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**Methods**

During excavation of the underfloor deposits on Level 2 and Level 3 of Hyde Park Barracks, individual items were removed by hand before the matrix was vacuumed out of each space and sieved, sorted and recorded (Burritt 1981: 29–30). Vacuuming did not occur in the hallways which appeared to have been disturbed so there is less material available from these areas and a bias towards larger, hand-recovered items (Mider 1996: 5). The smallest sieve used for the underfloor deposits was 2mm (Mider 1996: 5) and floatation does not appear to have taken place, so the macrobotanical collection is biased towards large fruit stones and nutshells which would have been visible to those sieving the material. The absence of species with smaller seeds such as figs and berries probably reflects the context of recovery and the techniques used rather than patterns of consumption.

Following initial sorting and some field identifications, botanists from the University of Sydney were engaged to identify some of the macrobotanical remains from Hyde Park Barracks and the neighbouring site of the Royal Mint. They produced a two-page report, identifying the following: nuts (hazelnut, peanut, walnut, macadamia, almond, Brazil nut and coconut); grains (wheat, barley and oats); fruit skin (orange, banana and passionfruit); fruit stones (peach, cherry, apricot, plum, date and woody pear); fruit seeds (orange, grape and loquat); vegetable seeds (pumpkin; bean with pod); other vegetable remains (onion skin and corn cob); plant remains (*Leptospermum flavescens* capsules and sprigs, Macrozamia sp. fronds, *Selaginella uliginosa* sprigs, Melaleuca spp. sprigs, Santalum sp. sprigs, *Livistona australis* fronds, Platysace sp. sprigs, Pteridium sp. fronds, bay leaves (Auld *et al.* 1981). However, the report does not distinguish between the two sites or provide any quantification of the remains. The preliminary nature of the analysis and the multiple iterations of the database system meant that at the time of this project, much of the material remained un-described or incorrectly identified.

My goal, therefore, was to assess the macrobotanical material as part of the larger study of food and dining-related material. As a result, the primary focus was the identification of edible species, although some landscape species are included. While preserved in small quantities, wood and charcoal were not included as they were considered of minimal relevance to dietary practice. There is extensive evidence of hat-making at the site, so palm fronds (primarily *Livistona australis)* have also been excluded from this study, as has straw which was used as stuffing for bedding.

I performed searches of the existing catalogue using terms such as ‘seed’, ‘pit’, ‘nut’, ‘unidentified seed’ and ‘organic’ to locate relevant artefacts. Since storage boxes are broadly organized by material, looking for one item in a box often revealed additional material which had been catalogued differently. I also visually inspected all the object bags in boxes labelled ‘mixed media’ or ‘organic non-food’ to identify plant remains.

Once identified as plant material, items were hand-sorted without magnification for identification, weighing and recording in a Microsoft Access database. Identifications were made with reference to manuals and databases (e.g. Sweedman & Merritt 2006; Bonner & Karrfalt 2008; Woldring 2011; Neef *et al.* 2012; South Australian Seed Conservation Centre 2018), modern comparative material specimens, and in consultation with colleagues, especially Professor Andrew Fairbairn (University of Queensland) and Merit Hondelink (University of Groningen). Where identification to species level was not possible, items were identified to genus or family. Tentative identifications are indicated by ‘cf.’ (compare) at the genus or species level. No attempt was made to differentiate between apple (*Malus domestica)* and pear (*Pyrus domestica).*
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