

Age of Barrier Canyon-style rock art constrained by cross-cutting relations and luminescence dating techniques

Pederson, Joel L.; Chapot, Melissa S.; Simms, Steven R.; Sohbati, Reza; Rittenour, Tammy M.; Murray, Andrew Sean; Cox, Gary

Published in:
National Academy of Sciences. Proceedings

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1073/pnas.1405402111](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1405402111)

Publication date:
2014

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Pederson, J. L., Chapot, M. S., Simms, S. R., Sohbati, R., Rittenour, T. M., Murray, A. S., & Cox, G. (2014). Age of Barrier Canyon-style rock art constrained by cross-cutting relations and luminescence dating techniques. National Academy of Sciences. Proceedings, 111(36), 12986-12991. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1405402111

DTU Library

Technical Information Center of Denmark

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The age of Barrier Canyon-style rock art constrained by cross-cutting relations and new OSL dating techniques

Joel L. Pederson^a, Melissa S. Chapot^{a,b}, Steven R. Simms^c, Reza Sohbat^{d,e}, Tammy M. Rittenour^a, Andrew S. Murray^d, Gary Cox^f

^aDepartment of Geology, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322 ^bGeography and Earth Sciences, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, SY23 3DB, United Kingdom ^cDepartment of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology, Utah State University, Logan, Utah 84322 ^dNordic Lab. for Luminescence Dating, Dept. of Geoscience, Aarhus University, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark ^eCenter for Nuclear Technologies, Technical University of Denmark, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark ^fCanyonlands National Park, Moab, Utah 84532

Submitted to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

Rock art compels interest from both researchers and a broader public, inspiring many hypotheses about its cultural origin and meaning, but it is notoriously difficult to date numerically. Barrier Canyon-style (BCS) pictographs of the Colorado Plateau are among the most debated examples; hypotheses about its age span the entire Holocene epoch and previous attempts at direct radiocarbon dating have failed. We provide multiple age constraints through the use of cross-cutting relations and new and broadly applicable approaches in optically stimulated luminescence dating at the Great Gallery panel, the type-section of BCS art in Canyonlands National Park, southeastern Utah. Alluvial chronostratigraphy constrains the burial and exhumation of the alcove containing the panel, and limits are also set by our related research dating both a rockfall that removed some figures and the rock's exposure-duration before that time. Results provide a maximum possible age, a minimum age, and an exposure-time window for the creation of the Great Gallery panel, respectively. The only prior hypothesis not disproven is a late Archaic origin for BCS rock art, though our age result of ~1-1000 AD coincides better with the transition to and rise of the subsequent Fremont culture. This chronology is for the type-locality only, and variability in the age of other sites is likely. Nevertheless, results suggest that BCS rock art represents an artistic tradition that spanned cultures and the transition from foraging to farming in the region.

rock art | OSL dating | Colorado Plateau | Barrier Canyon style

INTRODUCTION

Archaeology is focused upon material records, contextualized in time. Rock art is a record with the potential to provide unique insight into the dynamics and evolution of culture, but it generally lacks stratigraphic or chronologic context. Interpretation of the origin and meaning of rock art is indirect at best, or simply speculative. In the case of some pictographs, pigments may include or have enough accessory carbon for AMS radiocarbon dating (1-4). In other special situations, such as caves, minimum age constraints have been obtained by various techniques of dating material that overlies or entombs rock art (5-7). Yet most rock art remains undatable and researchers rely upon stylistic comparison and indirect associations with artifacts at nearby sites (8,9). The case in point for this study is arguably the most compelling and debated rock art in the United States--the Barrier Canyon Style (BCS) of the Colorado Plateau. Previous attempts to derive an absolute chronology have failed and its age remains unknown, with widely ranging hypotheses that have remained untested until now.

The continued development of dating techniques offers new possibilities for hypothesis testing. The optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) signals from mineral grains make it possible to date the deposition of most sediment that is exposed to a few seconds of full sunlight before burial, and its use in the earth and cultural sciences has greatly increased (10,11). Amongst the latest applications of OSL are techniques dating the outer

surfaces of rock clasts that have become shielded from light, including those with archaeological context (12-15). Recent work has furthermore utilized the "bleaching" profile of decreasing luminescence signal towards the surface of rock in order to estimate exposure time to sunlight (16,17). Using these dating tools, we can constrain the age of rock art and gain new insight into past cultures and landscapes.

Here we synthesize results from three novel approaches to dating the type section of BCS art, the Great Gallery in Canyonlands National Park of southeastern Utah. Through dating the full alluvial stratigraphy and a rockfall event that both have incontrovertible cross-cutting relations with the rock art, and then by determining the exposure-duration of a painted rock surface, we greatly narrow the window of time when the rock art was created. These approaches do not require direct sampling of rock art, and have strong potential for application to other archaeological and surface-processes research. While our results are only for the type-section of BCS art, and chronological variability should be expected for the style across the region, they suggest that BCS art coincides with the transition to agriculture in the northern Colorado Plateau and may not have been limited to a specific archaeological culture.

BACKGROUND

Barrier Canyon style (BCS) rock art was recorded in the central Colorado Plateau by the Claflin Emerson Expedition in the 1920s (18), and defined as a style by Schaafsma (ref. 19). This distinctive rock art stands out from its sandstone canvas in sharp, ruddy relief and is grouped in panels of life-sized, mummy-like

Significance

Key physical relations between the famous Great Gallery rock art panel in Utah, stream deposits, and a rockfall that removed some art, allow us to disprove all but a late Archaic hypothesis for the age of this type-section of the Barrier Canyon style. Use of a new luminescence-profile technique on the same rockfall furthermore outlines a window of time ~1 to 1100 AD when the figures could have been painted, generally more recent than expected. Our study illustrates novel and widely applicable approaches for dating rock art that don't require destructive sampling, and results suggest that Barrier Canyon rock art persisted across the transition from the late Archaic into the agrarian Fremont culture in the American Southwest.

Reserved for Publication Footnotes

137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204




Fig. 1. Location of the Great Gallery study site near the geographic center of the region of Barrier Canyon style rock art (tinted in red and modified from ref. 30) in the Colorado Plateau (CP) of the western U.S. Location of the Pecos River (PR) Archaic style is marked on the inset map.




Fig. 2. Timeline spanning the past 12,000 years, illustrating: (A) prior hypotheses for the age and cultural affiliation of BCS rock art, notably excluding the Fremont culture, and with the Early Archaic hypothesis supported by radiocarbon constraints on Cowboy Cave (C.C.) figurines; and (B) new age constraints. The Great Gallery was created after stream incision removed T2 alluvium, which contributes to the Early Archaic hypothesis being improbable. The cross-cutting rock fall dated to AD ~1100 rules out the post-Fremont hypothesis. Finally, the exposure-duration from OSL-profile analysis provides a more specific time window of AD ~1-1100 when the rock art could have been made.

anthropomorphs, often accompanied by realistic representations of animals and organized in 3-dimensional displays. The figures were formed by a meticulous combination of rock pecking and application of multiple pigments (19,20). The Great Gallery is the type locality for the BCS (Fig. 1), and researchers have called it the most spectacular pictograph site in the United States (18). The many figures of the Great Gallery are arranged along the nearly 100 m length of a sandstone alcove, anchored by the distinctive “Holy Ghost and his attendants” (Fig. 3A below). Barrier Canyon rock art is commonly interpreted as shamanistic (20,21),



Fig. 3. (A) Part of the Great Gallery and the geomorphic relations constraining its age. The panel must have been created after incision of the T2 exposed the lower alcove wall and before the rockfall partly removed figures. The chronostratigraphy of the T2 exposure at this locality as well as the T1 Alcove site downstream are presented in the *Suppl Info*. Note sheeting joints producing generations of rockfalls. OSL exposure-duration analysis pertains to the surface with the lower part of figures broken off. An etched horizon along the base of the panel may be either from preferential weathering where the basal gravels of the T2 used to lie or coincident with the top of former T1 flood deposits providing a platform for creating the art. (B) View downstream from the Great Gallery to another T2 fill terrace remnant just downstream, confirming aggradation to a height above the figures at the end of T2 time. The T1y is a “younger” component of the inset T1 deposit.

although this is contested (22). Similarity to other neighboring, potentially contemporaneous, styles most notably includes the Esplanade style of Grand Canyon (ref. 23, included in BCS area of Fig. 1). In the San Juan River drainage to the southwest there are several Basketmaker II (early farmers 1500 BC – AD 400) styles known (20), including the San Juan Anthropomorphic style, which shows elements of similarity to BCS (21). Stylistic consistency perceived between BCS panels has raised the prospect that they were painted by a single person (19). On the other hand, as BCS rock art has been increasingly documented, variability in the style has increased, with Cole (ref. 24) identifying seven variants. Panels are often located in prominent view along the walls of major canyons and generally afforded exclusive locations where superposition by later styles was avoided. Yet, BCS art commonly shows modification and embellishment over time, and Cole (ref. 20) argues that this shows the panels were not “frozen in time”. Barrier Canyon style art may in fact span considerable time and cultures, but the ability to test such ideas hinges upon building directly-dated chronologies.

The age of BCS rock art has been estimated by indirect methods, including typological cross-dating, stylistic content, and by association with dated sites in the vicinity. These approaches are useful for framing models, but they cannot be empirically tested in the absence of numerical ages. In fact, there have been two prior attempts to directly date BCS art at the Great Gallery through AMS radiocarbon methods. Successful AMS dating of Fremont rock art in Canyonlands National Park (2) lead to attempts to date pigment from fallen talus blocks at the Great Gallery (25). Unfortunately, there is no organic binder in the pigment and contamination by ancient hydrocarbons and modern aqueous carbon from the sandstone bedrock produced variably old and young dates (26). A second attempt at direct radiocarbon

205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272

Table 1.

Table 1. Geochronology summary^a

OSL sample	Unit	Location-position ^b	Dose rate (Gy/ky)	De (Gy) ^c	Age model	Age (ka) ^d
USU-186	T1	Alcove upper	1.89 ±	0.10 1.45±	0.80 MAM	0.7± 0.21
USU-276	T1	Alcove middle, marker d	2.00 ±	0.11 2.46±	0.98 MAM	1.2± 0.28
USU-120	T1	High Cave top	1.82 ±	0.10 2.74±	1.28 MAM	1.5± 0.40
USU-275	T1	Alcove middle, marker c	2.17 ±	0.11 4.93±	1.90 MAM	2.2± 0.41
USU-118	T1	High Cave base	1.57 ±	0.09 3.87±	2.02 MAM	2.4± 0.70
USU-180	T1	South park base	1.82 ±	0.10 5.03±	2.18 MAM	2.7± 0.79
USU-185	T1	Alcove middle, marker b	1.83 ±	0.10 5.30±	1.01 MAM	2.9± 0.43
USU-184	T1	Alcove base	1.03 ±	0.06 3.15±	1.37 MAM	3.0± 0.79
USU-671sg	T2	Great Gallery Sect. B unit 8	3.17 ±	0.16 25.4±	4.43 MAM	8.0± 1.13
USU-670	T2	Great Gallery Sect. B unit 5	1.88 ±	0.10 20.0±	2.48 MAM	10.6± 1.32
USU-179	T2	South park top	1.80 ±	0.10 20.8±	2.81 MAM	11.6± 1.63
USU-178	T2	South park middle	1.69 ±	0.09 20.4±	2.93 MAM	12.1± 1.68
USU-272	T2	Rincon middle	1.45 ±	0.08 19.4±	2.97 MAM	13.3± 1.85
USU-668	T2	Great Gallery Sect. A unit 4	1.79 ±	0.09 18.1±	2.45 CAM	13.9± 1.51
USU-181	T2	Rincon base	1.12 ±	0.06 15.8±	4.18 MAM	14.2± 2.51
USU-669	T2	Great Gallery Sect. B unit 1	1.49 ±	0.08 24.3±	4.91 MAM	16.3± 2.49
Riso	Talu	Subtalus rock face	1.88 ±	0.08 1.67±	0.07 CAM	0.8± 0.06
USU-847sg	Talu	Subtalus sediment	1.88 ±	0.08 1.53±	0.11 MAM	0.8± 0.07
¹⁴ C sample				Calibrated ka BP		Age (ka) ^e
Beta #283086	Talu	Cottonwood leaf		0.87± 0.08		0.9± 0.08
Beta #244296	T1	Alcove upper, detrital twigs		1.04± 0.10		1.1± 0.10
Beta #239779	T1	Alcove middle, detrital twigs		1.49± 0.09		1.5± 0.09
Beta #280472 ^f	T2	South park middle ash horizon		9.75± 0.16		9.8± 0.16

dating was also undermined by a lack of carbon, but one sample produced a tenuously reported and uncertain calibrated age of AD ~900 (26).

Although there have been unpublished arguments made for a Late Pleistocene age of BCS art based on stylistic similarities to rock art on other continents, the focus has been on an origin in early or late Archaic time (Fig. 2), before the advent of the Fremont culture in Utah (AD 250-1300). Similarities to clay anthropomorphic figurines from nearby Walters Cave and Cowboy Cave in the headwaters above the Great Gallery, in a radiocarbon-dated stratigraphic context of 5600-5000 BC (calibrated), imply an early Archaic age for BCS art (27). Yet, this inferred age is much earlier than most other evidence for the age of BCS, and the deposits at both caves are mixed in nature (28), highlighting the need for more-direct dating of the rock art.

The most frequent chronology for BCS art places it in the late Archaic period, before the spread of farming, the bow and arrow, and the Fremont culture (19). This is based on the rarity of the bow and arrow in BCS art, superposition of Fremont style rock art over BCS art in a few cases, and similarity to the Pecos River style of the Rio Grande in western Texas (Fig. 1). Maize and the bow and arrow made their way into southern and central Utah by AD 1-100 (29), and the Pecos River style is directly radiocarbon dated to 2000-1000 BC (30), so we illustrate this

hypothesis in Figure 2 as ranging across those dates. Although late Archaic archaeological sites also have been used as evidence for the age of nearby BCS panels (19), sites from post-Archaic cultures are also common across the entire geographic range of the BCS. With a late Archaic age in mind, Cole (ref. 20) explores relationships between BCS and various Basketmaker II styles in the neighboring region, with a focus on interaction among peoples, while also noting affinities of BCS to Fremont rock art at a few sites. Thus, the cultural context of this rock art may be one of greater continuity and interaction than allowed in past conceptualizations.

A final, contrasting hypothesis is that at least some BCS art is post-Fremont (Fig. 2), associated with the Southwest kachina complex that was fully formed AD ~1400, based on iconography such as fox-pelt pendants important in Puebloan ritual (31). Manning (ref. 31) also makes the observation that the very preservation of the delicate art, sometimes in exposed locations, argues against great antiquity.

RESULTS

Maximum age constraint, terrace chronostratigraphy

The Great Gallery lies along a reach of Horseshoe-Barrier Creek that is carved in sandstone of the Jurassic Navajo Formation. Farther upstream, the relatively wide canyon bottom

409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476




Fig. 4. Chronostratigraphic cross-sections representing (A) late Pleistocene strath terraces and late Holocene paleoflood deposits of the upper reach of Barrier-Horseshoe Creek in Kayenta Formation bedrock, which transition downstream to (B) the fill terraces preserved within the Navajo sandstone reach including the Great Gallery. Central OSL and AMS radiocarbon ages are labeled in stratigraphic position.




Fig. 5. Normalized OSL signal with depth into the buried face of the rockfall clast (blue data points and model-fit line) and the local calibration sample with known exposure age (red data points and model-fit line), reported with analytical error, modified from ref. 16. During burial and dosing, the OSL signal accumulated over time towards a saturated level set by crystallographic characteristics. During exposure, liberation (bleaching) of the OSL signal penetrates into rock at a rate that decreases exponentially. The rock surface some Great Gallery figures were painted upon had been exposed for only several centuries (713 yr model result from bleaching to dashed blue line) prior to the burial dose accumulated after the dated rockfall.

is marked by strath terraces and several bedrock knickpoints along the channel through the underlying Kayenta Formation, whereas in the narrower canyon through the Navajo sandstone, the drainage has a broadly convex longitudinal profile, a vegetated alluvial floodplain, and preserved fill terraces (32). Mapping reveals a series of three fluvial terraces traceable through the drainage, and the younger two, designated T1 (youngest) and T2 (older), have important physical relations to the Great Gallery (Figures 3 and 4). The T2 terrace has a bedrock strath mantled

with 0.5-1 m of clast-to-matrix supported, pebble-cobble gravel. As the drainage enters the Navajo reach, the preserved T2 deposit thickens to include more than 6 m of sandy alluvium atop the basal gravels. The inset T1 is up to 6 m thick and is a finer-grained package that occupies much of the valley bottom in the Navajo reach. It is comprised of medium beds of massive to upper-plane-bed, fine-medium sand interpreted as high energy channel deposits, as well as thinly bedded, fine sand with ripple cross-stratification and thin mud drapes interpreted as slackwater deposits.

The figures of the Great Gallery are situated 8-12 m above Horseshoe-Barrier Creek in an alcove. The stream aggradation recorded in the T2 deposit throughout the reach of the canyon buried this lower alcove, as indicated by the T2 remnant next to the Great Gallery, which buttresses the bedrock wall to a height above nearly all of the rock art (Fig. 3A). The bedrock bench below the panel is the locally-exhumed strath of the T2, and the remnant deposit embanked against the alcove includes interbedded lenses of bouldery talus fallen from the alcove and buried along the edge of the aggrading floodplain. The main rock art panel could not have been created until these deposits were subsequently incised by the stream, exposing the lower alcove. Nor could the rock art pre-date the T2 because the pigment would not have survived the burial, groundwater flow, exhumation, and then abrasion by subsequent flood discharges. Thus, the art is incontrovertibly younger than the top of the T2 alluvium, and moreover, it postdates most of the subsequent incision to where the inset T1 flood deposits lie along the channel. A conspicuous, etched horizon in the bedrock just below the toe of the Great Gallery figures is about the height of the top of the T1, and it may represent weathering related to those flood deposits (Fig. 3A). Alternatively, the etched horizon may mark where the water-saturated basal T2 deposit used to lie, and where local dissolution of bedrock cement has subsequently promoted preferential weathering.

Optically stimulated luminescence results on sediment in Table 1 are ordered by age, and these are all in agreement with radiocarbon results and in stratigraphic order, as illustrated in the primary sections of T2 and T1 studied at the Great Gallery and the nearby Alcove site, respectively (presented in *Suppl. Info.*). This highlights both the coherence of results and the ~5 ky hiatus marked by incision between deposition of T2 and T1 deposits. Most of the samples have dispersed and skewed equivalent-dose distributions characteristic of partial bleaching, which is to be expected with flood deposition in a canyon setting, and they are reported with analysis by a minimum-age model (ref. 33, full results in the *Suppl. Info.*). Two AMS radiocarbon dates from riparian-plant litter deposited within the T1 alluvium and one result from an ash and charcoal horizon in the upper T2 corroborate the OSL geochronology, with calibrated results converted to ka before 2010 AD in Table 1 for direct comparison to OSL ages. The age results, combined with their stratigraphic context, reconstruct fluvial activity over latest Quaternary time (Fig. 4). T2 deposition in the Navajo reach corresponds to the Pleistocene-Holocene transition, 15-8 ka. The highest OSL sample (USU-671sg) lies ~0.5 below the preserved top of the T2 at the Great Gallery, and so sometime after 8.01±1.13 ka deposition ceased and incision began (Fig. 3A). By ~3 ka, the basal flood deposits of the T1 were emplaced at essentially the same elevations as the modern wash throughout the drainage. Erosional bounding surfaces and chronology within the T1 suggest three distinct packages of flood deposits are preserved (31), dating to ~3 ka, 2.3-1.2 ka, and 1.1-0.8 ka (Fig. 4; *SI Fig. 3*).

The Great Gallery art must be younger than the episode of incision bracketed between the T2 and inset T1, which began sometime after ~8 ka. Indeed, incision through late Pleistocene talus and alluvium, and then bedrock, must have proceeded for

477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544

545 significant time until the lower alcove was fully exhumed and
546 available, and we suggest a conservative maximum age constraint
547 is ~6 ka (BC ~4000) (Fig. 2B). This reasoning alone makes
548 an early Archaic (>BC 5000) origin for the Great Gallery im-
549 probable, and any older hypotheses are ruled out. It is, in fact,
550 possible that formerly-preserved, 3.0-0.8 ka, T1 deposits provided
551 a standing platform for artists, marked by the etched horizon just
552 below the figures. The position of another example of BCS art
553 upstream along the upper drainage reach, the Blue-Eyed Moqui
554 Princess figures, supports these Great Gallery results. Two figures
555 at this locality are 4.5-6 m above the grade of the modern bedrock
556 channel they overlook, and they lie in a position directly below the
557 local T2 strath terrace. Likewise, the toes of these figures appear
558 abraded by later Holocene flooding.

559 *Minimum age from timing of rockfall*

560 Another clear cross-cutting relation at the Great Gallery
561 provides a minimum age—the rockfall that has removed parts of
562 the figures (Fig. 3A). In related work (15), we sampled the down-
563 facing (buried) surface of one of the talus blocks directly below
564 this scar. This rock surface had preserved pigment of broken
565 figures, but the sample was taken ~35 cm away from any and
566 where no surface preparation (such as abrasion) had been done
567 by the artists. We OSL dated both the quartz grains from the rock
568 surface as well as the near-surface grains of loose sediment the
569 boulder landed upon. The two OSL results are the same within
570 error, ~800-900 years old (Table 1; ref. 15). Serendipitously,
571 a third, independent age determination for the rockfall event
572 comes from a leaf trapped between the talus boulder and under-
573 lying sediment, dated by AMS radiocarbon methods to ~900
574 years old, again within error of both OSL results. These three
575 convergent dates provide a very solid minimum age constraint of
576 AD 1100, the height of the Fremont culture, ruling out the post-
577 Fremont hypothesis at this site (ref. 15, Fig. 2B).

578 *Exposure duration from bedrock luminescence profile*

579 The stimulation and release of trapped charge by sunlight that
580 resets luminescence signals happens at the surface of rocks as well
581 as sediment. Recent work takes advantage of how this “bleaching”
582 of rock penetrates through time into the subsurface up to a few
583 centimeters (16,17). The luminescence signal within the core of
584 rocks is saturated over geologic time due to ionization from local
585 radioactivity. The flux of sunlight at the surface penetrates and
586 releases this trapped charge population, but this effect attenuates
587 with depth and eventually comes into equilibrium with the dosing
588 rate within the rock. The measured depth and form of this luminescence
589 profile can be used to estimate the duration of surface-exposure,
590 particularly over decadal-to-millennial timescales. A primer on this
591 method is provided in the *Suppl. Info*. Briefly, exposure time is
592 calculated through fitting to a modeled, nested-exponential function
593 incorporating the opacity of the rock and the local daylight spectrum
594 and calibrated with a sample of known exposure duration (17). We
595 have applied this technique to part of the sample of the buried,
596 unprepared surface of the rockfall clast at the Great Gallery,
597 with calibration to a local Navajo sandstone sample in an analogous
598 position with respect to aspect and shielding and with independently
599 known exposure duration (16).

600 The luminescence profile of the down-facing rockfall clast has
601 a different form (Fig. 5), because it was not only exposed to sun-
602 light for some duration in the alcove, but also subsequently buried
603 at the foot of the Great Gallery. Thus, the bleached grains in the
604 depth-profile had been shielded, dosed, and re-accumulated a
605 small luminescence signal. Indeed, it is that small re-accumulated
606 signal that we measured in the outermost grains for one of the
607 dates on the rockfall (15). Once recent dosing is accounted for,
608 the profile analysis provides an exposure-duration estimate of
609 ~700 years for the fallen block (Fig. 5). A history of recurring
610 rockfalls incrementally deepening the Great Gallery alcove is

611 evident from both the talus interleaved in the T2 stratigraphy
612 and the sequence of exposed sheeting joints in the sandstone wall
613 (Fig. 3A). We therefore interpret the exposure age in terms of
614 the timing of a penultimate rockfall, which first uncovered the
615 rock surface about 700 years prior to the most recent rockfall at
616 AD ~1100. The uncertainty in this exposure-duration result only
617 expresses model fit and analytical error, but it confidently indi-
618 cates the pigmented rock surface was subject to several centuries
619 of sunlight exposure in the alcove, whereas exposure for over a
620 millennium is very improbable by our analysis in Sohbaty et al
621 (ref. 17). Those several centuries before the rockfall represent the
622 window of time, AD ~400-1100 strictly, but AD ~1-1100 more
623 conservatively, when it was possible for the Great Gallery figures
624 to be painted (Fig. 2B). This is consistent with the tentative AD
625 ~900 AMS age of Watchman (ref. 26) as well as the preservation
626 of the delicate rock art, suggesting it is not as old as some have
627 hypothesized.

628 DISCUSSION

629 Our ability to test hypotheses and understand prehistory increases
630 with each advance in geochronology, as experienced with AMS
631 radiocarbon dating and U-series dating of rock art (4,7). In
632 situations such as the Great Gallery pictographs where organic
633 material is completely absent from pigments or contamination is
634 an issue, or in the case of the countless petroglyphs directly etched
635 into rock, age control has nevertheless remained elusive. This
636 study illustrates that new techniques in OSL dating can help; these
637 have the advantage of analyzing deposits and surfaces associated
638 with rock art, rather than destructively analyzing the art itself.
639 Also, basic cross-cutting relations may be utilized more than
640 previously recognized. It is likely there are several other situations
641 where natural or man-made deposits, episodes of erosion, or
642 mass-movement events could provide constraints on the timing of
643 rock art or other archaeological features. In addition, the OSL-
644 exposure dating technique is broadly applicable where estimates
645 of rock-surface exposure on decade-to-millennial timescales are
646 needed, making it well suited for a wide range of applications in
647 archaeology and active surface processes.

648 Traditional OSL dating of alluvium along the Horseshoe-
649 Barrier drainage produces a chronostratigraphy reflecting a paleo-
650 environmental context important for interpretations of regional
651 archaeology. Like other alluvial archives throughout the Col-
652 orado Plateau, our record was generated by episodes of chang-
653 ing sediment transport, storage, and incision, which have long
654 been linked to changing paleoclimate, but in ways that are still
655 poorly understood (e.g. 34-37). The T2 deposit dates to the latest
656 Pleistocene-early Holocene transition, which in this area was a
657 time of highly variable climate, vegetation disturbance, and later,
658 an enhanced onset of the Southwest Monsoon (38,39). Middle
659 Holocene incision along the drainage may be driven by the mon-
660 soon, but also corresponds to a long-recognized episode of aridity
661 (38-40). Finally, paleoflood deposits of the T1 coincide with the
662 late Holocene increase in frontal-derived winter moisture (41)
663 and more variable climate with episodes of drought, flooding and
664 arroyo cutting. These have been linked to century-scale shifts in
665 El Niño patterns, the Medieval Warm Period (AD ~900-1300),
666 and the subsequent Little Ice Age (42,43). The Great Gallery was
667 painted in the overall wetter and more variable late Holocene,
668 during the transition to agrarian societies in this region, but
669 before the shifts in settlement patterns that coincide with drought
670 and arroyo cutting towards the end of the Medieval Warm Period
671 (43).

672 The timeframe for the Great Gallery type locality provides a
673 new context for BCS rock art within not only the paleoenviron-
674 mental record, but also, of course, the archaeology of the region.
675 The painting of the Great Gallery occurred during a window
676 between late Archaic (BM II) time, around AD 1, through the
677

introduction of maize and the bow and arrow to Utah, and on to the peak of the Fremont culture AD ~1100. The Archaic roots of the Fremont were noted long ago, and a variety of evidence indicates continuity between Archaic foragers and Fremont agriculturalists between AD 1–400 (29). It appears that at that time, immigrant populations brought agriculture and village lifeways from the Four Corners region to north of the Colorado River and a landscape already inhabited by forager populations (44). There is some evidence for multiple ethnic/language groups among these immigrants, and the Fremont emerged from this diversity and interaction, with their cultural variation expressed in Fremont rock art (19,44).

Likewise, as rock-art scholars have documented increasing variability in BCS art and noted overlaps of style and execution with neighboring rock art, it has been suggested that BCS art was a living tradition built over time as well as space (20). There are contrasts between Fremont and BCS rock art, and although our current chronology from part of the Great Gallery panel cannot specifically decipher whether BCS just preceded or coexisted with Fremont rock art, our results are consistent with there being multiple rock-art traditions within the greater Fremont temporal window. If the BCS was established before the origins of the Fremont, then it is nevertheless possible it persisted during the development of distinctively Fremont rock art styles. Rather than an exclusive match of rock art styles to particular archaeological cultures, BCS rock art may have endured in the midst of human mobility, interaction, and new traditions appearing. As more age constraints are obtained on BCS panels, we can test whether it was produced over a considerable span of time. If so, then it was made by peoples of contrasting heritage, but who nevertheless

maintained a common tradition, expressed in the compelling iconography of the Barrier Canyon style.

METHODS

Details of OSL methods, data and analysis are found in the *Suppl. Info.*, including a primer on the exposure-profile method. Full data and analysis for the rock-surface and rock-profile dating results are found in ref. 15 and ref. 16, respectively. For the OSL alluvial chronology presented here, samples were collected in steel tubes, and representative sediment was collected from within 30 cm for determination of dose rate. The bulk concentration of ^{40}K , ^{87}Rb , ^{238}U and ^{232}Th were measured using mass spectrometry, and dose-rates incorporating this, estimated water-content history, and cosmic contribution were calculated using the conversion factors of ref.45. Optical measurements were conducted on a target grain-size fraction of quartz isolated and etched following routine procedures. Measurements with RISO TL/OSL-DA-20 readers followed the single-aliquot regenerative protocol of Murray and Wintle (ref. 46), with the reported age calculated from >20 aliquots that passed criteria of signal reproducibility and reliability.

The equivalent-dose distributions of most alluvial samples were analyzed with a minimum age model (MAM, ref. 33) to statistically isolate data from mineral grains that were completely bleached before burial. Use of the MAM was based partly on the dispersion and skewness of equivalent-dose distributions (*Suppl. Info.*), but also by requirements of field-stratigraphic coherence and correlation to AMS radiocarbon dates. Sample USU-671sg, which provides a maximum age constraint, was analyzed using more intensive and accurate single-grain measurements (47) and calculated using a MAM. Total 1σ errors reported on all OSL ages include random and systematic errors from equivalent dose scatter, uncertainties in the calculation of environment dose rates, and instrumental error.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

We are grateful to Canyonlands National Park, especially archaeologist Chris Goetze, for permission and assistance in sampling. Initial funding was provided by the Foundation for the Scientific Study of Rock Art, Boulder, Colorado. Dr. Pete Poston graciously shared an AMS radiocarbon result (Beta-280472). The manuscript was improved by the comments of two anonymous reviewers.

- Russ J, Hyman M, Shafer H J, Rowe MW (1990) Radiocarbon dating of prehistoric rock paintings by selective oxidation of organic carbon. *Nature* 348: 710 – 711.
- Chaffee SD, Hyman M, Rowe M, Coulam N, Schroedl A, Hogue K (1994) Radiocarbon dates on the All American Man pictograph. *American Antiquity* 59(4): 769-781.
- Clottes J, et al. (1995) The paleolithic paintings of the Chauvet cave in Vallon Pont d'Arc (Ardeche, France); direct and indirect dating with the radiocarbon method. *CR Acad Sciences Paris* 320: 1133–1140 (in French).
- Rowe MW (2009) Radiocarbon Dating of Ancient Rock Paintings. *Analytical Chemistry* 81(5): 1728–1735.
- Roberts R, Walsh GL, Murray A, Olley J, Jones R, Morwood MJ, Tuniz, C, Lawson E, Macphail M, Bowdery D, Naumann I (1997) Luminescence dating of rock art and past environments using mud-wasp nests in northern Australia. *Nature* 387: 696-699.
- Sadier B, JJ Delannoy, L Benedetti, DL Bourlès, S Jaillet, JM Geneste, AE Lebatat, M Arnold (2012) Further constraints on the Chauvet cave artwork elaboration. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* 109(21)
- Pike AWG, D L Hoffmann, M García-Diez, P B Pettitt, J Alcolea, R De Balbín, C González-Sainz, C de las Heras, J A Lasheras, R Montes, J Zilhão (2012) U-Series Dating of Paleolithic Art in 11 Caves in Spain. *Science* 336: 1409-1413.
- von Petzinger G, Nowell A (2011) A question of style: reconsidering the stylistic approach to dating Palaeolithic parietal art in France. *Antiquity* 85(330): 1165-1183.
- Aubert M (2012) A review of rock art dating in the Kimberley, Western Australia. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 39: 573-577.
- Feathers JK (2003) Use of luminescence dating in archaeology. *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 14: 1493-1509.
- Rhodes EJ (2011) Optically Stimulated Luminescence Dating of Sediments over the Past 200,000 Years. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 39: 461–88.
- Habermann J, Schilles T, Kalchgruber R, Wagner GA (2000) Steps towards surface dating using luminescence. *Radiation Measurements* 32: 847-851.
- Greilich S, Glasmacher UA, Wagner GA (2005) Optical dating of granite stone surfaces. *Archaeometry* 47: 645-665.
- Vafiadou A, Murray AS, Liritzis I (2007) Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) dating investigations of rock and underlying soil from three case studies. *J. Archaeol. Sci.*, 34(10): 1659–1669.
- Chapot MS, Sohbatl R, Murray AS, Pederson J, Rittenour T (2012) Constraining the age of rock art by dating a rockfall event using single-grain and surface dating luminescence techniques. *Quaternary Geochronology* 13: 18-25.
- Sohbatl R, Murray A, Chapot MS, Jain M, Pederson J (2012) Optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) as a chronometer for surface exposure dating. *Journal of Geophysical Research (Solid Earth)* 117: B09202.
- Sohbatl R, Jain M, Murray AS (2012) Surface exposure dating of non-terrestrial bodies using optically stimulated luminescence: A new method. *Icarus* 221: 160-166.
- Gunnerson JH (1969) The Fremont Culture: A Study in Culture Dynamics on the Northern Anasazi Frontier. Peabody Museum, Cambridge. Reprint, University of Utah Press.
- Schaafsma P (1971) The Rock Art of Utah: a study from the Donald Scott Collection, *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology*, v. 65: Cambridge, Harvard University, 169 p.
- Cole SJ (2009) Legacy on Stone: Rock Art of the Colorado Plateau and Four Corners Region. Johnson Books, Boulder, Colorado.
- Schaafsma P (1994) Trance and Transformation in the Canyons: Shamanism and Rock Art on the Colorado Plateau, in *The Archaeology of Horseshoe Canyon: National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior*, p. 19-30.
- Kitchell JA (2010) Basketmaker and Archaic rock art of the Colorado Plateau: A Reinterpretation of Paleomage. *American Antiquity* 75: 819-840.
- Dickey J, Christensen DD (2009) A Preliminary Comparison of Colorado Plateau Archaic Rock Art: Barrier Canyon and the Esplanade Styles, *American Indian Rock Art*, v. 35 (Farmington, New Mexico. Edited by James D. Keyser, David Kaiser, George Poetschat, and Michael W. Taylor.), pp. 103-120.
- Cole SJ (2004) Origins, Continuities, and Meaning of Barrier Canyon Style Rock Art in New Dimensions in Rock Art Studies edited by Ray T. Matheny. Occasional Paper Series No. 9, Brigham Young University.
- Tippis B (1994) Barrier Canyon Rock Art Dating, in *The Archaeology of Horseshoe Canyon: National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior*, p. 35-45.
- Watchman A (2003) Dating Barrier Canyon style rock art, Great Gallery, Horseshoe Canyon, Canyonlands National Park: Final report to Canyonlands National Park, 13 p.
- Coulam NJ, Schroedl AR (1996) Early Archaic clay figurines from Cowboy and Walters caves in southeastern Utah: *Kiva* 61: 401-412.
- Schroedl AR, Coulam NJ (1994) Cowboy Cave Revisited. *Utah Archaeology* 7:1-34.
- Madsen DB, Simms SR (1998) The Fremont Complex: A Behavioral Perspective. *Journal of World Prehistory* 12: 255-336.
- Russ J, Hyman M, Rowe M W (1992) Direct radiocarbon dating of rock art. *Radiocarbon* 34: 867 – 872.
- Manning SJ (1990) Barrier canyon style pictographs of the Colorado Plateau. Part one: Hypothesis and evidence for the existence of post circa A.D. 1300 panels. *Utah Archaeology* 43-84.
- Pederson JL (2009) Chronostratigraphy and geomorphology constraining the age of Barrier Canyon Style rock art in Horseshoe Canyon, Utah: NPS Investigator report, 23 p.
- Galbraith RF, Roberts RG, Laslett GM, Yoshida H, Olley JM (1999) Optical dating of single and multiple grains of quartz from Jinnium Rock Shelter, northern Australia: Part I, experimental design and statistical models. *Archaeometry* 41: 339-364.
- Hack JT (1942) Erosion and sedimentation in the Jeddito valley and other valleys of the western Navaho country. *Papers of the Peabody Mus. of Am. Archeology and Ethnology*, n. 35, p. 45-69.
- Cooke RU, Reeves RW (1976) Arroyos and environmental change: Oxford, Clarendon Press, 213p.
- Graf WL (1987) Late Holocene sediment storage in canyons of the Colorado Plateau: *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 99: 261-271.
- Harvey JE, Pederson JL (2011) Reconciling arroyo-cycle and paleoflood approaches to

817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884

alluvial records in drylands. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 30: 855-866.

38. Spaulding WG, Petersen KL (1980) Late Pleistocene and early Holocene paleoecology of Cowboy Cave, in Jennings, J.D., ed., Cowboy Cave, University of Utah Anthropological Paper 104: Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, p. 163-177.

39. Wurster CM, W. P. Patterson, D. A. McFarlane, L. I. Wassenaar, K. A. Hobson, N. Beavan Athfield, Bird MI (2008) Stable Carbon and Hydrogen Isotopes from Bat Guano in the Grand Canyon, USA, Reveal Younger Dryas and 8.2 ka Events. *Geology* 36: 683-686.

40. Reheis MC, Reynolds RL, Goldstein H, Roberts HM, Yount JC, Axford Y, Cummings LS, Shearin N (2005) Late Quaternary eolian and alluvial response to paleoclimate, Canyonlands, southeastern Utah: *Geological Society of America Bulletin* 117: 1051-1069.

41. Anderson L (2011) Holocene record of precipitation seasonality from lake calcite $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ in the central Rocky Mountains, United States. *Geology* 39(3): 211-214.

42. Ely LJ, Enzel Y, Baker VR, Cayan DR (1993) A 5000-year record of extreme floods and climate change in the southwestern United States. *Science* 262: 410-412.

43. Meko DM, Woodhouse AA, Baisan CA, Knight T, Lukas JJ, Hughes MK, Salzer MW (2007) Medieval drought in the upper Colorado River Basin. *Geophysical Research Letters* 34: L10705.

44. Simms SR (2008) Ancient Peoples of the Great Basin and Colorado Plateau. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek, California.

45. Guérin G, Mercier N, Adamiec G (2011) Dose-rate conversion factors: Update. *Ancient TL* 29: 5-8.

46. Murray AS, Wintle AG (2000) Luminescence dating of quartz using an improved single aliquot regenerative-dose protocol. *Radiation Measurements* 32: 57-73.

47. Duller GAT (2008) Single-grain optical dating of Quaternary sediments: why aliquot size matters in luminescence dating. *Boreas* 37: 589-612.

885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952

Submission PDF