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Because people conceptualize the land on which they live metaphorically, it is suggested that metaphor theory is an important component of landscape theory. One kind of metaphorically charged landscape is the hunting landscape, a type of gendered landscape that embodies hunting and animal metaphors related to gender categories and provides a field on which to perform and establish maleness. Two archaeological examples of hunting landscapes in the American Southwest are explored to show how hunting and its associated landscapes facilitate the creation and substantiation of the male persona through metaphorical linkages between humans and animals, hunting and warfare, and game animals and women.

Recent developments in landscape theory underscore the idea that there is more to cultural landscapes than land and geography (e.g., Ashmore and Knapp 1999; Bender 1993; Cosgrove 1984; Cosgrove and Daniels 1988; Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995; Rossignol and Wandsnider 1992; Tilley 1994; Ucko and Layton 1999; Whittlesey 1997). Landscape is a conceptual and behavioral process; it is as much about what people perceive and do on the land as it is about what is on the land to begin with. Landscapes are created by human activity, which is influenced not only by the distribution of resources on the land but also by cultural perceptions of human relationships to these resources. Landscape is “an entity that exists by virtue of its being perceived, experienced, and contextualized by people” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:1).

Three elements of the cultural landscape make it a particularly useful and powerful concept for archaeology. The first is that landscapes have time. Landscapes are continually in a process of creation by human activity; they have temporality: “The landscape is an anonymous sculptural form always already fashioned by human agency, never completed, and constantly being added to” (Tilley 1994:23). It is the cumulative sum of “the layers of significance with which human beings blanket the environment” (Basso 1984:49). It is never complete and is perpetually under construction. This temporal aspect of landscape has important implications for the ever-changing/evolving relationship between human actors and the land, the perpetual cause and effect of the environment (Ingold 1993).

Landscape is simultaneously the medium for and the outcome of social action and relation; it is both constituted and constitutive. Moreover, as human agents create the cultural landscape, they simultaneously create themselves as cultural subjects to that landscape. Thus, landscape formation is also subject formation and the social reproduction of dominant ideological roles.

Landscapes also have space, another key element of all archaeological inquiries. More appropriately, perhaps, landscapes create place—“that most powerful fusion of space, self, and time” (Feld and Basso 1996:9). Places constitute space as centers of human action and significance; they are...
always more than points or locations on the land because they have distinctive meaning and values for people: “Place is both ‘internal’ and ‘external’ to the human subject, a personally embedded center of meanings and a physical locus of action” (Tilley 1994:18). Much of landscape construction is the creation of “special places,” those spaces on the land where meaning is greatest to its inhabitants because of the events and actions they witness, partake in, name, and remember.

Finally, landscape is a process based on experience, and different people or groups, depending on their specific experiences, both “mythic” and “real,” will perceive and hence construct a landscape differently. For instance, part of the power of place is its ability to motivate movement across and within a landscape or, as Casey describes, its “encouragement of event and motion in its midst” (1996:23). This movement through (and because of) place creates and facilitates the accumulation of meaningful experiences, associations, and histories, which can become embodied memory, that is, social memory experienced at the level of the individual body and the social (village) body. What this also means is that to experience landscape, people often will manipulate the land, leaving traces of those experiences for the archaeologist to find. Because ritual is frequently involved in these experiences, the construction of ritual monuments or even the repetition and reuse of an area in a particular way (an “obvious aspect” of ritual [Rapaport 1979]) may produce substantial archaeological residues that can be linked to the enhancement of landscape experience.

Created by humans, cultural landscapes thus embody time, place, and experience. But what are they, really? Relying on the above descriptions, this is a deceptively difficult question to answer. The following is a theoretical expansion of what landscapes are and how they “work” by explicitly coupling landscape theory with elements of metaphor theory. The main thesis of this article is that, because people tend to conceptualize the land on which they live metaphorically, elements of metaphor theory are a necessary component of landscape theory. This includes the idea that metaphors are grounded in bodily experience and that activities on the landscape bring metaphorical meanings associated with the landscape to the realm of bodily experience, perpetuating and reifying those meanings. The practice of hunting and its related rituals, for example, create a type of gendered landscape that I term the hunting landscape—a landscape that bears hunting and animal metaphors related to gender categories and provides a field on which to perform and establish maleness. Two archaeological examples of landscapes in the American Southwest are explored. Both focus on the masculine activity hunting, which facilitates the creation and substantiation of the male persona through metaphorical linkages between humans and animals, hunting and warfare, and game animals and women.

When Is a Landscape?

One of the more successful attempts at categorizing different types of archaeological landscapes is that of Ashmore and Knapp (1999), who distinguish between constructed and conceptualized landscapes. Constructed landscapes involve the building of culturally meaningful features on the land and can include pyramids, trails, houses, and villages, often in the vicinity of notable natural landmarks. Constructed landscapes often have a formal “ideological” structure to them yet operate to a large extent as built environments that both constrain and enable social action. Conceptualized landscapes, on the other hand, “are characterized by powerful religious, artistic, or other cultural meanings invested in natural features rather than in material culture or monuments, which are insignificant or absent” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:11). Conceptualized landscapes often “take shape” through assigning meaningful names to places on the land and linking them with significant deities, stories, or past events.

Although the dichotomy between conceptualized and constructed landscapes is a useful method for categorizing fairly unambiguous phenomena, as with any overly simplified classification system it fails to capture all variation that is present and obscures the variation that it does capture. Of particular concern are those patterns that incorporate elements of both or do not fit neatly into either category (see below). It also suggests that constructed landscapes are in some way not conceptualized by their builders, which is not the case. One solution to this problem is to define all cultural landscapes as conceptualized on some level, with some of those
incorporating more or less energy into construction or land modification in order to facilitate the realization of symbolic (especially metaphorical) associations.

Conceptual metaphor, as a central component of symbolic thought, is thus a key element—the basis—of many cultural landscapes. (Landscape symbolism may also be metonymic—for example, when a single building comes to represent an entire administration [e.g., the White House]—but the emphasis for this analysis is metaphor, which I believe is implicated in most landscape symbolism and is the most important level of analysis.) Landscape in this sense is the manifestation, the evocation, through pure conceptualization and language (e.g., the naming of place) or through the modification of material resources (e.g., the building of pyramids), of spatial metaphorical referents. Land is the ground from which conceptual metaphors arise; landscape is the resulting web of metaphorical meaning across space that is created by human agents. And through then experiencing the created landscape, the agent's relationship to the land and to other social bodies is manifest, and the agent is at the same time constituted as a cultural subject within that landscape. Landscape is thus both the creation of meaningful place through metaphorical assignation and, in the process, the creation of the culturally fashioned person in direct relation to place.

The advantages of defining landscape in this way are severalfold. The first relates to the nature of conceptual metaphors as put forth by metaphor theory (Lakoff 1993)—that they have directionality and are grounded in bodily experience. (For detailed presentations of metaphor theory and its relevance to archaeology, see Ortman 2000 and Tilley 1999.) Metaphor is essentially understanding and experiencing one thing (a target domain) in terms of another (a source domain). More specifically, metaphor is the conceptualization of complex and abstract elements of the world using the properties of more concrete realms of experience (Lakoff 1987, 1993; Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Thus, cultural metaphors that are routinely used as conceptual maps are directly implicated in bodily experience and action.

Concrete bodily experience constrains not only the “input” to the metaphorical projections but also the nature of the projections themselves, that is, the kinds of mappings that can occur across domains. Conceptual metaphors that compose the landscape, then, are not random and unassociative; they are based on nonmetaphorical preconceptual structures arising from everyday bodily experiences (Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999). Environment, technology, and routine acts in place are all relevant and contributing elements to experience on the land and by extension to the construction of the conceptual metaphors embedded in landscape. It is no accident that Chacoan great houses, Mormon tabernacles, and Mesopotamian temples, as metaphorical extensions of the domestic house writ large, all map onto domains of human experience that are common to most if not all cultures. In the Chacoan case, great houses appear to make the reference “community as household” (Ortman 1998); temples are literally referred to as houses of god(s).

Another common feature that facilitates human experience in space is the path, which cross-culturally often refers to destiny or time. Paths connect and move bodies through space (from place to place), allowing the creation of a past, a present, and a future that are experientially tied to this movement. They also may refer to proper conduct, as in “one must follow the path of correct behavior” (Basso 1996); bodies on a path do not deviate from the course of that path. Again, this analogue directly references the bodily experience of actors on the land (for a discussion of the embodied nature of spatial-relations concepts, see Lakoff and Johnson 1999:30–36).

An important corollary to the premise that metaphors are implicated in bodily experience is that for metaphors to perpetuate they necessitate practice. There is an essential behavioral component to the creation, embodiment, and reproduction of metaphorical structures to the extent that they become embodied knowledge (i.e., habitus [Bourdieu 1990]; see Lakoff and Johnson 1999:16–44). By extension, landscape, as spatially referenced metaphor, involves practice or life activities. Landscape in fact requires practice for its continuance; a neglected landscape becomes something else (Barrett 1999). As such, landscape and its associated activities—the “taskscape” (Ingold 2000:195)—facilitate the production and embodiment of the metaphorical affinities assigned to place. For archaeologists, then, those related activities are
important elements in the investigation of the landscape, both for the reconstruction of the experience of place and for understanding the practice involved in the creation and perpetuation of the meaning of place.

Finally, conceptual metaphors are generally imbricated—that is, overlapping and reinforcing—and operate at a variety of scales. Thus, structural patterns that are discernable in one aspect of culture should also be represented in other aspects, through language, pottery decoration, the content of religious ceremonies, the format of houses, and so on. For example, Ortman (2000), building on Swentzell (1990), makes the provocative argument that prehistoric occupants of the Mesa Verde area conceptualized the earth as a ceramic bowl and the sky as an inverted basket and that, by further metaphorical extension, the lower portions of kivas (round subterranean ceremonial rooms) were ceramic bowls (hence their similar geometric decoration to bowls) and their wooden “woven” roofs were baskets. And at a different scale still he suggests that canyon-head villages in this region were also conceptualized as bowls. The reinforcing, imbricated nature of the metaphorical manifestations is apparent in this example. As important, however, is the variety of material scales at which the metaphors operate, from bowl, to kiva, to village, to earth. If landscape is in large part composed of metaphorical referents associated with place regardless of scale, then possibilities are opened for investigating the imbricated nature of landscapes in ways rarely before realized.

One of the more important social domains of metaphorical mapping is the construction of gender categories. Gender as social and behavioral construction is an embodied category of identity. And the embodiment of gender and the cultural logic underlying it ultimately depends on certain metaphorical reifications operating at a variety of spatial and conceptual scales (Perry and Potter 2002). A multiscalar metaphorical system of gender construction of this sort appears to operate throughout the Puebloan world of the American Southwest. The Hopi, for example, implicate male as “hunter/warrior/agent of the spirit world” in a series of landscapes, the geography of which varies in scale from the carcass of a hunted animal, to a ceremonial room, to a mountain range. Each of these metaphorically linked contexts may be considered a gendered landscape. Indeed, animal carcasses, though not landscapes in the traditional sense, do contain locations on them that have social, discursive, and phenomenological qualities (what Whitridge [2002] refers to as “the topology of animal carcasses”). The major joints of large game, for instance, were places where spirits emerged; they were openings to the spirit world, and techniques for butchering carcasses incorporated the reality of this geography. These spirit portals were not unlike sipapu, small openings in the floors of ceremonial rooms that linked the spirit world with the outer world. These ceremonial rooms, or kivas, were the containers of male activities, including the performance of secret rituals and weaving, which generally were not visible to outsiders, especially women.

Interestingly, at a broader scale still, the San Francisco Peaks, a dormant volcano 110 km (70 mi) southwest of the Hopi villages yet highly visible on the horizon, contains a sipapu writ large, from which Kachinas (spirits from the underworld) still emerge into the outer world each spring and return each fall. These conceptual linkages were reified and experienced through various modes of practice. The hunting and subsequent butchering of large game by males (and never women) commonly occurred in the San Francisco Peaks area. And a fourteenth-century kiva uncovered at the ancestral Hopi site of Homolo’vi contained painted depictions of the San Francisco Peaks (Adams 2002). I suggest that all of these reinforcing geographies of meaning, from “the geography closest in” (Rich 1984) to a mountainscape far-off on the horizon, naturalized the image of the male and provided multiple imbricated landscapes on which to perform and embody “maleness.”

Hunting and the construction of metaphorical landscapes associated with hunting may be particularly salient elements of gender construction in small-scale societies. This is certainly the case in the American Southwest, as suggested by the ethnographic example above. The following is a more general discussion of hunting and landscape as they pertain to the construction of gender in small-scale societies. Although for practical reasons Puebloan groups of the Southwest are emphasized in the discussion, the intention is to provide a fairly broad theoretical foundation for the analysis of the relationship among hunting, landscape, and the construction of gender.
Hunting, Landscape, and the Construction of Gender

It has been estimated that by Pueblo IV times (ca. A.D. 1400) up to 80 percent of the Puebloan diet was corn (Snow 1991). In fact, it may be that hunted game never made up the bulk of the diet of ancient Southwestern peoples; Middle Archaic groups relied to a great extent on gathered plants and, by Late Archaic times, on corn. Yet hunting and hunted game, despite their arguably minor importance for subsistence staples throughout time and their lack of daily economic necessity, did come to possess immense symbolic and social importance in the Southwest. In addition, hunting, through the practical activities associated with it, is a source of knowledge, particularly about the landscape and its fauna (Ingold 2000:57). At the same time, elements of the landscape contain information for every hunter regarding the nature of the universe and the behavior of prey. The hunter is highly skilled at gathering information that is critical to the success of the hunt, yet this highly attuned perceptual system also allows him to engage in the symbolic constituents of that world. I suggest that in the Southwest this mutually reinforcing relationship—hunting as an activity that facilitates knowledge of the landscape/landscape as a medium bearing hunting knowledge—has been crucial for various groups in teachings of morality, the construction of status distinctions, the perpetuation of ritual knowledge, daily encounters with and honoring of ancestors, and most important for this article, the establishment and enhancement of masculinity.

Part of the effectiveness of the hunting/landscape relationship stems from the fact that hunters in many small-scale societies view animals as partners, so that dealing with animals is not so different than dealing with humans. Hunting, then, becomes a social as well as a technical pursuit, “a kind of interpersonal dialogue, integral to the total process of social life, where both human and animal persons are constituted with their particular identities and purposes” (Ingold 2000:49). The Navajo, for instance, considered the wolf, the coyote, the wild cat, the screech owl, and the crow as fellow hunters, each designated by its secret name, “because the hunters respected these animals as partners” (Hill 1938:104). The Zuni people regarded and treated game animals as living relatives. When a Zuni hunted and killed a deer, he would ritually draw the animal’s “last breath” out of its nostrils and simultaneously draw in the same breath to ensure that the deer would live again. The deer would then be taken home to “lie in state” in the hunter’s household and be adorned with jewelry and blankets. Among the Tewa, “the animals gave [the hunter] a bow and arrows and a quiver, dressed him in buck skin, painted his face black, and tied the feathers of the carrion-eaters on his hair. Finally they told him: ‘You have been accepted. These things we have given you are what you shall use henceforth. Now you are ready to go.’ When he returned to the people he came as Mountain Lion, or the Hunt Chief” (Ortiz 1969:14).

Because in many non-Western societies personhood is open to animals, their symbolic and social importance is enormous, and their place on the landscape is meaningful in conceptualizing, reproducing, and negotiating human social relations. Human social categories and animal categories become inextricably linked. One is often “mapped” in terms of the other (Tilley 1999:49), whether human and animal categories are perceived in terms of their differences in the natural world so that they become mirror images of each other, as Lévi-Strauss (1962) has argued, or whether a perceived notion of animals is brought into human categories to serve in ordering human social relations, as Douglas (1996) has suggested. Tilley writes: “Observations of the characteristics of animals inform the metaphorical workings of the human mind, providing it with raw materials for processing and informing an understanding of human society” (1999:50).

In nonindustrial societies animals can be particularly powerful metaphor source domains. Animal as ancestor, animal as partner, animal as spirit helper, animal as warrior, animal as woman, and animal as shaman are all metaphors that may be produced, drawn on, and internalized as symbolic resources through the activities associated with hunting and the creation of landscape. The landscape embodies these metaphors and provides access to them through the practice of hunting, and hunting and its associated rituals reaffirm their position as part of the landscape.

The hunting of large-game animals often involves metaphors of warfare, and hunting thus becomes an important component of male initia-
tion rituals and in conceptualizing and demonstrating leadership, masculinity, and strength. In Puebloan society, eagles and hawks are viewed as both warriors and hunters, and their feathers are used to fletch arrows for both endeavors. Among the Keres Pueblos, one who kills a bear or a mountain lion is eligible to join the Warrior Society, just as though he had killed a man (Lange 1959:137).

The action of large-game hunting—the gearing up; the stalking, killing, butchering, and distribution of the animal; and the strategic and often long-distance movement across the land—brings these metaphorical relationships to the realm of bodily experience, enabling (or forcing) the hunter to physically experience and embody this knowledge. Hunting rituals are particularly potent sources of bodily experience and in the Southwest can involve creating rock art, constructing shrines, making offerings such as cornmeal and turquoise, fashioning prayer sticks, and ceremonially burying particular animals, as well as nonmaterial aspects of ritual such as singing, dancing, praying, imitating animals, and fasting. These ritual activities may be included as part of the hunting taskscope, and the practice involved in this taskscope both produces and accesses the landscape as a resource for social action. As a result, the hunting/landscape partnership not only endures but becomes an intimate part of the social and religious lives of those who actively participate in the recursive relationship between these two realms of practice.

All of these actions simultaneously draw on and reproduce the historical, often communal structure underlying small-scale “tribal” societies and offer agents the opportunity to demonstrate individual skill and talent and thus challenge (or transcend) this structure. Hunting in small-scale societies is the paradoxical intersection of cooperation and competition, of the apparent conflict between group and individual effort and success. Accomplishment in hunting is one of the most effective ways to achieve status as a male in small-scale societies, providing a highly valued and visible food resource to portions of a group, and can also be a symbol not only of the mental and physical prowess and strength of the hunter but also of the social and spiritual competence of a hunter or hunt leader. Nothing in Puebloan society, for instance, happens by chance. If inordinate numbers of animals “offer” themselves to a particular hunter or group of hunters, then something is being done right—behavior is being properly conducted. Conversely, if no animals offer themselves, then there is something wrong with the human–animal relationship and consequently with society. Hunting is a moral mirror.

The success of a Puebloan hunter or hunt leader may also be a measure of his standing with the ancestors. Bird-David (1990) has made the argument that small-scale, sedentary cultivators tend to view the environment as “ancestor.” This is in contrast to forest-based hunter-gatherers, whose perceptions of the environment often are organized around the primary metaphor of “forest as parent.” Viewing the environment as ancestor rather than parent has implications for a whole set of cultural values and attitudes that structure the way people interact with the land, animals, and each other. As Tilley notes, “The forest as parent gives unconditionally. It shares its resources with people just as people share with each other. Ancestors, on the other hand, only give things in return for prestations” (1999:50). Thus, interacting with ancestors by making offerings, prayers, and shrines related to the sacred activities of hunting on the landscape becomes of paramount importance. And in Puebloan society it is usually men who conduct these activities.

In sum, the hunting/landscape relationship is important for the establishment and enhancement of masculinity in many small-scale societies, including Puebloan society. This is because (1) animals are viewed as humans (or nonhuman people) and thus interactions with animals—such as during hunting forays—are important in conceptualizing, reproducing, and negotiating human social relations; (2) hunting is often metaphorically equated with warfare (also a traditionally male realm), and the male initiation ritual (becoming a man) often involves reference to hunting and warfare; (3) the hunting taskscope, including hunting rituals, facilitates the embodiment of metaphorical associations of the landscape and of animals; (4) success in hunting provides for male status achievement and can be an indicator of ritual competence and moral standing; and (5) hunting and its associated rituals on the landscape provide males access to ancestors and to the knowledge of ancestors. Thus, hunting not only is a technique for procuring valued resources from the land but also, as it articulates with the landscape, is crucial in the con-
stitution and transformation of social relations, especially with regard to the construction of the male persona. The following archaeological examples further illuminate the importance of landscape to the construction of gender in the Southwest.

**Example 1: Mother of Game Animals**

A common element of Pueblo oral tradition is the female spirit who is responsible for game animals. At Hopi, Tuwabontumi (Earth-Altar Young Woman) is mother to the antelope, deer, mountain sheep, and rabbits. She is the Mother of Game Animals and must be appeased with offerings prior to the hunt (Parsons 1939:178). According to legend she was expelled from Oraibi for seducing and murdering young males and as a result was sent to live in the Little Colorado River Valley (Beaglehole 1936:14; Hays-Gilpin 2000:124).

Pat and Jack McCreery (1986) of the American Rock Art Research Association have identified a number of sites in the Little Colorado River Valley (in the Petrified Forest National Park) that they interpret as hunting ritual sites containing imagery of the Mother of Game Animals. One site, the Boundary site, contains a possible image of her with her arms raised and bent and her legs extended and bent. She is flanked by two solid disks and is associated with a quadruped. Another site, the Butte site, contains a similar female image, arms raised and bent, legs extended and bent, bracketed by solid disks, and associated with representations of masculine fertility (Hays-Gilpin 2000:124); bows and arrows, a flute player, two sets of footprints—the second toes of which are exaggerated to represent phalluses—and game animals in sexually receptive positions (Figure 1).

These images designate certain cultural metaphors common to Puebloan thought, particularly the conceptual link between human and animal sexuality (Hays-Gilpin 2000:123–129). For instance, Parsons (1939:81) has noted that Pueblo hunters abstained from sexual intercourse with their wives during the hunt. Men talked of hunting “two-legged deer” when joking about extramarital sex (Schlegel 1977:259). And hunters who had intercourse with the Mother of Game Animals (and survived) were more successful in the hunt (Parsons 1939:178; Stephen 1936:261). As McCreery and McCreery note, “It’s apparent that this panel is con-

![Figure 1. Mother of Game Animals Glyph at the Butte Site.](image-url)
cerned with reproduction and animal increase” (1986:4). Yet it is also concerned with presenting to the viewer a series of powerful images linking the concepts of hunting, sexuality, and maleness together in a meaningful way and, just as importantly, in a meaningful place.

The ritual nature of the Butte site is evident not only in the associated images and their metaphorical referents but also in the residue of offerings present. Pottery, dating from A.D. 1150 to 1400 (Pueblo III–IV periods), covers the site, but no evidence of habitation is present on or anywhere near the site, suggesting that deposition occurred as a result of ritual activities. Ethnographically, prayer feathers were deposited at the Mother of Game Animals’ shrine before the hunt, and other offerings were consumed in fire pits to ensure success. This was followed by a large bonfire that signaled the start of the hunt (Titiev 1944:188–193). McCreery and McCreery (1986:5–6) note that the Butte site contains evidence of fire on the top of the butte and suggest that the site was a place where the initiation of young males occurred, rituals were conducted, and offerings that ensured a successful hunt were made. It would also have been a place where cultural metaphors linking human and animal sexuality were “experienced.”

The closest villages dating to the time period represented by the pottery at the Butte site are Puerco Ruin (125 rooms) and Wallace Tank Ruin (250 rooms), both about 25 km (15 mi) east of the rock art sites. Each of these village sites has yielded ceramic assemblages with high percentages of Hopi Yellow Ware (26.7 percent and 21.3 percent, respectively [Duff 2002:81]), and thus at least some occupants of these sites likely visited the Butte when the sites were abandoned in the Pueblo IV period. The fact that rock art sites with images of the Mother of Game Animals and male fertility symbols are in an area where prehistoric habitation was limited indicates the importance of the association of these images with specific places on the land, where the metaphorical associations were consistent with the oral tradition of the Hopi and where it made sense to perform the rituals associated with those traditions. As Lewis-Williams (2002:157) discusses for Paleolithic rock art, the rock and its place on the land possessed its own intrinsic, situating meaning, and images placed on the rock related to it as much as they may have related to associated images. The land thus contained the places away from the villages that were significant to the performance of these rituals and subsequent hunting forays. And the actions associated with these rituals, especially the creation of rock art imagery related to the legends, produced and reaffirmed those locations as places of significance, where metaphors of maleness were experienced and embodied.

In this case, the metaphorical associations of these places and the significance of the sites as part of a larger hunting landscape are evident primarily because the interpretations are ethnographically informed. However, this is often not the situation when deciphering archaeological landscapes. The following is an example of a cultural landscape that requires a different methodology for its understanding.

**Example 2: A Prehispanic Hunting Landscape in Central Arizona**

The study of rock art has expanded from interpreting the specific “meaning” of glyphs, as in the above example, to the interpretation of pattern and association among glyphs. In general, this has been accompanied by a logical shift from a focus on single glyphs or panels to approaches incorporating data from numerous sites across a particular region or regions (e.g., Bradley 2000; Chippendale and Taçon 1998).

The creation of rock art is literally the inscribing of symbols on the land—a pecked image of an antelope is not really an antelope; it is a representation of an antelope; indeed, it may represent something else as well, depending on the conceptual layers underlying its creation. Rock art is thus an effective technique for manipulating natural resources on the land in order to create culturally meaningful places. It is a metaphorical representation of particular aspects of the universe. As such, it can portray multiple layered worlds of real or mythic events and personae. At the same time, rock art is a physical and symbolic alteration of the natural world; a natural resource (rock) is physically manipulated so that places are constructed in which particular information is symbolically stored, at which particular rituals repeatedly occur, and from which particular messages are communicated. In this way, the production of rock art creates symbolic landscapes not only in miniature on the rocks themselves but also on a much larger scale on the
land, influencing perception and even behavior across the land. Indeed, particular rock art images are created in particular places at particular times—they are not uniformly distributed across the land; nor do they necessarily map onto distributions of natural resources. They have structure or cultural rules for their placement—thus creating meaning across space or, in other words, creating place.

The following examines a set of rock art sites just north of Prescott, Arizona, in an upland area that lacked substantial prehistoric habitation but in which hunting and the creation of rock art occurred. The discussion follows Bradley's (2000) landscape approach to rock art analysis by examining the connections among the choice of imagery and the location of images on the land, the intended audience of the images, their accessibility (both physical and intellectual), their temporality, and their integration into the wider pattern of settlement and land use.

Talking Rock Ranch (TRR), 32 km north of the Town of Prescott, comprises 13.75 km² in an upland area; at about 1,525 m, it is at a higher elevation than both Chino Valley to the east and Williamson Valley to the west. Because of this, TRR lacks certain resources that these two bordering areas possess, including a perennial water source, such as the Verde River or Del Rio Springs, and an abundance of deep, arable soils. Consequently, habitation in the TRR area appears to have been seasonal and fairly small in scale (Potter 2000). However, the TRR environment is particularly productive in other ways because it encompasses both Sonoran Desert and píñon-juniper flora and fauna, including abundant deer, jackrabbit, cottontail rabbit, pec- cary, bobcat, coyote, fox, mountain lion, quail, roadrunner, and dove.

One of the more abundant archaeological arti-fact types in the area is projectile points: 140 points have been collected or noted in the area. They are primarily of chert and obsidian and represent Archaic, Cohonina, and Prescott Culture forms. Table 1 presents sherd-to-projectile point ratios for the TRR project and several other projects in the vicinity, including those in Williamson Valley and regions south of the project area. The ratio for TRR is lower by a factor of at least five (and in one case a factor of 10+) than ratios for any of the other areas, indicating the unique importance of hunting in the region relative to surrounding areas.

Rock art in the project area is present at 30 sites, one of which, the Inscription Canyon Petroglyph (ICP) site, contains over 1,300 rock art elements. The ICP site consists of a 400-m section of canyon in Cooper Wash, with rock art distributed across the schist and granite canyon walls from the modern floor of the canyon to approximately 4 m from the ground surface near the rim of the canyon.

In addition to the ICP site, there are 29 smaller rock art sites, some of which are associated with small, sparse artifact scatters. However, most rock art elements within the TRR project area are part of the ICP site. Of the 1,741 individual pre-Hispanic glyphs recorded within 3,400 acres, 75 percent are contained in this one site. The remaining 25 percent are distributed among the 29 other rock art sites. This concentration of glyphs suggests that this particular locus was a special place on the land.

The ICP site differs substantially from the other rock art sites in the area in other important ways that inform us of its cultural significance. In particular, there is a relatively high incidence of "circles," "cupules," and "linear" glyphs at the ICP site compared with other rock art sites in the area and a conspicuous paucity of anthropomorphs and

---

Table 1. Sherd-to-Projectile Point Ratios from TRR and Other Projects in the Vicinity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Projectile Points</th>
<th>Sherds</th>
<th>Sherds/Points</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking Rock Ranch</td>
<td>110*</td>
<td>8233**</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Potter 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas East</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>Barnett 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas West</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9564</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Barnett 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundown Site</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27,289</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Spall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ N:6:3(ASM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Archer et al. 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Ranch Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt;1000†</td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>Christenson 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8178</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes points from sites as well as IOs. Excludes points recovered from ceramic sites not systematically surface collected so that points are not overrepresented.

**Includes systematically surface-collected sherds and IOs.

†Estimates; no totals provided in report, but 15 sites had “numerous” ceramics.
zoomorphs at this site (Figure 2). The chi-square probability that this is a random distribution is < .001. This distribution of elements raises the question of how places were selected from the landscape for rock art. Is it possible to say why these places were chosen for special treatment while others were left untouched? What is most intriguing about this pattern is that the ICP site is the only site in the area that is contained within a drainage and incorporates the schist outcrops that define that drainage. The site is essentially a long narrow passageway enclosed by tall rock outcrops. The majority of the other rock art sites are in high, prominent places with overlooks to drainages or valleys or clear views to surrounding landmarks, such as Granite Mountain to the south. The only attainable view from within the ICP site is the rock art that covers the enclosing rock walls.

So whereas most other rock art sites contain zoomorphic and anthropomorphic glyphs (Figure 3) and appear to be associated with activities involving views of surrounding areas (Figure 4), the ICP site is much more internally focused and consists of more abstract elements, such as circles and linear glyphs, as well as cupules (Figure 5). These more abstract elements are almost certainly related to the range of ritual activities that occurred at the site (and perhaps the entoptic images conjured during these rituals) and the particular importance of the site as it relates to its position on the wider terrain.

Another distinction between the ICP site and other rock art sites in the area is the audience for which the messages contained within the glyphs were intended. The ICP site is easily accessible (physically), and the intended audience can be assumed to be anyone present at the site. Glyphs at this site are restricted to the middle and lower reaches of the outcrops, as if they were meant to be seen from the base of the canyon. They also do not extend the full length of the canyon, and the western extent of the glyphs abruptly ends well before the outcrops terminate. There is a sense that part of the intention was to communicate an overwhelming amount of symbolic information to as many people as possible in as restricted a time and space as possible.

Other rock art sites in the area, on the other hand, tend to be much less physically accessible
and are located in remote places on the land. The rock art panels at these sites are much less conspicuous, and the intended audience appears to have been a select few with access to knowledge of the local environment. On the other hand, the intellectual accessibility of the ICP site glyphs may have been more restricted than that at other sites. The dominance of complex abstract designs and nonrepresentational glyphs at the ICP site, as opposed to the anthropomorphs and zoomorphs composing the bulk of the glyphs at other rock art sites in the area, and the tight placement and often overlapping of images (i.e., the “clutter”) suggest that the messages were highly complex and layered at the site. The diversity of element types is part of this complexity as well. There is not only an enormous number of glyphs at the site but also an overwhelming number of different types (i.e., richness) of glyphs. This is probably at least partially because of the long time over which the site was used. Rock art sites in the TRR area often exhibit multiple glyphs and overlapping elements on the same panel, indicating reuse of these sites. If rock art can be thought of as the by-product of ritual, then the frequent returning to specific places where rock art occurs (places marked as special on the landscape) should be expected. The creation of rock art is the creation of landscape, and repetition of use is the perpetuation of landscape. Indeed, some rock art sites appear to represent multiple temporal affiliations. Several of the sites, including the ICP site, show varying amounts of rock varnish reformation within the glyphs and overlapping glyphs. One of the smaller rock art sites contains a grinding slick over a large petroglyph, indicating the incorporation of past features and underscoring the fact that landscapes are always under construction.

As indicated, permanent settlement associated with rock art in the area is lacking; the nearest large habitation sites are in Chino Valley to the west. The primary activities associated with rock art sites (other than the ICP site) appear to be (1) hunting, as evidenced by the inordinate proportion of projectile points in the area, the strong association with an intermittent water source in the form of tinajas (a draw for animals), and the high frequency of rock art with drainage/valley overlooks; and (2) ritual, which included the literal production of “landscape” on rocks (in the form of landmark depictions [see Figure 4]) and the depiction of

Figure 3. Ungulates depicted at an isolated site in the TRR area.
Figure 4. View of Granite Mountain (above) from isolated petroglyph site resembling the outline of the mountain (below).
Figure 5. Abstract linear glyphs (above) and cupules (below) at the Inscription Canyon Petroglyph Site.
zoomorphs and anthropomorphs. The association of these rock art sites with “viewscape” and *tinajas* is almost absolute. The exception, as mentioned above, is the ICP site, which has neither a viewscape nor *tinajas* but, rather, contains myriad arrays of “cluttered” abstract rock art glyphs as the dominant view and cupules, which may be the symbolic counterpart to *tinajas*.

That the TRR area constitutes a hunting/ritual landscape is further supported by interviews with Ernest Jones, vice president of the Yavapai-Prescott Tribe, who is quoted as describing the Inscription Canyon Petroglyph site as a “sacred canyon that ancestors of his Yavapai-Prescott Indian tribe avoided at all costs during hunting forays northwest of Prescott” (*Arizona Republic*, 16 May 2001: B1, emphasis added). The idea that a place can become so “special” or sacred that it must be avoided unless one’s visit is sanctioned or is for some specific purpose, or one possesses the requisite status or ritual knowledge, further illustrates the important distinctions between the ICP site and other rock art sites in the area, which did not evoke this response when visited by Native Americans (Potter 2000, 2002), and again highlights the structural complementarity of the ICP site versus other rock art sites. The ICP site had an intended audience that was large and diverse; it was physically accessible yet intellectually and ritually difficult to access; it was “internally” focused and contained no artifacts or features, suggesting that ritual and ceremony were the sole behaviors associated with the site for many generations. In contrast, other rock art sites had more specific intended audiences, were more difficult to access physically but were not necessarily inaccessible intellectually or ritually, and appear to have been intrinsically related to a different range of activities, especially hunting and landmark mapping.

Calling the TRR area a hunting landscape based on the high projectile point proportion and high animal density and diversity in the area does not necessarily mean that the zoomorphic and anthropomorphic images relate to hunting magic, the typical and often erroneous interpretation of “animal” glyphs in areas used for hunting. Instead, it may be that the images relate to shamanistic rituals that allowed shamans (predominantly male) either to negotiate with spirit masters for the release of animals to human hunters or to aid in finding a spirit helper, often an animal spirit helper, for male initiates during puberty rituals. Both of these ritual endeavors tend to occur in association with hunting expeditions, and both often involve the production of representational (zoomorphic and anthropomorphic) images (Ingold 2000:115; Lewis-Williams 2002; Whitley 1994, 1998). In either case, the presence of highly patterned animal/human imagery in an area clearly used for hunting and in juxtaposition with an intensive ritual site such as the ICP site suggests a link between the use of the area for ritual purposes and the use of the area for hunting. It also indicates the active construction of a symbolic landscape that facilitated the creation of the male as both hunter and bearer of knowledge—knowledge concerning animals and their behavior, the content of rituals, the meaning of symbols pecked on the rock, and the significance of landmarks and places on the land. And in participating in the various activities composing the associated taskscape, the hunter would have internalized and embodied this knowledge, thereby defining and creating himself in relation to this landscape.

**Conclusion**

It should be stressed that although these examples focus on landscape symbolism containing significant rock art imagery, the model put forth here (i.e., the linking of landscape with metaphor theory) is applicable beyond what Whitley (1998) refers to as landscape art. Most if not all landscapes are conceptualized metaphorically on some level, and thus the model may easily extend to other types of landscape studies. One of the more valuable elements of metaphor theory to landscape studies is the idea that metaphorical structures (knowledge) are embodied through practice (Lakoff and Johnson 1999) and that, because of this, it may be as important to focus on the activities—the taskscape—associated with the creation and perpetuation of landscape as on the symbols themselves.

A second point that should be made clear is that the stance here is not that all hunting in Puebloan or any other society was conducted by males or that all gendered landscapes are masculine. Although long-distance, large-game hunting was, for the most part, restricted to initiated male hunters, and the rituals associated with large-game hunting were male-
oriented rituals, Puebloan women and children commonly engaged in the hunting of small mammals such as rabbits, hares, and rodents and even the occasional deer that wandered into a garden. The point here, however, is not to discuss what men did versus what women did (e.g., men hunted and women made pots) but, rather, to describe how gender, regardless of biological sex, was performed, negotiated, and ultimately constituted, using landscape as a resource. In addition to the male-focused analysis presented here, there were certainly intricate, multiscale landscapes comprising conceptual metaphors of femaleness or femininity as well. The domestic landscape in which We’ wha, the famous Zuni ihama, actively participated is a case in point. Though she was biologically male, she conducted herself within a landscape charged with feminine metaphors and in so doing constituted her gender as female (Roscoe 1991).

Finally, as Sahlin (1985) makes clear, landscape can be a powerful prescriptive force in the transmission of cultural information and the interpretation of meanings. Because the physical characteristics of the land are highly stable and because the metaphorical associations of a place can be widely shared (for instance, widely known place-names or well-known stories associated with a particular place), landscape may be used to imbue certain ideological structures with a sense of immutability and permanence, especially when these conceptual links are emphasized through formal ritual (Basso 1984; Potter and Perry 2000). Using elements of the landscape in the construction of gender, then, provides a basis for the transmission of knowledge that is essentially unchanging from generation to generation (or transmits the perception of an unchanging cultural world), which lends the performance legitimacy. As pointed out above, the imbricated and multiscalar nature of conceptual metaphors—that they are reproduced at many different levels and in many different contexts—naturalizes cultural messages as well. The real question is why it would be important enough to put so much effort into the construction and performance of gender categories that it requires intricate metaphorical linkage with landscape. Are the categories so unstable and fluid that they necessitate constant symbolic shoring? Probably not. But if we take gender to be more about how individuals think and behave than about how they function biologically, then perhaps the link between gender and landscape and the prescriptive conservatism that comes with that link are primarily about the formation of the cultural subject—not just getting people to unconsciously think and behave a certain way but also providing to them the resources that allow for their successful negotiation of cultural life. In other words, it is the creation not only of place but also of person.
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