

## Chapter 2

# Shattered Mirrors: Gender, Age, and Westernized Interpretations of War (and Violence) in the Past

Kathryn M. Koziol

### Introduction

In thinking about this volume, I was intrigued by the cultural theoretical framing that was being explored for application by bioarchaeologists. I think that this is a positive direction and I am an advocate for more holistic and multi-field research with anthropology in general but also specifically in bioarchaeology. There is a tremendous potential for biocultural and bioarchaeological research that truly integrates these materials (Buikstra and Scott 2009; Goodman 2013, 2014; Goldstein 2006) and this current collection certainly will help add to the growing literature that includes this perspective. However, there are a few points that I want to explore more deeply in terms of making solid inter-subfield connections as well as looking at some of the potential issues that are likely to arise in this type of research. This, in general, involves deconstructing the specifics of theoretical frames and concepts that we seek to apply and ultimately concluding that their use might require limited application by bioarchaeologists. For instance, the concept of a continuum of violence (Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004:1), the use of modern terminologies in explaining past events (particularly in prehistoric contexts), and the continued dominance of Western concepts of sex and gender, and perceptions of age in our interpretations of the past (see Buikstra and Scott 2009 for a detailed bioarchaeological discussion of the life course approach, as well as a brief history of gender and sex discussions in anthropology), all struck me as potentially problematic areas for anthropologists researching ancient contexts of violence especially those who seek to engender these behaviors. These are not insurmountable issues and their exploration helps to demonstrate the inherent complexities that exist in both cultural behaviors and archaeological contexts. I suggest a broad application of the cultural data

---

K.M. Koziol, Ph.D. (✉)

Department of Anthropology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, USA  
e-mail: [kkoziol@uark.edu](mailto:kkoziol@uark.edu)

from modern cultures and theories of cultures because these theories and data might be best suited to exploring potential ranges in beliefs and behaviors but often are not well suited for constructing specific models of behavior to predict future behaviors universally nor to interpret the past in cross-cultural contexts. Supporting data used in this chapter were compiled from ethnographic, ethnohistoric, and archaeological contexts.

Acts of violence are indeed deeply embedded within cultural and social processes and we should recognize that as such these are not expressed, understood, nor experienced identically by members of different populations or even by members of the same population (Krohn-Hansen 1994:368; Ralph 2013; Redfern 2013:64, 68–69; Walker 2001). I cannot maximize the importance of understanding the cultural contingency of social contexts enough, as the variances in contexts might significantly impact our interpretations. In other words, we should not assume that our interpretations of acts of violence are not subject to our own cultural and social processes and that even actions that may appear mechanically the same (or very similar) may be valued differently between cultures. Nor, perhaps, should we assume that violent acts themselves are universally understood and seen as natural human behavior (see argument presented in Fry 2006). Patterns of violence certainly exist (Eller 2006; Ember and Ember 1997; Kelly 2000; Knauff 1987, 1991; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004; Martin and Frayer 1997; Martin et al. 2012; Ralph 2013, and many others) but they are by no means simple to extract and/or interpret even in modern contexts (Eller 2006), and when approaching it from a broad anthropological perspective it becomes evident that ignoring cross-cultural interpretations might cause researchers to miss the variations in meanings, and these may require multiple definitions to describe the act of violence itself (Bruhns and Stothert 1999; Guilaïne and Zammit 2005:233; Medicine 1983; Ralph 2013). By exploring the emic perspectives in modern cultures it becomes easier to see the differences that exist in the production of these actions in various cultures as well as demonstrate that these differences are significant and important. For example, there are vast differences in motivations, available participants—both as perpetrators and as victims, and in the specific forms of violence that may be culturally seen as acceptable versus unacceptable (which could furthermore be ignored by participants). Participants might even simultaneously be classified as both perpetrators and victims (Bornstein 2002); it would be difficult if not impossible to reconstruct that level of individual and social complexity and positionality in past contexts. Differences might also in part be attributed to differences in the sociopolitical arrangement of cultures but also may relate to belief systems, mythos, individual personhood, and more. In other words, it is erroneous to assume that we can always assess with sufficient confidence the specific meaning behind the actions (forms of violence) experienced by individuals, nor the identities of these individuals, through the interpretation of the pathological patterns visible on human remains or that we should assume to fully know the circumstances that produced these past contexts; we can only glean so much from these incomplete productions (Ralph 2013:3).

We should also recognize that the acts of violence themselves often overlap and that interpretations are limited to the contexts in which they are found and these

interpretations are further skewed by interpreter biases (Koziol 2010). For instance, prisoners of war might have been symbolically important sacrifices and their deaths could be classified in both categories of violent behavior (though not all prisoners may be viewed as suitable for sacrifice and other warfare casualties might never become prisoners). The captured individuals could be further subjected to interpersonal attacks (non-communal) that might include beatings, rape, humiliation, and more. Furthermore, they may have been selected for warfare participation based on their perceived identities, which could include considerations of sex, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, economic standing, and more. It may be impossible to distinguish all forms of violence present, just as it is likely impossible to identify all the intersections of the identities of these individuals. These are not new critiques in both archaeological and bioarchaeological research; however, in terms of trying to isolate and distinguish physical health, demographic, and other bioarchaeologically relevant consequences that may relate to warfare or violent conditions in the past, and specifically looking at the experiences of potential noncombatants, we find that these interpretations become murkier. Some of this difficulty in assessment is the result of the nature of the archaeological and bioarchaeological records and some comes as a result of the application of terminology that may lack cultural relevance and distinction in past populations. The goal of this chapter is not to discount the important and interesting information that is derived from previous bioarchaeological and archaeological studies of violence in the past but is to bring to this discussion some of the complications in applying modern social theories and modern understandings of gender, sex, and violence in both modern and past populations (Koziol 2010).

## **Using Modern Terminology and Concepts, and Interpreting Meaning in the Past**

Defining acts of violence in the past using modern terminology is not only difficult but may encourage applying Western models and understanding of these acts at the expense of losing sight of the culturally situated nature of the construction of these behaviors (Fry 2006; Koziol 2010; Ralph 2013). For instance, in the modern context, acts of torture are viewed in a predominantly negative light in most contexts and may be considered as a breach in international agreements of legitimate war actions and therefore may be punishable for the perpetrators of these acts in this broad context. If we take specific actions that might be included under categories of torture in many modern contexts (e.g., maiming, burning, cutting, beating, and more), these are not always viewed in the same manner by all populations. For example, looking throughout the historical record it is revealed that various behaviors that fall under this category may be mechanisms in some cases for individuals and/or kin groups to gain social prestige and status or to preserve the honor of kin groups; that they should not be simply dismissed as inhumane or seen as a breach in human rights (another modern concept) though they might be. Among the

seventeenth-century Huron, torture of prisoners was enacted by both men and women and was performed on men, women, and children in varying contexts that would provide a mechanism to gain honor for both the torturers and those who experienced the acts of torture but maintained a brave or defiant face (Koziol 2010; Robb 2008; Trigger 2002:58–64). This is not to say that there were not differences based on age and gender. For example, it was more common for males to be extensively tortured at the captors' home village, while women and children might be tortured and killed upon capture and if brought to the captors' home village women and children were more likely to be adopted into the group in various ways (Robb 2008:91; Trigger 2002:58). Through the use of ethnohistoric methods, Trigger was able to reconstruct some of these variances in contexts and was also able to include a discussion of the underlying motivations and meanings that were associated with these acts of violence. He was able to learn that warfare events were sometimes enacted as retaliation killings and feuds but also that they could be additionally motivated by religious matters or as a way to earn honor and prestige (Trigger 2002:52). These details are often lost to the archaeological record and cannot be reconstructed by looking at the treatment of the body even by the best trained bioarchaeologists, who are in essence forced to rely on their own cultural understandings and historical contextualizations about behaviors and meaning in interpreting acts of violence. It is not that the interpretations would be necessarily incorrect in their modern cultural contexts but as the values behind these actions are subject to change (Robb 2008; Rosaldo 1980), it is possible that from a cross-cultural or historical perspective these behaviors are not constructed in mutually intelligible ways and the effects of equifinality would further complicate interpretations of the past. Specifically, acts of torture and other violent actions that result from acute violence might be misinterpreted by using a modern lens and be assumed as actions that were solely (or primarily) used to dehumanize these victims, or they might be missing from the record as not all those who were tortured were treated in the same manner nor even experienced these acts at the same locations, as evident in the case of the Huron torture practices. Some of these acts of violence involve intersecting relationships between gender, status, ethnicity, and more which further complicates the production and interpretation of events, as one act of violence might overlap with other forms of violence (i.e., structural and symbolic) which might not be easily untangled, if at all, in many past contexts.

It is also significant to remember that some of our modern terminologies to describe acts of violence may present new ways to explore past events. Prior to WWII there was no term that was widely applied to violent events that included actions that systematically and intentionally destroyed populations. It is not that these behaviors did not exist prior to these events but that the scale as well as the shared knowledge and experiences of these events was so widely visible in the WWII context that they could not be dismissed and ignored by the increasingly interconnected global community. In fact, in coining the term genocide, Raphael Lemkin used the previous experiences of exile and killing of Armenians by the Young Turks as behavior that certainly fell under that category. Again, this does not represent a new or completely unique behavior but a change in how the behavior

was identified and discussed (Koziol 2010; Ralph 2013; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004). I agree with Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois (2004:6) that there has been a reluctance to discuss some violent behaviors in various indigenous cultures because of a legitimate fear that this would further “other” and exotify peoples but this not only produces a romantic view of the past, but it may also unintentionally dehumanize these populations further; in other words, it produces new and not necessarily less dangerous stereotypes of these populations.

Bioarchaeologists have long studied individuals and groups who were involved in violent encounters; the pathological indications left on some remains are undoubtedly clear in terms of their participation in violent acts (Martin and Frayer 1997; Martin et al. 2012; Walker 2001). It is also clear that indigenous groups around the globe participated in violent interactions, prior to Western expansions and for a variety of purposes (e.g., honor, resources, retaliation). New perspectives and classifications should not necessarily be left out of these discussions as the more traditional perspectives were also products of their time. Interestingly, accepting a fluidity and change in how we interpret these events also reminds us that their production and meanings also may have changed within the cultures that produced them (Rosaldo 1980).

The use of modern warfare and violence terminologies and concepts shapes the interpretations of these data by causing us to only consider some types of events (e.g., feuds, raids, battle, war, genocide, sacrifice) based on interpretations of scale, scope, and mode of death which are necessarily shaped by modern understandings, thus collapsing the intersections between categories like gender or age bias that could influence access to resources including diets, or the presence of poverty that might be experienced by some members of the society, or could lead to acts of violence based on gender, age, or economic status. At Cahokia’s Mound 72, interpretations focus on the possible status of killed individuals as sacrificial victims (Ambrose et al. 2003; Goldstein 1981; Porubcan 2000; Rose 1999; and many others). While that may be the case, it does not exclude the possibility that individuals experienced other forms of violence or held multiple identities, such as victims of gendered, ethnic, religious, or other targeted forms of violence, or may have been perpetrators of violent acts as well (Koziol 2010, 2012). Using a modern and usually Western frame shapes who we expect to see involved directly versus indirectly in these behaviors and therefore guides interpretations of combatants versus noncombatants, victims versus perpetrators, and more. It also significantly limits our ability to understand the complexity of both identities and violent events that are not discrete.

## A Brief Note on Scope and Scale

There are large issues in recognizing and interpreting the scale (size, including number of populations involved) and scope (sectors of the population who participate in or are affected by these acts directly or indirectly) of these events. In modern

contexts, this might affect aid and intervention response times that attempt to prevent or limit some acts of violence like genocide; these are further complicated by political plays, which also no doubt had a presence in past contexts and influence the performance of these events. Specifically, when we explore archaeological contexts these issues might cause us to misinterpret the type of event that occurred at a particular location based on things like burial practices, number and frequency of violent events, and who was likely to be involved as victims, perpetrators, or both. We should not assume that individuals or groups solely fulfilled just one of those roles but should see them as creative identity categories. In prehistoric contexts, it might also be difficult to assess the effects on communities and individuals who might be indirectly affected, such as having limited or restricted access to resources like food and water due to shortages or blockades versus environmental or other social causes in these restrictions that may or may not include violent behavior (e.g., rituals like rites of passage might involve intentional and prolonged food restrictions, blights and disease could destroy food and water resources in some communities while other communities are left unaffected both during periods of peaceful and non-peaceful interactions). These complexities can be untangled but in cases where there is little to no evidence of pathological incidences of violence or material remains of weapons they might be missed entirely. Mortuary analyses have further explored issues of the distance from home villages and the effects of larger raids and attacks on the likelihood of burial of victims of violence by community members (Parker Pearson 1999; Willey et al. 1997; Zimmerman 1997; Zimmerman et al. 1981). At Crow Creek, it was evident in the level of bone disarticulation and because of the presence of evidence of carnivore activity that some time had passed between the death and subsequent burial of individuals who were killed during a violent—likely a raid—event (Willey et al. 1997:516; Zimmerman 1997:82–83; Zimmerman et al. 1981). There is also a body research focused on the relationships of the deceased with those whom may have buried them and how these relationships may result in differences in burial modes that is useful to consider in these discussions (Parker Pearson 1999).

One of the most interesting points in this current discussion is that it allows us to challenge the assumption that women and children are typically less affected directly by the acts of warfare and violence. It enables to look at the modern context where examples include cases of women and even children not only as victims of these events but also at times perpetuating acts of violence even as soldiers or armed combatants. We can also see as new identities are being created (Malkki 1995), such as victim identities among families and ethnic groups targeted in these acts that include men, women, and children fulfilling similar roles to each other as they are trying to flee to safety, as recently occurred among the Yazidi of Iraq. Many of us may want to imagine current events like those in Syria, Iraq, and Gaza, where civilian casualties at times exceed the military casualties or include behaviors that fall under the categories of torture, humiliation, and attempts to terrorize local populations, as isolated and distant rarities, and this desired assumption is imagined for the past encounters of violence. The involvement of women and children in acts of violence and specifically in combat situations seems at times overlooked and under-

valued or they are painted as passive, accidental, or as collateral casualties (Redfern 2013:69). In these cases we are continuing to perpetuate the assumption that most women and children are typically noncombatants though they too can be killed during war events. For instance, at the Norris Farm site in Central Illinois, Milner et al. (1991) reported that males, females, and children were scalped and/or killed during raids and attacks on work parties who were distanced from the village. Throughout the Middle Missouri Valley women were actually nearly equally scalped compared to their male counterparts and all scalps were recognized as significant trophies (Bruhns and Stothert 1999:261). This seems to be a common pattern found in raiding type events where females and children might be included as victims more than generally expected in other combat events (Meyer et al. 2009:421) but these type of scenarios which might be more easily detected archaeologically, especially if they occur at or near villages, may unintentionally reinforce this view. This is because not only do they often seem one-sided (we often cannot reconstruct with complete confidence whom the attackers were, nor can we necessarily identify the myriad root causes that often motivate these events) but because in these raiding scenarios often the elements of surprise and speed might guide the potential outcome, attacks may be planned for times where portions of the population who might be the most able-bodied (of all sexes) are off-site. We should not assume that it was just males who would potentially engaged in these lethal behaviors, even if that is apparently true in many cases—instead we should perhaps recognize that in particular contexts cultures might enable or even encourage the direct participation of all whom are willing (or coerced)—without age, gender, or sex restrictions—in acts of violence and war. Particularly tumultuous times might change the expectation and participation level of individuals who might actively engage in violent events, as Redfern's (2013) discussion of Southern England during the Iron Age period of Roman conquest; here the bioarchaeological evidence supports the argument that overall females may have experienced lower participation rates in violent events but that certain circumstances were flexible to their increased participation. The participation of specific members of populations in these behaviors is no doubt both culturally and situationally mitigated, and Redfern's (2013) example should not be assumed to be an isolated exception.

## Engendering the Past and Deciphering Intersections in Forms of Violence

Positionality and aspects of identity like gender, socioeconomic and sociopolitical status, occupations, hobbies/interests, and more are often collapsed in archaeological contexts. There have been attempts to bridge these gaps; for instance, there have been attempts to engender our interpretations of the past by attempting to reconstruct contexts with a focus on gender (Bruhns and Stothert 1999; Buikstra and Scott 2009:29–34), but these bridges might further confuse and obscure the record when the Western model of gender is assumed. Again, this refocusing is in itself a



good thing; however, in Westernized models biological sex is commonly used as a proxy for gender (Buikstra and Scott 2009; Butler 2009 (1990)) and this concept guides the interpretation of these data. This model limits our understanding and reinforces the Western perspective. There is a long critique of gender and sex present in anthropological research which is largely absent in archaeological and bioarchaeological practice, though the discussions are there (Buikstra and Scott 2009:31–34; Walker and Cook 1998). This remains problematic because the range present in these categories on a cross-cultural basis is significantly reduced in the archaeological context and thus they are limited in their accessibility for reconstruction; this is the cause, but the solution should not be to simply assume (intentionally or not) that Western concepts will make do, or fit best. In other words, in the absence of depth in the culturally contextualized details we should not fall into the Westernized modes of thinking (i.e., binary models of sex and gender, economic models of mortuary contexts). In fact, the Western perspective problematically reinforces notions of fixed identities, fixed genders, binary sex (i.e., employing models which focus on biological sex in terms of reproductive potential, thus excluding or at the least severely limiting a discussion of intersexed individuals in the past), and more, that are not always understood or translatable into other cultural contexts.

Among the Cheyenne, there were multiple gender categories that went beyond simple Western binary notions of gender. Their gender categories included male, female, contrary (exaggerated masculine identity), and Halfmen-halfwomen (Hoebel 1978). Even more interestingly, these categories were not permanent and the roles and responsibilities of individuals could change over time (Hoebel 1978: 103). Individuals could choose to modify their gender constructions for a variety of reasons including economic considerations. Unfortunately, this active production of gender identities does not make it to the archaeological record as the final identities as interpreted by those who are burying the deceased are what are represented in the burial context (Parker Pearson 1999). This fluid, non-fixed construction of identity has been reported elsewhere; the Hua of Papua New Guinea, for instance, believe that the accumulation or loss of the substance *nu* in an individual's lifetime enables them to transition between the *figapa* and *kakora* gender categories (Meigs 1988, 1990). Certain behaviors and biological processes are viewed as promoting the change in personal levels of *nu* and these differences would cause individuals different access to roles, responsibilities, knowledge, and more. These are but two of many cultures that share concepts of mutable genders. Though these might not be easily reconstructed, we should not assume that genders are fixed and binary in past contexts. In the case of Cahokia's mass female graves in Mound 72, it has been noted that a minority of the individuals interred were possibly males (Thompson 2013). This does not necessarily mean that different genders were being represented though different sexes might have been included in these lethal rituals. Since gender is a cultural construction and can be created during ritual contexts, it is possible that these individuals were interpreted by culture members as holding the same gender position and/or identity though they may be sexed differently. Robert Hall (1997, 2000) writes that gender identities were mutable during certain rituals and ceremonies such as the Skiri-Pawnee Morning Star sacrifice ritual that enabled individuals



who were identified as biological males as well as those who were biological females to *become* the same gender during their participation in ritual. In other words, the identity of the participants is creatively changed throughout the performance of this ritual; therefore, the individuals' personal identities, including gender identities, are changed and muted by the imposition of a newly formed identity. Perhaps instead of referencing some of the Cahokian mass graves as "female graves" we could say that they are "feminized" when comparing them to the mass graves that are more evenly mixed in terms of sex of individuals present. Ultimately, the concepts of gender fluidity and the constructive nature of gender may be more significant than how we label these categories but the labels used should reflect flexibility, especially when attributing identities.

## **Why the Continuum of Violence Might Be Problematic: Taking a Cautionary Stance**

Though acts of violence are potentially possible for all individuals to participate in, they are constructed and valued in different ways by various cultures. These cultural constructions are not always predictable nor do they always result in the same patterns of pathological stress on the body. In fact, there are many acts of violence that fall under structural or symbolic categories that may or may not include physical elements and that may or may not be detected in an archaeological setting (Geertz 1995; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004; Ralph 2013). Among the Utku, Jean Briggs (1970) recognized acts of deflection and shunning as mechanisms used to diffuse some potentially violent occurrences from escalating to the point of a non-sanctioned verbal or developing into a physical altercation. Even in cultures that accept some acts of physical violence as a resolution to conflict, certain actions may be considered more or less acceptable based on the culturally contextualized beliefs and understandings of these behaviors (Ralph 2013). In other words, cultures not only inform the meanings attributed to specific acts of violence but may also mitigate how these actions are expressed in some circumstances. In order to gain a full understanding of the past, we would have to know how specific cultures construct acts of violence and which ranges are seen as legitimate and which are prohibited—this really is out of our reach, however, we can discuss potential scenarios that are informed by the ranges in behaviors and beliefs that we can encounter modernly. We should be reluctant to assume that modern concepts apply universally. Ultimately, differences in the conceptualization and performance of acts of violence matter and they should not be dismissed nor assumed to correspond directly to the experiences of modern peoples. The continuum of violence that Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois (2004:1) define recognizes that physical violence is just one dimension in a diverse array of actions that include structural and symbolic acts of violence. Since the physical dimension is typically the predominant dimension that can survive the annals of time, for bioarchaeologists trying to apply this model they would need to specifically consider how to include (when possible) the structural and symbolic dimensions.

Furthermore, though there have been studies that link some aspects of violence with potential future acts, and these may be identified as individual, family, peer/school, and neighborhood/community risk factors (Eller 2006:14–15), these risks are culturally bounded constructions. Perhaps they apply in a wide range of modern cultural contexts but their relevance and thus usefulness may not extend to all cultures. As with the concepts of gender/sex and interpretations about age categories (Buikstra and Scott 2009), if we try to create a model of past behavior using the concept of a continuum of violence, we may simply be applying a continuum that may be appropriate in some modern cultural contexts that has little relevance in other cultures, both modern and ancient.

## Conclusion

Despite ongoing efforts to engender the past, as well as the efforts to understand the range and individual contexts of acts of violence, the nature of the archaeological and bioarchaeological records is such that it lacks the information that can be provided through ethnographic methods, which might also be included in some historical accounts. Though we are not able to reconstruct with absolute certainty the specific meaning behind acts of violence, nor can we fully reconstruct gender identities and roles in the past, we equally should not assume that they were constructed and valued the same as in the modern Western experience. We should strive to consider the potential range in the expression of these data while accepting the reality that a slight shift in definition of terminology applied can disrupt some models. It is promising to see such strong interests in multi-subfield and multidisciplinary approaches to the topic of violence, as well the topics of gender and sex and life courses. I believe that this will have a positive benefit for all fields that explore these questions from their nuanced perspectives by being more inclusive and allowing the variations that exist in these areas be expressed as fully and deeply as possible.

**Acknowledgements** A special thanks to Debra Martin and Caryn Tegtmeier for organizing this volume and inviting my contribution.

## References

- Ambrose, S. H., Buikstra, J. E., & Krueger, H. W. (2003). Status and gender differences in diet at mound 72, Cahokia, revealed by isotopic analysis of bone. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 22(3), 217–226.
- Bornstein, A. S. (2002). *Crossing the GreenLine: Between the West Bank and Israel*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Briggs, J. L. (1970). *Never in anger: Portrait of an Eskimo family*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bruhns, K. O., & Stothert, K. E. (1999). *Women in Ancient America*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Buikstra, J. E., & Scott, R. E. (2009). Key concepts in identity studies. In K. J. Knudson & C. M. Stojanowski (Eds.), *Bioarchaeology and identity in the Americas* (pp. 24–55). Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Eller, J. D. (2006). *Violence and culture: A cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approach*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (1997). Violence in the ethnographic record: Results of cross-cultural research on war and aggression. In D. L. Martin & D. W. Frayer (Eds.), *Troubled times: Violence and warfare in the past* (pp. 1–20). Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Fry, D. P. (Ed.). (2006). *The human potential for peace: An anthropological challenge to assumptions about war and violence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1995). *After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goldstein, L. G. (1981). One-dimensional archaeology and multi-dimensional people: Spatial organization and mortuary analysis. In R. Chapman, I. Kinnes, & K. Randsborg (Eds.), *The archaeology of death* (pp. 53–69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstein, L. G. (2006). Mortuary analysis and bioarchaeology. In J. E. Buikstra & L. A. Beck (Eds.), *Bioarchaeology: The contextual analysis of human remains* (pp. 375–388). Burlington: Academic.
- Goodman, A. H. (2013). Bringing culture in human biology and biology back into anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 115(3), 359–373.
- Goodman, A. H. (2014). Toward deeper biocultural integration: A response to James Calcagno. *American Anthropologist*, 116(2), 406–407.
- Guilaine, J., & Zammit, J. (2005). *The origins of war: Violence in prehistory*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hall, R. L. (1997). *An archaeology of the soul: North American Indian belief and ritual*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hall, R. L. (2000). Sacrificed foursomes and green corn ceremonialism. In S. R. Ahler (Ed.), *Mounds, Modoc, and Mesoamerica: Papers in honor of Melvin L. Fowler* (Reports of Investigations, No. 28, pp. 245–253). Springfield: Illinois State Museum.
- Hoebel, E. A. (1978). *The Cheyennes: Indians of the Great Plains*. Holt: Rinehart and Winston.
- Kelly, R. C. (2000). *Warless societies and the origin of war*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Knaft, B. (1987). Reconsidering violence in simple human societies: Homicide among the Gebusi of New Guinea. *Current Anthropology*, 28, 457–499.
- Knaft, B. M. (1991). Violence and sociality in human evolution. *Current Anthropology*, 32, 391–428.
- Kozioł, K. M. (2010). *Violence, symbols, and the archaeological record: A case study of Cahokia's Mound 72*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas.
- Kozioł, K. M. (2012). Performances of imposed status: Captivity at Cahokia. In D. L. Martin, R. P. Harrod, & V. R. Pérez (Eds.), *The bioarchaeology of violence* (pp. 226–250). Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- Krohn-Hansen, C. (1994). The anthropology of violent interaction. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 50(4), 367–381.
- Malkki, L. H. (1995). *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Martin, D. L., & Frayer, D. W. (Eds.). (1997). *Troubled times: Violence and warfare in the past*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach.
- Martin, D. L., Harrod, R. P., & Pérez, V. R. (Eds.). (2012). *The bioarchaeology of violence*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Medicine, B. (1983). “Warrior women”: Sex role alternatives for plains Indian women. In P. C. Albers & B. Medicine (Eds.), *The hidden half: Studies of plains Indian women* (pp. 267–280). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Meigs, A. S. (1988). *Food, sex, and pollution: A new Guinea religion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Meigs, A. S. (1990). Multiple gender ideologies and statuses. In P. R. Sanday & R. M. G. Goodenough (Eds.), *Beyond the second sex* (pp. 99–112). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Meyer, C., Brandt, G., Haak, W., Ganslmeier, R. A., Meller, H., & Alt, K. W. (2009). The Eulau Eulogy: Bioarchaeological interpretation of lethal violence in corded ware multiple burials from Saxony-Anhalt, Germany. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 28(4), 412–423.
- Milner, G. R., Anderson, E., & Smith, V. G. (1991). Warfare in late prehistoric West-Central Illinois. *American Antiquity*, 56(4), 581–603.
- Parker Pearson, M. (1999). *The archaeology of death and burial*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Porubcan, P. (2000) Human and nonhuman surplus display at Mound 72, Cahokia. In S. R. Ahler (Ed.), *Mounds, Modoc, and Mesoamerica: Papers in honor of Melvin L. Fowler* (Reports of Investigations, No. 28, pp. 207–225). Springfield: Illinois State Museum.
- Ralph, S. (2013). The archaeology of violence: Interdisciplinary approaches. *The Institute for European and Mediterranean Archaeology distinguished monograph series*. State University of New York Press.
- Redfern, R. C. (2013). Violence as an aspect of the durotriges female life course. In S. Ralph (Ed.), *The archaeology of death: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 63–97). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Robb, J. (2008). Meaningless violence and the lived body: The Huron-Jesuit collision of world orders. In D. Boric & J. Robb (Eds.), *Past bodies: Body-centered research in archaeology* (pp. 89–99). Oxford, UK: Oxbow Books.
- Rosaldo, R. (1980). *Ilongot Headhunting: A study in society and history, 1885-1974*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rose, J. C. (1999). Mortuary data and analysis. In M. C. Fowler, J. C. Rose, B. Vander Leest, & S. R. Alher (Eds.), *The Mound 72 area: Dedicated and sacred space in early Cahokia* (Reports of Investigations, No. 54, pp. 63–82). Springfield: Illinois State Museum.
- Scheper-Hughes, N., & Bourgois, P. (Eds.). (2004). *Violence in war and peace, an anthology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Thompson, A. R. (2013). Odontometric determination of sex at Mound 72, Cahokia. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 151, 408–419.
- Trigger, B. G. (2002). *The Huron: Farmers of the North* (2nd ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.
- Walker, P. L. (2001). A bioarchaeological perspective on the history of violence. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 573–596.
- Walker, P. L., & Cook, D. C. (1998). Brief communication: Gender and sex: Vive la difference. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 106(2), 255–259.
- Willey, P., Galloway, A., & Snyder, L. (1997). Bone mineral density and survival of elements and element portions in the bones of the Crow Creek massacre victims. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 104, 513–528.
- Zimmerman, L. J. (1997). The Crow Creek massacre archaeology and prehistoric plains warfare in contemporary context. In J. Carman (Ed.), *Material harm: Archaeological studies of war and violence* (pp. 75–95). Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Zimmerman, L. J., Emerson, T., Willey, P., Swegle, M., Gregg, J. B., Gregg, P., et al. (1981). *The Crow Creek (39BF11) massacre: A preliminary report, contract DACW45-8-C-0018*. Omaha: Corps of Engineers Omaha District.

Bioarchaeology of Women and Children in Times of War  
Case Studies from the Americas

Martin, D.L.; Tegtmeyer, C. (Eds.)

2017, XIII, 187 p. 18 illus., 8 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-48395-5