

- nia's Spanish-Colonial Missions. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 35–61. London: Routledge.
- 2000b Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities. *World Archaeology* 32(2):180–92.
- In press Looking for Gender, Finding Sexuality: A Queer Politic of Archaeology, Fifteen Years Later. In *Que(r)rying Archaeology: The 15th Anniversary Gender Conference*. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Chacmool Archaeological Conference. Calgary: University of Calgary.
- Voss, Barbara L., and Robert A. Schmidt
- 2000 Archaeologies of Sexuality: An Introduction. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 1–32. London: Routledge.
- Warner, Michael, ed.
- 1993 *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weismantel, Mary
- 2004 Moche Sex Pots: Reproduction and Temporality in Ancient South America. *American Anthropologist* 106(3):495–505.
- Whelan, Mary K.
- 1991 Gender and Historical Archaeology: Eastern Dakota Patterns in the 19th Century. *Historical Archaeology* 25:17–32.
- Wilkie, Laurie A.
- 2000 Magical Passions: Sexuality and African-American Archaeology. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 129–42. London: Routledge.
- 2003 *The Archaeology of Mothering: An African-American Midwife's Tale*. New York: Routledge.
- Yates, T.
- 1993 Frameworks for an Archaeology of the Body. In *Interpretive Archaeology*. Chris Tilley, ed. Pp. 31–72. Providence, RI: Berg.

Archaeology, Men, and Masculinities

12

BENJAMIN ALBERTI

STUDYING MEN AND MASCULINITY in archaeology is a sticky proposition. While one's initial reaction may be, "Why of course! We must study masculinity alongside other aspects of gender," it quickly becomes apparent that it is not that simple. Feminist and gender archaeologies continue to reveal how "women" have been an invisible category in archaeological interpretation and history. "Men," in contrast, have always been visible, but their gender has been "unmarked." Their presence has been assumed—but assumed on the basis of a "neutral" body, unmarked by gender, race, or any other category of identity (Conkey and Spector 1984; Joyce 2004; Knapp 1998b:92; Nelson 1997:16; Wylie 1991). The genderless man comes to stand for society as a whole. The question then becomes, Can we "mark" men—give them a gender—without reinstating "man" as the universal historical subject, which would once again exclude women and subordinate men? Moreover, the inequality and violence that result from current ideas and practices associated with men and masculinity mean that to speak of "masculinity" is to invite engagement with the politics of knowledge.

The first part of the chapter considers the not entirely rhetorical question of whether we need an archaeology of masculinity at all. I argue that we need a critical study of past men and masculinities but that the framework for such studies is already in place. There is no need for a new subfield; such a move is potentially exclusionary. I further examine definitions of masculinity and point out that a certain degree of conceptual confusion exists. By disentangling such confusion, we can gain a better understanding of the ways in which masculinity and men have been understood in archaeological research. The next part of the chapter is an introduction to how men and masculinity have been understood and interpreted in archaeology. Most work on masculinity in archaeology must be inferred from general works or from work within gender archaeology. What clearly comes into focus is that issues around male bodies are at the forefront of recent work

on masculinity. Ironically, this potentially presents a foundational challenge to the nascent studies of masculinity in archaeology.

A crucial issue that emerges from my discussion, addressed in the final part of the chapter, is the status of the category "masculinity." I suggest that "masculinity" or "men" may not always be the most appropriate interpretive frameworks. Indeed, the decision of whether to use the categories hinges on methodological and political concerns. I suggest two ways to proceed: either admitting the contingency of the category but using it anyway (a kind of "strategic essentialism") or being prepared to let go of the category and allow apparent ambiguity or difference in the material to drive interpretation. Borrowing a term from Fox (1998), I argue that reflexivity and the issue of "critical need"—the tension between what we want from our material and what it can tell us—should guide our decision on which path to take. The search for complete narratives of past social lives is more likely to efface differences by reproducing the historical male subject, whereas admitting the fragmentary nature of our material may prevent reification of the category "masculinity."

Do We Need an Archaeology of Masculinity?

Gutmann's (1997) observation for the status of studies of masculinity in anthropology still stands for archaeology: a quick perusal of indices in archaeological works may show women as an entry but not men. Instead, men's presence is assumed. Moreover, there are few works that focus explicitly on masculinity in archaeology. Regardless, this chapter is not intended to be a clarion call for "an" archaeology of masculinity; it is not "men's turn" (see Gutmann 1997:403). I advocate a more cautious approach by asking, Do we need an archaeology masculinity? I argue there are compelling reasons why it is important to study masculinity in archaeology. However, there are also important qualifiers, including interpretive and conceptual issues, such as whether there is anything we can recognize as "masculinity" in the archaeological record.

It has been widely recognized that accounts of past peoples have actually been accounts of normative masculinity (e.g., Conkey and Spector 1984; Scott 1997:8). Simultaneously, men have long been presented as gender neutral in archaeological accounts of the past. Archaeologists arguing for the inclusion of masculinities in archaeology echo this point, stating that to ignore masculinity is to leave the idea of an undifferentiated, universal "man" in place (Caesar 1999b:115; Foxhall 1998a; Joyce 2004; Knapp 1998b:92, 1998a). Caesar (1999b:115) states that "archaeology has neglected the complexity of masculinity and made the prehistoric man invisible through the stereotypical way of interpret-

ing and representing the male sex." Others argue that focusing on women to the exclusion of men has had the unfortunate side effect of reinforcing the idea of a monolithic masculinity (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994; Knapp 1998b). Conceptually, therefore, there is a need to deconstruct the dominant concepts of "masculinity" and "man" as universal norms. Making past men's gender explicit reveals them as gendered subjects—rather than representing the whole of humanity, they can stand only for themselves.

Archaeological knowledge tends to reproduce an image of the contemporary dominant form of masculinity (see Caesar 1999a:133). The past is used as a repository of idealized archetypes that are called on by popular culture to reinforce essentialist ideas (see Joyce 2004). Caesar (1999b) points out that such "myths and stories" of man in prehistory then become active components in contemporary men's identity projects (e.g., the mythopoetic men's movement; Bly 1990; see also Middleton 1993). For example, essentialist arguments about the roots of men's aggressive sexuality that appear in the popular media use simplistic stereotyped notions of prehistoric gender arrangements to give their ideas the spurious credibility of time depth (e.g., Vedantam 2003). More sinisterly, nationalist and religious rhetoric frequently cites ideals of past male warriors and heroes (see Archetti 1998; Gutmann 1996; Mosse 1996). Thus, the "invisible man," the positive norm of masculinity in prehistory, is "a dynamic and active component in the present production of gender" (Caesar 1999a:115).

Making men's gender explicit has its own dangers. Hence, I argue that there is no need for a separate subfield ("the" archaeology of masculinity), as the necessary theoretical and conceptual frameworks are in place in feminist-inspired archaeology. Moreover, inaugurating an archaeology of masculinity has the potential to lend further solidity to an object ("masculinity") that, as discussed in this chapter, may not be a stable object of inquiry. The development of studies of masculinity in the social sciences and humanities disciplines (for overviews, see Clatterbaugh 2000; Connell 2000; Petersen 2003; in anthropology, see Gutmann 1997) has been met with skepticism by some feminists and pro-feminists (Braidotti 1994). For example, Solomon-Godeau (1995:76) signals the danger of approaching masculinity as a "newly discovered discursive object" when the fundamentals do not change but rather a newly expanded field for their deployment is offered. Moreover, as a simple "corrective" measure, it is flawed because the concepts of "men" and "masculinity" are already overvalued in Western society. Some authors have argued that the danger in creating a false equivalence between women's studies and men's studies is that men will once again be taken as representative of society as a whole (Hearn 2004; Solomon-Godeau 1995).

Carving out a disciplinary niche, or subfield, can be an aggressive process,

setting up exclusions or effacements as "proper objects" (Braidotti 1994) of study are defined and boundaries are established. One of the founding fathers of the field known as New Men's Studies, Harry Brod (1987; see Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:29–30), reveals such a process. He argues that only men can truly understand men (Brod 1987) and ignores years of feminist scholarship, resulting in reactionary rather than critical theory and debate (Canaan and Griffin 1990; Hanmer 1990; Hearn 2004:63; Solomon-Godeau 1995:20). As Almeida (1996:143) remarks in the case of anthropology, without feminist theory and women's studies, "masculinity" would never have made an appearance on the research agenda.

Knapp (1998a, 1998b; see also Knapp and Meskell 1997) has argued for a "masculinist" archaeology informed by feminism. He states that we must include the work of "masculinist" writers partially as a corrective measure, to avoid a "gynocentric," "exclusionary, feminist world-view" (Knapp 1998a:365). In much the same way, Brod argues that "New Men's Studies can offer the necessary corrective to the 'female bias'" in feminist-inspired work (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:30). The implication in both cases is that a "masculinist" perspective can challenge both androcentric and gynocentric accounts, whereas a feminist perspective merely replaces an androcentric account with a gynocentric one. Knapp's (1998a, 1998b) choice of terms is also curious; "masculinist" is not widely used in critical men's studies. In addition, it could be taken as unnecessarily antagonistic, its more common meaning being restricted to androcentric material and beliefs.

"Masculinist" perspectives have not caught on in archaeology. With Gutmann (1998:113–14), I agree that the inclusion of "masculinist" theory is not a prerequisite for either a feminist archaeology or critical studies of men and masculinity within archaeology. However, there are contributions to be made by the men's studies literature, as Knapp (1998a, 1998b) indicates. What are required, I argue, are both critical engagements with the concept of "masculinity" and the development of the means of conceptualizing sexual difference that go beyond the assumption of fixed binary categories of identity. Both these goals can be achieved through extant conceptual and theoretical frameworks within the discipline.

Defining Masculinity

There are two broad ways in which the category "masculinity" has been understood: as an "object" open to empirical analysis or as "configurations of practices" (Connell 1995, 2000). The status of the body is central to the distinction between these approaches. Practice-based approaches suggest the possibility that

the category "male" is not beyond cultural intervention. Consequently, the categories on which contemporary studies of masculinity are founded may not be universally significant, in which case "masculinity" may not always be a relevant dimension of analysis in archaeological contexts.

Any interpretation of past social worlds implies an understanding of what "masculinity" means, although few authors define the term. That task is notoriously difficult—studies of men and masculinity are riddled with imprecise definitions (Connell 2000:15; Hearn 2004; MacInnes 1998; Petersen 2003). Authors frequently entirely ignore any attempt at definition, relying on implied or taken-for-granted meanings (Clatterbaugh 1998; Connell 2000:16; Gutmann 1997:385–86; Petersen 2003:58). Some of the confusion stems from whether you consider the term a descriptive or an analytical one. Problems arise when the two usages are seen as equivalent or are not clearly separated. If the term is purely descriptive, then to define masculinity is to best describe the attributes that epitomize masculine identity (i.e., a measurable list of qualities). This can lead to essentialist notions of masculinity in which certain key attributes are said to define what it means to be a man in all times and places. It quickly becomes apparent that any such description is limited to one time, one place, and one type of man. Consequently, masculinity is currently more commonly conceived of as an analytical category the content of which is culturally and historically specific. Masculinity consists of traits, behaviors, beliefs, expectations, and so on that are commonly associated with males in specific cultures and, when internalized, are a constitutive part of their identities. At the root of the term as it is conventionally used is the assumption that one's behavior reflects the type of person one is (Connell 1995:67). In effect, descriptions of masculinity often appear as a list of qualities said to characterize the category. Aggression, competitiveness, and emotional detachment are common core elements for contemporary Western countries (Petersen 2003:58), with variations of the list for other cultures. As a result, "masculinity appears as an essence or commodity, which can be measured, possessed or lost" (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:12).

Even if used analytically, there remains the problem that this is a Western category of relatively recent genesis—a similar category that can be recognized as "masculinity" does not exist in many cultures (Connell 1995). Some have questioned, therefore, whether masculinity is generally applicable as a concept (Hearn 2004; MacInnes 1998). Others have argued that the inability to pin down a definition is because masculinity is not an object that can be studied empirically (Connell 1995). More recent theories of masculinity posit practice-based definitions in which the category is enacted rather than predefined by culture or society. For example, Connell (1995:44), a leading theorist in men's studies, understands

masculinities to be "configurations of practice within gender relations." Ideas that have been developed to encompass this more flexible definition include "multiple masculinities," in which the term is relativized, and "hegemonic masculinity" (Carrigan et al. 1987; Connell 1987, 1995), which gets at power differentials among groups of men and between men and women as well as how the dominant form of masculinity (often elided as the way to be a man in popular discourse) maintains its position of social, economic, and political privilege. Rather than conceive of masculinity in terms of a fixed list of traits, these traits can be best understood as "tendencies and possibilities . . . that individuals have access to at different points in time" (MacInnes 1998:15). As such, there are many different notions of masculinity, often contradictory and in tension. Furthermore, in practice-based approaches, it is understood that "completely variant notions of masculinity can refer simultaneously or sequentially to the same individual" (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:12).

At the heart of the tension between masculinity-as-object and masculinity-as-practice lies the sex/gender division, in which sex is a biological constant and gender is the meaning given to each sex by culture. This formulation has been challenged, opening up the category "male" to critique (see the discussion later in this chapter). Once "male" is challenged as a natural foundation for gender, it becomes hard to think of the category masculinity as universally applicable because the male-female binary is no longer a given. As Petersen (2003:58) points out, it is difficult to speak of masculinity without implying a binary notion of gender.

Archaeological Approaches to Masculinities

The following critical review of approaches to masculinity and men in archaeology reveals how the previously mentioned definitions of masculinity lie hidden in our interpretations of gender. Little of this work investigates masculinity directly. Therefore, I make explicit the understandings of masculinity implied in archaeological interpretation. I embed discussion of archaeological texts within a framework of research from other disciplines that address more directly questions of masculinity and include developments that are of interest to the archaeological study of masculinities. Also drawing from this work, recent research in archaeology brings the complexity of the category to the forefront, demonstrating the existence of a plurality of masculinities and forms of masculine identity formation. However, the underlying understanding of masculinity remains that of a quantifiable object. Other work has begun to challenge the stability and universality of the category "male," thereby exposing the interpretive limitations of the

category "masculinity." What becomes clear is that it cannot be assumed that what we understand as "masculinity" is inherent in the material. Feminist-inspired theories of embodiment indicate how sexual difference may be explored without resorting to the categories "masculinity" or "male."

Work that focuses explicitly on masculinity includes general theoretical works (Alberti 1997; Caesar 1999a, 1999b; Knapp 1998a, 1998b; Knapp and Meskell 1997; Meskell 1996; Nordbladh and Yates 1990), investigations into the formation of specific masculine identities (Harrison 2002; Joyce 2000; Shanks 1996; Treherne 1995; Yates 1993), and critical research into classical masculinities (contributions to Foxhall and Salmon 1998a, 1998b; Shanks 1996). Historical periods have also produced archaeological research on masculinity (e.g., Hadley 1998a; Harrison 2002; Wilkie 1998). Furthermore, Harrison (2002) has explored experimental modes of presentation in the form of fictionalized vignettes, following the work of feminist archaeologists (e.g., Spector 1993).

"Universal Man": Essentialist Approaches to Masculinity

Essentialist approaches to masculinity have played a dual role in archaeology. First, most interpretations of masculinity in archaeology were essentialist until the advent of gender archaeology. Second, even though soundly critiqued, such approaches demonstrate the political role of interpretations of past masculinities. The search for certain key attributes of masculinity was part of the driving force behind early archaeological explorations. In terms of a framework for interpreting masculinity in the past, essentialism is limited by an inability to account for cultural or historical variation. Masculinity is seen as firmly rooted in an undifferentiated male body.

Essentialist approaches highlight key characteristics that are said to define masculinity. Irrespective of culture, history, or experience, the basis for men's behavior and identities is linked to hypothetically innate psychobiological structures, or cultural universals. Sociopolitical arrangements, such as the division of labor or organization of sexuality and reproduction, are considered epiphenomena of these innate gendered behaviors. These forms of determinism appear in many archaeological interpretations, often subtextually. They have their roots in post-Enlightenment thought and are coeval with the emergence of archaeology as a discipline. Essentialism has recently experienced a renaissance in the form of sociobiological arguments about genetically programmed behavior.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, masculinity was given a psychohistorical dimension. Protestantism and belief in scientific progress and knowledge encouraged a distinction to be made between nature and reason in

which men and modernity were increasingly associated with the latter (Mosse 1996; Petersen 2003). Successful masculinity involved dominating base, animal urges through rational thought (see Connell 1994, 1995; Lloyd 1993; Seidler 1994). It was assumed that men everywhere faced the same challenge. Models of social evolution, proposed by Spencer, Morgan, and Tyler (see Trigger 1989), among others, in which human groups evolved through stages of increasing social complexity toward civilization implied a corollary psychohistorical model of the development of "mind." The psychic unity of mankind implied that all men had the potential for "cultured" (civilized) behavior and thought. Differences among men from different cultural contexts were of the nature of psychohistorical depth rather than due to individual or historicocultural difference. As such, nineteenth-century evolutionary models imply that "primitive" or prehistoric man reflected an earlier stage in the development of "modern man" both culturally and psychologically.

There is an intimate relationship between masculinity and the emergence of archaeology as a discipline. The analytical structures used by archaeologists are embedded in post-Enlightenment thought, which is deeply complicit with nineteenth-century ideals of masculinity (Baker 1997:183–84; Hearn and Morgan 1990:4; Seidler 1989:2–4; Thomas 2004). This is clearly seen in the relationship among classical archaeology, contemporary ideals of masculinity, and theories of masculinity. Classical "man" was the focus of early archaeological work, the classical world being considered a gold mine of attributes of ideal masculinity, such as notions of reason, and questions of aesthetic judgment and idealized masculine beauty (Gutmann 1998; Mosse 1996). More directly, classical myths and philosophy were the inspiration for psychoanalytical theories of masculine sexual identity, including essentialist perspectives (Foxhall 1998b:2–3). Similarly, Harrison (2002) has shown how colonial ideal masculinity was consciously created through material culture. Harrison (2002) examines the manufacture of Kimberly spear points in northern Australia as a case of the mutual constitution of hybrid masculinities, those of the local Aborigine men and colonial collectors. The collector aspired to capture for himself some essence of the Aborigine man's "primitive" masculinity. An important project for future work on masculinity in archaeology, therefore, must be to critique the role played by archaeological knowledge in the contemporary identity projects of men (see Caesar 1999b).

Essentialist ideas about masculinity have reemerged in academia and in popular culture. The racism of early socioevolutionary theories has been replaced by evolutionary perspectives that root behavior in DNA and genes. This form of essentialism is particularly pervasive in popular scientific accounts of sexual difference (e.g., Baker 2000; Buss 2003). Common themes include exploring the

genetic or socioevolutionary reasons for sexual behavior, violence, and hunting (e.g., Lovejoy 1981; Tiger 1969, 2000; Washburn and Lancaster 1968). There is little convincing evidence that genes or evolutionary adaptive behaviors predispose men to particular conduct or capabilities (for critiques of gender in human origins research, see Fedigan 1982; Hager 1997).

Essentialist ideas about masculinity are difficult to defend. Even if there are measurable, biological differences between men and women, trying to tie down such differences to specific conduct or capacities has proven unsuccessful (Connell 1995:46–52; Fausto-Sterling 1992). Similarly, the choice of "essence" is fairly arbitrary, depending on the theoretical leanings of the author in question (Connell 1995:69). In practice, essentialist approaches tend to focus on contemporary dominant ideals of masculinity (e.g., Gilmore 1990; see critique in Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:27). Archaeologically, we could only hope to find evidence of a fixed masculine "essence." Most essentialist work pre-dated the introduction of the sex/gender split into archaeology. As such, the essential attributes of masculinity were thought to emanate from within a clearly defined, universal male body.

Relativizing Masculinity: Social Construction

Social construction provided a way of thinking about masculinity that offered far greater flexibility. Most theories of social construction are based on the idea that sex and gender are two separate entities. Gendered identities and conduct are constructed by culture rather than existing within the body. Thus, variation in social arrangements and men's and women's roles cross-culturally can be explored. A limitation of this approach for exploring masculinity lies in the concept of gender used. Even though variation in "men" can be recognized, a form of essentialism remains in that the category "male" is unexplored.

A social construction theory of gender was adopted by archaeology in the 1980s (Conkey and Spector 1984) that opened the door for studies of masculinity in archaeology. However, such studies failed to materialize during this period. Given this paucity, the following is necessarily a schematic account. The meaning of "masculinity" is generally inferred rather than read directly from the texts. The focus in this section is on initial work within gender archaeology, which I inevitably falsely homogenize.

In the initial formulations of gender archaeology, "masculinity" referred to the actions and values habitually associated with males in a given culture (Conkey and Spector 1984). As such, masculinity can adhere to other people or things but must ultimately refer back to men. At times, "masculine" is used in a quantitative

- nia's Spanish-Colonial Missions. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 35–61. London: Routledge.
- 2000b Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities. *World Archaeology* 32(2):180–92.
- In press Looking for Gender, Finding Sexuality: A Queer Politic of Archaeology, Fifteen Years Later. In *Que(r)rying Archaeology: The 15th Anniversary Gender Conference*. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Chacmool Archaeological Conference. Calgary: University of Calgary.
- Voss, Barbara L., and Robert A. Schmidt
- 2000 Archaeologies of Sexuality: An Introduction. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 1–32. London: Routledge.
- Warner, Michael, ed.
- 1993 *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weismantel, Mary
- 2004 Moche Sex Pots: Reproduction and Temporality in Ancient South America. *American Anthropologist* 106(3):495–505.
- Whelan, Mary K.
- 1991 Gender and Historical Archaeology: Eastern Dakota Patterns in the 19th Century. *Historical Archaeology* 25:17–32.
- Wilkie, Laurie A.
- 2000 Magical Passions: Sexuality and African-American Archaeology. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 129–42. London: Routledge.
- 2003 *The Archaeology of Mothering: An African-American Midwife's Tale*. New York: Routledge.
- Yates, T.
- 1993 Frameworks for an Archaeology of the Body. In *Interpretive Archaeology*. Chris Tilley, ed. Pp. 31–72. Providence, RI: Berg.

Archaeology, Men, and Masculinities

12

BENJAMIN ALBERTI

STUDYING MEN AND MASCULINITY in archaeology is a sticky proposition. While one's initial reaction may be, "Why of course! We must study masculinity alongside other aspects of gender," it quickly becomes apparent that it is not that simple. Feminist and gender archaeologies continue to reveal how "women" have been an invisible category in archaeological interpretation and history. "Men," in contrast, have always been visible, but their gender has been "unmarked." Their presence has been assumed—but assumed on the basis of a "neutral" body, unmarked by gender, race, or any other category of identity (Conkey and Spector 1984; Joyce 2004; Knapp 1998b:92; Nelson 1997:16; Wylie 1991). The genderless man comes to stand for society as a whole. The question then becomes, Can we "mark" men—give them a gender—without reinstating "man" as the universal historical subject, which would once again exclude women and subordinate men? Moreover, the inequality and violence that result from current ideas and practices associated with men and masculinity mean that to speak of "masculinity" is to invite engagement with the politics of knowledge.

The first part of the chapter considers the not entirely rhetorical question of whether we need an archaeology of masculinity at all. I argue that we need a critical study of past men and masculinities but that the framework for such studies is already in place. There is no need for a new subfield; such a move is potentially exclusionary. I further examine definitions of masculinity and point out that a certain degree of conceptual confusion exists. By disentangling such confusion, we can gain a better understanding of the ways in which masculinity and men have been understood in archaeological research. The next part of the chapter is an introduction to how men and masculinity have been understood and interpreted in archaeology. Most work on masculinity in archaeology must be inferred from general works or from work within gender archaeology. What clearly comes into focus is that issues around male bodies are at the forefront of recent work

on masculinity. Ironically, this potentially presents a foundational challenge to the nascent studies of masculinity in archaeology.

A crucial issue that emerges from my discussion, addressed in the final part of the chapter, is the status of the category "masculinity." I suggest that "masculinity" or "men" may not always be the most appropriate interpretive frameworks. Indeed, the decision of whether to use the categories hinges on methodological and political concerns. I suggest two ways to proceed: either admitting the contingency of the category but using it anyway (a kind of "strategic essentialism") or being prepared to let go of the category and allow apparent ambiguity or difference in the material to drive interpretation. Borrowing a term from Fox (1998), I argue that reflexivity and the issue of "critical need"—the tension between what we want from our material and what it can tell us—should guide our decision on which path to take. The search for complete narratives of past social lives is more likely to efface differences by reproducing the historical male subject, whereas admitting the fragmentary nature of our material may prevent reification of the category "masculinity."

Do We Need an Archaeology of Masculinity?

Gutmann's (1997) observation for the status of studies of masculinity in anthropology still stands for archaeology: a quick perusal of indices in archaeological works may show women as an entry but not men. Instead, men's presence is assumed. Moreover, there are few works that focus explicitly on masculinity in archaeology. Regardless, this chapter is not intended to be a clarion call for "an" archaeology of masculinity; it is not "men's turn" (see Gutmann 1997:403). I advocate a more cautious approach by asking, Do we need an archaeology masculinity? I argue there are compelling reasons why it is important to study masculinity in archaeology. However, there are also important qualifiers, including interpretive and conceptual issues, such as whether there is anything we can recognize as "masculinity" in the archaeological record.

It has been widely recognized that accounts of past peoples have actually been accounts of normative masculinity (e.g., Conkey and Spector 1984; Scott 1997:8). Simultaneously, men have long been presented as gender neutral in archaeological accounts of the past. Archaeologists arguing for the inclusion of masculinities in archaeology echo this point, stating that to ignore masculinity is to leave the idea of an undifferentiated, universal "man" in place (Caesar 1999b:115; Foxhall 1998a; Joyce 2004; Knapp 1998b:92, 1998a). Caesar (1999b:115) states that "archaeology has neglected the complexity of masculinity and made the prehistoric man invisible through the stereotypical way of interpret-

ing and representing the male sex." Others argue that focusing on women to the exclusion of men has had the unfortunate side effect of reinforcing the idea of a monolithic masculinity (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994; Knapp 1998b). Conceptually, therefore, there is a need to deconstruct the dominant concepts of "masculinity" and "man" as universal norms. Making past men's gender explicit reveals them as gendered subjects—rather than representing the whole of humanity, they can stand only for themselves.

Archaeological knowledge tends to reproduce an image of the contemporary dominant form of masculinity (see Caesar 1999a:133). The past is used as a repository of idealized archetypes that are called on by popular culture to reinforce essentialist ideas (see Joyce 2004). Caesar (1999b) points out that such "myths and stories" of man in prehistory then become active components in contemporary men's identity projects (e.g., the mythopoetic men's movement; Bly 1990; see also Middleton 1993). For example, essentialist arguments about the roots of men's aggressive sexuality that appear in the popular media use simplistic stereotyped notions of prehistoric gender arrangements to give their ideas the spurious credibility of time depth (e.g., Vedantam 2003). More sinisterly, nationalist and religious rhetoric frequently cites ideals of past male warriors and heroes (see Archetti 1998; Gutmann 1996; Mosse 1996). Thus, the "invisible man," the positive norm of masculinity in prehistory, is "a dynamic and active component in the present production of gender" (Caesar 1999a:115).

Making men's gender explicit has its own dangers. Hence, I argue that there is no need for a separate subfield ("the" archaeology of masculinity), as the necessary theoretical and conceptual frameworks are in place in feminist-inspired archaeology. Moreover, inaugurating an archaeology of masculinity has the potential to lend further solidity to an object ("masculinity") that, as discussed in this chapter, may not be a stable object of inquiry. The development of studies of masculinity in the social sciences and humanities disciplines (for overviews, see Clatterbaugh 2000; Connell 2000; Petersen 2003; in anthropology, see Gutmann 1997) has been met with skepticism by some feminists and pro-feminists (Braidotti 1994). For example, Solomon-Godeau (1995:76) signals the danger of approaching masculinity as a "newly discovered discursive object" when the fundamentals do not change but rather a newly expanded field for their deployment is offered. Moreover, as a simple "corrective" measure, it is flawed because the concepts of "men" and "masculinity" are already overvalued in Western society. Some authors have argued that the danger in creating a false equivalence between women's studies and men's studies is that men will once again be taken as representative of society as a whole (Hearn 2004; Solomon-Godeau 1995).

Carving out a disciplinary niche, or subfield, can be an aggressive process,

setting up exclusions or effacements as "proper objects" (Braidotti 1994) of study are defined and boundaries are established. One of the founding fathers of the field known as New Men's Studies, Harry Brod (1987; see Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:29–30), reveals such a process. He argues that only men can truly understand men (Brod 1987) and ignores years of feminist scholarship, resulting in reactionary rather than critical theory and debate (Canaan and Griffin 1990; Hanmer 1990; Hearn 2004:63; Solomon-Godeau 1995:20). As Almeida (1996:143) remarks in the case of anthropology, without feminist theory and women's studies, "masculinity" would never have made an appearance on the research agenda.

Knapp (1998a, 1998b; see also Knapp and Meskell 1997) has argued for a "masculinist" archaeology informed by feminism. He states that we must include the work of "masculinist" writers partially as a corrective measure, to avoid a "gynocentric," "exclusionary, feminist world-view" (Knapp 1998a:365). In much the same way, Brod argues that "New Men's Studies can offer the necessary corrective to the 'female bias'" in feminist-inspired work (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:30). The implication in both cases is that a "masculinist" perspective can challenge both androcentric and gynocentric accounts, whereas a feminist perspective merely replaces an androcentric account with a gynocentric one. Knapp's (1998a, 1998b) choice of terms is also curious; "masculinist" is not widely used in critical men's studies. In addition, it could be taken as unnecessarily antagonistic, its more common meaning being restricted to androcentric material and beliefs.

"Masculinist" perspectives have not caught on in archaeology. With Gutmann (1998:113–14), I agree that the inclusion of "masculinist" theory is not a prerequisite for either a feminist archaeology or critical studies of men and masculinity within archaeology. However, there are contributions to be made by the men's studies literature, as Knapp (1998a, 1998b) indicates. What are required, I argue, are both critical engagements with the concept of "masculinity" and the development of the means of conceptualizing sexual difference that go beyond the assumption of fixed binary categories of identity. Both these goals can be achieved through extant conceptual and theoretical frameworks within the discipline.

Defining Masculinity

There are two broad ways in which the category "masculinity" has been understood: as an "object" open to empirical analysis or as "configurations of practices" (Connell 1995, 2000). The status of the body is central to the distinction between these approaches. Practice-based approaches suggest the possibility that

the category "male" is not beyond cultural intervention. Consequently, the categories on which contemporary studies of masculinity are founded may not be universally significant, in which case "masculinity" may not always be a relevant dimension of analysis in archaeological contexts.

Any interpretation of past social worlds implies an understanding of what "masculinity" means, although few authors define the term. That task is notoriously difficult—studies of men and masculinity are riddled with imprecise definitions (Connell 2000:15; Hearn 2004; MacInnes 1998; Petersen 2003). Authors frequently entirely ignore any attempt at definition, relying on implied or taken-for-granted meanings (Clatterbaugh 1998; Connell 2000:16; Gutmann 1997:385–86; Petersen 2003:58). Some of the confusion stems from whether you consider the term a descriptive or an analytical one. Problems arise when the two usages are seen as equivalent or are not clearly separated. If the term is purely descriptive, then to define masculinity is to best describe the attributes that epitomize masculine identity (i.e., a measurable list of qualities). This can lead to essentialist notions of masculinity in which certain key attributes are said to define what it means to be a man in all times and places. It quickly becomes apparent that any such description is limited to one time, one place, and one type of man. Consequently, masculinity is currently more commonly conceived of as an analytical category the content of which is culturally and historically specific. Masculinity consists of traits, behaviors, beliefs, expectations, and so on that are commonly associated with males in specific cultures and, when internalized, are a constitutive part of their identities. At the root of the term as it is conventionally used is the assumption that one's behavior reflects the type of person one is (Connell 1995:67). In effect, descriptions of masculinity often appear as a list of qualities said to characterize the category. Aggression, competitiveness, and emotional detachment are common core elements for contemporary Western countries (Petersen 2003:58), with variations of the list for other cultures. As a result, "masculinity appears as an essence or commodity, which can be measured, possessed or lost" (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:12).

Even if used analytically, there remains the problem that this is a Western category of relatively recent genesis—a similar category that can be recognized as "masculinity" does not exist in many cultures (Connell 1995). Some have questioned, therefore, whether masculinity is generally applicable as a concept (Hearn 2004; MacInnes 1998). Others have argued that the inability to pin down a definition is because masculinity is not an object that can be studied empirically (Connell 1995). More recent theories of masculinity posit practice-based definitions in which the category is enacted rather than predefined by culture or society. For example, Connell (1995:44), a leading theorist in men's studies, understands

masculinities to be "configurations of practice within gender relations." Ideas that have been developed to encompass this more flexible definition include "multiple masculinities," in which the term is relativized, and "hegemonic masculinity" (Carrigan et al. 1987; Connell 1987, 1995), which gets at power differentials among groups of men and between men and women as well as how the dominant form of masculinity (often elided as the way to be a man in popular discourse) maintains its position of social, economic, and political privilege. Rather than conceive of masculinity in terms of a fixed list of traits, these traits can be best understood as "tendencies and possibilities . . . that individuals have access to at different points in time" (MacInnes 1998:15). As such, there are many different notions of masculinity, often contradictory and in tension. Furthermore, in practice-based approaches, it is understood that "completely variant notions of masculinity can refer simultaneously or sequentially to the same individual" (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:12).

At the heart of the tension between masculinity-as-object and masculinity-as-practice lies the sex/gender division, in which sex is a biological constant and gender is the meaning given to each sex by culture. This formulation has been challenged, opening up the category "male" to critique (see the discussion later in this chapter). Once "male" is challenged as a natural foundation for gender, it becomes hard to think of the category masculinity as universally applicable because the male-female binary is no longer a given. As Petersen (2003:58) points out, it is difficult to speak of masculinity without implying a binary notion of gender.

Archaeological Approaches to Masculinities

The following critical review of approaches to masculinity and men in archaeology reveals how the previously mentioned definitions of masculinity lie hidden in our interpretations of gender. Little of this work investigates masculinity directly. Therefore, I make explicit the understandings of masculinity implied in archaeological interpretation. I embed discussion of archaeological texts within a framework of research from other disciplines that address more directly questions of masculinity and include developments that are of interest to the archaeological study of masculinities. Also drawing from this work, recent research in archaeology brings the complexity of the category to the forefront, demonstrating the existence of a plurality of masculinities and forms of masculine identity formation. However, the underlying understanding of masculinity remains that of a quantifiable object. Other work has begun to challenge the stability and universality of the category "male," thereby exposing the interpretive limitations of the

category "masculinity." What becomes clear is that it cannot be assumed that what we understand as "masculinity" is inherent in the material. Feminist-inspired theories of embodiment indicate how sexual difference may be explored without resorting to the categories "masculinity" or "male."

Work that focuses explicitly on masculinity includes general theoretical works (Alberti 1997; Caesar 1999a, 1999b; Knapp 1998a, 1998b; Knapp and Meskell 1997; Meskell 1996; Nordbladh and Yates 1990), investigations into the formation of specific masculine identities (Harrison 2002; Joyce 2000; Shanks 1996; Treherne 1995; Yates 1993), and critical research into classical masculinities (contributions to Foxhall and Salmon 1998a, 1998b; Shanks 1996). Historical periods have also produced archaeological research on masculinity (e.g., Hadley 1998a; Harrison 2002; Wilkie 1998). Furthermore, Harrison (2002) has explored experimental modes of presentation in the form of fictionalized vignettes, following the work of feminist archaeologists (e.g., Spector 1993).

"Universal Man": Essentialist Approaches to Masculinity

Essentialist approaches to masculinity have played a dual role in archaeology. First, most interpretations of masculinity in archaeology were essentialist until the advent of gender archaeology. Second, even though soundly critiqued, such approaches demonstrate the political role of interpretations of past masculinities. The search for certain key attributes of masculinity was part of the driving force behind early archaeological explorations. In terms of a framework for interpreting masculinity in the past, essentialism is limited by an inability to account for cultural or historical variation. Masculinity is seen as firmly rooted in an undifferentiated male body.

Essentialist approaches highlight key characteristics that are said to define masculinity. Irrespective of culture, history, or experience, the basis for men's behavior and identities is linked to hypothetically innate psychobiological structures, or cultural universals. Sociopolitical arrangements, such as the division of labor or organization of sexuality and reproduction, are considered epiphenomena of these innate gendered behaviors. These forms of determinism appear in many archaeological interpretations, often subtextually. They have their roots in post-Enlightenment thought and are coeval with the emergence of archaeology as a discipline. Essentialism has recently experienced a renaissance in the form of sociobiological arguments about genetically programmed behavior.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, masculinity was given a psychohistorical dimension. Protestantism and belief in scientific progress and knowledge encouraged a distinction to be made between nature and reason in

which men and modernity were increasingly associated with the latter (Mosse 1996; Petersen 2003). Successful masculinity involved dominating base, animal urges through rational thought (see Connell 1994, 1995; Lloyd 1993; Seidler 1994). It was assumed that men everywhere faced the same challenge. Models of social evolution, proposed by Spencer, Morgan, and Tyler (see Trigger 1989), among others, in which human groups evolved through stages of increasing social complexity toward civilization implied a corollary psychohistorical model of the development of "mind." The psychic unity of mankind implied that all men had the potential for "cultured" (civilized) behavior and thought. Differences among men from different cultural contexts were of the nature of psychohistorical depth rather than due to individual or historicocultural difference. As such, nineteenth-century evolutionary models imply that "primitive" or prehistoric man reflected an earlier stage in the development of "modern man" both culturally and psychologically.

There is an intimate relationship between masculinity and the emergence of archaeology as a discipline. The analytical structures used by archaeologists are embedded in post-Enlightenment thought, which is deeply complicit with nineteenth-century ideals of masculinity (Baker 1997:183–84; Hearn and Morgan 1990:4; Seidler 1989:2–4; Thomas 2004). This is clearly seen in the relationship among classical archaeology, contemporary ideals of masculinity, and theories of masculinity. Classical "man" was the focus of early archaeological work, the classical world being considered a gold mine of attributes of ideal masculinity, such as notions of reason, and questions of aesthetic judgment and idealized masculine beauty (Gutmann 1998; Mosse 1996). More directly, classical myths and philosophy were the inspiration for psychoanalytical theories of masculine sexual identity, including essentialist perspectives (Foxhall 1998b:2–3). Similarly, Harrison (2002) has shown how colonial ideal masculinity was consciously created through material culture. Harrison (2002) examines the manufacture of Kimberly spear points in northern Australia as a case of the mutual constitution of hybrid masculinities, those of the local Aborigine men and colonial collectors. The collector aspired to capture for himself some essence of the Aborigine man's "primitive" masculinity. An important project for future work on masculinity in archaeology, therefore, must be to critique the role played by archaeological knowledge in the contemporary identity projects of men (see Caesar 1999b).

Essentialist ideas about masculinity have reemerged in academia and in popular culture. The racism of early socioevolutionary theories has been replaced by evolutionary perspectives that root behavior in DNA and genes. This form of essentialism is particularly pervasive in popular scientific accounts of sexual difference (e.g., Baker 2000; Buss 2003). Common themes include exploring the

genetic or socioevolutionary reasons for sexual behavior, violence, and hunting (e.g., Lovejoy 1981; Tiger 1969, 2000; Washburn and Lancaster 1968). There is little convincing evidence that genes or evolutionary adaptive behaviors predispose men to particular conduct or capabilities (for critiques of gender in human origins research, see Fedigan 1982; Hager 1997).

Essentialist ideas about masculinity are difficult to defend. Even if there are measurable, biological differences between men and women, trying to tie down such differences to specific conduct or capacities has proven unsuccessful (Connell 1995:46–52; Fausto-Sterling 1992). Similarly, the choice of "essence" is fairly arbitrary, depending on the theoretical leanings of the author in question (Connell 1995:69). In practice, essentialist approaches tend to focus on contemporary dominant ideals of masculinity (e.g., Gilmore 1990; see critique in Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:27). Archaeologically, we could only hope to find evidence of a fixed masculine "essence." Most essentialist work pre-dated the introduction of the sex/gender split into archaeology. As such, the essential attributes of masculinity were thought to emanate from within a clearly defined, universal male body.

Relativizing Masculinity: Social Construction

Social construction provided a way of thinking about masculinity that offered far greater flexibility. Most theories of social construction are based on the idea that sex and gender are two separate entities. Gendered identities and conduct are constructed by culture rather than existing within the body. Thus, variation in social arrangements and men's and women's roles cross-culturally can be explored. A limitation of this approach for exploring masculinity lies in the concept of gender used. Even though variation in "men" can be recognized, a form of essentialism remains in that the category "male" is unexplored.

A social construction theory of gender was adopted by archaeology in the 1980s (Conkey and Spector 1984) that opened the door for studies of masculinity in archaeology. However, such studies failed to materialize during this period. Given this paucity, the following is necessarily a schematic account. The meaning of "masculinity" is generally inferred rather than read directly from the texts. The focus in this section is on initial work within gender archaeology, which I inevitably falsely homogenize.

In the initial formulations of gender archaeology, "masculinity" referred to the actions and values habitually associated with males in a given culture (Conkey and Spector 1984). As such, masculinity can adhere to other people or things but must ultimately refer back to men. At times, "masculine" is used in a quantitative

fashion: one can have more or less of it, as can things that are described as "masculine" (e.g., Osborne 1998). Therefore, "masculinity" can be treated as a clearly defined object that can be measured empirically and so is open to positivist approaches within archaeology (compare Joyce 2004). Material culture could be observed in association with evidence of a "male," leading to a quantifiable list of attributes that defined masculinity in that particular context. Mortuary studies, figurine analyses, and artworks were obvious realms in which such attribution could take place, as is the case with gender archaeology more broadly (Joyce 2004; Marshall 1995).

Gender was also conceived of as dichotomous, implying structural analyses: men's and women's activities could be inferred by the absence of that activity within the repertoire of the other sex. Similarly, symbolic analyses could be made by the association between "masculine" and "feminine" meanings and objects. A focus on gender "roles," combined with a general interest in materialist analysis (Voss 2000:182), and the ability to determine use wear on human skeletal remains lead to a number of studies focused on the division of labor. The relationship between material culture and gender was seen as one of reflection or ascription: particular activities, objects, and images were attributed to one or other gender. Those objects and activities then served to define "masculinity" or "femininity."

The concept of gender "identity" largely adopted in gender archaeology—that it reflects one's own feeling of being a man or a woman (Conkey and Spector 1984)—stems from work within psychoanalysis in the 1950s and 1960s, Robert Stoller (1964) being especially influential. In archaeological terms, material that is attributed to one or other sex—therefore assigning that sex a gender—is treated as the external manifestations of a stable, internal identity. Research on identity within men's studies and anthropology has also relied on Stoller's work (e.g., Gilmore 1990; Herdt 1987). Another influential source has been object-relations theories of identity formation, especially the work of Nancy Chodorow. Chodorow (1978) emphasized family dynamics as the root cause of masculine identity. She argued that boys are pushed to break their primary identification with their mothers, resulting in structures of personality that emphasize boundaries with people (see Connell 1995:20).

Chodorow's theories have been applied in archaeology to an innovative exploration of masculinity as a force for historical change. Caesar (1999b) proposes a general model of masculinity and social change based on the existence of separate male and female spheres of influence. When women attempt to occupy the male sphere, this results in the removal of the male sphere to a place where women do not yet have access, thereby maintaining male dominance and causing historical

change. At the roots of her theory of gender dichotomy and hierarchy is Chodorow's notion of the boy abandoning identification with the mother (i.e., the female sphere) in search of a male object of identification. As such, masculine identity formation drives historical change.

Social construction allows for the analysis of a dynamic relationship between men and women. Gender archaeology has always focused on questions of power through the notion of gender ideology. Following Conkey and Spector (1984), gender ideologies are taken to be the meaning of male, female, sex, and reproduction in specific cultural and social contexts. In practice, ideology in gender archaeology has operated to include issues of power in a broad-based sense in which the genders interact much like classes. The relations that dominate are those between two large blocks. Often questions revolve around male domination and perhaps evidence for women's resistance and alternative ideologies (McCafferty and McCafferty 1998). Men often remain the undifferentiated dominant block or group. "Masculinity" becomes virtually synonymous with male domination (see Shanks 1996; Treherne 1995). In effect, masculinity is conflated with ideology, which is taken to be the material (often symbolic) manifestations of the undifferentiated group "men."

There are limitations to this formulation of gender. Social construction can result in a notion of gender that is static and normative. The taking on of a gendered identity through socialization or psychological development is uncomplicated and quasi-automatic. Masculine or feminine identities adhere to a man or woman through their life cycle. Questions remain concerning how to account for differences among men and for differences through the life cycle of one man. Moreover, the formulation fails to come to grips with the complexities of individual identity formation in which other categories of identity are implicated, such as race, class, age, and so on (see Meskell 2002). Men's studies authors working within this framework found that men never actually achieve "normal" masculinity, which begs the question whether these are norms at all (e.g., Metcalf and Humphries 1985). Rather, they would appear to resemble unattainable ideals. Commenting on this paradox, Connell (1995:70) asks whether the majority of men are therefore unmasculine. Even in the case of pseudo-Freudian (e.g., Stoller 1964) and object-relations theories of identity formation, in which internal conflict is at the root of the process, the assumption that there is a single structure common to the formation of masculine identity in all times and places straitjackets the theory within universalism and ethnocentrism, a criticism that has been leveled at some studies of masculinity within anthropology (e.g., Gilmore 1990; Herdt 1981, 1987; see also Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:32–33).

Other problems revolve around the conceptualization of "men" and "women"

as dichotomous. Neither is implicated in the maintenance of the other, as they are essentially unitary and self-contained. This obscures the mutually constitutive or relational aspects of the creation of identity as well as the overlaps and commonalities between men and women (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:36). Relations of power tend to be categorical: all men have power, and all women lack power. Even when questions of class are introduced into the equation, which they often are when addressing issues such as ideology, power still operates between homogeneous blocks of people.

An important limiting factor in this understanding of masculinity is the status of the body. It has been commented that fear of biologisms prevents the categories "male" and "female" from being scrutinized or considered as social constructions (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:35–36; Moore 1994). In practice, sex and gender are often conflated in archaeology. Frustration has been expressed at the limitations of separately identifying sex or gender, leading some to suggest that an archaeology of gender is in fact an archaeology of sex (e.g., Marshall 1995; Sørensen 1992:35).

Multiple Masculinities: Disaggregating Men

The following work still fits within the general rubric of social construction but attempts to address some of the problems outlined in the previous section. The recognition of differences among men had previously been limited to the axes of cultural or historical difference. Research in men's studies, anthropology, and history introduced the idea that men also varied within cultures—there could be competing masculinities within a single cultural context. However, "masculinity" is still conceptualized as an identifiable, empirically measurable object residing in a "male" body. As such, the nature of the biological category "male" is not interrogated.

The weaknesses in conceiving of "man" as an undifferentiated, monolithic category in dichotomous relationship to an equally monolithic, undifferentiated "woman" quickly led to studies that began to consider variation both in terms of different kinds of men and in terms of how male subjects incorporate multiple influences in the process of identity formation. Knapp (1998a:93) has commented that the main contribution of men's studies literature to archaeology is to highlight the existence of "divergent, multiple masculinities." Historical studies have demonstrated both the contingent nature of masculinity and the plurality of forms of masculinities that exist, often side by side (e.g., Mosse 1996; Roper and Tosh 1991). Hadley, in an edited volume on masculinities in the medieval world, explores varying ideas about what men were in different historical contexts in

order to "disaggregate the generality of the term 'men'" (Hadley 1998b:2) in the literature on the Middle Ages.

Historicizing the category "man" and introducing the idea of multiple masculinities breaks down the idea of men as a single oppositional category. However, it also risks producing a series of self-contained masculinities divided by race, class, sexuality, and culture. In men's studies, the concept of "hegemonic masculinity" was developed to account for relations of power and hierarchy among men as well as those between men and women (see Carrigan et al. 1987:89–100; Connell 1987, 1995; Kauffman 1994; in anthropology, see Almeida 1996). Hegemonic masculinity refers to how "particular groups of men inhabit positions of power and wealth, and how they legitimate and reproduce the social relations that generate dominance" (Carrigan et al. 1987:92). The concept has been fine-tuned to include analytic categories such as "subordinated masculinities" (e.g., homosexual men), men who are not the "frontline troops" of domination but benefit nonetheless ("complicit masculinities"), and men, often from other classes or races, who can as individuals embody the hegemonic form but lack social authority ("marginalized masculinities") (see Connell 1995:76–81).

In archaeology, the concept of "ideology," when given a gendered dimension, has sometimes been used in a broadly similar way. For instance, Robb's (1994) analysis of the development of inequality in prehistoric Italy bears a striking resemblance to Connell's formulation of the structure of hegemonic gender relationships. Robb (1994) argues for the existence of a single "male ideology" in the Eneolithic and Bronze Age in Italy. This ideology was initially used to justify male dominance over women but developed to support a male warrior elite's domination of a commoner class in the Iron Age. The same ideological model was used to justify the domination of both women and subordinate groups of men by an elite group of men. Likewise, Connell's work relies on the theoretical principle that "the relationships within genders are centered on, and can be explained by, the relationships between genders" (Demetriou 2001:343) such that the dominance of women by men provides the model or structure for the internal hierarchical ordering of masculinity and femininity.

Thinking of men's power and its ideological underpinnings in terms of the hegemony of specific groups of men or types of masculinity gets away from categorical notions of power. Connell's (1987, 1995) work on hegemonic masculinities has been developed further by Demetriou (2001; see also Archetti 1998), who, drawing on Gramsci's notion of "hegemonic bloc" and Bhaba's notion of "hybridity," formulates the concept of hegemonic masculinity as a "hybrid bloc" that unites practices from diverse masculinities rather than merely excluding or ghettoizing the subordinate and marginalized elements. The advantage of the

author's approach is that it challenges the idea that masculine power is a closed, coherent and unified totality that includes no contradiction. Hybridity, Demetriou (2001) argues, leads to cunning transformations and the continuation of masculine hegemony.

The idea of a fixed, stable male identity has similarly been challenged by recognizing that the formation of the male subject is complex (Petersen 2003; Rogoff and Van Leer 1993). Object-relations theories of identity formation prioritize a unitary subject, defined by sex. Differences within a single gender category (through race, class, sexual orientation, and so on) are treated as add-ons rather than equally constitutive of the subject (see Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:32–33). Work by black, Chicano, and Asian men (e.g., Baca Zinn 2003; Espiritu 2003; Mac an Ghaill 1994) has led to the recognition that identity is an interpolation of differences. Similar ideas have been developed by archaeologists. Foxhall (1998a:1, 1998b) argues that a plurality of male selves existed in the classical Greek and Roman worlds. She argues that “each male self strives to be central” (Foxhall 1998a:1) by excluding others, such as effeminate men, slaves, and especially women, from the subject position. Excluded men and women have different positions in relation to the male subject. “Non-masculine” men may be derided, subjected to violence, and used as “anti-subjects” (Foxhall 1998a), but they are still men. They share a male body with their hegemonic counterparts. Subordinated men still collude with male power, whereas women's bodies disqualify them from ever becoming true subjects (Foxhall 1998b:4–5). The contributors to Foxhall and Salmon (1998a, 1998b) show clearly the nonunitary status of the category “masculinity” in antiquity.

Foxhall (1998a, 1998b) argues that the material culture and texts that constitute archaeological evidence in the classical world are complicit in the formation of ancient, male subjects. The monolithic facade—the appearance of coherence and wholeness—is an effect of reflexive male subject formation. The involvement of material culture in the active creation of dominant male subjectivity has been examined in other cultural contexts. Joyce (1996, 2000) takes figural and textual representations of male–male sexual practices in Classic Maya society as evidence of identification by a male audience with the powerful male bodies that are represented. Ritualized male bodies presented as powerful, youthful, and elaborately costumed were depicted in scenes representing all-male socialization events designed for exclusively male audiences. Joyce (2000) relates this imagery to a sexualization of masculinity and a generalized desire (by both men and women) for the male body rather than as evidence of stigmatized practices.

Bodies and the category “male” in fact occupy a slightly ambiguous status in the work on multiplicities and hegemony. On the one hand, this work shows that

different bodies can be taken as evidence of different types of masculinity. For example, Foxhall (1998a:2) shows how effeminate men and slaves' bodies in the ancient world acted as antibodies. They displayed characteristics that were positively male but were negatively construed when used to typify an “Other,” a non-hegemonic male. On the other hand, even though situated and marked by multiple facets of identity, the body and the sexed binary as fixed categories are still present. In men's studies, some of this confusion is revealed by Hearn's (2004) suggestion that we should be talking about “the hegemony of men” rather than hegemonic masculinities. Cornwall and Lindisfarne (1994:20) have pointed out that in their formulation of “hegemonic masculinity,” Carrigan et al. (1987) elide the terms “male” and “masculinity,” making that relationship seem natural and inevitable, in much the same way that sex and gender are often (unintentionally) conflated in gender archaeology. Other authors have recognized that masculinity formulated in this way becomes static, resulting in discrete blocks—groups of men and women—vying for dominance (Demetriou 2001:359; Hearn 2004:58).

Talking in terms of “masculinities” is an important step, but it does not automatically do away with masculinity as stable and unified—one simply has more stable, unitary subjects (see Dudink 1998:421). Furthermore, Petersen (2003:57) remarks that hegemonic masculinity has lost its dimension of power, simply standing for plurality or diversity. Connell has admitted that, in practice, masculinities tend to be posited as fixed “character types” battling it out for dominance (Demetriou 2001:347, n. 65). Definitions of masculinity become “additive” in the form of a fixed list of variables that are separate and relatively stable (Petersen 2003). In summary, sociological studies of men that focus on multiplicity and hegemony have added a typology of different men but have not challenged the status of the category itself (Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:2).

Deconstructing the Category “Male”

Essentialist and social construction approaches imply a stable object of inquiry, that there is such a thing as “masculinity” that can be measured or discovered in various cultural contexts. Social construction suggests that the specific form of masculinity may change through time but that the category itself is stable and in some sense predefined. The idea of a unitary category “man” has been challenged, but the essentialist categories “male” and “female” continue to provide the grounds for much archaeological research into gender. Recent trends in feminist-inspired archaeology and such areas as queer studies and explorations of sexuality have called into question these essentialist categories. Interestingly, the little

research that deals explicitly with issues of masculinity in archaeology almost exclusively falls here, both theoretical surveys of the masculinity literature (Alberti 1997; Knapp and Meskell 1997) and specific case studies on masculinity in archaeology (Alberti 1997; Joyce 2000; Knapp and Meskell 1997; Treherne 1995; Yates 1993). I argue that the logical outcome of the critique of fixed categories is that "masculinity" becomes a highly problematic foundation for research. Consequently, I indicate research that enables us to work beyond the category yet still focus on sexed differences as an aspect of past identities.

The sex/gender division has been widely criticized for the way it essentializes sex, taken as a biological constant (Butler 1990, 1993:1–12; Grosz 1994, 1995; Moore 1994; Yanagisako and Collier 1987; in archaeology, see Alberti 2002; Joyce 2004; Meskell 1996; Nordbladh and Yates 1990; Yates 1993). Supporting social construction has led to ignoring biology as a field of inquiry. By equating sex with biology, sex and the body are seen as historically and culturally invariant. The category sex is merely a vehicle for gender. The result is that masculinity is seen as derivative of this supposed natural binary division of bodies. Furthermore, identity is thought of in terms of an internal "core" rather than as the result of active engagements with the material world (Alberti 2001; Joyce 2004).

It is widely argued that sex as much as gender is culturally constructed (see Meskell 1996). Bodies are understood and arranged according to historically and culturally specific meanings (e.g., Busby 2000; Lacqueur 1990; Strathern 1988). Anthropology has provided examples of this process, such as models of how gender can be a relational aspect of identity, in which neither masculine nor feminine essences "stick" to a body but rather pass between contextually sexed bodies (Strathern 1988). There is also evidence that, in some cultures, possession of a male body at birth is no guarantor that a child will physically develop into a male adult (e.g., Herdt 1987; Roscoe 1993). Historical studies into men's bodies also reveal that notions of male embodiment are historically contingent (Bourke 1996; Lacqueur 1990; Mosse 1996; Petersen 2003:64). As such, there are various culturally distinct ways of conceptualizing male bodies that may call into question "male" and therefore "masculinity."

The influence of culture on bodies—and the power of discourse to shape them—has been explored in archaeology through poststructuralist and practice-based theories, drawing from authors such as Foucault, Lacan, and Bourdieu, and feminist theories of embodiment, based principally on the work of Butler and Grosz (for overviews, see Joyce 2004; Meskell and Joyce 2003; Perry and Joyce 2001). There are two related ideas that run through this work that have implications for studying masculinity through archaeology: first, that bodies can escape simple sexed dichotomies, and, second, that sexual difference (and, by extension,

genitality) is not always central to identity. The approach shares with other "post-processual" work in archaeology an understanding that material culture is not just a passive medium but is actively involved in shaping human action and identity (e.g., Barrett 1988; Joyce 1998, 2001; Thomas 2000).

The limits of a binary understanding of sexual difference has been explored by Yates (1993), who has produced a densely theoretical account of the construction of male subjectivity in prehistoric Sweden. He used Lacanian and neo-Lacanian theories of the role of the body in the process of subject formation to reinterpret rock art from Göteborgs och Bohuslän. The images include representations of figure with swords, horns, and phalluses and other figures that lack these features. There are also representations of isolated calves, boats, and animals. Traditional interpretations had taken the rock art as evidence of an aggressive warrior society. Figures without weapons or phalluses were interpreted as women. According to Yates (1993:67), the formation of an aggressive masculinity resulted from certain body parts acting as "points of focus and intensity." He argues that there is no natural arrangement of the body or greater significance being accorded one part or another. Rather, society imposes an image of the body on the self, which then organizes desire and attachments. Masculinity is channeled through signs rather than being a basic property of the body. According to Yates, "Masculine identity must be guaranteed by signs applied to the surface of the body, and these signs are detachable—they do not inhere in the body, but can be separated from it" (66). He argues that identities are presented as aggressive masculinity versus ambiguity, where the second category could encompass either males or females. As such, he recognizes that a particular identity is not dependent solely on the absence or presence of genitals but rather requires other "detachable" signs to guarantee that identity. Yates's approach shares in common with Foxhall's (1998a, 1998b) work on male subjectivity a concern with how a unitary male subject is formed through the active exclusion of other possible subjects, whether male or female. This may be because both authors rely on theories of identity formation derived from Lacan, which tend toward a universal structure. The "achievement" of male subjective formation through separation and exclusion is also reminiscent of Gilmore's (1990) global model of the "achievement of masculinity" (see also Foxhall 1998b:7).

Yates has been critiqued for overrelativizing the body (Joyce 2004; Treherne 1995), a common criticism of poststructuralist theory. Connell (1995) argues that a wholly cultural account of gender is no more tenable than one based on biological determinism, as the body provides resistance to its inscription. He proposes the notion of "body reflexive practices" to bridge the gap between biological essentialism and extreme social constructionism. Connell (1995:61) argues

that "bodies [are] both objects and agents of practice" and that the practices themselves form the social structures within which bodies are "appropriated and defined." In archaeology, Treherne (1995) develops a similar practice-based theory of masculine subject formation for Bronze Age European warrior societies. The warrior societies he describes show evidence that notions of beauty and the preparation and care for the body became central to male ideology during a general shift in Bronze Age Europe from a focus on communality to one in which masculine self-awareness is paramount. He argues that the body is an active part of the process of subjectification rather than being dominated by culture and language (Treherne 1995).

Treherne's work points to ways in which male identity is constituted through the interaction of bodies and material culture. However, what is missing from Connell's and Treherne's accounts is a sense of how the body can escape dualisms. Moreover, Treherne's interpretation can be criticized for being overly general and for arguing that the experience of violence is a universal constitutive element in male subject formation (Joyce 2004). The same criticism could be directed at Shanks's (1996) interpretation of proto-Korinithian imagery of hoplites.

The idea of "bodily reflexive practices" and the interplay between material culture and self-conscious subject creation are useful ways of looking at how "embodiment" is achieved. Combined with Yates's (1993:48–49) argument that the binary male–female is only one way of conceptualizing the structure of sexual identity, bodies are freed to signify in new ways. Approaches to embodiment in archaeology that draw on feminist scholarship are pushing in this direction. Central to this work is the recognition that material culture does not reflect certain categories of identity, or fixed, stable gendered divisions among people. Rather, material culture is intimately involved in the production of these categories. For example, Joyce (2004) has shown how embodiment is amenable to archaeological investigation through analyses of the connections among representations of bodies, bodily adornments that may imply physical alterations of bodies, and the development of subject positions within pre-Columbian Mesoamerican societies (Joyce 2001, 2004; Meskeil and Joyce 2003). Joyce (e.g., 1998, 2001) investigates the actual process through which bodies become categorized as subjects—how they are materialized into categories—and the active role that material culture played in that process. Certain material items demonstrate a closeness and intimacy with the body that provide clues to their roles in the creation of ancient subjects. Images and representations of the body provided precedents that were called on in the reiteration of certain bodily practices. The result is a reconstruction of past subject positions that takes the materiality of their embodied existence seriously and fully integrates material culture into that process.

Questioning the universality of a binary structure to sex opens up the possibility that body parts other than genitalia may have had especial significance. For example, Alberti (2001, 2002) has noted that in Late Bronze Age Cretan art, a physical binary structure to gender is not a consistent aspect of the imagery. All bodies exhibit a similar hourglass body shape. The only clearly marked sexed characteristics are breasts, which appear in conjunction with certain clothing in the images, leading Alberti (2001) to suggest that sexed differences are only a transient aspect of categorical differences as presented in the art. In fact, thumbs appear to be of greater significance in the artwork than penises, which are entirely absent (Alberti 1997). Drawing on similar theoretical sources, Knapp and Meskeil (1997) argue that androgynous figures and the lack of figures clearly represented as male among Chalcolithic (Cypriot Bronze Age) figurines is evidence that individuality was of greater contextual significance than group differences based on sex. In the case of Mesoamerican sculpture, Joyce (1998:160) recognizes hands rather than genitalia as the "bodily locus" of gender.

Deconstruction of the categories "male" and "female" has led to archaeological interpretations that stress the contingent and context-dependent formation of sexed categories and the active involvement of material culture in that process. However, bodies do not disappear when the categories are questioned. Rather, the focus moves from material culture as reflective of fixed categories of identity to one where material culture is constitutive of categories of identity. Furthermore, the terms of the debate are broadened to include the relationship between sexual difference and other forms of difference without assuming *a priori* that one is more central. Masculinity becomes a far less stable concept as a result. Suggesting that "male" and "masculinity" may not be relevant dimensions of analysis merely removes these objects, not the body or embodied experience of genitally differentiated bodies. Nonetheless, this work does suggest that there are logical limits to the use of "masculinity" as an analytical category.

Negotiating Masculinity

Arguing for the exclusion of "masculinity" as an *a priori* dimension of analysis is not merely an exercise in abstract thought. If the category is used—even when the objective is to "mark" men by giving them a gender—there is the possibility that it takes on the appearance of a universal structure. More nuanced understandings of "masculinities" do not guarantee that ideal forms will not reemerge. However, this need not mean that "masculinity" disappear entirely from interpretation. I argue there are two ways to proceed. Either the category is accepted and used as a kind of "heuristic fiction," or it is dispensed with entirely. The material

evidence should drive the decision of which path to take. Adopting a reflexive approach by admitting the tension between the limitations of your material and what you desire from it may prevent the category from becoming reified.

Categorical Dilemmas

Cornwall and Lindisfarne (1994:2) argue that men's studies authors have consistently failed to dismantle categories that they take for granted. This is partly understandable. The antiessentialist critique creates quite a dilemma for studies of masculinity, as "male" and "masculinity" can no longer be guaranteed to be universally present. An obvious reaction is the fear of erasing the categories altogether, one that I suspect is holding back men's studies from engaging fully with the implications of the poststructural critique of bodies (see Alberti 1997; Petersen 2003). This parallels Voss's (2000:186) comments on the reluctance of gender archaeology to fully critique sex, which would result in it having to relinquish its proper object, gender.

A further difficulty emerges when "masculinity" becomes the focus of inquiry, even in contexts where its presence can be assumed. At the beginning of this chapter, I stated that the concept "masculinity" must come under critical scrutiny to critique the idea of a monolithic man as well as to mark men as gendered. Ironically, this very strategy may have an undesirable side effect: by focusing attention explicitly on men, "masculinity" can become stabilized rather than destabilized. This process has been commented on in the case of historical works on masculinity, where the effort to "mark" the category has, paradoxically, led to it being reinforced (e.g., Dudink 1998, critiquing Mosse 1996). By showing masculinity as a specific historical category, it becomes stable and perhaps, once again, beyond history: "Apparently, wanting to write a history of masculinity by focusing on masculinity easily produces a perverse effect in that masculinity then quickly becomes a category of either incredible stability or a category that is somehow beyond history" (Dudink 1998:430).

The deployment of the term "masculinity" in archaeological work may be having the same effect. It is notable that the work produced to date has concentrated on violent men (e.g., Shanks 1996; Treherne 1995; Yates 1993; contributions to Foxhall and Salmon 1998a, 1998b; and work in sociobiology). A further tendency has been to conflate representations of idealized masculinity with masculinity in general. Masculinity, as it has been studied in archaeology, becomes exclusively associated with the ideal or normative form, hence losing its ability to differentiate among "masculinities."

Increased research on the connections between violence and masculinity, in

both sociology and anthropology, is a crucial resource for archaeologists if we want to either disassemble the idea that masculinity and violence are synonymous or better understand that process. This focus on violent masculinity in archaeology is partly explained by the preponderance of representations of violent men as well as material culture to do with warfare. The nature of the material remains encourages a focus on images, burials, and "gendered" artifacts that suggest a connection between men and such activities, in which case we may be repeating a distortion left us by a struggle for hegemony among various forms of masculinity in the past, the hegemonic male subject leaving us evidence of his success (see Fox 1998; Foxhall 1998a). It is a mistake, therefore, to equate such evidence with a generalized masculine identity. A focus on men and violence has also privileged certain types of evidence and representations over others, leading to a lack of research on men who were not warriors, priest-kings, and the like.

If hegemonic masculinity maintains its position of privilege precisely by forcing out alternatives and declaring one type of masculinity as the normative and positively valued (in this case, violent men), then archaeology would appear to be unwittingly supporting this process by excluding alternative masculinities from research. Ironically, these alternative masculinities tend to be studied within other areas of archaeological research, including work on sexualities and queer studies.

Strategic Essentialism

Is it inevitable that when masculinity does come under scrutiny in archaeology, it restabilizes the category, lending it an air of being beyond history? Both abandoning the category altogether and continuing to use it as a heuristic device present difficulties. The former approach begs the question, With what do we replace "masculinity"? The latter runs the risk of falling foul of the tendency to associate positive values and power with the term, again subsuming marginalized or subordinated masculinities, not to mention women, however contingent the categories. Which approach is adopted should depend on the nature of the material under investigation. As such, I am in agreement with those archaeologists who contend that grand theories and overgeneralized frameworks tend to obscure rather than bring out the difference inherent in much archaeological material. A single, authoritative account of past social life is beyond our grasp (see Thomas 1996, 2000; compare Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:45–46). Theoretical and methodological models should be responsive enough to grow out of a hermeneutic relationship with the material evidence.

Even if masculinity is a relatively recent invention (MacInnes 1998), there is clearly cause for its use as a descriptive or analytical category in historical periods.

Dudink (1998:430) suggests that what is required is an "outflanking move" by not starting from the presumption of the historical presence of a thing identifiable as "masculinity." Dudink (1998:430) writes, "One should study around the object, questioning evidence that may or may not imply its presence; in other words, a history of masculinity that does not focus on masculinity." Such a back-door route to studying masculinity may avoid restabilizing the category. Following this strategy suggests that we look for types of masculinities that may not be as exciting as warriors or kings. In other words, the pacifists, "stay-at-home dads," "wimps" and "layabouts" must come into interpretive focus. Contributors to Foxhall and Salmon (1998a, 1998b) have begun to address this issue for the classical world, as has Hadley (1998a) for medieval masculinities. Anthropology can provide concrete examples of practices that are not usually considered part of normative masculinity, such as alternative fathering roles, the *couvade* (e.g., Rival 1998), and homosexuality (e.g., Gutmann 1997:394–95; Herdt 1987, 1993). Simply recognizing the existence of practices that appear antithetical to normative masculinity (see Dowson 2000; Kimmell 1994) will broaden the terms of the debate (e.g., Joyce 2000; Voss and Schmidt 2000). In men's studies, Hearn (2004:50) argues that the category should be retained, but to avoid reifying it or refocusing our gazes exclusively on ideal forms, we should only refer to the category only in relation to women, children, other forms of masculinity, race, and so on. Locating masculinity in this way demands that attention be paid to explicitly situated subjects (see also Joyce 2004).

There will be many contexts in which the appropriateness of the category will not be clear. For example, to talk of "masculinity" in remote prehistory may make little sense. However, there is an argument to be made for its use as a heuristic device, or a "controlled fiction" (Strathern 1988). A common criticism of the antiessentialist critique is that political action becomes paralyzed if identity categories are destabilized. A response has been to use such categories strategically, employing them to achieve specific goals (Butler 1990; Petersen 2003:57). If used explicitly and critically, masculinity may serve a similar purpose in archaeological interpretation. A word of caution, though. Terms such as "queer" have been successfully strategically redeployed (see Butler 1993). But the category "masculinity" starts from a position of privilege, which puts it in a completely different relationship to power and knowledge. It is unclear whether it is possible to retain its use analytically without reinstating that same relationship of power in our interpretations.

A Methodological Corrective

The second possibility is to dispense with the category altogether. It has been remarked that archaeological evidence is inherently ambiguous (e.g., Knapp

1998a). A full critique of "masculinity" would take that ambiguity as a "tangible aspect" of the meaning of the archaeological evidence rather than a problem of methodology (see Alberti 1997; Yates 1993:47). One would not, therefore, start from the assumption that what we recognize as masculinity exists or that the analytical category "masculinity" is necessarily appropriate. Such assumptions could result in our trying to squeeze material into inappropriate interpretive frameworks. As argued previously, the sex/gender division implies a binary organization of bodies into male and female. Yates (1993) and Alberti (2001, 2002) have demonstrated how such an assumption can straitjacket the material, forcing a dualism and associated interpretations that are not inherent in the material.

To say that ridding ourselves of the category "masculinity" leaves us with few options to talk about "men" in the past would be disingenuous. Any mention of past identities is necessarily fragmentary, incomplete, and underdetermined by the evidence. Using terms that do not refer to a specific "masculine" identity but do refer to a sexed body—whether that sex is central to the identities represented or explored—is less likely to produce distortion than to redeploy a category that is heavy with meaning in the present but may not have had meaning in the past. Instead, identities and relations among persons can be built from the ground up using models that respond and are sensitive to the material in question (e.g., Joyce 2001; Meskell and Joyce 2003). Moreover, we should not expect all classes of material to be involved in every aspect of past life. For example, where monumental two-dimensional art may be involved in the enactment of power cut through with issues of hierarchy and dominance, it may not speak primarily to aspects of sexual identities. Similarly, burial goods and use-wear analyses of bones might indicate another level of interaction between things and people. Both are incomplete and will involve different usage of theory and different conceptualizations of the interrelationship between material and identity. For example, in a critique and reinterpretation of artwork from Late Bronze Age Knossos, Alberti (2001, 2002) argued that sexual difference was not central to the imagery. Consequently, the category "masculinity" seemed to be an imposition in talking about the art. This need not imply, however, that another body of material from the same period on Crete may not warrant mobilization of the category (bearing in mind the dangers of reification). Phallic imagery found at contemporary Cretan "peak sanctuaries" could indicate just such a possibility (see Peatfield 1992). Different material has different relationships to identity and sociopolitical structure, which begs for theoretical and conceptual flexibility and pluralism in approach.

Reflexivity and "Critical Need"

Studying masculinities in archaeology demands reflexivity on the part of the researcher to avoid interpretations that are reactionary rather than critical. Reflex-

ivity refers to the process of acknowledging what it is that we want from the material and being aware of the standpoint from which knowledge is produced. Feminists and anthropologists have written on the importance of the politics of location (see Cornwall and Lindisfarne 1994:45), as have men's studies authors (e.g., Hearn 2004:62). Gender archaeology and postprocessual approaches have shown how knowledge claims are embedded in sociopolitical experience (Conkey and Gero 1991; Engelstad 1991; Shanks and Tilley 1987; Thomas 2000:3; Voss and Schmidt 2000). The gap between what our evidence says clearly and what we say of it is obviously considerable. Being open to the ambiguity of the material and to the possibility that masculinity is inappropriate for modeling past gendered lives addresses part of the issue. To further avoid exclusions inherent in the use of dominant categories, men's studies authors are following a feminist lead by calling for greater attention to be paid to the politics of knowledge and the need for reflexivity on the part of (especially male) researchers (Hearn 2004:62; Petersen 2003:55; see also Haraway 1988). Men, in general, have greater access to resources and are able to make their voices heard more easily than women, although this tendency is heavily mitigated by other aspect of social identity. This requires a degree of self-reflexivity when studying issues such as masculinity, itself so heavily involved in systems of inequality (see Hearn 2004). Men are notoriously bad at being reflexive, especially when they think they are good at being reflexive. Middleton (1993:11) has noted that "reflexivity works imperfectly for men because they don't see what they're seeing when they see themselves."

Fox (1998) has addressed the issue of reflexivity in archaeological investigations of masculinity. Even though he focuses his critique on interpretations of Athenian men, his commentary on what is at stake by attempting to study men while simultaneously not allowing the categories of "man" or "men" to eclipse historical difference has general implications. The example Fox (1998:7) examines is the thesis of the ancient Athenian as the "constrained man," proposed by Winkler (1990). Fox (1998:12) states that Winkler's enthusiasm for his object—Athenian man—led him to prematurely create a historical subject based on readings of texts without first asking what kind of subject the texts themselves were creating. In order to explain why this happened, Fox introduces the concept of "critical need"—how the desires that motivate research into past social worlds influence "the boundaries of what we study and the kinds of analysis we produce" (12). He compares the position of ancient historians who focus on gender to feminist critics who deconstruct the category "woman," the basis of the political goal that they wish to further. A parallel can also be drawn archaeologists who deconstruct the categories "man" and "woman." Echoing my argument, Fox states that "it is the insistence upon historical difference which will prevent the category

of man from emerging" (12–13). Either we admit the contingency of our categories but readmit them because we consider them so important, hence dispensing with historicity, or we adhere to the goal of "reconstructing social realities" but with material that is so incomplete that clear "answers" are hard to come by (12–13). This is where "critical need" comes into play: our objectives in studying men are inseparable from the analysis. Drawing on Fox (1998:13), it may be that the category "masculinity" is present in our material only because of our desire to see it there. He argues that it is "a fantasy of narrative completion that motivates the attempts to produce a cohesive picture of the ancient self, when it is the cracks themselves which are a clear mark of a distinct historical character" (19).

Conclusions

Self-reflection on issues such as "critical need" may reduce what we say about the past, but it will also mitigate potentially destructive effects when addressing the study of masculinity. Moreover, ambiguity and uncertainty in the material may be the "cracks," or the "outflanking move," required to write a history of "men" through archaeology. Undeniably, research has successfully demonstrated the complexity wrapped up in the categories "man," "masculinity," and "male" for historical periods and in the classical world. Even so, Fox (1998) and Dudink (1998) alert us to the potential for such studies to lend greater solidity to a singular historical male subject, a process I suggest may be occurring in other areas of archaeology. Contexts that rely exclusively on nontextual evidence are even more vulnerable to imposing a category onto the material. As such, an important axiom to adopt, I suggest, is the willingness to admit that "masculinity" may not be salient in a given context. Even if we wish to afford it strategic value, I argue that there can be no archaeology of masculinity that is not simultaneously an archaeology of other historically situated and constructed subjects. The decision on whether to use the term will depend on each researcher's "critical need" and whether the local material and context warrant it.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Sarah Nelson for providing an opportunity to develop my thinking around the issue of how to study men and masculinities through archaeology and for her patience and support. I am grateful to Rosemary Joyce for sending me unpublished work and for inspiration. My colleagues at Framingham State College provided valuable input in departmental seminars where some of these ideas were presented. Ira Silver and Lisa Eck gave continuous support and insightful commentary, for which I am hugely grateful. Many thanks to Ing-Marie Back

Danielson and Camilla Caesar, who searched for and sent materials. Thank you to Thomas Dowson and Cassie Richardson. Without Karen Alberti, this chapter would not have been completed.

References

- Alberti, Benjamin
 1997 Archaeology and Masculinity in Bronze Age Knossos. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southampton.
 2001 Faience Goddesses and Ivory Bull-Leapers: The Aesthetics of Sexual Difference at Late Bronze Age Knossos. *World Archaeology* 33(2):189–205.
 2002 Gender and the Figurative Art of Late Bronze Age Knossos. In *Labyrinth Revisited: Rethinking Minoan Archaeology*. Yannis Hamilakis, ed. Pp. 98–117. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Almeida, Miguel Vale de
 1996 *The Hegemonic Male: Masculinity in a Portuguese Town*. Providence, RI: Berghahn Books.
- Archetti, Eduardo
 1998 *Masculinities: An Anthropology of Football, Polo and Tango*. Oxford: Berg.
- Baca Zinn, Maxine
 2003 Chicano Men and Masculinity. In *Men's Lives*. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, eds. Pp. 25–34. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Baker, Mary
 1997 Invisibility as a Symptom of Gender Categories in Archaeology. In *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender and Childhood into European Prehistory*. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott, eds. Pp. 183–91. London: Leicester University Press.
- Baker, Robin
 2000 *Sperm Wars*. London: Pan Books.
- Barrett, John
 1988 Fields of Discourse: Reconstituting a Social Archaeology. *Critique of Anthropology* 7:5–16.
- Bly, Robert
 1990 *Iron John: A Book about Men*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Bourke, Joanna
 1996 *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Braidotti, Rosi
 1994 Radical Philosophies of Sexual Difference. In *The Polity Reader in Gender Studies*. Pp. 62–70. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brod, Harry
 1987 The Case for Men's Studies. In *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Harry Brod, ed. Pp. 39–62. Winchester: Allen and Unwin.
- Busby, Cecilia
 2000 *The Performance of Gender: An Anthropology of Everyday Life in a South Indian Fishing Village*. London: Athlone Press.
- Buss, David
 2003 *The Evolution of Desire: Strategies of Human Mating*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.
- Butler, Judith
 1990 *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
 1993 *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. London: Routledge.
- Caesar, Camilla
 1999a The Construction of Masculinity—The Driving Force of History: A New Way of Understanding Change in the Past. *Lund Archaeological Review* 5:117–36.
 1999b Urmannen—Den Osynliga Normen: Maskulinitetsforskning Inom Arkeologin [The Ancient Man—The Invisible Norm]. In *Han Hon Den Det: Att Integrera Genus Och Kön i Arkeologi*. Camilla Caesar, Ingrid Gustin, Elisabeth Iregren, Bodil Petersson, Elisabeth Rudebeck, Eriak Räf, and Louise Ströbeck, eds. Pp. 115–25. Institute of Archaeology Report Series 65. Lund: University of Lund.
- Canaan, Joyce, and Christine Griffin
 1990 The New Men's Studies: Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution? In *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. Jeff Hearn and David Morgan, eds. Pp. 206–14. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell, and John Lee
 1987 Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity. In *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Harry Brod, ed. Pp. 63–100. Winchester: Allen and Unwin.
- Chodorow, Nancy
 1978 *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clatterbaugh, Kenneth
 1998 What Is Problematic about Masculinities? *Men and Masculinities* 1(1):24–45.
 2000 Literature of the U.S. Men's Movements. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25(3):883–94.
- Conkey, Margaret, and Joan Gero
 1991 Tensions, Pluralities and Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory. In *Engendering Archaeology*. Joan Gero and Margaret Conkey, eds. Pp. 3–30. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Conkey, Margaret, and Janet Spector
 1984 Archaeology and the Study of Gender. In *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*. Vol. 7. Michael Schiffer, ed. Pp. 1–38. New York: Academic Press.
- Connell, Robert
 1987 *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- 1994 Psychoanalysis on Masculinity. In *Theorizing Masculinities*. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, eds. Pp. 11–38. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 1995 *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 2000 *The Men and the Boys*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cornwall, Andrea, and Nancy Lindisfarne
- 1994 Dislocating Masculinity: Gender, Power, and Anthropology. In *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies*. Andrea Cornwall and Nancy Lindisfarne, eds. Pp. 11–47. London: Routledge.
- Demetriou, Demetris Z.
- 2001 Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique. *Theory and Society* 30:337–61.
- Dowson, Thomas
- 2000 Why Queer Archaeology? An Introduction. *World Archaeology* 32(2):161–65.
- Dudink, Stefan
- 1998 The Trouble with Men: Problems in the History of "Masculinity." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1(3):419–31.
- Engelstad, Erika
- 1991 Feminist Theory and Post-Processual Archaeology. In *The Archaeology of Gender*. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. Dale Walde and Noreen D. Willows, eds. Pp. 116–20. Calgary: Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary.
- Espiritu, Yen Le
- 2003 All Men Are Not Created Equal: Asian Men in U.S. History. In *Men's Lives*. Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner, eds. Pp. 35–44. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne
- 1992 *Myths of Gender: Biological Theories about Women and Men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fedigan, Linda
- 1982 *Primate Paradigms: Sex Roles and Social Bonds*. Montreal: Eden Press.
- Fox, Matthew
- 1998 The Constrained Man. In *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. Pp. 6–22. London: Routledge.
- Foxhall, Lin
- 1998a Introduction. In *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. Pp. 1–5. London: Routledge.
- 1998b Introduction. In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. Pp. 1–9. London: Routledge.
- Foxhall, Lin, and John Salmon, eds.
- 1998a *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. London: Routledge.
- 1998b *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Gilmore, David
- 1990 *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Grosz, Elizabeth
- 1994 *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- 1995 *Space, Time and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. London: Routledge.
- Gutmann, Matthew
- 1996 *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 1997 Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:385–409.
- 1998 Do We Need "Masculinist" (Manly?) Defenses of Feminist Archaeology? *Archaeological Dialogues* 5(2):112–15.
- Hadley, Dawn, ed.
- 1998a *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*. London: Longman.
- Hadley, Dawn
- 1998b Medieval Masculinities. In *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*. Dawn Hadley, ed. Pp. 1–18. London: Longman.
- Hager, Lori D., ed.
- 1997 *Women in Human Evolution*. London: Routledge.
- Hanmer, Jalna
- 1990 Men, Power and the Exploitation of Women. *Women's Studies International Forum* 13(5):443–56.
- Haraway, Donna
- 1988 Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse on the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14(3):575–99.
- Harrison, Rodney
- 2002 Archaeology and the Colonial Encounter: Kimberley Spearpoints, Cultural Identity and Masculinity in the North of Australia. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 2(3):352–77.
- Hearn, Jeff
- 2004 From Hegemonic Masculinity to the Hegemony of Men. *Feminist Theory* 5(1):49–72.
- Hearn, Jeff, and David Morgan
- 1990 Men Masculinities and Social Theory. In *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. Jeff Hearn and David Morgan, eds. Pp. 1–17. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Herdt, Gilbert
- 1981 *Guardians of the Flute: Idioms of Masculinity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- 1987 *The Sambia: Ritual and Gender in New Guinea*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Herd, Gilbert, ed.
1993 *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone Books.
- Joyce, Rosemary
1996 The Construction of Gender in Classic Maya Monuments. In *Gender in Archaeology: Essays in Research and Practice*. Rita Wright, ed. Pp. 167–95. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 1998 Performing Gender in Pre-Hispanic Central America: Ornamentation, Representation and the Construction of the Body. *RES: Anthropological Aesthetics* 33:147–65.
- 2000 A Precolumbian Gaze: Male Sexuality among the Ancient Maya. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Barbara L. Voss and Robert A. Schmidt, eds. Pp. 263–83. London: Routledge.
- 2001 *Gender and Power in Prehispanic Mesoamerica*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 2004 Embodied Subjectivity: Gender, Femininity, Masculinity, Sexuality. In *Blackwell Companion to Social Archaeology*. Lynn Meskell and Robert Preucel, eds. Pp. 82–95. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kauffman, Michael
1994 Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power. In *Theorizing Masculinities*. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, eds. Pp. 142–63. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kimmell, Michael S.
1994 Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity. In *Theorizing Masculinities*. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, eds. Pp. 119–41. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knapp, A. Bernard
1998a Boys Will Be Boys: Masculinist Approaches to a Gendered Archaeology. In *Reader in Gender Archaeology*. Kelley Hays-Gilpin and David S. Whitley, eds. Pp. 365–73. London: Routledge.
- 1998b Who's Come a Long Way Baby? Masculinist Approaches to a Gendered Archaeology. *Archaeological Dialogues* 5(2):91–106.
- Knapp, A. Bernard, and Lynn Meskell
1997 Bodies of Evidence on Prehistoric Cyprus. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 7(2):183–204.
- Laqueur, Thomas
1990 *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lloyd, Genevieve
1993 *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota Press.

- Lovejoy, C. Owen
1981 The Origins of Man. *Science* 211:341–50.
- Mac an Ghaill, Mairtin
1994 The Making of Black English Masculinities. In *Theorizing Masculinities*. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman, eds. Pp. 183–99. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MacInnes, John
1998 *End of Masculinity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Marshall, Yvonne
1995 Why Do We Need Feminist Theory? Paper presented at the Institute of Field Archaeologists Annual Conference, Bradford, April 11–13.
- McCafferty, Sharisse D., and Geoffrey G. McCafferty
1998 Spinning and Weaving as Female Gender Identity in Post-Classic Mexico. In *Reader in Gender Archaeology*. Kelley Hays-Gilpin and David S. Whitley, eds. Pp. 213–30. London: Routledge.
- Meskell, Lynn
1996 The Somatization of Archaeology: Institutions, Discourses, Corporeality. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 29(1):1–16.
- 2002 The Intersections of Identity and Politics in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:279–301.
- Meskell, Lynn, and Rosemary A. Joyce
2003 *Embodied Lives: Figuring Ancient Maya and Egyptian Experience*. London: Routledge.
- Metcalfe, Andy, and Martin Humphries, eds.
1985 *The Sexuality of Men*. London: Pluto Press.
- Middleton, Peter
1993 *The Inward Gaze: Masculinity and Subjectivity in Modern Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Moore, Henrietta L.
1994 *A Passion for Difference: Essays in Anthropology and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mosse, George L.
1996 *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, Sarah
1997 *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Nordbladh, Jarl, and Timothy Yates
1990 This Perfect Body, This Virgin Text: Between Sex and Gender in Archaeology. In *Archaeology after Structuralism*. Ian Bapty and Timothy Yates, eds. Pp. 222–37. London: Routledge.
- Osborne, Robin
1998 Sculpted Men of Athens: Masculinity and Power in the Field of Vision. In *Thinking Men: Masculinity and Its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition*. Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, eds. Pp. 23–42. London: Routledge.

- Peatfield, Alan
1992 Rural Ritual in Bronze Age Crete: The Peak Sanctuary at Atsipadhes. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 2(1):59–87.
- Perry, Elizabeth M., and Rosemary A. Joyce
2001 Providing a Past for *Bodies That Matter*: Judith Butler's Impact on the Archaeology of Gender. Theme Issue, "Butler Matters: Judith Butler's Impact on Feminist and Queer Studies since *Gender Trouble*," *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 6(1–2):63–76.
- Petersen, Alan
2003 Research on Men and Masculinities: Some Implications of Recent Theory for Future Work. *Men and Masculinities* 6(1):54–69.
- Rival, Laura
1998 Androgynous Parents and Guest Children: The Huaorani Couvade. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4(3):619–42.
- Robb, John
1994 Gender Contradictions, Moral Coalitions, and Inequality in Prehistoric Italy. *Journal of European Archaeology* 2(1):20–49.
- Rogoff, Irit, and David Van Leer
1993 Afterthoughts . . . A Dossier on Masculinities. *Theory and Society* 22(5):731–62.
- Roper, Michael, and John Tosh, eds.
1991 *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*. London: Routledge.
- Roscoe, Will
1993 How to Become a Berdache: Toward a Unified Analysis. In *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. Gilbert Herdt, ed. Pp. 329–72. New York: Zone Books.
- Scott, Eleanor
1997 Introduction: On the Incompleteness of Archaeological Narratives. In *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology*. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott, eds. Pp. 1–12. London: Leicester University Press.
- Seidler, Victor
1989 *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*. London: Routledge.
1994 *Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Shanks, Michael
1996 Style and the Design of a Perfume Jar from an Archaic Greek City State. In *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory: A Reader*. Robert W. Preucel and Ian Hodder, eds. Pp. 364–93. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shanks, Michael, and Christopher Tilley
1987 *Reconstructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Solomon-Godeau, Abigail
1995 Male Trouble. In *Constructing Masculinity*. Maurice Berger, Brian Wallis, and Simon Watson, eds. Pp. 69–76. London: Routledge.
- Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig
1992 Gender Archaeology and Scandinavian Bronze Age Studies. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 25(1):31–49.
- Spector, Janet
1993 *What This Axl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village*. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press.
- Stoller, Robert
1964 A Contribution to the Study of Gender Identity. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 45:220–26.
- Strathern, Marilyn
1988 *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thomas, Julian
1996 *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretive Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
2000 Introduction: The Polarities of Post-Processual Archaeology. In *Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader*. Julian Thomas, ed. Pp. 1–18. London: Leicester University Press.
2004 *Archaeology and Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Tiger, Lionel
1969 *Men in Groups*. New York: Random House.
2000 *The Decline of Males: The First Look at an Unexpected New World for Men and Women*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Treherne, Paul
1995 The Warrior's Beauty: The Masculine Body and Self-Identity in Bronze Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 3(1):105–44.
- Trigger, Bruce
1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vedantam, Shankar
2003 Desire and DNA: Is Promiscuity Innate? New Study Sharpens Debate on Men, Sex and Gender Roles. *Washington Post*, August 1: A01.
- Voss, Barbara L.
2000 Feminisms, Queer Theories, and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities. *World Archaeology* 32(2):180–92.
- Voss, Barbara L., and Robert A. Schmidt
2000 Archaeologies of Sexuality: An Introduction. In *Archaeologies of Sexuality*. Robert A. Schmidt and Barbara L. Voss, eds. Pp. 1–32. London: Routledge.
- Washburn, Sherwood, and C. S. Lancaster
1968 The Evolution of Hunting. In *Man the Hunter*. R. B. Lee and Irvine DeVore, eds. Pp. 293–303. Chicago: Aldine.
- Wilkie, Laurie
1998 The Other Gender: The Archaeology of an Early 20th Century Fraternity. *Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology* 11:7–11.

- Winkler, John J.
1990 *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Desire in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge.
- Wylie, Alison
1991 Gender Theory and the Archaeological Record: Why Is There No Archaeology of Gender? In *Engendering Archaeology*. Margaret Conkey and Joan Gero, eds. Pp. 31–54. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia, and Jane Collier
1987 Toward a Unified Analysis of Gender and Kinship. In *Gender and Kinship*. Jane Collier and Sylvia Yanagisako, eds. Pp. 1–50. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Yates, Timothy
1993 Frameworks for an Archaeology of the Body. In *Interpretative Archaeology*. Christopher Tilley, ed. Pp. 31–72. Oxford: Berg.

The Archaeology of Nonbinary Genders in Native North American Societies

13

SANDRA E. HOLLIMON



IN THE TWENTY YEARS since the publication of Conkey and Spector's (1984) groundbreaking work on gender and archaeology, the examination of systems of multiple genders in the archaeological record has grown. Some theoretical advances in the realms of gender, sexuality, and identity construction have provided archaeologists with new conceptual approaches to their analyses. Following the feminist critiques of science in general and archaeological theory in particular, researchers have continued to debate the meanings and manifestations of gender in the archaeological record (Voss and Schmidt 2000:14–18; Wylie 2002:185–99). Many of the recent discussions can be found in the seminal volume *Archaeologies of Sexuality* (Schmidt and Voss 2000) and in Voss (this volume). The developing approaches in archaeology that employ sexuality, performance, and queer theory are described fully in Voss (2000, 2005) and Perry and Joyce (2001). Therefore, in this chapter, I confine my discussion to the archaeological investigation of nonbinary genders in Native North American societies, north of the present Mexico–U.S. border.

Ethnographic and ethnohistoric information from Native North American societies provides evidence of nonbinary third and fourth genders, in addition to the binary genders of “woman” and “man,” as defined by the specific culture. For the purposes of this discussion, third genders are expressed by individuals who are biologically male but culturally not men. Fourth genders are expressed by persons who are biologically female, but are not recognized in their societies as women. If we recognize sex as a category of bodies and gender as a category of persons, we can better understand Native North American gender systems in which individual, acquired, and ascribed traits are more important in determining gender identity than biological sex assignment (Roscoe 1998:127). These systems frequently based gender on other variables than (but not necessarily exclusive of) biologically based primary and secondary sexual characteristics. Variables such as