

engaged with questions about how gender is experienced, how it can be gained or lost. My concern will be how these two forms of transformation may be both recognised and reconciled when analysing past societies.

Johanna Kranzbühler

skelettanalysen, Lich, Germany

Anthropology tells sex and archaeology tells gender? Insights from physical anthropology

THU
14:40

Tracing Gender Transformations

Sex estimation in anthropology is one of the most important data that are collected when skeletons are examined, as it allows conclusions about the demographic composition of a living past population, about the death rate and the life expectancy of different sexes (among other population groups), but also about funerary customs like occupation patterns in graveyards or, last but not least, a sex differing providing of grave goods.

It is here, where archaeological “gender estimation” takes (or should take) place: in the overlapping area between anthropological and archaeological data collection, as for several reasons, a discussion about gender in past societies is obsolete without knowledge of the persons’ biology.

Doing so, anthropology is usually considered to deliver the biological sex of the deceased person as a hard fact, while archaeology brings in the more flexible, interpretative cultural aspect, the social role of the individual buried.

This talk gives a quick overview about the possibilities and limitations of anthropological sex determination and asks if anthropology really provides the “naked truth” and “hard facts” of a person’s biology.

Olena Fedorchenko

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Kyiv, Ukraine

Upper Palaeolithic hunting societies in the region near the Black Sea: gender aspects

THU
15:20

Tracing Gender Transformations

Our current understanding of foraging hunters’ lifeway is based upon issues dominated by subsistence settlement strategies, mobility, and general models of social organization. Unfortunately, the questions about gender roles and identity were out of research scope during the long period.

In the late 19th century, evolutionary approaches were applied to the reconstruction of ancient subsistence systems. In the first half of the 20th century, a trend toward cultural historical approaches in archaeology brought a new vision of these issues with concepts of diffusionism, migration and cultural interactions. In the last part of the 20th century there was a rapid shift in the study of hunter-gatherer lifeways to more functionalist approaches such as existed in processual archaeology and the subsequent emergence of human behavioural ecology in the mid-1970s. The modern research period is characterized by the “fusion” of such theoretical approaches and methods as optimal foraging theory, theories from landscape archaeology, and initial efforts to implement network analysis. Ethnographic and ethnohistoric information provide us with many reasons for thinking that particular hunter-gatherer settlement patterns are strongly influenced by different kinship frameworks.

Applying of gender approach could be the possible alternative way of research these kinship frameworks as well as settlement patterns. Current research is dedicated to the evolution of gender systems in the Upper Palaeolithic society in the region near the Black Sea. The idea of connection between gender systems and settlement patterns was discussed and tested on the Paleo-Indian materials by M. Kornfeld and J. Francis (1991).

Despite great differences in space and time, there are compelling analogies for the hunting and settlement strategies that existed in the Ukrainian Upper Palaeolithic among the Pa-

leopard societies of the Plains region of North America. For instance, there are Paleoindian campsites and killsites in Canada and the United States with complex internal structure or bonebeds, among them Murray Springs, Jake's Bluff, Mill Iron, Lindenmeier, Agate Basin, Casper, Goshen (Plainview), Hell Gap, Carter/Kerr-McGee, Fletcher, Horner, Olsen-Chubbuck, Charlie Lake Cave, Heron-Eden, and Niska.

There have been a number of attempts to distinguish different types of archaeological sites during a long research history concerning Upper Palaeolithic bison hunters in the Ukraine. Nevertheless, this problem is still being approached more intuitively than analytically.

More complicated questions have been posed for settlement patterns in primeval foraging societies of the steppe zone of Eastern Europe. O. Krotova (1994) applied L. Binford's hypothetical models of hunter-gatherer mobility (with logistical vs. residential tendencies) to the Upper Palaeolithic data and discovered an evolution of settlement strategies.

This evolution of settlement strategies can also indicate development of gender systems during the Upper Palaeolithic period. At least, there were three main periods in the evolution of gender systems.

Literature:

Kornfeld, Marcel/Francis, Julie, Preliminary Historical Outline of Northwestern High Plains Gender System. In: Dale Walde/Noreen D. Willows (eds), *The Archaeology of Gender. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary (Calgary 1991)* 444–451.

Кротова, О. О., Виробництво та суспільні відносини населення Північного Причорномор'я в добу пізнього палеоліту. *Археологія*1, 1994, 19–31.

Daniela Nordholz

ArchaeNord, Bremen, Germany

Changing gender-perception from Mesolithic to Middle Neolithic period

THU
15:40

Tracing Gender Transformations

In researching the past conclusions are carefully articulated with the awareness that they are only transitional. Yet concerning gender identity and gender relations seemingly all caution is thrown to the wind in concluding that what is has always been thus. Despite progress anywhere else, there still seems to be a persistence towards the ideals of “man the hunter” and “woman the gatherer”, who is left behind with a gaggle of children to cope with all and sundry until the men return victorious (?) from their big game hunt. And later sedentary people created a domestic sphere for the women while leaving men to do everything but domestic chores.

But did they? A sample of Mesolithic (seven), LBK (14) and Middle Neolithic (four) cemeteries will be compared concerning gender identities and gender relations through quantity and quality of grave goods and – where available – through paleopathology and changes thereof.

John Robb¹ and Oliver Harris²

¹ *Department of Archaeology, University Cambridge, United Kingdom*

² *Archaeology and Ancient History, University Leicester, United Kingdom*

What would Neolithic gender actually look like, and how would we know it when we see it?

THU
16:00

Tracing Gender Transformations

The idea would be to assume that Neolithic gender might have taken qualitatively different forms than Bronze Age and later gender (including modern) and to develop some theoretical models for it and ask how they would result in different forms of material patterning archaeologists could use to interpret their evidence. Our argument in our recent paper is that Neolithic gender took a different form than modern gender, but we mostly have a negative argument (e.g. it doesn't look like later gender) rather than taking a positive argument (telling what it was like) and this is something that has important implications for what we identify as evidence of gender.