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Archaeology has become a field of epistemological ice floes, which occasionally bump into each other, but more often than not, glide silently past each other. There are many cleavages in archaeology, with the processual-postprocessual (or evolutionary-postprocessual) debate often used as a singular opposition to organize a range of theoretical tensions. However, this framing not only masks an enormous range of hybridity in actual archaeological practice, it reflects a parochial vision of archaeology, as the debate has been primarily an Anglo-American concern. If archaeology is to become a truly global enterprise, archaeologists need to acknowledge and more actively engage with the diverse histories and practices of national and indigenous archaeologies. This volume contributes toward this end with a new approach to comparative archaeology that explicitly engages the distinctive archaeologies and archaeologists of two regions of the world — the Southwest and the Iberian Peninsula — in the common goal of exploring the dynamics and historical trajectories of complex societies.

Comparative Archaeologies is the product of an Obermann Summer Seminar held at the University of Iowa in June 2006. The seminar was organized and directed by William (Billy) Graves, a Southwest archaeologist and my former colleague in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Iowa, and myself, an anthropologically trained archaeologist who has studied the late prehistoric societies of the Iberian Peninsula since the mid-1980s. Over the period of the nine-day seminar, 15 archaeologists from the United States, Portugal, Spain, and Austria worked together to share research, to educate each other, and to vigorously debate new ideas. By the end of the seminar, intellectual blindspots were revealed, potentially fruitful research questions were illuminated, and — most importantly — a deeper understanding of the entanglement between history and knowledge production in North American and European archaeology emerged.

The idea for Comparative Archaeologies began in a chance conversation I had with Billy Graves one afternoon in the spring of 2005. For reasons now forgotten to me, we found ourselves talking about pottery design while walking to the Anthropology Department main office to pick up our mail. As we talked, we recognized many parallels between the archaeological record of the Southwest and the Iberian Peninsula, but we also realized we were largely unfamiliar with the archaeology of each other’s area. This unfamiliarity left us with a lingering sense of unease. Despite our broad training in anthropological archaeology in North American institutions, the scholarly communities with which we found ourselves primarily interacting — Southwest archaeologists and Europeanists — seemed to be largely unaware of the other’s work.
FIG. 1  Map of North America, with main sites and regions referred to throughout the book.
At around the same time as this conversation, I was teaching a graduate seminar in Archaeological Theory and Method for which, among other texts, I had assigned Timothy Earle’s 1997 book How Chiefs Comes to Power. The book provided an intellectual space in which students from the different subfields of anthropology could react to and draw from. After our discussion of Earle’s book ended, however, I found myself increasingly wondering how our understanding of intermediate-level societies would be different if the ethnographies of the Pacific, North and South America, and Africa had not been available to serve as comparative models for our thinking about diverse cultural phenomena, such as material culture and exchange, power and inequality, and social evolution. While comparisons between, specifically, Pacific societies and ancient complex societies have generated a wealth of productive literature, the particular conditions of the Pacific—its island ecosystems, regular long-distance navigation and island colonization, and the ruptures associated with European colonialism—structure these ethnographic accounts and, surely, those archaeological analyses articulated to them.

In subsequent conversations, Billy and I discussed how historical contingencies, such as nineteenth- and twentieth-century European colonialism, have played into archaeological understandings of complex societies, and we began to contemplate the insights that might be gained by creating new comparative points of reference in archaeology. Thinking back to our original exchange, we wondered how we might engage the insights of anthropologically trained Southwest archaeologists with historically trained Iberianists toward better understanding the dynamics of complex, non-state societies. We put together a proposal for a seminar and—to our delight—we were awarded funds from the University of Iowa Obermann Center for Advanced Studies to organize Comparative Archaeologies: The American Southwest (AD 900–1600) and the Iberian Peninsula (3000–1500 BC).

This volume, based on the revised and expanded papers written for the seminar, is comparative at two levels: empirical and epistemological. At the empirical level, there are many parallels between the archaeologies of the Southwest between AD 900–1600 and the Iberian Peninsula between 3000–1500 BC that make their comparison appropriate. Human populations in both areas were engaged in a common set of social and political behaviors, including social differentiation, long-distance exchange, craft production, population aggregation, agricultural intensification, and the construction of monumental ritual spaces. Some of these parallels are likely due to similar environmental regimes, particularly the constraints imposed by the arid landscapes found in both regions. The common need to access key raw materials and finished goods while maintaining a relatively stable agricultural community may also account for some of the similarities. Recently, Stephen Lekson wrote, “Southwestern archaeology sometimes appears obsessed with complexity” (Lekson 2005: 236); Iberian archaeology could well be accused of the same (see Chapter 5). There are also historical parallels between these two areas: after an enduring tradition of decentralized political organization, ancient populations in both regions were subjected to colonial rule—in the Southwest by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century AD, and in the Iberian Peninsula by Rome in the third century BC. As subjects of archaeological inquiry, both regions have long and distinguished pedigrees, beginning in the nineteenth century.
FIG. 2  Map of the Iberian Peninsula, with main sites and regions referred to throughout the book.
In addition to this empirical comparison and in contrast to many comparative enterprises in archaeology, Billy and I also sought to engage different epistemologies and national traditions of archaeological research in our seminar. We were particularly keen on highlighting their differences and on finding common agendas for future research.

Distinctive archaeologies in the Iberian Peninsula and the Southwest have emerged not only owing to differences in the material record, but also because of the more recent political histories of Iberia and the Southwest. Archaeologists of the Southwest have played a key role in American anthropology for generating broad insights into social evolution. The ability of Southwest archaeologists to make historical connections to ethnohistoric and ethnographically documented human groups, to employ a range of fine-grained dating techniques, such as dendrochronology and ceramic seriation, and to reconstruct detailed environmental histories, through dendrochronology and packrat midden analysis, have also facilitated a nuanced narrative for the ancient Southwest. Archaeologists of late prehistoric Iberia, by virtue of the rich and highly varied archaeology of the Peninsula, have also made key contributions to more historically-oriented debates in Europe on the emergence of social inequality, politics and archaeology, megaliths, rock art, metallurgy, and the beaker phenomenon. Chronological control, however, is not as fine-grained as for the Southwest, and Iberianists must work with more expansive periodizations of a few hundred years. There are also no closely related living peoples with whom the archaeological populations of the third and second millennia BC might be compared.

*Comparative Archaeologies* is, therefore, not only about archaeologies, but also about archaeologists, who, while committed to a common set of problems, draw from different national traditions. It represents a complementary form of comparative archaeology that recognizes and embraces the totalities and historicities of past societies of similar forms, while reflexively focusing on in-depth and nuanced comparisons of multiple themes.

This volume is organized around five themes — Histories, Landscapes, Bodies, Gender, and Art. These themes were selected because they provide broad intellectual canvases on which a range of theoretical perspectives from both Americanist and Europeanist traditions had contributed and which, together, would generate a relatively coherent understanding of current research on our two culture areas. For each theme, two chapters — one written by a Southwest archaeologist and one by an Iberianist — are included. Each pair of chapters is introduced by a bridging chapter, coauthored by the two scholars who wrote the chapters on that theme. These bridging chapters were written after the seminar was completed, and in addition to providing an introduction to the subsequent chapters, they reflect emergent engagements that developed between the two regional approaches to archaeology as a result of the seminar.

Timothy Earle, an archaeologist long dedicated to comparative archaeology, introduces this volume. His chapter provides a historical context to our project and identifies some of its strengths and weaknesses. In the Conclusion (Chapter 17), I expand on the volume's goals, discuss the benefits and pitfalls of comparative research, and explore how this volume has contributed to the comparative enterprise and to the study of complex societies.
This volume — and the seminar on which it is based — are, in various ways, experimental. For example, the order of the chapters differs from the sequence in which they were delivered at the seminar. At the seminar, Billy and I wanted to experiment with the usual structure of archaeological narrative, which generally begins with (and implicitly privileges) the material conditions of a culture, such as environment and economics, and concludes with those aspects of culture more closely tied to ideology and cognition, such as art and religion. Thus, the seminar itself began with the papers on Art, then proceeded to Gender, Bodies, Landscapes, and Histories. At the conclusion of the seminar, when the structure for this book was discussed, the participants felt that the traditional materialist-idealist narrative sequence would work better for the publication. Billy and I felt that the experimental order had served its purpose, and we were willing to shift the themes back to a more conventional order for this book.

The contributors of this volume were all seminar participants and were selected through a competitive process involving an international call-for-papers. Billy and I sought scholars who had a demonstrated expertise in their thematic topic and a proven interest in comparative research. We also invited three keynote speakers to present papers. Tim Earle provided a historical reflection on comparative archaeology, and Barbara Mills and Antonio Gilman provided summary culture histories for the Southwest and Iberian Peninsula, respectively, in order to orient the seminar participants. For this volume, however, we felt that the two area summaries were less critical and would have lengthened the book considerably; thus, they were not included. The presence and participation of Barbara and Antonio, however, were central to the success of the seminar — and their thoughtful provocations are indirectly reflected in all the papers in this volume.

Three meta-themes emerge as central to this volume — and could well be taken as key leitmotifs in archaeological research on middle-range societies: History, Scale, and Power. I briefly introduce them here; in the Conclusion, I discuss them in greater depth.

History is entangled with archaeology at a number of analytical levels — and it became increasingly clear, as the seminar progressed, that archaeologists need to consider history at all these levels. First, histories of nations and regions shape the institutional structures that create and legitimate archaeological knowledge. The histories of research in different areas of the world are also central to understanding trajectories of thought. In the bridging chapters, the authors of this volume outline the history of research on their particular topics in order to better frame and contextualize their chapters (as well as to suggest areas of future research). Finally, the role of history — or the historical antecedents — to the archaeological peoples we study is increasingly being recognized as an explanatory variable to consider. Sometimes linked to memory studies, historical approaches to ancient societies have an important role to play in understanding emerging social inequalities — specifically, with respect to how people invoke their histories to legitimate actions, create ancestral genealogies, construct identities, or to claim territory.

Scale — both temporal and spatial — and determining appropriate and productive scales of analysis emerged as another critical dimension in our analyses. While comparative analyses in archaeology tend to focus on the level of the settlement system or culture area, comparisons between individual sites in different culture areas may also
draw out key insights to distinctive cultural particularities (as Lekson and Díaz-del-Río illustrate in Chapters 4 and 5).

Finally, power — in its diverse forms and materializations — was, not surprisingly, a common thread throughout the papers. Although focused on the exploration of histories, landscapes, gendered behaviors and artifacts, the treatment of bodies, and art in the ancient Southwest and Iberian Peninsula, the authors of this volume also grapple with the central issue of how power was created, legitimated, and resisted.

This book is the final product of an extended project that began in 2005 with the planning of the 2006 seminar, and it has benefited from the energies and commitment of many individuals and institutions. I wish to thank Billy Graves, the seminar’s co-director, for his invaluable insights and collaboration during the seminar. The Obermann Center for Advanced Studies provided not only the generous funding but the administrative support that made the seminar and this resulting volume possible. I am deeply grateful to Jay Semel, Director of the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies, and the Obermann Center staff, particularly Carolyn Frisbie, Jennifer New, and Karla Tonella for all their help. I wish to thank University of Iowa students Anna Waterman, Jonathan T. Thomas, John Willman, and Jody Hepperly for all their assistance during the seminar. Jonathan Thomas also aided in the preparation of this volume. I am grateful to Tim Earle, Leonardo García Sanjuán, Antonio Gilman, and Barbara Mills for their sage input and critical feedback on this volume. Jill Neitzel provided the perfect balance of constructive advice, counsel, and moral support in the final stages of this book’s production. Finally, I wish to thank all the seminar participants for their enthusiasm, their goodwill, and their contributions.
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Gendered research in archaeology began largely as a political act, as part of an agenda that a relatively small number of individuals pursued out of the conviction that critical examination of gender in an archaeological context could expose and perhaps help alleviate gender inequity in the present. Because the research was, in many ways, both personal and political, the early reach of engendered archaeology was idiosyncratic, based on individual researchers’ interest and expertise. In some parts of the world and some time periods, as in the US Southwest, gender has become a part of mainstream archaeology; in other areas, such as in parts of the Iberian Peninsula, it is just beginning to be studied. This chapter outlines the history of gendered archaeology in these two areas, considers differences in goals and approaches on both sides of the Atlantic, and identifies some areas of common interest that have considerable potential for comparative work in the future.

Histories of Research

Gender research in the Americas exploded in the 1990s, prompted in part by influential early work by Conkey (1984) and Gero (1989). Edited volumes on gender in the archaeological record of the Americas proliferated (for example, Claassen and Joyce 1997; Wright 1996), while archaeologists working in Europe began to link gender and age as seldom-discussed “invisible” aspects of ancient lives (Moore and Scott 1997). This increasing focus on gender in archaeology was part of an openly feminist program of research, which began partly as a reaction to male bias in previous generations: women (and they were almost entirely women) began documenting gender inequality in representations of the past (that is, textbooks, magazine articles, museum exhibits) and inequity within the profession.
When archaeologists turned to gender in the past, they struggled to justify the topic and to create the methods needed for studying a subject that was perceived as either unimportant or unknowable. Drawing on other disciplines, archaeologists adopted definitions of sex and gender that distinguished between biological and cultural definitions of individuals (Herdt 1994). Gender, in this view, is performative; individuals construct their own gender through means such as dress, hairstyle, makeup, posture, tone of voice, and other qualities (Butler 1993; Lorber 1994; Morric 1995). This definition, combined with cross-cultural analogy, opened the door for gendered research, resulting in a considerable body of research that identified females or women in prehistory, an approach that has since been characterized as “add women and stir.”

As researchers began to consider the implications of gender as performative, they began to shift their focus from documenting gender roles and activities to the consideration of status hierarchies and gender ideologies. This recent research combines multiple lines of evidence to consider the lived experiences of both women and men, and to examine the beliefs of different peoples about the nature and significance of gender (for example, Crown 2000b). The process of engendering archaeology has since become part of a larger particularistic movement to consider the individual in the past. Such research focuses on multiple aspects of difference among individuals, such as gender, life-cycle, class, ethnicity, and sexuality.

Archaeologists in the US Southwest became engaged in gendered research early on, amassing an impressive array of literature by the mid-1990s (see Crown 2000a for examples). Most of this research, however, circulated primarily within the Southwest, with relatively little notice by archaeologists working in other portions of the Americas (Rautman 1997 is a notable exception). This situation changed dramatically with the publication of Patricia Crown’s Women and Men in the Prehispanic Southwest (2000b). Based on a 1997 Advanced Seminar at the School of American Research, this edited volume systematically and thoroughly examines gender through time and across space in the Southwest. It quickly became the definitive volume on gendered archaeology in the Southwest, to the extent that much of the archaeological research in the Southwest now takes gender into account at a certain level. More recent volumes have examined gender in concert with other aspects of “difference,” such as childhood (Kamp 2002).

Studies from the US and the UK ultimately influenced gender research in Portugal and Spain. Towards the end of the twentieth century, a few meetings and publications focused on gender (Alarcão et al. 2000; Díaz-Andreu and Sorensen 1998; González Marcén 2000a, 2000b) and pointed out how biased research had been in Iberia until then (Jorge 1997; Querol et al. 2000; Sánchez Liranzo 2000). However, the spread of gender studies is not even throughout Iberia. In fact, these studies on the periods discussed in this book have mostly been developed in several regions of Spain, namely the southeastern and eastern regions of Iberia (Castro Martínez et al. 1993–1994; Castro Martínez et al. 2006; Sanahuja Yll 2002; Sánchez Romero 2005a; Soler Mayor 2006) and keep flourishing (Escoriza Mateu et al. 2008; González Marcén et al. 2007; Sanahuja Yll 2007; Díaz-Andreu and Montón Subias, forthcoming). Regarding Portugal, despite the Third Peninsular Conference in 1999 (Alarcão et al. 2000), held in Portugal, where some papers on gender studies were presented (by Spanish researchers), gender in the ancient
past has not been addressed as of yet. One notable exception, prior to the 1999 meeting, is that of V. Jorge and S. Jorge (S. Jorge 1996; 1997; 2005; V. Jorge 1997), who have approached the subject from an epistemological point of view. More recently, M. Diniz (2006) discussed this subject in general terms.

One explanation for the rarity of these studies in Portugal, and in other parts of Iberia in general, can be related to the few decades of democracy—just a generation removed from dictatorships. In Portugal, the Estado Novo, incarnated by António Salazar, lasted from 1926 until 1974, and in Spain Francisco Franco ruled from 1939 until 1975. Neither political regime was keen on adopting new ideas, especially if they contradicted the traditional models of “submissive woman” and “provider man,” as prescribed for example by Salazar’s trilogy Deus, Pátria e Família—God, Fatherland and Family (Medina 1993). These ideas were so imbedded in people’s minds (and in academia too) that they have only been changing slowly.

The incipient theoretical concerns and a persistent cultural historicism and materialism in approaches to archaeology, more frequent in Portuguese researchers, have also conditioned the adoption of new frames of reference. Nevertheless, some Marxist archaeologists have attempted to merge such theoretical approaches with gender (Castro Martinez et al. 1993–1994; Castro Martinez et al. 2006; Sanahuja Yll 1997; Sánchez Liranzo 2005).

Another explanation for the lack of studies on gender can be explained in the data itself. It is very difficult to sex or gender activities from the past based on the archaeological record. In fact, for a considerable portion of the Iberian Peninsula, there is no skeletal information due to taphonomic processes that prevent the preservation of those remains. Where they exist, such studies have been conducted and some results are coming to light (De Miguel 2006). A few archaeologists from the southeastern and eastern areas of Iberia have engaged in these studies, such as the ones mentioned in this volume (see Boaventura in this volume). In some regions of Portugal (Algarve and Estremadura), certain areas have a better preservation rate of bones due to soil alkalinity, which has made it possible to sex human remains (Silva 1996a, 1996b, 2002, 2003). However, despite this potential for information, these studies have not incorporated any analyses of gender. One explanation for this is the difficulty of associating individuals with specific artifacts in the collective burials typical of the Iberian Late Neolithic.

Another reason why gender has not been dealt with is also epistemological: archaeology in Portugal (and Spain) is less a social science (interested in social structures, explanations for inequalities, etc.) than a humanistic discipline. In addition, the new generation of archaeologists has more often become ‘dirt archaeologists’ than researchers concerned with theoretical approaches.

But there were/are other manifestations of ‘gender’ than through skeletal remains. Indeed, the discussions of a Mother Goddess cult in Iberia (and Europe) (Gimbutas 1974, 1989, 1991, 2001) are based on representational art (see below). Also, weaving technologies and its social implications were by tradition addressed as a female task (Alfaro Giner 1984). So, it is not as though some Iberian researchers have failed to deal with gender at all; rather, they have not problematized gender, rendering it invisible.
Bridging Gender

Major Themes for Comparison

Depictions

Engendered research in Iberia and the Southwest relies most heavily on cross-cultural regularities and ethnographic analogy, with supporting evidence from the archaeological record. The most direct lines of evidence regarding sex and gender are twofold: the bodies of individuals and depictions of individuals. Bodies can often be sexed based on dimorphic characteristics; unless there is evidence to the contrary, most researchers assume that the sex and gender of individuals coincides, such that males are assumed to be masculine in gender and females are assumed to be feminine in gender. Knowing the sex of bodies can provide direct insight into the treatment of individuals during life, through studies of health, nutrition, and trauma (Martin 2000). Studies of mortuary treatment provide additional information about gender ideologies and treatment of individuals at death (Neitzel 2000; Sanahuja Yll 2006). These subjects are treated at greater length in Pérez and Weiss-Krejci’s chapters in this volume.

Images of people are the second important line of direct evidence regarding sex and gender in the past. Representations of the human figure are common in the Southwest, particularly in the rock art and figurines of most time periods, in ceramics from the Mimbres, Hohokam, and Paquimé areas, and in kiva murals from the Ancient Pueblos of the 14th–16th centuries AD (see Hays-Gilpin 2000 for an overview). Some of these human figures are depicted in ways that suggest biological sex, such as images including genitals, breasts, or beards. The proportion of sexed images varies considerably through time and space; Hohokam ceramics seldom indicate sex, while about one third of humans on Classic Mimbres ceramics are clearly male or female. Many individuals who are not depicted with sexual indicators were almost certainly gendered through their postures, accoutrements, hairstyles, or other elements that would have made the indication of sex unnecessary. Although we do not know, in most cases, how gender was indicated, a few studies have uncovered gendered principles in representation, as in Hays-Gilpin’s (2002) identification of hair whorls as gendered feminine over long time periods and great spaces in the Southwest, or Munson’s (2000) study of gender indicators on Mimbres ceramics.

In Iberia, images of genders in material culture can be found mostly in rock art (see Fairén Jiménez, this volume). Besides these, another possible depiction of gender could be found in the representation of slate, limestone, bone, and clay figurines normally attributed to the Mother Goddess (Gimbutas 1974, 1989, 1991, 2001; Gonçalves 1995, 1999), based on interpretations of some of their characteristics as “breasts” and “pudenda,” or some other less evident as “facial tattooing.” Found within agricultural societies, these figurines were interpreted as related with fertility cults.

Male statuettes made out of bone and limestone, presenting what it seems to be a phallus, have been found in southern regions of Iberia, namely in Badajoz (Hurtado Perez 1981; Hurtado Perez and Perdigones 1984) and in the Guadalquivir River basin, such as in Seville (Fernández Gómez and Oliva Alonso 1980), but they are absent from the regions in study. However, their chronology seems to be attributed mostly to the second half of the third millennia BC (Hurtado Perez 1995).
During the Bronze Age of Iberia, visual culture is largely aniconic and, thus, depictions of males and females are rare.

Division of Labor

The division of labor between men and women is often one of the first topics that archaeologists consider when engendering the past. Researchers in Iberia and the Southwest, for example, are interested in understanding the degree to which labor was divided by gender, as is typical in virtually every known culture. What were the specifics of that division?

In the Southwest, the division of labor has been the subject of considerable research, and there is general consensus about the involvement of the genders in major tasks. Evidence from bodies, burial assemblages, and depictions indicates that women through the Southwest probably had primary responsibility for producing ceramics and for preparing food, including grinding corn and cooking. Activities that were likely the province of men included hunting large game and weaving (especially in kivas, or religious structures; see papers in Crown 2000b). Most of these tasks fall along expected cross-cultural variation, although the fact that men were primarily the weavers is unusual in comparison to other parts of the world. Although child care is often assumed to be a women’s task and tending crops is commonly thought to be men’s work, there is little evidence to confirm either assumption. Some tasks, such as making stone tools, were probably practiced by both genders, with some differences in the specific kinds of tools that men and women produced (Szuter 2000). Of course, complex tasks with multiple steps may have involved individuals of many different ages and genders, even if the activity was thought of as primarily masculine or feminine (Crown 2000a).

The evaluation of evidence for the division of labor during the Late Neolithic in Iberia is rare, although recent studies in Catalonia seem to suggest that certain tasks were associated with women or men (Castro Martinez et al. 2006; Gibaja Bao 2002, 2003a, 2003b; Sanahuja Yll 2006). The same can be said about the El Argar Bronze Age culture, for which studies support the idea that men were more active outside of settlements and women occupied a more important role in the domestic realm (Jiménez-Brobeil et al. 2004).

The division of labor by gender has major implications for many other facets of life in the ancient Southwest and Iberia, from men’s and women’s access to goods to their participation in community life and, ultimately, to their potential prestige, power, and authority. For example, association of one gender with ritually important items may imply influence over ceremonies or higher status based on roles critical to an entire community (Crown and Fish 1996). Such may be the case with women’s production of labor-intensive feast foods, such as tortillas or other foods using ground corn in the 14th–17th-century Pueblo Southwest (Crown 2000c). Determining whether or not women had similar roles in feasting in Iberia awaits additional information.

Mobility

The movement of individuals through the landscape holds considerable promise as an area of comparison between Iberia and the Southwest. The distances that men and
women commonly traveled have significant implications for the procurement of raw materials, for trade and exchange, and for establishing social relationships with distant groups. Discussions of men’s and women’s travel have usually combined cross-cultural analogy and the association of certain raw materials or exotic goods with one gender or the other. On this basis, long-distance travel, particularly to obtain valuables, is often assigned to men, while shorter trips that do not require long absences from the village are considered more typical of women.

Recent research in the Southwest, however, has added additional detail to this picture, considering how a variety of tasks may be embedded in other travel schedules, such as procuring tool stone or pigments during hunting trips (Szuter 2000). Sourcing of artifacts and raw material sources, such as ceramics and obsidian, has also complicated the picture, for the distribution of these two different materials suggests exchange on a similar scale; if indeed women made pots and men made formal stone tools, this implies that both genders had similar trade networks (Spielmann 2000). These studies are especially exciting because they push researchers to consider the social implications of trade and travel.

In the Iberian Late Neolithic, local mobility related to daily activities seems to not be gender defined. However, mid-range mobility may have been more male associated, as much as long distance would relate to herding animals, the procurement of raw materials, and the exchange of products (see Boaventura in this volume).

Although not too many studies exist, in the Bronze Age of El Argar culture the movement of women seems to be more related to domestic work, while men appear to have spent more time moving up and down the mountainous region. This is supported/suggested by the study of stress markers on individual skeletons where sex could be determined (Jiménez-Brobeil et al. 2004).

Knowledge Transmission / Learning

Archaeologists working on gender in the Southwest have begun to consider children in their research, recognizing the potential significance of children’s labor (for example, Fish 2000) and the importance of children learning the skills that they will need to be contributing adults (Kamp 2001). As with other topics in gendered archaeology, research on learning and the transmission of knowledge initially leaned heavily on ethnographic analogy; more recent studies have begun to consider the range of teaching strategies known ethnographically and to assess which strategies were used under different circumstances. Crown (2002), for example, has examined variation in the form and decoration of ceramic vessels as evidence of the interaction between skilled adult potters and unskilled learners, who were likely children.

In Iberia there is no irrefutable evidence of gender knowledge transmission during the Late Neolithic. However, the situation presented in the regions of Lisbon and Alentejo (see Boaventura in this volume) may suggest a certain degree of sharing/teaching gender practices or knowledge, namely on travel knowledge among men and ceramic production and weaving techniques between females. Nevertheless, there is a need for more data to better understand the degree of such transmissions.
For the Bronze Age culture of El Argar, ceramic studies have attempted to understand technology transmission of pot-making among women (Colomer i Solsona 2005).

Food and Cuisine

Cross-culturally, women in non-state societies are most closely associated with the procurement of certain kinds of food and with cuisine, or the preparation of food. One major area of potential for comparison between Iberia and the Southwest centers on changing cuisine and its impact on women's labor and status, as well as the health and nutrition of men, women, and children. In particular, changes in the form and dimensions of pottery (storage, cooking, and serving vessels) and of grinding stones through time have implications for the nature of the food being produced and served. Ortman (1998), for example, has documented changes in women's grinding facilities in the northern Southwest, while others consider the implications for women's labor of adopting increasingly labor-intensive foods such as tortillas and piki bread (Crown 2000c) and for men's scheduling when hunting required increased travel time (Szuter 2000).

Although certain studies on food types and preparation may be found in the literature on Iberian archaeology, it is normally associated by default with stereotypes such as woman the cook, man the hunter, etc., reflecting the continued lack of critical approaches that, with the exceptions mentioned here, are still common in gendered archaeology. However, there is a common consensus that women in general were associated with this daily crucial activity (Montón Subías 2005).

Status Hierarchies

All of the topics discussed thus far have social implications for individuals of different genders, as the various activities in which men and women engage have implications for status hierarchies. Status or prestige can be seen as incorporating three major dimensions — power, authority, and autonomy (Crown 2000a) — that change continuously throughout an individual's lifetime. Initial research into gender and status originally focused on the implications of activities in public and private contexts, under the assumption that the public sphere was associated with men and the private (or domestic) with women. Although the public/domestic dichotomy is problematic in some respects, Hegmon (2000) and other researchers in the Southwest have examined spatial organization in different time periods, discussing the implications of various degrees of seclusion or public visibility for gender and status. Archaeologists have also used other lines of evidence, such as possession of valuables, access to high-quality food resources, and participation in rituals, as indicators of status. For example, Mills (2000) considers the implications of craft production and specialization for women's and men's status, while Crown and Fish's (1996) study of the Hohokam combines multiple lines of evidence to examine changes in gender and status among the Hohokam.

In the Iberian Peninsula, several studies on gender have been approached from an epistemological point of view, calling attention to the traditional and stereotyped interpretations of archaeological data. Rather than “add women and stir,” in Iberia the mode is
“where are the women?” With that objective in mind, several works have focused their attention on household archaeology and specific contexts where women are expected to be or not be present, such as studies on ceramic, lithics, and metallurgy (Sanchez Romero 2005a, 2005b). In that sense, these studies fall in microscale perspectives, as pointed out by Conkey (2003). On the other hand, with accumulated data (although limited), several authors have tried to approach the macroscale, focusing on status hierarchies (Castro Martinez et al. 2006; Escoriza Mateu and Sanahuja Yll 2005; Hernando Gonzalo 2005; Sanahuja Yll 2002). However, the lack of research in several fields from a gender perspective makes it difficult to build a case for the entire Iberian Peninsula.

**Future Research**

Research on gender in the Southwest is a well-established tradition with a solid foundation of research, described in the chapters in Crown’s recent volume (2000b). Beyond these excellent overviews, however, there are many possibilities for systematic detailed comparisons that would provide additional insight into differing gender ideologies and status hierarchies across the Southwest. In particular, additional study and quantification of the frequency and nature of depictions of men and women would be useful, as would more systematic study of engendered objects, such as feminine-gendered string aprons. In addition, now that researchers have an understanding of the correspondence between cross-cultural generalities and gender in the ancient Southwest, it would be interesting to consider the implications of cross-cultural irregularities, such as men’s weaving.

In the Iberian Peninsula, the challenge for gender studies is much greater than in the Southwest US. Although studies on gender have occurred along the Mediterranean coast, for other areas there is still the need to call attention to how bias and andocentric stereotypes have been and continue to be maintained.

Therefore, one can only wish that the example of those already committed to such studies in Iberia (Castro Martínez et al. 2006; Díaz-Andreu 2005; Escoriza Mateu and Sanahuja Yll 2005; González Marcén 2006; Soler Mayor 2006; ) and other areas, such as the Southwest, is replicated and discussed.
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