Richard Tuffin David Roe Sylvana Szydzik E. Jeanne Harris Ashley Matic

# RECOVERING CONVICT LIVES

0000

A Historical Archaeology of the Port Arthur Penitentiary

# **RECOVERING CONVICT LIVES**

### Studies in Australasian Historical Archaeology

Martin Gibbs and Mary Casey, Series Editors

The Studies in Australasian Historical Archaeology series aims to publish excavation reports and regional syntheses that deal with research into the historical archaeology of Australia, New Zealand and the Asia-Pacific region. The series aims to encourage greater public access to the results of major research and consultancy investigations, and it is co-published with the Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology.

An Archaeology of Institutional Confinement: The Hyde Park Barracks, 1848–1886 Peter Davies, Penny Crook and Tim Murray

Archaeology of the Chinese Fishing Industry in Colonial Victoria Alister M. Bowen

*The Commonwealth Block, Melbourne: A Historical Archaeology* Tim Murray, Kristal Buckley, Sarah Hayes, Geoff Hewitt, Justin McCarthy, Richard Mackay, Barbara Minchinton, Charlotte Smith, Jeremy Smith and Bronwyn Woff

Flashy, Fun and Functional: How Things Helped to Invent Melbourne's Gold Rush Mayor Sarah Hayes

Good Taste, Fashion, Luxury: A Genteel Melbourne Family and Their Rubbish Sarah Hayes

Port Essington: The Historical Archaeology of a North Australian 19th-Century Military Outpost Jim Allen

Recovering Convict Lives: A Historical Archaeology of the Port Arthur Penitentiary Richard Tuffin, David Roe, Sylvana Szydzik, E. Jeanne Harris and Ashley Matic

The Shore Whalers of Western Australia: Historical Archaeology of a Maritime Frontier Martin Gibbs

# RECOVERING CONVICT LIVES A Historical Archaeology of the Port Arthur Penitentiary

Richard Tuffin, David Roe, Sylvana Szydzik, E. Jeanne Harris and Ashley Matic



SYDNEY UNIVERSITY PRESS

First published by Sydney University Press 2021

© Richard Tuffin, David Roe, Sylvana Szydzik, E. Jeanne Harris and Ashley Matic 2021 © Sydney University Press 2021

Reproduction and Communication for other purposes

Except as permitted under the Act, no part of this edition may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or communicated in any form or by any means without prior written permission. All requests for reproduction or communication should be made to Sydney University Press at the address below:

Sydney University Press Fisher Library F03 University of Sydney NSW 2006 AUSTRALIA sup.info@sydney.edu.au sydneyuniversitypress.com.au

A catalogue record for this book is available from

ISBN 9781743327821 paperback ISBN 9781743327838 epub ISBN 9781743327845 pdf

Cover photo by Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (PAHSMA) 2021 Cover design by Diana Chamma

The Penitentiary Precinct Conservation Project was a major conservation project for the PAHSMA. The structural stabilisation and first tranche of archaeological research excavations were part-funded with specific grants from the Tasmanian Government and the Commonwealth Government. The excavations of the ablutions yard and laundry were funded from PAHSMA budgets and supported by in-kind allocations from the University of New England as part of a continuing collaboration in archaeological research. The writing of this book took place while Richard Tuffin was employed by the University of New England.







# CONTENTS

List of figures	vii
List of plates	xv
List of tables	xvii
Acknowledgements	xix
Introduction	1
1. A short history of Port Arthur	13
2. The story of the penitentiary precinct	53
3. Private lives in public spaces: understanding the convict experience	129
4. Illustrated summary of the archaeological investigations	167
Conclusion: one building, many stories	261
About the authors	265
References	267
Index	273

# **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 0.1. The location of Port Arthur and its penitentiary.	5
Figure 0.2. The penitentiary is situated at the base of Settlement	
Hill (left), on the former edge of Mason Cove.	6
Figure 0.3. Detail plan showing the layout of the mill and granary	
in 1846.	7
Figure 0.4. Detail plan showing the layout of the penitentiary in 185	57.7
Figure 0.5. View looking east from the location of the bakehouse	
over the penitentiary.	8
Figure 0.6. Plan showing the penitentiary today.	8
Figure 0.7. Aerial view of the penitentiary.	9
Figure 0.8. Photo taken from the muster ground during	
conservation works in 2015.	10
Figure 0.9. During the 2016 excavations of the ablutions area.	12
Figure 1.1. An 1828 survey completed by surveyor Thomas Scott,	
showing the sheltered harbor of Port Arthur.	14
Figure 1.2. Map showing the location of places mentioned in the	
historical overview.	16
Figure 1.3. Illustration of Port Arthur in 1833.	20
Figure 1.4. By 1833 the settlement had substantially grown from	
its original cluster of huts.	21
Figure 1.5. Port Arthur's population during 1830–35.	22
Figure 1.6. By 1840 Port Arthur had sprawled to encompass Mason	۱
Cove.	23
Figure 1.7. This 1843 illustration shows Port Arthur from the	
northern side of Mason Cove.	24

Figure 1.8. Map of the Tasman Peninsula showing the stations	
operational during the probation period.	26
Figure 1.9. The extent of the settlement in 1850.	27
Figure 1.10. Port Arthur experienced a growth in convict	
population, just at the time other stations on the Tasman	
Peninsula were beginning to close.	28
Figure 1.11. Port Arthur in 1865.	29
Figure 1.12. A photograph of the settlement from 1871, showing	
the crowded nature of Settlement Hill.	30
Figure 1.13. Survey plan of the settlement completed by Archibald	
Blackwood in 1877.	31
Figure 1.14. Plan of the waterfront in 1833, showing the extent of	
the later penitentiary precinct.	32
Figure 1.15. Plan of the waterfront area in 1836.	33
Figure 1.16. Henry Laing's illustration of the waterfront workshops.	34
Figure 1.17. Illustration showing the settlement in 1842.	35
Figure 1.18. Illustration from 1851–52 showing the completed flour	
mill and granary.	36
Figure 1.19. Plan of the waterfront area in 1846.	37
Figure 1.20. The water was supplied to the mill via a composite	
system that was eventually found wanting.	38
Figure 1.21. Rough plan of Mason Cove showing the proposed	
reclamation.	40
Figure 1.22. Plan of the area in 1857.	41
Figure 1.23. Interior view of the penitentiary separate cells in the	
former treadwheel ward, taken post-1877.	42
Figure 1.24. View showing the penitentiary, likely during	
conversion works as neither the clocktower nor bakehouse are	
shown.	43
Figure 1.25. Detail of ca. 1856 plan, showing laundry area.	44
Figure 1.26. Plan showing the area in 1865.	46
Figure 1.27. Detail of ca. 1863 plan showing the ablutions area.	47
Figure 1.28. Detail of ca. 1863 plan showing the laundry area.	48
Figure 1.29. Photograph of the penitentiary during the convict	
period, likely early 1870s.	49
Figure 1.30. Detail of 1889 survey, showing the remnant structures	
in the laundry and ablutions area.	51
<b>Figure 1.31</b> . View of the ablutions area in the 1890s, prior to the	
1897 fire.	52
Figure 2.1. Dolerite fieldstone retaining wall on Settlement Hill.	56

Figure 2.2. Detail of the 1833 illustration, showing the waterfront	
area.	59
Figure 2.3. Graph illustrating the rapid rise of the number of	
convicts employed in the waterfront workshops between 1831	
and 1834.	61
Figure 2.4. Impression Bay probation station.	62
Figure 2.5. Rationing measures from the collection of the	
Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery.	65
Figure 2.6. Elevation and sections drawn by William Cart, Acting	
Foreman of Works, for a mill to be 'propelled either by the	
power of water or a Tread Wheel'.	66
Figure 2.7. Plans drawn by Cart showing the treadwheel sections	
and grinding gear.	67
Figure 2.8. The treadwheel at work.	70
Figure 2.9. Saltwater River probation station.	71
Figure 2.10. Cart's original 1839 plan for the treadwheel and mill	
house overlaid on the footprint of the mill (treadwheel ward and	
mill house) derived from the excavation.	73
Figure 2.11. Illustration of Port Arthur by John Skinner Prout in	
1845.	75
Figure 2.12. View along the underground brick aqueduct.	76
Figure 2.13. Convicts labouring at Port Arthur in 1836.	77
Figure 2.14. Table of work performed at the Glenorchy road gang	
in 1848.	79
Figure 2.15. The footings of the mill were primarily formed from	
dolerite.	81
Figure 2.16. The Port Arthur waterfront and Settlement Hill.	82
Figure 2.17. One of the radiographed concretions from the laundry,	
showing sewing pins and a nail.	87
Figure 2.18. The Eastern State Penitentiary, Philadelphia.	90
Figure 2.19. Isometric view of Pentonville Prison, as depicted in the	
1844 report of Joshua Jebb.	93
Figure 2.20. A later redrawing of a ca. 1850 plan of the Separate	
Prison.	94
Figure 2.21. View from the pulpit, Lincoln Prison chapel (UK).	95
Figure 2.22. The separate apartments of Portland Prison.	96
Figure 2.23. The 'Punishment Block', Spike Island.	97
Figure 2.24. Fremantle Prison, Western Australia.	99

Figure 2.25. Cell identification number in the separate prison,	
similar to the prison fittings imported from Britain and used in	
the penitentiary.	100
Figure 2.26. Historic plan detail of latticework.	103
Figure 2.27. The Paupers' Mess (foreground), with the Asylum in	
the background, 1890.	105
Figure 3.1. Some of the objects found during the 2013-16	
investigations.	131
Figure 3.2. The confines of a separate prison cell, much like those	
used at the penitentiary.	144
Figure 3.3. Distribution of clay smoking pipe finds during Phase I	
and Phase II.	148
Figure 3.4. Historic advertisement for R.J. Edwards' establishment	:
in Hobart.	153
Figure 3.5. Pipes bearing the British and American flags.	154
Figure 3.6. Distribution of tokens during Phase I (top), Phase II	
(middle) and recovered from post-1877 deposits (bottom).	156
Figure 3.7. A number of ceramic tokens recovered from the	
excavation.	157
Figure 4.1. Map showing locations where archaeological	
investigations have been carried out between 1976 and 2016.	169
Figure 4.2. Map showing the areas excavated during 2013–16.	176
Figure 4.3. Division of the ablutions and laundry areas into areas,	
quadrants and spaces.	177
Figure 4.4. Some of the methods used during the 2016	
excavations.	178
Figure 4.5. Artefacts were able to be identified through	
radiography. 179	
Figure 4.6. Illustrations overlaid on penitentiary plan, showing	
locations and layouts of ablutions and laundry areas 1830–54.	180
Figure 4.7. Illustration showing the series of slots cut into the	
ablutions area to examine features from the 1830–54 period.	181
Figure 4.8. Illustration showing key features in the laundry area,	
1830–54. The blank areas were unexcavated, or were where	
footings were present.	182
Figure 4.9. Map of the estimated line of the original waterfront in	
1830, with the outline of the penitentiary overlaid.	183
Figure 4.10. Outcropping dolerite found during the excavation of	
the laundry area.	184

Figure 4.11. Outline of penitentiary superimposed upon the 1836	
layout of the area.	185
Figure 4.12. Overlay of the site in 1836, showing the location of the	e
footing.	186
Figure 4.13. Illustration showing the estimated position of the	
ramp relative to the excavated area and the site's extant	
features.	187
Figure 4.14. Photograph of the dolerite boulders incorporated into	
the reclamation material below the penitentiary.	189
Figure 4.15. Penitentiary footings exposed during the excavation.	190
Figure 4.16. Internal divisions of the flour mill and granary, derived	ł
from archaeological investigation.	191
Figure 4.17. Map showing mill features.	192
Figure 4.18. Ablutions area, showing the pillar incorporated into	
the Champ Street retaining wall.	193
Figure 4.19. Course of the drain through the ablutions yard.	193
Figure 4.20. Illustrations overlaid on penitentiary plan, showing	
locations and layouts of ablutions and laundry areas between	
1856 and ca. 1862.	194
Figure 4.21. Illustration showing the ablutions area during the first	
phase of use, 1854 – ca. 1862.	195
Figure 4.22. Orthophotograph of the ablutions area during 1854 –	
ca. 1862.	196
<b>Figure 4.23.</b> Illustration showing the laundry area during the first	
phase of use, 1854 – ca. 1862.	197
Figure 4.24. Orthophotograph of the laundry area during 1854 – ca	
1862.	198
Figure 4.25. Excavations within the penitentiary, showing the	
truncation to the earlier mill house/waterwheel footings.	200
Figure 4.26. Broken dolerite raft underneath the separate cells	
within the penitentiary.	202
Figure 4.27. Broken dolerite and crushed brick surfacing, cut by the	е
footings for the bakehouse.	203
Figure 4.28. Champ Street retaining wall, showing the 1840s wall	
and the section reconstructed during Phase II.	204
Figure 4.29. The former 'baths' space, showing the mixture of	
brick and sandstone footings.	205
Figure 4.30. Compact crushed brick surface within the laundry	
space.	206

Figure 4.31. Illustration showing the course of the drain through	
the laundry.	207
Figure 4.32. Illustration showing the features of the laundry's	
easternmost spaces.	208
Figure 4.33. Illustration of ablutions area, showing drainage and	
sumps around the perimeter.	210
Figure 4.34. Detail of the central structure's shallow sandstone	
footings.	212
Figure 4.35. Illustration showing the central ablutions structure.	213
Figure 4.36. Illustration showing the position of the sumps within	
the central structure and the associated drain through the east	
yard.	213
Figure 4.37. The brick tile spoon drain within the central	
structure.	214
Figure 4.38. Section through the east yard showing the top of the	
brick tile spoon drain running from the central structure.	215
Figure 4.39. Section excavated against the dividing wall of the	
west yard.	216
Figure 4.40. Illustration showing the location of the three fireplaces	s
in the west yard.	217
Figure 4.41. Photograph of the westernmost fireplace, showing the	Э
in situ sandstone socket in one of the shelter postholes.	218
Figure 4.42. Illustration showing the elements covered by the later	-
extension of the laundry into the ablutions area.	219
<b>Figure 4.43.</b> Distribution of clay smoking pipe fragments across	
the west yard.	220
Figure 4.44. Photograph of the footing for the eastern yard's	
6	221
<b>Figure 4.45.</b> Location of fireplaces and associated features in the	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	222
Figure 4.46. Illustration showing the west yard and the extent of	
5	223
Figure 4.47. Extent and distribution of clay smoking pipe	
fragments in the west yard, deposited during and after the	
, 6	224
Figure 4.48. Illustration showing the extent of the mortar layer in	
	225
Figure 4.49. Compact mortar overlying the first phase gravels in	
the west yard of the ablutions area.	226

Figure 4.50. Illustration and photograph showing the striations in	
the gravels below the mortar.	228
Figure 4.51. Illustration showing the location of the bricks cut into	
the mortar layer.	229
Figure 4.52. Illustrations overlaid on penitentiary plan, showing	
locations and layouts of ablutions and laundry areas ca. 1862–	
1877.	230
Figure 4.53. Illustration showing the ablutions area during the	
period ca. 1862–1877.	231
Figure 4.54. Orthophotograph of the ablutions area during ca.	
1862–1877.	232
Figure 4.55. Illustration showing the laundry area during the	
period ca. 1862–1877.	233
Figure 4.56. Orthophotograph of the laundry area during ca.	
1862–1877.	234
5	236
Figure 4.58. Illustration showing the areas added during the	
,	237
	238
<b>Figure 4.60.</b> Illustration of the laundry showing the distribution of	
,	240
Figure 4.61. Distribution of buttons across the ablutions and	
, ,	241
Figure 4.62. Distribution of artefacts related to alcohol, food	
<b>o i</b>	242
Figure 4.63. Illustration showing the location of the sump and	
	243
<b>Figure 4.64.</b> Illustration showing the rebuilt section of the central	
	244
Figure 4.65. Illustration showing the section between Champ	
,	245
Figure 4.66. Illustration showing the day room space and the	
	246
	249
Figure 4.68. Distribution of clay smoking pipes in the west yard	
•	250
<b>Figure 4.69.</b> Illustration showing southern shelter in the west yard.	251
Figure 4.70. Illustration showing footings of central shelter in the	0
east yard.	252

Figure 4.71. Illustration showing southern shelter in the east	
yard.	253
Figure 4.72. Distribution of clay smoking pipes and buttons in the	
east yard from Phase II deposits.	256
Figure 4.73. Distribution of tokens recovered from Phase II	
deposits across the ablutions area.	257
Figure 4.74. Illustration showing late changes to the west yard.	258
Figure 4.75. Photograph of the early stages of the excavation	
showing the shallow nature of the archaeological deposits.	260

# LIST OF PLATES

Plate 0.1. Port Arthur, former penal station and now World	
Heritage historic site.	109
Plate 0.2. The Port Arthur penitentiary building (1842–77).	109
Plate 1.1. Illustration of Port Arthur in 1863, looking from the	
northern side of Mason Cove.	110
Plate 1.2. In 1874, members of Port Arthur's prisoner population	
were photographed.	110
Plate 1.3. The first plan of Port Arthur, produced in 1833.	111
Plate 1.4. Map by J.R. Hurst of Port Arthur in 1846. 112	
Plate 1.5. Plan of the penitentiary and its ancillary structures and	
areas in about 1856.	113
Plate 1.6. Detail of the ca. 1856 plan, showing the ablutions area.	114
Plate 1.7. Ground and first floor plans for the penitentiary, showing	g
changes to the ablutions and laundry areas ca. 1862.	115
Plate 2.1. Dolerite shore near Port Arthur.	115
Plate 2.2. A view of Port Arthur in ca. 1834.	116
Plate 2.3. Large log of 0.60m diameter incorporated into the	
reclamation cribbing, found during excavations within the	
penitentiary footprint.	116
Plate 2.4. Illustration of Port Arthur waterfront in 1843.	117
Plate 2.5. A convict-made pair of boots.	118
Plate 2.6. Plan of the treadwheel and milling gear proposed for	
Norfolk Island.	118
Plate 2.7. Booth's 1833 plan for the new prisoners' barracks.	119

Plate 2.8. Looking down upon the excavation (with the Phase I	
dividing walls visible) from Champ Street.	119
Plate 2.9. Plan of the 1835 prisoners' barracks.	120
Plate 3.1. Some of the clay tobacco pipes recovered during the	
2016 excavation.	121
Plate 3.2. Lead tokens found during the excavation of the ablutions	3
area.	122
Plate 3.3. A cluster of tokens was found in the topsoil, over the	
footings of the wet yard's central shelter.	122
Plate 3.4. A selection of buttons found during 2016.	123
Plate 3.5. Convict uniforms held in the Port Arthur collection.	123
Plate 3.6. A selection of bottles with some of the fragments found	
during 2016.	124
Plate 4.1. The laundry and ablutions areas before excavation	
commenced in 2016.	125
Plate 4.2. The laundry and ablution areas taken during the	
excavations.	126
Plate 4.3. The ablutions and laundry area, situated between the	
penitentiary and Champ Street retaining wall.	127
Plate 4.4. Mid-excavation shot of the ablutions block/day room,	
showing the area gridded for artefact recovery.	127
Plate 4.5. This 1851 painting by Ludwig Becker shows the timber	
cribbing used for building the two boat slips of the Port Arthur	
dockyard.	128
<b>Plate 4.6</b> . The diagonal sandstone dividing wall of the west yard	
during excavation.	128

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1. Lieutenant Governor George Arthur's hierarchical	
system of prisoner management.	17
Table 3.1. Artefacts recovered from convict period (1830–77)	
deposits during the 2013–15 excavations.	132
Table 3.2. Table showing artefacts (MNI) recovered from convict-	
period contexts during the excavation of the ablutions and	
laundry areas.	133
Table 3.3. Showing key artefact functions and use classification	
(not including architectural) and the breakdown between those	
found in the ablutions and laundry areas (MNI).	134
Table 3.4. Hours of convict labour, ca. 1868.	141
Table 3.6. Distribution of artefacts (MNI) in the ablutions area	
derived from convict period deposits.	152

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank the PAHSMA Board, CEO Stephen Large and the Executive Leadership Team for underwriting the research approach to archaeological work in the Penitentiary Precinct Conservation Project and for approving major funding to conduct the excavation series. In particular we acknowledge Dr Jane Harrington, Director Conservation and Infrastructure for supporting this work as a major PAHSMA project.

None of the work would have been possible without the dedicated archaeologists, PAHSMA staff, colleagues and volunteers who worked on the excavation in the first place:

Excavation team (penitentiary) 2013 volunteers: Adelia Tan, Ané van der Walt, Ben James, Bob Stone, Bronwyn Woff, Charlotte Gardner, Chelsea Morgan, Chris Burbury, Fiona Shanahan, James Cole, Jeffrey Pearson, Lauren Davison, Leah Ralph, Megan Rowland, Najat Skeate, Pamela Chauvel, Steven Hall and Teagan Lane.

Excavation team (ablutions area): Laura Bates, Lauren Davison, Jeanne Harris, Rhian Jones, Henry Lion, Ronan McEleney, Fiona Shanahan and Zvonka Stanin.

Excavation team (laundry area): Laura Bates, Emma Church, Lauren Davison, Josh Gaunt, Adam Pietrzak, Michelle Richards and Sam Thomas.

PAHSMA staff (past and present): Nicky Corbett, Matt Dillon, John Featherstone, Jodie Green, John Hack, Jane Harrington, Susan Hood, Naomi Jeffs, Jo Lyngcoln, Marty Passingham, Gareath Plummer, Ted Plummer, Michael Smith, Jody Steele, Caitlin Vertigan, Annita Waghorn and Peter Williams.

Photogrammetry expert: Peter Rigozzi.

The members of Conservation Volunteers Australia, under the supervision of John Hueston.

UNE for providing personnel and in-kind support, particularly Professor Martin Gibbs, Associate Professor David Roberts and Professor Hamish Maxwell-Stewart.

Radiology Tasmania for their critical assistance with developing and undertaking the X-ray program.

Hansen Yuncken for logistical and programming support in the archaeological monitoring phases of the 2014 structural stabilisation work.

The Tasmanian Heritage Council and the Tasman Council for statutory approvals for the excavation series.

Aboriginal Heritage Tasmania for advice on excavation planning issues.

The penitentiary is the most well-known structure at one of Australia's most visited historic heritage sites – the former male penal station of Port Arthur, Tasmania (1830–77). The imposing brick edifice has been captured in millions of photographs and depicted in hundreds of illustrations. Its angular façade, broken at intervals by the regimented lines of iron-barred windows, sits in stark contrast to the soft green of the manicured grass that surrounds it. Like much of the park-like nature of the modern historic site of Port Arthur, it can be difficult to reconcile such a scene with what we know about its past. Today, the penitentiary represents the challenge of giving access to difficult and complex pasts through site conservation, research and interpretation.

The obvious story of the penitentiary is told through the historical record and the upstanding architecture. Its high walls were built from clay dug, shaped and fired by prisoners, its frames and floors from timber felled and hewn by convict gangs. Beginning its life in the 1840s, as a flour mill and granary designed to convert convict-grown wheat into ration flour, by the 1850s it had become the place where these convicts were incarcerated. This book takes these stories and adds other layers, both metaphorical and literal, delving beneath the grass to tell the story of Port Arthur's most imposing structure via archaeological practice. Through those things left behind – the sandstone footing of a wall, the accumulated dust of years, or the lost object – we gain insight into previously unwritten histories, from the intensely personal to the bigger social, economic and political contexts.

#### **RECOVERING CONVICT LIVES**

This book is about archaeological excavations which took place in and around the penitentiary between 2013 and 2016. During 2013–15 the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority (PAHSMA) carried out a series of investigations linked to stabilisation works within the structure, as well as the reinstatement of interpretive elements associated with the former muster ground. In 2016 a large-scale investigation of the former ablutions and laundry spaces adjacent to the penitentiary took place. Together, this suite of excavations facilitated critical conservation work on an important historic structure. It also presented us with an opportunity to engage with the lesser-known aspects of Port Arthur's fascinating past, providing a window into the spaces where convicts worked and spent their limited free time.

The archaeological excavations – and therefore this book – also delved back beyond the history of the penitentiary. From the moment the penal station was first established in 1830, the area became a hub of industrial and penal activity, the site of work yards, wharves and workshops. The construction of the flour mill and granary between 1842 and 1845 stands as the perfect symbol for the administrators' never-ending quest for economy, its story intertwined with wider goings-on in colonial Tasmania and the faraway corridors of power in London.

These investigations provided an opportunity to understand some of the key aspects of the penal station's past. Through its early history we can learn about how economy was incorporated into penal regimes and how station administrators sought to balance day-to-day management realities against the expectations of colonial and British governments. The site's later history provides insight into how prison populations were managed, as well as how these populations managed to express agency and individuality throughout their incarcerated lives. The configuration of these spaces, as well as the material culture left behind, tells us much about the administrators' attitudes toward the management of the unfree men in their charge.

This book examines these aspects through an integrated application of the methods and approaches of history and archaeology. It is a work of historical archaeology, melding records created by the administrators and – more rarely – the unfree, with the very physicality of the places and spaces that they created. It is not designed to provide an exhaustive accounting of the excavation or the artefacts that were found. There are reports for those

who wish to lose themselves in this type of minutiae. Instead, we want to talk about histories – both big and small, of a space and the lives that were carried out within it. Within this space we find the genesis of the modern prison and prisoner. Only through multidisciplinary investigations such as the one outlined in this book can we even start to understand such beginnings.

#### About this book

This book began life as archaeology reports, written by and for PAHSMA. Although the preparation of such reports is an essential part of any excavation, they can be incredibly dry, full of tedious descriptions and tables of artefacts. While they are an essential part of any investigative program, these reports do not lend themselves to engaging reading.

This book aims to distill the results of our excavations into palatable form, divested of most of the strictures of archaeological reporting. In Chapter 1 we open with a short history of Port Arthur, establishing how and why this isolated station came to fulfill such an important role in the management of transported convicts in Australia. We also outline the known history of the area in which the excavation was situated, establishing why this small patch of waterfront is so important for understanding how the penal station was formed and how it developed over half a century.

In Chapters 2 and 3, we provide a narrative that sets the changes to the natural and built landscape of the penitentiary precinct against an expansive context, demonstrating how this contained landscape reacted to influences ranging from the local to the global. To do this, we draw upon the results of the historical and the archaeological investigations, weaving a developmental narrative with the lives and labours of Port Arthur's unfree and free.

In Chapter 4 we present the results of the archaeological investigations in a format that favours immediate comprehension. Context lists, matrices and endless descriptions of stratigraphy have been relegated, replaced by photographs, illustrations and maps. It is designed to provide the archaeological background to Chapters 2 and 3. The whole section has been divided according to the five main phases of occupation that we identified as a result of the investigation: an early industrial waterfront phase, the two main phases of penitentiary occupation, an intermediate phase of activity, and post-abandonment. This phasing is discussed in more detail at the introduction to Chapter 2.

For those interested in the raw archaeological information, an online data repository containing the original excavation reports has been established.

The repository is located at: https://open.sydneyuniversitypress.com.au/ recovering-convict-lives.html

A collection of photogrammetry can be found at: https://une.pedestal3d. com/r/68pm-yOWaL?sorting=1

A detailed overview of how Port Arthur evolved during the convict period can also be found at: www.convictlandscapes.com.au/portarthur

#### About the site

Port Arthur is located on the Tasman Peninsula, south-east Tasmania. With the peninsula accessible only by sea or via a narrow isthmus, it is easy to see why its security and isolation made it an attractive location for a penal settlement. Clustered around Mason Cove, the boundaries and layout of today's historic site remain much as they were during the convict period. The bulk of the settlement is located on the southern side of the cove, spread along the eminence known as Settlement Hill. Officers' quarters, the church and cleared ground stretch to the cove's west, while the station's former dockyards and the modern visitor centre occupy the northern ground.

The penitentiary stands on the southern side of Mason Cove, occupying ground at the base of Settlement Hill that was formerly waterfront until reclamation of the bay commenced in 1854 (Figures 0.1 and 0.2). To the rear of the penitentiary (south west) runs the elevated formation of Champ Street, then – as now – the settlement's main thoroughfare.

Much of the structure that we see today was actually built between 1842 and 1845, when a large brick flour mill and granary were erected on the former site of a waterside lumber yard and workshops (Figure 0.3). The largest portion of the structure housed a large 35-foot overshot waterwheel, the mill machinery and a timber treadwheel. The latter was a punishment device for convicts, the motive power generated by 48 men stepping on the treads of a 12-foot wheel. The power of man and water were harnessed to the grinding machinery. The smaller portion of the building housed a granary and offices.



Figure 0.1. The location of Port Arthur and its penitentiary.



**Figure 0.2.** The penitentiary is situated at the base of Settlement Hill (left), on the former edge of Mason Cove. The cove was partly reclaimed during the 1850s. (Hype TV for PAHSMA, 2017)

Alterations to the structure between 1854 and 1857 turned it into a secure penitentiary building capable of incarcerating 480 prisoners (Figure 0.4). The mill and granary were gutted, leaving behind a retrofitted shell containing cells, a mess hall, dormitory, chapel and library. A new bakehouse was built to the west and a building for watchmen added to the east. At the front of the building a muster ground was laid out on newly reclaimed ground, while to the rear were added exercise yards, ablutions buildings and a laundry.

The structure that remains today reflects both these phases of the building's occupation: an 1840s façade and the remnants of an 1850s interior. Much of the latter, including the structure's roof, was lost in an 1897 fire during the post-convict period. Fire and salvage claimed the penitentiary's ancillary structures, with the muster ground, exercise, ablutions and laundry spaces levelled and grassed over. This is how they remained for much of the 20th century. Today, thanks to the archaeological investigations, the area has been landscaped and interpreted to reflect its use between 1856 and 1877 (Figure 0.5).

Throughout this book, reference will be made to five main areas where excavation occurred: the penitentiary, encompassing the area of the former mill and granary; the bakehouse, referring to the footprint of that building; the muster ground; and the ablutions and laundry areas (Figures 0.6 and 0.7). Of these, the penitentiary, bakehouse and laundry were enclosed, multi-storey and multi-roomed buildings. The muster ground and ablutions were largely open, the latter fitted with exercise yards, shelters and sheds.



Figure 0.3. Detail plan showing the layout of the mill and granary in 1846.



Figure 0.4. Detail plan showing the layout of the penitentiary in 1857.



**Figure 0.5.** View looking east from the location of the bakehouse over the penitentiary. The muster ground is on the left, with the ablutions area on the right. Champ Street runs above the ablutions area. (Hype TV for PAHSMA, 2017)



Figure 0.6. Plan showing the penitentiary today.



Figure 0.7. Aerial view of the penitentiary. (Hype TV for PAHSMA, 2017)

## Project background

The archaeological excavations upon which this book is based were carried out during 2013–16 (Figure 0.8). They were undertaken as part of the larger penitentiary precinct conservation project which began in 2011. The project has been guided by the *Conservation Management Plan 2011: Penitentiary Precinct, Port Arthur Historic Site, Tasmania* and involved the large-scale conservation and structural work within the main penitentiary building, as well as improvements to existing drainage infrastructure.<sup>1</sup>

Integral to the work was a program of archaeological excavations and monitoring. These were tied to a series of significant research and interpretive goals, outlined in *Research Design for Archaeological Excavations within* 

<sup>1</sup> Andronas Conservation Architecture, 2011, 'Conservation Management Plan: Penitentiary Precinct, Port Arthur Historic Site, Tasmania', Melbourne.



**Figure 0.8.** Photo taken from the muster ground during conservation works in 2015. (PAHSMA 2015)

the Penitentiary Precinct, Port Arthur Historic Site. The high research value stemmed from the excavations' potential to provide information on the use and evolution of Port Arthur's waterfront space, as well as the lifeways of the convicts and supervisors associated with the penitentiary.

The first program of investigation was a series of 22 research excavations completed in 2013 in advance of conservation work. This was followed in 2014 and 2015 by a program of archaeological monitoring by PAHSMA staff and Pragmatic Cultural Heritage Services as the conservation work progressed.

The excavations in 2016 comprised the open-area excavation of the ablutions and laundry areas (Figure 0.9). The former was excavated by a team of seven archaeologists between January and May 2016. During November and December 2016 the laundry was excavated by a team of five archaeologists. These large investigations resulted from the need to carry out further conservation works within the precinct, at the same time as providing an opportunity to research and interpret some of the lesser-known stories and areas of the site.

## Authorship

As with all good works, the making of this book has been a collaborative effort. After directing the 2016 excavations, Richard Tuffin completed the reports, mapping and illustrations and, together with the results from the 2013 work, then turned them all into this book. During this time he worked for PAHSMA, then as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow for the University of New England.

David Roe, Archaeology Manager at PAHSMA, was the driving force behind the investigation, arguing for the importance of incorporating a wellplanned archaeological research project into the penitentiary stabilisation works program. He oversaw the completion of the 2013 archaeological works, as well as the later 2016 program.

Sylvana Szydzik, Conservation Project Officer at PAHSMA, was in charge of the post-excavation handling and cataloguing of artefacts during the investigation of the laundry area. Since that time, she has been instrumental in the implementation of the artefact x-ray program at PAHSMA.

Ashley Matic directed the 2013 research excavations and returned to Port Arthur in 2014 (as Pragmatic Cultural Heritage Services) to conduct the primary monitoring of the stabilisation project's in-ground works.

E. Jeanne Harris was a consultant on the excavation of the ablutions area, in charge of post-excavation artefact handling and cataloguing of all the assemblages. Jeanne produced the reporting from which the analysis of the artefacts was derived.



Figure 0.9. During the 2016 excavations of the ablutions area. (PAHSMA 2016)