

Edited by:

**JULIA KATHARINA KOCH, WIEBKE KIRLEIS**

# **GENDER TRANSFORMATIONS**

in Prehistoric and Archaic Societies





This is a free offprint – as with all our publications the entire book is freely accessible on our website, and is available in print or as PDF e-book.

[www.sidestone.com](http://www.sidestone.com)

Edited by:

**JULIA KATHARINA KOCH, WIEBKE KIRLEIS**

# **GENDER TRANSFORMATIONS**

in Prehistoric and Archaic Societies

© 2019 Individual authors

Published by Sidestone Press, Leiden

[www.sidestone.com](http://www.sidestone.com)

Imprint: Sidestone Press Academics

All articles in this publication have been peer-reviewed.

For more information see [www.sidestone.nl](http://www.sidestone.nl)

Layout & cover design: CRC 1266/Carsten Reckweg and Sidestone Press

Cover images: Carsten Reckweg. – In the background a photo of the

CRC1266-excavation of a Bronze Age burial mound near Bornhöved (LA117), Kr. Segeberg, Germany, in summer/autumn 2018. The leadership was taken over by 2 women, the team also included 10 women and 11 men, of whom the female staff were present for a total of 372 days and the male for 274 days.

Text editors: Julia Katharina Koch and Suzanne Needs-Howarth

ISSN 2590-1222

ISBN 978-90-8890-821-7 (softcover)

ISBN 978-90-8890-822-4 (hardcover)

ISBN 978-90-8890-823-1 (PDF e-book)

The STPAS publications originate from or are involved with the Collaborative Research Centre 1266, which is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation; Projektnummer 2901391021 – SFB 1266).

## Preface of the series editors

With this book series, the Collaborative Research Centre *Scales of Transformation: Human-Environmental Interaction in Prehistoric and Archaic Societies* (CRC 1266) at Kiel University enables the bundled presentation of current research outcomes of the multiple aspects of socio-environmental transformations in ancient societies. As editors of this publication platform, we are pleased to be able to publish monographs with detailed basic data and comprehensive interpretations from different case studies and landscapes as well as the extensive output from numerous scientific meetings and international workshops.

The book series is dedicated to the fundamental research questions of CRC 1266, dealing with transformations on different temporal, spatial and social scales, here defined as processes leading to a substantial and enduring reorganization of socio-environmental interaction patterns. What are the substantial transformations that describe human development from 15,000 years ago to the beginning of the Common Era? How did interactions between the natural environment and human populations change over time? What role did humans play as cognitive actors trying to deal with changing social and environmental conditions? Which factors triggered the transformations that led to substantial societal and economic inequality?

The understanding of human practices within often intertwined social and environmental contexts is one of the most fundamental aspects of archaeological research. Moreover, in current debates, the dynamics and feedback involved in human-environmental relationships have become a major issue, particularly when looking at the detectable and sometimes devastating consequences of human interference with nature. Archaeology, with its long-term perspective on human societies and landscapes, is in the unique position to trace and link comparable phenomena in the past, to study human involvement with the natural environment, to investigate the impact of humans on nature, and to outline the consequences of environmental change on human societies. Modern interdisciplinary research enables us to reach beyond simplistic monocausal lines of explanation and overcome evolutionary perspectives. Looking at the period from 15,000 to 1 BCE, CRC 1266 takes a diachronic view in order to investigate transformations involved in the development of Late Pleistocene hunter-gatherers, horticulturalists, early agriculturalists, early metallurgists as well as early state societies, thus covering a wide array of societal formations and environmental conditions.

The volume *Gender Transformations in Prehistoric and Archaic Societies* shows that gender matters on all societal levels and throughout times; be it in reconstructed social and economic organisation in research on prehistoric times, in the investigation and recent perception of women's roles in past and modern societies or as expressed in the still low representation of females in higher academic positions of knowledge production in archaeology. The proceedings are the outcome of the inter-

national Workshop on *Gender Transformations in Prehistoric and Archaic Societies*, which took place from 8-10 March 2018 in Kiel, Germany, organised within the framework of CRC 1266 *Scales of Transformation*. The workshop provided a platform to stimulate discussions on gender transformations in the past and the effects of gender inequality on scientific discourses in our research community, which was much appreciated by the numerous international participants, who promoted and enjoyed the cross-cultural academic exchange.

This volume is being presented in the 21st century, about 100 years after female suffrage was established in Germany. Nevertheless, feminists are still confronted with draw-back mechanisms, leading, *e.g.*, in Switzerland to demonstrations by women, who continue to have to demand equal pay, or in Germany, where females once more have to fight for sexual self-determination because gynaecologists are juristically punished if they inform the public about medical treatment concerning abortion. This shows that even today, gender equality and gender freedom are not self-evident, and that their necessity has to actively be kept alive in the general consciousness. Gender transformations, the topic of the workshop and this volume, also accompany our discussions on societal and environmental transformations, in particular when dealing, *e.g.*, with material culture or settlement patterns in the past, but also with the question of scientific actors and gendered bias in doing research. By gendering the archaeological discussion on transformation processes within the framework of our CRC, we want to assimilate and stimulate the impulses of gender-sensitive research and processes that are currently on the European and the worldwide agenda.

We are very thankful, in particular to Julia Katharina Koch, for the organisation of the workshop and for her engagement with the editing of this book. Her expertise in gender archaeology and her long-lasting engagement with the German association *FemArc e. V.* and the EAA-community *Archaeology and Gender in Europe* (AGE) enabled her to bundle an impressive number of contributions on gender transformations for this volume. We are especially grateful to Nicole Schwerdtfeger and Carsten Reckweg for the preparation of the figures for publication and to Katharina Fuchs and Hermann Gorbahn for controlling the editing flow and for further support with technical and communication issues. We also wish to thank Karsten Wentink, Corné van Woerdekom and Eric van den Bandt from Sidestone Press for their responsive support in realizing this volume.

*Wiebke Kirleis and Johannes Müller*

# Contents

<b>Preface of the series editors</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction to gender transformations</b> <i>Julia Katharina Koch and Wiebke Kirleis</i>	<b>11</b>
<b>1 Gendering fieldwork</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Matters of gender in the Kerameikos excavation in Athens</b> <i>Jutta Stroszeck</i>	<b>21</b>
<b>Women in the field. Preliminary insights from images of archaeology in Portugal in the 1960s and the 1970s.</b> <b>A first essay</b> <i>Ana Cristina Martins</i>	<b>43</b>
<b>Gendered and diversified fieldwork classes in prehistoric archaeology? An examination of and a perspective on Bachelor study programs of German universities</b> <i>Doris Gutsmedl-Schümann</i>	<b>65</b>
<b>'Fieldwork is not the proper preserve of a lady'. Gendered images of archaeologists from textbooks to social media</b> <i>Jana Esther Fries</i>	<b>93</b>
<b>2 Tracing gender transformations</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>2.1 In methodology</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>What is gender transformation, where does it take place, and why? Reflections from archaeology</b> <i>Marie Louise Stig Sørensen</i>	<b>111</b>
<b>Osteology defines sex and archaeology defines gender? Insights from physical anthropology</b> <i>Johanna Kranzbühler</i>	<b>125</b>

<b>Gender in Linearbandkeramik research. Traditional approaches and new avenues</b>	<b>133</b>
<i>Nils Müller-Scheeßel</i>	
<b>2.2 In burials</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>Changing gender perception from the Mesolithic to the beginning of the Middle Neolithic</b>	<b>155</b>
<i>Daniela Nordholz</i>	
<b>Making the invisible visible. Expressing gender in mortuary practices in north-eastern Hungary in the 5th millennium BCE</b>	<b>183</b>
<i>Alexandra Anders and Emese Gyöngyvér Nagy</i>	
<b>Copper Age transformations in gender identities. An Essay</b>	<b>205</b>
<i>Jan Turek</i>	
<b>Gender symbolism in female graves of the Bronze Age evidenced by the materials from the Lisakovsk burial complex of the Andronovo cultural horizon</b>	<b>221</b>
<i>Emma R. Usmanova and Marina K. Lachkova</i>	
<b>Male gender identity during the Ural Bronze Age. On the way down?</b>	<b>241</b>
<i>Natalia Berseneva</i>	
<b>Transformations in a woman's life in prehistoric and archaic societies of the Scythians and the Kalmyks</b>	<b>261</b>
<i>Maria Ochir-Goryaeva</i>	
<b>Tracing gender in funerary data. The case study of elite graves in the North-Alpine complex (Late Bronze Age to La Tène B)</b>	<b>275</b>
<i>Caroline Trémeaud</i>	
<b>2.3 In cultural landscapes</b>	<b>295</b>
<b>Social manipulation of gender identities in Early Iron Age Latium Vetus (Italy)</b>	<b>297</b>
<i>Ilona Venderbos</i>	
<b>Time- and space-related genders and changing social roles. A case study from Archaic southern Italy</b>	<b>315</b>
<i>Christian Heitz</i>	



<b>2.4 In ritual and art</b>	<b>339</b>
<b>'Shaman' burials in prehistoric Europe. Gendered images?</b>	<b>341</b>
<i>Nataliia Mykhailova</i>	
<b>Part-time females and full-time specialists? Identifying gender roles in ritual behaviour and archaeological remains</b>	<b>363</b>
<i>Andy Reymann</i>	
<b>Beyond gender. Approaches to anthropomorphic imagery in prehistoric central Anatolia</b>	<b>381</b>
<i>Aysel Arslan</i>	
<b>Art and gender. The case study of enamelling in continental Europe (4th-3rd century BCE)</b>	<b>403</b>
<i>Virginie Defente</i>	
<b>3 Gendering and shaping the environment</b>	<b>417</b>
<b>Gender and the environment in archaeology. A discussion</b>	<b>419</b>
<i>Julia Katharina Koch and Oliver Nakoinz</i>	
<b>The gender division of labour during the proto-Elamite period in late 4th millennium BCE Iran. A case study from Tepe Sofalin in Iranian Central Plateau</b>	<b>423</b>
<i>Rouhollah Yousefi Zoshk, Saeed Baghizadeh, and Donya Etemadifar</i>	
<b>Change and continuity. Gender and flint knapping activities during the Neolithic in the Paris basin</b>	<b>435</b>
<i>Anne Augereau</i>	
<b>Labour organisation between horticulture and agriculture. Two separate worlds?</b>	<b>459</b>
<i>Wiebke Kirleis</i>	
<b>The construction of space and gender in prehistory. An approach to the Chalcolithic walled enclosures of Iberia</b>	<b>477</b>
<i>Ana M. Vale</i>	
<b>Contributors</b>	<b>493</b>



# Women in the field. Preliminary insights from images of archaeology in Portugal in the 1960s and the 1970s. A first essay

*Ana Cristina Martins*

*Magis movent exempla quam verba*

## Abstract

Between the end of the 1960s and 1974, Portugal experienced a sort of political ‘spring’ (Primavera Marcelista). It started with the final illness of the dictator António de O. Salazar (d. 1970) and ended when the authoritarian Estado Novo government that he had established in 1933 was overthrown (Barreto 2000; Otero 2000). It was a time for hope and adventure, individual and collective, as, for the first time since the end of the 1950s, new ideologies, new theoretical frameworks, and new ways of working began to be introduced in the country, mainly thanks to a generation of intellectuals who went abroad to study at Western European and American universities. Archaeology was no exception, opening the way to international collaboration, in order to update theories, methodologies, and methods. This new era for this science in the country was only possible due to the commitment of the ‘transition generation’ of archaeologists, who constituted a bridge to new ways of thinking the past, of doing fieldwork, and of analysing the excavated data. The intellectual elites followed the new foreign theoretical frameworks and were eager to apply them in their everyday life. Even so, Portuguese society remained strongly conservative overall, especially concerning women. Despite this conservatism, a growing number of young women began studying archaeology, doing fieldwork, travelling abroad to update their knowledge, and collaborating with foreign colleagues.

Who were these women? What were their social and economic backgrounds? These are some of the questions I intend to answer in this paper. In addition, I aim to comprehend the reasons for some behavioural differences observed between female and male archaeologists, applying the Panofsky method of image interpretation (Panofsky 1939), using photographs as a primary historical source.

**Keywords:** *Portugal, history of archaeology, history of women, image interpretation*

**Ana Cristina Martins**

Institute of Contemporary History  
NOVA FCSH – Évora University Pole  
Universidade de Évora  
Palácio do Vimioso  
Largo Marquês de Marialva  
Apart. 94  
7002-554 Évora  
Portugal  
acmartins@uevora.pt  
ana.c.martins@zonmail.pt

## Some first thoughts, doubts, and possible answers

Writing about women in Portuguese archaeology is a massive exercise for a number of reasons. The first reason is that there are, as yet, few archaeologists dealing with it, which I connect to the insufficiency of women and gender studies in university curricula – a circumstance that I think should be analysed by different experts. The second reason is tightly linked to the first, namely, a silent disregarding for the theme, especially from most archaeological leaders in the country, including women, women who are reproducing – probably unconsciously – male narratives to ensure their university positions. The third reason is that there is a general understanding of gender and women's studies as exclusively female issues, which leads to unwished-for research 'ghettos'. But, knowing this, most Portuguese historians, of all genders, seem to continue to replicate male discourses – narratives that tend to ignore women's historical reality, even though there is a women's history to be encompassed by world history. Unless we stop replicating these discourses, women will remain accomplices – although involuntarily – of a world historiography they did not shape, live, represent, or write.

There are some Portuguese university groups working very seriously on women's issues. However, they are mostly focused on sex and gender equality problems, women and health care, sexual liberty, education, and labour – topics usually analysed from a sociological and a constitutional point of view, as they became central in Portuguese society after the Revolution of 25 April 1974. In the meantime, some of women's political, economic, and social requirements had already been fulfilled. Others, however, still need to be accomplished, even though women are the main workforce in the country. More than that, Portugal ranks fourth among the European Union (EU) countries in terms of proportion of women scientists and technicians, and the three main private cultural and scientific foundations (Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Fundação de Serralves, and Fundação Champallimaud) are headed by women (EUROSTAT data 2017). But inequality is still a problem, as mentalities are not changing as quickly as the legislation.

There are also universities comprising research groups more focused on the role played by women in the arts, literature, higher education, health care, suffragism, and the First World War. What about women in science? It seems a subject that does not draw as much attention as it does in other countries. Why? Maybe this national peculiarity can be explained by the absence of the second-wave feminism in the country due to the totalitarian and patriarchal regime of the Estado Novo (New State) (Vicente 2000; Torgal 2009). But two other phenomena may also have played a role in this process: the complex return of socially more liberal and urban Portuguese citizens from the former colonies (by then already labelled 'Overseas Provinces') following their independence, and the rapid adoption of a democratic constitution based – in theory – on equal rights for everybody (Silva 2000). Three events that somehow persuaded women to become more aware of their social role, of their role as an important workforce and, last but not the least, of their role as an important piece in the national political scenario. Their voices began to matter. And the proportion of women in secondary schools and colleges grew significantly over the past four decades.

I suspect that, because they did not live through this history and since women scientists now predominate in the country, the post-Revolution generations do not understand just how relevant it can be to study the history of women in science, at least not quantitatively. As for the top scientific positions, they are still occupied by men, even if this picture is also gradually changing. For instance, most national museums – archaeological ones included – are headed by men. And this is just one example of this sort of 'transition time', when most of the population remains ruled

by a gender (male) minority, as it has been throughout centuries. Most women do not even recognise how they continue to unquestioningly duplicate theories and ways of looking at the surrounding world. What is more, most women make almost no effort to compose other narratives resulting from new ways of seeing and from approaching life more in line with some social (Western) realities.

And this is a sensitive aspect to the history analysed in this paper: are there different ways of analysing the same phenomena, depending on whether one is a woman or a man? Do they think differently? Do they see things and approach things differently? Do they interpret things differently simply because of their biological sex? Or do they do so because they are the product of centuries of reproducing and transmitting, generation upon generation, the same ideas, based on the same life experiences, and therefore the same views and approaches? Regardless of the reasons, something is changing – and it must change, since more than a half of the world's population lives, sees, feels, and acts differently each day. And each day shows them that there is another way than the male way of approaching, analysing, and solving the same situations.

## **What about archaeology?**

In those (Western) countries where second-wave (and even third-wave) feminism was rooted deeply, archaeology became a very interesting research field, as it encouraged researchers to unveil women archaeologists and the role they played in the development of multiple aspects of archaeology, from fieldwork to museum studies (Frink and Weedman 2006). Additionally, it opened the way to approach the past from a feminist point of view while scrutinising the origin of some theories and even the language and the iconography (re)produced in compendiums, monographs, journals, newspapers, didactic material, movies, museum exhibitions, museum catalogues, and oral and/or poster presentations. And the conclusion was that the past seemed to be very similar to the most recent present. In fact, there was a predominant androcentric idea of that same past transferred almost unaltered to daily life, embodying almost every angle of our day-to-day life. On the other hand, there is an unconscious anachronism in analysing the past from our contemporary perspective. Can historians interpret the past otherwise? Or is the past always contemporaneous?

Still, this anachronical historical approach seemed no longer fit the reality of those (Western, mainly Anglo-Saxon and French) times. That is also why the generation of scholars graduating by the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s opened a Pandora's box from which are being now pulled such themes as the domestic dimension of life, always devalued, together with the role of women in cultural exchange, namely, through marriage politics, and rituals. Historians of archaeology are now facing and comprehending these new approaches in some way thanks to the so-called 'Third Science Revolution in Archaeology' (Kristiansen 2014, 24). At the same time, regional, national, and transnational projects on women in archaeology are being financed by the EU to reinforce equality in EU society and to underline the relevance of women's multiple roles.

## **What about women in archaeology in Portugal?**

In 1996, Susana Oliveira Jorge and Vítor Oliveira Jorge wrote the first essay on Portuguese women archaeologists (Jorge and Jorge 1996) – an attempt that did not seem to gain the interest of their fellow archaeologists and was seen more as an extravagance than a real archaeological exercise – because it was based on archival research and not on hard fieldwork (when most archaeologists refer to fieldwork, they do not mean archives and libraries). It is most impressive that, although most senior archaeologists have dedicated one or two papers to the history of archae-

ology in Portugal – while almost never mentioning the presence and contribution of women – they did not consider this history as a valid basis for future research projects. Why? Is it possible that they evaluated the history of archaeology as a prevalent domain for historians, and not so much for archaeologists? Probably, yes. But it is also possible to understand the late inclusion – compared with other countries – of the history of archaeology in Portuguese university curricula as a function of the priority given to fieldwork.

The history of archaeology should not be just one subdiscipline. It should play its own role within research units, contributing to interdisciplinary and transversal activities as much as possible. This is also why we could expect young scholars to be motivated to do history of archaeology. But they are not; instead most of them feel it a waste of time, unless it clarifies issues related to specific sites, collections, and artefacts they are studying. Only then do young scholars recognise its relevance, as biologists do regarding history of biology, anthropologists do regarding anthropology, or museologists do regarding museology.

In short, we identify the absence of women and gender studies in Portuguese archaeological curricula with the still weak status of the history of archaeology in these same curricula, as it continues to be regarded more as a dilettante exercise within the archaeological community. Additionally, I suspect that most Portuguese students and some professors – mainly male – have never read an essay on women, gender, and archaeology. Is this a strong statement? Maybe it is. But, how also can I explain, for instance, the fact that they constantly mix up sex and gender?

In 2017, my colleagues and I organised the second international seminar and workshop on gender and archaeology in Portugal. The time gap between that workshop and the first was three years. And there were almost no differences. To start with, the roster of Portuguese speakers was almost the same. This means that, contrary to the initial motivation and expectation, the impact of the first workshop was zero. More surprisingly, however, was the non-attendance of professors and students during the sessions. How can and how should I analyse this circumstance? Can I state that they do not care about this issue? If so, why? Is it because (as heard from some male colleagues) this is a women's affair – meaning that people ignored the gender aspect and therefore thought it not worthy of academic awareness? But even if I can understand – but hardly accept – this kind of reaction and response from older academics, I do not comprehend the disinterest shown by younger students. Is it because they follow, in this matter, as in many others, the thoughts of their professors? But some of these professors are women...

If the recurrent oral narrative spread in university corridors – not so in classrooms – is that this is a women's affair (to avoid saying 'feminist', in a pejorative way), then it is understandable that women professors do not try to officially change this view, as male professors continue to dominate candidate juries. It might be very clarifying to analyse the iconography of homepages of certain archaeological research centres, as they are full of sexist issues (even if unconscious): men prevailing in leading roles, mostly in fieldwork. I will scrutinise this subject elsewhere, in forthcoming essays and papers.

## Portuguese women in the field (a brief glimpse)

Women in the field were a serious and complex issue, not only in Portugal, but in every part of the Western world (Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen 1998; Sørensen 2000) – elite women, that is, as peasants and other professional categories, were of course used to manual labour. The nobility, especially the rural nobility, was well acquainted with peasants and looked after – in a paternalistic way – the people working and living on their land, that is, within their power geographies. And elite women

were getting used to travelling abroad, even if with chaperones, with their parents or brothers, to complete the 'Grand tour' (Colletta 2015). Nevertheless, the problem with women in the field emerged (not so) surprisingly with the establishment of Liberalism and with the bourgeois mentality. Interesting that it was botany which conferred some individual freedom on women (Page and Smith 2011). While walking in their own gentry properties and gardens, they collected plants and built a sort of domestic herbarium for their own pleasure, but also for the instruction of their family members, especially the youngest ones, usually their brothers, sons, or nephews. In fact, it was a sort of 'women's' work, as it implied inventorying, storing, and sometimes drawing and working in watercolour, which accorded with their education profile and with what (high) society expected from them.

Practising archaeology – as geology, for instance – was another thing (Burek and Higgs 2007). Some women were rich enough to bypass all social conventions and even gain the admiration of both women and men (but mostly the jealousy of women). Some were spies (Lukitz 2006) with their path opened, secured, and assured by top politicians, diplomats, and officers; some were married to archaeologists. Only exceptionally were they simple adventurers with nothing to lose, no money, no social condition, no family, no honour, being free in their search for (presumably) happiness.

Portuguese archaeology was a male occupation, at least during the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th century. This is not to say that women were completely absent from archaeology. Besides attending conferences and congresses, becoming members of erudite societies (usually as wives and/or daughters of male associates), there is at least one example of a woman, Amélie de Clarange Lucotte, who drew and created watercolours of some of the artefacts discovered by her husband, the archaeologist Sebastião Estácio da Veiga (1828-1891; Cardoso 2007). And there is a peculiarity that may explain this exception in such a conservative society as the Portuguese, by the end of the nineteenth century: She came from a foreign military family with strong cultural interests. But mostly archaeology was not a woman's job.

Not even the Republican regime would change this scenario, despite the role played by women during and after the First World War. Women went into nursing or teaching primary school. Eventually, they could also become secretaries. But, once again, we are talking about the elites, since most women worked at home or in the fields and factories. But even for the elites, almost the only way for a woman to be able to travel and participate in scientific research was for her to get married to a scientist liberal enough to take his wife with him. That was the case for the botanist and professor at the University of Coimbra, Luís W. Carriço (1886-1937), who went with his wife to Angola at the end of the 1920s (Martins 2014a; 2014b). It is not known what her real role was during this 'scientific mission', besides being his wife. The known photographs of her during their travels do not show a woman really prepared for fieldwork.

What I do know for sure is that, between 1946 and 1947, the Anthropological and Ethnological Mission to Guinea – organised by the Board for Overseas Geographic Missions and Scientific Research (BOGMSR), supervised by the physician, anthropologist, prehistorian, politician, and professor at the University of Porto António Augusto Esteves Mendes Correia (1888-1960) (Martins 2011b), and headed by one of his foremost disciples, the zoologist Amílcar Mateus – included a female zoologist, Mateus's wife, Emília de Oliveira Mateus (Martins 2014b; 2016b), who, as a scientist, played a role in the mission additional to that of being a wife, wearing male clothing more suitable to fieldwork, which she also carried out. Additionally, she collaborated in an archaeological excavation in Guinea and published papers together with her husband after returning to the metropolis. And her case was not the only one of its kind.



Other research couples were already identified in the history of science in Portugal, some of them working on the same BOGMSR. There were other examples, from universities, and even women who always signed their presentations, papers, and monographs with their unmarried surnames. Most of them were botanists and zoologists, and they worked mainly in gardens, herbariums, zoos, and laboratories. A minority, though, stayed away from home, sometimes in the middle of nowhere surrounded by unknown people and – what was more – by men. Others healed strangers. The human sciences seemed to be the exception to this pattern: history, languages, literature, philosophy, and geography, although especially physical geography was not particularly desirable for young women. What about the arts? They were complicated for women during the extremely conservative and moralistic Estado Novo. Nonetheless, women and men worked together, for instance, in the same laboratories, museums, or libraries, a fact that can help us to understand why women did not feel particularly gender discriminated against, and why it became apparently so easy for them to join their male companions during the Primavera Marcelista ('Marcelo's Spring') and the post-revolutionary period (see below).

## Women in archaeology in Portugal until the 1950s (another brief vision)

In addition to learning about the woman designer and watercolourist mentioned above and about the scarce female attendees at scientific meetings and female members of erudite societies, I can also use postcards to identify the link between women and archaeology, mainly representing dolmens – a central topic in Western archaeological debate between the end of the 19th century and the middle of the 20th century – where men and women, usually peasants, were used as a scale. This method of using humans for scale was also applied by foreign archaeologists, such as Georg Leisner (1870-1957), who came to Portugal to study the megaliths thanks to the support of the German Archaeological Institute (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut; DAI, founded in 1829). Precisely one of his photographs from the 1930s (<arachne.uni-koeln.de/item/objekt/176173>, photo: D-DAI-MAD-LEIG-LEI-03-006\_176173, retrieved 5 May 2019) shows his wife, Vera Leisner (1885-1972), seated to indicate the scale of a megalithic monument (Anta de Melriço, Castelo de Vide), who was a much-respected archaeologist, excavating, presenting, and publishing together with Portuguese archaeologists (Bohrer 2011).

In the meantime, the country hosted conferences from foreign experts, including women, as was the case for Jacquetta Hawkes (1910-1996; Cooke 2013), invited to give presentations in Lisbon about the Roman period, her academic speciality. Probably there are more examples such as this one, but finding them will require 'excavating' many more archives, as will finding out about their work and the purpose of their voyage.

José Leite de Vasconcelos (1858-1941), the mastermind and first director of what is nowadays called the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia (National Archaeological Museum, founded in 1893), hired Rosa Capeans (1894-1985), a former student at the Faculty of Arts, University of Lisbon, where he taught philology, epigraphy, numismatics, and archaeology, to work with him, mostly in the museum's library. Both a museum and a library could be considered perfect professional spots for women. Gradually, though, she began to accomplish other duties, especially under the supervision of the second museum director, Manuel Heleno (1894-1970), who seemed to make no distinction between proficient female and male students. More than that, he was able to hire Irisalva Moita (1924-2009) as an assistant professor at the beginning of the 1950s. In addition, Heleno encouraged his students – both male and female – to write their undergraduate thesis on materials stored in the



museum, in order to have them studied. He incentivised students to present oral papers and to publish, especially within the Instituto de História, Arqueologia e Etnografia (Institute for History, Archaeology and Ethnography), founded by him at the beginning of the 1930s to compete with the prestigious Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses (Association of Portuguese Archaeologists [AAP], founded in 1863). Other female students worked there as volunteers, cleaning, cataloguing, inventorying, and exhibiting collections (Bugalhão 2013).

Oddly, as far as we know, Heleno never recommended that his female students go abroad for specialisation. This endorsement came from other professors and experts. This was the case for Maria de Lourdes Costa Artur (1924-2006), belonging to a wealthy liberal family, who alone decided to become a major specialist in the Roman period and museum studies. This paper is not about her and her story, which is already partially published, based on previously unknown archival material (Martins 2016b). Nevertheless, she is the inspiration for the exercise I intend to undertake here. So, let's begin.

## Semiotic and semantic analysis I (one more brief insight)

Costa Artur worked with other archaeologists besides Heleno. Manuel Afonso do Paço (1895-1968) was one of them. And it was thanks to him that she obtained a grant from the Instituto para a Alta Cultura (Institute for High Culture; 1936-1952) to go to Madrid (Martins 2016b).

Together with Paço and Eugénio Jalhay (1891-1950), Costa Artur excavated the chalcolithic site of Vila Nova de São Pedro, near Azambuja, northern Lisbon (Cardoso and Ribeiro 2013), a site that is well known in Portugal.

Some of the photographs taken during the fieldwork allow researchers to analyse them from a semiotically and semantically (= heuristically and hermeneutically/iconographically and iconologically) point of view, according to coeval social parameters (Ruck and Slunecko 2008). I will apply the Panofsky method of image interpretation (Panofsky 1939), analysing the chosen photographs (= objects) separately at three levels: (1) first (= *primary* or *natural*), the factual description of what we see; (2) second (= *secondary* or *conventional*), the recognition of the events taking place in the images; and (3) third (= *intrinsic*), the disclosing of the inherent historical contexts.

As I did with the Mission to former Portuguese Guinea mentioned above, I will scrutinise these photographs not just as mere illustrations or complements of a certain written narrative. On the contrary, I will examine them exactly as they are, as a primary source, an imagetic narrative, 'written' in a specific historical context. This means that photographs (= images) are much more than 'mere' bi-dimensional objects. In fact, they are more than random sources. Just like any other depiction and audio-visual material photographs were created with a specific purpose in mind (sometimes unconsciously), and that is why they must be considered by historians, in general, following the methodology of historians of art, visual culture, and museum studies, not to mention anthropologists and ethnographers (Bergstein 2010; Pinney 2011; Sheehan 2015), or even archaeologists, and historians of archaeology (Smiles and Moser 2008).

Each photograph can tell us a lot about several aspects of individual and collective daily life. They just must be questioned by people searching for specific data; by people capable of making them talk, of transforming their supposed static, iconographic narrative into a written language. Photographs allow distinctive polysemic analyses, while their immateriality can unveil an emotional palimpsest. Furthermore, it is an imagetic narrative that (re)creates reality. That is why, as with any



Figure 1. Vila Nova de São Pedro (Portugal). Excavation team, beginning of the 1950s (photograph: unknown; Archive Ana C. Martins).

other kinds of record, we should not decontextualise them. Otherwise, we will never grasp their real sense and purpose, and we will never totally understand their paratext. In addition to the identification of the inherent contexts and actors, we should recognise the text and the pretext, as every image generates a narrative, whether oral or written (Joly 2000). Nevertheless, we should never forget that such analysis is always individual, and therefore full of subjectivities, especially because, most of the time, we do not know who took the photographs and for which purpose.

So, in almost every photograph I have selected to point up my own ‘narrative’ I am dealing with a discursive, interdiscursive, and metadiscursive material – material full of its own scenarios and language codes (= body language and spots). This is the case for local people, peasants, seasonally hired for archaeological work. Women, however, earned half the money men did, because they were women, because they were not supposed to do as much of the hard physical labour, or both. But this discrepancy was common – and even accepted – in those times. On the other hand, analysing the existing photos and other archive material, I can conclude that there were more female than male fieldworkers. Women busy with a main task: identifying and putting aside even the smallest pieces of hypothetical artefacts while sifting the soil excavated by their male companions.

Whether by a female complicity (resulting from the acceptance of different roles played by each sex in society, or from the establishment of an unofficial sex solidarity), or by various kinds of fieldwork duties, there are women’s and men’s groups in the first photograph I have chosen (Fig. 1). Looking at them, I have the feeling that I should envision different common narratives and narrative communities, or even social bias behind these same narratives. It is interesting though that the excavation’s leaders, Costa Artur (a woman) and Paço (a man), are standing closer to the women’s group. Does this reflect personal sympathy? A paternalistic attitude? I do not know.

But the photograph (Fig. 1) tells us much more than this. For instance, it speaks about (local, rural) poverty (Luís 2000). Poverty – realistic, mental, and psychological – disclosed, in this case, not only by their clothes and their shoes (or the absence of shoes), but also by the way they stand, look into the camera, and avoid the camera.

Even if I did not already know who they were, I could immediately recognise the excavation leaders. Costa Artur, the only female graduate in the field, stands in front of all the other women, looking confident, and smiling almost as if she did not care about the camera. And she is the only person with the hands in the jacket pockets

and – what is more – she is the only woman wearing trousers. A woman wearing working trousers was still quite unusual in a conservative society such as Portugal's, where there was a significant divide between how each sex should behave (Policarpo 2011). Her clothing should signify that she was mentally free – a freedom attained thanks to the liberal education she received at home to the point that she could work with men and stand beside them. In addition, by the end of the 1950s, the urban elites, who were less Catholic, began to be influenced by the prevalent foreign – especially Hollywoodian – aesthetics, thanks to the media, particularly television (Ferreira 2011, 259), and the example of extraordinary (still uncommon...) foreigner women (Cooke 2013).

What about Paço? He does not seem to be a fieldworker, at least in that moment, even though he is in a short-sleeved shirt. Apart from this, he is the only one on one knee, in an attitude of a true team leader. An attitude he probably adopted from his time in the military.

Regarding the other actors in this photograph (Fig. 1), we see how some women stand shyly and uncomfortably, as it was their first time in front of a camera. Others – the minority – seem not care about the camera, nor about the situation itself. One young man exhibits his tool, a tool that symbolises his collaboration in the excavation, a tool with a double function: excavate to produce, excavate to discover (= produce knowledge). This fieldwork tool is a unique sign with multiple significations depending on the working object and purpose.

Only one man is seated, perhaps the oldest one. Close to him stands a child. Another child is in a woman's arms, a situation that induces us to ponder how children were admitted to the excavation area. Was it because their relatives were not able to leave them with anyone else and they were too small to go to school? Usually this excavation took place during summertime, that is, during school holidays.

Summarising, there are obvious dissonances in the photograph (Fig. 1; but coherent in those times) in terms of social status, economic status, age, and leadership. But were local workers aware of those differences? Some of them appear to be, judging by the way they try not to look into the camera, as if they are ashamed of their own economic and social condition. Others, younger, seem not to care that much. On the contrary, they stand with a smile, apparently proud and relaxed, a mix of feelings that could be related to the fact that, in addition to providing extra money – though not that much – they would earn with this activity, hence helping their families economically, this novel fieldwork could be seen as a way of being temporarily freed from some restrictive social conventions and norms; it could be a way of subvert the monotony of their country lives once in a while. And this was no ordinary fieldwork. Not at all. It was special fieldwork, scientific work. So, from a social point of view, it could help them to reach some kind of local status, even if just psychological, especially considering that most of them were illiterate. Illiterate and generally not taken account of by the local powers. Or perhaps it had nothing to do with gaining status, since locals did not pay much attention to these activities, as they seemed not to contribute much to the improvement of their individual and collective lives. A situation to clarify with the survivors.

The second chosen photograph was almost certainly taken on the same day (mostly because of Paço's clothes) and witnesses another narrative construction (Fig. 2). Intentionally or not, there is always a narrative, as unconscious as it may have been. Unlike the first photograph, where, excepting for the oldest local man and Paço, all appear to stand in the same way as in the previous one, this photograph seems to have resulted from a hierarchical approach to the team, using the typical pyramid principle: men on the top or beyond the women, in a paternalistic/patriarchal/Victorian social vision. But there is a substantial difference this time: The two leaders, Costa Artur and Paço, are kneeling, side by side, as if they were



Figure 2. Vila Nova de São Pedro (Portugal). Excavation team, beginning of the 1950s (photograph: unknown; Archive Ana C. Martins).

equals – almost in the same way that Tessa Wheeler (1893-1936) was photographed (Carr 2012, frontpage). And there is something more in the photograph (Fig. 2) that elucidates country life: the three children – who had nowhere else to go or who were there just for the fun – are not wearing any shoes (we must remember that shoes were an expensive item for many people).

### What about archaeological excavation in the city during the same period?

First, urban archaeology was introduced in the country by the already mentioned Moita, who, as director of the city of Lisbon museum, among other tasks, supervised archaeological activities (Leite 2013). When construction for the Lisbon underground began, in the city centre, workers found ancient structures and artefacts. Called to the site, Moita attributed them to the 16th-century Hospital de Todos-os-Santos (Hospital of all Saints), destroyed by the severe earthquake of 1755. It was a brand-new situation for archaeology in Portugal, as Moita had to deal with several interests: modernisation of urban public transport; reinforcement of dominant public policies; and safeguarding Lisbon's heritage and memories. It was essential to find a compromise between these three visions and needs, and it was Moita who achieved it thanks not only to an outstanding personal charisma, resilience, and diplomacy, but also to a deep and strong sense of public duty.

The interesting thing is that, because it was not just an urban situation, but a central Lisbon situation, combining the needs and expectations of people from different local sectors, from politics to culture, Moita appears in this photograph, taken in 1960, almost alone among men, most of them playing relevant and ultimate roles in their own jobs, and whose final words could condemn or support Moita's archaeological and museological project for the site and the excavated artefacts. Looking to the photograph to illustrate this momentum (Fig. 3), I see very clearly that the context is urban, not rural. Moita is guiding a group of men and a woman among the ruins. I do not hear her, but I can imagine her explaining the importance of what was being found, and the need to safeguard it. She is wearing bright colours, with a skirt, short-sleeve shirt, wide belt, and high heels, looking very 'feminine' and coquettish, despite her not wearing a hat. It is a way of dressing that says much about her personality, but also about the urban context and the purpose of the visit. She





*Figure 3. Hospital of All Saints, Lisbon (Distrito de Lisboa, Portugal). Irisalva Moita at the excavation (photograph: unknown; Nogueira 2015).*

was a woman of strong personality reinforced by serious research, rich academic experience, and dense scientific knowledge.

Moita was an extraordinary exception in the general thematic of women in archaeology in the country by the end of the 1950s, a special case that resulted from a series of factors, one of the most relevant being her notorious competence as a museologist and archaeologist. And it was an exception that inspired others to emerge all over the country, until they became almost the rule: women archaeologists as museologists and even directors of local and regional museums, some of which included archaeological collections. It was a phenomenon to which the organisation of the Course of Museum, Palaces and National Monuments Directors, hosted by the Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga (National Museum of Ancient Art, founded in 1884), considerably contributed, with the direct involvement of other national museums and their directors (Ferreira 2017). It was the very beginning of museum studies in Portugal, a two-year course including an internship and a public dissertation defence<sup>1</sup>.

## Semiotic and semantic analysis II (more brief insights)

The beginning of the 1960s was a turbulent time in Portugal. In 1961, the colonial war (which lasted until 1974) began and India reannexed the Portuguese possessions of Diu, Daman, and Goa (Pélissier 2000; Perez 2000). It was the beginning of the end of the Portuguese Empire. Having been recruited to a non-understandable, anachronical, and unwanted war in Overseas Provinces unknown to much of the Metropolitan population, some younger people objected more clearly to the dominant

<sup>1</sup> On 9 and 10 May 2019, Moita was remembered during a special colloquium co-organized by the Lisbon City Museum and the archaeology of the Lisbon Geographic Society, by her surviving colleagues and many disciples, emphasising her many contributions to the development of urban archaeology and heritage studies in Portugal, especially in Lisbon, based on different unpublished archival materials, including her own book notes and working diaries. Ana Cristina Martins is one of the invited speakers, as she has obtained access to previously unknown documents from the time when Moita taught at the university and benefitted from governmental scholarships to do archaeological research.

political regime. Predictably, these protests infiltrated the university, where some of the most enlightened Portuguese intellectuals taught and studied. Even during the totalitarian regime, the university was an autonomous territory, where no one – not even the police – risked entering without authorisation. And it was precisely at the University of Lisbon that, in 1962, the first big public/student demonstration was organised against the prevailing anachronical political regime, led by students from the faculties of Law and Letters (Almeida 2000). They were unshakeable in their demand for better curricula, to the most recent Western standards (mainly French and Anglo-Saxon), and longed for individual freedom and freedom of association, echoing the Beat Movement and the Beatniks in spite of the censorship directed at these movements (Pappámikail 2011, 214-216; Thébaud *et al.* 1995).

## What about archaeology in this transition period?

Some episodes contributed to the need to update theories and practices in the country: the creation of the Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation; FCG, founded in 1956), which financed archaeological projects and attributed a prize for the best annual archaeological work; the 1st National Congress of Archaeology (Lisboa, 1958) (Martins 2016a); and the 1st Archaeological Colloquiums of Oporto (Porto and Guimarães 1961), this one held one year before the first public protests against the political regime, planned by Lisbon students. These were institutions and meetings searched and attended by dozens of people intending to become archaeologists, seeking to listen to foreign experts, looking for new approaches, both theoretical and methodological. All this happened while the country failed in democratising its political system, with deceitful presidential elections in 1958 (Raby 2000). However, that feeling toward archaeology was reiterated during the first centenary of the AAP (see above) celebrated in 1963 in several Lisbon cultural and scientific places, including the Faculty of Letters of the University of Lisbon (Martins 2016a).

But, were there any women attending these sessions, presenting papers, and publishing in its book proceedings, resulting from fieldwork and – more likely (we will see why) – lab work? Yes, there were, and in growing numbers. Some of them (very few by then) even went abroad, incentivised by museum directors, university professors, and independent researches recognising the need to innovate and modernise archaeology in Portugal.

One of the first events that helped a new generation of future archaeologists to be engaged with new theories and field methods began to take place in 1964 (Sangmeister *et al.* 1969). It was then that a group of experts from the DAI Madrid (department founded in 1943) came to Torres Vedras (northern Lisbon) to excavate a Chalcolithic hill fort<sup>2</sup>. Obligated by national legislation to include Portuguese archaeologists, this German project became an unofficial practical archaeological school for national students, and it encouraged some of them to go abroad in search of archaeological specialisation in Germany, where they were immersed in a true multi-disciplinary approach.

Looking at some photographs taken during these excavations, I can come to some conclusions. The photograph with the German team (which included Spanish colleagues) was carefully prepared, with a well-defined theme and a clear superstructure, exemplified by the pyramidal distribution of the actors, with the German members in the most prominent position (Fig. 4). This is a logical decision, as it was their project both scientifically and financially. And what do we see in this photo-

2 This archaeological site obtained an international relevance precisely with this project coordinated between 1964 and 1973 by Edward Sangmeister (University of Freiburg), Hermanfrid Schubart (DAI), and Leonel Trindade (Municipal Museum of Torres Vedras), with the collaboration of several experts – both male and female –, and students, namely from the Universities of Berlin, Göttingen, Granada (Spain) and Lisbon, among others (Sangmeister *et al.* 1968).



Figure 4. Zambujal (Distrito de Lisboa, Portugal). German team at the Chalcolithic hill fort during the 1960s (photograph: DAI Madrid, printed with kind permission of the DAI).



Figure 5. Zambujal (Distrito de Lisboa, Portugal). Excavation team at the Chalcolithic hill fort during the 1960s (photograph: DAI Madrid, printed with the kind permission of the DAI).

graph? An accurate, clean scenario composed by field material – mostly camping equipment – they brought from abroad. Front of stage we identify team members, four of them women and all of them wearing trousers. The social and cultural context allows them to do so, and they are also justified by the kind of fieldwork they had to accomplish. But looking more judiciously at this photograph, we have the feeling that nothing was done spontaneously. Besides the fact that the team appears to be pyramidally (= hierarchically) distributed, the photograph is reminiscent of some late-19th-century to beginning of the 20th-century images taken to illustrate travel adventures.

Analysing further, I recognise that the photograph's composition (Fig. 4) resembles that of a painting, with its alignment of three layers of representation, each with its own signification. From top to bottom, like a pyramid – truncated or not – or to a Victorian family portrait, we identify a first layer/record where four older men (team leaders?) stand looking serious, together with a young woman (the exception) in a much more informal position. The second or intermediate layer/record includes one boy and one girl both with one knee on the ground, as if they were heraldic tenants. Finally, the third layer/record has one girl and one boy, also lying down, as if they were a heraldic pedestal, holding the composition motto (illegible) with their hands. A motto somehow supervised by another person, a girl with both knees on the ground, as if she were one of the composition's vanishing points, even though she is standing in the same above-mentioned intermediate layer/record.

The next photograph (Fig. 5) is quite different. Apparently, there is no real perception of team hierarchy, maybe because it depicts an international team, with German, Spanish, and Portuguese archaeologists, and students, and local people (Fig. 5). Some of them are standing and others are seating on the ground, and almost all are chatting lively with each other. There is one peculiarity in this photograph: Nearly all of the women are sitting together, on the ground, in the right side of the picture (= excavation), and they are not looking into the camera – surely not out of shyness or shame, but perhaps because it was a spontaneous photograph, taken with no preparation.

### **Semiotic and semantic analysis III (a brief look to the end of the 1960s)**

Slowly, belatedly, but firmly, urban and university people, and people from the arts and letters, became more aware of the country's problems and needs, conscious that the political regime was obsolete in every sense of the word. Not only the regime, but society itself. There were some attempts to change some of society, mainly in what concerned women's desires, ambitions, and needs, with the publication of such papers as *Carta a uma jovem Portuguesa (Letter to a young Portuguese lady)* (Coimbra, April 1961), and even with the commercialisation of the contraceptive pill, repudiated by the long-term alliance maintained between church and state (Policarpo 2011, 54-57).

Something would have to be done; something would have to happen to modernise Portugal. The pretext was unexpectedly and involuntarily provided by the regime's leader. In 1968, while Paris was emerging into a hierarchical subversion (Vincent 1995, 134-136), Oliveira de Salazar (1889-1970) suffered a stroke that disallowed him from ruling the country. The man chosen to occupy his place was a law professor from the University of Lisbon, Marcelo Caetano (1906-1980), considered by many to be a democrat. He began what is historiographically known as the 'Marcelo's Spring' (1968-1970) aimed at the economic and social modernisation of the country, as well as at a moderate political liberalisation, nourishing expectations toward true regime reformation (Rato 2000). But, surrounded by technocrats loyal to Salazar, Caetano accomplished much less than was predicted. For instance, he was unable even to put an end to the colonial war.

This process began in the year of the events of May 1968 in France. In Portugal, it consolidated most of the internal demands students had been making since 1962 (see above), and built on the events of 1965, when the political police arrested 50 students for being alleged communists. More than 50 others were expelled by the university, and an equal number suspended. It was an unprecedented political challenge to the university's autonomous status, a status that students and many professors could not stand. Here was an opportunity to shout out their requirements, intellectual, cultural, ideological, political, and economic. This time, however, it was the Univer-



sity of Coimbra that headed the process, whether due to its historical role and international prestige or due to its geographic distance from Lisbon and the country's main persecutory mechanisms. The student protests took place in 1969, when it was already clear that 'Marcelo's spring' was more a 'Marcelo's autumn' (Almeida 2000). Aesthetically inspired by the demands made in Paris in 1968 (for social equality and sexual freedom, for instance), and additionally by the desire to see an end to the totalitarian regime and the colonial war, this was the generation responsible for most of the changes that occurred in Portugal subsequent to the revolution of April 1974.

However, disappointed with 'Marcelo's spring', this generation grew in its conviction, in its attitude, in its desire to innovating the country from every point of view, mainly political, social, cultural, and mental. Even so, its leaders – just as happened in Paris – were, with very few exceptions, male students, though females appeared more and more side by side with their male colleagues, holding posters and allowing themselves to be photographed, as they were no longer fearful. Yet, there were efforts to change this status quo. One of them was the book *Novas cartas Portuguesas* (*New Portuguese letters*; Lisboa 1972), forbidden by the censors, in which the authors, Maria Teresa Horta, Maria Isabel Barreno, and Maria Velho da Costa, wrote without restriction about sexuality, adultery, abortion, and what was more, the female body, desire, and pleasure (Policarpo 2011, 56).

It was impossible to go back. Besides, the international political context was not that friendly toward the internal political regime. The only solution was to bring more people to the cause, to reaffirm demands, and to act as if the future – built in that momentum – was theirs, aided by a 'transition generation' subscribing to and supporting their projects.

## Semiotic and semantic analysis IV (looking briefly to the 1970s)

The entire above briefly characterised internal scenario was also clear for science in general and for archaeology most particularly, as it is the core of this paper.

Observing the photographs, I have chosen, I identify, not just a wish, but a mix of hunger for freedom of being and of doing, with representatives from both sexes hand in hand, side by side, claiming a new way of looking at the past, of identifying, inventorying, analysing, safeguarding, and divulging its remains. It was time for a new generation, with the support of the 'transition generation', to open up new theoretical horizons and to apply new fieldwork methods, without which Portuguese archaeology would remain as outdated in its most general aspects as it had been. Or perhaps it was the other way around, and it was thanks to the young strength that the 'transition generation' was able to accomplish some of its scientific schemes, now supported by such institutions as the FCG and the recently founded (1971) delegation of the DAI in Lisbon. Or maybe it was a very happy and successful officious joint venture of two generations looking forward to innovating in a period that, both generations felt, even if unconsciously, was transitional. It was an in between period, but not as much as one might think, since very soon the entire national picture would be modified both rapidly and deeply, like in a vortex, a much awaited and wanted vortex – at least by most of the country.

In the first photograph related to the study of the Tagus Valley engravings, I identify young female and male students, standing side by side next to the team car, with fashionable hairstyles and clothing (all in trousers) and holding some fieldwork materials (Fig. 6). But my focus goes to the photograph's centre. Here, one of the female team members is consciously photographed in a pose that would have been unthinkable until very recently: standing with one foot on a box, in a very masculine manner, as if inspired by the 'flower power' depictions. And there is no



Figure 6. Vila Velha de Ródão (Portugal). Some members of the 'Tagus River generation' in the summer of 1973 (photograph: unknown; Baptista 2008).



Figure 7. Penedo do Lexim (Portugal). Excavation team in the 1970s (photograph: José Morais Arnaud; Silva 2015).

need to 'compose' the photograph's scenario, as it seems there was no instinctive or institutional imperative to cluster the women and the men. It is almost totally a spontaneous camera shot. The subjects all had the same project and the same purpose, and they were going to accomplish these together without any kind of prejudice, as they – and I must emphasise this – belonged to an intellectual elite, and sometimes a social and economic one (Nelson 2004).

The second photograph taken during the post-revolutionary period, at Penedo do Lexim, not only restates this assertion, it underlines and enlarges it (Fig. 7). But this photograph involved an intentional camera shot; consequently, there was a need for a certain composition/visual narrative, although not as formal and aprioristic and the photograph of the German team (Fig. 4). After all, this was a Portuguese team acting during a euphoric political momentum, when women could finally behave as they wanted (Ferreira 2011, 260-266), still inspired by the echoes from Paris 1968 (Vincent 1995, 138-141), and anxiously waiting for a left-wing political and social change – a composition/narrative that should have included almost everyone and everything related (directly and indirectly) to the excavation campaign. If we look more closely, we recognise 'invisible' records/layers, this time analysed from the

bottom up. In the first record/layer, central to the picture, we see some of the tools used by archaeologists during fieldwork.

The second and last record/layer shows team members standing up or sitting informally and almost carelessly, with females and males mixed. All of them are wearing clothes suitable for fieldwork and seem confident and relaxed. So comfortable that four of them, two women and two men, are seated on the top of the team's Land Rover (a national modernisation and symbol of empowerment). Additionally, we see in the left side of the photograph (Fig. 7) a woman, the landowner, and three children wearing shoes and watches, a different picture from the one observed at Vila Nova de São Pedro (Fig. 1), more than 20 years before, presumably thanks to the National Development Plans (between 1953 and 1974) and the Interim Development Plan (1965-1967) (Murteira 2000).

The local scenario includes a small, 18th-century house used by the excavation team and the landowner's house above it. What strikes us in this image is the unusual, prominent position of one of the team's women, as she stands above everyone else, with her hands on a boy's and a man's shoulders, facing the camera with a charismatic look. We are watching a leader, or at least someone who looks like one. And she is a woman. Yes, something was changing. The campaign leader was a man, however, university professor J. Morais Arnaud (b. 1946), absent from the picture because he was taking the photograph.

But perhaps a female in a leadership attitude was still an exception, even if the DAI delegation in Portugal (which was based in Lisbon) had been led by a female prehistorian, Philine Kalb (b. 1940), from 1973 to 1980 – a circumstance that surely must have inspired her Portuguese women colleagues. Colleagues who, such as the ones I have selected for this research-historical contribution, dedicated their work almost exclusively to pre- and protohistoric societies mainly because of their mentor's entourage, and for other reasons we will scrutinize.

Other photographs from the same decade<sup>3</sup> show how men were frequently in charge of supervising the excavation (even at Penedo do Lexim) while women excavated. That is what can be seen in other pictures I have selected, where men stand holding the excavation diary, plan, and sketchbook. The picture gradually changed in the past four decades, as more women who had completed undergraduate and graduate degrees in archaeology were hired as university professors and, more recently, began to occupy key positions in national heritage management and private archaeological enterprises (Sheffield 2006).

## Some final remarks

The field was always a place for women and a place of women, at least since Neolithic times. It has been a place for working women, peasant women, women walking across their land as its owner, riding horses, or being transported by carriage, or even walking the gardens surrounding their properties. But, when talking about science, I must acknowledge that the field has been above all a male territory and an elite territory – Western elite – since (almost) only elites had the opportunities to dedicate themselves to scientific research and technology. It is an occupation that demands time to read, to do fieldwork and lab work, to think, to write, and to publish. And in societies that do not finance these kinds of activities, it can be accomplished only by those who have the opportunity, by having money and social and political family influence. Otherwise, it would be/is almost impossible for someone to devote their life to research.

---

3 Photos that I have already identified in both public and private institutional and personal archives.

This was/is the general picture. In what concerned/concerns women, this picture was/is even more difficult – if not impossible – in any case until second-wave feminism and the establishment of a Western democratic world fighting together against social, economic, cultural, religious, sex, and gender inequality. A contest that must continue in face of the growing number of ultra-conservative parties that are emerging in Europe, and the EU, reminding us that nothing can be taken for granted, including human rights.

I will end with three observations. The first is that, according to this brief analysis, there was an understandable dominance of urban, upper class, and upper middle class women embracing this science. Women belonging to liberal families and wealthy enough to allow them to choose, if not a scientific career, at least a scientific activity to be accomplished as it should be (not a hobby, since it should and could not be that) – at least until they got married. And their contribution was much appreciated, as they helped with inventorying, lab work, drawing, the library, and exhibitions, and sometimes even fieldwork.

The second is that a growing number of women were dealing directly with archaeological activities, a circumstance that is certainly owing, in the first place, to their personal will and family support (even if sometimes intermittent) and, in the second place, to the encouragement of professors, directors, and fieldwork and laboratory supervisors – all men, except for Moita. That is why they began to co-work, co-present, and co-write with their male colleagues, regardless of their scientific and academic ranking. Gradually, though, some of them began to present oral papers and to publish as single authors, given the quality of their work and their self-confidence. Even so, they tended (unconsciously?) to reproduce their supervisors' narratives and research projects. And that is perhaps the main reason why they dedicated their research to the pre-, protohistoric, and Roman periods, being the ones studied by their supervisors. Additionally, some of these supervisors, directors, and/or professors encouraged women to go abroad in search of specialisation and/or to attend the first editions of the official course organised in the country on museology.

And here I come to my last observation (for now). Starting at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, an increasing number of women archaeologists decided to work in museums. Some of them were appointed director of important museums comprising archaeological collections. Why did this happen? Was it academically and professionally attractive? First, there were not that many professional offerings for those wishing to become archaeologists. Second, it wasn't until the 1990s that archaeologists began to work under the job title archaeologist. Before that, they could be anything (historians, museologists, economists, doctors, geologists, teachers, professors, *etc.*) but archaeologists. Archaeology was more a hobby than a profession, more a specialisation within historical, geographic, philosophical or even geological studies than a specific subject for graduation. This does not mean that archaeology was not recognised by universities, academies, and erudite societies. On the contrary. And its importance was acknowledged by people committed to the past.

So, in the 1970s, archaeology was not considered a profession, and therefore there were no places for archaeologists as such. The solution was to have, for instance, teachers dedicating their spare time (weekends and holidays) to archaeology. It was a picture common to many countries, and it was not that different from the general one known from the 19th century. A picture dominated by men, as it was socially more acceptable for them to do fieldwork and to stay away for longer periods from home and, if they had a family, their wife and, possibly, their children. For single women, doing fieldwork was almost impossible. For married women, there were basically three solutions: having an understanding husband, being married to an archaeologist, or giving up fieldwork to embrace museum activities, because museum jobs were more compatible with what society expected from women: to spend time with their family and take care of their husband, children, and older relatives (Vaquinhas

2011). Working in a museum, they could accomplish an everyday ritual with a short (not always, as we know) timetable, from 9 to 5. Moreover, they could reproduce there some housework tasks they were used to: inventorying, cataloguing, buying, arranging, taking notes, typing, selecting artefacts for temporary exhibitions, receiving and meeting people, or organising *vernissages*. Even if nobody thought so consciously, it was considered the kind of work that was ‘appropriate’ to women.

The situation has changed a lot since 1974, and we have now more female than male students, and more female than male archaeologists, but as I stated above, only now is the ‘revolution’ generation making way for the next one. Are we witnessing a substantial transformation of habits and behaviours? On the face of it, yes. But if we look more closely, we realise that the most important public archaeological courses and services are headed by men. This, of course, is not to say that women should be chosen just because they are women, to fulfil sex and gender equality commitments assumed by the government. On the contrary, women should be hired on merit. But I find it hard to believe that there are no highly qualified candidates in the female archaeological universe, that there are no women archaeologists good enough to satisfy at least some of the job requirements. Is it a case of women do not apply for these jobs? Yes, this occurs. But what is the reason?

Most recently, we are witnessing a somehow worrying phenomenon in Portuguese archaeology: talented young archaeologists – mostly women – giving up their jobs in some of the numerous private archaeological enterprises established during the past 20 years. They give up because of the extremely demanding everyday work, since they must prepare the excavations, coordinate them, supervise university internships, write reports, study artefacts, prepare oral and poster presentations, and write papers. And by the end of the day, there is almost nothing left for their personal life. This is perhaps why archaeology is one of the Portuguese professions where women, whether single or married, have no children or have them very late, closer to their 40s<sup>4</sup>. Additionally, their jobs are mainly temporary, which gives them almost no financial security to go ahead and plan to have a family. These findings match those of the transnational project DISCO – Discovering the Archaeologists of Europe, undertaken in 2014 with the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union (Bugalhão 2017)<sup>5</sup>.

The problems of today are quite different from the ones lived by the Portuguese women pioneers, but they are still problems. It is time to have a serious discussion about this situation and how we might solve it – a discussion to be engaged in by the entire national archaeological community, as the situation affects all of them. And we must do it now if we really want to accomplish the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by the United Nations, and especially its fifth goal: ‘*Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls*’.

There are many other issues yet to be analysed. For instance, it would be interesting to compare these data to those gathered from other sciences. And it is important to find out whether women want to change the way they lead their careers. They seem to privilege careers in teaching, museum studies, and tourism, but is this a preference or a necessity to accommodate their personal life, especially when they become mothers? Does society respond adequately to their professional wishes and requests? Is it possible that, as before, women are bypassed and allow to be bypassed by the people doing the hiring in the name of family? Or do men remain more adventurous and women more housewifely? Is this not a cultural construction and consequence?

Too many questions to be answered, demanding more inter- and transdisciplinary research, comparison, and reflexion, including from visual cultural studies.

4 See in general: <e-archaeology.org/doing-archaeology/projects/disco-discovering-the-archaeologists-of-europe/>; national report about Portugal: Costa *et al.* 2014.

5 *Ibidem*.



## Acknowledgements

I thank Julia Katharina Koch, for all her support, kindness, and understanding, and Suzanne Needs-Howarth for all her copy-editing work.

## References

- Almeida, Justino M. de 2000. Universidade de Coimbra. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal IX*, sup. P/Z. Porto: Figueirinhas, 559-563.
- Almeida, Justino M. de 2000. Universidade de Lisboa. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal IX*, sup. P/Z. Porto: Figueirinhas, 563-567.
- Baptista, Antonio Martinho 2008. Álbum históricos do Vale do Tejo 01. In: Baptista, Antonio Martinho (ed.). Webblog *Da Finiude do Tempo. Sobre Arte rubestre e artes da pré-história*. <dafinitudedotempo.blogspot.com/2008/08/lbum-histrico-do-vale-do-tejo-01.html>, e-published 01 August 2008; retrieved 13 November 2018.
- Barreto, António 2000. Salazar. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal IX*, sup. P/Z. Porto: Figueirinhas, 283-290.
- Bergstein, Mary 2010. *Mirrors of memory. Freud, photography, and the history of art*. New York: Cornell University.
- Bohrer, Frederick N. 2011. *Photography and archaeology*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Bugalhão, Jacinta 2013. As mulheres na arqueologia portuguesa. *Arqueologia em Portugal: 150 anos*. Lisboa: Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses, 19-23.
- Bugalhão, Jacinta 2017. O papel das mulheres na arqueologia portuguesa. *Ophiussa. Revista do Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa*, 1. Lisboa: Centro de Arqueologia da Universidade de Lisboa, 123-130.
- Burek, Cynthia V. and Higgs, Bettie 2007. *The role of women in the history of geology*. London: The Geological Society.
- Cardoso, João L. 2007. Vida e obras de Estácio da Veiga. *XELB 7. Encontro de Arqueologia do Algarve 4*, 2006. "Percursos de Estácio da Veiga: actas". Silves: Câmara Municipal de Silves, 15-72.
- Cardoso, João L., and Ribeiro, Maria 2013. Afonso do Paço e as escavações de Vila Nova de São Pedro (1937-1967): os contributos científicos possíveis e a sua projecção internacional. *Estudos Arqueológicos de Oeiras*, 20, 755-770
- Carr, Lydia C. 2012. *Tessa Verney Wheeler. Women and Archaeology before World War Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Colletta, Lisa 2015 (ed.). *The legacy of the Grand Tour. New essays on travel, literature, and culture*, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Cooke, Rachel 2013. *Her Brilliant Career. Ten Extraordinary Women of the Fifties*. London: Virago.
- Costa, Cláudia, Duarte, Cidália, Tereso, João, Viegas, Catarina, Lago, Miguel, Grilo, Carolina, Raposo, Jorge, Diniz, Mariana, and Lima, Alexandra 2014 (eds). *DISCO. Discovering the Archaeologists of Portugal 2012-14*. <e-archaeology.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/PT-DISCO-2014-Portugal-national-report-english.pdf> e-published 2014; retrieved 21 May 2019.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita, and Sørensen, Marie-Louise S. 1998 (eds). *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Ferreira, Emília 2017. *Antecedentes de um museu. Lisboa em Festa. A Exposição retrospectiva de arte ornamental portuguesa e espanhola, 1882*. Casal de Cambra: Caleidoscópio.

- Ferreira, Vítor S. 2011. Modas e modos: a privatização do corpo no espaço público português. In: José Mattoso (ed.). *História da Vida Privada. Os nossos dias*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores/Temas e Debates, 242-276.
- Frink, Lisa, and Weedman, Kathryn 2006 (eds). *Gender and hide production*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Joly, Martine 2000. *L'image et les signes*. Nathan: Université.
- Jorge, Susana O., and Jorge, Vítor O. 1996. Women in Portuguese Archaeology. *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia*, 36, 159-167.
- Kristiansen, Kristian 2014. Towards a new paradigm? The Third Science Revolution and its possible consequences in archaeology. *Current Swedish Archaeology*, 22, 11-71.
- Leite, Ana C. 2013. Irisalva Moita e a arqueologia em Lisboa. *Rossio, Estudos de Lisboa*, 1. Lisboa: Câmara Municipal de Lisboa, 24-31.
- Luís, António S. 2000. Pobreza. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal IX*, sup. P/Z. Porto: Figueirinhas, 102-107.
- Lukitz, Liora 2006. *A quest in the Middle East. Gertrude Bell and the making of modern Iraq*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2011a. Colher plantas. Semear ideias. Luiz W. Carrisso (1886-1937) e a *Ocupação científica das colónias portuguesas* (1934). In: Fiolhais, C., Simões, C., and Martins, D. (eds.). *Atas do Congresso Luso-Brasileiro de História das Ciências*. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra. <www.uc.pt/org/historia\_ciencia\_na\_uc/Textos/colher/colher>, e-published 2011; retrieved 22 November 2018.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2011b (ed.). *Mendes Corrêa (1888-1960), entre a docência, a ciência e a política*. Lisboa: ACD.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2014a. A Missão Antropológica e Etnológica à Guiné (1946-1947) entre o sagrado e o profano. In: Martins, Ana Cristina, and Santos, Ana Isabel (eds). *África reencontrada. O sagrado e o profano em duas colecções públicas portuguesas*. Lisboa: IICT, 20.23.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2014b. Fotografias da Missão Antropológica e Etnológica da Guiné (1946-1947): entre a forma e o conteúdo. In: Filipa Lowdes, Vicente (ed.). *Império da Visão. Fotografia no contexto colonial português (1860-1969)*, Lisboa: Edições 70, 117-139.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2016a. 'Mission': *modernize!* Portuguese archaeology in the 1960s (a preamble). In: Delley, Geraldine, Díaz-Andreu, Margarita, Djindjian, François, Fernández, Victor M., Guidi, Alexandro, and Kaeser, Marc-Antoine (eds). *History of Archaeology: International Perspectives Proceedings of the XVII UISPP World Congress (1-7 September 2014, Burgos, Spain)* 11. Oxford: Archaeopress, 179-187.
- Martins, Ana Cristina 2016b. Pioneiras da Arqueologia em Portugal: "another brick" against "the wall" of indifference. Maria de Lourdes Costa Arthur (1924-2003). *Clepsydra. Revista de Estudios del Género y Teoría Feminista*, 15, 77-100.
- Melo, Ana Á. de, and Cardoso, João Luís 2014. Virgínia Rau. Uma medievalista na pré-história. *Estudos Arqueológicos de Oeiras*, 21, 511-546.
- Murteira, Mário 2000. Planos de Fomento. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal IX*, sup. P/Z. Porto: Figueirinhas, 99-102.
- Nelson, Sarah M. 2004. *Gender in archaeology. Analyzing Power and Prestige* [2nd edition]. Lanham: AltaMira.
- Nogueira, Paulo 2015. O Hospital Real de Todos os Santos em Lisboa. In: Nogueira, Paulo, Weblog *Histórias com História*. <historiaschistoria.blogspot.com/2015/09/o-hospital-real-de-todos-os-santos-em.html>, e-published 22 September 2015, retrieved 13 November 2018.
- Otero, Paulo 2000. Corporativismo político. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VII*, sup. A/E. Porto: Figueirinhas, 425-431.

- Page, Judith W., and Smith, Elise L. 2011. *Women, Literature, and the Domesticated Landscape. England's Disciples of Flora, 1780-1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panofsky, Erwin 1939. *Studies in iconology: humanistic themes in the art of the Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pappámikail, Lia 2011. Juventude: entre a fase da vida e o tempo de viver. In: José Mattoso (ed.). *História da Vida Privada. Os nossos dias*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores/Temas e Debates, 208-241.
- Pélissier, René 2000. Guerras Coloniais. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal*, v. VIII, sup. F/O. Porto: Figueirinhas, 159-163.
- Perez, Rosa 2000. Estado da Índia. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VIII*, sup. F/O. Porto: Figueirinhas, 255-261.
- Pinney, Chistopher 2011. *Photography and anthropology*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Policarpo, Verónica 2011. Sexualidades em construção, entre o privado e o público. In: José Mattoso (ed.). *História da Vida Privada. Os nossos dias*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores/Temas e Debates, 48-79.
- Raby, David L. 2000. Humberto Delgado. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VI*, sup. A/E. Porto: Figueirinhas, 497-500.
- Rato, Vasco 2000. Marcelismo. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VIII*, sup. F/O. Porto: Figueirinhas, 421-427.
- Ruck, Nora, and Slunecko, Thomas 2008. A portrait of a dialogical self: image, science and the dialogical self. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 3, 261-290.
- Sangmeister, Edward, Schubart, Hermanfrid, and Trindade, Leonel 1968. Zambujal – 1968. *O Arqueólogo Português*, 3, 2, 71-114.
- Sangmeister, Edward, Schubart, Hermanfrid, and Trindade, Leonel 1969. Escavações no castro eneolítico do Zambujal, 1966. *O Arqueólogo Português* 3, 3, 71-114.
- Sheehan, Tracy 2015. *Photography, history, difference*. Hanover: Dartmouth College.
- Sheffield, Suzanne Le-May 2006. *Women and Science: Social Impact and Interaction*. Santa Barbara: Rutgers University Press.
- Silva, António Carlos 2015. Penedo do lexim (2). In: Silva, António Carlos, Webblog *Memórias das Pedras Talhas. Um blog pessoal para arquivo ocasional de mais de quatro décadas de militância pública ao serviço da memória*. <pedrastalhas.blogspot.com/search?q=lexim>, e-published 1 December 2015; retrieved 13 November 2018.
- Silva, António D. 2000. Descolonização. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VII*, sup. A/E. Porto: Figueirinhas, 504-507.
- Smiles, Sam, and Moser, Stephanie 2008 (eds). *Envisioning the Past: Archaeology and the Image*. London: Blackwell.
- Sørensen, Marie-Louise S. 2000. *Gender Archaeology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Thébaud, Françoise, Perrot, Michelle, and Duby, Georges 1995 (eds). *História das Mulheres no Ocidente 5. O século XX*. Lisboa: Edições Afrontamento.
- Torgal, Luís R. 2009. *Estados Novos. Estado Novo. Ensaios de História Política e Cultural*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra.
- Vaquinhas, Irene 2011. A família, essa “pátria” em miniatura. In: José Mattoso (ed.). *História da vida privada em Portugal*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 118-151.
- Vicente, Ana 2000. Mulheres. In: Barreto, António, and Mónica, Maria Filomena (eds). *Dicionário de História de Portugal VIII*. Sup. F/O. Porto: Figueirinhas, 565-571.
- Vincent, Gérard 1995. Uma história do segredo? In: Ariès, Philippe, and Duby, Georges (eds). *História da vida privada 5. Da Primeira Guerra Mundial aos nossos dias*. Lisboa: Edições Afrontamento, 115-389.