

Bei dem Versuch der Bewertung der einzelnen Lageparameter und ihrer Bedeutung für die Standortwahl wünscht sich der Leser mehr fachliche Begründungen. Warum wurden z. B. Abstandspuffer um die Fließgewässer mit einer Breite von 125 m gewählt (S. 57)?

Trotz z. T. sehr geringer Fundplattzahlen, was de Vries durch Zusammenlegen mehrerer Zeitphasen zu einer Zeitscheibe teilweise umgehen kann, gelingt es ihr, viele Details herauszuarbeiten. Obwohl es dem Leser im ersten Moment langweilig vorkommt, dass einfache Verbreitungskarten beschrieben werden, liegt gerade hier eine Stärke der Arbeit. Gerade der Vergleich der in anderen Regionen erkannten „Vorlieben“ oder „Abneigungen“ gegen bestimmte Standorte mit den Ergebnissen der Dresdner Elbtalweitung führt zu interessanten Details in Bezug auf die besonderen Spezifika dieses Naturraums. Solche Vergleiche fehlen oft in ähnlichen Arbeiten und de Vries belegt hier eindrücklich deren absolute Notwendigkeit für die Interpretation von Besiedlungsvorgängen. Als Fazit kann festgehalten werden, diese Grundlagenarbeit von Patricia de Vries sollte aus methodischen und inhaltlichen Gründen in keiner Bibliothek zur Landschaftsarchäologie fehlen.

D-91054 Erlangen

Kochstr. 4/18

E-Mail: doris.mischka@fau.de

Doris Mischka

Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg

DIANE BOLGER (ed.), A Companion to Gender Prehistory. Blackwell Companions to Anthropology volume 21. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester 2013. € 172.50. ISBN 978-0-470-65536-8. xxiii + 642 pages, 39 figures, 5 tables.

In the last twenty years gender research in archaeology has gone global. Through a rich collection of prehistoric case studies from almost around the world, this volume reviews this expansion of gender archaeology. The volume consists of 29 individual chapters written by 39 researchers with gender research and / or feminist or queer archaeology as their specific field of expertise. Each chapter aims to promote a comprehensive and accessible overview of gender in prehistory and the developments of gender archaeology in a region and / or within a specific subject or theme of research. The book chapters offer in-depth insights into gender prehistory and the progression of prehistoric gender archaeology in Africa, Asia and Eurasia, Australia and the South Pacific, North and South America and Europe including Scandinavia. At the same time, they provide an evaluating, somewhat troubled introspective of gender archaeology itself. Such writings are important since they hold potential for directing future research and assist the theoretical and methodological advance of gender research in prehistoric archaeology. The aim of the book is to provide students, scholars and the interested public with a comprehensive overview of gender archaeology from the 1970s up until the current themes of today, but also explore some areas and fruitful directions for future gender research (Bolger p. 11). Its production is a tribute to J. M. GERO and M. W. CONKEY's path breaking book *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory* (Oxford 1991).

Sadly, Joan Gero, a pioneer and leader in feminist and Andean archaeology, left us on July 14 this year, 2016. At the time of her way too early passing she was Professor Emerita at American University, Washington D.C. Prof. Gero's exceptional academic contributions will continue to enrich archaeology for years to come. She saw the complexity of archaeological practice and theory, pushed boundaries, honoured ambiguity and problematised certitude. Her tribute, *A Companion to Gender Prehistory*, develops along the same route, with noticeable tensions between the first (more theoretical and challenging) and second (more mainstream and practice-oriented) part of the book.

The *Companion to Gender Prehistory* is divided into two parts, 'Thematic Perspectives in Gender Prehistory' followed by 'Regional Perspectives in Gender Prehistory'. The two parts are further organised into sections, three for each part and six in total. The chapters of this book attest to the richness, across continents, of gender archaeological research. Readers should, however, not expect to find a coherent path into gender prehistory. Differences in language, history and academic culture have shaped more or less distinct regions of gender research. As this volume underscores, each country, region or language area has a different history and development of gender archaeology. Beneath the umbrella term of gender prehistory there is also gender, feminist and queer archaeology; and a careful reading of this volume reveals how different each of these strands approach and use the concepts of gender, sex and the body. The chapters do not bring forward a single route to gender archaeology or a common set of guidelines for how to do gender research. Certainly, there are things that do connect this research on gender prehistory. Bolger (p. 7–10) emphasises the focus on scale, context and diversity. Gender analyses successfully centre on micro-scale contexts and often bring a bottom-up view on human action and society. From the start of the volume, however, we are also notified of some debates occupying gender, feminist and queer archaeology, in particular the tension between gender and feminist archaeology dividing gender archaeology into opposing 'camps'. Many chapters also discuss this, for some gender researchers, uneasy alliance between gender and feminist / queer theory. There is in fact little agreement on the concept of gender, what gender is about, how gender research should be conducted or, for that matter, what role feminism or feminist theory ought to have (or not to have) in engendering and embodying prehistory. The volume highlights this central aspect of diversity, tension if you like, in gender archaeology.

In part one, we find 13 thematic and well-written gender, feminist and queer archaeological contributions to gender prehistory, divided into: (1) 'Current Themes and Debates', (2) 'Gender and Prehistoric Material Culture', and (3) 'Gendered Bodies and Identities in Prehistory'. Section one covers a wide range of themes, such as engendering human evolution (Zihlman), gender, complexity and power (Hutson / Hanks / Pyburn), embodied subjectivities (Bulger / Joyce), queer prehistory (Alberti) and the future of gender in prehistoric archaeology (Conkey). Section two includes gender and rock-art (Hays-Gilpin), lithic studies (Finlay), pottery (Bolger) and textile production (Costin). Section three centres on gendered bodies and identities. Here we find chapters on personhood (Marshall), bioarchaeological approaches to the body (Sofaer), figurines and the origins of the gendered body (Bailey) and goddesses (Goodison / Morris). The articles debate gender archaeology on a methodological and theoretical level and highlight the set-backs and future potential of archaeological gender research. The chapters offer multiple routes to the investigation of matter, sex, gender and the body. Readers will need to have a background in or in-depth insights into archaeological theory and feminist theory to be able to fully understand their rich content. Proposed frameworks differ between chapters and sometimes even shift within one and the same article. Most contributions, however, aim for a methodology that emphasises differences within, rather than between, sex and gender categories. This review aims to present some few examples.

Zihlman provides a most welcome chapter on gender and biology in the deep past. Focusing on the intersection between human biology (beyond reproduction), sociality and cultural practices, she offers a rich source of data on gender and human evolution that engages debate about gendered practices and challenges the conventional assumption of a binary sexual division of labour in prehistory including the grand narratives of male domination. Sex is here defined as a human biological binary (two sexes) while gender is about recognising variation in the cultural 'roles' of sex, shifting through an individual's life-history.

In the chapter on gender, complexity and power, Hutson, Hanks and Pyburn focus on transformations of gender coincident with the expansion of ancient states. The article starts by arguing that we should accept the ambiguity and diversity that feminist theory brings to the study of sex and gender rather than seek comfort in fixed binary frameworks of research. Archaeologists need to criticise categories such as male and female and consider that actors may be neither men nor women, and that gender may be irrelevant to gender prehistory (p. 46–50). The article then moves on to the study of the diversity of women's experiences, status and power in processes of political centralization. The chapter makes interesting reading of how status, power and gender might transform. However, there is a gap between theory and method. While theory opens up for the investigation of the dynamic construction of sex and gender (and even no-gender) in prehistory, the actual study centres on the category of women (sex) and differences among women (gender 'roles'). Women are used as the starting point of research and female gender is defined as linked to day-to-day activities or tasks, a rather conventional form of gender attribution. It appears as if the text is written by scholars with competing, even contradictory ideas about what sex and gender is about. Roughly, these differing standpoints to sex and gender demonstrate the tension between feminist archaeology and gender archaeology. Gender archaeological research tends to use the study subject (women / men, female / male gender) as a given category to be mapped and analysed archaeologically. Feminist and queer archaeology, in contrast, take the formation of the subject, sex or gender category as the most central question (Alberti / Bulger / Joyce). Historically, such inquiry has focused on how cultural discourses produce sex, gender and bodies. More recently, the research has taken a strong material turn. Feminist materialist studies focus on bodies and matter as active co-producers of culture and meaning. The latter theme is explored by Bulger and Joyce (also Sofaer). In their chapter on embodied subjectivities, they aim to bridge what they see as a gap between meaning and materiality. They place embodied subjectivity in centre of attention, the ways a body relates to and experiences the world. The body forms through this relationship and the process also creates variability and instability within each individual subject. This path to gender prehistory calls attention to individuality as diversity within individuals. There is very little discussion about sex and gender as either biological or broader social categories. Gender, age, sexuality, race and class are basically defined as intersecting categories, differences assumed to have an impact on the social ideals of the body. Gender, then, is employed as one among many variables.

In his chapter on queer prehistory, Alberti explores compares and evaluates different theoretical and methodological frameworks used in engendering prehistory. He finds an internal, contradictory tension between two positions – the critical and continually in flux and the stable or categorical around which the former must run. He argues that gender archaeology, like feminist materialist research, too often works from the basis of stable categories. Bodies of sex are thought to exist prior to the archaeological analyses. In feminist and queer scholarship, sex is not a given category but a body or phenomena shaped through the relations in which it is embedded. Sex like gender therefore needs investigation. To advance the study of gender prehistory, Alberti wants a critical feminist / queer methodology. We must critically investigate central categories and make active attempts to disrupt taken-for-granted.

This first part of the volume certainly offers several challenges and concerns for gender archaeology. For those interested in the debate and advance of archaeological theory and method it makes necessary reading. However, due to its complex content, it does not really fit an interested public. Mainstream archaeologists will also find it a challenging read. By mainstream archaeology is here meant all archaeology that does not take account of gender, fails to recognise the dynamic nature of gender constructs or refuse to incorporate gender and feminist theory into research and teaching agendas. Despite the worldwide popularity of gender archaeology, there is a prevailing inability,

even refusal, of mainstream archaeology to incorporate gender and feminist theory into the archaeological practice (Bolger p. 1).

The second part of the book is more conventional and will most probably attract a wider audience. Part two includes 16 geographically structured chapters focused on gender in prehistoric contexts and the changing landscape for gender research across countries and continents. Organised into three sections we find: (4) 'Gender Prehistory in Africa and Asia' (Barich, Wadley, Nelson, Linduff / Rubinson), (5) 'Gender in European Prehistory' (Sørensen, Chapman / Palıncaş, Días-Andreu / Montón-Subías, Edwards / Pope, Whitehouse, Hitchcock / Nikolaidou) and (6) 'Gender Prehistory in the Americas and the South Pacific' (Claassen, Kehoe, Brumfiel, Vogel / Cutright and De Leuien). These overviews provide a global survey of gender in prehistoric contexts. Some explicitly draw attention to the gaps in current theoretical approaches and offer paths for the future of gender archaeology (Bolger / Wright). Archaeologists do not agree on the definition of gender, but often refer it to the classic division of men's and women's roles within society. Gender research means exploring how these roles might have been organised or structured. This gender research largely gives emphasis to differences between, rather than within, binary sex and gender categories. Compared with the first part of the book, the small word 'role' dominates the scene. The basic concern is women, women's different roles and statuses and / or the relationship between women and men, female and male – themes since long central to gender archaeology.

Importantly, noticeable differences in the progress of gender archaeology across the globe are revealed. In North Africa, Barich describes an archaeology centred on environmental issues. There is a very limited amount of research on gender, but a notable increase in the interest of contextual analysis and aspects of human agency. Close studies of sites in the Sahara and Nile Valley between 10 000–5 000 B. P. have contributed to healthy and necessary debates about gendered activities challenging the notion of a universal sexual division of labour and the idea of male dominance (cf. Wadley, Chapter 16).

In East Asian and Eurasian archaeology, gender archaeology is new to most scholars. Linduff / Rubinson demonstrate that studies of gender are basically concerned with how to locate men and women in the archaeological record and how to understand their roles in society. This chapter makes very interesting reading since the thinking about sex and gender is so strongly guided by Confucian and Daoist (yin / yang) philosophies. Women and men possess opposite capacities, positions and roles but both are necessary to provide a harmonious society and universe. From the view of Southwest Asian archaeology, Bolger / Wright conclude that research on gender was almost non-existent before the 1990s but exemplify that gender archaeology is currently beginning to play a more central role. A stronger incorporation of gender and feminist theory and methodology into traditional archaeology is needed to overcome the longstanding misrepresentations of women's and men's roles in prehistory, in particular in relation to broader processes of change like agriculture and urbanism.

The chapters on gender prehistory in the Americas and the South Pacific demonstrate a thriving field of gender research, which recently has come to incorporate indigenous and postcolonial concerns (Kehoe). The use of ethnographic accounts is repeatedly questioned in American gender archaeology; yet, the chapters make clear that historic ethnographic analogy is a common base for much gender research. Perhaps this is why binary sex differences so often here act as the foundation for gender, approached as synonymous with the activities and roles of women and (sometimes) men in the past (Claassen). Gender complementarity is another widespread concept used; men and women have different gender roles but interact as structural complements in society. The basic assumption, then, seems to be that women and men are different *per se* and that female and male tasks should, therefore, also differ. American gender research, however, differs regionally

across the continent (Kehoe). There are tensions between gender archaeology, often focusing on women / female, and feminist and queer oriented gender research more often concerned with variability (Vogel / Cutright). Indeed, since the start of American gender archaeology, there have been continuous calls for questioning gender rather than assuming binary gender roles. Brumfiel's chapter on how to move beyond gender complementarity is an excellent example of the importance of such critique. Gender, too, often rests on the false assumption of a dichotomous sexual division of labour. Gender archaeology must instead seek to define and explain variability in gender roles, identities and ideologies across time and space. The history of gender relations in prehistory remains to be written – the evidence is available (Brumfiel p. 578).

In her chapter on gender and archaeology in Australia, Papua New Guinea and the South Pacific, De Leuien similarly demonstrates the need of feminist and postcolonial gender theory. After substantial publications and multiple conferences on gender throughout the 1990s, she describes a general failure to incorporate gender research into Australian archaeology. Gender is regarded as less factual and less important than core strands. There has been little systematic feminist influence on research agendas and the reliance of ethnographic evidence reinforces binary models. To advance, she argues, we need a change in theory and a critique of western binary notions of gender as sex.

If we move to Europe, we find a different history (or rather histories) of gender archaeology (compare for example Chapman / Palıncaş, Días-Andreu / Montón-Subías, Whitehouse). Despite eastern European archaeology being deeply informed by Marxist social theory and models of historical gender relations, gender research is almost absent. Essentialist concepts of sex and gender are widespread (Chapman / Palıncaş). In Spain, by contrast, gender archaeology emerged already in the 1980s and is now described as a leading area of research. In Portugal and France, however, gender research stirs little enthusiasm in spite of the long tradition of feminist theory in France (Días-Andreu / Montón-Subías). In Italian archaeology, gender archaeology has also made little impact. During the 2000s, there has been an increase in gender research. However, men and women are often approached as uncontroversial categories. Gender basically means to define biological women's and men's roles in society. Queer gender categories do not exist (Whitehouse). Despite many achievements, Greek gender archaeology has had a slow development. Currently it faces the challenge to move from a focus on female concerns in the face of androcentric models to gender beyond binary stereotypes. The record invites more complex readings (Hitchcock / Nikolaidou; cf. Brumfiel).

In Scandinavia, gender archaeology first started in the late 1970s, deeply rooted into feminist theory and critique. In the chapter 'The History of Gender Archaeology in Northern Europe' (Chapter 19), Sørensen seeks to trace the development of this important research. The text furnishes an overview of how feminist gender archaeology emerged and how, in the late 1980s, the difference between gender archaeology and feminist archaeology was introduced. She presents a general background of gender, explaining concepts such as first, second and third wave feminism (concepts referred to in the first part of the book but never explained there). The reading of the volume would perhaps have benefited from placing this chapter earlier in the book. However, her definition of what constitutes feminism, feminist theory and feminist archaeology is rather confusing. Instead of discussing gender in terms of differences between feminist theoretical positions (empiricist, standpoint, poststructuralist, materialist etc.), she presents Scandinavian feminist archaeology as characterised by first / second wave thinking on gender and as a mere critique of masculine regimes (p. 399). In her eyes this makes feminist archaeology political, too concerned with women and the upgrading of women as active participants of prehistory. Like other scholars in this volume, she argues that gender archaeology is better off without feminism and / or feminist

theory. We should encourage a more objective research on gender; a research climate free from constraints (Bolger p. 11). A paradox, as demonstrated by the volume chapters, is however that the concern with women and women's statutes appears much greater in gender archaeology than in feminist / queer archaeology. This certainly provides ground for much interesting debate. Unfortunately, the title is misleading. Sørensen is only and explicitly concerned with Scandinavia; that is Norway, Sweden and Denmark. In fact, the region of North and Central Europe, including Germany, is completely missing from this volume. Some few references are made to North and Central European gender archaeology, but these are not further discussed (Bolger p. 12; Sørensen p. 406). The neglect is peculiar. Gender and women's research have a rather long tradition in German archaeology. From a European perspective, the German-language area represents one of five distinct regions of gender archaeology (L. H. DOMMASNES, Gender, feminist, and queer archaeologies: A European perspective. In: C. Smith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology* [New York 2014] 2968–2980). Surely another researcher could have been invited to cover the gender prehistory of this region. Regrettably this was not done. The production of the *Companion to Gender Prehistory* for this reason does not really go with the principle of broad representation advocated by gender archaeology. Despite its global content, one can hardly say that writers cut across the globe. Of the thirty-nine researchers contributing to the volume, approximately 77 % belong to Anglo-American academic cultures (22 Americans, 8 from Great Britain). The book in that way repeats a pattern where Anglo-American gender archaeology and academic culture dominates the scene (S. TOMÁŠKOVÁ, Landscape for a good feminist. An archaeological review. *Arch. Dialogues* 18,1, 2011, 109–136). In archaeology, the majority of published gender archaeology is in English, and of the gender research articles published in leading peer-reviewed archaeological journals between the years 2001–2010, a total of 82 % were written by American (70 %) and British (12 %) scholars (I.-M. DANIELSSON BACK, Much ado about nothing. Gender research in journals during the last 30 years within archaeology. In: id. / S. Thedeén (eds), *To Tender Gender. The Past and Futures of Gender Research in Archaeology* [Stockholm 2012] 17–32). Nonetheless, the *Companion* is extremely valuable. Regional overviews provide deep insights into gender prehistory and the shifting histories of gender, feminist and queer archaeology across continents. Scholars do not reach a common ground with reference to the definition of sex and gender, but theoretical and methodological debates are healthy and assist in the constant developing of research fields.

SE-751 26 Uppsala
Box 626
E-Mail: cecilia.lidstrom_holmberg@arkeologi.uu.se

Cecilia Lidström Holmberg
Department of Archaeology
and Ancient History
Uppsala University

MICHAEL J. KAISER, *Werkzeug – Feuerzeug – Edelstein. Die Silices des südöstlichen Oberrheingebietes und ihre Nutzung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart.* Materialhefte zur Archäologie in Baden-Württemberg Heft 95. Theiss Verlag, Stuttgart 2013. € 54,-. ISBN 978-3-8062-2780-2. 400 Seiten mit zahlreichen Abbildungen und 28 Tafeln.

Michael J. Kaisers Dissertation zu den Silices des südöstlichen Oberrheingebietes fällt sofort durch das farbenkräftige Titelbild ins Auge, das gelbrot und grauweiß gebänderten Markgräfler Bohnerzjaspis zeigt. Das 400 Seiten und 28 farbige Tafeln umfassende Werk thematisiert die Nutzung und Bedeutung der Lagerstätten dieses außergewöhnlichen Silexmaterials sowie weiterer Silices der Rheinlandschaft zwischen Offenburg und Basel. Die 2007 an der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg eingereichte und 2013 veröffentlichte Arbeit beleuchtet den kulturgeschichtlichen Stellen-