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Abstract

This study investigated spatial variations of motif representation in Zimbabwean rock art. The major aim of the study was to examine the significance of this variation in the understanding of the lifestyles of its painters. It is the premise of this research that rock art motif variation over space, just like other cultural variables, reflects on the differences in the social, environmental, economic, political, and religious organisation of a society. Therefore, attending to the differences in motif representation contributes towards a holistic understanding of the meaning of the art and the social context of its production.

Previous researchers have alluded to broad regional differences in southern African rock art, dividing it into three, four, or five regions depending on particular approaches used to read this variation. Others have pointed out further variation even within these broad regions. However, this variation has not received further attention beyond mere mention. Instead, more emphasis was given to the unity of the character of the rock art of southern Africa. Today broad similarities are generally agreed upon. What remains critical is the exploration of motif variation which influences the interpretation of the art and the conceptualisation of its makers, the Later Stone Age hunter-gatherers in Zimbabwe and other parts of southern Africa.

Rock art variation comes in various forms. This research concentrated mainly on subject matter, colour and technique of execution. These were expected to reflect the main argument of the research which is that variation of the motifs across space is a result of differences in beliefs and social circumstances surrounding the production of the art in the different geographic areas studied. The research examined the character and frequency of each of these in three different geographic locations in Zimbabwe that are Northern Nyanga, Harare and Chivi. The nature of the rock art from these case studies was compared to what is already known from other parts of Zimbabwe. The research found that motifs do vary across space. The nature of variation points to differences in beliefs, social relations and to some extent the environment. Consequently, the research argues that variation found in the rock art of Zimbabwe can be used together with other archaeological evidence to reconstruct the nature of these aspects of the Later Stone Age societies.
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### Definition of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baboon-face motif</td>
<td>A rock art motif where human figures have baboon-like faces, i.e. human-baboon conflation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-chrome</td>
<td>An image made of two colours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflation</td>
<td>Combining two or more creatures; animal-human or animal-animal features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodile-men motif</td>
<td>Conflated human figures with reptilian features. They have rounded body features, thick necks, and a gaping mouth with fleshy limbs and stumps for hands and feet. Most have two teeth coming out of the lower jaw and exaggerated male genitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flecks</td>
<td>Small dashes that can be found depicting certain images, superpositioned on other images or on their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>Images that are painted side by side on a panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochrome</td>
<td>A painting with one colour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychrome</td>
<td>A painting with more than two colours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td>A term commonly used to refer to hunter-gatherers from southern Africa. The term is mostly used to refer to modern day hunter-gatherer groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaded bi-chrome/polychrome</td>
<td>When two or more colours are blended together on an image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamanism</td>
<td>A term used to describe how medicine people enter into the spirit world in order to perform certain activities such as healing,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rainmaking, and out-of-body travel.

**Snake-head motif**   Human figures with snake-like head, i.e. snake-human conflation.

**Squatting figures**   Images that look like human beings in a squatting position. Such images encompass what were previously termed obese, mythic women or mothergodess figures.

**Super-position**   Images that are painted one on top of the other.

**Therianthrope**   Human figures conflated with animal features.

**Trance**   The state of medicine people when they are in the spirit world.
Introduction

Rock art refers to paintings, peckings and engravings found on rock surfaces including walls of rock shelters and faces of boulders around the world. There are two kinds of rock art known in Zimbabwe, that is, hunter-gatherer and farmer art. The former is more ubiquitous than the latter. These two are different in terms of subject matter, technique of execution and the quality of the pigment used. In terms of the subject matter, hunter-gatherer art mostly has naturalistic images. It depicts recognisable figures such as human and animal figures although it also has a few geometric figures such as dots, flecks, lines, and circles. On the other hand, the farmer art is schematic and most of the depictions are not easily identifiable (Walker 1996, p.20). In relation to technique of execution, the hunter-gatherer art is considered as fine-line based on the finesse of the images, whereas farmer art is thick and finger-painted (Cooke 1974). The hunter-gatherer rock art includes both paintings and engravings whereas only paintings are known from the farmer art in Zimbabwe. The pigment quality differs in that the farmer art is usually white kaolin pigment, which is why it is referred to as “Late Whites” (Cooke 1974; Walker 1996). It rarely occurs in ochre-based pigments (Smith 2006). Hunter-gatherer rock art is usually done in ochre-based pigments. Both the hunter-gatherer and farmer art is found in all the case study areas. This thesis focuses mainly on the hunter-gatherer art of Zimbabwe.

Major advances have been made in the interpretation and understanding of the meaning of hunter-gatherer rock art in southern Africa. Many of the studies were conducted to understand the common characteristics of the art (e.g. Pager 1971; Lewis-Williams 1983,
1990a, 2002a; Garlake 1987a & b, 1994, 1995; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989). Some studies targeted specific geographic areas or themes (e.g. Vinnicombe 1976; Lewis-Williams 1981; Garlake 1990; Mguni 2002, 2004; Eastwood & Eastwood 2006; Nhamo 2007b). These studies have resulted in a general understanding of common aspects that are found in the rock art of southern Africa. Studying the common aspects was a necessary step towards inferring the meaning of the art. Nevertheless, in order to get a holistic perspective of the art, the nature of variation that exists within southern African rock art need to be appraised. In this endeavour, this study explores the nature and extent of the variation that exists within the hunter-gatherer rock art that is found in various parts of Zimbabwe. It also explores the reasons behind the spatial motif variation. Understanding variation in the rock art will aid in comprehending the nature of the social organisation of hunter-gatherer societies in Zimbabwe’s prehistoric times. As Jones and Leonard (1989, p.3) argued, studying variation provides a “means to examine the nature of processes that govern the representation of different classes of phenomena in the archaeological record”. Rock art as a product of this social configuration becomes an important source of information.

This study focuses mainly on variation in frequency of motifs over space. In this study, the definition of motif follows the one employed by Hampson et al. (2002, p.17) where a motif is considered as "a distinctive feature or element of a design or composition; a particular type of subject". In this research, a motif is restricted to the distinctiveness of subject matter, colour or technique of execution of rock art images in different parts of Zimbabwe. The presence of different motifs in various parts of the country offers the
opportunity to investigate the different beliefs and social circumstances that the artists experienced. In South Africa, for example, it was shown that the repertoire and frequency of human and animal figures in the rock art differs from place to place (Parkington et al. 1994; Smith 2006). The frequency of human figures has been shown to change from a strong emphasis on male to female figures as one move northwards from the Drakensberg Mountains to the Limpopo Province (Eastwood and Blundell 1999; Smith 2006). No similar studies have been carried out in Zimbabwe but allusion to differences in human representations has been made in studies of particular areas (Tucker and Baird 1983; Walker 1996; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006). The frequency of animal figures in South Africa ranges from emphasis on eland, hartebeest and giraffe to elephant (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Laue 2000; Parkington 2002; Hampson et al. 2002; Smith and Zubieta 2006).

In Zimbabwe, a study of kudu images has revealed that although this subject matter is ubiquitous, the way it is represented in the art differs from place to place (Nhamo 2006). In the Zimunya area in Manicaland, female kudu outnumbers their male counterparts while in places such as Malilangwe the depiction of both sexes is almost equal (Pearce et al. 2003; Nhamo 2006). Although these observations were made without detailed comparative analyses, they alluded to the variation in emphasis on subject matter from place to place. This research, therefore, presents a detailed analysis of the rock art in order to characterize and account for such kinds of variation in Zimbabwean rock art.
Three areas were chosen for detailed study and these are Harare, Northern Nyanga and Chivi (Map 1). The choice of these case studies was guided by a purposive method of sampling which took into account reports of the existence of certain distinct motifs in these areas. This approach was considered suitable for this type of research because some researchers have already alluded to the existence of variation in the art. The major aim of this research was to conduct an in-depth analysis and characterisation of this variation. This was then used to find ways of using this variation to expound on the Later Stone Age (LSA) lifestyles in Zimbabwe. Therefore, the previously enunciated variation is used here as a springboard for these investigations.

Harare has the circumscribed motif of certain conflated images that have been termed ‘crocodile-men’ (Goodall 1947, 1959; Nhamo 2008). Northern Nyanga has distinctive striped rock art rather than solid colours. Goodall (1959) reported a similar technique from the neighbouring Makaha area in Mudzi district. However, the decision to select Northern Nyanga for study was made after observing rock art sites documented in the area between 2006 and 2007 (Shenjere 2011). These showed a different technique of execution from that known from other parts of Zimbabwe.

The selection of rock art of Chivi was mainly influenced by reports of polychrome paintings in the area. The art from this area differs from much of the art in Zimbabwe that is monochromatic. Although Breuil’s (1966) study of the art from Masvingo is fraught with biases and errors, the images that he noted differ from those that are common in the rock art of Zimbabwe. Many researchers generally accept the distinctive nature of the art
from this area, but they oppose the idea of foreign influence in the production of the art as advanced by Breuil (Lewis-Williams 1983; Garlake 1987; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989). However, there has never been any further attempt at explaining the nature and extent of the distinctiveness of this art. A detailed comparative analysis of these images with those from the rest of the country had long been overdue. Despite this apparent variation, the rock art of Zimbabwe has largely been described as similar (Garlake 1987a, b, c and d, 1990, 1994, 1995).

Furthermore, the selection of the case study areas was also compelled by the need to draw examples from widely separated parts of the country with the assumption that variation of the art at that level of spatial separation could not have been marred by interaction. This research does not assume that the case studies represent all the aspects of variation that exist in Zimbabwean rock art. Other parts of the country might possess distinct rock art that is yet to be studied. These case studies only highlight the nature of variation that might exist elsewhere. The results of the analysis act as pointers to how that variation can be understood.

The three case studies provided an opportunity to probe the nature and extent of variation in the art. In addition, the research is conducted in areas that have not been widely researched on in recent times. Goodall (1959), for example, was the only one to mention the striped art in Makaha that is similar to that studied here in Northern Nyanga, while Breuil (1966) was the last to investigate the polychrome images from Chivi in any significant detail. By applying new theoretical approaches and research methods to these
previously under-researched areas, this study expands our knowledge of the character of rock art in Zimbabwe.

Map 1: Map of Zimbabwe showing areas with rock art sites mentioned in the text (by R Kapumha).
(The insert shows the location of Zimbabwe and neighbouring countries)

Structure of the thesis

The thesis begins by presenting in Chapter 1 an environmental and cultural background to the study of motif variation across space in Zimbabwe. The aim is to provide the physical and cultural context in which the rock art was made. The cultural chronology
targets the LSA, generally the period within which the hunter-gatherers produced the rock art.

Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical framework in which the study of motif variation over space is anchored. This includes the argument that variation was inherently part of the hunter-gatherer communities that made the rock art. This is explored by examining both the archaeological and ethnographic information. This research argues that in order to get a holistic picture of LSA lifestyles, one has to study and understand both similarities and variations in the hunter-gatherer material culture. The chapter also examines explanations that have been offered to account for the spatial variation in the rock art motifs in southern Africa in general and specifically in Zimbabwe.

The methodological construction of the thesis is outlined in Chapter 3. The chapter details the methods of data collection and analysis employed for this research. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 present the data obtained from the three case studies. The comparative analysis is presented in Chapter 7. General comparisons are made between the art from the case study areas and that found in other parts of the country and with the rest of the southern African subcontinent. Detailed discussion of the possible reasons for motif variation across space in the rock art of Zimbabwe is presented in Chapter 8. The chapter also assesses the manner in which the motif variation as observed in this research informs on the interpretation of the social organisation of Later Stone Age hunter-gatherers who made the rock art. Chapter 9 provides summary and concluding remarks to the thesis.
Chapter 1:
Cultural and Environmental Context

Hunter-gatherers’ “day-to-day activities were part of their re-acquaintance with the world around them”
(Dowson 2007, p. 58-59).

This chapter provides the cultural and environmental setting of the prehistoric hunter-gatherer communities of Zimbabwe. Special attention is given to reconstruction of these contexts for each of the case study areas. The first part of the chapter summarizes the archaeological and historical chronology of human occupation in Zimbabwe as currently understood. This embeds the study of variation within the cultural context of the rock art. Much of the rock art from southern Africa is dated to the Later Stone Age (hereafter LSA). However, technological and cognitive developments in the earlier phases influenced the artistic advances that were later witnessed within the LSA period. The development of food production within the last two millennia brought in a different social and artistic tradition. There is a possibility of some elements of acculturation from food producing communities and other “outsiders” in the selection of rock art motifs in some parts of the sub-continent (Jolly 2005; Eastwood et al. 2010). It is important therefore, to scrutinise the nature of contact between hunter-gatherers, herders and farmers.

The second part of the chapter discusses the general environmental setting in Zimbabwe. Some rock art researchers in southern Africa refrain from attributing variation in subject matter to environmental change (see Eastwood and Cnoops 1999; Hampson et al. 2002).
This arose from the concern about deterministic way in which the environment has been used to explain culture change in the past (Steward 1936, 1949; Willey 1953, 1956; Clarke 1968; Flannery 1968). The long history of archaeological research into the interplay between cultures and environments now demonstrates that these two are actually symbiotic (McGlade 1995, Dincauze 2000, Ekblom 2004, Manyanga 2001). Therefore, in spite of the concerns there is still need to assess the physical environment in which the artists survived without necessarily taking an environmental deterministic stance. The hunter-gatherer relationship with the physical environment has always been commented upon. These communities are said to be keen observers of the environment even when they are dealing with things that are not immediate to their subsistence (Heinz 1978). In this study, the environment is examined from such a perspective whereby the prehistoric painters would be influenced by the surrounding environmental conditions.

Elsewhere around the world, rock art studies have shown how communities perceived their environments (Bradley 1994; Bradley et al. 1994; Tilley 1991; Chippindale and Tacon 1998a; Ouzman 1998; Diaz-Andreu 2003). These have helped in the reconstruction of the hunter-gatherer perception of the environment. However, Smith and Blundell (2004) have called for caution in the use of these reconstructions, especially those presented without a sound understanding of the dynamics of the culture of the artists. Nevertheless, studies elsewhere have shown that analysis of the environmental setting of the different areas might help in the understanding of the context within which the artists were situated. This aids in the reconstruction of their social and physical
inspirations (Ouzman 1998). The environment provides the physical setting of both the economic and social actions of the society.

1.1 Cultural setting

Zimbabwe has a long human history which begins from the Stone Age to modern times. The Early prehistory of the country spans from the Early Stone Age (ESA) through to the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and LSA (Walker and Thorp 1997). The later prehistory includes the period of Early Farming Communities (EFC) and Late Farming Communities (LFC) (Pwiti 1996, Pikirayi 2001). There is also the historical period. Many researchers have reviewed the prehistory of Zimbabwe (see Pikirayi 1993; 2001; Pwiti 1996 1997; Manyanga 2001, 2007; Katsamudanga 2007; Soper 2002; Huffman 2007). Historians have covered the historical period including the pre-colonial period (e.g. Beach 1980, 1984, 1994; Mazarire 2010). This research focused more on the period when rock art is thought to have been produced, that is, the LSA with only brief reference to the preceding and succeeding periods.

Although a general picture of the country’s history of human occupation can be discerned, there remains a number of challenges. Not least is unequal distribution of research in both geographical and thematic terms. Some parts of the country are much more researched whereas other are not. In addition, research on the period of farming communities has been much more intense than that on the hunter-gatherer communities. The controversies surrounding the Great Zimbabwe and related sites attracted most of the attention. In some parts of the country such as Chivi, the available information is out-of-
date since archaeological research was last conducted three or four decades ago, much of it unsystematic. Although there is rock art associated with the farming period (later prehistory), it has generally not been studied in detail.

1.1.1 Early Stone Age

The ESA is the least known of the Stone Age period in Zimbabwe with information mostly coming from surface collections and unsealed contexts (Walker and Thorp 1997; see Map 2, 3, 4). In southern Africa, the ESA is dated from 2 million to about 120 000 years ago (Walker and Thorp 1997; Deacon and Deacon 1999; Mitchell 2002; Phillipson 2005). Artefacts akin to those classified elsewhere in southern Africa and East Africa as Oldowan, Acheulian and Late Acheulian/Sangoan have been identified in Zimbabwe (Cooke et al. 1966a & b; Cooke 1968; Walker and Thorp 1997; Mitchell 2002; Phillipson 2005). In Zimbabwe the Late Acheulian or Sangoan material is divided into two phases which are the Bembesi and the Charama industries (Walker and Thorp 1997). The Sangoan material has been identified at sites such as Mafungabusi, Hope Fountain, Gweru Kopje, Charama hill, Bambata, Pomongwe, Khami Waterworks, and Cranmore Farm (Cooke et al. 1966a & b; Cooke 1968; Walker and Thorp 1997). Within the case study areas, ESA sites have been reported only from Northern Nyanga (Robinson 1958). The data, however, come mainly from surface collections. The ESA is not associated with any rock art. The ESA of Zimbabwe shows the standardisation of artefacts that has been identified across the world unlike the succeeding periods that show regional diversification of artefacts (Phillipson 2005).
1.1.2 Middle Stone Age

The MSA of Zimbabwe is not well dated but it is thought to date to the period between 95 000 and 20 000 years ago (Walker and Thorp 1997). Two stone artefact industries belonging to the MSA have been identified in the country. The earliest is the Bambata (formerly Stillbay) industry followed by Late MSA (formerly Tshangula) (Larsson 1996, 2001; Walker and Thorp 1997; Mitchell 2002). These two industries are not well defined since the material comes from mixed contexts (Walker and Thorp 1997). Most of the material has also come from western Zimbabwe. Thus, not much is known of the MSA elsewhere in the country. Recently, MSA artefacts have been identified in eastern Zimbabwe (Soper 2005; Mupira and Katsamudanga 2007). Sites belonging to the MSA are known from Harare and some parts of Nyanga but not from Chivi (Robinson 1958; Cooke 1970, 1969b; Burrett 1990a &b). The end of the MSA is not well defined in the country but is thought to date between 13 000 and 20 000 BP (Walker and Thorp 1997). Although elsewhere in southern Africa evidence of rock art dates to the late MSA, much of the rock art in Zimbabwe is presumed to date to the LSA period (Walker 1995; Mitchell 2002). The MSA is thought to be the period where diversity and regional specialisation in the exploitation of resources began (Phillipson 2005). This becomes more defined in the LSA.

1.1.3 Later Stone Age

The LSA is better understood than the earlier periods but research in the country is still plagued with problems emanating from unclear methodologies and a proliferation of terminologies (Burrett 2002; Bandama 2008). Different researchers use different methods
of defining the context such that it is difficult to compare the data. Researchers also give new names to assemblages without clearly differentiating them from already known industries. Overall, however, the LSA is the period generally associated with the hunter-gatherer rock art (Walker 1987, 1994, 1996; Garlake 1995; see Table 1).

Archaeological material belonging to the LSA has been identified in many parts of the country. The LSA of Zimbabwe is divided into six industries, that is Early LSA (or Terminal Pleistocene microlithic industries), Maleme, Pomongwe, Nswatugi and related industries (also known as Rhodesian Wilton or Matopan), Amadzimba and contemporary industries, and Ceramic LSA (Walker and Thorp 1997). Most of these industries were defined based on evidence from western Zimbabwe where more intense Stone Age research has been conducted. The industries are dated from about 21 000 to around 2000 years BP (Table 1). There is, however, ongoing debate as to the character and status of each of these industries. Industries from other parts of the country beside the Matopo Hills are not well studied and the dating is in dispute.

Walker (1996) is of the opinion that most of the LSA rock art dates between 10 000 and 1 500 years BP, placing it within the periods from Nswatugi and related industries up to the Ceramic LSA (Table 1). The farmer rock art in Zimbabwe has not been dated but is widely thought to have been produced during the period after 2000 years BP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates BP</th>
<th>Period/ Industry</th>
<th>Characterisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 000-13 000</td>
<td>(Early Gokomere, Duncombe, lower levels at Pfupi)</td>
<td>Possibly represents the earliest evidence of LSA microliths in the country. Occurs in very small assemblages, but is absent in some parts of the country such as Matopo Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 000-11 000</td>
<td>Maleme</td>
<td>Mostly found in the Matopo Hills, evidence of transhumance between summer and winter months and people lived in large groups, evidence of painted tortoise and ostrich shells, a variety in stone artefacts, increase in population. It is assumed that some rock painting must have taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 000-9 400</td>
<td>Pomongwe, (Mtemwa, Diana’s Vow)</td>
<td>There is evidence that population continued to increase and people were still practising transhumance but with delayed-return economy. Archaeological evidence of ornaments, possible evidence of inter-group mediation, increase in pigment evidence (possibly increase in rock art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 400-6 000</td>
<td>Nswatugi, (Khami Dam, mid-Gokomere, Bulawayo, Pfupi, Chitura)</td>
<td>Evidence of large population, increased sedentism, intensive utilisation of local resources, variation in artefacts between groups, slight reduction in group size, territoriality, storage pits, increased rock art production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 000-4 800</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Reduction in population and group size, evidence of abandonment of some sites, high degree of sedentism and isolation, circumscribed home range and rare annual ceremonial gatherings. There is also evidence of diminishing rainfall, declining resources and increasing stress, there is a decline in art production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 800-2 200</td>
<td>Amadzimba, (Mazowe, Upper Nyazongo, Bumbuzi, Craiglee)</td>
<td>Increase in group size, evidence of seasonal aggregation probably ceremonial gathering, a lot of bone artefacts, evidence of increased contact with other hunter-gatherer groups indicated by exotic raw material such as chalcedony, possibly increased mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-2 200</td>
<td>Ceramic Later Stone Age</td>
<td>Sheep, pottery, new people especially pastoralists, revival of painting, short-lived increase in pigment evidence, increased population, painting to address inter-group relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Periodization of the LSA of Zimbabwe.

The LSA is the period where regional diversification in material culture is more pronounced in the archaeological record (Walker and Thorp 1997; Larsson 2001), reflecting similar developments throughout southern Africa and on the continent as a
whole (Mitchell 2002; Phillipson 2005; Barham and Mitchell 2008). Phillipson (2005) argues that there is a proliferation of localised stone artefact industries. This diversity is accompanied by increased development of non-material variation as indicated in burial customs and artistic traditions (Phillipson 2005). There are also differences in the manner in which the hunter-gatherer communities in different areas relate to the diverse environments. The occupation of varied environments shows increasing adaptability. In the Holocene period, some groups that lived in less predictable climate areas such as the Karoo show high mobility while those in areas with stable conditions intensified the exploitation of local resources (Mitchell 2002).

The variability in the stone artefacts of the LSA period has been observed among all the six broad industries (see Burrett 2002; Thorp 2004). There is so much variation in the LSA material culture such that it is difficult to group them into distinct industries. Walker and Thorp (1997) use the phrase ‘and related industries’ to cater for the variations. However, the Nswatugi period exhibits more of this diversity. As early as the 1950s, Clark (1970) had observed that material culture belonging to Nswatugi had regional variants, such as Zambezi, Matebeleland and Mashonaland variants. The Mashonaland variant has been termed Pfupi but recent research has shown that even the definition of Pfupi in Mashonaland is too broad because there are numerous differences among the stone artefact assemblages from the region (Burrett 2002). As was noted by Walker and Thorp (1997), stone artefact assemblages from the site of Mtemwa differ from those of the nearby Pfupi. Mtemwa has a high incidence of scrapers whereas Pfupi has more
backed artefacts (Burrett 2002, p. 73). Walker and Thorp (1997, p.24) also noted that the assemblages from Matopo Hills vary from those recorded in Bulawayo.

LSA sites have been reported in all the case study areas (see Map 1, 2 and 3). However, much of the material has not been classified into the established chronology as outlined above mainly due to lack of systematic research. For example, LSA sites have been reported in Harare but have not been excavated (Burrett 1990b, Archaeology Survey Room Records (ASR) at Museum of Human Sciences). There are no records of systematic excavation of any of the sites. On the other hand, the LSA of Chivi is known from stone artifacts and other material observed in disturbed stratigraphies. These include microlithic blades, thumbnail scrapers, hammer stones, chopping tools, ostrich eggshells and beads (Cooke 1970).

A few LSA sites have been reported in Northern Nyanga, but these have not been studied in any detail (Soper 2002; Shenjere 2011). Studies in other parts of Nyanga district, such as Nyazongo, Chitura, along the Nyangombe River and Diana’s Vow, have shown that the lithic material was related to, but with some differences from LSA industries in other parts of Zimbabwe, especially Pfupi (Martin 1938; Cooke 1978; see Table 1). Cooke (1979, p.139) noted that one of the main differences is in the preponderance of square scrapers and an increase in the incidence of blades in lithics from eastern Zimbabwe. Further, recent research on the LSA in eastern Zimbabwe conducted in the Zimunya area at Gwenzi and Manjowe has also yielded material with affinities to Pfupi but with some
differences. The two assemblages have numerous backed bladelets as at Pfupi but they also have segments and scrapers and axe-like implements (Soper 2005; Bandama 2008).

The above discussion of the cultural setting shows that hunter-gatherer rock art was produced within a period that was already experiencing regional variation and diversification in material culture. There are changes in other aspects of culture. The mobility patterns, group relations and even in social adaptation to the environment differs. Therefore, there is need to consider that rock art as part of that culture might also be reflecting this variation and diversity.
Map 2: Distribution of known Stone Age sites in Chivi (by R. Kapumha)

NB: Some sites are listed as just Rock Paintings or Stone Age on the archaeological sites database.
Map 3: Distribution of known Stone Age sites in Harare (by R. Kapumha)
Map 4: Known Stone Age sites in north-eastern Zimbabwe (by R. Kapumha)
1.2 A general outline of Zimbabwe’s environment

From the onset, it is important to point out the difficulties encountered in trying to situate the prehistoric rock artists and their communities in the context of the physical environments. Firstly, the environment is continually changing. Although there have not been extreme climatic changes during the Holocene in southern Africa, pulses of drying and cooling have been recorded (Barham and Mitchell 2008). The severity of these pulses has been compounded by the advancing human settlements that have led to drastic alteration of the environment in some parts of the sub-continent, especially in the last 2000 years. Increasing human settlements have interfered with many of the faunal and floral populations that were endemic to most parts of the country such that it is difficult to reconstruct the wild floral and faunal resources that were available to the prehistoric communities. Thus, only a generalised picture of the environmental setting can be made.

The challenge lies in the lack of detailed examination of past environments in Zimbabwe (Mitchell 1997; Katsamudanga 2007, 2009). Although there were no major long term changes in the environmental conditions, short-term minor oscillations between cold and dry with warm and wet climatic conditions are known to have occurred (Holmgren et al. 1999; Smith 2005). These are not well documented in southern Africa and more so in Zimbabwe. Furthermore, many archaeologists have provided generalised paleo-environmental reconstructions based on data generated from few specific sites that are far spaced in southern Africa and the African continent at large (e.g. Walker 1995; Mitchell 1997; Jonsson 1998; Burrett 2002; Katsamudanga 2007, 2009; Shenjere 2011). This may not be accurate since some of these might have had prevailing microclimatic conditions
that could not be globally applied to the whole sub-continent. Nonetheless, lack of
detailed accounts of the Zimbabwean paleo-environmental record means that these
generalized reconstructions are still employed for this research. Reconstructions done by
Zimbabwean researchers are also used to assist in giving a more localised version of the
environmental history (e.g. Walker 1995; Burrett 2002; Katsamudanga 2007, 2009,
Shenjere 2011). However, much of this data is found outside the case study areas
although some similarities do exist.

1.2.1 Paleo-environmental reconstruction

Southern Africa is thought to have become increasingly warmer and wetter from the
beginning of the Holocene (the period from 10 000BP to the present). The highest
temperatures occurred during the Holocene Altithermal, between 7000 and 4500 BP
(Barham and Mitchell 2008). Slightly cooler temperatures prevailed thereafter. There are,
however, conflicting signals as other findings show that there was a cold spell which
began about 6 000 BP (Holmgren et al. 1999). The cooling in temperatures could be true
for Zimbabwe since there is evidence of cultural adaptation that could be a response to
change in climatic conditions. The cultural adaptation strategies include reduction in
population, change in group sizes and a reduction in the production of rock art (Table 2).
Walker (1994, 1995) argued that a reduction in the production of rock art coincides with
the adoption of new subsistence strategies to cope with the changing ecological
conditions. The reduction in rock art production is therefore a result of the adoption of
other modes of interaction that were adapted to suit these changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates (BP)</th>
<th>Evidence of Rock Art in Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Evidence of Rock Art in the rest of southern Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 000 years</td>
<td>Painted slabs of granite from Pomongwe Cave-no recognisable depictions</td>
<td>Apollo 11, Namibia±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-25/28 000</td>
<td>Spalls with traces of paint from excavated section at Pomongwe Cave-no recognisable depictions-indicate the beginning of painting tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9000 years</td>
<td>Very few images predate this e.g. the possibility of depiction of an extinct giant Cape horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9000</td>
<td>Greatest painting activity- probably most of the faded art dates to this period, oldest art is monochrome then bi-chromes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>Reduction in painting activities, possibility of continued painting in other parts of Zimbabwe, polychromes</td>
<td>In the Drakensberg monochromes probably dated to 3000 BP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Brandberg Namibia dates of between 2760 +/- 50 and 2710 +/- 50±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-2200</td>
<td>Sheep paintings, hunter-gatherer painting probably ended by 1500 BP. Intense painting between 2200 and 1500BP Farmer art dates from 1500BP</td>
<td>In the Drakensberg polychromes dated between 2000 and 1600 BP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At other places it has been dated to 300 BP#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;300</td>
<td>Farmer art probably continued until recently</td>
<td>Art depicting horses and European people found in South Africa. Hunter-gatherer rock art from some parts of South Africa#. This shows the continuation of the tradition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Generalised chronology of rock art of Zimbabwe and other parts of southern Africa


The precipitation amounts increased in the Late Holocene due to a stronger Inter-Tropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) over Zimbabwe (Deacon and Deacon 1999; Burrett 2002). The ITCZ is pushed further south of the equator during warmer periods than during cooler periods (Deacon and Deacon 1999). There is however little information on the actual degree of climatic variations through time and space.

In southern Africa, after 2000 BP, a more detailed picture of the short-term climatic variation is available. Cycles of periodic warming and cooling were recorded. These were attributed to variations in the solar system (Deacon and Deacon 1999; Katsamudanga
It was noted that cooler periods were drier than the warmer pulses. Burrett (2002) argues that similar variations may have occurred during the entire Holocene period but they were too short to be detectable in the current paleo-environmental reconstructions.

There is very little documentation of the changes in vegetation during the Holocene period in Zimbabwe. Vegetation usually adapts to the prevailing climatic conditions. Warmer temperatures and an increase in precipitation bring in a wide range of vegetation species while cold and dry conditions see a retraction of the flora (Katsamudanga 2007).

Much of the vegetation in Zimbabwe might be resistant to short-term weather changes. Thus, the climatic oscillations that occurred might not have affected the distribution of the vegetation. Burrett (2002) tried to search for signatures of these climatic pulses from charcoal samples that he collected during his excavation of LSA sites in the Marondera area. He reported no major changes in the vegetation throughout the Holocene period. The vegetation was consistent with warm climatic conditions. Thus, he concluded that the cooler pulses might have been too short to affect changes in the vegetation type. He however noted that some tree species have gone into extinction but this could be attributed to human activities that led to extensive cutting down of trees for cultivation and iron-working processes in the last 2000 years, rather than climatic fluctuations. Taking this position, one can assume that the hunter-gatherers were interacting with more or less similar vegetation as that found in the case study areas today.
1.2.2 Topography

In terms of relief, Zimbabwe is located on the elevated central plateau (Highveld) of southern Africa with an elevation of 1200m above sea level (Relief Map of Zimbabwe 2001). The areas between 900 and 1200m are the Middleveld while areas below 900m constitute the Lowveld (Relief Map 2001). The Lowveld areas are mainly along the Zambezi valley towards Zambia and southwards into the Limpopo valley to the border with South Africa. The highest altitude on the Highveld is 2592 metres above sea level found in the Eastern highlands. Most areas of the Lowveld are less than 900m with the lowest point being 300m above sea level at the junction of the Runde and Save Rivers (Relief Map 2001). The average altitude for Chivi is 900m, showing a gradual descent into the Lowveld (Sayce 1987). Northern Nyanga is also partly Lowveld as much of it lies below 900m, on the leeside of the Eastern Highlands (Stocklmayer 1980). This further reduces the amount of precipitation received. In contrast, Harare is on the central plateau (Highveld) of the country with an average elevation of about 1 400 meters above sea level (Sayce 1987).

In Chivi, the mountainous parts rise to 100m above the lowlands (Biegel and Pope 1970). The area has numerous granite boulders that sometimes form large shelters. The open areas are also dotted with small hilly granite outcrops. Although some sites are located in these granite outcrops, many of the rock art sites are concentrated within the mountainous parts of the district. On the other hand, many of the rock art sites in Northern Nyanga are found in smaller granite kopjes and outcrops that are found across the low-lying plains to the east of the Ruangwe range. The Harare area has rocky outcrops, some of which are
just piles of balancing rocks, especially in the eastern parts of the research area (Plate 1). These have virtually no shelters such that the rock art is on boulder faces. On the western parts of the area, a few hillocks and low mountains complement the rocky outcrops on the plains. Here a few large sites occur in the rock shelters in Chivero and Nharira Hills.
Map 5: Relief, Geology, and Rainfall for Chivi
Map 6: Relief, Geology ans Rainfall for Harare
Map 7: Relief, Geology and rainfall for Northern Nyanga
1.2.3 Drainage and ground water resources

Topographic variations are influential to human societies because they influence the localized weather and climatic conditions. These, in turn, influence the resource availability and social circumstances of communities. The central plateau forms the main watershed of the country, giving rise to numerous large rivers that drain into the Lowveld (Moyo et al. 1998). As Harare is located on the central plateau, it is much better watered than Chivi and Northern Nyanga. Although the environment has been altered by the recent urban developments, reports from the 19th century AD present a well-watered environment for Harare. Selous (1881, 1896) reported that the Manyame River was deep with steep banks in the mid-1800s and the present day Harare area is intersected by perennially running streams. The major river is the Manyame but there are many smaller perennial rivers and streams throughout the landscape, including the Mukuvisi, Chiraura, Marimba and Ruwa (Plate 1, Map 6). Tanser (1964) also reported that Mukuvisi and Marimba streams had pools and swampy areas with tall reeds and bulrushes. There used to be a number of marshy lands with permanent pools.
The other two case study areas are drier. Northern Nyanga is situated between two major rivers; the Rwenya River in the west and the Gairezi River to the east along the border with Mozambique. Both these rivers are perennial because they are fed from the Eastern Highlands. The streams within Northern Nyanga area are mostly seasonal (Nyamapfene 1991). Chivi is also short of perennial sources of water with major rivers being Tugwi to the north and Runde on the southern parts of the research area. Although these are perennial rivers, the flow is reduced during the dry periods (Tafangenyasha and Dzinomwa 2005, see map 5). The mountainous area in the centre of the Chivi district influences the distribution of food resources. The mountainous area has a wetter microclimate with occasional occult precipitation (Biegel and Pope 1970). It is therefore significantly different from the drier plains around it in terms of the availability of water.
and food resources (Tafangenyasha and Dzinomwa 2005). In historical times, the mountainous areas are known to have been a contested environment with most new or aspiring rulers of the Chivi chieftaincy garnering for their control (Mazarire 2003). Today, people who reside within this mountainous area practice crop cultivation throughout the year, utilizing the perennial running water coming down the mountains. The less mountainous open areas lack surface water most of the year. The differences in water availability must have influenced settlement patterns and the economy of past hunter-gatherers and early agriculturists who occupied the area.

1.2.4 Present climates

In Zimbabwe, prehistoric localised variations have not been documented due to lack of detailed paleo-climatic studies in the country. The amount of rainfall and the average temperature are some aspects of the climatic conditions that influence the nature of subsistence within hunter-gatherer communities. The present climatic conditions indicate the existence of localized variations in Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe’s climate is tropical with three main seasons; a warm, wet season from November to April; a cool, dry season from May to August; and a hot, dry season between September and October (Ngara et al. 1998, p.106). Seasonal variation of rainfall and temperatures influences the availability of many of the plants in Zimbabwe. If this were the case during LSA, these would have affected food availability and strategies to acquire it. Certain plants, especially cereals and fruits would be important during certain periods (Burrett 2002). Walker (1995) has shown that prior to 9000 BP, the hunter-gatherer groups in the Matopo Hills moved in and out of the area depending on the seasonal movement of game. This was only curtailed with the
increase of human populations on the landscape. This was compounded by the fact that rainfall patterns in the country are unreliable such that there are many incidences of drought (Ngara et al. 1998, p. 107). These drought periods exacerbate the uneven temporal and spatial distribution of food resources.

There is a great deal of variation in precipitation and temperature across the country with the highest annual rainfall received in the eastern highlands and the lowest in the Lowveld areas. The average annual precipitation ranges from below 450 to above 1200 mm (Sayce 1987). The temperatures are moderate on the Highveld and Middleveld, averaging between 14°C and 32°C, but in the Lowveld temperatures can go up to 41°C (Ngara et al. 1998, p. 107). For the case study areas, Northern Nyanga temperatures range from 9°C in winter to 35°C in summer. The area is not as cold as the higher altitudes in the Eastern Highlands. The annual precipitation averages between 640 and 730mm per annum, received mainly during the rainy season from November to April (Stocklmayer 1980; Nyamapfene 1991; Soper 2002, see map 7). However, the area is subject to periodic seasonal droughts and severe dry spells (Summers 1958). This differs from the adjacent Eastern Highlands that receive rainfall throughout the year.

The annual precipitation averages for Chivi are between 500-600mm (see map 5). According to Chuma et al. (2000), the likelihood of droughts in the area is one in every five years but they have become more frequent in recent years. Harare has moderate temperatures compared to the other two areas. The average annual temperature is 18°C while annual rainfall averages 825mm per annum, with most of the rain coming during
the rainy season as well (Sayce 1987). However, periods of dry spells continue to be experienced and in some years, these last much longer than is normal.

1.2.5 Geology

The availability of raw materials for stone tool manufacture was an essential geological quality of an area for Stone Age people. There is even evidence of trade and exchange of some rare raw materials such as chalcedony in the Matopo Hills (Walker 1995). For hunter-gatherers, the geology does not only provide choices and constraints in tool making, but also the canvas on which the artists expressed themselves. In some places, the geology determined whether the artists would engrave or paint their art (Deacon and Deacon 1999). Where there are no shelters to paint, engraving is adopted. The geology also provides the pigments.

Generally, Zimbabwe has a heterogeneous geology which is dominated by the core of the Achaean basement known as the Zimbabwe craton dated to between 3.5 and 2.5 billion years (Schlüter and Martin 2008). The craton is principally composed of granitoids, schists, gneisses, and greenstone belts (Chinoda et al. 2009). It is bordered and intruded by the Karoo Super Group to the north and south, the Kalahari group to the west and the Mozambican Belt to the east (Stocklmayer 1980; Schlüter and Martin 2008; Koistinen et al. 2008). The Karoo Super Group is made up of the Limpopo Belt and Zambezi Belt. The Limpopo Belt is sub-divided into three zones, that is, the Northern Marginal Zone, Central Zone and the Southern Marginal Zone (Chinoda et al. 2009). The belts of Karoo
Super Group have metamorphosed rocks from terrestrial sediments and formations of feldspathic sandstones, grits, shale, and coal beds (Schlüter and Martin 2008).

The three case study areas are largely located within the Zimbabwe craton and the dominant rock is granite. This can explain the absence of rock engravings and the prevalence of paintings in these areas. However they have areas with intrusion from other geological structures. For example, in Chivi the granite greenstone belt and granite quartzofeldspathic gneisses of the craton are intruded by what are termed the “Chibi massive granites and quartzofeldspathic gneisses of the granulite and the rocks of the Neshuro complex” (Robertson 1970, p. 19, see map 5). There are patches of the gneisses that make up part of the Northern Marginal Zone of the Limpopo Mobile belt. In Northern Nyanga, the dominating rock type is granite whilst other gneisses and schists occur in small portions scattered within the environment. However, the Ruangwe Range (Plate 2, map 7) consists of dolerite, metadolerite, capped limestone, siltstones, and orthoquartzite (Stocklmayer 1980). Harare has mainly the Gneiss/ Granite rock with some intrusions of the greenstone (Moyo et al. 1998, see map 6). In all the case studies, many of the rock art sites are found in smaller granite kopjes and outcrops across the landscapes, although a few occur on different rock types.
Traditionally, researchers thought that the rock art in Zimbabwe was confined to the granitic areas of the country (Cooke 1969a, 1974; Garlake 1987 c, 1995). Granite is the most common rock type, forming large, rounded hills or ‘dwalas’ that characterise the country. Further research has shown that the rock art is also found on different types of rock such as on sandstones of the Karoo and Kalahari Belts (Eastwood et al. 1994; Pearce et al. 2003; Pearce 2009; Bonyongwa 2010; Haynes et al. 2011). Nevertheless, the current knowledge of the distribution of rock engravings is confined to the sandstone regions where they occur together with the rock paintings (Eastwood et al. 1994, Haynes et al. 2011; Nhamo and Bonyongwa forthcoming). Only rock paintings are found in granite areas.
1.2.6 Soils

There are numerous soil types in Zimbabwe, depending on the geology, rainfall, and topography of the areas (Nyamapfene 1991). The commonest are the sand soils derived from the granite rocks. Other kinds of soils are the brown, slightly red sandy loams from the reformed granite (paragneiss) are also known. Few places have black turf soils derived from basalt rock, rich red clay soils from dolerite, the sands from the Kalahari sandstones and the shallow greyish brown sandy loam from serpentine of the Great Dyke (Nyamapfene 1991). The granite-derived sands are generally inherently infertile and susceptible to erosion. The fertility of these soils depends not only on their physical characteristics but also on other aspects of the environment such as precipitation and vegetation cover.

In Chivi, the soils are mostly shallow sandy loam resulting from the decomposition of the granite rocks although a few areas have ‘sandy clay and grey-black vlei clays’ (Chuma et al. 2000 p. 46). For example, in Chivi, the soils are usually fertile in the hilly area mainly due to the leaf mould build-up but poor in the open areas (Anderson et al. 1993; Mapanda and Mavengahama 2011). The soils in both Harare and Northern Nyanga are fersiallitic red clay/chromic luvisols derived from the rocks of the basement complex or mafic rocks, and paraferralitic (derived from granite) (Nyamapfene 1991, p. 30). In Northern Nyanga, small and scattered areas with red soils are found in the dolerite area. The soils in Harare are richer due to the differences in environmental parameters such as the amount of rainfall and vegetation (Nyamapfene 1991). The type of soils together with other
environmental parameters would have determined the kind of food resources available to the hunter-gatherer communities in different parts of the country.

1.2.7 Vegetation

Zimbabwe has diverse flora. It has numerous types of grasses, flowers and shrubs. Vegetation in Zimbabwe is mainly deciduous miombo savannah woodlands (Wild and Barbosa 1967). Grasslands, montane vegetation, and moist evergreen forests occur in the mountainous Eastern Highlands (Whitlow 1987). On the Highveld, the predominant trees belong to the Brachystegia and Julbernardia family. In the drier regions of the Lowveld, the deciduous Colophospermum mopane (mopani) woodlands with patches of Combretum, Acacia and scattered Adansonia digitata (baobab) trees are prevalent (Sayce 1987).

The vegetation found in the case study areas varies. Bassett (1963 cited in Soper 2002, p. 21) noted that in general, the lowlands of the Nyanga area were characterised by mixed woodland vegetation. This type of vegetation has also been noted during fieldwork with thickets in and around mountains and the scattered granite kopjes but very sparse vegetation remains in the arable lands. The vegetation cover in Northern Nyanga was reportedly thicker during the early colonial period (Maxwell 1999). Nowadays, increased human population density has led to its clearance. Thick forests in mountain areas have species that include Julbernardia globiflora, Parinari curatellifolia, Terminalia spp, Brachystegia spiciformis, Brachystegia glaicescens, and Gardernia resiniflua. Other tree species that were noted during fieldwork include wild fruit trees such as Grewia
flavescens, Acacia polyacantha subsp. campylacantha, Piliostigma thonningii, Adansonia digitata, Sclerocarya caffra, and Garcinia buchananii. These might have played a major role in the diet of the communities that inhabited this area.

In Chivi, Biegel and Pope (1970) noted three types of vegetation. These are tree bush/savanna, woodland and gully forest (riparian), although there are areas with heterogeneous types of vegetation with elements of both woodland and savanna. Some areas have sudden changes from one type of vegetation to another. For example, at Razi Hill the northern facing slope has savanna vegetation while the south facing side has woodland and gully forest. Biegel and Pope (1970) argue that these are due to sudden changes in geology and soil type.

The tree bush/savanna is the predominant vegetation with dense stands of deciduous trees and low grass cover (Plate 3). Within the research area, this kind of vegetation was noted on the plains or the low-lying areas, especially to the north of Chivi Growth Point. This is dominated by Terminalia sericea and Colophospermum mopane. Fruit trees include Adansonia digitata, Sclerocarya caffra, Berchemia discolor, Piliostigma thonningii, and Grewia flavescens.
Plate 3: The bush/savannah vegetation in Chivi.
The mountainous part of the district is shown in the background.

The woodlands in Chivi are mainly found around the foot and on the slopes of the granite hills and mountains. They are mainly composed of *Brachystegia bohemii* with some *Julbernadia globiflora* and to a lesser extent *Brachystegia glaicescens*. Associated trees and bushes include *Kirkia acuminata*, *Rhoicissus revoilei*, *Commiphora mossambicensis*, *Pterocarpus rotundifolius*, *Allophylus alnifolius*, and *Gardenia resiniflua*.

The gully forest vegetation is found in the gullies and ravines especially along main river valleys such as Runde and Tugwi. The common trees are *Strychos hennigsii*, *Minusops zeyheri* and *Terminalia gazensis*. Other trees include *Tabernaemontana elegans*, *Cassipourea congoensis*, *Homalium dentatum*, *Croton sylvaticus*, and *Androstachys*
johnsonii. Rare trees include *Brachylaena huilensis* and *Cordia Africana*. At Nyoni Hills, Biegel and Pope (1970, p.18) reported the occurrence of *Bivinia jalbertii* which they said is restricted to these hills only in Zimbabwe. The variation in the types of vegetation in Chivi must have provided diversified food sources for the hunter-gatherer communities in the area.

The climate in Harare supports a natural vegetation of deciduous miombo woodland interspersed with grasslands, although some sections have dry, early deciduous tree savanna dominated by *Parinari curatellifolia* (Wild and Barbosa 1967). Selous (1896, 1893) reported this type of vegetation in the 1800s. He noted that the patches of open grasslands were small and one was never out of sight of forest trees. Tanser (1964) also made a similar report. Riparian vegetation occurs along the rivers, streams and around the marshy areas. It has a variety of plant species which could have been widespread before the growth of the urban settlement. Selous (1896, 1893) argued that vegetable foods and fruits were abundant in the 1800s, especially the *Uapaca kirkiana*, *Ximenia caffra* Sond and *Vitex payos*. The most common indigenous trees are the *Brachystegia spiciformis* and *Brachystegia bohemii*. Other plant species such as *Dovyalis zeyheri*, *Dombeya rotundifolia*, *Schotia brachypetala*, and *Dialiopsis Africana* also occur ([http://www.zimbabweflora.co.zw/index.php](http://www.zimbabweflora.co.zw/index.php)). Grasses and shrubs such as the *Dicliptera spinulosa*, and *Ficus verruculosa* are found.
1.2.8 Fauna
The past distribution of animals in Zimbabwe is not clear. The type of vegetation usually influences the distribution of some animal species, especially micro fauna such as rodents which are very sensitive to changes in habitat conditions (Kenmuir and Williams 1975). The short-lived climatic pulses that are thought to have characterized the Holocene period probably did not affect the macro-faunal species which are less sensitive to minor changes in climate (Plug and Badenhorst 2001). In southern Africa, it is the macro-fauna especially the antelopes that are depicted in the rock art. The micro-fauna that are sensitive to environmental change rarely appear in the art. For example, remains of kudu and eland, the most common animals in the rock art, have been found consistently at archaeological sites in various environmental regions dating back to 30 000 years BP (Plug and Badenhorst 2001).

The present day animal population in Zimbabwe is diverse. It includes elephant (*Loxodonta africana*), lion (*Panthera leo*), buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*), hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*), rhinoceros (*Ceratotherium sp.*), baboon (*Papio ursinus*), giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*), kudu (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*), eland (*Taurotragus oryx*), sable (*Hippotragus niger*), waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymnus*), zebra (*Equus quagga*), warthog (*Phacochoerus africanus*), aardvark (*Orycteropus afer*), porcupine (*Hystrix cristata*) and hare (*Lagomorpha sp.*). Snakes, lizards and birds abound. Although Zimbabwe is landlocked, there is diverse aquatic fauna in its rivers and lakes. Some of these aquatic animals occur in the rock art.
Due to over-exploitation and overpopulation in Northern Nyanga, the fauna is now restricted to the small species such as rock hyraxes (*Procavia capensis*) and hares, although the local people report occasional sighting of leopards (*Panthera pardus*), hyenas (*Crocuta crocuta*), bush pigs (*Potamochoerus porcus*) and porcupine (*Hystrix afericaeaustralis*). In this area in the 1870s, European hunters encountered herds of buffaloes, elephants and other animals (Burke 1969; Maxwell 1999). They also reported that hunting and gathering was an important part of the subsistence of the farming communities that occupied this area at the time (Maxwell 1999, p.15). The *Adasonia digitata* fruit and *Ndiya* root (no known scientific name) were gathered (Maxwell 1999). Young boys still go for hunting trips in the thickets around the mountains (Edward Sanyamuera pers. comm). The variety of plant and animal resources must have supported the hunter-gatherer groups in the area.

In Chivi, the fauna is no longer very visible because of high human population density that has resulted in the encroachment into the wild habitats of most animals. In the mountainous areas, there are still areas of thickets where fauna such as snakes, lizards and leopards are known (Broadley 1970). Some snakes were encountered during fieldwork for this research although their species were not recorded. The only one that was correctly identified was the python (*Pythonidae*).

There have not been any detailed excavations targeting Stone Age sites in the area, but Cooke (1970) reported finding rock hyrax (*Procavia capensis*) from the excavation material at Chomuruvati Ruins. A number of birds were observed, some of which have
restricted habitats in the three types of vegetation described above. For example, the
tallow white-eye (*Zosterops senegalensis*) is restricted to the gully vegetation (Irwin
1970). Many animals such as kudu, giraffe and eland must have been found as indicated
by their presence in similar habitats in Zimbabwe (Smithers 1983).

A wide variety of fauna was reported in Harare before the establishment of the urban
settlement. Selous (1896) noted large herds of eland, kudu and other antelopes roaming
around the area. Along the Manyame River, he reported animals such as hartebeest (*Al
celaphus*), tsessebe (*Damaliscus lunatus lunatus*), warthog, roan antelope (*Hippotragus
equines*), eland, zebra, sable, and oribi (*Ourebia ourebi*) among others. Included on the
list are animals such as rhinoceros and elephants that Selous and other European hunters
were after. Mukuvisi River is reported to have had a number of pools with crocodiles and
different types of fish (Tanser 1964). There are also reports of monkeys, an occasional
leopard and waterfowls along Mukuvisi (Tanser 1964).

1.3 Environment and culture: An overview

This chapter has summarized the cultural and environmental setting within which the
rock art was produced. The LSA provides this cultural setting for hunter-gatherer rock art
in Zimbabwe. The discussion here has shown that the cultural setting was characterized
by temporal and spatial variation in material culture. These include such issues as
adaptation to environmental and social stress that accompanies changes in climate and
population size. Changes in social relations and mobility patterns can be connected to the
adaptation and social stress. The chapter has also presented the present environmental
conditions with a view of laying the base for possible explanations for patterns in motif variation over space. Many of these environmental aspects have not changed much since the beginning of the Holocene period and therefore provide the physical context within which rock art was produced. Besides influencing the subsistence and economic strategies, the physical environment must have influenced the worldview of LSA communities.
Chapter 2: Conceptual Framework

As Jones and Leonard (1989, p.2) have argued, ‘…without the measure of diversity, we actually have very little knowledge of our materials’. This chapter provides a framework within which the study of motif variation has been formulated in this research. Although many researchers have noted the variation in the art, few have made it a focus of their studies. Most have considered variation in the rock art to be of minor significance compared to the commonalities. Variation in the rock art is considerable and therefore deserves a focused study of its own. The variation found in archaeological materials from the LSA period and the ethnography of the modern day hunter-gatherers further justify the study of variation in rock art. A detailed analysis of the art can contribute to the reconstruction of both the meaning of the rock art and the social history of its makers. The chapter provides the conceptual basis for researching on the spatial variation of motifs in Zimbabwean and southern African rock art.

The chapter begins by providing an exposé of the variation in the archaeology and ethnography of hunter-gatherers. It then expatiates on the working hypothesis of the research. The research is premised on the hypothesis that variation in motif representation is a result of differences in the social setting of the production of the rock art. This setting may be in terms of localized beliefs that were held by different hunter-gatherer groups. It can also be due to differences in the social issues being addressed by the artists through the rock art. These issues might be emanating from environmental, economic or cultural
variables in the community. Evidence from archaeological, ethnographic, and rock art research is used to interweave spatial motif variation with the outlined working hypothesis of the research. That there is variation in the archaeological record has already been exposed in Chapter 1. Therefore, this chapter focuses more on the rock art and the ethnographic data. It also weighs and evaluates the research carried out by previous scholars on motif variation to contextualize the objectives of the research within the broader theoretical and methodological approaches in rock art studies.

2.1 Archaeological context and variability in rock art

Most of the hunter-gatherer rock art in southern Africa is ascribed to the Holocene period of the LSA (Lewis-Williams 1983; Garlake 1995; Walker 1987, 1996; Mazel 2009, 2011). Therefore, it is important to understand the other archaeological aspects that prevailed during this period. Some researchers have argued that there could have been greater variability in the past since the archaeological record is more varied than is revealed by the modern day hunter-gatherer ethnographic literature (Kusimba 2005; Humphreys 2007). Wilmsen (1989) argues that the reduction in the heterogeneity could have been brought about by the loss of some territories to newcomers such as agropastoralists in the last 2000 years. The archaeological record of the period demonstrates the variation in the stone artefacts as compared to the situation in earlier periods. During the ESA period, stone tool technology is much more homogenous. Even though the MSA shows the beginning of this variation, the material culture is not as diverse as that of the LSA (Phillipson 2005). There is evidence of variation in subsistence strategies across space. A good example was provided by Sealy (2006) who demonstrated distinct
economic separation in two hunter-gatherer groups that lived 14km apart on the southern coast of South Africa. Although it might be difficult at the moment to show such minute differences using rock art only, this level of variation amplifies the need for greater awareness and research on variation within the archaeology of hunter-gatherer communities. The rock art embodies the signatures of variation characteristic of the period.

Within the archaeology of the LSA, there is evidence that there was also reduced mobility among the hunter-gatherer communities, which resulted in curtailment of direct contact between separate groups, thereby entrenching variation in cultural facets of the communities (Walker 1995; Sealy and Pfeiffer 2000; Mitchell 2002; Barham and Mitchell 2008). Walker (1995) argues that by around 9000 BP, people were occupying the Matopo Hills throughout the year whereas the norm in previous periods was seasonal occupation. There is little archaeological evidence of extensive long distance interaction between distant hunter-gatherer groups to reinforce any close cultural links. On the contrary, there is evidence of an increase in group identity and territorial ownership during the Holocene. Evidence of archaeological features such as storage pits, attests to delayed-returns economy in the Matopo Hills (Walker 1995). Walker (1987) connected this period with an increase in the production of rock art in the Matopo Hills. The period engendered variation in material culture and social relations. Walker (1995) suggests that rock art might have played a part in maintaining group boundaries by acting as a territorial marker since there is evidence of increasing importance of site ownership
among these communities. This evidence from Matopo Hills provides the possibility of such an occurrence across Zimbabwe and southern Africa.

Limited movement and contact between groups of people that live far apart implies increasing distance in social relations and needs. Although variation in the rock art cannot be only attributed to reduced interaction, sedentism leads to development of divergences in choices and identities. It necessitates the incorporation of other variables into the cultural arena that are not shared by distant groups and these in turn may affect the choices made in the production of the art.

2.2 Rock art studies and the regional variations

A number of researchers have worked on Zimbabwean rock art since the turn of the 20th century. Their research has ranged from quantitative, descriptive to interpretive works. These researches have alluded to variation of motifs across space in the rock art but have not studied it in detail. Cooke (1964) carried out a survey of the distribution of animals in the rock art on 1200 sites that were known at the time throughout the country. However, this was not detailed since it was an informal survey with some animals such as kudu, sable and other antelopes being left out. Nevertheless, this survey alluded to differences that existed in the art. Research such as that by Breuil (1966) which focused on the polychrome images from Masvingo also aided in showing motif differences in what is perceived by many to be a single region. Despite these allusions, the nature and character of rock art variation has not at all been clear. Therefore, this research was conceived to conduct a study of the extent of the variability that exists in Zimbabwean rock art.
The differences in the rock art, whether it is from site to site or region to region, have interested art enthusiasts from the beginning of rock art research in southern Africa, for more than a hundred years. However, there has been little exploration of these differences beyond coming up with stylistic chronologies since the variation was viewed to be the result of temporal differences. In southern Africa, regional differences in the rock art have been noted by scholars such as Burkitt (1928); Bleek (1932a); Frobenius (1931); Van Riet Lowe (1956); Rudner and Rudner (1970); Willcox (1984); Garlake (1995; 2001); Solomon (1998a); Hampson et al. (2002); Pearce (2009) and Eastwood et al. (2010). The variation in motif over space was noted as far back as the 1920s with Burkitt’s (1928) work. He used stylistic differences to define three major geographic regions, namely the Southern Rhodesian (Zimbabwean) group, the central group (rock art from the Free State Province in South Africa) and the southern group (rock art from the Western Cape). The characterisation only considered rock art found south of the Zambezi River since hunter-gatherer rock art from north of the river is generally regarded as significantly different (Smith 1997). Burkitt’s work influenced subsequent researchers although his delineations were based on ill-defined stylistic criteria and limited knowledge of the art (Hampson et al. 2002). Subsequent researchers have modified and adapted his geographic regions since the 1920s.

Although Bleek (1932a) disputed Burkitt’s stylistic chronologies, she updated his previous geographic division to four, with Cape Province, Drakensberg, Namibian and Zimbabwean rock art making up the regions. Van Riet Lowe (1956) agreed with Bleek’s divisions with a minor addition of the rock art from the Limpopo Province of South
Africa to the Zimbabwean group (Willcox 1968). Later on Rudner and Rudner (1970) divided the art of southern Africa into three distinct stylistic groups, namely, abstract, naturalistic and stylized. They borrowed considerably from Burkitt’s (1928) initial characterization but they incorporated an abstract group into which they placed the art from Zambia, Malawi and parts of Mozambique. The natural art group is that from the Eastern Cape and the Drakensberg area, which they also regarded as the ‘dynamic school of art’ (Rudner and Rudner 1970, p. 179). This phrase describes the action and colour, emphasizes movement and gives a three dimensional effect to the images by shading the colours. The stylized art, which they termed the ‘formal school of art’, is that from Zimbabwe and parts of South Africa such as Western Cape. This art, they argued, is characterized by stylized human figures and “economy of movement” (Rudner and Rudner 1970, p.179).

Apart from dividing the rock art into different schools, Rudner and Rudner (1970) also believed that different people or cultures made the different groups of art. For example, they assigned the dynamic school to the Smithfield people, while the stylized art was thought to belong to the Wilton culture (Rudner and Rudner 1970; Willcox 1984). These lithic cultures were based on archaeological research that was not clearly understood. Further research has shown that these Stone Age archaeological cultures are more complex than the simplified classes that Rudner and Rudner (1970) used. For example, in Zimbabwe, what was regarded as Wilton culture is now categorised into 4 periods (Table 1). The methodology employed for the geographic divisions by Rudner and Rudner (1970) has also been criticised for being too subjective and dependant on previously
assigned regions (Hampson et al. 2002). These regional assignments reflect an acknowledgement of variation in the art that is commonly accepted but not clearly explained.

Although Lewis-Williams (1983) did not agree with the methods employed by Rudner and Rudner (1970) in characterizing the different regions, he took on the regional differences in his survey of the rock art of southern Africa which he divided into four regions. Region 1 consisted of the rock art in Zimbabwe and parts of the Limpopo Province of South Africa, while Region 2 was the rock art of Namibia. Region 3 encompassed the rock art from the south-eastern Cape Province, including the Drakensberg/Maluti Mountains, while Region 4 covered the geometric art of the central plateau of South Africa. These regional distinctions were based on content and style. These regions are not very different from the ones by Rudner and Rudner (1970). Willcox’s (1984) compendium on the rock art of Africa also subscribes to these regional differences for southern Africa. Therefore, there is general accord in broad regional differences in the rock art of southern Africa. In spite of the problems that they present, these geographic regions are implied in most of the studies on southern African rock art. The implications of this regionalisation have never been fully investigated.

While coming up with different geographic rock art regions based on stylistic differences has been met with wide censure (Bleek 1932a; Lewis-Williams 1983, 1984; Garlake 1995) there is general agreement on the varying nature of the subject matter and its frequency across these regions. The most obvious example in the art is the emphasis on
different animals in the different parts of southern Africa. Within South Africa, the eland predominates in the Drakensberg Mountains, whereas in the Waterberg area it is the hartebeest and roan in Mpumalanga (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Laue 2000; Hampson et al. 2002). Elephants and sheep are more common in the Western Cape Province (Lewis-Williams 1983; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Parkington 2002). In Namibia, the springbok dominates the Brandberg rock art (Rudner and Rudner 1970; Lenssen-Erz 1994), while in most parts of Zimbabwe and north-eastern Botswana, kudu is the most frequently depicted (Walker 1996, 1998; Garlake 1987c; Nhamo 2006, 2007b). There is also convincing evidence of variability in the frequency of other aspects such as the ratio of male to female human figures and the greater variety in themes (Eastwood and Blundell 1999; Garlake 1995). Frobenius (1931, see Garlake 1995, p. 33) has argued that distinct subject matter in Zimbabwean art includes formlings, fields of flecks and plants.

Despite the fact that many scholars allude to these regional groupings, the issue of regionality remains one of the least understood aspects of rock art in southern Africa (Solomon 1999, 2008; Hampson et al. 2002; Mguni 2002; Smith 2006; Ndlovu 2009). A few scholars have tried to conduct detailed comparative analyses to establish the extent of the similarities and differences in the art of southern Africa (e.g. Rudner and Rudner 1970; Garlake 1987c). Even fewer researchers have tried to decipher the differences that they encountered in the art.
The broad regional groupings outlined above may lead one to assume that the rock art in one broad region is all similar, yet this is not the case. Parkington et al. (1994) pointed out that there are marked differences in the art even at sub-regional scales. These were noted from as far back as the 1920s when Burkitt (1928, p. 144) argued that within his central group of rock art from the Free State province, there were local variations or what he termed ‘geographic art centres’ with slightly different styles. Recently, Eastwood et al. (2010 p. 80) have shown that even within the Limpopo valley the art is different. While the art in the Limpopo Shashe Confluence Area (LSCA) has more humans than animals, Northern Venda has more animals than human depictions (Eastwood et al. 2010). Despite such evidence, researches have been focused on comparative analyses within and between regions to come up with palpable evidence for the incongruity of motif representation.

In Zimbabwe, researchers such as Goodall (1959), Breuil (1966), Garlake (1987c), Walker (1996) and Mguni (2002) have noted variations within the rock art but few have tried to analyse and explain it. In the mid 20th century, researchers were more interested in variation because they perceived it as a chronological marker of the art rather than as reflective of diversity within the broad regional groupings (for example, Burkitt 1928; Cooke 1957, 1963, 1959, 1974; Goodall 1959). In the last 30 years, the variations in the rock art were mostly dismissed in favour of the common attributes. Lewis-Williams (1983, p. 36) argued that no matter what the differences may be, the art shares many features. For him these commonalities were more important in interpreting the art. In Zimbabwe, much of the research has also focused on searching for commonalities in the
rock art rather than embarking on rigorous comparative analysis (e.g. Garlake 1987c, 1995). The commonalities were favoured because they fit into the trance/shamanism hypothesis which has been popular in the last three decades. However, this left out a large part of the hunter-gatherer lifestyles that is reflected in the variation. Issues such as social groupings across the landscape can only be understood by looking at differences rather than the common aspects. Studying variation in rock art can aid in this endeavour.

2.3 Ethnographic communities as analogies of variation in LSA archaeology

Rock art and other archaeological evidence demonstrates the actuality of variation within the LSA hunter-gatherer communities in southern Africa. Nevertheless, there is need to appraise the nature and extent of variation among the modern day hunter-gatherers as they are sources of analogies used in this research for the interpretation of variation in the archaeological record.

Currently, the rock art and other archaeological reconstructions of the LSA of southern Africa are based on ethnographic evidence from the 19th century hunter-gatherers in the Cape Province of South Africa (e.g. Bleek and Lloyd 1911; Bleek 1923, 1924, 1928a). This body of evidence is complemented by evidence from mid-20th century hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari (e.g. Schapera 1930; Marshall 1957, 1960, 1962, 1969, 1976, Lee 1972, 1979; Heinz 1972, 1975, 1978, 1979; Silberbauer 1981). Although drawing parallels from the ethnographic information has contributed significantly in the
quest for meaning in rock art research, it has also concretised the focus on the
commonalities that could easily be related to the available ethnographic information.

This approach has masked variability in both the archaeological record and the
ethnographic material. The ethnography, which has common aspects with what is in the
archaeology, is the one that has frequently been utilised, leaving out that which shows
diversity. This has led to the over-utilisation of the ethnographic information from certain
hunter-gatherer groups while the rest are considered a “poor-fit” to the archaeological
data (Kusimba 2005, p.337). Rock art researchers, Stone Age archaeologists and some
anthropologists have been accused of drawing most of their analogies from a few groups,
choosing only those groups that reflect their interest in the archaeological record, and
ignoring aspects of groups that are not compatible with their interpretations (Mitchell
2004, 2005; Kusimba 2005). For archaeologists, the emphasis on particular groups is
partially because these groups have been well researched by anthropologists. For
example, most analogies are drawn from the !Kung because their ethnography suits many
of the interpretations favoured by researchers. This over-reliance on the !Kung has seen
those modern hunter-gatherer groups that have varied information being sidelined to the
extent that some critics have called for the ‘de-!Kunging’ of the archaeology of southern
African hunter-gatherers (Parkington 1984; Mitchell 2004, 2005; Humphreys 2005,
2007). In the last few years this lack of variety in the ethnographic analogies has become
increasingly inconsistent with the greater variability now found in other aspects of the
archaeological evidence (Sealy and Pfeiffer 2000; Mitchell 2005a & b; Sealy 2006). In
this research, therefore, the variability of the modern day hunter-gatherer communities is
used as a model to interrogate the causes of the variation and the structuring principles in the past hunter-gatherer communities who made the rock art.

Tobias (1957) best described the variability of the modern hunter-gatherer culture when he argued that there is no single criterion to characterize all of them. Many early western travellers and missionaries portrayed the hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari as homogenous (e.g. Schapera 1960, 1961; Baines 1864). This has been proven false (e.g. Gordon 1990; Barnard 1992; and Wilmsen 1997), but the notion has not been completely abandoned. This is especially evident when researchers emphasize the common aspects and regard any differences to be a result of acculturation from their Bantu and Khoe neighbours (e.g. Jolly 1996, 2002; Eastwood et al. 2010).

There are different ethnic groupings in the Kalahari though the delineation and characterisation of these groupings is a point of contention among anthropologists (Barnard 1992). Most of the contemporary hunter-gatherer groups of southern Africa can be classified into three major groups based on linguistic characterisation. These are the southern, central and northern groups (Bleek 1927; Schapera 1927, 1930; Barnard 1992; Guenther 1999; Elliot 2004). These divisions have several linguistic sub-divisions within them, with some groups barely understanding each other. The southern group includes groups such as the extinct !Xam or !Xam-ka /ke of the Cape Province, //Xegwi, the Mountain Bushmen of Basutoland (Mphaki and Mamantso) and the !Khomani (Elliot 2004). The central group includes the Nhoro, G/wi, G/ana, Tshwa (Hietshware) and the Shua (Tyua). The northern group included the Ju’hoan, Auen, !Xu (Sekele) and !Xu...
(Kwankala) of Botswana, Namibia and Angola (Barnard 1996, Elliot 2004). The northern group is sometimes collectively known as the !Kung, although in some publications the term !Kung is used to refer to the Ju/'hoan (Biesele 1993). Extinct groups from southern Namibia have not been assigned to any of the broad linguistic divisions. They are just classified as the Namibian group (Elliot 2004, see Map 8).

Barnard (1992, p.40) argues that the linguistic groupings correspond roughly with cultural units. For example, the !Xo feel that all those who speak their language have common ancestral ties (Heinz 1966 cited in Barnard 1992, p.64)

Map 8: The distribution of contemporary southern Africa hunter-gatherer groupings
(Adapted from Schapera 1930; Barnard 1992, 1996 and Elliot 2004)
The hunter-gatherers in Zimbabwe are known from the western parts of the country along the present day Zimbabwe-Botswana border. The ones from the northwest belong to the Shua and those from the southwest to the Hietshware group. Both groups are known as Masarwa/Basarwa, Batwa or Amasili by the local farming communities and they have been regarded as such since the 1800s (Selous 1893, 1896; Dornan 1925; Hitchcock and Nangati 2000). The Shua are mainly found around the Hwange area and the Tshwa around the Tuli Circle and the Shashe/Limpopo area (Dornan 1925; Barnard 1996; Hitchcock 1996). Both belong to the central language group, which is heavily influenced by the Khoi language (Hitchcock and Nangati 2000 see Map 8). Prior to the 1920s, there were unconfirmed reports of hunter-gatherer groups in some parts of Zimbabwe such as the Matibi, Mberengwa, Chiredzi and other parts of Masvingo Province (Elton 1893; Dornan 1925). However, as Dornan (1925) argues, it is not known whether the groups reported in these parts of Zimbabwe were also Khoi speaking or belonged to other language groups. Thus, they are classified as others on the map.

Many of the languages spoken by the different language groups are mutually unintelligible even for those that are classified in the same broad language. Moffat (1842, cited in Humphreys 2007, p.100) observed a high degree of variation of hunter-gatherer languages “even when nothing but a range of hills or a river intervenes” between the ethnic groups. Contact with people from different language groups is common at the boundaries but those who live in the interior are only vaguely aware of other groups and their material culture (Wiessner 1983). This heterogeneity of the modern day hunter-
gatherer groups is used here for inferences on the variation of the LSA hunter-gatherer communities. The variation in material culture found in the archaeological record might be reflecting the variations in cultural aspects of the different groups of hunter-gatherers. This is the position taken by this research.

Members within the sub-linguistic cluster or dialect group see themselves as one group and some claim relations through a common ancestor. For example, Fourie (1928, p.85) reported that members of the #Ao-/e#in (#Au//ei) groups claimed descent from a first big #Ao-/e#in “bushman”. In addition to the language, they also share common exchange networks, systems of kinship, initiation rites and other ceremonial aspects (Wiessner 1983; Barnard 1992). They differentiate themselves from people from other language groups; they even have names for these outsiders (Wiessner 1983; Silberbauer 1981).

These sub-linguistic groupings in the Kalahari have three levels of social organization; the nuclear family, the band and the band cluster or nexus (Wiessner 1983). This basic structure of the hunter-gatherer social anatomy might be a useful axis for evaluating variation in the archaeological record. Nevertheless, groups such as the !Kung do not exhibit some of these levels of social organisation. The !Kung, for example, have a weak system of band clustering while the !Xo and the G/wi have strong systems (Wiessner 1983; Barnard 1996). Those groups with band clusters usually converge at certain times of the year, although the band is, however, the most interactive level.
Siblings who own a particular piece of land that forms the basic subsistence area for the unit (Lee 1972; Lee and Daly 1999) constitute the band. The band members might be linked by birth or through marriage (Heinz 1972; Lee 1979; Silberbauer 1981). Band membership is very fluid depending on the availability and seasonal variation of food and water resources (Yellen and Harpending 1972; Wiessner 1983). There are frequent extended visits to other bands within the band cluster (Wiessner 1983).

If hunter-gatherer societies in the past had a similar basic social structure, variation in material culture such as rock art might be a result of the differences in the groupings of the past communities. Although this research does not aspire to identify these groups in the archaeological record, the results of the analysis might be useful towards that enterprise in the future.

The above analogy is especially fruitful when used together with the variation that has been noted in the land tenure system of the modern day hunter-gatherers. The popular belief is that hunter-gatherers are nomads who move across the environment with no land tenure system to manage these movements. Research in the Kalahari has shown that this is an over-generalization of the mobility patterns of hunter-gatherers (Heinz 1972). Rather, hunter-gatherers move from one place to another within a defined area with defined boundaries. As early as the early 1900s, Passarge, a German geographer who recorded ethnographic information of some of the hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari showed the existence of a land tenure system among the Kalahari hunter-gatherers wherein every band had defined hunting grounds (Wilmsen 1997). Fourie (1928) noted
that each family group owned its group area and had authority and special rights over it. This territory is never taken away from the owners even in cases of conflict (Fourie 1928). For those groups that moved according to seasonal availability of resources, they would have two hunting grounds, one for the dry season and the other for the rainy season. Subsequent researchers have also confirmed this. Marshall (1960) and Lee (1972) for example, show that the land is divided into distinct territories (n!oresi) inhabited by separate bands (n//abesi). Borders of these n!oresi are roughly defined by a landmark or in terms of the area surrounding the landmark. These landmarks might include any recognisable elements in the environment such as trees, hills or mountains. This means that resource utilisation was confined to these particular areas and not unlimited. The size of the territory differs among the different hunter-gatherer groups. The territory of individual bands among the 'Kung and the 'Xo measures between 300-600 km². That of the G/wi are between 450 and 1,000 km² (Lee 1979; Silberbauer 1972; Wiessner 1983).

The observance of these territorial boundaries differs among the different ethnic groups in the Kalahari (Lee 1972; Barnard 1992). Some groups observe them fastidiously (Fourie 1928; Heinz 1972) while others, such as the 'Kung, have a nonchalant system of land ownership (Marshall (1960; Lee 1972; Wiessner 1982b). Researchers have postulated that the territoriality of the hunter-gatherers differs with the environment in which groups are located (Lee 1972; Barnard 1992, 1996). The availability of resources influences whether or not a group has a strict or nonchalant territorial system. This has also been observed among hunter-gatherer groups in other parts of the world such as the Nunaminut /Inuit and Akulmiut of North America (Binford 1980, 2001; Andrews 1994;
Burch and Csonka 1999). On the other hand, Wilmsen (1989) has argued that the loose sense of territoriality among some hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari is a result of the fact that they have lost their land rights through appropriation of the land by groups such as the herders, farmers and white settlers. He is of the opinion that before colonization when hunter gatherers still had rights to land, they had strong systems of territoriality. However, this is difficult to support with archaeological evidence.

In the Kalahari today, groups that live in areas where the resources are sometimes erratic have a flexible territorial system as in the case of the !Kung. The reciprocal access to resources would ensure that the key resources would be available to all at critical periods (Lee 1972; Wiessner 1982b). This reciprocal access is fostered by a gift exchange system known as hxaro (Wiessner 1982a, p.62). Groups that live in environments with plentiful resources or water sources such as the Nharo have a more closed land tenure system and are less mobile (Barnard 1980, 1992, 1996; Wilmsen 1997). On the other hand, groups that have low resources are more territorial. The G/wi also have exclusive rights to the land (Silberbauer 1963). The !Xo would not even dare ask for permission to use another band cluster’s land (Heinz 1979; Wiessner 1983). Barnard (1992, 1996) argues that the threshold of abundance and scarcity determines these systems. Where there are few resources the groups tend to be protective of them, whereas where the resources are almost non-existent there is nothing to protect. He has illustrated this by using the /Auni and #Khomani of southern Namibia who have even fewer resources than the !Xo and therefore have an open access system (Barnard 1996, p. 10). The case of the !Kung and the Nharo shows the reverse situation in this case. This diversified nature of the land
tenure systems among modern day hunter-gatherers can provide interesting analogies in
the interpretation of variation in the archaeological record. Among those with strict land
tenure, contact between widely separated groups is limited. Reduced mobility inflicted by
territorial boundaries may account for the variation in the cultural expression of widely
separated groups. Thus, territoriality and reduced contact might explain the degree of
variation in the archaeological material culture of the LSA people.

A comparative analysis of the social and political organisation of hunter-gatherer
communities in the Kalahari has also shown both major differences and commonalities.
Barnard (1992) argues that the major point of difference among modern day San societies
in the Kalahari is the way they relate, that is, the structure of their kinship and relations
with other members of the group. The societies are either kinship confederates or locality
incorporative. Those that are kinship confederates consider kinship ties more than
residence whereas the latter consider residence to override kinship ties. In the Kalahari,
both these structures are found among different communities depending on local factors
such as abundance of food and water. The !Xo, for example, are more of kinship
confederates whereas the !Kung prefer the locality incorporative. Among the !Kung, the
naming system allows any person with the same name to be a relative. Barnard (1992)
argues that the nature of social relations is influenced by environmental variables such as
the availability of water and food. Those groups that live in areas where water is readily
available are less seasonally structured while others are highly mobile because of the
scarcity of water in their area. The kinship structure of the groups would influence the
mobility of members.
The differences do not end with the structure of relations. According to Barnard (1992), there are differences in religious beliefs. The concept of *n!ow*, for example, is unique to the *!Kung*, although it is similar to beliefs about rain found among other groups. There is also variation even in the ‘common’ aspects of culture. Schmidt (1986, p.169) gives an example of the variations in the common story about a mythical figure called ‘eyes-on-his-feet’. He notes that the story differs among various groups of hunter-gatherers. It is adapted to different local patterns of narration giving it a local flavour. Fourie (1928 p. 89) also reports that the initiation ceremonies vary considerably among various ethnic groups. Solomon (1999, 2008) exposes the difference between *!Kung* and *!Xam* beliefs especially as regards cosmology, illness and its curing. Therefore, it is clear that although the modern hunter-gatherers share many commonalities, they also have differences that influence, and are a direct result of how they live. Archaeologists can thus use this variation to model the nature of variation that could have existed among the LSA hunter-gatherers.

An examination of variation in material culture of the modern day hunter-gatherers would also provide interesting analogies for the interpretation of the archaeological record. Schapera (1930, p.207) mentions how modern hunter-gatherers decorate a range of products such as pottery, ostrich eggshells, utensils, skin bags as well as stone and bone pipes. He, however, did not discuss these decorations in detail because he considered them to be of “no intrinsic value”. This is unfortunate because the decorations on this
material culture could have been very important in epitomising the nature of cultural variation among prehistoric hunter-gatherer communities.

Archaeological and ethnographic evidence of decoration on ostrich eggshells is a potential source of information on the variation in decorative art but little has been done to document the ethnographic information. Archaeological evidence of ostrich eggshells that have been recovered is mostly dated to the last 200 years. The data is however too scattered and too little to show patterns that can be used across the southern African region. Humphreys (1974) discusses a number of decorated eggshells that were discovered on the edge of the Kalahari Desert in South Africa. The patterns from the Orange Free State differed from those found in the Cape Province. Another cache of eggshells was discovered in the Northern Cape Province but they were not decorated (Henderson 2002). This evidence shows that different groups of hunter-gatherers could have expressed the artistry on eggshells differently. Decorated artefacts recorded in LSA contexts include bone and wooden objects (Cooke 1965b).

In support of the fact that material culture carries messages about group relations, Wiessner (1983, 1984, 1985) noted that items that carry social information are those that take a long time to manufacture and also those that are used for a long time, for example arrows, spears, knives, clubs, awls and musical instruments. Disposable items contained little or no stylistic messages in the form of decoration. Items that are highly visible also have these messages, for example, clothing, bone pipes and beaded handbags. Items such as aprons ‘signal’ group affiliation and thereby carry group identity markers (Wiessner
She also noted that items used for ceremonial purposes such as initiation were also agents for group identification markers or ‘religious objectification’ (Wiessner 1983, p. 260). Sackett (1982, 1985, and 1986) however argues that the differences are not consciously created to serve the purpose of group distinction but researchers can use them as identification markers. He regarded this as the *isochrestic* value of the style.

As demonstrated above, there is clear evidence of variation in the archaeological record and most importantly, there is variation in aspects of the culture of the ethnographic societies from whom most analogies are derived. Few researchers have tried to use this variation in the ethnographic evidence to explain the variation in the archaeological record. An examination of the variation in both the ethnographic societies and the LSA communities can be of great value in the quest to understand variation in the rock art of Zimbabwe. However, caution has to be exercised in using these analogies. Culture is dynamic. Thus what has been recorded from the modern hunter gatherers are somewhat different from the situation that prevailed in the archaeological record. The differences are exacerbated by the acculturation that has happened in the last 2000 years (see Wilmsen 1989). Contact with other groups such as the herders, farmers and European settlers have influenced some of the cultural aspects of the modern hunter-gatherers (Wilmsen 1989; Tanaka and Sugawara 1999; Humphreys 2007). Some modern-day hunter-gatherers now speak Bantu and Khoi languages (Silberbauer 1981, Denbow 1986).
An additional problem is that production of rock art ceased in the last few centuries. There was very little data recorded from those that had a direct relationship with rock art production. Apart from the rock art, information on other traditional artistic practices of hunter-gatherers has also been lost. Thus, the major setback of all ethnographic perspectives lies in the deficiencies in data. It has to be accepted that some use of ethnographic analogy is unavoidable. Refusal to use any ethnographic analogy merely forces researchers to fall back on mere statistical analysis and the “gaze and guess” approach of studying art (Mguni 2002). Ethnography is used here to provide models of possible structures of hunter-gatherer social lives. The variety of these structures is employed to show possible variation in the past. This is a point of departure from the traditional use of ethnography that focuses on the common aspects.

The variation in modern ethnographic groups only provides “frames of reference” for the spatial variability of motifs in the rock art. As McCall (2007) argues, there is need to go beyond the ethnographic data and look at the archaeological record for patterns that do not exist among ethnographic societies. The conceptual approach for this research is to combine ethnography and archaeology in this manner. It is possible that variation in the three aspects under review here are an indication of temporal differences in the art. Nevertheless, this is difficult to ascertain at the present due to lack of a strong chronological control in the study of the art in southern Africa as a whole.
2.4 Rock art and the concept of culture

Leo Frobenius (1931) argued that connecting rock paintings to cultures that created them is an arduous task that needs to be approached without haste, but gradually. Although Frobenius’ interpretations of the rock art have been heavily criticised, this has remained an important observation that has been proven valid throughout the history of rock art studies. However, there has been a long-standing problem of defining culture in anthropological circles. Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn (1952) famously compiled a number of definitions of culture. These have been modified and challenged over the years (Hall 1959; Geertz 1973; Keesing 1974; Rathje 2009; Haviland et al. 2005; Peoples and Bailey 2011). Today most definitions find common ground in considering culture as enduring shared, learned knowledge and expected patterns of behaviour that differentiate one group from another (Haviland et al. 2005; Peoples and Bailey 2011). Hofstede (1980, p. 21-23) defines culture as “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group from another”. No single definition has achieved consensus because the word culture is used in many different contexts and with different agendas (Rathje 2009). Therefore, it is important to contextualise the definition of the term according to a particular research. In this study, the emphasis is on the shared, learned and expected behaviour of a group, although Hofstede’s definition is also useful in the understanding of motifs in rock art which are visual expressions of the worldview.

Defining culture as shared, learned knowledge and expected patterns of behaviour of a group helps in the examination of rock art as a product of a certain group with shared values. Artists are part of this group and their art is informed by the thought systems of
the whole. They do not operate in a vacuum but rather, they draw their symbols from the shared worldview and they help in communicating the same worldview to others. The artist as an individual is not an isolated entity. This position would mean that other cultural aspects inform the art and it informs them in return. Art is therefore a vehicle that is made out of cultural issues but that also carries cultural messages. Against this background, one can take the variation in rock art motifs across space to reflect differences in the worldview of various groups.

The line of inquiry taken in this research looks at the individual as part of the group; the artist expressing the interests of the whole group, however it may be defined. The study of individual agency has received some attention in archaeology (Gardner 2004). As Gardner (2004) pointed out, the study of individuals can illuminate their relationships with the wider society. It can also show how the individuals interpret the society. Art of any kind is a product of an individual in a particular social context. Attempts at the study of the agency of individuals in rock art have not been popular due to methodological problems of identifying the individual artist (Garlake 1995, 1998, 2001). However, a number of researches centred on the agency of the individuals in rock art production have been conducted (Dowson 1994; Lewis-Williams 1997b; Layton 2003, Ling and Cornell 2010). This research will not focus on the individual basing on the Leo Frobenius’ premise that one has to understand the broader groupings before tackling the smaller components of groups. The study of individuals can be an important step in the reconstruction of the variability of the rock art.
The problem comes in the definition of groups that share the said aspects. As we have seen with the modern hunter-gatherer societies in the Kalahari, there are many levels of groupings. They range from the family, the band, band cluster, dialect group and the language group (Table 3). The definition of culture given above can also be used to describe all hunter-gatherer societies vis-à-vis agro-pastoralists communities. All these share some aspects but differ in others. One has to define the level of application of the study. As will be shown below, rock art studies in southern Africa have already looked at the hunter-gatherer-farmer trajectories. The study of commonalities in the art has also explicated the culture of southern African hunter-gatherers in general. This research argues that the challenge left is to look at culture at the level of language group, dialect group, band and other levels of social organisation in hunter-gatherer societies. A study of rock art motif variation across space will be of benefit in such an endeavour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunter-gatherer (as opposed to agro-pastoralist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublanguage group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Social groupings within hunter-gatherer communities

In many of the definitions of culture, the learned knowledge consists of meanings, perceptions, values, beliefs and other aspects that are socially transmitted. Tylor (1871) included it in what is regarded as the first explicit definition of culture. Others have since
taken after him to include art on the list of aspects that are cultural (e.g. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn 1952; Trilling 1955; Haviland et al 2005; Peoples and Bailey 2011). However, taking art, including rock art, as reflective of culture has its own problems. The art images themselves are not always transparently representative and sometimes a particular subject matter may signify different mental constructs. Nevertheless, today many of the researchers on rock art have either implicitly or explicitly taken rock art as reflective of culture. This information includes data from the archaeological record and anthropology of the modern day hunter-gatherers. The present knowledge of rock art has provided the general idea of the makers of the art and the ethnographic information has provided ideas, customs and social behaviours that might have informed the context within which the art was produced and consumed. With this general idea about the rock art, one can be able to interrogate the variability that exists in it. Understanding variation will lead to a holistic interpretation of the meaning of the art. It will also help in reconstruction of the economic, social and possibly political organisation of the artists.

Although variation in the rock art has not received intense investigation, it has partially influenced the way in which the art has been interpreted as part of culture. For example, some researchers viewed variation in the art from the migrationist standpoint, where a change in subject matter or style was thought to reflect new groups of people coming into an area with new cultural aspects (Burkitt 1928; Frobenius 1931; Goodall 1959; Breuil 1966; Eastwood et al. 2010). This was popular in the mid-1920s, when rock art images were used as evidence for the presence of foreigners in southern Africa at some point in prehistory. A good example is that of the images from the site of Rumwanda in southern
Zimbabwe, which got world acclaim for being the product of Egyptians (Impey 1926; Battiss 1948). Breuil (1948, 1966) also argued for foreign origins for bi-chrome and polychrome rock art from Masvingo Province. Cooke (1965a) did not subscribe to the view that polychrome art was executed by non hunter-gatherers. He, conversely, argued that the polychrome images were a result of hunter-gatherer artists observing “different” people who were distinctly different from their communities, probably the herding communities who were moving into southern Africa from the north. Thus, Cooke (1965a) used the occurrence of these polychrome paintings to draw possible routes of the migration of herder communities through present day Zimbabwe.

Old theoretical perspectives such as the hunting magic had variation as an inherent component yet they had problems in accounting for it. The hunting magic theory’s weakness in this regard was in its failure to explain why there was great variation in the rock art of southern Africa. From a hunting magic point of view, depictions, especially of the hunting scenes, were understood as a way of wishing for a successful hunt. This would mean that the art could be as diverse as the animals that were considered food. The problem came in explaining non-food subject matter that is widespread in the art of southern Africa. This theory never became popular due to its failure to account for the limited occurrence of hunting scenes, the preponderance of human depictions and non-hunting depictions in the art (Cooke 1969a; Garlake 1988, 1995; Lewis-Williams 1990a).

The failure of the hunting magic theory to explain the rock art of southern Africa led to firming of the art-for-art’s sake hypothesis. Followers of this theory argued that the art
was drawn for the pleasure of drawing, to celebrate the beauty of the animals and events that happened around the artists (Goodall 1959; Cooke 1964, 1969a, 1974; Woodhouse 1984). To this end, rock art was considered the result of intensely personal experience that was “not essentially necessary to the actual business of living” (Burkitt 1928, p 110). Other researchers have also argued along these lines (Battiss 1948; Lee and Woodhouse 1970; Rudner and Rudner 1970; Willcox 1973, 1978). Although this had an inherent component of variation, the consistency in the depiction of certain subject matter in certain areas goes against the grain of random depiction of images. Quantitative analyses of the 1960s and 70s proved beyond doubt that the subject matter in the rock art concerned was patterned in ways which cannot be a result of random choices of execution (Maggs 1967; Vinnicombe 1972; Lewis-Williams 1980, 1981, 1983; Cooke et.al 1983; Garlake 1988). Painting for art’s sake would not have produced such consistency, unless the art is guided by some cultural code.

Failure by traditional perspectives to find the meaning of various rock art images led scholars such as Vinnicombe (1972, 1976) and Lewis-Williams (1980, 1981, and 1982) to look to social anthropology for explanation. They were more concerned with explaining the emphasis and consistency in the depiction of certain subject matter in certain areas. The abundance of eland in the rock art of the Drakensberg, South Africa is a good case in point. Vinnicombe (1976) proposed what is now widely regarded as the social theory in rock art interpretation (Blundell 2004; Nhamo 2007b). The theory is based on the premise that the major point in making rock art was to communicate societal concerns and principles. The production of art was embedded in social, political,
economic, and religious circumstances of the whole community (Garlake 1987a, b, & d, 1994). This was also the context for the consumption of the art. It was intelligible to the viewers because it fell within the broader framework of symbolism and experience of the wider society (Lewis-Williams 1980, 1981, 1982). Rock art is now considered as a product of artists who were full-fledged members of their societies not the work of some “isolated geniuses driven by some powerful aesthetic imperative” who were divorced from the “ebb and flow” of daily life (Lewis-Williams 1994, p.277). Their artistic decisions were informed, inspired and restricted by the cultural ethos of their communities. Therefore, the rock art articulates and communicates the perceptions of their societies (Corbey et al. 2008). It was socially informed and sanctioned. For example, some hunter-gatherer groups viewed animals such as eland and kudu as mirroring of the human situations. Thus, they may have used them as such in symbolic representation in the art (Vinnicombe 1976; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006; Nhamo 2007b). This approach is grounded in taking rock art as an integral component of the hunter-gatherer culture.

With the rock art of Zimbabwe, the social nature was noted as far back as the 1930s when Leo Frobenius (1931 cited in Garlake 1997, p.43) proclaimed that the art was 'a symbolic art' concerned with 'symbolic concepts' that had a 'prescribed vocabulary of forms', which followed by a 'rigid, canonically strict code'. Today, this framework underpins the basic understanding of rock art. Rock art is seen as an expression of cultural aspects such as belief systems, moral codes, societal aspirations and religious experiences (e.g. Vinnicombe 1976; Garlake 1994, 1995; Mguni 2002, 2004, 2006a & b; Nhamo 2007b;
Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a & b; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). Therefore, the production context of the rock art was deeply rooted in the social relations of the communities that practised it (Dowson 1994). In this regard, rock art is a pragmatic tool for investigating prehistoric cultural variability. Ouzman (1998) argued that rock art is arguably the best evidence to use for archaeologically observing forager thought and life ways, or mindscape because it relied on the articulation of social variables. The commonalities and variations in the art are a reflection of the similarities and differences in cultural needs and values of the different communities from which the artists emanated. This research into the motif variation in Zimbabwean rock art is contoured along this line of thinking.

Even today, there is no agreement on the particularity of the social context in which rock art was produced. Some of the earlier works by Lewis-Williams (1980, 1981, and 1982) were situated in the social theory, which took into consideration a range of issues such as beliefs, rituals, myths and legends. However, most of his later work emphasised trance and shamanistic beliefs as the major context for the production and consumption of rock art (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1995a, 1998, 1999, 2001a, 2002b, 2003a). This approach was initially termed the trance hypothesis and later known as the shamanistic explanation (or hypothesis). The approach sees rock art as essentially religious, depicting the experiences of trancers or shamans (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Lewis-Williams 1997a; 1998, 1999, 2001a & c, 2003a; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). The making of the art is seen as situated within a range of hunter-gatherer shamanistic beliefs, rituals and experiences. Thus, the art consists of symbols of “supernatural potency, images of trance
dancers, fragments of trance dances, processed visions, transformed shamans, monsters and beings from the spirit world” (Lewis-Williams 1998, p. 87). Animals are part of this spirit world, which is believed to lie behind the walls of the rock shelter. Some of the rock art images are considered as hallucinations and visions from the spirit world seen by shamans during trance (Lewis-Williams 1983, 1998; 1999, 2001c, 2003b; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989). Although these concepts can be considered within the social theory, the emphasis on the religious experiences sets it apart from general applications of the theory. However, it has underplayed the role of other social aspects in the production and consumption of rock art (Layton 2000).

The shamanistic explanation is closely related to the interdisciplinary neuropsychological and the altered states of consciousness model (Lewis-Williams 2001c, 2003a; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a). This model was developed by Lewis-Williams and Dowson (1988, 1989, 1990) based on the argument that some of the San art was made by shamans as recollections of the visions they experienced during trance. Shamans could go into altered states of consciousness to contact the supernatural world, heal the sick, control animals and influence the weather (Lewis-Williams 1998, 2002a, 2003b, Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). The images they recall would also be related to these aspects.

The neuropsychological hypothesis argues for three stages of trance. In the first stage, shamans see entoptic phenomena such as luminous zigzags, grids, vortices, sets of lines, meandering lines, dots and other geometric forms (Lewis-Williams 1997a, p.325). In the
second stage, they try to make sense of their visions and they do this by interpreting the object with their cultural backgrounds, and they turn the entoptic phenomena into known things. The third is the deepest stage, where trancers lose consciousness and they see animals and monsters (Lewis-Williams 1997a, p.325). Trancers become part of the visions. They see conflated images for example people and animals, or animals with entoptic phenomena. It is argued that research on the human nervous system has shown this to be the universal experiences of people who go into trance/ altered states of consciousness (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1988; Whitley 1992, 2000; Clottes and Lewis-Williams 1998; Lewis-Williams 2002b; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). They experience similar visions, sounds and hallucinations regardless of differing cultural backgrounds (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1988, 1989; Lewis-Williams 1997a, 1998, 2003a; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). The different ways people interpret these visions depend on their cultures. According to Lewis-Williams, in southern Africa, the shamans are influenced by their San culture, beliefs and cosmology to understand these images. Therefore, one has to rely on the ethnography of the San for information regarding cultural connection in order to interpret trance related imagery.

The neuropsychological model was initially developed to interpret southern African hunter-gatherer rock art but has now been used as a perspective to understand rock art in Europe and the rest of the world basing on the universal wiring of the human nervous system (e.g. Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1988; Lewis-Williams 1994, 2002b). It has been applied to Upper Palaeolithic European rock art (e.g. Lewis-Williams and Dowson
The shamanistic hypothesis has always been generalising about the interpretation of the rock art (Parkington and Manhire 1997; Bahn 1997; Solomon 1997, 1998a & b, 1999; Layton 2000; McCall 2007). Lewis-Williams and Biesele (1978) conducted ethno-archaeological work among the !Kung of the Kalahari and found that there were many parallels in the belief systems, especially about the eland, among the !Kung and hunter gatherer groups whose ethnography was recorded in South Africa in the 19th century such as that collected by Bleek and Lloyd (1911), Orpen (1874) and others. These parallels led them to argue that there were commonalities among the belief systems of the hunter-gathers of southern Africa such that one can use the ethnography to understand hunter-gatherer rock art of the whole sub-region. On this basis, they argued for a shared underlying cognitive system among the hunter-gatherers over most of southern Africa (Lewis-Williams and Biesele 1978; Lewis-Williams 1992). Although this pan-San cosmology concept has been greatly debated in the late 1980s and 1990s, it has remained unchanged (Lewis-Williams 2002a, 2003a; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004a; Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). It still underlies many of the interpretations of hunter-gatherer rock art in southern Africa (Walker 1994, 1996; Garlake 1990; Mguni 2002, 2004, 2005; 2006a & b; Saetersdal 2004; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006).
Since the shamanistic hypothesis became the dominant theory in the last thirty years, its pan-San approach together with emphasis on commonalities led to the masking and under-study of variation within the sub-region. Some researchers have vehemently argued that the differences do not matter much but the underlying similarities are more significant (Lewis Williams 1983, 1984; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Ouzman 1998). Motif variations across space were explained away as reflecting a replacement of the common symbols with local variants but with similar meaning (Lewis-Williams 1983, p.54). For example, large antelopes such as kudu (and other great meat animals) could replace the eland (Parkington 2003). Along similar lines, Garlake (1995) suggested that the elephant takes the place of the eland in Zimbabwean rock art. Eastwood and Cnoops (1999) argue for kudu as the equivalent of the eland in the rock art. There has not been any detailed comparative analysis to substantiate these conclusions even within the realm of the shamanistic hypothesis. As McCall (2007) argues, this is a matter of preference because even within the shamanistic interpretation, it is possible to explore variation by investigating how the shamanistic practice varied from place to place and time to time rather than looking for a generalized model of shamanism.

The other problem of shamanism is that it emphasises the role of the experience of the shamans (Solomon 1998a and b; Parkington and Manhire 1997; Dowson 2007; Jolly 2002). The fact that shamanism is taken as the “overriding cosmology” means variation in other beliefs is not considered in influencing motif selection in the rock art. Dowson (2007, p. 52) has argued that too much focus has been centred on the person of the shaman when the ethnographic evidence shows that among hunter-gatherers even the
supernatural arena is for everyone, not only a preserve of the medicine people. The argument that shamanism permeates all facets of life has been strongly challenged (Guenther 1999; Dowson 2007). Everyone and everything, including plants and animals, has the power to influence the supernatural through the potency that they possess. The exhibition of the potency does not necessarily require one to enter into trance or the altered state of consciousness. This is what Guenther (1999) considers as fluidity of modern hunter-gatherer groups in southern Africa. The focus on the person of the shaman has led to domination of the shamanistic interpretation, overlooking the contribution of other members of the society in the production of the rock art. There is rigid separation of religion and aspects such as myths and legends. This has also led to a neglect of most aspects of hunter-gatherer culture in the interpretation of the rock art (Solomon 1994, 1997, 1998a and b).

The ethnography from modern day hunter-gatherers shows that the pan-San concepts are partially valid, but numerous differences are found as well amongst the groups. The concept has served well in the understanding of the commonalities that are found in rock art but will not serve much in delving into the differences that can help in distinguishing the groups. This is why some scholars have recently taken the position that if one is to examine the variation in the hunter-gatherer rock art, one has to move away from the pan-San forager shamanistic worldview (Eastwood et al. 2010). This is especially important if we are to research cultural differences at lower levels of hunter-gatherer social organisation, that is, the language, sub-linguistic, band cluster and band levels.
The above discussion shows how researchers have tried to connect rock art and culture in southern Africa. All these views show that rock art is an integral part of culture, a position taken in this research. The above views are reviewed and considered against the data on motif variation that has been collected from the different parts of Zimbabwe. As pointed out by Blundell (2005), there is no longer a need to dogmatically align oneself with one theory as in the past. Even the religious symbols are chosen based on social circumstances (Guenther 1999). For example, the eland plays a part in other social facets that are not necessarily religious (Lewis-Williams 1981; Layton 2000; Parkington 2002).

2.5 Surmising spatial motif variation in rock art research: A conceptual framework

This research subscribes to the broad social theory that considers the production and consumption of rock art to have been embedded in economic, intellectual and religious circumstances of the whole community. Therefore, the choice of rock art motifs would be influenced by the beliefs, ethics and aspirations of a particular community. The rock art symbols are therefore part of the shared cosmos. This was not a preserve of the few individuals (shamans), although they played their part in the whole system. Consequently, images that can be attributed to the religious context are taken to be a reflection of the beliefs and rituals associated with this rather than experiences of a particular individual. The trance dance and rituals are a communal undertaking in many hunter-gatherer groups in southern Africa (Schapera 1930; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992; Guenther 1999). Any member of the group can initiate the dance itself whether they are trancers or not. The dance serves purposes beyond just healing and going into
trance. It entertains, de-stresses and unifies the communities (Marshall 1976, 1999; Biese 1993; Guenther 1999).

The framework within which this research was conceived is that some of the variations in motifs indicate variation in belief systems that are not limited to the religious ones but include myths, legends and folklore characters. As Jolly (2005) has pointed out, there is no need to assume that these were not influencing each other. The research on modern hunter-gatherers has shown that there is no rigid differentiation between these (Guenther 1999).

Beyond the variation in religion and beliefs, this research also argues that motif variation resulted from differences in foci on the social issues addressed by the rock art. Spatial motif variation is taken to result from variation in availability of resources, beliefs and the social circumstances surrounding the production of art in different areas. The social circumstances surrounding the production of rock art will result in differences in motif selection. If rock art is contextualised in the socio-economic circumstances of its makers, then it is to be expected that different groups would make rock art according to their needs. Differences in concerns arising from inter and intra group relations, gender relations and environmental stress would influence the issues addressed in the rock art. Anthropologists have noted the connection between stress and an increase in ritual activities among hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari (Guenther 1999; Biese 1993; Marshall 1976). The thesis of this research is that other social variables could also have influenced the variation of motifs in rock art. Issues of identity and territoriality cannot be
excluded. Rock art could have been intended as a marker for group identity. Rock art is visible, permanent and ceremonial; therefore, it conforms to the aspects of group identity (Wiessner 1983, 1984). Increase in territoriality and delayed-return economy has been insinuated by LSA evidence from around the southern African sub-region. Walker (1994, 1995, and 1996) has shown that this is the period with the highest intensity of rock art production and is associated with reduction in mobility and an increased sense of territoriality. This, together with the nature of land tenure observed among modern day hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari informs the need to consider these aspects in explaining motif variation in the rock art. Although the differences that are noted in the art may not have been a result of intentional group or territorial marking, they might have been used as such. Today, researchers can also use these differences to understand the organization of different LSA groups over space.

The heterogeneity of the modern day hunter-gatherer groups discussed above is used to infer on the nature of the variation that existed within LSA hunter-gatherer communities. The circumscribed motifs could also be a result of reduced mobility that is associated with the period in which it was made. Reduction in mobility leads to distance in contact and social relations so it follows that the culture also varies somewhat. The reduction in mobility means that communities in the same environment would have different sets of issues to address. Therefore, apparent regional variations explicated above probably emanated from the reduction in contact.
Differences in motifs can also be influenced by the different environmental contexts of the rock art in different places. Barnard (1992) has shown that social structure among the modern day hunter-gatherers is influenced by environmental variables like the availability of water and food. Since modern day hunter-gatherers vary in their social organisation depending on their environmental surroundings, these must also have applied to the prehistoric communities. Thus, the circumscription of rock art motifs may be a reflection of localization of belief to suit the differences in the social focus. Therefore, different symbols are then taken to reflect on the different issues at play. One would expect communities living in different environs to communicate different concerns using rock art.

The environment has been proffered as an explanation for motif variation in the past (Butzer et al. 1979; Willcox 1984). Yet, it has not been well received by some researchers (e.g. Eastwood and Cnoops 1999; Ndlovu 2009). Smith and Blundell (2004) questioned the reliability of the environmental approach when used without recourse to the ethnography. However, much of the failure to employ the environment as an explanation may be due to the way researchers integrate it in studying the variation of rock art motifs. They expected the environment to be deterministic of the symbols in a particular area basing on what environmental conditions were present or absent. For example, the choice of kudu as a symbol would mean that eland was not readily available in the environment. Comparison of animal depictions and their natural habitats has proven this not to be the case (Eastwood and Cnoops 1999). Therefore, the approach here takes the environment as a factor that influences choices of symbols that would best deal
with the surrounding circumstances. The choice of symbols would be done in the same way that systems of social structure, kinship and land tenure are adopted and adapted among the modern day hunter-gatherers. These depend on the environmental conditions and one group would choose what is best for their locality. The choice of animal subject matter, for example, was probably based on qualities that best represent the focus of the communities.
Chapter 3:
Research methodologies

This research began by conducting a desktop study on Zimbabwean rock art. This involved a review of the published literature, copies and other documentary evidence of Zimbabwean rock art done by other researchers. This process aided in the selection of the case study areas for further documentation and detailed study. A comparative analysis of the descriptions and quantifications of the rock art motifs is presented. Comparison with different parts of southern Africa is based on published and unpublished material produced by previous researchers. However, the researcher had the advantage of having visited some rock art sites in South Africa, Namibia and Tanzania, whose attributes are usually likened to the Zimbabwean art (Frobenius 1931; Breuil 1966; Rudner and Rudner 1970; Willcox 1984; Lewis-Williams 1986; Garlake 2001). All these analyses allow a discussion of the meaning of variation in rock art and its implications in the social reconstruction of LSA hunter-gatherers lifestyles.

The interpretation of the results in this research is based on the social theory presented in Chapter 2. This is because although rock art depicts religious issues, other aspects of social lifestyle of its makers essentially influenced it. This position is well suited to the study of variation in the archaeological record since it looks at motif variation as emerging from different social settings and needs.

Although, the study of motif variation in the rock art of Zimbabwe is based on the three main case studies of Northern Nyanga, Chivi and Harare, additional data from other parts
of the country is used. This includes information from Zimunya, Chipinge and Beitbridge areas where the researcher undertook fieldwork and has intimate knowledge of the data. This data is not analysed at the same level as the three main case studies because it has already been analysed and presented elsewhere (Nhamo 2007b; Eastwood 1994 and Bonyongwa 2010). Data from these case studies are complemented with examples drawn from other sites around the country such as Murehwa, Mutoko, Zaka and Matopo Hills (Map 1). A comparison with parts of the southern African subcontinent is also carried out where necessary. Information on these areas was collected from records housed in the ASR, in Harare. This data includes original rock art copies, photographs and tracings done by Lionel Cripps, Elizabeth Goodall, and Henri Breuil. There are also published collections of rock art copies such as those by Frobenius (1931) and Breuil (1966).

3.1 Desktop research

A comprehensive desktop research was conducted before choosing the case studies used in this thesis. This aided in the selection of case study areas. The desktop study was also undertaken to assess whether it was possible to use material that had already been collected to explicate how and why there is variation in the rock art. It was also meant to assess the level at which variation in motifs has been studied in the past. The desktop study found out that although the variation in Zimbabwean rock art is alluded to in the published literature, it is glossed over without much detail being provided.

Desktop research included published material housed in the Special Collections section, especially rare monographs such as those by Breuil (1966) and Frobenius (1931). Slides
and photographs from the Archaeology Unit were also examined. Databases of archaeological sites were also consulted in order to inform on the sites that are known from different parts of the country. The desktop review was done in order to obtain an understanding of the character of known rock art sites in Zimbabwe. This information was also vital in informing on the selection of case study areas.

From the ASR, copies, recording cards, notes and unpublished manuscripts by Elizabeth Goodall were most useful. As mentioned by Garlake (1997, p 48), her copies have no match in skill and accuracy. She copied and recorded rock art from around the country, although much of it comes from Mashonaland region. There are also copies done by Cran Cooke mostly on rock art from Matopo Hills. Corona Thornycroft also did copies of rock art in Wedza, Marondera, Rusape and some sites in northern Zimbabwe. The copies done by Lionel Cripps were also useful since he is one of the few to record and copy rock art from most parts of the country although there is a slight emphasis on the Manicaland region where he resided (Nhamo 2007a).

The copies of rock art were useful in illustrating some of the images in the art from different parts of the country, but they have certain limitations such that it would not be possible to study the variation in the art based solely on them. Most of the copies were too selective because copyists were concerned mainly with certain motifs and they left out those that they deemed less interesting. The best example is that of Henri Breuil who copied art from Zaka and Chivi districts in Masvingo. He left out what he regarded as the work of the “hideous little Bushman figures” and concentrated on certain types of human
figures that were “foreign and superior” (Garlake 1997, p. 45). Although other copyists did not have such strong feelings about the depictions they left out, they did so because the images were not fitting in with their research agendas. Goodall was more interested in human depictions than in other subject matter in the art (Cooke 1971).

The copies also fragmented the painted panels since depictions from the same panel were captured on separated sheets. This means that the reconstruction of the relationships of images on the sites is somewhat distorted even though some copyists such as Cripps and to some extent Goodall tried to imitate the originals as closely as possible. Some of the copies are not accurate.

Various scholars, including Mguni (2002), contributed to the slides and photographs housed in the ASR. The slides widen the scope of the desktop research since many of the sites do not have copies but they have been photographed over the years. However, the slides also have the similar problems as the copies discussed above. They fragmented the sites and many had a problem of clarity. Most of the slides and photographs are not clear enough to be useful in any detailed analysis of the art. Some were taken in bad light while others were taken from distances and angles that do not allow for detailed documentation. They are only useful as guiding tools of what to expect at these sites. This problem also applies to the site records, which do not always contain detailed information on particular motifs on sites. Therefore, further field research was required in order to document aspects that provide a stronger basis for the conclusions.
Published works available in the University of Zimbabwe Main Library such as Leo Frobenius’ 1931 book entitled, *Madsimu Dsangara; südafrikanische Felsbilderchronik*, with more than 300 copies of rock art sites from southern Africa, and Henri Breuil’s 1966 book on rock art from Masvingo were also consulted. Guidebooks by researchers such as Peter Garlake (1987); Nick Walker (1996) and Cooke (1974) were also consulted. Other published texts such as *The Hunter’s vision: The Prehistoric art of Zimbabwe* (Garlake 1995); *Rock art of Rhodesia and Nyasaland* (Summers 1959), *The rock art of Africa* (Willcox 1984) and *The hunter and his art: A survey of rock art in Southern Africa* (Rudner and Rudner 1970) were also invaluable as information sources. Published articles from journals such as the *Zimbabwean Prehistory*, (formerly *Rhodesian Prehistory*) were also important information sources for particular areas (e.g. Garlake 1989; Tucker and Baird 1983; Thornycroft 1986). However, the illustrations in these books have the same problems as the copies, slides, pictures and other sources of information discussed above.

Apart from the above collections, the desktop also reviewed unpublished documents on rock art such as that by Eastwood et al. (1994) in the Beitbridge area and Pearce et al. (2003) from Malilangwe Conservancy, in Chiredzi. Soper (2002) and Shenjere’s (2011) research in Northern Nyanga proved vital and led to the selection of this particular area for detailed rock art analysis.

The information reviewed in the desktop research was useful in two main areas. It provided general pointers to the nature of motif variation that exists in the rock art. This
had an influence on the choice of areas to sample for detailed analysis of motif variation in the rock art. The review pointed to areas that have restricted distribution of motifs.

3.2 The field research

Although the research is aimed at understanding variation in the rock art in Zimbabwe, it was not possible to visit all the rock art sites known in the country. Thus, a sample had to be taken as expounded below. The desktop research pointed to rock art from Harare and Chivi as having attributes that could be utilised in probing the issue of variation in the art. Thus, detailed fieldwork was conducted in selected parts of the case study areas after consulting the site database in the ASR. The definition of a site did not follow the previous records since they do not explain how the sites were arrived at. Rather panels that were within 50 metres of each other were considered one site. This is an arbitrary figure that is commonly used by other researchers worldwide (Whitley 2001, p. 59)

The choice of the parts of the case study area to conduct detailed fieldwork, especially for Harare and Chivi, was guided by the occurrence of particular motifs at previously recorded sites according to the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ) records. For Northern Nyanga, much of the research was concentrated in areas that fall within 17° 30´ and 17° 45´ South and 32° 30´ and 33° 00´ East. For Harare the area between 17° 45´ and 18° 00´South and 31° 15´ to 30 45´ East was chosen while for Chivi it was between 20° 15´ and 20° 30´ South and 30° 15´ to 30° 45´ East. The areas covered are almost the same size in terms of geographic extent. Selection of the area was
based on the density of previously known sites in each area although research did not limit itself to these.

The strategy was not only revisiting the known sites but also to carry out surveys in the vicinities to locate rock art sites previous researchers might have overlooked. This was especially employed for Chivi and Harare where many sites were already known but it was not clear if there had been detailed field surveys. In Northern Nyanga, the few known sites were visited but further surveys were conducted as well.

In Chivi and Harare, where known sites were targeted, a number of constraints militated against revisiting and analysing all the sites that are recorded in the database in each of the case study areas. The first problem was to do with identification of the sites. Some of the sites are listed more than once under different names. This is a result of the different names having been assigned to the sites by different scholars. This problem was especially evident in Harare. The other problem was to do with locating the sites in the field. The grid references found in the database are sometimes inaccurate and vague leading to challenges in locating some of the sites.

The state of preservation also influenced the documentation of sites. Many of the sites in Harare were documented between 1930 and 1970. During fieldwork, it was observed that some recent developments such as the expansion of residential areas had destroyed sites that are still listed on the database. Apart from this, some sites are now too faded to be of any use in detailed analyses of the rock art.
Despite all these problems, enough data was gathered to provide for a reliable assessment of the nature and extent of motif variation in the rock art of Zimbabwe. Field trips were conducted to each of the case study areas. The documentation of the rock art sites was carried out between May and December 2009. The rock art sites in Harare were visited in May and August 2009 resulting in the documentation of more than 40 sites. Some of the sites could not be located while some were too faded for detailed analysis. Fieldwork in Chivi was conducted in June 2009. There were 23 known sites from the area and of these 16 were documented. Six others could not be located due to the problems to do with grid references and deterioration discussed above. A total of 30 sites that were not on the database were documented. The documentation trip to Northern Nyanga was conducted in July 2009. A total of 36 sites were documented for the current research.

The documentation of rock art sites included capturing data on a rock art recording form (Appendix 1) which was designed for this purpose and writing field notes to complement the recording forms. Photographs were taken at each of the sites to enhance the documentation process. These were taken using several cameras covering all angles of the panel including those whose images were not clear. Taking photographs using different cameras gave different perspectives to the site and ensured that everything was captured. This was very useful during analysis of the material as they complement the evidence collected on site forms and notes. It also enables a clearer view of some of the depictions projected on the computer. Some images that were not clear on the site would become much clearer on the computer. The whole documentation process ensured that
the researcher could identify all the details on the depictions and understand the relationship of images on the panels. The recording forms captured detail on elements especially concerning size of panel, subject matter, frequency of subject matter, colours and techniques of execution (Appendix 1).

For the subject matter, all depictions that were considered to be integral in the study of variation were included. These include animals, humans, plants and geometric designs such as flecks and dots. The identification of animals was aided by published illustrations of wild animal populations of southern Africa (e.g. Smithers 1983). Although identifications were done in the field, these were verified during analysis by referring to the photographic documentation. It was not possible to identify some of the animals due to deterioration of the art. Those that could not be identified were classified as indeterminate. Many animals could be identified to family only, especially the large and small antelopes.

Human depictions were further categorised as male, female, child, therianthrope, and indeterminate images. The identification of sex was based on clear depiction of the genitals or the breasts. The classification according to sex was done because in some parts of southern Africa the frequency of male and female depictions is significant in the interpretation of the art (Blundell and Eastwood 2001; Smith 2006; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006). Therianthropes are human figures with animal features. At times, it is difficult to tell if these transformed figures were depicting people in animal masks. All
images with a combination of human and animal features were classified as therianthropes.

Small human figures among large ones particularly when there is evidence of association such as a procession as well as those on the back of other human figures were considered to be of children. Additionally, human figures were described using their postures that can be walking, standing, seated, kneeling, bending or dancing. The geometric category mainly included formlings, lines, dots, flecks and circles. Flecks are small dashes that sometimes spread over other images but they are often found on their own. Formlings are so named because they are difficult to define, (Mguni 2002). They can be defined as compartmentalized sets of oval or lozenge shapes (Mguni 2006b, p. 53). However, they come in other shapes and sizes and are sometimes decorated with dots or flecks (Mguni 2004). Formlings are mostly found in Zimbabwe (Mguni 2002, p.3).

3.3 Methods of data analysis

The analysis of motif variability in the rock art uses both quantification and descriptive methods. Quantification is used to explore the patterns in the occurrence of motifs in the different case study areas. It can however never be overemphasised that the quantities are not to be taken literal but as a caveat to show choices in selection of motifs. The descriptive techniques target description of the association between images and minute details found on the depictions such as adornments on human figures. These are especially employed on aspects that are not quantifiable. The descriptions are used to highlight the outliers, which are numerically negligible. The descriptive approach was
also used in the comparisons of data from other parts of the country with that from the case study areas. Comparative analyses use the results of both the quantification and descriptive analyses.

3.3.1 Subject matter

The quantification analysis concentrated on the frequency of the different subject matter while descriptions placed significance on the details of the depiction, the form in which it is depicted and its association. These are categorized as previously stated. They were initially recorded in terms of their presence at the different sites (Appendices 2-4). The form gives a general idea of what is present and what is absent from different sites in the case study areas. Differences in the presence and absence of subject matter in the case study areas are essential in articulating what the artists preferred to emphasize in each region. In order to gauge the distribution of the subject matter, it is important to show their general occurrence rather than rely on actual counts that might be elevated by abundance of a motif at one site. The next level of quantification is numerical counts of each subject matter occurring in a particular case study area (Appendices 5-10). This provides the actual number of the subject matter and sub-categories. The subject matter might be present in an area but occurring in low numbers, while in another area, it is abundant. This would show the variation in its symbolism in the different areas.
3.3.2 Colours

The colours that were analysed were those that could be discerned by the researcher. This might not reflect the entire original range of colours that were used by the artists as some colours, especially, white deteriorate faster than others such as red do. The research on the colours rests on the assumption that if there are no apparent missing attributes to the image then it is considered complete. The colours observable on the image are assumed to be the ones that were used in the original depiction. In cases where images are incomplete or have some missing attributes, only the colours that can be discerned are recorded. In the analysis, the colours are divided into monochromes, bi-chromes, and polychromes. As with the subject matter occurrences, the colour quantification commences with the tabulation of the presence or absence of different colours within the art of each region. Exploration of the correspondence between colour and subject matter in the rock art is also quantified. This exposes the preference of use of certain colours for particular subject matter. Descriptions are employed to examine the minute details of the use of colour, for example in depicting details on certain subject matter.

3.3.3 Technique of execution

The analysis of the technique of execution concentrates mainly on tabulating the technique of drawing. This looks at whether paintings are executed in solids, stripes, or outlines. As with the other variables under study, both quantification and description are used to examine the aspect of technique of execution.
3.4 Comparative analyses

The presence and absence of motifs at different sites in each of the case studies is cross-tabulated for comparative purposes. The comparisons reflect on the similarities and differences in motif occurrence in each case. As Garlake (1995, p 43) argues, definition and recognition of significant attributes derives from close comparative study of images. The level of variation is determined by using statistical analyses such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Correspondence Analysis (CA). These show the degree of variation between attributes and among the variables (case study areas, in this instance). Shennan (1997) demonstrated adequately the archaeological applications of these analytical techniques. Abdi and Williams (2010) provide further explanations of the procedures. Descriptive observations in the case studies were also compared. Comparison of the results of the correlation across the case studies is discussed in relation to data that has been collected from other parts of the country. This refers to information gathered from the museum collections and published texts discussed above. This level of comparisons is based mainly on observation due to the limitations of the data as discussed above.

The results of all the comparisons are discussed in the final chapters of the thesis. The perspectives outlined in Chapter 2 inform this discussion. The various hypotheses that have been proposed for motif variation in southern Africa are evaluated against the data that has been generated in this research.
3.5 General overview of the methods

Although quantification is used here, it has had a love-hate relationship with researchers in rock art studies of southern Africa (Lewis-Williams and Loubser 1986; Lewis-Williams 1990b). They were popular in the 1960s and early 1970s when quantitative analysis was hailed as the basis for all scientific archaeology and the systematic study of rock art. Quantification worked in highlighting the importance of certain subject matter in the rock art of southern Africa (Maggs 1967; Vinnicombe 1967; Pager 1971). Lewis-Williams (1974) did a seminal paper on the quantitative analysis of rock art from the Drakensberg in South Africa where he introduced concepts of conventions of super-positioning in rock art.

However, since the late 1980s, quantification in rock art research has been questioned and by the late 1990s, many shunned it (Lewis-Williams and Loubser 1986; Lewis-Williams 1984, 1990b, 1991). Those who applied numerical analysis were criticised for assuming that the meaning of the art emerges from the counts (Garlake 2001). The categories they used were deemed crude and externally imposed, defining the imagery through the eyes of the researchers, not the artist. The meaning of the resultant quantities was therefore questioned. Some argued that whatever was drawn it was meant to be meaningful regardless of whether it is statistically significant (Lewis-Williams 1984, 1990b, 1995b). Nonetheless, it is important to note that quantification managed to highlight the character of the art. For example, Vinnicombe (1967) and Maggs’ (1967) quantification showed the dominance of the eland in the rock art of South Africa, which then led scholars to look for the meaning of this animal species in San cosmology (e.g.,
Vinnicombe 1976; Lewis-Williams and Biese 1978; Lewis-Williams 1981). Thus, the large number of eland in the art was the basis for further investigation into the meaning of the rock art. It is rare to conduct research aimed at meaningful interpretations of the art without referring to either the scarcity or abundance of particular subject matter in the art. Most interpretations, even those made by critics of quantification, find legitimacy in the frequencies of subject matter. For example, most interpretations by Lewis-Williams (1981, 1987, 1990a, and 2002a & b) are based on the dominance of the eland in the rock art of the Drakensberg. Since they provide a springboard for further research, quantification researches are useful.

Quantification gives room to ask further questions about the data and to direct these towards relevant issues of enquiry. It is not an end in itself. Theories such as the hunting magic and art for art’s sake were questioned because of data derived from quantifications that showed their inconsistency with the patterns of subject matter in southern African rock art (Maggs 1967; Cooke 1969a; Vinnicombe 1972; Lewis-Williams 1974; Cooke et al. 1983). Thus, rejecting quantification is like the proverbial throwing away the baby with the bath water. The potential of quantification is immense, especially when one is dealing with the issue of motif variation. As Jones and Leonard (1989) argue, it is through quantification that the conception of variation loses its intuitive quality. It provides the legitimacy to arguments, especially for data coming from previously unexplored areas (Hampson et al. 2002).
Therefore, the quantitative methods of analysis are adopted here, against the assumption that the patterns obtained reflect the importance of particular motifs to the prehistoric communities themselves. As Conkey (2001, p. 289) argues, formal analyses are not intended to stand as the structure that was developed and followed by prehistoric makers, but are analytical bridges to understanding the wider social and cultural structures within which such material production took place. Garlake (1998, 2001) advocated for quantification methods to be employed within a clear and explicit theoretical framework. That way, quantification provides researchers with the confidence necessary to their interpretations of certain concepts, beliefs, and values identified in the rock art. This research concedes that everything that is painted was important. Therefore, the research also employs a descriptive approach that is aimed at those depictions that might not be highlighted statistically. These depictions further inform on the aspects reflected by quantification.

3.6 Rock art chronology: probabilities and limitations

One of the major challenges in the study of rock art is the issue of dating. There are very few reliable chronometric dating methods for rock art. Dating is very important in distinguishing between spatial and temporal variation. It also enables the contextualization of this variation into the cultural complex known from other archaeological investigations. Thus, it is integral to most archaeological investigations. Worldwide, a number of direct dating methods have been tried with some satisfactory results. These methods include Cation Ratio (CR), Optically Stimulated Luminescence (OSL), Lichenometry, Uranium-Series (U-Series), Radiocarbon (C14) and Accelerator
Mass Spectrometry (AMS) (Dorn et al. 1992; Rosenfeld and Smith 1997; Roberts et al. 1997; Chippindale and Tacon 1998b; Bednarik 2002; Bednarik and Khan 2005; Watchman et al. 2005; Pike et al. 2012; Tacon et al. 2012). In southern African rock art studies, the application of common dating methods such as radiocarbon dating (C14) and Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (AMS) is still uncertain and limited to a few parts of the subcontinent (van Der Merwe et al. 1987; Chippindale and Tacon 1998a; Mazel 2009). Both C14 and AMS have dramatically improved the study of the chronology of American, Australian and European rock art (Chippindale and Tacon 1998b; Clottes 1998; Rowe 2000, 2009). The major problem with radiocarbon and AMS dating in southern Africa has to do with the fact that very few paintings are made of charcoal based pigments as those in Europe and Australia (Chippindale and Tacon 1998b). Most of southern African rock art pigment is ochre based. Researchers have tried to date other organic components of the pigments and binders but the issue of contamination and loss of these components through bio-deterioration has hampered progress on that front (Thackeray 1983). Many of the images are now just stains on the rock walls and thus there is not enough pigment left to collect for dating. This problem also haunts other potential dating methods such as amino acid racemisation that can date albuminous binders such as blood and egg-white that is thought to have been used in the art (Thackeray 1983).

There have been some advances in efforts to overcome these problems such that a few areas of the sub-region now have somewhat convincing dates (Mazel and Watchman 1997, 2003; Mazel 2009). These available dates are still too few to inform significantly
on the chronological sequence of rock art outside the regions they were generated. Many of these dates are from South Africa, and thus provide no fall back for Zimbabwean rock art research which is considered older than most of the South African rock art (Lewis-Williams 1983; van der Merwe et al. 1987; Mazel & Watchman 1997, 2003). More secure dates come from art mobilier and spalls that got incorporated into the stratigraphies rather than the art on the walls of rock shelters (Walker 1995, 1996; Pearce 2005). The dates from the excavated contexts only provide broad periods for the paintings but they cannot be used to distinguish change in the art through time. For example, dated spalls from paintings in Zimbabwe range between 10 000 and 30 000 years BP, a timeframe which marks the terminus ante quem for rock art (Garlake 1987c; Walker 1994, 1996).

Without a secure dating regime, it is very difficult to sequence observed patterns in the rock art. Thus, most researchers revert to relative dating methods. These include stylistic difference, different degrees of weathering, and super-positioning (Thackeray 1983; Chippindale and Tacon 1998a; Russell 2000). Weathered rock art images are considered older than clear and well-preserved images (Thackeray 1983; Walker 1996). However, the influence of differential weathering due to differences in the chemical composition of both the rock surface and the pigment should not be underestimated. Weathering cycles of the parent rocks have to be known but these only hints at the probable age of the rock art and not the date of individual paintings (Walker 1996). Therefore, their use in ordering the motif variation is limited.
Dating by the use of super-positioning is an established aspect of southern African rock art studies (Burkitt 1928; Goodall 1957, 1959; Cooke 1963, 1959). There is no denying the fact that wherever it occurs, super-positioning means that the image on top is younger than the underlying image. The problem is in establishing how young the top image is, especially considering issues of intentional super-positioning which could have happened a few minutes, hours, days, or years after the execution of the older image (Lewis-Williams 2002a). The problem is that the sequence of super-positioning varies from site to site. Goodall (1959) observed that at some sites three to four layers are identifiable whereas in others there may be up to fifteen different layers. Thus, collating the contemporaneity of images over large areas is problematic and it is difficult to use it as a temporal marker (Thackeray 1983).

Stylistic sequencing was once the popular method of dating. Most stylistic sequences have been established using a combination of weathering cycles, super-positioning, colours, technique of execution, subject matter, impressions, and the consistent associations depending on the choice of the researcher (Thackeray 1983; Garlake 1995). Table 4 summarise some of the previous chronological frameworks that have been used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Characterisation (Zimbabwe)</th>
<th>Southern Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style 1</td>
<td>Oldest with very simple paintings in one colour; the images are simple silhouettes without outlines and show no movement.</td>
<td>Similar rock art generally considered to be the earliest art throughout southern Africa (See Lewis-Williams 1983; Walker 1996; Russell 2000; Mazel 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 2</td>
<td>Showed movement, but the art is still in one colour and usually in outline. Large animals e.g. elephants, large antelopes, rhinoceros, buffalo predominate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 3</td>
<td>It is considered an experimental phase that did not last long. It had realistic images in outlines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 4</td>
<td>The introduction of has bi-chrome and polychrome images. The paintings have a lot of movement; appear as portraits of groups of animals with human figures and rudimentary landscapes.</td>
<td>Probably relates to Russell’s Layer 2, 3 and 5. Vinnicombe’s phase 2 also covers the bi-chromes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 5</td>
<td>Have crude copies of earlier art in black and white or a combination of the two; a few are in pinkish white and red.</td>
<td>Probably relates to Russell’s Layer 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 6</td>
<td>Figures are usually large elephants, sometimes with charcoal outlines plastered in kaolin clay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 7</td>
<td>Farmer rock art (Late Whites).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Southern African rock art styles**

Synthesised from Goodall (1959); Cooke (1963, 1974); Lewis-Williams (1983); Russell (2000, p.68); Mazel (2009).
Current stylistic sequences, however, have numerous inconsistencies that have been criticised by many researchers over the years (Lewis-Williams 1983, 1990a; Garlake 1995; Hampson et al. 2002; Mguni 2002). The resultant sequences are often subjective, ill-defined and arbitrary (Wilcox 1984; Garlake 1995, 2001; Walker 1996). The lack of consistency makes it difficult for other researchers to replicate the sequences elsewhere. For example, Willcox (1984) points out that Goodall’s (1957, 1959) and Cooke’s (1959, 1974) sequences classify the same motifs into different categories. The large animals in outlines are among the latest art according to Cooke whilst they are the oldest according to Goodall (1959). This shows the uncertainty of the method.

The phases developed from the Drakensberg relate to those developed for Zimbabwe (Table 4). Nevertheless, although these phases are sequential, aspects of earlier phases persist, for example monochrome images continue after the introduction of bi-chrome and polychromes. Because of this, it is difficult to relate some of the images to the phases. This is the reason why many researchers including Lewis-Williams have all but abandoned the use of these stylistic chronologies and concentrated on enunciating the “social and ideological relations it speaks” (Mitchell 2002, p.194).

Nevertheless, many researchers still implicitly apply these style-based chronological sequences. For example, many still imply that bi-chrome and polychrome images are younger than the monochromes (Burkitt 1928; Lewis-Williams 1983; Willcox 1984; Garlake 1995, 2001; Walker 1996). Walker (1996) argues that the bi-chromes in the Matopo Hills might date to 9 000 BP whilst the polychromes date to around 6 500 BP.
The bi-chromes on portable stones are dated to 20 000 years BP, but it is not clear how these dates are arrived at. These assumptions must be based on the traditional stylistic sequences (Table 4). There is an unexplained assumption that the art developed from simple to complex (Lewis-Williams 1983, p.28).

The use of super-positions to establish chronology has recently been taken up again using the Harris Matrix technique (Loubser 1993, 1997; Mguni 1997; Pearce 2000; Russell 2000). This technique analyses rock art in the same manner that one would do to stratigraphical layers using the law of super-positioning in an excavation (Chippindale et al. 2000; Russell 2000). Using this method, researchers have developed sequences for small areas. In some cases, they have compared the sequences with previous stylistic sequences. For example, Russell (2000) has verified the phases developed by Vinnicombe for the Drakensberg area. The application of the Harris matrix method in southern Africa has been criticised by Pearce (2006, 2010), although Mazel (2009) argues that such criticisms are ill-founded and questions the basis of Pearce’s criticisms. These disagreements show that there is still uncertainty associated with dating rock art in southern Africa. The difficulties faced in historicising the development of the art makes it imperative for future research to prioritise developing suitable dating mechanisms to enable more holistic studies of the rock art.
Chapter 4:
The rock art of Northern Nyanga

Northern Nyanga has had the least in terms of previous research among the case study areas. Similar art from the adjacent area of Makaha (Mutoko) was only mentioned in Goodall’s 1959 article in the book, *Rock paintings of Rhodesia and Nyasaland*. A few copies of the striped art from the same area are housed in the ASR. A Mr Gamble, who lived near the sites in the 1940s, produced these copies. Goodall (1959, p.54) regarded the style of depiction to be at variance with rock art from elsewhere in Zimbabwe. She argued that this art was made by different people from those who made the art in other parts of the country. She also argued that this striped art might be younger and more sophisticated than the solid art found elsewhere in the country. No further research was conducted on this art, which means that until now none of Goodall’s arguments have been tested or verified. This can only be done through a detailed comparative analysis with art from other parts of the country.

The geographical extent of this type of rock art has not yet been fully established. However, as pointed out above, sites with striped art have been reported in the Makaha area, 30km north of Avila Mission. The absence of this kind of art in other parts of Mutoko district less than 50km west of Makaha would mean that there is a gradual decrease of the art as one moves westwards. Unfortunately, no rock art sites have been recorded further north of the Makaha area, even during recent archaeological surveys (Shenjere 2011 *pers. comm*). There is also no knowledge of the art across the Mozambican border adjacent to the research area. Southwards, the furthest site recorded
with striped art is that of Majerejede, which is discussed below. Robert Soper (2012 *pers. comm*) also recorded similar art from Kadzura in the same locality as Majerejede (Map 9). There is no photographic record of rock art from areas south of Majerejede that can be used to determine whether the rock art is similar. However, the rock art south of the city of Mutare is distinctly different (Nhamo 2007a & b). It would seem that this striped type of rock art is found in a restricted area around Northern Nyanga.

Map 9: Known rock art sites around Northern Nyanga (by R. Kapumha)
4.1 Description of rock art sites from Northern Nyanga

Thirty-six rock art sites have been recorded. Five of these sites are too faded to be useful in any analysis, thus, only thirty-one are discussed here. These sites are taken as a sample on which general observations about the rock art from the area are made. Judging by the sample already obtained, this area has great potential to yield many more sites.

A brief description of each of the sites recorded in this area is given below. Major geographic reference points in the site description are Avila Mission, the local business centres and schools in the area (Map 10). The site description is followed by a general discussion of the various aspects that characterise the rock art.
Map 10: Location of rock art sites identified in Northern Nyanga.
1.) **Nyatsanziko**

The site of Nyatsanziko is located 3.5km northwest of Avila Mission. It is found on the northern side of a hill in Nyatsanziko Village. It has depictions of human figures and female kudu (Plate 4). It also has indeterminate animal figures.

![Plate 4: A female kudu from Nyatsanziko](image)

2.) **Nyamakamba**

Nyamakamba is 1.5km north of Nyatsanziko site and 5km northwest of Avila Mission. It has a long painted panel in a large rock shelter. There are many interesting features in the rock art at this site. The panel is dominated by geometric depictions which are clearer on the far-left (Plate 5). The geometric depictions seem to have spread over the whole panel in the past as they can be traced to the far right of the panel. The whole depiction is made up of formlings, dots and mazes of concentric lines. Some parts of the large depiction are painted in white while others are filled with a yellow kaolin based pigment. Some thick
white pigment is super-positioned on the geometric images, but it is not clear whether this is a later addition or it was part of the original depictions.

Plate 5: Sections of a large ‘formling’ depiction at Nyamakamba
The geometric depiction is closely associated with other figures on the panel, especially some of the kudu, elephant and human figures. Some of the images are drawn within the outlines of formling depiction. The geometric depiction is much more closely associated with some figures that seem to be floating (Plate 5a). Eight of these were identified but there could have been more since some figures on the panel are no longer clearly discernible. Four of the figures are depicted in outline and the others are striped. Human figures are also juxtaposed with kudu images. Other associated human images are in a similar bending forward posture to images found at other sites in this area. Human figures on the panel are single or in groups. Kudu figures are found between the formling segments and in juxtaposition to them. There is a group of elephants, one of them with a calf, which is depicted on the right side of the panel. The group is surrounded by human figures, some of whom are attacking the elephants with arrows.

3.) Nyamapfene 1

Nyamapfene 1 is located on top of a hill with the same name some 2.7 km to the east of Avila Mission. It has only one image of a kudu bull on a small boulder (Plate 6).
4.) Nyamapfene 2

Nyamapfene 2 is located on a low hill 1.8 km to the southeast of the site of Nyamapfene 1. It is has three painted panels with both human and animal figures. The human images include some that are bending forward (Plate 7b). These images have distorted facial features; one has antelope ears. Although some are no longer clear, some of the human figures at the site have snake-like heads. In this thesis, this type of motif is to be termed the snake-head in reference to this conflation of human and snake features. Some of the images are also holding snake-like objects. The animals include antelopes, wild pig/warthog, a snake and indeterminate animal figures (Plate 7a).
Plate 7: 7a Snake depiction; 7b Conflated images from Nyamafene 2
5.) *Nyazingwe*

The site of *Nyazingwe* was named after the mountain on whose foot it is located. It is 3km to the north east of Nyamapfene 1 and 5km from Avila Mission. The site is found on an isolated boulder. There are mainly animal images with a few humans. The animals depicted at the site include rhinoceros, kudu and what looks like a tortoise (Plate 8a). The rhinoceros depicted is being shot in the mouth with an arrow. Below this depiction, a feline, probably a lion attacking an antelope is juxtaposed to a therianthropic human image (Plate 8b).

*Plate 8: Images from Nyazingwe:*
6.) *Tsengerai 1*

This site is located on the south-eastern edge of a hillock in Tsengerai Village 7km along the road from Avila Mission to Ruangwe Business Centre. There are depictions of humans and animals. The humans are in various postures holding bows and arrows; one image is holding a barbed instrument (Plate 9a). The animals include buffalo, elephant and kudu. A few of the images depicted are in black while the rest are in red.

![Plate 9a: Human figures from Tsengerai 1.](image)

![Plate 9b: Human figures from Tsengerai 1.](image)
7. *Tsengerai 2*

Tsengerai 2 is located to the far western edge of the range of hills behind Bande School (map 11). It has solid images of kudu in brown with stripes super-positioned (Plate 10). A group of human figures seems to be engaged in a fight but these are no longer clear. There are also some concentric lines.

![Plate 10: Kudu depictions in solid with stripes on top.](image)

8. *Tsengerai 3*

This site is on the north-eastern side of the same range as Tsengerai 2. The painted panel is on a large boulder facing east. It has a depiction of what seems to be people partially covered by a “blanket” (Plate 11a). There is also a concentric circle connected to a red
line (Plate 11b). It also has some faded images of antelopes and indeterminate animals in
the solid technique.

Plate 11: Depictions from Tsengerai 3

9.) Tsengerai 4

Tsengerai 4 is on the southern side close to the apex of the range, 130m from Tsengerai
3. It is on a thin rock that leans out of the side of the hill (Plate 12a). The images include
kudu, sable and indeterminate animals. Most of the animals are depicted in outline (Plate
12b). The human figures are all of indeterminate sex. There is also a depiction of a bunch of leaves tied together.

Plate 12: Images from Tsengerai 4.

10.) Tsengerai 5

This site is approximately 130m to the southeast of Tsengerai 4. It has depictions of human, animal and geometric images. Human depictions include some that are holding
snake-like objects (Plate 13b). There is also a depiction of people in a bending forward posture crawling along a line (Plate 13a). An isolated image is in a bending down posture and has claw-like hands. The animals include kudu and buffalo. Some of the animals are in outline but many of them are striped. There is an image depicted in chains of dots but it is now difficult to identify its form. All the images are in shades of red.

Plate 13: Depictions of human images at Tsengerai 5.
11.) Nyatsizvozvo

This site is located at the summit of a mountain with the same name. It is 3 km east of the Tsengerai sites. It has human and animal figures. Some of the human images are crudely done in outline (Plate 14). The animals include kudu, rhinoceros, indeterminate antelopes and indeterminate species.

Plate 14: Human and animal figures from Nyatsizvozvo

12.) Mhako yaJokwiro

The site of Mhako yaJokwiro is 2.5 km northeast of Tsengerai 1. The site is on an isolated hillock. The shelter has one painted panel with human and animal images. The human images include some fine-line and others with thick crude stripes (Plate 15b). The animals include kudu, elephant, klipspringers and some indeterminate species. The klipspringers are done in solid red (Plate 15c) while the rest of animals are in either red outlines or stripes. One of the kudu bulls is in fine white outline (Plate 15a). There are remnants of images that were executed in white but these are no longer clear.
Plate 15: Animal and human figures from Mhako yaJokwiro
13.) **Kubve 1**

Three sites were recorded on Kubve Mountain, 3.5 km south of Renzva School. *Kubve 1* is located in a rock shelter on the edge of a stream that cuts through the mountain. Many of the images are human figures in crude lines similar to those at *Mhako yaJokwiro*. The figures are in groups, and some of them are holding hands (Plate 16a). The animals include zebra, elephant and kudu. These are depicted in white pigment (Plate 16b). Some of them are outlined in brown although the outlines seem to be later additions (Plate 16b). The animals are depicted in solid and striped technique.

![Plate 16: Depictions from Kubve 1](image-url)
14.) **Kubve 2**

This site is 100m up the mountain from Kubve 1. It is in a rock shelter below two boulders that are leaning against each other. The site has depictions of mostly human figures; there is also a kudu and indeterminate animal species. The human figures have *snake-heads*. The heads have erect arrow-like dresses (Garlake 1987, p.34); they are parted in the middle such that they look like ears. Some images have disc shaped attachments on their foreheads (Plate 17). Most of the images are male with exaggerated genitals but others are of indeterminate sex possibly due to fading of the art. Some of these images are holding arrows and carrying quivers, but others are holding what appear to be pods (Plate 17). One of the images is holding a snake-like object similar to those found at sites discussed above. The images have red, brown and sometimes white stripes. Solid white images are badly weathered.

![Plate 17: Human depictions at Kubve 2.](image-url)
15.) *Kubve 3*

*Kubve 3* is at the foot of the mountain 1km southeast of Kubve 1. It has two panels, one on each side of a boulder. The site has both human and animal imagery. Some of the human figures are similar to those at Kubve 2 (Plate 18a). Other human images are bending forward and reminiscent of the images at Nyamakamba; unfortunately, many of them are no longer clear (Plate 18a). A few of the bending images exhibit only three long claw-like digits on their limbs. There is also a single image carrying a long pole. Behind the boulder is another panel with faded images. Depictions of two leopards can be discerned; one is trying to catch a small antelope whilst the other following close behind (Plate 18b). The spots of the leopards are clearly depicted, a feature that is rare in the rock art of Zimbabwe (Garlake 1995, p. 117). This is juxtaposed to human figures although they might be underneath the leopard depiction. The order of super-positioning is no longer clear.
Plate 18: Depictions from Kubve 3.
16.) Mazizima

The site of Mazizima is located on a mountain with the same name, 6km to the west of Kubve Mountain. It has one panel with mainly faded images but the tusk of an elephant can be clearly seen. It also has remnants of a plant depiction (Plate 19), human figures and a snake.

Plate 19: A leaf-like depiction from Mazizima

17.) Manjanja

*Manjanja* is located to the west of Ruangwe Business Centre, close to Elim Mission, 700m up on the eastern slope the Ruangwe Range of mountains. The rock art is found high on the face of a cliff. The art has human, animal and geometric images. Two of the human figures have antelope ears but their facial features are no longer very clear. All the
images are male with exaggerated genitals and claw-like fingers. Three of the images have some strokes or tuffs on their buttocks (Plate 20b). Some of the human figures are holding bows and arrows, but one image is holding a snake-like item in one hand and a plant in the other. A set of large dots is painted between his feet. Another set of dots encircled with a thick red line is adjacent to the human image (Plate 20a). A faint red line passes through the mouth of the figure with the snake-like object and connects the human image on his right. Some of the human images are bending forward, reminiscent of other human figures at sites such as Nyamakamba, Kubve 2 and Kubve 3. There is a group of klipspringers depicted quite clearly in solid technique at the site. The art on the lower parts of the cliff is mostly finger painted in brown. It is thicker and has dots and spread-eagled designs (Appendix 14). All the other images are in red.
Plate 20: Human depictions from Manjanja
18.) *Nyakamupata 1*

To the north west of Manjanja, there are four sites in the Nyakamupata valley. *Nyakamupata 1* has several painted panels on a boulder on a hill. On one of the panel, there are weathered images but one can make out human images that have antelope heads and one of them is holding a snake similar to that found at Manjanja. On the main panel at the site, a number of human figures are also holding snakes. Most of the human figures have therianthropic features. Some have antelope heads whereas others have a range of distorted facial features and claw-like digits (Plate 21a & b). Many of these human images have exaggerated genitalia. On the lower part of the panel is a group of human images that surround two seated figures. These are juxtaposed with a procession of dancing figures which are now barely discernible. Animals include kudu images, a bird and indeterminate antelopes and animal figures.
Plate 21: Human depictions from Nyakamupata 1
19.) *Nyakamupata 2*

Nyakamupata 2, 3 and 4 are 1 km south of the hill where Nyakamupata 1 is located. They all have few images located on boulder faces. They do not have the same concentration of images as Nyakamupata 1. Nyakamupata 2 has depictions of animals in solid, outlines and stripes. There are also indeterminate human figures. Most images at the site are no longer clear enough to illustrate.

20.) *Nyakamupata 3*

Nyakamupata 3 has depictions of animal images in solid (Fig 22). Some of the depictions are no longer clear.

Plate 22: Kudu images from Nyakamupata 3.
21.) *Nyakamupata 4*

Nyakamupata 4 has an elephant and a procession of female figures (Plate 23).

![Plate 23: A procession of human images from Nyakamupata 4](image)

22.) *Garawizi*

To the east of Ruangwe Business Centre, a number of sites were also recorded. Garawizi 1 and 2 are located in the mountain of the same name 7 km southeast of the business centre. *Garawizi 1* has leaves that are drawn using brown pigment with a human figure in red seated next to the leaves (Plate 24). There is one indeterminate antelope and 2 indeterminate animals to the far right end of the panel.
Nyamahomba 1 is 1 km south of the Garawizi Mountain. It is located on a hillock. The rock art is on two panels 40m apart. The first panel is on a small rock overhang to the southern side of the hill. It has images of animals and humans (Plate 25a). Some of the human figures are depicted in solid red with dark red stripes on top but others are just striped. The other panel, on the western side of the hill has mostly striped and outlined animal images (Plate 25b).
Plate 25: Depictions from Nyamahomba 1
24.) *Nyamahomba 2*

*Nyamahomba 2* is 1 km to the east of *Nyamahomba 1*. It has human and animal figures. The human images at the site are however faded. Animals include buffalo, elephant and rhinoceros (Plate 26a & b). All the images are in red.

![Plate 26: A rhinoceros and an elephant in outline at Nyamahomba 2](Plate 26)

25.) *Nyamudeza 1*

*Nyamudeza 1* and 2 are 500m east of Nyamudeza School. *Nyamudeza 1* is on a large isolated boulder. The painted panel might have had a larger concentration of figures but most have faded. Many of the images must have faded due to exposure to the weather elements. A buffalo head, indeterminate antelopes and other animals can be discerned (Plate 27).
Plate 27: A buffalo head from Nyamudeza 1.

26.) Nyamudeza 2

Nyamudeza 2 is on a small boulder 70m to the south of Nyamudeza 1. It has a very faint depiction of a squatting human image and two zigzag lines that issue down from between its legs (Plate 29a). There is a small human figure attached at the end of the zigzag lines (Plate 29b). The legs of the squatting image are bending at the knees and they are levered on two spiked objects. The figure is holding two sticks in each hand and there are two short lines coming out of its head. The short lines issuing from the head are also found on the small figure attached at the end of the zigzag lines.
Plate 28: Depiction of the squatting figure at Nyamudeza 2
27.) Benguro

The site of Benguro is 2km east from Ruangwe Township. It is on a large isolated boulder but has a few clear images. There are indeterminate animal and human figures (Plate 9).

Plate 29: An indeterminate antelope depicted at Benguro

28.) Majerejede

The site of Majerejede is 2 km east of Masaya Primary School. It is located on the eastern edge of the Majerejede Mountain Range. In addition to the rock art, the landscape has large scatters of iron slag and remnants of iron furnaces. The rock art site has two panels on separate boulders. The main panel has images that include solid and striped images. It has solid animal figures (Plate 30a). There is also striped art similar to that found at other
sites in Northern Nyanga. Human figures include some hiding behind shields (Plate 30b). Animal depictions include zebra, kudu and elephant. The other panel has animal images, the most recognisable being the kudu and some indeterminate species.

Plate 30: Depictions from Majerejede
29.) **Kutungwe**

Kutungwe is atop an inselberg approximately 3.5km from Avila Mission. It has a depiction of a group of four people sitting with their bags, bows and arrows beside them. One is female whilst the others are indeterminate species. The woman and another figure have tassels on their hands and midriffs that might be indicative of women’s attire. If this is so, there is a possibility that the group is depicting two couples. There are two pairs of bows and arrows and six carrying bags laid nearby. The human images have gaps in front of their heads indicating the position of either mouths or faces (Plate 31). Their hands have three claw-like fingers depicted as seen at other sites in this area.

![Plate 31: Depiction of four images with their equipment](image-url)
30. Buseta

The site of Buseta is 1.4 km northwest of Avila Mission. It has human and animal depictions. The human images are in two groups. The larger group has more than 20 figures, most of which have distorted head features similar to those noted for other sites in Northern Nyanga. The figures form two lines joined into a triangular shape (Plate 32a). One line has figures that are bending down and the other with figures that are in a walking posture. Of the figures that are bent, a larger image is in red while the rest are depicted in a yellowish pigment. The large image has a snake-head with erect headdress similar to the ones mentioned earlier (Plate 32b). He is holding a bow and a quiver on his shoulder. It is no longer possible to discern whether the other images are also holding similar equipment. The other group has faded images that are difficult to discern. Animal figures on the panel include an elephant and warthog/wild pig.
Plate 32: A group of human images from Buseta
31.) Nyagoza

Nyagoza is in the Nyagoza mountain range 9 km northeast of Avila Mission. It has human and animal depictions. There are five kudu images, four of them bulls and one of indeterminate sex (Plate 33a). All the kudu images are in a running posture with human figures pursuing them. There are also three elephant depictions shown in a standing posture (Plate 33b). There is a set of circles below the animal images.

Plate 33: Kudu bulls and elephants from Nyagoza.
4.2 Characterisation of the rock art from Northern Nyanga

4.2.1 Subject matter

The rock art in Northern Nyanga consists mainly of humans and animals (Figure 1). Human images outnumber animals even though there are more sites with animal depictions (Appendix 5 & 6). Human images are drawn with their paraphernalia such as quivers and hunting equipment. Other kinds of depiction are mainly in the form of geometric designs such as circles, dots and lines. Although plant depictions have been identified, they are extremely rare.

![Graph showing Northern Nyanga subject matter frequency](image-url)

Figure 1: Northern Nyanga subject matter frequency
4.2.1.1 Human figures

Human images constitute the bulk of the rock art from the recorded sample of sites in Northern Nyanga, totalling 291 figures. They are shown in groups or as single images. Human figures from this area are mainly of indeterminate sex. More than half of those recorded could not be assigned to sex although for those identifiable, male images outnumber females (Table 5a). The male images have genital depictions and on occasion, these are exaggerated (Plate 21). Interesting aspects of the human depictions include the way the digits are executed. On many images, only three long and claw-like digits are depicted on each limb. This is evident at sites such as Tsengerai 5, Kutungwe, Nyamakamba and Kubve 3. The occurrence of other human depictions without these indicates that the claw-like depictions are not realistic depictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humans</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthrope</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>316</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therianthropes</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distorted facial features</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake-head</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope ears</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope ears + snake head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b)

Table 5: Northern Nyanga human frequency
In most cases, images with the claw-like fingers also have other therianthropic elements, that include distorted and conflated human and animal head features especially antelope ears e.g. at Kubve 2, Nyakamupata 1 and Tsengerai 1(Table 5b; Plate 21a & b; 7b). Apart from the ears, other antelope features have not been observed on transformed images. At sites such as Kubve 2 and 3, Nyamapfene 2 and Buseta, human images have *snake-head* (Plate 34b). The association between *snake-head* with real snakes is further strengthened by the fact that some of the therianthropic images are depicted holding snakes (Plate 34a). Some of these transformed beings are holding arrows and / or quivers while others are also holding pods or some other plants, e.g. Kubve 2 and Manjanja. Of note, however, is the frequency in the association of the transformed images and hunting paraphernalia.

![Plate 34: Depictions of humans associated with snakes](image-url)
A different form of conflation is found at Nyamudeza. It is part of the images termed primeval mothers, mother goddesses or mythical women in the rock art literature (Goodall 1949, 1959, 1962; Garlake 1966; Solomon 1994, 1998a). This is the only clear example of this kind of conflated images in Northern Nyanga. Another possible squatting image is found at Tsengerai 4, but this is no longer clear.

From the above description, one can conclude that the rock art from Northern Nyanga has a significant number of therianthropic images. Sites such as Nyakamupata 1, Kubve 2, Buseta and Manjanja have an unusual number of therianthropic images. Some images are depicted in a bending down posture. This has been noted at a number of sites. The classic example comes from Nyamakamba (Plate 35b). At this site, the bending posture is associated with others that seem to be “floating”, showing the supernatural aspects of this depiction. At Nyamapfene 2, the bending images have distorted head features that show the transformation (Plate 7b). At Tsengerai 4, images that are bending down are crawling along a line.
Plate 35: Bending figures with claw-like digits:
(a) From Tsengerai 5; b) Nyamakamba; c) Kubve 2)
The human figure is not always depicted in a therianthropic way in Northern Nyanga. There are some normal human images carrying equipment such as bows and arrows at Kubve 1, shields at Majerejede, long poles at Nyamakamba or a barbed weapon at Tsengerai 1 (Plate 36a & b).

Plate 36: Human depictions with hunting equipment

4.2.1.2 Animal images

Animals are present at all the recorded sites in Northern Nyanga, with the exception of Kutungwe. However, the repertoire of the animals depicted is limited (Table 6). This includes kudu, elephant, buffalo, zebra, sable, warthog/wild pig, indeterminate antelope, klipspringer, snake, felines, birds, rhinoceros, and possibly tortoise. For example, there is only one depiction of a bird at Nyakamupata 1. Klipspringer, feline, and sable are found at only two sites each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope indet</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/wild pig</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Animal frequencies from Northern Nyanga.

Only kudu and elephants are depicted at most of the sites. Kudu depictions outnumber any other animal and the female is more abundant than the male. Female kudu are usually depicted in groups or together with other animal images. However, at one site, Nyamapfene 1, just a single kudu bull is depicted. Kudu bulls are depicted with their distinct horns, and at some sites with the mane on the hump raised. The kudu cows are depicted in groups and in various postures.

Of the identifiable animals, elephants are the second most frequently depicted followed by snake. The high numbers of indeterminate animals may be due to the nature of
depiction. The stripes fade faster than the solid depictions although most of them are antelopes and probably kudu.

The animals are depicted in groups or as single images, but at some sites, they have a close relationship with human images. At a number of sites, humans are shown pursuing animals. At the site of Nyazingwe, a human image is shown shooting at a rhinoceros. The arrow is depicted piercing the rhinoceros in the mouth (Plate 37a). This hunting scene is juxtaposed with a feline catching a kudu. This juxtaposition is quite interesting since it reflects that the point of the depiction is not in showing a realistic hunting situation, but rather symbolic. The symbolism of the depictions is further reinforced by the therianthropic figure that is also juxtaposed to the images. At another site, Nyamakamba, there is a group of people depicted hunting elephants (Plate 37b).
Plate 37: Hunting of large animals
The symbolic relationship between animals and humans is also shown at Majerejede where two human figures are merging into animal images that are connected by a dashed line (Plate 38). The animals are not diagnostic but from the features of their backs, they seem to be large animals. One might belong to a large animal such as rhinoceros or hippopotamus while the other is probably a feline.

Plate 38: Human-animal relationships at Majerejede

4.2.1.3 Geometric images

In Northern Nyanga, geometric images come in the form of dots, lines, concentric circles and simple circles. Some of these are part of larger scenes that are no longer clear. For example at Tsengerai 5, a dotted ringed image might have formed a distinct depiction
which unfortunately is unclear (Plate 39a). Many of the geometric features are clearly associated with human images at the sites where they are found.

Plate 39: Geometric depictions from Northern Nyanga
Enigmatic geometric depictions are found at Nyamakamba where there is a concentration of formlings. Most of them have white and yellowish kaolin infill (Plate 39c). The whole site is dominated by these large depictions. There are human figures that are super-positioned on some sections of the geometric figure.

4.2.1.4 Other depictions

A few of the images observed in Northern Nyanga do not fall within the above classes. These include a few plant images. The site of Mazizima 2 has an imprint of a leaf whilst two leaves are depicted at Garawizi 1. At Tsengerai 4, there is a bunch of leaves or pods tied together (Plate 40a). Some human figures are depicted holding plants (Plate 40b). The rarity of plant depictions shows that plants were not a major corpus of rock art symbolism in this area. The other unique depiction that deserves to be mentioned is the depiction at Tsengerai 3 of human figures that seem to be lying under a blanket (Plate 11a).
Plate 40: Some of the plant depictions in Northern Nyanga

4.2.2 Technique of execution

The rock art from Northern Nyanga is dominated by the striped art rather than the solid technique (Figure 2). Most of the stripes are fine while a few sites have images with
thick, crude lines, for example at Kubve 1 and Mhako yaJokwiro. The chronological relationship between these two techniques is not clear since there is no site where they are super-positioned. Where they occur together, they are on the same panel but there is no clear association. However, it has been observed that images with the crude thick lines are usually fresher than the finely striped figures. Although, as suggested by Garlake (1995), there is the possibility that crude drawings were done by amateur artists, it is not likely in this case because of the frequency of the technique in the area. Basing on the freshness of the pigment it is possible that the crude drawings are later than the fine-line depictions. It has also been noted that the crude human images rarely have therianthropic features as opposed to the fine-line depictions. The animals are also rarely identifiable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>solid</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solid w stripe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outline</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>striped</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>554</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Frequency of the different techniques of execution in Northern Nyanga.*
Although the striped art is dominant in Northern Nyanga, there are some sites with the solid technique (Plate 41a). Nonetheless, striped images outnumber the solid ones at most sites, except at Majerejede, which could be at the periphery of the striped art zone. At this site, the solid images are very clear unlike at most sites where they are much more weathered than the striped figures. Therefore, solid images at the other sites might be older because of their faded nature but super-position between these two techniques has not been well established since it is rare in the area. It could have provided some clues towards deducing the chronology of the depiction of the techniques.

At some sites, there are solid images with stripes on top, e.g. Tsengerai 2 and Nyamahomba 1 (Plate 25a, 41b). The stripes are in dark red pigment while the solid base is brownish. It is not clear whether the stripes are later additions to the panel or not. At Kubve 1, some solid images have brown outlines. The pigment used for the outlines is the similar to that on crudely drawn striped human figures at the site (Plate 16a & b). This could buttress the argument that the striped images are later than the solid ones had it not been for the fact that there are some striped images that are also in white pigment as on the solid figures (Plate 15a, 41b, 16b). This, therefore, raises questions on the chronology of the art.
There is also the occurrence of some images in outlines with no infill. Many images are just in outline (e.g. Plate 26 and 28). Human, animal and some geometric figures are depicted in outlines.
4.2.3 Colour

The rock art in Northern Nyanga is predominantly monochromatic with red, dark red and brown colours. Yellow, black and white were rarely used. Black is usually found only on human figures (Plate 9b). Some white images have been recorded at sites such as Kubve 1 and Mhako yaJokwiro (Plate 42b, 15a). Most of the white images are animals.

Plate 42: The use of colour in Northern Nyanga.
As noted above, these are in both striped and solid techniques. Bi-chrome and polychrome images are very rare (Plate 42a, Figure 3). These include images in white with brown outlines at Kubve 1 and figures with solid yellowish colour and red stripes mentioned above. Images with more than two colours are found at Kubve 2 where the human figures have red, brown and white stripes.

![Graph showing frequency of colour schemes]

**Figure 3: Frequency of colour schemes**

The other mix of colours is found on the formling at Nyamakamba. Although there is a possibility that other images may have had more than one colour, there is no evidence to show that elaborate bi-chrome and polychrome images were once part of the art.

### 4.3 General observations on the rock art from Northern Nyanga

As a way of summing the characterization of the rock art from Northern Nyanga, it can be said that the art is dominated by animal and human images with a few geometric and plant figures. Many of the human images have therianthropic features some of whom are
shown in association with snakes. The kudu dominates the animal images in art. The rock art in Northern Nyanga is also predominantly monochromatic with red, dark red and brown colours. There are very few bi-chromes and polychromes. Striped art rather than the solid one dominate the rock art though a few images have a combination of both techniques. On the other hand, a number of images are in outline. The stripes are usually very fine, but at some sites, they are thick and the images are crude. It is possible that these two techniques allude to temporal differences, with the thicker one being later imitations of the earlier fine art. It is also possible that solid art is older than the striped art but a firm conclusion on this is difficult to reach using the current data. A tentative chronology is presented in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Chronology</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>Oldest</td>
<td>Some images are much more weathered than striped ones. However, a few images are fresh therefore, one cannot rule out influence of differing weathering process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped (fine-line)</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Some images are much more faded than the crude ones. No super-position with either solids or crude striped images was observed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped (crude)</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>The images are fresh wherever they occur. They look like imitations of the earlier fine-line images. The depictions do not have as much detail as on the fine lines. Humans are less therianthropic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlines</td>
<td>Newer</td>
<td>They are difficult to sequence since they occur with both fine-lines and crude images.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Tentative chronological development of rock art in Northern Nyanga
Chapter 5: Rock art from Chivi district

The rock art from Chivi includes both the hunter-gatherer and the farmer art, especially the ‘Late Whites’. The Late Whites are usually super-positioned on the hunter-gatherer art. There is only one site with exclusively ‘Late Whites’. The hunter-gatherer rock art from southern Zimbabwe especially in Chivi and Zaka became famous during the 1920s and the 1950s due to its bi-chrome and polychromatic images. However, the rock art from Chivi has not featured much in academic discourse in the last few decades. The last person to write about it in some detail was Breuil (1948, 1966) who sought to prove the alien origins of southern African rock art using rock art from Zaka and Chivi and the Brandberg region in Namibia. He argued that both sets depict people of Mediterranean origins who were sojourning in southern Africa. He copied a number of rock art sites from Chivi, sites such as Mapuvire, Sedza, Gondongwe, Chavasikana, Nzou, Mudadi (Chehonondo), and Rukonde Hill. Most of these sites were revisited for the present study.

More than thirty sites were visited and documented in Chivi. Some of the sites are now too faded to be useful for any characterization. Thus only twenty-six sites were used here. Other sites recorded by Breuil are considered, especially on issues that allude to some special features of the art. Rock art sites in Chivi are usually found in shallow shelters and on boulder faces (Plate 43).
Plate 43: The hilly parts of Chivi.

5.1 Description of rock art sites from Chivi

Even though the landscape boasts a large number of rock shelters, there are only a few panels with large concentrations of paintings. The rock art sites from Chivi are found in the northern parts of the research area with a relatively flat landscape, in the central hilly parts of the district and across the Runde River in Mazvihwa area (Map 11). The discussion of sites below takes a north-south dimension. The descriptions also include comments on the observations of previous researchers especially Breuil (1966).
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Map 11: Rock art sites under current research in Chivi (by R Kapumha).

1.) Mashakatira

The site furthest north of the research area is Mashakatira. It is located on a range of hills close to Tugwi River. It has one panel on a small overhang. Most of the depictions are weathered but identifiable ones include human, animal, and geometric images. Human images include both monochromes and bi-chromes. The bi-chrome images are painted in white and red (Plate 44). White constitutes the body itself while red is used to show
features such as ornamentation and clothing. These figures have stripes on the legs and arms, the back aprons, knees and elbow bands. The outline of their backs is also defined in red. There is a depiction of a human figure closely following that of a lion.

Plate 44: Bi-chrome human figures from Mashakatira

Monochrome human depictions at the site include red conflated human figures with animal heads. It is difficult to ascertain the relationship between the monochrome and the bi-chrome images at the site because both sets of images are too weathered to reflect on super-positioning clearly. The animals include kudu and indeterminate large antelopes.

2.) Zivurawa Hill

The site of Zivurawa is on a small hill, 2 km southwest of the site of Mashakatira. The site has images of humans and animals. The human figures are not determinable to sex, but some show signs of conflation with antelope features. Animals are mainly small
antelopes. Some of the antelopes are painted in a foreshortening position i.e. they are painted facing forward rather than the usual lateral view (Plate 45). This is rare in Zimbabwean rock art but occur more in South Africa especially in the Drakensberg area (Garlake 1987c, p. 23). All the images on this site are monochrome red.

Plate 45: Small antelope from Zivurawa hill

3.) Chemazizi

The site of Chemazizi is 4.4km southwest of Zivurawa. It is located on an isolated boulder close to a hill with the same name. It has both human and animal images (Plate 46). There is a therianthrope with a prognathic face, what Garlake (1987c) refers to as a muzzled face which is baboon-like. In this thesis this type of motif is termed baboon-face in reference to the conflation of baboon and human features. The body also shows animal
features with a tail. The animal imagery includes kudu, warthog, feline, buffalo, and possibly a rhinoceros. All the paintings at this site are red monochromes.

Plate 46: Animal images from Chemazizi

4.) Police Camp

The Police Camp site is 1 km southwest of the Chivi Police Camp. It is on the northern side of a hill, which forms part of the Nyaningwe mountain range. It has animal and human figures. Most of the human figures are faded. The animals include giraffe and indeterminate species (Plate 47).
5.) Chione

Chiome site is 1km northeast of Mapuvire 1. It has animal and human figures. The identified human figures are both female. The animals include kudu and wild pig (Plate 48).
Plate 48: A kudu and wild pigs from Chiome.

6.) Mapuvire 1

Three sites were recorded in the Mapuvire area, 6 km southwest of Chivi Growth Point. Mapuvire 1 is located on a low rocky outcrop with three painted panels on different boulders. It mainly has animal, human and geometric images. The main panel is one of the few with a high concentration of bi-chromes in the Chivi area. There are both animal and human bi-chromes together with white and red monochrome images. Some of the white monochromes have the baboon-face (Plate 49a & b). These are in a crawling posture and are surrounded by lines of white dots.
Plate 49: Images from the main panel at Mapuvire 1
The bi-chrome images include a group at the top of the main panel with images in a walking posture and others that are seated. The walking figures are male while some of those seated have breasts, indicating that they are females. The male figures are also depicted in white with arm and knee bands in red. There are six seated figures altogether. One of the seated figures is depicted in red with only the lower legs and arms in white. The other seated figures are white with red skirts, arm and knee bands. However, the figure at the centre of the seated images has red stripes along her legs and arms (Plate 49b). She does not have arm and knee bands. She is holding hands with another seated image in front of her. They have loincloth around their posterior in red. Some of the images have red stripes on the torso and legs similar to figures observed at Mashakatira (Plate 44). Similar figures are found on other parts of the panel.

The animals include kudu, sable, large antelopes, and indeterminate animals. Animal images on the main panel are in red and white. Many have red upper bodies and white lower legs but there is a male kudu in red with a white outline. Other panels are on open boulders and they have monochrome animal figures. These are very faded probably due to constant exposure to sunlight. The geometric figures are in the form of dots that are spread over the space at the top of the main panel above walking images (Plate 49a). The dots were considered by Breuil (1966) to resemble clouds but there is nothing to substantiate this claim.
Some of the details that he included in his copies have not been observed at the site during the current research. For example, he illustrated one of the female figures as seated on an animal hide with the head still attached to it. This was not identified at the site. Although this is illustrated and described in detail, it seems that it was a case of misidentification as it could not be ascertained even on slides and photographs taken in the past, including those taken by Breuil himself. He also represented one of the seated figures as a ladder-like image. This image is in fact holding hands with the central image. Some additional details on these human figures are also inaccurate. There is no evidence of the shoes that he mentioned and illustrates on some of the human images. The feet of the images are faded and it is doubtful that they were any clearer when he copied it. Other images on the site show feet which are clearly not shod. It is these kinds of misrepresentations that led Garlake (1997, p. 46) to state that Breuil’s copies were full of inaccuracies and invented details, presumably to justify the argument for the foreign origins of the art.

7.) Mapuvire 2

Mapuvire 2 is 500m southeast of Mapuvire 1. Breuil and his team did not record it. At this site, there are animal and human figures. The human figures are in both monochrome and bi-chrome colours. There is a group of bi-chrome images depicted in a purplish dark red colour different from that found at Mapuvire 1 (Plate 50). The group has seated figures and others that are walking. One of the images either is wearing a mask on his face or has an animal head. The image is no longer clear enough to tell. The painted panel
seems to have had many bi-chrome figures that are no longer clear. The monochrome images are faded but one can discern some human and kudu figures.

Plate 50: A panel from Mapuvire 2

8.) Mapuvire 3

The site of Mapuvire 3 is located 100m from Mapuvire 2. It is found on an overhang. It consists of monochrome animal and human images. The animals include kudu and other large antelopes. The images are however no longer clear enough to illustrate.
9.) Mudadi

The site is located on a large boulder in Mudadi village. The boulder forms a large shelter on the eastern side of a hillock. There are two panels on the boulder. The main one faces east. It has a high density of paintings. The other panel is on the southern face of the boulder. The main panel must have had a lot of super-positioning since many of the images at the site have traces of remnants of weathered layers of painting either on top or beneath. The remnants are mostly in the fugitive white pigment. There is a possibility that some parts of the panel were coated with whitish pigment before the latest paintings were executed since many red monochromes have traces of white on them. This makes it difficult to ascertain the chronology of depiction basing on colour. Even on images that do not have the whitish coat the super-position of images is difficult to discern since the monochrome and bi-chrome images interchange. There are bi-chromes images that overlie monochromes and vice-versa.

Both panels have bi-chrome and monochrome human and animal figures. The bi-chrome human imagery at the site is varied. Some are depicted in white with red hair, armbands and knee bands (Plate 51b). In other instances, white is used to show the clothing and other details whilst the whole body is in red. Some bi-chromes only have red waistbands with no other pieces of clothing (Plate 51b). Other images of bi-chromes have stripes on their legs and torso similar to the images at Mashakatira described above. Some of the images are seated while others are in a walking posture. On some of the bi-chrome images, the white is too weathered and what remain evident now are just the red hair, arm, and knee bands. The pigment used in the bi-chrome also differs. Some of the images
are in a white kaolin-based pigment that does not bind well to the rock surface. These images are no longer as clear as those made of stronger pigments. However, many of the bi-chrome images have *baboon-face* features (Plate 51b).

Plate 51: Animal and human depictions from Mudadi
There is a procession of red monochrome dancing figures (Plate 51a). White pigment is used to cover these images but it is now weathered. Monochrome human figures in red are on the lower part of the main panel where there is no white coating. There are also monochrome images in white on other parts of the panel.

The animals depicted at Mudadi include kudu, elephants, and indeterminate large antelopes. The bi-chrome animals are in red and white colours. These have mostly red bodies and white legs (Plate 51c). There is a large white elephant at the centre of the main panel. Kudu is the most frequent in both monochrome and bi-chrome figures. The geometric images are in the form of concentrations of red dots. Breuil (1966, p.68-69) copied several images from this site, although he also complained about the poor state of preservation. He argued that the polychrome images at the site are diagnostic of racial descent. For example, he argued that one of the images shows Negro features (Plate 52). From the observations on site, nothing distinguishes this image from the rest except that it is larger. He also considers some female figures as Mediterranean women who he termed the “Whitelady of Chibi”, referencing to the famous Whitelady depiction from Brandberg, Namibia. The same applies to the eyes on one of the female dancers whom he considers Negro (Plate 51a). No eyes could be identified on any of the human figures that were illustrated by Breuil (1966, p.41).
10.)  

*Sedza*

The site of Sedza is near Madya primary school 10 km southwest of Chivi Growth Point. It has a dense concentration of paintings (Plate 53a). The depictions include animals, humans, and geometric figures. It has both female and male human images. Several other human figures could not be identified to sex. Many of them carry bows and arrows. Sedza is one of the sites that Breuil (1966) copied during his visit to Chivi district in the late 1940s and early 50s. However, he considered the images from the site to be of poor quality because there are no bi-chrome depictions.

Some human figures at the site have *baboon-face*. There is a large rhinoceros in outline together with several large antelopes, especially kudu (Plate 53b). There is only one eland
depicted at the site. Geometric depictions include some formling-like images. The images are mainly red monochromes but brown also occur.

Plate 53: Paintings from Sedza
11.)  *Madya*

The site is located on an isolated small boulder in the midst of cultivated fields, 800m from Madya Primary School. There is only one image, an elephant partially covered in small red dots (Plate 54).

![Plate 54: An elephant depiction from Madya](image)

12.)  *Chebvute*

The site of Chebvute is located 5km southwest of Mapuvire 1. It is found in a large rock shelter at the foot of Chebvute Mountain. The site has a dense concentration of paintings. It has both animal and human images. There is a large kneeling bi-chrome human figure in white with red knees, waist, and stomach bands (Plate 55). The images also have red
bands on the chest and around the neck. Although the heads are no longer clear due to fading, it seems to have had *baboon-face*.

Plate 55: A large kneeling figure at Chehvute

There are several smaller human figures associated with these. Many of them also have the *baboon-face* (Plate 56c). Some are mostly walking whilst others are seated with legs outstretched or bending one or both their legs (Plate 56b). Another image is kneeling, the same posture as the large figure discussed above. The head of this figure is not clear but it has similar bands of ornamentation on its torso and red knee bands (Plate 56b).
Plate 56: Some of the figures from Chebvute
Another group of bi-chrome images is found on the extreme left side of the panel with images that are walking but with one running. Some images in this group also have *baboon-face* (Plate 56c). The human images are depicted in white whilst red is used to show features such as the neck, knee, and waistbands. The hair is also depicted in red. Some of the images have red bands that extend across their shoulders down to the torso.

Most images including the large ones discussed above do not have aprons but just bands around the waist. However, other bi-chromes have red stripes along the bodies rather than across legs and arms. The stripes may be continuous or dashed (Plate 56c). None of the bi-chrome images is carrying any weapons.

The animals associated with these human figures are also depicted in bi-chrome colours. A red kudu with white lower legs is super-positioned on some of the bi-chrome images (Plate 56c). There are other animal images including one in a supine position. Some animals are monochromatic although this might be due to loss of the fugitive white pigment. There is also an animal in monochrome white. Two handprints in monochrome red are depicted sandwiched between some bi-chrome images and other monochrome images that cannot be clearly discerned.
13.) **Masinire**

The site of Masinire is 6 km southwest of Chebvute. It is located on a small overhang. It has faded kudu images with white outlines. It is extremely faded because of exposure to the elements.

14.) **Manyame**

The site of Manyame is 2 km to the southwest of Masinire. It is located on a large boulder in a relatively flat area. The other panel is on the western side of the boulder. It has animal and human images. The human images are mostly indeterminable to sex but some have conflated animal features. There is a pair of human figures that seem to be engaged in a fight (Plate 57b). The animals include kudu and indeterminate large antelopes and other animals. There are also animal-headed snakes (Plate 57a), and some more faded snake-like images. The site must have had many more images but they are too faded to discern.
Plate 57: Depictions from Manyame
15.) *Chehara*

Sites recorded across Runde River in the Mazvihwa area include Chehara, Gomututu, and Manyere 1 and 2. Although these sites fall outside the modern Chivi district boundary, but occur within the same map sheet and fall within the same ecological zone. Chehara has one panel found at the summit of a small hill. It has monochrome human images only. All the images at the site constitute one scene. They include both males and females. The male images are depicted naked but female figures have bared chests with front and back aprons. Some are at variance with the usual aprons depicted in rock art in the area (Plate 58a & b). They are wide and pointed at the bottom. Some of the males are carrying bows and arrows while the females are carrying long sticks. Other male images are carrying globular objects.
Plate 58: Human figures from the panel at Chehara
16.) **Manyere 1**

Manyere 1 is located on an isolated boulder 3km west of Chehara. It is easily accessible and has been vandalised by the locals. There are traces of a procession of monochrome red human images. There could have been more images but they are no longer clear.

17.) **Manyere 2**

Manyere 2 is 3 km to the west of Manyere 1. It is in a shallow rock shelter on the eastern slope of a hill. It has a dense concentration of images. It has both human and animal images. Several human figures are executed at the site including one female image. Human figures are depicted in various postures with several kneeling. There is an elongated conflation of human and giraffe features (Plate 59). Another human image has *baboon-face*. Most of the human figures are in monochrome mostly red but there is one in white.
Plate 59: Images from the panel at Manyere 2
The most prominent of the animals are the giraffe figures depicted in different postures (Plate 59b). Some are just in outline with no infill whilst others are patterned. One of the giraffe images is “pregnant” with the foetus outlined. Other animal images at the site include a large elephant in white. A faded kudu in red and white is also present.

18.) Gomututu

Gomututu is located atop a mountain with the same name. The site has mostly monochrome human and animal figures. There are circles and dots also. However, some of the human images might have had white pigment especially the faces, but it has since faded leaving some of them headless (Plate 60). The animals include kudu and indeterminate animals.

Plate 60: The panel at the site of Gomututu
19.) Davira

The site of Davira is located in a rock shelter on the eastern side of Davira Mountain. It is 800m from Davira primary school. The site contains human and geometric images. The human figures are in two groups (Plate 61). One group has thick human figures in a kneeling posture with another row of human figures bending forward. Some of them carry arrows. The other group has a row of figures bending forward with another row of figures walking. Another depiction shows a figure covered in lines juxtaposed with another running figure. The images are monochrome reds although some might have had white pigment since they have gaps on the face.

Plate 61: Two scenes from Davira
20.) **Mahonye**

Mahonye has a few images that include both animals and humans which are all red monochrome. There are female and other indeterminate human figures. The animals include small antelopes and indeterminate animals (Plate 62).

![Plate 62: Antelopes from Mahonye](image)

21.) **Matsveru 1**

There are two sites in Matsveru village southeast of Chivi Growth Point. Matsveru 1 is located on an isolated boulder outcrop in the middle of a cultivated field. It has three panels on boulders that are close to each other. The depictions include both animal and human figures. The art on two of the panels is monochrome in red, but on the third panel, there are a few bi-chrome human images in dark red and white. They are however extremely weathered such that on some, only the crown of the hair and clothing in dark
red is still visible (Plate 63). The human figures are male and indeterminate. The animal images include kudu and indeterminate animals.

Plate 63: Remnants of the bi-chrome figures at Matsveru 1.

22.) Matsveru 2
Matsveru 2 is 2 km north of Matsveru 1. The site is located on the edge of a hill. It has both monochromatic and bi-chrome images (Plate 64). Animal and human figures are depicted in red and white. The human images include a female figure with large breasts and a squatting image. The other human depictions are indeterminate. The animals include kudu, indeterminate large antelopes, and other indeterminate.
Plate 64: Depictions from Matsveru 2

23.) Matarirano 1

Matarirano 1 and 2 are located 1.5 km southeast of Chivi Growth Point. They are 500 metres apart. Matarirano 1 has both animal and human figures. The human figures are male and indeterminate. The animals include kudu, buffalo, small antelopes, and indeterminate large antelopes. All the images are in red monochrome but some have been obliterated with whitewash although one can still make out some of the figures (Plate 65b).
Plate 65: Animal images from Matarirano 1
24.) **Matarirano 2**

Matarirano 2 is 1 km south of Matarirano 1. The site has red monochrome images consisting of both animal and human figures. Matarirano 2 comprises of two groups of people in procession. One of the processions is juxtaposed with an elephant and the other with a giraffe (Plate 66). Both groups seem to be part of a single scene.

*Plate 66: The scene from Matarirano 2*
25.) Chavasikana

The site of Chavasikana is 1.5km east of Chivi Growth Point. It is on a boulder facing northwest and exposed to the elements such that it is in a poor state of preservation (Plate 67). Breuil (1966) also noted the site’s poor state of preservation when he copied a few of the images. Some of the human figures at the sites are clearly male but others are indeterminate. The site has a number of kudu, giraffes, an eland and indeterminate animals.

Plate 67: A badly weathered kudu figure Chavasikana.

26.) Zvengururu

Zvengururu is 1.6km southeast of Chivi Growth Point. It is located within the Nyaningwe mountain range. It is located on an east-facing panel at the summit Zvengururu Hill. It has animal and human figures which are all executed in red. The human figures include male and female. Animals are mainly kudu and indeterminate large antelopes.
Other sites

Not all sites visited by Breuil were revisited during the current research. The grid references provided for the sites were erroneous and thus could not be located. These include Gondongwe cave, Nyaningwe and Rukonde Hill. There is information available in the ASR for these sites including copies and slide records taken by previous researchers. This information indicates that these sites have monochrome and bi-chrome depictions similar to other sites in Chivi.

27.) Rukonde Hill

Rukonde hill has both monochrome and bi-chrome depictions. It has monochrome human and animal depictions including three ‘squatting’ figures (Plate 68c). Kudu depictions that have stripes are clearly executed by leaving the space between the stripes unpainted (Fig 68a). There are also red monochrome indeterminate large antelopes and giraffe (Plate 68b). There are also zebra images in monochrome white. The bi-chrome animals include a group of giraffes in shaded red and white.
Plate 68: Depictions from Rukonde hill
28.) *Nyaningwe*

At the site of Nyaningwe, there are shaded bi-chrome giraffes similar to those from Rukonde. However, these are not clear enough to illustrate.

29.) *Gondongwe*

The bi-chrome human images from Gondongwe are not captured on the slides but copies done by Breuil show monochrome and bi-chrome human images. It also has monochrome animal images including kudu. There are elaborate bi-chrome human figures (Plate 69 a). There are people with white faces, holding weapons (Plate 69b).

![Plate 69: Images from Gondongwe](After Breuil’s copies in ASR)
5.2 Characterization of rock art from Chivi

Rock art sites in Chivi are usually found in shallow shelters and boulder faces. Since the colours used in the execution of the images have been pointed out in previous discussions for rock art from Chivi, it is important to begin the rock art characterization with this aspect.

5.2.1 Colour of paintings
The paintings from Chivi are monochrome, bi-chrome and shaded bi-chrome. The monochrome images predominate (Figure 4). These are mainly in different shades of red.

![Figure 4: Frequency of monochrome and bi-chrome paintings in Chivi](image)

Other colours such as yellow, white, brown and black occur, but these are very few. Some of the images in red could have had features painted in fugitive white. For example at Davira and Gomututu, some of the human figures may have had white faces but now
empty spaces remain (Plate 70a). This is only evident in a few instances; most have no trace of having been bi-chrome. It might also be a style of its own kind.

Plate 70: The use of colour on selected images in Chivi
Many of the bi-chrome images occur at sites with monochromes as well (Map 12). Both animal and humans are painted in bi-chrome colours. Most of the bi-chrome images are executed in dark red and white. Shaded bi-chrome depictions are very rare, occurring only at Nyaningwe and Rukonde. These depict only animal figures especially giraffe.

Map 12: Distribution of sites with bi-chrome depictions in Chivi (by R Kapumha)
The relationship between bi-chrome and monochrome images in Chivi is complicated. At many of the sites, it is difficult to discern super-positions as both monochrome and bi-chrome images overlays each other. This problem is compounded by the difficulties in differentiating bi-chromes from monochromes due to the fugitive nature of the white pigment. Animals are especially difficult to identify since many of the bi-chromes have bodies in red and white legs. Since legs are the ones usually painted white, where they are no longer clear, it is difficult to tell whether the animal was bi-chrome or not. Where they are discernible, most bi-chrome images are super-positioned on red monochrome figures. This lends some credence to stylistic chronologies that regard bi-chrome images as later introductions (Plate 71a & b). However, the occurrence of white monochrome underlying red monochrome images show that white pigment was not adopted only for bi-chromes (Plate 70b).
Nevertheless, it has been noted that the subjects in monochrome colours do not differ much from those of the bi-chromes. As shown later below, the types of animals depicted
are the same. Although there are a few differences, both monochrome and bi-chrome human figures also have many similarities. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether the use of colour has chronological implications. Breuil (1966) tried to use colour to come up with a chronology for the images. Because of the interchange of colour usage at many of the sites, he ended up suggesting that the monochrome art precedes and succeeds the bi-chrome. Nevertheless, the analysis presented in this study takes into consideration the colour differences to identify patterns that distinguish the bi-chromes from monochromes.

5.2.2 Subject matter
Most of the sites contain both human and animal images (Figure 5). There are a few sites such as Madya, Davira and Chehara that have either exclusively human or animal imagery. However human figures outnumber animals but there are more sites with animals. Other types of images are mostly geometric figures in the form of dots, lines, and circles.

Figure 5: Frequency of both monochromes and bi-chrome depictions in Chivi
5.2.2.1 Human images

Human figures in Chivi are usually depicted in group scenes. There are rare single depictions. This applies to both bi-chrome and monochrome art. Male figures are the most frequently occurring human figures in both the monochrome and bi-chrome images (Table 8). Among the monochrome images, 41.2% are male, 13.9% female and 7.9% therianthropes. Nevertheless, 37% of the human images are indeterminate to sex. The bi-chrome images have 33.3% male, 4.8% female, 5.7% therianthrope and 56.2% indeterminate. The high frequency of indeterminate bi-chrome images is due to the bad state of preservation of many of the images. This might explain the low occurrence of female representation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monochromes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthrope</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-chromes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthrope</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Table 8: Human images frequency in Chivi rock art

The hair crown/headdress is also not unique to the bi-chromes since similar depictions were observed on monochrome images in the area (Plate 72d). However, this hair type is
more common on the bi-chrome images than on monochrome. At some sites, only the crown of the head is what is left of these images due to weathering (Plate 72a).

Plate 72: Depictions of human figures from some sites in Chivi

In terms of features depicted, there are many similarities between bi-chrome human images and monochromes. They both exhibit conflation with *baboon-face* for example at Chebvute, Mudadi, Sedza, Davira and Manyere (Plate 72a, b & c). However, some monochrome images also have conflations with antelope features (Table 9).
Table 9: Therianthrope frequency in Chivi rock art

The bi-chrome human figures differ somewhat from monochromes in terms of some of their postures. They are usually depicted in groups with male figures walking or dancing. Female images are seated with their legs outstretched. Some female images are holding hands (Plate 49b). Even where identification to sex is difficult, most groups have some images that are standing, walking while others are seated. There are also figures that are kneeling down and bending forward such as those observed at Chebvute. This posture has also been observed among monochrome images, for example at Manyere 2 and Davira.

Another major difference between the bi-chrome and the monochrome images is in the depiction of colours to indicate particular features. On the bi-chromes, the body is usually depicted in white while details such as pieces of clothing, hair and other details are executed in dark red. Many bi-chrome images have red bands on the knees, waist and
upper arms and shoulders. Some have bands on the stomach and chest. The clothing includes back and front aprons on most of the female figures and a few back aprons on some of the males. The waistbands are found on many of the male images. These are unlikely to be loin clothes since they do not cover the buttocks. The red bands are high up the waist, which shows that they were part of body painting rather than clothes. At some sites such as Chebvute, there are traces of the male genitals even on images with waistbands which rules out the possibility of these being loin clothes. It is not clear whether the chest and shoulder bands on some male figures represent shoulder bags but they are unlikely to be scarfs or shirts that Breuil (1966) mentioned in his descriptions, nor do they show any sleeves as he suggested. Where feet are still clear, they are depicted in the same manner as those of monochrome paintings (Plate 55, 72c). The type of clothing depicted does not differ significantly from that executed on monochrome figures in the area. At some sites, monochrome images also have aprons (Plate 58a). One can argue that the clothes are just shown with much more finesse on some bi-chromes (Plate 56c, 72a).

Decorative features on the bi-chrome images are varied. Some of the images have solid linear stripes all over the body (Plate 73a). On others, these lines are in the form of dashes (Plate 73b). Dots were also used, as shown from the example on Breuil’s (1966) copy from Gondongwe, which shows decoration of red dots on the legs of the images.
Plate 73: Further illustration of human depictions from Chivi
5.2.2.2 Animal images

The animal depictions in Chivi are limited to a few species (Table 10). Animals are depicted in monochrome, bi-chrome and at some sites in shaded bi-chrome. Among the monochrome images, kudu is the most frequently depicted animal constituting 35.1% of all animals. Most kudu depictions are those of the female kudu with the male and the young very rarely depicted. The female kudu constitute 74% of kudu images while male depictions are 12%, young 5% and non-identifiable ones are 9%. Indeterminate large antelopes have the second highest frequency to kudu. Most of these are likely to be kudu depictions but due to fading and weathering, they are no longer clear. Animals such as giraffe occur less frequently. Nonetheless, it is important to note that on sites where giraffe occurs, there are several images. The best example is at Manyere 2, where there are eight giraffe depictions on a small rock face (Plate 59b). This has also been noted at Nyaningwe and Rukonde. Elephant images are very rare in Chivi. Most of elephant images observed here are monochrome in white or red (Plate 54 & 59a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monochrome</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate antelope</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelopes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated snake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/wild pig</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bi-chrome</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate antelope</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Animal frequency in Chivi rock art
Kudu dominates the bi-chrome art as well. Small antelopes and indeterminate animals also occur. Giraffes are depicted in shaded bi-chromes at two sites, Rukonde and Nyaningwe but these are not in any association with bi-chrome human images. On animals, white rather than red is used to emphasize certain aspects especially the legs. The body of the animal is usually in red and features such as the legs and head are done in white. This is in contrast to the human depictions, where the whole body is depicted in white with details in red. The conflation of snake and antelope at Manyame also occurs in this area (Plate 76b). Although many animals are depicted on their own, some have apparent relationships with human figures on the panels. This occurs in both monochrome and bi-chrome paintings. Such juxtapositions include those at Mashakatira, Chebvute, and Manyere 2 (Plate 56c, 74a).
5.2.2.3 Geometric images

Representation of geometric designs such as dots, circles and lines was observed in Chivi. It is only at Sedza where formling-like images are found. The dots and lines are found in association with human or animal depictions. There are no isolated concentrations of either. They are used to add particular meaning to the images when they make up details on some human figures. At other sites, dots and lines spread over human or animal figures for example the elephant at Madya (Plate 54) as well as the human figure at Davira (Plate 75). At Mapuvire, there is a concentration of dots above the procession of figures in the main scene (Plate 49a). These dots were interpreted by Breuil (1966, p.63) as a cloud. At Gomututu, the dots are super-positioned on human figures (Plate 70a). These geometric designs occur on both monochrome and bi-chrome images.
5.2.3 Technique of execution
Most of the monochrome and all of the bi-chrome images in Chivi are solid but a few of the monochromes were executed in outline (Figure 6). Stripes in this area occur mainly as details on bi-chrome human images or on animals such as kudu, showing the body patterns (Plate 68a, 73a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline with infill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Frequency of techniques of execution in Chivi

5.3 General observations on the rock art from Chivi

Although the majority of the rock art is monochrome, there is a substantial representation of bi-chromes. Few sites have shaded bi-chrome images. The geometric depictions include dots, circles, and lines. These cover human and animal figures. The therianthropes have baboon-face in both the monochrome and bi-chrome art. The rock art is dominated by the solid technique although outlines are found in the monochrome images. Stripes are used to show the natural lines on kudu in monochrome images. Among the bi-chromes, they are used to add details to human figures. It is difficult to establish temporal chronology to the art because of lack of clear super-positioning sequences. It is possible at many of the sites that the monochrome art is older than the bi-chrome but at others, they seem to interchange. Nevertheless, the fact that there are very few sites with the bi-chromes and shaded bi-chromes shows that the adoption of these did not mean the end of monochromes. Therefore, the bi-chromes and shaded bi-chromes might be contemporary with some of the monochromes. The similarities in the subject
matter show that there is a close relationship among the monochromes, bi-chromes and shaded bi-chromes. This would mean that the difference in the use of colour is symbolic rather than a result of temporal differences.
Chapter 6: Rock art of Harare

The rock art from Harare has been studied within the context of rock art from Mashonaland forming part of the mainstay of rock art studies in Zimbabwe (Goodall 1946a & b, 1947, 1949, 1957, 1959, 1962; Garlake 1987a & c, 1994, and 1995). However, many of these works emphasised the similarities rather than the differences in the rock art. Goodall’s work is mostly descriptive while Garlake was looking for what he termed the ‘archetypes’ in the art. Thus, the distinctive aspects of the art have been underplayed. Nevertheless, Goodall (1949) draws attention to some of the distinctive features of the art especially regarding the occurrence of a type of conflated figures that she termed ‘crocodile-men’. She argued that crocodile-men figures show conflations between human and reptilian features. This term is returned here in reference of such kind of conflation. The figures are a known distinctive subject matter provided a starting point for wider comparison with the rest of the country.

6.1 Description of rock art sites from Harare

More than 100 sites were surveyed but only 31 were analysed in detail (Map 13). This was to ensure comparability with other case study areas with fewer sites. Sites that are better preserved were mostly selected for detailed analysis. Most of the sites are located in the present-day Epworth/Ruwa area, Hatfield, Glen Nora, Rainham, Nharira Hills and Chivero National Park.
As noted in Chapter 3, some sites have several names in the museum records. This made it difficult to correlate the sites surveyed to those listed in these records. Therefore, the site names used here do not necessarily correspond with those on the database. In future,
there is need to work on rationalising this problem. Brief overviews of individual sites are given here.

1.) Prospect Farm

This site is in the Prospect area, southeast of the city centre. It has several panels on boulders close to each other. The art has human and animal depictions. The human figures are mainly male and indeterminate. Some of them have antelope ears. Many of the human figures at the site have erected arrow-like headdresses ‘parted in the middle and ties as separate crests’ (Garlake 1987c, p.34; Plate 76). This feature has also been noted at another site in this area which was not documented but was recorded by Goodall (1959) and Garlake (1995) in the Prospect Farm area. The animals include kudu, rhinoceros, and tsessebe.

Plate 76: Human figures with erect headdress separated into two crests.
2.) *Chedgelow*

This site is located on an isolated boulder outcrop in the Hatfield area. It is enclosed within a private residence. The site has 3 panels, one with a dense concentration of paintings and two with few images. It has human, animal and geometric images. There are eight human depictions with the *crocodile-men* in dark-red colour. Another human image in the same colour is in a reclining position. Other human images are no longer clear. The animals include more than 40 antelope heads that surround the reclining human image (Plate 77). There are also elephants, a bird and indeterminate animals in dark red. Other animals such as kudu, rhinoceros, and an eland are in a lighter red colour. The geometric figures are mainly in the form of formlings. There is also a plant in the same dark-red colour.

*Plate 77: Images from the panel at Chedgelow*
3.) *Epworth 1*

The sites in and around the present suburb of Epworth are located on the boulders scattered in the area. Epworth 1 is located within the boundaries of the present-day Chiremba National Monument. It has well-preserved images. All the images make up one scene. The scene depicts human figures with very long limbs and antelope heads. Other human figures are in various postures such as kneeling, seated or standing (Plate 78). The animal images associated with these human figures cannot be assigned to specific species although one is dog-like.

![Plate 78: Depictions from Epworth 1](image)
At other sites within Chiremba National Monument, the images are too faded for meaningful analysis.

4.) Epworth 2

The site of Epworth 2 is 200m to the southeast of the Chiremba National Monument. It has depictions of a group of human and fleck images (Plate 79b). The flecks form a meandering depiction (Plate 79a). Goodall (1959) regarded it as a river but there is no justification for this. The meandering depiction is connected to trees.

Plate 79: Depictions from Epworth 2
5.) Epworth 3

Epworth 3 has depictions of humans, animals, geometrics and plants. The human depictions include a large reclining figure in dark red. There are also therianthropic images including a number of squatting images holding rattles (Plate 80). Garlake (1995) termed them ‘obese images’ based on a distended stomach that is usually found on the images. There is a large elephant in outline with other smaller elephants in solid red. Other animals include kudu, rhinoceros, and buffalo.

Plate 80: Some of the depictions from Epworth 3

6.) Epworth 4

This site is 1 km to the southeast of Epworth 3. It has a large elephant depicted in outline with double lines, one in red and the other in dark red (Plate 81). It also has humans and animals.
Plate 81: A large elephant in outline from Epworth 4

7.) Rhodia

To the northwest of Epworth, is the site of Rhodia. It only has one panel with dense paintings with a lot of super-positioning. Some parts have been vandalised with white oil paint (Plate 82a). The humans include males, therianthropes and indeterminate images. The therianthropes include squatting figures that have obese bodies and are akin to tortoise, with short limbs. Human figures are depicted in various postures. A number of these are touching their faces (or mouths) while others are kneeling (Plate 82b). Some human depictions have elongated bodies. The animals include an aardvark, antelopes, baboon/monkey, wild pig, birds, eland, elephant, and kudu. Another depiction looks like a tortoise (Plate 82c). These are large depictions of formlings and plant images. Some images are depicted in flecks, but they are indeterminable.
Plate 82: Images from Rhodia
8.) *Mimosa 1*

Further to the east, between Epworth and Ruwa, some sites are located in what used to be Mimosa Park. Mimosa 1 is located on a boulder close to Ruwa River. It has depictions of animal images only. The group of animals consists of tsessebe and sable (Plate 83).

![Plate 83: Tsessebe and sables from Mimosa 1](image)

9.) *Mimosa 2*

This site has human and animal images. The animals include buffalo, tsessebe, kudu, and a large elephant in outline. The human figures are in various postures, some of them carrying arrows. Others have erect headdress similar to those from Prospect Farm (Plate 84a).
Plate 84: Depictions from Mimosa 2
Less than 50m away there is another panel with depictions of a human figure, a tree, large formlings and meandering lines. One of the human figures has therianthropic features. The site has been badly affected by salt encrustation (Plate 85a).

Plate 85: Depictions at Mimosa 2
b) Goodall (1959, p. 63) copy of the same panel

10.) Mimosa 3

Mimosa 3 is located on the same range of small hills as Mimosa 2 but further to the east. It is on a large boulder. It has depictions of human, animal and geometric figures. The human figures are all indeterminate. The animals include three large elephants in red outline. These are juxtaposed with a line of large dots (Plate 86a). There is an object with two pairs of dotted lines coming out of it (Plate 86b).
Plate 86: Depictions from Mimosa 3
11.) \textit{Mbizi 1}

Mbizi 1 and 2 are within the Mbizi Game Park. Mbizi 1 is located to the north-west of the main Mbizi Game Park offices. It contains human depictions of both male and female figures. Some of the human figures are standing on some “blocks” (Plate 87a). There is a large depiction of an elephant in red outline filled with white (Plate 87b).

\textbf{Plate 87: Images from Mbizi 1}
12.) **Mbizi 2**

Mbizi 2 is located 50 metres south of Mbizi 1. It has animal and human depictions. The animals include a rhinoceros with a calf and a large elephant in red outline. Human figures are super-positioned on the elephant depiction and they have flecks around them (Plate 88). Some of the human figures have therianthropic features. All the images are in red.

![Plate 88: Outline of legs of a large elephant](image)

13.) **The Bridge Paintings**

This site is located in the south-western part of the city of Harare in the suburb of Glen Norah. It is on a southeast facing boulder. The site has dense concentrations of images and super-positioning (Plate 89c). It has depictions of human, animal and geometric
figures. It has an interesting depiction of human figures crawling along two sets of curved lines joined together at both ends (Plate 89a & b). Goodall (1959) regarded these lines as rope bridges, which is how the site got its name. The figures are kneeling and bending forward in the baboon-dance posture. Several have hair raised on ends and three have lines emerging vertically from their backs. Some of these figures have therianthropic features. Juxtaposed to one of the sets is, in a darker shade of red, a line of images that seem to be human. They do not have any identifiable features. There are flecks around the scene and some of the flecks form a snake-like image that rises from one end of the lines (Plate 89b). This snake-like fleck is juxtaposed to another antelope-headed snake that is also connected to the lines. Some of the flecks are also part of depictions of trees. The flecks cover human depictions, elephants and an unidentified animal in juxtaposition. As with other sites in Harare, the flecks could have formed depictions that are no longer discernible.

Apart from the antelope-headed snake mentioned above, there is another one on a different panel at the site. The snake depicted is most possibly a female puff adder because of its ‘tail’ (see Mallen 2005). The snake is associated with a depiction of an antelope with horns that look like a snake. Other animals at the site include kudu, sable, and elephants.
Plate 89: Depictions from the Bridge Paintings site.
14.)  

**Glen Nora**

The Glen Nora site is the type-site of the *crocodile-men*. It is 4 km west of the Bridge Paintings site. The site has two panels on a small isolated boulder. On one face, there are 13 human figures, eight of which have very clear therianthropic features with rounded body features, thick necks, and gaping mouths (Plate 90a). They have two teeth coming out of the lower jaw. They also have fleshy limbs with no feet or hands. Most are male with exaggerated genetalia tuffed at the end. The image at the centre of the scene has a tail with fur all over the body. Although the body looks feline, it has tusks. Some of the images have antennae on their heads. Although Goodall (1959) regarded the images as *crocodile-men*, not all the images have crocodile or reptilian features. Only two of the images have reptilian features (Plate 90a).

Just below the 13 figures, there is another group of human figures with conflated features. The heads are conflated (Plate 90b). These encircle a reclining figure. To the far left of the panel, there is a kneeling figure that seems to be associated with these images as well.
Plate 90: One of the panels at Glen Nora

b) A close up of images below those in a)
On the other face of the boulder, there are 11 figures similar to the 13 described above. Six of these are standing upright while the four images are bending forward. Images that are in an upright position have \textit{crocodile-men} features but those bending forward do not exhibit them (Plate 91). This led Goodall (1959) to conclude that the figures that are bending were bowing to the \textit{crocodile-men} in an upright position.

\textbf{Plate 91: The second panel at Glen Nora}

Close to the \textit{Glen Nora} site, other smaller sites have not been analysed in detail here. They are too weathered and vandalised but those that are still visible include depictions of fish (Plate 92a), kudu, elephant, lions, plants, and human figures akin to the \textit{crocodile-men}. There is a human figure that is felling a tree (Plate 92b). This image is now flaked but Goodall’s copy from the 1950s is clearer (Plate 92c)
Plate 92: Depictions found in the vicinity of Glen Nora

c) Goodall’s copy, no number assigned
15.) **Rainham 1**

Rainham 1 is 100m northwest of a local abattoir in Rainham area, northwest of Harare city centre. The site has a few well-preserved images. There are a few faded human depictions. The images include two large elephants in outline and smaller images of solid elephants (Plate 93). There are also small antelopes and indeterminate animals.

![Plate 93: Elephants and small antelopes from Rainham 1](image)

16.) **Rainham 2**

Rainham 2 is 2km northwest of Rainham 1. It is comprised of several panels within 50 metres radius. One of the panels has images that include a large outline of an elephant with small birds perched on its head (Plate 94). Humans and other animals are depicted close to the elephant’s trunk. The animals include a kudu, buffalo and indeterminates.
Another panel has animals such as the wild pig, elephants, kudu, tsessebe, sable and some indeterminate animals. It also has human and plant depictions. One of the other panels contains a large animal that might have been a rhinoceros but it is now too weathered for clear identification. Another panel has formlings and some indeterminate animals.

Plate 94: A large elephant with small birds perched along its trunk.

17.) Stonehurst hill

Southwest of Rainham, another site that was recorded is found at Stonehurst hill. The hill has several panels but most have faded images. Those with visible images include human, plant, animal and geometrics. The human images include female figures. One of the panels has a procession of human figures that are very close to each other. Animals include a large elephant in outline with the legs clearly executed. There are also feline
depictions (Plate 95a). A concentration of dots forms a rectangular shape at one of the panels (Plate 95b). All the images are in red and dark red.
18.) Somerby

Close to Stonehurst hill, 1km to the west is the site of Somerby. It is a national monument. It has several panels with well-preserved images. One of these has many images that include human, animal and geometric depictions. The human images include men, women, conflated and indeterminate images. Other images have antelope ears. Some of the male images have thin upper bodies and thick legs. This has been noted at sites such as Rainham and Oatlands. The female images have aprons. Several other human figures are in various postures. The animal depictions include hippopotamus, kudu, buffalo, elephants and indeterminates (Plate 96a & 96b). There are snake depictions, one of which shows signs of conflation with antelope features (Plate 96a). Goodall (1959) thought these snakes were depicting eels but their similarities to other animal-headed snakes align them to such. There is a conflation of humans and ostriches. There is also a plant depiction. One of the other panels has depictions of human figures, tortoise and fish. Others have formlings and animals such as kudu.
Plate 96: Images from the panel at Somerby
19.) Oatlands 1

Two sites were recorded from Oatlands. Other sites in the area are too faded and weathered to be of use in this study. Oatlands is 7km south of Somerby on the eastern side of Chivero dam. Oatlands 1 has two panels located on a small boulder. One panel has human images only while the other has human, animal, and plant depictions. The human depictions include male and female images (Plate 97a). There is a crocodile depiction as well (Plate 97b). The flecks at the site form a human figure.

Plate 97: Figures from Oatlands 1
a) Human figures; b) a crocodile depicted at the site
20.) **Oatlands 2**

Oatlands 2 is 500m from Oatlands 1. The site has two painted faces on a boulder. One face has depictions that Goodall (1959) termed the bat paintings (Plate 98). This consists of figures with human bodies but the heads and the wings are bat-like. They also have horns. Thus, the images show conflation of human, bird and animal features. A feline and another indeterminate animal are super-positioned onto the therianthropes images. The panel has other human images. One figure just below the therianthropes is shown falling backwards, spilling the arrows. On the other face, there is another panel with a formling and human images.

![Plate 98: The conflated figures and animals from Oatlands 2.](image)

21.) **Kilworth 1**

In the Kilworth area, a number of sites were documented. Kilworth 1 is on the northeast edge of a hill. It has depictions of animals and humans. There are several processions of
human images but many of the images are faded. However, a line of stick figures is still clear (Plate 99b). Another procession of black human figures is executed beneath the red paintings. The animals include an ostrich, kudu, small antelope and indeterminate animals (Plate 99a). Concentrations of flecks, which could have been depicting forms that are no longer clear (Plate 99c).
Kilworth 2 is 300m to the northeast of Kilworth 1. It has two panels on the same boulder. There are depictions of animals, human and geometric figures such as the formlings. There are many human images at the site, some in groups while others are single depictions. Most of them are male but a few are indeterminate. Some carry bows and arrows. Others seem to have erect headdresses. On one of the panels, there is a depiction of two human figures encircled with a thick line. These seem to be sleeping. At the bottom of the panel, a procession is juxtaposed with a large formling in outline and another set in the solid technique (Plate 100). There is a tiny elephant figure that is superpositioned on the outlined formling (Plate 100). The elephant has its tusk and tail raised with the mouth slightly open. There is another line of formlings next to this. On the other panel, there are formlings at the top of the panel. Animals include small antelopes and indeterminate.

Plate 100: Depictions from Kilworth 2
Kilworth 3

Kilworth 3 is 200m southwest of Kilworth 2. The site is on the top boulder of balancing rocks. Four large buffalo depictions dominate the panel (Plate 101a). The site has other animals and humans. The human figures are mainly male and some have antelope ears. One image has dots on the neck and arms with aprons depicted in stripes (Plate 101b). Other human figures have erect headdresses. Apart from the buffaloes, there are also large elephants in outline as well as kudu and sables. There is a formling framed by lines of white dots (Plate 101c). A line of red dots was part of a depiction that is no longer clear.

101a

101b
Plate 101: Images from Kilworth 3.
The colours for animals also include yellow and dark red. A second panel is located 40m to the southeast with animal and human figures (Plate 102a). The animals include antelopes, one that is partially drawn (Plate 102b). There is also a pair of rhinoceros horns but the body of the animal is not depicted. There is a large lozenge formling on a nearby panel.
Kilworth 4 comprises several panels on the northern face of hill. The human figures are mostly male and indeterminate carrying equipment (Plate 103a). One panel has wild pig/warthogs, human images, a hippopotamus and a feline in black. Another has a procession of kudu in outline super-positioned on an outline of a large animal, probably elephant. It also has wild pigs. Another panel has one large formling in outline, and other solid ones. There is also a large rhinoceros in outline (103b).
Kilworth 5

Kilworth 5 is located on boulder overhang that is very low such that one has to lie on one’s back to view the art (Plate 104a). It has a large depiction of a snake, which is possibly a python. Although the head can be discerned, the tail is no longer clear, posing difficulties in identification (Plate 104b). An antelope on the same panel as the snake is in a different shade of red and is more faded and probably older.

Plate 104: Figures from Kilworth 5
a) The shelter; b) snake depicted at the site.
Kilworth 6

Kilworth 6 is located 100m southwest of Kilworth 5. It has two panels with human, animal and geometric designs. The first panel has a group of human images standing in a circular formation (Plate 105b). There are also unidentified objects associated with a human image. The animals include rhinoceros and some indeterminates. There is a possible feline partially covered by the rhinoceros image (Plate 105a). The other images are possibly sheep. On another panel, there is a large formling, a buffalo and human images.

Plate 105: Depictions from Kilworth 6
27.)  **Chivero 1**

Chivero 1 is located at the northern part of the Chivero National Park. It has several panels on three boulders. On one panel, there are antelopes and some indeterminate animals. There is a human figure in red and black colours. A pair of squatting human figures is also depicted at the site (Plate 106a). They seem to be male with exaggerated genitals. There are also therianthropic images with animal ears. On the other panel, there are animals and human figures as well. There is a group of four individuals. One of the images seems to be falling backwards. It is shown being assisted by another. Two associated figures have antelope features (Plate 106c). Another group of human figures has depictions that are running and carrying weapons. At the bottom of the panel, there is a faded procession of about 20 individuals. The animals include fish and indeterminate animals. The panel also has two large formlings and fleck depictions. A third panel is on a small boulder just off the second panel. It has a human figure holding what looks like a flute or a bow to his face (Plate106b).
Plate 106: Human depictions at Chivero 1
Less than 50m to the north there is another panel with a clear depiction of a feline and a fish (Plate 107). There are other faded images on the panel. These include a human figure that looks similar to the squatting figures.

Plate 107: Image of a fish and feline from Chivero 1

28.) Chivero 2

Chivero 2 is located 1 km further north of Chivero 1. It has two large depictions of crocodiles associated with human images, some with the crocodile-men features especially in the fleshy limbs (Plate 108a). More images of human figures are found on the far right corner of the panel. These are not in the same style as the crocodile-men. Their association with the two crocodiles is not apparent. One of the crocodiles is
depicted on its back with a human figure seemingly dangling a small animal (Plate 108b).

All the images are in various shades of red.

Plate 108: Human and crocodile depictions from Chivero 2
29.)  

Chivero 3

Chivero 3 is 2 km south of Chivero 1. The site is located on a boulder perched atop other boulders (Plate 109a). It has a group of kudu bulls that are associated with a line of thick dots. Goodall (1959) has interpreted this line as a track that the animals are following. There is also a warthog image and a formling close by. Below the animals, there is a group of human figures, some carrying bow and arrows, with two images shooting at each other (Plate 109b). Arrows hit some of the images in the group.

Plate 109: Figures from Chivero 3
Chivero 4 is located by the Chivero dam wall. The site is also known as Bushman point. It has two panels on opposing sides of a boulder. On the main panel, there are depictions of animals, trees, fish, and human figures. Groups of human figures are involved in a range of activities. They are also in different postures. Some are seated while others are dancing. One group is near the tree depictions, with two of the figures felling a tree (Plate 111a). Just above this group, there is a line of female dancing figures (Plate 110a). At the bottom of the panel, there is a procession of human figures that are seated and clapping their hands. Below them, there is another line of figures bending on all fours. On the far left end, another procession of red images is super-positioned on yellow striped ones. Some of the striped yellow figures are animals, probably antelopes. Other human figures on the panel are running whilst carrying bows and arrows.

Plate 110: Human figures from Chivero 4

The animals include a lion, eland, elephant, kudu and indeterminate ones. Chivero 4 has a number of eland figures (Plate 111b). Human figures are closely associated with the elands. There is a depiction of either a jackal or a dog. There are different kinds of fish
depicted. Below the human images, there is a small depiction of an elephant. Some animals are depicted with flecks. One is a conflation of a bird and human being. The other is fish. Other fleck depictions are no longer clearly discernible. On the other panel, there are two human figures with the *crocodile-men* features similar to those from the type-site (Plate 110b).

Plate 111: Depictions at Chivero 4
Less than 50 m to the south there is another panel with a scene depicting human figures only. They are in dark red and carry long sticks (Plate 112).

Plate 112: Human figures another panel at Chivero 4.

31.) Chivero 5

Chivero 5 is 2 km further to the southeast of Chivero 4. It is also located on the edge of Chivero dam. It has several panels. The main panel has a procession of human figures. These have blank spaces where their faces are supposed to be. It might be a technique of drawing or that another colour has washed off (Plate 113a). However, there is no evidence of use of colours apart from red at the site. The depictions also include that of a child (Plate 113b). Below them is another group of human figures, which include three
very tall individuals. Two of the tall figures seem to be trying to grab the head of an animal. A panel above this one has a large red circle. To the west is another panel with a large depiction of a figure in dots. There is another panel with fish, an antelope and a formling depiction.

Plate 113: Part of the panel at Chivero 5.
Some of the sites located in Harare were not visited during the current research. Nonetheless, information recorded by previous scholars is relevant to the discussion of the character of rock art from Harare. Important sites include those found in Prospect, Adelaide, Epworth and Hatfield. A site from Prospect farm recorded by Garlake (1987c, 1995) has several male and female figures; three of male figures are in a reclined position. In Epworth, there is site known as Chirimba 129 which was recorded by Goodall (copy 168). It has four human images with crocodile-men features, especially the gaping heads.

Other sites were visited but were not analysed in detail due to their poor state of preservation. These include sites that are found 500m across the road from the national monument. These are faded but at one site, there are human images with crocodile-men features still discernible. On a farm west of Mbizi Game Park there are other panels scattered in the hills. These contain mostly faded human figures and animals but there is one panel with single eland image (Plate 114).
Plate 114: An eland on a boulder near Mbizi Game Park

In the Rainham area there are other panels scattered around the area. One has two large outlines of elephant heads and concentrations of dots on the panel; some of which are finger-painted. Others have human images including ones with crocodile-men features. The site also has faded animal depictions but a large bird depiction can be discerned. It is either an ostrich or stork.
6.2 Characterisation of the rock art from Harare

6.2.1 Subject matter

The rock art of Harare has varied subject matter including human figures, animal figures and a number of geometric images and plants (Figure 7). Although the number of sites with plants is small, many contain multiple depictions.

![Bar chart showing frequency of subject matter in Harare](image)

**Figure 7: Frequency of subject matter in Harare**

6.2.1.1 Human figures

Most of the human figures in Harare are indeterminate to sex but of those that can be identified, male figures outnumber females and children. Female images constitute only 4.9% whilst males are 30.2% of all human imagery (Table 11). Children are rarely depicted. The therianthropic images include those akin to the *crocodile-men*, bat, and ostrich conflations (Plate 116b). The squatting images are also akin to tortoise. Other
conflated human images found in Harare are those with antelope head features (e.g. Plate 78, 106c). Some of the images have elongated limps but others have normal ones. The *crocodile-men* are found at other sites but they are best exemplified by the images from Chedgelow and Glen Nora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Figures</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthrope</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>708</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therianthrope</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crocodile-men</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bat conflation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope features</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich Conflation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise-like</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Frequency of humans in the rock art of Harare**

Images at other sites differ slightly from those at the *crocodile-men* type-site in Glen Nora. Most have similar features, especially the thick, fleshy limbs. They are usually depicted in dark red. Some have gaping mouths with two tusks emerging.
Plate 115: Close-up of images from Glen Nora

The transformation is obvious on most of them since they show a conflation of human and animal features. Some of them have reptilian features especially one of the images at
the type-site (Plate 115a). However, others are not clearly reptilian. They have gaping mouths and erect hair and fangs or tusks. These images are found at a few sites in Harare (Plate 116).

Plate 116: Human-animal conflations
a) From Chedgelow; b) Ostrich Conflations from Somerby
In Harare, there are two types of *squatting* images. One type is of images that are usually stout with short limbs holding rattles in both hands (Plate 117). Some of these are akin to tortoises that are also depicted in the area. These are found at sites such as Rhodia and Epworth 3. Goodall copied (copy 172) a similar squatting image from Hatfield Estate. The other version of the squatting images is found in the Chivero area at Chivero 1. These have longer limbs and one seems to be male (Plate 106a).

*Plate 117: A squatting human figure from Epworth 3*

Other human figures in Harare are depicted in various sizes and postures. They are usually depicted in groups although single images occur. Many of the male images carry
bows and arrows but some carry sticks. The arrows may be held in the hands or carried in quivers over the shoulders (Plate 118b). Some females also carry sticks e.g. at Oatlands 1 and Chivero 4 (Plate 118a). Although plants are depicted, there is no evidence of gathering. Garlake (1987c) recorded a site that he argues shows women with digging sticks in Chivero National Park. He also argues that the two figures at Makabusi are women on a gathering expedition. This is not explicit.
Human images are depicted in various postures including dancing, kneeling, touching their faces and clapping. There are also depictions of people being shot at by arrows. There are some rare depictions of people fighting at Chivero 3.

Most of the human figures are not clothed but a few have back-and-front aprons usually in the same colour as the body. A number of human images in Harare have elaborate headdresses, the most common being the erect headdress parted into two crests. A posture that is common in this area is that of reclining figures. Typical ones are those from Chedgelow, Chadcombe, and Epworth 3. A site from Prospect Farm recorded by Garlake (1995) has several male and female figures with three of the male figures are in a reclined position.

The reclining images were considered “dead” by some previous researchers such as Frobenius (1931) and Goodall (1959). Garlake (1987c, 1995) however, observed that the figures do not seem to be dead. The examples from Harare show that they are in total control of their limbs. Many hold their heads with one hand and the other is lifted high up (Plate 119a). One or both legs are usually lifted up as well (Plate 119b).
A wide range of animal species is depicted in Harare (Table 12). These include kudu, sable, elephant, buffalo, tsessebe and birds. Rarely depicted animals include monkey, giraffe, eland, crocodile, wild dog/jackal, aardvark and impala. The highest frequency is that of indeterminate antelopes, most of which are likely kudu but cannot be specifically identified due to deterioration of the pigment. Amongst the identifiable species, kudu has
the highest frequency. Female kudu outnumber identifiable male kudu, although there is one site with a group of kudu bulls (Plate 120a). Antelopes are generally depicted in groups, some with mixed species, for example, at Mimosa 1 and Somerby. A unique depiction is found at Chedgelow where forty antelope heads are depicted surrounding a reclining image (Plate 77).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboons/Monkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsessebe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate antelope</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippopotamus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelope</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet animal</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated snake + antelope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/Wild Pig</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodile/ reptile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildebeest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild dog/jackal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aardvark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>422</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Frequency of animal depictions in Harare.
Elephants occur in high numbers in the rock art of Harare. They are usually executed in large outlines that cover entire panels. At some sites such as Mbizi 2 and Stonehurst, only the giant legs are depicted. Other images are then super-positioned. This was the basis for the argument that the large depictions were the first style in the hunter-gatherer art (Goodall 1957, 1959). However, the associated images seem to have been deliberately placed on these large images such that they could have been executed at the same time. This brings in the problem of using super-positioning as a chronological indicator. The artist could have been emphasising the huge size of elephant although there are small elephants at sites such as at Chedgelow, Domboremari, and Epworth 3. No known depictions show the hunting of elephants. Other large animals that are also depicted in the rock art from Harare include the rhinoceros, hippopotamus and buffalo usually painted in solid technique.
Other animals are felines, snakes, tortoise (Plate 120b) and crocodiles. There are a number of feline images in Harare. These have been noted at Oatlands, Chivero 1, Chivero 4 and Stonehurst. They have also been noted at other sites including Maryvale in
Msasa, and Prospect farm (Goodall copies 50; 66). Snake depictions are not many in the rock art of Harare. The most outstanding depiction of a snake is that from Kilworth 5, which is probably a python. There are also a number of conflated snake images for example at Somerby and Bridge Paintings (Plate 121).

Plate 121: Antelope headed snake from Bridge paintings.

Animals that occur in the rock art of Harare include the aardvark and fish. The aardvark is depicted at Rhodia and at two other sites that were not visited but recorded by Goodall (Plate 122a). Fish is widespread in the area, depicted at sites such as Free’s Plot 45 and at Chivero 1 and 4.
Plate 122: Aardvark depictions from Harare.
The fish species that are depicted in the art include the tiger and catfish. The fish at Chivero 1 is similar to that at Chivero 4; this is probably *Clarias gariepinus* (barbell fish, Plate 123). The others at Chivero 4 have been identified as belonging to the *mormyridae* family sometimes called the elephant fish or freshwater elephant fish (Hubbard 2011).

![Barbell fish from Chivero 4](image)

**Plate 123: Barbell fish from Chivero 4**

### 6.2.1.3 Geometric images

In Harare, most of the geometric images come in the form of formlings. There are also lines, dots and flecks. Formlings also occur at some sites that were not visited, for example, formlings from Free’s plot, Epworth 106 and Epworth 134 that were copied by Goodall (Goodall copies 56; 47). Harare has many formlings, though not as elaborately detailed as in at other sites around the country, for example Matopo Hills and northern Zimbabwe (see Mguni 2002). In Harare, many of the formlings are in outline whilst others are solid (Plate 124a & b). Some are a combination of outlines and solids (Plate
153a). Most of the formlings are the lozenge type. The association between formlings and tree motifs noted by Mguni (2002) has not been observed in this area.

Plate 124: Lozenge shaped formlings
The other geometric depictions are flecks which are quite common in the rock art from the Harare area. The flecks were used to depict certain forms but at many of the sites, these are faded in parts such that they are no longer discernible for example at Rhodia, Epworth 2, and Epworth 3. Nonetheless, at some sites these are clear, for example the bird and fish at Chivero 4 (Plate 125a & b) and the snake at Bridge Painting (Plate 89b). Sometimes the whole panel is filled with these flecks, for instance, at Venturburg (Goodall 1959, p. 67). There is also a tendency for flecks to be associated with trees such that they have been interpreted as depicting the landscape (Frobenius 1931, Goodall 1959). This association has been noted at Chivero 4, Free’s Plot 45, and Epworth 2 (Goodall 1959).
Dots are not as common as flecks and formlings but they do occur at a number of sites. Some cover a large part of the panels, for example at Stonehurst (Plate 95b). At most sites, dots are used to add details, for example those at Kilworth 3. Large dots are used to
illustrate certain forms, for example, they form a line at Mimosa 3 above the elephant depiction, or the line associated with felines at Maryville (Goodall copies 50). At Chivero 5, dots are used to depict a formling (Plate 126). These are usually finger-painted. Other geometric depictions include circles e.g. at Epworth 3 (Plate 80).

Plate 126: Part of a formling depicted with dots at Chivero 5
6.2.1.4 Plants

The rock art from Harare has a high number of plant depictions. Out of all the sites that were analysed, 25% had plant depictions. A number of sites that were not visited also have plant depictions (Frobenius 1931; Goodall 1959; Garlake 1995). They come in the form of tubers, aloes, pods, branches, grasses, and trees. Trees are the most commonly depicted plants (Plate 127). Tubers, grasses, and aloes are rare. There are depictions of trees with flapping leaves such as the ones at Epworth 3 (Plate 127d), Free’s Plot 45, Rainham 2 (Plate 127a) and near Glen Nora (Plate 92c). Others have a circular canopy as seen at Chivero 4 (Plate 111a).

Plate 127: Plant depictions from Harare
6.2.2 Colour

The colours used in depicting rock art from Harare are mostly red or dark red. Very few images are executed in colours such as brown, white, yellow, and black. It has been observed that the *crocodile-men* are usually depicted in dark red. In Harare, there is very limited use of more than one colour. When this occurs, it is usually on outlines where double lines are depicted in red and dark red, for example, at Chivero 4 and Epworth 4 (Plate 81 Plate 128 and Plate 87b). It is possible that some images had features painted in white that have deteriorated due to the colour’s fugitive qualities. Some human images at Mbizi 1 and Chivero 5 seem to have had white on their faces but this is no longer clear. At Mbizi 1, this is even more probable since the elephant at the site is partly in white. White dots are used to add detail to some images, for example, the formling at Kilworth 3. Apart from these, most of the images from Harare are monochromatic (Figure 8). Nevertheless, the use of white on some of these features shows that it was known to the artists.

![Bi-chrome vs. Monochrome](chart.png)

**Figure 8: Frequency of colour schemes in Harare**
Plate 128: An elephant with double lines of outlines from Chivero 4

6.2.3 Technique of execution

In terms of the technique of execution, most of the rock art from Harare is solid. Outlines are the second most frequent technique (Fig 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline with infill</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9: Frequency of techniques of execution in Harare

Most of the subjects depicted in outline are animals (Plate 129a) and geometric designs. Few human figures are in simple outlines. Instead, they are sometimes outlined in part, for example only the torsos are in outline and the rest of the body solid. Flecking was also a technique of depicting certain forms in this area as noted above (Plate 125). In Harare, some figures are depicted in stripes. Goodall (1959) has likened the figures from Chivero 4 (Plate 129b) to the art from Makaha in Northern Nyanga. Although the images are very similar, they represent an isolated occurrence of such a technique. Beyond these, images with stripes are usually zebras showing details on their hide.
Plate 129: Technique of execution in Harare

a) From Kilworth 3; b) Chivero 4
6.3 General observations on rock art from Harare

The rock art from Harare is composed of humans, animals, plants and geometric figures. Male figures predominate. The therianthropic images come in a variety of conflations such as antelope ears, crocodile features, bat and ostrich conflations. Animal depictions show a variety of species such as elephants, kudu, sable, tsessebe, buffalo, and rhinoceros. The kudu dominates the art but small antelopes and elephants are also frequently depicted. In terms of colours, the rock art from Harare is predominantly monochromatic in red and dark red. Bi-chrome images are very rare. The rock art is mostly solid but there are a significant number of outlines. The stripes occur very rarely. No patterns that could assist in chronological determination were observed.
Chapter 7:
Comparative analysis of variation

This chapter discusses the patterns of motif variation that have emerged from the previous three chapters. It compares and contrasts data from the case study areas paying particular attention to the three aspects under consultation. These are subject matter, technique of execution and colour. It also draws comparisons from elsewhere in Zimbabwe using information gathered from publications and museum records. Reference is made to parts of the sub region whose rock art has been related to that from Zimbabwe. These include rock art from Brandberg (Namibia), Kondoa (Tanzania), and parts of South Africa especially the Limpopo Province.

There is however a problem in determining the contemporaneity of the rock art from the three case studies. It has been noted that in Northern Nyanga the solid images are usually more weathered than the striped ones, even those occurring at the same sites. This can be used to come up with a rudimentary chronology for the rock art of the area (e.g. Table 7) but it is difficult to say the same for Harare and Chivi because of the limited occurrence of striped images. In Chivi, the colours may be used as a chronological indicator but the same cannot apply in Northern Nyanga and Harare where most of the images have the same colour. Therefore, it is difficult to cross-reference the motifs chronologically across the case studies.
7.1 Variation in subject matter

The previous chapters have shown that some depictions are common to all the case studies but others are only prevalent in one or two of the areas. Human figures are generally depicted more frequently than any other subject matter in the art. The second most frequent are the animal depictions. Geometrics and plants follow respectively. Overall, the occurrence of subject matter in the three case studies shows a close relationship according to the CA plots (Figure 10b & c). The PCA plots however show that subject matter occurrence in Northern Nyanga and Chivi area much closer as compared to that of Harare (Figure 10d). However, plots for particular subject matters differ from this general picture as is illustrated in subsequent figures below.
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Figure 10: Comparison of frequency of subject matter.
7.1.1 Human images

The frequency of male figures has been noted in all areas. Males make up about 30% of all identifiable human figures in each of the case study areas. In contrast, female imagery constitutes less than 10% (Figure 11). The general preponderance of human figures in all the areas does not mask the variation that occurs in the nature of their representation in the art. Both quantitative and descriptive analyses have shown similarities and differences in the way human figures are represented in the case study areas. In Chivi, female human figures make up 10% compared to 4.9% and 2.8% in Harare and Northern Nyanga respectively (Table 5, 8a & b & 11). In the monochrome images, this percentage is even higher at 13.9% (Table 8a). Images of children are absent in Northern Nyanga and Chivi but they occur in Harare, though rarely. The CA and PCA plots (Figure 11c, d& e) can best illustrate these variations. The CA plots show that the occurrence of identifiable human figures is closely related in all the case studies. However, there is a slight variation in the female figures and a huge difference in representation of children (Figure 11a). Nevertheless, the differences are not great in terms of numbers. Thus, the overall assessment of the human representation shows that the case studies are similar (Figure 11d). The PCA plots show that Harare and Northern Nyanga have a much closer relationship with each other than with Chivi (Figure 11e). All these differences might be a reflection of the differences in the issues being addressed in the art. These issues are discussed in detail in Chapter 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Figures</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthrope</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11: Comparative frequencies of human depictions.
7.1.1.1 Conflated images

The frequency analyses show more therianthropic images in the art from Northern Nyanga (11.1%) compared to the art from Harare (9%) and Chivi (6%). In Northern Nyanga, particular sites have many therianthropic images with very few other human images. The tendency to have a concentration of therianthropic images at certain sites has also been noted in Harare, especially with the occurrence of the crocodile-men. Therianthropes, especially, those conflated with antelope features tend to be associated with ‘normal’ human figures. In Chivi, this is common. In terms of comparisons between the three case studies, both CA and PCA plots show considerable variation in the occurrence of therianthropic figures (Figure 12b, c and d). The CA shows that only the occurrence of antelope features and the indeterminate therianthropes are closer to each other within the case studies (Figure 12b).
Figure 12: Comparative analysis of therianthrope representation
Variations have been observed in the nature of conflating human and animal figures in the different areas under study. In Northern Nyanga, the *snake-head* and distortion of facial features are employed on most conflated images. These types of conflation have not been observed in the other areas under study. However, there are some affinities to the *crocodile-men* in Harare, especially in the associated exaggerated genitals and disks on their heads. Nevertheless, the conflations in Northern Nyanga do not have features such as the thick limbs with stumps for feet and hands that are found on the *crocodile-men*. Therefore, the therianthropes from Northern Nyanga can be considered a distinct regional variety of the general conflation in the rock art of Zimbabwe. The association between humans and snakes in Northern Nyanga further shows a possibility of perceived connection between humans and snakes. Many of the therianthropic images are depicted holding snake-like objects. This has not been observed in the other areas, although snakes do occur.

The *crocodile-men* depictions in Harare are also distinctively regional. They have not been observed anywhere else in the case study areas. In Chivi, the common therianthropic feature is that of human figures with *baboon-face*. It occurs on both the monochromes and bi-chromes. This conflation has not been observed in Harare and Northern Nyanga. There are also common types of conflation that have been observed in the research areas. The use of antelope features such as ears on human heads is especially widespread. It was widely observed in Northern Nyanga and Harare. Although it is not as common in Chivi, it has been observed at the sites of Manyame and Chemazizi.
Although the conflation with antelope heads is similar in all case studies, the bodies of the images that are conflated with the animal features differ in some respects. In Harare at Epworth 1, the human figures have elongated limbs (Plate 130). These types of images have not been observed in other areas under investigation but similar images have been reported in other parts of Mashonaland (Plate 130b).

Plate 130: Conflated human figures with thin elongated limbs

(130b after Goodall copies, 302)
The other common depiction is that of squatting images. Most such images have therianthropic features. In Northern Nyanga, only one such image was identified at Nyamudeza 2. Three depictions were observed from Matsveru 2 and Rukonde Hill in Chivi. Similar images were identified at Chivero 1, Epworth 3, and Rhodia in Harare. All these images are similar in that they have obese bodies and are frontal-facing. Many are usually holding crescent or rattle-like objects. Most of these are indeterminate in terms of sex except those from Chivero 1 that are male. Nevertheless, a number of differences have been noted among them. Those from Northern Nyanga and Chivi have leg astride with legs bent on the knees. The arms are half-raised i.e. bent at the elbow (Plate 131a & b).

![Plate 131 Squatting figures from Rhodia, Harare and Matsveru 2, Chivi](image)

In Harare, some of the figures have short limbs. The depiction is akin to the shape of tortoise, but the human features are apparent giving the depiction an appearance akin to that of a tortoise. Those from Chivero 1 have long unshaped limbs (Plate 106a). The figure from Northern Nyanga differs in that it has two long zigzag lines that issue out from between
its legs with a small human figure attached at the end. It is holding two sticks in each hand rather than the crescents or rattles. There are two short lines attached to its head. The levers on the legs do not occur elsewhere. All these differences show that although the subject matter is similar, it is treated in different ways in different places.

Apart from the differences in conflating images, human depictions also vary in their headdresses. The arrow headdress comes in two forms, one where the image has a crown of arrows around the head (Plate 132), and the other where the hair is separated into two crests. The former is not common in the case studies. It occurs in Chivi where it is found only on one image (Plate 132). The latter is not found in Chivi but it occurs widely in Harare and Northern Nyanga. In Northern Nyanga, it is common on therianthropic images.

Plate 132: A therianthrope from Chemazizi, Chivi
7.1.1.2 Human Postures

The manner in which postures are depicted in the different case studies also shows interesting variations. Many of the images are depicted in processions, walking, running or dancing. Another posture that has been identified in all the case study areas is the “crawling” posture, which has been termed the baboon-dance posture (Nhamo 2007). In Northern Nyanga, it is found at Tsengerai 5. This is well elaborated at Bridge paintings in Harare. In Chivi, there are some figures in this posture at Mapuvire 1.

A distinctive posture was noted in the rock art of Harare. This is the depiction of reclining images (Plate 119). Even though the reclining figures were considered one of the distinguishing features of Zimbabwean rock art (Frobenius cited by Garlake 1995, p.34), this research has shown that they are confined to some parts of the country. In the case studies, they have only been identified in Harare.

The other posture that was noted in the study is that of women who are depicted seated in the bi-chrome art of Chivi. These are usually seated with one or both legs outstretched in front of them. In most cases, one central figure is depicted in this way although it may be surrounded by other figures. Manner in which some seated figures are depicted in Harare is different from this (e.g. Plate 133a & 133b). The association with dancing male figures that surrounds the seated figures also sets the Chivi women apart from their counter parts in Northern Nyanga and Harare.
Plate 133: Images of seated people

(133a is after Goodall 1959)
Postures of bending down figures also differ from place to place. In Northern Nyanga, there are numerous images in forward bending postures. These figures usually have claw-like digits and most have conflations. Although similar images are found at Davira in Chivi, they are very rare. Similar images are only known from Glen Nora in Harare.

7.1.1.3 Human activities

The activities that the humans are involved in vary from place to place. For example, the hunting of large animals such as elephant and rhinoceros was noted in Northern Nyanga but not in Harare and Chivi even though both animals are depicted in the art from all these areas. Differences also show that most of the human depictions in Harare and Northern Nyanga have hunting weapons such as bows and arrows. Fewer images are carrying bows and arrows in Chivi among the monochromes and among the bi-chrome images where none of the human images carry weapons.

7.1.1.4 Human depictions in other parts of Zimbabwe

The representation of human images across the case studies has some similarities and variations when compared with other parts of Zimbabwe and southern Africa. The high frequency of male figures has been observed elsewhere in country, for example in Glendale, Wedza, Zimunya, Chipinge and Gwanda (Tucker and Baird 1983; Thornycroft 1986; Nhamo 2007b; Manyanga and Zhou 2009; Nhamo and Bonyongwa forthcoming). It has also been observed in the Drakensberg in South Africa (Smith 2006). On the other hand, the slightly higher percentage of female figures in the rock art of Chivi may suggest
that there is an increase in female imagery as one goes south towards the Limpopo basin where female images outnumber male depiction (Eastwood 2005; Smith 2006; Eastwood et al 2010). This conclusion can only be sustained when the areas between Chivi and Beitbridge are researched. Groups of women dancing are common in Beitbridge and Chipinge (Plate 134). Imagery of children has been reported elsewhere in the country (Cooke 1974; Garlake 1995). Their identification is difficult due to the lack of scales of measurement in the rock art in general.

Plate 134: Dancing women from Chipinge and Beitbridge

In terms of conflation of human and animal features, there are differences and similarities as well. The *snake-head* from Northern Nyanga has not been reported anywhere else in the country. The *crocodile-men* have been found in areas around Harare such as Domboshava and Marondera (Goodall 1959; Nhamo 2008; Map 14). Beyond this range, they are unknown. However, the *baboon-face* from Chivi has been observed in other parts of the country. It is known from Zimunya and Gwanda (Nhamo 2007b; Manyanga
and Zhou 2009). Nevertheless, it is interesting that there are no baboons observed in the art from Chivi where this conflation is common.

![Map 14: Distribution of crocodile-men motif](image)

The common conflation with antelope features especially the head and ears also occurs in other parts of the country (Cooke 1974; Garlake 1995). It has been reported in Matopo Hills at sites such as Bambata (Walker 1996). It has been noted in Zimunya in Manicaland, Pamushana and Chibvumani in Bikita (Nhamo 2007a and b). It also occurs elsewhere in southern Africa such as in the Drakensberg and Western Cape Province (Solomon 1992). However, the elongation of limbs on the therianthropes that was noted
in Harare is not as widespread. In Zimbabwe, it occurs only at some sites in Mashonaland such as at Chikupo (Plate 130b), Ballinard in Wedza and at Lilfordia site in Mashonaland central (Goodall 1959; Cripps Vol 4 p. 188; Cripps Vol 11, p. 256). In some parts of Zimbabwe and southern Africa, squatting images also have these antelope ears (Goodall 1949; Garlake 1987a & c; Plate 135a and c). These do not occur in the case study areas.
Plate 135: Some squatting images from around the country
a) from Liwonde in Goromonzi; b) Howick estate in Concession c) & d) Wedza e) & f) Chivhu

However, the squatting images from Northern Nyanga are much more similar in some respects to those observed in the neighbouring Mutoko area at sites such as Manemba, Mushayamvura, Mutoko Cave, Vumbuga, Gurure and Gambarimwe (Goodall 1949; Cripps Vol 5). They also occur in Murehwa from sites such as Murehwa Cave and Mucheka. They are similar in the occurrence of the two zigzag lines emanating from between it’s bestride legs. At Mutoko cave, the image with zigzag lines has a figure at the bottom of lines similar to the image from Northern Nyanga. Other sites in Murehwa and Mutoko have small human figures crawling up and down the zigzag lines (Plate 136). The difference is that in Murehwa and Mutoko, these images are usually found in pairs.

Plate 136: A pair of squatting images from Gambarimwe, Mutoko
(After Goodall 1962, p.402)
At Manemba, there are two pairs; one of each of the pairs has breasts while the others are not sexed (Goodall 1962). The indeterminate ones also do not have the zigzag lines. These have been presumed to be male (Garlake 1987c; Cripps Vol 5 p. 4). The female images from Murehwa and Mutoko are the ones that gave rise to the terms ‘primeval mother’, ‘mother goddess’ and ‘mythic women’ (Goodall 1949, 1959; Solomon 1992, 1994, 1998a).

Plate 137: Depictions of squatting figures, some with white ornaments
(After Goodall copies 680)
Another difference observed in some of the squatting images from Mutoko is that they have ornaments around the neck and stomach. At Gurure, the pair of squatting images is polychrome with the images in brown, the ornaments and the zigzag lines in white (Plate 137b). The head is also adorned with white and red headdress. Their faces also have white lines. This has not been observed on any of the squatting images in the case study areas. The squatting images from Harare differ from the images found around the country in their resemblance to tortoises (Goodall 1949). Similar images are also found at Chikupo, north of Harare (Plate 138).

Plate 138: Images of tortoise akin to squatting human figures from Chikupo
(After Goodall copies 17).

The squatting images are also found elsewhere other than in north-eastern Zimbabwe. They have been identified in Macheke, Chivhu, Matopo hills, Goromonzi, Rusape, Makoni, Wedza and Bikita (Frobenius 1931; Goodall 1959; Solomon 1998a). These images are very similar to the Northern Nyanga images although some have several short
lines emanating between their legs instead of the two zigzag lines (Plate 135f). These lines sometimes have smaller human images crawling up and down the zigzag lines similar to those observed in Mutoko. Some of these figures are female; a few are male but most are indeterminate (Plate 135). These images also occur elsewhere in southern Africa. They have been recorded in the Free State and Cape Province of South Africa (Solomon 1994, 1998a; Humphreys 1996) and in Kondoa, at sites such as B11 and Swera D17 (Fosbrooke 1950). However, these images do not have lines that emerge from between the legs.

Some of the postures observed also occur outside the case study areas. The reclining figures have been observed in parts of Mashonaland such as Concession, Marondera, Wedza, Rusape and Mutoko (Cripps Vol 3, p.79; Garlake 1987c, 1995). At Manemba in Mutoko, there are two reclining figures that pierced by arrows whilst surrounded by people carrying bows and arrows. The reclining figures at Diana’s Vow are famous (Plate 139). Both archival and field researches have shown that reclining figures are not found in the southern parts of the country. They have not been reported in any other parts of southern Africa.
Plate 139: The reclining figure from Diana’s Vow cave in Rusape.

There are minor variations in the manner in which reclining figures are represented. The ones in Harare do not have details of any sort whereas some such as those from Diana’s Vow are elaborately decorated (Plate 139). In other areas, although there are many similarities, they are neither elaborately decorated nor conflated as those at Diana’s Vow (Plate 140). Other variations come in the way in which the hands are depicted. In Harare, many of the images are holding their heads with one or both hands. Elsewhere, some reclining images are holding a disk in one hand while the other hand is holding the head.
The other posture is that of seated women, especially from Chivi. These have also been observed at rock art sites such as Muroyi in Zaka (Plate 141) and Mbara in Gutu (Breuil 1966, p.24). The associated images do not carry any weapons. Activities such as the hunting of large animals such as elephants and rhinoceros noted in Northern Nyanga have also been observed in the rock art from nearby Mutoko and Murehwa (Garlake 1987c, 1995). This is unknown anywhere else in the country but hunting of large animals has also been reported in the rock art of the Drakensberg area (Lewis-Williams 2003b).
7.1.2 Animal depictions

As with the human depictions, the animal depictions in the case study areas have similarities and differences. Certain animals are found across the case studies but others are confined to certain areas. Harare has a larger repertoire of animal species than Chivi and Northern Nyanga (Figure 13). There are more than twenty different species of animals identified in the rock art of Harare whereas both Chivi and Northern Nyanga have twelve but different species each.

Animals common to all case studies are kudu and elephant but also include buffalo, sable, zebra, and rhinoceros. Chivi and Northern Nyanga have very high numbers of kudu
images compared to Harare, which has only 17.3% of the images compared to 34.3% and 35.1% for Northern Nyanga and Chivi, respectively (Table 6, 10, 12). In Chivi, kudu images are found in both monochrome and bi-chrome colours. Indeterminate antelopes and animals are rarely associated with the bi-chrome human images. Apart from these, other animals are rarely depicted in bi-chrome colours.

![Figure 13: Comparative frequencies of animal depictions](image)

Figure 13: Comparative frequencies of animal depictions
Snakes also occur in all the case study areas. In Chivi and Harare, they are sometimes conflated with antelope heads, for example at Bridge Paintings in Harare and Manyame in Chivi. However, there are no antelope headed snakes in Northern Nyanga but rather snakes are conflated human beings as discussed earlier. People are also sometimes depicted holding snakes.

Animal species identified in Harare that do not occur in the other study areas include tsessebe, crocodile, baboon/monkey, hippopotamus, fish, and aardvark/ant bear. Another difference in frequency of animals is observed in depiction of birds. Although bird depictions are found in Harare and Northern Nyanga, there are far more bird images depicted in the former than the latter. Only one bird, probably a stork, was identified in Northern Nyanga. In Chivi, there are no bird depictions. In Harare, there are different types of birds ranging from ostrich, stork, to smaller birds such as the oxpecker (*Buphagidae*).

Another animal species that varies distinctly in the case studies is the giraffe. Giraffe have been recorded mainly from Chivi where some sites have entire panels with images. It is the second most frequent animal after kudu in Chivi. No giraffe depictions recorded in Northern Nyanga. Only two giraffe images were found in Harare.

Animals such as buffaloes and elephants are common in all the case study areas but differ in their frequency. Elephants are the second most frequent in Northern Nyanga. They also have a high frequency in Harare. Yet, there are very few elephant depictions in Chivi.
Buffaloes are also more frequent in Harare and Northern Nyanga than in Chivi. Eland images are generally rare in Zimbabwean rock art (Cooke 1964, 1974; Garlake 1995). This has been supported by this research. Among the case study areas, Harare and Chivi have very few eland images and none have been identified in Northern Nyanga.

Although they are rare, felines have been observed in all the areas under study. There are more felines in Harare than in Chivi and Northern Nyanga. Many of the images in all the case studies are difficult to identify to the species. However, the leopard from Northern Nyanga is easily identifiable because of its spots. In Harare, most of the images are possibly lions with the one from Chivero 4 possibly male. They are depicted as if on a hunt. This is shown by trails and possible track marks that they are sometimes associated with. In Northern Nyanga, felines are depicted catching their prey (Plate 8b, 18b). This is contrary to Chivi where a person is depicted following a feline (Plate 74a).

Summarily, the computation of frequencies of animals within the case studies is shown in (Figure 14). CA computations show that many of the animals occur in all the case studies (Figure 14b, c). This is the reason for the density of representation around the barycentre. However, there are a number of outliers such as 12, 16 and 22 (Klipspringer, Giraffe and Tsessebe). The PCA plot shows this occurrence of outliers by showing some distance among all the case studies, although Chivi and Northern Nyanga are closer that with Harare (Figure 14d). This is a reflection of the occurrence of many more animal species in Harare than in other areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aardvark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate antelope</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboon/monkey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated snake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodile</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippopotamus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelopes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsessebe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild dog</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildebeest</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortoise</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14: Comparative frequencies of animal occurrences
7.1.2.1 Animal depiction in other parts of Zimbabwe

The varied distribution of animals shows the variation that is exhibited in the rock art. The differences are also exhibited by depictions from elsewhere in the country. The dominance of kudu has been reported in Zimunya, Beitbridge and Matopo hills (Eastwood et al. 1994; Walker 1996; Nhamo 2007b). The high numbers of giraffe images have also been observed in rock art from Chipinge (Nhamo and Bonyongwa, forthcoming). In some areas such as Malilangwe, animals like giraffe are as dominant as the kudu (Pearce et al. 2003; Pearce 2009). Giraffes also occur in high frequencies in parts of southern Zimbabwe and Matebeleland. They are widely depicted in the rock art of the Matopo Hills (Walker 1996).

A few giraffe depictions have also been reported at other sites in Mashonaland (Cooke 1964). These are not as adorned as in southern Zimbabwe where they are elaborately depicted in both polychrome and monochrome colours (Plate 142). In this regard therefore, rock art from Chivi has affinities to the southern parts of the country. In southern Africa, giraffe are also common in the rock art of Limpopo Province of South Africa, eastern Botswana and most of Namibia (Walker 1998; Pager 1989a & b; Eastwood et al. 2010).
Snakes also occur in other parts of Zimbabwe. These are not similar to the figures from Northern Nyanga. On the other hand, the conflation of antelope headed snakes found in Chivi and Harare is much more common elsewhere such as in Rusape and Chivhu (Goodall 1959; Plate 143d). The conflated snake copied by Cripps (Vol 2 p. 417) from Rusape Valley is very much like the one from Bridge Paintings in Harare (Plate 143a). One example comes from Chikupo where large conflated snakes are depicted in red and outlined with white. This is similar to the conflated snakes at Silozwane (Plate 143c) and Gulubahwe in Matopo Hills. Conflated snakes have also been reported in Chegutu (Cripps Vol 4), Macheke, Marange (Cripps Vol 9) and Marondera. The one at Waltondale in Marondera has a reclining human figure at the bottom and numerous others crawling up its body (Plate 143b). This has been termed the tree of life by Goodall (1959, p.104).
There is a different way of conflating snakes that has not been noted in the case studies. This combines snake, antelope and human features. This has been noted at the labyrinth from Muromo in Zimunya (Nhamo 2007b; Plate 144a). Similar conflations are found in

Plate 143: Images of conflated snakes
(After Cripps Vol 2; Goodall 1959; Cooke 1959)
Wedza (Plate 144b& c) and Matopo Hills. The ones from Wedza have a human figure similar to the squatting depictions.

Plate 144: Conflations of human, snake and antelope features
(After a) Goodall 1959, p. 108; b) Cripps copies)
Some of the animals that were found in the rock art of Harare have been recorded elsewhere in Mashonaland. The aardvark is also absent from areas such as Northern Nyanga and Chivi but is found at many sites in other parts of the country, especially in Mashonaland such as Mutoko, Makumbe, and Mawanga.

Birds have also been reported at other sites in Mashonaland, for example, Surtic farm in Mazowe. A few have been reported in Matopo Hills (Walker 1996; Mguni 2002). They also occur in Manicaland. Cooke (1964) noted that there are more bird depictions in the eastern regions of the country than elsewhere and this has been confirmed by the work at Gwenzi and Manjowe in Zimunya (Nhamo 2007b). Cripps (Vol 2) also recorded a number of images from Marange and Rusape areas. In all these areas, the most common species depicted is the stork followed by the ostrich.

The depiction of fish, crocodile, and hippopotamus in Harare shows an interest in aquatic animals that is not found in the other case study areas. Hippopotamus are rare in Zimbabwean rock art but fish and crocodiles occur in other parts of the country. There are fish depictions in the rock art from Beitbridge (Plate 145), Matopo Hills, Gwanda, Murehwa, Mutoko, and northern and north-eastern areas.
Animals such as buffaloes and elephants are found in many areas though in other areas they rarely occur. For example, both buffaloes and elephants are rare in Matopo Hills (Walker 1996). Elands are underrepresented in most parts of Zimbabwe. A few depictions occur in Beitbridge (Plate 146b), Mutoko, Murehwa and Matopo Hills. Many of the depictions are in monochrome but in Mutoko and Murehwa there are some elaborate polychrome figures (Plate 146a).

There are no eland images in eastern Zimbabwe (Nhamo 2007b; Nhamo and Bonyongwa forthcoming). However, Cooke (1964) recorded a concentration of eland images in the south central parts of the country, around the Gutu district of Masvingo Province. Surveys conducted by museum staff in the area also report this according to the archaeological sites database. The surveys were not targeted at rock art, thus, there is need for further verification. If this were the case, it would be unique.
Feline depictions have been recorded in other parts of the country as well, for example in Matopo Hills at Nswatugi, in Mutoko at Manemba and Mutoko cave, in Murehwa at Madzangara, and in Makonde district, Mountain Home Estate and O’meath. They have
also been recorded at the Cave of Hands and Cave of Fish in Gwanda (Manyanga and Zhou 2009). There are also feline depictions in the rock art from Chipinge (Nhamo and Bonyongwa, *forthcoming*). Leopards have also been identified at Bambata in Matopo Hills and in Gwanda (Manyanga and Zhou 2009). Walker (1996, p.71) recorded a leopard depicted catching a buck in Matopo Hills, a scene similar to the one depicted at Kubve 3 in Northern Nyanga. Another leopard was recorded at Ndobe hills in Mazowe.

Although not common, baboon figures have been observed elsewhere in the country. Cooke (1964) recorded baboons at 27 out of the 1200 then known sites. Baboons have been recorded at sites in northern Zimbabwe. There is a baboon image at Echo farm outside the city of Harare. Baboons have also been recorded in Wedza, Odzi, Zimunya and Gwanda. They have also been noted at Wye valley in Wedza, Ruzawi and Carver in Marondera, Makumbe near Domboshava and Ndobe hills in Mazowe (Goodall copies 231, 232, 376; Cripps Vol 2). They are a restricted motif.

### 7.1.3 Geometric images

#### 7.1.3.1 Geometric depictions within the case study areas

Geometric images also vary in the case studies. Although formlings are considered a hallmark of Zimbabwean rock art (Garlake 1987c, 1995; Mguni 2002), there are no formlings of note in both Chivi and Northern Nyanga. Harare also has another restricted geometric motif in the form of fleck depictions. As with formlings, these depictions are not found in Chivi and Northern Nyanga. Harare also has circular depictions that have
not been observed elsewhere in the case studies. On the other hand, Northern Nyanga has concentric circles that have not been observed in both Chivi and Harare.

Dots are found in all the case study areas. Their variation comes in the sizes. In Chivi, only small fine dots have been observed. They cover certain subjects such as the elephant at Madya. In Harare and Northern Nyanga, both small and larger dots are found. The large dots are usually finger-painted. In Harare and Northern Nyanga, the larger dots are used to depict certain forms. They have been noted at Mimosa 3 in Harare where they are shown in association with an elephant. They are also found forming certain depictions, for example, at Mimosa 3 and Kilworth 3. The ones from Northern Nyanga are encircled sets associated with human figures as at Manjanja.

7.1.3.2 Geometric depictions in other parts of Zimbabwe

Outside the case study areas, it has been noted that formlings are common in Mashonaland and parts of Matabeleland (Mguni 2004; Manyanga and Zhou 2009). They are very rare, outside of these areas. For example, only one formling was recorded in Zimunya while another one was recorded in Marange (Nhamo 2007b; Katsamudanga 2007; Cripps Vol 5, p. 217). There are no such formlings in Chipinge, Beitbridge and Malilangwe (Eastwood et al. 1994; Pearce 2009; Nhamo and Bonyongwa forthcoming). In South Africa, only one formling has reported in the Limpopo Province (Mguni 2002).

The formlings in Harare differ from those from Matopo Hills and other parts of Mashonaland. The formlings from Harare are mostly monochromes. Among the sites
analysed for this research no bi-chrome or polychrome formlings were observed. Although there is a possibility that fugitive white pigment has deteriorated from the rock art, the monochrome formlings from Harare may be showing the original intention of the artists. At most sites, there is no trace of white whereas elsewhere in Mashonaland, bi-chrome and polychrome formling images have been reported at sites like Chikupo and Mountain Home Estate (Plate 147b). The most elaborate one of these come from Zombepata in northern Zimbabwe (Plate 147c). In Matopo Hills, polychrome formlings are known from Nanke, Bambata and Nswatugi.
Although fleck depictions have not been found in Chivi and Northern Nyanga, they occur elsewhere in Mashonaland. Fleck depictions similar to those found in Harare have been recorded at Marirangwe cave in Masembura, at Murehwa Cave in Murehwa, Bonn Farm in Macheke, and Beta in Musami (Goodall 1959). Cripps (Vol 2, p.302) has also recorded
similar use of flecks in Wedza. The finger-painted dots such as those from Harare and Northern Nyanga have also been noted in Chipinge where they form lines and circles. In all these areas, they are associated with fine-line paintings that are attributed to the hunter-gatherers.

7.1.4 Plants representation

7.1.4.1 Plant depictions within the case study areas

In the case studies, Harare has the highest concentration with 25% of the sites selected for analysis having plant depictions. In Northern Nyanga, there are a few depicted mainly in the form of leaves and pods. Chivi has no plant depictions. This shows that even though the general characterisation of Zimbabwean rock art includes the depiction of plants, they are not uniformly found across the country.

7.1.4.2 Plant depictions in other parts of Zimbabwe

Outside the case study areas, images of plants were reported in parts of Mashonaland such as Mazowe, Concession, Wedza, Mutoko and Murehwa. These have been observed at such sites as Ndobe Hills, Granite range, Duncombe farm, Mountain Home Estate and Manemba. Plants have also been reported in Matopo hills (Walker 1996; Mguni 2002). It has, however, been noted that the representations differ in emphasis of particular kinds of plants. In Harare, common trees are those with large flapping leaves and those with a circular canopy usually depicted in flecks. In some areas, other kinds of trees are more common but they are difficult to identify to species. In Murehwa and Mutoko, there are
trees with clearly depicted leaves. At Mucheka Cave, the tree has leaves with white dots (Goodall 1959, p.76). It is still difficult to identify to species. On the other hand, *brachystegia* and *Parinari curatellifolia* trees are common in the eastern parts of Zimbabwe (Cooke 1974; Cripps Vol 2, Nhamo 2007a, p. 46). *Brachystegia* trees have been identified in the rock art from Zimunya, Marange, Rusape and Wedza (Nhamo 2007b; Cripps Vol 2 and volume 6). Such kinds of depictions have not been identified in Harare. In Matebeleland, leafless trees are more common (Mguni 2002). These trees are depicted at sites such as Bambata, Amadzimba, Shanga 2, Tshangula, and Gudale. One tree at Bonne Esperance has fruits but with no leaves (Mguni 2002). Tubers occur widely in parts of Mashonaland such as Mazowe, Goromonzi and Concession (Plate 148). Cooke (1974) noted that the tubers are restricted to Mashonaland only. In other parts of southern Africa, plant depictions are rare. They have however been reported in Namibia in the Brandberg area (Pager 1989a and b), and in the Drakensberg, South Africa (Vinnicombe 1976).

![Plate 148: Depictions of tubers](image)

Plate 148: Depictions of tubers

(After a) Correte and Petie copy, b) Goodall copy 228 both in ASR,)
7.2 Variation in use of colour

Use of colour has been found to vary in the different case studies although all the case studies are dominated by the red and dark red shades (Figure 15a & b). The browns are significantly represented in Northern Nyanga and Harare but not in Chivi. On the other hand, white occurs rarely in the rock art of Northern Nyanga and Harare as compared to Chivi (Figure 15). White is found on both bi-chrome and monochrome images in Chivi. In both Northern Nyanga and Harare, it is usually limited to monochrome images. There is a tendency to depict elephants in this colour. The white elephants are found in all the case study areas. According to Garlake (1987c, 1995) many of the images could have had white additions but this is no longer evident due to deterioration. Even if Harare and Northern Nyanga had white additions, these would still be different to the way the white pigment was used in Chivi where it depicts the body features and red is the one used for the details. The CA plots on general occurrence of colours among the three case studies show that these are not very different (Figure 15c & d). The PCA plots however show greater distance between Harare and Northern Nyanga from Chivi (Figure 15e). This is influenced by the high usage of white at rock art sites in Chivi. This is further elaborated by the computations of colour schemes such as monochrome, bi-chrome and polychrome below (Figure16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark red</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 15: Comparative frequencies of the use of colour in the rock art.
The combination of colours into bi-chromes and polychromes varies in the case studies. Bi-chrome and polychromes occur very rarely in the rock art from Northern Nyanga and Harare. In Harare, many of the bi-chromes that have a combination of red and dark red outlines (Figure 16). Very few bi-chromes in red and white have outlines in red and white infill as with the elephant at Mbizi 1 (Plate 87b). There are human figures that have white, brown and red stripes at Kubve 2 in Northern Nyanga. The computations below show that the occurrence of multi colour schemes vary greatly among the case studies. Although the PCA plot (Figure 16e) show that Northern Nyanga and Harare have a much closer relationship than with Chivi in having less bi-chromes and polychromes, the CA computations show that in terms of actual colour schemes occurring in the two areas are different (Figure 16c & d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour schemes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red and white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark red and white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red and dark red</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red, brown and white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red and yellow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark red and brown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown and white</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 16: Frequency of bi-chrome depictions in rock art.
Elsewhere in the country, bi-chromatic and polychromatic images have been observed. Images similar to those from Chivi have been recorded in Zaka and neighbouring areas (Goodall 1959; Breuil 1966). The human images from Rumwanda in Zaka are depicted in white with red knee bands and armbands as in Chivi. Bi-chrome images were also recorded in the neighbouring areas at Dengeni, Chamavara and Mbara. The bi-chrome and polychrome animal images from Chivi are also similar to those observed in Zaka and Matopo Hills. The bi-chrome animal images are also similar to the ones found in at sites like Amadzimba in the way in which the body of the animal is painted in red whilst the legs are in white (Cooke copies; Walker 1996; Plate 149). The polychrome images from Nyaningwe and Rukonde Hill in Chivi are similar to the kudu images from sites such as Chamavara and Dengeni.

Plate 149: Bi-chrome animal depictions from Matopo Hills
(After Cooke copies in ASR)

In other parts of Zimbabwe, bi-chrome animals occur although they differ from those in Chivi, Zaka and Matopo Hills. These are known from Wye valley and Rusape valley (Cripps Vol 2). Zebra in white with red stripes are known from northern Zimbabwe from sites such as Mountain Home Estate, Musengezi Range and Mutorashanga. At Mountain
Home Estate, there are also bi-chrome red and white sables and elephants. Bi-chrome animals are known from sites like Chikupo, Zombepata, and Murehwa Cave.

The bi-chromes from other parts of the country differ from those in Chivi since they are executed in red with details in white. Many of the images in Mutoko have white stripes around the knees, waist, on the upper arms and around the wrist (Plate 137b). These details occur on the squatting images as well. The position of these details on the images in Mutoko is similar to the red bands on human figures in Chivi but the colours are different. The clothes on images from Mutoko are also in white. This is similar to the images from Diana’s Vow where white is used for contrast as well (Plate 150). Similar bi-chrome human images in Matopo Hills have the same details in the neck, upper arms, waist and knees as those from Mutoko. Human figures with similar details on the arms have also been observed in Zimunya (Nhamo 2007b).

Plate 150: Human figures and bags from Diana’s Vow, Rusape.
Animal images in Mutoko and Murehwa are also ornamented in similar fashion to human images. Buffaloes, elephants, and at times antelopes are decorated in this manner. At Manemba, buffaloes also have these around their hind legs, neck and on horns, similar to the way human figures are depicted (Cripps Vol v, p.8-11).

7.3 Variation in technique of execution

The results from the case studies have shown variation in the manner of executing images. The solid imagery is more common in Harare and Chivi whereas the striped images are common in Northern Nyanga (Figure 14). In Harare, striped images similar to those from Northern Nyanga are found at Chivero 4 only (Plate 151a). In both Harare and Chivi, stripes are usually used for patterning animal images such as kudu and zebra. On the overall, the computations of frequency of the techniques of execution show that there is variation (Figure 14). The diagram for the CA row plot show closer relationship in the occurrence of 1 (solids) and 3 (outlines) but more distance in 2 (striped) and 4 (solid with stripes) (Figure 14c). The column plot however shows a closer relationship among all three case studies (Figure 14d). This is influenced by the occurrence of solid images. The PCA computation shows that Harare and Chivi are closely related and distant from Northern Nyanga (Figure 14e). This is a result of the high numbers striped images.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid with stripes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 17: Frequency of the various techniques of execution among rock art sites.
In all the case studies, there are images in outline although Harare has a higher number than Chivi and Northern Nyanga. In Harare, large animals especially elephants are depicted in large outlines. This has not been observed in Chivi and Northern Nyanga.

Plate 151: Striped figures

Outside the case study areas, there are some areas with similar technique to that found in Northern Nyanga. A few striped images in white and red are found at Chikupo outside Harare. These are somewhat similar to the rock art from Northern Nyanga. Some images are also depicted in stripes in the Matopo Hills, for example at White Rhino (Plate 152). This shows that depicting in stripes was done elsewhere in the country but its emphasis in Northern Nyanga is unique. In all other areas just a few images are depicted as such whereas, the whole area of Northern Nyanga is dominated by the striped technique.
Rock art with a similar striped technique is also found in Kondoa, Tanzania. The manner in which human figures are depicted is similar to the way they are depicted in Northern Nyanga although they differ slightly. The hair and head features, especially, the insect-like/ butterfly-like heads that occur in Kondoa (B1 site, Mungoni wa Kolo); have not been observed in rock art from Northern Nyanga (Fosbrooke et.al 1950). However, an image from Makaha copied by Goodall show similarities to those in Kondoa although it does not have the butterfly tussles (Plate 153a). The other difference is that some human figures are cross-hatched in Kondoa but in Northern Nyanga, the lines are mostly vertical to the body. The feet of images from Kondoa are insect-like as well. There is no such occurrence in Northern Nyanga (Plate 153a).
Plate 153: Striped figures; 153a from Kondo and 153b&c from Makaha.

(153b after Mr Gamble’s copy in ASR, 153 after Goodall copies 553, 536)
7.4 General observations on motif patterning

The analysis above has revealed certain trends in motif patterning in the rock art of Zimbabwe. Although motif representations appear similar, detailed examination shows that there is a lot of variation in the way certain features are exhibited (Table 13). This can be seen in the differences in human and animal frequency, the use of colour and in the technique of execution. Although there is a difference in the use of colour, analysis of bi-chrome and polychrome images from Chivi has shown that these are not very different from the rock art in other parts of the country. Both human and animal figures are similar to those within the monochrome art. This shows that white was used everywhere. Therefore, the artists had the knowledge of white pigment but chose to use it differently. The striped art from Northern Nyanga also shows many similarities in themes to rock art elsewhere in Zimbabwe. Although this study has drawn all these conclusions, the conduction of this study has shown that the lack of secure dating of the art has far greater limitations on the conclusions that previously anticipated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Northern Nyanga</th>
<th>Chivi</th>
<th>Harare</th>
<th>Other parts of Zimbabwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human figures</td>
<td>Mostly male</td>
<td>Mostly male but with a higher number of female</td>
<td>Mostly male with a few occurrence of children</td>
<td>Mostly male but higher occurrence of females reported from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beitbridge area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated figures</td>
<td>Human-snake conflations with rare human-antelope ones</td>
<td>Mostly human-baboon conflations with very few human antelope ones</td>
<td>Dominated by human-crocodile and human-antelope conflations. A few other animal-human conflations occur</td>
<td>Human-antelope conflations occur in many other areas, human baboon found in some areas but no human snake or human-crocodile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human postures</td>
<td>Bending figures are peculiar to this area.</td>
<td>Groups with women seated whilst men are dancing</td>
<td>Reclining figures are common</td>
<td>Reclining figures are found in other areas such as Rusape, Wedza, Mutoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>Dominated by kudu and elephant. Klipspringer is unique.</td>
<td>More occurrences of giraffe. Very few elephants. No bird depictions</td>
<td>Larger repertoire of animals including aquatic animals, tsessebe, aardvark and birds</td>
<td>Many of the animals found in case study areas occur in other parts of the country but vary in frequency from place to place. Klipspringer has not been reported elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated Animals</td>
<td>No reports</td>
<td>Snake-antelope conflation</td>
<td>Snake-antelope conflation</td>
<td>Snake antelope conflation in reported around the country. Snake-antelope-human conflations also occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric figures</td>
<td>Dots and lines</td>
<td>Dots and lines</td>
<td>Flecks, dots, lines and formlings</td>
<td>Elaborately depicted formlings have been reported in northern Zimbabwe and Matopo Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>Very few pods and leaves.</td>
<td>No plants</td>
<td>Several depictions of trees, grass, and tubers</td>
<td>Different types of plant reported in some parts of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Mostly monochrome</td>
<td>Monochrome, bi-chrome and very few shaded bi-chrome</td>
<td>Mostly monochrome</td>
<td>Mostly monochrome but bi-chrome and polychrome also found in northern Zimbabwe, Mutoko and Matopo Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique of</td>
<td>Mostly striped and solids</td>
<td>Mostly solids</td>
<td>Mostly solids with a few outlines</td>
<td>Mostly solids, striped art is very rare for example at White Rhino in Matopo Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>execution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Summary of the motif variation found in rock art from Northern Nyanga, Chivi and Harare
Chapter 8: Variability and culture in the rock art of Zimbabwe

This research has determined the existence of variation in the spatial distribution of rock art motifs across Zimbabwe. In this study, the detailed exposé of this variation has been limited to only three components: subject matter, colour and technique of execution. The study submits that other aspects of the art beyond those discussed here might also reveal further variation in the Zimbabwean rock art. Nevertheless, for the sake of presenting a concise discussion these three aspects were taken as representative of the variation that exists in the rock art. The nature of motif variation across space in the three aspects has already been expounded in the previous chapters. This chapter uses these observations to explore the possible reasons for the variation. The chapter also examines the validity of some of the explanations that were previously tendered from variability of Zimbabwean and southern African rock art. At the end of the chapter, an outline of how observations on motif variation across space can be used to understand LSA lifestyles is presented.

8.1 Explaining spatial motif variation in Zimbabwean rock art

8.1.1 Migrationist explanations

Before delving into explaining variability of the art, a brief discussion of the common motifs that were observed in the case studies is required. The discussion mainly serves to interrogate migrationist misconceptions about the variation of rock art motifs across space in Zimbabwe. Previous researchers such as Goodall (1959), Cooke (1964) and
Breuil (1966) have interpreted motif variations observed in Chivi and north-eastern Zimbabwe from a migrationist point of view. The variation was regarded as reflecting contact and/or influence from new non hunter-gatherer groups. Breuil (1966, p. 7) suggested that the bi-chrome rock art from Chivi was executed by people from the Mediterranean region, probably of Semitic origin. He based this on the sophistication of the details on the art that he considered “foreign and superior” compared to the monochrome art that he attributed to the “little Bushman figures” (Garlake 1997, p. 45). Conversely, Cooke (1965a, 1974) saw the bi-chrome rock art from Chivi as a product of hunter-gatherers but argued that it was depicting foreigners such as herders who were moving into their landscape. Although she was not specific about the identity of the foreigners, Goodall (1959, p.54) also regarded the rock art from Makaha that is similar to the striped art from Northern Nyanga, as showing the presence of non hunter-gatherer communities.

Although this study has shown that rock art from the case studies varies in subject matter, technique of execution and colour, it is important to note that several common features in the case study areas dispel the migrationist assertions mentioned above. In terms of the presence of subject matter, all the case study areas show high frequency of human figures and animals such as kudu and elephant. These differ in frequency and in Northern Nyanga, these would be striped whilst in Chivi some of them are depicted in bi-chrome colours. Images that show human-animal transformation are also found in all three case study areas although associated conflated animals differ from place to place. General comparisons with hunter-gatherer rock art across Zimbabwe have also demonstrated a
considerable degree of similarity in subject matter. This refutes explanations for the variation in motif as the product of new migrants into the area, especially non hunter-gatherers. The strong co-occurrences in subject matter in the rock art is used here to argue for strong relationships between the societies that made the rock art of southern Africa, as has already been demonstrated (Garlake 2001; Lewis-Williams 1983). Thus, motif variation found in the art must be showing divergences and convergences within hunter-gatherer communities rather than a consequence of foreign influence.

On a general note, the issue of acculturation from other groups is difficult to use as an explanation for spatial motif variation in Zimbabwean rock art due to lack of dating of certain features that can be correlated with the presence of non hunter-gatherers. Recently, acculturation has been used to explain the occurrence of aprons in the rock art of the LSCA (Blundell and Eastwood 2001; Eastwood 2003; Namono and Eastwood 2005; Eastwood et al. 2010). The aprons have been interpreted as showing the influence of Khoe herders (or their culture) on hunter-gatherer motif selection. Nevertheless, none of the motifs observed in the current study indicate the possibility of acculturation in this manner.

Much of the rock art from Zimbabwe is regarded as older, dating well before the arrival of non hunter-gatherers in southern Africa as shown in Chapter 3. Cooke’s suggestion that the hunter-gatherers were depicting herders is difficult to support at the moment since the bi-chromes in Chivi are not associated with depictions of domesticated animals. The depiction of bi-chrome wild animals also renders this suggestion unlikely. Basing on
this current knowledge and lack of clear evidence of contact, acculturation and migrationist models become difficult to use in explaining the spatial motif variation of the rock art in Zimbabwe. Therefore, at the moment explanations that take motif variation as reflective of the emic structures within hunter-gatherer communities themselves seem to be more reliable.

8.1.2 Differing symbols and circumscribed beliefs.

The most likely explanation of variation in rock art motifs across space is differences in beliefs. This is not a new observation as other researchers (Huffman 1983; Vinnicombe 1986; Eastwood 1999; Eastwood and Cnoops 1999; Smith 2006; Smith and Zubieta 2006; Eastwood et al. 2010) have already noted that differences in beliefs could have influenced the subject matter in rock art. However, most of the researchers have not gone on to articulate how and why this is the case. As noted in Chapter 2, this research takes a social theory approach whereby rock art is considered a part of the social media that transmitted beliefs and other concerns of the wider society. It is the position of this research that variation in some motifs relates to circumscribed beliefs, be they religious or secular. As explicated in Chapter 2, rock art is the visual expression of societal thought and belief systems. In this research, the existence of variation in beliefs was illustrated through differences observed in aspects such as conflated images, human postures and absence or presence of certain animal, plant and geometric representations.
Human-animal conflations

The variation in representation of therianthropic or transformed images in the rock art from Harare, Northern Nyanga and Chivi can be used to show the occurrence of distinct beliefs across space. The therianthropes show a perceived relationship between people and animals that resulted in the combination of both. This opinion finds support from the beliefs recorded among modern hunter-gatherers in southern Africa. The belief that animals are people in other forms exists among many groups of the modern hunter-gatherers (Dornan 1925; Marshall 1976; Heinz 1978; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992). Many of the groups believe that the earliest ancestors of humans were able to easily change from human to animal and back (Bleek and Lloyd 1911; Bleek 1929, 1932b; Jolly 2002). There are also beliefs that some humans still have the ability to transform into animals or adopt certain physical features of an animal in order to perform various activities such as healing, hunting game effectively or for rain-making purposes (Theal 1910; Bleek 1928a, 1928b, 1932b, 1933; Barnard 1992).

Although there is a common belief in the conflation of animal and human attributes among the modern hunter-gatherers, the nature of this transformation differs from place to place (Guenther 1999). Similar variation in the beliefs is probably represented through the depiction of therianthropes in the rock art. The communities from which the artists came from shared beliefs about transformation but had different animals that they could assume. This was probably connected to animals that had a special relationship with the groups in question. Lewis-Williams (1981) and Vinnicombe (1976) have shown how the close relationship between the eland and the groups that lived around the Drakensberg
area resulted in the eland-human conflations in the rock art. As noted in the previous chapter, in Northern Nyanga, the most common conflation is that of the *snake-head* combining snake and human features. This differs from the *baboon-face* and *crocodile-men* conflations observed from Chivi and Harare respectively. Thus, all these conflations show variation in the animals that the people in the past could adopt.

The conflations also show the variation in beliefs surrounding animal-human transformation. In the Northern Nyanga area, the *snake-head* therianthropes reflect distinct beliefs about perceived close relationships between snakes and people. Associated depictions of humans holding snakes also congeal ideas about the existence of this special human-snake relationship in the area. The snake may have been considered powerful and therefore assuming its characteristics would enable performance of activities such as trance, healing and hunting. This view is supported by the existence of similar beliefs in the ethnographic record of some groups from the Kalahari. Biesele (1980, cited in Lewis-Williams 2002a, p. 112) recorded that among the !Kung some medicine people would turn into snakes in order to survive the turbulence associated with the spirit world. The spirit world has both good and malevolent spirits. Thus, to survive one needs to adopt the characteristics of powerful creatures such as snakes (Biesele 1978). Based on the high frequency of depictions with humans holding snakes and others conflated with snakes in Northern Nyanga one can argue that these are alluding to such kinds of beliefs about medicine people harnessing the potency of the snakes. On the other hand, the images can also be showing the subjugation of a powerful creature as what happens in curing ceremonies where evil spirits and sickness are warded off by medicine
people (Marshall 1969; Heinz 1975; Barnard 1992). Overall, the fact that the imagery is confined to the Northern Nyanga area shows the existence of distinct beliefs relating to perceived close connections between people and snakes.

Images of transformation in Northern Nyanga also show that the hunter-gatherer communities who executed the rock art had distinct beliefs about the actual process of human-animal transformation from those found in Harare and Chivi. The occurrence of conflated human images with claw-like fingers illustrates this. Garlake (1995, p. 116) has argued that claw-like fingers illustrate the process of transformation, probably into lions or other pawed (felines) creatures. If one takes this interpretation then the images from Northern Nyanga show the existence of this belief among the hunter-gatherer communities from the area. However, in this area, though there are images of felines there is no definite association with the clawed images. Therefore, there is a possibility that the claws are elaborating the snake motif basing on the fact that some ethnographic communities such as the Nharo classify snakes under pawed creatures (Garlake 1995, p.116). Unfortunately there is no ethnography from the area to substantiate this.

In this research the variation in beliefs about human-animal transformation is shown in the rock art of Harare. Unlike Northern Nyanga, Harare has a number of different types of conflation. The most conspicuous is the *crocodile-men* conflation. The images were interpreted in many ways. For example, Cooke (1974) considered them as people involved in a ritual dance. On the other hand, both Garlake (1995) and Huffman (1983) favour the trance explanation. Huffman (1983) argues that the *crocodile-men* are a
metaphor of trance, which means that they represent people entering trance. He argued that the gaping mouths represent the shrieking or gasping for air by medicine men entering trance and the erect hair and fangs show the sensation felt during this process. Garlake (1987a, 1990, and 1995) argues that the images might be creatures full of potency seen in the spirit world.

Although the images have been associated with medicine people going into trance, the beliefs about transformation are not confined to this aspect among hunter-gatherers. As Jolly (2002) argued, conflations such as this one can be resulting from beliefs about mythical people of earlier times (ancestral reference), a common topic of reference in the folklore of many hunter-gatherer groups in southern Africa. The circumscription of this type of conflation led Goodall (1959, p.91) to argue that there must have been primitive totemism and ancestor worship cult associated with crocodiles or reptiles in the area. Basing on the evidence of variation in human-animal transformations observed in this research, Goodall’s argument finds partial support. Although the beliefs may not have been about ancestral worship, they must have alluded to a perceived relationship (possibly ancestral) between people and reptiles. This belief was confined to areas around Harare probably due to the abundance of ground water resources as will be discussed later in section 8.1.5.

In Chivi, the baboon-face form of human-animal conflations dominates both monochrome and bi-chrome images. This is also referring to the animal that had relations with people in this area. All these differences in the variety of human-animal conflation
are indicative of the differences between the hunter-gatherer communities that occupied these areas. These probably relate to particular groupings such as bands, band clusters or language groups discussed in Chapter 2.

This argument is further buttressed by the fact that some common forms of human-animal conflations have also been observed. Nevertheless, even these show minute differences. For example, human conflations with antelope features take different forms. Some have normal human features with only the ears being antelope. Others have elongated limbs with antelope heads and hoofs as with the ones from Harare (Plate 130a), while some squatting human figures are also conflated with antelope ears in certain areas (Plate 135). All these variations emanated from groups drawing on commonly held beliefs on conflation of human and antelopes. They however represented the symbols with local additives, particular to smaller groupings. This variation of motifs may be analogous to the eyes-on-his-feet story referred to in Chapter 2. This folklore is common among many hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari but the narration differs slightly from group to group (Schmidt 1986).

Variation in human postures

It is the argument of this research that variation in representing human postures can also be used to demonstrate differences in beliefs from place to place. The artists used postures to illustrate actions, attitudes and generally expected behaviour of some sectors of the societies. It is argued in this research that postures such as the “floating” images from the site of Nyamakamba, and the bending forward figures from several sites in
Northern Nyanga are illustrative of these actions. Both these postures have been associated with trance sensations (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Lewis-Williams 1990a; Garlake 1995; Jolly 2002). Garlake (1995, p.76) argued that a floating posture illustrates the feeling of weightlessness that is associated with medicine people going into the spirit world. This could very well apply to the figures from Northern Nyanga since it is unlikely that they are depicting dances because the ‘floating’ images are in a strange position to be dancing. Some bending down images are depicted as just single images without any association with dancing figures thus they too may be depicting trancing. Therefore, the association between trance and transformation is a probable interpretation for the images from Northern Nyanga. Many of the images in these postures also evince transformations such as the *snake-head*, distortion of facial features and/or claw-like digits. If this is the case, then these images show a distinct perception of what happens when someone is going through trance since similar images have not been recorded anywhere else in the country.

The occurrence of reclining figures in the rock art from Harare is another restricted posture that points to differences in beliefs. These have not been recorded in Chivi and Northern Nyanga although they are found in other parts of Mashonaland. Although various interpretations have been proffered for these images, none seem appropriate for the figures from Harare. These reclining images have been interpreted as depictions of deceased kings (Frobenius 1931; Goodall 1946b, 1959) but as has been shown earlier they do not seem to be depictions of dead people. Garlake (1987c, 1995) associated them with trance in his interpretation of ‘similar’ images from Mutoko and Murehwa where he
noted that the reclining images are depicted being assisted by other human figures. To
him, this showed that the reclined figures are trancers who would have been overcome by
potency. However, many of the images observed in Harare are not in such associations.
They are single images with no sign of others ‘attending’ to them. Thus, the explanation
given by Garlake is not consistent with this particular imagery. If at all these are
associated with trance, the images could be exhibiting individual experience rather than
the trance that is experienced at gatherings. As such, the occurrence of the particular
reclined images from Harare could be showing variation in beliefs associated with the
process of entering into trance. Individual experiences of trance have been reported
among the modern hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari (Marshall 1969, Heinz 1975)

The squatting images are another depiction that shows variation in beliefs. According to
Goodall (1962), they are depicting pregnant female figures. She sees the distended
stomach as a sign of pregnancy and therefore connects the motif to fertility, a position
that is also taken by Solomon (1992, 1994, 1998a). Huffman (1983, p.53-54) has also
considered the images to be female. He argued that the lines issuing from between the
legs represent menstrual blood or amniotic fluid. He connected this with trance and
potency on the basis that such kinds of fluids are also associated with these aspects
among present-day ethnographic hunter-gatherer societies. As Garlake (1995) points out,
this interpretation leaves out clearly male images and those that do not have these
emissions. For Garlake (1987c, 1995) these images are trance dancers since most of them
are holding rattles or crescent objects. He argues that the distended stomach is an
illustration of unusual concentrations of active and expanding potency, n/um. His
argument is based on the fact that the !Kung believe *n/um* resides in the stomach. To him the streams or lines represent the release of this *n/um*.

At the moment, there are no concrete grounds to prove or disprove all these interpretations. However, the apparent variation in the sex of the images from place to place is what is used here to argue for differences in beliefs about this motif across space. In some areas such as Mutoko and Murehwa, they are usually paired, one female and one probably male (though this is not usually apparent). In Wedza, Marondera and Goromonzi, there are depictions of single female figures, whereas in Harare most are not clearly sexed. Lone male figures have however been reported north of Harare, at such sites as Chikupo and Concession (Plate 135b). Where the sexual representations are apparent, the depictions may be signifying the maleness and femaleness of the figures. The fact that the female images are associated with the emissions and in most cases, these have small figures crawling along them may support the argument for regeneration and probably cosmic origins. The pairing of these with male figures in Mutoko and Murewa may allude to father-mother symbolism, rather than just the “mother goddess” figures Goodall (1959, 1962) and Solomon (1992, 1994, and 1998) argued for. Omission of the ‘father’ motif in other areas may be showing differences in the emphasis of the process; the emphasis is on the product of the pairing.

Among many hunter-gatherer groups, masculinity is considered dangerous and aggressive while femininity is calm and generally good (Bleek 1928b, Marshall 1957; Heinz 1975; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992). These beliefs therefore, may have
influenced the sexing of the figures. On the squatting images, these differences in sex are also accompanied by differences in other features mentioned earlier such as conflation with antelope ears and affinities to tortoises. All these variations show that there were differences in beliefs associated with this motif.

*Animal representation*

As shown in the previous chapters, there are some differences in animals represented and emphasised in the three case study areas. It is the argument of this research that the variation of these representations has something to do with variations in beliefs associated with particular species in an area. The difference in animal emphasis in the rock art has been previously explained through what can be termed the replacement model. Researchers argued that motif variation across space was a result of mere replacement of symbols in the rock art without necessarily implying difference in the meaning of these in southern Africa (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1983; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Lewis-Williams 1990a). For example, the eland is the most frequently depicted animal in the rock art from many parts of South Africa such as the Drakensberg and Cederberg. Its symbolism in the rock art has been extensively researched (Vinnicombe 1976; Lewis-Williams 1981, 1987; Parkington 2001, 2003). Under the replacement model, interpretation interpretations made for the eland are transposed to all other frequently depicted animals in different parts of southern Africa. In Zimbabwe, applications of this nature can be seen to some extent in the interpretation of animals such as the kudu (Eastwood and Cnoops 1999; Nhamo 2007b), the giraffe (Walker 1996), or the elephant (Garlake 1995).
The problem with this approach is that, often, there is no satisfactory explanation of why elsewhere other animals are chosen instead of the eland. This question is especially pertinent in areas where the eland and the other widely depicted animals occur together in the natural habitat. For example, in and around Harare, both the eland and kudu were reported to have been abundant in the recent past (e.g. Selous 1893). This has been argued to be the same for much of the Holocene period since there were no major changes in the composition of flora and fauna as highlighted in Chapter 1. Therefore, the artists and their communities around the area knew both animals but they chose to emphasise the kudu rather than the eland in their art. Thus, there is need to explore the reasons behind the differences in the symbols.

The choice should have been due to some special qualities that the kudu possessed over the eland for it to be selected in these areas. It is unfortunate that there is very little ethnographic material from Zimbabwe which could assist in interpreting hunter-gatherer beliefs about both animals. However based on the quantity and quality of data gathered in this research, one can conclude that different communities chose these motifs due to differing qualities of the animals that in turn influenced beliefs surrounding them. The sexual dimorphism of the kudu is heightened in the rock art. As will be expanded on later, this sexual dimorphism of the kudu probably played a central role in addressing gender relations and negotiations. It was also essential in imparting moral and ethical concerns relating to the different genders in the society (see also Eastwood and Eastwood 2006, Nhamo 2007b). On the other hand, sexual distinctiveness is not emphasised in
depictions of the eland. The qualities of the eland that are emphasised in areas where it is
the most frequently depicted animal are different from those emphasised in kudu
depictions. Its sexual indistinctiveness appealed to some groups (Lewis-Williams 1990,
p.78), although some scholars argue that . Even the contexts in which the images are
depicted seem to differ. According to Lewis-Williams (1990, 2002, see also Lewis-
Williams and Challis 2011), in the Drakensberg the eland is mostly associated with trance
related depictions whereas kudu images are rarely associated with such activities in
Zimbabwean rock art (see also Garlake 1995, Nhamo 2007). It is rare to correctly identify
the therianthropic features as belonging to the kudu. Rather they are generic to antelopes.
This has led scholars to assign social significance rather than a religious one to kudu

Apart from the question of dominant symbols, this research has also shown that there are
differences in the occurrence and frequency of other animals in the case study areas. This
could also demonstrate variation in beliefs concerning these animals. As exposed by the
analysis of animal representations in the case study areas, the range of animals depicted
in the rock art differs significantly. Harare has a wider range of animals depicted than
both Northern Nyanga and Chivi (Figures 10 & 11). Other researchers have also noted
the differences in the number of animal species depicted in Zimbabwe and other parts of
southern Africa. Tucker and Baird (1983) identified 26 species in Darwendale whilst
Walker (1996) identified more than 40 species in Matopo Hills. A much wider variety of
animal species was recorded in the rock art of the LSCA than in the Drakensberg and
Cederberg areas (Eastwood et al. 2010). There are 39 species that were recorded in
LSCA compared to 22 species in the Drakensberg and 8 species in the Cederberg (Wright and Mazel 2007). It is argued here that as with human-animal transformations discussed earlier, this variation can be connected to the differences in wider beliefs about particular animals.

The variation in beliefs is also reflected by the occurrence of conflated animal motifs such as antelope-headed snakes. Within the case study areas, these were observed in the rock art from Harare and Chivi but not in Northern Nyanga. The conflation of snakes and antelopes is also found in other parts of the country and southern Africa as shown in Chapter 7. The antelope-headed snakes have been interpreted as rain-animals (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Walker 1996; Dowson 1998; Deacon and Deacon 1999; Mallen 2005), although, it is also possible that these had different meanings, probably representing famed supernatural beings in these areas. As mentioned before, snakes are associated with danger whilst the antelopes are usually symbolism for good things. These beings would probably be representing the co-existence of the two. This belief in the co-existence of good and bad is found in the worldview of some modern hunter gatherers. Among many groups in the Kalahari, the creator is usually both good and bad (Heinz 1975; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992). However, other groups differ in that they believe in the existence of two gods, one good and the other evil (Bleek 1923, 1935; Marshall 1962) In spite of the many possible sources of this symbolism, variation in the occurrence of antelope-headed snakes across space shows variation in beliefs surrounding them. Their apparent absence in Northern Nyanga shows that even though some beliefs were widespread, they might not have consistently occurred in all the hunter-gatherer groups.
Beliefs of antelope headed snakes might have conflicted with those associated with human-snake conflations discussed earlier on.

Although one can use the variation of animal representation in the rock art, other beliefs surrounding some animals may never be known from analysis of rock art because they may be represented by the absence of certain depictions from the rock art. In South Africa for example, scholars have argued that the praying mantis was not depicted because of prohibitions that were associated with it (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Parkington 2002). The insect was associated with the trickster deity !Kaggen revered among the /Xam (Bleek 1923; Schapera 1930). The mantis is also considered sacred among the !Kung (Marshall 1962). This insect is also not widely depicted in Zimbabwe. The only depiction of praying mantis is found at a site in the Nharira Hills (Plate 154). Unfortunately, images at the site have been distorted with gloss paint such that the authenticity of the depiction is difficult to ascertain.

Plate 154: Depiction of a praying mantis from Nharira Hills.
Plant representation

As with the representation of animals, differences in beliefs are also seen in the depiction of plants. Researchers such as Frobenius (1931) and Garlake (1987c) have generally characterised plant depictions as a feature of Zimbabwean rock art. However, as has been shown in this study, plant depictions are not evenly distributed across the country. Within the case studies, Harare has more plant depictions than Northern Nyanga. There are none in Chivi. Northern Nyanga only has a few illustrations of pods and leaves whereas there is a wide range of plant depictions in Harare, such as grasses, shrubs, tubers and aloe. Goodall (1959) regarded the plants as showing edible roots and bulbs that were gathered while trees show the landscape. However this is not a satisfactory explanation for the occurrence of plant depictions in the rock art because, as argued by Cooke (1964, p. 10), plants grow all over the country and they were utilised by all hunter-gatherers as foods. This being the case, one would expect them to be more uniformly depicted. Thus, the variation in their distribution in the rock art has nothing to do with differences in the food value of plants but beliefs surrounding certain plants.

In some parts of the country, certain plants are emphasised more than others are. As has been shown in previous chapters, there are leafless plants in Matopo Hills, *brachystegia* species in eastern Zimbabwe and tubers in Harare and surrounding areas. Thus, the choice of plants depicted must have been influenced by beliefs associated with them rather than availability. Plant depictions are however usually not sufficiently diagnostic for species identification. Nevertheless, the most commonly depicted plants in Harare do
not seem to be a *brachystegia* species, a family that is naturally abundant in the environment. Trees with a circular canopy and those with flapping leaves are more common. As with the differences in the emphasis on animal species, variation in plants supports the view that there were differences in beliefs among communities that inhabited the different parts of the country. Certain plants that were well suited to address the concerns of the communities were selected. The pods and leaves in Northern Nyanga may have had medicinal value since they are usually carried by transformed figures. These could have been aides in activities such as healing and warding away evil spirits. It has been reported that some groups used herbs for curing whereas others did not (Marshall 1962, 1969, Heinz 1975).

In Harare, however, this does not seem to have been the case. The plants here must have been depicted for different beliefs since the entire plant is depicted and there is no definite association with conflated images. Mguni (2002, 2004) interpreted tree depictions elsewhere in Zimbabwe that occur together with formlings as symbolism for the cosmological understanding of the world within hunter-gatherer communities. He argues that they show the relationship between the underworld as shown by termite mounds (formlings), the secular world where the trees are located and the spirit world above trees. In Harare however, very few trees are associated with formlings. Most of the tree depictions are not associated with formlings.

The ethnographic record from some hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari can give clues to the meaning of the depictions in Harare. Many groups consider trees to possess *n/um*
just like animals and human beings (Heinz 1975; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992; Marshall 1999). This *n/um* differs from plant to plant just like in animals. Therefore, the particular plants that are depicted in different parts of Zimbabwe could be those that were regarded to have the most powerful *n/um* in those areas. This might also be emanating from the characteristics of such plants, which are seen as powerful in both medicinal and spiritual values. On the other hand, some groups such as the !Kung and !Xo regard certain trees to be residencies for spirits and god (Marshall 1969; Heinz 1975; Guenther 1999). The Nharo actually associated one of their two gods with trees and animals. He is known as the ‘god of the veld’ (Guenther 1986, p. 225). The tree with flapping leaves and that with a rounded canopy depicted in Harare may be seen from this point of view.

**Geometric representations**

Apart from the human, plant and animal depictions, circumscribed geometric depictions such as flecks and formlings also show differences in belief systems. The analysis has shown that fleck depictions mainly occur in Harare and the surrounding areas. Goodall (1959) interpreted concentrations of flecks as a way of showing landscape features such as rivers and trees. However, the occurrence of subject matter such as fish, conflated snakes and birds depicted in flecks makes this interpretation unlikely. At some sites, the flecks form depictions overlay other depictions such as humans and elephants. These seem to be intentionally depicted as such although the temporal relationship is difficult to ascertain. Dowson (1989, p. 91) has argued that flecks show the presence of supernatural potency seen in the spirit world. In the same vein, these associations have led Garlake (1995) to interpret flecks as showing the presence of potency (*n/um*). However, an
argument can be made that the flecks were used to show the state of the object being depicted. The depiction of certain subjects in flecks may be indicating objects that were perceived to be invisible, especially if these are connected to the spirit world. For example, the depiction of an antelope-headed snake in flecks juxtaposed with one that is depicted in a solid technique at Bridge Paintings in Harare (Plate 89b) could be showing the invisible nature of the one in flecks. Therefore, the restriction of the motifs to Harare and the surrounding areas can be used to argue for the confinement of beliefs about the existence of such invisible forms.

Whether or not the flecks have the same meaning as dots is not clear. Garlake (1995) argued that flecks and dots represented the same potency but their occurrence together in the rock art of Harare suggests that they may have been used to symbolise different things. Differences in how dots and flecks are represented in the art as seen in previous chapters can also buttress the argument that they represented different beliefs. Dots are found in other case study areas as well.

The same circumscription applies to formlings. They are apparently absent in Northern Nyanga and Chivi. Formlings have not been recorded in Chipinge (Nhamo and Bonyongwa, *forthcoming*), Malilangwe (Pearce 2009) and in the Beitbridge area (Eastwood *et al.* 1994). They are also absent from the rock art of most parts of South Africa (Mguni 2002) but they are a common feature of the rock art in Harare and other parts of Mashonaland. They are found in the rock art of Matopo Hills and the surrounding areas as well (Walker 1996, Mguni 2005). Interpretations of formlings have ranged from
representations of landscape features to honeycombs. Recently Mguni (2002, 2004, 2005, 2006a & b) interpreted the formlings as representing termite mounds, basing on the importance of these underground features within the present day hunter-gatherer cosmology. As mentioned above, he connected their interpretation with that of tree depictions. Whatever their meaning might be, their circumscription shows the variation in beliefs among hunter-gatherer groups. The variation in association with trees and also in the manner of their depiction as noted in Chapter 7 is reflective of these variations in beliefs surrounding them. The fact that they are not universally depicted also advances this argument. These motifs demonstrate the existence of certain beliefs that must have been absent in other parts of the country.

8.1.3 Different symbols, different social context

Apart from beliefs, another possible explanation for variation in rock art motifs is in differences in social activities that are depicted in the art. It has been illustrated that activities such as communal dances, ceremonies and rituals provided the social context from which the motifs were derived (Lewis-Williams 1981). These could have differed from place to place resulting in different representations in the art. The differences in what was selected reflect the importance ascribed to a specific activity by a particular community.

Bi-chromes, body painting and associated ceremonies

In this research, the differences noted between the bi-chrome human images from Chivi and the rock art from Northern Nyanga and Harare can help in illustrating these
variations in the social activities that were represented in different areas. As observed in previous chapters, the use of bi-chrome colours in the rock art in Chivi is confined to group depictions with some images that are standing while others, especially women, are sitting. These groups are found at sites with monochrome images, although sometimes they are isolated as at Chebvute site. Goodall (1959) suggested that these images are depicting initiation ceremonies but the current research has found that there is little evidence to support this position. Initiation ceremonies have been widely recorded among modern hunter-gatherers and there is a great possibility that LSA hunter-gatherers also performed them. However, the images do not show any connection to this. There is no evidence of differences in age among the participants. The participation of both men and women in many of the scenes also makes the depiction of initiation rites unlikely since records from a number of hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari show that these were conducted separately (Fourie 1928; Bleek 1928c cited by Barnard 1992; Marshall 1976; Silberbauer 1981; Barnard 1992; Biesele 1993). Among most groups, males are excluded from girls’ initiation rites (Dornan 1925; Schapera 1930). Where males participate in girls’ initiation, usually only one or two individuals would be present. Women also do not attend boys’ initiation ceremonies among all the recorded groups (Schapera 1930). In any case, boys’ initiation would probably incorporate hunting symbolism since this is a common feature of initiation rites among many hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari (Barnard 1992). As will be discussed below, these images do not have any evidence of hunting symbolism. All this makes it unlikely that the scenes in the rock art are depicting initiation ceremonies since they have mixed participants.
Instead, these images must be depicting dances or other ceremonies that were held in high regard in the areas. The postures of the human figures further buttress the idea that these images are depicting ceremonies. The people are depicted in groups, with women usually seated while the men are standing or dancing. Among the modern hunter-gatherers from the Kalahari, this is characteristic of many dances where women are usually seated, clapping and singing whilst men are dancing around them (Dornan 1925; Fourie 1928; Biese 178; Heinz 1978; Silberbauer 1981). Therefore, there is a great possibility these images are depicting participants in such ceremonies.

The use of white pigment for depicting the bodies of the participants and red for decoration and/or clothing is distinct to Chivi and the surrounding area of Zaka. Goodall (1959, p. 47) suggested that the participants could have painted themselves in white for the ceremonies. The white on the bodies cannot be showing clothing since some of the images are apparently naked. Although her argument had no basis at the time, knowledge of how rock art exhibits ritualised motifs makes this more plausible today. The idea of white representing body painting also finds congruency in the occurrence of such practices among modern hunter-gatherers. Dornan (1925, p. 89) recorded that during some religious dances, performers would paint their faces and bodies with pigment made from a mixture of red and white clay soil. Sometimes men would dress up for ritual dances by tying dancing rattles around their ankles whilst women would wear headbands and bracelets around the legs and arms (Dornan 1925; Fourie 1928; Marshall 1969; Plate 155a).
Plate 155: Ceremonial dressing

a) A hunter-gatherer woman in ceremonial attire (after Fourie 1928, p. 88), b) An image from Chebvute, Chivi

The figures from Chivi conform to these descriptions (Plate 155b). Many of the figures have armbands, knee bands and waistbands that could have made up the ritual dressing similar to the rattles and ornaments described above. Although in certain parts of the country such as Murehwa and Mutoko human figures are also depicted with similar adornments, their bodies are not painted in white. Instead, the adornments are the ones that are executed in white. In these areas, clothing is mostly depicted in red on both the monochrome and bi-chrome images. Therefore, there is a deliberate choice to depict the images in white in Chivi and Zaka. The body painting practice could have had been a distinct feature of particular ceremonies that were practised in these areas. Thus, the images from Chivi may not be a result of temporal changes in the development of the
rock art as was suggested by some previous scholars (e.g. Cooke 1974), but are showing these peculiar ceremonies and ceremonial practises. This would explain the difficulties in using the colours to establish chronology as noted in Chapter 5.

Most ritual dances and ceremonies among modern hunter-gatherer groups are associated with a particular animal. These dances included the Eland Bull Dance, Baboon Dance and Gemsbok Dance (Bleek 1928b; Heinz 1975; Silberbauer 1981). To the G/wi the Baboon Dance was the most important whilst the Gemsbok Dance is important for the !Xo (Heinz 1975; Silberbauer 1981). The occurrence of the human-baboon conflation found on the bi-chrome images in Chivi may indicate that the baboon was associated with the ceremonies depicted. All the conflated human images observed in the bi-chrome depictions in this area have the baboon-face conflation. Figures such as those from Chebvute and Mudadi (Plate 55, 56,72b) may be elaborating on the belief systems by showing transition from baboons to persons associated with these ceremonies. There may have been other ceremonies conducted by hunter-gatherer groups in Chivi but the bi-chrome images seem to be targeting only the one where people painted their bodies in white and assumed baboon faces. However, the occurrence of human-baboon conflations in the monochrome art from Chivi shows that this perceived relationship was not restricted to these ceremonies. In Chivi, some of the bi-chrome images are associated with kudu and indeterminate antelopes although these are not conflated with humans. Thus, these might also have had a role in the beliefs associated with the ceremonies.
Hunting vis-a-vis non-hunting symbolism

The variation in the social context of the rock art is further elaborated by the fact that rock art from Northern Nyanga and Harare seems to emphasise hunting symbolism which is not found in the rock art from Chivi. In Harare and Northern Nyanga, many of the human figures including the therianthropic images are carrying bows, arrows or other weapons. Therianthropes, especially those with antelope features, are usually found among groups of hunters. Similar depictions have also been identified elsewhere, for example, in Zimunya (Nhamo 2007b). This hunting symbolism could be referring to a number of beliefs. Some researchers have argued that these depictions are showing rituals to do with the control of game or rainmaking and thus might not be illustrating actual hunts (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Lewis-Williams 1990a; Lewis-Williams 2003b; Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004b). Among modern hunter-gatherers, hunting symbolism is integrated in the several rituals even those that are not directly connected with the actual hunting activity. Depiction of arrows has also been argued to symbolise the release of potency, sickness or the cause of sickness from sick individuals (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1990; Garlake 1987c, 1990, 1995). This is based on beliefs about !Kung healing that were recorded in the Kalahari (Marshall 1969; Katz 1982). Guenther (1999) argued that hunting pervades all aspects of hunter-gatherer social life. Therefore, the rituals and ceremonies unquestionably carry hunting symbolism.

With the abundance of the hunting symbolism found in the rock art from Harare and Northern Nyanga, it is apparent that the bi-chrome images from Chivi are set within a different social context as reflected by the absence of any weapons. Breuil (1966) also
noted the absence of hunting weapons among the bi-chrome depictions from both Chivi and Zaka but he interpreted it incorrectly. He concluded that the absence of weapons shows that the people were not hunter-gatherers but foreigners passing through the land. The similarities of these images to monochromes are enough justification for rejecting this suggestion. The occurrence in Zaka and Matopo hills of images that are similar to the bi-chromes from Chivi but carrying weapons also serves to refute this (Plate 156). The bi-chrome images from Chivi are similar to those from Brandberg, Namibia but these also carry weapons. All this supports the argument that the ceremonies depicted in Chivi were set in a different social context although beliefs surrounding body painting were also associated with other activities as evidenced by the hunting symbolism used elsewhere.

Plate 156: Bi-chrome humans carrying weapons from Dengeni in Zaka.
(After Goodall 1959, p. 37)
Social relations and negotiations

To some extent, the variation that is exhibited in the rock art from the three case study areas must have been influenced by differences in the social relations that obtained within the communities that made the art. These social relationships include kinship structures, gender relations, and relations between group members (see Chapter 2, section 2.3). Many researchers argued that relations with other group members are very critical among modern hunter-gatherers (Marshall 1961, 1976; Lee 1979; Barnard 1992). The aspirations of the communities encompass morals and ethical issues. According to Guenther, equality and sharing are the foremost valued morals among modern day hunter-gatherers (1999, p. 23). Among the G/wi harmonious relationships are a dominant theme of most conversations (Silberbauer 1981, p.54). The harmonious qualities include friendliness, generosity and calmness. Biesele (1978, p. 170) reported that most stories told among the !Kung show concern for proper family relationships, gender arrangements and sharing. Lee (1978, p. 111) also reports that !Kung community members always denigrate pride, arrogance, laziness and selfishness. Similar relational considerations among past communities would have found their way into the rock art during the LSA. Therefore, some of the motif variations noted in the case studies such as differences in the animals depicted must have been a result of selection of symbols that communicate social relations pertinent to the different communities at the time of the production of the rock art.
It is widely acknowledged that hunter-gatherers did natural-modelling with the animals and plants in their environs (e.g. Mguni 2004; Mallen 2005; Pearce 2009). This concept refers to the consideration of certain features and behaviours of animals and/or plants as illuminating human behaviour (Mallen 2005, p. 3). Among modern hunter-gatherers, the behaviour of both plants and animals are likened to the human experience. They are considered to have customs similar to those of human beings. For example, animals that have a closed matriarchal system such as the kudu are likened to the human family (Heinz 1978). Actions by animals are considered by the G/wi as ‘rational and purposive’ just as those by human beings (Silberbauer 1981, p. 64). Bleek (1928b) reported the Nharo have masculine and feminine symbolism to indicate strong, tall, slender things or weak, rounded, short things, for example, a tall tree has a masculine sounding name while a rounded bush is feminine.

Such perceptions must have influenced the nature of animal depictions in the rock art. The representation of animals in groups could be fostering such issues as cooperation. The dominance of the female kudu in all the case study areas can be connected to its gregarious nature that fosters social relationships (see also Nhamo 2007b). The kudu females are mostly gregarious and in the art, they are frequently depicted in this manner. In the case study areas, other animals such as the giraffe and elephants are also depicted in groups. Thus, there seems to have been deliberate choice of animals that have gregarious social characteristics. This character, together with other peculiar features of animals, seems to have influenced the selection of symbols to use in the rock art. The kudu bulls and young male kudu are said to possess a father-son relationship among the
!Xo (Heinz 1978, p. 155). As association is greatly valued among most hunter-gatherer communities, a solitary kudu bull is considered “morose” (Silberbauer 1981). The occurrence of groups of kudu bulls at some sites in Nyanga and Harare can be addressing similar concerns as those of the !Xo and the Gw/î. Thus, variation in depictions of certain animals may help in exposing societal concerns that deal with morals and relations between different members of the community. These were obviously not uniform across all the hunter-gatherer groups. The artists from the different areas would choose subject matter with attributes that effectively communicate these relations. They would also depict these motifs in a manner that best addresses the issues at hand.

The other aspect of social relations that could have influenced motif selection is that to do with gender relations and negotiations. Parkington (1996, 2001, and 2003) has argued that the rock art from the Western Cape of South Africa may have played a part in the negotiation of gender issues in the past. In Zimbabwe, issues to do with gender relations may have influenced the nature of depicting human figures and the choice of societal aspects to depict in the rock art. Among the case studies presented here, Chivi has a slightly higher number of female representations than Harare and Northern Nyanga. This occurs especially in the monochrome images (Table 8). The difference in gender representation has also been noted elsewhere in southern African rock art. Eastwood et al. (2010), Smith (2006), Eastwood and Blundell (1999, 2001) and Eastwood and Eastwood (2006) have all alluded to the high percentage of female figures in the art from the LSCA compared to their low frequency in other parts of South Africa such as the Drakensberg.
Even though weathering has affected the identification of many of the bi-chrome images, many group scenes in Chivi also have both males and females. In Harare and Northern Nyanga, this association is rare. Rather there are a few scenes with groups of women dancing depicted on their own as found in Harare at Chivero 4 (Plate 115a, 133a). Most of the rock art depictions are showing male participants. The depiction of mixed groups may show that the rock art in Chivi is targeted at exhibiting particular rituals where both sexes participated, while the rock art from Harare and Northern Nyanga aimed at those that elevated the male participants. This emphasis on maleness is further elaborated in images that exaggerate male genitalia on the transformed images (Plate 21b, 115). This exaggeration of penises has not been observed in Chivi. Therefore, the variation in gender representation and gendered symbolism in rock art from the case study areas is showing that the art is addressing different gender relations and negotiations. The art from Chivi might be targeting ceremonies involving the participation of both men and women as a way of reducing gender tensions as suggested by Parkington (1996, 2001, and 2003). On the other hand, diffusing gender tensions may not have been a major issue addressed in the rock art of Harare and Northern Nyanga. Rather the artists were concerned with elevating masculinity probably resulting, from the need to assert and assuring androcentric values.

Gender representations may not be influenced by the simple societal relations only but also by the perception of cosmological issues. In the LSCA area, where female figures greatly outnumber the male images, researchers point to the significance of women in the
cosmology of the hunter-gatherers of this region compared to areas where there is a dominance of male figures (Eastwood and Blundell 1999; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006; Eastwood et al. 2010). In most parts of Zimbabwe, the female imagery does not outnumber the male imagery. There is also a high frequency of male therianthropes as opposed to female ones, which shows the beliefs on human-animal transformation were defined along gender lines. Apart from the squatting images, the other female conflated figure was observed in Chivi (see Plate 72b). This occurrence, together with the slight increase in depictions and the ceremonies that show mixed participants show an increase in female visibility in Chivi rock art. This is showing that they probably participated and were perceived as essential to the cosmological issues in this area and in other parts of the country. All this seem to indicate that gender perceptions within the hunter-gatherer communities differed with areas.

The gender dimension is not limited to human depictions. It can also be seen in the symbolism associated with animals among the modern day hunter-gatherers (Parkington 2003). Hunting of antelopes is especially likened to relations between a man and his wife among the !Kung (Biesele 1993). This might also have been the same in the past and that symbolism could have been represented in the rock art. Variation in some animal depictions may therefore be symbolising different notions of gender related issues and ways of addressing them within particular groups. As mentioned above, the animal symbolism that can be used in showing this kind of symbolism is that of the kudu. The representation of kudu cows and kudu bulls varies in different parts of the country. In most areas, female kudu are exhibited in groups whilst kudu bulls are mostly depicted
singly or among the females. The kudu cows may be exhibiting the qualities and characteristics of what is expected of women whereas the male kudu is showing particular relations with the females, probably sexual (Nhamo 2007b). In the wild kudu bulls move with females only during the rut (mating) season (Smithers 1983). However, in some instances as observed in the Harare and Northern Nyanga rock art, some scenes have groups of kudu bulls. This has also been recorded elsewhere in Mashonaland at sites such as Chikupo and Domboshava. These differences indicate that the art may be addressing entirely different gender issues. The depiction of groups of kudu bulls occur in areas where rock art was targeting male behaviours and how they relate. In Northern Nyanga and Harare, this argument finds support in the fact that there is also emphasis on masculinity on human figures, as discussed above.

In many parts of Zimbabwe, there is a preponderance of female kudu compared to male figures (Garlake 1995; Walker 1996; Eastwood and Eastwood 2006; Nhamo 2007b). However, data from Malilangwe, Chiredzi show that male kudu are depicted as frequently as the females (Pearce et al. 2003). This shows that there were variations in how the kudu as a social symbol of men and women was used to address particular gender issues. The variation in the representation of kudu images in different areas provides an example of how animal symbols could have been used to communicate social issues such as gender and other relations. Animals could have been used to address other social issues apart from gender relations and negotiations. These have been noted elsewhere, for example, snakes (Mallen 2005), rhebok (Challis 2005), and springbok (Lessen-Erz 1994). All these provided a social context for the production of the rock art.
8.1.4 Identity, mobility and territoriality

The variation in rock art motifs across space that has been observed in this research could also have resulted from the need for group differentiation. This need could have emanated from aspects of social organisation such as mobility patterns and resources ownership. As pointed out in Chapter 2, reduction in mobility and increased territoriality is evidenced in the archaeological record from the LSA across the African continent including Zimbabwe (Walker 1995; Barham and Mitchell 2008). The ethnographic evidence from modern hunter-gatherer groups has also shown that many groups are known to have avoided venturing out of their traditional territories (Dornan 1925; Fourie 1928; Humphries 2005). Fourie (1928, p.85) reported that among some of the hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari, the most widely separated groups had no personal knowledge of each other and lived in superstitious fear and dread of each other. Therefore, it is the argument of this research that the evidence of restricted mobility and territoriality from both the ethnographic and the archaeological record can be used to explain the variation of rock art motifs through space.

Spatial changes in motifs are evident in the rock art. The rock art from the case studies, as shown in Chapter 7, shares more similarities with neighbouring areas than with distant areas. The rock art from Harare is similar to that from other areas in Mashonaland in the occurrence of such subject matter as flecks, formlings, plants, and reclining human figures. The art from Northern Nyanga also shares motifs such as the squatting human figures with zigzag lines and crawling images with that in Mutoko and Murehwa. Chivi
rock art shares many similarities to Zaka and other parts of southern Zimbabwe. The bi-chrome human figures are confined to Chivi and Zaka whilst the high frequency of giraffes and female human figures is a feature of the rock art from southern Zimbabwe. All this evidence shows that the artists from neighbouring areas used similar symbolism and targeted related issues in their art.

There is also a possibility that differences in motif representation might have been deliberately made to emphasise group identity thereby distinguishing one group from another. As pointed out in Chapter 2, rock art is a suitable platform to use for group distinction since it is visible and permanent; aspects that are vital for identity marking (Wiessner 1983, 1985). As shown in the discussion above, present day hunter-gatherers use material culture to navigate identity aspects. Therefore, variation in the art might be a way of negotiating identities and boundaries (Vinnicombe 1986; Smith 1994). The use of stripes in the rock art from Northern Nyanga and Makaha is difficult to explain otherwise. The rock art exhibits mostly similar subject matter to those of neighbouring areas such as Ziwa, Mutoko and Murehwa but it is distinct in the technique of execution. The difference in technique is so striking that it would have been important for identity marking. This peculiar technique of executing rock art could have worked in the same manner as the stylistic variations in the size and shape of projectile points observed by Wiessner (1983) used to identify different hunter-gatherer groups in the Kalahari. The need for distinction may result from the nature of social relations that they had with other groups living in the neighbouring environment. As will be discussed later in the chapter, micro-environmental conditions can lead to inter and intra group social structuring that
influences restricted access to particular resources. Therefore, the fact that Northern Nyanga is adjacent to the wetter and colder region of the eastern Highlands could have played a part in inter-group relations in the area. This in turn might have led to the need for identity marking.

The use of territoriality to explain motif variation across space has previously not been popular because of the general view that hunter-gatherer groups in southern Africa have no sense of territoriality (e.g. Smith 2006). Smith (2006, p. 87) argued that intentional divisiveness is against the nature of inter-group relations known among the modern hunter-gatherers in the Kalahari. Yet, that groups identify themselves from others is known amongst modern hunter-gatherers (Heinz 1978; Silberbauer 1981; Wiessner 1983). Wiessner (1983, 1984) has argued that the people she interviewed constantly compared themselves to others within their group and outside. Silberbauer (1981, p. 62) has provided a diagrammatic illustration of how the *G/wi* groups perceive others (Plate 157). The diagram shows that a *G/wi* family closely relates with the band and band cluster members whilst it less secure in the company of other *G/wi* outside their clusters and non-*G/wi* people.
Barnard (1992, 1996) has argued that territoriality varies among the groups depending on the level of group interaction and resource availability. In a similar argument, Heinz (1972, p. 406) also stresses that territoriality depends on the social structure of the group and the area of residence of that group. The levels of territoriality differ with the levels of social organisation mentioned earlier on. Some sub-language groups are not territorial but when they relate to ‘outsiders’, they become territorial. In some groups, this is found at the band or the band cluster level (Barnard 1992, 1996). The !Xo for example are
territorial at the family, band and band cluster levels whereas the Nharo are not territorial at the family level but at the band level. Some bands such as the G/wi are temporarily territorial at the family level but exclusively territorial at the band level. The G//ana are temporarily territorial at the family level but not territorial at the band level. The !Kung have a nonchalant territorial system on all levels (Table 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Level of territoriality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju/'hoansi (!Kung)</td>
<td>Non-territorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/wi</td>
<td>Temporarily associated with Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G//ana</td>
<td>Temporarily associated with territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!Xo</td>
<td>Territorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nharo (Naro)</td>
<td>Non-territorial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Variation in territorial structures
(After Barnard 1996, p.11)

If one takes these as analogy for the LSA hunter-gatherer communities, then there is a high probability that certain groups were territorial and rock art could have played an important role in the identity and marking of the territories for them. Communities that lived in Northern Nyanga could have used rock art as a territorial and identity marker.

Even outside of the striped art area of Northern Nyanga, other distinct rock art motifs from Harare and Chivi could have been used for this purpose. As Wiessner (1983, p.19) has argued, no single cultural attribute consistently carries information about identity. Any attribute that varies over space is a potential media for identity marking by the group or by outsiders. Heinz (1979, p. 467-468) showed how different !Xo groups used
variation in environment, location, behaviour and other aspects as sources of identifying themselves or others. He recorded that:

‘the ![um ©ani (people that follow the eland), the Okwa people the Gau ©ani (people from the soft sand),... the Kang people #oa ©ani (people of the south), those of west of Oike pan towards Nojane lama ©ani (people where the sun sets), those from Lebututu Tshane in direction of Kang #ojo ©ani (people who drink from dips - not pans), and those to the north, between the #ojo ©ani and the ![um ©ani are called the loie ©ani (a term describing the peculiar way in which water is found between the grass, but not in pans)’.

This means that artists from elsewhere used different aspects from the technique of execution used in Nyanga. Therefore, the circumscription of motifs such as different kinds of transformed images may be delineating areas influenced by these beliefs and these delineations may have been used for identity purposes. The crocodile-men, for example, could have been used as a territorial marker, marking the influence of that being. Identity and territorial marking may not have been the sole factor in variation of motifs through space but it could have been used as such. This would work in the manner that Sackett (1982, 1985, and 1986) described as the isochrestic value of style.

The emphasis on different animals in different parts of the country may also have been linked to the issue of identity marking either intentionally or unintentionally. The emphasis on certain animals could have resulted in groups becoming known as ‘people of the eland’, ‘people of the kudu’, and ‘people of the giraffe’. The use of animals as identity markers is especially feasible since there is the possibility that totemism was part of hunter-gatherer cosmology in Zimbabwe. The existence of totems has been noted among the “Eastern Bushmen” in eastern Botswana and western Zimbabwe (Dornan
Dornan (1925) argues that one group from the Tuli River, the Du Kee were of the zebra totem while another was of the eland. Dornan could not establish whether this was a borrowed concept from the Bantu neighbours. However, there is also a possibility that totemism is of great antiquity because the totemic concepts found among hunter-gatherers is different in its character to that found among other groups such as the Khoe and Bantu (Barnard 1992; Guenther 1999). Cashdan (1979, cited in Barnard 1992, p.126) also argued that totemism could have been aboriginal to the eastern Khoe groups, the known hunter-gatherers nearest to Zimbabwe. Therefore, the hunter-gatherer societies who made the rock art in some parts of Zimbabwe could have had different totems. These would have become incorporated in the rock art. However, the influence of totemism on the choice of animal depictions is not clear. For example, along the LSCA, there are very few eland images, yet Dornan (1925) reported the existence of the eland totem in the area. Therefore, there may have been avoidance of the animal rather than its emphasis in depicting it in the rock art.

8.1.5 Environment as a factor in motif variation

Variation in environmental conditions across space may have influenced rock art motif selection in different parts of the country. Although environmental explanations have been proffered before (Butzer et al. 1979), their credibility has suffered from the vacillating love-hate relationship between environment and human behaviour throughout the history of archaeological research. The influence of the physical environment on the behaviour of past societies was very popular in the 1940s and 60s but started to lose favour by the late 1970s (Steward 1936, 1949; Willey 1953, 1956; Clarke 1968; Flannery
By the 1980s, social dynamics were considered more important than differences in the physical environment (McGlade 1995, Dincauze 2000). Consequently, many rock art researchers became disinclined to link the spatial variation in rock art motifs with environmental factors (Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Garlake 1995; Eastwood and Cnoops 1999; Hampson et al. 2002; Smith 2006; Ndlovu 2009). This has mostly been due to the reluctance to be labelled environmentally deterministic. Rather, they prefer the widely accepted humanistic approach which prioritises the human endeavour.

While this research takes into cognisance versatility of human agency, it has shown that to argue that the environment had no bearing on the selection of motifs would be misleading. From the three case study areas, direct influence of the environment on selection of subject matter has been noted since most of these, especially animals and plants, are drawn from the surrounding environment. No exotic animals that are not in keeping with the environments of the surrounding areas have been identified. The same observations were also made by Walker (1996, p.31) who noted that the animals depicted in the rock art of the Matopo Hills are not “exotic”. This shows that the environment provided the menu from which communities chose their subject matter.

Closer examination of some animal depictions with restricted distribution also shows some co-relationships between the rock art and the environment. For example, tsessebe is not distributed widely in Zimbabwe because they are water-dependent and thus live in areas with adequate supplies (Smithers 1983, p.618). This is reflected in the rock art where tsessebe are more common in the Harare area which has abundant waters sources.
They were also reported to have been abundant in the natural habitat (Selous 1893). A survey of the animals found in Zimbabwe reported that no tsessebe were reported in Chivi (Kenmuir and Williams 1975). Although there is no accurate distribution map for the animal, it is most likely that tsessebe did not occur naturally in Northern Nyanga. They are said to avoid areas 1500m below sea level (Estes 1991). This distribution supports that the animals that are depicted in art were most likely the ones that were naturally occurring in the area. This is especially likely if one considers the fact that the hunter-gatherers were practising natural-modelling as discussed above. They would therefore draw their symbols from the animals that they intimately knew.

It is also likely that the ubiquity and importance of the animals could also have influenced their integration into the belief systems. For example, the availability of permanent water sources could have influenced the integration of aquatic resources into the social symbolism of the society. This research has shown the occurrence of fish in the rock art of Harare where other aquatic animals such as crocodiles and hippopotamus also occur. These were integrated into the social symbolism as seen through the occurrence of the *crocodile-men* motif. From the environmental discussion in Chapter 1, Harare is markedly wetter than Northern Nyanga and Chivi. The same explanation can be given for the high frequency of fish in areas such as Beitbridge, along the Limpopo River (Eastwood *et al.* 1994). Tore Saetersdal (2011, *pers. comm*) also referred to the occurrence of fish depictions in the Mozambican part of the Chimanimani Range of mountains. Although the Zimbabwean side of the range has not been explored in detail, lack of similar depictions in surrounding areas such as Zimunya, Chipinge and Manica...
(Mozambique) may be a result of the fact that they are drier than the Chimanimani area. All this reflects that the depiction of animals found locally was a result of socially informed symbols being derived from the surrounding environment.

However as noted above, caution is called for in this approach since it seems that the occurrence of an animal in the natural environment did not guarantee its inclusion in the rock art. Generally, the limited number of species depicted in the art does not correlate with the wide variety of animals that were found in the natural environment. Additionally, the abundance of animal depictions in the rock art of an area does not necessarily mean that it was also abundant in the area. Some animals occur in the art even when they were not common in the area. Walker (1996, p. 31) argues that the giraffe and kudu are not well-adapted to the Matopo Hills although they are found in neighbouring areas in the Lowveld of the country. These animals are abundant in the rock art of the area. This shows that the animal was especially chosen for its qualities that were known to the artists. Kudu are common to all the case study areas but other animals such as giraffe may have been chosen for qualities that suited certain environments. Giraffes are not water dependent (Smithers 1983), thus, their resilience in that regard could have influenced their preference as symbols in the rock art of Chivi and other areas in the Lowveld of Zimbabwe. In this case, therefore, the environment would have acted as stimulus to human choices. Rather than searching for environmentally sensitive plants and animal depictions that are present and absent in the rock art, one probably needs to be looking at how the differences in the environments might have influenced the different choices of symbols.
Differences in environmental conditions would have brought in differences in economic and environmental stresses and these would in turn give rise to differences in concerns that groups needed to address in the rock art. The economic issues can be related to access to land and the resources therein. As noted in Chapter 3, land tenure systems today vary from one group to another in the Kalahari depending on social and environmental variables. Guenther (1999) noted that among the Kalahari hunter-gatherers access to land and other resources is the ultimate determinant of social structure especially in terms of acquiring and sharing of food among the related group members. Even among groups where the enforcement of land access seems to be lax, there are still rules to access the resources. For example, among the !Kung, one has to ask or join the band of the owners of the n!oresi in order to get access to the resources in a particular locality (Marshall 1976). Stricter controls have also been recorded among the G/wi and !Xo who are more territorial than the !Kung (Heinz 1972; Silberbauer 1981).

The extent to which the above situation applied to hunter-gatherers in the past is difficult to ascertain at present especially when considered against limited knowledge of the paleo-environments of the areas under study. However, diverse environments and the occurrence of microclimates restricted to certain areas are evident in the country, as shown in Chapter 1. The broad differences in the availability of surface water can be seen between Chivi and Harare, for example. This could have influenced differences in the land tenure and social structuring of groups that occupied these areas. Similar effects have been observed among modern hunter-gatherers in the Kalahari (Barnard 1992,
Micro-environmental factors in the Kalahari influence social relations such as aggregation and dispersal. The nature of societal engagement with the physical environment leads to the evolution of divergent concerns and beliefs. Strategies of dealing with environmental variables are usually integrated into the fabric of beliefs and thought systems of societies (Hassan 2000, p.121). This has also been observed in hunter-gatherer groups in other parts of the world such as Nunamuit (e.g. Binford 1980, 2001). All these differences inform both the cosmology and symbolic notions among hunter-gatherer groups (Guenther 1999). It is therefore important that the environment should not be taken solely as influencing the presence or absence of particular animals in the art due to the unavailability of their natural habitats in the vicinities of the sites. Instead, environmental explanations should be taken as having both direct and indirect influences on motif selection.

8.2 Rock art and Later Stone Age hunter-gatherer lifestyles

The overarching objective of all archaeological research is to come up with information that helps in the understanding of past communities concerning their subsistence, social organisation, religion and other aspects. Therefore, having explored the nature and causes of variation in the rock art, it is now imperative to look at how the variability contributes to an understanding of the lifestyles of the Later Stone Age hunter-gatherers who made the art. The discussion above has shown that variation in motifs across space in Zimbabwean rock art was a result of multiple factors. These include beliefs, economic, political and social relations. All these are likely to have been affected by the environments in which the different groups of hunter-gatherers were living. It is the
argument of this research that if all these factors influence the motif selection in the rock art, then archaeologists can use this variation to reconstruct the previously mentioned aspects as part of LSA hunter-gatherer lifestyles.

The heterogeneity of the lifestyles of modern-day hunter-gatherers is well known throughout the world (Binford 1980, 2001; Winterhalder 2001; Lee and Daly 1999). They live in small bands with varied religious, political, and economic structures (Guenther 1999, Lee and Daly 1999). Basing on such knowledge, the need to explore the presence of such structures in the archaeological record of hunter-gatherer groups is of interest. Thus, it is hoped that through research such as this, archaeologists can be able to investigate the variability of past hunter gatherer lifestyles in detail. The study of variation of rock art motifs can assist in this endeavour. As already noted the variation in motifs in the rock art of Zimbabwe means that diverse groups who shared some aspects and differed on others occupied this area.

As has been noted in Chapter 2, the hunter-gatherer cultural groupings are arranged at various levels. If one takes culture as encompassing ‘shared, learned knowledge and expected patterns of behaviour”, then the hunter-gatherer culture can be divided into several levels of social organisation, that is family, band, band cluster, sub-language and language groups. Each group has certain aspects that are shared within it even though it shares features with other groups at the levels of social organisation that are higher or below it. The studies by Wiessner (1983, 1984, and 1985) have shown that material culture such as projectile points and beadwork can vary according to these levels of
organisation, although for her research the variation was more apparent at band cluster and language level (Table 3). It is, therefore, important to articulate the level at which one is making the reconstructions.

Most of the studies of rock art in southern Africa have been at the level of broad cultural groupings such as hunter-gatherer, farmer, and herder. Researchers were concerned with articulating similarities within hunter-gatherer rock art across the sub-region (e.g. Lewis-Williams 1983; Lewis-Williams and Dowson 1989; Willcox 1984). The documentation of common motifs in this research has supported the reconstruction of this hunter-gatherer identity of the rock art as has previously been shown. The study has also shown that even where there are common beliefs, different communities expressed them in various ways, adding local appendages as explicated by the case of the squatting images. These minute variations may therefore be used to identify different groupings across space.

However, the study of variation at the scale done in this research has contributed to the identification of cultural groupings at lower levels such as language, sub-language, band cluster or band. The identification of groups and their characterisation may be done through mapping of motifs across space which aids in the delineation of areas with related beliefs. For example, it has been explicated above that the LSA communities in Zimbabwe did not have uniform beliefs about human-animal or animal-animal transformations. Appendices 11-13 show examples of mapping of the motifs registered in this study. The distribution of the conflations such as the *snake-head, baboon-face* and
crocodile-men motifs can be used to delineate groups that held such beliefs (Appendix 11).

Various observed characteristics can then be used together to reconstruct the lifestyles of groups. From the case study areas, for example, one can note that the communities from Chivi generally believed in human-baboon transformation as indicated by the baboon-face conflations that occur on both bi-chrome and monochrome images. They also conducted certain ceremonies where participants painted their bodies white and wore peculiar ritual dressing of arm, knee, and waistbands. The communities in Chivi held the kudu, especially the female, in high regard as it is highly frequent in the art. Other female animal figures are also frequent with one giraffe apparently pregnant (Plate 158). Giraffe also had special significance for these communities. As for their social relations, they seem to have emphasised male-female relations as evidenced by depiction of ceremonies that drew participation from both sexes. The general increase in female images in the rock art supports this point of view.
Plate 158: A depiction of a giraffe with a foetus in the womb

For Harare, the communities that occupied this area believed in human-crocodile transformations. However, they seem to have also believed that particular groups of people could assume other features reflected by the appearance of bat, ostrich, tortoise and antelope conflations (Table 11b). The communities emphasised male-related activities as evidenced by the dominance of male human figures, exaggeration of male genitalia, and emphasis on hunting symbolism. They had peculiar symbolism of formlings and reclined human images. The communities in Harare also symbolised the state (most likely spiritual) of certain objects through depicting them in flecks. The communities also drew special symbolisms from plants, especially trees with wide canopy and the one with flapping leaves. One can also say that the distribution of aquatic animals in the rock art shows that the area had abundant water resources.
On the other hand, the communities in Northern Nyanga believed in human-snake transformations and beliefs about “catching” snakes as shown by the occurrence of such depictions in their rock art. They also believed that the process of transformation involved adoption of claw-like digits and floating. The occurrence of distinctive markers such as the striped art from Northern Nyanga shows that communities could have deliberately distinguished themselves from others through rock art.

However, the mapping of the rock art motifs must be made taking into cognisance the fact that establishing the boundaries of cultural aspects is very difficult. This has also been seen among modern day hunter-gatherers in the Kalahari where variation in styles of material culture is more defined at the centre of the groups rather than on the peripheries (Wiessner 1983, 1984a & b). For the modern hunter-gatherers it is easier to identify the centre of groups because they are known. It is difficult to do the same with rock art as of now.

At present, it is also difficult to say at what level of the social structure of the hunter-gatherers these differences manifest themselves. At the moment it is difficult to precisely identify the level of grouping that are indicated by the motif variation. There is need to do detailed documentation of rock art motifs from across the country to determine the levels of variation each motif exhibits. For example, the depiction of kudu as a symbol might represent a common motif to a language or sub-language group. This is evident from the high frequency of this motif across all the case study areas. However, as has been pointed out, in other parts of southern Africa animals such as eland and springbok are more
common. On the other hand, the occurrence of the aardvark and klipspringer, for example, would indicate an animal that had significance at the band cluster level since they have restricted occurrences. In future, with detailed documentation and mapping of motif occurrence, this can be possible.

The data presented in this research also inform on the meaning of rock art in southern Africa. The data show that shamanistic models that have been used in southern Africa can apply to the meaning of some rock art images in Zimbabwe. The beliefs about transformation seem to fit into the shamanistic explanation (Lewis-Williams and Pearce 2004, Lewis-Williams and Challis 2011). However, this research has shown that even such depictions also vary across space. The research argues that these variations are a result of different conceptualization of transformation and consequently trance or shamanistic experiences among different groups. Therefore, these experiences should not be generalised, rather they must have been contextualised within the particular hunter-gatherer groupings. The research has also shown that there is need to look at other factors that influenced motif selection beyond just the religious ones. For example, the selection of female kudu as the main symbol seems not to be grounded in the shamanistic ideals but rather in the characteristics of the animal that resonate with moral concerns of the societies.

The variation in the rock art of Zimbabwe reflects variation that occurs across southern Africa. Mention has already been made of the South African rock art (see also Smith and Zubieta 2006, Hampson et al 2002, Eastwood and Eastwood 2006). Saetersdal (2010)
noted difference of this art to that found in the Tete province in northern Mozambique and the southern parts of Malawi. In Botswana rock art from the eastern parts is different from that which found other parts of the country (Walker 1998). Thus, the variation of rock art according to differences that existed within the smaller groupings of hunter-gatherers is evident across southern Africa. Regional studies of these aspects may concretise some of the findings made in this research.

In all this, there is need to study variation in rock art together with other archaeological data to fully reconstruct hunter-gatherer lifestyles. Archaeological reconstructions elsewhere have shown that it may be possible to identify smaller groupings, where material culture from two groups separated by just 14 km can be markedly different (Sealy and Pfeiffer 2000; Sealy 2006). This might be indicating different bands. Rock art researchers have had a tendency to work with just their own material without recourse to other archaeological data. In southern Africa, few researchers have tried to combine rock art and data from “dirt” archaeology (e.g. Walker 1995; Mazel 2009, 2011). Combining these would go a long way in characterising the nature of variation among prehistoric hunter-gatherers. It would also determine the level at which the social groupings can be identified. As Mitchell (2005, p. 68) noted “there is no doubt that a richer view of the hunter-gatherer past will emerge if and where rock art's wealth of reference to social relations can be integrated with 'dirt' archaeology”. Unfortunately, in the case study areas used here, there is inadequate artefactual research on the Later Stone Age period. This should be a priority in subsequent research. There is also need to deal with the issue of
dating of rock art as this will make relating the art to the excavated material more reliable.

The other major drawback for the detailed exposition of social groupings is the lack of ethnographic information on hunter-gatherer grouping in Zimbabwe. Had this information been available, much more of the information coming from rock art could be used in combination with these groupings. Unfortunately very little is known of hunter-gatherers in the country. Future research should try and glean this kind of information from the remnant communities of hunter-gatherers in the country.
Chapter 9:  
Summary and conclusions

The major thrust of this research was to investigate how motifs in Zimbabwe hunter-gatherer rock art vary across space. The research has examined the nature of spatial motif variation using three case study areas namely Harare, Chivi, and Northern Nyanga. The main attributes that were used in the examination and discussion of the spatial variation are subject matter, colour of the paintings and the technique of execution. Data from these case studies were complemented by information collected by other researchers. Generalised comparisons were made with information from elsewhere in southern Africa. While this research has reaffirmed the similarities that unite the hunter-gatherer rock art of Zimbabwe, it has shown that the motifs do not occur uniformly across the country.

In terms of subject matter frequency, the study has shown that some occur across all areas but others are circumscribed to particular areas. These include some animals such as the aardvark, the giraffe, eland and elephant. Motifs such as the crocodile-men are limited to specific areas such as Harare. Depictions such as formlings, female human figures and flecks also vary in their occurrence. There are also differences in the emphasis whereby some animals such as buffalo, elephant, and rhinoceros are frequently depicted in some areas but rarely occur in others.

This study has also shown that there are differences in the use of colour in the rock art from different parts of the country. Of the three case study areas, the bi-chrome images
were noted in Chivi whereas Northern Nyanga and Harare mostly have monochromes. A look at rock art from other parts of the country has shown that bi-chromes are actually widespread although there are differences in the way they are executed as shown in Chapters 7 and 8. The differences in technique of execution have also been noted with the striped art from Northern Nyanga standing out.

This research also investigated the possible causes of the spatial motif variation in hunter-gatherer rock art of Zimbabwe. It appears that most of the differences have to do with variations in beliefs and rituals depicted in the art. The beliefs relating to relationships between humans and animals influenced the representation of conflated images. Depictions such as the snake-head in the rock art from Northern Nyanga and the crocodile-men of Harare show these distinct beliefs. The research has also shown that the variation can be a result of local changes to common beliefs. This has been demonstrated in the differences in the adaptation of motifs such as the squatting images.

Apart from the differences in beliefs, the research has also pointed to other possible reasons for variation. The possibility that the variations were a way of regarding group distinction from other groups was also explored. The differences in the technique of execution of the rock art from Northern Nyanga have been used to show this possibility. Influences of inter-group relations such as gender negotiations have been considered. The differences in environmental conditions as a source of variation were also investigated. It is observed that the direct influence of environmental factors such as the occurrence of natural habitats can be seen on the selection of subject matter through animal
representation where most of those represented in the art were more common where they occur naturally. Nonetheless, the major influence of the environment may have been indirect through shaping the social structure, which would in turn affect the choice of motifs to represent in the rock art. However, the role of the environment should not be overemphasised, as animals that occur abundantly in an environment are not always found to dominate in the rock art. This research argues that the human choices took precedence. The environmental factors only offer possibilities for choices in subject matter.

This research has shown that the study of spatial motif variation in rock art can contribute to the broader understanding of past hunter-gather lifestyles. The investigation of motif variation through space in the hunter-gatherer rock art may assist in tackling some of the challenges in archaeology such as reconstruction of smaller scales of human groupings and their socio-political organisation in the past. The reconstruction of human grouping at a smaller scale is still considered to lie at “the fringe of archaeological possibilities (Meskell and Preucel 2007, p 121). Although it was not possible to identify the nature and composition of the groups in this work, the researcher hopes that, by continuing to carefully document the distinct motifs it can be possible to map the different groupings that existed among prehistoric hunter-gatherer population in Zimbabwe and the southern African sub-region. Much can be gained by developing methods and theories to explore variation in rock art. The overemphasis on common aspects excludes important information about the past societies. As argued by Meskell and Preucel (2007), identity is
better tackled with reference to differences as this point to the contrastive aspects of the subjects of study.

9.1 Contributions and Implications

Few studies of rock art have concentrated on characterising the variation that is found in the rock art of Zimbabwe. This study complements research that has concentrated mainly on showing the commonalities that are found in the art. The study provides a detailed comparative analysis of the rock art from different parts of the country, and this is an important step towards investigating and using motif variation to understand prehistoric hunter-gatherers. The results of this examination should contribute towards developing methodologies and concepts with which to explore motif variation in the rock art.

It is hoped that this study has contributed to knowledge of the character of rock art in Zimbabwe by incorporating data from areas whose rock art was previously unknown and others that have been under researched. The rock art from Northern Nyanga was not known to the academic world. The striped art similar to that from Northern Nyanga had only been referred to in Goodall’s publication of 1959. On the other hand, Breuil (1966) was the last to explore the rock art from Chivi in detail.

It is hoped that this research makes a significant contribution in a country where rigorous hunter-gatherer research is still limited. Although there have been papers published sporadically, Zimbabwean rock art as well as Stone Age research has not been as prolific as, for example, in South Africa. This has resulted in the generalisation of both the
meaning and character of rock art whereby the results from South African based research has been considered to apply globally to southern Africa, thus masking the differences.

9.2 Future research directions

Although this research is a contribution to rock art research in Zimbabwe, more still needs to be done. From this study a number of lessons were leant. This study has only worked with a sample. Expanding the sample size is essential. In Northern Nyanga, this can enable the establishment of a more precise geographical distribution of the striped rock art. Knowledge of the geographical distribution may add much to the understanding of relationship between the art from this area and that from other parts of Zimbabwe.

Outside the case study areas, there is need to continue with the detailed comparative research. The desktop research on other parts of the country has provided clues to the nature of motif variation in the country. The differences in the occurrence of motifs such as plants are one such pointer. Further exploration of unique motifs such as the praying mantis and the aardvark, is also required. Therefore, comparative research will greatly enrich further investigations into variation of motif across space. Detailed comparisons will also help to strengthen the patterns that emerged in this research.

Additionally, comparative research should be conducted at broader regional levels such as those discussed in Chapter 2. Although differences in motif representation in these regional groupings are generally agreed upon, little knowledge is available as to how these can contribute to an understanding of the structure of hunter-gatherer groupings
across the sub-continent. The similarities noted between the rock art from Northern Nyanga and Kondoa also require further exploration. Thus, a broader study will actually be much more useful in the identification of larger hunter-gatherer groupings such as language groups and their boundaries.

Of all the issues discussed, the urgent need for research on chronology cannot be overemphasised. Most of the rock art research is ahistorical because of the lack of reliable dating systems. Some of the issues that can influence the spatial variation of rock art motifs can only become clearer when there is a well-established chronology of the art and communities from which it was produced. Although this research has shown that the bi-chrome rock art from Chivi is similar in some of the subject matter, there is still a chance that the colour differences are emanating from temporal differences. Arguments for or against acculturation also depend on this aspect. The study of subtle variations at both the intra and inter site level are also dependent on sound chronology.

Another area for further investigation is that of variation of LSA material culture other than rock art. Studies of variation in material culture such as stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell ornaments and other objects can shed light on the function of art in hunter-gatherer societies. Examination of rock art engravings, although they are very few in Zimbabwe, may also assist in this endeavour. All these can also assist in the reconstruction of hunter-gatherer groups and their social organisation.

There is also need to study other types of rock art apart from that made by the hunter-gatherers. In all the case studies, especially in Chivi and Northern Nyanga, these occur. In
Chivi, there is the occurrence of paintings of the late white tradition that are usually associated with herder and farming communities. There is need for a thorough study of this art since it has never been studied in detail in Zimbabwe. It is also crucial to determine its relationship with similar rock art that has been studied in other parts of southern Africa such as Malawi (Zubieta 2006, 2010; Smith 1997) and South Africa (Van Schalkyk and Smith 2004; Namono & Eastwood 2005; Smith and Ouzman 2004; Eastwood and Smith 2005; Namono 2006). This will assist in the understanding of possible elements of acculturation in the hunter-gatherer rock art. Studying the relationship between the different types of rock art is therefore vital.
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1

**Rock Art Recording Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Number:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grid Ref:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elevation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Owner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil Type:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Type:</strong></td>
<td>Cave, Overhang, Rock shelter, Boulder, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Panels:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Panels:</strong></td>
<td>Width, Height, Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated number of paintings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colour of Paintings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monochromes:</strong></td>
<td>Red, Yellow, White, Black, Brown, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bi-chrome:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polychromes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Human, Male, Female, Indeterminate, Therianthrope, Group Scenes, Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Animal: ........................................................................................................................................

Geometric: Dots □ Lines □ Formlings □ Circles □

Other: ........................................................................................................................................

Comment on Association of images: ............................................................................................

State of Preservation: Fading □ Faded □ clear □ Very clear □

Other weathering processes: ...........................................................................................................

Vandalism: ....................................................................................................................................

Other Archaeological Finds: ...........................................................................................................

Comments: ....................................................................................................................................

Recording: Slides □ Photographs □ Drawings □

Other: ...........................................................................................................................................

Time of Recording: ........................................

Date: ................................................. Name of Recorder: .................................................

Institution: ......................................................................................................................................
### Appendix 2: Northern Nyanga Presence and absence form: P denotes presence while -- denotes absence

| ATTRIBUTES | Mbako | Nyamahomba 2 | Nyamarira 1 | Nyamarira 2 | Nyaza Ngwe | Mafurwe | Mazina | Kuhle 1 | Kuhle 2 | Kuhle 3 | Tengeria 3 | Tengeria 4 | Tengeria 5 | Nyazikihlo | Tengeria 1 | Tengeria 2 | Nyakamapa 2 | Nyakamapa 3 | Garawil | Nyamahomba 1 | Nyamahomba 2 | Nyamahomba 3 | Nyamahomba 4 | Bengore | Kutzingwe | Nyaza | Rukwa | Manjarela | Nyakamapa 1 | Nyakamamba |
|------------|-------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|--------|------|----------|---------|---------|
| DEPICTIONS |       |              |             |             |             |          |         |         |         |         |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |          |         |        |      |          |         |         |
| Plant      | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Geometric designs | P      | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Equipment | P      |              |             |             |             |          |         |         |         |         |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |         |         |      |          |         |         |
| GEOMETRIC DESIGNS |       |              |             |             |             |          |         |         |         |         |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |         |         |      |          |         |         |
| Formlings  | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Y-shaped designs | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Dots       | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Lines      | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Circles   | P      | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| HUMAN      |       |              |             |             |             |          |         |         |         |         |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |         |         |      |          |         |         |
| Female     | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| ANIMAL     |       |              |             |             |             |          |         |         |         |         |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |          |         |         |      |          |         |         |
| Baboons/Monkeys | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Elephant   | P      | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Giraffe    | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Zebra      | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Cattle     | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Impala     | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Hartebeest | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Sable      | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Indet antelope | P      | P            | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Warthog    | --     | P            | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| Fish       | --     | --           | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --          | --        | --       | --     | --     | --        | --       | --       |
| ATTRIBUTES | Mhako | Nsanzviro | Nyamapfene 1 | Nyamapfene 2 | Nsanzviro 1 | Nsanzviro 2 | Nkakumapata 2 | Nkakumapata 3 | Nkakumapata 4 | Garwidi | Nyamahomba 1 | Nyamahomba 2 | Nyamudze 1 | Nyamudze 2 | Beqero | Kutungwe | Nsangara | Buneta | Manjani | Nkakumapata 1 | Nyamakamba |
|------------|-------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------|----------|
| Snake      |       |           | P           | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Feline     |       |           |             | --          | --          |             |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Wild pig   | P      |           | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Klipspringer | P   |           | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Tortoise   |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Rhinoceros |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Eland      |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Buffalo    |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Birds      |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| COLOURS    |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Dark red   |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| White      | P      | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Yellow     |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Brown      | P      | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Black      |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Green      |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| TECHNIQUE OF EXECUTION |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Solid      | P      | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Outline only |   P  | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Outline with infill |   P  | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Striped    |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Solid with stripes |   P  | --        | --          | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| CONSERVATION |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Graffiti   |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
| Vandalism  |       |           |             | --          | --          | --          |              |              |              |         |              |              |            |            |         |        |        |
Appendix 3: Chivi Presence and absence form: P denotes presence while -- denotes absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Zivurawa</th>
<th>Zvunguru</th>
<th>Sedza</th>
<th>Manyame</th>
<th>Chamawezi</th>
<th>Mahoneye village</th>
<th>Chehvule</th>
<th>Madya</th>
<th>Chebara</th>
<th>Davira</th>
<th>Gomutitu</th>
<th>Mudadi</th>
<th>Mapovire 1</th>
<th>Mapovire 2</th>
<th>Mapovire 3</th>
<th>Maitsera 1</th>
<th>Maitsera 2</th>
<th>Mataririano 1</th>
<th>Mataririano 2</th>
<th>Manyere 1</th>
<th>Manyere 2</th>
<th>Mosakatira</th>
<th>Chsvika</th>
<th>Chivone</th>
<th>Police Camp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEPICTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Plant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Geometric designs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>GEOMETRIC DESIGNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Formlings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Y-shaped designs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Dots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Flecks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>HUMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>ANIMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Baboons/Monkeys</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Elephant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Giraffe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>Zvurawa</td>
<td>Zvengiru</td>
<td>Sezha</td>
<td>Manyame</td>
<td>Chirazidzi</td>
<td>Mahoney Village</td>
<td>Chebure</td>
<td>Madva</td>
<td>Chebira</td>
<td>Gomuntu</td>
<td>Mutadi</td>
<td>Mapavire 1</td>
<td>Mapavire 2</td>
<td>Mapavire 3</td>
<td>Maireveru 1</td>
<td>Maireveru 2</td>
<td>Matarirano 1</td>
<td>Matarirano 2</td>
<td>Manyere 1</td>
<td>Manyere 2</td>
<td>Masakofira</td>
<td>Chuwakana</td>
<td>Chiome</td>
<td>Police Camp</td>
<td></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>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<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>Zebra</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Cattle</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Impala</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Hartbeest</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Tssebe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Sable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Small antelope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washog/ Wild pig</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Fish</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Snake</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Feline</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Eland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Indeterminate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Conflated animals</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>COLOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Yellow</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Brown</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Black</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Green</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>Zivurawa</td>
<td>Zvengireru</td>
<td>Sedza</td>
<td>Manyame</td>
<td>Chemazii</td>
<td>Mahonye village</td>
<td>Chebecute</td>
<td>Madya</td>
<td>Chebara</td>
<td>Davira</td>
<td>Gomututm</td>
<td>Mudadi</td>
<td>Mapuvire 1</td>
<td>Mapuvire 2</td>
<td>Mapuvire 3</td>
<td>Matusvire 1</td>
<td>Matusvire 2</td>
<td>Matarirano 1</td>
<td>Matarirano 2</td>
<td>Manyere 1</td>
<td>Manyere 2</td>
<td>Mashakatira</td>
<td>Chavasikana</td>
<td>Chiome</td>
<td>Police Camp</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<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>TECHNIQUE OF EXECUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Outline only</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Outline with infill</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Striped</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>CONSERVATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Graffiti</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Vandalism</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Harare Presence and absence form: P denotes presence while -- denotes absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Glen Nora</th>
<th>Kilworth 1</th>
<th>Kilworth 2</th>
<th>Kilworth 3</th>
<th>Kilworth 4</th>
<th>Kilworth 5</th>
<th>Somerby</th>
<th>Outalnds 1</th>
<th>Outalnds 2</th>
<th>Chivhu 1</th>
<th>Chivhu 2</th>
<th>Chivhu 3</th>
<th>Chivhu 4</th>
<th>Chivhu 5</th>
<th>Rahimia 1</th>
<th>Rahimia 2</th>
<th>Standleigh hill</th>
<th>Epworth 4</th>
<th>Epworth 1</th>
<th>Epworth 3</th>
<th>Epworth 2</th>
<th>Chahora</th>
<th>Chichake</th>
<th>Chibuku</th>
<th>Mbiri 1</th>
<th>Mbiri 2</th>
<th>Mbirisa 1</th>
<th>Mbirisa 2</th>
<th>Mbirisa 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROCK ART SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>DEPICTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Plant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Geometric designs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>GEOMETRIC DESIGNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Formalings</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Y-shaped designs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Dots</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Flecks</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Inlets</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>HUMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theriomorphans</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>ANIMAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Baboons/Monkeys</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Zebra</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Impala</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Hartebeest</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Tsessebe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelope</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

452
| ATTRIBUTES       | Glenora | Kilworth 1 | Kilworth 2 | Kilworth 3 | Kilworth 4 | Kilworth 5 | Kilworth 6 | Sammy | Oaklands 1 | Oaklands 2 | Chibulo1 | Chibulo2 | Chibulo3 | Chibulo4 | Chibulo5 | Ramhun 1 | Ramhun 2 | Stonehurst Hall | Epworth 4 | Epworth 1 | Epworth 2 | Epworth 3 | Epworth 4 | Epworth 2 | Chadcombe | Mhela 1 | Mhela 2 | Mtona 1 | Mtona 2 | Mtona 3 |
|------------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| C. duiker        |         |            | P          |            | P          |            |            |       |          |            |          | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Bushbuck         |         |            |            | P          |            |           | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Warthog/Wild pig |         | P          |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           |          | P        |           |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Antelope (indet) |         | P          | P          | P          | P          | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Snake            |         |            |            | P          | P          |           | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Feline           |         |            |            | P          | P          |           | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Rhinoceros       |         |            |            | P          | P          |           | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Eland            |         |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Buffalo          |         |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Birds            |         |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Tortoise         |         |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Crocodile        |         |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Large animals (indet) |   |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Indeterminate    |         |            |            | P          |            |           | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Conflated animals |     |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| OTHERS           |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Arrows           |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Red              |         |            |            | P          | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Dark red         |         |            |            | P          | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| White            |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Yellow           |         |            |            | P          | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Brown            |         |            |            | P          | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Black            |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Green            |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |

**TECHNIQUE OF EXECUTION**

| Solid            |         |            |            |            | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Outline only     |         |            |            |            | P          | P          | P          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Outline with infill |     |            |            |            |            | P          |          |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |
| Striped          |         |            |            |            |            |           |           |       |           |           |           | P        |          |          |          |           |           |           |             |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |         |         |         |         |

**CONSERVATIONS**
| Attributes      | Glen Nora | Kilworth 1 | Kilworth 2 | Kilworth 3 | Kilworth 4 | Kilworth 5 | Kilworth 6 | Oatlands 1 | Oatlands 2 | Chivero 1 | Chivero 2 | Chivero 3 | Chivero 4 | Chivero 5 | Rainham 1 | Rainham 2 | Stonehurst hall | Epworth 1 | Epworth 2 | Epworth 3 | Rhodia | Prospect farm | Epworth 4 | Epworth 5 | Epworth 6 | Chadcombe | Mbizi 1 | Mbizi 2 | Mimosa 1 | Mimosa 2 | Mimosa 3 |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Graffiti       | --        | --          | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --           | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --           | P          | P         | P          | P        | P            | P         | P         | P          | P        | P         | P        |
### Appendix 5: Human frequencies at rock art sites in Northern Nyanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mhako</th>
<th>Nyamapfene 2</th>
<th>Nyamapfene 1</th>
<th>Nyatitiro</th>
<th>Nyatsizvo</th>
<th>Nyatsizvo</th>
<th>Nyazingwe</th>
<th>Mazizima</th>
<th>Kubve 1</th>
<th>Kubve 2</th>
<th>Kubve 3</th>
<th>Tsengerai 3</th>
<th>Tsengerai 4</th>
<th>Tsengerai 5</th>
<th>Nyamudeza</th>
<th>Nyamakamba</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 1</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 2</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 3</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 4</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 5</th>
<th>Nyamakamba 6</th>
<th>Nyamakanga</th>
<th>Bungure</th>
<th>Kutungwe 2</th>
<th>Nkupisa</th>
<th>Bvueia</th>
<th>Manjanja</th>
<th>Nyanhambu</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthropes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Indet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6: Chivi human occurrences among; a) monochromes; b) bi-chromes

a)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Zvurewa</th>
<th>Zvenguru</th>
<th>Sedza</th>
<th>Manyame</th>
<th>Chemazizi</th>
<th>Mahonye</th>
<th>Madya</th>
<th>Chabara</th>
<th>Davira</th>
<th>Gomustatu</th>
<th>Mudadi</th>
<th>Mapuvire 1</th>
<th>Mapuvire 2</th>
<th>Mapuvire 3</th>
<th>Matsveru 1</th>
<th>Matsveru 2</th>
<th>Matarifano 1</th>
<th>Matarifano 2</th>
<th>Manyere 1</th>
<th>Manyere 2</th>
<th>Masahakatira</th>
<th>Police Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthropes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Indet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Chebvute</th>
<th>Mudadi</th>
<th>Mapuvire 1</th>
<th>Mapuvire 2</th>
<th>Matsveru 1</th>
<th>Matsveru 2</th>
<th>Mashakatira</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therianthropes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Harare human representations

| Site       | Glen Nora | Bridge | Kilworth 1 | Kilworth 2 | Kilworth 3 | Kilworth 4 | Kilworth 5 | Soberby | Outlands 1 | Outlands 2 | Chivero 1 | Chivero 2 | Chivero 3 | Chivero 4 | Chivero 5 | Rainham 1 | Rainham 2 | Stonehurst hill | Epworth 1 | Epworth 4 | Epworth 3 | Epworth 2 | Chadcombe | Chadcliffe | Mimosa 1 | Mimosa 2 | Mimosa 3 | Total |
|------------|-----------|--------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| **HUMAN**  |           |        |            |            |            |            |            |         |            |            |           |          |          |          |          |           |            |               |           |          |          |          |           |            |          |        |        |        |        |
| **Male**   | 6         | 8      | 6          | 5          | 12         | 17         | 7          | 27      | 2          | --         | 17         | 13        | 6         | 29        | 6         | --       | 7          | 2          | 1           | 3          | 5         | 4         | 9          | 1          | 1         | 5        | 1        | --      | 7        | 7        | 21       | 4       |
| **Female** | --        | 1      | --         | --         | 1          | --         | --         | 4       | 4          | --         | 1          | --        | --        | 19        | --        | --       | 2          | 1          | --          | 1          | --        | --        | --        | --        | --        | 1        | --       | --       | 35       |        |
| **Therianthropes** | 16        | --      | --         | --         | 1          | 3          | --         | 2       | --         | 4          | 7          | --        | --        | 6         | --        | --       | 2          | --         | --          | 5          | 3         | 3         | 4          | --        | 7         | --       | 1        | --       | --       | 64       |        |
| **Child**  | --        | --     | --         | --         | --         | --         | --         | --      | --         | --         | --         | --        | --        | --        | --        | --       | --        | --         | --          | --          | --        | --        | --        | --        | --        | --        | --       | --       | --       | --       | 4        |        |
| **Indet**  | 6         | 52     | 10         | 24         | 5          | 19         | 24         | 6       | 9          | 1          | 49         | 5         | 12        | 41        | 21        | 2         | 14        | 22         | 4          | 9          | 17        | 6         | 10        | 5         | 2         | 1         | 5        | 6        | --      | 3        | 1        | 39       | 1        |
| **Total**  | 28        | 61     | 16         | 29         | 19         | 39         | 31         | 39      | 15         | 5          | 74         | 18        | 18        | 95        | 31        | 2         | 25        | 25         | 4          | 16         | 23        | 14        | 18        | 14        | 3         | 9        | 11       | 8        | 10       | 8        | 70       | 8        |
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Appendix 8: Northern Nyanga Animal representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS</th>
<th>Mhako</th>
<th>Nyamapfene</th>
<th>Nyamapfene 1</th>
<th>Nyamapfene 2</th>
<th>Nyashiripo</th>
<th>Mazudzira</th>
<th>Kabve 1</th>
<th>Kabve 2</th>
<th>Kabve 3</th>
<th>Tengezai 1</th>
<th>Tengezai 2</th>
<th>Tengezai 3</th>
<th>Tengezai 4</th>
<th>Tengezai 5</th>
<th>Nkamupi 1</th>
<th>Nkamupi 2</th>
<th>Nkamupi 3</th>
<th>Nkamupi 4</th>
<th>Garawiri</th>
<th>Nhamhenwa 1</th>
<th>Nhamhenwa 2</th>
<th>Nhamhe 1</th>
<th>Nhamhe 2</th>
<th>Renguro</th>
<th>Chitungwe</th>
<th>Nyanga</th>
<th>Boveta</th>
<th>Manjareja</th>
<th>Nkamupi 1</th>
<th>Nyamakumba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Elephant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<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>Antelope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet animal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild pig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Tortoise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Chivi animal occurrences

a) monochrome figures; b) bi-chrome figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS</th>
<th>Ziyurava</th>
<th>Zveungurumi</th>
<th>Sedza</th>
<th>Manyame</th>
<th>Chemazizi</th>
<th>Mahonye</th>
<th>Chiruva</th>
<th>Mutyu</th>
<th>Chedzara</th>
<th>Davira</th>
<th>Gomuhuru</th>
<th>Mudadi</th>
<th>Mapovire</th>
<th>Mapovire 2</th>
<th>Mapovire 3</th>
<th>Masvura 1</th>
<th>Masvura 2</th>
<th>Masvura 3</th>
<th>Matirirano 1</th>
<th>Matirirano 2</th>
<th>Manyere 1</th>
<th>Manyere 2</th>
<th>Mashakatira</th>
<th>Chiome</th>
<th>Police Camp</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsessebe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope indet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelope</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflated snake + antelope</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/wild pig</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 12 3 39 14 14 5 3 1 7 13 17 1 7 8 15 6 4 15 7 11 7 2 211
b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS</th>
<th>Masinire</th>
<th>Chebvute</th>
<th>Mudadi</th>
<th>Mapuvire 1</th>
<th>Matsveru 2</th>
<th>Manyere 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope indet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small antelope</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate animal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10: Harare animal representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS</th>
<th>Glen Nora</th>
<th>Bridge sediments</th>
<th>Kamburuma 1</th>
<th>Kamburuma 2</th>
<th>Kamburuma 3</th>
<th>Kamburuma 4</th>
<th>Kamburuma 5</th>
<th>Kamburuma 6</th>
<th>Smeaby</th>
<th>Outlands 1</th>
<th>Outlands 2</th>
<th>Chivero 1</th>
<th>Chivero 2</th>
<th>Chivero 3</th>
<th>Chivero 4</th>
<th>Chivero 5</th>
<th>Rainham 1</th>
<th>Rainham 2</th>
<th>Stoneyburn hill</th>
<th>Epworth 4</th>
<th>Epworth 3</th>
<th>Epworth 2</th>
<th>Chedgleow</th>
<th>Mlizi 1</th>
<th>Mlizi 2</th>
<th>Mimosa 1</th>
<th>Mimosa 2</th>
<th>Mimosa 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboons/</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkeys</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudu</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebras</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsessebe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinoceros</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippo</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indet animal</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** = 641
## ANIMALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROCK ART SITES</th>
<th>Glen Nora</th>
<th>Bridge ministries</th>
<th>Kilworth 1</th>
<th>Kilworth 2</th>
<th>Kilworth 3</th>
<th>Kirworth 4</th>
<th>Kilworth 5</th>
<th>Somerby</th>
<th>Oatlands 1</th>
<th>Oatlands 2</th>
<th>Chivero 1</th>
<th>Chivero 2</th>
<th>Chivero 3</th>
<th>Chivero 4</th>
<th>Rainham 1</th>
<th>Rainham 2</th>
<th>Stonehurst hill</th>
<th>Epworth 4</th>
<th>Epworth 1</th>
<th>Rhodia</th>
<th>Prospect farm</th>
<th>Epworth 2</th>
<th>Chedgleow</th>
<th>Mlizi 1</th>
<th>Mlizi 2</th>
<th>Minosa 1</th>
<th>Minosa 2</th>
<th>Minosa 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflated snake + antelope</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>wild pig</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Crocodile/ reptile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Wildebeest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Aardvark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Wild dog/jackal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Tortoise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<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>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Distribution of some human motifs in Zimbabwe (map by R Kapumha).

The demarcations denote areas of concentration of these motifs.
Appendix 12: Distribution of animal motifs in Zimbabwe (map by R. Kapumha)

The demarcations denote areas of concentration of these motifs
Appendix 13: Plant motif distribution in Zimbabwe (map by R Kapumha)

The demarcations motifs
Appendix 14: Finger-painted images, possibly from the farming period
a) Spread-eagled design; b) indeterminate animal
Appendix 15: Plant species mentioned in the text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Shona/Ndebele</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia polyvacantha subsp. campylacantha,</td>
<td>White thorn</td>
<td>Munanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adansonia digitata,</td>
<td>Baobab</td>
<td>Muyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allophylus alnifolius</td>
<td>Lowveld false-currant</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androstachys johnsonii</td>
<td>Lebombo ironwood</td>
<td>Musimbiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berchemia discolor</td>
<td>Bird-plum</td>
<td>Munhacha/Umnccaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivinia jalbertii</td>
<td>Cobweb seed</td>
<td>Mutuputupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachylaena huilensis</td>
<td>silver oak</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachystegia bohemii</td>
<td>Prince of Wales' feathers</td>
<td>Mupfuti/Itshabela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachystegia glaicescens,</td>
<td>Mountain acacia</td>
<td>Muche/Umbeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachystegia spiciformis</td>
<td>bean-pod tree</td>
<td>Musasa/Igonde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassipourea congoensis</td>
<td>Onionwood</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophospermum mopane</td>
<td>Mopane</td>
<td>Mupani/Iphane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commiphora mosambicensis</td>
<td>Pepper-leaved corkwood</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordia Africana</td>
<td>Large-leaved saucer-berry</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croton sylvaticus</td>
<td>forest fever berry</td>
<td>Mavvakata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialiopsis Africana</td>
<td>Velvet-fruit zanha</td>
<td>Muchenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicliptera spinulosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dombeya rotundifolia</td>
<td>Wild pear</td>
<td>Matongotowa/Umwane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovyalis zeyheri,</td>
<td>Oval kei-apple</td>
<td>Matsvoritoto/Umqokolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficus verruculosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcinia buchananii</td>
<td>Granite mangosteen</td>
<td>Mutunduru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardenia resiniflua</td>
<td>Gummy gardenia</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grewia flavescens</td>
<td>Sandpaper raisin</td>
<td>Mubhununu/Umtewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homalium dentatum</td>
<td>Brown-ironwood</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jalbernadia globiflora</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manhondo/Umshonkwie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkia acuminata,</td>
<td>White syringa</td>
<td>Mubvumira/Uvwumile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimusops zeyheri</td>
<td>Red milkwood</td>
<td>Muchechete/Umumbula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parinari curatellifolia</td>
<td>Mobola plum</td>
<td>Muchakata/Umkhuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piliostigma thonningii</td>
<td>Monkey bread</td>
<td>Musekese/1habahaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pterocarpus rotundifolius</td>
<td>Round-leaved bloodwood</td>
<td>Munungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoicissus revolei,</td>
<td>Bushveld grape</td>
<td>Mudzambirirga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schotia brachypetala,</td>
<td>African walnut</td>
<td>Matondosvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sclerocarya caffra</td>
<td>Marula</td>
<td>Mupfura/Umganu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strychos hennigii</td>
<td>coffee bean strychnos</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabernaemontana elegans,</td>
<td>Toad-tree</td>
<td>Muchanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminalia gazensis</td>
<td>Fringe-leaved cluster-leaf</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminalia sericea</td>
<td>Silver cluster-leaf</td>
<td>Mukomono/Umgwwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uapaca kirkiana</td>
<td>Mahobohobo</td>
<td>Muchanje/Umbobohobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitex payos merr</td>
<td>Chocolate berry</td>
<td>Mahbvu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ximenia caffra Sond</td>
<td>Sourplum</td>
<td>Munhengeni/Unthunduluka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>