

Human Modifications to the Landscape of Hunt and Sheep Mountains, Wyoming: Exploring Socially Constructed Space

Ralph J. Hartley and Anne M. Wolley Vawser

Midwest Archeological Center
National Park Service
Lincoln, NE USA
Ralph_Hartley@nps.gov

Abstract

The cultural topography of two adjacent mountain tops in the northern Bighorn mountain range of the state of Wyoming, USA, is examined through several field and computer aided techniques. Socially constructed space, as reflected in cumulative architectural features through time, was initially revealed by high resolution aerial photography of the mountain tops. Features observed included clusters of stone circles, solitary rock structures commonly known as vision quests, and various sized rock cairns. Field mapping of all features with high resolution GPS allowed exploratory analysis of spatial relationships of stone circles using categorical data and tessellation models in GIS. The variation in placement of rock structures and directional alignments by vision seekers on Sheep Mountain vs. Hunt Mountain is explored through cumulative viewshed analysis also in GIS.

1 Introduction

The use of high altitude mountain environments by pre-contact and historic Native American groups in western North America is a theme of archaeological investigation that is grounded in the anthropological implications of adaptation to harsh landscapes. The terrain of Hunt and Sheep mountains (2800-3100 m) in the Bighorn National Forest of northern Wyoming is a topographically bounded environment that has been used intensively since prehistoric times and has avoided intrusive or destructive archaeological investigation (Figure 1). Low-level, high-resolution, aerial photography of these mountain tops, flown at approximately 762 m above ground surface, revealed the extent of

numerous above-ground rock structures and alignments. In 2003, these two mountains were surveyed for above-ground features of human construction or alteration. The proximity of these mountains to the Big Horn Medicine Wheel (48BH302), a site of sacredness and assigned spiritual power, as well as their topographical situation in the greater surrounding landscape, lends significance to these material remains for northwestern Plains Indian individuals, societies, and, concomitantly, public land management (Campbell and Foor 2004).

Hunt and Sheep mountains are examples of cultural topographies that are subject to dynamics, from a materialist




Figure 1. Topography surrounding Sheep and Hunt mountains, Bighorn National Forest.



Figure 2. Examples of architectural remains recorded on Sheep and Hunt mountains. Left to right: stone circle, rock structure, rock cairn.

perspective, that form the attachment attributed to these places by indigenous peoples for centuries. Such established settings, construed socio-culturally as a category of “perceived social facts,” emerge and maintain social impact due to being collectively recognized (Stokals and Shumaker 1981). Recognition that the socio-cultural meanings associated with a place are often perceived as binding agents between individuals or groups and a particular environment is pertinent to observations of surface material on Hunt and Sheep mountains. The life history of a place in these settings can yield an introduced landmark where particular activities or interactions occurred (Zedeno 2000:106; Sundstrom 2003; Whitridge 2004; Stewart et al. 2004). The distinctiveness of such a place may be due to not only physical features but to personal or emotional attachment felt toward the place. The environments of Hunt and Sheep mountains exemplify landscapes that, in the words of McGlade (1999:459), should be characterized “as a dynamic arena in which interpretation and reinterpretation are seen as vital parts of the creation of cultural knowledge.”

The conundrum confronting a description of the cultural topography of Hunt and Sheep mountains from the materialistic metaphysic that underlies archaeology is that the reality of the phenomena of interest is characterized by a continual process of human induced change. Moreover, the complexities inherent in the formation of the evolving natural landscape is beyond the bounds of the examination presented here but potentially addressable by way of intensive investigation into those formation processes that are recognized to be potentially influential in human use of places through time. In the attempt here to explore the structure of these assigned units in space we, in effect, hold time constant (Wandsnider 1998a; 1998b).

Examining socially constructed space as reflected in cumulative material features on these two mountains necessitates a variety of approaches when attempting to posit generalizations about variation in the life history of places that functioned in social behavior. Deriving meaningful patterns in an archaeological record formed by the interaction of cultural and natural processes is inherently a subjective enterprise. It is acknowledged that the categorization of our observations on these mountains for use as analytic units may not be shared by others seeing the same physical landscape, an issue of measurement not unfamiliar in social science (Golledge and Stimpson 1997:400-405).

The objective mode of the data-led inquiry taken in this study allowed for the pursuit of three overarching goals: (I) the assessment of variation in clusters of circles of stone as a function of the number and sizes of stone circles; (II)

the assessment, using quantitative analyses of viewshed, of variation in the placement of structural features of rock on these mountain landscapes; (III) the attempt to frame direction for research that has the potential to build on the exploratory analyses described in this study.

2 Approach

Field observations of architectural remains on Hunt and Sheep mountains were recorded as 1) circles of stone or rock, or 2) rock structures that include non-circular alignments and stacked rock cairns (Figure 2). The data derived from the information collected allow for exploratory procedures that are informed by ethnohistoric and ethnographic descriptions.

2.1 Stone Circles

Thousands of stone circles are documented in the plains and mountain environments of North America. A total of 87 were mapped on Hunt (n= 72) and Sheep (n= 15) mountains for this study. Ethnohistoric and ethnographic accounts suggest that prior to efficient means of making wooden pegs, Native Americans used rock, and sometimes logs, to anchor tent coverings. Clusters of circles of large but portable stone are assumed to reflect tent camps. Use of the term “tipi ring” to describe a circle of stones in this study is avoided following Brassler (1982:313) because the implication of function narrows its utility as a unit of analysis.

Five clusters of stone circles were mapped on Hunt and Sheep mountains (Figures 3 and 4). For the purposes of this study, we consider these clusters (A-E) as “camp locales,” the topographical setting at which episodes of camping occurred. We assume that it was highly probable that these five places were used for temporary camps intermittently through time (cf. Adams 2002). The stone circles in these camp locales may be the remains of untold episodes of tent camping, forming what Schlanger (1992) has termed a “persistent place” on the landscape. The validity of camp locales as a “formal unit” of analysis is, therefore, definitely lacking (Wandsnider 1998b:94). Nevertheless, for the purposes of examining variation in the past use of settings of presumed residence on these mountains, the spatial content of clusters of stone circles permits means of exploratory analysis.

Circles of stone were defined by their arrangement on the ground surface, a sometimes subjective field task given the geomorphology of the Bighorn Mountains at high altitude.




Figure 3. Archeological features and camp locales, Sheep Mountain.




Figure 4. Archeological features and camp locales, Hunt Mountain.

Many stone circles were, however, well delineated, or could be identified with the help of the high-resolution aerial photography. All stone circles were mapped using a Trimble Pathfinder Power Pro GPS unit providing sub-meter accuracy. Locations of any observable concentrations of surface stone both within the circles and outside of the circles were also recorded. An interior vs. exterior set of rock were discerned at 41% of the stone circles documented on Hunt and Sheep mountains.

The diameter of the 87 stone circles varied widely. A search of ethnographic and ethnohistoric literature of the Northern Plains brought Quigg and Brumley (1984:17-20, 30) to suggest that size of tents varied due to function, the number of inhabitants when used as a residence, the socio-economic status of the inhabitants, and available transport options. Concentrations of tents used during any one camp episode may reflect kin groups or band proximity (cf. Binford 1991; Whitelaw 1991:151-165). These sources indicate that the layout of a camp was highly situational. Topography and the resource structure surrounding the site setting is acknowledged to often dictate the arrangement of tents (Reher 1983; Quigg and Brumley 1984:18-20; Banks and Snortland 1995). Cross-cultural information suggests, however, that distance between units of residence or camp activities has the potential to inhibit or facilitate interaction between individuals or groups. The ethnographic and ethnohistoric sources for this region suggest that larger tents were more likely to have served as familial residences or for ceremonies whereas nearby smaller tents were likely used for women's domestic activities, small family units, or lone individuals.

A common unit of measure for stone circles by archaeologists is diameter (e.g., Finnigan 1982; Winham 1982; Davis 1983; Quigg and Brumley 1984:84; Brumley and Dau 1988:329-331; Hanna 1991). Both the inside of the circle and the exterior limit of rock are often measured. A rationale for the interior vs. exterior measure is that the more interior rock reflects use for a tent lining. Quigg and Brumley (1984:40) note that the interior diameter of the circle is most representative of the living or activity area of the tent given ethnographic and ethnohistoric descriptions. For the purpose of this study, we use the area of the interior of stone circles in square meters for analyses.¹ This data was derived in ArcGIS (v.8.3) from the imported GPS data. This measure is considered a conservative estimate of the living or activity space within a tent.

The total population of stone circles was divided into quintiles to establish size classes I-V (Table 1). This categorical data permits the description of the relationships between

Table 1. Size Classes for Stone Circles on Hunt and Sheep Mountains.

Size Class	Area (m ²)
I	6.5 – 12.10
II	12.11 - 15.20
III	15.21 - 18.40
IV	18.41 - 21.25
V	21.26 - 38.00



Figure 5. Rock structures, commonly considered places of a vision quest, were observed consisting of both stacked (left in oval) and un-stacked rock (right).

camp locales and stone circle size classes. Furthermore, it provides a means by which to evaluate the extent to which the spatial distribution of larger stone circles conditions the observed location of smaller circles at each camp locale.

2.2 Rock Structures

Rock structures and alignments other than circles were observed on both Hunt and Sheep mountains. Similar to the stone circles, their location as well as the extent, when possible, was recorded with high-accuracy GPS. Structural enclosures of rock, commonly considered the place of Native American “vision quests” were observed consisting of both stacked and unstacked rock alignments (Figure 5). Twenty-two of these features were documented on Sheep Mountain and 11 on Hunt Mountain. Primarily a solitary male activity, vision seekers often constructed a semi-circular or U-shaped rock enclosure in which to reside for extended periods of time.² Efforts to transcend the material world in search of power and enlightenment may have required several consecutive days and nights of physical deprivation at the place (Lowie 1922; Benedict 1922; Dugan 1985; Hultkrantz 1987:51-56; Irwin 1994). Enclosures were often oriented to or have an expansive view of the rising or setting of the sun or a sacred peak. Lowie (1922:332), describing a typical vision seeking experience among the Crow, writes “The faster was virtually naked, using a buffalo skin for a blanket at night. According to Flat-head-woman, he would lie on his back with legs stretched out, the arms extended at the sides and facing east all night; his bedding was framed by rocks on both sides.” The situational positioning of these enclosures on high mountains, however, often enabled the occupier a panoramic view. Evaluating consistency in the orientation and extent of all enclosures considered places of vision quests is conducted here as a means of examining one dimension of variability in the presumed use of these places.

Narrowly-stacked rock, considered cairns (Sheep, $n = 3$; Hunt, $n = 5$) were also noted and recorded on both mountains (see Figure 2).³ Rock stacked high enough to be seen from some distance can serve as a landmark for which function is highly situational (e.g., Caldwell and Carlson 1954; Malouf 1962; Jett 1986). In addition to use by Native Americans, the erection of cairns by herders, as survey markers, and for

mining claims is known throughout the intermountain west. Landmarks are often distinctive, its recall being dependent on its contrast to the surroundings. The human formation of cognitive maps may be highly dependent on hierarchically structured landmarks serving as cues in an environment (Kaplan and Kaplan 1982:45-47, 57-59; Kitchin and Blades 2003:35-40, 42-43). Some cairns constructed by pre-contact and historic Native Americans in the northern Plains and Rocky Mountains are believed to have been associated with trails as well as places of vision quests, burials, pilgrimages, or villages (Adams 1978:13-14, 16, 60-64; Loendorf and Brownell 1980; Winham 1982; Platt 1992; Reeves 2003:363-365; Sundstrom 2003:270-271).

3 Analysis and Results

3.1 Stone Circles

Correspondence analysis, as an exploratory procedure (SPSS 11.5), was selected in order to describe relationships between the distribution of sizes of stone circles [SIZE CLASS] and camp locales [CAMPS]. Correspondence analysis (CA) serves to explore the relational structure of rows and columns of a contingency table. The method, increasingly used in archaeology, allows for the factoring of categorical variables and displaying them in a space that maps their geometric association in two dimensions (Blasius 1994; Baxter 1994; Cool and Baxter 1995; Shennan 1997). In our study, evaluation of full input data suggests substantive variation in the data set when total inertia is 0.298 ($X^2 = 25.95$, $df = 16$, $p = 0.05$) (Table 2). Figure 6 shows the plot of the correspondence analysis (CA) of the two variables using the symmetrical normalization method. The first two dimensions of the correspondence table explain 95.4% of the 29.8% of the variation explained by the model. Camp Locale B contributes the greatest inertia (variance) to Dimension 1, whereas the largest of the stone circles, Size Class V, accounts for by far the greatest inertia of the column points in both Dimensions 1 and 2. The lower left quadrant is defined by Camp Locales C and E, both highly concentrated sets of stone circles on Hunt Mountain. Although one must keep in mind that the inter-category distances on the map display are not measures of association, some generalizations can

be made, nevertheless. That is, the three camp locales on Hunt Mountain are more similar in terms of the distribution of stone circle sizes than those on Sheep Mountain.

Similarities and differences in camp locales were further examined by establishing the mean of each size class distribution within each of the five camp locales. Figure 7 shows the difference in stone circle size distribution between Camp Table 2. *Correspondence Diagnostics for SIZE CLASS and CAMPS.*

	Quantity ^a	Mass ^b	Inertia ^c	Dimen.1 ^d	Dimen.2 ^d
A	.918	.092	.068	.493	.425
B	.985	.080	.134	.985	.000
C	.996	.241	.047	.275	.721
D	.856	.264	.039	.049	.806
E	.967	.322	.010	.068	.899
I	1.0	.195	.092	.244	.755
II	.835	.195	.029	.467	.368
III	.742	.207	.031	.241	.500
IV	.871	.195	.007	.088	.783
V	1.0	.207	.139	.988	.012

^a A proportion of variance statistic indicating how well a point is represented by the first two dimensions.

^b Marginal proportion of the variable used to weight the point profile when computing point distance.

^c A variance measure of the distance from the average weighted by its mass.

^d Proportion of inertia accounted for by each axis as a squared correlation.




Figure 6. Correspondence analysis of sizes of stone circles with camp locales (1st and 2nd axes).

Locales A and B on Sheep Mountain relative to those on Hunt Mountain. Greater uniformity in both stone circle size classes and distribution are indicated on Hunt Mountain.

Spatial relations between stone circle units at each camp locale were explored in ArcGIS using tessellation models. This procedure uses an algorithm of Voronoi tessellation that divides a plane into polygons, in this study one for each Class V stone circle. A mosaic of tiles imposed over the area of interest is formed, commonly known as Dirichlet tiles, Thiessen or Voronoi polygons (Upton and Fingleton 1985:96-104; Haining 1990:20, 101-110; Halls et al. 2001). The spatial extent of each camp locale was apportioned into spaces, such that each Class V (largest) stone circle functioned as nuclei by which tessellation procedures forming polygons were constructed (Figures 8 through 12). Each polygon is conceptualized as a space oriented to a particular large stone circle with the position of other smaller stone circles designated as nearer to a given Class V stone circle than any other. These boundaries allow us to visualize the proximity of smaller to that of larger stone circles as well as the arrangement of Class V stone circles throughout a camp locale. The high-resolution aerial photographs on which the camp locales are depicted provide proximity information to topographic features.

Table 3 consists of measures for all polygons in each camp locale for which Size Class I-IV stone circles are in proximity to the Class V stone circle node of that polygon. Camp Locales A and C each contain one polygon in which no smaller stone circles were observed in proximity to the Class V stone circle node.

Five stone circles from the overall population were deleted from this summary table: three Size Class I stone circles, one each from Camp Locales A, B, and E, and two Class IV stone circles, one each from Camp Locales B and E. These stone circles were not included here due to their extreme distance (ca.100m) from a Class V stone circle node. The scale of the Camp Locale D map, relative to all others, accounts for the greater distance between many of the stone circles in that area. What may be of interest here is the distance between two clusters of stone circles, north and south, irrespective of polygon boundaries. A more intensive examination of the spatial content of this area would include isolating these clusters as separate camp locales.

The assumption that the stone circles at these camp locales reveal the remains of several camping episodes through generations contributes greatly to the “noise” in proximity patterning between class sizes of documented stone circles. Nevertheless, Camp Locale C on Hunt Mountain depicts an arrangement where, for the most part, the smaller the stone circle, the closer it is to a large stone circle. Although no overall pattern is readily apparent at the other four camp locales, at least one small stone circle is positioned adjacent to many of the Class V stone circle nodes. Further revealed by the maps of camp locales is the proximity of clusters of stone circles to variably deep crevices, especially at Camp Locales D, E, and A. The north cluster of Camp Locale D stands out as a prototype for locating tents in the summer season near what may have been a source of water by way of pockets of snow in the deep crevices (cf. Kehoe 1960:436; Dooley 2004:108).




Figure 7. Distribution of mean Stone Circle Size Classes at each camp locale.




Figure 8. Camp Locale A showing distribution of stone circles and polygon boundaries.




Figure 9. Camp Locale B showing distribution of stone circles and polygon boundaries.




Figure 10. Camp Locale C showing distribution of stone circles and polygon boundaries.

Table 3. Mean Proximity (meters) of Class V Stone Circles to Smaller Stone Circles by Camp Locale.

CAMP LOCALE	I	II	III	IV
A	-	36.5	56	28
B	-	30	8.5	-
C	13.5	17.5	25	21.25
D	69	54.8	52.5	45.8
E	16.5	17.5	14.75	14.33

3.2 Rock Structures

Wheatley and Gillings (2000) have argued that quantifying directionality is a means by which to elaborate on and differentiate viewshed. Assessing variability in directional line-of-sight and field-of-view (viewshed) from rock structures and alignments considered places used by vision seekers was conducted using GIS-based applications (ArcGIS v.8.3). The projected viewshed from each of the places of presumed vision quest was decomposed into eight




Figure 11. Camp Locale D showing distribution of stone circles and polygon boundaries.




Figure 12. Camp Locale E showing distribution of stone circles and polygon boundaries.

directional zones (Figure 13). The area of visibility for each zone extended to 4.828 km (3 miles) and was quantified in square meters. Vertical height from which view is calculated is one meter. Elevational view from this point is 90 degrees (+45 to -45 degrees from horizontal), permitting the inclusion of the area below the position of the structures on mountain tops.

A comparison of the places used by vision seekers on Hunt and Sheep mountains suggests that an easterly view was available to vision seekers on Sheep Mountain (Figure 14). The placement of structures on Hunt Mountain

permitted a more westerly view (Figure 15). The difference in natural topography of these two mountain tops contributes to this difference to some extent. However, decision-making of the vision seekers in locating their structures accounts for the variance when the summarized viewshed is quantified. Figure 16 shows the variation in directional view between structures on the two mountains. What appear to be somewhat recently constructed places of vision quests on Sheep Mountain contributes greatly to the summarized easterly view available from structures on this mountain (Figure 17).

4 In Pursuit of Pattern Perception

Constructing a model of place-specific activities having occurred in the past is, as Binford (2001:482) has noted, vastly different and more difficult than searching for an explanation of variability in the archaeological record. The static nature of the observations examined spatially on Hunt and Sheep mountains permits only conjectural reasoning about the distribution and use of human-made features. As emphasized by McGlade (1995:113, also see Kosso 1991:625), meaning assigned to human-made features observed in an archaeological context “resides in a perceptive relativistic and observer-dependent domain,” insight that should not be ignored in studies of cultural topography. Exploratory procedures with the categorical data and visualization constructed here do not permit inductive inferences to be made about the decision-making that resulted in these places being chosen for occupation or otherwise used in the past (Fotheringham et al. 2000:185-188; cf. Taylor 1977:149; Binford 1990:120; Goodchild 1996:245). We can, however, propose some questions resulting from the apparent similarities and differences in these features and locations that can be pursued with a goal of establishing empirical models that attempt to illustrate the complexity of relationships in the use of these places through time.

A wide array of environmental and topographic variables is considered by many researchers in both ethnography and archaeology to have influenced decision-making in camp placement (Kehoe 1960; Reher 1983; Quigg and Brumley 1984; Banks and Snortland 1995; Dooley 2004). What were the conditions characteristic of Hunt Mountain that made it more amenable to camping activities relative to those of Sheep Mountain?

Eleven stone circle sites were observed to have lithic and/or ceramic artifacts within the circle and 14 had cultural material adjacent to the circle. Rock concentrations were observed within the center of 23 stone circles of various sizes on Hunt Mountain and six on Sheep Mountain. Excavation of stone circles in other areas of the Northern Plains revealed these rocks to be often the remains of lined hearths (Winham 1982; Adams 2002). If, upon excavation, this were found to be the case on Hunt and Sheep Mountain, are rock-lined hearths placed within stone circles of any defined size range relative to other stone circles in a given camp locale? And do artifact assemblages recovered during excavation vary between those stone circles with defined hearths and those that do not reveal the remains of fire




Figure 13. Example of a rock structure on Sheep Mountain for which the area of visibility from that place was measured in eight directional zones.




Figure 14. A composite of viewsheds from documented places of vision quests on Sheep Mountain. Lighter shade values indicate greater commonality of view from these rock structures.




Figure 15. A composite of viewsheds from documented places of vision quests on Hunt Mountain. Lighter shade values indicate greater commonality of view from these rock structures.




Figure 16. Variation in area of view (m²) between places of vision quests on Sheep and Hunt mountains.



Figure 17. What appears to be a recently constructed, northeast facing, place of vision quest on Sheep Mountain. Note the remains of a cloth wrapped hoop in the foreground.

hearths? Do those stone circles lying far beyond the apparent concentration of Camp Locales A, B, and E reveal similarities or differences in structural morphology or cultural material relative to stone circles of similar size in the nearest camp locale?

Ethnographic and ethnohistoric sources suggesting preference for sunrise or sunset view by vision seekers is supported by the analyses of presumed places of vision quests on these two mountain tops. These sources also suggest that, in the past, these places were often re-used, resulting in what Reeves (2003:236) calls archaeologically “composite structures.” Did repeated use of structures by vision seekers result in a morphology of rock stacking and alignment that differs from that of contemporary places of vision quests?

End Notes

¹ Interpretations of the absence of stone in a portion of a circle as observed on the surface range from being a “doorway” for the tent to “rock robbing” for re-use of stone from a previous camping episode, i.e., “scavenging.” Likewise, clusters or “loading” of stone in the morphology of a circle are sometimes interpreted as reflecting the orientation of the tent to the prevailing winds during a particular season (e.g., Calder 1979; Adams 1978, 2002; Winham 1982; Finnigan 1983; Quigg and Brumley 1984; Brumley and Dau 1988; Hanna 1991).

² Adult women were also known to seek and have vision experiences in some Native American Plains groups (Lowie 1922:332; Irwin 1994:80-81).

³ In some cases, identifying cairns is a highly subjective decision. Collapsed, narrowly-stacked rock enclosures, once used by vision seekers, may appear to be eroded “cairns” and documented as such (Reeves 2003:363-365; Sundstrom 2003:271).

References Cited

Adams, Gary. 1978. Tipi Rings in Southern Alberta: the Alkali Creek Sites, Lower Red Deer River. Archaeological Survey of Alberta Occasional Paper No. 9. Edmonton, Alberta.

Adams, Gary. 2002. New tools for understanding Plains Indian sites in Grasslands National Park, Canada. In, *Archaeological Informatics: Pushing the Envelope*. Goran Burenholt, ed. pp. 335-339. Oxford: BAR International Series No. 1016.

Banks, Kimball M. and Snortland, Signe J. 1995. Every picture tells a story: Historic images, tipi camps, and archaeology. *Plains Anthropologist* 40:125-144.

Baxter, Jorg. 1994. *Exploratory Multivariate Analysis in Archaeology*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Benedict, Ruth E. 1922. The vision in Plains culture. *American Anthropologist* 24:1-23.

Binford, Lewis R. 1990. Mobility, housing, and environment: A comparative study. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 46:119-152.

Binford, Lewis R. 1991. When the going gets tough, the tough get going: Nunamiut local groups, camping patterns and economic organization. In, *Ethnoarchaeological Approaches to Mobile Campsites*. C. S. Gamble and W.A. Boismier, eds., pp. 25-137. Ann Arbor, Michigan: International Monographs in Prehistory,

Binford, Lewis R. 2001. *Constructing Frames of Reference*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Blasius, Jorg. 1994. Correspondence analysis in social science research. In, *Correspondence Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Michael Greenacre and Jorg Blasius, eds., pp. 23-52. London: Academic Press.

Brasser, Ted J. 1982. The Tipi as an element in the emergence of historic Plains Indian nomadism. *Plains Anthropologist* 27:309-321.

Brumley, John H. and Dau, Barry J. 1988. *Historical Resource Investigations within the Forty Mile Coulee Reservoir*. Edmonton, Alberta: Archaeological Survey of Alberta No. 13.

Calder, J. M. 1979. *Archaeology in Southern Alberta: Stone Circles at Chin Coulee*. Edmonton, Alberta: Archeological Survey of Alberta Occasional Paper No. 13

Caldwell, Warren and Roy L. Carlson. 1954. Further documentation of “Stone Piling” during the Plateau vision quest. *American Anthropologist* 56:441-442.

- Campbell, Gregory R. and Foor, Thomas A. 2004. Entering sacred landscapes—cultural expectations versus legal realities in the northwestern Plains. *Great Plains Quarterly* 24:163-183.
- Cool, Hilary E. M. and Baxter, Mike J. 1995. Finds from the fortress: artifacts, buildings and correspondence analysis. In, *Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology 1993*. John Wilcock and Kris Lockyear, eds., pp. 177-182. Oxford: BAR International Series No. 598.
- Davis, William E. 1983. A morphological analysis of stone circles from the Copper Mountain Project, Shoshoni, Wyoming. *Plains Anthropologist* 28:71-79.
- Dooley, Mathew A. 2004. Long-term hunter-gatherer land use in central North Dakota: An environmental analysis. *Plains Anthropologist* 49:105-127.
- Dugan, Kathleen M. 1985. *The Vision Quest of the Plains Indians—Its Spiritual Significance*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Finnigan, James T. 1982. Tipi Rings and Plains Prehistory: A Reassessment of their Archaeological Potential. National Museum of Man Mercury Series. Ottawa: Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper No. 108.
- Finnigan, James T. 1983. Tipi to tipi ring: A transformational model. *Plains Anthropologist* 28:17-28.
- Fotheringham, A. Stewart, Brundson, Chris, and Charlton, Martin. 2000. *Quantitative Geography—Perspectives on Spatial Data Analysis*. London: Sage Pub.
- Golledge, Reginald G. and Stimson, Robert J. 1997. *Spatial Behavior—A Geographic Perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Goodchild, Michael F. 1996. Geographic Information Systems and Spatial Analysis in the Social Sciences. In, *Anthropology, Space, and Geographic Information Systems*. Mark Aldenderfer and Herbert D.G. Maschner, eds., pp. 241-250. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haining, Robert. 1990. *Spatial Data Analysis in the Social and Environmental Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halls, P. J., Bulling, M., White, P. C. L., Garland, L., and Harris, S. 2001. Dirichlet neighbours: revisiting Dirichlet Tessellation for neighbourhood analysis. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 25:105-117.
- Hanna, Donald T. 1991. Architectural variability in prehistoric stone circles near Empress, Alberta. In, *Archaeology in Alberta 1988 and 1989*. Martin Magne, eds., pp. 173-198. Edmonton, Alberta: Provincial Museum of Alberta Occasional Paper No. 33.
- Hultkrantz, Ake. 1987. *Native Religions of North America—the Power of Visions and Fertility*. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Irwin, Lee. 1994. *The Dream Seekers—Native American Visionary Traditions of the Great Plains*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jett, Stephen C. 1986. Observations regarding Chartkoff's California "Rock Feature Complex". *American Antiquity* 51:615-616.
- Kaplan, Stephen and Kaplan, Rachel. 1982. *Cognition and Environment—Functioning in an Uncertain World*. New York: Ulrichs Books.
- Kehoe, Thomas F. 1960. Stone tipi rings in North-Central Montana and the adjacent portion of Alberta, Canada: their historical, ethnological and archaeological aspects. In, *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 173*, pp. 417-474. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Anthropological Paper No. 62.
- Kitchin, Rob and Mark Blades. 2003. *The Cognition of Geographic Space*. London: I.B. Tauris and Co.
- Kosso, Peter. 1991. Method in archaeology: Middle-range theory as hermeneutics. *American Antiquity* 56:621-627.
- Loendorf, Lawrence and Brownell, Joan Louise. 1980. *The Bad Pass Trail*. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota.
- Lowie, Robert H. 1922. *The religion of the Crow Indians*. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*. Vol. XXV, Pt.2. New York: American Museum Press.
- Malouf, Carling. 1962. Stone Piles. *Archaeology in Montana* 3(4):1-4.
- McGlade, James. 1995. Archaeology and the ecodynamics of human-modified landscapes. *Antiquity* 69:113-132.
- McGlade, James. 1999. Archaeology and the evolution of cultural landscapes: Towards an interdisciplinary research agenda. In, *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape—Shaping your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds., pp. 458-482. London: Routledge.
- Platt, Steve. 1992. *Trails and Aboriginal Land Use in the Northern Bighorn Mountains, Wyoming*. M.A. thesis, University of Montana, Missoula.
- Quigg, J. Michael and Brumley, John H. 1984. *Stone Circles: A Review Appraisal and Future Directions*. Bismark, ND: State Historical Society of North Dakota.
- Reeves, Brian O.K. 2003. *Mistakis—The Archaeology of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park*. Vol. I. Denver, CO: National Park Service.

- Reher, Charles A. 1983. Analysis of spatial structure in stone circle sites. *Plains Anthropologist* 28:192-222.
- Schlanger, Sarah H. 1992. Recognizing persistent places in Anasazi settlement systems. In, *Space, Time, and Archaeological Landscapes*. Jacqueline Rossignol and LuAnn Wandsnider, eds., pp. 91-112. New York: Plenum Press.
- Shennan, Stephen. 1997. *Quantifying Archaeology*. 2nd Ed. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press.
- Stewart, Andrew M., Keith, Darren, and Scottie, Joan. 2004. Caribou crossings and cultural meanings: Placing traditional knowledge and archaeology in context in an Inuit landscape. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 11:183-211.
- Stokals, Daniel and Shumaker, Sally Ann. 1981. People in places: A transactional view of settings. In, *Cognition, Social Behavior, and the Environment*. John H. Harvey, ed., pp. 441-488. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Ass.
- Sundstrom, Linea. 2003. Sacred islands: Religion and landscape in the Northern Great Plains. In, *Islands on the Plains – Ecological, Social, and Ritual use of Landscapes*. Marcel Kornfeld and Alan J. Osborn, eds., pp. 258-300. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Taylor, Peter J. 1977. *Quantitative Methods in Geography: An Introduction to Spatial Analysis*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Upton, Graham J. G. and Fingleton, Bernard. 1985. *Spatial Data Analysis by Example*. Vol. I. Point Pattern and Quantitative Data. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wandsnider, LuAnn. 1998a. Landscape element configuration, lifespace, and occupation history: Ethnoarchaeological observations and archaeological applications. In, *Surface Archaeology*. Alan P. Sullivan III, ed., pp. 21-39. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Wandsnider, LuAnn. 1998b. Regional scale processes and archaeological landscape units. In, *Unit Issues in Archaeology*. Ann F. Ramenofsky and Anastasia Steffen, eds., pp. 87-102. Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah.
- Wheatley, David and Gillings, Mark. 2000. Vision, perception and GIS: Developing enriched approaches to the study of archaeological visibility. In, *Beyond the Map—Archaeology and Spatial Technologies*. Gary Lock, ed., pp. 1-27. Amsterdam: IOS Press.
- Winham, Peter. 1982. Stone Circle Sites. In, *Cultural Resource Investigations of the South Dakota Segment of the Northern Border Pipeline*. L. A. Hannus, ed., Volume 4, 23:1-74. Brookings, SD: South Dakota State University.
- Whitelaw, Todd. 1991. Some dimensions of variability in the social organization of community space among foragers. In, *Ethnoarchaeological Approaches to Mobile Campsites*. C.S. Gamble and M.A. Boismier, eds., pp. 139-188. Ann Arbor, Michigan: International Monographs in Prehistory.
- Whitridge, Peter. 2004. Landscapes, houses, bodies, things: “Place” and the archaeology of Inuit imaginaries. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 11:213-250.
- Zedeno, Maria Nieves. 2000. On what people make of places—a behavioral cartography. In, *Social Theory in Archaeology*. Michael B. Schiffer, ed., pp. 97-111. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.