

2009

I Am No Man: A Study of Warrior Women in the Archaeological Record

Alexis Jordan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes>

Recommended Citation

Jordan, Alexis (2009) "I Am No Man: A Study of Warrior Women in the Archaeological Record," *Field Notes: A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology*: Vol. 1 , Article 7.

Available at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/fieldnotes/vol1/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Field Notes: A Journal of Collegiate Anthropology by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact open-access@uwm.edu.

I Am No Man: A Study of Warrior Women in the Archaeological Record

Alexis Jordan

Abstract

The study of gender in archaeology has become a prominent aspect of archaeological theory and the contributions of women in ancient societies are an every growing topic. This paper addresses one such category within this topic, warrior women of the archaeological record. Assumed standard divisions of labor between women and men across cultures that oversimplify the manifestations of gender and sex and ignore variation within these roles have been shown to be outdated androcentric approaches to archaeology. The importance of reexaminations of gender roles in ancient history is that they have helped to shed light upon the significant variation in the previously overlooked or distorted contributions of women to history. Research into the many representations of the warrior woman in different cultures and time periods offers new opportunities into a better understanding of manifestations of gender and power. An understanding of the concepts of gender and the warrior in archaeological contexts, along with the various female warrior manifestations, are the two key components needed to thoroughly examine archaeological evidence for the presence of warrior women. With these components in hand archaeologists can begin to more effectively identify not only warrior women, but also the presence of individual agency in action, and the amount of flexibility and variation within the social roles of a culture.

Introduction

For centuries, the roles of men and women in society have often been idealized, simplified, dichotomized, and

generalized. Despite areas of overlap between the two genders, societies have promoted the false notion that there are certain duties that could only be carried out by one gender and never the other. Therefore, any instance in which this strict dichotomy was breached exemplified something unique which could become the stuff of legends. Today, one of these archetypes has become a subject of interest for both scholars and popular culture alike. In recent years the histories and legends of warrior women have emerged in many formats (Dockstader & Fleming 2003; Holland 2001). The assumption that any activities involving warfare could have nothing to do with women because of the outdated notion that women are naturally predisposed to peace and nurturing is finally being reexamined. Nations like Israel and the United States are opening more and more combat positions in their militaries to female soldiers on the front lines. The new question arising in the world today is “why shouldn’t *some* women be warlike?” (Nelson 2004: 114). The importance of reexaminations of this kind is that they have helped to shed light upon the significant variation in the previously overlooked or distorted contributions of women to history. Research into the many representations of the warrior woman in different cultures and time periods offers new opportunities into a better understanding of manifestations of gender and power (Dockstader & Fleming 2003; Fraser 1988; Holland 2001). Archaeology has become one such research avenue. An understanding of the concepts of gender and the warrior in archaeological contexts, along with the various female warrior manifestations, are the two key components needed to thoroughly examine archaeological evidence for the presence of warrior women. With these components in hand archaeologists can begin to more effectively identify not only warrior women, but also the presence of individual agency in action, and the amount of flexibility and variation within the social roles of a culture.

Gender Issues in Archaeology

Archaeologists have begun investigating the many roles of women in ancient societies now that gender in archaeology has become a more prominent aspect of archaeological theory. Assumed standard divisions of labor between women and men across cultures (and the assumption of equally timeless binary genders of female and male) has been shown to be false by both cultural anthropologists and archaeologists. Such a dichotomy is an extreme oversimplification and the previously standard androcentric approach to archaeology is no longer sustainable. The notion that a powerful woman in an ancient civilization was an aberration is a biased generalization of the complexities of gender (Nelson 2004, 2006). Gender and biological sex do not manifest themselves in neat, organized ways, illustrated by the presence of third, fourth and even fifth genders, as well as biologically intersexed individuals (Graham Davies 2007; Weil 2007). Gender does not have to be dichotomous and should therefore be viewed on a continuum rather than as binary categories (Arnold 2002). With this in mind, the discovery of archaeological evidence of a warrior woman category could signify a number of things. It could mean the existence of a supernumerary gender involving women who take on predominately male roles in their communities, it could also be a cultural practice in which the role of warrior was open to both men and women. Furthermore, it could reflect a situation in which an individual woman of elite status (inherited or earned) used her position to gain more power and prestige and place herself in the category of warrior.

Types of Warrior Women

The appearance of women as warriors in cultures and contexts where they were previously absent can occur in a number of ways. History itself provides examples of the different manifestations of warrior women which archaeologists should be mindful of when examining the archaeological record. In

general, having elite status of some kind is an asset when attempting to step across a cultural boundary. If the group a woman is born into or becomes a part of already has power, prestige, or connection to a religious authority, then it can be easier for her to claim that taking on the role of warrior is just another manifestation of that inherent power. Antonia Fraser's 1988 compilation of histories regarding warrior queens is a prime example of this. The lives of women like Queen Boudica of the British Iceni tribe or Zenobia, Arab queen of Palmyra, demonstrate that it is easier to take power and titles when one already has an established position of status and respect (Fraser 1988; Holland 2001).

Another common theme among warrior women of elite status is the Appendage Syndrome, when a woman is "seen as an extension or prolongation of the rule of a particular great man" (Fraser 1988:107). This situation is common in a patriarchal context when a male elite dies without a suitable male heir available to take his place. These women then take power during crisis situations that include external or internal warfare, in which case it is better to have an unorthodox ruler than none at all. Boudica fits this description, as does Queen Elizabeth I of England (Fraser 1988).

Another context that can appear is the Honorary Male Syndrome. In these instances an elite female leader takes on male gender or male attributes to legitimize herself in patriarchal cultures where women would not be considered capable of ruling. This would set a woman apart from the rest of their gender, which had a low social standing in relation to men in the culture. These female rulers elevated themselves to a special status and could be considered genders unto themselves. In the case of Elizabeth I, she was not a woman, she was the queen, and therefore afforded special rights, privileges and respect. In such cases, the status of other women in this culture would not necessarily improve because

this female ruler was not seen as simply female like the rest (Arnold 1995; Fraser 1988)

Elizabeth I is also an example of a symbolic warrior. She, like other leaders (both male and female) maintained control over the English armed forces but did not participate in actual warfare. The title of monarch carries certain assumptions about the character of the person filling the role, including military prowess, courage, strength, and other qualities needed to lead and protect one's country. The more any kind of ruler (especially an unconventional one) is perceived as having the proper character the less likely their position will be threatened (Fraser 1988). Archaeologists should be wary of this possibility when examining evidence of elite status females or women holding special positions in a community (such as ritualists). Any of these titles could involve symbolic attachment to the role of warrior or simply be positions involving similar symbols and status privileges (Knüsel 2002).

Archaeological evidence of female warriors in patriarchal cultures can also offer a look at individual agency. Even if a woman had elite status or was an appendage, this did not mean that there would not be any objections to her or attacks against her. In many respects her own character determined a great amount of her success in the position. Sixteenth Century Irish chieftain Grace O'Malley would never have managed to protect the O'Malley clan or handle her business transactions had she not possessed intellect and courage which allowed her to successfully pirate the west coast of Ireland into old age (Chambers 1998). Joan of Arc, who had no status, power, or the ability to read still managed to convince the Dauphin and many of her countrymen that God had sent her to save France from the Hundred Years' War (Holland 2001). It is not enough to simply gain a title which women have been denied in a culture by exploiting loopholes or tumultuous situations; a warrior woman also needs great strength of personality to see it through effectively. The importance of this archaeologically is that any remains that

recall the existence of a warrior woman in a culture where such things were not normally accepted show the agency of an individual able to carve out a place for herself and be accepted by her people.

Warriors in an Archaeological Context

Identifying any kind of warrior in an archaeological context depends upon a number of factors. In most instances one type of evidence alone is not enough to positively identify the presence of a warrior. The most likely place to find evidence for the existence of warriors is in mortuary contexts because of the variety of evidence available. The examination of mortuary contexts is of special significance to archaeology because burials are “the direct and purposeful culmination of conscious behavior, rather than its incidental residue” (O’Shea 1981:39). They represent deliberate formal actions and ideas of the culture rather than an abandoned conglomerate of random materials. Burials are therefore significant acts instilled with meanings. Mortuary contexts are not without interpretive issues however, especially when it comes to sex and gender. What is found in a mortuary context is not a direct correlate to the life an individual led while they were alive. The dead do not bury themselves, instead it is the living that decide how the deceased are represented. How family members chose to inter their dead could often be influenced by resource availability, local politics, or other factors (Effros 2003; Parker Pearson 1999). Therefore, the burial of a warrior woman could only be identified if she had been accepted as a warrior by her community, one of whom chose to honor her status in this in burial.

Many mortuary analysts have not differentiated between sex and gender. In a mortuary context, sex is determined based on human remains while gender is established based on grave goods, iconography, body and grave positioning, or other factors. Gender is a cultural

determination which the burial creators chose to identify in the make up of the burial itself. Problems arise when archaeologists do not or cannot examine both the skeleton and the grave goods, which may or may not show the same patterns. Before the rise of gender research in archaeology, many ethnocentric and androcentric assumptions about women and men tainted interpretations. Often without much reference to cultural context or examination of the skeleton, researchers assumed a direct correlation between gendered grave goods and the biological sex of an individual. Grave goods were also gendered based on nineteenth century notions of acceptable activities for each sex. Weapons and tools belonged to men while craft items, or other things associated with the home and child rearing, were associated with women. Any grave that did not fit the standard assumptions would be ignored or given a convoluted explanation that would still fit the theory (Lucy 1997; Parker Pearson 1999). Interpretations surrounding the elite Iron Age burial of Vix in Burgundy exemplifies these problems. Despite the fact that the skeletal remains had been sexed as most likely female and the grave goods contained items specifically associated with females only, the burial was still considered to be male or a transvestite priest (Arnold 1991). This was because the burial was one of the wealthiest ever found of that period and contained almost all elite status symbols of the period. Some interpreters were uncomfortable accepting a clearly feminine grave assemblage with a female's skeletal remains, which would indicate that women in this period could also be considered high status elites. Instead they made up an entirely new category that lacked evidence to support it (Arnold 1991). Sexist blanket stereotypes like this have grossly contorted aspects of many cultures and made it difficult to determine how much fluidity and variety is present in gender constructions of past cultures.

Within the categories of sex and gender, other considerations are also critical. Skeletal sexing in archaeology can be a difficult process since determinations are often made with fragments of bones rather than entire bodies. The pelvis is

the most accurate area from which to establish sex, but in archaeological contexts this is not always possible. Criteria for using other parts of the body are available but they are mostly based on a “larger-smaller” series of nonmetric markers found on the skull, with larger, more apparent traits on the bones establishing the individual as male (Weiss 1972:247). The problem occurs when these traits are determined to be intermediary. In these instances, there is a 12 percent bias for labeling these remains as male. Not only could this give a false sex ratio of the population but also mask the appearance of biological women in graves not containing feminine grave goods (Weiss 1972).

Besides sexing, the skeletal remains offer a chance to find other evidence of a warrior lifestyle. Trauma injuries caused by weapons are good indicators of involvement in war activities. Osteological analysis can identify crushing and fracturing (from maces or clubs), piercing (from spears, lances, daggers, javelins, and arrows), or cutting (from swords and axes). However, the role of the injured individual is not always examined. Not everyone in a battle situation is a combatant. Warfare often occurs within settlements being attacked, thus non-warriors could be injured or killed in battle. Therefore, assuming someone who suffered from such injuries was a warrior would be incorrect. Repeated healed traumas on the front of the body and legs, and traumas consistent with injury while on horseback, both indicative of someone whose lifestyle was more likely to be the cause of the injuries rather than being in the wrong place at the wrong time, make the strongest cases for a warrior (Arnold 2006; Brothwell 1981).

Stress markers on the skeleton from repeated activities related to warfare can also be used as indicators. The repetition of physically strenuous motions can cause some deformation in bone. Evidence of horseback riding, archery, spear throwing, sword or axe swinging, and continuous marching create some of the more obvious types of bone stress. Each would leave

deformations or minor bone growths in specific locations on the skeleton. As with the trauma injuries, these stress indicators alone are usually not enough to identify a warrior. Mining, blacksmithing, and woodcutting, among other activities, can also create stress markers like those that appear from using an axe or sword. Additionally, horseback riding alone is not an indication of participation in warfare. Again, while these stress indicators are helpful in identifying warriors, their presence does not guarantee that the individual was an active combatant (Arnold 2006; Moore 2005).

The interpretation of grave goods can also be problematic in mortuary analysis. In each situation, cultural context is a key factor in identifying evidence in the archaeological record. However, in many situations knowing the precise cultural context of warriors and all of the items associated with them may not be an available option. One of the most common associations is between a warrior and his or her weapons and other associated gear, like protective equipment (shield, chain mail, etc.) and horse trappings (Arnold 2006; Härke 1990). In some situations, items normally associated with warriors could represent something broader when found in a mortuary context. They could be tied symbolically to gender, age, or the social ranking of the entire family. In such instances a weapon may not be simply a tool used by a warrior, but also a symbol for masculinity or elite status. Therefore, just as with the skeletal signs of warfare, individuals with weapons in their grave do not necessarily signify warrior status. Contexts with multiple burials to compare and contrast (like cemeteries or burial mounds) can offer some assistance in determining how weapons were used in funerary rites. If these items are found in the burials of sub-adults or individuals with physically debilitating conditions, it is likely that weapons did not represent a warrior in such societies, since neither of these demographics would have been physically capable of fighting. It is also important to consider the possibility that cultural practices and symbolic meanings associated with weapon grave goods change over time. In

some cultures where weapons were not just used for warfare but also for hunting, it can be difficult to know what weapons in burials may indicate. In addition, while weapons in some cases indicate a warrior burial, these weapons do not necessarily represent the entire fighting kit of a warrior. The presence of one dagger or javelin, or some other form of supplementary weapon or light blade, clearly does not represent the entire kit. It is possible that other pieces of equipment (like wooden shields) may not have survived in the archaeological record, or that some or all warriors simply were not buried with all of their equipment (Härke 1990; Stoodley 1999).

To identify a warrior woman in a mortuary context, multiple lines of evidence are necessary. Much of the evidence could be representative of something or someone other than a warrior. It is only when archaeologists find traumas, stress markers, grave goods, and biologically female skeletons in conjunction with each other that they can say they have found a female warrior with some confidence. Other lines of evidence such as oral traditions, written sources, ethnographic examples from a related culture, and iconography should also be explored when examining the possible existence of warrior women (Arnold 2006).

The Warrior Women of the Archaeological Record

The archaeological excavations of warrior women listed below are not the only possible examples of female warriors in archaeology, but each exemplify different issues involved in using the archaeological record to identify these types of women.

Amazons

One of the most famous series of Greek legends involves bands of warrior women who lived in the steppes of southern Russia, north of the Black Sea, sometime during the Scythian period

between the seventh and third centuries B.C. The Amazons, as the Greeks called them, were a fierce band of warriors and accomplished equestrians who engaged in many battles throughout the region. At the battle of Thermodon (now Terme, Turkey), the Greeks defeated them and took them as captives. But the Amazons escaped and were shipwrecked along the Black Sea Coast in the land of the nomadic Scythians. The Scythians were said to have called the women *Oiorpata* or man-killers. After a period of intense warfare the groups intermingled and intermarried with the group settling between the Don and Volga Rivers (Davis-Kimball 2002; Guliaev 2003). The descendants of this mixing of cultures became what the Greeks called the Sauromatians, whose women rode, hunted and fought with the men. Herodotus's account, and the other stories of the Amazons, were considered legends, albeit most likely the oldest and most well known legends of warrior women in existence. However, in the 1950s archaeologists in Russia began excavating sixth-century-B.C. *kurgans* (burial mounds), discovering the remains of female graves with weaponry, armor, and riding gear. Initially not much was thought of the find, but the evidence continued to grow. Further work on gender and status in Russia at sites dated between the sixth and fourth centuries B.C. by Renate Rolle in the late 1980s revealed that at least 40 warrior graves in Scythia were female, and approximately 20% of the Sauromatian warrior graves in the lower Volga region were female (Davis-Kimball 2002; Guliaev 2003; Rolle 1989).

The graves found in the Scythian region predominantly between the Danube and Don Rivers were identified as belonging to warriors based upon the kit of weaponry contained within them. This method has proven to be useful as, in this context, weapons are found in only specific burial contexts. Weapons in both male and female warrior graves included knives, lance points, remains of wooden and leather quivers, bronze arrowheads, and in some instances, armor. The female warrior graves also contained spindle whorls, bronze mirrors, pearl necklaces and bracelets, items only associated

with the females. Additionally, the skeletal remains of some of these women indicate traumas indicative of warfare such as head injuries from blows and stabbings and a bent bronze arrowhead embedded in a kneecap. The graves of female warriors, in contrast to the more typical Scythian female burials, are always at the center of the kurgans, the same as male warrior burials (Guliaev 2003; Rolle 1989).

These female warrior burials continue to be found across the Russian steppes. In the very eastern area of Pokrovka, Jeannine Davis-Kimball discovered another pocket of these burials. The Sauromatian kurgans in this area, dating to between the sixth-fourth centuries B.C., displayed seven Amazon type burials with iron swords, daggers, arrowheads, and whetstones (possibly for weapon sharpening), along with other items associated only with women, like the spindle whorl and mirrors. Here too, one of the bodies contained an arrowhead embedded inside it and one of the young girls aged between 13 and 14 years old had the bowed leg bones of a childhood spent on horseback. Davis-Kimball proposed that a group of graves containing clay or stone altars, bone spoons, and other feminine grave goods may have been for a priestess. She additionally argues that the appearance of certain types of ornaments and amulets found in both the “priestess” and warrior burials may indicate that some women served both roles (Davis-Kimball 2002).

The Amazon evidence emerging from the Russian steppes region is compelling and clearly supports the idea of women from the Scythian period playing an important role in the warfare of their people. However, what precisely this role was, and how it may have changed over time is still very unclear. The large geographic and time spans involved, coupled with the uncertainty of the function of items like altars in some female graves, indicate that extensive study of the *kurgans* in this region is still necessary. A more thorough investigation of the already excavated kurgans and a larger

sample size would greatly increase the understanding of these burial mounds, and hopefully provide a clearer picture of the place of warrior women in this society.

Fu Hao

In 1976 archaeologists began to unearth the remains of a tomb in the royal cemetery of the Shang dynasty capital on the outskirts of Anyang. What they discovered was the burial of Fu Hao, queen consort of Emperor Wu Ding (ca. 1040 B.C.) and possibly China's earliest warrior woman. Her tomb contained hundreds of grave goods including bronze dagger axes, bows and arrows, and four bronze *yue*, or drinking vessels, engraved with her name as well as symbols of royal and military power in the period. She was also accompanied by 16 attendants or slaves, 700 pieces of jade, 440 smaller bronze vessels, 499 bone hairpins, mirrors, and over 130 bronze weapons. Although her grave did not contain as much wealth as that of two other wives, Fu Hao's was the only female burial from this period with any kind of weaponry. The grave goods, in association with bone fragments of scapulimancy (oracle bone divination) found in the burial and at other locations, indicated that Fu Hao was not only one of Wu Ding's chief wives, but also one of his greatest generals. The scapulimancy pieces indicated that the *yue* were given to her by Wu Ding at the time of her various military commissions. She commanded a force of approximately 3000 men and battled in defense of the Shang territories on numerous occasions against a variety of enemies of the Shang. While her position as queen consort and general was greater than any other woman at the time, according to the scapulimancy bones, she was not the only woman involved in military campaigns (Peterson 2000; Wang 2004).

Fu Hao's richly filled tomb and list of accomplishments, along with the scapulimancy evidence for other females in the military, and the even greater wealth of the tomb of Lady Jing (who appears to be Wu Ding's primary wife) indicate that elite women held a position of status and

power in the royal court of this period. While Fu Hao's position was secondary to the king, her status clearly allowed her some autonomy in choosing her role in the Shang court, since she filled a position that would have typically been taken by a man. It does not appear that she was an appendage or honorary male as there was no shortage of men, and her grave goods contained the same feminine gender related items as other elite females, in addition to having weapons.

One oddity in her life still remains unclear. Sources are ambiguous as to whether or not she bore Wu Ding any children. Some say she had no sons (without reference to daughters), while others hint that perhaps they died before adulthood. Her inability to fulfill what may have been a perceived requirement of being queen (bearing children) may have been part of the reason she chose another path to serve her country. However, this notion is no more than speculation without a better understanding of the status and duties of the kings' wives (Chang 1980; Wang 2004).

While there are no skeletal remains to check for trauma or stress marks to confirm Fu Hao's presence on the battlefield, it is clear from the archaeological record that she was more than a symbolic military leader because she was specifically placed in charge of major military campaigns. Such a title would not normally have been accorded to her simply because she was an elite woman. The possible existence of other women involved in military practices (as indicated by the scapulimancy pieces) also supports the probability that she was more than a leader in name. It is therefore quite probable that she (in accordance with the scapulimancy remains) went on these military campaigns and was involved at least in a supervisory role in actual combat. Though preliminary evidence for a few other warrior women may indicate a measure of acceptance for women in this role, Fu Hao's military power in this period was exceptional.

Conclusion

The study of warrior women in the archaeological record is a complex topic in that it involves a large body of material. It cross cuts the study of gender, warriors, osteological forensics, and mortuary analysis within the archaeological record and involves historical knowledge of the contexts in which warrior women appear. Once this base of understanding is established, evidence for female warriors can be examined systematically to determine the validity of the claim. The manifestations of warrior women can help disprove the notion that all people can and should fit into binary and often unequal gender categories. With positively identified evidence for warrior women archaeologists can more fully understand and identify the range of gender rolls, the presence of individual agency as empowerment within a culture, and social flexibility, especially with regards to gender.

References Cited

Arnold, Bettina

- 1991 The Deposed Princess of Vix: The Need for an Engendered European Pre-history. In *The Archaeology of Gender*. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. D. Walde and N.D. Willows, eds. pp. 366-74. Calgary: Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary.
- 1995 'Honorary Males' or Women of Substance? Gender, Status, and Power in Iron Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 3:153-168.
- 2002 "Sein und Werden": Gender as Process in Mortuary Ritual. In *In Pursuit of Gender: Worldwide Archaeological Approaches*. Sarah Milledge Nelson and Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, eds. pp. 239-56. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.
- 2006 Gender and Archaeological Mortuary Analysis. In *Handbook of Gender in Archaeology*, edited by Sarah Milledge Nelson, pp. 137-170. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Brothwell, D.R.

1981 *Digging Up Bones The Excavation, Treatment and Study of Human Skeletal Remains*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, Anne

1998 *Granuaile The Life and Times of Grace O'Malley*. Dublin: Wolfhound Press.

Chang, Kwang-Chih

1980 *Shang Civilization* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Davis-Kimball, Jeannine

2002 *Warrior Women An Archaeologist's Search for History's Hidden Heroines*. New York: Warner Books.

Dockstader, Noel and Patrick Fleming dirs.

2003 *Warrior Women*. 5 hours. Discovery Channel. United Kingdom.

Effros, Bonnie

2003 *Merovingian Mortuary Archaeology and the Making of the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fraser, Antonia.

1988 *Warrior Queens*. New York: Vintage Books.

Graham Davies, Sharyn

2006 *Challenging Gender Norms: Five Genders among the Bugis in Indonesia* Thomson Wadsworth, Belmont CA.

Guliaev, V.I.

2002 Amazons in the Scythia: New finds at the Middle Don, Southern Russia. *World Archaeology* 35:112-125.

Härke, Heinrich

1990 "Warrior Graves"? The Background of the Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite. *Past and Present* 126:22-43.

Holland, Barbara.

2001 *They Went Whistling. Women Wayfarers, Warriors, Runaways, and Renegades*. New York: Anchor Books.

Knüsel, Christopher J.

2002 More Circe than Cassandra: The Princess of Vix in Ritualized Social Context. *European Journal of Archaeology* 5:275-308.

Lucy, Sam. J.

1997 Housewives, Warriors, and Slaves? Sex and Gender in Anglo-Saxon Burials. In *Invisible People and Processes: Writing Gender and Childhood into European Archaeology*. Jenny Moore and Eleanor Scott, eds. pp. 150-168. London: Leicester University Press.

Moore, Gregory

2005 Archaeological Correlates of Warfare in the Mortuary Record: Patterns and Variations. Master's Thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Nelson, Sarah Milledge

2004 Gender in Archaeology. Analyzing Power and Prestige. Second Edition. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

O'Shea, John M.

1981 Social Configurations and the Archaeological Study of Mortuary Practices: a case study. In *The Archaeology of Death*. Robert Chapman, Ian Kinnes and Klavs Randsborg, eds. pp. 39-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker Pearson, Mike

1999 *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Peterson, Barbara Bennett and Wang Guorong

2000 *Fu Hao*. In *Notable Women of China Shang Dynasty to the Early Twentieth Century*. Barbara Bennett Peterson, ed. New York: East Gate Books. pp. 13-16.

Rolle, Renate

1989 *The World of the Scythians*. Gayna Walls, translator. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.

Stoodley, Nick

1999 The Spindle and the Spear. A Critical Enquiry into the

Construction and Meaning of Gender in the Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Rite. BAR British Series 288.

Wang, Ying

2003 Rank and Power Among Court Ladies at Anyang. In *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. Katheryn M. Linduff and Yan Sun, eds. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press. pp. 95-116.

Weil, E.

2006 What if it's (sort of) a boy and (sort of) a girl? *New York Times Magazine* September 24, 2006. pp. 50-53.

Weiss, Kenneth M.

1972 On the Systematic Bias in Skeletal Sexing. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 37:239-250.