

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The title of this book would have made little sense to me when I chose to be a history major nearly four decades ago. I might perhaps have thought it an analysis of linguistic developments, as gender was something I considered (and bemoaned) largely when learning German nouns. The women's movement changed that, as it changed so much else. Advocates of women's rights in the present, myself included, looked at what we had been taught about the past – as well as what we had been taught about literature, psychology, religion, biology, and most other disciplines – and realized we were only hearing half the story. Most of the studies we read or heard described the male experience – “man the artist,” “man the hunter,” “man and his environment” – though they often portrayed it as universal. We began to investigate the lives of women in the past, first fitting them into the categories with which we were already comfortable – nations, historical periods, social classes, religious allegiance – and then realizing that this approach, sarcastically labeled “add women and stir,” was unsatisfying. Focusing on women often disrupted the familiar categories, forcing us to rethink the way that history was organized and structured. The European Renaissance and Enlightenment lost some of their luster once women were included, as did the democracy of ancient Athens or Jacksonian America. Even newer historical approaches, such as the emphasis on class analysis using social science techniques termed the New Social History which had developed during the 1960s, were found to be wanting in their consideration of differences between women's and men's experiences.

This disruption of well-known categories and paradigms ultimately included the topic that had long been considered the proper focus of all history – man. Viewing the male experience as universal had not only hidden women's history, but it had also prevented analysis of men's experiences as those of men. The very words we used to describe individuals – “artist” and “woman artist,” for example, or “scientist” and “woman scientist” – kept us from thinking

about how the experiences of Michelangelo or Picasso or Isaac Newton were shaped by the fact that they were male, while it forced us to think about how being female affected Georgia O'Keefe or Marie Curie. Historians familiar with studying women increasingly began to discuss the ways in which systems of sexual differentiation affected both women and men, and by the early 1980s to use the word "gender" to describe these systems. At that point, they differentiated primarily between "sex," by which they meant physical, morphological, and anatomical differences (what are often called "biological differences") and "gender," by which they meant a culturally constructed, historically changing, and often unstable system of differences.

Most of the studies with "gender" in the title still focused on women – and women's history continued as its own field – but a few looked equally at both sexes or concentrated on the male experience, calling their work "men's history" or the "new men's studies." Several university presses started book series with "gender" in their titles – "gender and culture," "gender and American law" – and scholars in many fields increasingly switched from "sex" to "gender" as the acceptable terminology: "sex roles" became "gender roles," "sex distinctions" became "gender distinctions" and so on. Historians interested in this new perspective asserted that gender was an appropriate category of analysis when looking at *all* historical developments, not simply those involving women or the family. *Every* political, intellectual, religious, economic, social, and even military change had an impact on the actions and roles of men and women, and, conversely, a culture's gender structures influenced every other structure or development. People's notions of gender shaped not only the way they thought about men and women, but the way they thought about their society in general. As the historian Joan Scott put it: "Gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power." Thus hierarchies in other realms of life were often expressed in terms of gender, with dominant individuals or groups described in masculine terms and dependent ones in feminine. These ideas in turn affected the way people acted, though explicit and symbolic ideas of gender could also conflict with the way men and women chose or were forced to operate in the world.

Sex and Gender

Just at the point when historians and their students were gradually beginning to see the distinction between sex and gender (with an increasing number accepting the importance of gender as a category of analysis) that distinction became contested. Not only were there great debates about where the line should be drawn – were women "biologically" more peaceful and men "biologically" more skillful at math, or were such tendencies the

result solely of their upbringing? – but some scholars wondered whether social gender and biological sex are so interrelated that any distinction between the two is meaningless. Their doubts came from four principal directions.

One of these was from biological scientists attempting to draw an absolute line between male and female. Though most people are born with external genitalia through which they are categorized “male” or “female” at birth, some are not. Their external genitalia may be ambiguous, a condition now generally termed “intersex,” though earlier termed “hermaphroditism.” Closer physical examination may reveal that their internal sexual and reproductive anatomy may also not match those usually defined as “male” or “female.” In earlier times most intersex people were simply assigned to the sex they most closely resembled, with their condition only becoming a matter of historical record if they came to the attention of religious, medical, or legal authorities. Since the nineteenth century this gender assignment was sometimes reinforced by surgical procedures modifying or removing the body parts that did not fit with the chosen gender. Thus in these cases “gender” determined “sex” rather than the other way around.

Because the physical body could be ambiguous, scientists began to stress the importance of other indicators of sex difference. By the 1970s chromosomes were the favored marker, and quickly became part of popular as well as scientific understandings. In 1972, for example, the International Olympic Committee determined that simply “looking like” a woman was not enough, but that athletes would have to prove their “femaleness” through a chromosome test; an individual with certain types of chromosomal abnormalities would be judged “male” even if that person had been regarded as “female” since birth, and had breasts and a vagina but no penis. The problem with chromosomes is that they are also not perfectly dichotomous, but may involve ambiguous intermediate categories, so that more recently the source of sex differences has also been sought in prenatal hormones, including androgen and testosterone. Tests came to evaluate all of these factors: in 2009, the International Association of Athletics Federations required South African middle-distance runner Caster Semenya to undergo an examination of her external genitals, internal reproductive organs (through ultrasound), chromosomes, and hormones.

Given the uncertainties in most “biological” markers, the intensity of the search for an infallible marker of sex difference suggests that cultural norms about gender (that everyone *should* be a man or a woman) are influencing science. Preexisting ideas about gender shape many other scientific fields as well; the uniting of sperm and egg, for example, was long described as the “vigorous, powerful” sperm “defeating all others” and attaching itself to a “passive, receptive” egg. (The egg is now known to be active in this process.)

A second source of doubts about the distinction between sex and gender is anthropology and ethnography. Though most of the world's cultures have a dichotomous view of gender, occasionally cultures develop a third or even a fourth gender. In some cultures, gender is determined by one's relationship to reproduction, so that adults are gendered male and female, but children and old people are regarded as different genders; in such cultures there are thus four genders, with linguistic, clothing, and behavioral distinctions for each one. In a number of areas throughout the world, including Alaska, the Amazon region, North America, Australia, Siberia, Central and South Asia, Oceania, and the Sudan, individuals who were originally viewed as male or female assume (or assumed, for in many areas such practices have ended) the gender identity of the other sex or combine the tasks, behavior, and clothing of men and women. Some of these individuals are intersexed and occasionally they are eunuchs (castrated males), but more commonly they are morphologically male or female. The best known of these are found among several Native American peoples, and the Europeans who first encountered them regarded them as homosexuals and called them "berdaches," from an Arabic word for male prostitute. Now most scholars choose to use the term "two-spirit people," and note that they are distinguished from other men more by their work or religious roles than by their sexual activities; they are usually thought of as a third gender rather than effeminate males or masculine women. (Third genders will be discussed in more detail in chapter 8.)

Comparative ethnography thus indicates that in some of the world's cultures, gender attribution is not based on genitals, and may, in fact, change throughout a person's life. In fact, day-to-day gender attribution is based everywhere on cultural norms rather than biology; not only are chromosomes and hormones not visible, but in most of the world's cultures clothing hides external genitalia. (Of course the clothing of men and women may be very different, but that is a culturally imposed gender distinction.) Children are taught these gender norms from a very young age – long before they learn anything about hormones and chromosomes – and even blind children share their culture's ideas about typical gender differences, so that these lessons are not based on external physical appearance alone, any more than they are based on internal body chemistry.

The arbitrary and culturally produced nature of gender has also been challenged by transsexual and transgender individuals, a third source of doubts about the distinction between sex and gender. Individuals whose sexual and reproductive organs and even chromosomal and hormonal patterns mark them as male or female may mentally regard themselves as the other, and choose to live and dress as the other, a condition known medically as "gender dysphoria" or "gender identity disorder." In the 1950s, sex reassignment operations became available for gender-dysphoric people who could afford

them. Sex reassignment surgery could make the body fit more closely with the mind, but it also led to challenging questions: At what point in this process does a “man” become a “woman,” or vice versa? With the loss or acquisition of a penis? Breasts? From the beginning? What does the answer to this imply about notions of gender difference? In the 1990s such questions began to be made even more complex by individuals who described themselves as “transgendered,” that is, as neither male nor female or both male and female. Should such individuals be allowed in spaces designated “women only” or “men only”? Should they have to choose between them, or should there be more than two choices? As had been true with the women’s and gay-rights movement, people involved in the transgendered movement also began historical study of people they identified as sharing their experiences.

The relationship between sex and gender is further complicated by sexuality, for persons of either sex (or transgendered persons) may be sexually attracted to persons of the other sex(es), persons of their own, or everyone. The transgendered movement is politically often associated with gay, lesbian, and bisexual groups (reflected in the LGBT acronym), though some adherents dispute this link, noting that the issue for them is gender, not sexual orientation. (The boundaries between the physical body and cultural forces in the issue of sexual orientation are just as contested as those in the issue of gender, of course, as some scientists attempt to find a “gay gene” and others view all such research as efforts to legitimize an immoral “lifestyle choice” or a futile search for something that is completely socially constructed.)

A fourth source of doubts about the distinction between sex and gender came from historians of women. They put increasing emphasis on differences among women, noting that women’s experiences differed because of class, race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, and other factors, and they varied over time. Because of these differences, some wondered, did it make sense to talk about “women” at all? If, for example, women were thought to be delicate guardians of the home, as was true in the nineteenth-century United States, then were black women, who worked in fields alongside men, really “women”? If women were thought to be inferior and irrational, then were intelligent queens such as Elizabeth I of England really “women”? Was “woman” a valid category whose meaning is self-evident and unchanging over time, or is arguing for any biological base for gender difference (or sexual orientation) naive “essentialism”? These historians noted that not only in the present is gender “performative,” that is, a role that can be taken on or changed at will, but it was so at many points in the past, as individuals “did gender” and conformed to or challenged gender roles. Thus it is misguided to think that we are studying women (or men, for that matter) as a sex, they argued, for the only thing that is in the historical record is gender; “women” and “men” are thus conceptual categories, not enduring objects.

Gender History and Theory

All of these doubts came together at a time when many historians were changing their basic understanding of the methods and function of history. Historians have long recognized that documents and other types of evidence are produced by particular individuals with particular interests and biases that consciously and unconsciously shape their content. Most historians thus attempted to keep the limitations of their sources in mind as they reconstructed events and tried to determine causation, though sometimes these got lost in the narrative. During the 1980s, some historians began to assert that because historical sources always present a biased and partial picture, we can never fully determine what happened or why; to try to do so is foolish or misguided. What historians should do instead is to analyze the written and visual materials of the past – what is often termed “discourse” – to determine the way various things are “represented” in them and their possible meanings. Historians should not be preoccupied with searching for “reality,” in this viewpoint, because to do so demonstrates a naive “positivism,” a school of thought whose proponents regarded the chief aim of knowledge as the description of phenomena. (Both advocates and critics of positivism often quote the words of the nineteenth-century German historian Leopold von Ranke, who regarded the best history as that which retold events “as they actually happened.”)

This heightened interest in discourse among historians, usually labeled the “linguistic turn” or the “cultural turn,” drew on the ideas of literary and linguistic theory – often loosely termed “deconstruction” or “post-structuralism” – about the power of language. Language is so powerful, argued some theorists, that it determines, rather than simply describes, our understanding of the world; knowledge is passed down through language, and knowledge is power. This emphasis on the relationship of knowledge to power, and on the power of language, made post-structuralism attractive to feminist scholars in many disciplines, who themselves already emphasized the ways language and other structures of knowledge excluded women. The insight of the French philosopher Michel Foucault that power comes from everywhere fit with feminist recognition that misogyny and other forces that limited women’s lives could be found in many places: in fashion magazines, fairy tales, and jokes told at work as well as overt job discrimination and domestic violence. Historians of gender were thus prominent exponents of the linguistic turn, and many analyzed representations of women, men, the body, sexual actions, and related topics within different types of discourses.

The linguistic/cultural turn – which happened in other fields along with history – elicited harsh responses from other historians, however, including

many who focused on women and gender. They asserted that it denied women the ability to shape their world – what is usually termed “agency” – in both past and present by positing unchangeable linguistic structures. Wasn’t it ironic, they noted, that just as women were learning they *had* a history and asserting they were *part* of history, “history” became just a text? They wondered whether the idea that gender – and perhaps even “women” – were simply historical constructs denied the very real oppression that many women in the past (and present) experienced. For a period it looked as if this disagreement would lead proponents of discourse analysis to lay claim to “gender” and those who opposed it to avoid “gender” and stick with “women.” Because women’s history was clearly rooted in the women’s rights movement of the 1970s, it also appeared more political than gender analysis, and programs and research projects sometimes opted to use “gender” to downplay this connection with feminism.

As we enter the twenty-first century, however, it appears that the division is less sharp. Historians using gender as a category of analysis do not all focus solely on discourse; many treat their sources as referring to something beyond the sources themselves – an author, an event, a physical body. Historians who were initially suspicious of the linguistic turn use its insights about the importance of meaning to include a wider range of literary and artistic sources as they investigate “traditional” topics in women’s history, such as organizations, work patterns, legal systems, and political movements. Scholars may not agree on the distinction between sex and gender, or between women as a group and “women” as a conceptual category, but they now describe the field as “women’s and gender history” – occasionally even using the acronym WGH – thus highlighting the link between them rather than the differences.

New theoretical perspectives are adding additional complexity and bringing in still more questions. One of these is queer theory, which was developed in the early 1990s, a period of intense AIDS activism, and combined elements of gay and lesbian studies with other concepts originating in literary and feminist analysis. Queer theorists argued that sexual notions were central to all aspects of culture, and called for greater attention to sexuality that was at odds with whatever was defined as “normal.” They asserted that the line between “normal” and “abnormal” was always socially constructed, however, and that, in fact, all gender and sexual categories were artificial and changing. Some theorists celebrated all efforts at blurring or bending categories, viewing any sort of identity as both false and oppressive and celebrating hybridity and performance. Others had doubts about this, wondering whether one can work to end discrimination against homosexuals, women, African-Americans, or any other group, if one denies that the group has an essential identity, something that makes its members clearly homosexual or women or African-American. (A similar debate can be found

within the contemporary trans movement, with some people arguing that gender and sexual orientation are fundamental aspects of identity and others that they are not or should not be.) In the last decade, queer theory has been widely applied, as scholars have “queered” – that is, called into question the categories used to describe and analyze – the nation, race, religion, and other topics along with gender and sexuality. This broadening has led some – including a few of the founders of the field – to wonder whether queer theory loses its punch when everything is queer, but it continues to be an influential theoretical perspective.

Related questions about identity, subjectivity, and the cultural construction of difference have also emerged from postcolonial theory and critical race theory. Postcolonial history and theory was initially associated with South Asian scholars and the book series *Subaltern Studies*, and focused on people who have been subordinated (the meaning of *subaltern*) by virtue of their race, class, culture, or language as part of the process of colonization and imperialism in the modern world. Critical race theory developed in the 1980s as an outgrowth (and critique) of the civil rights movement combined with ideas derived from critical legal studies, a radical group of legal scholars who argued that supposedly neutral legal concepts such as the individual or meritocracy actually masked power relationships. Historians of Europe and the United States are increasingly applying insights from both of these theoretical schools to their own work, particularly as they investigate subaltern groups such as racial and ethnic minorities. World historians also now often use ideas developed by postcolonial theorists to analyze relationships of power in all chronological periods.

An important concept in much postcolonial and critical race theory has been the notion of hegemony, initially developed by the Italian political theorist Antonio Gramsci. Hegemony differs from domination because it involves convincing dominated groups to acquiesce to the desires and systems of the dominators through cultural as well as military and political means. Generally this was accomplished by granting special powers and privileges to some individuals and groups from among the subordinated population, or by convincing them through education or other forms of socialization that the new system was beneficial or preferable. The notion of hegemony explains why small groups of people have been able to maintain control over much larger populations without constant rebellion and protest, though some scholars have argued that the emphasis on hegemony downplays the ability of subjugated peoples to recognize the power realities in which they are enmeshed and to shape their own history. Many historians have used the concept of hegemony to examine the role of high-status women, who gained power over subordinate men and women through their relationships with high-status men. The Australian sociologist R. W. Connell has also applied the idea of hegemony to studies of masculinity, noting that

in every culture one form of masculinity is hegemonic, but men who are excluded from that particular form still benefit from male privilege.

Both postcolonial and critical race theory point out that racial, ethnic, and other hierarchies are deeply rooted social and cultural principles, not simply aberrations that can be remedied by legal or political change. They note that along with disenfranchising certain groups, such hierarchies privilege certain groups, a phenomenon that is beginning to be analyzed under the rubric of critical white studies. (This is a pattern similar to the growth of men's studies out of women's studies, and there is a parallel development in the historical study of heterosexuality, which has grown out of gay and lesbian history.)

Queer theory, postcolonial studies, and critical race theory have all been criticized from both inside and outside for falling into the pattern set by traditional history, that is, regarding the male experience as normative and paying insufficient attention to gender differences. Scholars who have pointed this out have also noted that much feminist scholarship suffered from the opposite problem, taking the experiences of heterosexual white women as normative and paying too little attention to differences of race, class, nationality, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. They argue that the experiences of women of color must be recognized as distinctive, and that no one axis of difference (men/women, black/white, rich/poor, gay/straight) should be viewed as sufficient. These criticisms led, in the 1990s, to theoretical perspectives that attempted to recognize multiple lines of difference, such as postcolonial feminism. Such scholarship has begun to influence many areas of gender studies, even those that do not deal explicitly with race or ethnicity. It appears this cross-fertilization will continue, as issues of difference and identity are clearly key topics for historians in the ever more connected twenty-first century world.

This discussion of scholarly trends may make it appear as if focusing on women or using gender as a category of analysis has swept the discipline of history, with scholars simply choosing the approach or topic they prefer. This is far from the actual situation. Though investigating gender may seem self-evident to students in some graduate programs, there are also many historians who continue to view this as a passing fad, despite the fact that such judgments become more difficult to maintain as the decades pass. Until very recently, books that explicitly take a world, global, or transnational history perspective have focused largely on economic and political developments without examining their gendered nature. Other historians invoke "gender" without really thinking through its implications for their interpretations of the past. Though titles like "man the artist" have largely disappeared, as most authors – or their editors – have recognized their false universality, books still divide their subjects into "artists" and "women artists" or "rulers" and "women rulers."

Studies of women and gender are also very unevenly distributed geographically and chronologically. Books on women's experience or that use gender as a category of analysis in the twentieth-century United States or early modern England, for example, number in the hundreds, while those that focus on Kiribati or Kazakhstan may be counted on one hand. This unevenness is related, not surprisingly, to uneven growth in women's studies programs, which is in turn related to the structure of higher education around the world and the ability or willingness of institutions of higher education to include new perspectives and programs. By the late 1970s, hundreds of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada offered courses in women's history, and many had separate programs in women's history or women's studies. Universities in Britain, Israel, and Australia were somewhat slower to include lectures and seminars on women, and universities in western and eastern Europe slower still. In Japan and elsewhere, much of the research on women has been done by people outside the universities involved with local history societies or women's groups, so has not been regarded as scholarly. Women in some countries in the early twenty-first century still report that investigating the history of women can get them pegged as less than serious and be detrimental to their future careers as historians.

The history done in any country is shaped by regional and world politics, and issues other than gender have often seemed more pressing to historians in Latin America, eastern Europe, and other parts of the world where political and economic struggles have been intense. Universities and researchers in developing countries also have far fewer resources, which has hampered all historical research and limited opportunities for any new direction. Thus an inordinate amount of the work in women's history and gender studies, including that which focuses on the continent of Europe and many other parts of the world, has been done by English-speaking historians, and the amount of research on English-speaking areas far outweighs that on the rest of the world. There is also imbalance within English-speaking areas, for studies of the United States vastly outnumber those of anywhere else; as one measure of this imbalance, more than two-thirds of the proposals to present papers at the Berkshire Conferences on Women's History during the 1980s and 1990s, the largest women's history conferences in the world, were on US topics.

There are signs that this imbalance is changing somewhat, as organizations to promote women's and gender history and academic women's or gender studies programs are gradually being established in more countries. Yet the head-start of English-language scholarship, combined with the ability of many students and scholars throughout the world to read English – and the inability of many English-speaking students and scholars to read anything but English – have meant that the exchange of theoretical insights and research results has to this point been largely a one-way street.

Structure of the Book

The dominance of English-language scholarship is both a blessing and a curse for the purposes of this book. Because of the sheer amount of materials available and the book's intended audience of students as well as scholars, I decided to include only English-language materials in the suggestion for further reading that follow each chapter and that appear on the accompanying website. You can trust that these works contain much of the newest and best research available, and they point to materials in other languages, but even these also represent only a small fraction of what is there. To explore any topic fully, you will need to go far beyond them, and in many cases, as with any historical topic, to read source materials, analyses, and theoretical discussions in other languages as well.

Organizing a brief book on a subject this huge was a challenge, made even greater by the fact that a key theme in women's and gender history has been the arbitrary and artificial nature of all boundaries – chronological, national, methodological, sexual. One of the central concepts in feminist history is that of intersection – most commonly used in the phrase “the intersection of race, class, and gender” – which highlights connections rather than boundaries. I thus decided to organize the book topically rather than geographically or chronologically, in order to highlight the specific connections between gender and other structures and institutions. Each topical chapter investigates the ways in which what it meant to be male and female was shaped by such aspects of society as economic or religious structures, and also explores the reverse – how gender in turn shaped work, for example, or religious institutions. This organization risks presenting gender as monolithic and ahistorical, however, and to lessen that tone most chapters are arranged chronologically to stress the ways in which gender structures have varied over time. (The Chronological Table of Contents at the start allows you to follow this organization.)

A key insight in world history presented another challenge: that human history begins not with writing, but with the earliest evolution of hominids, or perhaps even earlier. The world historian David Christian, for example, begins his consideration of world history with the Big Bang. This book does not start that early, but it does include material on the Paleolithic (2,000,000–9500 BCE) – the longest phase of human history – and the Neolithic (9500 BCE–3000 BCE) eras. It thus relies on the work of archaeologists, anthropologists, and others who study the physical remains of the past as well as historians, reflecting the view that the line between “prehistory” and “history” is no longer very sharp. Each chapter includes material from many of the world's cultures, notes both distinctions among them and links between them, and suggests possible reasons for variations among cultures and

among different social, ethnic, and racial groups within one culture. I certainly could not cover every topic in every culture, so I have chosen to highlight specific developments and issues within certain cultures that have proven to be especially significant. World historians emphasize that variations in both chronological and geographic scale are important tools of understanding, and I have used this insight here.

The order of the chapters is in some ways arbitrary, though it seemed appropriate to begin with the family, the smallest, oldest, and arguably most powerful shaper of gender. Thus chapter 2 explores the ways in which experiences within the family group differed for boys and girls, men and women. Taking insights from anthropology and demography, it notes changes in family structure and function over time, and discusses marriage patterns, family size, links between the family and other institutions, and norms and traditions of family life. Chapter 3 focuses on the economy, tracing the ways in which changes in economic structures – such as the means of production, patterns of work and consumption, and ownership practices – and in the meaning of those structures, shaped and were shaped by gender. Chapter 4 looks at ideals, norms, and laws, observing the ways in which groups defined what it meant to be a man or woman, linked these meanings with other cultural categories, and developed formal and informal means both of heightening and lessening distinctions based on gender. Chapter 5 investigates one type of particularly powerful institution, religion, and looks at the ways in which traditional religions and the major world religions have simultaneously strengthened and questioned existing gender patterns through their basic doctrines and the structures established to enforce those doctrines. Chapter 6 considers another type of institution, politics, and explores how different forms of government have both shaped and been shaped by gender, from the earliest evidence of state formation to the contemporary political scene. It takes a broad view of political life, discussing civic and voluntary organizations along with local, national, and international political bodies, and it traces the movement for women's rights. Chapter 7 focuses on how gender figures in what is normally described as “culture,” such as literature, art, architecture, and music, investigating the differing opportunities for men and women to be involved in education, training, and cultural production. Chapter 8 switches from a focus on institutions to a more individualized topic, sexuality, and traces the ways in which sexual attraction and sexual activity have been viewed and shaped, noting also how these interact with gender to create a historicized body.

The main themes and questions within each chapter often link with many of the other chapters, as one would expect for an issue as complex and pervasive as gender. This is particularly true as one goes further back in history, for most of the records we have refer to institutions that had multiple functions: Buddhist or Christian monasteries that owned land, supported cultural

endeavors, and ruled territories, for example, or noble families who supported particular religious groups, organized work on their land, and used their children's marriages to increase family power. This interconnection is especially strong when looking at what many people regard as the key question in all of gender history, the origins of a gender hierarchy in which men are dominant and women are subordinate, what is normally called patriarchy. In every culture that has left written records, men have more power and access to resources than women, and this imbalance permeates every topic that will be a focus of subsequent chapters in this book – legal sanctions, intellectual structures, religious systems, economic privileges, social institutions, and cultural norms. Thus before we look at the ways these have separately interacted with gender, it will be helpful to explore various explanations that have been proposed as to the source of male dominance.

The Origins of Patriarchy

Searching for the origins of patriarchy first involves forgetting what biology, anthropology, psychology, and history have all revealed about the instability and ambiguity of dichotomous gender categories. Despite the presence of third and fourth genders, intersexed people, and transgendered individuals, most of the world's cultures have a system of two main genders in which there are enormous differences between what it means to be a man and what it means to be a woman. This dualistic gender system has often been associated with other dichotomies, such as body/spirit, public/private, nature/culture, light/dark, up/down, outside/inside, yin/yang, right/left, sun/moon, a process we will examine more closely in chapter 4. Some of these dichotomies, such as sun/moon and light/dark, are naturally occurring and in many cultures viewed as divinely created, which has enabled people to view the male/female dichotomy also as natural or divinely ordained. This dichotomy, along with others with which it was associated, has generally been viewed as a hierarchy, with the male linked with the stronger and more positive element in other pairs (public, culture, light, right, sun, etc.) and the female with the weaker and more negative one (private, nature, dark, left, moon, etc.).

This gender hierarchy is highly variable in its intensity and manifestations, but it has survived every change: every revolution, whether French, Haitian, Scientific or Industrial, every war, religious transformation, technological development, and cultural encounter. Twentieth-century Russia is a good example of this; whether under the czars or the Communists or the post-Soviet government, women still did the shopping and the housekeeping and most of the child care, adding an unpaid "second shift" to their jobs in

the paid workforce; these tasks were necessary to keep society functioning, but left women no time for the things that were valued and rewarded, such as further education or political activities. How did this incredibly powerful system originate?

Answers to this question have varied, with many scientists seeing the roots of patriarchy in the prehuman past. Compared to other animals, female mammals have to invest a great deal of time and energy in carrying and then nursing offspring if they are to reproduce successfully. Males simply fertilize a female. Thus, to many scientists, female reproductive success (defined as the transmission of one's genes to the next generation) is – to put it succinctly – a matter of quality, and male a matter of quantity. Females are more careful than males about choosing a partner that will provide protection, food, or help in rearing the young. This creates a conflict, and that conflict is often resolved by male sexual coercion: males force females to have sex, usually through physical violence, sometimes preceded by infanticide of a female's existing infant. Females sometimes give in – after all, a male able to drive other males away might also provide her with the protection she needs during birth and lactation – but they also resist. Effective resistance generally involves the female making alliances with other females or with a few males, or with certain females playing a “king-making” role, that is, with providing support to males who are trying to achieve and maintain high status in the group.

The success of male sexual coercion varies among primates, including among the great apes. It is greatest among those primates, such as orangutans, where females are usually on their own and not with a kin group that can help protect them. It is least among bonobos, who live in large groups of related males and females. The tendency for solitary or group living, and for females to depend on kin to protect them from male aggression, is dependent on the environment, and in some primates this differs from group to group. Among baboons, for example, in some groups female kin live together and support one another while in others females separate from their kin and males successfully dominate females. Such behavior is learned, however, and not “natural.” When scientists released a female baboon from a group in which female kin live together into another group in which they did not, she quickly learned to follow the strongest male, that is, the one who was threatening and biting her.

Male sexual coercion among most animals is an individual matter, and males interact with one another primarily by fighting over females. Among the “higher” animal species, however, including chimpanzees and dolphins as well as humans, males form alliances, generally with the kin with whom they live, to gain status against other males and to gain greater access to females. Male–male alliances allow for cooperative attacks on females, which makes female resistance difficult. In the animal world, male–male

alliances are often short-lived, as there is much fighting for status among the group. Among humans, sometime during the Paleolithic Era males developed the ability to control male–male competition within the group so that the group could be more successful in its hunt for prey and in its competition with other humans. They did this by talking with one another, and they developed what we call “rules,” “rituals,” or “cultural norms.” As the primatologist Barbara Smuts has commented, “If male chimpanzees could talk, they would probably develop rudimentary myths and rituals that increased male political solidarity and control over females and that decreased female tendencies toward autonomy and rebellion.”

To some evolutionary psychologists, male–male cooperation in organized violence was the origin of human as well as primate society. This argument builds on the work of sociobiologists the 1960s and 1970s, who asserted that, as in all mammals, because men produce millions of sperm and women relatively few mature eggs, reproductive success for men means impregnating as many women as possible while keeping other men from doing so, while for women it means caring for their offspring. Evolutionary psychologists added to this line of reasoning, asserting that physical and psychological differences enhanced these reproductive differences: pregnancy and lactation kept women dependent on others for food and protection, and men’s greater upper-body strength allowed them to dominate once humans walked upright and used hand-held weapons for hunting and against each other. This created, some asserted, a propensity for violence in men and nurturing in women that was passed down genetically and thus became “natural.” Male violence in humans was gradually controlled by rules that created a hierarchy among males, set patterns through which resources – especially meat – would be distributed, and allowed males to control female sexuality through something other than force. The rules were, of course, backed up by the possibility of violence if they were broken, but lessened day-to-day occurrence of that violence, and they slowly grew into political structures, economic systems, and laws. They also created all aspects of what we now term patriarchy: male dominance over females, dominance of some males over others, and inequality in the distribution of resources. Women had difficulty resisting male violence because they left their initial kin groups to mate, joining the kin group of their male mate in what the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss long ago termed “the exchange of women.” (The blander term for this is “patrilocation.”)

Very recently, some evolutionary scientists and anthropologists have challenged every aspect of this story about human evolution. They assert that promiscuity may actually be reproductively advantageous for females as well as males as it assures a greater likelihood of pregnancy. Food that came from gathering was more important than meat to survival in the long Paleolithic Era, and in any case much hunting may have been net or communal in which

women and children as well as men participated. Yes, humans are born more helpless than practically any other animal, so the investment of time and energy in caring, bearing, and nursing offspring is particularly great. But women had help. Although fathers could not provide breast-milk – the only food available to gatherer-hunters that infants can easily digest – they assisted in other ways. (Once humans began to domesticate sheep and goats, and to raise grain crops, animal milk and cereal mush were added as possibilities for infant food, although not until rubber was vulcanized in the twentieth century, making it soft enough to be made into an artificial nipple, was there a way to get these foods easily into the mouth of a very young infant.) More importantly, patrilocation was not the practice everywhere, and in many groups women relied on their female relatives, including their own mothers, in what the anthropologist Kristen Hawkes has termed the “grandmother hypothesis.” Hawkes and others note that communal care of offspring in humans far exceeds that of any other primates. Cooperative child-rearing, and the development of social skills and adaptability it encouraged, may have been a more important source of the development of human culture than organized group violence. Humans share organized violence with other species, but are unique in the duration and complexity of their care for children, so that studies of other primates may not apply well to early humans. Scholars warn about viewing primate behavior through the lens of human gender norms, as “jealous” male chimpanzees guard their “harems” or “beguiling” female bonobos “entice” food from the hands of “smitten” males.

This more egalitarian evolutionary biology is based on very new research, but in some ways it reinforces an old idea, that hunter-gatherers (or, more accurately, gatherer-hunters) were less hierarchical and that agriculture created patriarchy. This idea was first proposed by German social theorists of the nineteenth century, most prominently the scholar J. J. Bachofen. Bachofen asserted that human society had originally been a matriarchy in which mothers were all-powerful; the mother–child bond was the original source of culture, religion, and community, but gradually father–child links came to be regarded as more important, and superior (to Bachofen’s eyes) patriarchal structures developed. Bachofen’s ideas about primitive matriarchy were accepted by the socialist Friedrich Engels, who postulated a two-stage process from matriarchy to patriarchy. In matriarchal cultures, goods were owned in common, but with the expansion of agriculture and animal husbandry men began to claim ownership of crops, animals, and land, thus developing the notion of private property. Once men had private property, in most cultures they established patrilineal inheritance systems in which property was passed down through the male line. They became very concerned about passing it on to their own heirs and attempted to control women’s sexual lives to assure that offspring were legitimate. This led to the development of the nuclear family, which was followed by the development

of the state, in which men's rights over women were legitimized through a variety of means, a process Engels describes as the "world historical defeat of the female sex."

The idea that human society was originally a matriarchy with female deities and female leaders was taken up by a few archaeologists studying prehistoric cultures, for Europe most prominently Marija Gimbutus. Gimbutus argues that during the Paleolithic and Neolithic period, people living in Europe and the Mediterranean area were egalitarian, peaceful, and woman-centered, honoring the earth as a mother goddess. This "Old Europe" was gradually overtaken through conquest and migration after 4000 BCE by Indo-European speaking people who originated in the steppes of Russia. These new people were militaristic, seminomadic, and patriarchal, and they worshipped a single male god and often followed a single male military leader. Though most archaeologists dispute Gimbutus's ideas, they have been very influential among popular writers such as Merlin Stone and Riane Eisler, and among groups seeking alternative forms of spirituality; the Goddess now has a number of organizations and websites devoted to her worship, and her followers are developing new rituals and symbols that link to those of the prehistoric past.

Some scholars of Africa, most prominently Cheikh Anta Diop and Ifi Amadiume, agree with Gimbutus's critics that there is little evidence of matriarchy in Europe, but find evidence of matriarchy in ancient Africa. Diop points particularly to queenship among the ancient Egyptians, and Amadiume to matricentric household units and women's market networks. The notion that human society was originally a matriarchy has also been accepted by some historians from the People's Republic of China, who point to the development of certain characters in the Chinese writing system, ancient folk tales, and some archaeological evidence. Most Chinese historians do not agree with this interpretation, however, noting that the evidence for a subordination of women is much stronger and includes some of the earliest written sources; they attribute the desire to see a matriarchy more to the acceptance of Engels' theories for ideological reasons among Marxist leaders than to strong evidence. Archaeologists and historians of the early Americas have also debated the extent to which some groups may have been matriarchal and matrilineal (that is, couples lived with the wife's kin after marriage), or at least egalitarian in terms of gender, though here, again, the evidence is ambiguous.

The key problem in discussions of primitive matriarchy is the lack of written sources. Even those who argue that there was an original matriarchy agree that writing brought patriarchy, whether this was in Mesopotamia in the third millennium BCE or in North America in the eighteenth century CE. This means that earlier evidence – archaeological remains, oral tradition, discussions of older traditions in later written records, literary sources such as creation stories or mythology – is fragmentary and difficult to interpret.

Because of these problems, most historians avoid discussing matriarchy entirely, and many have chosen to stay away from all consideration of the origins of patriarchy, viewing the issue as too politicized and at any rate outside the time period in which they are interested. Anthropologists as well have pointed out the problems in focusing on the “origins” of anything, which tends to overlook multiple causation and divergent lines of development.

One historian who has not shied away from this debate is Gerda Lerner, who has tipped Engels’ line of causation on its head; women, she argues, *were* the first property, exchanged for their procreative power by men with other men through marriage, prostitution, and slavery. Thus patriarchy preceded other forms of hierarchy and domination such as social classes, and women became primarily defined by their relation to men. Like Engels, Lerner links patriarchy with property ownership and political structures, but she also stresses the importance of nonmaterial issues such as the creation of symbols and meaning through religion and philosophy. Women were excluded from direct links to the divine in Mesopotamian religion and Judaism, and defined as categorically inferior to men in Greek philosophy; thus both of the traditions generally regarded as the sources of Western culture – the Bible and Greek (particularly Aristotelian) thought – affirmed women’s secondary position. Because other hierarchies such as those of hereditary aristocracy, class, or race privileged the women connected to powerful or wealthy men, women did not see themselves as part of a coherent group and often supported the institutions and intellectual structures that subordinated them, a good example of Gramsci’s idea of hegemony.

Lerner’s ideas have been challenged from a number of perspectives. Materialist historians have objected to her emphasis on ideas and symbols, and to the notion that gender hierarchies preceded those based on property ownership, while some classicists have argued that she misread ancient prostitution and other aspects of early cultures. Despite these objections, however, some of her – and Engels’ – points are now widely accepted, and have been supported by subsequent research. Though the lines of causation are not clear, the development of agriculture was accompanied by increasing subordination of women in many parts of the world. Among gatherer-hunters, male control of meat resources was countered by female gathering, which placed some limits on male control of women. Seminomadic horticulture also requires women’s mobility, making it difficult for men to control women’s daily activities. Intensive agriculture, however, particularly agriculture using a plow, made it easier for men to control women’s movements and resources. Women’s work was more concentrated in a small area, so men could more easily monitor them. Plow agriculture increased the food supply, but also increased the resources needed to produce that food. As men plowed (literally) more resources into their land, they set up inheritance systems to pass land and other goods on to the next generation. In patrilineal systems, property went to their own

children, so men were motivated to increase their surveillance of women's sexual activities. (How much of men's desire to control women's sexuality in a patrilineal system is "biological" and how much is cultural is hotly disputed. In the less common matrilineal systems a man's heirs are his sister's children, not his wife's, so such surveillance was clearly based more on cultural norms about family honor than on a "biological" imperative to reproduce.) Men generally carried out the plowing and care for animals, which led to boys being favored over girls for the work they could do for their parents while young and the support they could provide in their parents' old age; boys became the normal inheritors of family land and the rights to work communally held land. Thus over generations, women's access to resources decreased, and it became increasingly difficult for them to survive without male support.

The states that developed in the ancient Middle East after 3000 BCE, and then in the Mediterranean, India, China, and Central and South America, further heightened gender distinctions. They depended on taxes and tribute as well as slave labor for their support, and so their rulers were very interested in maintaining population levels. All of these states were dominated by hereditary aristocracies, who became concerned with maintaining the distinction between themselves and the majority of the population. This concern led to attempts to control reproduction through laws governing sexual relations and, more importantly, through marriage norms and practices that set up a very unequal relationship between spouses. These laws built on existing rules already in place to enhance male–male alliances and lessen male–male aggression. In most states, laws were passed mandating that women be virgins on marriage and imposing strict punishment for a married woman's adultery; sexual relations outside of marriage on the part of husbands were not considered adultery. Concern with family honor thus became linked to women's sexuality in a way that it was not for men; men's honor revolved around their work activities and, for more prominent families, around their performance of public duties in the expanding government bureaucracies, including keeping written records.

These economic and political developments were accompanied and supported by cultural norms and religious concepts that heightened gender distinctions. In some places heavenly hierarchies came to reflect those on earth, with the gods arranged in a hierarchy dominated by a single male god, who was viewed as the primary creator of life. In others the cosmos itself was gendered, with order and harmony depending on a balance between male and female, but a balance in which male forces were the more powerful. The original human is often understood to be male, until something bad happens that results in females.

Most scholars thus see the development of patriarchy as a complicated process, involving everything that is normally considered part of "civilization": property ownership, plow agriculture, the bureaucratic state, writing,

hereditary aristocracies, and the development of organized religion and philosophy. Many point out that cultures in which most of these did not develop, such as the !Kung (Jul'hoansi) of South Africa, Mbuti of Zaire, or Innu (Montagnais-Naskapi) of Labrador, appear to be (or have been) quite egalitarian, with the tasks of men and women differentiated, but equally valued. Cultures in which several of these were lacking, such as some in North America that did not have bureaucratic states or plow agriculture, were also less patriarchal than the norm. This is not universally the case, however, for there are also gathering and hunting cultures in which male dominance is extreme. There are also differences in the level of male dominance in civilizations that grew up quite near to each other, such as ancient Mesopotamia, in which systematic repression of women was severe, and ancient Egypt, in which women were treated with more respect and were more active in politics and religion.

The gender structures that developed in the ancient world or in cultures that were largely isolated were thus variable and complex, and this complexity only increased as cultures came into contact with one another. The remainder of this book is an attempt to sort through some of this complexity, to view some of the ways in which gender has interacted with other types of structures and institutions that people have created and that subsequently shaped their lives. It is based on my own research and that of many people who examine what the (incomplete) written and material record reveals about the past. Much of that record is the story of women's subordination, which may make you, as the reader, feel angry, depressed, or defensive. If you do, please remember that this is not a book about what might have been, what should be, or what could happen in the future; that I leave to philosophers, ethicists, theologians, and you.

FURTHER READING

The best place to begin in considering the socially constructed nature of gender is still Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy McKenna, *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* (New York: Wiley, 1978). Judith Butler's works, especially *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (2nd edn., New York: Routledge, 2000), are central to thinking about sex and gender, though they can be challenging to read. Anne Fausto-Sterling's *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality* (New York: Basic Books, 2000) is equally significant. An important study of the relationship between gender hierarchies and other systems of power is R. W. Connell, *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 1987).

Much thinking about gender is undertaken by feminist scholars in many disciplines. An excellent overview of feminist thought is Rosemarie Tong,

Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction (3rd edn., Boulder: Westview Press, 2008). A collection with materials from an international and multiracial group of authors is Carole McCann and Sueng-Kyung Kim, eds., *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (2nd edn., New York: Routledge, 2009). For feminist scholarship in many fields, see the series Oxford Readings in Feminism.

There are several major collections of articles on gender history around the world, including Teresa A. Meade and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, eds., *A Companion to Gender History* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004) and Bonnie G. Smith, ed., *Women's History in Global Perspective* (3 vols., Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004). For a collection of the writings of feminist historians, organized chronologically, see Sue Morgan, ed., *The Feminist History Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

Joan Scott's widely reprinted article, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91:5 (1986), 1053–75 remains essential reading, as evidenced by the recent *AHR* Forum: "Revisiting 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,'" *American Historical Review*, 113:5 (2008), 1344–1430, which has articles by six historians about gender history around the world and a response by Scott. The development of women's and gender history as a field has been examined in Judith Zinsser, *History and Feminism: A Glass Half Full* (New York: Twayne, 1992); Johanna Alberti, *Gender and the Historian* (New York: Longman, 2002); Laura Lee Downs, *Writing Gender History* (London: Hodder/Arnold, 2004); special issue of *Journal of Women's History* "History Practice: Gendering Trans/National Historiographies," 19:1 (Spring 2007). Judith M. Bennett, *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) examines trends in women's and gender history over the last several decades and calls for historicizing the study of patriarchy. Kathleen Canning, *Gender History in Practice: Historical Perspectives on Bodies, Class, and Citizenship* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006) looks at the impact of gender history. For excellent surveys of trends in women's and gender history around the world, see Karen Offen, Ruth Roach Pierson, and Jane Rendell, eds., *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990) and Leonore Davidoff, Keith McClelland, and Eleni Varikas, eds., *Gender and History: Retrospect and Prospect* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000).

Sex and gender

For very thorough discussions that include the latest biological research on sex differences, see Natalie Angier, *Woman: An Intimate Geography* (New York: Anchor, 1999) and David C. Geary, *Male, Female: The Evolution of Human Sex Differences* (2nd edn., New York: American Psychological

Association, 2009). A succinct review of anthropological approaches is Frances E. Mascia-Lees and Nancy Johnson Black, *Gender and Anthropology* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 1999). Gilbert Herdt, ed., *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History* (New York: Zone Books, 1994) and Sabrina Petra Ramet, ed., *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 1996) contain essays about gender crossing, blending, inverting and transcending in past and present, and Joanne Meyerowitz, *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004) investigates the ways in which transsexual people have challenged ideas about sex, gender, and sexuality over the last 50 years.

Gender history and theory

Doubts about the value of “women” as an analytical category were conveyed most forcefully in Denise Riley, “Am I That Name?” *Feminism and the Category of “Women” in History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), though they have primarily been associated with the work of Joan Scott, such as *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2004) offers a broad survey of debates about history and theory.

For queer theory, good places to begin are Riki Wilchens, *Queer Theory, Gender Theory: An Instant Primer* (New York: Alyson Books, 2004), which incorporates the author’s experiences as an activist, or the more scholarly Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory: An Introduction* (New York: New York University Press, 1996). For essays linking feminist and queer theory, see Elizabeth Weed and Naomi Schor, eds., *Feminism Meets Queer Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997) and for a work that focuses on history, see Scott Bravman, *Queer Fictions of the Past: History, Culture and Difference* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997). For analyses of the current state of queer theory, see Thomas Piontek, *Queering Gay and Lesbian Studies* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), and a special issue of *The GLQ Forum*, “Thinking Sex/Thinking Gender,” 10:2 (2004), 211–313.

On critical race theory, see Kimberlé Crenshaw et al., eds., *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement* (New York: New Press, 1995). For the field of critical white studies, see Ruth Frankenberg, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993). Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) and Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (2nd edn., London:

Routledge, 2005) both provide good introductory surveys of the main ideas in postcolonial theory. A solid introduction to Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony is Joseph V. Femia, *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness and the Revolutionary Process* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

Two articles are especially helpful for understanding links between gender and race in history, and have been widely reprinted in various collections: Tessie Liu, "Teaching the Differences among Women from a Historical Perspective: Rethinking Race and Gender as Social Categories," *Women's Studies International Forum* 14 (1991), 265–76 and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race," *Signs* 17 (1992), 251–74. The best introduction to Critical Race Feminism is provided in two books edited by Adrien Katherine Wing, *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1997) and *Global Critical Race Feminism: An International Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2000). Several works that bring together gender and postcolonial theory are Trin T. Minh-ha, *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989); Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shoalt, eds., *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation and Post-colonial Perspectives* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); John C. Hawley, ed., *Postcolonial and Queer Theories: Intersections and Essays* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2001); Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).

The origins of patriarchy

The classic sociobiological account of human evolution is Edmund O. Wilson, *On Human Nature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978). The many books of Sarah Bluffer Hrdy, including *The Woman That Never Evolved* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999) and *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Human Understanding* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009) provide the new more egalitarian perspective on evolution, as does Kristen Hawkes and Richard R. Paine, *The Evolution of Human Life History* (Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 2006). The articles and books of Barbara Smuts provide fascinating accounts of primate society; the quotation in the text is from her "The Evolutionary Origins of Patriarchy," *Human Nature*, 6:1 (1995).

For the earliest writers who discussed primitive matriarchy, see Johann J. Bachofen, *Myth, Religion and Mother Right: Selected Writings of J. J. Bachofen*, trans. Ralph Mannheim (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University

Press, 1967) and Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, ed. Eleanor Leacock (New York: International Publishers, 1972). Marija Gimbutus has written over 20 books, most of which include her ideas about matriarchy and the goddess; her definitive work is *The Civilization of the Goddess: The World of Old Europe* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991). Her work has been the inspiration for Merlin Stone, *When God Was a Woman* (New York: Dial Press, 1976) and Riane Eisler, *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988). It has been criticized in Lucy Goodison and Christine Morris, eds., *Ancient Goddesses* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999). For matriarchy in Africa, see the many works of Chiekh Anta Diop, especially *The Cultural Unity of Black Africa: The Domains of Matriarchy and Patriarchy in Classical Antiquity* (London: Karnak House, 1989), and of Ifi Amadiume, especially *Re-inventing Africa: Matriarchy, Religion, and Culture* (London: Zed Books, 1997).

Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) remains the most important discussion of the origins of patriarchy by a historian. Many studies by anthropologists and archaeologists have contributed to our understanding of this issue; these are discussed in Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey, *Engendering Archaeology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991) and Sarah Milledge Nelson, *Gender in Archaeology: Analyzing Power and Prestige* (2nd edn., Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2004).

There is a much longer list of suggested readings, along with links to original sources, on the website associated with this book: www.wiley.com/go/wiesnerhanks.