



Figure 3 A scene from the second excavation, January 1936. L to R: G. Bunyan, C. Towle (Sr), F.D. McCarthy, C.C. Towle (Jr). (Photograph: Australian Museum V7256_34).

Further anomalies occur with respect to McCarthy's published record of matters relating to the first excavation. McCarthy (1948:1) states that before the second excavation, the rockshelter was dug 'by several private collectors, whose main interest was the acquisition of specimens, and they made no records of their work or of the specimens recovered'. Further, McCarthy (1978:50, 51) states that 'Bunyan and several of his friends whose names are unrecorded ... dug up the western half, and also a shallow strip at the back of the eastern end from which seven axes were taken to a depth of 30 cm, of the deposit ... What happened to the implements Bunyan's party dug up I do not know'.

McCarthy here makes three assertions. The first, that he did not know who was involved in the first dig, the second, that they made no records of their work and the third, that he had no knowledge of what happened to the artefacts retrieved. In addition, it is surprising to note that McCarthy makes no mention of Hornshaw at all in either of his publications (McCarthy 1948, 1978).

It is somewhat implausible that McCarthy was not conversant with the details associated with the first dig. This paper has clearly demonstrated the closeness of the network within which Hornshaw, Bunyan, Towle, Preston and McCarthy moved and how difficult it would be to undertake projects in isolation and without the knowledge of others in the group. That is how McCarthy found out about the rockshelter. Bunyan was with Hornshaw on the first dig. Bunyan in turn told Towle who in turn told McCarthy. Add to this the fact that Bunyan participated in both digs and that he possessed a reputation for openness and sharing all he knew about Aboriginal sites, Aboriginal art and Aboriginal artefacts. It is difficult to believe that Bunyan, Towle and McCarthy worked together for five days at the site without discussing and exchanging information

on aspects of the first dig, in particular the names of those involved, what artefacts were found, where those artefacts were, the type of documentation kept (field notes and photographs), and the main conclusion drawn by Hornshaw that the evidence indicated the existence of two cultural periods. This latter is the same conclusion drawn by Towle and McCarthy (McCarthy 1978:55, 56).

It is surprising that, especially in his primary paper of 1948, McCarthy should express total ignorance of personnel and records from the first dig. The records were available for anybody who expressed a desire to see them. His comments reveal a lack of scientific detachment and a reluctance to examine all the data before making a value judgment.

The field records made by Hornshaw of the work undertaken at the first dig are extant (Hornshaw 1892-1937, 1930-1937). They include field notes and photography. Hornshaw took great care of the artefacts from the cave and they remain in his collection all suitably labelled. Bunyan retained some of the artefacts (Norma Ritchie, pers. comm., 2003) but the current whereabouts of these is not known because of the events previously outlined.

Evidence of More Recent Use

McCarthy (1948, 1978) did not report any evidence from within the Lapstone Creek Rockshelter of more recent use. He possibly assumed this to be of no importance. Hornshaw did collect and record this evidence. At the time, he did not have the means to interpret or date this evidence, but it was retained and recorded for such a time when this might be feasible. Recent archaeological work at other locations in Australia have now made it possible to elicit useful information from this evidence.

Among the artefacts retained in the Hornshaw collection is a clay tobacco pipe found in the surface debris (Figure 4). The