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Chapter 1
Introduction

What Soft - Cherubic Creatures
These Gentlewomen are -
One would as soon assault a Plush -
Or violate a Star

*Emily Dickerson*
'What Soft - Cherubic Creatures' (c. 1862).

The Evidence

The material which represents the subject of this dissertation was excavated below the floor of the Pitt Street Uniting Church by Bob Holmes and Doug Armstrong, of the CSIRO, in their spare time during 1971. These excavations took place at a time when the discipline of historical archaeology was in its earliest formative phases and was still therefore largely without a coherent epistemological and methodological foundation. The absence of 'anchors' at these levels is reflected in some major flaws and constraints in the investigation process, among them, the absence of prior historical research, the absence of a research design, and a failure to interpret the resulting excavated material. Certainly, such an excavation would not be acceptable by contemporary standards, but it is important to acknowledge that to a large degree these standards had not been proposed, let alone accepted, at the time the excavation took place.

Notwithstanding its limitations by contemporary standards, by all accounts the excavation was undertaken with a high degree of diligence with the result that the archaeology of the site was thoroughly and meticulously explored and documented (to the field book stage).\footnote{14}{Judy Birmingham: 'Introduction' in Damaris Bairstow: 
Excavations in the City of Sydney 1971-1973 unpublished Historical Archaeological Project: Centre for Historical Archaeology: 1978.}

Unfortunately, there was no attempt at publication, or even of basic cataloguing, and the excavated material therefore remained inaccessible until a first attempt at cataloguing and interpretation was undertaken by Damaris Bairstow as a third year student project under the auspice of the Centre for Historical Archaeology of the University of Sydney in 1978.\footnote{15}{Damaris Bairstow. Excavations in the City of Sydney 1971-1973, Centre for Historical Archaeology, 1978.} Although obviously a very important activity, this first attempt at cataloguing and interpretation consequently lacks a familiarity with the context and process of excavation which can really only be derived from the excavator’s direct on-site experience.

In addition, this first inventory and interpretation occurred at a time when a standardised database for the recording and analysis of large quantities of artefactual material was not yet available.\footnote{16}{For example, the MINARK Scientific Database System, developed later by the Centre for Historical Archaeology, University of Sydney: for a discussion of this database refer to: Wilson, A. The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks; Archaeological Investigation Stage SA: Artefact Analysis: Unpublished Report NSW Department of Planning: 1985.} Consequently, Bairstow’s description of artefacts is based upon a rudimentary system of classification, which is susceptible to a high degree of subjectivity and inaccuracy, is
difficult to use for comparative purposes, and is not readily amenable to computer-aided data manipulation.

A first objective of this current research was therefore to re-examine and re-catalogue artefacts derived from the site according to a standardised computer-based classificatory system which would provide for the standardisation of descriptive variables across the assemblage, correct any errors and inconsistencies in original descriptions, and, most importantly, provide the basis for future comparative work.

A first attempt at interpretation

The second and major objective of this current research was to provide a more detailed interpretation of the site and its archaeology. As has already been noted, the 1978 catalogue also contains an attempt at an interpretation of the site, but this interpretation is very brief, does not benefit from anything but the most cursory prior historical research, and its conclusions have been for some time considered somewhat alarming in their 'positivist' assertiveness.17

The site's archaeological assemblage has always been recognised as quite significant for at least three reasons; first, because there are, *prima facie*, strong grounds to believe that it derives from a deposit sealed in 1846, dating the assemblage to the first half of the nineteenth century, second because it is an urban deposit, and until recently urban deposits were rarely the subject of historical archaeological investigation in Australia, and third, it derives from a site which is believed to have been occupied by 'working class' people, an area of research which also (until recently) has been long neglected in

Australian historical archaeology. A more detailed historical and archaeological interpretation of the site has therefore not only long been recognised as possible, but indeed, as essential to the development of Australian urban historical archaeology.18

Before embarking upon this more extensive interpretation of the site and its archaeology, it is important that we come to terms with the theoretical and evidential basis of the existing, 1978, interpretation of the site, with a view to determining whether it provides an adequate foundation upon which further interpretive work might be undertaken. Although brief, the 1978 interpretation of the site is dense with ideas and warrants complete quotation;

Glass:
Apart from the mass of window glass commensurate with the demolition of the cottages in 1841, the greatest proportion of the glass was dark olive, fragments of "black" bottles and case gin. This represents 92% of the surface glass, 81% of layer 4 and 100% of the glass found in the trench dug against the foundation wall in Bay 3. This seems to indicate that liquor bottles should be seen not as part of the domestic refuse of the cottages but as having been discarded by the builders and workmen employed by the Church.

The bulk of the remaining glass in Bay three was clear, apparently fragments of water carafes, tumblers or goblets and lamps.

Pottery:
The immediate impression is of homogeneity. Whilst one cannot be sure that the deposit was sealed until 1845 when the floor of the Church was certainly laid, the nature of the material, its femininity, suggest one cottage occupied by a lady of no great wealth but whose tastes reflect the gentility of her time.

Her China is British. Of that there is little doubt. Her table is laid with good quality, hard fired earthenware but she cannot afford English porcelain. Even the Spode fragment, P156, is earthenware.

If from one of the cottages, the China has a terminal date of 1841. Surely it should be easy to ascertain the manufacturer, but one is confronted immediately with the basic problem of most Australian finds. This is not porcelain. The books, the collectors, are not concerned with earthenware. Designs for porcelain were not used necessarily for earthenware. Nor is the blue, when fired on earthenware, of the same depth or quality as on porcelain.

There are four base marks. The Spode mark is of a type used 1770-1797. The "BB" impress on P237 could be Beardmore and Birks of Lane End, successors to Griffiths, Beardmore and Birks in 1831-43. However, the same impress was used mid 18th century by Hohenstein, a German Potter. The other two I have been unable to identify.

The shape of the hand-painted saucers, P161-3, is late 18th or early 19th century. These have been identified as Staffordshire but that attribution dismissed on the ground of colour which was referred to as "Liverpool Blue". One has a workman’s mark "X", very common in Bristol. A late 18th century date is preferred and I am inclined to follow the Liverpool suggestion.

The teacup, P87, has been dated 1825 onwards. Following the Liverpool lead, I have found that the Herculaneum Pottery used the cellular stringing seen on this cup on a number of vessels from 1808 onwards. Many of the border florals and stringing of the rim fragments were used at Herculaneum at this time. Unfortunately, however, they were not exclusive to Liverpool. Wedgwood used them and the Etruria pottery was a prolific producer of unmarked, blue transfer printed earthenware. As Wedgwood blues change colour, the shade doesn't help in the identification. There are no rim fragments large enough to give the full combination of florals. Similar florals appear on a plate published in "Australian Antiques" and there attributed by Marjorie Graham to an unknown Staffordshire potter. The period is right. The massed blue effect characteristic of the rim sherd was, of course, a common means of disguising poor quality fabric in the early 19th century.

The Chinese porcelain bowl, P200, was a shape common at the turn of the century though an early 19th century date is preferred. The Chinese plate, P206, is of a type then made for the export market.

Despite the enormous output of Staffordshire, the evidence here suggests Liverpool. In the early years of the 19th century the Herculaneum Pottery mass produced for export, mainly to America. The Liverpool docks gave it an advantage over its Staffordshire rivals. It is possible, however, that this unknown lady brought her China with
her when she sailed the nine months’ voyage to Sydney Town.

My preference for Liverpool should not imply one area of production. The scratch blue rim fragments, P165-184, show twelve varieties distinguishable by length, depth and the amount of colour.

Other material:
The bone fragments have not been analysed but, apart from the small teeth and claws, possibly a cat's, they are butchered or comprise other clearly domestic refuse such as chicken or fish.

The small shell may have been there for lime. The plaster, X24, contained shell. The bulk of shell, however, was oyster of a size no longer found in the environs of Sydney.

The flint fragment, X17, could have been used for striking but the other flint, X27, is, I am informed, naturally flaked and of a type possibly dredged from the bed of the Thames for Ship's ballast.

Conclusion:
The dress pins, M27-8, the thimble, M52, and the dress makers pins, M29-32, enforce the impression of the femininity of the finds. The button backs, X7-8, show this lady made clothes. The fragment of oiled cloth could have been stiffening material. The pins were for fine cloth.

I do not suggest the lady lived alone. The clay pipes, the brass button, M24, with the coarser cloth adhering, attest to the presence of a man. There is no hint of children. A young couple, perhaps, hopeful migrants to the land of milk and honey that soon was to enter the first of its recurrent economic depressions.

However brief, the 1978 interpretation of the site purports to be capable of determining with great precision many major characteristics of those persons occupying the site. The interpretation concludes a great deal in relation to their gender, social class, social role, consumer choice and economic status, among other things. This is an extremely interesting and exciting level of interpretation for an historical archaeologist to proffer, and therefore warrants careful consideration. Unfortunately, any initial excitement generated by the apparent level of this theoretical analysis begins to
disintegrate when the reader attempts to seek out the evidential basis for the conclusions reached. In fact, the narrative appears to comprise of little more than a series of largely unexplored and unjustified assertions and assumptions, and the reader is placed in the position of having to search for the basis of these claims without any guidance from the author. Thus, in order to assess the validity of the 1978 interpretation of the site and its assemblage, it is necessary to carefully identify each of the major assertions and assumptions made in respect of it, and then to examine the text, and the historical and archaeological data, for any evidence supporting such an assumption or assertion.

**The construct of femininity/gender**

Perhaps the most striking of the assumptions and assertions made in the 1978 interpretation is in relation to the gender of the principal occupant. On the basis of an analysis of the archaeological assemblage, the author assumes that the principal occupant of the site was a woman. This assumption is revealed in seven separate references to female gender in the course of the interpretation and is summed up by the extremely circular statement 'the nature of the material, its femininity suggests one cottage occupied by a lady ...'.

Unfortunately, the author does not at any stage explicitly argue how the material conveys an impression of femininity, and one can only assume from the context of these assertions and implications that she sees gender being conveyed by two factors; first, by the quality of the earthenware, and second, by its particular decorative motifs.
The author’s attempt to determine gender on the basis of earthenware characteristics is a methodologically absurd proposition. There is absolutely no historical or archaeological evidence to suggest that gender can be correlated with fabric quality or decoration. One might just as easily conclude that the presence of the fine quality and elaborately decorated 'Imari' style dinner services at Government House, Sydney, purchased for Governor Macquarie’s household, and Sir John Jamison’s house at Regentville were indicative of the presence of women and the absence of men.

Nor is an argument that tableware reflects a feminine taste by virtue of the fact that its purchase and maintenance was undertaken by women sustainable. In fact, there is historical evidence to suggest that dining, and the dining room, and their accoutrements reflected essentially male tastes and choices in the early nineteenth century. In this context, it is also worth noting that Sir John Jamison was not married at the time his Mason’s dinner service at Regentville was purchased, so the only taste he would have felt compelled to satisfy was his own.

Recently, and on a theoretical level particularly, there have been a number of attempts by feminist archaeologists to indicate the importance of the study of gender in the archaeological record, and the significance of such an avenue of inquiry is not in dispute here. A factor often stressed in such discussions

---

19 Sacred Dinners and Secular teas: Constructing Domesticity in Mid-19th-Century New York, in Historical Archaeology Volume 25, pp. 69ff.
however, is the methodological subtlety required to detect gender patterns, which are often heavily obscured for a range of sociological and historical reasons. This is particularly evident in Yentsch's gender analysis of the eighteenth century dairying industry in the eastern United States.\textsuperscript{22} Although she is ultimately able to detect gender-related technological shifts reflected in the archaeological record, she is only able to do so on the basis of an extremely detailed knowledge of historic context. The artefacts, in and of themselves, did not provide gender indications.

In any case, as will be discussed following, basic historical research has revealed that the site was occupied by four people, three of whom were men. This single, easily identifiable, historic fact contradicts any suggestion that the assemblage is 'feminine' in nature or origin.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{The construct of feminine proprietorship}
\end{quote}

Curiously, the last paragraph of the 1978 interpretation contains the statement 'I do not suggest the lady lived alone ... A young couple perhaps.' This statement would appear to the reader to contradict the principal premise of the interpretation; that is, that the assemblage is 'feminine' in nature, and the only way that this contradiction can be resolved internally to the interpretation is to conclude that the author regards the male component of this couple as having no archaeological impact on the site.

Implicit, therefore, in the 1978 interpretation's assumption of femininity is a yet deeper assumption of feminine proprietorship and dominance. Even

though the author suggests the presence of a male occupant, the interpretation of the site and its archaeology appears to be based on the intertwined assumptions that a woman was responsible for the acquisition of the site's material culture and its archaeological deposition and that the male presence on the site is of no archaeological significance; references to 'her China', and 'her table' serve to reinforce this implication.

_Primae facie_, it seems patently illogical to the reader for the author to suggest that a site occupied by 'a young couple' is only influenced by the female party to this couple. However the author appears to be oblivious to this contradictory argumentation, as there is no discussion of either the historical, archaeological or methodological basis for such a proposition.

In any case, again, basic historical research has revealed that the principal occupant of the site was Samuel Johns, who appears to have developed the property in 1822/3 and remained there until 1841. Any implication of feminine dominance or proprietorship of the site is therefore entirely refuted.

**The assumption of social status, and economic status**

A third significant assumption underpinning the 1978 interpretation concerns the social status of the principal occupant or occupants. The author asserts quite definitely that the principle occupant was a 'British' 'lady' of 'gentility'. These assertions appear, again, to be based upon the quality of the earthenware and its particular decorative motifs, and there is no discussion of the methodological basis for making such a claim.
It is interesting to note that this interpretation of social status uses the relative quality of the earthenware as an indicator of elevated social class, presumably because it reflects a refined taste. It is also argued that because the assemblage does not contain English porcelain (which in fact it does, see following) this 'lady's' gentility is 'faded'. This is presumably because English porcelain is assumed to be more expensive than earthenware and can not be afforded. Again, these two propositions are based upon apparently contradictory premises. Fine earthenware is assumed be an indicator of social status, but English porcelain apparently is not; at least its absence from the assemblage is only seen as being an indication of low economic status, not of low social status.

It is also salutary to note in this context that the 1978 interpretation excludes glass, notably case gin glass, from the analysis on the basis that because the site was occupied by a faded gentlewoman, the gin could not possibly have been consumed by such a person due to her social status, and therefore must reflect the Church's construction phase. This assertion is obviously based upon very circular assumptions, poor logic (why is it that people of high social status wouldn't drink gin, or at least reuse gin bottles?), and an extremely poor methodology, which is willing to disregard any evidence inconsistent with preconceived theories of gentility. It is also made in spite of the fact that case gin glass is found in each layer of the excavation, and its exclusion on the basis of proposed later deposition calls into question the process of deposition of all other classes of artefact.

The 1978 interpretation also appears to construe the supposed elevated social status of the principal occupant from a perceived 'homogeneity' of high
quality earthenware in the ceramic assemblage. However, the construction of 'homogeneity' is entirely misleading. In fact, the ceramic assemblage reveals a wide range of wares, from small quantities of gilt English porcelain and vitrious stoneware, through to good quality transfer printed wares, inexpensive scratch blue wares, and a variety of coarser kitchenwares; in other words, the assemblage, prima facie, reveals a diversity of composition typical of domestic refuse. This diversity of ceramic composition is reflected in the glass assemblage, which reveals a range of dark olive bottle glass, case gin and medicine bottles, through to a good quality glass decanter and tumbler set.

In any case, the notion of elevated social status is again entirely refuted by the historical evidence which reveals that each of the known occupants are ex-convicts, and what can be traced of their origins suggests that they were typical working class British subjects. There is absolutely no suggestion of 'gentility' in their backgrounds, faded or otherwise.

**Flaws in the 1978 Interpretation of the Site**

In summary therefore, the 1978 interpretation suffers from a major problem in epistemology. The author appears to labour under severe misconceptions both in relation to the nature of the archaeological record and of the nature of archaeological interpretation. She appears to be working from a deeply embedded naive positivist belief that it is possible to extrapolate detailed historical information from fragmentary archaeological samples, as if 'to see the world in a grain of sand'. It may be that the author is seeking to emulate
the 'positivist' epistemological approaches of James Deetz,23 Ivor Noel Hume,24 and even of Stanley South,25 (whose interpretative methodologies dominated historical archaeology at that time) but she does so by, in effect, 'copying' their positivist style of writing, apparently without the least comprehension of the underlying rigour and sophistication of their scholarship, and particularly without recognising its analytical and methodological underpinnings. Even at its height, 'positivist' epistemology would not have claimed to have been able to interpret the archaeological record with the definitiveness of Bairstow's interpretation,26 which in the final analysis, at least at the epistemological level, seems to be based upon a rather intellectually primitive search for certainty.

The 1978 interpretation is also flawed methodologically. For one thing, it is not based on anything but the most cursory prior historical research, even though such research would obviously have had enormous potential to inform the interpretation of the site.27 In this respect, it is simply amazing that the author would construct a scenario involving a faded gentlewoman to explain the archaeology of an Australian historic site, especially of this period, and of this apparent status. Indeed, one can not help being reminded that faded gentility is a typical motif of English nineteenth century romantic fiction, and

---

24 See for example, Ivor Noel Hume, Historical Archaeology, Knopf. 1969.
26 For a discussion of the history of positivist interpretation in archaeology see Bruce G,Trigger: A History of Archaeological Thought: Cambridge University Press; 1990. See also Lewis R. Binford, In Pursuit of the Past; Decoding the Archaeological Record, Thames and Hudson, p.8ff.
it would appear that the 1978 interpretation, whether consciously or not, is heavily reliant upon such works to provide the basic framework of interpretation of the site. Even the most respected historical archaeologists have been known to resort to romantic fiction for inspiration on occasion, but never in so simplistic and uncritical a manner!

The most elemental understanding of Australian history during the first half of the nineteenth century would render this kind of interpretation highly suspicious. The population of the colony during this period was for example, overwhelmingly dominated by convicts and emancipists, and additionally, overwhelmingly they were men. On the basis of simple probability, any interpretation of a site of this apparent status should therefore proceed with the view that it is a site more likely than not occupied by male convicts or ex-convicts.

Additionally, the 1978 interpretation appears to disregard even that historical information which apparently was available. For example, the initial discussion of the history of the site refers to two key pieces of historical information; an 1840 auction notice for 'cottages' on the site, and title information from 1829 and 1839. The 1840 auction notice clearly stipulates the sale of 'cottages', yet the 1978 interpretation ignores this quite unambiguous historic evidence and proposes instead that a single cottage

29 Wray Vamplew (ed) Australians Historical Statistics, Fairfax, Syme and Weldon and Associates, 1987, p.4-5; in the decade 1821 to 1830 for example convict immigration exceeded that of free-settlers by more than three to one, and men outnumbered women by a ratio of four to one (p.25).
existed on the site. Information related to land title from 1829 and 1839 clearly designates 'Samuel Johns' as the occupant of the site, but again, the 1978 interpretation ignores this basic historic evidence and proposes instead that the site was occupied by a gentlewoman. In these circumstances, it is difficult to avoid drawing one of two possible conclusions; either the author has a fundamental misunderstanding of the role of historical information in historical archaeology and therefore fails to apply it logically, or what historical information there was had been obtained opportunistically and incompletely from a general secondary source which did not provide the detailed primary information actually available. The quotation of historical sources in the 1978 narrative therefore provides only the illusion of (cursory) historical research, and in fact no such research may have been undertaken at all. In a broader sense, this approach represents a failure to apply the methods of Historical Archaeology at the most basic level.

It is also worth noting that the failure to use Land Title effectively is a second example of what appears to be a fundamental lack of understanding of the historic context of the site and its archaeology. Bairstow goes to some length to derive the identity of the principal occupant from earthenware characteristics without appearing to be aware that the same information could be obtained on the basis of a simple Land Title search, which would also have the added benefit of revealing the succession of occupiers, including the original grantee.

Additionally, the 1978 interpretation is marred methodologically by the fact that there is no form of research design to guide the analysis of the assemblage. The author proposes no questions to be answered, and no
hypotheses to be tested on the basis of the archaeological record. It is this factor perhaps more than any other which allows the interpretation to develop, perhaps somewhat unconsciously, a series of rather incredible assertions and assumptions with little or no evidence at all. Had a research design required that assumptions be made explicit in the first instance, their validity could then have been tested against the archaeological evidence. Without any such heuristic framework, there is no apparent relationship between the evidence and the conclusions drawn from it.

The 1978 interpretation is also significantly limited by virtue of the fact that it contains no discussion in relation to the nature of the assemblage, and how this was determined methodologically, the nature of its deposition, or of any taphonomic processes to which it might have been subject.

A further curiosity in respect of the 1978 interpretation are the somewhat histrionic attempts to date the site to the eighteenth century, as if the archaeological significance of the site and its assemblage increases as a result. In this respect, there are several attempts to date particular ceramics, where out of a range of possible dates, an 'earlier date is preferred' by the author, without reasons being given for why this is so. In fact, these earlier dates appear, on the basis of a re-analysis of the assemblage, to be unfounded. This would appear to reflect a antiquarian approach to the archaeological record.

---


32 For an introductory discussion on the use of models as heuristics in archaeology, see J.N. Hill 'The methodological debate in contemporary archaeology', in Clarke, D.L., Models in Archaeology, Methuen and Co., 1972, pp. 61-108.

33 For a full discussion of this issue refer to Chapter 4.
which has the potential not only to distort the interpretation of this site, but also the nature of historical archaeological significance more generally.

The overwhelming implication of our examination of the original interpretation is, essentially, that the interpretation of the site must start again from scratch. We are not in a position where the original interpretation can command sufficient confidence for us to be able to pursue more refined research objectives based upon what has gone before. Before any further work can be undertaken, the site and its excavation must be re-documented, re-inventoried, and re-interpreted, and it is to such objectives that this dissertation is addressed.

The Actual Historic Context of the Site

As has been implied in the preceding discussion, even the most preliminary historical investigation of the site reveals quite a different historic context to that proposed in the 1978 interpretation. In brief, the site is revealed to have been occupied by four emancipists, at least one of whom occupied the site from its initial development in 1822-1823 to its destruction in 1841. Further historic research provides much more detailed information in relation to each of the occupants, and this historical portrait of the occupants, combined with the fact that the site was sealed in 1846, makes it a very rich resource for exploring the material culture of working class emancipists during the first half of the nineteenth century.
New Questions Identified

The traditional paradigm of Australia's convict history tends to be divided between a romantic, nationalist construct within which convicts are interpreted as 'innocent and manly' victims of eighteenth and nineteenth century British cruelty, and a more recent construct of Australia as a 'fatal shore' to which were sent an intractable professional criminal underclass. To a very large degree these chauvinistic and ideological positions are lived out in academic discourse as much as they are in popular discourse.

It was during the early 1950s that Manning Clark first started to challenge what he saw as the romantic nationalist conceptions of Australia's convict past. Clark argued that the convicts transported to New South Wales could not be typified as poor rural workers pushed into poaching by enclosure and economic exigency: 'they were no helpless victims of a repressive and cruel British society, but persistent thieves engaged in a life of crime'.

Since the 1950s, Clarke's revisionist characterisation of the convicts has come to dominate Australian history, gaining particular momentum from Shaw's and Robson's statistical analyses of the convict indents during the 1960s. The current orthodox interpretation of the convicts is that they came from a unique British professional criminal underclass. For example, in 1983 John Hirst wrote that Shaw's work 'finally established the large professional

criminal element among the convicts',\textsuperscript{36} and, more recently, Robert Hughes argued, in a 'popular' history, that the innocence of convicts as a class was 'first exposed to criticism by Manning Clark in the 1950s and finally demolished with statistical analyses by I.L. Robson in 1965'.\textsuperscript{37} Brian Fletcher argued publicly in mid-1987 that 'The convicts sent to Australia really were criminals ... [not] basically decent people forced into a life of crime by adverse economic conditions'.\textsuperscript{38}

These interpretations are underpinned by very definite assertions in relation to the sociological and psychological characteristics of the convicts. In his analysis, Clark distinguishes the 'criminal classes' from the 'urban working class', by a 'certain character and upbringing', by a 'psychological aberration' which made them 'permanent outcasts' of society.\textsuperscript{39} Shaw asserts that the convicts had 'sprung from the dregs of society, and had been trained in crime from the cradle'.\textsuperscript{40} Lloyd Robson sees the convicts as a 'criminal class', the result of 'indifferent or non-existent parental control', and as a 'professional class of thieves who taught children, not always their own, but waifs and strays, how to pick pockets'.\textsuperscript{41} B. and M. Schedvin refer to the convicts as deriving from a 'criminal subculture' which emphasised 'easy money, idleness


and self-indulgences' - values traced to 'parental neglect and indifference accompanied by lack of discipline'.

Hughes writes of a subculture of crime in Britain, and in London particularly, from which 'many Britons made their living, wholly, or in part'.

The 'Manning Clark' paradigm of Australian convict history has recently been challenged in a ground-breaking new revisionist history of Australia's convict settlement. The concept of a 'professional criminal underclass' is rejected from both an ideological/conceptual point of view, and on the basis of an empiricist re-examination of the convict indents. At the highest level of this new analysis the convicts are seen as participants in a 'forced' migration arising from the social displacement of the industrial revolution. More specifically, they are revealed to be typical British working class citizens with a repertoire of useful skills essential for the development of the colony.

This new analysis of Australia's convict past is likely to generate much sociological and historical discussion and debate over the next decade, and has the potential to profoundly alter our national consciousness in respect of the origins and nature of first European settlement in Australia.

One of the most exciting, and yet surprisingly neglected, sources of evidence relative to this debate is the material culture of the convicts and emancipists. What does the material culture of the convicts and emancipists tell us about

---


their social class, social roles, their vocational and occupational capabilities and aspirations? Is the material culture of the convicts and emancipists an expression of the 'aberrant' psychology and sociology of a 'permanently outcast' 'professional criminal underclass' or is it that of 'typical working class British subjects' subjected to a 'forced migration'? The answers to these questions, and indeed the means by which questions such as these are to be answered, are deserving of much further conceptual and practical exploration.

A first, tentative, contribution

This dissertation proposes to examine the question of the 'real' identity of the convicts by investigating the material culture of a site occupied by emancipists between 1822-1823 and 1841. It can not be regarded as providing any conclusive results but it does most definitely call into question the 'Manning Clark' paradigm of Australia's convict origins, and demonstrates the rich potential of historical archaeology to contribute unique and possibly decisive insights to this debate.

The re-interpretation of the site also raises some very interesting issues relative to the 'Swiss Family Robinson' model of colonisation proposed by Birmingham and Jeans in 1983. The Swiss Family Robinson model proposes that the process of colonisation may be divided into an 'exploratory', 'learning' and 'developmental' phase of growth. The new interpretation of this assemblage suggests that at least with respect to 'forced' immigrants like the convicts, the initial response to an alien environment may have been one of

45 Judy Birmingham and Dennis Jeans, 'The Swiss Family Robinson and the Archaeology of Colonisations' in the Australian Society for Historical Archaeology, Volume 1 1983, pp.3-14.
cultural defensiveness, in which familiar lifeways are re-asserted, even in an exaggerated way, perhaps to meet deep psychological needs for security, continuity and certainty. Again this is a question for which only a tentative and limited answer can be offered here, but nevertheless the evidence allows us to present a very firm case for much further investigation of this proposition.
Chapter 2

Research Design

This dissertation offers a re-interpretation of a site excavated in 1971, and first interpreted in 1978. It is therefore important to recognise that the development of a research design for dealing with the site and its archaeological assemblage necessarily labours under a number of significant constraints.

Principal among these constraints is the fact that the formulation of the research design is retrospective. Because of the way in which the original excavation was carried out, and the time that has elapsed since it was done, the questions that are now to be asked of site and its assemblage are different from those questions under consideration when the excavation was undertaken. Additionally, no documentation survives to indicate why this excavation was undertaken, why certain areas were excavated and not others, and what questions were being asked by the excavators. Given the date of excavation, it is unlikely the excavators followed a consciously developed research design, although obviously their work would have been shaped by a variety of unrecorded intellectual and social processes.

Consequently, a research design formulated at this stage can only ask questions that the data already collected can answer. Normal procedure is to propose questions or hypotheses suggested generally by the data, then to specify both the precise data required and how it will be collected. In the case of a retrospective research design, this second step is limited because the data has already been collected; therefore the range of questions is itself limited.
The primary ideological and methodological orientation of this research project has been to recover meaning from the archaeological record. Accordingly, research has proceeded from the start by posing and exploring a structured set of questions and hypotheses arising primarily from the historical context, and systematically testing their validity against the archaeological record.

However, research procedures have also been substantially refined during the course of study. The progressive consolidation of evidence and conclusions at first-order frontiers of understanding has allowed increasingly more refined and sophisticated questions and hypotheses to be posed at more advanced levels. This progressive factor is built into the design as has been set out in the following three sections.46

'Research Themes' discusses the broad aims of the whole investigation, 'Research Strategies' outlines the avenues and approaches for the collection and presentation of data and the factors influencing data collection and presentation, and 'Analytical Techniques' discusses those approaches that will be used to analyse data after collection and presentation.

46 The model adopted here is a modified version of research designs developed for the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks and Sydney School of Arts projects, see Andrew Wilson, The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks Archaeological Investigation Stage 5.1, Artefact Analysis Report, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, 1985, and Andrew Wilson, Historical Archaeological Investigation of the Sydney School of Arts, Volume 1, Proposal, unpublished, 1989.
Research Themes

The primary pre-occupation of the analysis is the explanation of the assemblage, and its relationship to the site's function, and occupational history. This broad objective involves the detailed examination of a series of themes as follows:

(1) The relationship between the site and the development of Sydney, requiring investigation of the process and impact of Colonial Government land policy on the development and occupation of the site, with specific reference to the granting of Town Allotments.

(2) The changing usage of the site, in particular to determine any mix or shift between residential and commercial functions. This evidence is then examined in relation to local context and function, and any variations over time.

(3) The source and supply of materials and artefacts used by the occupants.

(4) The consumption patterns and lifestyles of the owners and occupants of the site in relation to their socio-economic status, ethnic traditions and social roles as far as these can be established.

In particular, since all known occupants emerge as emancipists, the assemblage will be explored as a potential contribution to sociological and historical debate concerning the 'real' identity of the convicts, one of the 'big' questions in Australian social history. The
earlier interpretation of the site in reference to this theme is also considered.

The Swiss Family Robinson model of colonisation is reviewed in order to determine its degree of 'fit' with the data from this site. The question will be asked whether any refinements to this general model are warranted in respect of the interpretation of this site.

**Research Strategy**

The research strategy is based upon four distinct, but inter-reliant research methods.

First, detailed historical research is undertaken to explore the availability of evidence for:

(i) indicators of the date at which site was first developed by Europeans.

(ii) the site's occupational history, including any surviving biographical information in respect of owners and occupants.

(iii) the site's functional history, including any mix or shift in functions that may have taken place.

(iv) the site's local context, and any variations evident in respect of local character, function and status over time.

(v) the site's developmental relationship to other parts of contemporary Sydney.
Second, the artefacts recovered from the site are inventoried according to a standardised, internally consistent, classificatory system. As has been noted, the site's archaeological assemblage was first catalogued in 1978 as a third year Historical Archaeology project. This first catalogue occurred at a time when a standardised database for the recording and analysis of large quantities of artefactual material was not yet available. It is based upon a rudimentary system of classification with a high degree of subjectivity, which is difficult to use for comparative purposes, and is not amenable to computer-aided data manipulation.

An objective of this current research is therefore to re-sort, inventory, describe and quantify artefacts derived from the site on a computer-based classificatory system which would provide for the standardisation of descriptive variables across the assemblage, correct any errors and inconsistencies in original descriptions, and, most importantly, provide the basis for future comparative work. The MINARK database system was selected for this purpose.47 A complete detailed descriptive inventory of the site's archaeological assemblage is obviously a pre-requisite for further study, and goes far beyond the scope and needs of this project.

Third, an attempt is made to analyse the site's stratigraphy to determine,

a) if we are dealing with a single phase of occupancy and deposition, or
b) if there are any changes across stratigraphic units.

No original information is available in respect of the site's stratigraphy other than what can be inferred from the artefact bag labels. No field books or other notes from the original excavation appear to have survived. The artefacts are therefore examined for reflections of stratigraphic changes across units on the basis of:

(i) artefact density ratios
(ii) artefact category comparisons
(iii) artefact conjoins across units.

Fourth, using the research techniques 'Manufacturer's Date Range Analysis' and two 'Models of Ceramic Availability', an attempt is made on the basis of the historical and stratigraphic evidence to infer the date and nature of artefact deposition.

Traditional approaches to the study of artefact distribution typically postulate or assume a direct interdependence between artefactual evidence and occupational behaviour. This is true for instance of the pattern recognition strategies advocated by Stanley South, which rely upon a simple relationship between artefact related activity and resultant artefact distribution and deposition.48 Such models were developed for isolated and relatively undisturbed single phase sites, but are of little value in explaining spatial and temporal distribution of artefact assemblages on complicated urban sites.49

In any case, methods of archaeological analysis which attempt to propose a

---

49 Andrew Wilson, The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks Archaeological Investigation Stage 5.1, Artefact Analysis Report, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, 1985, p. 34.
direct and simplistic relationship between occupational behaviour and artefact deposition, based upon the 'Pompeian premise' of a cultural system frozen at a specific moment in time,\textsuperscript{50} are extremely problematic methodologically and should be avoided,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Statements to the effect that the patterning of remains in a site directly reflects the structuring of past activities and social groups can be abandoned decisively now. The more realistic principle is that the structure of archaeological remains is a distorted reflection of the structure of material objects in a past cultural system.}\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

The distribution of artefact assemblages therefore must be understood initially in terms of depositional behaviour on the site, not occupational behaviour.\textsuperscript{52}

An analysis of depositional behaviour will be undertaken on the basis of,

(i) A model for determining the date range of deposition of the assemblage developed using the detailed historical research discussed in chapter 3.

The historical evidence would suggest that there are four distinct phases in the development of the site up until it is sealed by the construction of the Church in 1846. Deposition may have occurred in one or more of these phases.

(a) Immediately prior to 1822/3, allotment 14 is one of only a few unoccupied allotments on this city block, and there are developed allotments adjoining on both its northern and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{52}Andrew Wilson, \textit{The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks Archaeological Investigation Stage 5.1, Artefact Analysis Report}, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, 1985, p. 34.
\end{flushleft}
southern sides. Artefact deposition during this period is likely to occur as a result of dumping of refuse from neighbouring allotments, and is likely to comprise of a range of domestic and/or commercial artefacts from a wide variety of households and activities.

(b) Between 1822/23 and 1840 the site is occupied by Samuel Johns and others associated with his household. Artefact deposition during this period may occur as a result of domestic filling activity or midden accumulations, and is likely to comprise of a range of domestic, and perhaps some commercial artefacts with a recognisable degree of internal consistency with a date consistent with the period 1822-1840.

(c) In June 1840 Samuel Johns sold allotment 14 to George Hill who in turn sold the allotment to the trustees of the First Congregational Church on 5 August of that year. On 9 January 1841 the Church trustees advertised cottages on the site for sale on the basis that they be removed within seven days. The foundation stone for the Church was laid on 21 January. Deposition may therefore have occurred as a result of the demolition and removal of structures from the site, and is likely to be comprised of a high proportion of architectural rubble related to the removal of timber structures.

(d) Construction of the Church was almost immediately interrupted as a result of the 1841 depression and did not
recommence until 1844. Deposition may have occurred during this period as a result of the dumping of refuse or incidental scattering of material, and is likely to be comprised of domestic or commercial artefacts from a variety of households and activities with a date range consistent with the early 1840s.

(e) In 1860 the Church was extended on both the northern and southern sides. Deposition may have occurred in the context of these structural modifications, and is likely to be comprised of architectural materials relating to this modification.

These phases are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

(ii) a model for determining the nature of the deposit from which the assemblage derives. This is based on a model for the interpretation of fill deposits developed originally by Ruberstone,53 and adapted by Wilson and Birmingham for use in respect of the Mint and Hyde Park Barracks project.54

The adapted Ruberstone model divides fill deposits into six types and postulates the type of matrix and artefact types found in each, as set out following:


54Andrew Wilson, The Mint and Hyde Park Barracks Archaeological Investigation Stage 5.1, Artefact Analysis Report, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, 1985, p. 34, see also Judy Birmingham, 'The refuse of Empire: International Perspectives on Urban Rubbish' in Archaeology and Colonisation: Australia and the World Context; pp. 149-172.
(a) Surface fills may be of a variety of types including gravels and other artificial surfacing. They can include a range of artefacts within the matrix and trodden into the surface.

(b) Primary structural debris fills are heterogeneous deposits resulting from building collapse or decay. Most of the artefacts are building materials, often in an unweathered condition and retaining to some degree their original structural relationships.

(c) Secondary structural debris fills are heterogeneous deposits resulting from building demolition or robbing. Most of the artefacts are building materials, in a broken or worn condition.

(d) Refuse fill is generally redeposited garbage or landfill, deposited to build up an area. It can include a variety of artefact types, depending on the source of the fill.

(e) Midden deposits are generally deposits accumulated at the site of disposal and comprise of a high proportion of domestic artefacts and organic refuse.

(f) Mixed fill is generally redeposited fill that has been so mixed that it does not display any of the distinct characteristics of the other categories.
None of these categories will be considered mutually exclusive, as any one deposit may in fact be a blend of two or more types of fill. The analysis will proceed by determining the attributes of artefacts within the deposit, noting in particular their material, condition and reuse value. This evidence will then be examined in relation to the adapted Ruberstone model to determine the most appropriate classification for the deposit from which they derive. Once the deposit has been successfully classified and interpreted, the artefact assemblage can be analysed using methods consistent with that interpretation. For example, the ceramics from a midden assemblage will be analysed for economic scaling, but the ceramics from a mixed fill may not be.

Research Techniques

As a result of the manner in which the original excavation was conducted, aside from detailed historical research, the artefact assemblage is the major interpretative source now available, and its interpretation is therefore of over-riding significance to our understanding of the site. As discussed in the 'research strategies', the assemblage is examined overall for indications of date and site function.

Particular classes of artefact are then examined according to the following techniques,

(i) The date ranges of particular types of ceramics and glass will be determined based on any visible manufacturers marks. (Manufacturer's Date Range Analysis)
(ii) Many household artefacts, especially ceramics and glass, are purchased and used in sets, for example ceramic tea and dinner sets, and glass decanter and tumbler sets, which can sometimes be identified in the assemblage. (Analysis of Standard Sets)

Identification and analysis of these sets, based on research of contemporary retail catalogues and advertisements, can provide information on socio-economic status, purchasing motivation, eating behaviours, and artefact use. They can also be used to determine if the archaeological sample is representative, and thereby help to interpret depositional behaviour. The assemblage will be examined for the presence of such sets, and their analysis undertaken to interpret their spatial, economic and social significance.

(iii) The degree of use/wear marks on ceramics, for example, scratch marks on plates, stirring marks on cups, chips, repairs and so on should in general terms be a function of length, frequency and type of use before disposal (Use/Wear Analysis). Factors affecting this function include the type of use to which the artefact is subjected, the quantity of grit in food, premature breakage and the hardness of

56Standard Set Analysis has been used by the Centre for Historical Archaeology in the analysis of finds at both Wybalena and Regentville.
the material. Breakage is to some degree also a function of use, and of the hardness of the material.\textsuperscript{58} Provided that the type of deposit ultimately allows, ceramics will be analysed for use/wear marks as an indicator of their length of use.

(iv) Based upon extensive historical research of New South Wales newspaper advertisements for the period 1803 to 1868, Atkins has developed a model of availability for imported domestic ceramics for that period.\textsuperscript{59} The assemblage will be tested against this model of availability for information in relation to the temporal range of ceramics, and derivative consumer consumption characteristics, for example for indications of economic status, and social class (Atkin's Model of Availability of Imported Domestic Ceramics).

(v) Miller has proposed that the type of decoration on nineteenth century ceramics can be used to scale ceramics into four levels of cost which can act as indicators of the socio-economic status of their owners. These four categories of decoration are 'undecorated', 'minimal decoration', 'painted', and 'transfer printed'. Based upon extensive documentary research, he argues that for the first half of the nineteenth century, decoration is the key factor in pricing.

\textsuperscript{58}Linda Worthy, "Classification and Interpretation of late Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century Ceramics" in Roy Dickens (ed.) \textit{Archaeology of Urban America; The Search for Pattern and Process} p. 329-358.

although this appears to change by mid-century.60 (Miller's model of economic scaling of imported domestic ceramics).

There may be a number of constraints to applying Miller's economic scaling method in detail to Australian assemblages at this stage.61 However, the basic framework of Miller's approach is very promising in terms of its relevance for the interpretation of Australian domestic assemblages. It can therefore be applied in principle to the Pitt Street assemblage to determine any economic factors reflected by consumer choice.

Although this research design is divided into themes, strategies and techniques, which define the specific approaches and questions proposed, it is the interplay of the various sources of evidence and analytical procedures, rather than their discrete and independent application that characterises the emphasis in this project. This interaction is seen as the most promising way for historical archaeologists to proceed in the recovery of meaning.


Chapter 3
The Historical Evidence

The truth is rarely pure, and never simple
Oscar Wilde
The Importance of Being Earnest (1895) Act 1

Introduction and Overview

The historical evidence would suggest that the archaeological deposits considered in this dissertation derive from a site which in 1829, and possibly early as early as 1822, was later defined as Lot 14, Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence. It is not possible to determine conclusively however, when the site was first occupied by Europeans, or the form of this occupation.

Land Title on Lot 14, Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence was granted to Samuel Johns by Governor Gipps on the 23 September 1839. There is strong evidence to suggest however that Johns had some form of 'claim' on the land, apparently established through occupation, as early as 1823 and certainly by 1829. Additionally, there is absolutely no doubt that the site was occupied by four people, including Johns, at the time of the 1828 Census, and there are several further references to two of those four people between 1828 and 1839, indicating at least some degree of continuing presence on the block. It is not certain however, whether Johns, or his associates, were occupants immediately prior to the clearing of the site in early 1841.

---

62For a full discussion of issues raised in the Introduction and Overview, and for details of source material refer to section titled 'The Historical Evidence in Detail.'
On 18 June 1840, Johns sold Lot 14 to George Hill. Hill is unlikely to have had any 'presence' on the site as he was by that date a wealthy entrepreneur and speculator, and in 1835 had built Durham Hall in Surry Hills, which remained his home until his death in 1883. In any case, by 4 August of the same year, less than two months later, Hill had sold the property to the Trustees of the First Congregational Church.63 By 16 January 1841, Church Officials had overseen the clearing of the site, and a foundation stone for the Church was laid on 21 January of that year.

It would therefore seem likely either that the site was not occupied between June 1840 and January 1841, or that Johns and/or his associates remained there as tenants during this period. It is not possible to rule out the possibility of other short-term tenants, but even if this was the case, clearly their impact on the site would have been marginal compared to Johns' seventeen year occupancy. Although the foundation stone for the Church was laid in 1841, building ceased almost immediately due to a Church financial crisis arising from the 1841 recession. Construction did not recommence until 1844, and the building was not completed until 1846.64 The archaeological deposits considered in this dissertation can not therefore be considered 'sealed' until at least that year.

Even so, the historical evidence allows us to propose not only a temporally well-defined period during which the archaeological deposits are likely to have accumulated, but also provides for significant insights into the social

63Contemporary references to the Church often also designate it as the 'Independent Chapel'. The designation 'First Congregational Church' is used throughout this discussion only for the sake of consistency.

characteristics of those persons who appear to have occupied the site between 1823 and 1841.

The 1828 Census records four people as resident on the site; three men and one woman, all ex-convicts. Samuel Johns is identified as the principal occupant, and the three secondary occupants are Elija Cheetham, Mary Keating and George Woodford. Under the general heading of 'Employer', Elija Cheetham is referred to as a 'lodger', Mary Keating is referred to as a 'dressmaker' and George Woodford is referred to as an 'upholsterer' 'at Samuel Johns'. Significantly, the Census uses the preposition 'at' to describe the location of the employment; that is, George Woodford is an upholsterer at Samuel Johns.65

This suggests, firstly, and more generally, that the site served a dual residential/commercial function; secondly, that the nature of the commercial activity related to the manufacture and/or maintenance of clothing and furnishings, and thirdly, and more specifically, that Samuel Johns was the proprietor of this enterprise. However, the use of this preposition is the only historical indicator of a dual site function and we therefore have a very interesting and unresolved question in relation to site function to be explored in the archaeological evidence.

Of further interest is that the Census refers to Johns as a 'labourer', perhaps indicating that any commercial enterprise being conducted from the site in 1828 was not sufficiently financially established to support the proprietor. Pursuing this possibility further, it might be proposed that this could either

have been because the venture was still in a fledgling phase requiring capital investment which the venture itself was at that stage incapable of generating, and which Johns would not have had in reserve, or that the enterprise was an established but marginal and not particularly lucrative venture, requiring the proprietor to maintain a regular source of alternative income.

Whatever the case, the historical evidence indicates that the enterprise survived from 1828 at least until 1836, as George Woodford is still referred to in an 1836 directory as an upholsterer in Pitt Street. There is also some inconclusive evidence to suggest that the enterprise may have commenced as early as 1822, the year in which Samuel Johns starts receiving assigned convict labourers. For key dates in relation to the development and occupancy of the site, refer to figure 1.

It is clear from the historical evidence that the four individuals described in the 1828 Census had never been, and were never to become, wealthy or influential citizens. What little it is possible to trace of their English backgrounds suggests a backdrop to their lives in Australia of the poverty and displacement of the industrial revolution. Three of the four were transported for theft, Samuel Johns for forgery.

On the other hand, the overall portrait of the occupants of the site painted by the historical evidence does not appear to be concordant with the traditional paradigm of Australian history in which convicts are interpreted as part of an intractable criminal underclass; in fact, it suggests that the occupants of the site were skilled, enterprising, ambitious and respectable. This view of the
Figure 1.
Timeline showing key dates in the development and occupancy of Allotment 14, 1822-1846.
convicts in is keeping with the basic findings of a recent major revisionist
history of Australia's convict past. Of particular interest to the debate in
respect of the 'real' identity of the convicts will be the features of their material
culture, a matter explored later in this dissertation, and worthy of much
further research.

Direct evidence in respect of those structures which were on the site prior to
the construction of the Congregational Church is slight, although the
historical evidence when taken as a whole does allow us to draw several
inferences. Firstly, the Auction Notices advertising the on-site sale of these
structures prior to the construction of the Church describe them as
'weatherboard' cottages, suggesting at least two buildings of a general
residential style. Hallen's 1830 sketch drawings suggest three adjoining
weatherboard structures aligned with Pitt street with a single privy at the
back of the block. Secondary historical sources suggest that these cottages
were home to the 'lower orders' of colonial society, but never-the-less
presented with an image of 'neatness and cheerful appearance'.

More broadly, the historical evidence is strongly suggestive at a number of
levels of some of the major themes of Australian nineteenth century social
history. At the highest level, we can see vivid reflections of the impact and
features of the forced 'convict migrations' arising from the European
industrial revolution. More specifically, we can trace the beginnings of some
of the key determinants of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Australian
historical geography, such as the sociological and psychological significance
of land ownership/occupation, and the progressive displacement of the urban
poor for middle class amenity.
Historical Evidence in Detail

Identifying the Site on Surveyors Maps and Sketch Drawings Prior to Official Survey

The first issue to be settled before exploring and interpreting evidence of the development of the site prior to the construction of the First Congregational Church is the location of the site in respect of its depiction on surveyors maps and sketch drawings to 1841 when the property is conveyed to the Church trustees. This task is made easy for the period 1831 to 1841 due to the very precise definitions of the block surviving in published survey descriptions associated with offers of Land Grant, and in later conveyancing transactions.

The description of the allotment used in these transactions first appears in a Government Notice for Town Allotments published in the Sydney Gazette on 17 December 1831,

14. SAMUEL JOHNS, 24 p., Twenty-four perches; bounded on the west by Pitt-street bearing south 5 degrees, 30 minutes east 75 links; on the south by No. 15 Allotment bearing east 2 degrees 30 minutes north 198 links; on the east by No. 6 allotment bearing north 3 degrees west 76 links; and on the north by No. 13 allotment bearing west 3 degrees south 202 links.66

As this description is the same as that used by the Colonial Secretary on 13 April 1839 when the allotment is offered as a Town Grant for the second time67, and the same as that used in conveyancing transactions between

---

Figure 2.
A map entitled 'A Survey of the Settlement in New South Wales New Holland', author unknown, dated 1792. The approximate location of Section 17 is indicated by shading.
Figure 3.
A map entitled 'Plan of the Town of Sydney in New South Wales' by James Meehan, dated 1807. The approximate location of Section 17 is indicated by shading.
Figure 4.
A map entitled 'Plan of the Town and Suburbs of Sydney' author unknown, dated 1822. The location of Section 17 is indicated by shading.
Figure 5.
Detail of an untitled sketch map of Sydney by William Harper, dated 11 November 1822. The location of Allotment 14 is indicated by shading.
Figure 6. Detail of a sketch map of Sydney entitled 'Rough Original with Buildings', by William Harper, dated c.1823. The location of Allotment 14 is indicated by shading.
Figure 7.
Detail of Surveyor General Field Sketch Book drawing of Section 17 of the Parish of St Lawrence, by Ambrose Hallen, dated c.1830. The location of Allotment 14 is indicated by shading.
Figure 8.
Detail of Surveyor General Field Sketch Book drawing of Section 17 of the Parish of St Lawrence, by Ambrose Hallen, dated 1831. The location of Allotment 14 is indicated by shading.
Figure 9.
A map entitled 'Map of the Town of Sydney' by Hoddle, Larmer and Mitchell, dated 1831. The location of Section 17 is indicated by shading.
1822 & c.1823 William Harper 'Sketch Map of Sydney'

1830 Ambrose Hallen 'Sketch of Section 17, Parish of St Lawrence'

1831 Ambrose Hallen 'Section 17 of the Parish of St Lawrence'

Figure 10.
An analysis of the location and dimensions of Allotment 14, from 1822 to 1831.
Samuel Johns and George Hill dated 18 June, 1840, and between George Hill and the Trustees of the Congregational Church dated 4 and 5 August 1840, we can conclude that there was no variation in the location or dimensions of the block from 1831 to 1841.

Slightly more difficult to interpret is the informal development and subdivision of the city block bounded by Park, Pitt, Bathurst and Castlereagh Streets prior to 1831 when Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence was formally surveyed in preparation for its offer as Grants of Land by Governor Darling.

It is not certain when the development of this city block commenced. James Meehan's 1807 'Plan of the Town of Sydney in New South Wales' appears to depict the area as undeveloped (figure 3). This is quite significant in view of the fact that this map was prepared at the direction of Governor Bligh in the context of his efforts to curtail the 'disorderly growth of Sydney'. The map is therefore generally considered to be a precise representation of the development of the town up to 1807.

By 1822 however, the block has been clearly articulated by Macquarie's grid-patterned Sydney street plan, and internal sub-division has taken place. These developments are clearly evident on a map entitled 'Plan of the Town and Suburbs of Sydney', dated August 1822 (figure 4). The city block therefore develops after 1807, but before 1822. Its relative isolation on the eastern and

---

69 NSW Land Titles Office: Old Systems Title Deeds: Book 8: No. 1.

southern sides would appear to indicate however that it is a recent development in 1822, and so a later rather than earlier date within this fifteen year time frame appears more likely. If this is correct, it would seem likely that the sub-divisions depicted on this map represent the first sub-divisions of the block.

In order to understand the history, and most significantly, the archaeology, of the site, it is essential that we are able to trace the sequence of sub-division of that portion of land on this block that was to become allotment 14 during the period from the block's initial development and subdivision in 1822 to its formal articulation by survey in 1831.

In this respect it is crucial to reconcile four surveyor's maps and sketch drawings; William Harper's 1822 'Map of Sydney' (figure 5), William Harper's circa 1823 map of Sydney, entitled 'Rough Original with buildings' (figure 6), and Ambrose Hallen's Field Book sketch drawings of circa 1830 (figure 7) and 1831 (figure 8). Each of these maps and sketch drawings, with a greater or lesser degree of intent to do so, depicts that city block ultimately surveyed as Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence, and its sub-divisions over time. The wider implications of this collection of maps and sketch drawings for tracing the development of the block over time will be explored following. Our purpose at this point is simply to trace the history of informal sub-division of this city block from 1822 to 1831 so as to correlate the perimeters of these earlier sub-divisions with the definition of the block established by official survey in 1831.
This correlation can be represented figuratively (figure 10). Based on those survey annotations that are provided (which are not always complete, or particularly comprehensive), when these maps and sketch drawings are considered as a whole, and in relation to each other, it becomes apparent that the position and dimensions of the allotment show very little variation between 1822 and 1831. While there is some variation to the dimensions of the city block as a whole during this period, these variations are relatively slight, and their impact appears to have been absorbed by the corner, rather than intervening, allotments.

The consistency in the location and dimensions of the allotment from 1822 to 1841 is perhaps not surprising for two reasons.

Firstly, 1822 represents the end of Lachlan Macquarie's term as Governor, and as we have noted, the block would almost certainly have been laid out and subdivided during his term as Governor. In fact, although Macquarie was on his way back to England when the 1822 maps considered here were being completed, they would almost certainly have been prepared at his direction. 72

The Macquarie era is generally regarded as the most formative period in the development of nineteenth century Sydney, particularly in respect of its street formation and building patterns. 73 Before Macquarie, according to the surveyor, James Meehan, 'people generally built according to their fancy and without arrangement'. 74 When Macquarie arrived in the colony in 1810 he
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found it 'a dirty, straggling settlement of crooked streets and irregular buildings'.

During the period of Macquarie's administration 'the building of Sydney may be said to have commenced'. A great deal of effort was devoted to regularising street and building patterns in the colony. Soon after assuming office Macquarie ordered the streets de-stumped, straightened and widened to fifty feet. This involved doubling the width of Pitt Street. By 1820, Macquarie's new policies had such a profound effect on the development of Sydney that William Charles Wentworth was moved to say that 'the town may now be pronounced to be tolerably regular'.

In summary, the city block that was eventually to be surveyed as section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence, and the street pattern with which it was articulated, was laid out according to Macquarie's vision for Sydney. This street plan has experienced little variation in the last one-hundred and eighty years because it has been largely capable of sustaining the city's growth throughout this period. It would therefore seem quite unlikely that any city block laid down during the Macquarie era would experience other than marginal adjustment up to 1841.

The second reason why it would seem possible to predict little variation between 1822 and 1841 in the location and dimensions of that sub-division that

\[76\] The \textit{Cyclopaedia of New South Wales}: 1907: p.347.
was to be surveyed in 1831 as allotment 14 is suggested by the apparent sequence of internal subdivision of the city block. Harper's circa 1823 map (figure 6) would appear to suggest that other sections of the block were developed prior to any development occurring in that area later surveyed as allotment 14. It depicts developments on the corner of Pitt and Park Streets, and on both those sub-divisions which adjoin that sub-division which was later surveyed as allotment 14, but appears to indicate that sub-division as vacant. This would therefore suggest that the dimensions of this sub-division were determined by adjacent developments prior to any development occurring on the site itself, and there would therefore be little later 'room for movement' within this overall structure of sub-division.

### Evidence for the Date of Initial European Occupation

As has been noted, the city block bounded by Park, Pitt, Bathurst and Castlereagh Streets appears to have been developed and sub-divided slightly before 1822, but Harper's map of Sydney dated 11 November of that year (figure 5) appears to depict the sub-division that was to become allotment 14 as vacant.

We will now direct our attention to exploring evidence for the first development and occupation of this sub-division. Surprisingly, it would seem possible to isolate the period of initial development and occupancy to within a very narrow time frame; in fact to the period between 11 November 1822 and 30 June 1823.

It is possible to propose this time frame on the basis of the following evidence and inferences.
Firstly, we need to acknowledge and interpret an item of contradictory evidence. The map entitled 'Plan of Sydney and Suburbs' dated August, 1822 (figure 3) appears to depict a series of rectangular structures on each Pitt Street sub-division between Park and Bathurst streets. In each case these structures are set well back from the Pitt Street frontage towards the back of the block. The scale of this map makes it difficult to meaningfully correlate its sub-divisions with later sub-divisions on more detailed maps and drawings of the block, but those structures depicted would clearly extend over that sub-division later surveyed as allotment 14.

Although it is not possible or appropriate to entirely discount this evidence, it is worth noting that this map's primary purpose is to indicate Sydney's street plan and public buildings. It does not appear to be based on any intention to reflect in detail the presence and proportions, or absence, of Sydney's other sub-divisions and buildings. The broader context of these public thoroughfares and structures therefore appears to be rendered impressionistically, rather than descriptively. Under these circumstances it would not be reasonable to assume anything more than that the cartographer wished to provide a general impression of development and occupation in this area of the city. This interpretation is supported by Lynn McLoughlin's analysis of early maps of Sydney. On the basis of reconstructions of early shore lines and street plans, and comparisons between early maps, she concludes that the 1822 map is an idealised and 'quite inaccurate' plan of the

---

development of the town during this period. On this basis it is suggested that this map should not be regarded as indicating either occupation or the absence of occupation on the subdivision that was later to be surveyed as allotment 14.

In favour of the interpretation of the plan as 'impressionistic' is the contrasting description of the sub-division provided by more detailed plans of the block dated 1822 and circa 1823, discussed below.

**An untitled sketch map of Sydney by William Harper dated 11 November 1822**

The first of these plans is an untitled sketch map of Sydney in the archive of the NSW Surveyor General drawn by Assistant Surveyor William Harper, and dated 11 November 1822 (figure 5). The map clearly outlines the block of land that would later be surveyed as Lot 14, Section 17, in the Parish of St Laurence in line drawing, and although structures are clearly depicted on sites adjacent, this sub-division is depicted as vacant.

**A sketch map of Sydney entitled 'Rough Original with Buildings' by William Harper dated circa 1823.**

The second of these plans is also an sketch map of Sydney in the archive of the NSW Surveyor General drawn by Assistant surveyor William Harper, dated circa 1823 and entitled 'Rough Original with Buildings' (figure 6). Although this map is dated circa 1823, it is very similar to Harper's 1822 sketch map and may in fact be based upon it. Again, this map depicts no structures on the site, although structures are depicted on adjacent sites. Additionally, it is worth

---

noting that the title of this Map expresses a clear intention to depict buildings. The depiction of that sub-division that was to become allotment 14 as vacant would therefore appear to be also quite intentional.

On the basis of this interpretation of these two maps it is suggested that the sub-division had not been developed and occupied up to the 11 November 1822. It would appear however that development and occupation took place very soon thereafter.

**Governor Darling's Proclamation of 8 June 1829**

This proposition is based on an interpretation of a Proclamation issued by Governor Darling dated 8 June 1829, an excerpt of which is reproduced below,

> WHEREAS, much Inconvenience hath been occasioned by the want of sufficient Titles for Allotments of land in the Town of Sydney; And WHEREAS, such Titles have not been issued by the Government, except in a few instances, since the Thirtieth Day of June, Eighteen hundred and twenty-three: Now, therefore, in order to remedy this Inconvenience, and give the necessary security to private Property, I, the Governor, by Virtue of the Authority in me vested, do hereby ordain and proclaim, that, on application being made, a Grant, in Fee Simple, shall be issued under the conditions hereinafter specified, to every person (or his lawful Representative), who, on or before the said Thirtieth Day of June Eighteen hundred and twenty-three, was, bona fide, in Possession, by Lease from the Government, whether such Lease be now expired or not, or by mere right of occupancy, of any Allotment of Land in the said Town of Sydney, not hitherto alienated by the Crown ...

And, in order that all Parties interested may have an opportunity of proving such their respective Rights, a description of each Allotment, with Notice of the intention to complete a Grant thereof, shall be published, Three Months previously, for General information.

---

82 It is of course possible that these maps are dated at the time of drafting, rather than at the time of survey, and that there may as a result be a time-lag in their reflection of development and occupancy. Even if this is the case, time-lag involved is unlikely to be extensive.

83 Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser: 8 June 1829: p1.
As is discussed in greater detail following, when the Colonial Secretary’s Office published details of claims to allotments in response to Governor Darling’s Proclamation in the Sydney Gazette on 17 December 1831, allotment 14 had been claimed by Samuel Johns. Governor Darling’s Proclamation makes it clear that in order to claim the allotment, Johns would have been required to establish that ‘on or before’ 30 June 1823 he was, ‘bona fide’, in possession of the allotment, ‘by Lease from the Government ... or by mere right of occupancy’. As Johns did not hold a lease on the property we can thus conclude that the allotment would have to have been developed and occupied prior to 30 June 1823 for him to be eligible to claim it.

When considered together, these three pieces of historical evidence therefore allow us to propose relatively conclusively that the site was developed and occupied between November 1822 and June 1823.

### Land Title

A Land Title search reveals that Lot 14, Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence was granted as a 'Town Grant' to Samuel Johns by the then Governor, Sir George Gipps, on 23 September 1839, with all the 'Rights and Appurtenances whatsoever thereto belonging'.

The terms of the Grant required Johns to pay a lump-sum retrospective quit-rent of one pound and four shillings Sterling to cover the period from 1 July

---

1829 until 30 June 1835, and twelve shillings Sterling quit rent per annum. Additionally, the Grant was conditional upon the Grantee erecting a 'permanent Dwelling house, Store, or other suitable Building upon the said Land', but the blank type-space where the proposed time frame within which construction of a stipulated building would be required by the Crown is lined through on the pro forma Deed of Grant, suggesting that some structure conforming with this stipulation had already been erected.86

In accordance with the policy of the Colonial Secretary's Office at the time, the Governor's intention to proceed with this Town Grant had been advertised at least three months previously in the *Sydney Gazette*, on Saturday 13 April 1839 and prospective Grantees were requested;

... that within three months from the present date, the particulars required by the Government Notice of 1 October, 1838, may be accurately furnished to this Office, namely:- Surname, all Christian Names, and Residence of the person in whose favour the Deed is to be prepared, written at full length.87

The Colonial Secretary's archive preserves a letter to that Office from Samuel Johns, dated 5 August 1839, and headed 'Particulars for deeds', which provides information in respect of this request.88 It is worth noting that the letter has apparently been drafted by another party as there is a considerable difference in style between the text of the letter and the signature applied to it. This would suggest that Johns employed the services of a notary in his application for the grant. This might suggest that John's did not have a high level of

---

88 Archives Office of NSW: Colonial Secretary Office: Letters Received Relating to Land Matters: Volume 2/7879:1826-1860.
literacy, which if so, would provide us with an important social insight into the principal occupant of the property during the period in question.

In this letter Johns advises that his ‘residence’ is ‘Pitt Street’, and indicates that he claims the Allotment on the basis of ‘purchase’ from the Crown. An Officer of the Colonial Secretary’s Office has annotated the top left hand corner of this letter as follows;

*Deed executed September 23/39, in favour of Samuel Johns. Despatched November 20/39*

The precise details of the execution and dispatch of the Grant are of interest in respect of John’s almost immediate sale of the land to George Hill, the details and implications of which are discussed following.

The advertisement soliciting this information carried the heading 'Grants of Town Allotments'; and commenced with the following advice;

*The following descriptions of Town Allotments, with the names of the persons to whom they were originally promised, or by whom they are now claimed, are again published for general information ...*89

The introductory sentence to this advertisement would appear to indicate that September 1839 may not have been the first time an Offer of Grant had been made to Johns in respect of this Allotment, and in fact, subsequent research confirms that a similar offer had been made to Johns by the then Governor, Lieutenant General Ralph Darling, as early as 8 June, 1829.90 The final details

---

89 *Supplement to the New South Wales Government Gazette:* No. 407: Saturday 13 April 1839: p 429.

90 *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser:* 8 June, 1829: pI.
of this Offer of Grant apparently took some time to finalise however, as the Colonial Secretary's Office did not publish these details in the *Sydney Gazette* until 17 December 1831. As Assistant Surveyor Ambrose Hallen's Field Book sketches of Section 17 of the Parish of St Laurence (Figure 8) date from this intervening period, it would seem reasonable to suggest that after notional claims on allotments had been lodged with the Colonial Secretary in response to Governor Darling's Proclamation, the Surveyor General then had the formal and time consuming responsibility of surveying the allotments for the purposes of Land Title, and this process was not completed until 1831.

The Colonial Secretary's 1831 advertisement describes the allotment in the same terms as those used in the later, 1839, advertisement, and advises that,

*The following descriptions of Allotments of Land, in the Town of Sydney, with the names of the Parties by whom they are respectively claimed are published for general information...*  

We can therefore infer from this introductory sentence that Johns did in fact claim the Grant in 1829, in response to Governor Darling's Proclamation of 8 June of that year. Subsequent events indicate however that Johns in the event did not take up the Grant. It is significant to note that Darling's Proclamation stipulates the following terms;

*And Whereas, considerable Sums of Money are due to the Crown, as Quit rents upon the said Allotments, the immediate Exaction of which, as hath been represented to me, would be exceedingly oppressive to the parties concerned; but the total Remission of which would be equally unjust to such other Parties as have regularly paid the same: Now, therefore, in order to render the*
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Payment of the said Sums as little burdensome as possible, I do further Proclaim that the grants herein intended shall be issued under the following Conditions; namely, that no arrears of Quit-rent shall be demanded for the said Allotments beyond the aforesaid Date of the thirtieth of June, Eighteen hundred and Twenty-three, and that such Arrears as have since accrued since that Date, shall be calculated at the Rate of Sixpence Stirling per square Rod, per Annum, instead of Nine pence as heretofore; And also, that they shall be liquidated by Instalments payable annually, in addition, and equal to the regular Yearly Quit-rent, until the whole be satisfied 94.

This Proclamation, like its 1839 counterpart, places the condition of a retrospective quit-rent upon the Offer of Grant; in this instance, for the period 1 July 1823 to 8 June 1829. These arrears are to be paid at a reduced rate in annual instalments equal to the regular yearly quit-rent. The quit rent for Lot 14 published by the Colonial Secretary’s Office on 17 December 1831 was calculated at twelve shillings 95.

On the basis of this evidence it might be suggested that even though Johns was able to establish a 'claim' on the land in accordance with Governor Darling's Proclamation of 1829, he was, at this stage, unable or unwilling to accede to the terms of the Grant, most likely that term which required the payment of retrospective rent, and therefore did not take up the Grant.

There is no record of any Land Title or the Offer of Land Title in respect of the allotment prior to Governor Darling's 1829 Proclamation.

94 Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser: 8 June, 1829: p1.
Even though Johns did not ultimately take up the Grant when it was offered in 1831, he apparently continued to occupy the site, and its re-offer to him in 1839 confirms that his claim on the allotment was still recognised by the Crown. By 1839, Johns' financial circumstances appear to have changed, and when the Grant was offered by Governor Gipps, he is in a position where he is either able or willing to take it up.

The details Johns supplies for the preparation of the 1839 Deed of Grant indicate that he will be taking up the Grant by 'purchase', perhaps implying that he will be paying the stipulated rental arrears on the basis of a single payment, rather than on the basis of the instalment plan allowed for by the Colonial Secretary's Office. It should be noted however that there is insufficient evidence to establish this proposition conclusively.

Having obtained Land Title on the property in December 1839, Johns was then in a position to sell the allotment which he did with some haste. In fact, the Land Titles Office records that on 18 June of the next year, approximately six months after confirmation of the Granting of the allotment to him, Johns 'did grant, bargain and sell' Lot 14 to George Hill for the sum of one-thousand one-hundred and twenty-five pounds. Hill, it is worth noting, owned the adjoining allotment on the Park Street side. This indenture contains advice that the conveyance involved,

96In addition to the terms of the 1839 Offer of Grant which strongly suggest Johns' continuing occupancy of the site by requiring back-payment of quit-rent for the period 1823 to 1835, there is a further reference to Johns as being a resident of 'Upper Pitt Street, Sydney' in the NSW Directory of 1836.

97NSW Land Titles Office: Register of Old Systems Title Deeds: Book S: No. 268: p.227: see also later conveyance from Hill to the Trustees of the First Congregational Church where this conveyance is again described: Book 8: No. 12.
... all that piece and parcel of land more particularly mentioned and described in the Indenture of Release hereunto annexed with all and every the appurtenances to the same belonging. 98

This would appear to suggest that there was no demolition or removal of structures on the site at the time of this sale.

Upon registration of Land Title in respect of the allotment in his favour, Hill even more rapidly conveys the allotment to the Trustees of the First Congregational Church on the basis of two indentures dated consecutively 4 and 5 August 1841. The initial indenture provides for the sale of a lease on the property for five shillings, and the subsequent indenture for the outright purchase of the property for the sum of one-thousand four-hundred pounds. 99

The detail of this transaction provides that the vendor shall,

... permit and suffer the buildings and tenements now erected standing and being upon the said land premises to be demolished, pulled down and removed and permit a chapel or vestry room, or vestry rooms and other offices and also a dwelling house ...[to be constructed]. 100

This reference would appear to indicate that the property was conveyed to the trustees with 'buildings and tenements' intact. On the basis of this reference and the earlier reference to these structures as intact in the conveyance of the allotment from Johns to Hill, it might be concluded that there was no disruption of these structures from the end of the Johns' occupancy to the demolition of these structures in the week following 9 January 1841.

100 NSW Land Titles Office: Old Systems Title Deeds: Book 8: No. 12.
Land Title Transactions in Context

It is interesting to consider the broader context and possible implications of Title transactions in respect of the allotment as they may reveal important insights not only in relation to the process of alienation and acquisition of land in the colony during this period, but also in relation to the social character of those persons party to the transactions.

A Brief History of the Process of Alienation of Town Land

For one thing it is interesting to note that Samuel Johns had clearly occupied and developed allotment 14 prior to being granted Land Title in 1839. This reflects, in fact, a very common practice in the colony up until 1829, which can essentially be attributed to early colonial government land policies which reserved that portion of land from the 'Head of the Cove which is to the Westward of Sydney Cove to the Head of Garden Cove' inclusive for the Crown. This policy was laid down by Governor Phillip in 1792 and is reflected graphically on a 1792 map entitled 'A Survey of the Settlement in New South Wales New Holland' (figure 2). Within this boundary no land was to granted or leased, and any houses were to 'remain the property of the Crown'. Essentially the purpose of this Order was to ensure that the Governor and his authorities maintained control, for public infrastructure purposes, of the growth of the town. However, successive early Governors up until the time of Macquarie failed to develop coherent plans for the development of the town,

and Governor Phillip's policy, rather than providing for the orderly growth of the town, led to chaos.103

As Governor Phillip left before the first free and freed persons demanded the right to make a livelihood in Sydney, he did not have to deal with the consequences of his policy. His successors did however, but rather than dealing with the matter decisively they adopted the practice of issuing temporary leases. At first this was done on an ad hoc basis, but in June 1801 Governor King promulgated a General Order allowing for five year leases and setting out conditions of occupancy. Later, Governor King sanctioned a number of fourteen year leases, but in doing so he acceded to the self interest of some influential colonists, and issued land considered by his successor Governor Bligh to be essential for governmental purposes.104

Adding to the general chaos and controversy surrounding the colonial government's land policy, on assuming office, Bligh announced his intention to revoke those of these leases he objected to. He warned their occupants, which included John Macarthur, that if they constructed buildings, it would be at their own risk. The outcry generated by these threats is often cited as a key factor leading to Bligh's deposition.105

Bligh’s rebel successors renewed the leases of thirty-four tenants and issued 141 leases to new tenants. Again however, these leases were not renewed and granted in the context of any coherent land policy.  

Although Governor Phillip's intention to reserve land in the town for the future use of the Crown was not always adhered to in practice by his immediate successors, those exceptions which were made were to settlers of sufficient standing and influence to encourage or command the Governor's favour. In this period, property in the town was not generally available on the basis of either leasehold or freehold to the less influential settlers of the town. Such persons did, however, have to live somewhere, and in the face of necessity, and in the absence of security, they took occupancy of vacant land within the town and constructed that cheap and impermanent housing that was to appal Macquarie on his arrival in the colony in 1810.  

One of the principal objections to early leasing policies, and to the lack of availability of Land Title, was that residents were discouraged from effecting improvements on land because of the threat of resumption by the Crown. Macquarie was advised on arrival that 'in most cases the private buildings are of a perishable character'.  

Macquarie believed that Sydney was destined to become as ‘fine and opulent a town as any one in His majesty's other foreign dominions’, and introduced a
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number of reforms to ensure that this vision became a reality. As one historian has put it, Macquarie

combined a wide vision with a passion for order and symmetry and possessed the strength of character to ensure that his wishes were heeded.\textsuperscript{110}

On his own initiative, Macquarie permitted Robert Campbell and Simeon Lord, both of whom already owned impressive residences, to convert their leases into Grants. In informing the Secretary of State of this step, Macquarie recommended that a similar concession be extended 'to all such other persons as are able and willing to erect substantial and handsome buildings within the town'. The Secretary of State agreed to this proposal with the proviso that land required for public use must not be affected.\textsuperscript{111} It was in this way that settlers like Sir John Jamison for example, were able to obtain land in the Town during this period. Just prior to his departure from the colony in 1821 Macquarie made Jamison an offer of Land Grant in the area bounded by the Military Barracks, George Street, Charlotte Place and the Scots Kirk. This offer was conditional upon Jamison replacing dilapidated existing buildings with two new houses.\textsuperscript{112}

This practice was continued under Governor Brisbane until 1823.\textsuperscript{113} Once again however, this concession applied only to those wealthy and influential colonists who could carry out adequate improvements on their grants. The

\textsuperscript{112}Brian Fletcher: 'Sir John Jamison in NSW 1804-1844' in JRAHS: June 1979: p. 8
vast majority of Sydney's residents continued to lack a permanent title to their land, even though they were permitted to occupy allotments. It was not until after Governor Darling arrived that the situation was regularised.

Upon his appointment as Governor, Darling was increasingly confronted with the anxieties of colonists who had invested capital on improvements to allotments, but feared eviction due to lack of title. In response to this pressure on 1 May 1829, Darling drew up a Minute which after being considered by the Executive Council, formed the basis for his Proclamation of 8 June 1829 quoted above. On application from the occupant, leases or deeds conveying right of occupancy were to be converted into grants in Fee Simple. Quit rents were owing on much of this land and Darling waived any claim to sums due before 30 June 1823, this being the date upon which Governor Brisbane had last issued leases. Darling also reduced the rate from nine pence per square rod to six pence and permitted the balance to be paid in instalments. This Proclamation formed the basis of what at least one historian regards as the first systematic attempt at town planning in New South Wales.\(^{114}\) In fact, it probably represents the third major phase in the evolution of town planning in Sydney, the first being represented by Phillip's original zoning of the town, and the second being represented by Macquarie's efforts at regularising the street and building pattern. A fourth significant phase, which also occurred during Darling's period as Governor, occurred in 1831 as a result of the Goderich regulations which stipulated that Town land should be sold in future.\(^{115}\)


Paradoxically therefore, Governor Phillip’s desire to provide for the orderly development of the town through government regulation resulted in its unregulated development. Ultimately, faced with nearly forty years of development and occupancy, which of necessity, had taken place outside an official policy context or town plan, the Colonial Government could do little more than provide official sanction to these occupancies and developments.

It is also interesting to contemplate why Samuel Johns did not choose to take up the offer of Town Grant in 1831 when it was first offered to him, but chose to do so when it was offered again in 1839. We have already discussed the possibility that Johns could not afford to meet payments of retrospective quit rent in 1831, and therefore while claiming the allotment, in the event was unable to proceed with its purchase.

A second possibility worth noting is that Johns’ claim of the allotment in 1829 would appear to have had the effect of preventing any counter claim that might have resulted in his eviction, and this may have been his only purpose. There is no suggestion in the Colonial Secretary’s Public Notices associated with the advertising of the grant that it would lapse within a specified period unless taken up, and so Johns’ claim of the grant appears to have established his proprietorship in spite of the fact that Land Title was not ultimately granted. Further, it would appear that colonial authorities were prepared initially to tolerate his continuing occupancy of the allotment without title.

Whatever the case, throughout the 1830s the value of, and competition for, town allotments increased significantly as a result of the dramatic increase in
the population of Sydney. These developments resulted in increasing Colonial Government regulation of land occupancy, and enforcement of these regulations. By 1839 Governor Gipps introduced

An Act further to restrain the unauthorised occupation of Crown Lands, and to provide he means of defraying the expense of a Border Police. 

The purpose of this Act was to provide the Colonial Government with the means of exercising tighter control over the occupancy of land in the colony, and to provide the basis for the imposition of penalties in circumstances of unsanctioned occupancy

WHEREAS the unauthorised occupation of the unalienated Lands of New South Wales is derogatory to the rights of the Crown, and conducive to many illegal and dishonest practices ...

Be it therefore enacted by His Excellency the Governor of New South Wales, with the advice of the Legislative Council thereof, that from and after the first day of July, One thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine, any person who shall be found occupying any Crown Lands lying waste in New South Wales ... either by residing or erecting any hut or building thereon ... shall on conviction thereof, forfeit and pay the following penalties; that is to say, for the first offence, any sum not exceeding ten pounds...for the second offence, Twenty Pounds, and for the Third and any subsequent Offence, Fifty Pounds ....

It is significant to note that this Act was introduced just prior to the reissuing of the Offer of Town Grant to Samuel Johns on 13 April 1839, and the two actions are clearly related. In effect, Johns is being provided with a second

---

117Supplement to the New South Wales Government Gazette; 3 April 1939: Saturday April 6, 1839. Number 405: p 393.
118Supplement to the New South Wales Government Gazette; 3 April 1939: Saturday April 6, 1839. Number 405: p 393.
opportunity to purchase land Title on the allotment or face eviction or prosecution, or both. Under these circumstances he has no alternative but to purchase the allotment or forfeit his claim.

**Land Speculation**

John's rapid conveyance of the property to George Hill in 1840 is also deserving of some consideration.

Since the earliest days of the colony, the Colonial Governments had sought to encourage permanent residence and economic development through the incentive of providing land grants to individuals prepared to undertake improvements on their land.\(^{119}\) The policy was designed so as to make possession conditional upon occupancy and development in order to prevent any individuals accumulating multiple tracts of land for the purposes of speculation. The policy was not successful however, for while speculators were inhibited from obtaining land directly from the Crown, they were able to do so indirectly through the purchase of allotments from grantees, either through a simple purchase, or a more complicated lease then purchase arrangement\(^{120}\), or by providing finance for occupiers of allotments who could legitimately claim grants, but who lacked the capital necessary to purchase them. Following purchase, these grants may then pass to the financiers through notional purchase arrangements, or as a result of loan defaults.


\(^{120}\) This arrangement exploited a loop-hole in Colonial Government Land Policy which allowed the leasee of a property to purchase it. Intending purchasers were therefore able, quite literally, to lease a property one day and purchase it the next.
The conveyance of allotment 14 from Johns to Hill is strongly suggestive of this type of arrangement. For one thing, we know from a range of sources that George Hill was by this time a wealthy speculator, living at Durham Hall at Surry Hills, who owned at least four other properties in Pitt Street alone, including the property next door, as well as large tracts of agricultural land on his Yanco estates. He therefore would have had no interest in allotment 14 as a personal residence, and would certainly never have lived there.

It is also interesting to note that in his conveyance of the allotment to Church Trustees less than eight weeks after its purchase from Johns, Hill makes an overall profit of two hundred and seventy five pounds. It seems unlikely that the value of the property would appreciate by more than twenty per cent in such a short time-frame, and this may suggest that the purchase price Johns received from Hill was agreed to some time earlier, possibly as part of a finance or mortgage arrangement which provided the capital for Johns to purchase the allotment in the first instance. Exploring this proposal further, it can be noted that population increases and a more stringent Colonial Government land policy necessitated Johns' purchase or forfeiture of the allotment in 1839. Although he receives one thousand one hundred and twenty five pounds as the purchase price for the property, these funds are not used to purchase any other property anywhere else, and Johns dies in a state of virtual impoverishment. Does this suggest that Johns merely acted as a front for the purchase of the allotment in 1839, and received some form of

121 refer below to biographical notes in respect of George Hill.
commission or compensation from Hill for his co-operation? It is impossible to say, but the evidence is suggestive that this may be so.\textsuperscript{122}

In any case, for our current purposes, we can be certain that Hill would have had no archaeological impact on the site.

**Owners and Occupiers**

Land Title indicates that Samuel Johns occupied Lot 14 possibly as early as 1823 and certainly by mid 1829. The 1828 *Census*\textsuperscript{123} records Johns as living in 'Pitt Street', and on the basis of the evidence of his occupancy of Lot 14 both prior to, and following, that date, it is reasonable to assume that Lot 14 is his Pitt Street address in 1828.

The 1828 *Census*, in addition to providing us with a very significant insights in relation to the occupancy and functions of the property at that time, opens up a range of other avenues for primary historical research. In the first instance, this is due to the fact the census records assist us to relate people to one-another according to various relationships, for example as members of a family; in employee/employer relationships; or in tenancy relationships. The *Census* record of Samuel Johns for example, lists him as the principal occupant of the property, and then cross-references this entry with three other listings, 'Elisa Chittam', 'Mary Keating' and 'George Woodford' which emerge not only as secondary tenants of the property, but in two instances as probable employees of Samuel Johns.

\textsuperscript{122}Unfortunately very little is known in relation to the extent and dynamics of land speculation during this period. It is an area worthy of detailed primary research; pers. comm. Brian Fletcher, February, 1993.

Secondly, the mere fact of having access to a person's name, and the means and status of their entry into the Colony (a category of information also provided by the Census), opens up to investigation a range of other primary historical sources, which have the potential to yield rich additional insights into their social behaviour and characteristics.

Samuel Johns

Firstly, it is interesting to note that Johns did not enter the colony of his own free will; the 1828 Census records that he is an ex-convict, 'free by servitude'.

A search of convict records indicates that Johns arrived in the colony on the 10 February 1810 aboard the ship Ann on its second voyage to the colony, having been convicted for fourteen years. His date of sentencing is recorded in the convict records as 16 March 1807, although a different sentence date, March 1806, is provided in the 1811 Muster.

His place of sentencing is recorded as Devon in the convict records, and this is refined in the 1811 Muster to the city of Exeter in Devon. The British

---
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Home Office Criminal Register records that Johns was tried and convicted 'for having forged bank notes in his possession'.\textsuperscript{130} At the time of the 1828 Census, Johns was recorded as being forty-five years of age,\textsuperscript{131} making his age at conviction either twenty, or twenty-one, depending upon which sentence date is used as the basis of calculation. His religion is recorded as Protestant.\textsuperscript{132}

In the 1811 Muster, Johns is recorded simply as a 'convict'\textsuperscript{133} presumably in convict quarters and dependent upon the Government Store, but by the time of the 1814 Muster he is a 'ticket of leave' labourer no longer relying upon the Government Store.\textsuperscript{134} Johns' Ticket of Leave is recorded as number 690,\textsuperscript{135} but unfortunately no other details of Tickets of Leave for this period survive.\textsuperscript{136} By the time of the 1822 Muster, Johns is a 'free by servitude' labourer; his fourteen year sentence having been completed either in March 1820 or 1821 depending on his date of sentencing.\textsuperscript{137}

Johns' 'ticket of leave' would suggest that he did not incite the wrath of colonial authorities during his period of sentence, but nor does he appear to have earned any special favour: the convict records contain a petition from

\\textsuperscript{130}Archives Office of NSW: British Home Office Criminal Register.
\textsuperscript{135}Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
\textsuperscript{136}Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
Johns to Governor Macquarie, dated March 1811, appealing for the mitigation of sentence, which was apparently unsuccessful.138

We know from the Census records that Johns was occupying allotment 14 in 1828, and from conveyancing transactions that he remained there at the date of sale of the property in 1840. In addition, annotations in surveyors Field Book sketches of Section 17 dating to circa 1830 and 1831,139 indicate that Johns is the occupant of allotment 14 at that time, and the NSW Directory of 1836 records Johns address as 'Upper Pitt Street, Sydney'.140 When considered as a whole these references would appear to attest to his continuing occupancy of the allotment from at least 1828 to 1840.

There are a number of other, earlier, references to Johns which provide information as to his residence and location at different times. As Johns is an unassigned convict at the time of the 1811 Muster, he was presumably located in convict quarters. The 1814 Muster does not record an address for Johns, but as he is a ticket of leave labourer and is listed as being no longer reliant upon the government store for provisions, one can assume he was by this time in some form of private living, presumably in lodgings provided by his employer.

An 1821 reference to Johns provides his address as 'Market Wharf', located at the west end of Market Street.141 As has already been discussed, Surveyor General and Land Title records would appear to suggest that Johns occupied

138 Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
139 refer to list of maps.
140 NSW Directory: 1836.
141 Archives Office of NSW: GSV index to convicts arrived.
allotment 14 some time after 11 November 1822 but prior to June 1823. It is therefore of particular interest to determine if this evidence is corroborated by other historical sources. Unfortunately, the 1822 Muster simply records Johns' address as 'Sydney', and therefore does not assist us in this regard.  

Very little information appears to survive concerning Johns' activities and location following his sale of the Pitt Street allotment in 1839. The only subsequent reference to his place of residence appears to be that recorded on his death certificate in 1868. His address at the time of death is Wallsend, suggesting perhaps that he moved to work in the Hunter coalfields following the sale of his Pitt Street allotment.

Following his release from sentence Johns appears to have established and enjoyed a certain degree of respectability, if this is the correct inference to be derived from his appearance on a list of jurors in the inquest on Isabella Johnson held at Sydney on May 31, 1821. Additionally, the historical evidence would appear to support the inference that Johns quickly established himself in some form of commercial activity substantial enough to require additional labour. This inference can be drawn from convict records which indicate that Johns was assigned a convict labourer as early as September 1822. In addition to this reference there are
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two further references which indicate that Johns continued to benefit from the labour of assigned convicts during 1823 and 1824. 146

It is extremely interesting to note that the first of these labourers is assigned to Johns during exactly that period when Johns appears to have established himself on the Pitt Street site, and this would suggest that Johns selected and developed this site from the beginning as a residential/commercial complex. There is no means of establishing conclusively the nature of Johns' commercial activities at this stage, but it is certainly possible that they reflect the beginnings of what at the time of the 1828 appears to be a dressmaking and soft-furnishings business.

There are a number of indicators to suggest that Johns and his business venture struggled financially. The first of these indicators is the 1822 General Muster which provides records of all personal property and stock holdings; Johns by that date held no land or stock. 147 The next indicator is 31 December 1823 when Johns' name appears on a list of people who have defaulted in payment for assigned convict mechanics for the previous quarter. 148 Johns also defaults on this payment for the following quarter. 149

The 1828 Census records Johns as a 'labourer', 150 perhaps indicating that the commercial enterprise being conducted from the site in 1828 was not

146 Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
148 Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
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sufficiently financially established to support the proprietor, requiring him to maintain a regular source of alternative income. It is also worth noting that Johns does not appear on the electoral role when these are introduced in 1842, indicating that he was not in possession of property at that time. 151

Although we have no further direct evidence of Johns' financial situation until his death in 1868 it would seem from Probate records that Johns fortunes were not to improve significantly. Johns died without making a will and his estate was estimated as having an approximate value of only forty pounds.152

There is no record of any formal marriage between Mary Keating and Samuel Johns, although her occupancy of the property may be suggestive of the existence of a relationship between her and one of the male occupants. Johns did eventually marry however, but not until 1859 and to Mary Young,153 who appears to have any association with the Pitt Street property.

### Elija Cheatham

As has been noted, the 1828 Census records an Eliza Chittam as a 'lodger' 'at Samuel Johns', Pitt Street'.154

The Census further records that Eliza Chittam arrived aboard the Ocean on its second voyage to the colony in 1818, having been convicted for seven years.
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By the time of the Census Elisa Chittam is 'free by servitude', and fifty years of age. Her religion is recorded as 'Protestant'. 155

However, the name 'Elisa Chittam' does not appear in any of the musters prior to 1828; nor can that name be identified on the Indents of Convict Ships. 156 The possibility that Elisa Chittham is a name taken by marriage needs to be considered, however as there were no women at all aboard the Ocean in 1818, 157 one would then need to conclude that the Census records the wrong ship. Additionally, it is significant that the name 'Chittam' does not appear in any muster up to and including the 1837 Muster. 158 If Chittam is a name taken by marriage, the other party to this marriage would be expected to appear in at least one of these surveys of the population of the colony. The most likely explanation for this discrepancy therefore is that there is some form of error in the name recorded by the 1828 Census. 159

Assuming that the Census correctly records the transport as the Ocean on her second voyage, a search of the Indent of Convicts arriving aboard this ship reveals the phonetically similar name, 'Eija Cheetham'. 160
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The Convict Indent records that Elija Cheetham was sentenced at York on 8 July 1815 and convicted for seven years. His date of arrival in the colony is 10 January 1818. This name appears as 'Elija Cheatham' in the 1822 Muster which provides the additional information that he is, by that time, a 'free by servitude' labourer living at Windsor. His religion is recorded as 'Protestant'.

On the basis of currently available information, it is not possible to determine conclusively that the names 'Elisa Chittam', 'Elija Cheetham' and 'Elija Cheatham' refer to the same person. However there is very strong circumstantial evidence to suggest that this is the case; the date of sentencing, the length of conviction, the religion, the status 'free by servitude' and recorded occupation, when considered as a whole, appear to coincide. In a semi-literate society the significant difference in the spelling of the name is less important than the phonetic similarity of its pronunciation. It should be noted however that the age records are discrepant; the age recorded at the date of death, and at the time of the 1828 Census being in accord, but discrepant with the age recorded on the Indent of convicts arriving on the Ocean in 1818.

Home Office records indicate that Cheetham was convicted for 'larceny'. His 'Native Place' is recorded as Oldham in Lancashire, and his occupation is recorded as that of 'cotton weaver'. This profession is of particular interest given the nature of Johns' commercial activities on the Pitt Street allotment at
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the time of the 1828 Census. Even though the Census refers to Cheetham as a 'lodger', he may also have been in employ in the dressmaking and upholstery business.

Convict records indicate that upon arrival in the colony Elija Cheetham was sent to Windsor for redistribution. They also provide information of a more personal nature; Cheetham's age is recorded as twenty-nine years, his height as six feet, the colour of his hair as black to dark brown, and his eyes as brown.

On 14 December 1820 Cheetham provided evidence to the Bigge Inquiry in respect of its investigation into 'roguery' in the colony. He was at this time in the fifth year of his sentence, and reports that he has by that time been employed 'several times in making Bricks for Government, sometimes with Linton, and sometimes with Skinner'. Cheetham's evidence is essentially directed at exposing exploitation by his employer 'Mr. Fitzgerald' who fails to provide payment for Cheetham's services in money. Indirectly, Cheetham's evidence describes a system of 'in-kind' payment operating in the colony in this period based upon the provision of foodstuffs for services rendered. His evidence also describes the use of a kind of 'money order' which could be used as the basis of exchange for certain goods like shoes.

166 Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts: Archives Office of NSW: Indent to Convict Ships.
Convict records indicate that on 1 January 1822 Cheetham presented a petition for the mitigation of sentence.\textsuperscript{168} In view of the fact that Cheetham is later referred to as 'free-by-servitude' this petition was apparently unsuccessful.

Elija Cheatham died in the General Hospital, Sydney on 1 November 1839, and was buried the following day after a service at St James Church.\textsuperscript{169} He died intestate and there are no probate records.

\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Mary Keating} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{itemize}
\item The 1828 Census records 'Mary Keating' as being employed 'at' Samuel Johns, 'Pitt Street', as a dressmaker. The \textit{Census} provides the further information that Mary Keating arrived in the colony in 1817 aboard the \textit{Janus}, having been convicted for seven years. At the time of the \textit{Census} she is 'free by servitude', forty years of age, and her religion is recorded as Protestant.\textsuperscript{170}
\end{itemize}

However, the name Mary Keating does not appear in any of the musters prior to 1828; nor can that name be identified on the Indents of Convict Ships. Additionally, the \textit{Janus} arrived in the colony in 1820, not 1817 as recorded in the 1828 \textit{Census}.\textsuperscript{171} The most likely explanation for this later discrepancy is an error in the 1828 Census records.

The possibility that 'Keating' is a name later taken by marriage was investigated. The Indent of Convicts arriving on the \textit{Janus} provides the names

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{168}Archives Office of NSW: Records of the Principal Superintendent of Convicts.
\item \textsuperscript{169}Society of Australian Genealogists: Register of Births, Deaths and Marriages.
\end{itemize}
of four convicts with occupations approximating that of 'dressmaker', and with the first name Mary. Of these four, the information recorded in respect of the convict 'Mary Dyel' most closely matches the information recorded in the 1828 Census in respect of Mary Keating.

Mary Dyel arrived in the colony aboard the *Janus* on 22 October 1820, having been convicted at Nottingham for seven years. Home Office records indicate that she was convicted for 'dealing in stolen goods'. Her occupation prior to conviction is recorded as that of 'dressmaker and upholsterer'. She is recorded as being of 31 years of age at the date of sentence.

On the 7 August 1820 the name 'Mary Dial' appears on a list of persons seeking permission to marry at Parramatta. Her intended spouse is recorded as James Keaton, a free settler. On the basis of currently available information, it is not possible to determine conclusively that the names 'Mary Keating', 'Mary Dyel', 'Mary Dial', and 'Mary Keaton' refer to the same person and that this is the person living and working at Samuel Johns in 1828. However there is very strong circumstantial evidence to suggest that this is the case; the age, the date of sentencing, the length of conviction, the religion, the status 'free by servitude' and the recorded occupation of each reference is the same or very similar.

There are few other references to Mary. On 14 July 1820, just prior to the presentation of her marriage application, Mary Dial's daughter Caroline
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appears on a list of children to be admitted to the Female Orphan Institution.\textsuperscript{176} Mary Keaton died intestate in 1865.\textsuperscript{177} There are no probate records.

**George Woodford**

The 1828 *Census* records George Woodford as being an 'upholsterer' 'at Samuel Johns', 'Pitt Street'. The *Census* further records that he arrived in the colony in 1807 aboard the ship *Duke of Portland*, having been convicted for fourteen years.\textsuperscript{178}

Home Office records indicate that Woodford was convicted for 'fraudulently obtaining goods'. His place of conviction is recorded as London, and his occupation as that of 'cabinet maker'.\textsuperscript{179}

At the time of the *Census* he is forty years of age and is 'free by servitude'. His religion is recorded as Protestant.\textsuperscript{180}

Like Samuel Johns, Woodford appears to have achieved a certain respectability quite soon after his arrival in the colony, if this is a correct inference to be drawn from his appearance as a Juror at inquests on Ellis, Colebrooke and others on 3 August 1812.\textsuperscript{181}
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He also appears to have ventured into the liquor business very soon after release. On 7 August 1813 he appears on a list of persons holding licenses for sale of wine and spirituous liquors; his address is given as Clarence Street. On 1 April 1815 he appears on a list of persons licensed as publicans for 1815; his address is recorded as Sydney. 182

The evidence would also suggest that Woodford later ventured into some form of labour-based enterprise. On 21 December 1822 Woodford appears on a list of persons to whom convict mechanics have been assigned; his address is recorded as Kent Street.183 He appears again on a list of persons receiving an assigned convict on 9 October 1824.184 This enterprise may not always have been lucrative however as on 8 October 1824 Woodford appears on a list of defaulters in payment for assigned convict tradesmen up to 30 September 1824.185

It is not clear when Woodford commences living and working on the Pitt Street allotment. He is obviously there by the time of the 1828 Census, and the evidence suggests that he remained there at least until 1836. The New South Wales Calender and General Post Office Directory of 1832 records an entry in respect of 'George Woodford, Upholsterer, Pitt Street'.186 The New South Wales Directory of 1836 records an entry in respect of 'George Woodford, Upholsterer, 49, Pitt Street'.187
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It is interesting to note that Woodford starts to receive convict mechanics at the same time as Samuel Johns does. It is conceivable that this may reflect some form of business partnership or association in respect of the Pitt Street site, but if so, as Woodford's address is recorded as Kent Street in assign records, Pitt Street remains his place of work rather than residence, at least initially.

Woodford died intestate in 1860. There are no probate records.

George Hill

Land Title records indicate that George Hill acquired allotment 14 by purchase from Samuel Johns on 18 June 1840 and that the property remained in his possession for approximately eight weeks until its sale to the trustees of the First Congregational Church on 5 August 1840.

George Hill was born on 25 March 1802 at Parramatta, the son of William Hill and Mary Johnson. His father, a convict transported for life for felony, reached Sydney aboard the Ganges in 1797. His mother, also a convict, arrived aboard the Britannia the following year to serve a seven year sentence. William became the superintendent of the government slaughterhouse, and was provided with an absolute pardon in 1813. By the time of the 1828 Census he had established himself as a butcher in Pitt Street.

George Hill appears to have had little formal education and by the age of ten years he is recorded as working as a stockman 'on the coast'. In 1828 he is
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recorded as working with his father in Pitt Street, but by 1832 had acquired three inns in that street.

On 18 June 1832 George Hill married a widow, Mary-Ann Hunter, at St James Church.

Throughout the 1830's he continued to acquire real estate through speculation and grant and in 1838 acquired Yanko, a vast pastoral holding on the Murrumbidgee. However, his primary occupation remained that of a butcher, and proprietor of his own slaughter-house.

In 1842 Hill was elected for Macquarie Ward to the first Sydney Municipal Council and in 1844 became a magistrate. In July 1848 he was elected to the Legislative Council for the counties of St Vincent and Auckland.

In municipal politics he belonged to the Australian-born faction. In 1850 he was elected mayor. He is recorded as having brought 'dignity and respect' to that Office and was also praised in Bell's Life in Sydney for reforming abuses in the Police Courts. In 1856 Hill was nominated to the first Legislative Council after responsible government and in May 1861 resigned in support of Sir William Burton. In 1856/7 he again represented Macquarie Ward in the Municipal Council. He was a trustee of the New South Wales Savings Bank from 1850-83 and sat on the Committees of the Benevolent Asylum and the Cumberland Agricultural Society.

In the 1830s Hill was treasurer of the Sydney races and a subscriber to the Parramatta races. In 1842 his horse Toby won a trotting match at Homebush.
In the 1850's he was several times on the Anniversary Regatta Committee. Known as a 'gentleman of fancy' he backed Laurence Foley's fight at Echuca and later leased him a hotel in York Street. Hill's 'jovial face and bluff, kindly ways' were commented upon.

Hill built the mansion, Durham Hall, in Surry Hills in 1835, and died there in 1883 after his buggy had collided with a tram. He was buried in Randwick cemetery, survived by his second wife Jane, and by five sons and five daughters. His estate at the time of his death was valued at fifty-nine thousand, two-hundred pounds.

In colonial society, Hill was recognised as the head of a large family closely associated with the Wentworth's and the Coopers. One of his daughters married Fitzwilliam, W.C. Wentworth's eldest son; another married Sir William, second son of Sir Daniel Cooper. Hill's brother, Richard, was Wentworth's brother-in-law and his sister Elizabeth was Cooper's wife.

**Convict labour and enterprise explored**

Our exploration of the identity of those four persons resident on the site at the time of the 1828 Census reveals that they each entered the colony as convicted felons.

The established paradigm of Australian history has a strong tendency to interpret those convicts transported to Australia as part of a 'professional criminal underclass'. Manning Clarke characterised them as 'persistent
thieves engaged in a life of crime'.\textsuperscript{190} A.G.L. Shaw suggests that they 'sprung from the dregs of society, and had been trained to crime from the cradle'.\textsuperscript{191} On taking up his appointment to Australia's first chair in Australian history, Brian Fletcher declared in mid-1987 that,

\textit{'The convicts sent to Australia really were criminals ... [not] basically decent people forced into a life of crime by adverse economic conditions'}.\textsuperscript{192}

It is interesting to explore the assumptions that underpin these assertions. Clarke distinguished the 'criminal classes' from the urban working class, from which they came, by 'a certain character and upbringing', by a 'psychological aberration' which made them permanent outcasts of society'.\textsuperscript{193} Lloyd Robson sought the criminal class in 'indifferent or non-existent parental control' and the 'professional class of thieves who taught children, not always their own but waifs and strays, how to pick pockets'.\textsuperscript{194} B. and M. Schedvin identified a 'criminal sub-culture' which emphasised 'easy money, idleness and self indulgences' - values traced to 'parental neglect and indifference accompanied by lack of discipline'.\textsuperscript{195} Hughes believes there was a subculture
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of crime in Britain, and in London particularly, from which 'many Britons made their living, wholly or in part'.

Humphrey McQueen argues that since the bulk of those convicts arriving in Australia were professional criminals quite distinct from the urban working class from which they came, Australia gained from the convicts a 'deformed stratification which had itself been vomited up by the maelstrom which was delineating class in Britain'. For McQueen, the value system of the convicts was essentially 'lumpenproletariat', combining hatred of authority with individual acquisitiveness. According to Hughes,

'Mateship, fatalism, contempt for do-gooders and God-botherers, harsh humour, opportunism, survivors' disdain for introspection, and an attitude to authority in which private resentment mingled with ostensible recognition were the meagre baggage of values the convicts brought with them to Australia.'

It is often purported by historians that this characterisation of the convicts is supported by the statistical analyses of the convict indents.

However, it has been recently been argued by Nicholas and others in a masterwork of revisionist convict history that little of this interpretation stems from an accurate quantitative examination of the convict indents. Rather, it is suggested, this interpretation represents an elaboration of nineteenth century preconceptions of a convict criminal class, which is actually refuted by the statistical analyses of the convict indents. This distortion arises as a result of some historians selectively emphasising certain
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classes of information from the convict indents, and ignoring others. For example, it is argued that criminal offences have typically been painstakingly categorised and counted; but indications of working class background, and occupational skills, are virtually ignored. 199

Nicholas goes on to make the very serious claim that where the statistics do not fit the 'criminal class' hypothesis, this is ignored by some historians. In support of this claim he uses the example of Clarke who found in his analysis that transported criminals had surprisingly high levels of literacy, but then went on to argue 'that the criminal class was characterised by mental imbecility, low cunning and ignorance'. Further, it is suggested that although Clarke found that the percentage of skilled urban tradespeople among convicts was higher than the percentage of labourers and agricultural workers combined, this fact is ignored in his analysis.200

Nicholas' and others' revisionist analysis of the character of the male convicts transported to New South Wales, and Deborah Oxley's assessment of their female counterparts, does not indicate that they were habitual or professional criminals. In fact, their study indicates that most were first offenders found guilty of petty theft. Most had been employed as free workers in the British or Irish labour markets prior to their conviction. For many, their crimes were work-related: they had stolen tools or material from their employers, or possessions from their masters. Most were young working men and women who had been found guilty of larceny or receiving stolen goods.201

Of particular significance is Nicholas' representation of the irony that the notion of an Australian criminal convict class relies upon the existence of a prior British Georgian/Victorian criminal underclass, yet the existence of such an underclass has been resoundingly rejected by British historians of crime.

That Australian historians have clung so tenaciously to the Victorian notion of a distinct and separate criminal class is surprising. Historians of Victorian crime in England ... have rejected the idea of a dangerous class, born and bred to a life of crime and operating as organised gangs ... Not only were those transported to New South Wales not part of a criminal class, the fact is that there existed no such class in Victorian Britain from which to select the transportees202

Nicholas' and others go on to argue that the proportion of convicts in the skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupational categories was roughly the same as the percentages of each skill class for the English workforce in 1841. Their statistical tests suggest that the convicts came from the same occupational population as the free workers in England,

The convicts were the English working classes transported, bringing a cross-section of useful skills. 203

Also of interest in Nicholas' and others' analysis, is the suggestion that there was an urban skill bias in the convict inflow;

Early New South Wales should not be too readily treated as rural-orientated. The standard of living, tastes of the settlers and the isolation of the colony created a strong demand for consumer and producer goods requiring non-rural occupational skills which the convict workers were able to provide. 204

Nicholas' co-author, Deborah Oxley observes that while male convicts have traditionally been assessed for the significance (or insignificance) of their crimes, female convicts have traditionally been stereotyped as 'useless whores'. However, this ignores the fact that prostitution was not a crime in Victorian England. What fragmentary evidence there is on prostitution among the women convicts suggests that no more than twenty per cent practiced prostitution prior to transportation. A.G.L. Shaw's condemnation of these women as 'singularly unattractive', and their dismissal by Lloyd Robson as having 'little to recommend them', therefore shows scant regard for the historical data on female convicts' occupations and literacy. Oxley's analysis demonstrates that the female convicts brought to Australia immediately useful skills, especially as general servants, laundresses, kitchen hands, needleworkers and housemaids, and their traditional portrayal in Australian history is far from accurate.

The identity of convicts as this is portrayed in Nicholas' and others' revisionist history of Australia's convict origins appears to correlate very closely with the identity of those ex-convicts occupying allotment 14 at the time of the 1828 Census. All four convicts have offended only once, all come from major urban centres; three of the four are convicted for theft of property, three appear to have specific trades at the time of transport which are pursued in the colony.

Evidence of Structures and Neighbourhood Character

As has been noted, it would appear that Samuel Johns had some form of claim on Lot 14, established through occupancy, as early as 1823, and by the 1828 Census four people were living and working 'at Samuel Johns'. Direct evidence in relation to the character of those structures which comprised this residential/commercial complex, and the sequence of its construction is slight, although the historical evidence when taken as a whole, does allow us to draw several inferences.

Firstly, The Australian of the 9 January 1841, carries under the general notice of 'Building Materials' an advertisement for the auction of 'cottages' on the site,

Messrs Foss and Lloyd will Sell by Auction, on the Premises, on Tuesday next, January 12, 1841, at Twelve o'clock, The whole of the cottages now standing on the site of the new Independent Chapel, in Pitt Street, Sydney, (adjoining the residence of Captain Innes). The materials to be cleared off the ground within seven days from the day of Sale. To any Mechanics or other persons having Building allotments without the boundaries of the New Building Act, these cottages would be valuable, as being principally of weather boards, and in good condition; they may be readily removed and rebuilt in their present form at a cheap rate. 209

This auction notice suggests, allowing for some degree of embellishment by the auctioneer, that the structures on the site are principally constructed of 'weatherboards', which remain in good, reusable condition. The advertisement also makes it clear that there is more than one structure, and that the overall

character of these structures is that of 'cottages', implying a residential function and appearance.

A second source of direct evidence can be derived from Assistant Surveyor Ambrose Hallen’s circa 1830 Field Book sketches (Figure 8). His sketch of the block depicts a continuous rectangular unit with a Pitt Street alignment with a passage way on the southern side leading to the rear of the block, and a privy in the north-east corner. The principal structure is divided into three sections which are then filled in with contrasting parallel lines. This tripartite division, and the use of contrasting lines would suggest that Hallen intends to depict three distinct units, albeit that they appear to be a part of a single larger structure. The 'key' to this sketch indicates that the use of parallel lines is intended to depict weatherboards.

Hallen's sketches therefore suggest that in 1830 the site was occupied by three small weatherboard cottages, which were visually and functionally distinct from each other. The single privy, the apparent absence of any fences, walls or gardens between the cottages, and to a lesser extent, the single side passage, would suggest however, that the cottages had a close functional relationship with each other.

Hallen’s 1830 sketches also provide information in relation to the general character of the neighbourhood. The block would appear at this stage to be a mix of weatherboard, brick and stone buildings, although stone appears to predominate; there is only one other wholly weatherboard building on the block at this stage. The cottages appear to be smaller than other structures on the block, although not to the extent that they are discordant with the size of
other structures. Indeed, viewing this block and those adjacent as a whole, the dimensions and fabric of the cottages appears reasonably typical.

Inferences as to the general structure and appearance of the block can also be drawn from a number of early-to-mid nineteenth century commentators.

James Maclehose

James Maclehose, in his manual for prospective immigrants entitled Picture of Sydney and Strangers Guide in NSW for 1839, described by its publisher as 'a faithful record of facts, illustrative of the past and present state of Sydney', provides a brief, but highly descriptive impression of Pitt Street (including that section bounded by Park and Bathurst Streets) just prior to the conveyance of Lot 14 from Johns to Hill,

*From the intersection by Market Street towards Park Street, Pitt Street has a fine appearance, most of the houses being well built, and in general occupied by a most respectable tenantry, the lower orders having found residences for themselves at a less rental towards its north and south extremities.*

*From the crossing of Park Street to its Southern termination, Pitt Street, although less occupied by expensive buildings, is remarkable for the neatness and cheerful appearance displayed by most of the cottages with which it is lined on either side; the small garden plots before them, their shaded verandahs, and the regularity of design which many of them display, taken altogether, not only please the eye and gratify the tastes, but also have a direct tendency to recall the rustic beauties of Old England to the memory of everyone who can think of the land he has left, and rejoice in the land now his home.*

---


Maclehose characterises that section of Pitt Street bounded by Park and Bathurst Streets by using it as a contrast to that block between Market and Park Streets. He describes the northern block as being of 'fine appearance' with a 'very respectable tenantry'. By implication, this would suggest that the location and style of those buildings of the southern block, which includes those 'cottages' on Lot 14, are not built on the same scale and do not have the same prestige as those on the northern block. They are 'less expensive' buildings. Relaxedly, the occupants of the southern block, in Maclehose's estimation, are not of the same social class of those of the northern block, and represent the 'lower orders' of colonial society.

Even so, Maclehose clearly finds the general character of the southern block pleasing and remarks on its 'neatness and cheerful appearance'. He paints a picture of 'small', 'regular' 'cottages' with 'small' front 'garden plots' 'reminiscent of the rustic beauty's of Old England'.

**Joseph Fowles**

Joseph Fowles, writing in 1848, provides a quite detailed commentary in relation to selected Sydney streetscapes. Unfortunately, although Fowles describes the first Congregational Church in some detail, he does not deal with any other structures present on the Park to Bathurst street section of Pitt Street. He does however describe at some length the adjoining Market to Park Street section. It is important to be clear that by the time Fowles is writing, the Congregational Church had been constructed, and the previous structures on the site demolished for a period of just over seven years. Nevertheless the Fowles references to Pitt Street are of interest because they describe the general character of an adjoining block and neighbourhood at a time that is
not all that far removed from the period in question. Additionally, and quite significantly, Fowles refers to several buildings in detail which would have been contemporary with those structures on Lot 14 prior to the construction of the Church, and which may be of the same general character as these earlier structures.

Fowles account of character of the King to Market and then Market to Park Street sections of Pitt Street adopts the same general technique of contrast employed by Maclehole. In this instance, however, Fowles is contrasting the two blocks immediately north of the Park to Bathurst section of Pitt Street.

Proceeding along Pitt Street we cross Market Street, at which point the character of the former thoroughfare changes very considerably. The fashionable establishments give place in great measure to those of a more utilitarian description, among which are many wholesale and manufacturing concerns on a very extensive scale.212

Considering the Maclehole and Fowles accounts of Pitt Street streetscapes in combination, one develops the impression of a pronounced descending southward progression of scale and prestige in neighbourhood character and style.

Of particular additional interest is Fowles' reference to the 'utilitarian' character of the Market to Park Street section of Pitt Street, and the block's 'very extensive' retail/commercial functions. Presumably these are, to a significant degree, the same buildings that Maclehole is referring to in 1839, suggesting that the block as a whole, and those structures on its individual allotments, serve both residential and retail/commercial purposes.

Fowles' commentary would appear to suggest that there is an association between the scale and prestige of the structures on the King to Market Street section of Pitt Street and their functional specialisation (as residences). Conversely, Fowles appears to associate the southward descending progression in scale and prestige with an ascending scale of neighbourhood functional diversity. This very interesting reflection of early nineteenth century attitudes towards social class and labour will be explored in greater depth following.

Fowles then goes on to describe what he calls 'Pitt Street North',

> Having followed Pitt Street in a southerly direction as far as Park Street we retrace our steps, and our ninth and tenth numbers contain representations of the houses in Pitt Street north, from King Street, to its termination;....

> The present illustrations are highly characteristic of the transitory state of an infant City, from its primitive bark or slab huts to more convenient weather-boarded cottages, and lastly to the substantial and handsome stone and brick houses ....213

This section of Fowles' commentary is of particular interest in view of its vivid depiction of the transitional state of Pitt Street architecture during the 1840s from its 'primitive bark or slab huts' to 'weather-boarded cottages' to 'substantial and handsome stone and brick houses'. Clearly there is much change occurring in streetscapes during this period of which the demolition of the cottages on Lot 14 and the construction of the First Congregational Church is a reflection. One mid-twentieth century architectural historian referring to the commencement of construction of the Union Bank in 1839

suggests that 'Inevitably' its location is Pitt Street, 'that Paradise of architects in the forties.' 214

No doubt this transition from crude timber buildings to stone and brick reflects not only physical changes to these neighbourhoods, but also a social displacement of the 'lower orders' of colonial society out of the city to provide the way for an expansion of accommodation and amenities for the middle class. The change in function of Lot 14 in the late 1830s/early 1840s from a working class residential/commercial environment to what is essentially, in its purely physical dimensions, an ornament and status symbol of the middle class is therefore reflective of a process of progressive displacement of the inner-urban poor which was to escalate to tragic proportions nearly one-hundred years later, and which continues today.

Finally, Fowles' commentary draws attention to a number of buildings in Pitt Street which appear to have design features similar to those known features of the cottages on Lot 14. Fowles commentary is of particular interest because it is accompanied by line drawings of these structures (figure 11),

We have next a low range of weather-boarded cottages, in the first of which a wealthy old colonist of the name of Connell has resided forty-nine years. The fine row of brick houses opposite, known as Terry’s Buildings, form an agreeable contrast to the mean cottages just noticed, and which it is to be hoped, will soon give place to more substantial and ornamental buildings ... 215

The line drawings associated with this description depict two free standing structures, the second of which is comprised of three weatherboard cottages which are discrete elements of the larger composite structure. Each cottage has its own roof, the difference in roof line probably suggests different periods of construction. Each cottage has its own front entrance. The central cottage has two sixteen pane windows located asymmetrically on either side of the entrance; the other cottages have a single sixteen pane window each. The style of each cottage's windows is different, again suggesting a different construction date.

It is important to note that Fowles advises that one of these structures has been home to Connell, 'a wealthy old colonist' for forty-nine years, implying that this structure dates to the last years of the eighteenth century. If this is correct, they would thus be considerably earlier than those structures on Lot 14. It is also important to note that these structures are located in that section of Pitt Street north from King Street, and therefore some distance from the Park to Bathurst Street section of Pitt Street with which we are concerned. Nevertheless, based on the limited direct evidence available, the general composition and character of the Fowles' line drawings of this complex remain quite suggestive of those structures present on Lot 14 in 1839.
Figure 11.
An 1848 streetscape drawing by Joseph Fowles of Pitt Street between Market and Park Streets.
Chapter 4

The Archaeological Evidence

The Excavation

As has been noted, the archaeological investigation from which the assemblage derives was conducted by amateur archaeologists Bob Holmes and Doug Armstrong working at night and weekends during 1971. The excavation thus took place at a time when there was no statutory prohibition and very little regulation governing such activities. It also took place at a time when the discipline of historical archaeology was in its earliest formative phases, and was not yet embedded in a solid epistemological and methodological framework.

In combination, these two factors account for the fact that certain approaches to the archaeological record, considered mandatory by contemporary standards, were not adhered to in the course of this excavation. For example, there appears to have been no research design developed to guide the investigation of the site, and consequently the reasons for the excavation, and those questions and hypotheses being asked of the archaeological record are not recorded. Additionally, the excavators did not attempt publication, or even the basic inventory of finds. Certainly an excavation of this kind would not be acceptable by contemporary standards, but it is important to note that these standards had not been developed at the time the excavation was undertaken.

One of the major limitations facing any attempt at the re-interpretation of the archaeological assemblage is the degree of information surviving in relation
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to the process of excavation. While a notebook appears to have been maintained by the excavator, and to have been available to Bairstow in 1978, its location is now unknown. Information relating to the stratigraphy therefore has to be derived either from the unreferenced narrative of the 1978 interpretation, including two sketch-drawings of the excavation area (both of which are apparently derived from the excavator’s notebook) or inferred from artefact the bag labels. This information is set out following.216

The foundations of the Church divide its sub-floor area into six isles running east-west. The whole of this area was searched for surface finds which were assembled according to the aisle from which they came. In Area 3 and 4 the excavators noted a hard, sub surface layer, which they subsequently defined as layer 2. This layer was apparently investigated further, although the form of this investigation has not been recorded. Finds from this Layer 2 were treated separately from other finds. It should be noted that finds from Layer 2, Area 3, Division 3 (that is, that section subsequently excavated), are not included among the general finds for Area 3, Layer 2. This means in effect that there are two layers designated layer 2.

Excavation concentrated on Bay 3 of Area 3. This area has been identified on the basis of early maps and drawing to be in the back yard approximately 3m behind the cottages (refer to figure 14). Excavation proceeded by digging to arbitrary levels, the first level to a depth of 5cm, the second level to a depth of a further 5cm. No change in the nature of the finds was noted by the

excavators, and in some instances fragments of the same vessel were found in each layer. On the basis of these two observations, the 1978 interpretation chose to catalogue these two levels together.

Apparently finds petered out at 10cm below the surface, with the exception of a section near the foundations. In response, the excavation was then limited to this section, designated layer 4, which was dug to a depth of a further 5cm. The finds yielded from this layer were slight in comparison the upper layers, so the excavators again reduced the excavation area, this time to a trench beside the foundation wall, which was dug to a depth of a further 55cm. Figures 12 and 13 provide a plan and section of these excavation units respectively.

Buckets of unsifted soil were removed from the site through a man hole. Every bucket of soil was then sifted for finds, and apparently with some degree of sensitivity, as material as small as eggshell fragments, fish scales and grass were recovered.

The Assemblage

As has been noted, the 1978 catalogue represents a first attempt to inventory the finds from the investigation. However, this inventory is based on a rudimentary and quite subjective classificatory system that has been superseded by improvements in archaeological method, in particular as a result of the introduction of computer data-base programmes facilitating the rapid and consistent manipulation of mass material culture.
In the course of the project, the finds from the investigation have been re-sorted, described and quantified and this inventory entered onto the MINARK computer data-base. This inventory is provided as an appendix to this report and should provide a valuable ongoing resource for comparative study far beyond the scope of the present project.

It should be noted at the outset that although artefacts from all layers have been re-inventoried, entered onto the computer data-base, and a this full inventory provided in the appendix, a decision has been made not to include artefacts from Layer 1 in the present analysis. This decision is based upon the fact that there are artefacts in Layer 1 datable to the end of the nineteenth century, therefore indicating that this Layer is an underfloor deposit (probably accumulated during periods of modification and repair) unrelated to any phase of occupation prior to the construction of the Church, and therefore also unrelated to the purposes of this study.

**Stratigraphy**

Our first task in seeking to understand the assemblage is to determine whether it derives from a single stratigraphic unit, or from a number of units. As has already been noted, the original designation of 'layers' was determined arbitrarily by the excavators, and is not related to any observed stratigraphic variation. It has also been noted that the excavation, by repute, was meticulous, and it is therefore quite unlikely that any stratigraphic variation would have been overlooked. On this basis, it is reasonable to assume therefore that the assemblage derives from a single stratigraphic unit. However by using artefact density and conjoin analysis, and examining the overall
composition of the assemblage across each layer it is possible to make some additional stratigraphic observations in support of this conclusion.

The density of artefacts per cubic centimetre varies across the layers, with the highest density being recorded for Layer 4: layer 2/3 has an artefact density of 1: 42.7 cubic centimetres, layer 4 has an artefact density of 1: 20 cubic centimetres and Layer 5 has an artefact density of 1: 282 cubic centimetres.

The total range of artefactual material varies little across the three layers and in each layer the major elements of the assemblage are relatively constant, even if their overall proportions vary considerably (refer to table 1). This is also true for artefact functional categories (refer to table 2). The major variations in proportional composition across layers are associated with bone, shell and glass.

One ceramic conjoin, a large blue transfer print cup, has been identified between layers 2/3 (DBIB no.s. 368, 369, 366, 225, 362, 365) and layer 5 (DBID 863).

It is possible to draw a number of inferences from these three sources of evidence. First, on balance, it is clear that there is a general consistency in the material and functional composition of the assemblage across the three layers and this would suggest that the assemblage should be considered as deriving from a single stratigraphic unit. This conclusion is reinforced by the presence of a ceramic conjoin between the top to bottom layer.
Second, it is interesting to note that the higher density of artefacts in layer 4 is associated with a high proportion of shell and bone, and this would appear to suggest that the variation in density and composition arises as a result of burying activity, particularly as bone is also a major artefact category in layer 5. It is also worth noting in this context that the bone remains in good condition and has been unaffected by gnawing and treadage. This degree of preservation would also be consistent with burial.

Third, the proportion of glass is significantly higher in layer 2/3, and as this is largely made up of window glass, the question arises as to whether layer 2/3 might be a demolition layer stratigraphically differentiated from the other layers. On balance, this conclusion would seem unlikely for several reasons. For one thing, it is important to note that the high proportion of glass is a reflection of the number of artefact items (which is large), rather than their mass (which is low), and this produces a somewhat distorted image of the composition of the assemblage. Additionally, window glass occurs in the other two layers, and in fact its proportion is higher in layer 5 than in layer 4. The consistency in the presence of window glass throughout the layers therefore argues against a distinct demolition layer. A demolition layer is also likely to be characterised by a high proportion of architectural material in addition to glass, and this is not so in this instance.

In any case, large quantities of glass sherds can be generated as a result of a single 'routine' event, like the breaking and/or replacement of a window, and can therefore be accounted for without needing to resort to more complicated explanations.
**Nature of deposit**

The material and functional composition of the assemblage overall clearly suggests that it is of domestic origin (refer to table 3 and 4). The major classes of material comprising the assemblage are fine earthenware, iron, glass and bone, and the major functional classes are tableware, kitchenware, non-structural architectural items (predominantly window glass) and structural architectural items (predominantly nails). In addition however, there are a range of other 'domestic' materials represented in the assemblage including oriental porcelain, English porcelain, copper dress pins, pipes and stoneware, and a range of other 'domestic' functional categories, including, personal items (buttons and clothing fragments), medical items (bottles), household items, (wall paper fragments, lamp glass, ceramic vase fragments), food items, (egg shell, bone), and clerical items (seal).

However, although the overall character of the assemblage is domestic, there are also some items in the assemblage which may reflect commercial activity. For instance, while it is not unexpected that one would find dressmakers pins in a domestic assemblage, the significant number recovered from this site would appear unusual (refer to table 5).
Table 1: Frequency of major artefact classes across layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Layer 2/3</th>
<th>Layer 4</th>
<th>Layer 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine earthenware</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Frequency of artefact functional categories across layers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Layer 2/3</th>
<th>Layer 4</th>
<th>Layer 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-structural</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchenware</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Frequency of artefact items by material (complete assemblage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>% of assemblage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Earthenware</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Stoneware</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Porcelain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>1515</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oolite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz fibre</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Earthenware</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitreous stoneware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Porcelain</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Frequency of artefact items by function (Complete assemblage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableware</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Non-Structural</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Non-food</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cultural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchenware</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Structural</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequency of Household items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Item</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Umbrella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pins</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To step out of a strictly archaeological discussion momentarily, the historical evidence suggests that a dress making and upholstery business was conducted from the site during the period of the Johns occupancy, and this would appear to be corroborated by the high proportion of dressmakers pins in the assemblage. Having established that, it is also possible to identify in the assemblage other personal, household and architectural items which might derive from commercial dress making and upholstery activity. These include a range of buttons, a thimble, and upholstery tacks and pins (refer to tables 5, 6 and 7). However, returning to a strictly archaeological discussion, it should be noted that these items do not appear in a proportion where their presence can not be explained equally successfully by ordinary domestic activity.

Table 6. Frequency of personal items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Item</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Button (1 hole)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button (3 holes)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button (4 holes)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanked button</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset button</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other buttons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Frequency of Architectural items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Item</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand made Nail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine made Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholstery tack</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence Wire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Iron</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Chadding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deposition/Taphonomy

Having established that the assemblage comprises a single primarily domestic deposit, it is important that our attention is now directed towards inferring the mode of deposition. In this respect it is important to note that the physical limits of the deposit were not established in the course of the excavation and it is therefore not possible to deduce a pattern of deposition with any sense of certainty. Nevertheless, it is possible to draw several tentative inferences from the distribution of artefacts within the deposit.
First, it can be observed that there is a considerable degree of internal consistency to the assemblage, particularly in relation to particular materials like fine earthenware and glass. A conjoin has already been noted between layers 2/3 and 5, and there are also many connecting fragments of chamber pots, saucers, cups, plates, platters, bottles and tumblers. In addition, as will be discussed following, it is possible to identify within the assemblage two ceramic tea services, and one decanter and tumbler set.

Thus, although the assemblage represents a broad range of materials, it nevertheless has components comprising of small identifiiable groups, and this would suggest that deposition occurred primarily (although not necessarily exclusively) from a single household.

Second, the nature of the assemblage (that is, a highly inter-related primarily domestic deposit) would appear to suggest a midden accumulation, perhaps the result of domestic filling activity.

However, it does not seem likely that a simple process of accumulation has taken place. The ceramic conjoin suggests for example that there has been a distribution of material top to bottom, and it has already been noted that the state of preservation of the bone suggests burial. It is thus necessary to account, on the one hand, for a pattern of deposition which would result in the distribution of sherds from the same cup across layers within the deposit, and on the other hand, that would provide a stable environment conducive to the preservation of bone in its original butchered form.
One scenario which might accommodate these apparently contradictory implications is the gradual filling of a gully or depression. Such activity would provide the stable environment necessary for bone to be buried without subsequent disturbance, and at the same time provide a context where fragments of the same object might slide to different levels of a slope, which would ultimately be reflected as different depths.

It is of course possible that mixing of the deposit did take place, perhaps as a result of the excavation and redepositing of earth during the process of construction of the Church foundation wall. Mixing might also have occurred in the course of other forms of domestic activity like gardening, or be associated with disturbance by domestic animals like pigs or poultry. Although these possibilities can not be entirely ruled out, they appear unlikely due to the state of bone preservation, which suggests a single process of burial and excavation, and no further modification as for example, by chewing, breaking or abrasion.

It is also interesting to note that certain artefacts, for example some pipe and ceramic fragments, appear to have undergone substantial breakage and treadage, and this would be consistent with deposition in areas of high traffic or other activity. Conversely, some artefact fragments are large, and are apparently unaffected by treadage. These two contradictory implications would suggest that artefacts are being deposited from different sources; the large reconstructable fragments of the hand painted saucers suggest immediate discard on breakage and little subsequent disturbance, whereas the small, worn and burnt ceramic and pipe fragments suggest dumped sweepings from areas of high treadage. This is of course an entirely plausible model of
domestic discard behaviour, incorporating primary and secondary depositional activity.

In summary therefore, based upon the models set out in chapter 2, it would appear most likely that the deposit represents a midden deposit, accumulated as a result of domestic filling activity. However, until the limits of the deposit have been identified, it is impossible to come to any firm conclusion on these points.

Date

A model for determining the date range of deposition of the assemblage has been developed using detailed historical research (refer to chapter 2). It is fortunate that there are a number of artefacts which provide indications of date, and which in combination, allow us to firmly date the assemblage to the period of the Johns occupancy.

There are four artefacts within the assemblage to which a definite manufacture date or date range may be attributed: an 1807 George III Halfpenny (DBID 243); a Spode blue transfer printed plate fragment (DBID 151) dated by Godden to the period 1810 to 1833,217 and two clay tobacco pipes (DBID 600 and 617) marked 'M/G' on the spur, and dated by Wilson and Kelly to the period 1832-1877 (refer to figure 15).218


In addition, there are a number of artefact classes represented in the assemblage for which it is possible to assign a general date range (refer to figure 15). This includes four olive glass beer/wine bottles, two of which have a general date range of the late eighteenth century through to approximately 1830 (DBID 1067 and 1068), and two of which have a general date range of the late eighteenth century through to approximately 1835 (DBID 1070 and 1072).219 There are also eleven Clay tobacco pipes marked 'M.P.P./MAKER' (DBID 612, 614, 620, 622) which carry a general date of 1820-1840.220 The green tint glass food/snuff bottle (DBID 1055) carries a general date range commencing in approximately 1820 and continuing to the end of the nineteenth century, and the green tint pickle/chutney bottle (DBID 1054) carries a date range commencing in approximately 1845 and continuing through until the end of the nineteenth century.221

The presence of a high proportion of handmade nails is also suggestive a date before the 1840s when these nails began to disappear with developing technology. This is also true for the Crown window glass which is longer in use after 1845. The generalised absence of clear or tinted vessel glass is also suggestive of a date prior to 1845, after which this category of material

221 noted that this bottle type becomes common after pers. comm., Martin Carney, 1993. It should better 1845, but is available before that.
Figure 15.
Dated Artefacts from Pitt Street Church 1971 - Units 2, 3, 4 & 5
Figure 16.
Advertised Ceramics Present at Pitt Street Church 1822-1846 indicated in black [after Atkins 1991].
Figure 17.
Availability of Ceramics at Pitt Street Church 1823-1846, types present indicated in black (after Miller 1991).
proliferated due to the lifting of export duty. Before 1845 it is very rarely found.

Aside from this information, Atkins' model of advertised availability of English ceramics in the colony (figure 16), and Miller's model of absolute availability of English ceramics on the international market (figure 17), establish the general time frame during which particular forms of ceramic decoration were introduced, proliferated and then disappeared. As can be inferred by examining these models in combination with table 8, there is an extraordinary correlation between this assemblage and those forms of ceramic decoration in common use during the second and third decades of the eighteenth century.

In conclusion therefore, there is overwhelming evidence upon which to date the deposit prior to 1845, and to the period of the Johns occupancy. It has been established that the deposit represents a single stratigraphic unit, and that the deposit is a midden accumulation from domestic filling activity from one household. Finally, many of the artefacts recovered have a date or date range consistent with the Johns occupation period, and there is no datable evidence which is inconsistent with this occupation period.
Table 8. Frequency of Ceramic decoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic decoration</th>
<th>no of items</th>
<th>% by number</th>
<th>% by weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-Glazed</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White gilt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain White embossed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue transfer print</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown transfer print</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/grey transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full chrome transfer print</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Blue transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer print and Hand painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted and embossed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luster</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lustre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Easters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Wear Analysis

It was originally proposed that use wear analysis would be undertaken on the ceramics to determine if it was possible to identify any pattern in the length, frequency and type of use to which they were subject prior to discard. Unfortunately, most of the ceramic assemblage is too small to be able to conduct this analysis. There are however several fragments of a hand-painted saucer which reveal significant wear stains (DBID 358, 357, 353, 354, 355, 360, 356, 359). This would appear to reflect a very frequent pattern of usage that might be consistent with initial use as a tea saucer and then secondary use (after chipping or cracking) in some other way, perhaps as a soap dish, for example.

Analysis of Standard sets.

As has been noted there would appear to be three standard sets represented in the assemblage: an earthenware blue transfer willow pattern tea service with large cups (DBID 363, 361, 364, 367, 368, 369, 863, 366, 225, 362, 365); an earthenware hand painted tea service (DBID 358, 357, 353, 354, 355, 360, 356, 359), and a clear glass decanter and tumbler set (DBID 1285, 1082, 1078, 1090, 1096, 1084, 1086, 1063, 1286, 1287, 1288, 1062, 1081, 1180, 1087, 1083, 1080). Research has not revealed any further information in relation to these sets.

Faunal Remains

The assemblage provides a number of indications of diet and food preparation patterns. The occupants of allotment 14 appear to have enjoyed a varied diet of eggs, oysters, beef, mutton and lamb, pork, chicken and fish (refer to table 9).
Table 9. Frequency of Animal Bone Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Type</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/pig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Frequency of Cow Bone Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone Type</th>
<th>number of items</th>
<th>% by weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalange</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick bone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpal/Tarsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the beef, mutton and pork bones are related to cheaper, stewing cuts (Thick bones, Skull, Vertebra, Mandible) and cheaper roasts (Femur, Ulna, Tibula). There are also number of sheep bones (Tarsal, Phalange) in the assemblage which are not standard butchered cuts, and which may suggest on site slaughtering. On site butchering may also account for the presence of sheep skull fragments (refer to tables 10 and 11). There is no evidence for the
on-site butchering of cow, and this would suggest that beef was purchased from a local butcher shop.222

Table 11. Frequency of Sheep Bone Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone Type</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>% by Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalange</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thigh bone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibula</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long bone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

222During the 1830s, George Hill owned three butcher shops in Pitt Street, suggesting that butchered meat was readily available, Australian Dictionary of Biography.
Ceramics

The range of ceramic material and their proportion within the assemblage is set out in table 12. It should be noted that the range of material is typical of a domestic assemblage and includes fine earthenware, oriental porcelain, vitreous stoneware, English porcelain, fine stoneware and red earthenware.

The forms of fine earthenware decoration and their frequency are set out in table 8. It has already been noted in reference to Atkins model of advertised ceramic availability (figure 16), that there is a remarkable consistency between those fine earthenware's represented in the assemblage and those known to be available in the colony during the early decades of the nineteenth century. It has been further noted in reference to Miller's model of absolute ceramic availability, that this consistency extends to those English wares available on the international markets during this period. This would imply on the one hand that the preferences and consumption patterns of those persons purchasing ceramics for the Johns household were consistent with typical preferences and consumption patterns for this period. Additionally, based upon Miller's cost indexing model for ceramics, the significant proportion of blue transfer print, and the small quantity of English porcelain would imply an attraction to more expensive wares and a capacity to purchase them.
Table 12. Frequency of Ceramic material by number and weight of items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Type</th>
<th>% by number of items</th>
<th>% by weight of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine earthenware's</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red earthenware's</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine stoneware</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicenza stoneware</td>
<td>.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Porcelain</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English porcelain</td>
<td>.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass

Aside from window glass, the assemblage contains at least six olive glass bottles, at least four case gin bottles, one complete medicine bottle, and a fragment of another, and fragments of a clear glass decanter and tumbler set, of which there are four bases.

Clay Pipes

As can be noted from table 3, there is a significant proportion of clay pipe fragments represented in the assemblage. Aside from those pipes which have been dated to the 1830s (see above), most of the pipes are undecorated and would therefore appear to be either of local manufacture, or imports dating to the decade of the 1820s.²²³

In conclusion, this re-interpretation of the historical archaeology of allotment 14, Section 17, of the Parish of St Lawrence is quite significant for a number of reasons.

First, it has been demonstrated conclusively that the 1978 interpretation of the site is invalid both in fact and in terms of the epistemology and methodology in which it is embedded. The historical evidence presented in chapter 3 entirely refutes the proposition that the site was occupied by a 'woman of faded gentility'. Instead, it has been established that the principal occupant of the site was Samuel Johns, a man and an emancipist, and that his household comprised of three other emancipists of whom only one was a woman.

Although details in relation to the social status and background of the four occupants is fragmentary, it is nevertheless decisive. Samuel Johns arrived in the colony in 1810, having been convicted at Exeter in Devon in 1806 of forgery and sentenced to fourteen years imprisonment. His trade prior to transportation was that of 'labourer'. George Woodford arrived in the colony in 1807 having been convicted at London in that year of fraudulently obtaining goods and sentenced to fourteen years imprisonment. His occupation prior to transportation was that of cabinet maker. Elija Cheatham arrived in the colony in 1818, having been convicted at Lancashire in 1815 of larceny, and sentenced to seven years transportation. His occupation prior to conviction was that of cotton weaver. Mary Keating arrived in the colony in
1820 having been convicted at Nottingham of dealing in stolen goods and sentenced to transportation for seven years. Her occupation prior to conviction was that of dressmaker and upholsterer. There is therefore no hint of gentility in the background of any of the site's occupants, faded or otherwise, and the occupation of the site is clearly dominated by men.

In this context, it is salutary to consider that the surviving demographic information in relation to the occupants of the site is quite consistent with general Sydney demographic patterns during the first three decades of the nineteenth century. Reference to any standard historical work reveals that during this period the population was overwhelmingly dominated by male convicts and ex-convicts. Given these basic, very available, demographic facts, it is quite incredible that the 1978 interpretation would attempt to explain the assemblage within a construct of faded feminine gentility, without even the slightest supporting historical documentation to this effect. On the basis of simple probability alone, it has been demonstrated that such an interpretation of the site is extremely unlikely.

It has also been demonstrated that the 1978 interpretation is wrong in its conceptual and methodological underpinnings. The author appears to labour under severe misconceptions in relation to the nature of the historical and archaeological records and their joint role in historical archaeological interpretation. This is reflected in at least three dimensions. At the epistemological level, it is reflected in an extreme positivism which considers it possible to determine gender and social status from earthenware decoration, even where the historical evidence entirely contradicts the conclusions reached by this process. At the ideological level, it is reflected in a very
heavy and uncritical dependence upon notions of colonial demographic composition and development apparently derived from the librettos of English romantic fiction, rather than from easily obtainable Australian historical statistics. Finally, at the methodological level, it is reflected in a rather intellectually primitive antiquarianism which drives the author to attribute 'early' dates to materials, even those materials which have a wide date range, or which are demonstrably not 'early', as if their significance archaeologically would thereby be enhanced.

From these three overarching flaws, other flaws inevitably derive. For example, the author's extreme positivist epistemology in relation to the archaeological record leads her to neglect her responsibility of undertaking detailed historical research. An uncritical ideological reliance upon a romantic concept of Australian social development leads the author to neglect her responsibility to construct a research design and within it, to test hypotheses deductively on the basis of the historical and archaeological evidence in an intellectually and methodologically rigorous fashion.

In the final analysis therefore, the 1978 interpretation of the site has been shown to be little more than an archaeologically imaged fairy tale.

The second significance of this re-interpretation of the site arises from the fact that through detailed historical research and stratigraphic analysis it has been demonstrated that the deposit was in fact sealed in 1846. Although this had been assumed from the time of the original excavation, it has not to this point been demonstrated on the basis of an explicit and reliable methodology.
Third, detailed historical research has provided a very clear picture of the sequence of development and occupation of the site up to 1846. It has been demonstrated that the site was vacant up until at least November 1822, that Samuel Johns certainly occupied and developed it between November 1822 and June 1823, and that Johns' occupancy continued at least until June 1840. It has been further established that structures on the site were demolished and removed between 9 and 16 January 1841, and that the foundation stone for the Church was laid on 21 January 1841. Building was almost immediately interrupted however, as a result of a financial crisis arising from the 1841 depression, did not recommence until 1844, and was not completed until 1846.

It has also been demonstrated on the basis of the historical evidence that by the time of official survey in 1831 there were three distinct, but functionally related, weatherboard cottages on the site. The function of these cottages was not only domestic, but also commercial. The historical evidence indicates that Samuel Johns conducted a dressmaking and upholstery business on the site from at least as early as 1828 and possibly from as early as 1822, and that this enterprise continued at least until 1836, and possibly until 1840.

Reference to primary historical sources and to contemporary and slightly later secondary accounts of the development of City of Sydney, and of Pitt Street streetscapes in particular, has allowed us to develop a vivid image of a built environment changing across the period of the Johns occupancy from slab huts, to weatherboard cottages, then to brick and later to stone private houses and public buildings. It has been suggested that it is possible to identify an ascending ratio of functional specialisation and social status associated with this transition. Viewed longitudinally, these two factors
appear to have resulted in the progressive displacement of the inner city working classes in favour of middle class accommodation and amenity as the city consolidated and expanded.

Extensive efforts have been made to place the occupancy of the site in the context of developing Colonial Government land policy, and it has emerged that the history of the site vividly reflects the tensions associated with a failure of early Governors to develop a comprehensive and coherent town planning policy, and in particular, a policy in relation to the granting of Title on town allotments. The four major 'defacto' increments in town planning policy represented by the initiatives of Governors Phillip, Bligh, Macquarie and Darling have been considered in terms of their impact on the development and occupancy of the site. Paradoxically, this review has demonstrated that although the early Colonial Government's failure to develop a comprehensive town plan essentially arose out of an attempt to regulate the growth of the town, its ultimate effect was to allow for its organic, unregulated, development. By 1829, Governor Darling had little choice but to acquiesce and sanction developments that Governor Phillip had sought to avoid.

In the course of this review of land policy, the emergence and features of land speculation during the 1830s has been discussed, with particular reference to the conveyance of allotment 14 from Johns to George Hill in June 1840 and its conveyance from Hill to the Trustees of the Church in August of that year. Although the evidence is not conclusive, it would appear that these transactions reflect a speculation on Hill's part, perhaps arising on the basis of an initial informal financing or mortgage agreement with Johns.
Fourth, the archaeological assemblage deriving from the site has been re-sorted according to a standardised classificatory system and this inventory entered into a computerised data-base, making the assemblage amenable to rapid data-manipulation and more accessible for comparative study. The benefits of this resource will extend far beyond the scope of the present project.

The composition of the assemblage has been demonstrated to be primarily of domestic origin with an identifiable craft/commercial component. It has been conclusively dated to the Johns occupancy on the basis of stratigraphic analysis and the identification of particular classes and examples of artefacts to which a date or date range may be attributed. The location of the excavation in respect of structures dating to the Johns occupancy has been established as an area immediately behind the cottages. Artefact deposition patterns have been inferred with a reasonable degree of certainty as the result of domestic filling activity.

Fifth, when the historical and archaeological evidence is considered in combination, it becomes obvious that the site has an extremely well-defined social and temporal context. The social and economic status, occupational roles, religious affiliation, gender, marital status, national and regional origin and age of each occupant has been established through historical research. An insight into the material culture and consumption patterns of the occupants has been established archaeologically.

In many respects the combination of these two sources of evidence makes the site an immensely valuable resource both for comparative analysis and more
advanced theoretical study, particularly in relation to the construction and testing of models of consumer consumption. In fact, there are very few archaeological investigations in Australia that can be so closely defined. Port Essington and Wybalena are two exceptions, but at this stage there appears to be only one other urban site with this potential, and this remains unpublished.

The site's closely defined social and stratigraphic context provides an excellent basis for its historical archaeology in general, and material culture in particular, to be used to contribute to debates surrounding key questions in Australian social history. One major area of debate, dominated to this point essentially by historical perspectives, concerns the sociological identity of the so-called convict 'classes' transported to Australia during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Traditionally debate on this issue has tended to divide along ideological and chauvinistic lines between romantic nationalist conceptions of the convicts as innocent and manly victims of nineteenth century British oppression, and a construct of Australian colonisation within which the convicts are interpreted as a professional criminal underclass, with an 'aberrant psychology' that rendered them 'permanent outcastes' of civilised society. This later conception was first suggested in the 1950s by Manning Clark and to a great extent has become the accepted paradigm of Australian convict history.


Stephen Nicholas and others have recently challenged Manning Clark's interpretation of the sociology of the convicts, suggesting that they were in fact typical members of the British working class who became the subject of a 'forced' migration arising from the rural displacement caused by the industrial revolution. This new proposal is a radical departure from the Manning Clarke construct and in many respects represents a paradigm shift with the potential to alter Australia's national consciousness of its convict origins.

Given that this debate essentially involves a sociological question, and that the strictly historical evidence is well-known and has been and no doubt will continue to be used with different emphasis and interpretation to support competing hypotheses, material culture studies may offer a new and possibly decisive source of insight in respect of this issue.

In his book, Material Culture and Mass Consumption, Daniel Miller has suggested that people employ the goods and services they receive in the construction and expression of their personal identity and social ideals:

The object also acts to integrate the representative individual within the normative order of the larger social group, where it serves as a medium of intersubjective order inculcated as a generative practice through some version of 'habitus'. This order is continually objectified in the pattern or style of the artefactual world.\textsuperscript{226}

Material culture can thus be conceptualised as a semiotic expressed within a distinct cultural and sociological paradigm. The perimeters of this paradigm are broad enough to encompass individual psychological traits, but narrow

enough to provide for the identification of distinct cultural and sociological groupings. This is quite significant because as has been noted, Manning Clark's thesis proposes that the convicts are sociologically differentiated from the working classes, and *ipso facto*, this means that the 'aberrant psychology' of these 'permanently outcaste' would be expressed in deviations from the sociological paradigm of working class identity, including in its material culture dimensions. In turn, this should mean that this deviation can be identified in the material culture of sites with known convict and emancipist occupancies, such as in the material culture of allotment 14, Section 17, of the Parish of St Lawrence.

It is important to maintain consciousness of the fact that this is the evidence of only one site, and the identification of any form of overall material culture pattern would require evidence from many convict and emancipist sites, and detailed comparative analysis with non-convict sites. Such an endeavour is probably not yet possible as there is not a sufficient quantity of published or otherwise accessible evidence available upon which to base such a study, and in any case is far beyond the scope of this research project. At this stage it is therefore important not to over-generalise or overstate any inferences that might be derived from the present study.

Nevertheless, the historical archaeology of allotment 14 does provide some interesting insights into the sociology of convicts and emancipists. We know from the historical evidence for example, that each of the occupants have come from English urban environments, that each has a trade prior to transportation, and that this trade is continued upon emancipation in the colony. We also know that both Maclehose's and Fowles' accounts of the block
of which allotment 14 forms a part refer to the 'order', 'neatness' and 'Englishness' of its appearance across time. The overall impression arising from the historical evidence would therefore appear to be one of skill, enterprise, ambition and respectability; there would appear to be no sociological indicators of a permanently outcast population group.

The site's material culture would also appear to reflect a 'typical' domestic assemblage in terms of its overall composition and range. It has been demonstrated using the Atkins and Miller models that the ceramic component of the assemblage reflects a typical pattern of availability for the period and the large component of blue-transfer print suggests both the capacity and inclination to purchase more expensive wares. In fact, overall, the ceramic assemblage is not dissimilar to assemblages from far more prestigious sites dating to this period, like Regentville for example, provided that the most expensive wares are excluded from this comparison. It has been demonstrated that this observation is also true for the glass component of the assemblage. The commercial component, which comprises of a range of artefacts associated with dressmaking and upholstery, attests to a home-based pattern of industry and commerce typical of the period.

In summary therefore, the material culture of the site appears to reflect a lifestyle pattern which would place it decisively within a familiar cultural and sociological paradigm, rather than in one of aberrance. The evidence would therefore, prima facie, appear to contradict the 'Manning Clark' paradigm of Australian convict history, and favour instead the revisionist version proposed by Nicholas and others. Whatever the case, the historical archaeology of this site clearly demonstrates the rich potential of material
culture studies to contribute to this major question of Australian national identity.

Finally, although not exhaustively so, the historical archaeology of the site is significant in that it provides interesting reflections in relation to Birmingham’s and Jean's Swiss Family Robinson model of colonisation. The model is a paradigm account for the colonisation of Australia, derived from Johan David Wyss' romantic novel, 'The Swiss Family Robinson', published in Zurich in 1813, and in English translation in 1814. It consists of essentially three phases; an exploratory phase, a learning phase, and a developmental phase (see figure 18). It is suggested that this model can be used for the interpretation of the 'economy as a whole, or for individual industries and sites'.

The exploratory phase is proposed as being of relatively short duration, and is characterised by a dependence on imported materials and skills, and by the exploration and preliminary assessment of the biophysical environment. In the proposed learning phase, attempts are made to establish production systems to replace imports. These attempts proceed by trial and error. Unsuccessful attempts to establish production either result in a complete discontinuation of the production effort, or in revised attempts based upon a reassessment of the biophysical environment and production methods. In the final developmental phase of the model a successfully developed production system undergoes continual readjustment as it reacts to both local and international circumstances.

The process of cultural and individual adaptation proposed in this model is seen as a function of certain dynamics of perception and environment for which a second model is proposed (see figure 19). In summary, the model proposes that humans are influenced in their decisions by an environment they perceive (PE) which may differ from the total (or real) environment (TE). The perceived environment contains some aspects of the total environment, but may well include mistakenly, aspects which are not present. Additionally, there is a subset of elements, described in the model as the behavioural environment (BE), which decision makers take into account. Based upon this model of perception, Birmingham and Jeans suggest that,

... the history of Australia can thus be written around the idea of growing knowledge, in which the perceived environment becomes more and more congruent with the total environment in depth and accuracy.228

The Swiss Family Robinson model has been noted from the beginning, including by its authors, as being limited in its capacity to incorporate the social aspects of colonisation,229 and this becomes especially evident in respect of this site.

However, if we again work from Daniel Miller's premise that material culture is a major form of personal and social expression, the historical archaeology of allotment 14 may offer an important insight into our understanding of the Swiss Family Robinson model in view of its implications for the validity of the constructs of development and perception upon which the model is based.

Figure 18
Figure 19.
A Model of the Process of Perceiving the Environment [Birmingham and Jeans 1983, page 7].
Both constructs are embedded in an assumption that progress is utilitarian, voluntary, linear, progressive, and commences from a fixed point of imported cultural development. The historical archaeology of this site may suggest that these notions are too simplistic.

It has been suggested in this study that the site's material culture reflects a very distinct British working class cultural paradigm and that this impression of 'Englishness' is reinforced by the Fowles and Maclehose commentaries. Of further interest in this respect is the evidence provided by the design characteristics of the structures on the allotment. In occupying the site for the first time, Johns clearly had considerable scope to develop the land according to his taste. What he chose to do was to construct, either initially or in succession, three small semi-detached cottage structures. In conception these structures would appear to reflect a mindset influenced by the overcrowding of an English industrial city; such a response is not required by the size of the allotment itself. There would seem to be an underlying implication of land scarcity in the design of the cottages which is an illusion in the Australian context, but nevertheless a British lifestyle pattern familiar and important enough to be reasserted.

Each of these classes of evidence is strongly suggestive of a dynamic whereby an initial response of the convicts to an alien environment, after emancipation, was to resurrect previous life-ways, even in an almost exaggerated and illogical fashion, perhaps to meet deep psychological needs for security, identity and certainty which had been displaced as a result of the trauma of forced migration. Such an interpretation is consistent with Miller's
thesis that human beings use material culture (objects) to mediate and ameliorate disjunctions between internal feeling states and the reality of the external environment.\textsuperscript{230}

If this is correct, it may suggest that the first phase of colonisation, at least with respect to some sites, cannot be construed so simply as one of utilitarian and linear learning and growing knowledge. The Swiss Family Robinson model of colonisation as it currently stands may therefore represent a far too reductionist view of human behaviour.

However, the fact that the evidence from this site clarifies and to an extent challenges, some aspects of the Swiss Family Robinson model of colonisation serves to demonstrate its usefulness as a heuristic. It is only through the progressive exploration of questions and testing of hypotheses that weaknesses in existing constructs of understanding are revealed and new insights are able to emerge. In the case of the present study, it has been proposed that the historical archaeology of allotment 14 indicates that development and perception are influenced not only by rational utilitarian functionalism, but also by a range of psychological and sociological factors which transcend rationality, for which a linear, progressive model is conceptually unsuitable. This proposal must now itself be examined, and if necessary abandoned, in favour of further insights and refinements of understanding.

In conclusion, it has obviously been well worthwhile to revisit the historical archaeology of Allotment, 14, Section 17, of the Parish of St Lawrence. Indeed,\textsuperscript{230} Daniel Miller, \textit{Material Culture and Mass Consumption}, Basil Blackwell, 1991, p. 110.
given its demonstrated significance, one would hope it is a site to which historical archaeologists will return often, and with increasingly sophisticated questions.

It is interesting to reflect upon the fact that there is a debate currently taking place within the field in relation to the relevance and value of the long term maintenance and storage of artefacts. In fact, there are some historical archaeologists who are arguing for the disposal of artefacts following initial inventory and interpretation.

There is surely a very alarming arrogance underlying a view that there is no ongoing role for the primary archaeological resource beyond its initial description. For one thing, how can we be sure that the initial interpretation of this resource is correct, or exhaustive? The present study has revealed one instance where the initial interpretation of an archaeological assemblage was extremely flawed, even to the extent that there were significant errors and distortions in the rudimentary classification of artefacts. Perhaps this is an extreme example, but to assume that any interpretation is infallible and exhaustive to the extent that there is no longer a need to retain the primary resource is to argue in contradiction to the limits of human nature.

In any case, will we not always need to provide a place for alternative interpretations of the primary evidence based upon different emphases and approaches? Viewed in an historical trajectory, the progressive accumulation of knowledge, and refinements of theory and technique have always provided the basis for a re-examination of earlier interpretative contributions. It would seem to be almost an act of vandalism to knowingly limit the potential for this
ongoing process of intellectual iteration and evaluation, somewhat akin to burning the original version of Plato's Republic once it had been published in summary in English translation by the Readers Digest.

For all these reasons, it is important that good sense and intellectual humility ultimately prevails in this extremely worrying debate, and in this regard it is just possible that the results of 'Pitt Street Revisited, Revisited Again' will reveal at least to some people the immense value of maintaining the primary archaeological resource.
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