ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION

RH/46: QUEEN'S ARMS INN & ROUSE HILL POST OFFICE

For the

Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage 1) Works

Volume 1

Mary Casey

April 1995

Brayshaw McDonald Pty Ltd
51 Thompson Street, Drummoyne, 2047

Consultant Archaeologists
Telephone 02 819-7962
ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION

RH/46: QUEEN'S ARMS INN
&
ROUSE HILL POST OFFICE

For the

Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage 1) Works

April 1995

Casey & Lowe Associates
Archaeological & Heritage Consultants
68 Warren Road Marrickville (02) 558 2014

for

Brayshaw McDonald Pty Ltd
Consultant Archaeologists

on behalf of

Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage 1) Works Pty Ltd
**VOLUME 1**

1.0 Introduction

| 1.1 | Background           | 1 |
| 1.2 | Methodology          | 1 |
| 1.3 | Statement of Cultural Significance | 1 |
| 1.4 | Research Design      | 2 |
| 1.5 | Scope of Report      | 3 |
| 1.6 | Limitations          | 3 |
| 1.7 | Acknowledgements     | 3 |
| 1.8 | Author Identification| 4 |
| 1.9 | Abbreviations        | 4 |
| 1.10| List of Illustrations| 4 |
| 1.11| Lodgement of Artefacts| 5 |
| 1.12| Summary              | 6 |

2.0 Historical Background

| 2.1 | Primary Source Material | 7 |
| 2.2 | Oral History            | 11 |
| 2.3 | Historical summary      | 12 |

3.0 Archaeological Evidence

| 3.1 | Opening up the Site    | 11 |
| 3.2 | List of Contexts       | 11 |
| 3.3 | Description of Main Contexts | 12 |
| 3.4 | Structural Evidence    | 13 |
| 3.4.1| Queen’s Arms Inn       | 13 |
| 3.4.2| Hitching Posts         | 17 |
| 3.4.3| Occupation Deposits    | 18 |
| 3.5 | Artefactual Evidence   | 18 |
| 3.5.1| Ceramics               | 18 |
| 3.5.2| Glass                  | 31 |
| 3.5.3| Animal Bone            | 33 |
| 3.5.4| Miscellaneous          | 33 |
| 3.5.5| Metal Artefacts        | 34 |
| 3.5.6| Stoneware              | 35 |
| 3.5.7| Coins                  | 35 |
| 3.5.8| General Overview of Artefact Functions | 35 |
| 3.6 | Test Pits              | 36 |
| 3.7 | Other Physical Remains | 36 |
| 3.8 | Aboriginal Artefacts   | 37 |

4.0 Discussion and Research Design  

38

5.0 Recommendations  

42

6.0 References  

43

7.0 Illustrations  

48
8.0  **Artefact Reports**

8.1  General Aims  
8.2  Aboriginal Artefacts - Alice Gorman  
8.3  Bone - Anthony English  
8.4  Building Material - Anthony Lowe  
8.5  Ceramics - Mary Casey  
8.6  Clay Pipes - Iain Stuart  
8.7  Glass - Jean Smith & Jennifer Lindbergh  
8.8  Metals - Jennifer Lindbergh  
8.9  Miscellaneous - Jennifer Lindbergh  
8.10  Shell - Sarah Colley

**Appendices**

Appendix A  List of Contexts  
Appendix B  Photographic Recording Sheets  
Appendix C  Excavation Permit  
Appendix D  Catalogue Sheets  
  D1  Bone  
  D2  Building Material  
  D3  Ceramics  
  D4  Glass  
  D5  Metals  
  D6  Miscellaneous  
  D7  Stoneware
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In 1993 Casey & Lowe Associates undertook two survey projects: Historical Archaeological Survey of the Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage I) Works and Historical Archaeological Study and Assessment of Old Windsor Road and Windsor Road, Rouse Hill, NSW. These two projects required us to survey, identify and record historical archaeological sites within the area of the RHIP (Stage I) Works program area of impact. The excavation of RH/46 was undertaken for Rouse Hill Infrastructure (Stage I) Works because of the impact on the site from the laying of water lines (Fig. 1, 2). The likelihood of archaeological remains at this site and the proposed impact from the works program was specifically identified and assessed by Casey & Lowe Associates in the second report. These reports were commissioned by Brayshaw McDonald Pty Ltd, the archaeologists undertaking the work on the Aboriginal archaeology, on behalf of Rouse Hill Infrastructure (Stage I) Works Pty Ltd.

Only the area to be impacted by the works program was excavated. Initial testing was undertaken on site on the 1st December 1993 to confirm the presence of sub-surface archaeological remains at the predicted location. This testing confirmed the presence of stone footings and quantities of demolition material, mostly orange sandstock bricks and some rubble sandstone. The building location was approximately 1 to 2m further south than predicted but it was within the east-west zone that was to be affected by the works program. Following confirmation of the presence of the inn/post office within the area of impact a variation of the excavation permit was applied for and received (Appendix C). Excavation commenced in late December 1993 and was completed in January 1994. In all three weeks were spent excavating at the site.

1.2 Methodology

The site was manually excavated by Mary Casey and Tony Lowe with three assistants. Once the turf was removed a 2 metre grid was established across the site and all deposits were excavated within the grid. The artefacts from each deposit were labelled with the context and grid references. All deposits were planned, levelled and photographed. All artefacts were catalogued and entered into a relational database, Microsoft Access (Appendix D). Reports were produced for a number of the artefact categories (Section 8).

1.3 Statement of Cultural Significance

Statement of Cultural Significance included in the application for an excavation permit

RH/46 Post Office Site and Queen’s Arms

This site has historical, social, archaeological and group significance. It contains the remains of structures, features and deposits associated with the early occupation of this area. The site was actively involved with the daily life of the local Rouse Hill community through its provision of alcohol, accommodation and postal services. It was owned by an important member of the local community and a Member of the Legislative Assembly. It has the potential to illustrate the variety of activities associated with the occupation of the inn and its use as a Post Office.

1 p.24, p.32. This site was originally identified in Dallas, Mackay and Karskens, Archaeological Study of the Land within the Shire of Baulkham Hill in the Parklea Release Area, 1989, for Baulkham Hill Council.
Figure 1: Rouse Hill Infrastructure (Stage 1) Works Area.
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Figure 2: Location Plan. Riverstone Topographic Map, 1:25000, 1983.
Archaeological Sites and Group Significance
The archaeological sites in the Rouse Hill Village and those along the western side of the road to the south are a rare group of archaeological sites belonging to the occupation and land use of Rouse Hill and Old Windsor and Windsor Roads. The village and settlement in this area began in the early nineteenth century and continues today. The lack of building development provides a high degree of physical integrity for many of the archaeological deposits which is rare, especially on the village scale. These sites have the ability to illustrate and inform us about past activities through their archaeological deposits, features and structures. All the sites are linked through time, association and occupation. They have a high archaeological significance as a group.

New Statement of Cultural Significance
This site has historical, social, archaeological and group significance for past, present and future generations. It is known to contain the remains of structures, features and deposits belonging to the Queen's Arms Inn, at least from 1839, and the Rouse Hill Post Office, from 1857. This site was actively involved with the daily life of the local Rouse Hill community through its provision of alcohol, accommodation and postal services. These archaeological remains have the potential to illustrate the variety of activities associated with the occupation of the inn and its use as a Post Office. It was owned by an important member of the local community and a Member of the Legislative Assembly. It is one of the few archaeological sites excavated between Parramatta and Windsor and its remains can help inform us about the relationship between these two important towns of the early colony. In 1840 it was one of three brick or stone buildings in the region. The archaeological remains form this site can help us understand general research questions relation to consumerism, and urbanisation and development of the early colony.

1.4 Research Design
The aim of the excavation of the Post Office/Queen's Arms Inn site was to excavate the archaeological deposits to be disturbed by the Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage I) Works. To achieve this aim the excavation was designed to fulfil the research aims and themes identified through the statement of significance and other relevant avenues of inquiry. In the assessment of this site a Statement of Significance was prepared. In addition this site was included in the group significance of archaeological sites that belong to the Rouse Hill Village locality.

Intra-Site Research questions

1. Correlation of the historical and oral evidence with the archaeological evidence.

2. Site activities - the household - spatial analysis
   - Does the evidence allow us to interpret the activities of this part of the site?
   - What range of activities are indicated by the artefacts, features and deposits?
   - General nature of activities at the site.
   - Questions relating to the activities as evidence of public and private spheres.

3. Can this site provide evidence for questions of gender, ethnicity, status?

4. Site formation processes
   - Preparation of the site prior to construction of the inn.
   - Impact of the twentieth-century cottage on the nineteenth-century structure.
   - Examination of post-depositional activities.
5. **Questions about the technology used in the construction of the dwelling.**  
- What is the source of the materials used for construction?  
- Are any of the materials locally made?  
- Are some materials being processed on site?

6. **Evidence for date of construction and the earliest use of the site as an inn.**  
- There is some question about the date the inn was constructed. The earliest evidence that we have is that it was built by 1853 when the Post Office agency was acquired. But the date of construction is not known but it is likely to have been as early as the 1840s. Hopefully the archaeological evidence will help clarify this issue.

**Inter-Site Research Questions**

7. **How does this site fit into theories regarding the process of urbanisation - especially the core-periphery model?** We are dealing with a periphery site which is part of a small village.  
- Aspects of availability of consumer goods, and quality and variety of consumer goods found at the site and the interaction of the site with the world at large.

8. **Relationship to other sites.**  
- This is one of a group of sites in the area. How did this site interact with the other historic sites in the locality and with other sites in the locality that have been excavated. Is there evidence to support an archaeological Neighbourhood?

9. **The nature of the material culture at this site in relation to other rural sites and inn sites of a similar chronological period. How do they compare and differ?**

**1.5 Scope of Report**

This report covers the manual excavation of RH/46. All other archaeological monitoring for RHIP (Stage 1) Works was reported in *Archaeological Monitoring of Historic Sites for the Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage 1) Works*, August 1994.

**1.6 Limitations**

The main limitation on this project was the area of excavation. All excavation was restricted to the area of impact and immediately adjacent areas. This therefore had the effect of limiting the type of archaeological report that can be produced. However it does flag the likelihood of substantial intact archaeological remains at this site if there are further plans to develop the golf course.
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1.9 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAO</td>
<td>Australian Archives Office (NSW Branch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Bonwick Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>Conservation and Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHT</td>
<td>Historic Houses Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>Historical Records of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRNSW</td>
<td>Historical Records of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Mitchell Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLms</td>
<td>Mitchell Library Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWAO</td>
<td>New South Wales Archives Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POF</td>
<td>Post Office Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHAS</td>
<td>Rouse Hill Archaeological Survey (Dallas et al, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHIP</td>
<td>Rouse Hill Infrastructure Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sydney Gazette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 List of Illustrations

**Figures**

**Figure 1:** Rouse Hill Infrastructure (Stage 1) Works Area.

**Figure 2:** Location Plan. Riverstone Topographic Map, 1:25000, 1983.

**Figure 3:** Plan of site, 1885. CALM, Lands Office, Field Book #3107.

**Figure 4:** Painting from the Hamilton Collection, Rouse Hill House, probably by Bessie Rouse, post-1878. The Queen’s Arms Inn is in the second building from the right. HHT, Hamilton Collection Rouse Hill House.

**Figure 5:** Site Plan of RH/46 showing areas of investigation.

**Figure 6:** Plan of features exposed in original test trench, 1/12/1993.

**Figure 7:** Plan of area of excavation on the commencement of manual excavation, 23/12/1993.

**Figure 8:** Plan prior to removal of context #8, 30/12/1993.

**Figure 9:** Plan of excavation showing features associated with the front of building prior to monitoring on last day, 5/1/1994.

**Figure 10:** Final plan of excavation area on completion of work following monitoring, 12/1/1994.

**Figure 11:** Southern section of trench following completion of excavation, 10/1/1994.
Photographs

Photo 3.1: Southern part of trench showing the litter of sandstock bricks and rubble stone. This was typical of contexts 3-6, and 8. Scale 1m. RH/46 2:20.

Photo 3.2: Face of southeastern part of feature #3 showing a section through demolition deposit (#4, #5, #6 and #8). Note the general distribution of brick, mortar and plaster. The white flecks are fragments of plaster. Note the lighter coloured matrix at the base of this deposit. This contained more of the plaster, mortar and set from the facade of the building. Scale 1m. RH/46 2:19.

Photo 3.3: Looking south along eastern edge of trench with northern wall in foreground (#32) and stone of western wall (#38) of inn along grassy edge of trench. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:24.

Photo 3.4: Northern verandah wall footing (#32) running east-west with remnant timber post to west (#34). Scale 1m. RH/46 6:12.

Photo 3.5: Part of front wall of inn showing in situ stones and part of the robbed-out trench with fill of yellow mortar, white plaster and orange brick fragments. Scale 1m. RH/46 5:16.

Photo 3.6: Western end of northern wall footing (#32) and the associated timber post (#34) in the northern corner of the footing trench (#11). The wall footing has two courses of stone with the smaller stones embedded in shell mortar. This end of the footing is uneven suggesting that it was designed to be keyed into a footing return. Scale 30cm. RH/46 5:2.

Photo 3.7: View to north east showing the various features associated with the inn. Note the in situ wall stones (#37), the distinct edge of the footing trench (#11) with the shallow drop from its western edge and its relationship to the three visible postholes. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:17.

Photo 3.8: Round timber post (#35) situated on the edge of the western footing trench (#11) with two stones from the western verandah footing (#37) located within the trench. Post #36 is visible in the background. Scale 30cm. RH/46 5:0.

Photo 3.9: Round timber post (#36) located at the western edge of footing trench (#11). Scale 30cm. RH/46 4:34.

Photo 3.10: East-west footing trench (#42) and posthole (#41) to the west. This area was opened up on the last day to find the end of the inn structure. To the right of the photo is a large slab of worked sandstone thought to be a stone step, with tread marks, belonging to the entrance of the inn. Scale 1m. RH/46 6:8.

Photo 3.11: View to southeast following the completion of excavation prior to monitoring on the last day. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:22.

Photo 3.12: Southern section of site showing the changing levels to the west of the inn. RH/46 4:5.


Photo 3.14: Southern test pit with demolition rubble. RH/46 6:5.

Photo 3.15: Area to southeast of excavation showing in situ brick surfaces. RH/46 5:20.

1.1.1 Lodgement of Artefacts

The artefacts from the excavation of this site are lodged with the Hawkesbury District Historical Society Museum at Windsor. The Aboriginal artefacts were lodged by Josephine McDonald at the Australian Museum as part of the general Rouse Hill Collection from the RHIP (Stage 1) Works program.
1.12 Summary

The excavation of RH/46, the Queen's Arms Inn and Rouse Hill Post Office was excavated by Casey & Lowe Associates for Brayshaw McDonald Pty Ltd in late December 1993 and January 1994. The excavation focused on the area of the site to be impacted by the laying of water pipes. This involved the excavation of the front portion of the building, the verandah and the area to the west of the building. It resulted in the excavation of deposits of disturbed demolition material. This exposed remains of stone foundations, verandah postholes and hitching posts associated with the inn and post office.

The demolition deposits were disturbed in the 1970s by the Golf Course curator who used a bulldozer to grade and level the front of the site. This has resulted in the top 20cm of the western part of the site being disturbed but not the structural remains. Any disturbance to structural remains appears to be associated with the demolition of the building in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. These remains were used to build a cottage about 100m to the south. This was demolished in the late 1970s.

The artefacts found at the site included a wide range of material: ceramics, building materials, shell, animal bone, glass, Aboriginal artefacts etc. These were mostly found in the disturbed deposits. The deposits were known to be disturbed because they included modern artefacts such as golf balls. Analysis of the artefacts was undertaken to gather a general picture to address the research questions.

The inn was probably erected during 1838 and 1839. It was licensed to John Booth in 1839 as the Queen's Arms Inn. In 1857 John Rattalick became the first Postmaster of Vinegar Hill Post Office, which was by 1858 was renamed Rouse Hill Post Office. The Post Office operated from this building until 1886 when it moved to the corner of Windsor Rd and Commercial Road. In the 1840 census the inn was one of only three brick or stone buildings in the area.
2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

RH/46 - Post Office Site

2.1 Primary Source Material

Plans
The 1885 plan of Old Windsor Road provides a location for the Rouse Hill Post Office on the land to the south of Christ Church on the eastern side of the road (Fig.3). It shows an incompletely drawn building with a verandah facing west to the road. In front of the building is a pull-in bay to allow coaches to pull off the road. Its proximity to the roadway can be compared with RH/20, the Royal Oak.

Pictorial Material
The main pictorial material for the physical appearance of the Public House and Post Office is a painting hanging in the hallway of Rouse Hill House (Fig.4). It shows a two-storey building with hipped roof and at least three chimneys and a verandah at the front. There are four windows along the northern side of the upper floor. There seems to be outbuildings depicted to the rear. To the south of this building is the extant Royal Oak Inn and to the north is Christ Church. The details of the reproduction are difficult to determine because of the darkness of the oil painting and the trees in the landscape.

Land Titles
This section of land was originally Lot 10 of the District of Upper Nelson and in 1813 had been granted to Richard Fitzgerald as part of a 300 acre grant. The site of the Post Office was on land that was regranted to Thomas Kelly as a 46 acre parcel on the 31st January, 1818, as Allotment 79. At this stage there is no specific reference to the Parish of Castle Hill. The area is generally referred to as the District of Upper Nelson. Kelly sold the land in January 1822 to his neighbour to the south, Charles Davis for £40. In the 1828 census Charles Davies (sic) was identified as a farmer at Upper Nelson with 82 acres 46 of which were cleared and 15 were cultivated. He had two horses and 18 cattle.

Davis proceeded to sell the land in two portions in 1838. The ten acres that fronted onto Old Windsor Road (also known as Hawkesbury Road and Seven Hills Road) was sold to Sarah and John Booth in March 1838 for £125. John Booth purchased the remaining 36 acres from Davis on the 18th & 19th December 1838. In August 1840 John and Sarah Booth mortgaged the 46 acres to Robert Fitzgerald for £650. The mortgage of the Booth's ten acres to Fitzgerald included mention of:

all other hereditaments comprised in those Indentures Together with the Messuage or Tenement and Public House standing and being upon the said piece or parcel of Land And all Buildings Erections Yards Ways Paths Passages Waters Watercourses rights members and appurtenances (sic).

2 Burr & Ballisat, Accurate list of the landholders in the Colony of NSW, 1813 (MLMS C453).
3 Land Titles, Primary Search Application 25940
4 LTO, Book M Folio 731.
5 Sainty, M. & Johnson, K., 1985, p.116, Appendix 3, p.427. Davis arrived on the Hillsborough as a convict with a life sentence which was eventually converted to a conditional pardon. In 1828 he was aged 50 years. He was a Protestant and a farmer. Also residing with him was Margaret Davies (sic) (possibly nee Reece), aged 66. She arrived on the Experiment in 1802 as a convict with a sentence of 7 years. She was freed by servitude.
6 LTO, Book S Folio 817.
Figure 3: Plan of site, 1885. CALM, Lands Office, Field Book #3107.
Figure 4: Painting from the Hamilton Collection, Rouse Hill House, probably by Bessie Rouse, post-1878. The Queen’s Arms Inn is in the second building from the right. HHT, Hamilton Collection, Rouse Hill House.
In addition the Booths purchased Davis’ original property, immediately south of Kelly’s grant, in March 1841 for £200. Fitzgerald retained ownership of the land until his death in 1865 when it was left to his heirs: Robert Marsden Fitzgerald, Elizabeth Rouse Fitzgerald and Elizabeth Rouse Alston. They in turn left it to seven heirs who variously retained ownership until the early twentieth century. Specific reference is made to the land owned by Fitzgerald along Old Windsor Road as "his public House and ground on the Windsor road near Rouse Hill then in the occupation of John Rattalick".

Robert Fitzgerald married one of the Rouse daughters and donated part of the 46 acres to the local Anglican community for the building of Christ Church. The position of the church lands on the 1885 plan reveals that they and the post office were part of one original allotment which had the northern end divided off for the establishment of the church (Fig.3).

Based on the above land title information it appears that John and Sarah Booth erected the Queen’s Arms Inn between March 1838 and 1839. That its erection, including outbuildings, added considerably to the value of the property. There is no direct comparison of the value of the property other than in 1822 when the 46 acres changed hands for £40. The 1838 mortgage was for £650 suggesting that the construction of the inn had added considerably to the value of the 46 acres.

Directories
There are very few road directories that show the occupants of Windsor Road in the nineteenth century. The Post Office directories from the 1830s and 1840s show that there were few occupants along Windsor Road north of the junction with Old Windsor Road. There is no mention of the Queen’s Arms and only one inn is identified between the road junction and the creek. This was the Swan Inn, which was a half-way house between Windsor and Parramatta. The first mention of this inn in 1832 records the licensee as John Cross. The itineraries do not appear to be a complete record of the inhabitants in the area, rather being a key to the location of inns, well-known inhabitants and other roads.

Licensees
A search of the publican licenses issued to the Swan Inn, Queen’s Arms and the Royal Oak was helpful in establishing the existence of the inns at certain dates. John Booth who owned the property that the Queen’s Arms stood on between 1838-1840 was the licensed publican for the Queen’s Arms in 1839-1840, and 1842-1844. He was issued the first licence for the Queen’s Arms on Windsor Road in June 1839 at the cost of £30. James McGregor was the new publican in 1845 and Christopher Mainz took over in 1847. John Booth moved from the Queen’s Arms in 1845 to the Royal Oak about 200m down the road.

The Queen’s Arms was listed as Vinegar Hill, Windsor Road, Parramatta and the Royal Oak was cited as Windsor Road, Parramatta. It is likely that the Queen’s Arms that contained the Post Office was built by 1839. There was no listing for the Swan Inn along Windsor Road or at Vinegar or Rouse Hill. The listings for publicans were completed at irregular intervals.

Based on the hotel licenses the Queen’s Arms was erected by June 1839.

7 LTO, Book V Folio 224.
8 Land Titles, Register 965/608.
9 M. Galea, History of Kellyville, 1984(?), p.81.
10 NSWAO Publicans’ licences.
11 NSWAO Reel 5055, #50.
Historical Background

1841 Census
In 1841 the census return for John Booth who resided in the Parish of Castle Hill, District of Parramatta recorded that there were 14 persons in residence. Six were males aged between 21-45, and five males aged between 45-60. There was one female aged between 14-21, one between 21-45 and one between 45-60. One male and two females were married and nine males and one female were single. Two males and one female had arrived free, six males and one female were described as 'other Free persons', one male held a ticket of leave, two were in private assignment and the third female was 'born in Colony'. Seven belonged to the Church of England and seven were Roman Catholic. This dwelling was one of four stone or brick dwellings in the Parramatta Area. There were 79 wooden dwellings.12

Occupation:
Landed Proprioters, Merchants, bankers & Professional person - 1
Shopkeeper and other retail dealers - 0
Mechanices Artificers - 1
Shepherds and others in care of sheep - 0
Gardeners, Stockmen & persons employed in Agriculture - 7
Domestic Servants - 4
All other Persons not included in foregoing Classes - 1

Based on the Census information it is likely that John Booth described himself as the landed proprietor and Mrs Booth was the last entry, not being one of the other classes. It is difficult to say if the other persons worked at the inn, were on their way to somewhere else or had just popped in for a drink. It is likely that the remaining 12 people were a mixture of all three groups.

Post Office
The first Post Office was established on this site in 1857 when John Rattalick was granted permission by the Postmaster General to situate a Post Office in his public house.13 He called this public house the Queen's Arms when he wrote a letter to Robert Fitzgerald alluding to an earlier letter informing Fitzgerald of his decision to establish a Post Office at the inn.14 He discusses which room of the inn to use, either the "little parlour" or a section of his bedroom which was a downstairs room with outside access.

Rattalick appears to be seeking approval from Fitzgerald about the location of the Post Office. As Robert Fitzgerald was the owner of the property at this stage, as shown by the title search, his approval of the use of the property would be desirable. Another letter indicates that Fitzgerald wrote to the Postmaster General requesting the establishment of a Post Office at Vinegar Hill or Rouse Hill. The Postmaster General agreed to the establishment of the Post Office but questioned the advisability of establishing it in a Public House. Mr Rattalick's premises were to be inspected prior to agreeing to its use as a Post Office. The report on the premises said that the Post Office was to be "situated on the back of the building and the access through a gate from the road....(with a) large window in the room facing the back...for the letter box".15

The Post Office opened on 11/9/1857 with a starting salary for the Postmaster of £12.10.0 per annum. The original Post Office was called Vinegar Hill Post Office because it was located closer to Vinegar Hill than to Rouse Hill but on 13/4/1858 its name was officially gazetted as Rouse Hill Post Office.

12 NSWAO, Reel 2222, Return 1023.
13 AAO Rouse Hill POF.
14 AAO Rouse Hill PO folio 57/1033.
15 AAO Rouse Hill PO folio 57/1033, 11/9/1857.
Historical Background

Office after objections were received to the original name because of its association with the Castle Hill rebellion. Copies of both wax seals are held by Australian Archives.

There were a number of different Postmasters and Postmistresses who ran Rouse Hill Post Office while the Post Office was at this location. Following the death of John Rattalick in 1864 his wife Elizabeth Rattalick became Postmistress at £20 per annum. In March 1869 Mrs Rattalick bought a farm and asked her brother Sampson Nicholls to take over. He was duly appointed Postmaster but described his occupation as Storekeeper and Farmer. On his death in 1881 his wife Marion Louise Nicholls became Postmistress in August of the same year. When Sampson Nicholls died his brother re-located the Post Office within the premises and Mrs Nicholls protested about this action to the Postmaster General.

On 19th April, 1886 Mrs Nicholls wrote to the Post Office Inspector about the dilapidated condition of the building and recommended that the Post Office be removed to another premises. Her concern was that she was unable to transfer the Post Office to another individual because of the state of the building. Another letter dated 21st April, 1886 states that Mr George Whitting, who lived 100 yards to the south of the Post Office, had agreed to take over its operation. This was agreed to by the Postal Inspector. Mr Whitting was appointed in May 1886 as Rouse Hill Post Master. It is assumed that at this point the Post Office changed its location from the site of RH/46 to a building near the corner of Commercial and Windsor Roads.

In 1888 a record of the daily mail coach runs from Sydney to Parramatta and Rouse Hill indicates regular deliveries to the area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/12/1888</td>
<td>8am</td>
<td>leave Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>leave Parramatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>arrive Rouse Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>leave Rouse Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8pm</td>
<td>arrive Parramatta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time it took the coach to travel between Rouse Hill and Parramatta provides some evidence for the state of the roads during this period. This timetable would have been little different to that which operated the mail deliveries to the Post Office prior to 1886.

In 1924 when a land title search was carried out on the property of Adelaide Fitzgerald two Statutory Declarations were taken which discussed the Post Office Site. Both indicated the presence of a later cottage, called 'Sunnybrae', on the site of the Queen’s Arms/Post Office. This cottage was built around 1900 and had reused the materials from the earlier building.

---

16 Silver, p.135-141.
17 AAO Rouse Hill PO folio 57/1033.
18 AAO Rouse Hill PO folio 57/1033, 19/4/86, date stamped 20/4/1886 by the General Post Office.
19 AAO Rouse Hill PO folio 57/1033, 20/4/1886.
2.2 Oral History

During the course of the excavation a number of people who worked at the golf course or who lived nearby spoke to us about the site and another cottage to the south. The brick cottage built about 1900 was demolished in the 1970s. We were informed of this by the two men who demolished the house and took the bricks to northern NSW to the person who purchased them to build a house. The curator of the golf course spoke about the levelling of the ground where we were excavating. That about 20 years ago it was a rough paddock with mounds that they had levelled with a bulldozer. The grass on the site had grown by itself and was not purpose bought turf. This indicates that none of the artefacts at the site were deliberately brought in as part of the soil accompanying the turf.

2.3 Historical Summary

This allotment was originally granted to Richard Fitzgerald and was regranted as Allotment 79 to Thomas Kelly in 1818. It was one of many grants that were issued during this period of settlement of the Hills district. Thomas Kelly sold the land to his neighbour Charles Davis who divided it into two portions and sold the front 10 acres to Sarah and John Booth in March 1838 and the remaining 36 acres to John Booth in December 1838. Both sections of Kelly's original grant were sold to Robert Fitzgerald in 1840. This sale included a Public House on the 10 acres. John Booth had a liquor license for the Queen's Arms Inn in June 1839. Thus the Queen's Arms Inn appears to have been built between March 1838 and June 1839.

The Post Office was established in a Public House called the Queen's Arms by 1857. In 1839-1842 John Booth was recorded as the licensee of the Queen's Arms. This may indicate that the building which became the Post Office was built by 1839. Bowd refers to a two-storeyed sandstone inn called the Royal Oak which was north of Mungerie. This cannot refer to the extant inn building which is currently called the Royal Oak because it is a single storey building. The Rouse Hill painting shows that the modern Royal Oak was a smaller building then the Queen's Arms (Fig. 4). The Post Office was removed from this building in 1886 when it was described as dilapidated. By about 1900 the building was demolished and a new cottage built to the south. The cottage was demolished in the 1970s.

3.0 ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

3.1 Opening up the site

A trench approximately 13 metres long and 6 metres wide was excavated in the area where testing in early December 1993 had located the stone footings of a building (Fig.6). These footings consisted of a northern stone footing running east-west with a line of stones further south along the edge of the trench. To the west was an extensive deposit of sandstock brick rubble with some sandstone rubble.

3.2 List of Contexts

All deposits were excavated in an open area excavation within a 2m grid system. The top of the site consisted of landscape soil deposits and disturbed deposits containing sandstock bricks and some

---

largish sandstone blocks. These appear to have been a mix of demolition deposits from the Post Office/inn structure that were disturbed by later activity on site, mostly for the landscaping of this area by the Rouse Hill Golf Club. Deposits belonging to these phases are:

01 Deposit: Landscape Fill
02 Cut/Trench
03 Fill of #02
04 Deposit: Landscape Fill
05 Deposit: demolition
06 Deposit: demolition
07 Deposit: redeposited topsoil
08 Deposit: undisturbed demolition

While most of these deposits are disturbed the artefacts contained within these deposits still inform us about activities and processes undertaken at the site.

Undisturbed Deposits associated with the nineteenth-century occupation of the area:

09 Layer: within foundations

Features and deposits associated with the occupation of the building:

28 Lense
29 Lense
30 Deposit
31 Deposit
39 Lense/Deposit
40 Extension of area to the south by backhoe.

Features and deposits associated with the construction of the building:

10 Fill of #11
11 Cut: trench
32 Wall Footings
34 Cut: Posthole with post
35 Cut: Posthole with post
36 Cut: Posthole with post
37 Wall foundations
38 Wall Foundations
41 Posthole
42 Trench
43 Trench, contains wall #38
44 Trench, contains wall #32
45 Surface feature

Features and deposits associated with the hitching posts and other street furniture:

12 Cut: Posthole:
13 Fill of #12
14 Cut: Posthole
15 Fill of #14
16 Cut: Posthole
17 Fill of #16
18 Cut: Posthole
19 Fill of #19
A number of test pits were opened up along the E6 grid line outside the immediate area of the structure under excavation to determine if there were other remains that would be impacted by the laying of the water pipe:

- Test Pit 46
- Test Pit 47
- Test Pit 48
- Test Pit 49

### 3.3 Description of the Main Contexts

Context #1 was a layer of grass and associated soil. According to the golf course curator no turf had been brought to site.

Context #2 and #3 were located along the western part of the excavation. An extensive trench (#2) between 1.5 and 1m wide by 14m long was excavated following the removal of #1. This trench contained a deposit (#3) that was very similar to the other demolition deposits found throughout the excavation although it contained a larger number of modern artefacts than the other contexts. Context #2 appears to have been cut as part of road activities in the area. The removal of the fill (#3) of trench #2 exposed remains of an early star picket fence line (Fig.9). This was the earlier property boundary prior to the widening of the road reserve in this area. The dashed line across the centre of all the plans is the existing property boundary.

Contexts #4, #5, #6, and #8 were disturbed demolition deposits which contained the largest quantity of artefactual material. Orange sandstock bricks, plaster, set fragments and nails were the commonest artefacts found in these deposits. But quantities of other material were also found: sandstone rubble, ceramics, glass, stone artefacts, bone, shell, etc. Many of the artefacts from these contexts belonged to the construction of the building, its repair, occupation, decay and demolition. In all of these contexts there were some evidence of modern artefacts, mostly golf balls or some road side debris (car battery casing etc) but in general the material is consistent with the demolition of one or more structures with a similar date of construction.

While there were stratigraphic changes within these deposits there was an overall consistency of matrix and artefacts. Because of the limited nature of the excavation and the type of deposits these contexts will be discussed as a single unit. The consistency between these seven contexts is well illustrated in the nature of the building materials (8.4). Flat orange sandstock bricks were present in all these deposits. Most of the sandstock bricks were quantified and discarded on site. Only the brick fragments that were larger than fist size were recorded. In all the equivalent of approximately 320 bricks were recovered during the excavation and 21 pieces of tooled and rubble stone. Of the
Structural Evidence

3.4 Structural Evidence

3.4.1 Queen’s Arms Inn

Only the western verandah of the inn building was exposed during excavation (Fig.9). This consisted of two remnant in situ sandstone footings (Photo 3.3) that formed the western end of the northern wall #32 (Photo 3.4) and the western front wall of the inn #38 (Photo 3.5). This was the front verandah of the inn. These two footings consisted of stone blocks and rubble stone placed in linear trenches (#43, #44) which cut through a compacted surface (#9, #33). Only one or two courses of the stone footings remained in the northern wall (#32), while much of the stone from the front wall (#38) of the inn was removed and reused elsewhere. The stones from the southern wall were completely removed leaving behind a backfilled foundation trench (#42, Fig.9, Photo 3.10).

The northern wall (#32) was c155cm long, between 36 to 40cm wide and c32cm high. The stones were a mixture of large blocks and smaller flattish stones set on a lower course. The smaller stones on the upper course were embedded in a shell mortar. The uneven western end of this footing (Photo 3.6) suggests that it may have been keyed into the robbed-out western stone footing (#37, #11, Photo 3.7). The front wall of the inn, the easternmost wall uncovered during excavation (#38), was partly robbed-out. The remaining evidence consisted of a narrow linear trench (#43) with some rough shaped stones (#38) and a shallow backfilled deposit containing yellow shell mortar, plaster and brick fragments (Photo 3.3, 3.5, 3.7). The observed remains of the wall (#38) were 8m long and c20cm wide.23 Because the area to the east was not to be disturbed by the infrastructure works they were not uncovered during this excavation.

The western stone footing (#37) of the verandah was almost completely robbed-out (Fig.9). Remaining were a linear trench (#11) running north-south, c14m long by 60 to 80cm wide and between 2cm to 24cm deep (east face), with three in situ stones (#37, Photo 3.3, 3.7, 3.8). The eastern side of this trench was terraced into the western edge of the compacted surface (#9) of natural soil. The backfill of this trench (#10) consisted of brown weathered topsoil with clay and shale containing fragments of plaster, brick, sandstone and other artefacts. The removal of this deposit exposed a series of posts. At the end of the excavation, the trench (#42) for the southern verandah footing was exposed (Fig.9, Photo 3.10). It was 45cm wide and was backfilled with the local shalely soil. It was not excavated.

Four postholes, three with remnant timber posts, were associated with the main north-south trench (#11, Photo 3.7, Fig.10). The northern post (#34) and the southern post (#41) were located in the

23 This wall should still be in place as it was not going to be disturbed by the works program.
middle of the trench beyond the northern and southern wall trenches (#43, #44) of the building (Fig.10). Posts #35 and #36 were located along the front or western edge of the trench area. These four posts would have supported the verandah awning. The position of the various footings and postholes indicates that the verandah of the inn was 12m wide and the verandah 1.85m deep.

The northernmost post (#34) was a split timber slab oriented north-south (Fig.9, Photo 3.4, 3.6). It was located slightly to the north of the wall footing (#32) and was not in the back fill (#10) of the western trench (#11) but to the west of it. The slab post has a maximum width of 19cm and projected 32cm above the floor of the trench (#11). The northern end of this trench appears to have extended beyond the wall footing and incorporated the posthole. This indicates that the upper levels of the posthole were likely to be cut at the same time as the wall foundation trench was cut. This suggests that the verandah awning extended slightly beyond the verandah floor.

The next post (#35) was a round post (Fig.10, Photo 3.3, 3.7, 3.8) situated on the edge of the foundation trench (#11). It had a diameter of 41cm. There was much less remaining of the third post (#36, Photo 3.3, 3.7, 3.9) which had a diameter of 24cm. Either one of these posts may have been a replacement post installed during the life of the inn/Post Office although there is no evidence for a recutting of either posthole.

The fourth posthole was uncovered on the last day when the backhoe was brought in to open the southern part of the site. It revealed a circular posthole (#41) with a 19cm diameter (Fig.10, Photo 3.10). No remnant timber was visible in the feature and it is unclear if it was a circular or slab post, like the northern post (#34). As with the northern post (#34) this posthole was beyond the line of the east-west wall. Here the evidence for the relationship between the footing trench (#11) and the posthole is not as clear because there was more disturbance in this part of the site. The diameter for this posthole is the same as the northern slab post width, 19cm. It is likely that they were both slab posts rather than round posts.

The two central posts were different sizes. One post (#35) had a diameter of 41cm while the other post had a 24cm diameter. It was closer in size to the two end posts. They were approximately half the size of post #35 suggesting that one or more posts were replaced at some stage. Which posts were replaced are uncertain. If they were not replaced and were part of the original structure this would indicate that it was a rather rustic building. Somewhat in contrast to the historical depiction of this large two storey structure (Fig.4).

Between the two central posts (#35, #36) was a raised area (#45) of natural soil (Fig.9, Photo 3.3, 3.7, 3.8, 3.11). It is curved on the western side and cut through by the western foundation trench (#11) on the eastern side. We cut a section through the southern part of this feature and the area to the west of the foundation trench (#9) but it appeared to have been either a natural deposit or it was redeposited local shaley clay from the area. It is probable that this was where the steps up to the verandah were located. One large heavy slab of sandstone (Photo 3.11), thought to be a step, was found near this area. One half of the slab was smooth faced while the other half was flat but roughly finished. This part probably sat under another step. Therefore this mounded area was likely to have been associated with the stairs up to the verandah of the Queen's Arms Inn or as a mounded platform to the west of the verandah.

All the foundation trenches cut through a layer of compacted friable brown shaley clay (#9). This layer appears to have been a levelled area beneath the verandah. All structural features were cut through the natural soil (#33) in the area.
As noted in the building materials report (8.4) the foundations and possibly the lower courses of the inn facade were built in stone with a sandstock brick superstructure. The bricks would have been locally made, either on site or nearby. Sandstock bricks were rarely transported over any lengthy distance because of the likely damage to the bricks. The consistency of the fabric of the bricks suggests that there was a single source for their procurement. The mortar used in the construction of the original dwelling was shell mortar. Fragments of shell were found throughout the demolition deposits: #5, #6, #7, and #8 (8.10). These deposits contained quantities of broken bricks. Approximately 566 half bricks were counted and only 38 or so whole bricks were found.

The facade of the mostly brick building was lime plastered with a finishing layer of fine white plaster or set and marked with ‘blocking’ lines in imitation of ashlar stone masonry (8.4). There were a few fragments of triple layered plaster, likely to have been an interior finish. The building apparently disintegrated over time. There were two corner fragments of cement render indicating repairs to the corner of the building. In addition quantities of set seem to have flaked off the wall and formed a deposit (#8) at the front of the structure indicating a slow deterioration of the building once it fell into disrepair and a likely period of abandonment before it was demolished.

Evidence for the nature of the roofing used on the inn is not clear. While many rosehead nails (8.8) were found during excavation only a few of these could be specifically related to roofing. It is probable that the original roofing was shingles but none were found during excavation of the demolition debris. The replacement of shingles by an iron roof should have produced bulk numbers of galvanised nails and washers in the demolition debris but only a few were recorded. In addition no indication of slate roofing, such as quantities of broken slate or copper nails, was identified.

A quantity of window glass was recorded. All but a few fragments of window glass date to pre-1870 because of its thinness, generally between 1.0-2.0mm (Section 8.7). This glass was found in most of the contexts associated with the demolition material and the largest quantity was found in contexts #5, #6, and #8. It was either clear glass (78 frags), clear to light green (272 frags), or light green (32 frags).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th># Fragments</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bm</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>cl</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bm</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>cl-lgr</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bm</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>lgr</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bm</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>cl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bm</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>lgr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whole and fragmentary nails were recovered during excavation (8.8). Most of the nails were one of three types of rosehead. There were three overall date ranges for these. Wrought or cut roseheads dated between 1788-1860 (cat. metals sheets) while wrought or cut roseheads with wedge points date between 1820-1890 and the wire roseheads date between 1870 to 1890. These nails would have been used in the timber construction and joinery of the inn. The first two types of roseheads were available when the inn was built c1839. The brads, c1820, were used in flooring and probably date to the original construction of the inn. Many of the nails had no heads and therefore could not be definitely dated.
The historical and oral evidence refers to the demolition of this building and the re-use of these materials in the construction of a cottage nearby. This may have involved the re-use of existing roofing or the use of new roofing.

The painting of Rouse Hill village by Bessie Rouse which dates to post-1878 because of the presence of the church to the north, built in 1878, shows the inn with outbuildings (Fig. 4). It illustrates a two-storey building with grey-coloured hip roof with a two-level verandah at the front. The second floor windows may have had shutters. There are three chimneys, two on either side near the front of the building and one further back. The building is situated close to the road. The inn is surrounded by trees with bare hills beyond. The western side of the road is partly cleared. The image the painting portrays is one of idyllic rural countryside with the occasional person and cow dotting the landscape.

3.4.2 Hitching Posts

To the west of the line of verandah posts discussed above is another series of postholes and shallow squarish features (Fig.9, Photo 3.3, 3.7). The postholes #20, #18, #16, #14 and #12 run along a north-south line roughly parallel to the front of the inn. Only one of these postholes (#12) contained evidence of a post. All the rest contained fill of brick and mortar and natural soil. It is likely that these features were all postholes and were the uprights for hitching posts. The distance between the centres of #20, #18 and #16 is approximately 2.7m. The space between #14 and #16 is only 2.2m but this was the area of the entrance into the inn. Postholes #14 and #16 were 2.9m apart at their centres.

Aside from these five postholes are three squarish features (#25, #23, #26) along the front area of the inn, all of the holes are fairly shallow (Fig.9). They are all to the north of the entrance area into the inn. There are 2m intervals between these three features. Only the southern feature (#26) has any real depth to it. The other two features (#25, #23) were very shallow. It is likely these features were cut when the hitching rails went out of use or were replaced on the northern side of the entrance into the inn with another item. These cuts are all squarish and around 35cm to 40cm on each side. An item of street furniture may have been placed here that had three squarish feet and these features were excavated to stabilise it. This may have been a water trough, a seat or some other piece of street furniture that had three legs. It may have been a seat used by people waiting for the coach to arrive to take them to Parramatta or Windsor.

---

3.4.3 Occupation Deposits

The nature of the excavation made the likelihood of recovering specific occupation deposits unlikely. Isolated lenses were identified in a few areas but there was little other material or deposits. There are a few features that were identified on plan that are worthwhile discussing briefly. As discussed above all the inn footing trenches are cut through a compacted levelled area (#9, Fig.9). On the northern part of this deposit there was an extensive charcoal staining (Fig.9, Photo 3.3). It was staining of the soil rather than a specific deposit and a trowelling of the area revealed no artefacts. Generally there were fragmentary artefacts scattered all over the site, being mostly tiny slivers of window glass and small fragments of corroded nail or metal.

3.5 Artefactual Evidence

Many artefacts were recovered from the excavation of the demolition deposits. Aside from the bricks and associated building material from the demolition of the building they contained quantities of ceramic, glass, bone, shell, metal and other material. The artefacts associated with the construction of the inn were discussed above. I will briefly look at some other categories of artefacts before proceeding to a general overview of these artefacts in relation to the research questions. Each of the major categories of artefacts have an individual specialist’s report (Section 8).

3.5.1 Ceramics

This section discusses the range, nature and distribution of ceramics found at RH/46. A series of tables have been constructed using the catalogue information contained in the database. They are included in with the ceramics report 8.5.

3.5.1.1 Distribution

The greatest concentration of ceramic items was found between grid references E4 to E8 and N30 to N34 (8.5). While these items were spread over a number of contexts the majority were found in #5, #6 (29.5%) and #2/#3 (24.9). The upper levels of the site were disturbed during the twentieth century and the distribution of artefacts within the area excavated is not especially significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count of artefacts found in the various contexts.
3.5.1.2 Fabric

The number of fine earthenware sherds (71%) from the site is much higher than other fabrics. Bone china (13%) and porcelain (6%) are the next most common fabrics. The predominance of fine earthenwares is not unusual or surprising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric Type</th>
<th>Pieces</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone china/china</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse earthenware</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine earthenware</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironstone china</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terracotta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitreous porcelain</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitrified stoneware</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fabric Distribution

3.5.1.3 Decoration

There are a range of decorative wares. Whiteglazed wares (19.9%), mostly porcelain (including bone china) both moulded or gilded; and whitewares, plain (16%) and moulded (5%), are the most common followed by blue transfer printed (9%), variations of blue transfer prints including Willow (3.3%), and pearl wares (6%), linear ware (8%), and blue flow (6%). There are a variety of coloured transfer printed wares (11.4%), including black, brown, green, red, and purple. There were

---

25 I agree with Majewski and O'Brien 1987, p.135, that for the second-half of the nineteenth century it is necessary to use a hybrid approach that utilises both fabric and decoration to address questions of economic and social status.
only a few items of edged, peasant and sponge wares (3.2%). All of these decorative wares are made in England and imported into Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decor</th>
<th>% Items</th>
<th>% Decor</th>
<th>% Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>annular WW</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bl flow</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>mocha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blk flow</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>mocha, pl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blk/grn tp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3 must glz</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blktp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pearl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blktp, HP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 peasant &amp; sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bltp</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>pearl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bltp pl</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5pple tp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bltp pl Wil</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 provin W</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bltp Wil</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3 redtp</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bntp</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1 rock Gl</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 salt glaze</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge W pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3 selfslip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge WW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3 sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gilded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 sprigged</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glzd, mou</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 ungl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grnflow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3 unid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grntp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 WGL</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1 WGL mou</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP, mould</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 WGL, gilt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jackfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6 WW</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WW mou</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the count of wares found at RH/46.

The more expensive decorative wares are whiteglazed porcelains and blue and black flow and blue transfer printed wares, not including Willow pattern. Willow pattern is cheaper then other transfer printed wares and falls between these and still cheaper decorative wares such as sponge ware and edge wares. There is little indication of the cost of 'linear' decorative ware but it is likely to have fallen to the lower end of the medium price range or the top end of the cheapest price range. The cheapest ceramics were the undecorated whitewares. There is little discussion of whiteware in the American literature on economic scaling of ceramics but they seem to be equated with creamware prices. Whiteware (earthenware) appears after the 1830s and is seen as the final evolving stage of creamware, its lightest coloured form. Based on the method of scaling by amount of decoration applied to the fabric whiteware falls into the minimal decorative grouping and therefore are some of the cheapest ceramic items found at the site, if not the cheapest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow/ Transfer printed</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge/Peasant/HP/Sponge</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wares: Jackfield, Rockingham etc</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain &amp; deco</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the percentage breakdown of decorative wares.

---

Table showing the breakdown of the probable pricing structure of the ceramics overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decor</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High: Porcelains, flow/transfer printed</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium: Willow, Edge/Peasant/Sponge etc., Other</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low: Whiteware</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the breakdown of the probable pricing structure of the ceramics overall.

RH/46 contained a mixture of expensive, medium and cheaper priced ceramics. The price variance within the ceramics may mirror a number of factors including: chronological changes in the occupation of the site; the various uses of the site as an inn, with both residential and commercial usage; status variation within the inn's clientele; and availability of ceramic types from Sydney or Parramatta. As the demolition material does not necessarily contain a representative sample of ceramics from the site it will be necessary to re-evaluate these results if and when further work is done at this site. A comparison between this sample group and those excavated from other deposits would be an interesting exercise in testing archaeological sampling and methodology.

3.5.1.4 Relationship between Decoration and Fabric

The different decorative classes are found on a variety of fabrics. Of all the decorative classes whiteglaze was found on the widest variety of fabrics. 13.5% (47 items) of plain whiteglaze decoration was found on porcelain (including bone china). Of the moulded and gilt whiteglaze 1.5% (5) were on porcelain. In addition four sprigged sherds (1.4%) and one hand painted (0.3%) were on porcelain. The majority of fine earthenwares were associated with transfer prints with blue flow (5.8%) and blue transfer print (8.5%) being the largest decorative group. A few examples of transfer prints were found on ironstone: brown (0.6%), and red (0.6%). Linear ware, commonly called 'hotel ware', was mainly found on fine earthenwares (6.7%) as well as a few examples of porcelain and vitreous porcelain. The majority of whitewares were on fine earthenware (20.5%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular Ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peasant &amp; sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue flow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Peasant ware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue/green 'Gold Medal'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearl ware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purple transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black transfer print</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provincial ware (Chinese)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue pearl Willow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rockingham glaze</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown transfer print (few)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown transfer print</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>red transfer print (ironstone)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue transfer print</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shell edged blue</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue transfer print Pearl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shell edged pearl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sprigged ware (bone china)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sponge ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green transfer print</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terracotta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted few</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted china</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>White glaze (few)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand painted moulded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>White glaze (bone china)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese hand painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>White glaze china</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackfield ware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>White glaze (ironstone)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear ware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>White glaze (porcelain)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear ware porcelain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>White glaze (vitreous)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard glaze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>White ware</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha ware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>White ware (china)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the relationship between the various decorative and fabric groups.

Sub-table based on Table 4 (8.5). It shows the variety and number of decorative styles found on the ceramics from RH/46.
There is an extensive range of types of decoration and wares found at RH/46. In all there were 109 definite variations in decorations on various fabrics. There were another 28 sherds with decorations that could not be given a pattern number because the sherds were too small for identification. The variety of patterns available indicates that the occupants of this site had good access to the ceramics market and were able to purchase and use goods that fulfilled a variety of functions for different groups of people.

3.5.1.5 Shapes

The most frequently found shape were plates (35%), tea cups (17.3%) and saucers (12.7%). These constituted 65% of the shapes found at the site. These items are associated with tableware and teawares. The relative paucity of storage items is probably due to their occurrence within the stoneware and glass categories. As only the front of the site was excavated it does not contain a representative sample of the ceramics at the site. Therefore it is not appropriate to carry out extensive comparative site analysis.

Darling House, a site in Miller’s Point which has a similar date range, had a different overall relationship between shapes. At Darling House cups (23%) and plates (23%) were an equal percentage of the ceramic items and saucers (18%) were not far behind and 17% of all items were unidentified.

According to Linda Worthy the analysis of shapes is an important indicator of the likely function of a site. The large number of plates and the occurrence of Linear ware or ‘hotel’ ware is an indicator of the commercial nature of this building. Worthy also discusses that the greater the usage of a certain shape therefore the greater the likelihood of that shape being broken. Consequently as there were many more plates found at this site than individual cups or saucers then it is likely that plates were used much more frequently than cups or saucers. Based on Worthy’s assumptions about usage if we see cups and saucers as two parts of one item the relationship between cups/saucers and plates is closer. With the cup/saucer at 30% and plates at 35%. Yet if cups and saucers were used so extensively why was there only one teapot found at this site? There may be two explanations for this occurrence. Firstly a teapot, such as a Rockingham glaze one, is made of a more durable ceramic or it may be metal and in both cases they are less likely to break and the evidence of their use is disguised in the archaeological resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ginger jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jug</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lid?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plate</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stout bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teapot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tureen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unid</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 Worthy 1982.
Plates

Of the 120 plates found at RH/46 the highest percentage were plain (17.5%) and moulded whitewares (10%), linear ware (14.16%), porcelain (11.6%), and blue transfer printed (11.67%). The higher priced plates constituted approximately 36.67% of plates, 6.67% of all plates were vitrified porcelain, the cheaper decorated wares constituted 25%, with whitewares (27.8%) falling into the lowest price category and others at 4.1%. Thus 52.5% of plates fell into the medium and lower price categories while 36.67% were higher priced plates, with vitrified porcelain falling in between these two groups. The cheaper linear and whitewares are likely to mirror the function of the inn during the second-half of the nineteenth century and generally reflect this chronological variation.
% of plates within each decorative category

Graph illustrating the quantity of high, medium and low priced plates in relation to their decorative group.

**Cups and Saucers**

Few of the printed cups and saucers appear to be matching sets. Some of the linear decoration, with two red bands, is found on both cups and saucers as well as plates. These date from the 1860s and probably reflect a matching utilitarian set used at the inn. Within whiteware and whiteglazed ware many of the cups and saucers could have been seen as matching. With the transfer printed wares only one cup and saucer had the same transfer print design. One other possible matching cups and saucer were found with two sherds of sprigged ware (#8.038, #6.005). There is a range of diameters for the cups suggesting a variety of shapes and possibly functions: London size, Irish size, and coffee cans. A few of the diameters appear to be very small. Below are tables and graphs breaking down the value of the ceramics into relative cost groups.

Cups are found with a diversity of decorative styles and fabrics with whiteglazed porcelain (including bone china) (30.3%), blue transfer prints (6.8%), brown transfer print (8.5%), and blue flow (6.8%). Saucers follow a similar pattern with porcelain (35.74%), and blue transfer print (9.52%). The rate with blue flow (11.9%) appears to be nearly twice as high although there is actually one item difference with 4 cups and 5 saucers. The frequency of whiteware in both cups and saucers is fairly close with 4 cups and 5 saucers. In the overall quantities of cups (59) and saucers (42) there are

---

30 Context 3, Cat No. 008 and 014.
31 Miller 1991, p.15.
32 This figure is slightly exaggerated by the count of the black flow as 3 items when it is really 1 item. This was found out after this chapter was written and it was too late to alter the data.
remains of 17 more cups than of saucers. This fairly close relationship between cups and saucers reflects their connection to the drinking of tea and the use of wares of a similar cost whether they are matching in pattern or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Decor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>gilded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>sprigged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>annular W</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>bl flow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blk flow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blktp, HP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blktp pl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>brntp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>gntflow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>grn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>mocha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>peasant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>redtp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>WW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>WW mou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>ISTC</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>WGL, gilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>VPC</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>VPC</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cups grouped according to fabric and decoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Decor</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>gilded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>HP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>sprigged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>china</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>bl flow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blk flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blktp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>blktp pl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>brntp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>gnttp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>redtp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>sponge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>WW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>WGL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>WGL mou</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saucer</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>WGL,gilt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saucers according to fabric and decoration.

Cups grouped according to fabric and decoration.
Cups and decorative wares grouped into most expensive, medium priced and cheapest.

Graph illustrating various quantity cups in the decorative/ware groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decorative</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cost Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td>35.74</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow/Transfer printed</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge/Peasant/HP/Sponge etc</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteware, plain &amp; deco...</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saucers and decorative wares grouped into four price groupings.

% of saucers within the decorative categories

Graph illustrating the quantity of saucers in each decorative/ware group.
This graph presents a picture of the distribution of shapes within each decorative/ware group. A constant element of linear ware, vitrified porcelain and whiteware is the dominance of plates. While the linear ware and vitrified porcelain were usually evidence of commercial eating places the amount of whiteware may also fit this picture. Whiteware contains the largest quantity of plates (27.5%) of all the decorative/ware groups. It is likely that these plates were mainly associated with the serving of food on a commercial basis but in addition to this they may have been used by the people who worked at the inn cooking or serving the food. This is perhaps why there is such a large quantity of whiteware plates. The relationship between cups and saucers is fairly close, particularly within porcelain and flow or transfer printed wares. The number of items within the other decorative/ware groups is low and is therefore unreliable.
This last graph relates the four price groupings of plates, cups, and saucers to each other. There is a much higher occurrence of more expensive items with cups (69.4%) and saucers (73.8%) than with plates (36.6%). No Willow pattern (medium) cups were identified although they constituted approximately 5% of saucers and plates. In the medium/low range the percentage of plates (26.67%) and cups (23.8%) are closer together than saucers (9.52%) which is less than half quantity. In the low price range plates (31.66%) constituted about 20% more than saucers (11.9%) and more than four times the number of cups (6.8%). Linear pattern, one of the later medium/low style, commonly used by commercial premises, occurred mostly in plates (14.4%) rather than in cups (2.3%) or saucers (5.1%). Again the presence of vitreous porcelain plates supports the commercial use of plates at this establishment.

The occurrence of a higher percentage of cups and saucers in the most expensive ceramic decorative category and the low number of plates in this group suggests that they were used in different ways at different times. The clear preference for higher priced ceramic in the teaware groups supports the interpretation of teawares as attempting to express higher status and may indicate that they are part of the public social interaction of the family who lived at the inn. It may indicate that afternoon teas were served at this establishment and that more expensive teaware items were used for this purpose. Plates were fairly evenly distributed through the three price categories. This possibly suggests that plates operated in two different ways at the inn. They were used by the family who lived at the inn and by those members of the public who ate their meals at the inn.

33 Diana di Zerga Wall 1991.
It is important to recognise that the nature of these deposits makes it impossible to look at chronological questions with any real validity but chronology probably played a role in the variation of ceramic price ranges observed at this site. While whitewares, the cheapest ceramics, were available from 1830 other ceramics, such as blue transfer print in the 'asian pheasant' design and some of the green transfer prints, date from the 1850s and linear ware dates from the 1860s. These mid-nineteenth century ceramics clearly reflect later patterns of purchase than the whiteglaze and blue flow that date from 1800 and 1810 onwards.

3.5.2 Glass

In total 1430 glass sherds were found at RH/46. Many of the sherds from glass bottles relate to the consumption of alcohol and water, food preparation and storage, and pharmaceuticals. For a fuller discussion of the glass from the site see the report by Jean Smith and Jennifer Lindbergh (8.7). The direct equation of the number of bottles within these functional groupings is always difficult because of the problem of identifying individual bottles beyond using diagnostic features such as bases or necks. The following lists were constructed from the data base in order to identify the number of bases in each group as well as provide a count on the other items making up the main functional categories. The counting of bases occasionally included a neck if there were more necks than bases. In the last table a percentage breakdown of all items, as well as bases, was included to see if there was any real differences in the two ways of accounting. Overall there was a variation of 2% to 8% between the two sets of percentages in the five categories. The variation was sometimes greater or less. In general the heavier bottles, such as aerated water bottles, tended to break into fewer pieces while the finer glass, such as medicine bottles, broke into a greater number of pieces.

In the quantification of bottles according to bases the largest quantity were alcohol (43.2%), condiments (23.5%), aerated water (16.1%), pharmaceuticals (8.6%) and glass tableware (8.6%). It is common for the largest percentage of bottles found on a site to be associated with the consumption of alcohol. Therefore there is no real suggestion in this material that it is particularly evident of inn activities. Further work needs to be done to ascertain the usual type of ratio of alcohol to other types of bottles at specific types of sites. Inns, as do hotels today, often served beer or ale from casks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Func.</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>a/l</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>b/w</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>g/s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>spts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottles associated with the consumption of alcohol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific Func.</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aerated water bottles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Func.</th>
<th>Specific Func.</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>bot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>o/v</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>p/e</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>sauce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottles associated with food storage and preparation.
Artefactual Evidence: Glass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>tblw</td>
<td>stem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>tblw</td>
<td>tumb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glass tableware - tumblers and stemware.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pers</td>
<td>pharm</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottles used for pharmaceuticals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Bases</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other Items</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>condiments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>tblw</td>
<td>glasses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers</td>
<td>pharm</td>
<td>med</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of bottles and tableware found at RH/46.

% of bottles and tableware within each use group

The bottles and tablewares were made in a variety of places. For the purposes of this discussion I will only focus on those items with marks. Bottles by Australian Glass Manufactures were identified in a few contexts, #2.006, #3.001, and #5.062. There were a number of local aerated water bottle manufacturers and suppliers: Summons & Graham of Parramatta (1892-1930) (#3.022), Pegrum Bros of Redfern (1887-1889) (#3.038), D. Smith Red Hand Cordial Works, Ultimo (#5.002), McLaren's of Surry Hills (#5.066), Newling & Walker, Parramatta Water (#7.053), Joseph Ross of Camperdown (1866-1870) (#8.026), Starkeys, Sydney (1880-1891) on an English made bottle (#8.059). There were some English aerated water bottles, a Lamont (#7.052), the Dan Rylands/Barnsley bottle mentioned above (#8.059), and John Kilner of England (#6.076, #5.066).

A number of other vessels were identified as imported from London: Nuttall & Co. (1872-1913) (#6.067), alcohol; George Whybrow oil/vinegar bottle (#3.030) 1850-1880. There were a few fragments of what appear to be French wine bottles (#5.069, #6.037) and a Blackwood, London ink bottle c1860 (#8.041).
3.5.3 Animal Bone

Because we are dealing with disturbed deposits it is difficult to make meaningful statements based upon the artefacts, especially so with the faunal material. As this material was found in a secondary deposit there is little to be said about it beyond the type of meats that were consumed by the occupants of the building. The following brief discussion is based on the report by Anthony English (8.3). There were 218 bone pieces recovered during excavation, the majority from sheep and pig and cow. The most frequent bone elements found were rib pieces suggesting a use of cheaper pieces of meat, chops, soups, and stews. In general the evidence from this excavation supports a reliance on mutton and pig in the diet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Pig</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallaby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Und.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count of animal bone within each species found at RH/46.

3.5.4 Miscellaneous

The miscellaneous artefacts from a site contain information about the day-to-day activities at the site, the type of clothes people wore, the games children played and so on. This summary is based on Jennifer Lindbergh’s report (8.9). A table of the miscellaneous artefacts from RH/46 provides some indication of this range of activities. There were only a few items relating to food: the handles of two knives (#1, #6) and a teaspoon (#6), and bottle closure wire (#2, #6). There were personal items relating to clothing: buttons (22), buckles (6), and shoes (1). In addition there were a few items of adornment: locket, ring and bead. Aside from buttons one of the largest group of items were 16 children’s marbles, 12 of which were German with all but one dating between 1850 and 1915. The other is a ‘Bennington’ marble 1880-1915. Only a few items were associated with sewing: a thimble and a few pins (#7, #8). One important group were writing implements including fragments of slate pencils and writing tablets found in a number of contexts (#5, #6, #7, and #8). There were a number of synthetic or plastic items indicating the modern disturbance of contexts: parts of golf balls (#3, #4), electrical items (#1, #7), a car battery case (#3), a bottle cap (#1), and some fabric (#8).

These items cover a range of daily activities undertaken at the site. These include writing on lined slate. This may have included writing a menu or prices, times of mail delivery or other reasons for writing associated with the running of the Post Office or inn. The various aspects of personal attire, the copper ring and the locket, indicate that one or more female adults resided at the inn. The number of marbles indicate that either male or female children probably lived there as well. The variety of buttons support both male and female occupants of the building during its lifetime. It should be remembered that all or any of these items may have been lost by any of the visitors to the inn or Post Office. Because of the disturbed nature of the context it is impossible to say much more about these items.
3.5.5 Metal Artefacts

A number of metal artefacts other than those associated with building construction were found during excavation. For a fuller discussion see section 8.8. for Jennifer Lindbergh’s report. A number of items related to horses and vehicles. Whole and fragmentary horse shoes were found in contexts #3, and #6. Part of a buckle from a horse harness (?) was found in contexts #3 and #7. Other artefacts included part of a beer/wine barrel tap, a spring scale, a spring, a rasp, fragments of plain and barbed wire, parts of door locks and bolts, and other assorted metal items. Both the barrel tap and the spring scale probably directly relate to the two functions of the building as an inn and Post Office. The tap used for the serving of alcohol and the spring scale for weighing parcels or similar for postage.34

34 The writer of this report spent many summer holidays working in the Post Office and is familiar with the various elements involved in the processing and delivery of mail.
3.5.6 Stoneware

A few items of stoneware were recovered from the site. These were generally related to storage bottles or jars. In addition there were three ginger beer bottles, two beer bottles and an ink well. Only one of these bottles had a clear attribution to T. Field, Potters, Sydney and dated between 1842 to 1872.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shapes</th>
<th># of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bot/jar</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger Beer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of stoneware shapes found at RH/46.

3.5.7 Coins

Five coins were recovered from the excavation. Three half pennies, one penny, and one shilling. One coin came from a good context, an 1826 shilling. In all three coins appear to date before the construction of the inn in 1839. A half penny from context #5 had a hole in the top indicating that it was placed on a chain or string and worn as adornment. This suggests that it may have been used long after it was minted and lost anytime during the nineteenth century. The coin from context #10, the back fill of the foundation trench, was minted between 1825 to 1827. The presence of three coins pre-1839 is interesting but coins remain in circulation long after minting.

3.5.8 General Overview of Artefact Functions

The following table provides a raw breakdown of the function of items found during the excavation of RH/46. As would be anticipated with a demolition deposit the majority of items relate to building materials. Items associated with construction such as bricks and nails were about 26% and non-structural surface treatments, 9.6%. Aside from the 12% of unidentified functional items the other functions that constituted more than 5% were tablewares 15%, teawares 11% and serving wares 5.9%. This table has little real meaning but it does provide a relative proportional representation of the types of artefacts found during the excavation of this part of RH/46. It is likely to be useful for comparison across sites.
3.6 Test Pits

Four test pits were excavated 20 metres apart along the East 6 grid line (Fig. 5). These pits revealed little beyond that the upper 20 to 25cm was disturbed and redeposited. The profiles of the northern test pits support the oral evidence of grading across the front of the site (Photo 3.13). The southern test pit contained demolition rubble (Photo 3.14). For description of sections of the individual test pits see Appendix A.

3.7 Other Physical Remains

The excavation of RH/46 only focused on the areas to be disturbed by the new water pipe. But beyond this the assessment process requires us to indicate the remaining archaeological potential of RH/46 so that in the event of further development work the disturbance of archaeological remains can be properly managed. Without further testing it is difficult to gauge the extent of remains but the
results of the excavation and the identification of other exposed archaeological features does support the presence of extensive remains. The lines of the exposed footings appeared to continue to the east underneath the grass. Further to the east, beyond the area of excavation, various brick features were visible (Photo 3.15, Fig. 5). These were either building or yard surfaces. There are many glass and ceramic sherds in the golf course car park area. The disturbance of this area by car tires is constantly throwing up more artefacts.

3.8 Aboriginal Artefacts

A number of Aboriginal stone artefacts were found during the excavation of the demolition deposits. This material was disturbed by the grading of the area. A report on this material is included in section 8.2. An examination of the test pits by an archaeologist who specialises in Aboriginal archaeology said that the area to be excavated for the service trench was too disturbed to contain intact Aboriginal deposits. The local Aboriginal Land Council were informed of this material while they were monitoring the general Rouse Hill Infrastructure Project (Stage 1) Works. For further details on this material see the report in Volume 2.

35 Josephine McDonald pers. comm.
4.0 DISCUSSION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design outlined some of the areas of research potential that we believed could be investigated at this site. These question are listed in section 1.4. This part of the report examines the results of the excavation in the light of these research questions. The nature of the excavation makes it difficult to answer these questions without being aware that the complete excavation of the site may considerably alter and develop the answers in other ways. But some comments can be made on the questions at this stage.

4.1 Intra-Site Research questions

4.1.1 Correlation of the historical and oral evidence with the archaeological evidence.

With regard to the historical and oral evidence there was little correlation between what we researched and what local people knew. When we referred to the Post Office people thought we were referring to the second Post Office near the corner of Commercial Road or the site of the present Post Office. Some other people thought we were digging the site of the house built to the south about 1900 that replaced the inn building. The oral information and comments where they knew anything reflect a knowledge of the early twentieth century and any knowledge relating to pre-1880s was completely absent. There was no deliberate attempt on our part to construct oral histories but we certainly had a few people who believed that we were looking in the wrong place.

The 1885 historical map showing the inn and Post Office was accurate in regard to the location of the building. Our measurements suggest that it may have started 1 to 2m further north. As there were two parallel fences to the north of the Church it was difficult to be certain which one was used for the original measurements. The east-west position of the building was accurate. There was no real opportunity to examine the date of construction of the inn. There was no real evidence to suggest that the inn dated pre-1839 and in general the artefacts supported this mid-century dating except for a few coins that were pre-1983. The material at the site dating post-1900 is easily explained by the way the site was left open following the demolition of the building and the interference at the front of the site for recent roadworks.

We have not been able to test other historical aspects of the site because of the limitations of the excavation.

4.1.2 Site activities - the household - spatial analysis

- How does the evidence allow us to interpret the activities of this part of the site?
Clearly we were excavating the front verandah area of a building. It had a central doorway into the hallway or front room of the inn. This area contained remains and features associated with verandah posts, hitching posts and street furniture.

- What range of activities are indicated by the artefacts, features and deposits?
A wide range of activities were suggested by the type of artefacts found at the site. The site and the general vicinity were originally inhabited by Aborigines who made and used stone tools. Then in the mid-nineteenth century it was occupied by a building and its residents. These occupants utilised the usual accoutrements of mid to late-nineteenth-century Sydney life. They used a wide variety of table and teawares for serving and consuming food and liquids. There were artefacts that could be associated with the type of activities that would be anticipated at an inn or Post Office: horse shoes
and gear, barrel tap, spring scale, part of a printing stamp, and coins. The range of ceramic table, serving and tea wares supports the historical evidences that the inn provided meals for guests, including those who stopped on the coach trip between Parramatta and Windsor but without further excavation and research it is difficult to comment in more detail at this time. The modern artefacts, mostly the remains of golf balls, point to the upper disturbance of the site by golf club activities.

- General nature of activities at the site.
  Little can be said on this question at this stage other than the what has been said above.

- Questions relating to the activities as evidence of public and private spheres.
  Little can be said on this question at this stage other than the what has been said above.

4.1.3 Can this site provide evidence for questions of gender, ethnicity, status?

The analysis of the ceramics found at this site raise some interesting questions about the status of this rural household. The presence of at least 109 different ceramic patterns probably represent the remains of ceramics associated with four or more households. The remains from the 1850s were mainly associated with two related families, the Rattalicks and his sister and her husband Sampson Nicholls. Mrs Rattalick and Mrs Nicholls were the Postmistresses for much of the time. Thus the artefacts dating from the mid 1850s to late 1880s belonged to these two families. Further excavation should be able to throw more light on the evidence of gender, ethnicity and status.

In section 3.5.1.5 I discussed the prevalence of cups and saucers within the higher priced ceramic categories. The presence of this number of cups and saucers can be interpreted as confirming the use of teawares within the private space of women residing at the inn. I do not fully accept that this is the only way to interpret this material. Much of the literature on this relates to American usage which is likely to be different to colonial Australia. But I do support the view that they indicate status related activities, that these items were likely to be used on special occasions or when people of higher status stayed or ate at the inn.\[36\] They are not everyday wares, such as the whiteware cups and saucers.

The only evidence of non-Anglo-Saxon use of the site are the Aboriginal artefacts which indicate that this area was occupied by Aborigines prior to European occupation.

4.1.4 Site formation processes

- Preparation of the site prior to construction of the inn.
  The excavation of the front of the building provides little insight into how the site was prepared for the construction of the inn. The ground in this area is generally flat and therefore little leveling was required. The ground in front of the inn was cut away for the construction of the verandah foundations (Photo 3.3, 3.11). The sloping ground to the west, which slopes down towards the roadway, was probably cut away to provide drainage in wet weather. Coaches would have pulled into this area everyday when delivering mail on the journey between Parramatta and Windsor.

- Impact of the twentieth-century cottage on the nineteenth-century structure.
  The construction of this cottage required the demolition of the inn building. Some of the building’s stone foundations were removed during demolition, presumably for reuse in the cottage.

---

\[36\] Diana di Zerga Wall 1991.
Examination of post-depositional activities.

The landscaping of the study area in the 1970s involved the levelling out of mounded areas by a bulldozer. The excavation and the test pits suggest that there was considerable redepositing of deposits across the study area. The impact to the east appears to be less substantial because of the wall lines that were visible under the grass. It is likely that because the front of the site sloped away down to the road that in an attempt to level this area deposits, mostly demolition were pushed to the front area. It is likely that only the top of the site was disturbed and that all features dug into the ground will be substantially intact.

4.1.5 Questions about the technology used in the construction of the building.

- What is the source of the materials used for construction?
- Are any of the materials locally made?
- Are some materials being processed on site?

The main materials used for the construction of the Queen's Arms were sandstock bricks, sandstone, shell mortar, lime plaster (render and set), and nails. The sandstock bricks were probably made on site or locally as it is difficult to transport bricks over distances because they are easily damaged as well as heavy to move. The sandstone blocks may have come form local quarries in the area, down near the creek or elsewhere. The shells used in the mortar were possibly taken from Aboriginal shell middens. The use of lime in the render and set suggests a later date for the rendering of the building facade. The use of lime contrasts the use of shell mortar in the original building. Lime was scarce in the early Colony and it is likely that the building was rendered some time after its construction. The description of the decaying building by the 1880s suggest that it was not well constructed, or maintained, as this was only about 45 years after it was built. Nails were probably made as required by the builders as many were hand wrought.

4.1.6 Evidence for date of construction and the earliest use of the site as an inn.

The archaeological evidence has shed little evidence on the date that the inn was constructed. The historical evidence suggest that it was built between March 1838 and June 1839 when John Booth acquired a licence for the Queen's Arms. Three coins found at the site dated earlier than 1830 but coins are not reliable dating tools. At this stage there is no evidence to support a dating of the inn prior to 1838.

4.2 Inter-Site Research Questions

4.2.1 How does this site fit into theories regarding the process of urbanisation - especially the core-periphery model? We are dealing with a periphery site which is part of a small village.

I will mostly address this question to issues relating to consumerism.

This section examines questions relating to the availability of consumer goods, and quality and variety of consumer goods found at the site and what they tell us about the interaction of the site with the world at large. A few comments will be made about this research question keeping in mind the limitations on the type of analysis that can be made about this site.
The range and quality of ceramics, glass and stoneware artefacts found at RH/46 attest that the residents of this site had a reasonably good access to markets, purchased items that were in a variety of price ranges, often falling into the more expensive categories. There was a fairly broad range of ceramic patterns and types. There were 109 different patterns identified on various fabrics. The variety of patterns available argues that the occupants of this site had good access to a broad range of ceramics. There is little comparative material available on the variety of ceramics from other sites but comparison with these are likely to help us understand how archaeological sites fit into the general market economy. There were a few ceramic items that were not imported from England: a sherd of Chinese provincial ware (#6.022), and a handle of a Japanese hand painted cup (#6.006). Some of the mustard glazed items may be local but they were not marked and the location of the manufacturer was not identified.

The glass is more difficult to deal with because there were only a few marks on the bottles. Bottles may be English in origin but the products they contain may be local and aerated water and cordial bottles were often refilled. A few bottles were manufactured in England but bear the name of a local merchant (#8.059). There were bottle manufacturers in Sydney and Parramatta: Summons & Graham of Parramatta (1892-1930) (#3.022), Pegrum Bros of Redfern (1887-1889) (#3.038), D. Smith - Red Hand Cordial Works, Ultimo (#5.002), McLaren's of Surry Hills (#5.066), Newling & Walker, Parramatta Water (#7.053), Joseph Ross of Camperdown (1866-1870) (#8.026), and a few twentieth century bottles by Australian Glass Manufacturers (AGM). Marks of English manufacturer’s included: John Kilner of England (#6.076, #5.066), Nuttall & Co. (1872-1913) (#6.067), George Whybrow (#3.030) 1850-1880, and Blackwood. Most of the condiment bottles found on site were imported from England.

With the miscellaneous items a number could be identified either by knowledge of the items or marks on the objects. A number of porcelain and limestone marbles were made in Germany and possibly the USA. One example of an Australian product was a button inscribed with Hugh Savage, George Street. The origin of many buttons is not clear. Buttons, including mother of pearl, porcelain and glass buttons, were made in Australia as well as overseas.37

A review of market contacts evidenced by the artefacts found at the site gives us some picture of the occupants’ degree of market access as well as that of the general community. Obviously the site of an inn on a major thoroughfare between Windsor and Parramatta may not be considered isolated but travel was difficult and many perishable products were obtained locally. In this case the occupants of the inn probably travelled to Parramatta or Windsor for goods. The supplying of provisions for an inn would require more than that normally available to a household. It would presumably be easy to organise regular deliveries on the daily mail coach but quantities would be restricted.

The artefactual evidence does indicate that the occupants of this site had good market access to the household goods and utensils used daily. It would be valuable to compare this material to other sites in Sydney, Parramatta and from other rural areas. The variety of foreign manufactured goods supports that this site was generally involved in the world system. Sydney is generally viewed as being a periphery on the edge of the world system which has Europe as its core.

37 Jennifer Lindbergh, pers. comm.
4.2.2 Relationship to other sites.

- This is one of a group of sites in the area. How did this site interact with the other historic sites in the locality and with other sites in the locality that have been excavated. Is there evidence to support an archaeological Neighbourhood.

This question cannot be answered until the undertaking of further local archaeological work.

4.2.3 The nature of the material culture at this site in relation to other rural sites and inn sites of a similar chronological period. How do they compare and differ?

Due to the limited time and funds available to write this report I was unable to investigate these questions.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Any further development of the area that will impact on the substantial archaeological remains will require the complete excavation of this significant archaeological site. Much of the area of the Golf Course car park and the grassed area to the west are likely to contain archaeological remains.

Further research can be undertaken in a number of areas: probate inventories relating to the Rattalicks, and Nicholls and a search for existing family members.

Since the completion of excavation of this site it has been recommended for protection by the recent Heritage Study. It suggested that it had a regional level of cultural significance and recommended that it be included as a draft item in the new Heritage LEP.38

---

38 Simon Kinchington, Baulkham Hill Council, forward planner, pers. comm.
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7.0 ILLUSTRATIONS
Areas investigated by machine and hand

Figure 5: Site plan of RH/46 showing areas of investigation.
Figure 6: Plan of features exposed in original test trench, 1/12/93.
Figure 7: Plan of area of excavation at the commencement of manual excavation, 23/12/93.
Figure 8: Plan prior to removal of context #8, 30/12/93.
Figure 9: Plan of excavation showing features associated with the front of the building prior to monitoring, 5/1/1994.
Figure 10: Final plan of excavation area on completion of work following monitoring, 12/1/1994.
Figure 11: Southern section of trench following completion of excavation, 10/1/1994.
Photo 3.1: Southern part of trench showing the litter of sandstock bricks and rubble stone. This was typical of contexts 3-6, and 8. Scale 1m. RH/46 2:20.

Photo 3.2: Face of southeastern part of feature #3 showing a section through demolition deposit (#4, #5, #6 and #8). Note the general distribution of brick, mortar and plaster. The white flecks are fragments of plaster. Note the lighter coloured matrix at the base of this deposit. This contained more of the plaster, mortar and set from the facade of the building. Scale 1m. RH/46 2:19.
Photo 3.3: Looking south along eastern edge of trench with northern wall in foreground (#32) and stone of western wall (#38) of inn along grassy edge of trench. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:24.

Photo 3.4: Northern verandah wall footing (#32) running east-west with remnant timber post to west (#34). Scale 1m. RH/46 6:12.
**Photographs**

**Photo 3.5:** Part of front wall of inn showing *in situ* stones and part of the robbed-out trench with fill of yellow mortar, white plaster and orange brick fragments. Scale 1m. RH/46 5:16.

**Photo 3.6:** Western end of northern wall footing (#32) and the associated timber post (#34) in the northern corner of the footing trench (#11). The wall footing has two courses of stone with the smaller stones embedded in shell mortar. This end of the footing is uneven suggesting that it was designed to be keyed into a footing return. Scale 30cm. RH/46 5:2.

Casey & Lowe Associates

RH/46 Excavation

RHIP (Stage 1) Works
Photo 3.7: View to north east showing the various features associated with the inn. Note the in situ wall stones (#37), the distinct edge of the footing trench (#11) with the shallow drop from its western edge and its relationship to the three visible postholes. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:17.

Photo 3.8: Round timber post (#35) situated on the edge of the western footing trench (#11) with two stones from the western verandah footing (#37) located within the trench. Post #36 is visible in the background. Scale 30cm. RH/46 5:0.
Photo 3.9: Round timber post (#36) located at the western edge of footing trench (#11). Scale 30cm. RH/46 4:34.

Photo 3.10: East-west footing trench (#42) and posthole (#41) to the west. This area was opened up on the last day to find the end of the inn structure. To the right of the photo is a large slab of worked sandstone thought to be a stone step, with tread marks, belonging to the entrance of the inn. Scale 1m. RH/46 6:8.
Photo 3.11: View to southeast following the completion of excavation prior to monitoring on the last day. Scale 1m. RH/46 4:22.

Photo 3.12: Southern section of site showing the changing levels to the west of the inn. RH/46 4:5.

Photo 3.14: Southern test pit with demolition rubble. RH/46 6:5.
Photo 3.15: Area to southwest of excavation showing in situ brick surfaces. RH/46 5:20.