2.3.6 Phase 5: 1840s Upgrading for the District Hospital (1844–1878)

Western Privies
The main evidence for this stage was the southern stone wall of the rebuilt western privy dating to c1844 (Photo 2-22). Most of this was found during the Stage 1 works (Photo 2-24). The archaeology of the privy indicates that by 1844 there were only two rooms within the privies. It is uncertain if originally there were three rooms or cubicles for the 1818 hospital and these were adjusted to two as part of the rebuilding of the western privy. The rebuilding of the privies in 1844 indicates they were now probably used for males rather than females as the brick channels were probably urinals.

The eastern privy, which consisted of a brick cesspit, supports the current interpretation of the stone structure as dating to 1844 and the reconstruction of the privies.

Hospital Boundary Wall
During Stage 1 three sections of the western boundary wall were uncovered and some evidence for the northern wall was also found (Fig 2-12; Photos 2-40, 2-42, 2-43). During Stage 2c considerable remains were found of the southwestern corner, a small section of the southern wall, as well as a few elements of the eastern wall and footings for the gate piers in the Noller Kiosk area (Photos 2-33, 2-34, 2-39, 2-41, 2-13). Most of the Stage 1 wall consisted of footing stones and only a few of the superstructure stones were found. Multiplex placed all of these stones on pallets and are storing them in the site carpark for possible reuse.

More of the stone superstructure was found in Stage 2c and therefore provides a better overview of how the wall would have looked (Photos 2-33, 2-34, 2-36, 2-37, 2-38, 2-41). While only a small section of the eastern wall survived and had no in situ superstructure, more than 50 pieces of stone had been removed from the eastern wall during alterations to the eastern area of the site and buried within a new section of the twentieth-century hospital (Photo 2-35). This stone was salvaged and Multiplex is storing it and proposes to reused it in a reconstruction of the southeastern boundary wall. The in situ southern wall in the southwest corner was 17m long (Photo 2-34) and the western wall was about 7m long (Photo 2-33). The foundation stones vary in width from 1.06–1.25m. The superstructure walls were 45–50cm wide and the height of a course of the superstructure was approximately 25cm. Some stone blocks were solid, with no core, while others were faced stone with rubble core fill (Photos 2-43, 2-41). Other sections of the boundary wall were found further to the east (Photos 2-35, 2-36). The wall footings in the southwest corner and the northwestern areas consisted of wide rough cut stone footings placed on edge and laid into the footing trench (Photos 2-33, 2-40, 2-43). The sizes of the stones varied but many of them were quite large. The footing stones from those sections of the wall salvaged during Stage 1 are being stored by Multiplex.

The footings of the southern wall and the superstructure of the western and southern wall contained stones that had a range of different finishes which suggest that the stones were reused from another structure(s). This is also a pattern found with the footings of the 1879 kitchen where there was considerable reuse of substantial stone blocks.

The CMP identified that the hospital boundary wall was rebuilt as part of transforming the convict hospital into the Parramatta District Hospital, a public institution rather than a convict one.¹ In 1844 a series of alterations were undertaken to remake the hospital into this new use. Among these works was the construction of the stone boundary wall to replace the timber stockade fence erected in 1818 which had in turn replaced the earlier 1792 timber fence. There are a series of images that assist with understanding how the wall looked and operated within the landscape. The northern wall was originally a high stone wall and by 1881 was replaced with a timber picket fence (Fig. 2-14). The eastern boundary entrance, the main public entrance into the hospital grounds, had an estate picket

¹ CMP 2003:97.
fencing with stone bases and gate posts. At least one of the footing stones for the gate posts, probably the northern one, was found in the Noller Kiosk area (Photo 2-12).

The line of the southern wall is not square indicating it followed an older property boundary laid down prior to accurate surveying techniques. This angled line is visible on the historic plans and the overlay of the 1895 plan (Figs 2-7, 2-14, 2-15). This would have been the original southern hospital boundary as established in 1792.

The rebuilding of the timber fence with a wall in stone after the cessation of convict transportation (1841) and the discontinuation of convict-associated uses suggests an odd juxtaposition of actions. Even though there was no longer any need to constrain convicts within the boundaries of the hospital, a high and more secure wall was built. As there was no requirement to protect the community from the convict patients within the hospital then this wall represents a changing set of social priorities and a shift in colonial thinking associated with the change from being a penal colony to a free colony. If this is the case then there should be other evidence for this changing practice at this site and at other government sites in Sydney and elsewhere.

What was this new thinking? Was it about a proud expression of no longer being part of the penal system and no longer retaining that link to the penal colony as a dumping ground for the dregs for Britain? Was the wall designed as part of a new system of infrastructure for the developing free colony within its new system of self-government? Was it about marking the difference in the public mind between the changing functions of the old convict hospital and the new public hospital? Or all of the above and for other purposes as well? These issues will be further addressed in the final archaeological report where a new research question will be developed to address this important change in the history of colonial New South Wales.
Photo 2-33: Southwestern corner of the hospital boundary wall, looking north along the western wall.

Photo 2-34: Section of superstructure of southern boundary wall faced with cut stones. The black line outlines the southwestern corner of the boundary wall.

Photo 2-35: Section of twentieth-century hospital which contained the stone salvaged from the eastern boundary wall.
Photo 2-36: Southeast corner of the boundary wall. The stones on the right were removed from the wall and then realigned along the wall line. Scale 1m

Photo 2-37: Blocks of sandstone walling recovered near Marsden Street. Note the different finishing techniques used to face the stone. Bottom left and right are blocks with margin lines while others are rough faced. Scale 1m

Photo 2-38: Capping stone presumed to be from the eastern boundary wall. This is the only evidence found for the shape of the capping stone. Scale 0.5m
Photo 2-39: View to east along another section of the southern boundary wall. This section remains in situ. The pink string indicates the northern edge of the Trial Courts footprint. The area further to the east was considerably disturbed by the 1970s hospital building. Scale 1m

Photo 2-40: View to north over the angled line of the northern part of the western boundary wall footings found during Stage 1. Scale 1 m

Photo 2-41: Three of the stones in the western boundary wall.
Photo 2-42: Western boundary wall found during Stage 1 salvage. This was the first section of surviving superstructure above footing stones. Looking south towards Blood Bank. This section of walling is visible on Figure 2-12. Scale 1m

Photo 2-43: Section of western boundary wall found during Stage 1 Salvage. In this case the stone footings were considerably wider than the wall stones. Scale 1m

Figure 2-161: The timber stockade fence was erected around the perimeter of the 1818 hospital, *West View of Parramatta, 1819*, Joseph Lycett, ML 53, ML, SLNSW.
Figure 2-17: Northern stone wall between the 1818 hospital building and the infectious diseases ward (centre left) in the 1870s. CMP fig 16.

Figure 2-18: By the 1890s the stone fence to the north had been replaced by a timber one. This matches the information on the 1881 plan, Figure 2.14. CMP

Figure 2-19: Samuel Elyard’s 1873 sketch of the western side of the hospital and the western stone wall. It also shows the Surgeon’s Residence and store with the roof of the southern laundry just above the top of the wall. SPF, ML, SLNSW.

Figure 2-20: Eastern end of the 1818 Hospital, in the 1880s. There are the gate posts of the main entrance with the estate fencing. Adjacent to the right gate post a section of walling is visible indicating the walls was still intact at this point. The western wall is visible behind the gate. SAG 5/6468
2.3.7 Phase 6: New Services to the Hospital, 1879–1902

Changing the hospital during Phase 6 involved:

- Building of the Kitchen/Laundry Block
- New Toilets
- Service Road
- Operating Theatre

The main rebuilding during this phase was the 1879 kitchen/laundry block, a new toilet system, a new service road and in 1881 a new operating theatre. The kitchen/laundry and the operating theatre were recorded during Stage 1. This kitchen/laundry was associated with both the third and fourth hospitals. The construction of the new kitchen block involved the demolition of the 1818 laundry/female dead room in this area and it is presumed that the 1818 kitchen/male dead room was demolished at the same time. It was also built above the 1818 western privy which was altered in 1844. Therefore a new toilet system had to be built (Photo 2-44). It was located to the south of the kitchen/laundry. The evidence for the new toilets mostly consisted of stone footings forming a rectangular structure with four cross walls forming five cubicles. The toilets were built into the southern boundary wall and were therefore aligned to the odd angle of the original boundary. The exploratory excavation in this area found no evidence for cesspits and suggests that the toilets were probably plumbed. Most of the footings of the 1879 toilet are within the Conservation Area although the western most stones were within the footprint of the Substation and were therefore removed. The 1879 stone footings were cut through by the machine-made brick footings of the 4th hospital.

An entrance road running southwest from Marsden Street to the southern end of the kitchen block was built during this stage and is within the Conservation Area (Photos 2-45, 2-46, 2-47). This road was stratigraphically immediately beneath the 4th hospital footings and covered all other archaeology within this area except for a later concrete road and a series of twentieth-century services which had considerable impacts within this area. Some of these services were associated with asbestos pipes and due to OH&S regulations had to be left in place until safely removed and therefore some of the photographs show areas of the road that were not cleaned as we had yet to remove the asbestos.

Photo2-44: Remains of the stone footings of the 1879 toilet system. Note the footing of the 1879 kitchen/laundry block in the right background. The 4th hospital footings cut through the earlier remains.

2 CMP 2003:5, 33.
Photo 2-45: Looking eastwards along the c1879 service road. The red gravel or metalling formed the surface off the road with machine-made brick kerb and guttering. The dotted lines indicate the outer edges of the road where kerb and guttering survived. Scale 1m

Photo2-46: Section of road near Marsden Street. This area was cut down to the subsoil for the c1879 road and then for a modern concrete road that crossed through this area. The road with machine-made bricks crosses to the southwest. Looking east towards Marsden Street. Scale 1m
The service road had evidence of at least two different surfaces, red gravel metalling above bituminous surfacing (Photo 2-47). The road base was formed with rubble stone. There was a considerable change in level as the road rose from Marsden Street to the higher area near the kitchen/laundry block by 0.75m.

2.3.8 Phase 7: Construction of the Sulman Power Hospital, 1890s–1902, the Fourth Hospital, and Demolition of the Third Hospital
Footings belonging to the Sulman Power cottage hospital run through the Conservation Area (Photos 2-44 to 47, as well as various services associated with the building of the new hospital.

2.3.9 Phase 8: Later twentieth-century construction of buildings and services, 1902–1999
Later footings and services associated with the rebuilding of the 4th hospital during the twentieth century are found throughout the site. The services had a major impact on parts of the Conservation Area and the Substation Area (Photos 2-19 to 2-21). In the Substation Area the footings were less intrusive but they did create problems with understanding the stratigraphy throughout this area but generally we were able to clarify the relationships between the various deposits (Photo 2-25).

The main impacts from the upgrading of hospital services include the removal of the upper part of the northern half of the well (Photo 2-17) and the location of service junctions which put craters in the southwestern part of the Conservation Area (Photos 2-48, 2-49). The construction of the Accident and Emergency ward in the 1970s also had an impact on the southern part of the site with the reducing of levels and the removal of most of the remains of the southern hospital boundary (Photo 2-39).
Photo 2-48: Looking east over the Conservation Area where services and associated excavation cratered the area and removed significant archaeology, including much of the northern wall line of the 2nd hospital. Scale 1m

Photo 2-49: Looking south from Stage 1 area over the cistern (left foreground), the backfilled well (right middle ground) and the craters. The 1879 kitchen is to the right. The service road is in the background. Scale 1m

Photo 2-50: Substation Area cut through by 4th hospital footings which were hammered out by machine before we could commence excavation in this area.
2.4 Lot 98 – Brislington

2.4.1 Historical Background

This lot is on the corner of George and Marsden Streets and contained one of the early convict huts. On the 1804 map it is numbered as Lot 3 which was leased to Timothy Hollister, an ex-convict. This lease was dated 16 July 1804, probably acknowledging Hollister’s occupation prior to 1804 (Fig 2-21). His house was on the corner of the lane leading to the surgeon’s house and was bounded on the north by the ‘hospital paling’. Hollister came out in the Third Fleet on the *Albemarle* in 1791 with a seven-year sentence. He came from Middlesex and was sentenced in 1790. In 1800 Hollister was the government overseer at Parramatta and had two assigned convicts. Hollister was still in the house on Lot 98 in 1806. He died in 1821.

Lot 98 was purchased in January 1821 by John Hodges. Hodges noted that he had ‘purchased the Grant of another man. It was a Grant of Govr Phillips [sic] I believe’, presumably meaning it was granted by Phillip prior to his departure in December 1792 although there is no evidence of this and nearly all of the early grants for Parramatta, based on those on the 1804 list, were granted by Governors Hunter and King. Only two larger grants of 30 and 60 acres at Parramatta were identified as ones given by Governor Phillip. Hodges was an ex-convict with a life sentence who was transported to NSW on the *Duke of Portland* in 1807. He received his ‘ticket-of-leave’ on 1 July 1813 and a conditional pardon on 1 January 1816. Hodges is said to have received his freedom when he provided a horse and cart to help William Cox build the road over the Blue Mountains. Hodges was initially allocated to work with the Government House gardener.

Within a year of his arrival Hodges attempted to escape the colony:

> …manual labour was inherently distasteful to him. Having submitted for twelve weary months to the rigours of the colonial penal system, he and a fellow convict resolved to make a bold and determined effort to gain their liberty. They became stowaways on the *Sarah* and suffered all the hardships which must accompany such an existence, only to be discovered within a day’s sail of Timor; transferred in mid-ocean to the good ship *Elizabeth*, southward bound; and returned under escort to the settlement at Port Jackson where…

Hodges received a licence to operate an inn in 1818 but forfeited it for keeping a disorderly house but continued to sell ‘sly grog’. Hodges held a publican’s licence in 1818, 1821, 1822, 1827 and 1832. Francis Oakes, constable at Parramatta described Hodges character as ‘extremely bad, he has often been bought forwards for keeping a Disorderly House and for selling spirits without a Licence’. Hodges acquired his lease for Lot 98 in 1819 with the condition that he build a substantial brick house which he apparently started in 1819. Hodges received a grant of Lot 98 on 30 June 1823 when Brislington was valued at £1000.

---

3 Taken from Casey & Lowe 2005a:37-38 with some additional information.
4 [http://members.iinet.net.au/~perthdps/convicts/3rdfleet.html](http://members.iinet.net.au/~perthdps/convicts/3rdfleet.html). Taken from *New Holland Morning Post*, 18th October, 1791.
5 Kass 1990:5.
6 This was the date in Kass 1990 but it may not be correct.
7 Kass 1990:21, BT 1, 374. Analysis of 1804 leaseholders using Ryan 1981. The two grants by Governor Phillip were to Charles Smith (30ac) and Thomas Arndell (60ac).
10 Brown 1937:45. Pollen also refers to this incident 1983:58. This evidence is also recounted in the Bonwick Transcripts 1:375.
12 Quoted in Kass 1990, from Bonwick Transcripts 1:316.
14 LTO No. 4, Bk 26.
had been made to him by Governor Macquarie, that he should have a licence on condition of building a good house in Paramatta (sic), I find that he since received one in the year 1821, after having performed the condition.  

Hodges built Brislington, the brick house on the corner of George and Marsden Streets in 1821 and received confirmation of his grant in July 1823. The money to build the house was reputedly won playing cards at James Larra’s Woolpack Inn. He played a 6 or 8 of diamonds to win a round of euchre. This is supposed to be the source of the 6 diamonds outlined in dark bricks in the rear face of Brislington.

Hodges tried to sell the house in 1825 describing it:

the red brick building comprises four rooms on each floor with a variety of out-houses consisting of kitchen and pantry; two servants’ bedrooms, a four-stall stable and coach-house, and within one of the first wells of water in the town. The house is newly built and the site on which it stands, comprising the garden, is near one and a quarter acres. It stands most eligible for business and is secured by a perpetual grant.

By April 1844 Hodges, with Thomas Lynch, was in gaol serving a 12-month sentence for the theft of flagstones from the Hospital’s dead-house which was then under construction. The property containing Brislington was sold in January 1844 to Richard Webb, general dealer of Parramatta and James Slade, gentleman of Sydney for £3000. This sale included ‘the goods, chattels, merchandise, debts, credits, Horses, cattle, sheep, household furniture, carriages, plate, jewels, and all other personal property’. Kass notes that this was an attempt to avert a court action by John Ryan against Hodges. There was a Sheriff’s sale arising from the court action which saw John Ryan purchasing the western part of the property which included the stable.

Hodges died in June 1849 and was buried in St Patrick’s Cemetery. Under the terms of his will the property was left to Thomas Lynch and George Blackett both of Parramatta. His wife Elizabeth had left him in 1821. According to the 1828 census Thomas Lynch was a servant to John Hodges and had been transported with a life sentence on the Malabar (1) in 1819. Hodges is described in the deed as having lived at Brislington until his death.

By 1851 George Rattray consolidated the allotment by purchasing the western part for £530. By 1852 Dr Thomas Robertson, surgeon at the District Hospital, was residing in Brislington and began the continuous association of Brislington with the hospital. Rattray sold Lot 98 in 1854 for £2,500 to George Alfred Lloyd. Lloyd sold it to George Wigram Allen for £3000 in March 1855. Allen was a large property holder in Sydney and presumably leased the property until it was sold in 1875 to Henry Walsh and Nugent Wade Brown in trust for Walter Brown and his wife Sigismunda for

---

16 Kass et al. 1996:78, refers to the 6 of diamonds and there are six diamonds outlined on the back of the house.
17 Sydney Gazette 7 April 1825.
18 These references and quotes still need to be checked against the original sources for verification of their accuracy.
19 LTO No. 541, Bk 6; quoted in Kass 1990:11.
20 LTO No. 73 Bk 8.
23 LTO No 48, Bk 19.
26 LTO No 392 Bk 20; No 927 Bk 21; No 612 Bk 32.
27 LTO No 72 Bk 38.
In late 1857 the Brown family began to lease the property and beginning their approximately 90-year long occupation of the house and grounds.

Figure 2-21: Detail including the study area of Evans’ 1804 plan of Parramatta. This is not an accurate plan as it shows the George Street part of the study area with similar-sized allotments and it does show two buildings within the hospital area. Lot 98 is circled. Rosen 2003:132, 131.

Photo 2-51: Northern side or rear of Brislington with six diamonds outlined in the left side.

Photo 2-52: Front of Brislington with later awning. Compare Fig. 2-50

The name Brislington was given to the house at this time. Brislington was named after the locality in Bristol where Walter Brown was born, 5 September 1821. In 1861 Walter Brown was appointed Captain of the Parramatta Volunteer Corps (Fig. 2-23). The property was then held in trust for Sigismund Brown, Walter Brown’s wife. Brown was associated with the hospital and appears to

28 LTO No 983, Bk 149; No 270, Bk 160.
29 Brown 1937:70.
31 LTO No. 983 Bk 149.
have lived in Brislington for much of this period. The hospital resumed part of the land in 1916 and turned Brislington into a nurses’ home but in December 1920 it was reoccupied by the Browns. Dr Keith Macarthur Brown continued to practice from the house until 1947 when the rest of the property was resumed by the Parramatta District Hospital. During 1951/53 Brislington was converted into a nurses’ home.33

**Figure 2-22:** Brislington in 1870s without the later awning.

**Figure 2-23:** Painting of Brislington. Reproduced in Brown 1937:52, source unknown. The women are wearing Victorian costumes suggesting a date in the mid-nineteenth century.

---

32 LTO CT 1106 F. 188; CT 3905, F. 44-45; Clive Lucas Stapleton & Partners 1991:16-17.
33 Clive Lucas Stapleton & partners 1991:17
Brown was apprenticed to a doctor in Bristol when he was 16 and eventually completed his degree at the University of Edinburgh in 1843. Walter Brown arrived in Sydney in 1857, the year he started to lease Brislington. Walter Brown as the honorary medical officer at the Parramatta district Hospital form 1850 to 1883. In 1861 Walter Brown was appointed Captain of the Parramatta Volunteer Corps (Fig. 2-23). 34

Table 0-1: Residents and occupants recorded in Parramatta Rate Assessment Books for Lot 98, (extracted from Clive Lucas, Stapleton 1990: Appendix 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>George W. Allen</td>
<td>Patrick Quigley</td>
<td>weatherboard, 2 rm</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Frederick Kellow</td>
<td>weatherboard, 2 rm</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Brick, 6 rm</td>
<td>£80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>George W. Allen</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Wd House</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Br house</td>
<td>£90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>George W. Allen</td>
<td>Frederick Drinkwater</td>
<td>Wd house</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Frederick Drinkwater</td>
<td>Bk house</td>
<td>£90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Wd house</td>
<td>£16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Bk house</td>
<td>£95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>William White</td>
<td>Wd house</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Bk house</td>
<td>£110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Peter Quinn</td>
<td>Wd house</td>
<td>£26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Bk house</td>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>James Spiers</td>
<td>Wd house</td>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter Brown</td>
<td>Bk house</td>
<td>£65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Walter Brown Est</td>
<td>James Speers</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>£13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter S. Brown</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>£65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Walter Brown Est</td>
<td>James Speers</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>£13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“ “</td>
<td>Walter S. Brown</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>£80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 0-2: Sand’s Directory for Lot 98, (extracted from Clive Lucas, Stapleton 1990: Appendix 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>William White Dr Walter Brown</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Dr K.S.M Brown, physician C. Ralston Huxtable, MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Dr Walter Brown, ‘Brislington’</td>
<td>1926-1933</td>
<td>Dr K.S.M Brown, physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>J Speers Dr Walter Brown, ‘Brislington’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>James Speers Dr Walter Brown, ‘Brislington’</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Dr Walter Brown</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Dr Walter Brown</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Dr Walter S. Brown</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Dr Walter S. Brown</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Dr W. Sigismund Brown, surgeon</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Dr W. Sigismund Brown, surgeon</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Dr K.S.M Brown, physician</td>
<td> </td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 Archaeological Phases in Lot 98
The following archaeological phases were identified during the archaeological program in Lot 98. The phases are similar to the hospital occupation for the early period but are more varied for the nineteenth century.

- Phase 1: Natural Landscape.
- Phase 2: Aboriginal Occupation.
- Phase 3: Early Convict and Leaseholders’ Occupation, 1790s–1821
  - Phase 3.1: Site Clearing prior to Convict Occupation, 1788–1790

Phase 3.2: Convict, 1790–1804
Phase 3.3: Leaseholders Occupation of Convict Hut, 1804–1821

- Phase 4: Building and Occupation of Brislington c. 1821–1947
  - Phase 4.1: Building Brislington, 1819–1821
  - Phase 4.2: Occupying Brislington John Hodges, 1821–1849
  - Phase 4.3: Occupying Brislington, Brown Family, 1857–1947

- Phase 5: Twentieth-century Hospital uses of Brislington, 1951–2006

2.4.3 Phase 1: Natural Landscape
Considerable evidence for the east-west slope down to the creekline was found and surveyed in. There was also a fall in the slope from the high point where the 1818 hospital was built to the south towards George Street. Roy Lawrie, Soil Scientist, NSW Department of Agriculture undertook further recording of this soil profile. The western part of the site contained some remnant topsoil (A1 horizon) but none survived in the eastern area beneath the 1970s hospital. It had been cut down for the 1970s hospital to assist with the Marsden Street entrance. The pale buff silty sandy subsoil (A2 horizon) was also found across much of the site and it was often mixed through with some lumps of the A1 horizon indicating that there had been higher ground levels across the site and that there was considerable changing of levels throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as well as tilling of the soil.

Discussions with Roy Lawrie about using the B horizon as the basis for identifying the original slope were generally supportive and appropriate recording was undertaken to allow us to identify this slope in the area behind Brislington, within Lot 98. Only limited evidence survived within the original hospital property to reconstruct the original landform.

Soil and pollen samples were taken of natural across the site, using the test holes excavated for testing for the Aboriginal archaeology as survey locations for recording. The pollen analysis should allow us to reconstruct further evidence for both the pre- and post-1788 vegetation across the area.

2.4.4 Phase 2: Aboriginal Occupation
Dr Laila Haglund, Haglund & Associates, in consultation with the various Aboriginal stakeholders, undertook a five-day testing program to identify the potential for Aboriginal archaeology within Stage 2c. A section 87 approval was obtained from the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) for this work. This was the third stage of testing with previous work being undertaken as part of Stages 1 and 2b. A preliminary report was written for this work and lodged with DEC who approved a S90 for the whole site in August 2006.

Only limited Aboriginal remains were found across the site as much of the area was disturbed by nineteenth and twentieth-century occupation and various hospital construction activities. The type of stone artefacts found mostly conforms to a pattern of background artefact scatters with no clear activity areas. The ‘best’ examples of Aboriginal artefacts were found in ‘historic’ features and deposits. All these have been provided to Dr Haglund for analysis as part of the overall project. The final report on the Aboriginal archaeology should be completed by the end of October 2006.

2.4.5 Phase 3: Early Convict and Leaseholders’ Occupation, 1790s–1821
No specific remains associated with Phases 3.1 and 3.2 were found during Stage 2c although we did find evidence for the location of the convict hut further to the west of Brislington during Stage 1. This was reported on in that report, Casey & Lowe 2005b. Further analysis of the artefacts from Stage 2c may alter the dating of features and put them into this phase but. It is also possible that once the artefacts from the large test hole, immediately north of the Trial Courts footprint, excavated
during Stage 2b are analysed that there may be some artefacts that may be considered to belong to this phase.

2.4.5.1 Phase 3.3: Leaseholders Occupation of Convict Hut, 1804–1821
As part of the Stage 2c works the area immediately to the south of Brislington and to the southwest, within the Trial Courts footprint, was subject to detailed archaeological excavation. There were limited remains considered to belong to Phase 3.3. These include:

- A large tree bole which was presumably part of the clearing of vegetation from this area. The backfilling contained artefacts, lead-glazed pottery and Chinese export porcelain, which suggested that the tree stump was not removed until after the site was occupied, possibly after the convict hut site was leased out to Timothy Hollister by 16 July 1804 (Photo 2-53).35
- North-south linear trench with post holes at either end but some evidence that there were trenches to the east at either end but they did not continue very far. The backfill of the trench contained part of a well-cut stone column base (Photo 2-54). This may be determined to belong to Phase 4 following further analysis.
- A stone-lined sub-surface structure, possibly a storage cellar, may belong to this phase of the occupation of the site (Photo 2-55).

The dates of the backfilling of both the first two features require further analysis of the artefacts which is in progress. The stone-lined structure has been placed within this phase because when Brislington was built it had a cellar and therefore precluded the need for an exterior in-ground storage pit. Therefore it is likely to have been used prior to the construction of Brislington c. 1821. It is not considered to be a cesspit because it is wider then known double cesspits.

Further historical research reviewed and included in Section 2.4.1 indicates that John Hodges was probably living in the convict hut prior to its demolition c. 1821. As he was running a pub and possibly a ‘disorderly house’, presumably a brothel, prior to 1821 he may have been operating it from the former convict hut prior to the construction of Brislington.

---

**Photo 2-53**: Tree hole created by the removal of a tree. These are frequently found on early sites.

**Photo 2-54**: North-south linear trench with post holes at either end, phasing uncertain but possibly Phase 3.

**Photo 2-55**: Stone structure, possibly a stone storage pit.
2.4.6  Phase 4: Building and Occupation of Brislington c. 1821–1947

2.4.6.1  Phase 4.1: Building Brislington, 1819-1821
There is limited archaeological evidence associated with this phase. Brislington the building is still extant and the only other structural remains possibly belonging to this phase are the stable’s cobble floor and part of a wall footing (Photo 2-56). A series of structures were described in the 1825 sale notice in the Sydney Gazette: kitchen and pantry, four-stall stable and coach house, and well. No remains of the well were found and it may have been back further to the north in the area of the 1970s basement. It is possible that the pantry was the sub-surface stone storage structure placed in Phase 3 but this is unclear. No evidence for the kitchen was found but this may have been removed during construction for the 1970s hospital building.

Brislington was built near the northwest corner of George and Marsden Streets, to the east of where we predicted the footprint of the convict hut should survive. It is presumed that until Brislington was completed c. 1821 the hut continued to be occupied and was not demolished until after Brislington was liveable.

2.4.6.2  Phase 4.2: Occupying Brislington c. 1821-1857
The first part of this period 1821-1849 is associated with the ownership and occupation by John Hodges and his convict servants. By 1852 Brislington was occupied by Dr Robinson which then begins the long-term association of this site with the medical profession. There are a series of features that are likely to be associated with this occupation and then some other features that cannot be clearly placed in this phase until further work has been done on the artefacts.

One of the most important features found on Lot 98 was a pit containing the Wellington Jug. Additional research undertaken since the jug was found indicates that it could not have been made prior to c. 1820 and probably not after c. 1830, therefore connecting it, most likely, to John Hodges occupation of the site and to his ownership. This pit also contained considerable remains of at least four other lead-glazed vessels and some other artefacts which should help clarify the time of deposition (Photo 2-59). There are a series of pits in the northwest corner of the property but they may date to phase 4.2 or the first half of phase 4.3 (Photo 2-60).

The absence of any substantial remains is surprising. It is likely that there are remains to the south of the Trial Courts footprint immediately behind the convict hut. Other remains may have been within the footprint of the 1970s hospital basement which would have removed them. No remains of a well...
or obvious cesspits were found within this property, though a cesspit found within the eastern part Blood Bank area (Stage 2b) may be found to be the cesspit associated with this property. There are remains of features and deposits that are considered to belong to the second-half of the nineteenth century and probably associated with the Brown family of doctors rather than with this stage.

The Wellington Jug

The Wellington Jug has now been glued and the larger holes have been filled (Photo 2-57). The jug is a biochrome-coloured jug with pale yellow slip, dark red colouring on the neck and upper handle, and interior yellow lead-glaze with impressed rouletting around the neck (Photo 2-58). The jug is made from fine white clay and has three portrait medals on three faces, each with encircling victory wreaths. The jug is unevenly fired and has ‘New South Wales’ inscribed in handwriting on the base and is considered to be locally made, presumably in the Brickfields in the Sydney CBD. The three portrait medals represent Britannia, the Marquis of Wellesley and the Duke of Wellington. For this preliminary report some additional research has been done so the dating of the jug can be clarified to allow for possible associations with the known residents of Brislington and probable convict potters who may have been responsible for its manufacture.

There are three portrait medals on three faces of the jug: Britannia is in the centre with the two Wellesley brothers on either side (Photo 2-58). The original date of the striking of the Marquis of Wellesley medal appears to be c. 1820 and therefore the pottery copy and the making of this jug cannot date before c. 1820 and probably within a period of 10 years of that date but also possibly later. While there were many different types of medals made to commemorate the Duke of Wellington’s victories during the Peninsular Wars there was only one medal made to commemorate the Marquis of Wellesley’s victory in India at the Capture of Seringapatam, 1799 and it was struck c. 1820.36

Photo 2-57: Wellington Jug before and after infilling. This side has the Duke of Wellington medal.

Photo 2-58: Details of medals on the Wellington Jug: Marquis of Wellesley (right) Britannia (upper left) and the Duke of Wellington (lower left). Below is the base of the jug inscribed with ‘New South Wales’.

Figure 2-24: Medal struck to commemorate the Battle of Talavera, 1809. This medal has a group of three flaws from the original die from which the medal was struck. The flaws, on the right side, are visible as faint lines on the pottery portrait medal. The medal struck to commemorate the Battle of Vittoria has only one of these lines. Eimer 1994:18.
The Duke of Wellington’s portrait medal is by Donadio which is visible beneath the portrait. The sculptor’s correct name was Donadio but he occasionally signed ‘DONNADIO’.

There are two medals by Donadio with this bust of the duke, one for the Battle of Talavera, 1809 and another for the Battle of Vittoria, 1813. The medal shows the duke in the uniform of a field-marshal with a Garter sash on the left shoulder and wearing the neck badge of the Golden Fleece. The die from which the medal for the Battle of Talavera was struck had three flaw lines on the right side which are also faintly visible on the copy on the jug (Fig. 2-24, Photo 2-58). The medal from the Battle of Vittoria has only one of these lines. It is considered likely that the pottery medal on the jug was made from cast taken of the Battle of Talavera medal. The majority of medals of the duke depict him in profile but there are also representations of the Duke of Wellington as a figure with standards or astride a horse.

The jug’s central portrait medal is the goddess Britannia, the female personification of Britain and a representation of British victory and empire. It is one of many representations of Britannia found on nineteenth-century British coins and occasionally medals. The Britannia on the jug has a Corinthian helmet, and is possibly cast from a medal made to commemorate Wellington’s victory at the Battle of Toulouse, 1813. Most representations of Britannia show her seated on a throne with victory standards and/or other attributes.

The process of turning metal medals into clay portrait medals would require the making of a mould, possibly in wax or clay and then the production of the clay portrait. As noted above there were other types of medals to choose. The choice of the portrait medals probably indicates that they were easier to mould. Also it may have been a choice based on preferences for portraits and their availability. The clay portraits are extremely well produced and it would be surprising after the success of this casting that no further ones were produced, unless of course this was a specific commission.

Now that the date of the manufacture of the jug appears to be between c. 1820 and c. 1830, it is likely to have belonged to John Hodges and was probably thrown into the rubbish pit no later than c. 1849 at the time of Hodges death. The two most likely potters for this date rang are John Moreton and Leak who both arrived in NSW as convicts on The Recovery in 1819. The historical background on Hodges above and other work by Terry Kass (Appendix 3) sheds an interesting light on this very patriotic jug which commemorates British victories in Europe and India. Hodges was an emancipated convict who was frequently in trouble with the law and provided short-term loans to people for which, when they were not paid back, he sought the legal remedy of claiming their property as compensation. It is possible that he acquired the jug through such a process if he did not commission it himself.

Considerable additional research needs to be done before any firm conclusions can be reached about the manufacturing and ownership of the jug. It is an exceptional piece of locally-made pottery and possibly unique in terms of pottery manufactured by a convict potter although the very fine Moreton plaque does convey similar high quality abilities with casting and moulding of relief pottery (Figs 2-25, 2-26). Both these items radically challenges current perceptions on early pottery manufacturing which is typically perceived to produce utilitarian wares rather than higher quality commemorative or other relief pottery.

42 Eimer 1994:37.
Figure 2-25: Moreton Plaque, King George V Recreation site, the Rocks.

Figure 2-26: Stamp of ‘I. MORETON & SONS / POTTERS/ New South Wales’ Plaque, King George V Recreation site, the Rocks. The ‘New South Wales’ is similar to but not the same on the base of the Wellington Jug.

Photo 2-59: Early locally-made vessels found in association with the Wellington Jug.
2.4.6.3 Phase 4.3: Occupying Brislington, Brown Family, 1857-1947
There were a series of garden features including a section of paving in the shape of a quarter of a circle, post holes, the reuse of the stone storage pit (?) when it was lined with heart and diamond bricks and rendered and connected to a circular brick feature which was also lined (Photos 2-55, 2-61 to 2-64). A terracotta service pipe appears to have fed water into this feature, possibly from the house. The circular feature which initially we thought would be a well was found to be no deeper than 1.5m.

Photo 2-60: Northwest corner of Lot 98 where a series of rubbish pits were found. Scale 1m

Photo 2-61: Lot 98 and Brislington following completion of excavation. Note the test holes for Aboriginal archaeology throughout the area.
Photo 2-62: Most of the historical remains associated with Lot 98 were found in the central area, immediately west of Brislington, near the western fence line between Brislington and the house on the western half of the property (Fig. 2-15).

Photo 2-63: Water storage structure which reused the earlier stone storage pit. The service trench on the left had a pipe that fed water into the structure. Diamond and heart frog bricks are visible in the upper courses. Scale 1m
While it initially it was thought the circular structure would be a well it quickly bottomed out in natural clay. Scale 0.5m

The post holes in this area provided limited evidence for a timber structure, possibly a timber garden trellis or other similar structure. Scale 0.5m

The post holes did not define a regular structure and are interpreted as belonging to a garden structure. The rebuilt brick and stone structure is considered to have been some type of water storage feature, though it would not have contained as much water as a beehive cistern, possibly for providing additional water for maintaining a garden.

The other main features belonging to this phase are likely to be the rubbish pits found in the northeast corner of the site (Photo 2-60) but the accurate phasing of these pits depends on further analysis of the artefacts.

2.4.7 Phase 5: Twentieth-century Hospital uses of Brislington, 1951–2006

During the initial stages of this phase of use Brislington was used as nurses’ accommodation. During the phase 4 various additions were built to augment the accommodation at Brislington and these continued to be occupied until the 1970s when they were demolished back to the original structure. The Accident and Emergency building, demolished in June 2006, was constructed and this would have impacted on any surviving archaeology in the eastern half of Lot 98 to the rear of the house.
3.0 Results & Recommendations

3.1 Results of the Stage 2c Archaeological Program
The Stage 2c archaeological investigation has revealed substantive and extensive remains of the 2nd hospital (1792-1818) and the courtyard and outbuildings associated with the convict phase of the 3rd hospital (1818-1844) as well as considerable remains of the hospital boundary wall and further evidence associated with the later nineteenth-century alterations. In addition, remains of a second timber structure associated with the Marsden Street convict hut and the nineteenth-century occupation of Brislington were found. The main archaeological features found during Stage 2c were:

Second Hospital
- The western end of the southern hospital ward, 6m wide (Photos 2-1, 2-4). This included:
  - Small room at the western end which is the internal width of the hospital, 4.6m by 2.15m.
  - associated clay and roofing tile surface
  - possible post holes indicating a skillion/verandah along the southern side of the ward.
- Evidence for the eastern end of the southern ward indicated the building was approximately 25m long.
- A box drain partially dismantled when a storage cellar was built. The remains of the cellar were 3.9m by 1.3m and up to 0.5m high. The cellar was backfilled with a deposit likely to date to c. 1818 with approximately eight near-completed lead-glazed vessels dropped into the backfill (Photos 2-10, 2-11).
- Infants‘ burial, the burial contained two skeletons oriented east-west in a shallow burial (Photos 2-9).

Marsden Street Convict Hut
- A timber structure which was probably an additional building to the north of the convict hut.

Third Hospital
Other 3rd hospital remains found during this stage were:
- Well (Photo 2-17).
- Water cistern (Photo 2-18), phasing uncertain.
- Eastern brick cesspit/privy (Photo 2-19).
- Robbed trenches of the eastern kitchen/dead room outbuilding (Photo 2-20).
- Some remains of other structures/drains (Photo 2-21).
- Southern part of western privy and cesspool (Photo 2-22).
- Drain adjacent to the western privy and cesspool (Photo 2-24).
- Section of brick drain running westwards to the creek line which is part of the circular drain found during Stage 1 and further to the west (Photo 2-25).
- Section of stone box drain running from the 1818 laundry to connect into the brick drain (Photo 2-25, 2-26, 2-27).
- Pit containing amputated hand, animal bones, smoking pipes and bone-stopper shaped like a fist (Photos 2-28 to 2-32).

Phase 5: 1840s Upgrading for the District Hospital (1844–1878)
- Hospital boundary wall (Photos 2-33 to 2-42).
- Amendments to the 1818 privies (Photo 2-22).

Phase 6: Rebuilding of the kitchen/laundry block, operating theatre, southern road, 1879–1902
- Southern road (Photos 2-45, 2-46).
- 1879 toilets (Photos 2-44).
Brislington, Lot 98
- Wellington Jug and associated locally-made artefacts (Photos 2-57).
- Limited evidence for uses associated with convict period.
- Evidence for the garden and outbuildings (Photo 2-62 to 2-64).

3.2 Top Ten Discoveries
The most significant archaeological remains and evidence recovered from Stages 1, 2b and 2c of the PJP archaeological program are, in a general order of importance but not precedence:

1. Remains of the 2nd hospital.
2. Footings of the 1818 colonial hospital.
3. Remains of the 3rd hospital: privies, courtyard, artefacts, fences, etc.
4. Infants’ Burial.
5. Wellington Jug.
7. Marsden Street convict hut and outbuilding.
8. Bone button manufacturing and part of leg iron.
9. The boundary wall and associated 1840s alteration and how they assist us to understand changing colonial practices from a convict to a completely free colony.
10. Lead-glazed pottery from 2nd hospital and Brislington.

There is a lot of artefactual evidence which we have not yet had time to address and these may in time turn out to be more significant than we currently realise. This list contains the most ‘important’ evidence from my perspective and reflects my personal and professional biases although I do not think other archaeologists would necessarily produce a different type of list, perhaps just a different order.

These items should be included within the interpretation strategy within the Heritage Courtyard.
4.0 Interpretation Opportunities

4.1 General Issues
This discussion incorporates issues already identified in the Stage 1 preliminary report as well as new issues arising from the Stage 2c archaeological program. The sections from the Stage 1 report, where they have remained unchanged, are italicised while new comments are not italicised.

Challenges
- How to make the various and apparently disparate elements of this place read as an evolving colonial landscape which incorporates the place within the context of the wider landscape of colonial Parramatta? How does it address the river and other contemporary buildings that survive in Parramatta?
- How do we produce an interpretation strategy that engages the public and assists them in exploring the archaeology, landscape and place in an exciting and innovative way to engage with the new meaning we will give this place?
- An important challenge is not to fall into the trap of using the clichés of Australian history. Rather we need to contest them within this colonial landscape.
- How to use the results of the archaeological program as the core of the interpretation strategy, both the archaeological fabric and the new perspectives on our convict/colonial history that arise from the archaeological program.
- The means by which the 2nd and 3rd hospitals are interpreted within the landscape of the Heritage Courtyard, the differences between them clarified, and expressed in a way which engages the imagination of the public.
- Using the 1844 boundary wall and any reconstruction as a strong symbol of both the edges of the 2nd and 3rd hospitals and its landscape from 1792 to 1844 and as an expression of the changes made in the colony with the cessation of convict transportation.
- How to incorporate the archaeology and history of Brislington within the overall Precinct interpretation, notably the Wellington Jug and the complicated history of John Hodges, emancipated convict. Hodges, like Landrin at PCC, contested the nature and bounds of colonial law. Both used the acquisition of leasehold titles of property in Parramatta as a means of accruing wealth but they also had different means of realising this outcome. Both contested the strictures of colonial law in interesting ways. How do you express this within a justice precinct?
- How to incorporate the artefacts from the site in a meaningful way to engage the public and enlighten the past? Artefacts are not just illustrative of certain actions or processes – they are the material expression of how people lived in society and culture. The building footings tell us more about the structure of society and culture and the artefacts can tell us about people in society: how they lived within the society, the ideas that influenced them, the choices they made, what they valued and how they saw themselves as participants within this society or about the absence of freedom and choice. They are a material expression of people, both as an individual and as part of the wider community.
- How to sensitively include the infant burials within the interpretation program. These are extremely significant and need to be interpreted. This is a sensitive topic which hopefully we will further understand once the analysis of the babies is completed.

4.2 Suggested Interpretative Methods

Suggested Methods
- A way of creating links, both visual and physical within the landscape would be to use large see-through panels as interpretative elements within the landscape/courtyard. These could be etched with images, people and archaeological elements. By being see-through it allows for the appreciation of the landscape, connection between buildings and associated vistas. These should be located at appropriate spaces to assist with the public’s understanding of the place. The text
on these panels should be written in such a way as to provide keys and clues as to what might be found on other panels.

- Using outlines of the buildings and structural elements within the landscape. This allows for the public to understand the nature of the hidden remains. Do not make them as obscure as those used at the Museum of Sydney. Some could even be representational mosaics within the pavements.

4.3 Products from the Archaeological Program which can assist the Public Interpretation Program

The archaeological program will produce an overall excavation report that will include various media that can assist with the interpretation program.

Images and reporting include:

- Extensive digital photo record.
- Scale drawing of all the archaeological remains.
- Drawings of artefacts, small items and early pottery.
- Conservation of important artefacts.
- Additional site history relating specifically to the requirements of the archaeological program.
- Artefact reports on building materials, miscellaneous, glass and ceramics.
- Pollen analysis and images to assist with interpretation of the pre-European landscape and the planting of exotics within the post-1788 landscape. Such images were used at the Conservatorium of Music Site to great effect and help to create links between the archaeology and the landscape.
- Detailed excavation report and synthesis of the results of the archaeological program and a response to the research questions.

A more substantive outcomes would be the interpretation of the meaning of the archaeological site which addresses the various research questions outlined in the Excavation Permit Application for the site and also draws on the analysis undertaken for Mary Casey’s doctoral thesis, which while specifically addressing the significance of the landscape of the original Sydney Domain also developed an understanding and interpretation of the Macquaires’ colonial landscape of Parramatta. The Parramatta landscape is in many ways a companion landscape to the Sydney Domain as they are both iconic landscapes whose images define how we visualise colonial New South Wales. The use of older architectural styles at Parramatta – Palladianism – is seen as part of trying to implant more traditional styles of architecture into a new country with no traditional architecture and make it appear long settled by its new residents. This has the effect of creating a physical environment that free settlers would see as another part of their British home as well as make it appear to foreign visitors that the eastern part of the continent had not only been claimed by the British but was also now clearly settled. This therefore made other claims to the east coast of Australia impossible under international treaties.43 Such a settlement required the dispossession of the early inhabitants who needed to be portrayed as ‘uncivilised’ for the legitimation of this wholesale claiming.

43 Casey, Mary 2002 Remaking the Government Domain 1788-1821: Landscape, Archaeology and Meaning, PhD thesis, Department of Prehistoric and Historical Archaeology, University of Sydney.
5.0 Research Questions for the Archaeological Program

5.1 Research Questions Submitted in March 2005

The Parramatta Convict Hospitals and Health Care for Convicts

- Nature and evidence of the early buildings.
  - type of building material used and how it fits into current understandings of early building technology.
  - evidence for the construction materials used in the First Hospital.
  - relationship between the actual evidence for the First and Second Hospitals and how this fits with historical evidence and our current understanding of the evolution of the Colonial Hospital complex.

- Nature and evidence for early medical practices and standards at the hospital as revealed through artefacts, spatial relationships within and between structures and how this informs our understanding of colonial society and the struggle for survival during the early settlement.

- Was there a hospital garden to provide medicinal herbs and vegetables for feeding the convicts?

- Nature of the evidence for the accommodation of the convicts, how they were controlled and managed within the hospital space.
  - Evidence for convicts’ resistance to the types of controls to which they may have been subject while at the hospital.

- Contrasts presented by the convict and surgeon’s accommodation and access to material goods.

- How does the colonial hospital design relate to other known Watts’ hospitals and other contemporary colonial hospitals and institutions?

- How does the hospital, its design, construction and landscaping fit in with Governor Macquarie’s building program for Parramatta specifically and the colony generally?

- Other relevant questions that may arise out of further research or as a result of discoveries on site.

Convict and Free Life in Colonial Parramatta

- What differences were there between the lives of free or forced or institutionalised settlers?

- How did the deprivations of a frontier life alter the way in which free people lived in early colonial Parramatta?

- Nature of early agricultural practices, evidence for dairying etc. Address this issue through both the analysis of archaeological features as well as through analysis of early pottery and pollen samples.

- How does the evidence for the Brown family of doctors relate to the medical evidence found at the Colonial Hospital and archaeological evidence associated with other families/houses within the site?

Pottery was manufactured in Sydney and probably in Parramatta. It is typically found on early Parramatta sites where it is frequently unglazed. Our understanding of this pottery is fairly limited to

\[44\] I have drawn on some of the more relevant questions in PHALMS 2000 Figure 6.4, p. 167-175. Please note there are a number of important research areas which this research framework has not engaged with, such as constructions of gender identities, frontier theory, resistance to authority, the nature of early pottery and its relation to domestic site activities and early pottery manufacture. The research design uses the term ‘reflect’ in a number of cases. The view of archaeology as a ‘reflection’ of life is old-fashioned and refuted by current attitudes where material culture is seen as reflexive and therefore is both constructed by and constructive of life, society and culture rather than just a simple reflection.
date. Recent work by Mary Casey on the analysis of early pottery in Sydney (DMR site, Palmer’s bakehouse at the Conservatorium of Music) has considerably added to our understanding of the type of forms manufactured and used at specialist sites but we know very little about pottery at Parramatta, its manufacture and the forms and their uses. The work at sites in Parramatta, notably George & Charles Streets and the Parramatta Children’s Court site, has considerably added to our understanding of early pottery. This work has been catalogued and analysed since the original writing of this research design.\footnote{Casey & Lowe 2006a.}

- Consumption and commerce in colonial Parramatta:
  - How does it link into issues associated with local, regional and global economies?
  - What does it tell us about cultural and social practices in colonial Parramatta, relating to lifeways, diet and other issues associated with consumption?
  - How do patterns of consumption further our understanding of how early residents of Parramatta used material culture in the construction of personal and group identity?

These questions relate to the site where there may be evidence associated with convict huts and their late occupation by leaseholders but also relates to Parramatta-wide research issues.

**Landscape of Colonial Parramatta**

- How does the evidence from this site feed into the current perceptions of the convict-period landscape of Parramatta? Other issues to be considered are resistance to the way in which control manifested itself in the landscape and in daily life. Issues of power are central to the expression of landscapes of control.
- Nature and effect of modification of the pre-European landscape.
- Evidence for the pre-European landscape.
- Remaking of the landscape, the social cultural and political context and how it was manifest in this landscape.\footnote{This general topic was the focus of Mary Casey’s PhD thesis but in relation to the Sydney Domain (Casey 2002).} Are many of the same issues influencing the way in which the landscape was formed similar to those which affected the Sydney Domain?
- How does this site relate to the Parramatta Domain and the interaction between these landscapes and people who may have worked in the Domain such as cooper Anthony Landrin who resided within the study area and was known to work at the Government Cooperage and Samuel Larkin who was a government clerk, initially with two governors then with the Commissariat and Government Store?
- Order and amenity: is the layout of houses and other structures the result of cultural and social practices?  What was the role of these practices in changing the landscape and modifying people’s behaviour?\footnote{Some of these issues were the focus of analysis in Casey 2002.}

**Life in the Various Households within house sites**

- The range and variation apparent within the households where a range of families resided.
- Evidence for the nature of childhood and the way in which gender identities were constructed.
- The nature of the material culture and consumption patterns of the various households; how these remains related to the transformation of their environment from rural town and to an urban place.

\footnote{Casey 1999; Casey & Lowe 2002.}

\footnote{Casey & Lowe 2006a.}
• Evidence for economic differences present within the houses and how these might be represented within the archaeological evidence.
• Layout of the house and outbuildings and how this structured life in these households.
• Is there evidence for customary patterns (buildings, food, religious practice, cultural artefacts)?
• How was material culture used to represent personal and/or group identity?

It should be noted that the archaeological evidence may provide us with a range of information we are not expecting and the research questions are likely to evolve depending upon the type of evidence and artefacts found at the site.

5.2 New Research Questions Based on the Results of the Archaeological Program
As a result of writing this preliminary report two new research questions have been identified. It is likely that more questions will be identified following the artefact cataloguing and analysis and the writing of the excavation report. These new research questions are:

5.2.1 Locally-Made Pottery, Bricks & Tiles

Wellington Jug
The discovery of the Wellington Jug, in association with the Moreton Plaque, and the Moreton Water Jug in the Albury Pottery Museum, considerably add to our knowledge of ‘fine’ locally-made pottery, dating prior to 1830. The Wellington Jug is a high-quality vessel fired in an inadequate kiln that produced an uneven firing. This contrasts with the high level of skill in evidence in the manufacture of both the jug and the portrait medals. How does this jug and the analysis of its fabric (which has been completed) alter our perceptions of early pottery manufacture, the skills of the potters, and the type of market for which they were producing goods? What type of people was this commemorative vessel designed for? Highly patriotic colonialists or emancipated convicts trying to present an appearance of allegiance to British power and empire, perhaps a former convict made good who could afford the trappings of British identity? What does it tell us about the likely owner, John Hodges and the contrasting ideologies presented by his background, his continued flouting of colonial law once free and this highly patriotic jug with its representation of British heroes in Europe and India?

The choices made in the design of this jug represent a series of technological achievements in terms of making moulds of the medals and the successful production of such fine portrait medals.

How does the petrological analysis of the locally-made pottery, bricks and tiles augment our understanding of what vessels were locally made or imported?
Comparison of different ceramic and clay bodies should augment our understanding of locally-made pottery and brick manufacturing and help understand if our identification of locally-made ceramics is likely to be accurate.

5.2.2 End of Convict Transportation – the evidence of the hospital boundary wall and other remains
The rebuilding of the timber fence with a wall in stone after the cessation of convict transportation (1841) and the discontinuation of convict-associated uses suggests an odd juxtaposition of actions. Even though there was no longer any need to constrain convicts within the boundaries of the hospital, a high and more secure wall was built. As there was no requirement to protect the community from the convict patients within the hospital then this wall represents a changing set of social priorities and a shift in colonial thinking associated with the change from being a penal colony to a free colony. If this is the case then there should be other evidence for this changing practice at this site and at other government sites in Sydney and elsewhere.
What was this new thinking? Was it about a proud expression of no longer being part of the penal system and no longer retaining that link to the penal colony as a dumping ground for the dregs of Britain? Was the wall designed as part of a new system of infrastructure for the developing free colony within its new system of self-government? Was it about marking the difference in the public mind between the changing functions of the old convict hospital and the new public hospital? Or all of the above and for other purposes as well? These issues will be further addressed in the final archaeological report where a new research question will be developed to address this important change in the history of colonial New South Wales.
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Appendix 1: S60 Permit Conditions
APPENDIX 1: S60 Permit Conditions

RE: Parramatta District Hospital (SHR number 00828) Marsden, George and O'Connell Streets Parramatta and Brislington, No. 10 George Street, Parramatta (SHR number 00059)
Proposal: Archaeological investigations for the new Justice Precinct.
S60 Application no. 2005/S60/027, received on 07 March 2005
Information received with application: Casey and Lowe Pty Ltd, ‘Excavation Permit Application Parramatta Hospital Site, Marsden Street, Parramatta’ for Department of Commerce, March 2005.
Additional information requested: not applicable
Date additional information received: not applicable
Date submissions received: not applicable

As delegate of the NSW Heritage Council, I have considered the above application. Pursuant to Section 63 of the NSW Heritage Act 1977, the Heritage Council hereby informs Mr Gary Fitzhenry that approval is granted subject to the following conditions:

1. All works shall be in accordance with the methodology outlined in the S60 Excavation Permit Application number 2005/S160/027 and supporting documents, in particular the ‘Excavation Permit Application Parramatta Hospital Site, Marsden Street, Parramatta’ for Department of Commerce, March 2005 prepared by Casey and Lowe Pty Ltd, except as amended by the following conditions:

2. This permit is issued for archaeological investigations associated with the redevelopment of the site as a Justice Precinct. This will involve a two stage strategy as indicated in the report ‘Excavation Permit Application Parramatta Hospital Site, Marsden Street, Parramatta’ for Department of Commerce, March 2005. The investigations will involve archaeological testing across the site to assess the accuracy of the 2003 Conservation Management Plan; full exposure of the footings of the Colonial Hospital; the archaeological excavation of associated deposits, sites and features from the Colonial Hospital era (1789-1848) as required; archaeological monitoring and salvage excavation as required.

3. This archaeological approval does not cover the removal of any State significant relics which should remain available for possible in-situ conservation and display at the completion of the archaeological work. No removal of State significant archaeological features or structural evidence is permitted under this permit without further consultation with the Heritage Office. If the removal of State significant elements is proposed additional approval under either S60 or S65A of the NSW Heritage Act, 1977, may be required.

4. The Applicant must ensure that the Heritage Office is informed in writing of the start of the on site archaeological fieldwork at least five (5) days prior to its commencement and, that the Heritage Office is informed of the end of the on site fieldwork within five (5) days of its completion.

5. The Heritage Council and the Heritage Office reserve the right to inspect the site and records at all times and access any relics recovered from the site.

6. The Applicant must ensure that if any additional substantial intact archaeological deposits and/or State significant relics not already identified in the Application for S60 Excavation Permit number 2005/S60/027 are discovered, work must cease immediately in the affected area(s) and the Heritage Office must be contacted for advice. Additional assessment and
approval may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery. This includes in particular, the potential remains of huts along the Marsden Street frontage of the site if these are to be impacted by future works for the proposed Commercial Building or the access road to Jeffrey House.

7. The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director, Dr Mary Casey, or in her absence the Co-Director Mr Tony Lowe, carries out the excavation work. Under the supervision of the approved Excavation Directors, the work is to be completed in accordance with the methodology outlined in the S60 Application number 2005/S60/027, dated March 2005.

8. The Director of the Heritage Office must approve any substantial deviations from the approved research design (including extent and techniques of excavations) as an application for the variation of the permit under Section 65A of the NSW Heritage Act, 1977. If substantial variations are proposed a new application under S60 may be required.

9. If the nominated Excavation Directors will be absent from the site, the Applicant must forward for the approval of the Director of the Heritage Office the details of the Site Director in charge, including a current C.V. The Site Director must be a qualified archaeologist, and must meet the current Excavation Director Criteria for State significant sites as published by the NSW Heritage Council.

10. The Applicant must ensure that the Excavation Director takes adequate steps to record to scale and in detail relics, structures and features discovered on the site during the archaeological works in accordance with the approved research design and current best practice guidelines. This work must be undertaken in accordance with the Heritage Office guidelines, How to Prepare Archival Records of Heritage Items” (1998) and "Guidelines for Photographic Recording of Heritage Items (2004). Photography must include archivally stable formats including black and white photographic prints and colour slides.

11. The Applicant must ensure that during the period of excavation, the site is made secure and that artefacts, structures and features are not subject to deterioration, damage or destruction, during the fieldwork.

12. Throughout the archaeological excavation works the Applicant must ensure that:

   a. Appropriate signage to explain the history of the site and the archaeological programme is placed at the site during any archaeological excavation. This signage must be placed from the first week of the archaeological works on the site.

   b. A local public information programme is implemented including press releases to ensure the public is informed about the project and its outcomes.

   c. Free public brochures are available on the site for the public to collect. These public brochures must be available from the first week of the archaeological works on the site.

   d. The site is fenced in a way that allows the public to view the archaeological remains and works whenever possible.

   e. Volunteers are used where possible to assist with the archaeological works.

   f. The services of a conservator are utilised for conservation of significant artefacts and structural items or features as necessary.

13. The Applicant must ensure that at least two Public Open Days are conducted on the site, during each stage of the work. The Public Open Day(s) should be
carried out in a day during the weekend to facilitate public attendance and should be advertised at least one week ahead. Details of the proposed Public Open Day(s) during the excavation program must be discussed with the NSW Heritage Office once the archaeological findings are known, should be submitted for the approval of the Director of the Heritage Office.

14. The Applicant must ensure that local historical societies and other relevant cultural organisations are formally notified and invited to the Public Open Day(s).

15. The Applicant is responsible for the safe-keeping of all relics recovered from the site, during and after fieldwork. Adequate security measures shall be maintained until such time as a repository for relics is identified and approved by the Director, NSW Heritage Office.

16. The Applicant must ensure that the nominated Excavation Director cleans, stabilises, identifies, labels, catalogues and stores any artefacts uncovered from the site in a way that allows them to be retrieved according to both type and provenance.

17. A weekly report on the results must be submitted to the Director, Heritage Office as the archaeological fieldwork proceeds, in order that the results of the work may be used to inform future discussions about the salvage, conservation and display of the structural elements and relics within the site.

18. After the completion of the archaeological fieldwork the previously prepared ‘Draft Interpretation Strategy and Plan’ prepared by Conybeare Morrison (CM+) dated March 2005 should be revised to incorporate the findings from the archaeological works. An updated strategy and final Interpretation Plan should be submitted for the approval of the Director, Heritage Office.

19. Written advice must be received from the Director, Heritage Office, that the proposed treatment of the site and relics is acceptable before any bulk excavation or construction work is commenced for any new buildings.

20. The Applicant must ensure that the final report is prepared by the nominated Excavation Director, to publication standard, within one (1) year of the completion of the field based archaeological activity unless an extension of time is approved by the Heritage Council of NSW. Two hard copies and one electronic copy of this report must be submitted to the NSW Heritage Office. A further copy must be lodged in the local library, heritage centre or another appropriate local repository in the Parramatta City Council area.

21. The Heritage Council of NSW requires that the final report shall include:
   a. An executive summary;
   b. Due credit to the client paying for the excavation on the title page;
   c. An accurate site location and site plan;
   d. Historical research, references, and bibliography. The historical research should be formulated to provide an insight into the social and cultural context for the exposed structural remains and associated artefacts;
   e. Detailed information on the excavation including the aim, context of the excavation, procedures, analysis, treatment of artefacts (cleaning, conserving, sorting, cataloguing, labelling, scale drawings, photographs, repository);
   f. Nominated repository for the items;
   g. Detailed response to research questions; and
   h. Details of how information about this excavation has been publicly disseminated.

22. The Aboriginal relics present at the site, must be managed in accordance with advice from the Department of Environment and Conservation and in
accordance with a permit under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974.

CONTACT NUMBERS FOR THE NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION: Hurstville (02) 9585
6453 (in Head Office); Parramatta (02) 9895 7420.

23. The Applicant must ensure that any excavation which has revealed Aboriginal
objects should be referred to the Aboriginal Liaison Officer at the NSW
Heritage Office (Ph.: 02 9873 8500) as well as to the National Parks and Wildlife
Division of the Department of Environment and Conservation.

24. This approval shall be void if the activity to which it refers is not physically
commenced within five years after the date of the approval or within the
period of consent specified in the relevant development consent granted
under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, whichever
occurs first.

The above conditions have been imposed to ensure compatibility of the proposed work with
the existing heritage qualities of the item and to ensure consistency with the Environmental
Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. Your attention is drawn to the right of appeal against
these conditions.

It should be noted that an approval under the Heritage Act is additional to that which may be
required from other Local Government and State Government Authorities. If you have any
questions regarding the above matter please contact Siobhan Lavelle at the Heritage Office
on (02) 9873 8546.

Yours sincerely

Director
NSW HERITAGE OFFICE

cc.. Parramatta City Council, PO Box 32, Parramatta NSW 2124
Dr Mary Casey, 420 Marrickville Road, Marrickville NSW 2204
Appendix 2: Bricks from the 2nd and 3rd hospitals
PARRAMATTA HOSPITAL SITE, MARSDEN STREET 2006

Brick measurements

Note range, average and discussion based on more examples measured than listed below.

1818 Hospital, E Verandah Footing

Range: 200-218 x 93-111 x 64-70mm
Average: 208 x 102 x 68mm
Examples: 200 x 93 x 64; 209 x 111 x 70; 218 x 101 x 65mm

1792 South Wall, Context 6221

Range: 209-226 x 102-113 x 60-72mm
Average: East end 219 x 198 x 66mm; West end 215 x 107 x 67mm
Total 217 x 108 x 67mm
Examples: East end 215 x 105 x 68; 218 x 107 x 60; 226 x 113 x (hidden) mm
West end 209 x 104 x 72; 209 x 110 x 71; 218 x 102 x 62mm
*The one large example 226mm in length and one small example 209m in length appear to
be an aberration, with high teens to a max of 220mm more common.

Box Drain, Context 6324

Range: 224-233 x 109-115 x 60-70mm
Average: 230 x 112 x 66mm
Examples: 224 x 112 x 65; 231 x 111 x 68; 233 x 112 x 63mm
*The one small example 224mm in length, appears to be an aberration, with 5 others 229mm
in length or above.

Storage Cellar, Context 6330

Range: 216-240 x 100-122 x 60-77mm
Average: 228 x 113 x 69mm
Examples: 216 x 98 x 68; 230 x 114-115 x 67-70; 233 x 117 x 72; 240 x 118 x 77mm
*Only 5 out of 13 examples were below 229mm in length.

Barrel Drain, Context 6328

Range: 205-225 x 93-104 x 63-75
Average: 213 x 99 x 68mm
Examples: 205 x 98 x 68; 210 x 97-102 x 63-66; 223 x 93 x 72mm

Box Drain, in section south of cesspool, Context “6328”

Examples: red: ? x 102 x 74; ? x 105 x 72; orange/red: ? x 102 x 75mm

Anita’s bricks, possible drain?

Examples: 203 x 100? x ?; 210 x 100? x ? mm
*To measure as obscured by damage to bricks and their angle in the soil.
General Observations (before brick cleaning) by Context

6221: Many made of generally darker orange/red bricks, but due to soil conditions these were wetter than bricks in most of the other contexts so observed colour may be invalid. NB Couldn’t see profile of bricks as still in situ.

Use of half and broken bricks, particularly in 2nd and upper irregular coursing.

No mortar.

6328: Made of range of pale orange to dark orange/red bricks. All seen have moderately well crushed and mixed clays, fairly homogenous orange/red sandy with common small white clay lumps, rare small ironstones. Width of bricks less than those measured elsewhere.

Use of whole bricks, not halves, stretcher-laid only.

No mortar in lower half of structure but 2 types of sandy mortar with common crushed shell in upper half. The light grey is only evident on the mid north side, the brown to the west of the connecting sandstone drain on the north side and to the east of it on the south side. Mortar used during possible repair/change to structure or just in different batches to secure the upper half of the drain.

6324 Made of generally pale to mid orange/red sandy bricks that appear to be generally darker and whole in lower courses (wetter?). The bricks almost always longer than seen in other structures except for 6330.

Use of many half and broken bricks in 2nd and upper coursing. This may be for strength with header coursing, for levelling, or because it was OK to use poor quality bricks.

Use of under-fired cream/white bricks, many are broken, in upper coursing.

Mud mortar of redeposited khaki/grey subsoil, a fine clayey-sandy-silt with occasional flecks of charcoal and ironstone.

6330 As 6324 but less cream/white bricks. More courses with whole bricks, need for more accurate brickwork as walls to be higher?

Reuse of bricks from 6424.

Mud mortar as 6324.

In all these structures, EXCEPT 6328, the majority of the bricks are low to medium fired and a fairly homogenous orange/red sandy, with moderately well crushed and mixed clays, common small white clay lumps and rare small ironstones. However, a minority of the bricks are made of more poorly crushed and mixed red and white clays, containing common larger ironstone fragments. These latter bricks tend to crumble easily and are now usually found damaged. None of the poorly mixed bricks were found during the surface examination of the Barrel Drain 6328, but some may be evident once the structure is dismantled.

All bricks are soft, being unevenly and low-medium fired. The occasional darker red brick would have been higher fired, and generally more desirable for below ground construction as they let in less moisture and are thus more hardy. The waterlogged ground of this part of the site has made the bricks (and tiles) susceptible to breakage.

The reuse of bricks from the box drain 6324 in the construction of the storage cellar 6330, and the use of the same mud mortar suggests that the cellar was built shortly after the drain & by the same people. Perhaps the
builders realised that the drain was inadequate or poorly placed. Alternatively, a need for a cellar close to the kitchen may have been overlooked in the original scheme. A convenient way of keeping the walls and thus the items cool would be to utilise the groundwater in this damp part of the site. To this end the drain may have been quickly reconfigured, with the south-western section possibly used to drain water away from the roof of the cellar. The remaining north-eastern section of the box drain leading from the privy was either extended further south or connected to the new barrel drain 6328.

**Historical Context and Brick Standards**

The larger sized bricks, particularly the sandier orange/red ones from the box drain 6324 & the storage cellar 6330, may have been made by the convict brickmaker James Becket. He set up a brick and tile kiln at Parramatta Park, on the south bank just to the west of O’Connell Street (opposite the Hospital Site) in 1790. He operated the kiln until 1805 when he established another brickyard in the vicinity of Brickfield Street to the north of the river. This business apparently ran until c1830. His early bricks were described as being of the larger Birmingham Standard size, red and too soft to be durable. It was thought that they were defective either due to unsuitable local clay (too sandy), or were under-fired. Becket came from Birmingham where he learned the brickmaking trade. This city had a slightly larger standard size of bricks than that of London. Accordingly, the bricks that Becket made in Parramatta were larger than those made by the London-trained brickmakers in Sydney. A difference in tile making may also have existed but was not commented upon in the historical record.

Brick standards were measured when the brick was still green prior to firing. The firing process caused the clay in the brick to shrink by unpredictable amount and therefore it was not possible to accurately gauge what size the bricks would emerge from the kiln. However, general size differences were able to be assessed at the time and still may be so today. The clamp kilns used by the early colonial brickmakers also caused irregularity in the final brick colours, due to differences in heat from the centre to the outside. Bricks in the same firing could be over-fired to a dark crimson-red in the centre of the kiln, or under-fired to a pale creamy colour on the exterior. Similarly any normally red-brown ironstone fragment or pebble in the clay may have turned black in the over-fired bricks.

**(Green) Brick Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions (mm)</th>
<th>(inches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>216 x 102 x 64</td>
<td>(8.5 x 4 x 2.5&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>242 x 115 x 70</td>
<td>(9.5 x 4.5 x 2.75&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Varman

**Robyn Stocks**
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Appendix 3: John Hodges, extract from Kass 1990
The convict settled on the land in 1791 maintained and even increased his holdings. By 1800 and 1801, he was listed as holding either 60 or 90 acres.\(^1\) He was still listed as resident in the Parramatta district in 1814, as a "Landholder", with two assigned convicts and with a wife, Ann Pugh.\(^2\) He was the subject of a Sheriff's Sale in 1812, when some of his pigs and a quantity of wheat in stack was sold.\(^3\)

It is possible that this man is the same one who was leased the town allotment in 1806. In 1810, the *Sydney Gazette* had a notice of houses for private sale in Parramatta, which was the property of John Nichols. It was described as,

two commodious Dwelling Houses, with a spacious Allotment of Garden Ground, with an Oven and all the Materials in the Baking Line, a good Well constantly supplied with water, a Three-stall Stable, and every other convenience for the reception of a Family...

Enquirers were directed to apply on the premises.\(^4\)

**John Hodges**

John Hodges arrived as a convict on the *Duke of Portland* in 1807 on life sentence. Twelve months after his arrival, he and another convict had stowed away on the whaler, *Sarah* and had almost reached Timor and freedom, when the whaler's captain sighted another vessel en route to Sydney and sent him back to NSW.\(^5\) He was initially reassigned to Captain Laycock, but by 1814, was located at Parramatta in the service of "E. Schackley".\(^6\) Edward Shackley was the government gardener at Parramatta and had also arrived on the *Duke of Portland*.\(^7\)

Hodges obtained a Ticket of Leave. He later thought this was in recognition of,

my service in the Colony & the Circumstance of having married a native born Girl & also having Purchased a Farm of 30 acres at Seven Hills.\(^8\)

Hodges memory of this sequence of events may have been doubtful. On 17 November 1816, he had purchased Stephen Shore's 30 acre grant, at Seven Hills, known as "Pig and Whistle Farm".\(^9\) He received a Conditional Pardon in 1818(?) in recognition of sending a horse and cart to carry stores for Cox's building of the Bathurst Road. He had hired a horse and cart from Edmund Wright and despatched it to the roadworks and had bribed others to recommend his cart to be allowed to work there.\(^10\) He also arranged to pay money to Michael Robinson, the Colonial Secretary's clerk, ostensibly for searching the registers of the Colonial Secretary's Office for an alleged Conditional Pardon, which Hodges had been told was waiting for him, by Isaac Nichols, the colony's postmaster.\(^11\)

---

5. B. T. 1, 375.
8. B. T. 1, p. 368
9. Old Registers, Bk. 5, p. 329 p. 133. LTO
11. B. T. 1, p. 369-73
Hodges dealt in spirits at Parramatta. He received a licence in July 1818. At that time, he added to his rural holdings with the purchase on 10 July 1818, of John Jones’ 60 acre farm at Seven Hills, immediately adjacent to Shore’s farm which he had purchased earlier. His personal character and that of his business was severely censured during the Bigge Enquiry. Francis Oakes, constable of Parramatta, described his character as, Extremely bad, he has often been brought forward for keeping a Disorderly House and for selling spirits without a Licence.

Hodges purchased a great deal of his spirits from Hannibal Macarthur. He bought a total of £3 to £4,000 worth in five years. These purchases continued even after he had lost his licence. For this he was prosecuted, but not convicted, by a hench of magistrates which included Hannibal Macarthur. Hodges’ relationship with Macarthur was cause for concern. Edward Eager, the emancipist lawyer, claimed that the only way that Hodges had been able to obtain a licence to legitimise his illicit trading was one the recommendation of Macarthur. Eager claimed that Macarthur only sold liquor to those without licences, and that he had threatened the withdrawal of the licences of Charles Walker and Andrew Nash if they did not buy their spirits from him.

Hodges’ manner of commercial operation suggests the caricature often used to explain why small farmers lost their lands to officials and larger landholders. In 1822, he was recorded on the Muster with the relatively innocuous occupation of shopkeeper. Hodges provided credit for small settlers often for three months but occasionally for longer. He also bartered the spirits which he had received from Macarthur, in five gallon lots to settlers for pigs and wheat. He then sold these to the Commissariat in his own name. Since he took produce from the settlers at the store price, he was mainly converting the returns from his business into store receipts, in an economy which possessed little spare cash.

Hodges was keen to regain his licence after it had been withdrawn. At the Bigge Enquiry, he answered in the affirmative when asked if Governor Macquarie had promised him a licence if he built a good brick house in Parramatta. He had purchased the "Grant" of another man, and in January 1821 as the enquiry was proceeding, that house was under construction. That house is now known as "Brislington". Shortly afterwards, he was again granted a licence.

In 1823, he requested a valuation of his house to qualify for a grant of his Parramatta allotment, since the house was over £1,000 in value. The house did exceed those limits. Hence, on 30 June 1823, Hodges was granted 185 1/2 rods in George Street, Parramatta.

A corollary of Hodges’ economic role was his land dealings, particularly in an economy which had few other avenues for surplus investment. In 1821, he was listed as holding

---

1 Syd Gaz, 4 July 1818, 2.
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3 B. T. 1, p. 316
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12 Grant Registers, Bk 26 (formerly TG No. 1, 1823), No. 4.
100 acres of rural land by purchase. The 1822 Muster noted that of this land, 40 acres was cleared, and that he held 2 horses, 50 head of cattle, 8 hogs and 5 bushels of wheat and 20 of maize. At that time, he had one convict assigned to him at Parramatta. During the early 1820s, he was also supplying wheat and meat to the government store. In 1828, he held 220 acres of land, 60 of which were cleared and 10 acres was cultivated, plus 9 horses and 200 head of cattle. In 1828, he also had three assigned convict servants, all based at Parramatta.

Hodges' local economic role and a litigious character was also reflected in numerous Sheriff's property sales. After Hodges had successfully taken debtors to court the Sheriff auctioned the property of the defendants to pay the costs of the action. These sales included unspecified property at Parramatta, a brick 6 roomed house in Church Street, Parramatta, a log house in Church Street, Parramatta, a horse, cart and harness, a parcel of land adjoining the Nepean River with a mill and house, an substantial 7 roomed house, stockyard and piggery, with beef and pigs, opposite his town house [later "Brislington"], as well as a 4 roomed cottage.

At the same time, Hodges began to deal in Parramatta Town land on his own behalf. His earlier landholdings were largely rural. He was granted the 185 1/2 rods in George Street, Parramatta on 30 June 1823 on which his town house had been built. On the same day, he was also leased a parcel of land measuring 47 1/2 rods on the south side of George Street.

During the 1830s, a shift appears in his land holdings. His rural lands are given up and town lands appear to attract most of his attention. On 18 & 19 April 1834, John Pike conveyed nearly twenty rural grants, mostly of 25 or 30 acres at Toongabbie to Hodges for £2,500. Hodges may simply have been providing a mortgage or as a refuge to escape creditors, since, the land was conveyed back to Pike on 13 January 1837 for a mere £2,700. On the other hand, Hodges almost entirely divested himself of rural land during the 1830s. In October 1839, he sold the first two parcels of rural land he had acquired, Shore's and Jones' grants, for £330. In April 1836, he had already sold a an 80 acre and a 40 acre farm in the District of Kurrajong. Such a shift may have mirrored a shift in his economic activity. In 1835, he was describing himself as a "dealer". In the 1837 Return of Convicts, none were listed as assigned to Hodges.

John Hodges hovered on the fringe of respectable society mediating between the rough and illegal and the respectable and socially acceptable. Hodges land dealings also reflected his character. Many persons held town land in Sydney, Parramatta and other town centres without the benefit of a Crown grant. Some town allotments were covered

1 B. T. 25, p. 5508
2 General Muster of and Land and Stock Register of New South Wales, 1822, No B962
3 General Muster of and Land and Stock Register of New South Wales, 1822, No. A13238
4 Sydney Indexes.
6 Census of New South Wales - November 1828, C868, C1113, L1376
7 Aust, 12 Aug 1829, 3; 30 July, 1830, 4; 19 Nov 1830, 4; 1July 1831, 1.
8 Grants, Register 25 (formerly 16), p. 4. LTO.
9 LTOD, No. 944 Bk. F.
10 LTOD, No. 871 Bk. K.
11 LTOD, No. 880 Bk. P.
12 LTOD, No. 679 Bk. J.
13 Col Sec, Reports of the Commissioners of Claims, 1835-55, A. O. 2/1839, Mem. 720.
by Crown Leases, but many had only the right of a permissive occupancy. The
government commenced to regularize that situation during the 1820s, but little real
progress occurred before the 1830s. The acceptance of a Crown Grant entailed a certain
measure of responsibility and the willingness to invest sums of money in improvements
on the land. A grant could be awarded for the expenditure of a minimum of £1,000 on
town allotments. In 1823, Hodges had requested a valuation of buildings on his
Parramatta land prior to a grant. Yet, Hodges was often less willing to incur such
expense.

His business dealings invariably brought him into involvement in the ownership of town
land. The activity of the Sheriff in selling land to satisfy Hodges as a creditor has already
been noted. On 26 February 1830, he loaned John Mallone £120 for one year on the
security of an acre or so of land in Parramatta with a dwelling house and two skillions
thereon. When Mallone had difficulty repaying the loan, part of the land was auctioned
and Hodges became the buyer. Even before the legal deeds had been drawn up, signed,
sealed and delivered, Hodges put in a claim for this parcel of land to the Court of
Claims. A year later, Mallone conveyed more of the land to Hodges. Hodges had
acquired a useful hotel building, called the "Union Inn" by 1836. By March 1836, he
was also building on the southern part of the land and took out a mortgage for £600 to
finance it.

In the meantime, the Commissioners of Claims had reported favourably on Hodges'
claim for a grant for that parcel of land. However, Hodges was liable to erect buildings to
the value of £1,000 and to pay 21 years quit rent before the grant would be issued. Hodges
did little to meet these requirements, though the construction of buildings on the land in March 1836, may have been a way of partially meeting these requirements. The
northern part of the land, occupied by the "Union Inn", was sold by Hodges to Edward
Drinkwater for £200 cash and a promissory note for £400. Finally, on 19 August
1840, Hodges wrote to the Colonial Secretary, claiming that he had sold the land to
William Peisley, butcher of Parramatta, and asked if the land could be granted to Peisley,
since he had built buildings to the value of £1,000 and was willing to pay 21 years quit
rent. It is interesting to note that no conveyance registering such a sale has been located.
That letter was minuted by the Colonial Secretary's office that the grant could only be
made to Hodges since he was the person whom the Court of Claims had decided would
be the grantee, and that he would need to pay the 21 years quit rent. John Hodges finally
paid, and a grant was issued to him for that land on 30 November 1840. A little over a
year later, on 5 January 1842, Hodges conveyed that parcel to Richard Rouse for
£2,400.

Alarm over the financial consequences of the issue of grant may also have influenced
Hodges over another parcel of land. On 6 December 1833, three parcels of land on the
eastern side of Church Street adjacent to the Parramatta River, were assigned to him for

---
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the remainder of their 21 year Crown lease for a total of £505. Those parcels were sold on 7 & 8 September 1835, after he had discovered his liabilities if he wanted to receive a Crown Grant. These parcels were sold for £300 cash and two promissory notes for £200 at 6 and 12 months, a total of £700. This conveyance and the sale of the "Union Inn" in Church Street, both a short time after he found out about his liability for buildings and quit rent, are interesting because they were the only deeds of sales by John Hodges which involve promissory notes rather than cash in hand. Was John Hodges unloading land that may become a liability to him to the first purchaser who seemed reasonably able to repay? John Hodges' apparent unwillingness to accept the full responsibility of land ownership under the security of a Crown Grant is paralleled by Samuel Larkin who is dealt with below.

Hodges most remarkable dealing, however, involved the town house in which he lived. He appears to have attempted to avoid the consequences of legal action he himself had so actively used against others. On 5 January 1844, for £3,000 he conveyed his house and premises in George Street to Richard Webb, Church Street, Parramatta, general dealer and James Slade, George Street, Sydney, gentleman, including all sums of money and debts and,

the goods, chattels, merchandise, debts, credits. Horses, cattle, sheep, household furniture, carriages, plate, jewels, and all other personal property.

He may have been selling out his business, but the nature of the transaction is too complete to suggest such a move.

John Ryan, the Chief Constable of Parramatta had brought an action against Hodges in the Supreme Court for £65/4/5. A writ of fieri facias was issued on 23 July 1844 for this sum. The Sheriff, auctioned Hodges' house and land on 10 October 1844, but only the western half excluding Hodges town house was sold. The purchaser was John Ryan for a sum of £30. Whatever Hodges relationship was to Ryan, cannot have been too strained, since Hodges continued to occupy that house until his death in 1849.

James Harrex

After conviction in March 1795 at Suffolk, James Harrex (Horrax, Harrox) arrived in NSW on the Ganges in 1797, with a 14 year sentence. His rise to property was rapid. On 11 August 1804, he was leased 1 acre 1 rood and 7 perches of land in Parramatta on the eastern side of what is now Church Street, near Parramatta River for a term of 14 years. This lease was plotted on the 1803 map of Parramatta with a house on the main street frontage. (See Illus 2.01) Parramatta appears to have been the base for his operations from that time onwards. He married Frances Sarah Taber at Sydney on 3 February 1807, but from January 1808, all of his children were born at Parramatta until his death in 1825. Thomas Taber had also come to Sydney as a convict on the Ganges with Harrex.
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Allotment 98, Section 19, Granted to John Hodges, 30 June 1823

The allotment at the corner of George and Marsden Streets was shown on the 1792 plan of Parramatta as occupied by a convict allotment and hut. It was leased to Timothy Hollister on 16 July 1804, acknowledging his prior occupation.1 When James Meehan surveyed Parramatta on 4 April 1804, Hollister was in occupation of that allotment.2 John Hodges had acquired possession of that allotment by January 1821. He stated,

I purchased the Grant of another man. It was a Grant of Govr Phillips [sic] I believe.3

Hodges built the house (now Brislington) in response to a promise from Governor Macquarie that he would be given a liquor licence if he built a good brick house on that allotment.4

Hodges received a grant on 30 June 1823.5 In January 1844, he conveyed the house, land, and all his real and personal property to Richard Webb, general dealer of Parramatta and James Slade, gentleman of Sydney for £3,000, though this appears to have been a manner of averting the consequences of losing a legal action against John Ryan.6 At the Sheriff’s sale which arose from the court action, John Ryan, purchased the land, which amounted to the western part of the allotment only.7

After Hodges’ death, a series of legal transactions were required to clear up the legal title, including the purchase of the western part of the allotment from Ryan. George Rattray, a Sydney merchant, consolidated all of the land into his control in 1851.8 From the total of £530, Rattray had acquired the land for in 1851, it had leapt in value to £2,500 in 1854 when he sold it to George Alfred Lloyd, another Sydney merchant.9 It was sold by Lloyd to George Wigram Allen, the Sydney solicitor, for £3,000 on 30 March 1855.10

It remained in the hands of Allen until April 1875 when it was sold to a pair of trustees for the benefit of Sigismund Brown, wife of Walter Brown, a doctor of Parramatta.11 This family then retained a prolonged association with the land and with Brislington. Brown was associated with the hospital and the situation was ideal for him. Part of the land was resumed for the hospital in 1916.12 The land remained in the hands of the Brown family until 1947 when it was resumed by the hospital.13
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