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Many thousands of women were transported to Britain’s colony Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) between 1803, when the colony was founded, and 1853 when transportation ceased. Some died at sea; some endured colonial lives of struggle, poverty or crime; many failed to form families and lived out their years without kith and kin to support them. Eliza Williams was one who prospered. Williams achieved security, status and wealth. Her legacy of letters allows a new assessment of the life, aspirations and opportunities of convict women. Williams, a young Irish woman convicted of theft from her London workplace, arrived in Hobart Town in 1852. By 1862 she was living in Detroit, married to Irishman George Hanley, and with her first child toddling at her feet. In the space of a decade she had travelled from Britain to Australia and back, then across the Atlantic to New York and on to Detroit. Three decades later she was firmly established in Detroit society, living in its premiere Yankee suburb. She had departed Tasmania with skills, knowledge and determination. Hers is a story of transformation: from servant to mistress.

Williams served her sentence in the house of John Leake and his family. Leake was master to a household and estate workforce that was predominantly drawn from convict ranks. The Rosedale estate was an open prison. The way convictism shaped the lives of both master and worker is fundamental to this thesis. The original contribution of the research is an analysis of the impact on domestic life of the colonial convict experience. This is achieved by close examination of the lives of two nineteenth-century women, one a transported convict and the other her colonial employer. The thesis also explores how daily life in the private home was conducted and maintained.

The research has exposed a neglected archive to detailed examination. The Leake Papers held by the University of Tasmania provided the means to give voice to a diverse community who inhabited a colonial estate and hitherto were silent in the record.
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The room where Sarah Leake wrote her journal was not bleak, even if the weather outside was desolate. She sat in the most fashionable parlour in the colony surrounded by the trappings of gentility and wealth. But she was effectively alone, as she was to remain for life. She would not have anticipated being scrutinized, more than a century and a half later, as she started to write a new volume of her journal.

This thesis explores colonial Tasmanian domestic life and the lives of women in that setting. These women are largely out of sight. They are rarely counted as contributing to the physical infrastructure of the colony which was mainly built by convict men under the supervision and direction of free men. Land grants to women were uncommon. Women’s voices were not recorded in the pages of the legislative record or administrative instruction. Women were more prominent in the convict ledger than elsewhere. Yet this work is not only about women. It considers their lives in the context of social and family life, the opportunities and aspirations they may have harboured, and the means they had to be noticed and subsequently remembered.

The approach taken here is life history through which the lives of two colonial women are reconstructed. These women were not prominent, they were not exceptionally gifted or skilled and they were not noted much by others, particularly outside their respective families. They largely conformed although the expectations of them differed greatly because of the circumstances of their families of origin and their own conscious acts. The point of this work is to expand the framework within which such lives are thought about and to challenge the narrow range of expectations about who colonial women were and what they could accomplish.

This project began as an exercise in transcription and annotation. Miss Sarah Elizabeth Leake kept a daily journal of her actions as mistress of Rosedale, her father’s house

---

1 Sarah Elizabeth Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855,” in Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania Library. Entry for 25 April 1854. Miss Leake was a guest at Government House.
in the Tasmanian Midlands, near Campbell Town. An extant volume, for the period April 1854 to May 1855, was used to reconstruct her domestic and social life as the foundation primary source for a contribution to the history of private life. The setting was the private sphere of the home in colonial Tasmania: the family and the servants, the management of the household, the house and the function of its rooms, and the social networks associated with friends and family. The annotated transcription was published in 2014.

The decision to expand the project to its current scope required greater attention to theoretical issues associated with domestic service within the context of the private colonial household. ‘Learning to be the Mistress’ considers the impact of the way Rosedale was managed and run in the 1850s on both family and non-family members who were required to inhabit it and how the experience of convict service on a country estate shaped the subsequent lives of mistress and maid.

The thesis contributes to the study of domestic life. It explores how the manners, customs and behaviours of the nineteenth-century private home were exhibited and replicated. The research focuses on two extraordinary well-documented lives of nineteenth-century women, one a transported convict and the other her colonial employer. It uses a wealth of colonial diaries, letter books, private correspondence and other records to locate an account of their lives within the wider history of the private household and colonial convictism.

This approach developed out of the survey of materials conducted as part of earlier research. It became apparent that the Leake Papers, held in the archives of the University of Tasmania, were a complex series of interlocking records that could be used to trace the lives of those who inhabited a nineteenth-century colonial estate, Rosedale, the Leake family homestead and farm. The papers offer an intimate view of colonial family and business life and an exceptional opportunity for archival alignment. The collection is unusual in at least two respects. Firstly, it is centred on a family in their colonial domestic setting rather than on a single key individual. This allows a focus on the women in this setting. Secondly, some of the women were domestic servants (in this case predominantly transported convicts).

---

2 For the sake of simplicity, Tasmania is used throughout the thesis in place of the earlier name, Van Diemen’s Land, except in quoted material.
4 Alice Meredith Hodgson, Miss Leake’s Journal, Hobart: Research Tasmania, 2014.
5 Leake Papers, Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection. Bequeathed to the University of Tasmania in 1964 by a granddaughter of John Leake, Dorothy Elizabeth Foster, 1893-1964.
The Leake Papers include formal and family letters, journals, diaries and ledgers dating from John Leake’s courtship of Elizabeth Bell to after his death. While far from a complete record, they provide an insight into private life over more than six decades of the nineteenth-century for a family who arrived in Tasmania as settlers in 1823. Documents in the collection that were reviewed as background to this work include instructions and negotiations regarding the building, renovation and furnishing of the homestead; circulars, letters and contracts associated with hiring and maintaining free and convict farm workers and house servants; accounts and returns for stock purchases and sales, wool production, crops and land transactions; and expenses incurred in running the house and maintaining the family.

Sarah Leake’s journal and her father’s day book each function as representations of daily life on an elite farm in colonial Tasmania. Sarah Leake’s journal reflects life for privileged women and the day book both the public enterprise and the private expenses that supported this private life. The underpinning theoretical framework for this is a consideration of gender spheres and their pervasiveness for a woman living within the confines of a privileged household in rural Tasmania. The exercise of paternalism by John Leake and members of his family as a way of managing the complex social environment in which they lived is also considered.

The Leake Papers are also remarkable in that they contain letters written by subalterns. Among the stories these letters provoke, there is one that has entranced me for some years: that of Eliza Williams. A noteworthy and long life is not the reason that she is of interest to the historian. It is that she was a convict and a letter writer. Thus this thesis also contains an account of Sarah Leake and her convict servant Eliza Williams. For a short time their lives intersected, and then they went their separate ways. The intersection had a profound impact on the emancipation of the prisoner but marked little out of the ordinary for the mistress.

The original contribution of this research when first conceived was to be a social history centred on Sarah Leake’s social world. This has been partly achieved through the publication of Miss Leake’s Journal. Now this expanded project brings two Tasmanian colonial narratives together. Neither is a complete narrative, nor centred only on Tasmania. They intersect for a period during the 1850s. Each narrative is couched in terms of the individual’s life course: Sarah Elizabeth Leake is considered in detail for the period of her

---

journal; Eliza Williams is reflected upon for a longer period, from her childhood in Limerick, through her time as a London servant, her convict experience in Tasmania and her later life as a citizen of Detroit.

Each woman’s life echoed her familial, social and economic circumstances. Each exercised a degree of control and dynamism on her life course. An aim of the research was to demonstrate how the lives of individuals resonated with, and influenced, wider social and cultural priorities of their era. The narratives initially embed the reader in the Tasmanian countryside near Campbell Town, in a rural household steeped in colonial manners and customs, to demonstrate how modes of living were negotiated, learnt and able to be transferred across the oceans to new settler societies. A second narrative travels, as did Eliza, to new places and social mores. This thesis contends that Eliza’s social memory, and her criminality, were reformed by her experiences at Rosedale and that she used this knowledge to transcend the barriers and uncertainties of her new arena. The critical period, but only with the hindsight of the historian, was when both women inhabited Rosedale – one as mistress, one as maid.

Establishing the narrative strands

Life writing is at the heart of this thesis. This research involves using intensive accounts of individual lives to illuminate the social processes, connections and structures of their existence. Intense description of practices and events integrate the stories. Key to this consideration is the concept of life space. This notion is expanded in an original way, beyond the idea of geography or location, to encompass the connections between people and place. Rosedale’s rooms, hallways, gardens, sheds and paddocks are the prime spaces. The creation and maintenance of these spaces are the work of those who inhabit them. Some work much harder and longer than others: and the rewards differ. The lives of Rosedale’s inhabitants are plaited together and form a detached social world,

A number of directions are considered: life writing and its place in historiography; private life as it pertained to elite life in colonial Tasmania; the role of social memory in the formation of family and domestic culture; and separate gender spheres and paternalism as frameworks within which to consider roles and relationships. Initial aims of the research

---

included: to demonstrate how the lives of individuals resonated with, and influenced, wider social and cultural priorities of their era; to describe the familial and social networks that operated from the Leake homestead, Rosedale, in the 1850s and to use these networks to construct a domestic history of the key individuals in the household; to consider these networks in the context of the history of private life with specific reference to the communities of the key individuals in the narrative; and to identify the elements of social memory that may have influenced the life course of these individuals. In pursuing these aims, it became clear that the experience of convictism overlaid and influenced the life course of all those who resided at Rosedale whether or not they were elite.

The collection of letters from Eliza Williams in the Leake Papers is exceptional, yet it was only on close reading that their uniqueness became evident. Not all were precisely addressed yet it was possible to determine to whom they were directed by their contents, knowledge of Eliza’s life and the activities of those around her. Excerpts from the letters have been used to indicate the relationships that existed between Eliza and the men of the Leake family, and the matters of the day that were deemed appropriate to be discussed. While it is a mistake to ‘treat documents or source material as a continuous narrative,’ the letters provide the text for aspects of Eliza’s life in Detroit, the formation of her family, her successes and pleasures, and her concerns. They show a domestic progression to wife and mother, living comfortably in a substantial and well-built home, without the stress of financial or familial worries. Eliza’s letters are not representative of any one aspect of her life or personality. They exhibit her diversity of experience and interest and, even though the focus is primarily family, they range widely across topics. Nonetheless they show her dissatisfied with the lack of contact with people she valued from her past and her loneliness for longstanding relationships. In her letters Eliza’s voice is strong but occasional and there are no extant scripts for the other actors. I have had to envision the flow of life.

It was a challenge to work beyond domestic and social description. With only the letters to go on, this thesis attempts to place Eliza Williams in the American landscape that she described in her letters. Research of a different order was required but a social or economic history of Detroit was not attempted. Contemporaneous information in directories,

---

8 The Leake Papers do not contain letters from Eliza Williams to Sarah Leake. If they were written they were not kept, unlike letters from fellow emancipist Olive Dormer. Two letters from her to Miss Leake are in the archive. They are considered later in this thesis.

magazines and newspapers was used to add flavour to the commentary about Eliza’s life in Detroit. Many of these publications were available to her and may have helped her form a view of the new environment.

**Travellers**

The people central to this narrative travelled thousands of miles across the world’s oceans. Some endured a single voyage but a number were obliged to crisscross the seas under sail or steam. Once on board, the passengers had no capacity to influence the environment for ‘the sea has no appreciation of great men, but knocks them about like the small fry.’ Most surviving personal accounts of sea voyages in the days of sail are from cabin passengers. But nine out of ten passengers travelled steerage and there are accounts from these less advantaged travellers. Many wrote of the long haul from Britain to Australia. Their letters, logs and journals helped make sense of the journey and all paint a similar picture: the voyage was crowded, tedious, confining, dangerous to body and mind, and often heartbreaking. And there were those who were not passengers but cargo: the transported felons.

A privileged few ocean travellers were accommodated in the privacy of a cabin. Even though comfort was not much in evidence in the cramped and stuffy quarters, which were subject to leaking or worse, and where trunks and possessions were nailed or tied down, seclusion was highly prized. There was nothing private about travelling steerage. It was synonymous with below decks: confined, dark and musty. Accommodation was generally divided into separate spaces: for single men, for families, and for single women. People slept and spent their days on shared timber bunks. Tables, benches, water barrels, slop buckets and chests of cooking and eating equipment were packed and squeezed between the rows.

---

13 Newlywed Louisa Meredith described the cabin she shared with her husband on their voyage to New South Wales. The space was about eight feet square and she considered herself very fortunate to have light and air albeit through a leaky skylight. Louisa Anne Meredith, *Notes and Sketches of New South Wales During a Residence in that Colony from 1839 to 1844*, London: John Murray, 1844. Facsimile published London: Penguin Books, 1973, p. 2.
Personal belongings in baskets and bundles added to the jumble. All was often awash for any wild sea would pour down the hatches unless sealed.\(^{14}\)

Physical conditions for convicts could be superior to steerage passengers for they were, as chattels, the responsibility of the State. The convict transports were an iteration of the prison system and life aboard was institutionalised and regimented. William McCrea described the daily routine for the women aboard the *Anna Maria* whose convicts included Eliza Williams. The deck and sleeping quarters were daily cleaned and inspected and stoves were used to keep the quarters and the decks dry and warm as the weather from the outset was foul. A solution of chloride of zinc was regularly poured into the water closets and sprinkled about to reduce the stench arising from their constant use by 240 people, many of whom suffered dysentery from all or part of the voyage due to the poor diet. McCrea was satisfied that the use of the deodorizer greatly reduced disease among the prisoners. The food served to the *Anna Maria* prisoners was below standard and McCrea felt it greatly contributed to sickness: ‘The biscuit supplied to the ship was by no means good, great part of it was mouldy to a greater or less extent, & nearly the whole of it gave indication to the sense of smell of decomposition going on in it.’\(^{15}\)

As land neared, all travellers emerged from the cocoon of their quarters. For the free it was excitement, coupled with sheer relief that they had accomplished the journey: be it night when tiny pricks of light from shoreline cottages gave way to the brightness of town wharves, or daytime when cliffs and beaches flowed into a harbour anchorage. For the unfree it was trepidation.

**Master: John Leake Esq.\(^{16}\)**

Yorkshire man John Leake, a staunch Protestant, was directed by a belief in his obligation to his family. There is no indication in his papers that he reflected on either the oppressive


\(^{16}\) The term Esquire traditionally referred to British men placed between ordinary gentlemen and knights. In the colonial setting it was used to denote a wider range of professional men and those with relative wealth. Alex C Castles, *Lawless Harvests or God Save the Judges: Van Diemen’s Land 1803-55, a Legal History*, North Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2007, p. 194.
aspects of his land tenure or that his wealth was built on the dispossession and suffering of others, be they indigenous people or convicts. The papers indicate he engaged in both but the image his papers present is that he worked hard, as did his wife and older children, especially in their first decade of colonial life. Leake’s economic and public life was more successful than he had ever imagined. Even so, he was not a leading figure in the economic, political or social affairs of Tasmania despite participating in all three spheres. Leake wanted a better life for his children. Colonial living brought him property, wealth and social position that would not have been possible in Britain or on the Continent.

Although a successful merchant and banker, John Leake departed Leith aboard the Andromeda in 1822 to bring his family to Tasmania in search of prosperity. Leake had married Elizabeth Bell, daughter of Hull merchant William Bell in 1805 after a short courtship. Leake was an ensign, then lieutenant in the Hull Volunteers, based in Scarborough. He was 24, she 18. William Bell at first cautioned against the marriage as Elizabeth was in his view too young. The couples’ courtship correspondence provides an insight into relationship formation in the first years of the nineteenth-century. Personal letters in the Leake Papers, spanning over 45 years, indicate the marriage was one of deep and lasting affection. The couple had eight children, seven of whom survived childhood. The family had lived in Hamburg for a number of years, after a long period in Hull. The life of a Hamburg merchant and the rationale for the move to Tasmania were described by Leake in an account he wrote of the voyage:

I had been near six years settled at Hamburg as a commission Merchant, and enjoyed a respectable business in connection with some of the first Houses in Yorkshire, and particularly at the Town of Hull, where I had previously resided as partner in the Mercantile House of Travis & Leake during 14 Years. At Hamburg I became acquainted with the Family of Mr Benj. Horne with whom I was on terms of visiting and friendship and who about 14 months ago confided to me his intention of going to settle at Van Diemens [sic] Land. Although I had little reason to be discontented with

17 “Leake Family Papers: Summary and Index,” Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, c1979.
18 John Leake sat on the Legislative Council, March – September 1846, at the appointment of Sir John Eardley-Wilmot and again from 1848-1855 at the behest of Sir William Denison.
19 The last letter in this set is from Leake to Reverend M Barnard requesting him to officiate at his marriage to Elizabeth set for Thursday 3 October 1805, Leake Papers, L1/P73/1.
20 Children of John Leake (1780-1865) and Elizabeth Bell (1786-1852) were: William Bell (1806-1886), Eliza (1807-1814), John Travis (1810-1880), Robert Rowland (1811-1860), Edward John (1812-1867), Arthur (1814-1890), Sarah Elizabeth (1817-1881) and Charles Henry (1819-1889).
my business, except with regard to the increasing risk attending mercantile affairs yet as I had a large family of Boys I could not help feeling a great desire of pursuing a more certain and secure business and at length I made up my mind to wind up my affairs and accompany my friend Horne, who had already arrived in Scotland and had engaged his passage by the Andromeda. I accordingly wrote to Mr Horne to secure me a passage conditionally in the same Vessel and in consequence I left Hamburg with my family and arrived at Leith on 21 of August.  

New arrivals are never quite new. The decision to travel to a new place and to establish a new life there was made in the context of experience and habit. The prior context of life was the setting within which decisions about change were made, even when the ideas may have been novel. John Leake was used to making decisions about business and about travel. The choice of Tasmania was set within an experience of endeavour as a merchant. He had operated commercial businesses in Britain and Germany and Leake had relatives and friends who shared his aspirations. His wife and family were accustomed to foreignness and the youngest of his children was born in Hamburg. John and Elizabeth Leake would have based their final decision on the expectations built upon their recollection of previous experience. They were literate and aware. Leake had the skills and habits, which never left him, of collating and using information to make decisions, to which the Leake Papers bear witness.

The Leakes would have done what research was possible: read reports in the press about the conditions and opportunities; weighed up the advantages and disadvantages of the possible locations; consulted those in their circle who knew others who had made the journey; and examined reports and guides published for the potential free settler. There is no evidence that Leake sought a new beginning in the sense of breaking away from his past. He was seeking to build on his capital and social standing by moving his family to a more advantageous environment than that offered in post-Napoleonic-war Britain.

Irrespective of the status or wealth of the passenger, voyagers took what the seas offered them. The journey for John and Elizabeth Leake and six of their children aboard the Andromeda was arduous and unpleasant. Elizabeth miscarried shortly after arriving in

---

21 Leake, “Brief Narrative of My Voyage per the Andromeda Capt Muddle Towards Van Diemens Land,” Leake Papers, L1/P73/3.
23 The second son, John Travis Leake aged 13, remained in England. He studied medicine and later travelled to Australia to practice. The approximate ages of the children upon departure from Leith were: William 16, Robert 11, Edward 10, Arthur 8, Sarah 5 and Charles 3.
Hobart Town and had therefore been pregnant during the long sea voyage. She shared a cabin with her husband and two youngest children. Leake formally complained to Captain Muddle of the treatment his family received during the journey, particularly that his older sons, who travelled steerage, had been inadequately fed. Nonetheless, the Leakes disembarked into the unfamiliar setting of the open gaol that was Hobart Town on 7 May 1823. Tasmania’s population numbered about 10,000 people, more than half convicts and overwhelmingly male. The free settlers were predominantly English and Protestant. William Sorell was Lieutenant Governor. His tenure was central to the development of a civil society in which free immigration underpinned social development. Luck played its part in the Leakes’ prosperity for the family arrived at a time when settlers with capital were rewarded with land and labour.

Leake presented his credentials and was rapidly embraced by the colonial system. He lodged his letter of introduction from the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department with the Lieutenant Governor in the correct manner and received a Letter of Location, as was the standard, which enabled him to select his land. The original grant was 500 acres on the banks of the Elizabeth River, near the tiny settlement of Campbell Town. The property was named Rosedale. Leake and his son Robert were the first to travel north from Hobart Town, on foot in the company of others who had been granted land in the Midlands. They left Elizabeth Leake and the other children to protect their stores and stock and to live as best they could in rented accommodation. While Leake was seen as the pioneer striding his way to

---

27 William Sorell was Lieutenant-Governor from 1817-1824.
30 Leake Papers, L1/B4-6 contain the letters of introduction. Godwin helpfully provided a template to apply for this letter for the less literate would-be emigrant and Widowson, too, urged the emigrant to obtain sanction from the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department to be granted land prior to departing Britain, both to ensure a timely grant upon arrival and to reduce the likelihood of problems in local approvals. See Godwin’s Emigrant’s Guide to Van Diemen’s Land, more properly called Tasmania, London: Sherwood, Jones and Co, 1823, p. 58; Henry Widowson, Present State of Van Diemen’s Land, London: S Robinson, W Joy, J Cross and J Birdsal, 1829, p. 1.
a prosperous future, it was his wife, Elizabeth, who bore the brunt of the daily grind. Maintaining the everyday order of life, based on the customs and skills in Elizabeth Leake’s social memory, would have allowed her to manage within an alien environment.32

Leake had never been a farmer. The manuals and guides, which were widely read, encouraged enterprise and provided information on what was needed to establish a farm in the colonies.33 Such literature would have augmented Leake’s consultations with Horne and others during their preparation.34 *Goodwin’s Emigrant Guide*, particularly, encouraged settlers to Tasmania. It took a very positive attitude toward fine-wool sheep breeding and suggested the free granting of land and the availability of convict labour made it a superior destination for the emigrant. Having decided on emigration, and on Tasmania, Leake, the punctilious banker and conscientious record keeper, kept dockets and lists of what would be needed to construct settler life. The goods that came aboard *Andromeda* with the Leake family reflected a journey into the wilderness rather than the unknown. Personal possessions and ambition were loaded with the family. Foodstuffs and bulk goods were intended to enable them to establish a house and farm in keeping with their values and expectations. Four valuable Saxon merino sheep were procured in Germany and shipped to Leith to accompany the family on the voyage. The farm equipment indicated the extent of the plans even given the cost of transporting them.35 Leake took carts, ploughs, spare parts and tools and he crated and moved the materials to furnish a mill for grinding wheat, including the millstones.

There was nothing akin to the country they had left despite the virtues of the new landscape. There were not: ‘... windmills, rickyards, milestones, farmer’s wagons, scents of old hay, swing signs and horse troughs: trees, fields and hedgerows.’36 They were all yet to come. A house and outbuildings would be built using local materials and what equipment they had. There is no record of furniture in the *Andromeda’s* hold. The Leake house and all

32 A view based on the idea that individual and communal memory accumulates across all environments. See Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, p. 17.
34 The goods loaded by Leake closely match those listed by Widowson. Widowson, *Present State of Van Diemen’s Land*, p. 41. Louisa Meredith, recalled the preparations made by her uncle, and later father-in-law, George Meredith for his venture. South Africa was considered but Tasmania was chosen based in part on the information available about its promise. See Louisa Anne Meredith, “Reminiscence,” Hobart: in private collection, 1892.
35 The voyage cost was £380 with the luggage and items in the hold, including a crate of Spanish dollars, insured for £1500. Hudspeth, “Experiences of a Settler in the Early Days of Van Diemen’s Land,” p. 141.
36 Dickens, *Bleak House*, p. 79.
the furniture were sold to fund the expedition.\textsuperscript{37} The good sense of this is clear. There was little value in rooms of household furniture when the future indicated life would be lived, for a time at least, in a hut. But cooking utensils, kitchenware, glasses and tableware were numbered in the dozen. Supplies of stationary, quills and ink were packed away in the shipping crates. There were barrels of best beef, pork, oatmeal, rum, sugar, and flour. Elizabeth Leake packed more than 500 yards of fabric for the colony: silk, wool, stout cotton and linen. She was not fitting out a haberdasher’s store: she was simply bringing what she required. Thimbles, thread, darning wool, needles and buttons were crated up. The readymade clothing included dozens of men’s shirts in various stripe and check fabrics. There were 23 pairs of boots and shoes of various sizes and styles plus two pairs of work boots for Leake and each of his four older boys.\textsuperscript{38}

None of this suggests the expectation of a lavish lifestyle. It is indicative of a rural life; one that would be moulded from scratch and isolated from the practical lending and borrowing of relatives and long-standing near neighbours. They took what they thought they would need. Their social memory would furnish the spaces they created.

In a period of two years in the second decade of the nineteenth-century, the Leake family went from a comfortable house in a bustling and noisy cosmopolitan setting to a shelter in the backwoods. The silence of the landscape was broken with the weird and unfamiliar noises of native birds and animals rather than the click of horses’ hooves on cobblestone streets. Every member of the family worked even though it may have seemed like play to the younger children. John Leake was no longer a merchant. He was in possession of a substantial land holding and had workers to direct. He had become the master.

**Mistress: Miss Leake of Rosedale**

Sarah Leake became mistress of Rosedale upon her mother’s death in 1853. Elizabeth Leake’s life at Rosedale had been one of transitions. Her middle-class life in Hull and Hamburg, a subordinate role in the home supporting her husband’s endeavours in the wider

\textsuperscript{37} Hudspeth, “Experiences of a Settler in the Early Days of Van Diemen’s Land,” p. 141.

\textsuperscript{38} There is a list of items purchased for the journey included in John Leake, “Letter Book,” Leake Papers, L1/A6.
world, was replaced with a working existence. Her economic contribution was essential for
the success of the family venture. Elizabeth Leake toiled without criticism from her
neighbours who, in the first decade of settlement, were equally engaged in work. In the first
house she cooked over an open hearth, with roasting racks and camp ovens, in a kitchen hut
separate from the whitewashed sod ‘house’. House servants were difficult to recruit to the
country. She was much better served when the second house was built for the north wing
contained kitchen, scullery and storerooms. But, in these improved conditions, Elizabeth
Leake did not shirk work. Her letters and notes indicate that she had to cook, preserve, make
butter, prepare cordials, brew, supervise the servants and provision the house. Such skills
were essential in a rural setting. As the family prospered they became more remote from
daily tasks. Each time the house was enlarged more servants were required: to cook, to clean,
to serve at the table, and to maintain the carriage and gig, even though fewer family members
lived at Rosedale.

Sarah and her siblings lived a relatively isolated life on the farm; a fact that saddened
their mother. Books were Sarah’s companions. Elizabeth Leake lamented the arduous life,
the isolation and the lack of civil company and she was concerned for the morality of her
children. She was alarmed that convicts, particularly women convicts, disturbed the quiet
decency of her family and she would have none of it. Both house and farm servants were
male convicts in the first years and there was a constant turnover of felons, mainly thieves,
working in the house as assigned domestic servants. In the isolation of the bush, Sarah was
reliant on her family, especially her mother, for the stories, artefacts and family traditions that
encapsulated the culture that underpinned Sarah’s social memory.

Care of the six children also fell to Elizabeth. At first the older boys worked with their
father on the farm. Attempts to send Edward to school failed as he was found beyond the
management of the headmaster at Hobart Town Academy. He and Robert turned wild under
the expectation that they work alongside rough men and in the freedom of no school. Arthur
was sent back to relatives: to school in the care of his Uncle Edward Bell in Hamburg in

39 Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-
40 Elizabeth Leake to Mrs Taylor, 8 June 1833, draft, Leake Papers, L1/B524, also reproduced in Department of
History University of Tasmania, *Reports on the Historical Manuscripts of Tasmania, Numbers 1-7*, Hobart:
University of Tasmania, 1964, p. 52.
41 As indicated from the purchased titles listed in the ledgers and other household accounts.
42 Elizabeth Leake, “Diary, Jan c1826-28,” Leake Papers, L1/B634; James Thomson to John Leake, 1829, Leake
Papers, L1/B844.
1829. He returned in 1834 with indifferent results having had a period in one uncle’s counting house in Hamburg and then an unhappy time working in another uncle’s pottery business in Hull. Sarah and Charles were first taught by their mother. In time Sarah attended school. She was enrolled in Mrs Hannah Clarke’s school for young ladies, Ellentorpe Hall, and attended for several years until illness forced her return home. She continued to study and practice music and drawing from home and was accomplished in sewing, embroidery and wool work as befitted a young lady. Charles, her younger brother, attended lessons offered by the local Presbyterian minister who lived relatively nearby at Kirklands, a pony ride of four miles each way.

Miranda Morris includes Elizabeth Leake in her list of Tasmanian colonial women who successfully managed extensive farming properties whilst their husbands remained in Hobart Town engaged with their business interests. John Leake worked as a banker in Hobart during the depression years of the late 1820s leaving Elizabeth in charge at Rosedale. She was not always pleased with this but accepted hard work and perseverance as her duty. Elizabeth Leake and her children, as with other settler families, used the images of ‘Home’ and the material possessions they brought with them, to recreate a colonial version of domestic life. There was rarely another suitable woman to turn to in the seclusion of the farm. The isolation of their gender layered their experience. Married women were often hidden in the shade thrown by their husband. When writing to each other, Elizabeth Leake’s sons referred to her as Mrs J. George Gatenby called his wife Mrs Geo or Mrs G and his married daughter Mrs Hamlet.

Sarah Leake was debilitated by physical impairment and, at times, mental instability. She had a physical deformity in evidence from early childhood, possibly in her hip, which meant she learnt to walk relatively late in childhood and with a distinct limp. This was of great concern to her parents who tried many treatments. They understood that Sarah’s disability influenced her psychological state and were equally concerned at this aspect of her development. William, eleven years Sarah’s senior, also walked with a halt and suffered episodes of mental ill health. The illness that struck Sarah at school may have exacerbated her

46 John Leake to Elizabeth Leake, c1828, Leake Papers, L1/B8.
physical disability. Some suggest it was tuberculosis of the hip but there is no evidence of the true nature of the malady. Sarah suffered fits of despondency and hysteria in childhood and adolescence which were the topic of concerned correspondence between members of the family.

There is no indication in the Leake Papers, through for example letters from suitors or comments in letters between family members, that Sarah ever entertained the idea of a husband. As the sole daughter in a well-to-do household there were few physical boundaries around her freedom, though many may have been self-imposed or set by the strictures of social conformity. Sarah may have been unwilling to consider moving far from Rosedale or the countryside in which she had spent almost her entire life. In the era when Miss Leake may have considered marriage there were a number of reasons why she might reject such a future: no appropriate suitor, her disabilities, no wish to leave a secure home, parental disapproval of an early suitor, fear of sex and or pregnancy possibly related to her hip complaint, or no family encouragement to marry. Potential suitors included associates of her brothers and her father. Several of these men were regular visitors to the house but there is no suggestion of interest in any on her part. Indeed, a number of these men, like her brothers who did marry, did not do so until well into middle age and generally chose for their spouse a woman of much younger years. In the period marriage was seen as settling and civilizing the man, and often coincided with his taking responsibility for business or a profession. Wives were younger, often deliberately chosen to be ‘childlike’ to emphasise the husband’s maturity. No reasons or factors contributing to her spinsterhood, observations about the matter, or hints of ardour are revealed in her journal.

Sarah Leake was aged 35 when she formally became mistress at Rosedale. The new volume of her journal, commenced just under a year later, confirms her role for she details the daily routines of the household alongside her private occupations. As the daughter of a respected and wealthy man, she was able to devote her time to reading, music, visiting, sewing and a little fine cooking.

Rosedale was the centre of Sarah Leake’s world and was the departure point for her frequent journeys. Her most regular trip was to Campbell Town: this occurred on over half the days in the months listed in her journal. She would sometimes go to Ross to shop and

47 “Leake Family Papers: Summary and Index.”
48 Potential suitors at the time of Sarah Leake’s journal included widowers Thomas Mason, Frank Horne and Robert Kermode, and bachelor William Allison.
49 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, p. 323.
visit Campbell Town for the mail and to exchange library books on her way home. Very occasionally she would visit her brother at Ashby, the second family property. She did not record visiting Lewisham, a further family estate in the district. Activities, including picnics, horse racing, short visits and longer stays, took place at other midland properties. Hobart Town and Launceston feature as Sarah Leake visited each. Men in the family were more frequent travellers.

The dimension of time influenced Sarah Leake’s activities each day. Her decision to rise or not for breakfast, depending on her ‘wellness’, was acted out each day. The timing for appearing to the family and for ordering of meals was dependent upon this decision. Mealtime varied according to the needs of others: her father and brothers, arranged visitors, and casual callers. Visitors were more frequent in the afternoon than morning, and the timing of dinner was often set to suit guests. Afternoons were also used for trips to Campbell Town and to Ross. Sunday was the day for church but this was influenced by other factors: Sarah Leake’s health, the weather, the needs of others, and the availability of transport. The month influenced activities in the house: preserving and storing food, making jam, painting and paperhanging, travel for John Leake and outside activities. The seasons also feature, but not by name. Winter was particularly influential as floods and heavy rains were barriers to communication and socialising. There is no long-term planning indicated in the diary. John Leake’s attendance in the Parliament is the only commitment that is suggestive of an external timetable structuring family arrangements. Sarah Leake’s time was little influenced by this. Short-term planning, meaning from a day to a week ahead, was associated with occasional overnight stays with friends and visits to Hobart Town and Launceston.

Sarah Leake did not appear to have close acquaintances. The word friend appeared in her journal twice – once in reference to an unnamed friend of neighbour Charles Harrison who accompanied him to lunch at Rosedale, and once in relation to associates of the Leake family. The Masons, the Brickwoods and the Boyds were the guests at the dining table at Rosedale for this epithet to be applied. Mr Thomas Mason was the Police Magistrate, Rev William Brickwood the Anglican clergyman and Dr William Carr Boyd the Campbell Town Grammar School headmaster. All were closely related to the Protestant church: Mason as church warden of St Luke’s, Brickwood as its priest, and Boyd as the brother of Rev David Boyd who ran a school at Longford and held an appointment in the Convict Department in

---

Launceston. John Leake sat at the head of the table with his children, Sarah, Arthur and William to support him. Sarah Leake often visited Edith, Mrs William Brickwood, with her father and they would sit in the parlour drinking tea while the men discussed church business. Sarah Leake also visited the wives of neighbours, many of whom were of her mother’s generation. She does not suggest they were close friends. Two women appear to be on more intimate terms with her: Rose, Mrs Alfred Bisdee, and Eleanor, Lady Stephen formerly Eleanor Bedford, whom she had known since childhood. Sarah and Rose exchanged visits. Eleanor and Sarah exchanged letters for Lady Stephen lived in New South Wales.

Sarah Leake’s journal mentions domestic servants by name and by role, from time to time, in relation to their work and their misdemeanours. Praise was absent. The mistress supervised and instructed the house servants. It is fitting to note here that only Eliza Williams is mentioned as working with Miss Leake, even though she too was supervised and instructed and had her work inspected.

Maid: Eliza Williams, Vandemonian convict number 935

Eliza Williams was born to Thomas Williams and Susanna Powell of Limerick about 1832. They had married in Saint John’s at Limerick in 1829 marking them as Protestant. Life in the religiously divided and chronically damp city would have been miserable for families without adequate means. It was an environment where Roman Catholics were denied access to education, land ownership, the professions and political franchise. Yet being of the Protestant faith did not equate with prosperity despite the wealth being concentrated in Protestant hands. It did mean Thomas Williams had better access to work, housing and education. The Williams’ children were not barred from school, unlike children of Roman Catholic families. Eliza’s level of literacy suggests she went to school. Her mother may have initially taught her to read but the quality of her writing indicates she received more formal teaching although her later experiences would have provided her with further training.

---

52 Leake and Brickwood were also effectively Boyd’s employers for they were trustees of the Campbell Town Grammar School, which was also known as Boyd’s School.
53 Eliza Williams’ birth date was a moveable one. The 1900 United States Federal Census notes she was born in 1842. Her death certificate notes her birth date as 15 November 1837. The convict record suggests c1832. She was a woman who got younger as she aged.
Limerick was a city of rain. In the slums the roads ran with the water that poured and dripped from tenement eaves and the roofs of outhouses, stables and sheds. The water gushed in rough gutters set in the cobblestones and lay in growing pools in the back yards of the row cottages. The poor eked out their lives in the sodden and mouldy rooms of crowded houses where rent collection not maintenance was the priority of the landlord.

Eliza Williams’ Ireland was scarred by the Great Hunger and the diseases that followed it. 55 Famine was not an unusual event and disease was equally a threat. Potato blight had swept parts of Ireland in 1830 and 1834. Cholera cut swathes through the already depleted populace in 1847 and 1849, not only killing but forcing an abandonment of the previously close family networks and customs. 56 Starvation, mortality from famine diseases, and the lethargy, shortened life spans, chronic ill health and lost opportunities for those who survived, were all legacies of the famine. County Limerick was not immune. Entire villages were vacant and derelict. The living burned houses that held the dead, shredding the social fabric that had once been maintained by the familiar rituals of burial and mourning. 57 Families turned against neighbours, even their own, in the time when hunger dominated the lives of many Irish poor.

Famine and disease provide the impetus for immigration in many forms. People sought a better life, leaving a lesser one behind for Ireland offered little to many. Moving on became part of the life cycle of the Irish from the early 1850s. 58 Those who emigrated after the famine were the poor, rural dwellers, and adult younger children without the likelihood of inheritance, dowry or land. 59 They had little capital or experience. 60 Theirs was a culture of poverty, not just of being poor. People went where they could: to England, to Scotland, to America, to Australia. The Irish moved on: whole families migrated. Some went in waves with parents and siblings following to join a sole family member in a new life. Young women migrated, alone and in groups, to seek husbands and a new existence away from the place where a poor woman without a dowry was unlikely to marry. The most vulnerable died or were pushed from their homes. Irish people looked to America during and before the famine.

55 Also known as the Irish Famine, 1845-1852.
years and thousands made the hazardous trek – many to die soon after arrival from the effects of disease, malnutrition and the journey. It took resources and resourcefulness to take the long sea voyage to Australia. Patrick O’Farrell argues that immigration to distant Australia took initiative and it was the best who took this path. Those with money or connections to the colonies were able to make the journey. ⁶¹ Some without means took the deliberate, drastic and risky track of crime; and siblings and whole families are noted as having made the journey to convict colonies in the antipodes. ⁶²

With no prospects in Limerick, Eliza left her family and travelled to England. Aged sixteen or so, she was already capable of leaving her home and family. There is no way of knowing whether this was for a better life, to escape some family trouble, or to lessen the burden on her parents at a time of great poverty and hunger in Ireland. Getting to London was a major journey. It meant travelling by sea in one of the armada of ferries. The overland journey from Limerick to Dublin, or to the port city of Cork, would have been made over the rough narrow roads of the Irish counties. She would have been lucky indeed not to have walked every mile. Crossing the Irish Sea, then on to London, would have been equally arduous and fraught. Thousands of Irish men and women made this journey – either once to get away from Ireland forever or as a regular passage to earn money enough at agricultural or manufacturing work to return home and survive for a little longer.

Departing her family in Limerick would have been a wrench born of necessity. There is no indication of the circumstances or status of the Williams family. It is possible they were of middle-class origin but in deep debt or decline. But, had this been the case, Eliza would more likely have taken a genteel path to employment as governess or companion, not as a maid-of-all-work. Eliza would not have travelled to London for work had she been wealthy. The need for money, and her own drive for a better life, would have been motivators for her journey. Limerick offered few choices for a young woman without means – marriage to someone of her situation, domestic service, or a bleak spinsterhood caring for others. Her literacy would have been of little use in a society where surviving disease and hunger were priorities for the unfortunate.

Eliza disappeared into the undifferentiated mass of poor workers in London and shared its gaiety and uncertainty. Being in employment was the priority and the only means

to stay out of the workhouse. There were few opportunities for women and girls without a place in society. Eliza’s literacy and articulateness would enable her to improve her situation, but first it was vital to have an income. She joined the mass of young women in service. In London Eliza lived the dreadfulness of going each day from her bed in some boarding house or other hovel to rooms in Queens Street, Golden Square, as Elizabeth Lester’s maid-of-all-work, the lowest, hardest and dirtiest job on the servant ladder. Golden Square, in once fashionable Soho and notable as the address of the fictional Ralph Nickleby, had gone to seed by the 1850s losing it former distinguished inhabitants to smarter districts. At the time Dickens was writing the square was populated with ‘small hotels, boarding houses, business premises, offices and musical instrument makers’ suggestive of a bohemian lifestyle.

The moral tone of her testimony later in court indicates Eliza was not interested in prostitution and possessed strength of character that promoted independence. Eliza wanted to get home to Limerick and then be away to America. Meeting the ambition to get to America took money. One method to accomplish this was to thieve. And so she stole, though she swore she did not, from a woman for whom she had no respect, and was caught.

The official story began with the London Central Criminal Court trial record. There Eliza Williams found herself the centrepiece of a scene played out many times, in ‘a dirty frowsy room’ with an atmosphere tainted with the odours of fear and poverty. The charge was theft: stealing a watch, chains, charms and items of clothing to the value of £34 from her mistress to whom she went to work each day. The trial record introduced Eliza’s character through the testimony of others and her own evidence. Eliza’s voice was clear and firm. Eliza held her mistress in distain because the single Mrs Lester entertained men in her rooms. It was to Eliza’s disgust that the work included cleaning the boots of Mrs Lester’s overnight male guests. In this role reversal of mistress and servant, it was the servant who voiced the high moral position:

I went to the house thinking she was a respectable lady; she went out late at night, and brought home gentlemen with her; the last week I was there she came home drunk.

66 This was clearly stated in the record of her trial at the Central Criminal Court. “Eliza Williams, Theft, Stealing from Master, 7 April 1851,” The Proceedings of the Old Bailey, London: Central Criminal Court, 1674-1913, Reference No. t18510407-927, http://oldbaileyonline.org.
67 The Proceedings of the Old Bailey.
and slapped my face; the night before I left, she told me to come early in the morning; when I went, she scolded me for not coming earlier; I said I was half an hour earlier than usual; she said “You have to clean this gentleman’s boots which is the reason I wanted you early; for if he is not down by nine o’clock, he will lose his situation;” I left on account of her bad character…  

Elizabeth Lester, appearing as the victim, denied the impugned slur and detailed the offences. Apart from the victim’s evidence, the policeman who had been despatched to Limerick to return with the prisoner had his story.

I went to Limerick, by the Magistrate’s directions, and on 27th March found the prisoner at the Bridewell, in Kilpenny; her mother was there – I received this blue viste, and a duplicate for it, from one of the Irish constabulary, who said in her presence that he received it from the pawn-office, and that Mrs Williams had pledged it – Mrs Williams said she had pledged it, and had received it from her daughter, the prisoner, who said she knew nothing of Mrs. Lester, or of the robbery.

The Court would have been unsurprised to hear of Susanna Williams’ role, although no action was taken against her, for mothers were known to dispose of stolen items on behalf of their children. Jane Climpson, a servant to another resident of Queen Street, Golden Square, spoke against Eliza. But it is not her damming eyewitness evidence that is enlightening; it is the observation she made as an aside: ‘… she [Eliza] told me once that if she got a little money, she would go to Ireland first, and then to America.’ Jane Climpson’s words portrayed Eliza as a woman who had ambition, was not averse to change, and would travel to find a future. Eliza, a first offender, was sentenced to seven years’ transportation. The Court’s business on 7 April 1851 was all done in a matter of minutes.

Eliza was promptly transferred to Millbank Prison, a holding centre for those awaiting transportation, for supervision and inspection to assess her capacity for the punishment. She was not found wanting. Eliza embarked the convict transport Anna Maria from Millbank

69 Evidence given by Eliza Williams in her defence, The Proceedings of the Old Bailey.
70 The crime had been considered serious enough for the police to travel from Britain to Ireland in pursuit of the alleged offender and to return with her to the Old Bailey. The trial documents note that Eliza was apprehended at the Bridewell, a local gaol, in Kilpenny on 27 March 1851 and was, at that time, in the company of her mother. It is likely that Kilpenny is an error, and should have been taken down by the court clerk as Kilbeheny, listed as a civil parish in County Limerick, www://griffths.askaboutireland.ie.
Prison’s Thames Steps. The ship lay just out from the Steps. At low tide the stinking muddied waters receded to expose the green slime and captured filth of the city. Small boats stuck fast on the viscous mud. Those slow to reach the shore left gaping foot holes in the slush where they had squelched their way to the rock walls and steps that lined the river. Solid rubbish of any origin erupted from the mire and wedges of ephemeral paper, fabric and human waste clung while the river waited. The wash of the brackish rising tide brought no relief from the stench. The water pushed a jumbled raft of flotsam up the river before it. Fog, thick and yellow, relieved the image but not the odour of the river.73 Convict women, in groups of six or eight, were rowed out to the vessel, across the brown waters, through the shifting floating debris, amid the farewell shouts of those on shore and the noisy business of the river. Those with a bundle of possessions clutched them close to their bodies. The few precious items were the last connection with Home.

Loading the convict cargo, 200 women convicts and 46 of their children, took two days and, after lying at anchor for another five, the ship set sail. The swell of the tide forced the feet and bodies of convict women to adjust to being afloat. The sensations were not new for Eliza given her voyage across the Irish Sea but this voyage would be different: many months long, across vast oceans that could hardly be imagined, and without the likelihood of return. Many women had never before boarded a vessel. Some had not seen the ocean beyond the river’s mouth. For them the creaks and groans of the ship, the wind through the spars as she lay at anchor and the lapping water against the hull were curious and frightening sounds that overlaid their grief at departure. When the Anna Maria rose with the tide, and the shouts of seamen scurrying to the rigging to set her sails for departure filled the air, the dead weight of mourning settled on the women. Before they had cleared the river the seasickness had begun. The Anna Maria surgeon described the sea journey as long, arduous and isolated with the ship not touching land again during the voyage. His record does not include Eliza on the sick list but his description of conditions aboard ship, and of the maladies and treatments, underscore the hardship and misery aboard. 74

The Anna Maria dropped anchor in the harbour at Hobart Town on 26 January 1852 and the administration of the Vandemonian convict system unfurled around the vessel. There was little welcome for women convicts in the last years of transportation. The economics of

74 McCrea, “Surgeon’s Report, Anna Maria dated 22 September 1851 – 4 February 1852.”
convictism has shifted and changed over the decades of transportation and the anti-transportation movement had strengthened. Many Vandemonians wanted no more of the convict stain. Ships bearing transportees were often subject to protests on the wharf or in the press. After four months continuously at sea, Eliza Williams, number 935, native of County Limerick, disembarked as a nurse and needlewoman, aged 18. She was young, fit, literate, articulate, and able to acclimatize and adapt. She had already shown the propensity to seek a future. There was no indication of her having frailties. Her record had but one entry on it: her original conviction. Eliza was a ‘mover’ and it is likely her first landed journey, on shaky sea legs, was the march from the wharf to the New Town Depot.

Unfolding the narrative

In the pages that follow an intersection in the lives of two colonial women and its outcomes are explored. This chapter has provided an overview of the topic and the approach being taken within the thesis. It provides an initial context to life at Rosedale. The research centres on three items from the Leake Papers: a volume of the journal of Sarah Elizabeth Leake, the account book or ledger John Leake called the day book, and the letters of Eliza Williams. It introduces the chief actors within the context of private life at Rosedale: John Leake the master, then Sarah Elizabeth Leake and Eliza Williams, mistress and maid. This chapter has set the narratives in the context of Tasmanian colonialism, and charted the course of the argument. The time is primarily that of Eliza Williams’ servitude, 1852-1857, inclusive of the period of the first extant volume of Sarah Leake’s daily journal.

The key themes and approaches suggested by the literature are central to Chapter Two. The plan for the thesis sees literature integrated with analysis where appropriate, but in this chapter a more general literature related to the colonial setting is explored. The thesis looks outward to research and theoretical analysis in others’ work on the history of private life. There are several broad areas of attention: writing and writing about personal accounts of

---

75 As noted by Kim Simpson, “‘A basket on her arm and a blessing on her lips’,” in Convict Lives at the Launceston Female Factory, Lucy Frost and Alice Meredith Hodgson, eds., Hobart: Convict Women’s Press, 2011.
76 Eliza Williams per Anna Maria, CON 41/1/32.
78 Eliza’s sentence was served in during the period of the probation system of convict in Tasmania. The Anson, had been abandoned and there is no record of Eliza in the Cascades Female Factory at the time of the arrival of the Anna Maria.
daily life, biography and life writing as methods, models and constructs of related colonial private life, and theoretical and practical issues of taking a narrative approach. The interconnectedness of these areas is emphasised because later chapters move across and select from a range of perspectives.

Working with archival material is the focus for Chapter Three. Private collections and public archives of colonial and convict documents are considered and the approach to authenticating and working with items in the Leake Papers detailed within the context of accepted research practice. The role of the public record in convict management and the structure of the convict system over the early decades of the colony form the basis for a later discussion of the life-long impact of the record on the prisoner.

Chapter Four is concerned with the prison without walls, a concept that underlies the thesis argument: the physical infrastructure of Rosedale as the gaol. It traces the establishment of the estate and the sequence of house building. Attention then moves to household management: the requirements of running the house including room layout and function and their connections to work; the labour required to maintain the functionality of the household; and the resulting roles and responsibilities for family and servants. The interior spaces of Rosedale were where the relationship between mistress and maid was played out. The contextual infrastructure is described: the estate and the outbuilding of the prison system. The wider setting is established before developing the lines which thread through the narrative.

The focus of Chapter Five is maintaining the house and lifestyle at Rosedale: keeping house including the daily tasks in managing the household and the influence of the domestic layout and room function. The people who did the household work, primarily convict men and women on contract to John Leake, are introduced. The life associated with running or working the estate, the agricultural priorities, daily life of farm workers and impact of the seasons, has been reconstructed in order to set domestic life against that of the estate. The relationship between free and unfree workers is considered in the context of the convict system.

Chapter Six surveys the social settings and associated circuit from the perspective of Sarah Leake. Her journal provided a detailed listing of events and their locations making it possible to move with Sarah Leake through the landscape, into people’s homes and businesses, and to the communal functions on the local calendar. Campbell Town, within the wider Midlands, is portrayed as a starkly stratified community in which the elite, particularly
its women members, socialised in the home. Manners, fashion, social etiquette and gossip all formed part of this networked world. Sarah Leake is trapped inside walls constructed in part by gender, spinsterhood, age and isolation.

The letters of Eliza Williams are used to chart her life course post servitude in Chapter Seven. Hers was a life of significant transitions. The primary setting is Detroit, Michigan, in the United States. Eliza Williams lived there for the last fifty-eight years of her long life. Her letters provide a background chronology through which changes in relationships, lifestyle and domestic life, for the Leake family as well as for Eliza, are in the foreground.

Connecting the themes and theoretical strands forms the core of Chapter Eight. The link between the outcomes of Eliza Williams’ life and her experience of being a convict servant, with specific reference to her tenure in the Leake household, is described. She learnt to be the mistress. This final chapter also contains ideas and issues for future research and explores the diverse opportunities for scholarship intrinsic to the Leake Papers.

This thesis provides meaningful analysis of the personal realm of the elite family through primary materials on private life that have been little explored. Re-establishing the workforce at Rosedale in the 1850s presents a new picture of the operation of house and farm and foreshadows a reassessment of convict servitude and its contribution to the domestic economy. Transcription and the extensive historical and biographical sketches supporting the original records present the opportunity for others to access contextualised primary material.
Chapter Two: Doors open, doors close

We have come to know that every individual lives, from one generation to the next, in some society; that he lives out a biography, and that he lives it out within some historical sequence. By the fact of his living he contributes, however minutely, to the shaping of this society and to the course of its history, even as he is made by society and by its historical push and shove.¹

Expected and unexpected scribes

There are those who write about personal accounts and those who create personal accounts. Both are of interest here. The first category includes the work of those who write about essayists, journal and diary writers or edit their manuscripts; particularly those interested in colonial women writers.² Then there are those who wrote, scribbled, inscribed or otherwise crafted the diaries, reminiscences, margin notes in cookbooks, captions on the back of photographs, and letters. Their personal accounts include diaries, journals and other written forms intended for public scrutiny or private reflection. The accounts may have been connected to a task or particular time, like a visit or voyage, and exploring their purpose further connects the reader with the writer. Women’s writing was predominantly found in personal letters and journals and any collection provides an insight into their private sphere. Instances where a woman’s private diary has been brought to the public arena through scholarly publication are presented first. Then published examples of women’s accounts, both public and ostensibly private, of living in colonial Tasmania are described. Examples of men’s accounts of private life, free or unfree, relevant in time and place to this research, are also identified.

English maid-of-all-work Hannah Cullwick kept a diary at the request of her ‘master’ Arthur Munby who urged her to record all the tedious, arduous, grubby and loathsome

aspects of her work. In so doing she provided an exceptional insight into domestic service in the Victorian era and, despite not being in a colonial setting, generally the tasks and environment were transferable. Cullwick was a woman different from the standard upper and middle class diary keeper or letter writer. She did not have the benefit of an extensive education. Because of the diaries, Cullwick’s life, work and routines are precisely detailed. Cullwick was not famous: her entire life was played out in obscurity. She was the daughter of a housemaid and a saddler: a contemporary of Eliza Williams. She was born, raised, worked and died in Shropshire and worked mainly as a lower servant: nursery maid, scullion, kitchen maid or maid-of-all-work. Cullwick’s other roles included pot girl, cook, housemaid, char, and housekeeper and this demonstrates the multiplicity of occupations in the Victorian household, and suggests variation in skill sets across roles in domestic service. Cullwick did not write for her own pleasure but for Arthur Munby, who wanted the diaries written so he could read them.

Davidoff noted that Cullwick’s diary should be approached with caution for it was written for Munby’s eyes. It was not her freely chosen course and thus would have reflected her attitude towards him. Cullwick’s description of her early life and training show the pathway for female domestic servants: from childhood experience in the home to placement in a house under close supervision. Hannah had moved into service proper by age 14. That the employer exercised total power over the servant was instilled early. The importance of the record of Cullwick’s experience for this project is that it was contemporaneous. It provides an example of work and expectations from an English servant’s perspective. Her comments about management augment the colonial accounts by those who managed the servants.

---

5 Hannah Cullwick, (1833-1909)
9 This was exhibited by Cullwick not being told of her mother’s death until a fortnight after it occurred and, when told, being required immediately to return to work rather than to visit her family. Davidoff, “Class and Gender in Victorian England,” p. 37.
Not every personal account makes for gripping reading. Urlich’s description of Martha Ballard’s life as a Maine midwife in the late eighteenth century placed the mundane on view as well as those aspects of a life that demonstrate capacity to meet its challenges.\(^{10}\) The day-to-day existence that was exhibited by Urlich contributes much to an understanding of individual lives in both their public and private spheres, and to the collective experience of members of the family and wider circle of associates of the diary keeper. Martha Ballard, a midwife whose practice extended in communities along the Kennebec River area of Maine, kept a diary between 1785 and 1812 which records the 816 deliveries she performed over that period. Without the diary, Urlich notes, Ballard’s life would be no more than ‘a succession of dates’ from birth, through marriage and childbirth to death.\(^{11}\)

This thesis has adopted Urlich’s technique to connect the life of an individual within the context of their day. Ballard’s midwifery practice was set in the context of her marriage; the work and role of her husband (a miller and surveyor); the movement, relationships, trials and circumstances of her children; change in her community as it grew and became more populated; midwifery and medical practices of the day including learning and maintaining the skills, the social and professional relationships of her calling, and the impact that calling had on her personal health. Urlich captured the motion of Ballard’s life and that of her community: the travel, shifting house, children leaving to marry, workers coming in and out, and the movement of the loom upon which the female domestic economy was based.

Ballard’s diary was daily and descriptive. The reader also learns of the weather, who was in and about the Ballard residence, who ate and slept there, work done in the extensive gardens, and the cultural accessories associated with the major life passage events: birth, marriage, death. Urlich linked Ballard’s life to the wider historical themes of the period: early settlement, the development of industry and economy, the growth of townships in the remote and wild country, midwifery and medical practice, the role of women in the domestic and wider economy, to suggest a few.

The book is arranged chronologically. The diary is not fully transcribed but excerpts from selected months and years are presented at the beginning of each chapter as examples of social, medical, climatic, and familial events. While there is repetition of some events, this is handled by acknowledging the repetition and using it as a base from which to build new perspectives. The research entailed identifying the individuals and events in the diary and


\(^{11}\) Urlich, *A Midwife’s Tale*, p. 5.
then describing their life and place in the context of both Martha’s life and the historical themes. It is extensive and thorough. Urlich’s work is an example of shifting the focus from minutiae of life to the wider historical context in which that life was lived, and thus informed the approach to this thesis. Urlich fully describes the events that surround the daily entries. She provides a historical account of the event, identifies and describes the key players or issues that it includes, and links the event to the diary and day of Ballard. This technique can be taken as an example of the depth of research as well as the complexity of the issues associated with seemingly innocuous people and events. It is by tracing the role of people over the years that their character is exhibited.

One aspect of life writing and historiography is consideration of public and private accounts of life in colonial Tasmania that are relevant to the overriding spheres of this research: the history of private life in colonial Tasmania, the influence of gender roles and patriarchy within it. Vickery notes the importance of reading widely of personal papers and documents, rather than simply the set that is of specific interest, in order to have context for the individual and their words, and to have a broader understanding of their circumstances, or, as she puts it, ‘to reconstitute the pyramid of local society’. Published volumes include Louisa Meredith’s account of living in various houses in Tasmania as she followed the career of a peripatetic husband. From her we learn about ‘gentry’ life in more straightened circumstances, her economies, strategies to maintain an intellectual life in remote and small communities, the pressures of child raising, the disappointment of having to move house, and the isolation from distant family and friends. The manuscript diaries and reminiscences by middle-class women who led private lives in colonial Tasmania can be drawn on to provide insight into domestic arrangements, the management of servants and the hardships of family life in the period. Mary Morton Allport’s unpublished journals are one of Tasmania’s earliest extant examples. Allport was a well-educated woman who was accomplished in music, French and drawing as befitted a lady. Hers is the diary of a town wife with children.


16 Mary Morton Allport, nee Chapman, 1806-1895.
It centres on the needs of her family, the illnesses and complaints of her husband and children, the cost of living, bills, purchasing food, cooking, visits and visitors, clothing, and the needs of chaperoning and managing her growing children.

Men also wrote journals of daily life coupled with their business affairs. George Gatenby, who lived at Bicton in the Midlands contemporaneously with Sarah Leake writing at Rosedale, offered a well-to-do man’s view of life. Gatenby noted the weather, his financial position, his visitors for lunch, and the major crops and stock of his farm. Near neighbour of the Leakes, James Mercer, who lived at Morningside on the banks of the Macquarie River, kept a diary of the farm routine and of social and civic life in Campbell Town. Written in the 1860s, it nonetheless provides images of social and community events, life on a mixed agricultural and pastoral estate, and the tensions of providing advice and support to family and associates on business and private matters. These perspectives broaden the view from a single property and place the work of the Leake men at Rosedale in a wider community context.

William Archer’s farm management journal formed the original material for work about male convicts labouring on the Brickendon estate. It had a number of attributes that went beyond the daily journal: a record of conversations, decisions and reports from the overseer including details that may later be required in actions against convicts.

William Johnston, who came to live in Campbell Town in 1855, offered a man’s perspective on domestic matters within the context of his work as master of a Campbell Town school. Johnston’s wife and children feature in his journal, as do school routines, problems of not being paid and making money stretch, Campbell Town social life, and his relationships with people of all spheres. John Leake was a trustee of Johnson’s school and was mentioned in this respect as were several other of Leake’s associates.

While each of these diaries conveys a day-to-day life, as lived by the writer, as they saw it and for their use, they provide a collective view of lives of the period and in the setting of the thesis.

---

19 The Leake Papers include items of correspondence to John Leake from both George Gatenby and James Mercer on estate and business matters.
22 Names mentioned by Johnston that also appear in Sarah Leake’s journal include Rev Brickwood, Dr Valentine, William Morrison, Dr Boyd and her father Mr Leeke [Leake].
It is rare to find the diary of a Vandemonian domestic servant for, irrespective of their status as convict or free, they were embedded in a working-class culture that treated written artefacts as ephemeral. There are documents relating to the business of getting on in the world; generally found in collections representative of the ‘master’. This is the case with the majority of letters held in the Leake Papers that were written by convict servants and farm workers. Most are from men and relate to wages or other business matters but there are examples of private correspondence that indicate more personal relationships.23

Collections of private letters, like those found in the Leake Papers, and those of Lady Denison or Ellen Viveash augment diary, journal and reminiscences and give immediacy to the life and issues experienced by their writers.24 While letters and journals only tell us what was on the writer’s mind at the time, they serve to illustrate the wider concerns of their life and to give context to their contemporaries’ writing.

Convict records indicate that many convicts could write, at least a little. The letters of those who were literate, and those who were penned by literate others, can indicate the changing experiences of servitude. Hindmarsh noted the shifts in the writing style of each of the convict brothers, Richard Taylor and Simon Brown, in their letters to family, as their experiences of servitude changed.25 They employed religious, fictional, biographical and other tropes and set phrases to describe aspects of their lives. They also appear to have used form letters and scribes each of which were readily available and widely used. Hindmarsh argued that letters could be read ‘as a form of autobiography in progress,’ and each letter offers a partial account of the life as it progressed.26

A ‘hidden history’ of affectionate and caring domestic relationships may be illuminated through letters.27 The letters of Richard Taylor and Simon Brown are also examples of this. Picton-Phillips’ research identified that:

---

23 For example, Olive Dormer (nee Bloor) wrote to Sarah Leake from New Zealand thanking her for money and to offer family news, and she wrote a condolence letter to Charles Leake upon the death of his father. Olive Dormer to Sarah Leake, c1863, and, Olive Dormer to Charles Leake, 27th May 1868, Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania.
there was an ongoing tension between the bureaucratically desensitising effects of individual entries [in the indents] and the ghostly human beings whose recorded physical characteristics… gave the illusion of virtual corporeal reality.  

The people came to life. While her study was of the continuing personal links between those transported and those left behind as part of enhancing the understanding of transportation, this work considers letters between those in servitude and the masters as an example of the enduring bonds that could be formed.

A cohort of convict women can be identified amid women letter writers in New South Wales up to 1857, among them Mary Talbot, Margaret Catchpole, Ann Robinson, Mary Oliver (later McDonald), Mary Reiby, Ann Chapman and Lydia Esden. Their letters cover the full range of personal entreaties, hopes and disappointments; describe their fears; and illuminate the conditions in which they lived and served. Because of their letters, these individuals have a presence in convict history. For some, their place is reinforced by a glorified unauthorised biography. No such sample exists for Tasmania.

Life history

Life writing and its place in historiography are central to this thesis. The work draws on the methodology and rationale of biography and life history. To a straightforward mind, biography is the written record of the life of an individual. ‘Life history’ is more the intensive account of a life that uses personal documents like letters, photographs and diaries, to present an intensive individual account and to measure the personal contribution of an individual. This thesis draws on the form of life history that aims to shed light on the social processes, connections and structures of an individual’s existence.

Two main types of life history have been described: a more traditional approach to shed light on social practices through an objective account and the analysis of the production

---

30 Three of these women are numbered in the 6 women of 143 individuals listed as ‘convicts’ in the Australian Dictionary of Biography – Online Edition, www.adb.online.anu.edu.au/.
32 For example, the Tasmanian convict letters used by Cartwright were all penned by men. Celia Cartwright, “‘A miserable place for prisoners?’ Nineteenth century convict letters from Tasmania,” Tasmanian Historical Research Association Papers and Proceedings, 60 2, 2013, p. 75.
of life history. This work is a contribution to the former, but one that attempts to recognise personal context and views. Such an approach, as is demonstrated here, requires a longitudinal analysis and thus is a more widely scoped project than simply, for example, the year of an individual’s journal. The multiple relationships encountered by each individual and the multiple threads of each shape a biography, which in turn shapes history.

This work contributes to subaltern history and it takes a life-writing approach to do so. In a vein similar to Anderson’s study of the lives of marginalised people in colonial history, which is ‘... framed within a recognition of the historiographical significance of the interactions between biography and wider society,’ it is possible to write life history of minor players, people with little more than a private legacy to recommend them. The primary material was produced by people who had no thought for posterity when they wrote. Eliza Williams and members of the Leake family gave no indication that they expected to have their words reviewed and researched by a future third party.

‘History from below’ attempts to reconstruct the body of experience of ‘ordinary’ people and, where possible, to understand that experience from the perspective of those people. There are issues and problems with this approach: evidence, definition, significance and restriction. Each of these was considered. Evidence was not an issue in itself. The material studied was produced in relatively recent times, generally is in good condition and was able to be corroborated as the work of those it was purported to be by. This research does not focus on generalised ordinary life or culture. A female convict takes centre stage and her corps de ballet is composed of compatriot convicts, rural farm workers, and associates in the house of her master. Most can be clearly identified and named. This was not a search for an invisible woman. Unlike Maxwell-Stewart’s search for the man behind the notation on a convict narrative, ‘Convict Davis Servant,’ Eliza Williams was visible in the record. The only requirement was to ensure the correct Eliza Williams was identified. With regard to significance, this work has been able to further understanding of the macro history of

38 There were three women named Eliza Williams transported in the 1850s. Eliza Williams, 908, per Aurora, died at sea in 1851; Eliza Williams, 935, per Anna Maria in 1852 was contracted to John Leake, Campbell Town; and Eliza Williams, 987, per Duchess of Northumberland in 1853 served predominantly in Hobart Town, CON 41.
convictism, particularly in the context of private domestic life, because of the capacity to identify individuals precisely. This thesis takes a wide view of the issue of restriction implicit in ‘what is evidence’ and is reflective of the wealth of original material.  

This study is an attempt at ‘writing colonial lives.’ It values the private and public lives of free and convict equally and describes the interrelatedness of success in both spheres of life. Such life writing is enhanced by engagement with social history and critical theory. This engagement is promoted when the assumptions about the wholeness of a life and the sense of individual consistency are set aside and the background and context of a life is placed in the frame. As Pybus argues, ‘... [The] close examination of a life can illuminate much about the creative process, or social mores, or the mechanics of power.’ This thesis pursues a similar objective through detailed reconstruction of the lives of two women who inhabited the same space for a period in the 1850s and thereafter took separate directions. There are strong connections between biography and place, including travel and movement although in this case one woman travelled more in both geographical and social sense that the other.

The biographer’s role is to allow the subject’s perspective to be viewed while maintaining a detachment that enables objectivity. This is more challenging when writing of women due to less adequate primary sources related to their lives. Ambrosius recommends the methodology of comparative biography, meaning the exploration of the parallel lives of two or more people whose lives intersected: and this is attempted here, at least in part as will be clear in later chapters. However, an objective of this research is to illuminate private life in the colonial household, not to write a biography of either Sarah Elizabeth Leake or of Eliza Williams.

One contributor to the Ambrosius volume, Cooper, not one for subaltern history, notes biography to be complex work because, for comparison, subjects need to be roughly equal, in power or office, and to have ‘left’ sufficient primary material to enable an

39 Sharpe, “History from Below,” p. 28.
examination of their life. Empathy is as important as research and critical analysis. Cooper suggests that this empathy needs be coupled with a capacity and willingness to go where the biography leads, even when it does not take the direction the researcher anticipated. The role, and art, of the biographer is to enable the reader to experience the life of others in ways that are meaningful to the reader in their different time and place. This research aims not to reconstruct life but to appreciate its elements, tensions and boundaries. Cooper did not note the non-manuscript sources of photography or artifacts and indicated a blinkered view of primary sources, valuing the formal over the unofficial. The writer of life history must utilize all available materials in order to overcome the bias toward the male, the wealthy and the powerful, all of whom were more likely to leave formal written documents or private letters and diaries. This thesis contributes to life histories of the less prominent.

Contemporary biography can describe the way a life was played out with more complexity than a single or linear dimension. In so doing, the researcher needs to acknowledge their consciousness of, for example, gender and class so as to open to the conceptualizations of the period in which the subject lived. More recent biography draws on a shift in recognition of the role of the personal life, for men as well as for women.

Biography requires research in the private sphere of life as well as the public and equal attention to the priorities the subject applied to these: often exposing contradictions between public view and private behaviour. It is a means of charting the connections between the myths and realities of the past and the context in which an individual lived. The myth can be held and promoted by the subject as the reality of their life and it is the researcher’s job to go behind the legend. In the context of Sarah Elizabeth Leake’s journal and the letters of Eliza Williams, this idea suggests a comparison of the traditions of daily life, as implied by social and economic status, to the realities of that life as described in their writing.

---

46 Cooper, “Conception, and, conversation comparison: my experiences as a biographer,” pp. 87-8.
47 Ambrosius, Writing Biography: historians and their craft, p. ix.
48 Ambrosius, Writing Biography: historians and their craft, p. xi. Materials may be formal or informally written, photographic, or artefacts like craft works, tattoos or trinkets.
Women, irrespective of social rank, shared life experiences arising from the gender divisions within the structure of the society. This perspective obliges one to reflect on the gender bias of the documents in the study of any historical era. This is important in the consideration of colonial Tasmania particularly as there is evidence of a society firmly based in a paternalistic framework as will be demonstrated for both the wider society and for the management model in place at Rosedale.

The concept of the ‘life course’ was introduced by Bradley to describe a linear development of the individual’s experience of the penal system, and this can be extended to colonial society more widely. His advice was that the public and private record be used to create a joining-up of the documentation about an individual in order to move away from the silo approach to one that is more connected and holistic. This suggests archival alignment, the demonstration of which will be a specific contribution of this thesis. In this project, the archival alignment is primarily across private papers rather than across the private and public spheres. The separate documents included in the Leake Papers, which deal with aspects of an event or date, are aligned in order to more fully explore their meaning. For example, journal entries by Sarah Leake that remark upon specific events can be matched with the accounting of costs in John Leake’s ledger associated with the event, as is the case with the visit by John Leake and his daughter to Hobart Town to stay at Government House in April 1854. More prosaically, mention of retrieving the laundry can be matched to accounts for payment from the washerwoman and lists of items sent out. Alignment of public and private archives is, however, at the fore in the micro histories of Rosedale workers, particularly convict workers. This aspect, described more fully later, is derived from the consideration of a life history from information in the public record and the private archive.

Corbin purposefully set out to present the life of an unknown: to imagine feelings, relationships, animations and the sociability that may have shaped a life. He deliberately moved away from the ‘great man: great event’ form of historiography to focus on the hidden, private, ordinary existence of a nonentity whose life was marked by the records at birth and

death and only otherwise by ‘traces’.\footnote{Corbin, \textit{The Life of an Unknown}, p. viii.} Corbin’s innovation was that he openly imagined where there was no evidence or source to assist. This required him to reflect on contemporary attitudes and behaviours and to set aside assumptions arising from his own life and experience. Corbin is of interest here because of the approach, methods and sources he used, and those he rejected. Corbin argued his work was not micro-history, nor the history of an individual. He introduced the notion of ‘life space’ to the thinking represented in this thesis.\footnote{Corbin, \textit{The Life of an Unknown}, p. 1.}

Life space is a resonating term indicating not only the idea of living in a space or setting and taking up space, but also the intersection of life spaces of others and their longevity and interconnectedness as well as their separateness. It appears that, for Corbin, the notion of life space is the immediate geography or location of a life. A further conceptualization of life space, that explores more fully the interconnectedness of life spaces as indicated by selected items in the Leake Papers, will be introduced through this research.

In order to understand what an individual may have thought and felt, it is useful to determine what the person may have ‘seen’ in their day and life: the patterns of life and settlement, the physical structures of community, the changes in the seasons, attitudes, landscapes and routines of life, and the priorities set by others that may have influenced them. Corbin noted these as ‘markers’ that identify people and their position in relation to the individual and speculates on the emotions that would arise from these markers.\footnote{Corbin, \textit{The Life of an Unknown}, p. 21.} His work is a guide to thinking similarly and invites speculation about the daily grind of the farm and house implied by entries in the day book and the possible emotional responses to the events Sarah Leake describes in her impassive prose.

**Telling stories**

This thesis employs narrative as a form and contributes to the study of narrative as a mechanism for writing history. It seeks to include physical and geographical context to avoid the impoverishment arising from their absence.\footnote{Shayne Breen, \textit{Contested Places: Tasmania’s Northern Districts from ancient times to 1900}, Hobart: Centre for Tasmanian Historical Studies, 2001, p. 2.} Like Tuchman, who writes from the perspective of a historian rather than a biographer, this research is reflective of ‘a story teller, a narrator, who deals in true stories, not fiction.’\footnote{Barbara W Tuchman, \textit{Practicing History}, New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1981, p. 18.} Narrative is a means to bring the mass of
facts, names and places into a digestible form. In this project this has been achieved by
reading text in the original form, analysing the form, shape and condition of primary
materials, and standing in doorways and kitchens and laneways to capture a sense of the
reality. Tuchman’s narrative form – the biographical sketch – has been employed to extend
the population of this account.\footnote{See particularly Appendix Two. Tuchman notes the biographical sketch as a sub genre of biography and of
life writing, Tuchman, \textit{Practicing History}, p. 133.}

Case study narratives may be descriptive and extend to the impact, possible
impressions and thoughts of those in the frame.\footnote{Picton Phillips, “Convicts, Communications and Authority: Britain and New South Wales, 1810-1830,” p. 264.} This is at odds with the notion that the
historian cannot construct the views and opinions of others. This research indicates sympathy
for the descriptive tools that enable the reader to gain a writer’s impression of the impact of
the physical and emotional environment on their ‘characters’.

Historians are, with other researchers and thinkers, equally rooted in their social and
historical context. When Munz reflected, ‘The past is real enough. But the stories we tell
about it are constructions,’\footnote{Peter Munz, “The Historical Narrative,” in \textit{Companion to Historiography}, Michael Bentley, ed., London:
Routledge, 1997, p. 867.} he was suggesting that the generalizations of a period or people
are political and parochial constructions. They may be augmented or replaced by interpretive
generalizations or left to sit in their own right. Munz was firm in his conviction that narrative
is the only literary device for the telling of history because of the direct line of the ‘arrow of
time’ and he argues for an orderly narration along the spectrum of time.\footnote{Munz, “The Historical Narrative,” p. 852.} Further, he notes
that both primary and secondary sources are constructions of those who prepare them and,
with respect to primary sources, they do not fully represent the event, act, or situation that
they document. This aspect is a feature of the primary papers used here: they reflect no more
than the perspectives and priorities for the writer at the time they wrote.

A parallel approach was adopted by Frost and Maxwell-Stewart who shifted thinking
from convict narratives, as stories, to narrating convict lives.\footnote{Lucy Frost and Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, eds., \textit{Chain Letters: Narrating Convict Lives}, Melbourne:
Melbourne University Press, 2001, p. 1.} This gave place to those who
did not or could not leave a written account of their experience as a convict alongside those
few, mostly men, who did. Thus, this is a contribution to what is described as an ‘alternative
approach to the history of convict Australia’ in that prisoners’ stories in a convict voice are
interpreted and set against the gaoler voice that booms from the administrative record.\footnote{Maxwell-Stewart, “The search for the invisible man,” p. 49.}
Given the social history perspective inherent in this thesis, it is unsurprising that this work has a problem-solving element and is not simply story-telling. The context is the development of ‘new history’ as it moved away from the great man great event form to one as not so much about the past but about change, solving problems not storytelling, evidence based and literary: separate narratives that are plaited yet retain their visibility. This results in a combination of narrative and analysis whereby an argument is developed across themes and then encased in a narrative structure. A braided narrative provides a broader framework through which to manage the complexities of the tale. Several such interconnected, or braided, narratives are presented in this thesis: a narrative about the establishment of Rosedale; a narrative about the social world of Sarah Leake, a narrative about unfree labour and the security of the household, and a narrative about the later life of Eliza Williams.

Narratives can be seen as complex social transactions between the writer and the audience. Australia itself was an occasion for narrative in its differences, its remoteness, its colonial institutions and its patterns of settlement. An innovation that may reduce the gap between structural and narrative history is to have the story from more than one viewpoint. Further, having the writer visible in the narrative reminds the reader that the writer is not omnipotent or free of bias.

There are also aspects of this work that accord with a micro history approach. Levi describes this approach as addressing the causes and effects that different dimensions of social systems bring to the place individuals find for themselves within social structures. Micro history attempts to retain the integrity of individual events or lives for the purpose of revealing more general phenomenon. Resolving the complexity of an occurrence may require descriptive as well as analytical tools. Levi introduces the problem of reader reception and perception of the narrative when he contends that no reader is a blank canvas. This conundrum may be resolved by incorporating the procedures of the research into the narrative as is modelled here. Levi and a number of other writers note the connection between micro

---

history and thick description. Thick description is the: ‘... intensive, small-scale, descriptions of social life from observation, through which broader cultural interpretations and generalizations can be made.’ Thick description of human behaviour explains not just the behaviour, but its context as well, such that the behaviour becomes meaningful to an outsider. It is solid with detail and, as noted elsewhere, both interpretive and analytical.

Thick description is equated with thick narrative: the dense and precise depiction of practices and events that ‘integrate story and context.’ It should be able to accommodate individual sequence and intention as well as the structures and context of the actions. Burke can be interpreted to indicate that thick description and micro narrative are one and the same. Perhaps the latter term has more appeal to the historian. But no matter: they are tools whereby single stories are recounted to reveal broader structures. One concern regarding this approach is to link micro history to macro history: to connect ‘local details to general trends.’

This thesis is micro history in that it aspires to illuminate everyday experience and ordinary lives in order to offer an interpretation of the encompassing social structures. It does not invent characters, their words or their thoughts. It relies on the revelatory properties of extant artefacts. Micro history is micro in approach, not in length. The story must be told in the service of an argument, not as a story in isolation from the larger historical events that encompass it.

Each convict had such a micro history embedded in the ‘stated this offence’ record taken down by scribes before they were disembarked from their vessel of transportation. Many such micro histories can be recovered and included in a Tuchman-style biographical sketch. The convict whose life is ‘narrated’ may be the most silent of the players in the

---

76 Lepore, “Historical writing and the revival of narrative,” p. 51.
77 Burke, “History of events and the revival of narrative,” p 240.
78 Lepore, “Historical writing and the revival of narrative,” p. 51.
80 Lepore, “Historical writing and the revival of narrative,” p. 52.
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story. In early exploration of the convict narrative, Conlon noted narratives were presented as a moral tale, directed at the less educated reader, in the form of a convict memoir or yarn and that this structure persisted through the early decades.

It is a story of the only child of respectable parents, led astray by bad companions; the actual crime for which he is transported is often specified only vaguely. In a penal colony he suffers intensely but, like the ancient Mariner, returns to his native land, warning youth to avoid the mistakes that he himself made.

Conlon emphasised the rarity of convict narratives and the predominance, in the history of transportation, of the narratives of those who were not its subjects. Unfortunately, the two convict narratives purported to be by women convicts cannot be verified.

The men’s narratives reflected convict experience in both New South Wales and Tasmania, mostly during the period of assignment. Several reflect the probation management system in Tasmania after 1840. Conlon notes the difficulty of generalising the treatment within the system:

Chance, the differing personalities of the men and of those with whom they came in contact, even the different times of their arrival in the colonies, all served to vary their experiences. What can be seen, however, is the all transcending and pervasive power of the system of authority over the convicts, even when it was inefficient.

A verifiable female convict voice is at the heart of this research. Eliza Williams has been clearly identified and the narrative contained in public documentation, including convict records, is an example of the all-encompassing power of the convict system, the role private people played as managers in that system, and the extent to which convict agency influenced their life space.

**Reading the signs**

Social memory is a theoretical construction of direct relevance to a history of private life. Social memory is that collection of expectations, behaviours and ways of being within the
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world, gained and layered from infancy, that inform and structure interactions and relationships. It is social in that it is shared, within the immediate and extended family and into the communities with which the family is associated but it is not uniform either between individuals or within communities. Social memory is more than an act of recollection. It underpins and augments socialization. Social memory is the embedded memory that influences daily life. It can span the extreme from selectivity, distortion and inaccuracy to keen accuracy and complete exactness.86 While there may be a multiplicity of meanings and perceptions, attachment to the shared experiences and connections bind the members of the group.87

Social memory accommodates individuality in both the layering of the memories and the use of them. Such memories do not originate from a single source and they are both perceived and experienced, and not necessarily consciously so. Despite the individuality of social memories, they are shared on a wider level such that the members of a social grouping will have a commonality of view on how to be with each other. Within this view there may be perspectives that dominate and these may translate into mainstream discourse. In the colonial setting, conventional views on such matters as the role and place of mistress and servant, being convict or free, Protestant or Roman Catholic, English or Irish, underpinned daily social intercourse. Accuracy of memory was not the point. What was remembered and what was forgotten influenced the dominant discourse. Social memory also relates to how diverse people come to think of themselves as a group with a shared past, though not one that all agree upon in every detail. Conceptually, social memory can be used to explore the connections between social identity and memory of the past. The social aspect of social memory, rather than collective memory: ‘calls attention to the social contexts in which people shape their group identities and debate their conflicting perceptions of the past.’88 Forming a social memory required discarding as well as including and reframing events, experiences and practices. It is a biased process, individually and collectively. The act of remembering is not of concern here. Rather, the concern is with the embeddedness of social memory and its influence on daily life.

Connerton addressed the question: how is the memory of groups conveyed and sustained?89 He noted three types of memory: personal memory [arising from one’s life

87 See Fentress and Wickham, Social Memory, p. xi; and Scott A French, “What is Social Memory?,” Southern Cultures, 2 1, 1995, p. 17.
history], cognitive memory [of things learned or experienced in the past] and habit memory
[capacity to replicate performance]. Daily life was conducted using rules and behaviour that
were not formally summoned but part of the social memory of the person in the context of
their life history. Conceptually, this can sit alongside the notion of docility through which the
activities of the individual, particularly bodily practices, are regimented and incorporated into
amassed memory. Decorum and restraint in a private setting are as much outcomes of the
docile body as conformity to the rules of an institution.

Settlers brought their social memory with them and the settler experience augmented
that memory and influenced its transmission. Britishness, particularly Englishness, was one
dominant discourse Tasmanian colonial settler families imported, particularly those with
pretensions to elite status. In an early consideration of the concept, Vincent argued that social
memory was preserved and intensified by symbols, repetition and conscious thought. Ceremonies, anniversaries and similar events to refresh a society’s recollection of its traits and its past were critical. Artefacts and documentary evidence also supported social memory. Sarah Leake’s reading matter was one means of sustaining her social memory of Britishness, of ‘Home.’

There were multiple sites for British colonization in the early nineteenth century: the
Cape, Canada, Newfoundland and New Zealand as well as the penal colonies of New South
Wales and Tasmania. Each was a node in the imperial network. People, information, capital
and ideas flowed through this network for it was not only from the centre, or metropole, that
they originated. The notion of Britishness also moved and was contested within this
network. Tasmania was a society which imported institutions from the metropole with little
amendment: church, judiciary, executive government and the parliament. Colonists thought
of themselves as British, as did the government in London. They spoke of Great Britain as
‘Home’. And within this culture it was Englishness that dominated for it was English that
was spoken, the English were numerically dominant, English Common Law was the basis for
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the legal system and the institutions that arose from it, and the Church of England was the official religion of the colonies. A sense of ‘Englishness’ was embedded in Tasmanian settler society.

Colonisers transported their traditions and etiquette, embedded in their social memory and memorialised in the trunks, boxes, chests and packing cases of their possessions. One of Russell’s contributions to interpreting themes in Australian history is her analysis of the uncouth and unsettling truths about the culture and manners of settlers and society. Russell disabuses the reader of the theme of a civilized colonial society and furthers the trend of seeking a more complex and interrelated history rather than one separated into settlement, patterns of society and the relationship between the colonies and the ‘mother country’. She describes the ‘rituals of possession’ that followed colonizers:

… parceling out the land with surveys, grants and purchases; naming; clearing and fencing; holding and defending territory. And then followed, though unevenly, certain rituals of belonging: the building and furnishing of homes, the growing of gardens, the bearing and raising of families, the establishment of monuments and memorials, the forging of a history.

Some colonists took refuge in aloofness; others joined the degraded mass. Some challenged the basis or premise of English manners. John Leake was of the group that transferred, as near as possible in an upside down world, the mode of life that they held dear: a middle-class orderliness supported by displays of prosperity and gentility. England was transplanted in their colonial landscape. The name Rosedale, reflective of Rosedale Abbey in Yorkshire, connected the Leake family with ‘Home’.

Leading settler families retained a sense of personal mission to plant British institutions in the colonies. The strangeness of the land was not important. Their exclusivist attitude was built upon the fear that the crudity and lawlessness of convict and emancipist society would overwhelm all they held dear. Exclusiveness in social relationships seemed of more pressing concern than in commerce. Emancipists, which in the colonial context
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meant those who had done their time or been pardoned of their crime, carried the taint of their criminality. There was great tension and uncertainty about the appropriateness of their participation in public ceremonial events and private society. The Leake Papers indicate that John Leake and his sons did business with all comers but it appears from his daughter’s journal that she restricted her social circle to elite free settlers and their colonial-born relatives.

Lambert and Lester use the notion of imperial spaces to encapsulate the core, or metropole, and the periphery, or colony. Imperial spaces could be described as embodied in the constructions and domestic architecture at the core and the periphery. They note the link between political and economic motivation in empire building, and these motivations are also in evidence in the individuals who, although not famous, contributed the mass of population to the settlements. Further, they note the impact on the individual of their travels and settling: ‘... people did not just travel through and inhabit space: they altered it to some degree as they created their own trajectories and as they cross-cut or insinuated themselves into trajectories other than their own, either materially or imaginatively.’ From the outset Rosedale was an imperial space. It reflected and displayed connection with empire and the separateness of the colony. This had an impact on all who lived there.

Roles and responsibilities were embedded in social memory and in the wider culture of domesticity. Colonial Tasmania was a gendered landscape and women’s place was both social and geographic. Rosedale presented a male facade. The women at Rosedale, particularly Elizabeth Leake, worked to build comfort within but were not visible in the monument that was the house. Paternalism can be seen as the tail on a coin featuring gender on its head.

Middle and upper class women in the Victorian age were confined in the domestic sphere by virtue of their gender. Men inhabited the wider world. This separation was dependent upon adequate family income, earned largely by men in an increasingly differentiated world where work was regulated and defined. The middle class emerged
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from the ‘middling sorts’ in England as wealth increased and its members, and those of the elite, had a more defined day with periods for leisure as well as work.\textsuperscript{108}

The capacity to own land was pivotal to the emergence of a middle class for, where land was held by the aristocracy and tenant farming and serfdom were the norm, there was no capacity to develop capital. Differences between the aristocracy and middle classes extended further than their approaches to land tenure. For the middle class, land was more of an investment or capital item than an inherited estate. Middle-class men did not live from rents, rather their land was an investment and they needed to seek and maintain an income to buffer them against the fluctuations in the economy. Home became the haven from the market, even taking account of the contradiction that home was also generally sited within the economic unit: the shop, the business, the farm.\textsuperscript{109}

The separate gender roles of men and women were central to private life in nineteenth-century Britain and her colonies. This separation was not unique to this period but it was accentuated by the images and instruction of mass publications in a world of enhanced literacy. The setting for the history of private life is the household. The way private life was conducted was based on the physical layout and structure of the houses men built as much as the gendered roles and the interpersonal relationships acted out within them.\textsuperscript{110} Apparently, at least in Dickens’ fiction, not all women submitted willingly:

Such a mean mission as the domestic mission was the very last thing to be endured...
Miss Wisk informed us, with great indignation, before we sat down to breakfast, that the idea of woman’s mission lying chiefly in the narrow sphere of Home was an outrageous slander on the part of her Tyrant, Man.\textsuperscript{111}

The doctrine of the two gender spheres is an idealized dualism in which men occupied the public sphere and participated in the economic, political and civic life of the community and women occupied the private sphere of the home and supported the activity of their husband, or other male members of their immediate family, by creating a suitable domestic environment. In a foundation work on the theory, it was argued that the sexual division of labour within families acquired a heightened centrality with new conceptions of sexual

\textsuperscript{108} This differentiation is well described in the daily life of middle-class gentleman Arthur Munby and can be contrasted to the restriction on choice available to working-class servant women. See, Hudson, Munby, Man of Two Worlds: The Life and Diaries of Arthur J. Munby, 1828-1910.

\textsuperscript{109} Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850, p. 20.


difference. The context of Davidoff and Hall’s work was the hundred years from the late eighteenth to the late nineteenth century. This was a time of rapid social, economic and political change. These new traditions had lasting social and institutional effects.

An understanding of middle-class culture of the period required knowledge of what went on behind the scenes, in the privacy of the home: men making money, investing and working hard in the knowledge that women were doing their bit, economizing, making do, and contributing by raising children. Domestic harmony was viewed as ‘the crown of the enterprise as well as the basis of public virtue.’ Literacy among middle-class people played a central role in the spreading the word about gender spheres: bible, sermon, tract, novel, newspaper and pamphlet. Reading was important within the family as part of domestic life.

Separate spheres theory was not without critics despite the noted importance of the work. Vickery’s critical analysis ends with the plea that the text, *Family Fortunes*, not be given the status of ‘holy writ’ but discussed and debated. Her argument was that women, particularly middle-class women, were marginalized from the public sphere and within the private sphere. In a later work, Vickery placed more emphasis on patriarchy than gender spheres as the theoretical underpinning. This thesis accepts both concepts as instrumental and, later, stresses their interrelatedness.

Another critic, Wahrman, proposed that domestic ideology was re-formed into the separate spheres, but he expressed doubts about the reality for families as opposed to the model. He saw a separation between the development of the middle class and that of domesticity, suggesting that rather than being closely interrelated they developed in parallel. He argues that the evidence does not support the gender sphere thesis until after the mid 1830’s when there was a coming together of the two concepts, and that they have since become historically coupled.

This period coincided with the maturing of the Tasmanian convict system and an interrelationship between reform and domesticity was clear. Formal marriage and
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establishing a household were viewed as reforming, particularly for women convicts, although there were clear boundaries around the permission process. Marriage was supported as a means to settle convicts of either gender. An early example of this was embodied in the land grants given to emancipated men in New South Wales. More land was given to men who had wives and even more per child. ‘The policy was clearly intended to encourage marriage as part of the strategy of reform through reintegration.’

The marriage aspect of this policy was reflected in Tasmania and was accepted as a means of reform which aimed to quieten and sober convicts, particularly women, and to have them create tranquil homes.

Louisa Meredith saw suitable marriage as legitimate:

[We] never place obstacles in the way of good intentions. Those prisoner-women who settle in the country, with few exceptions, behave well and industriously. I know many wives of this class who keep their husbands’ little cottage as clean and tidy as any honest English village dame could do...

Ellen Viveash, in a two-pronged approach, used support for permission to marry as an inducement for good behaviour in a female convict and as the means of retaining the services of a good shepherd who was seeking a wife. In doing this she was simultaneously supporting the yeoman ideal of settled workers connected to the ‘big house’ and marital domesticity as a means to reduce female convict misbehaviour. Viveash was exercising her power over a convict worker by ensuring the servant was dependent upon her goodwill.

Male convicts, too, bargained and negotiated within rules for permission to marry. This was likely particularly so for men serving longer sentences for they had little to look forward to. A future opportunity for a separate domestic life of home and partner, rather than the barracks or gaol, was a significant incentive to behave.

As the nineteenth century progressed, the home became strongly associated with femininity. This ideal was considered cultivated and genteel as well as morally correct. With the separation of home and business spheres the home became households of women, children and servants. Men moved in and out. In the United States women’s place in the

---

123 Statham, *The Tanner Letters: A Pioneer Saga of Swan River & Tasmania 1831-1843*, p. 120.
125 Reid, *Gender, crime and empire: convicts, settlers and the State in Early Colonial Australia*, p. 149.
home was veiled by sentimentality. In the antebellum period a ‘cult of domesticity’ saw women’s place and proper sphere as the home. In the American literature the separation of the two spheres had an associate: sentimental domesticity. Women’s separation from the power of economy was considered to be compensated for by power in the home, over the family, and over the next generation. This concept of domesticity fundamentally held a division of labour that assigned women to the privatized realm of the home, which became the site and source of feeling, religion, morality, child rearing, purity, and order. What became the cult of domesticity was not a single belief system but rather a flexible group of ideas that ascribed to women, as wives and mothers, a special capacity for nurturance and benevolence. The cult saw women confined to their own sphere: the domestic sphere, the home.

In America, the role of the woman and that of the house were brought together by architects and domestic advisors as a way of facilitating the mother’s role. The Beecher sisters were, arguably, the proponents of American domesticity. How different this thesis would be if Sarah Leake had been reading *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* rather than *Bleak House* on the day she began a new volume of her journal. Catharine Beecher was a domestic reformer who saw systematic arrangement was essential to the harmony of the home. The tidiness of closets, bookcases, and presses were symptomatic of the well ordered home. Beecher extolled this virtue in her treatise on domestic economy.
the domestic ideal, proposed by her treatise and present in her sisters’ homes, embraced natural light, efficiency, uncluttered rooms, and ease of access from inside to outside with porches and outdoor areas. The home was the secure base from which men and women went forth into the world: a world less ordered and protected than the ‘home’.

The most important characteristic of this new domestic space was its ability to (ingeniously and simultaneously) integrate personal and national goals. It fostered uniform communities, molded socially homogeneous human beings, and produced a set of predictable habits among contemporary Americans.

The American ideal, a sentimental paradox in which the obligation for national respectability fused with a private virtue of being removed from national power was often associated with the paradox of the separate spheres. Women’s separation from the power of economy through work in the public arena was considered to be compensated for by power in the home, over the family, the next generation, and the day-to-day acts of those in the family. This sentimentality carried its own aesthetics: advice books, statues, photographs, pamphlets, lyric poems, fashion advertisement, and novels.

According to Welter’s analysis, women were to possess four cardinal virtues: piety, purity, submission and domesticity. Piety reframed women to be more religious and spiritual than men; purity was in heart, mind and body; and submission held women in perpetual childhood. Men dictated all actions and decisions. Industrialisation, through which men went out to the world of work, encouraged domesticity with the home as the woman’s domain. Welter’s article was considered a landmark analysis of this subject and, while since criticised, formed the basis for considerable theoretical analysis. Her work was the result of a survey of most of the longstanding women’s magazines during 1820-1860 in America and books that were considered ‘gifts’ including religious tracts, instruction manuals and cookbooks for the same period. Her corroborative data came from contemporary diaries, journals and letters. Welter read what women would have read, and what authors, many of them men, felt women should be reading and doing. Women were required to be, or appear to
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be, weak, timid, requiring of protection and advice, grateful for support, despite being considered equal, albeit different.

Submission was perhaps the most feminine virtue expected of women. Men were supposed to be religious, although they rarely had time for it, and supposed to be pure, though it came awfully hard to them, but men were the movers, the does, the actors. Women were the passive, submissive responders.  

Welter argued that women accepted submission as their lot and were portrayed, in the magazines at least, at home by the fireside, as daughter, sister, wife or mother. From the home women brought men back to, and kept them with God, and civilized their passions. It was Welter who introduced the concept of the cult of womenhood. In later analysis, Roberts argued feminist scholars came to understand that ‘the domestic ideal was not natural but naturalized.’

Davidoff and Hall argue that paternalism arose in the wake of new labour management models that moved away from the aristocratic deference and obligation. In this new master/worker relationship, employers could function as providers to their employees, not only to those in their private home. The language of paternalism could be applied to wives, children, servant and labourers. In Victorian society, taking an organic conceptualization, the head of the family was the adult middle-class male; he was also the head of industry, of government and of decision-making. This is the essence of paternalism. In the Tasmanian rural setting the head of the family led the estate, made the decisions in the business of farming and took responsibility for the estate ‘family’ which was composed of family and unrelated persons. This leadership was both public and private. In the private sphere, at home, the interdependence of the family and the servants, the management of the household, the house and the function of its rooms, and gender-based work roles are all topics for consideration.

This thesis argues that paternalism exercised by the Leake family, through the leadership and example of John Leake, as a way of managing the complex social
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environment in which they lived. Key to this analysis is an understanding of the parallel lives of masters and servants and the social roles attributed to each. Paternalism was a building block for colonial convict society and this was replicated in the wider social and economic structures that developed from the nascent colonies.\textsuperscript{144} The stage was set in Tasmania at the outset by Governor Collins utilizing an ‘intensely individualised paternalism.’\textsuperscript{145} In many aspects the convict management system replicated this paternalism in that it took responsibility for convicts under its control, including their welfare, health and maintenance. Paternalism was crucial to colonial authority but its form altered over time as delegated responsibility for day-to-day prisoner management was shifted from guards of the state to free settlers in their guise as masters.\textsuperscript{146} The prison walls were replaced by the fences and hedgerows of private properties. Paternalism saw the master ensure his domestic environment was safe and peaceful by the exercise of management strategies that were intended to encourage industry over recalcitrance. The master held the role of protector and was assumed to act in the best interests of the servants, who were limited in their opportunity for decision-making and independent action.

Paternalism created a ‘fragile bridge’ between master and convict that enabled relationship development.\textsuperscript{147} Both parties contributed to the nature of that human relationship, and the extent of power within it varied. Even with these variations, the stronger role was the master, and this was embodied in the convict law that was itself paternalistic, as it both enacted and recognised rights for convicts. The responsibility of retaining convict workers as both a duty and a burden can be translated into a management model where the duty and burden meshed in a moral code of behaviour that was out of keeping with the working-class origins of the majority of convicts.\textsuperscript{148} The master’s duty and burden was to aid the emergence of a yeoman class from the convict mass, a class that itself would rest on a paternalistic model of family. Rosedale, under John Leake’s leadership as both head of the family and head of the business, exhibited characteristics of such a paternal system.

Paternalism saw subservient men treated as if children.\textsuperscript{149} As with the father’s role in the family, leniency was the master’s prerogative within the terms of the convict system and the master-servant legislation. Brutality was an available alternative, but usually not
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economically viable. Paternalism was seen to be advantageous to both the ‘master’ and ‘servant’ but much more accrued to the master whose wealth depended upon the labour of the servant.\textsuperscript{150} The notion of fair but firm underpinned the paternal management model.\textsuperscript{151} Braithwaite argued that the majority story of convict experience was reintegration into respectable society. And this was possible, even encouraged, by paternalism by the master, who also had an eye to the stability of his workforce and the need to retain skilled or useful labour.\textsuperscript{152} The patronage system of convict management, built on paternalism, aimed to see the convict transformed from felon to yeoman with the morals and values of an industrious member of the community. The master, in the exercise of paternalism, was effectively an official of the convict system. The site of labour, be it house or farm, became the centre of a prison without walls. Settler families were ascribed the role of ‘crucibles of moral refashioning.’\textsuperscript{153} Female convicts were equally overseen by the master and his delegates in this gaol. The paternalistic management techniques of the Macarthur family of Camden in New South Wales were intended to ensure their best servants either remained post-servitude in their employ or were supported to stay on in the local community on farms of their own.\textsuperscript{154} Those who settled nearby could be called upon for shearing and harvest and to meet extraordinary needs. This was the ideal outcome of the convict system.

\textbf{At home}

Sarah Leake recorded reading \textit{Bleak House} in her journal.\textsuperscript{155} She was not alone in this: Mary Morton Allport and William Johnston also noted reading this novel.\textsuperscript{156} On occasion Sarah named other writers: Trollope, Macaulay, Leakey and more Dickens.\textsuperscript{157} Dickens was considered a ‘chronicler of domestic life’ and his descriptions of life and the embeddedness of his characters in their setting, in London in the mid nineteenth century, have been
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employed by others. Some went as far as to suggest Dickens was essential reading for social historians. Indeed, Dickens’ descriptions of criminal behaviour and the settings of crime, from *Oliver Twist*, are particularly evident in Robson’s early study of Australia’s convict settlers. Oxley argues that the nineteenth-century notion of ‘criminal class’ obscured the complexity and diversity of life course and attitudes of ‘criminals.’

Tasmanian historians noted there was little evidence of working conditions for female convict servants in Tasmania. Alexander turned to Caroline Leakey’s novel as an indicator of the work and environment. Winter noted the same work as ‘… the most powerful achievement of the novel [*The Broad Arrow*] is the portrayal of the female convict system in all its facets.’ Leakey’s novel was set in the probation period of convict administration when the *Anson* accepted female convicts. It reflected the convict management structure prior to Eliza Williams’ arrival but described one arrangement many of her fellow prisoners had experienced. In Russell’s view, ‘Leakey set out to portray the manners and morals of a convict society she had known well.’ Leakey’s work was rooted in the society of private houses, prisons, churches and shops of Hobart Town and Port Arthur in the early 1850s. She lived in a number of family households during her stay and, according to Morris, her work reflects ‘a good understanding of the lives of women in such a household, both convict and free.’

Elite private life in Tasmania in the period was substantially, but not exclusively, exercised within a social context that involved rubbing shoulders with convict labour. The physical and social imperatives of the early Victorian era meant that the dwellings inhabited by the rich and status-conscious could only function with the labour of a multiplicity of house
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servants. Finding ways to make it worthwhile for servants to stay in remote areas be they in Tasmania, New South Wales or other colony, was particularly problematic.167

The probation system remained in place for male convicts and was the overriding official management system.168 The convict servants and workers at Rosedale embodied variations of the convict experience depending, to some extent, on the management system in place at the commencement of their servitude. The longer the convict had served the greater their experience of the contrariness of the system. Several men in the Rosedale yard in the 1850s had each served a quarter of a century. Ending transportation did not end servitude: those in the system continued to work their time away.

The physical manifestations of prosperity were the house and the public display of how life was led. The house was more than a sanctuary for the family: ‘... the home was also a stage for social ritual and outward manifestation of status in the community.’169 Servants were critical to keeping the lifestyle operating and as a outward manifestation of social success. The day-to-day management of the house and the servants was a woman’s role, analogous to men’s roles in business in the differentiated gender world of home and work in a world where service culture had developed alongside industrialization.170

The thesis, in part, explores the social setting and associated social circuit of the Leake family as represented in Sarah Leake’s journal. The journal provided a detailed listing of social events and their locations and it is possible to move with Sarah Leake through the landscape, into people’s homes and businesses, and to the social functions on the local calendar. Campbell Town, within the wider Midlands district, is portrayed as a starkly stratified community in which the elite, particularly its women members, socialise in the home. Manners, fashion, social etiquette and gossip all formed part of this networked world. Sarah Leake’s journal marked an intersection between the house and the farm on a rural estate and the boundaries of these two realms also define aspects of the daily life for members of the household. As an element of the history of private life, the journal contributes to our understanding of domestic life, rural life, the life of a spinster, role differentiation in families between generations and between genders, and of the master-servant relationship in
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169 Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850, p 362.
170 Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850, p 394.
1850s Tasmania. The journal also invites an exploration of the alternatives available to members of the family if each did not fulfil their role in the domestic sphere. The era of the journal is early Victorian but it leans heavily on the prior traditions of British middle-class life imported with free settlers to colonial Tasmania and with settlers’ interpretations of appropriate customs and manners. The journal contributes to an understanding of how life was led in the very private realm of the home.

The setting for the history of private life is the household. The way private life was conducted was based on the physical layout and structure of the household as much as the interpersonal relationships. In the 1850s a Tasmanian colonial household, particularly one in a rural area, may have included an extended family spanning three generations, and servants both single and married. Contemporary accounts of life at home on the farm indicate that servants lived in the main house and sometimes in cottages or outbuildings on land adjacent to the main house. This domestic environment was a complex setting and was well represented by the specific spatial and population elements of Rosedale.

The analytical work arising from Sarah Leake’s journal draws on the interplay of domestic relationships related to the role and functions of the principal rooms of a household. When attention turns to the layout and function of the Rosedale homestead, later in this thesis, this discourse is presented in detail. By the mid 1850s the home was an abode for the immediate family, from which non-family members (except the ‘invisible’ servants) were barred without invitation. Here the conflicts and tensions of the relationship between servants and masters were played out. The home was a separate space and the need for privacy saw boundary markers like gardens, fences and gates between public and private spaces in both town and country. The middle classes were the creators of this defined space where their aspirations and beliefs could be fulfilled. The layout of the living quarters in the enterprise changed to that of the home with a separation of the working spaces of kitchen, scullery and laundry, the formal living rooms, and the bedrooms and nursery. The more servants could be
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171 As described, for example, in Russell, Savage or Civilized: Manners in Colonial Australia; Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850; Alan Atkinson, The Europeans in Australia: a History. Volume 2: Democracy, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2004.


173 Bryson, At Home: A Short History of Private Life, p. 5.

174 Davidoff and Hall, Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850, p. 361.
afforded the more likely the house had rooms which the family, released from chores and household work, could use for recreational pursuits.175

The shift in the role the house played in the separation of the spheres of life was also reflected in the separation of functions between rooms and the move away from multipurpose areas to enclosed specific spaces that progressively developed during the Victorian era. Rooms became differentiated: public rooms for receiving outsiders, private rooms for the family and intimate friends, and servant spaces.176 The separate space, the home, was paradoxically the prison. Elite Tasmanian families, like the Leakes, lived in quarters where a feature of daily life was prisoner management.

175 Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, p. 375.
176 Flanders, *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*, p. xxv.
Chapter Three: Paper

There await you a dark, stone archway, and an iron gate beneath it. There will be the relentless grating of its hinges, with the heavy sound of ponderous keys; and a coldness in the aspect of the building you are to enter will communicate itself to your soul, making you shudder to pass within its dreary portal. You must follow the guide along that narrow passage, where your footstep echoes cheerlessly through the dismal corridor. A doubly-locked door swings itself solemnly back, and there is silence, darkness, despair.¹

Like Caroline Leakey’s novel *The Broad Arrow*, this thesis will track the life of a female convict. The way convict experience shaped the lives of both mistress and servant is a recurring theme of analysis. The bureaucratic record of convictism is only a portion of the material that has shaped this analysis. The private archive of personal documents forms the foundation and the public archive of colonial and convict records is the superstructure. Both are ornamented and refined by a wider literature of the history of private life, convict experience, and colonialism.

Private papers

The Leake Papers form an outstanding collection of family and business correspondence, accounts, diaries and ephemera concentrated on the period after John Leake and his family arrived in Tasmania in 1823, and their life at the property they built, Rosedale, until his death in 1865. The Leake Papers contain a range of primary sources related to establishing Rosedale as both an enterprise and a home and include Sarah Leake’s journal for 1854-55, John Leake’s day book, and the letters of Eliza Williams. Other documents in the collection that have been reviewed as background to this thesis include instructions and negotiations regarding the building, renovation and furnishing of the homestead; circulars and letters associated with hiring and maintaining free and convict farm workers and house servants;

accounts and returns for stock purchases and sales, wool production, crops and land transactions; and expenses incurred in running the house and maintaining the family.\(^2\)

The Leake Papers are also a collection of objects. These objects include journals, letters, notebooks, photographs, prints and miscellanea and are of interest in their own right, not just for what they contain. For all that they are but a segment of the documentary evidence of the life of John Leake, his family and those identified as associated with him. There is no rhyme to what has been retained, or to what was bequeathed to the University of Tasmania. Researchers with an interest in the Leake Papers have included colonial scholars and family historians.\(^3\) Their work contributes alternative perspectives on social history, paternalism, master/servant relationships and family relationships central to this thesis.

Other archives of Leake papers exist: within the extant family at Rosedale and beyond, in other institutions and as disparate items in other collections.\(^4\) All indicate and reflect the material culture of their era. Riello identifies three ways material culture influences historical enquiry: history from things, history of things, and history and things.\(^5\) In this context, items in the Leake Papers are artefacts, with a narrative of their own, as well as contributing to the narrative of those who created them. The history of these objects is not the priority here: this thesis is not engaged in ‘object biography’ to borrow Riello’s colleague Dannehl’s phrase.\(^6\) For, apart from simple description of some of the artefacts used in this research, it is not intrinsically about them: it is about what they disclose. Riello’s work reminds us that narrative is not a methodology; rather it is an approach that is usable as an overlay upon various methodologies. Nonetheless, Riello’s ‘history and things’, taking objects in their own right and letting them be considered outside the mainstream historical narrative, requires ‘engagement with the artefact’ and its context, location, form, age, and

\(^2\) Leake Papers, Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection.


\(^4\) For example, “Medical Record, Letitia Leake of Portland Bay,” Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, 1854, TA465; “Correspondence - John Leake, Rosedale, Campbell Town,” Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, NS3296/1/98.


condition to derive meaning from the object. This perspective has been borne in mind for each key primary source item.

It is important to recognise that Leake’s day book cannot be taken as a full record of the transactions of the estate business. There certainly were other books. For example, no wages are shown paid to William Short, a groom, despite records of his arrival and his behaviour in the day book. There are indications that specific accounts were kept for Leake’s other properties, Ashby and Lewisham. Leake’s book did not function in the same way as William Archer’s journal for Leake did not record commentary about daily life on the estate. He confined himself to categories of business and the figures that measured its progress. The day book has been used selectively, not transcribed. A fascinating project awaits the researcher who tackles it more extensively.

The journal written by Sarah, John Leake’s spinster daughter, is a key source. It is a stiff account of the running of the Rosedale homestead and includes references to the convict servants and the work they did. It is a controlled chronicle of daily life. It does not include social notes or opinions about daily life. There is no gossip or musing and it is neither inquiring nor introspective. It is a strictly pared down description of the business of the day: instructions, meals, outings, activities and associates. It finds its place in colonial historiography for its clarity and simplicity, and its insights into the private world of domestic life.

Eliza Williams’ letters and Sarah Leake’s journal were wholly transcribed for this project. This was the most effective way of ensuring full use of them in this research. To accomplish this it was essential to give some attention to transcription methodology and practice. Transcription is a textual representation for it does not seek to replicate the form or layout of the original. Transcription has become more of a topic of attention as interest in historical manuscripts shifted from ‘great man’ to ‘common man’. Generic items of study, letters, diaries and journals, are ‘... emerging from the obscurity of family trunks, overlooked library collections and courthouse vaults.’ A review of the conventions and technical aspects of transcribing underpinned the practical task of copying out. The approach taken for this project is detailed in Appendix Three.

10 Eliza William’s letters are presented in full at Appendix Three. The transcription of Sarah Leake’s journal has been published as already noted. John Leake’s day book has only been used selectively. Other documents, like
Authenticity of authorship is a consideration when working with original materials. John Leake’s day book was an example of his record keeping and accounting reflective of his career as a merchant and banker. Leake was a master who was very familiar with the ledger.11 The day book had a paper hard cover, marked Day Book from January 1849, covered with random jotted numbers. It was sold to John Leake by Henry Dowling, Printer Bookseller and Stationer of Brisbane Street Launceston, as per the label on its inside cover. The page format is of an account book ruled with faint grey lines with an inch margin for the date, a wide column for the text, and three columns for the amount in pounds, shillings and pence. The columns are marked by red lines. The ink used by Leake was variously blue and black, occasionally pencil with some crossing out and rewriting. The handwriting varies but is predominantly John Leake’s as can be matched with letters he wrote to his wife and other documents. His sons, William, Arthur and/or Charles, may have made some entries: possibly others. Each year ends with a reckoning. No year represented in the day book recorded a deficit. Last entries in the accounts were for 22 January 1859 and Leake noted all entries for January 1859 had been copied into the new book, not extant. John Leake’s day book was darkened by wear and age.

The day book contains accounting detail of activities that are noted in other documents in the Leake Papers, thus its authenticity was not in doubt. For example, payments to Mrs Haseldene, the washerwoman, are matched by laundry lists and by reports of the laundry being collected. The validity of the day book was confirmed by the replication of style and the internal unity and consistency of the documents across the Leake Papers. William Johnston’s daily journal, with its mentions of events and people that feature in both Leake’s day book and his daughter’s journal forms a key element in triangulation of the material in the day book.12

Sarah Leake wrote her journal on the lined pages of a quarto exercise book with a tri-colour marbled cover, using black ink. The depth of ink colour varies from entry to entry and between pages, but the form of the daily entries does not alter. The cover is not distinguished in any way; rather it appears simply to be an exercise book, one of a number available at the stationer’s shop frequented by the Leakes. Sarah commenced at the very top of the first page

William Johnston’s diary and William McCrae’s surgeon’s journal are noted in passing. The same methodology has wherever transcription has been required.

and wrote through to the last line on the back page. Her opening words, ‘Journal continued 22nd April 1854,’ suggest she moved from the previous volume to the extant one, then on to a subsequent one at its conclusion. She rarely changed her mind about the words she had chosen, as would be evidenced by either crossing out or the excision of pages or parts of pages. Her writing varied in legibility depending, it would seem, on the amount of ink in the pen and on her care in physically writing. Some entries appear hurried and there are examples of entries written for several days in one sitting, as she noted was sometimes necessary, to catch up. The extant journal does not show wear. Taking Wevers’ point about a book’s life being visible, Sarah Leake’s journal does not have scratches and marks of reuse, no spills of ink, no signs of food or drink. There is much to suggest its pages were only ever turned once, to the last entry: not flicked through, revised or reread. The journal pages likely have been turned more often by researchers than by its writer.

That Sarah Leake’s journal is what it is purported to be can be verified by the match between the content of the journal and other documents held in the Leake Papers. Validity can be demonstrated by comparing the handwriting between documents written by Sarah Leake, as some letters written by her to members of her immediate family and her associates were retained and are held in the collection. Later volumes of the journal are also in a similar hand, and the differences in style and form can be attributed to Sarah Leake aging: the handwriting was less formed and clear, and lacked the penmanship of the volume being researched.

The letters from Eliza Williams to members of the Leake family, one penned as Eliza Williams and the balance as Eliza Hanley, though few in number, span three decades from the time she left Rosedale in the late 1850s. Her letters show the wear of folding, posting, opening, and accumulated reading. Several show signs of being written in domestic upheaval, grubbied with the marks of small children’s fingers. Others are indicative of a more reflective opportunity for composition. There is no triangulation in favour of Eliza Williams’ relics. The only evidence of her handwriting is her letters to the Leakes. There was no suggestion
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15 As noted elsewhere, Sarah Leake’s stay at Government House was corroborated by entries in the day book for expenses incurred by herself, her father and their groom for the visit.
16 Letters from Sarah Leake to her parents about a range of family matters, 1846-1852; Sarah Leake to Charles Leake, Monday, ND, c 1849-54; and, Sarah Leake to Miss Smith, 25 March 1874, Leake Papers.
17 Sarah Elizabeth Leake, “Journal, 1 October 1862 - 7 June 1867,” Leake Papers; Sarah Elizabeth Leake “Journal, 1 August 1877 - 22 February 1878; 9, 10 April 1878,” in Leake Papers.
the Hanley family held any personal papers, photographs or other memorabilia. It is clear from the existing letters that she wrote to others but the whereabouts of that correspondence is unknown.

Public parchments

Researchers with an interest in Tasmanian convict and colonial histories are greatly advantaged by the extant records. The development of digital technology further enhances their good fortune. Public records of this period are available in four main categories: Colonial Secretary’s Office, Governor’s Office, Convict Department and records of free immigration. The data base of the Female Convicts Research Centre, which contains transcriptions of Vandemonian female convict records and associated documents, is also invaluable. There core documents associated with the Convict Department for each female convict, the Conduct Record (CON 41), Indent (CON 15) and Description List (CON 19) are all fully searchable by name. Although some information is replicated between records, the full set provides a description of the person, including facial features, tattoos and scars; a record of their crime, sentence, place of trial, ship of transport, religion, literacy, marital status and native place; a record of service and placement and further offences including the name of the trial magistrate, places of incarceration, punishments and assignments; and, finally, a record of their attaining freedom or otherwise leaving the convict system. The detail for a convict far outweighs the record for a free settler.

The collective experience of convictism did not differentiate class or gender. The offender was:

...taken before the courts, sentenced, incarcerated for a long period in a prison or hulk, then shipped around the world to a penal colony where every aspect of their life would be recorded until they eventually received a full pardon and even then, often remained under police surveillance.
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19 The records of the Convict Department are part of the UNESCO Memory of the World International Register, along with convict records from New South Wales and Western Australia. This is equivalent to world heritage listing for built and natural sites. This recognizes the extraordinary detail of documentation about the thousands of people forcibly transported to form the beginnings of British colonies of Australia. The capacity to search these documents is due, in no small part, to the Founders and Survivors Project, properly titled: Founders and Survivors, Australian life courses in historical context, 1803-1920. www.foundersandsurvivors.org/project.
Convicts shared an experience unimagined by free settlers. They were bound, not by the actual voyage, the loss of family and friends, or the uncertainty of a new land, but by the denial of liberty and autonomy.

Tasmania’s system of convict management was not static. It developed and changed under the influence of different administrative regimes, and varied in its impact on the convict and the free population over time. There were broadly two main systems of convict management once the convict had been formally disembarked: assignment and probation.21 Concern that the threat of a sentence of transportation had failed to be a rein on crime had led Westminster to seek advice. Secretary of State, Lord Bathurst commissioned John Thomas Bigge to report on ‘whether transportation was any longer efficient as a punishment.’22 The first of his reports was published in 1822 and reform was a key element of the recommendations.23 Assigned deployment to public works or private service became the primary process of punishment in the colony. Convicts would be assessed on the basis of the record of their trade or skills, including their statement of their situation and the time they were to serve. Much depended on both the disposition of the master and the convict. Most women were assigned to private domestic service after a period, often short, in a female house of correction. The experience of domestic service could be brutal through to benign. For men the convict system presented the State with many options for private assignment and for labour on public works. A core element of the system was the record: where and with whom the convict was located, and how they behaved. The actual work was not detailed. Misdemeanours and the outcomes of investigations were recorded such that where charges were dismissed they remained listed alongside convictions and punishments. The record embodied the voice of the master and the magistrate, not the convict.

The success or failure of transportation as a system of providing labour to New South Wales and Tasmania, and its capacity to punish and reform were questioned in the mid 1830s. Opinion was divided. Methods of convict management were debated, as was the system itself: issues of moral degradation and inhuman treatment came to fore. The Molesworth Committee was convened in April 1837 to respond to accusations from colonials

---


and from within British political and humanitarian circles and calls for the end of the assignment system of convict management. Beside claims of slavery, concerns about the assignment system included the failure to distinguish between convicts in terms of their crime, age, character or sentence; the practice of assigning convicts on the basis of trade or skill without regard to their criminality; and the influence of the temper and disposition of the master on the treatment of individual convicts. Bargaining gave convicts vestiges of power in the labour market: sought-after skills could be balanced against indulgences and other rewards to achieve a more tolerable situation. The sense of assignment being a lottery in which the convict could find room to negotiate was not accepted as suitable punishment.

The probation system introduced in 1839 (1844 for women convicts) had convict workers serve a period in government work gangs after which they became passholders and competed in a tight labour market. Convict passholders, ticket-of-leave workers, emigrants and colonial-born all jockeyed for work through the depression years of the 1840s and beyond the end of transportation.

The probation system was not an improvement over assignment for convict, colony or the home government. The benefits expected of increased reformation did not eventuate. The cost to the colony and the Crown of probation was greater than anticipated and, for the colonist, the removal of convict labour from the market dented economic development. The lack of infrastructure meant that male convicts had to build the probation stations rather than to commence more productive work, a significant drain on the depressed local economy. Probation period policy for women was incarceration to enable observation of the woman’s behaviour rewarding her for industry, good conduct and a desire to improve. The aim was to punish and reform the convict before their return to society as a ‘useful person’.

---

Lack of knowledge by the British authorities of the economic and social condition in Tasmania contributed to the failure of the probation system. The conditions had an impact on the capacity of the colony to build and staff the stations and other essential infrastructure. Lieutenant Governor at the time probation was introduced, Sir John Franklin, complained that the weight and speed of the arrivals did not enable him to provide for or manage an effective probation system. A compounding element was economic recession in Tasmania during which time neither government nor landowner could bear the cost of wages for passholders. Governor Franklin’s fears about capacity and management were realised. The probation stations were deficient in funding, infrastructure, management and convict supervision.

Women prisoners served their probation on the Anson. For female convicts, the reality of the probation system was little different from the assignment system. Unless considered unsuited or unfit, prisoners continued to be sent to work, mostly as domestic servants. The probation period on the hulk Anson simply delayed the inevitable. Some colonists found the Anson most effective in quietening convict women. Louisa Meredith selected servants directly from the hulk.

Simply judging from the superior usefulness, willingness, and orderly, decent, sober demeanour of the women I have taken from the “Anson” over all others of their unfortunate class that I have known, I must believe the system pursued there... to be an excellent and effective one, and rendering the greatest possible benefit to the colony generally.

There were other minor experiments. A scheme of ‘exiles’ operated between 1844 and 1850 in New South Wales as well as other parts of Australia to meet labour shortages especially in rural districts. These convicts had served a substantial ‘rehabilitation’ period in gaol, often including labour on public works, before being transported. On arrival they were issued a ticket of leave and required to work in places of labour shortage.

The prison was fundamental. Throughout the transportation period the restraints that kept convicts in place were constructed of paper as much as of stone. The walls were visible at every location that convicts served across the colonial landscape. The individual pieces used to construct the prison were feather light. Assembled they were heavier than bricks and
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32 Thompson, *Probation in Paradise: The Story of Convict Probationers on Tasman’s and Forestier’s Peninsulas Van Diemen’s Land, 1841-1857*, p. 77. Sir John Franklin was Lieutenant Governor, 1837-43.
34 Ian Duffield and James Bradley, eds., *Representing Convicts: New Perspectives on Convict Forced Labour Migration*, London: Leicester University Press, 1997, p.3. Jeremiah Tibbits per Lady Montague, CON 33/1/110, appears to be the only ‘exile’ in the population of workers at Rosedale.
mortar. The pen had power: the record was all-encompassing. Formal complaints by the master remained visible long after the dispute or convict misdemeanour was forgotten. Judgements, letters, lists, musters, logbooks and indents surrounded each convict with the walls of servitude. Yet paper was also a door. Ink was a key that bolted and released. The parchment containing approval for ticket of leave, conditional pardon, certificate of freedom or, for the most fortunate, full pardon, was the symbol of independence.

Chapter Four: Stone

Little is known of Tasmania beyond its repute as a convict settlement; but five years have now elapsed since it ceased to be one; and as the traces of its former state are fast disappearing, it is to be hoped that the recollection of it will also vanish. The free-born sons of Britain have flocked to its shores, carrying with them the noble characteristics of the mother country, and by their unceasing perseverance and industry adding to the lustre of their race.¹

Henry Butler Stoney wrote a travel narrative intended to provide information to those at ‘Home’ in Britain that would lessen the reputation of Tasmania as a wild and dangerous place populated by convicts and bushrangers.² From the first pages, in his preface, Stoney directed the readers’ gaze from convictism. He traversed the colony in the mid 1850s writing of the people, land and community as he went. The tone of this work is a celebration of the replication of fine English ways – houses, gardens, trees, great men, and the style of life. Stoney was very taken with the Midlands. His travels took him to Oatlands and on to the village of Ross, which he lauded for its stone buildings. Thence to Campbell Town, of which he said: ‘The neighbouring gentry, men of considerable property and substance, are far in advance, and take the lead in all the agricultural projects of the colony.’³

Stoney saw the outcome of three decades of development in the Midlands. It was gratifyingly reminiscent of Britain, as another described it not many years later: ‘the names of the halting places keep up your remembrance of the old country... names which naturally send fancy roaming over the Highlands and down through the shires to the coast of the

English Channel. Estate names bestowed in the 1820s and 1830s reflected the origins of those who built them. Along the main roads, nameplates on gates leading to long tree-lined carriage ways reminded the traveller of Britain: Rosedale, Mona Vale, Woodbury, Clarendon, Egleston, Rookby, Meadow Bank, Clyne Vale, and many more.

The way land was granted prior to 1830 contributed to the colony’s class system. A three-tiered system developed in Tasmania of landlord, tenant farmer and itinerant farm labourer. In the Midlands it was more defined: a pastoral economy replicated the British system of landowner and serf. This latter system, classified as ‘the geography of Van Diemen’s Land’, or Old Tasmania, demonstrated the successful establishment of what Reynolds described as a ‘colonial gentry’. Primarily the gentry was formed by the emigrant families who received land grants in Tasmania prior to 1831. These families ‘continued to play an important role in the economic and political life of the colony until the concluding years of the century.’ They held onto their land and the social and political power it represented. Dillon does not concede or suggest colonial gentry: for her these early arriving families were all middle class. Men in these families became ‘district notables’. A majority of these families shared two background features: modest capital and respectability. Status for women was ascribed from the company they kept. However named, John Leake and his family were firmly in the privileged category.

The physical limits of arable land in Tasmania had influenced the development of agriculture and grazing and these limits were reached at a time when other colonies continued to expand. Pastoralists who had land granted or purchased early were in the strongest

---

8 Reynolds, “Men of Substance and Deservedly Good Repute”: The Tasmanian Gentry 1856-1875,” p. 61.
position to acquire more land, to ride out the troughs of the developing economy, and to maintain their productivity through modernisation in the ensuing decades of the nineteenth century. Patterns of settlement in Tasmania also advantaged the early settlers. The later arrivals not only had less option of tenure and scale. The problems of isolation from the colonial settlements of Hobart Town and Launceston meant these settlers had additional hardships associated with access to infrastructure and markets. Proximity to the main route from Hobart Town to Launceston was favoured because of access to easy transport.14

Rural towns developed along the main road. The Leake family business and social scene centred on two of these: Ross and Campbell Town.15 Ross was a military and convict centre up to the late 1850s and was also known for its fine quarries that produced building materials and grindstone. Its carved stone bridge, completed in 1836, marked the entrance to the town from the south. The mixed housing of its diverse population lined the main street alongside general stores, churches and hotels. The Ross Female Factory, with its yards, nursery, wash houses and solitary cells, processed hundreds of convict women between the years 1848 and 1854.16 Ross was also an education centre with highly regarded private schools for both boys and girls in the district that drew pupils from across the colony.

Campbell Town was the main commercial centre of the Midlands and included hotels, breweries, flourmills, black smithing and wheelwright shops, stores, churches and the public infrastructure needed to maintain the police, magistrates and the professions. Its promise was evident in 1829 as Mrs Augusta Princep recorded as she passed through, by gig, on a journey from Hobart to Launceston. ‘Campbell-town looked pretty with its long narrow bridge, or rather causeway, two hundred yards in length, over the Elizabeth River. It has a prosperous appearance, many good sized houses, a court house and jail already being built...’17 Chief agricultural crops were cereals, potatoes and mangolds, and sheep were the main grazing flock throughout the district.18 Three areas within the Campbell Town municipality were set

18 The Cyclopaedia of Tasmania, Volumes 1 & 2, Hobart: Maitland and Krone, 1900, Volume 1, p. 173. Mangolds were a beet crop grown for fodder.
aside as towns and marked out with plans for inns, barracks and homes but they were never built beyond the sign posts.\textsuperscript{19} Campbell Town was planned as a stratified community with the better-off people having ten acre blocks separated from the small allotments for working men and their families.\textsuperscript{20} Leake owned a ten-acre town allotment, in Grant Street, which he leased out, as well as his estate acres.\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{The geography of servitude}

Stoney appeared untroubled that colonial Tasmania was essentially a convict landscape. He moved through the panorama on roads cut and levelled by gangs of men in irons. The natural features were augmented with walls of chiselled rock. His breakfast may well have included bread made from flour ground at the treadmill in the Launceston gaol.\textsuperscript{22} Most of the settlers’ houses Stoney admired, particularly those of successful or wealthy rural families, were vital convict apparatus as barracks and places of labour and as a favoured setting for reform.\textsuperscript{23}

Inmates of the prison without walls were differentiated by their degree of autonomy. Those who arrived free were not bound by rules set down by a conviction: rather, they were constrained by the order and priorities of their place in the colony. Those who were sent unfree waited for liberty or elected to steal it. The free included the Leake family, their elite friends, their acquaintances and unbonded workers on the estate. Immigrant workers who were indentured to work on the estate, including in the house, were in an intricate relationship of obligation with the master. Convicts were not free. They occupied indoor and outdoor roles of varying degrees of status and hard labour. The state owned their labour power.\textsuperscript{24} Emancipists occupied a shadow land, neither unfree nor totally free for they were socially unsuitable even when they occupied an important work role.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{19} von Stieglitz, \textit{A Short History of Campbell Town and the Midland Pioneers}, p. 56. The towns were Llewellyn, Maitland and Lincoln.
\textsuperscript{22} Flour was ground at the treadmill in Launceston Gaol until it was dismantled to make room for stone-breaking in 1856. Keith Preston, “Prison Treadmills in Van Diemen’s Land: Design, Construction and Operation, 1828 to 1856,” \textit{Tasmanian Historical Research Association Papers and Proceedings}, 60 2, 2013, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{23} There were exceptions. The outbuildings, granary, workshops and woolshed at Winton were built and used by free men for David Taylor did not use convict labour. “Winton Garden,” unpublished pamphlet, c2010.
\textsuperscript{25} This lessened as time passed and transportation ceased.
John Leake’s views on convict matters had been provided to Lieutenant Governor Eardly-Wilmot in response to his circular requesting advice on convict labour. Leake indicated that male and female convicts had distinct roles: men with farm duties, and the women servants in the house. John Leake described his attempts to instil hope in the convict and to encourage occupation, moral and intellectual development, and in so doing, indicated the paternalistic approach that underscored his treatment of convicts:

Being beyond the requisite distance from a place of worship I have always assembled my servants & family once on Sunday to hear the Church Service & a sermon read. The business of a Stock Farm seldom permitted more – but they could go to the Church or Chapel if they wished and such as could read, had books lent and the weekly newspapers.

While he may have had their interests at heart, the convict labour assigned to John Leake enabled him to build a substantial estate. Leake provided the domestic infrastructure that ensured convicts were closely bound to Rosedale for shelter and provisions while also removing their opportunities for individuality. The social network for convict servants was limited by isolation and the attitude of the master’s family toward fraternisation. Leake’s control could limit the personal development and exercise of agency by individuals but, in the security it offered, those who were accepting of his role could be confident that they would prosper. Such occurrences were the quintessential outcome of paternalism: the convict system working at its best.

Religious observance was a central plank of respectability. From it derived notions of appropriateness in social and sexual relations, in love and marriage, in family, and in business dealings. Evangelical Anglicanism was the religion of the colonial middle class and remained within the established church. Shared concepts of family, home, gender roles and responsibilities within religious belief enabled a shared class status. Atkinson suggests

26 Lieutenant Governor, Van Diemen’s Land, 1843-1846.
paternalism was regarded as having a biblical basis. This was in accord with middle-class Protestant views. Religious observance was a key element in convict management, including on transports to the colony. Leake read prayers to his workers; Gatenby invited the local parson to do likewise and the scriptures were read to the women aboard the Anna Maria.

A model based on prisoner separation was the form for prison design. Radial arms and a central inspection station underpinned the expectation of surveillance that was considered fundamental to prisoner management. Rosedale formed an innermost panopticon hub which facilitated omniscient surveillance and functioned as the centre of the prison. It was not only the unfree who populated this prison. All who lived or worked there were enclosed by the rule of the master and his delegates, the terms of the pass holder contract, the controls of the master and servant legislation, the strictures of a society stratified by arrival category and gender, and the physical boundaries of the estate fences. The wider landscape was strewn with outbuildings of the convict system. Inmates moved between these sites – gaols, probation stations, hiring depots, and secondary prisons – on the basis of their failure or success in the scheme of reform. Prisoner management followed a continuum marked by freedom and confinement. Every convict worker at Rosedale had seen gaol and some experienced all the iterations of the system.

Secondary prisons known and rightly feared as places of severe punishment were integral to offender management. They were placed only just inside the gallows on the continuum of freedom and confinement. Even so, some men chose the noose to escape the floggings and punishments of secondary prison by deliberately committing or confessing to a

29 Alan Atkinson, Camden, South Melbourne: Oxford University Press Australia, 1988, p.33. Each of the following Bible references supports this view. Colossians 3:22, ‘Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservices, as menpleasers; but in singleness of heart, fearing God.’ Colossians 4.1, ‘Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a master in heaven.’ Ephesians 6:5, ‘Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ.’ Ephesians 6:9, ‘And masters, treat your slaves in the same way. Do not threaten them, since you know that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no favouritism with him.’ www.kingjamesbibleonline.org and www.biblehub.com


31 Janet Semple, Bentham’s Prison: a Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, p. 314. The panopticon penitentiary model was the basis of the design for a number of early Tasmanian gaols including the Launceston Female House of Correction and the separate prison at Port Arthur.

32 As is detailed in Chapter Five: Life in the prison without walls and Appendix One.
capital crime. The ‘fortress’ of Port Arthur underpinned all elements of the penal system for the men who served at Rosedale during the 1850s. The construction of the separate prison at Port Arthur, commenced in 1848, implemented a key principle of the penitentiary. It placed prisoners in separate cells for ‘such segregation, accompanied by strict rules of silence, would allow inmates space in which to reflect on their crimes and thus be reformed.’ Most convicts at Port Arthur worked outside their barracks. The work bell sounded the day’s labours and voices of command rang out.

The mass of pied yellow separated into sections, and to the ‘Get up’ and ‘Go on’ of the constables and overseers, diverged to the four outlets of Port Arthur. The boat’s crew passed to the water’s edge; the wood-fellers to Opossum Bay; the road-gang towards Safety Cove; the settlement servants to their several masters; and one party, harnessed to carts, was driven up the main road...

Other prisons included the local cells, at Campbell Town for the Rosedale fraternity, and gaols in Hobart, Launceston, Oatlands and other centres where longer terms were served. All prisons offered space for solitary confinement.

Each of the female houses of correction, known colloquially as female factories, was effectively prison, hiring depot and lying-in hospital for convict women. The Ross Female Factory, located on the outskirts of the town, provided all the requisite services: ‘a hiring yard, punishment blocks, workshops, solitary cells, a chapel, a hospital and the nursery...’ This female factory had been constructed over the fragments and rubble of its predecessor; repurposed from an earlier outbuilding of the convict system, the Ross male convict station. For women prisoners, the female factories were also places of secondary punishment. The crime classes separated women inmates, and duties and diet reflected the different grades of punishment.

Hiring depots generally housed convicts available to work. The Brickfields Hiring

33 William Allan, for example, confessed to murder in order to escape corporal punishment at Macquarie Harbour. Hamish Maxwell-Stewart, Closing Hell’s Gates: the Death of a Convict Station, Crows Nest (NSW): Allen and Unwin, 2008, p. 183.
34 Boyce, Van Diemen’s Land, p. 256.
37 Cascades Female House of Correction opened 1828, George Town Female House of Correction 1829, Launceston Female House of Correction 1832, and Ross Female House of Correction 1847.
38 Frost, Convict Lives at the Ross Female Factory, p. 10.
Provision for women prisoners operated for the decade 1842-52. After its closure it too was repurposed and used initially for an immigrant depot and later a pauper establishment.39 There were complaints about lax management, inmate idleness and improper hiring processes. From 1852 the Cascade Female Factory again provided the Hobart hiring function. The New Town Farm was another place from which women convicts were hired. Eliza Williams was one of them.

Probation stations were outliers: often in rural locations isolated from other prison infrastructure. More than eighty stations were established to varying degrees of security and comfort from the time when probation replaced assignment as the basis of the reform system. Many were hastily and poorly built.40 Men waiting employment remained at the probation stations until contracted to work for a private employer, thus they acted also as hiring depots. It could be a long wait of hard labour or idleness for a convict stationed in an isolated spot to be selected by an employer. After a period in a probation gang or station, male convicts were issued with a pass to enable them to work. But they were not independent. Their employment was structured by a written contract between a private employer and the colonial authorities for the State controlled the labour power of the convict.41 The system of written contracts was changed, in 1847, to a single formal register but the effect was the same, ink and parchment continued to symbolise progress, or not, through the convict system.42

Women’s experience during the probation period was more uniform. The Anson, a hulk, had been moored on the River Derwent as a temporary female probation station while awaiting a permanent structure. Women prisoners arriving in Hobart Town from 1844 were placed there upon arrival. For many this meant not stepping onto land until months after arrival in the colony. A walk through the Anson revealed the enterprise:

... [visitors] passed through rows of prisoners, who were variously employed in working, reading, and learning, it being their school-hour... Passing on they came to stalls where different trades – cobbler, bonnet-making, etc. – were being carried on.43

42 Unfortunately CON 30, Register of Employment of Probation Passholders does not include Leake. There are also other well-known names missing.
The methods used on the Anson were in keeping with reforming treatment: watchful supervision, employment, instruction in moral and social duties, and face-to-face admonishment to encourage reflection.\textsuperscript{44} The planned probation station for women was not built. The Anson was closed and the hulk broken up. From 1847 immediate hiring out of women prisoners was introduced under the system of probation that enabled them to progressively improve wages and conditions with good conduct.\textsuperscript{45}

Convicts were penal labourers, ‘simultaneously punished and worked,’ and this set them apart from all other workers be they bonded or not.\textsuperscript{46} The estate records indicated that labouring work at Rosedale was undifferentiated. Records suggest that Leake selected both men and women who were relatively mature. The oldest man in the yard had arrived aged 57.\textsuperscript{47} The convict experience was central to the master-servant relationship in the first colonies in Australia through a balance between reward and terror. The terror for both male and female convicts was ignited by transportation itself and the reality of isolation, hardship and punishment. Incentives and rewards were essential to press any productivity from felons.\textsuperscript{48} While the local courts offered a place of argument and restitution for both servant and master, the master was in the superior position, often a magistrate himself and appearing before his peers. In an environment where a trip to the magistrate and the resulting loss of labour for punishment time could be most costly and inconvenient, other means to gain cooperation were found.\textsuperscript{49}

The prison outbuildings, like the farm sheds, could be secure or porous. They housed prisoners in their free time as well as being the place of work. Labouring at the direction of the master at the unskilled tasks he required echoed the convict continuum of freedom and confinement: more or less arduous, more or less supervised, more or less exposed to the elements.

Convict passholders, ticket of leave workers, emigrants and colonial-born all competed for work through the depression times of the 1840s and the years of slow growth

\textsuperscript{44} A McMahon, “The Anson as a reformatory hulk with a taste of Earl Grey”, unpublished paper presented to the Female Factory Research Group, 5 May 2009.
\textsuperscript{47} George Haines [Haynes] per Duke of Richmond from Norfolk Island, previously per Woodbridge. He was assigned to Leake in 1849. It appears that youngest worker employed at Rosedale was Eliza Williams who arrived aged 18.
\textsuperscript{49} Dyster, Servant & Master: Building and Running the Grand Houses of Sydney 1788-1850, p. 44.
until the 1870s. Passholder contracts were generally to a maximum of twelve months. Workers who signed multiple consecutive contracts were paid more.\textsuperscript{50} Labour conditions varied for convict and free workers. Wages for the free worker were higher but passholders received rations as well as wages. Both categories of worker could also receive over rate payments, do piece work in their own time and negotiate other perks. Meredith and Oxley’s data indicates that immigrant bonded labour, married gardeners and married shepherds received the highest average annual wage over time.\textsuperscript{51} The skilled work, highly rewarded and regarded, was rarely the province of the serving convict. Taking the mean wage rates calculated for 1854-55 as a guide, wages at Rosedale were individualised for they were not uniformly higher or lower than the mean.\textsuperscript{52}

The Masters and Servants Act, 1828, legislation of the colony of New South Wales, had applied in Tasmania until local legislation was enacted in 1840. It corresponded to a period of schemes for paid migrant workers from Britain. The Act offered severe penalties, enough to deter a former convict who knew deprivation of liberty and a free settler who feared it. The Act reflected the patriarchal elements of the employment system: it emphasised ‘... the proper deference of men and women to their betters [that is, to the master].’\textsuperscript{53} The first draft of Tasmanian legislation was rejected by the Crown for it was considered weighted toward the employer to the detriment of the servant in a number of areas.\textsuperscript{54} The redrafted legislation provided the basis for private employment relationships through the 1840s. The foreshadowed cessation of transportation indicated that employment legislation would require revision, particularly to ensure immigrant and bonded workers were duly recognised. Leake held a seat in the Legislative Council at the time the Act was debated in 1852, 1854 and 1856.\textsuperscript{55} In the role of master, Leake sent send both convict and free workers to the local courts for breaches of their employment contracts.

Although all labour categories were represented by the men and women working the Rosedale estate, in the house or in the yard, most workers at Rosedale over the years had

\textsuperscript{50} Either because they were well paid and thus stayed, or they were paid to stay. Meredith and Oxley, “Contracting Convicts: the Convict Labour Market in Van Diemen’s Land 1840-1857,” p. 59.

\textsuperscript{51} Meredith and Oxley, “Contracting Convicts: the Convict Labour Market in Van Diemen’s Land 1840-1857,” p. 63.

\textsuperscript{52} Mean rates of nominal wages are described in Meredith and Oxley, “Contracting Convicts: the Convict Labour Market in Van Diemen’s Land 1840-1857,” p.54.


been sourced from the outbuildings of the convict system. Leake would pick from the lists of convicts awaiting work placement in the police cells, female factories, probation stations or gaols. Testimonials were often sought from former employers to test the veracity of the claims made by those who put themselves forward. Alfred Bisdee wrote to Leake in response to his queries about John Hickey. It was not a good reference: ‘I think he professes to do much more than he can and his conduct not very good.’

Leake was asked for a report on John Whitaker by Arthur Clarke. It is unlikely Leake responded favourably for Whitaker had been sent off Rosedale within weeks of arrival after behaving dreadfully.57

Throughout the 1850s the majority of house servants and farm workers were or had been convicts: some had received the indulgence of ticket of leave or conditional pardon; some had served their full sentences and held certificates of freedom. The cessation of transportation in 1853 stemmed the flow of new convicts but those already in the system continued to serve. This change in policy prompted John Leake to recruit emigrant labour from Britain and in early 1855 a group of workers arrived at Rosedale, including one house servant. While this was a transition in employment type, little changed in terms of conditions. Leake also recruited local labour. The usual means in the colony were to advertise in the press, to seek the advice of neighbours and associates, and to consider those who put themselves forward on spec.58 He sometimes used agents to recruit on his behalf but that could be fraught. In a notable incident, a free man seeking a situation as cook, had indicated he was without funds to travel to Rosedale. When provided with the fare the man made off with it.59

John Leake was an enterprising and hardworking ‘efficient man’.60 Likely he had similar expectations of his family and workers, including the convict servants. But not everyone liked him. Leake had a local reputation as a magistrate for favouring convicts and ‘taking the word of a convict over a free settler.’61 Ellen Viveash, the wife of Charles

57 A Clarke to John Leake, 1 December 1853, Leake Papers, L1/C83.
58 For example, George Haynes to John Leake, 23 February 1851, seeking re-employment as a farm hand, and Joseph Hughes to John Leake, October 1850, seeking employment as a groom and cook’s man. Leake Papers, L1/C56 and L1/C66.
59 Mrs Drury to John Leake 10 April 1852 and Mrs Drury to John Leake, 23 April 1852, Leake Papers, L1/C72 and L1/C74.
Viveash, a fellow magistrate, described John Leake in a letter to her mother as being an interfering fraud who had earned the district’s animus.62

**Constructing the prison**

Rosedale appears suddenly as a complete surprise... there stands a magnificent house. Like a white Italian castle, it towers above the visitor who circles the drive to the front entrance. Like the steps that lead to it, the raised verandah is set with heavy stone flags, in places worn by the tread of a family...63

When positioning the first house, Leake applied the advice contained in *Godwin’s Emigrant Guide* which urged the new settler to build a log or sod hut as the initial residence and place his energies into developing crops or herds until the grant of land returned an income.64 The initial shelter on Rosedale would have been a collection of tents, lean-to huts and the bullock wagons that carried the supplies and equipment. John Leake, several of his sons and a few workers, both convict and free, camped on the land within weeks of it being granted and began work to underscore Leake’s tenure. The first ‘house’ was a three room sod hut. Life in the hut, which was located on the flat near the river, allowed the Leakes to experience the seasons before the main house was built on the rise above the river. Garden building took place alongside construction of sheds and yards as each was integral to establishing the farm.65

A stone residence of eleven main rooms replaced the whitewashed hut in 1828. It was built high on the land facing the Elizabeth River which ran through the rich lower paddock. The house was substantial:

[Rosedale is] a typical colonial Georgian bungalow, a double pile plan with central corridor, a storey and a half high and all under a hipped roof with a pair of dormers at

---

65 This was not unusual. George Meredith, starting in a tent then moving to a slab hut, built his garden over six years on his grant near Swansea before he built his residence, Cambria, in 1835-6. All the while he was building his pastoral enterprise, Vivienne Rae-Ellis, *Louisa Anne Meredith: A Tigress in Exile*, Hobart: St David’s Park Publishing, 1990, p. 59.
the back to light the attics. It had a separately roofed encircling verandah and, flanking the main house to form a Palladian composition, were two gabled-roofed wings, which extended back to form a service yard, tied together by a high wall.66 The ground floor of this house contained the entrance hall, drawing room, parlour and dining room. Bedrooms were in the roof cavity which equated to a half storey. The kitchen and storerooms were in the northern wing and the stables and some outbuildings made up the southern wing of the domestic quadrangle. It was stoutly built of stone and brick with a stucco face.67 The front door, centred in the eastern facade, was set between long multi-paned windows and looked out across the river flat. Gardens filled the house quadrangle and extended out to the north of the house where they were augmented by fruit trees and kitchen plots.

A picturesque bucolic scene greeted the traveller approaching Rosedale. Sheep grazed amid sparse eucalypt and tussock grass. Low lying marsh and stony outcrops covered segments of a land framed by low lying hills and the distant Western Tiers.68 The trip from Campbell Town was past the neighbouring estates of Morningside and Merton Vale, over the Elizabeth River at the ford, across the river flat paddock and up the curved carriage way to the house. Servants would have gone in the western gate from the farm quadrangle to the kitchen offices, not in the eastern-facing front door.69 That some inner vision led John and Elizabeth Leake to site the house so exquisitely in the landscape is speculation.

Elizabeth Leake described her home in a letter to her friend, Mrs Taylor, written on 8 June 1833, in which she gave a sense of the proportions of the house and the scale of work required to maintain and run it. She had been living in the new house for five years.

[Rosedale is] a very comfortable house containing eleven good-sized rooms besides gig house, stables, dairy et cetera, standing upon an area of 10,000 sq. feet... We have about 9000 acres of land and upwards of 4000 sheep, 9 horses and about 50 head of cattle. We have a good garden and a well-stocked orchard.70

67 Some accounts for building materials and work remain. Leake Papers, L1/B636.
69 This road is no longer in public use.
The estate prospered. Leake acquired Lewisham and then the contiguous Ashby and leased additional grazing land. Sheep were the mainstay of the Midlands pastoral economy because cattle were not sustained by the native tussock grasses and died of what was termed ‘Midland disease’ as a result. Leake’s imported Saxon Merino sheep thrived. His land suited merinos as it was not too damp or lush and therefore reduced problems of blowfly and foot rot. Breeding required attention and protective infrastructure. The costs of pasture improvement, fences, stock supervision and fleece management were out of range for the small farmer but Leake had the capacity to improve his property and ride out a drought by sending his flock to graze on leased highland pastures over summer. Graziers and small landholders alike faced the problem of sheep diseases. A single scabby sheep could infect a flock. Moving sheep through stockyards and sale yards also moved the disease, and it was transferred from high summer grazing to lowland paddocks. The treatment for scab up to the mid 1870s was nicotine dip, thus most graziers, Leake included, grew an annual tobacco crop that was gathered and dried then soaked to produce the needed dip.

The family dispersed over the years: Edward and Robert to their own ventures in South Australia, Arthur to relatives in England and Europe for school and training. John Travis made his way as a doctor but did not practice in Campbell Town. William spent several years in Hobart Town taking the banking post his father vacated. He returned to join Sarah and Charles who remained at Rosedale with their parents. Life was very stable and steady growth in wealth was John Leake’s reward. The aggrandisement of Rosedale embodied this prosperity.

In 1846 James Blackburn began corresponding with Leake about the refurbishment of Rosedale. Blackburn leased Camelford, near Campbell Town for a time and used this as the base for his architecture and building practice. Clive Lucas describes Blackburn as ‘a true early Victorian architect’ and he cleverly transformed the house from a comfortable stone

---

76 During which time Blackburn also designed and built a spectacular eleven room gothic house, The Grange, for Dr William Valentine in Campbell Town. Robertson and Craig, *Early Houses of Northern Tasmania: A Historical and Architectural Survey*, p. 47. Camelford was originally granted to Henry Jellicoe in 1823 as Campbell Ford, the property and house were purchased by Walter Davidson of nearby Riccarton in 1848. At the time of the Rosedale refurbishment the property was leased to James Blackburn. Robertson and Craig suggest Blackburn did some remodelling there at that time, p. 62.
cottage into a fine villa in the Italianate style. Blackburn understood the site, and his use of height and perspective to give the house presence in the landscape, resulted in an elegant design that appeared to simply rest on the terrain it overlooked.

The Italianate building style was fashionable in the early Victorian period. Architectural pattern books ensured trends were available in remote corners of the empire. Italianate embodied the concept of picturesque in relation to the site. Gardens and approaches were set out to take advantage of these design imperatives and buildings were designed asymmetrically to add to this visual appeal. Thomas Archer’s property, Woolmers, originally built in 1817, was an early example of Italianate renovation. In 1843 it was extended to a design by Thomas Archer’s architect son, William. An entrance hall, dining room, drawing room and single-storey tower which housed a guest bedroom were constructed at the rear of the original residence. The Archer family continued to use the original front door and verandah facing the river. The door in the new façade, facing the lawn and formal garden with its sweeping carriage drive, was reserved for guests.

Blackburn’s scheme for Rosedale included a tall loggia across the front of the old house and the building of a double-storey wing with a dominating tower at the junction of the two on the south-eastern corner of the original house. The loggia masked the original house and the small windows in the upper storey of the additions were a feature of the picturesque style. The stone house was enlarged by the addition of a ground-floor drawing room, spacious entrance and stair halls, several bedrooms on the floor above and a covered viewing platform on the second floor of the tower. Service rooms and existing rooms were refurbished and redecorated. The Italianate form set in the landscape was the epitome of the picturesque and Rosedale’s external features lent the house a new grandeur. In Lucas’ view, ‘[The] whole is very theatrical and successful.’

The front door was moved to open into the new entrance hall and access was gained

---


80 Cox and Lucas, Australian Colonial Architecture, p. 192.

along the existing flagstone way, restyled by the erection of the covered loggia. The stables and store rooms on one wing of the original house quadrangle were demolished to make way for the new construction. The finished work redefined the two quadrangle spaces: the domestic square of house, kitchen, storerooms, offices and enclosed walled garden, and the larger farm quadrangle composed of the stables, shearing shed, cottages, stores and yards. The spaces were separated by a high stone wall and people moved to and fro through a gate in this divider. The architectural concept was not limited to the house. Blackburn designed a long barn with a central facade incorporating windows and a narrow doorway that lent the building elegance rarely reserved for a shed.82 This new barn incorporated the stables, living space for the groom, tack rooms and stores.

Diagram 4.1: Rosedale floor plan, ground floor, c1850.

---

The finished house had two staircases: one newly built to allow access to the upstairs rooms and the tower, and the old stairs that led to the bedrooms set into the original half-storey roof space. Once the building works were completed John and Elizabeth Leake and their guests would use the new stairs and their ‘children’ would mostly use the old. This separation of space would have added to the perceived gentility of the home. The changes to the house nearly doubled its floor space. This meant, for the housemaids, more cleaning and maintenance work, a longer distance to carry trays to the drawing room, and more steps to climb more often.

Quotations and plans were exchanged between Blackburn and Leake on such matters as quantities for materials, the likely costs of local labour, the dimensions of the work, timber specifications, and drawings of the roof line and guttering. The building work was of the highest standard available. Window heads and sills were dressed stone and new flagstones were installed along the loggia and porticos. Leake, the punctilious former banker, kept a memo book of hours worked by labourers and tradesmen on the house. From this and other correspondence, a sense of the orderliness of the renovation process can be gauged but they are devoid of the noise, tensions and problems that would have come for the family who lived in the house for several years in company of builders and their workmen, dust, part-completed rooms and buildings, stockpiles of bricks, stone and timbers, and the chaos of indeterminate finish dates.

Plastering, paperhanging and painting trades were all required to decorate the interior. The painter’s account was itemized by room so a list of rooms that were added or refurbished can be proposed: drawing room, hall and staircase, dining room, bathroom, bedroom. The painter billed by the yard of work. The plaster’s bill was also by room and included walls, ceilings and cornices for new rooms and for a number of existing rooms including Sarah’s bedroom.

---

83 Large colonial houses had separate passages and stairways for servant use. At Clarendon the stairs used by the family were carpeted. A more worn set of stairs, devoid of covering, were used by the servants.
84 James Blackburn to John Leake, 9 March 1846, Leake Papers, L1/B652; James Blackburn to John Leake, 30 March 1846, Leake Papers, L1/B653. Blackburn’s letterhead gave Camelford as his address. Blackburn responded when Leake queried the number of bricks explaining that the estimate was 73000 allowing for 18 inch thick walls in the drawing room rather than the original 14 inch.
85 John Leake, “Memo Book,” Leake Papers, L1/B660. For a researcher with an interest in Rosedale as a colonial building, the Leake Papers contain details of the process of its construction, the timbers used, and the costs associated with all aspects of supply and labour.
Leake was a particular man. He negotiated the quality and quantity of wallpaper for the drawing room via letter with the paperhanger until a product they both thought was suitable was available.\textsuperscript{87} Rolls of various patterns were sent by coach for inspection, presumably by Elizabeth Leake as much by her husband, enough of each design for the preferred one to be retained. Pearson, who supplied furniture and soft furnishing silks and other fabrics, was forced to apologize because items Leake selected could not be delivered and furniture, specifically made for Rosedale, was damaged in transit and had to be remade to meet Leake’s order. The carrier was obliged to pay for the replacement furniture.\textsuperscript{88}

The refurbishment was very modern. The ‘water closet and apparatus’ was supplied on 14 May 1849 by Thomas Harbottle and he apologized to Leake that he could not send the plumber when required: he travelled to Campbell Town by coach on 26 November 1849 in order to finalise the installation.\textsuperscript{89} The building and refitting process took several years and the accounts indicated that fittings were still being receipted in 1850 when the bathroom, including the shower bath, was completed.\textsuperscript{90} John Andrew upgraded the bells, the essence of servitude and the master-servant relationship, in 1850. He sent one of his men to Campbell Town and, as his tools and box were so heavy, asked for a ‘conveyance’ to be sent to meet the workman from the coach, thus saving all ‘time and expense.’\textsuperscript{91}

Leake had spent about £9000 on the renovations and rebuilding work by 1855. The accounts and correspondence are indicative of a carefully planned and managed reconstruction. They underscore the orderliness of John and Elizabeth Leake and their financial capacity. While not literally stacked atop each other, each house was constructed out of the previous one: a refinement of built form that suggests Rosedale, as with the Leake family, matured in its landscape. The entire estate was a theatre for John Leake’s power.

**Front of House**

At Rosedale the public rooms were magnificent. The entrance hall and drawing room were impressively grand. The dining room was elegant and spacious as a result of the redevelopment even though it was not newly built. The house reflected the new life that

\textsuperscript{87} John Perry to John Leake, March 1850, Leake Papers, L1/B763 and L1/B764.  
\textsuperscript{88} J Pearson to John Leake, 7 November 1850, Leake Papers, L1/B 765.  
\textsuperscript{89} Thomas Harbottle to John Leake, 1849, Leake Papers, L1/B734 and L1/B735.  
\textsuperscript{90} Leake Papers, L1/B736. The shower bath cost £6.10.  
\textsuperscript{91} John Andrew to John Leake, 27 September 1850, Leake Papers, L1/B749.
Leake had embarked on. With all the furniture from houses in Hamburg and Hull sold to meet the costs of immigration, the new and refurbished spaces were furnished with locally crafted or imported fixtures. Few family mementos had travelled in the hold of the Andromeda for the journey to Tasmania. Space had been used for farm equipment and supplies of goods not readily available in the nascent colony. Leake clearly knew it would be years before anything stylish or decorative would be required. But, when the time for display had arrived, the prudent Leake loosened the strings. An imagined tour of these rooms reveals their splendour and suggests the effort required to maintain them.

A feature of the entrance hall of this period was its number of doors: often firmly shut to exclude a preliminary view into a room into which guests may be ushered. This was the first impression space in which a visitor would receive their initial glimpse of the order, wealth, style and status of the household. Timberwork including picture rails, window casements and tall skirting boards flanked sober paint or paper walls that were hung with solidly framed art. Light was emitted to this space through a transom above the front door or windows either side of it. With few windows and closed doors, the entrance hall was dark, dignified, and even oppressive. Sideboards and strong chairs arranged formally around the edges of the hall filled what was often a broad space. The formal stairs with ornate curved and carved balustrades rose from the entrance hall in homes that included upper floors.

Building records and Sarah Leake’s journal mention many rooms in the house but there are very few descriptions or details of either the rooms or their functions. By mid-nineteenth century magazines, books, advice columns and manuals on arranging, managing and behaving in the home abounded. The house in the early Victorian era was redefined as a refuge; a haven from the tensions and demands of commercial life. This meaning was implanted in colonial society. The additions and refurbishment of Rosedale were based on imported architectural concepts. Each new vessel in Hobart Town disgorged letters from ‘Home’ containing society intelligence, gossip and advice; papers and magazines filled with news and advertisements; and new settlers and travellers with their tastes and recent experiences, late of the great European cities, the Orient, India or the Americas.

---

93 Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. xii.
The public rooms at Rosedale maintained the continuity and style arising in the Victorian period. The entrance hall was floored with tessellated tiling imported from Minton and Co of London, ordered by Leake during the renovation. Minton’s decorative encaustic tiles were the height of fashion. The hall’s five doors and architraves were cedar. A fan light of petal shapes to represent flowers, set in strips of polished timber rather than lead, allowed a little light into the hallway of the older part of the house. The new front door was solid without sidelights or a transom. The leadlight window to its immediate left illuminated the hall with a shaft of light and afforded a narrow view of the gardens and river flat below. It framed the outlook in such a way as to emphasis the picturesque, a feature of an Italianate design.

The standard drawing room was a transformation over the decades from the room where the family could gather away from the rest of the household, to a public room where guests were entertained. The drawing room was the room at the centre of the house. It was the ‘best’ room: “… the status indicator, the mark of gentility, the room from where the woman governed her domain.” The architectural fashion was for a long room with a high ceiling and bay window. Proportion was very important. The fireplace was centred in an end wall with a mirror above the mantle reflecting the balance of the room. Mirrors were meant to be higher than they were wide and this could only be achieved with high ceilings or by dint of artificially narrowing the fireplace; not the accepted practice.

A grand drawing room was the epitome of style and regarded as the high point of the house. Blackburn created one at Rosedale that reflected his artistry and attention to detail. The richly coffered ceiling has been described as ‘without equal’. The room also featured elaborate decorative plasterwork, a large bay window framed in Doric pilasters, a magnificent chandelier, and silk wall papers and soft furnishings. The beautifully proportioned room had a tall window on the northern side, emitting natural light and warmth in the antipodean winter months and featured an elegant fireplace and surround facing the eastern windows.

---

95 AJB, “Rosedale, the ‘White Castle’,” p. 13. The total account, including tiles for interior finishes was £22.12.6., Account, Minton and Co, 9 Albion Place, Blackfriars Bridge, 21 July 1848, Leake Papers, L1/B715.
96 AJB, “Rosedale, the ‘White Castle’,” p. 13.
98 Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. 131.
100 Cox and Lucas, Australian Colonial Architecture, p. 196.
The feminine drawing room was to be light coloured, more fanciful than the dark gravity of the dining room.\(^{101}\) The furniture varied over the period but Flanders provides a list for the beginning of the Victorian period. This was likely to have been replicated in the furnishing of the renovated Rosedale. On entering the drawing room, guests would have been met with:

... sofas, ottomans, upright chairs and easy chairs, stools, ladies’ writing desks, console tables, work tables, sewing tables, occasional tables and screens, and, indispensably, a round table for the centre of the room...\(^{102}\)

Leake imported mirrored glass in gilt frames for the end of the drawing room and for above the piano.\(^{103}\)

The dining room was an important public space where guests were entertained and the family’s wealth and social position were on display. It was regarded as a masculine space in early Victorian times, despite it being women who spent most time there.\(^{104}\) The masculinity was evinced through a dark environment of deep colour, heavy carpet and window coverings, solid furniture and sober art. Table and chairs in the dining room were likely to be mahogany, although blackwood was substituted in some colonial houses. There were fashion rules regarding which timber was used in which room and suites in matching timbers were generally in favour for dining, drawing and bedrooms.\(^{105}\) Displays of family wealth and lineage arranged in the dining room included solid silver ware and plate, family and ancestral portraits, and landscapes evoking a park-like environment in which nature was subdued by man’s hard work.

The Rosedale dining room, with its sideboards, long table and many elegant dining chairs, occupied space on the ground floor of the original part of the house. The renovation saw two original rooms combined to create a single formal space.\(^{106}\) French doors, with cedar shutters to close out the morning glare, looked east across the flagstone terrace and over the lower paddock to the Elizabeth River. The room had an intimate feel due to the low ceiling of the original house, unlike the drawing room and entrance hall, the ceilings of which were

\(^{101}\) Flanders, *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*, p. 215.
\(^{102}\) Flanders, *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*, p. 134.
\(^{103}\) Leake favoured the Belmont Glass Works in Birmingham with several orders, including glasses and decanters. Leake Papers, L1/B785-805.
\(^{104}\) Flanders, *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*, p. 215.
\(^{105}\) Terence Lane and Jessie Serle, *Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 28. For example, cedar or walnut was common in bedrooms.
lofty and highly decorated. Guests would enter from the drawing room across the tiles of the grand hall. A door from the dining room to the original hallway was for servant use and led to a butler’s pantry, despite there not being a butler. From there, the external kitchen, scullery and storerooms were gained through a covered concourse. The table setting would have been very grand with two twelve-inch silver plated candlesticks with silver mounts and double arm branches atop the table. When not in use the pearl-handled dessert knives and forks were put away in their purpose-made mahogany case.107

The Leake family often entertained dinner guests and had stocks of cutlery, plate, china and glassware to meet the needs of numerous sit-down guests in the context of Victorian dining.108 Such dinners had the ancillary purpose of bringing together those with power: the masters, magistrates and wardens of the prison system and the clergy that sanctified it.

**Back of House**

In theory, the Victorian house distinguished between public and private rooms. The private rooms, used predominantly by the family and at times by close family friends, included the parlour, morning room, bedrooms and bathrooms. Servants, too, passed through these private rooms of the house but not to enjoy their comfort. Servant spaces were located out of sight, mostly to the back of house, on the lower ground floor, or in the attic.

The parlour was equivalent to a study, or day room. It was of smaller proportions than the drawing room and a more intimate space. Images of the period indicate a well-furnished room, likely to include table, piano, books, pictures, ornaments, handmade mantle covers, upright chairs and possibly a comfortable chair. The home of Morton Allport, c1860, boasted two parlours, one each for him and his wife. Images of these rooms, which Allport referred to as ‘drawing rooms’, show small practical rooms: his with a bureau, high-back chairs, and a large round covered table for writing and reading; hers with a piano, harp, bookcase, easy chair, work table and sundry ornaments.109

---

107 These items were shipped from London. The total cost, including bill of lading and freight, came to £22.4.6. Account, Storrs and Beard of No. 106 Cheapside, London, 27 October 1851, Leake Papers, L1/B774.
108 Dinnerware was often replenished. For example, a dinner service was purchased, date unknown, consisting of 184 items. At another time, there was an order was for crockery of 86 pieces. Leake Papers, L1/ B738 and L1/B783.
109 Lane and Serle, *Australians at home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914*, p. 112.
Where there was a morning room, it was generally used by the lady of the house for the management of the household. Here servants would be given instructions, accounts kept, sewing done, and informal visits of very close women friends conducted. If this room was combined with a parlour for the use of the mistress it often also contained a piano or other instruments for music practice and her private enjoyment.

Sarah Leake’s journal mentions parlour, bedrooms and bathrooms, marking Rosedale as having modern amenities. It is possible that the parlour was synonymous with a morning room, for Sarah would have enjoyed a particular space as the mistress’s domain and with a substantial house there would have been rooms set aside for the tasks associated with running the house. Lucas refers to the ‘painted room’. This appears to be the small room at the front north-east corner of the original house and was probably used by the men of the household: for reading, conversation and smoking.

Bedrooms were used for sleeping, bathing and dressing whereas in former times they functioned also as sitting room or parlour, with space to sit, work or read. In a wealthy household the principal bedroom was fitted out – as were the reception rooms – in mahogany, cedar or blackwood, with the following:

... a central table, a wardrobe, a toilet table, chairs, a small bookcase and a ‘chiffonier’, a small low cupboard with a sideboard top... the bed... a washstand... with accoutrements, a pier glass and perhaps a couch or chaise longue.

Clothes were not hung on hangers. The dresses, the multiple linens, and outer garments were folded in chests of drawers, presses or trunks, or hung from pegs. Each bedroom would include a washstand, even if the house boasted a bathroom. The washstand had a centre hole for a bowl, often a tiled top, and was decorated in ‘ware’ meaning a set of ‘... a basin, a ewer or jug, a soapdish, a dish to hold a sponge, a dish to hold a toothbrush, a dish to hold a nail brush, a water bottle and a glass.’ Bedside tables were uncommon for the bed was for sleeping not reading. A single candle was thought adequate lighting for retiring but the more prosperous had a pair or two of candlesticks: on the dresser and the mantle.

The bedroom was also a private space that provided a retreat for distress, anxiety,
illness and death. Illness was nursed in the home. The bedroom, or a spare, could be
remade as a sick room as needed. Bed curtains, decorative soft furnishings and superfluous
furniture would be removed if the patient needed nursing for a long period. A daybed or
couch, positioned to take in a recuperative view, might be added when the patient was well
enough for a change of scene. Elizabeth Leake was nursed at the end of her life by a
combination of Sarah and the servants including Eliza. Professional nurses were used if
available, particularly for care during the night, but this was less likely in the isolation of the
country property.

Bathrooms of the period were large rooms often converted from other rooms to the
new function and decorated as lavishly as a bedroom, and in a style unsuited to water and
steam. They would include a bath and the availability of running water relied on hand
pumps. If there were no pump and internal plumbing, water would have been heated in a
boiler built into the kitchen range or, for a larger quantity, in the laundry copper. However
heated, the water was carried by the ewer-full to the bath and, once the bather had finished, a
servant would remove the water, pail by pail. Flanders suggests women bathed in the privacy
and seclusion of their rooms. This usually meant washing, bit by bit, at a washstand in the
bedroom. Women were saved the moral necessity of bathing or showering in cold water
expected of hardy men. In some houses the bath was placed in an outbuilding to reduce the
imposition of plumbing in an already complete dwelling. These bathrooms might be equipped
with a foot or hip bat, or a portable shower, available from the 1840s. Toilet equipment like
bidets, commodes and hip or foot baths were moveable and able to be carried, by the
servants, to any room requiring them. The renovations at Rosedale included ‘bathrooms’
and Sarah’s journal refers to these rooms in the plural. At Rosedale, in the 1850s, the shower
bath was a fixture.

115 Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. 316.
116 Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. 303.
117 Lawrence Wright, Clean and Decent: The Fascinating History of the Bathroom & the Water Closet and of
Sundry Habits, Fashions & Accessories of the Toilet Principally in Great Britain, France & America, London:
118 Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. 289.
119 See Wright, Clean and Decent: The Fascinating History of the Bathroom & the Water Closet and of Sundry
Habits, Fashions & Accessories of the Toilet Principally in Great Britain, France & America, p. 176; Lane and
Serle, Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914, p.
397.
120 Lane and Serle, Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to
1914, pp. 396-7.
The different types of toilet apparatus available in the nineteenth century included water-closets, earth-closets, privies, ash-pits, and cesspools. Palmer notes that, even in the matter of design and efficiency, there was a distinction between that for the family and that for the servant.\footnote{Roy Palmer, \textit{The Water Closet: a New History}, Wellington: A.H & A.W. Reed, 1973, p. 39.} Early lavatories were unreliable and unsanitary. Ladies were especially susceptible to the odours of the outdoor pan or long-drop toilet and would avoid using them.\footnote{Lane and Serle, \textit{Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914}, p. 263.} For delicacy, chamber pots were placed in the bedroom for use but screened in a box, cupboard or bed stair.\footnote{Lane and Serle, \textit{Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914}, p. 101.}

Several different forms of toilet were built at Rosedale: a lavatory, built on the ground floor as part of the renovations, for the family and guests; latrines or privies in the farm quadrangle for the farm workers, and an outdoor lavatory in the service compound of the house for servant use, for they were not to use the family lavatory in the house.\footnote{The double-seated privy in an outhouse by the back door of Highfield is an example of this convenience. A similar privy is built into the wall surrounding the kitchen garden at Woolmers.} A cesspit would have been constructed somewhere, out of mind and downwind from the house.

The other ‘private’ rooms were the servant spaces. The kitchen precinct with its ‘offices’, scullery and stores, was the cook’s preserve but not entirely their space. It often included work, storage and sleeping space.\footnote{‘Offices’ were the housekeeping rooms that included store rooms and cellar.} In larger houses where there were multiple members of staff, servants in the kitchen precinct were the cook and scullery maid, and possibly the laundry maid if the washhouse was attached. Otherwise, it was the preserve of the maid-of-all-work. Servant spaces also included bedrooms where servants slept and most likely bathed, and, in larger establishments, a servant hall for meals. Sarah Leake’s journal mentions kitchen, storeroom, cupboards and laundry spaces, and servants’ rooms, presumably bedrooms.

The Victorian-era kitchen and store rooms were where food was prepared, supplies of fresh and preserved ingredients housed, hot water maintained (using kettles of varying sizes depending on the need: a pot of tea or a bath), and rations portioned. The single-purpose ideal held that the kitchen was only for cooking.

Keeping a reliable cook at Rosedale was a continuous bother in the 1850s. John Leake selected men for this role. This practice dated from the earliest days of Rosedale partly due to
the physical requirements of the work, which included endless lifting. The kitchen was
dominated by the range: a temperamental device resembling a large cupboard with its own
chimney above and large oven below.\textsuperscript{126} Lighting and managing it was laborious and grubby
work. Stoves generally had an oven, water boiler and hot plates but were unregulated apart
from valves, and good results came from practical use and experience. The Tasmanian
colonial kitchen range was heated by wood that required cutting and carrying and this
additional labour was a reason some households chose male cooks.\textsuperscript{127} The stove was in use
every day and gave off intense heat when fully operational. In winter this was a bonus that
was quickly forgotten in the heat of summer. Heat, flies and tired feet were the cook’s
constant companions. The quote for a new stove from William Johnson of Launceston in
1855 suggested a stove that was three feet wide by two feet deep was the minimum required
but likely too small for the workload John Leake had indicated. The price was quoted at
£14.\textsuperscript{128}

Other tasks associated with cooking like food storage, food preparation, crockery,
cutlery and equipment storage, and dishwashing were accomplished in other rooms.\textsuperscript{129} The
scullery held at least one sink and could be the only room where there was running water.
This was the site of food preparation, particularly vegetables and meat that needed cleaning,
and dish washing. There could also be a pantry or larder where food, china and cutlery were
stored with a table or bench for food preparation. Larger establishments would also have a
store room or cellars to store the supplies purchased in bulk, and additional store rooms for
cleaning equipment and other domestic requirements. Some store rooms and the cellar were
locked and the keys were sought from the mistress when supplies were needed. She would
also be required to unlock the cupboards holding plate, fine china and glasswear when items
were required for the dining room.

The reality was the kitchen was often multipurpose, including racks suspended from
the ceiling for drying the laundry, and the only room where servants could sit or eat. The

\textsuperscript{126} Geoffrey Blainey, \textit{Black Kettle and Full Moon: Daily Life in a Vanished Australia}, Camberwell: Penguin,
2003, p 222.
\textsuperscript{127} Sarah Leake’s contemporary Louisa Meredith, too, chose male convict cooks. Louisa Anne Meredith, \textit{My
Home in Tasmania during a Residence of Nine Years}, 2 Volumes. London: John Murray, 1852. Facsimile
published Swansea, TAS: Glamorgan Spring Bay Historical Society, 2003, p. 155. That good ones were in short
supply was indicated by Meredith’s mother-in-law who found at her door a potential cook carrying a drake and
a letter from her friend who had found the man ‘civil and inclined to be obliging.’ MA Hobbs to Mrs [Mary
Ann] Meredith, 26 July 1839, University of Tasmania, Special and Rare Collections, G4/113.
\textsuperscript{128} W Johnson to J Leake, 24 March 1855, Leake Papers, L1/B786.
\textsuperscript{129} Flanders, \textit{The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed}, p. 63.
Rosedale cook had to share: with other servants and at times with the mistress herself. Because there was no servants’ hall, the kitchen acted as the only place, apart from their bedrooms, where servants could rest, chat or have some private time – if their duties gave them the opportunity.

Another feature of many Australian colonial houses was the coolroom, different from a cellar for storage, which was often dug in the yard. This building was considered part of the farm not the house. The kitchen was often built separate from the main house and connected to it by a covered walk or partly enclosed verandah. Access to cellars could also be from this verandah so that the entrance was protected from the weather. The need to segregate the family from convict workers, who often also slept in or above the kitchen, was one explanation for the separate kitchen along with solving the problems of ‘… juggling with the largely irreconcilable questions of cooking smells, flies... privacy and burning the whole house down.’

A servant’s bedroom was not solely their province for the rooms could be inspected by the mistress at will. The servant’s bedroom was devoid of the luxury of space or furnishings that the family enjoyed. A narrow bed, plain washstand and toilet set, a chest of drawers or trunk, and possibly a chair, were the rule. Where there were two housemaids, they often were required to share a bedroom, and thus there would be two beds but not necessarily any other duplication of furniture. Some had to share the bed. Maids often slept in an attic. These rooms offered little space or light. In winter they were cold and in summer they baked directly under the roof. Apparently every maid at Rosedale had her own room because whenever a maid departed, instructions were issued to prepare a room for her successor. This would have been a luxury for any convict woman and possibly the only time in their life when they experienced private space, except when in solitary confinement.

The rooms of Rosedale fashioned the set where the lives of the family and their servants were played out. The house was one sphere and it was encompassed by the estate which surrounded it.

---

130 An example of this building can be seen at Brickenden. There, it was also the place for butchering meat after slaughter.
132 This could lead to trouble as was the case for Margaretta Brymer who shared her bed with another female servant. She was in the bed when Margaretta was caught consorting with a male servant in that same bed. Female Factory Research Group, *Convict Lives: Women at Cascad Women at Cascades Female Factory*, Hobart: Research Tasmania, 2009, p. 37.
The estate

Running the estate was not Sarah Leake’s province yet working men inhabited her world. She rarely mentioned them. Rosedale was the centrepiece of the family estates and Ashby, Lewisham and additional leased grazing lands were directed from there. From the outset men worked the estate under Leake’s authority even though he often delegated the supervision to his sons. Life associated with the farm management, agricultural priorities and the daily life of farm workers offers a contrast to Sarah Leake’s private domestic world. Her prosperity and wellbeing were directly attributable to their labours. Not once in the course of her journal did Sarah reflect on the existence of the Rosedale working men but their presence would have coloured the daily conversations between her, the family, their friends and any associates they met along the way. When Sarah weighed out the men’s rations,134 it was for the farm workers whose wages were composed of cash, foodstuffs and, for some, clothing, tobacco and personal items. When she called for the gig or carriage it was readied and brought to her by the groom or one of the men. The vegetables and fruit that arrived at the kitchen door were grown and harvested by working men, at either Rosedale or Ashby for much produce was brought from Arthur’s for the Rosedale table. When a farm or house servant was ill enough to require medical attention, Miss Leake would speak to the doctor if he came to the house.135

By the 1850s Rosedale had evolved to an extensive and well-managed agricultural business. The focal point was sheep production in all its aspects: wool, breeding, developing stud lines, and selling ewes, lambs and wethers to other stockowners and for slaughter. The business also bred and sold cattle and horses. Cropping was a secondary but vital interest intended for domestic use and sale. Wheat, oats, tobacco and beets were all produced. The orchard contained apples in commercial quantities for cider and for sale, and a diverse range of vegetables and stone and berry fruits were grown for domestic use.

The infrastructure for this business was extensive and most was constructed in a village-like arrangement. Outbuildings of brick and fine stonework included barracks and cookhouse for the single men and cottages for the men who had families. The sturdy stone double-storey stable and coach house formed one wall and corner of the outer quadrangle. The shearing shed, workshops and sheds were arranged alongside stockyards to form the rest

135 Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855,” entry for 15 May 1854. Leake Papers. Dr Harrington was a regular dinner guest, as well as Leake’s doctor. There is no indication who Miss Leake consulted for medical advice.
of the yard. This much larger quadrangle was cut by a drive wide enough to move cattle and sheep through but all able to be closed off to protect valuable stock from predation.

The sheds were a busy and boisterous space where men assembled for their work instructions, conducted their daily lives, and hung about in their free time. Animals added their presence to the men’s. Yards, stalls and house paddocks held a domestic dairy herd, horses, and orphan stock, with pigs in stone sties set into the walls. Shearing would bring more men and hundreds of sheep at the yard’s busiest time of the year. Leake was in charge but any one of his sons was able to deputise for him during his regular absences. There is no record of an overseer or foreman but there was a hierarchy among the men, in terms of the type of work they did, whether specialist or labouring, their maturity in years and their free or convict status in the system. Maintaining this unwritten pecking order contributed to the scraps and fights between workers that occasionally led one or more of the men to the Campbell Town police cells.

Shearers, threshers and other seasonal workers came from time to time as the work required. They did not appear as individuals in the wages ledger: their presence was indicated by an item in the expenses of the estate and appears to be paid retrospectively. Major jobs for farm labourers included maintaining paddocks, ploughing and planting crops; pasture improvement by thistle, gorse and other weed removal; overseeing the cattle and horses; shepherding both in the high country in summer and around the estate, including maintaining the separation of the flock for breeding purposes; shearing and dipping in season; and fencing. Stump removal and dealing with the wild dogs that took sheep were constant tasks across the district. Farm equipment was both maintained and manufactured on site. Major implements like ploughs, threshing machines, shearing equipment and carts were kept functioning by the Rosedale wheelwright, but the carriage horses were taken to Campbell Town to be shod by the blacksmith, James Thompson. Stock was herded and branded. That George Gatenby, Leake’s neighbour at Bicton, put more than 4500 sheep through his shed with 487 shorn – his highest daily total in 1854 – indicates major fluctuations in labour requirements in the district. There was a constant round of building maintenance that also fell to the general hands and the sheds and stables were kept in fine condition through the

decades. When summer bushfires burnt the fences at Lewisham men from the estate were sent to repair them.104

At Rosedale maintaining the gardens, orchard, domestic herd, poultry and vegetable beds was farm labour. This was the preserve of the gardeners and there was work enough for two men. The garden was managed on a month-by-month basis and the house vegetables planted according to the guide issued with an annual almanac.105 The gardener’s journal indicated the range of vegetables that were planted and harvested: onions, cabbages, potatoes, beans, spinach, parsnips, carrots, tomatoes and asparagus, as well as plants for the ornamental garden. The journal keeper also gathered apples and made cider, and ploughed the house paddocks using bullocks to draw the plough.106 There was a greenhouse but no mention is made of working in the orangery that was attached to the main house. Men from the estate labour pool, which generally stood at around ten workers, would have been detailed to assist the gardeners as the workload dictated. It would not have been as neat and differentiated as the theory suggests. There would have been chicks and hens in the domestic quadrangle and in the garden; stray lambs and other immature stock would be kept close and watched; and a steady stream of foot traffic would move from the stables and yards to the kitchen offices.

Leake’s enterprise was very profitable by the mid 1850s. It had weathered the downturns in the economy and the stability that came with secure land tenure ensured that growth was the pattern over the years. While Rosedale was the base, income from other properties coupled with the benefit accruing from running stock across all the lands at Leake’s disposal, both owned and leased, indicate a complex and well-managed business with an eye for profit and improvement.

The primary income was derived from sheep. The proceeds of the wool clip and the ‘meat account’107 showed how prosperous the enterprise was. The December 1854 tally for bales of the complete wool clip for that year was £16,312.108 The clip income underscores the extent to which wool was the basis of Leake’s wealth. The meat account indicated a range of

---

104 As Sarah noted on 9 November 1854 and 12 January 1855. Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855,” Leake Papers.
105 An undated farm journal seemingly kept by one of the gardeners provides details of the work month by month. It is assumed to cover 1862 because of the almanac dates included in a cutting glued to the inside cover. “Journal, February to December c1862,” Leake Papers, L1/C374.
106 This is the only mention of bullocks on the property and indicates that Leake used whatever means was suitable to ensure effective work. Bullocks would have required specific harness and equipment.
107 The ‘meat account’ was the summary account into which was paid the proceeds of stock, predominantly sheep, for slaughter.
108 For example, wool income from Lewisham stock in October 1854 is noted as £1,317 6 shillings and 2 pence indicating the detail with which Leake kept his records. This amount is included in the December (annual) total.
buyers of stock for slaughter (including lambs, ewes, wethers and cattle): the Campbell Town butcher, Brown and Sons, and Patrick Kearney. All took regular quantities and were prompt in their payments. Arthur Leake sold two horses from Ashby in March 1854 to Scotch Jock via the intermediary of Henry Vallentine, a Ross storekeeper. They fetched £215.144 Throughout 1854 lesser amounts were earned selling wheat, oats, potatoes and apples, mostly to local traders.

Major expenses in running the estate relate to wages, rations and costs of labour including contactors for shearing, reaping and threshing.145 Other expenses are for tools and equipment, and the necessary inputs to plant crops and maintain the buildings, fences, stockyards and machinery across the estate. Leake also bought and sold stock: Theo Bartley Esq purchased 998 ewes in one lot in May 1854. These sheep would have been walked up to Launceston from Rosedale, alongside the main road, probably shepherded by Bartley’s men. Leake had purchased a small flock of ewes from Henry Harrison earlier in the year. To receive them may have been a simple procedure for Harrison’s father’s property, Merton Vale, shared a common boundary with Rosedale. If the sheep had been walked from the more distant Truelands, a property which was also held by the Harrison family, the process would have required more planning.

Leake’s valuation of his capital assets can be gained from his own rough list.146 He noted Rosedale as of 2840 acres at £3/10 an acre, Lewisham of 4000 acres at £3 per acre, and Ashby of 812 acres at £4 per acre. That gave a total of £26,134.147 He valued the carriage and gig at £200 and the carts and drays at £200, 6000 sheep at £3000 and the stock of horses and cattle at £800, and the furniture at £700. Thus, his asset account totalled £31,034. At 31 December 1854 Leake calculated his profit and loss. By his reckoning his business was £5,275, 17 shillings and 8 pence ahead of the ledger at the year’s close.

---

144 Arthur Leake refused to ride newly broken horses in bad weather. He would have had an eye on the value of the beast as well as on his own safety. Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855,” entry for 7 January 1855, Leake Papers.
145 Wages are difficult to calculate accurately. Each worker was paid cash and provided with rations. Leake withheld wages on account for some workers at their request, acting as banker to help them save money. Further, some used Leake’s account at Joseph Brickhill’s store in Campbell Town to purchase personal items like clothing and tobacco and these amounts were included in the wages equation. Similarly, men at Ashby used Leake’s account at Henry Vallentine’s store in Ross and these expenses were noted. The total of the Ashby workforce wages is given without details meaning another set of accounts for Ashby must have been kept.
146 This undated list, on a single loose sheet of blue paper in Leake’s handwriting, was interleaved in the day book.
147 This amount does not include the replacement value of the two houses, Rosedale and Ashby. Both were insured.
Chapter Five: At home in the prison without walls

Rosedale’s servant’s wing stirred before the main house. The darkness of a frosty July morning was little different to the bright first light of January. If you were a servant, work awaited: every morning, every noon, every night. Rosedale’s front rooms were populated with Leake family members and their guests. Visitors ranged from neighbours to the Governor and were predominantly male and associated with John Leake and his civic duties: the parliament, the magistracy, the church. Little record exists of visitors to other members of the family and where they are noted they are guests of less formality: friends of Leake’s children. Women rarely visited alone. Occasionally they accompanied their husbands to dinner parties or for a short stay: sometimes neighbouring women would come for a night or so. Young women were accompanied by a male guardian when they visited the bachelor sons of Rosedale.

Dust and light were the servants’ enemies. In Australian conditions, particularly the dry windy days of summer, fine grit from the paddocks and yards would settle on the highly polished furniture surfaces. The fashion for long high windows in the public rooms, often screened by curtains or shutters, would nonetheless allow light to fall and reveal to the inspecting mistress any dust missed by the cloth of the housemaid. Perfect cleanliness and order were the objects of the housemaid.1

Early criticism of female convicts failed to recognise the essential skills they brought and their contribution to the domestic economy.2 The work of women house servants was undifferentiated in a popular view that ignored the technical skills of cooking, cleaning, sewing and laundry work, particularly in households where there were expectations of variety and high standards, and the furnishing and clothing were refined. Skills were acquired by training, observation and experience. The wide range of domestic skill sets indicated in the convict indents were at odds with the notion of women convicts as unskilled. The delineation of skill sets by title (housemaid, kitchen maid, cook, nurse, needlewoman, laundrywoman) indicated different levels within a servant hierarchy where the more specialised the skill the more likely it would be highly regarded.

Few convict servants were trained in domestic service to the level of sophistication required by the elite despite the trade listed on their indent. As Alexander notes, they had to be taught by their employers and then closely supervised and this reduced their immediate effectiveness.\(^3\) The lack of skills compounded by untrustworthiness due to their conviction made convict house servants a burden as much as a help. Servants being both practically useful and socially essential for the elite and middle classes alike tempered the mistresses’ attitude of resignation.\(^4\)

The servants’ entrance was a revolving door. Convict women moved across households in their servitude. Only those with misdemeanours stand out in the record.\(^5\) In the colonial setting a high turnover of servants added to the employers’ burden. This was particularly so in the country districts. Female immigrant servants found the work too hard and preferred to remain in houses in the larger centres.\(^6\) The isolation from companionship and likely marriage partners would have compounded the dislike of service in the interior. There was little alternative for convict women. They went where the system sent them and many had no choice but to work in a country house. Nonetheless, with the shortages of servants and the gender imbalance in the population, keeping female servants was as much about negotiation as it was about management. Within the context of private life, the relationship between masters and servants was critical to the efficient and peaceful functioning of the domestic household. There was a social gap between servant and mistress, and the mistress often lacked sympathy for the servant’s situation. Some saw servants as alien, potential thieves, disruptive of their lives and values. Irrespective of the implicit menace, servants were an indicator of gentility.

Stanley’s biography of Hannah Cullwell brings to mind the superior bodily strength, energy and endurance of working-class women compared to those in the middle and upper classes.\(^7\) Each day servants faced complex manual work and heavy lifting in order that the ‘ladies’ of the house need do neither. The expectations for housemaids were dichotomous: do dirty work but always appear presentable; carry out tasks that were difficult, dusty and grimy but be silent, tidy and invisible about it; and complete work to the mistress’s satisfaction but

---


do not expect the fulfillment of praise or acknowledgement. A household routine, like having one housemaid making beds and cleaning the bedrooms while another was serving breakfast to the family in the dining room, was one way of maintaining the separation between the work of the servant and the business of the family. An established schedule carried out by trained servants enabled the mistress to do little more than issue instructions and supervise.

Servants were at hand but unseen when others were present. The public rooms were the largest spaces and required constant upkeep to ensure they were suitably presented for guests and unexpected callers. The detailed work to achieve this is the key to understanding the role. It was mostly cleaning: opening rooms for the day and at the end of the day closing them by moving curtains or shutters; cleaning the grate and lighting the fire; removing all trace of cinders and dirt; sweeping, scrubbing and dusting; and preparing rooms for their various specialist uses. A multitude of brooms, brushes, dusters and concoctions, most with a single use, were hulked about by the maids as they cleaned. The floors in the public rooms could be flagstone, tiles or fine timber flooring. Rugs and carpets would be placed on the floors both to decorate and to provide a softer surface underfoot. These floor coverings would be regularly lifted and taken outside to have the dust beaten from them. In the dining room dried used tea leaves would be sprinkled on the carpet then swept up with the dust, leaving a faint pleasant aroma.

The Rosedale public rooms were the province of the convict housemaids who did the majority of the housework. Sarah Leake refers to housemaids, not to a lady’s maid, nurse or laundrywoman. The housemaid role, where there was more than one, was divided generally into upper and under and Rosedale generally functioned with two. Besides cleaning, there was other work; serving at the table, managing the linen, sewing and doing the laundry. In winter fires would be maintained in all the public rooms in use and lit in the bedrooms in time for them to be properly warmed before the occupants retired for the night. Each task required different skills and carried different status: the grubbier the task, the lower the status.

The kitchen, pantry and associated passages had to be cleaned by the time breakfast was served so as not to interfere with the organization of the balance of the day. The cook and housemaids would be at work on these tasks and with preparing the first meal of the day while the family was still in bed.8 These were not small tasks. Each morning the duties were repeated: the dining room opened and aired, the hearth and grate cleaned and a fire lit if the

---

season, or the instruction of the mistress, required it. The table would be dusted and laid, the
sideboard set with the necessary utensils, and the coffee or tea urn heated then, at the last
minute, refilled with boiling water carried from the kitchen timed to coincide with the
presentation of the hot dishes in their salvers. Servants carried and served the food, removed
or replenished plates and cutlery as they were used, and all the while were invisible.\(^9\) All the
food was expected to arrive at the table hot or cold as designated, and in the right order.

Life on a busy agricultural property meant there was much taking and providing of
breakfast. Travel sometimes began at daylight, be it for pleasure or, more often, to deal with
the business of moving livestock, visiting leaseholds, buying and selling produce, and
maintaining supervision. Also, journeys out for help in an emergency would start at first
light.\(^10\) An early start broke the routine of the entire day: servants would be about even
earlier, in the dark well before dawn, to meet the requirements of the schedule.

The Leake family was not teetotal.\(^11\) The keys to the cupboards and wine cellar were
held by the mistress, to reduce the opportunities offered by their contents to the servants,
most of whom were tempted by liquor and had, at least once, been convicted of a
misdemeanor associated with alcohol.\(^12\) Drunkenness in servants was unacceptable but an oft
occurrence in colonial households. Louisa Meredith found the tippling nursemaid and groom
in her home disruptive and neglectful. She did not hesitate to be rid of them.\(^13\) Elizabeth
Fenton locked her storeroom and, if required to return there from her work, would lock her
trunk and workbasket before quitting the parlour. She recorded her complaints:

\[\text{... when I am again in the storeroom my expert attendant puts his hand into the case or cask behind me while I am opening some box or canister, and abstracts a bottle of wine or porter or brandy and coolly departs with his prize under his coat – or her apron.}\] \(^14\)

\(^9\) At Clarendon, food was prepared in a kitchen and bakehouse separate from the house. It was carried along a
covered way, down outside stone steps, into the basement scullery where it was portioned. It was then carried up
internal service stairs to the dining room to be served. At Clarendon the stairs for the family and its guests were
carpeted. Service stairs at the other end of the house were bare.

\(^10\) George Gatienby, “Diary of George Gatienby of Bicton” Campbell Town, 9 November 1847 to 31 January

\(^11\) Examples of liquor purchases include casks of porter, sherry and brandy purchased James Hamilton, a
Campbell Town storekeeper in 1849 and casks of port from Mr Lewis of Hobart Town in March 1854. John
Leake, “Day Book from January 1849,” in Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania
Library, 1849, L1/B755.

\(^12\) The exception was Williams whose only misdemeanour during her period of servitude was one count of
absent without leave. Eliza Williams per Anna Maria, CON 42/1/32.

\(^13\) Louisa Anne Meredith, My Home in Tasmania During a Residence of Nine Years, 2 volumes, London: John

Keeping presentable was a challenge for housemaids. In the space of the morning they could be required to wait on the table in the dining room, assist the mistress to dress, do dusty and dirty chores, answer the front door, and present visitors to the mistress in the parlour or drawing room. Neatness and cleanliness were expected whenever the maid was serving the family and it was a challenge to take the apron on and off, to keep long skirts dry when washing floors, and to maintain the expected invisibility.

The treadmill of domestic work was endless, exhausting and dull. Good work went unnoticed and it was the shortcomings in a servant, of character or output, that were remarked upon. So it was with Sarah Leake who noted the failings of servants in her journal, not their merits. Eliza drew no criticism as she moved about the house, quietly, conforming as did the other house servants to the requirement of the master for invisibility. Noise was dulled, as in the separate prison. Only the sounds of gentlemen’s boots on the tiles of Rosedale’s entrance hall disturbed the calm decorum.

The most difficult juggling was between cleaning and serving in the dining room. Meals were important points in the day for service to and inspection by the family. Manners and customs in the dining room were of great importance. Servants in this room had to learn and maintain the social rituals of the family. The master would be most particular when he had guests for dinner and then all traces of domestic work would be hidden. For the task of waiting on the table, the housemaid was required to be, in Beeton’s view:

… neatly and cleanly dressed... She should not wear creaking boots and should move about the room as noiselessly as possible, anticipating people’s wants by handing them things without being asked for them, and altogether being as quiet as possible.

After the family and their guests left the dining room, the housemaid, perhaps with assistance from the cook, cleared the china, glassware, cutlery and plate away, refolded the cloth and napkins and polished the table to remove any marks made by hot dishes. Then there was the washing up and restacking the crockery in the cupboards. All the while the cook may be laying out the trays with sandwiches, cakes and other delicacies to serve with tea. In winter fires would be maintained in all the public rooms in use and lit in the bedrooms in time for them to be properly warmed before the occupants retired for the night.

The relationship between the family and the servants was not one of companionship. It was marked by the control of the bell which was rung, even in small houses, when a

15 Higman, *Domestic Service in Australia*, p. 141.
servant was required. Formality structured the interchange. Devaluing servants by seeing them as functionaries had a long history. Servants were addressed by given name or work role and the family was addressed with formal titles. This underscored the paternalistic relationship of master and servant. A degree of informality, perhaps due to long service or particular favour, was indicated between Eliza and the sons of the house. In the presence of others, greater formality would have been observed.

Every day there were the bedrooms to do: making the bed according to the wishes of the room’s occupant including turning the mattress and fluffing the pillows; airing the room, moving the ornaments and light furniture daily for cleaning, and the heavy furniture often to clean under the bed and around the skirtings. The initial task each morning was to remove the slops and clean the toilet vessels, which generally consisted of a chamber pot, washbowl, dishes and glasses, especially in a ladies room if the occupant found using the WC distasteful. The housemaid would carry all she needed for the cleaning tasks to the room with her: the slops pail, cleaning tools, dusters, brooms, and a dustpan. The pail would be covered to mask its contents as she retreated down the stairs.

For the servant beds were regular solid heavy work. Bedding was immense: mattresses, underlay and mattress overlay, sheets, blankets, coverlet, pillows and bolsters. If the mattresses were organic they needed to be turned each day. Feathers were preferred for the top mattress. They needed to be aired to prevent mould and odour. The multitude of feather pillows needing to be plumped and smoothed added to the chore. Ornaments and bed coverings were essential – an over-mantle if there was a fireplace, chair and cushion covers, curtains, and drapes for window and bed. All needed washing from time to time and shaking to remove the inevitable dust. Rosedale had bedrooms of three levels of presentation: the master bedroom and guest room were decorated and presented as if public rooms; the family bedrooms were utilitarian; the servants’ rooms were basic. Each bedroom could, and
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18 The housemaid’s box was an essential store of items in constant use and kept ready to hand. It contained black-lead for the grate, polishing and blacking brushes, brushes for various tasks like stairs, banisters, shelves and stoves, dusters, dry leather for polishing the grate, fender and irons, furniture polish and paste, glue for on the run mending of damaged timbers or chipped china, and soap. The maid would also have larger items for use – a feather or goose-wing duster, a heavy coconut fibre broom to sweep the better carpets, furniture brushes to suit different finishes, a shaped brush for cornices, and other implements. Beeton, *Beeton’s Book of Household Management*, pp. 989-997.
19 There was often more than one mattress: horsehair, with a straw one underneath, and a feather mattress on top. Terence Lane and Jessie Serle, *Australians at Home: A Documentary History of Australian Domestic Interiors from 1788 to 1914*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1990, p 23.
would, be inspected by the mistress to ensure its orderliness.

Fresh linen including sheets, towels, and coverings for the occasional furniture were be kept in presses and be issued to the servant as required. Housemaids would remove the soiled clothes and linen to the laundry to be counted for the wash. Then the housemaids were expected to return to the hall and main rooms to dust and polish: stairs, banisters, ledges, windowsills, picture frames, furniture and ornaments. Each week there would also be a routine of heavier work and some specialist tasks to complete in each room: fully polishing each item of furniture, cleaning the plate and candlesticks, and trimming the lamp wicks. Heavier tasks again, like spring cleaning and lifting the carpets and taking them to the yard to beat the dirt out of them, would be done once or twice a year. There were always tasks in waiting for spare moments, or hours: cleaning the plate, polishing the silver, hemming sheets, dusting the books in their shelves, folding the linen.

Victorian women were considered frail, sensitive, nervous, and girls were in need of protection from disturbance, like stimulation and exercise, that could render them unwell. Infirmity could be employed as a social mechanism to obtain privacy and a degree of independence. Illness and invalidism rendered other ‘achievements’ in life out of reach and therefore not expected: like marriage, child-bearing and rearing, charity work or attendance at public functions. Sarah’s bedroom discreetly functioned as a sick room many times during the year of the journal for she was often too unwell to rise until late in the morning or the middle of the day, and she was for a period of weeks too unwell to function normally.

The mistress and any adult women in an elite house would require assistance to dress. The help of a lady’s maid or housemaid would be expected in the morning, to dress for dinner in the evening, and again before retiring for the night. The tasks included carrying hot water to the mistress’s bedroom, getting clothes out and putting them away and assisting her with the garments. Elastic hours to accommodate the socializing of the family were a servant’s lot. Household sewing was also expected of housemaids and those with good needlework skills were highly sought after. Sewing was a lady’s occupation and therefore any servant engaged in this work, which was clean and required specific skills, was of higher status. The work

22 Taking journal writing as normal activity for Miss Leake, she was too unwell to write between 20 March and 16 April 1855.
might include darning linen and worsted garments, turning and hemming sheets, making
pillows and cushions, sewing simple undergarments, or repairing and altering dresses.\textsuperscript{23}

The Rosedale cook prepared food for the household, not just the family, so daily
cooked for at least seven adults. Food did not arrive in small packages, particularly in the
country. Meat came by the carcass and flour, rice and sugar by the barrel. It was heavy work:
preparing and cleaning joints of meat, game and poultry, washing vegetables, making butter
and cheese, and carrying everything between store, scullery and kitchen.

The stove needed to be watched and tended and the cook had to learn to gauge its heat
and performance. Everything about the stove was heavy iron: the firebox and oven doors, the
hotplates, the kettles and the saucepans. All kitchen work was weighty: cutting and carrying
firewood, managing the fire, opening the firebox door many times a day, lifting the pots and
pans, not to mention the cooking. Each meal included several courses with a range of dishes
and the portions were substantial. Besides preparing daily meals, baking, preserving and
brewing was the cook’s province. At Rosedale, the gardener made the candles.\textsuperscript{24} The cook
would clock up many weary hours on flagstone floors traipsing from stove to table to bench
to sink, all in separate rooms, in a continuous march of food preparation.\textsuperscript{25} Kitchen cleaning
was extensive and regular heavy work.

In the early years of the colony cookbooks were not widely used. Many kitchen
servants, and some mistresses, were not literate. Household manuals and recipe books of the
early decades of the nineteenth century offered general instructions and ingredients together.
Few included baking or cooking directions. Sarah Leake does not mention recipes for her
cooking and possibly relied on her mother’s.\textsuperscript{26} Successive cooks could read and, given their
limited experience in elite homes, would have required instruction, from both the mistress
and from written guides, on what was expected and how to prepare it. Books known to be in
the colony during its early decades, and likely in the Rosedale offices, included Dods’ \textit{Cooks
and Housewives Manual}, Henderson’s \textit{Housekeepers Instruction} and Acton’s \textit{Modern
\textsuperscript{23} Some of these tasks are listed in Beeton, \textit{Beeton’s Book of Household Management}, p. 997. Others are taken
from entries in Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.”
\textsuperscript{24} Sarah Elizabeth Leake, “Journal, 1 October 1862 - 7 June 1867,” Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections,
University of Tasmania Library, 1854-55, L1/H81.
\textsuperscript{25} Flagstone was preferred in colonial Tasmania, as seen at Woolmers and Runnymead. In England the surface
was more likely linoleum.
\textsuperscript{26} Elizabeth Leake’s receipts (then the term for recipes) are contained in an unpaged memorandum book. Dates
on the recipe pages suggest they were written out c1811. Elizabeth Leake had been married about six years and
had 3 or 4 very young children. The recipes may have been taken down from others in anticipation of life in
Hamburg. Elizabeth Leake, “Memoranda Book c1800-1840,” Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections,
University of Tasmania Library.
Cookery. It was not until 1864 that Tasmania’s, and Australia’s, first locally published cookbook, Abbott’s *English and Australian Cookery Book* appeared. It had to compete with the already ubiquitous Mrs Beeton and survived only a single print run.

The housemaids and groom often had duties that brought them to the kitchen. Food to be served to the family and their guests had to be carried out the kitchen door along a short covered way, through a side door, along the passage and into the dining room. Any servant could be called upon for the duty of waiting on the dining-room table. When there were many guests, all the house servants and additional hired staff would be required. Sarah Leake was often in the kitchen: to inspect its state of cleanliness, to give instructions, and to cook herself. It was acceptable for genteel women in the Victorian era to prepare cakes, sweets and other delicacies. Sarah Leake, perhaps because of the isolation of her colonial childhood, did more diverse cooking and made savoury dishes from time to time, but she did not cook daily fare or manage the stove. She was much vexed when the cook ruined her plum cakes in the oven.

Laundry was servants’ work. Washing meant soaking, boiling, bluing, rinsing, wringing, hanging, folding and pressing and was hard manual labour. Some households, including Rosedale, sent the wash out: the sheets, towels, sundry coverlets, table linen, and men’s shirts, collars and underwear. Elite women may have been tempted to stay in bed during the day to reduce the number of times they had to dress or to avoid the necessary and expected layers of clothing, but all had to be washed eventually. The lady’s maid, if there was one, washed women’s underwear and dresses at home. Otherwise it was a duty for a housemaid or laundress, including taking care of delicate fabrics. This could mean unpicking parts of frocks to wash just those segments that were soiled. The dress was then remade.

---


32 An 1848 account for laundry sent to the then washerwoman, Mrs Pears, lists bags of washing with numbers of items. It has 55 entries, some of which comprised 5 separate bags or items. Sundry items included blankets and quilts. It appeared to represent the laundry for one month, and if this is correct, it is an astonishing amount of washing. The total bill was £15.17.0. Mrs Pears for Washing, 26 June 1848, Leake Papers, L1/B898.

33 These garments were likely to include a chemise; a corset [or for the unfashionable, poor, hardworking or sensible, just stays which were padded not boned]; a camisole of white cotton, shaped at the waste, to cover the corset; petticoats; a crinoline form – metal or whalebone cage which buttoned or tied at the waist; and knee-length drawers. Flanders, *The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed*, p. 270.
The physicality of the work was extreme: scrubbing floors pushing the bucket ahead, scrubbing table tops and shelves in the kitchen and pantry, scrubbing clothes then winding them through a mangle, carrying wood or coal, building the fire and cleaning the grate afterwards, carrying buckets to water and slops up and down stairs. When there were guests the work multiplied: trunks of clothes to carry to bedrooms, odd requests and at odd hours, more food, more places at the table, more cleaning up.

One housemaid would be required upstairs to assist Sarah Leake to dress between readying the dining room and serving on the days Sarah emerged for breakfast. Eliza, as the upper housemaid, would have enjoyed this lighter duty and would have learned the mistress’s preferences in toilette and dress. Eliza had the task to carry hot water to Sarah Leake’s bedroom, to lay out the choice of frock and underwear, and help her into the garments if that was required. The maid’s routine may have been repeated in reverse at night having earlier in the evening assisted the mistress to dress for dinner. The time of day was of no matter to Eliza; she had nowhere else to be.

Keeping Rosedale was work. Sarah Leake did assist from time to time where tasks were of particular delicacy or required participant supervision. She would arrange cupboards and shelves, count the laundry, instruct servants in her preferred methods and in tasks that were foreign to them, and arrange furniture although she would have directed the groom, or perhaps one or more of her brothers, to physically shift the items.

**Rosedale’s house servants**

The Leake family was well used to living with felons and the arrivals in the 1850s were unexceptional. Most comers in the early years of the decade were convicts or emancipists who had experienced the convict system for periods of varying length and intensity. The men had original or subsequent convictions for abusive and unruly behaviour and both men and women had shown a taste for alcohol or a tendency to absent themselves.

In contemporary fiction the Vandemonian convict maid was reviled. Elements of management included the mistress little caring for the feelings of women servants,

---

34 Caroline Woolmer Leakey, *The Broad Arrow: Being the Story of Maida Gwynnham a 'Lifer' in Van Diemen's Land*, North Ryde, NSW: Eden, 1988, p. 181. Maida Gwynnham, the pitiful convict heroine, is put to work as housemaid, parlourmaid, cook, and to wait on the dining table during her term in the Evelyn household. She is never asked to mind the baby for, having a life term for a conviction of infanticide, the lady of the house distrusted her with the infant.
humiliating them and ensuring they were keenly aware of their inferior position.35 Sarah Leake’s journal does not indicate these extremes. She said little about any servant, irrespective of their convict status. Generally individual servants were noticed only when something was unacceptable; like burning the cakes, getting drunk or staying out late without permission. There was no praise. The key elements of being a successful convict servant were to be hardworking, faultless, sober and invisible. The impression was that convict servants, in general, were a trial to be tolerated. The chief concern about them was the possibility that their criminal past, predominantly as thieves, would tempt them into crime when members of the family were out. It is unsurprising that Rosedale was not left unattended by a family member. Notwithstanding this deeply felt concern, there was no evidence in the Leake Papers, or apparent in individual convict records, of theft by convict servants while at Rosedale.

The house servant was ‘lost from view’; invisible to those who were not servants.36 Their work was endless, stretching beyond the middle distance into eternity. Every act of the family made work for a servant. Single women were preferred as housemaids. They were unencumbered by family, available for the long hours they might be required to work, and able to live in accommodation attached to the main house. Free women who worked as servants stayed in the sociable environment of the larger towns if they could but convict women went where they were sent. Convict women servants were not companions to the mistress. Sarah Leake found the women convict servants of her neighbour Mrs Harrison untrustworthy and was not confident in the information they provided about their mistress.37 Servants were also pawns in others’ disputes. George Meredith, in a letter to his daughter Fanny, complained his daughter-in-law, Mrs Charles, had instructed her servants not to allow his servants in her house.38

It was not until some years after the end of transportation that a pattern of tenure became more noticeable at Rosedale. The paternalistic environment, coupled with an adult household, provided a benign working environment for some and a small number of house servants and farm workers stayed on for years. Others went or were sent off after only a few weeks: for offending or by absconding, and not all were convicts. Many workers, it seems,

38 George Meredith to Fanny Meredith, 24 December 1853, Hobart: Special Collection, University of Tasmania, G4/89. He was complaining about Louisa Anne Meredith but referred to her in this letter as Mrs Charles.
departed as soon as legally able. Given that the house took at least four servants to function and the farm had around ten men at work at any one time, the number of people through the gate, or door, or ledger, was considerable.

Although Leake was the master to all Rosedale convict or free workers, his wife then his daughter was mistress to the house servants. The mistress did not choose those she managed: she trained and supervised those who were selected by the master. In this she took on a role in the convict system: daily responsibility for male and female felons. Sarah Leake could punish by reducing their privileges, send individuals to the magistrate, and present evidence that would influence their degree of freedom. Some women of her ilk were more public in their exercise of authority though it exacted a toll on their health. Ellen Tanner, Mrs Charles Viveash, in a letter to her mother, complained that sending a convict servant to the magistrate made her weak with nervousness such that she could not repeat the effort for another two recalcitrant convicts. She hoped the example set in the first instance might have a salutary effect on the others. Sarah Leake left the discipline to her father but her complaints influenced his decisions. In the first years of her residence in Tasmania, Elizabeth Leake had viewed female convict servants as immoral and had not wanted them in her home. Perhaps this view influenced the staffing patterns over the long term for no housekeeper was ever employed. Maybe John Leake and his sons did not want an outsider running their home. A spinster daughter or sister was most convenient: she was unlikely to abscond. Alternatively, Leake, who also did not employ an overseer on the estate, may have wanted to centre control in his own hands to ensure compliance with his routines, preferences and demands.

The normal routine required four servants: two housemaids and a cook and a groom. It was difficult to determine who held these roles in February 1852. Unlike the return home of the master when the house servants would present for muster and inspection, the arrival of a new maid did not disturb the running of the house. When Eliza arrived at the quadrangle gate from Hobart Town, likely having been collected from a dusty journey atop the coach by

---

39 The journal has examples of Miss Leake giving training and advice to servants. Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 1 January 1855.
42 Alexander interpreted the household as having three convict servants in 1854-55: a housemaid (Eliza Williams), a female servant (Charlotte Scott) and a male servant (George) who was the cook: the difference being not counting the groom, whom she did not identify. George Trinder was the cook, George Collins was the groom. Alexander, “The Public Role of Women in Tasmania, 1803-1914,” p. 75.
William or Charles in the Rosedale gig, she would have met her fellow servants by happenstance. Thomas Westlake, the convict groom, would not have been sent alone to collect a new maid. Elizabeth Leake, the mistress, was gravely ill and mostly bedridden. This may have influenced Leake to select a convict with the indent trade of nurse and needlewoman.

Margaret Rooney may have been delegated to lead the way to Eliza’s room. Margaret, a Dubliner, was a Protestant by marriage. She would have lived in a cottage in the outer quadrangle with husband Benjamin Sculthorpe, a farm labourer. Margaret, too, was a convicted thief but with a longer sentence than Eliza. She probably gave Eliza an encouraging smile for she had fared well under the patronage of Rosedale over the years. Margaret had arrived per Phoebe on 1 January 1845 having left Dublin in September 1844. She was convicted with a sentence of 10 years for larceny having stolen £5. She had often been convicted before and also acquitted many times for assault. Margaret’s record noted she was considered ‘bad.’ It also indicated that her trade was farm servant and that she was assigned to a location in Campbell Town, assumed to be Rosedale, in 1845. She became the wife of Benjamin Sculthorpe, per Mount Stewart Elphinstone, who had come to Leake in 1849. Sculthorpe was quickly attracted to the grey-eyed blonde. Permission to marry would not have been a foregone conclusion for Sculthorpe was newly arrived and Margaret, despite having served enough of her sentence to be considered suitably reformed, had spent time in the cells. Perhaps Leake identified a man who would serve him well and supported the marriage as an element in a larger unwritten bargain. Later that year they were married by William Bedford in the Campbell Town parish church. Benjamin, listed as a painter aged 29, signed the register. Margaret, listed as a house servant aged 26, made her mark. John Venn, who was a convict farm worker at Rosedale, made his mark as a witness as did fellow convict, but one of unknown employment, Ann Kilmurray.

In September 1851 Leake appeared to hire Mary Mannon to maintain the house complement. Mary was an immigrant who had arrived on the Beulah and there remains a letter seeking security for her on the journey from Hobart Town. Had she arrived safely, Mary would likely still be in the house early in the following year, but there is no record of her at Rosedale: no wages were accounted for, no note of her arrival, nor any letter or

43 Margaret Rooney per Phoebe, CON/41/1/5.
44 Sculthorpe/Rooney, RGD 37/1/8 /1849.
45 A Perry to John Leake, 9 September 1851, Leake Papers, L1/C/71. There is no detailed personal record of this immigrant.
contract in her name. The staffing pattern suggests Eliza replaced her.

Within one year of arrival Eliza was steady in the role of upper housemaid. She was allocated a greater variety of tasks, including sewing and fancy cooking, and was instructed by Sarah in some of the finer skills, like preparing drake feather and stuffing pillowcases. Eliza was the youngest house servant but, by the time of Sarah Leake’s journal, the most senior. The work of the under housemaid was done by a succession of less successful appointees in the early years Eliza was in the house: Susannah Green, Charlotte Scott and Susan Green. Susan Green proved a stayer and she was still at Rosedale when Eliza departed. Jane Wilson, who seems to have replaced Eliza in 1857, was still in the house in the 1860s for she is mentioned by Sarah Leake in a later volume of her journal.

In March 1853 a new housemaid can be clearly identified. Susannah Green arrived in Hobart, from London, on 14 April 1850 aboard the St Vincent. She was to serve seven years for larceny by a lodger. In effect she had pledged bedding to another and had served four months previously for a similar crime. Susannah was a diminutive widow of 27 years with the trade of laundress. She had one child but no mention is made of it bar a tick in the relevant column in her indent. She was sent immediately to the interior for she was banned from service in the district of Hobart Town. Susannah went to Leake at Campbell Town on 22 March 1853. This followed three months’ hard labour in the Hobart House of Correction for not having returned directly to the depot. But she did not stay at Rosedale for on 16 June 1853 she was again noted as in the Hobart Town House of Correction. There is no misdemeanour listed on her convict record and it is possible Susannah was simply unsuitable.

There is a gap between Susannah’s departure and the arrival of Charlotte Scott. This may well reflect the shortage of house servants in 1852 and beyond. By 1854 employers ‘seeking female convict workers were being rationed,’ thus it is possible that gaps in the Rosedale servant list were actual, and related to the failure to procure staff and the need for

---

47 By this time Eliza was 20. All other convict women who served during the period were aged 30 or more.
48 Two Vandemonian convict women were named Susannah Green and evidence suggests both served at Rosedale. They are differentiated herein by given name Susannah Green per St Vincent and Susan Green per Aurora for she was listed in the day book as Susan Green. There was one convict woman precisely named as Susan Green transported to Tasmania. She arrived per Princess Charlotte from Sydney Town at Port Dalrymple in 1820 to serve seven years for shoplifting. Her record is marked to NSW per Janus. CON 13/1/2; CON 40/1/3.
49 Leake, “Journal, 1 October 1862 - 7 June 1867,” Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania, 1862-67). Jane Wilson was noted as sewing, a higher order task marking her upper housemaid.
50 Susannah Green per St Vincent, CON 41/1/25.
51 Susannah Green per St Vincent, CON 19/1/8.
employers to wait in line. Some employers had to wait upwards of four months and there were rumblings of favouritism in the hiring depots.⁵³

Charlotte was Irish and her record suggests she was rather boisterous. She was serving seven years for stealing a purse and money and had previous offences for similar theft. Charlotte had been imprisoned for assault in Ireland, and had spent time ‘on the town’ before her transportation. Before her service at Rosedale Charlotte had a colourful record of absconding and drinking and she twice had the indulgence of ticket of leave revoked for misdemeanours. She began her contract at Rosedale in December 1853. Her bad habits did not change and she was dismissed by Leake in October 1854 and returned to the Female Factory in Ross from whence she had come.⁵⁴ Charlotte was closely supervised by the mistress. Washing she did was inspected. Charlotte was the only house servant of the Roman Catholic faith for the entire period of interest. She was also the only maid who was not fully literate, for she could not write. The Roman Catholic Irishmen in the yard, like Michael Killymede and Patrick Larkin, were likely more appealing to Charlotte than the Protestant house staff. Her record suggests she fraternised with the men on the farm and her fondness for alcohol saw her dismissed for she returned ‘tipsy’ from Campbell Town.⁵⁵

Susan Green arrived per *Aurora* in Hobart Town from London on 10 August 1851. Leake’s day book identified Susan Green as being on the wages roll at the end of 1854.⁵⁶ There is no entry at the back of the book for her and no details of the ship or date of her arrival as a convict. Susan had been sentenced to serve 10 years for stealing wearing apparel from a Mr Williams of Maidstone. Her trade was listed as housemaid, plain cook and laundress. She was aged 28 upon arrival, Protestant, and could read and write.⁵⁷ Susan would have been a sought-after servant in any household for she had a record of good behaviour from the surgeon and was relatively mature. Her first assignment was to Wilkinson of Evandale, which places her north of the Midlands. But just of short of a year she was sentenced to six months’ hard labour for neglect of duty, disobeying orders and being absent without leave. It is assumed, but not confirmed in the record, that she was returned to Wilkinson at the conclusion of this period of incarceration. The following year she was in the

---

⁵³ Female Convicts Research Centre, www.femaleconvicts.org.au/
⁵⁷ Susannah Green per *Aurora*, CON 41/1/31 and CON 51/1/7.
Launceston House of Correction where, on 30 October 1852, she was delivered of an illegitimate son, John. He died.\textsuperscript{58} Susan sought permission to marry John Robson, a free man, on 14 August 1853 but there is no evidence that this marriage took place.\textsuperscript{59} The services listed on her convict record indicate she was assigned on 10 October 1853 but the location is not legible. In 1854 Susan was not able to pick and choose her locations as she was still under sentence and without a ticket of leave.\textsuperscript{60} Susan remained at Rosedale until April 1857 when she was replaced by Caroline Bryant.

Two women named Jane Wilson were transported in 1852 per \textit{Sir Robert Seppings}. The records confuse the two women. The one listed as Jane Wilson (2) served at Rosedale.\textsuperscript{61} She had been tried at Westminster, London, her native place, in 1851 for stealing from the person and sentenced to 10 years’ transportation. Jane, a plain cook, was a Protestant who could read and write. She left a husband and four children behind her. Jane was awarded a conditional pardon in 1856. Her record shows no indication of Rosedale service, but she was at Ross. She is the more likely one to have come as an emancipist to Rosedale in 1857. She would then have been aged 29.\textsuperscript{62}

The Rosedale housemaids circulated through the prison without walls. Susannah moved from hard labour at the Cascades to hard labour in the house then back to the gaol. Her experience of prison had commenced in Britain, for prior offences. Charlotte, similarly, rotated through the cells, at Ross, having also experienced gaol in Ireland for a previous offence and served time in the cells at the Cascades. Susannah and Charlotte were banned from service in Hobart Town so were further punished by social isolation. Susan went immediately to private service, dispatched north from the Hobart Town dock, thence to the Launceston Female Factory for six months’ hard labour. She returned to service but, after less than a year, she was sent back to the Launceston Female Factory to await the birth of her child. Susan may still have been there, grieving for her dead baby and serving time for the misdemeanour of pregnancy, when she was selected to go south to Campbell Town and

\textsuperscript{58} The infant John Green died on 22 December 1852. Female Convict Research Centre, \url{www.femaleconvicts.org.au}.

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Permission to Marry Index}, Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office.

\textsuperscript{60} Susan Green was awarded a ticket of leave on 10 April 1855 and a conditional pardon on 22 July 1856. It is unclear where she was when this occurred.

\textsuperscript{61} It is near impossible to tell who the woman Jane Wilson, listed as at Rosedale in 1857 was, including whether she was a convict, an emancipist or a free immigrant. A review of the documentary evidence indicated that Jane Wilson was not, or extremely unlikely to have been, the Jane Wilson listed as being transported per \textit{Nautilus} 1838, \textit{Rajah} 1841, \textit{Royal Admiral} 1842, \textit{Woodbridge} 1843, \textit{Garland Grove} 1843, \textit{Lloyds} 1845, \textit{Sea Queen} 1846, \textit{Earl Grey} 1850, \textit{St Vincent} 1850, \textit{Aurora} 1851, or Jane Wilson (1) per \textit{Sir Robert Seppings} 1852.

\textsuperscript{62} Jane Wilson (2), per \textit{Sir Robert Seppings}, CON 41/1/34.
Rosedale. Jane, too, had seen hard labour at Ross for the misdemeanour of pregnancy, with additional time for fighting whilst there. Eliza’s tenure was unusual: she arrived at Rosedale straight from the docks; she stayed more than four years, requiring her to agree to multiple sequential contracts; she left with a conditional pardon.

These were not the only housemaids at this time but others have gone unrecorded. Leake offered household work to the wife of any of his indentured farm workers as part of their recruitment but none are identified as having taken up this offer, although it may have occurred on an irregular basis. Further, additional help was brought in for special events. Leake hired a waiter, who also appears to have cooked, from William Morrison’s tavern for three days during the Governor’s visit in October 1854.

Margaret was the only married housemaid and she had not been recruited as such. Charlotte and Susan had each applied successfully for permission to marry prior to their service at Rosedale but there is no record of these marriages being solemnized. Susannah and Jane had both left children in Britain. Fraternising was punishable for convict women and being delivered of an illegitimate child meant a term in a female factory, as both had experienced. There are no suggestions of such behaviour by the women house servants while at Rosedale. And, as Charlotte found, a night drinking in town meant ‘returned to government’ for a woman servant in the Leake home. The high walls of the domestic quadrangle created an enclosure of moral propriety for all who did not arrive through the entrance hall.

Bells were the quintessential marker of the master-servant relationship. They were installed at Rosedale, starting with the one at the front door. Where they would ring is a mystery, but likely in the back hall near to the door out to the kitchen. Miss Leake would ring: Margaret or Mary or Eliza or Susannah or Charlotte or Susan or Jane would answer. Bring hot water. Remove the slops. Bring the tray. Remove the tray. Open the door. Close the door. Yes Miss.

The duties of cook, kitchen maid and scullery maid were closely related and could be completed by the cook if this was the only servant in the kitchen, as was the case at Rosedale.

---

63 It is possible that Miss Leake did not identify some individual servants in the house in any way in her journal – they could be silent, nameless or collectivised.
64 Morrison’s was a public house in Campbell Town owned by William Morrison. Its formal name was The Caledonian.
65 Charlotte Scott’s application to marry Peter Smith per Radcliffe was approved in February 1850, CON 52/1/3. Susannah Green was given permission to marry Robert Cashburn in May 1854. Robert Cashburn per Rodney, CON 51/2/7.
66 ‘Returned to government’ was a common euphemism for being dismissed from service and sent back to gaol.
Cooking had a routine dictated by the menu and the requirements of the various meals and dishes. Most food preparation was done in the homestead kitchen: baking, pastry-making and preserving as well as ordinary cooking. Despite the availability of exotic condiments, spices, teas and groceries most daily fare was concocted from locally sourced raw ingredients.\(^{67}\) The cook could have the full care of the dining room as well as the kitchen. This was not the case at Rosedale for, with two housemaids and no kitchen or scullery maid, the division of work was gendered: a male cook to do the heavy work of maintaining the kitchen and cooking the majority of meals, and female housemaids to carry and serve at the table, and maintain the dining room on most occasions, with the groom, suitably attired, to assist if need be.

Menu planning and food consumption were guided by the social customs and personal habits of the household. Bryson reminds that ‘by the middle of the nineteenth century, gargantuan portions had become institutionalized and routine.’\(^{68}\) The number of courses, the choices of dish and the size of the actual serves measured these portions. Middle-aged men dominated the Rosedale dining room and they would have harboured expectations of robust meals and a well-laden table. The Leake family habit was to consume lunch in the middle of the day and dinner in the evening. These arrangements were altered to meet arrangements for Sunday worship, the needs of guests and on specific occasions such as arrival and departure of family members, celebratory days, and gubernatorial visits. For guests, the menu would have reflected the status of the visitors as well as the aspirations of the family. Dinner guests meant extra work for the cook and the mistress more often in the kitchen preparing fancy desserts.

Lunch was a lighter meal, generally composed partly of leftover concoctions in soup, pastry or stew and pudding with fruit. Custom dictated a family dinner of three courses, extended to five or more courses when guests were present. For the family, the cook would prepare a first course of soup, fish or other entrée, a second course of game, poultry or meat with vegetables and sauces, and a dessert course. Up to three choices were likely at each course.\(^{69}\) In practice, dessert could mean any or all of baked or boiled puddings, tarts, jellies, sweet ices or custard. All the food was expected to arrive at the table hot or cold as designated, and in the right order. For the servants, this meant carrying and serving food on trays and dishes, removing or replenishing plates and cutlery as it was used, and all the while

\(^{67}\) The imported delicacies included ‘souchong and orange pekoe tea, coffee, cheroots, wines and spirits.’ “Leake Family Papers: Summary and Index,” Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, c1979, p. 3.

\(^{68}\) Bryson, *At Home: A Short History of Private Life*, p. 89.

being invisible. Tea was often served, in the evening to dinner guests, and sometimes in the afternoon to lady visitors.

The Rosedale kitchen served the household. The cook prepared meals for house servants as well as family members and managed the ration supplies for the farm hands, all under the supervision of the mistress, who would sometimes count the rations herself. The cook at Rosedale regularly prepared food for up to ten diners and this number could double when there were guests. Not that they ate together: the servants ate when possible and might find their meals made up of leftovers or the remains on the serving plates.\footnote{Flanders, The Victorian House: Domestic Life from Childbirth to Deathbed, p. 228. There was no servant hall at Rosedale. The kitchen is likely the only place they were permitted to sit other than in their bedrooms.} The mistress supervised the kitchen cleaning as closely as other activities of the cook. It entailed emptying and blacking the range, scouring shelves, cupboards, tables and benches and floors in the kitchen and scullery, and washing cooking utensils. Food preparation was also weighty work: preparing and cleaning joints of meat, game and poultry, washing vegetables, making butter and cheese, and carrying everything between store, scullery and kitchen, all flagstone-floored. Cutting and carrying wood to feed the kitchen range was the cook’s task.

Leake employed men for the role of cook. This practice dated to the earliest days of Rosedale as was common in colonial kitchens due partly to the lack of women considered suitable for the role and partly to the physical requirements of the work. At the opening of the decade the cook was Frederick Derrick. In September 1850 he came to Rosedale as cook, and his wife Ellen Moren as housemaid. Derrick had been a steward on the Marie Somes which travelled between Launceston and Melbourne. Both were free settlers and had a contract with Leake for a year.\footnote{The agreement, in Frederick Derrick’s hand, was signed on 10 September 1850. Leake Papers, L1/C59.} They married just weeks before travelling to Rosedale.\footnote{Frederick Derrick and Ellen Moren, RGD 37/1/9/1850. This record lists Derrick as a steward on the Marie Somes.} The couple left at contract completion, some months prior to Eliza Williams’ arrival, and returned to Melbourne. They had stayed for exactly the period of the contract for reasons unknown. It would have been a good billet with housing for a married couple and work for both but something was amiss. Leake reverted to his usual practice of hiring single people having lost the cook and a housemaid in one go.

There is a gap in the records. It is not known who took up work in the kitchen from the time Derrick left in September 1851 and John Whitaker arrived in January 1853. Leake did try to recruit a cook from his Hobart Town agent in April 1852 but was unsuccessful and
lost money in the process. Whitaker was not a good choice and was returned to the government after only five weeks’ service. This was marked in the day book as well as his convict record. Whitaker was a much-convicted man during his servitude, particularly for absence and drunkenness. Leake sent him to the magistrate on 7 February 1853 for being drunk and breaking out of a room in which he was confined in his inebriated state for which he was sentenced to six months’ hard labour. Whitaker would have made a strong impression: a short bald burn-scarred man without eyebrows. He was unfortunate-looking for a cook, maybe this appearance resulted from his lack of sobriety in the kitchen, or perhaps it was due to an industrial accident.

Whitaker’s replacement, George Trinder, had the original trade of labourer but had remade himself as a cook. He possibly acquired this skill at Port Arthur, where he had been in the period immediately before his assignment to Rosedale. His Port Arthur servitude was indicative of a difficult man but the convict system may have made him thus. Trinder had arrived, aged 19, in 1846 to serve 15 years for a second burglary conviction. He spent more than two years at the Darlington Probation Station and gained 167 days off his sentence for hard work. Trinder was sent to the Midlands but he did not stay out of trouble. Another conviction for burglary in 1849 resulted in a life sentence, and transfer to Port Arthur for four years.

When Trinder replaced the violent and unruly John Whitaker as cook Leake must have wondered how matters would lie for Trinder, too, was soon sent to the magistrate for getting drunk and behaving violently in both assaulting the constable and damaging the watch house. When Trinder returned to Rosedale after 14 days in solitary the experience seemed to settle him. Likely Eliza cooked while Trinder did this time. Having no cook out back in the kitchen was more disruptive to the routine of the gaol than having the mistress upstairs unwell in her cell. Trinder was reassigned to William Morrison at the Caledonian and commenced there on 13 December 1854. Nothing in the records suggests this was related to bad behaviour or relationships at Rosedale but the words exchanged between him and the mistress, who spent the morning with him on 11 December 1854, either contributed to this move or resulted from his wish to depart.

James Renwick was on a ticket of leave working as cook at Ashby when he was transferred to Rosedale, at no notice, because of Trinder’s departure. He was serving ten

73 Mrs Drury to John Leake, 23 April 1852, Leake Papers, L1/C74.
74 John Whitaker per Maria Somes, CON 31/1/96.
75 George Trinder per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/84.
years for stabbing with intent to do bodily harm and became the only servant in the house with a conviction for a crime of violence. He had spent nearly three years in prison before being transported and had received a very good report.\textsuperscript{76} According to entries in the day book, Renwick came to Rosedale as a ‘house servant’ on 11 December 1854. The Brickhill accounts suggest he was at Rosedale during 1855, 1856 and 1857 and a later entry suggests he was rehired in 1858.\textsuperscript{77} As a ticket of leave holder Renwick would have had some say in the matter of the transfer from Ashby to Rosedale. Cooking in the Leake family house rather than for Arthur Leake and his workmen may have had some appeal. This man apparently stayed on.\textsuperscript{78}

It was accepted practice to consider the groom a house rather than a farm servant, despite the fact that he generally slept above the stables. According to Beeton, while the groom’s first duty was to the horses, he was also expected to perform:

… the duties of a valet, to ride out with his master, on occasions to wait at table, and otherwise assist in the house: in these cases, he should have the means of dressing himself, and keeping his clothes entirely away from the stables.\textsuperscript{79}

The stable duties included feeding, watering and cleaning the horses; care and maintenance of the bridles, reins and saddles; mucking out; and the maintenance and upkeep of the carriage, gig, and other domestic vehicles. In theory the carriage was to be cleaned to a meticulous spotlessness immediately upon its return and polished and dusted prior to next use, likely an impractical expectation in the dusty conditions of the Tasmanian farm. At Rosedale, in the absence of a coachman (a senior servant) or a stable boy (a lowlier servant), the groom had all the tasks, including coach driving. The groom’s work was dirty but he had to present himself clean and appropriately dressed when driving out. Successive grooms were issued with clothing.\textsuperscript{80} The ‘uniform’ outer garments would have stayed behind when the groom moved on but wear and tear and the varying sizes of the men who filled the role meant new items were issued from time to time.

When Miss Leake journeyed in the gig, it would be prepared and brought to the front

\textsuperscript{76} James Renwick per Equestrian, CON 33/1/111.
\textsuperscript{77} A Brickhill account refers to the request for payment from Joseph Brickhill, an emancipated shopman, to John Leake for items purchased at his general goods store in Campbell Town. Brickhill’s was used extensively for family and farm purchases.
\textsuperscript{78} Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
\textsuperscript{79} Beeton, Beeton’s Book of Household Management, p. 972.
\textsuperscript{80} For example, the itemised bill from John Macgregor, Tailor and Clothier of Hobarton includes for William Leake a fancy cashmere vest, for Arthur Leake a pair of best white drill trowsers, for the coachman a livery coat. Account Rendered, Macgregor to Leake 17 May 1845, Leake Papers, L1/B898.
door of the main house by the groom. When the carriage was required, the groom managed
the horses as carriage driver and was therefore a distant presence at the houses and public
places the mistress visited. He held the horses whilst she was at the library, at church,
visiting, or shopping. In theory, driving the carriage was a major task and the coach driver’s
most important function was the protection of the carriage occupants from accident. He was
not expected to descend to assist passengers for the control of the horses was paramount and
most carriages were designed such that ‘even ladies’ could get out from the inside.\textsuperscript{81} The
groom could and did inflict disharmony on the passenger’s day. Sarah Leake variously
commented on the groom’s capacity to lame the horses, to prepare them wrongly so that the
journey was interrupted by stopping to alter the reins, to fail to adequately prepare the
conveyance requiring stoppages for repairs, to ignore her instructions, or simply to be too
drunk to do his work and cause her to remain at home.\textsuperscript{82}

The old coach resting in a corner of the stable at Rosedale suggested as one of the
original family carriages,\textsuperscript{83} is a vehicle that could have held at least eight people, but only
three or four would have been able to travel inside particularly with women’s hoop skirts to
accommodate. The outside passengers, arranged in twos behind and above the enclosed
passenger box, would have swayed and lurched as the carriage careered over the rough roads
in the dust and wind under the hands of an ill-tempered groom. Any servant conveyed to
town for church or other private business would have travelled outside.

Leake’s day book indicates Thomas Westlake was the groom from November 1850.
After him, in order of their service to Leake over the period of interest, were George Collins,
William Short, John Parsons, George Jobson and Robert Crook. Only Jobson would prove
satisfactory and he was the only one without a convict past.

Thomas Westlake, unlike the men who came after him, was short. He would have
needed a box to mount the carriage. He was also a lady’s man and played up while in Leake’s
employ. Westlake was transported for life per \textit{Radcliffe} for violent assault and highway
robbery: a second conviction. A native of Devon, he had the trade of labourer and groom.
Some of his many transgressions were while at Rosedale. He had a ticket of leave approved

\textsuperscript{81} Beeton, \textit{Beeton’s Book of Household Management}, p. 976.
\textsuperscript{82} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” See, for example, entries for 15 May 1854, 14 June1854, 4
September 1854 and 10 September 1854.
\textsuperscript{83} As at 3 December 2011 when the researcher inspected the Rosedale gardens and farm sheds on an organised
tour of members of the Australian Garden History Society. Despite the tour guide’s commentary, the carriage
appeared to be a stagecoach, not a private one based on its size and extant images of public transport. Despite
this, the limitations of skirts would still have applied.
and revoked many times. In May 1852 he was sentenced to seven days’ solitary confinement for misconduct after he was caught with the diminutive Eliza Kenny, in the laundry at her place of work. Eliza Kenny, a convict maid from a homestead at nearby Stoney Creek, served out the harsher sentence of six months hard labour in the female factory for consorting with him.  

Westlake’s master, Leake, was deprived of labour for a relatively short period whilst the household employing Kenny was left wanting for months. Was he more useful? Was she held more responsible or less moral? They wed after she was released. William Bedford did the honours in Campbell Town for the well-matched short-stature couple. Given the list of charges on their conduct records, they were lucky to have the marriage approved. The date and location of the marriage suggest Westlake was still at Rosedale. He had a conditional pardon approved in June 1858. It appears he finished his sentence in Richmond.

George Collins, sentenced to seven years’ transportation for shoplifting and housebreaking, arrived in Tasmania per Aboukir on 20 March 1852. He was assigned to Leake on 10 November 1853. An Anglican, he could read and write a little and had generally been well behaved. His trade was machine maker. He was 24 when assigned to Leake and, with mermaid tattoos on each arm and a heavily pock-pitted face, was a noticeable man. Collins was groom and coachman for the journey to Hobart Town for Miss Leake and her father’s visit to Government House. He had been advanced £2 by Leake for expenses during the trip, reflective of a degree of confidence of the master in his servant. This confidence may have been cautionary for Collins had already been before the magistrate for drunkenness and resisting the constable on 14 February 1854. He received a sentence of 14 days solitary confinement. Upon release he was returned to Rosedale but he continued to behave ill. Collins departed in August 1854. His record did not improve for he was imprisoned with hard labour for three weeks at the end of that year for abusing his new mistress.

William Short was an emancipist. He had arrived in the colony per Sir George Seymour in February 1845 to serve a seven-year sentence for stealing a pocket book. He was Anglican and literate, and was a groom and waiter by trade. In these attributes he was seemingly very suitable for the mixed duties Leake required of him. He had earned his certificate of freedom in January 1850 and was employed by Leake as a free man under the

---

84 Eliza Kenny per Australasia, CON 41/1/24.
85 Thomas Westlake per Radcliffe, CON 33/1/91 and Eliza Kenny, per Australasia, CON 41/1/24. The marriage took place on 7 January 1853, RGD 37/1/12/1853.
86 George Collins per Aboukir, CON 33/1/106; CON 18/1/56.
87 Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
88 George Collins per Aboukir CON 33/1/106.
master and servant legislation. But, as his convict record displayed, Short had problems with alcohol and his temper. Despite maturity at about 35, he was an insolent disorderly man and had spent time in the Oatlands gaol since completing his term of transportation. Short was twice before the magistrate during his tenure at Rosedale, both times as a result of drunkenness. The second time he was gaoled for three months. He did not return to Rosedale.

The replacement groom, John Parsons, was another convicted thief. He had been transported for seven years for stealing a pruning knife and sheath. He arrived in Hobart Town on 3 July 1852, exactly three years from day of his trial. Parsons was a labourer by trade and barely literate. He was better suited to working on the farm rather than in the house. His liveried jacket may have covered the tattoos that coloured each arm but they would not have hidden those on the backs of his hands. Parsons’ arrival had been delayed by a nine-month term of hard labour for absconding from the Police Barracks. His convict record indicates he was to go to Leake in March 1854, possibly as part of a strategy by Leake to replace the unsuitable Collins, but this was foiled by Parsons’ unruliness. Thus, in the interim Collins was likely kept under sufferance and Short hired as a last and most unsatisfactory resort. Parsons was kept on as a farm worker after a new groom arrived to replace him in February 1855.

George Jobson was recruited in England by Charles Leake to fill the role of groom at the Rosedale stables. His trade was coachman and he arrived in Tasmania aboard the Fortitude on 15 February 1855 accompanied by his wife, Harriet, and two sons William aged 13 and Henry aged 10. Jobson, at 35 and with a wife and family, would have been seen as a steady man after the unruly set that had preceded him as groom. The Jobson family were well accepted at Rosedale. Peace settled on the stables as Jobson went about his work. Harriet Jobson was in and out of her cottage, a woman who liked a chat and a tempting morsel. Her younger son Henry became a favourite in the big house and was taken in the gig to town and given the privilege of opening gates on the trip between Rosedale and Ashby. Henry was

---

89 William Short per Sir George Seymour, CON 33/1/64; CON 14/1/26.
90 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
92 That Parsons continued to be listed as receiving wages indicates this. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
93 George Jobson per Fortitude, CB7/12/1/3.
94 As was later recalled by Eliza Williams. Eliza Williams to William Leake, 11 May 1876, Leake Papers, L1/M78.
taken through lessons in reading and arithmetic by the mistress, Miss Leake. He went daily to
the parlour, where he read aloud and worked at his copybook under her supervision. Two
decades later Sarah Leake was to provide the same service to her nieces.

Jobson was employed on a two-year indenture signed in England in late 1854. He and
the family departed Rosedale as soon as it expired. Maybe it was the isolation of the
Tasmanian countryside after English life; perhaps the lure of an independent life. Thus John
Leake recruited a new groom but he made an anomalous choice, despite the skill of the
newcomer, when he hired widower Robert Crook in December 1856. Crook had the trade of
groom and coachman but this man’s fondness for horses was extreme: he had been convicted
of bestiality with a filly in 1844. A death sentence was commuted to transportation for life
and he had spent time on Norfolk Island before being transferred to Tasmania. He was aged
45 and held a ticket of leave when he commenced at Rosedale. A tall, dark, grey-eyed man,
Crook would have lived above the stables, not in the cottage allocated to his predecessor, for
he had not remarried.95 And he did settle in for a time. The day book notes William Hunt,
who had come to the farm in 1857, was appointed groom in 1858.

While the theory of domestic management of the period specified roles and
responsibilities, the reality of life in a large house with many people coming and going was
that servants would ordinarily work across roles within the limits of gender expectations and
their physical capabilities. Trinder had been issued a waistcoat suggesting he sometimes
waited on the dining-room table. Parsons had a waistcoat and a livery coat indicating that he
was uniformed as coach driver but could also put in an appearance in the dining room. With a
male-dominated household the role of valet to Leake and his sons would have fallen to one of
the male servants. It may be that the groom undertook this, as it was accepted within that role,
but it is more likely that the men of the family largely did for themselves.

As members of the house staff, convict men were more trouble than convict women.
They generally had longer sentences, had greater experience of violence within the convict
system, and more misdemeanours entered on the record. While the groom could escape to the
company of the men in the sheds, the cook was incarcerated in the house. The other men
there were not company: they were officials of the prison.

Leake attempted to maintain continuity in his house servants. Recalcitrant servants, or
those who departed at the end of their tenure, were speedily replaced. For example, Renshaw

95 Robert Crook per Hydereaab to Norfolk Island; to Hobart Town per Pestongee Bomangee. CON 33/1/86.
His record indicates he was a widower.
arrived to replace Trinder in the kitchen within hours of Trinder’s unexpected departure. Estate management did not require the same level of exactitude. There the seasons and the tasks contributed to the timing of labour selection. Running sheep was the most important work and this included shepherding, shearing, breeding, maintaining fences and feed, tobacco growing and preparation for seasonal dips, and the presentation of sheep for sale and slaughter. Horses, bullocks, dairy cows, pigs and fowls added their noises to the farm racket and their needs to the workers labours. There were sheds and stock yards to build and maintain, fences to erect and mend, stock to be moved back and forward to pastures in the highlands, stump cutting, paddocks to plough, seed to sow, reap and stack, and the kitchen garden and orchard to tend.

The men

When Eliza Williams arrived at the quadrangle gate in February 1852 there were, as usual, about ten men working the farm under the supervision of Leake and his sons. There, in the isolation of the farm, was a troupe of rogues all at least a decade older than Eliza.96 Over the coming years they were followed by more thieves, swindlers, and killers of men and beasts. While none worked in chains they were all under the supervision of the master and did not have the freedom to come and go at will. Free men and young men were rare. None were there when Eliza arrived.97

‘Men’ was the undifferentiated term for male farm workers, referred to as such by Sarah Leake in her journal, and at Rosedale male farm workers were predominantly convict. George Gatenby reserved the term ‘men’ for convict workers and indicated other workers by name.98 The details of men on the estate may excite family historians and other researchers because of the preliminary work it represents but the point of the biographical sketches of the convict workers for this project was to restore humanness to the record, albeit fragmentary. The estate men worked to support the Leakes’ prosperity. John Leake named them in his accounting both for the enterprise and for the convict system. Sarah Leake did not distinguish

---

96 Appendix One presents selected characteristics of the Rosedale estate workers for the period.
97 The following men are also known from Leake’s day book to have been at Rosedale but they are unable to be further identified: Coleman, name not known; John Denier; James Elliot (arrived free in October 1854 via Drury the employment agent, Mr Drury to John Leake, 15 October 1852, Leake Papers, L1/61; John Hagan (arrived October 1854); Samuel Kettle; William Kidd (emigrant, arrived 1856); William Thomas (bricklayer, arrived in 1856); and Henry Temple.
98 Gatenby, “Diary of George Gatenby of ‘Bicton’ Campbell Town, 9 November 1847 to 31 January 1858.”
between them; the ‘men’ appear to have been no more than an amorphous instrument in her
affluence.

The farm-worker count is based on Leake’s list and in some cases is not confirmed by
the convict record or other public documents. The workforce was solidly of English origin
even though Irish-born made up about one in three convict estate workers for the period,
where origin was identified. Roughly, the average age of convicts or emancipated estate
workers upon arrival at Rosedale, irrespective of when they came, was 36 years.\textsuperscript{99} And,
within the convict group, the age differences could be as much as a generation. Convicts’
work was predominantly unskilled labouring. Those in the system continued to serve out their
time and progressively the men with shorter sentences, generally for less serious crime, were
emancipated. Those at Rosedale in the 1850s with short sentences had arrived in Tasmania
during the final years of transportation.

Most men in the yard had been at Rosedale for more than a year but would be gone
before the next was out. Only George Smith and Henry Brown were recent arrivals, each
having come in December of 1851. The longest serving Rosedale farm worker was John
Venn who had arrived in 1847. Also there were Henry Brown, George Haynes, John Hickey,
Sam Kettly, Benjamin Sculthorpe and gardener, James Connor. Likely there were others but,
as shearing traditionally was over before Christmas at Rosedale, it is possible there was a lull
in work during that hot summer month. The men would not even have been names to the new
housemaid. She had little freedom and no legitimate need to leave the house of her own
volition. Visiting the yard was as likely as a trip into Campbell Town. The separation
between house and estate was reinforced by the mistress and the wall. Eliza’s contact with
estate workers was limited to necessity and there was always the groom, who moved
constantly between house and yard, to be messenger.

The prison outbuildings had made their marks on the bodies and minds of the men.
Moses Cochrane, William Morton and Patrick Conroy had experienced Port Arthur. Each had
also worked in chains, done hard labour, been tied to the triangle and flogged, and
experienced solitary confinement. John Venn shared Cochrane and Conroy’s experience of
irons and the lash. Hard labour was a common punishment for misdemeanours but, unlike
most, John Appleton, James Connor and William Dibbin had done theirs in chains. All men
had spent periods in the cells. For George Haynes and Robert Crook, these cells had been on

\textsuperscript{99} Alexander notes the average age of convicts was 26, and for both men and women, 73 per cent were aged
between 17 and 30. Alison Alexander, \textit{Tasmania's Convicts: How Felons Built a Free Society}, Crows Nest,
Norfolk Island. Dibbin had experienced lengthy periods of solitary confinement. William Cox, Crook, John Hickey and Benjamin Sculthorpe were unusual in having conduct records clear of offences and punishments. John Martin was unlucky: his only slur was being reprimanded for playing cards.

The men were not different in their experience to the house servants. Trinder would have been able to share his stories of Port Arthur. George Smith and Thomas Westlake experienced the isolation of solitary confinement, as had Trinder, Collins and Short. Eliza’s record indicates she was harshly punished for her one transgression: five days’ solitary confinement for being absent without permission. All the convict women at Rosedale during this period, bar Eliza, had experienced hard labour. The most common form of this was at the wash tubs in Crime Class at one of the female factories: scrubbing dirty laundry and setting it to dry in the factory yards.100

The status of newly appointed men at Rosedale progressively shifted from convict to emigrant, reflecting the cessation of transportation and the earlier impact of the probation system of convict management. The average age of immigrant workers, mostly specialists, recruited after 1852 was 26. This would have contributed to a two-tier system in the yard based on freedom, wages, and type of work, all compounded by age. The indentured estate workers recruited by Charles Leake during his trip to England in 1854 were young Protestant men. Perhaps Charles had exerted his influence in the absence of his father to recruit a more youthful workforce. The average age of convict farm workers was older than his 35 years, and that may have rankled and led to problems of insubordination. The men who arrived from England early in 1855 came with specific skills and titles that generally distinguished them from the convict labour. Only Stephen Gillard was illiterate and he was the least successful of the group of immigrants. He absconded just three months from arrival and was caught. Gillard was tried under the master and servant legislation and was sentenced to solitary confinement with hard labour for ten days at the Campbell Town gaol and had costs awarded against him. Had he been a convict, his treatment would have been little different. He did not return to Rosedale.101

A number of the convicts listed as contracted to John Leake also absconded. It was fairly straightforward to simply walk off Rosedale. Men did not work in irons and their tasks took them away from the immediate surrounds of the house and yard – to the paddocks.

100 Female Factory Research Group, Convict Lives: Women at Cascades Female Factory, Hobart: Research Tasmania, 2009, p. 11.
101 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
sheep runs, on errands to other farms, into town and even, particularly for the groom, other towns including Hobart Town. Being absent was not the same offence as absconding for it included returning late from approved leave. Absconders made work for masters: attempts to find them, advising the convict department, advertising their flight, and court appearances if they were found. Moses Cochrane had been at Rosedale only a few months when he disappeared. Perhaps the mental treadmill he had been pounding, for many masters and in greatly varying conditions, for the previous 29 years without remission, was simply too much. For most absconders the outcome was less freedom signalled by an extended sentence and time in the cells. There is but one record of a recaptured convict absconder returning to Rosedale.102

The agrarian ideal for the Tasmania of the period was that yeomen farmers who were happy tilling the soil and raising their children in the security of the scriptures would settle the land.103 This ideal was also embedded in a culture where workers clearly understood they had something to lose if they did not comply with the law. Notions of fairness and access to procedural justice underpinned this ideal and the experience of no freedom and severe punishment for transgressions was ripe in convict men’s memories.104 The ideal was the reality, perhaps, for those who returned periodically to the Rosedale wages list over the years. One man who fitted this mantle was William Dormer for he worked on and about Rosedale for many years once emancipated whilst running a dairy under tenancy to another local landowner.105 But most men who worked at Rosedale in the 1850s did not fit this image for they remained single, or their married lives were marred. Some convict men were married but had been transported leaving their family behind. Such was the case for Michael Killymede who left a wife and four children at Longford in England and Patrick Larkin whose wife and four children were in County Dublin. Some men seemingly had nowhere else to go.

There were four men, possibly more, who lived on the farm with their wives at some stage in the early and mid 1850s. Several small stout cottages, with pig sties built into the rear

---

102 Michael Killymede absconded in June 1854. He was apprehended, tried, punished and returned to service. He was found guilty of being out after hours in July 1855 and reprimanded. He stayed on well after being conditionally pardoned.
105 William Dormer per Lord William Bentinck, CON 31/1/12; CON 18/1/14. His record does not indicate locations of service. The day book indicates his presence at Rosedale over the years. Dormer was tenant of a dairy farm owned by Robert Cameron at Clairville. Trudy Mae Cowley, 1858 Valuation Rolls for Central and Eastern Tasmania, Hobart: Trudy Mae Cowley, 2005, p. L1 27.
walls, were built into the outer quadrangle. The occupants, human and hog, lived at close quarters. Benjamin and Margaret Sculthorpe appear to have occupied a cottage on the property from 1849 to 1854. They were the longest stayers of the married set.

The arrival date of John Golden is not clear but he lived in a cottage on the property with his wife, Catherine Lynch, and her young daughter Mary Anne Dempsey in 1854. John and Catherine had married in Campbell Town that year and the birth of their first child, Ellen, was registered at Campbell Town in 1855. It is possible they were still at Rosedale when their first son James was born in 1857. Their small home may not have been peaceful for Golding had an instant extended family: his wife and all her five siblings were Irish convicts transported to Tasmania for collectively stealing a cow in 1849.106 Patrick Boyle and his wife Mary Flaherty had required permission to marry in 1851. They had a son, Pat Boyle, aged about 4, who had been born illegitimately to Mary in the Ross Female Factory.107 Thomas Westlake would have moved from the barracks to a cottage upon his marriage, in 1853, to Eliza Kenny. The emigrant groom, George Jobson, with his wife Harriet and their two sons, took up residence at Rosedale in February 1855.

The presence of wives and children suggests an alternative, perhaps placid, domestic atmosphere in the yard to one dominated by rough single men, at a loose end and looking for drink or a fight. But this romantic image must be tempered with the knowledge of Boyle’s assaults; on his wife and on an unrelated female child,108 Eliza Kenny’s misdemeanours,109 the restlessness of the wives who were equally confined by Rosedale’s isolation, and the influx of Mrs Golden’s relatives from time to time.

There was no clamour or racket inside the separate prison: the house. All slept in their appointed cells. Men’s boots were stilled. The slippers of the housemaids, provided by the master to ensure even greater invisibility in the dining room and other public rooms, lay on the floor awaiting dawn.110

106 Catherine Lynch per Australasia, CON 41/1/24. The database of the Female Convict Research Centre indicates Bridget and Ellen per Australasia, Mary per Earl Grey, James and Patrick per Blenheim. It notes Patrick died en route. www.femaleconvicts.org.au.
107 Boyle/Flaherty, 23 July 1850, RGD 37/267/1850. Pat Boyle’s birth is listed on Flaherty’s convict record. Mary Flaherty per Tory, CON 41/1/18.
108 As occurred on 23 June 1853 and for which he sentenced to three months’ hard labour, and on 5 November 1853 for which his sentence was extended by eighteen months. Patrick Boyle per Blenheim, CON 33/1/93.
109 Eliza Kenny’s record shows a pattern of absconding in 1853 and 1854. It is not known who she worked for but she spent lengthy periods in the cells. She was awarded a certificate of freedom in 1856 having served her time. Eliza Kenny per Australasia, CON 41/1/24.
110 The Rosedale house servants were issued with slippers. They were purchased from local boot and shoe maker Robert Goldspink, through Brickhill’s store, by the dozen in various sizes. Leake Papers, L1/B899.
Chapter Six: ‘... get away for a time’

Miss Leake’s social world

April 1854

Sunday was the day for church.¹ The weather was dull and rain threatened throughout the autumn day but Miss Leake twice set aside her reading to take the short walk over the road and up the street from the front steps of Government House to St David’s.² For morning service, she accompanied Sir William and Lady Denison. In the evening, in Papa’s company, she heard the Bishop preach.³ Walking to St David’s Cathedral Church, built on the corner of Macquarie and Murray streets, meant stepping across the ruts from carriage wheels and animal hooves and avoiding the worst of the muck and debris. The streets were damp with mud and dung. In the wind that blew down Macquarie Street, seemingly straight from Mount Wellington, parasols and umbrellas were an impediment, not a help.⁴ Ladies grasped their bonnet ribbons firmly so as to arrive in church with a respectable appearance.

Miss Leake sat erect in the pew. Her back was firmly straight within her stays and hardly needed to brush against the cedar rail to keep her upright. The hoops of her fashionable dress were stilled. Apart from the elevated company little differed from when she was at home. Sarah Leake was isolated and in effect by herself. The Governor’s other visitor, Lord Churchill, was otherwise engaged.⁵

Lord Churchill had travelled to Australia on a pleasure trip aboard the yacht Wyvern owned by his father, the Duke of Marlborough. They did not have an easy voyage and were

² This church, the second St David’s, was consecrated on 9 January 1823 by Rev Samuel Marsden as Senior Chaplain of New South Wales. It had become a cathedral in 1842 when Hobart Town was declared a city. The original St David’s Church had been built over the grave of Lt Governor David Collins in 1810 but was demolished by a storm. www.stdavidscathedralhobart.org/history.
³ Francis Russell Nixon, Church of England Bishop of the Diocese of Van Diemen’s Land.
⁵ Lord Alfred Spencer-Churchill (1824-1893) was the second son of George Spencer-Churchill, 6th Duke of Marlborough and Lady Jane Stewart. At the time of his visit to Tasmania, he was a bachelor. A former Lieutenant Colonel in the Oxfordshire Yeomanry, he had been a member of the British House of Commons as the Member for Woodstock between 1845 and 1847 and was to return to the House in 1857, the year he also married.
forced to take cover from ‘the stress of the weather’ at several points.\(^6\) The private yacht carried a crew of 18 men and, as was reported, carried a cargo of: ‘sheet lead, shot, nails, clothing, boots and shoes, brandy, wines, ale, cider, &tc, the whole valued at £5000.’\(^7\) The vessel also was intended for sale in Australia and Lord Churchill was unflatteringly described as supercargo. While in Hobart Town he was to attend dinners, receptions, and other social functions including the Royal Society of Tasmania, as a ‘stranger’ on 10 May 1854. His host, Sir William Denison, also the President of the Royal Society, was in the chair.\(^8\)

Lord Churchill’s visit provoked sceptical near cynical editorial comment, likely penned by John West,\(^9\) on the matter of the true identity and financial standing of antipodean visitors. The argument was that there was no process by which a traveller confirmed his identity, leaving the police in a convict colony, which the editorial described as ‘a gaol’, to exercise their judgement as to the veracity of the claim of legitimacy.\(^10\) For, as Kirsten McKenzie noted, unfixed characteristics and social confusion could beset colonial port cities and people could appear other than they really were, wearing the mantle of a new identity over a shady or disreputable old one.\(^11\) Churchill continued in a privileged state travelling from Tasmania to New South Wales aboard the HM Brig *Fantome* on 6 June 1854.\(^12\) Clearly the business with the *Wyvern* was done and the profit secured.

If Miss Leake gave a whimsical thought to the sturdy frame, bristling whiskers and confident oratory of the visiting bachelor aristocrat she betrayed it not to her journal. Throughout the day, in other rooms and venues her father, his friend Governor Denison, and their male colleagues dined, discussed matters of strategy and state, and debated the directions colonial society should take. Miss Leake continued to read and chat. Lady Denison was company in theory but she was busy with her young family and vice-regal organising. As Alexander explains, Lady Denison appealed to the middle classes and elite because she was in the background, a helpmeet to her husband, tending her family, unremarkable, and appearing occasionally to gracefully and dutifully fulfill her vice-regal role.\(^13\)

---

\(^7\) “British Gleanings,” *Illustrated Sydney News*, 7 January 1854, p. 5.
\(^8\) “General Intelligence,” *Courier*, 13 May 1854.
\(^9\) John West was editor of the *Launceston Examiner*.
\(^12\) “Shipping Intelligence,” *The Empire*, 6 June 1854.
An invitation to Government House was a mark of social respectability: a fact that even Lady Denison remarked upon. To be a houseguest there was the mark of elite status. The Government House that welcomed John Leake and his daughter in 1854 faced Macquarie Street. Extant images of the building show a front that was part double storey. The rear was a jigsaw of attached and freestanding outbuildings for household services, kitchen, laundry, coach house and stores. The long expanse of the white paling fence of Government House, with its wooden gate and guardhouse, stretched from Argyle Street to the rear of the government buildings facing Murray Street. The stout weatherboard annex built by Denison for a ballroom dominated the streetscape. Behind the jigsaw of structures that made up the house, treed ground stretched down to the cove. From the back windows of the upper storey and from some places in the grounds the bustling harbour could be seen. Thus the work and life of Hobart Town went on all around its walls. The public impression of Government House was that it was a lowly wooden building: ‘It’s a pretty cottage; [noted Mr Evelyn to Bridget when approaching to make a courtesy call] but as the allotted dwelling of his Excellency a scandal to Tasmania.’ It was no match for the stone and brick mansions erected as symbols of wealth by successful settlers.

Government House had been in poor repair for many of its years: Murray and his family did not live in it; Davey fell through the unfinished verandah and broke his leg, and, during Sorell’s tenure, it was demolished and rebuilt. But, when Arthur arrived in 1824 it was again in bad repair and underwent substantial rebuilding to meet his requirements. When Denison first toured the house he approved for it was large and had good stables and

---

14 Lady Denson, in her journal, 1 September 1847 cited by Richard Davis and Stefan Petrow, eds., Varieties of Vice-Regal Life (Van Diemen’s Land Section) by Sir William and Lady Denison, Hobart: Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 2004, p. 65. There was also a personal friendship between John Leake and Sir William Denison evidenced by private correspondence on a range of topics including farming practice, plant cuttings and family matters. Leake Papers, L1/B492-531.
15 Bolger, Hobart Town, p. 59.
16 Lady Denison would later witness the ceremonial arrival at the harbour of her husband’s successor, Sir Henry Fox Young, from one of the upstairs windows, as recorded in her journal as taking place on 6 January 1854. Davis and Petrow, Varieties of Vice-Regal Life, p. 250. At six months pregnant, Lady Denison would not have wished to view the proceedings in public.
18 Alexander, Governor’s Ladies: the Wives and Mistresses of Van Diemen’s Land Governors, pp. 51-73. The respective Lieutenant Governors noted as having an opinion on Government House were: Lt-Governor John Murray, 1810-12, Lt-Governor Thomas Davey, 1813-17, Lt-Governor William Sorell, 1817-24 and Lt-Governor George Arthur, 1824-36. Sir John Franklin, 1837-43 and Sir John Eardley-Wilmot 1843-46 also lived there prior to Sir William Denison, 1847-54 but their views on the domicile are not known. The list of Lt-Governors is drawn from Alison Alexander, ed., The Companion to Tasmanian History, Hobart: Centre for Tasmanian Historical Studies, 2005, p. 530.
19 Alexander, Governor’s Ladies: the Wives and Mistresses of Van Diemen’s Land Governors, p. 83.
offices, but it had a multiplicity of little rooms.\textsuperscript{20} For the Denisons, it would have been a small house for they had a big family, which increased during their tenure, and they required the services of additional servants, nursemaids, tutors and governesses to meet the care and education needs of their children. It may have looked substantial but it was crowded with the Governor, his family and retinue, officials, guests and servants and, in the tradition of the period, crammed with furniture and effects to portray the significance of its inhabitants.

John Leake and his daughter had been at Government House for nearly a week. They had travelled down from Campbell Town in their own carriage, a journey of two days. John Leake was required in the Parliament, for the Legislative Council sat, and the reason Miss Leake accompanied him may have been because of the visit of Lord Churchill. The journal offers no explanation. The receipt of the invitation from Lady Denison and any comment about it would have been recorded in the previous volume of the journal, now lost, if it was noted at all.

The shopping and streetscape of Hobart Town were still disrupted from the combined effects of fire and flood the previous summer. Several central blocks along the rivulet had been destroyed and the shopkeepers, servants and waifs who had lived in the wooden structures were forced out, to new houses and hovels in the suburbs, until rebuilding was finished.\textsuperscript{21}

After a seemingly dreary and socially unsuccessful visit to Government House, as too few calls were made and little shopping was possible due to the inclement weather, Miss Leake and her father boarded the family carriage for the trip home. George Collins, the groom, was seated on the driver’s box with the reins in his hand. Collins likely had a hangover from spending the £2 advanced him by his master for his town expenses injudiciously on grog. Miss Leake would have been grimly accepting of his dishevelled livery for he was not a fitting groom. The journey was broken with a stay at Lovely Banks, the home of Edward Bisdee and his family. Papa and Miss Leake would each have enjoyed the privacy of the guest rooms. Collins dossed down in the stables. When they arrived they found several other visitors in residence. The Bisdee gentlemen played host, setting aside their business in the farm offices, stable or library to take tea and to drive the ladies between the Bisdee family homes for visiting. John Leake would have spent his time inspecting the Bisdee property with Edward and discussing their mutual interests in developing pastoral and

\textsuperscript{20} Denison in a letter to his mother of 26 January 1847, cited in Davis and Petrow, \textit{Varieties of Vice-Regal Life}, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{21} Bolger, \textit{Hobart Town}, p. 64.
agricultural businesses, the challenges of managing convict and free workers, the administration of colonial justice, and the political situation in the period following the end of transportation.22 Lovely Banks and Rosedale were each highly regarded for wool production and sheep breeding. John Leake and Edward Bisdee, besides sitting together in the upper chamber, as two of the six nominees of the Governor, both shared the bench as local justices of the peace.

Miss Leake’s April social round was not over. Mrs Edward Bisdee accompanied the Leakes on the final leg of their homeward journey in order to stay for a few days. Miss Leake offers no insight into a friendship with Rose Bisdee, a woman of her own generation, despite her husband being of Papa’s vintage. Being hostess for the visit may have been no more than an obligation met in a pattern of formal relationships arising from Leake’s association with Edward Bisdee, Rose’s husband. Alternatively, the two women may have become friends after Rose’s marriage to Edward in 1844.23 Before that, as Rose Axford the daughter of a Bothwell miller, she was unlikely to have mixed in Miss Leake’s company.

May 1854

All was not quite right when Miss Leake and Papa returned to Rosedale, accompanied by Mrs Bidsee. They surprised elder brother William and his friend and houseguest Mr de Tremereuse who had not expected them home for at least another day. 24 William, the oldest of the Leake children, lived at Rosedale although now a bachelor in late middle age.25 The youngest of the Leake children, Charles, also lived ‘at home’ but he had departed early in 1854 to visit Britain and Europe and was not expected to return until the New Year.

22 Transportation to Van Diemen’s Land ceased in 1853.
24 Edmund De Tremeuse (also spelt De Tremerreux). Miss Leake never refers to him by his given name despite his obvious friendship with William Leake, unlike Charles Harrison, also her brother’s friend, whom she identifies by given name. Little is known of Edmund De Tremeuse beyond his camaraderie with William Leake who stood referee for De Tremeuse when he applied (unsuccessfully) for a post in the colonial government in 1854. Edmund De Temereuse, “Names of candidates for employment under the government,” Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, CSO80/1/1, p. 50. He was considered foreign and referred to as Monsieur. “Shipping Intelligence: Arrivals,” Launceston Examiner, 24 May 1862. John Leake uncharacteristically exhibited dislike towards him in public. The atmosphere at Rosedale with only William and his friend in residence may well have been relaxed and informal. Their surprise at the early return of Papa and Sarah may have masked disappointment or irritation at having their time disturbed.
25 In 1854-5 all of the Leake ‘children’ were mature adults. Their approximate ages were William 48, John Travis 44, Robert 43, Edward 42, Arthur 40, Sarah 37, and Charles 35. Arthur lived at Ashby. The other brothers did not live in Van Diemen’s Land.
William assisted his father with the management of Rosedale. His expenses were met but his father was in charge. For the period of the journal it seems William did not leave the district. He is a silent participant in Miss Leake’s days, at the dining table, in the yard, occasionally at church, and often visiting with her. There is no subtext of accomplishment for this, the eldest son. Younger brother Arthur was paid a wage to manage the additional Leake land grants and leases at Ashby and Lewisham at his father’s direction, and lived in the Ashby homestead ostensibly having had it built.\(^{26}\) The property belonged to his father, who had purchased it in 1841.\(^{27}\) The draw of the family home was very strong for Arthur. During the period of the journal, he many times dined or spent the night at Rosedale.

The surprise of an early return added to the day’s already considerable dramas. Two ‘men’ were dead: drowned at the Leake’s ford across the Elizabeth River.\(^{28}\) This was a rare reference to death, which broke a silence employed by Miss Leake in her journal. Silences came in several forms: events in which Sarah Leake was a key player are not named, domestic or family issues clearly of pressing concern are not noted, and there is an almost complete lack of expression of personal feeling. The journal is devoid of discussion about family events. Family birthdays pass without comment. There was no use of words that relate to life events. Baptism, betrothal, birth, death, demise, disease, funeral, illness, and marriage are absent. Apart from the men’s drowning, death was noted only obliquely, via a walk to ‘Mummy’s grave’, which was on the property.\(^{29}\) The domestic silences result in no information about Miss Leake’s views on managing the estate, the ordering of provisions for the house, the matter of access to spending money or the cost of items, the appearance of the house, its rooms and its garden, and the texture and breadth of the landscape in which her life was set. Miss Leake retains a formality with herself. There was no gossip and she evinced a deep concern that she may be implicated in the gossip of another.\(^{30}\) There was no happiness or comfort, no ambition or wishfullness, and only rare concern for others and then generally related selfishly to the impact on the Leake family of some unhappy circumstance.

Miss Leake and the Rosedale guests could not resist the spectacle of the river being dragged for the drowned men, but the bodies would not be found until the following day. The


\(^{28}\) Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 2 May 1854.

\(^{29}\) Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 15 October 1854.

\(^{30}\) Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 31 August 1854.
contrast between the noise and confusion of dragging the muddy floor of the pond held back by the ford with the calm peace of an autumn day went unrecorded.

The way Miss Leake referred to Harrison’s men indicated their inferior social position as working men and likely convicts. She possibly did not know their names, even though they both worked for an immediate neighbour and close associate of Papa’s, Hezekiah Harrison of Merton Vale. The major inconvenience was the ford could not be crossed necessitating a longer journey in the carriage to visit neighbours. What the men had been doing in the water is unknown, possibly one rescuing the other after an accident. The deaths of John Bowen, a free man, and James McIlreavy, a convict, did not rate a mention in the local papers but other records identified them. Bowen was a servant and this label suggests he was in the house at Merton Vale not outside as farm worker. As a free man, there was no information about his employment or person other than his death certificate. He was 29. The surgeon William Valentine, who noted Bowen had accidentally drowned, signed this certificate. McIlreavy was a Londonderry Presbyterian aged about 31. He was serving seven years’ transportation for burglary after having been caught with stolen clothing. McIlreavy signed a pass-holder contract with Hezekiah Harrison in November 1853 having spent the first months of his sentence with Captain William Wood, another gentleman of the district. It is not known if anyone wrote of his demise to his wife Jane and two young daughters Ellen and Margaret, left behind in Ireland. McIlreavy was buried on 5 May 1854. Dr Adam Turnbull officiated and the body was most likely interred at Kirklands. Conversation in the ensuing days in the dining room at Rosedale and in the parlours of Miss Leake’s associates would have included mention of this event for, although she indicated nothing of the dead men, those who signed the paperwork or officiated at the funerals were all in her father’s social circle.

After this sorry business, Miss Leake and her guest employed themselves out of doors. They had a mix of many activities to choose from: sitting in chairs on the verandah and reading, working wool or silk, chatting, collecting late autumn blooms from the rose gardens, walking in the grounds, or visiting the stables. There is no evidence that Miss Leake worked the earth in the vegetable or flower gardens, attended to the orchard, or took any active role in the daily tasks of maintaining the substantial parkland that surrounded the house.

32 John Bowen, Register, Deaths in the District of Campbell Town. RGD 35/251/1854.
33 James McIlreavy per Lord Dalhousie, CON 33/1/108.
34 James McIlreavy, Register, Deaths in the District of Campbell Town., RGD 34/2163/1854.
35 St Andrew’s Presbyterian Church in Campbell Town was not dedicated until 1855. See Margaret Morey, The Manse Folk of Kirklands, Campbell Town, TAS: M Morey, 1986, p. 21.
at Rosedale. Pruning, mowing, digging, felling and planting, stock management and stable mucking out were men’s work, done by convict and free estate labour under the supervision of Papa or Miss Leake’s brothers. In the paddocks sheep were tended and herded, stock crossed and bred, fences erected and maintained, and crops planted and reaped. Tobacco was grown, harvested and dried, its aroma filling the loft alongside the sweeter smells of hay and fodder, awaiting its role as the main ingredient for the late spring sheep dip. Miss Leake indicated no interest in such matters to her journal.

The noise and hustle of the farm, the squawk of turkeys, ducks and chickens in the fowl yard, shouted orders and responses from the men about the place, and the clank of machinery and tools around the sheds would hardly have disturbed the ladies at their leisure, the sounds of tiny birds chirping in the garden or the rustle of leaves on the breeze up from the river. Inside the house, the maids may not have been so content. They faced the work of making up the bedrooms, setting extra places for dinner, and cleaning and polishing in the wake of the houseguests.

Miss Leake, with Papa and Mrs Bisdee, attended to the Sunday ritual of church. They were at St Luke’s in Campbell Town and would have listened to a rousing sermon from William Brickwood.36 Reverend Brickwood arrived in Tasmania aboard the Clarence, from Melbourne, in the company of his wife and daughter on 10 January 1853.37 He took Trinity Parish in Hobart Town, which included Trinity Church.38 Brickwood was found to be too evangelical for Bishop Nixon’s liking and was removed although this provoked some debate about process in the congregation, who reportedly were quite satisfied with the reverend’s performance in the pulpit.39 He had been well liked in his new parish and preached to full houses.40 The Reverend Brickwood was a resolute man. On one occasion Brickwood refused to read the Anglican funeral service over the body of the man known as Black Harry, who had drowned at the ford on the Macquarie near Merton Vale, because he died under the influence of liquor. This matter was widely reported.41

Church attendance was integral to Miss Leake’s week. Papa was closely involved with the local parish and the family was a benefactor for the building and maintenance of St

---

36 William Brickwood, 1817-1901, late of Trinity Parish in Hobart Town, replaced Rev William Bedford who although on leave officially had the living from Campbell Town.
37 “Shipping Intelligence,” Launceston Examiner, 11 January 1853, p. 3.
38 “General Intelligence,” Courier, 12 July 1853, p. 2.
40 “Church of England,” Courier, 14 August 1854, p. 3.
Luke’s at Campbell Town. The Protestant community in the Midlands included Church of England and Presbyterian as well as minor denominations. Eliza Williams occasionally joined the family at St Luke’s but not in the family pew. She would have sat in the rear of the church. Roman Catholic adherents identified in the journal were all convict servants.

Charlotte Scott, the other maid, was given a lift to Mass from time to time when the family was going to church themselves. As master of Rosedale John Leake went to some trouble to ensure his servants practised their faith. Leake was often disappointed that his efforts to support religious practice were met by men who preferred to lie around and smoke.

Getting and keeping a good groom was a continual irritation at Rosedale. George Collins occupied the role at the time Miss Leake began a new volume of her journal. The annoyances and inconveniences of managing a groom of convict past, variously incarnated in the form of George Collins, William Short or John Parsons, were always present when Miss Leake travelled out. Any horse-drawn transport needed the care and attention of a specialist, for both horses and vehicles, and the carriage could not be used at all without a groom. There is no record of any man in the family driving the carriage: it required specific skills and, perhaps more importantly, it was not a suitable occupation for a gentleman. The provision of livery and the freedom to travel away from the estate were not adequate inducements for the groom to stay off the grog.

A further reality of life in a convict colony on an estate distant from immediate neighbours was played out the following Sabbath. Sunday dinner was taken in the middle of the day. It would have been a bright affair with Sarah mistress of a table of amiable men: Papa, her brothers Arthur and William and their friend, neighbour Charles Harrison. Their talk would have been of the farm and the seasons as autumn moved inexorably to the coldness of winter and the stresses the bleakest season of the year brought to the sheep business: frost, early lambing, protecting the flocks against predation, and managing a

---

42 Named as the ‘scotch church’ in the journal. Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 3 September 1854.
44 During the period of the journal, all the house servants but Scott were Protestant. The same was not so of the farm where several of workers were of the Roman Catholic faith, although not all Irish. All the immigrant workers who arrived in 1855, house or farm, were Protestant.
45 Charles Hill Harrison was born to Hezekiah and Caroline Harrison in 1828 in Hobart. He was their second eldest surviving child. As a close friend of Miss Leake’s brothers William and Arthur, Miss Leake refers to him as Charles Harrison in her journal. He lived with his parents and siblings at Merton Vale, only separated from Rosedale by the Elizabeth River. Hezekiah Harrison, JP, sat with Leake as a magistrate, amongst other shared interests.
workforce in weather that hindered outdoor work. A pleasant atmosphere in anticipation of a sociable trip to church and a stirring sermon was spoilt because all had to fall in to meet the requirements of having convict servants. William was called away and it had been his turn or duty to remain at home with the servants whilst others in the family went, in the carriage, to St Luke’s to hear Rev Brickwood preach. William’s business is unknown, but is likely related to the farm: a worker to discipline, a fence down allowing sheep to wander, or absconder needing to be reported. Such details did not trouble Miss Leake’s pen. Convict servants were not trusted. Servants in the house at this time were Collins the groom, George Trinder the cook and two housemaids, Eliza Williams and Charlotte Scott. Each had been in the Leake employ for more than six months, but this was of no matter. All had been convicted of theft and the family considered the Rosedale plate, silver, linen, and wines too tempting for felons to resist. With William out, everyone else stayed in.

Miss Leake spent a Monday afternoon in the parlour at The Grange, home of Dr William Valentine. There she was in the company of the women family members of Papa’s associates: Dr Valentine, Mr Thomas Mason and Reverend William Brickwood. In the drawing room these men were discussing church business. Whether it was the waiting around in his liveried waistcoat at the heads of the carriage horses outside the Valentine residence or some miasmic negative influence, Collins became ill. He had a record of poor health. Several times during his servitude he had been so ill as to be confined to the hospital. Dr Harrington, the younger of the two local doctors and the one who attended Leake when needed, made the house call to Collins a social visit to Papa and the family. Richard Harrington was another close family associate. At the time of the journal, he was unmarried, aged 35. He was an eligible bachelor, of similar age to Miss Leake. There is no indication that she consulted him or that he ever considered courting her.

On Monday 29 May Miss Leake did not arise at all. She was too ‘unwell’. This is the first instance of an oft occurrence during the year. Illness was a pervading theme in Miss Leake’s life. She remained in bed late into the morning, sometimes all day, or complained of illness at some stage in most months of the journal. December 1854 and January 1855 were

---

47 Thomas Mason, besides being Police Magistrate for Campbell Town was Church Warden of St Luke’s. His relationship with John Leake was multifaceted: Leake sat on the bench with him as magistrate, they attended to church business, and they enjoyed a close personal friendship evidenced by family house visits and dinners.
49 Richard Henry Harrington was to marry Ellen Mackersey Bayley at Campbell Town in 1859. Morey, The Manse Folk of Kirklands, p. 18.
the only two full months in which she was not indisposed enough to take to her bed. Apart from headache, no symptoms are described. Others in the household suffered colds or influenza at various times, but Miss Leake did not admit to these ailments. Miss Leake did not summon a doctor to herself nor was one sent for to attend her, despite their occasional attendance at the house and the frequent social calls by both Dr Harrington and Dr Valentine.

In this era, illness was a recognised means of a woman asserting a degree of independence.50 By absenting herself from the society of the family, she simultaneously sought attention and upset the balance of the house. Miss Leake made her presence felt by having no presence. When Miss Leake was indisposed the house ran itself. As mistress she was responsible for ordering the meals and supervising the household staff. From all appearances, the house operated smoothly when she was incapacitated, for, in this well-ordered establishment, the tasks of the day and of the week were firmly set and the servants knew both their work and their place.

Miss Leake unwell in her room made additional work. Invalid foods and tempting delicacies would be prepared and brought to her room on a tray. Eliza, the senior housemaid, would have been responsible for answering the bell rung by a wilted invalid hand, keeping the sick room tidy and aired, for shielding the patient from the glare of any bright light, making up a little fire for comfort and warmth, smoothing the pillows and bedding, quietly cleaning the wash stand and its vessels and emptying the slops. Eliza would have previously performed these services for Elizabeth Leake at the end of her long illness and when she lay dying and had the intelligence to have learnt how to please the mistress. While one of the men of the family may have issued instructions, the cook would have known what to offer on the menu for lunch and dinner, and would have prepared the standard dishes for breakfast. The routine of his kitchen was not lightened when Miss Leake was ill, but her absence gave the work an atmosphere of reduced supervision.

Miss Leake and Eliza often worked together, particularly on fancy cooking tasks. This represents the higher status of Eliza over Charlotte. No mention is made in the journal of the daily plain cooking as this was the preserve of the cook, but both Miss Leake and Eliza made desserts, cakes, jams, pickles, potted meats, beverages and other treats. Such cooking was acceptable for ladies, unlike the daily grind of regular meals.51

June 1854

June was a month of cold weather and ill health. Bitter winds blew from the Western Tiers across the open paddocks of Rosedale and its neighbours and, on still clear nights, frost formed and lay on the ground white into the morning. Illness may have inhabited the family home but outside, on the farm side of the quadrangle gate, the business of the farm continued in the raw frost or the rain or the howling icy wind. And it was unhappy.

The dinner table conversation again would have included comment about convict behaviour. Michael Killymede had, sometime during the day of 13 June, argued with the master, possibly in the form of William deputizing for Leake. Come the next day Killymede was gone. To make matters worse the groom lamed a carriage horse preventing Miss Leake from driving out: this was George Collins at work. It was a grave disappointment for it was a lovely day and she was obliged to stay home. Miss Leake spent the sunny afternoon indoors, lying on the couch and reading.

The Killymede matter was played out in the Campbell Town court where Thomas Mason sitting with Hezekiah Harrison, both firm personal friends with the complainant Leake, heard the evidence. Killymede, at 35, had been in the colony just over seven months. He was an illiterate Catholic who hailed from Longford where, without him, his mother, wife and four children remained. He was transported for assault and robbery and had arrived, per St Vincent, on 26 May 1853. It was short work to convict Killymede, who had been apprehended under warrant, of misconduct and absconding. He was sentenced to fourteen days at hard labour in the Launceston House of Correction, and to pay the costs of the matter.

Later in the month both Miss Leake and Papa fell sick but the complaints are not identified. Papa was so unwell that Dr Harrington was called. He visited his patient then stayed to dinner and overnight not returning to his home until he was assured of his patient’s condition the following morning. Making up the guest room and the extra place at the dining table was simply absorbed into the servants’ work. William was sent to collect the prescribed
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53 Michael Killymede per St Vincent, CON 14/1/47.
54 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861. Entry for 16 June 1854. Killymede’s convict record suggests that, despite occasional bouts of misconduct resulting in hard labour, he remained at Rosedale beyond his sentence. He was again before the Campbell Town court on 2 April 1855 on charges of misconduct by being out after hours. He pleaded guilty and was reprimanded. He was issued with a conditional pardon on 22 July 1856 and was still drawing wages at Rosedale in 1857. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
‘physic’ but it did not do the trick.\textsuperscript{55} The doctor was summoned a second time and was to call, each time also for breakfast, another three times in the following week. With Miss Leake also unwell, the tasks of sickroom nurse for Papa would have fallen to Eliza. All the servants would have felt the burden. There would be invalid food to prepare, trays to carry to each patient in bed, additional cleaning in the sick rooms to ensure they met the doctor’s standard, an extra seat at the breakfast table, and an even greater need for quiet. With Charles Leake in Europe, William would have run the farm in his father’s absence, just as he did when Leake was away from home on business or in the parliament.

July 1854

But by the first Sunday in July, Papa was well enough to attend church to hear the Bishop preach.\textsuperscript{56} July was a month of hard frosts and bitter cold wind. Miss Leake complained to her journal that it was a trying dull month and that she longed for a change of scenery. Six July mornings saw her breakfast upstairs in her room rather than joining the men in the dining room. Reading, letter writing and fancy cooking were Miss Leake’s only diversions. Visitors were few, and when they came it was usually for the company of the men in the family. The customary visits that were associated with trips to town were limited by the inclement conditions or the absence of prospective hosts. Rain made the roads so difficult that the gig got into trouble on the way to town one afternoon and Miss Leake and Papa were obliged to accept assistance. The tedium was relieved one day by a social call by the Protestant minister of the district, Mr Brickwood and the soon-to-be-ordained Dr Turnbull. They had come without their wives, signalling that the visit was to Papa. The topic of conversation would have centred on church business.\textsuperscript{57}

A visit to the Hornes at Chiswick on the way home from a shopping trip to Ross gave the end of the month a brighter tone.\textsuperscript{58} This visit shows the interlocking social scene of the colonial elite; people she had known most of her life. Benjamin Horne arrived in Van Diemen’s Land on 7 May 1823.\textsuperscript{59} He had traveled with his family aboard the \textit{Andromeda},

\textsuperscript{55} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 22 June 1854.
\textsuperscript{56} The preacher was Francis Russell Nixon, Church of England Bishop the Diocese of Van Diemen’s Land. He lived in Hobart but regularly travelled his diocese.
\textsuperscript{57} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 27 July 1854.
\textsuperscript{58} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 28 July 1854.
\textsuperscript{59} Benjamin Horne, c1777-1858.
and shared the voyage with the Leake family, and with his future son-in-law, Lewis Gilles.\textsuperscript{60} The men were all formerly Hamburg merchants who had migrated in order to raise sheep. Thus Sarah Leake had known Horne and his family since childhood. Horne was granted land at Ross, which he named Chiswick.\textsuperscript{61}

By 1854 Horne was an elderly man who had outlived two wives and was now living on the property in the company of his son Frank and his two granddaughters.\textsuperscript{62} Also present in the Chiswick drawing room that day was Robert Quayle Kermode who owned Mona Vale near Oatlands, a property he had inherited from his father William Kermode.\textsuperscript{63} He anticipated his houseguest, Mrs Joseph Archer, would visit Rosedale.\textsuperscript{64} She was sister-in-law to Kermode’s mother-in-law, Susannah Archer. At the time the widowed Susannah Archer, referred to as Mrs Thomas Archer, lived at Mona Vale with Kermode and had the care of his children.\textsuperscript{65} Her daughter Mary had died the previous year.\textsuperscript{66} Robert and Mary Kermode had had seven children.\textsuperscript{67} But the visit was not again mentioned and therefore a tide of anticipation would have receded to disappointment as the promised company and diversions failed to materialise.

August 1854

The journal entries provide a contrast between the quiet occupations of Miss Leake’s days and the bustle of the house and farm. William made the laundry run from Rosedale to the washerwoman in Campbell Town. He took the chaise cart, indicative of the size of the load of linen and clothing to be collected and the scale of supplies needed to maintain the household.\textsuperscript{68} Each item was counted as it was returned to the household presses and drawers.

\begin{itemize}
\item\footnote{60}{Lewis William Gilles married Mary Woodley Horne on 20 December 1823 at Hobart. He was 27 she 17. RGD 36/681/1823.}
\item\footnote{61}{Anne McKay, ed., \textit{Journals of the Land Commissioners for Van Diemen’s Land 1826–28}, Hobart: University of Tasmania in conjunction with the Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1962, p. 139. Also spelt Chiswich}
\item\footnote{62}{The first Mrs Horne died at Chiswick in March 1841 aged 57. The following year at Ross, Reverend William Bedford Jnr married Horne and Francis Manley formerly of Browns River. The bride was aged under 30 and the generation of Horne’s daughters. Francis Horne died at Chiswick on 27 December 1853.}
\item\footnote{63}{William Kermode, 1790-1852.}
\item\footnote{64}{Previously Elinor nee Binfield, she was the widow of Joseph Archer of Panshanger.}
\item\footnote{65}{The Archer and Leake families were long acquainted. Thomas Archer furnished 100 grafted apple trees for the Rosedale orchard, from Woolmers, in 1833. Thomas Archer to John Leake, 1832, Leake Papers, L1/B345.}
\item\footnote{66}{Referred to as Mrs Robert Kermode in Sarah Leake’s journal.}
\item\footnote{67}{The genealogy of the Archer family is well documented in Neil Chick, \textit{The Archers of Van Diemen’s Land: A History of Pioneer Pastoral Families}, Lenah Valley, TAS: Pedigree Press, 1991.}
\item\footnote{68}{Mrs Haselden, who operated a laundry in Campbell Town patronised by the Leakes, was paid for washing to 25 July on 15 August 1854: a total of £3.1 shilling. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”}
\end{itemize}
A cart from Ashby, driven by an unidentified man, brought pigs for the Rosedale sties. Miss Leake sent a note back with the driver inviting Arthur to dine with her other guests.

Again illness in the family and in the households of friends interfered with the social round. Five days in the month Miss Leake was too unwell to rise for breakfast. For three of these occasions she complained of bad headaches. These headaches persisted through the day several times, and visited her again one morning in September, then are no more mentioned. The doctor was not summoned and Miss Leake bore her discomfort with stoicism, at least to her journal. The response of the family and the household to her poor state went unrecorded.

A sense of anticipation accompanied Miss Leake’s decision to accept an invitation from Mrs Edward Bisdee to again stay at Lovely Banks. Papa was also invited. Miss Leake could easily travel in Papa’s carriage and stay at Lovely Banks without the need for a chaperone or any gossip arising from her stay. The tone of the journal suggests any journey was better than staying at home. It seems the two Legislative Councillors planned to travel together to the House for, a day after arriving, Papa and Mr Edward set off for Hobart Town under their own steam in Bisdee’s gig, leaving Miss Leake to see out the second night of the visit and then travel home alone.

Driving Miss Leake home would be one of the last duties of Collins as groom. His final appearance in the Rosedale records for the payment of wages as groom is August 1854. William Short then arrived at Rosedale to take up the post. His appointment was short-term and most unsuccessful. The convict record of the groom who succeeded him, John Parsons, suggests that Leake intended Parsons to arrive much earlier to replace Collins but was thwarted in this strategy. Short was employed while Parsons, who had been assigned to Leake, served a sentence of nine months’ hard labour for a misdemeanour committed before he could be transferred to Rosedale. 

September 1854

Spring with its bursting blossom and leaf was upon Rosedale’s English gardens. Boughs on the hawthorn hedges hung low, heavy with white flowers like late snow. In the orchard the apple, pear, almond, quince and peach trees were rendered exquisite in their dressing of pink and white. The first month of spring worked a cure and it was well that Miss Leake had her

---

69 Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
70 John Parsons per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/108.
health for it was a trying month of managing servants. The new groom, William Short, did not impress. With Miss Leake in the carriage, he failed to pull up at her request so she could talk to Mr Horne when she passed him in the street at Ross.\textsuperscript{71} This behaviour was a portent of things to come. The busy social round of visits to Campbell Town, Ross and the neighbouring properties was curtailed by his bad behaviour. Several days later his drunkenness meant that the carriage could not be used. It seems Short had been sent to town with the carriage horses, likely to have them shod, but had simply left them there and gone off to drink. Come next day, Sunday, Miss Leake and Arthur had to go to church in the gig. The young Arthur Harrison was obliged to drive Miss Leake home for Arthur Leake had found the carriage horses in town and decided to lead them home.\textsuperscript{72} Conversation at dinner that night, with guests Dr Harrington and Charles Harrison, must have included a lively exchange on the merits of inebriated convict servants. It was unlikely that the groom’s services were required in the dining room. The next day Arthur travelled into town and laid charges against Short for drunkenness. On Monday 11 September 1854, William Short was summoned to answer charges of being drunk on the previous Saturday and using indecent language in a public place. John Leake was in court to hear the charges against his groom. Short was fined 5/- for each offence.\textsuperscript{73}

Just one day later, Charlotte misbehaved by returning home tipsy after a trip to Campbell Town. Though not specified, the entries make it clear that the decision had been taken by the family that Charlotte had to go and arrangements were made for her return to the Female Factory at Ross. Charlotte was paid the wages of £5 she was owed. With the river too high for Arthur to drive to Ross, he took Charlotte in the gig as far as Campbell Town and she was required to make her own way to the Female Factory probably perched on an outside seat on Page’s coach with a pass permitting her to travel unaccompanied. Arthur collected the new housemaid and returned with her to Rosedale.\textsuperscript{74} Charlotte would have not been surprised at her punishment for misdemeanours with liquor. An uneducated Roman Catholic Irish thief, Charlotte showed a liking for a good time, or maybe she sought relief from the drudgery of the domestic routine. Irrespective, it was unlikely she would have been a success in the restrained Leake household. Charlotte found more friends in the farm quadrangle, with the Irish farm labourers Cochrane, Larkin and Killymede, than in the house.

\textsuperscript{71} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 4 September 1854.
\textsuperscript{72} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 10 September 1854. This suggests Sarah Leake did not care to drive.
\textsuperscript{73} Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
\textsuperscript{74} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entries for 21 September 1854 and 22 September 1854.
The journal suggests that the next housemaid came to Rosedale directly from the Ross Female Factory, seemingly a straight swap: new for tainted. The housemaid who is later named and appears to be the one who arrived that late Friday afternoon aboard the gig with Arthur was Susan Green. There is no record of her at Ross but that may be of no moment. The hierarchy in the house was undisturbed. Eliza continued to please as she would for several more years before leaving, long after her ticket of leave had been granted. When she finally left for Victoria it was with conditional pardon in hand – reward for her good service.

October 1854

It was the trying matters that Miss Leake recorded, as if they would slip her memory and not mount up for inspection if left unwritten. She has no similar need to record her pleasure at events, or visits, or people. Perhaps it is that she needed no memorandum for them. For example, she grumbled that William was remiss in not bringing the patterns, perhaps for wool work or embroidery, he was specifically asked to collect during a trip to Campbell Town but she never expressed pleasure or a sense of achievement in the needlework she completed. She was much vexed at the cook’s failure to correctly manage the oven such that her ‘cooking’ was not a success but she does not record her guests’ comments about food or the hospitality they received at Rosedale.75

The Campbell Town steeplechase brought some spring festivities. The Hobart Courier talked up the week-long series of activities. It anticipated a ball, an agricultural show, a formal dinner and horse racing: all on a grand scale. The attendance of the Governor, the Speaker of the Legislative Council and the Hobart Town Mayor were expected to add to the magnificence of the community events. The Governor was to get about in a splendid four-horse carriage lent by a member of the local gentry who had better carriages as well as horses than the vice regal entourage.76

Horse racing was a popular sport. Horses were brought in from Hobart and Launceston as well as from other colonies for important meetings on the local calendar. Many Campbell Town men owned racehorses and the custom was for them to ride rather than employing jockeys. Dr Harrington owned several gallopers. Earlier in the year he had won

75 Miss Leake’s plum cakes were ruined by Trinder’s inattention to the oven, Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 5 October 1854.
76 “General Intelligence,” Courier, 2 October 1854, p. 2. John Lord Esq of Woodbourne lent the Governor his carriage.
the Maiden Plate at Campbell Town upon his black mare Shan Van Vaught. The main event for the October meeting was billed the Great Midland Steeple Chase and had a purse of £300. A field of 17 horses competed over 17 leaps for a distance of three miles and 68 chains. A Victorian horse, Lottery, owned by Captain Clinch, won the big race. The event took just under 11 minutes to complete and, by all accounts, it was a tough race that tired both horse and rider. Earlier in the afternoon, Bob Aitkin’s mare, Cricket, with Aitkin in the saddle, won an impromptu flat race for hacks: one of the preliminary events got up to entertain the crowd before the big race. Dr Harrington’s mare, Gilt, ridden by its owner came in third. Aitkin and Harrington were both well-known local identities, young single gentlemen on the way up, and would have tempted many to wager on their potential for success.

Rosedale was bustling with visiting dignitaries. Sir William Denison and his aides, Colonel Last and Mr Charles Wilmot, stayed for one of the nights at Rosedale. All the family and their guests attended the races and witnessed Lottery’s win. Miss Leake made no mention of the glamour that accompanied such festivities; or of the dinner or other entertainments offered in the town. The Governor and ‘his set’ decamped the following day, leaving behind linen to wash, dry and fold, mattresses to turn and beds to air, silver and plate to polish and re-store and rooms to sweep, dust and clean, all supervised by Miss Leake, but accomplished by the convict servants.

Denison enjoyed himself and described the events in a later letter to his mother. He was gratified at the way he was received noting that his health was ‘drunk with enthusiasm’. It was his last tour of the colony before his departure to New South Wales and he noted more than thirty local gentry had ridden out to see him at the home of his host. Translated, this meant that Leake had hosted a reception for the Governor. Savories and drinks would have refreshed the guests. The cook was not able to enjoy the carnival with the scale of preparations required. Servants moved the furniture in the Rosedale drawing room aside to accommodate the men who gathered to toast the Governor. When the horses and gigs had departed, servants removed the remains of the revelry, washed the glasses and silver, cleaned the room and replaced the chairs and couches. It is little wonder that Leake hired a waiter from Morrisons. The event went unmentioned by Miss Leake who was likely reading quietly in the parlour at the other end of the house. In the absence of Lady Denison, who had

77 “Campbell Town Races,” *Courier*, 12 April 1854, p. 2.
78 “Campbell Town,” *Cornwall Chronicle*, 18 October 1854, p. 3.
80 Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
remained in Hobart Town, the event would not have included the ladies.

Miss Leake had a busy day ahead of her on Saturday 14 October. After the rush and excitement of the vice regal visit and the races, Papa was again leaving to travel to Hobart Town and she accompanied him and Arthur to Campbell Town so that he could catch Page’s coach for its southward journey. Papa secured a seat and was waved away. While Miss Leake visited the Davidsons, Arthur Leake took responsibility for the onerous task of relaying the latest misdemeanours of the groom to the constable at the local police office. That evening, after a safe return to Rosedale, a pleasant lunch, the departure of Arthur for Ashby and a peaceful afternoon likely spent reading in the parlour, Miss Leake was astonished by the sudden arrival of a visitor.

The arrival was marked by servant disquiet. At the door in the dim dusk light was a burly man with a grim scratched face. His demeanour was proprietorial but the servants did not know him. But Miss Leake and William recognised him at once, although they were greatly surprised at his arrival: it was their brother Edward who they had thought was far away on his station in South Australia. Edward’s face was scored with red welts as evidence of violence. His young wife had fought him throughout the journey from Portland Bay to New Norfolk to stop her removal. Despite the battle, Edward succeeded in his decision to commit Letitia Leake to the asylum for the insane. With the servants ordered from the room, Edward told his story.

Edward Leake had married Letitia Amanda Clark at the home of John Gordon McPherson of Wellington, a settlement on the Murray River in South Australia, on 31 July 1854. Miss Leake did not mention this event: the matters of note that day to her journal were the inclement weather and Papa’s need to travel through the rain to Campbell Town to keep an appointment to have his ears syringed. Mystery trailed behind Letitia. She was considered a widow but there was no record of a previous marriage. She was thought an immigrant yet there is not a ship list that indicates her status. She was known as both Letitia Clark and Letitia Hand, taking the surname of her mother or her father at will. It is possible

81 Edward Leake lived in an unidentified house at the Punt, now Nelson, in South Australia. He and his elder brother Robert owned and ran a station known as Glencoe. The house on Glencoe was named Frontier House where Robert and his wife Ruth nee Hickner lived. Sarah Leake never mentions her sister-in-law Ruth in her journal.
83 South Australian Marriage Registration (1842-1926), Book 18/139; “Family Notices,” South Australian Register, 4 August 1854, p. 2. The Leake Papers do not contain correspondence from Edward Leake to his father or siblings on this matter. If he wrote, the letter was not kept.
that, because Edward had chosen a wife who was half his age, a Roman Catholic, of questionable widowhood and not of his social standing, he did not inform his family of the nuptials until after the event. A minister from the Free Presbyterian Church married Edward and Letitia. This unlikely combination of religious affiliations could be explained by the isolation of people in the South Australian bush and the rarity of a man of god in their midst. The marriage was again solemnized at St Patrick’s Roman Catholic Church, Adelaide, on 21 August 1854, reflective of Letitia Clark’s faith.85

According to the medical record, Letitia arrived at the asylum in ‘a state of furious mania’ in which she had been for some months preceding her admission.86 She had a wild appearance: tall, thin and wan. In the first days of her treatment she destroyed all her clothing and ranted at the attendants. She threw furniture and logs cut for the fire at men who approached her, including the doctor and the chaplain. The diagnosis was post partum mania. Letitia exhibited the physical symptoms of having born a child.87 Letitia had been married to Edward for less than three months and there is neither mention of her child in the Leake family papers nor an extant record of its birth or death.

Miss Leake enjoyed a period of quiet family time for the few days after Edward arrived. Despite his shocking news, the house and garden provided a private haven for conversation, walks and visits of trusted friends. Letters about Edward’s troubles were written to Papa, still at the Parliament in Hobart Town. A heavy air of disapproval hung over the house. Edward had married beneath him and his wife had not ascended from her origins to take the mantle of status that he offered. That, of course, may have been of no importance to Edward at the time, or later. Miss Leake mentions nothing of the origin of Letitia’s insanity. This mania evidenced itself, amid the pandemonium of the asylum, in Letitia’s violent behaviour, raving and abhorrence of men to the extent that she tried to strike the doctor with logs from the fireplace early in her incarceration and she shied away from the asylum chaplain with distrust and horror. Periods of calm were followed with gibbering and violent jerking.88 A range of experiences including abuse, violence, miscarriage or still birth could account for Letitia Leake’s new-found rejection of men: Edward may or may not have

85 South Australian Marriage Registration (1842-1926), Book 30/307.
86 Letitia Leake, Royal Derwent Hospital, “Patient Records - Casebooks All Patients, Volume No 13,” 1 October 1851 - 31 December 1854, Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, HSD 52.
87 Expert eyes were brought to bear on Letitia Leake’s medical record: from history, medicine and the history of medicine. Although difficult to decipher, the consensus opinion was that it stated her condition as post partum mania.
88 “Medical Record, Letitia Leake of Portland Bay,” Hobart: Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, 1854, HSD 246/1.
been blameless. Miss Leake would further worry about the situation of her sister-in-law: not about Letitia’s mental or physical health, but how she, Sarah, might manage if Letitia was required to come to Rosedale rather than to remain in the asylum. The problem was that, as a resident of the colony of South Australia, Letitia Leake had no place in the Tasmanian asylum. But Arthur used the influence of the Leake family with Sir William Denison to successfully press a claim that his brother’s wife should remain at New Norfolk for treatment.89

Although Leake was in Hobart Town taking his part in the business of the Legislative Council, Rosedale matters proceeded in the local court. Two of his men had behaved ill during the carnival week and appeared in the Campbell Town courtroom. The running of both house and farm were disrupted by the absence of Cochrane and Short, but Leake would have judged it a necessary inconvenience outweighed by the need to instil discipline and to set an example to others.

The recalcitrant groom William Short was in the Campbell Town cells having been arrested on a warrant sworn by Arthur regarding his poor behaviour on 12 October 1854, the day of the big race. He faced the court on 14 October 1855 on a charge of breaching the Master and Servants Act. Arthur Leake claimed that Short had been drunk and insolent. Despite a plea of not guilty, Thomas Mason, sitting with Hezekiah Harrison, found Short guilty and sentenced him to three months’ hard labour with the final ten days to be served in solitary confinement.90 Short returned to the stables but his career at Rosedale was over.

On Monday 16 October Moses Cochrane appeared before Magistrate Thomas Mason. John Leake had ‘brought’ him there for drunkenness and misconduct in being out after hours in Campbell Town on the previous Saturday night. The festivities were clearly not intended to be enjoyed by the illiterate lifer now aged 49 and in his thirtieth year of servitude. Cochrane spent the next seven days in solitary in the Campbell Town cells.91 He was then returned to Rosedale and took up his spade or pick or hammer to work away more of his sentence.

William Leake escorted Short to Campbell Town on 19 October where, as a prisoner, he clambered up to an outside seat on the coach en route to the Launceston House of Correction. Thus exited another groom but the matter was not over. Short wrote to William

89 Letitia Leake remained an inmate at New Norfolk into 1855. She was discharged and lived again in South Australia with Edward to whom she had two children as is discussed elsewhere in the thesis.
90 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
91 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
Leake from prison demanding that unpaid wages be sent to him so he did not have to walk from Launceston to collect them.\textsuperscript{92} John Leake was undoubtedly piqued at this slight on his authority and imputation to his reputation as a gentleman.

November 1854

Cochrane was in the midst of another scrap within days of returning. William Roberts, a fellow farm hand, assaulted him in the last week of October. Roberts, a former spinner, had been sentenced to ten years’ transportation for burglary and had arrived in the colony in 1846.\textsuperscript{93} He was much convicted and punished after arrival for drunkenness, neglect of work, disobedience, and absenteeism and received multiple punishments of hard labour. His ticket of leave, awarded on 25 May 1852 had been revoked 18 January 1853. Just prior to coming to Rosedale, which occurred in May 1854, he had undergone a period of hard labour for disobedience of orders that had been extended due to idleness. Roberts’ assault on Cochrane resulted in Leake sending him to the magistrate. The case was heard on 1 November 1854 and the record displays a conflict of interest in the court system for it was Arthur Leake, son of the man bringing the charge, who sat with Thomas Mason on the bench for this case. Miss Leake’s journal indicated that Arthur and his father, again home from Hobart Town, travelled the few miles to Campbell Town together. Roberts was remanded.\textsuperscript{94} In her journal she displayed her disinterest in such matters. She had spent the time her father and brother had attended court at the library changing her books then travelled home with them in the coach.\textsuperscript{95}

She visited Ashby with her father but found Arthur was ‘from home’. They sent for him and he returned for a morning’s conversation. Possibly Papa was concerned about Lewisham where the fences had been lost in a bush fire, or some other matter that required discussion. But, maybe, they just wanted to chat to Arthur whom they had not seen for five days: an inordinately long stretch by their standards. Whether Arthur was happy to have his morning’s work disrupted is not known. The family received a letter from Robert Leake with the news that Edward had arrived at Glencoe in a very depressed state of mind – doubtless because of the continuing illness and mania of his wife Letitia, who remained in New Norfolk.

\textsuperscript{92} William Short to William Leake, undated, in Leake Papers, L1/C85b.
\textsuperscript{93} William Roberts per \textit{John Calvin}, CON 33/1/88.
\textsuperscript{94} Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
\textsuperscript{95} Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 1 November 1854. The library was a private subscription collection operated by Frank Turnbull.
and would do so until into the New Year. Miss Leake wrote to Robert with advice composed from a family conversation about what was best for Edward. At no time was there compassion expressed for Letitia in her journal. That late spring rain prevented the carriage crossing the river and thus her frustration in being prevented from a trip to church was of more moment.

December 1854

Arthur was shearing at Ashby and it was the season for strawberries. Charles wrote that he hoped to be home for Christmas. The cook departed. Perhaps tension between him and the mistress over his failings was more than he could tolerate. After a morning of discussion with Miss Leake, George Trinder departed for Morrison’s tavern, The Caledonian. Eliza was obliged to cook the lunch and then dinner. The problem was soon solved: Arthur sent his cook. Presumably someone else at Ashby stepped into the role of feeding the farm workers and other house servants. Life went on as normal. Miss Leake made strawberry jam and practised her piano. James Renwick settled himself in the kitchen and references to the cook disappeared from the journal. Order appeared restored in the house. The tasks for the coming Christmas season must have been well under control. Miss Leake put out ‘work’, meaning mending and plain sewing, for Eliza.96

January 1855

The year opened with scorching weather. Wind and heat combined in bushfires and created difficult working conditions. Arthur was held back from visiting one day, as the wind was too high to risk riding the horse he was breaking in. The fences at Lewisham caught alight again. Parsons, the groom, was sent to inspect the damage and was thrown from his horse in the difficult conditions.97 The matters of note in Miss Leake’s life are all domestic: the wanderings of elderly men on neighbouring properties, the impact of summer heat, reading and music practice, and making jam. Fruits of the summer abounded in the Rosedale kitchen and she made raspberry and strawberry jams to store for the coming year. The fruit was

96 Needlework was an important skill for an upper housemaid but was set aside when other tasks were pressing. Eliza, over time, sewed pillow cases, cushion and couch covers, cotton and linen sheets and garments.

97 Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855.” Entry for 12 January 1855. The groom was John Parsons. He was well able to manage such a farm task and was ill suited as the groom. When he could be replaced as groom he remained working on the farm.
mainly sourced from Ashby. It was also a time of socialising: invitations were given and accepted for dinners, teas and other visits. Fancy cooking and other preparations were made by Miss Leake and Eliza to tempt the guests out of the malaise accompanying trying heat.

Social life bound neighbours together despite distance and social class. Despite a formal social hierarchy, people mingled at church and social events. Multiple business interests and civic roles of individuals led to social connections, as was the case for James Mercer whose diary recorded his participation in a variety of business, civic and social associations. Balls, dances and meetings of local fraternities formed a social round. Keeping up could be wearing for the grazier on an outlying property who had to face the day’s work after a night of dancing preceded the evening before by a charity concert. Mercer reported, for example,

… got home from Mrs. Thompsons party a little before 6 o’clock am… dancing kept up all night, 3 of Campbell Town Band played during the night, also some of the Ladies. Self very tired by want of sleep.

This was not the experience for the Leakes: they were not a dancing family.

February 1855

Miss Leake became bored by her monotonous local social scene and did not relish attending another summer picnic. A newsy letter from Arthur who was in Hobart Town broke her tedium. He had travelled down by coach and had the company of an unnamed man from Adelaide who had gossip of Letitia: her previous husband was still alive, not dead as the family had been led to believe. Miss Leake must have contemplated the implications of this news: Letitia, not only young, Catholic and insane, but potentially a bigamist. Perhaps annulment for Edward would prove less socially onerous than keeping an insane wife. Not one to keep family intelligence to herself, Miss Leake wrote at once to Robert and Edward.

99 Transcribed as James Mercer, “James Mercer’s Diary for 1866,” in *Campbell Town Tasmania: History and Centenary of Municipal Government*, Campbell Town, TAS: Campbell Town Municipal Council, 1966. For example, the entry for 3 January 1866 notes his attendance that day at separate meetings of the Local Board of Works, the Road Trust and the Agriculture Society.
100 Mercer, “James Mercer’s Diary.” Entry for 19 December 1866.
101 “Leake Family Papers: Summary and Index,” Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, c1979, p. 3.
102 Nothing came of the rumour. Edward and Letitia remained wed until his death in 1867.
Charles arrived home from England, unannounced but an agreeable surprise for the family. Miss Leake said nothing of any celebration of his homecoming, his travel news, the family and friends he had visited on the Continent, his health or disposition after so many months absence, or his freedom to travel and to visit places she only read of. His presence in the house was immediately mundane to his sister yet oblique reference was made to his catch-up visits to neighbours and friends.

Callers with eligible daughters, and the young ladies themselves, were immediately more prevalent: the Misses Davidson, Tenly, Turnbull, Mackersley and Mason, suitably chaperoned by an older male relative, all called within a fortnight of Charles’ return. The rush of sociability disrupted the house. Visitors arrived unannounced at odd times: when the family was having dinner, or just before they planned to go out visiting themselves. In the kitchen and back hall, the servants hurried to keep up with the demands for refreshments, and the cleaning and tidying the guests left in their wake.

Charles was not the only arrival. Over the month the indentured workers he recruited in England turned up to take up their new work. George Jobson, who arrived with his wife and two sons, displaced Parsons as groom. But Parsons did not depart: his duties shifted to the farm. James Axton and William Chandler, two specialist gardeners, started work and Stephen Gillard took up his tools in the farm sheds. Miss Leake noted nothing of these changes. Her days were occupied with shopping, visiting and entertaining unexpected callers.

March 1855

The ‘new’ housemaid, Susan, was named for the first time when Miss Leake allowed her to journey to Campbell Town on the morning of 19 March to shop. Susan is not elsewhere mentioned, neither for good nor ill. It was Miss Leake’s practice as mistress to note misdemeanours and thus, as she is not noteworthy, it may be assumed that Susan was passable, even pleasing. How Susan travelled to Campbell Town is a mystery. Sarah and Charles drove there during the day, most likely in the gig with Charles at the reins. Susan may have been given a lift. If not, the walk was about five miles, at least a two hours for a fit woman: maybe much longer home if the walker was burdened with parcels and had already spent many hours on foot.

103 Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.” Wages were paid to Parsons in April 1855.
April 1855

Stephen Gillard, an indentured agricultural labourer recruited by Charles in London was unhappy in Leake’s service. He may have been homesick, he may have not settled in the mixed company of convict and free men, he may have fallen out with Leake or one of his sons, or he may have found the isolation on Rosedale intolerable. On 26 March he absconded, in breach of his indenture. He turned up in the employ of Mr Fletcher of Lake Hills who wrote to Leake as follows:

Dear Sir I observe by the ‘Cornwall Chronicle’ that an immigrant named ‘Stephen Gillard’ has absconded from your service. This man is now here and if you intend to prosecute him, you had better send a constable with the requisite authority for his apprehension. If I do not hear from you or see the constables I shall discard ‘Gillard’ after this week. I give you this information because I think it is the duty of employers to protect each other from fraud and imposition.104

The constable must have been sent for Gillard appeared in the Campbell Town Lower Court before Thomas Mason, the Police Magistrate, on 12 April 1855 charged with having ‘absented himself without leave on the 26th March from the services of John Leake before the lawful termination of his engagement.’105 He was remanded until the following day when Charles Leake formally brought the charges against him. Charles Leake would have in his hand as evidence the indenture agreement signed in London on 17 August 1854 between him and Gillard, committing Gillard to work at Rosedale for two years.106 Gillard pleaded guilty and was sentenced ‘to be imprisoned with hard labour in the common gaol at Campbell Town for ten days and to be kept in solitary confinement for the whole of that period.’107 He also had costs of 7/6 awarded against him.

Scratchy short journal entries for March were a precursor for what was to come. Miss Leake hardly surfaced in that month. Her days had been spent at home and, for many of them, she noted nothing other than her routine meal ordering. Sarah emerged from 27 days of sickness on 17 April. Again, silence about personal illness was one of the notable features of Miss Leake’s journal. No description was offered of her symptoms, treatment or the course of the malady that had ailed her. She noted not if a doctor attended her. The journal recorded an

104 Mr Fletcher to John Leake, 9 April 1855, Leake Papers, L1/C86b
105 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
107 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
immediate return to responsible activities: ordering the meals for the household, teaching Henry Jobson, visiting the library, reading and sewing for herself.\textsuperscript{108} Having Jobson in for his lessons was a practice that was to occur as a matter of course, but not on Sundays. Their relationship is not commented upon, nor is the content of his learning beyond hearing his reading and teaching him writing. Henry was the 10-year-old son of the emigrant groom. He was too young to work, but appears to have become a favourite in the house for he was taken in the carriage to Brickhill’s store, and given the responsibility of opening the gates for Arthur when he took the gig to Ashby. Teaching him may have been instigated by Papa as a means to draw Miss Leake from illness but no hint of this is given in the diary.

Miss Leake would have heard news of George Trinder on her first trip to Campbell town after her illness. Trinder had appeared in court the previous day, charged by his new master, William Morrison, with being drunk and absent. It appears that the move to a tavern kitchen, a setting where alcohol was ubiquitous, had been too tempting for Trinder. Morrison had given evidence as follows:

... last evening I was looking for him under half an hour to three quarters of an hour it was at the time the mail arrived – I could not get into the kitchen for hot water – he had fastened the door on the inside and had gone upstairs to his bed – I was obliged to free the window out. – I went upstairs found him on his bed, he was drunk – I then called the Constable and gave him into custody when I did so he said to me I’ll settle you for selling grog on a Sunday.\textsuperscript{109}

The verdict was guilty and the sentence seven days’ solitary confinement. The move from isolated Rosedale, where Trinder had not caused offence enough to be sent to the magistrate, to Morrison’s Caledonian where liquor was the stock and trade, presented opportunity that was not resisted. This misdemeanour by Trinder, and any other he may have subsequently committed, did not spoil his relationship with John Leake who, some years later, sent Trinder money when his wife was ill.\textsuperscript{110}

Arthur’s poor health, trouble with his leg, was worrisome and the subject of chat at the Ross Store. The doctor had been summoned to attend him at his home. Miss Leake invited Arthur to convalesce with them and Charles drove the gig to Ashby to collect him.

\textsuperscript{108} A subscription fee for the library operated by Francis Turnbull of £ 2 10 shillings was paid in July 1855 thus continuing Sarah’s access to its collection. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
\textsuperscript{109} Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
\textsuperscript{110} “George Trinder to John Leake,” 17 May 1857, Leake Papers, L1/C77. Leake sent Trinder £2 and wished him better luck to which Trinder replied with a letter of thanks, in a strong clear well-rounded hand. George Trinder to John Leake, 22 May 1857,” Leake Papers, L1/C78.
Arthur stayed for five nights: seemingly a pleasant time with another houseguest and amusing literary activities. There was no comment about the burden on the house of additional guests. People simply came and stayed. The servants would have felt the strain before, during and after the visits: cleaning, cooking, and carrying. Miss Leake’s journal remained silent about such pressures.

May 1855

Arthur continued his practice of visiting, now seemingly recovered from his leg injury. Ashby was again the provider of poultry and butter for the Rosedale household, indicative of a continual process of provisioning. Throughout the year it has been the source of berry, citrus and other fruit, meat, dairy products, vegetables and poultry. The former houseguest, Mr Beach, now ensconced with the Harrisons at Merton Vale, took the walk across the paddocks to visit for tea.

The first week of May made up the final entries in the journal volume. The routine was unchanging: Henry Jobson for lessons, meals to order, servants to supervise, visits to make, and church to attend. Miss Leake was busy in the house on the morning of 7 May: in the kitchen making sausages and in the bathrooms checking on the work of Eliza the maid. The entry at the bottom of the final lined page of the journal has her reading in the afternoon. Sarah Leake’s life continued, contained within the open walls of Rosedale, without hardship or privation but for all that confined in a prison where even the sound of the servants’ movement was muffled.

Unerringly incarcerated

Rosedale might just as well have been the Bleak House that Miss Leake read about: ‘The clock ticked, the fire clicked; not another sound had been heard in the room, or in the house, for I don’t know how long.’ Rosedale was at once a family home, a household of masters and servants, and the loci of farm, business, political and social activity. It expanded out into the wider rural area, to Campbell Town and across the island penal colony which contained disciplinary devices for rendering labour cheap and compliant including a separate prison

where convicts and warders moved in slippered feet so as not to disrupt the sound of the clock that measured out the slow passing of time.

For John Leake and his wife Elizabeth, and three of their children, William, Sarah and Charles, Rosedale embodied the social and practical world. It was the family home and the site of the family wealth and prosperity. Charles Leake, the youngest son, most emulated his father in political and community life. He was able to travel, he married, and he was engaged widely in the community. Charles lived a wealthy if ordinary rural gentry life as the head of the house and family after his father’s death. He inherited Rosedale and it is his descendants who possess it now. In the 1850s he led a bachelor life.

Rosedale was both social world and prison for Sarah Leake. Miss Leake was to live at Rosedale until her death, in 1881. Her journal of the mid 1850s reveals, even then, that she longed for new locales. But she never got away for longer than brief visits, albeit one to New South Wales. She had nowhere else suitable to go. Hers was the spinster’s life: the dutiful daughter, the housekeeper sister, regulator of domestic labour, her father’s companion at the dining table when he hosted his friends, and, late in life, companion to her younger sister-in-law and teacher to her nieces.

Home for eldest son William became the asylum. For the last decades of his life, Rosedale represented a freedom he was barred from.

Members of the local community had connections at various levels with the family: socially, in business, to fulfill the requirements of convictism, in religious and community activity, and by geographic association. The years of the 1850s were very stable. Despite Leake’s increasing frailty as he aged the business maintained its pattern of growth and stability and Leake’s life reflected his status as parliamentarian, church stalwart and community leader. Those of his children who remained at home or nearby, in middle age, continued in firmly set patterns: Arthur managed Ashby, Charles took his father’s path in superintending the farm, Sarah managed the house, and William moved about the place. None had married. There was no new generation at Rosedale.  

The house servants and farm workers inhabited a separate social world. The differences were not based solely on formality or informality, settler or convict, kin or outsider. There were multiple intersections in daily life for most inhabited the same space – the house and outbuildings of Rosedale. It was their prison for a time; for some for many years. Most were unable to leave without permission, to choose when and how they worked,

---

112 Sarah Elizabeth Clara Leake was born in 1869. She inherited Rosedale from her father, Charles.
or to participate in the wider community. They were held in place, at least temporarily, by law. All eventually left: some went free, some to new assignments, some because they could.

Miss Leake’s terse commentary about the paucity of decent reading material, penned more than thirty years after her arrival in Tasmania, demonstrated the social persistence embodied in her customary performance of reading English magazines to sustain the images of whom she was. These images were not personally experienced for she was a young child when she left Britain. The images were upheld and valued through a constructed social memory.

What were the elements of this Britishness beyond converting the landscape from a fire-stick farmed plain that abounded with wildlife? In time the sod hut was reframed to a spacious house with a domestic culture of literature and music. Oaks lined the carriage drive, hawthorn marked the boundaries of the domestic gardens and willows choked the creeks. Did furnishing imported from London in the new house recreate the environment of ‘Home’ the Leakes were seeking? Did a stiff upper lip and a clean shirt for dinner mark one as refined? Did it make you a suitable employer of convict labour? Did it produce a person of refined habit who could lead by example, capable of instilling discipline into those under sentence?

The spaces of the home can underscore control as much as those in a public institution. Architectural, functional and hierarchial complexities are created by discipline within spaces. The life space of Sarah Leake, her home, was both fixed and individualised. It reinforced her obedience and reduced the need for innovation or planning on her part.

From her journal it seems Sarah’s lasting lessons from ‘Home’ were aloofness, drawing-room accomplishments and manners. These equipped her for the microcosm that was her narrow formal social world. She did not mix with or trust women who were not free settlers. Britishness for Miss Leake socially separated her from the mass of Anglo Celtic convicts, emancipists and working-class free settlers that worked at Rosedale and throughout the Midlands. She had the social tools to move within the required social morass and then return to the quietude of her drawing room. As a spinster she had not the responsibilities of her own family and as Leake’s daughter she had no financial concerns. Even when Sarah became mistress at Rosedale, she spent time most days reading. As the family ledger showed the Leake family subscribed to a range of newspapers and magazines from Britain, including, the *Edinburgh Review*, *Punch* and the *London Illustrated News*. They also purchased novels.

---

from ‘Home’ including Dickens’ *Little Dorrit* and *Bleak House* and non-fiction works ranging from McCauley’s *History of Britain* to the *London Encyclopaedia*. Her reading was a key means of sustaining her social memory, through childhood and as an adult.

But for all of that she remained fixed, pinned by social convention at the heart of the prison without walls, the warder of labour, incarcerated by duty, recording the little misdemeanours of others in the journal she kept to help her in the unremitting task of regulating Rosedale.

---

115 Leake Papers, L1/B882-5.
Chapter Seven: The geography of improvement

I have been directed to acquaint you, that the Governor has been honoured with a Despatch from The Right Honourable The Secretary of State, intimating that having referred for the consideration of The Secretary of State of the Home Department a copy of His Excellency’s Despatch of the 9th August last. Sir George Grey has felt at liberty under the circumstances therein stated to advise Her Majesty to grant a Free Pardon to Eliza Williams.¹

Many months had elapsed since the letter from John Leake supporting a full pardon for Eliza Williams had been signed and sealed.² There was no guarantee that the request would be successful and, thus, life proceeded in an orderliness of servitude. The last entry in Leake’s Day Book that mentions Eliza Williams was in November 1856 when she received a regular wages payment. This may or may not signify her departure. Given the way the household was run and Eliza’s long tenure, it is possible that she remained in Leake’s employ until replaced by Jane Wilson, the new housemaid, who arrived in January 1857.

Leake’s letter specified the reason for the request: Eliza wished to marry. The timing of John Leake’s letter seeking a full pardon for her to allow marriage in Britain is the only evidence on which to base the notion that the couple met while Eliza was in servitude. There is nothing that suggests she had fancied anyone else. While fraternising was punishable, there was no opposition to marriage, for it was seen to facilitate and encourage reform. John Leake accommodated couples who had married while in his service. Margaret Rooney and Benjamin Sculthorpe had met and married at Rosedale. They were together when Eliza arrived in 1852. Thomas Westlake and Eliza Kenny married in 1853. Kenny, as Mrs Westlake, would have moved to Rosedale where Westlake was a farm worker.

Nothing has been revealed that explains when Eliza Williams formed a relationship with George Hanley. As the Chinese proverb suggests, ‘No matter how big the sea, there are times when two ships meet.’ There is no local application from Eliza Williams to marry, as was required of a convict, and it can be assumed that the couple did not want to take this path.

¹ Acting Comptroller General to John Leake, 26 March 1857, in Leake Papers, Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, L1/C94.
² This letter has not been recovered. The reply Leake received indicates he wrote before 9 August 1856. Sir Henry Young to John Leake, 28 August 1856, Leake Papers, L1/C91.
That Hanley came to Australia from America to seek gold is clear but there is silence on George Hanley’s entry and departure in Australia.\(^3\) There is nothing that suggests he had known Eliza Williams when both were still in Ireland. Attempts to establish the date that Eliza left Rosedale and travelled to Melbourne have failed. A conditional pardon was granted to Eliza Williams on 14 August 1855.\(^4\) She had been free to seek new employment since the granting of a ticket of leave in May 1854,\(^5\) but remained at Rosedale. The free pardon was issued on 31 March 1857. Another two years would elapse before Eliza left Melbourne.

In the late 1850s, Melbourne was at the heart of the Victorian gold rushes. Melbourne’s seaward gateways, Williamstown and Port Melbourne, were chaotic and the city the largest in Australia. There is no record of Eliza seeking her fortune on the diggings. She took the position of house and parlour maid to Mr and Mrs Short of Dudley Street.\(^6\) From there, she saved her money and waited until she was allowed and then able to travel back to Britain. Eliza was content with the position with the Shorts but the work would have been continuous: cleaning, polishing, dusting, sorting, sewing, and serving; ensuring there were fresh candles, linen and clothing; opening the curtains, shutters and windows in the morning and closing them at night; and living under the scrutiny of the mistress.

While at Dudley Street, Eliza received the one item that would ensure her capacity to return to Britain: a full pardon.\(^7\) She wrote to John Leake to thank him: ‘You have at all times taken a deal of trouble with trying to get me any indulgence you could for which I am forever indebted and will never be forgotten by me.’\(^8\) This is the only letter with a grateful, humble salutation. It is also the only extant letter written by Eliza to her former master, John Leake. The remaining letters are to either Charles or William. To Charles she signs herself less formally, sometimes only by name and, to William, Eliza writes once writes Dear Mr William rather than Dear Mr Leake, suggestive of a closer personal relationship.\(^9\) This informality may have been tempered by her knowledge of his poor mental health. Likewise,

---

\(^3\) *Mount Elliott Cemetery: A History*, Detroit: Mt Elliot Cemetery Trust, undated, p. 45. Entry for George Hanley.

\(^4\) *Hobart Town Gazette*, 14 August 1855, p. 904. The condition was ‘… that they shall not return to or be found within the countries in which they were severally convicted, or the United Kingdom of Great Britain or Ireland, during the remaining term of their sentences of transportation.’

\(^5\) *Hobart Town Gazette*, 16 May 1854, p. 448.

\(^6\) Eliza Williams to John Leake, 16 April c1857, Leake Papers, L1/C95.

\(^7\) *Hobart Town Gazette*, 31 March 1857, p 270.

\(^8\) Personal inspection revealed Dudley Street to be in a well preserved historic area of Melbourne of modest suburban houses in a parkland setting. Eliza Williams to John Leake, 16 April c1857, Leake Papers, L1/C95.

he may have encouraged her to treat him in a more casual way in his letters to her which, although not now in existence, were once written and received.

Ticket to America

It is tempting, and convenient, to hone in on evidence that supports a line of thinking, particularly where no alternative data presents itself. This was the situation when considering when Eliza departed Australia to Britain to wed George Hanley. The only reference of note was the shipping record. The timing suggested she did not hurry from Australia’s shores as soon as she was legally able, but departed in a planned way to meet George, to marry, then to travel to America. Eliza departed Australia in September 1859 with a full pardon in hand. She left from Melbourne aboard the SS Norfolk in the company of 156 fellow steerage passengers with a further 22 passengers in cabins, plus a cargo of opossum skins. She left to marry George Hanley which she did in Toxteth, Lancashire, on 27 December 1859.

George Hanley was a Roman Catholic. Eliza made the religious transition from Protestant to Catholic so successfully that later generations of her family were astounded to learn of it. The marriage was held in St Patricks Roman Catholic Chapel which still stands on Park Place, Toxteth near Liverpool: a chapel famous for the clover-leaf pattern on the soles of the feet of its statue of the Saint which was presented to the chapel by the defunct St Patrick Insurance Company of Dublin. The witnesses were Patrick McCoey and Mary McDonald both of River Street. There were no family members present for both sets of parents had migrated to America and were living in New York. After the wedding, the couple sailed to America and settled in Detroit, Michigan, where George prospered as a plasterer and builder. From the outset in the United States, Eliza was known as Eliza W (Williams) Hanley.

10 Index to Outward Passengers to Interstate, UK, NZ and Foreign Ports 1852-1923, Public Record Office, Victoria.
12 There is no evidence of her conversion in the St Patrick’s Catholic Chapel records which most usually would have been confirmed by baptism the day before marriage. Prior attempts by members of the Hanley family to know of Eliza’s time in Australia were hampered by their belief that she was Catholic. They searched the wrong records. Alice Meredith Hodgson, “Personal communication with Anastasia Pankiw Hanley,” Detroit, 2010.
14 Liverpool Record Office, Marriages 1859 – 1864.
16 This use of the Williams surname as a middle given name was to be carried on by each of her daughters later in their lives even though none was given the name in infancy.
Detroit in 1860 was no frontier outpost. The completion of the Great Western Railroad from Buffalo to Windsor had made direct rail travel between Detroit, New York and the east possible from 1854.\textsuperscript{17} Detroit had ceased to be the capital of Michigan having been replaced by Lansing in 1847. Nonetheless, the city had grown from its origins as a French fur-trading post. It was set on the banks of the Detroit River with Canadian farms and the village of Windsor clearly visible on the opposite bank. Islands dotted the river rising ‘like emeralds from the clear, tranquil water…’\textsuperscript{18} It was considered a western city in an America where the West was yet to be opened. It was also a modern conurbation with piped water throughout the city, a complex system of sewerage and wastewater removal and streets lit with lamps fed by a network of underground gas pipes. Detroit was a city of migrants and new citizens. The Michigan population in 1860 was just under 750000. Detroit housed 45000 of them and would more than double in the next two decades.\textsuperscript{19} The place was abuzz with growth.

Detroit was a city of newsheets.\textsuperscript{20} A multiplicity of churches, religious and community groups marked it out as a multicultural place although it had a strong Irish tradition.\textsuperscript{21} St Patrick’s Day had first been celebrated in 1808. The evolution of Detroit, over the first half of the nineteenth century, from village to modern city had been peaceful and prosperous. A fire in 1805 had completely destroyed the original settlement and a new town was designed along a planned radiating grid pattern of wide streets that formed the basis of the streetscape of downtown Detroit to this day.\textsuperscript{22} Capital punishment had been abolished in 1842, to the surprise of the world, after several cases of hanging the innocent.\textsuperscript{23} The city fathers were proud of their achievements for Detroit was a manufacturing and industrial hub in the 1860s, many decades before it became the motor city for which it is more remembered. The ‘Golden Age’ of the automobile would not have been possible without this prior industrial history.

Fine warm weather would have welcomed the travellers at the end of their train journey from New York. Detroit was a city entering summer. Remarkably, at this early stage

\textsuperscript{17} Paul Leake, \textit{History of Detroit: A chronicle of its Progress, its Industries, its Institutions, and the People of the Fair City of the Straits}, Chicago and New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1912. Volume 1, p 199.
\textsuperscript{22} Burton, \textit{The City of Detroit Michigan, 1701-1922}, Volume 1, p. 304.
of their married life, the Hanleys had the resources to set up a business and home. George’s skills as a plasterer were in strong demand in the rapidly growing conurbation. George had no personal funds, suggestive of a failed attempt at gold-digging. Eliza had a personal estate of US$300, a substantial sum for a young woman starting out married life. The source of these funds is not known but her record of saving her money suggests that at least some had been earned in Australia and carefully put away in anticipation of exactly what was now happening: the much sought-after life in the American Republic.

The 1860 US Census for Wayne County shows Eliza and George Hanley living in the City of Detroit rather than Irish Town. They were located in a diverse neighbourhood filled with young families. Their street address was not listed but it was clear their neighbours were of both American (New York, Maine, Ohio, Virginia and Pennsylvania) and international origin (Germany, England, Ireland and Scotland). Their immediate neighbours, George and Emma Buffum, similarly newly married and of the same age as the Hanleys, lived with George Buffum’s mother and his sister Margaret. The Buffums lived in the house owned by master builder Jeremiah Fisher, who at 24 years was a successful young man, also residing there with his wife and their child. The men were mostly working in the trades that were building Detroit: locomotive engineers, bricklayers, plasterers, stonecutters, copper and tinsmiths, blind and sash makers, and painters. One household had a servant. The 15-year-old Anestine Kehn was the domestic in the home of lawyer Elijah Meddaugh, ironically the same age as his daughter Caroline. Only two near neighbours owned their residences: Jeremiah Fisher whose real estate was valued at $2,000 and Betsy Holmes, a widow of English birth, with property listed as valued at $5,000.

George entered an existing partnership known as Roberts and Co and, by mid June 1860, he was financially able to stand the debts of the third partner who left the partnership, renamed Roberts & Hanley. The departing partner was William Roe, a 45-year-old plasterer of English origin, listed in the 1860 Census in Detroit Ward 6. He indicated owning $2000 of real estate and $500 of personal estate and was, therefore, a wealthy man. Maybe he was ready to retire, to invest elsewhere, or perhaps to move his wife and four young children on from Detroit. The remaining partner, Joseph Roberts, was a Welshman aged 41 with an English-born wife and a family of six children. The youngest two children had been born in

---

Michigan which suggests that the family had come to Detroit in the mid 1850s. The Roberts family had assets valued at $400, mostly real estate. George and Eliza’s first confirmed Detroit address was a rented house at 19 John R. George was operating the plastering business from home, or rather they were living at the business. Joseph Roberts and his family lived nearby, at 75 Columbia east.

There were few opportunities had Eliza needed to work. Being a servant was the most available work for employment but she was not likely to want to return to the domestic trade. Serving in the bar or dining room in a tavern was an alternative site of female employment. Some shops engaged women, but they were generally members of the storekeeper’s family rather than hired help. The theme of her new American life was to remove herself from service and to become mistress of her own home. Her literacy, numeracy and knowhow would have been invaluable to the business.

Michigan was an antislavery state and southern slave owners looked upon Detroit, where the underground railway received, fed and concealed runaway slaves, with ‘contempt and loathing.’ The sentiment in Michigan was that succession was revolution to be opposed. Work went on in the community to support the men who served the Union. The first regiment raised in Detroit departed Fort Wayne in 1861. Eliza, the former unfree worker, had to confront the issue of conscription, for every able-bodied man in the county aged 20 to 45 was required to enrol. George was not summoned to the war.

‘I am real comfortable and happy’ Eliza wrote to Charles Leake from her home, the rented building at 19 John R. This is the only time Eliza would live at the workshop. It is doubtful she complained, for she was a hardworking young woman who was now fulfilling two of her dreams – to live in America and to have a family of her own. Her news suggests that the letter was written late in 1862. Her first child, John Charles Hanley, was an infant but not new born. In a later letter to Charles, Eliza said that the baby had been named for both

27 Charles F Clark, *Charles F. Clark’s Annual Directory of the Inhabitants, Incorporated Companies, Business Firms etc. in the City of Detroit, for 1862-3*, Detroit: Charles F Clark, 1862. They may have lived at this address from the outset. The American convention for street naming is used: Woodward avenue (not Woodward Avenue), Watson (for Watson Street) and John R (for John R Street).
28 Clark, *Charles F. Clark’s Annual Directory*, p. 212. Clark lists both home and business address. They are the same.
32 Eliza Hanley to Charles Leake, c1862, Leake Papers, L1/M75.
33 John Charles Hanley was born 9 May 1862, as indicated on his headstone at Detroit’s Mount Elliot Cemetery.
‘Mr Leake and you’. 34 That these names were chosen over that of the baby’s father or any member of either family is indicative of the esteem in which the Leake men were held. The influence of benevolent paternalism extended over the oceans, from Rosedale to 19 John R. Her most important report was family success: her first child was thriving and her husband was at work building them a new house: brick not timber thus a symbol of stability and security in a city known for fires. Concerns of daily life were the substance of this letter which was written during the American Civil War. Privations in the early years of the War that most affected her were a lack of silver, for although there was no lack of paper money, silver and gold were unavailable to ordinary people; mail to foreign destinations was curtailed and there were shortages of luxury goods like writing paper. Eliza had been ill: infectious disease and ailments associated with childbirth and lactation. Cholera, jaundice, a damaged finger and apparently a breast abscess would have taken a toll. She was not shy of sharing such news with Charles Leake and this suggests their relationship was trusting, informal and chatty.

Eliza asked after Mrs Dormer, who was clearly dear to her. Her words indicated urgency about learning of this friend’s welfare and she noted the return of a letter she had addressed to Mrs Dormer in Launceston. Eliza’s interest in her former friends indicates that she wrote to others, beside members of the Leake family, and anticipated correspondence in return. Mrs Dormer remained a mystery until a note in John Leake’s ledger. 35 A little investigation revealed a great deal about Olive Dormer. As Olive Bloor, she arrived in Tasmania aboard the Emma Eugenia on 2 April 1844 having been sentenced, along with three male accomplices, to 15 years’ transportation for highway robbery. 36 A 22-year-old English woman with a marked limp, she was an unlikely highway thief. Olive was a farm servant by trade. She served her probation on the Anson, graduating 3rd class, and was issued a pass to work.

It is not known how she met her future husband William Dormer. He too had been a convict, transported for life for sheep stealing. Dormer arrived aboard the Lord William Bentinck on 26 August 1838 and disembarked, aged 20, with the trade of blacksmith. His gaol report was ‘bad’ and his convict record indicates a insubordinate and disorderly man. On

34 Eliza Hanley to Charles Leake, c1866, Leake Papers, L1/M76. She also wrote that she named her first daughter Olivia Nellie after her friend Olive Dormer. Again, this showed her affection for people she had met in Tasmania.


36 Olive Bloor per Emma Eugenia, CON 41/1/1.
24 July 1839 he was charged with ‘disobedience of orders and using indecent language 25 lashes’. At other times he was admonished for drunkenness, sentenced to solitary confinement for neglect of duty, given hard labour on the gang for absence without leave, and again lashed for absconding. Dormer was awarded a ticket of leave in 1846 but the record is silent on other indulgences. William Dormer and Olive Bloor were married at St Luke’s in Campbell Town by the chaplain, Rev William Bedford on 23 February 1846. The groom was 28, Olive was 23. William, listed as a labourer, signed the register and Olive, a convict spinster, made her mark.

Entries in the Day Book indicate that Olive and William Dormer were in contact with Rosedale from at least February 1849 to June 1858. Dormer was paid wages from time to time for shearing, and it could be that he was contracted for this annual task. The Dormers’ relationship with Rosedale was indicative of a patriarchal yeomanry model of compliant tenancy locked in place in a harmonious social control presided over by the family in the big house. The relationship between Eliza Williams and Olive Dormer was one of friendship. There is no evidence that they worked together, but this may have occurred for John Leake would hire wives of men working for him for duties in the house when needed. The first entry for Olive being paid wages was in 1853 and therefore she was on the property the year after Eliza arrived. With the trade of farm servant, Olive may have had charge of the dairy.

In 1858 the Dormers lived on a dairy near Cullenswood, owned by Robert Cameron of Clairville. Cameron owned vast acreages leased to tenant farmers, the epitome of yeomanry. At this time Leake was both paying Olive Dormer occasional wages and receiving money from her for him to remit to her mother, Mrs Ann Bloor, in Staffordshire. He had fulfilled this banker role for her several times over the preceding years. William Dormer went on to be the licensee of the Angel Inn, a Launceston hotel, during the early 1860s. The reason the letters written by Eliza were undelivered in Launceston, was that Olive Dormer had moved to New Zealand. She departed Launceston for Dunedin and the goldfields on the Ziska, as a steerage passenger with her daughter (listed as Miss Dormer), on 21 February 1863. William Dormer did not travel with them. Olive’s later letters to Sarah

37 William Dormer per Lord William Bentinck, CON 31/1/12.
38 Dormer/Bloor RGD 37/485/1846
40 John Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
41 Hobart Town Gazette, 14 January 1862, p. 56.
Leake suggest it was not a happy marriage, at least not in the end. She was fearful of William. Eliza may have known this, thus her concern for Olive.44

But Eliza was not to know this. There was no letter from New Zealand. Like many newly arrived families, the Hanleys moved house several times in their early years in Detroit. Lists of names, male and female, for which letters were held at the post office, were published in the daily press indicative of a moving population without fixed address.45 The loss of contact between Eliza and Olive, and the return of Eliza’s letters is an example of what Hindmarsh termed ‘a fragile chain of trans-global communication’.46 The chain was broken when Olive moved to New Zealand. Before then, at least Charles Leake knew where she was.47 Sarah Leake knew Olive’s address but it seems she did not convey it to Eliza for there is no record that they ever exchanged letters. Charles would later receive a condolence letter from Olive regarding the death of John Leake but it appears he did not tell Eliza this.48

Made in Detroit

‘... it is not to bad to have plenty of money’, wrote Eliza in July 1863, addressing her letter to C.H. Leake Esq, Rosedale.49 But it was bad in other ways. This letter said much about the impact of the Civil War and her sense of personal loss for she was grieving for old friends and family. The columns of the Detroit press in 1863 were filled with war news and political comment about the conflict. The reports reinforced that the Civil War was a war against the independent stand of the Confederacy, or ‘rebels’ as they were known, not a war against slavery.50 War news included reports of battles, debates in congress, lists of dead and wounded, and speeches made by politicians on the hustings. Local stories included reports of public charitable works, literary gossip, fashion news and news of domestic infidelities. Reports of the number of fires, called ‘conflagrations’ which were quick and complete with

43 Olive Dormer to Sarah Leake, 22 August 1863, Leake Papers, L1/H77.
44 There is more to Olive’s story. See Alice Meredith Hodgson, “‘I am still keeping the same house as when I last wrote I am keeping out of debt but saving no money’,” in Female Convict Research Centre Autumn Seminar, Hobart, 2015.
45 An example of these lists can be found in 1862 editions of the Detroit Free Press.
47 As was evidenced by Charles Leake paying Olive’s husband’s Launceston medical bill. Leake Papers, L1/C101b, L1/C101d.
48 Olive Dormer to Charles Leake, 27 May 1868, Leake Papers, L1/M96.
49 Date calculated by the age noted by Eliza of her son John. The infant is 14 months old. This suggests the letter was written in July 1863 given his birth date of 9 May 1862.
50 Detroit Free Press, 1863.
so many wooden structures, underscored that theatres, stores, houses, public building could all go the way of accident or arson.

Eliza wrote from her home at 49 Madison avenue. They lived there for less than a year before beginning their association with Columbia east. Eliza and George’s second child, a daughter, was born in 1864. She was named Olivia Nellie in recognition of Eliza’s distant friend, Olive Dormer. By 1865 George and Eliza, with their growing family, had moved to a house on the north-west corner of Columbia and John R. George was building a house for the family further along Columbia.

George and Eliza moved to the newly built home at 44 Columbia east in 1866. This was a year of family upheaval for, besides moving house, a second daughter, Minnie, was born and George’s younger brother James, also a plasterer, came to Detroit for a time and boarded with the family.

Life in America was tumultuous compared to the quiet of rural Tasmania. It was almost certainly with Rosedale and its clocks, slippers and regimented routine in mind that she wrote ‘... this is a terrible country excitement all the time.’ Given the respective birth dates of her two children, the letter was written between 9 May and 4 September 1866. Charles Leake was the recipient of this letter. His father died in 1865 and, with his brother Arthur, he was administering John Leake’s estate which had left Rosedale equally to William, Arthur and Charles. William’s insanity would result in the estate not being settled until after his death in 1886. These matters may have contributed to Charles not replying for some time. At Rosedale were Charles and Sarah Leake, and their young cousin Clara Bell. Arthur was at Ashby. All were adjusting to life after the death of John Leake.

Eliza’s letter retains a sense of happiness tinged with concern for her old friends. She would have been pregnant with her third child for, although not mentioned, Minnie was born in 1866. Mention of Mr Leake indicated that when this letter was written she did not know he had died. George Hanley was doing very well: the business was prospering; he owned investment real estate and was increasing the size of the house; and all were in health. The ‘excitement’ of America was not all good: political agitation associated with the Fenian movement and concern about cholera, again. Eliza did not display political consciousness of Irish origin, rather her interest seemed related to newsworthiness. Newspapers reported

51 Eliza Williams to Charles Leake, c1866, Leake Papers, L1/M76.
52 John Hanley’s 4th birthday was 9 May 1866 and Nellie was 2 on 4 September, 1866.
53 John Leake provided for his daughter Sarah through a bequest of £5,000. She did not inherit property. John Leake’s Will, Leake Papers, L1/D298-99.
progress of the campaign by the Fenian Movement for Irish nationalism. The *Detroit Free Press* of 2 June 1866 devoted its three front-page columns to news of the movement of regiments of supporters from American cities to Canada; the amounts of money raised in American cities to support the campaign and the movement of British regular troops in Canada. This news took more space than reports of cholera in New York from infected hospital ships.\(^5^4\) The United States President of the day, President Andrew Johnson or Old Andy as Eliza referred to him in common with the general populace, moved on the Irish nationalists, and the many Bostonians who supported the Fenians returned home. By 16 June the Fenian news had all but disappeared. It was to reappear now and again for the next few months with a focus on fundraising and rhetoric rather than troops and battles.

There was stability in the Hanley family life. George continued in partnership with Joseph Roberts. Joseph’s son Peter entered the trade. The Hanley family remained on Columbia. Katie Hanley was born into the family in 1869. George’s brother, James, returned to Detroit and plastering work, and boarded a couple of doors down at 70 Columbia. The Roberts and Hanley partnership appeared to be doing well. The partnership lodged its first directory advertisement which indicated the business address as 76-78 Congress.\(^5^5\) By the late 1860s, George and his brother James, along with Joseph Roberts and his two elder sons all worked in the business.\(^5^6\)

Successive census reports plot a continual rise in fortunes for the Hanleys and those around them. In the 1860 US census, George was listed as having no assets and Eliza as having a personal estate of $300. By the 1870 Census, they had real estate valued at $15,000 and personal assets of $3,500. In ten years in Detroit they had accumulated more than seven times the wealth of Charles Roe whose share in the plastering business George had taken on in the early months of their residency. The first decade of married life for Eliza had been associated with the home and family. By the end of it she had four living children.\(^5^7\)

The 1870 Census revealed that Joseph Roberts had real estate worth $6,000 and personal effects of $500. He lived at 125 Columbia east. His three younger children were at school. Their immediate neighbours included a painter, a dealer in stoves, and a bookkeeper. Women’s work was in the home in almost every instance. Two near neighbours had a

\(^{54}\) *Detroit Free Press*, 2 June 1866.

\(^{55}\) Charles F Clark, *Annual Directory of the Inhabitants, Incorporated Companies, Business Firms, etc. of the City of Detroit, for 1869-70*, Detroit: Compiled and published by Charles F. Clark, 1869, p. 432.

\(^{56}\) Charles F Clark *Annual Directory of the Inhabitants, Incorporated Companies, Business Firms, etc. of the City of Detroit, for 1869-70*, 1869, pp. 217, 340 and 443.

\(^{57}\) Eliza and George’s children by the end of this decade were John Charles, born 1862, Olivia Nellie, born 1864, Minnie, born 1866, and Katie, born 1869.
domestic servant but most wives were listed as ‘keeping house’. Generally daughters were either ‘at school’ or ‘at home’. One young woman, 19-year-old Minnie Coller was a teacher of music. She lived at home with her elderly parents and her siblings. Her elder sister did not work. There were several young men, unmarried and living with their family of origin, who worked as clerks in stores. This indicates a shift towards more middle-class professions for young men with an education. But, in the Roberts family, all the sons of working age were plasterers.58

The neighbours on the Hanley’s section of Columbia east, closer to the business district, were firmly in the trades: engineering, painting, plastering and carpentry but, similar to the Roberts’ precinct, a number of the young men in neighbouring families were clerks in stores or commercial offices. Eliza was listed as keeping house but the Hanleys had a servant, a 19-year-old Pennsylvanian Mary Boyne, daughter of an Irish-born couple, Anne and her labourer husband Thomas Boyne.59 Eliza had crossed the line to being mistress. She was no longer doing all the chores to maintain the home for her growing family. In 1871 her fifth and last child was born and this second son was named George after his father.60

The first half of the decade of the 1870s was very stable for the family and the business. Despite the depression years in Detroit in the mid 1870s the plastering partnership prospered and both George’s younger brother, James Hanley, and Joseph Roberts’ son Peter worked in the business. In 1875 the arrangements changed and the business partnership was dissolved to form two new entities: George Hanley & Bro at 78 Congress and Roberts & Sons Plastering at 212 Woodward avenue. The business split at a time of expansion in Detroit is more likely to represent an amicable shift reflective of family changes and change in the building sector than a disagreement. George Hanley took control of the workshop on Congress and he was to occupy that site for the remainder of his contracting career, which would span another twenty-one years.

Stability of a different order had emerged at Rosedale. Eliza wrote to William Leake on 11 May 1876, a letter addressed to the Lunatic Asylum at New Norfolk. William had been detained there since 15 July 1873. She took a reassuring tone:

60 George Hanley, Eliza’s fifth child and second son was born on 8 April 1871. Michigan Births 1867-1902, item 3, p. 189, record number 7172. George later became known as George H Hanley but there is no extant record of the change or the name, beyond the letter H. To avoid confusion between father and son, Eliza’s son George is herein given the name she used for him in letters to Tasmania: Georgie. Her grandson, George Philip Hanley is referred to in full.
I need to tell you how delighted I was to hear from you. I was very much grieved to hear that you had been so very sick. I cannot tell you how pleased I am to see that you have so far recovered as to be able to write me such a nice kind sensible letter.

William was first admitted to Hospital for the Insane in New Norfolk, aged 55, on 12 December 1861. Charles Leake had accompanied him to New Norfolk and signed the committal order. His medical record indicates his first attack of insanity occurred when he was about 30. William was delusional and he had been ‘more or less unwell for years.’

He was detained for the second time in July 1863. Edward Leake wrote to Charles in August and September of that year reassuring him that he had acted in William’s interests and that it was best that he be away for a time. It is not known how long William had been at Rosedale after his first release. He was considered confused, suffered hallucinations and at times appeared dangerous to others by threats. Dr William Valentine noted on the medical certificate: ‘General incoherence and extreme delusions that he is empowered to execute a thousand persons and that he has received bodily injuries.’ This time William was a patient at New Norfolk for nearly three years. There he was known as Bill Leake. He then boarded for some time with Dr George Huston, the asylum superintendent. He did not return to Rosedale until February 1867. A relapse, again certified by Dr Valentine, meant William returned to the asylum on 4 December 1871. William was admitted again in July 1873. The admission form indicates a worsening state: ‘... very distasteful habits, destructive, base in his language and manner and ... very insulting to females.’

The letters William wrote to his brother Charles from the asylum reflected short-lived periods of sanity. Several times he wrote to say he was well and ready to come home. The last of the letters to Charles confirmed William remained in the asylum in 1885. He died there in 1886. He also wrote to his other brothers and his sister over the years of incarceration. He often asked for goods to be sent: tobacco, chocolate, butter, cheese, lollies and clothing. In one letter to John Travis Leake, William wrote that he would take Charles and Arthur to court.

---

61 Eliza Williams to William Leake, 11 May 1876, Leake Papers, L1/M78.
62 This was about the time William quarrelled with his father. He had been living in Launceston and had behaved ill. His brothers all advised him to return to Campbell Town, perhaps to live with Robert who at the time lived on Lewisham. This matter is covered in extant letters. Leake Papers, L1/H17-19.
66 Leake, “Patient records - admission papers,” 4 December 1871.
for having him detained illegally. William also wrote to Eliza. In an 1878 letter he told Charles he had written to Eliza and asked for a copy of a daguerreotype, an early photographic image, to send her. He wanted a good one: William was concerned Eliza ‘would not care for one all grey and toothless.’

Eliza’s letter to the 70-year-old William Leake, of May 1876, recognised his mental illness. She may have sent him the accompanying bundle of newspapers as recreation, or it may have been her usual practice. She praised his ‘sensible’ letter and this suggests she was well aware of his frailties. Charles Leake was living at Rosedale with his wife, Clara Jane Bell. They had three daughters, the first two of which were ‘the little misses’ Eliza refers to. She was pleased to have their photographs in her hand to remind her of the folk at Rosedale. The photograph was a significant sentimental object in the American home, albeit modern, and its use as a decorative object in the house consolidated this sentimentality, particularly related to memorial and mourning. Clearly she had photographs of all the people from Rosedale that were dear to her. That no mention is made of Charles’ youngest daughter indicated William’s letter was written before her birth in 1874. Sarah Leake, too, still lived at Rosedale. She was not the topic of enquiry or news. With Clara the mistress of the house, Sarah had slipped into invisibility.

Detroit has been described as ‘the birthplace of industrial mass production.’ Long before the car industry developed, it led all other American cities:

... in the manufacture of freight cars, pharmaceutical preparations, stoves and varnishes, and was among the leaders in paints, perfumeries and half a dozen others. But, in addition to these, it had hundreds of factories devoted to other industries, working in iron and steel, brass and copper in various forms, brick, lumber and other building materials, furniture in wood and metal, textile fabrics, household articles in great variety, and novelties in endless forms.

In the 1876 *Detroit City Directory*, there was an update of the state of public infrastructure and economic progress. The report was of a growing city of the American west with a solid

---

69 William Leake to John Travis Leake, 7 September 1875, Leake Papers, L1/K49.
70 William Leake to Charles Leake, 26 April 1878, Leake Papers, L1/K7.
72 The ‘little misses’ were Sarah Elizabeth Clara (Bessie) Leake 1869-1929 and Mary Alice Rose Leake 1871-1931. The third daughter was Helen Letitia Constance (Dolly) Leake 1874-1961.
commercial base. It had taken on a suburban quality with miles of tramway making cheap railcar transport to all the outer ends of the major streets thus suburban life a reality.\textsuperscript{75} George, Eliza and the family still lived on Columbia east. In 1877 they moved to the house at number 11 and stayed there several years. The plastering partnership between the brothers flourished: James, too, still lived nearby on Columbia. The flow of permits for buildings in Detroit ensured continuous stream of work for contractors in all the building trades. In 1878 permits were allocated for “... 130 dwellings, 32 shops and places of manufacture, and 33 stores, the buildings alone aggregating in value, according to contractors’ estimates, $336,764.”\textsuperscript{76} This steady flow of employment maintained the prosperity of the wider Hanley family.

In the letter to the asylum Eliza suggested, seemingly jokingly, that William travel to America to witness the Centennial Exposition, held at Fairmount Park in Philadelphia, which celebrated the 100\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The exposition included exhibits from every state in the Union. Praise for the Michigan display filled local papers to satisfy the clamour for information from those unable to attend. The state received the world first prize for its manufacture of stoves, and another prize for its shoes.\textsuperscript{77}

The Yankees were an amusement to Eliza, even though she proudly recognised that her children were Yankees. She singled out the pace of life: so hurried that people ate in the street, on the move. There was mention of pranks at Rosedale as indicative of a good time in her youth. She and William obviously shared a history that was not all formality and tension. She recalled:

... there is a lady living across the way from my house that looks exactly like Mrs Jobson do you remember her well I have to laugh every time I see her when I remember the jokes I played on her one time I made something smell very savoury at the door and after a little while she ran into the kitchen to see what was cooking for dinner that smelled so nice she told me she [knew] anything in her life like it and of course I never told her the joke you know she was always wanting something good to eat and that was good for her\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{75} JW Weeks & Co’s Annual Directory of Detroit for 1876-77, Embracing a Complete Alphabetical List of Business Firms and Private Citizens, a Classified Business Directory, a Directory of the City and County Officers, Churches, and Public Schools, Benevolent, Literary, and other Associations, Banks, Incorporated Institutions etc. etc., Detroit: JW Weeks & Co, 1876, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{77} Marsh and Marsh, History of Detroit, p 235.
\textsuperscript{78} Eliza Williams to William Leake, 11 May 1876, Leake Papers, L1/M78.
This would have been a memory from 1855 or 1856 as that was the time Harriet, wife of George Jobson who had been a Rosedale groom, lived on the property.

Two years later, in another letter to William Leake addressed to the asylum, Eliza described her husband as he grew older.

I have had some photographs taken this week and will send you of myself and husband you will see that I am changed considerably but twenty years is a long time I have not got a grey hair in my head my Husband is quite grey but not so very old he will be forty seven next May  79

Her description matched his image in a photograph of him remarkably found in a public collection: the Randall scrapbooks. 80 The scrapbooks were the work of lawyer James A Randall and number over 100 volumes. They present a different perspective on Detroit for the period 1865 through to c1900. They are not the formal trial record of a successful lawyer, for they contain, beside newspaper cuttings of major criminal trials and some civil matters, the ephemera of Randall’s public life: political handbills, cartoons, voting tickets and advertisements; visiting cards; invitations to public and private events; programs for dances and concerts; hand-written notes between colleagues in the law firm; and the certificates associated with legal competence. Some volumes contain much newspaper gossip and scandal, with a strong focus on divorce, child marriage, fallen women and paternity.

The Randall scrapbooks include an extensive collection of images of individuals, many of whom are identified, and a few pictures of scenery and building, more reminiscent of holiday snaps. There are studio portraits, often repeated through a volume or across several volumes, of himself, his parents, wife and children, men in public life and women, some named, some not. The images of women range from portraits of his relatives through actresses and unnamed women, some in risqué and salacious poses. Randall’s brother, Corydon C Randall, was a photographer and many of the images bear the signature of his studio. In Volume 83 there is a named image of George Hanley, circa 1880. This suggests George was his client.

The Hanley family had spent some months in Florida because, as Eliza explained, they were afraid of smallpox that was rampant in Detroit. Florida for an extended summer holiday that lasted through the winter indicated a family with the surplus disposable income to pay for travel and weeks of accommodation. Eliza reminisced about Tasmania to William

79 Eliza Williams to William Leake, 7 March 1878, Leake Papers, L1/M79.
for she had been reminded of its climate and gardens by the orange groves of Florida. This was a departure from their standard summer practice: to travel by steamer up the Detroit River and the shores of Lake Huron to Mackinaw. Strategically located at the meeting of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron, the Straits of Mackinac had been a cross road of the Great Lakes since 1670. Mackinaw village, later city, was established on the Michigan side of the crossing in 1857. Beachside cottages and hotels ranged along the low flat bank of beach beside Lake Huron. Mackinac Island, with its grand hotel, and local highlights for tourists including Arch Rock and Sugar Loaf Rock, was a further steamboat trip across the lake.\textsuperscript{81} It was a widely publicised holiday destination for Detroiters.

Eliza’s family news was brief: her children were doing well. Education seemed the key to their future prosperity, presumably for the boys in the workforce and for the girls by marriage. Proficiency in French and piano were hallmarks of privileged girls and Eliza was proud to describe her girls’ progress. Only the death of close family clouded Eliza’s horizon: it appeared she was the sole surviving member of her immediate family of origin, and she continued to lament the loss of contact with Olive Dormer. William may well have mused on his own childhood; at school in Hamburg, learning Latin and mathematics, reading the classics. The grim high walls of the asylum bore no resemblance to an orange grove, be it in Tasmania or Florida, and encased not happy family musical evenings but endless nights of confusion and disillusionment.

It continued a consolidating period of business and family for the Hanleys. Advertisements in the city directory indicated that the business had broadened into large-scale contracting as well as domestic and commercial plastering. John Hanley, first-born child and son of George and Eliza was listed in the city directory for the first time, as a student. A pattern that would be familiar to the Leake men was being played out in Detroit. The further education they had been denied by the circumstance of colonial settlement was being bestowed on Eliza’s children. John attended Detroit College, the forerunner to the University of Detroit, an establishment of the Jesuit brothers which took its first students the year John attended.\textsuperscript{82} It was on a bustling corner of Jefferson. In class with John was James M Keenan, his future brother-in-law.\textsuperscript{83}

The publishers of the 1880 edition of the city directory commented upon the fast pace

\textsuperscript{81} Mackinaw City Historical Pathway, Billboard.
\textsuperscript{82} www.udmercy.edu/mission/university/history/index.
\textsuperscript{83} The class lists appear in Catalogue of Officers and Students of Detroit College, 1877/78 available at www.archive.org/details/catalogueof7778detr.
of growth in Detroit and the rising population in its outer suburbs like Hamtramck and Springwells. 84 They also commented on the growth of house building and the speed with which existing dwellings, once emptied, were taken by new residents. The Hanley family did not make the move to the new suburbs. They consolidated their life in the City of Detroit.

Eliza and George, and their family, made their final move, to Watson street in July 1885. This confirmed their status as a wealthy Yankee family. Detroit’s affluent established neighbourhoods without industry, in substantial brick dwellings, many with large grounds with carriage houses, within walking distance of downtown Detroit. 85 George had built the ample multistorey brick house at 63 Watson. It contained a carriage house and stable.86

Weekly advice on interior decorating and household management was presented to Detroit women by the Detroit Free Press in its Householder magazine. In 1881 a compendium volume was published, reminiscent of Beeton’s tome which may have been at Rosedale. 87 Part one was strictly alphabetical: Aeolian harps and aquariums to taxidermy and woods. It contained advice on how to create, build and or maintain rooms, furniture and the household, and to maintain appearances: in personal grooming; and in knitting, sewing, crochet, flower arranging and preservation; and other crafts. Part two was about food, meal preparation, recipes and all forms of catering for entertainments. The range of topics suggested the breadth of women’s tasks in the home. Many women had servants, but they had to be managed, trained and instructed. Women may have had cooks, but they also cooked themselves and needed to know how to prepare and maintain the apparatus and environment. If a woman wanted to re-curl an ostrich feather that had got damp atop a bonnet in a misty rain, this was the book for her.88

The geography of improvement for Eliza Williams was embedded in movement. In Detroit she advanced from house to house as circumstances improved. It was an upward trajectory: from the workshop to the first rented house; to a more substantial house; the
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85 This suburb is now recognised as the Woodward East Historic District. Olivier Zunz, “Detroit’s Ethnic Neighbourhoods at the end of the 19th Century,” unpublished paper, Centre for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan, 1977, p. 25.
86 Insurance Maps of Detroit, Michigan, New York: Sanbourn Map and Publishing Company, 1889. Insurance maps of the day illustrated the footprint of every house in the streets they covered. The Hanley house at 63 Watson appears on Sheet 95.
purchase of land upon which to build the family home; the acquisition of investment property; and the establishment of 63 Watson.

Map 7.1: 63 Watson street, Detroit.

On Wednesday, 11 August 1886, Eliza Hanley wrote to Charles Leake in reply to his letter.

I received your letter and was very glad to hear from you, but was sorry that you were in poor health. Trust by this time that you have fully regained your strength I should be very sorry indeed to have anything the matter with you.  

89 Eliza Williams to Charles Leake, 11 August 1886, Leake Papers, L1/M7.
She wrote from her home and the letter travelled, via San Francisco, to Campbell Town in Tasmania. Eliza, a well-to-do matron in her early 50s, was happy to tell her former master’s son that her children were doing well. She asked after his family and elder brother, and sent him family photographs and press cuttings indicative of contemporary political gossip. Eliza comments that it was 28 years since they last met. This places them together in August 1858, after she left Rosedale. The meeting most likely took place in Melbourne.

Eliza responded to the news Charles had sent her. Arthur Leake, with his niece and ward Letitia Sarah Leake, had travelled extensively during 1876-1878. He married a widow, Mary Turnbull nee Gellion, in England in 1878 and all returned to Tasmania. They journeyed again in 1882-84, and it may be this tour that Eliza referred to. The content of this letter illustrates the breadth of the topics discussed and the familiarity inherent in their long-standing relationship. In the most detailed letter in the collection, Eliza Williams described her children’s schooling and their progress. She had alluded to this in an earlier letter but, this time, perhaps in response to being asked, she wrote in more detail.

Grosse Pointe, on the shores of Lake St Clair, was transformed over the decades from the 1860s from farmland to holiday cottages as wealthy Detroiter established summer homes there. The site of the original Academy of the Sacred Heart, where Eliza’s daughters were educated, was a Grosse Pointe farm. An order of cloistered nuns, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, obtained the property and in 1868 opened the original school. The property continued a self-sustaining farm and home to the Order. Early benefactors were the Beaubien family. Pupils boarded year round but, as Eliza noted in her letter, parents were free to visit as the school was not distant from Detroit. It was not unlike Ellenthorpe Hall, the select school for the daughters of wealthy families where Sarah Leake, Eliza’s former mistress, had herself been educated. Nellie was at home having graduated. She did not work as befitted the eldest daughter of a wealthy man. Minnie was expected to be a prize winner. All in the family, excepting Eliza whose impoverished Limerick childhood did not include music training,

---

90 The letter has a San Francisco postmark.
91 Grover Cleveland became the first and only United States President to wed in the White House by marrying Frances Folsom in 1886. He was 49, she 21.
93 “Leake Family Papers: Summary and Index,” Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection, c1979, p. 5.
94 www.gphistorical.org
could play an instrument and they amused themselves with family concerts and, no doubt, entertained visitors. The children studied languages: French, Greek, and Latin. The young Hanleys experienced a very formal childhood. Georgie’s exploits on the bicycle matched those of his brother who was both cyclist and athlete. The ride from Windsor to Niagara Falls, on high-wheeled bicycles with a front wheel of 50 or 56 inches, was a feat accomplished by many in the 1880s and 1890s. Eliza’s pride in her son was based as much on his young age as on the feat itself. She writes of him with affection and expresses hope for a successful future for him.

John Hanley established a business partnership, with brothers Frank and George Williams (no relations as Eliza noted in her letter). In 1886 they offered books, stationery and printing as Williams and Hanley from premises on 171 Woodward avenue. This was a very sound business address for Woodward was one of Detroit’s principal streets. The partnership was short lived. The next year John offered books and stationery, from the premises at 171 Woodward avenue. He was very modern and had a telephone number, one of only a handful of businesses to list a phone number in the directory at that time. George Williams, previously one of John’s partners, was listed as a clerk in this new business which suggests John had the means to buy the brothers out. John continued to live at the family home.

The business partnership between brothers George and James Hanley ceased in 1887. George Hanley became a sole trader in ornamental and plain plastering. James Hanley continued in the plastering business operating out of his home at 76 Montcalm east. George took a leaf from son John’s book and had the telephone installed at the plaster works in 1889. The directory of that year included a street index. It showed that George’s immediate neighbours on Congress conducted a diverse range of businesses: insurance agent, a saloon, liquor seller, hardware merchant, plumber, tinner, cigar manufacturer, coal merchant, dyer, baker, vet surgeon, roofer, dressmaker, and tailor. There was also a laundry.

At the beginning of the 1890s John Hanley offloaded his business and James Hanley, his uncle, began his career in public life by becoming a Member of the Board of Public Works. Georgie, George and Eliza’s younger son, entered the workforce as Clerk for the City Engineer. He, like his brother John, remained living in the family home. In 1891 he entered the plastering business. It is unlikely that Georgie ever lifted a trowel – his role would have been that of a clerk.

---

97 Hodgson, “Personal communication with Anastasia Pankiw Hanley.”
99 *Detroit City Directory for 1889*, Detroit, RL Polk, 1889, p. 1535.
been to manage the contracts and to ensure the planning and bidding work was done to maintain and grow the business. Also in 1891, John Hanley entered the political arena as private secretary to the Sheriff of Wayne County, his uncle, James Hanley who was elected to office. The following year George made Georgie a partner in the plastering business and it was listed as George Hanley and Son.

The winter of 1893-94 was one of poverty for some: 25,000 workmen were unemployed and more than 5,000 families destitute. Detroit suffered a serious financial panic in which relief was required by the needy and a community effort saw public works projects and private land lent for vegetable growing. The situation was dire. According to Caitlin:

A number of wealthy citizens combined and organized relief squads, the various Masonic bodies collected money, clothing and good and established relief stores where these were held ready for distribution, they employed drays and other vehicles for the distribution of clothing, food and fuel to the needy. That was a winter long to be remembered in Detroit.

George Hanley was a member of the Knights of Columbus, charitable brethren that provided financial assistance and insurance to Catholic working families. James J Keenan and many other Roman Catholic businessmen were also members. This was an element of a networked business and community life that supported less prosperous Detroiters.

The partnership between George and his younger son prospered. They worked on large scale as well domestic projects. George was a contractor about town, not shy of using the courts to ensure his business interests were maintained. In 1895 George sued the City of Detroit for $20,000 over delays it had caused in his work of paving Gratiot avenue. George argued that their delays required him to store materials over the winter season when no paving work could be done, and that he had incurred interest on outstanding payments due while the stoppages were in place and damages. George won the suit and was paid $5,289.01 which the jury determined was his loss. The Board of Works’ Commissioners were most unhappy about the outcome as they had expected a victory for the City.

The Hanley family business interests extended to more than plastering. The paving contract for Gratiot avenue, a major downtown street, was a significant public works project.

---

103 www.kofc.org/un/en/about/history
In 1893 John Hanley was listed in the Detroit City Directory as Secretary and Treasurer of the Standard Paving Company. Its address was in Peninsular Bank Building on West Fort street. Here was a corporate vehicle through which to bid for paving contracts offered by the City. John had taken this role after he had ceased to be private secretary to his uncle, James Hanley, Sheriff of Wayne County, a political office with uncertain tenure. James Hanley, now out of office and again a contractor, also took one of the offices on the upper four floors at the Peninsular Bank Building.  

John Hanley moved to 41 Pitcher street, the Keenan family home from where he married Lily Keenan on 31 January 1894. An invitation to their wedding reception at the home of the bride is the final item of extant correspondence between Eliza Williams and the Leake family. The elegantly printed card was dual purpose. Although sent to Rosedale by Eliza, it was signed on behalf of the bride’s family and also acted as a visiting card indicating that Mrs James Keenan (formerly Elizabeth Hopkins) was ‘at home’ on Wednesday mornings. This was a proper gesture in serious tones, unlike the light-hearted reference to calling cards made by Eliza some years earlier. Here was a souvenir of success to be displayed on the mantelpiece. Her son was marrying into a wealthy formalised social set. Clara Leake would have opened this letter. None of John Leake’s children with whom Eliza Williams had corresponded or had mentioned in her letters remained living. Clara’s daughter Bessie, now Mrs Jack Foster, the exact contemporary of Eliza’s daughter Katie, owned Rosedale.  

After the wedding the couple set up house at 248 John R street. After a year they had new next-door neighbours: John’s newly-married second sister Minnie and her husband, Albert Kern. Hanley households were being established in close proximity, reminiscent of the familiarity between Charles and Arthur Leake who continued to live near enough to be regular dinner and overnight guests at either Rosedale or Ashby.
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105 The title page was missing from this edition. It is assumed to be *Detroit City Directory 1992-93*, Detroit: RL Polk & Co, 1893, p. 576.
106 Parmelia Keenan but known as Lily (Lillie)
107 Eliza Williams to Rosedale, undated invitation, c1893, Leake Papers, L1/N66.
108 Eliza Williams to William Leake, 11 May 1876, Leake Papers, L1/M78.
109 Clara Jane Bell arrived to live at Rosedale in 1857 having become reacquainted with her cousin Charles when he was in Europe in 1855. She may have arrived before Eliza departed for Melbourne. Clara’s father, Edward J Bell was concerned for her. She became ‘attached’ to the ship’s doctor on route but he was considered unsuitable. Arthur Leake had consent for marriage to Clara from her father in 1858 but something went awry. Edward J Bell to John Leake, February 1858, Leake Papers, L1/B290. Clara married Charles in 1869.
110 John Travis Leake died in 1880, Sarah in 1881, William in 1886, Charles in 1889 and Arthur in 1890. John Travis, Sarah and Charles each died at Rosedale. William died at the asylum and Arthur at Ashby. All are buried at St Luke’s, Campbell Town.
111 Both Sarah Elizabeth Clara Leake (Bessie) and Katie Hanley were born in 1869. Their mothers were similarly close in age, seemingly less than two years apart.
There was another link with the Peninsular Bank. George Hanley was a director. Eliza may have recalled the role John Leake held as a banker, and the associated reputation of trust. In 1892 the bank moved to new premises on West Fort. The chamber was a lavish setting for business. Hand drawn images of the interior show elegant columns across a spacious public chamber, walls lined with artistic plasterwork and wrought-iron friezes, and commanding vaults with separate secure enclosures. It boasted an elevator of the most modern construction. Its new site was in a strategic business location with its arcade connecting the bank directly to City Hall and the new post office.

Minnie Hanley married Albert Kern in 1894. Albert was the Michigan-born son of immigrants Rudolphe Kern, a real estate agent, and his wife Josephine Todt. Albert had started his working life as a clerk with TB Rayl & Co, wholesale and retail hardware merchants. His work in early married life was variously sales and clerical. In 1912 he became the manager of the Ford and Dime Savings Bank where he was to remain for the balance of his working life. Minnie and Albert’s daughters, Amy and Grace, were born in Detroit in 1901 and 1904 respectively. Amy Kern was Eliza Williams’ first grandchild.

George Hanley died on 15 August 1896 and he lay in the parlour at Watson street until the hearse left at 8.30am on 18 August to make its way to Saints Peter and Paul Catholic Cathedral where his funeral service was held. Hundreds attended and each of the major papers printed a tribute. Many members of building and contracting firms, unions and trade organisations were represented in the church where High Mass was celebrated. George was interred in the Mount Elliott Cemetery.

George was deeply mourned. There is no public tribute from members of the immediate family but the community was quick to speak. An obituary and memorials on behalf of the Builders and Traders Exchange and the Plasters’ Union were published on the day of his funeral. In a memorial written by the anonymous ‘D’ a few weeks after his death, the image of George as a man and as a solid American citizen was writ large. The memorial also reinforced the gendered patriarchal model of domesticity.

As a citizen he was tolerant of prejudices entertained by men of feeble intellect, and compassionate for those whose mental deformities were only exposed in the garb of
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religion, forgiving for all whose hatred of their fellow citizens was stimulated by the
fanaticism of irreligious ignorance … He was untiring in his industry and its fruits are
left as an abiding advantage to Detroit, and a memorial of his activity in promoting
the material interest of the city of his adoption… As a husband, father and brother his
life was devoted to his family, and in the atmosphere of peace that enfolded his hearth
and home no echo of worldly strife found fleeting resting place.118

The filing for probate of George’s will was publicly announced two weeks after his
funeral. Perhaps anticipating death, George finalised his will eleven days before his demise.
Its terms were summarized in the public record: Eliza was to remain in the family home for
life, youngest child Georgie effectively inherited the business in which he had a been a
partner and capital to facilitate its continuing success, Nellie received land, John received his
father’s watch and Minnie and Katie were left to wait out their mother’s life to receive their
portion of the inheritance along with their siblings. The probate description in the local press
cemented the image of George Hanley as a successful man. He left substantial real estate as a
symbol of affluence. His memorial plinth at Mount Elliott cemetery was a further marker of
this prosperity. It was, and remains, the tallest tombstone in the cemetery.119

George Hanley did not live to see his grandchildren despite the fact that both his
married children were aged in their thirties at the time of his death. This was a family where
childbearing was constrained and this pattern continued in the next generation, as similarly
occurred with the Leake descendants at Rosedale. With George Hanley’s death, changes were
made in the arrangements of the plastering business. While the business name remained the
same, the two brothers formed a partnership listed as John and George Hanley. The business
moved offices to 18 Peninsular Bank Building. Georgie continued to live on Watson with his
mother and his sisters Nellie and Katie. Nellie died of tuberculosis in 1899. She was nursed at
home through many months of illness. In death she was listed as Helen W (Williams)
Hanley.120 In life she was Nellie, not Olive for whom she had been named.

By the year 1900 Eliza Williams was known as the widow Hanley and she lived in the
family home at 63 Watson with her youngest child, Georgie and his elder sister Kate. John,
with his wife Lily, and his sister Minnie and her husband Albert Kern still lived in adjoining
residences at 246 and 248 John R street. John Hanley was in better financial circumstances

119 As was confirmed by inspection, October, 2010.
120 Transcript of Certificate of Death, 75224, Michigan. She was listed as Nellie W Hanley in the death notices.
Detroit Free Press, 29 April 1899.
than Albert Kern and this was a lasting pattern. John and Lily had a maid: Minnie and Albert
did not. The business name Hanley and Son disappeared from the directory. In its place John
Hanley Plastering is listed at the office address 21-22 Peninsular Bank Building. Contractor
James Hanley had also moved to this address. John and his uncle James had now worked
collaboratively for some years.

The celebration of Detroit’s bicentenary in 1901 marked a transition from the ‘gilded’
age.121 The manufacturing and heavy industries of the city, its steel production and its ‘heavy
influx of foreign born’ workers gave it the capacity to embrace the age of the automobile.122
This was to be, for decades to come in the twentieth century, the ‘golden’ age of Detroit. Car
making in the early years was done in dingy workshops by ‘visionaries’. In a decade to 1910
the industry had gone from virtually nothing but experimental risk capital to a multimillion
dollar manufacturing base with factories of concrete and steel and thousands of employees.123

In 1902 there was no directory listing for Georgie. John Hanley’s profession was
listed as Contracting Plasterer and Manufacturer and Dealer in Ivory Cement. He retained
offices at 21-22 Peninsular Bank Building. Georgie was unmarried and lived at home with his
mother. They would reside together for another 15 years, until her death in 1918. Georgie
Hanley remade himself. In 1904 he took on the profession of lawyer, thus fulfilling his
adolescent ambition. This change matched stability in John’s work life: John was the
businessman; Georgie was the lawyer. Things seemed good. John’s first car, purchased in
1901 from Bill Metzker’s bicycle shop, was an Oldsmobile. It was licensed number 6 for
Detroit. John had to make his own numberplate. After the trip to City Hall to register the
vehicle:

[The] next stop was TB Rayl’s hardware to purchase a brass house number, eyelets
and chain, which were attached to a leather sheet by a harness maker on lower
Griswold. The ‘plate’ was then hung on the Olds.124

In 1903 John presented his mother with a Cadillac, serial number 10, again purchased
from his friend Bill Metzker, who was by then the first sales manager of the infant Cadillac
Motor Car Company.125 Georgie, the bachelor, stayed living with Eliza, no doubt cranking
the car and driving her to Saints Peter and Paul for Mass. Sitting in the front passenger seat,
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proudly next to her youngest, Eliza was a world apart from the trips to Communion at St Luke’s in Miss Leake’s company. The stables were turned over to the automobile. John had a garage of vehicles. His sister, Katie Campau, also drove a Cadillac, license number 228.\textsuperscript{126}

The contracting business continued at the workshop at 78 Congress. John’s career was still connected with that of his uncle and, from time to time over the next decade, they shared premises. Georgie practised law from a home office at Watson street.

John and Lily moved into the Keenan family home, with James J Keenan, at 50 Alfred.\textsuperscript{127} They spent their summers, as did many of Detroit’s wealthy, at Grosse Point on the banks of Lake St Clair. The Keenan family retreat was on Lake Shore drive. They commuted there in John’s car, a rugged 1904 model Knox.\textsuperscript{128} Lily was the only female member of the family listed with a profession, that of Teacher in the Elocution Department at the Detroit Conservatory of Music. She appeared to do this just for one year. Lily Hanley died on 30 March 1912. John continued to live with JJ, and with them James Keenan Hanley, John and Lily’s son. Life stayed very much the same for all the family until John remarried. He wed Jane Keenan, first cousin to his first wife, in August 1915.

1918 was a miserably cold year: coldest since 1872. There was the greatest coal shortage in the history of the city, and many deaths in the winter of 1918-19 due to an influenza epidemic.\textsuperscript{129} Eliza missed the dreadful winter and the influenza. She died, at home at 63 Watson, of heart failure in the summer, on 22 July 1918. The day before her death, her fifth grandchild, George Philip Hanley, was born to John and Jane. Eliza’s funeral was a private family occasion with no public fanfare. Her children and grandchildren would have sat solemnly in the pews of Saints Peter and Paul. She was buried as Elizabeth Williams Hanley at Mount Elliott Cemetery and is memorialised by a plaque at the base of her husband’s plinth.

With Eliza’s death the Hanley children, all in late middle age, could now receive their inheritance, as George Hanley’s estate had instructed no settlement until his widow’s demise. Even in ‘modern America’, in a tradition described by the separation of gender spheres, Eliza had no control over the assets of his estate. The beneficiaries had waited a long time – but not

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Automotive Directory of Detroit}, Second Edition, Detroit: House of George Firs, 1904. It was a complimentary directory, presumably for George Firs’ customers. A copy is held in the National Automotive History Collection, Detroit State Library. This directory lists the licensed automobile owners of Detroit from number 1 to 1088. It shows numbers 5-24 were taken by WE Metzger for various makes, p. 5. Mrs HL Campau (Katherine Williams Hanley) owned a Cadillac, no.287, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{127} Alfred is also in the Woodward East Historic District.

\textsuperscript{128} Hanley, “Untitled memoir.”

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{1919 Detroit City Directory}, pp. 34-37.
in want for all were prosperous. Eliza’s death closed a life of stark contrasts and steady upward improvement.

The four family groups formed around the Hanley offspring, John and Jane Hanley, Minnie and Albert Kern, Henry and Katie Campau, and Georgie Hanley, all prospered. Each was established in a business with three of the men, John, Henry and Georgie, firmly in the real estate and insurance sector. Albert remained managing the Ford and Dime Savings Bank Building. Georgie lived and worked from his new home at 2209 John R, back on the street his parents had started out from, but in the new suburban end of smart houses and apartments indicative of the buoyant Detroit economy. The affluent life continued. Eliza’s five grandchildren took their own paths: each of the boys had a bent for engineering, mechanics and invention; the girls remained largely hidden from the public record but Phyllis Campau followed in her mother’s footsteps and became a renowned Michigan artist.130 How many knew that their grandmother, the pillar of respectability, had once been a convict?

Eliza Williams Hanley had several personas: Williams, Eliza convict number 935; Eliza, the housemaid at Rosedale then at Dudley Street; Eliza W Hanley, wife and mother; and finally the widow Hanley, as she was known for the last years of her life. In a decade, approximately 1850 to 1860, she travelled thousands of sea and land miles: Ireland to England, England to Tasmania, Tasmania to Victoria, Victoria to England and finally England to America. Her letters from Detroit, too, travelled thousands of miles. As she moved both socially and geographically in comparative terms time stood still at Rosedale.
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130 Phyllis began exhibiting with her mother, Katie Campau, already a noted artist, in 1949, *Detroit News*, 13 November 1949. She was one in the family who contended they were Detroiter for centuries back: true, but only on her husband’s side. “Pointer of Interest,” *Grosse Pointe News*, 23 June 1960, p. 28.
Chapter Eight: Learning to be the Mistress

The boat came breasting out of the mist, and in they stepped. All new things in life were meant to come like that.¹

This research started as an examination of the private life of one person within the context of her colonial domestic world. It has ended as an exploration of the impact of the intersections between the private lives of two women who, when they first met, were sharply distinguished by social markers. The prison without walls, which surrounded both women, fundamentally shaped their lives. In 1852, when Eliza Williams first stood at Rosedale’s quadrangle gate, Sarah Leake, a spinster, was effectively the mistress. Her father, John Leake, was the master. A pattern of life, established in the late 1820s, more or less continued unchanged. The relationship between Sarah Leake and Eliza Williams was structured by the penal system. One was Miss Leake, the mistress; the other Eliza, the convict housemaid. The only time mistress and maid were together outside Rosedale was on the trip to worship at St Luke’s. Eliza sat in the rear of the church. Miss Leake sat in the family pew at the front. When travelling to church in the coach, Eliza sat outside.

The methodology of comparative biography described by Ambrosias, which suggested the exploration of the parallel lives of two or more people whose lives intersected, was relevant for this work. While he argued that detachment was important for achieving historical objectivity it was vital to approach the world ‘from that other person’s perspective.’² As well as the lives of Sarah and Eliza the thesis has explored the forces which shaped the actions of other subsidiary characters.

The approach used for this work, life history within a micro history framework that allowed the development of individual and collective narrative, was not conveniently selected after the event. Early thinking made it clear that accounts of other actors, who offered a collective storyline that illuminated private life in colonial Tasmania in original ways, were essential to the story. Several interconnected, or braided, narratives are the result: a narrative about the establishment of Rosedale; a narrative about the social world of Sarah Leake and a narrative about the later life of Eliza Williams and the Hanley family.

In the Tasmanian rural setting the head of the family led the estate, made the decisions in the business of farming and took responsibility for the estate ‘family’ which was composed of related and unrelated persons. This leadership was both public and private. In the private sphere, at home, the interdependence of the family and the servants, the management of the household, the house and the function of its rooms, and gender separation within roles were all on show. A further theoretical framework for this social history was an analysis of paternalism as exercised by the Leake family as a way of managing the complex social environment in which they lived. Key to this analysis was an understanding of the parallel lives of masters and servants and the social roles attributed to each.

Learning to be mistress is a short form of the notion that skills can be learned and applied later in life and that this progression was played out in the life of Eliza Williams. This idea takes social memory as a base and proposes that it can be built upon and changed as environs and needs shift. Eliza Williams’ letters from Detroit are those of a confident woman, secure in her life. She does not share troubles, though doubtless she did have them. Even her reports of illness are glossed over, treatments are not described, and her tone is always that she will prevail. Her early aspiration to live in America was fulfilled, however not in the direct way she may have hoped for as a young London maid.

It is important to restate that the extant record is just that: what is left. It does not reflect the full correspondence or documentation of associations that existed between the Leakes and their workers. Relationships can only be guessed at on the basis of what was kept: that Olive Dormer and Sarah Leake maintained a relationship of trust and sociability; that Eliza Williams and Sarah Leake were not intimate enough to correspond; that Eliza Williams was on friendly terms with William and Charles Leake; that Benjamin Sculthorpe was confident that John Leake would speak well of him; or that John Leake trusted George Trinder with a loan. While the archive is silent about the intimate details of these relationships or their wider social or cultural underpinnings, they were all nevertheless patterns that lasted decades.

**From maid to mistress**

To be civilized and genteel were intangible notions. They did not rely on the trappings of possessions. Individuals held the respect of others simply because they were genteel. This esteem would have been near impossible to acquire for an Irish emancipist in Australia, irrespective of her capacity to learn. America delivered respect to Eliza Williams.
When she arrived at Rosedale, Eliza Williams’ social memory had been constructed by her family life in Limerick and augmented by experiences of poverty, service, travel and imprisonment. She had already moved far beyond her family and their domestic realm. There is no evidence that Eliza’s experience included visiting cards, dinners at tables set with plate and fine glass, indoor plumbing, souchong and orange pekoe tea, or the laundry being sent out. Her only obvious link with the social memory of members of the Leake family was religion: albeit that their Protestantism was differentiated by ethnicity and class. Importantly, this was a religion that permitted earthly reward for hard work.

The theme of Eliza’s new American life was to remove herself from ‘service’ and to become mistress of her own home and this she achieved. Within 15 years of arrival the Hanley family had built a substantial house, complete with a carriage house in the yard, at 65 Watson street in the best suburb of Detroit City. The couple had five children who were all privately educated. The boys went to college and earned degrees and the girls graduated from boarding school with French and music. The details of everyday life are included in Eliza’s extant letters to Charles and William Leake, an occasional flow from the 1860s through to the mid 1880s. These letters display the affection Eliza held for the Leake family that was clearly reciprocated for she responded to the news they sent her. The letters told the Leakes that she was steadily, bit by bit, becoming one of them: her family would be ushered through the entrance hall, not the back door. The letters also suggest there were others of whom she was very fond and that she wrote to them as well.

The role of mistress in a grand house as a member of refined society was unlikely to be the future Eliza Williams visualised when on her knees washing floors. Her success was to retain independence, to use the skills that the paternalism and the pain of the convict system instilled, and to convert the system’s investment in her to a future she chose. There are no indications in her letters that she sought social status or that she lived in a select environment. Her Protestant Irish legacy was discarded and she was known as a Roman Catholic of Australian origin.\[3\] It is not known if this reinvention included shedding her prior status as a thief transported for her crime.

Eliza Williams was in a position to create the sentimental household. It required resources and time and she had both. And there were manuals and other forms of script to assist the newly Americanized woman to take on the mold. The Beecher sisters’ work, \textit{The

\textsuperscript{3} Eliza’s elder son, John, noted her as of Australian origin. 1930 US Federal Census. Her husband’s memorial record also describes her as from Australia. \textit{Mt Elliott Cemetery: A History}, Detroit: Mt Elliott Cemetery Trust, undated.
American Woman’s Home, was widely read.4 This book may have been on the kitchen shelf in Eliza’s first rented home and the basis for the layout of her domestic spaces for American household design of the period embodied the domestic ideal it proposed.5 Dr Chase’s ‘information for everybody,’ which exhorted all to discard idleness and work hard, could have sat alongside.6 We do not know if Eliza pursued the public and benevolent activities that these writers suggest were a way in which some women marked out a life for themselves. From her letters it is difficult to envisage there was any element in her life with greater meaning than family.

The notion of social ritual could describe how Eliza ordered her life in America as she re-enacted the social rituals of the Leake family within the new context of her Detroit home.7 But, it is not fair to suggest that she simply parodied what she had witnessed. She had access to all the books and magazines that supported the rise in sentimentality and domesticity and reading these would have both confirmed her path and influenced its direction. But in the real world, the dour theory was out of pace with her delighted reality. Eliza wrote to William Leake in 1876 of her joy in her children and her household. By then she had her own servant and a modern newly built house and was no longer doing the heavy domestic work.

Eliza’s letters convey a sense of her life and the activities of those around her. While it is flawed to ‘treat documents or source material as a continuous narrative,’8 excerpts from the letters indicate the relationship that existed between Eliza and members of the Leake family, and the matters of the day that were exchanged. The letters also provide the text for aspects of Eliza’s life in Detroit, the formation of her family, her successes and pleasures, and her concerns. They show her as a successful wife and mother, living comfortably without the stress of financial or familial worries. They describe replicated behaviour in domestic, business and social relationships. They also indicate that she was not held back in becoming American by vestiges of English life that were instrumental in the Leake household. Her humorous but proud acknowledgement that her children were Yankees, her taking up the
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6 AW Chase, Dr Chase’s Recipes; or, Information for Everybody, Ann Arbor, Michigan: AW Chase, 1866, p. 337.
local habits of holiday making, and her eager interest in sharing news of local events, indicate that she swapped the immigrant mantle for that of a Detroiter.

Eliza Williams had much hardship early: famine, poverty, prison, transportation and servitude. Her later life can only be glimpsed. Her letters indicate her only sadness was the loss of old friends and the loneliness of having no members of her own family near her. Yet she lost an adult daughter to tuberculosis, her husband died relatively young leaving her to live another two decades, her eldest son was profligate and her youngest one never married. Eliza had the joy of grandchildren but, as with the Leakes, family formation was delayed and constrained. The children of both families married late if at all. Often offspring who did marry did not have children of their own.

The refined Rosedale presented an environment of learning if one was so inclined. There were British and colonial books, newspapers and magazines. The local doctors, members of the clergy and John Leake’s political and business associates were often at the dining table, occasionally with their wives. Sarah Leake’s journal suggested there was no retiring after dinner for brandy and cigars. Men and women sat together in the drawing room, over cups of tea, and discussed news, local events, farm business and new books. With no butler the housemaids served at the table and moved in and out of the reception rooms. After only a short while Eliza was the senior servant. This trusted position gave her entry to all the rooms of the house. Eliza was able to read the newspapers, magazines and books that were purchased for the house when spare moments allowed: the master encouraged it. She participated in ordering and laying in provisions, and plain and fancy cooking; she witnessed the Leake family’s social customs at the table and in the drawing room; she saw the reading, music making and letter writing; assisted in laying out clothes, dressing and packing for the many journeys to Hobart Town; and observed the receiving of guests and the routines of running a substantial and successful enterprise. At Rosedale she also observed the fashion of the elite, and the way in which houses were presented and furnished. There was no other avenue for her to have learnt the skills described in Sarah’s journal that were later revealed to have been employed in Eliza’s own life.

Eliza Williams left just seven letters and one printed invitation. Eliza’s letters range widely from the private sphere of home and family unlike, as Fitzpatrick claims, was generally the case in letters by Irish women. She used her letters to convey her opinions
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9 David Fitzpatrick, “‘This is the Place that Foolish Girls are Knowing’: Reading the Letters of Emigrant Irish Women in Colonial Australia,” in Trevor McLaughlin, ed., Irish Women in Colonial Australia, St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1998, p. 168.
about the economy, politics and broader social life. The letters are well spaced over the years and reflect issues of the era through the prism of Eliza’s family life: personal privations and difficulties of communication, changing economic conditions and improved personal circumstances, social mobility, and the consequences of ageing. The letters to members of the Leake family set her apart from her contemporaries given the dearth of original correspondence by convicts (either during or post their period of servitude) to those who exercised control over them. A specific value in Eliza Williams’ letters is that they present an alternative view of the outcomes of a system intended to reform. These letters convey that she was treated respectfully in the Leake household and that her interaction with the master’s family led to long-term social exchange.

The Rosedale legacy

A keen awareness of the need to consider future choices available to his children motivated John Leake to take his family across the world. The reality of this move was that the Leake family went from an affluent middle-class urban merchant life, through a lengthy sea voyage that was not without its problems, to a town at the very edge of British colonial life. From that town they then, over a period of months, moved to an isolated stretch of ground outside a nascent village. The seasons, air, scenery, vegetation and wild life were completely foreign. Often they only had themselves to talk to. They came to a divided society as free settlers in a convict colony. Leake made the most of the opportunities Godwin heralded in his descriptions of free land and free labour and stands as an example of the much sought goal of prosperity in a new land. While he was not alone in this, his collection of papers facilitates close inspection of the process.

John Leake was of the group that transferred, as near as possible in an upside down world, the mode of life that they held dear: orderliness supported by displays of prosperity and gentility. England was transplanted in their colonial landscape. John Leake, the private man, may have been very good at the stiff upper lip and being the warder but the price of his paternalism was a misshapen family. He died in his gracious house having not seen his grandchildren; his wife, a daughter and two sons predeceased him; two children suffered mental illness to the extent it influenced their daily lives; his surviving daughter never
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married; and possibly, unlike the servants, he was not aware of the love affair in his own
house between his youngest son and his niece.\footnote{Charles Leake and Clara Bell did not marry until four years after John Leake’s death.}

Convict experience shaping the lives of both mistress and servant is a recurring
theme. This shaping was explicit in the management role in the convict system required of
Sarah Leake. With convict servants in the household there was no choice but to manage them
and this included to train, direct and discipline. Sarah Leake’s journal provided ample
evidence of each of these requirements alongside the consequential experiences of distrust
and abuse of trust, disappointment, frustration, and repetition. The reward was a household
that generally operated effectively from the Leake family’s perspective: the house was
cleaned, meals were cooked and served at the dining table, guests were ushered into the
drawing room, journeys out were possible by carriage or gig, and clean laundry lay folded in
the presses. More widely, the estate prospered through the directed labour of the men. There
is no evidence that being a functionary of the open prison gave Sarah Leake any pleasure.
She conformed to, but could not escape, the demands upon her. She remained a dependent
woman; her bills were paid by her father, then her younger brother; her only independence
was to stay single, but that too was played out within the strictures of patriarchy.

Rosedale, as the centre of the prison without walls, contributed to effective success of
the convict system. Some offenders were clearly in favour with members of the Leake family.
This goodwill was exhibited by them taking on the characteristics of yeomen farmers
(William Dormer), of remaining at Rosedale long after emancipation (John Parsons, Michael
Killymede and James Renshaw), returning to Rosedale after a period working elsewhere
(George Haynes), or receiving references, loans and gifts of money from members of the
family (Benjamin Sculthorpe, Olive Bloor and George Trinder). Many convict workers at
Rosedale left the system reformed, married, skilled and sober. Yet there were also clear
failures of the system to change men and women who did not conform: those who absconded;
those who did not behave as the system required; and those who sought the comforts of
relationships outside the rules. These prisoners were dispatched to other gaols.

This thesis teased out the story by looking in parallel at the lives of the people in the
shadows of daily life at Rosedale: the servants and the men who, together, maintained and
supported the wealth of the Leake family and its trappings. The picture of life at Rosedale in
the 1850s that emerged was multifaceted: structured by the social conventions of successful
settler life, controlled by the obligations of the master to the convict system, influenced by
the ideas, behaviours and disposition derived from individual social memory, and modified by the needs and happenstance of diverse people.

While Miss Leake’s journal had the tone of a chronicle, the study of it places the list-making and repetition of tasks in the context of the private life led by its author. This ensures the journal’s capacity to illuminate and amplify understanding of major themes and questions. The journal indicates the spatial parameters, or the ‘life space’, of Rosedale. Sarah Leake identifies many of the rooms in the house: kitchen, parlour, bedrooms for members of the immediate family and for guests, drawing room, dining room, bathrooms, store room and servants’ rooms. The domestic quadrangle formed a boundary between the house and the farm, as with many colonial estates, and this architecture contributed to the separation of life spheres. Daily life at Rosedale was played out in these rooms and thus their use, and the people who inhabited them in the course of the day, go beyond chronicle to be instrumental to understanding of the private life they enclosed.

Eliza Williams was the convict. She did her time. Members of the Leake family did time differently. John Leake never left the open gaol that was Tasmania. William Leake was incarcerated in the New Norfolk lunatic asylum. Sarah Leake was imprisoned at Rosedale by the conventions of an affluent spinster’s life. Yet it is a trap to devalue women as social actors and participants rather than seeing them as active and individual and contributing to the social world around them. Vickery, for example, argued that imposing theory on action reduces that action to a mechanical observance of the theory’s elements. Perhaps the evidence was too slight upon which to make any commentary about daily life. It is possible that Sarah Leake was in reality active rather than passive within the confines of what was available and proper for her to do. She was not entirely retiring. Sarah did visit and take callers, go out to meetings, to church, shopping and to the theatre. The markers of being confined could be part of a theory imposed on her life, retrospectively by researchers, which was not a straitjacket that she wore in real life. By her own hand she disabuses one of this.

13 Sarah Elizabeth Leake, “Journal, 22 April 1854 - 7 May, 1855,” in Leake Papers (Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania Library, 1854-55).
14 This thesis included commentary on the built form as an element in the conceptualisation of the doctrine of the two spheres. Built form also greatly influenced the master-servant relationship as is described in Barry Dyster, Servant & Master: Building and Running the Grand Houses of Sydney 1788-1850, Kensington, NSW: New South Wales University Press, 1989.
Her journal indicated the extent to which she was ensnared, uninterested with her own society and that around her, hoping for change, but with no exit.

Presenting this material recalls Urlich’s rich descriptive style. Her presentation of Martha Ballard’s journal revealed wider historical themes and described the ‘substructure’ of social life.17 Sarah Leake’s journal was ‘unyielding in its dailiness’, but not trivial.18 Its dullness reflects Sarah’s life and the sameness of her day while at the same time revealing the domestic and social priorities and the circumstances in which she lived her daily life. Sarah Leake died at Rosedale, a spinster sister and aunt but not free.

**Doors close, doors open**

Women convicts did exercise agency in their servitude; through their behaviour, attitude and industry and continued to exhibit this as free women.19 There is a growing body of evidence of the circumstances and outcomes for Australian convict women,20 and for them in Tasmania.21 At Rosedale Eliza was able to learn the skills she was later to use in her own middle-class home. The activities she was engaged in required intelligence, capacity and judgement. Eliza took the opportunity Rosedale offered to equip herself for the future.

The foundation source for this research was the Leake Papers. They indicate a way of rural domestic living that was replicated across colonial Tasmania. There are other accounts in diaries, letters and published narratives which describe similarly elite lives, not necessarily wealthy, but certainly refined. The Leake Papers, especially its letters, diaries and journals, give humanness to the history. The lists, be they for purchases, stores, laundry, personal belongings, money owed, building materials, library books, furniture or rations, are a key to the methodical approach that signified a successful settler. Further study may indicate whether such method made any difference and tease out the extent to which luck in land
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18 Urlich, *A Midwife’s Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard, Based on Her Diary, 1785 – 1812*, p. 34.
location, soil type, neighbours, weather, or expertise made the difference that led to prosperity. Perspectives of Midlands’ men who kept diaries at the time broaden the view from a single property and place the work at Rosedale in a wider community context. Their writing indicated that Rosedale was not unique. Morningside, Bicton and other Midlands estates were of similar scale, organisation and productivity, and experienced similar strains in their role as outbuildings of the convict system.

This work has explored only a portion of a substantial archive. The Leake Papers offer a multiplicity of opportunities for others interested in the history of private life. For example, the courtship correspondence between John Leake and Elizabeth Bell presents an insight into the social and familial issues that beset a young couple in the first decade of the nineteenth century. The process of establishing a new life in a strange land is well covered with correspondence, accounts and diary entries. The recorded names of people who worked at Rosedale over the decades or who visited the house for social or business reasons provide avenues for other researchers to connect individual and personal aspects of colonial and convict studies. The Leake Papers hold many documents on the domestic issue of managing mental illness. They indicate that several members of the family were unwell from time to time, there were many occasions of institutionalisation, and Charles Leake gave financial support to former employees, including emancipated convicts, for whom mental illness was a concern.

There are primary documents related to the diverse issues of trusteeship and estate management. John Leake and his sons Arthur and Charles were trustees for members of their own family as well as for friends and notable members of the community. The tensions arising from being unable to settle John Leake’s estate because of the insanity of his eldest son William, one of the three beneficiaries, are an example of the overlaying strands of private life. The failure of Edward Leake to leave a will that correctly reflected his family status presents an opportunity to trace the outcomes for those included and those ignored. There is a good deal more.

This thesis has used the archive to reconstruct life on a colonial farm estate. Deceptively simple questions about John Leake and his labour management have emerged. For example was being Protestant an advantage for a convict; did those with shorter sentences fare better? Could any of the matters highlighted with respect to Rosedale be replicated or further developed using primary data from other colonial estates? With reference to the prison system more widely, there are clear areas for considered study in the role and impact of convict probation stations, for both men and women, and in the longer
term reformatory impact of secondary punishment. The process of identifying the convicts who served at Rosedale was relatively straightforward, if lengthy, and could be replicated for other properties headed by a Leake-style record keeper.

A visitor being ushered through the cedar front door into the Rosedale hall may have noticed silence and emptiness within the main house. Sarah Leake was in the parlour, quietly reading or sewing or copying out music. Eliza or other maids, with muffled steps, were invisible as they swept and polished. An unofficial separate prison was at work. Underlying the narrative is a theme of the calm controlled behaviour of the master and mistress versus the unruliness and outbursts of the workers. In the kitchen, along the concourse, the sounds of the cook’s heavy boots mixed with the clanking of iron utensils. Outside in the yards, Leake’s men went about the noisy dusty business of the estate.

This thesis reflects a deep and continuing interest in the history of private life within the prison without walls. It did not seek to find exciting revelations about what went on behind the closed doors, nor has it attempted to construct complexities that might be imagined but for which there was no evidence. This thesis has been a mechanism to retrieve individual lives from the anonymity of lists and to present an interpretation of the relationships between individuals who found themselves in the same place for a period, then went their own ways. Enhancing humanness within the convict narrative is the achievement of this study.
Appendix One: Rosedale workers c1852-1857, selected characteristics

Rosedale workers were not drawn solely from the pool of convict labour. From the outset, John Leake recruited migrant and local free labour and selected workers from the convict system. Therefore, Rosedale workers are not identified as representative of any particular type of worker. These tables indicate that the individuals were examples of all types of labour: free, indentured, contracted and convict. The data sources are predominantly convict records, simply due to them being made and retained. Other colonial records were either limited in their scope or not kept. Records in the Leake Papers have supplemented the convict record and, in some instances, are the only sources of information about an individual.¹

In the five years 1852–1857 more than forty workers were hired for Rosedale. Over three quarters of them were had arrived in Tasmania as convicts. Most of the others arrived in the same month, February 1855, as indentured emigrants. While the emphasis is on convict workers because the majority of Rosedale workers at the time were recruited from within the convict system, the final table is a summary from the scant information available about settler workers including those who arrived indentured. All workers identified in these tables are also included in the biographical sketches presented in Appendix Two.

The first group of tables, 1.1 to 1.3, present summaries of the convict status and personal details of each house servant at Rosedale in order of their service during the period. Housemaid was the only occupation for females at Rosedale. Not all were convicts at the time of employment: one housemaid was recruited as an emancipist. Previous experience in the role is indicated by the trades listed on the convict indent which all related to work in the house. Two had experience as cooks. The average age of housemaids upon appointment to Rosedale was 28. All had been thieves. None reoffended whilst at Rosedale. The cooks who worked in the Rosedale kitchen were male, all were convicts and all were Protestant. Only one left Britain with the trade of cook. The average age of these men was 31. Rosedale grooms were all Protestant men and all could read. Their backgrounds varied but the majority listed their trade as groom. Their average age at arrival at the stables was 32. Two of the five grooms who had arrived in Tasmania as convicts were serving life.

Tables 1.4 to 1.7 provide summary characteristics of men who worked on the estate. In January 1852 when Eliza Williams arrived at Rosedale to work as a convict housemaid

¹ Leake Papers (Hobart: University of Tasmania Library Special and Rare Materials Collection), including John Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
there were men in the estate yard who had been working there for some time. Not all could be identified but the seven described in Table 1.4 are indicative of the men’s attributes. All but one had arrived as a serving convict. While the average age was 34 the range was notable with the oldest aged 57. Most were in or approaching their thirties. The workforce was predominantly Protestant and literate. Four of the men tending Leake’s animals were serving sentences for livestock crimes, two were serving life. The men who came and went during the period similarly were predominantly convicts upon arrival at Rosedale. The average age of these men was 35, the youngest arrived aged 20 and the oldest of this group was 47 when he commenced in the sheds. The majority were literate. Nine men were of the Roman Catholic faith. All bar one of these was Irish.

Table 1.6 indicates that most of the settler farm workers arrived in 1855 and all but one of them appear to have remained beyond the period of interest. This man was the only one who was illiterate. He absconded. The purpose of Table 1.7 is to provide a context to the convict labour at Rosedale. The alphabetical list identifies arrival date in Tasmania, experience of the convict system, particularly of probation stations and secondary prisons, and significant punishments. Hard labour for women was usually served in at the wash tubs in a female factory.

Not every worker arrived in the yard without prior acquaintances in the Rosedale workforce. For example, as Table 1.8 indicates, all the immigrant workers who arrived in 1855 travelled either on the Australasia or the Fortitude and would have been known to each other. Also, in five instances, two men who became Rosedale workers, either as convict or emancipist, travelled to Tasmania aboard the same transport. Table 1.9 is an alphabetical list of all known workers at Rosedale for the period of interest identifying the primary source document upon which the data related to each individual used throughout this thesis is based. This final table is provided as a source guide.
Table 1.1: Housemaid, in order of service  
February 1852 to January 1855

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age²</th>
<th>Status³</th>
<th>Crime and sentence⁴</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Trade⁵</th>
<th>Tenure⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rooney, Margaret</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Larceny, 10</td>
<td>Roman Catholic, Protestant convert at marriage, read only</td>
<td>Farm servant</td>
<td>1845 – 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Eliza</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Larceny, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Nurse and needlewoman</td>
<td>1852 Feb – 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susannah</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Larceny, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Laundress</td>
<td>1853 Mar – 1853 Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Charlotte</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Theft, 7</td>
<td>Roman Catholic, read only</td>
<td>House servant</td>
<td>1853 Dec – 1854 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Stealing, 10</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Housemaid, plain cook &amp; laundress</td>
<td>1854 Sep – 1857 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Jane</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Emancipist</td>
<td>Stealing, 10</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Plain cook</td>
<td>1857 Jan +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Approximate age at the time of arrival at Rosedale, generally calculated from the convict record.  
³ Convict status on arrival at Rosedale.  
⁴ Sentences are expressed in years.  
⁵ Trade as listed on the respective convict indent.  
⁶ Calculated as best from the data available, primarily from the convict indent or John Leake’s day book. In some cases only an arrival year is known.
Table 1.2  
Cook, in order of service  
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Crime and sentence</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Larceny, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Professional cook</td>
<td>1853 Jan – 1853 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinder, George</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Burglary, 15</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1853 Feb – 1854 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, James</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Stabbing, 10</td>
<td>Protestant, read only</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>1854 Dec +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3:  
Groom, in order of service  
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Crime and sentence</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westlake, Thomas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Assault and highway robbery, life</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Labourer and groom</td>
<td>c1850 – 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, George</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Shoplifting, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, barely literate</td>
<td>Machine maker</td>
<td>Nov 1853 – Aug 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, William</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Emancipist</td>
<td>Stealing, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>Aug 1854 – Oct 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, John</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Stealing, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, barely literate</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>1854 Oct – 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobson, George</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Emigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>1855 Feb – 1856 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, Robert</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>Bestiality, life</td>
<td>Protestant, could read</td>
<td>Groom and coachman</td>
<td>1856 Dec – 1858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.4: Farm workers at Rosedale
January 1852

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Crime and sentence</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venn, John</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Killing sheep, life</td>
<td>Protestant, illiterate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ploughman &amp; farm labourer</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey, John</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stealing a horse, 7</td>
<td>Roman Catholic, literate</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Labourer &amp; ploughman</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculthorpe, Benjamin</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Larceny, 10</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1849 – 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynes, George</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Sheep stealing, life</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>1849 – 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor, James</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stealing, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, could read</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, George</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sheep stealing, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Labourer 7 ploughman</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Henry</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shoplifting, 7</td>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>House painter</td>
<td>1851 Dec – 1853 Feb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Venn’s religion is assumed from his attendance at Campbell Town’s Protestant church. He is also assumed to have been illiterate for, as witness at Benjamin Sculthorpe’s wedding, Venn made a mark rather than sign.
8 Hickey’s record does not include placements but it is known that he was at Sand Hill contracted to Alfred Bisdee prior to coming to Rosedale. Alfred Bisdee to John Leake, 25 June 1850, in Leake Papers, L1 C67.
9 Sculthorpe was awarded a conditional pardon in July 1852 and a free certificate in August 1854. There is nothing to suggest he had left Rosedale.
10 Haynes was with Leake 1849 and 1850. He departed and was rehired in 1851. It is possible he was still with Leake when he died in 1854.
11 Connor was an emancipist when hired by Leake. There is no indication of when he left.

Table 1.5: Convict and emancipist farm workers, in order of arrival
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Crime and sentence</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacKegg, Edward</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Larceny, 7</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Coachman</td>
<td>1852 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gately, John</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Horse breaker</td>
<td>1852 Aug – 1854 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, John</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Theft, 10</td>
<td>Roman Catholic, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Quarryman</td>
<td>1852 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, Samuel</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Housebreaking, 10</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1852 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name, Origin</td>
<td>Name, Trade</td>
<td>Crime and sentence, Tenure</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbits, Jeremiah</td>
<td>English, Carpenter</td>
<td>1852 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, John</td>
<td>Irish, Carpenter</td>
<td>1852 Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, William</td>
<td>English, Gardener</td>
<td>1853 Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killymede, Michael</td>
<td>Irish, Farm labourer</td>
<td>1853 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin, Patrick</td>
<td>Irish, Basket maker</td>
<td>1853 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Patrick</td>
<td>Irish, Farm labourer</td>
<td>1853, May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowlan, Michael</td>
<td>Irish, Farm labourer</td>
<td>1854 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, William</td>
<td>English, Spinner</td>
<td>1854 May – Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbin, William</td>
<td>English, Butcher</td>
<td>1854 Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenman, Michael</td>
<td>English, Labourer</td>
<td>1854 Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane, Moses</td>
<td>Irish with Scottish father, Labourer</td>
<td>1854, Jul – Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, William</td>
<td>English, Labourer (former soldier)</td>
<td>1854 Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Patrick</td>
<td>Irish, Coachman &amp; groom</td>
<td>1854 Dec – 1855 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finelly, John</td>
<td>Irish, Farm labourer</td>
<td>1855 Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 Killymede absconded in June 1854. He was apprehended, tried and punished. He is the only absconder listed as returning to Rosedale. He was found guilty of being out after hours in July 1855 and reprimanded. He stayed on long after being conditionally pardoned. Maybe he had nowhere else to go.

13 Nowlan was an emancipist when employed by Leake.

14 Roberts absconded 29 December 1854.

15 Cochrane absconded 24 October 1854.

16 John Finelly on his convict record. John Brown was the alias Finelly used at Rosedale.
Table 1.6: Free farm workers, in order of arrival
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Religion &amp; literacy</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Trade 17</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden, John</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roman Catholic, literate</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillard, Stephen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Protestant, illiterate</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Agricultural labourer</td>
<td>1855 Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Daniel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Presbyterian, literate</td>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>1855 Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins, James</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>1855 Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axton, James</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>1855 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, William</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Protestant, literate</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>1855 Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, James</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Roman Catholic, literate</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Agricultural labourer</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Trade as listed on the respective contract or emigrant indent.
18 Gillard absconded on 26 March 1855. He was caught and tried. He did not return to Rosedale.
19 Does not include prison prior to transportation for the crime for which the individual was transported.
20 Served prior to or during their Rosedale service. Several men were convicted of later crime and subsequently imprisoned.
21 Punishments indicate significant or severe punishments whilst in the convict system.

Table 1.7: Prisons and punishments, all Rosedale convict and emancipist workers
February 1852 – January 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (alphabetical)</th>
<th>Year Tas. arrival</th>
<th>Prior prison 19</th>
<th>Probation station</th>
<th>Secondary prison 20</th>
<th>Punishments 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, John</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour, including in irons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloor, Olive</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary; term extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Henry</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Much punished; hard labour, including in irons; flogged many times (once 75 lashes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Patrick</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary; term extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane, Moses</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, George</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Trade as listed on the respective contract or emigrant indent.
18 Gillard absconded on 26 March 1855. He was caught and tried. He did not return to Rosedale.
19 Does not include prison prior to transportation for the crime for which the individual was transported.
20 Served prior to or during their Rosedale service. Several men were convicted of later crime and subsequently imprisoned.
21 Punishments indicate significant or severe punishments whilst in the convict system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tas. arrival</th>
<th>Prior prison</th>
<th>Probation station</th>
<th>Secondary prison</th>
<th>Punishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connor, James</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wedge Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Much punished; solitary; hard labour in chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Patrick</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; flogged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, William</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, Robert</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>Browns River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbin, William</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Rocky Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour, including in irons; solitary, (once of 30 days plus other occasions); term extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, Samuel</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Noted but not named; twice flogged</td>
<td>Tasman Peninsular; Perth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary; sentence extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finelly, John</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gately, John</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Roscommon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susan</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susannah</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenman, Michael</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Cascades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynes, George</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>(Illegible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary; hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey, John</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killymede, Michael</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td></td>
<td>House of Correction, unnamed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin, Patrick</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Old Wharf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackegg, Edward</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>House of Correction, unnamed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, John</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, William</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour in irons; solitary, including a stretch of 30 days; flogged; sentence extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (alphabetical)</td>
<td>Year Tas. arrival</td>
<td>Prior prison</td>
<td>Probation station</td>
<td>Secondary prison</td>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowlan, Michael</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, John</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, James</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, William</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Norfolk Island</td>
<td>Cascades</td>
<td>Hard labour, including in chains; term extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooney, Margaret</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anson</td>
<td>‘The cells’, likely at Campbell Town Gaol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Charlotte</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Anson</td>
<td>Ross, Hobart Town</td>
<td>‘The cells’; hard labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculthorpe, Benjamin</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Oyster Cove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, William</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oatlands, Launceston</td>
<td>Solitary; hard labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, George</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbits, Jeremiah</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinder, George</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td>Separate prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venn, John</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td></td>
<td>House of Correction, unnamed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour, including in irons; flogged; solitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake, Thomas</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Noted but not named</td>
<td>Cascades</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour; solitary, separate treatment; sentence extended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Eliza</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solitary, likely at Campbell Town Gaol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Jane</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard labour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.8: Workers travelling together: ship of arrival in Tasmania
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Arrival date</th>
<th>Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australasia</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Atkins, James Gillard, Stephen Ross, Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Martin, John Renwick, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortitude</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Axton, James Chandler, William Jobson, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Brown, Henry Smith, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestongee Bomangee</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Conroy, Patrick Finelly, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pestongee Bomangee</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Mackegg, Edward Parsons, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jardine</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Appleton, John Greenman, Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.9: Primary data source, Rosedale workers
February 1852 – January 1857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Free/unfree</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Primary data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appleton, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>per <em>William Jardine</em>, CON 31/1/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkins, James</td>
<td>Emigrant</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Australasia</em>, CB 7/12/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axton, James</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Fortitude</em>, CB 7/12/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Henry</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>per <em>Rodney</em>, CON 33/1/105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant, Caroline</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>per <em>Tasmanian</em>, CB 7/12/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Patrick</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>per <em>Blenheim</em>, CON 33/1/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol, James</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>per <em>St Vincent</em>, CON 41/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, William</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Fortitude</em>, CB 7/12/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochrane, Moses</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>per <em>Medway</em>, CON 31/1/6; CON 23/1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, George</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Aboukir</em>, CON 33/1/106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor, James</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>per <em>Henrietta</em>, CON 33/1/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Patrick</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>per <em>Pestongee Bomangee</em> CON 33/1/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, William</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>per <em>Oriental Queen</em>, CON 33/1/114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook, Robert</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>per <em>Pestonee Bomangee</em>, CON 33/1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbin, William</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>per <em>Asia</em>, CON 31/1/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, James</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>per <em>David Clarke</em> CON 33/1/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Samuel</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>per <em>Pestongee Bomangee</em>, CON 33/1/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finelly, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>per <em>Cadet</em>, CON 33/1/58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gately, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Australasia</em>, CB 12/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillard, Stephen</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Australasia</em>, CB 12/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden, John</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>per <em>St Vincent</em>, CON 41/1/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susan</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>per <em>Aurora</em>, CON 41/1/31; CON 51/1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Susannah</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>per <em>St Vincent</em>, CON 41/1/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Free/unfree</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Primary data source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenman, Michael</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>per <em>William Jardine</em>, CON 33/1/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagan, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynes, George</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>per <em>Duke of Richmond</em>, CON 33/1/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickey; John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>per <em>Blenheim</em>, CON 33/1/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobson, George</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Fortitude</em>, CB7/12/1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killymede, Michael</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>per <em>St Vincent</em>, CON 33/1/155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin, Patrick</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>per <em>Blenheim</em>, CON 33/1/104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKegg, Edward</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Pestongee Bomangee</em>, CON 33/1/108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannon, Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leake Papers, letters files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Equestrian</em>, CON 33/1/111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton, William</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>per <em>Layton</em>, CON 31/1/32; CON 18/1/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowlan, Michael</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>per <em>Lord Auckland</em>, CON 33/1/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Pestongee Bomangee</em>, CON 33/1/108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, James</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Equestrian</em>, CON 33/1/111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, William</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>per <em>John Calvin</em>, CON 33/1/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooney, Margaret</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>per <em>Phoebe</em>, CON 41/1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Daniel</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>per <em>Australasia</em>, CB 7/12/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Charlotte</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>per <em>Lord Auckland</em>, CON 41/1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculthorpe, Benjamin</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>per <em>Mount Stewart Elphinstone</em>, CON 33/1/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short, William</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>per <em>Sir George Seymour</em>, CON 33/1/64;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, George</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>per <em>Rodney</em>, CON 33/1/105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple, Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Day book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibbits, Jeremiah</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Lady Montague</em>, CON 33/1/110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinder, George</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>per <em>Pestongee Bomangee</em>, CON 33/1/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venn, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>per <em>Henry Porcher</em>, CON 33/1/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake, Thomas</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>per <em>Ratcliffe</em>, CON 33/1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitaker, John</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>per <em>Maria Somes</em>, CON 31/1/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Eliza</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Anna Maria</em>, CON 41/1/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Jane</td>
<td>Convict</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>per <em>Sir Robert Seppings</em>, CON 41/1/34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Two: Biographical sketches

Biographical sketches are provided for individuals who feature in the narratives of this thesis. They do not present the essence of the individual, but rather the core of their connection with the narrative. Here they are presented alphabetically. Equally, each one could be placed in the main chapters where the individual first enters the stage but, for ease of reference, the decision on placement was to provide a list. The sketches are generally set in the period 1850-1857. Some information is replicated in the body of the thesis to facilitate the narrative flow.

The main sources for the sketches were convict records; census collections, particularly for Detroit; newspapers, published directories and biographies; and, where possible, the records of birth, death and marriage. Not every name could be verified. The Day Book, Sarah Leake’s journal and miscellaneous correspondence in the Leake Papers have been the primary sources of names. Dates are presented in years and have generally been calculated on the basis of data other than birth records. Many records indicated conflicting dates and often there was no way to be certain. The aim was to give a relative sense of age within a collective picture.

This work took a lead from Hudson who used individual footnoted pen portraits of every principal name mentioned in Arthur Munby’s diary – mostly male colleagues, family and later-to-be-famous friends. He provided the life dates and a brief description of their place in society, their qualifications, relationship to Munby and their future role. While the methods of prosopography have not been used, what Anderson called ‘ensembles of multiple fragments’ have been used, particularly in the sketches of convicts who served at Rosedale. Further, where possible the ‘stated this offence’ micro history of each convict is included, in italics, thus providing in their words, the crime and, for some, both its antecedents and implications.

1 As may be the case had they been prepared as described by Barbara W Tuchman, Practicing History, New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1981, p. 133.
2 Some sketches are developed from earlier work. Alice Meredith Hodgson, Miss Leake’s Journal, Hobart: Research Tasmania, 2014. See Annotations, pp. 105-150.
Allison, William Race, 1812-1865, was the eldest son of Francis Allison and Susannah Race. At the time of Miss Leake’s journal, William lived with his parents at Streanshalh on the Macquarie River. William Alison was a nominee of the Governor in the Legislative Council. He was contemporary to John Leake’s elder sons but his parliamentary and judicial colleague. He was to marry Bessie Leach in 1858. She was the 16-year-old daughter of the headmaster of the Normal School at Battery Point when she married the 47-year-old William Allison. They had five children, the last born after William Allison died.

Appleton, John, c1824-1882, arrived in Hobart Town in November 1850 per William Jardine to serve a ten-year sentence for theft: Stealing a watch belonging John Sparks a sailor at Liverpool Before transported 7 years for two pairs of boots served 4 years and 7 months at Woolwich for vagrancy 2 months He was a literate Roman Catholic quarryman, much tattooed about the arms. Appleton was assigned to John Leake in August 1852 but his entry in the day book is dated October 1852. Appleton was referred to as Arthur’s man, which suggests he worked first under Arthur Leake at Ashby. This man lived under an assumed name. His convict record notes his ‘proper’ name was John Hallen. Appleton received a conditional pardon in May 1854 and appears to have stayed on at Rosedale. He would have been aged about twenty eight when he arrived to work on the farm. Appleton died in Campbell Town in 1882 of decay of nature.

Atkins, James, born c1833, was an emigrant farm worker from Cambridgeshire. He arrived in Tasmania, aged 22, on 3 January 1855 aboard the Australasia, indentured to John Leake as a shepherd. Atkins could read and write and was a member of the Church of England.

Axton, James, born c1832, was an emigrant from Middlesex. He arrived aboard the Fortitude on 15 February 1855 aged 23. He was a gardener. Axton could read and write and was a member of the Church of England. It appears he stayed on, at least in the district, for he married Agnes Allen in Launceston on 6 September 1860 and their son was born at Campbell Town five weeks later.

---

5 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, Launceston: Charles Wilson, 1854, p. 37 and pp 52-58.
7 John Appleton per William Jardine, CON 31/1/98.
8 James Atkins per Australasia, CB 7/12/1/3/.
9 James Axton per Fortitude, CB 7/12/1/3; RGD 37/392/1860; RGD 33/740/1860.
Axford, Rose, 1824–1879, was born in Hobart the daughter of Thomas Axford and his wife Martha Emily Slade who had arrived in the colony in 1822. Thomas Axford’s original land grant was on the Jordan River. He acquired Thorpe at Bothwell where he built a mill. John Bisdee, of Hutton Park, had previously owned Thorpe.10 Rose married Edward Bisdee at Bothwell in 1844. She was younger than Sarah Leake and her husband John Leake’s contemporary. She lived with her husband at Lovely Banks.

Bedford, Rev William John Pickard, 1804–1869, second son of Rev William Bedford and Eleanor Mary Pickard. He was ordained deacon in the Anglican Church in 1831 and priest 1832 in the diocese of Lincoln.11 In 1833 he married Mary Ann Banks (also listed as Mary Ann Banks Mills) and they had three children: Mary Ann Elizabeth Bedford in 1833, William John Pickard Bedford in 1834 and Edward Henslowe Bedford in 1842. William JP Bedford was rector of St Luke’s Church of England in Campbell Town. For some of the time of this narrative, he and his family were travelling in England. Rev William Brickwood was rector in Bedford’s stead.

Bell, Elizabeth, 1786–1852, only daughter and eldest child of Hull merchant William Bell, 1754–1824, married John Leake after a short courtship. Her father at first cautioned against the marriage as she was in his view too young.12 Documents in the Leake Papers indicate the marriage as one of deep and lasting affection. They had eight children, seven of whom survived to adulthood. Six of these children accompanied them on the journey to Tasmania. Elizabeth Bell is mentioned in Sarah Leake’s journal only as Mummy, in relation to members of her family visiting her grave which was on the property. Elizabeth Bell was later reinterred with John Leake at the St Luke’s Cemetery, Campbell Town.

Bisdee, Edward, 1802–1870, born in England, was one of the five Bisdee brothers who owned property in Tasmania. He arrived in the colony in 1827 aboard the Hope. Edward Bisdee was originally granted land at Eastern Marshes.13 He acquired Lovely Banks from his brother, John Bisdee. In 1844 he married Rose Axford. They had no children. Edward Bisdee

---

12 William Bell to Elizabeth Bell. Leake Papers, Hobart: Special Collections, University of Tasmania Library, L1/P73.
13 McKay, Journals of the Land Commissioners, p. 131.
was John Leake’s generation and his wife Rose Axford was of Sarah Leake’s age. With Leake, he was a nominee of the Governor in the Legislative Council.14

**Bisdee, Isaac**, 1813–1868, was born in England. He was one of the five Bisdee brothers who owned property in Tasmania. Isaac Bisdee was unmarried and it appears he was living on Hutton Park.15 He married Eliza Rose Kemp at Brighton in 1862.

**Blackburn, James**, 1803-1854, a native of Essex, was a convicted forger who arrived per *Isabella* in 1833 with a life sentence: * Forgery upon the Bank of England in the names of [companies ] by whom I was employed for £600 it was not paid.* Blackburn was a man of respectable connections. On the voyage he had charge of the boys’ prison for which he gave great satisfaction to the surgeon.16 He left a wife and two children in England. Blackburn worked privately from 1841 after being pardoned having served much of his sentence as convict architect in the Department of Public Works. According to Clive Lucas, ‘Blackburn was a true early Victorian architect whose Tasmanian work is characterised by boldness and striving for effect.’17 Blackburn was competent and had an unrivalled use of style variation – Picturesque, Gothic, Greek, Italianate and Romanesque.18 He designed The Grange for Dr William Valentine which was built in 1848. The Campbell Town mill was originally built by Blackburn. He sold it to Frank Turnbull in 1850, having already gone to Victoria. There he was involved in designing and building Melbourne’s water supply and ironically contracted typhoid and died in March 1854.19

**Bloor, Olive**, born c1822, arrived in Tasmania aboard the *Emma Eugenia* on 2 April 1844 having been convicted, along with three accomplices, to 15 years’ transportation: *Highway robbery on Mr Smith tried with Esk Wollett Samuel Riley William Gardiner.* Olive Bloor, a 22-year-old English woman, was a servant by trade. A diminutive woman, she had burn scaring on her left leg and stomach and was also lame in the left leg. She was Protestant. Her literacy was not noted. She served her probation on the *Anson*, graduating 3rd class, and was

---

14 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1854, p. 37.
15 The Cyclopaedia of Tasmania, Volumes 1 & 2, Hobart: Maitland and Krone, 1900, Volume 1, p. 441.
16 James Blackburn per *Isabella*, CON 31/1/5.
assigned. Olive Bloor and William Dormer were married at St Luke’s Campbell Town by the chaplain, Rev William Bedford on 23 February 1846. The groom was 28, Olive was 23. He is listed as a labourer, she as a convict spinster. Olive and William lived about the Midlands district until early the 1860s. She left Launceston for Dunedin on the Ziska as a steerage passenger with her daughter on 21 February 1863.

**Bowen, John**, c1825–1854 was a servant of Hezekiah Harrison at Merton Vale. This job title suggests he was in the house not outside as farm worker. As a free man, there is little information about his employment or person and none about the circumstances of his accidental drowning in the Elizabeth River within view of the Rosedale drawing room. William Valentine, Surgeon of Campbell Town, who noted Bowen had accidentally drowned aged twenty-nine, signed the death certificate.

**Boyd, Dr William Carr**, arrived with his wife, Charlotte Mary Ann McAvoy in 1852 to join his brother, Rev David Boyd, at his school at Longford. They had married at Dugannon in Ireland in 1846. William Boyd was a classical scholar who advertised himself as ‘Graduate and First Prizeman of Trinity College, Dublin and Member of the Leipzig University’ when seeking pupils for the opening of the Campbell Town Grammar School, of which he was headmaster, in January 1855. He offered a classical education, with physics and chemistry, and classes for those wanting to matriculate. The Boyds’ second son, named Reginald Brickwood Boyd, without doubt in recognition of the Rev William Brickwood, was born in Campbell Town in 1855. Boyd’s respect for John Leake can be inferred by the naming of his fifth child, born in 1861: John Leake Gerald Boyd.

**Brickhill, Joseph**, c1800-1865, arrived in Tasmania per Dromedary in January 1820. A Londoner, he had been tried in Middlesex for an unidentified crime and sentenced to seven years’ transportation. He was an unremarkable youth physically beyond his height for he was a tall man for his day. His trade was shopman, one that he conducted with great success once emancipated. The business he started in Campbell Town in 1840 was as general importers.

---

20 Olive Bloor per Emma Eugenia CON 41/1/1A; RGD 37 485/1846.
21 A more extensive account of Olive Bloor’s life is found in Alice Meredith Hodgson, “‘I am still keeping the same house as when I last wrote I am keeping out of debt but saving no money’,” in Female Convict Research Centre Autumn Seminar, Hobart, 2015.
22 John Bowen, RGD 35/251/1854.
24 The Cyclopaedia of Tasmania, Volume 2, p. 177.
timber, bark and grain merchants. It reputedly commanded the better part of the trade for the district from the time it was founded. Brickhill’s shop was a fine establishment: ‘The premises, a splendid building with stone front and walls of brick, originally cost £6000.’

Perhaps this should be taken as a mark of his success as a merchant. He lived at the store with his wife, Grace Coombe, c1824–1856, who he had married in 1847. She died of convulsions in late pregnancy in 1856, an event recorded with sadness by William Johnston in his diary. Brickhill died in 1865 after being bitten by his dog. Joseph Brickhill endowed the Campbell Town Methodist Church which was built in his memory in 1880.

Brickwood, Edith, (natal surname unknown) was born c1818 on the Isle of Wight. She was married to Rev William Brickwood. Little is known of her. She died, at a date unknown, at Bedfordshire, where her husband held the parish of Totternhoe. At the time of the 1871 English census, all three members of the family were listed. In 1854 when she came to Campbell Town, Edith Brickwood was thirty-six,

Brickwood, Rev William, 1817-1901, was ordained a Church of England minister by the Bishop of Melbourne in 1849. He became rector of St Andrew’s in Brighton. William Brickwood arrived in Tasmania aboard the Clarence, from Melbourne, in the company of his wife Edith and daughter Edith Theodosia on 10 January 1853. He took Trinity Parish, which included Trinity Church. Brickwood was found too evangelical by Bishop Nixon and removed and there was quite some debate on this matter amongst the congregation, who appeared to have been quite satisfied with the reverend’s performance in the pulpit, as reported in the press. In 1854 he was listed as Chaplain in Charge at Trinity Church in Hobart Town. Rev William Bedford was listed in this year as having the living at Campbell Town but part way through the year had taken leave to travel with his family to Britain.

26 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1855, advertisement, p. 114.
30 “Port Phillip,” Colonial Times, 27 February 1849.
31 “Shipping Intelligence,” Launceston Examiner, 11 January 1853. p. 3.
32 “General Intelligence,” Courier, 12 July 1853, p. 2.
33 “Letter to the Editor,” Colonial Times, 11 April 1854, p. 3.
34 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1854, p. 43.
Brickwood filled the temporary post to replace Bedford as rector at Campbell Town and Ross. On one occasion Brickwood refused to read the Anglican funeral service over the body of the man known as Black Harry, who had drowned at the ford on the Macquarie River near Merton Vale, because he died under the influence of liquor. This matter was widely reported.

Brown, Henry, c1812-1877, a housepainter by trade, was sent to John Leake at Rosedale in December 1851 only days after his arrival, per Rodney, to serve the balance of a seven-year sentence: Shoplifting and stealing two hats [ ] in Coventry 10 years for housebreaking served 5 years and 3 months at Woolwich 6 months for house breaking. Brown was to work at Rosedale for fourteen months before being returned to the government. He received a ticket of leave the following month suggesting he was not returned for punishment. A small, pale man who could read and write, Brown did not keep out of trouble. He was reconvicted in Hobart in 1866 as an emancipist. Brown was sentenced to eight years, or as the record shows 2229 days for arson. He arrived at Port Arthur in December 1866. He was transferred to the male house of correction in April 1870 to complete his sentence. With special credits deducted from his sentence, he had an unexpired portion of 1452 days. When Eliza arrived at Rosedale, Brown, aged about 39, likely worked on the farm. He was an older man when convicted and was a contemporary of Arthur Leake rather than the other convicts. He died at the Brickfield pauper depot in 1877 of bronchitis.

Brown, John see Finelly, John

Bryant, Caroline, born c1839, an immigrant housemaid who commenced duties at Rosedale in April 1857 aged about 20. She arrived in 1856 per La Hogue to Sydney then the Tasmanian to Hobart Town. She was listed as aged 17, a housemaid, in the company of her widowed mother Charlotte Bryant, aged 51, who was a cook. She married William Chandler in 1859. Chandler was a gardener at Rosedale, having been recruited by Charles Leake in England for the role in 1854. It is possible that Bryant replaced Susan Green. She

35 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1855, p. 70.
36 “Church of England,” Courier, 14 August 1854, p. 3.
38 Henry Brown per Rodney, CON 33/1/105; CON 94/1/1; RGD 35/1/9/1877.
39 Caroline Bryant per Tasmanian, CB 7/12/1/6.
was paid wages in April 1857 which suggests she had been there some little while to earn the money. William moved to the Government House gardens and was employed there when the births of their children were registered during the early 1860s.

**Boyle, Patrick**, c1819, was Rosedale’s horse breaker. With the trade of coachman and groom he would have been sought after by colonial households but he did not fill that role at Rosedale. Perhaps he was too wild. Boyle was an Irishman from Tipperary who was transported under sentence for seven years for stealing money: *Stealing 7 'n 6 from a soldier*. He was single, illiterate and Catholic. At 30 upon arrival aboard the *Blenheim* in 1849, he was relatively mature for the convict workforce at Rosedale. He married Mary Flaherty in 1850 and they had at least one child, Pat, born illegitimately earlier that year. In 1853, in separate incidents, Boyle was charged with unlawfully threatening his wife with a knife for which he received three months’ hard labour and with assault on Jane Westbury, a child under four years of age, for which his term was extended by eighteen months. He was no trouble to Leake but stayed only 4 months after arriving in early December 1854. His next assignment was to Rev Brickwood of Campbell Town. He went there 8 March 1855. He was awarded a certificate of freedom after his full sentence, including the months of additional time. Boyle continued to offend: stealing, obtaining goods by false pretences, larceny but not violence it seems. He adopted an alias, Kelly, under which he was tried several times.40

**Campau, Henry Lewis**, 1861-1947, was the son of Henry Campau and Adeline Beaubieu. His was an ‘old’ Detroit family: the Campau family dated back to Jacques Campau, private secretary to Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac who was the founder of Detroit.41 His father had been a successful businessman and restaurateur then public official. He married Katherine Williams Hanley (Katie) in June 1901. They had one child, a daughter, Phyllis. The family lived for a time in California but returned to Michigan. In 1913 Henry established the Campau Insurance Agency, which he would continue to run with his brother Milton G Campau. This was a business in sync with his brothers in law for, by then, John Hanley and Georgie Hanley were in real estate.

---

40 Patrick Boyle per *Blenheim*, CON 33/1/93; Mary Flaherty per *Tory*, CON 52/1/3.
**Campau, Katie** see Hanley, Katie

**Campau, Phyllis,** 1908-1998, only child of Katie Hanley and Henry L Campau. She was Eliza Williams’ granddaughter. Phyllis married Robert J Kettenhofen, 1907-1953. Childless, they lived in Detroit. Robert died of a heart attack aged 46. Phyllis died at Grosse Pointe in 1998 under the name Campau Kettenhofen. She was a noted Detroit artist having been trained at art school in Los Angeles. During the 1940s Phyllis and her mother, Katherine (Katie), began to exhibit together.

**Carrol, James,** was a single man of unknown age or arrival date who worked as a farm labourer. He was a free man and had been at Rosedale since 1846. As he was known to be an immigrant, it is possible he is James Carroll who arrived in Tasmania 3 January 1842 aboard the *Prince Regent* from Dublin as other immigrants of that name have incompatible arrival dates. Carrol was a long-serving estate worker.

**Chandler, William,** born c1833, arrived in Tasmania aboard the *Fortitude* on 15 February 1855. He was a gardener from Middlesex, aged 22, who was recruited to Rosedale by Charles Leake. He could read and write and was a member of the Church of England. In 1859 he married Caroline Bryant an immigrant housemaid who came to Rosedale in 1857. They appear to have moved to Hobart by the early 1860s.

**Churchill, Lord Alfred Spencer,** 1824-1893, was the second son of George Spencer-Churchill, 6th Duke of Marlborough and Lady Jane Stewart. At the time of his visit to Tasmania, he was a bachelor. A former Lieutenant Colonel in the Oxfordshire Yeomanry, he had been a member of the British House of Commons as the Member for Woodstock between 1845 and 1847 and was to return to the House in 1857, the year he also married. Lord Churchill voyaged to Australia on a pleasure trip aboard the private yacht *Wyvern,* owned by his father, under the command of Henry Brehant. They did not have an easy voyage and were forced to take cover from ‘the stress of the weather’ at several points. The sale of the vessel and its cargo was intended to defray the costs of the journey.

---

43 William Chandler per *Fortitude,* CB 7/12/3.
Clarke, Letitia Amanda, c1836-1880, was the daughter of Bridget Clark and James Hand. It appears she immigrated to South Australia from Britain in the early 1850s but there is no clear record. She also used the name Letitia Amanda Hand. As Letitia Clarke, reputedly a widow, she married Edward John Leake at Wellington, South Australia, in July 1854. A second ceremony was conducted several weeks later, at St Patricks Cathedral, Adelaide, reflective of Leticia’s Roman Catholic faith. The couple lived at Edward Leake’s home at The Punt, near Nelson in South Australia and later at Frontier House on Glencoe, the property Edward inherited upon the death of his brother Robert Rowland Leake. They had two children: Letitia Sarah Leake, 1859-1923, and John Leake, 1862-1904. Letitia Clarke was widowed in 1867. She married Richard McCarthy in 1871 and they had three children.

Cochrane, Moses, c1807-1877, an illiterate labourer of Irish and Scottish heritage, was transported for life in 1825 per Medway. Cochrane did not settle under the convict system. He was punished for many infractions: theft, attempting to remove his irons, neglect of duty, receiving, absence from the penitentiary without leave, absconding, disobeying orders, profane language, insulting his overseer, and refusing to work. Cochrane was sent to Port Arthur in 1831 and required to work in irons. There he was lashed for neglect of work and again for outrageous and violent conduct. He arrived at Rosedale in July 1854 in the thirtieth year of his servitude. Leake sent him to the magistrate for drunkenness and other infractions. Cochrane absconded in October 1854 after two trips to the magistrate in quick succession. He was a man who aged in the convict system. He died, unmarried, in Hobart.

Coleman was listed in the day book as groom in 1850. There is no other identification. The day book has a separate entry of A Coleman needing boots in 1846. This person does not appear to be either Arthur Coleman per Forfarshire in 1843 or Anne Coleman per Hope in 1842 as neither is listed at Rosedale or in the Campbell Town district. Eliza Coleman, born c1833, did work for Leake. She had arrived per Tory from London in 1845 having been sentenced to seven years’ transportation for the crime of perjury a robbery was committed by Thomas [Duncan] and I at [ ] I swore an alibi one month for disorderly on the street and one week for the same offence. Eliza Coleman wrote to Leake seeking unpaid wages.

45 Moses Cochrane per Medway, CON 31/1/6; CON 23/1/1.
46 Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
47 Arthur Coleman per Forfarshire, CON 33/1/44; Anne Coleman per Hope, CON 40/1/2.
48 Eliza Coleman to John Leake, 1849, in Leake Papers, L1/C52.
is likely she had moved on when she married Samuel Brown, per *Titan*, in 1849 the same year she was awarded a ticket of leave.\(^{49}\)

**Collins, George**, born c1828, was groom at Rosedale from November 1853 until August 1854. Collins had been sentenced to seven-years’ transportation: *housebreaking stealing clothing 3 months for similar offence*, and had arrived in Tasmania per *Aboukir* on 20 March 1852. He had been assigned to Leake on 10 November 1853. An Anglican, he could read and write a little and had generally been well behaved. His trade was machine maker. He was about 25 when assigned to Leake and, with mermaid tattoos on each arm and a heavily pock pitted face, was a noticeable man.\(^{50}\) Collins was groom and coachman for the journey to Hobart Town for Miss Leake and her father’s visit to Government House. He had been advanced £2 pounds by Leake for expenses during the trip, reflective of a degree of confidence of the master in his servant.\(^{51}\) This confidence may have been cautionary for Collins had been before the magistrate for drunkenness and resisting the constable on 14 February 1854. He received a sentence of 14 days’ solitary confinement. Upon release he was returned to Rosedale but he continued to behave ill. Collins departed in August 1854. His record did not improve for he was imprisoned with hard labour for three weeks at the end of that year for abusing his new mistress. He received a certificate of freedom at Avoca in July 1856.

**Connor, James**, born c1823, was engaged by John Leake in December 1850 and became a Rosedale gardener the following year. He was about 28 when he came to Rosedale. He was hired as an emancipist having served his seven-year sentence: for *stealing a pair of boots prosecuted at Bristol 3 months for a [ ] sentence for leaving apprenticeship 14 days and one month*. An Englishman whose native place was Bristol, Connor had arrived in Hobart Town per *Henrietta* in November 1843. A useful man, being able to read and write, during his time of servitude Connor worked on a number of properties in the north of Tasmania: in Campbell Town, Fingal, Norfolk Plains and Tamar. His left arm was adorned with a heart and dart tattoo, with the initials JC and HL.\(^{52}\)

\(^{49}\) Eliza Coleman per *Tory*, CON41/1/6.

\(^{50}\) George Collins per *Aboukir*, CON 33/1/106; CON 18/1/56.


\(^{52}\) James Connor per *Henrietta*, CON 33/1/46.
Conroy, Patrick, born c1824, arrived at Rosedale in 1853 from Port Arthur. He would have taken up work as a farm labourer. Conroy arrived in Hobart Town per Pestongee Bomangee in January 1849 having departed Dublin in September 1848. Conroy was a convicted thief with a sentence of seven years’ transportation: stealing a coat. He was tried in his native place, Queens County, in July 1846 and spent time in gaol before being transported. Conroy had a ticket of leave awarded in September 1851. It was revoked in February 1852 when he was convicted of two counts of housebreaking. He was sent to Port Arthur to serve two years but did not see out the term. He was 28 when he was assigned to Leake.53

Cox, William, born c1808, was transported to serve a ten-year sentence: stealing a sheep for hay 7 days. He arrived in Hobart Town per Oriental Queen in February 1853 having already served four years in prison in England. Cox was assigned to Arthur Leake of Ross within days of arrival. Cox was a gardener by trade and possibly transferred from Ashby to Rosedale for the Rosedale kitchen gardens, orchard and ornamental gardens were extensive. He moved quickly through the system being granted a ticket of leave in November 1853 and a conditional pardon in July 1855. This man did not add to his record in the colony. Cox was tall, at just under six feet, and was an older man for a convict. He was 45 years old, a contemporary of William Leake, when he began at Rosedale.54

Crook, Robert, c1811-1868, had the trade of groom and coachman, one he appears to have taken to the extreme for he was convicted for bestiality with a filly. His death sentence was commuted to transportation for life. He arrived in Tasmania, via Norfolk Island, in April 1847. A widower from Gloucestershire, it appears he was considered frail [maybe meaning unstable] for the ship surgeon reported he possibly would require looking after. Notwithstanding his record, Leake hired Crook as groom in December 1856. He was aged 45 and held a ticket of leave when he commenced at Rosedale. A tall, dark, grey-eyed man, Crook would have lived above the stables, not in the cottage allocated to his predecessor, for he had not remarried. Crook was awarded a certificate of freedom in January 1858, 14 years after his trial and death sentence. He was to live another ten years. He died in the general hospital in Hobart in March 1868.55

53 Patrick Conroy per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/92.
54 William Cox per Oriental Queen, CON 33/1/114.
55 Robert Crook per Hyderabad to Norfolk Island then transferred to Hobart Town per Pestonee Bomangee, CON 33/1/86.
Currie, Edward, 1825-1895, was born in Edinburgh and came to Tasmania a free man. He had the profession of painter and paperhanger. In 1854 when Currie was commissioned to whitewash Rosedale interior walls he lived with his English-born wife, Amelia Watts, 1830-1892, and their child, in Church Street, Campbell Town. Amelia Watts, a former convict transported for stealing a tea caddy and other articles, arrived per Sea Queen, aged 17, in 1846. They required permission for their marriage, which took place at St. Luke’s Church of England, Campbell Town, in 1849.56

Davidson, Walter, 1880-1856, was born in Scotland and arrived in Tasmania in January 1823. His named the property he established with his original grant Riccarton. He married Agnes Galloway in Launceston in 1825. By the 1850s Walter Davidson was well established and the owner of Riccarton, Meadowbank and Camelford. He was effectively John Leake’s immediate neighbour for Meadowbank, on the west bank of the Elizabeth River, had to be passed on the way into Campbell Town. Walter Davidson lived there with his wife, Agnes Galloway and their two unmarried daughters Euphemia Jane, aged 23 and the 20-year-old Lucy Ann.

Denison, Lady see Hornby, Caroline Lucy

Denison, Sir William, 1804-1871, was appointed Lieutenant Governor of Van Diemen’s Land to replace Sir John Eardley-Wilmot. He arrived in Hobart Town in January 1847 and remained until, on appointment as Governor General and Governor of New South Wales, he departed in January 1855. Before he departed Tasmania, Denison toured much of the colony and enjoyed a very warm farewell.

Denier, John, is listed in the day book. No information to identify him further has been found.

de Tremereuse, Edmund, (also spelt De Tremerreux) was friend to William Leake. In March 1854 he applied for employment with the colonial government and William Leake was named as a contact on his application.57 His being a house guest at Rosedale in April

---

56 Amelia Watts per Sea Queen, CON 41/1/10; CON 52/1/3.
57 Edmund de Tremereuse, “Names of Candidates for Employment Under the Government.” CSO 80/1/1, p. 50.
1854 may be related to this search for employment. He travelled regularly from Melbourne to Tasmania, through Launceston.  

**Dibbin, William**, c1820-1883, was a farm labourer at Rosedale. He arrived in Tasmania per *Asia* to serve a sentence of 15 years for: *breach of trust embezzling £1 14 10 from Edward Vaughan once sheep skins one month again similar offence six months*. He was considered to have bad connections. Dibbin awaited transportation on one of the Thames hulks. A native of Shrewsbury, Dibbin was aged 21 upon arrival in 1841 and was a single, literate, Protestant man who was a former soldier. This man saw the colony during his servitude: Hobart Town, Launceston, Mount Vernon, time at the Cascades, then Bridgewater, Bagdad, Pontville, and Macquarie Plains. Over this time he was convicted for neglect of duty, refusal to work, absconding, being absent without leave and forging a certificate of good character purportedly from his master. The last entry in his record of assignment is John Leake of Campbell Town in June 1854. The day Sarah Leake noted weighing out rations, 5 July 1854, was also the day Dibbin was awarded a certificate of freedom to mark the completion of his sentence. He continued to work for Leake as an emancipist. Dibbin married Ellen Jones in Launceston in 1861 and lived out his life there.

**Dormer, Olive** see Bloor, Olive

**Dormer, William**, born c1818, was transported to Tasmania for life for sheep stealing. William arrived aboard the *Lord William Bentinck* on 26 August 1838 and disembarked, aged 20, a tall dark young man with the trade of blacksmith. His gaol report was ‘bad’ and his convict record indicates a disobedient and disorderly man. On 24 July 1839 he was charged with ‘disobedience of orders and using indecent language 25 lashes’. At other times he was admonished for drunkenness, sentenced to solitary confinement for neglect of duty, given hard labour on the gang for absence without leave, and again flogged for absconding. William married Olive Bloor in 1846. The couple lived in the Midlands until William obtained the licence for the Angel Inn in Launceston. William Dormer died in an asylum for the insane in New Zealand in 1891. He had been admitted there in 1864.

---

59 William Dibbin per *Asia*, CON 31/1/9.
60 William Dormer per *Lord William Bentinck*, CON 31/1/12; CON 18/1/14.
61 William Dormer’s inquest was reported, *Otago Witness*, 6 August 1891, p. 11.
Elliott, James. A letter from the employment broker, Mr Drury to John Leake in October 1852 indicates that Drury had hired James Elliot as gardener on Leake’s behalf. No further information has been unearthed.

Elliott, Samuel, born c1819, arrived in Hobart Town, aged 22, per David Clarke in June 1841 to serve a ten-year sentence for: housebreaking from Mr [ ] once for shoes one month twice flogged. His prior nine years’ service in the 23rd Regiment, suggests he was a child when he entered the army. Elliot had the trade of labourer and was a literate Protestant. That he was much tattooed is indicated by the long near-indecipherable list on his record. He served his time plus more: misbehaviour led to his sentence being extended by eighteen months. This man saw many Midlands properties, including Merton Vale and Quorn Hall, during his servitude. His record is unclear on indulgences and the date of his free certificate but it appears he came to Leake in October 1852, by then aged 33, and likely close to being emancipated.

Farm servants see: Appleton, John; Atkins, James; Axton, James; Brown, Henry; Boyle, Patrick; Carroll James; Chandler, William; Cochrane, Moses; Coleman; Connor, James; Conroy Patrick; Cox, William; Denier, John; Dibbin William; Elliot, James, Elliot, Samuel; Finelly, John (alias Brown, John); Gately, John; Gillard, Stephen; Golden, John; Greenman, Michael; Hagan, John; Haynes, George; Hickey, John; Kettly, Sam; Kidd, William; Killymeade, Michael; Larkin Patrick; Mackegg, Edward; Martin, John; Morton, William Layton; Nowlan, Michael; Roberts, William; Ross, Daniel; Smith, George; Temple Henry; Thomas, William; Tibbits, Jeremiah; Venn, John.

Finelly, John, born c1825, arrived in Hobart Town to serve a sentence of seven years’ transportation for: stealing a cow with Michael Finelly. Michael Finelly was possibly his brother but the record is silent. John Finelly disembarked the Pestongee Bomagee in January 1849 having left Dublin the previous September. He was an illiterate farm labourer of the Roman Catholic faith from Kings County. Finelly had a ticket of leave given and revoked twice. The record indicates he was reconvicted, as John Brown, 19 April 1854. Clearly he was known as Brown at Rosedale for that is how he is listed in one entry of the Day Book.

---

62 Mr Drury to John Leake, 15 October 1852, in Leake Papers, L1/C61 There is no other information to identify James Elliot.
63 Samuel Elliot per David Clarke, CON 33/1/13.
This volume also lists him as arriving on the *Pestongee Bomagee*, He arrived at Rosedale in October 1855, aged about 30. This was only weeks before his free certificate was awarded.\(^6^4\) The day book lists John Brown per *Palmyra* arriving in October 1854. There is no record of a John Brown on this vessel. This could be the same man the error being in the day book. It is not possible to tell. A convict named John Brown did arrive in 1845 aboard the *Pestongee Bomagee*. This man was assigned to George Meredith of Cambria.\(^6^5\)

**Gately, John**, born c1821, an Irishman from Roscommon, landed in Hobart Town per *Cadet*, in August 1844. Gately, convicted of *burglary [ ] 5/- from Patrick [ ] at Roscommon for same 12 months*, was a groom and horse breaker by trade and had been a soldier. He could have been injured in either pursuit which may have accounted for scars on his hand and face. He was a tall man. Leake’s day book indicates he came to Rosedale in 1852. Leake sent him to the magistrate on 20 March 1854 for disobeying orders for which he was sentenced to four months’ hard labour. He would not have returned to Rosedale for he was directed not to enter service north of Oatlands at the time he was sentenced. At age 35 he married the 19-year-old Mary Gilligan, a free immigrant from London who had arrived in Hobart Town in December 1856, in Launceston in October 1857. That year he was also awarded a conditional pardon. He did not stay out of trouble and was tried in Launceston in 1859 for uttering counterfeit coins. He was sentenced to two years’ imprisonment with hard labour.\(^6^6\)

**Gatenby, George**, 1801-1871, arrived in Tasmania from Yorkshire in 1823 with his parents Andrew Gatenby and Hannah Maw and siblings aboard the *Berwick*.\(^6^7\) The Gatenby family became very successful settler farmers on the Isis River. The original grant was Barton and Andrew Gatenby purchased Bicton and was granted additional lands. George Gatenby married Mary Ann Corney in 1830. She was the daughter of the Gatenby’s neighbour, also a Yorkshire man and an equally successful farmer, Robert Corney of Lake House. Upon his father’s death, George and his brothers each inherited an estate. George and his family settled at Bicton.

**Gillard, Stephen**, born c1831, an agricultural labourer from Dorset, arrived in Tasmania on 3

---

\(^6^4\) John Finelly per *Pestongee Bomagee*, CON 33/1/92.  
\(^6^5\) John Brown per *Pestongee Bomagee*, CON 33/1/92.  
\(^6^6\) John Gately per *Cadet*, CON 33/1/58; CON 18/1/39.  
\(^6^7\) *Hobart Town Gazette*, 28 June 1823; Anne McKay, ed. *Journals of the Land Commissioners*, p. 137.
January 1855 aboard the *Australasia*. He could neither read nor write and was an Anglican. He was aged 24.\(^{68}\) Gillard absconded and was brought to court by John Leake for breaching his employment contract. Charles Leake produced the indenture agreement as evidence.\(^{69}\) Gillard was sentenced to solitary confinement with hard labour for 10 days at the Campbell Town goal and had costs awarded against him. Gillard moved on from this unpleasant episode. He married Charlotte Maybank at Longford in 1857 and they eventually settled at Port Sorell where he established a farm.\(^{70}\)

**Golden, John**, born c1819, was an emigrant shepherd. It is not clear when he commenced at Rosedale but it was around the time of his marriage to Catherine Lynch. He required permission to marry her for she was a convict who was serving a sentence of seven years for cow stealing.\(^{71}\) All five of her siblings were similarly tried and sentenced; for the same cow. All were transported to Tasmania.\(^{72}\) This is possibly an example of the ‘chain migration’ of the Irish away from famine, poverty and lack of opportunity.\(^{73}\) Catherine Lynch had borne a daughter, Mary Anne Dempsey, at in the Ross Female Factory but the child died there in May 1854. Over her life, Catherine Lynch served time at Cascades, Launceston and Ross female factories. She had five children to John Golden: the first, Ellen, and possibly the second, James, were born when they lived at Rosedale.

**Goldspink, Robert (Bobby)**, 1796 – 1878, arrived in Hobart Town from England per *Arab* in 1822. His trade was boot and shoe making. Goldspink served 20 years. His sentence was extended beyond the original term of 14 years for misconduct. He was also much lashed. He was awarded a ticket of leave in 1843 and was commended for bravery in the pursuit of bushrangers. The suggestion that he be offered a free pardon for this bravery came to nought. He was eventually free by servitude. Bobby Goldspink married Susan Johnson at Longford in 1832 and they made their home in the house he built in Church Street, Campbell Town.

---

\(^{68}\) Stephen Gillard per *Australasia*, CB 12/1/3.
\(^{69}\) Indenture agreement between Charles Henry Leake and Stephen Gillard, 17 August 1854, Leake Papers, L1/C86A. The agreement which committed Gillard to Leake for two years was signed in London.
\(^{70}\) Gillard/Maybank, RGD 36/1/16/1857
\(^{71}\) Catherine Lynch per *Australasia*, CON 41/1/24.
\(^{72}\) Catherine Lynch, Female Convict Research Centre database, www.femaleconvicts.org.au.
Goldspink continued as a successful boot and shoemaker and employed journeymen to assist meet the demand for his products. He travelled about the district taking orders.\textsuperscript{74} He died at Campbell Town.

**Governor**, see Denison, Sir William

**Green, Susan (Susannah)**, born c1823, arrived per *Aurora* in Hobart Town from London on 10 August 1851. Green was sentenced to serve ten years for: *stealing wearing apparel from Mr William at Maidstone*. Her trade was listed as housemaid, plain cook and laundress. She was aged 28 upon arrival, Protestant, and could read and write. She would have been a sought after servant in any household for she had a record of good behaviour from the surgeon and was relatively mature. Her first assignment was to Wilkinson of Evandale, which places her north of the Midlands. But just of short of a year she was sentenced to six months’ hard labour for neglect of duty, disobeying orders and being absent without leave. It is assumed, but not confirmed in the record, that she was returned to Wilkinson at the conclusion of this period of incarceration. The following year she was in the Launceston House of Correction where, on 30 October 1852, she was delivered of an illegitimate son, John. He lived just eight weeks. This places Green in the Launceston Female Factory at the end of 1852 and she may have remained there some months on punishment duty for the misdemeanour of pregnancy. The services listed on her convict record indicate she was assigned on 10 October 1853 but the location is not legible. In 1854 Green was not able to pick and choose her locations as she was still under sentence and without a ticket of leave. At the time she enters Miss Leake’s narrative, she is 31 years old.\textsuperscript{75} She remained at Rosedale beyond the end of the journal.

**Green, Susannah**, born c1823, arrived in Hobart, from London, on 14 April 1850 aboard the *St Vincent*. She was to serve seven years for larceny by a lodger: *pledging bedding previous 4 months*. Green was a diminutive widow of 27 years with the trade of laundress. She had one child but no mention is made of it bar a tick in the relevant column in her indent. She was sent immediately to the interior for she was banned from service in the district of Hobart


\textsuperscript{75} Susannah Green per *Aurora*, CON 41/1/31; CON 51/1/7. Research indicates at least three women with the name Susan or Susanna Green were transported to Tasmania. This woman was known as Susan Green at Rosedale.
Town. Green went to Leake at Campbell Town on 22 March 1853. This followed three months’ hard labour in the Hobart House of Correction for not having returned directly to the depot. But she did not stay at Rosedale for on 16 June 1853 she was again noted as in the Hobart Town House of Correction. Green was awarded a ticket of leave 8 November 1853 and was thus eligible to seek work more independently. On 2 May 1854 her application to marry Robert Cashburn was approved but there is no evidence of her marrying him, or any one else. Her ticket of leave was revoked on 15 January 1856 for an undisclosed misdemeanour but by 19 August 1856 she had a certificate of freedom, having done her time.76

Greenman, Michael, born c1824, was transported, per William Jardine, to serve out a ten year sentence for theft: stealing copper and rags from Mr Moore at Bath for meat 3 months 6 weeks for a saucepan. He arrived in November 1850 with a good surgeon’s report. He was Protestant labourer and could read and write a little. Greenman was a very identifiable man with a large burn mark on the lower part of his face and a scar on his forehead. He was a man with dark skin, hair and whiskers and brown eyes. He had been charged with misdemeanours relating to absenteeism and drunkenness before coming to Rosedale but was not charged while he was under Leake. He was awarded a ticket of leave in January 1855 and a conditional pardon in January 1856.77

Groom, see Collins, George; Crook, Robert; Jobson, George; Parsons, John; Short, William; and Westlake, Thomas, who variously held the post during the period 1852 to early 1857.

Hagan, (Hagin) John, is listed in the day book as arriving at Rosedale in 1851. There is no further information on this man.78

Haynes, (Haines) George, c1792-1854, was sentenced to transportation for life for stealing 1 sheep property of Mrs [Hilary] Cowley and once for assault 5 months once a fish and a donkey 4 months 5 years in the [Middlesex militia]. After four years at Norfolk Island, Haynes arrived at Hobart Town in May 1844 per Duke of Richmond. He was Protestant,

---

76 Susannah Green per St Vincent, CON 41/1/25; CON 19/1/8; CON 41/1/25.
77 Michael Greenman per William Jardine, CON 33/1/98.
78 He could have been John Hagan, per Elizabeth and Henry, CON 33/1/65, per Ratcliffe, CON 33/1/69, or per Johannes Sarkies, CON 37/1/5, but the records do not provide evidence of service at Rosedale for any of these men.
literate, married and the father of two children but that had not altered his circumstances. George Haynes’ hard life showed in his face: his complexion was sallow and wrinkled. He saw service on various Campbell Town properties and was assigned to Leake in 1849, aged 57, the oldest worker in the farm quadrangle. A ticket of leave was awarded to Haynes in July 1850 and it was possible then for him to seek greener pastures than Rosedale. Perhaps he did. In 1851 he wrote to Leake asking to be taken back, either at Rosedale or Ashby. The convict record suggests he returned to Rosedale in November 1851. He died in Campbell Town in June 1854, less than a year after he was awarded a conditional pardon. The death record has him aged 57. This was incorrect: Haynes would have been at least 62.

**Hanley, Lizzie (Elizabeth, Bessie),** born 1859, was the New York born sister of George Hanley. She was the youngest child of John Hanley, born nine years after the family migrated from Ireland. It appears she moved to Detroit in 1872 and boarded with George, Eliza and the family at 70 Columbia east for her first few years in that city. She had the profession of teacher. Lizzie Hanley married Thomas Burchill in Detroit on 10 January 1900.

**Hanley, George,** 1832-1896 was born at Meath to Roman Catholics John Hanley and his wife Mary Ann. As a young man he travelled to America with his parents and a younger brother, James. They arrived in New York c1850. His sister, Lizzie, was born there in 1859. Hanley travelled to Victoria during the gold rush but was unsuccessful in his quest for gold. While in the colonies he met Eliza Williams. They married in Toxteth, Lancashire, in December 1859, then travelled to America and established themselves in Detroit. George’s trade was plain and ornamental plasterer and he pursued aspects of this occupation his entire working life. He and Eliza had five children in Detroit and enjoyed a prosperous life. He died in 1896. George Hanley is buried at Detroit’s historic Mount Elliot Cemetery. His memorial stone is the tallest in the cemetery. Plaques in memory of his mother, wife and several of his children are placed at the foot of the plinth.

---

79 George Haynes to John Leake, 23 February 1851, Leake Papers, L1/C56.
80 George Haynes per *Woodbridge to Norfolk Island, per Duke of Richmond to Hobart Town*, CON 31/1/52; RGD 35/1/23/1854.
81 *Hubbell & Weeks’ Annual Directory of the Inhabitants, Business Firms, Incorporated Companies etc. of the City of Detroit, for 1872-3*, Detroit, Hubbell & Weeks, 1872, p. 264.
83 Michigan Deaths, 1867-1897.
84 “Mt Elliott Cemetery: A History,” Detroit: Mt Elliott Cemetery Trust, undated. This booklet includes details of the many early Detroiters buried there, including George Hanley, p. 45.
Hanley, George (Georgie and aka George H Hanley), 1871-1951, was second son and youngest child of Eliza Williams and George Hanley. He did not marry. Georgie was in partnership with his father in the plastering business and later practiced law.

Hanley, George Phillip, 1918-2010, was the son of John Hanley and his second wife, Jane Keenan. He was born the day before the death of his grandmother, Eliza Williams. George Phillip, named for his maternal and paternal grandfathers, married Anastasia Pankiw, 1922-2013, the daughter of Michael and Ana Pankiw of Rochester, New York.85 They had three children, John, William (Bill) and Mary. George Phillip Hanley’s profession was mechanical engineering.86 He was the longest lived of Eliza William’s grandchildren. He was buried in the Mount Elliot Cemetery on 1 November 2010.

Hanley, James, 1847-1915, was born in Ireland to John and Mary Anne Hanley. The 1910 census indicates his immigration year was 1850 thus he was a small boy of about three when he accompanied his parents to America. James was the younger brother of George Hanley and, like him, began his working life as a plasterer. He became, variously, a contractor and politician, being elected Sheriff of Detroit for a term. He and his nephew John Hanley collaborated closely on business contracts for many years

Hanley, James Keenan, 1904-1965 was the son of John Hanley and Lily Keenan. He was born at the Keenan family property at Grosse Pointe, Wayne. Keenan Hanley pioneered the development of marine water jet propulsion and was the inventor of the Hanley Hydro Jet.87 He married Muriel Volt, 1908-1993, in 1929. They did not have children. He died in Prospect, Ohio where he and his wife had made their home.

Hanley, Mary Jane see Keenan, Mary Jane

Hanley, John, with his wife Mary Ann, and sons George and James, migrated from Ireland to America and settled in New York. They arrived in May 1850.88 John Hanley was a stone mason. He became father-in-law to Eliza Williams.

86 www.obitsforlife.com/obituary/134516/Hanley-George.
88 Irish Immigrants: New York Port Arrival Record, 1846-1851.
Hanley, John Charles 1862-1949, known always only as John Hanley, was first-born child of Eliza Williams and George Hanley. He was born in Detroit. John married Parmelia Keenan (Lily) in 1894 and they had one son, James Keenan Hanley. John was widowed in 1904. He married Mary Jane Keenan in 1915 and they had one son, George Phillip Hanley in 1918. Like his mother, his age in the census is generally a few years short of actual. Family gossip placed him as the playboy who spent his father’s money. In the 1930 census John listed his mother’s country of origin as Australia and his father’s as the Irish Free State. He was buried at the Mount Elliot Cemetery.

Hanley, Olivia Nellie (Helen Williams), 1864-1899, second child and first daughter of Eliza Williams and George Hanley, was born in Detroit. Nellie was baptised Olivia in memory of her mother’s friend, Olive Bloor. Nellie did not marry. She died of tuberculosis, at home. On her death certificate she was identified as Helen Williams Hanley. She was buried at the Mount Elliot Cemetery.

Hanley, Lily see Keenan, Parmelia

Hanley, Eliza Williams (Elizabeth) see Williams, Eliza

Hanley, Minnie, 1866-1944, third child and second daughter of Eliza Williams and George Hanley, was born in Detroit. Minnie married Albert Kern. They had two children, Amy, born in 1901, and Grace, born in 1907. Between having Amy and Grace, Minnie became known as Mary Elizabeth. The possibility that Minnie died or was divorced from Albert, and that he remarried a woman called Mary E and then she bore Grace, was dismissed by Minnie’s death notice. In it, she was called Mary Elizabeth Hanley. Minnie Kern died on 13 April 1944 aged 71.

Harrington, Dr Richard Henry, born 1819, was a medical practitioner in Campbell Town at the time of the journal. At that time he was unmarried, aged 35 and was the younger of two local practitioners, the other being Dr William Valentine. There is no indication that Miss

---

89 Alice Meredith Hodgson, “Personal communication with Anastasia Pankiw Hanley,” Detroit, 2010.
92 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1854, p. 70; Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1855, p. 76.
Leake ever consulted him. Dr Harrington did visit John Leake when he was unwell and was called to the men on the farm. Dr Harrington owned several gallopers which he jockeyed himself. He rode one at the Campbell Town races that the Leake family attended in the company of the Governor and his party. The Rev John Mackersey married Richard Harrington and Eliza Mackersey Bailey at Campbell Town in 1859.

**Harrison, Hezekiah**, 1798-1860 was born to Robert Harrison and Elizabeth Knapping in 1798. He married Caroline Matilda Hill in Hobart in 1825. In 1854, apart from Henry Nelson Harrison, the eldest surviving child, all the Harrison offspring lived at the family home, Merton Vale. Merton Vale and Rosedale were neighbouring properties. Hezekiah Harrison died aboard the steamer *Tasmania* off the Sydney Heads, 11 July 1860, aged 62. He was buried in the Camperdown Cemetery. Hezekiah’s death heralded a period of deep grief for the Harrison family. His father, Robert, died on 14 July; his mother, Elizabeth, died on 21 July, and Hezekiah’s wife, Caroline, died on 4 August 1860.

**Haselden, Martha**, (natal surname unknown) born c1805, and her husband Joseph Haseldene arrived in Launceston from London via Cork aboard the *Royal Saxon* in November of 1842 accompanied by their two daughters, Serene Jane, a child of eight and Harriet, aged about 14. Joseph, aged 38, was listed on the ship’s indent as a farm servant. Martha, aged 37, did not have an occupation listed and Harriet was identified as a domestic servant. Joseph Haselden, noted of very good character, was tied under the bounty system to D Taylor on the Macquarie (likely David Taylor of Winton, known not to employ convict labour). Although there is no record of this specific Haseldene family in 1854, there is no apparent record of any other Haselden family in Tasmania at that time. Thus, it is likely they settled in Campbell Town where Mrs Haselden, and possibly other members of her family, ran a laundry.

**Herbert, Daniel**, c1801-1868, lived at Ross. A former convict, he was a stone mason who had worked on the Ross Bridge and other Midlands government works. He arrived in the colony in 1827 having been sentenced to transportation for life for **highway robbery twice with 394/Lynch and 823 [C...] served 4 years 4 months out of 7 years mother at Leeds a**

---

93 Memorial plaque, St Luke’s Cemetery, Campbell Town.
94 Haselden per *Royal Saxon*, CB 7/9/1.
95 Tasmania, Australia, Immigrant Lists, 1841-1884.
widow I was last at Leeds a sign board writer. Herbert experienced hard labour, the treadmill and the lash. He received a free pardon in 1846. In 1842 he corresponded with Leake regarding stonework for the Rosedale extensions and refurbishment.

**Hickey, John**, born c1818, an Irishman, arrived in Hobart Town per *Blenheim* in November 1848. He had been found guilty at Kings County Court for *stealing a horse* and sentenced to seven years’ transportation. A swarthy man whose dark hair was beginning to grey, Hickey would have been useful on the farm as he had the trade of ploughman and could read and write. His record does not indicate assignments. Assuming Hickey came to Rosedale as his first and only placement, he would have been aged about 30 on arrival. Hickey did his time. His certificate of freedom was gained in April 1854.

**Hornby, Caroline Lucy**, died 1899, daughter of Sir Phillip Hornsby, married William Denison, later Sir William, in 1838. As Lady Denison, she travelled with him to Hobart Town where he took up the appointment of lieutenant governor. Of their thirteen children, eleven survived to adulthood. Alexander noted of her: “In later years she was rarely mentioned in the press, only appearing once every few months, gracing a bazaar or all urbanity at a ball; a ritual figure, with little personality, in the background except for dutiful, non-controversial activities, many functions she attended were not even mentioned in the newspapers. She had turned into just the sort of Governor’s wife the middle classes hoped for: a polite, charming figurehead, all individuality squashed.”

**Horne, Francis Sharpe (Frank)**, 1808-1893, son of Benjamin Horne and his first wife, Janet Sharpe, 1783-1841, arrived with the family aboard *Andromeda* in 1823, aged about 15. He was a contemporary of the elder sons of John Leake whose company he would have kept aboard *Andromeda*. He was generally called Frank. In 1832 he married Frances Raffealla Hynott, 1808-1843. They had two daughters, Janet Mary in 1835 and Charlotte Kerr in 1838. He lived at Chiswick with his daughters and his father, Benjamin Horne.

---

96 Daniel Herbert per *Asia*, CON 31/1/19.
98 John Hickey per *Blenheim*, CON 33/1/93.
Horne, Benjamin, c1777-1858 arrived in Tasmania aboard the Andromeda on 7 May 1823. Horne, his family and several of his friends, including his future son-in-law, Lewis Gilles, made the journey from Leith with the Leakes. Many were acquainted from their time in Hamburg. Horne took up a land grant near Ross which he named Chiswick. Horne’s first wife, Janet Sharpe, 1783-1841, died at Chiswick in March 1841. The following year at Ross, Reverend William Bedford married Horne and Francis Manley, 1813-1853, formerly of Browns River. The bride was of the generation of Horne’s daughters. Horne lived at Chiswick in the company of son Frank Horne and Frank’s daughters. He was widowed a second time in 1853.

Hortle, Susannah (Susanna), 1801-1875, daughter of James Hortle and Ann Wild was born in Sydney NSW in 1801. She married Thomas Archer in 1818. They had thirteen children, six of whom survived to adulthood. He built and lived at Woolmers, his original land grant. He also acquired Fairfield and Cheshunt, Norfolk Plains. Thomas Archer died of dropsy, at Woolmers, in 1850. A daughter, Mary Elizabeth Henrietta Archer, 1821-1853, married Robert Quayle Kermode of Mona Vale in 1839. They had seven children. She died of phthisis (tuberculosis) in 1853. After her daughter’s death, Susannah Hortle, referred to as Mrs Thomas Archer, lived at Mona Vale with Kermode and had the care of his children.

Huston, George Francis, 1812-1890, was the long-serving Superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane, New Norfolk. At times when well enough not to be committed, William Leake lived with Dr Huston and his family.

Jobson, George, born c1820, was recruited in England by Charles Leake to fill the role of groom at the Rosedale stables. His trade was coachman and he arrived in Tasmania aboard the Fortitude on 15 February 1855 accompanied by his wife, Harriet, and two sons William aged 13 and Henry aged ten. Jobson, at 35 and with a wife and family, would have been seen as a steady man after the unruly set that had preceded him as groom. He commenced work

---

100 McKay, Journals of the Land Commissioners, p 139.
102 McKay, Journals of the Land Commissioners, p 130.
104 Chick, The Archers of Van Diemen’s Land, p. 23.
105 George Jobson per Fortitude, CB7/12/1/3.
within days of arriving in Tasmania. Rosedale records indicate he left at the end of the two years required of him as a bonded immigrant.

**Jobson, Henry**, born c1844, was the younger son of George Jobson who, with his wife and family, migrated to Tasmania indentured to work at Rosedale for John Leake. Henry was too young to work on the property and received school lessons from Miss Leake. He also appeared to be a favourite among the Leakes for he was taken on outings in the carriage and gig with members of the family. He was trusted to open the gates enroute.

**Johnston, William**, 1821-1873, and his wife Mary Anders, 1833-1878, arrived in Campbell Town in 1855 to take charge of the Campbell Town School. They had spent the previous three years at Swan River in Western Australia. Although both were teachers, Mary was largely involved in caring for their three young children: Mary Margaret, William George and Lucy Ellen. The Johnston family lived in the St Luke’s Sunday School building at first – teaching in one part, living in another. It would have been very cramped. The lack of suitable accommodation was part of their disappointment in Campbell town.106 Two more children were born to them during their tenure in Campbell Town.107 The family moved to Hobart and Johnston taught for many years at Holy Trinity School.

**Keenan, James Joseph**, 1841-1919, was one of the two Keenan brothers who migrated to Detroit from Canada in the early 1860s. His daughter Lily (Parmelia) married John Hanley in 1894. JJ Kennan, as he was known, had a rag-to-riches story in the furniture business, starting with painting chairs in a factory and ending with partnership in one of the city’s finest emporiums, Keenan and Jahn.108

**Keenan, James M**, born 1873, was the son of James J Keenan and his wife SE Smith. He was John Hanley’s brother-in-law. They had attended Detroit College together.

---

Keenan, Parmelia (Lily, Lillie, Lillian Keenan Hanley), 1870-1912, daughter of James J Keenan, she married John Hanley in Detroit in 1894. They had one son James Keenan Hanley. Lily died of bowel cancer on 30 March 1912.109

Keenan, Mary Jane (Jane M Hanley), born c1875 in Ontario was the eldest daughter of Phillip (Chitty) Keenan, born c1848, and his wife Eliza Marie Doyle, c1848-1922.110 Her father was the only one of his brothers not to immigrate to America. Jane Keenan was a school teacher and had become a naturalised American in 1901.111 She married John Hanley, his second wife, in Ontario in 1915. Jane was first cousin to Lily Keenan, John Hanley’s first wife. They had one son, George Phillip Hanley (named George for his paternal grandfather and Phillip for his maternal grandfather).

Kettly, Sam. Not able to be further identified.

Keppenhoffen, Phyllis (Campau Keppenhoffen) see Campau, Phyllis

Kern, Albert, 1867-1942, born in Michigan to Rudolphe Kern and his wife Josephine Todt. The couple were Prussian immigrants. They had two sons, Rudolph and Albert. Albert married Minnie Hanley on 7 November 1894.112 They had two daughters: Amy and Grace. Albert Kern, aged 75, died on 27 July 1942.

Kern, Minnie (Mary Elizabeth) see Hanley, Minnie

Kern, Amy, 1901-1989 elder daughter of Albert Kern and Minnie Hanley. She did not marry. At the time of her death, on 2 August 1989 aged 88, she was living in Ypsilanti.

Kern, Grace, 1907-1979, younger daughter of Albert Kern and Minnie Hanley. Grace married Robert Brett Shaeffer. They did not have any children and lived out their lives in greater Detroit, at Grosse Pointe, the same district as Grace’s cousin Phyllis Kettenhofen. Robert Shaffer died aged 68, on 27 July 1971. Grace Kern died, aged 72, on 19 September 1979.

Kidd, William, born c 1829, was engaged at Rosedale in August 1856. He was an emigrant per Whirlwind from London which arrived in Hobart Town in March 1855.

Killymede, Michael, born c1818, arrived in Tasmania in May 1853 per St Vincent to serve a sentence of 15 years for assault and robbery of 2/6. Killymede’s trial had been at Longford, Ireland, in February 1848 thus he had spent time in gaol before being transported, which was the practice under the convict system at that time. He had also been incarcerated at Gibraltar. He was a farm labourer by trade and had left his mother, wife and four children behind. Killymede, at the time aged about 35, was sent to John Leake of Campbell Town on 31 May 1853 and served his entire sentence at Rosedale. He continued there after he was granted a conditional pardon in July 1856.

Larkin, Patrick, born c1818, an Irishman from County Dublin with the trade of basket maker, arrived in Tasmania per Blenheim in 1851. He had been sentenced to seven years’ transportation for stealing corn from a dwelling 3 months for copper. His first stop was the Old Wharf Probation Station in Hobart Town where he stayed a year before being available for assignment. During his servitude Larkin was sentenced to six months’ hard labour for being out without leave and representing himself as being free. Larkin went to John Leake at Campbell Town in January 1853 and appears to have stayed there. He was granted a ticket of leave in April 1854 and a conditional pardon in July 1855. Larkin was aged about 35 when he arrived at Rosedale. He had left a wife and four children behind in Ireland.

Leake, Arthur, 1814-1890, was the fifth son of John Leake and Elizabeth Bell. He was in his early forties and unmarried at the time of interest. He lived at Ashby, near Ross, a property owned by his father and was a regular visitor and overnight guest at Rosedale. Arthur was paid a stipend to manage Ashby and the adjoining Lewisham. He became guardian to his niece, Letitia Sarah Leake after the death of his brother Edward in 1867. She became his heir. Arthur Leake married Mary Turnbull née Gellion, 1841-1920, in 1878, in London. She was aged 36 and Arthur was 64.

113 Michael Killymede per St Vincent, CON 33/1/155; CON 14/1/47.
114 Patrick Larkin per Blenheim, CON 33/1/104.
115 Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
Leake, Charles Henry, 1819-1889, was the youngest child and sixth son of John and Elizabeth Bell. He lived at Rosedale for virtually his entire life as he was three years of age when the family arrived in the colony. Charles Leake married Clara Jane Bell, 1831-1916, daughter of his maternal uncle Edward Bell, in 1869. Clara Bell had come to live at Rosedale in 1857, having made Charles’ acquaintance when he was travelling in Europe during 1854-55. The present owners of Rosedale are direct descendents of Charles Leake and Clara Bell. Tasmania’s Lake Leake is named for Charles Leake.

Leake, Mrs Edward see Clarke, Letitia Amanda

Leake, Edward John, 1812-1867, was the fourth son of John Leake and Elizabeth Bell. Edward Leake, and his brother Robert, left Rosedale in the late 1830s to make their own way. They settled in South Australia and separately and together developed substantial pastoral holdings in the South East near what is now Mt Gambier. South Australia’s Lake Leake is named for them. Edward John Leake married Letitia Amanda Clark at Wellington in 1854. Letitia was 18 and Edward 42 when they married. Sarah Leake does not mention this marriage in her journal. Edward and Letitia had two children: Letitia Sarah, 1859-1923, and John, 1862-1904.

Leake, Robert Rowland, 1811-1860, was the third son of John Leake and Elizabeth Bell. At the time of interest he lived at his sheep station, Glencoe, with his wife Ruth Hickmer whom he had married in Portland, Victoria, in 1853. Both her parents had been engaged by Robert to work on Glencoe and they arrived with their five children on the emigrant ship Catherine in 1851. Ruth was 18 and Robert 42 when they married in 1853. They had no children. Ruth Hickmer married a second time, in 1867, to Henry W Thirkell.

Leake, Letitia’s first husband. No information has been obtained that identified the first husband of Letitia Clarke. There is speculation in Sarah Leake’s journal that he was dead and, later, that he remained alive after Letitia Clarke’s marriage to Edward Leake. There was no suggestion that Letitia had divorced a first husband.

Leake, Mrs John see Bell, Elizabeth
Leake, John, 1780-1865, was third child of Robert Leake and Sarah New. A Yorkshire man, who had for many years been a Hull merchant, Leake arrived in the colony aboard the Andromeda in 1823 with his wife, Elizabeth Bell, and six of their seven surviving children. He was granted land on the Macquarie River, which he named Rosedale, and subsequently acquired Lewisham and Ashby.\textsuperscript{116} By the 1850s he was the ageing patriarch but continued in charge at Rosedale and was active in public life as a member of the Legislative Council and justice of the peace. He played important roles within his church and community.

Leake, John Travis,\textsuperscript{117} 1810-1886, was second son of John Leake and Elizabeth Bell. When the family migrated to Tasmania, John Travis Leake remained in England for he was apprenticed to study medicine. He completed his medical and surgical training and established himself as a practitioner. In the 1850s it appears he was practicing in Victoria. Sarah did not see this brother during the period of her journal and the only reference to him relates to correspondence. John Travis Leake did not marry. He came to live at Rosedale late in life and died there.

Leake, Sarah Elizabeth, 1817-1881, was the second daughter and seventh child of John Leake and his wife Elizabeth Bell. She lived virtually her entire life at Rosedale. She did not marry.

Leake, William Bell, 1806-1886, was the eldest child of John Leake and Elizabeth Bell. He spent the majority of his adult life at Rosedale. For the period of the 1850s it seems William did not leave the district. According to his sister’s journal, he was a silent participant in Sarah Leake’s days, at the dining table, in the yard, occasionally at church, and often visiting with her. There is no subtext of accomplishment for this, the eldest son. Later in life William was admitted to New Norfolk Hospital for the Insane: the first time in 1861, when he was 55, where he remained for five months. Over the next 15 years, he was admitted a further four times for varying lengths of treatment.\textsuperscript{118} It was generally his youngest brother, Charles, who by then exercised day-to-day control over Rosedale, who committed him. William Leake died at New Norfolk. William was wrongly noted as dying young.

\textsuperscript{116} McKay, Journals of the Land Commissioners, p. 141.

\textsuperscript{117} Referred to as John Travis throughout to differentiate him from John Leake, his father, though the family called him John.

Mackersey James, c1794-1864, arrived in the colony in 1823 with his wife Eliza Letham, 1797-1871. He was granted a property at Oatlands known as Wallace and later acquired Greenhill on the Macquarie River. They had three-colonial born children. He was brother to Rev John Mackersey of Kirklands. It was James Mackersey who went missing from home in 1855 not to return for several days.

Mackersey, Rev John, c1789-1854, was one of three sons of Rev Dr John Mackersey, 1757–1831, and his wife Katherine Wallace. His brother, James Mackersey, had travelled to Tasmania and was farming at Jericho when John, with his wife Catherine Isdale, 1800-1853, and infant son John, c1828-1860, arrived to take up the Presbyterian ministry at Kirklands. Catherine had five more children at Kirklands, two of whom did not survive infancy. Their two daughters were Ellen, who married Henry Nelson Harrison, and Catherine Wallace. Besides his church duties, John Mackersey conducted a private school for boys at which Charles Leake had been a pupil. Rev Mackersey retired in 1854 and went to live in Campbell Town. Catherine, Miss Mackersey, went with him. John Mackersey’s other brother, William, 1796-1875, died in New Zealand.

McIlreavy James Michael, c1823-1854, was a Londonderry Presbyterian. He was serving a sentence of seven years’ transportation for burglary. He had been caught for burglary taking clothes for an assault one month. McIlreavy had been assigned to Hezekiah Harrison in November 1853 having spent the first months of his sentence with Captain William Wood, another gentleman of the district. McIlreavy drowned near the ford on the Elizabeth River. He fell from the bank. It is not known if anyone wrote of his demise to his wife Jane and two young daughters Ellen and Margaret, left behind in Ireland.

MacKegg, Edward [also Mckegg and McKeig], 1810 -1871 had the trade of coachman but it is unlikely when he arrived at Rosedale in August 1852 he was installed in the stables as groom. He had been transported for seven years for the crime of larceny: stealing shirts at Knutsford four months for buying stolen shoes for fighting one month. MacKegg was an older man, 42 years of age when assigned to Leake, within days of his arrival in Hobart Town.

119 McKay, Journals of the Land Commissioners, p 142.
121 James Michael McIlreavy, Inquest, 4 May 1854, Hobart, Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office, SC195/1/34/3251.
122 James McIlreavy per Lord Dalhousie, CON 33/1/108.
He had left a wife at Knutsford. As a literate Protestant he would have suited Leake but all
did not bode well. While at Rosedale he was reprimanded for drunkenness, fined for
drunkenness and indecent language and sentenced to hard labour for ill treating a horse.
Despite his misdemeanours, he was granted a conditional pardon in March 1855, whilst still
at Rosedale. MacKegg died in the general hospital in Hobart, of serious apoplexy, aged 57,
in November 1871.

Martin, John, born c1833, was the convict who broke the mould at Rosedale, though
nothing extant suggests anyone noticed. Martin was a slight young dark-eyed Irishman from
County Kildare. He was a carpenter by trade and, despite his Catholicism, literate. Martin
arrived per Equestrian to serve out a ten year sentence for highway robbery took £21 twice
imprisoned for housebreaking. He arrived in Hobart Town on 16 December 1852 and by the
end of the next week had been assigned to Rosedale. At age 19 he was the youngest male
hired in the 1850s, and likely before. He was not trouble beyond being reprimanded for
playing cards. He stayed on and was granted a ticket of leave in 1853 and a conditional
pardon in 1857.

Mannon, Mary, was hired as housemaid by John Leake in September 1851, as indicated in a
letter from the Immigrant Homes in Hobart. Nothing more is known of her.

Mason, Thomas, 1806-1888, held the post of Campbell Town Police Magistrate from
1831. He married Abigail Wellman, 1818-1852, in 1835 and they had six children, all born
in Campbell Town. Four were daughters: Emily Abigail, Frances Mary, Annie Elizabeth and
Agnes Maria. Thomas Mason was warden of St Luke’s Church of England and a member of
the governing board of the Campbell Town Grammar School. John Leake was similarly
engaged in each community activity. Thomas Mason was known locally as Mister Muster
Master Mason.

Mercer, James, c1821-1879, a gentleman, lived at Morningside. His second wife, Janet, was

123 Edward MacKegg per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/108.
124 Edward MacKegg, RGD 35/1/8/1871.
125 John Martin per Equestrian, CON 33/1/111.
126 A Perry to John Leake, 9 September 1851, Leake Papers, L1/C71.
127 Wood’s Tasmanian Almanack, 1855, p. 55.
the daughter of Claudius Thomson, a Waterloo veteran and former first Warden of the Campbell Town municipality, who had arrived in 1827 per *Albion* and established the property. Janet Mercer inherited Morningside.\(^{129}\) James Mercer died at Campbell Town.\(^{130}\)

**Morrison, William**, a Campbell Town hotelier, operated a thriving tavern called the Caledonian with the assistance of his wife.\(^{131}\) He had married Ellen Allen, born c.1815, in 1837. She required permission to marry for she had come to Tasmania per *Edward* in 1834 to serve a seven-year sentence for street robbery meaning that she was a pick pocket. Ellen was considered insolent and disobedient and Benjamin Horne, sitting as magistrate, once ordered her back to the government for neglecting her orders. She served time in the Cascade Female Factory. She was assigned to her husband but did not receive a free certificate until 1852.\(^{132}\) In effect she served double her original sentence.

**Morton, William**, c.1813 was sentenced by court martial in 1832 to life imprisonment for *desertion absent 14 days*. He had earlier been punished for *refusing*. Morton was reported bad and violent. During his servitude he was found guilty of misconduct, refusal to work, obtaining liquor, being disorderly and absent without leave. His sentence was extended several times, and he was sent to Port Arthur. There he was required to work in chains, suffered solitary confinement and the lash. He arrived at Rosedale in 1854, as an emancipist.\(^{133}\)

**Nowlan, Michael**, born c.1823, had killed a man. A literate Tipperary Roman Catholic, his conviction for manslaughter, *the man was struck on the head he lived two days*, saw him transported per *Lord Auckland* in 1846. His faith was tattooed on his right arm: a crucifix and two angels. The record shows that he was assigned variously in the Campbell Town area over several years after it was recommended he be assigned north of Oatlands for being suspected of having formed an improper intimacy with the wife of George Hill of Pittwater. Charles

---


\(^{130}\) James Mercer, RGD 35/1/48/1879.

\(^{131}\) Stancombe, *Highway in Van Diemen’s Land*, p 115.

\(^{132}\) Ellen Allen per *Edward*, CON 40/1/1; CON 51/1/1.

\(^{133}\) Two men named William Morton arrived per *Layton* in 1839 and the convict records related to them are confused and misdemeanours and punishments are both duplicated and exchanged in the records. The William Morton who worked as an emancipist at Rosedale from 1854 was listed as William Morton (2). There is only one indent record and it is not possible to determine which man it refers to. CON 31/1/32; CON 18/1/14.
Engelbert, a Campbell Town pubiclan, and Patrick Kearney, a local butcher, both took him twice. He was sentenced to hard labour for being drunk while assigned to Charles Engelbert. Nowlan was not assigned to Leake. He arrived at Rosedale in March 1854 nearly a year after he was awarded a conditional pardon.  

Page, Samuel, 1810-1878, arrived in Tasmania as a 13-year-old, with his mother, aboard the Belinda in 1823. In 1833 he married Grace Anne Harris and they moved to Oatlands where he became licensee of the Lake Dulverton Inn. He opened the Oatlands Hotel in 1839 which he ran for years. He started a daily coach service from Oatlands to Hobart in 1845 and won the mail contract between Hobart Town and Launceston in 1848. A short while later he bought out Mary Cox’s coaching service. Later, in the 1850s, after buying out his partner John Lord, he became the sole operator of the coaching service. Thus, it was his coaches the male members of the Leake family travelled in from time to time. Miss Leake appears not to have used a public conveyance.

Parsons, John, born c1831, was a convicted thief. He had been transported for seven years for stealing a pruning knife and sheath from W Norris, Devon for apples 2 months. He arrived in Hobart Town on 3 July 1852, exactly three years from day of his trial. Parsons was a labourer by trade and barely literate. He was 23 when he came to Rosedale in October 1854 as groom. He may have been better suited to working on the farm rather than in the house. His liveried jacket covered the tattoos that coloured each arm but it would not have hidden those on the backs of his hands. John Parsons’ arrival had been delayed by a nine-month term of hard labour for absconding from the Police Barracks. His convict record indicates he was to go to Leake in March 1854, possibly as part of a strategy by Leake to replace the unsuitable George Collins, but this was foiled by Parsons’ unruliness. In the interim Collins was likely kept under sufferance and William Short hired as a last and most unsatisfactory resort. Parsons was kept on as a farm worker, it seems, after a new groom arrived to replace him in February 1855.

134 Michael Nowlan per Lord Auckland, CON 33/1/82.
136 John Parsons per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/108. The length of time from sentence to arrival reflected the practice under the probation system of transportees spending an initial period of detention in Britain.
137 Parsons continuing to be listed as receiving wages indicates this. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
Powell, Susanna, was wife of Thomas Williams and mother of Eliza. Susanna and Thomas wed in St John’s, a Protestant church in Limerick, in 1829 and had three children: Eliza, Thomas and Susan. Susanna, with her husband and possibly other children, immigrated to America. They were established there by the end of 1859.

Renwick, James, born c1822, arrived in Tasmania per Equestrian in December 1852 to serve the balance of a sentence of ten years for stabbing with intent to do bodily harm: stabbing a game keeper whilst poaching. He had been tried at Newcastle-on-Tyne on 22 February 1849. He was a former farm labourer who could read but, perhaps, not write. Renwick had spent nearly three years in prison before being transported and had received a very good report. He was often punished by fines for the infraction of drunkenness. Renwick was working as cook at Ashby when he was transferred to Rosedale, on 11 December 1854 at no notice, because of the unexpected departure of George Trinder. As a ticket of leave holder Renwick would have had some say in the matter of the transfer: cooking in the Leake family house rather than for Arthur Leake and his workmen may have had some appeal. He was the only servant in the house at Rosedale with a conviction for a crime of violence. This man apparently stayed on.

Roberts, Joseph, born c1819, was one of two partners of George Hanley when he first entered the plastering business in Detroit in 1860. He was a Welshman, with an English-born wife and a family of six children. The youngest two children had been born in Michigan which suggests the family had come to Detroit in the mid 1850s. At the time of the 1860 census, they lived in Detroit Ward 6, as did the Hanleys.

Roberts, William, born c1818, an Anglesea-born man, arrived in Tasmania per John Calvin to serve ten years’ transportation for the crime of burglary for taking silver plate of £170. He was much convicted and punished after arrival for drunkenness, neglect of work, disobedience and absenteeism. Just prior to coming to Rosedale he had undergone a period of hard labour for disobedience of orders that had been extended due to idleness. His trade

---

138 The family is listed on Eliza Williams per Anna Maria, CON 15/1/7.
139 James Renwick per Equestrian, CON 33/1/111.
140 Renwick received wages beyond the period of the journal. Leake, “Day Book from January 1849.”
142 William Roberts per John Calvin, CON 33/1/88. Two men named William Roberts arrived per John Calvin in 1846 each to serve 10 years. The convict records confuse them. Misdemeanours and punishments are both
was spinner. His convict record notes he was sent to John Leake of Campbell Town on 17 May 1854. At the time of his arrival at Rosedale he was approximately 37 years old. Within weeks of his arrival Leake charged Roberts with the assault of another of the farm labourers, another new man, Moses Cochrane. The magistrate, Thomas Mason, and Arthur Leake in his capacity as a justice of the peace, heard the case indicating a significant potential for conflict of interest. Shortly thereafter he absconded and was recaptured. It seems he did not then return to Rosedale. Roberts did his time and was certified free in 1856.

**Roe, William**, c1815 was the second partner in the plastering business George Hanley joined when he established himself in Detroit in 1860. William Roe, a plasterer of English origin, his wife and four young children lived in Detroit Ward 6. Roe owned sizeable real estate and personal capital and would have been considered a wealthy man.

**Rooney, Margaret**, c1819-1877, had arrived per *Phoebe* on 1 January 1845 having left Dublin in September 1844. She was convicted with a sentence of ten years for larceny: *stealing £5 from Pat O’Brien once acquitted for a watch 4 times acquitted for assaults.* Rooney was considered bad. Her record indicates she was an illiterate Roman Catholic farm servant who was assigned to a location in Campbell Town, assumed to be Rosedale, in 1845. She served eight days in the cells for insolence and neglect of duty in January 1849, suggesting neither Leake nor his daughter was shy of sending a housemaid to the magistrate. She married Benjamin Sculthorpe, per *Mount Steward Elphinstone*, a Rosedale farm worker in 1849. They were married by William Bedford in the Campbell Town parish church indicating that Margaret had taken Benjamin’s faith. Benjamin, listed as a painter aged 29, signed the register and Margaret, listed as a house servant aged 26, made her mark. Like many before her, and since, Margaret did not ensure her correct age was on the marriage register. Margaret Rooney served her time. She obtained a certificate of freedom in March 1854. She died at Hobart in May 1877 of catarrh.

**Ross, Daniel**, born c1830, a wheelwright, possibly of Scottish origin, travelled aboard the

---

143 Campbell Town Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.  
145 Margaret Rooney per *Phoebe*, CON 41/1/5; CON 19/1/4.  
146 Female Convict Research Centre database; Margaret Rooney, RGD 35/1/48/1877.
Australasia to Tasmania arriving on 3 January 1855. He took up his tools in the Rosedale estate within days of arrival. Ross was a single man, aged 25. He was an adherent of the Church of Scotland, and could read and write.  

Scott, Charlotte, born c1819, arrived in Tasmania aboard the Lord Auckland in January 1849 having departed Dublin in October 1848. She was an assigned house maid at Rosedale from December 1853 until September 1854. Scott’s record suggests she was boisterous and not easy to contain: a poor fit for the restrained quietude of the Leake family home. She was serving seven years for stealing a purse and money from Monahan at Dublin 3 weeks for an assault 3 months for stealing 3/6. She had been imprisoned for assault in Ireland, and had spent time ‘on the town’ before her transportation. A Roman Catholic, Scott could read but not write. Before her service at Rosedale she had a colourful record of absconding and drinking. These habits did not change and she was dismissed by Leake and returned to the Female Factory in Ross from whence she had come. Charlotte Scott was aged 34 when first mentioned in the journal and she is identified only by her given name. The final note in her record indicates she again absconded.

Sculthorpe, Benjamin, born c1818, arrived in Hobart Town from London in June 1845 per Mount Stewart Elphinstone. He had been sentenced to ten years’ transportation for a fourth larceny conviction: stole a pocket handkerchief for similar offences 3 months twice and once 6 months. A single Protestant, Sculthorpe could read and write. He had two placements after probation then went to Leake on 3 March 1849. Sculthorpe was a much tattooed man with a sun, man, anchor, heart and letters on his left arm below elbow, and tattooed rings on the second and third fingers of his left hand. His face was marred by a scar on the right side of his upper lip. His request for marriage to Margaret Rooney, a Rosedale convict housemaid, came less than five weeks after he arrived. William Bedford married them at St Luke’s in Campbell Town in August 1849. John Venn, a fellow Rosedale convict farm worker, made his mark as a witness. It appears Benjamin, and his wife, remained at Rosedale until December 1854 when a certificate of freedom was issued him.

147 Daniel Ross per Australasia, CB 7/12/3.
149 Benjamin Sculthorpe per Mount Stewart Elphinstone, CON 33/1/66.
150 Sculthorpe/Rooney, RGD 37/1/8/1849.
**Sculthorpe, Margaret** see Rooney, Margaret

**Short, William**, born c1819, arrived in the colony per *Sir George Seymour* in February 1845 to serve a seven-year sentence for *stealing a pocket knife for being drunk fined three times*. In 1854 when employed by Leake he was an emancipist. He was Anglican and literate, and a groom and waiter by trade. In these attributes he was seemingly very suitable for the mixed duties Leake required of him. He had earned his certificate of freedom in January 1850. But, as his convict record displayed, Short had problems with alcohol and his temper. Despite maturity at about 35, he was insolent and disorderly and had spent time in the Oatlands gaol since completing his term of transportation. Short was twice before the magistrate during his 3-month tenure at Rosedale, both times as a result of drunkenness. The second time he was gaoled for three months. He did not return to Rosedale.

**Smith, George**, born c1820, was tried in Durham in 1849 for *stealing a sheep property of Bishop Auckland 14 days for timber* and sentenced to 7 years’ transportation. After a period in gaol, he embarked the *Rodney* in September 1851 and arrived in Hobart Town the following December. Smith was barely literate, a Protestant married man of 29. As a labourer who could plough he was a useful man and he was assigned to Leake within days of his arrival in Tasmania. His record shows Leake sent him to the magistrates for misconduct; being absent from his place of work and found concealed in the house of a prostitute. After a stint of 6 days’ solitary, Smith returned to service at Rosedale. He was awarded a conditional pardon in November 1854 and a free certificate was issued in April 1856. It appears he continued labouring at Rosedale.

**Sutton, Robert**, 1788-1860, a Campbell Town store keeper, and his wife, Charlotte, formerly Mrs James McVickar, were members of the St Luke’s Church of England congregation and thus had contact with the Leake family for business and at church. Robert Sutton had been transported for seven years for *embezzling £24* in 1833 and arrived in the colony per *Enchantress*. This convict past resulted in him being refused the role of post master in

---

151 William Short per *Sir George Seymour*, CON 33/1/64; CON 14/1/26.
152 Campbell Town Lower Court Records, 25 April 1853 – 20 Feb 1861.
153 George Smith per *Rodney*, CON 33/1/105.
154 Robert Sutton per *Enchantress*, CON 31/1/40.
Campbell Town despite local petitions to the Crown.\textsuperscript{155} His store, one of the many in Campbell Town, was on High Street.

\textbf{Temple Henry}. Not known. It is possible he was the son of waterman William Temple and his wife Mary born in Hobart Town and baptised in the Wesleyan Church in January 1830.\textsuperscript{156} If so, he would have been a young free man. The day book notes him but offers no further clues.

\textbf{Thomas, William}. Not known. The day book lists this man as a bricklayer and he was about the property in September 1856. He cannot be identified and there is no convict record of this name as a likely match.

\textbf{Thompson, James}, c1799-1879 was the Campbell Town blacksmith. Thompson, identified in the 1843 census as a mechanic and artificer, and his wife Eleanor Williams, arrived free.\textsuperscript{157} The forge was at the corner of High and King Streets. The family home was The Lilacs.\textsuperscript{158}

\textbf{Tibbits, (Tibbits and Tibbetts) Jeremiah}, born c1816, was tried at the Old Bailey in October 1848 for burglary and was sentenced to seven years’ transportation. He was a single literate man, an adherent of the Church of England and arrived in Hobart Town per \textit{Lady Montague} in December 1852. He was assigned to William Leake within days of arrival. Tibbits had broken a leg and likely limped, as did his master. He was a carpenter by trade and therefore a useful man. He has no record of misdemeanours and was issued a conditional pardon less than 18 months after arrival, in May 1854. However, given he had been convicted in 1848 this man had mostly done his time.\textsuperscript{159} Tibbits married Jane Green and they had a daughter, Sarah Jane, born in Launceston in June 1862.\textsuperscript{160}

\textbf{Trinder, George}, born c1828, arrived in Tasmania per \textit{Pestongee Bomange} in February 1847 having been convicted at the Gloucester Assizes the year before for \textit{burglary and stealing money from Thomas [Cummings] at Cheltenham burglary 3 months} and sentenced to 15

\textsuperscript{155} Historical Committee of the National Trust of Australia, Tasmania, \textit{Campbell Town Tasmania}, pp. 40-1.
\textsuperscript{156} Henry Temple, RGD 32/1/1/1830.
\textsuperscript{157} 1843 Van Diemen’s Land Census, Hobart, Tasmanian Archive and Heritage Office.
\textsuperscript{158} Geoff Dunacomb, \textit{A History of Campbell Town: ‘The Children of Erin,’} p. 82.
\textsuperscript{159} Jeremiah Tibbits per \textit{Lady Montague}, CON 33/1/110.
\textsuperscript{160} Sarah Jane Tibbits, RGD 33/1/40/1862.
years’ transportation. Trinder had the original trade of labourer but had remade himself as a cook. He possibly acquired this skill at Port Arthur where he had been in the period immediately before his assignment to Rosedale. His Port Arthur servitude was indicative of a difficult man but the convict system may have made him thus. He spent more than two years at the Darlington probation station and gained 167 days off his sentence for hard work. Trinder was sent to the Midlands but he did not stay out of trouble. A conviction for burglary in 1849 resulted in a life sentence, and transfer to Port Arthur for four years. George Trinder was reassigned to Morrison of Campbell Town and commenced there on 13 December 1854. He married Mary Ann Smith, a free woman, in April 1856 in Campbell Town and their son was born the following July. That their daughter, born in 1858, was not registered in Campbell Town suggests they had moved away from the district.

**Turnbull, Rev Dr Adam**, 1803-1891, arrived in Hobart Town aboard the *City of Edinburgh*. He was 21 years old. With him on board were his mother, Susanna Bayne Turnbull widow of his father Rev Adam Turnbull Snr, his wife Margaret Young, his four brothers, Francis Moira, John, Alexander and Robert, members of his wife’s family, the Youngs, and mutual friends, the Murrays. All these people settled initially in the Campbell Town area. Adam Turnbull practiced medicine and held a number of colonial posts. Turnbull was ordained into the Presbyterian Church in August 1854 and became rector at Kirklands and later St Andrew’s for the period 1854-1874. At the time of interest the family lived at Ivy Cottage in Campbell Town which was known as The Manse.

**Turnbull, Francis Moira (Frank)**, 1809-1857, known locally as Frank Turnbull, was the brother of Rev Dr Adam Turnbull. He arrived with his family of origin in Hobart Town aboard the *City of Edinburgh*. He married Elizabeth Cameron at Longford in 1831 and died at Campbell Town in 1857. Frank Turnbull was a successful miller and local businessman. Wheat from Rosedale was ground at his steam mill and Sarah Leake was a member of his subscription library. Frank Turnbull lived with his wife and family in Mill House, originally designed and built by James Blackburn.

---

161 George Trinder per Pestongee Bomangee, CON 33/1/84.
162 George Trinder, RGD 37/38/1856, RGD 33/101/1856 and RGD 33/5287/1858.
Valentine, Dr William, 1801-1876, arrived in Campbell Town as medical officer in 1839. He married Mary Anne Matcham at Campbell Town in 1846. He died there in 1876. Their home, The Grange, was designed by convict architect James Blackburn and built in 1847. A community-minded man, William Valentine was active in church matters as well as championing medical services. He was also an amateur astronomer of some repute.

Vallentine, Henry, born c1821, arrived in Tasmania a free man about 1841. He married Isabella Ann Davie at Browns River in 1843. In 1848, a year or so after the death of his first wife, Henry Vallentine married Elizabeth Tucker. Vallentine owned property in Ross and Campbell Town. He built the Sherwood Castle hotel in Ross and also ran a store there. He owned shops and houses in Campbell Town including Sutton’s. His tenants included Rev John Mackersey, in retirement, and Dr William Carr Boyd.¹⁶⁶ Henry Vallentine acted as treasurer for the patriotic fund collection, a risky business for the donors for he was later gaoled for forgery.

Venn, John, born c1817, an Englishman from Somerset, was sentenced to transportation for life for killing sheep with intent to steal: *selling sheep skins and killing sheep*. He arrived in Hobart Town per *Henry Porcher* in November 1836 having departed London the previous July. Venn’s trade indicated a very useful farm hand as he could plough, reap, mow and milk and, at age 19, he could have made a new start. Not so. Venn’s first misdemeanour was relatively minor but set the tone of his servitude: in September 1837 he was charged with misconduct in the government garden for carrying away a pear. He went on to be much punished including the lash and working on the roads in irons, generally for being absent, sometimes with intent to commit burglary. Venn was awarded a ticket of leave in 1842, it was revoked in 1844, again awarded in 1846. The record is silent on any conditional pardon or free certificate. Venn was assigned to masters in Campbell Town from time to time, and is last noted as there in 1847. Given the day book notation, Venn remained at Rosedale beyond 1847. Were he still there when Eliza Williams arrived, as is quite possible, he would have been 35 years of age.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁷ John Venn per *Henry Porcher*, CON 31/1/44.
**Westlake, Thomas**, born c1822, was transported for life per *Ratcliffe* for violent assault and highway robbery: a second conviction. A native of Devon, he had the trade of labourer and groom. The convict record and the day book are at odds about his arrival at Rosedale. Leake recorded Westlake as there in November 1850 and it is likely that this was the case. If so, some of his many transgressions were while at Rosedale. He had a ticket of leave approved and revoked many times. He married Eliza Kenny in Campbell Town in January 1853. Westlake had a conditional pardon approved in June 1858. It appears he finished his sentence in Richmond.168

**Whitaker, John**, born c1817, per *Maria Somes*, was a much-convicted man during his servitude, particularly for absence and drunkenness. He arrived in August 1850 to serve out seven years for larceny *stealing a casket for a similar offence 6 months*. That Whitaker was a single literate Protestant would have been appreciated in the Leake household. He was assigned to Leake on 1 January 1853 but did not last long. Leake sent him to the magistrate on 7 February 1854 for being drunk and breaking out of a room in which he was confined in his drunken state for which he got six months’ hard labour. According to a note on his record dated 11 February 1853 Whitaker was to: ‘... undergo six months additional probation to be added to sentence; to be placed in separate treatment and employed in any billet using the whole period of the Magistrate’s sentence and order of probation; to be employed on the most severe description of labour that is performed at the station.’ He would have made a strong impression: a short sallow burn-scarred bald man without eyebrows. He did not return to Rosedale. He received a free certificate in 1855, seven years and six months after his original sentence.169

**Williams, Eliza**, c1836-1918 was sentenced to seven years’ transportation for larceny: *stealing a watch [off] Lester at Golden Square*. Williams, who hailed from Limerick, was Protestant and literate. She had been tried in London where she had been working as a servant. Her indent at disembarkation from the *Anna Maria* in Hobart Town in January 1852 lists her as having the trade of nurse and needlewoman despite her having no trade listed when she departed London.170 Her trade may have encouraged John Leake to take her on

168 Thomas Westlake per *Ratcliffe*, CON 33/1/91; Eliza Kenny per *Australasia*, CON 41/1/24; RGD 37/1/12/1853
169 John Whitaker per *Maria Somes*, CON 31/1/96.
170 Eliza Williams per *Anna Maria*, CON 41/1/32; CON 15/1/7.
assignment for his wife was very unwell. Eliza Williams’ entire period of servitude was spent at Rosedale. She was to travel to England and then America having been granted a full pardon on the recommendation of John Leake.

**Williams, Susanna** see Powell, Susanna

**Williams, Thomas**, was Eliza Williams’ father. He was a Limerick Protestant and moved with his family to America at some point before the end of 1859. Little is known of him.

**Wilson, Jane**, it is near impossible to be precise about who she was, including whether she was a convict, an emancipist or a free immigrant. Research suggests she was one of the two women named Jane Wilson transported in 1852 per *Sir Robert Seppings* and was listed on the ships indent as Jane Wilson (2). The records confuse the two women. Born c1828, Jane Wilson had been tried at Westminster, her native place, in 1851 for stealing from the person and sentenced to ten years’ transportation: *robbing a lady at Walworth*. She was a Protestant who could read and write and left a husband and four children behind her. Jane was a plain cook. Jane Wilson was awarded a conditional pardon in 1856. Her record shows no indication of Rosedale service, but she was at Ross. ¹⁷¹ It appears that she arrived at Rosedale as an emancipist in 1857. ¹⁷² She would then have been aged 29. Seemingly this woman stayed on for in a later journal, Sarah Leake names her as doing needlework. ¹⁷³

---

¹⁷¹ Jane Wilson (2) per *Sir Robert Seppings*, CON 41/1/34.
¹⁷³ Sarah Elizabeth Leake, “Journal, 1 October 1862 - 7 June 1867.”
Appendix Three: Transcriptions

It is uncommon to study an archive of private papers that includes letters of people in a subaltern relationship with the key individual. The Leake Papers are a repository for formal and informal letters from servants, estate workers, storekeepers, hoteliers and local working people. It is not clear why a particular letter, account or note was retained as the collection is but part of the paper trail of John Leake’s life in Tasmania. Personal letters from emancipists and convicts are a particularly valuable seam for they indicate enduring relationships between master and servant in the convict colonial past. The letters transcribed and presented here are from one person: Eliza Williams. If another’s had been chosen, the narratives would be different. Their stories wait telling.

Researchers have varied in the decisions regarding transcription practice. Richardson’s goal in her treatment of the journal of Mary Morton Allport was to be accurate and maintain the idiosyncrasies of the original yet she made editorial changes that, in her view, balanced the needs of the reader with that of the journal writer. Frost chose to ‘silently’ insert punctuation and paragraph breaks in transcribing Annie Baxter Dawbin’s journal in order to enhance its readability. Vickery retained original spelling, punctuation and capitalization. Urlich had to tackle the problems of lack of punctuation, abbreviations and random spelling and capitalization when transcribing Martha Ballard’s journal. She sought to retain the essence of the text whilst rendering it uncomplicated to read. Stanley, in her work with the diary kept by maid-of-all-work Hannah Cullwick, elected to introduce punctuation, spelling and other consistencies. This was not necessary with Sarah Leake’s journal. Her high literacy meant that the text was well written and, while its punctuation seems hurried, meaning was rarely unclear. Eliza Williams’ letters, too, are clear and articulate.

6 The full transcription was published. See Alice Meredith Hodgson, Miss Leake’s Journal, Hobart: Research Tasmania, 2014, pp. 28-81.
Tanselle argues that it is best to be faithful to the original text rather than smoothing out peculiarities for the ease of the reader. Thus the text should not be tidied up with editorial full stops, capitals or with modern spelling. Further, while the transcriber may become the expert in the handwriting of the author that does not mean that another will not transcribe with variations – where there is a query it should be identified and discussed. Tanselle describes key differences in materials not intended for publication by the author. Such writing, like diaries or private notebooks, is not inhibited by thoughts of public audience. The writer may be oblivious to the idiosyncrasies of their style but they are integral to the document.

Transcription brings convenience of form to a manuscript which may be difficult or impossible to access by structure, appearance or location. Transcription is compromise in that the reader is not dealing with the original form, and is seeing the original through the work of a third party. Separate editorial comment may enhance the readers’ experience of the text. In a later work on transcription and editing, Tanselle suggested the initial approach to a manuscript be historical, that is to see the text within the context of the writer’s life and circumstance and not to impose, or intervene, with corrections or judgements based on standards not in place at the time.

The response to this has been to set each item in the context of the writer’s domestic circumstance. The classification of this work, based on his approaches to scholarly editing is historical, reproducing documentary texts without alteration, in literal transcription. Any awkwardness may be reduced when considering annotations to the transcription. Tanselle’s ‘conservative’ approach, intending to conserve or protect what has been left by the author, has been adopted. Close study of the text reveals a consistent personal style and shorthand. Sarah Leake’s journal is not considered to be an inaccurate account of what she intended to write. Her motivation and intended audience are unknown but, by the very presence of the extant documents, both were clear for her. With regard to the letters of Eliza Williams, her audience is generally clearly stated and the contents form segments of what was clearly a longitudinal conversation.

10 Tanselle, “The Varieties of Scholarly Editing,” p. 11.
The transcriber’s judgement contributes to reproduction of an artefact. The transcriber needs to decipher and to identify where words have been determined through research and speculation. The journal particularly contained a small number of errors – some struck out by its author, other left unaltered either intentionally to serve some personal purpose or unintentionally due to the author’s ignorance of the ‘truth’. In transcribing there was no distinction, and the approach was to transcribe; not to edit. For this work, the process of emendation was aimed at word identification where the handwriting is indistinct. Any word suggested is conjectural emendation using the process Tanselle identifies as the ‘best text’ approach.12 This required judgement based on reading of other parts of the journal and other items in its author’s handwriting and, when it came to names, knowledge of the names of those in the narrative at that specific moment. The task was not to identify errors. If any were apparent, they have been annotated; not corrected in the transcribed text. Spelling and grammar are markers of education and are usually related to affluence and social standing. Sarah Leake was well schooled both at home and at the exclusive Ellenthorpe Hall; Eliza Williams, as a Protestant, was likely to have attended school in Limerick albeit of the lesser grade available to poor families.

Literal transcription aims to make documents accessible to a wider audience. In doing this, it is important to describe the details that cannot be reproduced; appearance, paper, ink and characteristics of the handwriting. This project attempts to achieve this. As with an earlier work,13 the transcriptions are faithful to the originals to enable the writer’s style to be apparent to the reader. Words, grammar, punctuation and structure have been retained.

13 Alice Meredith Hodgson, Prospecting the Pieman: George Campbell Meredith’s Logbook November 1876 to March 1877, Sandy Bay, TAS: AM Hodgson, 2009, p viii.
Eliza Williams’ letters

Eliza Williams to John Leake: Leake Papers, L1/C95

Dudley St April 16th

Sir

I return you many thanks for your kind note and enclosure of a free pardon for me. You have at all times taken a deal of trouble with trying to get me any indulgence you could for which I am forever indebted and will never be forgotten by me

The thought of being free once more gives me a new life although I cannot say that I was treated otherwise. I have always met with good kindly friends since I parted with my home when I landed in Melbourne I felt that I was a stranger and alone. I knew no one and every place seemed strange but the almighty has protected me and raised up friends for me. I was only one day in Melbourne when I got this situation. I am now in as House and Parlour Maid thirty five pounds per annum there are only two in family. I have got such a nice kind Master and Mrs. I do not think there equal could be found in Melbourne so that I am very fortunate in always meeting with those that are very kind to me. I think I should have been very unhappy if I was living with a harsh family after the kindness received from you all at Rosedale but I am quite comfortable for Mr and Mrs Short are just as kind to me as you and family always have been. Hoping that all the family are quite well and that you are quite recovered again thanking you for your trouble. I am, Sir, your very grateful and humble servant Eliza Williams.

Eliza Williams to Charles Leake: Leake Papers L1/M75

I wish I could write you better. I will before I am done. My husband is getting along first notwithstanding these troublesome times busy all the time. I have got very thin lately. First I had cholera got over that then a sore breast then jaundice. now what they call in this country a felon on my fore finger which is very painful & it has been lanced and the Dr tells [me] there has a bone to come out before it gets better but still I am real comfortable and happy has nothing to trouble me my husband is going to put a large brick house this fall as
he has just bought a larger corner lot for eleven hundred dollars tell Mr Wm [William] my baby is just like him fine forehead fine soft blue eyes and curly hair and so fat I wanted his likeness taken to send you and Mrs Donner long since is not a pity I cannot do it I have plenty of dollars and postage stamps but what is the use I cannot write my friends I wish I could exchange American money for British then I could write please tell Mrs Donner to write to me and when silver comes again I will write good bye write soon Eliza Hanley

Eliza Williams to Charles Leake: Leake Papers, L1/M74

To C.H. Leake Esq

I am just going to send you a paper you will be surprised I did not write a letter to any of my old friends but I could not and I was grieved that you could not know the reason now that I have got the chance I will tell you there was a law past that no foreign letters or papers should leave the country without being post paid with silver or gold the fact is we could not get either as the Brokers bought up all paying as high as 73 per cent for gold which left us nothing but postage stamps for the currency they would not take our Dollar bills in Canada else I could easily post my letters their My husband has paid for 4 stamps by 1 shilling in silver to pay for this paper we have not seen a silver coin since last Dec I have a fine little boy in his fifteenth month he is trotting round and he is getting his hand so often on this bit of paper it will be all daubed before I am done please let Mrs Donner know why I cant write I hope she is well is it not to bad to have plenty of money good where you are but no where else I trust Miss Leake is well and all the family.

Eliza Williams to Charles Leake: Leake Papers L1/M76

To C.H. Leake Esq

Sir
I wrote you two letters one dated 13th June last the other 15th December and having receive no answer up to the present time that I feel sorry I have troubled you perhaps too much however I trust that you and the family are well I do hope Mr Leake enjoys good health well I cant help feeling anxious to hear from all the family how is Mr William How is Mrs Donner I would give anything to hear from her all my kind old friends I never can forget
please tell her to try to write to me you will be glad to learn that I am very comfortable my husband is doing an extension himself we own two beautiful houses the one we live in and the other we rent for 400 dollars per annum I have got two nice little children a boy named after Mr Leake and you, John Charles the little girl after Mrs Donner Olivia Nelly the little boy was four years old the 9th of May the little girl will be two years old the 4th of September next great excitement prevailed here owing to the Fenian Movement but has all been put down by the President (old Andy) as he is commonly called the next is the cholera season for the summer this is a terrible country excitement all the time

I have told you so much in my two letters that I have nothing more to tell you only wish Mrs Donner would write to me I wrote to Launceston but had the letter returned since then I have heard nothing of her please send me a Melbourne Paper I will send you the photographs of my two children when I hear from you Eliza

Eliza Williams to William Leake: Leake Papers, L1/M78

Detroit

May 11th 1876

Dear Mr William

I have just received your letter and Photographs of Mr Chas two little girls I need to tell you how delighted I was to hear from you I was very muchgrieved to hear that you had been so very sick I cannot tell you how pleased I am to see that you have so far recovered as to be able to write me such a nice kind sensible letter Thank you for all the news you wrote me and for your kind remembrance of me I am real glad to get those two dear little pictures what beautiful children they are so healthy and nice quite different to my Yankee children who are always so pale and thin I am so pleased to think I have got all your faces to look at once in while many very many thanks for remembering me I have sent you lots of newspapers when I see something that I think will interest will send it such as the [Bellinger] scandal and all those fellows at Washington I don’t think Grant will care much about a third term since all his […] were found out they will have great excitement here this year between the Centennial and Presidential Election Why don’t you come to the
Centennial you are awful lazy it would be amuse you to see the Yankees at Home They are so fast they don’t spare time to eat their meals you will see them leave the house with slice of pie or cake eating along the streets as they go to their place of business please tell Mrs Johns that there is a lady living across the way from my house that looks exactly like Mrs Jobson do you remember her well I have to laugh every time I see her when I remember the jokes I played on her one time I made something smell very savoury at the door and after a little while she ran into the kitchen to see what was cooking for dinner that smelled so nice she told me she never smelled anything in her life like it and of course I never told her the joke you know she was always wanting something good to eat and that was good for her

My oldest boy has been taking lessons in printing and his father has brought a small printing press when he comes from school he prints his Fathers business cards and bill heads he has printed me some calling cards to send to each one of you I remember all your initials but forget if Mr Arthur has a middle name I must send you the picture of the Centennial as soon as out yesterday was opening day now you said in your letter that I could not write as good as I did before you must remember that there was no Bodies under the Table or behind my chair climbing up my back as there is now now you need not laugh I have plenty to do with all those little people but I love children and don’t care what I do to make them happy Now Mr William you poor old dear write to me sometimes with your news and let me know when you get back to Rosedale I shall be so glad hoping all the Ladies and Gents at Rosedale well and that you are improving fast yourself I remain yours respectfully

Eliza
Detroit

March 7th 1878

Dear Mr Leake

I received your kind note and photographs of the three little misses. I was very much pleased to hear from you. The little girls are very pretty. The second little girl is a blonde. Is she not? I would have sent you some paper before now but we got scared of the smallpox and instead of going to Mackinaw last summer we went down south to Florida and remained all winter. But now that I am home again I will not forget you. Florida is a beautiful climate, something like Tasmania. What pleased the most was the beautiful orange groves. They are lovely to look at.

I should very much like to live there. I have had some photographs taken this week and will send you of myself and husband. You will see that I am changed considerably but twenty years is a long time. I have not got a grey hair in my head. My husband is quite grey but no so very old. He will be forty seven next May. My three little girls can all play on the piano and speak French very nicely. My oldest boy goes to College and is studying Greek and Latin. I wish for you to see what a nice large house I live in. Do you ever hear from Mrs Donner? I could but hear from that dear little woman I would be happy. I hope Miss Leake is well and Mr and Mrs Charles and Mr Arthur. I had almost forgotten the Doctor. I hope Sir you will not find fault with my writing. My hand is entirely out of practice. I never write only when I send you a paper. All my people are dead. I have no person to write to me and do you know sometimes I feel very sad and lonely. I will send you a paper this week. Many and sincere thanks for remembering me. Good bye.

Eliza
Detroit

August 11th 1886

C.H Leake Esq

Dear Sir

I received your letter and was very glad to hear from you, but was sorry that you were in poor health. Trust by this time that you have fully regained your strength. I should be very sorry indeed to have anything the matter with you. I must now tell you about my family. My eldest son together with two gentlemen of the name of Williams (no relations whatever, singular coincidence is it not) are doing a very fine business on one of our principal avenues.

Nellie the oldest girl graduated last June from the Academy of the Sacred Heart [Grosse Pointe]. Minnie will graduate next June from the same place. Kate is in the first class and will graduate the year after. All three are being educated in a convent. They only come home at Christmas for two weeks vacation and then not until the latter part of June when they have vacation until 1st September. The school is beautifully situated on lake St Claire it is eleven miles from the City and is only a pleasant drive out. We can see the girls any time we wish. They are good musicians and speak French fluently. I will send you Minnie's card it will show you what she received prizes for the last day of school. Their father can play the violin and John plays the flute. All can play the piano. Very often we have a concert of our own. Now I must come to Georgie, as we call him. He is a bright boy of fourteen. Goes to college and studies bookkeeping. Thinks he is quite a man and will study law. He thinks and wants to be a great man. He also rides a fifty inch bicycle. You would scarcely credit it but he rode from Niagara Falls a distance of 250 miles of course not in one day. He rode seventy-five miles one day. His brother was with him. He rides 56 inches in the photo of house it is Nellie and George and his two dogs in the front. The former is quite tall five feet 7 inches. I will send you her photo as she graduated and the other two girls and Georgie. He just got his first standing collar and feels big. The others I will send you some other time.
Thanking ever so much for the paper I have sent you some with a full account of Presidents marriage just fancy it is 28 years ago this month since I saw you what a long time ago it seems was Mr Arthur in Detroit I wish I had seen him I hope all the family are well Goodbye Eliza

Eliza Williams to Mrs Charles Leake: Leake Papers, L1/N66

Mr. & Mrs. James J. Keenan
invite you to be present
at the marriage reception of their daughter
Lily
and
Mr. John Hanley,
Wednesday evening, January thirty first,
Eighteen hundred and ninety four,
at eight o’clock.
41 Pitcher Street,
Detroit, Michigan.
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