

Zone 1: Central America

Martin Künne
Ethnologisches Museum Berlin

The paper consists of two different sections. The first part has a descriptive character and gives a general impression of Central American rock art. The second part collects all detailed information in tables and registers.

I. The first section is organized as follows:

1. Profile of the Zone: environments, culture areas and chronologies
2. Known Sites: modes of iconographic representation and geographic context
3. Chronological sequences and stylistic analyses
4. Documentation and Known Sites: national inventories, systematic documentation and most prominent rock art sites
5. Legislation and institutional frameworks
6. Rock art and indigenous groups
7. Active site management
8. Conclusion

II. The second section includes:

| | |
|---------|---|
| table 1 | Archaeological chronologies |
| table 2 | Periods, wares, horizons and traditions |
| table 3 | Legislation and National Archaeological Commissions |
| table 4 | Rock art sites, National Parks and National Monuments |
| table 5 | World Heritage Sites |
| table 6 | World Heritage Tentative List (2005) |
| table 7 | Indigenous territories including rock art sites |

| | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| appendix: | Archaeological regions and rock art |
| | Recommended literature |
| | References |
| | Illustrations |

1 Profile of the Zone: environments, culture areas and chronologies:

Central America, as treated in this report, runs from Guatemala and Belize in the north-west to Panama in the south-east (the northern Bridge of Tehuantepec and the Yucatan peninsula are described by Mr William Breen Murray in Zone 1: Mexico (including Baja California)). The whole region is characterized by common geomorphologic features, constituting three different natural environments. In the Atlantic east predominates extensive lowlands cut by a multitude of branched rivers. They cover a karstic underground formed by unfolded limestone. Embedded are extensive cave systems offering a lot of subterranean water resources. The central zones are characterized by volcanic mountain ranges comprising little highlands, numerous crater lakes and deep valleys. In contrast to the western plains the Pacific coastlands form a long, narrow strip. They comprise a great variety of bays, islands and peninsulas.

The diversity of natural geography is completed by a great diversity of climates, flora and fauna. They include the tropical rainforests of the lowlands as well as the sub-alpine vegetation of the central regions high mountains. Alone Costa Rica has twelve distinctive ecosystems offering highly diversified natural resources. They provoked different strategies of adaptation since the earliest presence of man in Central America that probably dates back to 12,000 B.C. (Piperno et al. 1990: 108-16; Snarskis 1979: 125-38, 1984: 198). Whereas the first human groups were constituted by hunters of megafauna (El Bosque) their subsistence patterns were followed by maritime or fluvial modes of nutrition (Orange Walk), by gathering fruit trees and wild plants (Casita de Piedra), by mixed economies (La Esperanza) and by agricultural systems of production (El Cerén). All subsistence patterns left different landscapes and archaeological contexts.

They divide Central America in two cultural zones with different structures of spatial and chronological organization (Kirchhoff 1943: 92-107; Lange 2001a: 357-65). In the further text I refer to Belize, Guatemala, western El Salvador and the west of Honduras as Eastern Mesoamerica. All territories south of the Uluá and Lempira river systems are called Lower Central America (fig. 1). The chronology of the former region is part of the Mesoamerican culture sequence comprising the Postclassic (1530-900 A.D.), Classic (900-250 A.D.), Formative (250 A.D. – 1600 B.C.), Archaic (1600-8000 B.C.) and Paleoindian (8000 - ? B.C.) periods. The culture sequence of Lower Central America (Lange 1984: 277-81) is oriented toward the northern regions of South America. It is constituted by six different periods without any descriptive denomination. Nevertheless, periods VI, V and IV (1520 A.D. – 1000 B.C.) correspond with the Mesoamerican Late, Middle and Early Formative according to their characteristics. Periods III and II (1000-8000 B.C.) are linked with the Archaic. The earliest period I (8000-? B.C.) can be understood as Paleoindian (table 1).

At the arrival of European conquerors Eastern Mesoamerica was dominated by speakers of Mayan and Nahuatl languages. Their complex archaeological cultures show all diagnostic traits of highly diversified societies, such as site hierarchy, monumental architecture, specialized sectors of utilization, elaborated iconographies as well as writing and calendar systems, pecked in steles and public buildings. In contrast Lower Central America was mainly settled by Misumalpan- (in the north) and Chibchan- (in the south) speaking populations during the early 16th century. Their archaeological cultures mostly lack hierarchic divisions, indicating in this way horizontal social segments without rigid vertical stratification. Early historic sources (Oviedo 1851-55 [1534, 1547]; Vázquez de Coronado 1908 [1563-65]) prove that the indigenous populations of the contact period (1600-1520 A.D.) were organized in chiefdoms and interaction spheres. They never constituted competing urban states as in Eastern Mesoamerica.

Whereas both regions exhibit differences in political organization, settlement patterns and material culture they also have commonalities such as shared modes of subsistence, similar stone tool industries or polychrome ceramic traditions. Mesoamerican jade and obsidian artefacts are also found in Lower Central America. On the other hand metal objects from Lower Central America appeared in Eastern Mesoamerica too. The mutual occurrence of imported raw materials, techniques and goods suggest stable trade networks facilitating cross cultural contact and exchange. In fact, the western and central regions of Honduras (Uluá-Chamelecon-Sula and Comayagua river systems), the east of El Salvador, the whole Pacific Nicaragua and the Nicoya peninsula of north-west Costa Rica (Guanacaste province) are often

understood in terms of direct cultural transition and mutual overlapping. For the purpose of this paper I will call this region Contact Zone.

2 Known Sites: modes of iconographic representation and geographic context:

Central American rock art consists of decorated but not completely sculptured stones, rocks and lithic formations (rock shelters, grottos, caves). Their representations can be divided according to the applied techniques of manufacture into three different categories: rock engravings (petroglyphs), rock paintings (pictographs) and painted rock engravings. Petroglyphs may be scratched, incised, cut, pecked, punched or abraded into stony surfaces. They all are product of stone tools application. Pictographs were painted or drawn utilizing mineral colours or charcoal. The painted representations can be dotted, blown or stamped. Coloured petroglyphs combine additive and subtractive techniques of decoration. Although most rock art shows geometric motifs there are also elaborated zoomorphic and anthropomorphic representations. Even architectonic structures (pyramids), archaeological objects (bowls), dresses (hipcloths, belts, head bands) and adornments (ear spools) are sometimes shown. In contrast phytomorph motifs (San Miguel Cave) are seldom. A particular mode of decoration is formed by positive and negative handprints (Cueva Los Sanchez). The rock art of Central America comprises abstract, stylized and naturalistic images. Sometimes the represented forms combine different perspectives within one single motif (Pedregal). Several engravings or paintings may be grouped together. They can form friezes (Los Fierros), scenes (Oropoli), narrative registers (Naj Tunich Cave), illustrations (Naj Tunich Cave) or hieroglyphic inscriptions (Las Pinturas Cave). Whereas Postclassic and Classic Mayan cave pictographs often have narrative character the geometric petroglyphs of Lower Central America seem mainly static in nature.

Rock art can also be found as semi-sculptured stones and little mobile objects. They may be understood as marginal categories of rock art analyses according to their different contexts, decorations and weights. Semi-sculptured stones are known from El Salvador (Sta. Leticia) and Guatemala (Escuintla) as well as from Pacific Nicaragua (Sonzapote) and Panama (Nancito). In the former two countries they may show hieroglyphic inscriptions. In the latter ones the shape of semi-sculptured stones is often varied by zoomorphic reliefs (fig. 9). Brady et al. (1997b: 725-50) and Helmke et al. (2003: 108-11) documented semi-modified speleothems in the caves of Belize (Actun Chapat Cave) and Guatemala (Juteria Cave). Gigantic stone spheres, decorated with abstract engravings (fig. 4, table 6), are reported from southern Pacific Costa Rica (Künne 2003b: 215, fig. 82). Some stone cist graves, documented in the highlands of Costa Rica and Panama, contain offerings that include little engraved stones (Fonseca and Watters 2001: 142; Harte 1952-59). Another particular category of rock art is represented by cuplike depressions. They are widely distributed throughout all geographic regions (Piedra Sellada, Petroglyph Cave) and may have served as iconographic decoration as well as a container for liquids, foodstuffs or minerals.

The spatial divulgation of Central American rock art corresponds to the cultural division of the region. Even though the volcanic mountain ranges of Lower Central America possess extensive cave systems as Eastern Mesoamerican karsts, they only have a few decorated caves, known until today. Among them are the Cueva El Tigre, the Gruta de Montelimar (both in Nicaragua) and the Gruta del Espíritu Santo (El Salvador). No or almost no cave art was documented in Panama and Costa Rica. Besides, no pictographs are reported from the former country. In comparison to Lower Central America alone the limestone formations surrounding the Maya Mountains have approximately a dozen caves and grottos decorated by rock art,

such as Robertos Cave and Actun Dzib in Belize or Naj Tunich (fig. 10), Santo Domingo and San Miguel in Guatemala. Probably some of them are linked to the Chiquibul cave system that is partially flooded during every rain season. However, none of the known rock art caves is affected by floodwaters. Almost all regions of Central America possess open air rock art that is often associated with water resources, outstanding natural formations, cemeteries or settlements. Only in Belize no open air sites were found, reflecting probably more the initial state of rock art investigation than a diagnostic cultural trait. Despite of its broad divulgation most Central American rock art seems to be concentrated within zones with extensive subsistence patterns. They comprise Eastern Mesoamerica as a whole, completed by the Pacific and central regions of Lower Central America. Further documentations have to prove if the vast Atlantic plains of Lower Central America are as scarce in rock art as they seem to be. In contrast to the latter zone the lowlands of Eastern Mesoamerica were densely populated throughout the whole Classic Period (900-250 A.D.). Several important archaeological sites are situated in the near vicinity of caves (Dos Pilas) and subterranean water resources (cenotes), that may be decorated (Cahal Uitz Na). Some caves (Copan) have been used already before the construction of monumental architecture began. However, in the highlands of Guatemala there are only two rock art caves (Bombil Pec and Cueva del Venado), known until today. A. Stone estimates that the whole "Maya-region" (including the peninsula of Yucatan and the highlands of Guatemala and Chiapas) has around 40 decorated caves that possess circa 2000 images (1995: 45). Nevertheless, they constitute only a minimal portion of all utilized subterranean places.

3 Chronological sequences and stylistic analyses:

Central America served as the only continental bridge for migrations to and from South America. Anyway, there is no proven evidence of hunter and gatherer rock art, manufactured in Archaic (1600-8000 B.C.) or Paleoindian (8000-? B.C.) periods. All existing claims for Archaic and Paleoindian sites are not well substantiated. The El Gigante rock shelter (Honduras) is decorated by red handprints and a zoomorph painting. The sites early archaeological features were dated by radiocarbon analyses around 12,000 B.C. (Haseman 1996: 65-66; Scheffler 2001: 115-23). Unfortunately there is no direct association between the dated material and the documented rock art. Haberland (1972: 286-91) suggests that the pictographs (fig. 2) of the Gruta del Espíritu Santo (east El Salvador) might be Late Archaic (2000-1000 B.C.). He believes that the images are contemporary with some obsidian artefacts of a pre-ceramic stratigraphic layer. However, this has been called into question by Coladan (1995: 40-42) because of the presence of later cultural material. Even early ceramic sites often have no direct connection to rock art representations. The cave drawings of the Cueva del Río Talgua and of the Cueva de las Arañas (near Catacamas, Honduras) seem to be associated with an Early-Middle-Formative (300-600 B.D.) ossuary and with Middle Formative (300-900 B.D.) ceramics (Brady et al. 1995: 36-40; Brady et al. 2000: 111-18). But also in this case a definitive age cannot be given until the charcoal pigments of the images have been dated directly.

In the present state of investigation Central American rock art is commonly thought to be a product of agricultural societies. It might be connected with the development of sedentary village life and the manufacture of ceramics that serve as an important chronological marker throughout the whole region. Nevertheless, absolute radiocarbon dates (AMS), direct archaeological associations and iconographic superimpositions are rare. Most Central American rock art is dated by nearby archaeological deposits or stylistic comparisons. Some

sites of Eastern Mesoamerica can be classified by the represented themes, motifs and hieroglyphic inscriptions too.

The oldest datable rock art is situated in the highlands of Guatemala and in the west of El Salvador. It belongs to the Olmec-Horizon (300-1200 B.D.) that can be analyzed from its iconographic characteristics. The pictographs of the El Diablo Rojo site, situated in the vicinity of the Amatitlan Lake (Guatemala), show two opposed anthropomorphic figures linked to the Middle Formative Period (300-900 B.D.). Olmec-Horizon motifs are also represented at the Las Victorias (El Salvador) and Abaj Takalik (Guatemala) sites. At Sta. Leticia-Ahuachapan (El Salvador) and Abaja Takalik (Guatemala) semi-sculptured rocks probably form part of the Late Formative (250 A.D. -300 B.D.). The oldest datable rock art of Central American lowlands was found in the northern Petén Department of Guatemala. It is constituted by the San Diego Cliff Carvings, which resemble a Late Formative stela. However, the abstract open air petroglyphs found in the bedrock at the classic urban centres of Piedras Negras (table 6) and Yaxha may date even earlier (A. Stone 2003: 134). Some rock drawings of the Naj Tunich and the Las Pintadas caves are associated with inscriptions. The Naj Tunich texts (fig. 10) include emblem glyphs and calendar dates. In this way the cave and its drawings can be linked to ancient urban centres and ruling dynasties. The two deciphered short count dates of Naj Tunich correspond to the Late Classic (800-600 A.D.), citing the years 692 A.D. and 771 A.D. (MacLeod and A. Stone 1995). Though most of Central American rock art consists of deeply engraved and regularly redrawn petroglyphs, superimpositions (that might serve for relative dates) are unusual throughout the whole region. Even patination can't be understood as a diagnostic trait of rock arts age. The tropical climate and the regular burning of fields prevent differences in the patination of open air representations. The colour of pecked and hammered grooves is often indistinguishable from the shade of the surrounding surfaces. This reaction may be a characteristic trait of basalt, diorite and andesite materials under the prevailing climatic conditions.

On the other hand, the first multispectral analyses of Eastern Mesoamerican pictographs (Brady et al. 1997a: 91-96; Robinson 2001; Ware and Brady 2001: 1017-21) revealed not only hidden layers of paintings (Cueva Casa de las Golondrinas) and inscriptions (Cueva Las Pinturas) but also identified superimpositions (Naj Tunich). Besides, the same technique is able to show identical paint recipes which are not obvious to the naked eye. Direct rock art dates, based on pigment samples, are only available from Eastern Mesoamerica too. They were produced by Marvin Rowe and his colleagues at Texas A & M University. The first samples came from an inscription in the Naj Tunich cave, placing it within the 8th century (Armitage et al. 2001: 471-80; MacLeod and Stone 1995: 155-84). A further AMS dating was intended for one of the three painted rock shelters of the Chiquimula site (900-300 A.D.).

Whereas rock art documentation and cave investigation constitute a specialized field of research in Eastern Mesoamerica, most systematic rock art investigation of Lower Central America is included in archaeological surveys and research excavations. In this way several radiocarbon dates are available for associated contexts. The geometric petroglyphs of the Guayabo de Turrialba (UCR-46) and the Rivas (RV-148-SJ) sites (Costa Rica) are directly integrated in mounds, causeways or house rings (Fonseca and Acuña 1986: 236-54; Lange and D. Stone 1984: 385-91; Quilter 2004: table A1, chart A2). The dates prove a principal utilization of both sites that spans 1400-1000 A.D.

There are no historic sources referring to the manufacture of petroglyphs or pictographs in Central America. However, it can be supposed that the execution of rock paintings and

engravings continued during the Early Colonial period (1600-1520). A. Stone (1995: 81, 86) documented in the caves of Dzibichen and Miramar (Mexican parts of the Yucatan peninsula) rock drawings that resemble the Madrid-Codex-Style, executed during the Late Postclassic (1530-1200 A.D.) and during the Early Colonial (1600-1520 A.-D.) periods. Besides, both caves also contain crude drawings of the Habsburg Eagle, proving the manufacture of rock art in colonial times. Some modern indigenous populations of Lower Central America draw traditional motifs and images that also can be found in rock engravings. The bribri and cabécar shamans of southern Costa Rica decorate their healing stuffs with lizard-like figures that have identical counterparts in the regions petroglyphs (Künne 2003a: 124-26, 300, 303). Nevertheless, it cannot be said if the engravings were made by historic populations.

Most of ancient Central American rock art seems to be connected with the prevailing styles of ceramics and stone sculptures (table 2). However, there is no reliable scheme that treats the rock art of Central America as a closed iconographic corpus. D. Stone (1948: 170, 191) assumes that Central American rock art would express a joint formative horizon of development, that underlies as well the urban societies of Eastern Mesoamerica as the horizontal interaction spheres of Lower Central America. Krickeberg (1949: 74-80) divided the rock art corpus of Lower Central America in six different style groups, connecting them with linguistic, historic and ethnographic populations. However, both authors don't give any archaeological evidence that could prove their hypothesis. In Nicaragua, Matillo Vila (1965) distinguished five different rock art zones (Pacific, North, Chontales, Islands of the Lake of Nicaragua and Atlantic Coast). Unfortunately his classification is not based on systematic iconographic investigation.

The present state of rock art research only allows local and regional stylistic analyses. The most exhaustive modern study of Eastern Mesoamerican cave art was published by A. Stone (1995). It concentrated on the iconographic representations of the Naj Tunich Cave (Guatemala). The same author (University of Wisconsin) also prepared a comprehensive, but unpublished documentation (1995) of the Lake Guijas petroglyphs (El Salvador). The caves of the Lake Petexbatún, the Lake Itza and the Poptún region (all: Guatemala, northern lowlands) were intensively investigated by Brady (University of California) and his team. Since 1996 the Department of Archaeology of Belize has supported systematic studies of ancient caves in the Maya Mountains (Awe, Griffith and Helmke). In Lower Central American Navarro (1996) edited a systematic iconographic comparison between the rock art of the Sierra de Managua and the petroglyphs of the Lake of Nicaragua (excluding the Ometepe island). His analysis includes 110 motifs classified into 14 iconographic categories. Since 1995 Baker (actual: Witwatersrand University) guides a running documentation project of the petroglyphs scattered throughout the Ometepe island (Nicaragua). Between 1989-1993, Hardy and Vázquez (1993) prepared a systematic documentation of the Pedregal site (Costa Rica). The complete documentation is kept by the Rock Art Archive of the Fowler Institute at the University of California (UCLA). A copy may be found in the Casona de Sta. Rosa research station (Area de Conservación Guanacaste). Further systematic surveys were carried out in the highlands of Guatemala (A. Stone 1997; Batres et al. since 1995), in the north-eastern highlands of El Salvador (Coladán 1997), in Honduras (Haseman and Kittrick 1993-95), in Costa Rica (Kennedy 1964-68; Künne 1998-2000; Sol Castillo 2000; Zilberg 1983) and in Panama (Brizuela 2004; Holmberg since 2003; Künne 2000-02; Quintero 1994-95). Zilberg (1986) investigated in particular the archaeological contexts of petroglyph sites. Besides, he published a systematic iconographic analysis of the Diquís (Gran Chiriquí) rock art.

However, much more rock art sites have to be documented completely, before any broad iconographic comparison could be started in the future. Provisionally, only motifs with a broad divulgation can be separated from those with a limited occurrence. In Eastern Mesoamerica the Mixteca-Puebla-Tradition (1520- 1200 A.D.), the Classic-Maya-Horizon (900-300 A.D.) and the Olmec-Horizon (300-1200 B.C.) are also reflected in rock art representations. Besides, there is an overwhelming majority of local and regional styles that may or may not have been integrated into the more general “horizons” and “traditions.” Most motifs of Lower Central American petroglyphs carry universal character (spirals, circles, wavy lines, crosses, points) requiring additional information for their iconographic interpretation. However, the fine lined engravings (fig. 7) of the Pedregal site (Costa Rica) show complex Mesoamerican motifs that can be linked with the ceramic groups that pertain to the horizon of creme slipped polychrom wares (1520-800 B.C.). Other rock art styles characterize more likely the qualities of the decorated materials. Interestingly, the extensive and complex geometric patterns of the Chiriquí region petroglyphs (figs. 4 and 5) aren't repeated in the simultaneous ceramics of the same zone. Leaving the cultural perspective of analyses, the social dimension of rock art styles cannot be neglected. Regarding that only a small minority of Central American rock art consists of elaborate figurative representations, A. Stone (1995: 45) distinguishes elite images from non elite iconographies. The former ones were probably manufactured by specialized full time craftsmen. Their figurative and codified motifs can be identified with the prevailing traditions and horizons of Eastern Mesoamerica. The so-called non elite rock art might be constituted in contrast by all schematic and geometric representations without detailed attributes.

Although Central American rock art probably doesn't open an additional window into the earliest prehistory of mankind, it may complete the present knowledge toward the self perception of formative and early state societies. Besides, the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Classic Maya cave considerably increased the known prehistoric text fragments. Their analyses may support the decipherment of the whole corpus of Maya hieroglyphic signs. The figurative petroglyphs and pictographs of Gran Nicoya allude to the topics of the disappeared codices of the region. Moreover, in Central America open air rock art constitutes the most accessible testimony of prehistory. In Lower Central America it figures commonly among the most popular archaeological monuments too. Considering these sympathies, rock art documentation could constitute a key position in more general education campaigns.

4 Documentation & Known Sites: national inventories, systematic documentation and most prominent rock art sites:

Most Central American countries don't have a national archaeological register or any particular register of rock art sites. The only exception is Costa Rica that possesses a central digital database of all reported archaeological sites, including all known rock art sites. In all other countries exist various archaeological inventories, handled by Ministries of Culture, National Museums or National Universities. In some cases anthropological associations or archaeological enterprises have their own registers. The existing inventories as well include documented rock art sites as places that are only reported by historic literature. Many of the latter ones cannot be revisited because of the lack of exact geographic details. Often there are no particular data sheets that could guide rock art documentation in the field. Regarding the initial state of archaeological investigation, even the most complete register could only provide a preliminary impression of the real number of all existing rock art sites.

Belize

The archaeological research reports are gathered by the Department of Anthropology, subordinated to the Ministry of Culture (Belmopan). Helmke et al. (2003: 97-117) mention 19 rock art sites, concentrated in the western Cayo District. All sites are in caves, 5 of them have pictographs (Actun Dzib, Roberto's Cave, Bladen 2, Actun Uayazba Kab, Actun Chapat). No single open air site was mentioned until today. The most prominent rock art site is the Actun Dzib Cave in the Toledo District (Helmke et al. 2003: 100, 114; Stone 1995: 91-94). It contains more than 75 drawings with black and brown outlines. The motifs are probably linked to the Late Postclassic (1530-1200 A.D.) and the Late Classic (900-600 A.D.) periods. The most important petroglyph sites are represented by the Petroglyph Cave and the Actun Uayazba Kab cave. Both are situated in the Cayo District. Alone the major panel of the latter site comprises more than 20 motifs. A particular category of analyses is formed by semi-modified speleothems and footprints, that were documented in the Actun Chapat cave (speleothems) and in the Actun Chek cave (footprints). Although some rock art sites of Belize belong to the Chiquibul National Park and to the Caracol Archaeological Reserve, none of the country's major rock art concentrations is included into these two areas.

Costa Rica

Künne (2003a: 59-63, 331-40; 2003b: 202) reports 171 rock art sites that are registered in a digital database at the National Museum of Costa Rica. They constitute 7% of all 2383 registered archaeological sites. 74 rock art sites are situated in the Central Highlands and in the Atlantic Watershed, 58 sites belong to the southern Diquís zone (figs. 4 and 5) and 39 sites form part of the north-west Gran Nicoya region. All together 81 sites are associated with datable archaeological deposits, mostly consisting of ceramics. 55 rock art sites (67,90%) are linked with the period between 1550-300 A.D. Hammett (1967) describes 71 sites from edited literature and oral information. According to her unpublished manuscript, only 4 sites had pictographs or painted petroglyphs. All rock paintings were located in the Gran Nicoya region (Stirling 1977: 47, 113-15). None of these representations survived natural destruction. A photographic documentation of the Diquís rock art (Gran Chiriquí) is kept by Künne. The most important sites in the country are Guayabo de Turrialba in the Central Highlands (table 6) and Pedregal on the slopes of the Orosí volcano (Gran Nicoya). In the southern Diquís region can be found some exceptional rocks with engraved scenic representations such as the rock of San Pedro (SJ-362/ SP-6), that was described by Richards et al. (1964: 139-45) and Künne (2003b: 210). The petroglyphs of Guayabo de Turrialba (UCR-43) are directly associated with monumental architecture, such as mounds, causeways and irrigation systems (Fonseca and Acuña 1986: 236-54). 90% of the 36 documented stones are linked to period VI (1450-1000 A.D.). A lot of unregistered petroglyphs can be found in the surroundings of Guayabo. The site represents the only archaeological monument of Costa Rica that is accessible to the public. The outstanding Pedregal site (G-540 Pd) comprises 465 engraved rocks. 90 boulders were documented by colour photos. The pictures are part of a report that was prepared for the National Museum of Costa Rica. The detailed, fine lined motifs of the Pedregal site show Mesoamerican images, such as the fire serpent, that are obviously connected to the Mixteca-Puebla-Horizon (1520-1200 A.D.). Similar topics appear also on the polychrome ceramics (1520-800 A.D.) of the Gran Nicoya region. The Pedregal site may constitute the most southern archaeological place that can be linked to the monumental iconography of Mexican Mesoamerica. Nevertheless, no settlement structures were found on the slopes of the Orosí volcano. The whole territory is part of the Area de Conservación Guanacaste that has constituted a World Heritage site since 1999. Yet erosion and weathering affect the almost invisible petroglyphs (fig. 7).

El Salvador

Archaeological research reports are kept in the National Museum David J. Guzmán in San Salvador. Coladan and Amaroli (2003: 143) believe there are approximately 100 rock art sites scattered throughout the whole country. In fact, they discuss 13 different places that can be completed by 3 additional sites published by Haberland (1954, 1956, 1959). All together 6 known sites have pictographs: the Gruta del Espíritu Santo, the Cueva del Toro, the Cueva de las Figuras (a rocky cliff), the Cueva de los Fierros (a rock shelter) and the Cueva de la Koquinca. They are all situated in the north-east Departments of Morazan and La Unión. In comparison, the Cueva del Ermitaño, that contains painted petroglyphs, can be found in the north-western mountains of the Chalatenango Department. A historic photographic documentation of 8 rock art sites, consisting of slides and black/white photos, is kept by Haberland. As well as Guatemala (Dos Pilas, Piedras Negras, Tikal, Yaxhá) and Honduras (Copán) El Salvador (Igualepeque, Tehuacán), has rock art sites that are associated with datable ancient urban centres. The most prominent rock art sites in the country are the Igualepeque peninsula (Department of Santa Ana) and the cave site Gruta del Espíritu Santo (Department Morazan). The stylized and geometric petroglyphs of Igualepeque (Lake Guija) were documented (but not published) by A. Stone in 1997. They are concentrated in the south-east portion of the peninsula that comprises around 250 decorated basaltic stones. The pecked boulders may be associated with an unexcavated archaeological site that is situated at the central summit of the peninsula. The cultural importance of the site is linked to the nearby Ixtepeque obsidian sources and its position puts it at the south-east frontier of Maya culture influence. The style of the deeply engraved petroglyphs indicates the Postclassic (1530-900 A.D.), Epiclassic (900-800 A.D.) or Late Classic (900-600 A.D.) periods. In comparison to the former site, the Gruta del Espíritu Santo represents a rock shelter that was decorated by petroglyphs and pictographs (paintings, positive and negative handprints). The represented motifs show anthropomorphic (fig. 2), zoomorphic and anthrozoomorphic figures. They appear as single representations or as iconographic groups. The paintings were executed in red, ochre, black and cream colours. Coladan and Amaroli (2003: 147) believe that the cream figures represent a younger iconographic layer. The particular importance of the site is linked to its unique style. Besides, Haberland claimed paleoindian obsidian artefacts. Nevertheless, Coladan also documented postclassic (1520-900 A.D.) and formative (250 A.D. – 1600 B.C.) ceramics. What kind of archaeological material is really connected with the rock art on the sites we do not know.

Guatemala

A. Stone (2003: 134) reports 60 rock art sites from Guatemala. 24 sites are scattered throughout the central highlands (Stone and Ericastilla 1999: 775-90), the other sites are situated in the northern lowlands. The highlands of Guatemala have only two painted caves (Bombil Pek and Cueva del Venado). In comparison the lowlands possess 19 decorated cave sites. The most prominent lowland sites are the eastern caves of the Poptún region. They comprise the Naj Tunich cave, the San Miguel cave, the Santo Domingo cave, Jobonche, Púsila, Jovelte, Jutería, Corosal and Poxte. Another important rock art region is the Cobanerita cave system that is situated in the south-west of Lake Itza. The zone includes the Cueva de las Pinturas, the Cueva Tecolote, the Cueva los Sapos and the Cueva los Monos (A. Stone 2003: 119-41). The extended cave system of the western Petexbatún region is under current investigation. Only the Naj Tunich cave has a direct AMS-date. Nevertheless, the documented archaeological deposits and paintings of the other caves also seem to indicate a Classic period (900-250 A.D.) site use. Three caves have hieroglyphic inscriptions. The corpus of Naj Tunich alone consists of 40 inscriptions (fig. 10), comprising circa 800 glyphs. The longest text is constituted by 64 hieroglyphs. Probably the analyzed inscriptions reflect

the Chol and Yucatec languages (A. Stone 1995: 99-233). The Cueva las Pinturas (Cobanerita cave system) has three polychrome hieroglyphic inscriptions (Brady 1997; Brady et al. 1997; Stone 2003: 126), the longest text includes 30 signs. Additional inscriptions were found in the Santo Domingo cave (Brady and Fahsen 1991: 52-55). Naj Tunich represents the most famous rock art site of Eastern Mesoamerica. The cave was discovered in 1979 and also includes rock art ceramics, fireplaces, graves and artificial terraces. Unfortunately, no part of the archaeological context is directly associated with rock art. The iconographic corpus of Naj Tunich comprises 94 panels, including 85 painted complexes. All motifs are constituted by black coloured outlines. The images represent ritual and mythic themes. They can be linked with the Late Classic (900-600 A.D.) period on the base of two calendar dates. Besides, 37 pictographs and 12 positive handprints were found. The represented emblem glyphs are connected with the urban centres of Sacul (fig. 10), Ixkun, Ixtutz and the site Q (Caracol?). Most of the detailed documentation was done by A. Stone (1995: 99-233) and Brady (1989, 1993: 141-49). A particular category of the rock art of Guatemala is formed by semi-modified speleothems. Similar representations were documented by Helmke et al. (2003: 97-117) in Belize. Brady (1999: 57-68), Siffre (1979: 163-65) and A. Stone (2003: 125) report speleothems from Pusilá, Jovelte, Jutería, Corosal and Poxte. All sites constitute petroglyph caves. The Bombil Pec cave (Alta Verpaz Department) is situated in the highlands of Guatemala. Its black-lined drawings show five animals that allude to the two hero twins of the Popol Vuh (A. Stone 1995: 96). One of the most numerous concentrations of Central American pictographs is situated at the Casa de las Golondinas site in the western highlands (Valley of Antigua). The rocky cliff harbours more than 100 red painted, but heavily weathered motifs (Robinson and Ware 2001). One sign shows an Aztec calendar glyph (Robinson 1997: 59-70) indicating thus the use of the site during the Late Postclassic (1530-1200 A.D.) period. Minor rock art sites are spread around the shores of the Amatitlan and Atitlan Lakes. They include the El Diablo Rojo site, Monte Sión and Los Mejicanos. Another prominent rock art site is formed by the three painted Chiquimula rock shelters in the eastern highlands (Batres et al. (1997: 2-23, 1998: 499-511, 1999: 791-805). Their most complex panel shows 35 motifs, executed in red, black and green. Until today the site cannot be linked to a particular horizon, tradition or culture. The painted rock of Ayarza (Santa Rosa Department) represents at least 13 motifs that correspond to the Late Mixteca-Puebla-Horizon (A. Stone 2003: 131; Navarrete 1996: 322). The most important petroglyph site of the eastern highlands is Los Fierros, situated in the south-west of Comapa (Jutiapa Department). Its principal panels are extended along a rocky cliff, that follows the banks of the La Paz river. The almost inaccessible site possesses abstract petroglyphs that stylistically cannot be connected with other rock art representations in Guatemala (Walters 1982).

Honduras

All archaeological information is kept by the Department of Archaeology that forms part of the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IHAH). Between 1993 and 1995 the Department of Archaeology realized the first systematic rock art documentation in the history of Honduras. The visited 21 rock art sites were documented by photos, drawings and sketches. Until 1995 all together 49 rock art sites have been registered. They are scattered throughout the whole country, only the rock art of the western Ocotepeque Department is unknown. 37 rock art sites have petroglyphs, 12 possess pictographs and an unknown number has painted petroglyphs (McKittrick 2003: 166; Murray and Valencia 1996: 186). Although the former project coordinator, McKittrick, published 13 sites (2003: 163-81), only 5 places were discussed more in detail. In 1994 and 1996 Brady et al. (1995, 2000) investigated a series of limestone caves surrounding the Río Talgua river (Olancho Department). The Talgua cave and the Cueva de las Arañas contain simple black and red line drawings. Besides, the Talgua

cave shows two frontal faces (Stone and Künne 2003: 203, fig. 9). The documented rock art may be exceptionally old because of the associated deposits. A preliminary evaluation of 5 Honduranian rock art sites was realized by Podestá in 2004 (Podestá 2005, pers. comm.). Considering that probably a lot of Honduranian rock art is still undiscovered, the most prominent sites in the country may be the Ayasta, Cueva Pintada, Sta. Rosa de Tenampua and Yaguacire sites. The Ayasta and Yaguacire rock shelters are situated near Tegucigalpa. The former site has mainly petroglyphs associated with some singular and heavily eroded pictographs. The engravings represent anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figures that may be superimposed in limited areas (McKittrick 2003: 166). The Yaguacire site consists of three different rock shelters decorated with white, red and orange paintings. They show zoomorphic and anthropomorphic motifs that may be grouped together. Other paintings represent handprints and genitals. Two test pits were made, but the documented material is not analyzed yet. The Cueva Pintada (La Paz Department) seems to be the most complex rock art site of Honduras. Its exceptional paintings and engravings are organized in 7 different panels (McKittrick 2003: 170-73) that may be divided into additional subgroups. Most pictographs were executed in white or ochre, others are coloured in red, blue and black. The iconographic corpus includes anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and geometric motifs. The geometric images comprise U- and V-motifs and ladder-like representations. The anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figures may be realistic or stylized. Some paintings combine different perspectives. Besides, negative handprints and genitals were represented. The superimposition of many figures and the broad variety of styles and colours suggest a continuous use during different periods. McKittrick observed that the style of the Cueva Pintada is similar to other rock art sites of the central region (Picila site). She believes that the Misumalpan-speaking populations (Lenca) of the colonial sources might have manufactured the documented paintings (2003: 173). Also the petroglyphs of Santa Rosa de Tenampua (Comayagua Department) show zoomorphic, anthropomorphic and geometric motifs. One representation is clearly a plumed serpent that alludes to the horizon of white slipped polychrome ceramics (1520-800 A.D.). Reyes Mazzoni compares this motif with a similar rock painting at the rock shelters of Sta. Elena de Azaculpa. Besides, the same theme can be found as a relief in Copan (altar O) and in Chichen Itza (Reyes Mazzoni 1976a, b). Two additional important rock art sites are represented by the El Gigante rock shelter (La Paz Department) and by the Oropoli petroglyphs (El Paraiso Department). The looted El Gigante rock shelter represents one of the scarce paleoindian and archaic sites in Central America. Although under current investigation by Scheffler, there is no direct AMS date of its positive and negative handprints. The Oropoli site consists of different volcanic cliffs, situated on both banks of the Oropoli river. Its anthropomorphic and zoomorphic petroglyphs are organized in various dense panels that are separated by natural fractures and cracks. Although only some figures were executed in fine line technique, all motifs represent the same style. McKittrick believes that the whole corpus was executed by one group of artists (2003: 174). The petroglyphs of the northern region are discussed by Reyes Mazzoni (1976c: 293-94) and by McKittrick (2003: 175-76). The former author mentions engraved rocks at the Río Plátano river that are included in the World Heritage in Danger List with the same name.

Nicaragua

The archaeological register of Nicaragua consists of data sheets and research reports that are kept by the National Museum. The whole inventory describes around 400 archaeological sites including 104 rock art places. Most sites have deeply engraved geometric or stylized petroglyphs. Only 6 rock art sites are decorated with pictographs: the El Tigre Cave (Bosawas), the Icalupe rock shelter (Somoto), the Montelimar cave (San Andrés), the Los Sanchez cave (Los Duendes), the Los Negros cave and the Laguna Asososca (Lago Nejapa).

The Montelimar cave, the Los Sanches cave and the Icalupe rock shelter also have painted petroglyphs. The polychrome representations of the Icalupe and the El Tigre sites are well preserved. In comparison the rock paintings of the Laguna Asososca (Squier 1851-52) have almost disappeared. In 1996 Navarro published the data sheets of 12 rock art sites that are scattered throughout the Pacific Managua, Masaya and Carazo Departments. Besides, his documentation includes 15 rock art sites of the Zapatera and El Muerto islands. However, the best investigated rock art of Nicaragua is situated at Ometepe. The island belongs as well as Zapatera and El Muerto to the Lake of Nicaragua (Lago Cocibolca, table 6). Its fertile soils probably attracted early agricultural populations in the past. Actually, the oldest ceramics of Central America, north of the Monagrillo site (Panama), were found in Los Angeles (Om-9). Since 1995 Baker mapped and documented 73 different rock art sites (fig. 8), that are scattered throughout the Maderas peninsula. Her detailed materials consist in digitized photos and drawings that include 1400 boulders with more than 1700 iconographic panels (Baker 1995-2002, 1996, 1997, 2000). The complete documentation is kept by the National Museum of Nicaragua. A historic collection of photos is owned by Haberland and by the Anthropological Museum of Hamburg. An additional photographic documentation, including some petroglyph sites of the Zapatera and El Muerto islands was established by Künne and Lettow. The El Muerto island (Navarro 1996: 89-90; Thornquist 1981) has probably the densest concentration of Lower Central American petroglyphs. They comprise at least 127 single motifs (fig. 11) that are located at a tremendous volcanic rock platform (IV-Z-10), from which the whole island can be seen. The culture sequence of El Muerto dates back to 500 B.C. Whereas the rock art of Ometepe is under systematic investigation, the petroglyphs of Zapatera (Navarro 1996: 81-88) are almost un-documented (fig. 9). The Sonzapote (IV-Z-1-3) and the Punta Las Figuras (IV-Z-1-2) sites consist in ancient cemeteries that are constituted by several burial mounds. Their monumental stone sculpture was already described by Squier (1851-52) and by Bovallius (1886). Some figurative motifs (figs. 8 and 10) of the Gran Nicoya region can be dated by style to the Late (1520-1350 A.D.) and Middle Polychrome (1350-800 A.D.) periods. They may be linked to the Mangue-, Nahua- and Maribio-speaking populations of the early historic sources. Laurencich Minelli et al. investigated 23 rock art sites of the Solentiname Archipelago that is situated in the eastern parts of the Nicaragua Lake (Lago Cocibolca). The reported sites belong to the Mancarrón, Mancarroncito, La Venada, Atravesada, Elvis Chaverría, and El Plato islands. All sites have petroglyphs, no pictographs are mentioned (Laurencich Minelli et al. 1996, 2000). Unfortunately, the historic photos of Matillo Vila (1965, 1968, 1973) have completely disappeared. He describes 26 rock art sites, concentrated in the Pacific and northern regions of Nicaragua. Since 2001 the SINSLANI archaeological project documented 57 boulders (with 211 panels) of the northern Estelí Department. The rocks and stones are scattered throughout the valleys of the Estelí, La Trinidad, Los Quesos and Pueblo Nuevo rivers. However, some of the documented stones were relocated in the past. The published documentation consists of sketches and photos (Gámez Montenegro y Cruz Cruz 2004). At the La Trinidad site a systematic excavation was established in 2006 (Koschmieder 2006, pers. comm.). The almost unknown Icalupe site is situated in the Madriz Department (Baker 2003: 189, fig. 71; Espinoza 2005, pers. comm.). Its motifs show anthropomorphic and zoomorphic paintings that were executed in red and blue colours. Some images are covered by a second layer of petroglyphs. Also the Atlantic El Tigre cave has two different iconographic layers. They show positive and negative handprints as well as geometric motifs (Kaufman 2005, pers. comm.). The site forms part of the Bosawas Biosphere Reserve (Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte), that constitutes the largest remaining forest in Central America (table 6).

Panama

There is no national archaeological register in Panama. The two existing private archaeological enterprises have their own sites inventories. In the past most archaeological research was realized by Linares (Western Region) and Cooke (Central Region). The former anthropologist was affiliated with the University of Panama, the latter one with the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute. Künne (2003b: 224) reports 63 rock art sites, that are scattered throughout the whole country: 31 sites are situated in the Western Region (Grand Chiriquí), 27 sites belong to the Central Region (Grand Coclé) and 5 sites are mentioned from the almost unknown East Region (Grand Darién). Many sites have deeply engraved petroglyphs that represent abstract or stylized forms. Neither pictographs nor decorated caves are reported. In the late 50' Harte (1960, 1961) documented 48 rock art sites that belong to the Western and Central Regions. Besides, he wrote 155 site index cards that contain rudimentary archaeological information (Harte 1952-59). Now his photographic documentation is deposited in the archive of the Fundación Gallegos in David. Künne (2003a) established a digital database that contains information about 10 revisited rock art sites of the Western Region (Gran Chiriquí). However, most Panamanian rock art lacks any documentation. Although the registered petroglyphs seem to belong to the Chiriquí (1520-800 A.D.) period, nearly nothing is known about their contexts. The earliest published (Seemann 1853) petroglyphs are located in Caldera (Western Region). The Piedra Pintada constitutes a grown basaltic rock with a length of 11m, a width of 6m and a height of 2,80m. Whereas its upper surface is covered with geometric motifs, the south-west side of the same rock exclusively shows figurative images. They represent zoomorphic masks, an anthropomorphic face and some lizards. The unique style of the petroglyphs was only repeated in Sta. Cruz (Diquís) and Palo Verde (Central Region). The Piedra Pintada is associated with the banks of the Caldera river and the nearby hot springs (Harte 1960; Holmberg 2005: 190-211; Künne 2003c: 226). The Remedios, Bongo de Cuchillas, Gualaca and Barriles petroglyphs form part of burial grounds. Whereas the Barriles, Gualaca and Remedios sites have been looted in part, the mounds of Bongo de Cuchillas are almost undisturbed. The Barriles petroglyphs pertain to an early political centre that comprised settlement mounds and monumental sculpture. Two AMS dates indicate the sites use during the Chiriquí (1550-1000 A.D.) and the Bugaba (600-200 A.D.) phases (Künne et al. 2005). Unpublished AMS dates exist for an ancient burial ground (Kotowa site) in the Boquete area, that is associated with 25 engraved boulders (Holmberg 2005, pers. comm.; 2005: 190-211). A dozen additional petroglyph sites are concentrated in the upper Chiriquí valley that formed a prehistoric migration route. Although Linares and Ranere (1980) realized systematic surveys and stratigraphic excavations, the investigation of rock art never took place. Other petroglyphs were documented in Quebrada de Piedras (Western Region), Soná, Ocu, Calobre, La Pintada and Bejuco (Central Region). The engravings of Quebrada de Piedra (Base Naval) show realistic zoomorphic and anthropomorphic figures, that cover three flat rocks. The rock art sites of the Azuero peninsula have to be revisited completely.

5 Legislation and institutional frameworks:

Legislation

In Central America rock art documentation is understood as part of archaeology. Nevertheless, only Costa Rica (University of Costa Rica) and Nicaragua (National University of Nicaragua) offer particular archaeological careers at universities. Often archaeology is included in anthropological formation. In order to prevent the uncontrolled destruction of the national cultural heritage every kind of archaeological activity is arranged by political constitutions and legislation. Generally spoken, Central American laws pronounce the state's monopoly in

decision making about all subterranean, terrestrial and marine resources that might be of national interest. The adequate legislations are commonly cited as Laws of the Protection of National Cultural Heritage (table 3). Nevertheless, often there is no particular legislation referring to rock art sites. In most countries rock art has to be declared a National Monument in order to get public attention and formal protection. However, the funding is often minimal. Panama is the only Central American nation that passed a particular law (Law no. 17, passed at 10th April in 2002), protecting all rock art sites (Künne 2000: 15-16). Its article 2 proclaims: “All images that our ancestors engraved in stone during the pre-Columbian era, are declared a Historic National Monument, in every part of the nation’s territory.” Nevertheless, the destruction of rock art usually does not have any consequences, in spite of the best intended legislative efforts. Some rock art sites are protected by their inclusion within natural reserves, National Parks (table 4) or World Heritage Sites (table 5). The protection and administration of National Monuments and National Parks is arranged by detailed regulations, decrees and laws (URL: <http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/>). Some National Parks may be World Heritage Sites as well (Archaeological Park of the Ruins of Copan, Tikal National Park). In Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama there are also indigenous territories including rock art sites (table 7). All indigenous territories have limited rights referring to political self-administration and resource management. Their application is arranged by the “Indigenous Law” of the appropriate Central American nation and by the “Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries.”

Institutional frameworks

Every systematic rock art documentation should be announced to the competent national institutions. Often they are represented by the National Archaeological Commissions (table 3), that commonly belong to the National Museums. The latter ones are subordinated to the Departments of National Cultural Heritage that form part of the Ministries of Culture. Applications for rock art documentation should include a detailed task and time schedule, a short description of the applied methodology, information about the documentation team and the extent of funding. Often there are ready blanks that have to be filled in. Because most rock art sites are private properties, some countries (Nicaragua) expect a written agreement of the sites owner with the intended project. Others ignore the owners’ will, pronouncing the state’s sole claim to archaeological monuments and subterranean resources. Commonly foreign funding and the participation of at least one national archaeologist in the requested project are expected. In some countries (Costa Rica) the project leader has to join the national register of archaeologists. Registration may be gratis (Costa Rica) or subjected to fees (Guatemala). When the project is finished a preliminary report is expected within one month. A second more elaborate report should be prepared within half a year. The whole documentation (photos, drawings, sketches) remains the property of the project leader. All excavated materials have to stay in Central America, preserved by Ministries of Culture, National Museums or National Universities. In some countries (Guatemala) a second, often less complicate but not less legal way of projects request is accepted. The team leader has to enter the National University, Department of Anthropology. Commonly the fees of inscription are lower than national registration rates. Besides, an inscription in the registers of archaeologists is not obligatory. If the project leader is accepted by the university, the request for documentation or excavation projects has to be addressed to the director of the National University. This way of application is commonly preferred, if a long-term investigation is planned. Every activity in National Parks has also to be announced to the park administration. Park management may be handled by governmental or non-governmental agencies, authorized by state Ministries of Environment and Natural Resources: Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales Renovables (INRENARE) in Panama, Ministerio de Ambiente y

Recursos Nacionales (MARENA) in Nicaragua or Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente (CONAMA) in Guatemala (table 4). Research programs in indigenous territories should be coordinated with the accepted representatives of the ethnic group. Often there is a double political structure: non governmental associations compete with corporative organizations that are more linked with the central states “National Commissions for Indigenous Affairs” than with the represented populations.

In Central America anthropology and archaeology are often seen in political terms. Contrary to Western Europe, the underlying ideology of nation building is not citizenship but culture. In this way most social questions are discussed in cultural terms. Also rock art documentation might appear within this frame. The only exception to this pattern may be Costa Rica because of its different traditions of constructing identity. In the whole of Central America, rock art is not only understood as heritage of “our indigenous ancestors”, but also as spectacular phenomenon of landscape. During the last 15 years an extensive and very differentiated system of natural parks was established. They may comprise Areas, Reserves, Regional Parks, National Parks or World Heritage Parks. Often a core area, an area of limited access and an area of sustainable utilization are known. Sometimes private areas are included within the park system (Area de Conservación Guanacaste). Most National Parks work with limited state funding and international support. Often regular evaluations are intended. Unfortunately, neither the Cobanerita cave system nor the caves in the surroundings of Poptún (Guatemala) are included in the National Parks system. Some Central American parks offer laboratories for systematic research. Others are reserved for scientific investigation only (Bladen National Reserve). Besides, six of seven Central American countries have national ICOMOS committees, linked with ICOMOS international and UNESCO. Only Belize is missing. Whereas the Panamanian committee is more oriented toward the restoration of mediaeval town centres and fortresses, the Committee of Honduras was very engaged in prehistoric archaeology too.

Threats

Existing laws and institutional frames are often ignored in reality. In most cases also, rock art protection remains a problem on executive, educational and practical levels. Many rock art sites are legally protected in name only. One of the most tragic cases was the destruction of 23 exquisite Classic Maya paintings (fig. 10) from the Naj Tunich cave (Guatemala) in 1989 (Brady 1990: 4-5; Stone 1995: 111, fig. 5-20). Although the government had provided guards in order to protect the cave, they were poorly trained and supervised. Additionally, many site guards are not well paid (Nancito in Panama). Although Guatemala has a lot of attractive rock art sites, neither caves nor open air places are protected in particular. Probably the management of the famous urban centres of the “Maya” cultures appears much more important for tourism industry. Considering that Guatemala has only two archaeological sites (Tikal and Quirigua), administrated by professional archaeologists, one might think that many monuments are exploited without securing the sites continuity by the investment of even minimal funds. Other rock art places are endangered by the construction of hydroelectric dams that are planned within the Plan Puebla-Panama. The Boruca dam (Costa Rica), that constitutes the major Central American hydroelectric project, will alone inundate at least 11 rock art sites in the General Valley (Blanco and Küne 2000: 20-24).

Many open air sites are affected by natural erosion and weathering as well as by destructive social practices. Intensive urbanization, deforestation and the extension of agricultural zones threaten not only biodiversity but also rock art. During the last 50 years most of Central American forests were replaced by extensive pastures or fields. In result erosion and

weathering are one of the most destructive factors in the present. Most open air rock art is no longer covered with soil or vegetation. The lack of shadow allows extreme climatic differences that provoke fractures, cracks, fissures, exfoliation or bleaching. Often petroglyphs and pictographs that outlived several centuries seem to disappear within a dozen years. On the other hand, many “Maya” cave paintings are well preserved by nature. The selected caves are not affected by floodwaters. All decorated places consist in dry limestone walls that are covered by a thin layer of silt. Often coarse surfaces, that allow a good adherence of colour, were preferred by “Maya” artists. Besides, most caves of Yucatan (Belize) benefit from the semi-arid climate in the peninsula. Nevertheless, slash and burn agriculture as practiced in the Maya Mountains (Belize and Guatemala) may completely denude the landscape of vegetation in the future. Its loss would provoke the disappearance of the thin layer of soil that covers the karstic underground. In effect much more water could penetrate the caves roof, dissolving in this way the limestone silt on the wall and washing the rock paintings away. Lighting of the caves could produce the growth of algae as is the case in commercially used caves. Nevertheless, human generated carbon dioxide and bacterial damage should not be a problem. The size of most caves would preclude visitation in numbers that could cause an adverse impact (A. Stone 1995: 243-52).

Traditionally there is no strong consciousness of preserving history in Central America. Natural catastrophes (Hurricane Mitch), long periods of civil war (Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua) and very limited financial resources (Nicaragua) prevented an active and effective management of historic and archaeological sites in the past. In this way the complex Oropoli site (Honduras) was heavily damaged by Hurrican Mitch (McKittrick, pers. comm. 2004). The Gruta del Espíritu Santo (El Salvador) probably served as camp for militaries or guerrillas during the Civil War period (Coladan, 2002, pers. comm.). On an individual level the exploitation of archaeological objects is often understood as part of sustenance. Rock art is affected by these attitudes in a direct and indirect manner. Looting rock art sites (El Gigante Cave) is very common because most people believe in hidden treasures. Movable petroglyphs are often sold (Costa Rica) or transported toward town halls, central parks (Estelí, Nicaragua) or museums (Lake Guija petroglyphs). Additionally, rock engravings are commonly scratched, chalked or painted (Caldera). Even well intended school teachers or state representatives painted petroglyphs in the recent past (Panama). Some sites (Ayasta site, Yaguacire site) serve for depositing treasure (Podestá 2004, pers. comm.). Often private landowners are afraid of expropriation, if their rock art should get additional attention (San Pedro, Costa Rica). The inhabitants of Nancito (Panama) eliminated all the engraved rocks of their territories when they learnt that anthropologists intended to establish a local Rock Art Park (figs. 3 and 6). Besides, communal or private rock art museums often tell fantastic stories about a completely imagined prehistory. Commonly there are no lectures about rock art at schools or universities. The lectures of Whitley (2004 at the San Carlos University) and Künne (2001 at the Autonomous National University of Chiriquí) are notable exceptions.

6 Rock art and indigenous groups:

Central American rock art is the product of its indigenous populations. In Eastern Mesoamerica they represent a considerable part of the present nations’ citizens (40% in Guatemala, 11% in Belize, 10% in El Salvador, 7% Honduras). In contrast, the native groups of Lower Central America constitute not only a social but also a numerical weak minority (3% in Nicaragua, 2% in Costa Rica, but 8% in Panama). Nevertheless, rock art cannot be linked directly to the present ethnic groups. The social organisation of ancient indigenous populations changed completely in the past. Not a single identity group survived European

conquest. Otherwise there are a lot of native language groups that might be connected directly with rock art. Sometimes their members preserve particular concepts of symbolic or functional interpretation. The bribri- and cabécar-speaking groups of southern Costa Rica integrate stone sculptures, semi-sculptured rocks and characteristic natural formations within the same category of classification. Besides, they don't distinguish between natural marks and culturally produced ones. For them, the iconographic potential of the modified rocks seems to be more important than the origin of the decoration. Often the mobile or immobile character of the images doesn't make a significant difference of definition (Künne 2003a: 6f., 106-16). Most probably rock art is understood as a complex icon combining natural and cultural features. The Q'eqchi' of Guatemala interpret decorated (Naj Tunich) as well as undecorated (Qawa Xucaneb) caves as entries to mythic underworlds. Rocky formations play an important role within their "sacred" geography. Some caves are included in an elaborate system of pilgrimages, ritual ceremonies and offerings. The activities exercised are oriented towards the traditional agricultural calendar or the individual life cycle (Adams and Brady 2005: 301-27; Brady 2000: 296-307). In this way many indigenous communities handle rock art as an integral part of their present social relations that are constructed by means of given natural characteristics. Although in Central America no vivid tradition of rock art manufacture continues, there is a tremendous treasure of syncretistic beliefs and popular legends that refer to ancient rock paintings and engravings.

7 Active site management:

During the past 15 years, a new, engaged and well trained generation of Central American anthropologists and archaeologists overtook responsible positions within the administration of Cultural Heritage. In the present there exist more national research, conservation and management projects than ever before. Nevertheless, most systematic investigation continues to be done by foreign scientists. In some cases their activities, sustained by national administrations of culture, stimulated the creation of rock art parks at a communal level. Funding is often minimal or non existent. Often rock art is seen as a tourist magnet. The consequences are diverse:

- The Nancito site (Panama) was in part destroyed by the relocation of many engraved rocks. Nevertheless, anthropologist activity provoked the creation of a scientific Rock Art Museum in 2002 (figs. 3 and 6). It should form part of a national network of communal museums. However, the community does not participate in the benefits except of two low-paid half time jobs.

- The "Foundation Barú" (Panama), a non-governmental and non-profit organization, offers rock art tours of petroglyph sites in the Chiriquí province. The program is sustained by the "Chamber of Commerce" and "Piedras Vivas." In consequence of the rock art lecture, held by Künne at the UNACHI University in 2001, the "Foundation Peterson" offered the payment of one complete archaeological course in the United States. However, the best student was a woman who was not allowed to leave Panama by her family.

- The archaeologist Brizuela (Arqueología S.A.) got some funding from SENACYT (Secretaría Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología) to realize a pilot project about rock art conservation in the western highlands of the Chiriquí province (Panama). The project included the cooperation with local schools and the recording of sites in a database. Another fund was given by PRONAT (Programa Nacional de Adjudicación de Tierras) for the identification of archaeological sites (and rock art sites) within territorial studies.

- At the beginning of the 90' the Colleges of the Midwest (USA) realized various rock art surveys in the General Valley (Costa Rica). All projects were supervised by a national archaeologist (Aida Blanco). In effect, limited site management was established at Finca Sonador (fig. 5). Traditional forms of protection are used. The community benefits directly from the interest tourists, offering guides and bed and breakfast. Nevertheless, the establishment of a visitor circuit failed.

- The Guayabo site (Costa Rica) has an active management practiced by professional archaeologists. The site constitutes the main archaeological attraction of Costa Rica and is visited by many tourists every year. Although most petroglyphs of the core sectors were removed from their original position, there are undisturbed petroglyph concentrations in the surroundings. Only a small part of the museum benefits are reinvested to the site.

- In 1993 the establishment of a Rock Art Park at the Pedregal site (Costa Rica) failed. The pre-study was done by Hardy and Vázquez (1993). All rocks (fig. 7) were registered and marked by little red labels located in their vicinity. Since 1999, the complete zone has been included in the World Heritage Site "Area de Conservación Guanacaste." Research possibilities are offered at the Casona de Sta. Rosa (central administration) and at the Maritza station. The zone has a very active management and multiple research programs.

- The Sonzapote site (Nicaragua) is situated within the National Park of Zapatera Island. Nevertheless, there is almost no funding. Petroglyphs (fig. 9) are included in a pre-Columbian cemetery that is well known for the famous stone sculptures exhibited in Granada (Squier 1851-52). The archaeological core area was settled and in part destroyed by civil war refugees who have no other place to stay. There is no drinking water on the island. The rights of property are unclear. Nevertheless, a local tourist program is offered in Granada. Site protection and monitoring are wished for by the inhabitants and their organization (Unión Agua y Tierra). Monitoring has to be realized urgently before the site will disappear.

- The "Finca Magdalena" (Cooperativa Carlos Díaz Cajina) offers allocation, nutrition and guides to the petroglyphs of the Ometepe island (Nicaragua). It represents an agrarian tourist project with site management (fig. 8). There is no state funding. Additional assistance is wished for and necessary. Nowadays, Ometepe represents the main tourist attraction of Nicaragua. The island archaeological resources have been heavily looted.

- The Chaqüttillo site (Department of Matagalpa, Nicaragua) is included in a program of communal development. Almost all petroglyphs were chalked to heighten their visibility.

In the past, rock art documentation, registration or analyses was promoted by:

- Colleges of the Midwest:

General Valley in Costa Rica

- Commission des Fouilles du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères:

Gruta de Espíritu Santo in El Salvador, Rock art site El Encanto in Costa Rica

- Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD):

Chiriquí Province in Panama, General Valley in Costa Rica

- Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG):

Ometepe in Nicaragua

- Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies (FAMSI):
 - Lago Guija in El Salvador
 - Casa de las Golondrinas in Guatemala
- National Geographic Society:
 - Petexbatún region in Guatemala
- Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA):
 - Guayabo de Turrialba in Costa Rica
- Smithsonian Institution:
 - Province Guanacaste in Costa Rica
- Viking Fund:
 - no example available

Most rock art study was carried out in Eastern Mesoamerica. Nevertheless, in comparison with the European cave art corpus (275 painted caves according to Bahn and Vertut 1988: 191) “Maya cave art” is characterized by its rare occurrence. The rock art of Lower Central America was less documented. However, there is a great potential of rock art investigation. Lacking archaeological sites with monumental architecture, most countries offer undisturbed natural refuges with a high tourist potential that may be completed by rock art museums.

8 Conclusions

Although Central America is characterized by strong social contrasts, there are small but prosperous elites that might participate in funding rock art projects.

Potential of rock art protection:

- offering an endogen perspective of Central American prehistory
- assistance in decipherment of the hieroglyphic corpus of Maya inscriptions
- strengthening national and communal identities
- promotion of agrarian and sustainable tourism on national and international levels
- argument for the sustainable use of natural resources (restricting in this way the effects of an aggressive dehydration of the landscape)

Main risks to rock art protection:

- destruction of rock art sites by mass tourism (cave sites) and failing management concepts
- short and middle term funding may produce destructive effects after the end of funding (more recommendation, more funding, more publicity, more destruction)

The main obstacles to rock art protection are:

- the fragility of rock art
- the ongoing deforestation and traditional agriculture
- the poverty and illiteracy of a high percentage of national population
- a limited consciousness of rock art preservation
- the scarcity of national financial resources
- no payment of duties (that could be attributed to Cultural Heritage) and the uncontrolled enrichment in the low national financial resources (Nicaragua)
- the limited profit margin of agrarian rock art tourism

- the strong centralization of Central American states threatens the communal participation in the benefits of rock art parks
- the lack in systematic documentation and comparative analyses
- the scarcity or non existence of management plans

In order to prevent further destruction of rock art one might suggest the following measures:

- application of existing laws and decrees
- regular monitoring of rock art sites, that are protected by law
- establishment of long term documentation, preservation and funding programs
- involvement of local communities in the benefits of rock art protection
- establishment of at least one rock art park in every Central American country
- divulgation of management experiences from the United States of America
- regular education programs at schools and universities
- establishment of digital rock art registers at National Museums
- closing of public entries to decorated caves and grottos
- cleaning of vandalized rock art sites
- establishment of well trained and well paid guards at important rock art sites
- application of cheap, traditional and sustainable strategies of open air site protection
- establishment of circuits and information boards
- inclusion of important rock art sites in the natural park system
- development of alternative economic strategies (sustainable tourism) as a compensation for the end to slash and burn agriculture.

See illustrations Annexe IV: page 217

Table 1: Archaeological chronologies

| Eastern Mesoamerica | Main archaeological (and historical) sites | Lower Central America | Main archaeological (and historical) sites |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Late Postclassic (1530-1200 A.D.) | Mixco Viejo, Iximché, Utatlán, Zaculeu, Tayasal, (Naco) | Period VI (1520-1000 A.D.) | (Tecoatega, Couto, Parita) |
| Early Postclassic (1200-900 A.D.) | Cihuatán | Period V (1000-500 A.D.) | Quelepa, Tenampua Conte site, Guayabo Barriles |
| Epiclassic (900-800 A.D.) | Tikal, Quirigua | | |
| Late Classic (800-600 A.D.) | Tikal, Dos Pilas, Copán, Quirigua, Tazumal (Chalchuapa) | | |
| Early Classic (600-250 A.D.) | Tikal, Copan, Cara Sucia, Cerén | Period IV (500 A.D. -1000 B.C.) | Cerro Zapote (1000 A.D. - 300 B.C.) Playa de los Muertos (300-600 B.C.) |
| Late Formative (250 A.D. - 300 B.C.) | Kaminaljuyú, Abaj Takalik, El Baúl (Cotzumalhuapa), Sta. Leticia, Nakbe | Period III (1000-4000 B.C.) | La Rama (1500 B.C.?) Monagrillo (2800 B.C.?) Boquete, Esperanza (4000 B.C.?) |
| Middle Formative (300-900 B.C.) | El Trapiche (Chalchuapa), Yarumela | | |
| Early Formative (900-1600 B.C.) | Cuello (1200 B.C.?) [Chiapas]: Altamira and Ocos (1600 B.C.) | | |
| Late Archaic (1600-2000 B.C.) | Quiché Valley [Chiapas]: Sta. Marta Cave | Período II (4000-8000 B.C.) | Acahualinca (4000 B.C.?) Cerro Mangote (4858 B.C.) |
| Middle Archaic (2000-5000 B.C.) | Los Tapiales (app. 5000 a.C.?) | | |
| Early Archaic (5000-8000 B.C.) | San Rafael (app. 5000 a.C.?) Orange Walk (8000 B.C.?) | | |
| Paleoindian (8000- ? B.C.) | Los Grifos [Chiapas] (11.000 B.C.?) | Período I (8000- ? B.C.) | Espíritu Santo Cave (?) El Gigante rock shelter (11.000 B.C.?) Guardiria and Isla Macapala (11.000 a.C.?) |

Table 2: Periods, wares, horizons and traditions

| Eastern Mesoamerica | Wares, horizons and traditions | Lower Central America | Wares and horizons |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| Late Postclassic (1530-1200 A.D.) | Mixteca-Puebla-Tradition Fine Orange Ware | Period VI (1520-1000 A.D.) | Creme Sliped Polychrome Horizon (1520-800 A.D.) |
| Early Postclassic (1200-900 A.D.) | Plumbat Ware | Period V (1000-500 A.D.) | |
| Epiclassic (900-800 A.D.) | Cotzumalhuapa-Tradition (900-500 A.D.) | | |
| Late Classic (800-600 A.D.) | Ulua-Yojoa-Polichrome Wares (800-500 A.D.), | | |
| Early Classic (600-250 A.D.) | Classic-Maya-Horizon | Período IV (500 A.D. -1000 B.C.) | Zoned Bichrome Horizon (500 A.D. – 500 B.C.) |
| Late Formative (250 A.D. -300 B.C.) | Usulután Wares (300 A.D. - 900 B.C.) Izapa-Tradition (200 A.D. - 400 B.C.) | | |
| Middle Formative (300-900 B.C.) | Olmec-Horizon (300-1200 B.C.) | | |
| Early Formative (900-1600 B.C.) | Monochrome Wares: Swasey and Xe Complex (600-1000 B.C.) | Período III (1000-4000 B.C.) | Monochrome Wares: Monagrillo Complex (1000-2800 B.C.) |
| | Monochrome Wares: Ocos Complex (1200-1500 B.C.) | | |
| Late Archaic (1600-2000 B.C.) | | | |
| Middle Archaic (2000-5000 B.C.) | | | |

Table 3: Legislation and National Archaeological Commissions

| Country | Legal base of rock art documentation | National Archaeological Commissions | Contact |
|----------------|---|--|---|
| Belize | | Ministry of Culture, Department of Archaeology | Dr. Jaime Awe jaimeawe@nichbelize.org |
| Costa Rica | Article 140 of the Political Constitution Law no. 6703, passed at 28 th December in 1981 | Museo Nacional de Costa Rica (MNCR), Comisión Arqueológica Nacional (CAR), Apartado: 749-1000, San José | Dr. Francisco Corrales fcorrales@hotmail.com |
| El Salvador | | Ministerio de Cultura y Comunicaciones, Consejo Nacional para la Arte y Cultura (CONCULTURA), Dirección Nacional de Patrimonio Cultural, Alameda Juan Pablo II y Calle Guadalupe, edificio A-5, San Salvador | |
| Guatemala | | Departamento de Monumentos Prehistóricos, Comisión Arqueológica Nacional, Avenida 2 y Calle 11, Zona 1 Ciudad de Guatemala | |
| Honduras | Decree no. 220-97, passed in 1997 (Decree no. 81-84, passed at 21 st May in 1984) | Instituto Hondureño de Antropología e Historia (IHAH), Departamento de Antropología, Villa Roy, Barrio Buenos Aires, Tegucigalpa, Apartado 1518 | Dra. Gloria Lara Pinto ihah2003@yahoo.com |
| Nicaragua | Law no. 1142, passed in 1984 (Decree no. 142, passed in 1941) | Instituto Nicaragüense de Cultura (INC), Dirección de Patrimonio Cultural, Palacion Nacional de Cultura, Frente a Casa Presidencial Managua | Lic. Edgar Espinoza edgarespinoza1964@yahoo.com.mx |
| Panama | Law no. 14, passed at 05 th May in 1982 Law no. 19, passed at 09 th October 1984 Law no. 17, passed at 10 th April in 2002 | Instituto Nacional de Cultura (INAC), Subdirección del Patrimonio Histórico, Apartado 662, Panama 1 | Domingo Varela |

Table 4: Rock Art Sites, National Parks and National Monuments

| Country | National Parks | National Monument | Year of declaration | Rock Art | Administrator | References |
|-------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Belize | Bladen National Reserve | | 1990 | pictographs | Department of Environment | Helmke 2003: 101-02 http://www.turq.com/belize/belnatpk.html http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Belize.html |
| | Chiquibul National Park | | | pictographs | Department of Environment | Helmke et al. 2003: 113 http://www.turq.com/belize/belnatpk.html http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Belize.html |
| | Caracol National Park | | | espeleothems | Department of Environment | Helmke et al. 2003: 109 http://www.turq.com/belize/belnatpk.html http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Belize.html |
| Costa Rica | Guayabo de Turrialba | | 1988 | petroglyphs | MINAE | Fonseca and Acuña 1986: 236-54 |
| | | El Farallón de Sandillal | 1995 | petroglyphs | MINAE | Künne 2003b: 212 |
| El Salvador | Parque Nacional El Imposible | | 1989 | petroglyphs | MARN | Coladán and Amaroli 2003: 154 http://www.nps.gov/centralamerica/salvador/ |
| | | Gruta del Espíritu Santo | | pictographs | MARN | Coladán and Amaroli 2003: 145-49, 157 |
| Guatemala | Parque Nacional Sierra de Lacandón | | 1990 | petroglyphs | CONAMA | Stone 2003: 127 http://www.parkswatch.org/parkprofile.php?l=spa&country=gua&park=slnp&page=phy |
| | Reserva de la Biosfera Maya | | 1990 | petroglyphs | CONAMA | Coe 1967: 84; Hellmuth 1978: 86-89, 114-15 |
| | Reserva Petexbatún | | | petroglyphs pictographs | CONAMA | Stone 2003 : 137 |
| Honduras | Parque Eco-Arqueológica Las Cuevas de Talgua | | | pictographs | SERNA | Brady et al. 2000: 111-18; Stone and Künne 2003: 202-03 http://www.ihah.hn/antropologia/peat/peat.htm |

| Country | National Parks | National Monument | Year of declaration | Rock Art | Administrator | References |
|-----------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Nicaragua | Parque Nacional Arquipélago Isla Zapatera | | 2000 | petroglyphs, semi-sculptured stones | MARENA | Baker et al. 2001: 21-59; Matillo Vila 1968; Navarro 1996: 81-103; Stone and Künne: 2003: 203-05; Thornquist 1981 http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Nicaragua.html |
| | Parque Nacional Volcan Masaya | | 1979 | petroglyphs | MARENA | Lehmann 1909, unpublished notebook http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Nicaragua.html |
| | Reserva Natural Laguna de Apoyo | | 2005 (?) | petroglyphs | MARENA | Lehmann 1909, unpublished notebook http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Nicaragua.html |
| | Reserva Natural y Patromonio Cultural Isla Ometepe | | 1995 | petroglyphs | MARENA | Baker 2003: 183-200; Lettow 1999: 73-85; Matillo Vila 1973; Stone and Künne 2003: 203-05 |
| | Bosawas Biosphere Reserve | | 1991 | pictographs | MARENA | Kaufman 2005, pers. comm. http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Nicaragua.html |
| | | Monumento Nacional Solentiname | 1990 | petroglyphs | MARENA | Laurencich de Minelli et al. 1996 : 23-45, 2000 : 235-69 http://www.ccad.ws:9010/legislacion/Nicaragua.html |
| Panama | | Parque Arqueológico Nancito | 2002 | petroglyphs | INRENARE | Künne 2003c: 238, 2005: 25 |
| | | Cerro de la Valeria/ Río Sta Lucía | 1984 | petroglyphs | INRENARE | Künne 2003c: 226-27, 237 |

National Parks that simultaneously constitute World Heritage Sites are not mentioned.

The utilized abbreviations mean: CONAMA: Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente, INRENARE: Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales Renovables; MARENA: Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, MARN: Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, MINAE: Ministerio del Ambiente y Energía, SERNA: Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y de Ambiente de Honduras

For more detailed information see: <http://www.anam.gob.pa/links%20de%20centro%20america.htm>

Table 5: World Heritage Sites

| Country | World Heritage Sites | Dates of declaration and extension | Rock art | References |
|------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Costa Rica | La Amistad National Park | 1983, 1990 | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 200, 204 |
| | Cocos Island National Park | 1997, 2002 | petroglyphs | Vázquez et al. 1998 |
| | Area de Conservación Guanacaste | 1999, 2004 | petroglyphs | Chávez Jiménez 1989; Hardy and Vázquez 1993; Künne 2003b: 203-04, 214 |
| Guatemala | Tikal National Park | 1979 | petroglyphs | Coe 1967: 84; Hellmuth 1978: 86-89, 114-15 |
| Honduras | Archaeological Park of the Ruins of Copan | 1980 | pictographs | Murray and Valencia 1996: 186-87 |
| | Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve | 1996 | petroglyphs | Conzemius 1927-28: 250; Reyes Mazzoni 1976c: 194-94 |
| Panama | Darién National Park | 1981 | petroglyphs | Joly Adams 2000 |
| | La Amistad National Park | 1983, 1990 | petroglyphs | Joly Adams 2003, pers. comm. |

Table 6: World Heritage Tentative List (2005)

| Country | National Heritage Sites pertaining to the World Heritage Tentative List | Rock Art | References |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| Belize | non | | |
| Costa Rica | Corcovado National Park and Isla del Caño Biological Reserve | | |
| | Plenitude under the Sky. Park of Pre-Columbian Stone Spheres | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 38; 2003b: 215 |
| | San José-Limón Region | petroglyphs | Fonseca and Acuña 1986: 236-54; Kennedy 1968: 87-91, 161, 164, 167, 177, 181, 184, 191, 207, 209,-10, 218, 246, 248, 251, 269, 273, 277, 279, 281, 284, 287, 290, 294, 298, 302, 307, 329, 332, 336; 1970: 49-99, 1973: 47-56; Künne 2003a: 331-36; 2003b: 204, 206-07, 217 |
| El Salvador | Cara Sucia/ El Imposible | petroglyphs | Coladan and Amaroli 2003: 154 |
| | Chalchuapa | petroglyphs | Coladan and Amaroli 2003: 144 |
| | Lake Guija | petroglyphs | A. Stone 1998, 1999; URL: http://www.famsi.org/reports |
| Guatemala | Naj Tunich Cave | pictographs petroglyphs inscriptions handprints | Brady 1989; A. Stone 1995, 2003: 123-24 |
| | National Park Sierra del Lacandón | petroglyphs | A. Stone 2003: 127 |
| | Protected Area of Lake Atitlán | petroglyphs | A. Stone 2003: 129 |
| Nicaragua | City of Granada and its Natural Environment | petroglyphs | Baker 2003: 183-200; Matillo Vila 1968, 1973; Navarro 1996: 80-103; Stone and Künne 2003: 196-213; Thornquist 1981 |
| | National Reserve Bosawas | pictographs, petroglyphs, handprints | Kaufman 2005, pers. com. |
| | Volcano Masaya National Park | petroglyphs | Lehmann 1909, unpublished notebook |
| Panama | National Park Coiba | petroglyphs | Joly Adams 2000 |

Table 7: Indigenous territories including rock art sites

| country | territory | ethnic group | rock art | references |
|------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Belize | no indigenous territories | | | |
| Costa Rica | Reserva Indígena Chirripó | Cabécar | petroglyphs | Hurtado de Mendoza et al. 1985: 91-106 |
| | Reserva Indígena Ujarrás | Cabécar | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 2003, 2003c: 205 |
| | Reserva Indígena Salitre | Bribri | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 200-01 |
| | Reserva Indígena Cabagra | Bribri | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 200-01 |
| | Reserva Indígena Térraba | Térraba (Teribe) | petroglyphs | Künne 2003a: 200-01; 2003b: 208; D. Stone 1961: 136 |
| | Reserva Indígena Boruca | Brunca | petroglyphs | Blanco and Künne 2000: 20-24; Künne 2003°: 200-01 |
| | Rerva Indígena Curré | Brunca | petroglyphs | Blanco and Künne 2000: 20-24; Künne 2001: 7-11, 2003a: 196, 226 |
| Nicaragua | Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte (RAAN) | Misquito, Mayangna (Sumo) | petroglyphs pictographs | Conzemius 1932: 103-06; 1997: 32, 39, 84, 103, 111, 113, 114, 137, 169, 185, 189, 201, 202, 214, 235; Kaufmann 2005, pers. comm. |
| | Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte (RAAS) | Misquito, Rama | petroglyphs | Conzemius 1929: 327-28 |
| Panama | Comarca Embera no.1 | Embera (Chocó) | petroglyphs | Joly Adams 2000 |
| | Comarca Ngöbe-Buglé | Ngöbe, Buglé (both: Guaymí) | petroglyphs | Quintero 1994-95 |
| | Comarca de San Blas | Cuna | petroglyphs | Fitzgerald 2004, pers. comm. |

Appendix: archaeological regions and rock art

The following zones correspond to the archaeological regions of Central America. In each of the sub-areas there are various rock-art traditions. If they constitute more general traditions or horizons it still has to be investigated by systematic archaeological documentation and iconographic analyses.

Eastern Mesoamerica

- Belize: north region,

as described by Helmke et al. 2003: 97-117. The zone includes all parts north of the Maya Mountains. The north region is in geomorphologic and cultural terms an integral part of the Yucatan lowlands. No rock art site is reported.

- Belize: Maya Mountains,

as described by Brady 1989 and Helmke et al. 2003: 97-117. The geomorphologic and cultural features are linked with the lowlands of Guatemala. Cave art includes pictographs (paintings, drawings, handprints), petroglyphs and semi-sculptured speleothems. No open air rock art site is reported.

- Belize: south region,

as described by Helmke et al. 2003: 97-117. The zone includes all parts south of the Maya Mountains. No rock art is reported.

- Guatemala: northern lowlands,

as described by Brady 1989, 1997; Brady et al. 1997: 91-96; A. Stone 1995, 2003: 119-35; Stone and Künné 2003: 196-213. The zone comprises both the Verapaz Departments and the Peten Department. Cave art includes pictographs (paintings, drawings, inscriptions, handprints), petroglyphs and semi-sculptured speleothems. Open air rock art consists of petroglyphs.

- Guatemala: north coast,

as described by Orozco and Bronson 1991. The zone includes the Lake Izabal and the surrounding lowlands of the Río Motagua Valley (El Progreso and Zacapa Departments). Cave art include pictographs and petroglyphs. No open air rock art is reported.

- Guatemala: western highlands,

as described by Stone 2003: 119-35. The zone includes the Departments of Huehuetenango, San Marcos, Quiché, Quetzaltenango, Otonicapán, Sololá (Amatitlan Lake), Chimaltenango, Antigua (Valley of Antigua), Ciudad de Guatemala (Atitlan Lake). Cave art and open air rock art include pictographs (paintings, handprints) as well as petroglyphs.

- Guatemala: eastern highlands,

as described by A. Stone 2003: 119-35. The zone comprises the Departments of Chiquimula, Jalapa, Jutiapa, Santa Rosa. Cave art and open air rock art includes pictographs (paintings, handprints) as well as petroglyphs.

- Guatemala: south coast,

zone as described by Schieber de Lavarreda (ed.) 1998. The region includes the Retalhuleu, Escuintla and Santa Rosa Departments as well as parts of the San Marcos and Jutiapa Departments. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art sites consist of petroglyphs and semi-sculptured rocks.

- El Salvador: west region,

region as described by Sheets 1984: 85-112; rock art as described by Coladan and Amaroli 2003: 143-6; Stone and Künné 2003: 196-213. The zone includes all regions west and north of the Río Lempira. Cave art consists of paintings and hand prints. Open air rock art comprises petroglyphs.

- Honduras: west region,

region as described by Healy 1984: 113-61. The zone includes the Copan and Ocotepeque Departments as well as parts of the Cortes, Sta. Bárbara and Lempira Departments. Cave art and open air rock art sites show pictographs and petroglyphs.

Contact Zone

- El Salvador: east region,

region as described by Sheets 1984: 85-112; rock art as described by Coladan and Amaroli 2003: 143-6. The zone includes all regions east of the Río Lempira. Cave art consists of paintings, hand prints and petroglyphs. Open air rock art comprises petroglyphs.

- Honduras: central region,
region as described by Healy 1984: 113-61; rock art as described by Murray and Valencia 1996: 186; McKittrick 2003: 163-81. The zone includes the Río Ulua-Sula-Chamelecon river system, the Lake Yojoa region and the central highlands of Honduras with the Río Comayagua valley. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art sites consist of rock shelters, grown rocks, and stones decorated with pictographs (paintings and handprints), petroglyphs and painted petroglyphs.

- Honduras: south region
region as described by Healy 1984: 113-61; rock art as described by Murray and Valencia 1996: 186; McKittrick 2003: 163-81. The zone includes the Choluteca and Valle Departments. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art consists of petroglyphs. No pictographs are mentioned.

- Gran Nicoya,
region as defined by Lange 2001b: 517-21; rock art as described by Baker 2003: 183-200; Künne 2003: 201-21; Stone and Künne 2003: 196-213. The zone comprises as well the whole Pacific coast and mountain ranges of Nicaragua (northern sector) as the Guanacaste Province and the whole Nicoya peninsula of north-western Costa Rica (southern sector). Cave art includes pictographs (paintings and handprints), petroglyphs and painted petroglyphs. Open air rock art sites consist of petroglyphs and semi-sculptured rocks.

Lower Central America

- Nicaragua: northern mountains,
region as described by Espinoza et al. 1996; rock art as described by Baker 2003: 183-200; Gámez Montenegro and Cruz Cruz 2004. The zone comprises the north-western mountain ranges of Nicaragua, covering the Departments of Jinotega, Nueva Segovia, Matagalpa and Madriz. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art sites consist of pictographs and petroglyphs.

- Honduras: north region,
as described by Brady et al. 2000: 111-18; Healy 1984: 113-61; Murray and Valencia 1996: 186; McKittrick 2003: 163-81. The zone comprises as well the Gracias a Dios, Colon, Olancho and Atlantida Departments as parts of the Yoro Department. Cave art consists of pictographs (paintings and drawings). Open air rock art is represented by petroglyphs. No pictographs are mentioned.

- Nicaragua: Atlantic lowlands,
as described by Baker 2003: 183-200; Stone and Künne 2003: 196-213. The zone includes the autonomous indigenous regions Atlántico Norte and Atlántico Sur as well as the Department Río San Juan. Cave art consists of pictographs (paintings and handprints). Open air rock art is represented by petroglyphs.

- Costa Rica: central highlands and Atlantic watershed,
region as defined by Snarskis (1984: 195-232); Vázquez et al. 1998; rock art as described by Künne 2003: 201-21. The zone includes the highlands of San José and Cartago as well as the central pacific and atlantic lowlands. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art sites consist of petroglyphs.

- Gran Chiriquí, as defined by Haberland 1961 and described by Hoopes 1996: 15-47; rock art as described by Künne 2003: 223-39. The zone includes the southern parts of Costa Rica and the western region of Panama. It includes all territories south of Río Savegre and Río Pacuare (Costa Rica), the Panamanian provinces Bocas del Toro and Chiriquí and the autonomous Guaymí Comarca of Panama. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art consists of petroglyphs.

- Gran Coclé (Central Region),
region as defined by Cooke (1984: 263-301); rock art as described by Künne 2003: 223-39. The zone comprises the Veraguas, Herrera, Los Santos and Coclé Provinces, including the Azuero peninsula. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art consists of petroglyphs.

- Gran Darién (East Region),
as defined by Cooke (1984: 263-301); rock art as described by Künne 2003: 223-39. The zone comprises the Colon, Panama and Darien Provinces (including the Channel Zone) as well as the autonomous indigenous Comarca San Blas. No cave art is reported. Open air rock art consists of petroglyphs.

Appendix: recommended literature

The following literature may be useful for a more detailed evaluation of Central American rock art and its contexts:

Central America

Brady, James E. and Keith M. Prufer (eds.)

2005 *In the maw of the Earth Monster. Mesoamerican ritual cave use.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.)

2003 *Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América.* Indiana Beiheft, 16. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Murray, William Breen and Daniel Valencia

1996 "Recent rock art research in Mexico and Central America." In: Bahn, Paul and Angelo Fossati (eds.): "Rock Art Studies: News of the World, I: 185-201. London: Oxbow Books.

Stone, Andrea

1995 *Images from the Underworld. Naj Tunich and the tradition of Maya cave painting.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Stone, Andrea and Martin Künne

2003 "Rock Art of Central America and Maya Mexico." In: Bahn, Paul and Angelo Fossati (eds.): *Rock Art Studies: News of the World, 2: 196-213.* Oxford, UK: Oxbow Books.

Belize

Awe, Jaime J.; Cameron Griffith and Sherry Gibbs

2005 "Cave stelae and megalithic monuments in western Belize." In: Brady, James E. and Keith M. Prufer (eds.): *In the maw of the Earth Monster. Mesoamerican ritual cave use,* pp. 223-48. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Helmke, Christophe G. B.; Jaime J. Awe and Cameron S. Griffith

2003 "El Arte Rupestre de Belice." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): *Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América.* Indiana Beiheft, 16: 97-118. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Costa Rica

Hammett, Florence

1967 *A study of Costa Rican petroglyphs.* Associated Colleges of the Midwest Field Studies Program in Central America. Unpublished manuscript.

Künne, Martin

2003b "Arte Rupestre de Costa Rica." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): *Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América.* Indiana Beiheft, 16: 201-22. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Künne, Martin; Ines Beilke-Voigt and Kay-Uwe Voigt

2000 "Petroglyphs of the northern part of the General Valley in Costa Rica. Their situation in different landscapes." *British Archaeological Report. International Series (Oxford, UK), 902: 131-41.*

Zilberg, John

1986 "The Diquís petroglyphs: distribution, archaeological context and iconographic content." In: Lange, Frederick W. and Norr, Lynette (eds.): Prehistoric settlement patterns in Costa Rica. Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society (Urbana, Illinois), 14(1-2): 339-60.

El Salvador

Coladán, Elisenda and Paul Amaroli

2003 "Las Representaciones Rupestres de El Salvador." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América. Indiana Beiheft, 16: 143-62. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Stone, Andrea

1998 "A study of the carved boulders of Lake Güija, El Salvador and a survey of Rock Art in Highland Guatemala." Report to the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies (FAMSI). URL: <http://www.famsi.org/reports> [summary].

Guatemala

Batres, Lucrecia Pérez de; Carlos Batres; Ramiro Martínez; Nury Escobar de Milián and Luisa Rosada
1999 Estudio de la pintura rupestre de Chquimula: Peñasco los Migueles, Alonzo y Cerán." In: La Porte, Juan Pedro; Héctor Escobedo and Ana Claudia Monzón de Suasnávar (eds.): XII. Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueológicas en Guatemala, 2: 791-805. Guatemala-Ciudad: Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes; Museo Nacional de Arqueología y Etnología.

Brady, James E.

1989 "An investigation of Maya ritual cave use with special reference to Naj Tunich, Guatemala. Ph.D. dissertation. Los Angeles: University of California.

Stone, Andrea

1995 Images from the Underworld. Naj Tunich and the tradition of Maya cave painting. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

2003 "Arte Rupestre de Guatemala." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América. Indiana Beiheft, 16: 119-42. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Honduras

McKittrick, Alison

2003 "Arte Rupestre en Honduras." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América. Indiana Beiheft, 16: 163-82. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Murray, William Breen and Daniel Valencia

1996 "Recent rock art research in Mexico and Central America." In: Bahn, Paul and Angelo Fossati (eds.): "Rock Art Studies: News of the World, 1: 186-87, 198. London: Oxbow Books.

Nicaragua

Baker, Suzanne

2003 "Arte Rupestre de Nicaragua." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América. Indiana Beiheft, 16: 183-200. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Gámez Montenegro, Bayardo and Filiberto Cruz Cruz

2004 Registro arqueológico de los petroglifos de la cuenca del Río Estelí. Estelí: ADESO, SINSLANI.

Matillo Vila, Joaquin (Hildeberto María, Hno.)

1965 Estas piedras hablan. Estudio preliminar del arte rupestre de Nicaragua. Managua.

1968 El Muerto, isla santuario. Estudio de su arte rupestre. Managua.

1973 Ometepe. Isla de círculos y espirales. Managua: Centro de Investigaciones Rupestres.

Navarro Genie, Rigoberto

1996 Arte Rupestre del Pacífico de Nicaragua. Las variables de las representaciones entre la Costa del Pacífico y el Lago Cocibolca. Managua: Fondo Editorial INC/ASDI; Editorial Universidad Centroamericana.

Thornquist, Peter

1981 Las rocas grabadas de 'El Muerto'. Guía de la exposición en el Museo Estatal de Illinois, Springfield. Managua: Ministerio de Cultura, Dirección General de Patrimonio Cultural, Departamento de Arqueología.

Panama

Harte, Neville A.

1960 Preliminary report on petroglyphs of the Republic of Panama, 1951-1960. Panamá (Curundú, Canal Zone).

1961 Panorama of Panama Petroglyphs. Panamá.

Holmberg, Karen

2005 "The voices of stones: unthinkable materiality in the volcanic context of western Panamá." In: Meskell, Lynn (ed.): Archaeologies of materiality, pp. 190-211. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Künne, Martin

2003c "Arte Rupestre de Panamá." In: Künne, Martin and Matthias Strecker (eds.): Arte Rupestre de México Oriental y de Centro América. Indiana Beiheft, 16: 223-39. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.

Appendix: References

Adams, Abigail E. and James E. Brady

2005 "Ethnographic notes on Maya Q'eqchi' cave rites: implications for archaeological interpretation." In: Brady, James E. and Keith M. Prufer (eds.): In the maw of the Earth Monster. Mesoamerican ritual cave use, pp. 301-27. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Armitage, Ruth A., James Brady, Allan Cobb, John R. Southon y Marvin W. Rowe

2001 Mass spectrometric radiocarbon dates from three rock paintings of known age. In: American Antiquity, 66(3): 471-80.

Bahn, Paul and Jean Vertut

1988 Images of the Ice Age. London: Winward.

Baker, Suzanne

1995-2002 [Unpublished field notes and petroglyph forms]. Oakland, California.

1996 "Reconocimiento arqueológico y registraci3n de petroglifos, Isla Ometepe, Nicaragua. Temporada de campo 1995." [Unpublished file.] Managua: Museo Nacional de Nicaragua Departamento de Investigaciones Arqueol3gicas.

- 1997 "Reconocimiento arqueológico y registraci3n de petroglifos, Isla Ometepe, Nicaragua. Temporada de campo 1996." [Unpublished file.] Managua: Museo Nacional de Nicaragua Departamento de Investigaciones Arqueol3gicas.
- 2000 "Reconocimiento arqueol3gico y registraci3n de petroglifos, Isla Ometepe, Nicaragua. Temporada de campo 1997." [Unpublished file] Managua: Museo Nacional de Nicaragua Departamento de Investigaciones Arqueol3gicas.
- Baker, Suzanne and Michael Smith
2001 "Prospecci3n arqueol3gica en la Isla Zapatera, investigaci3n de campo de 1986." In: Huellas. Revista de Antropolog3a e Historia, 2: 21-59.
- Batres, Carlos; Lucrecia P3rez de Batres; Luisa Rosada; Ramiro Mart3nez and Nury Escobar de Mili3n
1997 "La pintura rupestre del Peñasco los Migueles." Estudios. Revista de Antropolog3a, Arqueolog3a e Historia, 3: 2-23.
- Batres A., Carlos; Ramiro Mart3nez; Nury de Mili3n and Lucrecia P3rez
1998 "Las pinturas rupestres del peñasco Los Migueles, Municipio de San Juan Ermita, Chiquimula: informe preliminar." In: La Porte, J. P. and H. L. Escobedo (eds.): XI Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueol3gicas en Guatemala (1997.), pp. 499-511 Ciudad de Guatemala: Museo Nacional de Arqueolog3a y Etnolog3a.
- Blanco, Aida und Martin K3nne
2000 "La documentaci3n de petroglifos en el Valle de El General, Costa Rica: ¿Nacimientos muertos de la investigaci3n cient3fica?," Bolet3n de la Sociedad de Investigaci3n del Arte Rupestre de Bolivia (SIARB), 14: 20-24.
- Bovallius, Carl
1886 Nicaraguan antiquities. Stockholm: Kongl. Boktryckeriet.
- Brady, James E.
1990 "Report on recent damage to the inscriptions at Naj Tunich." *Mexicon*, 12(1): 5-6.
- 1993 "Exploraciones de la rama nueva de Naj Tunich: implicaciones para su inter-pretaci3n." In: III Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueol3gicas en Guatemala, pp. 141-49. Ciudad de Guatemala: Museo Nacional de Arqueolog3a y Etnolog3a.
- 1997 "Las Cuevas de Cobanerita, San Benito, Pet3n." Unpublished report to the Instituto de Antropolog3a e Historia, Ciudad de Guatemala.
- 1999 "The Gruta de Jobonche: an analysis of speleothem rock art." In: Gubler, Ruth (ed.): *Land of the turkey and the deer*, pp. 57-68. Lancaster, California: Labyrinthos Press.
- 2000 *Die dunklen Geheimnisse der Maya – Arch3ologische Erforschung von Maya-H3hlen*. In: Grube, Nicolai (ed.): *Maya. Gottk3nige im Regenwald*, pp. 297-307. K3ln: K3nemann Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Brady, James E. and Federico Fahsen
1991 "The discovery of a new Maya cave painting site in Guatemala." *The Explorers Journal*, 69(2): 52-55.
- Brady, James; George Haseman and John Forgety
1995 "Harvest of skulls and bones." *Archaeology*, 49(3): 36-40.

- Brady, James E.; Gene A. Ware; Barbara Luke; Allan Cobb; John Fogarty and Beverly Shade
1997 "Preclassic cave utilization near Cobanerita, San Benito, Peten." *Mexicon*, 14(5): 91-96.
- Brady, James; Ann Scott; Hector Neff and Michael Glascock
1997 "Speleothem beakage, movement, removal, caching: an aspect of ancient Maya cave modification." *Geoarchaeology*, 12(6): 725-50.
- Brady, James E.; Christopher Begley; John Fogarty; Donald J. Stierman; Barbara Luke and Ann Scott
2000 "Talgua archaeological project: a preliminary assessment." *Mexicon*, 32(5): 111-18.
- Brady, James and GeneWare
2001 "Las inscripciones de Naj Tuncih: avances recientes de imagen multi-espectral." In: La Porte, Juan Pedro; Ana Claudia Monzón de Suasnívar and Bárbara Arroyo (eds.): XIV. Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueológicas en Guatemala, 2: 1017-25. Guatemala-Ciudad: Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes.
- Chavez Jiménez, Adrián
1989 "Visita a la estación Maritza, faldas de volcán Orosí, Guanacaste." Unpublished Report to the Museo Nacional de Costa Rica. San José.
- Coe, William R.
1967 *Tikal. A handbook of the ancient Maya ruins*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.
- Conzemius, Eduard
1927-28 "Los indios Payas de Honduras." *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, 19: 245-303; 20 : 253-360.

1929 "Die Rama-Indianer von Nicaragua". *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, pp. 291-362.

1932 *Ethnographical survey of the Miskito and Sumu indians of Honduras and Nicaragua*. Bulletin of the Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, 106. D.C.
- Cooke, Richard
1984 "Archaeological research in Central and Eastern Panama." In: Frederick W. and Doris Stone (eds.): *The archaeology of Lower Central America*, pp. 263-304. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.
- Ericastilla Godoy, Sergio A.
1998 "Informe de la visita al pictograma del cerro de La Mariposa." *Utz'ib*, 2(4): 29-30.
- Espinoza Pérez, Edgar; Leraín Fletcher and Ronaldo Salgado Galeano
1996 *Arqueología de las Segovias: una secuencia cultural preliminar*. Managua: Instituto Nicaragüense de Cultura; Organización de los Estados Americanos.
- Fonseca Zamora, Oscar y Víctor Acuña Coto
1986 "Los petroglifos de Guayabo de Turrialba y su contexto." In: Lange, Frederick W. and Lynette Norr (eds.): *Prehistoric settlement patterns in Costa Rica*. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society*, 14(1-2): 236-54.
- Fonseca Zamora, Oscar and David Watters
2001 "Interpreting photographic documentation of C.V. Hartman's 1903 excavation at the Chinchilla site." Paper at the 66th Annual Meeting of SAA, New Orleans. Unpublished manuscript. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Haberland, Wolfgang

1954 "Apuntes sobre petrograbados de El Salvador." *Comunicaciones del Instituto Tropical de Investigaciones Científicas de la Universidad de El Salvador*, 3(4): 167-71.

1956 "Apuntes sobre petrograbados de El Salvador." *Comunicaciones del Instituto Tropical de Investigaciones Científicas de la Universidad de El Salvador*, 5(2-3): 95-96.

1959 "Apuntes sobre petrograbados de El Salvador." *Comunicaciones del Instituto Tropical de Investigaciones Científicas de la Universidad de El Salvador*, 8(3-4): 23-25.

1961 *Archäologische Untersuchungen in der Provinz Chiriquí, Panamá. Acta Humboldtiana. Serie Geografica et Etnografica*, 3. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

1972 "The Cave of the Holy Ghost." *Archaeology*, 25(4), 286-91.

1991 "Informe preliminar de investigaciones arqueológicas en la Gruta de Corinto y sus alrededores." *Mesoamérica*, 21 : 95-104.

1992 "The culture history of Ometepe Island: preliminary sketch (survey and excavations 1962-1963)." In: Lange, Frederick W.; Payson D. Sheets; Anibal Martínez and Suzanne Abel-Vidor (eds.): *The archaeology of pacific Nicaragua*, pp. 63-117. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.

Hardy, Ellen T. and Ricardo Vázquez L.

1993 "Proyecto arqueológico volcán Orosí. Results of preliminary investigation of Sitio Pedregal. Area de Conservación, Guanacaste, Costa Rica." Unpublished report to the Museo Nacional de Costa Rica.

Harte, Neville A.

1952-59 Site index cards. Museo de Historia y de Arte José Obaldía. Archivo de la Fundación Cultural Gallegos. Unpublished materials. David.

Haseman, George

1996 *El ambiente y las culturas precolombinas.*" In: Hasemann, George; Gloria Lara Pinto and Fernando Cruz Sandoval (eds.): *Los Indios de Centroamérica*, 1. Madrid.

Healy, Paul

1984 "The archaeology of Honduras." In: Lange, Frederick W. and Doris Stone (eds.): *The archaeology of Lower Central America*, pp. 113-61. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.

Hellmuth, Nicholas M.

1978 *Maya archaeology. Tikal, Copan travel guide.* Guatemala.

Hoopes, John

1996 "Settlement, subsistence and the origins of social complexity in Greater Chiriquí: a reappraisal of Aguas Buenas tradition." In: Lange, Frederick (ed.): *Paths to Central American prehistory*, pp. 15-47. Niwot, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.

Hurtado de Mendoza, Luis; Víctor Acuña and Eduardo Castillo

1985 "El sitio Ta'Lari del Pacuare (datos de una prospección inicial)." *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 2 : 91-106.

Joly Adams, Luz Graciela

2000 "Solicitud a la Mesa no. 6 del III Congreso Centroamericano de Antropología, para la creación de una ley por la cual se declaren Patrimonio Cultural y Monumentos Históricos todos los sitios de Petroglifos en la República de Panamá." Paper at the III Congreso Centroamericano de Antropología, Panamá. Unpublished manuscript.

Kennedy, Williams Jerald

1968. Archaeological investigations in the Reventazón river drainage area, Costa Rica. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

1970 "Petroglifos de la cuenca de drenaje del Río Reventazón, Costa Rica." Informe Semestral del Ministerio de Obras Públicas, Instituto Geográfico Nacional de Costa Rica, julio-diciembre, pp. 49-99.

1973 "A comparison of certain Costa Rican petroglyph designs with those from adjacent areas." Proceedings of the IV. International Congress for the study of pre-Columbian cultures of the Lesser Antilles, pp. 47-56. Gainesville, Florida.

Kirchhoff, Paul

1943 "Mesoamérica: sus límites geográficas, composición étnica y caracteres culturales." *Acta Americana*, 1: 92-107. México.

Krickeberg, Walter

1949 *Felsplastik und Felsbilder bei den Kulturvölkern Altamerikas mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Mexikos*. Berlin: Palmes Verlag.

Künne, Martin

2000 "Proyecto de Ley sobre Arte Rupestre en Panamá." *Boletín de la Sociedad de Investigación del Arte Rupestre de Bolivia (SIARB)*, 14: 15f.

2001 "Sitios arqueológicos y leyendas indígenas." *Estudios de las Tradiciones Sagradas de Abia Yala*, 8: 7-11.

2003a *Präkolumbische Felsgravuren im Valle de El General (Costa Rica). Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Aussagen über Bodendenkmäler mit Symbolcharakter*. Ph.D. dissertation. Rahden, Westfalen: Verlag Marie Leidorf.

2005 "Nuevos estudios y enfoques sobre los petrograbados de Panamá." *Boletín de la Sociedad de Investigación del Arte Rupestre de Bolivia (SIARB)*, 19: 24-27.

Künne, Martin; Ines Beilke-Voigt and Luz Graciela Joly Adams

2004 "Fechas por radiocarbono de la excavación arqueológica en el sitio Barriles Bajo (BU-24-I), Chiriquí, Panamá." David: Universidad Autónoma de Chiriquí (UNACHI). URL: http://unachi.ac.pa/publicaciones/Fechamiento_por_radiocarbono.pdf

Lange, Frederick W.

1993 "The conceptual structure in Lower Central American studies: a Central American view." In: Miller Graham, Mark (ed.): *Reinterpreting prehistory of Central America*. Niwot: University Press of Colorado.

2001a "Intermediate Area: Overview." In: Toby Evans, Susan and David L. Webster (eds.): *Archaeology of Ancient Mexico and Central America. An Encyclopedia*, pp. 357-65. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc.

- 2001b "Nicoya, Greater, and Guanacaste Region." In: Toby Evans, Susan and David L. Webster (eds.): *Archaeology of Ancient Mexico and Central America. An Encyclopedia*, pp. 517-22. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Lange, Frederick W. and Doris Stone (eds.)
1984 *The archaeology of Lower Central America*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.
- Laurencich Minelli, Laura; L. Bolondi; C. Bolondi; F. di Cosimo and I. Sini
1996 "Un primo approccio all'archeologia dell'Arcipelago di Solentiname." *Quaderni di Neotropica*, 5(2): 23-45.
- Laurencich Minelli, Laura and Patricia di Cosimo
2000 "L'Arte Rupestre Ne'Il arcipelago di Solentiname." *Studi Americanistici* , 235-69.
- Lehmann, Walter
1909 [Unveröffentliche Notzibücher]. Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut Berlin. Nachlass Lehmann. Berlin.
- Lettow, Hartmut
1999 "Petroglyphen von Ometepe, Nicaragua." *Das Altertum*, 45: 73-85.
- Linares de Sapir, Olga F. y Anthony Ranere (eds.)
1980 *Adaptive radiations in prehistoric Panamá*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.
- Loubser, Johannes
2001 "Management planning for conservation." In: Withley, David. S. (ed.): *Handbook of rock art research*, pp. 80-115. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press.
- MacLeod, Barbara and Andrea Stone
1995 "The hieroglyphic inscriptions of Naj Tunich." In: Stone, Andrea: *Images from the Underworld*, pp. 155-84. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Navarrete, Carlos
1996 "Elementos arqueológicos de mexicanización en las tierras altas mayas." In: Lombardo, Sonia and Enrique Nalda (eds.): *Temas mesoamericanos: 305-52*. México, D.F: Instituto de Antropología e Historia.
- Orozco, R. and R. Bronson
1991 "Proyecto arqueológico Izabal: Fase II." Unpublished report.
- Oviedo y Valdéz, Gonzalo Fernández de
1851-55 [1534, 1547] *Historia natural y general de las Indias, islas y tierra firme del mar océano*. Madrid: Imprenta de la Real Academia de la Historia.
- Piperno, Dolores R., Mark B. Bush, and Paul A. Colinvaux
1990. "Paleoenvironments and human occupation in Late-Glacial Panama.", *Quaternary Research*, 33: 108-16.
- Quilter, Jeffrey
2004 *Cobble circles and standing stones. Archaeology at the Rivas site*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Quintero Sánchez, Blas y P. José Laín

1994-95 "Los petroglifos del distrito Tolé." Unpublished manuscript.

Reyes Mazzoni, Roberto

1975 "Representación de deidades mesoamericanas en los petroglifos de la Cañada de Santa Rosa, Honduras."

1976a "Representación de deidades mesoamericanas en los petroglifos de Santa Rosa Tenampúa." *Boletín de la Academia Hondureña de la Lengua*, 19(9) : 185-235.

1976b "Influências mayas y mexicanas en los petroglifos de la quebrada de Santa Rosa Tenampúa, Honduras." *Katunob*, 9(3): 38-51.

1976c *Introducción a la arqueología de Honduras*. Tegucigalpa: Editorial Nuevo Continente.

Richards, Barbara and María E. Bozzoli de Wille

1964 "Petroglifos de San Pedro de Pérez Zeledon." *Informe Semestral, Instituto Geográfico de Costa Rica*, pp. 139-45.

Robinson, Eugenia

1994 "Informe del Proyecto Kaqchikel: área de las faldas del volcán de Agua entre Ciudad Vieja y San Miguel Escobar." Unpublished manuscript. Ciudad de Guatemala: Instituto de Antropología e Historia.

1997 "Protohistoric to colonial settlement transition in the Antigua Valley, Guatemala." In: Gasco, Janine; Greg Charles Smith and Patricia Fournier-García (eds.): *Approaches to the historical archaeology of Mexico, Central and South America*, pp. 59-70. Los Angeles, California: Institute of Archaeology at university of Los Angeles, California.

Robinson, Eugenia y Gene Ware

2001 "Multi-spectral imaging of La Casa de las Golondrinas rock paintings." Unpublished report to the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies (FAMSI).

Sheets, Payson D.

1984 "The prehistory of El Salvador: an interpretative summary." In: Lange, Frederick W. and Doris Stone (eds.): *The archaeology of Lower Central America*, pp. 85-112. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.

Schieber de Lavarreda, Christa (ed.)

1998 *Taller arqueológico de la región de la Costa Sur de Guatemala*. Retalhuleu: Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes; Instituto de Antropología e História.

Sol Castillo, Felipe

2001 "Nuevos datos para la arqueología del delta Diquís: una prospección en la Fila Grisera". *Vínculos. Revista de Antropología del Museo Nacional de Costa Rica*, 26(1-2): 129-135.

Scheffler, Timothy E.

2001 "Research report on the Proyecto Cueva El Gigante – 2000, La Paz, Honduras." *Mexicon*, 23(5): 115-23.

Seemann, Berthold

1853 *Narrative of the voyage of H. M. S. "Herald" during the years 1845-51* [...] London.

Siffre, Michel

1979 "Mystérieuses civilisations dans les entrailles de la terre." A la recherche de l'art des cavernes du pays Maya. Nice: Editions Alain Leveuvre.

Snarskis, Michael J.

1979 "Turrialba: a paleoindian quarry and workshop site in eastern Costa Rica." *American Antiquity*, 44 (1): 125-38.

1984 "Central America: the Lower Caribbean." In: Lange, Frederick and Doris Stone (eds.): *The archaeology of Lower Central America*, pp. 195-232. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press.

Squier, Ephraim G.

1851-52 *Nicaragua: its people, scenery, monuments and the proposed interoceanic canal*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Stirling, Matthew W. and Marion Stirling Pugh

1977 *Investigaciones arqueológicas en Costa Rica*. San José: Museo Nacional de Costa Rica.

Stone, Andrea

1998 "A study of the carved boulders of Lake Güija, El Salvador and a survey of rock art in Highland Guatemala." Report to the Foundation for the Advancement of Mesoamerican Studies (FAMSI). [a summary is available under: <http://www.famsi.org/reports>]

1999 "Rock art at the crossroads: the carved boulders of Lake Guija, El Salvador." Unpublished paper at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Stone, Andrea and Sergio Ericastilla Godoy

1999 "Registro de arte rupestre en las tierras altas de Guatemala: resultados del reconocimiento de 1997." In: La Porte, Juan Pedro; Héctor Escobedo and Ana Claudia Monzón de Suasnívar (eds.): *XII. Simposio de Investigaciones Arqueológicas en Guatemala*, 2: 775-90. Ciudad de Guatemala: Ministerio de Cultura y Deportes; Museo Nacional de Arqueología y Etnología.

Stone, Doris Z.

1948 "The basic cultures of Central America." In: Steward, Julian (ed.): *Handbook of South American Indians*, 4:169-93. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

1961 *Las tribus talamanqueñas de Costa Rica*. San José: Museo Nacional de Costa Rica.

Walters, Gary Rex

1982 "In search of Cinaca-Mecalco. Part 1-A. Commentary on the 1980-81 research." *Artifact*, 8.

Vázquez, Ricardo et al.

1998 *Banco de datos sobre sitios arqueológicos de Costa Rica*. Unpublished manuscript. San José: Museo Nacional de Costa Rica.

Vázquez de Coronado, Juan

1908 *Cartas de Juan Vázquez de Coronado, conquistador de Costa Rica*. Edited by Ricardo Fernandez Guardia. Barcelona: Imprenta de la Vda. de Luis Tasso.