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Abstract

This thesis presents data collected during the 2012 and 2013 recording of painted sheep imagery from five painted rock shelters in the northern Drakensberg, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Through studying the micro- and macro-context of these paintings, I try to understand their presence in the rock art here. Paintings of sheep are believed to have been made by San hunter-gatherers and thought to be relatively old. Using multiple strands of evidence from the rock art, the excavated record, ethnographies, and drawing on human-animal theory, I explore when the sheep were painted, whose sheep were painted and for what reason.
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Introduction: Exploring painted sheep imagery in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg rock art.

In the northern part of the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg, KwaZulu-Natal, between the Royal Natal National Park and the Injasuthi Park, close to Lesotho’s eastern highlands, lie five painted rock shelters containing depictions of sheep; all except one, are fat-tailed sheep (Figure i.1). This thesis explores what I believe are all the sheep paintings that remain in the northern Drakensberg in 2013.

This project originated from a larger aim to record painted sheep imagery throughout South Africa with the ultimate aim to understand who painted them, when and for what reason? I was also interested to see whether they might lend anything new to the debate surrounding the introduction of sheep into southern Africa around 2000 years ago (Sealy & Yates 1994). Currently, the rock art of sheep receives little attention in this respect. However, sheep paintings provide a unique type of archaeological evidence that might allow us to explore the impact that these animals, and their keepers had on the southern African landscape.

Previously, the sheep paintings found in the northern Drakensberg have not been systematically recorded nor have they been discussed in any detail. These images are a unique phenomenon in the rock art of this region, as there are so few of them and they occur in a different context to painted sheep imagery in the southern Drakensberg.

The aim of this research therefore was to record, study and explore this imagery through both a macro and micro-context analysis. The objective was to see when these images might have been made, by whom, and what they might mean.
The thesis begins in Chapter 1, with a consideration of their authorship and age. This is followed in Chapter 2, by an overview of the dated evidence for sheep bones in the archaeology here. Chapter 3 explores sheep rock art in southern Africa and outlines previous hypotheses about their meaning. Two geo-referenced radiocarbon databases from 3000 b.p. to the historic period were compiled to try to understand the peopling of this area prior to, and during the time at which sheep first appear in South Africa. This forms the macro-context analysis of painted sheep imagery that is presented in Chapter 4. It provides a particularly interesting visual presentation of the painted sheep sites in relation to other types of archaeological evidence. Chapter 5 presents, on a site-by-site basis, the sheep imagery recorded during fieldwork between 2012 and 2013. Chapter 6 introduces a new way of thinking about sheep imagery by exploring human-animal relations.

Figure i.1: Location of the northern Drakensberg research area
This is then applied to interpret the sheep paintings in Chapter 7. The thesis concludes in Chapters 7 and 8 where I present my thoughts about what sheep might have meant to those who encountered and painted them. I also discuss my opinion of their age in the rock art.
Chapter 1: The age and the authorship of the rock art of sheep in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg

1.1. Introduction

This chapter explores the age and authorship of the sheep imagery that I recorded in the northern Drakensberg between 2012 and 2013. There are no direct dates for the sheep rock art and so the challenge is how to go about approaching an undated corpus of rock art, with the ultimate aim of understanding why the paintings were made. Patterns in time and space are used to build up an argument to address this. As with much of the thesis, many strands of evidence, that do not hold much weight alone, are brought together to try to build a convincing argument. In this chapter, previous research on direct dating and the sequencing of rock art in the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg is reviewed to see whether it can help to address these two questions. In a similar vein, previous research opinions on the age of sheep rock art in the larger context of southern Africa are also considered. Mazel (1982; 2009a; 2013) has already suggested a San authorship to the fine-line rock art, and finger paintings in the northern Drakensberg to a possible Khoe pastoralist authorship (Figure 3.3b. pg 51). Here, evidence in support of a San authorship for sheep paintings is presented.

1.2. Who painted sheep in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg?

Tackling the question of authorship in rock art is challenging. This is especially so if we consider that within the last 2000 years, the assumed date range for sheep paintings, the southern African landscape has undergone a complex series of fusions and fissions between people who differed ideologically, economically and socially (Kent 2002). The idea that ethnic identity is fluid and negotiable and that
it may be cross cut by other forms of identity such as gender (Mack 1981; Conkey & Spector 1998; Meskell 2007) and status (Schrire 1980, 1992, 1994; Smith, A. 1986, 1993, 1995, 1998, Cronk & Dickson 2001; Cronk 2002; Lee 2002; Meskell 2007;), means that we must be aware of this in ascribing authorship to rock art. Evidence may also indicate that whilst some groups opted to form new alliances and shared identities, other groups actively chose not to do so and this too must be taken into consideration when ascribing authorship (Sadr 2002; Guenther 2002; Kent 2002).

The sheep paintings studied in this project all share a similar appearance and application (‘style’) to other paintings found on the same rock face, and to other rock art surveyed within the vicinity of the painted sheep shelters, and so it is likely that they were made by the same people. Although Style has somewhat of a notorious reputation, because it is often hard to define, it is nevertheless useful in rock art. It has been used to understand authorship in southern African rock art (Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004; Blundell 2004; Namono & Eastwood 2005; Smith, B. 2006; Mallen 2008). Here it is used to describe the motifs, the manner of their depiction, types of application of paint, colours, techniques and superpositional characteristics of the rock art.

In the northern Drakensberg, Mazel (1981; 1982), who originally recorded the majority of fine-line sheep images studied here, identified sheep paintings as belonging to the larger corpus of San hunter-gatherer paintings. Based on personal observation of the style of sheep paintings and a limited survey of other painted sites within the vicinity of sheep sites, there is no reason to suggest that these paintings do not conform to the larger San fine-line painting tradition.

1.2.1. Painting conventions as a clue to authorship

Upon initial investigation of the placement of sheep imagery in the shelters, studied during this project, it became clear that superpositioning is rare and complex layering of paintings is absent. There are just two instances of superpositioning in the sheep sample; at the sites Junction Shelter in the Didima Gorge (Figure 1.1 ) and Boschman’s Klip A, located about 20km outside of the
Cathedral Peak State Forest (Figure 1.2). In two instances, sheep are found superpositioned over paintings of humans. The superpositioning of certain motifs over others can be identified within the broader symbolic scheme of San rock art production. These types of superpositions do not only reflect layers of time but also layers of meaning and the rules that governed what the artists could and could not paint. Lewis-Williams (1972, 1974) observed, in his study in the Giants Castle Game Reserve and Barkley East area that humans are almost always painted underneath antelope and most commonly that animal is an eland. Drawing on this, Lewis-Williams (1972, 1974) suggests that rules governing superpositioning in the form of antelope over human or eland over human, is used to express relationships and a statement is made about the thoughts and of the artists who painted them. These relationships were also documented by Vinnicombe (1976) in the southern Drakensberg and on its outskirts in East Griqualand, as well as by Pager (1971) in the paintings of the Didima Gorge. Evidence for this convention in the rock art of sheep in the northern Drakensberg further supports a local San authorship.
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**Figure 1.1.** Superpositioning of a white fat-tailed sheep over a red monochrome human figure at Junction Shelter in the Didima Gorge.
Figure 1.2: Superpositioning of two red sheep over a dark-brown human figure at the site Boschman's Klip A outside the Cathedral Peak area.
1.2.2. Hunter-gatherers painting sheep

A San authorship for sheep rock art is commonly suggested. Across southern Africa, researchers have identified San as the authors of paintings of various livestock in the form of sheep, cattle, goats, dogs and horses (Vinnicombe 1976; Mazel 1981, 1982; Huffman 1983; Van Rijssen 1984; Manhire et al. 1986; Van der Merwe 1990; Yates et al. 1991; Loubser 1993; Loubser & Laurens 1994; Anderson 1996; Masson 2011). Earlier work by Cooke (1965) proposed that the makers of sheep rock art were quite distinct from the keepers of sheep and he suggested that these paintings were made by local hunter-gatherers.

However not all San groups in southern Africa painted livestock. For example, the Seacow River Valley, Van der Merwe (1990) noted that although sheep had been mentioned numerous times by San informants in historical accounts, no paintings of sheep were found in the region. Van der Merwe’s (1990) finding contrasts to areas such as the southwestern Cape, parts of the Northern Province, Free-State, and the northern Drakensberg where sheep are found painted. In the Northern Cape and Lesotho, images of sheep are rarer than other areas in southern Africa. This makes the northern Drakensberg sheep rock art particularly interesting in this respect.

1.2.3. A word of caution: identifying ethnic identity in rock art research

Style does not always equate to ethnic identity in rock art. Recent research has highlighted the difficulties in establishing a direct link between the style of a particular rock art to broad categories of identity (Jolly 1994, 1995, 1996, 2007; Ouzman 2005; Hollmann 2007; Mallen 2008; Challis 2009, 2012; Russell 2013).

In the Caledon Valley, Jolly (2007) proposes that fine-line cattle paintings otherwise associated with a hunter-gatherer tradition of rock art making could have also been made by Bantu-speaking agriculturists whose lives were intertwined with those of hunter-gatherers through inter-marriage and partnership. Challis (2012), in his study of fine-line horse paintings in Matatiele, identifies horse and baboon motifs as the work of a creolized group consisting of runaway
slaves, hunter-gatherers, pastoralists, farmers and Europeans, known collectively as the AmaTola. However both of these studies are set within a more recent timeframe. Although the art itself has not been directly dated, evidence in the form of colonial (i.e. 19th century) imagery, such as horses, provides a tighter chronological control to these studies.

In the context of undated pastoralist rock art in East Africa, Russell (2013) notes the difficulties in linking particular groups to symbols painted or engraved on the rock. In her review of the different rock art making groups in the Horn of Africa, Russell (2013) notes that it is possible that certain groups of hunter-gatherers may have actively chosen to replicate paintings made by pastoralists as a way of belonging to more dominant groups on the landscape at a particular time.

1.3. **Tackling the age of sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg:**

1.3.1 *The spatial context of sheep rock art as a clue to their antiquity.*

Mazel (1981, 1982) and Manhire *et al.* (1986) draw attention to the spatial distribution of painted themes in the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg. Mazel (1981) drew a boundary from the latitude of 29° 15’ south in order to divide the area between Royal Natal National Park and Bushmen’s Nek into two, the northern and southern Drakensberg. This geographic division is based on Mazel’s (1981) analysis of the distribution of painted themes in the region. The contrast identified between the paintings was enough to warrant a spatial division of the northern research area from the southern research area. The boundary between these two regions is located in the Giants Castle Game Reserve.

In Mazel’s (1981) analysis of some 20 668 paintings in both areas, a striking pattern emerged not only in the spatial distribution of painted themes but also in their frequencies. Part of this spatial pattern includes the painted sheep sites studied in this project which are found clustered within the northern research area. The patterns are as follows:

1) More sheep paintings in the North.
Paintings of sheep occur more frequently in the northern Drakensberg research area than in the southern Drakensberg. Eight paintings of sheep are listed from Mazel’s 1979-1981 recording, 40 are recorded in Pager’s (1971) study at Junction Shelter out of a total of 3909 paintings from the Didima Gorge; and a further one painting outside of the Didima Gorge (Pager 1971). 32 sheep paintings were also recorded by both Maggs (1974; Natal Museum Database) and Pager (1975) at the site Boschman’s Klip A. This is a total of 81 sheep paintings for the northern Drakensberg. I recorded a total of forty-nine sheep motifs during 2012 and 2013 in the same area (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1. Showing the number of painted livestock motifs recorded in the northern and southern Drakensberg by various researchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Drakensberg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Drakensberg</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horses</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>Not surveyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total paintings recorded by various researchers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 668</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>3606</td>
<td>Total of five rock shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although sheep paintings do occur in the southern Drakensberg research area, there are fewer sites. Vinnicombe (1976: 157) recorded only two sites containing seven sheep out of a total of 3606 animals painted in the southern Drakensberg.

2) Colonial imagery negligible in the North.

Paintings of sheep in the northern Drakensberg do not occur with colonial imagery. This finding contrasts significantly with sheep paintings in the southern Drakensberg where they are often found associated with horses. Mazel (1982)
notes that, with the exception of a painting at Sigubudu 1 in the Royal Natal National Park, depicting men with guns, there are no other colonial scenes in the northern Drakensberg.

3) Style of cattle paintings is different in the North.

Cattle paintings are recorded from both regions, however, these paintings are considered to be stylistically different both in terms of their form and colour. In the northern Drakensberg, Mazel (1981) recorded five cattle paintings from the Didima Gorge. Pager (1971) recorded up to 14 cattle in Didima Gorge and a further 20 from the surrounding research area in Cathedral Peak State Forest and Cathkin State Forest. In the 2012 and 2013 survey I found that two of the painted sheep sites, Junction Shelter and Zunckel’s Cave in Cathedral Peak Park, contained paintings of cattle. According to Manhire et al. (1986: 27) there are an additional 12 paintings of cattle near the Royal Natal National Park. This totals forty-six cattle paintings recorded for this region. Mazel (1981) and Manhire et al. (1986) note that in the northern Drakensberg, paintings of cattle are predominately in monochrome black but white, grey and sometimes bichrome white and grey are also recorded. The horns of these cattle are depicted in a twisted perspective as if viewed from above (ibid).

In Vinnicombe’s (1976) southern Drakensberg survey area, cattle paintings are also found predominantly painted in monochrome black although white and the addition of orange is recorded for these images. Vinnicombe (1976) also noted that cattle paintings are often seen to show a patterned hide and horns similar to Sango cattle. Vinnicombe (1976) recorded 242 cattle from her research area, whilst Mazel (1981) recorded a total of 97 for the southern Drakensberg, of which includes part of Vinnicombe’s (1976) survey area. Vinnicombe (1976: 157) places these cattle paintings within a more recent phase of paintings as they generally occur with horse imagery and are depicted in white, black or orange pigments that are “typical of the more recent art”.

4) No painted horse motifs in the northern Drakensberg.
Horse imagery is absent from the northern Drakensberg with their most northerly extent reaching to the area in the southern part of Giants Castle Game Reserve (Mazel 1982). To the south there are many horse motifs. A total of 558 images were recorded by Vinnicombe and 135 images recorded by Mazel (1981) in the southern Drakensberg. Most of Mazel’s (1981) recording of horses in the rock art included Vinnicombe’s research area.

Besides the patterns in the distribution of painted domestic animals between the northern and southern Drakensberg, patterns in other subject matter were also observed. The occurrence of bees and rhebuck predominate in the northern Drakensberg. Depictions of rhebuck (91) outnumber eland (75) in the Royal Natal National Park (Wright & Mazel 2007). Bee paintings are only found in the north and occur more frequently in Cathedral Peak and specifically the Didima Gorge where Pager recorded up to 32 images of bees and related bee imagery in the rock art (Pager 1971; Mazel 1982). Trance buck or flying buck also predominate in the northern research area (Mazel 1981, 1982).

1.3.2. Sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg are older than those in the southern Drakensberg

Data collected in surveys by Mazel (1981) and by Vinnicombe (1976) suggest that paintings of sheep in the northern Drakensberg are older than paintings in the southern Drakensberg. This is because in the South, sheep and other domestic livestock are painted with more recent historical imagery, this association is absent from sheep paintings in the North. It follows, that cattle paintings may also be older in the northern Drakensberg for the same reason. The near absence of historical scenes in the northern Drakensberg suggests that the larger corpus of rock art was made before historical times. This still leaves a wide breadth of time in which sheep were painted, for we know that sheep first arrived in southern Africa around 2000 years ago (Sealy & Yates 1994).

Whitelaw (2009) has suggested that the sheep paintings and cattle paintings in the northern Drakensberg pre-date the 1800s (Whitelaw 2009:143). He interprets these paintings as reflecting the relations between the San and agro-pastoralist
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communities in the northern Drakensberg region where he suggests that the San were often situated on the margins of agro-pastoralist communities, where they were acting as ritual specialists for the agro-pastoralists. Whitelaw (2009: 143) thus sees the spatial distribution of sheep and cattle paintings in the northern Drakensberg as a response to their relations with agro-pastoralists on the landscape.

1.4. **How old is other rock art in this area?**

Dating rock art is one of the more challenging tasks in rock art research. Attempts to do so use the content of the rock art, relative chronologies and direct dates.

1.4.1. **Direct dating of southern African rock art**

In recent years progress has been made in the development of different dating techniques and methods which have been applied to fine-line paintings in the Drakensberg. Radiocarbon dates obtained from carbon containing minerals associated with paintings have provided some direct dates for rock art (Table 1.3) (Mazel & Watchman 1997, 2003; Mazel 2009a, 2009b; Bonneau et al. 2011). However, only a few sites have been dated and dated paintings represent only a fraction of the total number of paintings for this region.

There are only a handful of direct dates from paintings in southern Africa, most of which come from the Drakensberg (Table 1.2) (Van der Merwe et al. 1987; Mazel & Watchman 1997, 2003; Bonneau et al. 2011). Radiocarbon dates can be obtained from dating: (1) Carbon material found in association with rock art on slabs that have been found in archaeological deposits, though this only provides a *terminus ante quem* for the paintings (Deacon et al. 1976; Vinnicombe 1976; Thackeray et al. 1981; Thackeray 1983, Mazel 1992a, 1994; Jerardino & Swanepoel 1999); (2) Carbon containing material found in the oxalated crusts formed underneath or over paintings, also providing a *terminus post/ante quem* (Mazel & Watchman 1997, 2003); and (3) dating carbon containing pigment (Van der Merwe 1987; Mazel & Watchman 1997; Bonneau et al. 2011; Bonneau et al. 2012).
Table 1.2. Radiocarbon dates taken from paintings in the northern & central Drakensberg as well as Biggarsberg. After Van der Merwe et al. (1987), Mazel & Watchman (1997, 2003) and Bonneau et al. (2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>Cathedral Peak</td>
<td>ANDRA3</td>
<td>white and orange eland, fine line</td>
<td>plant fibre</td>
<td>330 ± 90</td>
<td>OZB 127 U</td>
<td>This is a radiocarbon determination. The fibre has been dated but not the actual pigment in which the fibre has been found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>Cathedral Peak</td>
<td>ANDRA9</td>
<td>cream eland, fine line</td>
<td>calcite paint</td>
<td>*420 ± 340</td>
<td>OZB 130 U</td>
<td>* Not reliable due to possible presence of contaminants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barne's Shelter</td>
<td>Giant's Castle</td>
<td>ANDRA12</td>
<td>red paint indeterminate</td>
<td>crust covering painting</td>
<td>1060 ± 65</td>
<td>OZD 446</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents minimum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Elephant Shelter</td>
<td>Giant's Castle</td>
<td>ANDRA25</td>
<td>monochrome red human figure, fine line</td>
<td>crust covering painting</td>
<td>1930 ± 65</td>
<td>OZD 452</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents minimum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highmoor 1</td>
<td>Highmoor</td>
<td>ANDRA19</td>
<td>red and white hartebeest, fine line</td>
<td>crust underlying red area of painting</td>
<td>2310 ± 70</td>
<td>OZD 450</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cave North</td>
<td>Giant's Castle</td>
<td>ANDRA17</td>
<td>shaded polychrome rhebuck, fine line</td>
<td>crust underlying polychrome rhebuck</td>
<td>2360 ± 70</td>
<td>OZD 449</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cave North</td>
<td>Giant's Castle</td>
<td>ANDRA16</td>
<td>red and white bichrome eland [same eland as ANDRA15], fine line</td>
<td>crust underlying white area of painting</td>
<td>2760 ± 75</td>
<td>OZD 448</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highmoor 1</td>
<td>Highmoor</td>
<td>ANDRA21</td>
<td>red and white bichrome eland, fine line</td>
<td>crust underlying red area of painting</td>
<td>2770 ± 75</td>
<td>OZD 451</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cave North</td>
<td>Giant's Castle</td>
<td>ANDRA15</td>
<td>red and white bichrome eland [*same eland as ANDRA16], fine line</td>
<td>crust underlying red area of painting</td>
<td>2900 ± 80</td>
<td>OZD 447</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 continued: Radiocarbon dates obtained from rock paintings in southern Africa. The dates from the northern and central Drakensberg and Biggarsberg region, KwaZulu-Natal represents minimum and maximum age determinations. After Mazel & Watchman (1997; 2003), Bonneau et al. (2011), and Van der Merwe et al. (1987).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biggarsberg, KwaZulu-Natal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqonqo Cave</td>
<td>eastern Biggarsberg</td>
<td>ANDRA28</td>
<td>indeterminate painted figure</td>
<td>crust underlying surface of painting</td>
<td>3720 ± 100</td>
<td>OZD 453</td>
<td>Radiocarbon determination represents maximum age. It is most likely that this painting postdates 3720 years b.p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Drakensberg, Eastern Cape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA TYN2</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>RP/2003/003/13</td>
<td>painted rock spalls not found with the original iconography</td>
<td>black pigment</td>
<td>2072 ± 28</td>
<td>OxA X 2370 29</td>
<td>Direct radiocarbon date of black pigment after contaminants were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA TYN2</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>RP/2003/003/29</td>
<td>painted rock spalls not found with the original iconography</td>
<td>black pigment</td>
<td>2083 ± 32</td>
<td>OxA X 2370 31</td>
<td>Direct radiocarbon date of black pigment after contaminants were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA TYN2</td>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>RP/2003/003/34</td>
<td>painted rock spalls not found with the original iconography</td>
<td>black pigment</td>
<td>2100 ± 40</td>
<td>OxA X 2370 30</td>
<td>Direct radiocarbon date of black pigment after contaminants were removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Cape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sonia’s Cave Upper</td>
<td>Boontjeskloof</td>
<td></td>
<td>black human figure finger painted</td>
<td>black pigment</td>
<td>*500 ± 140</td>
<td>OxA 515</td>
<td>*The pigment may have contained contaminants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District
Many of the radiocarbon dates associated with paintings or engravings have come from archaeological deposits. These include mobiliary (portable) art found in deposits from Apollo 11 (26 000 b.p.-250000 b.p.) (Wendt 1976), Blombos Cave (6 400 b.p.) (Deacon et al. 1976) and Klasies River Mouth Cave 5 (3 900 b.p.) (Thackeray et al. 1981). The oldest dated parietal art comes from the site Steenbokfontein Cave in the Western Cape, where Jerardino and Swanepoel (1999) obtained three radiocarbon dates (3510 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 6805); 3635 ± 30 b.p. (Pta 7020), and 3640 ± 60 b.p. (Pta 6794)) from secure deposits surrounding the painted slabs. Interestingly, the slabs found within the deposits contain depictions of seven human figures mostly in monochrome red that do not correspond with the subject matter depicting domestic sheep that is currently on the shelter’s wall. Thus Jerardino and Swanepoel (1999) observe that the art found painted on these slabs relate to an earlier time before the introduction of sheep in the rock art at Steenbokfontein Cave.

More recent dates come from Collingham Shelter, situated on the outskirts of the northern Drakensberg, and are associated with a fallen piece of painted ceiling found in deposits dated to 650 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 5098; charcoal)\(^1\) and contains a painted white rhebuck, the neck and head of shaded polychrome eland and some red human figures. Another broken sandstone slab containing paint smudges in black, a human figure, parts of an indeterminate animal and another possible seated human figure was recovered from lower levels at Collingham Shelter. Although not directly dated, it occurs between two securely dated layers (1800 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 5096; charcoal & 1830 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 5098; charcoal) (Mazel 1992a, 1994, 2009a).

It has been argued that most, if not all, of the paintings found in the Drakensberg region were made relatively recently (Vinnicombe 1976; Campbell 1987; Lewis Williams & Dowson 1992). Most of Vinnicombe’s (1976) and Campbell’s (1987) research was situated in the southern Drakensberg where there is a large corpus of rock art containing colonial imagery. This may have influenced their argument for a more recent timing in rock art making. Also at the time, Denninger’s (1971)

---

\(^1\) In this thesis, radiocarbon dates provided in the text are presented in the order of: uncalibrated year b.p., lab number, and material that has been dated.
direct dates for the paintings in the northern and central Drakensberg corroborated Vinnicombe’s (1976) hypothesis that they were more recently painted. However, Thackeray (1983) has noted the problems in Denninger’s (1971) method, and these dates are now considered unreliable and are no longer used.

In 1996, Mazel and Watchman (2003) collected 25 samples from a number of sites situated in the uKhahlamba Drakensberg and Biggarsberg region. Only a few dates could be extrapolated from these samples as some contained insufficient carbon for dating (Table 1.2). One of the radiocarbon dates was obtained from a plant fibre part of the paint pigment belonging to a fine-line white and orange eland from the site Esikolweni Shelter in the northern Drakensberg. The plant fibre produced a direct date of 330 ± 90 b.p. (ANDRA 3) (Table 1.2). Mazel and Watchman (1997) interpret this date as coinciding with contact between San hunter-gatherers and farmers as observed from deposits from the site Mhlwazini Cave, situated 15km away, with contact deposits dated to around the same time (320 ± 40 b.p.; Pta 4850; charcoal) (Mazel 1990). This suggests that some of the rock art in the northern uKhahlamba Drakensberg was made relatively recently and could be dated to the time period where contact between hunter-gatherers and farmers occurred (Mazel & Watchman 1997).

At Main Caves North, in the central Drakensberg, Mazel and Watchman (2003) obtained three radiocarbon dates (2360 ± 70 b.p.; ANDRA 17; 2760 ± 75 b.p.; ANDRA 16; 2900 ± 80 b.p.; ANDRA 15) from oxalated crusts overlying and underlying the paintings. It is suggested that the formation of a crust found underneath and on top of these paintings would have developed over hundreds of years rather than thousands of years (Mazel & Watchman 2003). The sample ANDRA 17 taken from crust underlying a shaded polychrome rhebuck produced a date of 2360 b.p. and has become one of the key dates for the emergence of the shaded polychrome technique in the northern and central Drakensberg around 2000 years ago (Mazel 2003, 2009a, 2009b, 2011).

Other radiocarbon dates obtained from the uKhahlamba Drakensberg and Biggarsberg are represented in Table 1.2. These dates provide robust evidence for
the antiquity of San hunter gatherer paintings in this region (Mazel 1994; Mazel & Watchman 2003).

A project to directly date black paint pigments is underway by Bonneau et al. (2011, 2012) in the southern Drakensberg. Carbon containing black pigments found on rock spalls from a surface collection at the site RSA TYN 2 in the Eastern Cape, produced three radiocarbon determinations (Table 1.2). The rock spalls could not be linked to paintings found on the shelter wall (Bonneau et al. 2011).

Direct dating is still in its infancy and the vast majority of rock art remains undated. One direct date does not provide a clear cut temporal resolution for the entire painted site. This is especially the case if the shelter has had different painting episodes through time. One painting may have a very different date to another painting within the same vicinity on a panel (Mazel & Watchman 2003).

These considerations must be taken into account for the sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg. Although, none have been directly dated, there is still the question of when different images may have been made on a panel and whether or not these images were made before, after or at the same time as the sheep images.

1.4.2. Dating by content

A common relative dating technique is based on the appearance of new and datable iconography in rock art (Thackeray 1983). This iconography includes domestic animals, such as sheep, cattle, goats, horses, and dogs, and their keepers for example farmers, herders, Europeans, as well as their associated material culture including guns, hats, spears, shields, knobkerries. This is referred to as ‘contact period rock art’ which encompasses a time when new groups of people and their animals moved and settled on the landscape and formed varied and often complex relationships with indigenous hunter-gatherers (ibid).

In the southern Drakensberg, horse paintings provide a tighter chronological control based on the fact that horses were introduced into the region at around 1830, when large numbers of them are historically recorded with the arrival and
settlement of Europeans (Wright 1971: 16). For cattle and sheep paintings, however the temporal gap is wide stretching from around 2000 years ago to the more recent past and because of this subject matter alone is not a good chronological indicator for the art (Loubser 1993: 101).

1.4.3. The colour of sheep paintings and their age

Some of the sheep imagery that was recorded in 2012 and 2103 in the northern Drakensberg are made in white paint. Pearce (2006) has argued that the appearance of white paint may indicate that paintings were made relatively recently. This is based on the assumption that white pigment does not have a lasting presence on the rock face, due to its poor rate of preservation (Pearce 2006). However Mazel (2009b) challenges this argument and observes that the presence of white paint does not always indicate the recent age of a painting. For example, a radiocarbon determination of a shaded polychrome rhebuck suggests that the white paint has survived relatively well through time (Mazel & Watchman 2003). A single rhebuck made in white paint identified by Russell (2000) at Main Cave’s North suggests that it was not the oldest nor the earliest painting made at the site. This is based on Russell’s (2000) analysis of painted sequences using superpositioning to determine where the paintings fit within temporal episodes of image making at the site. Ward and Maggs (1994) also identify differing preservation states of images and suggest that older paintings may have a higher preservation rate than more recent ones. Thus, it would seem that white paint may preserve for longer than assumed by Pearce (2006) and this is taken into account when trying to age the white painted sheep images in the northern Drakensberg.

None of the sheep paintings in the Northern Drakensberg show bright vermillion colours as identified in the most recent painting phases as recognised by Pager (1971), Vinnicombe (1976) and later by Russell (1997, 2000). Nor do these paintings appear block-like or powdery as identified by Loubser and Laurens (1994) for the more recent paintings of domestic animals in the rock art of the Caledon Valley.
Some of the sheep paintings are found close to shaded polychrome paintings. Although, there is the problem of establishing when each of these images were made through time. However if they are made at the same time then they may be as old as 2000 b.p. (Mazel 2009a, 2009b).

1.4.4. Sequencing rock art through time: Zimbabwe, Southwestern Cape and the Caledon River Valley

With only a few individual paintings dated, and no firm chronological framework based on direct dates, the sequencing of rock art to build a chronology has become a major component in research (Loubser 1993, 1997; Anderson 1996; Mguni 1997; Russell 2000, 2010; Pearce 2002, 2006, 2010; Swart 2004, 2006; Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004). Results from the Drakensberg are summarised in Table 1.3.

In southern Africa, the technique of sequencing rock art through the analysis of superpositioning is frequently practiced, although the application of the Harris Matrix has not always been used (Willcox 1956; Cooke 1969; Pager 1971; Vinnicombe 1976; Loubser & Laurens 1994). In some of this research, it was evident that multiple artistic traditions or styles which could be elucidated from the art (Yates et al. 1994).

Cooke (1965, 1969) places the occurrence of domestic animals in Style 3 and in Style 4. This is based on Cooke’s analysis of superpositional sequences in which he identifies five Styles of paintings in the rock art. Cooke suggests that Style 3 consists of naturalistic paintings, including polychromes and shaded polychromes and he characterises this phase of painting as “an artistic explosion resulting in all manner of experimental work” (Cooke 1969: 47). Style 4 is also characterised by the occurrence of shaded polychrome paintings, but in this phase Cooke (1969) notes that other groups are represented in the rock art along with their material culture and domestic livestock. He associates this phase to reflect the nature of contact between the artists where he states that “…there is a succession of rapid changes [in the rock art] which presages the final cessation by some alien invaders” (ibid: 49). Cooke (1969) identifies his Style 3 and Style 4 as being very different to the later Style 5 in the sequence and this is generally associated with black and white schematic paintings associated with agro-pastoralists.
Table 1.3. Sequences of rock paintings in the Drakensberg. Adapted after Russell (2000: Table 6). *Only part of Swart's (2004) sequence is provided here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pager (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ndedema Gorge, Northern Drakensberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinnicombe (1976)</td>
<td>Style 1: Earliest Style</td>
<td>Phase 1: Earliest Phase</td>
<td>Monochrome red, paintings appear fragmentary and lack of detail may be due to the disappearance of fugitive colours (white)? Paint appears as a stain on the rock surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell (1997; 2000)</td>
<td>Style 2: Unshaded bichromes red and white</td>
<td>Phase 2:</td>
<td>Bichromes red and white (detail) human figures and animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer 1: Earliest Layer</td>
<td>Monochrome purple bovids and human figures. Bichrome dark purple and white bovids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style 3: Shaded bichromes with black introduced for details</td>
<td></td>
<td>No equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style 4: Mid sequence</td>
<td>Phase 3: Mid sequence</td>
<td>Shaded polychromes eland and rhebuck. Perspective is used for antelope. Unshaded monochromes, bichromes and polychromes continue. Black used for detail. Paint is thick and brushstrokes are distinguishable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer 3: Mid sequence</td>
<td>Shaded polychromes (pink, orange, purple, brown, black and white) eland and rhebuck. Bichrome human figures with orange or brown. Black is used for detail. Paint is thick and brushstrokes are visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style 5: Mid sequence</td>
<td>Phase 4: Final Phase</td>
<td>Shaded polychromes decrease with greater use of black, yellow and bright vermilion or orange. Paint appears powdery in often block-like representations. Bichrome and polychrome elands become more stylised with white heads and yellow or orange bodies. (The final phase has also been marked with the introduction of European imagery).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer 5: Mid sequence</td>
<td>Shaded polychromes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style 6: Unshaded polychrome elands in bright yellow, orange, and vermilion colours with black and white.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style 7: Final Style</td>
<td>Unshaded monochromes and bichromes in white, vermilion, yellow or orange and black. Few shaded bichromes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Layer 7: Final Layer</td>
<td>Bichrome yellow and white eland and polychrome yellow, white, and black eland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anderson (1996) and Mguni (1997) applied the Harris Matrix technique to rock paintings in the Western Cape. In both cases, these researchers were dealing with multiple traditions and styles of art. Anderson (1996) identified clear stratigraphic patterns in style between fine-line paintings, handprints and finger paintings, and colonial imagery in the Bokkeveld and Sandveld area of the southwestern Cape. These patterns showed that 1) fine line paintings were the oldest group of images, 2) that fine-line images were followed by medium and small handprints and finger paintings as well as colonial imagery and 3) the more recent images comprising of larger handprints, specific colonial imagery and black charcoal drawings.

Earlier research conducted by Mguni (1997) showed clear stratigraphic styles in the paintings of Diepkloof Kraal Shelter, also in the Western Cape. This chronological sequence of paintings include: 1) fine-line paintings being the oldest, 2) followed by handprints, 3) a layer of finger markings, 4) colonial imagery and geometric designs and 4) the more recent graffiti. Both researchers identified a similar pattern in the sequence of rock paintings for the Western Cape. Sheep paintings are believed to fit somewhere within the latest of fine-line paintings and the occurrence of handprints (Anderson 1996).

In the Caledon Valley, Loubser (1993) observed, through superpositioning, that shaded polychrome paintings are often found painted over other shaded polychrome paintings, but that domestic livestock, were not found painted in superpositions. Instead, livestock are painted in a powdery pigment with a block-like appearance and that often these paintings are found over a large surface area. In shaded polychrome paintings the pigment appears to bond well with the rock face. On the other hand, Loubser (1993) observe that depictions of domestic livestock and associated eland have poor binding properties on the rock face. Thus Loubser (1993: 102) states:

“The ‘stratigraphic’ relationship between shaded polychrome paintings and blocked ones, together with the consistent link between subject matter, pigment use, mode of depiction and motif layout, imply that blocked paintings of domestic animals and occasionally associated contact motifs can be systematically distinguished from earlier shaded polychrome paintings”.
Of interest is that none of the sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg contain a similar description of powdery pigment or block-like appearances. Instead, they are depicted in similar colours to other paintings on the rock face including red and white. This suggests that these sheep do not conform to the recent paintings identified by Loubser (1993) for the Caledon Valley, and therefore may be older. The pigment used in the depiction of the northern Drakensberg sheep images also appear to bond well with the rock face. All of which appear to be thinly applied onto the rock face. This may also support these paintings to be older, than those described by Loubser (1993).

1.4.5. Sequencing paintings in the Drakensberg

In the 1950s (Willcox 1956) and during the 1970s (Pager 1971, Vinnicombe 1976), attempts were made at sequencing Drakensberg rock art by using the fact that San rock art is often painted on top of other paintings and so a relative chronology can be discerned where older paintings are those closest to the rock surface. Vinnicombe (1976) found that patterns in the use and application of different colours could be used as a chronological marker in the Drakensberg, but that subject matter was not such a reliable marker.

Later, Russell (1997, 2000) applied the Harris Matrix technique to four panels at Main Caves North in the Giants Castle area of the central uKhahlamba Drakensberg. Her analysis was based on the superpositioning of various individual motifs within the single San rock art tradition. She identified seven different layers of painted Styles (Table 1.3). These Styles were based on criteria, which included the colour of paint, its application and mixing (monochrome, bichrome, and polychrome), and its appearance on the rock surface (Russell 2000: 61). Russell (2000) subsequently compared her sequence with the earlier sequences by Pager (1971) (Table 1.3) who identified seven Styles for the Didima Gorge, northern Drakensberg and Vinnicombe (1976) (Table 1.3) who had identified four phases for the southern Drakensberg.
Although there were differences, there were also similarities that could be identified within all three rock art sequences. Pager (1971) identified shaded bichrome elands within his style 3 but both Russell (1997, 2000) and Vinnicombe (1976) did not identify this style in their sequences. During mid-sequence, Pager (1971), Vinnicombe (1976) and Russell (1997, 2000) identified the first appearance of shaded polychrome paintings (Table 1.3). In Russell’s layer 4, also in mid-sequence, she identified the appearance of monochrome white rhebuck, a distinctive phase identified in her analyses. This was not identified by Pager (1971) or by Vinnicombe (1976).

Swart (2004) (Table 1.4) also produced a detailed sequence for paintings found at Eland Cave in the Cathedral Peak area of the northern Drakensberg and Ngongwane 8 in the southern Drakensberg, using the Harris Matrix method. Swart (2004) identified the introduction of new subject matter including polychrome felines, hartebeest, reedbuck, and bushpig during mid-sequences at these two sites. Swart (2004) also identified the appearance of rhebuck during mid-sequence but also again at the end of the sequence.

1.4.6. Dating sheep imagery with reference to the occupation history of the Northern Drakensberg.

The archaeological evidence for the occupation of the Drakensberg by different groups through time is reviewed in detail in Chapter 4. However brief mention will be made here of Mazel’s (1989a, 1998, 2009b) observation that there was a hiatus in the occupation of the northern Drakensberg between 1600 and 600 b.p. and this is supported by the radiocarbon patterning at sites for the last 2000 years in this area. This limits the time period in which sheep might have been painted to either the period from their first introduction to southern Africa, at around 2000 b.p. to 1600 b.p., or to after the hiatus, from 600 b.p. onwards.

1.5. Suggestions made for the age of sheep rock art in southern Africa:

It is often suggested that where sheep paintings occur, without other images of livestock in southern Africa, that these paintings pre-date cattle paintings (Cooke
1965; Hall 1986, 1994; Manhire et al. 1986). This is because archaeological evidence indicates that it was sheep that appeared first on the landscape, followed shortly afterwards by cattle.

Cooke (1969) has placed domestic animals in his Style 3 and Style 4 in the rock art of Zimbabwe, where he suggests that shaded polychrome paintings are also found within the same phase as domestic animals. Cooke (1969) noted that, through interviews with agro-pastoralists presently living in the area, that they do not recollect paintings of this kind being made by their forefathers. Instead, they are referred to as “madzimudzangara” which translates into ‘spirits of long ago’ (Cooke 1969: 51).

Cooke (1965, 1969) proposed that sheep paintings found in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe, could also be aged by the absence of cattle in the rock art. Cooke (1965) noted that cattle paintings were absent from Zimbabwean rock art and assumed that the painters would have seen sheep first rather than cattle. Thus sheep must have arrived into the region before cattle did (ibid). Today however, cattle paintings are documented at five sites in Mashonaland (Izzet 1980) of which none have been dated.

Hall (1986, 1994) tentatively proposed two different temporal phases for the paintings of sheep and of cattle in the Eastern Cape. He suggests, based on the distribution, that sheep paintings may relate to an earlier phase of painting during a time when hunter-gatherers and pastoralists were present. On the other hand, cattle paintings may relate to a later second phase of painting when hunter-gatherers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists were present on the landscape. Manhire et al. (1986) have also postulated an earlier time frame for the occurrence of sheep paintings in the southern and western Cape. This is based in part on their distribution in the mountainous regions, although Jerardino (1999) documented sheep paintings from Steenbokfontein Shelter situated in the coastal region of the Western Cape where they had previously thought not to have occurred.
1.6. Summary:

I believe that the paintings of sheep are pre-colonial and were made by local San communities in the northern Drakensberg. The question as to whether these San were hunter-gatherers or hunters herding sheep will be discussed in Chapter 7. They may have been made after 600 b.p. at the end of the hiatus period. Evidence for dated sheep remains (Chapter 2) seem to show that this time frame might indicate this. It is also possible that they were made earlier, possibly around 2000 – 1600 b.p, with the proposed date for shaded polychrome paintings in the northern Drakensberg (Mazel 2009b). This will be further explored in Chapter 4.

In the next chapter I look at the breeds of sheep that were first introduced into South Africa and compare these to the types of painted sheep. The archaeological evidence of sheep remains is also reviewed.
Chapter 2: The introduction of the first domestic livestock and their keepers in southern Africa: with a focus on the earliest dated archaeological evidence for sheep in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg, KwaZulu-Natal region.

2.1. Introduction

The first domestic sheep arrived in southern Africa circa 2000 years ago b.p. (Sealy & Yates 1994; Henshilwood 1996). Their appearance in the rock art and their remains in the excavated archaeology testify to their presence on the landscape and the age of their remains constrain the time breadth of sheep paintings to not older than 2000 years ago. Although of course they may have been painted much more recently than this, thus the question remains: Where within this timeframe do the paintings of sheep fit?

In this chapter the ways in which archaeological evidence for the first arrival of sheep (*Ovis aries*) and of other livestock, have been interpreted in southern African archaeology is explored. It begins by outlining the leading hypotheses for the first introduction of sheep and then considers the earliest dated archaeological evidence for sheep in the northern Drakensberg. It follows by looking at the historical records and the rock art record for the types of sheep that may have been initially encountered in the past. Together, this evidence is explored to gain a better understanding for why and when sheep were painted.

The emergence of pastoralism in southern Africa is by no means a neat picture as there are competing views as to how it should be identified in the archaeology. The remains of sheep are at the centre of these debates. It is their antiquity and their status as the first livestock to appear on the landscape that makes them an interesting yet challenging subject to explore. Sheep paintings have received little attention in this respect.
2.2. The arrival of livestock in southern Africa

The pattern for the spread of domestic livestock into southern Africa is characterised by temporally filtered movements with sheep first, then followed by cattle (Ehret 1982, 2008; Clutton-Brock 2000; Gifford-Gonzalez 2000). These movements occurred relatively rapidly, as soon after 2000 years ago sheep appear for the first time in the faunal assemblages at widely distributed sites in southern Africa (Sealy & Yates 1996).

Sheep remains dating to about 2000 b.p. provide the earliest evidence for the appearance of livestock in southern Africa (Sealy & Yates 1994, 1996; Henshilwood 1996; Webley 2001; Robbins et al. 2008; Pleurdeau et al. 2012). Cattle (*Bos taurus*) seem to have arrived a couple of hundred years later, between 1600 and 1500 b.p. (Klein 1986) in the western Cape. On the eastern side of southern Africa, cattle arrived around the early to mid-first millennium AD (Huffman 1990). Little is known about the exact timing for the first arrival of goats and dogs. Clutton-Brock (1994/1995) and Mitchell (2002, 2008) as well as Plug (1996) believe that dogs (*Canis familiaris*) may have accompanied the earliest arrival of livestock (sheep) into southern African around 2000 years ago. One of the problems associated with the identification of dogs in the archaeological record is that it is difficult to distinguish them from their wild counterpart - the wild-dog (Klein & Cruz-Uribe 1989). It is possible that goats (*Capra hircus*) may also have arrived during this time, although they seem to only occur in archaeological deposits dated to more recent times (800 AD) in the western part of southern Africa (Webley 1984; Klein 1986; Badenhorst 2006). On the eastern side of the subcontinent goats most likely arrived with early agropastoralist people around 350 AD (Voigt 1984; Voigt & Von den Driesch 1984; Clutton-Brock 1994/1995; Badenhorst 2006). Although, once again, there is the problem of distinguishing between sheep and goat remains in the archaeology; the species are often lumped together as *Ovis/Capra* in faunal analyses (Badenhorst 2006).
Gifford-Gonzalez (2000) offers different reasons for why there seems to be a discrepancy between dates for sheep and those associated with cattle. She suggests that factors including climatic, environmental and epizootic disease may have hampered the movement of cattle more so than sheep south of sub-Saharan Africa. She focuses on the barriers for this movement including diseases such as Wildebeest derived malignant catarrhal fever, East Coast Fever, Foot-and-Mouth disease, Rift Valley Fever, and trypanosomiasis where cattle are more susceptible to these diseases than are sheep. This may explain why sheep appear earlier in the archaeological record (ibid).

2.3. Three diffusion models for the spread of sheep and their keepers in southern Africa 2000 years b.p.:

Since there is no evidence to suggest that domestic animals have wild progenitors in southern Africa, their introduction must have come from the north in sub-Saharan Africa (Robertshaw 1978; Sealy & Yates 1994; Sadr 1998; Smith, A. 1998, 2008).

2.3.1. Model 1: Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists

It is widely accepted that a demic diffusion of agro-pastoralist populations with livestock including sheep, cattle, goats and possibly dogs, into southern Africa occurred at the beginning of the first millennium AD (Huffman 1990). This movement is restricted to the eastern side of the subcontinent where high summer rainfall often exceeding 800mm per annum allowed for the cultivation of cereal crops, including sorghum and millet (Whitelaw & Mitchell 2005). To the west and no further than approximately 33 degrees south, where there are only smaller pockets of winter rainfall such as in the southwestern Cape, agro-pastoralist groups are absent (Hall & Smith, A. 1986). In central South Africa these communities are believed to have arrived more recently, and in Lesotho there is little evidence for the occupation of these groups in the archaeology until around the nineteenth century (Mitchell et al. 2008).
The time period for early agro-pastoralist north to south-easterly spread and settlement is termed the Early Iron Age (EIA) beginning at around 350 AD in South Africa (Huffman 1990, 1993, 2007; Maggs 1994/1995; Vansina 1994/1995; Phillipson 2005). The term (Early) Iron Age (IA) however is now considered largely inadequate for identifying and labelling these communities and their modes of economic, subsistence and technological innovations in southern Africa (Mitchell 2002). Sadr (2008b) has also suggested that the term does not reflect a time of interaction between indigenous hunter-gatherers and agro-pastoralists of which the two time periods overlap. In this thesis, I use the term Iron Age sparingly.

In KwaZulu-Natal, settlement began around the third and fourth centuries known as the Mzonjani Phase. This was followed by three other phases of occupation identified through ceramic style, they are: 1) Msuluzi (seventh century); 2) Ndondondwane (eighth and ninth centuries) and 3) Ntshekane (tenth century) (Maggs 1980a, 1980b; Maggs & Michael 1976; Maggs & Whitelaw 1991; Whitelaw 1994/1995).

Early agro-pastoral communities are fairly well documented through South African archaeology (Davies 1974; Maggs 1980a, 1980b, 1982; Hall 1980, 1986; Huffman 1990, 2007; Whitelaw 1994; Feely & Bell-Cross 2011). They have been identified with metallurgy, pottery, and an agricultural and pastoral way of life with a relatively permanent village type settlement (Huffman 1990, 1993, 2007; Maggs 1984; Voigt 1986; Arnold 2008; Russell & Steele 2009; Feely & Bell-Cross 2011). During the Mzonjani phase in KwaZulu-Natal, their settlements are found in close proximity to the coastline and up to 8km further inland. During later periods farmers moved away from this coastal corridor, inland where they chose to settle on flat valley floors near major rivers. Finally, during a much later period after 1000 AD, farmers moved to higher altitude zones close to the foothills of the Drakensberg (Maggs 1994/5; Whitelaw 2009).
2.3.2. Model 2: Demic diffusion of Khoe speaking pastoralists

Proponents for the demic diffusion of pastoralists include the work of Cooke (1965), Elphick (1985), Ehret (1982, 2008), Parkington (1984), Smith, A. (1986, 1990, 1998, 2005a, 2005b, 2008), and Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004). Smith, A. (1986, 2005a, 2005b) identifies the appearance of a cultural package including sheep, a ceramic technology, and an ideology oriented around the keeping of domestic livestock as marking the arrival of a new group of people onto the landscape, Khoe-speaking pastoralists. Unlike agro-pastoralists, Khoekhoen did not practice agriculture (Smith, A. 2005b). Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) have added geometric rock art, including handprints and finger paintings, to the proposed pastoralist package. At the core of this argument is that pastoralists leave very little archaeological trace on the landscape, and their presence may be masked by more dominant signatures of settlement such as agro-pastoralist settlement (Smith, A. 2000). However, rock art may provide a permanent marker for these groups in southern Africa (Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004).

Earlier works by Westphal (1963), Cooke (1965, 1968) and Elphick (1985) presented two different migration models for the movement of early Khoe herders. At the time, evidence was supplied by linguistics (Westphal 1963; Elphick 1985) and sheep paintings (Cooke 1965). Presently both models have neither been confirmed nor have they been entirely refuted by evidence (Russell 2004).

2.3.3. The Routes: Sheep paintings and linguistics

Earlier work by Elphick (1985), who was heavily influenced by the work of Westphal’s (1963) classification on the Tshu-Khwe language family, proposed a route initially originating in northern Botswana. This spread proceeded southwards towards the Orange and Vaal Rivers where it split into two branches. One branch proceeded westwards to Namibia via the Orange River where it further split north and south along the coast, whilst the other branch moved down central South Africa into the western and eastern parts of the Cape.
Paintings of sheep were hypothesised by Cooke (1965) to document the route for the movement of pastoralists into southern Africa. According to Cooke’s (1965) route, Khoe pastoralists moved southwards towards Zimbabwe and then westwards to Namibia followed by a southward movement down the western coast of South Africa. Although Cooke (1965) noted a few exceptions in the distribution of sheep paintings where some occur further inland away from the coast in South Africa, it seems anomalous why he concentrated on the western coast as today paintings of sheep have been found widely distributed across the country. It is of interest that little attempt has been made to test Cooke’s hypothesis for sheep paintings in southern Africa.

2.3.4. Model 3: An indigenous development of sheep-keeping by the San

Others strongly disagree with a migration hypothesis and favour the indigenous development of sheep-keeping in southern Africa (Deacon et al. 1978; Kinahan 1986, 2001; Sadr 1998; 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2008a; Sadr & Plug 2001; Fauvelle-Aymar & Sadr 2008, Fauvelle-Aymar 2008). In Namibia, Kinahan (1986, 2001) favours an interpretation that sees local hunter-gatherers adopting and herding sheep. Sadr (1998, 2003, 2004a, 2008a) proposes that sheep were passed on from one hunter-gatherer group to another through a gift giving system, that included some sought after prestige items, such as sheep, in the southwestern Cape. Sadr (2003) traces this cultural diffusion somewhere north in Zambia/Botswana to the south in the southwestern Cape where San hunter-gatherers eventually became herders. Sadr (2003) terms this the Neolithic of southern Africa, whereby food-production in the form of herding practices was a local independent development amongst indigenous hunter-gatherers.

Sadr (2008a) does recognise a late migration of Khoe pastoralists into southern Africa during the later part of the first millennium AD. He argues that the appearance of a stylistic chain in ceramic technology, such as lugged pottery, and other changes in the archaeological record marks their arrival. Sadr (2008a) proposes that a later Khoe migration most probably can be attested with the historically documented KhoeKhoen of the southwestern Cape who were recorded
owning large flocks of fat-tailed sheep and large herds of cattle at the time (Raven-Hart 1967).

2.3.5. Cultural versus demic diffusion for sheep: theoretical positions

Theoretically, these two positions represent different ways of viewing how prehistoric livestock herding appeared on the southern Africa landscape 2000 years ago. Sadr (2003, 2004a) and others (Deacon et al. 1978; Mitchell 2002; Mitchell et al. 2008) suggest that a transition from foraging to herding was made indigenously and that this led to casual changes, not necessarily a complete shift in the ideology and social structure of indigenous San hunter-gatherers. However, Smith, A. (1998, 2005a, 2008) following the work of Ingold (1980, 1986) opposes their view. He (Smith, A. 1998) stresses that such a transition would not be an easy one and that in order to make it would have to be a shift in ideological, economical, and social practices amongst local hunter-gatherers (Smith, A. 1990). A change that he believes is not casual but rather revolutionary. Barnard (2008) agrees that this transition would be difficult. However, he questions not how difficult this transition would be, but rather how different groups with diverse ideologies surrounding their animals and modes of production would have impacted on one another during periods of interaction and transition (Barnard 2008: 64).

These debates however are not exclusive to the first millennium AD archaeology of the western side of southern Africa. They also extend to the eastern side of the subcontinent where it has been presented that local hunter-gatherers more recently adopted livestock from their agro-pastoralist neighbours (Hobart 2003, 2004; Jolly 2007; Mitchell et al. 2008) and by Mazel (2009b; 2013), who suggests that there may have been a Khoe pastoralist presence in the northern Drakensberg just after 2000 years ago.

The distinction between the identities of the Khoe and the San, and tracing these identities (cultural, economic and social), and their boundaries in the past is tricky. Researchers have questioned the type of boundaries that may have existed between these groups. Some researchers argue that Khoe and San were two
completely different groups of people who not only spoke mutually unintelligible languages but also who were different in economic, ideological and social terms (Ehret 1982, 2008; Smith, A. 1986, 1990, 1998). Others suggest that this distinction is based on those who had livestock and those who were without, and that these boundaries may have been more fluid (Barnard 2008). Without knowing who the Khoe were it becomes difficult to identify their society, culture and ideology (Barnard 2008).

There is also an issue of terminology used to identify the practices surrounding livestock. Here, pastoralism may be defined as the ways in which people orientate themselves around their livestock (economically, socially, and ideologically) regardless of mode of subsistence (Robertshaw & Collett 1983; Smith, A. 2005a). Sadr (2003: 198) however opts for a “less loaded term” - herding (or herder), which he believes better suits the archaeological data for the presence of domestic remains in faunal assemblages, the presence of livestock in paintings, and stock enclosures. I use both terms as they provide equally important, but also different kinds of information concerning the groups who practice the keeping of livestock. In this dissertation I refer to San who adopted livestock as San herders whilst maintaining the term pastoralists for Khoekhoen.

2.4. Identifying the keeping of livestock in archaeology:

Some of the proxies used to identify the emergence of pastoralism in southern Africa, and the groups who may have been connected with these practices, include pottery and livestock remains, particularly in the form of sheep.

2.4.1 Livestock remains

It is often thought that the remains of domestic livestock found in dated archaeological deposits provide strong evidence for herding practices. In some instances they do, for example, Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists sites (Huffman 1990). However, in some instances they do not. Difficulties in establishing who
occupied Late Stone Age (LSA) sites containing livestock remains include whether or not hunter-gatherers may have had access to livestock through theft or exchange, or whether or not these remains reflect herding practiced by hunter-gatherers. In southern Africa, LSA deposits containing livestock remains have either been interpreted as:

1. reflecting the presence of Khoe pastoralists, in the case of the southwestern Cape (Smith, A. 1993),
2. hunter-gatherers with access to livestock through theft or exchange and were used predominantly as an immediate form of subsistence (meat) (Smith, A. 1993),
3. hunter-gatherers who adopted and herded their own livestock (Sadr 2003) or
4. sites may have been ephemeral occupations by groups such as agro-pastoralists, on the eastern side of the subcontinent (Mazel 1998).

The challenges in establishing how livestock remains entered the LSA archaeological record and the groups they may belong to have long played a critical role in the debate concerning the origins of pastoralism in southern Africa.

2.4.2 Early Pottery

Pottery provides the next best proxy for the appearance of pastoralism. Often it was thought that where domestic livestock remains are missing, pottery could be used as a proxy for their presence at a site (Kinahan 2001; Lindholm 2009). However evidence suggests that this is not always the case with some pottery predating sheep in parts of southern Africa (Mazel 1992b; Mitchell 1996a; Kinahan 2001). The origin of this early pottery is debated.

In the case of the western side of southern Africa, Sadr (1998) argues for the presence of regional diversity as reflected in stylistic variations in decorated, thin-walled pottery. He suggests that although there are similarities in the technological production of ceramics, regional diversity in decorative style could
be better explained through cultural diffusion rather than migration of Khoe pastoralists. Smith, A. (2008) raises caution to Sadr’s (1998) stylistic approach towards early pottery and argues that decorative style may not indicate its importance to people, but rather he suggests that the function of the vessel may serve as a better indicator for homogeneity for early pottery in southern Africa. Smith, A. (2008) contends that decorative motifs would have a limited geographical distribution and that one would not expect to find a stylistic chain across the entire subcontinent.

2.5. What evidence is there for sheep remains in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg?

The first dated evidence for domestic livestock remains in KwaZulu-Natal comes from early farming community sites. Some of these sites include Msuluzi Confluence (1310 ± 40 b.p.; Pta 2195; charcoal) (Maggs, 1980b), Mhlopeni (1400 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 2878; charcoal) (Maggs & Ward 1984); Wosi (1430 ± 60 b.p.; Pta 4104; charcoal) (Van Schalkwyk 1994), and KwaGandaganda (1395 ± 60 b.p.; Wits 1918; charcoal) (Whitelaw 1994).

Figure 2.1 shows that there is a relatively large spatial gap between early sheep remains and the 2012 and 2013 recorded paintings of sheep in the northern Drakensberg. These large spatial distances between painted sheep sites and those with early sheep remains include a proximity of 72km, as the crow flies, from the nearest sheep painted site, Boschman’s Klip A on the outskirts of Cathedral Peak State Forest, to the nearest dated sheep remains (1310 ± 40 b.p) at the site of Msuluzi Confluence. Other painted sheep sites occur between 100km to about 200km away from dated sheep remain sites. This includes a distance of 213km from the painted sheep site, Sigubudu 4 in the Royal Natal National park to an early agro-pastoralist site, KwaGandaganda where sheep remains are found in association with a 1395 ± 60 b.p. radiocarbon date.
Figure 2.1.: The spatial distribution of the earliest dated sheep remains with the dates in years b.p., and their proximity to the painted sheep sites in the northern Drakensberg, KwaZulu-Natal.

This contrasts with hunter-gatherer sites containing livestock remains where they are dated by association to more recent times. This is generally after 1000 AD (Mazel 1998) (Figure 2.2). This would seem to correspond with the arrival of later farming communities into the higher grassland areas surrounding the Drakensberg. Figure 2.3 demonstrates that the sheep remains found in hunter-gatherer contexts occur in close spatial proximity to later farming community sites in the northern Drakensberg. For example, the painted sheep sites Junction Shelter and Zunckel’s Cave situated in Cathedral Peak State Forest are approximately five kilometres away from the site Mhlwazini Cave which contains sheep remains. The four other painted sheep sites occur within a radius of 100km to 120km from later agro-pastoralist sites. Based on these faunal assemblages, it may suggest that sheep were painted within the last 1000 years. This is further explored in Chapter 4.
Figure 2.2: The spatial and temporal distribution of hunter-gatherer sites containing sheep remains in Lesotho and the Thukela Basin, KwaZulu-Natal. Full site names can be found in Appendix A (pg 222 & 223).

Figure 2.3: Hunter-gatherer sites containing dated sheep remains and their spatial and temporal proximity to agro-pastoralist sites and painted sheep sites. Note that some of these sites are questioned marked as the age of the remains is unclear. Full site names can be found in Appendix B (pg 227).
2.6. What were the first breeds of sheep encountered in southern Africa?

There are four common morphological types of African sheep; fat-tailed with hair, fat-rumped, thin-tailed with hair, and thin-tailed with wool (Epstein 1971; Horsburgh & Rhines 2010). Today, the majority of ‘indigenous African’ breeds have been cross bred with more recent European breeds and many of the older breeds have now disappeared (Epstein 1971; Du Toit 2007a). In archaeology it is often difficult to identify the breeds of livestock based on faunal assemblages. However, recent research conducted on mitochondrial DNA of Die Kelders sheep remains in the southwestern Cape, suggests that they were part of the worldwide expansion of haplogroup B from the Asiatic Mouflon of western Iran and Turkey (Horsburgh & Rhines 2010). Further DNA studies on sheep remains may be able to separate out the different breeds present at sites in southern Africa and perhaps further trace their lineage across geographical areas in Africa (ibid). It is however their depiction in the rock art, and their description in historical records, which provide, for the time being, more robust clues for the types of sheep that were possibly first encountered and herded in the past.

2.6.1 Fat-tailed Sheep

In a 1801 account for the description of sheep at the Cape, John Barrow describes the sheep as follows:

“They are long-legged, small in the body, remarkably thin in the forequarters and across the ribs, the whole [of the fat] is collected upon the hind part of the thigh and upon the tail: this is short, broad, flat, naked on the underside, and weighs in general about five or six pounds...when melted it retains the consistence of vegetable oils. The sheep of the Cape are marked with every shade of colour: their necks are small and extended, and their ears long and pendulous”

(Clutton-Brock 1994/5: 164).

This account describes the fat-tailed variety of sheep, referred to more commonly as the Afrikaner sheep in the Cape Colony (Epstein 1971; Du Toit 2007a). Of interest is that the sheep encountered by Barrow consisted of various colours. In
earlier accounts, John Davys (1598) and Parmentier (1530) also make reference to the fatness of the tails and the type of hair of Afrikaner Sheep at the Cape:

“They sheepe have exceeding great tailes only of fat, weighing twelve or fourteene pounds: they have no wooll but a long shag haire”


And earlier by Parmentier in 1530:

‘the sheepe are very big and very good meat. They have no woll on their backs, But haire and great tailes, like the sheepe in Syria’.

(Parmentier 1530 in Raven-Hart 1967:11)

In another 19th century account, Burchell (in Du Toit 2007a: 8) describes in his travels to southern Botswana, both the Damara sheep and the Afrikaner sheep of the Cape:

“…the Damaras; but as a particular variety having long thin tails, only, the Cape Sheep were far more preferred on account of their large tails of pure fat, a substance almost essential to the bodily comfort of any African”

(Du Toit 2007a :8).

The tails of fat-tailed sheep vary according to the amount of fat reserve stored within them, giving a characteristic twisting of the lower ends of the tail and/or uneven lumps (Figure 2.4). In the fat-tailed Damara, the tail appears long and straight and hangs below the hock of the animal (Figure 2.5). Although it does not contain a large amount of fat, the Damara sheep are considered to be fat-tailed (Du Toit 2007a).
Figure 2.4. A fat-tailed sheep belonging to a Turkana pastoralist groups living near Lake Turkana in northeast Kenya. Note that the underside of the fat tail is bare. Note the pendulous ears. Photograph taken by Russell in 2011.

Figure 2.5. A Damara breed fat-tailed sheep. Note the pendulous ears and oval shaped long body and long legs. Photograph taken from Du Toit (2008: 7).
These characteristics of fat-tailed sheep are found in paintings and engravings in southern Africa (Figure 2.6). The emphasis is often placed on the fat tails, pendulous ears and body proportions that are shaped long and oval. However, in the majority of these paintings, fat tails are depicted in various forms; this could reflect the heterogeneity within breeds of fat-tailed sheep encountered by people at a particular time.

Figure 2.6. Examples of the different paintings of fat-tailed sheep in southern Africa. Note that each tail has been depicted differently but all have been depicted with relatively long and oval shaped bodies.
Although depictions of sheep with characteristic fat-tails, floppy ears, and oval bodies are found in hunter-gatherer rock art, there has been little investigation into whether or not this may have been the only salient feature of these animals for hunter-gatherer artists. For example, amongst the Damara fat-tailed sheep of southwest Africa, Du Toit (2007b:23) notes their striking resemblances to African antelope where both have relatively long legs, oval shaped bodies, sloping rumps and prominent withers. Lundie (2007: 59) also notes similarities between the facial markings and the tail markings of Damara sheep and African black-faced impala where both show thin black lines down the tails and on the face (Figure 2.7). This raises the question of whether or not sheep, either fat-tailed or thin-tailed, were thought of as similar to other wild animals in the past. This is important to consider because it has been argued that cattle may have symbolically replaced the eland in rock art production and that similarities between their size and spoor would suggest that the San saw them as quite similar animals (Lewis-Williams 1981: 106).

**Figure 2.7.** The similarities between Damara sheep colouration marks and those found on Black-faced impala. Both animals also have white underbellies. Photograph from Lundie (2007: 59).

### 2.6.2. Thin-tailed sheep

Robinson (1986) draws attention to the thin-tailed breed of sheep which are found depicted at the site Ruchera Cave in Zimbabwe (Figure 2.8). Robinson (1986) suggests that depictions of thin tails may relate to thin-tailed breeds from
northeast Congo and southern Sudan. He comments that as with thin-tailed sheep, fat-tailed sheep may also have been associated with the movement and establishment of Bantu-speakers in southern Africa (ibid).

2.6.3. Identifying sheep in rock art

One of the challenges with the identification of paintings of sheep is that in certain instances the artists did not depict all three of the characteristic features of the sheep, i.e. the tail. In certain images, the focus seems to be on tail rather than the ears, or alternatively, the ears and sheep-like facial features are depicted, with less emphasis on the tail. Another challenge is that some images will display sheep-like characteristics yet still have a predominant ‘wild’ animal like appearance.

A) thin-tailed sheep from Ruchera Cave, Zimbabwe (Robinson 1986: 34).

Figure 2.8. An example of a thin-tailed sheep in the rock art of southern Africa. This is questionable as a sheep.
(Figure 2.9); the formal conventions sometimes resemble those used to depict antelope or smaller buck.

**Figure 2.9.** An indeterminate animal recorded next to a fat-tailed sheep at Battle Cave, Injasuthi. Note that the body is oval and long which is similar to other depictions of sheep and buck. However it does not have a characteristic fat-tailed or pendulous ears. Re-drawing done by Lander in 2013.

2.7. Summary:

Evidence suggests that sheep remains in KwaZulu-Natal date to the early movement of agro-pastoralists into the Thukela Basin around 500 AD, and that hunter-gatherer sites containing these remains are relatively recent in date. It could be that sheep paintings fall within the last 1000 years AD. Evidence is further explored for the appearance, identification, and the dating of livestock remains in this region in chapter 4.
It seems most likely that the first sheep encountered by the San were fat-tailed, although thin-tailed varieties have also been documented in the rock art; however, thin-tailed sheep seem to comprise a far smaller proportion of paintings. Sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg, as presented in Chapter 5, will be investigated to see what type of sheep the San painted in the past.
Chapter 3: The interpretation of sheep paintings by other researchers in the archaeology of southern Africa

3.1. Introduction

There have been few studies conducted on sheep rock art in southern Africa and little attention has been paid to these paintings in terms of the debates surrounding how sheep were first introduced to the subcontinent. This is most probably because most, if not all, of the sheep rock in southern Africa is undated. But is there a way to incorporate them into these debates as a further line of evidence?

One of the main aims of this project is to explore why the San chose to paint sheep in the northern Drakensberg and whether or not this could provide further insights into the impact of the introduction of domestic animals and their keepers onto the landscape and the impact on the San who encountered these animals perhaps for the first time.

The ways in which researchers have attempted to understand sheep imagery, as well as other livestock imagery, and their meaning in rock art is explored in this chapter. I begin by reviewing where sheep rock art is found in southern Africa and then consider the various ways in which it has been interpreted.

3.2. The location of painted sheep sites on the southern African landscape

Sheep paintings have been documented in Zimbabwe (Cooke 1965; Huffman 1983; Robinson 1986), the Brandberg of Namibia (Pager 1993), the central Limpopo Basin in the Northern Province of South Africa (Eastwood & Fish 1996; Smith, B. & Hall 2000). They have also been found in Swaziland (Masson 2011), the Free State of South Africa (Lewis-Williams 1985) the Eastern Cape (Hall 1986), and further southeast in the Maloti/Drakensberg range (Pager 1971; Vinnicombe 1976; Mazel 1981, 1982) and in the southwestern Cape (Manhire et
These paintings, although found across most of southern Africa, are rare. For example, in the Brandberg only 0.4 percent of a total of over 10,000 images recorded by Pager (1993) depict sheep. In Zimbabwe only six sites have been so far identified containing depictions of clearly identifiable sheep paintings (Cooke 1965; Robinson 1986; Manhire et al. 1986). In the southwestern Cape, note that sheep paintings are found at 11 sites in the mountainous areas (Manhire et al. 1986) and another one confirmed site is located on the coastal belt of the southwestern Cape (Jerardino 1999). Hollmann (1993) recorded a further 26 sheep paintings from a survey of 50 painted shelters in the Koebee area of the

Figure 3.1. A distribution map showing painted and engraved sites with images of sheep in southern Africa. After Manhire et al. (1986: 23)
Western Cape. The rarity of sheep imagery is thus not a peculiarity of the northern Drakensberg region.

However, their distribution is different to that of other domestic livestock paintings in southern Africa; cattle and horse paintings are found predominantly in the southeastern portion of southern Africa and when they do occur they are generally found in greater numbers than paintings of sheep (Smith, A. 2005). Manhire et al. (1986) estimate that over 75 percent of cattle paintings are confined to an area between 28.33° S and 26.30° E, that includes the southern Drakensberg, Lesotho, parts of the southern Free State and the north-eastern Cape. Cattle paintings, however, do occur outside of this range (Figure 3.2), for example in Botswana, Zimbabwe and Namibia, however they are less concentrated. In the southwestern Cape, cattle paintings are absent (Manhire et al. 1983). Hall (1986) noted that sheep paintings are found in the Winterberg, north of the Fishriver, whilst cattle paintings predominate the Cape Fold Belt. These distributions however, may look very different when ordered through time rather than just by space.

3.2.1. Pastoralist rock art in southern Africa

Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) have used the spatial distribution of geometric rock art in the interior of southern Africa to argue for a Khoe pastoralist presence. Their findings indicate that geometric rock art occurs along watercourses and that engravings are seldom found on hill tops or ridges where fine-lined engravings occur.

This geometric rock art has been used as a proxy for the presence of immigrant Khoe populations into southern Africa and have been identified through both engravings and rock paintings of geometric designs, finger smears and representational imagery. It is found from the north in southern Angola, western Namibia and the Central Limpopo Basin to the south west in the central and western parts of South Africa (Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004) (Figure 3.3a).
Figure 3.2. A distribution map of painted and engraved sites containing cattle imagery in southern Africa. After Manhire et al. (1986: 25).

Figure 3.3a. The distribution of Khoe pastoralist rock art as identified by Smith, B. & Ouzman (2004). Map produced by Russell in 2002.
As with the distribution of sheep and cattle paintings (Figure 3.1 & Figure 3.2), the map showing the distribution of a Khoe geometric rock art may look very different once ordered through time rather than just by space.

Mazel (2013) considers the possibility of an early Khoe rock art in the northern Drakensberg (Figure 3b). This would suggest that the distribution as seen in Figure 3.3a. may also look quite different when plotted with rock art of finger-paintings in the northern Drakensberg.

Figure 3.3b. An example of finger-paintings at the site Bundoran 2 situated in the southern Drakensberg. Mazel (2013) recorded similar finger paintings throughout both the northern and southern Drakensberg. Photograph taken by Mazel between 1971 and 1981.
3.3. What has been said previously about painted sheep imagery in southern African archaeology?

There are differing thoughts as to why sheep were depicted in San rock art. These interpretations of this imagery by other researchers are summarised here.

3.3.1. Sheep are trance metaphors relating to fat and potency.

Huffman (1983) suggests that paintings of fat-tailed sheep found in Zimbabwe were unlikely to be narrative depictions of ‘other’ people moving through the subcontinent, as had been suggested by Cooke (1965). Instead, drawing from the earlier work of Lewis-Williams (1981), Huffman (1983: 51) suggests that sheep paintings may depict complex scenes regarding the control of potency related to trance ceremonies among San hunter-gatherers. At one site, Huffman (1983) records a painting of a sheep superpositioned on top of another painting depicting a honeycomb. He connects the fat of the sheep to honey, as both provide potency.

Huffman (1983) suggests that the large quantity of fat found in the tails of fat-tailed sheep may have had a particular metaphorical meaning to San shamans. Lewis-Williams (1981) has argued that the anomalous quantities of fat in eland was symbolic to the San, especially in that fat was considered to contain potency that was important in ritual activities associated with shamans entering into trance. Huffman (1983) considers that the fat of sheep could be seen by San hunter-gatherers as analogous to the fat of an eland, and that this may be one of the reasons why San chose to paint sheep. A similar argument was previously put forward by Lewis Williams (1981) concerning the relationship between cattle and eland in the paintings in the southeastern mountains of South Africa. Huffman (1983) also notes that images of human figures associated with sheep display features associated with trance. Lewis-Williams (1981) argues that paintings of human figures that are depicted for example with blood coming out their noses, hairs standing on edge, and/or elongated limbs are some of the signs that shamans were experiencing trance related phenomena.
Huffman (1963) proposes that paintings of sheep and related human figures may be better explained within a shamanistic framework. Particularly in that these paintings may have reflected the beliefs and customs of San hunter-gatherers as proposed earlier by Lewis Williams (1981).

Eastwood and Fish (1996) have made a similar argument for the rock art of sheep in the Limpopo Valley. They agree that sheep fat may have been ritually important to San shamans during the period of contact with other groups of people on the landscape. Smith and Hall (2000) agree too, that sheep may represent a new form of potency due to their large quantity and quality of fat.

3.3.2. Women as likened to the fatness of sheep.

Hollmann (1993), commenting on three sites with paintings of sheep, notes that sheep may have become ritually significant to the San. Hollmann (1993) further suggests at site in the Koebee area which contains four paintings of sheep in association with a steotopygous woman, may possibly indicate similarities between the fatness of a women and the fat of the sheep (Figure 3.4).

Figure 3.4. (A) steotopygous female figure situated to the left of a group of fat-tailed sheep from the site Boschklouf 1808, Western Cape recorded by Hollmann in 1992. (B) Two steotopygous figures, one depicts a female and the other a male, from the painted sheep site RSA KIK11 in the western Cape. Images courtesy of SARADA.
3.3.3. Sheep as symbols of ritual stress.

Smith and Hall (2000) propose two possible explanations for sheep in the rock art of the Central Limpopo Basin (north-eastern South Africa) (Figure 3.5 and Figure 3.6). These explanations may be considered as interwoven.

The first explanation proposed by Smith, B. and Hall (2000: 40) is that sheep and human figures may have been the ‘intentional’ depiction of other groups by San hunter-gatherers. Following the work of Campbell (1987), Smith, B. and Hall (2000) propose that the presence of sheep in rock art may have been a ritualistic response by hunter-gatherers to the appearance of Khoe herders and their animals in the Limpopo region.

Previously, Campbell (1987) has argued that ritual activity increased among San shamans in the southeastern mountains due to contact with agro-pastoralists and later Europeans. The increase in ritual activity as seen in the rock art depicting shamans, cattle, and later horses, sought to alleviate the stressful circumstances under which San found themselves. In addition, images of cattle and horses became a symbolic metaphor of control and prestige for shamans in their labour of production (rain making and raiding) for other groups present on the landscape. Smith, B. and Hall (2000) and Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) argue that sheep paintings may have functioned in the same way and that sheep and human figures were painted as a possible way of alleviating stressful and competitive circumstances with the arrival of Khoe herders into the region. Eastwood and Eastwood (2006) believe that the San who painted these animals in the rock art would have seen very different meanings in the sheep rock art as compared to the way in which Khoe pastoralists and Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralist thought of their animals. They (Eastwood & Eastwood 2006: 181) write:

“The San imbued a sheep with supernatural potency, a quality that is a world away from the farmer or herder concept of sheep”.
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Figure 3.5. Four fat-tailed sheep with a human figure from the site Edmonsburg 1 32, Soutpansburg, Limpopo Province (Northern Province). Image courtesy of SARADA.

Figure 3.6. Two fat-tailed sheep from the site RSA TOO II, Limpopo Province (Northern Province). Image courtesy of SARADA.
3.3.4. Sheep as stereotypic expressions of identity.

Using the theoretical framework of social identity in conjunction with contextual meanings, Anderson (1996) proposes an alternative explanation for sheep paintings in the southwestern Cape. He focuses on identity formation and maintenance through contact between San hunter-gatherers and Khoe herders. He suggests that the identity and material culture (sheep) of outgroup members (Khoe herders) is negotiated through intergroup members (San hunter-gatherers) own categorisation of identity and group ‘norms’.

Anderson argues that the nature of contact between Khoe and San was not a case of assimilation and acculturation but rather about the differences of identity between two groups. Anderson further proposes that contact enhanced the maintenance of San hunter-gatherer (particularly males) salient intergroup identity (Anderson 1996: 87). He bases the nature of contact between the Khoe and San on the following evidence: 1) that fine-line paintings were discontinued by 1500-1000 b.p. (Yates et al. 1994), suggesting that the time span for contact could not be explained by assimilation, but is instead better explained through the differences in the identities of San and Khoe (Anderson 1996: 88); 2) through the use of ethnography, Anderson (1996: 86) suggests that intergroup anxiety was negotiated by the San with concern to their own status and the status of Khoe herders; and 3) the rock art of sheep.

Anderson identifies that 1) sheep paintings lack variability in comparison to other fine-line imagery; and 2) that most of the human figures associated with sheep do not display overt features associated to trance. Unlike Campbell (1987), Anderson (1996) argues that the homogeneity of the paintings do not represent metaphors of trance but rather San hunter-gatherers response to Khoe herders during contact. Anderson (Anderson 1996: 87-88) proposes that paintings of sheep made by San hunter-gatherers are stereotypic expressions of the Khoe, both in terms of their material culture and identity. Furthermore, Anderson argues that by San’s stereotyping of sheep, outgroup (Khoe) identity appears homogenous.
Contrary to a shamanistic approach used by others, Anderson (1996) does not believe that sheep paintings in the southwestern Cape can be explained by metaphors of trance. He also rejects the fat metaphor as a way of explaining why sheep were painted. Anderson (1996) argues that there is no evidence to suggest that sheep fat was as important as eland fat and that sheep as a metaphor in San mythologies were used to describe the low status positions of San in relation to herder/farmer neighbours and not necessarily the importance of the animals, themselves.

### 3.3.5. Sheep as prestige items used to express political statements amongst transegalitarian San

Meat-feasting has been identified among complex and transegalitarian hunter-gatherers in northern America, New Guinea and East Africa (Hayden 1998, 2001, 2002). Sadr (2004b), adopting a Mediterranean European model for explaining the Neolithic in the southwestern Cape, has argued for the possibility of meat-feasting at the first millennium AD open-air site Kasteelberg. This has been suggested through the evidence of high numbers of sheep remains with other material items such as pottery, possibly considered valuable, and the site’s location on top of a hill, which may have served as a special location for meat-feasting (*ibid*). Sadr (2004b) also describes Kasteelberg as being dominated by highly fat-rich foods such as seal and sheep. Sadr (2004b) suggests that the occupants were involved in a political act of holding special feasts and that this could be attributed to transegalitarian San groups and that sheep were a form of prestige in this act (*ibid*).

### 3.4. Other domesticates in the rock art of southern Africa: interpretations by researchers

Research into cattle and horse paintings has received more attention than that of sheep paintings. Perhaps this is in part explained by the rarity and the wide but sparse distribution of sheep painting or perhaps because focus is often made on
larger animals, such as cattle, in historical records where there is a bias that concentrates more on cattle than on small ruminants such as sheep and goats (Blench 2000).

The majority of research thus far for cattle and horse imagery has been in the areas surrounding the Maloti/Drakensberg Mountains where there is an abundance of this imagery.

Campbell (1987) was one of the first to set forward an argument for their presence. Subsequent studies by Hall (1994), Jolly (1998, 2007) and Challis (2009, 2012) have also focussed on contact imagery within the same region, although their arguments differ from Campbell’s (1987). The following section introduces some of these arguments. This may be useful when considering the place of sheep imagery, particularly in the northern uKhahlamba Drakensberg rock art.

3.4.1. Cattle and horses as signs of prestige and control during contact.

Campbell (1987) proposes that paintings of cattle and horses were important metaphors in the relations of production for San shamans. During the period of contact, San shamans performed ritual activities in the form of rain-making for their neighbours, agro-pastoralists, and in return shamans were paid with cattle. Campbell (1987) argues that shamans were increasingly able to control their access to cattle, resulting in an inequality, with the shaman’s appropriating more power through other group members the surplus of cattle. Campbell (1987) suggests that cattle paintings are able to communicate these relations of production in the form of the shaman’s control and prestige to other San members. Campbell (1987), following Lewis Williams (1981), suggests that cattle may have been seen as analogous to the eland. Later, with the arrival of horses and the settlement of Europeans, raiding became increasingly important for the prestige and status of Shamans. In his analysis, Campbell (1987) argues that figures riding horses became a symbolic metaphor for the Shaman’s control over rainmaking, cattle and horses. Campbell (1987: 91) argues that “these paintings were an explicit ideological response to the impact of the contact period on the southern
San”. He further suggests that during this period of contact, San hunter-gatherers increasingly found themselves within stressful circumstances and in order to alleviate this stress, shamans intensified their ritual activities (healing) in the form of trance dances which increased their importance and influence during this period. Campbell (1987) suggests that most of the paintings in this region reflect the intensification of ritual activities by San shamans during the contact period.

Hall (1994), building a hypothesis that is based on Campbell’s (1987) hypothesis, that cattle paintings in the Eastern Cape too, were part of the more elaborate control by shamans over rainmaking. Hall (1994) also thinks that cattle may have become a key symbol for rainmaking activities associated with San shaman’s relations of production.

The concern with rainmaking rituals and its connection with San rock art depicting cattle have also been investigated by Loubser and Laurens (1991) and Lewis-Williams and Pearce (2004).

In an attempt to test Campbell’s (1987) hypothesis, Van der Merwe (1990) analysed the rock art depicting cattle and horses from the Seacow River Valley in the Northern Cape. She, however, did not obtain the same findings as Campbell (1987) from the southeastern mountains. Based on her analysis, Van der Merwe (1990) suggests that the difference between the two regions could be explained either by 1) rock art activity ceasing to be practiced by the San and ending much earlier than rock art making in the southeastern mountains where it continued until the nineteenth century, or 2) the new symbols in the form of cattle not being incorporated as frequently and to the same extent that they had been depicted in the rock art of the southeastern mountains. Van der Merwe’s (1990) research illustrates how these types of interpretations must be confined in both a spatial and temporal framework. For instance, Van der Merwe’s (1990) study shows that not only was there possible regional diversity in the frequency of contact imagery between the two regions but also that certain contact imagery does not always allow itself to be investigated from hypotheses developed for rock art found within more recent historical contexts.
3.4.2. *Cattle representing the introduction of new ideologies and ritual practices.*

Jolly (1994) proposes that ideologies and ritual practices were shared during interactions between the southeastern San and the Nguni/Sotho agro-pastoralists and that this contact may explain the appearance of cattle imagery during this period. He (Jolly 1994, 2007) argues that during interaction, San and agro-pastoralists intermarried, with some ago-pastoralists joining San groups and that the hybridity of these groups resulted in the sharing of beliefs. Jolly suggests that images such as snakes and cattle may reflect the shared beliefs concerning the ritual importance of these animals. For instance cattle are strongly associated with ancestors in agro-pastoral communities and are symbolically important in maintaining these ties. In addition snakes are ritually important in their role as rain animals, a widespread belief shared between indigenous San hunter-gatherers and agro-pastoralists. Similarly, Challis (2009) has argued that beliefs surrounding baboons (as depicted in the rock art of the southern Drakensberg) were also widespread amongst San and agro-pastoralists.

3.4.3. *The horse and baboon part of the beliefs of the creolised identity.*

Drawing from colonial records, Challis (2009, 2011) is able to locate a group of nineteenth century raiders from diverse origins within the mountains of the southeastern Cape Colony. In addition to these records, archaeological evidence in the form of rock art depicting people riding horses with guns and trance dancing attest to a group known as the AmaTola. The creolized identity of the AmaTola group consisted of multiple ethnic identities including San, Hottentots, and runaway slaves and agro-pastoralists. Challis (2009: 106) suggests that the AmaTola brought horses from the Eastern Cape frontier to the southern Drakensberg and that they, “forged themselves a new identity around symbols of the horse and baboon” as seen in the rock art of the southern Drakensberg. He further notes that the baboon, a shared cultural symbol amongst San, Khoe herders and agro-pastoralists, symbolized protection against activities undertaken in raiding during the Colonial era. According to Challis (2009), closely linked to the baboon was the horse, in that horses may have been viewed similar to baboons in their
‘running gait’ and that baboons carry their young similarly to a person riding a horse (Challis 2009: 106).

Research into contact imagery is often placed within a historic context and interpretations of this kind relate to what may have been happening on the landscape at a particular time. In contrast to these approaches, not many researchers have attempted to explore pre-historic imagery of sheep or cattle and their meaning. This could be because most of the rock art of this kind of “contact” remains to be dated.

3.5. Summary:

There are differing opinions on why sheep may have been painted and their meaning in the rock art. The fatness of sheep may have been seen as highly potent to the San and perhaps likened to women as has been suggest by Hollmann (1993). I disagree with Anderson (1996), that this type of fat was not important to the San who painted sheep as ethnographic evidence explored in Chapter 7 shows that amongst numerous hunter-gatherer groups, fat is a highly sought after product and is used almost always in all ritual aspects of life (Marshall 1976; Lewis-Williams 1981; Kratz 1988). I explore this concept of fat and its association to sheep, as well as to the San, and the concept that these animals were considered prestigious in Chapter 7.
Chapter 4: A review of 3000 years (b.p.) pre-colonial occupation in the uKahlamba-Drakensberg, KwaZulu-Natal: with focus on San hunter-gatherers, Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists and the possibility of a fleeting Khoe pastoralist presence on the landscape.

4.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the georeferenced and dated archaeological record with the aim to paint a picture of the different groups of people who may have been connected to sheep and other livestock in the region through different slices of time. This evidence is used to postulate the timing of sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg and to try to understand whose sheep may have been painted.

The main focus is the Thukela Basin region, of which the northern Drakensberg forms part, although adjacent regions such as Lesotho and other parts of KwaZulu-Natal are also included.

In this review a number of questions are asked of the archaeology:

(1) Do the excavated and rock art records provide clues as to whose sheep were painted?
(2) What are the spatial proximities of dated agro-pastoralist sites to the painted sheep shelters?
(3) Is there any evidence for interactions between agro-pastoralists and hunter-gatherers and could this indicate that the painted sheep were those belonging to agro-pastoralists?
(4) Is there any evidence in the archaeology for other groups, besides Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists, who may have been keeping sheep in this region? If so, then could the sheep depicted in the rock art have belonged to these groups?
Influenced by the works of Mazel (1989a, 2009b, 2013) in the Thukela Basin and by Mitchell et al. (2008) in Lesotho’s eastern highlands, evidence is explored to see whether other groups besides Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists, may have been the keepers of sheep that were painted. Two thoughts are presented here. The first being that hunter-gatherers adopted livestock through exchange networks and became part-time or possibly full-time herders as has been argued for San hunter-gatherers occupying the Lesotho Highlands around the late first millennium AD (Mitchell et al. 2008). The second is that there was a fleeting presence of Khoe pastoralist, with sheep, in the region just after 2000 years ago as is currently being hypothesised by Mazel (2009b, 2013, pers.comm. 2013).

Three ‘packaged’ scenarios are offered in the final section of this chapter for who may have been connected to the sheep that were painted in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg rock art.

4.2. The compilation of geo-referenced radiocarbon databases for KwaZulu-Natal from 3000 years ago (b.p.) up to the historic period:

Two geo-referenced radiocarbon databases for all known published archaeological sites in the KwaZulu-Natal region, including the Thukela Basin and northern Drakensberg, were compiled at the beginning of this project (Appendix A). They form part of this chapter. One database was compiled for the last 3000 years (b.p.) of late Holocene LSA (Late Stone Age) occupation and includes sites from other regions such as Lesotho, Free State and the Eastern Cape (Appendix A); and another was compiled for the arrival and spread of early (before 1000 AD) and late (after 1000 AD) agro-pastoralist communities in KwaZulu-Natal (Appendix B).

The aim of these databases was to situate hunter-gatherers, agro-pastoralists, and possibly Khoe pastoralists, onto the landscape through time. This is used to provide a visual understanding for the spatial timing of groups occupying the region and to establish the spatial proximity of the dated archaeological sites with painted sheep sites in the northern Drakensberg. The hypothesis here is that San
painted the sheep of those closest to them on the landscape though of course, the San may have covered greater distances while hunting. This may or may not provide an indicator for the timing of sheep in the rock art of this region.

4.2.1. Choosing the temporal limits for the databases
Three thousand years (b.p.) up until the historic period was chosen as this is inclusive of over a thousand year period of hunter-gatherer occupation prior to the movement and settlement of agro-pastoralists and their livestock into the region at around 350 AD. This allows for consideration, of whether there were any changes in the spatial material record of hunter-gatherer groups prior to the slightly later settlement of agro-pastoralist populations in the Thukela Basin at around 500 AD, or whether these changes might be connected to other keepers of sheep on the landscape after 2000 years ago (Mitchell et al. 2008; Mazel 2009b, 2013). A review for the historic period has been omitted, this is because none of the sheep paintings are found painted with colonial imagery (Mazel 1981, 1982; Manhire et al. 1986; personal observation 2012 & 2013) and I believe that the northern Drakensberg sheep paintings are older.

4.2.2. Compiling the databases
The databases were compiled from two main sources, including published site records (namely from the journal: Southern African Humanities, formerly known as the Natal Museum Journal of Humanities and Annals of the Natal Museum) and from published sites in the KwaZulu-Natal Museum database. Table 4.1 and Table 4.2, lists the information gathered for the databases.

4.2.3. Radiocarbon dates
Most of the radiocarbon dates recorded in the databases are from charcoal found in association with material culture. Thus besides few direct AMS dates, most of the dating is by association. Where dates are considered unreliable due, to depositional disturbance, these dates were marked and recorded as unreliable in the database.
Table 4.1. An example of the information gathered for the hunter-gatherer database from the Thukela Bain, KwaZulu-Natal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>The area in which the site is found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No:</td>
<td>Map sheet number used to plot on ArcGIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (degrees, minutes, seconds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (degree, minutes, seconds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>Height above sea level in metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of site</td>
<td>Shelter, open air, midden etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock art</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorder details</td>
<td>Name and date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence for interaction</td>
<td>YES/NO/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material associated with interaction</td>
<td>(e.g.): pottery, beads, iron, domesticated fauna or flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphy associated with radiocarbon date</td>
<td>(e.g.) Layer 1, 2, 3 or spit 1, 2 or 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncalibrated radiocarbon date (b.p.)</td>
<td>(e.g.) 2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>(e.g.) ±60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated material</td>
<td>(e.g.) Charcoal, wood, pottery, bone etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID</td>
<td>(e.g.) Pta 2977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS/ conventional/OSL</td>
<td>(e.g.) Conv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibrated date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Tools</td>
<td>Number and type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Material</td>
<td>Raw material related to lithics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean thickness &amp; standard deviation</td>
<td>pottery (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of pottery</td>
<td>Vessel shape, core colour, possible affiliation to a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faunal remains</td>
<td>Number and taxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cultural material</td>
<td>Material that was mentioned in the excavation e.g. OES beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments made by author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of occupation</td>
<td>Ephemeral, intensive etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2. An example of the information gathered for agro-pastoralist database in KwaZulu-Natal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Map No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (degrees, minute, seconds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (degrees, minutes, seconds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of site</td>
<td>Midden, structure, open air, (surface)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphy associated with radiocarbon date</td>
<td>Pit 1 etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncalibrated radiocarbon date (b.p.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS/Conventional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibrated date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottery Type</td>
<td>Mzonjani, Ntshekane, Moor Park etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream (Human 2007)</td>
<td>Western/Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>Domesticated and number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cultural material</td>
<td>Ceramic figurines, domesticated flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of interaction</td>
<td>YES/NO/Possible (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material associated with interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these sites have radiocarbon dates although the style of pottery was also recorded as providing an indicator of their age and occupants (Huffman 2007).

4.2.4. Mapping

All geospatial and temporal information is plotted onto 1: 50 000 topographic digital vector maps using the software ArcGIS version 10.1. Relief lines for the maps are used and are separated into 300 metre contour intervals, each represented by a different colour in the maps. All of these maps show the location of the painted sheep sites and their proximity to other types of archaeological information in and around the northern Drakensberg.
4.2.5. The KwaZulu-Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg

A visit to the KwaZulu-Natal Museum in Pietermaritzburg early in 2013 was undertaken in order to locate, record, and observe some previously excavated material from the sites of Collingham Shelter, excavated by Mazel (1992a) in the late 1980s; Driel Shelter, excavated by Maggs & Ward (1980) in 1974; and Pager’s (1971) surface pottery finds from the sites of Junction Shelter, Corner Cave and Poacher’s Cave, collected in the late 1960s. This was done to get a better understanding of some of the cultural material dealt with in this chapter. Unfortunately, some of Pager’s pottery collection mentioned in Pager (1971) could not be located either at the KwaZulu-Natal Museum or at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, despite an extensive search of the collections.

4.3. Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer occupation from 3000 years ago until the arrival of the first farmers (500 AD):

Understanding the Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer sequence before the arrival of food producing communities around 500 AD provides a starting point from which to try to better understand the types of responses that the San may have had when new groups of people and their animals appeared for the first time (Mazel 2009b; Parkington & Hall 2012). Surely their impact would have been dramatic.

According to Mazel (1989a, 1989b), three social regions connected to alliance networks, based on gift giving and exchange, also referred to as hxaro among the Ju’/hoansi in the northwestern Kalahari, developed after 4000 years ago and lasted until around 2000 years ago in the Thukela Basin.

The identification of alliance networks is based on the spatial distribution of material culture such as Ostrich eggshell (OES) pieces and beads and bone points recovered from sites north of the Thukela Basin (Mazel 1989a, 1989b). No OES were recovered from sites south of the Thukela Basin during this time (Mazel
Mazel (1989a) suggests that OES pieces and beads were obtained from further northwest, indicating that hunter-gatherers had connections over a long distance. Coastal contact is also evidenced from the remains of red and blue duiker and marine shells from the site of Mhlwazini Cave, dated to around 900-200BC (2760 ± 60 b.p.; Pta 5045; charcoal and 2280 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 4868; charcoal) (Mazel 1990) and indicates that some hunter-gatherers had a network operating to the eastern coast about 200 km away (Mazel 2009b). Thus hunter-gatherers were involved in long-distance acquisitions of material items possibly either obtained themselves or through exchange networks. Mazel (1989a, 1989b) has interpreted this period as one with internal changes amongst the Thukela Basin San communities’, particularly concerning changing gender relations. Around 2000 years ago, these social regions are suggested to have disappeared (ibid).

It is shortly after 2000 years ago, that once again changes are seen in the material remains of the Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers (ibid). This has been identified by changes in the temporal and spatial patterning of material culture including OES and marine shells, as well as the introduction of new material items such as early thin-walled, grit-tempered pottery (Mazel 1989a, 1992b, 2009b). It is proposed that around the same time, the production of shaded polychrome paintings began in the northern and central Drakensberg and possibly, the southern Drakensberg too (Mazel 2009b). This hypothesis is based on the direct dating of a shaded polychrome painting from the site of Main Caves North in Giants Castle which dated to 2310 ± 70 b.p. (OZD450; crust underlying shaded polychrome rhebuck) (Mazel & Watchman 2003) as well as the position of shaded polychrome paintings within the larger painted sequence, where they are believed to sit in mid-sequence (Russell 2000; Swart 2004; Mazel 2009b). Shaded polychrome painting is suggested to have continued until approximately 1600 b.p. in the northern Drakensberg, where radiocarbon dates indicate a hiatus of hunter-gatherer occupation beginning at this time and lasting for about 1000 years (Mazel 1989a, 1998, 2009b).
Table 4.3 lists these patterns in the radiocarbon dates for the Thukela Basin sites and indicates this hiatus in the northern Drakensberg where sites are absent in the section of radiocarbon dates dating from 1600 years ago to 600 years ago. This compares well with the spatial distribution of sites in Figures 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, where there is a slight change in location of sites from 3000 years and 2000 years ago to 1600 years ago, from the northern Drakensberg to the central Thukela Basin, and again at around 600 years ago, from the central Thukela Basin to the northern Drakensberg.

It is also argued that shaded polychrome paintings abruptly disappear after mid-sequence and this has been judged by their absence in overlying layers of paintings. This may also correspond with the pattern of radiocarbon dates where there is a hiatus in occupation shortly after 1600 b.p. in the northern Drakensberg (Mazel & Watchman 2003; Mazel 2009b).

A thousand year hiatus in hunter-gatherer occupation is suggested to be a result of hunter-gatherers moving to the central Thukela Basin to be closer to newly arrived agro-pastoralists who were occupying parts of the basin at the time (Mazel 1989a, 1998, 2009b) (Figure 4.2). It is only after 600 years ago that hunter-gatherers returned to the northern Drakensberg (Mazel 1989a, 1998) (Figure 4.3). This corresponds with the arrival and settlement of later agro-pastoralist communities, who spoke a proto-Nguni language and who occupied the foothills of the Drakensberg range (Mazel 1989a, 1998, 2009b; Mitchell & Whitelaw 2005; Wright & Mazel 2007; Whitelaw 2009).
### Table 4.3. Radiocarbon dates in years b.p. for the Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer sites. Also see Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Stratigraphic layer/unit</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>AMS Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Calibrated date</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sikhanisweni Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 5764</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1988a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwaThwaleyaikhe Shelter</td>
<td>layer 6</td>
<td>Pta 5360</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwaThwaleyaikhe Shelter</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 5349</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapnopi Shelter</td>
<td>ANDRA28</td>
<td>OZD453</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>3720</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skape Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 5369</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1988a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skape Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 5443</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1988a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 8</td>
<td>Pta 7234</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 7</td>
<td>Pta 7232</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 6</td>
<td>Pta 7384</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 2974</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1984a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 2977</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2810</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1984a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 6</td>
<td>Pta 6339</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 7</td>
<td>Pta 6708</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 7</td>
<td>Pta 6700</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 6</td>
<td>Pta 6542</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlalwazini Cave</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 5085</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlalwazini Cave</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 4868</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3247</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 2971</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cases North</td>
<td>ANDRA15</td>
<td>OZD447</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Cases North</td>
<td>ANDRA16</td>
<td>OZD448</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2760</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hluhluwe 1</td>
<td>ANDRA19</td>
<td>OZD450</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>BSV3</td>
<td>Pta 5103</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>GAD</td>
<td>Pta 5098</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>BSV2</td>
<td>Pta 5096</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>BSV1</td>
<td>Pta 5255</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driel Shelter</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 3678</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 6543</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 7231</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 7230</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 7229</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 5359</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geble Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 5242</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1984b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>TB5</td>
<td>Pta 5408</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 2973</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1984a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Shelter</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 3678</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barne's Shelter</td>
<td>ANDRA12</td>
<td>OZD446</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>painting</td>
<td>OZB127U</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. &amp; Watchman, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3853</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3584</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3684</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3488</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3853</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgbela Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 3665</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnde Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 3869</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1986b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>TB5</td>
<td>Pta 5092</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1992a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlalwazini Cave</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 4864</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlalwazini Cave</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 4850</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlalwazini Cave</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 5102</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geble Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 5243</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1984b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 7459</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashai Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 7227</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 6538</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 6541</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 6715</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conv.</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mazel, A. 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1. The temporal and spatial distribution of Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer sites dating between 3000 b.p. and just after 2000 b.p. Included in this distribution are the dated paintings by Mazel & Watchman (1997, 2003). Full site name can be found in Appendix A (pg 222).

Figure 4.2. The temporal and spatial distribution of Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer sites from 1600 b.p. years ago in the Thukela Basin. Note the near absence of sites in the northern Drakensberg. Full site name can be found in Appendix A (pg 222).
4.3.1. What caused changes in the patterning of material culture and social changes among Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers just after 2000 years ago?

It is believed that one of the catalysts for changing cultural material patterns, the introduction of shaded polychrome paintings and the broadening of exchange networks amongst local hunter-gatherers in the Thukela Basin shortly after 2000 years ago was the movement of a new group of people, Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists, who were moving southwards down the eastern side of the subcontinent at around the beginning of the first millennium AD (Huffman 2007), and who arrived on the eastern coast of KwaZulu-Natal at around 400 AD (Maggs 1980a; Maggs & Whitelaw 1991; Mazel 1989, 2009b). It is proposed by Mazel (2009b) that the movement of a new population would have caused internal social anxieties among local hunter-gatherers in the region, and who may have already
been aware of this group long before they had reached the Thukela Basin at about 500 AD (Maggs 1980b; Maggs & Michael 1976; Maggs & Whitelaw 1991; Whitelaw 1994/1995, 1994; Greenfield & Van Schalkwyk 2008; Mazel 2009b). Mazel (2009b:105) has compared this to a “chain of connections”, as described by Mulvaney (1976) for Australian aboriginal hunter-gatherers, whereby local hunter-gatherers may have been fully aware of the arrival of new groups of people and their animals on the landscape through extensive networks operating over long distances with other groups. This would have impacted the responses of Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers before actual contact was made with new groups (Mazel 2009b).

Mazel (2009b, 2013, pers.comm. 2013) has recently suggested the possibility of another earlier group keeping sheep and marking their presence through a different type of rock art in the northern Drakensberg around 2000 years ago. This new group may have been Khoe-speaking pastoralists. Earlier, Mazel (1992b) raised this possibility when he questioned the early appearance of thin-walled pottery at some of the Thukela Basin sites. Mazel (2009b, 2013) contemplates whether an earlier occurrence of Khoe pastoralists on the landscape may have had some form of impact on the San, and whether it was a Khoe presence rather than a Bantu-speaker presence that is linked to the emergence of shaded polychrome paintings in the region.


4.4.1. Ostrich eggshell pieces and beads and marine shells:

It is only after 2000 years that Ostrich eggshell (OES) pieces and beads are recovered south of the Thukela Basin and there is a dramatic increase in marine shells (Mazel 1989a). This may have been a result that followed the arrival of agro-pastoralists onto the landscape with the broadening of exchange networks and of exchange items among hunter-gatherers (Mazel 1989a, 2009b). At around the same time or perhaps earlier in Lesotho’s eastern highlands, Mitchell (1996) notes that OES pieces increase in frequency, however, seashells decrease during
this period, as documented at the site Sehonghong. Mitchell (1996a) believes that this decrease may be a result of reorienting exchange networks away from the eastern coast towards the west and possibly along the Orange River.

The reorientation of exchange networks in Lesotho’s eastern highlands may also be connected with newly arriving agro-pastoralists, where hunter-gatherers shifted their network to the southwest to obtain ostrich egg shell pieces and beads and also perhaps earlier thin-walled pottery. This would have likely opened up new relations with other hunter-gather groups and possibly hunter-gatherer herders occupying the southwestern part of southern Africa (Mitchell 1996a).

Evidence provided here, suggests that hunter-gatherers were neither isolated nor completely unfamiliar with ‘new’ material items. This is because it has been suggested that these groups were involved in long-distance networks of exchange whether it may have been for reciprocal gift exchange or other forms of exchange over long distances and through time (Mitchell 2003).

4.4.2. Exploring the material remains at Collingham Shelter

It is also shortly after 2000 years ago, that new material items are found in the archaeological record for the first time. Collingham Shelter, situated on the outskirts of the northern and southern Drakensberg, produced two copper beads recovered from the BSV2 deposit and radiocarbon dated to 1800 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 5096; charcoal) (Mazel 1992a) (Figure 4.4). A single iron bead was also found from VP2 deposit dated to 1700 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 5274; charcoal) (ibid). There is uncertainty surrounding the age of these items because of the disturbance of a small area of deposits where rodent droppings and pieces of newspaper were found (Mazel 1992a). Whitelaw (pers. comm. 2013) suggests that the two copper beads are similar to those recovered from the early farming community site KwaGandaganda dated to around 555 AD (1395 ± 60 b.p.; Wits 1918; charcoal) (Whitelaw 1994) and thus suggests that Collingham’s beads could be more recent. However, Mazel (pers. comm. 2013) argues there is a strong possibility that they date to around 1800 b.p.. If the metal beads do indeed date to around 1800 b.p.
and 1700 b.p. respectively, this would suggest that they are the oldest known for the region and predate the settlement of early agro-pastoralists (Mazel 1992a).

Tufts of hair were recovered from layers attributed with the initial occupation (1880 b.p.-1700 b.p.) of the site. This includes stratigraphic units GBS, ABSV, BSV2L, BSVG, and BSV3 (1880 ± 45 b.p.; Pta 5101; charcoal) (Mazel 1992a). Some of the hair contains small ochre pellets (Figure 4.5).

In southern Africa, LSA burials associated with ochre smeared skulls and ochre pellets found in hair have been identified from the southern Cape, some of which have been radiocarbon dated and postdate 2000 years ago (Lazarides 2012). Some of the LSA burials have been interpreted with transegalitarian hunter-gatherers, with the differential treatment of the dead suggesting that importance was placed on certain individuals (Inskeep 1986; Hall & Binneman 1987; Jerardino et al. 1992; Sealy et al. 2000).

Figure 4.4. Two copper beads recovered from BSV2 deposits dated to 1800 b.p. (Pta 5096; charcoal), Lander 2013.
Figure 4.5. Collingham Shelter ochred-hair recovered from the initial occupation of the site between 1700 b.p. and 1800 b.p. (Mazel 1992a), Lander 2013.
It does not appear that Collingham Shelter ochre hair is associated with a burial given the absence of other human remains at the site (Mazel 1992a). It is possible that the hair may be associated with something other than burying the dead. Ethnographic evidence suggests that amongst Khoe pastoralists, Koranna boys are rubbed with ochre and fat during a month of seclusion during initiation (Engelbreght 1936 in Barnard 1992). Amongst the Damara, girls are secluded for four days in a hut where an elder female will apply a mixture of red powder and fat into a girl’s hair after her first menstruation (Barnard 1992: 215). According to Barnard (ibid) and Schapera (1930), the girls’ initiation ceremony closely resembles San initiation practices. The practice of shaving the head is commonly found in the ethnographies and historical records of Khoe pastoralists and the San !Kung of Nyae Nyae. For instance, amongst historic Eastern Cape Khoe, the practice of shaving the heads of young girls’ soon after her first menstruation was practiced (Schapera: 1930:278). Marshall (1976:181) notes that among the San !Kung of Nyae Nyae a special ritual is attended by relatives for a child’s first haircut.

It is also possible that the decorated hair formed part of everyday living and perhaps acted as a marker of identity for an individual. This is commonly practiced amongst East African pastoralist groups and is used as a decorative purpose to show an individual’s social status (Russell 2013) (Figure 4.6). However, at this stage it is difficult to tell why the hair accumulated at the site. Ochre is also found widely distributed at the site and is found on grindstones, beads, and lithics.

Large quantities of eland remains (Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI) 68/7) were also identified from the initial occupation at Collingham Shelter (Mazel 1992a: 41). According to Mazel (1992a: 42) the number of eland represented at Collingham is by far the highest recorded in and surrounding the Thukela Basin and far outnumber those recovered from Sikhanyisweni Shelter (MNI 1) (Mazel 1998a); Driel Shelter (MNI 1) (Maggs & Ward 1980) and Mhlwazini Cave (MNI 3) (Plug 1990), combined. This has led Mazel (pers.comm. 2012) to postulate that
Collingham Shelter may have been used during aggregation for meat-feasting (a pastoralist practice (Russell 2013)).

Collingham Shelter’s material which includes large quantities of gourd (Figure 4.7), eland remains, two copper beads, early thin-walled pottery, ochred grindstones, and ochred hair is particularly interesting as some of these materials predate the arrival of agro-pastoralists in this region. It could be that this shelter may be linked with the presence of Khoe pastoralists. Further evidence in the form of two black finger smears found on a collapsed slab found in securely dated deposits from the initial occupation layers of this site may, as Mazel (2013, pers. comm.) suggests, be of a Khoe pastoralist rock art. It is thus possible that Collingham Shelter is connected in some way to their presence on the landscape (Mazel pers. comm. 2013). The radiocarbon dates for the initial occupation (Appendix A) at the site would also suggest that this occurrence is before hunter-
gatherers adopting livestock in the eastern Lesotho Highlands at around the late first millennium AD (Mitchell et al. 2008).

**Figure 4.7.** A piece of gourd from Collingham Shelter found in TBS deposits dating to a later occupation at the site (1260 b.p.; Pta 5408; charcoal) (Mazel 1992a), Lander 2013.

4.4.3. **Driel Shelter**

Driel Shelter, situated near the northern Drakensberg, produced a talc schist bowl (Figure 4.8) from layer 3 and radiocarbon dated to 1775 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 1381; charcoal) (Maggs & Ward 1980). This is of interest because the only known source for talc schist occurs 160 km east in the Thukela Basin (Mazel 2009b: 104). Driel Shelter also produced early pottery. The remains from both this shelter and Collingham shelter are suggested to predate the arrival of agro-pastoralists on the landscape.

The question of how these items arrived remains to be answered. Although their appearance at the sites Collingham Shelter and Driel Shelter could possibly be
explained by long-distance exchange networks operating to the north and perhaps to the east (Mazel 1989a; 2009b). Whitelaw (1994) comments that the copper beads from the site KwaGandaganda most likely were obtained north of the Pongola River. It could be that the Collingham Shelter’s copper beads may have had a similar source, although Mazel (1989a, 1989b, 2009b) has suggested that exchange networks for OES pieces and beads may have come from the northwest possibly indicating that copper beads came via a similar route. It is possible that they were obtained by early agro-pastoralists or pastoralists (Mazel 2009b, 2013).

Figure 4.8. Talc schist bowl from Driel Shelter (Maggs & Ward 1980), Lander 2013.

4.4.4. The appearance of pre-agriculturalist pottery at around 2000 years ago in the northern Drakensberg and surrounding areas

Early pottery found in LSA deposits in the Thukela Basin is described as undecorated, thin-walled, between 5.8 mm to 7 mm thick, with a smooth surface, grit-tempered, and often bag-shaped or u-shaped, and occurs around 2000 years ago (Mazel 1992b) (Figure 4.9). Still little is known about its origins, and how it reached this region. The makers’ of this pottery is also debated. Mitchell (2004) believes it was made by hunter-gatherers. Sadr and Sampson (2006) also propose
a local hunter-gatherer production, but also suggest an alternative scenario that includes a small group of ceramic making artisans making their way through the subcontinent. Mazel (1992b, 2009b) and Mitchell (2002) have also postulated whether or not this pottery may be linked to an archaeologically unattested presence of Khoe pastoralists.

Although represented by only a few highly fragmented sherds, pottery has been recovered from sites in and around the northern Drakensberg including Clarke’s Shelter (2160 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 2971; charcoal) (Mazel 1984a), Collingham Shelter (1880 ± 45 b.p.; Pta 5101; charcoal) (Mazel 1992a) (Figure 4.9) and Driel Shelter (1775 ± 40 b.p.; Pta 1318; charcoal) (Maggs & Ward 1980; Mazel 1992b). The radiocarbon date of 2280 ± 50 b.p. (Pta 4868; charcoal) derived from Mhlwazini Cave is less certain (Mazel 1990). Figure 4.10 shows that their distribution is mainly contained within the northern Drakensberg and not to the south. It also occurs further north in Lesotho’s eastern Highlands and to the west in the Eastern Cape.

Early pottery assemblages are considerably different to the ceramic assemblages recovered from later LSA occupation sites that are mostly described as thick-walled, coarse-surfaced and often decorated (Mazel 1983, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1998a, 1999). They are linked to both early and later farming communities in KwaZulu-Natal and the Thukela Basin (ibid).

Early pottery occurs throughout most of the southeastern side of southern Africa. It occurs at Good Hope Shelter in the Underberg from deposits dating to 2160 ± 40 b.p.(Pta 383; charcoal) (Cable et al. 1980) (Figure 4.10). In the Eastern Cape, pottery was recovered from Colwinton Shelter (1890 ± 45 b.p.; Pta 2549; charcoal) (Opperman 1987) and Bonawe Shelter, although this still remains to be dated (Opperman 1987). Both Border Cave (2010 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 506; vegetation) (Beaumont 1973), and Siphiso Shelter (1970 ± 390 b.p.; TX 5620; bone) (Barham 1989) in Swaziland have also produced early pottery.
Figure 4.9. Early thin-walled pottery from Collingham Shelter. Pottery recovered from stratigraphic units (A) VP1; (B), (C) & (D) BSV2 (1800 b.p.; Pta 5096; charcoal); (D) ABSV; (E) & (F) DSV2L (Mazel 1992a), Lander 2013.
Thin-walled grit temper pottery also occurs in eastern Lesotho including sites such as Sehonghong (1710 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 6063, charcoal) (Mitchell 1996), Likoeng (1310 ± 80 b.p.; Pta 7877; charcoal) (Mitchell et al. 2008), and from more recent deposits as Pitsaneng (960 ± 90b.p.; OxL 1314; pottery) (Hobart 2003). All of the grit-tempered ware from these sites in Lesotho has been recovered with livestock remains. In the Free-State, grit-tempered ware appears at the sites Roosfontien (1290 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 5931; charcoal) (Klatzow 1994; Thorp 1998) and Rose Cottage Cave (680 ± 50 b.p.; Pta 5622; ?) (Wadley 1992; Thorp 1996). These dates appear to be more recent than those dates attributed with sites containing thin-walled pottery in the Thukela Basin.

Research conducted thus far on the occurrence of early, decorated, and thin-walled pottery in the subcontinent indicates that it is stylistically different between

**Figure 4.10.** The location and distribution of early thin-walled pottery in the northern Drakensberg and its outskirts, and in Lesotho's eastern highlands.
regions. This would suggest it was the product of local indigenous hunter-gatherer manufacture. This is argued to be the most likely explanation to account for its heterogeneity between regions in southern Africa and for down-the-line cultural diffusion rather than a migration of early Khoe speaking pastoralists (Sadr & Sampson 2006; Motloung 2007). Smith, A. (2008) however contests this argument commenting that decoration is only found on a few selective samples, with the majority being undecorated. He argues that decoration on pottery, if it existed at all, would not have been as formal as Sadr (1998) and Sadr and Sampson (2006) suggest. Instead, Smith, A. (2008), following Hodder (1991), suggests that pastoralists are less inclined to follow formal decoration on pottery. It is difficult to identify where early undecorated, thin-walled pottery found at sites on the south eastern side of South Africa may fit in terms of a cultural adoption or a pastoralist presence.

A number of possible scenarios for how early pottery arrived in the eastern side of southern Africa are proposed. Mazel (1992b) questions whether or not the pottery could have been brought by diffusion between hunter-gatherers, perhaps from the northwest of southern Africa via a similar route with OES pieces and beads. Similarly, Mitchell (2004:8) postulates whether its adoption by hunter-gatherers may indicate long-distance exchange, perhaps from an early farmer groups, such as the Chifumbaze Complex or, possibly with ceramics found to the southwest potentially associated with hunter-gatherers who were herding sheep. Mitchell (1996: 51) suggests that with OES items, pottery found in eastern Lesotho could indicate that it too travelled along the Orange River acting as a ‘highway’ for these items.

Pager (1971) also identified thin-walled pottery from some of the sites in the Didima Gorge. He distinguished this pottery from coarse thick-walled pottery associated with Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists. Pager (1971: 31) describes the pottery as follows:

“The majority of potsherds have as a common feature only their smooth surfaces and their simple shapes, these being round or bag-shaped pots and straight walled bowls without either necks, spouts, carnations or lugs. Other features of the wares can have a variety of differences in wall thickness and varies between
8-15mm, colours can be grey, buff, red or brown, and different firing techniques produced a range from poorly baked wares to ones of brick quality."

Contrary to this, Whitelaw (pers. comm. 2013) identifies that some of the pottery collected from other sites in Pager’s (1971) research area seem to fit the description of agro-pastoralist ware. Although, sites such a Junction Shelter, Corner Cave and Botha’s Shelter pottery assemblages could not be located.

4.5. Was there a fleeting presence of pastoralists with sheep in the northern Drakensberg just after 2000 years ago?

Ehret (2008) proposes that an extant Limpopo Khoe population occupied the Northern Province of South Africa around 2000 years ago and that this population may have been as far south as southern Mozambique. Ownby (1985) further proposes based on the general borrowing of Limpopo Khoe words in proto-Nguni groups, that these two groups may have been in close proximity to one another in the same broad region which includes the area between the eastern Highveld, South Africa, and Swaziland. If this is correct then linguistic evidence suggests that these populations were occupying regions near the KwaZulu-Natal region, where later expansion of Nguni languages took place (Ownby 1985).

As mentioned, the possibility of an earlier presence of pastoralist peoples passing through the northern Drakensberg is currently being reviewed by Mazel (2013 & pers. comm. 2013) through the archaeology and some of the rock art of the northern Drakensberg. I wonder whether sheep paintings may be connected with this presence on the landscape. However, in the excavated archaeology there is no evidence of early sheep remains (Maggs & Ward 1980; Mazel 1992a).

It is well known that pastoralists leave behind very little trace on the landscape so to find a permanent marker for these groups is alluring. Southern African researchers have identified what they believe is a Khoe pastoralist rock art. This is finger painted in white or red, and consists of a number of geometric designs, finger markings in the form of handprints, finger-smears and finger dots, and
representational imagery generally in the form of aprons, and in rare instances people and animals (Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004; Eastwood & Smith, B. 2005; Eastwood & Eastwood 2006). In the Northern Province of South Africa, Eastwood and Eastwood (2006) have suggested that red finger paintings belong to an earlier period of pastoralist rock art making whilst the use of white paint may reflect a later period of Khoe rock art.

4.5.1. ‘Finger-style’ paintings in the form of handprints and finger smears in the northern Drakensberg

In the northern Drakensberg, Pager (1971) drew attention to a small corpus of finger-style paintings in the Cathedral Peak and Cathkin Park. Twenty-one rock shelters containing finger paintings of crude animals, finger dots, dashes, and handprints, some of which were placed in arbitrary ways on the shelters’ walls were noted (Pager 1971: 56). According to Pager (1971) the majority of shelters containing this style of art were less suitable for human occupation. Two iron artefacts were recovered from two of the shelters containing finger paintings. Pager (1971: 337) concluded that these paintings although a “minor artistic trend in the area” were very different to hunter-gatherer paintings and that the art probably belonged to another group, most likely to be Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists occupying the foothills of the Drakensberg. Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) concur with Pager’s (1971) suggestion that these paintings were most likely to be of an agro-pastoralist origin. In the southern Drakensberg, Vinnicombe (1976: 148), also noted orange finger smears, often found in pairs, and sometimes found painted on the ceiling of rock shelters.

Until recently, finger-style paintings in the uKhahlamba-Drakensberg have gone relatively unnoticed and they have only recently been taken up again by Mazel (2013) who had originally recorded these paintings between 1979 and 1981 as part of an extensive survey to document the Drakensberg rock art (Figure 3.3b. pg 51). Mazel recorded up to 49 sites containing finger-paintings, mostly in the form of finger-smears, finger-daubs, smudges and handprints out of a total of 338 painted shelters (ibid) (Table 4.4). Their distribution can be seen along the eastern Drakensberg escarpment and in close proximity to some of the painted sheep.
shelters (Figure 4.11). Mazel (2013) suggests that these paintings were unlikely to be made by hunter-gatherers. Instead, he contemplates whether or not this art may belong to pastoralists. This raises the question as to whether the sheep paintings in this region are also connected to a Khoe presence rather than an agropastoralist one.

Table 4.4. Number of finger markings recorded by Mazel 1979-1981.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Handprints</th>
<th>Finger Smears</th>
<th>Finger Smudges</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Natal National Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral &amp; Cathkin Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injasuthi &amp; Giants Castle Game Reserve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkomazana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushmen's Nek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total finger markings recorded</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.11. The spatial distribution of finger paintings in relation to the sites containing painted sheep.
Mazel (2013) suggests that black finger smears found on a fallen painted slab at Collingham Shelter may provide a clue to the age of finger-style paintings. At Collingham Shelter a collapsed slab found in securely dated deposits of 1800 b.p. shows that besides fine-line paintings of human figures, there are three black finger smudges, similar to a Khoe pastoralist rock art as identified by Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) in parts of southern Africa (Mazel 1992a, 1994, 2013). This would suggest that finger paintings may pre-date the arrival of agro-pastoralists into the region by at least 200 to 300 years.

4.5.2. Challenges encountered with identifying a Khoe pastoralist rock art in southern Africa

The authorship and timing of Khoe pastoralist rock art in southern Africa is contested. Sadr (2008) has questioned whether the art represents a 2000 year old presence of pastoralists, or whether it was made later at around the beginning of the second millennium AD. Mitchell and Whitelaw (2005: 215) also raise caution to the timing of the rock art, stating that it “lacks poor chronological control”. However, the Collingham Shelter slab suggests that finger smears are old (Mazel 1994, 2013). The next challenge is to assign authorship to the markings of handprints, finger-smears and finger daubs.

It is argued by Van Rijssen (1984) that the majority of finger paintings and handprints in the southwestern Cape are made by Khoe pastoralists. Eastwood and Eastwood (2006) argue for an exclusive pastoralist authorship for handprints and finger-markings in the Northern Province but identify that these images may cross over with other rock art making groups, including the San. Others have been more tentative about ascribing an authorship to handprints. For example, Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004: 514) comment that “given the crossover and alliance between San and Khoe rock art in the Western Cape, it is not always possible to associate an image such as a handprint exclusively to one group”. However, they too attribute finger markings to Khoe pastoralists in the Northern Province.

The possibility that other groups were making handprints and finger-smears has been raised. For example, Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1989: 108) think that
decorated handprints, rather than signalling ownership by marking on the rock face, may instead relate to San cosmology where making handprints is akin to marking the rock with the eland, both of these forms of image making would have fixed potency onto the walls of the rock shelter. Thus, they suggest that handprints were likely to have been made by the San. Agro-pastoralists may have also marked the rock with handprints for example, in central Tanzania, Masao (1979) recorded farmer rock art containing white handprints.

4.6. Sheep remains in the northern Drakensberg and other Thukela Basin hunter-gatherer sites.

There is no evidence for sheep remains recovered from sites in the northern Drakensberg or from other parts of the Thukela Basin pre-dating 500 AD. When they do occur, their appearance is generally associated with the settlement of early agro-pastoralists in the Thukela Basin. Even with earlier dates for sheep remains at agro-pastoralist sites, sheep only appear much later in the dated hunter-gatherer archaeological sequence (Mazel 1998). Sheep and cattle remains are also only represented by a few specimens in hunter-gatherer deposits when compared to agro-pastoralist sites (Table 4.5 & Table 4.6.). A time lag of approximately 600 years is seen between the earliest dated occurrence of sheep at agro-pastoralist sites and those found at hunter-gatherer sites (Figures 2.1, 2.2 & 2.3: pg 37 & 38).

The appearance of domestic stock in the form of *Ovis aries* and *Ovis/Capra* and a few *Bos taurus* from the sites of Mgede Shelter (Mazel 1986), KwaThwaleyakhe (Plug 1993), iNkolinashi (Badenhorst 2003); Mzinyashana 1 (Plug 2002), Maqonqo Shelter (Plug 1996), Nkupe Shelter (Mazel 1988) and Mhlwazini Cave (Plug 1990) in the Thukela Basin provide the first evidence for livestock at hunter-gatherer sites and are generally suggested to date within the last 1000 years AD (Mazel 1998) (Table 4.6). However, there have been no direct dates taken from these livestock remains. Instead, dating of these remains has relied on association by carbon containing materials found in the same layer. In some instances, livestock remains are found in heavily disturbed deposits and their timing is unclear.
Table 4.5. Early dated agro-pastoralist sites showing the number of livestock remains (NISP). Also see Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>uncal. Date</th>
<th>Years b.p.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dating Method</th>
<th>NISP</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Msuluzi Confluence</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Pit E</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pta 2195</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Maggs (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pta 2197</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>6 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Voigt (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanda</td>
<td>NAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wits 1917</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Plug (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capra hircus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhlopeti</td>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 2878</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Voigt (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magogo</td>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 2874</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 3716</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>13 Capra hircus</td>
<td>Voigt (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Canis familiaris</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesi</td>
<td>WOS</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Wits 1918</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Bouger (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 4100</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>16 Capra hircus</td>
<td>Voigt &amp; Peters (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Canis familiaris</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pta 4095</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Voigt &amp; Peters (1994b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 4094</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>77 Capra hircus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Canis familiaris</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamba 1</td>
<td>MAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pta 4164</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Voigt &amp; Peters (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Canis familiaris</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>NDW</td>
<td>Sq G2</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 2388</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Maggs (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47 Capra hircus</td>
<td>Voigt &amp; Von den Driesch (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1458 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>960 Bos taurus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62 Canis familiaris</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Gallus domesticus</td>
<td>Arnold (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neshekane</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>feature O</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 1058</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Michael (1976)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Early dated agro-pastoralist sites showing the number of livestock remains (NISP). Also see Appendix B.
Table 4.6. Hunter-gatherer sites showing the number of livestock remains (NSI). The dates are relatively recent but in some instances sites contain disturbed deposit and their date is not secure. Also see Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>uncal. Date</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Dating method</th>
<th>MNI</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgede Shelter</td>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 3443</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Mazel (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1 Bos taurus/buffalo</td>
<td>Klein (in Mazel (1986))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimahashi</td>
<td>NKM</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 7227</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 Ovis aries</td>
<td>Mazel (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>MZY</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 6715</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Mazel (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Plug (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 6541</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 Ovis aries</td>
<td>Mazel (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Plug (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pta 6538</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 Ovis aries</td>
<td>Mazel (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Plug (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkape Shelter</td>
<td>NKB</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pta 3443</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 sheep/goat</td>
<td>Mazel (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Klein (in Mazel (1988))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhlwazini Cave</td>
<td>MWZ</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>last 300 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Pta 3443</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1/1 sheep/goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plug (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaThwaleyakhe</td>
<td>KT</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>post 1000AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Mazel (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plug (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqonqo</td>
<td>MQQ</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>last 500 years?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td>Mazel (1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ovis aries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plug (1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The suggestion that sheep in hunter-gatherer deposits date within the last 1000 years AD corresponds more closely with the movement of hunter-gatherers back to the northern Drakensberg around 600 years ago and with the spread and settlement of later farming communities (Mazel 1998). This can be seen in Figure 2.3 in Chapter 2, where sheep remains from hunter-gatherer sites and painted sheep sites are found in closer proximity to later farming community sites.

4.6.1. Who occupied the sites with livestock remains?

One of the problems with identifying livestock remains in archaeological deposits is the question of which group these remains belonged to. Mazel (1998) has commented that the overlap of material signatures from two different groups, hunter-gatherer and farmer, makes it difficult to determine who occupied a site at a particular time.

Mazel (1998) suggests that sites of iNkolimahashi (Mazel 1993), Mzinyashana 1 (Mazel 1997), KwaThwaleyakhe (Mazel 1993), Maqonqo Shelter (Mazel 1996) and Mhlwazini cave (Mazel 1990), were ephemerally occupied by agro-pastoralists, who left the remains of their livestock, pottery and other material items behind. Plug (2002) is wary of identifying some of these sites as agro-pastoralist occupations, based on the remains of domestic livestock alone. At Mzinyashana 1, Plug (2002) offers three possible explanations for how sheep and
cattle remains came to be represented at the site. Based on their frequency in the Mzinyashana 1 faunal assemblage, she argues that herding may not have been important to the people who occupied the shelter and it is possible that livestock was either acquired through exchange with agro-pastoralists or that hunter-gatherers were slowly adopted a herding way of life. Alternatively, it may also be possible that the site was temporarily used as a stock post by herders (ibid). However, Plug (2002) comments that the majority of livestock remains indicate that they were juveniles. This contrasts with agro-pastoralists sites where livestock remains are adults (ibid). At KwaThwaleyakhe, a single sheep talus was recovered from layer 1, and this layer has not been dated (Mazel 1993). Once again there is difficulty in establishing who occupied layer 1 at the site as it is suggested that the sheep talus may be associated with a divining kit used in ritual practice amongst agro-pastoralists (Plug 2002; Whitelaw 2009).

From the Thukela Basin archaeology, it is unclear whether or not hunter-gatherers adopted and herded domestic livestock. However, Mazel (1989) and Wright & Mazel (2007) suggest that the San may have become client herders for Late farming communities in and around the Drakensberg. The challenges with identifying groups who may have been herding livestock is perhaps compounded by the fact that (1) there are no direct dates taken from livestock remains in hunter-gatherer contexts and (2) the problems associated with identifying the socio-economic groups who may have occupied these sites at a particular time.

A further consideration of exchange networks operating over 2000 years ago and within the last 2000 years could indicate that hunter-gatherers had knowledge of sheep and other livestock perhaps, before they were even present in the area and before they accumulated in hunter-gatherer deposits. Such encounters may be archaeologically invisible on the landscape today. Rock art containing painted cattle or sheep may possibly reflect the long-distance exchanges and encounters between individuals or groups outside of the Thukela Basin.
4.6.2. Evidence for hunter-gatherers becoming herders with livestock

The earliest evidence for sheep in hunter-gatherer contexts derives from an open-air site, Likoeng, situated near the Senqu River in eastern Lesotho and has been directly dated to 1285 ± 40 b.p. (GrA 23237, bone) (Plug et al. 2003) (Figure 2.2, pg 38). This is a relatively early date that precedes the establishment of the Basotho, a later farming community in the Maloti Range, who are believed to have been driven into the area with the expansion of Europeans around the late nineteenth century (Mitchell et al. 2008). Cattle (NISP 3) also occur with the sheep/goat remains (NISP 4) as well as with early pottery and one Msuluzi/Ndondondwane sherd in layer 1 at Likoeng (ibid).

The uncalibrated date of 1285 years b.p. corresponds with the establishment of early agro-pastoralist settlement in the central Thukela Basin, east of the escarpment between Lesotho and KwaZulu-Natal. Mitchell et al. (2008) believe that it is likely that Likoeng occupants acquired their animals through networks operating across the escarpment with early agro-pastoralist communities in the Thukela Basin. This would also seem to support the occurrence of a single Msuluzi/Ndondondwane sherd found at the site.

After considering a number of scenarios in which sheep and cattle became incorporated at Likoeng, Mitchell et al. (2008: 62) propose that hunter-gatherers acquired livestock from early agro-pastoralists and then independently adopted and integrated these animals within their own economy. Similar evidence for hunter-gatherers becoming herders with livestock is presented by Hobart (2003, 2004) at the site Pitsaneng located in the Lesotho Highlands near Sehonghong and Likoeng. Sheep/goat (NISP 253) as well as cattle remains (NSIP 69) have not been directly dated, although Hobart (2003, 2004) suggests that the five dates, three of which derive from pottery (420 ± 60 b.p.; OxL 1315; 870 ± 80 b.p.; OxL1316; and 960 ± 90 b.p.; OxL 1314) are stratigraphically secure. Hobart (2003, 2004) proposes that long-distance exchange networks of items such as OES beads and a single soapstone bead, also carried livestock to these sites.
Evidence of livestock remains from sites such as Likoeng (Plug et al. 2003) and Pitsaneng (Hobart 2003, 2004) has prompted Mitchell et al. (2008) to re-evaluate other sites in Lesotho’s eastern highlands, including the site, Sehonghong, where a number of domestic livestock has been recovered from faunal assemblages in what appear to more recent archaeological deposits. Similarly Mitchell et al. (2008) call into question some of the livestock remains from the Thukela Basin and more specifically from the site Mhlwazini Cave where a single sheep humerus was recovered and thought to be relatively fresh (Plug 1990). The sheep bone is found in layer 1 which is undated although layer 2 has been dated to 190 ± 45 b.p. (Pta 5102; maize) (Mazel 1990).

Besides the examples provided from the eastern Lesotho highlands, there is little archaeological evidence to draw from for the remains of livestock in the Thukela Basin that would support earlier occurrences of hunter-gatherers becoming herders or encountering sheep. It is argued that only later, after about 1000 AD, with the arrival and settlement of later agro-pastoralist communities that hunter-gatherers may have become client herders or possibly acquired livestock from agro-pastoralists (Wright & Mazel 2007). This would suggest that San were herding these animals for others. It is important however to note that these sites have not been investigated with the aim of establishing whether or not hunter-gatherers were herding their own livestock. Another issue to tackle is how can we tell if hunter-gatherers were herding and painting their own livestock, rather than that of others, in the rock art of this region.

4.7. Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists: their arrival and settlement in the Thukela Basin from around the mid first millennium AD to the second millennium AD

Around 500 AD, the arrival of agriculture (in the form of cultivated sorghum and millet) mixed with pastoral (the herding of livestock-sheep, goats, and cattle) practices mark the establishment of early farming communities in the Thukela Basin (Maggs 1980b, 1984; Van Schalkwyk 1994a, 1994b). It is also during this time that the first evidence for sheep as well as other livestock is found in
KwaZulu-Natal (Voigt 1984; Voigt & Von den Driesch 1984; Plug 1996) (Figure 2.1).

Four phases, based on ceramic traditions and radiocarbon patterning, have been identified with the settlement of early farming communities (Maggs 1980, Whitelaw 1994/5, Greenfield & Schalkwyk 2008) (Table 4.7).

The earliest, Mzonjani or Matola Phase, with the sites Mzonjani (1670 ± 40 b.p., Pta 1980, Maggs 1980a), Enkwazini (1650 ± 50 b.p., Pta 1874, Hall 1980), Inanda Quarry (1580 ± 50 b.p., Pta 5492, Whitelaw & Moon 1996) as well as many other small surface clusters of Mzonjani type pottery (Natal Museum database), are restricted to a 6 km inland corridor along the KwaZulu-Natal coast. Mzonjani communities are representative of the first pioneer farmers to have moved into the KwaZulu-Natal coastal region (Maggs 1980a). There is little firm evidence to indicate the social and political organisation of these communities, nor is there sufficient evidence for the keeping of livestock or crops, given that most of the sites along this coastal region are poorly preserved (Whitelaw & Moon 1996).

Although, Maggs (1980a) identified a possible cattle ceramic figurine showing a fragmented piece of the ceramic horn from the site Mzonjani dated to around 380 AD.

The second phase, Msuluzi (beginning at around 500 AD) marks the dispersal of farmers’ inland (Maggs 1980a, 1989, Greenfield & Schalkwyk 2008). Msuluzi farmers opted for dry valley woodlands where settlement occurred on river valley floors (below 1000m asl.) with deep colluvial soils for the cultivation of crops (Maggs 1980a). Included in this dispersal is the lower and central Thukela Basin (Greenfield & Schalkwyk 2008).
Table 4.7. Radiocarbon dates and associated phases of agro-pastoralist sites in KwaZulu-Natal. See also Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Stratigraphy</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Material Dated</th>
<th>AMS/Conventional</th>
<th>Uncal. Date Years b.p.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pottery Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enkwazini</td>
<td>layer 2 (Grid A364)</td>
<td>Pta 1847</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mzonjani</td>
<td>Hall (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkwazini</td>
<td>layer 2 (Grid A397)</td>
<td>Pta 1977</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mzonjani</td>
<td>Hall (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanda Quarry</td>
<td>Pit 3</td>
<td>Pta 5492</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Matoke/Mzonjani</td>
<td>Whitelaw &amp; Moon (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2931CA 174</td>
<td>midden</td>
<td>Pta 7577</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Matoke/Mzonjani</td>
<td>Moon (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2632CD 2</td>
<td>midden</td>
<td>Pta 002</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Matoke/Mzonjani</td>
<td>Vogel &amp; Marais (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msuluzi Confluence</td>
<td>Pit E (MH)</td>
<td>Pta 2195</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Maggs (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msuluzi Confluence</td>
<td>Pta 2197</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Maggs (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanda</td>
<td>Wits 1917</td>
<td></td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2930DB 43</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>Pta 4303</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdlopeni</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>Pta 2878</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magogo</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>Pta 2874</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magogo</td>
<td>Pta 3716</td>
<td></td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wosi (Woshi)</td>
<td>layer 4 (Grid 2)</td>
<td>Pta 4104</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wosi (Woshi)</td>
<td>layer 3 (Grid 2)</td>
<td>Pta 4100</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wosi (Woshi)</td>
<td>layer 2 (Grid 2)</td>
<td>Pta 4095</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wosi (Woshi)</td>
<td>Pit (Grid 1)</td>
<td>Pta 4094</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaGandaganda</td>
<td>Sq 25</td>
<td>Wits 1918</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaGandaganda</td>
<td>Sq 25</td>
<td>Wits 1938</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaGandaganda</td>
<td>Sq 22</td>
<td>Wits 1919</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaGandaganda</td>
<td>Sq 22</td>
<td>Wits 1937</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaGandaganda</td>
<td>Sq 14</td>
<td>Wits 1920</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ntshekane</td>
<td>Whitelaw (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberton Way</td>
<td>layer 3-4</td>
<td>Pta 2881</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Horwitz et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberton Way</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 2880</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ms/Nd</td>
<td>Horwitz et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhlanga Lagoon</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 2879</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ms/Nd/Ntshekane</td>
<td>Horwitz et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Sq G2 (50cm-60cm)</td>
<td>Pta 2388</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Maggs (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Sq 110(40cm-50cm)</td>
<td>Pta 2389</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Maggs (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamba 1</td>
<td>Pta 4164</td>
<td></td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Van Schalkwyk (1994b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntshekane</td>
<td>feature O (Pi)</td>
<td>Pta 1058</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ntshekane</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Michael (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntshekane</td>
<td>feature V (Pi)</td>
<td>Pta 1057</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ntshekane</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Michael (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntsitsana</td>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>Pta 4684</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Msuluzi</td>
<td>Prins &amp; Granger (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntsitsana</td>
<td>Pit 5</td>
<td>Pta 4695</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Prins &amp; Granger (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntsitsana</td>
<td>Pit 6</td>
<td>Pta 4687</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ndondondwane</td>
<td>Prins &amp; Granger (1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third and fourth phases include Ndondondwane (8th-10th century AD) (Maggs 1984) and Ntshekane (10th-11th AD century) (Maggs & Michael 1976). They are characterised by a similar choice of inland valley settlement below 1000m asl. (Maggs 1980a, 1984, 1989). It is during these phases that there is robust evidence for a mixed economy comprising of pastoral and agricultural practices (Arnold 2008).

These movements are captured in Figure 4.12 through radiocarbon dating and the spatial analysis of archaeological sites which shows the movement of agro-pastoralists from the eastern coast inland towards the Thukela Basin.

Figure 4.12. The movement and spread of early pioneer agro-pastoralists into KwaZulu-Natal and around the Thukela Basin.

It is just after 1000 AD that later agro-pastoralist communities began to settle in the higher grassland regions around the Drakensberg (Wright & Mazel 2007) (Figure 4.13). Very few archaeological excavations have been done in the region. Some of these sites include Moor Park (Davies 1974), Blackburn (Davies 1971), Mgodyanuka (Maggs 1982), and Mpambonyoni (Robey 1980). Other sites can be found in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8. Radiocarbon dates for later agro-pastoralist sites in KwaZulu-Natal. See Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Stratigraphy</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>AMS/Conventional</th>
<th>Uncal. Date Years b.p.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pottery Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Pit F</td>
<td>Pta 162</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Davies (1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpambonyoni</td>
<td>Midden B</td>
<td>Pta 2528</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Robey (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpambonyoni</td>
<td>Midden A</td>
<td>Pta 2527</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Robey (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpambonyoni</td>
<td>Midden A</td>
<td>Pta 2534</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>Robey (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Park Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Terrace H</td>
<td>Pta 849</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Davies (1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Park Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Terrace A</td>
<td>Pta 850</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Davies (1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Park Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Terrace E</td>
<td>Pta 853</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Davies (1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iGujwana</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td>Pta 8101</td>
<td>wooden stub</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iGujwana</td>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>Pta 8335</td>
<td>Tamboetie</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntomdaliana</td>
<td>Trench 3</td>
<td>Pta 8697</td>
<td>bone</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewula Gorge</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td>Pta 8370</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewula Gorge</td>
<td>Trench 1</td>
<td>Pta 8372</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhloopeni</td>
<td>Pta 5480</td>
<td></td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Moor Park</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Pta 1770</td>
<td></td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Hall &amp; Maggs (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgoduyanuka</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 1698</td>
<td>maize cob</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Maggs (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabhija</td>
<td>Ash lense</td>
<td>Pta 1699</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Maggs (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkwazini</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 1848</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkwazini</td>
<td>layer B</td>
<td>Pta 2485</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nqabeni</td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkwazini</td>
<td>layer B</td>
<td>Pta 2537</td>
<td>conventional</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huffman (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7.1. Pastoral activities and ideology with reference made to sheep, goats, and cattle in the agro-pastoralist excavated record for the Thukela Basin and surrounding areas

It is clear from the material record, that a full time commitment to pastoral activities and its connected social and ideological practices mark agro-pastoralist identity on the landscape (Huffman 1990). These practices seem to have a long antiquity amongst communities including both early and later agropastoralist groups (ibid). This is not only demonstrated through faunal remains alone, but also through ceramic figurines recovered from early agro-pastoralists sites including: Msuluzi Confluence (Maggs 1980a), Ntshekane (Maggs & Michael 1976), KwaGandaganda (Whitelaw 1994), Magogo (Maggs & Ward 1984), and Ndondondwane (Maggs 1984). These often represent cattle and date to around 500 AD to about 700 AD (Maggs 1980a; Whitelaw 1994, 1994/1995).
The movement and settlement of agro-pastoralists into the Thukela Basin must have had a profound impact on the San occupying the region. Although, the San were most likely aware of the impending arrival of these groups, their actual appearance in the Thukela Basin must have been dramatic for the San at the time. Their first encounter with these groups may have been particularly important for how the San saw them and their relations with their livestock on the landscape. Understanding these relationships and the social behaviours towards livestock by agro-pastoralist communities as well as in their preferred choice of livestock may potentially be useful for understanding how the San saw and thought of these groups.

There is disagreement amongst archaeologists over the central importance of cattle versus sheep in the archaeology of early farming communities (Huffman 1990, 2010; Plug 1996; Arnold 2008; Badenhorst 2010, 2011). This is because sites including Mhlopeni (Voigt 1984), Magogo (Voigt 1984), Wosi (Van Schalkwyk 1994b, Voigt & Peters 1994b), Mamba 1 (Van Schalkwyk 1994a, Voigt & Peters 1994a), Ndondondwane (Voigt & Van den Driesch 1984), and Ntshekane (Maggs & Michael 1976) contain large numbers of small ruminants (sheep or goats). As suggested by the numbers (NISP) represented for livestock in Table 4.5, this indicates that sheep remains far outweigh that of cattle during the early establishment of farmers in the Thukela Basin. Based on the high frequency of sheep remains over cattle remains, researchers suggest that sheep had a more substantial role than cattle for these communities (Badenhorst 2006). The focus on cattle is with the establishment of later farming communities. Badenhorst (2006) further argues that sheep may have been considered as a primary animal and he links this to matrilineal ideology where small ruminants are closely associated with females, compared to the patrilineal ideology, where cattle are associated with males. However, Huffman (1990, 2010) contests this argument by suggesting that sheep were not as important to both early and later farming communities and were most likely placed peripheral to cattle. He also notes that sheep and cattle are treated differently in death. Cattle remains will often be burnt, and thus he argues that the discrepancy in the faunal remains does not necessarily indicate that sheep
were important ideologically but rather that cattle are missing from these assemblages. In later historic accounts, Schapera (1930) observed that sheep kraals are often placed outside the central area where cattle are kept amongst the Tswana. Sheep may also have not been considered as important in comparison to cattle in marriage payments. As Schapera (1953:41) notes, among Tswana groups, animals involved in bridewealth payment referred to as **bogadi** generally consist of cattle although in rare cases sheep were given, but goats are never used. Instead, amongst the Tswana, goats were more regularly used as sacrifices to the spirits (**badimo**) or ancestors (Schapera 1953: 59).

4.8. *Archaeological evidence for interactions between Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers and agro-pastoralist communities:*

The spread of agro-pastoralist communities closely correspond with the spatial-temporal patterning of hunter-gatherers sites in the Thukela Basin where hunter-gatherers moved to the central Thukela Basin after 1600 years ago with the settlement of early agro-pastoralists (Figure 4.14). The San only returned to the northern Drakensberg 600 years ago with the establishment of later agro-pastoralist communities occupying the Drakensberg foothills (Mazel 1998). The spatial and temporal correlation between these two groups is found in Figure 4.15, where hunter-gatherer sites in the northern Drakensberg can be found once again after a 1000 year hiatus. Wright and Mazel (2007) however question this spatial pattern during this time period.

The presence of agro-pastoralist pottery at some hunter-gatherer sites suggests that hunter-gatherers acquired material items from these groups, although the exact nature of the relationships is hard to understand (Table 4.10). Mazel (1998) suggests that the two groups were likely to have formed alliances and possibly intermarried but at the same time there was also an ambivalent relationship with hunter-gatherers never fully trusting of their relationships with their neighbours on the landscape. Hammond-Tooke (1998) and Prins and Lewis (1992) have suggested that there were cultural borrowings from San cosmology into later farming community ritual practices.
Figure 4.14. The temporal and spatial patterning of hunter-gatherer sites dating to the beginning of 1600 years and agro-pastoralist sites in the central Thukela Basin around 1500 b.p. Site names can be found in Appendix A (pg 222).

Figure 4.15. The spatial and temporal pattern of hunter-gatherer sites after 600 years ago and their proximity to later agro-pastoralist sites. Full site names can be found in Appendix A (pg 222) & B (pg 227).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Layer/unit</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>uncal. Date</th>
<th>Years b.p.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Estimated Date</th>
<th>Material associated with farmers</th>
<th>Glass beads</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mshabane Shelter</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1520 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 piece of iron; Msuluzi pottery</td>
<td>3 pieces of iron; small amount of sorghum caffrorum; Msuluzi pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mazel (1986a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 3678</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>post 470 b.p.</td>
<td>1 piece of slag, sorghum caffrorum; LIA</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3848</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>post 470 b.p.</td>
<td>1 piece of slag; 1 iron point, LIA pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 3684</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pieces of slag, sorghum caffrorum; LIA</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwathwaleya khe Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1290 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ntshekane pottery; 5 landsnail beads</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td>Mazel (1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 5350</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ntshekane pottery; 4 modified tab bovid (divining bones); 29 landsnail beads; 133 pieces of iron</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post 470 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ntshekane pottery; 1 Ovis aries talis; 3 landsnail beads; 6 pieces of iron; 1 piece of slag</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimashi Shelter</td>
<td>layer 5</td>
<td>Pta 7230</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd millennium AD pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td>Mazel (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 7231</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd millennium AD pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 749</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 landsnail beads; 1 possible EIA pottery sherd; LIA pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 7227</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheep phalanx; LIA pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 3658</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>last 360 years</td>
<td>LIA pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mninyasha 1</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1200 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 sheep; 3 cattle; 1 decorated Ntshekane pottery; 1 sheep; 3 sheep/goat; 2 cattle; landsnail bead; LIA pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 6538</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd millennium pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 6541</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 decorated Moor Park &amp; Blackburn pottery sherds</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 6715</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheep/goat; 3 cattle; pieces of ceramic figurines; 1 decorated Moor Park &amp; Blackburn pottery sherd; LIA pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mninyasha 2</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3584</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 pieces of slag; 2 pieces of iron ore; LIA pottery; 2 metachatina beads; 1 nassarius kraussianus bead</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 3851</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 pieces of slag; 1 broken iron bangle; LIA pottery; 2 metachatina beads; 1 nassarius kraussianus bead</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post 1500 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 decorated Moor Park &amp; Blackburn pottery sherds</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSindolweni Shelter</td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 3584</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 pieces of slag; 1 broken iron bangle; LIA pottery; 2 metachatina beads; 1 nassarius kraussianus bead</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 3851</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 pieces of slag; 2 pieces of iron ore; LIA pottery; 2 metachatina beads; 1 nassarius kraussianus bead</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post 1500 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Ntshekane decorated shed</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post 1500 b.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 sheep; 21 sheep/goat; pottery</td>
<td>5 glass beads</td>
<td>Mazel (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driel Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>piece of iron; cane glass bead; LIA pottery resembling those from the southern highveld; 1 iron awl; LIA pottery resembling those from the southern highveld; sorghum caffrorum; lagenaria siceraria</td>
<td>2 glass beads</td>
<td>Maggs &amp; Ward (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhwalini Cave</td>
<td>layer 4</td>
<td>Pta 4864</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LIA pottery</td>
<td>2 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 3</td>
<td>Pta 4850</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 piece of slag; modified gourd; LIA pottery; sorghum caffrorum; lagenaria siceraria</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 5102</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 iron point; modified gourd; LIA pottery; Zea mays; sorghum caffrorum; lagenaria siceraria</td>
<td>2 glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgede Shelter</td>
<td>layer 2</td>
<td>Pta 3665</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 cattle/buffalo?; LIA pottery; piece of iron</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td>Mazel (1986b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 3669</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sheep/goat; 3 pieces of iron; LIA pottery</td>
<td>1 glass bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td>Pta 5092</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 spear-head; 1 asseiger</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mazel (1992a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magongqo Shelter</td>
<td>layer 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>last 500 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 sheep; 21 sheep/goat; pottery</td>
<td>5 glass beads</td>
<td>Mazel (1990a, b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Material items found in hunter-gatherer deposits related to the interactions with agro-pastoralists. Also see Appendix A.
An interesting point raised by Hobart (2003) however is that, based on the small number of livestock remains found in hunter-gatherer deposits, there is little evidence to support extensive trading of livestock between agro-pastoralists and hunter-gatherers. This is also reflected in Table 4.6, showing the small amount of livestock remains found at hunter-gatherers sites, and Table 4.5, showing the large amount of livestock remains at agro-pastoralist sites.

Mazel (1989a, 1998) and Wright and Mazel (2007) question the exact nature for the types of relations between Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers and later farming communities. A re-evaluation of settlement patterns, and the quantity and the types of material culture moving between these two groups suggests that perhaps the relations between these two groups were not as close as previously proposed (Wright & Mazel 2007: 47).

The types of ambivalent relationships between Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers and agro-pastoralists have also been documented around the Caledon Valley (Loubser & Laurens 1994). Loubser and Laurens (1994) propose that hunter-gatherers were often settled on the margins of agro-pastoralist societies and that this could be seen through the negative spatial correlation between stone-walled structures and rock shelter occupations. In addition, the interpretation of the spatial correlation between rock art imagery including shields and cattle are also said to be indicative of these relations. Whitelaw (2009) proposes that this may have characterised Thukela Basin hunter-gatherers and their relations with later agropastoralist communities after 1000 AD, during which time hunter-gatherers moved back into the Drakensberg.

From the perspective of later farming communities, Whitelaw (2009) suggests that the ambiguous the relations between agro-pastoralist and hunter-gatherers may have aided in their involvement in Nguni divination, including rainmaking practices. According to Whitelaw (2009), the San were constructed as asocial beings, cast to the lowest level of the social hierarchy among Nguni society. It is potentially for these reasons that San were incorporated into Nguni divination practices, as it is generally the people who are considered ambiguous and
polluting that make the best ritual specialists within agro-pastoralist society (Whitelaw 2009: 155).

Jolly (1995, 1996) argues that relationships between the San and later farming communities, including Nguni and southern Sotho groups were highly complex and suggests that both groups intermarried and San were incorporated into Bantu-speaking farming communities and some farmers were also incorporated into San groups. These ethnic boundaries may have not been as impermeable as sometimes assumed (Jolly 1995). These close relationships have also been suggested through linguistic evidence (Ownby 1985) and through genetic studies (Mitchell 2010). Today, these identities are highly complex and fluid and are recognised through the history of the region where there are still San descendants living in Nguni society (Francis 2007).

Jolly (2007: 102) also suggests that San hunter-gatherers would have been able to acquire livestock through a number of ways. He offers a number of possible scenarios including: (1) that San may have adopted livestock through ivory trade with Bantu-speakers; (2) Bantu-speaking chiefs may have given their livestock to the San in an attempt to make them lead a more settled lifestyle; and (3) through bridewealth and the payment of livestock by agro-pastoralists who married San women. Eventually the San would have learnt from their neighbours how to rear these animals (ibid). Although, in the Thukela Basin there are only few livestock remains found in hunter-gatherer contexts.

4.9. *Three possible scenarios for whose sheep may have been painted in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg*

In this section, I present three broad scenarios for whose sheep may have been painted.
4.9.1. Scenario One: Sheep belonged to agro-pastoralists groups who were herding these animals on the landscape.

Mazel (1998a) suggests that the relations between farming communities and the Thukela Basin San were close yet ambivalent. Evidence indicates that sheep may have been highly valued among agro-pastoralists and that their remains in the excavated record of early agro-pastoralists sites may indicate that value was placed on sheep rather than cattle in earlier farming communities (Plug 1996; Arnold 2008; Badenhorst 2009). Historic evidence also suggests that the San acted as client herders for agro-pastoralists and were highly important as ritual specialists in rain-making (Wright 1971). In the southern Drakensberg, Campbell (1987) interprets the depictions of cattle as important animals in rainmaking. There is also evidence that sheep were thought of as rain animals among some Nguni and southern Sotho groups (Jolly 1995). Black sheep in particular were slaughtered for rain-making ceremonies (Kuper 1963). However, Mazel’s (1982) recording of paintings in the northern Drakensberg suggest that rain-making scenes are absent although they do occur in the Harrismith District of the Free-State (Lewis-Williams 1985), and in some of the paintings for the southern Drakensberg (Mazel 1982). It is only after the arrival of farmers that we see evidence for sheep in the archaeological record, although the amount of these remains in hunter-gatherer deposits is slight.

4.9.2. Scenario Two: The sheep depicted belonged to herders who were once hunter-gatherers.

Mitchell et al. (2008) has presented an argument for hunter-gatherers adopting and keeping livestock in the eastern Lesotho Highlands. Mitchell (1996) further proposes that long distance exchange networks operating to the southwest may have brought early thin-walled pottery to this region, along with the movement of ostrich eggshell pieces and beads. This exchange network may possibly have included other groups of San who were committed to the herding of livestock.

In the Thukela Basin, there are no direct dates for sheep remains in hunter-gatherer contexts and the question of whether hunter-gatherers adopted and
herded their own livestock is difficult to establish based on the number of livestock remains at these sites. Jolly (2007) has recently proposed the possibility that cattle paintings may have belonged to hunter-herders in the Caledon Valley and provides historic evidence that the herding of cattle was part of the economic basis of some San groups. If San were herding their own livestock in the northern Drakensberg, then the sheep depicted could be that of San herders.

4.9.3. Scenario Three: Sheep belonged to Khoe pastoralists passing through the northern Drakensberg just after 2000 years ago.

There may have been a fleeting Khoe pastoralist presence on the landscape just after 2000 years ago (Mazel 2013, pers. comm. 2013), but their presence is masked by the more dominant archaeological signatures of agro-pastoralist sites. This is based on rock art that is similar to a Khoe pastoralist rock art (ibid) and possibly dating to 1800 b.p as identified from a painted slab with black finger marks at Collingham Shelter. Early thin-walled pottery and other material items such as copper beads may indicate that its sources were possibly from pastoralists on the landscape. If pastoralists were in this region, then could it be that sheep paintings were connected with the presence of this group rather than with agro-pastoralists?

4.10. Summary:

Cabling complex strands of evidence together from the dated archaeological record and the undated sheep rock art is challenging. In this chapter, three scenarios based on a review of all literature concerning the prehistory of the northern uKhahlamba Drakensberg and adjacent regions have been offered for whose sheep may have been painted. This is further explored in the discussion of sheep imagery in chapter 7.

In the next chapter, I present the micro-context of painted sheep imagery, recorded between 2012 and 2013, in the northern Drakensberg.
Chapter 5: Recording the micro-context of painted sheep imagery in the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg rock art.

5.1. Introduction

Sheep paintings are rare in the northern Drakensberg rock art, with only eight known sites in the region. This is based on a study of all field reports from the Natal Museum database and the South African Rock Art Digital Archive (SARADA), personal communication with rock art specialists, a review of published literature and a field survey conducted during 2012 and 2013 for this project.

Of these eight, one of the sites, Green Leopard Shelter, situated in the Solar Cliffs Valley of Cathedral Peak State Forest, collapsed in 2001 (Natal Museum Database; Nardell pers.comm. 2012). Upon survey, another site, Montonto 1 Shelter, situated only 50 metres away from Green Leopard Shelter, could not be located. A previously recorded single painted sheep image at the site Sigubudu 2 in the Royal Natal National Park, shows no evidence that a sheep was painted there. This has reduced the number of recordable sites to a total of five for this region. At these five sites, a total of forty-nine sheep images were recorded during eighteen days of fieldwork. Previous records indicate that this number was greater than it is today. In 1969, Pager (1971) recorded over forty sheep images at the site Junction Shelter in the Didima Gorge, Cathedral Peak State Forest, and it had contained the second largest number of sheep images known in southern Africa; the first is Andover in the Eastern Cape which contains over fifty painted images of sheep (Manhire et al. 1986).

The comparatively low number of sheep paintings recorded during this project contrasts significantly with Mazel’s (1981) recording of 2081 eland and 1226 rhebuck images in this research area. It is the paucity of sheep imagery compared
to other animals that make them an interesting but also a challenging phenomenon to understand in the Drakensberg rock art.

This chapter outlines the techniques used to record the painted sheep. The sheep are described site by site, starting from their most northerly location in the Royal Natal National Park and moving to their most southerly location in the Injasuthi Park of the northern Drakensberg. The rock art is explored to see whether there are any similarities or differences between the sites containing painted sheep imagery that might inform us of their meaning.

5.2. Recording the micro-context of painted sheep shelters in the northern Drakensberg:

5.2.1. Locating the painted sheep sites

The five painted sheep shelters were located through personal communication with Mazel (2012, 2013), and from the Natal Museum Database and site records, as well as by the Southern African Rock Art Digital Archive (SARADA). These five sites are listed in Table 5.1, and shown in Figure 5.1, from their most northerly location to their most southerly location in the northern Drakensberg. Each site was visited at least twice during 18 days of field recording. Battle Cave was recorded over six days.

Table 5.1. Five sites listed as containing sheep images in the northern Drakensberg in 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Co-ordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sigubudu 4</td>
<td>Royal Natal National Park,</td>
<td>28° 40’ S; 28° 57’ E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sigubudu Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boschman’s Klip A</td>
<td>Cathedral Peak area</td>
<td>28° 27’ S; 29° 23’ E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Shelter</td>
<td>Cathedral Peak State Forest,</td>
<td>28° 59’ S; 29° 18’ E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Didima Gorge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zunckel’s Cave</td>
<td>Cathedral Peak State Forest</td>
<td>28° 58’ S; 29° 20’ E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Cave</td>
<td>Injasuthi</td>
<td>29° 09’ S; 29° 24’ E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1. The location and distribution of five painted sheep sites in the northern Drakensberg. Google Earth 2013.
In 2012, a field survey was carried out to ten other sites found in the vicinity of the five painted sheep shelters. This survey was conducted to gain a better overview of the San painted sites. In Giants Castle Game Reserve, further south of the research area, it came to light that there was a possible sixth site which may possibly contain a single sheep image (Nardell pers. comm. 2012). Upon investigation, however, this was difficult to determine (Figure 5.2).

![Figure 5.2. A possible depiction of a sheep at White Elephant Shelter, Giants Castle Game Reserve. It may have sheep-like facial features, Lander 2013.](image)

### 5.2.2. The aim of recording

The aim of the field recording was to gain data on the micro-context of painted sheep imagery. The following objectives were kept in mind whilst recording:

1. The type of sheep painted; thin-tailed or fat-tailed.
2. The conventions and style used in their depiction including their colours, application, and appearance on the rock face.
The types of painted imagery found within the vicinity of sheep images.

The placement of sheep paintings in the shelter and on the rock face.

The mannerisms/behaviour of sheep that have been depicted.

Any superpositional relationships involving sheep.

The position of painted sheep sites on the landscape.

5.2.3. Techniques used in the field

Free-hand sketches and digital photographs were used to document the sheep panels’ at all five sites (Figure 5.3). For this study, a panel is considered the expanse of a rock face containing groups of painted motifs (Ouzman 1997:232; Russell 2000:61). Entire sites that contain sheep imagery were photographed. Where sites were too large, in terms of the amount of paintings present, and the time constraints of the project, hand sketches were limited to those paintings that were situated next to the sheep paintings. Drawing rather than tracing, allows one to focus and engage with the image in view and importantly minimises damage to the rock surface, as there is no contact.

Figure 5.3. An example of sketches made from the site Boschman's Klip A in 2013 field recording.
The freehand sketches offer a fair record of what is seen at the site, at a particular time by the recorder. Where scale is distorted, photographs were able to correct this. Over 600 photographs were taken at the five sites.

Each motif found on the panel was given a description according to subject matter, colour, size and direction; these motifs were then numbered alphabetically and in a random order. Additional recording of other painted imagery at the sites was undertaken. These paintings were described and photographed but not sketched.

One of the challenges faced during the recording of sheep imagery at these sites was the question of how far to or how close to sheep images, other images have to be in order to be considered related to them. For instance, painted markings on a sheep image were noted on a panel at Battle Cave and to the far left hand side of this site other markings on rhinoceros images were also observed, that seemed similar. Yet the paintings were quite a distance apart.

Where superpositioning was visible, this was studied to see what paint overlapped another. This was recorded and numbered according to the sequence of superpositioning observed in the field. No sheep images were found in complex superpositions, although sheep at Junction Shelter and at Boschman’s Klip A are shown superpositioned over human figures. Two instances of an animal painted over a human figure at Battle Cave, Injasuthi and at the site Sigubudu 4 in Royal Natal were also recorded.

Adobe Illustrator (CS3) was used to trace the paintings. This was done by overlaying both photographs and sketches into Adobe illustrator. This aids in the visual representation and clarity of images for presentation in this project.

All of these drawings are provided in this chapter but larger panels from Boschman’s Klip A; Battle Cave, and Junction Shelter have been enlarged in order to make them more easily read. These enlarged re-drawings and photographs can be found in Appendix C.
5.3. *Presentation of the painted sheep sites in the northern uKhahlamba Drakensberg:*

The following section presents the paintings of sheep recorded from the five rock shelters located in the northern Drakensberg and describes them according to the objectives listed above. Because each site exhibits subtle differences they will be dealt with individually.

5.3.1. *Site 1: Sigubudu 4, Sigubudu Valley, Royal Natal National Park*

The site Sigubudu 4, situated in the northern part of the Royal Natal National Park near the lower part of the Sigubudu Valley, is the most northerly extent of the research area containing painted sheep imagery (Figure 5.1). It is located 2.5 km north of the site Sigubudu 1 where Mazel (1981, 1982) documented the only known painted historic scene in the northern Drakensberg region.

Sigubudu 4 sits at 1487m asl. deep within the Sigubudu Valley, facing north westerly and is situated approximately four to eight metres away from the Sigubudu River. Because it is nestled deep within the valley, it has a limited view of the surrounding foothills (Figure 5.4). The shelter floor and deposit have been greatly disturbed by its proximity to the river which has deposited large amounts of debris and fine river sand into the shelter itself. As a result no occupational debris was seen on the surface.

5.3.2 *Sigubudu 4 Sheep Panel*

The painted site is relatively small containing only 16 fine-line painted images and a further four red ochre paint daubs. Today, the sheep panel is located high up on the sandstone rock face, though because of its proximity to the river and its flooding, it is impossible to know what the original floor level was at the time the paintings were made (Figure 5.5).
Figure 5.4. The location and position of the site Sigubudu 4 in the Royal Natal National Park. (A) shows the position of the painted sheep at the shelter and (B) shows the location of Sigubudu River near the shelter.
Figure 5.5. Section drawing of the left hand side of Sigubudu 4. The red block highlights the area where the painted sheep image occurs at the site.
Figure 5.6. Photograph and re-drawing of Sigubudu 4 sheep panel.
This site was originally recorded as containing a total of three painted sheep images by Mazel in 1979 (Mazel 1981, 1982). In 2013, only one sheep was firmly identified. The single sheep image (A; Figure 5.6) is painted in white with a red face and an ear as seen in a single perspective and the pigments appear to have been thinly applied to the rock face. The single sheep is depicted much larger in comparison to the surrounding images and appears to the far left hand side of the panel (Figure 5.6).

To the right and below the sheep image, are kaross-clad human figures that are depicted either carrying sticks or bags (C, B, E, F, G; Figure 5.6). These paintings are made in monochromatic red with white features. A long thin image also depicted in red and white may represent a serpent and it is touching the stick of the kaross-clad human figure (D; Figure 5.6).

Off centre of this panel is a group of superpositioned motifs. The superpositioned motifs (HI-H3; Figure 5.6) indicate that H1, a red human figure, was the first painted. H2, a red polychrome faded eland, and H3, an indeterminate white image, are in superposition, yet it is difficult to discern in what sequence they were painted as both paints from these motifs (H2 & H3) overlap one another.

Other imagery recorded at this site, includes a group of faded yellow and red polychrome eland located on the far left side of the shelter away from the sheep panel. These were the only other paintings found at the site.

5.3.3. Site 2: Boschman’s Klip A, Cathedral Peak area

Situated along a sandstone band on a ridge near Vimy Ridge, Cathedral Peak area, in the central part of the research area lies the site Boschman’s Klip A at 1385m asl. (Figure 5.7 & Figure 5.8). Although this site is small, it contains the second largest grouping of painted sheep for the research area. A total of 32 sheep were recorded (A; Figure 5.9 & Figure 5.10) out of a total of 104 painted images recorded at the site.
Figure 5.7. The position and location of Boschman’s Klip A (A). The view of the surrounding area whilst standing at the site (B).
Figure 5.8. A section drawing of the site showing the position of the painted panels at Boschman's Klip A.
Figure 5.9. Photograph and re-drawing of the painted sheep panel from Boschman’s Klip A. Note that the majority of paintings are made in dark-brown and red with white. A1-32 represents the flock of 32 fat-tailed sheep depicted at the site.
The rock shelter is north facing and contains no evidence of occupational debris. It has a wide panoramic view of the surrounding foothills and valleys (Figure 5.7).

A total of 3 panels were recorded at Boschman’s Klip A: a baboon panel (Figure 5.8 & Figure 5.11), an eland panel, and a sheep panel (Figure 5.9 & Figure 5.10, Appendix C). The baboon panel contains a total of 9 baboons, painted in monochrome black and in a striding position facing towards the right hand side of the panel. The eland panel consists of multiple depictions of shaded polychrome eland superpositioned and overlapping one another. Included in this panel are human figures found painted beneath the majority of eland. An indistinct black animal is also depicted.

Figure 5.10. Re-drawing of a flock of 32 fat-tailed sheep at Boschman's Klip A. The dark-brown sheep are always depicted over the red painted sheep. Note the elongated figures superpositioned within the flock.
Figure 5.11. Photograph and re-drawing of the Baboon panel from Boschman’s Klip A. This panel is found to the far left hand side of the site.

5.3.4. Boschman’s Klip A sheep panel

A1-32 (Figure 5.9 & Figure 5.10; Appendix C) represents the flock of 32 sheep, which follows the same convention in depiction as other imagery on the same rock face. They also appear to be thinly-applied. Included with this flock are two elongated human figures (B, C; Figure 5.10). Three sheep that are depicted in red (18, 19 & 13) are superpositioned over the lower human figure however the upper human figure is superpositioned over sheep 11 and 12. All sheep are facing towards the right with sheep 17 and 18 heads bent downwards. In all instances the monochrome red ochre sheep are superpositioned over monochrome dark brown sheep, although they appear to have all been painted at the same time.

The sheep panel is situated to the right of the shelter and contains a wide range of imagery including five ‘flying buck’ painted in monochrome dark brown and in bichrome red and white. They face towards the flock of sheep on the left hand side (D, E, F, G, H; Figure 5.9; Appendix C). Six human figures with bags, bows and quivers (L, M; Figure 5.9) as well as two dancing figures painted in both red and white (J, I; Figure 5.9) are also depicted below the flock of sheep. Associated with these figures are two monochrome yellow hartebeests facing right and one shaded polychrome rhebuck (N, O, K; Figure 5.9). The rhebuck faces in the same direction as the flock of sheep, which is towards the right of the panel. Two
possible female figures, each carrying digging sticks, are represented below the two hartebeests (P; Figure 5.9). A group of sitting female figures, clapping their hands, are situated to the left of the flock of sheep and on the left of the crack in the rock (T; Figure 5.9). A group of thinly painted red and white human figures, of which three are dancing, one in a sitting position and another climbing a line are found depicted near the bottom edge of the rock face (R; Figure 5.9). Several faded human figures in monochromatic are slightly visible on the panel (Q; Figure 5.9).

5.3.5. Site 3: Zunckel’s Cave, Cathedral Peak State Forest

Zunckel’s Cave sits at 1985m asl. and is located in the foothills of the Drakensberg between the Nkwazi and the tributary of Mhlwazini rivers just outside the Cathedral Peak State Forest (Figure 5.12). It is a northwest facing rock shelter that has a panoramic view of the surrounding foothills and valleys as well as to the top of the surrounding Little Berg. Passes to Lesotho are also visible from the shelter and include: Mlambonja Pass, Tsekelseke Pass, Xeni Pass and Mike’s Pass (Figure 5.12).

The shelter contains possible occupational deposit although this is largely covered by rocks and vegetation. A few LSA lithics and some bone fragments were found on the surface. A total of 64 fine-line paintings were recorded (Figure 5.13).

5.3.6. Zunckel’s Cave Sheep Panel

Zunckel’s Cave has only one clearly identifiable fat-tailed sheep image. The sheep is depicted in white with a red ochre outline and has a fat-tail (F; Figure 5.14). The sheep at Zunckel’s does not display the commonly found convention of pendulous ears and the gait and facial features almost suggest feline characteristics. This sheep was first recorded by Pager (1971) in the late 1960’s as the only other sheep image to occur outside his research area in the Didima Gorge.
Figure 5.12. The position of Zunckel's Cave on the landscape (A) and the surrounding view from the shelter where Mlambonja Pass, Tsekelseke Pass, Xeni Pass and Mike's Pass are visible (B).
Figure 5.13. Section drawing of Zunckel’s Cave showing the position of the painted sheep panel. P1-P7 represent areas where other paintings are found at the site.
Figure 5.14. Photograph and re-drawing of the painted sheep panel from Zunckel's Cave. Note that the fat-tailed sheep has been outlined in red (F) and above it a white cow (*Bos taurus*) has been painted (B).
A single monochrome white cow (*Bos taurus*) with horns is depicted above the fat-tailed sheep (B; Figure 5.14). Along with the single cow and sheep, stands a bichrome (yellow and white) eland (A; Figure 5.14) and another bichrome (red and white) animal that cannot be positively identified (C; Figure 5.15). Two red human figures with bags attached to them and carrying sticks are also present in this panel and are facing the same direction as all four animals represented on the panel, this is to the left (D, E; Figure 5.14). There were no superpositions found in the sheep panel.

5.3.7. Site 4: Junction Shelter, Didima Gorge, Cathedral Peak State Forest

Junction Shelter is situated on the outer eastern slope of the Didima Gorge at 1666m asl. in the Cathedral Peak State Forest (Figure 5.15). The site was fully recorded by Pager (1971) during the late 1960’s as part of a larger rock art recording project for the entire Didima Gorge (Appendix C). It was further studied by King in 1998, with focus placed on the superpositioning of paintings found on a large fallen rock located on the left hand side of the site. Interpretations of certain sections of the site, including the painted sheep panel, was made by Blundell (2004) as part of his larger aim in identifying figures that he referred to as ‘spirits-of-the-dead’ in Drakensberg rock art. Challis (2005) also studied the ‘men with rhebuck heads’ situated to the right of the sheep panel at the site.

Pager (1971) recorded over 3909 paintings in the Didima Gorge, however today this area does not contain as many paintings as Pager’s original recording. The Gorge is known for the large amount of paintings of bees, bees-nests, beehives and ladders. The Zulu naming of the Gorge, Didima, means ‘reverberation’ or ‘upheaval’ (Mazel 2012). During storms, the gorge reverberates sound and Mazel (2012) suggests that it was an important place that produced varying types of sound for hunter-gatherers during the performance of trance dances. According to Mazel (2012), the acoustics in the gorge may have been one of the factors influencing the large number of paintings made in the area.
Figure 5.15. The location of Junction Shelter in the Didima Gorge, Cathedral Peak (A). The site overlooks the junction of the Ndedema and Mhlwazini Rivers (B).
Pager (1971) recorded 1143 paintings which are mostly executed in fine-line, although he also identified a few finger-style paintings from this site. During Pager’s (1971: 58) recording of the site in the late 1960s, he noted that the site had varying degrees of preservation with some images completely exfoliated off the rock surface and with others that were well preserved. In 2013, a different picture of the site was observed. The site is poorly preserved with a thick layer of hard dust covering the majority of paintings. The only well preserved paintings occur on the far left of the shelter nearby the sheep panel. As a result of the dust coverage, many of the paintings are no longer visible when compared to Pager’s (1971) original recordings (Figure 5.16 & Figure 5.17; Appendix C) (Figure 5.18 & Figure 5.19; Appendix C). Thus it was difficult to identify some of the images. For instance Pager (1971) recorded a few finger-style paintings and a painted swarm of bees and a honeycomb, these images could not be located on the rock face. Other imagery such as baboons and cattle were searched for over two days and were eventually found, largely covered by dust.

5.3.8. Junction Shelter sheep panel

Although Pager (1971) recorded over 40 sheep paintings at Junction Shelter (Figure 5.16 & Figure 5.17; Appendix C), only 14 were found in 2013 (Figure 5.18 & Figure 5.19).

All of the sheep that were identified are depicted in white and are fat-tailed. It is also the third instance in the research area that sheep are depicted with long pendulous ears (Figure 5.20). It appears that the majority of sheep imagery occurs on the right hand side of the panel. In Pager’s (1971) reproduction, there is a single white sheep depicted with two tails on the upper left side of the panel (E39 Figure 5.17; Appendix C). This could not be seen during 2013 recording at the site. A study of superpositioning on the panel revealed that two of the sheep (E9 & E10; Figure 5.17 & Figure 5.19) are superpositioned over two human figures (M; Figure 5.17 & Figure 5.19).
Figure 5.16. Pager's (1971) reproduction of the left hand side of the fat-tailed sheep panel. Sheep E1-E3 continue to the right hand side of this panel. Image courtesy of SARADA.
Figure 5.17. Pager’s (1971) reproduction of the right hand side of the fat-tailed sheep panel. Sheep continue from E4-E42. Image courtesy of SARADA.
Figure 5.18. Parts of the left hand side of Junction Shelter fat-tailed sheep panel that have been re-drawn in 2013. Many of the white images Pager (1971) (Figure 5.17) recorded on this side of the panel are no longer visible today. E1-E3 are remnants of white paint where sheep are located.
Figure 5.19. 2013 recording and re-drawing of the right hand side of Junction Shelter fat-tail sheep panel. Note that many of the paintings are no longer visible. For example the white baboon and possible sheep with two tails that were recorded by Pager (1971) (Figure 5.18).
All of the painted sheep appear to be moving towards the edge of the rock face, which is towards the right hand side of the panel. Only two sheep that are superimposed over human figures face the opposite direction. Ten sheep are depicted on the edge of the rock face (Figure 5.17), however only three of these were visible in 2013 (Figure 5.20).

**Figure 5.20.** Three sheep depicted at the edge of the right hand side of Junction Shelter fat-tailed sheep panel. These were some of the most clearly visible sheep at the site in 2013. Note the long pendulous ears, long fat tails and slender legs, as well as long, oval shaped bodies. All of these sheep are depicted in white paint.

Using Pager’s (1971) painted reproductions for the site was helpful in that some of the images that were found on the rock face could be compared to Pager’s reproductions. Other imagery that occurs alongside sheep on this panel include, white painted baboons, running human figures with bows, quivers and sticks, most of which are now no longer visible. A female figure, apparent by the identification of breasts, a digging stick and a child on the female figure’s back (K; Figure 5.16 & Figure 5.18) was identified at the site and this matched Pager’s reproduction of the figure. To the left of this and further above the female figure is another human figure with a white animal latching onto its legs (I; Figure 5.16). This animal-like figure has fingers and a fat tail and a large penis. A number of indeterminate animals were also recorded by Pager (1971) (Figure 5.17). The majority of the right section of the panel is painted in white whilst to the left, most
of the imagery is painted in deep maroon or red (Figure 5.16 & Figure 5.17; Appendix C).

5.3.9. Junction Shelter cattle panel

Located to the left of the sheep panel, but on a separate rock face, is a panel of cattle paintings (Figure 5.21). Cattle are depicted in mostly monochrome black, although close inspection of Pager’s (1971) reproductions show that some cattle in this panel were painted in a combination of white and grey. Their horns are depicted with a 180° perspective. These images seem to conform to Mazel’s (1982) original description for cattle paintings in the northern Drakensberg.

Figure 5.21. Photograph and re-drawing of cattle recorded from Junction Shelter in 2013.

5.3.10. Site 5: Battle Cave, Injasuthi Park

Battle Cave is situated around 600 m upstream from the junction of the Mbovaneni stream and Injasuthi River and at an altitude of 1672m asl. in the Injasuthi Park. It is the most southerly limit of sheep paintings recorded for the research area (Figure 5.1 & Figure 5.22). The site overlooks the Injasuthi River and surrounding area (Figure 5.22). The northern facing sandstone rock shelter is
the largest recorded of all five painted sites and contains over 1235 paintings. Between 1979 and 1981, Mazel (1981, 1982) recorded 7 finger smears at the site.

Because the site is extensively painted, I divided it into sections according to where the paintings occurred. These divisions for the site include: Upper section, Mid-section, Lower-section and Bottom-section (Figure 5.23 & Figure 5.24). Paintings also occur on fallen rocks in the shelter (Figure 5.23 & Figure 5.24).

5.3.11. Battle Cave sheep panel

Battle Cave’s sheep panel stretches approximately one metre in length in the lower section of the site and contains a single clearly identifiable fat-tailed sheep painting (A; Figure 5.25; Figure 5.26; Appendix C). The panel also contains a procession of 11 human figures, all facing right towards the painted sheep (D, E, F, I, J, K, L, M, N, O; Figure 5.25). On the right side of the panel, this procession has become severely obscured due to possible geological or weathering agents that make the rock appear as if it has been rubbed. Two of the human figures are depicted with ‘caps’ and have white dots along them (F, I; Figure 5.25 & Figure 5.27) and another two have white dots painted across their torsos (D, E; Figure 5.25 & Figure 5.27). All 11 figures are depicted with hook-heads.

A deep red (otherwise referred to as maroon) animal is superpositioned over two human figures (P, E, F; Figure 5.25 & Figure 5.27). This animal may possibly represent an antelope. All animals on this panel are facing the opposite direction to the procession of painted human figures.
Figure 5.22. The location of Battle Cave in the Injasuthi Park (A). This shelter overlooks the Injasuthi River (B).
Figure 5.23. Section drawing of the left hand site of Battle Cave shelter. P19-P39 represents the distribution of paintings at the site.
Figure 5.24. Section drawing of the right hand side of Battle Cave shelter. P1-P28 represents the distribution and location of paintings at the site.
Figure 5.25. Photograph and re-drawing of fat-tailed sheep panel from Battle Cave.
Figure 5.26. Photograph and re-drawing of fat-tailed sheep (A) and animal B at Battle Cave. The sheep (A) is marked with a chevron on its back, three circular designs on its neck, and one circular design around its eye. Animal B has been marked with a chevron on its hindquarters and a rectangular shape on its neck. Note the faint human figure (R) below the fat-tailed sheep. There are also two red faint lines by the animals’ noses.
Figure 5.27. Re-drawing of part of the procession from the painted fat-tailed sheep panel. Figure F has a cap with white dots whilst Figure D and E have white dots painted across parts of the body.

On the far right hand side of the panel is a depiction of a fat-tailed sheep (A; Figure 5.25 & Figure 5.26). This sheep has a fat tail and a floppy ear. Alongside the sheep, another animal (B; Figure 5.25 & Figure 5.26) has been depicted. This second animal may possibly represent another sheep. However it does not appear to have a long fat tail, although its body is long and oval and similar to that of the sheep. The image has sheep-like qualities in the tail however it could also represent a mixture between sheep-like features and other animal-like features.

Both animals (A, B; Figure 5.26) are superpositioned over very faded red paintings; however these faded images are difficult to elucidate. Beneath the fat-tailed sheep are a faint human figure and a single painted red line which is painted
just over the sheep’s nose (R; Figure 5.26). Animal B has a similar faint red line near the end of its nose (B; Figure 5.26).

The fat-tailed sheep is marked with a chevron design on its back as well as with three circular markings, two on its neck, and one around its eye (Figure 5.26). These markings are made in white paint against the pinkish colour of the rest of its body. Markings are also found on animal B, with a larger chevron design on its hindquarters as well as a rectangular design on its neck (Figure 5.26). No other painted markings were recorded on sheep paintings in the research area.

Other markings on animals at the site have been identified. Situated at the other end of the shelter are two bush pigs painted in white with red lines cutting diagonally across the neck, torso and mid-section, as well as the hindquarters (Figure 5.28). Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1992) identify these two figures as rhinoceros. It is possible that what may look like the horns of a rhinoceros are actually the tusks of a bush pig.

![Figure 5.28. Photograph and re-drawing of two bush pigs from Battle Cave. Note the red lines across parts of its face mid-section, legs and hindquarters. These paintings occur at the opposite end of the site from where the fat-tailed sheep image is found.](image)

5.4. *Discussion of all five painted sheep sites: some similarities and differences*

In this section, I discuss the following: the sites locations in relation to one another, their location at a micro-scale, the absence and presence of certain
imagery at each site and the number of sheep that have been depicted in this region.

5.4.1. The physical landscape and the sites:

All five sites are found clustered in the northern Drakensberg where it has been argued by Mazel (1982) that the distinct distribution of sheep between the north and south potentially provides evidence that the focus was on sheep in the northern Drakensberg and that these images are chronologically older than paintings in the southern Drakensberg. Cattle do occur in the research area, and are also recorded at the painted sheep sites Zunckel’s Cave and Junction Shelter. This confirms the distribution of both animals in this region.

The area between Royal Natal and Injasuthi is steep with few open ‘corridors’ or passes into Lesotho or further north. This contrasts with the central and southern Drakensberg where the mountainous terrain opens up to form natural corridors into other regions.

All sites are located near water and at relatively high altitudes. This would be expected since the majority of valleys in the Drakensberg are cut by rivers or streams and given that this is one of the higher altitudinal zones reaching at least 1900 metres above sea-level, the sites are not unusual for this region. The site Sigubudu 4, containing one painted sheep however is quite different to the other recorded sites. It lies low within the valley in close proximity to water. Apart from Sigubudu 4, the remaining four sites have a wide panoramic view of the surrounding areas. These sites, except for Junction Shelter and Battle Cave, are relatively small with only few paintings found in comparison to the larger sites in the research area.

5.4.2. The number of sheep and the types of sheep depicted:

All animals identified during field recording are clearly marked by their tails, and in some instances such as at Battle Cave and Junction Shelter, pendulous long
ears. Although all the sheep recorded at the five sites share these attributes, they are also quite distinct from one another.

At both Junction Shelter and Boschman’s Klip A, the sheep are found in large groups whilst only single sheep are represented at Sigubudu 4, Zunckel’s Cave and Battle Cave. Sigubudu 4, in Royal Natal National Park was the only site containing a thin-tailed sheep. It is however also likely that this sheep may possibly be a fat-tailed breed. All other images of sheep in the research area show distinctive fat-tails. Battle Cave’s sheep is particularly prominent in that the tail is proportionately larger in comparison to the rest of its body and it is marked around the neck, eye and back in white paint. This fat-tailed sheep image displays the only painted marking that was identified in the research area containing paintings of sheep. Zunckel’s Cave fat-tailed sheep is unique in that its hindquarters are sheep-like whilst its head and neck are almost feline-like.

5.4.3. Other findings

There is no evidence to suggest that other groups of people such as agro-pastoralists or possibly pastoralists were painted nor is there evidence of their material culture painted at the five painted sheep sites. This is interesting as another difference to other areas where livestock are depicted, for example, the Eastern Cape where cattle are found painted with shields, and sometimes with Bantu-speaking farmers. The absence of this type of evidence in the rock art of sheep in the northern Drakensberg may indicate that it was the sheep that the painters were interested in. It might also indicate that the sheep belonged to the painters. This is explored in Chapter 7.

5.5. Summary:

The sheep imagery that were recorded between 2012 and 2013 are rare in this region and their fragmentary state, makes this corpus of rock art a particularly challenging but interesting subject to explore. The other rock art found next to this
imagery may or may not reflect a similar time period for when sheep were painted. Evidence indicates that there is an absence of other groups, namely agro-pastoralists, in the panels depicting sheep.

In the following chapter I consider ways in which to approach this imagery, in order to better understand their possible meaning in this rock art.
Chapter 6: People encountering sheep on the prehistoric southern African landscape: theorizing human-animal relationships in the past.

6.1. Introduction

In this short chapter, I briefly introduce the concept of human-animal relationships and raise the questions it might usefully address in chapter 7. Human-animal theorizing has continually informed the way in which I have thought about sheep rock art, its meaning, and the impact that these animals and their keepers had on the San who painted sheep in the northern Drakensberg.

I started to explore how we go about understanding the types of relationships that occur between the San and other groups of people, namely agro-pastoralists and pastoralists, and also those between people and animals, both wild and domestic, in southern African archaeology, and found that the relationships between animals and humans are highly complex and that this complexity is not always addressed when approaching the arrival of livestock in southern African archaeology. This has led me to think of different ways to understand the relationships between the San and sheep as well as their keepers in the northern Drakensberg during prehistory. By re-orientating ourselves away from Western perspectives of viewing or engaging with animals (i.e. commercial farming, pets, zoos, game parks, pet stores) to considering the very different ways in which people in the past may have perceived and engaged with them, a different kind of picture emerges for understanding how the San may have responded to ‘new’ animals and their keepers, Khoe pastoralists or Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists in the northern Drakensberg, perhaps who were encountered for the first time.

The rock art of sheep is evidence that the painters were in some way connected with sheep. In this chapter I provide a theoretical background to the question I pose in Chapter 7: How and why did the painters of the northern uKhahlamba Drakensberg associate with sheep? And how can we get to an understanding of
their presence in the rock art? I draw on ideas around human-animal relationships to try to answer them.

6.2. Beyond subsistence: a consideration of the role of animals in San beliefs:

In southern Africa, animals have a big role in hunter-gatherer customs and beliefs. This is demonstrated through southern African hunter-gatherer ethnographies provided by contemporary San presently living in the Kalahari, Botswana; in hunter-gatherer paintings and engravings, and also in the faunal assemblages that they have been left behind (Vinnicombe 1976; Lewis-Williams & Biesele 1978; Lewis-Williams 1981; Guenther 1988; 1989; Mitchell 2002, 2008). Hunter-gatherers and animals shared in, and were intimately bonded in the landscape, and the narratives surrounding animals, particularly larger game animals such as the eland, blesbok, and hartebeest (Hollmann 2004), illustrate the pervasiveness of non-human animals in both cosmological and everyday practices in hunter-gatherer society. For example, Parkington (2003: 137) highlights the creation story of “people of the early race” in /Xam mythology which describes the first family and particularly a curious character, /Kaggen, a mantis, who is able to transform himself, and perform a number of magic tasks. Included in this story are a number of other persons/animals including the Mantis’s wife, the dassie, who, as Parkington (2003) suggests are difficult to identify as being human or non-human animal. These ambiguities between humans and animals are a common theme in the mythologies of numerous southern African San groups. They illustrate the complexity of San thought and worldview surrounding animals and people. Animals are clearly a central aspect in how San thought about their worlds in both the cosmological and ordinary everyday realms. So how would the San have been impacted by the sight of a never seen before animals and its keepers in prehistory?

Around 2000 years ago, domestic animals arrived on the southern African landscape along with new groups of people, including agro-pastoralists and pastoralists, who had their own worldviews as well social and economic practices surrounding the herd animals they owned. Little is known about how indigenous
hunter-gatherers responded to newly arrived animals on the landscape. How were these animals seen or thought of? Were these animals considered strange or familiar? And how were the people who may have been intimately connected with these animals viewed by indigenous hunter-gatherers?

In one of the few attempts to address these questions in southern African archaeology, Parkington et al. (1986: 324) consider the profound effect that the initial introduction of livestock and Khoe pastoralists to the Western Cape had on local hunter-gatherers at the time. They suggest that:

“The concept of ownership and the realization that domestic animals were relatively docile beasts which were ‘out of bounds’ must have seemed extremely disturbing to hunter-gatherers” (Parkington et al. 1986: 324).

I believe that the arrival of domestic livestock onto the southern African landscape would have had a profound impact on San groups and that the type of impact would have played out quite differently in the past. I also believe that it was not just the concept of ownership, although a highly important factor, that made these animals and their keepers different but that the San would have responded in a variety of ways when encountering these animals for the first time.

6.3. Approaching rock art from a human-animal perspective

I think that through the study of human-animal relationships, we can gain an alternative way of understanding the encounters between hunter-gatherers and sheep in the northern part of the uKhahlamba Drakensberg.

6.3.1. The study of human-animal relations

The study of human-animal relationships has been a part of both anthropological and archaeological inquiry. In East Africa, the earliest works on human-animal relations includes: Galaty (1977) who explored the centrality of cattle among the Maasai and how Maasai herders are able to distinguish their cattle through kinship and lineage; Evans-Prichard (1940, 1956) also explored the role of cattle among the Nuer; Deng (1998), who investigated the place of cattle and wild animals among the Dinka of Sudan; and Tomikawa (1972) who has concentrated on the
importance of cattle to the Datoga of East Africa and Schneider (1957) for Pokot cattle symbolism, to name but a few. These studies all illustrate the importance of animals, from a social perspective, within contemporary herding societies and the way in which human and animal lives are intertwined.

In Southern Africa, Guenther (1988, 1989), also highlights the centrality of human-animal relationships amongst contemporary indigenous San hunter-gatherers. Ingold’s (1980, 1984, 1994, 2000) work has contributed substantially to promoting a more social approach to understanding animals in archaeology. His (Ingold 1980) research amongst the northern Lapland hunter-gatherers and reindeer herders, shows the different ways in which hunter-gatherers view animals as compared to herders.

More recently, there has been resurgence in attempts to understand the types of relationships that occur between people and animals (Mullen 1999; Orton 2008, 2010; Insoll 2010; Oma & Hedeager 2010; Oma 2010; Fijn 2011; Taylor 2011; Taylor & Signal 2011; Balcombe 2011).

The study of human and non-human animal relations does not follow a particular model or theory. Instead multiple schools of thought have been used to understand people’s attitudes towards non-humans (Taylor 2011; Orton 2008). These schools of thought have developed across disciplines including anthropology, ethnology, sociology, veterinary sciences, and archaeology. The study of human-animal relations is a cross-disciplinary approach towards understanding the relationships between people and animals both in contemporary environments and past environments (Fijn 2011).

A common theme running throughout the different schools of thought is the question of conceptual boundaries or binarisms between nature: culture, human: animal, and wild: domestic. Mullen (1999) and Taylor (2011) suggest that by crossing these conceptual boundaries, new and innovative ways can be found to explore human-animal relationships. I believe that by investigating these boundaries we will gain new insight into the archaeological record by exploring peoples’ attitudes towards sheep during prehistory.
6.4. **Blurred boundaries between animals and people**

Taylor (2011) points out that the study of human-animal relationships requires scholars to question the Cartesian assumptions concerning the way in which the dichotomies between nature and culture, and human and animal, are viewed and understood. Taylor (2011) suggests a re-evaluation of the ways in which we think about animals, particularly in the assumption that humans are always considered the ‘subject’ within current thinking. He also argues that the belief in the importance of human ‘subjects’ over non-humans ‘objects’ results in entrenched anthropocentrism which often distorts our perceptions of non-humans. It is also likely that this anthropocentric bias affects the way in which we go about understanding groups of people who do not necessarily follow Western ways of thinking. Furthermore, Taylor (2011:3) suggests that the belief that social (culture) is entirely separate from the natural (nature) and that humans and animals are seen as set apart, is untenable and misleading when approaching human-animal relationships.

Tim Ingold (1980, 1984, 1994, 2000) has attempted to cross the conceptual boundaries between nature and culture. He argues that hunter-gatherers do not approach their environment as an alien world containing in-animate physical objects (nature including animals) as this is not how hunter-gatherers thought of or practiced being in the world. Instead, Ingold (2000) pursues a different direction in thinking about nature and culture by looking at the concept of being in the world and the ways in which hunter-gatherers are intimately and consistently engaging with their environment. Mullen (1999) further notes that among non-Western societies, nature as a category on its own is not perceived as opposite to society or culture. According to Mullen (1999: 202) boundaries between humans and animals are flexible and in some non-western societies, animals can be thought of as persons or as with tricksters, who are able to transform into either animal or person, a concept with which we are all familiar within southern African San ethnography.
In southern African rock art research, and particularly concerning images of therianthropic figures, Parkington (2003) has raised similar questions concerning the boundaries between nature/culture and animal versus human. Parkington (2003: 136) suggests that amongst the San, the boundaries between people and animals are always up for negotiation and such boundaries are a “fertile territory for cosmological thought.” Both Parkington (2003: 136) and Guenther (1999: 227) suggest that the southern African San appear tolerant to ambiguities between the identities of person and animal, and that these ambiguities are at the core of the southern African hunter-gatherers worldview. Parkington (2003) proposes that these types of boundaries, or rather the ambiguity found between boundaries, can potentially better explain some of the southern African rock art imagery.

This concept is not restricted to hunter-gatherers or to southern Africa. In an example amongst herding societies, Fijn (2011) critiques anthropocentric biases where scholars view the world of domesticated animals as being similar to objects and different to subjects (or persons). In her analysis conducted among Mongolian herders, Fijn (2011) argues that herders do not view their herd animals as objects or solely as economic items; rather, Mongolian herders have a different attitude towards their animals and in some cases animals may have their own individual personalities and social characteristics which Mongolian herders can identify. This is also the case amongst East African pastoralists (Wilson 1953; Gulliver & Gulliver 1953; Evans-Prichard 1953; Dyson-Hudson 1966; Tomikawa 1973; Barrett 1997; Deng 1998).

One of the major points in the field of human-animal relationships is the recognition that the boundaries between non-human/human and nature/culture can no longer be used as a way of viewing the world, present or past. The oversimplification of these boundaries hides a “much messier terrain of interconnected ‘things’”, between human-animal, nature-culture and wild-domestic (Taylor 2011: 5).

The boundaries between nature and culture, and human and non-human in Western thought does not necessarily apply to non-western ways of thinking nor does it necessarily apply to societies who lived in the past. This point is
particularly useful in how we think about and engage with the subject of peoples’ attitudes towards animals during prehistory on the southern African landscape. By breaking down these conceptual boundaries perhaps we can achieve a better understanding of the impact domestic animals may have had on the southern African landscape and the people who were living amongst these animals around 2000 years ago. By acknowledging how hunter-gatherers in the past viewed and engaged with their animals on the landscape, I propose that we could possibly find an alternative way of how they may have engaged with the arrival of sheep and people.

I consider the following questions as a way of thinking about the possible attitudes towards domestic animals and the relationships that may have taken place between humans and animals: Were hunter-gatherers attitudes towards domestic animals similar or different to their wild animals? How would they have been seen as similar or different? In addition to these questions, I also consider how hunter-gatherers may have responded to people connected with these animals. Were their attitudes towards these animals different or similar to how San saw these animals? These questions are addressed in chapter 7, where I discuss the meaning of sheep in the rock art of the northern Drakensberg.

6.5. A social approach towards animals

In archaeology as with many other disciplines, animals are seen either as providing subsistence, or as economic objects, or as symbolic objects (Orton 2008, 2010). The focus is predominantly set on the materialties of animals. Whilst these approaches to animals may be important in understanding certain aspects of society and their organisation around animals, it also runs the risk of treating animals as objects and not as subjects in their own right (Ray & Thomas 2003). A social approach to animals recognises that they play a highly active role in human societies and that, animals, far from being just material objects, are social beings and are part of the social landscape in which people also live.
Orton (2008) critiques archaeological approaches towards the study of human-animal relationships by focusing on how archaeologists attempt to understand animals within the archaeological record. He suggests that focusing exclusively on animals as products of economic importance severely neglects the role animals play within society. Likewise, the treatment of animals as only symbolic objects is also problematic in that it presupposes their separation into two different spheres, domestic and ritual (Orton 2008). By thinking of animals in this way not only are they objectified but also they lose their position as living beings, “their basic animality” (Orton 2008: 36). Crucially, many archaeological approaches towards the arrival of livestock and food production, the Neolithic, seem to assume a shift or change in how humans engage with non-humans and that once people begin to take up herding or other forms of food production, people are considered to act against ‘nature’ (Orton 2008). He proposes that in order to avoid this conceptual pitfall, we should consider how people engaged with animals outside the context of adopting a Neolithic way of life. By comparing these two aspects, we can possibly get a better and perhaps more nuanced understanding of peoples’ engagements and relationships with animals during the Neolithic period (Orton 2008). I consider Orton’s (2008) view particularly relevant when thinking about how researchers begin to approach hunter-gatherer’s responses and attitudes towards domestic livestock on the southern African landscape.

Another side of this spectrum of human-animal relationships is how we understand the possible similarities and differences in how people treat domestic versus wild animals, and connected to this, is how we view people who are associated with these different types of animals.

Based on his analysis of northern hunter-gatherers and reindeer herders, Ingold (1984, 2000) argues that the attitudes of two groups towards animals, wild and domestic, are different. Ingold (2000) suggests that hunters and their prey share in a reciprocal relationship whereby animals are willing to give themselves up to the hunter. According to Ingold (2000), the social processes of domestication of animals involve the domination, by herders, and by the subordination of animals.
Many scholars (Oma 2010, Fijn 2011) contest the type of relationship which Ingold (2000) suggests for herders and herd animals.

Contrary to Ingold, Fijn’s (2011) analysis of Mongolian herders and their relationship and attitude towards animals (mostly domesticated) demonstrates how animals are involved intimately with herders and vice versa. Through observation and participation among the herders, Fijn observes that both humans and animals develop an understanding for one another and that the relationship between herder and herd animal is reciprocal. Her analysis also illustrates the intimacy of non-humans and humans and that the behaviour of humans, as well as animals, has an impact on one another, in what Fijn refers to as a ‘co-domestic sphere’ (Fijn 2011: 36). In addition, Fijn (2011) points out Mongolian herders are not necessarily the same as other herders but share similarities with northern hunter-gatherers, particularly in their attitudes towards animals. Fijn (2011) suggests that it is misleading to consider herders under one category, separate from hunter-gatherers.

The study of human-animals relations not only allows us to explore aspects of human society but also encounters between humans and non-human animals.

In the next section I draw on southern African examples to explore how archaeologists have attempted to understand the types of relationships and engagements that may have emerged between indigenous hunter-gatherers and domesticated animals as well as animals that were already present in hunter-gatherer society. These studies are situated within different temporal and historical contexts.

6.6. Archaeological interpretations in southern Africa

The following examples illustrate the different ways in which southern African archaeologists have attempted to understand the types of relationships and associations made between indigenous hunter-gatherers and domesticated animals as well as animals that were already present in hunter-gatherer society. These studies are situated within different temporal and historical contexts.
6.6.1. Interpretation 1: Some domestic animals are seen as unimportant

In research conducted in the Western Cape, Anderson (1996) suggests that sheep were possibly considered unimportant to hunter-gatherers. Instead, He argues that paintings of sheep represent salient inter-group mediations by hunter-gatherers towards Khoe pastoralists. Drawing from the Bleek and Lloyd ethnography surrounding the /Xam Bushmen, Anderson (1996) notes that sheep were not mentioned as an important animal by the San and that sheep were probably considered as a low status animal. Similarly, Guenther (1986) suggests that goats, sheep, dogs and donkeys were not considered impressive animals by the San. Unlike cattle, these animals may possibly have been seen as second class citizens in San thought.

6.6.2. Interpretation 2: Wild and domestic animals have similar qualities

Lewis-Williams (1981) suggests that cattle and eland may have been seen as the same by south-eastern San communities and that some San transferred the metaphorical qualities of the eland, a ritually powerful animal in San cosmology, to cattle during a time of interaction between San and farmers in the southeastern mountains. Lewis-Williams (1981:106) notes that eland and cattle may have been considered by hunter-gatherers as being very similar in that both animals are robust in size, have similar spoor to the point that they are sometimes indistinguishable, that both cattle and eland have similar temperament, and lastly, that both animals meat have a similar taste.

Mitchell (2008) similarly suggests that for some San the domesticated dog could be identified more closely with the wild dog (as opposed to jackal), an animal that is genetically closely related to domesticated dogs. Looking at the behavioural traits of both animals, the domestic dog and wild dog, Mitchell (2008: 109) notes that these animals could be seen as equivalent to one another, particularly in that both share similar behavioural characteristics when hunting game. Unlike the associations made between cattle and eland (Lewis Williams 1981), Mitchell (2008: 110) notes that “the unimportance of dogs in /Xam mythology is paralleled
among other Bushman groups” and that they were possibly considered as a “second-class citizens” in San society (Guenther 1986: 227). However, drawing on aspects of rock paintings depicting dogs, Mitchell (2008) suggests that that the dog may have had a symbolic role in its ability to protect symbolically powerful animals, such as the eland, against bad shamans.

Both Lewis-Williams (1981, also Manhire et al. 1986; Campbell 1987; Ouzman 2003) and Mitchell (2008) believe that domestic and wild animals should not be considered as completely different. They suggest that the qualities and behaviour of wild animals could have been transferred to domestic animals by hunter-gatherers. Could sheep have been thought of as analogous to a wild animal in hunter-gatherer society?

6.6.3. Interpretation 3: Domestic animals as prestige items/objects

Campbell (1987) suggests that cattle became a marker of prestige in San shamans’ relations of production. Taken from a Marxist structuralist point of view, Campbell (1987) argues that rainmaking activities performed by San shamans for Nguni and Sotho farmers during the later part of the second millennium AD, allowed shamans to access social ranking and heightened prestige within their own communities. Campbell (1987) believes that cattle began to replace eland in the paintings of the southern eastern mountains during this time. Later, with the arrival of Europeans and the conflict that ensued amongst Nguni and Sotho farmers with hunter-gatherers, Campbell (1987) associates horses and cattle paintings within stock raiding scenes as shamans maintaining prestige and power within an historical context. The concept of prestige and paintings of sheep in the northern Drakensberg is explored further in Chapter 7.

6.6.4. Interpretation 4: Domestic animals seen as animals of the ordinary world and not private property.

Ouzman (2003) provides an alternative interpretation of how southern African hunter-gatherers might have viewed domestic animals in the context of stock raiding during historical times. Animals from the ordinary world were not
considered personal property but instead they were shared among people (Ouzman 2003:9). Ouzman (2003) suggests that cattle and sheep were most likely considered as animals of the ordinary world and that perhaps the act of stealing these animals by the San should be considered in light of how they saw animals of the everyday world, not as private property but as animals that could be shared among others.

6.6.5. Interpretation 5: hunters-with-sheep circa 2000 b.p.: sheep as a means of prestige

“As to why west coast hunter-gatherers of two millennia ago would have wanted to adopt sheep, the answer may have more to do with acquiring prestige than a new mode of subsistence” (Sadr 2004b:13).

Sadr (2004b) proposes that hunter-gatherers who adopted sheep in the Western Cape around the first millennium AD saw sheep as prestige items rather than a means of subsistence. Sadr (2004b) suggests this through the evidence of large quantities of sheep remains found on special location hilltop sites situated at Kasteelberg. In addition, Sadr (2004b: 12) associates these prestige items, sheep, to meat feasting among hunter-gatherers and that this was used as a means of gaining social rank within a transegalitarian community. This is discussed in context of how prestige might look in rock paintings in the northern Drakensberg.

6.6.6. Interpretation 6: hunter-gatherers were unlikely to have adopted sheep or a herding way of life: clients not herders

“…a new species of animal whose behaviour would have been unfamiliar.” (Smith, A. 2005b: 4)

Smith, A. (1998) believes that hunter-gatherers and herders have very different social, economic and ideological ways of viewing animals and that the barrier to transitioning from a hunter-gatherer way of life to a herding way of life would have been difficult to cross. He further argues that the social and symbolic relations towards animals, political alliances, and ownership of livestock would have little relevance to the ideology of hunter-gatherers. Smith, A. (1998: 60)
notes that the relationship between herder and his herd animals is regarded as essential. For Smith, A. (1998) this is not to suggest that this ideology is lost on hunter-gatherers but rather that it conflicts with the beliefs and organisation of hunter-gatherer communities. Smith, A. (1998: 62) points to the Zu/'hoasi of Nyae Nyae (eastern Bushmanland) who regard livestock as a source of food, although they do not see stock as wild animals, they allow these animals to be unattended. Smith, A. (1998) also suggests that the relationship between herders and hunters would have been unequal whereby hunter-gatherers would be mostly likely marginalised due to herders’ economic and corporeal organisation. Smith, A. (1998) argues that this would have been a likely scenario that may have played out in the Western Cape.

6. 7. Summary:

I suggest that by approaching ‘new’ iconography such as sheep using human-animal relations theory, perhaps a new understanding might be uncovered.

In the following chapter, I explore why sheep may have been painted by the San in the northern Drakensberg, and present some preliminary thoughts about their meaning. Here, I engage with the topic of human-animal relations to see whether this may help us better understand the impact these animals might have had on the San at the time they were being painted on the rock shelter walls.
Chapter 7: Exploring the meaning of sheep imagery in the rock art of the northern uKhahlamba-Drakensberg.

7.1. Introduction

Throughout this thesis I have wrestled with the fact that none of the sheep paintings recorded from the five painted rock shelters are dated. This makes them a particularly challenging piece of evidence to approach. I agree with Mazel (1982, pers. comm. 2013) and Manhire et al. (1986) that the northern Drakensberg sheep images are relatively old. This is because they do not occur with historical imagery as compared with imagery in the southern Drakensberg, nor is there any evidence in their application, as recorded between 2012 and 2013, that would suggest that they were made recently. This of course, remains open to debate and only once this rock art is dated we will know where sheep images fit in the temporal context of image making at the five sites and in the broader context of the history of the northern Drakensberg San rock art. The absence of secure dates, has led me to think about these images from a number of different perspectives that I suggest are useful to approaching this rock art.

To try to understand the meaning of sheep imagery, a number of questions are raised: How did the San associate with these animals and possibly their keepers? Was this rock art made by San herders and if so, would its meaning in the rock art be different than to, say, a hunter-gatherer rock art of sheep? Is there any evidence from the sheep paintings themselves, such as their colour or mannerisms that might provide clues to their symbolism?

The aim of this chapter is to explore these questions by building on evidence presented in the previous chapters, and to present some preliminary thoughts on the meaning of this imagery in the rock art of the northern Drakensberg region.

Here, I will draw on previous interpretations given for sheep in southern African archaeology. The first interpretation and most widely quoted, is that the large quantity of fat in the sheep’s tail was associated with potency in San rock art.
(Lewis-Williams 1981; Huffman 1983; Van der Merwe 1990; Hollmann 1993; Eastwood & Fish 1996; Hall & Smith, B. 2000; Eastwood & Smith, B. 2005; Eastwood & Eastwood 2006; Bassett et al. 2008). The second interpretation I investigate is that of sheep as prestige items (for sheep, Sadr 2004b; and for cattle, Campbell 1986, 1987; Dowson 1994, 1998). If sheep are seen as prestige ‘items’ by their painters, then, is their painting a socio-economic and political statement about the relations between the people who raised them and by those who were painting them? This also raises the question of the authorship of the rock art which will be discussed further in this chapter.

This provides a starting point from which I further explore the rock art of sheep through the perspective of human-animal theorizing, an approach that recognises the differences and similarities in the social behaviours and attitudes expressed towards animals, both wild and domestic, by different groups of pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and hunter-gatherers. I draw on a range of ethnographies including nineteenth century Bleek and Lloyd /Xam ethnography, and twentieth century Kalahari San ethnographies (Marshall 1976, 1999; Guenther 1975, 1988, 1989, Biesele et al. 1986, Biesele 1992), southern Bantu-speaker ethnographies and East and southern African pastoralist ethnographies, to explore these relationships between people and their animals.

I begin this chapter with my thoughts on the chronology and authorship of sheep paintings. I appreciate that this section and others provide working hypotheses about the rock art and that they come with a degree of uncertainty. Despite this I believe that the suggestions given here are thought provoking and that the arguments that I develop have merit in the questions they raise about the presence of sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg.

7.2. The timing and authorship of sheep in the rock art

7.2.1. Evidence from the archaeology of the northern Drakensberg

The review of the archaeological evidence in this area and its plotting on the landscape, as presented in Chapter 4, is useful as one piece of evidence to use in trying to understand the timing of the sheep rock art. It provides a picture of the
changing distribution of different types of archaeological evidence on the landscape. In particular the location of painted sheep sites is compared to other types of evidence. Here, the assumption made is that the closer together the different types of archaeological evidence, the stronger the impact and influence they might have had on each other (and this, of course, is debatable too). I will refer to these strands of evidence, as I build an argument for when the sheep were most likely to have been painted.

Mazel (1989a) demonstrates that there is an occupational hiatus in the northern Drakensberg between around 1600 and 600 b.p. (Table 4.3 pg 70). The hiatus is clear in a comparison of Figures 4.1 to 4.3 (pg 70).

The hiatus is useful as it provides two pockets of time in which the paintings of sheep were made, either prior to 1600 b.p. (but after 2000 b.p.) or after 600 b.p..

The evidence from the excavation of dated sheep remains provides the most support for 600 b.p. up until the colonial period for sheep image making. In Figures 2.3 and 4.3 (pg 38 & pg 72), re-inserted below for ease of reference (Figure 7.1), the location of hunter-gatherer sites with dated sheep remains, are more recent and are in close proximity to later farmer sites and to the painted sheep shelters.

This would correlate with the return of hunter-gatherers to the northern Drakensberg, and this too is correlated with the settlement, in the vicinity, of later agro-pastoralists. In this scenario it would seem most likely that the sheep that are being painted are those belonging to Bantu-speakers, and there is nothing in the archaeological evidence to suggest that the San are herding their own livestock full-time. Therefore this would be San hunter-gatherers painting Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralist’s sheep.
Figure 7.1. Showing the dated sheep remains from 600 b.p. corresponding with the arrival of later agro-pastoralists into the area (A). Showing the relationship of later agro-pastoralist sites with hunter-gatherer sites dated within a similar time bracket (B). This supports a San hunter-gatherer authorship of Bantu-speaker sheep.
I believe, however, that it is also possible that these sheep paintings are older, falling within the period from 2000 to 1600 years ago. There is no archaeological evidence for sheep remains for this period. However, the earliest dated sheep remains, that do date to around 1600 b.p., are found far away from the painted sheep shelters. This is clearly demonstrated in Figure 2.1 (pg 37), which plots the distribution of the earliest dated sheep remains, from early farmer sites, and the location of the painted sheep sites. I re-insert this figure into the text below for ease of reference (Figure 7.2). Once again this may provide clues to the authorship and ownership of the sheep and their paintings.

**Figure 7.2.** The earliest dated sheep remains which are found in early farmer sites far from the painted sheep sites, suggests that the sheep painted during this time period may, then, not have been Bantu-speaker sheep.
Because of their distance from Bantu-speaker sites, it is possible that it was not Bantu-speaker sheep that were painted. Instead the sheep painted at this time may belong to Khoe pastoralists or San herders who had acquired stock from Khoe pastoralists or by exchange with other San groups. Other strands of evidence can be built up in support of this argument. This date range, as suggested by Mazel (1992b, 2009b, 2013) would correspond with the emergence of shaded polychrome paintings at circa 2000 b.p., the arrival of thin-walled pottery, and might be connected to the presence of Khoe pastoralists making finger-paintings in this area. The location of thin-walled pottery that is dated to approximately 2000 b.p. is in close proximity to the painted sheep shelters (Figure 4.10, pg 83, re-inserted in Figure 7.3. for ease of reference).

**Figure 7.3.** Support for a 2000 to 1600 b.p. timing of sheep paintings which are found in close correlation between the location of painted sheep sites and sites containing thin-walled pottery.
Finger painted sites and painted sheep sites are also found close together. Figure 4.11 (pg 87) shows the overlap in distribution in the northern Drakensberg. The Figure (7.4.) is produced here for ease of reference.

**Figure 7.4.** Support of an older San hunter-gatherer authorship of Khoe owned sheep is found in the overlapping distribution of sheep and finger painted sites.

Finger paintings have been dated to approximately 1800 b.p. in this area (Mazel 2013). This is another strand of evidence that can be used to argue for the greater antiquity of sheep paintings. This also supports the hypothesis that Khoe pastoralists were in the area and that San hunter-gatherers might have been painting their sheep.
7.2.2. White paintings and the age of rock art.

Sixteen sheep (recorded in 2012 and 2013) are depicted in white paint with an additional single white painted (possible) thin-tailed, sheep. These occur at sites; Sigubudu 4 (thin-tailed sheep or possible fat-tailed?), Zunckel’s Cave, and at Junction Shelter. At Battle Cave, the single depiction of a fat-tailed sheep appears in pinkish-red and white. At Boschman’s Klip A, in the central part of the research area, 32 fat-tailed sheep are depicted in the colours of red and dark-brown, with no white (Figure 5.9 pg 121 & Figure 5.10 pg 122).

Although, there are fewer sheep depicted in white paint today, this contrasts with their numbers over 40 years ago when Pager, in the late 1960s, recorded over 40 images of white fat-tailed sheep at the site, Junction Shelter. Upon counting these images from Pager’s (1971) original reproduction, I found that there were more than 40 sheep depicted in this panel and possibly close to 45, although some of the images that appear to be sheep-like may not be sheep at all. The small remnants of white paint that mark where sheep imagery used to be placed reflect the fragmentary nature of evidence in rock art. As suggested in Chapter 1, the appearance of white paint may suggest that the paintings are not old, as its poor rate of preservation may indicate that when white paintings do occur, they may be seen as being made relatively recently (Pearce 2006; Blundell 2004; Mallen 2008). However, following others (Mazel 2009b; Ward & Maggs 1994), I do not believe that this is a reliable chronological indicator for their age in the rock art. One of the factors that might contribute to its presence or absence in the rock art is the varying degrees of deterioration over time and at different sites. An example of this may be taken from the site Sigubudu 4 in Royal Natal National Park where, although situated very close to running water (Sigubudu River), the site is sheltered deep within the valley and where the single white sheep image is preserved well. This contrasts to the poorly preserved site, Junction Shelter, where images have exfoliated off the rock face and thick layers of dust have accumulated over the images. The images at this shelter are far more exposed to surrounding elements than at the site Sigubudu 4.
However, all things being equal, white paint does fade faster than other paint pigments (e.g. hook heads demonstrate this in the rock art) and it is for this reason that it is possible to suggest that perhaps more white images of sheep were made in the past, but are no longer visible today. This should be taken into account when dealing with the fragmentary nature of archaeological evidence.

7.2.3. Evidence drawing on patterns in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist rock art in South and East Africa that supports a hunter-gatherer authorship to sheep paintings.

Rock art studies in other parts of South Africa and in East Africa show an interesting pattern; that rock art made by pastoralists (whose lives are centred around their livestock irrespective of the subsistence mode (Robertshaw & Collett 1983) never, or very rarely contain rock art depicting domestic stock. For example, in the Northern Province of South Africa where Khoe pastoralist rock art occurs, Eastwood and Eastwood (2006: 61) note that the majority of representational imagery consists mainly of aprons with only ‘a mere handful of animals and people’. Eastwood and Smith, B. (2005: 68-69) identify only one domestic cow of a Khoe pastoralist style, in the Central Limpopo Basin out of a total of 1061 paintings recorded. This image occurs in red paint which is identified as an earlier colour used in Khoe rock art (Eastwood & Smith, B. 2005; Eastwood & Eastwood 2006). Interestingly, no paintings of sheep in this style have been mentioned by Eastwood and Smith, B. (2005) for this region.

The Northern Province is argued to be one of the areas where the earliest Khoe rock art is found (Smith, B. & Ouzman 2004). Whilst Eastwood and Smith, B. (2005) identify that paintings of livestock are rare in the rock art of the region, little is known of whether this holds true of the other regions. In the northern Drakensberg, the majority of finger paintings which may have a pastoralist origin do not contain depictions of domestic animals.

Amongst agro-pastoralists, we find that animals are painted more frequently than in a pastoralist rock art (Prins & Hall 1994; Maggs & Ward 1995; Smith, B, 1997; Namono & Eastwood 2005; Smith, B. 2006). Although, I suggest that this is still
in much smaller numbers than the San rock art of animals. Prins and Hall (1994) also note the rarity of animals and people in this rock art that it does not conform to a hunter-gatherer rock art tradition.

In East Africa too, we find a similar pattern, pastoralists rock art is dominated by geometric imagery (for Maasai, Gramly 1975; Samburu, Chamberlain 2006; Turkana and other Nilotic speakers, Russell & Kiura 2011, Russell 2013; regional geometric rock art, Mguni & Smith, B. 2004) and human imagery (for Samburu, Chamberlain 2006), that may show human figures mimicking their cattle in dance (for Dinka and other Nilotic speakers; Russell 2013) and there are very few depictions of the actual livestock. So when depictions of domestic stock are found, it could be argued, that their authorship is hunter-gatherer as their rock art is ungulate dominated.

In summary, I believe that the evidence is pointing towards an older San authorship of sheep imagery and that they may have been reacting to an encounter with Khoe sheep-keepers. Human-animal theory has influenced the way I have thought about the initial encounter. I will build an argument throughout this chapter that it was the novelty of the animal and its special qualities that made them especially interesting to the San artists. In section 7.4 of this chapter Sadr’s (2004b) hypothesis of sheep as prestige items is explored as this too contributes to understanding whether the authors of the sheep paintings were San hunter-gatherers or San herders.

7.3. Considering the initial encounters and the reason that San would have painted sheep.

Fahlander (2007: 16) suggests that a social encounter with a previously unfamiliar item, artefact, or animal may have as profound an impact as an encounter or meeting between individuals with different ideologies and practices. In this section, I draw from Fahlander’s (2007:16) comment, and explore why the San would have been interested in painting sheep in the northern Drakensberg. I believe the sheep tail, the colour of the sheep, their branding, their similarity to
wild animals, and their control by pastoralists all made them seem special and powerful to the San.

7.3.1. The sheep tail.

In documenting the use of fat amongst Khoe-speaking Nama, a group of pastoralists presently occupying parts of the Northern Cape, Webley and Brink (2006/2007) observed that boiling the fat from the tail of a sheep renders it and produces a thick liquid, often used and stored in pots. According to Schapera (1930: 298), amongst the historic Cape Khoe, it was sheep that were most sought after, the tail was a particularly relished part of the animal.

The tail of the fat-tailed sheep most likely consisted of a different kind or quality of fat to that of wild animals. This is because accounts suggest that the boiling of the fat from a sheep’s tail will alter its state, and will produce a liquid substance similar to a vegetable oil that does not revert back to its original state (Rudner 1968; Blackburn 1971; Galaty 1977; Kratz 1988; Clutton-Brock 1994/1995; Webley & Brink 2006/2007; Russell pers.comm. 2011 & 2013). This liquid fat can be stored up to one month (Webley & Brink 2006/2007: 21). I have not come across an account in ethnographies which make reference to a similar rendering of fat that produces a liquid-like substance made from wild animals. Although, many /Xam and contemporary !Kung speak of ‘drinking’ fat (Marshall 1976; Biesele 1978; Lewis-Williams 1981). I suggest that this type of fat may have been particularly interesting to the San as it was not just any type of fat. I do therefore agree with Huffman’s (1983:51) earlier suggestion that sheep fat was particularly potent to the San. I think that the quantity as well as the quality of fat found in fat-tailed sheep may have been one of the reasons why San painted them, and that in some way the San must have felt that these animals were powerful.

Of the sheep recorded from the five painted sheep sites, 48 images depict fat-tailed sheep. In particular, at Battle Cave, a single sheep has been depicted with a tail that is very large in proportion to the rest of its body (Figure 5.26. pg 142; Appendix C). This suggests that the artist was drawing attention to the tail. At the
site Sigubudu 4, there is a single image of a thin-tailed sheep; interestingly, here, the tails is not emphasised (Figure 5.6. pg 117). Note, however, that fat-tailed breeds, such as the Afrikaner ram, can appear to have thin rather than fat tails (Almeida 2011, Fig. 1), and so the possibility remains that this is in fact a fat-tailed breed of sheep. At any rate, in the majority of cases, fat-tailed sheep seem to have been the focus for San in this region.

Fat is widely used amongst numerous hunting and gathering groups, although it is also a relatively scarce product (Blackburn 1971; Marshall 1976; Biesele 1978, 1993; Lewis-Williams 1981; Kratz 1988; Hayden 1990). For instance, amongst the Nharo !Kung of the Ghanzi, Botswana, fat is scarce because meat obtained by hunting only constitutes one quarter of the overall diet and this meat is low in fat (Guenther 1989: 15). For the Okiek, who are East African hunter-gatherers, fat is also scarce. When it is acquired, it is used in blessings during transitions in lifecycles such as initiation or marriage (Kratz 1988). Amongst the Okiek, the birth of a baby calls for the slaughter of a sheep so that the mother may drink the fat (Kratz 1998: 240). Fat, among these groups almost always involves women’s ceremonies and sheep are most commonly the choice of animal (ibid).

Lewis-Williams (1981) draws similarities between the fatness of an eland and the fatness of San women from /Xam mythology. He suggests that the eating or drinking of fat may have connotations of sexual intercourse and that the contemporary !Kung believed that fat and sex were linked (Lewis-Williams 1981: 48, Biesele 1993). Fat also relates to a constant state of balance not just among females, but also for the entire group, specifically concerning harmony in food supply and in rain (Lewis-Williams 1981: 50).

7.3.2. The colour of sheep and its symbolism.

Hardly any wild animals in the wild have white hides. Therefore, it is not hard to imagine that the San encountering white sheep for the first time would have had a special interest in them. However, we also know that these sheep were not, in reality, white but a mixture of colours (Epstein 1971; Clutton-Brock 1994/1995; Du Toit 2007a, Lundie 2007), but the San chose to paint most of them in white in
the northern Drakensberg. When they are depicted in other colours, it is only red/brownish ochre that is used. Here, I consider the significance of this. This may also provide possible clues to their meaning.

White is often associated with power in San thought. As Hollmann (2004: 91) writes:

“White is the scarcest of the [colour] variations-perhaps its rarity and the fact that this colour is associated with much !gi: (supernatural power) made the white springbok a special creature”.

There are three different colour variations that distinguish antelope according to the /Xam. In 1875, Lloyd recorded from Dia!Kwain, that in earlier times (Primal Time) (Guenther 1988), the trickster /Kaggen fed various antelope the products made by bees. “Little bees which when chewed are white like milk” (LV.3:4071-4074), this would have made some of the animals who ate this white substance appears white in colour. The springbok is both red and white because it was fed by /Kaggen the liquid of white bees and of the red cells in which young bees are found.

Analogies between white can be drawn when one looks at the colour that is associated with fat. As mentioned previously, the rendering of fat from the fat-tailed sheep often appears as liquid-like substance that is whitish in colour (Webley & Brink 2006/2007). Among the Maasai (Maa-speaking pastoralists) in East Africa, sheep fat is associated with the colour white (Galaty 1977), so too amongst the Okiek (East African hunter-gatherer group), where white and fat are seen as analogous (Kratz 1988).

Amongst the /Xam, the colour white is often involved when speaking about fat. In 1874, Bleek (B.XXXVI:2473-2486) recorded a story by San informant, Dia!kwain, of the Bushman woman who sent out crows in search of their husbands who had not returned from hunting; they proceeded to hang fat around the crow’s neck on its journey to locate the men. The fat that was hung around the necks of these animals is the reason why they have a white colouration around their necks or breasts.
The fat of an eland is also associated with the colour white. In an account provided by //Kabbo (B.XXIV:2251-2255; Hollmann 2004: 348), the eland’s fat lumps are seen white as it hangs on the krieboom. In another story linking fat and the colour white, Lewis-Williams (1981: 48-50) makes reference to an account made by /Han#Kassõ (L.VIII.9.6786-6857), about a girl named #Nüituru whose face was beautifully white and when the men returned from hunting, they were so encapsulated by her beauty that they gave her the breast of a springbok which is noted for its fat.

The sheep first encountered showed abundance in two qualities that were scarcities but also things of potency in San worldview, namely fat and the colour white. Here was an animal that encapsulates both qualities.

As mentioned earlier, not all fat-tailed sheep were painted in white. Instead red and dark-brown were used to depict 32 fat-tailed sheep at Boschman’s Klip A. What is the colour symbolism of this? If white relates to the colour of fat, then why are sheep depicted in red? In reviewing these colour variations through the ethnography of /Xam and its use in rock art especially for the eland, a few clues are available that might explain why sheep were also painted in the colour red. Lewis-Williams and Biesele (1978:121) write:

“Red is the colour most highly esteemed by both !Kung and /Xam. !Kung informants explained ‘red things are beautiful things’. The word /'hum translated here as ‘beautiful’, also has connotations of goodness”.

It is possible that sheep, with their high quantity and quality of fat, may have been seen as ‘things’ of goodness. Fat is sweet, and relates to all things that are good (Galaty 1977; Lewis-Williams 1981; Kratz 1988).

7.3.3. The ability to ‘control’ animals

In this section I explore whether the San would have seen the herding of sheep as similar to their own beliefs about their ability to ‘control’ or to ‘influence’ the movement of their own animals. I also raise the possibility that this too, would have made the sheep a special animal to the San. It could be that the ability of herders to control their animals on the landscape might have been seen as highly
powerful to San hunter-gatherers who encountered these groups. The San may possibly have seen the sheep keepers as powerful too.

Ingold (1994, 2000) argues that attitudes towards animals are different, where he suggests that hunter-gatherers share in a reciprocal relationship with the animals they hunt, whilst groups such as pastoralists or agro-pastoralists characterise their relationship with animals as one of domination and control. Smith, A. (1998) has taken this argument to argue that the transition between San hunting and gathering mode of production to one orientated around the keeping of domestic livestock would have been a dramatic shift that not easily could be done. Here, I highlight how the San were already familiar with the idea of the controlling of certain animals. This idea, however, may have also played out quite differently in practice. It is by looking at this, that I suggest the arrival of keepers onto the landscape would have had an impact on how San saw them, as possibly the controllers of animals, and that this may have been considered particularly powerful.

Lewis-Williams (1980, 1981, 1988) highlights the ability of certain San shamans to ‘control’ the success in hunting game. The /Xam term /ki may mean the ability to control or possess a source of potency (Lewis-Williams 1980:8). Shamans were thus capable to possess potency of a certain animal which they could draw upon to control the whereabouts and movement of an animal (ibid). An example of this ability to ‘control’ the movement of food animals in /Xam mythology concerns people with springbok caps. In an account given by Dia!Kwain, the springbok sorceress, Tänô-/Khaukö, was believed to be able to control the behaviour of springbok (Hollmann 2004: 275). Dia!Kwain tells the story:

“... the old women said, keep it and see whether the springbok do not follow the cap to the place to which it goes. You must go and stay at your home where you usually walk about, you must look whether one springbok will not appear; you will see it where you are walking about; you must keep on looking, for you say, I must let the springbok travel, you believe that I really own springbok, that I am a springbok’s sorceress”...”and mamma spoke, she said to her about it she should not speak thus; for; she [sorceress] should now think that mamma had little children; they were those of whom she [sorceress] must therefore think; that she
should therefore allow that the springbok should travel for the children that the children might get food from mamma (vie sheep or goats) or (vee cattle); therefore, she wished that she would therefore think that springbok were those which mamma was used to eat; mamma did not possess things which mamma was used to kill, feeding herself with them. For, these springbok, they were those of which mamma made her flocks”


This account speaks of the ways in which shamans were able to possess the potency of animals in order to ‘control’ where they moved. Both Lewis-Williams (1980; 1988) and Challis (2005) suggest that rhebuck headed figures depicted in the rock art of the southeastern mountains, may have had a similar metaphorical meaning. However, Challis (2005: 18) argues that instead of the term to ‘control’ the movement of animals, the term ‘to influence’ may be a better fit for men with rhebuck caps who may ‘influence’ the game.

7.3.4. Sheep sharing similar characteristics with wild animals.

It is argued that cattle may have symbolically replaced the eland in rock art production and that similarities between their size and spoor would suggest that the San saw them as quite similar animals (Lewis-Williams 1981). It is possible that sheep may have been seen as similar to another animal, with which the San were already familiar. Thus, perhaps sheep although ‘strange’ were also slightly ‘familiar’ to the San.

In the paintings of sheep in the northern Drakensberg, they are depicted according to conventions similar to those used to depict the smaller buck, and similar to perhaps a rhebuck or impala (Figure 2.7. pg 43).

7.3.5. Brand marks on animals.

Branding is commonly practised amongst East African pastoralists (Figure 7.5). These geometric marks, which can be quite elaborate, are not marks of ownership; they carry with them a wide number of symbolic meanings such as clan membership, lineage, and god (Tomikawa 1972; Barrett 1997; Deng 1998; Chamberlain 2006; Russell 2013). Here, I raise the possibility that Khoe
pastoralists also branded their stock and this is something that the San would have seen and reacted to during their first encounters with them.

Brands on the skin of livestock in geometric forms may have seemed particularly potent to the San who encountered them. These geometric marks made on animals may have been seen by the San as being very similar to the geometric images they paint on the walls as well as those images experienced during trance performance, otherwise referred to as ‘entoptics’ (Lewis-Williams 1985; Lewis-Williams & Dowson 1988:213). Could it be that the San saw the ‘entoptics’ on sheep and this made them triply potent, i.e. white hides, huge fat laden tails, and covered in ‘entoptics’?

Figure 7.5. Brand marks made on a goat by a Turkana pastoralist. Photograph taken by Russell in 2011.
In southern Africa, there is little known of the practice of branding livestock and whether it took place amongst early agro-pastoralist or pastoralists groups in the past. There is little historical reference to this. Some evidence does indicate that at least among some historic Cape Khoe, markings were made on cattle. Schultze mentions that “cattle are marked in special ways, by cutting, perforating, and lopping the ears” (Schapera 1930: 293). Figure 7.6. shows this type of alteration on the ear of a fat-tailed sheep from East Africa. Schultze, however, does not describe whether these marks were made on other parts of the body besides the ears of cattle, or whether or not there was a specific mark made by each owner. This type of image making would not be visible in the archaeology today.

Figure 7.6. Fat-tailed sheep with brand marks on its ears in the form of cutting and notching the skin. Photograph taken by Russell 2011.
7.3.6. Khoe pastoralists marking ‘the veil’ with entoptic like imagery.

Mazel (2009b, 2013, pers.comm. 2013) speculates about the possibility that Khoe pastoralists in the northern Drakensberg made finger-smears, handprints, and some geometrics in some of the rock shelters in this region (Figure 3.3b. pg 51). Mazel (2013) argues that the paintings are unlikely to have been made by the San. Earlier, Pager (1971) also suggested that this rock art does not fit with a hunter-gatherer rock art tradition in the northern Drakensberg.

Smith, B. and Ouzman (2004) distinguish a Khoe pastoralist geometric rock art that comprises geometric paintings formerly associated with the San and interpreted as entoptic imagery. They also suggest that there is a small overlap between geometrics painted by pastoralists and those that are painted as entoptics by the San, although Khoe geometrics are not integrated with representational imagery as is found in San rock art (ibid). Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1988, 1990) also note that handprints and smears were a means of tapping into the supernatural potency of the rock face.

Thus, if this rock art were made by the Khoe, it might have been seen by the San as similar to harnessing potency from the rock interface or through entoptics during trance by San shaman. This perception might have added to the ways in which San responded to these groups on the landscape; perhaps they were regarded as being especially powerful.

7.4. Sheep as prestige items

Sadr (2004b) suggests that sheep herding was adopted by San hunter-gatherers who then became herders and used the sheep as prestige items in gift giving. I explore this proposition in terms of what we know of San ethnography and how this might present itself in rock art.

It is frequently suggested that domestic animals were a form of prestige amongst different groups (Campbell 1986, 1987; Dowson 1994, 1998; Hayden 1990, 2001; 2002; Weissner 2001; Sadr 2004b). Here, I review the definition and the context
of this notion to see whether or not sheep were painted for this reason in the northern Drakensberg. As briefly highlighted in chapter 4 and in chapter 5, it is possible that the sheep in the paintings of the northern Drakensberg may have also been kept by the painters. I explore this idea by looking at the rock art and in view of the ways that scholars have defined the concept of prestige.

7.4.1. What is a prestige item?

I investigate two areas in which the study of prestige takes place 1) through meat-feasting (Hayden 1990, 1998, 2001, 2002; Dietler 2001; Weissner 2001; Sadr 2004b) and 2) through social relations and social status in rock art production (Campbell 1986, 1987; Dowson 1994; 1998).

Hayden (1998: 2) suggests that prestige items are those which display wealth, success, and power, and are used to appeal to others in a variety of ways, but most importantly they display economic, aesthetic, technical or other labour intensive skills. In transegalitarian societies, where there are social and socio-economic hierarchies and displays of private ownership, prestige items reflect wealth and power, with a special investment made in their production (ibid: 13). Generally such items have been acquired through long distance, regional exchange (Hayden 1990:44). These items are status objects and set a competitive edge in society (Hayden 1990: 4). This definition, it seems, also agrees with how Campbell (1987) and Dowson (1998) approach the concept of prestige amongst San shamans in the southeastern mountains of southern Africa.

According to Hayden (1990: 41) domestic animals were more than just meat as they were more likely to be eaten on special ritual occasions. The value in raising domestic animals resided in rearing animals with an unusual high fat content, a very special kind of substance esteemed by almost all hunter-gatherers (Hayden 1990: 41). For Hayden (1990: 59), the fatness of domestic animals is one of the most important characteristics in their use as an item of prestige. In meat-feasting contexts, animals with high quantities of fat enhance the status of an individual or groups holding this ritual. This occurs in both transegalitarian and egalitarian
groups (Hayden 1990: 38-41). It could be that sheep would have at some time been considered by the San as highly esteemed fat ‘items’. Sadr (2004b) has suggested this for the occupants which he interprets as being San herders, at the first millennium AD site, Kasteelberg, in the southwestern Cape.

7.4.2. In what context is something or someone considered prestigious?

Hayden (1990, 2001) places prestige items and their contexts in the ritual of meat-feasting in the socio-economic sphere, where he emphasises economic and political power relations that play out between individuals and groups during feasts. He sets this context mainly amongst transegalitarian groups or complex groups (including some hunter-gatherers, pastoral/agricultural minded people), where he argues that prestige was mostly economic and political in orientation. Examples of this include the Enga of the New Guinea Highlands (Meggit 1977; Weissner 2001) where ‘Big men’ accumulated wealth, prestige and status through establishing bonds or credits in the form of pigs, based on kinship ties, and through long-distance ties with other groups, in what Wiessner (2001: 122) refers to as “chains of finance”. Ritual feasts held by Big Men enabled them to accrue partners through credit (pigs), and power through prestige (ibid).

Amongst the Lou, a Nilotic speaking agricultural group of western Kenya, feasts are held at important events such as funerals (Dietler 2001). The death of an individual is marked by the consumption of large quantities of beef and beer and is accompanied by dances and the parading of cattle (Dietler 2001: 96). According to Dietler (2001: 76) this form of feasting, which he terms “empowering feasting”, involves the “manipulation of commensal hospitality toward the acquisition and maintenance of certain forms of symbolic capital and sometimes economic capital as well.”

In terms of San ritual healers, Guenther (1975, 1986) notes that among the Nharo who have become farm labourers in the Ghanzi area of present day Botswana, the movement of shamans from farm to farm to perform rituals has led to their increased possession of ritual potency, and thus their accumulated prestige as ritual specialists. This has political and economic implications too with the
ownership of small herds of cattle gained in exchange for ritual services (Dowson 1998: 337). According to Dowson (1998: 337), San shamans in the southeastern mountains were paid for their rain-making services by their neighbours, Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists, in the form of cattle. Through this they acquired a new status as the “procurers of meat” and as the people who had the power to distribute it among members of the group. Thus, he suggests, paintings of pre-eminent figures and domestic animals in the rock art may suggest that these paintings highlighted the prestige of the shaman. Domestic animals here are considered to be a reflection of this prestige, as they are associated with the procurer (San shaman) of meat. The shaman accrues political, economic and ritual status by being the provider and distributor of meat for other band members (ibid).

7.4.3. San hunter-gatherers painting sheep as prestige?

Prestige items, as status objects that reflect power and wealth, do not really fit with what we currently understand about how San viewed their wild animals and their relationship with them in the past and there is no reason to believe they would have treated domestic animals any differently. Although, a different picture does emerge when we explore later 19th century and twentieth century contexts, where there is a plethora of research that suggests San did treat the idea of keeping domestic animals quite differently (Marshall 1976; Bieseke et al. 1986; Guenther 1989; Bieseke 1992). Currently, I believe that the rock art of sheep is better explained by looking at the association between sheep and potency, as outlined. I struggle to understand under what circumstances the San would have seen sheep as prestige items and then painted them. I return to this idea in my conclusion in Chapter 8.

7.4.4. San Herders painting prestige items

I mention briefly here the idea that the painters of the sheep were San who had adopting herding. The excavated archaeology, thus far, from the Thukela Basin does not shed light on whether hunter-gatherers were becoming herders. If the painters were San herders, then the question that must be addressed is whether they would have painted sheep as a form of prestige to separate themselves from
other groups without livestock. There are examples from east and southern Africa that illustrate the complex relationships and changing identities that have arisen in the past between those with stock and those without (Bieselet al. 1986; Guenther 1988; Bieselee 1992; Smith, A. 1998; Cronk 1989, 2002; Cronk & Dickson 2001; Russell 2013). This is beyond the scope of this thesis but something that would be interesting to explore further.

7.5. Exploring human-animal relationships: people’s attitudes towards animals in the past.

“For Khoekhoen and Bantu alike, sheep were presumably a source of wealth. They slaughtered animals for eating as well as on ritual occasions, and it may be assumed that they also had cattle, which were possibly more important to them. By contrast, if evidence from the paintings is anything to go by, the San imbued sheep with a supernatural potency, a quality that is a world away from the farmer or herder concept of sheep”


This statement, and particularly the latter half, made by Eastwood and Eastwood (2006), for sheep in the rock art of the Northern Province, sets the stage from which I explore the use of human-animal theorizing and the ways in which different people think about their animals. Contra to Eastwood and Eastwood (2006), I argue that there is much more complexity in the relationships between domestic animals and pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. This is because these groups, just like the San, revere their animals beyond their economic value. As with the San and their relations with animals (wild), the distinctions between human and animal are blurred by pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. The ways in which these groups thought of their animals and engaged with them is very different to that practiced today in western farming for example.

The blurring of boundaries between human and non-human animal; between wild and domestic; between tame and un-tame or; controlled and uncontrolled, in the past, is a useful way to look at the encounters that might have occurred between San and sheep and their keepers in the past. This requires us to look beyond
animals as meat, or as economic symbols in societies, we know that this would not be the only important factor in the past.

7.5.1. Hunter-gatherers turning into animals: ‘Animals are people’ but they are also ‘animals’.

I began to compare the relationships between different groups of people and their animals, in order to get a better understanding of people’s attitudes towards animals in the past to see if there were any similarities or differences expressed towards animals, both wild and domestic. I found that not only are there differences between hunter-gatherers, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in how they view animals, but also that there are some similarities too. In this section, I draw on the rock art of these three groups, their relationships to animals, and present some thoughts on how San may have thought of or encountered these groups with livestock in the northern Drakensberg. This is demonstrated in several examples that are provided below.

The relationship between San and their animals is highly complex, they are both a meat source (economic) and like people (symbolic). In the present order, animals are negotiated out of sameness (i.e. animals may have personalities or that animals are people) and out of otherness (i.e. hunting animals as meat) (Guenther 1988). Among the /Xam and Nharo as well as many other San groups, animal personas dominate the landscape (Guenther 1988: 193; Parkington 2003). In Primal Time, the creation myth includes tricksters- /Kaggen, the mantis (among the /Xam; Bleek 1924; Lewis-Williams 1981, 2003), Pate (a trickster being amongst the Nharo !Kung; Guenther 1988), and the Jackal (amongst the Nharo !Kung; Guenther 1989; Marshall 1976), who take on among many other things, animal disguises. It is also during Primal Time that animals were people and people were once animals. In the reversal of this order to the present/new order, people carry with them a ‘residual trace’ of their prime order. That is; people in the present order can reverse back to being an animal (Guenther 1989: 31). According to Guenther (1989: 31), among the Nharo, “the ambiguity of the early humans that existed alongside the were-beings, was less pervasive” that this was manifested when taboos were violated (i.e. menstruating women violating the rules that
dictate that they cannot do certain things), as a result band members were easily capable of turning back into animals and other artefacts of nature (i.e. a reed, a bush, or honey amongst the !Kung (Marshall 1999: 73)). Guenther (1988: 193) notes that women, more so then men, carry with them a special kind of animality as they were not fully reversed from the prime order. In the present order, ritual healers or shamans are able to transform themselves into an animal from which gain n/um (supernatural power) (Marshall 1999). Marshall (1999: 73) on speaking to a !Kung healer, commented that in the Giraffe Dance, he becomes a giraffe. Similarly, Lewis-Williams (1988: 205-209) commenting on the relationship between medicine people, animals, and the curing trance dance, states that: “the animal is a man, and man is an animal; man and animal become one”. This relationship with animals suggests that they are more than just objects; animality is an intrinsic part of San belief and this is expressed in their attitudes and social behaviour towards them (Guenther 1988).

It is in these relationships of sameness and of becoming animal but at the same time human, that the San consider animals to be highly potent. It is also important to mention that whilst the boundaries between San and animal is blurred, so too is the boundary between considering animals as other and as the same. Guenther (1988: 198) notes that it is the otherness of the animal which is embellished through the hunt. For the San, holding this concept of both animality and of otherness is the focus of the hunter’s mind. Amongst both the /Gwi and the Nharo (Guenther 1988) animals as sentient beings are often approached with a bond of sympathy. San hunters relate with these animals by ‘mimicking’ their very movements (Guenther 1988). This bond of sympathy is operationalised before the hunt begins, where men call upon an animal to harness its potency for the hunt and will also strictly avoid food taboos. This is a bond of connectedness with the animal as a sentient being but also as an ‘other’ being which can be killed (ibid).

7.5.2 Pastoralists running parallel with animals but not turning into animals.

Barnard (1992: 258) notes similarities between the beliefs of San and those of the Khoe. Amongst the Nama and Damara (Khoe-speaking pastoralists), Haitsi-aibib (ancestor hero) has the ability to change himself into the form of an animal. He
may take on the form of trickster characters, which also figure in /Xam, !Kung and Nharo mythologies. A review of east African pastoralists groups indicate that some of these groups do not turn into animals (domestic) but rather, their lives run parallel with them.

Among pastoralists such as the Samburu, Nuer, Pokot, Turkana, and Datoga, humans and animals undergo the same set of transition rites, it is only once these transitions are made, that animals (cattle predominantly) gain voice in society and with the ancestral world (Russell 2013: 10). For instance, Tomikawa (1972) who conducted research on brand symbols among the Datoga pastoralists of northern Tanzania draws parallels between the transition of Datoga boys into adulthood and cattle. She identifies that branding is performed at a particular stage in cattle growth where after two years they are considered no longer to be calves but rather, adult cattle. This corresponds with the stages in growth for young Datoga boys before and after initiation (ibid). Barrett (1997: 50) also draws parallels between the Turkana and the branding of their livestock, where once a brand is made on the animal it is subject to the customs of the clan and to ritual life, just as the people are. Again, amongst the Nuer, age-sets are often described in relation to men and cattle and the transition from boyhood to adulthood is marked with changes in their relationship with cattle at initiation (Evans-Prichard 1940: 17). The Dinka also link cattle to god (Deng 1998). For the Zulu (Bantu-speaking agro-pastoralists), cattle, like their owners, belong to a clan or kinship group, and their identities are paralleled with maleness in society (Poland et al. 2003: 26).

These lifecycles may also be expressed through the slaughtering of a particular animal and the transition of an initiate. For example, amongst the Griqua in the Northern Cape, a girl’s transition to womanhood is symbolised with the slaughter and death of a sheep (Waldman 1989). The pelvis is often removed from the sheep as it is seen as the same to the initiate’s pelvis (ibid). Sheep are used more frequently in these types of ceremonies than cattle and this choice in a particular animal is important.
Schapera (1930: 403) states that the value placed on domestic animals amongst the Cape Khoe is reflected in all aspects of ceremonial life. For example, women abstain from milking animals during menstruation and young female initiates must slowly be reintroduced to the kraal where they may touch the animals to confer potency onto them. Schapera (1930) notes that it was sheep that was of utmost importance in this respect. Webley and Brink (2006/2007) who conducted interviews among the descendants of Nama-Khoekhoen, identified sheep as the predominant animal in ritual slaughter among this group.

Amongst both pastoralists and agro-pastoralists, animals maintain links and open channels to the ancestral or spirit world. For example, among Basotho diviners, sheep or goats are linked with the country of the ancestors (Shalabeng) (Laydevant 1933: 347). When a person is sick and this cannot be easily cured, then a sheep or a goat must be taken home, as a way of connecting with the maternal ancestors (Laydevant 1933: 347). It is in slaughtering animals, that the Swazi gain voice with the ancestral world, this is generally in the form of cattle but goats may also be used (Kuper 1963). The Tswana also use goats as a medium with the spirit world (Schapera 1953: 59). Schapera (1953: 59) states: “He [the diviner] sacrificed and prayed to the dead at their graves whenever they revealed themselves through dreams or calamity…He also invoked them on all important domestic occasions, e.g. birth, marriage…when he offered him libations of beer or sacrifices of fowls, goats, and in emergencies even cattle”. Among the Zulu, and especially in the past, specific cattle are associated with the ancestors and are chosen according to colour, temperament, and importantly belonging to a family herd that may have been connected with the ancestors (Poland et al. 2003: 27-28). Like the San, groups of Khoe-speaking pastoralists did not believe in ancestors but instead had God, deities, and spirits of the dead; this too was marked with the sacrifice of an animal (cattle; goat or sheep) (Hoernlé 1922; Barnard 1992). Their beliefs are similar to those documented for pastoralists in East Africa. Evans-Prichard (1940: 16-17) noted that amongst the Nuer, oxen and rams are agents in all issues concerning ritual aspects of life. Cattle are more important in this respect, as they are seen, as with an initiate, as entering ritual life with god (ibid).
In these examples pastoralists and agro-pastoralists use their domestic animals to connect themselves to the ancestors or god. The blurring of boundaries between human and non-human runs parallel amongst all three groups. Could it be that the arrival of sheep with the keepers, who also saw their animals as being powerful, have had some kind of significance to the San who encountered them, knowing that their relationship with animals is highly complex where animals and people are seen sometimes as one, and how they approach them as sentient beings.


White geometric markings made on a single fat-tailed sheep at Battle Cave are a unique phenomenon in the rock art of sheep for this region, although this particular rock art image brings together many characteristics of sheep that may have made them powerful to the San (Figure 7.7). A review of the Southern African Rock Art Digital Archive (SARADA) for other sheep paintings in southern Africa confirm that Battle Cave’s fat-tailed sheep and its markings are particularly unique as there seems to be no other evidence for other sheep to be marked in this way.

Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1988) and Lewis-Williams (1995) suggest that geometric forms in San rock art can be explained through entoptic phenomena, which takes the form of geometric shapes, generally in grid or lattices, nested catenary curves, chevrons, or filigrees (fine lines or threads), sets of parallel lines, dots, and short flecks, to name a few. These forms are seen during altered states of consciousness where shapes are construed by shamans during trance hallucinations and where they may be projected against iconic forms such as certain animals encountered during altered states.
Figure 7.7. Markings made in white paint on animal B and the fat-tailed sheep (A) at Battle Cave. Note the chevron design on both the animal’s backs and the circular designs around the eye and neck of the fat-tailed sheep.
Entoptics are believed to form part of the !gi (amongst the /Xam) or n/um (amongst the !Kung), translated as supernatural power, seen and often harnessed by shamans. Such construals can be seen as items of the everyday world and as things which appear on extracorporeal journeys to the spirit world (Lewis-Williams & Dowson 1988; Lewis-Williams 1995). Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1988: 213) suggest that even novel construals may have been familiar to the San viewer because they would have been seen as belonging within the beliefs surrounding the San shaman. Lewis-Williams (1985, 1995) notes that the majority of animals with these marks in the paintings, are not animals of the everyday, but rather animals that are part of or have entered the spirit world.

The marks on the fat-tailed sheep at Battle Cave may therefore relate to some form of potency as seen by shamans during trance and that this suggests Battle Cave’s sheep is not part of the ordinary world. In this particular instance then, and contra to Ouzman (2003: 9), who suggests that cattle and sheep were animals of the ordinary world, as well as by Guenther (1986), who argues that sheep, being unimpressive animals to the San, the fat-tailed sheep as depicted in the rock art at Battle Cave, indicates that this animal was part of the San spirit world and most likely was associated with some form of power. This is also supported by the presence of similar markings made on animal B to the left of the sheep, as well as by white dots painted across some of the figures in a procession facing towards the sheep, that can be related to potency (Lewis-Williams & Dowson 1988; Lewis-Williams 1995). These figures, most likely are shamans.

Both Animal B and the fat-tailed sheep at Battle Cave have been depicted with a red line near the nose. Although, there is a very faded human figure painted near the neck of the sheep, and it could be possible that this red line is part of the bow associated with the figure. It is also equally possible that both of these animals are bleeding from the nose (Figure 5.26, pg 139). As Lewis-Williams (1980, 1981, 1992, 1998) and others (Blundell & Lewis-Williams 2001; Hollmann 2002; Lewis-Williams & Pearce 2004) highlight, bleeding from the nose is a common sign of altered states of consciousness during trance amongst San shamans. Painted lines associated with for example, the nose of the eland, may suggest the
animal has been ‘captured’ and its potency harnessed by a shaman (Lewis-Williams 1987: 172). This would likely add further support to the sheep at Battle Cave being part of something other than from the ordinary world, and likely to contain a large amount of potency.

7.7. Summary:

I believe that sheep were seen as powerfully potent animals to the San hunter-gatherers that first encountered and painted them. I also think that their keepers were seen as powerful too. It seems more likely that these paintings were made on first encounters, when the novelty of the sheep would have been more striking and bewildering to the San. I therefore favour that they fall within the 2000 to 1600 b.p. time bracket before domestic animals became a more common animal of the landscape in this region. In the next chapter I conclude the thesis and draw attention to areas that require further research.
This research set out to try to understand the small body of painted sheep imagery that is found in the northern Drakensberg. To do this I needed to identify their authorship, and to work out their age. Because none of these paintings have been dated, I have approached them from a number of different angles and this I believe, has enabled me to start to build an argument for their timing, authorship and meaning.

I believe that sheep paintings in the northern Drakensberg are old and may represent an expression of the first encounters of San hunter-gatherers with sheep-keeping Khoe pastoralists at around 1800 b.p. I favour this over the alternative scenario that I have considered, namely, that the sheep paintings are made by San hunter-gatherers who were painting Bantu-speaking farmer’s sheep at around 600 years ago.

It is in their initial encounters with sheep and their keepers that the novelty of sheep (and their owners) may have been particularly bewildering and interesting to the San.

To understand the response that the San would have had to sheep, I have drawn on human-animal relationship theorizing. This pushes us to think beyond our modern understanding of domestic and wild animal-human relations and to try to imagine how, by drawing on ethnographies, the San might have viewed animals, both wild and domestic, in the past. I believe that the encounter with an unfamiliar animal would have been profound. There would have been many characteristics of the sheep with which the San would have been familiar. They had vast stores of fat, like the eland. They were controlled by humans, in the same way the San shaman could control or influence the movement of animals. But they also had qualities
which were unfamiliar to the San, but that the San may have interpreted from their own worldview. Many of the sheep are white, a scarce colour amongst wild animals and a special colour to the San. The sheep may have been branded with geometric marks (as is a common and widespread practice amongst African pastoralist groups) these may have appeared to the San like geometric shapes that shamans see during trance, and in their rock art. For these reasons, the sheep would have been a very potent and powerful creature to the San, worthy of paintings ‘on the veil’.

8.1. Challenges that need further investigation

The hypothesis, as presented in chapters 4 and 7, is that the closer together the archaeological evidence of different groups, then the more influence they might have had on each other. Of course this is debatable. We know that San hunter-gatherer exchange networks operated over long distances, of hundreds of kilometres (Mazel 1989a, 2009b; Mitchell 1998, 2003, 2004). Mitchell (1998, 2003) and Mitchell et al. (2008) suggest that the Orange River may have acted as a highway for the movement of ‘things’ into the Lesotho eastern highlands. Mazel (1989a, 1998, 2009b) notes that exchange networks operated northwest and east of the Thukela Basin. Both argue that these exchange activities increased around 2000 years ago and it is possible that sheep formed part of long-distance encounters, perhaps even acquisitions, with other groups.

Much of my argument for the age of sheep imagery was built around the 1000 year hiatus in the northern Drakensberg, which is marked by radiocarbon dates which show that sites in the northern Drakensberg were not occupied from about 1600 to 600 ago (Mazel 1989a, 1998, 2009b). Mazel (1989a, 1998, 2009b) suggests that this hiatus is the result of hunter-gatherers moving to the central Thukela Basin to be closer to the settlements of early Bantu-speaking agropastoralists with whom they interacted. It is possible, however, that even though the San were not living in the northern Drakensberg, they may still have continued to paint there.
These are the sorts of issues that need to be considered when evaluating my argument. Only with further research will the answers become clearer.

8.2. Further research

This project grew out of a larger aim to document paintings of sheep throughout South Africa. I believe studies of sheep rock art may inform the broader debates surrounding the introduction of livestock into southern Africa and the types of impact these animals had on the San. And other debates, for example, whether or not the San became herders. Yet very few archaeologists have considered this form of evidence in these debates surrounding the start of livestock-keeping in southern Africa. An exploration of rock art found in other regions in South Africa may help to identify whether there are patterns in the rock art of sheep over a larger geographic area. It could be that findings from the northern Drakensberg sheep rock art are not produced elsewhere. Sheep may have been painted at different times and for different reasons across southern Africa. This would be interesting to explore.

It might also be interesting to re-visit Cooke’s (1965) hypothesis concerning sheep paintings and the movement of pastoralists into southern Africa.

I suggest the San sheep painters in the northern Drakensberg were not herding these animals. This is because the excavated record in the northern Drakensberg does not show evidence for this, although it has been suggested to occur around the later part of the first millennium AD in eastern Lesotho (Mitchell et al. 2008). In trying to explore the authorship of sheep rock art in this region, I raised a number of questions that I believe will add further value to research conducted on sheep, and other livestock imagery in San rock art. These include investigating whether a San herder rock art may mean something quite different to a San hunter-gatherer rock art of sheep, and whether or not this is seen in the form of prestige, status, and identity making in rock art. Two thoughts are presented here: Would San herders paint livestock to separate this status from those San groups, or other groups, without livestock? Or alternatively, would San hunter-gatherers have painted livestock, perhaps as a way of belonging or fitting in with other
groups with livestock? These questions, I believe, raise interesting but complex avenues of research that need further investigation.
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Appendix A: A late Holocene hunter-gatherer database from 3000 b.p. to the historic period covering the Thukela Basin, parts of Lesotho, KwaZulu-Natal, the Free State, the Eastern Cape and Swaziland

Introduction:

This appendix lists the late Holocene hunter-gatherer geo-referenced radiocarbon dates from 3000 b.p. to the historic period and their associated cultural material for the Thukela Basin and adjacent regions.

Site names and their abbreviations as displayed on the maps presented in this dissertation and listed in the database are inserted below for ease of reference. These site names are divided up according to their location on the landscape.

List of hunter-gatherer sites and their abbreviations in the Thukela Basin, KwaZulu-Natal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barne's Shelter</td>
<td>BRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Caves North</td>
<td>MCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley's Shelter</td>
<td>SHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botha's Shelter</td>
<td>BOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqonqo Shelter</td>
<td>MAQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhanyisweni</td>
<td>SKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke's Shelter</td>
<td>CLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Shelter</td>
<td>MBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eSinhlonhlweni</td>
<td>SNW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham Shelter</td>
<td>CLH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgede Shelter</td>
<td>MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Elephant</td>
<td>WES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 1</td>
<td>DIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhlwazini Cave</td>
<td>MWZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebaaieni</td>
<td>SBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driel Shelter</td>
<td>DRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 1</td>
<td>MZY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mzinyashana 2</td>
<td>MZY2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esikolweni Shelter</td>
<td>EKW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNkolimahashi Shelter</td>
<td>HGM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehle Shelter</td>
<td>GEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkupe Shelter</td>
<td>NKP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poacher's Shelter</td>
<td>POC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwaThwaleyakhe Shelter</td>
<td>KTK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of hunter-gatherer sites and their abbreviations in **Lesotho**:

- **BOL** Bolahla
- **LQ** Leqhetsoana
- **PIT** Pitsaneng
- **HC** Hololo Crossin
- **MAS** Masitise
- **SEH** Sehonghong
- **LIK** Likoaeleng
- **MEL** Melikane
- **LIP** Liphofung
- **MOS** Moshebi’s Shelter
- **LIT** Lithakong
- **MUE** Muela

List of hunter-gatherer sites and their abbreviations in **KwaZulu-Natal**:

- **BEL** Belleview Shelter 1
- **FAL** The Falls
- **SHO** Shongweni South
- **BS** Borchers Shelter
- **GRD** Grindstone Shelter
- **UBB** Umbeli Belli
- **BT** Bottoms Up Shelter
- **GH** Good Hope Shelter
- **UMH** Umhlatuzana

List of hunter-gatherer site names and abbreviations in the **Free State**:

- **ROI** Rooikrans Rock
- **RFT** Roosfontein Rock Shelter
- **RSC** Rose Cottage Cave
- **TDB** Tandjesberg Rock Shelter

List of hunter-gatherer site names and abbreviations in the **Eastern Cape**:

- **BWE** Bonawe Rock Shelter
- **COL** Colwinton Rock Shelter
- **RVC** Ravenscraig Rock Shelter

List of hunter-gatherer sites and abbreviations in **Swaziland**:

- **BC** Border Cave
- **SIP** Sophiso Shelter
The sites are arranged on worksheets in the excel file database according to the regions in which they fall. There are separate worksheets labelled Thukela Basin, Lesotho, KwaZulu-Natal, Free-State, Eastern Cape, and Swaziland.

Radiocarbon dates that do not have a secure association are highlighted in red.

The sources are published reports and the Natal Museum database. The Natal Museum database reference refers to the Thukela Basin sites only.

Sites contain the following information:

1) Site information:
   (i) Site Name
   (ii) Site ID-abbreviations as used in thesis

2) Geographic information:
   (i) Map Number
   (ii) Latitude (degrees; minutes; seconds)
   (iii) Longitude (degrees; minutes; seconds)
   (iv) Elevation above sea-level

3) The Type of site: i.e. shelter; open-air; midden etc.

4) Rock Art:
   (i) Presence of rock art (Yes/No)
   (ii) Recorder Name and date

5) Evidence of contact with Bantu-speaker farmers:
   (i) Identification of Iron Age occupation at this site? (Yes/No)
   (ii) Contact (Yes/No)
   (iii) Material associated with contact

6) Radiocarbon dates:
   (i) Stratigraphic layer
   (ii) Uncalibrated date b.p.
   (iii) standard deviation
   (iv) Dated material
   (v) Radiocarbon ID by lab number
   (vi) Dating method (AMS or conventional)
   (vii) Undated layers (estimated maximum date and estimated minimum date)
(viii) Why has this date been suggested?

7) Cultural Material:
   (i) Formal tools
   (ii) Raw material
   (iii) Number of pottery sherds
   (iv) Intrusive/in-situ pottery
   (v) Mean thickness of pottery
   (vi) Standard deviation of pottery
   (vii) Shape of vessel
   (viii) Decoration and burnish
   (ix) Core colour
   (x) Early Pottery (grit-temper thin-walled)
   (xi) LSA Pottery (grass-temper)
   (xii) Farming pottery
   (xiii) Other pottery
   (xiv) Reason for pottery ascription
   (xv) Fauna
   (xvi) Other cultural material

8) Excavation date

9) Publication:
   (i) Publication
   (ii) Comments from publication

10) Natal Museum Database reference:
    (i) Page number
    (ii) Map ID

11) Type of occupation: i.e. ephemeral or intensive
Appendix B: Early and Late geo-referenced Bantu-speaker agro-pastoralist database for KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Introduction:

This appendix lists radiocarbon dates, spatial information, and cultural material for early and late farming communities in KwaZulu-Natal. In this database, Early Farming Communities (EFC) are presented first, followed by undated early agro-pastoralist sites, and lastly by Late Farming Communities (LFC) ordered on each sheet.

For ease of reference site names and their abbreviations as presented in the maps in this dissertation and in the following database are listed below.

List of early agro-pastoralist sites and abbreviations in KwaZulu-Natal:

- EW Emberton Way
- HT Hilltop Site
- IQ Inanda Quarry
- KGG KwaGandaganda
- NDW Ndondondwane

List of later agro-pastoralist sites and abbreviations in KwaZulu-Natal:

- BLB Blackburn
- ENK Enkwazini
- GUJ iGujwana
- MBH Mabhija
- SG Sewula Gorge

Sites contain the following information:

1) Site information:
   (i) Site Name
   (ii) Site ID – abbreviation as used in this thesis
(iii) Natal Museum Site Number
(iv) Map Number

2) Geographic Information:
(i) Latitude (degrees; minutes; seconds)
(ii) Longitude (degrees; minutes; seconds)

3) Site Type: i.e. surface, midden, structure.

4) Radiocarbon dates:
(i) Stratigraphy or feature
(ii) Uncalibrated date b.p.
(iii) Standard deviation
(iv) Material dated
(v) Radiocarbon ID by Lab number
(vi) Dating method (AMS or conventional)
(vii) AD calibrated date given in publication

5) Pottery Type:
(i) Pottery type: i.e. Mzonjani, Msuluzi, Ndondondwane, Ntshekane, Moor Park etc.
(ii) Tradition: i.e. Urewe, Kalundu, after Huffman 2007

6) Fauna (domesticated only)

7) Other material culture

8) Interaction with hunter-gatherers:
(i) Interaction: Yes/No/Possible?
(ii) Hunter-gatherer items that suggest interaction

9) Publication:
(i) Publication
(ii) Comments by authors

10) Natal Museum Reference:
(i) Page Number from Natal Museum Database
Appendix C: Photographs and re-drawings of Boschman’s Klip A, 
Junction Shelter and Battle Cave sheep sites in the northern Drakensberg.

Introduction:

Three sheep painted sites that were recorded from the northern Drakensberg are 
presented in this appendix through photographs and re-drawings. These have been 
enlarged for the purpose of easy reading and are presented in the following order:

(1) Boschman’s Klip A
(2) Junction Shelter
(3) Battle Cave