

Editorial

When the opportunity arose to edit this volume of the Journal I was pleased to undertake the task as I hoped to encourage consultants who were working on interesting projects to succumb to an enticement to write a paper. I am pleased to report that some responded with timely papers.

This issue of the Journal is mostly the work of consultants or archaeologists employed in government authorities, in the equivalent of consulting positions. Many of the papers specifically address issues of urban and public archaeology, mostly within Sydney. One of the real pleasures of editing the Journal has been to encourage people who otherwise may not have written their paper. I certainly appreciate the timely effort they have expended on their contributions.

The Journal's contents list reveals that the eight articles were written by six women and five men, a fairly even distribution. As I have discussed at length elsewhere, women editors are more likely to ask women to write papers as they know them and are perhaps more aware of the general range of work being undertaken by other women.¹ I must admit I did not know the gender balance of authors included in this volume until I started writing this editorial, so my observations that people tend to seek papers from people inside their peer or work groups has proven true in this case.

This volume of the Journal offers papers that will assist in the contextualisation of the results from archaeological excavations and open up the way for detailed analyses of our evidence. This should allow for a more exciting debate about urban archaeological sites and their meaning within the context of nineteenth-century Australian society and history.

While many of these papers are on urban archaeology, usually citing Sydney sites as case studies, they present a diverse overview of different sets of archaeological evidence. Four papers address specific classes of artefacts or structures found on urban sites. While aspects of all the papers are descriptive most are the first substantive papers in this Journal on these classes of evidence as they relate to Australia.

Jennie Lindbergh describes the type of buttons found on urban sites in Sydney with a brief case study of the material from the CSR site. She discusses buttons as evidence for the type of clothing worn and by whom it was probably worn. Anna Wong provides an overview of the range of drains and sewers likely to have been built in Sydney prior to 1857. As I have said on many occasions in the last 15 months, 'drains are ubiquitous on archaeological sites'. It is extremely useful to be able to place all these drains within a wider historical, social and technical context.

Denis Gojak and Iain Stuart describe the type of tobacco pipes likely to be found on Australian sites, with examples from Cadmans Cottage, Sydney, and examine pipes within their wider socio-economic context. They propose that tobacco pipes are an 'ideal' artefact from which to draw larger conclusions about nineteenth-century life. Mary Casey analysed the locally-made early pottery from the DMR site, Area B, in the Brickfields and found that it conveyed her into the realm of early brickfields, potteries, and pre-industrial dairying. It resulted in the production of a model for early pottery based on historical evidence and archaeological examples.

The next two papers were written by two scientific specialists who provide many of the Sydney's archaeological consultancies with advice and expertise. Roy Lawrie offers an overview of the chemical analysis of soil profiles from a range of urban

archaeological sites for almost 20 years. Dr Mike Macphail presents a survey of the results of extensive palynological work on sites in Sydney and environs and discusses the results and significance for archaeological interpretation. Both contributors see their work as part of the whole archaeological process and as a set of data that should be incorporated into the overall archaeological interpretation. Their work illustrates the multi-disciplinary approach of many consultant archaeologists to urban sites.

The paper by Richard Mackay and Dr Grace Karskens is a response to Emeritus Professor Graham Connah's paper, 'Pattern and purpose in historical archaeology', in volume 16 of this Journal. It explores the current state and future prospects for historical archaeology in Australia and proposes an alternative view of public archaeology and believes there is cause for optimism. This paper presents the viewpoint of consultants that is markedly different to that seen by an academic.

It is most appropriate to publish this type of response in the Journal. While many of us often have different opinions to those expressed by authors we do not always have time to put them onto paper and these two contributors must be congratulated on taking the time to write a response.

I would briefly like to add to the debate through noting that some of the papers published in this Journal are a substantive response to observations by Connah although most were requested before his paper was published. I do believe that many of us are aware of the problems that beset historical archaeology but it takes time to be able to produce substantive results from archaeological excavations. One important way forward for the discipline is the work being undertaken by postgraduates. Three of the contributors are undertaking doctoral research in historical archaeology and another's paper is based on a Masters thesis. It is from this source, the work of postgraduates, that often the most thoughtful work is produced: by someone who has the time to think about their topic and undertake detailed analysis of the archaeological evidence.

Early September 1999 will see the launch of three publications on the historical archaeology of Sydney. The first by Jane Lydon, *Many Inventions: The Chinese in the Rocks 1890-1930* is based on her Masters thesis. The second, a public book by Grace Karskens, *Inside the Rocks: The Archaeology of a Neighbourhood*. The third, to be launched at the same time as Karskens' book, is the publication of volumes I-V of the *Cumberland/Gloucester Street Archaeological Investigation Reports* by Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd. It is anticipated that these books will make a marked contribution to the discipline of historical archaeology in Australia.

The final two contributors, Pamela Smith and Lyn Devereux have been involved in the saving of Streeter's Jetty, Broome, Western Australia. This was an 1880s jetty and one of few remaining structures surviving from the early pearling days of Broome. The publication of the results of interesting or important CRM projects is an important feature of this Journal and is to be encouraged.

I wish to thank the many anonymous referees for the thoughtful undertaking of their duties, Tony Lowe for providing editorial support and many location maps and Dr Aedeon Cremin for her assistance. Mostly I thank the contributors for their diligence, persistence and efficiency.

MARY CASEY
Sydney, Australia

1 Mary Casey in Casey, M., D. Donlon, J. Hope and S. Wellfare. 1998. *Redefining Archaeology: Feminist Perspectives* Research Papers in Archaeology and Natural History, No. 29, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, pp. 71-72.