

This article was downloaded by: [Tallinn University]

On: 26 March 2012, At: 04:46

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954

Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Reviews in Anthropology

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/grva20>

Twelve Timely Tales: On Biographies of Pioneering Women Archaeologists

ELISABETH ARWILL-NORDBLADH

Available online: 22 May 2008

To cite this article: ELISABETH ARWILL-NORDBLADH (2008): Twelve Timely Tales: On Biographies of Pioneering Women Archaeologists, *Reviews in Anthropology*, 37:2-3, 136-168

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00938150802038984>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

TWELVE TIMELY TALES: ON BIOGRAPHIES OF PIONEERING WOMEN ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh

Cohen, Getzel M. and Martha Sharp Joukowsky, eds. *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004. viii + 571 pp.

Breaking Ground, edited by Cohen and Joukowsky, presents biographies of twelve female American and European archaeologists who pursued fieldwork in the Old World in the late 19th and 20th centuries. Though accurately grounded in archival sources and careful citation, readers would need guidelines to theoretical and methodological issues to better understand the type of scholarly products that the various biographies represent. As explicit historiographic and gender discussions are avoided, focus is placed on these pioneers' individual experiences. The anthology provides a wide-ranging but somewhat fragmented understanding of the gendered character of the archaeological discipline.

Keywords: Archaeological historiography, early female archaeologists, gendered profession, scientific biography

PROLOGUE

On the occasion of his 75th birthday, the Swedish archaeologist Oscar Montelius (1843–1921) gave a unique interview for a daily



ELISABETH ARWILL-NORDBLADH is lecturer at the Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Gothenburg. Her research interests focus on gender studies, the Scandinavian Viking Age, and the history of archaeology. Recent publications include articles on memory and material culture and historiography of archaeology. She is currently working on a biography of the feminist and archaeologist Hanna Rydh.

Address correspondence to Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Göteborg University, Box 200, SE 405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden. E-mail: E.Nordbladh@archaeology.gu.se

newspaper. Sharing glimpses from his life, Montelius mentioned an episode as he was participating in the Archaeological World Congress in Athens in 1905. At a reception he was introduced to:

... a young lady, Miss Harriet Boyd, who was the subject of much attention, as she on her own had conducted the excavation of Gournia. When I wondered how a young, tender woman had been able to pursue such a hard task, I got the answer that she was—American. And when I expressed my astonishment that she dared to do such a thing in an environment as insecure as eastern Crete, I was eased by the following explanation: Miss Boyd, who for several years had stayed in Greece to study antiquities, had during the Greek-Turkish war at the end of the 1890s worked as a nurse in the Greek army, and for this reason the Greeks were so grateful that she in their eyes was sacred. Without any risk she could move around in the Greek world wherever she wanted. [*Aftonbladet* 1919, April 27:8, my translation]

This quote raises some reflections. An archaeological excavation was far from the common notion of the proper domain of a woman. The laconic answer that Miss Boyd was an American shows that both Montelius and his company were fully aware of the fact that issues which were allowed for women, the gendered norm, were socially and culturally situated and thereby negotiable and possible to change. Things that were difficult or impossible for a European women to pursue, were quite conceivable for an American, well educated lady, maybe because of perceptions of the New World's modern flair, or its emphasis of purposefulness, boldness, and individuality.

The quote also tells us that Boyd had been working as a nurse. That, on the other hand, suited the traditional gender role very well. Maybe Boyd herself considered it useful, that she as a nurse had an unquestionable tie to the traditional gender role when she, through her archaeological enterprise, was challenging the same role (Allsebrook 1992:95). It must have been a great advantage that she as a nurse at the front was identified as a Greek national hero (Allsebrook 1992:76–79).

The episode with Boyd also raises the question why Montelius recollects this particular memory in an interview which otherwise concerns his family background, childhood and some important personal and professional events. The simple answer can be related to the fact that Montelius seems to have been a strong supporter of women's emancipation (Arwill-Nordbladh 1987), and that he here wanted to show a remarkable example of its progress.

Finally, the quote also shows us an example of historiographic and biographical sources, which sometimes appear due to sheer serendipity. In this case an interview in a newspaper gives us information about past generations' archaeology and archaeological personalities. Sources such as letters, diaries, written memories, interviews, stories, and even material objects, with their various prospects to survive over time, have different interpretative potential and methodological approaches—factors which form biographical work (Gillberg 2003; Söderqvist 2006:100–102).

Such questions are the focus of *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. The book, edited by Gezel M. Cohen and Martha Sharp Joukowsky (2004) with an introduction by Margaret Cool Root, is an anthology of biographies of twelve early female archaeologists. The title is well chosen: we are shown the life of women who are walking un-trodden paths and are formulating their own agendas. Light is shed not only on different individuals' personal choices, but we also see how striving and purposeful actions in societies shaped by strong gender norms and clear notions of female and male practices played a role during the formative years of archaeology.

Before I discuss each chapter, I will draw attention to some aspects concerning biographical writing in general, scientific biography in particular, and scientific biography about women specifically.

ON SCIENTIFIC BIOGRAPHIES AND SCIENTIFIC BIOGRAPHIES OF WOMEN ARCHAEOLOGISTS

The biographical genre can be characterized as the life-writing of an individual, where life is interpreted against the subject's personality, her work and achievements, and her time and cultural context (Possing 2007:46). A branch within biographical writing is the "scientific biography" (Shortland and Yeo 1996; Yeo 1996). As for all biographical writings, the biographer plays a crucial role as an interpreting and editing agent. Scientific biographies are often written by researchers working within the same or a related discipline, but the genre has also been explored by scholars within theory and history of science (i.e., Keller 1983, 1985:158–176; Söderqvist 2003, 2006).

Many researchers emphasize the scientific biography's potential to increase the insights of academic disciplines (Shortland and Yeo 1996:6). Through the history of the individual, conclusions can be drawn about the historiography of the discipline. This can contribute to a positive disciplinary critique. Within archaeology this has been

stated by Givens (1992) and Murray (1999); see also Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen (1998a, 1998b), Sørensen 1998, and Gillberg's overview 2001:52, 60, 63). Söderqvist points to the multiple aims of a scientific biography. From a historiographic point of view, the scientific biography can be seen "as a method for writing the contextual history of science" (Söderqvist 2006:106). It can enlighten the process of how science is fabricated, how scientific knowledge is established, and the character of that knowledge. Another reason, deeply rooted in the biographical tradition, is to pay ones respects to an admired scientific personality or achievement: a eulogy (2006:114–116). However, Söderqvist (2006:118–121) especially endorses the ethical aspect—within the approach of *value ethics* the complexity of the specific person is acknowledged. By focusing on the choices of the complex individual and the consequences of these choices, Söderqvist (2006:120) claims "a virtue ethical theory, where moral reasoning also involves reflection about the way one lives, carves out a life course, builds a personality and character, and cultivates or wastes one's talents." The ethical aspect is also applicable to the biographer, as he or she is writing the life of another person, who is not able to reply.

There are, consequently, several reasons for highlighting individuals and scientific biographies as a research theme. However, reading the more influential archaeological historiographies (i.e., Daniel 1981; Hudson 1981; Trigger 1989) and biographical collections (Murray 1999), it appears that a majority of the sub-discipline's professionals have been male. Women's access to the genealogy of archaeology is very limited (Champion 1998; Sørensen 1998:31; Root 2004:5). Nevertheless, new research shows that women have participated in the discipline from its earliest days (i.e., Claessen 1994; Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen 1998a; Koch and Mertens 2002; Hjørungdal 2005).

Why, then, is it important to draw attention to female professionals and their work? Apart from concerns for equality, the acknowledgment of marginalized individuals and their work, and the identification of role models, arguments for writing such biographies can also be found within feminist anthropology and gender studies (for archaeology see i.e., Wylie 1996; Conkey and Gero 1997:225–228). Researchers like Harding (1991) and Haraway (1991) claim that knowledge is not neutral and hegemonic, but situated, local and plural. Therefore it is important to ask who it is that is working with the production of knowledge. This is a question of significance whenever masculinity and femininity are conceptualized as normative, opposing, of different value and status—and when research problems are defined and strategies for solutions are presented in a

one-gendered research context. If, moreover, this one-gendered context, with its experiences and priorities to localize and formulate the researchable, is part of an unproblematized, androcentric norm—which has characterized much of our research society—then the uneven gender division constitutes both a democratic and content-related problem (Conkey and Gero 1997:427) and is also a legitimate topic, to study the work of the underrepresented gender of research-society.

The standpoint that knowledge is not neutral but situated within time, place, linguistic and cultural contexts should imply that gender and feminist discussions should be of particular importance within the genre of research biography—and vice versa, as the individual's encounter with (research) society is literally situated in the gendered body. If research society includes matters that are connected to the organization and financing of its different milieus as well as to the archaeological craft, its mechanization and technological changes, then a gendered biographical perspective should bring broad, new knowledge to the history of archaeology and to the individuals working within the discipline (Nordbladh 1995:10).

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

The above are just a few of the reasons that make *Breaking Ground* such a welcome book. In the volume's 550 pages, fifteen authors present twelve women archaeologists, who belonged to the generations of pioneers both as archaeologists and as female professionals. The chapters are organized in chronological sequence based on the year of birth of the biographical subject, which has the advantage of clarity, even if a thematic organization might have been more creative.

The texts are framed by a short preface and conclusion (pp. v–viii, 554–559). These pages are unsigned, but are most likely the product of the editors. The editors are made even more invisible as they are missing in the authors' biographical statements—even if they are presented on the inner leaflet of the jacket. That is a pity, as they deserve to be made visible in this well thought-out and carefully edited volume.

The reader is guided into the text by maps over the main sites mentioned, and by a glossary of the most important scholars that appear in the chapters (pp. 561–563); the fact that about forty names are listed and only five belong to women is illustrative of the research milieu in which our twelve pioneers were to meet.

On the whole, the twelve biographies are designed in a similar way. After a short introduction to each subject—which includes family background, childhood, upbringing and course of study—follows a presentation and discussion of the subject with an emphasis on professional rather than private life. Most of the authors do this by combining chronology and theme. In general, the biographical subject is referred to by her surname, which suggests professional respect and distance rather than intimacy. A final section of each chapter contains a selected bibliography of the subject, a selection of suggested further reading, endnotes and references, and information of where the most important archival material is kept—one of the book's great strengths. The often-lengthy list of notes is proof of the authors' firsthand knowledge of the archival sources. This explicitly documentary endeavor (Root 2004:3) has been successful and it enhances the book's scientific and historical value. It will help those readers who want to go further, as much archival material is difficult to find or is subject to access restrictions. About 50 photos are included in the volume. They give the reader a face to relate to, as well as adding a feeling for time and place.

One of our twelve pioneers is French, the others are British or American. Geographically, their research concerns Egypt, the Mediterranean area, Turkey, East Africa, and Southwest Asia to Persia. Geopolitically this means areas that are situated in some of the most contested parts of the world during recent centuries, characterized by a struggle for dominance between different colonial powers, between colonizers and colonized, and between local and regional conflicting interests (Trolle-Larsen 1996; Root 2004:17; Meskell 2004). Chronologically the research ranges from the Paleolithic in eastern Mediterranean to the medieval monuments of Great Zimbabwe.

The book covers a span of 134 years, between 1851, when the oldest of the twelve, Jean Dieulafoy was born, and 1985, when Gertrude Caton-Thompson and Theresa Goell passed away. This may seem a long time period to be considered groundbreaking. But bearing in mind that the youngest, Kathleen Kenyon, was ten years old when Dieulafoy died in 1916, the biographical subjects are brought closer to each other. These women, characterized as the first and second generation of women archaeologists (Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen 1998:11, 15; Root 2004:22), first appeared when archaeology still was a nascent discipline and went forward when it was in an optimistic process towards a professional identity. They all took part in archaeology's formation under conditions that were fundamentally different from those of their male colleagues.

The Chapters

The prelude of the volume is set by Margaret Cool Root (2004), “Introduction: Women of the Field, Defining the Gendered Experience.” Root informs the reader of some of the guidelines forming the volume, explicit stating that the point of departure was the available sources. The various biographies do not represent any particular theoretical approach. It seems to have been the individual author’s own preference and choice to apply the kind of intellectual perspective towards the biographical project. Root (2004:3) characterizes this as a “documentary goal.” However, reading the subtext, it seems that Root was invited into the project at a relatively late stage. This explicitly stated non-feminist background might have been a bit uncomfortable as Root (2004:3) suggests that “any interpretative biography of any female” must, at least in a broad sense, have a political (read feminist) stance. Root, moreover, explains that she, being affiliated to the same university as some of the women who are presented in the volume, is for historical and personal reasons unable to take the role of a neutral discussant.

The tension between the neutral material-based descriptive project design and the inevitable feminist emancipatory stance a project like *per se* this means can leave the reader with an insecure and double message. Root solves this contradiction by choosing a social-historical approach for her discussion. In this she connects well to the diverse biographies. However, in spite of the subtitle of her chapter, “Defining the Gendered Experience,” Root confines the explicit gender-discussions to a descriptive approach in line with “the documentary goal” and avoids deeper gender analyses. She also leaves it to future researchers to draw conclusions for a gendered historiography (2004:29), even as she praises the volume’s potential.

A volume like this, with an openness toward the individual author and her scientific approach—an attitude which is inclusive and welcoming—needs some kind of commentary toward the disciplinary work of the research which is involved in the writing of scientific biographies. Regrettably, both Root and the editors avoid such a discussion. Biographical writing is not performed in a theoretical or methodological vacuum. Consequently, in line with the open guidelines to the authors, the biographies vary from chronicle narrative to focused presentation of specific aspects of archaeology in a life. Neither of these approaches can be considered more “right” or “wrong” than the other (e.g., Söderqvist 2006), but the reader is left without guidance in attempts to evaluate the biographies as scholarly

products. In my opinion, this explicit avoidance of theoretical and methodological issues is astonishing and the volume's weak point.

Jean Dieulafoy

The earliest of the twelve pioneers is Jean Dieulafoy (1851–1916), presented by Eve Gran-Aymerich (2004), who together with J. Gran-Aymerich has published a biographical monograph on the subject (1991). The research is based on archival material mainly kept in the Library of the Institute of France. The author has also made a close study of Dieulafoy's writings, which consist of archaeological documentation, travel reports, and historical novels.

Dieulafoy was born to a merchant family in Toulouse, southern France. She was brought up partly in a convent, learning classical and modern languages, painting, and drawing. This emphasis on languages and humanistic ideals was shared by other early female archaeologists (cf. regarding Johanna Mestorf: Mertens 2002:32; Unverhau 2002:116–117, 121; Hjørungdal 2005; regarding Amelia Edwards: Champion 1998:180; Gertrude Caton-Thompson: Drower 2004 b:352). Both male and female archaeologists working during the years when antiquarianism turned into archaeology had to shape an educational agenda of their own, in order to acquire the education, experience and practice which were to create the discipline. For female archaeologists, it might have been crucial that some of the ingredients of traditional Victorian education that were considered as parts of the conventional cultivated private sphere were well suited to development towards an archaeological scientific approach.

Dieulafoy is one of the few of the biographical subjects who married. All her life she worked with her husband, a railway engineer and a specialist in art and prehistoric architecture. The marriage was childless. In the 1880s they explored parts of Persia, investigating the ancient cities of Persepolis and Susa. Their cooperation was fundamental in their archaeological excavations, mapping, and photographic documentation (Gran-Aymerich 2004:43, 59–60, 62). During and after the late 19th century, marriage was often an obstacle to a woman's pursuit of professional work. If a married woman entered a profession together with her husband, her contributions were often hidden within the work of her husband (Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen 1998 b:14–15, Root 2004:9–10, but see Hudson 1981:1, pp. 106–107). Anick Coudart (1998:62) has sketched a different situation within the French culture. Here, from the last decades of the 19th century, the official ideology supported a married couple having a shared profession. Gender differences were a reason to “justify,

rather than reject a similarity of career path” (Coudart 1998:65). However, as Gran-Aymerich (2004:41) demonstrates, Dieulafoy did not want to accept the traditional female norm. Instead, she clearly stated that she wanted to take part in archaeology as her husband’s *collaborateur*, with the masculine ending of the word.

For scholars who study complexities within the historical constructions of gender, Gran-Aymerich’s presentation of Dieulafoy offers interesting empirical observations about her ambiguous gender identity, pursuing masculine fieldwork with her hair cut short, her masculine clothing and weaponry (pp. 37–38, 43, 49). Personal appearance seems to have been important to Dieulafoy’s perception and demonstration of her gender identity. Back in Paris, she followed the example of the author Georges Sand and the artist Rosa Bonheur and always wore men’s city style clothing (pp. 52, 56 n. 4). The elusive gender-appearance is well demonstrated by the four illustrations, which express the young girl’s Victorian femininity, the resolute explorer of Persepolis, the androgynous figure in leisurely circumstances and, possibly, a trans-gendered person gazing steadily at the viewer (Figures 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4).

One of the most interesting perspectives in Gran-Aymerich’s article is her demonstration of how the Dieulafoys’s archaeological enterprise became a pawn within the colonial project. Even if Jane Dieulafoy was an attentive and curious observer and interpreter of past worlds, she nevertheless embraced the national prestige linked to the archaeological enterprise (pp. 40–41, 45, 49, 59–60; cf. Söderqvist 2006:118). The chapter gives substantial information for those who wish to explore early archaeology’s embeddedness in nationalistic and colonial projects of ideological and economic value.

Ester Van Deman

The biography of Ester Van Deman (1862–1937) is written by Katherine Welch (2004). Van Deman’s main archaeological enterprise was the exploration of Roman brickwork buildings in order to establish chronologies. Welch’s sources are Van Deman’s own texts, archival material from several American colleges, universities, and the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and the enormous number of photographs by Van Deman herself, which are kept in the Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome.

Rooted in a Midwest American pioneer farming community, where the independence of strong women was praised, Van Deman is presented as a forceful, willful, and probably rather uncompromising personality (Welch 2004:69, 75). She got a “solid education”

(Welch 2004:70) and in 1898, as the first woman obtaining a doctoral degree in Latin at the University of Chicago, she presented her thesis about the cult of Vesta Publica.

In her biography of Barbara McClintock, Evelyn Fox Keller has shown that women who had obtained a Ph.D. commonly held the position of teacher at a women's college. McClintock chose another, less steady way, working in a laboratory as an experimental researcher (Keller 1983). Van Deman seems to have been similarly disinterested in a secure teaching position. After a few years as a teacher at Mount Holyoke College, a scholarship to the American School of Classical Studies in Rome in 1901 made it possible for her to pursue fieldwork. In Rome she was able to obtain scholarships and fellowships so that, with some U.S. interludes, she managed to remain in Rome for the rest of her life.

At the time of Van Deman's arrival in Rome, the city had been capital of Italy for thirty years and was rapidly expanding and teeming with life. Restorations and archaeological enterprises were in full swing, concentrated on the Forum Romanum, which also comprised the *Atrium Vesta*, the core of the Vestan cult. Welch (2004:71–73) emphasizes the extraordinary fact that Van Deman, as a foreigner and a woman, obtained permission to utilize this important material for her research. Welch also notes that Van Deman's approach to research differed from that of her female colleagues Eugénie Strong, Gisela Richter and Margrete Biber, who focused more on art (2004:74, see also Wehrgartner 2002). Others have taken this idea even further by suggesting that Van Deman, through her studies of "prosaic" technical aspects of Roman architecture, not only broke with a female norm but "with the entire intellectual tradition in classical studies" (Einaudi 1991b:17). In a thorough discussion, Welch (2004:87–83) demonstrates Van Deman's importance for future research.

While doing fieldwork in Rome and the surrounding countryside, Van Deman developed the use of photography for documentation and more than 3000 of her photographs have been preserved (Einaudi 1991a, 1991b; Geffken 1991). Welch (2004:91–95, 100) emphasizes the enormous historical value of these photos and she offers an interesting discussion about the motifs both from a gender perspective and in the context of Van Deman's life.

Margaret Murray

Margaret S. Drower (2004a) is the biographer of the British Egyptologist *Margaret Murray* (1863–1963). Like Murray, Drower

has worked at University College, London and she has personal memories of her subject, which come across very well (Drower 2004a:132–133). Archival material is sparse, but Drower makes use of Murray's autobiography (Murray 1963). It is interesting to note the weighting that Murray gave to certain events of her life at the expense of others that she chose to omit (Drower 2004a:115). These are about gendered responsibilities that might have rendered Murray's participation in the scholarly world more difficult. Did Murray want to repress such obstacles? As Drower contextualizes Murray's scientific production in relation to the contemporary research society she is able to demonstrate how Murray's scientific endeavors are marked by her position as the only woman in a masculine academy.

Growing up in India, educated in India, England, and Germany, Murray began her Egyptian studies at University College in London. Her teacher, Sir Flinders Petrie (Drower 1999), soon realized her pedagogical abilities, and in 1896 she was offered a position to teach the first year classes in hieroglyphs. Two years later, she became the first woman to be appointed junior lecturer, "on a salary of forty pounds a year" (Drower 2004 a:115). Murray remained in the employ of the university until her retirement in 1935.

Drower demonstrates how Murray was given a heavy responsibility, as she was teaching while Petrie every year spent several months doing fieldwork in Egypt. To her disappointment, Murray herself was allowed to join him only one season. Murray documented much of the material that Petrie brought back (cf. Gero 1985). In spite of this she managed to pursue research of her own, including fieldwork. However, Drower emphasizes her "slow promotion" as she was not appointed lecturer until 1921, senior lecturer the year after, and finally in 1924, at the age of 62, assistant professor (Drower 2004a:115). Even if Drower does not state it clearly, her text implies that Murray's knowledge and capacity was exploited by the academic world. Her economic reward was meager. Murray herself seems to have been surprised and honored when she in the early 1930s was awarded an honorary doctorate and made an honorary fellow of the college. In spite of these late acknowledgements it seems that Murray in her professional life had to fight for her position in the academic world. Within its patriarchal hegemony, her currency of negotiation was a deep scientific knowledge, an ability to work hard, and a determination to maintain her female gendered integrity. No wonder that Murray throughout her life was "a passionate feminist" (Drower 2004a:117).

Gertrude L. Bell

The complex life of Gertrude L. Bell (1868–1926) is the subject of Julia M. Asher-Greve’s chapter (2004). There has been great interest in Bell’s life, and the sources are rich. Asher-Greve mentions “eleven full biographies; three dissertations; scores of biographical articles” apart from entries in dictionaries, notifications in innumerable autobiographies, and Bell’s own letters and diaries (Asher-Greve 2004:180–181, n. 1, 2, 4–9). The presence of 260 footnotes shows that Asher-Greve really uses these sources to the full. In spite of the interest in Bell’s life, so far only limited attention has been given to her archaeological achievements (p. 142).

Asher-Greve succeeds well in describing Bell’s personality. She belonged to a wealthy family that supported intellectual ambitions. She was intelligent, beautiful, self-confident, adventure-loving, and “in constant search of challenges” (p. 152). She followed a non-curriculum educational path which included reading literature, writing, and studies under professional specialists—Samuel Reinach in Paris was her archaeology teacher for several years. She traveled widely and learned to speak eight languages.

In contrast to most of the biographies in the *Breaking Ground* volume, the structure of Asher-Greve’s chapter does not follow the time- or theme-based life chronicle. After Bell’s unusual life is presented, paying attention also to her ambiguous gender identity, Asher-Greve turns to the most dramatic and tragic event in Bell’s life: her suicide three days before her 58th birthday (see also Root 2004:19–20, 27). This gives a tension to the following presentation of Bell’s archaeological pursuit, as the reader knows that in spite of her much-loved archaeological work, which Bell describes as an “absorbing occupation” (p. 163) her scholarly endeavors were pursued against a disharmonic background.

Bell’s archaeological achievements were many. Her expeditions in Asia Minor and Syria resulted in documentation and recordings of ancient, often previously unknown architecture and texts. She published several scientific reports and included descriptions of ancient ruins and sites in her travel accounts (pp. 156–157). During World War I Bell worked for British military intelligence in Cairo; after the war she followed the military to the new headquarters in Baghdad. There she got a position as honorary director of the Department of Antiquities. She was instrumental in preparing the new Laws of Antiquities, which she saw enacted in 1924. Bell also “worked relentlessly” (p. 175) with collections in the museum of Baghdad, and

in June 1926, a few weeks before Bell took her own life, a new building for the National Museum of Iraq was inaugurated.

Harriet Boyd Hawes and Edith Hayward Hall Dohan

The two archaeologists Harriet Boyd Hawes (1871–1945) and Edith Hayward Hall Dohan (1879–1943) followed a similar path of research. Both got scholarships to study at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, and while working in Crete, and Harriet Boyd, eight years Edith Hall's senior, supported Hall in her early career. Both left fieldwork after marrying and raising a family, and both returned to archaeology, but in different ways, when their children grew older.

Vasso Fotou and Ann Brown (2004) are the authors of Boyd's biography. The rich number of sources available consists of archival material in the United States and Greece, a biography by Boyd's daughter (Allsebrook 1992) and interviews. This material is well used. The 327 endnotes are the most numerous in the whole volume. This means that first-hand information around fieldwork material is raised, but with so much information it is almost inevitable that some of it is anecdotal. The biography of Hall is written by Katherine Dohan Morrow (2004), an archaeologist and Hall's granddaughter. Morrow uses the same type of archival material as Fotou and Brown, and as Hall's near relative she is in a unique position of proximity to her subject, something Morrow uses as an asset.

In Boyd's biography, the authors emphasize her personality, with an independent, curious, active, and sympathetic mind. They also demonstrate Boyd's ability to create supportive networks, such as those from her college years, where she made friends in disciplines as diverse as botany and art, who could contribute their skills to the expeditions in Crete. She made others in Greece, where she could benefit from the support of Heinrich Schliemann's widow and even the country's queen, as well as the backup from influential archaeologists. But just as important for the success of Boyd's project in Gournia was the fact that she arrived at a politically favorable time. Her support of the Greek nation during the Turkish war meant a lot. Another fact was that Crete, autonomous from the Ottoman government since 1898 and boasting a new Antiquities Law, welcomed foreign archaeological expeditions. When Boyd arrived in Crete, the English and Germans were already established, but there were no Americans. That lacuna incited the American opinion, and the endorsement from the Archaeological Institute of America, and

later the American Exploration Society was decisive (Fotou and Brown 2004:206–208, 225; Morrow 2004: 282, 295 n. 29).

The authors show how Boyd negotiated a successful archaeological enterprise. In her own strategic way she was able to travel and conduct field-surveys, and as a foreign woman she could use her diplomatic skills to make contact with the local people and receive information about antiquities. The authors do not, however, pick up the observation that Boyd, while doing fieldwork, followed a type of cooperation that was modeled as an idealized form of the democratic government of the ancient Greek *polis* (Picazo 1998:204). This might be interpreted as indicating that Boyd explicitly wanted to distance herself from general fieldwork organization, designed after military campaigns.

In spite of Boyd's many achievements Fotou and Brown demonstrate that the research society did not fully recognize her achievements for many years. Documents in both Boyd's and Arthur Evans's archives show that Boyd's scheme of classification was of greater importance for Evans in establishing his Minoan chronology than has previously been recognized. Furthermore, it is implied by Evans's unorthodox way to present his results at the annual meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1904, that he was very eager to be the first to present a ceramic chronology (Fotou and Brown 2004:231, 267–268, n. 267, 268.). Moreover, in two major publications, one by Evans himself, not Boyd but her male collaborator was given credit of the discovery of Gournia (Fotou and Brown 2004:245). Do we here see how Boyd reached her glass ceiling?

In 1904 Edith Hall joined Boyd's excavation team. Morrow focuses her account on Hall's work in Gournia, but also gives some attention to Hall's further investigations in Greece till 1912 and her later museum work in the United States. In her description of the time in Gournia, Morrow's main sources are Hall's letters to her family. By taking direct quotes from the letters and presenting them in mostly chronological order, we are able to follow the course of the work, camp life, and relations with nearby villagers. When Hall recounts the toils and results of the excavation it gives us an impression of Hall's character: patient, balanced and diplomatic. As these attributes seem to be much needed, it indirectly implies some contrasting features in Boyd's character. Hall's analyses of part of the Gournia pottery rendered a chronological scheme, which Hall was invited to present at the International Archaeological Congress in Athens in 1905, the same congress that is referred to in the beginning of this article. This was considered a great honor (Morrow 2004:287). The same attention which, according to Montelius, encompassed

Boyd, seems not to have surrounded Hall and suggests that Hall kept a low-profile attitude.

Morrow (2004:282) concludes that Boyd's and Hall's different personalities apparently complemented each other in a positive way. These differences have also been observed by Diane L. Bolger (1994). Her conclusion is that it is important to notice how two such different characters, each in their own personal way, could contribute to the formation of the discipline and "fulfill their peculiar goals and interests" (Bolger 1994:49). Such a conclusion can be linked to the discussion by Söderqvist (2006:110) on the interaction of the personal life and science-in-the-making. (An illuminative example is bell hooks' 1990:135–143 analysis of the anthropologist Zora Neale Hurton as anthropologist and writer).

Morrow's biography, with its short, concentrated form expresses precisely the things that seem to have characterized Hall: no exaggerations, clarity and focus combined with personal strength of feeling. Biographical subject and biographical text meet in a sophisticated way.

Hetty Goldman and Theresa Goell

Hetty Goldman (1881–1972) and Theresa Goell (1901–1985) also spent part of their careers working together; Goell was a field-director at Goldman's last field season in the 1940s, and Goldman supported Goell in her Turkish project.

Goldman's biography is written by Matcheld J. Mellink and Kathleen M. Quinn (2004). As a participant in Goldman's Tarsus-expedition in 1948, Mellink has firsthand knowledge of Goldman. The sources for the biography are archival material from her education and workplaces, sponsors, Goldman's writings, and interviews with family and friends. The text is organized as a chronological narrative, covering a professional life of over 60 years. Goldman's archaeological achievements during her many years of surveying and excavating in Greece, Turkey, and the former Yugoslavia are given detailed presentations, and her scholarly results concerning chronology and ancient trade routes are highlighted.

Born in an intellectual and wealthy family with classical scholarly ideals, Goldman received after college graduation a prestigious Harvard fellowship to study at the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. Mellink and Quinn clearly demonstrate the difficulties that met the women who wanted to take part in the School's fieldwork, even a decade after Boyd's and Hall's pioneering work (p. 303; for a discussion of the gender-political landscape of

contemporary Greek women archaeologists, see Nikolaidou and Kokkinidou 1998). Goldman and her female student-colleague had to organize the excavation mainly at their own expense. These economic restrictions, which Goldman understood to result from gender prejudices, seem to have followed her over time. Her desire to pursue fieldwork for a living, almost impossible for a woman, was for a long time enabled through support from her family, and particularly her father (Mellink and Quinn 2004:303, 328–329). These conditions remained even when Goldman had clear affiliations with a university and a museum in the United States. Accordingly, Goldman seems to have taken special care to support other women within archaeology.

Among the *Breaking Ground* chapters, the biography of Hetty Goldman is one of the clearest examples of life writing as a chronological narrative. This structure brings well-organized information, and it broadens our empirical knowledge. However, as the various sources are added into a harmonizing chronicle it gives the life-course a less dynamic and complex character than most human lives indicate. Direct quotes from Goldman herself (pp. 305–306) clearly illustrate the observation that those women who were integrated in the early archaeology had to negotiate within “a system which was not designed for them” (Sørensen 1998:47); most likely Goldman’s position, as that of other contemporary female archaeologists, was more complex than this biography shows.

The biography of Theresa Goell is written by Donald H. Sanders and David W. J. Gill (2004). Their material consists of documents from archives in libraries and museums in the United States including unpublished articles, Goell’s publications, and interviews with Goell herself and members of her family.

Goell was born in New York. She gained her BA at Radcliffe in 1923, but during her studies was stricken by hearing loss, and consequently she learned to lip read and used a hearing aid (p. 483). In 1926, together with her husband and son, she moved to Cambridge, England where Goell joined classes in archaeology and architecture at Newnham College. Goell worked at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem for two years. After her return to the United States she did not pursue fieldwork until her son had grown up. She returned to archaeology, with the double disadvantage of her gender and her disability (p. 485), yet managed to pursue an extremely difficult enterprise: the exploration of the Nemrud Dagi monument in the remote Kurdish mountains of Turkey. Encouraged by her archaeological contacts in the United States and Jerusalem, she spent 25 years pursuing this laborious task, raising funds, organizing campaigns, spending seasons in the field,

surveying, mapping, excavating, and reporting the results. In the early 1960s Goell extended her research by introducing remote sensing methods by using seismic, gravity and magnetometric surveys (pp. 509–511).

While describing the work at Nemrud Dagi, a considerable proportion of Sanders and Gill's chapter consists of quotations from letters by Goell to her archaeological colleagues. This can be seen as a rhetorical device, which gives the text an authenticity and a feeling of closeness to the subject, but more importantly, it is an intertextual narrative method, for which these particular letters seem to be well suited (Hesjedal 1998:105). Written to colleagues in serious scholarly communications, Goell's personal voice in combination with her scientific information show us examples of archaeological practice during difficult circumstances. This research biography helps us to explore how science can be fabricated.

Gertrude Caton-Thompson, Dorothy Garrod, and Winifred Lamb

Three biographical subjects, Gertrude Caton-Thompson (1888–1985), Dorothy Garrod (1892–1986), and Winifred Lamb (1894–1963) come from a similar British intellectual milieu and can thus be discussed together.

Margaret S. Drower, the biographer of Murray, also writes about Caton-Thompson (Drower 2004b). The archival material about Caton-Thompson is sparse, and Drower uses obituaries, other memorial texts and Caton-Thompson's writings, especially her memoirs. Drower organizes her presentation as a chronological narrative, following Caton-Thompson's life from youth to old age. The author succeeds in explaining the contributions Caton-Thompson has made to archaeology. As she was of independent means she could create her personal educational path. After studies in Egyptology, paleontology, surveying, and Arabic, she joined Petri's Egyptian fieldwork. Over almost two decades she got the opportunity to excavate at different sites in Egypt, in various parts of the Mediterranean area, and in the Middle East. She developed a method of excavation with a careful stratigraphic registration, including geological analyses. Thus she redefined the prehistoric chronology in most of the areas where she worked (pp. 356, 358, 370–372). Her most important undertaking was the commission she was given by the British Association of the Advancement of Science, exploring the origin of the ruins of Great Zimbabwe in former Rhodesia (see also Trigger 1989:133). She was able to show that the ruins were of African origin and dated mainly to the 16th and 17th centuries.

However, Drower's biography of Caton-Thompson is not as analytical as her biography of Murray. The reason for this perhaps lies in the availability of sources—even if the archives are sparse for both biographical subjects, Murray seems to be somewhat better represented. In both cases the author draws on her subjects' own scholarly texts. Here too, Murray's material is more abundant, and her texts show a wider thematic variation. Maybe the autobiographies of the two subjects are of such different character, that they can give rise to narratives of different sorts. The autobiography as an active tool to form one's own picture of the ego for posterity, "the autobiographical reflection" (Kranz 1997:53; cf. Root 2004: 26–27) requires specific methodological considerations (Gillberg 2005). In this case the titles, *My First Hundred Years* and *Mixed Memoirs* might express such variations. When Murray's title, and in part also the content, shows a reflexive attitude toward her own life (Root 2004:27), Caton-Thompson's title points towards the event-focused narrative of the memoir-genre. Moreover, Caton-Thompson's biography seems to have an ambiguous background. The autobiography was privately printed, accessible to a chosen few as it was circulated only among friends and distributed to a small number of libraries (Drower 2004b :376). Trigger (1989:414) characterizes the work as both "perceptive intellectual" and personal, which indicates a diffuse focus in relation to a target group. That might explain this biography's partially descriptive and anecdotal form.

Ofer Bar-Yosef and Jane Callander (2004) are the authors of the biography of Dorothy Garrod. They obtained access to a recently discovered archive in Saint Germain-en-Laye, Paris (Smith et al. 1997) and material in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, Oxford, as well as other correspondence, memorial texts, and interviews with people who knew Garrod. They also use Garrod's own writings.

In 1939, Dorothy Garrod was the first woman to be appointed Disney Professor in Archaeology at Cambridge University. When Garrod 26 years earlier began her studies at Cambridge's Newnham College, women were not even allowed to take degrees there (Bar-Yosef and Callander 2004:381–382).

When Garrod was awarded her diploma with distinction in 1921, she received a two-year scholarship to study with Abbé Breuil. France led the world in Paleolithic research, and Garrod's studies of museum collections in combination with fieldwork offered her a profound knowledge, which she used and developed in other territories throughout her life. Garrod's main contribution was connected to fieldwork in Gibraltar, Palestine, Kurdistan, Lebanon, and France, her second home country. In her research, by careful

stratigraphic analysis, often including skeletal remains, she was able to bring clarity to chronology and cultural influences according to the so-called phylogenetic model of interpretation (Clark 1999). Thereby both great contact areas and specific local developments were considered. Her field of research stretched from Europe to Southwest Asia, covering periods from the early Paleolithic Tayacien to the epipaleolithic Natufien.

It is Bar-Yosef's and Callander's explicit goal to relate Garrod's life and research to its contemporary social-historical context (Bar-Yosef and Callander 2004:381). In my opinion this is done very well. One reason for this is the way they use the varied source material. They contextualize letters, interviews, field notes, and the like, creating a dynamic text. Through using Garrod's own words as much as they do, her voice comes across very clearly. The authors' basically positive presentation does not, however, prevent them from observing less flattering characteristics of the biographical subject (p. 406), but this is done with an analytical understanding. They connect their subject's achievements to today's research, especially the implications of new dating methods. This makes the article interesting not only for readers in biographical studies but also for those interested in Paleolithic research in general.

David W. Gill, one of Goell's biographers, is also the biographer of Winifred Lamb, who for many years conducted fieldwork in Greece and Anatolia (Gill 2004). Lamb was for more than 40 years associated to the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge. The author has used archives from this museum, from the British School of Classical Studies in Athens, and letters from Lamb. Gill uses the sources profoundly, with about 300 footnotes.

Like many of her British female colleagues, Lamb studied classics at Newnham. During the war she was engaged by the Naval Intelligence Department, where she worked decoding messages. Gill suggests that the methodology used might have influenced her post-war analyses of ceramics and bronzes, for example when she identified specific artists or workshops (p. 427). From 1920 Lamb was affiliated to the British School in Athens, and she pursued fieldwork, particularly in the Greek Isles and in Turkey. As a result of her knowledge in ancient artwork, Lamb was commissioned to search for objets d'art for British museums, to fill gaps in their collections, particularly for the Fitzwilliam Museum where she was Honorary Keeper (pp. 454–455).

Gill's presentation is mostly descriptive and chronologically organized. However, such a perspective gives less foundation for an analytic discussion of life and work. In spite of this remark, the article

brings us much interesting information. In my opinion, the most interesting theme is related to the politics of keeping and expanding museum collections and the antiquities trade. This is an ethical question in current debate, and in order to get an historical perspective, it is valuable to see how the profession dealt with this issue in times past (p. 454). The arguments to search for and fill “gaps” in the collections (e.g., pp. 451–452), the efforts to raise money to buy or donate specific objects (e.g., pp. 431–432, 454), the presence of a convincing forgery (e.g., pp. 447–448, 453), and the problematic situation that arose when exhibited objects had left their Mediterranean origin in an inappropriate way (p. 454); such issues, which have implications for character of museum collections today, were handled by Lamb. Because of the thorough empirical research, the chapter can also be of interest to scholars working in general anthropology and museum studies.

Reading the biographies of these three pioneers, their lives might appear personal and unique. However, by comparing experiences and attitudes, we see that the individual is involved in a creative, active, and responsible relationship between herself and the world (Söderqvist 2006:118–121). In their concluding remarks, Bar-Yosef and Callander (2004: 413–414) make such a comparative discussion in relation to their biographical subject. Through this, their chapter stands out for its acknowledgement that biographical understanding can be deepened.

Kathleen Kenyon

William G. Dever is the author of the biography of the British archaeologist Kathleen Kenyon (1906–1978), who with her excavations in Jericho and Jerusalem, became a well-known figure in the exploration of Biblical Palestine (Dever 2004). Dever himself is a prominent person within this field, and he has participated in the same research process as Kenyon. With personal memories of Kenyon (pp. 527–528, 533) and his own scholarly presence—the footnotes show that Dever’s first contribution to the debate was published in 1973—Dever’s biography of Kenyon turns to a mixture of life history and an archaeological scientific discussion.

As the daughter of Sir Fredrik Kenyon, director of the British Museum and a student of the influential Mortimer Wheeler, Kenyon’s inheritance was both privileged and burdensome. The surrounding research society had difficulties in recognizing her search for a personal identity (p. 526) and her independent development of archaeological methods (pp. 527–529). She worked in an unstable

research-political landscape, and Dever makes an elegant sketch of the never-ending complications where British, American, Israeli, and Palestinian interests had to be considered. Such matters could be the reason for some of the intradisciplinary controversies which Dever approaches, but he poses that the fundamental reason for the disputes is to be found in Kenyon's field methodology. "Careful observation of stratification in section drawing and the recordings of the raw data" (p. 527), methods that were useful in study of the British-Roman remains of Verulamium, where Kenyon got her introductory field training, could possibly be applicable in a Southwest Asian tell like Jericho, which had been excavated by others earlier, but hardly in Jerusalem and other places with complex architectural remains. Moreover, the meticulous field documentation caused problems for the analyses and publication of data (p. 535; for a less critical presentation see Holland 1999).

Acknowledging both the honor and the challenge to write about Kenyon (p. 525) Dever seems to have mixed feelings toward his biographical subject. However, he frequently emphasizes Kenyon's skill as a field archaeologist. Her Marshalltown trowel (p. 528), visible in her hand in three of the four photos (Figures 12.1, 12.2, 12.4), seems to be emblematic for Kenyon.

This biography differs from the others in *Breaking Ground* because Dever was directly involved in Kenyon's research. It is difficult to avoid the impression that Dever, in his discussion of Kenyon's archaeological legacy mainly as an opponent, takes the opportunity to evaluate Kenyon's Palestinian research. His arguments are convincing and Kenyon is no longer alive to answer them: a clear illustration of the biographer's advantage over his biographical subject.

BIOGRAPHIES AS SCHOLARLY PRODUCTS

The *Breaking Ground* volume inspires reflection concerning theoretical and methodological approaches in the genre of scientific biography. Some sentences in the preface and conclusion can be taken as a point of departure. In the beginning of the volume it is stated that the purpose of the project is to "examine the lives of these pioneers. . . , tracing their path from education in the classics to travel and exploration and ultimately recognition in the field" (Cohen and Sharp Joukowski 2004:vii). And in the conclusion it is stated that, "Now their stories have been told" (p. 554). But the writing of biographies can neither be seen as a definite nor as a finished story of a person's life—an illuminating example is the multivocal, posthumous life of V. Gordon Childe. With the perspective presented

above, the scholarly task of the biographer will be simplified, and the theoretical and methodological considerations will be made invisible. The Danish historian Birgitte Possing sees such “non-discussions as a result of a myth, that biography is just a story that starts in the cradle and ends at the edge of the grave” (my translation). Such an “evolutionary unilinearity” disregards the importance of asking questions about matter, theoretical approaches and historiography (Possing 2007:42). The collection itself is a proof of the thesis that biographers with different stances and material produce very different kinds of stories. This is also pointed out by Root (2004:2–3) in her introduction, but neither Root nor the editors address this question in a deeper way. By this I am not saying that any one of the various biographical approaches are qualitatively better than the others (Söderqvist 2006:105), but they do result in different kinds of scholarly products.

Evidently none of the biographies is an absolute example of one specific genre. However, some categorizations can be made. One genre, that of a chronicle which describes a scientific life, can be represented by the biographies of Boyd Hawes (Fotou and Brown 2004), Goldman (Mellink and Quinn 2004), Caton-Thompson (Drower 2004b), and Lamb (Gill 2004). A different stance is presented in Garrod’s biography, in which a disciplinary historiography is combined with a discussion of gender (Bar-Yosuf and Callander 2004). The biographies of Dieulafoy (Gran-Aymerich 2004) and Bell (Asher-Grave 2004) show clear inspiration from psychological methodology (cf. Söderqvist 2006:114–116). The authors of the biographies of Hall Dohan (Morrow 2004) and Goell (Sanders and Gill 2004) have focused on specific sources, rendering the authors’ arrangements and interpretations more obvious. The biographies of Van Deman (Welch 2004), Murray (Drower 2004a), and Garrod (Bar-Yosuf and Callander 2004) present a scholarly lifework drawing on a range of sources, while acknowledging the sources’ differing potential for interpretation. Dever’s (2004) biography of Kenyon can be understood as a statement in a scholarly discussion, something which in turn can be of interest for future historiography of the discipline. In all cases, the biographers express admiration for the biographical subject. According to Söderqvist (2006:114–116), this is most usual within the process of biographical production, but a theoretical awareness of the phenomena of eulogy is only touched upon by Morrow (2004:291).

Characteristics like these have not been pointed to in the introductory chapters or in the conclusion. To illustrate my thesis, I will point to an example of such “non-discussion” with joint theoretical

implications. With the exception of the Goell biography, the biographers have chosen to pay attention to the subject's childhood and upbringing. Whether a conscious feature or not, this can be attached to a traditional notion within the genre of biography that the formative years of youth were of fundamental significance for the life of the adult (Sörlin 1997:221). This perception turns the methodological approach towards the biographical-psychological field. Such features could be clarified, as they might have implications for how one builds up one's interpretation.

Still, a discussion of biographical methodologies does appear in Root's introduction (2004:26–28). She raises this question from the perspective of feminist life-writing. Feminist theorists have challenged the idea that biographical writing is consistent with scientific demands on objectivity, as biographical writing consists of complex and variable layers of subjectivity (p. 26). The biographical subject incarnates both the object of research and a person, whose individuality is supposed to be understood as veraciously as possible. In this process the biographer needs “to engage in kind of disciplined subjectivity” where “idealisation, ego distortion and transference” should be recognized (Shortland and Yeo 1996:34). Some biographers practice a research method of establishing a relationship toward the biographical subject which integrates as much empathy as possible together with a scholarly and reflexive stance (Nilsson 1997:204–206). This means that the subjectivity of the researcher is acknowledged as a scholarly method. Such contradictions might seem to challenge the objectivity of science. Root refers to the way feminists have treated such issues while developing the topic of life-writing, regrettably without connecting the discussion to any of the biographies in the *Breaking Ground* volume.

Without objecting to her overview, in this discussion I would like to highlight the significance of the biographical sources. There is a complex “triangular” relation between the biographical subject and the biographer together with her interpretation of the plural source material. This makes the traditional dual focus on the subjectivity-objectivity distinction less crucial. This is also something that Root implies, but does not discuss further (Root 2004:2, 26). However, within this “triangle” an analysis and understanding of the sources is of greatest significance. The types of sources, their variations, original context(s), archival arrangements and rearrangements, material properties—even their non-presence as erased lines or torn page—all require analysis of various levels within this corpus. This is of fundamental importance for the credibility of the result (Larsson 2001). An emphatic interpretation and organization of the sources would make it possible to situate the data

within the biographical narrative (e.g., Joyce 1994). An explicit discussion of such situating makes the subjective features of the research process more transparent, and the narrative thereby more credible (cf. Larsson 2001; Wetterberg 2007:135).

Breaking Ground offers an instructive example of an epistemological and methodological dilemma in current biographical writing. On the one hand “the explicit documentary endeavour” (Root 2004:3) and the efforts to trace and publish the lives of the archaeological pioneers is connected to a wealth of data. The data are primarily grounded in archival material, which is presented in a careful and informative way. The footnotes inform us of hosting archives, files, senders or receivers of letters, and the like. This is all sound and necessary and it is considered as a guarantee for the scientific quality, as it makes the data possible to retrieve, check, and accessible for other researchers to develop and reanalyze. This wealth of well-cited data inscribes the biographical narratives in the realm of objective science.

If, however, the biographer wants to interpret the biographical subject’s life as veraciously as possible, the data also will be situated within the narratives, not only as sources with objectively accounted references, but as plural voices with acknowledged and contested wishes, strivings, and desires. In relation to specific questions the biographer opens up the “interpreting process, where the task of the biographer is to value and organize her material in order to get a pattern as credible as possible” (Wetterberg 2007:135, my translation). Instead of harmonizing the data into a homogenous and cumulative chronicle, a more dynamic life-writing will appear, which integrates a more transparent research process. Then, the traditional subjectivity versus objectivity controversy looses some of its significance.

BIOGRAPHIES AND GENDERED HISTORIOGRAPHY, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND GENDERED BIOGRAPHIES

The subtitle of Root’s chapter is “Defining the Gendered Experience,” but in the biographies explicit gender theories have been played down (p. 4). This is perhaps understandable. It might at first seem as if a contradiction exists between biographical writing and gender-analysis: biographies focus on life from the perspective of the individual; one of the aims of gender research is to focus on features of structural character, to illuminate for example gender orders and hierarchic and normative perceptions of gender. However, it is possible to connect personal history with the conclusions of an

historical and a contextual character that a gender-perspective evokes (Sørensen 1998:47–54). And I agree with Root's statement (2004:16), that the traditional biographies of the "Great Men" of science represent an unquestioned gendered narrative in favor of an androcentric norm. A gender-critical analysis of such "normal science" life-stories would encourage deeper insight into the gendered relation between life and work.

In this anthology, fascinating empirical wealth is brought to our attention. It is stated that it is outside the scope of the book to emphasize a gendered archaeological historiography (p. 16); however, for me it is a pity not to use the rich and sometimes provocative empirical data for drawing conclusions in relation to the historiography of archaeology. A biographical collection evokes comparisons and raises theoretical questions. The abundance of empirical material can be applied to gender-sensitive observations in a discipline's historiography. I will just give one example related to economy and the organization of fieldwork. The economic funding of fieldwork was often a complicated matter, in which different sponsors, such as learned societies, museums, universities or private persons could be involved. The driving forces behind the contributions may have varied, but through their support the sponsors became involved in a public production of knowledge.

Breaking Ground documents several examples when the family of the biographical subject paid for parts of a fieldwork project. For example, Winifred Lamb's parents donated a substantial part of the costs for excavations pursued by the British School at Athens, in which Lamb participated (Gill 2004:466 n. 43). Should this be interpreted as an example of parents who are negotiating their daughter from the private sphere of the family, into the public sphere? Or is the position in the public sphere only a fiction, the economic power and decisions of the family determining this position? Or is this ambiguous position an indication that the conceptual distinction between the private and the public spheres has lost its analytical capability in this case?

The comparative stance can also help us to formulate new themes for research. I will give an example that might be well suited to the biographical genre. Many authors in the collection give some attention to the teams' residence in campsites or villages during fieldwork. The temporary home established in professional circumstances seems to have been of significance for extension of personal identity. Maybe here is an opportunity to investigate a theme of home and homemaking as a basis for individualization, sociability and emancipation (hooks 1990:41–49; Young 1997; for archaeology see Cornell and Hjørungdal 2006; Hjørungdal 2006). An observation by Root serves as a background to

this discussion. She highlights an episode in the Egyptian desert, when Margaret Murray, Hilda Petrie, and Lina Eckenstein expressed personal and creative feelings linked to the excavation and the campsite (Root 2004:21–22). Root explains this as a situation in which they were temporarily loosed from the patriarchal structures and confines of the society at home (p. 22). Being related to a professional enterprise that is inclusive toward female emancipation, the process of homemaking at an archaeological campsite might be a rewarding theme for feminist biographical studies.

The richness of sources in *Breaking Ground* opens the door to developments within biographical methodology to widen the scope of evidence. This can be linked to ongoing explorations of relations between individuals and material objects (i.e., Strathern 2004). Welch has focused on this in relation to Van Deman's photographic equipment (Welch 2004:95, 107 n. 103, 104; see also Einaudi 1991b:19–21). This can inspire reflection about the bonds that an individual may establish to material objects, bonds that sometimes are deeply personal and emotional. Such significant details or shards have been used by the French biographer Pierre Assoulin (2006; cf. Ginsberg 1980 on clues; Sörlin 1997:225; Wetterberg 2007:135). In fictional form, and with the creative privilege of a literary author, Pulitzer-prize winner A. S. Byatt (2000) has explored the biographical potential of material objects. Archaeology, with its acquaintance in material studies, can develop the inclusion of material objects within biographical methodology, thereby extending the evidence for the writing of scientific biography (Josefson 2005).

Perhaps the most intimate biographical source is the experience of the physical body (Söderqvist 2006:109). The fact that Goell was introducing remote sensing technologies can lead to a comment that might seem a bit farfetched, but which is nevertheless appropriate: maybe we here can see a deeply personal connection between life and work through Goell's own experiences of how technical aids can strengthen bodily sensibilities (cf. Hamilakis, Pluciennik and Tarlow 2002; Merleau-Ponty 2004). This might have made her realize, how a personally experienced physical and technological principle—of waves' reactions against resistance—could expand the sensibilities of archaeological practice. In order to develop the methodology of biographical writing, unconventional ideas such as these, can be studied. *Breaking Ground* offers much inspiration for such explorations.

CONCLUSION

Breaking Ground's greatest value lies in demonstrating, through highlighting the contributions of neglected and marginalized female

archaeologists, that archaeology is not, and was not even in its earliest days, exclusively a masculine enterprise. The volume achieves this with grounding in archival sources, carefully cited and thereby put at the disposition of the scholarly community. In accordance with the proposed goals, the project was successful. However, as the collection of biographies is rooted in various theoretical and methodological stances, a coherent product is lacking. To counterbalance this, the reader would have needed some guidelines around theoretical and methodological issues to better understand the type of scholarly product that the biographies represent. Otherwise, the interpretative research process by the biographer is hidden, and there is a risk of the biographical narrative being read as an unarguable fact. But just as human life is complex, the biographer as well as the reader has to recognize the complexities of the various levels within the scientific process, while pursuing the delicate and somewhat presumptuous task of interpreting the life of another human being.

In spite of these critical remarks, this volume gives an important contribution to the field of biographical writing in anthropology, of particular interest to those pursuing archaeological, feminist, and gender studies. A number of fascinating and admirable persons are brought to our attention, and thus revitalized, they can re-enter the anthropological arena in new discussions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most grateful for constructive comments and suggestions from the reviewers and the editor-in-chief of *Reviews in Anthropology*. I wish to thank Ericka Engelstad, who brought Byatt's novel to my attention. My warm thanks also to Anna Söderblom, who skillfully and with a gentle hand has improved my English. The research on which this article is based was undertaken at University of Gothenburg, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History in the framework of the AREA network, with the support of the Culture 2000 Programme of the European Commission.

REFERENCES CITED

Aftonbladet

1919 Med Oscar Montelius genom tre kvarts sekel. April 27:8.

Allsebrook, Mary

1992 *Born to Rebel: The Life of Harriet Boyd Hawes*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Arwill-Nordbladh, Elisabeth

- 1987 Oscar Montelius and the Liberation of Women: An example of Archaeology, Ideology and the Early Swedish Women's Movement. *In Approaches to Swedish Prehistory: A Spectrum of Perspectives in Contemporary Research*, Tomas B. Larsson and Hans Lundmark, eds. Pp. 131–142. Oxford: BAR International Series.

Asher-Greve, Julia M.

- 2004 Gertrude L. Bell, 1868–1926. *In Cohen and Joukowsky*, eds. Pp. 142–197.

Assouline, Pierre

- 2006 Rosebud. *Eclats de biographies*. Paris: Gallimard

Bar-Yosef, Ofer and Jane Callander

- 2004 Dorothy Annie Elizabeth Garrod, 1892–1968. *In Cohen and Joukowsky*, eds. Pp. 380–424.

Bolger, Diane L.

- 1994 Ladies of the Expedition: Harriet Boyd Hawes and Edith Hall at Work in Mediterranean Archaeology. *In Women in Archaeology*, Cheryl Claassen, ed. Pp. 41–50. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Byatt, Antonia Susan

- 2000 *The Biographer's Tale*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Champion, Sara

- 1997 Women in British Archaeology, Visible and Invisible. *In Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen*, eds. Pp. 175–197.

Claassen, Cheryl ed.

- 1994 *Women in Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Clark, Grahame

- 1999 Dorothy Garrod 1892–1968. *In Encyclopedia of Archaeology: The Great Archaeologists*, T. Murray, ed. Vol. I. Pp. 401–412. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Cohen, Getzel M. and Martha Sharp Joukowsky, eds.

- 2004 *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Conkey, Margaret and Gero, Joan

- 1997 Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology. *Annual Review in Anthropology* 26:411–437.

Cornell, Per and Hjørungdal, Tove

- 2006 *The Materialities of Home*. *In Abstracts of the 12th Annual Meeting, EAA, Krakow, Poland, September 19–24, 2006*. Pp. 92–93.

Coudart, Anick

- 1998 *Archaeology of French Women and French Women in Archaeology*. *In Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen*, eds. Pp. 61–85.

Daniel, Glyn, ed.

- 1981 *Towards a History of Archaeology*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Dever, William. G.

- 2004 Kathleen Kenyon (1906–1978). *In Cohen and Joukowsky*, eds. Pp. 525–553.

- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen, eds.
 1998a *Excavating Women. A History of Women in European Archaeology.*
 London: Routledge.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita and Marie Louise Stig Sørensen
 1998b *Excavating Women: Towards an Engendered History of Archaeology.* In
 Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, eds. Pp. 1–28. London: Routledge.
- Drower, Margaret S.
 1999 Sir William Matthews Flinders Petrie 1853–1942. In *Encyclopedia of
 Archaeology. The Great Archaeologists*, Tim Murray, ed. Vol. I. Pp. 221–232.
 Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- 2004a Margaret Alice Murray, 1863–1963. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds.
 Pp. 169–141.
- 2004b Gertude Caton-Thompson, 1888–1985. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds.
 Pp. 351–379.
- Einaudi, Karen Bull S. ed.
 1991a Ester B. Van Deman: Images from the Archive of an American
 Archaeologist in Italy at the Turn of the Century. Rome: American Academy in
 Rome.
- Einaudi, Karen Bull S.
 1991b An Archaeologist's Archive. In Ester B. Van Deman: Images from the
 Archive of an American Archaeologist in Italy at the Turn of the Century,
 Karen Bull S. Einaudi, ed. Pp. 14–23. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
- Fotou, Vasso and Brown, Ann
 2004 Harriet Boyd Hawes, 1871–1945. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds.
 Pp. 198–273.
- Geffcken, Katherine A.
 1991 Ester Van Deman—A Profile. In Ester B. Van Deman: Images from
 the Archive of an American Archaeologist in Italy at the Turn of the Century,
 Karen Bull S. Einaudi, ed. Pp. 7–13. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
- Gero, Joan
 1985 Socio-Politics of Archaeology and the Women-at-Home Ideology.
American Antiquity 50:342–350.
- Gill, David W. J.
 2004 Winifred Lamb, 1894–1963. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 425–481.
- Gillberg, Åsa
 2001 En plats i historien. Nils Niklassons liv och arbete. GOTARC Serie B
 Gothenburg Archaeological Theses no 18. Göteborg.
- 2003 Archives and Biography. In *Scandinavian Archaeological Practice—In
 Theory. Proceedings of the 6th Nordic TAG, Oslo 2001.* Jostein Bergstøl, ed.
 Pp. 292–298. Oslo: Archaeological Series Nr. 1.
- 2005 Arkeologers självbiografiska texter. In *Från Worm till Welinder*, Joakim
 Goldhahn, ed. Pp. 163–195. GOTARC Serie C Arkeologiska Skrifter no 60.
 Göteborg.
- Ginsburg, Carlo
 1980 Morelli, Freud and Sherlock Holmes—Clues and Scientific Method.
History Workshop 9:5–36.

Givens, Douglas R.

- 1992 The Role of Biography in Writing the History of Archaeology. *In* *Rediscovering Our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology*, Jonathan E. Reyman, ed. Pp. 51–66. Aldershot: Avebury.

Gran-Aymerich, Eve

- 2004 Jane Dieulafoy, 1851–1916. *In* Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 34–67.

Gran-Aymerich, Eve and J. M. Jean Gran-Aymerich

- 1991 Jane Dieulafoy. *Une vie d'homme*. Paris: Perrin.

Hamilakis, Yannis, Mark Pluciennik, Mark and Sarah Tarlow

- 2002 *Thinking through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Haraway, Donna

- 1991 *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*. *In* Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: *The Reinvention of Nature*, D. Haraway, ed. Pp. 183–201. New York: Routledge.

Harding Sandra

- 1991 *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hesjedal, Anders

- 1998 Comments on the Problem-Oriented Scientific Biography as a Research Method. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 31(2):103–108.

Hjørungdal, Tove

- 2005 *Instead of a Review: Outline and Discussion of a Book on Johanna Mestorf, a Lady Amongst 500 Gentlemen*. *Meta* 2005(4):18–37.
- 2006 *What Is in a Home? Issues of Home and Materiality in Archaeology*. *In* *Samfunn, symboler og identitet – Festskrift til Gro Mandt på 70-årsdagen*, Randi Barndon, Sonja M. Innselsett, Kari K. Kristoffersen, and Trond K. Lødøen, eds. Pp. 321–332. UBAS—Universitet i Bergen Arkeologiske Skrifter. Nordisk 3. Bergen: Universitetet i Bergen.

Holland, Thomas

- 1999 Kathleen Mary Kenyon 1906–1978. *In* T. Murray, ed. Vol. II. Pp. 481–493.

hooks, bell

- 1990 *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.

Hudson, Kenneth

- 1981 *A Social History of Archaeology. The British Experience*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Josefson, Kristina

- 2005 *Sökandet efter en tidsanda. I spåren efter Absalon*. *Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology* nr 38. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Joyce, Rosemary A.

- 1994 *Dorothy Hughes Popenoe: Eve in an Archaeological Garden*. *In* *Women in Archaeology*, Cheryl Claassen, ed. Pp. 51–66. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Keller, Evelyn Fox

- 1983 *A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

- 1985 Reflections on Gender and Science. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Koch, Julia K. and Eva-Maria Mertens, eds.
2002 Eine Dame zwischen 500 Herren. Johanna Mestorf—Werk und Wirkung. Frauen—Forschung—Archäologie Band 4. Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Krantz, Kjell
1997 Livshistoria—biografi—livsöde. In Att skriva människan. Essäer om biografien som livshistoria och vetenskaplig genre, Sune Åkerman, Ronny Ambjörnsson and Pär Rinby, eds. Pp. 43–60. Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag.
- Larsson, Lisbeth
2001 Sanning och konsekvens. Marika Stiernstedt, Ludvig Nordström och de biografiska berättelserna. Stockholm: Norstedts förlag.
- Mellink, Machteld J. and Kathleen M. Quinn
2004 Hetty Goldman, 1881–1972. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 298–350.
- Meskell, Lynn ed.
2004 Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East. London: Routledge.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice
2004 Basic Writings. Thomas Baldwin, ed. London: Routledge.
- Morrow, Katherine Dohan
2004 Edith Hayward Hall Dohan, 1879–1943. In Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 274–297.
- Murray, Margaret
1963 My First Hundred Years. London: William Kimber & Co., Limited.
- Murray, Tim ed.
1999 Encyclopedia of Archaeology. The Great Archaeologists, Vol I, II. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Nikolaidou, Marianna and Dimitra Kokkinidou
1998 Greek Women in Archaeology. An Untold Story. In Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, eds. Pp. 235–265.
- Nilsson, Ingemar
1997 Att skriva biografi: Biografins hermeneutik. In Att skriva människan. Essäer om biografien som livshistoria och vetenskaplig genre, Sune Åkerman, Ronny Ambjörnsson and Pär Rinby, eds. Pp. 201–212. Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag.
- Nordbladh, Jarl
1995 Individens i arkeologihistorien. In Arkeologiska liv Jarl Nordbladh, ed. Pp. 9–13. GOTARC. Serie C. Arkeologiska Skrifter No 10. Göteborg: Institutionen för arkeologi, Göteborgs universitet.
- Picazo, Marina
1998 Fieldwork Is Not the Proper Place Of A Lady: The first women archaeologists in Crete. In Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, eds. Pp. 198–213.
- Possing, Birgitte
2007 Et kritisk blik på biografien. Genren med de mange liv. In Med livet som insats. Biografien som humanistisk genre, Henrik Rosengren and Johan Östling, eds. Pp. 33–50. Lund: Sekel bokförlag.

Root, Margaret Cool

2004 Women of the Field, Defining the Gendered Experience. *In* Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 1–33.

Sanders, Donald H. and David W. J. Gill

2004 Theresa B. Goell (1901–1985). *In* Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 482–524.

Shortland, Michael and Richard R. Yeo

1996 Introduction. *In* Telling Lives in Science: Essays on Scientific Biography. Michael, Shortland and R. Yeo, eds. Pp. 1–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Pamela Jane, Jane Callander, Paul G. Bahn, and Geneviève Pinçon

1997 Dorothy Garrod in Words and Pictures. *Antiquity* 71:265–270.

Söderqvist, Thomas

2003 Science as Autobiography: The Troubled Life of Niels Jerne. New Haven: Yale University Press.

2006 What Is the Use of Writing Lives of Recent Scientists? *In* The Historiography of Contemporary Science, Technology, and Medicine: Writing Recent Science, Ronald E. Doel and Thomas Söderqvist, eds. Pp. 99–127. London: Routledge.

Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig

1998 Rescue and Recovery: On Historiographies of Female Archaeologists. *In* Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen, eds. Pp. 31–60.

Sörlin, Sverker

1997 Späd barndom—mogen vetenskap? Kontinuitet och kausalitet i den intellektuella biografien. *In* Att skriva människan. Essäer om biografien som livshistoria och vetenskaplig genre, Sune Åkerman, Ronny Ambjörnsson and Pär Rinby, eds. Pp. 213–232 Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag.

Strathern, Marilyn

2004 The Whole Person and Its Artifacts. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:1–19.

Trigger, Bruce

1989 A History of Archaeological Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trolle-Larsen, Mogens

1996 The Conquest of Assyria. Excavations in Antique Land. London: Routledge.

Unverhau, Dagmar

2002 Johanna Mestorf—Lebensabschnitte statt einer Biographie: Frühe Jahre und der Weg nach Kiel als Kustodin am Museum vaterländischer Alterthümer. *In* Eine Dame zwischen 500 Herren. Johanna Mestorf—Werk und Wirkung. Frauen—Forschung—Archäologie Band 4, Julia K. Koch and Eva-Maria Mertens, eds. Pp. 103–145. Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.

Wehrgartner, Irma

2002 Spurensuche: Frauen in der Klassischen Archäologie vor dem 1. Weltkrieg. *In* Eine Dame zwischen 500 Herren. Johanna Mestorf—Werk und Wirkung.

- Frauen—Forschung—Archäologie Band 4, Julia K. Koch and Eva-Maria Mertens, eds. Pp. 267–279. Münster: Waxmann Verlag GmbH.
- Welch, Katherine
2004 Ester B. Van Deman, 1862–1937. *In* Cohen and Joukowsky, eds. Pp. 68–108.
- Wetterberg, Christina Carlsson
2007 Att biografiera en kvinnlig intellektuell. *In* Med livet som insats. Biografen som humanistiska genre, Henrik Rosengren and Johan Östling, eds. Pp. 127–140. Lund: Sekel bokförlag.
- Wylie, Alison
1996 The Constitution of Archaeological Evidence: Gender Politics and Science. *In* The Disunity of Science. Boundaries, Contexts and Power, Peter Galiston and David J. Stump, eds. Pp. 311–343. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Yeo, Richard R.
1996 Alphabetical Lives: Scientific Biography in Historical Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias. *In* Telling Lives in Science: Essays on Scientific Biography, Michael Shortland and Richard R. Yeo, eds. Pp. 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, Iris Marion
1997 House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme. *In* Intersecting Voices. Dilemmas on Gender, Political Philosophy and Policy, Iris Marion Young, ed. Pp. 321–332. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.