K

Kimberley Rock Art

Sam Harper, Peter Veth and Sven Ouzman
Centre for Rock Art Research + Management,
University of Western Australia, Perth,
WA, Australia

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the current state of rock art research in the Kimberley, Western Australia, which is a globally significant corpus of tens of thousands of rock art, archaeological, ethnographic, and contemporary sites. We present a history of rock art research in the region, discuss linguistic and cultural diversity, across the Kimberley, and outline the development of rock art stylistic sequences and spatial analysis. A new generation of scientific dating of the art and associated excavations is also harmonized. Aboriginal ontologies and recorded ethnography associated with the rock art are highlighted. We also present land tenure land management under native title and affiliated ranger groups as heritage management challenges and opportunities.

Definition

The Kimberley is a biogeographical and cultural landscape covering 423,517 km² of northwest Australia. The landscape is marked by massive

waterways and river systems, which once continued onto the now-submerged Sahul Shelf, meaning the Kimberley was almost twice its current size during the Last Glacial Maximum 26–19 thousand years ago. This large geographical area has been continuously occupied by people for over 50,000 years by multiple cultural and linguistic groups (Wood et al. 2016; Veth et al. 2019). The Kimberley is part of the non-Pama-Nyungan language bloc. These ancient and distinctive languages cover the Kimberley, Arnhem Land, a small area of the Gulf of Carpentaria and Cape York, and Tasmania (McConvell 1996). There are four major language groups across the Kimberley with between two and nine dialects (AIATSIS 2019):

1. Worrorran: Worara, Wunambal, Gamberre, Miwa, Kwini, Ngarinyin, and Worla
2. Jarragan: Yijji, Kija, Kadjerrong, and Miriwoong
3. Bunaban: Bunaba, and Gooniyandi
4. Nyul Nyulan: Bardi, Yawaru, Jabirr, Nimanburu, Warwa, Nyikina, Ungumi, Umida, and Unggarangi

All Kimberley rock art was made by people ancestral to these groups. Kimberley rock art and iconography are well-known, particularly Gwion Gwion (formerly “Bradshaw”) and Wanjina (also “Wandjina”) “styles” or “traditions” that were produced and maintained by Aboriginal people. It is thus both creation and subsequent

Kimberley Rock Art, Fig. 1 Namarali Wandjina: 1930 repainting (left: Love (1930), in Layton (1992)) and 2000 Olympic Games use (right: BBC Mundo, bbc.co.uk); with inset map showing the Kimberley's location

maintenance that are key to understanding this rock art. For example, Layton's (1992) synthesis opens with Love's image of the Wandjina Namarali (1930), which was repainted between January and March 1929 by Indamoia and Wallamurra and was later reproduced for use by Donny Woolagoodja in the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games Opening Ceremony (Fig. 1).

Throughout this entry, we use Wanjina and Gwion Gwion rock art traditions as leitmotifs that help us better understand the Kimberley's many other forms of rock art.

Historical Background

The Kimberley was never an isolated human landscape, with considerable trade, movement, and contact with the outside world for at least the last few hundred years. Prior to European invasion/colonization, Macassans from Island South East Asia visited the region to harvest *bêche-de mer* (trepang or sea cucumber) along the Kimberley coast for "at least two hundred years" (1803

encounter recorded: Crawford 2001:70, 3) and likely much longer. Crawford (2001) recorded 16 Macassan sites along the Kimberley coast and excavated a selection of these in the 1960s with Aboriginal Traditional Owners. New Macassan sites have just been identified and excavated in 2019 on Sir Graham Moore Island, north of Kalumburu (Paterson, personal communication)

European incursions that document rock art include George Grey in 1837–1838, Alexander Forrest in 1879, and Joseph Bradshaw in 1891. These travelers' inability to reconcile "complex" rock art with people they thought of as "primitive" generated an enduring and mendacious myth of non-Aboriginal authorship of the rock art. For example, Grey writes: "It is certain that they may have been very ancient, ... but, whatever may have been the age of these paintings, it is scarcely probable that they could have been executed by a self-taught savage. Their origin therefore I think must still be open to conjecture" (1841: 263). Later, Bradshaw continues this trope by stating "Indeed, looking at some of the groups [of Gwion paintings], one might almost

think himself viewing the painted walls of an ancient Egyptian temple” (1892: 100). This pathology of British colonialism is entirely without factual basis and has been successfully challenged by both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal scholars (e.g., Mangolomara et al. 2019; McNiven 2011).

This “dissociative archaeology” (McNiven 2011) occurred in tandem with dispossession of land for pastoralism from the 1880s as a result of Forrest’s expedition. Aboriginal resistance and remoteness combined to make pastoralism largely unviable until the mid-twentieth century (Crawford 2001). Christian missions across the Kimberley, at Kunmunya, Munja, and Wotjalum in the West, and Kalumburu and Pago in the East (Crawford 2001) brought further disruption. However, Europeans also recorded valuable ethnography, including the creation and repainting of rock art from at least 1929 until today (cf. Layton 1992; Love 1930).

Key Issues and Current Debates

We identify four key issues in Kimberley rock art:

1. Time – Relative sequencing and association, as well as direct dating of rock art traditions
2. Space – Spatial distribution of rock art traditions and their relationship to current linguistic and cultural territories
3. Meaning – using both Aboriginal ontologies and archaeological/anthropological research
4. Heritage – management of rock art and related heritage now and into the future

Time: Relative Sequencing and Association

While Aboriginal people know rock art to be produced at both many and all times, “western” science prefers discrete dates and ranges. It has been proposed that Kimberley rock art dates to the Pleistocene, even as far back as initial colonization ~50,000 years ago (Veth et al. 2019). But in the absence of direct dating of rock art for most of the twentieth century, researchers relied on superimpositioning, the construction of “stylistic sequences” and associating painted motifs with

those found in excavations or known ethnographically. We explore these before presenting current and new direct dating evidence.

Two key stylistic chronologies were published almost simultaneously by David Welch (1993) and Grahame Walsh (1994). Welch classified and sequenced by technique, namely, cupules, engravings (petroglyphs), and paintings (pictographs), and by iconographic detail, such as, anthropomorphic body position (i.e., bent knee or straight parts) and attributes (e.g., tassels, material culture), without applying consistent variables between his five “periods” (Archaic, Tasseled, Bent Knee, Straight Parts, Wandjina, Contact: Fig. 2). Walsh’s (1994) chronology included three Epochs (Archaic, Erudite, and Aborigine), each with two Periods, namely, “Pecked Cupule”; “Irregular Infill Animal Period”; “Bradshaw (Agnes Schulz of the 1938–1939 Frobenius Expedition first labeled Gwion Gwion as ‘Bradshaws’ in reference to Joseph Bradshaw publication on the same (1956: 45))”; “Clothes Peg”; “Clawed Hand”; and “Wanjina,” some of which has further group subdivisions, each with subdivisions (Fig. 3).

Walsh’s (1994) tripartite temporal led him to hypothesize discontinuity between Epochs, which at that point matched apparent site abandonments recorded archaeologically (e.g., O’Connor et al. 1999) – but which recent micromorphological research has challenged, suggesting continuous human occupation of the Kimberley (Travers and Ross 2016) albeit with fluctuating intensity. He linked the two most recent Periods – Clawed Hand and Wanjina – with living Aboriginal culture, but separate from the earlier “Erudite” styles.

In 1999, Walsh and Mike Morwood co-published the known occupation sequences from stratified rock-shelter excavations across the Kimberley – covering the last 42,000 years. This data was combined with observed changes in the art sequence, particularly the superimposition of spears, spear-throwers, and other armatures. For example, early “Tassel Bradshaw” (Gwion Gwion) has short spears depicted with an acute barb at one end, and multiple barbs at the other, with no spear-throwers depicted. In the later “Clothes Peg” (Static Polychrome) tradition, new types of spears are depicted, and spear-

AU3

AU4

AU10 Kimberley Rock Art, Fig. 2 Welch (1993) stylistic sequence

195 throwers are present. This builds on Lewis's
196 (1988) key research across Arnhem Land and the
197 Kimberley on style and material culture,
198 confirming that there are patterned changes in
199 technology across identified styles. At about the
200 same time, excavation-centric research in the
201 southern Kimberley produced the oldest known
202 age for pigment applied to rock in the form of a
203 hematite-covered limestone slab excavated at
204 Carpenters Gap. This slab was found in layers
205 dating to 42,700 BP (O'Connor and Fankhauser
206 2001).

207 **Time: Scientific Dating**

208 Fortunately, while direct dates are technically
209 challenging due to paucity of dateable material
210 within most pigments, (with the exception of char-
211 coal used in, e.g., Wanjina eyes, as well as rare
212 beeswax art (Morwood et al. 2010)), technology
213 has advanced. Over two dozen published, direct
214 dates are now available with dozens more soon to
215 be published (Table 1). At least seven different
216 techniques have been used to date material above

or below painted motifs to determine maximum 217
and minimum ages. These include conventional 218
and AMS radiocarbon as well as OSL dating of 219
mud-dauber wasp nests and AMS radiocarbon 220
dating of beeswax. Uranium-thorium dating of 221
mineral crusts and geomicrobiology are also 222
being trialed, while cosmogenic dating of rock 223
slabs is looking more broadly at when rock- 224
shelters formed. 225

Table 1 provides a summary of dated Kimber- 226
ley rock art from published sources. Wanjina and 227
Gwion Gwion traditions have, once again, 228
enjoyed particular attention with the former 229
dated to between 5100 ± 240 BP and the present 230
and the latter controversially dated to older than 231
17,500 ± 1800 (Roberts et al. 1997; Table 1; see 232
Aubert 2012). Ross et al.'s (2016) multi-year 233
research in the Northwest Kimberley used multi- 234
ple dating techniques, with successful OSL and 235
AMS radiocarbon on fossilized mud wasp nests, 236
returning dates from the terminal Pleistocene into 237
the Holocene. This program questioned the 238
sequential, as opposed to overlapping, nature of 239

Kimberley Rock Art, Fig. 3 Walsh (1994) stylistic sequence

Kimberley Rock Art, Table 1 Published Kimberley rock art dates

Style	Date (CalBP)	Method	Sample	Material	Description	Reference
Gwion Gwion	17,500 ± 1800	OSL	KERC5	Quartz grain	Adjacent to Gwion motif (KERC4)	Roberts et al. (1997)
Gwion Gwion	16,400 ± 1800	OSL	KERC4	Quartz grain	Directly over Gwion motif	Roberts et al. (1997)
Wanjina	5100 ± 240	OSL	LM-13	Quartz grain	Macropod	Ross et al. (2016)
Gwion Gwion	3880 ± 110	AMS	CB3	Mineral crust	“Cane Bradshaw”	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	3780 ± 60	AMS	OZC434	Beeswax	12 × 10 cm Wanjina head	Watchman et al. (1997)
Gwion Gwion (Mambi)	3280 ± 190	OSL	UP1A	Quartz grain	Cage shape over Gwion Gwion	Ross et al. (2016)
IIAP	3140 ± 350	AMS	CB3	Mineral crust	Zoomorph	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	1630 ± 110	OSL	CA-7	Quartz grain	Argula	Ross et al. (2016)
Unknown	1600 ± 100	OSL	CA-8	Quartz grain	Yam-like shape	Ross et al. (2016)
Gwion	1490 ± 50; 1490 ± 290; 1430 ± 180	Radiocarbon	KF1	Mineral crust	Tassel; minimum; minimum; maximum dates	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	1440 ± 120	Radiocarbon	OZC107	Beeswax	Stick figure below repainted Wanjina head	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	1420 ± 240	OSL	BRY-6	Quartz grain	Fish	Ross et al. (2016)
Warrarrajai (Static Polychrome) Gwion	1290 ± 30	AMS	LROIC-3	Charcoal	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Warrarrajai (Static Polychrome) Gwion	1285 ± 30	AMS	LROIC-2	Charcoal	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	1240 ± 80	Radiocarbon	OZC118	Shell	Ochre stained baler shell from Wanjina site	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina Period Argula	1230 ± 35	AMS	LR03S-01	Charcoal	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	1210 ± 140	Radiocarbon	OZD081	Charcoal	Eye of large Wanjina	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	1200 ± 90	Radiocarbon	OZC115	Charcoal	Tail of Wanjina-style flying fox under Wanjina head	Watchman et al. (1997)

(continued)

Kimberley Rock Art, Table 1 (continued)

Style	Date (CalBP)	Method	Sample	Material	Description	Reference
Wanjina	1170 ± 60	Radiocarbon	OZC111	Beeswax	Argula under a “sea” Wanjina and rock cod	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	1160 ± 40	Radiocarbon	OZD076	Beeswax	Anthropomorph under Wanjina and macropod	Watchman et al. (1997)
Warrarrajai (Static Polychrome) Gwion	930 ± 50	OSL	JS-10	Quartz grain	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	700 ± 40	OSL	BRY-3	Quartz grain	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Unknown	650 ± 120	OSL	JS-11	Quartz grain	Star-yam	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	630 ± 125	Radiocarbon	OZC113	Beeswax	Anthropomorph under small Wanjina	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	610 ± 40	Radiocarbon	OZD075	Beeswax	90 x 138 line under Wanjina	Watchman et al. (1997)
Transitional	530 ± 80	OSL	CA-9	Quartz grain	Between Mambi (Gwion Gwion) and Warrarrajai (Static Polychrome)	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	338 ± 15	AMS	Wk-47,814	Charcoal	Top layer of charcoal Wanjina eye	David et al. 2019
Wanjina	300 ± 85	Radiocarbon	OZC549	Charcoal	Lowermost of 38 paint layers on Wungurr (Wanjina snake)	Watchman et al. (1997)
Wanjina	155 ± 30	AMS	BRY-3	Charcoal	Anthropomorph	Ross et al. (2016)
Wanjina	150 ± 10	OSL	DR2	Quartz grain	Red pigmented Wanjina (same figure for DR1 and DR6)	Roberts et al. (1997)
Wanjina	100 ± 10	OSL	DR1	Quartz grain	Red pigmented Wanjina (same figure for DR2 and DR6)	Roberts et al. (1997)
Wanjina	Modern	Radiocarbon	OZB020	Charcoal	Wanjina eye	Watchman et al. (1997)

styles in Kimberley rock art and highlighted the need for a larger dating program.

Current research is working to refine dates across all traditions, with upcoming publications for Gwion art, to understand the relationship of Gwion Gwion to the inferred older Irregular Infill Animal tradition. Recent presentations of primary data on AMS dates from bracketing mud wasp nests (Finch et al. 2018) suggest that at least some of the complex Gwion Gwion style art is of

terminal Pleistocene age (c. 14–12 ka). Understanding temporal contexts helps us to make spatial sense of Kimberley rock art traditions.

Space: Distribution of Rock Art Traditions and People

When these different rock art traditions are mapped onto the extant Kimberley landscape today, interesting trends emerge. Figure 4 shows the spatial distributions of three key traditions:

Gwion Gwion, Static Polychrome (Clothes Peg figure), and Wanjina. While there is significant overlap of all three traditions, Gwion Gwion motifs have the most restricted distribution – albeit with an eastern outlier in the Keep River region of the Northern Territory, where Static Polychrome figures are more dominant. Wanjinas have the most southern distribution and may connect to desert areas.

Veth et al. (2018) revised the temporal and spatial sequence, matching the six macro-styles (Pecked Cupule; Irregular Infill Animal, Gwion Gwion, Static Polychrome [Clothes Peg], Painted Hand, and Wanjina) with archaeological and environmental evidence across a 50,000 year chronology (Fig. 5). This work used 3750 rock art sites across the Kimberley – with the greatest concentration in the central and southwestern Kimberley as recorded by Walsh, and built upon by current research projects and housed in the Takarakka and *Kimberley Visions* project databases. This work also tracked the prevalence of plant motifs, often identifiable to species, across traditions (Veth et al. 2018). Plant motifs include grasses, trees, tubers, human-plant conflation, and plant-based material culture such as digging sticks, dilly bags, hafted axes, spears, spear-throwers, and boomerangs. Plants are also represented directly via direct grass “prints.” This work establishes the likelihood that the Kimberley houses some of the oldest depictions of plants in the world, with examples from both IIAP and Gwion traditions, which are thought to be Pleistocene in age, and continuing also into the most recent art traditions. This work moves us away from static understanding of past Aboriginal people as “hunter-gatherers” or “foragers” and explores human manipulation of plant resources over millennia in a complex people-plant relationship described as “eco-scaping” (Ouzman et al. 2017).

Interestingly, at both the center and on the edges of the Kimberley, a number of traditions have been identified that do not fit within existing style sequences. In addition, the southeastern Forrest River art styles (Kaberry 1936) share similarities to Keep River region and other desert fringe art styles. Indeed, the linkages of rock art traditions with other areas may occasion us to rethink

and redefine what we mean by the “Kimberley” – especially when realizing a great deal of what would have been human-occupied land is now underwater.

Here “contact” rock art provides instructive examples. While not as prolific as in Arnhem Land (May et al. 2010) or the Pilbara (Paterson and Wilson 2009), it includes “new” imagery such as boats (European and Macassan), cars, camels, horses, and European clothes (O’Connor and Arrow 2008; O’Connor et al. 2013; Ross and Travers 2013). There are also new production techniques for “old” imagery, such as scratching and use of charcoal to produce anthropomorphs with elaborate headdresses (O’Connor et al. 2013). Interpretation of contact art has focused on identification and antiquity of boats (Akerman 2015; Ross and Travers 2013) and the creation of art as an act of resistance during the contact period, mostly since the 1820s (O’Connor et al. 2013). However, not all boat imagery was created during the contact period (Akerman 2015; Ross and Travers 2013; Walsh 1994), as there are a series of canoes painted in Gwion Gwion scenes, suggesting great antiquity. This broad temporal and spatial sweep allows us to better understand possible meanings for these rock art traditions.

Meaning: Aboriginal Ontologies and Archaeological Research

This expanded understanding of the Kimberley, and utilization of multiple data sets – rock art, archaeology, ethnography, and paleoenvironment – productively disproves and displaces early interpretations of Kimberley rock art by outsiders as simplistic or even non-Aboriginal in origin. Indeed, a key development in Kimberley rock art research in the later twentieth century is the increasing coexistence of Aboriginal ontologies alongside archaeological research (Porr and Bell 2012).

For example, the Kimberley is in an instructive position with regard to the Wanjina – a broad cultural practice embodied in a rock art that is at least 5000 years old and which continues today (Akerman 2016). The late David Mowaljarlai characterized Wanjina thus:

Kimberley Rock Art, Fig. 4 Key Kimberley rock art traditions' distributions. (Modified from Walsh 1994)

To us they are IMAGES. IMAGES with ENER-
GIES that keep us ALIVE. Those IMAGES were
put down for us by our Creator, Wandin. So that
would make us learn the story, to put new life into
those IMAGES (1988: 690; see also Elkin 1930;
Shulz 1956).

Wanjina cosmology is exceptionally rich: it
weaves art, ochre, rain, and regeneration into a
complex and integrated worldview. Wanjina
country is traditionally within the Worora,
Wunambal, and Ngarinyin language group,
divided into patrilineal clan estates which were
each responsible for Wanjina sites and their main-
tenance (Akerman 2016). Wanjinas are known as
individuals named and associated with specific
sites, events, and heroic actions. Wanjina is
closely linked with Ungud, the serpent, but their
relationship varies from the west to the east Kim-
berley. Recent excavation of Borologa rock-
shelter on the Drysdale River in the northeastern

Kimberley has revealed three Wanjina painting
episodes over the last 2000 years, as evidenced
through recovered ochre fragments and paint
drops recorded in situ during meticulous excava-
tion (David et al. 2019). This research highlights
that stylistic and spatial variation through time is
yet fully to be understood.

Such successive painting episodes intensify
into the practice of retouching Wanjina images,
which was recorded by Love, Elkin, and
Crawford. Godden noted that on seeing a faded
Wanjina at the site Wumbadengari, the senior
Aboriginal men Mowaljarlai and Jagamurro
would return to paint the site, once "*they had
received proper permission from the old men
and women*" (1982: 24). More controversially,
David Mowaljarlai was involved in a
government-funded repainting program in 1986
(Layton 1992; Mowaljarlai et al. 1988;
Mowaljarlai and Peck 1987; Utemorrhah and

Kimberley Rock Art, Fig. 5 Revised stylistic chronology and plant motif distribution (Veth et al. 2018)

Vinnicombe 1992). Debate arose around this particular repainting program, an official complaint submitted by a non-Aboriginal pastoralist and labeled “defacement” by the Australian media (Bowdler 1988). These criticisms perpetuated a static view of Aboriginal culture, promoted rock art as a pristine relic, and removed agency of Aboriginal people and ownership of their living culture.

In the east Kimberley around Forrest River, a different kind of repainting was recorded by Kaberry (1938), with repainting on crocodile motifs recorded as an increase ritual for that animal. Additionally, Kaberry records women artists on this side of the Kimberley but highlights potential rich work in researching gendered aspects of rock art.

It is important also to understand “rock art” as not being restricted to a rock-shelter but transferring across media. For example, Wanjina is also associated with standing stones, which are understood to be transmogrified Wanjina called *djilgaiya* by the late Sam Woolagoodja (Layton 1992). Such transmogrification relates closely to Wanjina as living entities with close parallels to human life and form. Here, Adolphus Elkin’s early but oft-overlooked research in the 1930s identified features in Wanjina art such as the headbands, hair, hair belts, and associated features such as lightning or cockatoo feathers (Fig. 6).

Material Culture and Dance

This focus on the human body and close relationship between rock art, the people and agents who made it, and performativity is continued further back in time with Gwion Gwion paintings. David Welch’s intriguing observation that Gwion Gwion material culture and accouterments – despite their likely Pleistocene age – are strikingly similar visually to ethnographically recorded Kimberley material culture (2015: 219) merits further examination, for example, ethnographic photographs of Kimberley men dancing with *ngadari* head-dresses and carrying spear-throwers and bunches of leaves and feathers remarkably similar to those shown in the rock art (Fig. 7). But rather than relying on direct ethnographic analogy as an analytical approach to explain the connection

between these headdresses, accouterments, and the rock art, this deep time rock art repetition of motifs sees longer-term persistent behaviors of social reproduction. These persistent themes through varying traditions likely reflect long-term connections to country, cohesive group identities, and the cultural transmission of clan and linguistic affiliations. These social relations were dynamic as sea levels rose, climate fluctuated, and environmental landscapes shifted (Veth et al. [in press](#)).

Heritage: Managing Heritage and Change

We have used both ancient and modern Kimberley rock art to illustrate the rock art’s enormous temporal, spatial, and ontological scope. But simply understanding this art is not enough – it has to be actively managed and made known to the world. Following successful native title determinations since 1992, the Kimberley is today dominantly Aboriginal owned with over 84% of it and managed through large Indigenous Protected Areas (IPAs), Aboriginal Corporations, and affiliated Aboriginal ranger programs (Fig. 8). There are 70 full-time rangers in 13 ranger groups (Balangarra, Bardi Jawi and Bardi Jawi Oorany, Dambimangari, Gooniyandi, Kara Jarri, Kija, Ngurrara, Yimardoo Warra [Nyikina Mangala], Nyul, Paruku, Uunguu, and Wunggurr rangers. There are also non-Aboriginal pastoral and tourism leases and government land. While the history of dispossession, relocation of people, the missions, and the current variety of tenures have all had an impact on Aboriginal access to traditional lands and cultural sites, there is an active program of reconnection to country in which rock art plays a key but as yet not fully realized role.

International Perspectives

The Kimberley presents one of the world’s largest multi-style rock art bodies that stretches back at least 40,000 years and which remains connected to modern Aboriginal people today. This rock art coexists with rich archaeological, ethnographic, and paleoenvironmental data that has only been scientifically explored over the last few decades,

Kimberley Rock Art,
Fig. 6 Wanjina at
Beleguldo (Modum) (Elkin
1930)

Kimberley Rock Art,
Fig. 7 Kimberley men
dancing with *ngadari*
headdresses (Welch 2016,
top) compared to Gwion
images with
headdresses from the King
George River, East
Kimberley (Balangarra
Aboriginal Corporation,
bottom)

483 promising new and ongoing research findings that
484 will inform us of rock art's role in managing social
485 and environmental change.

486 **Future Directions**

487 Future directions for Kimberley rock art research
488 include the continued direct dating of rock art
489 across traditions and regions. More work needs

to be done contextualizing rock art and other 490
symbolic markings and structures with subsurface 491
archaeology. Especially exciting are nascent indi- 492
cations of how people and rock art connected 493
across northern Australia and into Southeast 494
Asia, which we now describe. 495

Rock art was most likely a key element in the 496
colonizing repertoire of the First Australians, pro- 497
viding us with detail on the type and timing of 498
their move into what was then the Sahul landmass. 499

Moving to northern Australia per se, Darrell Lewis (1988) first suggested that the now submerged Bonaparte catchment culturally connected the Kimberley and Arnhem Land. He recognized that at the height of the Last Glacial Maximum (~19,000 years ago), the Pleistocene coastline would have been hundreds of kilometers north of its current iteration. Additionally, Gwion Gwion and Elegant Action figure traditions of the Kimberley show marked stylistic and material culture correspondences with Arnhem Land's dynamic tradition rock art, which is also thought to be Pleistocene (May et al. 2018). These similarities suggest an older, more unified cultural

bloc that used rock art to signal a common identity, which then evolved over time into more specific place-based adaptations and signalings.

Conclusion

Kimberley rock art is best understood using multiple analytical lenses to account for the enormous variation in time, space, and cultural range. Kimberley rock art research provides an ideal model for twenty-first century science in that it is empirically rigorous, enmeshed in paleoclimatic and paleoenvironmental frameworks, and socially responsive, working with Aboriginal custodians and two-way learning. Research directions are negotiated within this milieu, along with multiple ontologies, needs, ethics, and aspirations.

References

- Akerman, Kim. 2015. A review of the Indigenous watercraft of the Kimberley region, Western Australia. *The Great Circle* 37 (1): 82–111.
- Akerman, Kim. 2016. *Wanjina: Notes on some iconic ancestral beings of the Northern Kimberley*. Carlisle: Hesperian Press.
- Aubert, Maxime. 2012. A review of rock art dating in the Kimberley, Western Australia. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39 (3): 573–577.
- Aubert, Maxime, Adam Brumm, Muhammad Ramli, Thomas Sutikna, E. Wahyu Saptomo, Budianto Hakim, Michael J. Morwood, Gerrit D. van den Bergh, Leslie Kinsley, and Anthony Dosseto. 2014. Pleistocene cave art from Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Nature* 514 (7521): 223.
- Aubert, M., P. Setiawan, A.A. Oktaviana, A. Brumm, P.H. Sulistyarto, E.W. Saptomo, B. Istiawan, T.A. Ma'rifat, V.N. Wahyuono, F.T. Atmoko, and J.X. Zhao. 2018. Palaeolithic cave art in Borneo. *Nature* 564 (7735): 254.
- Bowdler, Sandra. 1988. Repainting Australian rock art. *Antiquity* 62: 517–523.
- Bradshaw, J. 1892. Notes on a recent trip to St. Regent's River. *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australia (Victoria Branch)* 9 (2): 90–103.
- Crawford, Ian. 2001. *We won the victory: Aborigines and outsiders on the north-west coast of the Kimberley*. Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Center Press.
- David, B., et al. 2019. Dating painting events through by-products of ochre processing: Boroloma 1 Rockshelter, Kimberley, Australia. *Australian Archaeology* 85 (1): 57–94.
- Grey, George. 1841. *Journals of two expeditions of discovery in North-west and Western Australia, during the years 1837, 38 and 39*. Adelaide: Libraries Board of South Australia.
- Kaberry, Phyllis. 1936. Spirit-children and spirit-centres of the North Kimberley division, West Australia. *Oceania* 6: 392–400.
- Layton, Robert. 1992. *Australian rock art: A new synthesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Darrell. 1988. *The rock paintings of Arnhem Land, Australia: Social ecological and material culture change in the post-glacial period*. Oxford: B.A.R.
- Love, J.R.B. 1930. Rock paintings of the Worrora and their mythological interpretation. *Journal of the Royal Society of Western Australia* 16: 1–24.
- Mangolomara, S., L. Karadada, J. Oobagooma, D. Woolagoodja, J. Karadada, and K. Doohan. 2019. *Nyara pari kala niragu: Gadawara ngvaran-gada: Inganinja gubadjoongana: We are coming to see you*. Fremantle: Fremantle Press.
- May, S.K., P. Taçon, D. Wesley, and M. Travers. 2010. Painting history: Indigenous observations and depictions of the 'other' in northwestern Arnhem Land, Australia. *Australian Archaeology* 71 (1): 57–65.
- May, S.K., I.G. Johnston, P.S.C. Taçon, I.D. Sanz, and J. Goldhahn. 2018. Early Australian anthropomorphs: Jabiluka's Dynamic Figure rock paintings. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 28 (1): 67–83.
- McConvell, Patrick. 1996. Backtracking to Babel: the chronology of Pama-Nyungan expansion in Australia. *Archaeology in Oceania* 31 (3): 125–144.
- McNiven, Ian J. 2011. The Bradshaw debate: lessons learned from critiquing colonialist interpretations of Gwion rock paintings of the Kimberley, Western Australia. *Australian Archaeology* 72 (1): 35–44.
- Morwood, M.J., G.L. Walsh, and A.L. Watchman. 2010. AMS radiocarbon ages for beeswax and charcoal pigments in North Kimberley rock art. *Rock Art Research* 27 (1): 3–8.
- Mowaljarlai, D., and C. Peck. 1987. Ngarinyin Cultural Continuity: A project to teach the young people our culture, including the repainting of Wandjina rock art sites. *Australian Aboriginal Studies* 2: 71–78.
- Mowaljarlai, D., P. Vinnicombe, G.K. Ward, and C. Chippindale. 1988. Repainting of images on rock in Australia and the maintenance of Aboriginal culture. *Antiquity* 62 (237): 690–696.
- O'Connor, S., and S. Arrow. 2008. Boat images in the rock art of northern Australia with particular reference to the Kimberley, Western Australia. In *Islands of Inquiry: Colonisation, seafaring and the archaeology of maritime landscapes*, ed. G. Clark, S. O'Connor, and B. Leach, 397–409. Canberra: ANU E-Press.
- O'Connor, S., and B.L. Fankhauser. 2001. Art at 40,000BP? One step closer: An ochre covered rock from Carpenter's Gap Shelter 1, Kimberley Region, Western Australia. In *Histories of old ages: Essays in*

- [AU7](#) 658 *honour of Rhys Jones*, eds. A. Anderson, R. Jones,
659 I. Lilley, and S. O'Connor, 287–300.
- 660 O'Connor, S., J. Balme, J. Fyfe, J. Oscar, M. Oscar,
661 J. Davis, H. Malo, R. Nuggett, and D. Surprise. 2013.
662 Marking resistance? Change and continuity in the
663 recent rock art of the southern Kimberley, Australia.
664 *Antiquity* 87 (336): 539–554.
- 665 Ouzman, S., P. Veth, C. Myers, P. Heaney, and
666 K. Kenneally. 2017. Plants before animals? Aboriginal
667 rock art as evidence of ecoscaping in Australia's Kim-
668 berley. In *The Oxford Handbook of the archaeology*
669 *and anthropology of rock art*, eds. B. David and
670 I. McNiven. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 671 Paterson, A., and A. Wilson. 2009. Indigenous perceptions
672 of contact at Inthanooona, northwest Western Australia.
673 *Archaeology in Oceania* 44 (S1): 99–111.
- 674 Porr, M., and H.R. Bell. 2012. 'Rock-art', 'animism' and
675 two-way thinking: Towards a complementary episte-
676 mology in the understanding of material culture and
677 'rock-art' of hunting and gathering people. *Journal of*
678 *Archaeological Method and Theory* 19 (1): 161–205.
- 679 Ross, J., and M. Travers. 2013. 'Ancient Mariners' in
680 Northwest Kimberley rock art: An analysis of water-
681 craft and crew depictions. *The Great Circle* 35 (2):
682 55–82.
- 683 Ross, J., K. Westaway, M. Travers, M. Morwood, and
684 J. Hayward. 2016. Into the past: A step towards a robust
685 Kimberley rock art chronology. *PLoS One* 11 (8):
686 e0161726.
- 687 Shulz, Agnes S. 1956. North-West Australian rock paint-
688 ings. *Memoirs of the National Museum of Victoria*,
689 Melbourne 20: 54–64.
- 690 Travers, M., and J. Ross. 2016. Continuity and change in
691 the anthropomorphic figures of Australia's northwest
692 Kimberley. *Australian Archaeology* 82 (2): 148–167.
- 693 Utemorrh, D., and P. Vinnicombe. 1992. Northwestern
694 Kimberley belief systems. In *Rock art and ethnogra-*
695 *phy, proceedings of the ethnography symposium (H)*,
696 *Australian Rock Art Research Association Congress*,
697 *Darwin 1988*, Occasional AURA Publication, ed. M.-
698 J. Morwood and D.R. Hobbs, vol. 5, 25–26. Mel-
699 bourne: Archaeological Publications.
- 700 Veth, P., et al. 2019. Minjiwarra: Archaeological evidence
701 of human occupation of Australia's northern Kimberley
702 by 50,000 BP. *Australian Archaeology* 85 (2): 1–11.
- 703 Walsh, Grahame. 1994. *Bradshaws: Ancient rock paint-*
704 *ings of North-West Australia*. Carouge-Geneva:
705 Bradshaw Foundation.
- 706 Welch, David. 1993. Stylistic change in the Kimberley
707 rock art, Australia. In *Rock art studies: The post-*
708 *stylistic era or where do we go from here?: Papers*
709 *presented in Symposium A of the 2nd Aura Congress*,
Cairns 1992, ed. M. Lorblanchet and P.G. Bahn, 710
711 99–113.
- 712 Wood, R., Z. Jacobs, D. Vannieuwenhuyse, J. Balme,
713 S. O'Connor, and R. Whitau. 2016. Towards an accu-
714 rate and precise chronology for the colonization of
715 Australia: The example of Riwi, Kimberley, Western
716 Australia. *PLoS One* 11 (9): e0160123.
- Further Reading** 717
- 718 Bird, M., R.J. Beaman, S.A. Condie, A. Cooper, S. Ulm,
719 and P. Veth. 2018. Palaeogeography and voyage model-
720 ing indicates early human colonization of Australia was
721 likely from Timor-Roti. *Quaternary Science Reviews*
722 191: 431–439.
- 723 Capell, Arthur. 1939. Mythology in northern Kimberley,
724 north-west Australia. *Oceania* 9 (4): 382–404.
- 725 Cheinmora, Dolores. 2017. *Belaa plants and animals:*
726 *Biocultural knowledge of the Kwini people of the far*
727 *north Kimberley, Australia*. Balanggarra Aboriginal
728 Corporation: Northern Territory Botanical Bulletin.
729 Vol. 46. Batchelor: Batchelor Institute Press. [AU8](#)
- 730 Clement, C., J. Gresham, J. Jeffrey, and H. McGlashan.
731 2012. *Kimberley history: People, exploration and*
732 *development*. Perth: Kimberley Society. (Maybe ditch
733 this one? And move to rec reading).
- 734 Crawford, Ian. 1968. *The art of the Wandjina: Aboriginal*
735 *cave paintings in Kimberley, Western Australia*.
736 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 737 Elkin, Adolphus P. 1930. Rock-paintings of north-west
738 Australia. *Oceania* 1: 257.
- 739 Gunn, R., B. David, L.C. Douglas, J.-J. Delannoy,
740 S. Harper, P. Heaney, S. Ouzman, and P. Veth. in
741 press. 'Kimberley Stout Figures': A proposed new
742 motif type in Kimberley rock art, north-western
743 Australia. *Australian Archaeology*. [AU9](#)
- 744 Kenneally, K.F., M.R. Lewis, M. Donaldson, and
745 C. Clement, eds. 1997. *Aboriginal rock art of the Kim-*
746 *berley*. Perth: The Kimberley Society.
- 747 Lewis, Darrell. 1997. Bradshaws: The view from Arnhem
748 Land. *Australian Archaeology* 44 (1): 1–16.
- 749 Mowaljarlai, D., and J. Malnic. 1993. *Yorro Yorro, every-*
750 *thing standing up alive: Spirit of the Kimberley*.
751 Broome: Magabala Books.
- 752 Veth, P., S. Harper, K. Ditchfield, S. Ouzman, and
753 Balanggarra Aboriginal Corporation. in press. The
754 case for continuity in the Kimberley occupation and
755 rock art. In *Companion to indigenous*
756 *history*, ed. A. McGrath and L. Russell.
- 757 Welch, David. 2016. *From Bradshaw to Wandjina:*
758 *Aboriginal paintings of the Kimberley region, Western*
759 *Australia*, Australian Aboriginal culture series. Vol. 12.
760 Coolalinga: David M. Welch.