

Gender-Critical Archaeology in Sweden. A Review

Tove Hjørungdal

This paper summarizes feminist, gender-critical Swedish archaeology as well as some Swedish archaeological literature mentioning aspects of gender in general. The literature discussed was published primarily during the last decade or so. Attempts are made to deduce problems and to some extent to enlarge upon certain questions felt to be of urgency. One conclusion is however, that investigations and analyses have to be expanded on and conclusions and statements outlined, in order to understand why Swedish archaeology is depicted as it is by several different authors, seen in a gender-critical perspective.

Tove Hjørungdal, Department of Archaeology, University of Umeå, S- 901 87 Umeå, Sweden.

In reviewing literature on gender and archaeology in Sweden, it feels urgent to try to discuss it in its social and intellectual context. I have as such thrown some light on educational factors as well as on general conditions of gender-critical, feminist perspectives. As a consequence of this, I have stressed the Present/Past relationship in my classification. It is a pleasure to note that the total number of publications on gender-critical issues within Swedish archaeology is much larger than I had expected before I started my compilation of them for a survey. However, after a systematic read through of this literature, one gets the general impression that conditions for male and female archaeologists, respectively, still seem to be far from equal. Statistical analyses as well as outlines of personal experiences reveal that conditions are not beneficial to women, rather, they seem to be in favour of men. This conclusion is drawn on the basis of presentations in Swedish archaeological publications during the last decade or so. The critical analyses in question are made

by male and female archaeologists, many of whom have worked within Swedish archaeology for a long time. The conclusion is, however, not a surprise. It corresponds to conclusions from analyses carried out in archaeology (Engelstad *et al.* 1992; Wylie 1992) and in academia at large (Fürst 1988).

I am going to list and briefly summarize recently published literature on gender-related questions in Swedish archaeology. A review paper is not the medium for a thorough outline and explanation of conditions, statements and facts found in the scholarly publications in question. It will as such only be possible here to give a superficial impression of the importance and necessity of gender-critical perspectives in Swedish archaeology. The conditions of gendered relations of power comprise the very point of departure for gender-critical, or feminist, research. If one had the ambitions to get a firm background to the conditions of engendered power in Swedish archaeology, it would not be sufficient to read the publis-

hed literature. There are too many circumstances and facts that have to be taken seriously; and too many points as well as general conclusions in the literature listed here are not enlarged upon.

In order to explain and discuss why there are unequal possibilities in Swedish archaeology, and to get a closer look at how these inequalities are maintained and questioned, I would prefer comprehensive analyses from a sociological, current as well as a historical perspective. To complete a synthesis on gender-related power in archaeology, analyses should also be conducted on the new university reform with its present changing structures of power on a general level. The same kind of analysis should be carried out in connection with the so-called HUR-reform, which represents aspects of a generally changing power structure within the realms of archaeology in Sweden (cf. Pérez & Browall 1992). I think it is of vital importance to be aware of the fact that in the archaeologists' reply to the HUR-document, no equity issues are touched upon.

Through the university reform program, on the contrary, equity issues are stressed. Another important aspect of the matter is that universities also have published programmes aiming at bringing such inconvenient and shame-laden topics as sexual harassment to the surface - as well as aiming at dispelling such ways of extreme and explicit gendered power relations in future. I am not going to discuss the above mentioned documents. Such an investigation would, in my opinion, be a natural part of a larger sociological investigation and would demand extensive research resources with regard to both economy and time as well as personnel.

Swedish archaeological literature in the present paper refers to works written by archaeologists usually living in Sweden and usually employed by Swedish museums, universities, antiquity boards, etc. Accordingly, papers in foreign books or periodicals, as

well as Swedish publications on prehistoric source material from areas outside the country, are defined as Swedish archaeology. Another point in this respect is that some of the works on gender are written by scholars who have, or earlier had, a foot in Norwegian archaeology (Hjørungdal; Johnsen; Lundström; Magnus; Welinder). As a consequence of this, it feels natural to start my outline with the mid-1980s, at the time of the foundation of K.A.N., "Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge" (= Women in Archaeology in Norway (1985)). It seems that this had some impact on Swedish archaeology as well.

Although issues like woman's position and equity were briefly debated in Swedish archaeology some years earlier, in connection with the International Women's Year of 1975, the debate did not immediately lay firm ground for a feminist, gender-critical archaeology on a systematical level. The roots of Swedish modern archaeology to a certain extent have also been characterized by a strong emancipatory tradition from Oscar Montelius and Hanna Rydh (cf. Arwill-Nordbladh 1987; 1989; 1990a; 1991a). Swedish archaeology can take pride in being able to trace its emancipatory roots back to one of the real giants within European archaeology. However, the tradition from Montelius has not been continuous. For example, there are not many Swedish gender-critical archaeological papers, if any, during the period between the International Women's Year of 1975 and the time of the foundation of the Norwegian K.A.N. in 1985. In Norway conditions were different, and the first theses were written during the middle of the 1970s (cf. Dommasnes 1992). During the Women's Year, museums were supposed to issue something on the topic of women. At the Museum of National Antiquities in Stockholm an exhibition was produced as well as a catalogue on this, made up of papers written by well-known researchers (Thålin-Bergman ed. 1975). At the University of Lund, female professors were

asked by the university staff to write paper on women within their own subject. Professor Berta Stjernquist fulfilled this task on the behalf of archaeology, writing on famous women in prehistory (Stjernquist 1975). Shortly after, a report was written on the question of equity issues at the Museum of National Antiquities (Jämställd 1984/85). However, the report was unfortunately not published.

What gender is supposed to mean, is a very complicated matter. In Swedish archaeology several concepts are accepted, like Women's studies, Gender archaeology, Gender-critical archaeology and Feminist archaeology, but there are only a few authors who discuss the gender concept thoroughly (Nordbladh & Yates 1990; Wennstedt Edvinger 1993). It is possible to discuss it from several aspects.

ON SURVEYING THE LITERATURE - HOW?

I will then move to the literature I was asked to go through; and as a convenient point of departure I have chosen K.A.N. No. 12 (1991), a special issue on gender perspective in Swedish archaeology. Here Swedish archaeology is analysed in a gender-critical light, statistically as well as historically. Some of the papers in this collection were first given at a conference in Uppsala in November 1989, which was initiated by Stig Welinder. In K.A.N. 12, papers are grouped into three different themes:

- I. "Women's Archaeology" (Sw. *Kvinnoarkeologi*)
- II. "Swedish Archaeology from a Gender Perspective"
- III. "Prehistoric Women"

Is this an adequate way, then, of categorizing Swedish gender-related archaeology?

I think it is worth posing this question for several reasons. First and foremost, it is not the only obvious way. Accordingly, I think it

is vitally important to discuss possible ways of labelling, just as it is important to state the fact that through this very classification a subdivision is already suggested. If we take a look at a recent categorization of Norwegian gender-critical archaeology (Dommasnes 1992), we will instead find that a historical periodization is made. If we look back some years we will, however, also find within Norwegian gender-critical archaeology a subdivision that is similar in many respects to the one referred to in Sweden. According to the Norwegian scholar Dommasnes, roughly at that time there were approaches focusing on women as groups within social systems, approaches focusing on gender relations, as well as a more deeply rooted "her-story" approach (Dommasnes 1987). The question that arises then, is whether it is too early to write a systematical and analytical research history of Swedish gender-critical archaeology that would make it possible to arrange the development into relatively clear defined phases, the way Dommasnes did in Norwegian archaeology. I do not think it is.

To bring up another point of discussion, which is also a personal one, I am not very happy with the term "Kvinnoarkeologi," suggested in K.A.N. 12. In English this certainly means "Women's archaeology," which sounds rather good to my ears, as does the notion of "Women's history." In Swedish, however, I have the feeling that "Kvinnoarkeologi" sounds very different. To be more precise, this label makes it sound as if there ought to be two different archaeologies, one "different" or odd one for women exclusively (cf. Welinder 1988; Tomasdotter-Hed 1992) and one "normal" or real one for the rest (i.e. men).

All this makes me inclined to try to arrange a review in an alternative way. In my opinion it would be a better idea to make topics like Present and Past. By stressing the past/present relationship, I think we are able to get an impression of the researcher/

researched relation. In this way we have an opportunity to investigate the subject/object distinction, and to treat this as a vital relation as well. This very point illustrates the heart of the matter of a gender-critical, or feminist, research, that is, to question and investigate traditional male-biased bipolarities and hierarchies, instead of treating them as natural and unbreakable relations of power.

Anyway, as long as gender-critical archaeology makes analyses of prehistory as well as of current scholarly context, I think the labelling of Present and Past will make sense, even though it might not be the only "correct" one. There is yet another dimension within a Present/Past relationship, and that is History of Archaeology, which should be given more attention, and which certainly has an impact on both Present and Past.

EVERYDAY LIVES IN A GENDERED REALITY

It is still a good idea to try to visualize both female archaeologists and women in prehistory, but this is certainly not the entire point of gender-critical archaeologies. The point is rather to problematize cultural categories of power, such as masculine/feminine, culture/nature, public/private, and to try to open up new paths for understanding human identities, relationships, culture and society. Thus, a critical focus on the Present/Past bipolarity seems to be a necessary way of getting to the root of the matter of trajectory interpretations. There already is a clear focus on this area of problems in Swedish archaeology, especially through Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh's investigations (e.g. Arwill-Nordbladh 1989; 1993).

Let us take a closer look at the present, at our own lives. To start with the educational aspects, *undergraduate* education in archaeology in Uppsala is discussed by Svante Norr. One of the most important conclusions drawn by Norr is that during the third term (C-level) of study, women more often

than men leave or drop out. During the first and the second term there are no clear differences between men and women dropping out of courses. Norr asks several questions which might help to explain this situation, but it is not possible to give any definite answers. Wherever the core of the problem, it is in Norr's opinion within education that we have the best opportunity to change the circumstances (Norr 1991). I am inclined to agree with Norr, as due to a change of the organization of education, conditions have changed in Uppsala and female students do usually not drop out of courses the way they frequently did earlier.

Welinder's study of the *undergraduate* students of archaeology at Stockholm University shows the same trend as Norr's study of the Uppsala students. During the last years the number of female third-term students has decreased (Welinder 1991a).

Graduate students as well as *doctors* are discussed in a gender-critical perspective. Welinder continues with an exposé over doctors in Swedish archaeology during the present century. He reminds us of the fact that neither individual intellectual capacity nor endurance alone is a crucial factor in pursuing graduate studies. Social factors like family building and financial situation have to be taken into consideration as well. One of his general conclusions is that a change in the educational policy in Sweden around 1970 seems to have furthered the possibilities for women; unfortunately Welinder does not elaborate on this point (Welinder 1991b). Jarl Nordbladh, on the other hand, discusses men and women in archaeology from the point of view of *academic structure*. One important conclusion is that men hold the majority of attractive positions, e.g. as professors and research fellows (Nordbladh 1991a). Elsewhere Nordbladh takes up similar questions with a clear focus on *power relations* in academia at present as well as in a historical perspective (Nordbladh 1991b). Welinder (1991b) mentions the

pioneer female doctors in Swedish archaeology. They have been a topic of discussion in other publications as well. Dr. Hanna Rydh (1891-1964) was the pupil of the professor and emancipation champion Oscar Montelius. In 1919 she became the first female doctor in Scandinavian archaeology. Her long and multifaceted career has been discussed from different points of view. Ewa Ryberg focusses on the fact that Rydh until recently seems to have been unappreciated and forgotten as a scholar. Rydh's scientific works are discussed, as well as her many areas of activity within politics and charity. Hanna Rydh was a scientific author as well as an author of fiction, and not least an author of popular books and children's books (Ryberg 1986; 1990; cf. Arwill-Nordbladh 1987). Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh has elsewhere (1987) discussed the *ideological and emancipatory* aspects of Rydh's work, and in this way yielded an excellent picture of Dr. Rydh as a child of her own time and social context.

Welinder (1991b) mentions two other female pioneers, Dr. Agnes Geijer and Dr. Greta Arwidsson. The latter was the first woman to be appointed a professor in Swedish archaeology. Since then there have been several others, one of whom is Professor Märta Strömberg, University of Lund. In K.A.N. No. 12 she gives a brief characterization of aspects of the changing academic situation throughout her own career, starting in the 1940s (M. Strömberg 1991). Some glimpses into another kind of career are given by Barbro Johnsen. For many years Johnsen worked within several archaeological institutions in Sweden and Norway. She finally decided to devote herself mainly to the study of language instead, partly because there already is an archaeological career in her family (Johnsen 1991).

Museums and antiquity boards are also analysed in K.A.N. No. 12 (Welinder 1991c; 1991d; Lagerlöf 1991; Magnusson 1991), and in another context female antiquarians

are discussed by Sweden's first female "Riksantikvarie" (Biörnstad 1990).

Field-survey has been one of the most conservative bastions in Swedish archaeology. Until 1961 women were denied work within this area, and were not employed on a permanent basis until 1983 (Magnusson 1991). A more thorough analysis of the conditions within the Central Board of National Antiquities was carried out by Agneta Lagerlöf. She takes up the question of the number of men and women employed, the division of work, and the possibilities of internal advancement, especially for women (Lagerlöf 1991). Questions within the same area of archaeology are discussed by Lagerlöf in additional papers (Lagerlöf 1989; 1990). Lena Thålin-Bergman discusses her own generally unequal position as a female antiquarian during the past 40 years (Thålin-Bergman 1990). One of the most recent papers on women's conditions in archaeology was written by Welinder. Not long ago he was in China, where he took the time and trouble to inform himself, and in turn us, on women in Chinese archaeology. Two facts are striking: first, conditions in China seem to resemble those in Scandinavian archaeology about 60 years ago; second, oppressive attitudes toward women may in some cases be held by women themselves. One example of this is the attitude toward women expressed by the sole female professor within Chinese archaeology, whom Welinder met for an interview. She did not want any more women within her profession because there were so many problems with them (Welinder 1993b). The fact that Chinese women live and work under far less equal conditions than we are used to in Sweden, is, however, neither a comfort to us nor an excuse for relaxing work on equity issues.

To conclude this paragraph, the majority of investigations mentioned were carried out some years ago. It would be important to continue investigations to see if, and

how, conditions have changed during the last few years.

PERIODS AND DISCIPLINES

Concerning new knowledge and discussions about different prehistoric periods and topics, a relatively small number of gender-critical papers are written by Swedish archaeologists. A convenient way of classifying themes is by period, i.e. *Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Medieval and Post Medieval Period*. Another way of classifying is by discipline, and here I think also *osteology* is to be listed. As we usually distinguish between the fields of archaeology and osteology in Sweden, I would like to discuss published works within each of them respectively. To these fields can be added some works within the area of *museum exhibitions* and public information (e.g. Adolfsson & Lundström 1993; Pettersson 1994; Welinder 1991e) as well as within the *research history of archaeology* (Hjørungdal 1994a; 1994b). There are certainly additional areas such as *archaeobotany* and *environmental archaeology*, treated abroad in a gender-critical study by Christine A. Hastorf (Hastorf 1991). No extensive gender-critical works have however been written on this in Sweden, even though the questions are touched upon by Welinder (Welinder 1992; 1993d). So is as well the case with *Ethnoarchaeology* (Welinder 1994). *Underwater archaeology* is another additional field, but I do not know any gender-critical works here. As underwater archaeology seems to make up a context where gender roles are preserved, gender-critical analyses would be welcome.

PREHISTORY

Which questions of the past are discussed by archaeologists in a gender-critical perspective? Which source materials are taken into the discussion? I will give a general, and not too detailed, discussion on this.

In the paper *Female and Male in Meso-*

lithicum Stig Welinder's point of departure is a single but somewhat spectacular find, namely, the skeleton of the so-called "Fisherman from Barum – mother of several children" (Welinder 1987; cf. Gejvall 1970; cf. as well Stjernquist 1975). This burial has acquired the status of a signifier of archaeologists' prejudices when gender is concerned. The skeleton from Barum or Bäckaskog, was first interpreted as a male because it was accompanied by an arrow. Later on its pelvis was re-examined with the aid of new osteological methods. The conclusion was that this person must have been pregnant several times, and accordingly it was a woman. This is the content of the discussion. Welinder discusses, however, several aspects of the questions related to the burial from Barum. Essential to this find is that its appearance called into question our pre-suppositions about men always being the hunters. However, the find is in fact difficult to interpret anyhow. One suggestion has been that the weapon in the grave killed the woman. Women in the Stone Age burial context is also discussed by Gunborg O. Janzon (Janzon 1993). The examples given are three different Middle Neolithic Gotlandic graves. The graves represent, respectively, a double grave with a young woman and a middle-aged man, a woman with a child, and an old woman with an old man. One of Janzon's conclusions is that the three women had an equal position as well as an individual importance and status in work and society. Her conclusions are based on a contextual interpretation of the burials. Not much has been written in Sweden on typical hunter and gatherer societies from a gender-critical point of view. In her master's thesis Britta Wennstedt Edvinger (Wennstedt Edvinger 1993) addresses this problem explicitly and questions several traditional notions on gender in a hunter - gatherer context; and she does so not least by asking the question whether or not there really has been gender in the context of her analysis. There is no

evidence of a bipolar sex-based organization in Stone Age hunter-gatherer societies of northern Sweden. Edvinger principally draws her conclusions on the basis of rock-carvings, in which there are no evident principles of sex.

The introduction of cultivation has been discussed on a wide scale within anthropology and archaeology. In Swedish archaeology the question of women's roles in the stage of initial cultivation is raised by Kristina Jennbert (Jennbert 1991; 1984). She stresses the relationship between different Late Mesolithic/Early Neolithic societies, and discusses the importance of marriage alliances to the introduction of cultivated cereals. The principle of the Gift is central to Jennbert's ideas on early cultivation.

Other Stone Age themes are only mentioned and have not yet been discussed thoroughly. One issue worth mentioning is Palaeolithic depictions of women (Gustafsson 1993).

The question of matriarchy is given much attention abroad, for example in German gender-critical archaeology (Fries 1993; Kästner 1993). This is not the case in Swedish or in Scandinavian archaeology. Swedish archaeologists have only touched upon the matter of matriarchy in a popular version of discussions on old and recent theories (Hjørungdal 1985).

Swedish Bronze Age researchers have discussed gender in relation to rock-carvings and figurines, but the total number of papers is small (Coles 1991; Hedengran 1991; Lundström 1993; Ullén 1993a; 1993b). One of the problems addressed by Hedengran in her studies of rock-carvings is that there are plenty of human beings represented in rock-carvings, but there are problems with engendering them. Finding criteria to recognize female figures or types of expressions has been especially difficult.

Lundström looks at the possibilities of discussing prehistoric labyrinths in terms of

fertility cults. Labyrinths might also represent phenomena in relation to aspects of life and death. The preference for one of these interpretations does not exclude the possibilities of integrating aspects of the other, according to Lundström (Lundström 1993, with references).

Another area of investigation touched upon is the classical one of weapons and jewellery, as well as tools, in the Bronze Age context (Herner 1991). Herner throws some critical light on the question of which categories of artefacts we usually ascribe to men and women respectively.

Swedish Iron Age researchers have addressed questions on gender within the prehistoric period of the Iron Age as well. Both Swedish and foreign find materials are discussed. Burials is a material category which is frequently represented.

Among foreign Iron Age source materials can be mentioned examples from Norway (Hjørungdal 1988; 1989a; 1990; 1991; 1992a; 1992c; n.d. 3), from Italy (Berggren 1993) and from Greece (A. Strömberg 1993). When gender is addressed in the Iron Age context, ritual aspects are often integrated into the studies of burials and other categories of material culture (e.g. Andrén 1993; Arwill-Nordbladh 1990b; Hjørungdal 1990; 1991; Magnus 1993; Welinder 1993a). The question of how to understand Iron Age societies, or communities, is briefly discussed (Hjørungdal 1991; n.d. 3). As already touched upon, Arwill-Nordbladh in her works has focused on the relation between Past and Present, for instance, through a critical review of images of Viking Age woman (Arwill-Nordbladh e.g. 1991c; 1993).

MEDIEVAL AND POST-MEDIEVAL

There seems to be only one earlier paper addressing a gender-critical view within Swedish medieval archaeology, written by Professor Hans Andersson (Andersson 1990; but cf. Iregren 1988a; 1988b). While my present paper was still in an embryonic stage, a

seminar on gender-critical medieval archaeology was taking place in Lund (late autumn 1993). Medieval archaeology in Sweden until recently has been a typical male bastion, and very few women have aimed at academic positions through which it is possible to have an impact on the development of the subject. The meeting in Lund has thrown some light on the question of why these conditions have existed, and papers from this seminar are published (META 94:1). With inspiration from the works of Roberta Gilchrist, topics concerning churches and gender are discussed (Gilchrist 1993; cf. 1994a; 1994b; Wienberg 1993). Some themes related to post-medieval times have already been touched upon from a gender-critical point of view. These are, first, women and the cultural landscape (Magnusson 1990; Welinder 1990) and, second, women's labour in iron works (Magnusson 1991b).

OSTEOLOGY

Through the approach of Historical osteology, osteology is a discipline which is intimately related to archaeology, especially at the University of Lund. As such, the question of women in prehistoric and historical times is discussed by Swedish scholars of human osteology. There are several works focusing on sex/gender differentiation, as seen in relation to biological as well as social conditions (e.g. Iregren 1988a; 1988b; 1992a; 1992b).

CRITICAL POINTS

There are several themes that should be enlarged upon when the application of notions and theories is concerned. I will mention only briefly some of the problems and difficulties here. In the discussion of Iron Age burials, there are several papers on gender in recent and current Swedish archaeology which are not gender critical, but rather traditionalist, through their firm bipolar view of gender. This question is of an awkward nature, and I have tried to outline it more

thoroughly elsewhere (Hjørungdal 1994b).

I think it is important to pay attention to non-critical research areas of gender and burial because, intentionally or not, they reveal a traditionalist construction of gender and perhaps of cultural universes in general.

This seems also to be the problem with traditional theories referred to in discussions of exchange and scarce resources, as e.g. in Mats Burström's paper on silver hoards in Gotland, which he interpreted as bridewealth (Burström 1993). What is bride-wealth?

I would like to stress the point that notions like this should be discussed in a gender-critical light before we continue the application of them to archaeology. In traditional theories senior men are usually assigned the control over "scarce resources" like bridewealth, and as such, women are easily objectified, just "exchanged" or "bought." As Henrietta Moore (Moore 1988 :70 ff) points out, this question ought to be outlined from women's points of view as well. However, some notions which must be seen as related to this theme, namely, the polarity of exchanger/exchanged, have already been questioned by Gayle Rubin (Rubin 1975).

Another problem is astonishingly enough connected with the visualization of prehistoric women. My reason for making this a question here is, first, a statement made by Anne-Sofie Gräslund and, second, a conclusion drawn by Arwill-Nordbladh on the basis of her analyses of the Gothic Revival. Gräslund states that women in old-fashioned archaeology were more visible than they are within certain more modern directions focussing on power structures (Gräslund 1989). This might be part of the truth. However, Gräslund does not point to the questions of how images of women are represented, or to the ideologies behind representations, or to the consequences of uncritical images. The intention of making women visible, has not always had emancipatory

grounds, but rather the contrary. The movement of the Gothic Revival is, as pointed out by Arwill-Nordbladh, an example of this circumstance (e.g. Arwill-Nordbladh 1991a; 1991c). To this I can add my own conclusions drawn on the basis of investigations of early antiquarian classification of male/female burials, carried out in Mecklenburg-Schwerin from the 1830s on. Antiquarians of the Gothic Revival defined the theme of male/female in archaeology and constructed this model of gender through oppositional material criteria of e.g. weapon/sewing needle, respectively. Woman was indeed made visible through this way of looking at prehistoric sources. However, she was visible exclusively within the private sphere, as the eternally embroidering character shut up in a doll's house and as such having no impact on the public and political spheres of society. The material pair of weapon/sewing needle is a powerful metaphor for asymmetrical gender relations (cf. e.g. Hjørungdal 1994a). So might also be the case with other kinds of material items aiming at making gender visible and explicit. The images through which prehistoric women (and men) are made visible are accordingly worthy of a critical stance.

An interesting point has been made concerning questions of processual versus post-processual archaeology. In the paper written by Nordbladh & Yates, it is argued that gender was ignored by processual archaeologists (Nordbladh & Yates 1990: 222). On this question there seems to be an opposite opinion within Norwegian archaeology, as expressed by Dommasnes. In her outline, *New Archaeology* is treated as an important point of departure for the first phase of women's studies in Norwegian archaeology (Dommasnes 1992). There are different views on processual archaeology and gender, but this is the case with post-processual archaeology and gender as well. This is a topic which can be generated against the background of the Nordbladh & Yates paper,

as they discuss the question of subjectivity with reference to Lacan. It is worth noting that the Norwegian Professor Ericka Engelstad has later given a totally problematizing feminist critique of archaeological interpretations based on Lacan's theories of development of the subject. The consequence of Lacan's theories on the subject, are that this can only be a male subject, and the female does not exist as a subject at all (Engelstad 1991 with references). The fact that post-processual archaeology discusses gender does not mean that it is non-androcentric. In Engelstad's view it rather seems to be the opposite, according to her critique of British post-processual archaeology. The bottom line of her paper is that post-processualism should not continue in its present androcentric vein (Engelstad 1991:512). I think the few problems addressed here are among those one also must face in further discussions of gender-critical archaeologies.

PRESENT AND FUTURE

I think we can state that at present a gender critical-perspective in archaeology is taught at all universities as well as at some regional colleges in Sweden. How to teach it, and how to organize an education that is gender-critical all through, must be regarded as very vital questions as well as great challenges. During lectures on gender-critical issues, I have sometimes had the opportunity to notice something that might be of profound importance: I thought I was able to observe that students were discovering themselves as scientific subjects. He or she realizes that they are among the creators of archaeology, of presents and pasts within this realm of academia. The discovery of their own subject may express itself through discussions of themselves in a gendered reality, as private persons as well as scholars. There is no easy answer to the question of how to enlarge upon a gender-critical perspective in archaeological educational programmes (cf. Hjørungdal in prep.). From

archaeologists abroad we can get some inspiration through published training programmes and syllabae (Spector & Whelan 1988; Claassen 1992). There is, however, active work on the topic of gender and pedagogy in archaeology in Sweden as well. A seminar on how to teach archaeology gender critically took place during the autumn of 1994, but questions related to this were already suggested and debated at an archaeological pedagogical seminar in the spring of 1993. The Department of Archaeology and the Department of History at the University of Lund have in fact been collaborating already for a couple of years on issues of teaching a feminist perspective.

For more than a decade many seminar papers have been written on questions like woman's position in prehistory, male and female dress, burial, tools and division of work, as well as on engendered relations of power (cf. reference list "Seminar papers"). At most archaeology departments in the country there are also some students who are currently working on gender-critical seminar papers, and at most universities there are graduate students working on theses on gender-critical archaeology. One doctoral thesis (Hjørungdal 1991) and one master's thesis (Wennstedt Edvinger 1993) both of which are gender-critical in their views, have already been published. Further development of gender-critical teaching and learning

ought to make it feel easier to start working on gender-critical theses as well. This is a vital point concerning the future of gender-critical directions in archaeology.

CONCLUSIONS

This rather brief review addresses issues of gender in Swedish archaeological literature. Instead of going into details, I have tried to generate some problems and topics which ought to be more thoroughly investigated in future research. My attention has mainly focussed on explicitly gender-critical research, but I have also mentioned some works treating aspects of gender without questioning the meaning of this concept. I have made some critical remarks on concepts, questions and definitions which seem to be of a problematic nature, or, alternatively, which have not been sufficiently outlined. I have, however, hardly focussed on all questions and problems relevant to gender-critical perspectives. Currently it seems like re-interpretations of material culture is developing into an important topic, in Sweden as well as internationally. But taken together, there seems to be a lot of urgent as well as interesting questions to be enlarged upon in future research, concerning both past contexts and present scholarly milieus as well as histories of archaeology.

English revised by Laura Wrang.

REFERENCES

My ambition has been to include the complete number of gender-critical works within all areas of Swedish archaeology. This is why there are more references listed than one finds in the main text. There may also be relevant works which I unfortunately have overlooked. Foreign literature of vital importance to Swedish archaeology, or to the discussion I have presented here, is also included in the reference list.

- Adolfsson, G. & Lundström, I. 1993. *Den starka kvinnan. Från völva till häxa*. Museiarkeologi 6. SHM. Stockholm
- Andersson, H. 1990. Försummat perspektiv, eller...? *Kulturmiljövård* 3/1990
- Andrén, A. 1993. Doors to other worlds: Scandinavian death rituals in Gotlandic perspectives. *Journal of European Archaeology* 1/1993
- Arwill Nordbladh, E. 1987. Det dubbla budskapet

- hos Hanna Rydh. *K.A.N.* 4
- 1989. Oscar Montelius and the Liberation of Women. An Example of Archaeological Ideology and Early Swedish Women's Movement. In: Larsson, T.B. & Lundmark, H. (eds): *Approaches to Swedish Prehistory. A Spectrum of Perspectives in Contemporary Research*. B.A.R. International Series 500. Oxford.
 - 1990a. Oscar Montelius och kvinnans frigörelse. *Kulturmiljövård* 3/1990.
 - 1990b. Nyckelsymbolik i järnålderns kvinnogravar. *Fornvännen*.
 - 1990c. The Swedish Image of Viking Age woman: Stereotype, Generalization and Beyond. In: R. Samson (ed): *Social Approaches to Viking studies*. Cruithne Press. Glasgow.
 - 1991a. Det emancipatoriska arvet efter Oscar Montelius. *K.A.N.* 12.
 - 1991b. Review of Hjørungdal 1991: Det skjulte kjønn. *Tværtantene* 1991: 4.
 - 1993. Det förflutna en del av nuet. *Historiska Nyheter* Nr. 55.
 - 1994a. Begriper vi begreppen? Om androcentrismen i några vanliga analytiska begrepp. *META* 94:1.
 - in print. Om metaforens roll i en genderkonstruktion. *K.A.N.* 17.
 - in prep. Hanna Rydh. In: A Historiography of Women in European Archaeology. The Theoretical Archaeology group. University of Durham.
- Berggren, K. 1993. Spindle Whorls: Their Symbolism in the Villanovan Cemetery of Quattro Fontanili, Veii. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 1.
- Biörnstad, M. 1990. En riksantikvaries funderingar. *Kulturmiljövård* 3/90.
- Burström, M. 1993. Silver as Bridewealth. An Interpretation of Viking Silver Hoards on Gotland, Sweden. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 1.
- Claassen, C. 1992. Workshop 3: Teaching and Seeing Gender. In: Claassen, C. (ed): *Exploring Gender Through Archaeology. Selected Papers from the 1991 Boone Conference*. Monographs in World Archaeology No. 11. Prehistory Press. Madison Wisconsin.
- Coles, J. 1991. Sex on the rocks. Manligt, kvinnligt, mänskligt. *FYND* 2/1991.
- Dommasnes, L.H. 1987. Tanker rundt et program for arkeologisk kvinneforskning. *K.A.N.* 5.
- 1992. Two decades of Women in Prehistory and in Archaeology in Norway. A Review. *N.A.R.* Vol. 25, No. 1, 1992.
- Engelstad, E. 1991. Images of power and contradiction: feminist theory and postprocessual archaeology. *Antiquity* Vol. 65. No. 248. Sept. 1991.
- Engelstad, E. et al. 1992. Equity issues in Norwegian archaeology. *K.A.N.* 13-14.
- Fries, J. 1993. Zum Verhältnis zwischen traditioneller (deutscher) Archäologie und Matriarchatsforschung. In: *Bericht zur Tagung der Archäologinnen 1992 in Kiel*. Kiel.
- Fürst, E. 1988. *Kvinner i akademia - inntrengere i en mannskultur?* Oslo.
- Gejvall, N. G. 1970. The fisherman from Barum - mother of several children! *Fornvännen*.
- Gilchrist, R. 1993. "The Empress's New Clothes? Medieval Archaeology and the feminist critique: Gender in the medieval castle (paper in print).
- 1994a. *Gender and material culture. The archaeology of religious women*. Routledge.
 - 1994b. Gender as an analytical category: The archaeology of medieval nunneries. *META* 1994/1.
- Gräslund, A. S. 1989. "Gud hjälpe nu väl hennes själ". Om runstenskvinnorna, deras roll vid kristnandet och deras plats i familj och samhälle. *TOR* Vol. 22, 1988-1989.
- 1993. Valkyria, sköldmö, husfru - om vikingatidens kvinna. In: Sjøstedt, L. (red): *Den osynliga historien. Kvinnornas historia*. FRN Rapport 93 : 2. Stockholm.
- Gustafsson, A. 1988. Kvinnliga avbildningar under överpaleolitikum. *URD* 1-2, 1988.
- Gustin, I. & Sabo, K. 1994. Inledning. Kvinnor inom medeltidsarkeologi. *META* 94:1.
- Göransson, E. M. 1993. Kroppens idé i den yngre järnålderns bildkonst och gravskick. In: Burström, M. (red): *Pågående avhandlingsarbeten vid den Arkeologiska institutionen, Stockholms universitet, VT 1993*. SAR. Stockholm Archaeological Reports Nr. 26, 1993.
- 1994. The Virgin Mary and the Sacred Body. The Ideology of Gender Embodied in the Cistercian Church. *Current Swedish Archaeology* 2.
- Hastorf, Chr. A. 1991. Gender, Space and Food in Prehistory. In: Gero, J.M. & Conkey, M.W (eds): *Engendering Archaeology. Women and Prehistory*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.
- Hedelin, H. 1991. Några aspekter på innebörden av kvinnoarkeologi. *K.A.N.* 12.

- Hedengran, I. 1991. Att synliggöra människor. Figurer eller gestalter? Kring hållristningsforskningens förutsättningar. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Herner, E. 1991. Kvinnligt och manligt i bronsålderssamhället. Smycken och vapen utförda med skicklighet och skönhet. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Hjørungdal, T. 1985. Matriarkatet - myt och vision, begränsning och möjlighet. *Populär Arkeologi 3/1985*.
- 1986a. Women in the Archaeological Past. Rapport från TAG i Glasgow 1985. *K.A.N. 2*.
- 1986b. Rapport från International Conference on Women's History, Amsterdam, mars 1986. *Nytt om Kvinneforskning 4/1986*.
- 1986c. Presentation av "Kvinnenes Kulturhistorie". *Populär Arkeologi 2/1986*.
- 1988. Kan man identifiera kvinnors arbeid utifrån gravar? In: Iregren *et al.* (eds): *Gravskick och gravdata*. University of Lund, Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 32.
- 1989a. Noen aspekter på gravgods i eldre jernalder. Kan gravgods belyse kult? In: Larsson & Wyszomirska (eds): *Arkeologi och Religion*. University of Lund, Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 34.
- 1989b. Forhistoriens kvinner er blitt tydeligere. *Kvinnejournalen 1/1989*.
- 1990. Volva frå Os - forvaltar av ein lang tradisjon. *Arkeo 1/1990* (also printed in the daily newspaper *Os & Fusa-Posten, March 7th, 1992*).
- 1991. *Det skjulte kjønn. Patriarkal tradisjon og feministisk visjon i arkeologien belyst med fokus på en jernalderkontekst*. *Acta Archaeologica Lundensia 8:19*.
- 1992a. Mot ett nytt bilde av eldre jernalder. *Nytt om Kvinneforskning 1/1992*.
- 1992b. Från hjältinnor till genus. Fortid, arkeologi och könsmakt. *Häften för kritiska studier 2/1992*.
- 1992c. Om nokre reiskapar som var meir enn reiskapar. *Gavlen 2/1992*.
- 1993a. Feminist Archaeology in Scandinavia. A Summary. In: *Bericht zur Tagung der Archäologinnen 1992 in Kiel*. Kiel.
- 1993b. Fragment från västnorska grottor. *Grottan 3/1993*.
- 1994a. Antikvarien, synålen och svärdet. Forskningshistoriska aspekter på gravar och könsideologi. *Kontaktstencil XXXVII*. Umeå.
- 1994b. Poles Apart. Have There Been Any Male and Female Graves? *Current Swedish Archaeology 2*.
- 1994c. Genusperspektiv på arkeologins historia. Projektpresentation. *Kvinnovett 1994: 1*. Kvinnovetenskapligt forum, Umeå.
- 1994d. Synålar som uttryck för naturlig och evig kvinnlighet. Ett exempel från tysk 1800-tals arkeologi. In: "*Det dolda budskapet*". Arbetets Museum. Norrköping.
- n.d. 1. En gammal historia. Arkeologins mans- och kvinnogravar. Forthcoming in *Arkeologi i norr*. Umeå.
- n.d. 2. Kjønn og materiell kultur i arkeologien. Forthcoming in *K.A.N. 17*.
- n.d. 3. Early Iron Age in Western Norway. A Gender Critical Perspective. Forthcoming in Hill, J.D. (ed): *B.A.R. British Archaeological Reports*.
- in prep. Genusperspektivet. En kvalitet i arkeologiundervisningen. Forthcoming in *Konferensrapport. Kvalitéer i studier och utbildning*. Universitetspedagogisk konferens. Umeå 1995.
- Hylén, H. 1993. Review of Hjørungdal 1991: Det skjulte kjønn. *Folkets Historia Årg. 21 Nr. 4, 1993*.
- Iregren, E. 1988a. Människor i medeltid - historia och biologi i ett samhällsperspektiv. Ett planerat projekt vid avdelningen för medeltidsarkeologi vid Lunds universitet. In: Iregren *et al.* (eds): *Gravskick och gravdata*. University of Lund, Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 32.
- 1988b. Avbruten amning blev barnens död?: ett försök till tolkning av Västerhusmaterialet. *Populär Arkeologi*.
- 1992a. Kvinnor och barn under medeltid - ett antropologiskt perspektiv på några skelettmaterial. In: Lövkrona, I. (red): *Kvinnospår i medeltid*. Kvinnovetenskapliga studier 1. Lund University Press.
- 1992b. Scandinavian Women During the Medieval Period; Health, Childbirth and Childcare. *Collegium Antropologicum. Vol. 16, No. 1/1992*. Zagreb.
- Janzon, G. O. 1993. Tre gotländskor. *Historiska Nyheter Nr. 55*.
- Jennbert, K. 1984: *Den produktiva gåvan. Tradition och innovation i Sydskandinavien för omkring 5300 år sedan*. *Acta Archaeologica Lundensia 4:16*.
- 1991. Kvinnor och introduktion av odling. *K.A.N. 12*.

- Johnsen, B. 1991. En siffra i statistiken. *K.A.N. 12. Jämställd? 1984/85*. Resultat av RAÄ och SHMMs jämställdhetsenkät. Unpublished report. Stockholm.
- K.A.N. (Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge) No. 12. Special Issue on Swedish Archaeology. Kulturmiljövård 3/1990*. Tema: Ett annat perspektiv.
- Kästner, S. 1993. Abriss einer Forschungsgeschichte zum Themenkomplex "Matriarchat" aus archäologischer Sicht. In: *Bericht zur Tagung der Archäologinnen 1992 in Kiel*. Kiel.
- Lagerlöf, A. 1989. Dold ojämsliddhet i forskarsamhället. *Fornetid och Nutid 1989:18*.
- 1990. Vilken/vilkas arkeologi bedriver vi? Rapport från den kvinnoarkeologiska konferansen i Uppsala 6-8 nov. 1989. *Kulturmiljövård 3/90*.
 - 1991. Riksantikvarieämbetets Fornminnesavdelning. Funderingar kring jämställdhet. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Lindman, G. 1990. Arkeologin på 90-talet - Vad blir vårt bidrag? *K.A.N. 9-10*.
- Lundström, I. 1993. Kvinnan i labyrinthen. *Historiska Nyheter Nr. 55*.
- Magnus, B. 1990. Kvinner i kulturminnevernet - noen norske refleksjoner. *Kulturmiljövård 3/1990*.
- 1993. Den gullsmykkete kvinnen rakte ham begeret. *Historiska Nyheter nr. 55*.
- Magnusson, G. 1990. Kvinnors arbete - ett dolt kulturlandskap. *Kulturmiljövård 3/1990*.
- 1991a. Fornminnesinventeringen - av traditionen människors värld. *K.A.N. 12*.
 - 1991b. Kvinnor inom järnhanteringen. En kommentar till några äldre bilder. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Mandt, G. & Næss, J. R. 1986. Hvem skapte og gjensker vår fjerne fortid? Struktur og innhold i norsk arkeologi i perspektivet: Hvor mannlig er vitenskapen? *K.A.N. 3*.
- META. Medeltidsarkeologisk Tidskrift 1994:1*. Lund. Special issue on gender.
- Moore, H. 1988. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Polity Press.
- Nordbladh, J. 1991. Kvinnor och män i universitetens arkeologi. *K.A.N. 12*.
- 1991b. Ingen tobak - inget halleluja. Forskarutbildningens dilemma: mötesplats för frihetskamp och maktsträvanden. In: Larsson & Ryberg (red): *Arkeologi och makt*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 40.
- Nordbladh, J. & Yates, T. 1990. This Perfect Body, This Virgin Text: Between Sex and Gender in Archaeology. In: Bapty & Yates (eds): *Archaeology after Structuralism. Post-structuralism and the Practice of Archaeology*. Routledge London.
- Norr, S. 1991. Grundutbildningen i Uppsala 1965-1990. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Pérez, B. I. & Browall, H. 1992. *Arkeologi och exploatering. Betänkande av HUR-utredningen*. SOU 1992:137. Stockholm.
- Petré, B. 1993. Male and Female Finds and Symbols in Germanic Iron Age Graves. *Current Swedish Archaeology 1*.
- Pettersson, B. 1994. Kvinnor och män i Birka. *META 94:1*.
- Rubin, G. 1975. The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex. In: Reiter, R. (ed): *Toward an Anthropology of Women*. New York, Monthly Review Press.
- Ryberg, E. 1986. Hanna Rydh - en bortglömd forskare. *K.A.N. 2*.
- 1990. Hanna Rydh - förmedlare av förhistorien. *Fornvännen*.
- Spector, J.D. & Whelan, M.K. 1988. Incorporating Gender into Archaeology Courses. *K.A.N. 7*.
- Stjernquist, B. 1975. Kvinnans sociala ställning i forntiden. *LUM (Lunds Universitet Meddelar) Nr. 16, 1975*.
- Strömberg, A. 1993. *Male or Female? A methodological study of grave gifts as sex-indicators in Iron Age burials from Athens*. Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology and Literature. Pocket-book 123. Paul Åströms förlag. Partille.
- Strömberg, M. 1991. Min erfarenhet av att vara kvinnlig akademiker. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Svedin, M. 1991. Våndan att våga välja C-uppsats med feministisk inriktning!! *K.A.N. 12*.
- Tomasdotter-Hed, A. 1991. Behöver vi två arkeologiska vetenskaper? Om kvinnoarkeologins vara eller icke vara. *K.A.N. 12*.
- Thålin-Bergman, L. (ed) 1975. *O forna tiders kvinnor*. Stockholm.
- 1990. Arkeologi och kvinnor - kvinnor och arkeologi. *Kulturmiljövård 3/1990*.
- Ullén, I. 1993a. Den attraktiva makten. *Historiska Nyheter nr. 55*.
- 1993b. Bronsålderskomplexet vid Apalle, Uppland. In: Burström, M. (red): *Pågående avhandlingsarbeten vid den Arkeologiska institutionen, Stockholms universitet, VT 1993*.

- SAR. Stockholm Archaeological Reports Nr. 26, 1993.
- Welinder, S. 1986. Review of K.A.N., Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge 1. *Fornvännen*.
- 1987. Kvinnligt och manligt i mesoliticum. *K.A.N. 4*
- 1988. Review of Kyle, G. (ed) 1987: Handbok i svensk kvinnohistoria. *Fornvännen*.
- 1989a. Arkeologi med stort Q. *Universitetets Oldsaksamling. Årbok 1986/88*.
- 1989b. An experiment with the analysis of sex and gender of cremated bones. *TOR Vol. 22 1988-1989*.
- 1990. Det mångtydiga landskapet. *Kulturmiljö-vård 3/1990*.
- 1991a. Grundutbildningen vid Stockholms universitet. *K.A.N. 12*.
- 1991b. Doktorer i arkeologi på 1900-talet. *K.A.N. 12*.
- 1991c. Uppdragsverksamhetens säsongsanställda arbetskraft. *K.A.N. 12*.
- 1991d. Landsantikvarier och länsantikvarier. *K.A.N. 12*.
- 1991e. Fördummande förmedling. In: Larsson & Ryberg (red): *Arkeologi och makt*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 40.
- 1992. *Människor och landskap*. Societas Archaeologica Upsaliensis. Uppsala.
- 1993a. Pots, Females and Food. *Current Swedish Archaeology 1*.
- 1993b. Kvinnor i kinesisk arkeologi. *K.A.N. 15*.
- 1993c. Review of B. Sawyer 1992: Kvinnor och familj i det forntida och medeltida Skandinavien. Occasional Papers on Medieval Topics 6. Skara. *Fornvännen*.
- 1993d. *Miljö, kultur och kulturmiljö*. Stockholm.
- 1994. The Ethnoarchaeology of a Swedish Village. *Current Swedish Archaeology 2*.
- Wennstedt Edvinger, B. 1993. *Genus och djursymbolik. Om den norrländska fångstkulturens organisation med avseende på kön*. Arkeologiska Studier vid Umeå Universitet 1.
- Wienberg, J. 1993. Tavse romanske tårne. *META 1993: 3-4*.
- Wylie, A. 1992. Workplace issues for women in archaeology: the chilly climate. *K.A.N. 13-14*.

SEMINAR PAPERS

There are probably additional seminar papers touching upon the topic of gender in some way or other. The papers listed below explicitly mention gender, feminism, or male and female (burials).

- Andersson, E. 1993. *Jungfrun i tornet. Om kvinnor och kvinnoartefakter på Lindholmen*. Lund.
- Annuswer, B. 1983. *Vendeltida gotländska mansgravar. En källkritisk studie*. Uppsala.
- Brusling, A. 1992. *Döda män klär i rutigt - Mansdräkten under yngre järnålder*. Uppsala.
- Carlson, I. 1992. *Portabel konst - den bärbara människan under senpaleolitikum*. Lund.
- Carlsson, Y. 1993. *Kvinnan på Ire*. Stockholm.
- Enocson, E. 1989. *Rites de passage under yngre järnålder? En analys av några föremålskategorier i kvinnogravar från Lovö och Spånga socknar i Uppland*. Stockholm.
- Franzén, B. 1983. *En vapengrav från Lilla Vi, Djursdala sn i Småland under romersk järnålder. Vad var denna mans funktion/position i det småländska samhället?* Stockholm.
- Gidlöf, K. 1992. *Samekvinnans sociala ställning i äldre tid. Samiska gravar i Sverige och Norge under samisk järnålder*. Lund.
- Gustafsson, J. 1993. *Från Hanna Rydh till Märta Strömberg. En studie av kvinnors insatser inom svensk arkeologi*. Uppsala.
- Gustafsson, A. & Jonsson, H. 1990. *Kvinnor, män och makt*. Göteborg.
- Hulth, H. & Jahn, K. 1992. *Den lilla skillnaden. Om könsmarkeringar i järnåldersgravar*. Uppsala.
- Josefson, K. 1992. *Nycklarna i de gotländska gravarna från folkvandringstid*. Lund.
- Kjebon, B. 1992. *Egtvedflickans roll i bronsålderns samhälle. En jämförande studie med utgångspunkt från bronsstatyetter och hållristningar*. Stockholm.
- Knutman, R. 1989. *Venus-statyetter*. Lund.
- Knutsson, H. 1992. *En källkritisk studie av arkeologisk könsbedömning utifrån de skånska stridsyxegravarna i Mats Malmers "Jungneolitische Studien"*. Lund.
- Kyhllberg, K. 1983. *Kvinnor och män i uppländska runinskrifter - en metodstudie*. Stockholm.
- Lindvall, C. & Tibe, A.M. 1993. *Familjestrukturen på Lundagravfältet*. Lund.
- Matthing, O. 1992. *Vendeltida vapengravar på Gotland; bönder, krigare eller stormän?* Uppsala.
- Norlander, Å. & Pedersen, V. 1985. *Kvinnans dräkt*.

- skick och samhällsställning i Danmark under äldre bronsålder. Göteborg.*
- Olsson, M. 1991. *Som de levde begravdes de och - - -? Graven som spegelbild av arbetsdelning och status mellan man och kvinna under stenåldern. Lund.*
- Pettersson, B. 1994. *Indiana Jones på Birka. Om arkeologi och popularisering. Lund.*
- Rodenborg, E. 1990. *Neolitiska kvinnostatyetter: Gudinneavbildningar eller barnleksaker?* Stockholm.
- Ross, K. 1993. *Kvinnans roll i bronsålderns jordbruksamhälle. Uppsala.*
- Sanell, Ch. 1992. *Hur var den vikingatida kvinnan klädd? En jämförelse mellan arkeologisk forskning och vad som visas på museerna. Umeå.*
- Stål, E. & Stål, Y. 1981. *Gravfynd - könsbestämning - sysselsättning - könsroll? Göteborg.*
- Wennstedt, B. 1983. *En semiotisk bearbetning av kvinnodräkten i Birka. Umeå.*

