Minding The Gap:
An Exploration Into The Social Landscapes Of Rock Art
At Stuart Lake/ Nak’al Bun, British Columbia

Suzanne Mitchell
B.A., University of Northern British Columbia, 2003

Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfillment Of
The Requirements For The Degree Of
Master Of Arts
in
Interdisciplinary Studies

The University Of Northern British Columbia
May 2006

© Suzanne Mitchell, 2006
NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.
ABSTRACT

Minding the Gap: An Exploration into the Social Landscapes of Rock Art at Stuart Lake/ Nak’al Bun, British Columbia

by Suzanne Mitchell

This thesis explores the multiplicity of meanings embedded in the rock art landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, British Columbia. It is interdisciplinary in nature and effectively combines Archaeology, Anthropology and First Nations Studies. Information from the existing ethnographic record along with data obtained through interviews with First Nations people from the Yekooche, Tache and Nak’azdli communities are highlighted in this thesis. Together these sources are developed into a de-colonized ethnography that explores the social aspects of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art landscape, both in the past and the present. Contemporary Aboriginal perspectives form the basis for understanding the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art assemblage in terms of a cultural landscape. An archaeological survey of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, conducted for this research, provides information regarding the motifs and the physical landscape of the rock art. Photography forms the basis of the rock art recording methods employed in this research and specific methods for achieving optimum photographic results are presented.
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Chapter One
INTRODUCTION

The Project

In this thesis I highlight the presence and importance of Aboriginal rock paintings in British Columbia. Through a case study of the pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, located in Central British Columbia, I present information gained through interviews with First Nations people from the Nak’azdli, Tl’azt’en and Yekooche Nations which provides the foundation of knowledge I present regarding the rock paintings. I supplement the information gathered in these interviews with information from the ethnographic record. As a body of interdisciplinary work, this research combines methods, theories and issues from Archaeology, Anthropology and First Nations Studies, through which I explore the social processes involved in the creation and use of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock paintings. As well, I present a method of recording pictographs that creates consistent and reliable photographic reproductions.

The goals of this thesis are threefold: 1) to systematically locate and record the pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun; 2) to develop an understanding of these rock paintings in terms of human agency and finally; 3) to bring recognition and respect to the meaning that is embedded in the rock art landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. In addition to meeting these research goals and satisfying the requirements for an Interdisciplinary Masters Degree at the University of Northern British Columbia, I am committed to developing a body of knowledge that is of importance and relevance to the First Nations communities involved in this research process. Therefore, I will present this thesis along with a modified version to
each these First Nations communities and the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun school. Consultation and collaboration with curriculum advisors at the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun school will play a key role in the development of this alternate body of work, which will be finalized after the completion of my degree program.

My Rock Art Beginnings

My interest in Aboriginal rock paintings began several years ago as the result of an undergraduate research assignment which introduced me to the topic of rock art. Preparation for the assignment entailed perusing books filled with wonderful photographs of rock markings from around the world. I was amazed at how images of all sizes, shapes and colours had been painted and pecked onto rock surfaces across the planet. I remember the initial feelings of awe settling in as I studied and read about the images. But, as with so many of the other aspects of the archaeological record that I was beginning to learn about, alongside my interest and curiosity about the past, I felt a growing sense of disappointment. The source of this disappointment was the recognition that I only knew of these cultural remains through the words and occasionally the pictures contained within articles, books and lectures.

I believe this project actually started the day I realized that I could visit a rock art site in British Columbia. In the summer of 1999, armed with this realization, some lingering questions and a copy of John Comer’s *Pictographs: Indian Rock Paintings in the Interior of British Columbia* (1968), I set out for Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and the journey to see Native rock paintings throughout the province. I had imagined, prior to visiting rock art sites, what it would be like to see the images for myself. I naively assumed that my questions would be
more easily answered once I found and saw the markings. But this was not the case. As time
would tell, I would eventually come to realize that finding more rock art did not necessarily
mean I would find more answers. Instead, each site I visited posed new questions and left
me wondering about the reasons behind the creation of the markings.

In British Columbia there are two main types of rock art, petroglyphs and pictographs.
Petroglyphs are images that have been etched, pecked or cut into a rock surface, where the
shape of a petroglyph is visible by the removal or reduction of the rock surface. Pictographs
are motifs that have been applied onto the rock surface with organic and mineral based
pigments (Darvill 2002:362). All of the rock art images at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are
pictographs.

These pictographs were the first rock art images I visited. Because of this fact these
paintings and the area of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun have special meaning for me. This is in part
why I chose to focus on this particular rock art assemblage for my graduate studies. Roughly
50 miles in length and 6 miles wide, Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is flanked on the north side by
the southern edge of the Omineca Mountains and forested lowlands on the other. Stuart
Lake/Nak’al Bun is a major tributary of the Nechako-Fraser river system. Enormous cliff
faces rise up out of the lake and provide the canvas for what seems like an endless array of
paintings. Immortalized onto the stone surface, painted images of frogs, humans, birds, and
fish (to name only a few) hang suspended as if frozen in time. None of the reading I had done
could have prepared me for what it was like to see the paintings with my own eyes.

Seeing the paintings for the first time was nothing less than surreal for me, and I quickly
realized it was so much better than looking at pictures in a book! Barbara Little (2002:14)
writes, “there is nothing quite so compelling as personal experience of a place to begin to
understand its significance.” I appreciate now that this is so, because to visit a rock art site means to journey, both physically and mentally. Rock art sites are so often located in remote and difficult-to-reach places. In British Columbia, rock art is located in all types of terrain and negotiating a variety of Nature’s characteristics is usually a visitation requirement. Successfully finding rock art is something that never fails to leave me with a sense of accomplishment. Visiting rock art sites has led me to some of the most beautiful and soul-soothing places in British Columbia.

Just as visiting a rock art site entails a bodily journey that offers an opportunity to experience a specific physical landscape, the opportunity for a cognitive journey is equally present. I say this because rock art is in situ – it is located exactly where it was created and intended to be seen. To visit a rock art site means the opportunity to see and ponder the thoughts and histories of people from the past, made visible to us today in the form of paintings and to stand in the exact spot as the painters did so very long ago. This cognitive journey enables the painters of the past to momentarily become part of our contemporary landscape. This is one of the many reasons that rock art sites are so important and it is what gives them the power to repeatedly overwhelm me.

**Geographic Setting**

Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is located approximately 150 kilometers northwest of Prince George with the town site of Fort St. James on its eastern shore (Figure 1). Fort St. James is perhaps best known for its connection to Simon Fraser and his efforts, on behalf of the North West Company, to institute the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun Post in 1806 (cf. Lamb 1960). Economic prosperity associated with the Fur Trade ensued shortly after the Fort’s
establishment and the burgeoning settlement eventually became New Caledonia’s economic capital. ¹ Christened Fort St. James in 1822, one year after the North West Company merged with the Hudson’s Bay Company, the town site continued to play a leading role in the fur trade until the 1860s (Moriee 1905). The discovery of gold in the nearby Omineca Valley eventually brought about the demise of the Fort’s economic importance. Today the Fort is a National Historic Site and a thriving tourist attraction. Visitors are invited to experience the past through the efforts of costumed staff who re-enact life at the fort, as it was thought to have occurred over 100 years ago.

Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is located in Carrier traditional territory. The name Carrier refers to a group of First Nations people sharing common linguistic and cultural origins. Carrier

¹ New Caledonia was the name Simon Fraser initially bestowed upon the area around Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Shortly afterward, this name came to identify the central interior of what is now British Columbia.
territory is located in the central interior of British Columbia (Figure 2). Carrier lands are bounded on the west by Gitxsan, Wet'suwet'en, Tsimshian and Haisla peoples. To the north east, their territory borders Sekani and Dunne-za lands. Their neighbors to the south include the Tsilhqot'in and Secwepemc. The Carrier language is part of the larger Athapaskan language family that is spoken by various Aboriginal groups throughout British Columbia, the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Alberta and the United States, including Alaska. Carrier First Nations people continue to share social practices and political organization, but they also exhibit several unique dialects and varying traditions.

![Figure 2. Map of British Columbia indicating approximate locations of traditional First Nations territories (Government of British Columbia 2001)](image)

**Cultural Setting**

The name Carrier has two interesting stories associated with its inception. According to the European traders who arrived in the early 1800s, the name Carrier referred to a particular cultural practice concerning the treatment of the dead, where tradition dictated that a wife
carry the bones/ashes of her deceased husband for a period of one year (Morice 1905:6). Traders and missionaries, both endowed with a strong sense of ethnocentrism, considered this practice demeaning to women, while being offensive to the dead. In reality, this practice served an important mortuary ritual for the Carrier people – the reunification of the deceased with her or his relatives and place of birth (Marucci 2000:2).

Lizette Hall (1992:34), a member of the Carrier Nation, offers an alternative origin for the foundation of the Carrier name. She acknowledges the existence of this mortuary-related belief, but she is adamant in pointing out, that as a cultural practice, this ritual is not included in her discussion of the Carrier culture. Her exclusion of this tradition is based on testimony by her father Chief Louis Billy Prince, grandson of Chief Kwah, whom she consulted regarding widows’ customs. Hall (1992:34) reports that neither her father nor his elders were aware of such a practice.

In place of this mortuary ritual, she offers a less spiritual origin for the name by explaining that Aghelh Ne (Carrier) means “one who packs” (Hall 1992:4). This refers to the way the people of this area used to pack their goods on their backs or in canoes. Hall (1992:4) also suggests a non-European origin for the name and credits the Sekani Nation for first coining the term, before the arrival of Europeans. Despite its controversial origins, many of the First Nations people of the area have replaced the name Carrier with Dakelh, which means “we travel by water.” Dakelh refers to the people and their language.

The Dakelh people of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun area reside in three main communities – Yekooche, Tache and Nak’azdli (Figure 3). Yekooche is located at North Arm on the west side of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and comprises four reserves with approximately 180 hectares of land. Until recently, the Yekoochet’en (“people of Yekooche”) were a part of the Stuart-
The Stuart-Templeur Lakes Band was the result of a 1959 Federal Government decision to amalgamate Tache, Pinche, Portage (Yekooche), Grand Rapids, and Middle River First Nations people into one all encompassing band. In 1994 the Portage Band separated and became known as Yekooche. The four remaining original bands today are still affiliated with one another, but are now called the Tl’azt’en Nation.

All of these communities are proactive in preserving their cultural heritage, attentive in developing diverse economic strategies and engaged in negotiating modern day treaties with the British Columbia and Canadian governments. The Tl’azt’en Nation works closely with the Nak’azdli First Nation on many levels. Nak’azdli, formerly known as Necoslie, is located at Fort St. James. Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli are further connected by a shared membership with the larger Carrier Sekani Tribal Council.

Doing Research

At the onset of this project I entered into a research accord with each of the Yekooche, Tl’azt’en, and Nak’azdli First Nations. This was primarily coordinated through each
community’s Band Council Office. As part of our mutual agreement, I was given permission to conduct my research on the lake, interview community members and utilize sources in the Tache and Nak’azdli libraries. Reciprocally, I am responsible for supplying copies of the interviews conducted during the fieldwork, providing the full results of the research and generating an additional version of this study that will be suitable for the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun First Nations elementary school curriculum.

Negotiating my own position within this research process entailed recognizing the reality of conducting research, as a non-Aboriginal person, in a First Nations community. I am all too aware of the fact that academics are often considered to be in a position to have their voices heard through journals and various other forms of media, while those collaborating in research projects are often left silent. Consequently, I realize that my very position as a researcher, albeit still as a student, affiliated with a university means that I am in a position already furnished with a certain amount of privilege. This is something I wanted to make certain did not get in the way of my learning and working in the community and interacting with people.

Working on this project provided me with unique and rewarding experiences. Not only was I given the opportunity to experience diverse, varied and optimistic work environments and conduct first hand rock art research, I had multiple opportunities to meet, speak with and listen to many remarkable Elders and others. The people I interviewed for this project welcomed me into their homes, took time to meet with me and they spoke from their hearts to me about rock art and the past. I arrived to most, if not all, of the interviews feeling extremely nervous and self conscious, but I left each and every one of them filled with a sense of appreciation and accomplishment. I was aware at every interview of the great
respect for the past each individual possessed. Without the knowledge, involvement and kindness of these people this project would not have been possible.

Throughout the research process, I exerted a conscious effort to ensure that people from each of the Yekooche, Tl'atz'en, and Nak'azdli communities were involved in the interview process. Having more time to speak with even more people would have been ideal and likely beneficial to the project and for the recording of cultural knowledge. However, the people who were interviewed undisputedly spoke of the rock art in terms of the same meaning. The consensus regarding the creation and use of the paintings was overwhelming. This project examines one small part of Dakelh culture and it does so at a very specific location. I do not intend this work to be representative of all pictograph creation and use throughout Dakelh territory, nor is it likely to be definitive of all pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, for all time. Rather, it describes two important aspects of rock art creation and use. Perhaps future research will reveal further levels of continuity in rock art production across time and space in Northern British Columbia, which forms part of the worldwide production of rock art.

**Indigenous People and Archaeology**

Archaeology in British Columbia is of direct relevance to the interests and heritage of First Nations peoples of the province today. Contemporary First Nations people have a connection to the people whose lives, actions and cultural practices are represented by the archaeological record. Despite this direct connection, First Nations people have, until very recently, been excluded from much of the archaeological process. Indigenous peoples around the world share in this history of exclusion (cf. Tuhiwai Smith 1999). This condition has
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2 I use the term First Nations to indicate the Aboriginal people of Canada while the term Indigenous has a broader context and refers to Aboriginal peoples from around the world, including the First Nations people.
frequently resulted in the generation of archaeological representations of the past that are of little relevance to contemporary Aboriginal people.

Given the connection and lineage that British Columbia First Nations people have to the societies being studied archaeologically, an interpretation of the past that is foreign to them is likely to be of questionable authenticity. Inclusion of First Nations’ voices and interpretations in archaeology creates understandings and constructions of the past that are likely to be more realistic and representative of past life-ways.

Cooperation between archaeologists and First Nations people is, of course, not assumed to be without complications. Archaeologists and First Nations people are likely to have different interests in the events of the past and different ideas about how to understand those events (cf. Nicholas and Andrews 1997). Contrasting world-views and opposing ideas about the treatment of human remains are potentially key sources of conflict between Western archaeologists and Indigenous peoples (Little 2002:6; see also Hoffmann 2000). It is important to recognize that while cooperation is desirable, it is more than a matter of dealing with differences of opinion. Archaeologists and Indigenous people come to this table of negotiation with completely different sets of experiences, histories and priorities regarding the purposes and effects of archaeology (cf. Smith and Wobst 2005).

In the past, the archaeologist, who was usually a man from the West, has had the balance of power tipped in his favour. Indigenous peoples throughout the world have experienced the archaeological pursuit of knowledge as one of the many layers of imperial and colonial power (Tuhiwai Smith 1999:2; see also Nicholas and Andrews 1997). Tuhiwai Smith (1999:2) notes that research itself (archaeology included) has been “a significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of
resisting the Other.” A balanced relationship, rather than one side having complete control, is needed in order for archaeology to be respectful, ethical and useful to all people (cf. Smith and Wobst 2005). The fact that both parties share a sincere interest in and concern for the past gives this relationship the potential to succeed.

Public Archaeology

Through archaeology we visit different times and different cultures, with some aspects similar to our own lives and others very different. In this exploration of sameness/difference we may come to see just how arbitrary and historically rooted are our own “universal truths” (M.P. Pearson 1993:227).

Archaeology is profoundly political, (Little 2002:6) rather than neutral, and therefore, it is laden with power. “Archaeology can empower local groups by supporting local identities and cultural heritage, but, it can also fuel ethnic nationalism and distort the past to serve dangerous political goals” (Little 2002:8). It is important to recognize this political nature because archaeology finds its way into mainstream society in a variety of influential ways. Archaeology takes form in magazines and books, the Internet, television programs, museums and school curricula. This intersection between archaeology and the public has a profound effect on how people view the past. Not only does archaeology provide the “discovery” of the past it serves to authenticate what we know about the past (Lipe 2002:20).

A great deal of credibility is attached to archaeology. This integrity is due in part to its scientific underpinnings and the objectivity that is believed to be inherent in scientific investigations. Archaeological sites, artifacts and interpretations have significant educational value (Little 2002:4). As a result, the authenticity that archaeology fosters leads to the establishment of public opinions regarding what is valuable and important about the past.
This sense of worth is more often than not bestowed unevenly onto the past. This imbalance is connected to the nature of the archaeological record and how research is disseminated.

All of humankind’s past is not patiently waiting to be discovered intact in the archaeological record. A multitude of conditions and characteristics, along with a certain amount of chance, are involved in the preservation and location of cultural remains. As a result, only portions of the past are actually retrieved or even retrievable. Even a smaller amount of what gets recovered through the processes of archaeology makes for good television or magazine articles. Consequently, the general public is typically exposed to aspects of the human past that can be presented as mysterious and flamboyant (cf. National Geographic, the Knowledge Network).

Academic journals in contrast, abound with details of site excavations containing less flashy and mystifying finds, such as, bone and stone fragments, broken pottery, and charred floral remains. The general public is less likely to be exposed to this type of archaeological data, instead, spectacular finds like mummified remains of ancient Egyptian kings fill television screens and the pages of magazines. The public, preoccupied with a sense of wonder and appreciation for the aesthetically pleasing and exotic images presented to them, develops a sense of what is interesting and typical about the past and its people, as well as, what is insignificant and unimportant, thus potentially fulfilling ethnocentric or even racist views of the “Other” in the past and the present.

To conduct archaeology is to give voice to the past (Kennedy 2002: xiii), therefore, it is a privilege that comes with responsibilities and obligations. In light of the recognition of the power embedded in archaeological research, practitioners are required to be mindful and respectful of their social and political roles (Little 2002:7). Archaeology is “serious business”
(Kennedy 2002: xiii) and what we learn about the past is as important as how we learn it. It is quickly becoming essential to the discipline that archaeologists embrace de-colonized methodologies and establish partnerships with Indigenous people, as well as, recognize the impact archaeological reconstructions of the past have on the public at large.

**Minding the Gap**

A gap exists in the way British Columbia rock art research has been done and what such endeavors aim to produce in the way of knowledge about the past. At Stuart Lake/Nak'yal Bun specifically, several records of the paintings have been compiled (cf. Corner 1968; Nankivell and Wyse 2003; Richards 1978). Despite this effort, we have yet to fulfill our obligations as archaeologists to move from curative to narrative roles and develop interpretations of meaning (cf. Little 2002). In British Columbia, archaeologists have an opportunity to advance their research in ways that are not always available to researchers in other parts of the world. Developing partnerships and cooperative strategies with British Columbia First Nations people creates opportunities to work with the descendants of the people whose culture is embedded in the archaeological record. A working relationship such as this has the potential to invigorate the results of research. This fact, along with the blessing of a rich body of ethnographic literature from which to draw, is what gives archaeology and, particularly rock art research in British Columbia, an advantage not always present in other parts of the world. This project endeavors just this – to develop a working relationship with the First Nations people of the area in order to generate a narrative of meaning and a sense of human agency regarding the Stuart Lake/Nak'yal Bun pictographs.

---

3 See Chapter 2 for a full discussion of previous works.
Today, the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, and elsewhere around the world, is endangered by natural erosion and vandalism. I feel a sense of urgency in contributing to the study of rock art because of this imperilment and to raise my voice in protest against the deliberate destruction of such a significant and fascinating part of the past. By recognizing the importance and interest of rock art as part of this land’s cultural history and imparting the results of this project onto a larger audience, it is my wish that this research also contribute to the recognition of the destructiveness of vandalism to rock art and contribute to the diminishment of such senseless actions.

**Summary**

In this introduction I have provided an overview of this research project and highlighted some fundamental acknowledgements and concerns. I have presented the importance of incorporating First Nations interpretations and viewpoints into the practice of archaeology, both for ethical and research-benefiting reasons. I have highlighted a need for the development of narratives of meaning and the recognition of human action as ways of approaching rock art research, along with my concern for vandalism to rock art.

I present a literature review of sources concerning rock art in North America in Chapter 2. Here I place a focus on British Columbia based rock art studies. I follow, in Chapter 3 with a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of this project. Set within a post-processual framework, I explore interpretive archaeology, landscape approaches and feminist perspectives. I discuss my research methods in Chapter 4 where I provide a “road-map” of the approaches I took to conduct this project. Chapter 5 is my journey of learning about the rock art. Here I present a series of narratives that discuss the meanings embedded in the rock
art landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Chapter 6 contains my final discussion and conclusions regarding the rock art and this thesis.
Chapter Two

LITERATURE REVIEW

A survey of the rock art literature for North America readily displays as much variation in the approaches taken to this subject as there is in the rock art itself. This is not a condition limited to the continent of North America, but rather, it is a world-wide actuality. John Beaton’s (1994) “Seven Ways of Seeing Rock Art” provides a glimpse into a variety of approaches to rock art research that spans North America, the South Pacific and Australia. This body of work, combined with a perusal of the plethora of literature concerning the rock art of Europe, Africa and South America, reveals the rich diversity of interests and motives associated with world-wide rock art research (cf. Chippindale and Tacon 1998; Clottes 2002; Clottes and Courtin 1992).

In North America, researchers have concerned themselves with understanding rock art sites in terms of inter and intra site associations, stylistic frequencies, regional variations, the age of images, authenticity of markings, the role gender plays in the production of motifs and the meaning embedded in rock art landscapes (cf. Chippindale and Tacon 1998). These heterogeneous research priorities demonstrate the innovative nature of the researchers, as well as the complexity of rock art as a subject of study.

As with other disciplines, rock art research has evolved in theory and method. Contemporary researchers benefit from the efforts of predecessors, and with each new generation alternative ideologies and techniques are employed. Anthropological and archaeological theoretical changes have greatly influenced the path rock art researchers have
followed. In particular, the transition from processual to post-processual theory and method marks a substantial change in the study of rock art.

Processual-based rock art studies are typically focused on understanding the technologies associated with marking, establishing relative and direct dating chronologies, recognizing motif repetition between and among sites, and developing rigorous scientific recording methods (cf. Bednarik 2001; Rowe 2001). In a processual framework of inquiry, social aspects of rock art, such as, human action and agency, are not contemplated. Bednarik (2001:2) goes so far as to say that a focus on the humanistic or non-scientific components of rock art is merely an example of “the time honored practice of inventing mythologies about rock art” and he calls for the termination of such practices in order to “glimpse some of the real potential of our discipline” (2001:2). It is unlikely that post-processualists would agree this is the best way to improve the discipline.

Post-processual oriented rock art studies operate within a humanistic paradigm where emphasis is placed on developing an understanding of rock art in terms of human activity and meaning (cf. Bradley 1997; Chippindale and Nash 2004). Efforts are spent discussing rock art within particular cultural contexts and offering motif interpretations (cf. Schaasfma 1980; Vastokas and Vastokas 1973). Phenomenology is common to this paradigm, and researchers embed themselves in the text along with the people of the past. Landscape approaches work favorably toward developing humanistic portrayals of the past, where physical places emerge as teeming with cognitive and emotive meanings (cf. Tilley 1994).

Despite the obvious differences rooted in these two approaches, several issues remain shared and inherent in both paradigms — recognition and concern for the effects of natural
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4 The culture histories associated with Traditional archaeology share a similar focus on the more descriptive aspects of rock art research.
erosion and vandalism to rock art (cf. Bednarik 2001; Chippindale and Tacon 1998) and the concern to practice extensive and reliable recording methods that ensure the possibility of future study (cf. Chippindale and Tacon 1998). Notwithstanding the theoretical direction rock art research has taken, investigators have presented valiant efforts to describe, record and understand a part of the archaeological record that continues to enchant and bemuse academics and the public alike.

To fully appreciate the current condition of rock art studies in any given area, the path that researchers have carved over the years must be considered. The following literature review is offered as an effort to provide a reflection on the history and development of rock art research primarily in British Columbia. Literary works pertaining to Canada and North America will also be considered. Because of the focus of this study particular emphasis and effort will be spent discussing British Columbia rock art texts. This section is intended to be descriptive in nature while providing an introduction to rock art research.

British Columbia rock art studies first appear, almost buried, inside detailed accounts of Native life (cf. Morice 1893; Teit 1900, 1927/28). During the latter part of the 19th century much effort was spent gathering and recording information about First Nations culture and society. We find the first recognition and inquiry into rock art embedded in these early works. It is not until quite some time later that rock art emerges as a study in its own right.

Father Morice who, according to Wilson Duff (1964:1), “dominated the [study of the] northern interior of British Columbia” between 1885 and 1903 was the first to comment on Carrier pictographs. Morice’s (1892-93) publication, “Notes on the Western Dene” contains descriptions and hand drawn illustrations of some of the pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Information regarding the rock paintings appears as one section among many that are
devoted to the presentation of facts and information concerning the culture of the Western
Dene people. Morice (1892-93:206) comments that rock markings were often the result of
dreams and therefore, laden with a protective power for the dreamer/painter. His focus lies
almost exclusively on imagery rather than detailed aspects concerning the authors or the
processes associated with painting.

Morice (1893) dedicates a similar level of attention to rock art in “Notes Archaeological,
Industrial and Sociological on the Western Dene.” But, here he presents the rock art in
conjunction with other systems of communication and decoration, such as, bent sticks
associated with hunting (cf. Figure 39, p. 121) and with facial and bodily tattoos (1893:209-
211; cf. Figure 34, p. 116 and Figure 35, p. 117). This body of work tends to favour the more
utilitarian aspects of rock painting rather than the spiritual focus of his previous work.

Morice’s literary concerns and career pursuits were oriented around the acquisition of his
own superiority and the benefits that accompany such a position. Mulhall (1986) writes
extensively of Morice’s desire for attention, influence and dominance in Will to Power: The
Missionary Career of Father Morice. Mulhall portrays Morice as paternalistic in his attitude
toward the Aboriginal populations and as insubordinate toward his superiors. Through this
account of Morice’s career we understand him to have sought a missionary posting as a way
of gaining independence and power that would have not been possible had he remained in
Europe.

For Morice, the rock art formed only one portion of Native life, and therefore, only one
small part of his own expansive knowledge. As such, it did not warrant individual attention.
The minimal consideration he pays to rock art in these two texts is in keeping with his larger
interests and career aspirations. Nevertheless, Morice’s work, here and elsewhere, abounds with cultural details that provide an insight into the past that is of incalculable value.

Harlan I. Smith, the leading archaeologist for the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, has written a multitude of anthropological and archaeological texts (cf. 1897, 1900, 1910). His work, beginning in the late 1800s and progressing well into the 20th century, provides rich cultural details concerning North American Native societies. Smith made a comprehensive effort to account for all facets of Native life. In a similar fashion to Morice, Smith presents cultural overviews that contain staggering amounts of valuable information.

At times, Smith breaks with the custom of documenting Native culture in its completeness in favour of one specialized aspect of society. In “A List of Petroglyphs in British Columbia” (1927a) Smith takes the time to recognize the presence of rock art in the province. This text contains the location of over 50 petroglyph sites along the coast and in the interior of British Columbia. Information beyond that of site location for these petroglyphs is absent in Smith’s work – clearly his aim was focused on presenting an inventory of known and speculated locations for petroglyphs in the province.

Smith (1927b) takes a closer look at a particular rock art site in “A Pictograph on the Lower Skeena River, British Columbia.” In this article, Smith describes in detail the location and content of a single pictograph panel. Unfamiliar at the time, this site is the now well-known portrait of Chief Legaik painted in the 1880s by Lequate, a Tsimpshian artist (Lundy 1983:93). Operating from a self-appointed position of authority, Smith (1927b:612) takes it on himself to cut down the alder and spruce trees growing in front of the painting so as to allow “photographing all of it and to make it entirely visible from passing trains.”
Based on the depiction of coppers within the painting, Smith postulates a wealth-based meaning for the pictograph. Despite his efforts to consult local Natives and non-Aboriginals regarding the painting, he presents very little information beyond descriptive details about the rock art panel. Smith suggests the site be designated either a provincial or national monument as a way of ensuring its preservation.

James Teit, also a member of the Jesup North Pacific Expedition and a contemporary of Smith, has authored many works that provide in-depth facts of Native life for groups occupying the southern portions of the province. In a similar fashion to Morice, Teit (1900) provides details regarding the many aspects of Thompson culture in *The Thompson Indians of British Columbia*. His painstaking attention to detail is based largely on personal experience and insight gained through his affiliation with the Thompson Nation, along with sound ethnographic research.

From Teit’s efforts we learn about rock art in a ritualistic manner, whereby adolescents painted rock surfaces as part of purification and vision ceremonies (Teit 1900: 311-321, 354-356, 388-392). Teit makes it clear that one cannot comprehend the pictographs of the Thompson Nation without a consideration of the aspects of culture to which the images are connected. This body of work does much to promote, highlight and inform us of the intricacies of Native life at the turn of the 20th century.

Interestingly, it is prior to this work, rather than after, that Teit (1896) opted for a close look at rock art in “A Rock Painting of the Thompson River Indians, British Columbia.” Here he delves into the condition of a painted boulder at Spence’s Bridge. Teit (1896:227) utilizes the knowledge of Waxtko, a female elder, who attests to the practice of painting in conjunction with girls’ purification ceremonies. But, despite his access to Waxtko and her
first hand experience at painting, Teit disregards the process of painting and focuses exclusively on describing and identifying the images painted onto the boulder. This is a brief, but informative paper which abounds with first-hand Native interpretations of the painted markings.

Continuing with cultural studies, Teit (1927/28) provides another in-depth look at Native life in “Salishan Tribes of the Western Plateau.” This ethnography considers the Coeur D’Alene, Okanagan and Flathead Indians — no mention of rock art practices are noted for the Flathead. This text is as thorough, informative and as well illustrated as has become expected of Teit.

Here Teit discusses the practices of rock painting for both the Coeur D’Alene and Okanagan people in terms of rites of passage. He reports that male initiates painted for the purposes of acquiring guardian spirits through vision quests (1927/28:194) and that female initiates painted to ensure strength and skills for life’s duties (1927/1928:282-283). In addition to the ritual related nature of rock painting, images seen in dreams and aspects of recent battles were also depicted onto rock surfaces (1927/28:194). In both cases, ritual and otherwise, the rock art images, once created, function to transmit power to the creator both during and after the painting process (1927/28:194; 282-283).

Franz Boas’ (1955) work, *Primitive Art*, takes an in-depth look at the fundamental traits of world-wide Aboriginal art. Boas provides an analytical description of a wide variety of art works. He pays particular attention to the art of the North Pacific Coast of North America. Surprisingly, Boas’ attention to rock art is meager at best. Paleolithic pictographs are briefly mentioned in a discussion of symmetry (1955:32) and more recent rock paintings are scantily included in a section regarding style (1955:166-167). The minor attention paid to rock art
does little to bring awareness to this aspect of the archaeological record. Readers are, however, made acutely aware that when speaking of Plains Indian rock art, Boas is of the opinion that “their pictography never rises to the dignity of an art” (Dewdney and Kidd 1967:19).

Elsewhere in Canada, efforts to record and understand pictographs and petroglyphs were proceeding in a similar fashion to the work being done in British Columbia. Late 19th century efforts were spent describing and identifying locations of rock art sites newly discovered by European enthusiasts. “Pictograph fever,” as Selwyn Dewdney (1977:1) put it, was well on its way to becoming an epidemic.

An early concern for recording sites en-mass appears in “Picture Writing of the American Indians” (Mallery 1893). The author, Garrick Mallery, presents a “voluminous survey of picture-writing in North America” (Dewdney 1977:1). Published and presented to the United States Bureau of Ethnology, this text contained only a few Canadian sources, and as such, it “gave no hint of how rich a resource of [Aboriginal] rock art lay waiting discovery in Canada” (Dewdney 1977:1).

Texts concerning the rock art of Aboriginal Canada compounded as time progressed. Interpretations – religious and secular alike – were put forth in the coming decades (cf. Dewdney 1963, 1964; Dewdney and Kidd 1967; Habgood 1967). Rock art, as an avenue of inquiry independent of larger more-encompassing cultural studies was well on its way to becoming a disciplinary study by the 1960s. For the most part, researchers upheld the traditions put forth by Morice, Smith and Teit in that effort was spent reproducing and identifying the locations of stone markings.
Reports and articles from this era provide details regarding the location of rock art sites, hand drawn illustrations, possible interpretations and speculations regarding age. Stylistic frequencies were developed for various sectors of the country (cf. Grant 1967) and rock art was studied and organized according to geographic location and Native affiliation (cf. Maurer and Whelan 1977; Meade 1971).

Gjessing (1967) considers petroglyphs and pictographs on the coastline and in the interior of British Columbia in terms of common motifs and stylistic patterns in, “Petroglyphs and Pictographs in British Columbia.” Gjessing discusses cultural similarities between interior groups like the Chilcotin, Salish and Carrier peoples and hints that rock art traditions are also likely to be shared. His conclusions favour carvings in stone as generally being older than paintings. His findings are based on his observations that petroglyphs along the coast lack the European influences found in interior pictographs.

For Gjessing’s research area his conclusion is rational. However, his survey did not encompass the rock art assemblage of the coastline in its entirety. The European sailing vessels depicted in stone at Clo-oose, an outer-coastal village site on Vancouver Island, provides an opportunity to counter Gjessing’s conclusions. Perhaps for the areas considered in his assessment a general trend exists that supports the notion petroglyphs are likely to be older than pictographs. Even so, Gjessing’s work keeps the rock art conversation going by thoughtfully considering style, technology and chronology. Gjessing’s efforts to categorize the rock art in terms of chronology and to develop an appreciation for the development of techniques over time are understandable. This effort is a prime example of the overwhelming human need to organize and understand enigmatic phenomena in ways that
help us comprehend the unfamiliar. His concerns here seem to be based on the security associated with scientific classificatory schemes.


Issues such as paint preparation, application techniques, form, style and content are discussed at length. Set within the context of Boas’ distinction between form and content, the authors favour the opinion that “the [A]boriginal artist was groping toward the expression of the magical aspect of his life, rather than taking pleasure in the world of form around him” (1967:20). It is evident that Dewdney and Kidd are of the mind that the painters’ interest in content overrides the interest in form. They attribute the observed trend to “distort” images from a natural state to that of “fantasy” as being connected to the importance many Aboriginal peoples place on dream images (1967:20).

Dewdney and Kidd (1967) offer an anthropological examination of the rock art sites they consider. They pay respect to the Aboriginal painters and their traditions, as well as local contemporary Natives’ knowledge of the land and the rock art. They acknowledge that the paintings can only be understood in the “broadest of terms” and that motives for painting differ greatly between the many Aboriginal groups world-wide (1967:18).

Of the many rock art studies that followed, John Comer’s (1968) *Pictographs: Indian Rock Paintings in the Interior of British Columbia* is of particular interest. This publication sets precedence for future work in the province for years to come. Its methodology and
content transcends time (cf. Jones 1981). Corner (1968) focuses his attention on providing hand drawn illustrations, detailed descriptions and minor interpretations for more than 100 pictograph sites – complete with explicit directions regarding location.

On occasion, Corner (1968) draws from early ethnographies and incorporates information from Teit’s and Morice’s work along with his own knowledge of the province. What he does not do is highlight the importance of incorporating the views of local First Nations people into his interpretations. Corner’s work is both valuable and informative and many researchers have relied heavily on it (cf. Keyser 1992; York et al. 1993). Similar efforts to record and describe paintings were conducted by others, but it is more likely than not that Corner’s work is referenced in most rock art studies conducted after 1968.

In the decade that followed, many archaeological permits were issued by the provincial government of British Columbia pertaining to sites containing rock art (McMurdo 1989). A majority of the permits issued were initiated out of concerns for salvage operations due to construction (McMurdo 1971), economic expansion (McMurdo 1989: 183-234) and preservation (cf. Brand 1975; Brand and Lundy 1974). However, information pertaining to rock paintings continued to be limited to descriptive accounts (cf. Hobler 1978; McMurdo 1971; Meade 1971). The tendency, as laid out by Corner, to catalogue rock art sites and focus on form, size, colour and location is one that does not sway for many years (cf. Baravalle 1977, 1978, 1981; Hill and Hill 1973).

In keeping with this sentiment and the desire to establish inventories of rock art, the British Columbia Provincial Museum, beginning in 1974, set out to systematically record all petroglyphs in the province. Many petroglyphs were selected for casting and the replicas were to be housed in the Museum’s new Archaeology and Ethnology galleries. At the
project’s completion, the following year, 30 petroglyph casts had been selected for display (Brand and Lundy 1974:1). To its credit, the museum solicited the approval of all First Nations on whose traditional territory the petroglyphs resided (Brand and Lundy 1974:1). The importance of forming inventories of rock art remains a priority that continues on into the coming years.

Expanding on the practice of developing rock art inventories, Beth Hill (1978) contemplates several petroglyph sites along the West Coast of North America in, Guide to Indian Rock Carvings of the Pacific Northwest Coast, in terms of potential age and reasons for creation. Based on a consideration of motif style and content, Hill (1978:17-22) postulates a variety of possible ages for the markings. Myths associated with the creation of petroglyphs are offered as a way of understanding the images and the reasons for their conception. Powers invested in the petroglyphs by shamans are discussed by her as playing an important role in ensuring adequate rainfall and the seasonal return of salmon. Hill’s efforts are also spent providing descriptions of the images and site locations, as well as highlighting the need for protection and conservation.

In an effort to go beyond the purely descriptive accounts of rock art, which made up the majority of the existing body of knowledge at this time, Doris Lundy (1974) offers, The Rock Art of the Northwest Coast. Her efforts take the form of a stylistic frequency base from which to understand and categorize petroglyphs and pictographs within British Columbia. The petroglyphs of the coastline are highlighted and presented in terms of marking territory in a similar fashion as crests and carvings. Lundy’s endeavor marks the beginnings of a transition in British Columbia rock art research and her style scheme is still relevant today.
Nick Gessler’s (1979) excavation of a burial cave containing the then only known pictographs on the Queen Charlotte Islands also stands in contrast to the established norms of rock art research at that time. His work and that of Lundy (1975) conducted on Protection Island, both exhibit efforts to link rock art with data recovered through traditional archeological field techniques and excavations. Lundy (1975:1) says of her excavation, “the project was somewhat unusual in British Columbia archaeology, as it marked the first time a controlled excavation was conducted in midden deposits partially overlying a petroglyph.”

A similar divergence from the more empiricist approach typically associated with rock art study is illustrated in Sacred Art of the Algonkians: A Study of the Peterborough Petroglyphs (1973). Vastokas and Vastokas (1973) highlight the shamanistic aspects of Canadian Shield rock art as they discuss Algonkian territory and material culture in conjunction with a petroglyph site. Already protected by a chain link fence, the Peterborough rock art site is interpreted as a meeting point between upper and lower worlds. The motifs themselves are determined to be the representations of “hidden meanings in nature whose significance it has been the shaman’s task to conjure up and capture on stone” (1973:142).

LaVan Martineau (1973) opts for a completely different approach to the study of rock art imagery in The Rocks Begin to Speak. Martineau, raised in the Paiute tribe of Utah, utilizes his knowledge of Native sign and spoken languages and his training in cryptography to read rock art iconography in Washington County, Utah. Martineau denounces pictographs and petroglyphs as forms of art and presents the practice of stone marking as a form of written communication. He provides a detailed analogy for each of the symbols he deciphers in a clear and rational manner, allowing the reader to follow his logic. From this text we learn about real-life events for several Native tribes, and as such we cannot help but contemplate
the individuals of the past, as well as the system of communication made evident by Martineau’s decryption.

Martineau (1973) deciphers stone markings under a three stage premise. First, the science of cryptanalysis is the only science with which Indian markings can be deciphered. Second, if a system of communication is consistent it can be deciphered, regardless of complexity or simplicity. Third, a communication system possesses a self-proving or translation-testing element that can support or disprove an interpretation. Martineau’s work contributes a unique perspective to our considerations of rock art by offering a linguistic understanding of petroglyphs and pictographs.

Returning to the more traditional approach to the study of rock art, Thomas Richards (1978) offers “A Pictograph Survey of Southeast Stuart Lake, British Columbia.” Richards (1978), then an undergraduate student at the Cariboo College in Kamloops, conducted a pictograph survey of the southeast end of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Richards’ approach emphasizes description, illustration and interpretation of 21 pictograph panels. He compares images between sites and notes stylistic similarities for the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and Takla Lake rock art assemblages. He classifies the paintings according to zoomorphic, anthropomorphic, and geometric designs. Interpretations lie almost exclusively with the author and he says the paintings “marginally conform to the Interior Rock Art Style” (Richards 1978:1) set out by Lundy (1974) and he makes an inferred connection to coastal styles.

Lundy’s system for determining and understanding rock art style, first laid out in 1974, appears again as part of a prehistoric art symposium held at Simon Fraser University in 1976. Published several years later as Indian Art Traditions of the Northwest Coast (1983) it
contains a condensed version of Lundy’s original work on style. Interestingly, this publication clearly categorizes pictographs and petroglyphs as art forms rather than the language/communication system put forth by Martineau (1973) a few years earlier.

By 1977, the Canadian Rock Art Research Associates, a group of professional and non-professional rock art enthusiasts, had met officially for the fourth time. *CARA '77* (Lundy 1979), the outcome of this conference, presents the then current condition and concerns of rock art research in Canada. Work up until this time was largely driven by method and void of theory. Analogy, at this time, was not acknowledged and very little, if any, time was spent contemplating process or agency.

Researchers were preoccupied with recording and preserving images so much so that descriptions became not a means to an end, but rather, the end itself (cf. Bentley and Bentley 1981). It is as though researchers were preparing for new approaches and innovative conceptual frameworks yet to come by collecting as much raw data as possible (cf. Leen 1984). Perhaps they realized that in general rock art research efforts stopped short of offering sound understandings of the markings and the past life-ways to which they were connected. Nevertheless, it is the work of these individuals that enables the continuation of rock art studies into the next decades and onto today’s investigations.

Shortly after the original inception of the Canadian Rock Art Research Associates (CRARA) in 1969, an American counterpart was established. The American Rock Art Research Association (ARARA) founded its 1974 constitution in a similar manner to that of CRARA (Wellmann 1979:375). Organized out of a concern for inter-regional research cooperation, the ARARA vowed to promote the advancement of rock art research in the
United States in a manner that would enhance the protection and preservation of sites, while providing an opportunity for public education (Wellmann 1979:376).

As with any formal organization, ARARA suffered from growing pains and the differences of opinion often found in group settings. Its diverse membership – professionals and amateurs alike – however, were able to organize several symposia and publish a variety of volumes by the time ARARA was into its third year. Despite the differences of opinion between members, that at times “irritated the spinal nerves of those of the other,” (Wellmann 1979:378) ARARA was committed to strengthening the tie between rock art and archaeology. As a result of its growing professionalism, ARARA branched out quickly into new territories and its inception saw the eventual extinguishment of smaller regional-based organizations (Wellmann 1979:378).

Formulated as a professional national organization, ARARA undoubtedly influenced up-and-coming American researchers. Texts that followed the establishment of ARARA shared a similar commitment to bridging the gap between archaeology and rock art. Schaafsma (1980) discusses rock art in an anthropological manner in *Indian Rock Art of the Southwest*. In her examination of the prehistoric rock art of southwestern United States, Schaafsma (1980) highlights the typically neglected position rock art maintains in archaeological inquires. She positions the rock art directly into the archaeological record by emphasizing its in-situ nature and the uniqueness and value of information that is associated with primary context.

Archaeology’s concern for expanding our understandings of past life-ways is made evident by Jane Young’s *Signs from the Ancestors: Zuni Cultural Symbolism and Perceptions of Rock Art* (1988). Young presents the rock art of the American southwest in
the context of traditional Zuni cosmology, and in doing so she enlightens us about the past. Her efforts provide a glimpse into the underlying structure of traditional Zuni worldview. In conjunction with a focus on past life-ways, Young incorporates contemporary concerns and wishes of Zuni Elders as they discuss the cultural changes witnessed in younger generations.

Many of the rock art studies in Canada and the United States at this time organized and segregated rock art sites according to current day geographical boundaries – usually based on provincial, county or state borders (cf. Crosby 1997). As time progressed, researchers were want to draw conclusions that transcended these boundaries and cross-border similarities in style and content were sought. Eventually, these geographic borders gave way to considerations of traditional Native territories and researchers organized and presented rock art studies on larger scales.

With a sound background of knowledge regarding the abundance of rock art in British Columbia, researchers forged ahead with continuing enthusiasm. During the next few decades, articles and books attested to the continued persistence of rock art researchers. Keyser (1992), a professional archaeologist, contemplates the rock art of British Columbia in a context that expanded its provincial boundaries in *Indian Rock Art of the Columbia Plateau*.

Keyser (1992) considers a variety of themes for the rock art of the Columbia Plateau area and he notes a remarkable homogeneity across the region in terms of form, function and style. He draws parallels between the Columbia Plateau rock art assemblage and that of the Canadian Shield. The geographic areas of the plateau also serve as the boundaries for the regional variants he presents.
Keyser (1992) acknowledges that the public are more often than not excluded from rock art publications and as such they are left to their own devices for understanding pictographs and petroglyphs, a strategy that often results in erroneous and skewed understandings. Keyser offers this text as a remedy for this situation. His work responds effectively to the call of his predecessors and their shouts for the inclusion of traditional knowledge, ethnography and the inclusion of Native voices in rock art studies (cf. Haggerty and Inglis 1984; Hill and Hill 1973).

A few years later Keyser teamed up with Michael Klassen, also an archaeologist, to consider the rock art of Colorado, Alberta and the western Dakotas in Plains Indian Rock Art (2001). Here Keyser and Klassen discuss a multitude of rock art sites in terms of vision quests, battles, ceremonies and day-to-day activities. In addition to discussing technique, style, dating and offering interpretations, they provided an overview of the rich natural and archaeological history of the northwestern area.

Even though the benefits of cross-border examinations were beginning to be recognized, not all research efforts at this time favored broader geographic and cultural considerations. Researchers did, however, continue building on the work of their predecessors and new angles from which to approach the study of rock art were put forth.

Francis and Loendorf demonstrated the building-block nature of rock art research in Ancient Visions: Petroglyphs and Pictograph from the Wind River and Bighorn Country, Wyoming and Montana (1998). Francis and Loendorf examine grand themes, such as the shamanistic hypotheses (cf. Inglis 1998; Rajnovich 1994) and neuropsychological models, presented by Lewis-Williams (1986) for upper Paleolithic art in Europe, as a way of situating their work. Here Francis and Loendorf acknowledged the problems associated with rock art
dating and they highlighted issues related to the development of stylistic schemata. In this work, they exert considerable effort to expand and improve these aspects of rock art research.

A unique approach to the study of rock art, is presented in They Write Their Dreams on the Rock Forever: Rock Writings in the Stein River Valley, British Columbia (1993). Annie York’s (York et al. 1993) contribution to the interpretations offered for the pictographs along the Stein River has a special significance not typically found in previous research efforts. York, a Native elder, offers interpretations based on her experience and intimate knowledge with ‘Nlaka’pamux (Thompson) symbolism and rock painting practices. The audience gains an understanding into ‘reading’ the images within the ‘Nlaka’pamux world-view. This is not to say that ‘Nlaka’pamux fluency is obtainable for the reader, but an understanding of the complexity of the images is gained.

Information regarding the purpose behind the paintings is attributed to shamanism, puberty ceremonies and dreams. This body of rock art research is particularly indispensable especially since the Stein River contains one of the largest rock art sites in Canada (York et al. 1993). Local Native input had largely been missing from rock art analysis since the days of Morice and Teit; this text illustrates the level to which rock art can be better understood when contemporary First Nations’ input is utilized.

Shamanism and dream-related origins of rock art appear again in studies of the Canadian Shield area. This time, shamanism, associated with rock art thought to contain healing powers, is presented in Interpreting the Indian Rock Paintings of the Canadian Shield (Rajnovich 1994). Here, we learn about the efforts of shamans to summon spiritual help and appeal for aid in times of crisis. The rock art images Rajnovich examines are believed to be the shamans’ “memories of the manitous who reached out to help so long ago” (1994:16).
Rajnovich discusses the pictographs of the shield area in terms of picture writing, rather than as a form of art per se. This approach is drawn from the similarities she notes between picture writing and sign language. To her credit, Rajnovich examines, in detail, picture writing as it appears in other aspects of Algonkian culture—such as on bark scrolls and songs, body decoration and basket designs—as a way of interpreting and understanding the rock art iconography. This approach provides a logical and acceptable rationale for the interpretations she offers.

Joy Inglis (1998) presents the petroglyphs of Quadra Island in *Spirit in Stone*. In addition to the inclusion of site location and motif imagery, Inglis discusses the petroglyphs in terms of their connection to salmon spawning areas, puberty rites and shamanistic activities. She advocates for an understanding of Aboriginal culture as the way to fully appreciate rock art and that rock art studies are not complete without the direct participation and permission of local First Nations people. She offers her appreciation of coastal petroglyphs by emphasizing the magic, spirituality and beauty of the images.

Judith Williams (2001) documents a newly created pictograph on the Kingcome River, British Columbia in *Two Wolves at the Dawn of Time: Kingcome Inlet Pictographs, 1893-1998*. Williams accompanies Marianne Nicolson, a Dzawada’enuxw artist, as she paints a giant-sized copper at a traditional rock art site. The new painting, located near to an historic pictograph panel, is the first painting in the inlet to be made in over 60 years.

The historically significant pictographs that Williams examines depicts a 1927 potlatch conducted during the time that the Department of Indian Affairs had declared a ban on all Native ceremonies. Williams provides historical details surrounding the creation of the 1927 panel in such a manner that readers learn of the early tensions between Aboriginals and
settlers – and of Native resilience. Williams blends her experience of the contemporary painting project with that of Nicolson’s and the many band members who participated and observed the painting process. Human agency, past and present, is made evident throughout this book as we learn about the lives of real people.

Peter Johnson (1999) demonstrates a similar interest in history as he takes an interesting and informative approach to presenting the petroglyphs of Clo-oose in *Glyphs and Gallows: The Rock Art of Clo-oose and the Wreck on the John Bright*. The petroglyphs along the outer rim of Vancouver Island are presented as part of coastal history and a long tradition of petroglyph art. The author weaves his personal experiences of finding and appreciating the site with the history of contact between Aboriginal people and Europeans.

We learn much about the early histories of interaction between these two peoples in terms of economic and trading activities. The tragedy of the *John Bright*, a British sailing vessel, is told through a presentation of early 18th and 19th century Russian, Spanish and British economic interests in this part of the world. A profound sense of wrong-doing on the part of Europeans, and the corresponding atrocities experienced by Native populations are what Johnson uses to set the stage for a better understanding of the intentions behind the petroglyphs at Clo-oose.

Johnson’s historical account of the shipwreck details the events that led up to the tragedy, as well as the actions that occurred as a result of it. The *John Bright* sank at sea as a result of notoriously bad weather, yet the Europeans, present at the time, chose to blame the local Natives. As a direct result of European prejudice, two Native men were hung for their alleged participation in the sinking of the *John Bright* and for atrocities believed to cause the death of the crew and passengers.
Johnson discusses the carved images of European sailing vessels as functioning to remind us – Native and non-Aboriginal alike – of this wrong doing. He interprets the rock art site not as a location of residency, resource-use or vision-quest, but as a place where Native people came to record their histories. His interest in the site includes its physical shape – which he considers largely to be associated with femaleness. Johnson notes both female and male figures at this site and he identifies a “sexual tension” (1999:185) between these figures. Johnson indicates that the female figures depicted at this site are connected to rites performed by female shamans and he presents the area as a sanctuary of sorts, laden with sexual power, along with the real life events associated with the John Bright.

One of the more recent publications concerning rock art in British Columbia, Exploring B.C.’s Pictographs: A Guide to Native Rock Art in the British Columbia Interior (Nankivell and Wyse 2003) provides details as to the location of over 250 pictographs sites in British Columbia’s interior. Readers are encouraged to follow the directions and the GPS waypoints provided to discover the “fascinating display…of hidden archaeological treasures” (Nankivell and Wyse 2003:4).

Written very much in the style of John Corner (1968), attention is placed solely on site location and motif form. This catalogue of sites is successful at recording a portion of the known rock art in the province. In doing so, this text pays attention to aspects of British Columbia’s pre-history and history that are usually missing from considerations of the past. But more importantly, this book has caused alarm throughout many First Nations communities in the province.

Its release has been met with less than favorable attention by many of the province’s Aboriginal communities. Permission to publish this text was never sought nor granted by any
of the Bands who are connected to the rock art sites (Bellet, Vancouver Sun {VS}, 5 September 2003). Understandably so, many Band councils and Native communities became increasingly concerned about the potential for vandalism and intrusion into their traditional territories after the release of this publication. The Upper Smilkameen Band, for example, organized an official boycott of bookstores carrying this title (VS, 5 September 2003) and other communities became concerned with information sharing and closed their libraries to non-Band members.

Action in the form of publishing without consent does nothing to strengthen the relationship between First Nations people and the non-Aboriginal sector. On the contrary, this type of conduct perpetuates the marginal position that First Nations people and voices have typically occupied in rock art literature, as well as in so many other aspects of post contact society.

Conversely, Erica Ball provides an example of research that respects and acknowledges First Nations’ claim to the land and traditions in Anlagasimdeex: The History of a Gitxsan Settlement (2004). A blending of ethnography, archaeology and history come together in her work to generate an understanding of a Gitxsan petroglyph site in terms of real people’s lives, past and present. Through Ball’s efforts, the audience learns about Gitxsan sense of identity through traditional houses, stories and territories.

Through an exploration into the traditional practice of Gitxsan re-location a history of the rock art site is developed. According to Ball (2004), village residency is superceded in importance by the relationship Gitxsan people have to a territory. This has direct relevance to the rock art site in terms of its continued meaning despite its abandonment. The inclusion of narratives allows individuals to be visible. Ball portrays the story of a people and their land
through a consideration of the rock art that acknowledges human action and agency and respects traditional Native ways of life.

**Summary**

The continent of North America contains a vast amount of rock art and an equally voluminous amount of publications are available for perusal. Considering the sheer magnitude of books and articles available, a consideration here of *all* of the literature pertaining to rock art in North America is not feasible. The texts chosen for this review were selected as a way of illustrating the development and changes over time to the study of rock art across a large geographic and cultural area. This approach has endeavored to highlight British Columbia rock art research and to place it in a broader context, with the intention of fostering a sense of familiarity with North American rock art research.

From this synoptic literature survey it is evident that, like the rest of North America, British Columbia possesses a diverse and varied rock art research background. Through the efforts and perseverance of researchers over the years, it is now possible to understand the rock art of the province in a variety of ways – as being directly connected to spirituality and the acquisition of power (cf. Morice 1892-93), as visual representations of dreams and the activities associated with rites of passage (cf. Teit 1896, 1900; York et al. 1993), as unique and often ambiguous motif designs (Richards 1978), in groupings based on stylistic frequencies (cf. Lundy 1974), as forms of communication (cf. Morice 1893), as testaments to Native traditions and identity (cf. Ball 2004) and as places worthy of our time and attention (cf. Corner 1968; Smith 1927a).
Yet, despite all of this effort what we really understand about British Columbia rock art remains somewhat superficial. Our present understanding of the meanings embedded in rock art sites is limited. We know very little about the social processes involved in the formation of the paintings and the use of rock art after it was created. We know even less about the painters and their audiences. I see the work of the researchers discussed here, and others not mentioned, not as falling short of offering information of value but rather as providing a spring board or an advantageous position from which to continue studying rock art.

It is from this summary of rock art publications that I move into the next chapter where I will present the theoretical standpoints I believe have a contribution to make to the study of rock art. I will argue that landscape-based approaches offer a suitable body of theory and method that has the potential to enhance rock art research in British Columbia. In addition to a consideration of the merits offered by landscape theory, I will discuss feminist approaches and interpretive archaeology in the same light.
Chapter Three
THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Introduction

In this section I introduce some of the problems associated with rock art research in British Columbia and I acknowledge quandaries often related to “representation” in archaeological reconstructions of the past. I identify the marginalization of the study of rock art within the discipline of archaeology and a preoccupation with motifs as areas in need of attention. With respect to archaeological reconstructions, I highlight the influence that ethnic and gender biases often exert in representations of the past.

In response to these conditions, I present rock art as an avenue of archaeological inquiry that is capable of contributing to our understanding of past life-ways, and as such, it warrants a more distinguished position within archaeology. When discussing the viability of rock art research I consider the current fixation on rock art motifs as one of importance, but highlight the need to incorporate a broader point of view, one that encompasses the surrounding terrain, the images and the image-makers. I maintain the position that feminist scholarship in archaeology is well suited to dealing with biases evident in representations of past societies, as well as in generating dialogues of meaning. I explore the ability of rock art research to inform us about the past through a post-processual theoretical context where interpretive archaeology, feminist archaeology and landscape studies provide the perspectives and practices necessary to generating meaningful discussions of rock art.
Rock Art Research in British Columbia and Archaeological Reconstructions

Hundreds of prehistoric and historic paintings created by British Columbia’s Native peoples are scattered throughout the province. Ancient images painted in varying shades of red ochre have been adorned onto lakeshore cliffs, riverside boulders and caves. Much effort has been spent recording and describing these images, but because of its time consuming and subjective nature, along with dating and interpretive difficulties, rock art research in the province does not always receive the same professional academic attention paid to other aspects of the archaeological record. In short, rock art research is marginalized within the larger discipline of archaeology (cf. Hays-Gilpin 2004).

Much of the information that has been gathered regarding rock art in British Columbia is due to the efforts of amateur enthusiasts with a variety of motivations, interests and ethics (cf. Corner 1968; Nankivell and Wyse 2003). Many of the archaeological inquiries into areas that contain rock art are the result of impact assessments and salvage operations with non-pictograph related priorities (cf. McMurdo 1989). Professional acknowledgement of rock paintings in British Columbia typically does not exceed description or minor attempts at low-level interpretation. Such research endeavors exhibit priorities that are often given to developing stylistic and chronological sequencing where focus falls exclusively on the images. In this manner, rock art research is reflective of archaeology’s culture history approach.

This narrow field of view leaves the potential sources of information at the rock art site and the surrounding area untapped – this conduct serves to isolate rock art from the site itself, from the rest of the archaeological record, and from the surrounding natural topography. This habit typically works to displace images and deconstruct panels, thereby, rendering rock
art not as the feature it is, but as the (displaced) portable artifact it is not (Bradley et al. 1994:374).

Without knowledge of association and spatial location, artifacts lose vital details necessary to creating a valid sense of the past (cf. Hester et al. 1997). Provenience and spatial context are of primary concern in archaeological endeavors, but oddly enough these fundamental concerns are not usually associated with rock art research in British Columbia. This condition results in a loss of context and therefore, a loss of information, which in turn acts to compromise the rigor of rock art research.

Through the exclusive emphasis on images alone, rock art becomes an objectively observable system of the past. Objective in that rock art is defined by (and limited to) observable attributes, such as, size, description, condition of decay or preservation, simplicity or complexity and how well motifs fit into or defy pre-established classifications. This exclusive focus on the materiality of rock art is in some ways not so different from contemporary mainstream archaeology in British Columbia, where the bulk of research efforts are concerned with artifact attributes rather than meaningful discussions of agency.

Through this approach, rock art becomes a system of painted or carved images that appear throughout the province. We learn that some sites share motif attributes, while others vary significantly in terms of style and content. This exclusive focus on images does not allow for any contemplation of the rock art in terms of people. We are left to ponder for ourselves about the painters and other important aspects of rock art, such as, production and use.

As an objectively observable system of painting and carving, rock art sites are reduced to landscapes void of people and void of meaning. From this standpoint, the people responsible for the creation of the images are afforded little or no agency. In this manner, cultures of the
past and human behavior have been left unconsidered and un-constructed. On this note, it is questionable whether rock art research in British Columbia contributes directly to the aims of archaeology – namely, its endeavor to understand the human past.

When archaeological reconstructions and considerations of the past have attempted to focus on human actions and behavior, imbalances in the representation of past cultures are often exhibited and one particular group in a society is favored over all others. For example, in British Columbia, and elsewhere, reconstructions of the past typically place an emphasis on men’s activities and work. Men are positioned centre-stage and associated with action and culture, while women are pushed to the wings and linked with passivity and nature (cf. Hays-Gilpin 2004; Milledge-Nelson and Rosen-Ayalon 2002). These men and women are more often than not constructed from an ethnocentric framework that reflects the history and values associated with the archaeologist’s own gender and culture.  

The history of gender bias along with ethnocentrism in archaeology has resulted in a denial of the presence, power and importance of women, and other marginalized groups, such as British Columbia’s First Nations populations in reconstructions of the past. Considering only one portion of the human population renders archaeological interpretations as fragmented and imbalanced reconstructions of the past. Ultimately, this fact is more a reflection and reinforcement of social inequalities in our present society than it is an accurate representation of the past (cf. Zimmerman 2003).

Through a consideration of post-processual archaeology I will discuss how it is possible to go beyond the typically descriptive accounts of rock art described here and how issues of bias in representations can be dealt with. I will demonstrate how we can understand rock art

---

This potential for a fundamental bias in interpretations and reconstructions of the past is further enhanced by the reliance archaeological interpretations have historically placed on ethnographic studies, which in turn were primarily conducted by men.
and rock art sites in terms of meaning and in terms that are meaningful. I will argue in favour of adopting a landscape-based approach with a feminist perspective as a way of developing meaningful discussions of rock art that endeavor to include all members of a society. This argument is based on the core belief that is through the practice of humanistic based inquires that a sense of the meanings contained within landscapes can be recognized.

In this chapter, I will begin with a description of processual archaeology as a way of introducing post-processual archaeology. As avenues of post-processualism, I will introduce interpretive and feminist archaeology. From there, I will discuss the concept of landscapes. Finally, I will assess the suitability of these theoretical frameworks to enhance the study of rock art.

**Processual and Post-processual Archaeology**

Processual archaeology, also known as the New Archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s, offered researchers alternative approaches to the descriptive priorities associated with the writing of “culture histories” inherent to Traditional archaeology (Trigger 1989). Grounded in a positivist view of the past, processual archaeology was concerned with turning Traditional archaeology into a science-based anthropology (Whitley 1998:3). Positivism was adopted as a way of explaining social phenomena in terms of general relationships (Shanks and Hodder 1998:69) – much like the laws associated with the natural sciences. Data, collected from the ground, was believed to be independent from the theories used for explanation, and therefore, able to provide objective knowledge about the past (Whitley 1998:3).
Processualists saw human behavior and culture change primarily as an adaptation to the environment (Ucko 1995:14). Aspects of culture such as technology, subsistence strategies, and social organization were thought to be most affected by the environment and, therefore, the most important to study (Whitley 1998:3). Positivism sought to move beyond simply describing the archaeological record, as previous Traditionalists had done, by providing explanations for the patterns observed within it (Darvill 2002:341; Shanks and Hodder 1998:69). With a commitment to rigorous methodology and the pursuit of objective knowledge, positivists felt that “the ideas of the people of the past were unobtainable in the archaeological record and, therefore, they could not be studied scientifically” (Flannery and Marcus 1998:35). Consequently, aspects of culture such as, religion and art were treated as “analytically irrelevant” (Whitley 1998:3).

Post-processual archaeology objected to the positivist viewpoint that individuals in the past were “passive reflectors of the forces and factors in their surrounding environments, not individuals acting out their own ideas and intentions” (Whitley 1998:4). Post-processual archaeologies challenged the notion of behaviorism by putting, at the forefront, “the human mind and cognition [rather than the environment] as key factors in the creation of the archaeological record” (Whitley 1998:5). The post-processual critique of processual archaeology was less about method and more about theory, where “the main emphasis was on opening archaeology to a broader range of theoretical positions, particularly those in the historical and social sciences” (Hodder 2001:1).

In place of behaviorism, post-processual archaeology introduced relativism, where knowledge is understood to be created within a cultural system (Darvill 2002:355). From this standpoint, “everything is subjective, including the past, and since there can be no objective
past there can be no objective reconstruction of it” (Whitley 1998:10). As such, knowledge and reconstructions of the past are spatially and temporally located. Knowledge necessarily then contains a certain amount of contemporary social structures of dominance and subordination, found in the archaeologist’s own time period and society (M. Johnson 1999:167), where it is often “the present which is preserved, not the past” (Shanks and Tilley 1992:68).

Post-processual archaeology denounced the positivist belief that one unifying science was appropriate for all disciplines (M. Johnson 1999:167). In place of universality, post-processualism espoused a multiplicity of approaches that resulted in a variety of archaeologies (Flannery and Marcus 1998:35-37) – each equally true and valid. In place of scientific explanations regarding the systems of the past, post-processual archaeology adopted a humanistic perspective committed to maintaining an “interest in the human mind and especially the importance of intentional human actions in creating the past” (Whitley 1998:6). Post-processual studies favoured interpretation and meaning, rather than the generalized explanations associated with processual approaches (Shanks and Hodder 1998:69).

Some have seen Post-processual archaeology as anti-science where subjectivity and particularism replace generalization and explanation (Shanks and Hodder 1998:69) – what often results is a science versus relativism dispute. Post-processual archaeology makes no apologies for the aspects of science it rejects, however, it is not imperative that science be rejected completely (Whitley 1998:11; see also Hodder and Shanks 1995). A moderate position whereby a blending of the benefits associated with processual and post-processual approaches is both possible and necessary. Interpretive archaeology allows such a blending.
Interpretive Archaeology

Interpretive archaeology accepts some science, but does not rely on it entirely as processual studies do (Whitely 1998:24). An interpretive world-view assumes more complexity and less absolute knowledge than a positivist paradigm. Culture theory, which highlights the intentional actions of humans, replaces behaviorist theory and seeks to examine changes from *within* a society. Conversely, interpretive archaeologists utilize alternative models of science that allow their scientific *and* humanistic goals to be achieved – “without committing the offenses of positivist approaches” (Whitley 1998:24).

Built out of post-processual thinking, interpretive archaeology places the presence and work of the interpreter at the forefront (Darvill 2002:197; Shanks and Hodder 1998: 70). Interpreters attempt to convey meaning and bridge gaps of understanding by providing a dialogue which functions to make things easier to understand (Shanks and Hodder 1998: 71). The interpreter does not operate according to certain predetermined actions intended to lessen their influence and subjectivity, as with processual studies, but rather, the interpreter recognizes and takes responsibility for their presence and interpretations (Shanks and Hodder 1998:70). Thus, archaeologists’ representations of the past are constructions built in the present. As such, they are as much (if not more) about the author as they are about the past societies being examined (Shanks and Tilley 1992:68; M. Johnson 1999:167). Contrary to scientific reasoning, these constructions are viewed by interpretive archaeologists as no less truthful or authentic for having being constructed (Shanks and Hodder 1998: 70; M. Johnson 1999:166-167).

Consequently, interpretation is multivocal where “different interpretations of the same field are quite possible” and expected (Shanks and Hodder 1998:70). Interpretive
archaeologists view all archaeologies in this manner – processual included. Scientific
representations of the past are viewed by interpretive archaeologists as being equally
subjective as interpretive depictions, with one particular difference – the realization and
admission of subjectivity by the researcher.

Recognizing the subjective element in any given archaeology and focusing on the feelings
and actions of individuals in the past, does not imply that just any meaning can be crafted
from the archaeological record. Interpretive archaeology is only possible when “the body of
supporting data is sufficiently rich” (Flannery and Marcus 1998:37). Shanks and Hodder
(1998:78) point out that just as an artist cannot craft anything from a block of clay,
archaeologists, too, are governed by certain limitations and properties of the archaeological
record.

Where scientific reasoning is opposed to developing empathy for individuals in the past,
interpretive archaeology embraces such sentiment and seeks out human actions and meanings
embedded in the archaeological record (Whitley 1998:13). To interpret is to determine
meaning and this implies an “extension or building from what there is here to something
beyond” (Shanks and Hodder 1998:72). As with scientific based studies, interpretive
archaeology shares a need for context and provenience in order to determine meaning and to
offer credible understandings of the past. Rigorous data collection, not the fanciful
imaginings often attributed to cognitive archaeologies, is as much a part of interpretive
archeology as it is a part of processual archaeology. “When done well, cognitive archaeology
makes archaeology broader and more well-rounded; poorly done, it results in some of the
worst archaeology on record” (Flannery and Marcus 1998:37).
Discussion: Processual and Post-Processual Archaeology and Rock Art Studies

Processual perspectives in archaeology were oriented toward developing discussions of material remains located in the archaeological record, but were resistant to discussions of the meanings embedded in those remains. The post-processual recognition of people as active and knowledgeable agents, responsible for creating meaningful pasts meant that opportunities to study the meaning and significance of human action became possible. Where traditional and positivist approaches held onto priorities far removed from developing an understanding of “those aspects of ancient culture that are the product of the human mind” (Flannery and Marcus 1998:36), post-processual and in particular, interpretive approaches sought out such phenomena.

Prior to the advancement of post-processual archaeology, rock art studies were theoretically limited to providing descriptive accounts of rock markings and providing explanations of rock art in terms of generalities – where both culture history and processual approaches were employed. As such, rock art sites were defined by motifs alone and were void of any sense of human presence. The adoption of a humanistic post-processual perspective enabled rock art researchers, for the first time, to venture beyond descriptions of markings and generate discussions of meaning – such opportunities were not available with previous positivist paradigms (cf. Chippindale and Tacon 1998).

It is through interpretive archaeology that rock art researchers are able to continue generating important empirical data concerning rock markings and pursue social aspects of rock art, such as, societal influences for production and conditions for use (Chippindale and Nash 2004). Interpretive approaches enable researchers the opportunity to contemplate rock
art sites as populated social landscapes. From this theoretical approach, it becomes possible to understand rock art sites as the social landscapes they once were/are.

The inclusion of people and a consideration of the social conditions relevant to the production and use of rock art enable discussions of meaning to be generated. It is the presence of people that makes reconstructions of the past meaningful. This is because human presence, behavior and action give the past its most engaging characteristics (cf. Lowenthal 1985). Interpretive archaeology is the theoretical context in which we can begin to understand rock markings in terms that were essential to their creation – human action and agency.

Not only does interpretive archaeology allow for this exploration of meaning and human agency in rock markings and rock art sites, it acknowledges the constructed nature of all archaeological representations. One of the hallmarks of post-processual theory in archaeology is the revelation that the past is constructed in the present (cf. Hodder 1999, 2001; Shanks and Tilley 1992; Trigger 1989). A relationship exists between the past we construct and the contemporary social conditions in which we carry out the act of producing knowledge. A consideration of feminist scholarship provides insight into the influence historical conditions and biases associated with today’s social order play in the outcome of archaeological constructions.

Early Feminist Thinking in Archaeology

Feminist thinking in archaeology was initially sparked by a concern for the status inequalities of women within the profession (Preucel and Hodder 1996: 416). Objection to the inequalities between male and female researchers in the form of career prospects, public
image and funding opportunities was officially launched in the early 1980s (cf. Conkey and Spector 1984; Gero 1983, 1985). Early feminist works introduced gender as a topic of “legitimate archaeological research” (Preucel and Hodder 1996:416) and concern along with the feminist identification of male bias inherent in the discipline.

This recognition of women’s marginalization within the profession itself revealed that gender biases were also present in other areas of the discipline. In addition to influencing and curtailing opportunities for female archaeologists, gender bias was successfully at work, and had been for many years, excluding and misrepresenting women in interpretations of the past (Preucel and Hodder 1996:419). Distorted images and an all-too-often absence of women in reconstructions of the past were ultimately linked to contemporary gender ideologies that were self-legitimating – past gender roles, based on contemporary gender ideologies were used to “legitimate those same gender roles in the present” (Preucel and Hodder 1996:419).

Gender bias, grounded in the present and reflected onto the past, served to generate portrayals of past societies that were teeming with Western androcentric values. Notions of a universal male power and control in past societies emerged that largely reflected contemporary Western biases rather than the values associated with the past societies being studied. This condition served to deny the presence and importance of women, and other members of society, over both time and space (cf. Kehoe 1999).

Feminists opposed the power and privilege that was being afforded to these Western androcentric constructions of the past. The structure of the discipline itself contained the basic assumption that culture was both created by and intended for men. Western androcentric bias was so deeply ingrained in the “rhetoric of archaeology, that it [was] in danger of passing by unnoticed” (Milledge-Nelson 1997:25). In response to the recognition
that the discipline of archaeology was profoundly embedded with gender bias, feminist scholars began to consider gender itself as an analytical category and began to examine how that might affect and enhance interpretations of prehistory (Preucel and Hodder 1996:416; see also Spector and Whelan 1990).

**Contemporary Feminist Archaeology Theory**

Feminist archaeology accepts that the practice of archaeology itself is a socially constructed and contextually conditioned activity (Gero 1996:258). As such, an objective understanding of the past cannot be achieved. Feminist archaeology embraces this concept while simultaneously explores the power hierarchy evident in constructions of the past.

Feminists recognize that archaeological fieldwork itself is a social practice and it is historically specific. This recognition is similar to how interpretive archaeologists acknowledge relativism and an understanding that knowledge is spatially and temporally oriented. Both feminist and interpretive archaeology see the act of archaeological fieldwork as conditioning the data that is collected (cf. Gero and Conkey 1991). Through the practices of excavation and observation, archaeologists generate data that are essentially unverifiable (Ehrenberg 1989:13:15; Gero 1996:251-253). As soon as artifacts are removed from the ground, provenience and association exist only as recorded data in the archaeologist’s notebook. The ramification of this is that inferences are constructed from one single uncheckable authority (Gero 1996:253) Thus, it becomes obvious just how much power is bestowed upon the archaeologist (cf. Hays-Gilpin and Whitley 1998; Spector 1993).

From this position of privilege, archaeologists exert powerful influences over fieldwork practices and interpretations, which ultimately effects the findings offered as knowledge. It is
not just issues pertaining to gender that are inherent in archaeological fieldwork practices and interpretations. Ideals associated with Eurocentric Western culture are often at the forefront, overriding and essentializing archaeological data, knowledge, and the constructions of the past. This is in part due to the extensive presence of male Western archaeologists and the history of the discipline itself (cf. Handsman 1993; Milledge-Nelson and Rosen-Ayalon 2002; Tuhiwai Smith 1999). Although, today there are more Indigenous people active in archaeology than at any other time in history, the majority of practicing archaeologists are non-Aboriginal (cf. Nicholas and Andrews 1997). These factors contribute to the production of prejudiced renditions of the past teeming with male gender biases and ethnocentric assumptions, which become publicly documented facts.

Feminist approaches enable archaeologists to establish new and innovative methods and theories geared toward challenging Western assumptions and the power imbalances embedded within the discipline. Just as interpretive archaeology is believed to make mainstream archaeology more inclusive, feminist theory has the potential to make interpretive archaeology more holistic. This is true because it has the capability of being the “means by which the ‘givens’ in archaeology can be taken apart while simultaneously generating alternatives and replacement concepts” (Conkey 1993:27). Feminist perspectives allow archaeologists to be more sensitive to the inequalities exhibited in “traditions” of writing archaeology, and as a result, feminist archaeologies are less gender and ethnicity exclusive (cf. Handsman 1993; Spector 1993).

Feminist scholarship rejects the universals and essentialist arguments put forth by positivism in much the same manner as post-processual archaeology. In contrast, renditions of the past oriented toward “relational identities” and “versions of hermeneutics” (Preucel
and Hodder 1996:417) are developed. Favoring human agency over environmental
determinism, feminist archaeology advocates for a past shaped and constrained by the efforts
of humans. Connected to the recognition of human agency is the realization that peoples’
experiences throughout prehistory, history, and the present are diverse and varied.

Feminists advocate for the reconstruction of varied lived experiences as a way of creating
more informed views of past lives. It is the nuances of difference and variation in individual
experiences and meaning that are of interest and value. On this note, feminist thinking is
likened to phenomenological inquiries within interpretive archaeology where researchers
attempt to “understand the way in which people experience the worlds they create and
inhabit” (Darvill 2002:320; see also Tilley 1994).

In conjunction with a focus on “experience,” feminist methods are adamantly reflexive.
As interpretive archaeologists recognize their presence in the research process, feminist
investigators consciously recognize and claim their own position, influence, and power in
their research. Reflexivity acknowledges that rationality and objectivity are both myths,
regardless of how unbiased or objective studies are portrayed to be (Conkey 1993). Through
the process of research and the production of knowledge, feminists unapologetically expect
to “affect the shape of what is known and what is knowable” (Conkey and Gero 1991:25).

The opportunity for bias in reconstructions of the past is plentiful because facts or data are
not recorded in the archaeological record but must be “observed and crafted out [of what is
often] an array of confusing and conflicting observations that are modified and reformulated
out of knowledge of what other researchers are working on…” (Gero 1996:252). In short,
artifacts do not speak for themselves, they must be interpreted. Harding (1986: 134)
eloquently points out that "it is necessary to be a feminist to do good science, because to do otherwise is to introduce [an unrecognized and unclaimed] bias."

Feminist archaeology does away with the positivist focus on the "ultimates," such as the "oldest" or the "biggest" archaeological find because such presentations are "grounded in progressive evolutionism which contributes to the validation of the status quo [s]" of today (Preucel and Hodder 1996:421). Further, these representations are more often than not defined in androcentric and Eurocentric ways. In place of "origin" studies, feminist scholarship centers on those aspects of the archaeological record typically deemed less important by mainstream archaeology, and traditionally thought, by positivists, to be inaccessible. Such studies include focusing on gender roles, the sexual division of labour or bringing new approaches to household archaeology (cf. Small 1991).

Feminist archaeology rejects the language associated with positivist discourse because of its ability and inclination to perpetuate the same power hierarchy that feminist scholarship seeks to critique and eliminate. Through mainstream archaeological discourse, contemporary constructions of gender and ethnicity differences are transformed into scientific information (Handsman 1993:337; Milledge-Nelson 1997:24) and presented to the public. The power of interpretation manifests itself into the generation of what is perceived to be fact, and this works to publicly "legitimize modern ideologies of gender [and ethnicity] difference" (Handsman 1993:333). Because of the power of language, vocabulary used in feminist archaeologies endeavors to "reflect the agency and intent of the humans in the past" (Conkey and Gero 1991:20), as a way of eliminating the way in which women’s (and other marginalized groups within society) activities have typically been devalued.
Scientific language works to reduce complex human experiences in the past to de-humanized systems void of meaning (Preucel and Hodder 1996:422). What typically results is the writing of "boring, tedious, confusing to read descriptions of artifacts [which produce] similar feelings [of distance, objectivity, and lack of interest] that are transferred to the people of the past" (Spector 1993:33). In response, feminists strive for alternative ways of writing archaeology (cf. Edmonds 1999; Spector 1993) that allow for and highlight "empathy and recreation of lived [human] experiences" (Preucel and Hodder 1996:422) rather than focusing on material remains and systems of the past. The creation of narratives and dialogues of meaning(s) are often offered in conjunction with (cf. Spector 1993) or in place of descriptive scientific accounts of material remains.

**Discussion: Feminist Archaeology and Rock Art Studies**

Feminist thinking in archaeology initially identified gender imbalances, where it was realized that the paucity of women's standing within the discipline and in interpretations of the past were more a factor of current social conditions rather than the "facts" of the archaeological record. Feminist outlooks brought recognition to the social and contextual condition of archaeology itself in much the same way as interpretive archaeology acknowledged the "constructed" nature of archaeological understandings of the past and the ever-present interpreter. Feminist theory, however, focused more attention on the power afforded to the interpreter and the imbalances in understandings of the past that resulted.

Reflexivity was introduced as a means of acknowledging and embracing the biases inherent in archaeological reconstructions of the past. Where positivists sought to develop understandings of a generalized past, feminists sought to understand the variety of lived
experiences of individuals. Consequently, aspects of the archaeological record previously considered unimportant were revitalized with a new found interest - what was studied in archaeology became equally important as how studies were performed.

Feminist scholarship and post-processual theories associated with interpretive archaeology meant that researchers now had a paradigm from which to understand past human conditions in terms far more complex and holistic than previous theories would allow. Post-processual archaeology has been credited with providing researchers with suitable bodies of theory from which to draw out and discuss “meaning” from the archaeological record, as witnessed by feminist and interpretive models. It was this underlying theoretical change that brought about opportunities to realize new and innovative ways of understanding and interpreting the past that went beyond the achievements of processual archaeology (cf. Moore 1991).

Feminist advances in the discipline of archaeology have the potential to impact rock art research in several ways – here I highlight its ability to provide useful and interesting ways of focusing on people and innovative ways of generating texts of meaning. Feminist archaeology endeavors to incorporate women and other marginalized groups into discussions of the past, what it does not attempt to do is create a “glorious new past” for these groups. The feminist approach to archaeology and its application to the study of rock art entail a shift in focus away from “traditional” approaches that are exclusive, towards methods that are inclusive and that aim to incorporate those groups typically silent and invisible in archaeological writings.

For rock art studies, feminist perspectives permit alternative ways of writing archaeological accounts of rock art sites that highlight “empathy and [the] recreation of lived
experiences” (Preucel and Hodder 1996:422). The experiences of painting the rock and the experiences with the painted rock are what delineate the meanings of rock art sites. Feminist approaches necessarily acknowledge the presence of the researcher in the research process. A shift of focus in this direction takes away from the typical emphasis on the materiality of the rock art images as a system of the past. The creation of dialogues of experience regarding the social production and use of rock art, necessarily gives way to an exploration of people and meaning (cf. Wylie 1994). Acknowledging reflexivity adds a new dimension to the data that is missing in typical approaches to the study of rock art. Just as feminist inquiries strive to create a meaningful understanding of the past by recognizing human presence and agency, landscape approaches possess similar and complementary interests. The concept of landscape is discussed and presented next.

**Landscape Approaches**

Landscape archaeology is a notoriously varied and complex endeavor. No one distinct theoretical framework or methodological approach offers a single inroad to this type of inquiry. This is due in part, to the multifaceted and subjective nature of the concept of landscape itself, and the fact that landscape studies are distinctly set within a post-processual framework – they must be, by this association, polyvalent. As a result, archaeologists incorporate a variety of approaches and theories to reach their particular research goals. It is this diversification and complexity which has the potential to result in innovative and eclectic interpretations of the past, which is the strength of landscape archaeology.

Understanding landscape as a body of theory begins with the consideration of landscape as a concept. As a concept, landscape is multifaceted and it varies spatially, culturally, and
temporally (cf. Bender 2002; Thomas 2001). This means that people perceive the concept of landscape in varying ways depending on their geographic location, ethnic affiliation and historical time period. For most people, according to Keller, (1994:81) landscape is the world in which we all live. It is from a sense of this tangible physicality that I begin.

Landscape as a topographical surrounding comprised of natural features is, at its most fundamental level, a requirement for human presence. We cannot be in the world without this physical component of landscape, to which we are dependent for survival. The “ubiquitous materiality of landscape is simply everywhere and people are in it on a daily basis” (van Dommelen 1999:277). The relationship that exists between the physical earth and human existence is universal, but the way in which this connection is perceived is vastly diverse (Thomas 2001:81). For example, Western viewpoints typically recognize a dichotomous relationship, where humans and nature are separated. Conversely, Eastern and First Nations perspectives, for example, see no partition between humans and the natural world; instead of separation they see interconnection. It is this interpretation of our relationship with the Earth that brings us to the next dimension of landscapes, which is much less tangible than the physical reality of topographic surroundings.

As a physical entity, landscapes provide the arena for interaction to occur between people and with nature. Landscapes are “the entire surface over which people move and within which they congregate” (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:277). It is through this interaction with nature and the congregation between peoples that landscapes become so much more than a physical environment for human survival – they become a way of seeing the world and interpreting one’s surroundings. Ways of seeing and interpreting are subjective acts that differ between interpreters. Interpretational differences exist because “different people,
differently placed, engage with the world [and each other] in different ways” (Bender 2002:106). This differential experience results in a multitude of ways of seeing and being in the world.

The practice of interacting and interpreting the world is an ongoing and repetitive process. Repeated encounters with one another on the land create an additional layer to our understanding of landscape. This understanding continues to be linked to the physical realm, but is no longer limited to it (Thomas 2001:171). What I mean by this is, that physical places on the land play a role in how we interact and experience the world. It is these places that provide the medium necessary for social space, or interaction, to occur. Social space works to create meanings that become associated with a particular place. This sense of meaning, created through experiences of interaction, transcends the physical landscape transforming it into a cognitive landscape of meaning.

Cognitive landscapes are constructed and maintained by the social spaces of interaction and repeated occupancy that occur in places throughout the physical landscape (cf. Crumley 1999). A relationship exists between the outer reality of the physical landscape and the inner perception, which is the cognitive landscape. This relationship is reciprocal – each landscape, is both influential to and influenced by the other (Thomas 2001:171). The division between the outer and inner landscapes is not clearly defined or definable. Because of the reciprocal relationship between these two landscapes, we cannot completely separate one from the other (Keller 1994:95; Thomas 2001:21).

Cognitive landscapes remain connected to, but not wholly dependant on physical landscapes. A variety of groups of people may share a particular physical landscape, but the cognitive landscapes of each group may vary drastically. Aspects of society, such as, class,
gender, and ethnicity etc. all result in different social spaces. These encounters and experiences in turn create fundamentally different cognitive landscapes. For example, First Nations and non-Aboriginal peoples share the same physical landscape of British Columbia, but through the processes of social interaction over time each group has a very different set of personal, collective, and ancestral histories that act to influence and create differential cognitive landscapes.

Each landscape, whether it be physical or cognitive, exerts a particular level of power that affects the other. By this I mean that because we have experiences of a place, that place holds a certain meaning for us. That meaning and our experiences are what we use to negotiate that place and other places in the future. Undoubtedly, our repeated experiences of places are never identical, therefore, the meanings we attribute to places are always changing and different. The way in which we understand and generate cognitive landscapes is relative to experience and memory. This relevance is "derived from specific historical and cultural contexts" (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:6).

Memories accrue through repeated visits or experiences with places. Through this process of accretion, meanings become layered overtime (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:25; see also Darvill 1999). With each new spatial encounter places take on different meanings, which in turn, give rise to ever-changing cognitive landscapes (Bender 2002:103). The landscapes we create today have actually been "fashioned out of past landscapes, which are in turn fashioned out of landscapes before that" (McGlade 1999:469). Cognitive landscapes, therefore, exhibit an unstable element, which is demonstrated by this repeated cycle of recreation.
Spaces, on one hand, contribute to this unstable quality of cognitive landscapes by constantly generating new meanings. Yet, simultaneously, spaces ensure an element of continuity by consistently producing sites of meaning or places (De Certeau 1984; Tilley 1994). The presence of places within a landscape forms a stable component in as much that places are always present (though ever-changing). Places also contribute to this sense of stability because they act to anchor space in the landscape. The relationship between space (the act or experience of interaction) and place (the site of interaction) is cyclically reliant and influential to one another – one is responsible for and responsive to the other (Layton and Ucko 1999:8).

Landscapes are created by people (Bender 2002:103) and turned into places through the processes of space. Once a sense of place is established humans can no longer abstract themselves from that place (Lovell 1998:6). It is the meanings, embedded in places that are both “by and for human socialability and identity” (Lovell 1998:4). Because places are invested with meaning, they act to create the people who are from that place (Tilley 1994:26). Therefore, place is “fundamental to the establishment of personal and group identity” (Tilley 1994:18).

Association with a particular place evokes not only a sense of personal and collective identity, but also feelings of belonging and loyalty to a community (Lovell 1998:4). This collective identity, forged from the set of mental notions (or cognitive landscapes) a group of people has in common, creates a cultural landscape of meaning (Keller 1994:89). Cultural landscapes contain both the natural features of a land and “a series of stories [and experiences] constructed through time and space” (Nash and Children 1995:1). Due to the fluid and dynamic nature of space, the meanings embedded in cultural landscapes are more
likely to change than they are to remain constant (Ashmore and Knapp 1999:6; Layton and Ucko 1999:15).

Discussion: Landscapes, Social Space and Rock Art Studies

Landscapes are multidimensional, on one hand they are the tangible topographic features of a land, and on the other, they are the metaphysical constructs of a group of people. This physicality and intangibility exist simultaneously. Landscapes are constructed through the social processes of human interaction. Experience and the memory of experience are what transform locales in the physical environment into places of meaning. How we have experienced a place in the past affects how we will experience that place (and others) in the future. Meaning is what transcends the physical realm and influences the construction of cognitive landscape. Places of meaning essentially reside in both the physical and cognitive landscapes. Attempting to separate this outer physical landscape from the inner cognitive landscape is futile – one cannot exist without the other.

Space and the social interactions that occur between peoples are an essential component to the creation of landscapes. De Certeau (1984) discusses aspects of space and social relations in “Spatial Stories” in a way that is relevant to the study of rock art. De Certeau juxtaposes the concepts of “maps” and “tours” in such a manner that it deals directly with the issues associated with rock art research in British Columbia that have been identified in this thesis. This section will present concepts from “Spatial Stories” and landscape theory that relate directly to the study of rock art.

De Certeau (1984) introduces the notion of “map” as a tableau of knowledge, and “tour” as a series of movements. He presents these concepts as two poles of experience (1984:119)
existing at opposite ends of a paradigm continuum. The concept of “map” resides at the
scientific end, while “tour” occupies the humanistic realm of this continuum. The “map” as a
tableau acts to fragment knowledge, much in the same way scientific discourse acts to
objectify and at times essentialize knowledge (1984:119). The “tour” is representative of the
social practices that constitute place, but it too, provides only a partial truth. Where the
“map” emphasizes form and generates categories and classifications of data, the “tour”
highlights processes of production and grapples with understandings of meaning.

De Certeau (1984:120) describes and discusses the history of cartographic maps as a way
of illustrating the relationship and tension between the concept of “map” and “tour.”
Medieval maps initially bared the markings of pilgrimage journeys. Stops of interest and
venues for prayer were graphically intertwined with illustrations of places to stay and cities
to pass through (1984:120). But, over time maps became disassociated from the journeys
they represented and illustrations of the practices of travel and social interaction associated
with the pilgrimage ceased to be included on the map.

With respect to rock art research the concept of “map” can be viewed as the exclusive
focus researchers in British Columbia have placed on the rock markings. Rock art research in
the province with its focus on form, size, and location is essentially the “map” that disregards
the social actions of the painters or “tour” necessary for the creation of the images. The
“map” provides a way of recording important information such as content and style, but it
serves to suppress the cognitive and cultural landscapes to which the paintings are connected.
The “tour” offers insight into the process of production and use. A combination of both the
“map” and the “tour” approach transforms the typical focus on form to a broader more
holistic one that includes process.
Through the application of a landscape-based approach and a consideration of De Certeau’s “map” and “tour” concepts, rock art research becomes more than a descriptive task and rock art itself becomes more than an observable system of the past. The inclusion of the “tour” provides access to the people of the past in a manner that the “map” cannot. This is achieved by the “tour’s” potential to transform the rock art into the oral history of a land and its use by people in the past. Recognizing rock art sites as places of meaning within physical and cognitive landscapes illuminates the processes of painting as social spaces orchestrated within a particular cultural and temporal context. By endeavoring to understand the social conditions that shaped and constrained the processes of rock painting we acknowledge human agency. Once we have peopled past landscapes then and only then are discussions of meaning possible.

Why are Discussions of Meaning Worthwhile?

When rock art landscapes are understood in terms of human presence and agency they become meaning-full. But, why is it important to develop a meaningful construction of the past? Why is it not enough to simply describe cultural remains? Why are the people of the past important? The importance of establishing meaning is the primary function of archaeology itself. Here it is important to realize the way in which archaeology is written severely affects the influence it exerts over the public and that directly affects how people come to know the past.

Supposedly, “objective” scientific data, such as numeric details about a rock painting, do not reveal the presence of people. The objects or cultural remains that archaeologists study are the direct result of past human action and cognition. It only makes sense then, to create
Archaeological texts play a key role in shaping how people today understand the human past. What we come to know as the human path of progress and evolution is often contextualized along lines of gender and ethnicity. This fact often results in the perpetuation and false justification for contemporary power imbalances and behavior. The political implications of archaeology cannot be ignored and the fact that archaeological data has significant public value (Spector 1993:33) emphasizes the importance of peopling the past.

Perceiving a past void of people is simultaneously one that is also void of meaning. Developing a sense of interest and respect for the past, and its people, is much more likely when the intentions and actions of people are included in accounts of the past. The need to populate the landscapes of the past has a direct relevance to rock art studies in British Columbia. This is because many of the province’s rock art sites have been defaced or completely destroyed, presumably, by people who have no knowledge, empathy, or consideration for the value of such aspects of the past. How we do rock art research and the way we communicate, or more appropriately, the way we do not communicate the importance and meanings of rock art indirectly plays a role in the perpetuation of vandalism.

If we continue to discuss and present rock art in terms of systems of the past rather than the creations and experiences of real people, or as chronological sequences rather than stories laden with meaning and activity, or as stylistic frequencies rather than cultural statements of identity, then we will have missed the opportunity to contribute to the conservation of rock art in the most effective manner: the prevention of damage. I believe that through the practice of writing and talking about the social spaces of rock art, the importance of rock markings can be imparted to a larger audience. If more members of the public are made aware of the
meaning invested in rock art landscapes perhaps the diminishment of vandalism will be possible.

Summary

Landscape approaches offer a suitable body of theory and method that has the potential to enhance rock art research in British Columbia. First, a landscape approach provides the opportunity to develop meaningful interpretations. This possibility contrasts sharply with the typical lack of interpretation where researchers have limited themselves to descriptive or antiquarian accounts of rock art. Second, these approaches allow for the consideration of the larger surrounding terrain, natural and cultural, which provides information regarding provenience, association, and context to be integrated into interpretations. Through a landscape approach the meanings of rock art sites can be studied and interpreted in terms of inter-relationships between the human world and the physical environment (Hodder 1987:123).

Landscape approaches are oriented toward recognizing the presence of places as sites of meaning, in both spatial and temporal contexts. In this way, landscape approaches are very suitable to rock art studies because “rock art is such an obvious way of assigning special significance to a place” (Bradley et al. 1994:213). Landscape studies offer a humanistic understanding of the environment to be realized that is of direct relevance to rock art because rock art sites are part of the physical environment and they are the product of human creation.

A landscape approach enables archaeologists to look beyond the individual site (Thomas 2001:165) to consider the larger surrounding natural and cultural terrain. The inherent
physical connection between rock art and the natural topography is seldom taken advantage of by archaeologists (Bradley et al. 1994:374). This is evident in British Columbia rock art studies where images are typically displaced rather than contextualized. Landscape studies however, provide an opportunity to take advantage of the enormous benefits offered by the *in-situ* nature of rock art.

Adopting the broader field of view associated with a landscape approach allows for an inclusion of the natural terrain or the physical context of the rock art. This inclusion works to transform the rock art, rightly from “artifact” to “feature” (Bradley et al. 1994:374) and posits the markings *in context* rather than *in displacement*. Hodder (1987:123) reminds us that, “to be interested in artifacts [and features] without any contextual information is antiquarianism” rather than archaeology, because it is context that archaeologists use to weave material culture together “so as to be meaningful”.

This broader frame of reference offers the opportunity to study spatial arrangements between rock art sites and other locales of human activity in the context of the natural features of the land (Hays-Gilpin 2004:3). Linking the location of rock art sites with different uses of different terrains in the surrounding area permits a realization of a “general pattern of movement through the landscape” (Bradley et al. 1994:377). What results from this broad frame of reference is not just attention to pockets of activity punctuated throughout a physical landscape, but larger more comprehensive patterns of land use set within particular temporal and spatial contexts. This approach allows for a consideration of activity and occupancy that is “more closely matched with the physical scale at which human societies operate” (Darvill 2002:221).
Feminist perspectives are complementary to a landscape-based study of rock art. First, this perspective gives voice to those who are typically silent in archaeological writings. For studies of British Columbia rock art, this would include the painters and their audience, as well as, contemporary people to whom the rock art landscapes continue to be meaningful. It thus becomes possible to gain a sense of the multiplicities of meaning that are embedded in landscapes and how that meaning changes with time. Second, feminist scholarship allows room for alternative ways of writing archaeology. Bodies of text that present rock art landscapes in innovative and eclectic ways are more likely to reach a broader audience than the scientific accounts of rock art that have typically been generated in British Columbia. Undoubtedly, the production of an “alternative” account of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun will be important when adapting this research for the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun elementary school curriculum.

In the next chapter I employ these theoretical frameworks as I outline the methods I used to design and implement an interpretive/feminist/landscape-based study and analysis of the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun.
Chapter Four

RESEARCH METHODS

My thesis aims to explore the social processes associated with the production and use of the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. In order to develop this understanding I consulted a variety of texts regarding the Carrier culture and where possible, sources regarding the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art. My research also included conducting fieldwork in which I located, recorded and photographed the rock paintings. I also interviewed First Nations people from the communities at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun regarding the rock paintings. It is these three components and the intricacies associated with each stage of my research that I present in this chapter.

First in this chapter, I begin with a discussion of the ethnographic and archaeological texts I consulted for this project. Even though this stage of the research was continuous throughout the project I present this step first because these sources influenced my research right from the beginning. Second, I move on to discuss acquiring approval and permission from the University of Northern British Columbia Ethics Review Board, the First Nations communities at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, and other individuals and institutions I contacted during this research. Third, I describe the stages of conducting fieldwork which I divide into two components: archaeological, where I examine my pre-fieldwork planning and testing activities, along with the locating and recording method I engaged in to document the rock art; and ethnographic, where I examine the process I employed to interview the First Nation people of the area. Finally, I provide details regarding the analysis I performed with respect
to the information generated during the interview process and the rock art motif data I
gathered.

My research methods were significantly influenced by the work of Linda Tuhiwai Smith,
author of the renowned Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples
(1999). In this work, Tuhiwai Smith discusses at length the history and intricacies of research
and how it has, and continues to impact Aboriginal communities around the world. I
developed my research framework based on several key points Tuhaíwai Smith advocates
regarding de-colonized research. In particular: I acquired permission and sought input
directly from the communities associated with the rock art I intended to study; I engaged in a
study that was of interest and importance to the First Nations communities I was working in;
I conducted a project that recognized the people participating in the research; and I engaged
in a study that revealed aspects of culture that respects people.

Ethnographic and Archaeological Texts

Ethnographic and archaeological texts provided me with background knowledge
regarding Carrier culture history in the area of Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun and rock art research
throughout British Columbia and North America. These texts and other secondary sources
comprise the literature review in Chapter 2. Some of these ethnographic sources and
archaeological reports provided me with a basic knowledge of the symbols used by the
Carrier people to communicate with one another. Consulting these sources prior to
generating first-hand information enabled me to embark on the fieldwork portions of my
research with an informed mind.
In particular, I rely on the work of Morice (1893), Corner (1968) and McMurdo (1971). I chose these specific sources because of the First Nations interpretations of signs, symbols and rock markings recorded by each of these authors. Morice’s work is particularly relevant to this study because over 100 years ago he recorded information regarding the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun based on the knowledge provided by the Native peoples of the area. Although the effects of contact and efforts to assimilate the Carrier people were already well established by the time Morice was writing in 1893, he was privy to traditional knowledge generated at a time and in a cultural context that was closer and perhaps more similar to the traditions of the painters and their contemporaries.

From Morice I draw information regarding Carrier symbols, which include hunting signs, tattoo images and rock art motifs (cf. Figure 34, p. 116; Figure 35, p. 117; Figure 36, p. 118). The similarity in terms of form and subject matter between these symbols provide me with a base of known-images to work from in order to “see” and interpret other rock markings. The direct connection between the information Morice provides and the rock art I study in this project justifies the emphasis I place on his work to provide interpretations of the paintings. I include reproductions of Morice’s illustrations to provide details concerning the signs, symbols and markings he identifies. I discuss the process of acquiring permission to include Morice’s illustrations and the work of others further on in this chapter.

Corner (1968:117) does not record an abundance of Native perspectives regarding the rock art but he does record several interpretations for some of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun markings, based on First Nations perspectives in 1929. In a similar manner as I draw from Morice, I consult Corner’s work to identify and interpret the rock markings. I include reproductions of Corner’s illustrations of the rock art motifs because his drawings bring
clarity to some of the images that have deteriorated since the time of his writing thirty-eight years ago (cf. Figure 37, p. 119; Figure 38, p. 120).

McMurdo’s (1971) work was produced as a result of salvage efforts sparked by the construction of a new railway link between Fort St. James and Dease Lake. The repercussions of the new rail-line included the purposeful destruction of six rock art sites on Takla Lake. Prior to the destruction of the pictographs, McMurdo visited the Takla Lake rock art with a local First Nations Elder, Mrs. French, who provided him with interpretations and explanations of the paintings. The cultural affiliation between the people of Takla Lake and Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, along with a striking similarity in rock art motif design, makes the inclusion of McMurdo’s report relevant and important in this study. I draw from Mrs. French’s interpretations to aid in the identification of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art motifs that I provide in Appendix L.

These secondary sources continued to play an important role throughout my research, especially during the analysis component. In particular, the information Morice generated regarding the rock art of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and his close affiliation with the people of the area were too significant to this study to disregard. I discuss how these texts informed my analysis later in this chapter.

Approval and Permission

The rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is of relevance to all of the First Nations people who live in this area (Figure 4). Before I could start my research I needed to acquire permission from the First Nations people in the area to locate and record the paintings and to interview community members about the markings (cf. Tuhiwai Smith 1999; Association of
Canadian Universities for Northern Studies 1998). I started by contacting the community of Tache and making an appointment with the elected Chief. I chose to seek the approval of the First Nations people before I applied to the Ethics Review Board at the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) because it was important for me to know, before I began, if this project was of interest and importance to the people at Stuart Lake/Nak'Al Bun (cf. Bishop 2002; Kirby and McKenna 1989).

In July of 2003 I met with Chief Thomas Alexis at Tache to discuss my research ideas and asked permission to study the rock paintings and interview community members. This meeting was my initial contact with the people at Stuart Lake/Nak'Al Bun and it concluded with Chief Alexis granting his personal permission for my intended study. After our meeting he introduced me to the research department staff at Tache and informed them of my project.

I contacted the community of Yekooche in the fall of 2003. I met with Dean Joseph, Treaty Coordinator for the Yekooche Nation, at his Prince George office and explained my research project. Dean made arrangements for a meeting with Chief Joseph Allan and Council members Curtis Joseph and Linda Allan. We met a few days later and I presented my research interests about the rock art and my desire to include people from Yekooche in
the interviews. Chief Allan and the Council expressed a keen interest in the project and they too approved my request to interview Yekooche community members.

I was advised by the research staff at Tache to get in touch with Sharon Bird at the Treaty Office in Fort St. James regarding working with members of the Nak’azdli community. I did this several months after I received the initial permission from Chief Alexis. Sharon requested a copy of my research proposal which she forwarded to the Band Council. Shortly after their next meeting in June of 2004, I received written permission in the form of a Band Council Resolution that allowed me to interview Nak’azdli community members (Appendix A).

During my permission-seeking meeting with Chief Thomas Alexis, he suggested I develop a version of the research that would be suitable for the Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli elementary school curriculum – a module that could contribute to the ongoing efforts aimed at connecting the children to the land. This suggestion was exactly what I was looking for in the way of “giving back” something of importance and interest to the communities. When I spoke with Chief Joseph Allan and the Band Council at Yekooche, we agreed that they too would receive this tailored version of the research for their school curriculum.

Although this work for the school curriculum is not part of this thesis, I will draw directly from my research to fulfill this commitment. This will involve tailoring a version of my thesis to meet the needs of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun school curriculum and it is one of the contributions I make with this research. I will embark on this project after I have fully completed this thesis.

Once I knew the communities of Tache, Yekooche and Nak’azdli were interested in my project and approved my research ideas, I applied for research ethics approval from the
Research Ethics Board at UNBC. All research projects conducted by students and faculty at UNBC must first meet the requirements set out by the Ethics Board. In August of 2004, I received the Ethics Board approval for my research project (Appendix B). This approval enabled me to conduct research involving people in an interview environment. Part of the success of my ethics application included the interest and approval I had received from the First Nations communities.

In terms of other types of “permission” that I was required to apply for I contacted Early Canadiana Online (ECO) by email to request permission to include some of Father Morice’s illustrations of the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. In my request, I provided general information regarding my research project and which illustrations I planned to used. On November 24, 2005 the ECO office replied and approved my request (Appendix C).

In order to request permission to include other relevant illustrations of the rock art, I telephoned the residence of Mr. John Corner in Vernon, British Columbia and spoke with Mrs. Corner about my research and my interest in her husband’s illustrations. We decided I would draft a letter outlining my research and a consent form she could sign once she and her children reviewed my written request. Mrs. Corner signed and returned the consent form to me early in December 2005 (Appendix D).

I also requested permission from the British Columbia Archives in Victoria, British Columbia, to include photographs of the rock art taken in 1948. I mailed my request and details regarding which images I wanted to use to the Archives office on November 8, 2005. I received written permission later in November 2005 to include the photographs of the rock art (Appendix E).
On December 20, 2005 I met with Terry Chamulak who is the Senior Hydrologist with the Saskatchewan Watershed Authority, regarding the history of water levels at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Terry provided me with several graphs regarding the water levels at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun that he had generated from the data provided on the Water Survey of Canada internet site (www.wsc.ec.gc.ca). At that time Terry gave me verbal permission to include these graphs in this thesis.

Fieldwork

I chose to begin the fieldwork portion of my research not with the interviews but with locating and recording the rock paintings. It was important to me to be familiar with the types and locations of the markings before I interviewed people. Recording the rock paintings before the interviews enabled me to bring photographs of the paintings for people to see and talk about at the interviews. In this section I describe the processes involved in locating and recording the rock paintings and the planning and testing that occurred before hand.

Archaeological Fieldwork

I essentially began the pictograph locating and recording stage of this research a few years ago when I first visited Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. By the time I was to conduct the official survey for this project, I had already visited the paintings quite a few times and was familiar with the location of several of the northeastern rock art sites. For this project, however, I would need to survey the entire shoreline of the lake in a systematic and efficient manner. Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is a substantial body of water and it has 270 kilometers of shoreline, and several islands – all of which I had to consider in my search for the paintings.
**Pre-Fieldwork Planning and Testing**

In order to achieve an efficient and thorough survey of a lake this size I organized it into manageable sections on a nautical map. Working from the nautical map in conjunction with topographic information I was able to determine which areas of the lake would be less likely to contain paintings and which areas held a higher probability of having markings. The areas less likely to have paintings were along the southern shore, where the terrain is predominately cliff-free forested land. Conversely, the topography of the northern shoreline was more likely to have paintings because of the abundance of exposed rock surface at the water’s edge and at inland areas near the shoreline. This was an important part of the planning stage because areas with less rock surface to examine would require less time for viewing and recording.

I considered all areas of the lake important to examine, including the areas with a low probability for markings because they could very likely contain shoreline boulders or rock outcroppings too small to be indicated on my maps. I determined that in order to conduct a thorough survey I would need to examine the entirety of the lake, including the southern shoreline and all of the islands. I explain the process I used to conduct this survey later in this chapter.

Rock art sites contain a vast amount of information that needs to be recorded properly. Prior to conducting fieldwork I consulted several sources regarding rock art recording practices (cf. Whitley 2001; Bednarik 2001). In particular, I needed to determine what type of data I would need to gather at each of the sites. I amalgamated information from these sources and composed a rock art recording card that would be both functional to use in the field, as well as to ensure the recording of vital data (Appendix F).
Photographic Testing. Photography plays a very important part of rock art recording because, unfortunately the photographs we generate today may be all that is left of the rock art for us to study and appreciate in the future (cf. Bednarik 1994, 2001). Rock art researchers, therefore, have an obligation to produce the best quality photographs and recordings possible. With this realization in mind, I set out to determine the suitability of the photographic practice I intended to use by conducting several tests. This part of the preparation process led me to consider particular aspects of photography – gamut, colour charts, and lighting. This next section discusses these issues and presents the testing processes I engaged in prior to photographing the paintings, and the recording process I used to photograph the rock paintings.

Gamut. Gamut is the range of colours a piece of equipment or a photographic process has the ability to reproduce. Cameras, lenses, film, paper, and processing equipment all have a certain gamut range and each does not have the ability to reproduce colours that reside outside of that range. In order to establish whether or not the photographic equipment I intended to use was capable of reproducing the colours of the paintings with clarity I conducted several gamut-revealing tests.

I began my gamut tests by selecting pages from the Munsell Soil Color Chart that best corresponded to the colours of the pigment in the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. I had previously been to the lake and compared the pigment of the paintings to the Munsell Soil Color Chart and established a sense of the ranges of colour that were present in the paintings. I photographed these pages with the camera and lens combinations I intended to use during the fieldwork. Similarly, the film was processed and printed by the photo lab I planned to use. I compared the photographs to the original pages of the Munsell Soil Color Chart in
order to determine if any of the rock painting pigments resided outside of the gamut range of
my photographic equipment and the photo lab’s processing equipment.

All of the test photographs successfully reproduced the colours of the Munsell Soil Color
Chart with definition and clarity. Had a lack of colour separation between hues been evident
in the photograph of the Munsell Soil Color Chart my photographic equipment and process
would have been unsuitable for recording the paintings. I recognize that my method for
determining gamut suitability was based on a purely subjective test – one that was reliant on
my visual perception alone – however, it is important to note that this type of test has the
ability to *instantly reveal* when a gamut range is unsuitable. From this test I was able to
determine that the equipment and process I intended to use during the fieldwork did, in fact,
have the ability to reproduce and distinguish the colours of the paintings.

**GretagMacbeth ColorChecker Color Rendition Chart.** For many years professional
photographers have used the GretagMacbeth ColorChecker Color Rendition Chart (Macbeth
Color Chart) to establish consistency in colour reproductions (Appendix G). Photographers
place the Macbeth Color Chart in the photographs they take and then make visual
comparisons between the reproduction and the original. The goal of this exercise is to
reproduce the colours of the Macbeth Color Chart accurately, thereby, generating
photographs that authentically reflect the colours of the subject. There is a significant need to
establish control over colour reproduction because many elements are present in a
photographic process that can act to prevent the achievement of reliable and consistent
colour. Elements such as the camera, lenses, lighting conditions, processing procedures, and
time of day all play a potentially detrimental role in the reproduction of accurate colour.
When photographers use the Macbeth Color Chart, a sense of control and consistency is gained, however, its use is entirely subjective. The process of using the Macbeth Color Chart is based on the skill, experience, and perspective of the individual making the comparisons. Colour accuracy and perception can differ greatly between individuals and this is further enhanced or compromised by environmental lighting conditions. Establishing colour consistency is a more complex procedure than determining gamut suitability. Because of this fact, I felt unable to rely on the Macbeth Color Chart during the photographic stage of the research. I decided to see if there was a less-subjective method that would be more conducive to achieving the high quality and consistent results I envisioned.

**IFRAO Standard Color Scale.** My concerns led to me to consider colour scales designed primarily for rock art recording purposes. Several years ago the International Federation of Rock Art Organizations (IFRAO) developed a colour scale specifically for rock art photography (Bednarik 2001:163). As with the Macbeth Color Chart, the IFRAO Standard Color Scale (The Scale) is intended as a means of establishing colour consistency in photography (Appendix H). As the intended foundation of a universal rock art recording method, The Scale comes with very specific instructions. Successful use of The Scale is dependant on its specific angle and placement inside the photograph, and its distance from the camera (Bednarik 2001:67-73). The key to the functionality of The Scale, beyond a subjective perspective is its use with a specific software program – exclusive to the Museum of Man in India (Bednarik 2001:67).

Having some familiarity with the features of the natural landscape and the location of the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun I doubted the likelihood of being able to successfully use The Scale in its specific manner. I knew I would not be able to photograph many of the
paintings from the distances and angles required when using The Scale. This fact, along with the inaccessibility of the software program, offered me little in the way of achieving my photographic goals. I found myself no further ahead in the way of achieving a better method for colour consistency than was offered by the Macbeth Color Chart.

In addition to these concerns, the IFRAO Standard Color Scale exhibited other characteristics that were non-conducive to my aims of gaining a better hold over quality and consistency. The Scale is essentially very small, and the opportunity to use its colour swatches in a meaningful manner is, therefore, compromised. In reality, many of the rock art panels at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are unsuitable in size and location for a photograph containing The Scale to be useful in the goal of establishing control over colour casts. Size was not the only concern I had regarding The Scale.

Only saturated colours comprise the IFRAO Standard Color Scale. Bright rich colours can endure significant fluctuations in light before displaying a change in colour. Relying on purely saturated hues to indicate colour casts augments the likelihood of inconsistency, thereby, compromising quality. Mark and Newman (1997) note a similar dissatisfaction in the choice of colours on The Scale, and they favour the use of the Macbeth Color Chart for photographing rock art. Their choice is based on the presence of saturated and subdued colours with the Macbeth Color Chart. Subdued colours are more sensitive to changes in light and, therefore, more likely to be effective in displaying colour shifts. The inclusion of subdued colours makes for a more reliable check for colour casts and improves the potential for high quality photographs.

*MiKs Image Calibration Chart.* Despite the findings of Mark’s and Newman’s (1997) test and the durability of the Macbeth Color Chart over time, I have chosen to develop a
colour chart specifically for the photographic process involved in this project (Appendix I).
The MiKs Image Calibration Chart (The Chart) offered several benefits that were unavailable
to me with the IFRAO Standard Color Scale and the Macbeth Color Chart. First,
predetermined mathematical values embedded in the MiKs Chart permitted me to break from
a purely subjective colour correction method. Unlike the Macbeth Color Chart this new
method was not completely reliant on individual perception of colour. Numeric values,
determined and manipulated by a computer software program (Adobe Photoshop CS) would
enable me to achieve more consistency in terms of density and colour.

Second, the MiKs Chart was developed within the same system that was used to produce
the photographs of the paintings. By this I mean the same camera, lenses, film, chemistry,
and paper were used to develop The Chart as was used to capture and reproduce the images
of the rock art. Utilizing the same equipment and printing process for The Chart and for the
rock art photographs added a level of reliability and consistency that was otherwise
unavailable to me.

Third, the colours chosen for The Chart include subdued, in addition to saturated colours.
Because of a higher sensitivity to light, subdued colours offered an added advantage for
detecting colour casts. Shades of the primary colours (red, green, and blue) were included on
The Chart because a diversity of colours is needed to detect the many possible colour
fluctuations that can occur. Several of the colours were selected from the Munsell Soil Color
Chart that are reflective of the pigment found in the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. This
fact added a degree of relevance with respect to pigmentation and potential changes in colour
that could not have been achieved with the IFRAO Standard Color Scale or the Macbeth
Color Chart.
In addition to the colour swatches on the MiKs Chart, black, gray, and white patches have been included. These patches, like all colours, contain values of red, green, and blue (RGB). With respect to the MiKs Chart, the RGB values of the black, gray, and white patches were set by a computer software program (Adobe Photoshop CS). The selected RGB values are based on tests conducted by Haynes and Crumpler (1997). This program recognizes RGB values along a continuum, 0 being the darkest and 255 being the brightest. At each end of this continuum no detail is discernable in a photograph, because it is either too dark or too bright for detail to be recorded. The purpose of photographing a subject is to record detail and appearance, so operating within a certain range of this continuum is necessary to produce photographs that contain detail in both the brightest and darkest areas. The RGB values in the black, gray, and white patches reflect my concern for operating within the detail-laden areas of the highlighted and shadowed portions of the photographs.

The function of the black, gray, and white patches is to enable a mathematical, rather than a purely subjective process to be used in the production of photographs. I recognize that I cannot do away with subjectivity completely. There will always be an element of individual perception in the photographs of the paintings, but the inclusion of the MiKs Chart contributes toward achieving more consistent and reliable colour. The purpose of the MiKs Image Calibration Chart is to provide the opportunity to edit, where possible, every photograph through the same process and to balance the RGB values in the photographs to the same numeric value. Without the use of The Chart, significant differences in colour would be inevitable in all of the rock art photographs.

Where possible I photographed each pictograph panel twice, once with the MiKs Image Calibration Chart present and again with The Chart absent. The second photograph was
taken immediately after the first, with no camera setting or lighting changes. My intention here was to produce one data-photograph and one presentation-photograph that were identical to one another in terms of colour and quality. The MiKs Chart, present in the data-photographs, was used to determine colour corrections, which in turn were applied to the presentation-photographs. At times some of the panels were located so high on the cliff faces that it was impossible to include The Chart. In these cases I made visual comparisons with formally edited photographs and balanced the colour accordingly.

**Lighting Conditions.** Throughout the day, natural sunlight changes in colour as it passes through the Earth’s atmosphere at different angles. Photographs taken in the morning differ in colour considerably to those taken in the evening, as it does with photographs taken at different times of the year. The MiKs Chart enables a negotiation of this type of change, however, it does not provide a means to deal with all the changes to natural light that happen in the course of a day.

In addition to changes in colour, natural light fluctuates further according to cloud cover and the movement of the sun. As a result of weather conditions, photographs often contain a combination of well-lit areas and shaded spots. This discontinuity in lighting plays a less-than-advantageous role in rock art photography (as well as in field archaeology). Paintings partially covered by shadow and partially inundated with sunlight cause problems for light metering, camera settings, and ensuring the recording of detail in both the highlighted and shadowed areas.

This condition proved to be a daily challenge during the photography portion of my fieldwork. The sun shone brightly everyday for the three weeks I worked on the lake recording the paintings. The lovely sunny weather caused strong shadows to be cast across
the rock art panels. Consequently, I found myself backtracking to panels later in the afternoon or ensuring I arrived early in the morning to particular sites in order to photograph them in even-lighting conditions. It was not until after I had completed the photographic portion of my fieldwork that I had an opportunity to consider a method for blocking and reflecting light that would have been beneficial to the recording process.

The blocking and reflecting tests I conducted showed that reflected light created a flattened sense to photographs, as a result the pictographs were somewhat more visible than with unaided natural light, but the natural condition of the rock surface was lessened. Blocked light restored the contours of the rock face giving the pictograph a more authentic appearance, but the pigment was slightly less visible. From these tests, I determined that reflected light was better suited for photographing faded or calcite covered pictographs because it may enhance the pigment and bring out more details. Conversely, blocked light was better suited to well preserved, more vibrant pictographs where retaining the natural features of the rock surface could be achieved without sacrificing visibility of the paint.

**Locating and Recording the Paintings**

Once I had determined the approach I would take to locate and record the paintings I departed for Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and several weeks of intensive work. The testing and planning I had done prior to locating and recording the paintings enabled me to work efficiently and record a vast amount of information. Almost all of the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are visible from the water and those that are not are most easily accessed from the water. It was therefore, logical to locate the paintings by boat.
I began the shoreline survey at North Arm and worked down the lake in sections toward Nak'azdli (Figure 5). I spent three weeks scrutinizing the entire shoreline of the lake, slowly traveling the perimeter in a 14 foot Mercury inflatable boat searching rock outcroppings and cliff faces for pictographs. My husband, Robert Ksyniuk accompanied and aided me during this portion of my fieldwork, as he did during the interview process. I examined the southern and northern shores with equal attention, despite the low probability associated with the southern shore. Even though the leg of my survey along the southern shore took less time than the examination of the northern shore, I thoroughly explored this entire shoreline. I exerted the same effort with respect to the islands in the lake, where I examined the perimeter of each land mass.

I photographed all traces of pigment that I found, regardless of how small or how deteriorated sections of pigment appeared. As a result, some of the photographs of the paintings contain patches of red pigment that no longer have any discernable shape (Appendix L). I incorporated the MiKs Chart in the photographs I took of the paintings. In cases where the paintings were located at inaccessible heights I did not utilize the Chart.

During the archaeological survey I organized the paintings that I located into sites. A site is defined as a place where past human activity is evident (Bednarik 2001). I determined the
boundaries of the rock art sites according to the natural features of the land, where I considered the location of the paintings and how that corresponded to the rock outcroppings and cliff faces. Through this approach I recognized 14 rock art sites (cf. Figure 7, p. 101; Figure 8, p. 102).

Within each of these sites I organized the paintings according to panels. Whitley (2001) defines a rock art panel as “a natural rock cleavage plane or surface.” I determined the boundaries of the panels in accordance with the natural orientation of the rock surface. If the surface of the rock changed in terms of the direction it faced I classified it as a separate panel. This approach resulted in varying numbers of panels between sites. For example Site 2 extends for several hundred feet and contains eighteen panels while Site 13 is composed of a single painting. These organizing approaches enabled me to acknowledge the placement of the paintings in the physical landscape.

In addition to photographing the rock art, I filled out a separate recording card for each panel. I generated a site and panel number for each painting and I recorded measurements, where possible, and the direction each panel faced. I recorded the location of each rock art panel onto a Garmin etrex Vista global positioning system (GPS) as a waypoint. These waypoints recorded the location of the rock art sites digitally and they provided me with a way to keep the rock art images organized in the order they were located along the shoreline. GPS units vary in precision according to the satellite signal received by the unit. Location and cloud cover for example, can interrupt and alter the accuracy of the signal received by the unit. In order to acknowledge this fluctuation I recorded the level of accuracy in distances of feet for each waypoint.
Ethnographic Fieldwork

At the time I began my research, many aspects of the Carrier culture were in the process of being studied through organized efforts in each of the community treaty offices. Attention was focused on incorporating research results into the First Nations school curriculum so that the knowledge gathered during projects was reciprocated with the communities. The timing and nature of this project fit nicely into the agenda and scope of Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli research aspirations and the aims of the Yekooche people to highlight the traditional ways of their people.

Interviews with First Nations People

I chose to conduct the archaeological survey prior to the ethnographic portion of my fieldwork. At the beginning of my working relationship with the people at Tache we discussed the possibility of Elders accompanying me to the rock art sites during the recording stage, but unfortunately this did not happen. The busy nature of people’s lives, my own included prevented us from successfully coordinating group-trips to the rock art. Recording the rock art prior to conducting the interviews enabled me to develop a familiarity with the paintings prior to speaking with First Nations people and to bring photographs of the markings to the interviews. I felt it would have been inappropriate for me to arrive at an interview without the information I gathered during the archaeological survey, to have done otherwise seemed to me to be disrespectful to the people who had agreed to an interview.

Arranging Interviews. Once I had all of the rock paintings photographed and recorded I started to organize and arrange interviews with First Nations people at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. At the time of my initial meeting with Chief Alexis, I was furnished with a list of potential Tache respondents. I worked from this list to organize interviews and I coordinated
this process with the Treaty Office at Tache, under the supervision of Beverly Bird and Mona Anatole. From this list I interviewed Philip Felix and Josie Felix on October 25, 2004 and Celestine Thomas on November 9, 2005. My interviews with these people took place in their homes at Tache.

A similar process occurred at Nak’azdli, where I coordinated my efforts with Sharon Bird at the Treaty Office. At Nak’azdli I interviewed Mildred Martin in her home on October 27, 2004. At Yekooche I coordinated my activities with Dean Joseph who supervised and helped me arrange interviews. The people from Yekooche that participated in this project are Johnny Joseph, Bessie Joseph, and Agnes Joseph. I interviewed the Josephs in their home at Yekooche on March 16, 2005. With the exception of the Yekooche participants, who were contacted in person, all the remaining participants were contacted by telephone to arrange interviews.

Despite the close working relationship between the Tache and Nak’azdli offices, each operates in a very different manner. Negotiating the expectations and protocols of each office took some getting used to. For example, at Tache the research department preferred to control the arranging of interviews. At Nak’azdli, the research department was happy for me to organize my own interviews and inform them of who intended to participate. Once I was familiar with the intricacies and expectations of the individuals on staff at these offices, I was better able to navigate this portion of the fieldwork. The Yekooche office also operated in a different manner. There I was invited to an Elders’ gathering in Fort St. James. Dean Joseph introduced me to several people and initiated the interview process by explaining the project and asking people if they would like to be interviewed.
In addition to contacting people on the reserves, I telephoned the Dakelh Elders’ Society in Prince George and explained my project and asked if they knew of anyone who would like to participate. I was referred to Nellie Prince, who agreed to an interview on April 9, 2005. During the initial telephone conversation with Nellie, she suggested I contact Yvonne Pierreroy in Prince George. Yvonne and I met at UNBC on October 5, 2004 to talk about the rock art. My conversation with Yvonne led to an interview with her mother Mildred Martin, of Nak’azdli.

The Tache Treaty Office kindly provided me with transcripts from six interviews conducted by the TL’azt’en Nation in 1998 and 2004. These interviews covered a variety of topics, but only two interviews pertained to the pictographs, consequently they are the only previously conducted interviews I utilize in this research. These interviews were conducted in 2004 with Robert Hanson and Sophie Monk.

**Conducting Interviews.** At the interviews I conducted, each participant was provided with a consent form and a written description of the research project. I explained the project to each person and we reviewed the consent form in detail before we began talking about the rock art. Most people were uncomfortable signing the consent form before we had discussed anything, but I was careful to explain the necessity of informed consent and how the interview could not begin without their written permission (cf. Crabtree and Miller 1999; LeCompte and Schensul 1999).

I recorded onto tape each of the interviews I conducted. Recording the interviews in this manner permitted me to listen with undivided attention to what people were saying and to fully appreciate the many family photographs I was shown. I transcribed each interview tape
and organized the information people provided into several themes, according to the
functions and purposes of the rock art. I discuss these themes in detail in the next section.

At each interview I made sure the participant was aware that they could choose to be
anonymous at anytime during the research process (cf. Flick 1998). However, none of the
informants chose to be anonymous therefore their names appear in this research. Without the
input of these individuals this project would not have been successful at revealing the unique
and purposeful nature of the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun. As a way of bringing
recognition to the people who taught me about the rock paintings I have been careful to
include their names and voices throughout this thesis as testimony to their presence in this
research and the knowledge they shared.

Each informant also had the opportunity to request copies of the transcripts and details of
the research as it unfolded. I made sure each person was aware of this and I was careful to
include several ways in which I could be contacted so people could make such a request.
None of the informants or members of the various treaty offices made any requests to see
transcripts or read drafts of this research.

The type of questions asked during an interview can play a significant role in the kind of
information that is passed on. I wanted to be sure that I did not sway the interviews in any
particular direction. I saw my role as being to encourage people to talk about their
knowledge and feelings toward the paintings (cf. Maguire 1987; Reinharz 1992). I did go to
each interview with a list of questions (Appendix J) I hoped would be answered, but in
reality the answers to my questions arrived in varying degrees throughout the conversations I
had with people.
Asking participants to “tell me about the rock paintings” was at times the only question from my list that I inquired about. I preferred to listen to what people had to say and how they wanted to say it, rather than control the direction of conversation (cf. Hesse-Biber et al. 1999). By listening to Elders speak and by following their paths of consciousness I was led to unexpected and interesting places that my prepared questions could never have reached.

During the interviews people spoke about the rock art in terms that reached far beyond our discussion of the paintings. People spoke of their experiences that were relevant to the rock art in personal ways. They expressed their knowledge of the functions attributed to the paintings and they spoke of traditional life-ways of the past. Accompanying the knowledge they provided were expressions of sentiment and respect toward the past and its people.

At Tache and Nak’azdli, Elders participating in this research received monetary acknowledgement for their contributions. The Nak’azdli and Tache offices respectfully and kindly provided this support. I contributed to this acknowledgement by bringing a gift of appreciation for all of the informants at the time of the interview, including the people I spoke with at Yekooche.

I had originally intended to engage in collaborative story or “tour” writing with the people I interviewed. I envisioned band members gathering together to develop a story line for a rock art narrative that could be incorporated into this thesis – one that could illustrate the human activities associated with rock painting. Unfortunately, this joint writing activity did not come about for a variety of reasons, of which the lack of space to hold such a meeting and my own lack of familiarity with orchestrating such an event played key roles.
Analysis

This interview process generated a vast amount of interesting information. In order to organize and thoroughly utilize the knowledge and experiences that had been passed on to me, I examined the transcripts of each interview and isolated two general themes associated with the meanings and purposes of the rock art. Within these two broad categories I identified several sub-categories. Table 1 below illustrates these themes and the associated sub-categories. The intricacies of these themes are fully explored in Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message-Paintings</th>
<th>Divination-Paintings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informative to the audience</td>
<td>Informative to the painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide details about the painter’s location and activities on the land. These paintings aid the audience to find the painter.</td>
<td>1. Function as divination portals that provide information about the painter’s adversary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide details about the territory and how to travel through an area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide details about the sightings and locations of animals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Themes in the meanings and purposes of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art.

In addition to this information regarding the functions of the rock art people talked about the paintings in terms of contemporary personal meanings. This information was important to my research because it indicated that meaning continued to be embedded in the rock art landscape despite the disappearance of the painting tradition. I isolated these personal meanings from the transcripts and organized them according to participant. I present these personal meanings in Chapter 5.

I found during the analysis stage of my research that negotiating the transformation from spoken to written word presented some challenges. I realize that this transformation is a very
real and necessary part of research. This thesis is an example of a type of research that is dependant on that transformation, but one that simultaneously allows the voices of the participants to be heard. During this transformation process, I paid particular attention not to distort or filter words. I do, however, recognize that my presence has not been completely removed. I feel that by presenting the words and experiences of the informants I have successfully navigated this transformation. I feel that by including the words of the informants as they were spoken effectively removes myself as researcher from the traditional position of omniscient observer thereby maintaining a focus on the participants and their knowledge (cf. Tuhiwai Smith 1999).

In terms of analyzing the rock art sites I recorded during the locating and recording stage of my fieldwork I organized the photographs of the paintings according to their location on the lake. I kept these photographs easily accessible and visible throughout the analysis stage of my research so that I could become completely familiar with the motifs and their locations on the lake (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Working-organization of the rock art photographs.
I worked through the images of the rock art and identified the subject matter of each painting according to seven main categories. I divided each of these base-categories into several sub-categories. I was not able to identify all of the images down to this smallest classification because some of the motifs did not contain enough detail to make this possible. My interest here was to be able to identify as much detail as possible in each of the motifs. Table 2 illustrates this organization and category scheme. The catalogue of photographs in Appendix L contains this information for each of the paintings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Related</th>
<th>Human Related</th>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnivores</td>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Dot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox/Wolf/Coyote</td>
<td>Den</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Tally-mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>Fishing basket</td>
<td>Finger-mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungulates</td>
<td>Laying down</td>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Rock art motif categories and sub-categories.

I identified the subject matter of each painting according to the interpretations contained in Morice (1893), Corner (1968), and McMurdø (1971). In order to understand how each
image was constructed I spent time drawing the motifs. This exercise enabled me to recognize intricate details and identify basic elements in each of the motifs that aided me in the interpretation stage. My interpretations of the rock paintings appear in Appendix L.

Throughout this project I endeavored to understand the rock art based on First Nations knowledge and information. The sources I relied on to understand the social processes associated with the paintings are the interviews I conducted with First Nations people and to a lesser degree the work of Morice (1893). I continued with this sentiment in the interpretation stage even through I relied on secondary sources to identify the markings. The secondary sources I draw from to interpret the paintings are rich with First Nations identifications of the motifs.

In the following chapter, Rock Art Tours and Meanings, I focus on the incentives and motivations for the production and use of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art. I also provide information regarding the location, access and orientation of the rock art sites and I include some photographs and interpretations of the rock art, along with the personal narratives generated in this research.
Chapter Five
ROCK ART TOURS AND MEANINGS

Since the onset of this project it has been my goal to emphasize human action and agency with respect to the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. This goal has stemmed from my interest to reach beyond a strictly quantitative approach to the study of rock art. It is my belief that the adoption of a research framework that includes an examination of the social processes of rock art and the content of markings is better suited to the aims of archaeology and its endeavor to understand the human past. It is when we consider the human social processes associated with rock art in conjunction with the markings themselves that we gain a richer insight into the past as a place and a time of meaning(s).

In this chapter I present the information and experiences that comprise my fieldwork and archival research. This chapter represents my journey of learning about the rock art. Here I embrace the concept of “tour” first introduced in Chapter 3, as I include my experiences of conducting this project. In keeping with the spirit of the “tour,” the voices of First Nations people resonate throughout this chapter including those who participated in this research and projects conducted in 2004 by the Tl’azt’en Nation. The words of Father Morice as he endeavored to understand the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are also included in this chapter.

I begin with an account of the rock art landscape and the physical context of the markings. I provide details concerning location and accessibility and orientation of the pictographs. From there I move on to a consideration of the rock art motifs themselves where I provide a discussion of the symbols and signs traditionally used by the Carrier
people for communication. Here I make the connection between the rock art motifs and this larger system of non-verbal communication based on a shared subject matter and image style. Next, I discuss the human action and agency associated with the production and use of the rock art by focusing on the teachings of the First Nations Elders who participated in the interviews for this research and projects conducted previously. I also draw from Morice in this discussion of social processes. Finally, I present the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art as a landscape of continuous meaning. My own photographs of the rock art punctuate this chapter and I provide a catalogue of rock art images and interpretations in Appendix L.

The Physical Landscape of the Rock Art

In addition to locating and photographing the rock paintings during the archaeological survey portion of my fieldwork, the time I spent on the lake looking for paintings provided me with a sense of the physical landscape of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun as well as a familiarity with the location and types of rock art images. The process I utilized to locate the paintings included traveling slowly along the water close to the shore, examining rock surfaces for markings and exploring the many trails and escarpments located near the water. It was during this leg of my research that I became familiar with the rock art in the context of the physical landscape of the lake and the immediate surrounding area. It is with this context that I begin the “tour” of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art.  

Previous research efforts in the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun area have recognized several of the same sites that I identify in this thesis. In particular, the work of Morice (1893), Comer (1968) and Richards (1978) have identified the location of rock art sites along the southeast shoreline of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. In this research I build on these previous efforts to include a survey of the entire shoreline of the lake, including the islands. My survey of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun results in the identification of rock art panels not previously recorded. Each of Morice (1893), Comer (1968) and Richards (1978) have their own unique ways of organizing the rock art into sites, as do I, making it difficult to identify exactly how many more sites have been identified in this thesis.
Location

Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is approximately 50 miles in length and it is roughly 6 miles across at its widest point. The northern shoreline in particular exhibits a natural landscape that is breathtakingly beautiful and considerably more suitable for rock painting than the southern shore. The lake is circumscribed by exposed rock faces and mountainous areas along the northern shore and forested lowlands along its southern edges. The rock faces of the northern shore provide miles of potential painting areas, and it is this shoreline toward the east end of the lake, that the largest concentration of rock art sites is found (Figure 7). The lake contains roughly 30 islands, many of which exhibit exposed rock surfaces that are suitable for painting. Interestingly, only one of these islands - Battleship Island - houses paintings. The map below (Figure 8) illustrates the distributions of sites around the lake and complements the information in Table 3.  

---

7 I have chosen not to disclose the exact locations of the rock art sites identified in this research because of my personal concerns regarding vandalism.
Figure 8. Map of Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun identifying the inland rock art sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Mainland</th>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Shoreline Paintings</th>
<th>Inland Paintings</th>
<th>Open Air</th>
<th>Rock Shelter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 5</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 6</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 7</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 8</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 9</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 10</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 11</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 12</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 13</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 14</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Rock art site locations on Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun.
The pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are located on prominent rock outcroppings and exposed cliff faces along the shore for the length of the lake (Figure 9 and 10). To a certain extent, the painters chose the location for their markings based on the presence of these outcroppings and cliffs, but a substantial amount of suitable rock surface along the shore remains unpainted – indicating that the placement of paintings was dependant on criteria other than the availability of rock.

*Today we started and finished surveying the section of lake near Tache. Found only one pictograph today near the Caroosat Reserve. I was surprised to find just this one painting in an area of this size, especially considering the amount of exposed rock along the shore. Today has left me contemplating the placement of paintings and questioning why here and not there?*

Field Journal entry for June 2, 2004

At this point during my fieldwork in June, 2004 I knew the locations of the paintings were not solely dependant on the presence of exposed rock, but it would not be until I spoke with the First Nations Elders during the interviews that the connection between the placement of the paintings in the landscape and the messages contained in the markings would be fully revealed.

All of the rock art sites at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun contain paintings located along the shore. Two of these sites also have markings located at inland areas away from the shoreline.
These inland sites are located within a few hundred feet of the main shoreline. Even though these sites are accessible from the shore I have categorized them as "inland" versus "shoreline" because they are not directly accessible or visible from the water. The photographs in Figures 11 and 13 illustrate the location of these two sites with respect to the water's edge. The paintings that are located on Battleship Island are also positioned at the water's edge.

With the exception of one pictograph, all of the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak' al Bun are located at open-air sites where the markings are exposed to the year-round forces of nature. The exception to this condition is a large rock shelter that houses one painting (Figure 12). This pictograph is located at the top of a steep slope and it cannot be seen from the water. At the top of this rocky rise a trail skirts the edge of the rock shelter and continues up the mountain. This rock shelter houses one of the 18 rock art panels at Site 2. Despite the presence of exposed rock surfaces and small outcroppings on the mountain I did not locate any more paintings in this area.

Figure 11. Photograph of the rock shelter site at Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun. The white arrow indicates the approximate location of the painting at Site 2.

Figure 12. The pictograph located in the rock shelter.
Accessibility and Orientation

All of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun can be reached via water travel, including the two inland sites. While some sites are only accessible from the water others have shore access that would have provided a landing on which the painters stood to produce the markings. Many of the sites can be accessed from both inland and water routes, however, at most sites there is little room or suitable ground surface for people to have been at the location for purposes other than to paint the rock. Large jagged rocks compose much of the ground cover at many of these sites. Consequently, the opportunities to excavate the areas directly associated with the paintings are minimal. The graph below illustrates the accessibility of the rock art panels at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun (see Appendix K which provides more in-depth details about site accessibility).
The paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun have not always been accessible and oriented in the manner that they are today. The information contained in Figure 14 and Appendix K reflects the contemporary accessibility and orientation of the rock art. The position of the paintings relative to the shoreline would have been different during the time the paintings were created and used. Changes in the physical landscape caused by lake level fluctuations would have affected access, orientation and travel to the rock art to some degree. Determining the exact condition of the landscape at the time of the painters is beyond the scope of this project, however it is important to note that the physical landscape of the rock art has changed over time.

Figure 15. Seasonal fluctuations in water level at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Graph kindly produced by Terry Chamulak, Senior Hydrologist, Basin Operations, Saskatchewan Watershed Authority. Reproduced with permission by Terry Chamulak.

Changes over time to the physical landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun in terms of lake level fluctuations have been recorded by the Water Survey of Canada (www.wsc.ec.gc.ca). This organization maintains records regarding the history of lake level fluctuations throughout the country. These records for Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun span from 1955 through to 1995. Since the time this record keeping began, Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun has exhibited a
general seasonal trend in lake levels where the highest fluctuation occurs in the months of June and July. At this time of the year the lake level fluctuates approximately 4.5 meters (Figure 15). A significant change in lake level potentially affects both the accessibility and location of the rock art. The physical changes to the rock art landscape in terms of lake level are illustrated below (Figures 16, 17 and 18).

Figure 16. Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art, Site 9. Photograph taken in 2005. Lake level is considerably lower than it is in the 1948 photographs of the same site in Figures 17 and 18 below.

Figure 17. Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art, photograph taken in 1948. The white box location of the paintings. Photograph courtesy of British Columbia Archives, I-20885.

Figure 18. Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art, taken in 1948. The white box indicates the location of the paintings. Photograph courtesy of British Columbia Archives, I-20886.
The history of annual water levels at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun indicates that on a yearly basis the average daily water level peaked inconsistently throughout this forty year period (Figure 19). Consequently, the mean monthly water levels for Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun reveal no historic trend capable of estimating historic water levels prior to 1955 (personal communication Terry Chamulak December 22, 2005). This condition prevents calculating the water levels associated with the distant past and the creation of the paintings, however, characteristics of some of the paintings indicate that a significant change in water level, relative to today’s conditions, is plausible for the time period when the paintings were placed onto the rock.

Some of the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun are located so high up the rock faces that reaching them from the water is impossible (Appendix K). In the cases of all of these higher elevation paintings, no footholds or ledges are available to provide access for humans to
ascend the cliff face. Here it is important to consider how the painters could have reached these heights and how the level of the lake may have played a role in the placement of these higher elevation paintings. Elsewhere in the province, Aboriginal rock art is located at similar heights on what seems like impassable rock surfaces. The Stein River Valley in southern British Columbia is such a place. Several rock paintings are located in places much higher than is humanly possible to reach. For the Stein River rock art, First Nations oral history reported that in the past people dangled from above, secured by ropes, to access and paint prominent rock panels (York et al. 1993; see also Williams 2001 for a contemporary approach to high elevation Aboriginal rock painting).

The terrain associated with the higher-elevation paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun is such that it is unlikely for someone to have descended from the rock cliffs above. The condition of the rock surface is such that a person would have to descend an incredible distance to reach these panels. Descending the mountain from above to reach the location of these higher-placed paintings would also entail bypassing equally suitable if not more-prominent rock surfaces located much higher up. Such methods of painting are not indicated in the ethnographic material for Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, nor were they discussed during the interviews with First Nations people.

It is more likely that the water level, at the time of painting, was higher than it is today. An increase in the water’s level anywhere from 5 to 15 feet would have provided the elevation increase needed to place these higher-located paintings in their current positions. The increase in water level that provided the conditions necessary for the painters to place these higher-elevation markings onto the rock would have also caused the submersion of other paintings (Figure 20).
When I conducted the lake survey for this research I started looking for rock art sites at the northwest end of the lake near Yekooche, and I traveled southeast toward Nak'azdli. On previous trips to the lake I had always traveled in the opposition direction, beginning at the east end and working my way up the lake in the direction of Yekooche. Part of my reason for beginning at the northwest shore was to vary my experience on the landscape and to begin recording the rock art at the farthest point on the lake. This new route meant that the rock art sites I was already familiar with would be reversed in order and therefore I would see them from a new perspective.

Some of the paintings that I had so easily seen when I traveled the lake in my usual direction toward Yekooche, were now not so easily visible. For these paintings I had to look
back, away from the direction I traveled in order to see them. If I had not already known where some of these markings were positioned I could have easily missed locating them because of the direction of my journey. These paintings are not so much obstructed from view when approached from the northwest as they seem to have been consciously placed with travelers from the east in mind. Could the painters have oriented their markings with the target audience’s direction of travel in mind? Or did the orientation of the markings reflect the painters’ direction of travel?

Figure 21. Shoreline rock art site oriented away from the water. The white arrow indicates the approximate location of the painting.

Figure 22. Pictograph located at the site featured in Figure 21, Site 11.

Other markings around the lake are positioned on rock surfaces so as to be visible via a particular approach or route of travel. The paintings located along the shoreline are typically oriented toward the lake and most are only visible from the water, indicating that water travelers were the expected audience and that the painter had used the same mode of transport. However, two shoreline paintings are purposely oriented away from the water and positioned on the rock to be most visible to travelers arriving at the shore via an overland route (Figures 21, 22, 23 and 24). The position of the paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun does not necessarily function to dictate a path of movement across the landscape but rather positioning reflects the direction of travel most commonly taken by the audience. Placing
paintings according to common routes of travel would have been in the painters’ best
interests for communicating their messages.

Figure 23. Shoreline rock art site oriented away
from the water. White arrow indicates the general
placement of the painting.

Figure 24. Pictograph located at the site featured
in Figure 23, with inset illustration, Site 11.

During the archaeological survey it was my intention to locate and record as much of the
rock art possible, but I recognize that my efforts have produced only a partial recording of
the entire rock art assemblage. The vastness of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and the abundance of
exposed rock surfaces both contribute to the likelihood of me having “missed” locating and
recording some of the paintings, as do the processes of weather and the effects of taphonomy
which work to deteriorate and remove pictographs from the rock surface (cf. Bednarik 2001;

Figure 25. Deteriorated pictograph, Site 2.
Figure 26. Deteriorated pictograph, Site 2.
Figure 27. Deteriorated pictograph, with inset, Site 4.
Given the extent to which First Nations people have occupied the area of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and the rest of the province, it is feasible to expect more rock art to be located in this region. It is plausible that much more rock art (than was recorded in this study) did exist at one time at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun and that the affects of weather and taphonomy have successfully removed these older paintings. I did located evidence of eroded pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun during the archaeological survey. The photographs in Figures 25 to 31 illustrate examples of some of the deterioration that has occurred with the passage of time.

Figure 28. Deteriorated rock art panel. Traces of pigment indicate that at one time many paintings covered this rock panel, Site 4.

Figure 29. Illustration of pictograph panel featured in Figure 28.

Figure 30. Pictograph encased in calcium carbonate, Site 2.

Figure 31. Illustration of pictograph featured in Figure 30. Produced by John Comer, 1968. Reproduced with permission from Mrs. Dora Comer.
Locating and recording the rock art was one part of my fieldwork. Identifying and interpreting the images was another part. Although some of the motifs are easily recognized as animals and humans, others are more difficult to identify. Despite the challenges of interpretation, it is evident that the paintings share a remarkable similarity in terms of form. Once I had learned to identify the subject matter of the motifs I recognized that the content of the markings was also significantly similar. This comparability in style and subject matter indicated that the painters constructed their markings based on a collective understanding of symbols, rather than as an individual expression of style. The Carrier practice of using commonly understood symbols to communicate with one another was not limited to rock art motifs.

**Carrier Communication Symbols**

Toward the end of the 19th century Father Morice investigated the symbols commonly used by the Carrier people. His research included an investigation of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun where he recorded illustrations and First Nations interpretations for a few of the pictographs (Figures 32 and 33). At this time, the Native peoples considered most of the pictographs at the lake to be “very old” (Morice 1893:207). In addition to his interest in the rock art motifs, Morice was also concerned with other types of symbols. In particular, he gathered information about the symbols used by the Carrier people for facial and bodily tattoos (Figures 34 and 35) and the signs used by hunters for communication in the forest (Figure 36).
Just as a similarity is evident in the rock art motifs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, a correlation in terms of style and subject matter exists between the markings made on rock, the images used for tattoos and the hunters’ symbols recorded by Morice. The important role animals played (and continue to play) in First Nations economic and subsistence strategies is
reflected in this system of non-verbal communication where animal forms dominate the assemblage of symbols. The types of animals portrayed in this system of symbols were (and most still are) the basic food and raw materials traditionally harvested by the Carrier people (cf. Morice 1889, Hudson 1983).

It is because of this similarity in form and subject matter that I draw from this assemblage of symbols to identify and understand the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art motifs (Appendix L). I recognize that Morice recorded only a selection of symbols rather than an entire system of graphic images. It is therefore likely that the assemblage of tattoo symbols and hunting signs used by the Carrier people contained additional images unreported by Morice, just as the types and quantity of rock art motifs present at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun exceed those markings recorded by him. Nonetheless, these symbols and the interpretations provided by the First Nations people offer a logical starting point from which to understand and identify the subject matter portrayed in the rock art.

![Figure 34. Carrier facial tattoos identified by First Nations people in the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun area, circa 1890. Produced by Morice (1893). Reproduced with permission from Early Canadiana Online, produced by Canadiana.org, CIHM 15679.](image)

The subjects depicted in this system of symbols were part of the “real-world” in which the Carrier people lived and engaged in a reciprocal relationship with the land and its resources,
but the way in which these images were rendered was coded rather than “real”. This coded form of communication was based on a series of simple efficient line-types where only the predominant features of the subject were depicted. For example, the fish in Figure 34 has been reduced to several solid lines that represent its body, tail, gills, and fin, as have other animal forms in this same table. Similarly, the beaver and other animals in Figure 36 are composed of straight lines that represent the main features of each animal’s body. These characteristics are also reflected in the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art motifs (Appendix L).

Most of the symbols recorded by Morice are of this “sold-line” type but others are more “outlined” in terms of style, where characteristics of the subject are indicated by blank internal spaces. The crane/beetle motif in Figure 32 and the beaver symbol in Figure 34 are examples of this style. Some “outlined” images contain internal markings which provide details which are characteristic of the subject. The frog motif in Figure 33, the fern root digger in Figure 34 and the beaver symbol in Figure 35 are examples of images displaying internal detailing. Other symbols have this internal space completely filled in with pigment, rendering the image in a “silhouette” style. The caribou marking in Figure 32, the grizzly bear, grouse, and sturgeon motifs in Figure 33 are examples of this “silhouette” style.
Morice (1893:206) indicated that the practice of tattooing had already begun to diminish by the time he recorded this information. He also indicated that the knowledge and ability to interpret tattoo images and rock art motifs were also rapidly dwindling by the time of his writing (1893:209). The paucity of Native knowledge regarding these practices, however, may not have been so pronounced. It is possible that Morice, eager to demonstrate his success at assimilating the Native peoples, exhibited a certain level of resistance with respect to reporting the continuation of traditional ways and traditional knowledge (cf. Mulhall 1986).

Based on a letter sent to Harlan Smith in 1929, Corner (1968:117) indicated a similar receded level of First Nations knowledge regarding the interpretation and understanding of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun pictographs. At this time, Chief Louis Billy Prince and “other Carrier Indians” (Corner 1968:117) interpreted some of the rock markings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. The interpretations these people provided appear in Figure 37 and 38.
rock art interpretations gathered in 1929 differ somewhat from the identifications made in 1893. For example, Morice (1893:207) records the central animal symbol in Figure 37 as a grizzly bear with a trail of paw prints. The Native people interpreting this image in 1929 identified this same animal figure as a caribou with grizzly bear tracks (Corner 1968:117).

The discrepancies in interpretations can be attributed to a variety of causes. It seems from Corner’s report that the efforts in 1929 to record interpretations of the rock art were based on the knowledge of a very small group of people. The small population providing the interpretations, along with the passage of time, discontinuation of the painting tradition and physical changes to the motifs due to the affects of weather and taphonomy likely contributed to these discrepancies.
Despite the alleged lack of knowledge regarding the subject matter of the rock art motifs, the people providing interpretations in 1929 acknowledged the context in which the paintings originated as being dreams and life events (Corner 1968:117). This context echoes Morice's account of the role dreams played in the creation of some of the pictographs featured in Figure 33. Similar sentiments regarding the connection between the motifs and real life events were made by the contemporary First Nations people participating in the interviews conducted for this research. I discuss these aspects of the purposes and functions of the rock art shortly. Here what is important is that the Native peoples from the Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun area have identified the same influences and contexts for the production of the rock paintings over the past one hundred and twelve years.

In addition to these "hand drawn" symbols, hunters and other people traveling through the forest left other types of messages for one another (Morice 1893:210; see also Blackstock 2001). These additional types of messages were constructed from tree branches which were cut, secured into the ground and modified according to the nature of the message (Figure 39).
These messages were left in the forest at prominent places along the path. This type of communication was used in conjunction with the symbols in Figure 36, which were typically drawn onto trees with charcoal. Morice (1893:210-211) recorded the following examples and interpretations of this mode of communication.

![Carrier communication signs](image)

A. an unmodified branch  
B. “we are going to camp a short distance off. You need not be in a hurry”  
C. “we are going to camp a long distance from here; hurry up!”  
D. “we have turned back a while, but finally gone on”  
E. “a burnt rag hanging from a bent down rod; it is the signal of famine and an appeal for help, the direction of the stick always points to the trail of the distressed party”  
F. “a small bunch of dry grass wherein a small rod has been driven as an indication that a member of the band has been shot”  
G. “a short stick is found hanging across the trail...everybody will understand that a person in the preceding party has come to his death from natural causes”

Figure 39. Carrier communication signs identified by First Nations people in the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun area, circa 1890. Produced by Morice (1893). Reproduced with permission from Early Canadiana Online, produced by Canadiana.org, CHIM 15679.

The level to which the Carrier people could effectively communicate with one another through this system of symbols and messages is made evident by the following passage by Morice (1893:210),

*I was traveling in the forest at a time when the yearly reappearance of the salmon was eagerly looked for. At a certain spot not very far from a stream we came upon one of those aboriginal drawings made by an old man who had no knowledge of the syllabic signs now used to write the Dene*
languages. The drawing represented a man with a woman, a horse with a burden, the emblem of a bear with three marks underneath, and a caribou. Above the whole and hanging from a broken branch were four pieces of young bark cut out in the conventional form of the fish. Now the message was instantly read by my companions, and it ran thus: "Such a one (whom they named) has passed here with his wife, and a good load of furs, after having killed three bears and one caribou; and furthermore he captured four salmon two days ago. He is now gone in that direction that we follow ourselves." This date could evidently not have been told had the Indian marked with charcoal the sign of the salmon. He was so well aware of this and was so much intent upon fixing the time of the first appearance of the fish that he had had recourse to the pieces of bark, the relative degree of freshness of which he knew could easily be determined by the experienced eye of his fellow Carrier.

George M. Dawson reported a similar incident in his journal of 1875-1876 (Cole and Lockner 1989:256). Referring to a Carrier man he hired to guide him from Fraser Lake to Francois Lake, Dawson recorded this experience,

Where stopped for lunch, found an old canoe drawn up, & near it, tied to a piece of bark-string & depending from a pole, a bundle of weeds, about 9 inches long, neatly folded together, & a piece of spruce bark, on the inner side of which roughly drawn a figure... Could not quite understand the Indians explanation of these signs, but appears that the Indian owning the canoe left it here, & not having returned, or been seen for a long time, is supposed to be dead. These signs put up by some of his friends to make this known.

Both Morice and Dawson provide explicit examples of the extent to which this system of symbols and signs were capable of communicating detailed messages. These examples also demonstrate the existence of a collective understanding, on behalf of the Carrier people, regarding the interpretation and meanings embedded in this system of graphic images. During the interview process, contemporary Elders spoke of the rock art motifs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun in terms of this shared understanding of form and meaning, and the ability of people long ago to read details from a few simple rock markings.
The Humanized Landscape of Action, Agency and Rock Art

Philip and Josie Felix were the first Elders to teach me about the paintings. We sat at their kitchen table in their home at Tache, and looked at the photographs I had brought and we talked about the rock art (Figure 40). Philip often pulled pictures from a family photo album to show me the places and experiences he spoke of. His voice was confident and his manner was that of a man easy to respect. I saw faces of cherished family members in the photographs and heard Philip tell stories of travel and expeditions into the mountains. A sense of pride resonated in his voice when he spoke of the past, and at times, I sensed a pang of longing in him for days gone by.

Figure 40. Looking across Stuart Lake/Nak'āl Būn from Tache.

Philip explained that the paintings were connected to people traveling across the land as they went about their business. “My dad used to tell me, they go, wherever they travel, they pen these, or any rock where people pass by,” he said, pointing to the photographs (Figure 41). “Whatever they had been doing, they put their design on the rock.” He explained further that, “clans all over the place, they got their own design...and they put it, they put it on the rock... when they go traveling around looking for animals, when they see one, they put it on, they put their mark on the rock.”
Philip informed me, in the past, people used to locate and follow animal trails in order to make observations about animal behavior and learn the habits of the creatures in their territory (Figures 42, 43 and 44). He explained, that because different areas had different animals, people were usually familiar with the patterns and habits of the animals in their own territory, but not the animals found in other regions. Markings, he said, left on the rock, worked to help those people traveling outside their own territories find the animals they were looking for. As an example, Philip explained,

*If Manson Creek man pass through down here he'll put his design like the caribou - them, they got caribou - so these people around here, they don't know where this animal like that kind is [but] then after that (the painting) they know where to go, where to get caribou. Anywhere they travel...them people, they used to travel all over, they were hunters, they hunt all over, no little small area.*

*We just hunt what we know best around here – like moose, deer, and bear and things like that, and beaver. All that we know we've got here, that's our design – all that animals around here. And them, they got caribou and elk further down south, and out west they might have something else, they've got all kinds of designs. That's how these got on the rock.*
Throughout the time that Philip spoke about the paintings, Josie offered insightful information that brought clarity to our discussion of the rock art. Josie commented that the paintings indicated things like the location of meeting places for hunters to draw together and that the short tally-mark paintings indicated a system of counting – perhaps relating to the number of days spent in the bush, or the expected duration of a trip (Figures 45 and 46).

My interview with Philip and Josie Felix revealed information about the rock art that surprised me. I had not expected them to speak about the markings in terms of practical functions associated with everyday life. Most of the readings I had done about the purposes of rock art usually contained a link between the creation of motifs and vision quests, rites of
passage and dreams (cf. Teit 1896; York et al. 1993). From the teachings of Philip and Josie, however, it became apparent that the rock art was once part of a vernacular landscape of the past that was associated with the painter’s everyday activities of economic and subsistent pursuits.

Two days later, after having spent the morning with Philip and Josie at Tache, I found my way to Mildred Martin’s house near Nak’azdli. Soon after my arrival and our initial greetings, I sat on the floor of her living room and we paged through the rock art photographs. Mildred studied the photographs carefully and thoughtfully before she spoke. She told me the paintings were “messages that they leave for each other,” so people could tell one another what they were doing. The paintings were messages that contained information about peoples’ activities on the land.

Mildred explained that painting the rock was like “leaving a message for the person to know what he is doing, when he will be back.” I asked Mildred how someone reading the paintings could know who went where, and she answered by reassuring me that the people reading the messages, “know where and what it means.” Mildred explained that most people in general were well aware of each other’s activities out on the land,

“everybody knows where they set their traps. They know their lands. Just about everybody knows each other’s lines, where their lines are, where they’re trapping, where this person is trapping, and that person, where he is trapping. They all know each other’s lines.”

Mildred associated the painted circle image, which appears with considerable frequency at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, as representing traps or traplines. She interpreted the painting in Figure 47 as “three days out, three days back,” with respect to traveling to a trapline (see also Figure 48).
Mildred identified the painters as men “because they are the ones that travel around” but, she also noted, “there was always a woman with them. The woman traveled with the men on the traplines, long time ago. Sometimes, the whole family would go together on traplines.”

We talked next of men and women and how they would have been represented in the paintings. Mildred explained that women would be depicted wearing a long tunic-like skirt, much like the image of the woman illustrated by Morice in Figure 36. I eagerly scanned the rock art photographs hoping to find a human figure portrayed in the manner Mildred described, but I did not—all of the figures seemed to be wearing pants rather than skirts and others were only head and shoulder depictions that did not reveal either gender (Figures 49, 50 and 51).

Mildred Martin spoke of the purposes of the paintings in the same practical manner as Philip and Josie Felix had discussed subsistence practices and the communication function of motifs. Even though I had not identified the images of women in the rock art motifs or confirmed their role as painters as I had originally hoped, Mildred’s knowledge of the rock art revealed that the presence and importance of
women was associated with the paintings because they were present during the activities marked onto the rock. Not only were the images associated with the activities and work of women and men, but the presence of entire families traveling together on the land was contained in some of the markings.

My next interview was in the home of Johnny, Bessie, and Agnes Joseph, at the community of Yekooche (Figure 52). I sat at the kitchen table with Johnny and Bessie and we talked about the paintings and looked at the photographs. Someone had recently placed a bough on top of the wood stove in the kitchen and gradually a fresh forest scent mixed with the warmth of the fire spread throughout the room—it was lovely.

Johnny's extensive knowledge and experience with traditional hunting and trapping was demonstrated to me as soon as we began talking. The way he spoke of such things reflected a level of knowledge that could have only come from a lifetime of experience. This knowledge was what was embedded in the detailed miniature traps and snares he had skillfully crafted and happily showed to me. Johnny began to explain the rock paintings by telling me "the paintings are stories of what they have been doing, all those things, what they been doing when they go out trapping, fishing. They set rabbit snares, they set wolf snares, all that."
Bessie Joseph explained that the details recorded in these stories could aid in the recovery of lost hunters and trappers, by revealing information related to the whereabouts of the missing people. Bessie stated it was more likely when someone was hunting, rather than trapping, that they would become lost. A lost hunter would be inclined to stay underneath a spruce tree overnight and then find their way back in the light of day, she said. The painting feature in Figure 53 reminded Bessie of a lost hunter sleeping under the trees.

Agnes Joseph joined us at the table shortly after I arrived. Her hair was silvery white and her face beautifully etched with time. She sat beside the table in a comfortable chair and listened thoughtfully to our conversation. After a few minutes, Agnes began to explain the paintings,

"long time ago, they write on this – where they are going, what they are doing- that’s what they do...When they were in the bush there, that’s what they do, they write on the rock, where the path is and they tell them where they’re going...the Indian ways, they write...so they don’t get lost, if they get lost they have to look for it... they write things the Indian way, our language” (Figures 54, 55 and 56).

Agnes explained the concept of how the paintings would have been used, with respect to lost trappers,

"when our husbands they going to go to their trapline or some other place they tell us where they are going and then if they don’t come back, then somebody has to go and look for them if they get lost... he writes where he is going to go and if he don’t come back, they have to look for it (the painting)."
Johnny, Bessie, and Agnes all explained the rock art to me with a conscious effort to focus on the past and explain how things used to be. They commented about how things have changed so much with the passage of time and that gaining a complete understanding of the rock paintings and the messages contained in them is very difficult to achieve today. Bessie identified this problem and eloquently stated that it was so because, "the people who knew about the rock art are gone now."

The Josephs spoke of the messages contained in the rock art that were associated with subsistence activities and the desire on behalf of the painter to communicate with others who were out on the land. In particular, Agnes Joseph highlighted the function of the paintings as serving to aid in the location of individuals or groups out on the land. In this manner the rock art motifs functioned in a similar way as the hunting signs reported by Morice (1893:210-211). In both the rock art and hunting signs, placement in the landscape played a key role
alongside a shared understanding of the symbols. The knowledge shared by the Josephs complemented the real life activities discussed by the other participants and the association of such events with the rock art.

I returned to the community of Tache some months later to meet and interview Celestine Thomas. Two people from the Treaty Office, Morris Joseph and Nathan Seymour had arranged to be present for the interview and to video tape Celestine. I met Morris and Nathan at Celestine’s house and we gathered in the living room next to the wood stove. The door to Celestine’s house was propped open which allowed the crisp November air to mix with the warmth from the fire. Throughout the interview, Morris and Celestine often spoke in Carrier to one another and I wondered about the impact English was having on the research and how different things would be if I were able to speak Carrier.

We began our discussion of the rock art by talking about people traveling through the territory and Celestine explained that, “people used to go from place to place depending on the game and what time the fish is ready. Especially when the salmon run, that’s when they come here. They move from place to place, they never stayed in one place, they were all over” (Figure 57). Celestine explained the process of making paint by first identifying that a “special type of rock” was needed and “not any type of rock will do.” Once the proper rock was ground into a fine powder, she said, it was boiled and then ready for use. Our conversation turned to the durability of the paint itself and Celestine and Morris both commented how the paintings at the lake had just simply always been there.

Figure 57. Fish symbol and shoreline motif with inset illustration, Site 4.
One of the First Nations people participating in the interviews conducted in 2004 by the Tl’azt’en Nation, spoke about the preparation of the paint used in the pictographs. The red ochre, he said, was taken from the hillside across from Honeymoon Island. The people long ago, he said, would “make it just like powder. They pound, they pound until it get just like powder and they put grease on it and that’s what they paint it with.”

Another person participating in the 2004 Tl’azt’en Nation interviews was Sophie Monk, who stated that the rock paintings used to function in a similar way to placenames in that they provided information to travelers regarding how to move through an area. In particular, she indicated, rock paintings tell of important land and water-use places such as sites to take off for fishing. In cases such as this, the proper placement and location of a painting on the rock was most important.

Morice (1893:207) discusses this importance of placement with respect to one of the rock art sites at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun (Figures 58 and 59). The site Morice (1893:207) examines is perhaps the best known of all the rock art on the lake. This painting was created by many individuals over a lengthy period of time, therefore it does not have a continuity in that all the images work to communicate a single message, but rather many individual messages have been left at this site.
Based on information provided by First Nations people, Morice (1893:207) reported that the images at this site were personal totems painted over time by inhabitants of the area. According to Morice (1893:203), personal totems were usually an animal revealed during a dream, after which the dreamer was bound to “look upon it as sacred and to be especially revered and protected.” The totem, then considered a relative, was believed to provide powerful protection in return (1893:203).
Morice (1893:207) explains the significance of this site and the painted totems,

> It is to be seen about half way between this place, Stuart’s Lake or Na’krazti (Nak’azdli) and Pintce, (Pinchi) the nearest village by water. By painting in such a conspicuous place the totem which had been the object of his dream, the Pincte Indian meant to protect himself against any inhabitant of Na’krazti, as the intimate connection between himself and his totem could not fail, he believed, to reveal by an infallible presentiment the coming of any person who had passed along the rock adorned with the image of his totem.

The Carrier people of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun “believed that every youth obtained a guardian spirit, but that only a few favored individuals, through dreams of a special character, apparently, acquired definite medicine power and ranked as medicine men” (Jenness 1943:543). Morice (1889:161) explains this aspect of dreaming further by saying that,

> It was while dreaming that they pretended to communicate with the supernatural world, that their shamans were invested with their wonderful power over nature, and that every individual was assigned his particular natural or tutelary animal-genius. Oftentimes they painted this genius with vermilion on prominent rocks in the most frequented places, and these rough inscriptions are about the only monuments the immediate ancestors of the present Denès have left us (see Figure 60).

It is unclear from Morice’s account of personal totems whether the process of producing the totem image was as essential as the form of the motif. He identifies the need for a particular animal motif in order for divination to occur, but he does not indicate whether all representations of that animal provided the same connection for all individuals who considered that animal kin. The process of painting the totem onto the rock may have been an integral component in establishing this “supernatural” connection between the individual and the totem motif.
The “supernatural” function of the rock paintings highlighted by Morice contributes an additional understanding of the purposes of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art. For this type of pictograph the “success” of the painting was not as dependant on an accurate reading by the audience as it was with the message-paintings, but rather on the relationship the painter had with the motif and the faith she/he had in their personal totem. What is particularly interesting here is that the subject matter and location of motifs in the landscape were important components to these divination-paintings, just as the subject matter and placement were also essential to the message-paintings discussed earlier. Despite the different functions in these types of pictographs a shared reliance on form and placement existed.

**Continuous Meanings**

Although the rock art is no longer produced or used in the same manner as the Elders and Father Morice revealed, the paintings continue to be part of an important and meaningful landscape to the First Nations people of the area. The discussions that took place during the interviews I engaged in with First Nations people included topics that ranged far beyond the actual paintings. People were constantly reminded of the past while we spoke of the pictographs. People recalled personal memories that were not always directly related to the rock art, but it was apparent that the paintings both triggered and were connected to the memories they spoke of. In each case, the people looked back to their own past with fondness. It is these memories and meanings that I highlight here.

Yvonne Pierreroy described the meanings and her personal memories that are invested in the rock art landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Yvonne was the first person I interviewed
for this research and we met on campus at the University of Northern British Columbia.

Yvonne took time to listen to my research ideas and she made suggestions regarding people to contact. One such person was her mother, Mildred Martin. Although I had not yet met her mother at the time Yvonne and I spoke, I would soon find out where she acquired her patient and thoughtful manner. Yvonne explained the significance the paintings hold for her by saying, "*it tells that we were here, and we are still here, this is proof that we were always here.*"

Yvonne’s memories, invoked by our discussion of the paintings, were focused on family and the past. As we talked about the paintings she remembered events from her childhood,

*My dad would travel all around the lake and all around the lakes around it, all our lives we did this, and our ancestors too. As children, every summer, my dad used to take us, he used to build river boats and he would go when we were out of school in the summer. We lived in Fort St. James and he kept a twenty foot river boat, he would pack about a month’s supply of food and fuel for the boat and just take us up the lake and camp in a tent and then we would just camp along the lake. We’d visit family and friends along the lake and just camp out* (Figure 61).

![Figure 61. Looking toward North Arm, Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun.](image-url)
Mildred Martin, Yvonne’s mother also spoke of memories associated with her own past as she identified particular features in the paintings that were connected to the traditional trapping efforts of the painters. Our talk of traditional trapping and the painters moving about the land reminded Mildred of a time with her own family,

*When I first came out of Lejac I was fifteen years old. That’s when we started out on the trapline. They teach me how to trap... I was more like a tomboy! I was just right along with them... my dad, me and my mother and my brother, David – he never went to school, my dad had him out on the trapline all these years he was growing up. We used to go by boat, we had a small motor and we had a little camp stove right in the boat, there we had a fire going in the boat for the children. My mother, she had four boys, smaller ones, we had them in the boat. Keep fire going, cook our food right there on the stove. Yeah, we had fun! That’s really really good. I learned lots and just like nothing, we never feel the cold or anything, all fun for us. We went around the lake and wherever there was creek running out we set some more traps.*

Mildred explained her feelings toward the rock art and the people who had created the paintings, *I feel very proud of the people that left it there. They had something to show that they understood each other, like they were there for each other. It’s really something how they made it* (see Figures 62, 63 and 64).

![Figure 62. Pictograph panel near Pinchi Bay, Site 11.](image)

During Robert Hanson’s interview with the Tache research staff he identified the durability of the paint itself as having a particular personal significance for him,
You know, that's why they say Indian people they have more power than anyone else. By the looks of this, you know, the paint it don't rub off. Ordinary paint, you know, it rub off right now, about a couple of years, that's all it lasts, but this, look how many years that water has been slashing in there, it never change, and the sun. That really means something....

In a similar vein, Philip Felix, of Tache, spoke about the rock paintings in terms of the traditional ways associated with the lives of the people who had painted the rocks. The connection between the rock paintings and the painters traveling across the land in search of animals reminded Philip of his own journeys through the area and the values he attached to traditional ways,

You see, we go from Middle River, we go up the mountain, that's how them old people they used to travel, they would stay in their old cabins... We were going up the mountain and that's where we see all kinds of signs there. People went through there hunting. That's seven thousand feet up that mountain, we walk, them old people, they're just like mountain goats! They run around all over, in the past. It took us three days to get up there. We had to bring powersaws, that trail was long time ago. Now its oldtime windfall, we had to cut it out. We even find a post carved out like that, out of a tree, carved name, Gunanoot... Lot of people living like that when I was up the mountain, you met up with them, you help them out, you give them what they need.

That's the way they do it in them days, but now even in our days that's the way I teach my boys. I've got some pictures of them. I bring them out with me wherever I go trapping or hunting when they were small, about 4 or 5 years old. You just bundle them up and put them on the skidoo and I go. No matter how cold it is, you go!
Josie Felix recalled an experience her parents had on the water at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun that she felt may be connected to one of the pictographs. Her memory was sparked directly from the painting featured in Figure 65 where a giant fish is seemingly about to devour a man. Josie remembered what her parents told her,

*I wonder if this is that one, long time ago they talk about this rock bluff. Down there, they say, they see some kind of a they call it snake... maybe that’s what they see! They call it some kind of big big snake, that thing. I think it lives in there, you know where the rock bluff is? They say maybe it lives in there somewhere...this is where that rock bluff is, somewhere near Honeymoon Island. Somewhere around there they, my parents, seen it too. Really seen it, they see something out there, big waves under the surface, you know. It could just live somewhere down below in the rock bluff, it is deep! Dangerous...harmful... do something to the people who paddle a long time ago.*

Summary

My effort in this chapter has been to provide an exploration of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art and to present my journey of learning about the markings. I have incorporated information pertaining to the location, orientation, accessibility and interpretation of the motifs with the teachings of the Elders and other First Nations people along with information gathered from the existing ethnographic record in order to understand the physical rock art landscape and the social processes and meanings associated with the markings. These sources have provided insight into the rock art in varying ways. It is the contributions these sources make to the understanding of the rock art that I review here.

The narratives presented in this chapter affirm a connection between the rock art and activities of the past that were associated with traditional economic and subsistence pursuits.
These message-paintings articulate the real life activities of people traveling through the area and experiencing the landscape as they hunted, fished and trapped. The intimate knowledge the painters and their audiences possessed regarding the land and its resources is reflected in the rock markings.

The functionality of these message-paintings was dependant on both content and location. An understanding, shared between the painters and their audiences, of the symbols themselves and the meanings embedded in the markings was essential to the success of message-paintings. Without this common understanding the paintings would be illegible to the audience. The placement of such markings was equally important because a "mis-placed" message-painting would be ineffective in communicating information about animal sightings and the locations of people engaged in activities on the land.

The information I have drawn from the existing ethnographic record, namely the work of Father Morice, reveals that a connection exists between the practice of painting the rock and the process of acquiring and engaging in a "supernatural" relationship with personal totems. The adornment of a totem image onto the rock afforded the painter protection in the form of advanced warning regarding encroaching adversaries. The connection people shared with their personal totem images was intimate and powerful and it was this connection that enabled the transmission of information to occur between the painting and the painter.

The placement of these divination-paintings in the landscape and the subject matter depicted onto the rock both played important roles in terms of the functionality of this type of marking. The ability of a divination-painting to communicate in a "supernatural" manner with the painter was dependant on the relationship an individual had with her/his personal totem.

---

8 Personal “totem” is reflective of Morice’s terminology. I use “totem” throughout my discussions of divination-paintings rather than “crest” because I draw from and build onto information contained in Morice’s work.
totem; therefore only this type of image would enable divination to occur. Sites chosen for
divination-paintings were necessarily strategically located in the landscape so as to be
informative regarding the whereabouts of rivals. Dreams provided the content for divination-
paintings and the painter’s experience in the landscape provided the knowledge of where to
place the painting.

The need for a collective understanding of the symbols used in rock paintings was more
essential for message-paintings than it was for divination-paintings. A painting intended for
divination would have been functional to the painter regardless of its interpretation by others,
as long as it was a representation of the individual’s personal totem. Message-paintings
however, would have only functioned if the audience were able to accurately read and
interpret the markings.

In addition to a common understanding of the symbols used in message-paintings, the
painters and their contemporaries also shared a collective understanding of the use of the
landscape as a means for communication. The practice of painting the rocks in order to leave
messages for others was one that occurred at various points along the length of Stuart
Lake/Nak’al Bun. The survey portion of my fieldwork revealed that the many rock art sites at
the lake exhibit a common subject matter, style and placement. It is these commonalities that
affirm a collective use of the landscape for communication.

This collective use of the landscape to communicate with one another is a practice that
extended well beyond the boundaries of Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun. Many of the lakes in the
nearby vicinity exhibit painted symbols similar in content, form and placement as those at
Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun (cf. Corner 1968; McMurdo 1971). The rock art at Stuart
Lake/Nak’al Bun (and the surrounding area) avows to a continued presence of people over time and it expresses the traditional relationship the people had with the land.

The narratives presented in this chapter also suggest that the rock art continues to be revered by First Nations people of the area as a landscape of meaning, despite the cessation of the painting tradition. The narratives shared by First Nations people discuss the meaning and importance of the rock art in terms of the values associated with the distant past of the painters and the more immediate personal pasts of contemporary First Nations. Here we can understand the rock art landscape at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun as the engagement of people in place over time, where meanings continue to be acknowledged despite the changes to the “original” use of the markings. “Even after the “original” meaning(s) of an inscription is forgotten the mark – “fixed” in the landscape – participates in people’s constructions of the world” (Wilson and David 2002:6).

In the following and final chapter I offer my conclusions and comments regarding this study of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun.
Chapter Six

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the pages of this thesis I have explored a method for researching rock art that is atypical for such studies in British Columbia. I have engaged in this method through a case study of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock paintings. I bring a concern for vandalism, which is prevalent at many rock art sites in the province and around the world, as my initial motivation for exploring this alternate research approach. In this research I have also explored a method of photographing pictographs that enables consistency and quality in terms of generating photographic reproductions. I review and discuss these research component in this final chapter. First, I begin with an assessment of the photographic process I created to record the rock art. Second, I discuss the research theories and approaches I utilized in this study. Third, I examine the concepts of “tour” and “map.” Here I discuss the communicative function of the rock art. Fourth, I acknowledge the contributions offered by this project. I conclude this chapter with a discussion of rock art as a social landscape.

The Photographic Process

The process I employed to photograph the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun enabled me to generate reproductions of the motifs that exhibit clarity and consistency in terms of colour and quality. These are important aspects of photography in general, but especially in rock art research where photography plays a potentially key role in future studies. Because of the non-renewable nature of rock art and the many adverse conditions
affecting rock paintings and carvings, photographs will potentially be all that remains for future study and appreciation (cf. Bednarik 1994, 2001). Photographs generated today will enable First Nations communities to continue teaching their children about the rock art, and in doing so keep the meanings of the landscape alive.

Incorporating the MiKs Chart into my photographs permitted me a method for establishing consistency among the many pictures of the rock art I generated during this research. Editing each photograph with the use of the Chart was time consuming, but the results made this tedious process worthwhile. Utilizing the Chart in Adobe Photoshop removed colour casts and enhanced the details in both the shadowed and highlighted areas of the photographs.

**Research Theories and Approaches**

In this thesis I have endeavored to understand the pictographs at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun in terms of human action and meaning. I have explored a humanistic approach to the study of rock art where the central challenge has been to understand the social processes traditionally associated with the production and use of the rock art. My efforts in this study have been to create a body of research that speaks to a broad audience and illustrates the significance of rock art in terms of people, both past and present.

Thus I initiated a theoretical and methodological inquiry into the study of rock art that was guided by post-processualism. In keeping with this spirit, I have incorporated theories and methods conducive to interpretive archaeology, landscape studies and feminist scholarship. I have explored the humanistic interests associated with these avenues of post-processual research through the “tour” concept exercised in this study. These theories and methods also
speak to the interdisciplinary nature of this research and its integration of archaeology, anthropology and First Nations studies, where the presence and importance of people are central interests.

I have adopted a de-colonized approach to research that is embedded throughout this study. From the onset of this project I consulted and collaborated with the First Nations people from Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun, where I ensured this research was of interest and importance to them and that they approved of the research topic itself as being one in which they would like to participate. These are essential components to de-colonized research, where acquiring permission prior to conducting inquiries into First Nations cultures is paramount, as is the participation of the First Nations people who are connected to the research topic (Tuhiwai Smith 1999:175-176).

Central to the concept of de-colonized research is the action of “recognizing” the people who choose to participate in research (Tuhiwai Smith 1999:175). Acknowledging the participants in this study as individuals and as members of the Yekooche, Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli nations is one of the ways I attribute “recognition” in this thesis. I continue in this vein by “recognizing” that through their sharing of knowledge and feelings about the rock art, the Elders and other First Nations people played a vital role in the outcome of this research (cf. Nicholas and Andrews 1997).

Research that respects people, in terms of both research methods and interests, is not only one of Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999:176) elements for de-colonized methods, it has been one of my key interests for this project since its earliest inception. Because rock art reports in British Columbia tend to focus on form and completely ignore process, the people responsible for the paintings are denied both agency and presence in our understandings and ways of
thinking about rock art. This fact has been one of the driving forces for this project – to understand the social/human processes of rock painting.

Paintings are created and used by people and it is essential to acknowledge and explore these social processes in order to better understand rock art and to conduct research that respects people. I have approached this study of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art as a product of human agency rather than simply a typology of material culture. This is reflected in my interest to understand the rock art in terms of the people associated with the creation and use of the markings in the past and my desire to understand the rock art as a contemporary landscape of meaning. By focusing on human action and agency I have respected the efforts and presence of the people connected to the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art landscape, past and present.

I recognize that the humanistic interest associated with post-processualism is typically missing in British Columbia rock art studies, where an exclusive focus on form usually prevails. However, I have argued that a blended approach that acknowledges both form and process is better suited to the study of rock art and the aims of archaeology. I have acknowledged the “traditional” approach of British Columbia rock art research and its concern for quantitative data in this study, but the bulk of my research interests and efforts have been to highlight the human component of rock art. In this endeavor, the adoption of the “tour” approach has produced interesting and valuable information that would not have been generated by a focus on form alone.
Rock Art "Tours" and "Maps"

The "tour" approach implemented in this research is based on the teachings of First Nations Elders in the Stuart Lake/Nak'al Bun area. The knowledge shared by Elders was complemented by the testimonies of other First Nations people along with information gathered from the existing ethnographic record to produce a series of narratives. These narratives provide insight into the social nature and meaning of the rock art during the time the paintings were "originally" produced and used in the distant past. These narratives also indicate that the rock art landscape continues to be invested with meaning for the First Nations people of the area.

The "map" component of my research is represented in part by the focus I place on the content and form of the symbols and the correlation I recognize between rock markings, tattoo images and hunting signs. I continue in the tradition of the "map" in Appendices K and L where I provide in-depth information regarding the rock art motifs in terms of form, orientation, accessibility and interpretation.

I combine the "map" and "tour" concepts to reveal the communicative nature of the rock art in terms of human action. Here I draw from "traditional" rock art research approaches by focusing on the form and content of the markings to make a connection between painted motifs and other forms of graphic communication recorded in the ethnographic literature. Support for this communicative role of the paintings was established during the interview process that formed the basis of the "tour." When combined, these two concepts provide a meaningful understanding of the function of the paintings in terms of human action and agency.
The quantitative data gathered through the “map” approach provides essential information such as, site location, image form, painting size and marking orientation. The “map” approach is what provides a visual experience of the paintings through its focus on motif form and content. Through this approach, important information is gathered regarding the rock art assemblage, but the “map” essentially acts to catalogue the past and discount the presence and activity of the people who created the markings. It is through the “tour” that access to the people of the past is provided.

The “tour” of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun allows for the contemplation of the people associated with the paintings by discussing the social processes of motif production and use. It is through this approach that we become acutely aware of the painters and the audiences as people active on the land and knowledgeable of the terrain and its resources. The “tour” enables us to envision women, men and children traveling across the territory and engaging in traditional subsistence activities, which permits us to identify the function of the rock art as being a form of communication and to understand the human context of the production and use of the markings as the traditional activities of hunting, trapping and fishing. Here we see the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun as part of an embodied landscape of meaning that affirms a continued human presence over time.

**Communication Through the Rock Art**

Information provided by contemporary First Nations Elders revealed a connection between the rock art and traditional economic and subsistence activities of the past, where the painted motifs functioned as a form of non-verbal communiqué. The similarity, in terms of content, style and purpose, between the message-paintings identified by Elders and other
forms of graphic communication recorded by Father Morice, indicate that the paintings were an interrelated component of a graphic system of communication.

This system of pictorial communication resided outside the normal spoken word and although these symbols did not replicate speech in the same manner as an alphabetic system, (Hill Boone 1994:8) these markings did communicate thoughts and knowledge with the same effectiveness a system of writing communicates ideas. The efficiency of this graphic communication system is attested to in this research through the experiences of Morice (1893) and Dawson (Cole and Lockner 1989), who recounted the depth of information contained in messages created with this system of symbols. The First Nations Elders participating in this research indicated the same level of communicative effectiveness of the symbols and the ability of the Carrier people to “read” details in the painted messages.

These painted motifs were part of a meaningful socially constructed landscape that involved bodily and cognitive experiences. It was through the experience of painting the rock and the experience with the painted rock that people engaged in spatial encounters with one another. Through the symbols, the Carrier people were able to “envision information” (Tufte 1990:33) and recall to mind details of the land, rivers and paths located at important places throughout the territory. This familiarity with the markings and the physical landscape was essential for the transmission of information and the success of the message-paintings. In this manner the rock art functioned as a form of mapping the landscape which was both in and of place. Here we can understand the painters and their contemporaries as a people deeply connected to the land.

An intimate knowledge of the land and the whereabouts of others’ traditional-use areas and activities were revealed, in the interviews conducted for this research, to be common-
knowledge both in the past and the present. Even in the short time I spent in the First Nations communities it was apparent to me that people today have a deep connection to the land that has been passed on from previous generations and a strong familiarity with one another that has been forged over time. All of the informants indicated that the painters and their audiences created and used the pictographs based on their experience and knowledge of the land and its resources. The context in which the message-paintings were created and used was directly connected to the day to day activities in which everyone participated – painting the rocks with messages was a common practice that was likely available to the general population.

Some of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun also had a function that was specialized and more likely only available to a few select members of society. Jenness (1943:543) notes that although all members of society had the opportunity to acquire a guardian spirit, the ability to exert “medicine power” through the painted image of that spirit was a privilege afforded to only those who achieved the rank of medicine woman/man. In a similar vein, Morice (1889:161) notes that only shamans had access to the power of the supernatural world and the ability to communicate through dream images. The production and use of these divination-paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun was dependant on a level of power and “sight” vested in only a few members of society.

**Contributions**

The information presented in this thesis contributes to the understanding of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art in terms of its meanings and purposes. Through contemporary First Nations narratives we are able to identify the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun as a
vernacular landscape and through the interpretations and explanations provided by First Nations people to Father Morice we are also able to understand the rock art as a spiritual landscape. The narratives also make us aware that the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art landscape continues to be meaningful to the First Nations people today.

This project has explored an approach to the study of rock art that is rigorous in theory and method, and productive in the knowledge it has generated, but is not solely dependant on purely scientific methods and objectives. The “tour” and “map” concepts explored in this research are representative of the blended approach characteristic of interpretive archaeology, where researchers utilize alternative research models that allow for both scientific and humanistic goals to be achieved. Through its emphasis on conducting interviews and generating ethnographic narratives and locating, recording and identifying the rock art, this research brings recognition and respect to the Carrier people’s tradition of oral history and rock painting.

The “tour” and “map” concepts employed in this research have enabled the generation of information that is important and relevant to developing an understanding of rock art in terms of the human past. This study has highlighted the importance of developing narratives of meaning and recognizing human action as a way of approaching rock art research. Through the generation of rock art narratives of meaning, rather than reports focused exclusively on quantitative information, the general public has an opportunity to develop an appreciation for rock art which has the potential to address issues of vandalism. These concepts and the approach taken in this study provide a model for “doing” rock art research at other locations throughout British Columbia. Through this combined approach it is possible to recognize
rock art sites as meaningful humanized landscapes (past and present) at locations other than Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun.

This research provides a contribution to the First Nations communities at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun in three important ways: first, this thesis contains a thorough survey of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun where photographs and details regarding the pictographs have been carefully recorded and presented; second, the knowledge and teachings of Elders regarding the rock paintings is documented in this thesis; and three, the information generated in this research provides an opportunity to create a rock art component for the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun school curriculum. The words of the Elders and the photographs of the paintings will provide the basis for developing an educational module for the school curriculum that will teach the children about the cultural and physical landscapes of the Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun rock art.

This project has demonstrated the importance and benefit of working cooperatively and respectfully with First Nations people in archaeological research endeavors (cf. Nicholas and Andrews 1997). The contributions made by First Nations people in this study were central to developing a more complete understanding of the paintings. Without their participation, the understandings of the purposes and uses of the paintings generated in this research would not have been as insightful. As a result of the inclusion of First Nations people in this project an understanding of the rock art at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun as a social landscape of meaning, past and present, has been generated.
Social Landscapes of Rock Art

When we talk and write about rock art sites as social landscapes a change occurs in our perception of the importance of these types of places. Focus is no longer exclusively placed on the images and we begin to realize and acknowledge the processes of human action and interaction involved in the creation of rock markings, as well as a more embedded and holistic connection between people, agency and the larger landscape.

This connection between the landscape and people is interdependent where landscapes are both influenced by and influential to human action and behavior (C. Smith 1999:189). Landscapes “are not a record but a recording, and this recording is much more than a reflection of human agency and action; it is creative of them” (Bender 2002:103). In this manner we can understand landscapes never to be “finished” in terms of the meanings they hold for people and as such they are “living.”

“Living” landscapes are simultaneously artifact and process in that they are the material product of the actions and behavior of people in the past and in that they continually play a significant role in how we perceive our personal and collective identities today (Tilley 1994:18). Through the “living” landscape we are connected to the past and in turn the past is linked to the present. “The past lengthens life’s reach by linking us with events and people prior to ourselves” (Lownethal 1985:48). We use this connection to the past and its people as one of the many ways in which we make sense of ourselves and the present.

Just as landscapes are “living,” the past too, is never dead. Even though “we can’t see the past, back in the bends and curves behind us … it’s there” (Finney in Lownethal 1985:20). The ability to recall and identify one’s own personal past provides a sense of identity, purpose and meaning (Lowenthal 1985:41). The past that is interpreted from the
archaeological record also provides us with a sense of purpose and meaning, but it does so on a more collective or global human scale. On this note Lowenthal (1985:40) reminds us that “we combine not only our lived experiences through memory but what we have heard and read to form an understanding of the present.” This connection between the past and the senses of purpose and meaning we ascribe in the present reveals not only the importance of the archaeological record itself but the significance of our interpretations of its material culture.

The public learns about the past through archaeological reports and books, television programs and museums. Typically the public experiences a detached way of learning about the people and the material culture of the past that is solely dependant on the writing, presentation and interpretation of others. Rock art however, offers an opportunity for an extraordinary “lived experience” of ancient paintings and carvings located exactly where they were created and used by people in the past.

Visiting a rock art site means to travel both physically and mentally. The location of rock art enables a journey across a physical landscape that provides us with a personal experience of the terrain and the setting of the rock art. The in-situ nature of paintings and carvings enables us to envision painters and their audiences and to experience a moment of timelessness where we share the landscape with the people of the past. It is because of these important and interesting features that rock art sites should be protected, respected and appreciated.
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Thank you
Sue Mitchell

Thursday, November 24, 2005 6:53 AM

Hello Ms Mitchell

You may use the images requested for your thesis. It would be appreciated if you indicated that the images are from Early Canadiana Online produced by Canadiana.org along with the CIHM number. It is important for us that users identify ECO with CIHM. I have been suggesting using "... from Early Canadiana Online, produced by Canadiana.org, CIHM number #, page #".

Sincerely,
Judi McNeil
Cataloguing Coordinator
Canadiana.org (Formerly Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions (CIHM))
395 Wellington Street, Room 468
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4
Phone: 613-232-3472
Fax: 613-235-9752
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MRS. DORA CORNER PERMISSION TO PUBLISH ILLUSTRATIONS

This letter is to state that Sue Mitchell has been given permission to reproduce the following illustrations in her Interdisciplinary Master's Degree Thesis.

From: Corner, John

Illustrations: Page 115 for Site No. 100 and Site 101; and Page 116&117 for Site No. 101

Dated Nov. 28, 2005 Permission granted by DORA CORNER
(Please print name)

Signature Dora Corner
(P/A for John Corner)
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BRITISH COLUMBIA ARCHIVES PERMISSION TO PUBLISH PHOTOGRAPHS
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INTENDED USE
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> Publication
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> Web or Internet
> Private Contractor
> Slide or Power Point Presentation
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COPYRIGHT, CREDIT AND PERMISSION TERMS
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### ROCK ART RECORDING CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUART LAKE ROCK ART RECORDING PROJECT Analysis and Data Verification</th>
<th>INFORMATION PER FIGURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site # __________________________________________ Date: __________</td>
<td>FIGURE # ____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION: MAINLAND ISLAND</td>
<td>PERSPECTIVE: ABOVE BELOW HORIZON DORSAL FRONTAL PROFILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION OF THE LAKE: ________________________________________</td>
<td>APPLICATION: FINGER BRUSH UNCERTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS: WATER SHORE INLAND</td>
<td>&quot;FINGER DOTS&quot; INSIDE BESIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION: WATER SHORE INLAND</td>
<td>LINE TYPE: STRAIGHT CURVED COMPOSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTION: _________________________________________________</td>
<td>STYLE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL: TO NORTH ARM FR NORTH ARM BOTH</td>
<td>PERSPECTIVE: ABOVE BELOW HORIZON DORSAL FRONTAL PROFILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAINTED FROM: _______________________________________________</td>
<td>APPLICATION: FINGER BRUSH UNCERTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;FINGER DOTS&quot; INSIDE BESIDE</td>
<td>LINE TYPE: STRAIGHT CURVED COMPOSITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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GRETAGMACBETH COLORCHECKER COLOR RENDITION CHART
APPENDIX H

IFRAO STANDARD COLOR SCALE

IFRAO 10 cm

November 2001
APPENDIX I

MIKS IMAGE CALIBRATION CHART
APPENDIX J

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Tell me about the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun.
2. Who painted them?
   a. Ancestors? Or people from outside your society?
   b. Did both women and men paint?
   c. Did people of alternate genders paint?
3. When were they painted?
   a. Circumstances?
   b. Time of year/day/moon phase?
   c. Era?
4. Why were they painted?
   a. Tell me about that circumstance/occasion/ritual.
5. How were locations chosen?
   a. Did locations already have a certain meaning?
   b. Did that meaning play a role in the choice of location?
   c. Or was meaning instilled because of the process and presence of the painting?
   d. What happened to an area after it was painted?
6. How were images chosen – how did someone decide what to paint?
7. How was the paint prepared and applied?
   a. How was the area/locale prepared?
8. Do people still paint today?
   a. Why or Why not?
9. Have you ever made a painting?
   a. Tell me about that experience.
10. Has anyone you know made a painting?
    a. Tell me about that circumstance.
11. How important are the rock paintings to you today?
    a. What do the rock paintings at Stuart Lake/Nak’al Bun mean to you today?
    b. Has this meaning always been the same for you or has it changed overtime.
    c. What has made it change?
12. How did you first learn about the rock art?
    a. When? How? From whom?
13. Does the rock art have a place in your day to day life?
    a. How do you interact with the rock art?
14. Can you identify the images? (Or more images if not all finished)
15. Do you know any traditional stories that are connected to the panels?
16. Can you tell me where more paintings are located?
17. Can you suggest anyone that would be interested in being interviewed about the rock art?
18. In terms of conservation, protection, and education what would you like to see done with the rock art?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panels Oriented Toward Water Travelers</th>
<th>Panel Access by Land Only</th>
<th>Panel Access by Water and Shore</th>
<th>Panel Access by Water Only</th>
<th>Tally-Marks</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Human Related</th>
<th>Humans</th>
<th>Animal Related</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Total Number of Panels at Site</th>
<th>Panels</th>
<th>Tally-Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selection and Comparisons of Rock Art Data**

Appendix K
APPENDIX L

CATALOGUE OF ROCK ART PHOTOGRAPHS

In this appendix I present my photographs, illustrations and a selection of field data for the rock paintings I located during the archaeological survey portion of my fieldwork. I also include a chart of human motifs at the end of this appendix. My effort in this appendix has been to present these images in the order the paintings appear along the shoreline of Stuart Lake, from east to west. However, some photographs are out of sequence because of page and image sizes. Where these exceptions occur, the identification number (explained below) attached to each pictograph indicates the proper sequence. My interpretations of the paintings included in this appendix have been significantly influenced by the identifications of Carrier symbols contained in Morice (1893) and McMurdo (1971) that were provided by First Nations people to each of these authors. This appendix provides details regarding the subject matter of the rock art and it provides a starting point from which to better understand the similarities and differences between and among the pictographs at Stuart Lake and it allows comparisons to be made between the Stuart Lake rock markings and other rock art assemblages located in other areas.

Guide to Reading Appendix L

1. The photographs and illustrations of the rock art are arranged into two columns on each page, beginning with the left column.
2. Each photograph and illustration is accompanied by a number that identifies the location of the rock art on the lake (Site Number), the organization of the pictographs within each site (Panel Number), and the identification of each individual motif within a panel (Figure Number). For example: 2/7/1 indicates Site 2, Panel 7, Figure 1; similarly 14/13/23 indicates Site 14, Panel 13, Figure 23. A map of the rock art sites at Stuart Lake has been included here for convenience.
3. The information beside the identification number indicates the orientation of the motif in terms of north, south, east and west. Information below the identification number indicates: the interpretation of the motif; a description of the pictograph where necessary; comments regarding taphonomy; and other relevant information such as measurements and reference to similar pictographs.
4. Pictographs that are too faded/eroded to be photographed with detail are included in this appendix as illustrations only.
# 1/1/1 SE
Frog
Lichen and erosion
See illustration below

Illustration of #1/1/1

# 1/1/2 SE
Unknown
Traces of pigment
Rock surface exfoliation

# 1/1/3 SE
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
and lichen
See # 881 for similar motif
See illustration below

Illustration of #1/1/3

# 1/1/4 SE
Caribou
Calcium carbonate,
lichen and rock surface
exfoliation
See illustration below

Illustration of #1/1/4

# 1/2/1 SE
Unknown
Incomplete circle with
“foot”
#1/2/2
Unknown
Circle with dots

# 1/3/1 SSE
Unknown
“Patch” of pigment
See # 8/6/1, # 8/6/7,
#10/3/6 and # 11/3/8 for
similar motifs
# 1/3/2
Tally marks x 29
#1/3/3

#1/3/4
Human
Depicted either frontal
or dorsal view, arms out
to the side
Rock surface exfoliation
and calcium carbonate
Panel measures 15.5
inches wide by 19
inches high

Unknown
Arch with “down-arrows”
See # 2/11/7 for similar feature
# 1/4/1 SSE
Unknown
Semi-circle shape
Organic deposits

# 1/4/2
Bird
Depicted in profile

# 1/4/3
Frog
Surrounded by finger-dots
See illustration below

Entire panel measures 16 inches wide and 38.5 inches high. The bird image is 20 inches high, the frog image is 18.5 inches high

# 2/1/1 S
Lizard
Motif measures 9 inches high

# 1/5/1 SSE
Fish symbol
Rock exfoliation
Motif measures 13 inches high

# 2/3/1 S
Unknown
Calcium carbonate

# 2/4/1 SSE
Unknown
Motif has features of the beaver symbol, but it remains unidentified
Calcium carbonate
Previously interpreted by Richards (1978) as a human falling from the cliff above

# 2/5/1 to # 2/5/9 SSW
See illustration below for interpretations
This panel is oriented at a 45° angle and exhibits a balance of motif placement unlike any other panel at Stuart Lake
#2/6/1 SSW
Tally marks x 3
Hunting or trapping related motif
Circle
Erosion
See illustration below

Illustration of #2/6/1
and #2/6/2

#2/7/1 to #2/7/4 SSW
See illustration below for interpretations
This panel is located very close to the current water level, any increase in lake level potentially threatens these pictographs.

Illustration #2/7/1 to #2/7/4
F1: Bear paw-print with unknown diagonal line
F2: Unknown
F3: Bear paw-print
F4: Beaver
Entire panel measures 16 inches wide

#2/8/1 S
Bird
Calcium carbonate
Pictograph is located in a rock shelter

Illustration of #2/8/1

#2/9/1 SW
Unknown
See #2/1/2 for similar motif
A single “dot” is located next to this pictograph
See illustration below

Illustration of #2/9/1

#2/10/1 to #2/10/8 SW
Beaver (4) with a den on a mountain (Morice 1893)
Rock surface exfoliation and/or chipping
Pictograph measures 21 inches wide by 23 inches high

Illustration #2/10/1 to #2/10/8

#2/11/1 S
Snake
Motif measures 16 inches high
#2/11/2
Caribou
Motif measures 8 inches wide
# 2/11/3  S
Unknown
Vertical finger “swipe-mark”
Calcium carbonate

# 2/11/4  S
Unknown
Horizontal finger “swipe-mark”

# 2/11/5  S
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
# 2/11/6
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
See # 2/12/2 for similar motif
See illustration below
Illustration of # 2/11/5 and # 2/11/6

# 2/11/7  S
Bird
Wings of bird have similar “down arrows” as # 1/3/3
Calcium carbonate
Pictograph measures 34 inches wide and 8 inches high
Illustration of # 2/13/1, # 2/13/2, # 2/13/3, and # 2/13/4

# 2/14/1 SE
Unknown
Circle

# 2/14/2
Unknown
Arch with centre line
See # 10/4/1 for similar motif
See illustration below

Illustration of # 2/14/1

# 2/15/1 SSW
Unknown
Circle
Pictograph is located approximately 12 feet higher than current water level

# 2/16/1 SE
Unknown
Motif has features of the fish symbol and beaver image but it remains unidentified
See # 3/4/1 and # 8/1/1 for similar motifs

# 2/17/1 S
Unknown
Rock surface exfoliation

# 2/18/1 S
Unknown
Only traces of pigment are visible here

# 3/1/1 SSE
Frog
Erosion
Motif measures 9 inches wide and 24 inches high

# 3/1/2 SSE
Unknown
Arch with centre dot and a series of linear tally marks
Motif measures 21 inches wide
See illustration next page
Illustration of # 3/1/2

# 3/1/3 SSE
Beaver with 13 finger-dots, evidence for an additional finger-dot exists
Motif measures 6.5 inches wide by 6.5 inches high

# 3/1/4 SSE
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
See # 4/1/1 to # 4/1/7 for a possible similar motif
See illustration below

Illustration of # 3/1/4

# 3/1/5 SSE
Beaver Erosion
Motif measures 7 inches long
See illustration next column

Illustration of # 3/1/5

# 3/1/6 SSE
Crane or beetle motif (Morice 1893)
Rock surface exfoliation
Motif measures 15.5 inches wide by 32.5 inches high

# 3/1/7 SSE
Beaver
Motif measures 20 inches high

# 3/2/1 SW
Unknown
Circle

# 3/2/2 SW
Tally-mark x 3
Unknown
Rock surface exfoliation
# 3/3/2
Tally-marks x 5
# 3/3/3
Tally-marks x 3
Entire panel measures 6.5 inches wide and 14 inches high

Unknown
Motif has elements of beaver symbol, but it remains unidentified
See # 2/16/1 and # 8/1/1 for similar motifs

Unknown
Erosion
See # 14/12/1 and # 14/12/3 for similar motifs
See illustration below
Illustration of # 4/2/1

Unknown, possible tally-marks
# 4/3/2
Human
Depicted in profile with extended arm
# 4/3/3
Unknown
Circle
# 4/3/4 and # 4/3/5
Bear paw-prints
Entire panel measures 67 inches wide, including # 4/4/1 and # 4/4/2 which are a part of this panel
See # 8/2/1 to # 8/2/4 for similar motifs

Unknown
Entire panel has deteriorated, only traces of pigment remain
At one time, this panel was adorned with many pictographs
See illustration below
Illustration of # 4/1/1 to # 4/1/7
# 4/4/1 S
Shoreline
Motif measures 24 inches high
# 4/4/2
Fish symbol
This panel is closely associated with #4/3/1

# 4/5/1 S
Unknown
Only traces of pigment are visible, this panel is closely associated with #4/3/1, #4/4/1 and #4/4/2

# 5/3/1 E
Human
# 5/3/2
Unknown, possibly a canoe
Calcium carbonate
Entire panel measures 6.75 inches high
See illustration below

Illustration of # 5/3/1 and # 5/3/2

# 5/2/1 S
Unknown
Previously interpreted by Richards (1978) as an inverted bear paw-print
See illustration below

Illustration of # 5/2/1

# 6/1/1 # 6/1/2 # 6/1/3 S
Unknown Unknown Unknown
Semi-circle Circle
Entire panel measures 19.25 inches wide
See illustration below

Illustration of # 6/1/1 to # 6/1/3
**# 6/2/1** SW
Unknown
Rock surface exfoliation

**# 6/3/1** SSW
Unknown
Motif has features of beaver symbol, but it remains unidentified

**# 6/3/2**
Unknown
Erosion

See illustration below

**# 7/1/1** S
Unknown
Circle
Motif measures 6.5 inches wide

**# 7/2/1** NE
Human
Depicted in frontal or dorsal view

**# 7/2/2** NE
Unknown
Erosion

**# 7/2/4**
Bear paw-print

See illustration below

**# 6/4/1** SSW
Unknown, motif has elements of beaver symbol but remains unidentified

See # 8/3/1, # 8/3/3 and # 11/1/1 for similar motifs

See illustration next column

Illustration of # 6/4/1

Illustration of # 6/3/1 and # 6/3/2

Illustration of # 7/2/2 to # 7/2/4
# 8/1/1  SW
Unknown
See # 2/16/1 and # 3/4/1 for similar motifs
See illustration below

Illustration of # 8/1/1

# 8/2/1  E
Unknown
Circle
# 8/2/2
Human
Depicted in profile with arm extended
# 8/2/3 and # 8/2/4
Bear paw-print
# 8/2/5
Unknown, possible topographic features
See illustration below

Illustration of # 8/2/1 to # 8/2/5
Entire panel measures 35 inches high

# 8/3/1  NE
Unknown
“Arrow”
Motif measures 3 inches high
# 8/3/2
Unknown
“X”
Motif measures 4.5 inches high
# 8/3/3
Unknown
“Arrow”
Motif measures 2 inches high
See # 6/4/1 and # 11/1/1 for similar motifs
See illustration below

Illustration of # 8/3/1 to # 8/3/3
These markings seem to indicate direction

# 8/4/1  SSW
Unknown
These markings are closely associated with # 8/3/1 to # 8/3/3
See illustration below

Illustration of # 8/4/1
# 8/5/1 E
Unknown
Traces of pigment

# 8/7/1 E
Unknown
Double arch
# 8/7/2
Fish symbol
# 8/7/3, # 8/7/4 and 
# 8/7/5
Fish symbols

# 8/8/1 S
Unknown
See # 1/1/3 for 
similar motif

# 8/6/1 ESE
Unknown
“Patch” of pigment
See #1/3/1, #8/6/7, 
# 10/3/6 and # 11/3/8 
for similar motifs

# 8/9/1 SW
Unknown
“Chevron” type mark
Closely associated with 
# 8/8/1 and # 8/10/1

# 8/10/1 SSW
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
Previously interpreted 
by Richards (1978) as a 
human
# 8/10/2
Caribou
See illustration below

Illustration of # 8/10/1 
and # 8/10/2
Closely associated with 
# 8/9/1 and # 8/8/1
#8/11/1 SW
Unknown
Traces of pigment
Closely associated with #8/10/1, #8/10/2, #8/9/1 and #8/8/1

#9/1/1 to #9/1/14 S
See illustration and interpretations below

#9/2/1 W
Caribou on a mountain
#9/2/2
Unknown
Semi-circle
#9/2/3
Tally-marks x 4
#9/2/4
Tapline with tally-marks x 6

F1: Human
Depicted horizontally with extended arm
F2: Fish
F3: Fish
F4: Fish symbol
F5: Bird in a trap
F6: Unknown
F7: Bird

F8: Moon
F9: Unknown
Diagonal line
F10: Bird
F11: Bird
F12: Bird
F13: Bear paw-print
F14: Animal—ungulate
F1: Fish symbol with three finger-dots
F2: Moon
F3: Fish symbol
F4: Unknown—arch
F5: Water
F6: Fish symbol
F7: Fish symbol
F8: Frog
F9: Bird—see # 1/3/1 and #2/11/7 for similar features
F10: Frog
F11: Fish symbol
F12: Fish symbol in a net
F13: Water
F14: Bear with exaggerated paws
F15: Unknown—diagonal lines
F16: Sturgeon emerging from water (Morice 1893)
F17: Unknown—symbol inside a circle
F18: Unknown
F19: Unknown—diagonal line
F20: Unknown
F21: Unknown
F22: Fish symbol
F23: Human lower torso only surrounded by finger-dots
Depicted either frontal or dorsal view
F24: Bear paw-print
F25: Human lower torso only
Depicted either frontal or dorsal view
F26: Human head and shoulders only surrounded by finger-dots
Depicted with outstretched hand and possible head-piece
F27: Bear paw-print
F28: Unknown
F29: Bear paw-print
F30: Unknown
See # 9/6/1, # 14/13/5 and # 14/13/10 for similar motifs
Unknown
Circle
#9/5/1
Unknown
Rock surface exfoliation

#9/6/1
Unknown
See #9/4/30, #14/13/5 and #14/13/10 for similar motifs

#10/1/1
Bird
Motif measures 11 inches wide and 6.5 inches high
#10/1/2
Fish symbol
Motif measures

#10/1/3
Beaver
Motif measures 11 inches high

#10/2/1 to #10/2/6
See illustration to the right for interpretations

#10/2/3
Fish symbol
#10/2/4 to #10/2/6
Beaver symbols

#10/3/1 to #10/3/4
Fish symbols
#10/3/5
Beaver
#10/3/6
Unknown
“Patch” of pigment
See #1/3/1, #8/6/1, #8/6/7 and #11/3/8 for similar motifs
See illustration below
Illustration of #10/3/1 to #10/3/6
Entire panel measures 28 inches wide

#10/1/4
Unknown Pigment
Located in a “natural” handhold on rock ledge, possibly a “finger-print” of the painter

#10/2/1
Frog with elongated tail
#10/2/2
Finger dots x 3
# 10/4/1 NW
Unknown
Calcium carbonate
See # 2/14/2 for similar motif
See illustration below

Illustration of # 10/4/1

# 11/1/1 S
Unknown
Rock surface exfoliation
Pictograph measures 7.5 inches high
See # 6/4/1, # 8/3/1 and # 8/3/3 for similar motifs

# 11/2/1 W
Bird
Pictograph measures 16 inches wide and 8.5 inches high
# 11/2/2
Beaver symbol
Pictograph measures 10 inches high

# 11/3/1 to # 11/3/13 S
Lichen and calcium carbonate
See illustration below for interpretations

F1: Unknown, motif measures 29 inches wide
F2: Frog, motif measures 11 inches wide
F3: Unknown—animal related, motif measures 13 inches wide
F4: Unknown, motif measures 7.5 inches high
F5: Fish symbol
F6: Fish symbol
F7: Fish symbol
F8: Unknown
See # 1/3/1, # 8/6/1, # 8/6/7 and # 10/3/6 for similar motifs
F9: Star
F10: Unknown, motif measures 6 inches wide
F11: Unknown, possibly topographic feature
F12: Fish symbol
F13: Fish symbol
# 11/4/1  SW  
Bird  
Calcium carbonate  
Motif measures 22 inches wide  
See illustration below

Illustration of # 11/4/1

# 11/5/1  NW  
Unknown  
Traces of pigment  
# 11/5/2  
Unknown, possible caribou  
# 11/5/3  
Unknown  
Circle with inner markings  
See illustration below

Illustration of # 11/5/1 to # 11/5/3

# 12/1/1  E  
Unknown  
Traces of pigment  
Calcium carbonate, other organic deposits

# 13/1/1  E  
Bird  
Organic deposits  
Pictograph measures 8 inches wide and 14 inches high  
See illustration below

Illustration of # 13/1/1

# 14/1/1  ENE  
Unknown  
Diagonal line of pigment  
See illustration below

Illustration of # 14/1/1
# 14/2/1 E
Unknown
Traces of pigment
Organic deposits
No photograph of this motif

# 14/3/1 SE
Beaver symbol
Erosion
Pictograph measures 12 inches high
No photograph of this motif

# 14/4/1 SE
Unknown
Traces of pigment
No photograph of this motif

# 14/5/1 SE
Unknown
Traces of pigment
No photograph of this motif

# 14/6/1 to # 14/6/7 SE
Beaver symbols
Erosion and organic deposits
No photograph of this motif

# 14/7/1 SE
Unknown, possible moon
Erosion
See illustration below

# 14/8/1 SE
Unknown
Traces of pigment
Erosion
See illustration below

# 14/9/1 SW
Unknown
Pictograph measures 87 inches wide
See illustration on next page
Illustration of # 14/9/1

# 14/10/1 SW
Animal Erosion
# 14/10/2
Unknown Erosion
See illustration below

Illustration of # 14/10/1 and # 14/10/2

# 14/11/1, # 14/12/1, #14/12/2 and # 14/12/3 SW
See illustration below for interpretations

# 14/12/3
Unknown Motif
Measures 38 inches high
See #421 and # 14122 for similar motifs

# 14/12/2
Unknown Motif
Measures 45 inches high
See # 421 and # 14123 for similar motifs

# 14/12/1
Unknown
# 14/11/1
Unknown traces of pigment
Calcium carbonate, lichen growth and other organic deposits

See illustration below for interpretations

F1: Animal on a trapline with a trail
F2: Human with tally-marks x 8
Depicted frontal or dorsal view
F3: Bear paw-print
F4: Bear paw-print
F5: Unknown
See F10, # 9/6/1 and # 9/4/30 for similar motifs
F6: Unknown
F7: Beaver symbol
F8: Fish symbol
F9: Unknown
F10: Unknown
See F5, # 9/6/1 and # 9/4/30 for similar motifs
F11: Unknown, possible human
F12: Human
Depicted in profile and "walking"
F13: Frog with tally-marks x 4
F14: Unknown with tally-marks x 4
F15: Beaver symbol
F16: Human
Depicted in profile
F17: Unknown
F18: Animal
F19: Bear paw-print
F20: Unknown, motif has elements of beaver symbol but remains unidentified
F21: Beaver symbol
F22: Unknown
F23: Shoreline with unknown symbol
See # 14/12/2 for similar motif
Human Motifs

# 1/3/1

# 5/3/1

# 7/2/1

# 9/1/1

# 8/2/2

# 14/13/2

# 14/13/12

# 14/13/16

# 9/4/26 and # 9/4/25

# 9/4/23