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Abstract

The study of historic faunal remains in European and North American archaeology has become commonplace. In Australia, however, studies have revolved mainly around butchery practices. Excavations of the Beresford Arms Hotel on Gilles Street, Adelaide, South Australia revealed a moderate assemblage of faunal remains, the majority being from sheep/goat, cow, rabbit, rodent and bird. These represent the waste from meals served when the property was functioning as a hotel, from meals after the hotel became a private dwelling, and remains brought in from other areas of Adelaide as landfill. Almost all show the effects of taphonomic processes and the sheep/goat, cow, rabbit and bird bones have been butchered to some extent. MNI and NISP counts show that sheep/goat made up the diet staple over the period, and an examination of the butchering patterns suggests that cuts eaten included ribs, steaks, chops, and soups among others. Owing to the nature of the deposit, it was not possible to distinguish between landfill and hotel/house waste. No definite inferences could be made, therefore, on the socioeconomic status of the patrons of the hotel.
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Glossary and Abbreviations

BAH Beresford Arms Hotel

Butchering  ‘the human reduction and modification of an animal carcass into consumable parts’ (Lyman 1994:294).

Butchering Pattern  ‘the results of the [butchering] process’ (Lyman 1994:296).

Butchering Process/Technique  ‘the actions and activities involved in butchering’ (Lyman 1994:296).

Chop  ‘Similar to cuts except they are wider marks where a cleaver or ax-like (sic) tool has removed a small wedge of bone’ (Crader 1990:705-706).

Cut  ‘Straight, narrow, incised lines probably made with a metal knife’ (Crader 1990:705-706).

Diaphysis  The shaft of a long bone.

Distal  The part of the bone furthest from the head.

Epiphysis  The ends of a bone that articulate with other bones and fuse with the diaphysis over time.

Fragment  A broken piece of bone that is usually not identifiable to a skeletal element.

Gentility  An ideology of the nineteenth century middle class society which acted as a standard of behaviour.

Hotel  An establishment offering accommodation, food, drink and entertainment on a larger scale than an inn or tavern.

Inn  An establishment offering accommodation and, consequently, the necessary food and drink.

Medial  The central line of an animal or bone, dividing it into symmetrical halves.

MNI  Minimum Number of Individuals. A quantification method that involves counting the minimum possible number of animals in any assemblage

MW  Meat Weight. A quantification method that involves calculating the importance of a species in a diet by determining the amount of meat they contribute to this diet.

NISP  Number of Individual Specimens Present. A quantification method that involves counting the number of individual bones, per species, in an assemblage, to determine a maximum possible number of animals present.

Proximal  The part of the bone closest to the head

Public House  A term used to represent any establishment offering accommodation, food, drink and entertainment (i.e., hotel, inn and tavern).

Respectability  An ideology of the nineteenth century working class society, which acted as a standard of behaviour.

Saw  ‘Flat, planar surface of bone bears regular, parallel striations where a metal saw was repeatedly drawn back and forth through the bone tissue’ (Crader 1990:705-706).
Scrape  ‘Where a shallow layer of surface bone has been removed leaving numerous, irregular striations’ (Crader 1990:705-706).

Shear  ‘Straight-walled, planar surfaces where the bone has been split apart, probably by a powerful blow with a cleaver or ax-like (sic) implement’ (Crader 1990:705-706).

Social Class  ‘A relationship between an individual and the control of investments and resources, decision making, the physical means of production and labor power’ (Burke 1999:39).

Social Status  ‘A relationship between people of disparate prestige’ (Burke 1999:39).

Socioeconomic Status  A term developed by sociologists and anthropologists to combine the ideologies of social class and social status, although archaeologists have critiqued this term as being imprecise, and confusing (Groover 2002:120-121).

TA  Town acre

Taphonomy  A term used to describe the history of a bone, from the moment of its death to its subsequent burial, excavation, and analysis.

Tavern  An establishment in direct competition with an inn, offering food, drink and entertainment.
1 Introduction

As the title would suggest, this thesis examines issues of socioeconomic status in nineteenth century colonial Adelaide, South Australia, through an analysis of the faunal assemblage uncovered from the Beresford Arms Hotel, 188 Gilles Street, Adelaide. It will do so by answering three research questions; firstly, what meats were the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel and the citizens of colonial Adelaide eating? Secondly, what meat cuts and meals do the faunal remains indicate? Finally, what was the socioeconomic status of the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel, and the general nineteenth century Adelaide population? Associated issues, such as butchery, will also be addressed in this thesis.

The Beresford Arms Hotel was built on the rural fringe of Adelaide city in 1840 (see Images 1.1-1.4). As the city grew the area became less rural and more urban, a change which may be reflected in the assemblage (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000). Although it had only one owner, it was licensed as a public house for 20 years under nine different publicans, one of whom held a license twice in different periods (Hoad 1986:420). In 1856 its name was changed to the Oddfellows Arms (Australian Heritage Places Inventory 2009), in 1860 the public house closed and the building became a private residence.

The Beresford Arms Hotel underwent several construction phases over its lifetime. Determining these construction phases was the focus of an excavation in November and December 2006. The excavation is discussed in detail in chapter four since it is important to have a clear understanding of these phases in order to gain an accurate picture of the forces acting on the assemblage. In addition to faunal remains, the excavation also revealed ceramics, glass and personal paraphernalia. This non-faunal material
formed the basis of a study by Beric in 2008, who concluded that the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel were of working class respectability and that these patrons were being served large, filling, individual meals on simple but matching dinnerware. Although Beric (2008) undertook a detailed study of the material culture from the Beresford Arms, and determined the form of the meals being served, it is still unknown exactly what food types were being consumed.

*Image 1.2: Adelaide, South Australia (Google Earth 2009).*
**Image 1.3:** Adelaide, South Australia, corner of Gilles Street and Harriet Street marked (Google Earth 2009).

**Image 1.4:** The Beresford Arms, 188 Gilles Street, corner of Harriet Street, Adelaide, South Australia (Google Earth 2009).
More evidence is also required to support Beric’s (2008:88) conclusion that the patrons were of working class respectability. It is expected that the faunal assemblage will reflect the working class patronage of the hotel, although several studies (see, for example, Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000 and Schmitt and Zeier 1993) have noted that there is often a variance between the socioeconomic status indicated by non-faunal material and that indicated by faunal remains. This could be a result of class-imitation, where persons of a lower social class try to emulate the culture of a higher social class through non-faunal material or the foods they eat. Variation in the indication of status between fauna and other classes of material remains has also been attributed to the idea that some persons will eat according to taste, rather than fashion. An analysis of the faunal remains from the Beresford Arms should contribute to all of these arguments.

Socioeconomic status is an important issue in historical archaeology as it relates to the identity of a group of people. In turn, identity is also an important component of ideology. The central idea behind mid-19th century socioeconomic status includes the working class notion of respectability, and the middle class notion of gentility (defined and discussed in chapter 3). South Australia was settled as a free colony by immigrants travelling from Europe, predominately the United Kingdom. As free men and women, they would have identified with a social ideology (i.e. respectability or gentility). These ideologies shaped the way the working and middle classes conducted their lives. A study into the faunal remains will increase our understanding of the people of 19th century Adelaide by offering insight into the diet and consumption practices of everyday people who may not be mentioned in the written record for religious, socioeconomic or other reasons (Orser 2002c:651).

Additionally, the Beresford Arms Hotel itself is a ‘significant landmark in Adelaide’s colonial history’ (Beric 2008:89), as the following statement of significance from its heritage listing on the State Heritage Register (Australian Heritage Places Inventory 2009) indicates:

... this building remains as a rare and relatively intact example of the many early public houses which traded within the City of Adelaide. Of simple construction on a domestic scale, the building is also one of the few remaining examples of a residential rather than government or religious building within the city dating from the first years of the colony.

A study of the faunal remains recovered from the Beresford Arms Hotel will add to the emerging history of the establishment and increase the establishment’s historical and social significance. It will also provide an insight into the lives of early European settlers in Adelaide, giving current residents a link to the past.
Unfortunately, the majority of literature regarding faunal remains and socioeconomic status originates from overseas studies, mainly American and European. The European studies tend to focus on the medieval period and this difference in time makes these studies incompatible with the Beresford Arms Hotel assemblage as society has changed significantly since this time. As there is a comparative lack of Australian literature investigating the connections between faunal analysis and socioeconomic status, this study of the Beresford Arms Hotel assemblage is significant for its rarity. An additional aim of this thesis is, therefore, to contribute a detailed faunal analysis to Australian historical archaeology that will be comparable to other sites, collections and studies.

Since the 1960s, historical archaeologists have begun to give more attention to the study of faunal remains in archaeology, and it has been hypothesised that a relationship exists between the cost of food and the socioeconomic status of those who purchase it (Carroll 2002:143-144). As a result of this relationship, food remains should indicate the socioeconomic status of the consumer, with more expensive and exotic meats and meat cuts indicating a high socioeconomic status. This assumption underlies every socioeconomic faunal analysis. Several studies worldwide have determined that it is possible to deduce socioeconomic status from faunal remains, as well as information on diets, butchery practices, animal husbandry, social changes, ethnicity and religion (Briggs 2000; Deetz 1996; Greenfield 1989; Rothschild and Balkwill 1993; Schmitt and Lupo 2008 and Schmitt and Zeier 1993). In the early years of faunal analysis several techniques for quantifying faunal remains were developed. Of these MNI (Minimum Number of Individuals) and NISP (Number of Individual Specimens Present) have become the most popular methods and will be used for this study. There are also several works on the study of taphonomic processes which affect faunal assemblages (e.g., Lyman 1994 and Reitz and Wing 1999), which are taken into consideration during the analysis of the Beresford Arms assemblage.

The research questions above will be answered and a contribution made to the gaps in the archaeological record by attempting to determine the diet and socioeconomic status of the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel, and also the diet and socioeconomic status of the wider 19th century Adelaide community. The faunal remains will be sorted into taxa, skeletal element and age at death. Any butchering modification or taphonomic processes will be recorded, as well as the probable meat cut of the bone. Newspapers from colonial Adelaide offer pricing for different meat types, and overseas studies give an indication of the value of different meat cuts. Using the data gained inferences will be drawn about the nature of the diet and the socioeconomic status of the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel, as well as of the wider Adelaide community. It is also possible that butchery patterns will be identified.
1.1 Chapter Summaries

1.1.1 Chapter 2
Chapter 2 gives a brief history of the early years of European settlement in Adelaide, the development of farming in Adelaide and its surrounding areas, on public houses in Adelaide and, more specifically, of the Beresford Arms Hotel itself.

1.1.2 Chapter 3
This chapter offers definitions for several concepts raised throughout this thesis, a theory of socioeconomic status, its position in archaeology and its relationship with faunal remains. It also reviews current literature on socioeconomic status, faunal remains and non-faunal material and other related topics such as butchery practices.

1.1.3 Chapter 4
Chapter 4 looks at the methodology used to analyse the faunal remains, including issues of taphonomy, expected to be encountered throughout the assemblage, various ways of butchering animals and the marks this leaves on an assemblage, and a brief overview of the quantification methods MNI and NISP. A summary of the excavation technique is also presented and the methodology adopted for sorting and recording the bones. The limitations for this study are also addressed in this chapter.

1.1.4 Chapter 5
The results gained using the methods outlined in chapter 4 are presented in this chapter. This includes MNI and NISP counts, dating of the contexts, a breakdown of the representation of each taxa in different rooms and contexts, taphonomic processes present in the assemblage, element composition, meat cuts and determination of age-at-death from the bones.

1.1.5 Chapter 6
This chapter discusses the results of the study and draws inferences on the socioeconomic status of the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel and the citizens of colonial Adelaide. Newspapers were examined to obtain prices for meat and American studies are drawn on to rank different meat cuts.

1.1.6 Chapter 7
Chapter 7 is the concluding chapter, bringing together all the information gathered over the length of the thesis to finalise an answer to the research questions. Recommendations for future work are also offered in this chapter.
2 History

In order to fully understand the faunal assemblage of the Beresford Arms Hotel it is necessary to first understand the historical context in which it developed. This chapter offers a brief history of the settlement of Adelaide and the development of public houses in Adelaide. It also looks at farming practices in the new settlement, as the availability of local animals will influence the fauna present in the Beresford Arms assemblage and indicate whether meat is being imported from other states or overseas. A history of the establishment and use of the Beresford Arms itself is also presented.

2.1 The early years of settlement in Adelaide

South Australia was first settled by Europeans in 1836. The first governor was John Hindmarsh, however it was Colonel William Light, the first surveyor-general, who selected the Torrens as the location for the capital – Adelaide, named after the consort of King William IV. Gargett and Marsden (1996:1) claim that Adelaide was well known for its Englishness, more so than any other Australian colony despite all of them being settled by British Islanders. This could be related to the manner in which Adelaide was settled. By the end of the 1700s there was still no system for colonising a new country (Gargett and Marsden 1996:9). In the 1830s, Edward Wakefield, in England, devised a scheme for ‘systematic colonisation’. He argued that land should be sold to settlers, and the funds raised would pay for the free emigration of the people (Gargett and Marsden 1996:9).

Great hopes were held for Adelaide – there were to be no convicts like other states, and it was to be settled by free people. It was hoped for self-advancement and social reform (Gargett and Marsden 1996:9). The settlers were a religious people, comprising of Protestant Christians including ‘Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists and Unitarians’ (Gargett and Marsden 1996:13). Light divided Adelaide into two halves: North Adelaide and South Adelaide. South Adelaide was made up of 700 one acre blocks, whereas North Adelaide had only 342 blocks (Gargett and Marsden 1996:12). Light’s initial survey was completed in 1837 but was restricted to areas close to the city; country sections were not available until 1838 (Gargett and Marsden 1996:23). Lieutenant George Gawler became the state’s second governor in 1838. On his arrival at the settlement he found that farming in the new colony was negligible, people were buying and selling land without using it, there were no public buildings or prosperous industries, and food and stock had to be imported from other colonies. As a consequence, Gawler worked quickly to survey country lands and sell them (Gibbs 1984:43). The Adelaide plains and foothills became the first agricultural land (Gargett and Marsden 1996:23), farming sheep and cattle, and growing wheat.
Food was scarce and expensive in the new colony; the majority was imported from Hobart, Sydney and India (Gibbs 1984:52). Gibbs (1984:52) reports that a ton of flour would cost a settler £100, given this, many settlers turned to the local wildlife for food, eating kangaroos, emus, cockatoos and other parrots. Roads were also an issue in early Adelaide. To the southeast, in the vicinity of the Beresford Arms, there was no surveyed road beyond Glen Osmond (see Image 2.1). Governor Grey endorsed the building of a road from Glen Osmond valley into the hills in the mid-1830s and for the next seven years road tolls were collected on this new road to pay for the road-maker’s expenses. Two shillings were collected for a bullock-wagon and a half-penny for every sheep to use the road (Gibbs 1984:53-54). The completion of the Great Eastern Road (now called Glen Osmond Road) in October of 1841 would have opened up the Beresford Arms Hotel to traders, farmers and producers. A government train line from Adelaide to Port Adelaide was opened in 1856 but, other than this, there was no form of public transport in or around the city (Gargett and Marsden 1996:34).

![Image 2.1: Showing the proximity of Glen Osmond to Gilles Street and Adelaide (Google Earth 2009)](image)

Although the plan for colonisation of South Australia was to preserve class distinction (for a definition of ‘class’, see chapter 3) by maintaining a balance between land-owning employers and employee labourers (Adair 1989:12), there was some mixing of socioeconomic groups, as evidenced by an account from Augustus Short, Adelaide’s first Anglican bishop, in 1847 (Brown 1973:37):

> Victoria Baylem
The first colonist introduced to me was Mr Graham, who receives £12,000 p.a. from the Burra mine … next a Roman Catholic priest who grasped me by the hand!!! … Then came Mr Montefiore a Jew, followed by Mr Hagen of the Society of Friends. Such is the society. Presently our little friend the priest … said to the Archdeacon, you won’t be scandalized shall you at my playing a game of whist? So he and his co-priest Mr Bach … sat down with a Jew and a Roman Catholic layman at the Whist table.

Working class homes were often situated quite near the homes of wealthy families, although the densest working class areas were located in the west end of Adelaide and lower North Adelaide (Gargett and Marsden 1996:29). In the eastern colonies the wealthy, by comparison, lived on rural estates. In Adelaide, as the agricultural industry began to prosper, many pastoral ‘kings’ built grand homes in Brougham Place, North Adelaide, or East Terrace, Adelaide, as well as at Glenelg and Brighton, or further in the country at Glen Osmond, Torrens Park and Walkerville, in addition to their station homesteads (Gargett and Marsden 1996:29). Gargett and Marsden (1996:31) argue that the wealthy families of Adelaide came very near to recreating life as English country gentlemen.

2.2 Farming
Sheep, cows and horses were brought over from England with the settlers. No mention of pigs is made, although a journal entry by George Stevenson, Hindmarsh’s secretary, does make reference to ‘The Governor’s mules, pigs, cow, geese, turkeys, and dogs’ (Gibbs 1984:33). If pigs were farmed in Adelaide from the beginning, they did not make a large contribution to the economy; this is evidenced by a lack of mention of them in the literature.

Sheep farming grew quickly from the first arrival of settlement, sheep farms, dairy farms and orchard farms emerged 10 miles (16.1 kilometres) from the city (Gibbs 1984:54). The sheep adapted well to the Australian climate (Osterstock 1974:36) and it wasn’t long before the export of wool formed a major part of economic growth. The South Australian Company had a flock in the Noarlunga district hills, and there was another early sheep farm in the Barossa Ranges. As the settlement grew the sheep farms were pushed further and further away from the city (Hitchcox n.d.:15). Cattle stock was of poor quality at the start of the colony and they were not as suited to the country as sheep, however they did well closer to the city (Osterstock 1974:37). By 1857 it was claimed that the amount of land cultivated had reached 235 965 acres, sheep numbers were at 2 075 805, cattle at 310 400 and horses had reached 26 220 (Pascoe 1901:125). The annual value placed on imports to the colony stood at £1 623 052 and exports came to £1 744 184 (although note that this figure is not exclusively the product of farming) (Pascoe 1901:125). Over
the next nine years, the number of sheep and horses continued to increase, whereas the number of cattle decreased (Pascoe 1901:128).

2.3 Hotels in Adelaide

Adair (1989:4) discusses the differences between an inn, a tavern and a hotel. An inn’s primary function was to offer accommodation; consequently, it was also necessary to provide food and drink. A tavern was a direct competitor of an inn, offering food, drink and entertainment. He argues that the use of the term ‘hotel’ increased during the nineteenth century as buildings became larger, implying that hotels operated the same services, but on a larger scale than either taverns or inns. Adair used the term ‘public house’ to refer to all three. ‘Public house’ will be adopted throughout this thesis, unless talking specifically about one or the other.

As a new colony, the settlers were searching for a sense of security and identity (Adair 1989:6). Adair (1989:6) argues that this was partially achieved by re-establishing familiar British practices and values, such as opening public houses, which were very important to the social atmosphere in England. According to Adair (1989:7), a British public house was a multi-functional place, dominated by males – usually labourers – who came for refreshment after work. Meals and accommodation were provided for locals and travellers, and recreational activities were organised to entertain the patrons. Public houses were also a place of arrival and departure for travellers, and a place where coronial inquests and surgical procedures were carried out (Adair 1989:7). In addition, in Australia, hotels often acted as a post office (Beric 2008:7).

Adair (1985:6) argues that British working class leisure time was ‘public and gregarious’ and generally held at a public house. Public houses were, therefore, ‘welcomingly familiar and seemingly permanent.’ Here there is controversy, for public houses were viewed by the social reformers as ‘a threat to morality, frugality and industry’ (Adair 1985:9). The South Australian Colonisation Commission had examined potential colonists for their ‘soundness of physical condition and ‘respectable’ character’, in an attempt to avoid ‘social evils’ such as drinking and gambling (Adair 1985:13). However, it was agreed that some alcoholic drinks were more acceptable than others were. Spirits were considered particularly bad and beer was preferable. George Fife Angas (cited in Adair 1985:28) is quoted as writing in 1835 ‘if possible … spirituous liquors should be prevented from being distilled or imported into the colony … porter, ale and wines of different descriptions should be encouraged in preference’. Despite this, wines, brandy, rum, whiskey, geneva and malt liquors were all sold in public houses, along with a selection of non-alcoholic drinks, including ginger beer, soda water, cordials, tea and coffee (Adair 1985:30-31). In
addition to cultural identity, the settlers of Adelaide had another reason for drinking: alcohol was a trusted replacement for water when the latter was polluted or scarce, a problem which would have been persistent in early Adelaide (Adair 1985:8).

Legislation for public houses was introduced in 1839, in the form of the South Australian Licensing Act. A hotel license cost £100, with an additional annual fee of £25, plus two payments of £50 from two guarantors, for surety that ‘the licensee would sell none other than good and wholesome liquors, without fraudulently diluting or adulterating the same, and not introduce or permit bull baiting, dog or cock fighting, gambling, or any other disorder or disturbance’ (Hoad 1986:2&4). Under the legislation public houses had to be closed by 10pm on weekdays and Saturdays, and could only open between 1.30pm and 3pm on Sundays, and this was only for the sale of malt liquor for consumption off the premises, and for travellers. In 1855 opening hours were extended to 11pm on weekdays and Saturdays, and from 1pm to 3pm and from 8pm to 10pm on Sundays (Hoad 1986:3). It seemed that drinking in moderation, rather than prohibition, was enough to be ‘respectable’ in Adelaide (for a definition of respectability, see chapter 3) (Adair 1985:39).

2.4 The Beresford Arms Hotel

Colonel Light was the first owner of Town Acre (TA) 597, on which the Beresford Arms Hotel was constructed. On his death in August 1839 the land was made over to his mistress, Maria Gandy, and was sold to Robert Milne in October 1839 (Sumerling 2006:3). The Beresford Arms Hotel was constructed and licensed between this time and March 1840, although the first publican was John Martin, not Robert Milne (Sumerling 2006:1&3). No license was issued between 1843 and 1846, probably because there was an economic depression at this time and it is possible that the hotel ceased trading during these years (Sumerling 2006:8). Alternatively, it has been suggested that the hotel may have continued to operate unlicensed – apparently a common practice at the time (Beric 2008:9). In August of 1844 the most westerly lot of TA 597 was sold to John Martin and in 1845 half of the northern end of TA 597 was sold to John Gibbs (Sumerling 2006:3). Between 1846 and 1847 the hotel license belonged to William Moorhead, and between 1847 and 1853 the licensee was James Ellery (Hoad 1986:420; Sumerling 2006:9). In 1851 the westerly lot, which sat between John Martin’s lot, and the Beresford Arms, was sold to John Daniel (Sumerling 2006:18). From 1853 to 1855 the license was held by William Tidswell (Hoad 1986:420). In March 1855 the lease was transferred from John Martin to Hugh Hall, and in September of the same year, the only female publican – Esther Smithson – held the license. In 1856 the hotel was licensed to Henry Meek, William Wilkins and Henry Palmer in quick succession (Hoad 1986:420; Sumerling 2006:4). In December 1856 Palmer changed the name of the public house from the Beresford
Arms Hotel to the Oddfellows Arms; he surrendered his lease in September 1858 and in December of that year the lease was picked up by William Tidswell for a second time (Hoad 1986:420; Sumerling 2006:3). Tidswell was the last publican of the Oddfellows Arms, which closed in 1860 and became a private residence. By 1861 Tidswell no longer held a license (Sumerling 2006:9). The owner of the hotel, John Martin, then sold the hotel to Johannes Andreas Schrader in April 1873. In April 1904 Schrader sold the property to John Wilson, who in turn sold it to Ernest Harold Stanton in January 1950. On the death of Stanton in 1987 the property transferred to Gordon Leslie Stanton (Sumerling 2006:9) (see Appendix 1 for a timeline of events for the Beresford Arms Hotel).

According to Sumerling (2006:9), the Adelaide City Council Rate Assessments claimed that in 1851 the hotel consisted of six rooms and a yard. By 1852 the room count had increased to eight (see Appendix 2 for a floor plan and proposed construction sequences). Construction of the building took place over twelve phases and several years, below is a brief summary of these phases, however the reader is referred to the full report¹ for an in-depth construction sequence.

2.4.1 Phase 1
The original building was constructed in an ‘L’ shape, consisting of rooms 1 and 2 (Sumerling 2006:1). It had a simple Georgian domestic architecture ‘with typical parapet, multi-paned windows and stucco finish’, built from local brick and limestone, with a wooden shingle roof (Sumerling 2006:2). Room 2’s west wall had a door leading to the yard (later room 3/4). Room 2 and this section of the yard were filled, leaving the remaining piles of waste from construction buried some 200-300mm below the ground surface (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8). The floors of rooms 1 and 2 were compacted earth over the original topsoil and the base of Room 2 was not scraped clean prior to the construction of the hotel (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8). Room 2 also had a dividing wall running east-west.

2.4.2 Phase 2
The north wall of room 6 was constructed during the second phase, creating a courtyard between room 2 and Harriet Street; the courtyard was initially laid with pavers. It is also possible there was a toilet or kitchen attached to the north side of this wall (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

¹ Available from Austral Archaeology or the Adelaide City Council.
2.4.3 Phase 3
The next phase of construction was the cellar pit, with a stairwell going down from the yard, north of the courtyard wall. At the time of the construction of this cellar the backyard had been partially filled, and the wooden floor of what would later become room 5 was laid (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

2.4.4 Phase 4
This phase involved the building of the upper walls of room 5, with an east door into what was to be room 7. The removal of the east-west dividing wall in room 2 also happened in this phase; the footings of this wall were covered in earth (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

2.4.5 Phase 5
Next was the construction of room 3/4 external walls, although at this time these two rooms were one. By the time these walls were constructed the backyard had been completely filled in. An oregon floor was laid in room 3/4 directly over the yard surface, and also in rooms 1 and 2, over the earth floors. Room 6 was then enclosed with the erection of the east wall and a door added for direct access from Harriet Street (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

At this stage the building consisted of six rooms (including the cellar) and a yard, it can be assumed therefore that this construction took place between 1840 and 1851. Since it is unlikely that any construction would have happened during the economic depression, it might be further assumed that the building of rooms 3/4, 5, 6 and the cellar took place between 1846 and 1851.

2.4.6 Phase 6
The next phase of construction was the building of room 7. If there was a kitchen or a toilet north of room 6, then this building would have formed the eastern wall of room 7, making only the construction of the north wall necessary. The floor of room 7 was the compacted yard surface. The cellar stairwell was now located inside room 7, however, due to awkward access, a second stairwell was built in room 2. At this time room 6 was also given a timber floor, and a dividing wall was built over the oregon floorboards of rooms 3/4 separating them completely (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

2.4.7 Phase 7
A flood event happened in this phase, causing the installation or replacement of wooden floors as discussed below.
By 1851 the Beresford Arms consisted of eight rooms. Using the ACC Rate Assessment as a guide, it can be assumed that the construction of these extra rooms took place between 1851 and 1852. No further major construction to the building took place until post-1880, however some minor changes which affected the integrity of the assemblage include: replacing the floor boards in rooms 3 and 4; partially excavating room 4 to construct an air vent and scraping a channel out of room 3 for another air vent; bricking up the cellar stairwell in room 2 and back filling the cavity with soil; and re-flooring rooms 1 and 2 (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8). Post-1880 construction included the building of outbuildings 8, 9, and 10, and the conjoining of rooms 1 and 6 (and with it a change in room-use) by knocking down a large part of the north wall of room 1 (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8). A concrete path was laid over where the possible toilet/kitchen chimney to the east of room 7 may have been located. The cellar was then filled with soil (landfill). The north wall of room 5 was replaced with a bay window, and the floor of room 7 was re-concreted and a small exit ramp to the back yard created (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8). In addition to this there were several flood events over the lifespan of the building that would also have affected the assemblage (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.8).

2.5 Conclusion
This chapter has shaped the historical context in which the Beresford Arms Hotel was constructed and operated. It has determined that drinking to excess was considered immoral and non-respectable in Adelaide, and yet the presence of public houses was tolerated and even enjoyed by members of the community. Sheep and cattle were the main domesticated animals available, making it likely that these animals were consumed most frequently. The Beresford Arms Hotel has had a large number of publicans; all of whom must have been wealthy enough to be able to afford a license. Despite the regular turn-over of licensees, the building itself has remained relatively stable, although the construction phases give an idea of the amount of disturbance to the deposit and therefore the possible problems with the integrity of the faunal assemblage.
3 Theory and Literature

Prior to the 1960s the study of faunal remains in historical archaeology in North America and Australia was virtually non-existent. Daly (1969:146-147) contended this was because faunal remains were considered to be of low cultural significance, ‘nonartifactual’ and ‘too hard’ to analyse. However, since the 1960s, their use in archaeological studies to determine diets and the importance of particular animals in these diets has steadily increased. Currently, faunal remains are included in studies in an attempt to uncover information not just about diets, but also about slaughtering, animal husbandry, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, which will be the focus of this project. Ideally, studies from Australia and the United Kingdom would be the most relevant for comparison to the Beresford Arms Hotel assemblage, however the majority of literature from the United Kingdom is focussed on the medieval period, and literature from Australia tends to neglect the issue of socioeconomic status.

3.1 Terminology

3.1.1 Social Class and Social Status

The term ‘status’ is often used interchangeably with the term ‘class’, therefore, it should be made clear that, in this thesis, these terms have separate meanings. Burke (1999:39) defines class ‘as a relationship between an individual and the control of investments and resources, decision making, the physical means of production and labor power’; it is then, an economic relationship, whether you are a property owner, or a business owner and employer, self-employed or an employee etc. Status is a social relationship, it is defined ‘as a relationship between people of disparate prestige’, with a ‘status group… share[ing] a common lifestyle and generally accepted forms of conduct that are recognised as bases for interaction, such as dress, accent, or the application of membership sanctions in voluntary organizations’ (Burke 1999:39). Given these definitions, Burke (1999:39) contends that it is possible for people of the same class, to be accorded different status.

3.1.2 Respectability and Gentility

Other terms which arise in relevant literature include ‘respectability’ and ‘gentility’; likewise these terms are often used interchangeably despite having different meanings and need to be defined for this thesis. The issue of respectability and gentility is addressed by Young (1997, 2003), Briggs (2005) and Beric (2008). Like status and class, the two terms are ideological, and difficult to define. The development of ‘respectability’ is most often attributed to the working-class from approximately 1850 (Briggs 2005:1). It developed as a means of distinguishing between the working-class and the middle-class, as a result of new social conditions ‘arising out of industrialisation and urbanisation’ (Briggs 2005:1), yet it essentially shares significant characteristics with gentility (Young 2003:60). Respectability was about the daily
actions of men, women and even children, and its general behavioural rules included: ‘[to] not get drunk, nor behave wildly; to exhibit “propriety of speech and decorum of bearing”; to dress tidily, especially on Sunday; to have a clean house, inside and out; and to provide a good example to others... [to be] ‘independent’ and law-abiding’ (Briggs 2005:1). From the idea of respectability arose the notion of domesticity - the male breadwinner and the mother-and-housewife (Young 2003:60). Independence was an important notion to the working-class, the ability to feed and provide for a wife and family. There was a dividing line between the ‘traditionalists’ and the ‘modernists’ within the working class, such that the traditionalists rejected the ideology of respectability, while the modernists embraced it (Young 2003:58).

Young (1997, 2003, see also Briggs 2005) uses the term ‘gentility’ to describe the culture of the middle-class. There is much debate between academics whether the idea of ‘respectability’ is an imitation of ‘gentility’, or whether they are different rules, arising from ‘a different set of values’ (Briggs 2005:1). Young (2003:60) argues that, although both are very similar, there are differences between the two cultures, which suggests autonomy. The nineteenth century middle-class were aspiring towards a refined culture, but one flexible enough to adapt to middle-class conditions (Young 1997:17). Young (1997:17) argues that one necessity of high-class society was to have sufficient wealth to be freed from the need to work. High-class ideology said that to work was a ‘sign of ignobility’. The middle-class reversed this view, so that not working became a ‘standard of poor behaviour’. The leisurely activities of women, such as making music, embroidery and drawing, were raised from ‘leisure’ status, to ‘work’ status (Young 1997:17-18). Another cultural requirement of gentility was the practice of self-control, in the body, emotions, and social interaction. This was expressed through clean housing, clothing, feeding, personal presentation, posture and the prohibition of expressive feelings (Young 1997:18).

3.1.3 Socioeconomic Status
The term socioeconomic status was developed by sociologists and anthropologists to combine the ideologies of social class and social status, although archaeologists have critiqued this term as being imprecise, and confusing (Groover 2002:120-121). To prevent confusion it should be noted that, unless referring specifically to social class or social status, the term socioeconomic status shall be used and is referring to both class and status. Due to the recognised limitations (discussed below) of determining social class and social status from archaeological material it is difficult, and at times impossible, to distinguish between deposits associated with class, and deposits associated with status. For this reason it is sometimes necessary, even if sometimes inappropriate, to combine the two under one term.
3.2 The Importance of Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status is an important issue in historical archaeology as it relates to the identity of a people. It has long been argued that identity is an important component of ideology (see Burke 1999; Leone, Potter and Shackel 1987; and Parker Pearson 1984). Burke (1999:25) argues that identity is ‘a crucial aspect in allowing [ideology] to make at least minimal sense of people’s position in the world, and thus their day-to-day life experiences’. Ideology deals with those aspects of everyday life that go unnoticed or taken for granted (Leone, Potter and Shackel 1987:284) and includes the “nature of our work and leisure, house forms, food preparation, our use of the past, [and] attitudes between men and women…” (Parker Pearson 1984:60). Leone, Potter and Shackel (1984:284) argue that ideology rationalises such things as inequality, bondage and frustration and makes them acceptable. As such, ideology then becomes highly relevant to class stratification and wealth holding (Leone, Potter and Shackel 1984:284). For this reason, socioeconomic status is an important theme to study. Determining the socioeconomic status of the patrons of the Beresford Arms hotel could provide an idea of the position that these people held in the colonial society of Adelaide, or the changing composition of this society over time.

3.3 Determining Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status can be determined from an assemblage in two ways, first, from an analysis of non-faunal artefacts, such as ceramics, and second, from an analysis of the faunal remains. It has been recognised that there is a relationship between socioeconomic status and the foods that people eat (e.g. Deetz 1996, Greenfield 1989; Schmitt and Lupo 2008, Schmitt and Zeier 1993). The basic assumption that underlines any socioeconomic-faunal material analysis is that people of higher socioeconomic status eat foods that are more expensive or exotic than people of a lower socioeconomic status. It can therefore be assumed that such a relationship between socioeconomic status and food remains would be visible in the archaeological record. Therefore, if an assemblage contains a higher count of exotic animal bones or expensive meat cuts, it can be argued that the consumers were of higher socioeconomic status.

There is a distinct lack of literature on the study of faunal remains to determine socioeconomic status within Australia. The majority of socioeconomic status studies in historical archaeology have revolved around the analysis of non-faunal artefacts, such as ceramics, pottery or even architecture, rather than faunal remains (see Bartels 2005; Bedell et al. 1994; Beric 2008; O’Donovan and Wurst 2001-2002; Wholey 2006 and Zierden 1999). This is possibly due to the complicated nature of faunal deposits, which deters many researchers from assessing this data. However, non-faunal remains can be deceptive; occasionally people of a low socioeconomic status mimic the trends of higher socioeconomic groups (see
for example, Bedell et al. 1994:52), although this is unlikely to be the case for the Beresford Arms Hotel. For this reason, animal remains are a good source of information when determining socioeconomic status, as people of different status, class, ethnicity, religion and time periods value different foods.

The majority of work relating to faunal remains concentrates on developing methodologies for counting, and analysing taphonomic processes on these remains (Colley 2006; Landon 2005; Lyman 1979; Rothschild and Balkwill 1993; Schmitt and Lupo 2008). Methodological issues relating to faunal studies will be discussed in chapter 4. Several studies focus on the diets of consumers, ethnicity, animal husbandry, and/or slaughtering practices (Briggs 2000; Gibbs 2005; Greenfield 1989; Milne and Crabtree 2001; Piper 1991; Sportman et al. 2007). These latter studies commonly use both non-faunal and faunal remains for their data. Five of these six studies have centred on domestic (private) or commercial (slaughtering house) waste, with little focus directed towards waste from public houses.

Many of the studies that have looked at social class or social status through faunal remains are from North America (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000; Crader 1984, 1990; Drucker 1981; Schmitt and Zeier 1993; Scott 2001; Singleton 1995; Zierden 1999) or other overseas sites (Hall 1993; Schmitt and Lupo 2008). As Colley (2006:47) has stated, the most relevant overseas studies are those from Britain, as South Australia was colonised, in the majority, by British immigrants. However, British historical studies tend to concentrate on the medieval period, making comparisons difficult, as, by the nineteenth century, social systems had changed drastically.

Studies that concentrate on the links between socioeconomic status and faunal remains are most relevant for the purposes of this thesis. The focus of these studies is to determine the types of animals consumed, particular meat cuts, the types of meals being prepared, and the relationship between faunal remains and other classes of archaeological data. Studies of this nature will assist in the analysis of the Beresford Arms Hotel and are broken down into categories and discussed in detail below.

3.4 Type of Animal and Butchery
Studies have shown that the type of animal eaten can be related to the socioeconomic status of its consumers. Archaeological investigations have revealed that Western diets in eighteenth and nineteenth century America were very similar, made up of both domestic animals, such as cattle, sheep/goat, pig, and poultry, game animals, such as deer, and imported animals, such as fish, lobster, oysters, clams and turtles (Greenfield 1989:97; Milne and Crabtree 2001:40-42 and Zierden 1999:82-83).
Greenfield (1989) studied faunal remains recovered from excavations at the Broad Financial Plaza in New York City. This area was a complex mix of ethnic groups, dominated firstly by Dutch settlers and later by the British. In this study, Greenfield (1989:85) sought to 'increase our understanding of the changing environment and ethnic mix, and cultural patterns of food consumption in colonial New Amsterdam/New York City.' Her results found that the main diet included cattle, sheep/goat, pig and deer, with cattle and sheep/goat counts increasing over time, and pig and deer decreasing over time (Greenfield 1989:97). Greenfield (1989:97) concluded that one possible explanation for this changing diet was a changing environment. Another possibility was that a changing ethnic majority, with a decreasing Dutch population for whom pork was an important dietary contributor, and an increasing British population for whom pork played only a small role in diet (Greenfield 1989:102-103). Greenfield (1989:97) noted that a common argument for the presence of game animals was a lack of domestic animals early in the colony, but as the colony grew and settled game animals lost their importance to middle class citizens. Citizens of lower class continued to rely on these animals for dietary supplements, and for citizens of higher socioeconomic class they acted as a show of wealth and status, game animals therefore functioned as socioeconomic status markers.

In a similar study, Milne and Crabtree (2001:31) sought to add to the knowledge of working class diets in the mid-1800s by studying three faunal assemblages from three different households in Five Points, New York. They found that a carpenter's household was subsisting on pig leg and shank, whereas a brothel was serving expensive foods, such as veal, lobster, oysters and clams. Alternatively, the assemblage from a rabbi's household was dominated by cattle, kosher chicken, and fish (Milne and Crabtree 2001:40-43). All these households were of working class status, this was reflected in the faunal remains from the carpenter's and the rabbi's household, but the assemblage from the brothel was associated with high class food remains. This can be explained by the customers the brothel would have been serving, who would have been of high class. Milne and Crabtree (2001:44) argued that the occasional appearance of expensive food types in working class people's diets was a reflection of improvements in transportation and access to specialty foods.

A study of upper class Nathaniel Russell's house in Charleston, South Carolina (c.1808), by Zierden (1999:82-83), revealed a presence of exotic animals such as turtle, goose, duck and turkey. Zierden (1999:82-83) found that these animals were slaughtered on site and concluded that they were probably caught as game from Russell's plantations. The self-slaughtering of animals in urban settings is argued to be high class social behaviour. Middle class citizens would have been eating the same animals, but
would have obtained them from a butcher; an assemblage derived from a butcher should therefore have a higher percentage of sawed bone (Zierden 1999:82-83).

As part of their study of 12 features, including dugouts, houses and a blacksmith’s shop, within a historic mining community in Grantsville, Nevada, Schmitt and Zeier (1993:26) used both the diversity of animals present and the quality of meat cuts (see below) to determine the socioeconomic status of consumers. They found cattle, sheep, pig, fish, bird and deer present throughout the features. They ranked deposits as having a high variety of species (four or more), a moderate variety of species (two to three) and no variety (a single species present) (Schmitt and Zeier 1993:26). The theory behind this analysis was that the higher socioeconomic households would have been eating a greater variety of meat types. Alternatively, households that showed no variability in faunal variety may have been occupied by ‘individuals or small groups who seldom prepared foods’ and households that showed a high variability could represent family or group homes (Schmitt and Zeier 1993:27).

Gust (1997) studied the faunal assemblage uncovered from a Chinese-American site in Sacramento Valley, California. The animals found were diverse, including elk, deer, antelope, rabbit, duck, goose and other migratory birds. Domestic animals, such as cattle, sheep and pig, were also present, although pig had a comparatively small count. This was attributed to the fact that the environment was ill suited for pig farming, making pig meat scarce and driving up the price of pork (Gust 1997:249). This is an argument also offered by Greenfield (1989:100) to account for the changes in diet throughout the decades at Broad Financial Plaza, New York. The native fauna were all game animals and could have been hunted by the consumer or purchased from the market (Gust 1997:249), but the butchery patterns on the domestic animals suggest that they were purchased from a butcher (Gust 1997:251) which, according to Zeirden (1999:82-83), would indicate a middle-class diet.

Sportman et al. (2007), in their examination of a faunal deposit at high Sylvester Manor, Boston, which had a known high socioeconomic status, also found that the occupants were butchering and eating their own animals. In addition, they noted that the butchery pattern was not particularly economical to get the most meat possible from the animal, indicating just how prosperous the Manor was (Sportman et al. 2007:137).

In a study most relevant to the Beresford Arms Hotel, Briggs (2000) analysed the excavated faunal material from a site in Divett Street, Port Adelaide. This was a commercial butchery site, dated between 1870 and 1886. Briggs (2000:138) found that the assemblage was dominated by sheep, followed by
cattle and pigs. She argued that this pattern reflected the availability of animals in the colony at the time, also the cost of the animals, with mutton being considerably cheaper than both beef and pork (Briggs 2000:138). Briggs noted that, whilst there was some variation to the butchering pattern, it was mostly standardised (Briggs 2000:140), with the saw being the most common tool used (Briggs 2000:141). The faunal remains at this Port Adelaide site are dominated by a cheaper meat (mutton) indicating that the butcher was selling to people of a lower socioeconomic status. It also indicates that in Adelaide working and middle class diets were likely to be dominated by sheep.

These studies agree that the presence of exotic or expensive animals, such as deer, veal, oysters, clams, lobsters, goose, duck, turtle and turkey, indicate that the consumers are of a higher socioeconomic status. This can be confirmed by examining the butchery patterns of the animals: high socioeconomic food remains will most likely have been self-butchered, possibly in a less economical, way. Alternatively, households that contain a large variety of animals are also argued to be of high socioeconomic status. A majority of pig, cattle, sheep/goat and fish in the assemblage, on the other hand, may represent the diet of lower socioeconomic consumers, as would a higher rate of commercially butchered meat. There are alternative causes for the presence of some animals within an assemblage, however, including improvements in transportation, storage, environment, ethnicity, religion, personal preference, and the intrusion of non-edible animals into the assemblage (i.e. rodents and other scavengers).

Contrary to these studies, in an analysis of faunal remains from several deposits in lower Manhattan, New York (Lovelace Tavern floor [1670-1699], Hanover Square basement [1740s], Hanover Square Block [pre-1700], Stadt Huys Block well [early 1700s], and Telco Block privy [c.1830]), Rothschild and Balkwill (1993:81) found no statistically significant correlation between social class and the purchase of mammals, poultry, game birds or fish. Any slight correlation that did exist showed that persons of higher socioeconomic status ate more mammals, and less fish and bird (Rothschild and Balkwill 1993:81). The lack of a clear relationship was blamed on people eating according to taste, rather than rank, or people eating at a poorer level than expected due to only recently gaining a higher social position (Rothschild and Balkwill 1993:84). It is also possible that the results indicate the consumers were behaving miserly. All of this emphasises the complexity of social identity, which we would expect, particularly in situations where class structures are more fluid (such as at the beginning of a colony, or in times of massive social change).
3.5 Meat Cuts

The residences of three 18th century working class families, both ordinary farmers and poor tenants, were excavated in Delaware, USA (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000:24). The archaeological excavations revealed an extensive diet, including horse, cattle, pig, sheep, chicken, goat, deer, opossum, raccoon and local fish, all of which were consumed by these working class people. The most commonly consumed items were cattle and pigs (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000:27-28). As rural farmers, it is likely that the consumers were butchering their own meat. Cattle and pigs were represented by most skeletal elements which, in turn, included ‘head, foot, chuck, round, loin and prime rib’ (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000:33) meat cuts. This was argued to be a mixture of high, medium and low quality (ranked) meat cuts, including those which were highly desirable (prime rib, loin, round), and those that were poor food or waste (head, foot, chuck). Bedell and Scharfenberger (2000:33) noted that this was a common pattern found on other Delaware farm sites, where farmers of both high and low class consumed the whole animal, rather than just the desirable parts.

Cow was the main contributor to diet in Schmitt and Zeier’s (1993) Nevada mining community study. In addition to the quantification technique discussed above, Schmitt and Zeier analysed the bones in terms of meat cuts using Schulz and Gust’s (1983b) 1850-1910 retail price of wholesale beef cuts (Schmitt and Zeier 1993:26). This system ranks short loin, rib, sirloin and round as high quality meat cuts, rump, chuck, arm and short rib as medium quality meat cuts, and plate, brisket, neck, foreshank and hindshank as low quality meat cuts (Schmitt and Zeier 1993:28). They found that some deposits were dominated by one ranked cut, but also had evidence of cuts from other ranks, whereas other deposits contained only cuts from one rank. Using this data, inferences could be drawn about the socioeconomic status of the consumers.

Gust (1997:222) drew on her previous work in 1996 to divide meat cuts found in deposits in the Sacramento Valley into differing ranks. The meat cuts from the different deposits showed that households purchasing low ranking meat cuts could occasionally also afford moderate and high ranking cuts, whereas households with a large amount of high ranking cuts were also buying a large range of moderate and low ranking cuts.

In summary, these studies have found that rural farmers tend to butcher their own animals for consumption and utilise all parts, both high quality and low quality, whether a high class or a low class farmer, whereas more urbanised farms and plantations could afford to only eat the more desirable parts of the animal. It was also found that assemblages associated with lower class consumers would only
contain a small variety of meat cuts, mostly low quality, with the occasional high quality cut. Conversely, assemblages associated with high class consumers, who have the means to eat to taste, contained a wide variety of meat cuts including high, medium and low quality. The anomalies found in such assemblages can be attributed to the fluid nature of personal identity, an attempt to improve the quality of life, or maybe to impress somebody else through an emulation of a higher class culture.

### 3.6 Meal Types

If different meat cuts are known, it is also possible to determine the kinds of meals that are being consumed. For example, Bedell and Scharfenberger (2000:33) found that all the cattle and pig bones within the Delaware assemblage were chopped with a cleaver into large chunks of meat that would have been roasted or stewed, but there were no individual steaks or other small portions. Schmitt and Zeier (1993:28) argued that one deposit of beef had many single serves, but also large, multiple serving cuts. Many of the long bones had flake scarring, which they argued was a sign that the bones were further processed for stock to be used in soups. Of the Chinese-American faunal deposits in Sacramento, Gust (1997:255-256) reported that the majority of high priced cuts were steaks, with a few roasts, the medium priced cuts were distributed between steaks and roasts and the lower priced cuts were used for stews and soups. These studies again indicate that groups of high socioeconomic status were consuming expensive, individual meals such as steak, whereas groups of lower socioeconomic status would eat more multiple serving dishes, such as roasts.

### 3.7 The Non-Faunal Material of the Beresford Arms Hotel

Only one other study has been undertaken on the Beresford Arms Hotel, this was conducted by a Flinders University Honours student, Marica Beric, in 2008. Beric aimed to assess the development of gentility as a social construct in 19th century Adelaide by examining the ceramics, glass and paraphernalia (Beric 2008:i). In examining gentility Beric also looked at the closely at the issue of respectability. Beric (2008:xii-xiii) defined gentility as:

> a new social order, establishing itself across the western world in the 1800s and 1900s. Associated with specific and controlled social behaviour, economics, and spiritual obedience, in order to segregate the middle from the upper and lower classes...

Briggs’ (2005) definition of respectability, as ‘the daily actions of men and women and the judgements passed on those actions by their peers and spectators’, was also used by Beric (2008:5). These definitions were used in conjunction with physical and non-physical manifestations of gentility, such as
whether mismatched or matching tableware and tea ware were used, the use of accoutrements, attitudes of temperance towards drinking and smoking, and the use of educational and moral toys, among other things (Beric 2008:22). Beric, however, occasionally confused these two ideologies and uses the words interchangeably throughout the study, sometimes even mixing them up with other words such as ‘class’ (see for example, pages 26, 77).

The lack of complex table settings, the variation in form, and the appearance of specialised platters, accoutrements and tea ware, led Beric to conclude that the Beresford Arms Hotel was a place of respectability, rather than a locus for the development of gentility (2008:77). She argued that this class behaviour was represented through the use of Willow and Fibre Art matching ceramic sets (Beric 2008:77). Glass beer bottles and smoking pipes were also recovered from the excavation, offering support to Beric’s conclusion that the patrons aspired to be respectable (Beric 2008:83, 86). Owing to time constraints, Beric felt that the assessment of activities at the Beresford Arms was incomplete and would benefit from a future study of the faunal material. Beric also identified the need to compare the behaviour between members of the working, middle and upper classes of South Australia in general, through both historical documentation and the study of faunal remains (Beric 2008:90). Beric (2000:81) argued that the food provided during the tavern period (1840s-1860s) was mainly dinners due to an absence of breakfast and lunch serving dishes. In addition, the size of the plates indicated that dinners were likely to have been large, filling meals (Beric 2008:81), and a lack of tea ware suggested that the patrons were mostly men (Beric 2008:82).

3.8 Conclusion
Socioeconomic status is an important issue to study in historical archaeology as it relates to the identity of people and to people’s behavioural patterns; it is therefore important to have a firm grasp on socioeconomic status if culture is to be fully understood. Studies have shown that there is a direct – although broad – link between the socioeconomic status of a consumer and the food types they consume. This link appears in the archaeological record in the form of faunal remains, which can be analysed to deduce what animals were being eaten, what meat cuts were being consumed, and what meals were being served. The above studies have shown that persons of a lower socioeconomic status tended to eat a smaller variety of animals, purchased cheaper meats, such as sheep, and cheaper meat cuts, such as shanks for soups and stews. People of higher socioeconomic status tended to eat a greater variety of animals, including expensive and exotic species such as deer, veal, oysters, lobsters, goose and turkey. They also consumed cheaper animals, and both poor and high quality meat cuts. Butchering patterns can also be an indicator of socioeconomic status, with self-sufficient groups, such as members
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of higher socioeconomic groups in urban areas, and rural farmers of all classes, butchering their own animals, sometimes in an uneconomical way. There are explanations for anomalies in faunal indicators, such as a personal preference. Transportation systems, changing environments and, later, taphonomic influences, and intrusive animals can all affect a faunal assemblage and must be taken into account where necessary.
4 Methodology

There are many examples of different methodologies that can be followed to analyse faunal remains. For example, White’s (1953) suggestion of Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI), and meat weights (MW). Another popular quantification technique is Number of Identified Specimens Present (NISP). Also Lyman’s (1994) work on taphonomy. Each of these techniques have been heavily scrutinised (e.g., Piper 1991; Lyman 1994 and Reitz and Wing 1999), but are still used widely in historical archaeology. All agree, however, that no matter the methodology one chooses to follow, factors such as taphonomic processes, butchering practices, species identification and bone quantification are essential to any analysis.

4.1 Taphonomy

Taphonomy was coined by Russian palaeontologist, Efremov, in 1940; he defined it as ‘the science of the laws of embedding or burial … the study of the transition, in all details, of organics from the biosphere into the lithosphere’ (Lyman 1994:1). Taphonomy can be applied to many different artefacts in the archaeological record, in this case, the faunal remains from the Beresford Arms Hotel. Taphonomy examines the histories of bones, focusing on the ‘postmortem, pre-, and post-burial’ (Lyman 1994:3). There are several different taphonomic processes that can affect bones, those relevant to this thesis include: weathering, root etching, trampling, gnawing and butchery. All these processes can aid in destroying archaeological evidence needed for the interpretation of the bones.

4.1.1 Weathering

Weathering of bone is an abiotic factor (Reitz and Wing 1999:116), and can include ‘wind, rain, floods, earthquakes, and other phenomena’ such as the sun and temperature. Behrensmeyer (cited in Lyman 1994:354) describes weathering as:

the process by which the original microscopic organic and inorganic components of bone are separated from each other and destroyed by physical and chemical agents operating on the bone in situ, either on the surface or within the soil zone.

The weathering of bones happens at different rates, varying between different species and locations, although rates can also differ at the same site, and even between different bones of the same animal. For example, small, compact bones will weather more slowly than lighter bones and cattle bones are more likely to survive weathering than bird bones (Lyman 1994:358). Reitz and Wing (1999:116) note that winds:
will dry [organic material] and ultimately break it down by scouring the surface … Flowing water has a similar effect … scouring [material] with the force of the water and water-borne sediments. Alternate drying, wetting, freezing and thawing promotes shrinkage and expansion … so that it loses its integrity.

Weathered specimens are usually demineralised, with cracked and flaking compact bone; some bones show a dendritic pattern of shallow grooves similar to that of root etching. Longitudinal fractures from the proximal to distal end of the element, sometimes bending around the shaft, may be present (Reitz and Wing 1999:138).

4.1.2 Root Etching
Root etching appears on bones as wavy dendritic lines etched into the surface, its presence signifies that, for at least part of its history, the bone has been in soil where vegetation is growing. It is uncertain whether root etching is created by humic acid excreted by roots, or acids secreted by fungi associated with decomposing plants (Lyman 1994:375-376). Either way, root etching can destroy evidence such as butchery/cooking marks and lead to bias in the assemblage. Root etchings are usually lighter in colour than the bone surface; this is because of the decalcification that occurs due to the acid (White and Folkens 2005:57).

4.1.3 Trampling
Trampling fragments bone material in a manner that can be confused with butchery marks (Reitz and Wing 1999:137); fragmentation also reduces the size of pieces of bone, making skeletal identification harder or impossible (Lyman 1994:379). Breakage patterns such as “wishbone” breaks at the mandibular symphysis and “snaps” of scapular and pelvis … as well as grooves and scratches’ (Reitz and Wing 1999:137) are all created by trampling. Trampling doesn’t just cause fragmentation however, it also causes movement of the bones; this movement can be both horizontal and vertical. Horizontal movement is more likely to occur to bones that sit on the soil surface, as a result of kicking (Lyman 1994:378). Vertical movement can be either up or down depending on other variables, such as how intense the trampling is (whether it occurs often, whether it is heavy trampling or light trampling), how compact the soil is, how deeply the bones are buried, and the size and shape of the bone (Lyman 1994:379).

4.1.4 Gnawing
Many animals gnaw at, and eat, bones, including pigs, dogs, cats, rats, mice, lizards and insects. Gnawed bone tends to erode more quickly that non-gnawed bone (Greenfield 1989:90). Rodents are possibly the most common gnawers; they leave closely spaced or fan-shaped patterned, flat-bottomed,
parallel grooves on bones (Reitz and Wing 1999:134; White and Folkens 2005:57). Carnivores such as
dogs and cats leave ‘irregular broad grooves and pit-like fractures’ (Reitz and Wing 1999:134), as well as
‘scoring, and puncturing’ (White and Folkens 2005:57). Gnawing may also cause movement in the
assemblage, as animals often move bones from one location to another when gnawing (Reitz and Wing
1999:135). Small animals, such as mice and rats, will often die among the assemblage and become part
of it (called intrusive animals).

As would be expected there are taphonomic processes clearly at work on the Beresford Arms
assemblage, these will be discussed in detail in chapter 5. During analysis, bones were graded as to
their condition. Grades included excellent, very good, good, poor, and bad, and were scaled by
comparison with the rest of the assemblage (i.e. compared to the rest of the faunal assemblage, the
condition of this tibia is very good).

4.2 Butchery

Lyman (1994:294) defines butchering as ‘the human reduction and modification of an animal carcass into
 consumable parts’; consumable parts are not limited to food products. Lyman (1994:296) further defines
‘the actions and activities involved in butchering’ as the butchering process/techniques and ‘the results of
the process’ as the butchering pattern. Butchering of animals can remove the identifiable features of a
bone, making it very hard or impossible to identify which animal the bone has come from, or its precise
skeletal element. Butchery marks are usually the result of three activities: 1. Skinning; 2. Disarticulation;

4.2.1 Butchery Type

The identification of butchering types (including tools used, fracture patterns and burning) can provide
information on the processing and preparation of animals for food (Crader 1990:705). Tool marks were
identified using Crader’s (1990:705-706) definitions:

1. Cut: ‘Straight, narrow, incised lines probably made with a metal knife’,
2. Chop: ‘Similar to cuts except they are wider marks where a cleaver or ax-like (sic) tool has
   removed a small wedge of bone’,
3. Scrape: ‘Where a shallow layer of surface bone has been removed leaving numerous,
   irregular striations’,
4. Shear: ‘Straight-walled, planar surfaces where the bone has been split apart, probably by a
   powerful blow with a cleaver or ax-like (sic) implement’ and,
5. Saw: ‘Flat, planar surface of bone bears regular, parallel striations where a metal saw was repeatedly drawn back and forth through the bone tissue’.

Due to the fact that cut marks occur as a result of the removal of meat from the bone, unless the bone is very near to the surface of the skin, the marks can often be mistaken for gnawing. There have been several suggestions as to how to differentiate between gnaw marks and cut marks, including a repetition of the mark in the same place, repetition on like specimens, a detectable anatomical purpose for the occurrence, and the fact that gnawing marks will follow the contour of the bone (Lyman 1994:298).

4.2.2 Meat Cuts
By examining where the animals were butchered it is possible to determine what meat cuts were being purchased, and possibly what meals were being served at the Beresford Arms Hotel. Different meat cuts from sheep and cattle have been amalgamated by Piper (1991:335-371), and a selected number can be seen in Appendix 3.

4.3 Quantification Techniques
There are many different techniques used for analysing faunal remains, such as Minimal Animal Unit (MAU), Meat Utility Index (MUI), Estimated Number of beef cut Units (ENU), Grand Minimum Total (GMT), Relative Frequency of occurrence of each species (RF), Number of Identified Specimens Present (NISP), Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI), and Meat Weights (MW). NISP and MNI are the most commonly used (Lyman 1994:100) and will be the only techniques briefly discussed here. Much has been written on the advantages and disadvantages of these two techniques, with the main discussions brought together by Piper (1991).

NISP is the simplest quantification method. It is defined by Lyman (1994:100) as the number of identified specimens per taxon, taxon meaning a subspecies, species, genus, family or higher. NISP determines the relative abundance of different taxa by a simple algorithm (Piper 1991:35):

\[
\text{Relative Frequency of Taxon X} = \frac{\text{NISP for X}}{\sum (\text{NISP for all species})} \times 100
\]

The disadvantage to this method is that it suffers under a number of assumptions, also presented by Piper (1991). Firstly, ‘unless articulated to another bone, every individual fragment identified to one species is used to measure that species abundance relative to other species’ (Piper 1991:36). In other words, every bone fragment that has been identified to a taxon is used to measure how common the
species is compared to other species in the assemblage, unless that fragment is connected to another bone, and then the two articulated pieces are counted as one. This assumption would lead to an over-reflection of the number of any one species in the assemblage, for example, just because there are two sheep ribs in one assemblage does not mean that there are two whole sheep present, the two ribs could be from the same animal. Secondly, ‘all bones, from each species are equally affected by taphonomic factors’ (Piper 1991:36). This assumption suggests that a cattle bone would be equally affected by a taphonomic factor, such as gnawing, root etching or weathering, as a rabbit bone. As discussed above, this is rarely the case, as taphonomic processes often vary from species to species, and even between different elements of the same species. Thirdly, ‘the number of identifiable skeletal elements is the same for all species’ (Piper 1991:36). This assumption is closely related to the first issue, the problem being that there might be 20 bones in an assemblage, ten belonging to a sheep, and ten to a cow. All the sheep bones are identifiable, but only five cow bones are. NISP would then indicate that sheep were more prominent in a diet than cow, but in reality this is not so. Finally, ‘that each species is exploited in the same manner… [and] that the butchering practices are the same for each species’ (Piper 1991:36). This would mean that all butchers carved their animals into the same meat cuts, at the same places, with the same tools. NISP advantages include that ‘it does not suffer from the problems of aggregation… that it is relatively easy to calculate, and that… subsequent NISPs are additive to the originals’ (Piper 1991:36), which is necessary if further excavation takes place after NISPs from the previous excavation have already been done.

MNI is the most commonly used method to quantify faunal remains. It is determined by counting the rights and lefts of the most numerous skeletal element representing each identified species (matched according to characteristics of age, size and sex), and then using the highest value as the estimated MNI (Piper 1991:37). The disadvantages of MNI include the last four assumptions of NISP, in that it has also been demonstrated that MNI values are a function of sample size; in addition, it has a tendency to over-represent rare species (Piper 1991:38, 39). However, to its advantage, the variables produced by MNI are essentially independent. For this reason, it can be used to determine the dietary importance of different animals within an assemblage; it can also be ‘used in further statistical manipulation’ and is not influenced by butchering strategies or differential fragmentation (Piper 1991:38). One concern raised over MNI is how comparable it is when researchers use different calculation methods and different units of aggregation (Piper 1991:39). Unless analysts agree to one particular method, as Klein and Cruz-Uribe (cited in Piper 1991:39) have suggested, this concern is not resolvable.
The MNI count of the Beresford Arms Hotel suffers from one major assumption: that the entire animal was disposed of in the same location/room. This is, however, highly unlikely. It would be more likely that the animal parts were consumed over a couple of days and, unless bone fragments from different rooms can be conjoined, a project which will not be attempted due to time limitations, there is no way of knowing whether the animal bones were disposed of in the same room or in separate rooms as consumption took place. Due to the questionable accuracy of both the NISP and MNI counts, it was decided that meat weights would not be calculated.

4.4 Excavation
Below is a summary of the methodology used in the excavation of the Beresford Arms Hotel, for a full report of the excavation the reader is referred to the Austral Archaeology report (McCarthy 2009(in prep)).

The Beresford Arms Hotel was purchased by the Adelaide City Council in 2006 in an attempt to restore, preserve and conserve the building. The council contracted Austral Archaeology to undertake an excavation of the premises. The main excavation took place over two weeks in November and December 2006, with additional work occurring in September 2007 (Beric 2008:37). It was supervised by Justin McCarthy of Austral Archaeology and Robert Stone, with the assistance of Flinders University archaeology students organised by Dr Heather Burke (Beric 2008: 36).

4.4.1 Pre-excavation
Work carried out before the detailed survey and excavation included a geophysical survey of the back yard, the removal of floor boards within the house by the Adelaide City Council, and a collection of the surface scatter (McCarthy 2009(in prep):Section 3.2).

4.4.2 Backyard
In this area surface artefacts were collected during the initial surface survey, then catalogued and stored for later analysis. The majority appeared to be from the late 20th century (McCarthy 2009(in prep):Section 3.3). The area was then cleared of vegetation and topsoil by hand to a depth of about five centimetres and three test pits of 1 x 1m were excavated. Faunal remains were recovered, however no artefacts that pertained to the Beresford Arms Hotel era were found (McCarthy 2009(in prep):Section 3.3). An excavator was then used to remove all surface soils and organic matter to the depth of the original yard surface, and the artefacts recovered were retained for later analysis. The whole area was manually cleaned and three areas were then identified for excavation (C0003-C0005) in addition to one area identified by the geophysical survey (C0006); bones were excavated from all areas. All artefacts were
catalogued and stored for further analysis. After this the whole area of the backyard was excavated down to its natural soil level (McCarthy 2009(in prep):Section 3.3).

4.4.3 The Main Building
The house itself was excavated one room at a time, using the numbering system adopted by Flightpath Architects Pty Ltd (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4).

4.4.3.1 Room 1
The floorboards from this room were removed by the Adelaide City Council before excavation began, although a small section (½ sq.m) of pine boards was left in situ below the south wall window. The surface scatter was collected and appeared to be post-1990s (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.1). The underfloor soil type was a very fine, dusty silt. Very few artefacts and faunal remains were recovered. A trench beside the west wall was excavated to investigate suspected doorways and another trench was placed in the northeast corner (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.1).

4.4.3.2 Room 2
The floorboards from this room were removed by the Adelaide City Council before excavation began. The deposit was a fine, dusty silt and filled the underfloor space almost to the floorboard level. Initially this deposit was removed to the bottom level of the joist-supporting bricks (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.2). Three trenches were excavated in this room. The southeast and northwest corner trenches were excavated through an earth floor deposit to the natural soil level. In the northeast trench the outline of a brick structure was exposed and it was decided to extend the excavations along the east and west walls. An unexcavated corridor was left through the centre of the room to allow for access into other rooms (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.2). Further excavation of the northeast corner revealed a brick stairwell to the cellar (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.2).

4.4.3.3 Room 3
The floorboards in this room were still in situ, although some parts were broken and fire damaged. Surface debris was collected for analysis and the floor boards were removed for salvage (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.3) The underfloor area was filled almost to the floorboard level with a fine, dusty silt. There were some brick alignments, which may have been either an earlier phase of joist alignment or the remains of yard paving. The entire underfloor of room 3 was excavated (McCarthy in prep:Section 3.4.3).

4.4.3.4 Room 4
The floor boards had been removed by the Adelaide City Council before excavation commenced. The underfloor space was deeper than that of room 3, some remaining brick joist support piers were removed and approximately 50mm of the surface of the floor was trowelled back. It contained fire debris and some artefacts. Two 1 x 1m trenches were then excavated along the centre of the east and north walls until sterile clay was reached (McCarthy in prep: Section 3.4.4).

4.4.3.5 Room 5 – Above Ground
The floorboards of this room had been removed by the Adelaide City Council prior to excavation. Areas for excavation initially included the stairwell from room 2, a section below the central lintel in the east wall, the void beneath the fireplace and a section against the stone south wall in the southwest corner. Access was created through the bay window for the removal of excavated soil and artefacts (McCarthy in prep: Section 3.4.5.1).

4.4.3.6 Room 5 – Cellar
The cellar was partially excavated to the floor level at a depth of approximately 2m, including the northwest corner (McCarthy in prep: Section 3.4.5.2). This room alone uncovered approximately 18% of the overall assemblage.

4.4.3.7 Room 6
Major excavation was not undertaken in room 6, however test trenches were conducted. The floor boards had been removed previously by the Adelaide City Council (McCarthy in prep: Section 3.4.6). No faunal material was excavated from this room.

4.4.3.8 Room 7
The floor of this room was tar paper linoleum laid over a cement layer that covered a thicker concrete floor. The floor was cut, broken up and removed to allow for excavation. Earth that was disturbed during the removal of the floor was cleared and two trenches excavated: one in the southeast corner and the other in a rectangular brick structure by the west wall (McCarthy in prep: Section 3.4.7).

4.5 Sorting and Recording
Each bone and bone fragment was identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible (in some cases this may have only been to phylum). Specimens that could not be identified to a level were placed in a size-class (for example, large mammal [horse, cow], medium mammal [sheep, goat, pig], small mammal [rabbit, rat, mouse], giant bird [emu], large bird [turkey, goose], medium bird [chicken, duck, pigeon], and
small bird [quail]). Bones and bone fragments were then further identified into skeletal element, which side of the skeleton it belonged to, age-at-death (unfused, fused), whether butchering was present and what the butchering type was, as well as any evidence for taphonomic processes. Sorting and identification of the bones and bone fragments was done using comparative specimens from a reference collection (as suggested by Reitz 2008:503) held at the South Australia Museum, with assistance from Dr Keryn Walshe and volunteer Flinders University students. Illustrations from Lyman (1994), Piper (1991) and Schmid (1972) were also used, in addition to an identification ‘key for placing a bone in the skeleton’, presented in Ryder (1969:17-22). All bones were kept in their separate rooms and contexts. Due to the difficulty of differentiating between sheep and goat bones, the archaeological category of ‘sheep/goat’ has been adopted. All data was entered into an electronic Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (see Appendix 4). Bones were not measured due to time limitations. NISP and MNI counts were conducted.

4.6 Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The first is that the backyard and cellar both had landfill deposited from an unknown source; however, Beric (2008:38) found that the deeper contexts in both areas were more consistent with early use of the site. For this reason, these upper contexts, totalling approximately 85% of the entire assemblage, cannot be attributed to the hotel, greatly reducing the size of an already moderate assemblage. All contexts from the backyard and cellar are included in the results and discussion. The integrity of the assemblage is also compromised by construction disturbance (see Chapter 2 for more details) and flooding episodes. There was also a structural fire in 2002 which damaged surface scatters (Beric 2008:38).

The dates of the bones are also questionable, as the only method used for dating was the makers’ dates of associated ceramic and glass materials (see Beric 2008). Glass and ceramics are often recycled and are continually used for many years after first purchase. Much of the material was manufactured by companies operating for several decades (for example several contexts have only broad dates, such as between 1820 – 1870, indicating that the material may have been used at any time before or after the operating period of the hotel). The assemblage itself is highly fragmented, making definitive identification of the taxon, element, and age-at-death difficult, and sometimes impossible.

In addition, the excavations were carried out by inexperienced undergraduate students of archaeology from Flinders University. This greatly increases the chance for mistakes to be made. There are 41 faunal remains that cannot be ascribed to either a room or a context, or both, and one bag labelled ‘Rm7/SW CNR WEST WALL’ was assumed to be from context Rm7/005. This is also the first faunal assemblage
examined by the author, some mistakes were made during the sorting and recording of the bones, these have been rectified wherever possible.

4.7 Conclusion
This chapter has examined the taphonomic processes which are likely to have affected the faunal material at the Beresford Arms hotel site, including weathering, root etching, trampling, gnawing, and butchery. It has outlined the different butchery types and examined the advantages and disadvantages of using NISP and MNI quantification techniques. A brief outline of the excavation was reported. Methods used for identifying and analysing the faunal assemblage were presented and the limitations acknowledged. The results gained from the faunal material will be presented in chapter 5 and discussed in chapter 6.
5 Results

Altogether there were 1873 bones, of these 305 were unidentifiable due to being incomplete shaft fragments and 43 could not be placed into a room and/or context. These bones were not included in the MNI and NISP counts. The assemblage showed moderate effects from different taphonomic processes, including weathering, root etching, butchery, burning, abrasion, discolouration, gnawing and fragmentation.

Figure 5.1 shows the frequencies of the bones recovered from each of the areas excavated. The majority of the bones were uncovered from room 5 (33.2%), followed by the cellar (17.8%). Together they represent half the faunal assemblage (51%) for the site. Room 2 revealed 9.8% of remains, followed closely by the backyard with 9.7%, room 7 with 8.9%, room 3 with 7.3% and a small amount recovered from rooms 1 and 4 (1.9% and 1.5% respectively). No bones were excavated from room 6, and the backyard ‘surface’ contained only three bones (0.2%). Figure 5.1 also breaks down each bone count into the different representations of each taxon, demonstrating that sheep/goat bones accounted for the majority of the assemblage.

Figure 5.2 demonstrates how each identified taxon is spread across the different contexts for each room and context that there were faunal remains recovered from (unidentified bones were excluded). Room 5/NC – the cellar – shows an unusually high bone count when compared to the other contexts; this is due to the fact that the cellar was not excavated in contexts. When the cellar is eliminated, the highest bone count is room 5/007 with 131 bones (6.99%), the lowest bone count, with just one bone, was found in ??/003, room 5/019, room 7/011 and test pit 2/002. The mean of bones across the contexts is 30.2 (1.6%).
Spread of Faunal Material Across the Site

Figure 5.1: Showing the Amount of Faunal Remains Recovered from each Room.
Figure 5.2: Showing the Different Taxa Recovered from each Room and Context.
5.1 Dating

Table 5.1 below shows the rooms and contexts in which faunal remains were recovered, and the dates of associated non-faunal material as identified by Beric (2008:48-49). Dates for the cellar are based on the approximate dates the cellar was constructed and then refilled. These dates offer no distinction between faunal remains deposited by the hotel, and faunal remains deposited by the private residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date (Beric 2008:48-49).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Fine powder-like deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Trench for footing - NE Corner</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Joists and bricks</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Deposit between joists</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Red compact clay</td>
<td>1815-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Red compact clay with black fragments</td>
<td>1810-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Brown sandy and stony surface with timber bearers embedded</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Red clay deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>Grey ash deposit</td>
<td>1820-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>036</td>
<td>Brown clay with stone intrusions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Top layer - surface scatter</td>
<td>1900-1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Top layer - brick supports</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Third layer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>Fill deposit in foundation cut south and west wall</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Loose surface deposit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Surface deposit - newspaper and modern refuse predominant</td>
<td>1840-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Red brown silt deposit</td>
<td>1810-1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Firm deposit, dark brown building slurry</td>
<td>1800-1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Concrete flooring, adjacent to fireplace and west wall</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Dark chocolate brown clay-like fill</td>
<td>1810-1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Dark brown fill, silty in texture in front of fireplace</td>
<td>1810-1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>1840-1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Southwest corner</td>
<td>1840-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>Southwest corner - inside brick architectural feature</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>West half of box window - surface fill</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>Box window - brick rubble fill</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Box window – rubble fill</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>Chimney fill</td>
<td>1840-1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Box window - red clay fill</td>
<td>1810-1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>Surface box window - east half</td>
<td>1840-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>028</td>
<td>Box window east – hard brown fill</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No Context</td>
<td>Cellar</td>
<td>1840-1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Fill within brick work</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Red earth surface, assumed RM7005 as no</td>
<td>1820-1870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 5.2 indicates, sheep/goat had the highest MNI and NISP, making up 33.3% and 81.8% of the assemblage respectively. This was followed by bird at 21.8% and 6.2% respectively. The MNI and NISP counts correlate well, except between pig and the class mollusca, where MNI and NISP show that mollusca accounted for a greater proportion of the diet than pig. There are two reasons for this: firstly, there were more mollusca shell fragments than pig bones, making the count higher, and secondly, the taxonomic classification of ‘mollusca’ is higher than that of ‘pig’, so more individual species fitted under this heading. Could the mollusca shells been reduced any further into a lower taxonomic classification, their MNI and NISP counts  would certainly have been lower than the pig. This discrepancy could be rectified with the determination of meat weights, however it was decided that these would not be calculated (see chapter 4).

5.2 MNI and NISP Counts
As Table 5.2 indicates, sheep/goat had the highest MNI and NISP, making up 33.3% and 81.8% of the assemblage respectively. This was followed by bird at 21.8% and 6.2% respectively. The MNI and NISP counts correlate well, except between pig and the class mollusca, where MNI and NISP show that mollusca accounted for a greater proportion of the diet than pig. There are two reasons for this: firstly, there were more mollusca shell fragments than pig bones, making the count higher, and secondly, the taxonomic classification of ‘mollusca’ is higher than that of ‘pig’, so more individual species fitted under this heading. Could the mollusca shells been reduced any further into a lower taxonomic classification, their MNI and NISP counts would certainly have been lower than the pig. This discrepancy could be rectified with the determination of meat weights, however it was decided that these would not be calculated (see chapter 4).
Animal | MNI # | MNI % | NISP # | NISP %
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Sheep/Goat | 29 | 33.3 | 1249 | 81.8
Bird | 19 | 21.8 | 95 | 6.2
Rabbit | 10 | 11.5 | 47 | 3.1
Cow | 6 | 6.9 | 45 | 2.9
Fish | 5 | 5.7 | 28 | 1.8
Pig | 2 | 2.3 | 2 | 0.1
Mollusca | 6 | 6.9 | 7 | 0.5
Rodent | 10 | 11.5 | 52 | 3.4
Totals | 87 | - | 1525 | -

*Table 5.2: MNI and NISP counts for the Beresford Arms Hotel faunal assemblage.*

### 5.3 Taphonomy

Of the bones, 73.7% were affected by one or more taphonomic processes. Table 5.3 gives a breakdown of the taphonomic processes evident according to a bone count and the percentage of the assemblage this covered. It should be noted that the percentages do not add up to 100 because some bones had more than one process acting upon them, and have therefore been counted more than once. As only human-induced taphonomy forms part of this study, non-human-induced taphonomic processes are looked at only briefly, as it is acknowledged that these processes have influenced the assemblage and therefore the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taphonomy</th>
<th># of Bones</th>
<th>% of Assemblage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchery</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weathering</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staining</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fracture</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Etching</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnawing</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrasion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3: Taphonomic processes evident on bones.*

One quarter of the assemblage (26.3%), deriving from all rooms and contexts, were in excellent/very good condition and did not display any signs of taphonomic processes. Just over half of the assemblage (56.7%) showed butchery marks or evidence of burning. Although it is highly likely that the remainder of the fauna (minus rodent) were also butchered and eaten, the remaining fragments did not have marks to substantiate this.
5.3.1 Butchery

The most common butchery type was the shear at 31.7%. This high count may be due to the fact that many bones, especially rib and vertebrae, do not have a thick layer of compact bone making the butchery types difficult to distinguish, making it appear as though a bone had been sheared when this may not have been the case. Cut, chop and saw marks were closer in count at 4.8%, 3.6% and 2.9% respectively. Some common butchery methods were evident: ribs would quite often be sheared and one side would end in a ‘v’ shape (see Images 5.1 and 5.2). Vertebrae were also sheared, usually parallel with the bone and to one side of the spinal process; occasionally vertebrae were also sheared perpendicular to the bone (see Image 5.3). Scrape marks are often the result of meat being removed from the bone (Crader 1990:706); in this assemblage 40% of scrape marks occurred on ribs. From the butchering patterns it would also seem that a common butchery practice was to saw, cut or shear only a certain distance through the bone, and then snap the bone the rest of the way (see Images 5.4 and 5.5).

5.3.2 Burning

The majority of the burnt fragments (74.8%) were beyond identification. One-third (33%) of the burnt bones were excavated from a grey ashy deposit at the bottom of the internal stairwell to the cellar, suggesting that the soil around them had also been burnt. Since the structural fire did not go through until 2002 and these bones were buried, it is possible that these bones were thrown into a pile and set on fire. Of these burnt fragments, 33.5% came from test pits 1 and 2, which were associated with modern rubbish. Of the bones that exhibited both burning and butchery, 42% were also from test pit 2, and 21% were from the cellar fill and therefore cannot be provenanced to the Beresford Arms. The surface scatter did not seem to be affected by the structural fire, with only one surface bone exhibiting burning, but also butchery.
5.3.2 Weathering
Weathering was visible on 25.9% of the assemblage, mostly in the form of surface flaking/cracking, although there was one case of bleaching. On some bones, especially vertebrae and ribs, exposed ends looked particularly dry and cracked, however this could also be attributed to cooking and consumption.

5.3.3 Residue
Residue on the bones in the form of soil, roots, and a white substance determined to be wall plaster (at first thought to be a fungus), was present on only a small percentage (2.9%) of the assemblage. Some bones had more than one type of soil residue remaining on them, for instance one sheep/goat vertebra had both creamy-coloured sand and chocolate brown soil residue. This could indicate either movement within the deposit, or an alternative origin for the bones, implying that they were transported in as landfill from elsewhere. In some cases soil residue was strongly adhered to the bone surface and could not be removed, possibly hiding butchery marks beneath it.
5.3.4 Staining

There were several different staining patterns on the bones; the most common was a staining from the soil it was deposited in. Some bones exhibited a black/brown spotting, others had green, pink, and a rust-like stain. Quite often the latter would be associated with a small amount of bone loss within the stained area (see Images 5.6-5.9).

5.3.5 Fracturing and Fragmentation

Whilst the majority of the assemblage exhibited fragmentation, with complete bones being rare, several bones were also fractured parallel and perpendicular to the bone. These fracture marks are sometimes associated with butchery; however, other fractures are likely to be the result of trampling.
5.3.6 Root Etching

Root etching was visible to varying degrees on 6.4% of the assemblage; some bones had just one or two lines, whereas others were covered to the point where the bone surface was obscured (see Image 5.10). It is possible that the extent of the root etching destroyed some butchery marks.

5.3.7 Chewing

Human chewing was present in 5.2% of the bones (see Image 5.11), in the form of tooth marks and associated bone loss, generally at the epiphyses, probably in order to get at the bone marrow. Chewing was noted on cow, pig, rabbit, bird and sheep/goat bones, the latter of which made up 91% of the chewed bones. Vertebrae and ribs were the most commonly chewed skeletal element, making up 42.7% and 35.9% of the chewed assemblage respectively.
8 Gnawing
Gnawing by dogs and rodents was another taphonomic process that could have removed evidence of human modification (such as butchery or consumption). Gnawing can also remove bones from the assemblage completely. There was a great deal of variation in the rodent gnawing of bones, some bones showed no gnawing at all, others showed minimal activity, whereas others were heavily gnawed around the edges (see Image 5.12). Gnawing affected 5.8% of the total assemblage and the majority of gnawing was concentrated in room 5, contexts 007 and 002 (18.5% and 10.2% respectively) and room 1, which had 4.9% gnawing. Backyard deposits had a surprisingly low count of gnawing (0.97%). This would indicate that rat nests were likely to have been present under the floors.

5.3.9 Abrasion
A minimum number of the bones (0.4%) appeared to be polished by soil abrasion, some of this abrasion may have occurred during analysis when a brush was used to remove soil residue.

5.4 Element Composition and Meat Cuts
A total of 17.8% of the assemblage was not identifiable to the element level. The assemblage was dominated by rib fragments, comprising 29.4%. This was followed by vertebrae fragments at 26%. Of this, only 1% could be identified as caudal vertebrae, 14.4% as lumbar, 6.4% as thoracic and 6.2% as cervical. Of all the vertebrae, 71.4% could not be identified to a particular set of vertebrae. Long bones were the next common at 12.9%, followed by metapodials at 3.6% and scapulae at 2.2%.
Table 5.4 below shows the bone count and percentages of the skeletal elements in the assemblage, Table 5.5 below uses this information to determine meat cuts, as described in Piper (1991:335-380)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Bone Count</th>
<th>Percentage of Assemblage</th>
<th>Percentage of Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertebrae Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>487</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unidentified</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caudal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lumbar</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thoracic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cervical</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Epistropheus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Bone Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>241</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unidentified</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ulna</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Radius</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Humerus</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tibia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Femur</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fibula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvis</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unidentified</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cranial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Caudal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innominate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapulae</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranium</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcaneous</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patella</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coracoid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbosacrale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavicula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.4: Skeletal Element Bone Count and Percentages of Assemblage.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxon</th>
<th>Skeletal Element</th>
<th>Meat Cut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/Goat</td>
<td>Proximal Rib</td>
<td>Best end of Neck, Rack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre Rib</td>
<td>Cutlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distal Rib</td>
<td>Brisket, Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lumbar Vertebrae</td>
<td>Saddle, Loin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximal Femur, Cranial Pelvis</td>
<td>Fillet, Loin, Chump, Sirloin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Femur/Tibia, Proximal Tibia, Caudal Pelvis</td>
<td>Leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distal Tibia</td>
<td>Hind Shank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scapula, Humerus, Complete or Proximal Radius/Ulna</td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distal Radius/Ulna</td>
<td>Fore Shank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thoracic Vertebrae</td>
<td>Best end of Neck, Rack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cervical Vertebrae</td>
<td>Scrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crania</td>
<td>Brain, Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>Shank, Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>Crania</td>
<td>Brain, Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lumbar Vertebrae</td>
<td>Short Loin, Porterhouse, Baron, Loin, Sirloin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thoracic Vertebrae and Proximal Rib</td>
<td>Chuck, Chuck Roast, Rib, Rib Roast, Shoulder, Best end of Neck, Forequarter, Neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre Rib</td>
<td>Arm, Thick Rib, Thin Rib, Shoulder, Short Ribs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distal Rib</td>
<td>Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>Chuck, Chuck Roast, Blade, Leg of Mutton-Piece, Rib, Shoulder, Forequarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximal Ulna</td>
<td>Fore Shank, Shin, Fore Knuckle, Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>Hand, Spare Rib, Collar, Prime Back, Neck end, Boston Butt, Foreloin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.5: Meat Cuts Determined (Piper 1990:335-380).*

### 5.5 Aging

Unfortunately, 64.7% of the assemblage had an undetermined age-at-death. Several of the bones also exhibited both fused and unfused epiphyses (i.e. one end was fused, whilst the other end was unfused). These bones were classified as partially fused, however since complete bones were rare it is possible that many of the fused and unfused bones have been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfused</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Fused</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fused</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molars Present</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.6: Age-at-death*
aged incorrectly. Due to the high count of unidentified ages, age-at-death could rarely be taken into account during the MNI and NISP counts. Table 5.6 gives a break down of the age-at-death bone counts of the assemblage.

5.6 Conclusion
The Beresford Arms Hotel faunal assemblage is dominated by domesticated animals, with sheep/goat being the most common, followed by bird, cow, and pig. This diet was occasionally supplemented by caught species of rabbit, fish and mollusca. Due to the small count of mollusca, it is unlikely that this animal was served as a hotel dish and most likely that they are the remains of private residence meals. Contexts 2/003, 2/010, 2/024, 5/001, 5/011, 5/013, 5/027, 7/005 and 7/012 had associated dates more consistent with the hotel’s period of use, however as context 5/001 was a surface scatter and also had modern artefacts and several neighbouring contexts had dating that far outstripped the life of the hotel, this throws into question the accuracy of these associations. Within the hotel contexts, bird remains dominated context 2/003, although sheep/goat were present. Context 2/010 was mostly unidentifiable with an equal count of bird and sheep/goat present. Conversely, the other contexts were all dominated by sheep/goat with some cow present and more unidentifiable bones. Despite the difference between the dominant species in room 2 contexts, sheep/goat is still the dominate species of all rooms overall.
6 Discussion

The faunal assemblage from the Beresford Arms Hotel is a good reflection of diet in colonial Adelaide and the availability of certain meat products. However, as there is insufficient data to solidly link any faunal remains to the activities of the hotel, as opposed to the activities of the residence after the hotel closed, only broad inferences can be made about the socioeconomic status of the patrons.

6.1 Meat Prices in Colonial Adelaide

Retail prices for local meat products were available in Adelaide newspapers from early on in the colony; the prices for the 1840s and 1850s are shown, when available, in Tables 6.1 and 6.2.\(^2\) Beef and mutton were also available for purchase at wholesale prices, per 100lbs, however the prices were very similar and so not recorded. For example in 1855 the wholesale price for beef was 40 shillings per 100lb, this equates to 4.8 pence per lb, which sits within the retail price range (The Adelaide Times July 2 1855). Prices were recorded from newspapers for the months of January, April, July and October, the minimum and maximum prices expected are shown. It should also be noted that in 1855 shellfish and dried fish first appeared in the newspaper market reports. Despite the comparative scarcity of cattle to sheep, beef consistently brought in a similar price to mutton. Even pork, which barely warranted a notice in literature from the time, is never considerably more expensive than beef/mutton, except for the years of 1855 and 1856. This could be a reflection of the quality of both the beef and the pork, since several cattle market reports in the newspaper comment on the poor quality of the cattle (see, for example, the Adelaide Times April 1 1851):

The market on Wednesday was moderately supplied. The supply of sheep was good but of poor quality the highest price for the lot was 8s; a few fetching 9s. Oxen are still scarce, poor, and were bought at an average, say 12s to 13s per 100lbs.

The price of cattle has experienced but little change during the week. Oxen being still scarce and poor. Sheep may be quoted at last. (Adelaide Times April 22 and 29 1851)

The pricing could also reflect a low demand for these meats, driving prices down to encourage buyers to purchase them.

\(^2\) 12d=1s, 24s=1£, d=pence, s=shilling, £=pound, 1lb=0.45kg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Butchered Meat</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1842</th>
<th>1843</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Beef p.lb</td>
<td>7d – 10d</td>
<td>4d – 9d</td>
<td>3d – 6d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>2d – 3d</td>
<td>2d – 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Mutton p.lb</td>
<td>7d – 10d</td>
<td>4d – 9d</td>
<td>4d – 6d</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>1.5d – 3d</td>
<td>1.5d – 3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork p.lb</td>
<td>£5 – £9*</td>
<td>9d – 10d</td>
<td>8d – 10d</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geese ea.</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>6s – 7s</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys ea.</td>
<td>£1 5s – 10d</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>6s – 12s</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks p.pair</td>
<td>15s</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>5s 6d</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowls p.pair</td>
<td>12s</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3s 6d – 4s 6d</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veal p.lb</td>
<td>10d – £3 1s</td>
<td>9d – 10d</td>
<td>8d – 10d</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3d – 5d</td>
<td>3d – 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb p.lb</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>10d</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1s 6d – 2s**</td>
<td>1s 6d – 2s**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens p.pair</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2s – 2s 6d</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quail p.brace</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves heads</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2s – 2s 6d</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per barrel **Per quarter

Table 6.1: Minimum and Maximum Retail Prices for Meat in 1840s Adelaide (The Adelaide Chronicle and the South Australian Advertiser Jan, Apr 1840; The Adelaide Chronicle and the South Australian Literary Record Jan, Apr, Oct 1841-1842 the Adelaide Examiner Feb 1842, Jan, Apr 1843; The Adelaide Times Oct 1848, Jan, Oct 1849).
Butchered Meat | 1850 | 1851 | 1852 | 1853 | 1854 | 1855 | 1856 | 1857 | 1858 | 1859
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Beef p.lb | 1d – 3d | No data | 4d – 5d | No data | 4d – 5d | 4d – 8d | 4d – 5d | 4d – 7d | 4d – 8d | 2.5d – 8d
Mutton p.lb | 1d – 3d | No data | 2d – 5d | No data | 4d – 5d | 4d – 8d | 4d – 5d | 4d – 6d | 4d – 7d | 2.5d – 8d
Veal p.lb | 3d – 5d | No data | 3d – 6d | No data | 5d – 10d | 4d – 8d | 4d – 7d | 7d – 10d | 7d – 9d | 6d – 10d
Lamb p.quarter | 1s 6d – 2s | No data | No data | No data | None – 5s | 3s 6d – 6d | None – 5s | None – 6d | None – 7s | None – 5s
Bacon p.lb | 4d – 6d | 5d – 8d | 6d – 7d | 8d – 10d | 10d – 1s | 1s | 1s – 10d | 7d – 10d | 7d – 10d | 6d – 10d
Pork p.lb | 4d – 6d | 5d – 8d | 6d – 7d | 8d – 10d | 10d – 1s | 1s | 1s – 10d | 7d – 10d | 7d – 10d | 6d – 10d
Fowl p.pair | 3s – 4s 6d | 2s – 5s | 3s – 5s | 4s – 6s | 5s – 6s 10s | 6s – 8s | 5s – 6s | 5s – 7s | 5s – 7s
Pigeon p.pair | 1s 6d – 2s | 1s 6d – 2s | 1s 6d – 2s | 1s 6d – 2s | 3s – 4s | 4s – 4s 6d | 6s – 8s | 7s – 9s | 7s – 10s
Duck p.pair | 5s – 6s 6d | 5s – 8s | 6s – 7s 6d | 6s – 8s | 8s – 13s | 10s – 12s | 8s – 11s | 7s – 10s | 6s – 9s | 7s – 10s
Turkey ea. | 6s – 8s 13s | 7s – 16s | 6s – 7s 12s | 7s – 9s | 8s – 15s | 9s – 15s | 8s – 12s | 8s – 12s | 8s – 12s | 8s – 10s
Geese ea. | 6s – 8s 8s | 6s – 9s 8s | 6s – 12s | 6s – 9s | 10s – 15s | 9s – 15s | 8s – 12s | 8s – 12s | 8s – 10s | 8s – 10s
Quail p.brace | 1s | 1s | No data | 1s 3p – 1s 6d | None – 1s 6d | 1s 6d | 1s 6d | 1s 6d | 1s 6d | No data
Rabbit p.pair | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data | No data | 3s – 8s

*Price determined by gender of bird  **Scarce

Table 6.2: Minimum and Maximum Retail Prices for Meat in 1850s Adelaide (The Adelaide Times Jan, Apr, July, Oct, 1850-1851, 1854-1858; the Adelaide Morning Chronicle July, Oct 1852, Jan 1853; The Advertiser Jan, Apr, July, Oct 1859).

Birds, on the other hand, were expensive, never under 1 shilling for a pair, with a single turkey costing £1 10s at its highest. Rabbit entered the newspapers in 1859 at a hefty 3 to 8 shillings per pair; however, it is likely that these animals were available prior to this. As discussed in chapter 2, Gibbs (1984:52) reports that, due to the scarcity and cost of European food, colonists in South Australia were eating native animals such as emu, kangaroo and parrot. In 1842 kangaroo and emu meat were sold in Adelaide at a high 1 shilling per pound minimum (compared to the 3-4 pence per pound of beef and mutton), but were not mentioned in papers from any other years (The Adelaide Chronicler and South Australian Literary Record April 6 and 20 1842).

These prices are somewhat unexpected since the scarcity of cattle and pig in the colony would predict a higher retail price than mutton, although they remain reasonably similar and affordable. The
high cost of birds, rabbit and native animals would indicate that they were only found on the tables of people from a higher class and were not regarded as opportunistic supplementary foods.

Whilst there was no information found on the prices of specific meat cuts in colonial Adelaide, other authors have identified meat cut rankings. Schmitt and Zeier (1993:28), based on American preferences and drawing on work by Schulz and Gust, identify beef cuts of short loin, rib, sirloin, and round as high-ranking cuts, rump, chuck, arm and cross/short rib as medium-ranking cuts, and plate, brisket, neck, foreshank and hindshank as low-ranking cuts. A study of Chinese-American meat cuts by Gust (1997:256) found that beef cuts of porterhouse, sirloin and prime rib were high-ranked, round, rump, chuck and rib were medium-ranked, and hindshank, foreshank, brisket and neck were low-ranked. Mutton loin, sirloin and leg were high-ranked, rib and shoulder were medium-ranked and hindshank, foreshank, brisket and neck were low-ranked (Gust 1997:247). High-ranked pork cuts were the sirloin, loin and ham. Rump, shoulder butt and picnic were medium-ranked and the belly, neck, foreshank, hindshank, jowl and feet were low-ranked cuts (Gust 1997:247).

6.2 Wages in Mid-Nineteenth Century Adelaide

Also available in Adelaide newspapers were the average wages of working class labourers. Table 6.3 shows the wages for working class employment in 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Payment with Board and Lodging</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Payment without Board and Lodging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Servant - Male</td>
<td>£60 – £70 p. annum</td>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>12s – 16s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Servant - Female</td>
<td>£20 – £30 p. annum</td>
<td>Bullock drivers</td>
<td>8s 4d p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Servant – Married couple</td>
<td>£45 – £70 p. annum</td>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>14s – 16s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Servant – Single men</td>
<td>£50 – £70 p. annum</td>
<td>Cabinet makers</td>
<td>12s – 14s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Servant – Shepherd</td>
<td>£35 – £50 p. annum</td>
<td>Carriage makers</td>
<td>12s – 16s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>£2 – £3 p. week</td>
<td>Coopers</td>
<td>10s – 12s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>£1 16s – £2 12s p. week</td>
<td>Day labourers</td>
<td>10s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock drivers</td>
<td>£1 5s – £1 10s</td>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>12s – 20s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12s – 15s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmakers</td>
<td>25s p. 1000</td>
<td>Masons</td>
<td>12s – 14s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyers</td>
<td>15s p.100 ft</td>
<td>Millers</td>
<td>10s – 12s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>9d p. hour</td>
<td>Mowers</td>
<td>10s – 20s p. acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reapers</td>
<td>25s – 30s p.acre with rations and beer</td>
<td>Painters and Glaziers</td>
<td>8s – 10s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8s – 10s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10s – 12s p. day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>1s p. hour slack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoing smiths</td>
<td>14s – 17s p. day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>10s – 12s p. day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch and clock makers</td>
<td>15s – £1 p. day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwrights</td>
<td>12s – 16s p. day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Payments include board and lodgings.

Table 6.3: Showing the wages of the working class in 1851 (The Adelaide Times January 7 1851).
6.3 The Beresford Arms Hotel

Beric’s (2008:77) study on the material culture uncovered from this site led her to conclude that the hotel was a place of respectability, serving the respectable working-class. She argued that the larger plate sizes were evidence for the hotel serving large, filling meals to lodgers and local residents, with no, or minimum small meals (desserts) and refreshments (Beric 2008:81). A lack of tea ware also led Beric to conclude that the hotel was frequented by men, and rarely by women (Beric 2008:82). Matching table settings of low quality Willow and Fibre Art patterns were high in the assemblage, which Beric argued demonstrated a propensity for breaking dishes and that the patrons of the hotel were predominately labourers and the working class (Beric 2008:82). She also noted that the matching sets were, at the very least, an indication of an attempt to maintain respectability within the hotel (Beric 2008:82), although it could also just indicate the simplest means of buying en masse – i.e. a hotel needs a lot of crockery (particularly if it’s regularly broken) so buying a bulk lot of one type is sensible. Of the glass bottles, the most common was an olive green colour, and likely filled with beer, followed by ginger beer bottles. Beric again argued that this implied the hotel catered for labourers, serving ‘hearty meals washed down with several pints of ale’ (Beric 2008:84). Beric (2008:85) also found that the majority of glassware was from local producers, not expensive imported material. Toys were present in the assemblage, but Beric (2008:87) argued that it was unlikely these toys belonged to the children of publican Esther Smithson, as they were found in the lower level contexts and the cellar, although as Smithson held her license between September 1855 and March 1856, before the cellar was filled, it is not impossible.

Although Sportman et al. (2007) demonstrated that domestic and commercial deposits could be differentiated, this was not so at the Beresford Arms. The reason for this is that the domestic and commercial deposits studied by Sportman et al. were in separate locations, away from the house, whereas the residential and hotel deposits of the Beresford Arms were mixed together throughout the house and backyard. It was also not possible to differentiate between food remains from the hotel period (1840-1860), and those from the private residential period (1860 onwards) using Beric’s dates gained from analysis of material culture due to the issues discussed in chapter 4. However, contexts 2/003, 2/010, 2/024, 5/001, 5/011, 5/013, 5/027, 7/005 and 7/012 all had dates more consistent with the hotel. Sheep/goat, bird, and cow dominated these contexts, rabbit and pig were also present and although they did not exhibit any sign of butchery it is probable that they formed part of the diet. According to Mrs Beeton’s *Household Management* (n.d.:634-644) one rabbit would be sufficient to feed approximately 3 to 4 people, and two rabbits approximately 5 to 6 people, depending on the meal being served. A chicken was estimated to feed anywhere between 3 and 10 people, again depending on the meal, with an average of 3 to 5 persons per chicken (Beeton n.d.:564-585). Given the small size and expense of rabbit and bird, it is likely that these animals would have been cooked complete, probably roasted or boiled, and served in sections or whole. Pig was represented by a
single scapula, which could represent one of several meat cuts including hand, spare rib, collar, prime back, neck end, boston butt and fore loin. Spare rib and neck were used for chops (Beeton n.d.:561). The cow elements were ribs and a vertebrae, this would suggest servings included steak, rib and roast. Sheep/goat that revealed the highest variety of meat cuts, including loin, sirloin, leg, hind shank, fore shank, shoulder, rib, breast, cutlets and best end of neck.

This is similar to the findings by Briggs (2000) at the Port Adelaide site, where there was also a dominance in sheep, followed by cattle and pig respectively (Briggs 2000:84). Meat cuts that dominated this assemblage though were waste cuts, such as the phalanges and metapodials, this difference was expected, as the Port Adelaide site was a butchery location, where edible meat cuts are taken away from the site but waste elements thrown away. There were still a large count of rib and vertebrae within the assemblage however, these were also considered waste by Briggs (2000:102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meatcut</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Bone Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheep/Goat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillet, Loin, Chump, Sirloin</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loin</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind Quarter</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best End of Neck, Rack</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlets</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind Shank</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fore Shank</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrag</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shank</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisket, Breast</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock, Soup, Waste</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cow</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Loin, Porterhouse, Baron, Loin, Sirloin</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rump, Aitchbone, Loin End, Chump</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck, Chuck Roast, Rib, Rib Roast, Shoulder, Best end of Neck, Forequarter, Neck</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck, Chuck Roast, Blade, Leg of Mutton-Piece, Rib, Shoulder, Forequarter</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm, Thick Rib, Thin Rib, Shoulder, Short Ribs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fore Shank, Shin, Fore Knuckle, Shoulder</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock, Soup, Waste</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pig</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand, Spare Rib, Collar, Prime Back, Neck end, Boston Butt, Foreloin Jowl (Cheek), Head</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Meat cuts throughout the whole assemblage and their social class ranking (drawn from Piper 1991:335-380).
Schmitt and Zeier’s (1993) and Gust’s (1997) meat cut rankings show that the faunal assemblage comprised high, medium and low quality meat cuts (see Table 6.4). Medium quality meat cuts were the most commonly represented by bone count, with an even count of high and low quality cuts. Of the medium quality cuts, rib, vertebrae and shoulder were the most common.

These cuts, though only loosely tied to the hotel, support Beric’s (2008:81) conclusion that large, filling, individual meals were being served, most likely chops, steaks and roasts with bird and sheep/goat providing the majority of the diet by MNI count. The choice of the publicans to provide sheep/goat over beef and pork despite the similarity in price could be based on either, or both, of two factors. Firstly, that the patrons preferred mutton to beef and pork, and secondly, the higher availability of sheep/goat in the colony made it a more practical purchase to prevent having to change the menu to often. Although, as Greenfield (1989:100) discusses, due to difficulties in transporting live pigs over distances (which would have been an issue in the early years of the Beresford Arms) and difficulties with preserving freshly butchered meat, most pork was ‘salted or smoked, and deboned’, which would greatly reduce its appearance in the archaeological record. The presence of bird in the assemblage, comparatively expensive meat to mutton and beef, could be explained if the hotel was keeping chickens on the premises, probably for eggs, and butchering them as they stopped producing. The lack of bird waste (such as skulls) throughout the assemblage does not support this theory, although there were a number of bird metatarsals. However, these waste bones could have been used to make stock for soups. Beeton (n.d.:136) recommends that bones can be boiled more than once for a stock, this would cause great damage to the structure of the bone, causing it to disappear from the archaeological record more quickly. There is no evidence for butchering on site, which Zierden (1999:82-83) found to be a practice in upper class residences, suggesting a middle or working class establishment.

No advertisements in available, early (1840-1859 inclusive) Adelaide newspapers (The Adelaide Times, The Adelaide Chronicle and South Australian Advertiser [later The Adelaide Chronicle and the South Australian Literary Record], the Adelaide Morning Chronicle, the Adelaide Examiner, the Adelaide Independent, The Advertiser) for the Beresford Arms Hotel were located, however several other public houses in Adelaide were advertising. In 1850 the Clarendon Hotel on Hindley Street was advertising a Free and Easy every Monday and Saturday at 8 o’clock, also board and lodgings for 18 shillings per week (The Adelaide Times January 3 and 21 1850). By 1851 board and lodgings had dropped to 12 shillings per week (The Adelaide Times January 9 1851). Henry Catchlove, landlord of the Black Bull Inn, also on Hindley Street, directed his advertisement to bushmen and country gentlemen, offering them moderate board and lodgings with a substantial Ordinary at 1 o’clock and chops and ‘stakes’ at any hour of the day (The Adelaide Times January 2 1851). The Farmer’s Inn was another public house offering an Ordinary at 1 o’clock (The Adelaide Times January 2 1851).
The Blenheim Hotel on Hindley Street advertised to the mercantile community and country gentlemen, also serving an Ordinary at 1 o’clock, and luncheon between 11 and 2 o’clock, which included ‘soups, chops, steaks etc, and sandwiches of every variety’ (The Adelaide Times July 2 1855). Similarly, the Napoleon Bonaparte Hotel on King William Street offered soups, chops and steaks between 11 and 3 o’clock, and an Ordinary at 1 o’clock (The Adelaide Times July 2 1855). All public houses advertised a variety of beers and wines. The similarity in these advertisements between the different public houses shows a direct competition between them, the faunal remains from the Beresford Arms would suggest this competition had reached public houses on the outskirts of the city by the early 1850s at the latest. These advertisements all offer similar menus of large, mid-day meals. The meat cuts from the Beresford Arms, discussed above, suggest that it was serving similar meals. Whether these were lunch or evening meals, or both, cannot be determined, but as other public houses were advertising these as lunches it would be likely to be the same. The situation of the Beresford Arms, on the outskirts of the town, would probably have attracted bushmen, stockmen and country gentlemen coming into the city from the country areas. Local labouring residents would also very likely have attended the hotel for hearty meals and beer, and in 1854 Gilles Street blocks 57-62 went under auction (The Adelaide Times July 1 1854). This sale of land would likely have increased local patronage. A lack of exotic, expensive and imported foods in these contexts, such as kangaroo, emu, venison, oysters, fish and other seafoods, would suggest that the hotel was not catering for people of higher socioeconomic status, as Milne and Crabtree (2001) found in their study of a Five Points brothel. It would seem, however, that the hotel was occasionally buying more expensive meat cuts of cattle and sheep/goat, perhaps as their patrons demanded.

6.4 Colonial Adelaide

The rest of the assemblage could not be distinguished between hotel waste and residential waste. In addition, the elimination of the landfill from the cellar and backyard greatly decreases the amount of data, making it even less reliable. However, analysing the remains from the household and landfill together draws out diet and socioeconomic information for nineteenth century Adelaidean residents as a whole. The faunal remains uncovered do not vary greatly from the contexts previously discussed. Sheep/goat continue as the most common remains throughout the assemblage. Other animals contributed to the diet in varying degrees, including cow, pig, bird, rabbit, shellfish (mollusca), and fish. This similarity in diet to the Beresford Arms would indicate that the majority of nineteenth century Adelaidean citizens were of middle and working class.

There is a total absence of native fauna, such as kangaroo and emu, in the assemblage, even in the landfill. There could be several reasons for this; firstly, it could indicate that the market had settled down and domesticated animals such as cattle and sheep were readily available by 1840, making the consumption of these fauna unnecessary; secondly, it could indicate that native fauna were
considered the food of bushmen, not the meals of ‘respectable’ society. However, taking into account
the high cost of kangaroo and emu in 1842, it is far more likely that these native fauna were
considered exotic foods, which people of a higher class consumed. The lack of appearance from
native animals in the assemblage would imply that they were a luxury meat that the majority of
citizens could not afford to consume. This would be interesting to test against a higher class
assemblage, since this goes against what historical documents suggest (e.g. Gibbs 1984).

There is very little mention of pig in the literature and it seems to play a small role in the diet.
Greenfield (1989) examined in detail the problems with farming pigs in a developing colony. Although
pigs are ideal for their rapid reproduction, quick maturation rates, and unselective foraging, they have
to be transported over distances by vehicle to prevent weight loss, which requires good road systems
(Greenfield 1989:100). Roads in the early Adelaide colony were notoriously bad and it wasn’t until
1841 that the city was opened up to eastern country areas (Gibbs 1984:53-54). This lack of suitable
transportation routes around Adelaide would probably have discouraged many from farming pigs,
although there are advertisements in the early newspapers selling pigs for breeding. In a study of
despised pork for its lowness’. Briggs (2000:139) found that in the 1870s pig was bringing in
extremely high prices. This, in addition to a low regard for pork, would suggest that citizens of higher
class, but lower social status, would have been consuming pigs, that is, persons who could afford the
extreme prices, but were not within the high social status that would dislike pork for its lowness.
However, it is also known that residents of Adelaide kept pig privately, one of these residents being
Governor Hindmarsh (Gibbs 1984:33). Whether his pigs were kept for consumption purposes or for
other reasons is not known, however as Governor he would have been expected to set a leading
example for behaviour fitting someone of a higher socioeconomic status. If the colonisers considered
pork low at this time, it is unlikely that the Governor would have kept pigs (unless they were for his
servants). It is, therefore, more likely that persons of higher class and status were consuming pork.
The lack of pig in the assemblage would suggest that ordinary Adelaide citizens could not afford the
high prices asked, and were therefore of lower social class. One other possible explanation for the
lack of pig in the assemblage is that the pig may have been salted or smoked and deboned before
leaving the butcher, eliminating any trace in the archaeological record (Greenfield 1989:100).

Table 6.4 shows bone counts and meat cuts for sheep/goat, cow and pig remains throughout the
whole assemblage. Whilst medium-ranked meat cuts were the majority, low and high quality cuts
were also abundant. Bedell and Scharfenberger (2000:33) had similar findings in their study of
farmers and tenants living in rural Delaware, USA. They argued that it was a common pattern
amongst farmers to eat the whole animal after it was slaughtered, so the elite were seen to eat poor
quality cuts and the poor would eat high quality cuts (Bedell and Scharfenberger 2000:33). Early in
the development of the colony, the Beresford Arms was situated in a rural area, and as the city grew, it became more urbanised. It would be unlikely that the landfill was brought in from a great distance due to the expense this would have incurred. It is far more probable that the source was close to the Beresford Arms and this pattern of eating the entire animal in the rural areas is possibly being seen in this assemblage, accounting for the even high and low quality cut counts.

Briggs’ (2000) study of an 1870s slaughter house in Port Adelaide also found that sheep dominated the assemblage, followed by cattle and pigs. In the 1870s Briggs found that sheep were considerably cheaper than cattle. Briggs (2000:140) also argued that, whilst there was some standardization to the butchering of the animals, there was a great deal of variation within the assemblage. As discussed in chapter 3 this was explained as functional variation, and also a lack of standardised carcass division (Briggs 2000:140). The Beresford Arms Hotel assemblage contained some elements that were fractured in a fashion that did not fit in with any of the butchering patterns collected by Piper (1991). However, the majority of the assemblage appeared to have a standardised butchering pattern that would suggest that the most of the animals were obtained from a butcher, a behaviour that Zierden (1999:82-83) attributes to middle class households. The remaining bones that do not fit into a standard butchery practice could represent the meals of a few elite families who were butchering their own meat (Zierden 1999:82-83), or they could represent the lack of standardised carcass division suggested by Briggs (2000:140).

6.5 Conclusion

Newspapers from the 1840s and 1850s show that mutton, beef and pork were relatively cheap meats, whereas bird, rabbit and native animals were expensive. The patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel were mainly consuming a mix of the cheaper mutton and beef, and the expensive poultry. The majority of mutton and beef meat cuts were of a medium quality, however low and high quality cuts were equally present. This supports Beric’s (2008) conclusion that large, hearty meals were being served, most likely steaks, chops and roasts. Sheep, cow, pig and bird were also the main contributors to the diet of colonial Adelaide residents; however, rabbit, fish and shellfish were also present in smaller quantities. Like the patrons of the Beresford Arms Hotel, the citizens of Adelaide were consuming a mix of low, medium and high quality meat cuts. Factors such as transport and preservation issues may have affected the availability of meat products, and their appearance in the archaeological record. The high occurrence of a butchery pattern to the faunal remains would suggest that the meat was being purchased from a butcher, rather than being slaughtered privately, a behaviour associated with the middle class.
7 Conclusion

Although there are only a few contexts that may be loosely tied to the Beresford Arms Hotel specifically, it may be tentatively argued that the patrons of the hotel were of middle socioeconomic status. The hotel diet consisted of a mix of cheap and expensive meats, including sheep, bird, cow, pig and rabbit. The majority of meat cuts were from the rib, which, according to Schmitt and Zeier (1993:28) and Gust (1997:247 & 256) is a medium-ranked cut. High- and low-ranked meat cuts, such as loin, sirloin, leg, shank, neck and brisket, were also occasionally being served by the hotel.

This finding supports Beric’s (2008) conclusion that large, filling and individually-plated meals of chops and steaks were being served, probably to a male dominated patronage, and also multiple serving dishes such as roasts. However, Beric’s conclusion that the hotel was a working-class establishment is not substantiated by the faunal remains. This disparity in socioeconomic status indicated by non-faunal material and faunal remains has also been noted in several other studies, including Schmitt and Zeier (1993:33-34) and Bedell and Scharfenberger (2000:33). This could be caused by the small sample size, which has resulted in a lack of data, and indicate that there needs to be more detailed investigation into the relationship between diet and status, and between status and the use of ceramics. It is difficult to untangle the social complexities of any society, and to address separately issues such as ethnicity, economic position, class or status. These concepts are often intertwined and, to an extent, dependent on each other.

Other contexts from the Beresford Arms Hotel assemblage have indicated that the majority of Adelaide’s citizens in this area in the mid-nineteenth century were of working and middle socioeconomic status. This is evidenced by a lack of exotic and imported foods, by the majority of meat cuts being from the rib, and by a standardisation of the butchery pattern of the animals which, according to Zierden (1999:82-83), is an indication of middle class behaviour. Some variation in butchery practices did exist within the Beresford Arms assemblage; however Briggs (2000:140) found this to be a result of a lack of standardised carcass butchering. The absence of native faunas in the Beresford Arms assemblage is interesting, as historical sources (e.g. Gibbs 1984) would lead researchers to expect to find at least a minimal amount of native fauna in colonial food disposal deposits. It was expected that people of a lower class would be eating these animals as diet supplements due to the scarcity (and therefore high prices) of European foods. However, the prices for kangaroo and emu in early papers would suggest that only people of a higher class could afford these foods. It is clear that the role of native faunas in colonial diets deserves further research, perhaps through excavation of comparatively higher class assemblages, or by documentary research into the place of native foods in the local diet (see for example, Heuzenroeder 2006).
This thesis has contributed to the Australian literature on the relationship between socioeconomic status and faunal remains, a research area that has largely been ignored in Australian archaeology. Due to the fragmentation of the assemblage, the inability to differentiate between the hotel faunal deposits and the residential faunal deposits, and inaccurate dating of contexts, only loose statements about the socioeconomic status of the Beresford Arms Hotel patrons could be made, along with generalised statements about the diet and socioeconomic status of Adelaide citizens as a whole. Despite the failure of this thesis to firmly answer its research question, it has been demonstrated by other studies (for example, Schmitt and Lupo 2008) that it is possible to determine socioeconomic status from faunal remains given the right conditions. Unfortunately, the right conditions are rarely found in archaeology.

The determination of meat weights for the assemblage in the future may assist in diminishing the difference between the non-faunal material findings and the findings from the faunal remains, as might further identification of the bird remains into lower taxonomic classes. Due to the inaccuracy of the MNI and NISP counts, this thesis did not commit to meat weights and the bird remains could not be identified further due to the lack of a suitable reference collection. Further studies into the prices of specific meat cuts in Adelaide would also help to better understand socioeconomic issues for Adelaide citizens, rather than relying on overseas studies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Colonel William Light owns TA 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Maria Gandy left Light's estate in will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1839</td>
<td>TA 597 Sold to Robert Milne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1839</td>
<td>Construction of BAH (rooms 1 and 2) begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1851</td>
<td>Construction of rooms 3/4, 5, 6 and the cellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843-1846</td>
<td>Possibly ceased trading due to economic depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aug 1844</td>
<td>Land transaction for westerly lot, sold from Robert Milne to John Martin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>John Gibbs bought half of the TA on northern end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>William Moorhead becomes publican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1847</td>
<td>James Ellery licensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>ACC Rate Assessments claim it comprised of six rooms (including the cellar) and a yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>ACC Rate Assessments claim hotel consists of eight rooms (including the cellar) and a yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1853</td>
<td>William Tidswell becomes licensee for first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1855</td>
<td>Lease from John Martin to Hugh Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1855</td>
<td>Esther Smithson holds license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1856</td>
<td>Henry Meek licensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1856</td>
<td>William Wilkins licensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/Dec 1856</td>
<td>Lease from John Martin to Henry Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1856</td>
<td>Henry Palmer renames BAH Oddfellows Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1858</td>
<td>Surrender of lease by Henry Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1858</td>
<td>William Tidswell becomes last publican of OA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1860</td>
<td>OA closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Tidswell no longer licensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1873</td>
<td>Owner John Martin sells OA to Johannes Andreas Schrader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-1880</td>
<td>Cellar filled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1880</td>
<td>Three outbuildings constructed, north wall of room 1 demolished. Main residence has six rooms, three outbuildings and a yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1904</td>
<td>Johannes sells property to John Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1950</td>
<td>Sold to Ernest Harold Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Ernest dies, property transfers to Gordon Leslie Stanton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A1.1:** Timeline of the Beresford Arms Hotel (BAH) (constructed from Sumerling 2006 and Hoad 1986).
Figure A2.1: Floor plan and possible construction sequence for the Beresford Arms Hotel, adapted from original by Flightpath Architects (Stone 2007:21).
Appendix 3


Appendix 4

Table A4.1 Digital copy of the Beresford Arms Hotel faunal assemblage Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.