

1 1

Gender Models in the Southwest

A Sociocultural Perspective

Louise Lamphere

The chapters in this book make a number of important contributions to both the anthropological study of gender and the study of Southwestern cultures through time. Their authors take us beyond the temptation to make the contemporary Hopis or Zunis a generalized model for gender in Pueblo society, with the corresponding assumption that a matrilineal "tribal-level" organization held sway in precontact times and that any contrasts among contemporary pueblos arose through Spanish colonial contact. Instead, they demonstrate that there was a rich and changing history of gender relations in each of three culture areas—the Hohokam, the Mogollon, and the Ancestral Pueblo—and that there were regional variations as well as temporal ones. By carefully examining the division of labor in a number of spheres—hunting, agriculture, craft production, cooking, and trade—the contributors to this volume offer us a much clearer idea of how tasks were divided in particular time periods in the past and in various culture areas, giving us a much more nuanced sense of the important variability in men's and women's work lives. These data on the gender division of labor, along with material on health status, violence, and the accumulation of wealth and goods in burials, can begin to help us build models

of gender relations and show how these might be linked to relations among kin groups and communities. In other words, we can now begin to evaluate evidence for gender hierarchies versus equality and evidence for a relationship between gender and social differentiation (unequal differences among households, kin groups, and communities).

In this short commentary, I use sociocultural approaches to gender in order to build two models of gender relations that I feel will help us understand the dynamics and oscillations that occurred during Southwestern prehistory as gender relations and political-ritual relations changed.

ISSUES OF POWER, STATUS, AND HIERARCHY

Most sociocultural theories about power, status, and authority draw from two major traditions in social theory: those that stem from the work of Marx and those that rely heavily on the insights of Weber. For those working from a Marxist position, power and authority are rooted in productive relations. To use one example, Karen Sacks (now Karen Brodtkin), in her book *Sisters and Wives* (1979), used a modes-of-production analysis. In revising her earlier approach, voiced in "Engels Revisited: Women, the Organization of Production and Private Property" (1974), she relied more heavily on Marx than on Engels. She argued that institutionalized power (or the recognized right to make decisions for others, commonly called authority) "rests ultimately on the possession of socially critical property, the means of production" (1979:72). In communal modes of production (usually found in foraging societies), all members are owners of productive property, whereas in class societies a small group or class owns and controls productive property. In kin corporate modes of production (the model most relevant to tribal-level societies, including those in the historical and prehistoric Southwest), productive property is held by kinspeople, and "every individual has access to at least some productive property." Power exists to the extent that these corporations control unequal amounts of productive property and members within them have unequal access to their kin group's property (Sacks 1979:73). Women have access to property as "sisters" in kin groups or as members of female associations, age groups, or secret societies. In the eighteenth century, for example, Iroquois matrons, as senior members and "sis-

ters" in the matrilineal *gens* (the localized clan grouping), held control over agricultural production, supervised households, provisioned war parties, and could nominate and depose sachems (male chiefs who were heads of clans), village leaders, and tribal officeholders (Brown 1975). In the nineteenth century, Cheyenne and Arapaho quilling societies were a source of women's power in Plains Indian societies (see Schneider 1983).

Sacks, like other Marxists, has argued that in many societies men and women held equal control of productive resources and political power. In contrast, those who have based their gender analysis on Weberian notions of power, authority, and status have argued for both universal gender asymmetry and for the idea that some societies were egalitarian. Sherry Ortner and Harriet Whitehead (1981) provide an example of the gender asymmetry position. Their introduction to *Sexual Meanings* relies heavily on Weber's notions of status without drawing on his ideas about economic class or political power and authority. Weber differentiated classes based on "life chances" and economic interests from status groups determined by the "social estimation of honor." Although the control of wealth often led to high social honor, there was always some slippage between the two. Weber treated class and status as relatively independent variables. Power and legitimate authority, a third set of constructs, were based on notions of the ability to control others, or the probability that certain commands would be obeyed by a given group of persons (see Gerth and Mills 1946:180, 187; Giddens 1971:156)

Ortner and Whitehead focused on "prestige structures," or sets of positions that result from a particular line of social evaluation (1981:13). Gender constitutes an important prestige structure, and one of many in any individual society. Gender affects other ranking systems, however. Prestige structures, such as those based on age, wealth, charisma, ritual expertise, or physical prowess, tend to be genderized and made consistent with one another. Thus, larger prestige structures are located in a male-dominated public sphere, and categories such as warrior, statesman, and elder are essentially male roles, whereas women are often defined in terms of their relations to men (as wives, mothers, sisters, and a variety of other kin statuses) (Ortner and Whitehead 1981:8). Ortner and Whitehead assumed that prestige structures were

always hierarchical and entailed a ranking of higher or lower on whatever dimension is being evaluated. They found little evidence in the ethnographic record that female prestige was consistently higher than male prestige. Thus, social honor in relation to gender was always a matter of ranking males above females.

In contrast, Alice Schlegel, in her introduction to *Sexual Stratification* (1977a), did not assume a gender ranking along the dimensions she discussed: rewards, prestige, and power. Her notion of rewards relied on Weberian ideas of "economic interests in the possession of goods or opportunities for income" or the "disposition of material property" rather than on the Marxist concept of a "means of production" or "productive control." Her concept of prestige as "deference granted an individual, role, or category" seems clearly based on Weber's ideas about "social honor," and her discussion of power and authority owes much to Weber's definitions, since she argues that authority is one form of power, or the "recognized and legitimated right to make decisions concerning others." Men and women derive their power "from their ability to control their own persons and activities and the persons and activities of others," by whatever means (1977a:8). In her analysis of Hopi society, Schlegel argued that the sexes were divided into "two domains of action," the domestic and the political-religious. The domestic organization of the lineage and house was under the control of women, while the religious and political organization of the Hopi village was under the control of male community leaders. At the level of the clan, in between the household and the community, authority was shared by a brother-and-sister pair. This system was supported by an ideology of sexual balance or equality between the principles of maleness and femaleness (Schlegel 1977b:246).

These three examples from feminist sociocultural anthropology illustrate the range of ways in which we have looked at gender relations: one based on the control of productive resources, with notions of power growing out of this control and little attention given to prestige; one based primarily on notions of prestige; and a third hinging on economic variables, power, and prestige, treated as three separate dimensions. Sacks and Schlegel would agree that there is a range of societies, including some that are egalitarian; Ortner and Whitehead would argue that all societies have some kind of gender hierarchy. Other mod-

els seem to be variations on these three. Eleanor Leacock (1981) and Christine Gailey (1987b) have argued for models based on the control of economic resources, whereas many other scholars have seen gender stratification as an issue of multiple dimensions sometimes operating in different spheres: domestic, public, religious (Errington 1990). Finally, some feminist anthropologists have emphasized issues of value (prestige) but have pushed for emic (indigenous) notions of value and argued that some systems place femaleness higher than maleness, or they see a balance (Sanday 1981).

How can we use these kinds of models to examine the archaeological record in the Southwest? How can we get from abstract concepts like power, prestige, and productive control to some of the concrete relations that can be "seen" in the archaeological record? First, we have to confront issues of how to get at productive control using data on the gender division of labor as well as evidence that some households or kin groups could accumulate wealth. Second, we need to think about how to measure notions of value. And third, we need models relating productive control, power, and value (prestige) to gender. All of these issues involve figuring out how to recognize hierarchy (or lack of it) from evidence of gender difference versus similarity and how to assess household or kin-group equality versus differentiation.

TWO MODELS

I have found Sherry Ortner's approach in "Gender Hegemonies," an essay in her book *Making Gender* (1996:138-72), an enormously helpful way to examine gender relationships in a more historical and processual light. Borrowing from Gramsci and Williams, Ortner reversed her previous position and built a new approach for understanding both egalitarian and nonegalitarian gender systems. She used the term "hegemony" to describe the set of ideas implicitly accepted by members of a culture as the way in which the world operates. For Ortner, however, the term not only encapsulated ideas about prestige and value but also included practices that were about the exercise of power. Hegemonic ideas and practices were the dominant ones, but Ortner also assumed that there were subversive, challenging, and "counterhegemonic" ideas and practices. In addition, I think it is important to reinsert into this model the notion of an economic base.

Coming as it does from Marxist theory, the notion of hegemony goes hand in hand with the idea that those who control the means of production or have accumulated economic resources also create and control the hegemonic ideas and use political power to reinforce and reproduce them.

One of the positive aspects of the Ortner model is that one can characterize a hegemony in relatively emic (rather than etic) terms. Doing this for the Southwest entails the extensive use of ethnographic analogy, drawing on what we know about Southwestern cultures in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Southwestern notions of power were tied not to the secular world but to ideas about the supernatural and about ritual power. Power derived from knowledge acquired directly through visions, dreams, or techniques of divination or through learning the proper ritual actions, the proper ways to construct ritual objects, or the songs and prayers that brought the aid of supernatural beings.

It is important here not to project a Western split between the human and the supernatural, or between the natural world and the supernatural, but to see both as imbued with the same forces. For traditional Southwestern Native Americans, humans and other beings (including those that existed in the mythological past) are composed of the same elements and are part of the same universe. For example, in Navajo cosmology, the primary elements—moisture, air, substance, and heat—make up not only the universe but also the *Diyin Diné'e*, or Holy People, and the *Diné*, or Navajos. “All persons who live now or who have ever lived in the Navajo world—hooghan, baskets, corn plants, corn beetles, humans, cradles, mountains, prayers—were and are constructed of the same fundamental elements, linked by metaphoric structures including complementarity, permeated by vibration in the form of sound or movement, and possessed of the same seven senses and anatomical components, including mind, eyes, ears, legs, and feet” (Schwarz 1997:35–36). Similarly, Alfonso Ortiz (1969) showed how Tewa cosmology incorporates a fourfold model of the universe that merges both sacred places inhabited by beings Westerners would call supernaturals and Tewa villages inhabited by the Dry Food People (or Tewa), including those who have been initiated into one of the societies and have become “Made People.” There

are six categories of "persons," including three who are living and three who are supernatural beings, which mirror each other. Thus, the *Towa é*, literally translated as "persons," are represented both by six pairs of supernaturals (brothers) and by six male human beings who are selected each year "to head those of our traditional ways" (Ortiz 1969:64). For the Zunis, both the "raw people" (who eat raw food, can change their form, and are given sacrifices by the cooked people) and the cooked, or daylight, people are "people" in the sense that they have the same bodily qualities and treat each other as kin (Tedlock 1979:499).

A second important theme present in Southwestern ethnographic material is the division between those with ritual knowledge (and power) and "ordinary people," a division found in several Pueblo social structures. There is some variability in the participation of women in the societies that confer ritual power, but most of the contemporary evidence indicates that most of those with ritual or political power are or were male, though a few women may play important counterhegemonic roles.

Three contemporary examples of these distinctions come from the Zunis, the Tewas, and the Hopis. Zunis distinguish between "daylight people" and ordinary Zunis who have not been initiated (who are poor or without religion). Males are initiated into the kachina society to become "valuable or protected," a status women already enjoy because of their connection with birth. At Zuni, women are rarely initiated into the kachina society, and then usually to cure them from being frightened by kachinas. (There was one female member of a kiva group in 1930.) Women participate as "wives of male members, preparing feasts for kachina impersonators, helping with costumes, and providing an admiring audience" (Tedlock 1979:502). Women can be initiated into the medicine societies or the rain priesthods (but are ineligible for the bow priesthood) (Ladd 1979b:85).

Tewas express this difference in the concepts of "dry food people" and "Made People," or those who belong to one of eight different societies. One of these is the women's society. Women are also ritual assistants to four other societies, and two women are lay assistants to the winter and summer chiefs.

Hopis distinguish between the *pavansinom*, the "most powerful" or

“most important” people, and the *sukavungsinom*, the “grassroots” or “common” people. Peter Whitely (1988) described the “important people” as the members of the core lineage segments with principal ceremonial offices. “Their authority rests in the religious societies and is repeatedly validated in myth and ritual. Ritual action, because of its intent to affect instrumentally the conditions of existence, is simultaneously political action.” He concluded: “The power—to make significant transformations in the world—derives from various sorts of esoteric knowledge, the primary locus of which is in ritual. Initiation into a religious society confers power, but the greatest proportion adheres to the chief-priests. Their specialized knowledge is kept with strict secrecy from ordinary participants” (Whitely 1988:69). Furthermore, political decision making is deliberative; the authority of the *pavansinom* lies in the ritual capacity to plan the future course of events. At Oraibi in the late nineteenth century, the main chief-priests were all male. There were three women’s societies, however: Lakon, Owaquol, and Maraw. The rituals of the first two are usually referred to as “Basket Dances,” and they stress fertility and the celebration of the harvest. Maraw, which is related to the male Wuwtsim society, is associated with fertility and the fruits of warfare (Whitely 1988; also see Levy 1993). Discussions of the Oraibi split mention only male leaders in this period.

In using these ethnographic data to interpret the prehispanic archaeological record, it is important to distinguish between periods when hierarchies of ritual power were less pronounced and periods when they were more pronounced. At some times, the differences between “important people” and “common people” (between ritual specialists and the initiated rest) might have been damped down, and women might have had their own societies or been frequent participants in societies and kiva groups that gave them the status of important people. These would have been times when most adults became initiated and both sexes had wide opportunity to acquire ritual knowledge. During these periods, the village leader (*kikmongwi*, *pekwin*, etc.) was probably a spokesman for all and a consensus articulator. These times might have contrasted with periods when people placed greater cultural emphasis on ritual—periods for which ritual activities are more evident in the grave goods of a few elaborate burials and for which there might be spatial or residential evidence for a

ritual elite. Ritual structures that are village- or community-wide or that seem to have served primarily for male ritual activities would perhaps indicate that women participated in ritual in limited ways or had their own religious societies.

Finally, there is also a pervasive theme of gender dualism in most of the ethnographic accounts of Ancestral Pueblo religion, as well as in accounts of the Navajo and Piman peoples. Supernaturals are often paired—male and female, two females, or two males (sisters or brothers). The important symbolism of four and the use of four directions, four colors, four stones, animals, and so forth in ritual often lead to a pairing and balancing of genders as part of this larger framework. Certainly female supernatural figures are very important. The two sisters *Iatiku* (mother of the Corn clan) and *Nautsiti* (mother of the Sun clan) are important in the Acoma origin story (Gutierrez 1991:3–7). Blue Corn Woman and White Corn Maiden were the first mothers of each of the moieties among the Tewa (Ortiz 1969:13). And Spider Grandmother gives crucial help to male figures in Hopi stories (Clemmer 1995:15, 16).

In what follows I examine evidence concerning (1) the division of labor as it relates to the control of productive resources, (2) Southwestern notions of power as they help us to develop an emic sensibility about how to examine both power/authority and prestige (notions of social honor), and (3) gender dualism in religious ideology as it, too, relates to prestige and social honor. I propose two models, one that I call the “balance model,” and the other, the “ritual power model.” Each model is a way of presenting economic, political, and ideological relations that are hegemonic, but it also contains parts of the other model (or counterhegemonic tendencies) within it. In the balance model, the allocation of productive resources and mechanisms for redistribution are such that they damp down the possibility that some households or kin groups can accumulate more resources than others. Ritual-political power is similarly downplayed. Archaeologically, this model would be manifested in evidence that kin groups and households were the important ritual units and that both males and females had access to ritual spaces and ritual items. In the ritual power model, which I discuss at greater length later, it is ritual power that underpins differential social honor or prestige.

DIVISIONS OF LABOR

Ethnological work on the gender division of labor, especially work on large cross-cultural samples, has tended to classify tasks (such as cooking, hunting, and agriculture) as "male" or "female." Single-culture studies of gender have dwelt less on careful analysis of the division of labor than on topics related to conflict, power, ritual, and, more recently, the colonial encounter. One of the important contributions of the chapters in this volume is their analysis of the division of labor within the whole complex of activities and processes that come under the headings of "hunting," "pottery production," and "agriculture," for example.

In these chapters, we see two models of the division of labor: the overlapping and the complementary. What I have termed the balance model can include either of these two types. Overlap in the division of labor can occur in several ways. First, men and women can do the same tasks. Second, a complex of tasks that occurs over time in several locations, such as hunting, pottery making, or cloth production, can involve some steps completed by men and others by women. And third, production at one site and in one time period can include mixed-gender groups rather than single-gender groups.

Sue Ellen Jacobs has argued for overlapping sex roles among the Tewas, but she gives virtually no examples in which men and women actually perform the same tasks (Jacobs 1995:208–9). Among Navajos in the subsistence economy of the 1930s, however, there are a number of examples. Both men and women herded sheep, sheared them, and helped in the birthing of lambs. Both men and women participated in planting fields, weeding crops, and harvesting them. To use an archaeological example from this book, Christine Szuter suggests that women could have been involved along with men in hunting small game (e.g., rabbit hunting as depicted on Mimbres pottery).

Regarding the second type of overlap (participation of one gender within a complex of activities usually attributed to a different gender), Szuter discusses the possibilities that women produced feathers for arrowheads while tending birds and carried game from kill sites. As an example of the third type of overlap (gender-integrated production at one site), Barbara Mills argues that shell production in pre-Classic Hohokam sites was organized by household rather than by gender. "Shell working is a labor-intensive process that combines flaking, cut-

ting, and abrading of the raw material. Reamers and a variety of ground-stone abraders were found in nearly every structure. Although shell working might have been a men's activity in situations of less intensive production, women and children's labor was probably used at these sites to increase output" (Mills, this volume). The second, or complementary, version of the division of labor is consistent with either the balance model or the ritual power model. It entails a highly differentiated but complementary gender division of labor in which (1) men and women do very different activities, (2) the steps involved in these activities tend to be done by only one gender, with minor participation by the other, and (3) production sites involve the work of only one gender. The contributors to this volume generally agree that for the early time periods in the Southwest there is more evidence for overlap, whereas gender differentiation in tasks is more clearly evident in later time periods (e.g., after A.D. 900 or 1000).

A complementary division of labor might support hierarchy rather than balance. In the former case, a complementary division of labor with more male-only or female-only task complexes would support important power differences between men and women. This might be specifically the case when women's work load is particularly heavy relative to men's. Thus the complementary division of labor can be a double-edged sword. For example, if women are pressed into hours and hours of corn grinding in communal mealing rooms, and if they also devote large amounts of energy to cooking, child care, and pottery making, then women might consequently hold fewer ritual roles, participate less in long-distance trade networks, and perform fewer other activities that would balance men's important ritual power. In contrast, in contexts where the power associated with ritual is widely dispersed among kin groups and among men and women, and where there is little in the way of control over productive resources by kin groups whose leaders are "important people," a complementary division of labor would make little difference and might even signal "high social honor." For example, women could hold prestige as excellent potters or providers of vast amounts of food for feast days.

THE RITUAL POWER MODEL

In this model, notions of ritual power are hegemonic, and the

importance of ritual power undergirds the higher social honor or prestige afforded ritual practitioners (heads of sacred societies, heads of kin groups that hold society paraphernalia). Furthermore, the complementary division of labor (and much clearer differences between males and females in productive activities) becomes part of the hegemony and supports the social differences between “important people” and “commoners.” Craft production (turquoise bead manufacture, pottery) could be focused on display for ritual occasions, and agricultural work, hunting, and food processing would often be harnessed for ritual feasting. Archaeologically, one would expect to see some indications (in burials, for example) that prestige was being accorded to ritual practitioners. If there were few avenues for women to become “powerful people,” then one could argue for increasing male dominance and a gender hierarchy. There might also be indications that control over productive resources (agricultural products, craft items, wealth items) was more concentrated in some households than in others. This would be reflected in residential and ritual architecture.

There are four periods outlined in these chapters and in other literature on Southwestern archaeology that are good candidates for the more hierarchical hegemony in which ritual power resided with “important or powerful people,” most of whom were probably male. In each of these cases there is clear evidence for inequalities between kin groups, and men and women of higher-ranking groups apparently had greater access to productive resources, ritual power, and prestige than did men and women of lower-ranking groups. In some instances, women in the kin groups of “important people” might have had some advantages over “ordinary women.” But both sets of women still engaged in productive and reproductive work, particularly pottery making and corn grinding. In addition, it is not clear that women were subordinate to men in their own kin group, because aspects of a complementary division of labor (the balance model) still held sway. There is less evidence for overlapping patterns, which means that it is possible to make contradictory arguments regarding power and prestige. On one hand, women’s work loads increased and women might have been more confined, yet on the other, they could have been part of women’s work groups, produced socially valued goods, participated in trade networks, and contributed to ritual activities through the provision of food

or the care of ritual paraphernalia. Classic Hohokam, Classic Chaco, and Postclassic Rio Grande Pueblo are examples of economic-political and social structures to which the ritual power model probably applies. The transition from Classic to Postclassic Mimbres is one in which a ritual power model could have been the guiding hegemony on a smaller scale, but counterhegemonic forces tipped the scale to a new period when a more balanced hegemony was reasserted.

Classic Hohokam: Confinement or Integration?

For the Hohokam Classic period (A.D. 1150–1400), there is ample evidence of increasing social differentiation and the emergence of an elite. Domestic architecture changed to include walled compounds made up of from 3 to 69 rooms; the larger compounds were probably occupied by a number of households. Some compounds also incorporated platform mounds, which included structures that were used for residence. Food processing, food preparation, pottery production, and fiber processing all took place in the rooms and courtyards on top of the mounds. Other households continued to occupy pit structures. Patricia Crown and Suzanne Fish (1996:807) argued that “the high incidence of exotic artifacts found in association with the mounds and the unusual architecture of the mounds and their surrounding compounds imply that ritual activities occurred in association with the mounds as well. It is likely that the elite occupying the mounds derived at least some of their power through ritual performance and possession of esoteric knowledge. Whether women were directly involved in the performance of ritual is unknown, but their presence on the mounds and in the compounds surrounding the mounds indicates that they were not segregated from ritual structures during the Classic period.”

Elites living on the mounds and those living in the compounds below and nearby utilized an extensive system of canals (which were originally built in some areas during the pre-Classic). This irrigation system potentially underwrote the production of agricultural surpluses, although it is not clear that some households or kin groups controlled substantially more production than others.

Shell production in the Classic period indicates that “households in compounds associated with platform mounds seem to have made and used a greater proportion of shell items than did households

farther away" (Mills, this volume). Mills concluded that elite households participated in shell production and that production of shell items used in ritual and as symbols of authority was by men.

The evidence from burials is complex. Although women were buried on some platform mounds, there were two mounds without female burials, whereas men were consistently buried on the tops of the platforms. There seem to have been few differences between female burials on the tops of mounds and those in nearby compounds. Although the grave lot values—the measure Jill Neitzel uses in her chapter—of the materials buried with females were higher during the Classic period than during the pre-Classic, there was a greater proportion of adult males and children among those who had the wealthiest graves. Women tended to be buried with utilitarian objects, including spindle whorls, pestles, manos, and higher frequencies of ceramic vessels, whereas Classic-period men were more likely to have been buried with ornamental or ritual items, axes, abraders, and smaller numbers of ceramic vessels. Men also tended to be buried in adobe boxes located on mounds and in adobe-lined pits, indicating that more effort was put into male burials. Crown and Fish concluded that "adult males were accorded greater social honor at death than females" (1996:810).

What are we to make of these data, which indicate the prominence of males in ritual roles (buried in special places with ornamental and ritual materials) and the (literally) elevated status of households engaged in ritual activities? There does seem to be ample evidence for a ritual-political system in which power and prestige were in the hands of elite males. The situation for women is much more ambiguous, and one could argue that women's activities supported the ritual system but at the same time confined them. Or one could argue that women's activities provided a counterhegemonic tendency that "put the brakes" on ritual power and integrated women's economic and reproductive roles more clearly into the structure, giving them a parallel basis for control over resources (pottery), power, and prestige. From this description, we see three groups of women, those on the platform mounds associated with "elite families," those in compounds but not on platforms, and those living in pit structures. Among all three groups there was a clearly differentiated division of labor, with shell work being done by men and pottery making by women. Within the sets of activi-

ties entailed in cloth making, there was still an important gender division of labor. Females spun agave and cotton thread, and males wove the cloth.

Crown and Fish (1996) also argued that overall, women's work loads increased during the Hohokam Classic period. They began making tortillas on the *comal*, a more labor-intensive process of preparing corn for consumption. They produced highly polished red ware and Salado Polychrome pottery, which required more steps and time in manufacture. And they contributed to the production of clothing by processing agave fibers for thread and spinning cotton. (Men were assumed to have dug up the agave and to have woven both agave-fiber garments and cotton on upright looms; Crown and Fish 1996:805.)

In some senses, there seem to have been few differences between the women in the courtyards on the mounds and those in the courtyards below. The enclosed courtyards could have promoted greater cohesion, cooperation, and loyalty among households in the same kin group. Senior women might have exercised leadership in women's activities, and a walled compound might have made it possible for fewer adults to watch the children, freeing some women for productive activities. On the other hand, women might have been more secluded from the outside world and less in contact with the entire village community, whereas men and women living in unenclosed pit structures might have had greater access to community activities, interaction, and gossip (Crown and Fish 1996:806). Crown and Fish (1996:813) tended to see women's productive activities as "keeping power in balance," or, in my terms, as providing a counterhegemonic tendency to male access to exotics, ritual items, and the spoils of warfare and hence to places in a system of ritual-political power and prestige. I think a convincing argument could be made that increased female labor means that women end up supporting a system that gives them less autonomy.

Chaco Canyon, A.D. 1050–1130: Widening Social Differences

The time when a ritually based power system seems to have been best developed was the late Pueblo II–early Pueblo III period at Chaco Canyon, particularly the years between A.D. 1075 and 1115. Evidence for social differentiation and a ritual elite is found most prominently in architecture and the division between great houses and small houses, a

difference made prominent by the building boom in the late eleventh century. Although new construction on Chetro Ketl and Pueblo Alto had begun earlier, a great deal of construction took place between 1075 and 1115. Earlier, during the Bonito phase (A.D. 900–1050), clusters of small-house sites were associated with one or more great kivas. These small sites, many of them on the south side of the canyon, were occupied for a century and remodeled many times.

In contrast, the great houses, including Pueblo Bonito, Chetro Ketl, Pueblo Alto, and Pueblo del Arroyo, were multistoried buildings with stunning examples of masonry. Recent research indicates that large parts of these structures were used primarily for storage and ceremonial activities. Only a few suites exhibit evidence of having been inhabited on a permanent, year-round basis. Thomas Windes (1987) concluded that only a small percentage of the population actually lived in the great houses. In addition, there are relatively few burials at Chaco. This and the lack of enough arable land to support more than 2,000 people (Judge 1984:8) indicate that Chaco was a ritual center and that not all those who utilized it lived there permanently. The extensive network of roads connecting outliers like Salmon Ruin, Kin Ya'a, and Pueblo Pintado to sites in Chaco Canyon and to Pueblo Alto support this notion.

Status differences between those who lived in great houses and those occupying small houses are indicated by data on health and nutrition. Nancy Akins (1986) argued that "authority-holding elites" in Pueblo Bonito had greater access to nutritional resources and enjoyed better health. Pueblo Bonito males and females were taller (by 4.6 cm) than males and females in outlying pueblos. Life expectancy was greater and fertility lower at Pueblo Bonito (Nelson et al. 1994:100).

Neitzel (this volume, table 4.9) suggests that the burial data for Chaco indicate that there was a male-dominated hierarchy in the Chaco great houses between A.D. 900 and 1050. Male grave lot values in great houses were higher than female ones. (In the small houses, female grave lot values were higher.) Included in the richest burials throughout the Southwest are two burials from Pueblo Bonito, both males interred with thousands of turquoise beads, pendants, effigies, and other objects, including offerings. Akins concluded that these were individuals of the greatest authority and power in a three-tiered social

ranking system (Akins 1986:115–17, 133, 162–63). There were no male burials dating between 1030 and 1150 at Chaco, but hierarchy with indications of important wealth differences continued. At Aztec Ruin, a Chacoan outlier dating between 1100 and 1300, there are also two adults buried with beads, disks, pendants, pots, and projectile points (Morris 1924:155–61), indicating the accumulation of wealth. Women's burials at Chaco tend to include ordinary goods such as mats, baskets, cotton, and pitchers, whereas men's burials have more manos, jars, and throwing sticks (Jill Neitzel, personal communication).

Data on the division of labor also suggest differences between great houses and small houses. In the small sites, grinding was done with movable metates set into adobe mealing bins that integrated spaces from a number of adjacent structures (Bustard 1996). In contrast, the great houses had grinding complexes found in room suites. There were also communal grinding rooms with 10 to 12 mealing bins. Michelle Hegmon and her colleagues (this volume) argue that these grinding rooms were used for food preparation on a suprahousehold scale.

Male and female craft production tells a different story. Recent research has indicated that much of the pottery and turquoise found at Chaco was produced outside the canyon. Between A.D. 1040 and 1200, about 30 percent of all ceramics at Chaco were made in the Chuska area, especially near Washington Pass (Mills, this volume). This amounts to about 1,000 vessels a year, most of them going to larger sites (Spielmann, this volume). Mills suggests that although men might have been involved in procuring wood, temper, and clay, women might not only have made the pottery but also have been involved in bringing vessels to Chaco Canyon during "pilgrimages" or feasts. There seem to have been extensive trade networks that connected the Chuska sites with Chaco, and women from the Chuskas might have traded their pottery for food with women in villages closer to Chaco, or they themselves might have brought the pottery to Chaco for feasts or for trading (Spielmann, this volume).

Men might at times have been absent from Chaco itself in order to procure turquoise, timbers for houses, and game to supplement what must have been a depleted faunal population (Mills, this volume). Men seem to have been involved in working turquoise for ornaments in kivas in Chaco Canyon (2 of the 11 excavated ornament production

areas with dates between A.D. 920 and 1220 were in kivas; Mathien 1984, cited in Mills, this volume). There seem to have been few producers, however—perhaps just one or two individuals. Much of the shell and turquoise seems to have been concentrated in the great houses in Chaco Canyon, particularly in the elaborate burials mentioned earlier.

I suggest that between A.D. 1050 and 1130, the differentiation between kin groups in the great houses and those in the small houses indicates a significant difference in status, possibly between those who were “important people”—most likely male ritual specialists and their sisters, male kin, wives, and children (organized into some sorts of kin groups, possible matrilineal or bilateral extended families or matrilineages)—and “ordinary” people living in small houses and outlying villages. The data also point to a more differentiated division of labor in the great houses, with women spending more time grinding corn (though possibly only in relation to feasting rather than every day), and men more engaged in hunting, procuring turquoise, and carrying building materials from faraway sites. The emphasis on ritual goods in male graves and on ordinary goods in female graves might mean that male ritual activities were becoming dominant while females spent long hours in necessary but supplementary work to support the rituals (particularly corn grinding and food preparation).

The counterhegemonic tendencies here come from the small houses and from outlying villages in areas such as the Chuska Mountains. On one hand, one could argue that the production of valuable pottery by women in distant villages and the use of female trade networks to bring pots and/or food into Chaco Canyon might indicate the calling in of economic resources for ritual purposes—the way in which potlatching or feasting in “big man” systems operates. On the other hand, if such rituals served as redistribution systems rather than as systems for appropriating goods, then women involved in craft production and trade might have retained a measure of autonomy and leverage, even prestige.

The Pueblos after A.D. 1300: Women’s Work in Larger Villages

Michelle Hegmon and her co-authors (this volume) argue that the Pueblo IV period brought an important change in Ancestral Pueblo organization, coincident with large-scale migration into the Rio

Grande area. Villages in the 1300s were highly formalized and carefully planned. These authors point out that the unit pueblo structure (living quarters, storage rooms, and kivas) disappeared, "in favor of integrated community architecture, the dissociation of kivas from households and their extension to larger organizations, the reduced social scale of households, and the increased visibility of food preparation." These were large villages with a dramatic increase in the amount of food prepared outdoors. There are also single mealing bins, suggesting that households were smaller and that women did not do mealing in larger groups of kin. Kivas contain anchor holes for upright looms, indicating male weavers working in ritual spaces controlled by males. Hegmon and colleagues argue that larger social units (such as moieties, religious societies, clans, or sodalities) used these kivas.

In the late thirteenth century, the *comal*, fire dogs, and rectangular fire pits were all introduced to produce tortillas and *piki* bread. There is some indication that the use of *comales*, the fine grinding of meal or flour, and the use of oil for frying were all part of an effort to cook corn quickly and might reflect an increased concern with fuel (Crown, this volume). These techniques also increased women's work loads.

In terms of craft production, a new ceramic technology, glaze ware, spread rapidly across the Albuquerque area, suggesting direct contact among women (Spielmann, this volume) and a shared concept among women potters of what a glaze paint should be. Because most glaze bowls were significantly larger than the indigenous white-ware bowls, ceremonial feasting may have been important, too.

Hegmon and her co-authors argue that women's prestige declined with the end of the unit pueblos. Women lost power as a result of a decline of household symbolism, exclusion from the kiva, and the end of special grinding rooms. They retained some autonomy through exterior grinding and ongoing contributions to ritual food (Hegmon, Ortman, and Mobley-Tanaka, this volume, table 2.3).

Mimbres Reorganization: Increased Household and Gender Autonomy

In an article on Mimbres abandonment and reorganization, Hegmon, Nelson, and Ruth (1998) compared material from pre-A.D. 1150 Mimbres Classic sites with material from Postclassic sites

dating after 1150. The Classic-period sites consisted of both field houses composed of 3 or fewer rooms and larger villages of 50 to 100 rooms. In the later period, the villages were abandoned and the field houses were remodeled and expanded, usually to 5 to 15 rooms. The shift, then, was from aggregated villages to dispersed hamlets of only a few households.

The authors, utilizing data on pottery and the presence of different hearth and mealing facility forms, argued that during the Classic period, the "entire region appeared to have a strong 'Mimbres focus,' with a homogeneous material culture. At least in the Mimbres Valley, this focus may have involved the fairly strong social control necessary to organize large aggregates of people and cope with the increasingly over-exploited environment" (Hegmon, Nelson, and Ruth 1998:158). These homogeneous villages were replaced by small hamlets with a high degree of diversity, and regional networks and alliances were expanded. Since women presumably made the pottery, during the Postclassic they were learning different traditions and combining Cibola and Mimbres styles. From this evidence, Hegmon, Ortman, and Mobley-Tanaka (this volume) argue that women were maintaining their own networks independently of men. Altogether during this period there was residential mobility, with smaller kin groups moving out of villages, perhaps abandoning a more ritually centralized system. At the same time, female craft production and trade networks became reorganized and possibly stronger. Contrasted with the Chaco situation, female pottery production was not in the service of a centralized ritual-political system.

CONCLUSION

The Classic Hohokam, Chaco Canyon, and Pueblo IV examples are ones in which we see increasing differentiation between elite and nonelite households that probably represents the increasing importance of ritual power and the ability of "important or powerful people" (mostly male) to centralize and redistribute goods and resources. The Mimbres example, in contrast, is one in which a ritual system "devolved" into a balance model of small household clusters.

In all these cases, women retained their important productive and reproductive roles in both elite and nonelite households and wider kin

groups. They continued to produce pottery, and there is no indication that elite women, even if confined in Hohokam compounds and the tops of ceremonial mounds, became completely dependent on male-generated economic resources. This is also true of women who lived at Pueblo Bonito and the other Chacoan great houses and in the post-1300 Rio Grande large villages. Their role in food processing was equally important, in addition to cooking, child care, and possibly other craft production. In a class-divided society, one would expect to see elite women primarily as consumers rather than producers and more differences in wealth associated with elite versus nonelite women. That utilitarian goods appear in female burials in both Classic Hohokam mounds and Chacoan great-house sites suggests elite female participation in productive and food processing activities. On the other hand, one could argue that elite women were often pressed into work for the ritual hierarchy, particularly carrying out the hard labor of corn grinding in communal grinding rooms. Counterhegemonic tendencies are indicated at both the elite and nonelite levels, in the former case in the rare instances where elaborate female burials indicate possible high ritual status, and in the latter case, where female trade networks (mostly in pottery and often in nonelite villages) suggest control of religiously oriented activities. The Mimbres case is particularly intriguing because it suggests that at times of cultural and population shifts, when communities broke up and were reorganized on a smaller scale, women profited as the system devolved into a much more balanced one.

In sum, these chapters contribute to building an approach to gender and hierarchy that is complex and nuanced. As such they have important implications for the study of gender more broadly. For those working in the Southwest, particularly in sociocultural anthropology, this volume gives time depth to the study of gender and hierarchy and lays out the range of variability among societies before European contact. Much of the contemporary anthropological work on gender in the Southwest has focused on the nineteenth- and twentieth-century Pueblos and Navajos, who are often thought of in terms of the balance model. Without a careful examination of gender and hierarchy for the Classic-period Hohokam, eleventh-century Chaco Canyon, and the Rio Grande region during Pueblo IV, we would have a very inaccurate sense of how gender relations have been constituted in the Southwest. We

would fail to see how, in certain periods, hierarchy increased yet women continued to play important economic and domestic roles, many of them undergirding ritual activities that were in the hands of men. In other times and places (Postclassic Mimbres and some historical Pueblo situations), hierarchy decreased, and the balance model seems more appropriate as an account of gender relations. Certainly, this volume should affect how we teach and write about cultures of the Southwest.

In anthropology more generally, this volume can contribute to gender theory involving the study of societies that are often thought to be “middle-range”—pastoralists and sedentary horticulturalists who are not part of state-level, class-based societies. There is a lack of conceptual clarity in how to think about gender in these societies, which are often labeled “tribal.” They are found in great numbers in the Americas, Africa, and Oceania and have undergone transformations during the colonial period and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries through the policies of the larger nation-states in which they are embedded. Clearly there are regional patterns that have significant time depth, and as this volume shows, it is important to include archaeological material in the analysis of gender for any particular region.

We need, however, to get beyond thinking only in terms of how simple economic types (horticulturalists or pastoralists), kinship systems (patrilineal or matrilineal forms), or political models (tribes or chiefdoms) might define gender relations. Here, this volume is a model. By examining particular topics (agriculture, hunting, cuisine, trade, etc.) across sites and time periods, the authors unravel the complexities of gender relations. They are able to show that women contributed to a number of spheres in which female participation might not be assumed (hunting and trade come to mind). They are also able to demonstrate that hierarchy increased in the ritual and religious sphere in the prehispanic Southwest while women continued to contribute economically (through craft production and trade). Corn grinding and food producing are the most ambiguous activities. It is possible to argue that these activities brought women together, creating solidarity and anchoring women in an important role within a ritual structure that emphasized feasting. Alternatively, one can see the increased work load as subordinating women and decreasing their

autonomy. It would be interesting to investigate whether these same relationships hold for other regions or whether very different patterns have emerged.

In these kinds of middle-range societies there is likely to be a wide variety of patterns, since gender hierarchy does not neatly dovetail with class hierarchy as it does in state-level societies. We will need a number of different models to encompass the variation found worldwide in different historical time periods and as these societies have been transformed under colonialism and nation-state building. This volume goes a long way toward making such a theory of gender relations in mid-range societies possible.