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1 Introduction

The aim of this brief is to create a framework for the creation of an exhibition utilising the materials and information obtained from seven excavations that have taken place in the city of Adelaide in the least 20 years. This document was prepared for the Adelaide City Council under the direction of John Greenshields and Dr Heather Burke.

The sites involved in the brief were:

- The former Beresford Arms Hotel located at 188 Gilles St
- The “Rookery”
- The Tivoli Hotel
- The Queen’s Theatre
- The North Adelaide Institute
- Turner’s Paddock
- The former crematorium located in West Terrace Cemetery

These sites cover a diverse range of functionality including entertainment, domestic residences, waste disposal, and funerary ritual. Reuse is a theme that occurred often with these sites as many of them served more than one purpose during their periods of use. With the exception of the crematorium, the construction of these sites dated back to the first 20 years of the settlement of Adelaide. The crematorium was constructed in the very early 1900s.

The brief will be structured in a way that will detail the sites individually and then links them together by their commonalities. Each site will have both its historical background and the archaeology conducted on the site detailed. This information will then be used to establish
what features the site has that can be used in the exhibition. These individual features will then be drawn together to create the exhibition as a whole.

A recurring theme in the brief will be archaeology. One of the main aims of this exhibition is to show archaeology and the archaeological process to the public. This is not limited to excavation work, but also the way sites of archaeological interest are handled in terms of heritage management.

Another theme that will appear often in this brief is people. As much effort as possible was made to associate any relevant individuals with each site. These sites did not occur in isolation and many of the people associated with the sites can be related to the history of South Australia.
2 A Brief History of South Australia

South Australia represents a unique case in the early colonisation of Australia. The city of Adelaide was deliberately founded and was the only one settled entirely by non convicts. The area was surveyed and the land divided into plots that were sold at auction. This was done in accordance with a scheme of colonisation devised by Edward Gibson Wakefield. The concept was that auctioning the land would generate revenue that could be used to facilitate the emigration of free settlers from Britain (History Trust of South Australia 2003).

The most famous person involved with the establishment of the city of Adelaide was the city’s surveyor-general Colonel William Light. Light was responsible for the very distinctive layout of Adelaide. The city was deliberately designed with open areas of parklands to surround the inner city. Light arrived in South Australia in 1836 accompanied by his mistress. That Light lived openly with a mistress was considered scandalous by many of the prominent settlers. Light purchased through auction 13 town acres in Adelaide, including the land that the Beresford Arms would be built on. He died in October of 1839, approximately three years after arriving (Sumerling 2006). However, although he was only in Adelaide a short time he developed a lasting reputation, and is, despite John Hindmarsh being the first governor, referred to by many as the founder of Adelaide (History Trust of South Australia 2003).
3 Sites

3.1 188 Gilles Street

3.1.1 History
The structure at 188 Gilles St was constructed in late 1839. It was known as the Beresford Arms during the peak of its use. The site represents one of the oldest standing structures within the city of Adelaide. The Beresford Arms was located over a mile from the centre of Adelaide at the south eastern edge of the city. The land that the structure was constructed on was one of the blocks of lands that were originally purchased by Colonel William Light. The land was sold to John Milne in the aftermath of Light’s death and the Beresford Arms was constructed shortly after (Sumerling 2006).

The dwelling at 188 Gilles St is one of roughly a dozen structures that survive from the earliest days of the founding of the city of Adelaide. The structure is unique in that it is the only public house surviving from this era. The other structures that survive include: Part of Government House, the first stages of the Adelaide Gaol and several churches. Included in these sites are also a few domestic dwellings, but the building at 188 Gilles St did not serve as a solely residential property until later in its life. For the first 20 years of its existence the building at 188 Gilles St was known as the Beresford Arms and then the Oddfellow Arms and served as a public house. Its location left it fairly isolated until the construction of the south eastern road connecting the city of Adelaide to the towns in the hills, such as Mt. Barker and Mt. Osmond. The hotel had multiple publicans up until its final closure in 1860. After this the building became a purely residential property (Sumerling 2006).
Despite its age the building has only had four owners since its construction. Even more notable is that it has only had two since 1904. The current owners of the property have owned it since 1950. It has been suggested that the fact that the property has had so few owners has contributed to its longevity (Sumerling 2006). The property was originally constructed as a simple Georgian style house. In this earliest period of Adelaide public houses located outside of the very centre of town had a tendency to be nearly indistinguishable from domestic dwellings. The building has had several additions since its initial construction but none of note since the 1880s. The property has been unoccupied since 2002 when it was gutted by a fire.

3.1.2 Archaeology Conducted

The archaeology involving the former Beresford Arms in Gilles St is still in progress. The excavation work was conducted in November and December of 2007. The initial survey work was conducted by Austral Archaeology. The major excavation work, as well as artefact collection and analysis, was conducted by students from Flinders University directed by Dr Heather Burke (Stone 2008a).

The excavation that was conducted was extensive. The intention was to excavate to the earliest period of use. By doing this it was possible to determine the different periods of occupation/use. There were three distinct periods identified. The first was the original structure dating to 1839. The second was from 1842 when the first extensions were made to the premises. The final was from 1880 when the last extensions were made.

Although the excavations at the site are complete, the analysis of the material recovered from the site is still unfinished. So far only a preliminary report of the excavation work has been
completed. The analysis of the artefacts is being completed by Marica Beric as part of her honours studies (Stone 2008b).

3.1.3 Features to be used in exhibit

Given that the site is still under investigation the site represents an excellent opportunity to show the archaeological process in progress. If a more conventional approach is preferable then the site is useful as an example of early public houses.

There are several factors that make the site favourable for showing the archaeological process. The site is still under investigation. It is the subject of at least one current honours project for a Flinders University archaeology student. Added to this is that the fact site is an existing building that many members of the public will know. It is entirely possible that residents in the area had seen what was going on at the time of the excavation and may wish to know more. This avenue also has room for follow up as the site has been earmarked for restoration once the archaeological work is complete (Stone 2008a).

The site will also serve as a good example of an early public house. Pub culture is something that can be easily identified with in Adelaide given the large number of pubs in Adelaide currently. With this in mind it would make more sense to focus on the site’s history as a public house than its subsequent occupation as a domestic dwelling. Unfortunately, given that the analysis of the site is unfinished it is unclear what artefact evidence is available dating to that period. If sufficient material is available then it should be a fairly easy matter to display the site as a public house and will make a good crossover with the Tivoli Hotel site.
3.2 Rookery

3.2.1 History

The site known as the Rookery was a small series of nine cottages located in the south eastern corner of the former Adelaide Fresh Produce Exchange (Austral Archaeology 1992a). The exact date of construction of the cottages is unknown but records place a tentative date of between 1857 and 1858. The inhabitants of the site are suspected to be of the poor working class (Austral Archaeology 1992a).

Throughout the period of inhabitation two things were common. The first was that the breakdown of men to women 3:2 in favour of women, but, there was no record of any children present Austral Archaeology 1992a). It seems unlikely that there were no children present during the entirety of the use of the site, especially given the fact that women comprised the majority of tenants. However, it is possible that were few children present as the archaeological evidence of the presence of children is fairly scarce.

The other thing that occurs is that the period of residence for tenants was fairly short. The longest residing tenants on record were there for six years. These two people, Mrs Haigh, a needlewoman/domestic servant, and Frederick Reed (Reeve), an agricultural labourer, were both in residence from 1879 to 1885. It is difficult to determine why people were only living in the Rookery for short periods, but the fact that the site could hardly be called ideal living conditions likely played a part. The cottages were fairly spartan and provided only the most basic of accommodations.
3.2.2 Archaeology Conducted

The site was excavated in 1991 by Austral Archaeology (Austral Archaeology 1992a). There were no extant remains of the site as it was destroyed in order for the area to be used as a car park.

A section of the site was excavated comprising seven of the nine cottages plus the associated area around them. The layout of the site was fairly simple, with the cottages in a row running east to west towards East Terrace. Along the northern edge was a small brick paved area. To the south there was a thin cobbled walkway and a yard.

The cottages themselves were fairly uniform in layout. Each consisted of a single room with hearth. They were all 3m by 6m in size with shingled roofs. They had an entrance on both the southern and northern sides of the cottage. The original floor was packed earth but was replaced with floorboards later. The hearths were also expanded during this period (Austral Archaeology 1992a). The associated areas contained amenities for the cottages. In the northern most corner of the site was an underground water storage tank. In the yard at the southern side there were three cess pits that served as toilets. Initially these were drop toilets but were later upgraded to include sewerage pipes (Austral Archaeology 1992a).

The most significant feature uncovered at this site was the wealth of artefacts recovered. In total 75 archive boxes of material were recovered and are currently being stored at the Netley Facility (Austral Archaeology 1992a). The artefacts were divided into two categories: inventory items and accession items. Inventory items were those artefacts with significant diagnostic features to sufficiently identify them (Austral Archaeology 1992b). Accession items were those without sufficient diagnostic features, being primarily objects such as
broken pieces of glass, unidentifiable ceramic sherds, and structural materials such as nails (Austral Archaeology 1992c). The second and third parts of the report created for the excavation contain a full catalogue of the items recovered (Austral Archaeology 1992a).

### 3.2.3 Features for exhibit

The artefacts recovered from the excavation conducted at the Rookery are an excellent choice for displayable material. As the site was inhabited primarily by the poor working class it is surprising to see the kinds of artefacts that were recovered. This is not to suggest that the artefacts found would compare to wealthier areas but it is interesting to find that despite their economic status the people living in the Rookery owned goods of quite respectable quality (Austral Archaeology 1992a).

The largest category of items was bottles. There were 272 bottles or fragments of bottles. These items were fairly unremarkable and comprised a spread of bottles that would be expected from this period in time (Austral Archaeology 1992a).

The items of most interest were the ceramics. Fifty seven earthenware items were uncovered in the excavation. Seventy seven percent of these items were of Staffordshire make and 50% of those had the common blue and white under glaze. The two most unusual items in this collection are two commemorative plates commemorating the inauguration of the United States President Zachary Taylor in 1948. This may very well suggests that some of the occupants were immigrants from the United States.

There were numerous metal items recovered. The largest category was buttons. This is not surprising as one of the longest serving residents was a needlewoman and domestic servant.
There were also 49 coins uncovered, comprising a reasonable spread of small value coins from that period. Twelve items of jewellery were recovered in the excavation. Five of these were made of gold.

Further research into sites of similar economic status may provide an interesting comparison. Several of the items recovered from the site, specifically the gold jewellery, does not reflect the assumed economic status of the inhabitants of the site. It would be useful to compare this site to other similar sites as any result would be usable. If these types of artefacts are common then site can be used a representative site of its type. If the artefacts are uncommon then the site can be used as an exceptional case where the inhabitants owned items they would not be expected to have.

Given that the artefacts can establish the identity of the people who lived on the site it may be useful to find some examples of the people who lived. Admittedly this may be difficult as the poor working class are usually not well represented in the historical record (Austral Archaeology 1992a). Added to this is the fact that the two longest serving tenants were only there for six years each. Names exist in the records of the rents payed for the cottages and it might be possible to find information through local history sources or genealogical sources. Any ability to put a “face” to the people that lived at the Rookery will again help visitors to relate better to the people who lived there.
3.3 Tivoli Hotel

3.3.1 History

The Tivoli Hotel was constructed in 1850 (The City Messenger 2004). It has served as a pub and entertainment venue of various types throughout its history. In its earliest days it served as a public house, and was upgraded/extended in 1883. This purpose continued into the early 1900s when it served as an integral part of Adelaide’s German culture (South Australian Heritage Register). In more recent times the hotel has served as a live entertainment venue (Thomas 1999). It has hosted many bands over the years of varying degrees of fame, including artists such as one of Australia’s most well known bands; Cold Chisel (Cold Chisel Official Website 2008).

The site is now the subject of a large scale development. An eight storey apartment building is being constructed adjacent to the hotel (Engineering Surveys 2008). This development has been underway since January of 2007 and the date of completion is unknown. The intention is leave the Tivoli Hotel building intact and build the apartment building in close proximity (Engineering Surveys 2008).

3.3.2 Archaeology Conducted

An archaeological excavation was conducted in 2005 by Austral Archaeology. Only a preliminary draft was available for this excavation. The work was conducted on behalf of P&S Investments (Austral Archaeology 2005).

The excavations took place in four rooms of the existing structure. The work undertaken involved the removal of existing floorboards then excavation if possible. Two of the areas
had modern concrete directly under the floorboards and no further work was done in these areas. The first area excavated yielded the most results. A filled in cellar was discovered that is from the original construction of the hotel in 1850. The top layer of fill was dated as being from the 1980s but there was a lower layer that was believed to be much older. Unfortunately the scope of the project did not require the excavation of the cellar and no artefacts were recovered. The only other area excavated yielded results about modifications that had been made to the structure. The area was a column near the fire door and the layers around it showed several phases of renovation (Austral Archaeology 2005).

3.3.3 Features for exhibit

As the archaeology conducted on the site was fairly limited it would make more sense to focus on information from historical sources. The site could be used as a contrast to the Beresford Arms. It could also be used alongside the Rookery site due to its close proximity. Lastly the site can be used as an example of the interaction between heritage and development.

Whereas the Beresford Arms represented a stop on the way to the south, the Tivoli Hotel is much closer to the centre of Adelaide. The hotel is in fairly close to the location of the Rookery, which was considered a poor, working class area. It is entirely possible that people from this area made frequent use of the Tivoli Hotel. However, even if the opposite is true then it is still interesting as the hotel is still located very near a very poor area. The building has links to German culture in the early 1900s as well (South Australian Heritage Register). German culture is very popular in Adelaide still, with the Schutzenfest held in Bonython Park annually being consistently well attended.
The fact that the Tivoli Hotel is listed on the South Australian Heritage Register as a place of state significance would have made development difficult. It could prove interesting to show the process required to undertake a development of this scale in such close proximity to a heritage listed building. Great effort would have been required to not affect the heritage significance with the development. Or it may be more poignant to ask the question of whether or not the significance of the site has been impacted. This case may be a way to show heritage protection in action, or it failing to provide sufficient protection.
3.4 Queen’s Theatre

3.4.1 History

The Queen’s Theatre was originally constructed in 1840 but has served many purposes during its history. It has seen use as a theatre, law courts, auction rooms, a horse bazaar, car garage and car park. There was also a tavern associated with the building that although it had several name changes stayed open through all the changes the theatre went through until its eventual closure in 1872 (Heritage Group 1989).

The theatre first opened in January of 1841 with Othello as its first performance. It was the first substantial theatre constructed in Adelaide and at the time was the largest privately owned building in Adelaide. Unfortunately the theatre never proved to be very popular and closed in November of the following year. Following the closure of the theatre the building had a brief stint of use as auction rooms (Heritage Group 1989).

In 1843 the theatre reopened in a new role, to serve as the Supreme, Magistrates and Police Commissioner’s courts for Adelaide. Extensive works were undertaken to convert the building for its new function. The city council apparently was more than happy with this arrangement but the judge apparently was not. The judge was concerned with the adjacent tavern. He was concerned that the noise would be a disruption to the court. Regardless, the building served as courts until 1850 when a more permanent building was constructed to house the courts (Heritage Group 1989).

While the building was still being used as law courts a section of the tavern was used and expanded to house a new theatre. This theatre continued operation until 1850 when the courts
were vacated. At this point the entire building was restored to its former use as a theatre. The Royal Victoria Theatre was opened in December of 1850. It was very much a return to the original theatre. It was a very large theatre with a capacity of 700 people decorated in the style of Parisian theatres of the times. Unfortunately, although the structure itself was greatly praised, it suffered the fate of the original Queen’s Theatre and was closed the following year. The structure again served briefly as auction rooms before it was sold in 1852 (Heritage Group 1989).

The theatre spent the next two years in limbo before reopening in 1854. However, this time thrived. The theatre was in operation all the way through to 1867. It is unclear as to exactly why the theatre was able to prosper during this period when it had failed so dismally previously (Heritage Group 1989).

The next use of the building was as a horse bazaar. The building underwent extensive refitting to serve this purpose. The most significant was the flooring. The floor in the theatre had previous been normal floorboards but this was replaced by packed earth to better accommodate the building’s new function. The ownership of the building was transferred in 1897 but it remained a horse bazaar until it was sold in 1928 (Heritage Group 1989).

The building was purchased by the Gilles Arcade Parking Service and converted to yet another purpose. It served as a light engineering works for cars, as well as a showroom and store. The building remained open until it was sold in 1977. The site was then unoccupied until 1988 when the building was purchased by the Hooker Corporation and earmarked for development (Heritage Group 1989).
3.4.2 Archaeology Conducted

The site was excavated in 1989 by the Heritage Group in preparation for development by the Hooker Corporation. The excavation was based around four main objectives:

1. Fully excavate the under stage and dressing room areas for the original Queen’s Theatre and the Royal Victoria Theatre.
2. Investigate the remnants of the new Queen’s Theatre, that operated between 1846 and 1850 alongside the law courts, and the tavern that was in use from 1840 through to 1872.
3. Document and record the existing structure that remained from the original Queen’s Theatre and the Royal Victoria Theatre.
4. Collect samples of the wallpaper that was used during the site’s occupation.

Due to funding constraints, only the excavation of the under stage and dressing rooms areas was completed. However, this excavation yielded exceptional results. The area was almost completely structurally intact. There were also substantial artefact quantities recovered as well. Only one section of this area was unable to be excavated due to the presence of a wall from the existing structure (Heritage Group 1989).

The excavations of the new Queen’s Theatre and tavern were not quite as extensive. It was sufficient to discern that the both the tavern and new Queen’s Theatre were both structurally intact. However, no artefacts were recovered as funding constraints limited the excavation work (Heritage Group 1989).
Of the original structure it was concluded that roughly three quarters of the masonry from the original Queen’s Theatre was intact. As the Royal Victoria Theatre was a renovation of the original structure no significant structural changes were made in its construction.

There was no further mention of the wallpaper that was to be collected. It is assumed that objective was not achieved.

3.4.3 Features for Exhibit

The former theatre can be exhibited in two ways. The first is that it is the first theatre of large scale in Adelaide. It also shows reuse and adaptation to serve multiple purposes.

The use of the building as a theatre in its many incarnations is capable of being an example of the development of the arts in Adelaide. The artefacts recovered were from the dressing room and under stage areas, meaning that they would reflect the performances that were done in the theatre. According to the report they include common items associated with the operation of the theatre. Unfortunately the items that have survived best are ceramics, not fabric items such as costumes, but there are examples of makeup containers and similar items (Heritage Group 1990). Through further historical research it may also be possible to discern what productions were undertaken in the theatre and also who was in them.

The building has served a multitude of purposes throughout its life span and this is reflected well in the archaeology. It is possible to physically see the change in use of the structure as the alterations made to the building are visible in the archaeological record of the site. The site had four major changes in use that required significant alterations to be made. The
original theatre structure was converted to a law court with the major change needed was a large dividing wall placed in the centre of the theatre. After the courts vacated major renovations were required to restoration the building to a theatre. Next was the conversion of the site into a horse bazaar. Finally was the change to a car workshop, showroom and store. All of these changes are visible in the archaeology of the site.

There is one other aspect of the site that may be useful in an exhibition. This is the people that were involved. The person of most significant interest is the original owner Emmanuel Solomon (Heritage Group 1989). This man was a convict that ended up having a very successful career as a businessman. He was originally sent to Australia as a teenager for the crime of stealing clothes and encountered further trouble with the law upon arrival in Australia. However, he was able to succeed despite this inauspicious beginning and develop a successful trading company as well as the property he owned, which includes the Queen’s Theatre (Heritage Group 1989).
3.5 North Adelaide Institute

3.5.1 History
The North Adelaide Institute was constructed, much the same as other structures of its type, to serve as a subscription library and public building (Department of Environment and Heritage 2008). Institute buildings were built to serve multiple purposes. They were primarily built for a function similar to the public library which would eventually replace it. They were also built to provide a public space that could be used for multiple functions such as public lectures, dances, films etc. The building is still intact and currently houses a post office. There is also space available to be rented for functions. The building is on the South Australian Heritage Register as a place of state significance (South Australian Heritage Register).

3.5.2 Archaeology Conducted
In June of 2003 Austral Archaeology was called upon by the Adelaide City Council for the collection of artefacts from the site. No excavation work was required as the artefacts were above ground. The artefacts were discovered when the existing floorboards were removed. The artefacts were in two piles and simply needed to be removed and catalogued (Austral Archaeology 2003).

Due to the lack of stratigraphy all artefacts recovered were classified as accession items. This was unusual as there were artefacts that would normally would be considered inventory items. However, due to the lack of stratigraphic integrity the archaeologists had no choice but to consider all recovered material as accession items. Many of these items still have display potential. The largest group of artefacts were rubbish items, such as confectionary wrappers,
cigarette packets, and ticket stubs. All of these are datable and many have a direct relationship with the activities the building was used for (Austral Archaeology 2003).

3.5.3 Features for exhibit

The institute building has two obvious features that can be exhibited. The first is the collection of artefacts recovered. There were numerous confectionary wrappers recovered from the site that were dated from between 1920 and 1960. They make an interesting collection as many are of brands that are still current. There are also a number of cigarette packets as well that form a similar collection (Austral Archaeology 2003).

As a precursor to public libraries institute buildings held a quite important place in Adelaide’s history. They were multifunctional buildings used in a variety of activities such as meetings, public lectures, dances and films. It would seem that the North Adelaide Institute could be used as an example of these buildings and be used to demonstrate the way public space were used and the kinds of activities conducted in them. Further research into particularly the public lectures that were held here may be worthwhile as it would give a picture of the kinds of issues the local residents were dealing with.
3.6 Turner’s Paddock

3.6.1 History

Turner’s Paddock, known officially as Park 23, is located in the parklands on the western edge of Adelaide. It is fairly representative of refuse dumps around Adelaide from that period (Piddock 1992). The site is located adjacent to Burbridge Road and the West Terrace Cemetery. The site was used not long after the formation of the colony and continued into the early twentieth century. The name of Turner’s Paddock came from the 1920s when it was used by Turner’s Butchers for pasturing their horses (Piddock 1992).

Refuse collection conducted officially in Adelaide dates back to as early as the 1870s. The first officially recorded occurrence of refuse collection is from 1877. It is recorded in the Mayor’s Annual Report that 140 people were employed for the purpose of the removal of home refuse. The entirety of the parklands surrounding Adelaide was used in this practice. Turner’s Paddock was one of three sites in the western parklands. The practice of using the parklands for the dumping of refuse by the council authorities continued until very early in the twentieth century when it was decided that this practice was destroying the image of the parklands (Piddock 1992).

In more recent times the site has become a favourite of local bottle collectors. It has been suggested that the site has been the subject of illegal excavation by various individuals over the last 20 years (AHBC 2001). The evidence is for this is speculation at best though, as no arrests have been made (AHBC 2001).

3.6.2 Archaeology Conducted
No official archaeological excavations have been conducted on the site at Turner’s Paddock. However, a significant excavation was undertaken by the Adelaide Historic Bottle Club (AHBC). The important thing to note though is that although archaeologists from Flinders University were allowed to be present, the excavation was conducted strictly for the purposes of removing material from the site (AHBC 2001). The Adelaide Historical Bottle Club successfully gained a permit to excavate the former dump site. The dig was conducted in 1993 with the intention of stripping the site bare. Two large earth movers were used as the primary means of excavation as the excavation was conducted under the premise of gaining as much material as possible in the allotted time (AHBC 2001).

Unfortunately due to the motivation of the bottle club the details of the excavation are poorly recorded. There is a small section on the club’s website, but this is far from what could be considered a publishable report. What was obtained from the site by the bottle club is also poorly documented. It may be possible to gain some details of the material collected by contacting the bottle club itself. Unfortunately there are few scarce details of the excavation from the club which do not contain any form of detailed catalogue of the finds (AHBC 2001).

A combined team from the Flinders and Adelaide universities was allowed on site. In fact a large proportion of the existing glassware teaching collection at Flinders consists of material from the Turner’s Paddock dig. Obviously the items deemed to be of most value were kept by the bottle club.
3.6.3 Features for exhibit

The site of Turner’s Paddock has two elements that are useful for display purposes. The first is the material obtained during the excavation. The bottles obtained currently form the Flinders University Archaeology Department’s teaching collection. They are used in teaching students how to identify bottles from fragmentary remains. There are intact bottles to that would be usable in an exhibition as well as many fragments of bottles. As the collection is a teaching there is quite a good variety of different bottle types. The fragments could be used in a similar way as that which they serve at the University. They could be used to show the process by which artefacts are identified.

This site also serves as an example of the interaction that can occur between archaeologists and the public. The site is an unusual case. The site was not intended to be the subject of any archaeological work. The AHBC was a private group that had an interest in the site. An excavation permit was obtained at great expense through fundraising by the club. The help of archaeologists was not sought; rather it was the archaeologists who approached the bottle club to gain involvement (AHBC 2001).
3.7 Crematorium

3.7.1 History

The Crematorium was located in the West Terrace Cemetery and was the first of its kind built in Australia (Nicol 2003). The crematorium was constructed in 1901 and was in operation from 1903 until 1959. The building was eventually demolished in 1969 (Austral Archaeology 2005b). The crematorium was commissioned by the Cremation Society based in Adelaide. The building was designed by local architect Alfred Barnham Black. It was built using entirely private funding. The first human cremation occurred on the Fourth of May 1903, that of Sikh Bishin Singh. The following month the South Australian government assumed responsibility of the crematorium and continued to do so until its eventual closure (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

Given that it was the first crematorium built in Australia, the crematorium plays a role in the history of the cremation movement. The cremation movement in Australia started in the 1860s. One of the underlying issues in the cremation debate was public health. Traditional burial was viewed by the supporters of cremation as unsanitary and a risk to public health and offered cremation as an alternative. The movement received strong opposition from religious groups as sacrilege, considering the notion of burning the deceased offensive. Victory however, would go to the supporters of cremation with the passing of the first bill of its kind in Australia allowing the practice to cremation in 1891 (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

The most notable element of the push for the legalisation of cremation is South Australia was the people involved. For the most part the most active members of the cremation movement were from the wealthier parts of the community (Austral Archaeology 2005b). At the
forefront of this group were many of the prominent businessmen in Adelaide, as well as a number of solicitors and clergymen (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

3.7.2 Archaeology Conducted

The remains of the building were excavated in 2005 by Austral Archaeology. The excavation was conducted in preparation for the expansion of the cemetery in order to create space for more burials. The main objectives of the excavation were to uncover the remains of the crematorium building and locate any associated artefacts. In addition to this broad objective several research questions were posed mainly relating to the operation of the crematorium (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

The excavation was successful in uncovering the entirety of the crematorium building. In fact, much of the building was largely intact. The most important part of the crematorium, the furnace was almost completely intact. As it was in the basement of the structure, and therefore below ground level, the furnace room was in very good condition. The room was intact to a depth of two metres. The other parts of the building, specifically the chapel were not in as good condition. The only remains of the chapel were the foundations which served to form an outline of where the structure was (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

The artefacts found on the site mostly related to the operation of the crematorium. In terms of metal artefacts the majority came in the form of fittings. These include various screws, nails and brackets plus a few more interesting pieces such as a door handle and related fittings. The excavation also uncovered were the counter weight for the chimney damper door and the flue tunnel hatchway cover. Fire bricks constituted the bulk of the ceramic artefacts found. Aside from this there were sherds from terracotta tiles and piping. There were a few sherds of
pottery uncovered but nothing intact. The only artefacts of note that did not seem to be related to operation of the crematorium are suspected to be refuse that was dumped when the structure was filled after its demolition (Austral Archaeology 2005b).

3.7.3 Features for exhibit

The site was a very significant part of a movement showing a change in attitude towards funerary practices. The best way to display this site would be to place it in context with the cremation movement. The site represents the climax of approximately 40 years of work by the various groups in Australia seeking to gain greater public acceptance of cremation. Again, this site represents another opportunity to identify people. As many of the most prominent advocates of cremation were said to be people of good standing in Adelaide there should be a few significant figures in the history of Adelaide that featured.

As the material recovered from the site was reburied there are displayable artefacts from the site. In this case it might be more appropriate for something such as a reconstruction such as a model of the crematorium in its working condition. This would give visitors a very clear idea of how exactly the process was actually conducted. There is enough historical data and enough of the site was intact to facilitate a fairly accurate copy of the original plans.

It would seem prudent to structure the exhibition in a way that makes this site the last section of the exhibit visitors would come to. Given that the site is associated with death it seems appropriate that it should be at the end of the exhibit.
4 Exhibition

4.1 Themes

There are several recurring themes that the sites share that can be used to tie them together to form the exhibit as a whole, they are:

- Entertainment
- Reuse
- Archaeology
- People

Given the age of the sites, the most sensible approach seems to be to focus on a specific period in time, most likely the first 20 years of Adelaide. By looking at the sites with this in mind it is possible to form a picture of Adelaide from this time period.

The development of the arts and public entertainment is visible in several of the sites. The Queen’s Theatre can be used to show the history of theatrical performances. Both the Tivoli Hotel and the Beresford Arms are examples of public houses and the beginnings of pub culture in Adelaide. The North Adelaide Institute can be used to show a few activities, including films and dancing.

Two of the sites: Gilles St and the Queen’s Theatre are excellent examples of reuse. Added to this is the intended use of the North Adelaide Institute as a multi functional building. The Queen’s Theatre is the better example of the two for reuse. The theatre changed use six times during its life span, in most cases requiring radical renovations. Gilles St shows an example of reuse in a more conventional way. Early public houses were built very similar to domestic
residences and it was a simple matter to convert it to be used as such. The institute building was purpose built to multifunctional.

A very important part of this exhibition will be archaeology. As much effort as possible must be made to incorporate archaeology is the primary medium by which much of the data about the sites is obtained as well as the material for display. There are other elements of archaeology that be displayed as well. Gilles St provides the opportunity to show archaeology up close. This was an excavation conducted very much in the public eye. The Tivoli is an example of how the system for protecting heritage is used. Lastly the bottle dig in Turner’s Paddock shows the way archaeologists interact with the public. The AHBC did not have to let the team from Flinders onto their site but the fact that they did not gave a great opportunity to show professionals working alongside amateur enthusiasts.

The last theme to examine is the one that will prove most useful in creating an image of early Adelaide: the people that lived in or were associated with the seven sites. Some sites lend themselves to this better than others, in particular the Rookery, the Queen’s Theatre, Gilles St, and the crematorium. The Rookery contains examples of the people that are usually poorly represented in the archaeological record and are therefore of interest. The activities of the poor working are usually poorly documented. But, the archaeological evidence that at least one of the inhabitants was performing their work at home and therefore there is evidence of this. The Queen’s Theatre has an excellent example of the way many of the early inhabitants of Australia turned their lives around after arriving here. The owner of the Queen’s Theatre was a convict who was sent to Australia and managed to develop a successful business career. Through its obvious connection to the arts it can be used to showcase the people who helped develop the arts in Adelaide. Gilles St has the easiest
connection to make with its association with one of the most influential figures in Adelaide’s history: Colonel William Light. An interesting choice could be made with Light as the perception and assumed knowledge of Light is different from the fact. However, it may be risky to portray Light in a negative way. Finally the crematorium has a strange connection with some of the more prominent figures Adelaide in the mid to late 1800s. It is said that members of the wealthier population of Adelaide were at the forefront of the cremation movement.

4.2 Crossover

Although it is necessary to link sites together by the themes that they share it is necessary to show the contrasts that occur within these themes. The themes that can be used in showing the contrast between the sites is the same as before with one addition: residences.

There are distinctly different types of entertainment associated with each venue. The best way to show the contrasts between is to view them in how formal each is. Both the Tivoli Hotel and the Beresford Arms represent a very informal type of entertainment, they are social drinking place. They are a place to relax with friends. The entertainment at the North Adelaide is slightly more formal. The activities undertaken here are organised activities. They were events such as public lectures, dances, films etc. This means although they were still quite social occasions they were still more structured than the pub. Lastly the Queen’s Theatre represents a very formal type of entertainment. The theatre was considered quite an opulent venue and represents a very formal occasion.

The contrast in reuse is best shown between the Queen’s Theatre and the North Adelaide Institute. The Queen’s Theatre had to be significantly altered each time it changed function.
This was to the point where the existing structure bears little resemblance to its functionality. However, the North Adelaide Institute was a purpose built structure. It was designed to be able to cope with serving different functions.

The archaeology associated with the sites is not so much in contrast as it is representative of the range of work that archaeology includes which may not be apparent to the public. A site such as the Rookery represents the most common image of archaeology. The site was excavated, artefacts were recovered, analysis was done to determine the nature of the site and the people that lived there. The North Adelaide Institute was similar to this but shows a subtle difference. Given that it is an existing structure no excavation was necessary but it still produced artefacts in a similar way to the Rookery. At the other end of the spectrum, the Tivoli Hotel represents an area that many professional archaeologists are employed: the protection and management of heritage. Heritage management is a very important issue and the public may not be aware of the role archaeology plays in this.

The people associated with the sites is the area of biggest contrast. There is an association with some of the most well known and least well known who have lived in Adelaide. Gilles St has an association with one of the most important figures in Adelaide. Whereas the Rookery is associated with some of the poorest people to have lived in Adelaide and for this reason are as interesting as Colonel Light. The other sites fill in the area between these two extremes well.

The economic status of the Rookery’s inhabitants plays a part in its contrast with Gilles St in another area. The comparison between the use of Gilles St and the Rookery as residences shows a significant contrast as well. At the rookery site there are nine cottages that consist of
one room all in very close proximity. This again creates an image of the people who lived at this site being very poor. The other factor that lends itself to this is that the period of occupation for the individuals who lived here was very short, with the longest serving residents living there for six years. In contrast, Gilles St was a dwelling that would have housed a normal nuclear family quite comfortably. Added to this is the fact that the property only changed hands three times before its recent acquisition by the state government in the aftermath of the fire that gutted the property.

4.3 Style/Appearance

The overall concept of the exhibit revolves around creating an image of Adelaide in the first 20 years of its existence and it should reflect that. There are a couple of ways to achieve this goal. The easiest way to keep the theme consistent is through the use of colour in the exhibit. Using a colour palette that reflects the sites in the exhibit will keep the feel of the exhibit consistent.

Another way is to have the elements not directly related to the sites created in a way that reflects the time periods. This includes things like display cases. Instead of having modern display cases it would fit in better to use older looking furniture to house artefacts. A good example of this is the way the exhibits have been set up at the migration museum. Many of the displays use what appears to be period style furniture that has been adapted to function as part of the display. Keeping the other visual elements in a similar style should also be feasible. The photographs of the sites from their period of use are likely to be in black and white. However, it is a simple matter to convert these to match the style of the older material. The drawback with this is that it is likely to be expensive to do.
Regardless of the methods use to create the appearance of the exhibition artefacts will need to feature prominently. The artefacts uncovered at the sites in several cases, specifically Turner’s Paddock and the Rookery, represent more information than the historical record. Also artefacts are an easy visual tools to help communicate many of the themes that are associated with the sites. Most importantly the artefacts represent physical evidence of the activities and people associated with the sites.

4.4 Children’s Aspects

An element that was requested to form part of the exhibition was the presence of something specifically designed to engage children. Due to my own relative inexperience in this area my ideas were unfortunately quite limited.

An area that can be used to keep the interest of children is the choice of colour used. Children respond to colour and a poor choice of colour in the creation of the exhibit could easily result in a negative response from children.

Another area along a similar path is that children respond more to visual stimulus than writing. Children are more interested in things that they can see and touch. Again, the Migration Museum serves as a good example. Many of the displays were interactive that they will engaged children. This was clearly visible in a visit to the museum, with children enjoyed that there was something they could touch rather than have to read large blocks of text.

One last area that may prove successful in engaging children is incorporating children in the sites. An attempt should be made to show the presence of children at each site, with the
obvious exception of the crematorium. Seeing examples of children in the sites may provoke a positive response.
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