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Abstract

This study looks at how ethnicity is manifested in the material remains of a Polish settlement in the mid north of South Australia. The settlement of Polish Hill River was unique; it was only the second Polish rural settlement outside Europe in the nineteenth century to be established. During its lifetime it was a world within a world, where Polish customs, including language and religion, existed almost to the exclusion of all others. Polish Hill River was created out of a need for the Polish to leave their own country for political reasons to keep their way of life intact and provide a future for their families. The community existed from the mid 1850s until the early twentieth century when it appears that all Polish customs were completely supplanted by the traditions of the dominant societies surrounding the village (British and Australian), and the settlement was forsaken.

This project analysis the ethnic correlates of the Polish material remains through the use of documentary records, oral histories, and archaeological survey and excavation. The immovable physical remains of Polish Hill River are comprised of seven separate dwelling sites, scattered over a three-kilometre radius, while the movable culture consists of a mix of glass, ceramic, bone and metal objects from these dwelling sites. Some of these objects show confirmation of Polish ethnicity although most are a direct reflection of the dominant British culture of colonial Australia. However, this does not mean the Polish did not fashion a unique social identity for themselves from these non-Polish domestic items. It appears that the Polish had two roles, public and private. Their public persona was one of ‘Britishness’, where the Polish had to act within the confines of a British society. They arranged their consumer choices and the aesthetic look of their outside world to mirror the British social order, while inside their homes, their private, ‘Polish’ persona was free to be expressed, and thrived for generations.

Nevertheless, there is also evidence that the ideology behind this community’s Polish ethnicity was slowly undergoing a transformation from Polish to British/Australian, and their material culture also reflects this substantial shift in belief.
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Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The study of minority cultures within Australia has become more common in the discipline of archaeology as a general public awareness of the multi-culturalism of Australia has grown in the last 50 years. Yet, many people today still tend to overlook the fact that Australia has been a multi-cultural society for over two hundred years; in fact some would argue that Australia has been a multicultural society for around 50,000 years. While a number of these cultures arriving in Australia made attempts to assimilate with the dominant culture of the time, others took pride in maintaining their own customs and traditional ways of life. Learning about these different cultures and how they are represented in material remains is crucial to an understanding of Australian society.

This project is based on a nineteenth century Polish settlement in South Australia and looks at how a culture can be distinguished from other cultures using the analysis of material culture, but also narrows this broad subject down to one specific area: Polish Hill River. This site can potentially supply answers not only to this question, but also to other questions, such as what type of material remains can be used to determine Polish ethnicity? This project will benefit not only Australian archaeology through its focus on cultural identity, but also contribute data to the study of Polish colonisation throughout the world.

The remains of the settlement known as ‘Polish Hill River’, settled in 1856, are situated in the lower north of South Australia, in the County of Stanley and the Hundred of Clare (Resource Information: Government of South Australia: http://www.placenames.sa.gov.au: 22 Feb, 2001). It is 120km north-northeast of Adelaide and 3km east of the town of Sevenhill (Figure 1.1). Paszkowski (1988:735) has written that Polish Hill River “was a unique example of a Polish ‘colony’ in Australia because [the people] maintained their language, cuisine, customs and even a different style of architecture and decoration of houses”. However, despite this traditional way of living, the influence (both material and social) of the Polish in the lower north has proven difficult to determine (Dallwitz and Marsden 1983:23) from historical information.
It is unclear from historical sources just how large the settlement was, or even where the individual farms were located (Szczepanowski 1987:13) because of the limited nature of previous research that has taken place on this village. A few anecdotes of the people at Polish at Hill River are mentioned in local histories (Noye 1980; Schmaal 1980; Johnson 1994). Articles about the settlement appear in some journals (Cmielewski and Cmielewski 1989; Birtly and McQueen 1989) and books on Polish immigration (Sussex and Zubrzycki 1985; Zubrzycki 1988). A book has been written detailing the land history of Polish Hill River (Pattullo 1994) and two on the history of Polish families living at Hill River (Mlodystach 1985; Marlow 2003). In addition, a thesis was written on the history of the site, which was later edited and published (Szczepanowski 1976; Szczepanowski 1987).

Figure 1.1 Partial map of South Australia showing Polish Hill River (Gregory’s Australia State tourist map series. Map 519: First Edition).
Archaeology offers the opportunity to redress the gaps in our knowledge of this significant settlement. Through archaeology, it is possible to learn details of others’ lives that often are not recorded for one reason or another. In particular, archaeology can fill in the grey areas about women or children, two areas of society often overlooked in the literary records (Scott 1994:3). Archaeology can help to define the ethnicity of a settlement, and can also attempt to answer questions about everyday life, details that were perhaps not considered important enough to record in historical sources (Deetz 1977:8). This is especially important when historians are relying on primary documents from the period under research, as the recorders of these accounts were typically white, male, middle aged, of a certain religious background and class. These recorders of our history often tended to leave both ‘others’ (who did not fit their ideas of ‘one of us’) and ‘unsavoury’ events out of their recollections, or had different ideas about was important to record.

1.2 Importance of Study

This study is important for several reasons. Firstly, although a few works dealing with the Polish at Hill River have been published, they are based exclusively on historical research. No archaeological study of Polish ethnicity in South Australia, or for that matter, in Australia, has been undertaken to this point. Furthermore, while studies in determining ethnicity from archaeological remains have been attempted in Australia (Jack, Holmes and Kerr 1984; Young 1985; Ioannou 1987; Hill 1998; Smith 2003), no study of this type has been done on any Polish settlement in Australia, and at Hill River, the Polish were concentrated to such an extent as to almost exclude all other nationalities (Szczepanowski 1987:1). Thus a void exists in Australian historical archaeology that can in part be filled by this study.

Second, Paszkowski’s (1988:735) statement that the Polish at Hill River almost exclusively maintained their customs warrants investigation. Did the Polish live in an insular community where their customs were unchanging and adaptation to their new environment was minimal? Or did the Polish slowly become integrated into the surrounding communities by mixing with other groups of people in the area? Archaeological techniques could help to answer these questions by assessing how Polish ethnicity was manifested in their material remains.
Third, a study on the Polish colonists in South Australia can provide comparative data for researchers throughout the world doing similar analyses. It will create a body of comparative data that can be referred to in an effort to understand similar colonisation patterns by Polish in other countries. Furthermore, this study adds to the data on the settlement of minority European groups around the world. It can supply answers to wider questions about relationships between minority cultures and dominant cultures and it explores some of the ways in which minority groups relate to or react against dominant groups.

Thus, the broad overall question that this study seeks to answer is can a minority European culture living in Anglo-Saxon colonial South Australia be distinguished from other cultures by their material remains?

This research will focus on a case study of the Polish in Australia, specifically at Polish Hill River in South Australia. In order to answer the overall research question it is necessary to assess the movable culture of the Polish. Consequently, the specific question being asked is what type of material remains can be used to determine Polish ethnicity?

1.3 Polish Hill River

Polish people have been arriving in South Australia since 1838 (two years after British settlement), when a Polish family disembarked with Pastor Kavel’s group of Germans. Others came to South Australia with Captain Hahn and settled in Hahndorf in 1839 (Paszkowski 1988:735; Migration Museum 1995:372).

The first substantial numbers of recognisably Polish immigrants to arrive in South Australia (31 people) left Wielka Dabrowska in the Province of Poznań in 1844 and settled in Tanunda, some of these people later moved to Hill River (Noye 1980:16; Szczepanowski 1987:4-5; Migration Museum 1995:372-373). Small numbers of Polish followed, encouraged by favourable correspondence from those living in South Australia. More Polish arrived in South Australia following the 1848 revolutions in Prussian annexed Poland, with the greatest numbers arriving between 1853-1858 (Migration Museum 1995:373). Migration peaked in 1870-1871 because of the
Franco-Prussian war (Szczepanowski 1987:6). These people settled for the most part at Hill River, while other small groups went to Penwortham, Blyth and Mintaro in the lower north (Figure 1.1), and Terowie, Dawson and Peterborough in the mid north (Migration Museum 1995:373). Most of the Polish arriving in Australia in the nineteenth century came from villages in the western border regions of Poznań, such as Wielka Dabrowska, Zbąszyń, Babimost and Pardyz; however, a small number of Kashubs also arrived in South Australia and settled at Hill River. The Kashubs were a Polish group from Pomerania and spoke a different dialect from the other Polish at Hill River (Szczepanowski 1987:6).

In 1856 a group of 25 Polish families (approximately 100 people) arrived and settled at Polish Hill River, and by the 1860s over 30 properties in the Hill River Valley were occupied and farmed by the Polish (Migration Museum 1995:373). At the height of the settlement in the early 1880s there were over 65 Polish families or approximately 400 people living at Hill River (Migration Museum 1995:373). Most of their farms varied in size from several sections of 80 acres each, to a single section or part of a section, while other Polish people owned no land at all (Szczepanowski 1987:14). However, most of these farms were too small to earn a viable income from which to support a family and some Polish farmers supplemented their income with other work (Schmaal 1980:61; Szczepanowski 1987:18; Johnson 1994:13). The Polish practice of each son inheriting part of their father’s farm also contributed to the shrinkage of farmland per family and consequently, the loss of income for families (Johnson 1994:13).

In this study, the settlement of Polish Hill River will sometimes be called ‘Hill River’, as this was the name by which it was known in the nineteenth century. It was officially renamed Polish Hill River by the Clare Council in the recent past to celebrate the Polish heritage of the settlement and to distinguish it from a large farm/station north of Clare which was also known as Hill River (it was also situated on the Hill River).
1.4 Hill River Geology and Climate

The surface rocks in the Polish Hill River region are sedimentary in nature and are “formed by the depositing of material in layers in seas or lakes” (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:8). This accumulated material comes from existing rocks or organic sources. Some common examples in the Polish Hill River area of sedimentary rocks are sandstone, shale and limestone (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:8). Surface rocks are generally used for creating roads and building construction.

The soil in the area is by and large devoid of any type of limiting chemical or physical properties, which means it can be used for farming of any sort (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:10) and the vegetation consists mainly of eucalyptus woodlands (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:14). The average annual rainfall is between 400-800mm per year (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:18), while the average hours of bright sunshine per day during summer is between 8-10 and in winter, 4-6 (Camm, McQuilton, Plumb and Yorke 1987:16).

1.5 Project Aims

“Archaeology is the study of past peoples based on the things they left behind and the ways they left their imprint on the world” (Deetz 1977:4). How did the Polish at Hill River leave their imprint on the area in which they lived? What made them distinctive from the Germans or the Irish already living in the area? Historical sources indicate the probable answer is their culture (Simons 1944; Paszkowski 1989), and all the things that are associated with culture, such as religion, language and architecture. “Culture is embedded in the ways we relate to one another” (Burgmann and Lee 1988:xii). A shared culture and ethnicity is what made the Polish band together in a cohesive group at Hill River. It helped them to work together and bonded them as a community instead of groups of individual Polish families. Furthermore, culture can be a recursive relationship: by coming together as a community the Polish also reinforced their traditional customs. Yet how do we determine this from the material record?
This research aims to answer the question can a minority European culture living in Anglo-Saxon colonial Australia be distinguished from other cultures by their material remains? The methods used to determine the answer to this question are:

- Study of archival evidence for information on Polish culture.
- Collection of oral histories.
- Identification and assessment of the state of the surviving farmhouse structures built by the Polish at Hill River.
- Recording in detail the form, style, features and building materials of all surviving farmhouses.
- Excavation of the remains of a farmhouse identified from historical documents as Polish, to attempt to ascertain whether a Polish cultural identity can be established solely from material remains.

1.7 Thesis Structure

This thesis explores the work undertaken by other archaeologists on culture and ethnicity, both within Australia and overseas, with specific reference to Polish and German settlements in Chapter Two. Next, Chapter Three contains a brief history of the events that took place in Poland to trigger Polish migration to Australia, as well as the history of Polish migration around the world. Polish immigration to colonial Australia and the settlement of Polish Hill River as a specific subset of this will also be examined. Chapter Four includes a discussion on the comparative material culture likely to be seen in the lower mid-north of South Australia (such as housing) from the Germans, Polish, Irish and English. Chapter Five delves into the methodologies employed in the historical research and in the archaeological field data collection, while Chapter Six imparts the documentary results found during this study. Chapter Seven presents and discusses the archaeological survey results, while Chapter Eight presents and discusses the archaeological excavation results. Chapter Nine concludes with further research and future directions for this type of project.

1.8 Discussion

The Polish Hill River settlement can be called one of the most noteworthy in the study of the archaeology of multi-culturalism in colonial South Australia because of
its uniqueness. Nowhere else in Australia was there a nineteenth century settlement by the Polish of such planning and duration.

This study is important because of the lack of archaeological studies on the Polish in Australia. Furthermore, this study addresses the question of whether or not the Polish exclusively maintained their customs in an unchanging manner or was their adaptation to their new environment considerable? Finally, an analysis of the wider implications of this study suggests that the results of this investigation could not only lead to further research on the archaeology of the Polish in Australia, but also to the deeper exploration of Polish settlements around the world. The study of this village could lead to implications about the continuity of ethnic traditions and acculturation of Polish groups, immigration patterns and changes in identity for Polish immigrants. The theories behind ethnicity and acculturation are complex and changing, as are people’s identities. This is because of what is termed ‘culture’, something all humans live by and with. Archaeological studies previously done on minority cultures in Australia need to reflect an understanding of these changes if they are to fully appreciate the psyches of the people they are investigating. Chapter Two explores this difficult and complex topic to investigate the theories that motivate the people who create the material culture understudy.
“The underlying premise is that objects made or modified by man reflect, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of the individuals who made, commissioned, purchased, or used them and, by extension, the beliefs of the larger society to which they belonged” (Prown 1998:19 in Beaudry, Cook and Mrozowski 1991:150).

Chapter Two: Archaeological Theory

2.1 Theoretical Context of Research

Studies of historical archaeological sites are numerous, with each archaeologist striving to contribute a new piece to the puzzle of the past. They do this by examining the site they are studying, from the smallest artefact to the landscape around it, and then taking the data they have collected and interpreting it, using historical research and documentary evidence. As Tilley (1989:189) has said, the meaning of the past is something archaeologists do not have, so instead they must work towards it, using analysis to reveal the underlying principles at work.

This study examines how ethnicity is manifested through material culture at a specific historical site. Lydon (1999:14) states that the notion of identifying human groups through their material culture has always played a central role in archaeology. Looking through archaeological literature “much of this work . . . has had several different, but related aims: to chart assimilation and acculturation (or lack of it) of ethnic groups into Anglo-American culture, uncover oppressed groups’ otherwise unknown past, and explore the nature of different ethnic groups’ distinctive material culture patterning” (Lydon 1999b:16).

However, “studies of ethnicity in archaeology have been plagued by difficulties in identifying ethnic groups archaeologically and in relating material culture to the operation of ethnicity” (Cusick 1995:77). As Cusick notes, the correlation between ethnicity and artefacts remains poorly understood (Orser and Fagan 1995:210). Even with historic and ethnographic sources, it may not be possible to identify material remains based purely on the inhabitant’s ethnicity (Kelly and Kelly 1980:133). Many theorists, not only in the field of archaeology, but also anthropology, ethnography and
sociology have spent countless years attempting to define ethnicity and most use
terms similar to ‘social or cultural characteristics’, ‘common descent’, ‘similarities’,
‘distinct group’ or ‘shared history’ (Cornell and Hartmann 1998:17). Cornell and
Hartmann (1998:17) point out that if all that is required to determine ethnicity is a
shared history or social or cultural characteristics, then prison inmates, lawyers,
university students and drug addicts could all be termed separate and distinct ethnic
groups. In its broadest sense, ethnicity refers to the characteristics a group accepts as
pertinent to them. This means that a group of people, either a nationality such as the
Polish or groups of different peoples such as the Celts or Gypsies, share enough
physical and cultural characteristics to define themselves as ‘us’ and everyone else as
‘them’ (Jones 1996:66). In society today, for most people, the term ethnicity has
come to be tied up with the geographical areas of the planet where your ancestors or
you were born. It has become synonymous with the borders and boundaries of
modern day countries.

Yet, the annals of the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) based in the United
States, shows little in the way of ethnicity studies until the 1980s, with most emphasis
on the subject coming after McGuire’s article ‘The Study of Ethnicity in Historical
Archaeology’ (1982). A notable exception to this is Schuyler’s (1980) edited work on
Afro-American and Asian American culture history. Schuyler argued that “there are
some aspects relating to this complexity which need to be discussed at present, so that
archaeologists, particularly historical archaeologists, may be made more aware and
less accepting of seemingly clear-cut ethnic identification” (Schuyler 1980:133). It is
not until the 1990s that ethnicity makes any regular appearance as an analytical
subject, with the majority of research being done on African Americans, Hispanics
and overseas Chinese (Babson 1990:20; Staski 1990:124). Babson (1990:20) has
suggested that each of these groups has an identity that is connected to the identities
of the present groups descended from these people, and that the main reason these
three groups have been studied so extensively is the desire of these present day
groups to understand their ancestors. Staski (1990:125) believes that these three
groups have been looked at primarily because they are the easiest ethnic groups to
distinguish materially in the historical archaeological record. This is because the
material culture of these groups is extremely distinctive, exotic even, when compared
to the material culture of the dominant European colonists. Another reason
hypothesised for the concentration on the Chinese, African Americans and Hispanics is their poor visibility in the documentary records of the time (Staski 1990:125).

Various articles abound from the United States Society of Historical Archaeology *Journal*, usually one off studies on ethnicity that promise a great deal, but deliver little in the way of new information on how ethnicity manifests itself in the material record. Most if not all end up stating that it is very difficult to find any evidence of ethnicity from material remains. Hunt (1993:97) examines the relationship between ethnicity and a specific kind of trade good (firearms) at the Fort Union Trading Post, North Dakota. Cultural continuity and burial practices are looked at in Jamieson’s paper (1995:55), where he draws the conclusion that mortuary rituals of the African Americans before 1800 AD were used to emphasize what their ancestors had taught them about proper burial. An interesting study concentrating on blue beads as African American cultural symbols came to the conclusion that, as a consequence of the slaves being taken from their native land and forced to survive in a different and hostile setting, previous and specific cultural elements were selected, modified and magnified by these people (Stine, Cabak and Groover 1996:65). Gronenborn and Magnavita (2000:65) have pinpointed changing ethnicity through style in ceramics using a combination of historical documents, archaeological analysis and ethnography in Nigeria. A change in the style of decoration can show that a group of people who identified themselves with one specific ethnicity, could be integrating themselves into a different society and incorporating that society’s decorative motifs into their own stylistic system.

The subject of ethnicity in archaeology has fared better as a separate entity, rather than being examined in conjunction with a historical site. A pivotal work in this field is by Jones (2000), based upon her PhD research on the archaeology of ethnicity. Jones delves into the history of the study of ethnicity in archaeology and the different theoretical approaches adopted when studying ethnicity through archaeology. Other books are a collection of different ethnicity studies linked together under the heading of cultural identity or ethnicity. Shennan’s (1989) edited work, for example, contains 22 studies undertaken by archaeologists on the culture of groups from all over the pre-historic and historic world. In this work no new revelations regarding the relationship between archaeology, ethnicity and culture are really uncovered. The
very first sentence in Shennan’s introduction highlights this, “the essence of the argument in this book is that the phenomenon of cultural difference raises profound problems for archaeology at all levels of both theory and practice” (Shennan 1989:1). Schuyler’s (1980) edited text contains 14 studies on the ethnicity of the African Americans and the Chinese in the United States, while an edited work by Graves-Brown, Jones and Gamble (1996) delves into the relationship between cultural identity and archaeology and the construction of different European communities.

Yet, despite this hopeful start to the study of ethnicity around the world, it seems that specific historical studies dealing with ethnicity and material remains, in Australia at least, are few and far between. What has been done usually concentrates on the Chinese, a culture highly distinguishable from others around them by their material remains (Lydon 1993:36-37). Since the inception of the Australasian Journal of Historical Archaeology in 1980 (ASHA), there have been 16 papers dealing with the archaeology of ethnicity in Australia, and the eight of these come from the same edition on the overseas Chinese (Vol 21). The first is Jack, Holmes and Kerr’s (1984) study on Ah Toy’s garden, a Chinese market garden from nineteenth century north Queensland. Their study mentioned nothing about ethnicity *per se*, and although they found Chinese artefacts, they were mixed among a spoil heap along with artefacts of European, Japanese and Philippine origin. The authors went on to say that there was regrettably no archaeological evidence to conclusively prove Ah Toy’s house to be of Chinese origin (Jack, Holmes and Kerr 1984:57), which in itself is an interesting comment about the visibility of a specific ethnicity in the archaeological record. The next study is by Young (1985) on early German settlements in South Australia. This paper is based on Young’s considerable body of work on Germans in South Australia. However, this is an architectural study, not an archaeological one, and ethnicity is not mentioned again in any detail. In contrast, Ioannou (1987) examined the Germans archaeologically through his study on the German potter Hoffmann. This work looks at Hoffmann’s work, and details the results of the excavation done on Hoffmann’s home and workshop. Ethnicity expressed through material culture is analysed in relation to the surviving products of his work, particularly his pottery. Lawrence-Cheney’s paper on the Dolly’s Creek goldfield (1992) briefly discusses the various groups of miners who were present at this site, including the Chinese and “members
of at least eleven ethnic or national groups” (Lawrence-Cheney 1992:38). However, no detail is given on any specific groups’ ethnicity and the impact this would have had on the site, which is an oversight that could have been remedied. Lydon’s (1993) paper on the archaeology of the Rocks (Sydney) has a section on the general ethnicity of the people present at the site, and specifically talks about the Chinese material and cultural beliefs. The 1993 article on historical archaeology and the historian by Jack devotes a large section to the Chinese in Australian history, and how archaeology can help to furnish new facts about this subject (Jack 1993), while Bell (1996) gives an overview of Chinese archaeology within Australia. In Hill’s (1998) paper on a Welsh village in nineteenth century Victoria she deals specifically with the cultural identity of the Welsh and analyses how this impacted on the landscape around them. However, this article proves disappointing in relation to her analysis of the Welsh culture and its impact on their creation of movable and immovable culture, little is said that is not self explanatory. As mentioned the most recent volume of ASHA (2003) deals specifically with the overseas Chinese, however, only one of these talks about identifying Chinese ethnicity from material culture (Smith 2003). Like most other studies on the ethnicity of a particular site, Smith uses the architecture of the hut remains and other artefacts found during the excavation (mainly ceramics) to help determine whether the site was Chinese. Again like most other historical archaeological excavations, the historical documentation supported the likelihood that the site was Chinese, and the archaeological remains proved this to be the case. Smith writes “the type of vernacular building, the traditional construction method and characteristic material culture evident in the archaeological remains at the Kiandra camp site show a clear imprint of being associated with people of Chinese ethnicity” (2003:27). However the Chinese are highly visible in the material record, would this study have fared as well with a site of less distinctive characteristics?

The subject of ethnicity has been studied in greater detail in separate publications on Australian archaeology. Perhaps the best archaeological study done on ethnicity in Australia is Lydons’ (1999) work on the Chinese in Sydney’s Rocks area. It is comparable to Ritchie’s (1986) work on the Chinese in New Zealand for its completeness on the subject. Lydon delves deeply into the cultural identity of the Chinese in China and in Australia and how this identity was reflected in the Chinese
material culture of the time (Lydon 1999a; 1999b). An edited text on the transformation of the material culture in the Arafura Region by Fredricksen and Walters (2001) analyses ethnicity is expressed through the material remains of several different cultures, such as the Macassans and Chinese, and their impact on different cultures present in northern Australia.

These studies are relevant to this work in that they have touched on similar themes and addressed similar questions in relation to ethnicity and material culture. They all came to the general conclusion that this study found, that it is extremely difficult to conclusively determine a specific cultures’ ethnicity from their material remains. When taken together these studies demonstrate that this finding can be attributed to many cultural factors including decisions that are made within a family, community and society at large.

2.2 Culture and the Material Record

All people maintain some form of culture, whether their ancestors passed it down to them or it is the general culture of the society in which they chose to, or are forced to live within. Culture literally is the symbolic meanings given by us to everything around us (cf Johnson 2000:189). “The ability to bestow meaning on things or acts, and then to live according to these meanings is the distinguishing characteristic of human life” (Barrett 1990:55). Lydon writes that, while ethnicity is not seen to be co-extensive with culture, it has been argued that it can take the form of a marked self-consciousness of culture (1999:11).

Generally archaeology tends to look at different cultures as being compartmentalised into boxes. This culture lived next to that culture and they interacted or they didn’t, Schuyler wrote “culture comes to us in history in the form of ‘packages’, functional units with temporal and spatial boundaries” (1988:40). However, this is not really the case, cultures can interact and intermingle, and can sometimes be very hard to distinguish from one another.

Yet how do archaeologists obtain information about culture and ethnicity from the material record? Singleton (1996) makes the distinction between value culture and
reality culture (1996:142). Value culture refers to customs, beliefs and values influenced for example, by a Polish heritage, (although in her article, Singleton is referring to African American slave culture). Reality culture refers to aspects of life influenced by external forces (1996:142), such as the type of foods available in the general market place to make traditional (value culture) meals. Thus, the reality culture (external forces) influences the value culture (internal identity). However, even if external forces do influence internal identity, can some form of value culture still be seen in the things people create?

Singletons’ approach of value and reality culture highlights the differences between the material culture the Polish would have used at Hill River. What constitutes the value culture that would have been seen at Polish Hill River? The answer is language, dress, dance, song, food, architecture, religion and writing. Most of these items are intangible in the material record. You can not find evidence of a song or a dance or language that was not written down. Evidence of the kind of foods consumed can be found but this tells very little of the manner in which traditional dishes were prepared. Clothing does not usually survive well in the archaeological record (except for metal or bone/shell buttons or hooks), nor do spiritual beliefs as such, if they were not documented or externalised in some way through material remains. Thus, we are left with two types of value culture evidence from the Polish: their architecture and their writings. But if we take another look at these two things, architecture and writings, which is the true representation of value culture? Not architecture. Buildings themselves are influenced by what is at hand to construct them, and the design of the buildings needs to be adapted to suit the local environmental and geographical conditions. Thus, architecture would seem to be more indicative of reality culture than value culture. In fact, would not all material remains be evidence of reality culture? The remains of traditional Polish meals, housing and clothing (although traditional dress styles could still be sewn with British cloth) would all be constrained by reality culture to a certain extent in this non-Polish country, where Polish traditional foods and clothing were not available. Therefore, if the material evidence found represents reality culture, does that mean the documentary sources, Polish letters, diaries and reminiscences would constitute value culture? Will identity and ethnicity find a way of being seen?
2.3 Identity and Ethnicity

Ethnicity is a very personal term. It gets even more complicated when you involve identity, as these two terms or ideas are inextricably linked. People very rarely consider themselves to be only one type of ethnicity, such as Welsh or Polish or South African. A person from Australia might consider themselves Australian only in the broadest sense for nationalistic reasons. They might have moved there from China and identify themselves as Chinese living in Australia or if their ancestors were Chinese they might see themselves as Chinese-Australian. But what if only this person’s father was Chinese and their mother was French? Do they see themselves as French-Chinese-Australian? What if the father of this person with the increasingly tangled genetic web was from a minority group living in China, such as the Hakka who fled due to persecution? Does this person then consider themselves as Hakka or Chinese? This argument could be pursued indefinitely without even mentioning ideology, which is also closely tied to ethnicity.

For the purposes of this study, the definition of ethnic identity will be taken from Jones: “that aspect of a person’s self-conceptualisation which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and or common descent” (Jones 2000:xiii). Originally, the Chinese community in the Rocks were held together by little more than a common destination and European perceptions of them (Lydon 1999a:267).

Lydon (1999a:270) states that for a group who left their home or country because of bad circumstances, a clear definition of the difference between themselves and the people they found themselves now living amongst would have been very important. This difference could have been expressed by assertive continuation of traditional behaviour or even the creation of new symbols of traditional identity. Thus, when people face hostile circumstances they bond more closely together, by identifying more with group ethnic representations. The Chinese in the Rocks used food, medicine and ritual to assert their culture and even manipulated the Victorian architecture of the area for their purposes (Lydon 1999a:267; 1999b:90). Using historical records archaeologists have been able to discover that the Chinese in Sacramento kept their traditions by practicing their traditional belief of Feng Shui on
topographic features in the landscape of their section of town, through public displays such as the Chinese regatta on the lake, and through dress and language (Praetzellis, Praetzellis and Brown 1987:43, 44), while the some groups of Chinese in Australia used an adapted (because of the new hemisphere and diverse environmental conditions) system of Feng Shui to reinforce their culture in a different country (Smith 1998; Stankowski 2000) However, it has also been noted in ethnographic studies that where relations between the minority culture and the dominant culture are good, outward signs of differing ethnicity become less noticeable (Lydon 1999b:184).

The material culture left behind by a specific group does not always reflect their shared identity and ethnicity. Furthermore, the outward, material aspects of culture may change, while the more subtle inner aspects of culture and their meanings may stay the same over long periods of time (Kelly and Kelly 1980:133). Consequentially, archaeologists attempt to locate ethnicity from material remains by looking at ‘ethnic markers’ (Orser and Fagan 1995:210). This term refers to specific items that are seen to represent one particular group of people, such as opium bowls and pipes being assumed to represent the Chinese.

Greenwood (1980) researched the Main Street of the town of Ventura, California during the 1970s and used opium pipes as ethnic markers of the presence of the Chinese in nineteenth century Ventura. She found two archaeological features (a well and a rubbish dump) that were identified specifically with the Chinese (Greenwood 1980:116). Approximately 75% of the artefacts located from these sites were of Chinese origin including rice bowls, teacups, ginger jars and soy bottles. Non-Chinese artefacts such as ceramic cups, plates, bowls, and chamber pots were also found (Greenwood 1980:115). Lydons’ excavation at the early twentieth century former household of merchant Hongon Jong (75 ½ George Street, the Rocks, Sydney) revealed a similar result. A rubbish pit with a range of Chinese and non-Chinese artefacts was located, with a large assemblage of European alcohol bottles and a large number of Chinese made ceramics and medicine bottles (Lydon 1999a:270).

However, despite the fact that Greenwood found a number of objects of Chinese origin, does this definitely indicate a Chinese presence? Not for certain. How can you ever tell with 100 percent certainty what was being used by the Chinese and what was
being used by the non-Chinese? Opium was smoked not only by the Chinese, but by many people of European origin as well. Vessels that originally were created and used by the Chinese at one time may have passed on into non-Chinese use. As Orser and Fagan point out (1995:212), this type of interpretation depends far too much on racial stereotypes. Deetz, in Fennell (2000:285), has warned against using ethnic markers because no quantity of these artefacts can give complete proof of the presence of a specific group of people without other evidence such as historic records to back them up.

Even with historical records, it can be difficult to identify material markers of ethnicity. When Baugher and Venables looked at seven New York state sites, they went prepared with historical information on the ethnicity of four of these sites: Irish, English, Scottish and French. Yet, they were unable to find any clear signs of ethnicity from the archaeological remains at these sites (Baugher and Venables in Orser and Fagan 1995:210). De Cunzo examined artefacts from six nineteenth century sites created by Irish and English settlers from the town of Paterson, New Jersey. Again, no clear evidence was found of ethnicity at these sites. There was no difference in either the quantity or diversity of ceramic and glass objects in the privies. De Cunzo therefore was unable to distinguish any material difference between the historically documented English or Irish households (De Cunzo in Orser and Fagan 1995:210). As we see, the study of archaeology and ethnicity has an uneasy alliance.

Furthermore, identifying cultures from their material remains often presents the problem of over emphasising ’cultural markers’:

In an interpretive model that views meanings emanating from culture, objects tend to be reduced to vastly different exotic goods or familiar goods produced and given a monolithic collective meaning by the dominant group. This reduces objects like colonoware to “authentic” artefacts counterposed to “artificial” commodities, with no concession to the vast range of meanings between, or to the overlap between seemingly distinct types of goods (Mullins 1999:34).
What this means for this study is that the material culture uncovered can not just be divided up into boxes labelled ‘created by Polish’ and ‘created by British’. There is a vast range of intersection between the two.

Historical archaeologists usually study ethnicity in one of three ways: assimilation, studies on ethnic pride, or the material correlates of ethnicity (McGuire 1982:161,162). McGuire (1982:163) states that of these three, material evidence of ethnicity is likely to be hardest to find in the archaeological assemblage. This is for the same general reasons known to most archaeologists: only the durable items survive, and people do not usually dispose of valuable (culturally and monetarily) objects. Many symbols of ethnicity are either archaeologically intangible, such as clothes (except for fastenings such as buttons) and cooking recipes, while other items that might show ethnicity, such as letters, photos and religious symbols generally are not thrown away, have a long use life or do not survive archaeologically.

Archaeological attempts to identify ethnic markers are usually from the same classes of data: ceramics, food remains and architecture (McGuire 1982:163). Luckily for the archaeologist studying ethnicity, these are three items that are very commonly found in the archaeological record! (which would be why they are the strongest links).

Kelly and Kelly (1980:134) point out that instead of trying to use material culture to identify traits of ethnicity, you could look at other things which the group may identify itself with, or use to contrast with an outwardly imposed identity. Ethnic groups could be studied as categories of ascription: are the group a category to the extent that it is so defined by others (i.e. an imposed ethnicity)? Other studies on ethnicity look at the effects of migration on ethnic identity, or at the way in which ethnicity is generated, transmitted and changed (Kelly and Kelly 1980:134).

Waters (1995) looked at the correlation between ethnicity and migration in his article on the formation of ethnic enclaves by six German nineteenth century immigrant groups in both Russia and North America. Interestingly he found that some of these migrant German groups formed distinct communities where traditions were maintained for a long time after immigration, while others disappeared into the general mesh of the surrounding communities quite quickly (Waters 1995:536). He
discovered “that the main deterrent of enclave formation for Germans was the free mobility of human capital and/or the free market in land within the larger host society” (Waters 1995:515). What Waters means by the free mobility of human capital is the immigrants’ economic base. Can they bring with them the economic base they inherited from their parents, such as farming, Guild membership or class status? (Waters 1995:516) If they cannot then they will be forced to look for employment to supplement their economic base outside of their own closed society, creating constant contact with the greater society in which they live. Waters speculates that this in turn governs which image, old/traditional or new, will decide the collective identity of the migrant group (Waters 1995:516). Walters adds a point which I find a fascinating insight into peoples’ psyche: “if a migrant group assimilated, it was in the material interests of individuals to do so, while if they did not, there were corresponding material advantages to forming an ethnic enclave” (Waters 1995:516). It is interesting to note that in some cases identity can take second place to money.

Babson (1990:20) has argued, “any study which proceeds simply on the basis of identifying ethnic markers, but stops at this basic level, will likely prove too simplistic to be of much value”, and that simply accepting the ethnic group’s existence as a fact to be identified could belittle them. In this statement Babson clearly overestimates the past and current skills of archaeologists in the interpretation of material culture. The inability to properly explore ethnicity in archaeological sites is largely due to a lack of so-called ‘simplistic’ material culture studies. Babson also insinuates that identifying ethnic markers is easy. I have attempted to show in this thesis that it is quite the opposite. There is still much work to be done in this field, particularly with archaeologically ignored migrant groups in Australia. Perhaps when this not-so-basic level of research is given due credit, archaeology may proceed to the numerous larger questions regarding ethnicity that still need to be explored. Furthermore, by trying to aid in identifying an under represented group in the historical record you recognise them by learning all you can about them.

However, one thing is for certain; the subject of ethnicity expressed through material remains is never as simple as we might expect or hope. There are a variety of other
contexts that come into play when examining the archaeology of a specific community.

2.4 Community

This study is one that concentrates on the material remains of an ethnic community. Cusick (1995:61) argues that there are three main ways of studying community: studies of the meaning of community, studies of communities as categories of human social organisations (urban versus rural) and studies of social phenomena in the context of a community (for example, how ethnicity is expressed in a particular location). Archaeologists usually choose the last alternative and this study also takes this approach.

Lawrence (2000:12) has said that the simplest definition of a community is a group of people who live in the same place and interact daily with one another. The smaller the area of the community, the more interactions occur between individuals. The bigger the area, the less chance there is of meeting on a daily basis. Nevertheless, this definition of a community can be seen as limited, as communities can extend over thousands of miles, with members in many locations. Or, for that matter, members of a family living in different places could be considered by themselves and by others to be part of the same community. However, this definition will suffice for this study, which focuses on a geographically bounded village in South Australia. The people at Polish Hill River were a group of people who lived in the same place and interacted daily with one another. These interactions or shared activities can, and do aid in keeping a community together (Lawrence 2000:13-14). Shared activities are not just events that see people coming together; they also constitute group style.

2.5 Style

People in every society possess a strong wish to create self-image through social comparison and to project this image to others in a positive way (Wiessner 1990:109). They do this through style. In short, style is the way things look. It is a way to express both personal and social identities (Wiessner 1990:109). Style, like language, can be used to keep the initiated people in the group, and the uninitiated out. Style is the archaeologists’ access to difference (Burke 2000:25). In this way style can and is used
by archaeologists to identify groups of people or even individuals, via comparison
with others (Wiessner 1989:58). Style can represent identity in such a way that one
thing, such as a particular pattern, range of colours or even a shape can be made to
stand for a particular grouping of people (Burke 2000:26). However, using style to
represent a specific group of people, or even a single manufacturer of mugs, can be
difficult.

This is because style can change over time as a group alters or adapts to differing
circumstances. Group identity can be ‘switched on’ in certain situations, creating a
style that might not have been seen otherwise. For example, a community of Indian
people move to an area surrounded by English people. In a reaction against the
Englishness, the Indian people might reinforce their general traditions to a higher
level, thus creating more ‘Indian’ in the style seen in their material culture. Other
situations that might switch on group identity and reinforce style could include fear,
inter-group competition or aggression, the need for co-operation to achieve certain
goals and imposed political control requiring group action (Wiessner 1990:109).
Personal identity can also be switched on, however, replacing group identity with
inter-individual competition or options for individual enterprise (Wiessner 1989:59).
Then style becomes the archaeological appearance of ideology through its role as the
material expression of aspects of contextual identity (Burke 2000:28).

Burke (2000) and Conkey (1990) talk about analysing style through a two-tiered
approach. The first of these is pattern recognition, where the archaeologist describes
the observable patterns of artefact variability and relates them to group social
relations. The second is to look at the symbolism beneath the stylistic patterns in
order to grasp the underlying nature of the group’s social relations. Questions that you
would ask with this approach would include, why those groups of those patterns at
those times? What do those particular expressions of social identity convey about
participant construction of the world and the relative positioning of people within it?
(Conkey 1990:11; Burke 2000:26). Conkey (1990:10) argues that archaeological
analysis of style needs to take place with an understanding of the role that context in
the genesis of style. This can be approached with questions such as why that style in
that place? Why that style at that time?
Information that can be obtained from style through material culture is information about groups, boundaries and interaction, changing relations between individuals and society, and information about status and social hierarchies (Wiessner 1990:110).

But what happens when the particular group you are studying no longer exists? How do you analyse the style of a group when you cannot ask them what their style meant to them? When you do not know what the particular feature does, or did for them? For style to function as a symbol, there has to be people to whom it means, or meant something, and among whom there is an understanding that one thing represents another (Noble and Davidson 1996:32). Archaeology is the study of past cultures. As an archaeologist you can never truly work out what something meant to another person who is only represented by that object. You can only try and extrapolate what that object did, and perhaps from this information determine what the people might have thought about it.

2.5.1 Style through architecture

The link between ideology and style, and analysing it through architecture is not a new concept in historical archaeology (Burke 2000:29). The use of different styles in architecture can be seen in all communities of the world. Each society, consciously or unconsciously, seeks to put their own individual stamp on the structures they create. The style of these structures can be used to help analyse the ethnicity and identity of the people who created them, and the reasons behind their creation. Markell (1994:56) has pointed out that architecture is a fundamental part of the life of the maker or user. It is a statement that is understood when interpreted as part of the whole cultural context.

Architects and archaeologists look at the style of architecture in different ways. Architects examine structures to see how they fit into a known scheme, but they do not generally ask the questions of why it does or does not fit. Archaeologists ask why a structure looks a particular way, and in the archaeologist’s case it is particularly important to ask the questions of why it does or does not correspond to that scheme (Burke 2000:30). Archaeological landscapes of structures can express trends through time. These trends can be a reflection of popularity, status or tradition rendered
visible through the material structuring of the spaces that people create (Burke 2000:165).

McGuire (1991:108) found that this phenomenon took place in Broome County, New York in the nineteenth century. The elite people of the area consciously used the landscape of their community to reinforce their view of the world and to give reality to that view. The landscape was manipulated to invite interaction between groups in some contexts and discourage it in others. The built environment can then express meaning about status (Anderson and Moore 1988:402). Johnson (1992), in his study on polite architecture in sixteenth century England found that building traditions that had no practical reason for existing were still built into castles. Moats were often still constructed at great expense, yet had no possible use for defence. The same applied to the battlements. Walls were often built capped with battlements too small to be practical and without the necessary fighting parapets (Johnson 1992:47). Interestingly, he proposed that these obsolete traditions were necessary to maintain the illusion of status, of being upper class. They were symbolic. Thus, traditions in architecture can linger a long time after they become functionally unnecessary. Other traditions disappear relatively quickly due to the deliberate choices made by the people creating them as seen in this study.

2.6 Assimilation

Identity, ethnicity, style and the culture that lies behind them are not fixed. They can change and be adjusted as people adapt to different environments or social situations (Barrett 1990:59). Traditions are generally flexible, although core features can endure with relatively little change. But sometimes tradition is not always adaptable. It can remain constant over long periods of time for no practical reason at all, except that people have always done things that way. It has been suggested by Zubrycki (1988:7) that there are two types of tradition: the great tradition and the little tradition. The great tradition is one of a groups’ achievements, beliefs and history, and is taught in schools and temples, while the little traditions are things such as cooking techniques and styles of dress which are self-replicating in the daily lives of the ordinary people in their village communities. What then happens to the traditions of a group of people coming from one culture to live in the middle of a completely different culture?
Assimilation? Adaptation? Integration? Inflexible adherence to the original culture? A mixture of all?

These questions can be addressed through the consideration of both assimilation and integration. Integration allows the perseverance of a group’s own culture to influence the Indigenous culture and be influenced by it, while assimilation generally means the immigrants submerge their cultural heritage altogether in favour of a new culture (Johnston 1969:1, 2). Some other terms seen often in archaeological literature are ‘acculturation’ and in North American literature, ‘creolization’. Lydon takes her definition of acculturation from Staski (1990) and defines it as one aspect of assimilation that “eliminates particular behavioural and material patterns that symbolically distinguish those individuals who are members from those who are non-members of the ethnic population” (Staski 1990: 123-4; Lydon 1999b:17). Creolization refers to the formation of new social identities for the children of interracial and inter-ethnic marriages (Loren 2000: 85). These cultural changes can take place over one or two generations or over hundreds of years. Dawdy (2000:107) mentions three types of creolization: transplantation, ethnic acculturation and hybridisation. She goes on to say that these three types of creolization are “transitions that occurred in the self-fashioning of Louisianans as expressed through their houses, gardens, clothes, food and household goods” (Dawdy 2000:107). In other words the effects of creolization can be visible through the material remains of the people who created them.

Transplantation refers to the first generation of immigrants, who (it is expected) would create buildings and households that closely corresponded to those they left behind. Their children would be the first generation to consistently integrate Old World and New World products into their daily lives (Dawdry 2000:111). Ethnic acculturation is when new immigrants quickly embrace the material identity of a dominant ethnic group and leave behind their ethnic traditions much more quickly than the first generation of settlers (Dawdry 2000:111). The final term, hybridisation, refers to the freer exchange of ideas, materials and people (intermarriage) between ethnic groups because of a lack of, or shift in, the dominant (ethnic) culture to control political and economic aspects of society (Dawdry 2000:111). Generally when two different cultures meet there is a sharing of ideas and traditions; this can be called...
“accommodation on both sides” (Mullins 1999:33). Mullins wrote that (1999:35)
“culture was the ever-evolving product of African Americans forging individual and
social desires and negotiating racialized social structure. This negotiation continually
reproduced, modified, and jettisoned pre-existing practices, appropriated dominant
practices, and focused upon tactical concerns of the moment”.

Johnston (1969:5), in her study on the assimilation of second-generation Polish
children in Western Australia has argued that there are two kinds of assimilation;
external and subjective. External assimilation deals with the immigrants’ lesser
distinguishability from members of the ‘host’ group, while subjective assimilation is
the psychological identification of the immigrant with Australians in areas that
initially set them apart (Johnston 1969:5). Johnston (1969:6) then goes on to give an
example: if a person becomes an Australian citizen only for practical reasons such as
unemployment benefits, then that person is externally assimilated; if they become an
Australian citizen because they identify with their new nationality, they are
subjectively assimilated.

The assimilation of an immigrant cannot take place without three things. Firstly, the
immigrant must approve of the culture presented to them. Second, they must be
willing to behave as people in the new culture do, and finally, they must experience
satisfaction in doing this (Johnston 1969:7). This mental leap in identity is not
particularly uncommon. The assimilation of groups of people from one culture into
another has been happening throughout human history, all over the world. It has
occurred here in South Australia. In 1839 a number of Germans arrived in the colony
in an attempt to gain religious freedom. While the Germans created separate
settlements around Adelaide, notably Klemzig, Hahndorf, Bethany and further away
in the Barossa Valley, where they built their traditional style of housing and practiced
their religion in peace, eventually (over a period of many decades) they were
integrated into the general society around them (Ioannou 2000). McGuire (1982:159)
has noted in the United States that the German and Polish immigrants have also been
for the most part assimilated into the general culture. However, Staski (1990)
mentions the possibility that Euro-American ethnic diversity remained common in the
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, while the material indicators of that diversity
disappeared due to increasing British control over trade, and as a consequence of this,
the restrictions on available goods led to an apparent homogeneity of material culture (Staski 1990:126). So, how are ethnic groups or enclaves identified when the symbolic markers that make them different disappear? How can you identify groups who have made an effort to assimilate? By definition these groups are making an obvious attempt to mask the differences we use to trace their presence through history (Waters 1995:520). Common sense tells us that this group has to have gone through the assimilation process. They arrive here as Polish, and later they are no longer Polish. How do you trace this? The answer is with difficulty! This comes back to Singleton’s (1996) argument about value and reality culture. When value culture is restrained to a large extent by the reality culture that these immigrants found themselves living amongst, it can blur the lines of ethnicity. While the ethnicity of these people might be as strong as ever, the physical manifestations of it can’t be seen through their material remains because of outside factors beyond their control, such as a British control over trade, or a conscious decision to present a specific image to other people.

Perhaps partial or eventual assimilation is inevitable. Examination of artefact assemblages of Chinese market gardeners in Tucson, Arizona, U.S.A, shows that the Chinese adapted to the local environment and economic limitations by preparing non-traditional food items, while keeping some of their traditional cooking practices and purchasing a number of imported Chinese products (Diehl, Walters and Thiel 1998:19).

There are three areas of self that are important assimilation markers: food, language and social contacts (Johnston 1969:26). Waters (1995) has added to this list dress, political units, residential patterns and religion (Waters 1995:519). By keeping or discarding these identity markers a group or even a person, can include or exclude themselves or others from the society around them. By speaking only Polish a group can exclude those who don’t speak Polish, by learning English they can include themselves in the surrounding community. By cooking only Polish food they can keep their ties to their homeland, but by cooking ‘Australian’ food they are expressing the wish to create ties to their new homeland. By socialising and marrying within their community they can keep their culture untouched by any other, by social
contacts outside of their community they can experience the differences and feel free to keep their own culture or adopt a new one.

Another way to achieve exclusion and to reinforce the continued sense of community is through organised events (Greenwood 1980; Staski 1990:130). The eighteenth century German Moravians from North Carolina had a ritual whereby early each Easter morning the congregation was woken by horns and trumpets. They would get up and gather at the meeting-house used for church services. They then walked in a procession to the cemetery for their Easter liturgy. This custom was unique in the area and it attracted the attention of the surrounding communities who used to come and watch the procession (Thomas 1994:21). The distinctiveness of this custom helped reinforce the difference between the Moravians and their neighbours.

2.7 Discussion

All the terminology examined in this chapter: culture, identity, ethnicity, community, style and assimilation are terms imposed by societies to justify and/or quantify aspects of our behaviour. These characteristics are present in all human societies and for the most part, are felt by every human on this planet. The settlement at Polish Hill River was no different than anywhere else. All of these ideas were also present there. For a time it was a living and breathing group of people, who, whether they knew it consciously or not, were all held sway to these factors. What was this community like? How did they live? For the answers to this we must turn to historical research.
Chapter Three: Poland and the Polish

3.1 A brief history of relevant historical events in Poland

The history of Poland is a history of invasion. Poland had no sooner recovered from one war, than another attack turned the country upside down. Gross (1979:236) argues that this is one of the main historical reasons for Poland’s continued poverty in the past and today. Present day Poland is situated in the middle of Europe, bordered by the Baltic sea and Russia to the north, Lithuania, Belarus and the Ukraine to the east, the Czech Republic and Slovakia to the south and Germany to the west. In the nineteenth century an independent Poland was completely surrounded by three giant Empires. The Prussian Hohenzollern’s to the west, the Austrian Hapsburg’s to the south and the Russian Romanov’s to the west.

Today the country covers 3,126,775 square kilometres, yet is almost entirely flat. In the north are the lakes and forests, while in the south the Sudetes and Carpathian Mountains are found (Kaluski 1985:5). The main river is the Vistula, 1068 kilometres in length, flowing from the Baltic Sea, through Warsaw to the southeast. The climate is temperate, with humid warm summers and cold winters suitable for agriculture, and indeed two thirds of the population of Poland was dependant on rural pursuits in the nineteenth century (Paszkowski 1988:737). Polish agriculture specialised in the production of grains for export, based on the system of manor farms worked by serf labour (Wandycz 1974:6).

The Polish nation in the eighteenth century consisted of the Crown, which was made up of the Polish and Ruthenian (Ukrainian) areas and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Lithuania and Belarus) and Gdansk (Danzig), which was autonomous, under the direct jurisdiction of the King (Wandycz 1974:4). The country was comprised of various ethnic groups including Lithuanians, Ruthiens, Belorussians, Germans, Jews, Russians, Tartars, Walachians, Gypsies, Karaites, Latvians and Czechs. Some were native to the areas they lived in, while others immigrated to these areas over the
centuries (Wandycz 1974:3). Prior to 1772, the population of Poland was around 11 million and by 1795 it had risen to 14 million (Wandycz 1974:3). This made Poland the fourth largest populated country in Europe. Yet the distribution of people was uneven, with the greatest numbers in the province of Poznań and the lowest numbers in the northeast borderlands (Wandycz 1974:3). Catholicism was the predominant religion. However, Uniates, Orthodox Jews and Protestants also practiced in Poland (Wandycz 1974:4).

Poland has a long and chequered military history. The highlights consist of defeating the German Teutonic Knights at the Battle of Grünwald in 1410, making Poland one of Europe’s leading nations (Kaluski 1985:4). The Polish Army also won important battles in the seventeenth century, when they captured Moscow and took the Czar prisoner. However, Poland’s greatest victory was defeating the Turks at the gates of Vienna and breaking the city’s long siege under the leadership of King Jan Sobieski in 1683 (Kaluski 1985:4). The memory of this battle became so important that the Polish at Hill River celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of it in 1883, with a special mass presided over by the Bishop of Adelaide (Szepanowski 1987:53).

Despite this history, Poland also participated in devastating wars with Sweden, Russia, Transylvania, the Tartars, the Ottoman Turks and the Cossacks (Kaluski 1987:4). By the eighteenth century the constitutional and socio-economic system of Poland was in complete decay (Wandycz 1974:7). The country was experiencing a decline in the production of all goods, increasing peasant poverty, limitation of domestic markets, a rise in prices and a general economic regression. In 1780, the revenue of Poland was purportedly 40 times smaller than France and 10 times smaller than Russia (Wandycz 1974:7).

Figure 3.1. The three partitions of Poland (Zamoyski 1987:251).
It was no surprise that with Poland in such a state, her bigger neighbours were watching her borders with acquisitive eyes. In 1772, Prussia, Russia and Austria succeeded in initiating the first partition of Poland, where all three powers annexed some of Poland’s land. Poland was in no state to resist, although the remaining nation did try to implement drastic political and economic changes with the 1791 constitution to prevent Poland from disintegrating further. It was not to be however, and the three nations partitioned more of Poland in 1793 (Wandycz 1974:10). The third and final partition took place in 1795 and an “independent Poland disappeared from the map of Europe” (Figure 3.1) (Wandycz 1974:11).

Russia had taken 62% of the land containing 45% of the population, Prussia received 20% of the land and 23% of the population, while Austria got the remaining 18% of the land and 32% of the population. The new borders did not correspond with any geographic, ethnic, economic or historical factors. The three partition countries evoked dynastic, and other claims to validate their actions (Wandcyz 1974:11).

Some small semblance of Poland was re-created in 1807 when Napoleon and Czar Alexander of Russia agreed on the establishment of the Duchy of Warsaw from the Prussian share of the second partition. It was a small semi-autonomous state with its own constitution (dictated by Napoleon) based around the city of Warsaw; it also included the city of Poznań (Zamoyski 1987:263). The Duchy of Warsaw was dissolved in 1815 with the exile of Napoleon and in the same year, all three-partition countries signed the Treaty of Vienna, which created the Congress Kingdom, carved out of all the Polish partition areas. It was 127,000 km² with a population of 3.3 million, and had the Czar of Russia as its King (Zamoyski 1987:266). Russia, Prussia and Austria also turned the area around the city of Krakow into a tiny republic. The rest of the Polish lands were signed away to their respective subjugators with many clauses about good treatment for the Polish, and respecting Polish institutions (Zamoyski 1984:266). Nevertheless, in 1832 Russia unofficially dissipated the Congress Kingdom and all its land came under Russian domination again (Eversley 1973:292). The Republic of Krakow was dissolved and placed under Hapsburg rule in 1846 after a failed insurrection against Austria (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:338).
Under the partitions, all three colonising powers attempted to enforce conformity and their own values on the conquered Polish (Zamoyski 1987:290). Almost all the Polish from Hill River emigrated from Prussian occupied Poland, with approximately 90% coming from the crowded province of Poznań (Polish)/Poseń (German), plus a small number from Great Silesia and Pomerania (Paszkowski 1988:10). As a result, it is these areas of occupied Poland that are concentrated upon in the following pages, rather than Russian or Austrian Poland.

Prussian Poland is the official term used to describe the Grand Duchy of Posen, however, its popular use has come to encompass all the land that Prussia received from Poland, including Posnania, West Prussia, South Prussia from 1795-1807, New Silesia and New East Prussia (Davies 1982:112). Pomerania and Silesia were generally regarded at the time to be part of Prussia proper. To the Polish, however, Prussian Poland included every area of the Kingdom that contained a predominantly Polish population or which had in some way been previously connected to Poland. Because of this, Prussian Poland came to refer eventually to Silesia, Pomerania and East Prussia as well (Davies 1982:112).

Under the Treaty of Vienna, the Prussian Government had agreed to give the Polish in the Prussian Kingdom the right to autonomy (Davies 1982:119). However, this was never given to the Polish in Pomerania, West Prussia or Silesia. Only in the province of Poznań, (carved from the western part of the Duchy of Warsaw), and renamed the Grand Duchy of Posen, did the Polish gain any independence (Davies 1982:119). This Grand Duchy was semi-autonomous, with its own representative bodies (Zamoyski 1987:301). In 1815 Poznań consisted of approximately 29,000 km² and had a population of 850,000, which grew to 1,340,000 people over the next 30 years (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:344). Eight out of ten people in the Grand Duchy spoke Polish as their native language (Davies 1982:120). In 1846 a census of the population in Poznań showed 804,000 Polish, 453,000 Germans and 81,000 Jews (mostly German), with 83% of the population being agricultural workers (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:344).

Under Prussian rule, the Polish people did have some rights, for example, they were admitted to the benefits of the Stéin-Hardenberg land reforms. These reforms freed
the Polish peasants completely from serfdom and gave them permanent interests in their holdings (Eversley 1978:305). Furthermore, in 1815 Frederick William III guaranteed the Poles in Poznań integrity of their national status, maintenance of the Catholic religion and equal rights to the Polish and German language. This made the Grand Duchy the most favourable of all Prussian Polish provinces for the Polish national spirit to flourish (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:345, 352).

While the Polish nation did not officially exist, the Polish national spirit was stronger than ever (Davies 1982:122). Occupation of Polish land by Russia, Prussia and Austria only increased the Polish peoples resolve to keep their traditions, language and religion alive. This determination led to revolts and attempted revolutions against all three occupying powers. The 1846 uprising in Austrian controlled Galicia dramatically changed the life of Prussian Polish people in Poznań. Fearing a similar revolt, authorities dissolved Polish societies; Germanised schools and bought Polish land with the intention of promoting German immigration (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:354). The failed 1848 insurrection in Berlin and Poznań caused even stricter measures to be adopted. After 1848, Poznań lost its semi-autonomous privileges. The Grand Duchy became the Prussian Provinz-Posen and the Polish white eagle on its coat of arms was removed (Davies 1982:120). These events created a great rift between Prussia and the people of Poland (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:367).

Over the next 50 years, life grew increasingly difficult for the Polish in Prussian Poland. A speaker at the Frankfurt Parliament called Poland a “nation of lesser cultural content” (Zamoyski 1987:301) and the Polish began to be treated as such. Prior to the 1870s there had not been overt hostility to the Polish, this changed with the advent of the declaration of the German Empire in Versailles in 1871 (Davies 1982:131). With this came a resurgence of German pride and a desire to see all of German lands completely Germanised. Accordingly, Otto Von Bismarck declared ‘Kulturkampf’ (culture struggle).

*Kulturkampf* was Germany’s war on the Catholic religion and regionalist tendencies in the German empire. This meant that in 1872 children could only be taught in German in schools, and teachers were forbidden to join both Polish and Catholic
societies. All graduates, including priests, were required to pass an exam in German culture (Davies 1982:127). In 1874 the use of Polish textbooks was forbidden by law and in 1876 German became the exclusive administrative language in all areas from law courts to the post office, with translations into German costing an additional 50% (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:412). In 1887 the study of Polish as a second language was abolished in the educational system completely (Zamoyski 1987:302). The year 1886 saw Bismarck’s scheme for the buying of Polish land for colonisation by German settlers (Zubrzycki 1956:21). In 1888 another law was passed dictating that if the majority of Sunday school children in a class were German, the entire class had to be taught their catechisms and prayers in German. Because of this law, over 100,000 Polish children went on strike and refused to attend classes. As a result, many were flogged and their parents were fined (Eversley 1973:312, 313). In 1889 Polish schoolteachers had to cease using Polish in their family circles. Finally, in 1898 a series of special laws turned Polish people into second-class citizens in the German Empire (Zamoyski 1987:304).

Unfortunately for the Germans, their suppression of the Polish people had the completely opposite effect they intended (Gronowicz 1985:40). In fact, Davies has suggested that without kulturkampf there might have been no Polish nationalist movement in Prussia at all. Until the German government chose to harass and oppress the Polish people, Germanisation was thought to be the natural destiny of all Prussian non-German subjects (1982:130). Despite all these measures by the Prussian Government, the German speaking population of Poznań fell from 1860-1890 from 41% to 34% (Zamoyski 1987:305).

The German attacks on the Catholic Church in Prussian Poland had the same effect as the harsh laws being enacted on the people. The partitions pulled the Polish Catholic Church to bits. The Catholic Church in Prussian Poland was under the control of the Protestant Church and was never encouraged as a religious choice (Zamoyski 1987:314). However, until the 1870s the impediments placed in the path of the Roman Catholics were at the most, casual (Davies 1982:117). After the Archbishop of Poznań Gniezno was imprisoned in 1874, he became a national hero and Polish nationalism and the Catholic Church formed a common front (Pacyga 1991:120). Peasants were particularly angry about the attacks on the Church as they associated
themselves with Catholicism even more than they did with their nation (Zamoyski 1987:315). This partnership managed to dull the push of German colonial policy aimed at Poland. The clergy helped the peasants by giving advice on anything from taxation and agriculture, to emigration (Zamoyski 1987:303), which was one way for the people of Poland to hold on to their culture and beliefs, and to escape persecution (Pacyga 1991:125).

3.2 A brief history of Polish emigration

Throughout the partition period of Poland’s history, emigration frequently occurred. There were two types of emigration from Poland in these years: political and economic (Davies 1982:275). Zamoyski has commented that the Polish carried their nation and their country around in their knapsacks wherever fate scattered them and that ‘Polishness’ became a moral condition that had nothing whatsoever to do with the state (1987:290). However during the immigrations by the Polish to Texas in the 1850s, one German journalist wrote about the exodus and noted that it was worth commenting upon “because, as it is known, Slavic people are so attached to their native land that emigration among them is extraordinary” (Baker 1979:23).

The political emigration began in the 1730s and continued at regular intervals up until Poland’s independence from the United Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) in the 1990s. Years of significant political emigration were 1772, 1795, 1831, 1848, 1864, 1905 and 1944 (Davies 1982:275), and for the most part coincided with the partitions or revolts against the three partition countries. The Great Emigration, as it is known, took place in 1831. Whilst this immigration was not great in number, it included almost the entire political elite of the Congress Kingdom and a large part of the artistic talent of its day (Davies 1982:276). Most Polish political emigrants settled in France, Switzerland, Rome, England and Belgium and these places became the focal points of Polish political life abroad (Davis 1984:284: Kaluski 1985:8).

Major economic emigration began in the 1840s and became common in the later nineteenth century (Davies 1982:276). Davies (1982:277) has suggested that economic emigration originally developed from seasonal migration, initially taking place between Prussian Poland and Prussia, and later to France and Belgium. From
the 1860s immigration also began to north and South America. Like the Chinese to America and Australia, these immigrants hoped to stay for only a few years and return home to their families with enough money to support them (Davies 1982:276). Later in the nineteenth century, increasing over-population in rural areas and urban poverty forced large numbers of people to emigrate with little thought of return (Davies 1982:277; Kaluski 1985:8). Emigration also benefited those left behind, as it relived the overcrowding and made agriculture in the area less competitive (Zamoyski 1987:304). Bad harvests in the Poznań region from 1853 to 1855 (Reddaway, Penson, Halecki and Dyboski 1951:412) would also have encouraged immigration. Perhaps it was this that caused the emigrants to Polish Hill River to finally make the decision to leave Poland.

Economic emigrants differed from political ones. They were poor, mostly illiterate and numbers consisted overwhelmingly of peasants, small craftspeople or miners. They left their homes deliberately. Economic migration was not a relocation of a number of individuals, but a mass exodus motivated by a desire to find better economic opportunities, a higher standard of living and a greater measure of economic security (Zubzycki 1956:10). Unlike the political emigrants, economic migrants had little awareness of polish culture or political traditions. When they died the only thing they generally had to leave their children of their Polish heritage was their language, religion, a few songs, dances and costumes, and some traditional cooking techniques and recipes (Davies 1982:278). Even these things did not last very long. Generally, they were by and large swallowed up by the process of assimilation into the non-Polish community usually by the second or third generation.

Nineteenth century economic emigrations established Polish communities in the United States of America, Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Germany and France. Fewer than 1000 Polish people immigrated to Australia, probably because of its distance from Poland and the fact that during the nineteenth century, Australia by and large favoured British immigration (Kaluski 1985:8).

Tentative emigration figures suggest that by 1939 over 195,000 Polish immigrants had settled in Brazil, 456,000 in France, 250,000 in Canada, 1,500,000 in the United States and over 2,000,000 in Germany (Davies 1982:279). However these figures
cannot be corroborated, as Polish people were not listed as such when arriving at their destinations up until 1918, but under the nationalities of the three partition countries (Davies 1982:278).

The Polish in Brazil were concentrated in the provinces of Parana, Santa Catarina and Rio Grande de Sul. Antonio Bartnicki (Bartnicki 24 March, 1891 in Zubrycki 1988:75-77) wrote to his son from Rio Grande de Sul telling him of the excellent life to be had in this area, and to immigrate immediately. He also asked his son to bring items hard to purchase or missing in this locale (medicines, guns, pictures, household items, window glass).

The Polish population of Great Britain can trace its origins to immigration in the early nineteenth century (Davies 1982:284). Their numbers were never very great until World War Two, and then a large number of political refugees arrived. After World War Two a large part of the Jews from Europe fled to Palestine, a number of them were Polish but saw themselves as Jews from Poland, not Polish Jews (Davies 1982:284-287).

Most of the Polish arriving in Australia in the nineteenth century came from the western border regions of Poznań, such as Wielka Dabrowska (Gross Dammer), Miedzyzey (Messeritz) Zbąszyń (Bentschen), Babimost (Bomst) and Pardyz (Figure 3.2) (Paszkowski 1987:10). The village of Wielka Dabrowska was annexed by Prussia under the second partition of Poland and was renamed ‘Gross Dammer’. After the partitions, life became difficult due to the anti-Polish Prussian policies, yet this village led the struggle against Germanisation, and was called by the Germans a “fortress of the Polish language and Slavism” (Chomicz in Paszkowski 1987:10).
A small number of Kashubs also arrived in South Australia and settled at Hill River. The Kashubs were a Polish group from Pomerania who spoke a different dialect from the other Polish at Hill River (Szczepeanowski 1987:6). While at least one family originated from Gdansk (Danzig) from northern Poland (Marlow 2003:187). Yet, it is worth noting that the Kashubs also came from Prussian occupied Poland, as did the rest of the immigrants to Hill River (including the family from Gdansk), and all were united in this at least.
In the nineteenth century, Polish Hill River was the main Polish rural settlement in Australia. However, another smaller group of Polish immigrants arrived in Australia in the late 1870s, creating the town of Cracow, in Queensland, as their centre. Family records from Polish Hill River show no less than one family arriving in Polish Hill River after living in Queensland for several years (Marlow 2003:187). Unfortunately, in the late nineteenth century, Cracow was devastated by bushfire and abandoned, with the survivors moving to Brisbane (Sussex and Zubrzycki 1985:3).

Generally peasants from neighbouring localities formed a group, arranged for a local parish Priest to lead them and departed en-mass from ports such as Bremen, Danzig, Hamburg or Riga (Davis 1982:277; Zamoyski 1987:304). This was the case for the Polish village of Panna Maria. The people who settled there were peasants organised into groups from a few villages who were determined to maintain the social bond that made them into their ancestral community (Zubrzycki 1988:6).

3.3 Panna Maria, Texas

The most comparable example to Polish Hill River in time and context, is Panna Maria, Texas (Baker 1979). Panna Maria (meaning ‘Virgin Mary’) was not only the first organised settlement of Polish immigrants in the United States, it was also the first organised settlement of Polish immigrants anywhere in the world outside Europe (Dworaczyk 1954:1). Both it and Polish Hill River have much in common. They were both settled around the same time (mid 1850s) and both were composed of peasants organised in distinct village groups determined to keep the social ties which made them into communities (Zubrycki 1988:6). The Polish people arriving in Texas from the province of Silesia, in Prussian Poland were peasants from the counties of Opole (Oppeln), Strzelce (Gross Strehlitz), Toszek-Gliwice (Tost-Gleiwitz), Lubliniec (Lublinitz) and Olesno (Rosenburg), and they were all Roman Catholic (Baker 1979:5).

Panna Maria is located in Karnes County, Texas, 55 miles south of San Antonio and was settled in 1854 by a group of Polish people from the village of Płużnica. This is two years before the Polish first arrived at Hill River, South Australia.
A Polish Franciscan priest, Father Leopold Moczygemba had been working in Texas since 1852 and wrote to his family in Silesia to join him there, where there was enough land for everyone (Dworaczyk 1954:23). As a result about 100 families from neighbouring villages set sail for Texas in 1854, including four of Father Moczygemba’s brothers (Baker 1979:8). Reasons for immigration included very high food prices as a result of the Crimean War, the general poverty of Silesia, high taxes, several natural disasters that hit the region during this time and “the basic inequalities and discrimination of the society in which the ruling German minority dominated the majority Polish peasant population” (Baker 1979:9, 10, 14).

Baker writes that “unlike the stereotype of Slavic immigrants as poverty-stricken masses longing for just enough bread to live, the Silesians who were leaving Texas were propertied people with a stake in society” (1979:21). They were people who owned property and had stable social positions in Silesian society, although there were a few poorer members of society also wanting to immigrate and the practice of borrowing money from family members for passage to Texas was somewhat common. Some people arrived in Texas as indentured servants to richer Polish peasants for a period of time (Baker 1979:21, 30).

After a nine-week ship journey from Bremin, the Polish people landed at Galveston, Texas. They hired carts, or assembled the ones they had brought over for their belongings (including agricultural implements and a large wooden cross for the new church) and walked to San Antonio where Father Moczygemba was waiting for them (Baker 1979:31; Davies 1982:278). A reduced number (some died or left the party along the way) then walked on to the land that the priest had picked out for them. They arrived at Christmas time and quickly began building their settlement (Davies 1982:278).

The people at Panna Maria found their new life difficult; they were unused to the harsh conditions, the snakes, malaria, Native American attacks, outlaws and the climate and environment. For many years the settlement struggled and many regretted leaving Poland (Dworaczyk 1954:37, 41). Because of their distinctive customs and language they were not completely accepted by their non-Polish neighbours, as the Polish were at Hill River (Baker 1979:62, 63). Despite these harsh conditions, the
Polish at Panna Maria wrote home about how good life was and encouraged others to join the community (and to bring lots of food, grain, agricultural equipment and other essentials missing from life at Panna Maria) (Moczygemba, 13 May, 1855 in Zubrzycki 1988:58-59). The community persevered and a Church was built in 1856, as was the first Polish school in the United States, and three more groups of Polish immigrants arrived. Houses and shops were built in traditional ways using techniques handed down for generations with adaptations for the new climate and conditions (Baker 1979:43, 44). Immigration continued in 1855 and 1856 as a result of favourable correspondence from the immigrants to their families back in Silesia, but slowed to a stop after that, due in part to improved economic conditions in Silesia and to the major drought Texas went through during those years (Baker 1979:31). In 1867 a census of the population of Polish towns and settlements in Texas by a Polish priest revealed 75 families in Panna Maria, 43 families in San Antonio, 12 families in Bandera, 34 families in Martinez, 13 families in Yorktown, 14 families in Coleto, 13 families in Victoria and 12 families in Inez (Baker 1979:59).

Once the American Civil War (1860-1865) was over the Polish community at Panna Maria became more isolated due to a number of factors such as the railway bypassing the town, and as a result, it retained its strong Polish identification and language. More Polish priests arrived from Poland, as did Polish nuns to teach at the school (Baker 1979:55, 56). Zubrzycki (1988:6) has written that it was this, as well as their common ethnic origin and traditions, the practice of their ancestral faith and their familial solidarity that kept Panna Maria, and its neighbouring Polish villages of Częstochowa, Kościuszko and Helena, essentially Polish in character for generations longer than at Polish Hill River (Figure 3.3, 3.4, 35) (Baker 1979:3). Indeed, visitors to the area as late as the 1980s would meet people who spoke the old Silesian/Polish dialect that was first brought out by the original settlers. Polish traditional ceremonies were still practiced, as were religious services in Polish (Henneberg, M. 2003. Pers comm., 27 March). Was this the case for the Polish at Hill River?
3.4 History of the Polish at Hill River

The Surveyor General of South Australia first surveyed the area around Hill River in 1842. This special land survey was the northern most of the time and laid out the
sections of what became known as ‘Hill River’ and later as ‘Polish Hill River’ (Johnson 1992:12) to distinguish it from the cattle property known as Hill River to the north. Arthur Young, whose address is listed as Aberdeen, Scotland, originally owned the land on what was later to be known as Hill River Valley. In 1842 he purchased 50 sections from the Hundred of Clare and from the Hundred of Upper Wakefield (Johnson 1992:12). However, over the next few decades he sold portions of this land to the immigrants who were arriving in the area, most of whom were Polish, but to some of who were German, Irish and English (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:283).

Polish people had been arriving in South Australia from 1838 (two years after British settlement of the colony), when a Polish family disembarked with Pastor Kavel’s group of Germans. Others came to South Australia with Captain Hahn and settled in Hahndorf with other Germans (Paszkowski 1988:735; Migration Museum 1995:372). The main reason for this initial German migration to South Australia was the persecution of some Lutherans for refusing to practice the united Lutheran and Reformed Church liturgy determined by Friedrich Wilhelm II (Pike 1967:130; Paszkowski 1987:7). The Prussians who arrived in South Australia were from Brandenburg, Silesia and Poznań, the areas situated around the River Oder (now part of modern day Poland) (Schubert 1985:51). Many of the Germans arriving from Prussia’s eastern provinces, (whose population was Polish-German) had Polish last names (Kaluski 1985:18). The Polish who accompanied the Germans were generally from this area and were converted Lutherans. Thus, they blended quickly into the German settlements around South Australia (Szczepanowski 1987:45). Polish people mixing with Germans was not at all unusual, as in 1795 Poland had ceased to exist at a separate country due to the gradual partitioning and eventual conquering of its territories by Prussia (Germany), Russia and Austria (Migration Museum 1995:372). It is for this reason that it is difficult to obtain definite numbers for Polish immigration to Australia, because they were listed under a German nationality. However, it is believed that approximately 1000 Polish people arrived in Australia before the Polish were listed as a separate nationality until after World War One (Paszkowski 1988:737). Furthermore, last names cannot be used as indicators of ethnicity as some Polish people had German last names, while other Germans had
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

Polish last names, for example a Polish family called the ‘Wyman’s’ had a German last name.

The first large group of recognizably Polish immigrants to arrive in South Australia (31 people) left Wielka Dabrowska (Figure 3.6) in the Province of Poznań in 1844 on the George Washington, and included families with the surnames of Gidda, Kroll, Mlodystach, Pinetzki, Przybyla, Wallent and Stanietzki (Paszkowski 1987:8). They had a “remarkably fine journey” (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:24), and on arrival settled in Tanunda and, later, moved to Sevenhill (and the vicinity in and around Polish Hill River once it had been established) (Rogalski 1871:1; Noye 1980:16; Szczepanowski 1987:4-5; Migration Museum 1995: 372-373). After the initial Polish migrations, small numbers of Polish followed (often relatives of the initial settlers) (Rogalski 1871:2) because of favourable correspondence from those living in South Australia. However, even more Polish arrived following the 1848 revolutions in Prussia-annexed Poland, with the greatest numbers arriving between 1853-1858 (Migration Museum 1995:373). Migration again peaked in 1870-1876 because of the Franco-Prussian war (Szczepanowski 1987:6), possibly so the males could avoid conscription into the Prussian Army.

Figure 3.6. Map of the Zbąszyń region, showing the village of Wielka Dabrowka (Dabrowka Wielkopolska) (black dot).
Some men arriving at Hill River had traces of self inflicted wounds to avoid conscription in this war (Paszkowski 1987:13). These Polish people settled for the most part at Hill River, while other small groups went to Penwortham, Blyth and Mintaro in the lower north and Terowie, Dawson and Peterborough in the mid north (Migration Museum 1995:373).

The founding of a Jesuit mission at Sevenhill in 1851 also encouraged the Polish Catholics to settle at Hill River. St Aloysius College already ministered to and taught Catholics of other nationalities in the area, such as the Irish and Germans (Migration Museum 1995:373). Although most of the Germans to arrive in South Australia were Lutheran, a small number of German Catholics from western and southern Germany also immigrated and settled in Sevenhill, where a priest who accompanied them (Father Aloysius Kranewitter) began the Jesuit mission with several other Jesuit priests who arrived soon after (Schmaal 1980:16; Dallwitz and Marsden 1983:27; Harmstorf 1994:18). It can also be hypothesized that the Polish were encouraged to come to Sevenhill to work on the Jesuit vineyards or as builders and labourers on the extensions to the college (Johnson 1994:12).

In 1856 a group of 25 Polish families, some with the surnames Mlodystach, Staniecki, Pawelski, Nykiel, Polomka, Malycha, Nayda and Niemetz (approximately 100 people), arrived in Adelaide on the August (Paszkowski 1987:9) and officially established the Polish settlement at Hill River. By the 1860s over 30 properties in the Hill River Valley were occupied and farmed by the Polish (Migration Museum 1995:373). In the early 1880s there were over 65 Polish families (approximately 400 people) living at Hill River, nearly all engaged in agriculture (Rogalski 1871:2; Migration Museum 1995:373). Most of their farms varied in size from several sections of 80 acres each, to a single section or part of a section, while other Polish owned no land at all (Szczepanowski 1987:14). This is in contrast to the Polish settlers in Texas, where the average farm size was 68 acres, with a value of over $300 (Baker 1979:48). Most of the Polish Hill River farms were too small to earn a viable income to support a family and some Polish farmers supplemented their income by keeping orchards or vineyards; while others hired themselves out, women went into domestic service, many stripped wattle bark off trees to sell to tanneries, while others set up their own businesses (Schmaal 1980: 61; Szczepanowski 1987:18; Johnson
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1994:13). Clare Council Reports frequently mention small roadwork tenders being given to the Polish (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:285). The Polish tradition of each son inheriting part of their father’s farm also contributed to the shrinkage of farmland and consequentially, the loss of income for families (Johnson 1994:13). In fact, because of this, in Poland in 1985 only 11% of all farms were over 10 hectares in size (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:13). Evidence of this is seen in John Nykiels’ 1910 will, which clearly sets out that his wife and all of his children, including his married daughter, were to receive shares of his considerable property assets on his death. The bequests ranged from between one acre to 358 acres, and assorted buildings (Nykiel 1910: Probate Registry, South Australia, Ref No. 16774).

The Polish attended Mass every week, walking overland or driving the three kilometres in carts to the Jesuit church (Johnson 1994:13). Despite the fact that the Polish could attend Catholic services in Sevenhill at St. Aloysius Church, a German priest delivered the sermon in Latin, German or English, and the Polish wanted to hear the service delivered by a Polish priest (Johnson 1994:13). Furthermore, this Polish/German language barrier would have prevented the Polish from being able to attend confession and receive absolution. Paszkowski (1987:10) has written that:

The Austrian Jesuits gave sermons in German as well as English, they had no Father who was proficient in Polish, in the earliest days of the mission, though some one or two had an infinitesimal knowledge of the language [and] did what they could to help those Poles who knew little or no English. In 1866, Father Hinterocker came to Sevenhill and he knew sufficient Polish to be able to preach in that language, more or less indifferently. But the Poles were always asking that a native Polish speaker might help them.

Thus, the community at Hill River decided to build their own church and school. John Nykiel, a leader in the Polish community, donated two acres of land and the families began to quarry the necessary stone and build the church themselves (Johnson 1994:13).
During construction, in 1870, a Polish Priest (Father Leon Rogalski) arrived at the Sevenhill Jesuit Church from Galacia in southern (Austrian) Poland and began to minister to the Hill River community in their own language (Figure 3.7). According to a former resident of the Polish Hill River community, Father Rogalski “wanted to keep all Poles together and have a little Poland in Australia” (Mrs Simkinson in Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:284). The church was formally consecrated on the 30th November 1871 as the Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka (Johnson 1994:13). Interestingly, there was also a church dedicated to St. Stanislaus Kostka erected at Blyth, in part by Polish settlers from Hill River who moved further north in later years (Dallwitz and Marsden 1983:28). It was the centre of Catholic worship in the area until the 1970s, when rising costs and falling membership made it too expensive to maintain. The building was demolished in 1982 to make way for a senior citizens home (Johnson 1991:44). The altar, pews, statues and stations of the cross from this church were bought by the Polish Hill River Museum committee to furnish the rebuilt Church/Museum at Polish Hill River (Johnson 1991:44). The building of this ‘sister’ church in Blyth raises an interesting point. Although Polish traditions were slowly being lost, the Polish tie to the Catholic faith lasted much longer. They took it with them when they left Hill River. Thus, religion was extremely important to these
people. This reflects what Zamoyski (1987:315) has stated, that the Polish people associated themselves more with their religion than they did with their nation.

In addition to his preaching at the church, Father Rogalski taught Polish children in the school built adjoining the church (constructed by 1880 on the north and east side of the church) and ran three pastoral missions to minister to the Polish in the mid-north (Szczepanowski 1987:31, 35). The first mission was based around Sevenhill, Clare, Penwortham and Emu Flat. The second was at Hill River and Farrell’s Flat, while the third was located at Tanunda (65km southeast from Sevenhill) (Rogalski 1871:5-8). All these communities had large groups of Polish living there (Szczepanowski 1987:31) and were visited by Rogalski on horseback (Paszkowski 1987:12). Despite the presence of the Polish in the area, very little was written about the Polish in the district paper (based in Clare), the *Northern Argus*. They were simply another cultural minority sharing a common religion with the Irish and Germans of the area (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:284). In fact, it is debatable just how many English and Irish people even attempted to distinguish the Polish culture from that of the Germans who lived in Sevenhill.

The church and school (which also incorporated a Polish library) was the centre of life for the Polish groups (Figure 3.8). The Polish library was sent books and magazines from donors in Poland after appeals were made (generally by Father Rogalski) in Catholic journals and newsletters in Poland (*Missye Katolickie*, vol.6, 1887 quoted in Zubrycki 1988:82-87). One of the teachers of the school at Polish Hill River (James Crowe) also made various appeals to overseas individuals on his own behalf, or for Father Rogalski, who needed Polish reading matter for the school library (Crowe 1884:3).
The attendance book for the St. Stanislaus School from 1882-1885 shows that during these years there were at least 31 children attending the school coming from 19 local families at Hill River, Sevenhill and as far away as Penwortham (7km southwest) (Attendance Book 1883, 1884, 1885). There was a period in the settlement’s history when the church was so crowded during services that those who arrived late had to stand under the verandah (a later addition to the building) and watch mass through the windows (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:261). Through the church and school, these people were able to maintain their faith, language and traditions (Paszkowski 1988: 735; Migration Museum 1995:373). Polish women and girls favoured their traditional bright clothing (often sky-blue) and sometimes wore a bonnet headdress tied with long bow ribbons under the chin, with flaps large enough to cover part of their shoulders (Figures 3.9 and 3.10) (Simons 1944:23). Figure 3.10 shows a lady wearing what appears to be the Polish national costume described above, walking to or from a market in the town of Sevenhill (3km east of Polish Hill River). Polish women usually only spoke Polish at home (Simons 1944:23), any lapse and they would be told it was a sin to speak English in the house (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:282-3).
It was only by such strict rules that their forbearers had been able to keep the Polish language alive in the midst of the Germans back in their homeland (Mlodystach Book Committee 1985:283). Historical events of Polish national importance were also commemorated, including the 200th anniversary of the Polish defeat of the Turks outside the gates of Vienna (9th of September 1883). This event was celebrated at Polish Hill River with a thanksgiving mass and songs (Szczepanowski 1987:53). Reproductions of paintings of this battle were imported from Poland for the people of Hill River, along with a number of commemorative medallions made in Krakow (Szczepanowski 1987:53). Paszkowski (1987:20) has written that the Polish settlement at Hill River and Sevenhill was one of a kind because it:
maintained its own national character for nearly 60 years (1856-1914). It is the only known case of a Polish ‘island’ lasting for such a long time in the sea of an Anglo-Saxon population. The reason lay in the possession of their own church and school, and also in contracting marriages almost exclusively within the Polish group. …This Polish group had many common features which bound them together: language, religion, traditions and manners, songs and even dances.

Nonetheless, this did not stop the Polish community from mixing with their neighbours and joining in community activities. Dr Anton Sokolowski was a member of the first council in Clare in 1853 and again from 1858-1859, Michael Rucioch was a councillor in the district of Clare from 1873-1877, 1880-1883, 1887-1889 and Chairman of the Clare District council from 1877-1878 and in 1884. Carl Kozlowski represented Sevenhill in the council from 1876-1884 and 1900-1908, while John Nykiel was a councillor of Mintaro council from 1875-1880, 1882-1898, 1900-1907 and Chairman from 1898-1900 (Paszkowski 1987:13; Szczepanowski 1987:49). From all accounts, the people in the surrounding districts, mostly of German, English and Irish descent, did not have any quarrels or difficulties, racial or otherwise, relating to the Polish at Hill River. Local reminiscences of a man who lived at Clare as a child (Simons 1944) highlight only one known disagreement involving the Polish. However this was over a difference in religion, not race. An old Polish man, living alone at Sevenhill on his farm, had for sometime been carving his own headstone (a crucifix) out of a 9 ft tree stump. After he died a caretaker was appointed to guard the crucifix until it could be removed and placed on the dead mans grave. When that time came, the crucifix was missing. The caretaker had burned it, remarking that burning was what “should be done to all emblems of Popery” (Simons 1944:35).

Their religion was strong for the Polish; the community at Hill River had a Catholic Easter ritual that took place every year at St. Aloysius College in Sevenhill. The Corpus Christi procession came to pass on Easter Sunday. Mary Brysky (2000. Pers comm., 9 January) recollects the ritual:
They used to have three altars out in the churchyard. You had Benediction when you came out of church. You had Mass first. You walked to the first altar and you had Benediction. You sang and you went to the second one. They had Benediction there and then you went to the third one and you had Benediction there.

Simons (1944) too, recollects this ritual. He describes how the annual Corpus Christi procession used to slowly make its way a long a bush track, stopping at altars made from plaited wattles boughs (Simons 1944:25). He also recollects how until the Polish settlement vanished, the Polish men used to gather with muskets at specific points along the procession, and fire blank shots as a salute to the Host as it went by, carried by the priest (Simons 1944:25). This ritual could have been used by the Polish, not only to reconfirm their religious sentiments, but also as a subtle means of exclusion from the surrounding communities.

By the late 1880s the lack of new farm land, poor crops and a shortage of water in the area saw many of the Polish settlers head further north (Paszkowski 1987:14) where large tracts of land were opening up, and better farm machinery made higher production feasible; other Polish left for mining regions around South Australia (Migration Museum 1995:373). The Wastelands Amendment Act of 1869 (or as it is more popularly known, the Strangways Act) allowed land to be purchased on credit for the first time in South Australia’s history, but only in specially selected areas located inside Goyder’s line in the upper north of the state (Williams 1977:11-12). The Polish became more scattered over the greater lower, mid and upper north regions and by the 1890s many Polish settlers had left Hill River and their buildings had begun to fall into disrepair (Szczepanowski 1987:61; Johnson 1994:13). After Father Rogalski’s death in 1906 the Church was used infrequently (once a year, on the feast day of St. Stanislaus Kostka), and it finally closed in 1950. The school was taken over by the government and re-named the Sevenhill East School. However, it closed in 1924 due to a decline in enrolments (Szczepanowski 1987:35). It appears that after Father Rogalski died, the last influence of a deep-seated Polish identity in the area was gone, and the remnants of the community assimilated all the more quickly into the Anglo culture of the area.
South Australian almanacs available during the lifetime of Polish Hill River (1856-1930s) (Sands and McDougall South Australian Directory, the National Directory of South Australia, the Boothby Adelaide Almanac and Directory, and the South Australian Almanac and Directories) list dozens of people with Polish names living in the lower mid north of South Australia in Polish Hill River, Sevenhill, Mintaro, Penwortham and Blyth. Yet by the 1930s only one was listed in the Hill River ward, a G. S. Konetzki, while the surrounding towns of Auburn, Penwortham, Clare and Sevenhill still had a number of Polish second or third generation residents (Sands and McDougall 1930:463, 704, 735). However, these directories do not generally take into account mailing addresses, and in all probability a few Polish residents could still have been residing at Hill River whilst being listed under a differing mailing location.

In 1971, Archbishop Reverend J Gleeson gave the land that the crumbling church and schoolhouse is located on to the Federation of Polish Organisations in South Australia (Migration Museum 1995:373). The Polish community then raised the money to restore the church and rebuild the school (Cmielewski and Cmielewski 1989:22), and have since turned both buildings into a museum documenting the history of the Polish at Hill River and of the Polish who arrived in South Australia after World War II (Figure 3.11 and 3.12).

Figure 3.11. Polish Hill River Church circa 1956 (Paszkowski 1987:xxiv).

Figure 3.12. Polish Hill River Church 2001 (photo by author).

The Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka, or the Polish Hill River Church Museum, was subsequently identified as being of heritage significance because of its association with the early Polish settlers of South Australia and was nominated for listing on the
State Heritage Register in 1978 (South Australian State Heritage Register and Inventory 2001). The church was provisionally listed in 1979 and was formally registered in July 1980. Furthermore, the church was also listed on the National Estate Register in 1993 (South Australian State Heritage Register and Inventory 2001).

3.5 Discussion

The history of Poland highlights the circumstances of the Polish who immigrated to Hill River. They were restricted in practicing their traditions, religion and speaking their own language by the Prussians who controlled their land and their lives. This led to large-scale emigrations (both political and economic) around the world, by people who were hoping to find a better way of life for themselves and their children, where they could be ‘Polish’ without persecution. Two of these settlements were Panna Maria in Texas (1854) and Polish Hill River (1856) in South Australia. Here, the settlers of these two villages continued to practice all the traditions they held so important. Yet at Panna Maria these traditions continued into the 1980s, while at Polish Hill River they were generally abandoned in favour of a more ‘Australian’ way of life by the 1920s. Although these settlements were established within two years of each other, the settlement at Panna Maria progressed much more rapidly than Polish Hill River. Within two years the Polish in Texas had built a church, yet it took the Polish at Hill River over 15 years to do this. Partly this can be explained by their physical location: the people at Panna Maria were literally in the middle of nowhere, surrounded by empty land. They had nowhere else to go to worship, while the people at Hill River did. They could afford to wait, and still attend church in a near by town. The Polish at Panna Maria had to fend for themselves and create everything from nothing, while the Polish at Hill River were surrounded by towns and people who could help them, advise them, give them work and help them in setting up their community. Panna Maria also had a diverse section of immigrants from farmers to artisans, they did not need to go outside the community for things if they did not want to. This is why the Panna Maria community maintained their traditions for so long, there was little outside influence, while the Polish at Hill River were mixing with outsiders from the inception of their community. Another difference between the two settlements was the point of emigration for the Polish. The people at Panna Maria
came from the province of Silesia, while the Polish at Hill River came from the neighbouring province of Poznań. Whether this resulted in any variation as to how long basic traditions were maintained in the settlements cannot be determined at this point, but it is doubtful this would have made any difference. Yet how is this shift in mindset from traditional to new, reflected in the material culture of the Polish at Hill River?
Chapter Four: Material Culture of the Polish, Germans and Australian Vernacular Architecture

4.1 Introduction
Chapter Two of this thesis presented data showing that the most likely material remains to reflect ethnicity would be architecture, ceramic and faunal remains. Of these three, architecture has been focussed on primarily, with ceramics being looked at as a secondary group of artefacts. Faunal remains have also been discovered, but most were found on the surface, some still articulated, and all bleached by the sun. Thus it has been postulated that they are from deceased animals that were left to graze around the former Polish dwellings; and have not been concentrated on (Chapter Six discusses this subject in more detail). Nonetheless, to distinguish what is Polish, as opposed to what was created or imported by the neighbouring German, English or Irish populations living close by, we need to look at these groups’ material culture in more detail so comparisons can be made. Australian vernacular architecture must also be examined so architectural trends seen in the later Polish houses still in evidence can be understood, as well as the landscape of the settlement itself.

4.2 Architecture
Architectural style can be used to express individual or group identity and relate groups to others in the area in a physical way, as part of the process of seeing and being seen (Burke 2000:175). The Moravians used their German architectural half-timbered tradition in the early buildings of their settlement in North Carolina to express who they were and who they wanted to remain, despite being surrounded by the Anglo-American culture (Thomas 1994). Building this way helped maintain their sense of community. This is similar to the early German settlers in South Australia, who also maintained their traditional architectural housing designs for generations in the nineteenth century (see Young 1978; Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981; Young, Aeuckens, Green and Nikias 1983; Harmstorf and Cigler 1985; Young 1985; Ioannou 1987; Harmstorf 1994; Ioannou 1995 and Ioannou 2000). However, after several years, once the Moravian community had become established, their buildings began to display elements belonging to the English building tradition of the American colonies (Thomas 1994:19). These changes over time may reflect a general slow assimilation into the surrounding communities, or may represent a deliberate
suppression of group identity designed to make them appear to ‘fit in’ during a time of great upheaval (the American revolution) (Thomas 1994:19). Architecture is a way for people to reinforce their beliefs and traditions. It is also a way of delivering a subtler message of power and status. But it should not be forgotten that architecture has a more important job to do in the world. It keeps people warm and dry. When it comes down to it, architecture is designed to perform a very functional purpose. Thus architecture is also a practical concern, and this is where vernacular architecture comes into play.

4.3 Vernacular Architecture
Vernacular architecture merges the cultural traditions of the occupants, the surrounding physical environment and economic factors into one form (Gailey 1984:7). People who built traditional houses did so according to the norms that were generally known and accepted. The builders, designers and clients usually all shared common cultural experiences. It was enough for a person to decide they wanted a house of three rooms, the client knew what they wanted and so did the builder (Gailey 1984:7). However, the ultimate in vernacular architecture was designed and built by the amateur, usually the occupiers of the building who had no training in design. They were guided only by a series of conventions built up in their locality. Function was the most important factor, with tradition as the guide for construction. The aesthetic was present but minimal, with local materials used as a matter of course (Brunskill 1987:25). A concise definition for vernacular house is one that is built in a traditional form, in traditional way, and with traditional materials (Mercer 1975:1). Every culture and nation has its own style of vernacular architecture, something that is generally different from everywhere else; so what constituted the Irish and English nineteenth century vernacular architecture? What aspects of the vernacular architecture from these two countries were incorporated into Australian colonial vernacular architecture?

4.4 Irish Architecture
Gailey (1984:8) has written that all vernacular farmhouses in Ireland in the eighteenth and nineteenth century shared the same fundamental characteristics, and these characteristics would have been transferred along with the Irish who immigrated to
South Australia. Usually the houses were a single room deep between the front and rear walls with end walls unlikely to be cut by doors or windows (except small upper floor attic windows). The chimney was commonly located on the ridgeline, reflecting the axially located internal hearths. The walls surrounding each room extended up to the roof structure.

4.4.1 Construction
Most of the common methods of construction seen in vernacular Australian farmhouse architecture in the nineteenth century were also present in Northern Ireland (Gailey 1984:48). Fieldstones were primarily used in random rubble building (Gailey 1984:48). Course rubble building was seen in all types of buildings at all social levels (except buildings constructed by the landless poor and byre dwellings) (Gailey 1984:48). Cementing stonewalls with lime mortar lasted into the nineteenth century, especially in the poorer houses. A common earlier bonding material in domestic buildings was clay mortar (Gailey 1984:52). Wattle and daub construction was widespread:

> tenants build their own houses of clay and scraw or rushes. They make the walls solid, raise them two feet at a time with mud and rushes, allowing them 10 days to dry between the several layers. The doors and windows are cut out with a spade and the sides made straight and smooth. … Most of the poor people prefer these thatched mud cabins to a house of stone and slate (Gailey 1984:56).

Plastering internal and external walls with clay or lime was frequent as to leave a dry wattle and daub wall un-rendered in Ireland’s wet climate would have been impractical (Gailey 1984:62-63). Tinted lime washes did not often get used until the twentieth century. However, occasionally the use of a yellow wash was seen while pink and blue were sporadically used on socially advanced structures (Gailey 1984:65).

Roofing materials used in Northern Ireland were also seen in Australian vernacular architecture (see section 4.6.2). Thatch was the roofing of choice throughout Northern Ireland from the early seventeenth century until into the twentieth century. Nor was
its use restricted to the lower, or even middle socio-economic levels of society (Gailey 1984:94). A variety of coverings were used including wheat straw (which was the preferred choice), rye straw, barley straw, reeds, rushes, coastal grasses, flax, mountain grasses and heather (although its use was rare).

Other common roofing consisted of shingles, which were generally made of oak, this was an imported tradition and was not often seen outside towns. Tiles, like shingles, were an imported technique, of which there are only a few examples. Slate was the most frequent type of roofing after thatch. By the middle of the second half of the nineteenth century, slate had been widely adopted across Northern Ireland (Gailey 1984:107).

Flooring in Northern Ireland was generally clay or mud in the first half of the nineteenth century. The areas predominantly susceptible to wear, such as the doorsteps or the hearth, were paved or cobbled (Gailey 1984:125).

4.5 English Architecture

Similar construction techniques and materials to Northern Ireland were seen in England. This is not unexpected as there probably was some English influence on the Irish architecture due to the historical occupation of Northern Ireland by the English. Vernacular architecture in England had two types of structural systems: mass construction and frame construction (Brunskill 1987:34). In frame construction the house frame carried the weight of the roof and floors, with timber being used for this type of frame. Mass construction used the walls to carry the weight of the roof and floors to the foundation. Stone, flint, cobbles, brick and earth were seen in this type of structure. Both these types of construction were used over the whole of England.

4.5.1 Walling materials

Walling materials commonly in use in England consisted of sods and turf, clay and straw, bricks, stone and timber frames. When building a house from clay and straw, the clay (with chalk and pebble inclusions) was moistened and mixed with chopped straw. This mix was then kneaded into a glue-like texture and turned into walls, either slowly, a bit at a time for a thick wall, or an entire thin wall raised at the same time
(Brunskill 1987:50). Bricks came into use in vernacular buildings during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By the later half of the nineteenth century bricks were the universal building material in England (Brunskill 1987:46). Stone use was common, both random rubble (irregular masonry) and ashlar wall construction was and still is seen in England. At the base of the wall the heaviest stones were used, with the main wall was constructed of undressed fieldstones, quarry faced stones or straight cut stones from the ground near the building. The walls were usually less than 2ft (61cm) thick (Brunskill 1987:37). Timber framed walling, commonly known as wattle and daub was generally used as the infill between the timber frames (Brunskill 1987:52, 58).

### 4.5.2 Roofing materials

Thatch was the general roofing material in England, with the main thatch materials used being reeds, straw and heather. As it was a light roofing material it could be used with the poorer quality walling materials. It was replaced in England by slate, tiles and corrugated asbestos (Brunskill 1987:84). Slate was used increasingly in the eighteenth century, by the nineteenth century widespread rail transport meant that Welsh slate was used in all areas of England (Brunskill 1987:86). Stone flags, stone tiles, clay tiles and pantiles were also seen. Tiles were usually favoured in towns. Originally imported from Holland, the pantile was manufactured locally from the eighteenth century and spread over the whole eastern counties north of London, up to the Scottish border (Brunskill 1987:92). Stone flags were thick, heavy roofing slabs (Brunskill 1987:88).

### 4.6 Australian Vernacular Architecture

When Australian architecture was first developed, the dominance of British styles and layouts was taken for granted. The settlers used local materials in British ways and gave them British names (Moore, Burke and Joyce 1989:20). The first foreign influences came through Britain. For example, Marseilles tiles came from France via Britain, and then to Australia (Irving 1985:11). The verandah was an adaptation imported from British India (Lorrimar 2002:4). It was in use by the British there, and its presence was so desirable on houses in Australia because of the climate, that it was being mentioned in real estate advertisements prior to 1850 (Evans 1983:8). The
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verandah “became common in Australian colonial houses, early in Australia’s history. It was, and remains [still] a popularly brandished symbol of Australian vernacular architecture. … Though it does reveal somewhat of the nature of appropriation and requisition of Australian architecture” (Lorrimar 2002:4).

Following technical innovations and adaptations that arose from necessity, or as a spontaneous response to the settlers’ experience in their new country (Pikusa 1986:1), an architectural tradition was created in Australia to suit the people living here. It is known as Australian vernacular architecture and is comprised of elements from most of the groups who settled here (Lorrimar 2001:4).

Australian identity was also reflected in the architecture of the later nineteenth century. “Political forces directed at federating the colonies in the 1880s influenced the discussion of style towards becoming a national one” (Lorrimar 2002:3). The most obvious architectural manifestations of this were the patriotic symbols (kangaroos, emus, kookaburras, wattle flowers and Aboriginals) re-created in the Victorian iron lace that decorated houses in the late nineteenth century (Evans 1983:61). It is difficult to define in exact terms the elements that make up Australian vernacular architecture. Many different architectural styles and methods of construction fall under this heading, and they vary from state to state depending on the available materials and the climate (Evans 1983:10). The vernacular architecture of South Australia is vastly different in detail (general floor plans are pretty similar) to that of Queensland, where the climate and other factors necessitated the building of most houses on pylons and with enclosed verandas around the house (Moore, Burke and Joyce 1989:60). Below is a general definition of styles of vernacular architecture common to South Australia. Not all types of architecture seen in that state have been included however, as they were not common in the area under study. It was not felt necessary to delve into dug outs (Birt 1999:37) or dwellings built into trees (Ioannou 2000:74) both of which were used by settlers for shelter in the early colonial times in the rural areas of South Australia.

The basic cottage seen in both cities and rural areas of South Australia is based on the small country cottage from Britain, as seen in the Scottish highlands and the west coast of Wales (Pikusa 1986:19). The walls were built of local stone with a saddle
back roof and fireplaces set in the gable end walls. In particular, the plan from the west coast of Wales bears a close resemblance to the early Adelaide cottage plan. It was used as a ‘starter’ kit, or a nucleus that could be extended later into something bigger. This cottage diagram still appeared in the city and suburbs during the late nineteenth century, and in rural areas well into the twentieth century (Pikusa 1986:22). The following features characterise this plan (Pikusa 1986:19-20): two small windows set in the protected side facing south flanked the entrance. The front measured around 9.5m long. Two small rooms were generally divided by a timber or wattle and daub partition. The house had two similar sized open fireplaces set into the two end walls to provide heat while the chimneys for these fireplaces were placed in a central position at the head of the gable walls. There were variations on this basic plan, with three or four rooms being common, as well as the addition of more doors or windows.

An interesting tradition in South Australian vernacular architecture was the building of a ‘backender’ (Archer 1987:129). A backender was a skillion roofed stone house (with one or two rooms). This house was designed to become the rear of a larger dwelling when the settlers began making some money. This slightly odd looking house remained as it was if the settlers never became successful (Archer 1987:129). The general propensity for creating houses in South Australia in the British style is a comment about the general population of the settlement of this state in the mid nineteenth century, approximately 90% British (Vamplew 1987:11).

4.6.1 Construction
The materials used in the construction of homes varied widely in Australia. People relied on their own initiative and mostly used the materials that were free and available to them, such as stone, earth, grass, clay, branches, saplings, bark and timber. The tradition of using ‘found’ local materials continued throughout the nineteenth century in Australia (Evans 1983:9). Evans (1983:26) outlines other types of construction such as sod walls, which were seen in South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria. A Pisé wall was a technique where mud was rammed into position in timber frames, which were progressively moved and raised as the walls dried. Cob walls used damp pliable lumps of mud to form into walls about 2ft (61cm) thick. Wattle and daub (used in Britain for over 1800 years) was a technique using wickerwork
frames of supple sticks woven between posts were set into the ground at intervals of around 3ft (92.5cm). This frame was then daubed with mud, which had lime, dung, straw or animal hair added and plastered to a smooth surface. Adobe walls used sun dried brick. This technique was seen in Britain, but it could have been brought from the United States by miners coming to Australia for the gold rushes. The method was used after 1850 and very common in the Bendigo (Victoria) area. Half-timbered walls were formed by nailing or tying longer saplings to both sides of a buildings’ corner posts. The gap between the two horizontal rows of saplings was filled with mud and stones. This method was used widely in Australia in colonial times. Slab houses were comprised of slabs of wood, formed by splitting timbers and trimming the edges to create planks around 50mm thick. These planks could be used vertically or horizontally. Gaps between the slabs were filled with mud, timber battens, plastered or papered over on the inside. This was the most typical dwelling in the nineteenth century Australian bush (Evans 1983:28). Random rubble used individual pieces of stone, gathered from fields or nearby building sites to build ‘random rubble’ homes. With a minimum of shaping, the stones were roughly assembled with irregular mortar joints (Irving 1985:193). “Preferred for its performance, stone was used mostly in its simpler forms for cottages, usually as coursed or random rubble laid in weak lime mortar” (Moore, Burke and Joyce 1989:33). This method of building was widely used across scattered areas of Australia in the nineteenth century (Evans 1983:35). Stone was very common in certain areas of Australia, including country South Australia (Moore, Burke and Joyce 1989:33). Local stone was shaped and turned into coursed or semi-coursed structural walls. Ashlar stonewalls was the best and most expensive method. They were created by accurately squared and dressed blocks, closely fitted with thin mortar joints (Irving 1985:193).

4.6.2 Roofing

The types of roofing seen in Australian vernacular construction are all common across Australia. Evans (1983:36) groups roofing materials into two types: materials that could be found on or near the building site and made from natural materials, and those created by a technological process and transported to the site. The first group consists of thatch, bark and shingles (Evans 1983:36-40). Thatch was very common in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia and widely used in rural areas of Australia. Thatching materials consisted of reeds, grasses, rye straw,
wheat straw, barley straw, oat straw and the grass tree (colloquially known as the blackboy). Bark was used and typically tied in place with hide thongs and weighed down with branches. Bark could not be nailed due to shrinkage. Shingles were cut from bush timber.

The second group consists of slate tiles, terracotta roofing tiles and galvanised iron roofing. Slate tiles were available in eight sizes. They were generally expensive as they had to be imported from Britain, the United States, New South Wales or South Australia. Terracotta roofing tiles (Marseilles tiles) were first imported from France in 1892 but not widely seen outside the main cities (Evans 1983:40). Galvanised iron roofing was initially used in Australia in the early 1850s (it was imported from Britain) (Evans 1983:37). This became the most popular roofing material used in Australia.

4.6.3 Decoration
Like today, the fashions of the time, the availability of materials, the taste of the owner and their economic situation were the main influences on the decoration of houses in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Australia (Evans 1983:86).

On the outside of the house, contrast was the aim. Shutters, windows and doors in a darker tone offset light coloured walls. In mid Victorian times (1860-1880) the outside walls were often rendered and were marked out with lines to simulate stone (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:33). This was probably an emulative effect, meant to make their houses look more upper class, as if they had ashlar stonework. A galvanised iron verandah was often part of the decoration, frequently being painted in red and green or red and white stripes (Evans 1983:86). Inside the house, the decoration of individual rooms (before the 1920s) usually made a statement about the purpose of the room. The entrance hall was decorated in a formal manner; light tones were used in the drawing room, whilst the dining room was decorated in darker tones (Evans 1983:95). Traditional colours were preferred for decoration (which varied in shade as painters mixed their own paint). Indian red, Brunswick green, Chrome yellow, Vandyke brown and Prussian blue were all popular in the Victorian era. Inside and outside walls could also be lime-washed (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:33).
The dominant fashion from 1870-1920 was to divide the interior walls of a house into three zones, each decorated in a different style (Evans 1983:86). These zones consisted of the dado, a broad band of colour occupying the lower third of the wall. The dado was the foundation for the decoration in that room. The main wall: the filling. This section of the decoration was above the dado, and was the principal decorative theme of the room. Finally came the complementary frieze, which was located under the cornice.

The practice of stencilling walls and ceilings was extremely common in Australia, especially from the second half of the nineteenth century until the 1930s (Evans 1983:91). “A stencil is a design cut in firm paper, cardboard or tinfoil, and the colour is stamped through the openings in the manner of printing” (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14). It was possible to buy prepared stencils, or to create an individual design that could be used in every room of the house (Evans 1983:91). Stencils could be found in almost every room of the house, even the kitchen and bathroom, however the most decorative stencils were saved for areas that visitors would see, such as the entrance hall, drawing and dining room (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14). The range of stencil designs was so large that it was rare to see a stencil pattern repeated from one building to the next (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14) (Figure 4.1). It was also common for stencils to be repainted over time in different patterns or colours as fashions changed (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14).
On the outside the home, a popular trend in late Victorian times was the use of cast iron for decoration. Cast iron pillars, lamps and lace edging for the roof and verandah of the house were commonly seen in the cities and the great country homes. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, as popular feeling towards the Federation of Australian colonies grew, the patriotic sentiment making its way through the population was manifested in this decorative medium (Evans 1983:61).

4.6.4 Miscellaneous

A few vernacular traits do not fit into the above headings; for example, many nineteenth century houses in rural or isolated areas had their own cellars, either under their house, next to it, or built into a hill close by (Evans 1983:19). Up until the 1850s kitchens were often partly or fully detached from the main house as a precaution against fire (Evans 1983:24). Until the late nineteenth century, mortar was a traditional mix of sand, lime and water (Evans 1983:34). Stucco used from the 1830s until the 1890s was made from Roman cement, sand and slacked lime or Portland cement. Before the stucco dried, pattern lines were drawn into it to simulate the
appearance of brick coursework in stonewall construction (Evans 1983:33). Simple homes often only had floors of beaten or puddled earth or clay (Evans 1983:41).

4.6.5 English, Irish and South Australian vernacular architecture

As stated, Australian vernacular architecture was, and is, largely comprised of traditions that were brought here from Great Britain. Traditions that were incorporated into South Australian architecture from Ireland and England by immigrants were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish Architectural Traits</th>
<th>English Architectural Traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One room deep between front &amp; back walls.</td>
<td>End walls unlikely cut by doors/windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End walls unlikely to be cut by</td>
<td>Mass frame construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doors/windows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattle &amp; daub construction.</td>
<td>Wattle &amp; daub wall construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random rubble construction.</td>
<td>Random rubble wall construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course rubble construction.</td>
<td>Ashlar stone wall construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime mortar in wall construction.</td>
<td>Brick wall construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastering internal and external walls.</td>
<td>Sod wall construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatch &amp; slate roofing.</td>
<td>Thatch and slate roofing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay or mud flooring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Irish and English vernacular architectural traits used in colonial South Australian house construction.

It can be seen from this table that most of the English and Irish vernacular architectural traits were generally quite similar. But what of German and Polish vernacular architectural traits? Are they similar to those we have already examined?

4.7 Prussians/Germans

The Germans in South Australia “worked very hard, considered that they had a duty (from God) to care for their land, strove to maintain traditions brought with them from Germany and believed that the Church was a vital part of their lives” (Martin 1998:32).

The Germans planned their towns in various patterns, the most popular being the hufendorf and the strassendorf (street town). A strassendorf was a dense settlement with the farmhouses placed close together on both sides of a road (Young, Harmstorf,
Brasse and Marsden 1981:32). The *hufendorf* was a settlement laid out in long narrow equal strips of land parallel to the road and river behind. The farmhouse was located in the front section, facing the road, generally with a flower and vegetable garden in the front, while in the back, pig sties, chicken coops, barns and an orchard were common (Figure 4.2). Further on towards the stream the farmer planted crops of seasonal grains, while beyond that, next to the stream, the cattle were pastured (Young, Aeuckens, Green and Nikias 1983:84).

Figure 4.2. Reconstruction of a *hufendorf* settlement (Young 1978:21).

Germans used both the *hufendorf* and *strassendorf* plans in South Australia to structure their settlements, with Lobethal and Hahndorf being the most well known *hufendorf* towns, Hahndorf was later converted into a *strassendorf* (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:84). While the land the Germans settled on in Klemzig, Hahndorf and Lobethal had been previously surveyed and was purchased from English businessmen, both these businessmen, William Dutton and George Fife Angus, had bought large enough sections of land so as to be able to provide enough space for a town to be established. The German settlers of Klemzig rented 268 acres, while the settlers of Hahndorf rented 240 acres (Schubert 1985:113,114). Thus, while the Germans did rent and eventually buy previously surveyed land, they were able to purchase the entire area for their township in one go and thus divide up their land along the lines of their traditional towns back in Europe.
4.7.1 Prussian Architecture

Along with their village designs, the Germans also brought to South Australia their traditional house and barn architecture styles. The house designs used in the German settlements in this state were distinctly German for at least 30 years after their arrival (1839) (Harmstorf 1994:30). Traditional examples of German house designs were constructed and in some cases can still be seen at Hahndorf, Pachetown, Lobethal, Klemzig and in the Barossa Valley.

There were six designs of houses from nineteenth century Prussia, designed to suit every climate and family. The most common design used in South Australia was the latter franconian house, a one or two roomed building, with an extensive attic, which incorporated a complex arrangement of cooking hearths and ovens all linked together into a centrally located chimney. This type of house became known in the colloquial as the through-passage-kitchen house (*flurküchenhaus*) (Figure 4.3).

![Comparative plans of German farmhouses in South Australia](image)

The kitchen could be a separate room at the end of the passage or part of the passage itself (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:33). The more elaborate of these houses had black kitchens (*schwarze Küche*) installed (Figure 4.4). These were built entirely of brick, following the rules laid out in the fire ordinances of nineteenth century Prussia (Harmstorf 1994:19). There are no true black kitchens seen in
Hahndorf. However, there are, or were, a number of them seen from in the German settlements in the Barossa Valley (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:154). Ioannou (2000:138) has detailed how the base of the black kitchen contained the food preparation area, while above it opened up into a large brick chimney, where there was space for meats (usually pork) to be hung off the ceiling rafters and smoked. The rafters were reached by a small trapdoor from the loft above the ceiling under the 45º-angled roof (2000:76). Sometimes, the smokehouse was built as a separate building, away from the main structure, from brick or wattle and daub (Ioannou 2000:138).

The smoking process used various types of fuel, including almond husks, chips of native red gum, cypress pine or peppermint and onion skins (each type of fuel gave a different smoky flavour to the meat). The Germans built a slow burning fire using damp chips placed on top of hot coals. The fire burnt from morning till night, or longer, until the meat was coloured golden brown (Ioannou 2000:138).

Apart from the overall design of the houses, there are three obvious German features that can be seen in most of the historical German homes in South Australia, however, not all of these features can be seen in every house, as some dwellings contain only one or two. The first of these is the black kitchen. The second is the extensive baking
oven, often incorporated into the farmhouse design, or as a separate building in a farmhouse complex, such as at the Bretag complex at Monarto (Owen and Steele 2001). The third feature, and the most obvious from the outside of the house, was the 45º gable of the roof, which enclosed an attic door, reached by an inside or outside ladder (Figure 4.5). The attic ran the length of the house and was used for storage and/or sleeping. This tradition stems from when the house was shared with the animals, which were penned on the ground floor in the cold European climate (Harmstorf 1994:30).

Figure 4.5. The Schubert House, Springhead, showing 45º angle of roof (Faull and Young 1986:50).

It was not only the design of the houses that was markedly different. The construction techniques used were also different. Initially, German dwellings were simple timber one-roomed homes with the end section partitioned for the parents. A large fireplace or cooking hearth was located at the other end of the house, often with a back up smoking/baking oven on the outside (Young, Aeuckens, Green and Nikias 1983:85). Later on, many German houses and barns or sheds were constructed in the traditional fachwerk (half-timbered) style. In Hahndorf and Pachetown examples of this type of structure can still be seen. The manufacture of a fachwerk house was basically the creation of a timber skeleton, with both horizontal and diagonal timbers. The spaces between the timbers were filled with wattle and daub filling or later by bricks (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:159). The structure was whitewashed inside and out for weatherproofing (Figure 4.6). These fachwerk houses were more than just attractive. The clay soils of the Adelaide region are known for their instability that results in considerable building damage (Archaer 1987:53). In 1892 E. H. Hallack noted that German:
houses and their construction commend themselves as useful object lessons to builders on clayey or Biscay cracking soils. One of the oldest was built in 1840 on the Swiss or Chalet lines of architecture, as are also many others here and in Friedrichstadt. Thatch for roofing, with brick walls intersected with gum-framing v-shaped, horizontal and other shaped walled lacings, they score anything but cracks, the wooden lacements of bracings preventing the possibility of such. These ‘German ideas’ of building are well worthy of imitation and adoption in many other localities (in Archer 1987:53).

In the Barossa Valley, this style was also used. However, due to the lack of suitable timber, more houses were constructed out of stone, and later on with bricks. Stone houses consisted of walls built by undressed stones laid out at random, with a mortar of mud or a mixture of mud and lime. Solid brick houses had internal walls usually of single brick, with the external walls double bricked (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:157-158). Roof construction in both the Adelaide Hills and the Barossa Valley German settlements was initially made of the traditional thatch. However, later on, once galvanised iron became popular, it replaced thatch (Harmstorf 1994:19).
4.8 The Polish

Unlike German settlements, in Poland, the population were mainly dependant on shifting cultivation and generally had temporary settlements. However, the Rundling settlement pattern (Figure 4.7) has been credited to the Polish (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:31-32). This type of community has no more than 12 farms, tightly arranged around an irregular open space, with only one access road that could be closed off for herding or defence.

![Figure 4.7. Polish Rundling settlement plan (Young 1978:19).](image)

4.8.1 Polish architecture of the Wielkopolska region

The Polish at Hill River emigrated from the Wielkopolska region in the province of Poznań, located in the central lowland region in Poland/Prussia. Tłoczek (1958:13) notes that this region does not have a uniform tradition of architecture because of the difference in economic development of the differing ethnic groups of this area. Furthermore, the Prussian economic overhaul of this area in the nineteenth century meant that most traditional structures were demolished. This means there is little evidence of original vernacular architecture. However, this region has several common factors that can still be seen in its architecture (Tłoczek 1958:13)

- Only one room located between the front and back walls is typical (single cell plan).
- In double celled room plans (two rooms located side by side, between the front and back walls), the rooms were arranged around a central fireplace (Figure 4.8).
A hallway is located in the middle of both single and double planned houses (Tłoczek 1958:18).

The oven was located at the base of the chimney, accessed from the kitchen or hallway.

Timber walled construction was replaced by clay and brick, causing a departure from the traditional log (slab) wall construction seen in the rest of Poland (Tłoczek 1958:18).

The chimney is located under the roof ridge in the hallway. This meant the development of an additional room, which was turned into a white room (a room commonly used for visitors or a bedroom, as opposed to a black room used for cooking and daily activities) (Translators notes; Florek 2002:1).

Houses usually had a two surface roof (a gable roof), thatched, with an additional gable panelled with wood. The angle and slope depended on the volume of rain and snow for the area (Tłoczek 1958:19).

In older buildings a four-surfaced roof (a hip roof) can be seen.

The lower ends of roof rafters rest directly on the beams of the ceiling.
Evidence surviving from nineteenth and early twentieth century cottages suggests that the typical cottage in this region also had an arcade (a verandah like structure) along the gable side, facing the road (Figure 4.9).

Clay walls were painted white with gypsum. Furthermore in areas where walls are painted, there is a tendency to use them for decorative effects by using a large selection of colours and motifs (Tłoczek 1958:19).

In some areas, peasant homes were adorned at the windows and doors with geometric or plant patterns carved or burnt into the wood (Soltynski ND:11) (Figure 4.10).

In several locations around Poland outside walls could be whitewashed or tinted pale pink or yellow (Gorzuchowski 1937:109).
4.8.2 Polish and German comparison

As Poland and Germany are geographically located next to each other and history has dictated that there was quite a large amount of interaction between the two countries, it would be expected that they would share very similar vernacular architectural traits. Table 4.2 highlights the similar and different characteristics between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Vernacular Architectural Features</th>
<th>Polish Vernacular Architectural Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through-passage-kitchen house (<em>flurkitchenhaus</em>) generally featuring a central fireplace.</td>
<td>Rooms arranged around a central fireplace in double roomed houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Kitchens (<em>schwarze kiche</em>) incorporating an interior or exterior smoke house into the chimney. An interior or exterior baking oven.</td>
<td>Oven located at base of chimney, which is accessed from the kitchen or hallway. One room located between front and back walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitewashed interior and exterior house walls.</td>
<td>Whitewashed interior and exterior house walls. Decorative colour finishes and colourful motifs. Carved or burnt decorative wood patterns around doors and windows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Comparison of German and Polish traditional vernacular architectural features.
4.8.3 What is distinctly Polish in origin?

As we see from the above table this is difficult to ascertain. Both the Polish and the Germans in South Australia arrived from the same area in Poland/Prussia, and in some cases even the same districts. Therefore, one expectation might be that both groups would be building in the same general style or tradition of housing, using the architectural trends predominant in these regions, with minor variations based on area and personal preference. The area of Poland that the Polish Hill River settlers immigrated from had been colonised by Prussians in the 1760s; and had been ‘Prussian’ for at least 70 years, thus the Polish people would have been surrounded by, and in all probability used a number of Prussian building techniques. There are, however, some indications of different methods of construction between the Prussians and the Polish, with Polish characteristics being:

- Clay and brick wall construction.
- An arcade (a verandah like structure) on the gable side.
- Geometric or plant patterns carved or burnt into the wood windows and doors.

While this is not a great deal of evidence, it does indicate that there is some deviation from traditional Prussian techniques seen in the Wielkopolska region of Poland that could have been translated into the architecture of the Polish in South Australia.

4.8.4 Discussion

Architecture can be one of the most lasting remains of past occupation at any archaeological site. A series of crumbling walls and collapsed roofing are often the only artefacts left that can be examined in any real depth. Possibly it is the only material culture left that was created by the people under study. However, it is generally not the only physical remembrance, it is just the easiest to see, other forms of material culture also can be discovered. What they can tell us about the people who used them is usually more open to speculation, but they need to be examined in depth for any complete conclusions to be drawn about a site.

4.9 Other Forms of Material Culture

There are other forms of material culture that can be used to establish the ethnicity of a specific group of people such as grave markers, ceramic and glass.
4.9.1 Graves

Graves, or more specifically, grave markers, are a very important aspect of material culture. Whilst graves are built exclusively for the dead, the markers are built for the living. As a remembrance of those who have gone, a place to visit and grieve, and to provide information about the dead to those who did not know them to make sure they live on, a mortal’s attempt at immortality. Grave markers provide specific information about the person who died: when, sometimes how, and usually other additional information (Martin 1998:3), however they can also lie.

Although the Polish at Hill River arrived from an area in eastern Germany/western Poland, their spiritual beliefs differed from those of the Germans they lived among. The Germans were Lutherans, the Polish were Catholics. From this it would be expected that there would be some difference in graves styles from the Germans.

Polish grave markers can be both elaborate and simple, with plain iron crosses at one end of the spectrum, to detailed stone tombs at the other (News from Poland: http://www.polishworld.com/polemb/news/1198/warsaw.htm: 16 Feb, 2003) (cf. Krajewska 1983; Ochino 1989). In some cases grave markers from overseas Polish settlements from the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, up to the present have had their inscriptions engraved in Polish. (Interment.net: http://www.interment.net/data/us/wa/kittitas/polish/polish.htm: 12 Feb, 2003). Polish symbols, such as the white eagle, have been used as decoration on grave markers in the nineteenth century in Polish cemeteries (Traces of the Polish Resistance in the Cemetery: http://www.zchor.org/tomaszow/treis.htm: 12 Feb, 2003).

German grave monuments followed general European traditions of style, although Harmstorf (1985:76) has noted that slab markers or tombs are less common than in English graveyards. It has also been observed that the Germans had a strong attachment to symbols of hope and piety and a liking for statues in the form of an archangel or cherubs (Harmstorf and Cigler 1985:77). The inscriptions were significant. They were used to recollect the image of Germany and to invoke scenes of the dead person’s home. They were also used to emphasise the faith of the Lutherans, with bible verses used freely (Harmstorf and Cigler 1985:77). Early
German tombstones in the Barossa Valley, South Australia are engraved in German, as are German headstones in the town of Burra, South Australia (Figure 4.11).

![German grave dating from 1886 from the Barossa Valley. Inscription in German. Photo in Ioannou 2000:71.](image)

**4.9.2 Ceramics and Glass**

Ceramic is a very variable indicator of ethnicity. On the one hand, there is ample evidence for the importing of ceramic by other distinct ethnic groups such as the Chinese, for use in Australia (Jack, Holmes and Kerr 1984). On the other hand, the availability of cheap imported ceramic from Britain was extensive, and could have been used in place of the more expensively imported ceramic from Germany or Poland.

The different patterns and makers marks seen on ceramics enable archaeologists to be able to date, and in some cases determine where a piece of ceramic was manufactured, and by whom. All the stylistic analysis of patterns and makers marks in this thesis were done using Goddens’ *Encyclopaedia of British Pottery and Porcelain Marks*, as well as some additional information on specific patterns from other sources.

Glass is not a good indicator of ethnicity, as glass bottles were reused over and over and could be swapped or traded with the contents from settlement to settlement.
Furthermore, the types of glass known to come from Eastern Europe, such as Bohemia Crystal, were quite expensive and generally out of reach of the ordinary person.

Glass containers were also inexpensive and easy to obtain in South Australia. In fact the town of Clare, only 7km north of Polish Hill River had no less than three breweries operating, selling liquids in both glass and ceramic bottles, from 1850-1865, and at least one from 1865-1917. In addition there was a ginger beer brewer from 1869-1872, and three aerated water companies operating at various times from 1891-1936 (Shueard and Tuckwell 1993:223-230). There would be no reason to import glass or ceramic containers for any other reason than for its contents, such as something that was perhaps used to celebrate a special occasion or a medicine. However the trade network between Australia and Poland was not as well established as the one between Australia and China. It was much more difficult to import something from Poland, unless you had a relative or a friend immigrating to Australia. This was something that did occur, and no doubt many things were requested and brought over for people living here. But would glass be one of them? Possibly if it were a high status symbol or of special value to the family. However, in all probability, all glass purchased would have been made in Australia or possibly Britain.

Like ceramics, glass bottles can be identified by the type and colour of glass used in the vessel, as well as the makers mark that was sometimes stamped in the base of the bottle. All the information used to identify the bottles based on colours and makers marks came from Boows’ *Early Australian Commercial Glass; manufacturing process* and Shueard and Tuckwells’ *Brewers and Aerated Water Manufacturers in South Australia 1836-1936.*

4.10 Discussion

The architectural styles of both the Polish and Germans are generally distinctively different from that of the Irish and English in the nineteenth century, as are their settlement landscapes. Consequently, identifying the differences between Polish and British architecture should not be overly difficult. However, this is not the case when
trying to identify differences in architectural styles seen in Prussia and Poland. Both appear to be similar in style and creation. Thus, there is the potential problem of not being able to distinguish a major category of Polish material culture from German material culture.

The movable material culture such as gravestones, ceramics and glass can be of some help in answering the research question, but also have problems associated with using them as correlates of ethnicity. The methods used in this thesis have been chosen in order to address this problem.
Chapter Five: Methods

5.1 Introduction

The methods used in obtaining the data for this thesis were essential to answer the questions set forward by the author: can a minority European culture living in Anglo-Saxon colonial Australia be distinguished from other cultures by their material remains? What types of material remains can be used to determine Polish ethnicity? What trait can we use to say that this piece of ceramic was created and used by the Polish?

The answer lies in several areas. The first of these is the use of local materials to construct items that are traditionally Polish in design and custom. At Hill River the main source of material culture left behind are the houses the Polish once lived in. Written sources indicate that the Polish maintained their traditional style of housing:

…the few [houses] that survive appear tiny, but to the peasant Poles from crowded Europe where the intense cold of winter encouraged small homes because the smaller the rooms, the easier they were to keep warm, the new arrivals built as they did in Poland (Simons 1944:22).

The Polish mostly built their farm buildings using stone. However, others used both stone and wood, with most houses initially having thatched roofs (Szczepanowski 1974:23). How this style of housing might differ from other housing in the region has yet to be determined.

The second way of maintaining Polish ethnicity and culture was for the colonists at Hill River to bring with them, or import, traditional products from Poland. As a consequence of this, if the glass and ceramic containers being found during fieldwork at Hill River are primarily Polish in origin, it can be assumed with a degree of certainty that the Polish were maintaining a certain level of contact with their former homes. Of course, people arriving in a new country will buy local items to replenish what could not be brought over with them, however in cases where there are strong cultural ties to their country of origin, some items such as food stuffs were imported. This same analytical approach has been put to use at Chinese and German sites.
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elsewhere in Australia (see Jack, Holmes and Kerr 1984; Ritchie 1986; Ioannou 1987; Piper 1988). Furthermore, the amount of British ceramic and glass at Polish Hill River can also tell archaeologists the degree to which these people were mixing with, and utilising the material culture of people not of their own ethnic group, and thus in a sense, assimilating themselves into the ‘mainstream’ British culture of Australia. Naturally, discovering a specific ethnicity from material culture is never as clear-cut as stated above, there are always other factors that need to be taken into account. For a more detailed discussion on the issues surrounding the correlation between ethnicity and material culture see Chapter Two.

This last point highlights why this research is so important, we don’t know the answer to too many questions regarding the Polish in Australia. Thus, this research was needed because of the lack of previous archaeological research into the study of the Polish in Australia, to add to the body of knowledge of Australian historical archaeology and to promote future multicultural research. So information can be given back to the general (not necessarily Polish) local community.

The use of documentary sources and archaeological recording techniques in tandem is an integral facet of historical archaeology. Separately, these records do not add up to the whole picture: they provide only one view, yet together they can give the ordinary person a glimpse of what people of the past might have been thinking, and how the material culture in their lives reflected the evolution of their beliefs and traditions.

5.2 Historical Records

Despite the fact that the Polish were a minority culture living in South Australia, a number of historical records exist which complement the material record left by them. The first step in the research process was to visit the Polish Hill River Church Museum to see what historical information was available on the actual settlement (its size, number of houses and number of settlers). The museum contained a great deal of documentary research on the history of Polish Hill River, unfortunately, as most of this information relied on previous research already accessible, very little new knowledge came to light. A number of photos of Polish houses were on display listing the owner’s names and the section numbers of their land. When an attempt was
made to verify this information, it was found that some of these houses were no longer in existence, whilst others had been wrongly identified, or the same house had been photographed from different angles and presented as two different dwellings.

Other secondary sources including academic Theses, books, articles and newsletters have also been published on the subject. A number of primary sources also exist and help to provide a partial picture of the people at Polish Hill River. These additional sources include:

- **Lands Title Records held at the Lands Titles Office in Adelaide, South Australia.** These detail the land history of Polish Hill River from the date it was first surveyed under special licence in 1842 until present.

- **Clare Council Rate and Record Books held at the State Records of South Australia at Netley, provide information on council rates and land ownership from the 1860s until 1917, as well as limited information on structures built on the land.**

- **Almanacs and Directories such as Sands and McDougalls’ South Australian Directory, Boothbys’ Adelaide Almanac and Directory and the National Directory of South Australia, to be found on microfilm at Flinders University Library, all provide information on where the Polish settlers were located in South Australia.**

- **The Northern Argus**, the local district paper for the Clare region in the nineteenth century and today, provides some anecdotes and other information about the Polish who used to reside at Hill River.

- **Wills held by the Probate Office in the Old Supreme Court Building, Adelaide, provide details on the property owned by the Polish, as well as its disposal, and information about the descendants of the deceased.**

- **Photographs and pictures held by various groups and the general public around the state and the country show a glimpse of the community under study.**

- **Oral histories from people who lived at Polish Hill River provide an insight into what life was like and help shed light on the material remains seen today.**

- **School records of the Polish Hill River School are available for a limited period (1882-1885), and show which families were living in the district at that time.**

- **Letters written by members of the Polish Hill River community. While this would have been an excellent source of information, none of these were located during the study as none of the descendants seemed to have any in their keeping.**
5.2.1 Assessment of Sources

Each of these primary sources has problems associated with their use that are inherent to the type of document they are. However once these problems are identified, the records can still be of immense help.

The biggest problems associated with these records are the details left out of them. Both the Land Titles Records and the Clare Council Rate Books do not list structures built on this land as a matter of course, information is random. Furthermore, the information on land owners and sections of land contained in these records is at odds with each other (discussed further in Chapter 7.3). Almanacs and Directories do not list everyone who is living at a settlement, only those who ask to be listed, thus they do not give a complete account of the population of the settlement.

Newspapers are selective about what they report, and who they report about, and often ordinary every day people are not mentioned in them apart from Birth and Death notices, and sometimes not even then. Wills are probably the most complete type of primary record, every person and item listed in them did once exist. However not everyone makes wills, and unless they were registered at the probate office copies do not often survive from people who died long ago. Photographs can also be somewhat misleading as they are often staged, and often do not reflect the way people really were. Informal photographs are not common from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (see Lydon 2002).

Oral histories are can reveal a great deal of what it was like to live in the time period being studied or about people that has not been recorded in texts. However, people can censure what they chose to reveal about people they might have known. Some memories might be deemed to personal to talk about, while others might simply be forgotten. School records are a very specific source of information on area and the people who lived there. However, these records do only deal with matters relating to the children. Little is often mentioned about the wider community. Letters can be the most personal source of information about a person or family, telling everything that has occurred, and the writers deepest feelings about their lives. However, letters can also be used as a smoke screen, hiding the bad events with cheerful lies to keep the family or friends back home from finding out the truth. Letters can also be
impersonal, and not reveal any specific aspects of life that the reader does not want told.

Secondary sources such as books and theses also have problems inherent with their use, the most prominent being that they are based on primary sources. All the problems found in primary sources can make their way into the secondary sources if the authors do not take care to compensate for them. Furthermore, secondary sources can have the added complication of repeating the same information over and over. This is an especially important consideration if the information contained in the original secondary source is wrong in the first place. Then the wrong information just gets recycled over and over again.

5.3 Recording Sample

In answering the question under study, the author had to make some decisions regarding the recording sample. Although the largest concentration of Polish people living in the mid north region of South Australia was at Hill River, there were other pockets of Polish living around the lower-mid north area, from Sevenhill, only three kilometres away, to Penwortham, a further four kilometres south from Sevenhill and as far north as Blyth and Jamestown, over 100 km away. It was necessary to limit the size of the area under study for several reasons. The first was the obvious ‘island’ of traditions, seen from Polish Hill River. The constrained geographic location of the settlement meant that nowhere else were the Polish traditions seen to such an extent as to exclude other cultures (Paszkowski 1987:20). It was felt that if any area were going to provide answers to questions about the correlation between Polish ethnicity and material culture, it would be this region.

The time and research constraints of a Masters degree meant that artefacts spread over such a large area could not be properly analysed and each individual Polish structural remain could not be surveyed. Furthermore, there were more primary documentary sources available for the settlement of Polish Hill River, with both the Lands Titles Records and the Clare Council Records still in existence for this area. Moreover, some independent research was also carried out on this site, making it much easier for the documents to complement the material record. The (local)
Mintaro Historical Society was very much interested in the outcome of this study and was able to offer invaluable support and information, while oral evidence from landowners in the area indicated that there was an excellent chance of locating a fairly large material sample in the Polish Hill River area, and that access would not be complicated.

Of the remains found, it was decided not to survey any Polish residence that was still in use for the reason that access to these places was somewhat difficult to arrange. Furthermore, the author did not want to inconvenience or unsettle any person, by asking to be invited into their private space to map their home. It was also felt that the sample size would potentially become too unwieldy if these structures were included, as there was a large enough sample without including these specific dwellings.

The houses that were still in occupation had also undergone a great deal of renovation and structural alteration, and thus determining the original structure would have been an added challenge. This is not to say that archaeologists do not get perfectly valid data from houses that are still in current occupation, and that have been substantially altered. However, it was felt that this added dimension of information would have taken time away from the essential analysis of the many un-occupied structures still standing.

5.4 Field Methods
A number of field techniques were necessary to achieve the authors’ aims, which were to:
- Identify and assess the state of the surviving farmhouse structures built by the Polish at Hill River.
- Record in detail the form, style, features and building materials of all surviving farmhouses.
- Excavate the remains of a farmhouse identified from historical documents as Polish, to attempt to ascertain whether Polish cultural identity could be established from material remains at that site.
Initially, visual surveys of the settlement (based on historical maps uncovered during the documentary search; see Chapter Six) were carried out to determine which, if any, of the buildings have survived into the present day. When structures were found, it was necessary to do a search of the land records to ascertain if these structures were indeed located on what was once Polish land. It was also hoped to locate the provenance of these structures, although it was not generally necessary to submit plans for approval to build houses or other structures in rural nineteenth century Australia. No conclusive provenances for the buildings were located, thus, the only source of information on the histories of the houses were oral histories from locals of the area. These, along with general historic records identifying the area the houses were in as being used almost exclusively by the Polish were relied upon to establish the Polish connection with the houses. Many landowners in the district have been there for generations, and thus their recollections are in all probability, pretty accurate.

Structures with Polish connections were surveyed using base-line and offset and an EDM to plot in the outlying features such as trees, out-buildings or posts. These measurements were turned into plans of each structure that made it possible to compare and contrast the similarities or differences between the structures. Furthermore, these buildings can now be compared with plans of Polish cottages from the nineteenth century in the Poznań region of Poland. These houses were also contrasted with general vernacular architectural trends from both Ireland and England, as Australian vernacular architecture is a general mixture of both, with a few inventions added in as a concession to the environmental conditions of South Australia.

Walking surveys around the identified sites were undertaken in an effort to find any material culture that may have been thrown away, lost or left behind. Artefacts discovered were photographed (but left in situ) and compared with the general material culture in use in this area during the settlement’s history.

After the pre-disturbance surveys, a site was chosen for possible excavation. This excavation comprised of nine small trenches both in and around the dwelling in an endeavour to locate a larger sample of Polish material culture. The site chosen for
excavation was a three-roomed structure, known locally as the ‘Wyman House’. This house was selected above six other Polish structures for a number of reasons, the house was located on the land of a farmer sympathetic to historical research and, thus there was no difficulty in obtaining permission to excavate on this land. The house was still relatively intact, except for a missing roof, beams and window-panes (the galvanised iron roof came off in the Ash Wednesday bush fire of 1983, and is subsequently lying next to the house in sheets) (Smith, M 2002. Pers comm. 15 Sept.). The house contained two features that had been noted as being located in most of the Polish structures surveyed in this thesis. These features seem distinctively Polish in origin (see Chapter Seven). The house did not originally contain slate flooring (it was added at a later date) which is common in most of the other remaining Polish structures at Hill River. Thus, there was a greater chance of locating artefacts in sub-floor deposits from inside the house, there were also several visible artefact scatters inside and outside the house. Furthermore, the owner of the land had discovered several handmade stoneware bottles (with German writing on the maker’s mark) in this structure (see Chapter Six). The Polish provenance on this land was of a sufficiently long term to warrant attention (17 years; see Appendix One).

While there were more ‘Polish’ structures mapped during the survey that displayed more characteristics compliant with known Polish vernacular architectural design traditions, and thus were identified more clearly as being built by a Polish person, the Wyman house was chosen because the other structures were in some way unsuitable. For example, the preferred excavation site (because of its traditional Polish architectural design) still had the entire original slate floors intact, and thus it was felt that very little would be found in the way of material culture from inside this house. Furthermore, the owner of this house and land did not want the slate flooring disturbed. Moreover, no discernable rubbish dump could be found for this site where discarded household items would have been disposed of, and thus any excavation of this house would have been too much like searching for the proverbial needle in the haystack.

The excavation was carried out over a period of five days and comprised nine trenches located both inside and outside the house (see Figure 8.1). The square and rectangular trenches were all located in places that were felt to have been in high
usage during the lifetime of the house. Thus, it was probable that most of these areas would have an elevated potential for artefact recovery. Trenches were located:

- Inside the structure. Both the front room (Trench Two) and back rooms (Trench Four) were sampled by their respective fireplaces.
- A section of the back room next to the original rear door (Trench Eight) to the house (architectural analysis indicates the front of the house was built first, and the back added on at an unknown later date) was also excavated.
- In the front garden, which was excavated by the front door (Trench Seven), under the garden step (Trench Nine) and in the corner of the garden enclosure (Trench Six).
- Beside a visible artefact scatter on the northern side of the house (Trench One).
- By the back of the house beside a possible wall (Trench Three).
- At the forge built on the hill (Trench Five), which is believed to be contemporary with the building of the back rooms of the house, was excavated (Smith, M. 2002. Pers comm. 17 Sept.).

In addition several dumps of earth around the house were examined to establish whether they warranted further attention. A well-like structure built approximately 50m from the house and used as a rubbish dump in the early twentieth century was also looked at and discarded as a site due to the amount of fieldwork time it would have required. Material from this feature was sampled however, using a selection processes based on the diagnostic attributes of the artefacts.

The methods of excavation were based on stratigraphic principles, rather than using arbitrary spit levels and the trenches were excavated to down to sterile soil (approximately 40-50cm). All soil material taken from the trenches was sieved using a 5mm sieve.

5.5 Artefacts

There were five primary groups of artefacts undergoing analysis:

- Structural remains
- Grave stones
- Ceramic
- Glass
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- Metal
- Bone

All artefacts recovered during the recording of standing structures and the excavation analysed using comparative style analysis. By this it is meant, for example, that the house structures were compared stylistically to other houses of the same era in the neighbouring local and beyond. Glass and ceramic were identified, analysed and dated using a combination of their colour, pattern, appearance and any special marks or makers marks or stamps that might be seen on the artefact.

Once excavated, all artefacts were catalogued on a database with the following categories of information:

- Identification number. This number was created using both the trench and context number that the artefact was located in, for example if an artefact was located in Trench 1, context 02, it was given the identification number of 102_01.
- The site code. The site code for the Polish Hill River excavation is PHRO2, with PHR standing for Polish Hill River, and 02 referring to the year of excavation 2002.
- Trench number. In addition to the nine trenches (101_00 to 901_00), there were also two other categories, ‘Round Stone Well’, representing the stone well artefact collection, and ‘Outside House’, representing the surface collection from around the house found prior to excavation.
- Context number (#). The context number for each trench was assigned by the contexts location in relation to the other contexts. For example there was the surface/spoil context number 00, the next context under the surface context was 01, then 02, then 03 until the trench was completely excavated. When there was an extension to the trench the area the trench and context number has an ‘e’ after it, for example 101_1e.
- Name of object. This is generally the material of the object, such as cork, glass or earthenware, or if it was possible to identify the type of artefact, such as jar or bottle this was listed in this category.
- Specific identification. This is the specific identification of each artefact. For example if the artefact was identified as a bottle under ‘Name of object’ here it was identified (if possible) as a soft drink bottle.
- Full description. In this category a full description of the artefact was listed.
Distinguishing marks. If there were any distinguishing marks on the artefact they were described here.

Colour description. Descriptions of the colours on the artefact are listed here.

Condition. The categories of artefact condition used in this database are fragile, poor, fair, good and excellent.

Portion complete. The percentages of portion completeness used when describing the artefacts are: 0-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-99% and 100% (complete).

There were five categories of artefact dimension: length, width, thickness, height and other.

Two categories were created for weight: kilograms and grams.

A category was created for the fabric/composition of the artefacts.

Two categories existed for the artefacts original function and subsequent function (if they could be established).

Three categories were created for the manufacturer, date of manufacture and place of manufacture (if known).

There were two categories for associated artefacts and the identification number of the associated artefacts. By associated artefacts it is meant any other artefacts found in the same context that can be identified as coming from the same vessel.

A final artefact category was created for any other information found about the artefact.

The last two database categories were for the database entry information. They are the date the artefact information was entered on the database, and the name of the person who entered it.

5.6 Constraints and Limitations of Data and the Study

In a study of this type, which deals with a specific sub-culture, rather than the dominant culture of the society they lived in, there are a number of limitations, for example the Polish community under study has long since assimilated into mainstream Australian culture, and therefore much information was lost during this transition including both oral histories and primary documents. There was also little original correspondence to people back in Poland from the settlers at Polish Hill River found during the study, which would describe their new life in South Australia, and the different conditions they found here, and the adaptations they had to make.
because of this. Furthermore, the author does not read Polish. This limited the sources able to be utilised, as most sources were in German or Polish, and thus not all relevant studies could be translated and included in this work.

The Polish who came to Australia in the nineteenth century were technically from Prussia, as Poland was an occupied nation at that time. Thus, all these immigrants were listed as Prussian, not Polish in their immigration records. Because of this, it is difficult to pinpoint Polish settlers from the many Prussians who arrived in South Australia in the early nineteenth century. Furthermore, this is the reason that surnames cannot be used to establish ethnicity with any certainty, as some Polish people had German names and some German people had Polish names. For example a Polish family living in Hill River were called Siepelt, also the name of a vineyard in the Barossa Valley, establish by a German family (spelled Seppelt). The different spelling of this surname could be a Polish/German variation, however, it highlights the difficulty faced if using last names to try and pinpoint ethnicity.

Most primary documents that were previously located in Prussia or Poland were destroyed during the World War One and World War Two. While the majority of comparable examples of material culture from Poland that could be directly contrasted with those at Polish Hill River, such as traditional vernacular architecture, were also destroyed during these wars.

Comparative data for architecture from England and Ireland is limited. Moreover, texts written in English on the subject of nineteenth century Polish graveyards and grave markers are extremely difficult to locate. Library and Internet searches of both book suppliers and online library catalogues (Library of Congress) found only two sources, one of which was out of print and thus unattainable.

The historical data available in South Australia was patchy, and in most cases names were wrongly entered or misspelled in public records or records were not kept at all. While, the historical work done by local and national authors on the subject of Polish Hill River contains the same set of historical facts, used over and over, as all subsequent work used the same initial work (Paszkowski 1987; Zubrzycki 1956 & 1988) written on the community as their starting point. This meant that very little new
information was written on the subject. It also meant that any factual errors present in the original research were repeated in later research.

The area that Polish Hill River is located in is now part of one of the foremost wine and farming districts in South Australia. Most Polish material culture has been demolished to make way for vineyards or farms (see Figure 9.1). Thus a limited amount of material culture exists with which to answer the questions under study.

The Polish societies within South Australia, including the Polish Association of South Australia and Polish Pioneer Descendants Group, a group descended from the people at Polish Hill River, have little additional information regarding the first Polish in South Australia. While pictures and artefacts abound, they have no provenance and cannot be established definitely as being made by or for, or being used by, the Polish at Hill River. Furthermore, information presented in the Polish Hill River Church Museum as being correct on this subject, is very obviously incorrect.

Finally, any results found on the material correlates of ethnicity from this study are site specific and cannot be indiscriminately applied to every group who migrated to a different community. They can be used as a basis of comparison, but it must be remembered that the results from this study are culturally particular to the Polish in South Australia in the nineteenth century.

5.7 Discussion
As can been seen from the limitations of study, research into this area has been somewhat challenging. However, while the historical sources are patchy and need to be used with caution, they do exist. Looking at the material culture of the Polish through a combination of archaeological surveying and excavation techniques not only attends to the aims of this thesis and provides the data to answer the research question this thesis poses about distinguishing a minority European culture from other cultures from their material remains, but it also complements the documentary sources available. Thus, future researchers will have a more complete picture of the psyche of the people living at Polish Hill River, and the changing effect this had on their material culture.
Chapter Six: Historical and Documentary Research Results and Discussion

6.1 Introduction
In order to answer the overall research question (can a minority European culture living in Anglo-Saxon colonial Australia be distinguished from other cultures by their material remains?), it was necessary to use both documentary and archaeological information. This chapter details the historical and documentary research undertaken on the site at Polish Hill River.

6.2 Documentary Research
Initial research located an Honours thesis, undertaken through the Department of History at the University of Adelaide on Polish Hill River (Szczepanowski 1976). This thesis traced the beginning, middle and end of the settlement and provided the starting point for the archaeological analysis being undertaken in this thesis. It contained two maps drawn by former residents of Polish Hill River, giving approximate locations of the farm houses in the settlement, and in some cases attaching owners names to the houses (Figures 6.1 and 6.2).

For the archaeological survey, each place represented by a dot on the following two maps was visited individually to ascertain if there were any remains of these houses still visible. These maps are based on people’s memories from long ago and it was believed by the author that there might be an element of error in the positioning of the houses.
Other documentary evidence uncovered consists of:

- A letter written by the school teacher of the Polish Hill River school (James Crowe) in 1884 to a Polish/American author asking for a copy of his book for the school library.
It is likely that most Polish came as free settlers as there is no evidence of any indenture or other contract. A search of the documentary records gave no indication that the Polish who arrived here did so under a contract system. By this it is meant that they did not get someone to advance them their passage fare, and then have to work to pay back the money once in Australia, like many Chinese immigrants did under the Credit Ticket system (Yong 1977:1, 230). Nor is there any record of them borrowing money to purchase land after they had arrived, as many Germans who settled Klemzig or Hahndorf in South Australia did (Schubert 1986:7). This indicates that the working class Polish farmers and labourers who arrived here did so with enough money, not only to get them here, but also to establish themselves and were of the same upper peasant class as the immigrants to Texas. They probably would have arranged their passage to Australia through immigration agents who represented German shipping companies, and who operated in cities and towns throughout Prussian Poland (Baker 1979:18).
6.2.1. Naturalisation Records

The naturalisation records of several residents of Polish Hill River were located at the South Australian office of the National Archives of Australia. Eleven entries were located prior to 1903 for people who were known to have lived at or near Polish Hill River (Table 6.1). Naturalisation records indicate that members (all male) of the Polish Hill River community were being naturalised as British citizens as early as 1867. Naturalisation as Australian citizens did not begin until after Federation in 1901. The majority of naturalisations took place in 1895 (eight men).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Listed Place of Birth</th>
<th>Listed Place of residence in SA</th>
<th>Length of time in SA when Naturalised</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year Immigrated</th>
<th>Year of Naturalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulla, Paul</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Hill River</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski, Jacob</td>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>Sevenhills</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostera, Paul</td>
<td>Posen, Germany</td>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>21 years</td>
<td>41 years</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozlowski, Carl</td>
<td>Bomst, Prussia</td>
<td>Sevenhills</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel, John</td>
<td>Dammer, Prussia</td>
<td>Sevenhills</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>59 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski, Andrew</td>
<td>Dammer, Poland</td>
<td>Penwortham</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski, Viktor</td>
<td>Dammer, Prussia</td>
<td>Sevenhill</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polomka, Paul</td>
<td>Benchen, Germany</td>
<td>Hill River</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>69 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruciaik, Michael</td>
<td>Posen, Germany</td>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>60 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch, Antoni</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Hill River</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>28 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruchioch, Lukaz</td>
<td>Prussian Poland</td>
<td>Hill River</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>58 years</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1. Name and dates of naturalisation of Polish Hill River members (National Archives of Australia).

There are some very interesting results from these naturalisation records. Four of the subjects listed themselves as former residents of Poland or Prussian Poland. This is a country that technically did not exist at this time. This indicates that the Polish national spirit was alive in people who had left this country for a different life.
However the fact that at least three men, Paul Bulla, Antoni Rucioch and Lukaz Ruchioch, were naturalised 10-12 years after arrival (1866-1868) seems to indicate that a definite mind shift had taken place. While they still identified themselves with Poland (as they still lived in Polish Hill River and practiced Polish customs), they were determined to make a new life here, and the naturalisation process was a step towards this.

Three people have listed Dammer as their place of birth, which is an abbreviation of Gross Dammer, the Prussian name for the village of Wielka Dabrowska (Dabrowka Wielkopolska), where the majority of people at Polish Hill River were listed as emigrating from. Carl Kozlowski has given his place of birth as the village of Bomst, which was the Prussian name for the Polish Babimost, while Paul Polomka listed Benchen in Germany as his place of birth. This could be a contraction of the Prussian village name of Bentschen, which is now the Polish Zbąszyń (refer to Figure 3.2 and Figure 3.3 for locations of these towns in modern day Poland).

Four people were living in Hill River when they were naturalised, while the remainder were living in the surrounding districts at Sevenhill, Blyth and Penwortham. All the people naturalised in 1895 were living away from Hill River. This was the period when the community had begun to disband, and people had commenced moving elsewhere.

Eight of the eleven people naturalised arrived here in 1856, making them part of the initial wave of Polish immigrants to the area. The other three people arrived in 1869, 1874 and 1875, indicating that there were at least three more waves of Polish colonisation to Polish Hill River.

The fact that these Polish people chose to become British citizens, in some cases quite early after arrival, when all evidence suggests that they were moving here to protect and maintain their Polish heritage, raises a question. Why were they so keen to take this very significant measure towards assimilation into the British system, if they were also taking steps to isolate themselves with their Polish heritage such as language, customs and religion? Perhaps they wanted to demonstrate their loyalty towards this country. However, the answer could lie with the vote. By naturalisation
these men were now entitled to all the “rights and capacities of a natural-born British subject” (British Aliens Act 1864). In Prussian-controlled Poland, Polish people were slowly losing the right to have a say in how their country was run taken away from them. They had no right or recourse to say how they wanted to live. Here, by becoming a British subject, they did. Thus, it could be speculated based on this evidence that some Polish were becoming externally assimilated into British society. This might also explain why there are no naturalisation records for Polish women up to 1893, as they would not have been able to vote in South Australia until this time (Moss 1985:201-202). This does not explain why no women chose to become naturalised in 1895, however, when the majority of the Polish men did. Perhaps they were more closely tied into their Polish ethnicity as for good deal of time after their arrival here the women still wore their national costume and spoke only Polish. Or perhaps this disparity in the naturalisation records was because it was the men who went out and worked in the outside world on a daily basis, while the women generally kept to the home environment. This would mean that it would be the men who would be exposed to other customs to a greater extent, and would be perhaps be more likely to ‘pick-up’ non Polish traditions, as opposed to the women.

An interesting sidenote is that two other men with the last name of Ruciak (Rucioch) were also listed on the naturalisation records. The first, a Ludewig Ruciak (farmer) is listed as living at Angas Park (in the Barossa Valley). He arrived here from Gross Dammer, in the district of Meseritz, the province of Posen (Poznań) in 1847, and was naturalised in 1854, age 26. Another Ruciak, Thomas (farmer), also arrived from Gross Dammer (1846) and was living at Tanunda in 1855 when he was naturalised, age 55. This means that there were Polish migrants arriving from the same towns as the people that colonised Polish Hill River prior to 1856. This, in turn, implies that there unquestionably was communication to those back home in the form of letters, encouraging other family and community members to emigrate to South Australia.

The possible assimilation of the Polish at Hill River was a concern for Father Rogalski, the Polish Priest administering to their faith, and also for the people back in Poland. An article about the Polish at Hill River in the Cracow journal Miszye Katolickie (vol. 6, 1887, quoted in Zubrycki 1988:82-87), warns of the possible dangers faced:
From the first moment of his arrival he (Rogalski) attempted to make contact with his dispersed countrymen. This attempt to establish contact made him familiar with the exceptional conditions under which the Poles...live. Exceptional, I stress, because nowhere are they so utterly torn from their family roots, nowhere so distant from them. If we add a further problem, one similar to that encountered in America, the influence of the wider social environment and the repeated encounter at almost every step with foreign elements which exercise an extremely powerful attraction, then it becomes apparent that only a miracle of the Lord, or a miracle of their own energy and strength, can save them from eventual absorption and Anglicisation (Zubrycki 1988:83).

The Polish at Hill River maintained their ties to their homeland for several generations at least. The above journal also contained an account of the people from Hill River organising a collection amongst themselves of approximately £20 to send back to Poland to assist in the building of the young peoples’ home at Chyrów and for the clean up of a fire at Starawieś. The article goes on to say that “our ‘Australian’ settlers, although far off, remain close to us in their everyday lives, thoughts and feelings” (vol. 6, 1887 in Zubrycki 1988: 87).

Not close enough apparently (Figure 6.3). When Zubrycki visited Polish Hill River in the 1960s he stated that he found little evidence of the “survival of Polishness” at the site (Zubrycki 1988:7). Through studying church records and talking to the settlements’ descendants he discovered the settlement kept their traditions for at least three generations, but eventually fell victim to assimilation (Zubrycki 1988:7). It would appear now, almost 150 years later, that no distinctive Polish traditions survive amongst the descendants of the people from Polish Hill River, other than a pride in their ancestors’ history and achievements, and an annual picnic at the site of the settlement’s church (Polomka, B. 2002. Pers comm., 10 April).
But was the assimilation of the Polish a bad thing? In light of later political events, perhaps not. Harmstorf (1987:2) has pointed out that by not assimilating more fully or quickly into the general British society some Germans in South Australia might have left themselves open to persecution and internment during World War One. He argues that those of German descent who saw themselves as South Australians were firmly told otherwise, as a measure of Anglo-conformity or assimilation into the British way of life was the only road open to people who wished to achieve status and social acceptance in middle class Adelaide (Harmstorf 1987:6). Even if you and your parents were born in South Australia, unless you acted British, that fact did not count. Thus, it was the appearance of conformity that mattered, not actual conformity itself.
6.3 Discussion
The historical and documentary evidence uncovered some interesting results. When the Polish arrived here they obviously did so with the intention of maintaining their Polish way of life through the use of religion, language and dress. They brought out a Polish priest to minister to them, and kept ties to their homeland, even going so far as to send money for the needy back in Poland. However, the naturalisation records also document a changing mind-shift from the Polish to the British way of thinking. It was perhaps the first step for some toward acculturation, along with the obvious need to learn some sort of English for writing and reading. Or, this naturalisation process could have been a reaction against the way they were regarded in Poland by the Prussians in the past, as second class citizens, and the desire never to be treated that way again. By naturalisation, the Polish were entitled to the vote, and all other rights of a British citizen. It was their way in having a say in how their lives and their community would be run. Yet, why is there no record of the women becoming naturalised? It was also their right to do this, and after 1893 (Moss 1985:201-202), they too had the right to vote in South Australia. What we are seeing through the documentary evidence could be one of two things: the Polish women did not want to become British citizens, or, the Polish women were not ‘allowed’ to become British citizens by their husbands. There is no evidence to suggest that this wasn’t a strictly patriarchal society, where the husband’s and father’s word was law, and there is also no evidence to suggest that it was. It could be both, a lack of desire by women to change their status and reluctance by their partners for this to happen.

It is obvious that the documentary evidence points towards the Polish community being assimilated into the general culture around them at some point. But is this result reflected in the archaeological evidence?
Chapter Seven: Archaeological Survey Results and Discussion

7.1 Introduction

Guided by historical documentation and the personal knowledge of local landowners, a survey of Polish Hill River was undertaken. During this time the local Mintaro Historical Society, Wilsons Vineyard, Pikes Vineyard, the Hogben family, the Hackett family and the Smith family proved invaluable in their knowledge of the local area. Martin Smith was especially helpful with his knowledge and connections in Polish Hill River. Indeed at least three of the sites are located on his land. This walking survey led to the maps seen in Chapter Six being amended (Smith, M. 2001. Pers comm., 18 May) (Figures 7.1 and 7.2).

Figure 7.1. Amended map from Szczepanowski 1976:Appendix One. Original map unknown. Note the addition of an extra cross in section 340 that is not on either of the previous maps.
After the walking survey had been completed (August 2001), it was evident that of the approximately 35 houses seen on the maps, only 12 structures still remained. In addition, an extra house was discovered due to Martin Smith’s knowledge that was not present on either map. It was known in the neighbourhood as ‘Pawelski’s’. A search of the land titles for Polish Hill River showed that this section of land was indeed owned by a Pawelski for at least 14 years, and this site was also included in the study. As stated in Chapter Five, it was decided to limit the study to structures that were no longer in current use: that is being lived in or occupied in some other fashion. This meant that of the 12 structures owned by the Polish, only seven were to be included in this study (Figure 7.3). These sites are listed on sections 154 (northwest), 155 (south), 157 (south), 332, 340, 459 and 460 (both previously section 172) of the Hundred of Clare.
Once a number of sites had been established as being of interest, it was necessary to survey them using the chosen archaeological techniques of baseline and offset, an EDM and site and elevation drawings to create an accurate picture of the dwellings as they are at this point in time.

7.2 Settlement Pattern

As seen from Figure 6.2, the settlement pattern of Polish Hill River is nothing like either the Polish Rundling system outlined in Chapter Four (Figure 4.1), or the typical German *hufendorf* pattern of settlement (Figure 4.5). Rather, it is more like the Celtic pattern which placed each farmhouse on its own block as is seen in most of today’s Australian rural communities (Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981:31).

The deviation at Hill River from the Polish Rundling plan or even German settlement plans is the result of both government land surveys and previous land ownership. Most of the land the Polish settled on was first owned by a Scotsman (Arthur Young), who had bought 50 sections in 1842 after the land had been specially surveyed and laid out according to the British system of land use. Over the next 10 to 15 years this...
man, and other landowners in the area, sold their land to others, who in turn rented or sold a few sections at a time to the various Polish settlers who could afford them. The first land bought by a Polish farmer (Joseph Niemetz) was 137 acres in section 332 of the special survey in 1857, one year after arrival, for £137 (the next Polish person to purchase land was Stanislaus Malycha in 1859) (Johnson 1994:12). Thus the Polish would have had little or no choice about the land settlement pattern used in their township.

Another possible reason that the settlement at Polish Hill River was not laid out along traditional lines was that the first Polish settlers did not arrive in great enough numbers or as part of an organised tight knit community under the strict leadership of a priest (like the German settlements in South Australia) who could have facilitated the buying of land for the community. These factors would have played a significant role in determining the shape of the settlement at Polish Hill River.

7.3 Housing History

It should be explained that when looking at the rate books for Clare Council (held at State Records South Australia), that there were three categories of land ownership/rental. There was a category for the landowner, the land lease and the person actually residing on the land. These three people did not necessarily have to be the same person. The first records of houses on the lots under study come from the 1857 Clare Country Rate Assessment Records (SRSA MRG19-4). Section 157 (the F. Wyman house) is being lived on by W Stanickey, with the land listed as being owned by G and D Young. The next listing for some of the sections comes from the 1865-1866 Clare Country Rate Assessment Records (SRSA MRG19-4). Section 155 (the Bulla house) is listed as being owned by two different people. Casper Modista (Modystack) is recorded as owning lots 155 and 222, with wood and wire and a pine hut on this land. Powel (Paul) Polunka (Polomka) is also listed as owning lots 155 and 122, and having on this land wood and wire, open land and a pine hut. Joseph Nimmitt (Neimetz/Niemetz) is listed as owning sections 332 and 325. These sections have wood and wire, open land and two wood huts on them. Section 340 is listed as being owned by John Michael (non-Polish), and having wood and wire and a mud hut situated on it. There are no rate assessment records for sections 459 (172) and 460.
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

(172) at this time. Other Polish landowners at Polish Hill River during this period were Martin Buczkowski, John Nykiel, Jacob Nykiel, Lucas Malcha, Stincla Malcha, Valentine Powiliskie (Pawelski) and John Wyman. The following year’s rate assessment books from Clare Council (1866-1867) (SRSA MRG19) lists parts of section 155 as being owned by both Casper Modesta and Powell Pollumker (note different spelling for different years). Both have huts and crops on their land. Joseph Nimmett (again note change of spelling) is listed as owning 332 and 325, with 60 acres under crop, a one-acre garden and a slab hut. John Nicholl (Nykiel) is now listed as owning 40 acres of section 157 out of a total of 282 acres. Somewhere on this land he had two pine huts.

From 1867-1868 (SRSA MRG19) the land ownership stayed almost the same, except that Joseph Niemitz sold section 332 to John Nimitz (Niemitz). From 1868-1869 (SRSA MRG19) the land ownership in Polish Hill River seems to drop off, with most of the land owners listed previously not listed under this town’s name anymore. The rate books indicate that they have instead re-located to near Penwortham, Sevenhill and elsewhere. There are no further listings for the sections under study. The information listed above from the Clare Council Rate Assessment books is at times at odds with the land title records for these sections, seen in Appendix One. For example the Clare Council Rate records (SRSA MRG19-4) list that Andrew Wyman purchased part of section 153 in 1867-1868, while the land title records list the Rev. Joseph Tappeiner and the Rev. Joseph Polk as the owners (Pattullo 1994:13). Another discrepancy in the historical records lists only one farmer living at Polish Hill River in the *Adelaide Almanac and Directory* from 1864-1866, while the baptism records for the Catholic Church in Sevenhill (1857-1862) list 17 children of Polish parents from Polish Hill River (Szczepanowski 1976:18). However, almanacs in the early-to-mid nineteenth century tended to be very selective during this time: people were invited to be listed, and had to pay for their entry (Bell, P. 2003. Pers comm., April 25; Cook, J. 2003. Pers comm., April 29), and this could be the reason for this discrepancy. By the early twentieth century these almanacs had turned somewhat into street directories and appear to list the head of every household in the major urban and rural areas, even the poor who could not have afforded to pay for their entry because the almanac compilers went door to door to obtain their information (Bell, P.
2003. Pers comm., April 25). People without incomes such as women and children were not listed, however, unless the women had employment of some kind, for example as a postmistress, a nurse, or a teacher (Bell, P. 2003. Pers comm., April 25).

All of the dwellings listed in the Council records as existing on these lots of land are called ‘wooden’ or ‘slab’ structures. These are clearly not the stone dwellings under study on these sections today. Thus it can be speculated that the stone buildings were built after these rate records were written (1869) and that written descriptions refer to earlier, more temporary structures.

As an interesting side-note, the rate books indicate that vineyards were being cultivated by the Polish as early as 1866 in Polish Hill River, when Stanislaus Malecca (Malchya) is listed as owning 330 acres, with 20 acres under crop, a stone house, a barn and vineyards.

7.4 Architecture

As noted, the survey identified seven surviving houses or house complexes that were built, or at one stage owned, by a Polish family or person at Hill River. These houses have been listed on the above maps (Figure 7.3) as the Josef Borowicki house, the Bulla (also spelled Bula) house, the Drula (Deula) house, the F. Wyman/Hogben house, the Niemetz/Niemiec house, the Pawelski house and the J. Wyman house. During the survey plans were drawn detailing structural and architectural features and photographs were taken of each of these structures, highlighting key architectural elements and other archaeological features.

7.4.1 The Josef Borowicki House (land section 459)

The land the Borowicki house is situated on was purchased in 1904 by Josef Borowicki for £80. Josef owned this land until he died in 1923 when it was bought by his executors (descendants of the Polish community who had moved away from Hill River), with purchase completed in 1925. It was then bought by John Wyman in 1925. There are no records of the dwelling on this land being built at any point but local knowledge (Martin Smith, current landowner) attests this house belonged to Josef Borowicki (Smith, M. 2002, Pers comm., 18 May).
This house (Figures 7.4 and 7.5) was a single room, 5 x 5.5m in length and was constructed of random rubble (local stone) and mortar. Plans indicate that it had one doorway, facing east, and a fireplace on the south wall. There is no evidence of windows because all of the walls except the southeast corner have collapsed to a height of 0.5-1m. The house was white washed on the outside. There is a depression
very close to the house, which contains a large amount of metal rubbish which in winter turns into a small pond, approximately 2m in diameter.

Due to the collapsed nature of the former dwelling, it is difficult to ascertain any more than what is listed above. There is no existing evidence of any type of roof or roofing material. Sheep currently graze around this collapsed structure at certain times of the year.

7.4.2 The Paul Bulla (Bula) House (land section 155 south)
Section 155 south was bought by Paul Polunka in 1867, with purchase completed in 1882 for £420. Paul Bulla then purchased this property in 1887 from mortgagees Frederick Richardson and Charles Richardson. In 1906 this land passed to Barbara Bulla who was its owner until her death in 1924. The house situated on this land has a date of 1883 carved into the original brickwork, and then whitewashed over.

Figure 7.6. Plan of the Bulla house. Drawn by Tim Owen, 2001.
The Bulla house is a structure consisting of five rooms (including the smokehouse/kitchen room) and a cellar (Figure 7.6, Figure 7.7). The house is approximately 16 x 12m in length (including the attached cellar). Construction evidence clearly shows that rooms one, two and three, along with the smokehouse and its connecting fireplaces were built as one unit. This is presumably the oldest section of the house. The evidence of these differing construction phases are joins in the walls, with different types of construction material (stone) on either side (Figure 7.8). The addition of rooms four and five are believed to have taken place at some point later in the house’s history. A third extension is probable, with room one being extended to match the length of the house when rooms four and five were added. The initial house was constructed from coursed, dressed mortared stone. The second addition to the structure shows rather less care taken with a random rubble-base (Figure 7.8). The interiors of the fireplaces and the chimney have been constructed of red brick.
There is no evidence of the line or pitch of the roof. The Ash Wednesday (1983) bush fires came through here and there is a great deal of burnt wood and smoke blackened stone and brick. It is possible that this fire destroyed the roof. The large amount of galvanised iron found next to the house (Figure 7.7) indicates that this house had an iron roof.

Posts on the east side of the house suggest the possibility of a small verandah, while further to the east of the house is evidence of another, smaller structure, consisting of a tumbled down wall, possibly a shed or garage. A great deal of melted bottle glass was recovered from here, which is more possible evidence of the bush fires that have swept through this area.

The house is built on a rise, with the south, west and north sides of the surrounding land about 0.75-1m lower. Steps are present on the north and west side from the house to the ground. There are two round stone platforms built on to the west side of the house rise that suggest the house may have had rain water tanks positioned here, which filled with the run off from the roof and gutters. The house was and is whitewashed inside and out, with the outside whitewash coloured pink, while the inside is white.
Two dates were found carved into the house stone. The first is to the right of the external doorway seen in Figure 7.7, leading into the house, and reads 1883. The second is underneath the first alcove next to the fireplace in room one. This also reads 1883. The first date on the outside of the house, was carved in the stone and whitewashed over. When bushfires went through the house, the whitewash came off, except in the grooves of the date. The second date next to the fireplace is the same as the door date, and thus is believed to be contemporary with the initial construction of the house. These dates make this house the only structure to have probable construction dates attached to it.

Inside the house there are also a number of features worthy of note including three alcoves or niches present in the internal walls. Two are placed either side of the fireplace in room one (approximately 80 x 60 x 50cm) just below waist height. The third is placed to the left of the fireplace in room three (approximately 70 x 60 x 50cm), also at just below waist height. There is also evidence of internal stencilled decoration. This is most prominent in room three where near ground level on the walls is a pink and blue hand painted decorative border of straight lines. A similar coloured border of a more elaborate, curved style is mirrored at the top of the walls near where the cornice would have been. The same coloured pink and blue-stencilled border is also present at the top of the walls in rooms four and five (Figure 7.9). Above the fireplace on the mantel, there is the remnant of a blue painted pattern, reminiscent of butterflies. In rooms three and four there is evidence of an older motif, perhaps the house’s original stencil decoration, it is a pale blue flower-like pattern. It is present near the fireplace in room three and round the small window cut into the south wall in room four (Figure 7.10).

A rectangular indent has been cut into the wall in room three (approximately 44 x 76 x 10cm) next to the window on the south wall. On the plan this has been labelled the altar, but it is probably not a religious alter. It is more likely that a cross or a picture would have hung there. It would be more accurate to describe this as a possible religious niche (Figure 7.11).
Figure 7.9. Later decoration motif found around the walls in the Bulla house. Photo by Jody Steele, 2001.

Figure 7.10. Earlier decorative motif seen around interior windows and doors in the Bulla house. Photo by Jody Steele, 2001.
Figure 7.11. Possible religious niche seen on the south wall of room three in the Bulla house. Photo by author, 2001.

The Bulla house is the largest and most elaborate of all the houses located during the land survey of Polish Hill River, and the only one that matches in any way the architectural plans for traditional Polish housing. Currently, the house is in a paddock used to graze cows at certain times of the year.

7.4.3 The Drula (Deula) House (north east corner 154).

This land was originally part of a special survey to Arthur Young of Scotland in 1842. It then passed through a number of owners before being sold in 1864 to Stanislaus Malycha. This land was sold again in 1882 to John Marlow, and divided, with Peter Wyman buying the northeast portion, and John Marlow retaining ownership of the balance. After Peter Wyman died intestate, this section of land was sold to Michael Drula (labourer) in 1884. Michael Drula also bought a western portion of the southwest section of 154 from John Marlow in 1884. Michael sold the northeastern portion of 154 in 1897 (he owned it for 13 years) to John Marlow. He retained the west portion of the southwest section until his death in 1901, when it passed to his
wife Josofy, who sold it in 1902 to Paul Bulla. Based on the positioning of the road in location to the house (the house is on the northern side of the road), it appears this dwelling is on the north west portion of 154. Both the Drula family history (Marlow 2003:189) and the personal recollection of a local farmer (Smith, M. 2001. Pers comm., 15 May) attest this house belonging to the Drula family.

![Drula House plan](image)

Figure 7.12. The Drula house plan. Drawn by K. Stankowski, 2002.

![Drula house](image)

Figure 7.13. The Drula house, facing north taken from the road. Photo by author, 2001.
The Drula house is approximately 20 x 7.5m long (not including the front verandah, which is approximately 2 x 7.5m). This measurement does include the back add-on room/verandah. This house now consists of two front rooms (rooms one and two), a single middle room (room three) extending the entire length of the house, and an additional room (room four)/back verandah (Figure 7.12).

The house is constructed out of coursed stone, plastered both inside and out, except the back room/verandah that is made of corrugated iron (Figure 7.13). Evidence seen in the construction could indicate that the front section of this house, consisting of rooms one and two was the original nucleus of this structure. Room three might have been added on later, and finally room four/verandah was built last. This is indicated by the different construction techniques seen in the two fireplaces: the first in room one is quite large and constructed out of stone. It is built so that it protrudes on the outside of the house, while the second in room three is smaller, made of brick, and integrated into the wall structure. This could also mean, however, that all three rooms were built contemporary to each other, and the fireplace in room three was added at a later date.

The roof is a gabled roof, comprised of galvanised iron, with the back section of the roof being a skillion addition. The front section of the house has a bull nose verandah attached to it, constructed of galvanised iron.

The front two rooms of the house have a central front door, with a window located on either side on the southeast side of the structure. Room one has an internal window, which looks directly into room three. The front two rooms are separated by a wattle and daub partition, which has partially been torn down, so no evidence of the doorway between these two rooms exists. An internal central doorway leads from room one into room three, with a window located on the left of this doorway. Room three has a central back doorway, leading to the verandah and room four, with a window either side.

Room four has corrugated iron walls, and could have been used as a sleep-out if necessary. This room has two windows, one in the partition between room three and four and one facing the back of the house. Its doorway faces southwest.
Inside the room one, to the right of the fireplace, is a small niche approximately 1.5m above ground, measuring around 25 x 20cm (Figure 7.40). The interior of each room is plastered a different colour. Room one plastered white. Room two is plastered pink. Room three is plastered blue. Outside, the exterior of the house has white plaster with coursing marks etched into it.

This house is in extreme disrepair, with some of its walls and roof collapsing. It is currently being used to pen and shear sheep at certain times of the year.

7.4.4 The F. Wyman/Hogben Houses (land section 157 south)

In 1864 this land was bought by Andrew Weimann, a farmer of Polish Hill River. When he died in 1885, the land passed to Frances Waymen, his widow, living at Polish Hill River. This lady died in 1910, and it passed (presumably to her son), Frank Wayman until his death in 1925. The land then passed to Mary Agnes Wayman in 1925, and then in 1944 to Olive Theresa Seipelt of Sevenhill. The last person of Polish descent to own this land was Brendan Kluska of Mintaro, who gained ownership in 1967. There are no records of a house or houses on this land from the Clare Assessment books for the nineteenth century.

This site is actually what appear to be two buildings, and thus it will be referred to as a housing complex. In the plans and drawings it has been referred to as the ‘Hogben’ house, after its present day owners, to avoid confusion at the time of survey with a second house also being surveyed, called the John Wyman house.

![Figure 7.14. The F. Wyman house. Plan drawn by Tim Owen, 2001.](image-url)
This complex consists of two structures/houses (Figure 7.14). It is approximately 19 x 7m long. Both structures appear to have been one roomed and both have been constructed of random rubble (Figure 7.15, Figure 7.16). Both have been plastered on the outside, with coursing marks engraved into the plaster. The larger structure (structure two) to the north has evidence of the original timber framework still encased inside its walls. The fireplace in structure two has a narrow flue and is situated in the southern wall.

Neither structure shows evidence of any type of roofing. The south wall on structure two would seem to indicate a gable roof because of its triangular shape; local stories attest that these buildings had thatched roofs (Hogben, D. 2001. Pers comm., 4 April).
Structure one has a niche/alcove present in the northerly wall. Evidence for the rest of this structure is the mound seen along with the niche in Figure 7.16.

These houses are in an advanced state of collapse. However they are in no danger of being demolished as the current owners of the property like their ruin in the front garden. In fact they used the previously collapsed rubble from the structure to line their driveway and construct other random features on their property.

7.4.5 The Niemetz/Niemiec* Houses (land section 332)

This land is considered to be the first land purchased by a Polish person at Hill River. In 1857 Joseph Niemetz bought this section of land (332) for £137. It was then bought by Thomas Niemetz in 1867 until 1901, when it was leased for 10 years to James Brown. This lease appears to have been terminated in 1913, when Paul Peter Niemetz bought the land. In 1927 this land passed out of Polish hands when this man died.

Like the F. Wyman complex, the Niemetz complex is in fact not one house, but three, all built next to each other, plus a cellar and shed (Figure 7.17, Figure 7.18).

![Niemec Houses](image)

* This family have been referred to as both Niemetz and Niemiec in historical records.
Figure 7.18. Overall plan of the Niemetz complex showing location of cellar and structure one in relation to three houses. Plan by Katrina Stankowski, 2002.

Figure 7.19. Structure one (the shed?) to the south of the three houses. In the background (from the left) is building one, building two, building three and the cellar in the hill. Photo by author, 2002.
Figure 7.20. Building one, facing southwest. Photo by author, 2002.

Figure 7.21. Building two, facing southeast. Photo by author, 2002.

Figure 7.22. Building three, facing southeast. Photo by author, 2002.
This group of structures is comprised of three houses, a possible shed on the hill to the south, and a cellar built into a hill next to the creek to the north (Figures 7.19-7.23). The Niemetz complex is spread over an area of 110 x 65m. Building one is approximately 10 x 20m, building two is approximately 9 x 12m, building three is approximately 10 x 21m and the cellar is 4 x 4m.

Buildings one and two are built of random rubble construction from local stone, while building three is built of roughly coursed stone. Based on the rough nature of construction in buildings one and two, it can be speculated that they were built prior to building three. Buildings one and two look to be cheaper in construction, built with stone found on the land around them, and a cheap clay and seed mortar, while building three is made of better stone which has been shaped, indicating the use of a stone mason. A proper lime mortar has been used to bind these stones together, and the exterior of the building was completely plastered.

There is no evidence of what type of roofing was on any of these houses. Building two may have had a gabled roof, indicated by the triangular angle of the top of the south wall. There is also no suggestion of any fireplaces in these three houses. However, owing to their massive state of disrepair, the fireplaces could have collapsed.
Building one possibly had two rooms and an outside bakehouse/smokehouse. There is no indication of any door, windows, fireplace or chimney present in building one, as the building is in an advanced state of disrepair. The walls are collapsed to a height of around 1.4m on the south side, with the other three walls not in existence to any extent (Figure 7.20).

Building two consists of one room, with a possible extra room or even two rooms built to the south, however this section has collapsed to such an extent that it is difficult to identify any walls, as there is rubble covering the area (Figure 7.21). This building has evidence of one window next to the doorway on the eastern wall, but no evidence of a fireplace or chimney. There are signs of slate flooring in this building, with a few random pieces left in situ. Furthermore, in the south wall there is evidence of a possible alcove/niche that has been filled in with a large stone and mud and wheat mortar (Figure 7.44).

Building three has two rooms. There is a doorway in the north wall and two windows in the southern wall. The corner of the northern and western wall has been demolished, along with most of the northern wall. There is no evidence of a fireplace or any chimney, however the roof has been extensively altered, thus, in all probability the chimney was demolished. This building also has a slate floor. As evidenced by Figure 7.22, the owners of the property have extensively altered building three, adding cement rendering, steel poles and a new doomed roof. These alterations would generally preclude this house being used in this study. However as the other two houses at the same site are being included, it was felt that it was necessary to look at this structure also.

Built into the hill to the north of the complex, is a cellar constructed of mortared random rubble and mortar (Figure 7.23). The interior is filled with rubble, possibly from the ceiling collapsing. However, there is no evidence of a roof on this building, so there is no way of knowing if it had a timber roof or a stone roof, with grass grown on top to keep the cellar cool, or a thatch roof. A galvanised iron roof would be extremely unlikely, as this would increase the heat in the cellar, instead of helping to keep it cool, as would have been the desire.
Structure one, on the hill to the south of the site (theorised to be a shed) was of random rubble construction. Most of this building has collapsed, with only a partial wall (the northwest corner) and corner remaining upright (Figure 7.19).

7.4.6 The Pawelski House (land section 340)
William and John Browne first bought this land in 1856. In 1858 the land was divided, with half of section 339 going to Abraham Arbon, and the balance of 340 and 339 going to Valentine Pawelski for £276. Valentine sold this land in 1879 to John Chewings of Mintaro, and it passed out of Polish ownership completely after this point.

Like the previous two sites, the Pawelski complex also consists of a number of buildings, including of a house, a smokehouse, a cellar and extensive walling around the site (Figure 7.24).

Figure 7.24. Plan of the Pawelski complex. Drawn by Katrina Stankowski.
Figure 7.25. The Pawelski complex, facing southeast. Visible are the house to the right, the smokehouse to the left and some of the walling. Photo by author, 2001.

Figure 7.26. The Pawelski smokehouse, facing north. Photo by author, 2001.
The Pawelski complex consists of a two roomed house, of which only two walls remain. The complex is spread over approximately 23 x 22m area. The house was 6 x 2.5m, the smokehouse was 2.5 x 2m, and the cellar was 2 x 2m (Figures 7.25, 7.26 and 7.27).

The house was constructed of mortared random rubble of local stone. It is possible that there was a fireplace on the southern inside wall of room one. The house was whitewashed inside and out and there is no evidence of any type of roofing or roof structure. There is also no suggestion of any kind of niche, filled in or otherwise at this site.

Not connected to the house to the north is a chimney structure. This is a possible bakehouse or smokehouse (Figure 7.26). This is also constructed of random rubble with mortar. A room (possibly a kitchen) surrounds the chimney.

Where the site slopes down towards the creek to the east, there is a cellar built into a hilly incline, facing the creek (east). This cellar was built of random rubble, and is almost completely collapsed, with walls of around 0.5m in height; the interior is filled in with the fallen rubble (Figure 7.27). It is connected to a series of random rubble walls that surround the complex and join parts of it to each other.
There is evidence of the creek sides being shored up with walling. The creek running through the site from north to south is a branch of the Hill River. There is extensive evidence of introduced vegetation around the site including olive trees, roses, lilies and irises.

7.4.7 The John Wyman House (land section 460)
This land was originally leased to Jacob Nykiel, a Polish settler in 1870, until 1877 when Ellen Edwards took over the lease. Her lease was terminated in 1881 and John Marlow leased the land until 1904. In 1904 this land was divided into four sections, with John Wyman purchasing section 460 for £80. He owned this land until his death in 1921, when it was bought by Norman Wellington, an orchardist from Sevenhill and passed out of Polish ownership.

Figure 7.28. The Wyman house plan. Drawn by Christie Honan and Kris Bender, 2001.
Figure 7.29. The Wyman Forge. Drawn by Katrina Stankowski, 2001.

Figure 7.30. The Wyman shed plan. Drawn by Tim Owen, 2001.
The Wyman house consists of a three roomed dwelling (Figure 7.28, Figure 7.31 and Figure 7.32), a forge (Figure 7.29) and a possible shed (Figure 7.30). The house is 10.5 x 9m in size, the forge is approximately 3 x 3m and the possible shed is approximately 4 x 3.5m.
The original house structure is believed to be the double back room (Figure 7.32). One room was added on to the front of the structure at a later date. Construction evidence of stone and mortar joins in the walls suggest that the back two rooms were originally one long room, which was then partitioned off into two rooms. This would suggest that this house was a backender. Local oral history confirms this. Martin Smith, the farmer who owns the property the house is on has stated that the back half of this house was constructed first, with the front being a later addition (Smith, M. 2002. Pers comm., 15 September). The house is made of roughly cut stone, with an attempt at coursing, as well as some random rubble construction. A slate floor once covered the entire front room (it cannot be ascertained as to when this floor was laid). Half of this was later taken out by the current owner and given away.

There are two windows in the front, on either side of the door and two back windows to the left of the back door. There is evidence that the southern back window was originally a back door as the stone underneath this window has been cut specifically to fill this space. The bottom has been filled in, and as a consequence this window is slightly higher than the northern back window. There are no internal windows.

The back two rooms are built on higher ground than the front section of the house, thus there is a step up into the back portion from the front living room. The original back door to the original one roomed structure has been filled in with stone, and a new internal door connecting the front and back half of the house has been built to the south of the original back door. The construction of the back section of the house is out of kilter with walls constructed in a slightly crooked manner (Figure 7.32).

There are two fireplaces, both on the northern wall of the house, one in the front room, with the second in the back northerly room. Both are constructed so the fireplace is external to the building, that is, they jut out from the exterior wall. The two fireplaces and chimneys are constructed of red brick.

The roof was constructed of galvanised iron, the front section in a hip style, with the back section in a skillion style. It was destroyed in the Ash Wednesday (1983) bushfire and no evidence of beams remains, a great deal of galvanised iron is situated to the north of the house and is the remains of this roof.
Two alcoves/niches are present in the back section of the house, one on the left hand side of the fireplace at shoulder height. The other is situated in the back south room in the south wall at shoulder height although there is no fireplace in this room. Both are roughly of the same size (20cm x 25cm).

The house was whitewashed outside, as well as inside, while there is evidence that the back northern room had blue pigment on the walls. Slate was used outside the back of the house for a width of approximately 2.5m as paving for the backyard. This slate is still present, under a 1-5cm layer of dirt and grass. The front of the house has a raised platform bordered by slate, which reaches to the front door. There is a slate front doorstep and there was also a slate verandah doorstep, however this has been removed. Below this verandah are two rows of imported flora: jonquils, daffodils and snowdrops. A keystone extends out from the southern sidewall for approximately 40cm, it is possible that it was left like this in anticipation of further construction.

7.5 Common features of the houses

The remaining houses from Polish Hill River all share common features.

- All of these houses have some form of random rubble construction. The Bulla and house three in the Niemetz complex are also constructed using coursed rubble.
- They are all constructed of various local stone, including sandstone, slate and dolomitic shale.
- Three of the houses (Bulla, Drula and J. Wyman) have fireplaces and or chimneys built out of red brick. All of the houses except the Bulla house have their fireplaces set against the northern side walls.
- Three of the houses have evidence of slate flooring (Bulla, J. Wyman and Niemetz).
- Three of the houses (Drula, J. Wyman and Bulla) show definite evidence of additional construction.
- Three houses still have evidence of galvanised iron roofing (Drula, Bulla and J. Wyman).  

Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.
Three of the houses have cellars built next to or nearby the structures. The Bulla house has a cellar built next to room three, while the Niemetz and the Pawelski house have their cellars built into nearby slopes.

Four out of seven of the houses have what have been called ‘niches’: shelves built directly into their walls (Drula, F. Wyman, Bulla and J. Wyman). A fifth house (Niemetz) has what could have been a niche, but was later filled in. These niches are not seen anywhere else in the area. It is possible that these are evidence of Polish ethnicity (discussed further in Chapter Seven).

In four of these houses, the niches are placed next to fireplaces.

All houses were all white washed inside and out. In three out of the seven (Drula, J. Wyman and Bulla) there is evidence of internal use of colour in the plaster on the walls, or in applied decoration.

All houses show evidence of introduced flora around the dwellings.

The only two features that are not an Australian vernacular architectural trait are the niches and central smokehouse design of the Bulla house. These alone stand out as something other than what might expect to be seen in Australian architecture. The niches are not seen anywhere else in the area and it is entirely possible that these are evidence of Polish ethnicity.

7.5.1 Architecture

Based on the archaeological surveys undertaken at Polish Hill River, when comparisons of the houses are made with traditional Polish and German styles of architecture, the remaining houses at Polish Hill River are for the most part created almost entirely in the tradition of Australian vernacular architecture, which itself was created generally in the style of English and Irish architecture (Table 7.1) (Moore, Burke and Joyce 1989:20). Only one house, the Bulla house, showed any deviation from this. All of the other houses had the following vernacular traditions seen commonly around South Australia.
South Australian vernacular architectural traits

- Random rubble wall construction utilising ‘found’ field stones.
- Coursed stone wall construction.
- Fireplaces located against the side walls.
-Skillion verandahs or back additions.
- Thatch roofing replaced by corrugated iron.
- Whitewashed interior and exterior house walls.
- Stencilled designs on interior walls and ceilings.
- Brick coursework pattern lines drawn into exterior whitewash or rendering.
- Cellars attached to, next to, or built into a hill nearby the house.

Polish Hill River architectural traits.

- Random rubble wall construction utilising ‘found’ field stones.
- Coursed stone wall construction.
- Fireplaces located against the side walls.
-Skillion verandahs or back additions.
- Thatch and corrugated iron roofing.
- Whitewashed interior and exterior house walls.
- Stencilled designs on interior walls.
- Brick coursework pattern lines drawn into exterior whitewash and rendering.
- Cellars next to, or built into a hill nearby the house.

Table 7.1. A comparison of South Australian vernacular architectural traits and architectural traits used by the Polish at Polish Hill River.

The remaining Polish Hill River houses were all a one, two, three or four roomed structures, with a central doorway, and a symmetrically arranged window to either side. Two of the house structures show evidence of further extensions, with either two more rooms being added behind, or separate houses being built next to the original house, presumably for extended family. Two to four roomed structures were also seen in the Wielkopolska region. However, in four roomed houses the rooms should be grouped around a central fireplace, as is seen in the Bulla house. The fireplaces in at least four houses were not located centrally, but against the sidewalls. Two of these four houses had four rooms. The houses did not have hallways or central passages. In the Wielkopolska region both two roomed and four roomed houses have a central hallway.

Roofing was originally thatch on at least one site (the F. Wyman houses). Most of the roofing seen lying next to, or still on the houses today is corrugated (rippled) galvanised iron. This does not mean that the original roofing was not thatch or some other type of cladding. Depending on when the house was built, it is possible that the roofing was replaced later with galvanised iron. However, as galvanised iron was quite popular throughout the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Evans 1983:37),
it cannot be ruled out as the original roofing. Thatch (straw) roofing was generally used in the Wielkopolska region (Tłoczek 1958; translated by Florek 2002:19. Veranda’s are in evidence on at least three homes (Drula, Bulla and J. Wyman). Although the typical Polish cottage usually did have an arcade (a verandah like structure) on the gable side (Figure 7.33), all evidence of verandas noted at Polish Hill River was distinctly Australian in design (Figure 7.34). They were skillion or bull-nose additions along the front.

Figure 7.33. Polish cottage with arcade attached from the Wielkopolska region (Pulkowo, Wąbrzeźno district) (Tłoczek 1958:plate 48). Also showing 45° angle of roof and central chimney.

Figure 7.34. Picture of the Drula house showing the typical verandah design seen in most Australian homes of the early twentieth century. Photo by author.
The fact that all but one of the houses displays traditional South Australian vernacular characteristics such as verandas, skillion extensions and fireplaces against the walls means that they display characteristics more akin to English or Irish architecture, than to traditional Polish architecture. It also indicates that, over time, the Polish architectural traditions were adapted to suit the new climate and environment, resulting in a steering away from characteristics that were specifically Polish. The 45º-angled roof was no longer necessary to stop the weight of the snow accumulating on the top of the roof because there was hardly any snow in this region. The large attics used to trap warmth, traditionally used for storage and sleeping in Poland, were also no longer necessary, as the ground floor was sufficiently warm enough all year round for sleeping. Indeed, during the summer months the attics would have become sweltering with the lack of insulation.

Although there are no conclusive dates for six of the seven houses, it could be speculated that from their design and the lack of general Polish or Prussian architectural characteristics that they are from a later stage of the merging of Polish house architecture and Australian vernacular architecture. It could be that the original houses built by the Polish and listed in the Rate books as ‘pine’ or ‘slab huts’ were built in a Polish tradition. Then, after time had passed, when finances permitted, new stone houses were built utilising the knowledge that the Polish had gained about the Australian environment and climate. Thus the surviving stone structures seen today would not generally show Polish characteristics. However this is a subjective argument. There is no evidence for this, only speculation. This line of reasoning also assumes that acculturation was the final stage in these settlers journey, which is not necessarily the case.

However, as stated in section 7.4.2 one house was atypical in its design from all the other remaining houses. The Bulla house showed distinctly Polish traits in its layout. The central smokehouse and the through-passage-kitchen plan both suggest the use of traditional Polish architectural traits (Figure 7.35). The plan shown in Figure 7.36 suggests that rooms one, two and three were constructed around the central smokehouse (with rooms one and two having interconnecting fireplaces). However room one was considerably smaller than it is today, with its western wall continuing the wall line of the smokehouse and room two.
Figure 7.35. Polish Weklopolska region cottage plan showing central smokehouse with connecting fireplace, as seen in the Bulla house (Tloczek 1958:30).

Figure 7.36. The Bulla house plan, drawn by Tim Owen, 2001.

Two dates were found engraved in the stonework: one to the left of the fireplace in room one, and one on the outside wall of the house, to the left of the external door leading into room two (Figure 7.37). The construction sequence in relation to these dates suggests that the original structure was built in 1883 with three main rooms surrounding the chimney/smokehouse. Later, at an unspecified date, the house was extended, with rooms four and five being built, and room one being extended. To do this the western wall of room one must have been knocked down to extend the original room to match the new length of the extension.
Niches

At least four (possibly five) of the seven sites did display one feature that has not been traditionally seen in Australian, German (Young, G. 2001. Pers comm., April 14; Young 1978; Young 1985; Young, Harmstorf, Brasse and Marsden 1981; Young, Aeuckens, Green and Nikias 1983), English or Irish (Evans 1983; Irving 1985; Pikusa 1986; Archer 1987) vernacular architecture in South Australia. These niches (Figure 7.38-7.43), measuring anywhere from 20 cm in length and height, to 50 cm by 60 cm have been seen in the Bulla house which has three niches, the Drula house (one), the F. Wyman house (one) and the J. Wyman house (two). In addition, house two in the Niemetz complex (Figure 7.44) might have once had a niche in the southern wall that was filled in at a later date. Most of these niches (with two exceptions) are located next to fireplaces, at around shoulder height, while the F. Wyman niche and the Niemetz niche are at waist height.

The only houses surveyed in this research that did not show any evidence of niches is the Pawelski complex and the Borowicki house. This in itself is interesting. Why out of seven, should five have niches, and two be left out? The Borowicki house is only a series of ruins, a series of small walls and a collapsed fireplace, no more than 1m in height. Thus as the walls have collapsed, there is no way of telling whether or not it originally contained niches. The Pawelski house is a different matter however. The wall containing the fireplace is still intact and there is no evidence of any possible niche to be seen, or of any evidence of structural alteration which would indicate the filling of a niche. What does this mean? There are three possible explanations:

- Polish people did not build this house, even though local oral history attributes it to the Pawelski family (who were Catholic).
The Pawelski family built the house, but they did not feel the need to incorporate any niches into the structure.

The house had a niche or niches, but the physical evidence is gone. Several of the walls have collapsed from the main structure, and it is possible that these walls contained evidence of a niche. Unfortunately, we cannot reconstruct these walls to find out if this was indeed the case.

7.5.3 Possible uses?

In an effort to gain more information on the niches as no printed references could be found for them in Polish architecture (in English or Polish), enquiries were sent over international archaeological Internet lists in Australia and Britain. Replies came back from archaeologists stating that niches were used beside fireplaces in Orkney for safe keeping of the family Bible and tobacco (Brundle, A. 2001. Pers comm., 24 October). It has been speculated by members of the Polish community in South Australia that these niches might have held tins of salt, to keep it dry during the winter (Polomka, B. 2001. Pers comm., 15 September). An alternative is that these niches might have fulfilled not only a practical purpose for holding tobacco and other items, but also a religious one. Statues or figurines might have been placed in these spaces, so they could be looked at whilst sitting in front of the fire. Arguments against this are (Barford, P. 2001. Pers comm., 23 October) that Poland is the exception to the Catholic affinity for sculptured images. The sculptured images in the churches are not reflected in the rural homes. Instead, paintings, holy images (woodcuts, glass) and icons are commonly hung on the walls rather than displayed as standing figurines. Furthermore, religious images were more traditionally displayed on walls or shelves, located high in the room, in the corners, so they can look down on what is happening in the room.
Figure 7.38. Two niches located in Room One, next to the northern fireplace in the Bulla house. Photo by author.

Figure 7.39. Single niche located in Room Three, next to the southern fireplace in the Bulla house. Photo by author.

Figure 7.40. Niche located next to the southern fireplace in the Drula house. The northern fireplace does not have a niche.

Figure 7.41. Niche located in the ruins of a second room/structure in the F. Wyman house. Survey plans indicate that there was a fireplace directly next to this niche (to the right).
Figure 7.42. Niche located next to the eastern fireplace in the J. Wyman house. This fireplace was the back section of this house, which is believed to have been built at a later date than the front room. Photo by author.

Figure 7.43. Niche located in the second back room of the J. Wyman house. It is the only definite example of a niche not located next to a fireplace. It is located in the middle of the southern (possibly a bedroom) wall. Photo by author.

Figure 7.44. Possible niche filled in with a large stone in building two in the Niemetz complex. Photo by author.
Barford (using his archaeologist contacts in Poland) confirms that in Polish rural architecture, niches were “a feature found in Polish farmhouses and served a number of purposes such as keeping containers of food warm and dry, or that some were cages for laying hens” (Barford, P. 2002. Pers comm., 25 September). Professor Maciej Hennenberg confirmed Barford’s comments, stating that niches were found in his home in Poland when he was a child and were located next to or in the stove area. They were used to keep pots of food hot, while cooking other foods on the stove (Hennenberg, M. 2003. Pers comm., 27 March). However, while this explanation fits perfectly well for the larger niches from the Bulla house and the F. Wyman house, the three niches seen in the Drula and J. Wyman house are much too small (approximately 20 x 25cm) for such a function (even though two are located next to fireplaces). It could be that these smaller niches are an adaptation of the traditional larger niches by fireplaces, however, their function remains speculative at this point. It is my belief that they were used to keep things in, such as pictures or tobacco.

Why are there niches in houses that were for all intents and purposes, generally Australian in their architecture? There are several possible reasons for this: the Polish did not want to abandon part of what was their traditional architecture, in an environment where all other traditional architectural features had to be altered because of practicality and social reasons. Perhaps because the niches are in a private internal space and thus, only seen by family and invited friends, they may have survived as a Polish tradition much better than external Polish traits which are geared toward public display. Finally, the niches could be the final step in the architectural process of acculturation, the last thing to be seen architecturally of Polish tradition. It could be speculated that future houses, had they been built in Polish Hill River, might have been built without this adaptation.

7.5.4 Decorative Features

Three houses show indications of decoration (the Bulla, Drula and J. Wyman house). This ranged from exterior coloured plaster on the walls (Bulla house) and internal colouring on the walls (Drula and J. Wyman house), to stencilled patterns on the upper and lower portions of interior walls, as well as around interior doorways, windows and on fireplaces mantels (Bulla house). None of these decorative features are unusual for nineteenth or early twentieth century Australian houses (Evans, Lucas
and Stapleton 1984:14). However, it cannot be ascertained with any certainty when these decoration motifs and colours were painted in these houses.

Stencils were extensively used in the late nineteenth century in all types of Australian houses (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14). They were used in almost every room of the house (Evans 1983:91), with the range of designs being so large that it was unusual to see the same stencil pattern repeated in different houses (Evans, Lucas and Stapleton 1984:14). There is evidence of at least three different stencil patterns in the Bulla house: the blue and pink border by the top cornice in rooms three, four and five; the semi-geometric pattern around the window in room four and near the fireplace in room three; and the possible butterflies on the lintel of the fireplace. In addition there is a blue and pink hand drawn border around the bottom of the wall in room three. All of the walls in these rooms were plastered or painted white. Both Australian and Polish homes were decorated with colourful combinations of colours and patterns. In Poland the tradition was to paint walls white and then decorate them with a large selection of colours and motifs (Tłoczek 1958; translated by Florek 2002:19), but this was not uncommon in Australia either.

The Drula and the F. Wyman houses had evidence of the internal walls being painted a variety of colours. Room one in the Drula house was cream, room two was salmon pink and room three was sky blue. This same sky blue colour was seen on the remaining plaster in room two in the F. Wyman house. Again, this was not unusual for Australian decoration during this period.

The outside of the Bulla house shows evidence that it was plastered and painted with what is now a pink/apricot colour, which is seen when the smoke and ash blackened outside layer of plaster is removed (Figure 7.37). This was not unexpected, for there is evidence that in some locations around Poland outside walls could be whitewashed or tinted pale pink or yellow (Gorzuchowski 1937:109). Furthermore, eyewitness accounts of the houses at Polish Hill River mention that:

The Poles loved exterior colour on their houses, and those who were better off than some rejoiced in fancy sawn woodwork to decorate their verandas… Doors, verandah posts, window frames and sashes were often
treated with a gaudy mixture of bright blues, reds and pinks thrown up against white backgrounds. … This taste for colours on houses seemed to belong particularly to Poles and other Slav types (Simons 1944:22).

Thus, the decorations seen on the interior and exterior of the houses could be a mix of Australian and Polish traditions, which melded together in a symbiosis of colour and taste. Or they could be something completely different, not a mixture of traditions at all, but a statement about how they wanted their houses to look: aesthetically pleasing and vibrant.

7.6 The Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery

The grave monuments of the Polish at the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery follow general British and European trends of style. The Polish used the Sevenhill Catholic cemetery because the church at Polish Hill River did not have an attached graveyard, however, this was not the only cemetery where the Polish were buried. There are also Polish graves in the Mintaro Catholic cemetery, unfortunately, these graves have no remaining headstones, bar one. It is the grave of the two children of Paul and Anne Bulla, who died in the 1890s and is also designed in a British style. The headstones of the Polish are made out of slate, marble, wood, iron and local stone. They are tablets, in the shape of arches and crosses or slab tombs lying flat upon the ground, and have the usual symbols of flowers, wreaths, crosses and hearts. Most of these headstones appear to have been manufactured by the local tombstone maker in the nearby town of Clare (H. W. Glaetzer). Some were purchased in Adelaide and made by J. Tillett while for others the provenance is unknown, although they are engraved with the manufacturer’s names (C. E. Morgan and W. Laycock). Some of these markers appear to be the originals, made at the time of burial, while others seem to be modern replacements. None of the writing on these headstones is written in Polish (Figure 7.45).
Figure 7.45. A Polish grave in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery. Inscription in English reads ‘Sacred to the memory of John Nykiel, who died August 19, 1887. Aged 87 years’. John Nykiel was one of the original settlers of Polish Hill River. Photo by author, 2001.

The Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery was surveyed as part of the fieldwork for this research, and all of the relevant Polish graves were documented. Not every Polish grave was surveyed, for the simple reason that Polish communities in South Australia still use this cemetery for burials. Furthermore, the Polish communities continue to take up collections to replace grave markers that are succumbing to time and climate. Thus not every headstone in the cemetery for the Polish Hill River settlers is the original one. The cut off date for grave recording was set at 1930, as this was the last year when records (Sands and McDougalls Directories) list anyone living in the settlement. However it was realised during the survey that many of the newer graves still belonged to people who had been born at the settlement in its final years. Thus it was left up to the discretion of the recorders as to which graves past this date were recorded (Table 7.2, Figures 7.46, 7.47). In total, 46 Polish graves were not recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Date Born</th>
<th>Date Died</th>
<th>Age at Death</th>
<th>Original gravemarker?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bocian</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>15/9/1930</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowicki</td>
<td>Ignatius</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>6/3/1938</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowicki</td>
<td>Peter Paul</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>27/6/1921</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>24/5/1920</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski</td>
<td>Paulina(w)</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>5/6/1942</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski</td>
<td>Joseph (s)</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>19/5/1913</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski#</td>
<td>Leo (s)</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>28/3/1918</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borowski#</td>
<td>Jenner#</td>
<td>Sydney (gs)</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>19/12/1897</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky</td>
<td>Valentine Felix</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>10/60/1968</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>25/9/1902</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky</td>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>3mth.</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brysky**</td>
<td>Joseph A</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1/12/1945</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buczkowski</td>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>16/10/1904</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulla</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>23/8/1924</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drula</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>15/6/1901</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drula</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>30/9/1905</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Annie Mary</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>6/5/1953</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulla</td>
<td>Alexander John</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluska</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>21/8/1962</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluska</td>
<td>Thomas Johanna Frances</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>4/8/1967</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostera</td>
<td>Frances Paul</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>12/8/1911</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostera</td>
<td>Paul Valentine</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>18/7/1929</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostera**</td>
<td>Paul Valentine</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>13/12/1909</td>
<td>14 yr, 11 mth.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malycha</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malycha</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>30/60/1910</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malycha</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>16/5/1915</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modystack</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>28/7/1910</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modystack</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>29/8/1931</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modystack</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>30/10/1968</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemetz</td>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>6/12/1906</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td>Helena Frances</td>
<td>22/10/1</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>8/3/1923</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>27/2/1910</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>19/8/1887</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td>Mary Jacob</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nykiel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>2/12/1873</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes, oldest in cemetery-wood cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>31/10/1921</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Mary M</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>21/6/1931</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>8/5/1877</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Viktor</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>24/6/1918</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawelski</td>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polomka</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polomka</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polomka*</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>26/8/1859</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruciak</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>3/7/15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruciak</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>26/11/18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruciak</td>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>28/8/1916</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>5/8/1963</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1/10/1966</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>24/9/1919</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seipelt</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seipelt</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seipelt</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seipelt</td>
<td>Hyacinth</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobczak</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>23/6/1911</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>22/11/1946</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>5/11/1945</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>25/7/1900</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rucioch</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>11/8/1904</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Cassimars</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>15/12/1963</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyman</td>
<td>Ludwig</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2. Dates of birth and death dates for the Polish settlers buried in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery.

* Share same headstone. Inscription for Rosa reads ‘In memory of daughter Rosa, lost in bush as toddler, 26/8/1859’.
** Died away from Polish Hill River, but buried with other Polish settlers/descendants in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery.
# Died in war.
N.R: Not Recorded.
(w): Wife; (s): Son; (gs): Grandson; (f): Father.

Note. More than one name in a cell indicates that these people share the same headstone. It is unclear whether they share the same grave, as some of the multiple named headstones have a single gravesite, while others share a multiple gravesite.
*The names Borowicki and Borowski, and Ruciak and Rucioch are different spellings of the same original family name, but have been listed separately.

Figure 7.46. Graph showing Polish names and number of graves in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery.

Figure 7.47. Graph showing date of death ranges and number of graves in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery.
7.6.1 Graves
The major noticeable difference between the German and Polish graves was that the earlier German graves in the Barossa Valley were engraved entirely in the German language, while all the Polish graves in evidence from the Sevenhill Catholic cemetery and the Mintaro Catholic cemetery (the Polish Hill River church had no cemetery) show only English inscriptions. This was a surprise, as even the graves of the settlers at Panna Maria had Polish inscriptions (Baker 1979). There are number of possible reasons for this, for example, there was no one in the Polish settlement able to create and engrave headstones as there was in the German settlements, this is possible as the immigrants who arrived at Polish Hill River were for the most part farmers. Possibly the people at Polish Hill River could not read or write Polish, and thus were unable to instruct the grave makers in Clare and Adelaide how to engrave Polish tombstones. Szczepanowski highlights that many of the immigrants to Polish Hill River were illiterate. A number of marriage certificates and land tax returns from the Polish were signed with an ‘X’ (1976:24). However, this explanation is unlikely. Father Rogalski could read in Polish, English, Latin, German, French, Greek, Italian and Ukrainian and converse and write in at least five of these languages (Szczepanowski 1976:28). He could have facilitated the gap between Polish and English.

The grave makers in Adelaide and Clare might have been unwilling to create markers in a language other than English. This seems unlikely, as they would do what they were paid to do, but it could be true. It might be beyond their job description to do such a thing. However, a local businessman would not want to lose the goodwill of a community. It is likely that if they could have, they would have helped the Polish people. The grave makers might have charged more money for the service of creating a headstone in Polish, a price that the Polish families could have been unwilling or unable to pay. Or it might have been a deliberate choice to have the grave markers written in English in an attempt to ‘fit in’. Clark (1987:385), illustrates this by stating:

Just as lower-class individuals may strive to become upper class, ethnic individuals whose occupations bring increased income may strive to imitate more prestigious non-ethnic behaviour. Their consumer choices would be the same as those of non-ethnics.
There is evidence in the form of wills from some Polish from Hill River that indicates that some Polish people did manage to increase their income quite substantially from when they arrived (Szczepanowski 1987:15, 18). For example Jacob Nykiel (farmer), died in 1880 (intestate), with his real and personal estate valued at £500 (it went to his wife Mary Anna) (Probate Registrar Supreme Court, South Australia: Ref No. 12A-111). Incidentally, there is no grave marker for Jacob in the Sevenhill Cemetery and the grave for one Mary Ann(a) Nykiel, a wooden cross (believed to be the oldest in the cemetery) gives the date of her death in 1873. There is obviously a discrepancy here. The cross was quite weather damaged and the date very hard to read and its interpretation is probably where the problem lies.

When his son, or possibly his brother, (family relationships are hard to define in this family as all the men are called John or Jacob), John Nykiel died, his will detailed the ownership of a house at Hill River plus the half an acre it stood on, the Black Eagle Hotel in Sevenhill, plus the 1 acre, 17 perches it stood on, real money of £250 and 675 acres of farm land to members of his family. His estate on this death was valued at £4000, quite a large sum the time (Nykiel 1910: Probate Office of South Australia, Ref No. 16774).

The Germans and the Polish were different in that the Germans stayed very much German for quite some time (Harmstorf 1987:2), and the Polish were not really viewed that way for long by their surrounding communities. People still felt threatened enough by the Germans, or their ties to their homeland to intern many of them during World War One (Harmstorf 1994:7-10), yet the Polish who came from what was, in essence, Germany, suffered no consequences because of this fact. Perhaps the differences in gravestones are a symptom of this. The Polish tried to blend in, and succeeded, while the Germans did not and were punished for it.

A final explanation could be that at least some of the Polish graves are replacements for original tombstones written in Polish, which had deteriorated. This is also possible. There are some very new looking tombstones with old dates on them. There are also a lot of very old looking tombstones written in English (see Table 6.1). In all probability, the truth is probably a combination of all of the above theories. Unless
further historical documentation is uncovered, the precise answer is likely to remain unknown.

A minor difference seen in the grave markers was the use of symbols on the headstones themselves. The Polish graves showed repeated use of a particular set of symbols such as wreaths, crosses, ivy, flowers or scrolls. In some instances there was no decoration at all, only the epitaph. German graves used symbols of hope and piety such as crosses and anchors. The inscriptions on both the Polish and German headstones are also different in style. While the German inscriptions call to mind images Germany, often with biblical verses on them highlighting the Lutheran faith (Harmstorf and Cigler 1985:77), the Polish inscriptions are different. They are simple, to the point, and pretty much only stated the facts (Figure 7.48 and 7.49). Occasionally a ‘dearly beloved husband or wife’ was included. The only exception is the Bulla children’s grave in the Mintaro Catholic cemetery contains the inscription: ‘There is a home for little children beyond the bright blue sky’, and after their second child died, ‘Another bud to bloom in heaven’ was added.

The difference in both the symbols and the inscriptions on the headstones could again be attributed to the availability of pre-made headstones, the grave makers themselves, or perhaps the Catholic faith. The religious difference between the Polish (Catholic) and Germans (Lutheran) could indeed be the reason for the deviation in the headstones. However, I don’t think this is the case. The Lutheran faith definitely made an impact on German material culture, such as the headstones. Conversely, the Catholic faith did not appear to have the same impact on the Polish headstones. These headstones seem more generic in appearance, and the images on them often appear in other non-Catholic cemeteries in the area. The headstones in the Sevenhill Catholic Cemetery seem to be neither Catholic nor Polish in design, they are generic markers, chosen because there was a job to do, and the Polish needed something to do it.
7.7 Other Material Culture

Other material culture came to light during the walking surveys. At the F. Wyman house a large number of ceramic and glass shards were discovered in the niche in the building ruins. These pieces were collected over the years by the F. Wyman children from around the house and placed there (Hogben, D. 2002. Pers comm., September 18). Random pieces of ceramic and glass were also observed at the Bulla house and the Wyman house. The Bulla house had a standard array of items such as door locks, padlocks, sieves, and pitchforks scattered around the house and in the cellar (which had been used as a rubbish dump for all the house debris by the current owner).

In addition to this, Martin Smith, (who owns the property on which the J. Wyman house is located), volunteered some interesting artefacts he and his children had collected from around the site in the last 50 years. Two handmade stoneware bottles were found inside the Wyman house that bore what appeared to be a German maker’s mark (Figure 7.50). Stoneware is a type of ceramic, fired at high temperatures, not needing to be glazed to keep moisture out (Savage and Newman 1976:275).
The maker’s mark in the centre of the circle reads ‘…. Pullna’. Around the circle the German words ‘Bitter Wasser’ can be seen. ‘Bitter Wasser’ translates in English as ‘Bitter Water’ in German. It is most likely that these bottles are water bottles made specifically for water from the mineral spring, Pullna, located in the Bohemia region of the Czech Republic (Figure 7.51). This province is famous for its mineral springs, with over 200 located in the region. The water from the Pullna spring (known as ‘bitter water’), along with around 15 others were (and still are) used for medicinal purposes (Bohemia: http://96.1911encyclopedia.or/B/BO/BOHEMIA.htm: 23 Feb, 2003).

Although this spring was located in Austria, this does not preclude these bottles from having arrived with the Polish settlers. Austria annexed a part of Poland in the late eighteenth century, and the Polish Catholic priest who arrived to minister to the Polish Hill River congregation was from Austrian annexed Poland. In fact when Austria went to war with Italy (1859), Rogalski was a field chaplain with the Austrian Army, and by all accounts served with distinction (Szczenapowski 1976:27). Father Rogalski could have brought the bottles of ‘medicine’ as a kind of preventative measure for any ailments he might contract in an unknown country. This is, of course, sheer speculation; any one of the settlers could have obtained this through trade networks in Europe prior to departure for Australia. The poor quality of the hand made bottles might indicate that they were a cheaper product and therefore affordable.
to the Polish who arrived here. The Polish who did emigrate did so with money accumulated in Poland. Thus the possibility that it was one of the general Polish parishioners who purchased this water cannot be ruled out.

![Image of a bottle with a maker's mark](image)

Figure 7.51. Maker’s mark on one (the right in the above picture) bottle. Photo by Matt Schlitz.

In a stone well (approximately 100m east from the house), a gold ring was discovered by one of the Smith children in the 1980s (Figure 7.52), bearing the word “Mizpah”. Mizpah (or Mizpa, Mitzpah) is a Jewish term for the sentiment “the Lord watch between you and me” or “God will watch over us when we are apart” (Porat jewelry Online Shop: [http://www.porat-jewelry.com/mizpa.html](http://www.porat-jewelry.com/mizpa.html); 23 Feb, 2003; Mizpah: [http://www.barefootsworld.net/mitzpah.html](http://www.barefootsworld.net/mitzpah.html); 23 Feb, 2003). The term “Mizpah” can still be found on jewellery sold today, both gold and silver, and usually in the form of a necklace ornament ([GreatLooks.com](http://www.greatlookz.com/product/3MITZPAH); 23 Feb, 2003). Using the word “Mizpah” on a piece of jewellery was a very popular fad in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Several catalogues from the early twentieth century feature jewellery embossed with the word Mizpah (Cuffley 1997:80, 82).

The gold ‘Mizpah’ ring discovered gives no clue as to who owned it. Although Mizpah is a Jewish word, this term was very popular in the late nineteenth century and adorned a number of jewellery items, including lockets, necklaces ornaments and rings. The fact that Mizpah means “God will watch over us when we are apart” could
indicate that the person wearing the ring was given it by someone close to them, perhaps a wife or a husband. The ring is generally big and probably worn by a man, who could have been given it by a wife (perhaps as a wedding ring). The ring is gold, so would have cost the buyer a considerable amount of money. Similar sized rings cost from 14s for a 9ct. ring in catalogues from the early nineteenth century (Cuffley 1997:79). Apart from these facts (that it is gold and a large size), nothing else can be determined about this ring.

![Gold ring](image)

Figure 7.52. Gold ring found in well near Wyman house. It reads ‘Mizpah’. Photo by Peter Birt.

### 7.7.1 Ceramic, Glass and Metal

The miscellaneous material culture located fell into three categories: ceramic, glass and metal. A great number of ceramic shards were located at the F. Wyman house, the Bulla house and the Wyman house. The greatest concentration was located at the F. Wyman house (Figure 7.53). There, members of the family had for years been collecting the artefacts found in the ruins and placed them in a pile in the niche, seen in the wall of the house. These pieces were noted, but not catalogued or weighed, as they were left undisturbed on site. All were small pieces of common earthenware with an underglaze transfer print, and were readily available for anyone to purchase. Only two partial maker’s marks were discovered on the ceramic shards (Figure 7.54).

The first piece of ceramic is an earthenware piece, earthenware is the English term for pottery not vitrified (all pottery except Stoneware) (Savage and Newman 1976:103). It consists of a mixture of potash, sand, felspar and clay and is fired around 900°C. Earthenware is easy and cheap to produce, it is not very durable, chips easily and must be glazed if it is to contain any sort of liquid (Hudsons Antiques: [http://www.asiaticpheasants.co.uk/potterms](http://www.asiaticpheasants.co.uk/potterms): 4 Mar, 2003). This piece had a purple and white transfer print on it. Transfer printing involves a wet tissue paper transfer applied to a pre-fired piece of ceramic. Once the paper was removed, the design was
left on the ceramic and a clear glaze was applied which sealed the piece before final firing (Samford 2000:58). Unfortunately, the partial maker’s mark on this piece has not been able to be identified.

Figure 7.53. Examples of ceramic from Polish Hill River. The top two pieces are the only ones found with partial maker’s marks. The third piece is flow-ware (a type of transferware) and has an inconsistent blue colour over the entire piece, however it is impossible to show this in a black and white drawing. Drawing by author.

The second piece of ceramic with a maker’s mark is a fragment of earthenware with a blue and white transfer print design. The design on this piece of ceramic is called ‘Asiatic Pheasants’, it was one of the most common and copied designs from the second half of the nineteenth century, second only in popularity to the ‘Willow’ Pattern (Neale 2000:16). Popular designs were often sold to more than one ceramic maker, frequently with insignificant changes made with each sale (Samford 2000:58). The maker’s mark or ‘cartouche’ on this fragment has been identified as belonging to the company of Charles Hobson of Staffordshire, with production of this particular maker’s mark ranging from 1865-1873. His cartouche was a ‘CH’ (Godden
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

1991:327). Information indicates that the ‘Asiatic Pheasants’ mark was used only during the original business under Charles Hobson, and not the later business of Charles Hobson and Son, which operated from 1873-1880 (Godden 1991:327). This date range fits with the occupation of Polish Hill River.

All the ceramics found during the survey were primarily earthenware, which is a very common form of ceramic. Sets of earthenware crockery in the nineteenth century can be likened to today’s Target plate sets: cheap and readily available. The designs seen on the ceramic are transfer ware, which indicates the Polish were utilising common technologies, as transfer ware was also extremely widespread, especially in the later half of the nineteenth century. In fact, by the 1850s English imported transfer ware from Staffordshire (the main production centre of English ceramic) was considered so cheap that even the poorest could afford some pieces (Samford 2000:58). The range of colours seen on transfer ware included blue (dating from 1774), purple (1814), green (1818), red (1818), brown (1818), black (1875) and two-colour printing (1818) to name only the more common (Samford 2000:75).

The only item of transfer ware to be identified was belonged to an almost universally known pattern, ‘Asiatic Pheasants’. The maker of the piece operated in Staffordshire, England between the dates of 1865-1873. This means that this piece of ceramic was imported from England and then purchased here, or purchased in England and then brought out with someone immigrating here. The fact that it was imported probably would have made the piece slightly more expensive to buy. However this piece is not of outstanding quality, which would suggest that it was not that expensive in the first place, so the extra cost placed on the set with import would still not have put it out of the price range of the people at Polish Hill River. The pattern on this piece was very popular, and can be found on a large number of historical excavations around Australia, especially in the Sydney region (Casey, M. 2003. Pers comm., March 20). The pattern would have made this piece somewhat coveted as it was very fashionable, but it was around in such large quantities on earthenware that it would have been easy to obtain.

With the exception of the two handmade bottles (Figure 7.50) and the two small pieces of earthenware found during the excavation (Chapter Eight) and listed in the
database (#802_12) as having unidentified ‘foreign’ writing on them (possibly Greek; Figure 8.10), all the ceramic and glass recovered from the during this project was from British or local sources. This was not unexpected. The trade network between the Polish at Hill River and people back in Poland was sporadic at best and no evidence has been uncovered for regular trading back and forth. While the Polish did correspond with family and their communities back in Poland, and presumably did ask for small items to be sent over with others who were immigrating, there would not have been a great deal of extra space for non-essential items. Even Father Rogalski found it difficult to maintain regular book deliveries for his parish mission from his brotherhood in Poland (Crowe 1884).

7.8 Discussion

The archaeological survey uncovered some very interesting results from both the movable and immovable material culture from the Polish at Hill River. The architecture tended to show a general trend towards the Australian vernacular in style, with the exception of the Bulla house, which was designed in a traditional Polish/German style. Five house sites showed the presence of a niche, or possible niche, something not seen in the German, English or Irish architecture in the region. The fact that these niches are seen only in internal spaces, which are designed for private usage, highlights the fact that an appearance of conformity was necessary for whatever reason in the general society in which the Polish lived. In public they may have appeared British orientated, but their internal, private environment was still Polish. This was perhaps the better way managing private and public identity, when the historical events of the paranoia surrounding the Germans during World War One are taken into account.

While neither the Polish grave markers, nor the surface material culture indicated any evidence of Polish ethnicity in their creation, the possible exception to this is the ‘Pullna’ bottles. This link is not irrefutable, however, as there is no proof that the Polish brought these bottles with them. Thus, we must turn to a different archaeological approach to try and find more material to answer this question: excavation.
Chapter Eight: Excavation Results and Discussion

8.1 The Excavation

After all the sites had been surveyed, it was felt that there was a further need for more archaeological research into the site. Whilst there was a great deal of standing material culture recorded during the survey, it was felt that more evidence of ethnicity in ceramic and other forms of movable material culture was needed in order satisfactorily answer the question. Thus it was decided to conduct a test excavation at one site.

The Wyman house was chosen for the site of the excavation for several reasons:

- It was the most accessible of all the sites.
- There was clear evidence of material culture scatters around the house.
- The two hand-made ceramic bottles had been found in the site.
- This house contains two niches/alcoves that indicated Polish construction and occupation of the building.
- The landowners had no objection to the site being excavated.
- All the other sites were either too disturbed or had slate floors still intact, limiting the potential amount of material culture that could be found.

Nine trenches were placed at intervals around the house and its environs in an effort to sample the best possible spread of material culture (Figure 8.1).
8.2 Excavation Results

None of the material excavated out of any of the nine trenches showed an indication of being of Polish origin or of Polish creation. As the catalogue of the artefacts shows (Appendix Two), all the artefacts were from a fairly standard array of British and Australian made materials, with one or two special finds. Table (8.1) details all the different types of artefacts recovered during the excavation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item or Object¹</th>
<th>Number ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Key</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt &amp; Nut</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt &amp; Washer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt Loosener</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt, Nut &amp; Washers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (unidentified): Sheep</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified): Beer</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Drink</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick (red)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle (belt or harness)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullet Casings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat hanger Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey Shoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Handle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving Dish</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvanised iron roofing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer Head</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (glass- unidentified):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condiment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal (unidentifiable)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal cap</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Clip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Eye</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Instruction Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Ornament</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal ‘S’ Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Spike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentifiable)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oven Plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padlock &amp; Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain (unidentified):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing Pin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Stud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screws</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/coil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (knife sharpener)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack (metal)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.1. List of artefacts recovered during the excavation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Cog:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodplane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL FINDS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin (1856? Penny)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Registration Tag (1924-5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button (metal)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornament (neck)- metal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Denotes the type of material found, not the completeness of the artefact. It is not meant to imply that entire bottles etc. were found, but fragments of the whole that were identifiable as being from a bottle.

² Number denotes the number of times the artefact type was catalogued in the database, not the true number of artefacts. Some numerous artefact types, such as window glass were catalogued under one entry, when they came from the same trench context (even when there were multiple pieces). For example if 100 pieces were of window glass were found in one context, they were catalogued under one entry.

Table 8.2 lists all the artefacts, by trench and context, while Figures 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5 and 8.6 show the numbers of different types of artefacts uncovered. Figure 6.48 lists the percentages of all ceramics found by trench and Figure 6.49 lists the percentage of all glass bottles found during the excavation by trench.
### Object or Item Type¹  | Number²
---|---
#### House Survey Outside:
- Bottle (unidentified): | 2
- Beer | 2
- Soft Drink | 1
- Bottle Cap | 1
- Earthenware (unidentified) | 1
- Jar (unidentified glass) | 4
- Condiment | 1
- Metal tool/part (unidentified) | 1
- Unknown artefact | 1
#### Trench One (outside Path area):
- Bottles (unidentified) | 16
- Earthenware (unidentified) | 4
- Tea Cup | 1
- Jar (unidentified): | 3
- Condiment | 1
- Metal tool/part (unidentified) | 3
- Nail | 3
#### Trench Two (inside front room by fireplace):
- Bone (sheep) | 1
- Bottle (unidentified) | 2
- Earthenware Plate | 4
- Tea cup | 1
- Metal tool/part (unidentified) | 3
- Nails | 12
#### Trench Three (behind house, up hill, under olive tree):
- Bottle (unidentified) | 2
- Brick (red) | 1
- Bullet casing | 1
- Jar | 1
- Metal tool/part (unidentified) | 2
### Trench Four (back living room, by fireplace):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone (sheep)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle Stopper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick (red)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullet casing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving Dish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone (partial-knife sharpener)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack (metal)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trench Five (Blacksmith/tool shed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Rabbit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle (belt/harness)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullet casing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog registration tag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey shoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door handle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer-head</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal instruction plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal ornament</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal spike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar &amp; paint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padlock &amp; chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack (metal)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Plane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench Six (NNW corner of front Verandah):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘S’ Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Key</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt &amp; Nut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt &amp; Washer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt Loosener</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt, Nut &amp; Washers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clamp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat Hanger Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door handle part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware Plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye (metal)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (unidentified glass)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentified)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace ornament</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oven Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press stud</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack (metal)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch cog:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench Seven (front door step):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (unidentified)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullet casing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye (metal)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing (galvanised iron)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trench Eight (internal back living room doorway):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick (red)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tool/part (unidentified)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.2. Listing by trench of artefacts recovered in the excavation.

¹ and ² Denotes the same as in Table 8.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artefact Type</th>
<th>Trench Nine (front verandah step):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bolt and two nuts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone (unidentified):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle (unidentified):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poison:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buckle (belt or harness):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tea cup:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal (unidentified):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unidentified tool:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal tack:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rubber:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring/coil:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window glass:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wire:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round Stone Well, approximately 100m west from house:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bottle (unidentified):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cork:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthenware Serving dish:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tea Pot:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jar (unidentified glass):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metal cap:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcelain cup:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoneware plate:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oven plate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing Pin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt and two nuts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (unidentified)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle (belt or harness)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware (unidentified)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea cup</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal (unidentified)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified tool</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal tack</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/coil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window glass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle (unidentified):</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware Serving dish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Pot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar (unidentified glass)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal cap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain cup</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware plate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.2. Percentage and types of ceramic from excavation.

Figure 8.3. Percentage and types of bottles and jars from excavation.

Figure 8.4. Percentage and types of bone from the excavation.
Figure 8.5. Percentage and types of metal artefacts from the excavation.
From the above data we can ascertain several trends:

- Metal was the largest artefact category, with unidentified metal tools or parts, giving the largest numbers, next was unidentified metal, with nails coming in as the third most represented metal category. However the majority of this metal came from the forge, not the house.

- Out of all of the ceramic, unidentified earthenware was the largest category, with the next most represented category being earthenware plate.

- Sheep bone was the largest category represented in the fauna. This is not a surprise as the house where the excavation took place is used to graze sheep in, and it was evident that a number of them had died in and around the house.

- Out of the glass, window glass was the largest represented category, with the next being unidentified bottles.

Trench One (2 x 2m) consisting of four contexts, and dug to a depth of 40cm, indicates that there was a path area outside the house, and this area was later used as a dumping ground for refuse by subsequent owners of the site. The large numbers of
broken bottles and random metal seen in the results indicate this. Bottles were the largest artefact category out of this trench.

Trench Two shows that the front rooms were in use before the extensive slate flooring was in place, as the majority of artefacts were recovered from under three slate slabs that were pulled up next to the fireplace. Underneath the slate slabs were all excavated to different depths. Slab one was dug to a depth of 40cm after the slab was lifted, slab two was left with its mortar intact, while slab three was excavated to the levelling layer underneath the mortar. The large range of nails found under slab one would seem to indicate that there was a substantial construction phase prior to this floor being installed. The mortar of slab two into which the slate was laid contained the paw prints of a cat. This would suggest that the owner of the house had at least one pet.

Trench Three (1 x 2m), excavated to a depth of 13cm and consisting of two contexts, was located up the hill under an olive tree, and while it initially looked like there might be part of a structure (wall line) in this spot due to large amount of rocks partially buried, this trench yielded little information. A few pieces of random material culture indicated that no substantial structure or activities were occurring within this location.

Trench Four (1 x 1m, with a 30cm extension towards the fireplace) consisted of six contexts and was excavated to a depth of 42cm. The artefacts recovered from this trench indicate that the deposit in the back room by the fireplace was quite disturbed, as a glass bottle stopper was located in the same deposit as plastic. The largest amount of ceramic was located from this trench, with the largest percentage being earthenware. It is possible that because of the disturbed nature of the deposit, this floor was also covered by slate, and then the slate was removed at some point.

Trench Five appeared to be located in a blacksmith’s workshop, which was later used as a tool/storage shed. This trench was not excavated to any substantial depth, as the clearance of surface tools alone took a number of days. The number of implements that were pulled out of the trench illustrates this (see Table 8.2). There is also evidence in the base structure of a forge. A dog registration tag was located in this
trench indicating that whoever lived there (Norman Wellington, Orchardist from the Land Title Records) in 1924-1925 owned a dog, registered with Council whose name is not on the tag. A metal button was also located, bearing the words ‘C. Rowley’ and ‘Patent’ on one side. This structure was burnt down in the 1965 bushfire in the area (Smith, M. 2002. Pers comm., September 16), and the partially melted bottles found in this trench would seem to confirm this fact.

Trench Six (1 x 1m) excavated to a depth of 15cm, with three contexts, was located in the northern corner of the front verandah and generated a number of artefacts. An improvised (possible) necklace ornament (silver) with a coat of arms (Figure 8.7) on it appears to have been fashioned out of a larger piece of metal with a hole drilled into it.

![Figure 8.7. Coat of Arms present on the silver medallion found in Trench Six. The figures in the top right and bottom left squares appear to be lions.](image)

The medallion (2.7gm.) is extremely worn and thin, with the embossed decoration almost worn off in some places. This could indicate that the owner wore it constantly around their neck, which in turn implies that this medallion was special to them. They cherished this medallion, in all probability because of the decoration on it. If this decoration was a family crest (which it resembles), it indicates that the owner treasured their family history and traditions, they had a feeling for their past. However, the majority of the Polish at Hill River were farmers, and thus did not have family crests, as this was a right reserved for the nobility in Europe none of whom immigrated to Polish Hill River. In fact, the Wyman (Wayman) family did not
possess a family crest (Marlow 2003:261). This implies that this crest is unlikely to have belonged to a Polish occupier of this house in the traditional sense, however it could have been a treasured memento from a friend.

The large amount of metal bolts, nuts and other paraphernalia from Trench Six indicate a possible building phase at some point. Two pocket watch parts and a very small clock part indicate that the person who lived here at one point had enough money to afford some little luxuries. A metal button was also found here, with the words ‘J.M Marshall & Co’ and ‘Adelaide’ on the front. Unidentified metal tools and parts made up the majority of artefacts from this trench. Two keys, possibly from the front door lock were also found in this trench.

Trench Seven (1 x 1m) was dug to a depth of 41cm, and had four contexts. It was located 30cm from the front doorstep, and then extended 50 x 30cm to the doorstep. The presence of plastic in the artefact array indicates that that this deposit was also disturbed to some extent. There was also a very large quantity of window glass found in this trench, as well as a large number of earthenware fragments and a coin. The coin (19.1gm), is a British penny from the reign of Queen Victoria, dating from the 1850s. The date is partially obscured, but possibly reads 1856, coincidentally the year the first group of immigrants arrived at Polish Hill River. However, this fact is can not be called significant, as coins of the realm were reused for a number of decades, and it could have fallen or been placed there at any point. In fact, British coins were in constant reuse in Australia until well after Federation (1901), when Australia started minting its own silver and bronze currency at the Royal Mint in London in 1910 and 1911 respectively (Clarke 1971:4). The placement of a coin or other items such as photos, documents or newspapers in the foundation deposits of a house by people (of many nationalities) was not uncommon: “Besides serving as the spirit of a building, these articles are also intended for a future witness and reference” (Groves 1991:63). This land was first leased in 1870 (see Appendix One), thus, the house could not have been built and the coin lost or placed there until that date.

Trench Eight (1 x 2m), 31cm deep and four contexts, was placed in the same back room as Trench Four; however this trench was located by the former back door, which is now positioned between the front and back room. Again this deposit was
disturbed, with plastic being located in the bottom context. The majority of artefacts out of this trench were bone and earthenware, with this trench having the second highest percentage of ceramic from the trenches. Trench Eight also yielded two small fragments of cream earthenware with indecipherable writing on them. Although this writing cannot be positively identified due to the fragmented nature of the pieces, it looks to be Greek or Russian (Figure 8.10). There was evidence of plaster in the bottom context of the trench, indicating that the floor could have been lime washed at some point prior to being slated, however this wash could have fallen from the walls, which is more likely as there is still evidence of coloured plaster on the walls above this trench.

Trench Nine (75 x 50cm), 10cm deep and two contexts, was the final trench, located in the front verandah step. The majority of artefacts that came out of this trench were metal: such as bolts, wire and spring coils. Next was glass and bone, with earthenware also having a healthy representation. Plastic discs found in context two indicate that the top deposits were quite mixed. A stone well approximately 100m (used as a rubbish dump) west from the house was also randomly sampled, as a gold ring was found here that could have been a significant part of Polish material culture. The majority of artefacts from this well were broken bottles with a range of dates from the late nineteenth to the mid twentieth century.

Figure 8.8. Percentage of all ceramics found during excavation by trench, listed by external and internal placement of trench.
Figure 8.8 illustrates that ceramic was found in all the trenches, with the exception of Three and Five. This is not surprising, as trench three contained few artefacts and Trench Five was the forge/tool shed, where ceramic would be unexpected. Trenches Four and Eight had the highest proportion of ceramic. Both of these trenches were in the back room, which could indicate that it was the room used for cooking and eating, with the front room being used as a living room. This also fits in with a general local belief that the back section was built first, as this would be expected to have the largest amount of artefacts in it. The rest of the trenches had a fairly even distribution of ceramic. However, the highest distribution of ceramic was from the internal rooms.

![Glass Bottle Fragment Numbers](chart.png)

Table 8.9. Percentage of all glass bottles fragments from excavation by trench, listed by external and internal placement of trench.

Figure 8.9 indicates that the highest proportion of glass bottles was to be found in Trench One, Five and Seven, all external trenches. Trench One had a high proportion of glass on the surface context, which is where most of the bottle fragments were found. Trench Seven had the highest proportion of bottle fragments from context two, three and four. The next highest bottle ratio came from Trench Five, which is not
unanticipated as a tool shed often contains bottles for storing items such as poison (which was found in Trench Five), pesticides, turpentine and methylated spirits. The fact that more glass was found externally would seem to indicate that there were numerous bottle dumps around the house. The MNI numbers seen in Table 8.3 for bottles and jars would seem to confirm this conclusion for trenches One and Five, however trench seven only had one bottle emerge from the fragments. These MNI numbers are probably the minimum number of vessels at the site, not a complete number of vessels from this location.

![Table 8.3. MNI numbers for each trench for bottles and jars. The MNI numbers for the bottles and jars were determined using bases and necks and lips. When there was a base and a neck of the same colour from the same trench, only the base was counted as part of the MNI. When there was a bottle fragment (not a base or neck) of a significantly different colour, such as blue or black glass, the first one of these fragments was counted in the MNI count as a vessel. Any other fragments were then discounted.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottle/jar colour</th>
<th>Round stone well</th>
<th>Outside house</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst/purple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua/Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive/Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total MNI per trench bottle/jars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottle/jar colour</th>
<th>Vessel use based on colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amber:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey Amber</td>
<td>Aerated waters, Beers, Medicine and Cures, Bitters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Aerated waters, modern beers, Medicine and Cures, Bitters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Amber</td>
<td>Medicines and Cures, Beers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amethyst/purple:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Amethyst to Amethyst</td>
<td>Medicine, Aerated Waters, Sauces, Fruit Jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Amethyst</td>
<td>Medicine, Aerated Waters, Sauces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apricot</strong></td>
<td>Soda Syphons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blue:</th>
<th>Apothecary Jars, Chemist Jars, Poisons, Castor oils.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark cobalt/ cobalt blue</td>
<td>Pickles, Salt jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid blue</td>
<td>Pickles, Salt jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Blue</td>
<td>Medicine, Chemists, Fruit Jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice blue/cornflower blue</td>
<td>Soda Syphons, Fruit Jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Same uses as Amber Glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>All bottles and Jars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua/Green</td>
<td>All Bottles and Jars, Beers, Sarsaparillas, Aerated Waters, Poisons, Gins, Whiskys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive/Black</td>
<td>Beers, Gins, Aerated Waters, Champagne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>Vegimite Jars, Cold Cream Jars, Medicines, Bitters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td>Ginger Beer, Demijohns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4. Bottle/Jar colours and uses. Information in this table came from the Aussie Bottle Digger Website: http://www.users.bigpond.com/oz-riley/bottle_colours.html.

Based on the information in Table 8.3 and 8.4, we can see that the bottles and jars uncovered during the excavation held a variety of contents from medicines, poisons, pickles, and alcohols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic type/colour/pattern</th>
<th>Round stone well</th>
<th>Outside house</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
<th>T9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E/W White/Cream: Serving dish: Plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Cream &amp; Green: Side plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Yellow, cream &amp; blue: Unknown type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Cream, green &amp; pink: Unknown type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Brown: Unknown type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Beige: Serving dish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W Yellow: Unknown type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E/W blue &amp; white: Unknown type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Description</td>
<td>MNI per Trench 1</td>
<td>MNI per Trench 2</td>
<td>MNI per Trench 3</td>
<td>MNI per Trench 4</td>
<td>MNI per Trench 5</td>
<td>Total Ceramic MNI per Trench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W Green &amp; white transfer pattern</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W blue &amp; white/cream transfer pattern</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Cup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W brown &amp; white transfer pattern</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W blue &amp; white willow ware pattern</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W blue spongeware</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E/W blue flowware</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porcelain white</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.5. MNI numbers for ceramics found during excavation. The MNI numbers for the ceramic were determined using different stylistic patterns and colours on the pieces. When there was a piece without a pattern, such as a plain white or black shard, it was counted as one individual only once in the MNI count. Most of the ceramic sherds were quite small, and there were only a few pieces of rim or base found, making it necessary to revert to counting patterns for the numbers. No ceramics were found outside the house, in Trench 3 and Trench 5.

Table 8.5 reveals that the people or person using the Wyman house were utilising a standard array of vessels, with quite common patterns and colours. All of these types of vessels and patterns could be locally bought.

While the MNI numbers do not reveal any useful information in the search to determine the artefacts origin ethnicity, and indeed could be considered to be a very processual (and somewhat outdated) practice for this type of study, it was felt that
such a count was necessary. This is because “frequencies of occurrence of the different artefact types recovered can provide useful information on patterns of behaviour, including those patterns relatable to ethnic identity” (Staski 2003: pers com). Unfortunately, this was not the case here as while there were a number of bottles and ceramics found, the only useful information on patterns of behaviour that they related was a definite reliance by the Polish on local materials and locally bought produce. In all probability this dependence on locally made and bought materials has nothing to do with a degree of assimilation into the surrounding society, but more to do with the convenience and cheapness of purchasing these items, as opposed to having the equivalent Polish items imported especially.

8.3 Excavation Discussion

While the excavation uncovered a vast array of material culture, none of this could be identified as being of Polish origin. This is not to say that these items were not purchased by or used by the Polish. However, they are not identifiable as being manufactured in Poland or by a Polish person. The artefacts excavated are a standard array of items that would be uncovered from any historical excavation around Australia, with the exception of the blacksmith/forge tools, as these are for a specific profession (for a specific list of tools see Tables 8.1 and 8.2). For example, excavations from miners family houses built into the Burra Creek banks in Burra (40km NE of Polish Hill River) South Australia, which were in use in the mid nineteenth century revealed a similar array of artefact vessels and types (Birt 2004). An excavation at a house site at 15 Quebec St, Port Adelaide, which has been in continuous use from the mid nineteenth to the present showed a similar array of artefacts again to those found at the Wyman house excavation (Briggs 2004: Pers Comm).

When analysing the artefact uncovered during the excavation, several facts are uncovered: a cork and a bottle stopper were found, meaning that there were bottles on the site that were manufactured prior to outside screw closure bottles (circa 1920) (Boow 1991:81).
Forty-seven fragments of bone were found; for the most part these were unidentified. Of those that were identified, 28 were sheep, one was bird, two were rabbit and two were pig. The number of sheep bones was not a surprise as this house has sheep freely grazing through it at certain times of the year, and the ground in the paddock all around the house is littered with sheep bones. At least four of the bones recovered during excavation were subsequently analysed and found to be field deaths (based on the bleached colour of the bone and their proximity on or to the surface of the ground). The bird and rabbit bones are also not a surprise, as there are birds nesting in the walls and rabbits living in the paddocks. The interesting find is the two possible pig ribs. These must have been brought to the site, as there is no record of a styte on the land, and in all probability they were consumed as food.

The pieces of earthenware, porcelain and stoneware are typical of the array seen in the nineteenth century. Of these, transferware is the most common type of ceramic and out of the 33 pieces, 16 were identified as being some type of transferware, including sponge-ware and flow-ware. The rest of the earthenware was coloured cream or a combination of cream and some other colour like blue, green, pink or black. There are few fragments of porcelain, however, two of these pieces were found in the stone well, where the contents were clearly mixed. Modern items were found next to items from the nineteenth century, so this porcelain cannot be clearly identified as belonging to the occupants of the house. They could be the result of random rubbish dumping. Three other pieces were located in the house trenches, which could indicate that the owner was slowly accumulating finer items, or that they were given these items.

The large number of identifiable metal tools came for the most part from Trench Five, which was located in the tool shed. They were found in a random jumble, just under the surface, along with charred wood, charcoal, melted glass and fallen stone. This would indicate that this area was formerly in use as a forge, and later on as a storage/tool shed (which it was still was at the time it was destroyed during the bushfires). The random nature of the tools would support the second answer. While there were a number of tools consistent with the building being a forge, such as farrier’s pincers and tongs, there were also a large amount of random tools such as wood planes, files, saws, bits of metal and odd parts of cars (like radiator grills) and
other machinery that indicate that this building had become a random junk shed (see Table 8.2). The tools excavated and sampled for the database are just that, a sample. In fact, there were so many tools removed (approximately 50-100), that it was impossible to bring them all back and catalogue them. While they could have been catalogued on site this was not practical due to time constraints. There were also a number of tools excavated from Trench Six, and the reason for this remains somewhat of a mystery. This trench was located in the north corner of the verandah structure. Why there would be so many artefacts buried in this particular spot, especially metal tools such as bolt looseners, clamps, an Allen key, bolts and assorted other unidentified tools, defies explanation. Perhaps it was a general rubbish dump for a period of time but it is a very unorthodox spot for it. This possible dump could date from when the house was a ‘backender’; this dump would have been several metres away from the original back structure at that point, making it a more logical placement of it.

The items sampled from the stone well, positioned approximately 100m southwest from the house need further clarification. This well was sectioned into two halves by a stone wall. The eastern half was obscured by a large rose bush, meaning that access was not possible. On the western side the well was filled to the top with stone and random rubbish. As the ‘Mizpah’ ring was located here, it was decided to take a random sample of the contents (based on diagnostic qualities) from the well. This being said, it was recognized that this well had probably been a dump for random material from the site since the 1960s, and any finds from it would have to be analysed with this in mind. Thus the five bottles (two unidentified, one beer and two medicine), the cork, the earthenware serving dish and teapot, the unidentified glass jar, the metal screw cap, the porcelain mug (two pieces) and stoneware plate (two pieces), cannot really be analysed in relation to the Polish living in the dwelling close by. Some of these artefacts are modern in origin (the metal screw cap, the porcelain mug pieces for example), while others indicate an older pedigree (such as the cork from a bottle and four bottle fragments, #000_06-000_09).

While some of these artefacts could have been placed there by Polish inhabitants of the house, there is an equal possibility that they were not. They could have been picked up from anywhere on the site and dumped there by the family living on this
land now (indeed most of the substantial property has been utilised as a recycled old parts dump). However, it is also a possibility that the items thrown away here were at some point bought and used by the Polish living in the nearby house in the early twentieth century. All that can be said with certainty is that none are Polish in origin, or show no evidence of any modification that could be attributed to the Polish.

8.3.1 Special Finds
The excavation uncovered five special finds: a coin, a dog registration tag, a handmade silver medallion and two buttons. The coin (27mm diameter) was identified as being a British penny from the 1850s, however this coin could have been in use up until the time Australia began minting its own money (1910) (Clarke 1971:4). The fact that it was found under the doorstep could mean its placement there was a deliberate house blessing/ritual, as this was not uncommon when building a new dwelling. Alternatively, the more prosaic alternative is that it fell out of someone’s pocket.

The dog registration tag (34 x 32mm) is dated 1924-1925. It does not say which council the dog was registered with, but it can be presumed that it was the closest council, Clare. The timing of the registration means that the owner of the dog was not Polish, as this property was not owned by J. Wyman at this time, it was sold by John Wyman to Norman Bruce Wellington, orchardist in 1921. The location of this find (the forge building) suggests that Wellington was utilising previous buildings on the property, as it would be unlikely that an orchardist would have built a forge. The range of tools and other paraphernalia found in the rubble of this building indicates it was used for storage later in its life, and thus the dog could have been in here with its master when the tag was lost or replaced with a new tag.

The handmade silver medallion (23 x 25mm) is much more interesting. It was cut from a larger piece of silver, to fit the coat of arms that is embossed on it. A hole was then cut into the top so it could be worn around the neck (Figure 8.7). Furthermore, the medallion is quite worn, with the silver being very thin, which seems to be a sign that it was worn close at all times. This indicates that this medallion was probably very special to its owner. The coat of arms consists of four panels, two with possible
lions on them and two with what appears to be spades (like in a deck of cards). It has not been possible to trace the coat of arms at this time.

The two buttons both have the maker’s names engraved into them. One is a small brass four-hole button, known as a ‘sew-through’ button (Lindbergh 1999:51). It has a stamped brass sunken panel with ‘J. Marshall & Co’. Adelaide on the front of it. This indicates that the button was manufactured in Adelaide, and the article of clothing it was attached to was at least purchased in this state. J. M. Marshall owned and operated a substantial Drapery firm, Importers, Cabinet Makers, Upholsterers and Furniture Warehouse business in Adelaide from 1882 until 1928 (Boothby Almanacs 1882; South Australian Almanac and Directory 1923:1374). This business began in 1877 as Marshall & Taylor, Drapers (Boothby Almanacs 1877:200), and then became quite successful and operated in up to five locations, including a London store before its closure. These sort of sew-through buttons were common, and from its size (16mm), was likely to be from a man’s trousers (Ritchie 1986:515; Lindbergh 1999:50-57). The second button is made of copper and is also of the sew-through type. It has the name ‘C. Rowley’ and ‘Patent’ engraved on the front of it. At this time the manufacturer ‘C. Rowley’ has not been located. The inner circle has two metal threads that form the holes used to attach it to the material with thread. This button is probably a three piece construction and this makes it machine made and thus post 1850 (Ritchie 1986:528). The size of this button (16mm) indicates it was used for fastening men’s trousers, coats, jackets and pyjamas (Lindbergh 1999:51).

The two pieces of earthenware bottle that have possible foreign writing on them have also yet to be identified (Figure 8.10). There is not enough left of the piece to be able to identify the symbols on them conclusively. They look like they could be from the Greek alphabet, but this cannot be confirmed.
8.4 Discussion

All of the other excavated artefacts are a standard range of domestic products, and tell us little except that the person or people living in the J. Wyman house used crockery, glasses, kept liquid in bottles and used metal for a variety of things that are really quite ordinary. This leads back to McGuire’s (1982:159) comment in Chapter Two, that in the United States, immigrant groups of both Polish and Germans blended for the most part into the general culture. Yet Staski’s (1990:126) point about the possibility of diversity still being present, but being masked by factors such as a British dominance over trade is also possible. From what we have seen the Germans in Australia did appear to have kept their traditional material culture (including their housing, grave markers and farming techniques) along with their traditional way of life for longer than the Polish, whilst still living in the same colony with the same trade conditions.

The Germans suffered for this, however. When World War One began, Germans and people of German descent were persecuted in South Australia, despite previously being called “conscientious and industrious in service, regular, sedate and capable of applying themselves to many different kinds of labour” (Schubert 1985:100) and
having men from the German community serving in the Australian army during this conflict (Harmstorf 1994:49). Some Germans were interned like criminals because of their place of origin or descent, and their perceived highly visible differences in South Australian society. Furthermore, by an official Act of Parliament 69 place names were changed in South Australia from their original German names to more acceptable ‘English’ names (the names of 11 towns have been changed back to their original names over the years) (Harmstorf 1994:7-10, 55). Harmstorf has written that there is “little to suggest that the Germans in South Australia could have escaped the vilification that was heaped upon them in the period 1914-1918. Because of their inherited cultural interests they were perceived to be much more ‘German’ than they really were” (Harmstorf 1994:47). The Polish however, were not persecuted. Technically German, they too should have come under fire from general society. However, they did not. Whether this is because they had a lower public profile in South Australia (in other words not as many people were aware of their presence as they were with the Germans), or because of the fact they might have acculturated more quickly into South Australian society (or at least presented a British front), is unknown.

Water’s (1995) study on six German immigrant groups from the eighteenth and nineteenth century highlights what could be the answer to the question of the difference between the Polish and German immigrants in South Australia. He found that some communities maintained their traditions for many generations, while others did not. This was mostly due to the ability to transplant their economic base with them. If they could not, they were forced to look for work outside their communities, thus facilitating continued contact with outside influences. When the German immigrants came to Adelaide they brought with them farmers (33%), artisans (37%), labourers (12%), commerce specialists (9%) and professionals (1%) (which include the Pastors and missionaries) (Harmstorf 1994:19). In short they transplanted entire communities, thus bringing their economic base with them (Harmstorf 1994:19). This meant they did not need to seek work outside their communities, and thus had little contact with others, enabling them to be ‘closed communities’. The Polish community, on the other hand, was comprised mostly of labourers and farmers. Because of this the Polish had to seek outside help whenever they wanted anything
they could not create, such as gravestones. This in turn led to their continued interaction with the wider community and their eventual acculturation.

This research supports Lydon’s (1999:90) statement about groups asserting their ethnic practices to a greater extent when escaping hostile circumstances by immigrating, or when in a hostile position. The Polish at Hill River did flee a hostile situation in their homeland, where from all accounts the asserting of their traditions was used as a way of asserting their culture. When the Polish arrived here, that assertiveness continued. Only Polish was spoken in the home, women wore traditional costumes, Polish was taught in the school, a Polish priest was brought out, and a church built to worship in. Lydon has also noted, however, that when the relations between the minority culture and the dominant culture are good, the outward signs of differing ethnicity become less noticeable (Lydon 1999b:184). Relations between the Polish and their surrounding communities were good. There were no conflicts relating to ethnicity or otherwise (except the one mentioned in Section 3.4). The outward signs of ethnicity did seem to disappear over time as the acculturation of the Polish became more pronounced. However, this again goes back to Staski (1990), with his argument about outside forces affecting the external display of ethnicity.

What about the internal evidence of ethnicity? What about how these people thought about themselves and the world around them? Here the documentary evidence sheds some light.

The records available for naturalisation seem to indicate that it took some time for most of the people who were naturalised to make this decision, with the majority of men being naturalised in 1895. However, three men did take this step significantly earlier, within 10-12 years of arriving in South Australia. Becoming naturalised indicates that an important mind-shift had taken place. These Polish immigrants were definitely becoming externally assimilated, and possibly subjectively assimilated into Australian society as well. They wanted the advantages that came with being a British citizen in Australia.

The artefacts from Polish Hill River indicate a similar story of eventual assimilation into British society. The Polish at Hill River were first externally assimilated into colonial South Australian society, and eventually over time subjectively assimilated
into the dominant culture of the area. For 60 years they were a tight-knit community bound by Polish tradition, language and religion and then, the community disappeared. The people scattered into the countryside, taking with them only their names to distinguish them as people of Polish extraction.

The overall difference in the communities and eventual assimilation patterns between the Polish and the German settlers in South Australia points to differences inherent to their identities and their methods of immigration. The Germans generally arrived as whole communities under the care of their priest, who usually had arranged land for them to live on in advance. They settled as a community on big enough parcels of land to support the entire group of people. In this way they were able to continue their traditions from Prussia, including their land settlement pattern, their religion (Lutheran), their food and clothing traditions, their language, and most importantly for this study, their material culture traditions. They were able to continue building their homes, furniture, headstones and even their coffins using traditional methods because they had people in their village that could do this. The Germans in South Australia even had their own newspaper, ‘Australische Zeitung’ (Australian Newspaper) (Schubert 1985:177).

The number of German settlers facilitated this, as did the closeness of their settlements to one another in Adelaide (Klemzig), the Adelaide Hills (Glen Osmond, Hahndorf, Paechtown, Friedrichstadt, Lobethal, Grünthal (Verdun) and Blumberg (Birdwood), and in the Barossa Valley (Tanunda, Angaston, Nuriootpa, Bethanien (Bethany), and Lyndoch, to name a few) (Schubert 1985:144). During the nineteenth century, the Germans comprised the largest non-British immigrant group in South Australia (Vamplew 1987:11), estimated at between 7-10% of the total population of the state (Harmstorf 1994:18). If one community did not have someone of skill to make something in the traditional way, the next village did.

This was not the case for the Polish. They arrived here in generally small family groups, rather than as an entire community. More importantly, they could not afford to buy a parcel of land large enough to keep their village settlement patterns intact. They arrived without a priest to organise them and thus had to worship outside the
community for many years. They were the only group of Polish in South Australia, and had no other Polish people to turn to if they needed help. Numbers also limited the settlers, being mostly farmers and labourers they could not support a community without outside assistance. This is the overall difference between the Germans and Polish in South Australia: their immigration patterns. And this is one of the main reasons that their settlements, and their material remains differed so much from each other as time progressed.

8.4.1 The Empty Niche

When the first group of Germans arrived in South Australia, only three years after the state’s colonisation, they came into a landscape that had not been explored or utilised to any great extent by Europeans (local Aboriginal groups (NAMES) had of course been using this land for millennia’s but had been moved on by squatters by this time). Thus, they were able to find themselves a ‘perceived empty niche’ and fill it, not only in the cultural landscape, but also in South Australian society itself. South Australia was founded under the banner of a ‘free settlement’. This meant two things: there were no convicts involved in its colonisation and it was a place where anyone could settle and have freedom of religion and way of life (Gibbs 1995:22; 26-27). The Germans were the first large group of non-British immigrants to put this political ideology to the test, thus filling a political niche in society.

The Germans entered a cultural landscape which did not have a colonial character established. They felt, and were, free to make their own imprint on the landscape and used their own background as the template. By contrast, when the first Polish arrived in the state some 17 years later, they moved into a landscape and a society where a British colonial character had already been imprinted. The ‘cultural niche’ had been filled and the Polish built their homes to blend in with the established character of the landscape and society. This, too, is the difference between the Polish settlement at Panna Maria and the one at Polish Hill River. The Polish in Texas also filled an empty niche in the landscape and were able to keep their traditions and way of life with minimal interaction from outsiders, while the Polish at Hill River could not.

Before the Polish arrived the Germans had already overcome serious (British) opposition to their naturalisation, their being elected to Parliament, and their full
acceptance into everyday society. Indeed in September 1885, a letter from a ‘sexagenarian Briton’ appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on the issue of Germans being elected to South Australian Parliament and their naturalisation as British citizens, arguing that “our teutonic friends have very good reason to be thankful for the refuge South Australia has afforded them… and they ought to gratefully acknowledge and quietly enjoy their freedom. I would naturalise no more Germans until they made the English language a professed object in their education. … To have the rights of Anglo-Saxons they must cease to be Germans” (Harmstorf 1994:13). In facing and overcoming these difficulties the German community had already fought the battles to be accepted and to take their place in society, thus smoothing the way for other groups who arrived later.

The differences seen in the settlements and the visibility of the Polish at Hill River and the Polish at Panna Maria, and the Germans in South Australia can be broken down to several key factors. To maintain traditions and remain visible in both the archaeological and social records, immigrant groups need:

A. A good reason, or necessary ‘push’, to leave their home country and move to a new one. This push can be because of economic factors or political factors.

B. Sufficient immigrant numbers to maintain population levels.

C. A perception of an ‘empty’ cultural landscape, where there is enough room to be able to set up a community and practice important traditions without fear of retribution.

D. Sufficient money to be able to afford to purchase land and the necessary equipment to set the community up.

E. A ‘leader’, such as a minister, to make the arrangements and make sure the community has a reason to stay together.

F. Links to the home country to maintain trade networks so traditional items can be imported.

G. ‘Chain’ migration. Letters from the immigrants to those left behind urging them to migrate to keep population numbers constant in the first few years.

The artefacts uncovered during the excavation point to a story of difference between the Germans and the Polish in South Australia inherent to their different immigration
methods. This, in turn, affected their strategies for fitting into colonial society and consequently, their visibility in today’s society.
Chapter Nine: Conclusions and Future Directions

9.1 Introduction
This thesis has two research questions. The overall question is can a minority European culture living in Anglo-Saxon colonial Australia be distinguished from other cultures by their material remains? In order to answer this question however, it was necessary to formulate another research question: can Polish cultural identity be established solely from their material remains? By first finding an answer to a correlation between Polish ethnicity and material remains, it was possible to distinguish a difference between the Polish, Germans and British using the combined resources of archaeology and historical documents. The answer to both questions is, in the case of Polish Hill River, ‘Yes’.

9.2 Ethnicity
Most of the studies on ethnicity and material remains in the discipline of archaeology have been somewhat restricted in both Australia and the rest of the world. Typically, what has been done concentrates on the cultures that ‘stand out’ from the rest, usually the Chinese, African Americans and distinctive European cultures, such as the Germans or specific European sub-cultures like the Moravians (Babson 1990:20; Staski 1990:124; Thomas 1994; Waters 1995; Stankowski 2000). This is not unusual, as the physical remains of these cultures are quite distinctive and to a certain extent can be easily detected in both the archaeological records and in historical documents (Staski 1990:125).

What indeed is ethnicity? This study used Jones’ (2000:xiii) definition of ethnic identity: “that aspect of a person’s self-conceptualisation which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or common descent”. Culture and ethnicity are a part of what characterise a person, whether they consciously know it or not. Thus, the idea of looking at ethnic correlates and material culture is that specific ethnic groups create and use things that reflect this identity (consciously or unconsciously) and if the archaeologist excavates this item, they should be able to tell what culture or ethnicity
created them by examining and comparing it with similar items from other cultures. Unfortunately, this is no simple matter.

It is one thing to excavate a site from the historical period in Australia and uncover opium bowls and Chinese coins. It is quite another to state that this was a Chinese site because of this material culture. It is absolutely feasible to say with accuracy that the Chinese made these items, quite possibly in China, but it does not automatically follow that this was a Chinese site as a result. Chinese coins were quite a popular collectable (and still are) and the addiction to opium was by no means confined to the Chinese. So, was this then a Chinese site or a European site? Unless that perfect site comes along where something unique occurs in the archaeological record that can be definitely tied to the culture under study (usually using historical documentation), it is not possible ever to know with one hundred percent certainty whether the artefacts have a one to one correlation to the culture under study.

It is because of this that virtually every paper or book written on the subject of ethnicity and archaeology has stated in one way or another that the ethnic correlates of material culture are poorly understood and difficult to establish (Cusick 1995:77). Polish Hill River is no exception to this rule. In fact it helps to reinforce it. Almost every type of artefact studied from Polish Hill River (graves, houses, ceramic, glass, metal and bone) is no different to any other type of artefact uncovered from the same period almost anywhere in Australia. The Polish had the same house designs, the same ceramic patterns and types, the same generic metallic objects, the same types of bone and the same type of glass bottles and jars.

In Chapter Two, Singleton’s (1996) theories on value and reality culture were discussed in relation to looking at ethnicity and the site at Polish Hill River. Using her terms, value culture refers to customs, beliefs and values influenced by a specific ethnic heritage, while reality culture refers to aspects of life influenced by external forces, such as the type of foods available in the general market place to make traditional (value culture) meals. This could possibly be translated into a situation where all the material remains left behind could be called reality culture, as they were in some way influenced by external factors, while the documentary sources such as letters, diaries and oral reminiscences would be value culture because this would be
affected to a much lesser extent by outside factors. In this study the lack of letters and diaries meant that most, if not all of the material culture looked at was reality culture, and thus affected by external factors. The implications of this for the study are important. If outside forces affected all the material culture of the Polish at Hill River, then the ability to distinguish a specific Polish ethnicity from the surrounding general forms of material culture was compromised and, therefore, became a much harder task.

This leads to the next subject under study: acculturation or assimilation. The ability to distinguish a specific culture’s remains from the mainstream society in which it is situated depends on whether or not the minority culture has completely assimilated into the majority culture. Identity and ethnicity, and the culture that lies behind them, are not fixed. They can change and be adjusted as people adapt to different environments or societies (Barrett 1990:59). One form of this is assimilation. Assimilation generally means that the immigrants completely submerge their cultural heritage altogether in favour of a new culture. Acculturation is seen as one aspect of assimilation that removes a specific behavioural or material pattern that symbolically differentiates those individuals who are members of an ethnic population from those who are non-members (Staski 1990:123-4). Thus, acculturation would also affect the extent to which ethnicity can be seen in the material culture of an immigrant group like the Polish at Hill River.

Figure 9.1. Diagram showing the relationships between value culture, reality culture and assimilation.
So the ethnicity (value culture) of the material remains of the Polish at Hill River is affected by both outside forces (reality culture) and internal forces (assimilation) (Figure 9.1). Thus, defining the Polish by their material culture becomes doubly hard.

There is one way in which the Polish could have used reality culture to create value culture at Polish Hill River. They could have used local materials to construct Polish items. In addition to this they could have brought with them, or specifically imported, traditional Polish products to counter the tide of reality culture here. Would the Polish have done this?

9.3 The Polish at Hill River

The Polish at Hill River were a group of people who left their homes in search of what they presumably thought would be a better life for themselves and their children. They were for the most part farmers and labourers, heavily religious and very Polish. These people created a community that flourished for over 60 years, where the Polish language, religion (Catholicism) and traditions were given free reign. This group had a strong sense of identity and unity of spirit. They built their own church and brought out a Polish priest to minister to them. In other respects these people were just like everyone else at the time: they worked hard, married, had children, went to church and died, and their material culture reflects this similarity.

That is one of the reasons why it is so hard to establish any kind of ethnic correlates to their material culture: their material culture was for the most part like everyone else’s. They built their houses using the same stone, made their clothes out of the same cloth, and ate the same type of food off the same kind of plates, using the same kind of utensils. They had the same kind of grave markers and had to converse in the same language as those outside their village (English) to get by. The same patterns (Willow-ware and Asiatic pheasants), and types (earthenware) of dishes found at other historical excavations in Australia were found at the excavation in Polish Hill River. If this is the case, and it is, how can any degree of Polish ethnicity be established at this site from the material remains left behind?
We know from documentary evidence that the Polish way of life was very strong in this community. Their language, dress, songs, dances, food, architecture and traditions were meant to enforce their Polish heritage. It could be possible that their distinctly Polish world view was translated into patterns of non-Polish artefacts.

There are archaeological arguments that detail how artefacts can look the same as everyone else’s, but have different meanings and interpretations in different contexts. This is called ‘multivalence’ (Mullins 1999:30). Different immigrant groups brought their own ideas about what the world was like with them when they immigrated, but had to use foreign material to express these ideas. Thus, the same material culture is used by different cultural groups in different ways. Mullins also argues that the range of meanings an object can assume changes over time, and differs from one environment to the next, but is always socially grounded and limited by the artefact’s physical form (1999:30).

This obvious disparity between the documentary sources, which tell a story of a cohesive Polish community, and the material records, which tells a different story of assimilation, can perhaps be best explained by the Seinfeldian concept of ‘worlds colliding’. The Polish arranged their universe so that they had two ‘worlds’. One was the British society (public world) they had to deal with daily in business interactions, while the other was their Polish home life (private world). If you can imagine, when a Polish person stepped outside his front door, he was confronted by the colonial Australian (British) landscape (community) and all its entailments: working, trips into non-Polish towns to sell produce, buy land, pay taxes and pick up mail. There the Polish had to have a modicum of ‘Britishness’ to survive, they at least had to have the appearance of conforming to the outside world to keep their lives running and to smooth their interactions with people outside the Polish Hill River community.

However, when this hypothetical Polish man went back home and stepped into his private space, he saw Poland: his family spoke Polish to him, his wife wore traditional dress and cooked traditional meals. This Polish view of his world expanded over time to encompass the Polish Hill River community, with the building of the Polish church and the hiring of the Polish priest who could say Mass and
converse in Polish. In his private world, he was free to be what he wanted: Polish, or
British, or both.

The material culture of the Polish indicates that they seemed to acculturate quite
readily in general society. However, I believe this ‘acculturation’ was just for show
for a long period of time. The division of public and private space is exemplified by
one particular aspect of the material culture uncovered, the niches. This Polish
vernacular trait was present inside the houses, and nowhere else, while the remaining
houses generally looked very much vernacular Australian in their design. This
illustrates the two worlds, on the outside British, on the inside, Polish. These people
arranged their consumer choices and the aesthetic look of their outside world to
mirror the British society, while inside their central core their Polishness still thrived
for generations. Eventually, the Polish began to view their two worlds as the same.
Their private space became a mirror for the landscape that surrounded it, their public
world. There was no more mental division; their separate British and Polish identities
had merged to become Australian.

Generally, when two different cultures meet, there is a sharing and exchange of ideas
and customs on both sides, (even though one culture maybe dominant in many
respects) with each culture maintaining core traditions. The Germans in South
Australia influenced the culture of the state to such an extent that German words and
types of foods are still in common usage today. For example, the word ‘delicatessen’,
used in South Australia to describe the corner store (or ‘Milk Bar’ in other states of
Australia), comes from the German words ‘Delikat Essen’, meaning speciality foods
(Harmstorf 1994:31). The German term ‘Berliner’ is still used to describe a type of
donut (filled with jam) and ‘Fritz’ refers to a German cold sausage sold throughout
the state (in other states this is known as ‘Devon’) (Harmstorf 1994:31). The German
festival, the ‘Schützenfest’, is still held annually in Adelaide (previously held for over
a century in Hahndorf) (Harmstorf 1994:29), and still draws crowds in the thousands
to listen to the German music, eat German food, and drink German (and Australian)
beer. Other festivals that highlight German culture and history are held at other
traditional German centres such as the Barossa Valley. It is quite popular for the
general public to buy traditional German foods and visit the towns built by the
Germans. In fact, Hahndorf is now one of the most popular tourist attractions in the
greater Adelaide area, and its German character has been substantially boosted to facilitate this.

This does not seem to be the case with the Polish at Hill River, where the flow of ideas appears to have been primarily in one direction, from the British to the Polish. Today, in the lower north of South Australia there is no obvious Polish influence or traditions that seem to have lingered as there are for the Germans in this state. All that indicates the presence of the Polish in South Australia’s history is the name of the area where they settled, and the last names of their descendants. This is not to assume that in the past the Polish culture did not influence and exchange ideas with the other communities around it, but if this did take place there is no evidence of this today.

Perhaps this is because the one thing that the Polish truly believed in and cherished, and would have wanted to spread to different communities was already firmly established in South Australia at the time of their arrival: the Catholic Church. As was seen in Chapter Three, Polish people associated themselves with Catholicism even more so than they did with their nation (Zamoyski 1987:315). The Polish loved the Church, Catholicism was not just a religion for them, it was a way of life. The Church was part of what made them who they were and their connection to it reinforced their identity and made them feel secure.

The Polish settled at Hill River because of the already established German Catholic Church in nearby Sevenhill. They attended mass every week without fail, sometimes everyday or even twice a day during religious festivals (Easter) (Brysky, M. 2000. Pers comm., January 9). They participated in the choir and other church activities, in fact “for a long period St. Aloysius’s had a unique choir. There was a blend of Irish, German and Polish voices. Almost every adult German and Pole could sing and they all seemed to have a natural sense of choral values” (Simons 1944:24).

As soon as the Polish could they built their own church with their own hands and paid for a priest to journey to Australia and minister to them. He visited them in their homes, married them, baptised and confirmed their children and buried them. In fact at the school attached to the Hill River Church, Saints’ days were observed with zeal, with the entire community coming together to celebrate the Feast days of St. John the
Baptist, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, St. Michael, St. Stanislaus, St. Anne, the Nativity, St. Luke, the Immaculate Conception, St. Patrick, the Conversion of St. Paul and St. Mathias (to name a few) (Sisters of St. Joseph Polish Hill River School Diary, 1874, 1875:1, 4, 5). On these days, the women from the community would help the children decorate the church, and Father Rogalski would say mass to all members of the community after they had finished work. On some Saints’ days, school was cancelled (Sisters of St. Joseph Polish Hill River School Diary, 1874, 1875:1). Even when members of the Polish community were forced to move north, they took their religion with them. A sister church to St. Stanislaus was built in Blyth in 1910 (Johnson 1991:44), by a committee comprised mostly of Polish farmers (Dallwitz and Marsden 1983:28). Thus the Polish could afford to keep their traditions to themselves, as their most important cultural trait, Catholicism, was already firmly established in the region.

9.4 Fieldwork

This study sought to answer research questions about ethnicity, and therefore assimilation, using the following methods: identifying and assessing the state of the surviving farmhouse structures built by the Polish at Hill River, recording in detail the form, style, features and building materials of all surviving farmhouse, excavating the remains of a farmhouse identified from historical documents as Polish to ascertain whether a Polish cultural identity could be established solely from material remains, and research into historical documentation and oral histories.

This fieldwork analysed seven sites at Polish Hill River that were for the most part still intact. The most of the rest of the Polish Hill River structures had been torn down, or fallen down over time and the materials either cleared away or re-used in other buildings (Figure 9.2), such as the many wineries that now populate this area.
The houses remaining at Polish Hill River are all in a state of disrepair, with missing roofs, fallen down walls and chimneys. This is the result of time and other factors such as bushfires and the deliberate stripping of materials from these houses by people in the area. Unless the owners of these dwellings make a decision to repair these houses, it is likely that nothing but the foundations will remain after a further 20 years. All the seven remaining houses were mapped and recorded in detail (see Chapter Seven), so any future research on this settlement will have a reference to what this site was like at this time. During the survey it was noticed that four, possibly five houses had a similar unusual feature: a square or rectangular hole (niche) in the wall, while one (the Bulla house) had an architectural design quite different from others in the area. Furthermore, the survey of the area uncovered several interesting items of material culture, including two pieces of earthenware with partial maker’s marks. In addition, two stoneware bottles and a gold ring were presented by one of the property owners as being found in and near a Polish residence.

The excavation at the J. Wyman house (Chapter Eight) did not turn up any material culture that could be identified as being made in Poland or by a Polish person. Again, this was not to say that a Polish person/family did not create or use any of the items,
but if they did there is no way of knowing this from the material remains. There were a number of special finds recorded from this excavation, yet once more they did not reveal anything specific about the person or people living here.

In all probability, the movable material culture that would display some aspect of Polish tradition or ethnicity isn’t in the archaeological record for two reasons. The first is that there was never much of it. The Polish who immigrated to Hill River would have had limited space to bring their worldly goods with them, a trunk each at best. There would not have been room for items not deemed to be essential. Secondly, these items would have been highly regarded and would have had high status. They would have been cared for, perhaps rarely used, or at least not in everyday use. Furthermore, they would have been taken with the families when they moved house and handed down for future generations. It would be unusual to recover something so significant. These items are things that you keep, even when they are broken, because they say something about who you are and where you came from. They are your heritage.

Thus, if an answer to the questions under study is to be found, it is from the immovable material culture, the actual dwellings themselves. It is in the remnants of the homes these people built as soon as they had the land and the money, homes that they used all their skills, knowledge and traditions to build.

Of the three items of material culture that stood out as being different from any other site in the area, two are found in the design and construction of these homes: the architectural design of the Bulla house and the niches found in four (possibly five) of the seven houses. In addition, the stoneware bottles from Austria found in the J. Wyman house indicate a different origin from the rest of the household items uncovered during the study. These artefacts are unique in the area and provide the only possible positive answer to at least one of the two questions under study.

All three of these artefacts can be used to establish material correlates of Polish ethnicity at this site. Thus, the answer to the first question is ‘yes’, it is possible to establish Polish identity of this site based on its material remains. The niches are the most positive evidence for this, as they do not appear to be present anywhere else in
the area, and thus, in theory, could be used to distinguish Polish houses from those created by people of different nationalities. The Bulla house is the next piece of evidence of Polish ethnicity. The design of the house, especially the central smokehouse, has been identified as being present in nineteenth century Polish architecture from the Wielkopolska region, the province where the Polish at Hill River came from.

The two handmade stoneware bottles were from the Pullna mineral spring in what was the Bohemia region in Austria (now the Czech Republic), and could be a possible link to Polish trade from other areas where the Polish had a large population (see Chapter Three). It is possible that the Polish settlers or the Polish priest (who was from Austrian Poland) brought these bottles with them when they immigrated. This is a very specific mineral water, used as a medicine. It would not have been drunk regularly, rather only used when someone was sick. However, all that can be said with any certainty is that these bottles came from the same general region of Europe that the Polish who lived here did.

The answer for the overall question concerning the ability to distinguish one minority European culture from others, is also ‘yes’, but with some reservations. The presence of the niches in the Polish houses, yet not in the German settlements around South Australia, would seem to indicate that it is possible to distinguish one minority culture from another culture living in the same area from a specific aspect of their material culture. However, this finding is both culture and area specific. It comes from the specific circumstances surrounding the settlement of Hill River by the Polish. This conclusion does not mean that it is possible to distinguish all Polish from all German settlements around Australia or around the world. Much more research on this subject would have to be done to have anything approaching a concrete answer to this question. And obviously not just on the Polish/German question, but on all minority cultures. The architecture of the Bulla house, specifically the central smokehouse, which has been used as evidence of Polish ethnicity in the Polish Hill River settlement, can also be seen in traditional German house designs. Thus, the plan of the Bulla house cannot be used to distinguish traditional Polish house designs from traditional German house designs. The bottles cannot be used to distinguish the Polish
culture from another at all. However, they do point towards a tantalising glimpse of possible Polish trade that is interesting to speculate on at this site.

The Polish at Hill River were a complex community whose changing identities and view of their world was reflected in their material culture. Archaeological theorists (Babson 1990) would suggest that simply to try and establish a specific ethnicity at a site using an ethnic marker, such as this study has tried to do (and succeeded at), is of very little archaeological value and theoretically simplistic. I can understand why they would think this. To merely identify a specific culture from its material remains is limiting, especially if other factors such as the theories behind the creation of that material culture, for example ethnicity, style and acculturation, are not explored.

However, the position that this study is simplistic is in fact a one-dimensional idea of archaeology. Archaeology by definition is the study of past societies based on their material culture. A society’s beliefs and culture (in part their ethnicity) helps shape their material culture and to ignore this is to ignore a large part of that society. How can an archaeologist truly say that they have studied a site in depth if they consider that the correlation between ethnicity and material culture is a crude type of investigation and ignore it in their theoretical analysis? Granted, this area of archaeology is a grey one, with much left to speculation, however that does not make it any the less valid. When theories of identity, style and assimilation are considered in tandem, a picture emerges that is not just one of a simple ethnic marker left by people who died long ago, but a story about a community who were undergoing a transformation of ideology and belief that is reflected in what they created. The thoughts of the people at Hill River about their lives and their mind shift from that of a Polish immigrant keen to keep their heritage, to one looking towards a future for countless generations in Australia is evident. How can this be simplistic? It is amazing to be able to infer this from the ruins of a house and a piece of pottery (among other artefacts).

This study adds to the conclusions of previous authors who have also done work in this area. As stated, this study has found that the movable material culture of the Polish at Hill River did not show any evidence of their ethnicity, and thus does not differ in any way to the other studies in this regard. Nevertheless, it has found what
appears to be a material correlate of Polish ethnicity that is not seen in either the German or English/Irish material remains of the region.

9.5 Future Directions and Research
This thesis raises issues for future directions of research on both the subject of Polish rural settlements outside Poland, and other settlements created by immigrants to Australia, both in this country, and also around the world. Polish Hill River is one small Polish settlement. The conclusions that arise from this research into this community only apply to this site, and nowhere else. Naturally, this work can act as a comparison for other work on the Polish, but any answers to the research questions that have been obtained cannot be taken to be answers for all Polish in Australia, around the world, or even for other isolated Polish settlements. This study does, however, provide a framework against which the establishment of other Polish settlements can be assessed.

As stated in Chapter Five, it was necessary to limit the study of Polish settlement in South Australia to its nucleus, the village of Polish Hill River. However, the study of the Polish in South Australia is an extremely broad subject, with much more information to be found. This is because there was a significantly larger area around Polish Hill River where the Polish lived and farmed. Furthermore, the spread of the Polish further north in the state meant that the potential region that could have been included in this analysis grew to hundreds of kilometres in size. A PhD or post-doctoral work would be perfect for a study of such size and possible results, which uses this work as a starting point, and as a comparison for future research.

Furthermore, this thesis sought to compare the Polish to other cultures living in the same area to establish whether their material remains can be distinguished from one another. It is recognised that the only other minority culture that the Polish were compared with were the Germans, as both the English and the Irish were the dominant cultures in the region. Thus future research on this topic must also include comparisons of the Polish to other minority cultures, who perhaps did not live in the same specific locality, but did live in the same region, such as the Cornish or Scottish.
Possibly another direction for future research on the Polish and their material culture to take could be on focussing how Polish material culture differed from the cultural norms of the region, rather than comparing it to another minority culture. This perhaps would have been the easier study to undertake in light of the obvious similarities between the Polish and German material culture and difficulties in distinguishing between the two, however it was felt that this type of study would have mimicked the multitude of other archaeological studies on ethnicity done around the world and been some what of a cop out.

The study of possible Polish nineteenth century trade connections and the importation of traditional goods by the Polish living in South Australia would also be of immense value to the study of the Polish role in Australia’s history. The stoneware ‘Pullna’ bottles provide a glimpse of possible trade, if not between Poland and Australia, then at least between Austrian Poland and Prussian Poland.

The further study of not only the ethnic correlations of the material culture of Polish rural settlements outside Poland, but also the archaeological manifestation of land use patterns and general transportation of traditions from Poland to the new country, would also be beneficial to the archaeological records of immigrant minority groups. The concentration has generally been on minority groups more easily seen in the archaeological record (Babson 1990:20; Staski 1990:124), those that stood out more from the general Anglo colonial settlers of the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and other British colonised countries. This study has taken a different tack. By examining those cultures that were different, but not so different as to significantly stand out, the archaeological record will be much more complete and a picture can be created of all areas of society. In historical archaeology, which is in essence the study of the European colonisation (and its impact on the Indigenous cultures) of parts of the world after 1500 AD, there is no reason for archaeologists not to study all aspects of society, as the historical documents are present to at least point archaeologists in the right direction.

The expanded study of multi-culturalism in Australian historical archaeology is necessary because, like our historical counterparts, the United States, New Zealand and Canada, archaeology in this country focuses on the historically obvious sites.
This study can be used as a basis for the study of material correlates for ethnicity of other under-represented cultures in the historical record. It can be argued that studies of the material correlates of ethnicity are of no benefit because the ability to ‘prove’ that a certain culture made or used a specific type of artefact is almost impossible. For the most part, this study agrees with this statement. However, the niches provide a small ray of hope for the singling out of a specific ethnicity from the general material culture around it. Although it cannot be said with one hundred percent confidence that these niches do provide positive evidence of Polish ethnicity, their presence in houses of Polish manufacture, and no others in the region (including German houses) is highly suggestive. Future research on this specific feature of material culture is highly recommended, not only in Australia, but also in other Polish communities around the world.

This research should begin in Poland, in the specific area that Polish emigrants to Australia (Poznań) and the United States (Silesia) came from. This investigation should look first at the spread of these niches, and then for their specific uses. Was their appearance only confined to the area in Poznań where the Polish emigrated from, or was it more widespread? What where they used for in Poland? What is their specific positioning in the house? A survey could then be done of specific Polish nineteenth century rural settlements in the United States, Canada, Brazil and other countries. This hopefully would reveal whether these niches could be positively used to identify Polish houses from that period in different Polish settlements around the world.

However, it is not only the ethnic correlates of the Polish that need to be studied further. One of the main issues that can be examined further is whether or not Mullins argument for multivalence can be applied to the ways in which the Polish used common domestic items produced by the dominant society in which they lived. It is possible that by looking at the overall picture for use of common household goods at different Polish immigrant sites around the world, a pattern, or ‘archaeological signature’ of Polishness may be able to be distinguished. If this pattern were found, it would in turn imply that the Polish were taking non-traditional items and adapting them to fit their ‘Polish’ ideas of the world. This signature is not apparent from this study, however this does not mean it does not exist. Further excavation at Polish Hill
River may reveal this, or it may be apparent at other sites around the world. This type of signature has been seen at African American sites in the United States of America, with the adaptation of ‘colonoware’, but was not recognised until Ferguson’s now classic study of numerous slave sites around the country (Ferguson 1992).

Another branch of research suggested by this work is the role of gender in the continuity of ethnicity at immigrant sites around the world. At Polish Hill River it was the men who generally went out into non-Polish society on a daily basis. They dealt with the surrounding communities for the sale of their crops, produce, to gain employment, to buy land and to pay taxes and land rates. These men had to have a working knowledge of the society around them, and of which they were a part and they had to have at least a passing ability to speak, read and write English to survive. The women, on the other hand did not require this depth of knowledge, as they generally stayed at home to tend to the house, its environs and their children. They did not need learn to speak English or to have knowledge of the general society around them if they did not want to. This makes these women the real focus of Polish ethnicity in the household. They cooked the Polish meals, spoke the Polish language and wore Polish clothes on a daily basis (Figure 3.7), at least in the beginning of the community. Basically, they were the ‘core’ of Polishness that the men came home to. This gendered continuity channel for ethnicity could be something to be examined at other immigrant sites around the world, both Polish and non-Polish.

9.6 Conclusion
With a multi-cultural society that stretches back for hundreds of years, the investigation of all cultures should be a basic facet of historical archaeology in Australia. The fact that this study is somewhat out of the ordinary says something quite important. Further research needs to be done on cultures other than those dominant in Australian history, or those minority cultures that stand out in the historical record. The future of Australian archaeology needs to embrace this way of thinking or soon become extraneous. When your job is one that relies on the interest of society in general, you have to come up with new ways of examining the past in order to stay relevant. Archaeologists in the United States have realised this and are choosing to examine the different cultures of that country in new ways with
innovative studies on slavery and creolization (see Dawdy 2000; Groover 2000; Mullins and Paynter 2000; Wilkie 2000). The potential for this diversity in archaeology is present within Australia. It just needs enough interested people to take it on.
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Appendix One

The land history of sections 153, 155, 157, 332, 340, 459 and 460 (both formally part of section 172), Hundred of Clare, South Australia. This land history compiled by William Pattullo in 1994 from records dating from 1842-1990. Pages 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 48, 49, 68, 70, 74, 76, 153, 170, 173. Polish names are bolded.

Abbreviations:
CT Certificate of Title.
No. Number.
Pt. Part of Section.
RPA Real Property Act.

Section 154 (and 51 other sections in the Hundred of Clare).
15/6/1842 Land Grant No. 353, Book 9 to Arthur Young, Aberdeen, North Britain.
   Land order No. 211 issued by the Colonies Commissioner.

31/7/1849 Conveyance No. 393, Book 15 from
   Arthur Young, of the special survey, 1st part and
   James Hadden Young, of the special survey, 2nd part to
   Joseph Gilbert, Pewsey Vale, Wiltshire.
   Price £500 and subject to mortgage debt of £5000 plus interest due to
   Eagle Henderson, City of Edinborough, Merchant and
   Thomas Young, Leith, County of Edinborough, Merchant and
   Archibald Boyd, Leith, County of Edinborough, Merchant.

1/4/1853 Reconveyance No. 433, Book 49 from
   Eagle Henderson, Thomas Young and Archibald Boyd to
   Joseph Gilbert (repayment of mortgage).

Section 154 to 158 and other sections.
9/10/1854 From Henry Gilbert, Pewsey Vale, Esq. to
   William James Browne, Home Park, Esq. and
   John Harris Browne, Pt. Gawler, Esq.

Section 154.
15/8/1864 Brought under RPA CT Vol 58 Fol 63 in name of
   Stanislaus Malycha, Hill River, Farmer.

CT Vol 58 Fol 63 Stanislaus Malycha, Hill River, Farmer.
15/2/1882 John Marlow, Hill River, Farmer.
16/3/1882 Land divided as follows:
   North East portion CT Vol 387 Fol 48, Peter Wyman.
   Balance (2 parts) CT Vol 387 Fol 49, John Marlow.
Part Section 154 (North east), The Drula House.
20/5/1883 Death of Peter Wyman, Intestate.
10/3/1884 Barbara Wyman, Hill River, Widow, as Executor.
17/8/1897 John Marlow, Hill River, Farmer.
20/8/1909 Death of John Marlow.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow, Hill River, Widow, as Executor.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow.
New CT Vol 1342 Fol 129 (combined with other parts).

Part Section 154 (balance).
2/3/1883 Portion Northwest corner CT Vol 415 Fol 99 to John Stalmacher.
13/2/1884 Portion southwest CT Vol 443 Fol 11 to Michael Drula.
Balance CT Vol 443 Fol 168 to John Marlow.

CT Vol 415 Fol 99 (John Stalmacher).
20/8//1909 Death of John Marlow.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow, Sevenhills, Widow as Executor.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow.
New CT Vol 1342 Fol 129 (combined with other parts).

Part Section 154 (South west)
CT Vol 443 Fol 11 (Michael Drula).
14/6/1901 Death of Michael Deula (Drula).
25/5/1902 Josofy Deula, Hill River, Widow, as Executor.
31/7/1902 Paul Bula, Hill River, Farmer.
21/12/1912 Charles Rucioch, Sevenhills, Labourer.
12/12/1931 Thomas Victor Seipelt, Clare, Farmer.
New CT Vol 3518 Fol 160 (combined with other land).

Part Section 154 (Balance).
CT Vol 443 Fol 168 (John Marlow).
20/8/1909 Death of John Marlow.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow, Sevenhills, Widow, as Executor.
12/7/1910 Annie Marlow.
New CT Vol 1342 Fols 129, 130 (now with other land).

Part Section 154 (North).
CT Vol 1342 Fol 129 (Annie Marlow).
3/5/1931 Death of Annie Marlow.
2/7/1931 Thomas Henry Symons, Clare, Accountant as Executor.
2/7/1931 Aloysius Marlow, Thangool, Queensland, Labourer.
21/9/1932 Peter Louis Modystack, Sevenhills, Labourer.
9/4/1974 John Leslie Wilson, Banksia Park, Doctor and Patricia Anne Wilson, his wife
Finish.

Part Section 155 (south) The Bulla house.
15/5/1867 Conveyance No. 170, Book 223 to Paul Polunka, near Clare, Farmer.
Area 40 acres, price £420.
4/6/1887 From Mortgagees Frederick George Richardson and Charles Houghton Richardson to Paul Bula, Hill River, Farmer.
27/4/1906 Barbara Bula, wife of Paul Bula.
23/8/1924 Death of Barbara Bula.
11/11/1924 John Mark Wyman, Sevenhills East, Farmer, as Executor.
5/1/1933 Annie Wyman, Mintaro, Spinster.
6/5/1953 Death of Annie Wyman.
22/3/1962 Stanley George Wyman, for his life and to Sylvia Rose Barber, Kensington, Married woman, in remainder expectant upon the determination of the life of Stanley George Wyman.
14/3/1968 Roger Hugh Sanders, Clare, Merchant.
19/12/1977 John McLean Cocker, Station Hand and Patricia Graham Cocker, Home Duties, Waterloo Corner.

New CT Vol. 4143, Folio 95.
Finish.

Part Section 155.
Portion CT Vol. 626, Folio 175 to Paul Bula, Hill River, Farmer.

New CT Vol. 1811, Folio 71 (now includes sections 156, 159, Pts 154, 155, 158).
CT Vol. 1811, Folio 71 John Frank Modystack, Hill River, Farmer.
12/12/1942 Death of John Frank Modystack.
20/3/1943 Mary Rose Modystack, Sevenhill, Widow, as Executor.
20/3/1943 Death of Mary Rose Modystack.
25/10/1943 Peter Louis Modystack and Leslie Francis Modystack, Sevenhill, Farmers, as Executors.
25/10/1943 Peter Louis Modystack and Leslie Francis Modystack.
25/2/1954 Road adjoining Section 159 closed.

New CT Vol 2327, Folio 52.
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

9/4/1974 Land Divided as follows:  
Portion to District Council of Clare.
Pt. Section 154 CT Vol 4021, Folio 166 to John Leslie Wilson and Patricia Anne Wilson.
Pt. Section 158 CT Vol. 4021, Folio 167 to Polish Association of South 
Australia Inc. and Polish Education Society of South Australia Inc.
Balance CT Vol 4021, Folio 168 to RV and NS Rzeszkowski.
New CT Vol 4145, Folio 746.
20/12/1979 Wolf Blass Wines International Pty Ltd, Nuriootpa
20/10/1986 Bilyara Vineyards Pty Ltd, Adelaide.
Finish

Section 157 (and 51 other sections in the Hundred of Clare) The 
Hogben house.
15/6/1842 Land Grant No. 353, Book 9 to Arthur Young, Aberdeen, North 
Britain.
Land order No. 211 issued by the Colonies Commissioner.
31/7/1849 Conveyance No. 393, Book 15 from 
Arthur Young, of the special survey, 1st part and James Hadden Young, of the special survey, 2nd part to 
Joseph Gilbert, Pewsey Vale, Wiltshire.
Price £500 and subject to mortgage debt of £5000 plus interest due 
to Eagle Henderson, City of Edinborough, Merchant and 
Thomas Young, Leith, County of Edinborough, Merchant and 
Archibald Boyd, Leith, County of Edinborough, Merchant.
1/4/1853 Reconveyance No. 433, Book 49 from 
Eagle Henderson, Thomas Young and Archibald Boyd to 
Joseph Gilbert (repayment of mortgage).

Section 157 (and four other sections).
1/2/185? Conveyance No. 395, Book 75 to Henry Gilbert, Pewsey Vale.
Price £1400.
9/10/1854 Henry Gilbert, Pewsey Vale to 
William James Browne, Home Park and John Harris Browne, 
Port Gawler (land then divided up).

Section 157 (north).
2/6/1864 Bought under RPA, CT Vol. 55, Folio 149 in the name of 
John Nykiel, Hill River, Farmer.
27/1/1910 Death of John Nykiel.
20/7/1910 John Nykiel, the younger, Hill River, Butcher, and Paul Kostera, 
Blyth, Farmer, as Executors.
9/2/1920 Memo of Appointment: John Nykiel, the younger, and Arthur Prater, 
Prospect, Produce Merchant, as Executors.
10/11/1920 Albert Edward Crossing, Mintaro, Farmer.

New CT Vol. 1660, Folio 120.
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

6/2/1941 Road adjoining east side closed.


24/6/1964 Lindsay David Cheetham, Clare, Farmer and Grazier, and Ella May Cheetham, his wife as Tenants in Common.

Finish.

Section 157 (south).

2/6/1864 Brought under RPA, CT Vol. 55, Folio 211 in the name of Andrew Weimann, Hill River, Farmer.
3/5/1885 Death of Andrew Weimann (or Wayman).
3/7/1885 John Nykiel and Paul Kostera, Farmers, as Executors.
2/10/1885 Frances Wayman, Hill River, Widow.
8/6/1910 Death of Frances Wayman.
19/9/1910 Frank Waymen, (or Wayman), Hill River, Farmer, as Executor.
19/9/1910 Frank Waymen.
7/4/1925 Death of Frank Waymen.
22/7/1925 Peter Lucus Wayman and Joseph Frederick Wayman, Sevenhill, Farmers, as Executors.
19/9/1925 Mary Agnes Wayman, Sevenhill, Spinster.
14/2/1931 Marriage of Mary Agnes Wayman to James Verrran, Sevenhill, Gardener.
6/2/1947 Road adjoining East side closed.
8/12/1967 Brendan Albert Kluska, Mintaro, Farmer.
19/7/1977 Donald Hogben, Kings Park, University Lecturer, and Joyce Elaine Hogben, his wife.

Finish.

Section 332 The Niemetz Complex.

22/1/1857 Land Grant Deposit No. 360 of 1857 to Joseph Niemetz, Clare, Farmer.
Area 137 acres, £137.
9/9/1867 Brought under RPA, CT Vol 107, Folio 55 in the name of Thomas Niemetz, Mintaro, Farmer.
1/1/1901 Lease, 10 years, with other land to James Henry Brown.
5/9/1913 Paul Peter Niemetz, Sevenhill, Farmer.
25/8/1927 Death of Paul Peter Niemetz.
8/12/1927 Elders Trustee and Executor Co. Ltd., as Executor.
16/5/1928 James Smith, Daniel Smith and Phillip Smith, Mintaro, Farmers, as Tenants in Common.
15/1/1932 Death of Philip Smith.
30/9/1932 Catharine Smith, Mintaro, Widow, as Executor, of 1 undivided 1/3 part.

New CT Vol. 1877, Folio 78.
22/1/1946 Daniel Smith as Executor of 1 undivided 1/3 part in Estate of Phillip Smith, left unadministered by Catharine Smith, who died 30/11/1936.
22/1/1946 Daniel Smith and James Smith, 1 undivided 1/3 part.
22/1/1946 From James Smith, 1 undivided 1/3 part to Mary Ellen Josephine Smith, wife of Daniel Smith.

New CT Vol. 3474, Folio 178 (with other land).

**Section 332 (and sections 323, 333, Pt. Sections 338, 506).**

New CT Vol. 3474, Folio 178 (with other land).

Daniel Smith, Mintaro, Farmer, and Mary Ellen Josephine Smith, his wife.

22/7/1961 Easement and Right of Way Natural Gas Pipeline Authority of South Australia.

CT Vol. 3887, Folio 20.

New CT Vol. 3663, Folio 161 (now with other land).

16/9/1977 Land divided as follows:
Sections 323, 332, 333, Pts. 171, 172, 174, 175, 177, 506, 338.
3 new Titles, CTs Vol. 4106, Folios 3, 4, 5.

CT Vol. 4106, Folio 4, Sections 232, 332, 333 Hundred of Clare.
Martin Daniel Smith.
 Finish.

**Section 340 (also 325 and 339) The Pawelski Complex.**

19/2/1856 Land Grant No. 35 Book 103 to William James Browne, and John Jarris Browne, Booboorowie, Stockholders.
Area 325 acres, price £325

2/2/1858 Land Divided as follows:
Area 80 acres, price £200.

Pt Section 340 and Pt. Section 339 (south) (with other land).
Bought under RPA, CT Vol. 76, Folio127 in the name of Valentine Pawelski, Hill River, Farmer.

Section 325, Conveyance No. 335, Book 205 to Joseph Niemetz, Clare, Farmer. Area 92 acres, price £276.


New CT Vol. 85, Folio 17.

10/3/1879 John Chewings, Mintaro, Sheep Farmer.
26/4/1879 Death of John Chewings.
28/8/1879 Charles Rischieth and Thomas Drew as Executors.

1/4/1880 Thomas Chewings, Mintaro, Farmer and Mary Chewings, Mintaro, Spinster, as Tenants in Common.
Polish Hill River. Cultural Identity from Material Remains.

New CT Vol. 331, Folio 66.
7/1/1884 Samuel James Way, Adelaide, Esq., Chief Justice of Supreme Court of South Australia.


8/1/1916 Death of Samuel James Way.
7/3/1916 Hon. George John Robert Murra y, Magill, Chief Justice of Supreme Court of South Australia and Hon. Alexander Buchanan, Millswood, Judge of Supreme Court of South Australia and Eustace Beardon Grundy, Adelaide, Solicitor, as Executors.
16/11/1928 Easement and Right of Way CT Vol 1708, Folio 117.
Mid North Electricity Co. Ltd.

New CT Vol. 1708, Folio 120.
29/7/1954 CT Vol. 2344, Folio 103, to Kadlunga Ltd (along with 14 other Sections and Pt. Sections).

CT Vol. 3171, Folio 193 Kadlunga Ltd, Adelaide.
8/12/1988 Portion to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II for Road purposes.
8/12/1988 Name change to Kadlunga Pty Ltd, Adelaide.
New CT Vol. 4336, Folio 880.

Now includes Sections 169, 173, 179, 326, 327, 328, 331, 340, 348, 494, 495, 497, Pt. Sections 174, 175, 178, 307, 325, 339.
Finish.

Section 459 (previously section 172) The Borowicki House.
No Land Grant was issued for Section 172. It was owned by the Crown since Survey, until 13/7/1904. Transactions during this time were:

1/8/1870 Aboriginal Lease No. 73 for 6.5 years to Jacob Nykiel, Hill River, Farmer. Annual Rental £19 15s.
31/1/1877 Lease Expired.
1/10/1877 Aboriginal Lease No. 114 for 14 years to Ellen Edwards, Manoora, Hotel Keeper. Annual Rental £22.
30/9/1881 Lease terminated for non payment of rent.
1/4/1883 Aboriginal Lease No. 134 for 21 years to John Marlow, Mintaro, Farmer. Annual Rental until 1890 £15 15s. Rent then reduced to £9.
31/3/1904 Lease Expired. Offer to purchase by John Marlow declined.
13/7/1904 Land Divided into 4 Homestead Perpetual Leases, with right of purchase agreements.
Section 459, the Josef Borowicki house.
13/7/1904 Agreement No. 283 with Covenant to Purchase Homestead Block. CT Vol. 677, Folio 78.
Josef Borowicki, Sevenhill, Labourer.
Area 20 acres, purchase price £80.
Annual Instalments £1 15s 3d plus 2% interest.


21/8/1924 Purchase completed with final payment of £38 16s.
Total cost of block- Purchase £80. Interest £20 10s 7d.
6/4/1925 Bought under RPA CT Vol. 1370, Folio153 in the name of John Nykiel and Frank Kluski, as Executors.

10/1/1925 John Mark Wyman, Hill River, Farmer.
28/1/1961 Death of John Mark Wyman.
5/5/1961 Public Trustee, as Executor.
1/7/1961 Rose Susan Berns, Hackney, Widow.
8/2/1962 Donald Smith and Philip Damien Smith, Mintaro, Farmers and Graziers, and Adrian Christopher Smith, a minor, born 1/12/1945.
8/3/1967 Philip Damien Smith, Adrian Christopher Smith and Martin Daniel Smith, a minor, born 1/5/1949, as Tenants in Common.
22/1/1973 From Philip Damien Smith to Adrian Christopher Smith, and Martin Daniel Smith, 1 undivided 1/3 part.

Section 460 (previously part of 172) The J Wyman House.
No Land Grant was issued for Section 172. It was owned by the Crown since Suvey, until 13/7/1904. Transactions during this time were:

1/8/1870 Aboriginal Lease No. 73 for 6.5 years to Jacob Nykiel, Hill River, Farmer.
Annual Rental £19 15s.
31/1/1877 Lease Expired.
1/10/1877 Aboriginal Lease No. 114 for 14 years to Ellen Edwards, Manoora, Hotel Keeper.
Annual Rental £22.
30/9/1881 Lease terminated for non payment of rent.
14/1883 Aboriginal Lease No. 134 for 21 years to John Marlow, Mintaro, Farmer. Annual Rental until 1890 £15 15s. Rent then reduced to £9.

31/3/1904 Lease Expired. Offer to purchase by John Marlow declined.

13/7/1904 Land Divided into 4 Homestead Perpetual Leases, with right of purchase agreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Agreement No.</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>Lessee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Egnac Borowicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Jacob Bula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Josef Borowicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>John Wyman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 460, the John Wyman house.**

13/7/1904 Agreement No. 20 with Covenant to purchase Homestead. Block CT No. 499, Folio72. John Wyman, Sevenhills East, Labourer. Area 20.5 acres. Purchase price £80. Annual instalments £1 15s 3d, plus 2% interest.

19/2/1921 Purchase completed with final payment of £40 4s 6d. Total cost of block- purchase price £80. Interest £20 3s, total £100 3s.

12/9/1921 Bought under RPA CT Vol. 1212 Fol. 97 in the name of John Wyman, Sevenhill, Labourer.

9/11/1921 Name change- John Mark Wyman.

9/11/1921 Norman Bruce Wellington, Sevenhill, Orchardist.

28/1/1961 Death of Norman Bruce Wellington.

16/6/1961 Public Trustee, as Executor.

21/7/1961 Rose Susan Berns, Hackney, Widow.

8/2/1962 Daniel Smith, Phillip Damien Smith, Mintaro, Farmers and Graziers and Adrian Christopher Smith, a minor, born 1/12/1945.

8/3/1967 Philip Damien Smith, Adrian Christopher Smith and Martin Daniel Smith, a minor, born 1/5/1949 as Tenants in Common.

22/1/1973 From Philip Damien Smith to Adrian Christopher Smith and Martin Daniel Smith, 1 undivided 1/3 part.


7/9/1989 Right of Way north west corner to Bilyara Vineyards Pty Ltd.

New CT Vol. 4347, Folio 930 (subject to right of way).

Finish.
Appendix Two
Appendix Three

Polish peasant cottages.

Translator’s notes.

There are a number of terms in this book that derived from a combination of old Polish language and regional folk dialects. Therefore it proved very difficult to find the adequate English terms for translation. On a few occasions descriptive terms were used instead. For the readers’ benefit these terms are explained below and referenced, where possible, with relevant illustrations.

A cottage plan is generally enclosed within a rectangle, where long sides form usually, but not exclusively, the front and back of the house respectively. Where there is only one room between the front and back walls of the cottage (Fig. 2, 4 & 12) it is referred to as a single-cell plan. A cottage with two rooms located, side by side, between the front and the back wall (Fig. 9, 10 & 13) is described as double-cell plan. There are some cases described as single-and-half-cell plans, implying that there are two rooms in one half of the cottage, while the one room only in the other half (Fig. 18).

Rooms in the peasant cottage were used differently than in modern Australian family homes, thus our terminology such as living room, dinning-room and bedroom could be misleading. Commonly used terms to describe cottage rooms include black room, white (or light) room, pantry, alcove and hallway. Black room is where the stove was located, where cooking was done and most of the daily activities took place. White room was kept clean and tidy, rarely used during the day; it was for guests and representation, also used as a bedroom. The pantry was used not only to store food but also clothing and some equipment, sometimes also as a bedroom. The alcove was essentially an additional little room, often with a bed, but without a window, one place that afforded more privacy. The hallway was often used for various jobs, storage and sleeping, depending on the size of the cottage and the number of occupants.

Wall construction occurs in two general forms, entirely wooden walls and walls with wooden framework filled in with clay, bricks, or a combination of both (Fig. 34; Photos. 59, 61, 63, 64).

Wooden walls are constructed in three basic types:
Crib structure, where ends are cut to form the tight clasp joints at the corners. The length of logs would normally limit the size of a cottage (Fig. 4; Photos. 16, 24, 35, 46).

Post structure, where the ends of logs are inserted into special slots cut into vertical posts integrated into a wall structure (Fig. 33). By-wall-post structure, where posts are positioned close to the walls and their corners as supports (Fig. 9 & 10; Photos. 15, 17, 39).

In practice these constructions are often used simultaneously in various combinations.
Cottage roofs can be divided into two general groups, two-surface roofs (where transversal, shorter side of the house has a gable) (Fig. 22, 24, 28; Photos. 33, 39, 41, 42), and four-surface roofs. The four-surface roofs occur in three basic variants: Full roof surface, where each surface covers an area from the rooftop down to the upper edge of a wall (or little lower) (Fig. 9, 11, 12; Photos. 14, 17, 22, 25).

Half roof, where two transversal surfaces of the roof cover only the lower half of the area above the wall, leaving the upper part for a gable (Fig. 7, 8, 16; Photos. 2, 4, 11, 23).

Crown, where transversal surfaces of the roof cover only the upper, usually small, part of the area, leaving space for vertical surface (gable) below (Photos. 30, 64). Crown often appears in combination with the half roof (Photos. 12).

The footnotes in this book are used exclusively to provide bibliographical references. In translation these references are given in text, while footnotes include only translator’s remarks.

The captions for the photographs include only the site names and their districts, and therefore were not translated. Instead, whenever possible, references to photographs were included in the text to assist the reader in linking descriptions with the images. Photos 51-53 are missing.