick drain of pre-1820 date. This drain probably issued from the southern outbuilding kitchen area

- slots in the clay, being the remains of the privy timber walls.
3.0 THE BRIEF

The Brief, of 10 March 1987, states that:
- the excavation is to determine whether or not structural remains of FGH have survived in situ beneath the surface of Raphael Place.
- the work is to be completed within a two week period.
- the objective of the excavation is to identify areas of undisturbed archaeological features associated with FGH which remain in situ beneath the surface of Raphael Place.
- the excavation will not involve excavation of the FGH deposits, just the identification of the presence or absence of significant features.
- manual investigation of Area B [Fig. 1] to determine the existence or otherwise of archaeological remains of FGH and assess their condition and significance.
- supervision of the mechanical excavation of the two strip trenches, one in each part of Area A, [Fig. 1] plus photographs and section drawings as appropriate.
- the preparation of a report.
- the methodology should follow that employed on previous excavations. It should not contain unnecessary detail.
- the consultant must liaise with the DEP and the PWD and attend joint meetings.
- a total of 12 days is allocated for the work, broken down as follows - 2 days preparation of site offices and site; 7 days excavation and backfilling; 3 days report preparation and writing.
- a draft Report is to be submitted 12 days from the date of commencement, which is agreed as 16 March 1987.

3.1 COMMENTS ON THE BRIEF

Section 3.1 of the Brief states that the investigations will not involve excavation., just the identification of the presence or absence of significant features.

Section 3.4 states that Area B will be investigated manually to determine the existence or otherwise of FGH remains and assess their condition and significance.

To assess the condition and significance of features some excavation must take place, to clear and to clean features in order that they can be clearly identified, and their significance assessed.

Minimum excavation took place, and all structural features of the FGH period remained in the ground.

The excavation of strata above and around these features was
necessary for identification purposes. All artifacts excavated were labelled and bagged following the appropriate procedures established in the previous excavation seasons.

3.2 CONSTRAINTS ON THE WORK

The work commenced as scheduled in the Contract on Monday 16 March 1987. Excavation was to commence on Wednesday 18 March. However, due to problems with the removal of the bitumen and concrete paving archaeological excavation began in the site at 10am Friday 20 March. Because of the concrete-breaking problem, and the heavy rain on Thursday night 19 March, 2½ days excavation time had been lost. Staff were deployed in setting up the FGR 2 metre grid and extending it to this new area; planning the MWSDB inspection chamber; preparing forms and plans for excavation, and shovelling the southern area of Area A down to bedrock.

In the Contract backhoe work was to commence on Wednesday 18 March, the projected first day of excavation. By Friday morning, because of the concrete-breaking and removal problem, backhoe excavation was projected to take place on Saturday and Sunday. On Saturday the backhoe driver did not turn up for work, and was unable to be contacted by the Contractor. By Saturday evening, as the Contractor and his team were not working on Sunday, the backhoe trenching was scheduled for Monday 23 March.

The archaeological team was deployed in excavating the privy area, the privy walls, and the rear wall of the southern outbuildings exposed in the east of the E-W trench.

Backhoe trenching took place on Monday 23 March and exposed the remains of the stable building footings, the cut in the bedrock behind the stables, and the brick oviform drain in the E-W trench. The revealing of these new features meant that on Monday 23 and Tuesday 24, staff would have to be deployed in exposing and recording these features.

The Contract stipulates seven working days for excavation and filling in. As excavation commenced on Friday 20 March, filling - in was scheduled to be completed on Thursday 26 March.

A problem developed at the onset of work as the Contractor did not have available equipment suitable for breaking heavy roadbase. The two day delay in the breaking of the roadbase disrupted the tightly scheduled excavation programme, adding approximately 81 person hours to the archaeological programme. Therefore, in terms of the archaeological processes stipulated in the Contract there was no time for:

- Section drawings. No section drawings were drawn in any excavated area. [Contract 3.5: "section drawings as appropriate."] All sections were photographed only.
Plans or sections of the cut in the bedrock, and outcropping bedrock in the stables area. Rushed photographs only were taken.

By taking these emergency measures archaeological work at the site was completed by about 3.00pm on Tuesday 26 March 1987, and the site filled in by the Contractor by about 5pm.

During the filling in the Contractor broke through the bitumen seal in an area of about 2 metres square, over the FGH outbuilding remains. This break should be made good or the remains will be damaged by stormwater and surface run-off.

### 3.21 Projected Time Schedule and Actual Time Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FGH</th>
<th>RAFAEL PLACE</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED TIME SCHEDULE AT 20 MARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI 20</td>
<td>SAT 21</td>
<td>SUN 22</td>
<td>MON 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; EXCAVATE</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>BACKHOE</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ACTUAL TIME SCHEDULE |
| L | EXCAVATE | REPORT | REPORT | REPORT |
| BACKHOE | FILL | AS | AS | AS | AS |
| AS | AS | AS | AS |

| FRI 20 | SAT 21 | SUN 22 | MON 23 | TUE 24  | WED 25 | THU 26 | FRI 27 |
4.0 DESCRIPTION OF SIGNIFICANT REMAINS OF FGH ENCOUNTERED DURING INVESTIGATION OF RAFAEL PLACE

4.1 THE SITE PLAN OF 1845 BY MORTIMER LEWIS, COLONIAL ARCHITECT

Structures represented on the 1845 site Plan of FGH project into the later construction of Raphael Place. [Fig.8]

The features of FGH which do so are:[Fig 4]
- part of the rear wall of the southern outbuilding
- the separate privy building;
- part of the stables

As predicted, these three structures were encountered during the excavation:
- the rear wall of the southern outbuilding in the Area A, E-W trench
- the privy in the Area B area in the N-E corner of Raphael Place
- the stables and cut in the bedrock behind them in Area A, N-S trench

Other features from the FGH period and later, which do not appear on the 1845 Plan were also excavated.

4.2 RECENT SERVICES WHICH HAVE CUT THROUGH FGH REMAINS

4.2.1 Electricity Cable

An electricity cable, marked on the services diagram [Fig.9] is live at night, lighting the streetlights attached to the west side of Raphael Place. The cable is old, of about the 1920s, according to a SCC representative who came to the site on Wednesday 25 March. A PWD electrical engineer, Mr. Adrian Vernon, came to inspect the cable and tell us whether it was live or not, as it penetrated the full length of Areas A and B. Mr. Vernon had never before seen a cable of this type. George Gibbons has suggested it was encased in gutta-percha, an early form of bitumen.

4.2.2 The MWSDB Sewerage Inspection Chamber

A sewerage inspection chamber cut through the N-W part of the privy building, destroying the northern privy sump.[Figs. 5, 10, 20].

The southern sump still exists, but has been re-used as a sump at a later date, being encased in concrete. However, from the
overlay of the 1845 Plan it can be seen that this location is undoubtedly the FGH privy site.

4.2.3 The Bedrock Behind the Phillip Street Terraces

At some time in the FGH period, probably when the stables were built, the bedrock which rose behind them was cut back parallel to the rear of the stables block. This cut was about 2.5m behind the stables, allowing access to them from the rear, and enabling stormwater and groundwater to drain away from the building.

During the 1984 stables area excavation this cut was revealed behind the Phillip Street terraces to be about 1m deep. [Fig.4]

By the time the cut appears in the Raphael Place backhoe excavation area, in the N-S trench of the roadway, it is only about 50cm deep, the rock having been shaved to flatten the area for the road. The natural groundslope to the west would also have contributed to the shallowness of the cut when encountered in Raphael Place itself.

4.2.4 Metal Water Pipe

This pipe, rusted and no longer is use, was excavated in Areas A and B to the north side of the electric cable. Its diameter is about 3.5cm. The pipe turned the corner, like the electric cable, but at right angles, and can be seen in the excavation plan drawings of the area. [Figs.14 and 19]

4.2.5 Comment on the Services Diagram Provided by PWD, Compiled from the FGH Conservation Plan.[Fig.3]

The Services Diagram was not useful except to give warning that an electrical cable may be found along the N and E sides of Raphael Place. Because the cable looked so old, and appeared to be cut through by the MWSDB inspection chamber [See Fig.16] I asked to be informed whether it was live or not. This was ascertained by Mr. Adrian Vernon PWD on Monday 23 March.

The only way to ascertain whether the sewer pipes might appear in the areas to be excavated is to lift off the manhole covers and inspect the sewers. This was done in the case of the inspection chamber in Area B [Figs. 10,12,20]. Inspection of this chamber revealed that the sewer diagram supplied from the FGH Conservation Plan is not accurate, as it shows sewer lines which are no longer in use, coming from the Phillip Street terraces, and also from the junction into the main site. Conversely, it does not show other sewer lines which are in use
entering and leaving the chamber.

Conservation planning of the FGH site would be aided if further research at the MWSDB records office was carried out, and also if on-site inspection of sewers took place.

4.3 THE REAR WALL OF THE SOUTHERN OUTBUILDINGS

The rear wall of the outbuildings appears in the 1845 Plan overlay in the Area A, E-W trench in Squares 10R4 and 10R6 [Fig 4].

The wall was found in exactly that place, confirming once again the accuracy of the 1845 Plan.

The wall has been disturbed in a minor way by the electric cable trench in 10R4, and more of it was missing in 10R6, as it was also disturbed by the construction of the MWSDB inspection chamber.

4.3.1 Construction of the Wall

[Figs. 14,15,16]. The wall is made of orange-red-coloured sandstock bricks, with light grey shelly mortar. A sample of this mortar was taken by George Gibbons on Friday 20 March for analysis.

As with all other features encountered, under this Contract minimal excavation took place. Once the form of the wall had been ascertained, rubble from the cable trench was left in situ, covering parts of the wall.

The western end of the wall was excavated to define the northern return of the wall.

Two courses of footings were defined, with one course of the wall, two stretchers wide, above them. [Fig.15] This wall course continued into Square 10R6 [Fig. 16] where three bricks remain in the section.

4.3.2 Posthole

A posthole, about 30cm square, and about 30cm (1 foot in imperial measurements) behind the wall was clearly visible dug into the natural soil [Fig. 15]. It was black in colour, and probably rotted in situ. It may have been a scaffolding pole or a fence post as part of a barrier erected at the rear of the building.

4.3.3 Interpretation

This wall is part of the rear wall of the southern outbuilding shown in the James Meehan Plan of Sydney of 31st October 1807.[Fig.1]
When overlaid on the present day site plan the building lines up exactly with that on the 1845 Lewis Plan. This is a remarkable fit, considering the small scale of the Meehan Plan and the more primitive surveying instruments available at the time. This information provides the solution to the mystery of the date and the southern extent of the rear of the outbuildings that had remained unresolved at the close of the previous excavations. [See Fig. 18 for my discussion of the archaeology and history of the outbuildings prepared for Conybeare Morrison and Partners as advice for the FGH Conservation Plan 1985].

The southern outbuilding in this form is at least as early as 1807, and may be as early as 1795, when the first press office was established. However, with more detailed evidence from the stratigraphic analysis now emerging, in June 1987, it appears more likely that it is the "separate brick printing office" referred to by Governor King in his correspondence of 1803. This may also be the building shown in the Watling pictures, particularly that seen in the oil painting of 1794, and in the painting by Edward Dayes of 1802.

4.4 THE PRIVY WALLS

It appears from the 1845 Plan that the privy walls were only 20cm (8 inches) wide. Therefore the privy was probably a timber structure, with the sump hole dug into the bedrock. This proposition is supported by the excavation as no brick or stone remains of the wall footings, nor timber post holes were found.

At the base of the square, in clay above the bedrock, dark lines forming patterns were observed. These may be:

- impressions of timber slots for walls
- marks on the disturbed natural surface of the bedrock unrelated to the privy
- scrape marks from the clearing back and removal of the FGH surface, and all remains of the privy walls, prior to building the Phillip Street terraces and the Right of Way, later Raphael Place, seen in the 1880 Plan of the area [Fig. 11].

4.5 THE PRIVY SUMP

4.5.1 The MWSDB Inspection Chamber

The 1845 Plan privy shows two adjoining toilets. The top of the northern sump was destroyed by the building of the MWSDB inspection chamber. The depth of the privy is not known. It is possible that below the concrete chamber the rest of the privy hole could still remain. This may contain FGH occupation and demolition material.
It is not known when the inspection chamber was built, but it appears on the plan of the PWD Tin Shed building in the 1970s [Fig. 10]. The inspection chamber was entered by myself and the Contractor, and courageously planned and a section drawn by Laura Jane Smith. [Fig. 20]

4.5.2 The Southern Privy Sump

The FGH privy sump seen on the 1845 Plan would have been cut through the bedrock, which crops close to the surface here. When excavated during this project it was seen to have been re-used as a sump at a later date - being covered with concrete at the rim and lined with the same material, finishing off with a smooth cement render finish.

About one quarter of the area of the sump was excavated, and an iron "U"-shaped hand hold was observed and recorded in the north and east section. [Fig. 21]

4.5.3 The 1901 City Council Plan

This Plan [Fig. 12] shows the sump in use. It does not appear in other plans after the 1845 demolition of FGH and the formation of Raphael Place, eg. the 1865 and 1880 plans. It may be that drains were not noted because they were not considered to be relevant to those plans.

At some time after 1901 this sump was filled in with sandstone rubble, covered over by the road, and the inspection chamber was used instead.

It is interesting to note that this specific location has remained as an area for the collection of sewage and drainage since the construction of the FGH privy, and still retains that function today.

4.6 THE STABLES AREA

4.6.1 The Stable Building

Figure 5 shows the area of the FGH stables, to the south of the FGH main complex. The stable remains were sought in the Area A, N-S trench.

No brick footings were found, but the bedrock appears to have been modified at the north and south corners of a central room of the stable block. This interpretation is based on the overlay of the 1845 Plan.
The bedrock may have been shaped in this way to serve as a footing for the stable walls.

4.6.2 The Cut in the Bedrock

In the 1984 excavation season a deep cut in the bedrock was observed about 2.5 metres behind the presumed location of the stable buildings, in the N-S trenches 2 and 3.

This cut was encountered again in the backhoe trench in the predicted location behind the stables. It is a clearly defined straight cut with a steep slope, showing pick marks. The depth is about 50cm from top to bottom.

Much of the bedrock in this area has been shaved off to create a flat surface for the Phillip Street terraces and the Raphael Place roadway. The ground surface during the FGH period would have been much higher, and therefore the cut much deeper, compared to that excavated behind the terraces in 1984. The ground surface naturally slopes down to the west, so that if the cut had survived without later modification it would have been shallower than that further to the east.

4.7 THE OVIFORM DRAIN

A brick oviform drain was excavated in the Area A, E-W backhoe trench. It lies to the west of the southern outbuilding wall in Grid Squares 10-12R2.

There was no prior evidence that this drain existed. It runs at an angle of about 30°N. Projected on to the 1845 Plan it originates at the Sydney Gazette office and southern kitchen area.

According to George Gibbons the bricks are pre 1820; and the drain could have been built at least as early as 1807, when the southern outbuilding was in use. The drain has been blocked, probably accidentally. The upper half contains fill of stones, soil, gravel, and brick fragments, while the lower half contains a deliberate fill of a mixture of coke, charcoal, and coal. [Figs. 22 and 23] This charcoal mixture was often used as a filter to purify the gases from noxious materials such as sewage and waste water.

The black fill contained small bones and a tooth, probably of sheep, and two fragments of transfer printed blue and white earthenware. One sherd bears a cross hatched pattern, common as rim decoration of willow pattern plates. This decoration has been found in FGH deposits in previous seasons.
The drain slopes away from the FGH site, probably issuing into the gully or ditch which ran roughly N-S between the site and the Tank Stream. This ditch is marked on the 1807 Meehan Plan of Sydney.

5.0 CONCLUSION

This excavation, though sampling only a small area of Raphael Place, with a small team in a limited time, and using detailed excavation techniques on only two small segments, produced much evidence of the FGH period occupation of the area.

With an awareness of the wealth of material excavated in the former car park and behind number 39 Phillip Street in the 1983 and 1984 seasons, this was to be expected.

It is clear that were further excavation to take place in Raphael Place more remains of FGH structures and occupation would be found.

If any future digging of the road for building or services is planned it is recommended that archaeological excavation take place prior to this and that an archaeologist be engaged to carry out a watching brief during any further work.
Comments on Refilling of Excavations

First Government House Site: Raphael Place

These comments relate to two openings in Raphael Place:

A. Partly above 1783 (?) privy
B. Above part of S wall of later outbuilding.

General Comments:

1. Because the privy site is now marked by a deep sump (presumably in sandstone), and there is a sewerage line close to excavation B, and the site will be asphalted, therefore no special measures need be taken to control ground water.

2. Because of the concrete collar around the sump rim, no special
measures will be necessary to strengthen this part of the site.

3. The main dangers to the outbuilding wall (B) are:

(a) shock vibrations from passage of vehicle wheels over the structure;

(b) differential compaction causing concentration of loads on the brickwork rather than surround fill.

Recommendations

A. Privy site: Refill with material from the excavation, perhaps marking the interface with strips of inert fabric. Tamp well. A layer of sand and/or gravel could be laid, if
desired beneath the asphalt topping.

B. Rear of outbuilding: Replace clay removed from pit to 10 cm (min.) depth over area except brickwork, and along the edge of the gutter. Tamp this material very thoroughly. Then fill area above remaining brickwork to same height with similar material, avoiding larger lumps, and tamping to a lesser degree.

Then lay a reinforced cement slab over the projecting brickwork (perhaps 1.4 m x 0.6 m x 15 cm?), fill with sand, tamp, and lay asphalt.

Site Maintenance

Any subsidence of surface should be promptly filled with asphalt.

G. Stibbons

23-3-87
Looking east

A  hard-tamped earth
B  tamped earth
C  slab (laid or poured)
D  9t tamped sand
E  road surface
FIGURE 1 Attachment to Contract
FGH Site, Additional Excavation
in Raphael Place, DEP, March
1987
FIGURE 3 Attachment to Contract
FGH Site, Additional archaeological probes, Raphael Place Services Diagram, PWD, March 1987
FIGURE 4 Raphael Place showing areas of hand excavation, features, backhoe trenching, features revealed and 1845 structures overlaid on 1845 plan:  

- Floating stone above backhoe
- High backhoe outcropping with flintstone paucity
- Stone drain pipe
- Metal pipe
- Bedrock cut back to 1845
FIGURE 5 Raphael Place showing areas of hand excavation and backhoe trenching, features revealed, and FGH structures on 1845 Plan, but in outline only.
FIGURE 6 Limits of E-W backhoe trench and features revealed
FIGURE 7 Limits of N-S boring trench and features revealing
This diagram shows the existing drainage system. Scale: 40 feet = 1". This work must be carried out in accordance with the Board's By-laws and Regulations.

M. W. S. & D. B.

"NOTE This diagram only indicates availability of a sewer and any sewerage service shown as existing in Board's records (By-law A Section 3). The existence and position of Board's sewers, storm water sewers, pipe, mains and structures should be considered as information only and Board's Head Office or any of Board's South Coast District or Board's Wollongong Office or any of Board's Records Office, (Section 2) of Board's Act). Position of structures, boundaries, sewers and sewerage service shown herein are approximate only."

This work will be certified by:

M. W. S. & D. B.

Engineer-in-Chief
FIGURE 15 Plan of E-W trench 10RG showing remains of pre 1070 southern outbuilding wall

OUTBUILDING WALL
SANDSTONE BRICKS IN SITU

Raphael Place E/W Trench

CONCRETE GUTTER

SPECIAL PIPE
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KEY

brown/black gutta-percha

concrete

sandstone (bedrock?)

sandstone brick
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ELECTRIC INTEGRAL
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Raphael Place Road Surface
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1.06

1.2075

0.97

22/3/1987
Jean Smith

All levels below Site Datum.
FIGURE 16 Plan of outbuildings enlarged from James Meehan's Plan of Sydney 31st October 1807 overlain over the site grid. This plan shows that the wall in the excavation existed when the 1807 Plan was surveyed.
These outbuilding footings are 2 feet or 600mm wider and 6 inches narrower than the house footings.

These footings show one internal and two external north-south walls, the whole of the east-west front wall, and allow the interpretation of part of the east-west back wall.

Part of an east-west "garden wall" of rougher construction was found 2.4m to the south of the northern outbuilding wall.

These outbuilding footings as excavated do not show their whole plan in 1845.

There is a anomaly in that the eastern wall appears to be about 2m shorter than the east and central walls.

I have limited pictorial and plan evidence to mark as the excavation was carried out as a rescue operation and only limited historical research has been done to date.

**FIGURE 17:** Extract from Report to Conybeer Morrison and Partners for the FGH Conservation Plan

by Anne Bickford

**EARLY 1810s**

When the first phase of the outbuildings was demolished and the second phase was constructed in the early 1830s the 1786 eastern, and part of the central wall footings were re-used. The western wall was demolished to enable the room to be enlarged, and new outer walls built to the west.

Excavation shows that the north wall of the outbuildings forms one line with the southern wall of the house, and that the two structures were about 5.4m apart. This is about 3.5m closer than the distance suggested by Robert Water and reproduced in *Woodford p.39.*

Though there is no direct in-ground evidence, by analysing the excavated footings and the Lewis Plan of the outbuildings, I consider that some of the second phase walls were rebuilt on the original 1786 footings, and that the 1786 outbuildings were shaped:

**FIGURE 18:** Plan of the 1786 outbuilding complex as consistent with evidence in the Watling Collection drawings, the 1793 Plan of Sydney by Water, and Irving's reoccupation, but not with Bradley 1786 or Blake's engraving of Sydney in 1802.

The northern part of the outbuildings may have been built after 1785, but must have been present by 1785 when the press office was established, and all the remains of which have been excavated in the southern part of the outbuildings location. Although the many small scale ground plans are contradictory it does seem that by 1832 there was a southern building behind the 1786 structure, as it is shown in a painting by Edward Dayes, dated 1803, in the Mitchell Library.

**FIGURE 19:** The area where the remains of the small position room to the west may have been was not excavated, and so its location cannot be traced.

By analysing the pictorial and plan evidence available it appears that the northern structure was brick and the southern of weatherboard. (Watling Coll. Drawings and Thomas Water paintings 1901).

This plan for the 1786 outbuilding complex is consistent with evidence in the Watling Collection drawings, the 1793 Plan of Sydney by Water, and Irving's reoccupation, but not with Bradley 1786 or Blake's engraving of Sydney in 1802.
FIGURE 18 Plan of 6-8R10 showing possible timber structure slots

RAHAFEL PLACE 6-8R10 (final plan)

showing possible timber structure slots.

Possible trench.

---

Linear marks on surface of 6-8

(6) Pale stratified sandy clay + small pieces of crushed sandstone (ie disturbed weathered surface of bedrock)

(12) More pure clay (white to grey/blue) variation of 6)

23/3/1987
R. Atcheson

All levels below site datum
FIGURE 19 Sketch Plan and Section of MWSDB inspection chamber in 8R6. Extracts from Field Notebook

PLAN OF INSPECTION CHAMBER
MWSDB IN 8R6

PLAN AND SECTION BY L. J. SMITH
19/3/1987

SECTION OF INSPECTION CHAMBER
**FIGURE 20** Plan of privy sump in 6R8

- Sandstone Rubble
- Top of Bump
- Concrete
- Iron hand hold in side of sump

**Levels below Site Datum**
CROSS SECTION OF DRAIN (FGH) 10-12 RM

SEE PLAN FOR LOCATION OF CROSS SECTION

FACING NNE

All levels below Site Datum

Electric cable in wood trough
(Actually passes in front of this section)

5TH SECTION
CORE, CHARCOAL, COAL
LAYER SURFACE
IS TA 1-96

NOTE:
ONLY 3 BM'S BETWEEN BOTTOM OF DRAIN AND SIDE OF DRAIN ON THE SIDE BUT 4 BM'S ON THE OTHER SIDE

SAND, SOIL, GRAVEL, BROKEN BRICK
SIDE OF DRAIN

COKE, CHARCOAL, COAL
EXCAVATION OF PRIVY WALLS AND PRIVY. DOUGLAS PARK IN PRIVY, 22 MARCH.

COMPLETED EXCAVATION OF AREA B SHOWING POSSIBLE TIMBER WALL, 22 MARCH.
EXCAVATED SECTION OF PRIVY SUMP. SCALE: 50cm LONG.
CONCRETE TOP AND SANDSTONE RUBBLE FILL.
SITE OF STABLE BUILDING. HIGH BEDROCK FOOTINGS OUTCROPPING. LOOKING N.
CUT IN BEDROCK BEHIND STABLES. FILL OF ROCKS, METAL AND WOOD.

CUT IN BEDROCK AFTER EXCAVATION COMPLETED.