

Anthropology 942 Proseminar The Archaeology of Gender

Fall 2018 M 5:30-8:10 SAB 394 Anthropology Conference Room 3rd Floor Sabin Hall
Professor Bettina Arnold OFFICE: SAB 229 TEL: 229-4583 HOURS: M 2:00-4:00 or by
appointment. E-mail: barnold@csd.uwm.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course is a graduate-level critical review of approaches to gender in anthropological and archaeological research over the past two decades. We will examine the archaeology of gender from methodological, theoretical, and historical perspectives. The following learning goals are built into the readings and assignments:

- 1) Students will be introduced to the many ways we can recognize gender archaeologically and will learn how archaeology can contribute to theoretical discussions related to gender in the social sciences and humanities more generally.
- 2) The political implications of gender studies will provide students with a way to explore how the field of archaeology contributes to how gender is understood, and misunderstood, in contemporary cultures.
- 3) We will explore the question of whether an "ungendered" archaeology is possible or even desirable.
- 4) The interdisciplinary implications of such questions in archaeology will be contextualized against a backdrop of more general anthropological theories regarding gender roles, gender ideology and gender politics.

READINGS: There are two textbooks for this course:

Ortner, Sherry B. 1997 *Making Gender: the Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Boston: Beacon.
Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig 2000 *Gender Archaeology*. Oxford: Polity.
Additional readings are on D2L organized by week.

EVALUATION AND GRADING:

Attendance and participation: 5% of grade

Two page weekly critical article summaries and discussion questions: 15% of grade.

One short paper (10 pages minimum): 20% of grade.

Final paper (20 pages minimum): 30% of grade.

Oral Presentation: 30% of grade.

Please see www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf for information on Academic Policies and Misconduct.

Topics & Paper/Presentation Due Dates

Weeks 1-2 Sept 3 & 10	Definitions, Concepts and Historical Perspectives on Sex and Gender Note: First face-to-face class meeting not until September 10th!
Weeks 3-4 Sept 17 & 24	The Evolution of "Man": Biological Perspectives
Week 5 Oct. 1	"Desperately Seeking Models": Ethnographic Analogy
Week 6 Oct. 8	Gender and Symbolism Oral presentations 1st half of class weekly beginning Oct. 8
Weeks 7-8 Oct. 15 & 22	Space and Gender: Forest, Field, House, Village, City Final Paper Topics & Preliminary Bibliography due Oct. 22
Weeks 9-11 Oct. 29 - Nov. 12	"Sleep's Sister Death": Bioarchaeology and Mortuary Ritual Short Papers due Nov. 5
Weeks 12-13 Nov. 19 & 26	"Women's Work": Gender and Systems of Production Final Paper drafts due Nov. 26
Week 14 Dec. 3	"Romancing the Goddess": Feminist Archaeology & the Public
Week 15 Dec. 10	"Indiana Joans": Women in Archaeology Final Papers due Friday December 14 by 5pm!



Week by Week Reading Assignments

Weeks 1-2 Definitions & Concepts/Historical Perspectives

Ortner Chapter 1; Sørensen: Chapters 1-2

1. Brown, S. 1997 Ways of seeing women in antiquity. In A.O. Kolosky-Ostrow and C.L. Lyons (eds) *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Archaeology*, pp. 12-41. London and New York: Routledge. (2)
2. Conkey, M.W. and J.D. Spector 1984 Archaeology and the study of gender. *Archaeological Method and Theory* 7:11-45. New York: Academic Press. (1)
3. Dobres, M.-A. 1988 Feminist archaeology and inquiries into gender relations: some thoughts on universals, origin stories and alternative paradigms. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 7(1):30-44. (1)
4. Gilchrist, R. 1991 Women's archaeology? Political feminism, gender theory, and historical revision. *Antiquity* 65:495-501. (2)
5. Gilchrist, R. 1999 Introduction. *Gender and Archaeology*. London: Routledge. (1)
6. Hayden, B. 1992 Observing prehistoric women. In *Exploring Gender through Archaeology*, pp. 33-48. (2)
7. Jayachandran, S. and R. Pande 2014 The youngest are hungriest. *New York Times* Sunday August 10, 2014 p. 4. (1)
8. Landau, M. 1984 Human evolution as narrative. *American Scientist* 72:262-268. (1)
9. Nixon, L. 1994 Gender bias in archaeology, in L.J. Archer, S. Fischler and M. Wyke (eds) *Women in Ancient Societies*, pp. 1-23. London: Macmillan. (2)

10. Pyburn, K.A. 2004 Introduction: Rethinking complex society, in K.A. Pyburn (ed.) *Ungendering Civilization*, pp. 1-46. London and New York: Routledge. (2)
11. Sofaer, J. 2006 *The Body as Material Culture*. Chapter 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (2)
12. Weil, E. 2006 What if it's (sort of) a boy and (sort of) a girl? *New York Times Magazine* September 24, 2006, pp. 50-53. (1)
13. Wright, R.P. 1996 Introduction: Gendered ways of knowing in archaeology. In *Gender and Archaeology*, edited by R.P. Wright, pp. 1-22. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (1)
14. Wylie, A. 1992 The interplay of evidential constraints and political interests: recent archaeological research on gender. *American Antiquity* 52:15-35. (2)

Weeks 3-4 "The Evolution of Man": Biological Perspectives
 Ortner Chapter 2; Sørensen: Chapters 3 and 10

1. Fedigan, L.M. 1986 The changing role of women in models of human evolution. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:25-66. (3)
2. Goldberg, M. 2014 What is a woman? *New Yorker* August 4, 2014, pp. 24-28. (4)
3. Haraway, D. 1990 Women's place is in the jungle. In: D. Haraway (ed.) *Primate Visions: Gender, Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science*, pp. 279-303. London, New York: Routledge. (3)
4. Hurcombe, L. 1995 Our own engendered species. *Antiquity* 69: 87-100. (3)
5. Kuhn, S.L. and M.C. Stiner 2006 What's a mother to do? The division of labor among Neandertals and modern humans in Eurasia. *Current Anthropology* 47(6):953-980. (4)
6. Moraw, S. 2012 Introduction. In: S. Moraw and A. Kieburg (eds) *Mädchen im Altertum/Girls in Antiquity*, pp. 13-26. Münster: Waxmann.
7. Silk, J. 1993 Primatological perspectives on gender. In: B. Miller (ed) *Sex and Gender Hierarchies*, pp. 212-235. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (3)
8. Slocum, S.L. 1975 Woman the gatherer: male bias in anthropology, in R. R. Reiter (ed) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, pp. 36-50. New York: Monthly Review Press. (4)
9. Sperling, S. 1991 Baboons with briefcases vs. Langurs in lipstick: feminism and functionalism in primate studies, in M. DiLeonardo (ed) *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge*, pp. 204-234. Berkeley: University of California Press. (3)

10. Wylie, A. 1997 Good science, bad science or science as usual? Feminist critiques of science. In: L.D. Hager (ed.) *Women in Human Evolution*, pp. 29-55. London and New York: Routledge. (3)
11. Zihlman, A.L. 1981 Women as shapers of the human adaptation. In: F. Dahlberg (ed) *Woman the Gatherer*, pp. 75-120. New Haven: Yale University Press. (3)
12. Zihlman, A.L. 1997 The Paleolithic glass ceiling: Women in human evolution, in L.D. Hager (ed) *Women in Human Evolution*, pp. 91-113. London and New York: Routledge. (4)
13. Zihlman, A.L. 2013 Engendering human evolution. In: D. Bolger (ed) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, pp. 23-44. London and New York: Wiley Blackwell. (1)

Week 5 Desperately Seeking Models: The Archaeology of Gender and Ethnographic Analogy

Ortner Chapter 3; Sørensen: Chapters 4 and 9

1. Bender, B. 1989 The roots of inequality. In: D. Miller, M. Rowlands and C. Tilley (eds) *Domination and Resistance*, pp. 83-95. London: Unwin Hyman.
2. Draper, P. 1975 !Kung women: contrasts in sexual egalitarianism in foraging and sedentary contexts. In: R.R. Reiter (ed) *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, pp. 77-109.
3. Luedke, T. 2004 70. Gender and agency in economic models of Great Zimbabwe. In: K.A. Pyburn (ed.) *Ungendering Civilization*, pp. 47-. London and New York: Routledge.
4. Meigs, A. 1990 Multiple gender ideologies and statuses. In: P.R. Sanday and R.G. Goodenough (eds) *Beyond the Second Sex*, pp. 98-112. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
5. Mills, B.J. 1995 Gender and the reorganization of historic Zuni craft production: implications for archaeological interpretation. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 51:149-172.
6. Moore, H. 1988 *Feminism and Anthropology* Chapters 1 & 2. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
7. Pate, L. 2004 The use and abuse of ethnographic analogies in interpretations of gender systems at Cahokia. In: K.A. Pyburn (ed.) *Ungendering Civilization*, pp. 71-93. London and New York: Routledge.
8. Peacock, N. 1991 Rethinking the sexual division of labor: reproduction and women's work among the Efe. In: M. DiLeonardo (ed) *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge*, pp. 339-360. Berkeley: University of California Press.

9. Robin, C. 2006 Gender, farming and long-term change: Maya historical and archaeological perspectives. *Current Anthropology* 47(3): 409-433.
10. Rosaldo, M. 1980 The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding. *Signs* 5(3): 389-417.
11. Taylor, T. 2010 Modeling the “Amazon” phenomenon: colonization events and gender performances. In: Douglas Bolender (ed) *Eventful Archaeologies: New Approaches to Social Transformation in the Archaeological Record*, pp. 132-150. Albany: State University of New York.
12. Whitehead, H. 1981 The bow and the burden strap: a new look at institutionalized homosexuality in Native North America. In: S.B. Ortner and H. Whitehead (eds) *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*, pp. 80-115.

Week 6 Gender and Symbolism

1. Alberti, B. 2013 Queer prehistory: bodies, performativity and matter. In: D. Bolger (ed) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, pp. 86-107. London and New York: Wiley Blackwell.
2. Brumfiel, E. 2008 Solar disks and solar cycles: the domestic origins of Aztec art. In: S. Monton-Subias and M. Sanchez-Romero (eds) *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities*, pp. 35-43. Oxford: BAR.
3. Diaz-Andreu, M. and T. Tortosa 1999 Gender, symbolism and power in Iberian societies. In: P.P.A. Funari, M. Hall and S. Jones (eds) *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, pp. 99-121. London & New York: Routledge.
4. Gilchrist, R. 1999 Ch. 4. *Gender and Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
5. Gutiérrez, A.V., Stanton, T.W. and Ardren, T. 2011 Mujeres en la guerra: una vista desde arqueología. *Anales de Antropología* 45: 143-152.
6. Hays-Gilpin, K. 2013 Gender and prehistoric rock art. In: D. Bolger (ed) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, pp. 122-141. London and New York: Wiley Blackwell.
7. Joyce, R. 2008 *Ancient Bodies, Ancient Lives: Sex, Gender and Archaeology*. Introduction and Ch. 2. London: Thames and Hudson.
8. Marshall, Y. and B. Alberti 2014 A matter of difference: Karen Barad, ontology and archaeological bodies. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 24(1):19-36.
9. Olsen, S. and D.G. Harding 2008 Women’s attire and possible sacred role in 4th millennium northern Kazakhstan. In: K.M. Linduff and K.S. Rubinson (eds) *Are All Warriors Male? Gender Roles on the Ancient Eurasian Steppe*, pp. 67-92. New York: Rowman & Littlefield/AltaMira.
10. Robb, J. 1997 Female beauty and male violence in early Italian society. In: A.O.

Kolosky-Ostrow and C.L. Lyons (eds) *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality and Gender in Classical Archaeology*, pp. 43-65. London and New York: Routledge.

Weeks 7-8 Space and Gender

Sørensen Ch. 8

1. Chase, S. 1991 Polygyny, architecture and meaning. In: D. Walde and N. Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender*, pp. 150-158. Calgary: University of Calgary. (7)
2. Galloway, P. 1997 Where have all the menstrual huts gone? The invisibility of menstrual seclusion in the late prehistoric southeast. In: C. Claassen and R. Joyce (eds) *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, pp. 47-62. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (8)
3. Guillen, A.C. 1993 Women, rituals and social dynamics at ancient Chalcatzingo. *Latin American Antiquity* 4:209-224. (8)
4. Hendon, J. 1997 Women's work, women's space, and women's status among the Classic-Period Maya elite of the Copan Valley. In: C. Claassen and R. Joyce (eds) *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, pp. 33-46. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (7)
5. Jamieson, R.W. 2000 Doña Luisa and her two houses. In: J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski and R. Paynter (eds) *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeology of Race, Class, and Gender*, pp. 142-167. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. (8)
6. Oyuela-Caycedo, A. 1991 Ideology and structure of gender spaces: the case of the Kaggaba Indians. In: D. Walde and N. Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender*, pp. 327-335. (7)
7. Rautman, A. 1997 Changes in regional exchange relationships during the pithouse-to-pueblo transition in the American Southwest: Implications for gender roles. In: C. Claassen and R. Joyce (eds) *Women in Prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, pp. 100-118. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (8)
8. Sweely, T.L. 1999 Gender, space, people and power at Cerén, El Salvador. In: T.L. Sweely (ed.) *Manifesting Power: Gender and the Interpretation of Power in Archaeology*, pp. 155-172. London and New York: Routledge. (7)
9. Wall, D. 2000 Family meals and evening parties: constructing domesticity in nineteenth century middle class New York. In: J.A. Delle, S.A. Mrozowski and R. Paynter (eds) *Lines That Divide: Historical Archaeology of Race, Class, and Gender*, pp. 109-141. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. (8)
10. Whitridge, P. 2002 Gender, households, and the material construction of social difference: metal consumption at a classic Thule whaling village. In: L. Frink, R.S. Shepard

and G.A. Reinhardt (eds) *Many Faces of Gender: Roles and Relationships through Time in Indigenous Northern Communities*, pp. 165-194. Boulder: University Press of Colorado. (7)

11. Yentsch, A. 1991a Access and space, symbolic and material, in historical archaeology. In: D. Walde and N. Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender*, pp. 252-262. Calgary: University of Calgary. (7)

12. Yentsch, A. 1991b The symbolic divisions of pottery: sex-related attributes of English and Anglo-American household pots. In: R.H. McGuire and R. Paynter (eds) *The Archaeology of Inequality*, pp. 192-230. Blackwell. (8)

Weeks 9-11 "Sleep's Sister Death": Bioarchaeology and Mortuary Ritual

Ortner Chapter 4; Sørensen: Chapters 5 and 7

1. Arnold, B. 1991 The deposed Princess of Vix: the need for an engendered European prehistory. In: D. Walde and N. Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender*, pp. 366-374. Calgary: University of Calgary. (9)

2. Arnold, B. 2016 Belts vs. blades: the binary bind in Iron Age southwest German mortuary contexts. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 23(3): 832-853. (10)

2. Baxter, J.E. 2005 Ch. 7 Socialization, childhood and mortuary remains. In: J.E. Baxter *The Archaeology of Childhood*, pp. 93-108. Walnut Creek: AltaMira. (11)

3. Berseneva, N. 2008 Women and children in the Sargat Culture. In: K.M. Linduff and K.S. Rubinson (eds) *Are All Warriors Male? Gender Roles on the Ancient Eurasian Steppe*, pp. 131-151. New York: Rowman & Littlefield/AltaMira. (11)

4. Cohen, M. and S. Bennett 1993 Skeletal evidence for sex roles and gender hierarchies in prehistory. In: B. Miller (ed) *Sex and Gender Hierarchies*, pp. 273-296. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (9)

5. Crass, B. 2001 Gender and mortuary analysis: what can grave goods really tell us? In: B. Arnold and N.L. Wicker (eds) *Gender and the Archaeology of Death*, pp. 105-118. Walnut Creek: AltaMira. (10)

6. Delgado, A. and M. Ferrer 2012 Life and death in ancient colonies. In: B.L. Voss and E.C. Casella (eds) *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, pp. 195-213. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (11)

7. Effros, B. 2003 Ch. 3 Grave goods and the ritual expression of identity. In: B. Effros *Merovingian Mortuary Archaeology and the Making of the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 119-173. Berkeley: University of California Press. (11)

8. Flannery, K. and J. Marcus 1994 On the perils of 'politically correct' archaeology. *Current*

Anthropology 35(4):441-442 and McCafferty & McCafferty reply, pp. 442-445. (11)

9. Garcia-Luque, A. and C. Risquez 2008 Maintenance activities in the funerary record: the case of Iberian cemeteries. In: S. Monton-Subias and M. Sanchez-Romero (eds) *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities*, pp. 53-62. Oxford: BAR. (10)

10. Ghisleni, L., Jordan, A. and Fiocoprile, A. 2016 Introduction to “binary binds”: deconstructing sex and gender dichotomies in archaeological practice. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 23(3): 765-787. (9)

11. Halcrow, S.E. and N. Tayles 2008 The bioarchaeological investigation of childhood and social age: problems and prospects. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 15: 190-215. (10)

11. Hanks, B. 2008 Reconsidering Warfare, status and gender in the Eurasian steppe Iron Age. In: K.M. Linduff and K.S. Rubinson (eds) *Are All Warriors Male? Gender Roles on the Ancient Eurasian Steppe*, pp. 15-34. New York: Rowman & Littlefield/AltaMira. (10)

12. McCafferty, S. and G. McCafferty 1994 Engendering Tomb 7 at Monte Alban. *Current Anthropology* 35(2):143-166. (9)

13. O’Gorman, J. 2001 Life, death and the longhouse: a gendered view of Oneota social organization. In: B. Arnold and N.L. Wicker (eds) *Gender and the Archaeology of Death*, pp. 23-50. Walnut Creek: AltaMira. (10)

14. Palavestra, A. 2009 Fragmentation of amber necklaces in the central Balkans Iron Age. In Aleksandar Palavestra, C.W. Beck, and J.M. Todd (eds) *Amber in Archaeology: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Amber in Archaeology, Belgrade 2005*, pp. 164–177. Belgrade: National Museum. (9)

15. Prados, L. 2010 Gender and identity in Iberian funerary contexts (5th-3rd century BC). In: L.H. Dommasnes, T. Hjørungdal, S. Montón-Subias, M. Sánchez Morena and N.L. Wicker (eds) *Situating Gender in European Archaeologies*, pp. 205-224. Budapest: Archaeolingua. (10)

16. Reinhold, S. 2003 Traditions in transition: some thoughts in late Bronze Age and early Iron Age burial costumes from the northern Caucasus. *European Journal of Archaeology* 6(1):25-54. (11)

17. Storey, R. 1999 The mothers and daughters of a patrilineal civilization: the health of females among the Late Classic Maya of Copan, Honduras, in A.L. Grauer and P. Stuart-Macadam (eds) *Sex and Gender in Paleopathological Perspective*, pp. 133-148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (10)

18. Sullivan, L. 2001 Those men in the mounds: gender, politics and mortuary practices in late prehistoric eastern Tennessee, in J.M. Eastman and C.B. Rodning (eds) *Archaeological*

Studies of Gender in the Southeastern United States, pp. 101-126. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. (9)

19. Wilson, D. 1997 Gender, diet, health and social status in the Mississippian Powers Phase Turner Cemetery population. In *Women in Prehistory*, edited by R. Joyce and C. Claassen, pp. 119-135. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (9)

Weeks 12-13 Women's Work: Systems of Production

Ortner Chapters 5 & 6; Sørensen Chapter 6

1. Bird, D. and R. Blige Bird 2000 The ethnoarchaeology of juvenile foragers: shellfishing strategies among Meriam children. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 19:461-476. (12)
2. Brown, J. 1970 A note on the division of labor by sex. *American Anthropologist* 72:1073-8. (12)
3. Buffalohead, P.K. 1983 Farmers, warriors, traders: a fresh look at Ojibway women. *Minnesota History* 48: 236-244. (12)
4. Costin, C. 2013 Gender and textile production in prehistory. In D. Bolger (ed) *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, pp. 180-202. London and New York: Wiley Blackwell. (13)
5. Crown, P.L. and W.H. Wills 1995 Economic intensification and the origins of ceramic containers in the American Southwest, in W. Barnett and J. Hoops (eds) *The Emergence of Pottery*, pp. 241-254. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press. (13)
6. Estioko-Griffin, A. 1993 Daughters of the forest, in M. Womack and J. Marti (eds) *The Other Fifty Percent*, pp. 225-232. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press. (12)
7. Gero, J. 1991 Genderlithics: women's role in stone tool production. In: J.M. Gero and M.W. Conkey (eds) *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, pp. 163-193. Oxford, Blackwell. (12)
8. Gilchrist, R. 1999 Ch. 3. *Gender and Archaeology*. London: Routledge. (12)
9. González-Marcén, P., S. Montón-Subías and M. Picazo 2008 Towards an archaeology of maintenance activities. In S. Monton-Subias and M. Sanchez-Romero (eds) *Engendering Social Dynamics: The Archaeology of Maintenance Activities*, pp. 3-8. Oxford: BAR. (13)
10. Hamann, B. 1997 Weaving and the iconography of prestige: the royal gender symbolism of Lord 5 Flower's/Lady 4 Rabbit's Family, in C. Claassen and R. Joyce (eds) *Women in Prehistory*, pp. 153-172. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (12)
11. Montón-Subías, S. 2010 Maintenance activities and the ethics of care. In L.H. Dommasnes, T. Hjørungdal, S. Montón-Subías, M. Sánchez Romero and N.L. Wicker (eds) *Situating Gender in European Archaeologies*, pp. 23-33. Budapest: Archaeolingua. (13)

12. Peterson, J. 2002 Ch. 1 An investigation of labor patterns, in J. Peterson *Sexual Revolutions: Gender and Labor at the Dawn of Agriculture*, pp. 1-10. Walnut Creek: AltaMira. (13)
13. Rice, P. 1991 Women and prehistoric pottery production, in D. Walde and N. Willows (eds) *The Archaeology of Gender*, pp. 436-443. Calgary: University of Calgary. (12)
14. Sassaman, K.E. 1992 Lithic technology and the hunter-gatherer sexual division of labor. *North American Anthropologist* 13(3): 249-263. (12)
15. Spector, J. 1983 Male/female task differentiation among the Hidatsa: Toward the development of an archaeological approach to the study of gender, in P. Albers and B. Medicine (eds) *The Hidden Half*, pp. 77-99. Washington: University Press of America. (13)
16. Spector, J. 1991 What this awl means: toward a feminist archaeology. In J.M. Gero and M.W. Conkey (eds) *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, pp. 388-406. Oxford: Blackwell. (13)
17. Wright, R.P. 1996 Technology, gender and class: worlds of difference in Ur III Mesopotamia, in R.P. Wright (ed.) *Gender and Archaeology*, pp. 79-110. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (13)

Week 14 Romancing the Goddess: "Feminist" Archaeology and the Public

1. Anthony, D. 1995 Nazi and eco-feminist prehistories: counter points in Indo-European archaeology, in P. Kohl and C. Fawcett (eds) *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, pp. 82-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Barstow, A. 1978 The uses of archaeology for women's history: James Mellaart's work on the Neolithic Goddess at Catal Hüyük. *Feminist Studies* 45(3):7-17.
3. Biehl, J. 1991 The Neolithic mystique, Chapter 2 in *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics*. Boston: Southend Press.
4. Eisler, R. 1988 Introduction, Chapters 1, 2 and 13. *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*. New York: Harper & Row.
5. Fagan, B. 1992 A sexist view of prehistory. *Archaeology* 45(2):14-16, 66.
6. Grindell, B. 1993 Rewriting the past to save the future: a review of "The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future". *Arizona Anthropologist* 10:119-129.
7. Meskell, L. 1995 Goddesses, Gimbutas and 'New Age' archaeology. *Antiquity* 69: 74-86.
8. Nicholas, G. 1994 On the Goddess myth and methodology. *Current Anthropology* 35(4): 448-49.

9. Rigoglioso, M. 2007 The disappearing of the Goddess and Gimbutas: a critical review of *The Goddess and the Bull*. *Journal of Archaeomythology* 3 (1): 95-105.
10. Stone, M. 1976 Preface, Intro., Ch. 1. *When God was a Woman*. New York: Dorset Press.

Week 15 "Indiana Joans": Women and Gender in Archaeology
Ortner Chapters 7 & 8

1. Arnold, B. 2008 Review of *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists* by Getzel M. Cohen and Martha Sharp Joukowsky. *Current Anthropology* 49(2): 342-343.
2. Brown, S. 1993 Feminist research in archaeology: What does it mean? Why is it taking so long? In: N.S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin (eds) *Feminist Theory and the Classics*, pp. 238-71. New York: Routledge.
3. Claassen, C. (ed.) 1994 *Women in Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (**Volume on 2-day Reserve** [CC110 W66 1994](#)).
4. Drower, M.S. 2004 Margaret Alice Murray (1863-1963). In: G.M. Cohen and M.S. Joukowsky (eds) *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*, pp. 109-141. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
5. Fotou, V. and A. Brown 2004 Harriet Boyd Hawes (1871-1945). In G.M. Cohen and M.S. Joukowsky (eds) *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*, pp. 198-273. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
6. Gero, J. and D. Root 1990 Public presentation and private concerns: archaeology in the pages of *National Geographic*. In *The Politics of the Past*, edited by P. Gathercole & D. Lowenthal, pp. 19-37. New York: Routledge.
7. Kehoe, A.B. and M.B. Emmerichs (eds) *Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. (**Volume on 2-day Reserve** [CC107 .A77 1999](#))
8. Jones, S. 1991 The female perspective. *Museums Journal* 91(2):24-27.
9. Jones, S. and S. Pay 1990 The legacy of Eve. In: P. Gathercole and D. Lowenthal (eds) *The Politics of the Past*, pp. 160-169. New York: Routledge.
10. <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/e-mails-ignored-meetings-denied-bias-at-the-search-stage-limits-diversity/>
11. Miller, C.C. 2014 Can family leave hurt women's careers? New York Times Sunday August 10, 2014, p. 6. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/10/upshot/can-family-leave-policies-be-too-generous-it-seems-so.html?_r=0&abt=0002&abg=1
12. Noël Hume, I. 1975 *Historical Archaeology: a comprehensive guide for both amateurs*

and professionals to the techniques and methods of excavating historical sites. Excerpt on women and fieldwork. New York, Knopf.

13. Parezo, N. and S. Bender 1994 From glacial to chilly climate: a comparison between archeology and socio-cultural anthropology. In: M.C. Nelson, S.M. Nelson and A. Wylie (eds) *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, pp. 73-81. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5.
14. Reyman, J. 1994 Gender and class in archaeology: then and now. In: M.C. Nelson, S.M. Nelson and A. Wylie (eds) *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, pp. 83-90. Archaeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5.
15. Root, M.C. 2004 Introduction: Women of the field – Defining the gendered experience. In G.M. Cohen and M.S. Joukowsky (eds) *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*, pp. 3-33. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
16. White, N.M, L.P. Sullivan and R.A. Marrinan (eds) 1999 *Grit-tempered: Early Women Archaeologists in the Southeastern United States*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida. (Volume on 2-day Reserve [CC110 .G75 1999](#))
17. Wylie, A. 1993 The trouble with numbers: workplace climate issues in archaeology. In: M.C. Nelson, S.M. Nelson and A. Wylie (eds) *Equity Issues for Women in Archaeology*, pp. 65-71. Archeological Papers of the American Anthropological Association 5.

Assignment Guidelines

1. Critical Article Summaries: Summaries must be a minimum of two pages long.

a. Choose three articles each week from the D2L PDFs (the week # is in parentheses after the bibliographic reference in the syllabus).

b. Critique the approach or problem outlined in the article, identifying the effective arguments as well as those that you feel are unconvincing. Pay particular attention to the following in your summary: What is/are the main point(s) of the article? Are you convinced by the author's/authors' reasoning? Why or why not? What are your recommendations? Is the article worthwhile? Why or why not? How could the arguments have been more persuasive or the approach more productive? Think critically! This involves more than simply shooting holes in someone else's theory or approach. Present more than one side of an issue. Suggest alternatives.

c. Generate four open-ended discussion questions each week that identify key or controversial points and are designed to stimulate conversation. Include these at the end of your summaries and be prepared to contribute one or more of the questions during class when called upon.

2. Papers

Goals: 1) Demonstrate the ability to research a topic successfully in depth as demonstrated by identifying and defining a research problem and locating and citing seminal sources on the chosen topic. 2) Produce a summary of the work of those scholars whose research and interpretations have contributed significantly to our understanding of the chosen topic. 3) Provide a critical evaluation of the issues and possible divergent opinions associated with the analysis of the chosen topic, suggesting possible avenues for further investigation.

Format: Papers must be typed (computer or typewriter) with margins of 1" (no more, no less). Paginate all pages beginning with Page 2! Papers must be double-spaced. Make sure your name is on the paper and that the paper has a title.

Short paper: Papers must be a minimum of 10 pages long. You must cite at least 10 sources in constructing your argument. These may be drawn from the D2L articles, but **at least three** must be sources you have tracked down on your own. Use the Bibliographies from class readings as a starting point for your source search. Other places to find sources include Eureka, WorldCat (see UWM Library Web site for links) and the Anthropological Index On-Line (<http://aio.anthropology.org.uk/>)

Final Paper: Papers must be a minimum of 20 pages long. You must cite at least 20 sources, at least 15 of which must be sources you have tracked down yourself and NONE of which may be Web sources unless the article comes from a reputable database such as JSTOR and is published in a peer-reviewed journal. You may cite a maximum of five sources from the e-Reserve readings. See data base information above.

When citing sources (whether quoting directly or paraphrasing) within the text, the following rules apply:

The author's last name (include the first initial only if there are two authors with the same last name cited in the paper) followed by the year of the publication, a colon and the page number(s): (Renfrew 1979: 112-15). (This is the standard procedure in anthropological publications). Quotation marks should be used where appropriate, as in the examples below.

Ex. #1 Direct quotation: "The moon is made of green cheese" (McDonald 1989:123).

Ex. #2 Paraphrasing: According to Williams, the moon is made of fried green tomatoes (1988:19-23).

You must include a bibliography with full references at the end of the paper. You may use any of the articles assigned for the class as a template for the bibliography. KEY: Whatever format you choose, BE CONSISTENT!

3. Oral Presentation

- Fifteen minute PowerPoint presentation on a topic clearly related to gender archaeology. I will assign dates for your presentations, **which do not need to be related to the topic for that week**. You may run suggestions for topics by me ahead of time if you wish.

- No later than the Sunday before your presentation e-mail me **a one page summary** with: your talk title, abstract, 5 discussion questions related to the topic you have chosen.

PowerPoint Dos and Don'ts

<http://gethelp.library.upenn.edu/workshops/biomed/ppt/dodont.html>

<http://www.hrsonline.org/Education/WomensLeadership/ProfGrowth/EffectivePres/PPT/DoDont/>

<http://www.microsoft.com/office/powerpoint-slidesfest/do-and-dont.aspx>

Good luck! E-mail me at barnold@uwm.edu if you have any questions.