RESPONSE TO SHACKLEY AND MOORE

Matthew Liebmann

Shackley and Moore's Comment misrepresents the focus of my 2017 article, which is not "regional" in nature but rather attempts a focused study of one community's relationship with the Valles Caldera; furthermore, the vast majority of the data they present do not correspond temporally with my study.

El comentario de Shackley y Moore tergiversa el enfoque de mi artículo de 2017, que no es de naturaleza "regional", sino que intenta un estudio enfocado de la relación de una comunidad con los Valles Caldera; además, la gran mayoría de los datos que presentan no corresponden temporalmente con mi estudio.

Shackley and Moore's "Comment" characterizes my 2017 article as an "essay on regional landscape" and flawed by a lack of regionally specific data. This misrepresents the focus of my article, which does not purport to be "regional" in nature. On the contrary, my article attempts to discern only ancestral Jemez Pueblo meanings in the landscape, not those of other communities. As noted in the original article (Liebmann 2017:649), the goal of this research has always been to investigate ancestral Jemez interactions with the Valles Caldera. My article does not purport to document the regional distribution of Cerro del Medio (CDM) obsidian throughout northern New Mexico or the meanings of the Valles Caldera to any community other than Jemez.

The goals of my research and Shackley and Moore's "Comment" are thus fundamentally different. While my article starts from the Pueblo of Jemez and looks back toward the Valles Caldera, Shackley and Moore start from the Valles Caldera and look outward to the surrounding regions. Their critique simply attempts a different analysis than that of my article.

Additionally, the majority of the data presented by Shackley and Moore predate the period addressed in my study (AD 1300–1700). Ninety percent ($n = 630$ of 703) of the artifacts detailed in their "Comment" date to the Developmental (AD 900–1200) and Coalition (AD 1200–1325) periods. Just 10% date to the Classic period ($n = 73$). Of their Classic period subsample only 21 artifacts consist of CDM obsidian (Valles Rhyolite), as compared with the 1,173 CDM artifacts detailed in my study, all of which hail from ancestral Jemez pueblos dating between AD 1300 and 1700. While the data provided in Shackley and Moore's "Comment" could be used to expand my study for different purposes, the vast majority do not pertain to the case at hand.

Reference Cited

Liebmann, Matthew J.
2017 From Landscapes of Meaning to Landscapes of Signification in the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 82:642–661.

Submitted May 4, 2018; Revised May 22, 2018; Accepted June 27, 2018

Matthew Liebmann ■ Department of Anthropology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA (liebmann@fas.harvard.edu)

American Antiquity 83(4), 2018, p. 756
Copyright © 2018 by the Society for American Archaeology
doi:10.1017/aaq.2018.50

https://doi.org/10.1017/aaq.2018.50 Published online by Cambridge University Press